UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 101—PART 2

FEBRUARY 10, 1955, TO MARCH 14, 1955
(PAGES 1421 TO 2858)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1955

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, as we again unite our hearts in the fellowship of prayer, may we be eager and willing to make the great adventure of trying sincerely to become the kind of men and women Thou wouldst have us be.

Wilt Thou give us the wisdom and the desire to trust and cultivate and obey those noble intuitions and instincts which Thou hast planted within our souls.

Grant that we may have more of the spirit of our blessed Lord, whose beauty of character haunts us and makes us ashamed of ourselves and fills us, however, with lofty aspirations to be like unto Him.

May we daily continue to seek and follow the ways of righteousness and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 8, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 587. An act to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic Games at Detroit, Mich.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight next Monday to file a report on H. R. 1, and that the same period of time be allowed for the filing of any minority, individual, or separate views on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

FEBRUARY 10, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER M. MUMMA,
Member of Congress.

NEW ATHEISTIC DRIVE SWEEPS SOVIET

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union today is fighting a battle for which no weapon of war has yet been invented.

It is the battle of communism against religion—the Kremlin against God.

Moscow's war on religion has been going on for more than 35 years, but the current crackdown which began last summer has been termed the most intense and best organized campaign since 1930.

The U. S. S. R.'s trump card is propaganda, and its ultimate aim, to shatter the very foundation of every church still remaining under the Soviet regime.

Thousands of Communist propagandists are spreading the doctrine of atheism from one end of the Soviet Union to the other. Communist writers are turning out new atheistic books filled with scorn against Christian, Jewish, and other faiths. Publishing houses issue stacks of antireligious pamphlets, and Communist agitators are going into the schools, homes, and factories of every town to lecture to people who have no choice but to listen.

Moscow's renewed purge on religion began last July when the Soviet newspaper Pravda sounded the keynote for the present campaign. Since the religious persecutions and crudities of the past had failed, Pravda advocated a different technique. Instead of outright insults to the church, Pravda told Communist propagandists to disguise their insults with scientific and educational theories.

Premier Malenkov was taking no chances with the type of antireligious attacks that took place under Lenin and Stalin, when priests were shot or arrested and church property was confiscated. Proving that violence only drove people to church rather than out of it, a 1937 survey by the Union of Militant Atheists showed that at least one-third of the urban population and two-thirds of the rural population still clung to religion despite the purges.

What Moscow Pravda advocated last July was shrewder, more adroit tactics. The campaign was to have a new look and a velvet-glove technique and was to be placed on a so-called high, scientific level. In this way, the Kremlin hoped to use more subtle measures to take away from the people the belief in God which they refused to give up.

Overzealous propagandists, however, deviated from the new party line. Even Radio Moscow went so far as to refer to Catholics as "verminous creatures" and "svoloch"—scum—and all religious rites were subjected to ridicule.

"Just as cheap alcohol, vodka, dulls the mind of individuals, so religion weakens and confuses them," said Radio Moscow.

"The Soviet people do not need the aid of miracles and faith in God," chanted the lesser Estonian network.

And the Soviet children's magazine, Pionerskaya Pravda, told its young readers: "Belief in God, the church, is a legacy of the aged."

The Soviet Union turned Leningrad's famous Kazanski Cathedral into a shrine to atheism, and what had been a national religious monument in the days of the Czar now boasts exhibits exposing what the Communists call the reactionary nature of religion.

Alarmed over an increase of religion among its troops, the Soviet armed services radio, demanded that soldiers be "convinced that the survival of religion is humiliating to Soviet citizens, especially to Soviet soldiers."

Other broadcasts called religion the enemy of peace and the misfortune of women. Said Radio Lutsk in the Ukraine:

Religion has put women in a subservient position in the family and in society. By viewing her as an inferior creature, unable to act independently, religion offends and humiliates women, harms her intellectual development, and hinders her participation in political and cultural activities.

And Radio Minsk was equally vociferous:

All religious institutions, and in the first place, the center of the world reactionary clergy—the Vatican—spare no efforts in order to disguise the social order of slavery, oppression, and imperialist wars. For this purpose, Catholicism, and all religious institutions abroad are extensively availing themselves of prayers, are poisoning the minds of the working people, causing them to lose confidence in themselves and are diverting them from the struggle for peace, freedom, national independence, and democracy.

The outside world listened—and was shocked. The United States Information Agency, through its news and broadcasting services, reported Moscow's latest antireligious activities to its overseas posts which, in turn, relayed the facts to the people of many countries. Obviously, this is not what the Kremlin had in mind. Abroad, Soviet propaganda blandly was assuring the world—and still does—that peaceful coexistence of communism and religion is entirely possible, and that all peoples of the U. S. S. R. are free to worship as they choose.

The Soviet regime, says Moscow in its frequent broadcasts abroad, really is not so bad as it is painted. Has it not asked for an alliance with the Catholic Church to bring about world peace? Has it not allowed a small number of Moslems living in the U. S. S. R. to resume the pilgrimage to Mecca, and has it not permitted the Russian Orthodox Church to exist with its official blessing?

The Soviet Union has, from time to time, gone out of its way to make overtures to religious groups abroad, but the political implications are clear. Moscow made a bid for Vatican support at a time when the Soviet Union was paving the way for the Communist-inspired World Peace Council which met in East Berlin last spring. It also sought to tie in the Catholic Church with the Soviet version of a ban on nuclear weapons—a version which did not get far in the United Nations.

Last June, for example, the secretary general of the Italian Communist Party, Palmiro Togliatti, urged "Catholic forces to attempt, together with the Communists, to reach concrete agreement for the solution of basic problems in the sphere of both foreign and home policies." Said the party leader: "Such agreements between Communists and Catholics are quite feasible."

The Vatican newspaper, Osservatore Romano, promptly replied that either Mr. Togliatti lived in a world of dreams, or he believed that the Catholic world has lost its senses.

Not long afterward, in a home broadcast, Radio Moscow referred to Catholics as "verminous creatures" and "svoloch"—scum.

The so-called annual pilgrimage to Mecca has been another Soviet prize conversation piece in broadcasts beamed to the Arab countries. In 1953, for the first time since 1945, and again in 1954, the Soviet regime allowed a small number of Moslems living in the U. S. S. R. to resume the pilgrimage to Mecca.

At the same time Communist Party workers in the Turkmen S. S. R. were urged by Moscow to wage unrelenting war against Islam and Moslem practices. Said Radio Ashkhabad last August:

With a view to preserving the religious poison in the minds of the backward people, the Moslem clergy call upon the religious people to fulfill the customs in connection with burying the dead, visiting the tombs, and calling the Moslems to prayer. Those who observe such demands of the Islamic religion are backward people.

In its propaganda abroad, the Soviet Union carefully omits any reference to the Shariat, the Moslem code of laws which governs the private life of the faithful. Today the Shariat no longer exists in the Soviet Union. According to the Soviet political dictionary: "In the U. S. S. R., now, the Shariat is eradicated."

Visitors who have penetrated the Soviet screen of misinformation, report some interesting facts. Last year, one English clergyman who had recently returned from the U. S. S. R. told his congregation that only 45 out of Moscow's 1,600 churches were still in operation. Canon Mervyn Stockwood, vicar of the Morrisfields parish in Bristol, England, said one church he attended had 3,000 persons jammed inside.

For the most part, and particularly since the start of the current campaign, Moscow has been careful to prevent visitors from grasping the true state of religious affairs in the Soviet Union. As proof that there is no oppression, a selected few religious leaders are invited to come and see for themselves. However, they are closely shepherded around the few places of worship kept open for the express purpose of impressing foreigners.

Radio Moscow, in an October broadcast to the Near East, found it profitable to relay this statement by an archbishop of Lebanon:

I spent a few days with the Patriarch of Moscow who stressed the great care taken by the Soviet Government for the preservation of churches, religious schools, and the academy of theology.

What the visiting archbishop did not say was that the Russian Orthodox Church is under strict Government control through the Council on the Russian Orthodox Church headed by Georgi Kerpov, who in 1945 was given the title of major general for his work in the Soviet secret police force.

Moscow agreed in 1943 to give the Russian Orthodox Church official recognition in return for a heavy price: complete subservience to the Soviet Union.

The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, the official church monthly, carefully parrots the latest party line. Even the Orthodox Church Calendar for 1954, published by the Moscow Patriarchate, indicates the increasing subservience of the church to the state and to its propaganda aims.

While Moscow continued to turn a pious front to the Western World, its latest antireligious drive was being reported by the free press and radio. This brought worldwide criticism upon the heads of the Soviet hierarchy and last November the Kremlin came to the conclusion that its propagandists had gone too far.

Since the drive was going badly, Soviet leaders began to scold their propagandists for poor taste. They did so officially on November 10, when the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee issued a decree signed by Party Chief Nikita Khrushchev.

The decree stated:

Insulting attacks against believers and the clergy can only lead to strengthening and even intensification of religious prejudices among the people. Instead, patient, well-organized scientific athiestic propaganda among the believers will help them finally free themselves from their religious errors.

At first glance, it looked as though the Kremlin had come up with a new idea in the present campaign, but to observers who have traced the U. S. S. R.'s antireligious drives from the beginning, the decree only brought a tighter Soviet grip on the church and clergy. It again directed propagandists to employ a more subtle technique instead of the direct attack, which had failed. And it reemphasized that atheism might be achieved more quickly through a shrewder campaign.

The Vatican promptly branded the decree as a tactical propaganda move to convince the outside world that the Soviet Union was softening its attitude toward religion. The United States Information Agency noted that Moscow's slanderous broadcasts had stopped. This was significant because a survey of Soviet home broadcasts for one day last September disclosed that 50 percent of the broadcasts in the RSFSR and 75 percent of those in the Ukraine dealt with antireligious themes.

One reason for the halt in broadcasts came from none other than Radio Moscow itself. A week after the Soviets shut off antireligious propaganda, Radio Moscow deplored the "claims put forward in anti-Soviet propaganda, particularly American propaganda." It was a frank admission that USIA reports on what was going on in the Soviet Union had hurt the Kremlin in more ways than it had foreseen.

Today, however, the antireligious campaign in the U. S. S. R. appears to be as strong as ever.

In the first article to appear in the Soviet Union since the decree, the central committee magazine, Party Life, pointed out that it is not a matter of slowing up the activity of antireligious propaganda, but to correct its errors. Said the magazine:

It is a matter of convincing everyone of absolute opposition between science and religion: Science is based on facts and experiments, while religion rests on nothing but fantastic inventions and Biblical or other legends. Scientific-atheistic propaganda, well carried on by the cadres, will bring out the triumph of materialist ideology and will raise the cultural level of the workers.

The magazine also disclosed that Moscow is considering putting a stop to religious pilgrimages.

It must be shown—

Said the magazine—

that the observance of rites and pilgrimages to holy places seriously prejudices the national economy, distracts thousands of people from their work, and thus undermines all work discipline.

For the first time in many years, the Kremlin is extending its attack on Christianity to include the Protestant Churches, and especially the Baptists. A recent issue of the publication, Soviet Latvia, says:

Every religious sect is an organization which preaches antiscientific, reactionary ideology. At the present time the center of the Baptist sect is the United States of America. The executive committee of the World Union of Baptists is in Washington. This is actually a branch of the State Department. The American imperialists are only too pleased to use this sect for the purpose of recruiting spies to send to the U. S. S. R.

All this propaganda, and more, is being echoed by the Soviet satellites.

The Vienna Roman Catholic news service, Kathpress, reports that the Polish Ministry for Culture has prohibited religious teaching in all Polish elementary schools. From now on, the report says, religious education of Polish children will be possible only at home or in the churches.

Recently a new Chief of the Office of Religious Cults was appointed by the Polish Government. Rome radio, viewing this as an indication that Poland is increasing its religious persecutions, said in a recent broadcast:

The Polish Government appointed Jan Izydorczyk, former Polish Ambassador in East Germany, as Chief of the Office of Religious Cults. The present chief was transferred to another post, as he was considered to be too mild toward the Polish clergy. The appointment of Izydorczyk to such an important post shows the intention of the Polish Government to increase its antireligious propaganda and religious persecutions, as the former Ambassador is in great favor with Soviet ruling circles. His duties will be to direct the activities of the antireligious office in such a way as to make the work and life of the Polish clergy more difficult, acting under Moscow orders.

The radio Rome forecast was followed by reports received from Poland which say that Izydorczyk has closed the theological faculties of the universities of Warsaw, Cracow, and Poznan.

This move limits the fields of higher theological studies in Poland to the independent Catholic University of Lublin, which was specifically protected by the church-state agreement of April 1950. The agreement allowed the Catholic University of Lublin to continue its activities within the scope hitherto enjoyed. Primate Wyszynski, however, pointed out to the Government in May 1953 that this agreement had already been violated by the closing down of the faculties of law and economics at Lublin—a move which resulted in the dismissal of more than a dozen professors.

Petrusblatt, the official Roman Catholic weekly in Berlin, reports that Catholic nuns of German origin have been forcibly driven out of their convents by officials of the Polish Government and put to work in the fields near Cracow. The newspaper also reported that Polish authorities have turned the Benedictine Abbey at Gruessay, Silesia, into a military barracks.

In Czechoslovakia the newspaper Nova Svoboda has announced that science established the fact that Jesus Christ never existed and that the church borrowed the stories about him from Egypt, Rome, and the East.

According to a Czechoslovakian priest now in Germany as director of one of the largest havens in Western Europe for refugee priests, the Roman Catholic clergy probably will die out in Soviet satellite countries in 10 to 20 years if the present pace of cold persecution continues.

Msgr. Adolf Kindermann, himself a victim of Communist persecution, views the present Communist war on religion as much more relentless and diabolically conceived than the persecution of the Christians under the reign of Roman Emperor Diocletian.

He says that of the 40,000 Catholic priests in the Soviet satellite countries before the early persecutions began, only about half remain, with most of them prevented from performing their priestly functions by imprisonment or by separation from their congregations.

As Moscow continues to pump its atheistic propaganda into the satellites the drive grows even more vicious at home. What is happening in the U. S. S. R. today speaks for itself.

The Soviets now are turning to 18th-century French philosophers to find more ammunition. The Journal of the Soviet Academy of Sciences says that a library of antireligious works will be set up and particular importance will be given to the books of Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot.

Radio Odessa denounces Christmas as a harmful survival of ancient superstitions. One broadcast said:

The church invented Christmas and imposed it upon the believers to prove the existence of the invented Son of God, Jesus Christ. There is nothing sacred and divine in Christmas and in other church festivals.

Another example of current Soviet propaganda is an article which appeared recently in the Soviet trade union daily newspaper, Trud. The paper, attempting to carry out the so-called scientific approach in the present campaign, claimed that Soviet children have split minds because they are taught religion at home and atheism in school.

Trud said that since the children are taught at school that there is no God and that religion is just superstition, it confuses them to learn otherwise at home and turns them into problem children.

The campaign concentrates heavily on youth, since Moscow is having its troubles with young people who forget their Communist training long enough to insist on church marriages and baptisms. For example, the Communist youth newspaper, Komsomolskaya Pravda, printed this lament for its young readers:

On a Sunday, Mikhail Shakh, a Komsomol (youth) member in a township of Moscow oblast, visited his married sister. She told him that she wanted to have her baby baptized in church, and asked him to join her.

Mikhail found it peculiar that he, a Komsomol member, should be asked to take part in a religious rite. He has been in the Komsomol for several years, had never been religious, and had never been in church. And now he was asked to be a godfather to a baby in church.

Writing about all this to the Komsomolskaya Pravda editor's office, he said: "Several days have elapsed since then, and I still cannot get over it. I understand that I acted wrongly. I let down the honorable title of Komsomol member."

In its editorial, Keep to the Principles, the paper says:

Yes, Mikhail, you did not act as a Komsomol member. A Komsomol member must keep to the principles, which originate in lofty, ideal consciousness and a stable, Socialist's world view, with which the Communist Party arms Soviet youth. Our world view is a Marxist and materialistic world view, the most advanced and the only scientific one.

A Komsomol member pledges himself to follow consistently the charter of the organization, which demands that its members struggle against religious prejudices and superstititions, keep to their principles always and everywhere, and serve as an example for the younger members. And what has happened now? Wanting to please your relatives, you acted not according to your principles, you made a bargain with your own conscience. You did not stand the test of making your deeds follow your conscience. You stand now before your comrades as one man in words and another man in deeds. And in our country we judge people after their deeds, their action.

In short, the Communists again have turned on the pressure against faith in God—a pressure that was relaxed during World War II. When the stakes were high and Moscow needed the support of all groups, the Soviet press was silent, religious faith was undisturbed, and the church became a matter of unfinished business—to be hauled out at a riper time. That time has come. The brief era of relaxation is at an end, and the purge of religion has begun anew.

I add a news story which tells, country by country, the fate of the Catholic clergy under the Soviets:

ESCAPEE PRIEST TELLS OF COMMUNIST PERSECUTIONS

FRANKFURT, WEST GERMANY, November 11.—The Roman Catholic clergy probably will die out in Soviet satellite countries in 10 to 20 years if the present pace of cold persecution of priests continues, Monsignor Adolf Kindermann predicted today.

In an interview on Communist treatment of the Catholic clergy, the Czechoslovak expellee told of priests being murdered and tortured behind the Iron Curtain and described Communist desecration of Catholic churches, schools, and seminaries.

Monsignor Kindermann, himself a victim of Communist persecution, is now the director of the Albert Magnus Seminary at Koenigstein, one of the largest havens in Western Europe for refugee priests from Soviet satellite countries. Formerly director of a theological seminary at the University of Prague, he was arrested by the Communists in 1946 for what they termed "high treason against the state," but escaped from prison just as he was to be sent to Siberia.

Reviewing the Communist war on religion, currently revived in the Soviet Union as a campaign to "educate the masses in scientific atheism," the priest charged that the Communist persecution of the Catholic clergy is much more relentless and diabolically conceived than the persecution of the Christians under the reign of Roman Emperor Diocletian.

He said that of the 40,000 Catholic priests in Soviet satellite countries before the persecutions began, only about half remain, with most of them prevented from performing their priestly functions by imprisonment

or by separation from their congregations. Approximately 3,000 East European priests, he said, have escaped to Germany, 350 to Austria, and 100 to other countries. He also pointed out that no Catholic priests have been ordained in Iron Curtain countries in the past 6 years, and that the education of the few young priests trained in the state-dominated seminaries has consisted more of Communist ideology than of the Catholic faith.

Here is Monsignor Kindermann's country-by-country report of the persecution of Catholic priests in Communist countries:

Albania: Archbishop Vinzens Prennushi, of Durazzo, nearly 70 years old, was tortured to death in prison when he was placed in a wooden cage studded with iron points. Monsignor Gjini, of Oroshi, and 10 of his followers were shot as he was blessing his companions and 1 of his priests was buried alive. Priests were tortured by Communists who threw them into cesspools, put salt in their wounds, and sawed off their legs. A total of 130 churches were desecrated and Catholic schools, seminaries, and cloisters were closed.

Bulgaria: Most of Bulgaria's 160 priests have by now died martyr's deaths or are at work draining marshes to build up the Communist economy. Three seminaries existed until 1949, but all are now closed.

Rumania: The Roman Catholic Church had 6 dioceses with 7 bishops and 1,400 priests. Today not 1 bishop can exercise his functions; 2 have died in prison, namely, Bishops Cisar and Scheffler; the others were imprisoned, including 85-year-old Bishop Pacher. The year 1948 brought an end to the Catholic press and schools. Since 1951 there has been one state-operated seminary at Alba Julia, where the Marxist doctrine is the major course.

Croatia: In September 1953 Monsignor Lajca Bunavic II, the bishop of Subotica, was beaten into unconsciousness by a Communist mob. Of late other bishops and priests have been drafted into the army as soldiers. Churches have been desecrated and seminaries closed.

Slovenia: 55 priests have been killed. Bishop Vovk was burned when the Communists poured gasoline on him and set him aflame. Seventy priests are in prison. One of the two seminaries has been closed. The other, at Ljubljana, conducts courses in communism.

Hungary: 19 priests have been killed. Cardinal Mindszenty was condemned to life imprisonment. Bishop Wilhelm Apor was killed by Soviet soldiers and about 350 priests live in exile. Only 6 out of 23 seminaries remain and these are under state control.

West Czechoslovakia: Archbishop Beran is in an unknown prison and auxiliary Bishop Zele, of Olmutz, has been condemned to 25 years' imprisonment. All but one seminary, now under state control, have been closed.

Slovakia: All religious priests are in prison or concentration camps and 600 secular priests have been deported. Nearly 150 priests have died in exile. One state-controlled seminary still exists.

Poland: Cardinal Wyszynski and 8 other bishops have been imprisoned, 37 have been killed, and the fate of 260 others is unknown. A total of 360 priests have been deported, 700 have been imprisoned, and more than 800 secular priests have escaped to other countries. Since 1952, 59 seminaries have been closed.

Lithuania: Bishop Matulionis, of Katsedorys, died in prison; Monsignor Borisevicius, of Telsias, was condemned to death; three other bishops were exiled. Every priest is suspected of being an "enemy of the state." Monasteries and seminaries were closed because the Communists said they were "revolutionary nests." The most beautiful cloister in Lithuania, Pazauseis, was converted into an insane asylum.

Ukrainia: All of the country's 10 bishops have been sent to concentration camps and 6 have died. Most of the former 3,000 priests are in concentration camps southeast of Moscow and about 400 were able to escape to the outside world. All seminaries have been dissolved. The Holy See and the Roman Catholic clergy are considered the worst enemies of the state.

Latvia: Only one bishop remains. Nearly all the priests have been condemned to forced-labor camps. Some have been exiled and 10 have been killed. Priest Gladislav Litaunieks had a crown of thorns placed on his head by Soviet soldiers. The country has one state-controlled seminary.

Estonia: This country no longer has a Catholic bishop. It is problematical whether any priests remain.

Soviet Union: Only two Catholic priests remain: The chaplain of the American Embassy in Moscow, who is not permitted any contact with civilians, and the priest attached to the Church of St. Louis in Moscow. The other bishops and priests have been in concentration camps for years, many of them since 1927.

HOUSING FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to addres the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that associated together as cosponsors are 12 members of the Banking and Currency Committee and 1 former member in a legislative effort to give relief to the senior citizens of our country in the matter of housing, specially constructed for the greater convenience of the aging, and within the financial means of those who have passed the productive period of life and at the best have little more than retirement pensions usually running not more than $100 to $150 a month.

It is a new approach in the field of public housing which we trust will have sympathetic study by all the Members of this body. We bespeak also sympathetic study and cooperation by those in private industry, also of course by the churches, the civic groups, the press, and the public.

It well may be that the bill which we are sponsoring after study will need changes both as to form and policy. We will appreciate your suggestions to the end that one of the great accomplishments of the 84th Congress will be legislation assuring our senior citizens of freedom from worry in the matter of the roofs above their heads in the years of lengthening shadows.

Among the cosponsors of the bill are the distinguished gentlewomen from Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Michigan—BUCHANAN, SULLIVAN, and GRIFFITHS—who are members of the Banking and Currency Committee. Other Members sponsoring the bill are the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, the Honorable ABRAHAM MULTER, the Honorable ISIDORE DOLLINGER, the Honorable THOMAS L. ASHLEY, the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, the Honorable IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, and the Honorable CHARLES A. VANIK.

As medical science improves we have more and more older people among us. They are no longer part of large family units. A shocking number of them lead lonely and frustrated lives in houses that are too large for them and are dilapidated. These people, who once served active and useful lives in their communities, are dependent for income on small savings, inadequate pensions, and on their families. They now have no place to turn for suitable modern housing. Many who wish to pass the remaining years in continuing independence in their own homes are forced to live with children and grandchildren, welcome and beloved it is true but nevertheless in the status of charity guests.

The bill introduced today envisions homes for the aging and aged within their financial means and located in or near the communities in which their children and friends reside and dear to them from the memories of past associations.

Many of the aged are living in oversized units or in dilapidated units. A special study prepared by the Bureau of the Census in agreement with the Division of Housing Research of the Housing and Home Finance Agency shows that only 66.4 percent of the aged were living in housing in 1950 which had private toilet, bath, and hot running water. By contrast 72 percent of those persons under 65 years of age live in houses having private toilet, bath, and hot running water.

Eleven and three-tenths percent of the aged do have private toilets, bath, and cold running water, but most of them live in a dilapidated house. Twelve and eight-tenths percent of the aged had running water but no private toilet or bath, and 8.4 percent did not even have running water available to them. In addition, they find that their property continually depreciates and that they are not able to keep it in repair because of physical and financial reasons.

Not only do the aged live in dilapidated units, but usually they occupy oversize units as well. Fifty-eight percent of the aged live in houses involving 5 or more rooms although they have smaller families than households headed by persons under age 65.

The aged often experience a feeling of extreme insecurity, not because of inadequate income but because they live alone. They fear the possibility of a fall or an illness with no one to notice their illness or their failure to appear at mealtimes. As a result they lead lonely and frustrated lives. Because their families are grown and no longer dependent upon them, they often have a feeling of uselessness as well which makes life hardly worth living for them. They desire companionship; they desire a feeling of being needed; they wish security in a psychological sense just as much as in an economic sense. This is not possible unless they are housed decently.

Unhappily for them the commercial market provides practically no opportunity to secure adequate housing. The reason for the lack of housing for the aged in the commercial market is not hard to understand. The aged are relatively questionable as a mortgage risk.

Hence, there is usually a large down-payment required of them, and the only mortgage given them is a relatively short-term mortgage, with resulting high monthly payments. The consequence of all this is that only the well-to-do aged can easily qualify for a new house in the open market.

From the landlord's standpoint, many are doubtful about renting to the aged because they fear the aged may become ill and be unable to pay their bills; or the aged may require expensive medical care. He fears that they may become a very real burden upon him and require more and more of his attention.

From the builder's standpoint, the market has been so good for housing for young families for the last 10 to 15 years that he has kept busy building homes for them. He has not thought to cultivate the market for housing among the aged. From the standpoint of rental housing, speculative builders have managed to do very well building for the young bachelor person, the young married couple, and the childless couple. Why should they undertake the risk involved in building rental units for the aged?

Neither have investors such as insurance companies, thought to cater to this market. The aged are certainly not likely to develop organizations through which they can provide housing for themselves. No case of consumer cooperatives, for example, composed of the aging has ever been called to my attention. The likelihood that older persons will organize a new corporation to build housing for themselves on any general basis is very small.

Older people need low rental housing especially designed to meet their special limitations and needs. Federally financed public housing, however, has not been generally available to them because the law states that such housing may be used only for family occupancy. Administrators, knowing that one member of an older couple may die soon, have been unwilling to accept older families.

State financed public housing in New York, it is true, has set aside 5 percent of all new housing for individuals 65 years and over, without reference to their family status. Massachusetts recently established a loan fund of $15 million which is available to local housing authorities to build low-rental housing for the low-income group aged 65 and over. Already 23 communities have provided plans and have applied for these funds. Efforts of these kinds are so limited, however, that they do not begin to meet the need.

A program of Federally financed public housing for the aged as provided in the bill introduced today is the only solution for the aged with low incomes.

I pray that this body speedily will enact it into law.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday next on the subject of Lithuanian independence, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is an admitted fact that our schools are in serious trouble. There is an emergency situation existing throughout the Nation which calls for immediate Federal aid for school construction. In my opinion the President's proposal to relieve this crisis is not adequate enough to help solve this urgent nationwide problem. His proposal may be helpful for a long-range program, but it will not fill the widening gap between existing inadequacies and increasing enrollments. Practically speaking, classroom bricks should be laid immediately and thousands of new classrooms should be near ing completion before the machinery for this school-building agency plan can be put in motion.

We are in an emergency period. Urgent school-building needs throughout the country have reached tremendous proportions. The time is now for Federal aid, the need is nationwide, and Congress must heed the warnings from citizens across the country.

The President's plan does not meet our present school construction predicament which is at the critical floodtide point. It is as one of my colleagues described: "The present emergency calls for a 'Mae West' life jacket and the President threw out a lifesaver—a candy one."

Our schoolchildren in this country should not be required to wait for halfway adequate housing until the various school districts throughout the country run an impractical obstacle course, especially when many of the most needy areas will find the course impossible.

As the following editorial from the Floyd County Times dated February 3, 1955, at Prestonburg points out, this type of plan does not meet our emergency:

[The] plan to create a National School Building Authority to lend money to the States, which in turn would lend money to school districts for building, may be a matter of too little, too late.

The school districts that have reached their bonded indebtedness limit and hence the very districts that need help most, might be excluded from this form of Federal aid because they could not contract added indebtedness, no matter how long they had in which to repay it.

It is basically right to encourage local efforts, to avoid give-away programs. But when our people here at home need roofs for their children at school, that should be a matter of no great consequence, in view of millions given toward the betterment of other peoples over the world.

The President admits that we have a shortage of more than 300,000 classrooms, with needed replacements annually adding to this total. There is an additional need of 50,000 new schoolrooms per year merely to meet the enrollment increases in elementary and secondary schools.

The President's recommendations, designed to meet the needs of a 3-year period, proposed appropriations of $750 million for loans and $200 million for grants in aid to school districts which cannot raise additional funds because they have reached their bonded indebtedness.

A proposal to appropriate amounts of slightly less than $67 million per year for the next 3 years for grants to needy districts can scarcely be considered realistic. This is less than 1 day's expenditures of the Department of Defense, or 1 week's interest on the national debt. In fact, the amount is approximately equal to $1 per year for each employed worker in the country. The total amount may sound like a substantial sum, but when a country with a population rapidly approaching 170 million people cannot appropriate even $70 million to provide classrooms for school children in a real emergency, it is time to start a survey of our economy as well as of our educational system. We must equip our youth so that they can help maintain our economy and our society at steadily rising levels. This can be done only if we provide adequate classrooms and schools for their training.

The President's grant-in-aid proposal is an admission by him, according to one editorial writer:

That restrictive debt limits forbid many school districts to borrow in this fashion and that in many others "the amount of taxable property and local income is so low as to make it impossible for the district either to repay borrowed money or rent a satisfactory school building." To the impoverished districts he would make Federal grants in conjunction with the States—thus breaching, so far as they are concerned, the wall he had previously erected against Federal intervention. If direct Federal aid will not imperil the independence of communities unable to borrow, it will not imperil the independence of more solvent communities.

The President's estimate of the need for an additional 450,000 classrooms during a 3-year period indicates that he considers the current cost of school building to be at the rate of $4,000 per classroom, of which the Federal Government would provide $2,000. I do not believe that classrooms constructed at an average cost of $4,000 per room will be adequate to modernize our school-building facilities.

As one columnist emphasized the other day—Walter Lippmann, February 3, 1955:

Though we cannot solve all the problems with more money, that is no excuse for failing to meet the gross, material, obvious deficiencies which can be cured and have to be cured with money. We shall never have the chance to solve the other and higher problems of our schools if we allow them to become more and more overcrowded, if we allow the teachers to become more and more overworked, if we allow the educational community to become more and more overwhelmed and discouraged.

The President said in his message that we have an emergency situation at hand and he considers this proposal to be an effective measure to meet the situation. He has proposed a middle-of-the-road plan, calling for a 2-lane highway, when nothing short of a 4-lane turnpike could possibly handle the flow of needed emergency aid for school construction.

He has also pointed out that his plan leaves room for the additional suggestions which will come from the State and local educational conferences, culminating in the White House Conference on Education next November. His proposal, however, would involve a long-term financial agreement with the States which would take the local school districts 20 to 40 years to pay off. It may appear pennywise, but it is ill-advised and parsimonious and certainly too little, too late. Moreover, it is far more entangling than any of the current congressional bills for emergency Federal aid for school construction would be.

The President's plan is not a measure designed to combat the urgent immediate need for more classrooms. In my opinion, the plan for bond purchases and the creation of State school building agencies is a hesitant, circuitous, and inadequate way to meet a problem that requires swift action and beachhead strategy. The President's plan is not enough, soon enough to attack the stupendous problem that is currently weakening this Nation's future security. This is a national problem which must be met with energetic action in keeping with the greatness of this country's reputation. We can meet this national educational crisis far more effectively, I believe, through enacting one of the emergency bills proposed in the present Congress. I personally feel that the Hill bill, provides the proper approach. However, these bills provide for enough emergency aid to help alleviate this national problem. We need Federal aid for school construction and the need is now.

TAX ON COAL

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 7, I introduced a bill calling for the removal of an old, worn-out, moth-eaten tax of 4 percent on the transportation of coal. Historically, the reason for the existence of that tax obviously no longer exists, especially when you realize that many such taxes—and I have in mind especially the one on the motion-picture industry—are not concerned with national defense or the national economy, as is the coal industry. I have seen various administrative officials for many years shed tears about the distressed condition of the coal industry of this Nation. Yet, for no reason at all, our requests to remove this obnoxious and unnecessary impost at this time is denied. In dollars it will amount to less than $1 million. Psychologically there is no historic or economic, practical reason for this irritating tax at this time.

It is generally recognized that the coal industry is facing serious economic difficulties which have widespread implications throughout national economy as well as in the anthracite region from which I am a Representative. It is also to be noted that the anthracite industry is today a progressive, aggressive industry, facing up to its problems in realistic fashion. It is streamlining its production methods. It has developed new, modern, convenient, automatic equipment. It is now embarked on a suited industry program to market its product and improve its services. And it is successfully standing up to competition as never before in recent years. This is the kind of fighting American industry that is deserving of every consideration and certainly not to be subjected to unfair tax burdens.

I have before me a resolution adopted by the Eastern States Retail Solid Fuel Conference, representing fuel merchants from Northeastern and Middle Atlantic States. It reads as follows:

Whereas the Governors' Fuel Conference at Bolton Landing, N. Y., on July 12, 1954, and the committees of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government have highlighted the importance of a healthy coal industry to the national well-being and security; and

Whereas Congress has granted relief from wartime excise taxes to other industries, no more deserving or essential than the coal industry; and

Whereas the coal industry still bears the undue burden of a 4-cent Federal transportation tax per ton of coal, cancellation of which would contribute to the economic welfare of the coal industry; increased employment of mine workers and maintenance of those companies now in the business: It is hereby

Resolved, That the Eastern States Retail Solid Fuel Conference request the Congress of the United States to eliminate this 1942 4-cents-per-ton Federal transportation tax on coal, and relieve the coal industry of an inequitable obligation.

The motion-picture industry and others have come before this body and been granted relief from wartime excise taxes which were proving a handicap to them during a period of readjustment. I am sure their need was no greater than that of the coal industry. I know that none of them is more essential to our national economy during times of peace or more vital to our national security during times of emergency. Repeal of the 4-cent transportation tax does not mean a great deal to the Federal Government in terms of money. For the anthracite industry it will total only slightly more than $1 million. But it will mean a great deal to the retail fuel dealers and the coal-producing region. It will spur them on in their battle to stabilize a sound and prosperous industry. Up to now the legislative mills have ground slowly insofar as action to aid this industry is concerned. Not a single important remedial action was taken by the last Congress. The passage of this bill to repeal the 4-cent Federal transportation tax on coal will therefore bring encouragement to the people of the coal industry as well as financial relief. It will be encouraging for them to know that in this one instance, at least, the Federal Government has shown understanding and consideration in its attitude toward this deserving and loyal American industry.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUT ORGANIZATION

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday morning, as you yourself well know, for you were one of the dignitaries who attended the meeting and you made a short speech of welcome, I attended the annual breakfast meeting of the Boy Scouts of America.

This is the 45th anniversary of that splendid organization. It has been the custom for many years for one of the outstanding Eagle Scouts of each district in the United States to come to Washington, and to have this group present an annual report to the President of the United States. At one time they came down here and handed in a report. Then that was changed to the present method of having a demonstration, a visual report of some kind, which has become more interesting year by year. It was an inspiration to all of us who were privileged to attend. Members of the House in attendance were the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CRETELLA; the gentleman from New York, Mr. PILLION; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JAMES; the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. GREGORY; the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WINSTEAD; the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COOLEY; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JOHANSEN; the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ROGERS; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT; the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. BERRY; the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. COON; the gentleman from California, Mr. HAGEN; also the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. THYE, and the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT.

The breakfast guests heard a message from President Eisenhower, honorary president, as follows:

To the Boy Scouts of America:

Boy Scout Week gives all of us an opportunity to honor the 2,765,000 boys and their nearly 1 million leaders who make up this great organization. Self-development and service to others, independence and good citizenship, a sense of brotherhood and responsiveness to spiritual values—these qualities which Scouting fosters mean much to America. To all Boy Scouts I extend congratulations on what they are achieving and on what they promise for our Nation's future.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a special interest in the ceremonies honoring the Boy Scouts of America on their 45th anniversary, for in 1916 the group was chartered by act of Congress. The pride which the Congress has in the Boy Scouts' progress was demonstrated by the presence of

our distinguished Speaker at the annual breakfast for the 12 outstanding Eagle Scouts on last Tuesday. These young men, accompanied by the Representatives from their respective districts, presented an impressive program. Those honored were Robert G. Pilvenis, Branford, Conn.; David L. Gerwitz, Williamsville, N. Y.; Larry Hutchinson, Thornton, Pa.; Paul B. Wellford, Paducah, Ky.; Jimmy Noblin, Forest, Miss.; Alexander R. Moore, Raleigh, N. C.; Lowell Gillem, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Bruce Kent, Denver, Colo.; John R. Cookerly, Fort Worth, Tex.; Charles Braun, Rapid City, S. Dak.; Robbie Langley, Milton-Freewater, Oreg.; Lee Talbert, Taft, Calif.

An impressive report of Scout activities was presented by Scout officials, John M. Schiff, president, and Chief Scout Executive Arthur A. Schuck. They reported a total of 41,721 different projects in soil and water conservation; 38,125 projects in forestry; 29,323 projects in fish and wildlife conservation; and 30,450 activities designed to keep America beautiful by eliminating litter along roadways, parks, rivers, and streams. In an effort to arouse public recognition, Scouts built some 40,940 public exhibits and demonstrations; gave 56,678 talks at public gatherings on conservation; and distributed more than 3 million posters.

Another significant message was the official greeting signed by the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON; the Senator from Kentucky, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY; the Senator from Arizona, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN; all of whom served in the 64th Congress when the act was passed which chartered the organization. These are the only Members of the Congress which authorized the incorporation now serving in the Senate or House in the 84th Congress, and I can assure you that the appearance of our beloved Speaker to represent the Congress on this occasion drew a heartwarming response from the Scouts and their assembled friends. I am sure that every Member of the House joins in extending sincere congratulations and best wishes to the Scouts and their leaders across the country.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TELEVISING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call the attention of the membership to the subject matter I wish to discuss later this afternoon under special order. I propose to discuss the telecasting and broadcasting of House committee hearings.

I introduced a resolution—House Resolution 99—to permit telecasting which is now pending before the Rules Committee. I have also read with considerable interest the discussion of other Members of the House on this subject.

I hope the Rules Committee will consider my resolution early in this session so we may have a definite ruling on this very important question before the committees get too far into their program.

THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the public hearings which the Ways and Means Committee has been conducting on the bill H. R. 1.

In years gone by the traditional position of the Democratic Party nationally was in favor of a low tariff, while that of the Republican Party was for a protectionist tariff. I have always felt that these attitudes probably resulted from the fact that the strength of the Republican Party lay in the industrial States and centers, while the strength of the Democratic Party lay in the agricultural States of the South, which section has been throughout the years the stronghold of the Democratic Party.

As conditions have changed in recent years, the South has increased its industrial production and has made rapid strides in manufacturing, particularly in the textile field.

We can no longer feel that our interest in the tariff is based almost wholly upon our status as an agricultural section.

As we have increased industrial production, more and more of our people are in position to be affected by the volume of manufactured goods imported from other countries. Year by year the number of Georgia citizens has increased whose livelihood and income is derived from the payrolls of manufacturing and industrial concerns.

We have seen agriculture become more mechanized. We have seen more efficient methods of farming adopted. As these changes have taken place, surpluses of agricultural products have been created. The demand for farm labor has decreased, and many farmers have moved to the towns and cities to become a part of our program of industrial production.

If this industrial production is decreased now, it will, of course, mean unemployment for some who are now employed. The percentage of unemployment will depend upon the percentage of decrease in production.

In former years agriculture could always make a place for a returned farm worker. Such is not the case now with agricultural production under Government controls. The cotton farmer who is now allotted 5 acres or 10 acres—and there are many of them—can barely make ends meet for himself, and certainly cannot make a place for a son or brother who loses his job in town.

These are some of the problems which we must consider in passing upon this reciprocal-trade bill.

I have made plain my position to members of the Ways and Means Committee while this legislation was being considered there, that I would like to support the bill when they bring it out. But it is imperative that the bill contain adequate safeguards to prevent the destruction of the domestic market for our textile goods which constitute such a great part of our industrial output in Georgia, and particularly in the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to close my eyes to the possibility of disastrous consequences which may befall the thousands of Georgia men and women unless adequate safeguards are placed in this bill to protect our domestic markets against a flood of textile products from abroad, manufactured by cheap labor with which our people cannot compete. It is of the utmost importance that we take such action here as we can to assure uninterrupted production of our textile mills, a continuing market for our textile products, and continued employment for the men and women who earn their livelihood in this industry.

The Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, which made a report in January 1954, said in that report regarding tariffs and trade policy:

> We are fully aware of the arguments for free trade. It is sufficient to say that, in our opinion, free trade is not possible under the conditions facing the United States today. Even in moving toward greater freedom of trade we must consider all of the rigidities, both here and elsewhere, which negate some of the premises upon which the arguments for free trade rest. We must take into account that while the United States employs impediments to trade, primarily through tariffs and in only limited fields through quotas, other countries also employ these devices. Beyond this, they employ the quota procedure far beyond our use, and against other countries as well as against us, and also employ exchange controls and many other devices not used here.

I do not think anyone can claim that our present tariffs, duties, and quotas are unreasonable, or that they should be further reduced. The Randall Commission, which studied the question, carefully said:

> It is clear, on the evidence examined by this Commission, that, although many United States tariffs are high and many of our customs procedures are slow and cumbersome, many other United States tariffs are low, and more than half our imports enter free of duty.
>
> We fully recognize the dangers of using averages; yet it seems clear by any test that can be devised that the United States is no longer among the higher-tariff countries of the world. Taken by and large, our trade restrictions are certainly no more of a cause of payment imbalances than the rigidities maintained by other nations.

The Randall Commission recommended, on page 49 of its report, that the

President's power to negotiate trade agreements and to place them in force should be extended for not less than 3 years, but in the same sentence they recommended that this be done with appropriate safeguards. In my opinion, it is imperative that the power given to the President to negotiate these agreements should be restricted with appropriate safeguards, as recommended by the Randall Commission. I think it is important that the escape clause and the peril-point provisions should be retained in whatever extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act Congress grants. The Randall Commission likewise recommended that these provisions be retained.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I commend to the attention of the Members the following editorial entitled "Textiles and the Tariff" which appeared in the February 8, 1955, issue of the Atlanta Journal:

TEXTILES AND THE TARIFF

Georgia and its neighbor States contain the majority of the Nation's textile mills. Most of these mills are located in small communities and, frequently, are the principal support of the community. If the mills shut down, the people are out of work and the community is on the rocks.

The traditional position of the South has been for low tariff. In general, that is still the Southern position. But it is right that the people understand certain facts which concern the textile industry and, therefore, directly affect the economic structure of Georgia and the Southeast.

The chief cost in manufacturing textiles are raw materials and wages.

Raw materials can be delivered to a mill in Japan at substantially the same price as similar material can be delivered to a mill in Georgia.

But in Japan the average hourly wage paid textile employees is 13.6 cents. In the United States a textile employee is paid approximately 10 times that amount. The difference gives Japan an almost insuperable advantage.

The House Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings in Washington on a bill, known as H. R. 1, that would extend the reciprocal trade agreement program for 3 years. It also would give the President authority further to reduce United States tariffs.

The dilemma is obvious. Lower American tariffs would stimulate world trade and bolster the internal economy of our allies. But lower American tariffs might endanger certain American industries, among them the textile industry.

Opponents of the bill have pointed out that we in the United States are erecting further safeguards against lower wages in this country. They argue that this is irreconcilable with offerings of further tariff advantages to countries of distinctly low wages.

Virtually every industry has some claim to hardship in the matter of tariff, and the textile industry is not selected for especial support; but the problem of this industry is a particularly vivid and enduring problem in Georgia where textiles are so important.

The people of the State would be wise to understand the problem, whether or not they support the position of the textile men. It is a matter that directly concerns so many individual Georgians and so many communities in the State and throughout the Southeast.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

IS THERE ADEQUATE MEDICAL TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1951, the Korean war was at high tide and one of the first disappointments many of my constituents experienced was their inability, through me, to use the good offices of the House of Representatives to help gain admission for their sons and daughters to out-of-State medical or dental schools. New Jersey had neither. It does now. Therein lies the tale of this talk: "Is there adequate medical training in the United States?" I suggest that my colleagues read the following and judge for themselves:

IS THERE ADEQUATE MEDICAL TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES?

I. HOW MANY MEDICAL SCHOOLS ARE THERE IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. There are 74 approved medical schools and 6 approved schools of basic medical sciences in the United States, including 1 approved medical school in Puerto Rico.

II. HOW MANY STUDENTS ARE THEY TRAINING?

1. Twenty-seven thousand six hundred and five students were enrolled in the country's medical schools and 438 students in schools of basic sciences in 1953–54, making a total of 28,043 persons now preparing to fill the Nation's need for doctors.

2. Six thousand eight hundred and sixteen students graduated from medical schools in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1954. However, it is estimated that about 4,000 doctors are lost each year through death and retirement, so that the actual net increase of doctors was only 2,816.

III. HOW MANY APPLICATIONS FOR ADMISSION TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS ARE RECEIVED?

1. Fourteen thousand six hundred and seventy-eight individuals applied for admission to American medical schools for the college year of 1953–54.

(a) Forty-three percent of these applicants came from 6 States (New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, and California).

(b) Applicants from the following 7 States (Delaware, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Wyoming) represented only 1.4 percent of all persons submitting applications for admission to our medical schools.

(a) Among these 7 States there is only 1 approved medical school—in Vermont.

2. In contrast, a total of 20,000 individuals applied for admission to American medical schools during the college year 1951–52. This drop in the number of applications reflects three things:

(a) The increasing cost of medical school tuition is pricing thousands of potential medical school students out of the market. (New York University recently raised its medical school tuition to $1,000 a year.)

(b) The end of eligibility under the GI bill of rights.

(c) A general feeling among college graduates that it is just too tough to get into medical schools.

IV. HOW MANY OF THESE APPLICANTS WERE ACCEPTED?

1. Fifty-three percent of the 14,678 applicants, 7,489, were admitted as freshmen to the medical colleges in the United States in 1953–54.

(a) 41 percent of all first-year students in 1953–54 in the United States came from the 6 States listed above (New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, and California) in which are situated 36 percent of the approved medical schools.

V. WHAT ARE THE DIFFICULTIES ABOUT GAINING ADMISSION TO OUR MEDICAL SCHOOLS?

1. Large numbers of qualified applicants are unable to gain admittance to any medical college in this country because of geographical restrictions.

(a) Thirty-eight percent of the State and municipally owned medical colleges (15 out of 39) restrict enrollment of 1st-year students to residents of the State in which the school is located.

(b) Twenty-three schools limit the number of out-of-State residents to less than 10 percent of the positions in the entering class.

(c) Only 22 schools admit out-of-State residents in numbers equal to more than 50 percent of the positions in the entering class.

All but one of these schools is privately supported.

2. As a result of these geographical restrictions, some medical schools are forced to take nearly everyone who applies, while others can accept only 1 out of every 10 or 15 applicants.

(a) The State medical schools, because of their restrictions against out-of-State students, have fewer applicants than the private medical schools.

(b) Thirty-six percent of all applications (17,434 of 48,586) were made to the 22 schools admitting out-of-State residents to more than 50 percent of the positions in the entering class.

(c) Of the 7,489 freshmen admitted to our medical schools in 1953–54, 1,889, or 25 percent of the total, were admitted to these 22 schools.

3. The basic barrier to increasing the number of physicians is actually the limited capacity of our medical schools. This means that the proportion of students who enter medical school has remained almost constant for the past 20 years, whereas the proportion who receive a college education has more than quadrupled, and the proportion entering engineering has increased sixfold.

VI. HAS THE NUMBER OF MEDICAL SCHOOL GRADUATES INCREASED TO CORRESPOND WITH THE INCREASE IN POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES?

No.

1. In 1910, there were 4,440 medical school graduates when the United States population was about 92 million.

2. In 1954, there were 6,816 medical school graduates when the estimated population was 160,927,000.

3. In other words, since 1910 the population has increased 75 percent, yet the annual number of medical school graduates has only increased 54.5 percent.

4. Based on the generally accepted ratio of one active doctor for every 750 people, our net rise in population in 1954 demanded a net increase of 3,333 new doctors, yet our actual net increase of new doctors was only 2,816 in 1954, a deficit of 517 in 1 year alone, excluding any consideration of the existing shortage of some 20,000 doctors.

VII. HOW MANY DOCTORS ARE IN PRACTICE IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. As of December 31, 1953, the total number of physicians in the continental United States was 218,522. This includes: 156,333 engaged in private practice; 6,677 in full-time research and teaching and physicians employed by insurance companies, industries,

and health departments; 29,161 interns, residents in hospitals, and physicians engaged in hospital administration; 17,040 in Government services; 9,311 retired or not in practice.

VIII. HOW MANY MORE DOCTORS DO WE NEED TO BRING THE REGIONS OF THE NATION WITH THE LOWEST RATIOS OF PHYSICIANS TO POPULATION UP TO THE CURRENT AVERAGE FOR THE NATION?

1. The report made in 1952 by the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation stated that in 1960, in order to bring the regions of the Nation with the present lowest ratios of physicians to population up to the current average for the Nation, it would require 22,000 aditional physicians over and above the predicted supply for that year.

(a) This means that between 1952 (when this estimate was made) and 1960 our existing medical schools must train about 2,750 more physicians per year (or roughly 50-percent more medical-school graduates per year than are currently being graduated yearly in order to have these additional 22,000 badly needed physicians in 1960.

IX. HOW MANY MORE DOCTORS WILL WE NEED BY 1960 FOR REASONABLY COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL CARE FOR THE WHOLE CIVILIAN POPULATION?

1. The report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, made in 1952, stated that by 1960, the United States will need 30,000 additional physicians over and above the predicted supply for that year for reasonably comprehensive medical care to the whole civilian population, for the pressing needs of public-health services, industrial medicine, mental and tuberculosis staffs, faculties of medical schools and schools of public health, and to meet all the requirements of the Armed Forces at present mobilization levels. This estimate, however, would still leave the physician-population ratio for the country as a whole well below that which prevails in some sections of the country today.

X. HOW MANY MORE DOCTORS WOULD WE NEED BY 1960 FOR THE WHOLE NATION TO HAVE THE SAME PHYSICIAN POPULATION RATIO OF NEW ENGLAND AND THE CENTRAL ATLANTIC STATES?

1. The report of the President's Commission on the health needs of the Nation, made in 1952, stated that in 1960, in order to bring all regions of the United States up to the average physician-population ratio of New England and the Central Atlantic States, it would require 45,000 additional physicians over and above the predicted supply for that year.

(a) This means that between 1952 (when this estimate was made) and 1960 our existing medical schools must train about 5,625 more physicians per year (or roughly twice as many more medical school graduates per year) than are currently being graduated yearly in order to have these additional 45,000 badly needed physicians in 1960.

XI. HOW MUCH MONEY DO DOCTORS EARN YEARLY IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. In 1949 (latest figures available), United States doctors (excluding interns and full-time teachers) averaged $11,058 net. General practitioners of all ages averaged $8,835.

2. In 1950, the average physician earned $11,538.

3. In 1951, the average physician earned $12,518.

4. Among full specialists in independent practice in 1949, the fields in which the largest incomes were made are the following:

	Average net income, 1949
Neurological surgery	$28,628
Pathology	22,284
Gynecology	19,283
Orthopedic surgery	18,809
Roentgenology-radiology	18,540
General surgery	17,765
Obstetrics and gynecology	17,102
Neurology and psychiatry	16,476
Urology	16,370
Cardiology	15,589

5. Among salaried full specialists in 1949, the fields in which the largest incomes were made are the following:

	Average net income, 1949
Roentgenology-radiology	$12,326
Pathology	11,745
Multiple specialties	10,742
Ophthalmology-otolaryngology	10,644
Industrial practice	10,271
Anesthesia	10,034
Orthopedic surgery	9,580
General surgery	9,283
Urology	9,218
Physical medicine	8,500

XII. WHICH ARE THE LARGEST MEDICAL SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES?

The first 10 medical schools with the largest enrollments for 1953–54 are:

	State	Enrollment	Graduates
1. University of Tennessee	Tennessee	750	159
2. University of Michigan	Michigan	728	155
3. University of Illinois	Illinois	667	169
4. Jefferson Medical College	Pennsylvania	666	163
5. University of Texas, Galveston	Texas	599	132
6. Indiana University School of Medicine	Indiana	575	139
7. Ohio State University College of Medicine	Ohio	575	136
8. State University of New York, New York City	New York	573	131
9. Northwestern University	Illinois	533	136
10. Harvard Medical School	Massachusetts	531	148

XIII. HOW MANY NEW MEDICAL SCHOOLS HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED IN THE LAST 20 YEARS IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. Only five medical schools have been established since 1935:

(a) Medical College of Alabama, division of University of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala., established 1943;

(b) Southwestern Medical Foundation, Dallas, Tex., established 1943, which became a branch of the University of Texas on September 1, 1949, and changed its name to the Southwestern Medical School of the University of Texas.

(c) University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, Wash., established in 1946;

(d) University of California at Los Angeles, established in 1951, will admit its fourth class in 1954;

(e) University of Miami School of Medicine, established 1952, will admit its third year class in 1954, and plans to have all 4 years in operation by the fall of 1955.

2. There were 1,136 students enrolled in these five medical schools for the year 1953–54. There were only a total of 227 graduates in the year ending June 30, 1954, from the Medical College of Alabama, Southwestern Medical School, and the University of Washington School of Medicine. The University of California at Los Angeles Medical School and the University of Miami School of Medicine have not as yet graduated any medical students.

XIV. ARE ANY NEW MEDICAL SCHOOLS BEING PLANNED?

1. If medical-school development plans, as outlined in the Journal of the American Medical Association of September 11, 1954, are carried through, four 4-year medical schools will be added. These new schools would be:

(a) The Albert Einstein College of Medicine at Yeshiva University anticipates that progress on construction will be sufficiently rapid to permit admission of a first-year class in 1955.

(b) The University of Florida at Gainesville has received a $5 million appropriation from the 1953 legislature to develop the medical-science building that will constitute the first unit of the college of medicine. According to current planning, the school will admit its first class in 1956.

(c) A new medical school—Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry—has just been incorporated in New Jersey. It is hoped that the new college will be ready to accept students for the fall of 1955. This new college will be at the Jersey City Medical Center.

(d) University of Kentucky's board of trustees has sanctioned the establishment of a medical school in Lexington to cost about $25 million. This will not get underway constructionwise until about July 1, 1955.

XV. ARE ANY 2-YEAR SCHOOLS PLANNING TO EXPAND TO 4-YEAR MEDICAL SCHOOLS?

1. The following 2-year schools have plans to expand to 4 years:

(a) The University of Mississippi is completing the construction program of its new hospital and medical-school building at Jackson. It is anticipated that the first regular third-year class will be registered in the fall of 1955.

(b) The legislature of Missouri has appropriated $13,500,000 for the building program now underway at the University of Missouri, and it is hoped that the developmental program will permit the 1953–54 entering class to continue on into its third year of training at the University of Missouri.

(c) At West Virginia University, planning for their new medical center continues, but no definite date has as yet been advanced for registration of the first third-year class.

(d) In North Dakota, the legislature has directed that the school of medicine admit a third-year class by 1955, and that a full 4-year program be in operation by 1956.

It is impossible to predict the number of students who will graduate from these new 4-year schools and the 2-year schools planning to expand to 4-year schools in the next 6 years. For example, the University of Florida at Gainesville will only enroll 50 freshmen. This means a first graduating class of only about 45 doctors. By 1960, when it is estimated we will need at least 22,000 doctors over and above the predicted supply of new doctors graduating each year (about 6,800), most of these schools will have been able to turn out only 1 graduating class toward meeting this deficit.

XVI. HOW MUCH MONEY DO MEDICAL SCHOOLS SPEND EACH YEAR FOR TRAINING NEW DOCTORS?

1. Estimated funds available to our medical schools in 1954–55 totaled $148,645,201.

Budgeted funds and appropriations	$93,408,312
Funds for miscellaneous projects	4,978,812
Research grants from outside agencies	43,383,666
Teaching grants from outside agencies	6,874,411
Total	148,645,201

2. The $93-million estimated basic budgets of the medical schools represent an average budget of about $1,167,604 for each of the 80 schools if the money were evenly distributed.

(a) Thirty-eight schools report 1954–55 budgets of over a million dollars; six of the 4-year schools report budgets of less than $500,000, with one such school having a budget of less than $400,000.

3. Of the $93-million estimated basic budgets of the medical schools, about $18,182,000, or only 19.5 percent, of the budgets is provided by students' tuition.

XVII. WHAT ARE THE MEDICAL SCHOOLS SPENDING FOR CONSTRUCTION?

1. An estimated $110,013,846 is budgeted for capital expenditures at the present time for construction and equipment of basic medical science, hospital and clinic, dormitory and other facilities.

(a) During 1953 projects of this nature totaling $64,115,574 were completed.

2. In 1947–48 medical schools estimated a need of about $330 million for construction of facilities over and above operating-fund needs and research-fund needs. All but 4 schools out of 79 reported a need for additional or improved space.

3. The Journal of the American Medical Association of September 11, 1954, states: "Medical schools indicate that large sums are still needed for construction of new buildings, remodeling and modernization of existing facilities, and the purchase and installment of new permanent equipment."

XVIII. HAVE THE COSTS OF EDUCATING A DOCTOR INCREASED?

1. The average cost of educating one doctor has increased more than 100 percent in the last 20 years, and is estimated today at more than $13,000. Epoch-making advances in scientific knowledge in the past few decades have made the essential curricula for a medical student much more complicated and costly, as well as a steadily rising cost of living due to inflation.

XIX. HAVE THE TUITION FEES INCREASED FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS?

1. Tuition fees for resident students have increased 62 percent since 1940, and tuition fees for nonresident students have increased 76 percent during the same period. However, they pay only about one-fifth of the cost; and the fees cannot be raised without seriously narrowing the groups from which our future doctors can come.

Average tuition fees for resident students:

1940–41	$391
1953–54	633
1954–55	645

Average tuition fees for nonresident students:

1940–41	$445
1953–54	772

XX. WHAT IS THE COST TO A STUDENT FOR A MEDICAL EDUCATION?

1. The average annual expenditure by a student for 1 year of medical school in 1953–54 was $2,380, a total of about $9,520 for the entire undergraduate period. This included tuition, special fees, equipment, books, and essential living costs.

2. Minimum costs reported averaged approximately $1,690 per year, or $6,760 for the entire 4 years.

3. Of the $3,000 to $4,500 a year it costs the medical school to educate him, the medical student pays $600 to $900 a year in tuition, or about one-fifth of the cost.

XXI. IS THERE A SHORTAGE OF QUALIFIED PERSONNEL TO FILL TEACHING POSITIONS IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS? TO FILL INTERNSHIPS? TO FILL RESIDENCIES?

1. Yes. Out of 80 schools, for the year 1954–55, there were 258 vacant full-time positions. Of these 258 vacancies, 107 were in basic medical science faculties and 151 were in clinical departments.

2. In 1954, 22 percent of the 10,542 available internships in 844 hospitals were unfilled. This shortage of more than 2,000 interns is a serious crippler of hospital services throughout the county since interns are the backbone of emergency and routine medical services in many hospitals. This shortage poses a serious threat to good patient care.

3. In 1954, 21 percent of the residency appointments in the various medical specialties were not filled. Of 23,630 approved residencies in internal medicine, surgery, obstretics, pediatrics, etc., 5,011 were not taken. The resident, who takes an average of 2 years training in a specialty after having completed his internship, is a valuable and key part of any hospital staff.

4. The New York Times reports that in their 1952 nationwide survey it was found that "45 percent (of the Nation's medical schools) find it difficult to get a sufficient number of qualified faculty members."

XXII. ARE THERE SHORTAGES OF NURSES, AUXILIARY NURSING WORKERS AND TECHNICIANS?

1. Yes. According to latest available figures taken from the 1952 report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, it is estimated that the shortage of nurses for this country as a whole in 1960 may exceed 50,000.

(a) In 1951, about 27,000 nurses graduated from 3-year programs and less than 2,000 from 4- or 5-year programs which lead to a college degree. The expected supply of nurses in 1960 will not meet the increased demands of new hospitals and expanding community health services, nor will it make up present deficiencies.

(b) In public hearings before the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, community leaders pleaded for more nurses to staff their essential health services. Hospital administrators testified to large numbers of wards closed because they cannot obtain nurses to staff the beds. Mental and tuberculosis hospitals need more nurses, public health units are begging for them, industrial health programs suffer for want of them. Nursing schools and nursing education suffer from a lack of qualified teachers.

2. There are almost 300,000 auxiliary nursing workers in hospitals, and perhaps another 100,000 elsewhere. The need in 1960 for these workers is estimated at more than 450,000.

(a) Most auxiliary workers receive poor training. This training should be developed and intensified so that these workers can take over routine housekeeping and bedside tasks to release the graduate nurses to use the special skills in which they have been trained.

3. The technician shortage is a serious bottleneck in the provision of medical service. Hospitals in the United States recently reported about 18,000 vacant positions for workers in 7 major fields allied to medicine (i. e., laboratory technicians, therapists of all kinds, X-ray technicians, hospital administrators, clinical psychologists, etc.), and an expected need for 35,000 additional workers in these allied fields in another 5 years. The opening of new hospitals and the increasing demand for more comprehensive medical services will aggravate these deficiencies.

4. President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message to Congress on January 7, 1955, stated as one of his medical recommendations: "To reduce the gaps in medical service, I shall propose: New measures to facilitate construction of needed health facilities and help reduce shortages of trained health personnel."

XXIII. DO OUR MEDICAL SCHOOLS NEED FINANCIAL SUPPORT?

1. In a nationwide survey conducted by the New York Times in 1952 it was found that "30 percent of the Nation's medical schools report that they are unable to get sufficient funds to meet their operating budgets."

2. Brig. Gen. James S. Simmons, the late dean of the Harvard School of Public Health, states that the Nation's 10 schools of public health are in a precarious financial position with student tuition fees paying less than 10 percent of the cost of training these students. "The financial plight of these 10 public-health schools is such that their total output of specialists is now only one-fifth of the number needed to operate the Nation's peacetime health program."

3. The medical colleges absorb approximately 30 percent of the total budgets of the universities of which they are a part, although they enroll only 10 percent of the total university population. "Many university trustees are wondering whether they can afford their medical schools," said a recent statement of the National Fund for Medical Education.

4. In 1948, as the result of surveys compiled through the American Medical Association, the Surgeon General's Office and the Association of American Medical Colleges, the National Fund for Medical Education states that the Nation's medical schools had a deficit of $10 million and that by 1955 the deficit will probably be $20 million.

(a) The Surgeon General's committee goes even further and states that $30 million additional was needed (in 1948) in annual income to adequately perform the existing functions of our 79 medical schools, over and above the $10 million yearly needed to compensate for existing annual deficits actually on the books in red ink.

(b) None of the foregoing takes construction needs into consideration. In 1947–48 medical schools estimated a need of about $330 million for construction of facilities, over and above operating-fund needs and research-fund needs. All but 4 schools out of 79 reported a need for additional or improved space.

5. Medical-school budgets have already been trimmed to a point where any further reduction would endanger the quality of the product; that is, of medical teaching and research, and eventually of medical practice and medical care. Faculty time per student today is already 7 percent lower than it was 10 years ago; some schools have had to reduce teaching staffs to bare minimums. Current deficits now make it difficult to retain capable faculty members and make needed additions to the faculties impossible to consider.

XXIV. WHAT IS THE MEDICAL PROFESSION DOING TO HELP ITSELF FINANCIALLY IN THE MATTER OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING?

1. The National Fund for Medical Education was founded in 1949 as a central fund-raising agency for the Nation's medical schools. From its inception until July 1954, the fund distributed $6,941,056 to the medical schools. Of this amount, roughly, 45 percent, or a little over $3 million, was raised by the American Medical Education Foundation (an arm of the American Medical Association).

(a) The $6,941,056 expenditure by the National Fund for Medical Education represents a per annum average allotment of a little more than $1 million since the establishment of the fund. This contrasts with the goal of the national fund, which is to provide the medical schools of the Nation with funds approximating $10 million annually to aid in meeting the operational cost of their educational programs and to the annual deficits of our medical schools which is estimated to be between $10 million and $30 million.

2. This $10 million yearly goal of the national fund includes no funds for construction, research, or scholarships. In January 1954 a sum of $154,296,214 was requested for the construction of research facilities alone by medical schools, hospitals, and institutions throughout the United States from the National Institutes of Health,

United States Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.

XXV. HOW DOES EXPENDITURE FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION COMPARE WITH MONEY SPENT ELSEWHERE BY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE?

1. In contrast to the $93,408,312 to be spent for medical education in the academic year 1954–55, the American public spent approximately in 1953: $5,310,000,000 for tobacco products and smoking supplies; $377 million for parimutuel net receipts; $105,960,000 for makeup bases, face powder, and lipsticks; $96 million for face creams.

Mr. Speaker, we in New Jersey are no strangers to the problem of adequate medical training as my opening remarks and certain research data cited below indicate.

In 1951, during my first term in Congress, I sent letters to every medical school in the United States and Canada on behalf of my constituents and their aspiring young men and women. Letters of regret from the deans of those schools said, in effect, "sorry, we're filled," or, "as our medical school is State controlled we are obliged to accommodate our own cititzens first; sorry."

Data concerning medical or dental schools in New Jersey shows no dental schools in being up to 1954. The first dental school is reported to have been established in December 1954 in Jersey City by Seton Hall University.

According to the New Jersey History Committee's Outline History of New Jersey, a rival medical society to the New Jersey Medical Society established in 1790 a school at Elizabethtown which was closed in 1807. In addition to this, Queens College, later Rutgers, permitted a school to be opened in New Brunswick, under its charter. This school was attended mostly by New York students and in 1811, when the New York Legislature refused to license its graduates, it closed.

The American Medical Association Directory, 1950, lists the following medical schools as having operated in New Jersey until 1891 when all of their charters were revoked—why, is not disclosed: Hygieo-Therapeutic College, Bergen Heights; Medical and Surgical College of the State of New Jersey, organized 1888; Livingstone University, Haddonfield; Central University of Medicine and Science, Jersey City.

Then came the 20th century with its three wars. Each stepped up the need for medical and dental doctors and operatives—World War I, World War II, and Korea. In December 1954 Seton Hall University, of New Jersey, established a medical and dental school, open to all, in Jersey City.

In America, we are reared with the spirit of standing on our own feet, to hold our own. As one of the first of the Original Three States to join the Union in 1787, it is fitting and proper that with its new medical and dental school, the State of New Jersey, at long last, can take its place in the ranks of those who can more adequately look after their own, and others, too, if need be.

The below cited article of January 15, 1955, from local New Jersey sources, tells more on this score, and adds, I think, information for the benefit of the House on the question, "Is there adequate medical training in the United States?"

DEAN OF MEDICINE NAMED FOR SETON MEDICAL SCHOOL

SOUTH ORANGE.—A long-awaited announcement was forthcoming this week when the identity of the dean of medicine in the Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry was announced by Seton Hall University's president, Msgr. John L. McNulty.

Heading up the medical side of New Jersey's first college of medicine and dentistry will be Dr. Charles L. Brown, presently dean of the Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia.

The dean of the dental school, according to previous announcement, has also been selected and he is expected to be named in the near future.

Dr. Brown's resignation at Hahnemann will be effective July 1. Prior to that time, he will act as consultant for the Seton Hall College of Medicine.

Monsignor McNulty identified Dr. Brown as "a man with an unbroken span of over 20 years' experience in medical education with some of the best medical schools in the country. He has," Monsignor McNulty continued, "demonstrated an organizing and administrative ability that could be equaled by few and that has gained for him national recognition as an authority in medical education."

The Seton Hall president said that Dr. Brown will begin right away the determination of admission policy and procedures; the formulation of curricula; the screening of candidates for faculty appointment; and the overall pattern of organization for the Seton Hall College of Medicine.

The new dean will also represent the Seton Hall College of Medicine in consultations on the transformation of the 16-story clinical building in Jersey City Medical Center into a medical education unit with classrooms, laboratories, conference rooms, and library facilities. He plans to take up residence in Jersey City after July 1.

Dr. Brown received his bachelor of science degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1919 and his doctorate in medicine from the same school in 1921. In 1923 he joined the faculty of the Harvard University Medical School as an instructor in pathology. He participated in a teaching fellowship and served as an instructor in internal medicine at Harvard until 1928 when he joined the faculty of the University of Michigan Medical School as an associate professor of medicine.

In 1935, he left Michigan to become head of the department of medicine at the Temple University Medical School in Philadelphia.

His association with Hahnemann Medical College began in 1946 when he was appointed dean. In 1948 he assumed additional duties as head of the division and the department of medicine at Hahnemann.

Correlative with his experience as a medical educator, Dr. Brown has held many hospital positions. He has been resident pathologist at the Children's Hospital, Boston; chief of the department of medicine, Philadelphia General Hospital, and head of the department of medicine, Hahnemann Hospital.

Dr. Brown is a fellow of the American College of Physicians, and a diplomate of the American Board of Internal Medicine. He is a former president of the Philadelphia County Medical Society and received the Strittmatter award from that organization in 1951. In the same year he received an honorary doctor of law degree from Temple University.

As dean of the Seton Hall College of Medicine, Dr. Brown will retain the position of chief consultant in internal medicine to the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration in Washington.

He has contributed many scientific papers to the journals of the profession and is a member of the editorial board of the J. B. Lippincott Publishing Co. He is currently engaged in writing a textbook on medical treatment in general practice.

The Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry, New Jersey's first, was incorporated on August 6 last year. On August 11 ceremonies marking the formal establishment were held in the Medical Center and attended by public officials and prominent educators and professional men. The new medical-dental college received its charter from the State board of education on November 17, and a formal lease for the use of the clinical building was signed by the college on December 11, 1954.

INVITATION TO HOLD 1960 OLYMPIC GAMES AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 14) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich., in 1960, the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games in the United States at Detroit, Mich.; and expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site for this great enterprise in international good will.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to bring to the attention of the House certain observations and the feelings of the city of Detroit in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 14.

This resolution, unanimously adopted by the Senate on Tuesday, calls upon the United States Government to join with the United States Olympic Association in extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games in Detroit, Mich.

Detroit was selected by the United States Olympic Association as the only city in this country which would have official endorsement for the games of 1960.

The selection of Detroit as the official American site was made by a special committee which spent many months weighing the bids of many cities.

Detroit business and community leaders have labored a dozen years to bring the International Olympics to America's fifth largest city, a city which became known as the arsenal of democracy in World War II and which is now in the forefront of production for America's defense needs.

Of the score of persons who have been intimately associated with this venture on behalf of Detroit the names of Frederick Matthaei and Douglas Roby stand out. These able business and community leaders have devoted years of their

time at great personal expense to win this honor for Detroit. Mr. Roby will be remembered for his distinguished record as president of the Amateur Athletic Union of America.

Another to whom Detroit and the Nation owe a deep debt of gratitude for presenting a united front and thereby enhancing our chances of winning the 1960 games is Avery Brundage, present chairman of the United States Olympic Association.

Mr. Brundage can rightly be called Mr. Athlete for the years of untiring efforts he has expended on behalf of sports in this country. He has performed yeoman service and should be applauded for the good will for this country he has spread in his many travels throughout the world.

Detroit is proud of the work of its community leaders and is proud that it was selected as the official American site by our Olympic Association.

But this honor and the opportunity to make a substantial contribution to international good will would not be for Detroit alone. The entire Nation would share in this enterprise. The athletic eyes of the world would be focused on our great country for the entire year of 1960 should the Olympic games be awarded to us.

Detroit business leaders are confident that Detroit and nearby communities in Michigan could master the enormous problems involved in such an undertaking.

It has been estimated that staging of the games would cost $12 million. This would be spent for housing and other special facilities needed for the thousands of athletes and guests who would participate in the Olympics.

Detroit is fortunate in having at hand adequate stadia and athletic plants required for the Olympics. In nearby Ann Arbor, home of the University of Michigan, there is a stadium which seats nearly 100,000 people. Detroit and Ann Arbor are linked by modern divided expressway highways.

In addition within the city of Detroit there are the great athletic facilities of the University of Detroit, which only recently completed a new $5 million field house and Olympia stadium, an indoor arena of suitable size.

Detroit is blessed with great natural advantages, being situated on the Detroit River, the busiest waterway in the world, and closely adjacent to Lakes Erie, St. Clair, and Huron, three of the Great Lakes.

Then, too, Detroit has excellent transportation advantages, being linked with the rest of America and the world by the great airlines, railroads, and highways.

Detroit has two modern airports and plans are in the making for a third major airport, servicing national and international flights. Detroit is served by five of America's great railroads—New York Central, Baltimore & Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wabash, and Chesapeake & Ohio—and has a direct link by rail with Canada, our good neighbor to the north and one of the world's great countries. Windsor, Ontario, Canada, is only a 5-minute car ride by way of bridge and tunnel across the Detroit River.

Detroit, too, is linked with the world by sealanes. Detroit is fast becoming one of the world's busiest ports and the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway will add to the city's growth.

In every respect Detroit more than meets the needs of this country in staging a successful Olympiad.

There is even a greater resource not yet mentioned. That is the planning knowhow of our great industrial and community leaders. These are the men and women who mobilized industry to meet this country's needs in World War II and since. These are leaders of vision and ability, people from whom great things can be expected at any time.

Detroit can quite properly boast of an enthusiastic citizenry to back up its leaders. As has been proved dramatically in the past, Detroit can get big jobs done.

But because the benefits of playing host to the 1960 Olympic games go beyond the borders of any city or State, I would suggest to my colleagues in the Congress that staging these games should be a national responsibility.

In the past the host city has been solely responsible for holding the international games in this country. The most recent example was Los Angeles, which successfully handled the games in 1932, the last time the games were held in this country.

In view of the international aspect of the Olympic games and the fact that benefits would accrue to the entire country, I most seriously suggest that the Congress consider sharing the financial costs involved with the city of Detroit, should the games be awarded to this country. No other country places the entire financial burden on the host city.

This is a matter to which we can give more serious attention at a later date, but basic planning must be begun as soon as the International Olympic Committee makes a favorable decision on the invitation of this Nation.

At any rate this resolution deserves the unqualified support of each Member of the House. There is no partisan flavor to this resolution. It is a challenge to the pride of America and the Congress should go on record in support of this country's Olympic Association in endorsing the city of Detroit as host for the 1960 Olympic games.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE RUSH DEW HOLT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of Rush D. Holt, a former United States Senator from Weston, W. Va., at the Federal Research Clinic, at Bethesda, on Tuesday, reminds us again of the uncertainty of life and the certainty of death.

Rush Dew Holt was born June 19, 1905, at Weston, W. Va. He was elected to the United States Senate in the year 1934 at the age of 29 years, and served 1 term. He has been a member of the West Virginia House of Delegates for many years, both prior and subsequent to his service in the United States Senate, having first been elected at the age of 25 years.

The former schoolteacher was still 6 months short of the required 30 years in November 1934 and did not take his Senate seat until June 19, 1935.

Age had always been a thorn in the side of the "boy wonder." He graduated from high school in his native Weston at 14. He was turned down at the University of Cincinnati as too young. Instead, he went to small Salem College, West Virginia. He later received degrees from LaSalle University and West Virginia University. Before entering politics seriously, Mr. Holt served as a teacher or instructor at Bedford (Va.) High School, Salem College, and Glenville (W. Va.) State Teachers College. He married the former Helen Froelich, of Gridley, Ind., a teacher at the old National Park College, Forest Glen, Md., in June 1941. They had two children, a daughter Helen, and a son, Rush, Jr.

Rush Dew Holt was the son of Dr. Matthew Holt, a Weston physician and editor. His mother was the former Mrs. Lele Dew. Mr. Holt was an able, conscientious young man and citizen. He had deep convictions with respect to what he believed to be right and wrong. He stuck with those convictions and did not hesitate to express his views.

The passing of Mr. Holt was not unexpected. He had been in failing health for many months and unable to qualify as a member of the House of Delegates of the West Virginia Legislature now in session.

To his grieved wife and family, I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy. May our God who looks over the destinies of us all give them strength and courage to bear their sorrow.

A CAFETERIA AND A DINING ROOM FOR HOUSE LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES AND FOR THE REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, while I know of no one who is opposed to the project which would provide an adequate and comfortable eating place for legislative employees of the House, who number more than 1,500, and Members of Congress, who number 435, previous attempts to provide those adequate facilities bogged down.

Permit me to suggest that legislative employees and Members of the House write the Speaker and the minority leader, telling why she or he favors this move.

The only reason for this suggestion is that I personally know of no one op-

posed to it, but we know that the assistance of the Speaker and the minority leader will give us what we all want before the House adjourns late this summer or early next fall.

The recent message from the President of the United States among other things stated in reference to health insurance the following:

To the Congress of the United States:

Because the strength of our Nation is in its people, their good health is a proper national concern; healthy Americans live more rewarding, more productive and happier lives. Fortunately, the Nation continues its advance in bettering the health of all its people.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this solely for the purpose of inquiring what the program for next week will be. I think the Members would like to know.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very happy that my friend from Illinois made the inquiry.

There is no business on Monday or Tuesday.

Wednesday we will consider H. R. 3828, the pay-raise bill for judges, some of the officials of the Department of Justice, and the Members of Congress.

Thursday and Friday, if a rule is reported out, which I expect, H. R. 1, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, will come up.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the soldier-ballot bill come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. That matter is before the Committee on Rules, and I understand, as the result of hearings, further consideration of one of the titles of the bill is going to be given by the Committee on House Administration. It may be that we can bring it up if the matter is adjusted, but I cannot announce it in the program at this particular time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3322, that is of deep interest to every Member of this body. This bill would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and make clear beyond any doubt what the Congress meant when it said in 1949 and 1950 that surplus property, both real and personal, no longer needed by the Federal Government and which is needed and useful for educational and health purposes may be donated for such purposes.

Since introducing this bill I have received many calls from Members of this body, indicating very clearly that they have just as deep an interest in this matter as I.

Because of the expressed approval and deep interest that has been shown, I have found it desirable to schedule hearings before the Subcommittee on Donable Property of the Committee on Government Operations beginning next Tuesday, February 15, in room 1301, New House Office Building at 10 a. m. I hope that all members will make note of this time and place and be present either on this day or the next following days.

I am pleased to announce that Senator McCLELLAN and 21 cosponsors have introduced an identical bill in the Senate—Senate bill 1004—and Senator McCLELLAN made an excellent statement in the RECORD of February 7 concerning this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is again necessary to hold hearings, issue reports and enact legislation on this subject. I thought that the Congress after a thorough investigation of the matter in 1949 had clearly expressed itself in Public Law 152, and reiterated its directions in Public Law 754 on September 5, 1950.

The fact is, however, that the Department of Defense has in recent months established its own regulations and requirements in such a manner, that the intent of the laws passed by Congress have been brushed aside, and as a consequence, the donation program is in very great danger.

In a similar and related situation, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has epitomized the matter in words that compel my admiration and exactly reflect my views.

In a letter to the Secretary of Defense, dated January 19, this year, Congressman CURTIS stated:

In my opinion this is directly contrary to the laws by the Congress in words and certainly in intent. It is directly contrary to the statement of policy as expressed by the President from time to time. In my judgment this is one more instance where the Congress in proper fulfillment of its constitutional authority has written laws and the Military Establishment has sought to subvert these laws.

The important fact is that the Comptroller of the Department of Defense has issued a recent regulation based on a permissive law dealing with a related subject. As a result, large inventories of military property have been capitalized into stock funds which, by Department of Defense interpretation, means that such property, though useful and needed for education and health purposes, is no longer eligible for donation.

Instead, property of great public usefulness, is being sold in quantities all over the country at a very small return to the Government.

We all know of the dire needs in the fields of education and public health. I submit that by donating Federal property of no further Federal usefulness to these suffering institutions, we are making the most beneficial disposition of Government property.

As Members of the Congress, we are called upon to make contributions of our surplus food and property to foreign countries. We find it to be in our enlightened self-interest to do so. What about enlightened self-interest at home? What about our own institutions that need assistance?

May I paraphrase a well-known axiom, "giving begins at home."

May I also point out that the total donations for educational and health use from the surplus disposal program, is a small fraction of the total now being sold on the American market.

Since the donation program started, hundreds of schools and hospitals have received help. Many have found that even small amounts of surplus Federal property to be a godsend in carrying them over the long emergency period which may yet last a generation. Over and over again they have testified that without this property, it would have been difficult if not impossible to have coped with the swollen school enrollments and hospital loads.

If the Federal Government sells something that cost a dollar and only gets a few pennies return, and if this same property is really useful and needed by our schools and hospitals, I say give it to them for nothing.

It is only common sense to do so, and thereby lighten the load for which we as Members of Congress have at least some responsibility. This was our intent when the Congress passed Public Laws 152 in 1949 and Public Law 754 in 1950. Now we find that the Department of Defense, from which 85 percent of the surpluses come, is making ineffective the wishes of Congress, is bypassing these laws, because it chooses to do so.

It is claimed by the Department of Defense that the donation program is obtaining increasing amounts of property. This is misleading. The truth is that the disposal program in the military agencies has been enormously accelerated but the dollar value going to educational and health purposes while increasing slightly in some States, does not tell the story of the percentagewise reduction. Much surplus property of great value for school and hospital use is not being offered for such purposes but is being sold to the highest bidder.

It is most important that immediate action be taken on this bill, which will reaffirm what Congress wants done with this surplus property, because more large sales are scheduled for the near future.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole right and obligation to control the sale of all Government-owned property. The passage of this act will indicate in no uncertain terms what the Congress wants done.

The taxes that American citizens paid to the Federal Government bought this property, the public owns it, not Federal agencies, and all this bill will do is to see that the public utilizes for good purposes what it already owns.

WHEAT MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 145) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to yield to the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. HOPE], for a statement on the bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the Senate unanimously, and was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Agriculture. It is a departmental bill, submitted by the Department of Agriculture, and deals with a very critical situation with respect to the production of durum wheat. It must be passed this week if we are going to get full advantage of it, because it must be explained to producers, and they must become familiar with it prior to seeding time which begins soon after the first of March.

The purpose of the legislation is to encourage the production of durum or macaroni wheat which is in very short supply due to the ravages of a new type of stem rust known as race 15B.

Under this legislation farmers will be permitted to seed, harvest, and sell durum wheat over and above their regular wheat allotments. The bill applies only to the 1955 crop and is limited to the States of North and South Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana.

I know of no opposition to the measure and urge its prompt passage at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1334 (e)), is amended, beginning with the 1955 crop of wheat, to read as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Secretary shall increase the farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1955 crop of wheat for farms located in counties in the States of Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota designated by the Secretary as counties which (1) are capable of producing class II durum wheat and (2) have produced such wheat for commercial food products during 1 or more of the 10 years 1945 through 1954: *Provided,* That the increase in the wheat acreage allotment for any farm shall not exceed the difference between the acreage of cropland on the farm suitable for the production of wheat and the wheat acreage allotment, if any, determined without regard to this subsection, and the increase in allotment shall be conditioned upon the production thereon of class II durum wheat. The increase in wheat acreage allotments authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the national, State, and county wheat acreage allotments, and the acreage of class II durum wheat thereon shall not be considered in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the bill S. 145.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

USE OF OFFSHORE OIL REVENUES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, considering legislation to provide Federal assistance for a program of school construction, I was deeply impressed by a circumstance most unusual in my experience in Congress. Not one person appeared to speak in opposition to a program of school construction financed in part by the Federal Government. To the best of my knowledge no person or organization sought an opportunity to express opposition. It can, therefore, be taken for granted that there is uniform acknowledgment of the fact that there is a drastic situation which must be faced up to by all Americans. A solution to our overcrowded and understaffed schoolrooms must be found immediately if we are going to continue to afford ourselves the luxury of being proud that we are Americans.

During the hearings on the Senate side, and in discussions I have had with Senators and Members of the House, it seems to me the only area of concern now is the amount of money to be taken from the Federal Treasury and the method to be applied in apportioning this sum among the several States in order to accomplish the maximum good.

I am not too much worried about a formula, though I am concerned. I do not want the wornout concepts of "wealthy States" and "poorer States" employed. I want to see the Federal Government apply its resources in the areas where there is the greatest need and at the same time I want the law to spell out clearly that the State which is the recipient of these Federal funds must be able to demonstrate that it is exhausting its best efforts to meet the school problem. I have no doubt the Congress can and will work out a formula which will be satisfactory—and will accomplish the real purpose of this legislation.

I am introducing a bill which is directed squarely at the problem of obtaining the funds to be divided among the States. I think all of us acknowledge that States with substantial revenue resources must not complain about helping a sister State with substantially less resources. I think we all acknowledge, also, that the development of the Federal establishment has preempted a substantial area of revenue raising—thus, in a sense, depriving individual States of funds which could be put to good use, within their own borders.

Having this in mind, I propose that resources which are the property of all the United States be earmarked for the support of this school-construction program which is properly the problem of all the United States.

Here is a problem which, as I say, is acknowledged by everyone and apparently is opposed by no one. Here are resources which in my opinion belong to everyone in the country. These resources should not be permitted to fatten the coffers of a few States, who will be looking for their share of a Federal-aid-to-education program. Permitting the income from this valuable area to go solely to the bordering States puts all other States at a distinct disadvantage and subjects them to an improper penalty every time taxes are collected to support a Federal program intended to benefit all the States.

This proposal, I know, has the enthusiastic support of several Senators and Members of the House. It seems to me it affords a painless method for solving a very painful problem.

Joint resolution to subject the submerged lands under the marginal seas to the provisions of the Submerged Lands Act, and to amend such act in order to provide that revenues under its provisions shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education

Whereas as a result of the per curiam opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States of March 15, 1954, it is clear that the United States acquired in a proprietary as well as sovereign capacity the submerged lands beyond the ordinary low-water mark extending seaward from the coasts of the United States and outside of the inland waters (hereinafter referred to as "the submerged lands under the marginal seas"); and

Whereas section 5 of the Submerged Lands Act provides that there is excepted from the operation of section 3 thereof "all lands acquired by the United States by eminent domain proceedings, purchase, cession, gift, or otherwise in a proprietary capacity," and in consequence of this exception, the provisions of section 3 of that act are inapplicable to the submerged lands under the marginal seas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Submerged Lands Under the Marginal Seas Act."

SEC. 2. The provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act are hereby made applicable to the submerged lands under the marginal seas as if such lands were a part of the outer Continental Shelf, as defined in such act, any provision in the Submerged Lands Acts to the contrary notwithstanding, and any provisions in the Submerged Lands Act to the contrary are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act is amended by deleting section 9 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Disposition of revenues: (a) All rentals, royalties, and other sums paid to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Navy under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and held in a special account and, except for the payment of refunds under the provisions of section 10 of this act, such moneys shall be appropriated exclusively for the purpose of promoting the national defense and national security through grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

"(b) An Advisory Council on Education for National Security is hereby created to be composed of 12 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States with regard to their experience in the relationship of education to national defense and national security, of whom 6 shall be from the fields of education, and research in the natural and social sciences. It shall be the function of such Council to recommend to the President of the United States for submission to the Congress not later than January 1, 1956, a plan for the allocation of the grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education provided in paragraph (a) of this section in such manner as will contribute most effectively to meeting the immediate and long-range requirements of education as it relates to national defense and national security."

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF CLASSROOM FACILITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, now that President Eisenhower has made known his position on legislation to meet the nationwide demand for Federal assistance in meeting the shortage of classroom facilities in our primary and secondary schools, I am sure my colleagues would be pleased to know some of the reactions to his proposal from school officials, parent-teacher groups, and the Nation's press.

The Washington Post and Times Herald refers to his proposal editorially as "half a loaf" and makes the point that it is as futile as applying a poultice to cancer. The editorial goes on to say as follows:

This recognition is a significant step forward and renders a most valuable service to the Nation. But the remedy proposed by the President seems to us hesitant, temporizing, and inadequate.

Mr. Eisenhower's hesitation grows out of a fundamental misapprehension. He fears that Federal aid to State public-school systems may introduce an element of national interference in local activities which ought to be kept resolutely independent. But the fear is an unreal one. The proposals for Federal aid put forward by the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate obviate any danger of Federal control. They offer financial assistance from the Nation because the problem is a national one and because the States lack the resources to meet it; but they carefully preserve local responsibility and local independence.

Instead of a program of direct and simple financial aid to the States, Mr. Eisenhower has proposed a complicated system under which the States and the Federal Government cooperatively would purchase school bonds issued by local communities. He acknowledges, however, that restrictive debt limits forbid many school districts to borrow in this fashion and that in many others the amount of taxable property and local income is so low as to make it impossible for the district either to repay borrowed money or rent a satisfactory school building. To the impoverished districts he would make Federal grants in conjunction with the States—thus breaching, so far as they are concerned, the wall he had previously erected against Federal intervention. If direct Federal aid will not imperil the independence of communities unable to borrow, it will not imperil the independence of more solvent communities.

We think the President has balked at a bugbear. The condition of the schools as he has pictured it constitutes a national crisis. Congress now has before it carefully considered bills which will meet this crisis more quickly, more generously, and more effectively than the President's plan. We hope it will enact one of them soon.

The Washington Post and Times Herald in today's edition comments editorially on the President's remarks at his news conference yesterday. The editorial under the caption "False Economy on Schools" is as follows:

Judging from his news conference comments yesterday morning, President Eisenhower feels strongly that the main burden of revitalizing the Nation's public schools ought to be borne by State governments and local public school districts. He would confine the Federal contribution, except in the case of genuinely indigent communities, to a kind of pump priming. Indeed, of the $7 billion of expenditure for school construction recommended in his program, only $1,120,000,000 would come from the Federal Treasury.

A part of the President's preference for this limited Federal participation stems apparently from a desire for economy. Most of the Federal outlay—$900 million earmarked for loans to State agencies—would be repaid in time, and with interest. But this is an economy only in a bookkeeping sense, and only from the Federal point of view. Whether schools are built out of Federal funds, State funds, or local funds, American taxpayers are going to have to foot the bill. Because the Federal Government takes, in a sense, the first bite, and the largest bite, out of the taxpayer's income, and because State and local sources of tax revenue are narrowly limited, we think that the emergency burden in school construction ought to be shouldered by the Federal Treasury.

In his message to Congress Mr. Eisenhower noted with approval that "capital outlays for public-school construction will reach an all-time high of $2 billion this year." This entire load is being carried by the States and localities. It comes very close to the emergency expenditure which the President has recommended—$7 billion over the next 3 years. Thus the President is proposing to double the State and local load. The trouble is that the States and localities are already staggering under the load they carry now.

The President's program looks oblique, cumbersome, and inefficient as compared with a program of direct Federal grants-in-aid to the States on a matching basis. The latter program, as approved unanimously by the House Committee on Education and Labor, would apply national resources candidly and generously to the solution of a national problem. That seems both sound economy and sound public policy.

The press today gives the reaction of the school officials in the areas of Virginia and Maryland, adjacent to the Nation's capital:

Nearby Maryland and Virginia school heads expressed keen interest yesterday in President Eisenhower's proposal for direct Federal-State emergency school construction aid—but to a man were unable to see how their respective systems could avail themselves of its principal benefits.

Their reactions were:

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

School Superintendent Forbes H. Norris termed President Eisenhower's education message to Congress Tuesday not too hopeful for schools in his jurisdiction.

He said present school borrowing is far below the county's 10-percent debt limit and that no lack of local income could be demonstrated to qualify for outright grants.

He added that interest on county school bonds is not excessive and therefore the school system would not need to sell bonds directly to the Federal Government.

Norris estimated that 130 elementary-school rooms and 70 high-school classrooms will be needed next year. He said that the school board will request funds to meet the deficit in its 1955-1956 budget.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

Assistant Superintendent Thomas S. Gwynn said the President's program would be studied to determine if the county could benefit from any of its provisions.

Gwynn pointed out that although Prince Georges County has been forced to borrow some $26,700,000 for new school construction in the past 10 years, the interest rate has remained at a comparatively low figure. He said the last school construction bonds were sold at an interest rate of about 2.7 percent.

The county has at present authority from the State legislature to issue up to $5 million in bonds for new school construction. Gwynn said that the school board plans to ask the county commissioners to issue those bonds in June or July.

He pointed out that Prince Georges has received Federal funds under Public Law 815, enacted to assist local communities whose school populations had been affected by Federal activity.

About $4,600,000 has either been received or appropriated to Prince Georges County under this law.

FAIRFAX COUNTY

School officials said this area would not be affected by the President's proposed $7 billion program.

They said the county has spent about $29 million dollars since 1950 on school construction and will need another $3 to $4 million a year to carry them through 1960.

George Pope, administrative assistant to the superintendent, said that by February 1956 when the current construction program will be completed the county will have a sufficient number of classrooms.

ALEXANDRIA

Superintendent T. C. Williams said about 30 classrooms costing about $400,000 are needed immediately in the city. He said the money can be obtained through a bond issue since the city has not reached its debt limit.

During the past 5 years the city has spent about $5 million on school construction. Williams said he did not think Alexandria

would be eligible for any of the proposed new Federal funds.

ARLINGTON COUNTY

Superintendent of Schools T. Edward Rutter expressed disappointment in the program.

Rutter praised the program for the aid it will give some areas, but said Arlington will not benefit.

Arlington County will require a total of $10 million by 1960 for additional school construction, Rutter said. During the past 5 years the county has borrowed $20 million to support the school system. Additional money could be borrowed, if the voters approved, since there is no legal debt limit for Virginia counties, but Rutter said there is a practical limit above which county credit would be impaired.

However, an annual increase in school enrollment of 3,000 to 4,000 children will require another $20 million construction program during the next 5 years. The county has no debt limit and has been able to sell school bonds well under the President's proposed interest limit.

FALLS CHURCH

Superintendent Irvin H. Schmitt said he feels the Eisenhower program will not be adequate to take care of the country's school needs. He pointed out that Falls Church will receive no benefit.

Schmitt said that even with construction of all presently planned classrooms Falls Church will be 20 to 25 classrooms short by 1960. Schmitt said Falls Church is now within 3 or 4 percent of its debt limit.

The House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I have the honor to be a member, will begin hearings on school construction legislation within a week or 10 days. I feel sure it will be the decision of the committee to give careful consideration to the President's plan.

I note the committee in the other body, where hearings are underway, will also consider the White House plan, but not to the exclusion of other proposals coming from interested Members of the Senate.

It is my considered opinion that the Congress should, at this time, initiate a long-range program and make Federal grants-in-aid in sufficient amounts over a period of 5 or 6 years on a matching basis in order to meet the overall problem.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. It seems to me the President has taken some of the proposals out of my bill, H. R. 2857, and changed the figures around.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inform the gentleman from Michigan that that is the President's prerogative.

Mr. LESINSKI. He changed the figures around. I have set forth the complete figures in the RECORD of Tuesday. It seems to me that he made some misstatements.

I was very disappointed with the school construction proposal outlined by the President Tuesday. He calls it a plan of Federal cooperation with the States. But his program offers very little with which to cooperate. It does no good for the President to express his sympathy. We need action. The scope of the school crisis cannot be placated with a gesture. We can tackle this difficult problem only with a concrete program of significant Federal aid.

The President speaks of State and local ressponsibility. Good heavens. How much does a community have to work itself to the bone and sacrifice on other needed functions before it can establish responsibility?

I am also for State and local responsibility, and I am strongly opposed to any Federal control of education. No one is suggesting that education be taken from the control and direction of the States and local communities. The President unfortunately seems fascinated with a fantasy of a figment. To feign fear is to foment fraud.

The truth is that Federal contributions to State and local systems under Public Laws 815 and 874 have been to the public interest. Educators themselves have approved and urged Federal aid for school construction, operation, and maintenance. I say that the administration cannot conceal the inadequacy of its program under misleading words.

Let us examine the President's complicated proposal. In the first place he recommends that the Federal Government be authorized "to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at a reasonable interest rate."

What is a reasonable interest rate? The going rate of interest varies in areas of a State as well as between the States. Is the Federal Government to discriminate between areas having different going rates of interest? This does little more than what the school districts can already do for themselves.

Secondly, the President paternally recommends that the Federal Government participate with States having school-construction agencies to establish a fund for these agencies amounting only to a year's payment on principal and interest. The State school-construction agency would issue bonds through the customary investment channels, then build schools for lease to local districts.

But note how high the rentals would be. They not only would have to cover the payments on principal and interest of the bonds outstanding, but also provide a payment for a reserve fund, besides sharing in the administrative expenses of the State construction agency.

This suggestion is clearly not something for nothing. By the time the rentals were paid off, a school district could be worse off than before.

Lastly, the President suggests what may be regarded as a subsidiary proposal. He asks that Congress authorize $200 million for a program of grants-in-aid for school construction in stranded school districts.

Two hundred million dollars were recommended when it was shown over a year ago that $4.7 billion were urgently needed for construction in school districts having exhausted all sources of revenue—source: Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey, December 1953, page 114, published by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

No one can argue against the merits of evolving a long-term plan of financing our public schools. But it seems pretty callous to reduce boys and girls to dollars and cents. The Nation needs more classrooms and needs them now.

The greatest investment we have in this country is the boys and girls we are educating and bringing up to be the future citizens of this country.

There is some question as to how long many of the States can continue the present expenditure for school construction. And you cannot expect a badly needed increase in teachers' salaries when you are overwhelmed with the construction problem.

I feel that the whole approach of the administration is turned around in this matter. We should first agree on a program of direct and simple financial aid to the States. Our first consideration should be nothing less than a billion-dollar grant-in-aid program to extend over the next 2 years.

As an additional and supplementary form of aid, may I call your attention to my bill, H. R. 2857? It would provide a sound program whereby Federal loans could really assist States and local communities in building schools.

With assurance against Federal interference, my bill, submitted January 24, would provide a loan fund of $3 billion from which each loan would bear interest at the rate of 1 percent a year. It would have maturity of not more than 30 years.

The Federal Government would be authorized to make loans to States having school-construction authorities, or for those States that do not have such authorities loans may be authorized for school districts that obtain the approval of the State agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary and secondary schools. A school district may be eligible to borrow when it equals or exceeds 50 percent of its legal debt limit. Real effort on the part of the school district is therefore shown. A school district or a State school-construction authority may be eligible to borrow providing that it has not defaulted on any loan made to it under this proposal.

From the funds appropriated, the proportionate amount of money each State, or the aggregate of school districts therein, could borrow would be determined according to the number of schoolchildren in each State as it bears to the total school-age population of all the States.

A loan program should supplement a grant-in-aid program. I feel that only a loan proposal such as I have outlined can materially assist States and local communities which might otherwise find it difficult to borrow for school construction.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] for his comments and the legislation which he has introduced to provide the school and health authorities of the several States with a better and more equitable and fairer distribution of surplus property. I have already begun to get letters from school superintendents in my State asking that we support your legislation.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say I have received a letter from Governor Herter, who is very much interested. There is a tremendous interest in this matter. The purpose I have in mind is to carry out the intent of the Congress. What happened was that we passed a bill which contained provisions known as the donors' provision. Forty days afterward the Congress passed a law relating to another subject under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. A year later we passed another law reincorporating in whole or in part the original donors' provisions showing the intent of the Congress, and by the law passed 40 days after our original act in which the donors' provisions were included and relating, as I say, to another subject within the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, they stretched the interpretation of that second law, which, in effect, defeats the purpose of the Congress in connection with the disposition of surplus goods to our States, political subdivisions, colleges, hospitals, schools, and the other beneficiaries of the so-called donors' provisions of existing law.

The purpose and the idea was to try to have the intent of Congress carried out, because the sales to date show that in connection with the acquisition cost the Defense Department is getting an average of between 7 and 8 cents, and the cost of the sales in relation to the acquisition cost is anywhere from 3 to 5 cents. So that for a negligible return our States and subdivisions, our schools and colleges are being denied the benefits that are of inestimable value to them and to the people of America.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to assure the gentleman that his legislation will have my support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

KHRUSHCHEV: AVOWED ENEMY OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Russian autocrats are at each others throats again, and as usual, a large segment of the leadership of the Western World is attempting to figure out the significance of this recent event. The Russian experts are placed at a disadvantage because Malenkov was still alive when his confessed resignation was announced to the world. It would have been much easier on them if Georgi had made his appearance before the firing squad before his obituary was announced. Moreover, these experts are put on the spot because their pet theory—to the effect that a so-called managerial class had arisen in the Communist empire which could be influenced by intellectual manipulation, has been discredited. When the world was treated to the announcement of Stalin's death, these same experts proclaimed the theory of rule by committee as contrasted with dictation by one all-powerful individual as a natural development within the international Socialist camp. It was also claimed that our best hopes for peace rested in a plan whereby we would seek to influence a new managerial class which Malenkov headed and who gave promise of being reasonable in terms of getting along with the non-Marxist world.

It has been this false assumption which has guided our approach to the threat of world communism since March 1953. The conduct of the cold war against communism has been anchored to this basic assumption. In truth, the implementation of the policy of liberation has been guided—or if you choose, impeded—by the acceptance of this fundamental assumption by the top foreign policymakers within the administration. This brings back to memory the 1952 campaign promises of the Republican Party—promises that if the Republicans were elected they would work for the liberation of the many non-Russian nations enslaved by the Communists. This memory refresher seeks no partisan advantage. It does, however, strongly suggest that the Republican leadership should immediately make a complete review of its present position with respect to the promised policy of liberation. Such a review should be balanced against all the stresses and strains within the Communist empire and these have been obvious to the objective students of the U. S. S. R., and at the same time to make a realistic evaluation of what has been done in the past 2 years to help the enslaved people regain their independence. The benefit of hindsight which would accrue from this process would help greatly in launching a political offensive in the cause of human freedom.

During the 83d Congress I served as a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression. That committee, as Members of the House are aware, submitted some 27 reports on the subject of its inquiry. The summary report which presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the committee, calls for a political offensive against the conspiracy of communism as the only course of action which gives hope of preventing world war III. That report was submitted to Congress on January 3, 1955. In my opinion the information set forth in that report is an excellent guide to a practical understanding of the events taking place within the empire of communism especially during the last several days. I would urge every Member of Congress to reread the summary report of the committee against the background of these events.

There now seems little doubt but what Khrushchev has won the mantle of full dictator which Stalin wore until March 1953. The period of shadowboxing which the Russian experts called rule by committee is now over. A new Communist era has begun and it should be properly called the Khrushchev era. Just how long this era will last is a matter of pure speculation. Its tenure will very likely depend upon how much blood the new dictator and his immediate henchmen are prepared to spill and how deep they are prepared to go in the process of purge which must accompany the new dictatorship. On the basis of the evidence at hand, it would appear that the Khrushchev era will be with us for a while.

It is quite well established that Khrushchev is the real Czar of the Russian Communist empire. Bulganin, as Premier, is nothing more than window decoration. In fact, he has always been a stooge for the Russian Communist Party and as political commissar of the Red army, he was in charge of placing machine guns in the backs of the professional army officers so that they in turn would keep their machine guns in the backs of the foot soldiers of the Red army. He is completely subservient, as are all the Communist Party functionaries, to the will of Czar Khrushchev.

There are some interesting facts about Czar Khrushchev which to date have not been brought out in the free press. I believe it to be of fundamental importance that we get all the reliable information available concerning this new dictator out in the open so that the American people can better understand what he represents. It is a rather old-fashioned American custom, but one which strikes me as being sensible in these circumstances, to measure a man by his past record.

Khrushchev has been called a Ukrainian. He is in fact a Russian and as such is a confirmed imperialist. It is true that he spent many years in the Ukraine but—unhappily—in the capacity of hatchet man for the Kremlin. He was born in Russia, of Russian parents. His place of birth was close to the ethnographic borders of the Ukrainian nation. He did work in the Russian mines as a boy and there met many Ukrainians who were being used as involuntary laborers. When the feudal Russian Empire collapsed in 1917, Khrushchev lost no time in joining up with the Lenin Bolsheviks. He was assigned to Ukraine in 1919 as one of a task force directed to destroy the Independent Ukrainian Democratic Republic. He earned his Communist whip by demonstrating his disdain for all human values and his contempt for democracy and freedom.

He remained in Ukraine until 1927, serving in the capacity of hatchetman in the all-out Russian effort to destroy the popular movement for Ukrainian national independence which blossomed in 1917. There remains no doubt as to the vicious and cruel role he played in forcing the system of Russian collective farms upon the Ukrainian people. All loyal and freedom-loving Ukrainians will never forget the heroic struggle of the Ukrainian nation against this new Russian encroachment upon the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people.

In 1927 Khrushchev was recalled to Moscow—as a reward for his ruthless treatment of the heroic Ukrainian people. He remained in his native Moscovy until 1935. It is not completely clear at this time as to everything that occupied his evil talents but there is good reason to believe that he played a part in developing the blueprint for the man-made famine in Ukraine during 1932–33,

when up to 7 million patriotic, freedom-loving Ukrainians were starved to death because of their stubborn opposition to Russian collectivization efforts. This occurred in a year when the crop in Ukraine, the historic breadbasket of Europe, was as good if not better than average. This terrible crime against humanity has been best described as the "man-made famine." For more complete details on this sad chapter in the history of mankind, I would urge all Americans to read the eighth interim report of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression. This report, in my considered judgment, presents the most authentic picture of life under the Rusisan autocrats since the publication of the Journals of Marquis de Gustine in approximately 1844. It is a reliable index to the behavior we must expect from Khrushchev and all his henchmen.

In 1935 this Khrushchev was sent back to Kiev by the Russians as secretary of the Communist Party in Ukraine. He then openly engaged in a ruthless program to destroy the "intelligentsia" of the Ukrainian nation. The Russian-made famine in Ukraine of 1932–33, even though it wiped out close to 7 million human beings, did not break the Ukrainian spirit for national independence. The new Khrushchev task, therefore, was to ferret out and destroy all elements of leadership among the Ukrainians. By the process of torture, liquidation, and mass deportations, Khrushchev was able to temporarily subdue the spirit of nationalism in Ukraine.

In 1938 this same Khrushchev was named to the Russian Politboro. This was the reward he received for his ruthless persecution of the heroic Ukrainian people.

During World War II Khrushchev won further Communist laurels by directing the Kremlin effort to stamp out all resistance in the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. In this connection, it is important to note that he organized and controlled the Communist partisan groups and elements parachuted into Ukraine, Poland, Byelorussia and other non-Russian nations. Here again he demonstrated his ruthless character and complete disdain for human life.

Following the defeat of Nazi Germany this same Khrushchev was again assigned as purge master of the Ukraine. As is now well known, the great and patriotic Ukrainian people completely revolted against the imperial Russian Communists during the course of World War II. While despising the Nazis, they sought to win their national independence. For aspiring to this noble goal, the Kremlin masters decided they must be punished. Stalin assigned their boy, Khrushchev, to this task—a tried and skilled executioner. He carried out this assignment with cold dispatch. In the same manner he now seeks to carry out his enlarged mission of enslaving the entire world.

More recently Khrushchev has been the advocate of a new population transfer within the U. S. S. R. He calls it the pioneer resettlement program. Some Russian propagandists have even likened this program to the efforts of the American pioneers. The essence of his plan is to move millions of people from their native lands to the interior reaches of the U. S. S. R.—there to reclaim millions of acres of land for food production. Naturally these people are not going to go there voluntarily because they are not fooled by the propaganda of Khrushchev. This has resulted in another wave of forced deportations from the non-Russian nations of the Communist empire. All those who resist the decaying process of communism are rounded up as "volunteers," for the new pioneer movement. This is the latest device created by Khrushchev to break the spirit of resistance within the empire and at the same time to hide the facts concerning it from the civilized world. How many millions of people will be purged by this scheme is anyone's guess. But of one thing we may be sure, this silent but thorough purge would not be underway if there were not great internal troubles confronting the Communists

Khrushchev has been built up as the symbol of peaceful coexistence between Russian communism and the democracies of the West. In this capacity he intends to carry out the goals of Lenin which in the words of Lenin himself are:

First. Use any device, method, or sacrifice to advance the ends of world communism.

Second. If needs be, two-thirds of the peoples of the world must perish in order that communism may triumph.

These are the goals Khrushchev represents. This short review of his background shows he is skilled in the inhumanities. There should be no doubt as to the policy which the United States should follow in these circumstances.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. What is the gentleman's view on the direction which our policy should take?

Mr. FEIGHAN. My views on what we should do about the present situation are well expressed in the summary report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress. As a member of that committee, I took part in its hearings and in the preparation of the reports it submitted to Congress. In particular, I would like to invite your attention to the series of recommendations made by that committee as the only course open to us which gives reasonable hope for avoiding all-out war. I would like to read at this point the recommendations of the select committee which appear on page 6 of the summary report:

The committee rejects the current Communist propaganda campaign of peaceful coexistence between the nations of the free world and the Red regimes of the Communist empire as the only alternative to preventive war. It recommends rather that the Government of the United States immediately launch a positive, bipartisan, political offensive against the international Communist conspiracy and in behalf of the enslaved nations, and that the following steps be undertaken as a part of such a program.

1. The committee again recommends that the President of the United States take the initiative in convening an international conference of all free non-Communist nations for the following purposes:

(a) To express formal recognition of the fact that the Communist governments, which now control over 800 million human beings, are not representative of the will of the people.

(b) To seek agreement whereby the free non-Communist nations acting in concert will withdraw diplomatic recognition from all Moscow-controlled Communist governments.

(c) To reaffirm the friendship and solidarity of the people of the free world with the people and nations enslaved by communism.

(d) To develop a program for the rapid and complete termination of all commercial treaties and trade with Communist governments and the initiation of a program of trade among all non-Communist nations which will strengthen the security of the free world.

(e) To develop an overall, dynamic program for the defeat of the international Communist conspiracy.

2. That Congress establish a joint committee on all United States overseas information programs in order that maximum results may be assured in bringing the full force of truth to all the people of the free world and increased hope to the millions of people enslaved by communism.

3. That Congress by appropriate action reiterate and make clear that the eventual liberation of all the nations enslaved within the Communist empire, together with unqualified support for the principle of national self-determination through free elections and the secret ballot, are firm and unchanging parts of our national policy.

4. That in the advancement of the American program for world peace and freedom all efforts therein be measured against the criteria of whether they assist the captive peoples to hasten the day when they may achieve their liberation, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected.

5. That the spirit of resistance to Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain be encouraged and supported through the judicious use of funds already authorized by Congress for such purpose.

6. That the appropriate agencies of the Government concerned with the threat of world communism give maximum opportunity to those private American organizations, groups, and individuals that have a natural bond with the enslaved nations and people, to play a major role in the restoration of freedom in the lands of their ancestry.

7. That, as a demonstration of our genuine sympathy for the enslaved nations and peoples, and to weaken the will of the armies under Communist rule to fight and support the Kremlin's plan for world conquest, the President immediately direct the establishment of the national military units formed from escapees from the enslaved nations as authorized by section 101 (a) 1 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, thus providing a concrete symbol of a genuine coexistence and unity between the nations and peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

8. That Congress at the next session enact H. R. 8000, known as the Political Asylum Act of 1954, to provide for the rapid and effective reestablishment of selected escapees from communism and to encourage the defection and escape of others.

9. That the Congress give the United States Information Agency full support not only by way of an increase in funds but also by strengthening its role in our Government's political offensive. Similarly, foundations, private organizations, and indi-

vidual citizens are urged to continue and increase their support to the Committee for Free Europe (Radio Free Europe).

10. That an International Juridical Commission be established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so that Communist crimes perpetrated against humanity may be fully recorded and officially noted for prosecution.

11. That the Department of State transmit copies of this report, together with all other reports of the committee to each member nation of the United Nations.

12. That the Department of State formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this report, branding the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against all the nations enslaved by communism and that the United States delegation to the United Nations be instructed to take immediate steps to place this resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

13. That the work of this committee be continued in order to complete the investigation of all phases and techniques of Communist aggression in areas of the world not already covered by the committee, together with further inquiry into conditions of life within the Communist empire; a program that lack of time has thus far prevented.

CENTURY OF PROGRESS: TAMPA, FLA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to a century of progress that is being celebrated today and throughout the balance of this year in the city of Tampa, Fla. This week, with gay and colorful ceremony, Florida's great port on the gulf, commemorates its 100 years of charter as a corporate town. Part of that celebration is the famed invasion of the pirate crew of Jose Gaspar. Part of that celebration is the largest Florida State fair now in progress and part of that celebration is the vision of a city that has in 100 years of its corporate existence grown from fewer than 100 homes to a city of over 200,000 souls.

I should like at this time to present to the Speaker of the House a plaque in commemoration of this celebration. I should like to read the inscription on the back thereof, which states:

TAMPA CENTENNIAL YEAR, 1955

The year 1955 marks the 100th anniversary of Tampa's existence as a corporate town under a charter granted by the Florida Legislature on December 15, 1855. But actually, Tampa, now a colorful, cosmopolitan city of 233,000, and center of Florida's flourishing west coast area, is older than any of its remembered birthdays.

When the first Spanish explorers landed in south Florida more than 400 years ago—Ponce de Leon in 1521 and Hernando de Soto in 1539—they found Tampa already established as the chief town of the Caloosa Indian Tribe.

Since that day, 100 years ago, when the Florida State Legislature approved the charter of the city of Tampa, its history has been one of progress. That progress was foreseen many years before, when the Spanish explorers discovered what was described by Cabeza de Vaca in 1528 as the "finest harbor in the world" on the beautiful west coast of subtropical Florida. Since that time the port of Tampa has played its important part in the life of Florida and the Nation.

Old Jose Gaspar, around whose fabulous name has been built the annual festivities of the Gasparilla Krewe, himself first dropped anchor in Tampa Bay in the closing years of the 18th century. The precise date, not pinpointed for us by diary, chronicle, or bruited legend, could not, however, have been later than 1790. By that time the old pirate was well established as the overlord among the pirates of Florida's west coast. Tampa then surrendered to his reign, and today Tampa surrenders to the modern Krewe of Gasparilla on the invasion day, February 14. I would extend an invitation to all of you that are young in heart but jaded from the travesty and travail of weather and work to join with me and the other thousands that will witness the invasion of the gaily bedecked pirate ship of Gaspar's Krewe into the famous old port city of Tampa. It is an exact replica of the ship sailed by the famous buccaneer over the seas in search of gold and prizes. The mystic Krewe will come thundering into the port city with cannon roaring and with the Jolly Roger flying at the masthead of this piratical old-fashioned square rigger. Hundreds upon hundreds of other vessels will accompany her. In the city and its Latin quarter the bells of celebration will ring out, and, along with the revellers, you, too, can become young again in heart and relax in the golden glow of Florida's sun.

The story of this centennial year of the city of Tampa is not one of just fun and frolic, however. Tampa is a strong, aggressive town that has faced a stern future with pride of its beginning and courage to face each day of its future with stalwart hearts and a spirit of teamwork that cannot be downed by the adversary unforeseen. Tampa is a city today only through the foresighted men who have made it. It opens its second century of growth with a wide vision of progressive minds to guide it to greater destiny.

The city of Tampa has played its part in the stern days of crisis for our Nation. Early an important port and fort as well as source of supplies for the troops of our Nation who fought against the Indians in the early history of our State, Tampa's sons set forth to serve in the War Between the States. Point of embarkment for troops during the Spanish-American War, many of these soldiers returned to add to the progress of the west coast of Florida. In two world wars Tampa has served as a manufacturing center and base for soldiers of the Nation who set out from here to defend the cause of freedom and democracy.

The great port of Tampa today, as it celebrates its 100 years of progress is a city of business and men, a city of trade and manufacture, a city of produce and distribution, a city of entertainment and guests. One hundred years have seen this "best port in the world" flourish in a garden land to a point that finds little equal in the gulf waters of our great land.

An even temperature, a verdant land, and plentiful rainfall make the area that surrounds Tampa one of the garden spots of our Nation. The produce of its farms finds its way to your homes each day—vegetables and beef, fruit, dairy and poultry products—all are there to make it one of the important agricultural sections of the land. Secretary Benson, in his visit to Florida just last week, lauded the progress that is there and commended the growth of the area. Farms are valued at over twenty-five million; the cattle at one hundred and fifty-three million—annual vegetable production is over five million; dairy and beef products over a million and a half. All of this proof of a fabulously growing agricultural empire around the 100-year-old port city of Tampa.

The Florida State Fair this year will show to the thousands upon thousands of visitors the many products of our fields. The fair that serves all the State is larger than ever this year with its own celebration of 50 years of expositions. A panoramic view of the whole State of Florida that brings attention to the many things that demonstrate a firm economy in agriculture and manufacture and a future that is today being demonstrated by the phenomenal growth of the area that surrounds Tampa and extends throughout the Nation's playland that is Florida. Here side by side will be displayed the manufactured products that form the background of payrolls that make the west coast economy sound—the exotic fruits and vegetables that grace your tables and serve to bring the health of the vitamins entrapped from Florida's sun to our children—the processed foods, citrus concentrates, crystalized and canned as well as the varied packs of vegetables—the arts of the cigar-manufacturing industry that saw more than 660,700,000 cigars manufactured in 1954—the products of the largest meat packing center in the Southeast—and all that goes to make a balanced economy that is expanded far beyond the limited confines of our neighbors in the States to the north of us. The Florida State Fair in its 50th year of operation during the 100 years of incorporation that is celebrated by the city of Tampa contributes a great part to our learning and the American ideal provided in the exchange of information.

To those of you who would witness a parade of progress and pageant of beauty I would extend the invitation to visit this showing of Florida's bounty and beauty at the Florida State fair.

It is an outstanding salute to the future of the great harbor at Tampa that in the budget message of President Eisenhower to this Congress was included the first funds of a program for improvement of this great port. The President's recommendations, which I commend to this body and those who will deliberate on the matter, would see even greater growth of these port and harbor facilities and a strengthening of our defense abilities and productive services. I pledge great effort in the interests of improving these facilities and furthering the progress of this famous harbor

that for hundreds of years has served the South.

One hundred years of incorporation have seen the people of Tampa grow in understanding and broaden in the viewpoints that demonstrate ideals for all America. In this great city there are traditions that can be traced back to the courts of Spain, there are gracious ways of living and courtesies of language and manner that came from the early Italian settlements. Tampa is a southern city with all the warm hospitality for which the South is famous and with many of the southern customs preserved. Tampa is a modern city with a vitality that amazes many of its visitors. Tampa is a gracious host to many tourists each year and in 1954 a million and a quarter people were warmed by the soft breezes from the Gulf of Mexico, charmed by its hospitality and entertained royally by the many activities planned for their pleasure. I am happy to say that many of them today remain to become a part of this growing metropolis.

These are just a few of the notes of progress that make this celebration of 100 years of growth for Florida's great west-coast port a milestone of future certainty. The tempo of progress and development are here. There is a pulsebeat of prosperity in its manufacturing, distribution, transportation, international trade, resort business, and agriculture.

Everyone is proud of their home State and community—and justly so. I am proud of this city that is the bustling center of trade in the first district of Florida that I represent among you in this center of our great Nation. I believe I have cause, however, to stand just a little straighter and face the future just a little bolder because I know of the strength and security, the hearty and cheerful, dedicated and principled soul that is Tampa, Fla. Its people are ones that afford the whole country a brighter future and many more hundreds of years to eternity of progress and growth together with a life that is gracious under Florida's sun.

I ask that you join in the centennial celebration of this great city of Tampa on Florida's west coast—personally if you can—as the swaggering pirates of old Gaspar take over your hearts—and wisely as you would see all-Florida on display during the Golden Anniversary State Fair—but always remembering to bow to the courage of those who 100 years ago founded so successfully upon the bay. Among you I am proud to rise and proclaim this century mark of a great city in our Nation.

TAMPA'S CENTENNIAL YEAR: 1955—A BRIEF HISTORY OF A CITY THAT IS OLDER THAN ANY OF ITS REMEMBERED BIRTHDAYS

Tampa—cosmopolitan, colorful, flourishing trade capital of Florida's west coast, the world's largest phosphate shipping port; long famous for its fine handmade clear Havana cigars, its luxurious Spanish restaurants, its Latin quarter (Ybor City). Tampa is the center of the world's largest citrus-canning area. It is Florida's leading industrial city and the State's second city in population (population 233,400) as estimated by Standard Rate & Data.

Tampa was first granted its charter as a corporate city by act of the Florida Legislature on the 15th day of December, 1855.

In celebrating 1955 as its centennial year, Tampa freely acknowledges that only 1 of its more recent anniversaries is being observed, for actually 100 years is but a fraction of Tampa's existence. It is one of the oldest place names in North America. The shores of Tampa Bay were echoing to the clang of Spanish armor a full century before Plymouth and Jamestown were settled.

Indeed, if anniversaries are wanted, Tampa could already in this 20th century have celebrated the 100th anniversary of the arrival of Ponce de Leon in 1521; or the 1528 expedition of Panfilo de Narvaez, whose chronicler, Cabeza de Vaca, was the first white man to write of Tampa Bay: "The port is the best in the world."

And 1539 brought Hernando de Soto, who gave Tampa Bay its first Spanish name, Espiritu Santo—Holy Spirit Bay—at the same time bequeathing to scholars and to the civic pride of a later day the unsettled question of where, on the shores of this sunlit bay, he made his first landing. The question is largely academic since he covered every foot of it in the 6 months his expedition was based on Tampa Bay. He set the fashion for today's visitors to whom Tampa says: "See all of Florida from Tampa." Tampa's magnificent De Soto oak, under whose branches he is said to have conferred with the Indians, is a legendary landmark of his stay.

These Indians were not the Seminoles familiar to today's tourists. They were Timucuans and Caloosas, both now extinct, the latter masters of south Florida. Tampa itself is a Caloosan word, and was recorded by the Spanish historian Fontaneda in 1575 as the name of the leading town of the Caloosa Indians, though he spelled it "Tampa." Herrera's early map of Florida, done in 1601, used the modern spelling and the name "Tampa Bay" in preference to DeSoto's "Espiritu Santo."

Hillsborough River and Hillsborough Bay, the upper area of Tampa Bay, were later named for Lord Hillsborough, British colonial secretary of state in 1772.

The Seminole Indians, separatists from the Creek tribes of Georgia, were established in north Florida and had already given Gen. Andrew Jackson an excuse for a brief adventure in 1817—the so-called First Seminole War—resulting in moving the tribes southward. The United States acquired Florida from Spain in 1821. One of the first results was the establishment in 1824 of Fort Brooke at the mouth of the Hillsborough River. Here was the nucleus of the future city of Tampa, and here the first white child of the area, John Mercer Brooke, was born in 1826, son of Col. George Mercer Brooke, the fort commander. John Brooke grew up to become chief of the bureau of ordnance of the Confederate Navy and directed the conversion of the Merrimac into the world's first ironclad warship.

Being located entirely on a Government military reservation, the community of Tampa offered little lure to developers for a quarter of a century. Weekly sailing vessel service between Pensacola and Key West via Tampa offered the only contact with the outside world. The first post office, officially the Tampa Bay Post Office, was established November 24, 1831, with William Saunders, a native of Mobile and proprietor of the first general store, as postmaster.

But new faces appeared from time to time. One newcomer was Augustus Steele, a Connecticut Yankee, who had wangled an appointment as deputy collector of customs at Fort Brooke in 1832. Two years later he was credited with inducing the State legislature to create, on January 25, 1834, the new county of Hillsborough, carved out of old Alachua County, with the county seat at Tampa and Augustus Steele as county judge. He had already replaced Saunders as postmaster.

Hillsborough was vast in those days. Its 5,500,000 acres included all the present counties of Hillsborough, Polk, Pinellas, Pasco, Manatee, and Sarasota, as well as Charlotte, DeSoto, Hardee, and Highlands. But the records show less than 100 civilians in the entire county at the time.

Seven years of bloody warfare with the Seminoles began in 1835, touched off by the massacre on December 28 of Maj. Francis L. Dade and his detachment of 107 men near Bushnell while on march from Fort Brooke, at Tampa, to Fort King, near Ocala. The remaining garrison at Fort Brooke was in peril until reinforced by Marines from Key West—the first time in United States history that Marines and the Army engaged in joint operations.

When the costly fighting ended, in 1842, 4,000 Seminoles had been deported to the West and only a few hundred remained in the Florida Everglades. Their great Chief Osceola, captured while under a flag of truce, was dead in the "white man's prison" at Camp Moultrie, S. C. Fort Brooke was reduced in importance, and on July 25, 1848, President Polk signed an act giving 160 acres of the military reservation to Hillsborough County. For the first time, property already platted as "Tampa" could be legally sold to private owners, and tracts were quickly disposed of, one to Capt. James McKay, who built the county's first official courthouse.

The first municipal government was formed in 1849 when a group of Tampans chose M. G. Sikes, a stonemason from Savannah, as president of the township trustees. But lacking taxing powers, the trustees were unable to meet the costs of government, and in 1852 were forced to sell the townhall furnishings and public market stalls to liquidate the public debt, which had reached $42.50.

But the very next year the town council was reestablished, with John Darling, a storekeeper from Vermont, as president. It was a frugal and successful government. On September 17, 1855, the townsmen voted to seek a charter from the legislature.

The legislature granted Tampa this first corporate charter on December 15, 1855—and thus gave Tampans of 1955 the occasion for a centennial jubilee. In the election of city officials, Judge Joseph B. Lancaster, a Kentuckian who had gained distinction as a Florida jurist, became Tampa's first mayor, only to die in office within a twelvemonth.

The year 1855 also brought the Third Seminole War—2 more years of Indian fighting against the handful of Seminoles remaining in the 'Glades, but a greater struggle was ahead—the War Between the States. Tampa was blockaded, bombarded, and finally invaded by Federal forces out of Key West, and the town's economic life was for a time destroyed.

But a courageous pioneer citizenry could rise above the recurrent disasters of wars, hurricanes, and pestilence—yellow fever, which struck repeatedly and with deadly effect. It should be noted that it was a Tampa physician, Dr. John P. Wall, who first proposed the theory that the disease was mosquito-borne.

The last three decades of the 19th century brought the upswing in Tampa's fortunes. A flourishing cattle trade with Cuba developed, which pumped new money into all south Florida. Tampa's four hotels, best known of which hostelries was the Orange Grove Hotel at Madison and East Streets, listed an increasing guest list, including poet Sidney Lanier. Incidentally, an English musician, J. A. Butterfield, composed When You and I Were Young, Maggie, while in Tampa, and organized the town's first brass band.

A progressive Tampa group organized a community telegraph company in order to

string a line from Tampa to Fort Meade, 40 miles away, where it could connect with international Ocean Cable Co.'s trunkline running down through the State to Key West and Habana.

One thing was needed: a railroad. And Henry Bradley Plant, founder of the Southern Express Co., brought that to Tampa in 1883, thereby starting a chain of reaction of prosperity. The first bank, the Bank of Tampa, later renamed the First National Bank, was opened that year. New industries followed the railroad. The world's richest phosphate fields were discovered near Tampa. And the cigar industry moved in, under the joint sponsorship of the chamber of commerce, known then as the board of trade, and Vincente Martinez Ybor, of Spain, Cuba, and Key West.

The cigar industry had been driven out of Cuba by revolutionary disorders, moving first to Key West, but labor troubles, plus a disastrous fire, prompted leading manufacturers to seek a new base. Senor Ybor was invited by a friend, Gavino Gutierrez, a New York importer, to take a look at Tampa. The result: Ybor City sprang up at the northeast corner of Tampa, Ybor sold sites to other manufacturers, and, in 1886, fine handmade cigars were rolling out of three factories—those of Ybor, Sanchez & Haya, and Lozano, Pendas & Co. Descendants of some of the pioneer cigarmakers are still rolling fine cigars in Tampa today—more than 2 million cigars every working day.

On the west bank of the Hillsborough River, Plant, the railway magnate, wrought an Arabian Nights miracle in the wilderness with his Tampa Bay Hotel, a $3 million specimen of Moorish architecture, whose 13 minarets remain today a distinctive feature of Tampa's skyline. The imposing 6-acre structure, which now houses the University of Tampa, was begun in 1888, and opened to the millionaires of the nineties, on February 5, 1891. It was for many years one of the great luxury hotels of this world. During the Spanish-American War, when Tampa was the chief United States port of embarkation, the hotel was headquarters for the Army's General Staff—and, of course, Col. Teddy Roosevelt.

Plant had previously established a steamship line to Cuba, placing the luxury steamer *Mascotte* in operation on January 7, 1886. With the other Plant ship, the *Olivette*, the *Mascotte* made an emergency run to Habana before the outbreak of war to bring back to Tampa cigar factories huge cargoes of tobacco. Bales of leaf were jammed even into staterooms of the two vessels. The *Mascotte* is pictured in the present official seal of the city of Tampa.

It was not surprising that even before the Spanish War, Tampa, numbering among its citizens hundreds of Cuban born, was an intense partisan of the Cuban cause. Cigar workers pledged 1 day's pay each week to the Cuban junta's representative here. Filibusterers' ships, loaded with arms, sailed for Cuban waters with the absolute minimum of local interference. Jose Marti, great Cuban patriot, set up headquarters in Tampa, and his small cottage is now a Cuban national shrine.

With the end of the war and the arrival of the 20th century, Tampa moved to take its place among the modern, progressive cities of America. Perhaps in 1898 it was, as Richard Harding Davis described it, "a sand-blighted city." But not for long. It paved its streets; electrified its street railways; put in new gas, water, sewer plants; engaged in land title battles, franchise fights, private scandals, and political brawls; displayed all the lusty manifestations of growing pains common to one-time frontier towns touched by destiny.

It got deep water for the port that the Spanish chronicler had called great 4 centuries before—first 12 feet, then 20 feet, then on to 30 and more. It got new industries, including huge shipbuilding plants during two world wars. And it got soaring population figures. The town that could count only 720 inhabitants in 1880 had 5,532 in 1890, 15,838 in 1900. By 1910 there were 37,782, with more than 10,000 workers, men and women, in the cigar factories alone.

Three more firsts—the first commercial airline in the world began operations New Year's Day, 1914, between Tampa and St. Petersburg, with Tony Jannus as pilot of the one plane, a Benoist flying boat. The world's first air express shipment was made January 12, smoked meat from a Tampa packer to St. Petersburg.

And in 1915 Tampa became the first American city to enjoy citywide automatic telephone service.

Growth became sensational during the twenties, accelerating dizzily into the Florida real-estate boom of 1924–25, which was nevertheless an era of major development for Tampa and its prosperous neighbor cities of St. Petersburg, Clearwater, Plant City, Lakeland, Bradenton, Sarasota, and Fort Myers. Their growth as tourist centers sped Tampa's expansion as a distribution and services center.

When a frenzy of land speculation cooled and a major depression began, Tampa could still credit the land boom with millions of dollars' worth of permanent improvements added to its skyline and its environs.

The remarkable Davis Island development, a sizable city in itself, was pumped out of the bay by D. P. Davis, who sold $18 million worth of created properties within 12 months. Gandy Bridge, long dreamed of by George S. (Dad) Gandy, was completed in 1924, linking Tampa and St. Petersburg.

And a score of developers and builders opened new residential areas, built handsome new homes, and the city's expanding population quickly absorbed all this new construction.

The Tampa of today, with its population of more than 233,000, its wide diversity of industries and interests, its sound economy, and its progressive people, has been built by men and women of the frontier spirit—the spirit that rises above every form of hardship to achieve ultimate success. They have built a solid foundation for the greater Tampa of the future.

EVIL IS HE WHO EVIL THINKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the intemperate, uncalled-for, unnecessary, unwarranted, and untrue words attributed to actor Paul Douglas, star of the Caine Mutiny Court Martial at Greensboro, N. C., some time ago, have caused the disbanding of the entire troupe and the cancellation of the remaining program of this company. Over 70 percent of which were scheduled to take place in that land of fable, song, tradition, hospitality, and prosperity, known as the South.

This is not the first occasion that Douglas has demonstrated bad judgment. If my memory serves me correctly, he was one of the leading lights of the Anti-Nazi League back in 1939. The publication Hollywood Now under date of 1939 states this:

Hollywood stars hold giant save Spain rally Sunday. * * * Melvyn Douglas, Gale Sondergaard, Chester Conklin, John Garfield, W. S. Van Dyke, Maxwell Shane, Oliver P. Garrett, Whitney Bourne, and Paul Douglas, representing the motion-picture artists committee in the rally are the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion, Young Democrats, Medical Bureau, and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, American League for Peace and Democracy, and the United Anti-Nazi Conference.

As everyone knows these front organizations were to give aid and comfort to the Communists. The North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, and the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Battalion, and all of these other high-sounding names which were designed to carry the ball for Stalin against the courageous and dauntless fight of Franco in Spain which cost the lives of over a million men, women, and children.

Douglas has no reason to stray so far from the beaten path. He was born in Philadelphia some 48 years ago, attended Yale University, played professional football, and I remember when he was a sports announcer for Chesterfields on CBS; since, he has, I have been informed, married and divorced four times, this may be the reason he was selected to play the part of Captain Queeg. Those of us who read the book or saw the play or movie recall that Captain Queeg was as odd as a $3 bill. He was as unpredictable as the Washington weather, and about as popular aboard his ship as a skunk at a lawn party. Douglas was a natural for this part.

Recently when his outfit came to Charleston, S. C., my hometown, members of the cast, a genuinely fine group, made the statement that Douglas considered himself too good to travel with the rest of the troupe. One star of the play had this to say: "He does not even see the South; he travels by airplane."

His only observations of my land and my people were from high up in the blue which evidences beyond the peradventure of a doubt that Douglas was schooled in his dislike for my land and my people, to be sure, an old Communist maneuver. He is like the rest of those who know more about my people than we do ourselves. He gets his impressions from far away and he gives out these mean, vile epitaphs long before he has had occasion to know a single solitary thing about the South.

The cancellation of the Caine Mutiny Court Martial was not done because of any gesture of friendship to my people. It was done for the obvious and practical reason that the most sensitive nerve in the body has been offended, that is the pocket nerve of the producer, Paul Gregory. It is elementary that this troupe cannot continue playing to empty houses.

Paul Douglas not only offended the dignities of his troupe, but made an unfortunate reflection on that segment of the American people, both white and colored, who are compelled to eat "lower down on the hog" than Paul Douglas. Good fortune did not smile on these people.

The newspapers have been kind to this individual. They have obeyed the spiritual admonition of "Answer not a fool according to his folly lest he be wise

in his own conceit." Despite the fact that they were mindful, as Mr. Lowell aptly said:

A lie may keep its throne a whole age longer, if it skulk behind the shield of some fairseeming name.

My people have ignored Paul Douglas, instead of booing him or egging him from the South, they desired to shun him as a copper snake, or a leper, and let him, without molestation, depart with nothing but his guilty conscience to smite him; with nothing but his countless abominations to rebuke him; with nothing but the ghosts of his intemperate thoughts and utterances to haunt him for his treachery and unwarranted attacks on my people and our traditions.

Mr. Speaker, long after Paul Douglas has returned to the vile dust from whence he sprung, my land and my people will continue to hold the great promise it now has. We will continue to progress despite those who, like Paul Douglas, would remake us and our land. Despite the political decisions of the Supreme Court, the Executive orders of Presidents, and the unconstitutional acts of Congress of the United States, despite all these, the land of the magnolia, the honeysuckle, the camellia, and the warm and genuine hospitality will continue to attract all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include with my remarks editorials from the News and Courier and the Charleston Evening Post, not saying anything about Paul Douglas but making a few reflections on this sad man now without a job and who has caused the Caine Mutiny to bust up right in his face.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The editorials referred to follow:)

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of January 25, 1955]

SOME SOUR LINES

On reading remarks about the South attributed to Mr. Paul Douglas, an actor who played Charleston and other southern cities lately in the Caine Mutiny, we conclude that he was well cast in the road company as Captain Queeg, the naval officer who was all mixed up in his head. A reporter in Greensboro, N. C., says Mr. Douglas told him the South, in the elegant language of Hollywood, "stinks." Also, he said, it is a land of "sowbelly and segregation." Later Mr. Douglas said he was misquoted, that he was talking only about Greensboro.

No matter; we do not think Mr. Douglas, as a traveling player, is qualified to speak with much authority either about Greensboro as a city or the South as a region. He flits from place to place, we are told, by airplane, while other members of the troupe travel by highway. As to sowbelly, we wonder how Mr. Douglas happened to come across any of that nourishing but plebeian foodstuffs. We can't recall seeing any of it on the menus of public eating places. We wonder whether Mr. Douglas visited in any southern homes where sowbelly was served.

As to segregation, of course it is true that the South continues, in the face of misunderstanding and hostility in other regions, to maintain in certain areas a separation of the races. Mr. Douglas has made no new discovery there.

Steve Brodie, another member of the troupe, said Douglas was speaking only for himself. "He doesn't even see the South," Brodie said. "We've been treated wonderfully and we're enjoying ourselves tremendously."

When he was in Charleston, Mr. Douglas was a guest in one of Charleston's most hospitable houses. We have inquired and we can vouch for the fact that the entertainment was segregated, but that no sowbelly was served. Maybe the best answer to Mr. Douglas is to suggest that he stay in character on the stage as Captain Queeg, a much more attractive fellow than Mr. Douglas seems to be offstage.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Evening Post of January 27, 1955]

MAGNOLIA BLOSSOMS AND HONEYSUCKLE VINE

Paul Douglas is an actor of talent, any lapse of good manners to the contrary notwithstanding. His stage performance in Charleston last week won him applause and admiration. Then, a few days later, he told a reporter in Greensboro that "the South stinks."

It had been our intention to ignore the rudeness, but some of our readers feel Mr. Douglas should be ticked off.

Let us say that the verb he selected makes us recoil. It is a harsh, an almost nauseating word. According to Webster it means "to emit an offensive and disgusting smell or odor." It refers to things vile and foul.

Mr. Douglas could not have meant what he said. He probably had in mind some dressing room, some men's room, or some hotel room he had seen somewhere during his southern peregrinations. He could not have meant the entire South—the land of magnolia blossoms and honeysuckle vines.

Our feeling is that the Greensboro reporter happened to catch Mr. Douglas at a time when his nerves were frayed and his temper shortened by too much traveling, too much stage portrayal of a neurotic, and too much self-pity. His trade carries him barnstorming around the countryside. He yearns for a few quiet evenings at home. Who doesn't?

Mr. Douglas let his bad manners show, but we cannot detect in our heart bitterness against him. The South has survived many cataclysms and catastrophes and somehow we'll manage to ride this one out. Sticks and stones may break our bones, etc., etc., etc.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING HEARINGS OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, last evening I sat in my living room and watched the President in his press conference, on television. This is a new practice in the White House, to telecast presidential press conferences. This must be the second or third such conference televised.

I may say that I think President Eisenhower handled himself extremely well under rather adverse circumstances. With what has been going on this last week it was perfectly apparent that the reporters present at the press conference were going to ask some pretty hot questions, and they did.

It makes one wonder, occasionally, whether it is not a risky practice to answer off-the-cuff, impromptu questions on such matters as the upheaval in the Russian Communist dictatorship, the tense situation in Formosa, and other problems of great national and international import.

I call attention to that press conference of the President to remind the House that we have before us now in these early days of the 84th Congress a parallel problem: Whether or not committees of the House shall be permitted to allow the telecasting or broadcasting of their public hearings.

I raised that question last month. I introduced a resolution which is now pending before the Rules Committee of the House (H. Res. 99). It would dispel any doubt about the power of committees of the House of Representatives to permit telecasts and broadcasts of their public proceedings.

Apparently, under the interpretation of the rules by Speaker RAYBURN, House committees are now prohibited from telecasting hearings. I am going to discuss a little bit later the applicable passages of the rules of the House of Representatives which lead me to suggest that the Speaker's interpretation is not crystal clear under the present rules of the House.

This matter is one of great public concern, because it has to do with the people's knowledge of the public business.

The other body has no such rule preventing telecasting of committee hearings.

Now that the executive branch of the Government has commenced the practice of televising presidential press conferences, it seems to me that we in the House of Representatives, frequently referred to as the greatest parliamentary body in the world, should concern ourselves with the access of the public to our activities in their behalf.

Of course, the radio and television industry is very much interested in this question. I understand that an association of reporters dealing with telecasting and broadcasting has addressed a communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives urging that he reconsider the ruling he gave in response to my parliamentary inquiry. But the public interest goes far beyond that of the broadcasting and telecasting industry.

I hold in my hand an editorial from the Ann Arbor News, my hometown newspaper, dated February 1, 1955, which is as follows:

MEADER CHALLENGES RULING AGAINST TELEVISED HEARINGS

House Speaker RAYBURN's ruling against telecasting of House committee hearings has been challenged by Representative GEORGE MEADER, of Ann Arbor, who has a resolution pending before the Rules Committee to give committees full freedom to publicize their activities.

The Senate operates under an entirely different principle in the matter, a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee having recommended January 7 that no restraints be put on televising Senate committee hearings. Congressman MEADER argues that unless the Rayburn ruling is set aside the public will come to know less and less about proceedings of the House, as compared with its knowledge of senatorial and Presidential activities.

In the last Congress, Republican Speaker MARTIN decided that House committees themselves should determine whether to let their activities be telecast. Under the Rayburn ruling, however, House committees

now not only are forbidden to allow telecasting or broadcasting of their hearings, but they may not admit newsreel cameras nor permit even still pictures while they are in session.

The Senate subcommittee's ruling earlier this year in favor of telecast hearings recognized criticism that TV cameras may transform hearings into carnivals, tempt lawmakers to substitute grandiloquent gestures for statesmanlike moves, and tend to cheapen the legislative process. No doubt they were recalling the McCarthy hearings, but they can hardly be taken as typical of congressional hearings and therefore are not a valid measuring stick.

The subcommittee pointed out the premise that the public is entitled to be present at all public sessions of congressional committees, and "it would seem to follow that broadcasting, televising, and photographing of such proceedings * * * are legitimate means of acquainting the public with the activity of the legislature."

An open policy on telecasting would not mean, of course, that all congressional committee hearings would be telecast or broadcast. Most of them would make pretty dull reporting or viewing. Involved would be a selected few dealing with matters of general interest. It should be noted that in the Senate subcommittee's recommendation on the subject reference is made to public sessions of congressional committees. Too few of them are public; not only are telecasters and broadcasters barred but all representatives of the press and public, while lawmakers debate spending billions in taxpayers' funds.

Representative MEADER's resolution would not open any more committee meetings to the general public, but it would be a step toward increasing citizen interest in affairs of government, and any step in that direction is a good one.

There isn't any way of measuring, but it's probable that the televised Kefauver hearings gave millions of Americans a terrific jolt, as well as a great new interest in the country's crime rate. Selected televised hearings properly conducted could spur interest in many other subjects just as important, although it might be necessary for the House and Senate to draft a code of deportment for their Members to observe during the time they are operating in front of TV cameras. The danger would still exist that voters might be unduly impressed by ham acting on the part of some Congressmen. The sound thinkers may not be the boys who shine brightest under the lights of television.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a few passages from this excellent editorial entitled "MEADER Challenges Ruling Against Televised Hearings."

Let me read the opening paragraph:

House Speaker RAYBURN's ruling against telecasting of House committee hearings has been challenged by Representative GEORGE MEADER, of Ann Arbor, who has a resolution pending before the Rules Committee to give committees full freedom to publicize their activitites.

I omit a few paragraphs and refer specifically to the following:

An open policy on telecasting would not mean, of course, that all congressional committee hearings would be telecast or broadcast. Most of them would make pretty dull reporting or viewing. Involved would be a selected few dealing with matters of general interest.

A little further on I read the following:

Representative MEADER's resolution would not open any more committee meetings to the general public, but it would be a step toward increasing citizen interest in affairs of government, and any step in that direction is a good one.

There isn't any way of measuring, but it's probable that the televised Kefauver hearings gave millions of Americans a terrific jolt as well as a great new interest in the country's crime rate. Selected televised hearings properly conducted could spur interest in many other subjects just as important, although it might be necessary for the House and Senate to draft a code of deportment for their Members to observe during the time they are operating in front of TV cameras. The danger would still exist that voters might be unduly impressed by ham acting on the part of some Congressmen. The sound thinkers may not be the boys who shine brightest under the lights of television.

Mr. Speaker, I have today addressed to the chairman of the Rules Committee, Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, a letter requesting that the Rules Committee set an early date for hearings on House Resolution 99 to amend the rules of the House with respect to conduct of the proceedings of committees. This letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1955.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached is a copy of House Resolution 99 which I introduced in the House of Representatives January 20, 1955, on which day it was referred to your committee. This is to request that your committee hold hearings on that resolution as soon as practicable.

House Resolution 99 is identical with House Resolution 550 which I introduced in the 83d Congress on May 17, 1954. In a general way, this subject matter was considered by the Scott Subcommittee on Committee Procedure of which you were a member in the 83d Congress. I appeared before that subcommittee and testified in behalf of my resolution and in opposition to certain other methods of dealing with committee procedural rules.

I share the reluctance of the leadership, both under Democratic and Republican control, and the Parliamentarian, toward amendment of House rules. I therefore have kept my proposed amendments as simple as possible. However, in my judgment they include everything which needs to be done by way of amendment of House rules to improve the functioning of committees and to clarifying their authority.

The two most significant provisions are contained in paragraphs (4) and (5) on page 2 of my resolution. The first facilitates the work of committees and subcommittees by easing the quorum requirement. The second clarifies an area of existing ambiguity by expressly authorizing committees in their discretion to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their public hearings.

It is my hope that your committee will grant a prompt hearing on my resolution.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I would like to clear up which arose during a previous address I made on this subject. In response to a question by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], I stated that I believed committees should retain control over the reporting of their public proceedings. He asked the question because the President in his press conference apparently has a practice of having a newsreel camera film and tape recording made of the press conference; then he or his staff selects certain passages of the press conference which they are willing to let the broadcasting and telecasting companies show on television and over the radio.

Now I understand that 23 minutes of the press conference held yesterday was shown on television last night or, at least, were available to be shown. It seemed like a pretty complete coverage of the press conference.

I answered the inquiry of the gentleman from California by saying that I thought similar control should remain in the committee of the House of Representatives. Because of the use of the words "editorial control," I feel that an explanation is in order.

Of course, if the committee elects to permit live telecasting or live broadcasting of its proceedings at the beginning of its session, there is not much they can do by way of editorial control except, that in the event they feel it necessary, they could rescind the permission granted. Now, it might be necessary to do that in the interest of fairness.

I recall one instance in the Senate where the 5-percenter inquiry had before it a witness who was testifying to the gift of certain deep freezers to persons high in Government. The counsel of that committee immediately stopped the witness and stopped the public hearing, and the committee went into executive session on the ground that the testimony about to be given was a surprise to the committee and the committee did not want innocent persons smeared by offhand, casual comments made by witnesses in their public proceedings. After hearing the witness in executive session and ascertaining the validity or the soundness of his testimony, they again went into public hearing and heard his testimony on the record in public.

It is situations of that character that I had in mind when I said that I believed it was proper for the committee continually to retain control over the conduct of its proceedings and the manner in which the news of those proceedings would be disseminated.

Now, if the committee should agree to permit telecasting or broadcasting of its proceedings only by recording or by newsreel camera, it would be possible for the committee to make the same arrangement that the President has made, namely, to release certain portions of whatever had been recorded for public use.

But I did not in any sense have in mind, as someone later who spoke on this subject seems to have understood me, that the committee would have the right to have all news reporters submit in advance the stories they were going to write so that the committee in a sense could write its own news reports. That would be farthest from my mind.

Once the committee has opened up hearings to public consumption for news reporters or for telecasters or broadcasters, it seems there would not be any effective way of controlling the material which would be televised or broadcast except by completely shutting off the privilege.

I believe also that it is possible—and I think this was referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who discussed this subject—by placing

the camera in a certain way or by selecting shots of various sections of the committee hearing room to put a slant on something which is seen live over television. Of course, it would be possible, I suppose, in rebroadcasting or retelecasting to eliminate certain passages of testimony and perhaps give a distorted impression of what actually happened.

However, let me say this: I think that telecasting and broadcasting are far less susceptible to distortion than the secondhand accounts of those who were personally present as observers. It is pretty difficult to take primary evidence and make anything different of it than what actually happened.

Now, with respect to the existing rules of the House, the only thing that can be said is this: The ruling, of course, comes from rule 11.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he gets away from the other part of his discussion?

Mr. MEADER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there is a very definite arrangement between the White House and the television and radio broadcasters giving the President and the staff authority, after the broadcast, to go over what has been said and what has been done and to delete any part of that that they desire?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman, of course, must recognize that I do not speak for the White House. I said what I did only because of my understanding that it has been the practice in the past before telecasting not to permit direct quotation of the President. I understood when it was annnounced that this first press conference would be televised, that it had been edited by someone on the White House staff. I do not know the detailed terms of any understanding between the President and any reporters using telecasting or broadcasting of the conference.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It is the general understanding, however, that this new form or medium of dispersing news carries with it that authority that such portions of the film may be deleted as the editing staff of the President decides. That is generally understood, is it not?

Mr. MEADER. I believe that it is, but I have no more information on that than has the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I assume that that is the basis on which the gentleman proceeds here in connection with his disagreement with the ruling of the Speaker; and certainly he has that right in interpreting the rules of the House. But does not the gentleman feel that it is far worse, if it may be so described, for a committee of the Congress to have proceedings and then that information that is to go out to the public of what actually happened to be cut out and later someone else may pick it up in a column, distort it, and give some picture that is not the true picture? Would it not be better not to have these televised programs at all, if they are going to be edited?

Mr. MEADER. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not advocating any specific treatment by a committee. I think those situations must be met as they arise. But I would say to the gentleman—and I know that he is a high-ranking member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—that I would trust him and his committee to deal with those situations as they arise. That is all that I am suggesting, that the committees be entrusted with discretion concerning the media through which their proceedings are reported. I am talking of their public proceedings. I agree with the gentleman heartily that leaks of executive material, premature, surreptitious releases of reports of committees before they have been approved, are a very damaging thing to the reputation of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, would my friend yield again?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to take too much of the gentleman's time. I do want to say that I appreciate his expression of confidence in our committee. We do know a great deal about this business of broadcasting, dealing, as we do, with the television and radio industry. The gentleman is talking about a subject vital to the American people. Of course, the Congress of the United States also is very vital to the American people. But after all, we have got to recognize, I think the gentleman would agree, that there must be decorum maintained in the House and therefore in the committees. The only way it can be maintained is to follow the rules of the House. The committees certainly should not be permitted, in my humble opinion, to proceed under one rule while the House proceeds under another.

Mr. MEADER. I think the gentleman has a real point there, and that brings me to the point that I was about to make when the gentleman asked me to yield.

This is governed by rule XI–25 (a) of the rules of the House, which reads as follows:

> The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable—

Of course, that clause, "so far as applicable," is so general that it leaves a lot of doubt. But let us see what the rules of the House are right now.

Rule XXXIV–(3) reads as follows in material part:

> Such portion of the gallery of the House of Representatives as may be necessary to accommodate reporters of news to be disseminated by radio, wireless, and similar means of transmission, wishing to report debates and proceedings, shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters thus engaged shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe.

I know the gentleman has been present at many joint sessions of the House of Representatives and the Senate to hear addresses by the President on the state of the Union, or other messages, where we have had broadcasting and telecasting apparatus in the Chamber of the House. I have checked this with the Parliamentarian, and this comes under the Speaker's general powers and is stated in rule I–3 as follows:

> He shall have general control, except as provided by rule or law, of the Hall of the House, and of the corridors and passages.

Under that rule, it is my understanding, without anything in the precedents, that the Speaker has permitted the telecasting and broadcasting of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives in joint sessions and also in so-called joint meetings, which are not legal sessions of the House but meetings to hear a foreign premier or a representative of a foreign government or a distinguished citizen.

Following this logic for just a moment, if the Speaker of the House now has under the express rule I have just read, the authority to permit telecasting of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, then it seems to me if the rules of the House are the rules of the committees either the chairman of a committee or the committee itself has the power to control the proceedings in its committee room.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield further, certainly the gentleman makes a point if the House is actually in session at these joint meetings to which guests are invited and during the time they are here the proceedings are televised, but the gentleman himself mentioned a moment ago that the House is not actually in session at such times. We are in recess, and we are in recess for the purpose of inviting guests to come in here. Consequently, you are not televising the actual proceedings of the House, you are televising what goes on while the House is in recess.

Mr. MEADER. I am suggesting to the gentleman that rule XXXIV–3 is broad enough to permit radio, wireless and television reporters to cover the proceedings of the House under regulations of the Speaker. Perhaps I am wrong in that interpretation. At least, let us say that the joint sessions of the Senate and the House are official meetings of the House and the Senate and have been recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Journal. They are different from joint meetings where a distinguished citizen or a representative of a foreign government speaks.

I want to make one other point. This should not be a political question. It could be argued that it is, because the Speaker of this Congress and the 82d Congress, under Democratic control, ruled against telecasting, and the Speaker of the 83d Congress, under Republican control, permitted it. However, I do not think it was decided by either one of the Speakers on a political basis. I think it was their honest interpretation of the existing rules.

It can become a matter of politics only if the Democratic controlled 84th Congress ignores this problem and does not permit its Committee on Rules to consider this question and present it to the House of Representatives for a decision. Then the leadership must have the responsibility for denying to the American public full access to the public proceedings of the House of Representatives. I think that radio and television

are here to stay. We cannot turn back the clock, and I do not think we can stop the demand of the public for the knowledge of public business they can gain through these new instrumentalities any more than King Canute could stop the waves from rolling up on the seashore.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if there are no special orders at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. The gentleman is discussing a very interesting and a very important question. I wonder if he would clear up one question in my mind. If we open up the hearings in the committees in the House of Representatives and the other Chamber of the Congress, how are we going to correct the lies that are perpetrated upon the general public through these media in open hearings, and we have had some of the results of that in the last few weeks by the admission of at least one of the witnesses who have appeared before a committee, and who have then come back and admitted that their testimony was complete lies. How are we going to disseminate this further information to the general public unless we have these things settled before they go out over the air through radio and television?

Mr. MEADER. Let me say to the gentleman that a committee of the Congress is a privileged forum and encourages people to be quite free in their expression of opinions and in their statement of facts, but they are also under oath and can be punished for perjury. That is true whether the proceedings are telecast or not. The official record is there and the lie is there whether the public sees it through television or through newspaper accounts or by the printed record of the committee.

I do not think that the question the gentleman raises has anything to do with the means of the dissemination of the news.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I think it would be better if there was a preliminary investigation.

Mr. MEADER. I agree with the gentleman that it would be better to have a preliminary investigation in those instances of deliberate falsehood before the committees, and that is the avenue through which the evil at which the gentleman and I, too, are aiming, could be corrected. But I do not think that has anything to do with the means of dissemination of opinions and news.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to remind him that not on every occasion is a witness under oath so that he can be punished for lying or perjury under oath. But the situation is this. When people are damaged through testimony before a congressional committee in some of the great dramas that we have had, and which I, as a private citizen no more than 6 months ago or a year ago, would look on, these great dramas were being put out as being truths before the American public, and then within the period of a very few short months, we find out that the stars in the drama were merely lying and putting out this information to the American public through channels of public information disseminating news. I think that those questions had a great bearing on the decision of our great Speaker in his ruling before the Congress this year.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman knows, perhaps, better than I what the Speaker's attitude on telecasting is as a matter of policy. Let me say, and I want to be completely fair about this, that the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] took the trouble when this matter was first under discussion in February 1952, and this is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 2, page 1570, to state that the ruling of the Speaker did not indicate his belief about whether telecasting should be permitted or not, but only his interpretation of the rules of the House. I have never heard an expression of the Speaker as to what he would like to do. I know it is terrifically important and I would hope that he would favor as a matter of policy the telecasting of committee hearings because I know that the Committee on Rules of the House is very sensitive to the views of the Speaker with respect to amending the rules of the House. I would hope as a matter of policy he would be for it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I want to make myself clear and to state that the Speaker of the House never has talked to me or told me why he made this decision. I merely said I think that the attitude I have told you about prompted, perhaps, part of his decision. At any rate it bears witness for the wisdom of his decision. I do want to say this—that I certainly hope any time misinformation is sent out from this Congress such as has been sent out through these channels of public information, we will find a way to reinform the people because they are under the belief today that certain citizens in America were traitors and Communists and so forth due to the false testimony, and that a great number of people were thrown out of the Government because of this testimony as a result of the great dramas on television.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will help correct that kind of situation.

Mr. MEADER. I am sure the gentleman and I are not in disagreement. I am quite sure the gentleman would not take the position that it is all right for a lie to be reported through the press, but wrong to have it reported through television or radio. I think they are just media of communication. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that there should not be any lying no matter what means of news transmission prevails in the hearings.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. McDOWELL.

Mr. GENTRY.

Mr. PATTERSON in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 587. An act to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 12, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Geo. L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	$5,823.00
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	5,823.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	5,823.00
Mabel C. Downey	Assistant clerk	5,795.79
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	3,524.96
Alice Klotz	do	3,190.36
Betty Prezioso	do	2,729.66
Arlow Hill	Clerical aid	1,525.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	41,480.61
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	450.14
Total amount expended from June 11, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	41,930.75
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	8,069.25

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$5,823.00
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	5,823.00
Corhal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	5,823.00
Robert E. Lambert	do	5,823.00
Paul M. Wilson	do	5,823.00
Ross P. Pope	do	5,823.00
Jay B. Howe	do	5,823.00
Samuel W. Crosby	do	5,642.52
Carson W. Culp	do	5,296.92
Robert M. Moyer	do	5,296.92
Robert P. Williams	do	5,158.68
Frank Sanders	do	4,813.02
Robert L. Michaels	do	3,941.88
G. Homer Skarin	do	3,941.88
Lawrence C. Miller	Junior assistant clerk.	3,145.26
Earl C. Silsby	do	3,065.58
Francis G. Merrill	do	2,667.30
Samuel R. Preston	Clerk-stenographer	2,428.32
Donald R. Bridges	do	1,817.58
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,854.78
Willie Tarrant	Janitor-messenger	1,517.52
Ralph W. Horton	Clerk to the majority.	4,500.50
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to the minority.	4,951.26
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,216.14
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to chairman.	2,189.34
Delores Cropper	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.	1,870.68
Charles C. Andersen	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee.	2,189.34
Helen F. Baden	do	2,189.34
James W. Dudley	do	2,189.34
John G. Clevenger	do	2,189.34
Jane T. Lumpkin	do	1,824.45
Hilda C. Yeatman	do	364.89
Margie H. Trew	do	2,189.34
David P. Doyle	do	364.89
Phyllis N. Troy	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee.	2,189.34
Virginia S. Hudgins	do	2,189.34
Julia M. Elliott	do	2,189.34
William J. Neary	do	2,189.34
Mary A. Vaughan	do	2,189.34
Nella L. Adams	do	1,459.56
William Albert Jackson.	do	1,277.12
Robert S. Bourbon	do	364.89
Beverly D. Arneson	do	1,824.45
Agnes L. Norten	do	1,824.45
Molly O'Day Saguto	do	1,824.45
Helen A. Livengood	do	1,824.45
Carl Phillips	do	1,094.67
Jesse C. Hughes	do	1,094.67
Barbara Koons	do	729.78
Aleta Lister	do	364.89
Lois W. Woodworth	do	364.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$330,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1954	144,572.98
Total amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1954	144,572.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	185,427.02

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harris H. Huston	Director of Surveys and Investigations.	$5,823.00
George S. Green	Investigator	5,642.52
Robert W. Zehring	do	5,400.60
Rose Marie Wahler	Stenographer	2,388.48
Ethel P. Powers	do	2,061.84
Ralph W. Horton	Investigator	900.10
Robert A. Collier	Consultant	3,379.59
J. Harold Deveau	do	7,138.27
T. Howard Dolan	do	4,737.76
Merrill M. Hammond	do	1,831.82
John J. Mahaney	do	6,150.00
Frank C. Mentillo	do	3,144.84
William E. Morris	do	5,293.75
Francis T. O'Donnell	do	5,735.15
W. Bradlee Smith	do	2,551.95
James F. Tierney	do	5,867.25
Charles W. Tucker	do	3,170.70

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Department of Commerce: C. C. Hulse.	Special consultant	$408.00
Department of the Interior: D. Otis Beasley.	do	284.80
Department of the Navy Otho William Helm.	Clerk-stenographer	309.23
U. S. Railroad Retirement Board: Eugene H. Mock.	Special consultant	690.53
Travel and miscellaneous expenses.		6,020.01

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$450,000
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1954	78,930.19
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	78,930.19
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	371,069.81
Payment of bills rendered for prior fiscal period	1,468.05

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 12, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$5,823.00
John R. Blandford	Counsel	5,823.00
Charles F. Ducander	do	5,823.00
Philip W. Kelleher	do	5,823.00
Janice G. Angell	Clerical staff	2,810.70
L. Louise Ellis	do	2,810.70
Agnes H. Johnston	do	3,065.58
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,810.70
H. Bailey Yeager	Clerical staff (month of July, Aug. 1 to 13).	290.51
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	$5,823.00
Edward T. Fogo	Investigator	4,467.42
Lloyd R. Kuhn	do	3,734.76
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	2,428.32
Dorothea Clore	do	2,428.32
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	2,428.32
Ethel L. Mott	do	2,347.37

(Office of the Special Counsel operating under H. Res. 125 and H. Res 156, 83d Cong.)

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	83,002.39
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	27,751.85
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	29,814.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec 31, 1954	39,245.76

DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Professional staff	$5,823.00
John E. Barriere	do	5,823.00
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	5,823.00
Elsie L. Gould	Deputy clerk	4,322.04
Helen E. Long	Assistant clerk	3,145.26
Mary W. Layton	Stenographer	3,145.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	None
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from ____ to ____	None
Total amount expended from ____ to ____	None
Balance unexpended as of	None

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DECEMBER 30, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$5,822.28
Wendell E. Cable	Assistant clerk	5,822.28
Ruth Butterworth	do	3,750.66
Margaret S. Rogers	do	2,300.82
George R. Stewart	Professional staff	5,642.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	256.08
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	15.75
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1954	271.83
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	1,728.17

SID SIMPSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 10, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John O. Graham	Staff director	$5,823.00
Fred G. Hussey	Minority staff director	5,823.00
Edward A. McCabe	General counsel	5,823.00
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	5,823.00
L. M. Weltmer	Assistant general counsel (began Oct. 1).	2,911.50
Ben H. Johnson	Investigator	3,762.54
Jeanne E. Thomson	Assistant to the staff director.	3,001.86
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant to the minority staff director.	3,001.86
Helen M. McCarthy	Stenographer	2,985.96
Marion E. Sittler	do	2,985.96
EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 116 AND H. RES. 543 (H. RES. 115)		
Arad Riggs	Special counsel (began July 26).	4,135.90
L. M. Weltmer	Special counsel (end Sept. 30).	2,021.81
Frederick D. Rosenberg.	Special counsel (began Aug. 1).	3,135.50
Raymond C. Cole, Jr.	Special investigator (began July 23).	3,302.71
Myrtle S. Locher	Clerical assistant	1,791.00
Mary Ryan	Clerical assistant (began July 12).	2,803.48
Mary Bryan Cummings.	Stenographer (began Aug. 1).	1,890.80
Angela Novello	Stenographer (Sept. 1–Sept. 30).	497.66
Elisabetta Kaplun	do	374.85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	20,250.97
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	60,151.68
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	80,402.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	44,597.35

SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator and committee clerk.	$5,823.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan	Staff consultant	5,823.00
Roy J. Bullock	do	5,823.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	do	5,823.00
June Nigh	Staff assistant	3,145.25
Winifred G. Osborne	do	3,384.23
Helen C. Mattas	do	3,145.25
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	3,145.25
Helen L. Hashagen	do	3,145.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	18,885.22
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	6,170.25
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	25,055.77
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	49,944.53

ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Helen M. Boyer	Staff director	$5,823.00
J. Robert Brown	Research analyst	4,743.90
Elizabeth A. Buell	Clerk-stenographer	2,715.06
Patricia J. Burtner	do	2,507.94
Christine Ray Davis	Minority professional staff.	5,476.62
Reuben S. Heppes	Clerk for research and coordination.	2,667.30
Carl E. Hoffman	General counsel (Dec. 1 to 31, 1954).	894.34
Annabelle G. Moore	Clerk-stenographer	2,715.06
Martha C. Roland	Minority clerk	4,246.02
Clyde W. Smith	General counsel (July 1 to Nov. 21, 1954).	4,561.35
Annabell Zue	Chief clerk	5,504.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for full committee and Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee expenditures	$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	59,198.79
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1954	71.43
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1954	59,270.22
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	40,729.78

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

ANTIRACKETEERING SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 23, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louis B. Atkinson	Investigator (Aug. 16 to Oct. 15, 1954).	$1,466.01
Frank V. Battle	Special counsel (June 28 to Dec. 10, 1954).	4,984.43
Dorothea Dickinson	Stenographer (July 7 to Oct. 15, 1954).	1,335.57
Stanley T Fisher	Investigator (June 23 to Dec. 15, 1954).	4,110.13
Virginia H. Gunther	Stenographer (July 6 to Dec. 31, 1954).	2,283.39
Murray E. Jackson	Chief investigator (July 1 to Nov. 28, 1954).	4,071.04
Curtis E. Johnson	Investigator (July 1 to Dec. 15, 1954).	3,211.72
Charles R. LaFrance	Investigator (July 4 to Oct. 15, 1954).	2,531.53
F. Albert Reiman	Investigator (Sept. 1 to 30, 1954).	836.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (committee authorized on June 23, 1954	None
Amount expended from June 23 to Dec. 31, 1954	46,490.32
Total amount expended from June 23, to Dec. 31, 1954	46,490.32
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31 1954	$28,509.68
Expenditures for which vouchers have been filed, but not paid as of Dec. 31, 1954	770.43
Balance	27,739.25

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations (Antiracketeering Subcommittee).

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

JANUARY 1, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leslie T. Mahurin (July 14 to 23 inclusive).	Investigator	$162.09
Jane E. Morgan	Clerk	2,746.98
Ray Ward	Staff director	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 339)	$59,625.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	31,964.40
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	10,010.39
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	41,974.79
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1955	17,650.21

NOTE.—There are several bills outstanding which have not been paid as of this date.

CECIL M. HARDEN,
Chairman.

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

JANUARY 6, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Michael P. Balwan	Staff director	$5,780.82
Paul J. Cotter	Chief counsel	5,823.00
Robert T. Morris	Assistant counsel	3,623.22
James F. Eckhart	Investigator	3,224.94
Walter R. Whitver, Jr.	do	3,424.08
Sylvia L. Swartzel	Clerk-stenographer	2,488.30
Mary L. Vaughan	do	2,507.94
Donna J. Walters (June 25 to July 31, 1954).	Clerk-typist	359.79
Mary F. Einstein (Sept. 1 to 30, 1954).	Clerk	707.67
M. Carey Brewer	Reimbursement to Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 1 through July 31, 1954.	502.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$115,425.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	79,019.96
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	33,733.83
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	112,753.71
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	2,671.29

R. WALTER RIEHLMAN,
Chairman.

INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Maurice J. Mountain	Staff director	$5,823.00
Edward C. Kennelly	Counsel	5,366.04
Walton Woods	Investigator	4,536.54
Arthur Perlman	do	4,536.54
Wallace Parks	do	3,611.28
Chesley Prioleau	Clerk-stenographer	2,348.64
Lois M. Knudson	do	1,859.86
Government contract for insurance.		66.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$118,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	79,169.51
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	28,148.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	107,317.53
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	10,682.47

CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
Chairman.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lucille E. Benthin	Clerk-Stenographer	$1,287.39
Geraldean Colevas	do	3,092.14
Stanley T. Fisher	Investigator	283.07
Elizabeth Frazer	Clerk	3,576.77
C. Niles Garrick	Investigator	2,123.01
Rita Giovannetti	Stenographer	767.95
Susie P. Gross	Clerk-typist	498.04
Francis X. Plant	Assistant counsel	583.55
Nina M. Reed	Clerk-stenographer	1,950.36
Arthur Toll	Investigator	3,321.64
Vera Wasielewski	Clerk-typist	1,296.78
Mary Evelyn Wilson	do	526.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$117,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	84,235.81
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	25,391.64
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	109,627.45
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	7,372.55

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie Savage	Clerk	$5,823.00
Jack Watson	Assistant clerk	4,951.26
Lura Cannon	do	3,596.68
Loretta Livingston	do	2,077.78

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 12, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
R. S. Butler	Minerals consultant	$4,951.26
Sidney L. McFarland.	Engineering consultant.	4,951.26
George W. Abbott	Counsel	4,951.26
John L. Taylor	Territories consultant.	4,951.26
Clerical staff:		
Orland T. Huyck	Chief clerk	4,605.66
Nancy J. Arnold	Assistant chief clerk	4,093.92
Laura Ann Moran	Minority clerk	2,985.96
Patricia Ann Murray.	Clerk	2,985.96
Eve Fatzinick	do	2,667.30
Beryl L. Schaum	do	2,667.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,784.52
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	7,432.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	23,217.15
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	26,782.85

A. L. MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$5,823.00
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	3,264.72
Herman C. Beasley	Assistant clerk	3,264.72
Georgia G. Glassmann.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,826.60
Helen A. Grickis	do	2,826.60
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,189.34
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,823.00
Arlin E. Stockburger.[1]	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,823.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	5,823.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	5,823.00

[1] Retired, effective c. o. b. Dec. 31, 1954.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,717.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	3,296.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	14,013.00
Balance (approximate) unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	45,987.00

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bessie M. Orcutt	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
William R. Foley	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Walter R. Lee	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
Malcolm Mecartney	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	5,823.00
Violet T. Benn	Clerical staff	3,702.90
Anne J. Berger	do	3,702.90
Rebecca D. Bergesen	do	3,065.58
Lucille E. Brooks	do	3,702.90
Frances Christy	do	3,702.90
Mary DeMatteis	do	3,065.58
Helen Goldsmith	do	3,702.90

1. Funds for Preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and Revision of the Laws:

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):

Unexpended balance June 30, 1954	$59,824.56
Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1954	16,257.82
Balance Dec. 31, 1954	43,566.74

B. Revision of the Laws, 1955:

Appropriated in Legislative Act, 1955	13,700.00
Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1954	5,956.67
Balance Dec. 31, 1954	7,743.33

C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):

Unexpended balance June 30, 1954	13,504.69
Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1954	0.00
Balance Dec. 31, 1954	13,504.69

2. Funds pursuant to H. Res. 50 (H. Res. 66 and H. Res. 622):

Unexpended balance June 30, 1954	19,748.10
Funds provided by H. Res. 622	25,000.00
Total available	44,748.10
Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1954	19,690.34
Balance on hand Dec. 31, 1954	25,057.76

Employees pursuant to H. Res. 50 (H. Res. 66 and 622):

Janet Romney, clerk	2,268.96
Bart Wigby, messenger (Aug. 1-Dec. 31)	1,448.41
Total	3,717.37

CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 14, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leonard P. Pliska	Chief clerk	$5,124.06
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	5,823.00
John M. Drewry	do	5,823.00
Helen M. Gibbs	Staff member (from Aug. 1, 1954).	4,126.05
Ruth E. Brookshire	Clerk	3,782.52
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	2,667.30
Shirley Schwartz	do	3,782.52
Frances Still	Clerk to minority	3,782.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,979.13
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	10,300.84
Total amount expended from Aug. 3, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	12,279.97
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	37,720.03

THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
Acting Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	$5,823.00
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	5,435.16
Thomas C. Raum	Chief clerk (Jan. 1-Dec. 15, 1954).	4,602.02
Henry C. Cassell	Clerk (Dec. 17-31, 1954).	374.35
John B. Price	Staff assistant	3,463.92
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	3,224.94
Lillian Hopkins	Secretary	2,826.60
Ann Gould	Stenographer	2,667.30
Evelyn Carson	do	2,348.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	32,695.02
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1954	10,910.86
Total amount expended from Feb. 18, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	43,605.88
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	6,394.12

EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 4, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert F. McConnell	Chief clerk and counsel.	$5,823.00
Charles G. Tierney	Counsel	5,823.00
Jos. H. McGann, Sr.	Assistant clerk	5,823.00
Margaret R. Beiter	Staff assistant	4,246.00
Violet Schumacher	do	4,246.00
Mildred Ames	do	2,587.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	19,875.16
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	5,452.21
Total amount expended from July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	25,327.37
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	4,672.63

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jane W. Snader	Assistant clerk	$4,246.02
Agnes R. Hanford	do	3,033.72
C. O. Haley	Minority clerk	3,463.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,500
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	1,500
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	1,500
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	1,000

LEO E. ALLEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 10, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
STANDING COMMITTEE		
Dolores B. Anderson	Reporter	$4,271.35
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	5,711.69
Thomas W. Beale, Sr.	Chief clerk	5,823.00
Juliette P. Joray	Secretary to chief clerk.	4,322.05

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
STANDING COMMITTEE—continued		
Robert I. Kunzig	Counsel	$5,823.00
Raphael I. Nixon	Director of research	5,823.00
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to counsel	4,157.32
Thelma L. Scearce	Secretary to investigators.	4,144.65
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Counsel	5,823.00
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section.	4,605.66
INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE		
James A. Andrews	Investigator (resigned Aug. 31, 1954).	1,604.34
Robert B. Barker	Investigator (appointed Aug. 1, 1954; resigned Aug. 31, 1954).	311.78
Frank Bonora	Investigator	3,264.72
Robert C. Carr	Research analyst (appointed Aug. 1, 1954; resigned Sept. 30, 1954).	534.80
John W. Carrington	Assistant to the clerk.	3,782.56
Florence B. Clark	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Sept. 1, 1954).	1,910.96
Raymond T. Collins	Investigator (appointed Dec. 1, 1954).	577.32
George E. Cooper	Investigator	4,246.02
Anniel Cunningham	Information analyst	2,826.60
Barbara H. Edelschein.	Telephone operator	2,109.66
Elizabeth L. Edinger	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Sept. 1, 1954).	1,778.20
Earl L. Fuoss	Investigator	5,239.32
Jennie R. Hayes	Clerk-typist	2,428.32
A. Merle Holton	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Aug. 16, 1954).	1,907.51
Lillian Howard	Research analyst	3,344.39
W. Jackson Jones	Investigator	4,467.42
Larry Kerley	do	2,932.84
Phyllis I. Lukeman	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Oct. 1, 1954; resigned Dec. 31, 1954).	$744.90
Helen I. Mattson	Research analyst	3,503.75
C. E. McKillips	Investigator	4,246.02
Isabel Nagel	Clerk-stenographer	2,826.60
Lorraine Nichols	do	2,906.28
Courtney E. Owens	Chief investigator	5,735.32
Muriel Pickles	File clerk (appointed Aug. 2, 1954).	1,328.08
Asselia S. Poore	Editor	3,463.92
Carolyn G. Roberts	Assistant chief of reference section.	3,623.22
Rose Sanko	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Sept. 13, 1954).	1,021.86
Leslie C. Scott	Research analyst	3,463.92
Josephine Sheetz	Clerk-typist	2,268.96
Marjorie Sirlouis	Secretary to counsel	2,985.96
Gladys Slack	Information analyst (resigned June 30, 1954).	471.10
Riley D. Smith, Jr.	Stock clerk	2,428.32
Alvin W. Stokes	Investigator	3,463.92
Ruth K. Tansill	Information analyst	2,906.28
Rea S. Van Fosson	Investigator (appointed Nov. 24, 1954).	873.36
Alice E. Walker	Information analyst (appointed Aug. 2, 1954) (part-time employee).	1,328.08
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	5,573.40
George C. Williams	Investigator	4,605.66
Kathryn Zimmerman	Clerk-stenographer (resigned Sept. 1, 1954).	1,021.87

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$575,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	410,059.58
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	143,259.05
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	553,318.63
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1955	21,681.37

HAROLD H. VELDE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
Casey M. Jones	Professional aid	5,823.00
Harold A. L. Lawrence.	do	5,823.00
Oliver E. Meadows	do	5,823.00
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	5,823.00
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	4,951.26
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	3,129.30
Frances Montanye	do	3,129.30
Ida Rowan	Administrative assistant.	5,823.00
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	3,264.72
Helen Wright [1]	Clerk-stenographer	3,771.00

[1] Paid from special funds authorized to the committee for an inspection of the Veterans' Administration (H. Res. 34, approved Mar. 4, 1953).

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	16,624.29
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	4,906.30
Total amount expended from Mar. 5, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	21,530.59
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	28,469.41

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell E. Train	Clerk (C)	$5,823.00
Thomas A. Martin	Professional assistant (P).	5,711.70
Richard M. Furlaud	do	5,711.70
Karl T. Schlotterbeck	Professional assistant (P) (to Aug. 1954).	1,196.94
Leo H. Irwin	Minority adviser (P).	5,823.00
Susan Alice Taylor	Staff assistant (C)	3,782.52
Frances C. Russell	do	3,782.52
June A. Kendall	do	3,153.24
Anne Gorden	do	3,105.42
Virginia M. Butler	do	3,105.42
Grace Good	do	3,105.42
Irene Wade	do	2,778.78
Hughlon Greene	Messenger	1,998.12
Walter B. Little	do	1,998.12

DANIEL A. REED,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1954

DECEMBER 31, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 10, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Stanley P. Kimmel	General counsel	$4,852.50
Marie J. Nye	Clerk	2,316.21
Samuel H. Still, Jr.	Special counsel	1,519.21
William E. Murray	Investigator	1,168.65
Carolyn Taylor	Stenographer	459.61
Sara McLain	do	131.60
J. F. Trazzare	Handwriting expert	162.50
Grace G. Shelfer	do	48.03

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from ——— to ———	
Total amount expended from Aug. 10 to Dec. 31, 1954	19,406.71
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	5,593.29

C. W. BISHOP,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carl E. Davis	Staff director	$4,605.66
David E. White	Chief investigator	3,941.88
L. V. Monzel	Research analyst	3,941.88
Melvin M. Miller	Counsel	2,985.96
Ernest L. Stockton	Economist	59.27
Jane M. Deem	Clerk	3,105.42
Harriet I. Lane	Secretary	2,985.96
Elizabeth H. Feltman	Clerical assistant	2,985.96
Elva W. Bell	do	2,667.30
Virginia Hell	do	2,667.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$160,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	92,642.89
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	35,875.27
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	128,518.16
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	31,481.84

WILLIAM S. HILL,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

JANUARY 3, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James J. McTigue	Chief counsel	$5,823.30
Edward M. O'Connor	Staff director	5,823.30
Will Allen	Chief investigator	4,501.98
Richard B. Walsh	Staff consultant	5,020.38
John P. Simpson	Investigator	3,742.68
Jack H. Bishop	do	3,742.68
Jan Karski	Consultant	2,321.78
Charles T. Baroch	Research analyst	4,055.94
Patrick McMahon	Consultant	3,882.20
Margaret J. Robey	Clerk-stenographer	1,539.20
Mary C. Kersten	do	563.26
Bette B. Welch	do	2,253.06
Jessie G. Phillips	Clerk	1,005.03
Margaret Kennedy	Clerk-stenographer	491.34

CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
Chairman.

(Received too late to be included in the August 3, 1954, printing)

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY THE SEIZURE AND FORCED INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA BY THE U. S. S. R.

NOVEMBER 23, 1954.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James J. McTigue	Chief counsel	$4,824.60
Edward M. O'Connor.	Staff director	834.10
Richard B. Walsh	Staff consultant	4,554.78
Will Allen	Chief investigator	3,762.78
Charles T. Baroch	Research analyst	3,523.14
Patrick McMahon	Staff consultant	804.10
John P. Simpson, Jr.	Investigator	562.18
Jack H. Bishop, Sr.	do	524.75
Mary Kersten	Clerk-stenographer	617.02
Jessie Phillips	do	795.33
Margaret J. Robey	do	1,950.00
Bette B. Welch	do	1,851.06
Kurt Glaser	Investigator	153.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$180,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,090.32
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1954	45,783.68
Total amount expended from June 30, 1953 to June 30, 1954	60,874.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1954	119,126.00

CHARLES J. KERSTEN,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

FEBRUARY 10, 1955.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bowen, Onda	File clerk	$567.67
Casey, Kathryn	Legal analyst	3,611.28
Cox, Mildred	Assistant clerk	2,826.60
Dodd, Norman	Research director	928.90
Koch, Arnold T.	Associate counsel	839.61
Lake, Ellyn	Secretary to counsel	404.72
Lauren, Lee Davis	Research assistant	750.33
Lonergan, Lucy W.	do	2,591.86
McNiece, Thomas M.	Assistant research director.	750.33
Marshall, John, Jr.	Chief clerk	502.97
Pickett, Virginia	Secretary	433.93
Wormser, Rene A.	General counsel	2,911.50
Lawless, James J., Jr.	Stenographer	266.33
De Huszar, George B.	Special expert	712.74
Ettinger, Karl E.	Research consultant	351.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$115,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	89,093.89
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954	25,222.83
Total amount expended from Sept. 15, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1954	114,316.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1954	683.28

CARROLL REECE,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

398. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 10th Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, dated February 1955, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

399. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

400. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the court's order of February 8, 1955, in the case of *John J. Braund* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 9–52), pursuant to House Resolution 700, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

401. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the Third Semianual Report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (Public Law 203, 83d Cong., as amended by Public Law 751, 83d Cong., pursuant to sec. 19 of Public Law 751, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

402. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1955 and for other purposes, in the amount of $913,508,767, together with several proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 88); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

403. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

404. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

405. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the definition of 'airman' in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

406. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

408. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

410. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands with respect to the disposal of mineral deposits in which the United States owns a partial or future interest"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

412. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled: "A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

413. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of McFarland Cockrill, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 881. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Sardo; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow; without amendment (Rept.

No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1048. A bill for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1177. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski; with amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1192. A bill for the relief of Angelita Haberer; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1206. A bill to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself; with amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1511. A bill for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath; with amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1645. A bill for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of Charles Chan; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of David Manuel Porter; without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief or Orlando Lucarini; without amendment (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul); without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Theodora Sammartino; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of Basil Theodossiou; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi; with amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 3873. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to certain individuals who are over the age of 18 but who are incapable of self-support by reason of permanent physical or mental disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3874. A bill to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3875. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3876. A bill to allow certain persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for meals and lodging when employed away from home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3877. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Look-Out Mountain National Park in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3878. A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3879. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3880. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3881. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3882. A bill to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3883. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3884. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3885. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 3886. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3887. A bill to exempt from tax amounts paid for admissions to certain rodeos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3888. A bill to exempt from tax assessments paid by club members for capital improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3889. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3890. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social-security benefits or subject to social-security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a longer period for claiming refund or credit of income tax where the claim is based upon a judicial decision affecting tax liability in a similar case; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3892. A bill to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income-tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3893. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of medical expenses without regard to the maximum limitations of existing law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3894. A bill to increase the usefulness of the St. Lawrence Seaway by increasing the width and depth of certain locks, increasing the controlling depth of channels and canals, and by providing for the deepening of certain connecting waterways in the Great Lakes area so as to permit oceangoing vessels using such seaway to reach all the Great Lakes ports; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3895. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3896. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3897. A bill to relieve the Secretary of the Interior of certain reporting requirements in connection with proposed National Park Service awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3898. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Programs Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3899. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 3900. A bill to amend section 5701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3901. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to aid

business enterprises in financing improvements to reduce smoke, air pollution, and contamination; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 3902. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3903. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3904. A bill to amend section 7851 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for loss of wages or other compensation by reason of calls to jury service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 3906. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3907. A bill authorizing an appropriation of $5 million to repair hurricane damage along the coast of South Carolina from Georgetown to Cherry Grove Beach; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3908. A bill to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 3909. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for the payment of annuities thereunder to the widowers of female employees who die in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3910. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 3911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers using the standard deduction to deduct such expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3912. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3913. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3914. A bill to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the extension services; to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity; and to promote economy in agricultural extension work; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3915. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 10 acres of land in the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., to School District No. 1, Pondera County, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3916. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3917. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3918. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3919. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3920. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3921. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 3922. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 3923. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 3924. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3925. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 3926. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3927. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 3928. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 3929. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 3930. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a 9-foot channel in the Minnesota River, Minn., from mile 14.2 to its mouth; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of individual taxpayers, a deduction equal to 30 percent of amounts paid as tuition for college or university students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3932. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3933. A bill to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3934. A bill to provide for the recognition of organizations of postal and other Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3935. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for officers and employees within the purview thereof additional benefits with respect to qualification for retirement and computation of principal and survivor annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3936. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3937. A bill to establish a Medical Advisory Committee on Alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3938. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3939. A bill to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold-coin standard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 3940. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3941. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3942. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to penalize unauthorized use of interstate motor trucks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3943. A bill to grant to veterans with service after June 27, 1950, the same exclusive preferences provided under the Boulder Canyon Project Act for veterans with service during other periods of hostility; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3944. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3945. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 3946. A bill to permit employees of the Panama Canal Company who are piloting vessels through the Panama Canal to retire under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, after 20 years

of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3947. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 3948. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3949. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3950. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (by request):

H. R. 3951. A bill to amend section 8 (b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3952. A bill to amend the cotton-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 3953. A bill to amend the cotton-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to subject the submerged lands under the marginal seas to the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and to amend such act in order to provide that revenues under its provisions shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution for Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution for Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution for Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution for Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution for Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution for Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution for Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution favoring temporary continuation of certain post offices after the Postmaster General has ordered their discontinuance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution proposing immediate enactment by the Congress of necessary legislation to relieve certain farmers from acreage controls and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Montana Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Status of Forces Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Status of Forces Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that H. R. 246, now pending in the House of Representatives be passed and approved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3954. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Etella Weinstock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3955. A bill for the relief of Dennis LeCompte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 3956. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rotics Whitney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 3957. A bill for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3958. A bill for the relief of Louis Elterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 3959. A bill for the relief of Dr. Beni Horvath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3960. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gago Santana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3961. A bill for the relief of Paul, Zelma, and Ivan Fulop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3962: A bill for the relief of Robert Grossman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Kingan, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of Max Moskowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of Harry and Sadie Woonteiler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hedeuk Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Cornel A. Lengyel-Leahu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Shaoul I. Khedouri, Suzette Khedouri, Franklin Khedouri, and Frances Khedouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of Sang Won Liu and Yung T. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of certain Yugoslav seamen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 3973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3974. A bill for the relief of Bernard Joseph Gignac and Rita Gignac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3975. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3976. A bill for the relief of Lisa El Anid and Alfred El Anid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3977. A bill for the relief of Yrjo (George) Israel Erkinpoika Haapanen; Anna Esther Alfhild Haapanen, nee Talkari; Seppo Pellervo Haapanen; Anna Lissa Hytinen, nee Haapanen; Timo Juhani Haapanen; and Eira Telervo Haapanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3978. A bill for the relief of Herman Y. Misirliyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 3979. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 3980. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, and Junior K. Schoolcraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 3981. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3982. A bill for the relief of James H. R. Stumbaugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3983. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sigrid Jurksaitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 3984. A bill for the relief of Nella Norma Giorgi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3985. A bill for the relief of Filippo Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3986. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia M. Tondel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3987. A bill for the relief of Onie Hack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3988. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Saleh Eidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

86. By Mr. FINO: Petition of Miss G. F. Hogan, Bronx, N. Y., to amend the Social Security Act to permit dependents of unmarried workers to receive benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

87. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, Bettendorf, Iowa, relating to a redress of grievance involving his attainder petition against the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

88. Also, petition of Cirila Teanila VDA. De Terrobias, Bato, Catanduances, Philippine Islands, relative to her claim regarding her deceased son Jose Terrobias, case No. USVA–XC–6385173; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Wage-Payment Law for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in Congress to regulate the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia similar to the labor laws of Connecticut.

I am amazed to find that Washington, D. C., has no wage-payment law. I am offering my bill to fill this vacuum. My bill is solely designed to afford the wage-earners of the Nation's Capital the same degrees of protection now enjoyed by workers in the more progressive States like Connecticut.

As a member of the House District of Columbia Committee it is my duty to give legislative attention to correcting glaring inequities in the laws of this Federal city where the citizens are denied the right to vote on their own laws. Members of Congress who are assigned to the District of Columbia Committees have this responsibility in addition to looking after the best interests of their own States and the Nation.

My wage-payment bill if enacted will not materially affect the responsible business establishments of Washington, but is directed specifically at the fly-by-night afterhours bottle clubs and irresponsible subcontractors that pull up and leave without properly settling with their dismissed workers.

I am advised by the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board that this Board can enforce a statute along the lines of my bill at a very small additional cost to their regular operations, and would be of assistance in the enforcement of minimum-wage laws in the District of Columbia.

The language and the principles incorporated in my bill were initially adopted by a committee of State labor commissioners, with the endorsements of the United States Department of Labor, the International Association of Governmental Labor Officials, the National Conference of Labor Legislation, and the American Federation of Labor.

The purpose of my bill is to require regular payment of wages at least semimonthly in Washington, D. C., and to assist employees in collecting valid claims for wages due. Where, however, by custom or contract, an employer has been accustomed to paying employees at least monthly he may continue to do so.

My bill further provides that wages shall be regularly paid in cash or by check; it provides for payment of wages in the event of discharge, voluntary quitting, or in consequence of a labor dispute, and specifies the method of payment in the event of a dispute concerning the amount of wages due.

The Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board of the District of Columbia would be authorized to represent employees in the collection of wages due them and unpaid.

Forty-six States now have comparable legislation; only Delaware, Florida, and the District of Columbia are without a wage-payment law.

About two-thirds of the States, including Connecticut, require prompt payment of wages to discharged employees.

Almost half of the States, including Connecticut, give similar protection to workers who quit.

Also, my bill provides that willful violations of the act are subject to punishment as misdemeanors, and liquidated damages, not to exceed the amount of unpaid wages, are provided as a means of enforcing the act.

A similar bill was passed by the Senate last year, but Congress adjourned before the House took action.

A comparable bill is now pending before the Senate District of Columbia Committee.

We Must Help Our Underpaid Postal and Federal Employees Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement of February 1, 1955, to the chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

On January 5, 1955, I introduced H. R. 274, which provides for an increase in pay of $1,000 per annum for postal workers.

Last year, when the postal and Federal employees pay increase bill came before us, although the increase was inadequate, I voted for the measure because it was the best that we could get at that time. It was a grave disappointment to me and a serious blow to the employees when the President vetoed the measure, for a pay raise was long overdue and they were entitled to it.

Postal and Federal employees are many years behind in catching up with the cost of living. They cannot meet their obligations or give their families adequate care or support on their present pay. They suffer hardships and anxiety.

Living costs continue to rise, the tax burden is being shifted more and more to the shoulders of the low- and middle-income families, and there is no reason why the Federal Government should not provide its postal and Federal employees with a justified wage increase so that they can enjoy a decent standard of living.

Postal workers, who have always been underpaid, need a raise of at least $1,000 per year. Likewise, the other Federal employees need the same help. This sum would bring their pay only to the level of pay they would receive from private industry for similar effort on their part. If we wish to maintain the efficiency of our postal service, then we must recognize the necessity of providing adequate pay for faithful and competent work, and this also applies to all Federal service.

It is our duty to grant this increase in pay without further delay. I trust that your committee will take prompt and favorable action so that Congress may have the opportunity to vote on the necessary legislation in the very near future.

Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, a bill has been reported to the House which would raise congressional salaries from $15,000 to $25,000.

I oppose this legislation on two grounds. The first is that the present salary will suffice, or should be made to suffice, at least until Congress is willing to stop voting appropriations that, even with our very high taxes, prevent our Government from living within its income and result in more borrowing and more debt. The Treasury will have to borrow the money to pay any increase in salary we vote ourselves, and the taxpayers will have to pay interest on it for generations. My second objection to this legislation is that the granting ourselves of this large increase in salary on the recommendation of the President would unconsciously, if not consciously, make us more responsive to pressure groups which will insist on the passage of the remainder of the President's recommendations, much of which cannot be afforded by our people because of its great cost.

Of all salaried and wage-earning people in America, 90 percent get less than $5,000 per year and less than 1 out of each 450 receives as much as the $15,000 already paid Congressmen. A Member of Congress, however, actually receives more than $15,000. Congressmen passed a law 9 years ago giving themselves retirement at 62 with 6 or more years' service. The retirement age was later lowered to 60. Retirement pay is $200 per month after 6 years' service, $400 per month after 14 years' service, and $700 per month after 26 years' service. These payments last for life. If the pay raise passes, retirement payments will increase in proportion to the raise in salary.

One-half of the funds necessary to meet these retirement payments are contributed by Congressmen during their service, the other half being contributed by the taxpayers. Members also receive certain traveling expenses. In addition, Congressmen, under the duties of their office, may travel extensively, not only throughout the United States, but throughout the world. This is a privilege which, by reason of circumstances, is

denied most of the people of our country. In addition to the $600 income exemption given all taxpayers, Congressmen passed a law giving themselves an additional $3,000 exemption upon showing expenses of that amount while living in Washington. The Government, under a law passed by Congress, also gives each Member of Congress life insurance of $5,000, free of any cost.

There are those who say the salary here should be large enough to make one resist temptation, while some say it should be large in order that others than the rich can afford to come here. An answer to the first would seem to be that only honest people should be sent here and that honest men do not yield to temptation. Since it is contended that the salary here has not been sufficient for several years now, the charge that this condition makes it possible for only rich men to serve here seems completely disproved by the fact that only a handful of the present Members are men of even moderate means. It is entirely likely that larger salaries would result in more men of wealth trying to come to Congress, instead of fewer.

Members of Congress should be paid reasonable salaries, of course. Is not $15,000, with all the added considerations, a reasonable salary? And, is it not true that a man who loves public service and devotes his time to the discharge of the duties of his office will find that a reasonable salary is sufficient for his normal mode of living? One of the great compensations in occupying any place of public trust is the satisfaction of having served your country in a position that gives a mesaure of public recognition. The office of a Representative in the United States Congress is such a position, one that is honored in the estimation of the American people.

Under all the circumstances would it not be fair for this proposed legislation to be deferred until after the next election? Then, the position of every candidate for Congress next year can be made known on this issue and the people themselves can decide it. If that is not acceptable, would it not be only fair to at least defer passing it until late in next year's session in order that the people of the Nation may, in effect, pass judgment on it soon thereafter?

The President's state of the Union message which recommended that congressional salaries be raised, also made other recommendations which would require additional expenditures of more than $25 billion. While there will be many urging congressmen to pass the particular recommendations in which they are interested, most of these recommendations should be rejected. This is true because their passage, at a time when the Treasury is absolutely bare, can only result in the Government taking and spending more of the people's savings, thereby further increasing an already dangerous public debt.

The combined debt today of the Federal Government, State and local governments, businesses, and individuals, is more than $650 billion. It amounts to $16,000 for each American family. This debt has tripled during the last 15 years. It has increased by one-third in the last 5 years. Even more alarming is the fact that both individual debts and State debts have actually doubled within 5 years. The Federal debt alone is $280 billion.

Our taxes today are so high that a person on a salary of $250 per month must pay an income tax of $422 per year. If one makes $300 per month, the income tax is $541. These do not include social-security payments. This illustrates the severity of present-day taxes and argues strongly against our increasing them for our own benefit.

If we now give ourselves a large salary increase, will not that action make it less likely that we will resist those who will so strongly insist that we pass all others of the President's recommendations just as we did his recommendation concerning ourselves? If we do that, when will we ever have the responsible fiscal policy which has been promised and which is so vitally needed here in Washington? When will we, if ever, lighten the tax load that so heavily burdens the American people?

Lithuanian Independence: A Tribute to a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I wish to say that any nation that has withstood for more than a century and a quarter continued foreign domination and oppression from a ruthless and tyrannical neighbor and still survive certainly deserves the praise of mankind. Such praise Lithuania deserves; for in spite of the fact that Lithuania has been occupied and ruthlessly dominated by Imperial Russia and Soviet Russia for periods totaling over 125 years this nation still lives.

In many respects the Lithuanian people today are ruled by a far more ruthless master than in the days prior to the foundation of the Lithuanian nationality was relegated to an inferior status in the days of Czarist Russia; but the suppression exercised by the Czar might well be termed moderate when compared to the suppression imposed by the Soviet.

In this 20th century our language has taken on a new word—genocide—which means the willful destruction of a nation and a people. Genocide is the long-range objective of the Soviet rules; it is to destroy the Lithuanian nation. Deportations of thousands of Lithuanian people and the resettlement of Russians and other Soviet peoples in Lithuania have thus far done much to change the ethnic character not only of that country but also of the other Baltic States—Latvia and Estonia. As part of its scheme of communization Soviet Russia has laid down a plan calculated to eradicate the Lithuanian national consciousness. Along with their plan to destroy the idea of Lithuanian nationality, the Communists are seeking to remold this once free and happy country in the image of the Soviet state.

That Lithuania is going through an epoch of great trial goes without saying. But the Lithuanian nation is a virile nation. It is a nation with a glorious historical past and a sense of national destiny for the future. It is a nation which has survived other oppressions and shall survive this one.

On this occasion commemorating the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the message of America is a message of hope that one day the Lithuanian people shall fulfill their national destiny and that they shall again enjoy the natural right of every nation to be free, as they once were, so that they can once more resume their tasks of development and progress, and pursue the happiness they once enjoyed as a free and independent people.

John C. Hazzard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heartfelt sense of personal loss and with deep regret that I announce the death of John C. Hazzard who passed away on January 29, 1955.

Among the many positions held by Mr. Hazzard were the following: chairman, Public Service Commission, State of Delaware; sales manager for Warner Co., Wilmington, Del.; Democratic National Committeeman for the State of Delaware; past chairman of the State Park Commission for the State of Delaware; and Democratic candidate for Congress in 1934. Mr. Hazzard was a distinguished citizen of the State of Delaware who attained much success in business and governmental affairs.

A recognized leader among men he was a devoted and loyal servant of the State of Delaware and of the Nation. His contributions to better government were many and he performed his duties in his many positions of trust with a zeal and faithfulness.

Of his many fine personal attributes, his capacity to get along with others and the practical way in which he got things done were outstanding. He was possessed of a keen sense of humor and a friendliness that were ever present in his associations with people of all walks of life. My State and I have suffered a great loss and my warmest sympathy goes out to his family and many friends in this time of deep sorrow.

John C. Hazzard was truly a fine American, loyal Delawarean, and worthy friend.

American Participation in World Trade Fairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, United States Secretary of Commerce, for his forthright action in establishing the new Office of International Trade Fairs in the Commerce Department and appointing Mr. Roy F. Williams, Boston industrialist, to direct the new organization set up to promote American foreign trade expansion.

Soviet Russia has been grabbing the spotlight in all the world trade fairs. This is an integral part of the Soviets' aggressive program to exploit the world markets in a vicious campaign of economic warfare.

It is gratifying that Secretary Weeks is taking forthright action to put America to the forefront in the race to win the world markets.

It is my understanding that Secretary Weeks has no intention to compete with Russia in purely propaganda assaults, but to win sales contracts by attractively presenting superior American-made products and by superior American merchandising know-how.

The Russian Government has budgeted vast funds to build the most magnificent pavilions stocked with the biggest display of exhibits at these world trade fairs. How much the Russians have grabbed in the way of sales contracts is a debatable question. But we do know the Communist traders are making inroads in the world markets strategically designed to undercut American exports and thus create unemployment in the United States. This is the same old pattern of Soviet trade before World War II when the Soviet dumping program depressed the world market.

Secretary Weeks' projected program is the first time America has seriously sought to participate in the world-trade fairs except by small-scale representations. Historically speaking, these trade fairs are long-established trade marts in Europe extending back to the early middle ages. In the days of Charlemagne the annual trade fairs were great festival occasions where the East met West over the bargaining counter.

Today West meets East but not to barter with the rich merchants of the East with their rare perfumes, spices, and silks. Today a ruthless politico-economic power, producing with slave-labor, prepares to dump cheap commodities on the world market in a shrewd exchange for the raw materials and implements of war.

In order to avoid misunderstandings about these world-trade fairs, please permit me to explain that these world fairs are not operated for the entertainment of the general public nor for the benefit of sightseeing tourists.

Admission to these trade fairs is by official invitation only. Invitations are generally limited to big buyers in the world markets, industrialists, scientists, engineers, labor leaders, diplomatists, and high political leaders.

The big-scale operations of these world-trade fairs may be pictured by just one example, namely, the 1954 International Samples Fair at Milan, Italy, where 12,336 exhibitors displayed 900,000 samples and 84,213 foreign buyers representing 109 nationalities, inspected the displays in the colorful, flag-draped pavilions of all the leading exporting nations of the world. And the forthcoming International Trade Fair at Paris will be the world's biggest affair of its kind. America will be represented by a central exhibit entitled "Main Street, U. S. A." depicting the fuller, better life that is possible with American-made products.

These world-trade fairs are the cheapest and most effective advertising methods ever devised. Here sellers meet buyers from the far corners of the earth and are afforded the opportunity of getting acquainted and dealing directly. I am going to urge the Atomic Energy Commission within bounds of security to design an exhibit portraying the peaceful use of atomic energy to be entered in the Paris fair beginning May 14 of this year.

Another exhibit at the Paris Fair will be a four-sectional exhibit of a New England manufacturing town, showing a home, a school, and a farm, and a factory. A large-scale model of a typical New England house will have a full-scale furnished kitchen, diningroom, and livingroom in which life-size models of residents are placed. Many labor-saving household devices will make it clear how well we live in New England under our great system of free enterprise. This is one of many American exhibits for the Paris Fair.

There is keen competition among businessmen for the limited space in the American pavilion. I hope to see Connecticut's skilled techniques and high-quality products displayed at all the world trade fairs during the coming months.

I will be glad to help get proposed Connecticut exhibits entered in the limited American space available. I will be happy to cooperate with Connecticut industry and labor in promoting our State's foreign-trade expansion by soliciting the Commerce Department for our equitable share of recognition in the activities programed by the new Office of International Trade Fairs.

I offer the following information relative to dates and places of the world-trade fairs selected by the Commerce Department for United States participation:

The international spring fair at Frankfort, Germany, to be held March 6–10 is the first European fair selected under the 1955 program. Over the 200 American industrial products—from an eggbeater to a tractor—will be exhibited by American companies at the central exhibit.

Trade Agreements Extension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we have normally in the United States an agricultural machine geared to abundant production. The American farmer produces enough for himself and 18 others; crop production per acre has increased 30 percent since 1920 due to better tools and techniques, more and better fertilizer, insecticides, and fungicides, hybrid corn, improved seed varieties, rural electrification, and the conservation of soil and water resources. Production per animal has increased 50 percent since 1920. The farmer has become one of the most important consumers of the automotive industry.

But American agriculture cannot prosper if it can only produce the food and fiber needed for the people of the United States. Agriculture must export or die. In 1951 we exported around $4 billion worth of agricultural products. In 1954 we exported a little less than $3 billion worth. It is necessary that we regain our export markets. Our markets must be world markets. Our customers must be mankind. If the American agricultural industry is to produce only for the domestic market, it is faced with bankruptcy; industry is faced with shutdowns, the industrial worker with unemployment. It is certainly a fundamental fact in our economy that when the farmer cannot buy, the industrial worker cannot work.

Trade is a two-way proposition. It is fundamentally an exchange of commodities. There is only one way that a person can buy anything and that is through the sale of commodities or personal services. Foreign nations need to sell to us in order that they may have dollars to pay the American farmer for his surplus production of cotton, wheat, lard, rice, and tobacco.

The extension of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, without crippling amendments, is of vast importance to the American farmer and to the industrial worker whose well-being is dependent upon the health of the agricultural economy.

Congressman Dollinger's Report to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the first session of the 84th Congress, I shall prepare and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to

my constituents. I make this statement now so that the people I represent may know that the report will reach them shortly after the close of the session, and that they will be advised of progress made and the status of legislation of interest to them.

Suspension of Import Duties on Scrap Metal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to suspend the import duties on all metal scrap in order to insure an adequate supply of essential raw materials for Connecticut industries and to reduce the amount of strategic metals now going to Russia, China, and other nations in the Soviet bloc.

My bill continuing the suspension of import duties on metal scrap is only one step in the direction of protecting our industrial economy, but it is a vital step. In the 80th Congress, I was the original sponsor of legislation to take the duties off copper imports badly needed by Connecticut's great copper and brass industries. I am gratified that each succeeding Congress has voted the continued suspension of taxes on imported copper. I need hardly add that I will continue the fight to get essentials for Connecticut's industries. There is much to be done yet.

In connection with the present bill I wish to explain that scrap metal is an essential raw material, the processing of which provides work for Connecticut labor. It should be permitted to enter the United States free of duty or import tax as an essential raw material.

The tonnage of scrap metal imported is very small when compared with United States production and consumption of such metals, but this small tonnage is very important to the welfare of the waste materials industry.

Imports of lead scrap and zinc scrap are principally from Canada and other countries in the Western Hemisphere which are good customers for articles produced in Connecticut. Every ton of scrap metal imported reduces the drain on our natural resources, and insures a stable market for domestic scrap and in preventing temporary shortages of metal scrap with the accompanying excessive variations in price due to the sudden jump in the London market.

I, therefore, recommend to Congress that legislation be enacted to provide for the suspension of import duties and import taxes on all metal scrap for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. I feel confident that Congress will see the need for such legislation in view of the critical world situation today.

Deadline Dates for Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, assembled here is a list of several deadline dates before which eligible veterans must act if they wish to take advantage of certain benefits.

July 25, 1956: For those now in training under the World War II GI bill, no additional education or training may be afforded after this date except for veterans who may have additional training time under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945.

July 25, 1956: In general, no vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16 based on World War II service may be afforded beyond this date except for certain hardship cases who are granted an additional 4 years in which to train.

July 25, 1957: No guaranty or insurance will be available on World War II GI bill loans for homes, farms or businesses after this date except for those who have established a later terminal date under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945.

January 31, 1963: Those who start their education or training within their required 3-year period must complete their training under the Korean GI bill by this date or 8 years after discharge, whichever is earlier.

January 31, 1964: For vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 894, eligible disabled veterans of the Korean conflict must start in time to finish their rehabilitation by this date or 9 years after separation, whichever is earlier.

January 31, 1965: For GI loans on homes, farms or businesses, eligible veterans of the Korean conflict now have until this date to receive VA guaranty or insurance as a result of the President's proclamation. No further guaranties or insurance may be issued after that date on loans made to veterans under the present law.

The Korean benefit termination dates apply to eligible veterans except in certain hardship categories. For these, an additional 4 years are granted by law in which to complete their rehabilitation.

Seriously disabled veterans of the Korean conflict may apply for a $1,600 grant toward the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance, but they must apply within 3 years after they leave service or they forfeit the benefit. The President's proclamation set January 31, 1955, as the end of the Korean conflict period, during which eligibility for this grant may be established. This means injuries to be covered by the law must have been sustained in active service on or before that date.

No application deadlines prevail on the other VA administrative benefits for veterans of the Korean conflict on the wartime basis. These include: hospitalization and domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities; compensation for service connected disabilities or death at wartime rate; pension for total and permanent and non-service-connected disabilities or death; reimbursements of burial expenses and a flag to drape the casket.

Income Tax Deduction for College Tuition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in Congress to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of individual taxpayers, a deduction equal to 30 percent of amounts paid as tuition for college or university students.

The purpose of my bill is to afford a higher educational opportunity to many young men and women who might otherwise be denied the benefit of a college education that opens the door to successful careers in all walks of life. This is accomplished by easing the tax burden on the parent or benefactor who pays the tuition fees for college students. The taxpayer receives a 30-percent deduction of amounts paid for tuitions. Not only does this provide tax relief for low-income families struggling to send their children to college but offers an incentive to higher-income benefactors to cut their income tax by sending talented and deserving young persons to college.

From the national standpoint, the proposed legislation I am now offering will materially assist in providing a future supply of trained leadership and technical skill. In his budget message, President Eisenhower stressed the need for highly qualified scientists. Furthermore, today there is a pressing need for engineers and technologists in the rapidly expanding field of new industries and commerce. There is always the need to fill the vacancies in the older professions in this great Nation of free enterprise.

According to a recent survey conducted by the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training, only about 51 percent of the highest talented high-school graduates are currently enrolling in college. My tax relief proposal for education is especially designed to aid that 49 percent denied the privilege of educational advancement. The cornerstone of our Republic is our system of free enterprise, and there is no higher aspiration of free enterprise than pursuit of education.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the quiet of this moment of prayer we would hush all earth's noises and make our souls a sanctuary of Thy spirit. In the midst of thronging duties and confused issues we would keep the avenues of our lives open to Thee, the source of all goodness and beauty and truth. Be Thou our chart and compass in all the complex problems of state. May we know no glory but the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world our utmost service, unsullied by base motives of self-interest, as again with the golden gift of a new day we pledge at this white altar of devotion integrity of character, purity of heart, cleanness of hands, and unswerving firmness of purpose in the fulfillment of our high and holy calling as servants of the Republic. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 9, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 145. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 9, 1955,

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, on February 10, 1955, submitted the following favorable reports:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments; without amendment;

S. Res. 56. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters"; without amendment;

S. 913. A bill to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate; with an amendment (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 40. Resolution continuing the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to investigate employee welfare and pension plans and funds subject to collective bargaining; with an amendment (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 41. Resolution authorizing additional expenditures and the employment of further temporary assistants by the Committee on Government Operations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 30); and

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and appropriating funds therefor; with an additional amendment (Rept. No. 28).

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF DEFINITION OF "AIRMAN" IN CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 10th semiannual report of that Commission, dated February 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Henry A. Alexander, of Atlanta, Ga., remonstrating against the continuation of the reading of Washington's Farewell Address (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The petition of Carribel Beck Holmes, of Baton Rouge, La., praying for a redress of grievances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE NAVAHO PROJECT—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have received Senate Joint Memorial No. 4 from the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico.

The memorial, introduced by Mr. Guido Zecca, asks the Congress to enact legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navaho project as one of the participating projects in the upper Colorado River storage project.

I present the joint memorial, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

Memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navaho project as one of the participating projects in the Colorado River storage project

Whereas there has been introduced in the 84th Congress of the United States a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

Whereas the foregoing proposed legislation includes the Navaho project in New Mexico, as one of the participating projects, for the irrigation of reservation and nonreservation lands located on the Navaho Indian Reservation and adjacent thereto; and

Whereas the Navahos are at present a low-income, underprivileged group, numbering more than 75,000, whose population is steadily increasing, and whose economic condition is steadily declining because of the extreme drought existing on the Navaho Reservation; and, recognizing that where a group of people exist under such adverse economic conditions as do our neighbors, the Navahos, it affects the whole economy of the surrounding area; and

Whereas the proposed Navaho project will irrigate reservation lands which will provide for approximately one-fifth of the present Navaho Indian population with a living standard equal to that of non-Indian agriculturists within the area and will greatly improve and better the economic condition of our neighbors, the Navahos: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to enact legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navaho project as one of the participating projects in the Colorado River storage project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico.

JOE M. MONTOYA,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD G. ROMERO,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DONALD D. HALLAM,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
FLOYD CROSS,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved by me this 31st day of January 1955.

JOHN F. SIMMS,
Governor, State of New Mexico.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 456. A bill relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters; with amendments (Rept. No. 32).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1030. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport or a visa from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1031. A bill to extend the authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1032. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1033. A bill for the relief of Ann Arbor Construction Co.;

S. 1034. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish;

S. 1035. A bill for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox;

S. 1036. A bill for the relief of Gust Kostas Kountoupis;

S. 1037. A bill for the relief of Chung Herp Youn; and

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania) (by request):

S. 1039. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a national organization of combat wounded composed solely of Purple Hearters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1040. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the transportation of passengers by common carriers operating over regular routes within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1041. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1042. A bill for the relief of Angel Feratero Madayag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1043. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter defining crimes and providing penalties for possession, transportation, and sale of narcotics, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of Edward Naarits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DUFF, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1045. A bill to make permanent certain temporary judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1046. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1047. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1048. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 1049. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the construction by the Atomic Energy Commission of an experimental facility for the production of electric power from nuclear fission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1050. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Look-Out Mountain National Park in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1051. A bill to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1052. A bill to authorize projects for the improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1053. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion in order to authorize the renewal of such lease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of Helene Kaljuse; and

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Domenico Leonardi and his wife, Clara Corradi Leonardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1056. A bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his wife Gertrude Mazartzian and their children Mario Mazartzian and Aram Mazartzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1057. A bill to permit the consolidation of District of Columbia banks and the conversion of national banks into and the consolidation of national banks with District of Columbia banks; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1058. A bill to allow certain persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for meals and lodging when employed away from home; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1059. A bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to institute a comprehensive study for the purpose of assisting the coal industry develop new markets and a greater utilization of our coal resources and byproducts derived therefrom; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

IMPROVEMENT OF GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS ABOVE LAKE ERIE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, based on recommendations by the Chief of Army Engineers, after studies and findings by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the improvement and the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

This bill authorizes work in the navigation channels between Lakes Superior and Huron, Lakes Huron and Michigan, and Lakes Huron and Erie, and includes the St. Marys River, Straits of Mackinac, St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and Detroit River.

The board found that the controlling depths of these channels should be 27 feet, the same as that authorized for the St. Lawrence Seaway from Lake Erie to Montreal.

Mr. President, the start of this work is vital to bringing closer the date when the American industrial heartland will be directly connected with the ports of the world.

I envision the day, Mr. President, when this waterway will be considered to be

one of the greatest steps forward ever taken in the economic development of the Nation.

The initial cost of this enterprise and the annual maintenance expense will be returned many times in savings to the American taxpayer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1032) to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

DR. CRISTJO CRISTOFV, HIS WIFE, AND CHILDREN

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduced, for appropriate reference a bill to provide for permanent residence in the United States for Dr. Cristjo Cristofv and his wife and two children.

The Cristofv family has been subjected to so many harrowing experiences and has been the victim of so many false charges that I earnestly hope the Congress will act to approve this bill without delay, so the family may find, at long last, a haven in our land of freedom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1046) for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL AID IN CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this bill would increase the authorization for the Federal-aid highway program. It provides for the appropriation of $500 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system, $325 million for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system, $275 million for Federal aid on urban projects; and an additional $500 million for the interstate system.

The Subcommittee on Public Roads, of which I am chairman, by virtue of assignment by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], will begin hearings on this bill and related bills on Monday, February 21, 1955.

CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL FACILITIES FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC POWER FROM NUCLEAR FISSION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the construction by the Atomic Energy Commission of the experimental facility for the production of electric power from nuclear fission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1049) authorizing the appropriation of funds for the construction by the Atomic Energy Commission of an experimental facility for the production of electric power from nuclear fission, introduced by Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that 6 months after the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, no license has been granted to a private concern for the construction of a reactor to produce power. The Commission has informed the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that no application has been made.

I would not close the door to private industry to move into this field. Indeed, I would keep it ajar, and invite and encourage private industry to come in.

I believe that one effective way of encouraging the entrance of private industry into this field is for the Government to build an experimental plant to point the way. Scientists have made rapid progress in recent months, and inform us that they believe such an undertaking is now feasible. The bill authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with such a program, and authorizes the making of an appropriation for that purpose.

CONVERSION AND CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS WITH DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BANKS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the consolidation of District of Columbia banks and the conversion of national banks into and the consolidation of national banks with District of Columbia banks.

An identical bill, H. R. 396, was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 5, 1955, by Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1057) to permit the consolidation of District of Columbia banks and the conversion of national banks into and the consolidation of national banks with District of Columbia banks, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DEDUCTION FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES OF AMOUNTS PAID FOR CERTAIN MEALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to allow certain persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for meals and lodging when employed away from home. The purpose of the bill is to correct an inequity in existing tax legislation. Our tax laws today allow persons engaged in business to deduct from their income expenses in connection with activities they engage in pursuant to their business responsibilities. Thus meals and lodging expenses incurred by business people when on a business trip are deductible. The same rule does not apply, however, to working men and women who spend money for meals and lodging when they are employed away from their homes. This particularly affects adversely building trade employees who must travel away from home in pursuit of employment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from William D. Gunn, secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, together with a copy of a letter he submitted to me which he received from the district director of the Internal Revenue Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1058) to allow certain persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for meals and lodging when employed away from home, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letters presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
January 29, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We enclose a copy of Resolution No. 74 of the last convention of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor. We also enclose a copy of a letter from the Internal Revenue Service with respect to the position of that agency on the subject matter embraced in the resolution.

The problem is particularly significant with respect to construction workers who by the very nature of their employment work only short periods of time for particular employers and often are required to leave their hometown and family in search of employment.

Under the present law, when a construction worker living in Hibbing, for example, is required to leave Hibbing because of lack of construction work in Hibbing and go to

some other city for employment, he is not permitted to deduct the additional expenses involved in taking this away from home employment. In other words, the construction worker will necessarily have to provide for personal expenses of his family in Hibbing, and in addition he will have to provide for his personal expenses in the new location of employment. Nevertheless, the worker is not permitted to deduct the additional expenses incurred.

The problem of the construction and similar worker is peculiar. There is no good reason for the construction worker to move his home and family every time he is hired for a different construction job, because there is ordinarily no permanency to the new employment. This is why we feel that some consideration should be given to this kind of worker so that he will be permitted to offset against his income the additional amount of personal expense necessarily incurred in maintaining his permanent residence as well as his temporary dwelling place while engaged in work away from home.

We hope that you will agree with our view that the present law is unfair in this respect, and that you will sponsor an amendment to the law designed to correct the inequity.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM D. GUNN.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

Mr. DONALD C. SAVELKOUL,
Care of Minnesota State Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. SAVELKOUL: This is in reply to your letter of December 17, 1954, in which inquiry is made relative to the deductibility of travel expenses for Federal income-tax purposes.

You state that the following resolution was adopted at the recent convention of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor:

"Whereas building and construction tradesmen are frequently called upon or find it necessary to work out of town away from home; and

"Whereas when employed on such jobs they incur considerable additional expenses in addition to maintaining their permanent home; and

"Whereas the interpretation of an existing law issued by the Director of Internal Revenue does not permit most of these tradesmen to list out-of-town expenses as allowable deductions on income tax; and

"Whereas most employees of Government and in private business in practically every field are allowed certain expenses when they must leave their home in course of employment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota State Council of Carpenters and Joiners take action requesting the proper legislators to do everything possible to have this unfair situation corrected, either by legislation or a more favorable interpretation of existing laws."

You wish to be advised what interpretation of the Federal Income Tax Division would not permit employees to deduct expenses as indicated in the resolution.

Generally, the question of the deductibility of subsistence costs incurred during periods of employment away from the taxpayers' customary places of residence becomes a matter of concern to two principal classes of taxpayers whose income is derived from salaries and wages:

(1) Those taxpayers who are regular and continuing employees of their employers and who are assigned to temporary jobs away from their established homes or regular posts of duty, with the expectation that they will return to their established homes upon completion of each such temporary assignment or that they will then proceed to other temporary assignments of work away from their homes in pursuance of the business of their employers; and

(2) Taxpayers who voluntarily terminated or sever their employment or business connections in one locality to accept employment for indefinite periods of time in other localities.

It is the position of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the courts that the cost of subsistence incurred by taxpayers described in (1) above, while they are temporarily away from their homes in pursuance of the business of their employers, may be deducted from gross income under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. *Leach* v. *Commission* (12 TC 20 (ACQ)).

In the case of taxpayers who have incurred subsistence expenses under circumstances described in (2) above, it is the position of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and of the Director of Internal Revenue at St. Paul, Minn., that the cost of such subsistence is not deductible from gross income for Federal income tax purposes. Such position is based upon the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *J. N. Flowers* (326 U. S. 465), and upon subsequent court decisions which have consistently followed the rules laid down by the Supreme Court with respect to this issue in its decision in the J. N. Flowers case.

In view of the weight of the decisions bearing on this issue, this office will continue to maintain its position held heretofore that, in cases where taxpayers have terminated their employment or severed their business connections in one locality to accept employment at another locality, the cost of their subsistence during the period of such employment is not deductible, although the taxpayer may continue to maintain a residence for himself or his family at a location removed from his employment.

The term "home" in connection with traveling expenses is distinguished from domicile or legal residence. "Home" in such cases, has been construed to mean the taxpayer's "post of duty," "principal place of business," or "place of employment."

Very truly yours,

V. C. MULLANEY,
Acting Chief, Review and Information Section.

AMENDMENT OF PROVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN INCREASED PAYMENTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1059) to amend section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (by request), was received read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This bill would repeal the provision of the Soil Conservation and the Domestic Allotment Act which provides for increasing the total payment to any person under that act where the total payment is less than $200. This provision was incorporated in the act at a time when the principal purpose of payments under that act was to improve the economic position of farmers. At present the principal purpose is to encourage conservation practices.

The Department of Agriculture feels that these small payment increases do not contribute materially to effectuating this purpose and are no longer desirable. The Department points out that more than 90 percent of all payments under the program are under $200, and that the small size of a payment does not necessarily indicate that the recipient is a small farmer.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, RELATING TO INCREASED MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act. This resolution has but a single purpose—to increase the mortgage insurance authorization of FHA by an amount deemed sufficient to allow it to operate until June 30, 1955. It has been estimated by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, that $1½ billion of authorization will be required for that purpose.

In the Housing Act of 1954, approved on August 7, 1954, the Congress increased the FHA mortgage insurance authorization by $2 billion. $500 million of this amount was to be made available to FHA only with approval of the President. Such action was taken by the President on December 28, 1954. On December 31, 1954, FHA had an authorization balance of approximately $602.9 million. Net use of this authorization during December 1954 amounted to about $298.6 million. Information now available indicates that use of the authorization in January and February 1955 will continue at about the same rate. On the basis of budget estimates of mortgage insurance applications and commitment activity, about $1,466,000,000 in authorization will be used between January 1, 1955, and June 30, 1955.

In order to make it possible to carry out the contemplated FHA program, the proposed joint resolution would increase FHA's mortgage insurance authorization by $1.5 billion. This would be accomplished under the resolution by amending section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended. This section presently contains the mortgage insurance authorization for all programs administered by FHA under the National Housing Act, with the exception of the home improvement and repair program carried on under title I of that act.

It is common knowledge that the rate of building activity assisted by FHA mortgage insurance in recent months has shown a substantial increase over the early months of 1954. The continuance of this increased activity is of great importance to the many persons and segments of industry which make up the building industry. It should also be kept in mind that considerable advance planning is required in the building industry.

For these reasons, and in order to avoid an artificially stimulated rush for applications for FHA mortgage insurance

just prior to the presently expected date of exhaustion of mortgage insurance authorization, it is essential that the Congress take immediate action on this resolution.

The President has already indicated his intention of asking for an additional $5 billion of mortgage insurance authorization for FHA to cover the period from July 1, 1955, through June 30, 1956. The committee intends to examine this request thoroughly in its relationship to the total amount of FHA mortgage insurance authorization outstanding. However, it appears that the proposed increase in mortgage insurance authorization contemplated in this joint resolution is necessary and should receive early attention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS TO RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under date of January 21, Senate bill 627, to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance and benefits for others who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Inasmuch as the bill deals with social security, and the Committee on Finance has handled bills of this character in the past, I now ask that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making studies as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and pursuant to its jurisdiction under rule XXV (1) (d) 4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable; and with the consent of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Address delivered by him before the Lawyers Association of St. Louis on December 3, 1954.

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by Senator MARTIN of Pennsylvania on February 10, 1955, at a Lincoln Day dinner at Hagerstown, Md.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Address delivered by Senator BENDER at the Lincoln Day meeting at Portsmouth, Ohio.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In his capacity as a Senator from Georgia, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the nominations of three persons, whose names appear elsewhere in the RECORD of this date, to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. Notice is hereby given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled on the following nominations for Friday, February 25, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building:

William E. Miller, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

M. Frank Reid, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

THE TREATY WITH NATIONALIST CHINA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning, on page 1, carried a significant article relating to the Formosa Treaty. The headlines read as follows: "Formosa says United States pledged to defend all offshore isles. Foreign Minister Yeh's statement is held to contradict 'understandings' insisted on by Senate in ratifying treaty."

This article may be prophetic of serious complications to come because of what I consider the most unfortunate failure of the Senate to adopt formal reservations to the Chiang Kai-shek treaty, as strongly urged by me and by a number of my associates. I ask unanimous consent to have the news article printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMOSA SAYS UNITED STATES PLEDGED TO DEFEND ALL OFFSHORE ISLES—FOREIGN MINISTER YEH'S STATEMENT IS HELD TO CONTRADICT UNDERSTANDINGS INSISTED ON BY SENATE IN RATIFYING TREATY

WASHINGTON, February 10.—Nationalist China's Foreign Minister asserted today that the United States was pledged to defend all the offshore Chinese islands in addition to Formosa and the Pescadores.

George Yeh made this comment as he paid farewell calls on Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and on Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Mr. Yeh, who has been in the United States since last October, is returning to Taipei tomorrow.

He said he had discussed with Mr. Dulles "a few matters of common interest." His remark on a United States pledge to defend the offshore islands, including Quemoy and Matsu, appeared to contradict the understandings that the Senate insisted upon in ratifying the Formosa defense treaty last night by a vote of 64 to 6.

One of these understandings, concurred in by Mr. Dulles although it is separate from the treaty, provides that the United States will not be obliged to take military action in defense of the Nationalists beyond Formosa and the Pescadores unless the treaty is specifically amended.

President Eisenhower, however, under the terms of the congressional resolution adopted January 28, can order the Seventh Fleet and its carrier-based planes to fight for Quemoy and Matsu if he deems those positions essential to the defense of Formosa.

Mr. Yeh appeared to be suggesting that the President had promised the Nationalists such assistance. Mr. Eisenhower has consistently refused, when pressed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, to commit the United States publicly to fight for Quemoy and Matsu.

The State Department earlier today poured cold water on a statement by Rear Adm. Liang Hsu-chao, commander of the Nationalist naval forces in the Formosa Strait. The admiral said he had been assured United States carrier-based planes would aid in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu whenever they were needed.

A State Department spokesman made this comment: "The Department does not know of any such commitment. Presumably that decision would be up to the President."

Mr. Yeh was no less emphatic than Admiral Liang. Asked whether he had received a pledge of United States military assistance for Matsu and Quemoy, he replied that Washington had promised to help the Nationalists defend related positions and territories.

Did that mean Quemoy and Matsu? a reporter asked.

"Of course," Mr. Yeh replied. "The pledge includes all the offshore islands."

When another reporter suggested that the related positions and territories to be defended would be those the United States deemed essential to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, Mr. Yeh said: "We can deem, too."

Asked about the juridical status of Formosa, he said:

"Are you writing a doctor of philosophy thesis in international law? Let's talk of practical matters. There has never been any legal question about who has Formosa and to whom Formosa belongs.

"It was made a province of China right after V-J Day and Japan recognized this status in surrendering the island to us."

On this point, a reporter suggested, Mr. Yeh appeared to be in accord with Communist Premier and Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai.

"I pay no attention to what that —— says or writes," he replied.

The State Department declined to comment on Mr. Yeh's remarks, delivered as he was leaving Mr. Robertson's office, accompanied by Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, Nationalist Ambassador to Washington.

One official said the policy remained as announced last Saturday, when the evacuation of the Tachen Islands was authorized. This was that the United States "will extend assistance to the Republic of China in defending such related positions and territories now in its hands as the United States deems to be essential to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GENERAL KOSCIUSZKO

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, February 12 will mark the anniversay of the birth of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the great Polish hero who fought in the American Revolutionary War. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared to mark that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO, POLISH GENERAL AND HERO, FEBRUARY 12, 1955

February 12 marks the anniversary of the birth of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a great national hero of Poland, and also of America. General Koscluszko was not only a great leader in the struggle for Polish liberation and freedom in the 18th century, but in 1777 he came to the United States to fight for freedom's cause in the American Revolution. Under the leadership of this skilled commander and engineer, the American fortifications at West Point were constructed. He also participated in the Saratoga and Carolina campaigns before returning to his native land.

When General Kosciuszko returned to Poland, he joined with the Polish forces of freedom who were fighting against the Prussian and Russian oppressors. After the unsuccessful uprisings in 1794, General Kosciuszko lived in exile in Switzerland until his death in 1817.

The memory of General Kosciuszko, and his service to our great Nation in the hour of its birth, remind us of the great debt we owe to Poland's sons and daughters. Against the background of this memory, we must think of the present plight of the Polish people, living under the yoke of Communist enslavement. We have a special obligation to these people, who have kept the torch of freedom burning through many long nights of foreign oppression and occupation.

We Americans must give more than lip service to this cause. We must show by action our continuing concern for the eventual liberation of the Polish people. For example, we must liberalize our immigration and refugee laws to provide a haven in the United States for some of the escapees and refugees from Poland.

We must strengthen the Voice of America, so that the voices of freedom will continue to penetrate the Iron Curtain.

We must press for the ratification of the genocide convention, in order to demonstrate to the world our conviction and determination that the destruction of national, racial, or religious groups must be placed beyond the pale of international law and punished accordingly.

Through these, and many other acts of faith in freedom, we in these United States will be fulfilling the fundamental principles for which our Nation was conceived, and for which General Kosciuszko so valiantly and heroically fought.

THE GENOCIDE TREATY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the genocide treaty has been buried in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for more than 4 years. This is a most unfortunate and highly regrettable situation. There have been indications from the present administration that it has no intention of pressing for the ratification of this highly important convention. This was one of the concessions Secretary of State Dulles made to the pro-Bricker amendment forces in the Senate—a tragic sacrifice, in my opinion.

I believe with all my heart that the United States should join with the 48 other nations of the free world to outlaw the infamous crime of genocide. It is my hope that the Foreign Relations Committee, under the distinguished leadership of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], will move this year to report the convention to the Senate, so that it may be debated on the floor and acted upon.

In this connection, I ask that an editorial on this subject appearing in the New York Times of February 8, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE AND GENOCIDE

More than 4 years ago a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably on the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide—the U. N. treaty popularly known as the genocide convention. But since that time, although distinguished leaders of industry, labor, civil liberties, church and legal groups have testified to its worth and moral necessity, the treaty has languished in the Senate. It has not been allowed to get to the floor for full debate and the vote.

Forty-eight nations have ratified or acceded to the treaty. Forty-eight nations have said in effect—and this includes Russia, whose state document, for what it is worth, has been boldly on view at the U. N.—that genocide is criminal; that they adhere to this great principle which outlaws the destruction of national, racial, or religious groups; that such acts are punishable.

That the United States and Britain still drag their feet on this treaty, whose principles they live by, is lamentable. What should certainly be clear, at least to our own lawmakers, is that such an international law as this is both moral inspiration and deterrent—telling this atomic-minded generation that moral force is vital in a materialistic world; staying the ambitions of the wicked and the ruthless.

After leading the fight for this treaty in Paris back in 1946 shall we now allow our leadership to go by default to the Soviet Union? Is the crime of genocide less evil than war itself?

Let's get on with the job. Let's get on with ratification.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 8, President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress on Federal assistance in school construction and the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] introduced a bill to implement the President's recommendations, which bill it is my privilege to cosponsor.

Since Tuesday the President's school-construction program has been subjected to unjustifiable criticism. Much of this criticism has been partisan. Any objective analysis of the President's program clearly indicates a soundly conceived approach to a major national problem.

I ask unanimous consent that five editorials from leading American newspapers objectively analyzing the President's school-construction program be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of Wednesday, February 9, 1955]

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

The eagerly awaited administration proposal on school construction has now been put forward by President Eisenhower. As was to be expected, its emphasis is on helping local communities help themselves, but it also cautiously recognizes the principle of direct Federal aid to meet what is truly an emergency need. It is sure to be shot at, both on the basis that it is inadequate and on the opposite ground that it opens up a new field for Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

There is one point on which the friends and foes of even so restrained a program as the President proposes can agree, and that is the extreme shortage of classrooms and the urgent necessity of providing decent school facilities for America's children. The virtual cessation of school construction during the war, coupled with a subsequent jump in the national birth rate, has brought about a present deficit of 300,000 classrooms, quite apart from the 50,000 new rooms now needed annually to keep pace with increasing enrollments. The utterly inadequate salaries of teachers in many parts of the country—including, of course, New York City—is another but related question.

The key to the President's program lies in the two sentences: "Fundamentally, the remedy [for shortage of school construction] lies with the States and their communities. But the present shortage requires immediate and effective action that will produce results." Whether his proposals will actually bring about "immediate and effective" action is a question, but we do agree with the President that the fundamental responsibility for education is primarily a local one and ought to remain so. Some localities can afford to spend more for education than others, but it is highly improbable that there is a State in the Union that cannot afford to spend more than it is now spending for this purpose if it is willing to tax its citizens accordingly. The funds for Federal aid are not manna from heaven; they come out of the pockets of citizens just as surely as if they were raised by local agencies.

The difference is, of course, in distribution. When the Federal Government steps into the picture, the taxes levied in New York, already inadequate for our own schools, help as well to pay for even more inadequate schools elsewhere.

We do not say this is wrong. In fact, we think it is right because poor educational facilities in any State adversely affect the Nation as a whole, not that State alone. When the school situation has become as bad as it has become throughout the Nation, it seems to us that the only practical way to solve it is through Federal action. Under the circumstances it is hard to see why there should be Federal aid for housing, for highways, for hospitals, for dams, etc., etc., and no Federal aid for the most valuable facilities of all—facing the greatest emergency of all—namely, the schools.

The President's proposals involve principally Federal aid to localities in the financing of their school structures. But he also asks Congress to appropriate $200 million in grants-in-aid on a matching basis for the most needy districts. The President has made an important move toward ameliorating the school emergency "within the traditional framework of local responsibility for our schools." Congress now has the opportunity to improve on this program, if it can, while retaining the essential principle expressed by the Chief Executive.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1955]

FEDERAL LEADERSHIP ON SCHOOLS

President Eisenhower's special message to Congress on the crisis in the public schools is a plea for emergency action. It recognizes that delay cannot be tolerated. With the educational system struggling under a deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms, to say nothing of the need for greater quantity and quality in teaching, it is self-evident that a vast school-building program is called for. This must be started at once.

What the President proposes is a plan of Federal cooperation with the States. He says that great numbers of additional schools are required as quickly as possible. Here there can be no argument whatever. The Nation has the resources in production and income. The only question is as to method. Shall the Federal Government give the money outright, with the inevitable trend toward more and more Washington strings on the schools? Or shall the funds be largely loaned, with direction of policy and details lodged by continuing tradition in the States and the local boards of education?

Mr. Eisenhower, of course, is against centralized control. He opposes Federal aid that would nourish a national bureaucracy posing a threat to education for freedom. His idea is that of Federal leadership to encourage vigorous action on every local front. About a billion dollars of Federal funds are proposed for a 3-year emergency building program, but this money is largely in the nature of advances. Outright grants are proposed only for areas with proved need and lack of local income. And every part of the plan, it should be emphasized, specifies sharing of the obligation between the Federal Government and the States.

The program, then, is one which faces up to urgency. The children cannot wait; thousands of schools must be built right now. But the President also properly insists on the free way that leaves people at home in charge of their schools. The crisis will be met—of that there can be no doubt. The best and quickest method is Federal leadership and help—under a plan that keeps education free.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 9, 1955]

TO SPUR DRIVE AGAINST CRITICAL SCHOOL SHORTAGE

In proposing a broad program of Federal aid to ease the shortage in school buildings, President Eisenhower has clung to the concept, favored by most educational authorities and other citizens, that the education of the Nation's children is primarily a local responsibility.

No one who has the slightest acquaintance with the school situation can doubt that a shortage, approaching emergency proportions, exists. The combination of a slowdown in construction during the war with a rapidly rising birthrate, has brought on a situation where there is a deficit of more than 300,000 elementary and high-school classrooms. Moreover, to meet future needs, an additional 50,000 must be constructed each year.

Mr. Eisenhower's recommendations to Congress for measures to meet this problem consist, in essence, of Federal moves to spur the States and local communities to do more than they have been doing to cope with the schoolroom shortage.

Part of his program calls for an expansion of the authority system, now used in Pennsylvania, under which authorities would finance construction and lease the school buildings to school districts. Federal funds would be used to help States launch such programs.

A second part calls for Federal purchase of school bonds issued by local communities which have found difficulty in selling them at reasonable rates. Federal funds amounting to $750 million over 3 years would be used for this purpose.

Finally, there would be provision for direct Federal aid to communities too poor to build their own schools or to lease them under the authority system. But this aid would require matching State contributions.

Although Pennsylvania appears to have kept up with its school responsibilities better than some other States, the need for a concerted effort to overcome the schoolroom problem will be readily appreciated here.

Most people also will agree with the President that the problem of getting and keeping better teachers by paying them decent salaries must be met if we are to provide proper education for our children. Congress, in studying the President's classroom program, might well consider also what might be done to insure that our growing school system is staffed by capable and adequately paid teachers.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 10, 1955]

BLUEPRINT FOR CLASSROOMS

President Eisenhower's program for Federal aid to school construction follows expected lines. It reflects the administration philosophy that the Nation's public-school system should continue to be basically a State and local responsibility, free from Federal control or political domination. At the same time, the President acknowledges that there is today a most serious deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms, and that Federal assistance to the States and communities is essential to meet this crisis.

Accordingly, he has proposed three emergency steps: (1) That the Federal Government be authorized to purchase school bonds which local communities have been unable to place at reasonable interest rates; (2) that the Federal Government should join with the States in establishing reserve funds to cover bonds issued by statewide school-building agencies; and (3) that there be authorized a $200 million 3-year program of direct Federal matching aid to States for school construction in districts unable to finance their own building. To cope with the long-term local financing problems, the President proposed a joint Federal-State study of debt limitations and other restrictions.

This four-way line of attack would implement, in effect, the comment by the President in his state of the Union message that the Federal Government should serve as the "catalyst" in spurring State and local action on school construction rather than resorting to "the simple remedy" of direct financial intervention. At the President's earlier suggestion, a series of State educational conferences began last year and will be climaxed in a national meeting here next November. The President has implied that any further development of administration policy toward the school problem must await the findings of these conferences.

The administration approach already is under fire, of course, on Capitol Hill and from quarters eager to see the Federal Government undertake a large program of direct spending for school construction. Legislation has been proposed both in the House and Senate to provide direct and immediate construction aid. While this latter method might bring quicker results, it would also increase the prospect of Federal control of education and the danger of local abdication of appropriate financial responsibility.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of February 9, 1955]

MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

In his message on education the President made clear that while there is a deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms, there is a great deal of school construction. Capital outlays will reach an alltime high of $2 billion this year, for the 60,000 classrooms being built. During the last 5 years some $7 billion has provided new classrooms for 5,750,000 pupils in public schools, while about 5,500,000 additional children enrolled. And while the rate of construction has more than kept pace with mounting enrollment, it has only slightly reduced the classroom deficit.

Hence, there is nothing more urgent than this program of rebuilding and expanding our public schools which have been outgrown and neglected during the past decade. The facilities of public education throughout the United States are in dangerously short supply. It is basically the responsibility of communities and States. But the real need can only be met with Federal cooperation—and that means Federal money.

There is need, says the President, for a long-range educational program—to bring the physical plant into keeping with a steadily mounting population, to pay teachers better, to recruit better teachers. But there is also a need for emergency action to meet an emergency situation.

Without interfering with the responsibility of State and local school systems, the President proposes over the next 3 years a total expenditure of $7 billion for badly needed new schools under a four-point program which envisions the needs of even the poorest communities.

The President recommends legislation authorizing the Federal Government, cooperating with the several States, to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at a reasonable interest rate.

Where there are special statewide school building agencies that can borrow advantageously, schools can be built and rented to school districts. The Federal Government would share with the States in establishing an initial reserve fund equal to 1 year's payment on principal and interest. The State under this proposal could issue bonds in the next 3 years to build $6 billion worth of new schools.

Where needed to relieve extreme overcrowding, double shifts, hazardous or unhealthful conditions, the Federal and State

aid would be in an amount sufficient for a school district to qualify under either proposal 1 or 2 for financing the remainder of the building costs.

And last it is proposed that the Federal Government furnish one-half of the administrative costs of State programs which are designed to overcome obstacles to local financing or to provide additional State aid to local school districts.

The President is convinced that the basic facts are sufficiently established to justify emergency action now and he believes he has good reason to expect active support in Congress.

There is, of course, need to make sure that Federal funds are not made a device to insinuate the Federal Government into the running of the schools themselves. Federal interference can be protected against. The fact that the Federal Government matches State funds in highway construction doesn't mean that the Federal Government has any hand in making the State traffic laws.

The States and communities simply haven't the resources to build urgently needed classrooms. Here is where the States and the Federal Government must combine to do what the Nation urgently requires: More classrooms in more schools now, unless we are to let our public school system dangerously deteriorate.

Here is good news for the Nation's harassed teachers in their overcrowded classrooms, and it is good news for the students. It is also good news for scores of companies that are feverishly turning out everything from blackboards to school buses in an effort to meet a demand that keeps growing by leaps and bounds.

We are convinced that the substantially increased funds needed for our public schools can be found without an undue burden upon the economy. Economists generally foresee a rising level of productivity which will reach some $525 billion a year in the next 10 years and, on the basis of such an increase in the gross national product, it is believed that the increased costs of public education will not be impracticably large.

ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERVIN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me concerning the recent anniversary of the founding of the junior chamber of commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERVIN

The distinguished work of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is well known and appreciated by men and women in positions of leadership.

I wish to congratulate the junior chamber of commerce on its 35th anniversary which has just passed. I shall do so by referring to only a few of its highly significant contributions to the betterment of the people of North Carolina which I have the honor to represent.

The North Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1929 by the Charlotte Junior Chamber of Commerce, followed closely with the organization of the Winston-Salem Junior Chamber of Commerce. Its State organization has been in existence since 1937. Mr. Spruille Thornton of Winston-Salem was elected its first State president. North Carolina Jaycees, as they are affectionately called, now have approximately 6,000 members from 104 local clubs. I am particularly happy that my son has the present honor of serving as president of the Jaycees in Morganton, N. C.

Jaycees of the Tar Heel State have always stood in the forefront in the recognition of the necessity of community development. They have carried on Farmers Day projects, recreation improvement, nonpartisan voter interest drives, Operation Christmas for orphans, highway safety promotion, prisoner rehabilitation, mental health, and a multitude of other activities which have resulted in manifold blessings for our citizenry.

The official definition of the organization is: "A junior chamber of commerce is a constructive action organization of young men who devote a portion of their time to community service in the public interest, developing young men as leaders in their community."

This definition can most assuredly be applied to North Carolina Jaycees.

Let it be publicly recognized that a good local Jaycee club in a community is a good sign of progress. Multiply the local clubs in the State organization and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce—America's heritage for those who follow us will be bright indeed.

IMPORTANCE OF STATE GUARDS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in Texas we have a very strong State Guard. The men who make up this fine organization are patriotic citizens who feel that by participating in an organization of this type they can render a service to their State and Nation, when circumstances might prohibit their doing so as a member of the Reserve forces or the National Guard. This group has rendered fine service in times of emergency, in cooperation with the civil-defense and disaster authorities.

Recently, President Eisenhower recommended Federal recognition to these State guard groups by the enactment of legislation permitting States to maintain militia forces "which would take over the National Guard's domestic missions and support civil-defense activities upon its withdrawal." A provision in keeping with the President's recommendation is contained in the proposed legislation dealing with the Reserve program, now under consideration in the House Committee on Armed Services. I hope Congress will give recognition to this body of men who are ready, willing, and able to perform any required service in time of emergency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the State Guard Association of the United States, concerning the State militia section of the national Reserve plan, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE MILITIA SECTION OF THE NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

(Submitted by the State Guard Association of the United States)

The members of our Government who are familiar with the vital role played by the State Guard during World War II are not unmindful of the services rendered by the various States' militia during the absence of the National Guard in Federal service immediately prior to and during the conflict; and, the State Guard Association of the United States submits that to delay further the recognition of State guards by the failure to enact proper congressional authority for the various States to organize and maintain such State militia units in time of peace would be overly optimistic and would deny many citizens the right to participate in a most vital part of the defense of this Nation.

During World War II countless thousands of citizens not eligible or not then on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States performed militia duty without compensation or any desire for reward as members of the States' guards during the absence of the National Guard in Federal service. Many thousands of men eligible for service in the regular forces were given training which better prepared them for their impending military duty and saved the military establishment money and (most valuable of all) time. The members of this State militia were men over and under age, those who could not meet the regular physical requirements, and those who were deferred for good cause.

The public has been constantly reminded that the next conflict might well involve their own cities and homes, and, under such conditions the regular forces including the National Guard, will be engaged in actual combat or in some vital containing action other than internal security.

To properly cope with any disaster, in the absence of the National Guard in Federal service, a State guard militia organized and trained in internal security tactics is necessary. Under conditions of panic or hysteria, from whatever cause, it would be impossible for civil defense to perform its tasks of first aid, decontamination, feeding, housing, etc., unless law and order is restored and maintained, unless panic is controlled, unless traffic (both civilian and military) is channeled; and, unless looting and sabotage is prevented by the weight of a trained military organization.

The very reason for the existence of any armed force is the protection of home, family, industry, and way of life, and all of this would be forfeit unless a complete program, including State militia forces in addition to those now recognized by the Federal Government, is not only authorized but is made the subject of positive action to the end that each State may have such a force properly organized, equipped, and trained to immediately take over the National Guard's domestic missions and support civil-defense activities.

The patriotic citizen who cannot become a part of his country's Regular or Reserve forces does not demand or require that he be furnished equipment and instruction equal to that of combat troops, but he does deserve the chance to familiarize himself with his task before he is expected to perform one of such importance. Volunteer forces, although making minimum demands upon public treasuries, will more than repay whatever their cost in patriotic service and in aiding in a better understanding of the military problems of our Government.

Many problems will arise in the organization and development of the State guard militia of the various States. Even after Federal authority to organize such forces, many States will require additional State legislation before they can participate in this program. While Texas, California, Utah, Oregon, and perhaps a few others have such State authority at the present time and are actually maintaining State Guard Reserve units on a cadre basis without Federal authority or assistance, the large majority of States will require time to enact their own laws before participating in this program.

The State Guard Association of the United States heartily endorses the new National Reserve Plan as outlined by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress January 13, especially part 5 of such address, quote:

"Fifth, existing law does not permit States to maintain troops in addition to the National Guard. In view of the fact that the potential enemy possesses weapons of mass destruction and means for their delivery, it is a matter of urgent importance that there be no break between the time that National Guard units might be called into Federal service and the time that the State could raise additional forces to replace them.

"I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation which would permit the States to raise and maintain in time of peace organized militia forces which would take over the National Guard's domestic missions and support civil defense activities upon its withdrawal."

The State Guard Association of the United States also endorses H. R. 2967, section 5, for State militia in addition to the National Guard, but respectfully calls your attention to and recommends that the first sentence of subsection (f), line 21 through line 25, page 20, and the first four words of line 1, page 21 (of the printed bill) be deleted, for the reasons hereinbefore stated, and that the remaining portion of subsection (f) of section 5 of the bill be left unchanged as it is adequate and self-explanatory.

In the future development and planning of the State militia portion of the program, the State Guard Association of the United States respectfully requests that its representatives be given an opportunity to appear and be heard.

STATE GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
By DONALD W. PEACOCK,
Colonel, GS, TSGR, Executive Director.
CARL C. HARDIN, Jr.,
Colonel, GS, TSGR, Legislative Officer.

IMPORTANCE OF PROMPT DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN SYSTEM

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, because of increasing demands for power and the desirability of constructing flood-control projects in the Columbia River Basin, it is imperative that there be no unnecessary delay in continuing the integrated development of this river system.

A joint report on the proposed development of the Middle Snake River and its tributaries has been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers. The administration has advocated a partnership plan, but events have caused little progress to be made so far in the implementation of a plan which will insure orderly utilization of the water resources of the tributaries of the Columbia in the upper watershed.

Mr. President, Idaho is vitally concerned with this resource development. It would be extremely unfortunate if it should be delayed by involvement in political controversy. Therefore, in order to obtain some timely information, I requested the Department of the Interior to provide data. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and also a statement he made February 3, 1955, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, outlining an adequate water resources development program to meet the demands of our national economy.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1955.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: This is in reply to your letter of February 8, to Secretary McKay, requesting information on the administration's partnership plan, with particular reference to projects in Idaho.

The principal premise of the partnership program is that this Department is not opposed to construction by non-Federal groups, either public or private, where such development is in accord with a plan assuring optimum use of our water resources. In the case of those projects providing benefits which are both nonreimbursable and reimbursable—i. e., flood control, navigation, power, irrigation, etc.—the Federal Government is willing to share the costs for purposes which are necessary to accomplish broad public or national objectives. An example of this type of project is the proposed Priest Rapids development. Under legislation passed by the 83d Congress, local agencies would be permitted to develop the power potentialities of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River in accordance with the terms and conditions of a license issued pursuant to the Federal Power Act. The law further authorizes inclusion of navigation and flood control facilities at Federal expense either as a part of the initial construction or at a later date.

Applications for licenses or permits are now pending before the Federal Power Commission for private development of the Hells Canyon, Penny Cliffs, Bruces Eddy, Mountain Sheep, and Pleasant Valley sites in Idaho. As you undoubtedly know, the Federal Power Commission held extensive public hearings on the Idaho Power Co.'s proposal to develop the Hells Canyon site, and a final decision has not yet been reached by the Commission.

A joint report on the proposed development of the Middle Snake River and its tributaries has been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers. This development comprises two dams and reservoirs to be constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers at Bruces Eddy on the North Fork of the Clearwater River and at Penny Cliffs on the Middle Fork of the Clearwater River, and two dams and reservoirs to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation at the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites on the Snake River above its confluence with the Salmon River. This report was submitted to the Columbia River Basin States and Federal agencies for comment and review. Most of the replies have been received and are now under consideration in the Department.

On December 21, 1953, the Pacific Northwest Power Co., made up of the Montana Power Co., the Washington Water Power Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Mountain States Power Co., and Portland General Electric Co., applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit for the Penny Cliffs and Bruces Eddy sites. Permit to make preliminary studies prior to application for a license was issued by the Federal Power Commission on August 18, 1954. The company later applied for an amendment and was granted its request to exclude from the permit the Penny Cliffs development. The reasons given by the applicant and recited in the Commission's order amending preliminary permit are as follows:

"The applicant states that investigations thus far conducted under its preliminary permit respecting costs, nonpower features, possible financing arrangements and other related matters in connection with the proposed Penny Cliffs development—solely from the viewpoint of power development—show that the public interest would best be served by development of other hydroelectric sites prior to development of the Penny Cliffs site. The applicant notes also that there is an indication that the proposed Penny Cliffs development might have an effect on the wildlife and fish in the area and that an adequate investigation to determine the effect of this impact might occupy a period of time in excess of the period of the outstanding preliminary permit or any legal extension thereof."

Recently, the Pacific Northwest Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for a permit for the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites. This application is now under consideration by the Federal Power Commission.

It is apparent that there is considerable interest on the part of non-Federal groups to undertake hydroelectric power developments in Idaho. However, conflicts among various groups have developed so that it may be expected that final decision on these proposals will be delayed.

For your information and assistance, there is enclosed a statement which I recently made before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. This statement sets forth the position of this Department regarding the development of our Nation's water resources.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

STATEMENT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FRED G. AANDAHL, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(Panel discussion on public works policies before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Thursday, February 3, 1955)

The President's Economic Report calls for an acceleration of the development of our natural resources. To speed this process, with particular reference to the programs for reclamation and hydroelectric power under the Department of the Interior, the Federal Government has attempted to distinguish as clearly as is possible the proper role for Federal participation, and to encourage the States, local governmental bodies, and private investors to undertake as much resource development as they possibly can.

The Government can contribute in a very substantial degree by undertaking those multiple-purpose projects which may not readily be undertaken by others. Where projects are of great size or complexity, or where they serve numerous national interests, such as flood control, navigation, reclamation, fish and wildlife conservation, recreation, and pollution abatement, as well as hydroelectric power production and municipal water supply, and produce many benefits which are not always assessable against the beneficiaries, there is an excellent opportunity for the Federal Government to supplement the enterprise of others in the work of resources development.

An adequate water resources development program to meet the demands of our national economy is a matter of national concern. It is appropriate that the Federal Government take cognizance of the problems in this field and endeavor to formulate sound national policies in the public interest. As you may know, the President's Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy is currently reviewing many aspects of existing policies and programs in this field.

The planning of development of water resources on a river basin basis with active and cooperative participation by both Federal and non-Federal interests is necessary to assure coordination of construction and operation of related units within a river system,

and to promote the maximum economic utilization of the valuable resource with a minimum of interference in the case of conflicting uses.

The policies we have been following in the Department of the Interior are based on the development of the natural resources of the country through the initiative and industry of its citizens with the assistance but without domination of the Federal Government.

The Department of the Interior constructs hydroelectric powerplants as a part of the reclamation program, markets this power, and also markets power generated at hydroelectric plants constructed by the Corps of Engineers as a part of the national flood-control and navigation program.

Over a year ago the President approved a power policy for this Department. The policy recognizes that the Federal Government has a proper but limited role in the power field. The Reclamation Act of 1902, and various other acts of Congress have made Interior the power-producing and marketing agency at many Federal plants. These various laws have established basic policies for the marketing of power, as well as for the planning of facilities for generation and transmission. Primary responsibilities of the Department in the field of water resources are the reclamation of arid lands and the development of natural resources as authorized by Congress. This includes a disposal of electric power which can be economically produced in such developments. The Department, therefore, actively plans and recommends construction of generating facilities in water projects under its jurisdiction when such facilities are economically justified. We recognize that the primary responsibility for supplying power needs rests with the local people. We do not oppose the construction of facilities which local interests, either public or private, are willing and able to provide and which are consonant with the best development of the natural resources of the area. The Department will construct and operate transmission lines that are economically feasible and necessary for proper interconnection of Federal plants. Transmission facilities also will be built and operated to carry power to load centers within economic transmission distances unless other public or private agencies will provide the necessary facilities upon reasonable terms.

We do not favor a general disposition or transfer of title to the project facilities now held by the Federal Government. In two exceptional instances, discussions have been pursued regarding the transfer of ownership of physical facilities to the States concerned. In both cases the States initiated the negotiations but in neither case has the transfer been arranged. California inquired as to the terms on which the Central Valley project might be transferred to that State. Arizona inquired as to the purchase of the feeder transmission system in that State. In any case, in the event that an equitable arrangement could be agreed upon and the repayment of the Federal investment assured, legislative action by the Congress would be necessary before a property transfer could be made.

Direct Federal participation in water-resources development, in keeping with the President's policies, is provided in his recent budget message. It was recommended in the message that the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, be authorized to undertake the construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which together will require an investment of over a billion dollars. These projects will require some years of progressive development before their long-range objectives are reached. They are beyond the capabilities of local initiative, public or private, but are needed in their respective regions for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These projects, which are familiar to many of you, are the Colorado River storage project, serving the States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico; and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in the State of Colorado.

The budget for 1956 contemplates initiation of construction on these two projects in the fiscal year 1956 upon their authorization by the Congress. An amount of $7 million is included in the budget as an estimated 1956 supplemental appropriation to initiate these developments. Their construction will continue the pattern of Federal construction of such large-scale projects as the Central Valley project in California, the Columbia Basin project in Washington, and the Missouri Basin project. In addition to such vast developments, however, the small irrigation project which does not have the ability to show ready repayment by the irrigators alone, but is otherwise economically justified, is equally a part of our balanced program.

Thus, the budget contemplates initiation of five small reclamation projects having an estimated total cost of $33 million. These are: Foster Creek Division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington; Haystack Equalizing Reservoir, Deschutes project, Oregon; Michaud Flats project, Idaho; Palo Verde project, Arizona-California; and Santa Maria project, California.

The total appropriation estimate for the Bureau of Reclamation in the 1956 budget is $176 million. This finances planning, operation, and continuation of construction on 63 projects in the Western States.

The appropriations for all Interior water and power agencies as submitted for the 1956 fiscal year total $201 million, as compared to $195 million for 1955.

In regard to your question on the sharing of costs of construction and maintenance by the Federal Government, it is to be commented that today certain Federal programs in the field of water resources are entirely reimbursable, others partially reimbursable, and some essentially nonreimbursable. Thus, municipal water supply and hydroelectric power are reimbursable with interest; irrigation is reimbursable, but without interest; and flood control, navigation, and certain conservation programs are essentially nonreimbursable in respect to the Federal investment, although frequently there is required the provision of rights-of-way, local maintenance, or other local contributions. These practices are founded on the provisions of existing law.

The President has stated in his budget message that an important policy of this Government is to encourage an increased sharing by State and local governments of our long-range development projects. For example, under legislation passed last year, the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma and the Priest Rapids projects in the State of Washington, both with large power developments, will be built by State or local units with modest Federal contributions for those purposes, such as flood control, which involve national responsibilities.

The message goes on to say that achievement of the resource development basic to the economic progress and security of the Nation requires encouragement of local public and private initiative and, where Federal participation is necessary, requires emphasis on the partnership aspects of essential cooperative arrangements with State and local governments or with private enterprise. To the greatest extent possible, the responsibility for resource development, and its cost, should be borne by those who receive the benefits. In many instances private interests or State and local governments can best carry on the needed programs. In other instances Federal participation or initiative may be necessary to safeguard the public interest or to accomplish broad national objectives where projects, because of size or complexity, are beyond the means or the needs of local public or private enterprise. The Federal Government must be willing and ready to share the cost of improvements made for national purposes; but in all cases where the partnership principle logically applies there is automatically acquired a concern for economy and efficiency that is often lacking when no local contribution is required.

In connection with the general question of cost sharing, it is of interest that, in order to establish equity between the Federal Government and other interests, the administration repeated in this year's budget message the recommendation for enactment of legislation to provide that the Federal Government make payments to non-Federal owners of water-resources projects when Federal hydroelectric developments benefit from these projects.

May I say in conclusion that under our policy we will revive and encourage local responsibility, avoid greater demands for Federal investments than our national income will permit, and continue the Government's proper participation in developing the water resources of the Nation.

FORM-LETTER OPPOSITION TO APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN TO SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to something which I believe to be rather interesting and significant. I refer to certain communications which I have received from my State. In recent days I have been receiving quite a large number of form letters opposing confirmation of the nomination of Judge John Marshall Harlan to the Supreme Court of the United States. Almost all of the letters are on the letterhead of a particular manufacturing company in my State, namely, Crawford & Doherty Foundry Co., 4604 Southeast Seventeenth Ave., Portland 2, Oreg. The letters are signed by people who apparently are employees of that one company. All these letters are worded identically. Inasmuch as the letters are very short, I shall read one of them, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR:—

In some cases the letters are addressed, "Dear Mr. Senator"—

For the sake of the Constitution of the United States of America and this country's free men, I, as a registered voter, ask that you oppose confirmation of Judge John Marshall Harlan to the Supreme Court.

Then the letters are signed, on lines labeled "Signature" and "Address," by persons who evidently are residents of my State and of the community in which I live.

What disturbs me about this matter is that all the letters are identical in form, including the letterhead. They cite absolutely no reason why the appointment and confirmation of the nomination of Judge John Marshall Harlan to the Supreme Court would threaten the Constitution of the United States, or why it would be a danger to the freemen of this Nation.

It seems to me that either this company is dragooning its workers into signing these petitions against confirmation of the nomination of Judge John Marshall Harlan, with no reason given, or

there is some undercover movement, for which no real evidence is cited, against the nominee.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that of course every American has the right of petition; and if there is any reason why the nomination of Judge John Marshall Harlan to be a member of the United States Supreme Court should not be confirmed, the Senate should have it. But I am concerned and alarmed when 40 or 50 persons sign identical letters, but give no reason at all why the appointment would, as they state, threaten the Constitution or the freemen of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that a sample letter, without the signature, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that all Members of the Senate may see for themselves one of the letters, all of which attempt to attack and discredit Judge Harlan, but give no evidence at all as to why he is unfit for the position to which he has been nominated.

There being no objection, the sample letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRAWFORD & DOHERTY FOUNDRY CO.,
Portland, Oreg., February 9, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: For the sake of the Constitution of the United States of America and this country's free men, I, as a registered voter, ask that you oppose confirmation of Judge John Marshall Harlan to the Supreme Court.

Respectfully yours.

VISIT BY SENATOR HENNINGS TO FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT DANBURY, CONN.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, throughout the previous Congress, I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the able junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] on the Subcommittee on Federal Penitentiaries. In that capacity, I visited and inspected a great many Federal penal and correctional institutions in various sections of the country. I have always tried to make it a point to visit such institutions unannounced, so as to be able to see conditions exactly as they are. I also make it a point to talk to the prisoners alone, without the warden or other prison officials being present.

Recently, I inspected the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article from the Danbury News-Times describing that visit and setting forth my observations on that interesting institution.

In connection with my visit at Danbury, my attention was called to a number of letters addressed to the editor of a national magazine following the publication of an article written by a former inmate of that institution. I asked for copies of some of those letters, which have been furnished to me, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these letters also be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Danbury News-Times of December 31, 1954]

HENNINGS FINDS FEDERAL PRISON STANDARDS UNIFORMLY HIGH

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat of Missouri, said yesterday he finds standards of administration and personnel in Federal prisons uniformly high.

The Senator, a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Prisons of the Senate Judiciary Committee, was interviewed on a visit to the Federal Correctional Institution.

He commented that inmate morale seemed exceedingly high.

A visitor to any prison can usually sense a high or low degree of tension if tension exists, he said. "I have seen no sulkers here."

Senator HENNINGS toured the FCI under the guidance of Warden Harold E. Hegstrom and Assistant Warden Thomas Joyce, stopping frequently to chat in friendly fashion with prisoners, guards, and instructors.

Talking to newsman, the Senator emphasized that he was not there to snoop. "I have great confidence in the kind and caliber of men in the prison service," he said.

"The morale of the prison personnel is remarkably good here and in all the institutions I have seen. The workers here are well disciplined, alert, and take pride in their work.

"They show a remarkably fine spirit toward the inmates, I heard one prisoner say, 'If you've got to be locked up, at least here you learn something.' "

Senator HENNINGS noted that the FCI was one of a dozen penal institutions he had visited in the last few weeks.

Crime, punishment, and rehabilitation are subjects in which he has long been interested, he explained. He is a former district attorney in St. Louis and currently a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency as well as the prisons subcommittee.

He is also a national director of the Big Brothers of America, an organization which strives to provide guidance for young men and keep them out of trouble.

Reporters who followed Senator HENNINGS through the prison's busy typewriter repair shop and glove factory judged he was seeing a true picture of conditions at the FCI.

Nothing appeared specially arranged for his benefit. The newsmen noticed that Mr. Hegstrom and Mr. Joyce often strolled out of earshot as the Senator talked with workers and inmates.

They did not appear to be at all concerned with what he might hear.

Senator HENNINGS himself was convinced that he was getting an undistorted view. "With my experience," he said, "I could spot a setup easily."

The Senator explained that he is touring the prisons to discover what problems prison officials face in respect to administration, plant, or personnel, and what he can do to make their job more effective.

He said he feels more medical and psychiatric personnel are needed at all the penal institutions so inmates can be given more individual attention.

He added that he believes prison service pay inadequate and that he intends to back a pending bill to raise it.

The better the pay, the better prison personnel will be, he said, and only good personnel can turn out a good "end product"—rehabilitated convicts ready to be useful members of society.

Warden Hegstrom, answering a question from the Senator, said the FCI is now operating with fewer personnel than ever before.

During his visit, Senator HENNINGS also learned that the FCI could use a chapel and a gymnasium. Religious services are now held in the auditorium.

The lawmaker was asked whether he had seen any signs of coddling as he made the rounds. Prisoner coddling is a favorite charge of critics of the institution.

"Everything here is disciplined and orderly," Senator HENNINGS replied. "Everyone has a job to do and does it."

COMMENTS ON J. PARNELL THOMAS' LIFE MAGAZINE ARTICLE, RED HUNTER'S RED JAILMATES

In its October 4, 1954, issue Life magazine published an article, Red Hunter's Red Jailmates, by J. Parnell Thomas, which was critical of the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn. James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, has made available to Federal Probation copies of a few of the many communications sent to the editor of Life and to the Bureau of Prisons, commenting on the article.

Telegram to the editor of Life from Senator WILLIAM LANGER:

OCTOBER 5, 1954.

Having been a member of the Senate Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries for many years and as its chairman for 4 years, I am entirely familiar with the operation of these institutions including the Danbury Federal Correctional Institution. I therefore request opportunity and equal space and artistic assistance to reply to the distorted, unfair, and misleading article of J. Parnell Thomas published in your last issue. The fee which should be in fairness equal to his will be donated to the crippled children's home at Jamestown, N. Dak. As one North Dakotan to another don't you believe in simple fairness you should grant this request.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary and Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries.

(Senator LANGER and Judge Morgan Ford of the United States Customs Court in New York City made an unannounced visit to Danbury on the Sunday following the publication of the article and, as a result, sent the above wire.)

SEPTEMBER 30, 1954.

To the Editor of Life from James V. Bennett, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons:

You have done an irreparable disservice to a public agency sincerely attempting to execute faithfully the sentences of the court when you permit embittered and vindictive Parnell Thomas to ventilate his unfounded charges. During the nearly 4 years he has been attempting to get them published they have been carefully investigated by this office and the appropriate Federal agencies and found to be utterly without substance. The one statement you checked because it involved a person who was not a defenseless ex-prisoner or a public official you eliminated from your final copy. Certainly this incident alone should have alerted you to check on others of the charges or have given some heed to the warning voice of Mr. E. R. Cass, secretary of the American Prison Association, who knows the institution and the efforts made to operate it constructively.

Also it should have been well known to your editors that the charge Federal prisons were staffed with political appointees was false, since civil-service laws are applicable to all but a few positions. As a matter of fact, every employee of the Federal Prison Service from the Director on down was recruited in accordance with civil-service regulations. It has shocked and saddened all of us who are proud to be a part of what we consider a satisfying public service, notwithstanding its hazards and exasperations, to have Life magazine circulate such uncorroborated statements.

I realize it will be impossible for any denial to overtake the misstatements, half-truths, and innuendoes the article contains, but I do hope Life will do what it can to remove the wholly erroneous impression the article creates.

JAMES V. BENNETT.

To the editor of Life from Harold E. Hegstrom, warden, Federal Correctional Institution, Danbury, Conn.:

OCTOBER 1, 1954.

You have printed without verification the article by former prisoner, J. Parnell Thomas, with his rantings and criticisms of prisoners, personnel, program, facilities, and services of prison life at Danbury 49 months ago.

Apparently you did not take into account that this article permits a former convicted prisoner to impugn the integrity and loyalty of competent civil service employees carefully screened, trained, and never arrested. That conditions described by the former prisoner are not true can be attested by many public and private agencies, the FBI, and by qualified unbiased individuals whose fairmindedness cannot be questioned. The article is unfair to the present inmate population who are worried that their families and friends will believe the untruths that Life editors consider news after a lapse of 4 years.

You have made our task more difficult without any constructive end and with no good purpose.

HAROLD E. HEGSTROM.

To the editor of Life from Dr. George G. Killinger, member of the United States Board of Parole:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1954.

In Mr. J. Parnell Thomas' Life article of October 4, 1954, he states that 95 inmates went before me for parole consideration on June 13 and 14, 1950, and as time passed all were released except three.

His statement is without foundation. The facts are that only 68 individuals were given parole hearings at the June 1950 meeting to which he refers.

Of this group 45, or 66.2 percent, were denied parole and 23, or 33.8 percent were granted. During subsequent months, before expiration of sentence, parole was granted to 10 additional prisoners (including Mr. Thomas) meaning that only 33, or 48.5 percent of the group, were eventually paroled. Thirty-five, or 51.5 percent, continued to be denied and completed their sentences.

All parole decisions are majority decisions by a quorum of five members of the Board and each decision is the result of careful and intensive study of each case. Mr. Thomas' statements that any factors other than the merits of an individual case are considered by the board in reaching a decision are untrue.

Mr. Thomas was required to serve 9 months, or 50 percent, of his 18-month sentence, and even though he seems to feel that he should have been paroled immediately following his initial hearing it is well to note that the average Federal prisoner serves approximatley 62 percent of his sentence before release.

I regret that Life published this article before ascertaining the facts.

GEORGE G. KILLINGER.

To the editor of Life from Dr. Walter M. Wallack, president, American Prison Association:

OCTOBER 4, 1954.

Your article in the October 4 issue of Life magazine, entitled "Red Hunter's Red Jailmates," by ex-Congressman and ex-prisoner J. Parnell Thomas, is a blow below the belt to the progressive element in American penology. Moreover, it is an unjustifiable attack upon the high level competency of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and its enlightened management.

Approximately 25 years ago the Federal prison system was a fair example of almost everything a prison system should not be. That condition no longer prevails since the reforms inaugurated by Sanford Bates and Austin MacCormick have been carried to maturity by Director James V. Bennett who is unquestionably one of the ablest, if not the ablest, prison administrators in the country.

Many of us, including Mr. Bennett, are aware of the numerous, and in some cases deplorable, shortcomings of the penal institutions in this country and have devoted our energies toward the eradication of faults. The Federal institutions have been pacesetting in their progress and have served as a fine example for the emulation of the State jurisdictions. It is therefore most disconcerting to note that a publication such as Life, whose journalistic integrity is believed by millions to be of the highest order, would stoop to printing a canard such as this article is. You have done a disservice to an element of social welfare that is greatly in need of constructive help and criticism. The damage of the Thomas article to the cause of penological reform may be irreparable. Why you did not check the facts, which we know you did not, is beyond our comprehension. There are many who could have assured you from firsthand knowledge that the Thomas article was filled with half-truths and innuendos. That the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., is not only one of the best in the Federal system, but also in the country, is well known by those who are informed concerning penal affairs.

Speaking for the American Prison Association let me assure you that nearly all of our members do resent the unfair and irresponsible way in which you handled the Thomas article and sincerely hope that you will try to undo some of the damage it has done, if that is possible.

WALTER M. WALLACK.

To Mr. Henry R. Luce, editor in chief of Life, from Sanford Bates:

OCTOBER 21, 1954.

I read with indignation and dismay an article in your issue of October 4 by former Congressman and Convict J. Parnell Thomas. I can understand his frame of mind and I have no doubt that what he might say would be repudiated by the reading public with the same definite action that the people of his district repudiated him at the polls last fall. What I cannot understand is the willingness of an influential magazine like yours to publish dogmatic statements without first investigating the accuracy.

I shall refer to only one or two of them—"Federal penitentiaries are full of political appointees, misfits who will never understand the meaning of rehabilitation." Inquiry would disclose the fact that the prison personnel is covered by civil service right up to the top position and the medical, surgical, and psychiatric services are furnished by the competent United States Public Health Service.

Thus, the aspersions on the medical services are reflections on one of the most respectable career services in our Government. From its very inception, that is one thing that the Federal bureau has been practically free from; namely, the influence of politics which has been so ruinous an influence in many State institutions. It may be that prison food will never be wholly satisfactory to the inmates, but one charge that cannot be made against the Federal system is that the food is meager and that the clothing allowance insufficient.

As a former director of the Prison Bureau, I happen to know that Dr. Killinger is an honest and conscientious person and that the Federal parole system, while it exercises its own judgment in each case, has never been charged with venality or bribery.

The Federal Prison Bureau is one of the great Federal bureaus that has been conducted along strictly professional and competent lines and it certainly is a discouraging thing to "reward" the men and women who have made it what it is by the publication of an irresponsible and exaggerated article such as you have published in your last issue.

SANFORD BATES.

To the editor of Life from Rabbi Jerome R. Malino:

OCTOBER 6, 1954.

I have been chaplain to the Jewish inmates of the Federal correctional institution since the day the institution was opened in 1940. It would be a simple matter to refute in detail the accusations made by an ex-convict who seems intent upon clearing his own past by suggesting that legislators and the judiciary ought to spend some time in jail. Would he suggest under circumstances similar to his own? I will not, however, attempt a general refutation of the article because there are others in the administration who could more properly do so. I am able to affirm nonetheless that Thomas' reference to the concentration of the Jewish inmates in a so-called Israel house is not true now, was not true when he had a Danbury address, nor was it ever true in the history of this institution. At the present time there are 33 Jewish inmates distributed in varying numbers among 10 housing units, the distribution being determined, as in every case, by factors other than religion or color.

JEROME R. MALINO.

To the editor of Life from Protestant Chaplain Harrison L. Anthony and Catholic Chaplain Joseph J. Maglione:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1954.

As the chaplains of the Federal Correctional Institution in Danbury we feel that our first concern is for the welfare of the inmates of the institution. Next, we must consider the mothers and fathers, the wives and families of the inmates.

If the allegations of Parnell Thomas are true, then we, the chaplains, are committing a grave injustice to the inmates and to their families if we allow such conditions to exist.

May we frankly and flatly state that the allegations of Parnell Thomas are grossly exaggerated. He has taken some isolated instances and has given them a false and tainted reality. In other instances, he has let his imagination run wild.

All in all, practically the entire article is nothing but unadulterated trash.

HARRISON L. ANTHONY.
JOSEPH J. MAGLIONE.

Excerpt from a Danbury News-Times editorial, October 2, 1954:

"A magazine with a national circulation has just published what Warden Harold Hegstrom, of the Federal Correctional Institutions calls an article packed with 'malicious lies.'

"The article was written by J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey Congressman, who served 9 months at the FCI after being convicted of payroll padding and accepting kickbacks from Federal employees in his office.

"Parnell Thomas certainly does not come into courts with clean hands. And anyone who knows Warden Hegstrom—as many people in the Danbury area do—most certainly will accept his word as against that of the tarnished former Congressman from New Jersey.

"Thomas alleges that almost nothing was right at the FCI, and everything wrong. Food was poor, and insufficient, immorality and graft were rife, near-riots threatened many times, guards were brutal and almost sadistic, drugs were easily obtainable, and bribery common. Prisoners in desperate need of medical care and medicine received neither, and malnutrition was common. Thomas goes allout in his accusations. * * *

"Mr. Hegstrom made this pithy observation: 'I think most of the inmates here would take exception to almost everything Thomas said.'

"It seems absurd and ridiculous for a criminal such as Thomas to take a righteous stand, and to spell out ways to aid young men to become moral and better while in prison. One would think that a public servant who betrayed his trust and was convicted of serious crime would want to hide himself and his name forever from the public, rather than to flaunt it openly in a magazine article.

"The hard fact about publishing such charges is that many will believe them, no matter how absurd they are, or how completely they are proved false.

"Although Warden Hegstrom was not at the FCI when Thomas served his sentence there, he knows what went on, and he knows the Federal prison service, where he has had a distinguished and honorable career. When he says that what Thomas alleges is a mass of 'malicious lies' we believe him. So does everyone who knows him, and knows the unsavory record of Parnell Thomas.

"It is not surprising that the former Congressman, embittered, his career ruined by his own viciousness, should turn and pour the phials of his wrath on the place where he was confined. It is surprising, we feel, that a magazine of good repute would publish such mouthings. Surprising and disappointing."

To the editor of Life from a former inmate of the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn.:

"Upon reading an article relative to conditions in the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., which was published in the October 4 issue of Life magazine, I felt that out of a sense of fairness I should relate my observations from personal experiences as to conditions there in 1954.

"I was admitted with a group of 24 men, examined and assigned by the qualifications board to work in the hospital. It was my observation that each man was examined physically, intellectually, and practically to determine which type of work was best suited for him. Too, should he for any reason feel that he did not wish to carry on his assignment, he would be placed at a different task. Many men were shifted from week to week if necessary. Naturally here, as in any field, there were maladjusted persons who found it difficult to conform in the institution as they did on the outside. It is not an easy task to show this type of person that bitterness hindered, not helped, him to busy himself, accept his sentence, and so make his stay there easier to endure.

"Many of us, including myself, felt that we did not deserve the penalty imposed upon us but were astute enough to accept the uniforms, institutional food, and inconveniences, which could be compared to the vicissitudes of Army life, with good grace and make the best of them. The clothing was clean, and the food, I found, while it could not compare with the meals which I have been used to, was well balanced. It contained a sufficient number of calories, proper ratio of carbohydrates, proteins, and fats, with enough diversity from day to day.

"Relative to hospital treatment of inmates I can state that they have the best that can be given under the circumstances. The pharmacy is well stocked, and when a new drug is needed it is supplied quickly. X-ray examinations are done routinely; no one is refused this added help in diagnosis. The machines such as X-ray are serviced immediately should this be necessary as is the case in any well-regulated hospital. Right now an up-to-date machine is being installed.

"With regard to rehabilitation of the men I can truthfully say that the moral, physical, and educational components are being covered as adequately as possible. All told I feel the morale is on a high plane if one considers the whole as a cross section from so many different strata of life.

"At no time during my stay was there ever a hint at bribery regarding paroles.

"The above statement is purely voluntary and is made by a man who at no time received any special consideration and who states the facts as he saw them in the year 1954.

"PMB–10737."

Letter to James V. Bennett, Director, Bureau of Prisons, from a former Federal prison inmate:

OCTOBER 7, 1954.

After reading an article written by a former inmate named J. Parnell Thomas who served a short prison sentence at the correctional institution located in Danbury, Conn., it became my duty to write you a personal letter in reference to the untruth in the story.

I must do my duty in respect to the lies and unfairness of such an out-of-order story which was written by Thomas.

My name which appears upon the letterhead will reveal my identity as a former Federal prison inmate. * * *

I must also state in this letter that the officers of the prison were decent and human. Inmates such as Thomas and others who were prominent in the free world thought that they should be treated better than the average inmate. This does not happen in the Federal prisons as I know from past experience during my 5-year sentence at Lewisburg. * * *

Many times I thought of writing you a letter of praise in regards to the decent handling of inmates by the Bureau. You as Director, and your staff of officers, are to be merited and respected for the clean and outstanding system.

Before I sign off, many praises to you and your staff for the human, clean, and outstanding Federal Prison System.

PMB–16651.

To a Danbury inmate from his wife:

"DEAREST LOVE: I had a pleasant trip back to Philadelphia and everything was going rather smoothly until I read an article in Life magazine about the place you are in and I got so upset I was sick for 2 days. Everyone is calling me on the phone and asking me about it."

To another Danbury inmate from his wife:

OCTOBER 3, 1954.

DEAR JACKS: I just finished reading an article in this week's Life by a former inmate (political) and it was awful. It made me sick. He said he worked 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, and that the place was dirty and the clothes battered and that Jews and Negroes are segregated. I know these letters are censored, but the article is in Life for everyone to read. How can that be? You looked well-clothed and you said that the place was immaculate and that there was no anti-Semitism, and the food was good. He said most of the guards were bad and you told me how understanding and kind they all are—and I believe you, because when we visit we are extended every courtesy and treated kindly. He also said there is much indecency and bad medical facilities. This was only 4 years ago. Can he be lying or has everything changed for the better since then? I am very much concerned. Why doesn't some outgoing inmate write the truth—when guards and officials treat you as though you were in a correctional institution and not a prison (like you told me) why isn't the public told of how they try and not let anyone get away with such lies.

From an article entitled "The Truth About Federal Prisons," written for submission to Life magazine by Una C. Walters, wife of a correctional officer at the Federal Correctional Institution, Seagoville, Tex.:

"I have just read the article in the October 4 issue of Life, by J. Parnell Thomas, and as I begin this I blush for shame—not for the Federal Prison Bureau, but for the integrity or rather the lack of it in a former Congressman of the United States. On one point I must agree with Mr. Thomas. Justice is not very well regulated. Military courts often mete out too stiff sentences, and civil courts will sentence a man 20 years for bank robbery, while a fellow citizen elected to a position of trust and control is given 6 to 18 months for flagrantly cheating the people who trusted him, violating the very principles he pretends to represent, released after serving half his maximum term to return to his game as dangerous to our democracy as communism itself. The game is bribe and be bribed.

"For 7 years my husband has worked as a Federal correctional officer in a Federal penal institution, all of which are under the same direction and rules set up by the Federal Prison Bureau, very ably headed in Washington by Mr. James V. Bennett. Remembering the intensive training period my husband went through in the beginning of his career to fit him for his work, the burning of the midnight oil to learn what was required of him, the hard work and earnest effort he expended, and even now seeing the tired lines and too rapidly graying hair that so often accompanies the constant dealing with those less fortunate than oneself, helping when help is often resented, enforcing rehabilitation, when self-improvement is neither wanted nor the need for its recognized—all of this plus experiences that could fill volumes, and the firm belief that he is typical of the officers that make up the force of the Federal prison system, I am furious to see these men and those who share their responsibility belittled and underrated by a common snob.

"Much of Mr. Thomas' article is false; all of it is the composition of a broken, bitter man who, for the first time in his life, evidently, has had to live by the same rules and regulations that govern others, unable to bribe or threaten his way into a soft spot."

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, all of us have given considerable thought to the subject of rules of procedure for congressional investigating committees. Many proposals to regulate and define such procedures have been presented in this body. On January 6, I submitted Senate Resolution 15, designed to assure the unhampered continuation of legitimate investigations, and at the same time to assure fair conduct in such investigations. Since that time I have received many letters from thoughtful citizens commenting on this subject in general, and my resolution in particular.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the issues raised in one such letter, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to have this letter printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALDWELL, DOWNING,
GARRITY & EASTIN,
Kansas City, Mo., January 10, 1955.

Senator THOMAS HENNINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I congratulate you upon the introduction of Senate Resolution 15 suggesting an amendment to the Standing Rules of the Senate.

I have two suggestions for your consideration. The first grows out of the thought and research that I have given in connection with the power of the Senate to investigate. You have a rough copy of the authorities

that influence my thinking on this point. Certainly one must agree with your conclusion that power to investigate exists "to develop concise and adequate information in order to formulate intelligent legislative policy."

I am doubtful about the existence of the power, and certainly about the exercise of that power should it exist, "to supplement the extensive investigatory machinery work in the executive branch."

Certainly the Senate should exercise its power to investigate how legislation can authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cry "Wolf," on Wolf and how the State Department can hear such a statement and merely act as though someone had belched at a diplomatic dinner. My point is that as Missourians whose ancestors had quite a good deal of experience with test oaths, I think that both of us would overhaul a good many of the laws under which the executive branch acts because I am inclined to think that many of these laws have vested far too much power to make nonjudicial judgments on the conditions of men's minds in the exercise of methods completely foreign to our basic traditions.

Of course, that problem is one of alternatives and judgment as to where the greatest risk might lie. I personally find myself lining up with the basic Jefferson philosophy as most eloquently expressed by Judge Hand in 1952 when he accepted a degree from New York University.

Secondly, I am bothered by the omission of even a limited right of cross-examination in the suggested amendment. Quite correctly, you have based your plea for following rules of evidence upon the time-tested rules of fair play, pushing the origin back to the Plains of Runnymede. But one of the traditional restraints on power demanded and received from King John by the barons was the right of cross-examination.

Perhaps there are compelling reasons, practical and otherwise, that prevent the inclusion of that right, at least in a limited form in connection with what you call the inquisitorial phase of congressional investigation, in paragraph 4 of your proposed amendment, but unless those reasons are most compelling I would be hopeful that the right of cross-examination will ultimately be included.

May I close with the expression that certainly your approach is basically sound. This business of promulgating codes and pious statements leave me quite cold because as long as the power exists to investigate in accordance with one's personal whim, I am inclined to think that Lord Acton's dictum as to what power tends to do and what absolute power does is quite applicable, even to the United States Senate.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. OLIVER.

Mr. HENNINGS. The writer of this letter expressed doubt about the existence of a congressional power to supplement the extensive investigative machinery at work in the executive branch. I pointed out to him that Congress has an overwhelming obligation to safeguard the general welfare of our country, and if the executive should plainly be deficient in protecting the security of the United States. Congress must assume the role.

The writer also expressed concern over the absence of the right of cross-examination from my proposal. I explained to him that such omission seemed necessary. For such a right could perhaps be abused by persons not sincerely interested in the welfare of our country. I explained that my resolution is intended to prevent such abuse, and at the same time to assure injured persons the right to answer their accusers.

I believe that this letter is typical of the concern which all citizens feel in this matter, and I am encouraged that the people are taking the time to express this concern to their elected representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business to be transacted, the Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

ALIEN PROPERTY SEIZED UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that on last Tuesday there was introduced in this body by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a bill which will result in the return of the property seized from its private owners under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

During the last session of Congress the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] introduced a similar bill and it was considered by the committee. I also introduced a similar bill, which was considered by the committee, but no action was taken by the Senate on either bill. I hope the legislation recently proposed by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Illinois will receive favorable action at this session of Congress.

It is now 10 years after hostilities. Further delay in returning this property is neither necessary nor wise. Closing out this situation will permit a substantial reduction in administrative expense by ending the need for the agencies which are now engaged in administering the property for the Government.

Favorable action now upon this proposed legislation is especially desirable for other important reasons. There is in Western Germany a government which has evidenced an unwavering desire for friendship with us and a steadfast adherence to the principles of the Western World. The actions of the government of Chancellor Adenauer are those of a friend determined to join with us in resisting communistic aggression. Events over the last weekend in France make it clear that there still are great obstacles to be overcome before West Germany will be accorded the full status of a partner in the common defense of the Western World, even though the constancy of the purpose which the Adenauer government has shown demonstrates that it has earned the right to this partnership now. It is lacking in realism to believe that this constancy has been achieved by the Adenauer government without domestic difficulties. There are those in Europe who oppose communism but who are not willing to be active in their opposition. Some of the neutralists are in Germany. The Communists have made and will continue to make glamorous offers to Germany as well as elsewhere. Chancellor Adenauer has consistently pierced the sham of these offers. But some Germans may succumb to them.

The best way for us to help the friendship, which has been so important to establish, to prevent Germans from being beguiled by Communist promises and to continue in Germany a government with ideals like those of our own country, is now to act toward Germany with a spirit consistent with that which a sincere partnership requires.

It is inconsistent with such a spirit to continue to withhold private property from its rightful owners simply because they are German citizens. As Chancellor Adenauer himself has said, the failure to return this property to its rightful owners is and continues to be a sore spot in German-American relations.

But this is not the only inconsistency. To refuse to return this property to its private owners is inconsistent with our tradition. It is inconsistent with the opinions and judgment of all the recognized writers of international law since the beginning of this country. It is inconsistent with the views of every American authority with a reputation beyond the community in which he lived.

It is inconsistent with the spirit of the Farewell Address of George Washington, which will be read in the Senate on the 22d day of this month. In that address the great President asked the people of the United States to meet their obligations and to treat all people correctly and firmly.

The measure of this inconsistency and the strength and long-standing character of this tradition are shown by the names of those who have held that our Government does not have the right to confiscate the property of private persons who are distinguished from other persons in that they are enemy aliens. The list includes Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, Benjamin Cardozo, Charles Evans Hughes, Cordell Hull, John Bassett Moore, and Edwin Borchard among the others. They uniformly condemn confiscation of private property as a violation of the right to private property.

These authorities have made clear that unless confiscation is rejected the individual's right to property becomes a sham. They have held that expediency or compromise cannot apply when basic principles are involved, if basic principles are to remain basic. Their position is that we must stand firm on principle. I submit that that is the course we must now follow.

Our Government is a government charged with protecting private rights and not with destroying them. Especially within the past 2½ years has the idea or principle that private rights must be protected been emphasized by the administration.

That the Government has the power to destroy such rights should not make us blind to the fact that its power cannot properly be exercised to destroy them and that when such unfortunate action has occurred it is the duty of the Government to make reparation.

As the law now stands it is in conflict with the principles which we have always held to be basic to our tradition. As the law now stands the right to private property in the United States is not inviolate; our Government has exercised the power

given to it to protect the property rights of individuals and to destroy such rights in the case of some people. In the passion of wartime, with the suffering and hate of such tragic periods, the spirit of vengeance often replaces reason.

There has now been time enough for calm reflection, and with it the realization that basic principles have been violated in the existing legislation. That being the case, the error should be corrected. The great men whose names I have mentioned point out the corrections we must make. The bill introduced last Monday adopts the advice they give.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am delighted that the senior Senator from New Mexico, who is a very warm friend of mine and whose judgment I greatly respect, has finally and at last come around to the viewpoint that the German property should be returned. Eight years ago, 7 years ago, 6 years ago, 5 years ago, 4 years ago, 3 years ago, 2 years ago, and 1 year ago I offered a bill on the subject, but every time the bill was reached on the Consent Calendar, my distinguished friend from New Mexico objected to its consideration.

Finally, approximately a year ago, the Senate passed Senate bill 155, providing for the return of the German property, but, as my distinguished friend from New Mexico will remember, the House failed to act upon it. The Senator will find that in the bill about which he is now speaking Senate bill 155 is incorporated in its entirety. The bill should have been passed, Mr. President, 6 or 7 years ago, when it would have done much more to help the situation in Germany than the passage of a bill today will accomplish.

Adenauer is standing with his back to the wall. He has lost the past two elections. It may be that, if we can get prompt action on the bill, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico now suggests, it may still do a great deal of good.

I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which had under consideration the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] last year. It was reported by unanimous vote of the Judiciary Committee, but we were unable to get action upon the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to compliment my friend for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate today, and I can assure him that I shall fight shoulder to shoulder with him in the effort to pass the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the proposed legislation is not political; it is not Democratic or Republican. It merely carries out the Amercan idea of fair play and decency. That is all that is intended to be done. Ten years have passed since the war. What country do we depend upon to oppose Communist China. The people of Japan. What people do we depend upon in Germany at this time to be our friends even as against our so-called allies? The people against whom we fought 10 years ago.

I feel, Mr. President, that individuals should not be held responsible for the doings of governments. The property involved is individual property. It belongs to A, B, C, D, and probably to X. Are we going to continue to use their property because we were once at war with the German Government, or are we going to be fair? Are we only sermonizing with respect to our democracy? Are we going to show the world that when a piece of property belongs to Jim Jones we are going to protect the rights of Jim Jones?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let us consider a situation, for example, in which an American boy has an insurance policy worth $10,000. The insurance is made payable to his mother in Germany. Yet, at the present time, the money cannot be sent to his mother. There are numerous cases of men in this country who have made some money setting up trusts for their fathers or mothers in the old country, Germany or Austria. But at the present time, even though the fathers and mothers may be starving, they cannot get the money.

Mr. President, I congratulate my friend from New Mexico, and I hope we may obtain prompt action upon the bill to which he has been referring.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the passage of this bill will demonstrate to the Germans and the Japanese, people and governments alike, that principles are important to us and that they control not only the actions of our people but our Government. It will be a concrete illustration of the regard for life and property by governments which are subject to the rule of law as contrasted with the lack of such regard by the Communist master government which asserts all power unfettered by any law.

We cannot compromise between right and wrong. The property taken should be returned to those from whom it was taken.

Mr. NEUBERGER obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I have a luncheon engagement which has been waiting for half an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oregon may proceed.

STATEMENT OF NATIONALIST CHINA'S FOREIGN MINISTER WITH REFERENCE TO FORMOSA AND THE PESCADORES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment on a story appearing in this morning's New York Times, headed "Formosa Says United States Pledged To Defend All Offshore Isles."

I read from the story, as follows:

Nationalist China's Foreign Minister asserted today that the United States was pledged to defend all the offshore Chinese islands in addition to Formosa and the Pescadores.

George Yeh made this comment as he paid farewell calls on Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and on Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Mr. Yeh, who has been in the United States since last October, is returning to Taipei tomorrow.

Further on in the article it is stated:

One of these understandings, concurred in by Mr. Dulles, although it is separate from the treaty, provides that the United States will not be obliged to take military action in defense of the Nationalists beyond Formosa and the Pescadores unless the treaty is specifically amended.

President Eisenhower, however, under the terms of the congressional resolution adopted January 28, can order the 7th Fleet and its carrier-based planes to fight for Quemoy and Matsu if he deems those positions essential to the defense of Formosa.

Mr. Yeh appeared to be suggesting that the President had promised the Nationalists such assistance.

The article leaves the impression that Mr. Yeh is of the opinion that the President of the United States has made that pledge. I do not believe it, Mr. President. I wish the RECORD to show that I do not believe the President of the United States has made such a pledge to the Nationalist Chinese. I wish the RECORD to show that I do not think the Nationalist Chinese minister is telling the truth. If he is, it is a sad day for America. If he is telling the truth, Mr. President, we are headed for serious trouble in the East. Yet in the debate spokesmen for the administration on the floor of the Senate sought to leave with the American people the impression that no such commitment has been made by this Government to the Nationalist Chinese.

I should like to know who is lying. The American people are entitled to know who is lying. If the Nationalist Chinese have in this country a foreign minister who is issuing such lies, he should be repudiated by this administration, because his statements are very disheartening to the American people. We want to go forward unitedly behind our President, but we also want at the same time assurance from our President that there is no commitment to defend the Quemoys and the Matsus, because we have not the slightest legal right to be on the Quemoys and the Matsus. That will be the judgment of history and of international law.

So I close, Mr. President, by saying that the Chinese foreign minister himself raised the issue yesterday. Let the President of the United States answer him, because he owes it to the American people to do so.

PROPOSED REFORMS IN THE TREATMENT OF THE MENTALLY ILL IN ALASKA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have introduced 2 bills to bring about 3 urgently needed reforms regarding treatment of the mentally ill in Alaska. These bills are S. 1027 and S. 1028.

These proposals, first, provide for construction of a modern hospital within Alaska for treatment of men and women who are mentally ill; second, improve

and modernize the methods of committing the insane in Alaska; and, third, transfer these functions from the Interior Department to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where they properly belong.

I am sponsoring the proposed legislation because, in view of an extraordinary situation, I believe it must originate with a Member of Congress from the State of Oregon to have a reasonable chance of adoption.

Since 1904 all insane Alaskans have been treated at the Morningside Hospital in Portland, Oreg., a private institution. This hospital served a useful purpose during Alaska's frontier era, and it has been operated by responsible and conscientious owners. However, the system of contract care has long been recognized to be fundamentally wrong and has been abandoned in modern, humanitarian communities. It is particularly cruel and archaic, in my opinion, to transport American citizens who are mentally ill into confinement several thousand miles from their loved ones.

EX-GOVERNOR FAVORS CHANGE

In his recent authoritative book, The State of Alaska, ex-Gov. Ernest Gruening, who served outstandingly as Governor of Alaska for 15 years, has written that "accessibility of relatives and friends" is a basic prerequisite for successful treatment of most mentally ill individuals, yet this accessibility is denied to Alaskans by the lack of hospitals and by the ancient laws which compel Alaska's mental patients to be treated in Portland, Oreg., rather than within Alaska itself.

Not 1 of the 48 States represented in the Senate would think of sending its mentally ill citizens 2,000 miles to be confined in a hospital operated for private profit, and I can see no sound reason why this system should continue to apply to the residents of Alaska.

On earlier occasions Members of the Congress from my State may have used their influence to block a change in the treatment of Alaska's mentally ill because the Morningside Hospital has provided a valuable local payroll in Portland.

I renounce any such considerations. I know that the humane and upright people of Oregon join me in this stand.

I also should like to make clear that my proposal involves no criticism of the operators of the Morningside Hospital. I have no doubt of their competence and their personal devotion to the patients under their care. But would residents of Oregon look with favor upon any system which required the mentally ill people of Oregon to be treated at Phoenix, Ariz., for example, or at Fort Nelson, British Columbia? The people of Alaska certainly have an equal right to be comparatively near relatives who have lost their sanity.

PHYSICIANS URGE HOSPITAL IN ALASKA

In 1949 a committee of distinguished psychiatrists reviewed the Alaskan program for treating the mentally ill. These leading physicians in the field of mental health had this to say of the Morningside Hospital in Portland:

> Only custodial care is provided at the present time, and as such it is reasonably good as compared with the poorer mental State hospitals. The facilities as a whole are overcrowded, but not so seriously as in some State institutions. The patients appear to be well fed and sympathetically treated * * * Practically no psychiatric treatment is afforded the many patients who urgently need such treatment. The professional staff is inadequate numerically and professionally to provide the required treatment * * * Although the physical layout of the plant is not good, it is evident that there have been substantial improvements made in recent years, and your committee was informed of additional betterments planned, such as an improved dining room for the patients.

In addition to this impartial analysis of the Morningside operation, the committee of doctors pointed out:

> The fundamental principle of contract care in proprietary institutions is wrong. It has long been outmoded in the United States. * * * It is subject to criticism on sound humanitarian grounds.

This committee then unanimously recommended construction of a modern mental hospital in the central region of Alaska, with at least 350 beds, plus a short-term 50-bed clinic in southeastern Alaska for acute cases.

A follow-up survey made in 1954 further pointed out that many patients from Alaska have a limited knowledge of English and that the cultural barrier between them and psychiatrists in the distant hospital makes treatment difficult.

A great many of these patients are Indians and Eskimos and, therefore, cannot communicate with the persons who are treating them.

Moreover, the distance between Portland and the Territory makes it almost impossible to parole patients who show improvement to their homes.

OREGON WILL NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST ALASKA

Undoubtedly there was a time, during Alaska's pioneer era, when the facilities at Morningside Hospital were the best available for treatment of the mentally ill. But, as the poet Lowell wrote, "new occasions teach new duties, time makes ancient good uncouth."

Today, Alaska has a population of about 200,000. It has modern buildings, supermarkets, bus lines, a streamlined railroad train, vast airports, and some of the world's biggest defense installations. Yet the system for caring for the mentally ill of Alaska remains anachronistic and, in some respects, barbaric. Proximity to home and loved ones is, as I have said, an important phase of therapy in insane cases. Yet the mentally ill Alaskans at Morningside Hospital in Portland are as far from their families as would be a mentally ill Oregonian in Omaha, Nebr. I ask again: What would the citizens of Oregon think of any such arrangement involving their relatives?

MENTALLY ILL PEOPLE MUST BE NEAR FAMILIES

The hardships of having to travel far from home to receive mental hospitalization and treatment will be eliminated only when the mental hospital which has been needed and urged so long is actually built in Alaska. I hope the 84th Congress will authorize the construction of such a hospital and appropriate the funds for its construction.

In the meantime, however, many of the worst cruelties of the existing system can be somewhat alleviated by the adoption of modern commitment procedures which will make the process of qualifying for and obtaining mental hospitalization as speedy and humane as the actual conditions in the Territory can possibly permit.

The legislation I propose would finally do away with the archaic trial of the sanity or mental illness of an individual by a United States Commissioner's jury of laymen. It would substitute modern processes of voluntary, involuntary, or judicial hospitalization based upon the best medical examination available. Based upon model legislation, similar proposals have received favorable consideration in conjunction with hospital-construction bills in earlier sessions of Congress and, I understand, came close to passage last year. As it is completely uncontroversial and as the need is universally recognized, I am confident that modernization of the commitment procedures of Alaskan mental patients should win speedy approval in the present Congress.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT SHOULD TAKE OVER

The bill which I have introduced is very similar to H. R. 610, introduced in the House of Representatives by the able Delegate from Alaska, Hon. E. L. BARTLETT. Like H. R. 610, my bill would transfer responsibility for the operation of a modern program of mental health to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the agency of our Federal Government with functions in the field of health that obviously equip it and its personnel for this work. I also had the privilege of studying the suggestions of Mr. Wayne Coe, of Portland, who, in managing Morningside Hospital, has had more experience than any other person with the mentally ill of Alaska, and who has urged upon me the importance of bringing the archaic commitment procedures up to date without further delay.

I am informed by the office of Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska, that approximately $25,000 annually is spent just in transporting patients the long distance by air or sea from various Alaskan communities to Portland, Oreg. A substantial portion of this sum certainly can be saved when a mental hospital is constructed in Alaska, although I confess that my purpose reflects far more humanitarian than budgetary considerations.

The unfortunate people of Alaska have been unable to correct the existing situation themselves, and so only Congress can provide a method of dealing with Alaska's insane which is worthy of a great free nation. This is because the Organic Act of 1912, which first established Alaska as a Territory, expressly forbids the Territorial legislature at Juneau "to alter and amend, modify and repeal" the present code dealing with Alaska's insane.

Previous to the Organic Act of 1912, conditions with respect to the treatment of the insane were completely disorganized, and anarchy prevailed.

OREGON'S PEOPLE WILL NOT BE SELFISH

I realize that there may be some in my home State and in the city of Portland, where I was born and reared, who will criticize me for introducing legislation which threatens a Government contract with a local institution which provides a local payroll. But I know that the great majority of my fellow residents of Oregon realize that, as a United States Senator, I must serve the best interest of all the people of our country. Alaskans are our fellow American citizens. They are as much entitled to humane consideration by our Government as are the residents of Oregon or any other State.

It is my conviction that no Americans anywhere should have to be taken into custody under archaic procedures, to receive hospitalization under a "contract" arrangement many thousands of miles from their homes and families. It is this conviction which has motivated my sponsorship of the present bills.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore of the Senate may have the authority to sign bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to act on nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George T. Moore, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the routine diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the routine diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the routine diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the United States Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John O. Boyer to be commissioned lieutenant commander, subject to qualifications provided by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of these nominations.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 15, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11, 1955:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Thomas Coggeshall, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice George C. McConnaughey, resigned.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board for the remainder of the term of 2 years from December 1, 1953, vice Raymond Sayre, deceased.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the terms indicated, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified:

Laird Bell, of Illinois, for a term expiring January 27, 1957, vice James L. Morrill, resigned.

Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, for a term of 3 years, expiring January 27, 1958. (Reappointment.)

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, for a term of 3 years, expiring January 27, 1958. (Reappointment.)

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer of the Reserve of the United States Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line, subject to the prescribed qualifications:

George A. Parkinson

The following-named officers of the Reserve of the United States Navy are nominated for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line or staff corps indicated:

LINE

William A. Read	William W. Drake
Karl L. Lange	Charles L. LaBarge
James M. Ross	Harry P. Stolz
Edward C. Holden, Jr.	Richard R. McNulty

MEDICAL CORPS

Richard A. Kern
Alphonse (n) McMahon

DENTAL CORPS

Charles R. Wells

SUPPLY CORPS

William L. Nelson

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Maurice S. Sheehy

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Robert C. Johnson

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grades indicated:

Captain, line

William H. Sublette	Blish C. Hills
Clarence A. Keller	Frank G. Selby
Charles E. King	Stevan Mandarich
Lewis L. Snider	Richard Lane
Raymond D. Fusselman	Harry C. Maynard
	Murray Hanson
Porter F. Bedell	Clayton L. Miller
Philip W. Winston	William C. Mott
Francis O. Iffrig	William J. Catlett, Jr.
George P. Koch	Martin W. Mason
James R. Reedy	Gerald L. Ketchum
Robert S. Camera	Charles M. Jett
Jamie E. Jones	Charles S. Hutchings
Edward H. C. Fredericks	Gifford Grange
	Vernon Williams
Albert G. Pelling	David J. Walsh
Edward E. Grimm	Richard G. Copeland
Glover T. Ferguson	John A. Gamon, Jr.
Garrett S. Coleman	Charles W. Travis
John D. Bulkeley	Hilary C. Rowe
Jesse B. Burks	John C. Morgan
James B. Denny	Charles W. Fielder
Theodore H. Brittan	Sam A. Lief
James D. Ferguson	John M. Wyckoff
Charles O. Larson	James R. Cain, Jr.
Carl E. Bull	John N. Ogle
Raymond P. Zimmerman	Robert D. Powers, Jr.
	Frank A. Nusom
Christopher S. Barker, Jr.	Arthur R. Gralla
	Charles H. Gerlach
Rufus L. Taylor	Edgar H. Batcheller
Irvin L. Dew	Bernard A. Smith
Stanley M. Barnes	Lawrence R. Neville
George D. Gregor	Walter E. Baranowski
James A. Smith	William A. Brockett
Reuben E. Stanley	Edward J. Fahy
Poyntell C. Staley, Jr.	James E. Halligan, Jr.
Elmer C. Long	James P. Craft, Jr.
Henry S. Monroe	Edward R. Tilburne
Elliott L. James, Jr.	John V. Smith
Morgan Slayton	Richard F. Kane
George P. Unmacht	George H. Browne
David McCampbell	Spencer M. Adams
Edward W. Abbot	Frank L. Pinney, Jr.
William M. Rakow	George C. Wells
Dillon R. McMullen	William W. Keller
John L. Maloney	James M. Wright
John M. Stuart	Jacob T. Bullen, Jr.
Robert E. Magoffin	George F. Pittard

Fred D. Pfotenhauer
Russell H. Maynard
William B. Brooks
William W. Walker
Paul T. Metcalf
Lester R. Schulz
Harley K. Nauman
Robert D. Risser
Reginald Rutherford
Brown Taylor
William M. McCormick
Lester S. Chambers
Arthur C. Smith
Edwin S. Lee, Jr.
Edwin H. Schantz
Leslie M. Slack
Grayson Merrill
Cedric W. Stirling
Orme C. Robbins
Clyde J. Van Arsdall, Jr.
Paul Van Leunen, Jr.
Albert L. Becker
John J. Hyland
Eugene C. Rider
William E. Sweeney
Walter T. Griffith
Robert L. Townsend
Charles M. Henderson
Rollin E. Westholm
Charles Blenman, Jr.
Robert H. Close
Donald A. Scherer
John R. Bromley
Ernest E. Christensen
William L. Guthrie
Edgar S. Powell, Jr.
Robert J. Ovrom
James R. Compton
Howard T. E. Anderson
John M. Phelps
John A. Horton, Jr.
Reuben T. Whitaker
James D. Fulp, Jr.
Charles R. Stephan
Joseph J. Staley, Jr.
David S. Edwards, Jr.
John G. Roenigk
Richard C. Latham
Charles C. Mann
Edward F. Dissette
Donald G. Irvine
Keith E. Taylor
James S. Shilson
John M. Hyde
Robert J. Hardy
Robert J. Oliver
Richard D. Shepard
John W. Howard
Arthur E. Krapf
Richard E. Nichols
Duncan P. Dixon, Jr.
John B. Morland
George E. T. Parsons
Walter H. Baumberger
Allan G. Schnable
John C. Nichols
William S. Maddox
George S. Bullen
Harry L. Thompson, Jr.
Wilson M. Coleman
Benedict J. Semmes, Jr.
Melvin H. Dry
James E. Smith
Statton R. Ours, Jr.
Joseph B. Tibbets
Barton E. Day
Earle K. McLaren
Clarence E. Dickinson
Howard E. Day, Jr.
Allyn Cole, Jr.
Harry H. Greer, Jr.
John F. McGillis
Marshall W. White
Lyle E. Strickler

Albert L. Gebelin
Nels C. Johnson
Warren S. McLeod
Arthur R. Manning
Francis O. Fletcher, Jr.
John Harllee
Ernest V. Bruchez
Bernard A. Clarey
Harold D. Fuller
Robert A. Paton
Lowell S. Price
Paul S. Savidge, Jr.
George M. Clifford
Cecil K. Harper
Robert R. Williams, Jr.
Ellis B. Rittenhouse
Herman H. Kait
Stanley S. Daunis
Francis D. Boyle
William I. Martin
Arthur C. House, Jr.
Benjamin C. Fulghum
Willard E. Hastings
Frank K. Upham
George W. Lautrup, Jr.
John T. Lowe, Jr.
Herman J. Kossler
Louis Lefelar
John W. Florence
Richard H. O'Kane
Colin J. Mackenzie
Jackson D. Arnold
Irving S. Presler
William M. Collins, Jr.
Curtis H. Hutchings
James H. Newell
Wilbur H. Cheney, Jr.
Henry C. Spicer, Jr.
Hugh Q. Murray
James E. Owers
William T. Dutton
Carlyle Ingram
Francis W. Scanland, Jr.
William A. Dean, Jr.
Robert W. Leeman
Robert E. Wheeler
George D. Hoffman
James E. Johnson
Samuel R. Brown, Jr.
Robert F. Sellars
James D. Babb
Clarence T. Doss, Jr.
William N. Deragon
Robert A. Chandler
James H. Ashley, Jr.
Fletcher L. Sheffield, Jr.
Henry L. Miller
William T. Kinsella
Craig R. Garth
Robert E. Bourke
Frank G. Marshall, Jr.
Lester J. Stone
Eugene W. Davis
Frederick A. Gunn
Willie M. Dickey
John C. Martin
Robert C. Bengston
Charles C. Coley
Douglas L. L. Cordiner
Charles M. Bertholf
James C. Bentley
Sidney D. B. Merrill
Claude F. Bailey
Francis E. Fleck, Jr.
Thomas W. South, 2d
James E. Vose, Jr.
Thomas H. DuBois
Albert P. Coffin
Isaiah M. Hampton
John L. Foster
Gordon P. Chung-Hoon
Russell B. Allen
Edwin E. Lord, 3d

Captain, Medical Corps

Walter R. Miller
Philip J. McNamara
Edward E. Hogan
Merrill H. Goodwin
Thomas J. Canty
Clifford P. Phoebus
Richard W. Garrity
Russell H. Walker
Shakeeb Ede
Charles F. Gell
Samuel J. Wisler
Joseph A. Syslo
Arthur L. Lawler
Marion E. Roudebush
Edward P. McLarney
Earle E. Metcalfe
Jefferson Davis
Joseph M. Hanner

Captain, Supply Corps

Edward F. Metzger
Roy G. Buck
Thomas A. Long
Laurence A. White
Howard F. Kuehl
William I. Robbins
Dennison C. Ambrose
Edward M. Fagan
Harold E. Cole
Richard S. Klunk

Captain, Chaplain Corps

Roland W. Faulk
Robert M. Schwyhart
Martell H. Twitchell
Paul W. J. Dickman
Emil F. Redman
Harris W. Howe

Captain, Civil Engineer Corps

Eugene J. Peltier
Jule C. Tate
Neil E. Kingsley
James R. Davis
Arthur H. Castelazo
Charles S. Daily, Jr.
Lewis C. Coxe
William C. G. Church

Captain, Dental Corps

Niels H. Martin
James R. Justice
Gail T. Curren
Caryl J. Hoffer
Maurice E. Simpson
Otto H. Schlicht
Mallie A. Griffin
Roger V. Chastain

Commander, line

Edgar H. Forrest
Philip C. Morgan, Jr.
Miles S. Whitener
Paul T. Roy
Walter G. Bisek
Robert F. Erdmann
Duane J. Gerry
Walter F. Toy
Richard C. Marquardt
Henry D. Vanston
William H. Reinhardt, Jr.
James W. Johnson
John W. Hughes
Fletcher H. Herrald
Michael E. Panciotti
George R. Fraser
Charles Koenigsberger, Jr.
Harry C. Grothjahn
Charles D. Payne
Thomas L. Horner
John A. Goodwin
Bernard W. Davis
William R. Wilson
Robert P. Shimp
James A. Laurich
Lyle A. Juhnke
James S. Dowdell
Thomas A. Thompson
Harold J. O'Neill
Arthur E. Lundgren
John H. Sims
Giles F. Bunn, Jr.
James B. Hildreth
Lowel E. Darby
Edward A. Sandor
Norman E. Chalmers
William P. Toran
Frederick W. Pennoyer III
Edward G. Pollak
Everett B. Gladding
James B. Elliott, Jr.
John P. Bienia
Richard B. Redmayne
Arnold R. Christiansen
Ross R. Hirshfeld
William D. Craig
Bernard Frankel
Ralph E. Cook
Michael E. N. Vallario
William B. Hirst, Jr.
Charles R. Hake
James H. Spalding, Jr.
John F. Maynard
Benjamin H. Downs
Walter C. Sands
Geoffrey C. Wood
Robert E. Barnhart
Edward F. Carl
William Gundlach
Paul H. Speltz
William R. McDowell, Jr.
Albert O. Morton
Gilbert B. Jansen, Jr.
Harry F. Stanford
Kent M. Cushman
Vincent A. Dahlstrom
Charles E. Tilden
Eric W. Pollard
Robert K. Campbell
Van V. Eason, Jr.
Lawrence M. Madden
Clay Harrold
Charles H. Witten
Robert F. Menge
John L. Gallahar
Donald H. Wiss
Walter J. McGuire, Jr.
David Spirt
Eugene F. Verdery III
James H. Huff
Melvin E. Hirschi
Donald S. Chay
Robert C. Mayo
John C. Donahue
Charles B. Swayne
John H. Terry
Carl M. Smith
Clement M. Craig
Roy M. Isaman
Burgin "L" Benton
Edward T. LaRoe
Earl E. Watson
Wayne R. Bise
Max A. Piper
Victor F. Hultstrand
Arthur S. Irish
Andrew H. Henderson
Walter E. Greene
John L. Holmes, Jr.
Clifton E. Cantlon
Frank A. Blackwood
John B. Glanzman
Urcel B. Holloway
Robert M. Elder
Edwin L. Plowman
Max C. Replogle
Roy S. Belcher, Jr.
George M. Douglass
Harry Wood
Morris E. Haller
Harvey Larson
Hobert May
Carlton B. Starkes
James T. Crawford
Clifton B. Davis
Franklyn L. Jones
William L. Perry
Gordon J. Brown
Edgar E. Coonrod
James E. Little
Charles E. Russell
David P. Klain
Carlton E. Soderholm
Halsey Hines
Richard E. Webb
Henry M. Schroder
James A. Ford
Thomas V. McEnery
William J. Ruefle
Robert L. Sollenberger
Harry E. Stirling
Richard H. Tibbets
Taylor W. Gray
Sam E. Edelstein, Jr.
Robert F. Harbison
Verner Utke-Ramsing, Jr.
Thomas B. Denegre, Jr.
Bernard J. Lauff
Charles C. Wilbur
John P. Jones
Alvin E. Gillogly
Arnin M. Weiss
Henry S. Ryder
William R. Gibson
Floyd W. Gooch, Jr.
Wynne A. Stevens, Jr.
Robert S. Kilcourse
Elden R. Vanderburg
Ray E. Oliver
Carl L. Scherrer
Douglas G. Anstett
Charles D. Griffin
David A. Dickson
Thomas E. Kendall, Jr.
David A. Merrill
John E. Balson
John D. Westervelt
Richard A. Sexton
Raymond L. Pitts
John B. Schley
Walter J. J. Leary
David F. Welch
Robert M. Carroll
Edward L. Willey
John H. Davis
James A. Krattli
Philip C. Kelsey
Rufus T. Brinn
Keith G. Nichols
John H. Dolan
Bruce G. Kroger
Everett A. Rhoades
Robert J. Ahern
Carl Carmichael
Walter B. Griffith
Alfred W. Rose
John S. Neil
Ebenezer F. Porter
Adelbert R. Evers
George A. Tredick, Jr.
Clifford H. Selden, Jr.
William J. Rogers, Jr.
Paul T. Jorgensen
Russell C. Medley
Samuel M. Shelton
John L. Butler, Jr.
Frederick J. Johnson
Edward B. Johnson, Jr.
Leo F. Frick
John W. Lawyer, Jr.
John G. Williams
Gustav F. Swanson
Edward M. Ward
John E. Mishan
James F. Rumford
Norman H. Rudd
David S. Crockett
Clellan B. McAfee
Herman P. Kooy
Ralph D. Ettinger
Alexander W. Belikow
Frederick C. Nugent
George W. Miller
Lewis R. Hardy, Jr.
Robert B. Minton
Robert C. Coats
Schuyler W. Bacon
Roger M. Wolfe
William J. Lahodney, Jr.
Verne E. Geissinger
Roy G. Anderson
Herbert H. Hassenfratz.
Ralph M. Thudium
Harrison J. Olingy
Layman D. Moyers
Amos L. Wooten
Robin E. Larson
Donald E. Weissenborn
Vernon P. O'Neil
Thomas J. Wood
William H. Craven, Jr.
Harry C. Rodin
Hugh P. Lyon
William R. Sisley
Thomas Seabrook
Robert P. Chase
Charles J. Alley
William E. Cardinal
Robert S. Salzer
Humphrey L. Tallman
Herbert L. Salyer, Jr.
Lewis W. Chick
John L. Carter
Ralph B. Varner
Jefferson Kennedy, Jr.
Henry B. Bassett
Howard L. Grimmell, Jr.
David M. Walley
Lucas B. Mayer
Eddie M. Bray
Clark H. Gates
William Arnold
Clyde A. Williams
James R. Wilson
Ernest J. Knoche
Ruben L. Johns
Paul F. Stevens, Jr.
Elmer F. Williamson
Daniel B. Wilder, Jr.
Charles S. Quinn, Jr.
Donald G. Miller
Narvin O. Wittman
Edson G. Loftus
Walter M. Sessums
Milton R. Dahl
Thomas L. Andrews, Jr.
John R. Mayher
James N. Howell, Jr.
Hugh T. McCabe, Jr.
Harry M. Cocowitch
Forrester C. Auman
Thomas J. Ball
John N. Phelps
Earl C. Gillen
James A. Riner, Jr.
Henry M. Kosciusko
George W. Daly
Elmer B. Fiorini
Burdick H. Brittin
James E. Chippendale
Edward R. Hunt
William Seith
Robert A. Sweatt
James M. Ireland
John F. Powell
John E. Boyle, Jr.
Harry B. Lawrence
Theodore J. Martens
Richard H. White
Kevin D. Harty
Dugald T. Neill
Daniel F. Harrington, Jr.
John F. Jones
John F. Finneran, Jr.
William M. Price
Arden E. Baughman
James T. Webster
Arthur J. Stanziano
Norris E. Black
Edward J. Bauser

Lowell P. Daniels
Hubert W. Dannevik
William S. Tenhagen
James G. Murray
James T. Pendergrass
Sterling H. Ivison, Jr.
William H. Sours
Thaddeus F. Rudnicki Jr.
George E. Essenwine
Ray A. Shadow
John A. Davis
Philip M. Donahue
Henry J. Cappello
Robert W. Dickinson
Robert E. Williams
Willard V. Louthen
William A. Whitman
John F. Collingwood
Harold T. Smith, Jr.
Dan T. Drain
Talmai F. Godding, Jr.
Steven T. Cornelissen
Stanley G. Kalemaris
Theodore W. Runk
Archer R. Gordon
Grover L. Rawlings
William S. Bradway, Jr.
William T. Hunt
Gordon Gemmill
John C. Azab
John M. Connolly, Jr.
James F. McRaith
Harry A. Burns, Jr.
Jacob Scapa
Vincent C. Langan
Duane J. Bellinger, Jr.
John E. Shinners
Frederick W. Teepe
Grady H. Lowe
Walter M. Ousey
James D. Lift
Elwood C. McCoy
Walter D. Ashe
Gayle C. Foltz
Robert G. Charles
George R. Brines
Edward T. Sullivan, Jr.
John F. Weidling
Paul W. Frazier
Joe H. Floyd
Robert B. Harrell
Howard T. Fulton
Bacil C. Wheatley
Jerry P. B. Morelock
Paul E. Dickson
Norman W. McLeod
William A. Simpson
William F. Salkowski
Edmond F. Frazier
Joseph Buehlman
James S. Lees
William S. Hall
Fred J. Livingston
Robert S. Selby
Fred M. Burdette
Harold J. Gilpin
Paul E. Dignan
Thomas L. Cleaver, Jr.
George L. Dunn
Peter G. Trapani
Oscar Osheim
Walter Schimmelpfenning
John J. Bartko
Nels J. Nelson
Joseph W. Duchnahl
Clarence E. Johnson
William T. Miller
John I. Rustin
Furman D. Waltrip
Alfred J. Yuzakowich
John F. Miller
Robert A. Dusch
Harold E. Erickson
Oscar E. Robinson
Emmett C. Suggs
Roy E. Marsden
Guy R. Strickland
Rollin M. Reed
Sidney M. Skjei
Kenneth A. Mundy
John W. Nesbitt
John M. Siran
Ernest B. Hess
Merle A. Grant
Wayne G. Wright
Adolph Viegelmann
William J. English
Bascome K. Osborne
William I. Hobbs
Christian T. Jensen
Clarence M. Taylor
Jesse E. Lee
Eldon L. Guhl
Charles T. Duvall
Horton C. Kessler
Vincent R. Dahlen
Stewart C. Miller
John R. Davidson
Francis W. Barrington
Charles E. Napier
Victor A. Schmalfeldt
Frederick M. Betts
Nelson J. Watkins
James R. McKenzie, Jr.
Albert H. Baker
Milfred W. Thomas
Donald K. Ross
Robert N. Huey
Clifford W. Engler
Harold F. Duval
Alonzo R. Moeller
William E. Fuller
Daniel A. Boone
Norman W. Bixby
Stanley J. Lewandowski
Otis L. Scheibeler
Truman E. Turnipseed
Leo E. Therrien
George L. Kent
Elmer E. Niebuhr
Marion S. Evans
Otto A. Fennig
Garnet M. Smithson
William R. Boehlert
Irvin H. Bordihn
Woodrow D. Crossley
Marinus Pilkington
Charles H. Eaton
Richard R. Garriott
Clinton J. Merritt
Joe R. Moring
Robert W. Eichelberger
John E. Hunt
William B. Dickson
Arthur L. Bureau
Vane M. Bennett
Stuart R. Miller
Sigmund Popko
Albert O. Tate
Chauncey B. King, Jr.
Stephen J. Nemeth
Philip N. MacDonald
Aubra Calhoun
Arthur W. Nordquist
Edward N. Hann
Robert E. Mansard
Allan R. Carlson
Norman Thompson
Herbert H. Vanaman
Luther R. Miller
Thomas H. Davis, Jr.
Edward G. Hatchell
Paul H. Dice
Warner M. Minor
Looie W. Rash
Dwight F. Asmus
James H. Manning
Boyce S. Webb
Willard M. Iverson
William E. Jenkins
Russell G. Harriman
Charles L. Suggs
Robert E. Wheeler
Russel D. Smith
George W. Perrin
Stuart V. Glenn
Theodore F. Aldous
Francis E. Law
Meredith C. Riddle
Henry F. Berck
Gordon B. Dosskey
Hall B. Wessinger
Cecil R. Thorne
Ned A. Garretty
Leo R. Brown
Donald R. French
Emory C. Geise
Earle B. Perce
Robert M. Israel
Jack O. Polk
George P. Koch
Joseph M. Schick
Fowler H. Justus
William J. Miller
Charles A. Miller
Edwin H. Edgerton
Norman L. Sorenson
Charles E. Saxton
Howard W. Dye
Lewis E. Thompson
George C. Littmann
Francis R. Jones
Ralph N. Pickles
Don E. McLeod
Homer L. Kisner
Wade H. Cone
Ivan H. Douglas
William S. Ellis
Raymond A. Frady
Roy C. Shriber
John J. Huggard
Walter R. Watkins
Jesse W. Franklin, Jr.
John J. Butlak
Joseph D. DeLuca
Lloyd C. Knowles
John G. Gillissie
Robert M. Metzger
James W. Meehan
Edward C. Miller
John E. George
Charles C. Tidwell, Jr.
Ned A. Gardner
John K. Metzger
Robert G. Hoffman
William T. Davern

Commander, Supply Corps

Fred T. Adams, Jr.
Charles R. Ernst
Hollis W. Cooley
Alfred H. Gabriels
William V. Hughes
Thomas H. K. Russell
Charles R. Ruark
Kenneth M. Beyer
Robert R. Van Der Maaten
John P. Wolfe
Louis F. ReDavid
Sherwoode A. Taffinder, Jr.
Robert W. Mullins
James J. Lynch
Clyde E. Maddock
James P. Murphy
John J. Risser
John C. Angelopoulos
John R. Behr
Rolland A. Helsel
James E. Harvey, Jr.
Grover V. Clark
Joseph D. McLaughlin
Charles E. Lee
Howard S. Hyde
Carl A. LaBarre
George S. Foster, Jr.
Richard A. Rosso
Joseph P. Quinn
Alfred B. Wettermark
Maurice A. Borst
Patrick W. Moore
Henry J. Skipper
William W. Gray, Jr.
Charles L. Knight
Harry J. Hicks, Jr.

Commander, Chaplain Corps

Matthew J. Bouterse II

Commander, Civil Engineer Corps

Robert E. Sparks
Dennis K. Culp
James A. Wright, Jr.
James B. Urquhart
Wilburn J. McFarland
James C. Young
Henry J. Johnson
Harry Stevens, Jr.
William T. Maley, Jr.

Commander, Dental Corps

William D. Dwyer
Ernest A. Thayer
Stephen A. Grady
Jack J. Kelly
Frederick H. Bradshaw
Frederick B. Lukins

Commander, Medical Service Corps

Willard C. Calkins

Commander, Nurse Corps

Ruth A. Houghton
Hazel Bullard
Catherine E. Yarnall
Bertha R. Evans
Wilma L. Jackson
C. Edwina Todd
Thelma A. King
Nell P. Seroka
Wayne H. Crawford, Jr.
Arthur E. Strauss
John R. Lastova, Jr.
Robert M. McLaughlin
Harold P. Deely, Jr.
Robert A. Aiken.
James L. Harrison, Jr.
Frederic J. Clawson
Robert E. Durfos
William L. Prange
Dale L. Kratzer
Robert W. Crouter
Donald T. Giles, Jr.
Joseph M. Rideout III
George R. Lathan
William A. Buttlar
William B. McGinty, Jr.
Harvey L. Decker
John A. McCook
Roy E. Williams
William McKinley
James Thomson
Jack F. Ayres
William A. Feltovic
Victor D. Brockman
William F. Beatty
Gerald A. Warnke
Douglas A. Washburn
Herbert L. Joss
George E. Allison
Norman J. Neiss
Albert J. Monger
Carey P. McMurray
Harland B. Cope
Arthur R. Maier, Jr.
Albert W. Crevier
Frank H. Zoske, Jr.
William J. Childs
Charles F. Peksa
John A. Wade
Francis E. Trusdale
David L. Beesley
George L. Steer
Milton L. Sutter, Jr.
Robert R. Poitras
John F. Doheny
Louis V. Roberts
Erwin E. J. Hauber
John R. Holm
James R. Stohl
Phil G. Olsen
Richard E. Case
Irwin H. Seligman
Robert P. Metzger
Nicholas Guletsky
Doyle W. Lynn
Ellison Capers
William H. Bartlett
Joseph V. Godfrey
Cameron O. Mixon, Jr.
Stanley Hecker
Harry E. Davis
Charles R. Stephan
Paul Gonzalez
Charles H. Lowry, Jr.
Alvin H. Grobmeier
Harold Hoag
Raymond O. Kellam
Robert H. Nicholson
Ward Boston, Jr.
Charles E. McDowell
James D. Wilder
Frank A. Nelson
David W. Miller
Franklin E. Porter
Billie J. Cartwright
Frank A. Smith
James F. Jenista, Jr.
John G. Herndon
Rodney B. Carter
Robert E. Wurlitzer
George Brown
Samuel F. Catterlin
Thomas B. Wilson, Jr.
Marvin D. Marsh
Charles Mertz III
John D. Ness
Frank C. Gilmore
Francis E. Brooks
Louis M. Guerrieri
Stuart M. Brownell
Eugene C. Moss.
Earl C. Carpenter, Jr.
Jackson B. Reavis
Robert S. Chew, Jr.
Edward Phillips
Randolph Moore
Edward B. Fleming
Alfred N. Fowler
Edward S. Disbrow, Jr.
Eldon A. Jacobs
Richard C. Adams
John H. Pickering
John P. Prisley
Jack C. Kays
William E. Madden
Elmer A. Rice
William Wegner
Boone C. Taylor
Kenneth A. Horn
John G. "W" Jackson
Donald D. Foulds
Daniel W. Cullivan
Peter R. Moureau
Alonzo M. Poteet, Jr.
Keith D. Boyer
William F. Sallada
William E. Gildow
Murray C. Cook
Charles E. Hathaway
William H. Barton, Jr.
Eugene R. Christie
John S. Patton, Jr.
Richard D. Meldahl
John D. Caylor
Robert E. Huntzinger
Nicholas A. Castruccio
John W. Klinefelter
Delton B. Pruner
Arthur O. Wolf
William N. Small
John D. Omvig
Edward S. Siergiej
John L. Jensen, Jr.
William D. Dittmar
James A. McCaig
John C. Wold
Herbert K. Gates, Jr.
Arthur R. Hasler, Jr.
Wallace S. Gabriel
Robert P. Hilton
Francis C. Fogarty
Norman L. Halladay
Nicholas J. Vagianos
Robert E. Schwoeffermann
William G. Walston
Beaumont M. Buck
Alan S. Wilhite
Frederick L. Eareckson, Jr.
Jack Cowden
Ernest E. Tissot, Jr.
Roger W. Kelly
Earl F. Resch
Leslie C. Hofto
Guy G. Wooten
Delmar H. Evans, Jr.
Leland E. Nelson
William R. Barton
Joseph E. Klause
Woolson S. Brown
William C. Pierson
John P. Sundberg
Jerry T. Becker
Charles W. Stevens
Richard W. Iligen
Henry H. Dodd
William T. Mitchell, Jr.
Kevin Hanlon
Donald W. Perry
Carl B. Austin
Frederick D. Jackson, Jr.
George E. Russell
Roger A. Chapman
Gerald C. Edwards
Robert L. Taylor
Robert S. McGihon
Ramon L. Carpenter
Clarence O. Robins
Francis C. Johnson
Carl C. Neidlinger
Charles P. Coulter
Albert P. Lesperance
Jack H. McDonald
Donald B. Hall
John E. Mulcahy
Charles D. Bolan
John W. McCord
Claude E. Dorris
Kenneth A. Burrows
Claude F. Giles
William F. Fraser
Ralph I. McFarland
David L. Wright
William N. Brook, Jr.
Sumner K. Moore
Jason P. Law
Charles H. Brown
Richard E. Shimshak
Gordon R. Engel
Fred A. W. Franke, Jr.
Frederick L. Nelson
Richard C. Boyd
Albert J. Thompson
Lyle R. Olson
Walter P. Ziarnik
John W. James
Edward L. Miles
George W. Marshall
Theodore W. Pstrak
Walter M. Earley, Jr.
Jack H. Conable
Jack F. Andrus
William V. Gillen
Charles O. Brown
Robert G. Buechler
John C. Mape
Thomas F. Kilduff, Jr.
George M. A. Willows
Robert C. Connolly III
Robert F. Henning
James H. Foxgrover
William R. Stuyvesant
Ernest C. Castle

Walter G. Markham
Richard P. Allen
Robert K. Smyth
Robert L. Field
Daniel P. Walchko
James V. Clampet
Herbert E. Reichert
Richard T. Duncan, Jr.
Max D. Barr.
Karel E. Yedlicka
Walter J. Wright, Jr.
Jack L. Gracey
Thomas W. Cuddy
George F. Smith
Douglas D. Swift
George W. Dittmann
Edward D. Jackson, Jr.
William R. Ayers
Raymond P. Notson
Robert E. Melhorn
Eldon P. Varner
Alvin S. Hibbs
Tudor M. Bogart
David R. Hamlin
Philip H. Bolger
James S. Brunson
John E. Horan, Jr.
Wyndham S. Clark, Jr.
William W. McCue
James "G" Hayes
Edward P. Supancic
James K. Welsh, Jr.
Harold F. Smith, Jr.
Jack M. Fretwell
LeRoy O. Mosher
Harley D. Mayfield
James E. Henry
William H. Wood III
Richard Struyk
Terry A. Ross
John C. Dunn
Eugene J. Noblet
Walter H. Singleton
Herbert P. Benton III
Stanley H. Bueg
Eugene R. Murray
William A. Kanakanui, Jr.
Oliver F. Brown
Eugene H. Bouslog
Joseph P. Rogers, Jr.
John F. Schneider, Jr.
William C. Sharpe
Harold C. Schwan
William F. Goodman
Paul F. Abel
Lee C. Miles
Ted R. McGinnis
Alvin E. Geist
Richmond D. Brannen
Robert A. Komoroff
Edward B. Rogers, Jr.

John G. Clifford
Walter T. Blakney
Thomas E. Stanley
Clarence V. Burch, Jr.
Harry L. Jones
Francis P. Koval
Bradley L. Daley
Rex R. Berglund
Charles A. Smith
Robert C. Olsen
Leland A. Holdren
James F. Ward II
Rufo W. Robinson
William "S" Shaffran
Vernon L. Crow
Charles R. Hall
James A. Schader
Harry N. Key, Jr.
Thomas M. Hopkins
Edward B. Hebden
Charles W. Melville, Jr.
Reynold F. Stelloh, Jr.
Liona R. Roberts, Jr.
John M. Davis
Austin L. Zicht
Robert W. Hanby, Jr.
Robert P. Blount, Jr.
Elmer A. McCallum, Jr.
Floyd H. Blizard
Donald R. Simon
Charles S. Porter
John D. Shaw
Edward J. Ortlieb
Lloyd P. Ross
Howard E. Lyon
Albert C. Messier
Virgil W. Warner
Robert E. Pierce
William H. Potts, Jr.
Philip C. Gliem
Anthony Dombroski
Richard Green
Waldo D. Groom
Arthur C. Black
Francis L. Schlude
Travis A. Mathis
Robert H. Smith
Eugene B. W. Meeker
John H. Bilkey
William A. Evans
Louis J. Yakich
Robert D. McBain
John A. Pino
Ralph L. Anderson
Douglas I. Blancheri
Alexander Lennox, Jr.
Lewis B. Shults
George E. Smith
Edward G. Phillips
Roy L. Hoffman

Lieutenant, Medical Corps

Marshall W. Olson
Charles K. Deeks

James E. Banta, Jr.
Mack E. Allison, Jr.

Lieutenant, Supply Corps

Raymond D. Lochner
Leif A. Houkom
Thomas J. Pawlowski, Jr.
Darrell N. Coba
James D. Hereford, Jr.
William M. Emery
Robert E. Melville
Bruce A. Beckner
Richard C. Schutt
James F. Reeves, Jr.
Carlton E. Hamel
Robert S. Blassic
Robert J. McAdams
Ralph E. Deem
Oscar G. Tucker II
Robert G. Ford
Richard L. Verdow
James C. Will
Kenneth G. McGrath
Walter Garbalinski
LeRoy E. Hopkins
William L. Winfrey
Charles R. Braley, Jr.

Martin J. Deutch
Harry C. Dolbeck
Charles C. Swanke
David F. Morrow
Dale E. Jackson
James C. Billings, Jr.
Michael Dasovich
Ben R. Schmidt
Robert F. Dunbar
Carl H. Newman
George A. Murphy
Robert S. Leventhal
Charles L. Suit III
William F. Cecil
Wilburn A. Speer, Jr.
Walter E. Linthicum
William H. Borchert
John M. Bristow
Kenneth B. Webster
Robert G. Whitman
Roy F. Smith
Andrew L. Frahler
James H. H. Carrington

Kay K. Thurman
John J. Mahaffey
Raymon L. Burke
Darrell E. Swenson
Karol M. Morphew
Dean O. Powell
Roger C. Bliss
William J. McMordie
Harry K. Welge
Robert T. Broili
Kenneth W. Dunwody, Jr.
Reginald G. Ferrell
Donald C. Mehaffey
Elwood A. Carmer

Raymond H. Stutheit
Harry M. Volkmann
Richard C. May
Stephen J. Walsh
John G. Slattery
William J. Crutchfield
Robert V. Schmidt
Kiehl E. Underhill
Walter M. McCandless
Harold Kearsley
Ralph A. Smith
Mack B. Bingham
Leonard D. Ellingwood
Gerald K. Gamber
Raymond A. Medlin

Lieutenant, Chaplain Corps

Alla W. Robertson
Howard E. Waters
Robert F. Barlik
Edward O. Riley
Charles E. Hailstone
Harlin E. Tillberg
Samuel R. Hardman
Don M. Michael

John P. Byrnes
Lucian C. Mattiello
Harold F. Symons
Billy N. Wolfe
Roger L. Crabtree
George M. Hershberger
Paul G. Riess
Lester I. Somers

Lieutenant, Civil Engineer Corps

William E. Nims
Charles C. Heid, Jr.
Herbert C. Williams
Robert W. Mix
Robert C. Doerpinghaus
Gordon W. Schley
George L. Hoffman
Steven K. Kauffman
Gordon A. Anderson
Charles W. Gulick, Jr.
Philip J. McEleney
Edward A. McManus
Domenico N. Bibbo
Herbert R. Foster
Charles W. Calhoun
Howard D. Graessle II

George A. Leighton, Jr.
Richard M. Fluss
Edward L. Maccordy
Nicholas F. Truog
Charles B. Hogan
Dexter M. Welton
Robert G. Carroll
David M. Smith
Donald O. Taber
Arthur E. Hackett
Nestor P. Michaleczko
Richard L. Tinklepaugh
Arnold W. Ebert
Frank D. Wilson
John D. Watson, Jr.

Lieutenant, Dental Corps

Maury E. Wortham
Phillip V. D. Reitz
Leon L. Cepparo
Julius E. Lueders
Edward C. Penick
Charles W. Cogar

Andrew J. Bartosh
Loren V. Hickey
David J. Knoedler
Donald G. Pollie
Walter N. Johnson

Lieutenant, Nurse Corps

Mary F. Barrett
Irene D. Walker
Mary E. Howard
Katheryn L. T. Doherty
Olga Segin
Katherine A. Massey
Joan T. Ernst
Owedia M. Searcy
Veronica A. Lesho
Betty L. Gregorio
Margaret T. Barrow
Margaret J. Stewart
Mae B. Wilson
Betty J. Alexander
Janice M. Burcham
June R. Thurnau
Gloria V. Rapp
Virginia M. Cardillo
Barbara Ellis
Elsie M. Lovely

Cecile R. Normandin
Dorothy L. Rowe
Kathryn E. Zabel
Helen A. Kenyon
Nathalie A. Roark
Katherine G. Shea
Geraldine M. Warner
Virginia M. Cleary
Dorothy J. Goodell
Alice T. Griffin
Marjory H. Werme
Lois C. Merritt
Florence J. Delynko
Laura C. Haring
Mary M. Wein
Arline L. Murphy
Betty M. Davis
Mary C. Sheridan
Dorothea M. Short
Aldona Krushinski
Eva K. Roth

The following-named officers of Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Abbott, George J., Jr.
Abel, Minor F., Jr.
Abele, Stanley F.
Abernathy, William F.
Ables, James W.
Abney, William H.
Abucevicz, Theodore M., Jr.
Acton, Thomas E.
Acton, William D.
Adams, Benjamin W.
Adams, Joseph E., Jr.
Adams, Paul A.
Adams, Will M., Jr.
Adams, Willard E.
Adams, William F.
Adamson, Presly M., Jr.
Addy, Frederick S.
Adelfson, Norman O.
Adrianse, Homer R.
Agee, James N.
Agnes, Joseph L.
Agness, Robert J.
Agur, Peter V. A.
Ahern, Eugene A.
Alden, Franklin H.
Alden, John D.
Alderton, Dickson W.
Ales, George A.
Alexander, Joseph K.
Alexander, Richard G.
Alford, Ralph M.
Algiers, Norman A., Jr.
Alldredge, Walter W.
Allen, Bain S.
Allen, Benjamin F.
Allen, Charles C.
Allen, James H.
Allen, Joseph F.
Allen, Joseph K.
Allen, Milton O.
Allen, Robert C.
Allen, William W.
Allison, Irl J.
Allison, John K.
Alvord, Henry C.
Ambrose, Robert B.
Ambroziak, Eugene
Ammidown, Robert L.
Amory, Carlyle E.
Anania, Vincent J.
Andersen, Andre R.
Anderson, Charles O.
Anderson, Donald W.
Anderson, Elmer V.
Anderson, James W.
Anderson, John C.
Anderson, Theodore A.
Anderson, Verner C.
Anderson, Vernon F.
Anderson, Wallace I.
Anderson, William H.
Anderson, William T.
Andrade, Bernard A.
Angelino, Anthony A., Jr.
Anglemyer, Robert E.
Anglin, Hugh W.
Anson, Henry O., Jr.
Anthony, Ronald
Aponowich, Frank
Archer, Lowell B.
Armour, Robert H.
Armstrong, Frank D., Jr.
Armstrong, William O.
Arnold, Eugene F.
Arthur, Earl Z.
Arthur, John C.
Arthur, Robert E.
Atchison, Elmer J.
Athow, James K.
Atkins, John R.
Atkins, Robert E.
Atkinson, Randal N.
Atkinson, Wilton L.
Austin, Thurman J.
Axene, Dean L.
Aydelott, William "L"
Ayers, Rollin
Badgett, James H.
Bagby, Henry L.
Bagby, Lee A.
Bager, Thomas E.
Bailey, Herbert E.
Bailey, Ronzel L.
Bain, Edward McN.
Bain, Edwin C., Jr.
Bain, Thomas L.
Bair, Edward S.
Baker, Burdell J.
Baker, John T.
Baker, Lawrence H., Jr.
Baker, Ozrow G.
Baker, Philip
Baker, William E.
Baldock, George O.
Baldwin, Rhudolph M.
Baldwin, Robert B.
Ball, James L.
Bane, George A.
Banker, George E.
Banks, Frank P.
Banks, Milton W.
Barca, Santo J.
Barham, Fred G., Jr.
Baribault, Arthur B.
Barich, Louis A.
Barker, Donald W.
Barkley, Edward P.
Barkley, Floyd "M"
Barkley, Paul H.
Barlow, Frank D.
Barnes, Harold B. J.
Barnes, Horace L.
Barnes, Robert J.
Barnes, Willis C.
Barnette, James B.
Barnhart, Robert C., Jr.
Barnier, Robert E.
Barnum, Donald W.
Barr, Charles J.
Barr, Leon V.
Barrett, Ernest R.
Barrier, William B.
Barry, Bruce C.
Barry, Searle J.
Bartels, Lloyd G.
Bartlett, Edwin C.
Bartlett, Ernest E., Jr.
Bartlett, Jack D.
Barton, Kiah A.
Bascom, Wade R.
Bass, William N.
Bates, Edwin J.
Bates, Elmer J.
Bates, Kenneth O.
Bates, Richard S.
Bathel, Leonard F.
Batten, Hugh N.
Battles, James E.
Bauder, Eugene W.
Bauer, John M.
Bauer, Leo R., Jr.
Baumberger, Harold E.
Baumgaertel, Lawrence F.
Baxter, James L.
Baxter, Thomas J., Jr.
Beadle, Willard R.
Beall, Thomas H.
Bearden, Luther G.
Beardsley, William J.
Beason, Darrell E.
Beaty, Addison N.
Beaty, Chancy B.
Beaudoin, Jerome W.
Beaulieu, Maurice E.
Beauzay, Pierce W.
Beavers, Clarence W.
Beavers, Troy C.
Beck, Clark L.
Becker, George R.
Becker, Merlin D.
Beckham, Joseph C.
Beckley, Robert M.
Beese, Lawrance L.
Behm, Edward W.
Beierl, Peter G.
Beland, John
Belch, Alonzo E., Jr.
Bell, Carroll F.
Bell, George M.
Bell, Joseph G.
Bell, Lloyd F.
Bell, Louis W.
Bell, Ralph W.
Belt, Robert D.
Benjamin, Ivan S.
Bennett, Darrell "C"
Bennett, Ezra R.
Bennett, William L.
Benson, Arthur L.
Berens, Robert J.
Berg, Frederick E.
Berg, Royal D.
Berg, Thorval L., Jr.
Bergen, Franklin S.
Berkey, Ward L.
Berning, Raymond A.

Berry, Charles D.
Berry, Fred T.
Berry, Lamar S.
Besancon, Victor C.
Besco, Steve
Bess, James O.
Bessac, Norman B.
Bessette, Alfred C.
Bickenbach, William K.
Bicknell, John R.
Bidwell, Robert F.
Biernat, Wladyslaw S.
Bigger, Joseph
Biggs, Ted
Bilbo, Charles A.
Bingham, Byrum C.
Bingham, Patrick J.
Biordi, Rudolph V.
Bishop, Charles R.
Bixler, Jene M.
Black, Raymond A.
Black, Roy A.
Black, Sherman C.
Blackerby, Gaines P.
Blackhurst, Francis C.
Blackman, Frank E.
Blad, Ralph E.
Blade, Dale O.
Blades, Charles P.
Blair, Carvel H.
Blair, Richard D.
Blake, Frank W., Jr.
Blakely, Robert G.
Bland, William F.
Blaser, Frederick
Blevins, Earl B.
Bley, William F.
Block, Claus A.
Bloom, Lyman C.
Bloom, William R.
Blum, Frederick E.
Blum, Howard E.
Blumenthal, Stanley H.
Blythe, Samuel D.
Boak, James K.
Bodnaruk, Andrew
Bogue, Leonard A.
Bohlken, John R.
Boice, Myron
Boldt, Charles H., Jr.
Boles, Hubert B.
Boles, John K.
Bolger, Joseph F., Jr.
Bolstein, Philip W.
Boltz, Paul W.
Bonds, Joseph E.
Boney, Bobbie E.
Bonner, Arden P., Jr.
Bonner, Kermit H.
Bono, Vernon C.
Bonser, Roy R.
Boo, Willis J.
Bookman, Irvin S.
Boozer, Warren M.
Boriotti, Joseph
Borkowski, Walter B.
Borley, Clarence A.
Borowski, Arthur A.
Bostwick, James L.
Botts, Frederick W., Jr.
Boudinot, Edgar J., Jr.
Bouldin, James M.
Boutin, Alfred V.
Boutwell, Emmett B.
Bowcock, Charles S., Jr.
Bowen, Charles H., Jr.
Bowen, James W.
Bowes, William A.
Bowler, Roland T. E., Jr.
Bowman, Marvin K.
Bowser, Robert S.
Boyd, Charles A.
Boyd, Daniel H.
Boyett, Arford C.
Boylan, Robert G.
Boyle, James E.
Boynton, Mack M.
Braden, James L.
Bradford, Charles R.
Bradley, James F., Jr.
Bradley, John R.
Brady, Bernard J.
Brady, Donald B.
Bragan, Charles M.
Braid, Herbert C.
Brandenburg, Charles W.
Brann, Warren B.
Bransom, Richard K.
Branson, "J" "F", Jr.
Brantley, Melvin H.
Bratkovic, Frank A.
Bratten, Toria, J., Jr.
Brauer, Walter J.
Braun, James F.
Brazzell, Robert J.
Breaux, Lester F.
Breeding, Curtis B.
Brehm, Raymond
Brekke, Trond G.
Bremer, Woodson P.
Brender, Bernard W.
Brennan, William F.
Brewer, Ryburn
Brewer, Sam H., Jr.
Brewington, William I.
Brewster, Vernon S.
Briant, Benjamin F.
Briggs, Claude "M", 3d
Briggs, Donald L.
Briggs, Richard W.
Brigham, Rollin W., Jr.
Briley, John W., Jr.
Brister, William E.
Bristol, William I.
Brocato, Samuel J.
Brockett, Earl E.
Brockhaus, William F.
Brogoitti, Bobby C.
Brooks, Cecil T.
Brooks, Charles L.
Brooks, Laurence G.
Broscha, Donald E.
Brosnahan, James J.
Brothers, George
Brotherton, William DeR, Jr.
Broughton, Ellis, Jr.
Brower, Abraham H.
Brown, Charles B.
Brown, Donald N.
Brown, Glenn H., Jr.
Brown, Guy C.
Brown, James E.
Brown, John E., Jr.
Brown, LaVerne W., Jr.
Brown, Melvy M.
Brown, Ralph J.
Brown, Robert N.
Brown, Robert S.
Brown, Russell E.
Brown, Willis I.
Brownell, Wallace G.
Brownlee, Orville S.
Brugman, Nels E.
Brumfield, John F.
Brunick, Joseph T.
Brunner, Harold R.
Brunson, Leighton J.
Brunson, Robert E.
Bryan, Clarence R.
Bryan, John I., Jr.
Bryan, Leonard G.
Bryant, James L.
Bryant, Olney J.
Bryant, Thomas G.
Bryant, William J.
Brzostek, Bernard F.
Buccini, Albert
Buchal, Robert J.
Buckbee, William D.
Bucknell, Howard, 3d.
Buell, Arthur W.
Bugg, Henry T.
Bugg, James E.
Bugg, Paul
Buker, George E.
Bunch, Jerry J., Jr.
Bunn, Eugene R.
Burgener, Bernard L.
Burgess, Carlton E.
Burkhardt, Calvin
Burkholder, John
Burks, Vesper E.
Burnham, Russell O.
Burns, James F.
Burns, Robert
Burns, Robert J.
Burns, Roy "D"
Burnside, Leland N.
Burris, John P.
Busch, Francis B.
Buselmeier, Rudolph M.
Busey, Charles W.
Bush, Lloyd L.
Bush, Thomas A., Jr.
Bushy, Willard L.
Bussey, Samuel T.
Butler, Thomas E.
Butler, Thomas S.
Butterbaugh, Robert E.
Buxton, Richard W.
Bywater, George K.
Cade, Howell A.
Cagle, Sherman C., Jr.
Calderwood, Gilmour H.
Caldwell, Warren L.
Cale, Sherman L.
Call, Melvin E.
Callaghan, James L.
Callahan, Charles W.
Callahan, George E.
Callahan, John C.
Callahan, Robert J.
Callas, Edward G.
Callaway, Steven W., Jr.
Callies, Leo B.
Cameron, Robert B.
Camp, Henry A.
Campbell, Clyde H.
Campbell, Donald L.
Campbell, Hugh L.
Caple, Edward S., Jr.
Capozzalo, Daniel S.
Card, Robert V.
Carey, Walter L.
Carleton, Robert D.
Carlson, Allen B.
Carlson, Elmer "P"
Carlson, Nils A. A.
Carmichael, Kenneth E.
Carnicom, Francis E.
Caros, Gustave L.
Carozza, Edward
Carpenter, Donald B.
Carr, Charles P.
Carr, Howard W.
Carr, John E.
Carrier, William, Jr.
Carrillo, Andrew J., Jr.
Carroll, Billy
Carroll, Charles H.
Carroll, Herbert C.
Carruth, Edward N.
Carson, James D., 256132
Carson, James D., 333992
Carter, Allen E.
Carter, Harry E.
Carter, Homer W.
Carter, Lester D.
Carter, Louis T.
Carter, Lyle E.
Carter, Robert J.
Carter, Wilbur W.
Cartwright, Harold S.
Caruthers, Ralph R.
Casagrande, Pulvio J.
Casebeer, Floyd W.
Casebolt, Woodrow W
Casey, John W., Jr.
Casey, Thomas A.
Cash, Eugene
Caskey, James C.
Cassidy, Melvin W.
Casteen, John D.
Casterline, Robert E.
Caswell, Charles H.
Catanzarito, Joseph
Causer, Donald D.
Cely, Frederick W.
Cerney, Ralph S.
Chaires, William F.
Chamberlin, William B.
Chambers, Kenneth W.
Chambers, Milton W.
Chambless, William H.
Chambliss, Joe "E"
Chandler, Daniel F.
Chandler, Nicholas M.
Chaney, Clarence M.
Chapman, John W.
Chappell, John R.
Chappelle, Charles M.
Charles, John M.
Chartier, Wilfred G.
Chase, Eugene F.
Chase, Howard E.
Chatelain, Gurley P.
Cheney, Richard R.
Chesler, Daniel E., 3d
Chester, Raymond M.
Chester, William R.
Cheuvront, Harlan R.
Childers, Herbert E.
Chilton, Robert D.
Chinn, Donald T.
Chirillo, Louis D.
Chisholm, Colin R.
Chormicle, Randall F.
Christensen, Merle P.
Christiansen, John S.
Christie, Leo D.
Christine, Jack A.
Christofferson, Edward A., Jr.
Christy, Douglas G.
Church, Joseph W.
Churchill, Jack G.
Claar, Lewis R.
Clack, Bryce L.
Clancey, Robert J.
Clanton, John L.
Clapp, Walter C.
Clark, Eugene F.
Clark, Floyd W.
Clark, Leslie A.
Clark, Richard M.
Clary, Warren "L"
Clausen, Lyle O.
Claypool, Sheldon
Claytor, Samuel T.
Cleland, Henry G., Jr.
Clements, Daniel C.
Cleveland, Hugh A.
Cleveland, Jesse S.
Clifford, Frank F., Jr.
Clingan, George M.
Close, Robert A.
Clunie, John E.
Clymer, Floyd K.
Cobb, Jesse B.
Cobb, Paul W.
Cobb, Willie O.
Coble, Reid E.
Coburn, James W.
Cochran, Ralph J.
Cochrane, Edward L.
Cockrell, Fred T.
Cockrill, James T., 2d
Codemo, Joseph E.
Coe, Carl W.
Coffland, Albert E.
Cofield, Perry C.
Cogswell, George W.
Cogswell, Lyle G., Jr.
Cole, Fred W.
Cole, Lanier G.
Cole, Stewart R. K.
Cole, William R.
Colegrove, Warren R.
Coleman, Edward P.
Coleman, Joseph L.
Coleman, Robert G., Jr.
Colhouer, Jack "D"
Collier, James R.
Collins, Delbert H.
Collins, Francis L., Jr.
Collins, John D.
Collins, Ralph W.
Collins, Walter V.
Colonna, Frank
Colton, Joseph
Colvin, Ted H.
Combs, Charles W., Jr.
Compton, Donald E.
Comstock, Franklyn M.
Conerly, Luke O., Jr.
Congdon, Alfred C.
Conolly, Theron A.
Conover, Wiley V.
Constance, Walter E.
Converse, Paul V.
Cook, Arthur W.
Cook, Homer T.
Cook, Walter J.
Cooke, Emmett M., Jr.
Cooke, George E.
Cooke, Paul
Cooke, Richard J.
Cooley, Samuel M., Jr.
Cooper, Claude B.
Cooper, Oran J.
Cooper, Parker C.
Copeland, John B.
Cornely, Herbert E.
Cornetta, Martin V.
Cornwell, Roy S.
Correia, Frank B.
Corrigan, Gerald P.
Corson, Ralph W.
Cory, Kenneth "J"
Cote, Joseph J.
Coughlin, Leo R.
Coulthard, Robert O.
Counts, William D.
Courtney, Marion L.
Cousins, John E.
Coven, Frank M.
Cowsert, Louis L.
Cox, Carroll E.
Cox, Howard D.
Cox, Lyle A.
Craig, James R.
Craig, Thomas E.
Crain, Max A.
Cramer, Maley O., Jr.
Cranney, "W" Loron, Jr.
Crawford, James H., Jr.
Crawford, Walter L.
Crayton, Louis B., Jr.
Creider, Anthony S.
Crenshaw, William P.
Criddle, Merdin C.
Crippin, David W.
Crisman, James L.
Crites, Jack O.
Cronin, George F.
Crosby, Derrill P.
Crosby, Edward O.
Cross, Lloyd G.
Cross, Sidney G.
Crossno, Bernard P.
Crowder, Clyde E.
Crownover, Edgar P.
Crum, Lawrence R.
Crumbaugh, Fred R., Jr.
Crutchfield, Edgar J. O.
Culbert, George W.
Culotta, Joe J.
Culp, James D.
Culp, Robert S.
Culver, Andrew D.
Cunningham, Patrick F.
Cunningham, William H.
Cupp, Joseph H.
Curra, Louis
Curran, Donald C.
Currin, Howard T.
Currin, Norman P.
Curry, Raymond F.
Curry, Raymond R.
Curtin, Robert H.
Curtis, Leonard A.
Curtis, Roy E.
Curtis, Theodore E.
Cushing, Leonard W.
Custer, Robert E.
Cutchin, Robert E.
Cwynar, John S.
Cyr, Hector C.
Czerwenka, Adolph P.
Czerwinski, Walter J.
Dace, Carl C.
Daigle, Arthur L.
Dalton, Pierre H.
Dame, Allen M.
Dangelo, Anthony S.
Daniel, Alfred E.
Daniel, Frank C.
Daniel, Royal T., Jr.
Daniels, Earnest W.
Darnell, Frederick D.
Darnell, Jesse R.
Dasso, Luis A.
Daubin, Scott C.
Daughity, Charles E.
Daughtrey, Ezekiel H.
Davenport, Fred W.
Davenport, John A.
Davidson, Hubbell Y.
Davidson, Paul D.
Davila, Daniel I.
Davis, Albert
Davis, Alvin R., Jr.
Davis, Charles H.
Davis, Edward P.
Davis, George W.
Davis, Hugh P.
Davis, John F.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Luna A.
Davis, Paul L.
Davis, Richard L.
Davis, Richard M.
Davis, Robert J.
Davis, Roy G.
Davis, Tharrell W.
Davison, Dale W.
Dawson, Floyd W.
Day, Lawrence A.
Deal, Ernest J.
Deal, James M.
Deamer, Robert E.
Dean, Benjamin H.
DeBri, Thomas H.
Decker, Benton W., Jr.
DeCoux, Bradford J.
Dedrick, Walter
Deems, Eugene F.
Deen, Harvard F.
DeFelice, Joseph C.
Delaney, Charles E.
Delaney, John A.
DeLany, Walter S., Jr.
DeLauer, Richard D.
Delgado, Robert
Delly, Daniel B.
Demel, Joseph G.
Dempsey, James W.
Dempster, John T., Jr.
Denton, Hildon H.
Deremicio, Dominic
DeRoco, Vernon J.
Derr, Phaon B., Jr.
Derry, LeRoy C.
Descoteaux, Joseph A. R.
Desel, Robert F. P.
Dever, William B.
DeVille, Joseph M.
Devlin, Morris M.
Dewing, Lawrence A.
Diana, Daniel J.
Dick, Kenneth S.
Dickerson, Richard G.
Dickson, Jack E.
Diedrichsen, Raymond T.
Dietzen, Walter N., Jr.
Dilgren, Paul A.

Dimes, Joe, Jr.
DiNapoli, Leonard B.
Dipboye, Jesse "J"
DiPretoro, John E., Jr.
Dittler, Harry C., Jr.
Ditto, Carl B.
DiVito, Anthony J.
Dix, Gerald L.
Dize, Melvin W.
Doak, Joseph J., Jr.
Dobbs, Charles E. W.
Dodge, James D.
Domorasky, Walter A.
Donaghy, Charles F.
Donavan, Robert D.
Donovan, Gerard M.
Dooge, "B" Russell, Jr.
Dooley, Raymond J.
Doolin, Edward H., Jr.
Doolittle, Richard H.
Dorchester, Chester H.
Dorman, "R" "H"
Dornblaser, Stanley P.
Dorris, Charles M.
Doster, James B.
Doty, Guy L.
Doubt, William A.
Dougan, George McD.
Douglas, Robert G.
Dow, John F.
Dowlen, Wayne L.
Downey, Richard S.
Downing, John W.
Downing, Robert C.
Doyle, Clement C.
Drag, Theodore F.
Dreiling, Elmer E.
Drelicharz, Leon J.
Drew, Brand W.
Drew, Elmer O.
Drinkwater, Thomas H.
Drown, Loraine "E"
Drumm, John T.
Drummond, Paul D.
DuBois, Philip C.
DuBois, Robert E.
Dubree, Harold M.
Duckworth, Edward W.
Ducoing, William F.
Dudley, Robert H.
Duff, John, Jr.
Duhon, Willis P.
Dullaghan, John C., Jr.
Dunagan, Willis H.
Dunbar, Robert C.
Duncan, Richard E.
Dunklee, Donald L.
Dunlap, Larry E.
Dunlap, Lynn A.
Dunn, Charles A., Jr.
Dunn, Jack B.
Dunn, Richard J.
Dunn, William A.
Dunning, Harvey K.
Dunton, Donald D.
Dunwoody, Edward H.
Dunwoody, Jesse W.
Duquette, Herbert E., Jr.
Durant, Clyde C.
Duss, Charles L.
Dussel, Alexander N.
Dutch, George B.
Dutton, John P.
Dwyer, Thomas L.
Dye, Robert W.
Dyson, "Y" "J"
D'Zamba, John A.
Dzikowski, Richard J.
Eads, Lyle W.
Eakin, Edward M.
Eakin, John C.
Earhart, Hugh L., Jr.
Earl, Mancil L.
Earl, William O.
Early, Juston H.
Earnhardt, Elmer H.
Eason, William R.
Eastman, Arthur "B"
Eaton, Arthur H. M.
Eaton, John D.
Eberley, Jack R.
Eberly, Harold L.
Ebersbaker, John F.
Ebersole, Robert "H"
Echterling, John E.
Ecker, William B.
Eckert, Robert V.
Edelman, Sidney
Edge, Donald B.
Edgerton, Lloyd G.
Edmonds, Leroy S.
Edmunds, Wesley N.
Edwards, Farley D.
Edwards, Jack
Edwards, William E.
Egerer, Ernest
Egger, Victor A.
Ehm, Robert H.
Eidson, Robert A.
Eirich, Norman C.
Elam, William W.
Eldred, Hubert W.
Eldridge, Richard A.
Eley, Virgil "D"
Ellefson, Laurence M.
Ellington, Clarence G.
Elliott, Homer S.
Ellis, George F., Jr.
Ellis, Glenn
Ellis, William D.
Ellstrom, Bert
Emerson, Ralph W.
Emery, Clayton M.
Emme, Louis R.
Enabnit, Harry W.
English, Addison R.
Enos, Lawrence
Entrikin, Joseph W.
Entwistle, Ray
Enyeart, Donald C.
Ehprom, Glenn O.
Erb, Arthur G.
Erickson, Jack L.
Erickson, Philip M., Jr.
Erishman, Charles A.
Ernst, Werner G.
Erwin, Haskell A.
Escott, William H.
Esmiol, Morris A., Jr.
Esposito, Michael L.
Ethier, Henry E.
Etter, William H.
Euliss, Robert E.
Evans, Glenn A.
Evans, Glenn E.
Evans, Keith J.
Evans, Russell A.
Evans, Simpson, Jr.
Even, Glen M.
Everman, Donald D.
Everson, John K.
Ewald, Frank W.
Ewing, James W.
Ewing, Robert H.
Eyer, Harold R.
Faddis, James M.
Fadeley, Charles F.
Fahey, John A.
Fairbanks, George W.
Falcone, Ralph E.
Falkowski, Edward
Fancher, Eugene R.
Fannin, William E.
Farley, John W.
Farmer, Lewis T., Jr.
Farmer, Roy E.
Farquhar, Lawrence A.
Farrand, Langdon S.
Farrell, Crumpton
Farrell, Edward V.
Farrell, Ferris L.
Farrell, Ted L.
Farwell, Jack M.
Faulk, Joseph R.
Fay, Richard C.
Feaster, Joseph E.
Featherstone, Thomas A.
Fedorowicz, Vladimir
Feely, William F.
Felchner, William E. H.
Felten, Robert E.
Fenton, Edward N.
Fentress, Alvin K., Jr.
Ferguson, John A.
Ferguson, William E.
Ferguson, William P.
Ferrell, George R.
Ferrin, Robert W.
Ferris, Adrian J.
Fick, Theodore R.
Fidler, Harold J.
Field, Frederick E.
Fields, Thomas
Fierce, Vernon R., Jr.
Finders, Forrest
Findly, Lee B.
Fischer, Elmer M.
Fish, Norris L.
Fisher, Carlos E.
Fisher, Dale W.
Fisher, Joseph H.
Fisher, Lyle H.
Fitch, Lowell F.
Fitzgerald, James B.
Fitzgerald, John W.
Fitzpatrick, Robert P.
Fitzwater, Harry E., Jr.
Flathers, Donald F.
Fledderjohn, Donald W.
Fleming, Dean G.
Fleming, Ernest D.
Fletcher, Edwin H.
Fletcher, Keith G.
Flory, Edwin B.
Flowers, Elton E.
Floyd, Harold D.
Floyd, Wesley
Flynn, William J.
Fogg, Reginald S.
Fogle, Claude C.
Foisy, Lawrence H.
Foley, John J.
Foley, Walter A.
Folsom, Oscar, Jr.
Folsom, Riley T.
Fontenot, Yourick N.
Fooshe, Thomas R., Jr.
Foote, Edward J.
Foote, Norman C.
Forbes, Bernard B., Jr.
Forbes, Don H.
Forbes, Forrest B.
Ford, "J" "D"
Ford, John E.
Fordemwalt, John W.
Forehand, James M.
Forrester, David L., Jr.
Forsht, Eugene R.
Fortner, Leslie O.
Fortson, Robert M., Jr.
Foulks, Francis D.
Fowler, Ralph E.
Fowles, Joseph E.
Fox, Charles J.
Fox, George L.
Fox, Lyle B.
Fox, Melvin E.
Fraise, George J.
Francis, Ira A.
Franck, Herbert A.
Franklin, George E.
Franklin, Laron S.
Franz, Edward D.
Fraser, Charles W.
Frediani, Harold M.
Freeman, Bennie D.
Freeman, John K.
Freeman, John T.
Freiberger, Joseph G.
French, Dean M.
French, Paul V.
Freudenberg, Max G.
Frieden, William H.
Frink, Clifford L.
Frisbie, Charles N.
Frketic, Louis J.
Frodahl, Roland P.
Frosio, Joseph M., Jr.
Frost, Frank B.
Frost, James G., Jr.
Froyd, George R.
Fry, Elmer C.
Fulton, Jesse B.
Fulton, Robert D.
Furey, Laurence J.
Furtek, Adolph J.
Gahagen, Francis E.
Gaither, Donald
Gallagher, Bernard F.
Gallagher, Marion R.
Gallagher, Paul M.
Gallemore, James G.
Gambill, Maurice A.
Gambrill, Nelson J.
Gano, Hubert D.
Gant, Ralph W.
Garbrous, Joseph V.
Gargas, Arthur E.
Garlinger, Lorin P.
Garlitz, James E.
Garner, Richard A.
Garner, Roland M.
Garrett, Robert R., Jr.
Gaschk, Milton
Gassaway, Clyde W.
Gatlin, William A.
Gauen, George M.
Gavett, Theodore C.
Gawthrop, Wilson R.
Gay, Grady R.
Gayle, Robert E., Jr.
Gayler, Gilbert C.
Gaylord, Burner DeW.
Geer, Norman L.
Geiger, Anson D.
Geist, Donald R.
Gentry, Harold R.
George, Edgar L.
George, Milton D.
Gerich, Walter R.
Geringer, Walter H.
Gerszewski, Remig F. F.
Getz, Walter S.
Giancola, Daniel G.
Gibbons, William J., Jr.
Gibbs, Charles W.
Gibson, Warren L.
Giebler, Clifford L., Jr.
Gifford, Lewis G.
Gilbert, Albert K.
Gilbert, Calvin R.
Gilbert, Glen W.
Gilbert, John R.
Giles, Olen G.
Gill, James J.
Gill, Robert L.
Gillcrist, John A.
Gillespie, Ronald R.
Gilliland, Max M.
Gillooly, John F.
Gilmore, Allen J.
Gilmore, Clyde
Gilmour, Robert, Jr.
Gimbert, Frederick L.
Ginther, Roy L.
Glab, Joseph T.
Glantz, Jack E.
Glasscock, Robert L.
Glenn, John T.
Glenn, Will F., Jr.
Glennon, Edmund
Glenzer, Hubert, Jr.
Glezen, Glenn F.
Glica, Matthew J.
Glidewell, Willard E.
Goben, Howard G.
Godshall, Walter H.
Goeb, Robert E.
Goff, Robert "G"
Gohr, Robert B.
Golden, Charles L.
Golding, Frank S.
Golnik, Jerome J.
Goodall, Arthur R.
Goodberlet, Alphonse G.
Goodnow, Harold J.
Goodpasture, Joseph H.
Goodrich, John
Goodwin, Frank E.
Goolsby, Don C.
Gordinier, Harold R.
Gordon, Arthur D.
Gordon, John T.
Gordon, Robert
Gore, Frederick S.
Gorley, Lester P.
Gorman, Raymond
Gorsline, Samuel G., Jr.
Goulet, Lionel J.
Gourgues, Ralph C.
Goyne, Arthur H.
Grace, William C.
Graddy, David A.
Graham, Ranald F.
Grainger, Inslee E.
Granat, Arnold M.
Grandia, William L.
Grant, James "A"
Grant, Ralph F.
Grant, Robert H.
Graven, Herman A.
Gray, Albert E.
Graybill, Arthur E.
Greany, Edward J.
Green, Donald M.
Greene, William M. A.
Greenstein, Marvin W.
Greenwood, Thomas E.
Cresowski, Karl C.
Grewe, Carl O.
Griffin, James H., Jr.
Griffin, Juel, Jr.
Griffin, Marion E.
Griffin, Mitchell C.
Grigsby, Gene H.
Grigsby, Ralph I.
Grimmett, Charles D.
Gronemann, Carl W., Jr.
Gross, George V.
Groves, Albert R.
Groves, Samuel N., Jr.
Grubl, Truman F.
Guertin, Frederick F.
Guhse, Donald E.
Guidos, John C.
Gulbranson, George W.
Guna, Andrew
Gundrum, James O.
Gurtler, Peter T.
Gustafson, Harris F.
Guttenberger, Francis M.
Guyer, George F.
Haas, Robert F.
Haase, Norman S.
Habecker, Ralph H.
Hafler, Raymond W.
Hague, Henry W.
Haines, Frank L.
Haines, John B.
Haines, Lawrence I.
Hale, Robert R.
Hale, William C.
Hall, Alfred J., Jr.
Hall, Boyd "L"
Hall, Edward A.
Hall, Edwin W.
Hall, Harry D.
Hall, Horace M.
Hall, Paul H.
Hall, Rayborn M.
Hall, Richard F.
Hall, Richard L.
Hall, William R.
Halverson, Edwin P.
Halverson, Richard L.
Hambley, Louis C.
Hamilton, Charles B., Jr.
Hamilton, George A.
Hamilton, George T.
Hamilton, Robert E.
Hamilton, Robert H.
Hammarlund, Arthur
Hammond, James C.
Hampton, Harold W.
Hanlon, John F.
Hannifin, Patrick "J"
Hansen, Baron L.
Hansen, Cedric M.
Hansen, Earl W.
Hansen, Eugene E.
Hansen, Ivol E.
Hansen, Jens B.
Hansen, Jonh G.
Hansen, Ray L.
Hansen, Theodore W.
Hanson, Donald M.
Hanson, Harold G.
Hanson, Leonard M.
Hantsche, Edgar M.
Harbert, Rex
Harbilas, James N.
Hardee, Joe T.
Harding, Charles F., Jr.
Hardy, Leslie B.
Hardy, Richard
Hardy, Willis E.
Harmon, Alfred W.
Harper, Thomas E., Jr.
Harrell, Russell A.
Harriman, Harold L.
Harris, David D.
Harris, Jack
Harris, Manford K.
Harris, Noel M., Jr.
Harris, Richard A.
Harris, Roger L.
Harris, William F.
Harris, Willie W.
Harris, Wilson E.
Harrison, Alpha R.
Harrison, George S.
Harrison, Howard H.
Hart, James V.
Hart, William J., 3d
Hartin, Albert W.
Hartnett, Walter F.
Hartson, Frederick W.
Hartung, William C.
Hartzel, Harvey C.
Harvey, Donald C.
Harward, Phillip S.
Harward, Robert S., Jr.
Hashmall, Benjamin
Hastings, Edward E., 2d
Hatcher, Floyd H.
Hatchl, Quentin R.
Hauer, Earl W.
Haugh, Derald E.
Havens, Howard "G"
Haverty, Cecil L.
Havron, Billy L.
Hawkins, Jack H.
Hawkins, John F.
Hawkins, Ralph M.
Hawkins, Rex "E"
Hawkins, Victor N.
Hawkinson, Thomas D.
Hawver, Harry E.
Haycraft, Cecil R.
Hayes, George M.
Hayes, Henri L.
Hayes, Robert S.
Hayler, William B.
Hazlewood, Robert G.
Haegerty, Harold R.
Heath, Philip R.
Hecker, George M.
Hedlund, Wells P.
Heekin, Robert P.
Heffernan, Francis
Heffernan, William J.
Heid, Robert S.
Heine, Theodore J.
Heinze, Arthur D.
Heller, Glenn G.
Hemphill, James I.
Henderson, Charles C.

Henderson, Charles W.
Henderson, Henry H.
Henderson, James C.
Henderson, James L.
Hendry, David
Hennegan, James B.
Henning, Walter J.
Henry, John L.
Henry, Robert R.
Henson, Alton R.
Henson, John H.
Henson, Josiah
Herman, John S.
Herman, Saul W.
Herman, Warren
Hermann, Edward P.
Herms, Ralph R.
Herold, Charles C.
Herrick, Ralph E., Jr.
Herrick, Robert W.
Hertig, William S.
Hertzig, Richard D.
Hervey, George H.
Hess, William J.
Hessley, John B.
Heule, Franklin I.
Hevener, William B.
Hibbs, William H.
Hicken, Frederick J.
Hicks, George D.
Hiers, Joe B.
Higgins, Arthur E.
Higgins, Roy T.
Highfill, Harold C.
Hilgel, Charles E.
Hill, Harold C.
Hill, John F.
Hill, Milton R., Jr.
Hill, Sam A.
Hiller, William C.
Hillesheim, Hubert J.
Hillson, Herbert "J" "A"
Hilson, Ralph A.
Hilton, David E.
Hinman, Rex, Jr.
Hirons, Wesley
Hladik, Theodore
Hoar, Charles H., Jr.
Hoblitzell, Charles M.
Hoch, Harry K., Jr.
Hodge, Carl L.
Hodge, Ervin "F"
Hodges, Ashley "R"
Hoffland, Walter F.
Hoffman, Walter P.
Hoffos, Peter N.
Hogan, Roy A.
Hogg, Forrest G.
Hogsed, Robert A.
Holcomb, John W.
Holderby, Rhodell L.
Holley, Horace C.
Holley, James F.
Holly, Harold E.
Holmes, Francis M.
Holmes, Glenn W.
Holmes, Henry W.
Holmes, Robert C.
Holmgaard, Evald
Holt, Harris K.
Holt, Leahman J.
Holton, George S.
Homyak, James A.
Hood, Rufus M.
Hoop, Louie "B", Jr.
Hooton, Ralph L.
Hoover, William H.
Hope, Herbert L.
Hopfinger, Richard M.
Hopkins, Samuel, Jr.
Hoppe, Gordon E.
Hopwood, Gordon R.
Horn, Carl G.
Horn, John O.
Horn, Leslie E.
Horoschak, Metro
Horton, Benjamin C.
Horton, Bennett H.
Hostutler, Robert F.
Hough, Fred R., Jr.
House, William C.
Hovland, Jerome O.
Howard, Clarence H.
Howard, Cornelius S., Jr.
Howard, Edward H.
Howard, Robert E.
Howard, Vernon
Howard, William M.
Howe, Arthur W., 3d
Howe, Elmer C.
Howe, Lee V.
Howell, Ralph T., Jr.
Howell, Raymond S., Jr.
Howland, Frank S.
Hoyt, Herbert D., Jr.
Hoyt, Merle G.
Hubbard, William H.
Huckaby, Donnie W.
Hudson, Ray G.
Huffman, Landon W.
Hughes, Morris L.
Hughson, Robert M.
Hull, Richard H.
Hulshof, Andrew
Humes, Jo A.
Humphrey, Loren R.
Humphries, George E.
Hunt, Clyde G.
Hunt, David W.
Hunt, George B.
Hunt, Joe H.
Hunt, Paul A.
Hunter, Clifford E.
Hunter, Lionel J.
Hunts, Lawrence H.
Hurley, Ellis L.
Hurley, George W.
Hurst, Walter
Hurtt, Thomas B.
Husband, Joseph E.
Hussey, Patrick F.
Hutcheson, Edward L.
Hutchison, Clarence H., Jr.
Hyde, Edward H.
Hynson, Herbert R., Jr.
Iglesias, Edward
Ihrig, Lewis C.
Imming, Cyril L.
Ingalls, James W.
Ingram, James D.
Ingram, James T.
Inman, Bryce D.
Irano, Michael G.
Irby, Barton
Ireland, Clifton R.
Irvin, Leroy E.
Irwin, William F. H.
Isakson, Harold E.
Isen, Forester W.
Ishie, Everett E.
Itte, Charles M.
Ives, Charles W.
Ives, Thomas K.
Ivy, James E.
Ivy, John F.
Jackman, Carl S.
Jacks, Edward E.
Jackson, Harry E.
Jackson, Mercer L., Jr.
Jackson, Ralph F.
Jackson, Robert C.
Jacobs, William A., Jr.
Jacobson, Robert G.
Jaeger, Richard G.
Jakes, William H.
Jalbert, Llewellyn E.
James, William R.
Jan, John
Janecky, Joseph W.
Jarboe, Evan A.
Jarock, Walter J.
Jay, Darrel H.
Jaynes, Sutton "L"
Jeffery, Harold W., Jr.
Jeffries, George E.
Jenkins, Henry C.
Jenkins, James D.
Jenkins, James E.
Jenkins, John W.
Jenks, Edwin R.
Jennison, Lewis L.
Jensen, Pierce A., Jr.
Jensen, Samuel B.
Jessup, Charles R.
Jester, Richard H.
Jeter, David M.
Johns, Harry E.
Johns, Walter W.
Johnsen, Alan K.
Johnson, Armand H.
Johnson, Charles E., Jr.
Johnson, Claud A.
Johnson, Clayton F.
Johnson, Donald J.
Johnson, Elbert B.
Johnson, Francis F.
Johnson, Franklin D.
Johnson, Garvis D.
Johnson, Gerald M.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Julius M.
Johnson, Lauren M.
Johnson, Paul
Johnson, Richard
Johnson, Robert H., 323142
Johnson, Robert H., 350938
Johnson, Roy E.
Johnson, Roy G.
Johnson, Ted S.
Johnson, Theodore L.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, Douglas M.
Johnston, Philip D., Jr.
Johnston, Roy S.
Johnston, William S.
Joiner, James R.
Jones, Arthur H.
Jones, Arthur W.
Jones, Benjamin F.
Jones, Charles C.
Jones, Dean R.
Jones, Donald H.
Jones, Edward D.
Jones, Edward G.
Jones, Elmer S.
Jones, Frank M.
Jones, Gordon W.
Jones, Harvey B.
Jones, Howard W.
Jones, Ira G.
Jones, Kenneth L.
Jones, Robert "E" "L"
Jones, Robert F.
Jones, Robert T.
Jones, Roy K., 2d
Jones, Thomas R., 3d
Jordan, LeRoy K.
Jortberg, Richard E.
Juarez, Robert
Juillard, Floyd
Julian, Alexander, Jr.
Kadel, Frank E.
Kahlbau, Hugh W.
Kakol, Joseph F.
Kalina, John F.
Kalinoski, Alex J.
Kalmbach, William W.
Kalnitzky, Myron R.
Kamps, Harold J.
Kane, Ralph V.
Karge, Orville B.
Karn, Chelcie W.
Karnes, Austin G.
Karns, Floyd H.
Karonis, Peter.
Kasten, Robert I.
Kasworm, Martin A.
Kauzlarich, William A.
Kavanagh, Robert T.
Kaye, Jack G.
Kearsey, Gordon L.
Keating, James H.
Keating, John A.
Keck, Carroll B.
Keebaugh, Melvin C.
Keeler, William E.
Keenan, John T.
Kees, Galen D.
Keevil, Arthur K.
Keith, Omar F.
Keller, Ruben G.
Kelley, Arthur R.
Kelley, Edward G.
Kelley, Fonville
Kelley, Ford S.
Kelley, Frederick J.
Kelley, Lawrence W.
Kelley, Stephen F.
Kellogg, John L.
Kelly, Harold H.
Kelly, John C.
Kelly, Joseph F., Jr.
Kelly, Merrill E., Jr.
Kelly, Walter P.
Kelone, Emerick S.
Kemp, Edmond D.
Kemp, Robert E.
Kennedy, Donald W.
Kennedy, James S.
Kenney, Edward J.
Kenney, Robert F.
Kent, Charles J., Jr.
Keogh, John D.
Kepler, Homer W.
Kerns, Clifford D.
Kerr, Alex A.
Kerr, Stuart W.
Kerr, Thomas E.
Kersbergen, Nicholas
Kersey, John R.
Kershall, Matt T.
Kervin, William
Ketchum, Roy B.
Kidd, John D.
Kidder, Francis R.
Kiernan, Loyd J., Jr.
Kilcoyne, Francis J.
Kilcoyne, William M.
Kilgore, Jasper C.
Kimball, Franklin S.
Kincaid, Charlie T.
King, Arthur R.
King, Arthur W.
King, Ernest J., Jr.
King, Evans P. K.
King, Joseph L.
King, Nathan H.
Kingery, Leonard E.
Kingry, Walton W.
Kingston, Frank G.
Kington, Joseph E., Jr.
Kipe, Richard E.
Kirk, Robert
Kirkpatrick, Hugh J.
Kirkpatrick, Warren E.
Kisak, Valdimir
Kistler, William C.
Kitchen, George A.
Kleber, Francis T.
Klein, Harry J.
Kleinert, Charles E.
Klepak, Philip H.
Kline, Robert L.
Klombies, Carl B.
Kloppenberg, Joseph E.
Klotzbach, John C.
Knapp, Kenneth L.
Kneiple, William E.
Knick, Victor R.
Knight, Frank L.
Knight, Hale B.
Knoeckel, Richard C., Jr.
Knotek, Adolph A.
Knott, Zebulon V., Jr.
Knudsen, John T.
Knudson, Irving H., Jr.
Koch, John L.
Koch, Robert A.
Koch, Roger J.
Kodis, Anthony J.
Kodzik, Anthony
Koehler, Philip W.
Koen, George
Koetsch, Clarence R.
Kohlberg, Harry
Kohler, Harry R.
Kole, Carl B.
Kolisek, John C.
Koon, Jackson L.
Koone, Willard
Koressel, William J.
Korn, Ralph E.
Kornmann, Russell F.
Korte, Don W.
Korte, Ernest J.
Kratochvil, Edward J.
Krebs, Paul E.
Kreis, Herman W.
Krejci, Clayton L.
Kribs, David A., Jr.
Kriss, John
Krol, Chester M.
Krolczyk, Stanley P.
Krone, John R.
Krueger, Duane M.
Kruger, Ira K.
Krupp, Leo
Kube, George F.
Kucharski, Leo F.
Kuntz, Ray
Kurfess, John F.
Kurlak, William B.
Kurz, Frederick
Kurz, Lloyd A.
Kushman, Howard B.
LaCava, John, Jr.
Lacey, Frank M.
Lachance, George D.
Lair, Raymond G.
Lake, Herbert T.
Lake, Julian S.
Lake, Kenneth "B"
LaMar, Burris D.
Lamartin, Frederick H., Jr.
Lambing, Clarence L.
Lampman, Lester B.
Lanaghan, Donald P.
Lance, Archie J.
Lane, Frederick E.
Lane, Virgil V.
Lang, Ralph R.
Lang, Robert J.
Langdon, Russell A.
Lange, Harry D.
Langevin, Gerald J.
Langland, Robert G.
Langley, Ben G.
Larsen, Herman C.
Larsen, Jack A.
Larson, Theodore R.
LaRue, Richard M.
Lassiter, Daniel L.
Latch, Herbert
Lathrop, Dorl G.
Laughlin, Kenneth W.
Laughlin, Leonard R.
Lauriat, Philip R.
LaVack, Lloyd F.
Lavender, Kermit F.
LaVoie, Joseph E., 334058
LaVoie, Joseph E., 263094
Law, Robert L., Jr.
Lawrence, Clayton G.
Lawrence, Edward J.
Lawrence, Eston D.
Lawson, George E.
Layman, Harold E.
Layton, Jake "W"
Leach, Norman E.
Leavitt, Eben, Jr.
LeBlanc, Louis S.
LeBlanc, Ulric J.
LeBourgeois, Julien J.
Ledoux, Joseph W.
Lee, Allen W.
Lee, Ellis E.
Lee, John D.
Lee, John W.
Lee, Melvin W.
Lee, Ornsby
Lee, Richard H.
Leedy, Gerald F.
Leffingwell, George D.
Legare, Rupert W., Jr.
Legg, John "D"
LeHoy, John
Leightley, Albert L.
Leinen, John F.
Leland, Dee L.
Lemons, Merrel
Leonard, Charles R.
Leonard, John W.
Leslie, Jean L.
Leslie, John K.
LeTourneau, Joseph R. E.
Levy, Henry N.
Lewis, Albert R.
Lewis, Arthur W.
Lewis, David D.
Lewis, Heber S.
Lewis, Leslie E.
Lewis, Morton L.
Lewis, William C., 389768
Lewis, William C., 389769
Libby, John M.
Lichack, Elwood
Light, Robert C.
Lileks, Vernon A.
Lillig, Richard M.
Lindler, Charles R., Jr.
Lindquist, John F.
Lindsay, William A.
Lines, Clifford O.
Lines, Paul W.
Linker, Duan W.
Linn, "J" "A"
Linskey, Joseph E.
Lipfert, Ralph G.
Lissy, Floyd K.
Little, Charles E.
Little, Hermon T.
Lively, Harvey L.
Lizotte, Wesley "E"
Lloyd, James F.
Lloyd, William J.
Lockwood, Burton G.
Loflin, Eugene P.
Loftin, Edward H., Jr.
Lollar, Samuel R.
Long, Donald B.
Long, John G.
Longfield, John N.
Longley, Thomas B.
Longton, David M.
Lopresti, Vincenzo
Lops, Anthony
Lorah, Paul F.
Lotzgesell, James H., Jr.
Loudermilk, "L" "B"
Loughner, William D.
Loughran, Donald S.
Love, Warren H.
Loveday, John C.
Lovell, Frederick A., Jr.
Lovell, John T.
Loveridge, George W., Jr.
Lower, William B.
Lowman, Robert W.
Lowry, James J.
Ludington, John C.
Ludwig, David W.
Ludwig, Helmuth A.
Ludwig, Wallace R.
Lukasik, Albert E.
Lundy, Robert T.
Lusson, Victor W.
Luttmer, Walter
Lutzleman, John W.
Lux, Frank W.
Lynch, Francis K.
Lynn, Clarence D.
Lyons, John T.
Lyons, Robert F.
Lyons, Thomas W.
Maberry, Lewin A.
MacDonald, Wallace E.
MacGillivray, Donald A.
Mack, Robert B.
Mackay, Douglas S.
MacKenzie, Gordon C.
MacKenzie, James B.
Macklin, Bobby S.
MacKnight, Harding C.

Maddock, Edmund J.
Madigan, Thomas W.
Maghan, Robert J.
Maier, Charles W.
Maksimoski, Edward B.
Malone, Clifton
Malone, William C.
Malpus, Kenneth C.
Mancuso, Vincent J.
Manger, Arthur J.
Mangham, Raymond L.
Manhart, Harrison D.
Manherz, Jack M.
Mann, Howard E.
Mann, Richard W.
Manning, Fletcher A.
Mansfield, Richard W.
Manship, Cecil
Marafino, Benedict J.
March, James D.
Marconnet, Earl J.
Marcozzi Phillip
Marker, Raymond K.
Markkanen, Eino J.
Marks, Thomas W.
Markwell, Norman R.
Marn, Albin
Marquardt, Howard M.
Marr, Robert I.
Marshall, Louis S.
Marta, James J.
Martin, Charles E.
Martin, Merrill K.
Martin, Orvis A.
Martin, Sidney J.
Martin, Wilfred X.
Martini, Michael V.
Masek, William, Jr.
Mashburn, Jessie L.
Mason, Hugh C.
Mason, Wilson L.
Masterman, Howard W.
Masters, James C., Jr.
Matheson, James C.
Mathews, John R.
Mathwick, Leon E. L.
Matlock, Irvin W.
Matt, Johnnie W.
Matthews, Edwin W.
Matthews, Herbert S., Jr.
Matthews, Lloyd
Matthiesen, George H.
Mattison, John A.
Mattus, Ralph J.
Maurel, Andre A.
Maxwell, Riley F.
May, Arthur L.
May, Frank T.
May, Harold A.
May, Herbert A.
May, Robert E.
May, William C.
Mayencourt, Herman
Maynard, Vincent D., Jr.
Mazoway, Louis A.
Mazur, Anthony J.
McAdams, John K.
McAfee, Paul H., Jr.
Mcauly, John J., Jr.
McBride, Thomas D.
McCain, Howard G.
McCall, Carr C.
McCall, Laurence L.
McCall, Virgil M.
McCallon, Victor L.
McCallum, Kendall C.
McCartan, Edward F.
McCaskill, James M.
McCauley, Duane B.
McClaskey, Arrie J.
McClaugherty, Bernard M.
McClelland, Bert R., Jr.
McClelland, Willis C.
McClintock, Robert, Jr.
McCloskey, Roy P.
McCloskey, William H.
McClure, Philip A.
McCollough, Robert G.
McCool, James K.
McCool, Richard M., Jr.
McCord, Stanley R.
McCoy, Dale M.
McCrary, Robert D.
McCutcheon, Russell D.
McDade, Nolan H.
McDermott, Frederick P.
McDermott, Joseph A.
McDonald, James C., Jr.
McEowen, Stanley W.
McEwen, Richard C.
McFadden, Joe M.
McFarlane, John G.
McGarry, William J., Jr.
McGarvey, James F., Jr.
McGee, William
McGinley, Frank C.
McGinnis, John F.
McGlothing, Charles V.
McGlothlin, Joseph H.
McGrievy, Joseph L.
McGuire, Herbert W.
McHugh, Richard P.
McIntire, John C.
McIntire, Richard G.
McIntyre, Douglas E.
McKeel, Alonza B., Jr.
McKeever, John H.
McKernan, James T.
McKinley, Donald E.
McLain, Martin E.
McLaughlin, William H., Jr.
McLellen, Jack E.
McLenaghan, Thomas R.
McMahon, Charles A.
McMahon, Richard E.
McManus, James R.
McMenamin, John T.
McMenimon, John J.
McMillian, Alfred N.
McMorrow, Gerald
McMullen, Birton E.
McMullen, James E.
McNaught, Joseph R.
McNaughton, Joseph
McNeill, Joseph E.
McNett, Edgar L.
McPherson, Clyde C.
McRae, Duncan C., Jr.
McSharry, William F.
McTigue, James T.
Mead, Robert W.
Meadows, James T., Jr.
Meadows, Warren T.
Mecom, James I., Jr.
Medefind, Addison E.
Meek, Vern
Meints, Alvin L.
Meissner, Clarence R.
Mekkleson, Carol O.
Meldrum, James R.
Mendenhall, Gerald W.
Merinar, Amos L.
Merrick, Robert H., Jr.
Merrill, Charles F., Jr.
Merrill, Clayton W.
Merz, Allen C. H.
Messenger, Orville V.
Metz, Roger C.
Metzgar, Richard V.
Meyer, Connie W.
Michalek, Chester
Michalek, Frank A.
Michel, Eldon L.
Midgett, Joe L.
Mikulich, John L.
Milano, Daniel O.
Milhan, Harry L.
Millar, Robert W.
Miller, Berwyn J.
Miller, Charles P.
Miller, Clay R.
Miller, David
Miller, David L.
Miller, Glen G.
Miller, Harry R.
Miller, Henry "K"
Miller, John G.
Miller, John R., Jr.
Miller, John W.
Miller, Lloyd A.
Miller, Ned
Miller, Robert C.
Miller, Robert W.
Miller, Robertson L.
Miller, Rolland E.
Miller, Samuel J.
Miller, Warren O.
Miller, William W. K., Jr.
Milliken, Mason DeM.
Mills, Allen W.
Mills, Kenneth G.
Mills, Stewart A.
Miner, George L.
Minion, Gerold W.
Minkler, William A.
Minnick, John L.
Miskill, Thomas G.
Mitchell, Cleo N., Jr.
Mitchell, George A.
Mitchell, George W.
Mitchell, Howard R.
Mix, Leroy R.
Modica, Anthony R.
Moe, Andrew C.
Moffit, Lloyd W.
Moloney, Robert J.
Momberg, Vernon B.
Monahan, Alfred E.
Montgomery, James W.
Moomey, Victor D.
Moore, Albert L.
Moore, Bobbie P.
Moore, Charles K.
Moore, Donald D.
Moore, Edwin C.
Moore, Elmer K.
Moore, Franklin B.
Moore, Horace N., Jr.
Moore, Jack L.
Moore, James D.
Moore, Lee R.
Moore, Lewis M.
Moore, Robert H.
Moore, Robert L.
Moore, Thomas A.
Moore, Vernon L.
Moore, William B.
Moorer, Joe P.
Moranville, Horace B.
Moreland, Milton B.
Morgan, Chauncey J.
Morgan, James E.
Morgan, Lindsay E.
Morgan, Theodore L.
Morgan, William M.
Morris, James B.
Morris, John
Morris, Lester
Morris, Loyd C.
Morris, Robert E.
Morris, Robert H.
Morrison, Basil T.
Morrison, Clyde O.
Morrison, John M., Jr.
Morrison, Robert
Morse, John R.
Mortimer, Raymond M.
Mosely, Marvin A., Jr.
Moses, Francis G.
Mosser, Milo W., Jr.
Mote, Gerald E.
Motley, Arthur W., Jr.
Moul, Cornelius F.
Moulson, Harold S.
Moyce, Murray A.
Mross, Joseph W.
Mudd, Robert P.
Mudgett, Leon P.
Muenich, Gustav J.
Muhlethaler, Walter
Muirheid, Willard F.
Mullen, John, Jr.
Mulligan, Champ C.
Mullinix, George A.
Mullins, Roger H.
Mumford, Richard J.
Mundt, Clinton H.
Munson, Arthur H.
Murnighan, Thomas J., Jr.
Murphree, Hugh D.
Murphy, John L.
Murphy, William C.
Murray, John T.
Murray, Paul J.
Murray, Robert E.
Murray, Royal C., Jr.
Murray, William B., Jr.
Myers, Denzil E.
Myers, Edward J.
Myers, William A.
Nagel, Harold
Nagle, Millard H., Jr.
Nall, Frank C.
Nance, James W.
Napier, Edward D.
Napier, Jack H.
Nasset, Lawrence O.
Naylor, John F.
Neal, Charles
Neal, Joseph A.
Nearman, Leonard M.
Neasham, Robert S.
Neeb, Lewis H.
Neely, Joseph B.
Neeper, William D.
Neil, Victor J.
Neill, Arthur
Nelsen, Raymond K.
Nelson, Charles F.
Nelson, Donald D.
Nelson, Frederick A.
Nelson, James A.
Nelson, Lionell H.
Nelson, Marvin J.
Nelson, Robert A.
Nelson, Roger D.
Nelson, Roy E.
Nelson, Wayne S.
Nettleton, Clifford I.
Neuneker, Keith E.
Nevins, Clifford R.
Newberry, Denny A.
Newberry, Ralph E.
Newby, Robert G.
Newcity, Harry M.
Newell, David G.
Newell, Floyd A.
Niblock, Alexander
Nichols, John E.
Nichols, LeRoy
Nieman, Ray C.
Niemann, William E.
Niles, Robert A.
Noel, Walley H.
Noonan, Hiram D.
Norconk, John T.
Nordgren, Gustaf O.
Norman, Robert J.
North, John R.
Norton, Hassell L.
Norwood, Alfred F.
Novelli, Raymond A.
Nowell, Vernis L.
Nowels, Robert E.
Nuschke, Paul L.
Nyberg, Gordon C.
Oas, Clifford J.
Obermier, John N.
O'Brien, Eugene A.
O'Brien, John P.
O'Brien, John T.
O'Brien, Robert L.
O'Connor, Harry N.
O'Connor, Paul
Oddone, Raymond
Oder, Lyle D.
Offret, Ellwood H.
Ogier, Herbert L., Jr.
Ognibene, Salvatore
O'Hearn, Charles C.
O'Hopp, Michael
O'Kane, John D.
Okins, Elliott E.
O'Leary, Arthur W.
Oliver, Almon "P"
Oliver, Edmond H.
Oliver, John D.
Olsen, Alfred R., Jr.
Olson, Francis L.
Olson, Gilbert W.
Olson, Joseph C.
Ondrechen, Theodore C.
O'Neil, James F.
O'Neil, Warren H.
O'Neill, Irvin W.
O'Neill, John W.
Onorato, Jordan P.
Orcutt, Robert E.
Ornelas, Victor M.
O'Rourke, Gerald G.
O'Rourke, Vincent P.
Orr, Lowell O.
Orr, Stanley C.
O'Shea, George A., Jr.
Osterholm, Robert E.
Ostermiller, John K.
Ott, Casper D.
Otterlei, William K.
Ottesen, Otto A.
Otti, Charles L.
Otto, Clarence E.
Otto, William F.
Overall, Sidney R., Jr.
Overton, Robert L.
Owens, Elmer L., Jr.
Owens, Gordon S.
Pabarcus, John P.
Packard, Donald E.
Packer, Francis A., Jr.
Padbury, Harry R.
Padgett, John B., Jr.
Padgett, Junius I., Jr.
Padis, Alexander A.
Page, Irving M., Jr.
Page, Myrl G.
Page, William P.
Paine, Charles S.
Palmer, Ben F.
Palmer, Harry H.
Palmer, Ivan L.
Pamp, John D. B.
Parady, James T.
Paris, Warren F.
Parke, Everett A.
Parker, Denison A.
Parker, Edward V., Jr.
Parker, Raymond
Parker, Robert C.
Parks, David P.
Parnell, James M.
Parolini, Gaecoma A. "G"
Parramore, Douglas G.
Parris, Paul O.
Parrish, Elbert W.
Parsley, Clarence L.
Parsons, Earl, Jr.
Pate, Jack A.
Patrick, George L.
Patterson, William B.
Pattillo, William H.
Paulick, James A.
Pavela, Joseph V.
Pawelczyk, Alvin E.
Payne, George E.
Payne, James A.
Peacock, Robert E.
Pearce, John E., Jr.
Pearman, Charles H.
Peck, Scott E., Jr.
Pedigo, Joe
Peed, George P.
Peeples, Eli B.
Peirano, James H.
Pendrey, Warren K.
Pennington, Ross C.
Penola, James L.
Peoples, Robert L.
Perkett, Arthur J., Jr.
Perkins, Billie L.
Perkins, "J" "W", Jr.
Perkins, LeRoy
Perkins, Peter R.
Perkins, Terrance F.
Perry, Eugene R.
Perry, John L.
Perry, Walter I.
Perry, William B.
Person, Irving J.
Peters, Harvey
Peters, John V.
Petersen, Chester L.
Petersen, Forrest S.
Peterson, Gordon I.
Peterson, "J" Donald
Peterson, Ray A.
Petranek, Jerry J.
Petrie, Conner M., Jr.
Petty, Homer P.
Peyton, Henry A. R.
Pfiester, Charles W.
Phalan, James E.
Phalan, Robert A., Jr.
Phelps, William J.
Phillips, Arthur R.
Phillips, Cass E.
Phillips, Donald M.
Phillips, Harold
Phillips, Orville H.
Phillips, Thomas A., Jr.
Pickens, Robert S.
Pierce, Carlton E.
Pierce, Everett E.
Pierce, Harley J.
Pierce, Robert L.
Pierre, Raymond G.
Pierson, William H.
Pitsenberger, Guy L.
Pittman, James P.
Plante, Richard J.
Plizga, Joseph
Ploss, Richard L.
Plowden, James E., Jr.
Pobuda, Louis F.
Poe, Donald T.
Poenicke, Charles F., Jr.
Polansky, Lewis J.
Polk, Thomas H.
Pollacek, Harold J.
Pollock, Lawrence C.
Pollock, Walter F.
Ponsford, James W.
Poole, Stuart G.
Poorman, Herbert "R"
Portenier, Loren R.
Porter, James W., Jr.
Porter, Loran R.
Posey, Eugene V.
Potter, John R.
Pounders, Jerry K.
Pounds, John R.
Powell, Chalmers M.
Powell, Guy E.
Powell, John C.
Powell, Robert F.
Pratt, Arthur P.
Pratt, Harold C.
Praytor, John E.
Preble, Casmer E.
Preston, William R.
Prew, John A.
Price, Harold B.
Price, Howard R.
Price, John
Price, John N.
Price, "L" "F"
Price, Stanley V.
Priest, Charles, Jr.
Prine, Robert L.
Prothro, Randell H.
Prout, Russell K.

Pruden, John B.
Pruett, Henry H.
Pruitt, James P.
Puckett, Ishmael L.
Purcell, Samuel C.
Purkrabek, Paul V.
Quarles, Frank N., Jr.
Quarterman, Carl O.
Queck, Walter P.
Quick, Thomas J.
Quiel, Norwald R.
Quinn, Rayburn M.
Quinn, Thomas D.
Rabe, Raymond A.
Raczkowski, Charles
Radcliffe, Carl E.
Rader, John R.
Raehn, Raymond V.
Railsback, Robert A.
Rairden, Percy W., Jr.
Rambo, Lewis W.
Ramey, Robert W.
Ramsey, Harry E., Jr.
Randall, Craig E.
Randall, Gordon T.
Rappelt, Gilbert W.
Rasche, Bruce C.
Rasmussen, Ralph R.
Rath, George W.
Ravesi, Thomas
Rawlings, Earl F.
Rawlings, Frank T., Jr.
Raymond, John E.
Read, Robert G.
Reardon, William L., Jr.
Red, Arthur G.
Redeye, Fredrick A.
Redman, Clarence R.
Redmond, Richard E.
Reed, Irvin W.
Reed, Robert F.
Reed, Wilbur E.
Reeder, Charles W.
Reeder, William E.
Reedy, Joseph "S"
Reese, Frank G.
Reeve, Robert W.
Reeves, Edward R.
Reid, James A.
Reidel, Charles R.
Reidl, Charles J.
Reifel, Conrad H.
Render, William E.
Rentschler, Alexander K.
Rexroad, Wilford A.
Reynolds, Elsworth C.
Rhea, Robert W.
Rhinesmith, John W.
Rhodes, Adrian B., Jr.
Rhodes, Hamilton E.
Rhodes, Joseph C.
Rhudy, George D.
Rhymes, William S.
Rice, Robert L.
Rich, Robert C.
Richards, Donald R.
Richards, Floyd D.
Richards, Floyd E.
Richardson, Carl C.
Richardson, Galen W.
Richardson, Kenneth
Richardson, Loring R.
Richardson, Neil H.
Richardson, Robert L.
Richey, Chesley W.
Richison, Warren C.
Rickey, Paul E.
Rider, Russell D.
Ridge, Harry R.
Riggan, Thomas H.
Riise, Morris M.
Riley, Edward A.
Riley, Horace, Jr.
Riley, John F.
Riley, LaVaughn C.
Riley, Ralph R.
Rink, Victor B.
Rinker, Russell W.
Riordan, Eben M.
Rippa, Peter
Rippey, William H.
Riser, Roy
Rishel, Maurice O.
Ritchie, David C.
Rizzone, Robert
Robb, Earl J.
Robb, Lewie "A"
Robb, William H.
Robcke, Jack H.
Roberts, Berthel L.
Roberts, Earle E.
Roberts, Harry D.
Roberts, Loren J.
Roberts, Marlin D.
Roberts, Michael D.
Roberts, Owen A.
Roberts, Thomas L.
Robertson, Carleton J.
Robertson, Charles R.
Robertson, Floyd
Robertson, Heber L.
Robinson, Charles D.
Robinson, Earl L.
Robinson, Edgar O.
Robinson, Fred R.
Robinson, James H.
Robuck, John F.
Roche, Joseph H.
Rocker, Frank
Rodgers, Charles E.
Rodgers, George M.
Roe, John C.
Rogers, Benjamin C., Jr.
Rogers, Franklin W.
Rogers, Lloyd E.
Rogers, Lloyd G.
Rogus, Michael F.
Rohde, William E., Jr.
Roll, Walter D.
Rolleri, Joseph
Rominger, James T.
Ronimus, Arthur D., Jr.
Roper, Dewitt A.
Rorman, Harry E.
Rose, Ivan O.
Rosier, Warren "W"
Ross, Edwin R.
Rossiter, Dwight E.
Rotchstein, David S.
Roth, Jerome S.
Roth, Paul
Rothermel, Carroll W.
Rothermel, James L.
Rothlisberger, Marche
Rountree, Jack
Rowett, Ernest J.
Roycraft, Ernest
Royer, Leonard L.
Rozycki, Joseph N.
Rueber, Gerhardt W.
Ruff, Olin R.
Ruffin, Roscoe
Rule, John F.
Rumble, Richard E.
Rundall, Paul S.
Rush, Max R.
Rusk, Stephen L.
Russ, John E., Jr.
Russ, Lester R.
Russell, Holland A.
Russell, James C.
Rustad, Robert T.
Rutledge, Julian L.
Ryce, Clarence O.
Rymal, George R.
Sabol, Edward W.
Sackett, Albert M.
Sadler, William C.
Sager, William H.
Sagor, Wayne E.
Sailors, Benjamin G.
Salisbury, Harley G.
Salistean, John T.
Sally, Aloysius
Samek, Dan W.
Samford, Kenneth L.
Sampson, Russell
Sanders, Emmett O.
Sanderson, Edward
Sanderson, Veriel E.
Sandling, Joseph D.
Sanfilippo, Joseph
Santrock, Joel H.
Sargent, Keith N.
Saroch, Emil, Jr.
Sarris, Frank J.
Satterfield, Charles R.
Satterthwaite, Fred C.
Satterthwaite, Guilford W.
Saunders, David McK.
Saunders, George E.
Saunders, Kirk Y.
Saunders, Stephen I., Jr.
Savage, Homer D.
Savage, Vann E.
Sawick, Theodore
Scarborough, Charles N.
Scariano, Nicholas
Schaedler, George A.
Schaff, Gerald E.
Schappals, Everett A.
Schell, Clarence L.
Schellenberg, Albert
Scherrer, Robert A.
Schexnayder, Robert L.
Schiffbauer, Earl J.
Schlaack, Eugene
Schlecht, Fred J.
Schleis, William J.
Schlembach, John E.
Schlemmer, George S.
Schmeltzer, Louis B.
Schmidt, Lavon C.
Schmitz, Harold A.
Schmuckal, Kurt H.
Schneider, William E.
Schoenfeld, Louis J.
Schold, Stanley C.
Scholz, Walter E.
Schooling, Ralph L.
Schrick, Jerome J.
Schrock, Eugene C.
Schroeder, Edward M.
Schultz, Harry N.
Schulz, Quinley R.
Schwager, Joseph E.
Schwartz, Matthew J.
Schwartz, Walter W., Jr.
Schwem, William A.
Scofield, James N., Jr.
Scott, Benjamin F., Jr.
Scott, Bob, Jr.
Scott, Kenneth W.
Scott, Robert W.
Scott, Stanley W.
Scott, Wesley "B"
Scruggs, Frank R.
Searles, Philip N.
Sears, Alfred R. J., Jr.
Sears, Raymond B.
Seay, Samuel D.
Secovitch, Tony
Seiberlich, Carl J.
Seiwert, Ray W.
Selfridge, Samuel W., Jr.
Sellman, Lloyd E.
Sentar, Edward O.
Serrell, Andrew
Sette, Lyle H.
Settle, Eugene I.
Setzer, Andrew R.
Severns, Earl H.
Severns, Robert L.
Seward, Edmond W.
Seymour, Horatio, Jr.
Shafer, Elroy J.
Shaffer, Glenn M.
Shalag, William C.
Shamburg, John N.
Shanley, Edward J.
Shannon, Milner N.
Shannon, Robert
Sharp, Ralph H.
Shaw, Vernon R., Jr.
Shaw, William H.
Shea, John
Shearn, Albert J.
Shelton, Doniphan B.
Shelton, Robert A.
Shepard, Alan B., Jr.
Shepard, James D.
Shepard, William B., Jr.
Sherard, Lloyd L.
Sherfy, Ronald
Sheridan, Lawrence W.
Sheridan, William J.
Sherley, Grady W.
Sherman, Robert O.
Sherman, Robert S.
Sherry, Louis L.
Sherwood, Charles
Shiers, Richard G.
Shinn, Conrad S.
Shipes, William T.
Shipley, Harold L., Jr.
Shirah, Angus M., Jr.
Shiveley, John P.
Short, Alvin L.
Short, Vaun G.
Showen, Anderson V.
Shurtleff, Kenneth L.
Shurtz, Roger F.
Sibert, Victor J.
Siddall, Frank S.
Sieckenius, John H.
Sigrist, Carl F.
Silliman, Henderson G.
Simcox, William A.
Simmons, Charles B.
Simmons, Robert L.
Simpson, James M.
Simpson, William H., Jr.
Sims, Ralph E.
Sims, Wilbur N.
Sistrunk, Vernon J.
Skees, Michael
Slaff, Allan P.
Slattery, Thomas G.
Slayton, Tison E.
Slifer, Allen W.
Sliger, Denver G.
Smallwood, Deward
Smies, John J.
Smith, Andrew R.
Smith, Barclay W.
Smith, Bruce B.
Smith, Carl E.
Smith, Donald R.
Smith, Edwin P.
Smith, Elvin M.
Smith, Ernest E.
Smith, Ernest O.
Smith, Henry G.
Smith, Hiram E., Jr.
Smith, Hubert W.
Smith, John J.
Smith, Lawrence N.
Smith, Lawrence R.
Smith, Lewis O.
Smith, Maurice R.
Smith, Newel W., Jr.
Smith, Paul A.
Smith, Ralph T.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smith, Richard E.
Smith, Robert B.
Smith, Robert M.
Smith, Russell L.
Smith, Stanley E.
Smith, Walter R.
Smithey, Thurman E.
Smyth, Robert P.
Snicer, Edward
Snowden, Harold F.
Snyder, Joseph E., Jr.
Snyder, Joseph M., Jr.
Snyder, Willis G.
Socha, Edward J.
Soderlund, Charles A., Jr.
Soholt, Arthur L.
Somervell, Willis L., Jr.
Sommers, Harold E.
Soncrant, Richard L.
Sones, Harold O.
Sonner, Harry M.
Sowar, Joseph F.
Spadone, Leighton
Sparks, Samuel A.
Sparks, Warren G.
Spearman, Roscoe P.
Speciale, Joachim F.
Spencer, Erwin J.
Spencer, Frank O.
Spencer, Paul
Sperberg, Franklynn R.
Spiel, Paul L.
Spiess, Morris K.
Spindler, Richard H.
Stadler, Paul C.
Stafford, Edgar
Staiger, Hugh K.
Stallings, Wilbur L.
Stalnaker, Will L.
Stanfill, Joseph F., Jr.
Stankiewicz, Joseph F.
Stansell, Herman, J., Jr.
Stanton, Robert F.
Stanton, William E.
Staser, Beverly de P.
Statchen, Henry J.
Steele, Arthur W.
Steele, George P., 2d
Steele, Robert D.
Steele, Robert H.
Steele, Roy M.
Steere, Lucius E., 3d
Steffen, Edward J.
Stegall, Robert L.
Steinbeck, Albert A.
Stell, Ralph W., Jr.
Stempski, Henry J.
Stephens, Leonard D.
Stephens, Theodore B.
Stephenson, Cameron N.
Stephenson, Clarence B.
Stephenson, Henry E.
Steuteville, William V.
Stevens, John A.
Stevens, Russell N.
Stevenson, James E.
Stevenson, John R.
Stevenson, Robert J., Jr.
Stewart, Clifford L.
Stewart, Ellis E.
Stewart, Ernest L.
Stewart, Harold E.
Stewart, John S.
Stewart, Marlar E.
Stewart, William S., 3d
Stickles, Robert B.
Stine, Howard H.
Stith, Morris E.
Stitt, Mason L.
Stjerne, Paul
St. John, Raymond
Stoddard, Gerald W.
Stoll, Ralph F.
Stone, Donald D.
Stone, James F.
Stone, William A.
Story, Lester T.
Stoufer, Frank M., Jr.
Stout, Clarence N.
Stout, Graydon T.
Strahl, Robert E.
Strickland, Jack P.
Striplin, William E.
Strong, William W.
Stroupe, Joseph R.
Stuart, Harold H.
Stubblefield, George W., Jr.
Stull, John O.
Sturgeon, James L.
Sturgis, James W.
Sulewski, Frank
Sulick, Tom E.
Sullenger, Charles R.
Sullivan, Harold H.
Sullivan, James T.
Sullivan, Joseph E.
Sullivan, Joseph W.
Sullivan, Patrick L.
Sullivan, Robert C.
Sundberg, Harry J.
Sutherland, Will R.
Sutton, Fred V.
Sutton, LuReign
Swainson, Gustave F., Jr.
Swallow, Chandler E., Jr.
Swank, John A.
Swanson, Donald A.
Swanson, Donald "E"
Swarts, Richard A.
Swedlund, Floyd W.
Sweeny, John W.
Swensen, Robert A.
Swigart, Robert E.
Swinburne, Harry W., Jr.
Swint, George, III
Swirsky, Arthur T., Jr.
Sykes, James E.
Sylvester, Clyde W.
Szikney, Alphonse J.
Tait, George L.
Takitch, Edward J.
Tall, Harold R.
Tamassia, Edward P.
Tanner, Carl B., Jr.
Tanner, James E.
Tarleton, George L.
Tarnowski, Zemo C.
Tartre, Robert J.
Tarver, James E.
Tarver, "L" "C"
Taskey, Stanley R.
Tate, Claude D.
Tate, Hugh J.
Tate, Neal M., Jr.
Taylor, Arnett B.
Taylor, Clarence P.
Taylor, Donald W.
Taylor, Edward A.
Taylor, Grover W.
Taylor, Harold A.
Taylor, James B.
Taylor, James E.
Taylor, Robert P.
Taylor, Robert W.
Taylor, Thaddeus M.
Taylor, Warren
Teal, Thomas W.
Teevan, Charles L.
Temple, Walter N.
Ten Brink, James W.
Tennant, John A.
Tenold, Gene C.
Terrio, James V.
Terwilliger, Samuel S., Jr.
Tharp, Ted R.
Thede, William L.
Theiss, Charles L.
Theiss, Conrad C.
Thibodeau, Howard A.
Thomas, Arthur R. W.
Thomas, Harold B.
Thomas, Homer B., Jr.
Thomas, John B., Jr.
Thomas, Patrick T.
Thomas, Robert W.
Thompson, Guy E.
Thompson, James C.
Thompson, Jerrold W.
Thompson, Lee R.
Thompson, Leslie
Thompson, Marcum C.
Thompson, Mason E.
Thompson, Ogden L.

Thompson, Vernon
Thompson, Wendell D.
Thomson, Boyd
Thornton, Albert H.
Thornton, George C.
Thuftedal, Raymond O.
Tidwell, Joseph P.
Tiernan, Charles E.
Tierney, John F., Jr.
Tilley, George K.
Tilley, Joel E., Jr.
Tillman, James L.
Timm, Richard C.
Tinsley, Dennis P.
Tipler, William J.
Tobin, Richard G.
Tobin, William F., Jr.
Toczko, Edward A.
Tomkins, Lewis A.
Tomlin, Merle E.
Tomlinson, Clifford S.
Tomlinson, Leslie L.
Tomlinson, Orville L.
Tomkins, "J" "L"
Toon, Owen R.
Toponce, Harvey E.
Torlay, Dwight L.
Tougas, Eugene J.
Towne, Thomas W.
Townsend, Gordon E.
Tracey, Don M.
Tracy, Frank L.
Tracy, Gilbert L.
Tracy, Lloyd W.
Trautman, Wilbur C., Jr.
Travers, Martin J.
Traynor, William J.
Trefero, Francis J.
Tremaine, Mark G.
Trettin, Harold D.
Triplett, Laverne C.
Tripp, Albert E.
Troike, John R.
Troup, Howard H.
Trube, Alfred G., Jr.
Truesdale, Ross R.
Trumbo, Roger D.
Tschirgi, Raymond H.
Tuenge, Otto A., Jr.
Tuggle, Francis J.
Turansky, Louis
Turja, Richard H.
Turner, Charles A.
Turner, Frederick C.
Turner, Robert C.
Turner, Roger M.
Turner, William W.
Turney, Robert F.
Tuttle, James F.
Tuttle, John S.
Tweddell, Jack L.
Twibell, Murrell D.
Twiss, Ernest B.
Tyler, Ellery E.
Tyler, Robert E.
Udick, Mitchell L.
Ullrich, Howard C.
Ulrich, Clarence E.
Underwood, John H., Jr.
Underwood, Richard L.
Underwood, Robert J.
Unger, John E., Jr.
Urech, Jake
Urquhart, John
Ursettie, Howard J.
Utegaard, Thomas F.
Vales, Robert F.
Valletta, John
VanAcker, Albert
VanBrunt, Charles J.
Vance, Dale W.
Vanek, Arthur J.
VanGorder, Keith R.
VanHorn, Edward
VanOrden, Merton D.
VanOss, Willis B.
VanPelt, Wallace V.
VanRooy, Lester A.
Varnado, Earl D.
Vaughan, Elwood
Vaughan, Vie J.
Vegelahn, Norbert P.
Vehorn, Charles M.
Verdon, Patrick A. C.
Viccellio, Lansing A.
Vint, Vincent C.
Violette, Clinton J.
Vissering, Victor M., Jr.
Vittek, Albert W.
Vlach, Vincent J., Jr.
Vollenweider, Robert W.
Vollmer, Wayne F.
VonAchen, Stanley P.
VonAspern, Taylor
VonEgger, Harold K.
Vroman, John W.
Wacker, William J.
Wade, Kenneth W.
Wadleigh, Fred L.
Wadleigh, George C.
Wagner, Adrian D.
Wagner, James H.
Wagner, Theodore A., Jr.
Walbridge, Clarke B.
Walden, John S.
Waldron, Harvey M., Jr.
Walker, Jack A.
Walker, John F.
Walker, John R. D.
Walker, John S.
Walker, Ralph L.
Wallace, Howard K.
Wallace, Luther B.
Wallen, Clay D.
Walsh, William J.
Walstrom, Clifford C.
Walters, Joseph F.
Ward, Dale E.
Ward, Lyttleton T.
Ward, Marshall D.
Ward, Thadeus F.
Ware, William J.
Warlick, Wilbur W.
Warneke, Lawrence E.
Warner, Robert L.
Warner, Vernon L.
Warren, Parker V.
Warren, Richard L.
Warren, Robert H.
Warrick, Frank W.
Washburn, Orval J.
Waters, Robert M.
Watkins, James C.
Watson, Charles R.
Watson, David B.
Watson, Fred C.
Watson, Robert H., Jr.
Watson, Tom
Watts, Joe "W"
Weaver, Curtis A.
Weaver, Marvin V.
Webb, Arthur J.
Webb, Howard "T", Jr.
Webb, Max R.
Webb, William L.
Weber, Harry E.
Webster, George H.
Wehr, Richard M.
Weidemeyer, Dick
Weidner, Jack W.
Weinbeck, Eugene J.
Weininger, John A.
Weinman, Robert W.
Weir, Saxton A., Jr.
Weisse, Carl
Weland, Gerald G.
Welch, Leonard D.
Wellons, William I., Jr.
Wells, Daniel C.
Welsh, John D.
Wenger, James E.
West, Donald L.
Wester, John F.
Westmoreland, William J.
Whalin, Raymond C.
Wheeler, Robert I.
Whisler, William G.
White, Covert P.
White, Edward
White, Edward C.
White, Gordon C.
White, Jack E.
White, John N.
White, Lloyd R.
White, Robert E.
Whiteman, Stephen J.
Whitlock, Thomas A.
Whittaker Homer C.
Widdicombe, Richard W.
Wiedinger, George W.
Wieland, Dicky
Wiesendanger, Carl F.
Wiggins, James R.
Wigner, Frank A.
Wilberding, Joseph H.
Wilder, George, Jr.
Wilder, Lawrence A.
Wilder, Tracy H., Jr.
Wiley, Howard F.
Wilhide, Charles R.
Wilkerson, James L.
Wilkes, Johnnie J.
Wilkes, Jules M.
Wilkinson, William L.
Willerton, Vincent L.
Williams, Finley C.
Williams, Gordon W.
Williams, Harlan D.
Williams, Harold W.
Williams, Hatcher W., Jr.
Williams, Henry J.
Williams, Joe, Jr.
Williams, Malcolm W.
Williams, Martin T., Jr.
Williams, Milo M.
Williams, Paul H.
Williams, Reginald M., Jr.
Williams, Robert E.
Williams, Roger L.
Williams, Wesley R.
Williams, Wilmot L.
Williamson, Harold F.
Williamson, Perl B.
Williamson, Richard E.
Willingham, Oscar R.
Willis, Henry C.
Willyard, Harold A.
Wilroy, William T.
Wilschke, John C.
Wilshin, Daniel G., Jr.
Wilson, Dick G.
Wilson, Embree D., Jr.
Wilson, Ernest E.
Wilson, Frederick G.
Wilson, Gerald W.
Wilson, Irving G.
Wilson, Jenning B., Jr.
Wilson, Louis A.
Wilson, Milton L.
Wilson, Robert E.
Wilson, Ronald O.
Wilson, Vernon
Wilson, Victor B.
Wilson, Walter O.
Wilson, William R.
Windle, Henry F.
Windsor, Clayton C.
Winfield, Robert E.
Winfree, Boyd E.
Winkler, James W.
Winslow, Devon F.
Winslow, George H.
Wirth, James H.
Wise, John P.
Wiseman, Eugene R.
Wittman, Charles H., Jr.
Wojcicki, Matthew J.
Wolf, Jerome L., Jr.
Wolford, Stanley E.
Wommer, Donald E.
Wood, Clifford A.
Wood, Ellis L.
Wood, Herman N.
Wood, Robert C.
Woodburn, Fred K.
Wooden, William W.
Woods, Vernon A.
Woodward, LaMar L.
Woolard, Stephen R.
Woolley, Jackson E.
Wooster, Robert B.
Working, John D.
Worley, Carson R.
Wortley, Edmund L.
Woryk, John J.
Wouters, John C.
Wray, Dudley C.
Wrigglesworth, Walter, Jr.
Wright, Albert G., 3d
Wright, Clyde A.
Wright, Francis J.
Wright, James R.
Writt, William W.
Yager, Marshall L.
Yarbrough, Charles F.
Yates, Paul F.
Yeagle, Carl H.
Yenter, Norman E.
Yockers, Donald C.
Yonts, Edward M., Jr.
York, Daniel A.
York, Joe "T"
Yost, John E.
Young, Charles E., Jr.
Young, Earle B.
Young, Elza H.
Young, Frederick J.
Young, George L.
Young, Thomas C.
Young, William A.
Zabler, Wallace E.
Zangel, Howard C.
Zavodny, Roland J.
Zech, Lando W., Jr.
Zeigler, William T.
Zeitvogel, James R.
Zemke, Otto B.
Zenisek, Edward F.
Zentz, Bernard L.
Ziebell, Donald H.
Zimmerman, Ernest L.
Zink, Maurice W.
Zorzanello, Baselio G.

MEDICAL CORPS

Arentzen, Willard P.
Baisch, Bruce F.
Baker, Howard A.
Becker, Frederick B.
Bowman, Murdock S.
Brown, Carleton J.
Brown, Loy T.
Burdick, Robert L.
Carmichael, David B., Jr.
Cole, James M.
Connor, Richard P.
Country, John C.
Davis, Harold A.
Deas, Thomas C.
Diklish, Milan, Jr.
Dimmette, Robert M.
Dineen, James R.
Dixon, David C.
Dobbins, Richard F.
Dunn, Adolphus W.
Esswein, John G.
Featherston, John S.
Foulk, Richard
Fowler, Nathaniel E.
Fuller, Frank D.
Fultz, Robert E.
Geib, Philip O.
Giknis, Francis L.
Greaney, Martin O., Jr.
Greer, James W.
Hamilton, James R.
Hammon, Frank P.
Hansen, Walter F.
Harris, James H.
Hill, Mack M., Jr.
Holmes, Alden V.
Holmes, James H.
Holmes, Roy W.
Hood, Raleigh M.
Hoopingarner, Newman A.
Horr, Edward A.
Houghton, Charles C., Jr.
Howard, John W.
Jones, Jack T., Jr.
King, Robert L., Jr.
Krasno, Louis R.
Krech, William G.
Kustermann, Stuart D.
Lear, Charles L.
Lebherz, Thomas B.
Lee, Richard H.
Lemmon, Robert H.
Lewis, Charles W., Jr.
Lewis, Garner L.
Lewis, Thomas H.
Lieurance, Richard E.
Lineberry, William T., Jr.
Lloyd, Donald E.
Loeffler, Robert A.
Luehrs, Richard E.
Mangin, Charles E.
Marra, John J.
Martin, Edward, Jr.
Martin, Richard J.
McCarthy, Robert J.
Mead, Charles A., Jr.
Meyer, Frederick W., Jr.
Molnar, Charles J., Jr.
Morrell, James F.
Moschella, Samuel L.
Muehe, Charles C.
Nauman, Richard D.
O'Brien, Robert W.
Park, William F.
Parker, Edward E.
Pennypacker, Paul H.
Peterson, James C.
Poynter, James M.
Rogers, Charles E.
Rowand, Robert E.
Rulon, David B.
Samuelson, Myron E.
Schmoyer, Maurice R., Jr.
Schneider, Peter W.
Schwenker, Harry F., Jr.
Sederstrom, Leslie W.
Semmens, James P.
Sharp, Robert W., Jr.
Sharp, William C., Jr.
Sherer, Bernard D.
Shook, Daniel M.
Smith, Edward M., Jr.
Spicher, Robert W.
Steele, Marshall K., Jr.
Stonestreet, Marshall P.
Strunk, William M.
Sweet, Rex E.
Taber, Thomas H., Jr.
Taylor, George J., 3d
Thorn, James I.
Tomlin, Edwin M.
Tratar, Anton A., Jr.
Tyler, Lockland V., Jr.
Valusek, Fred A.
Van Petten, George T.
Wallner, Ernest F., Jr.
Walter, Herbert L.
Watson, Alan D.
Watters, Lorrain E., Jr.
Welborn, John P., Jr.
Whiteside, James E.
Wiegand, Frederick G. F.
Williams, Robert G. W., Jr.
Wilson, Theodore H., Jr.
Withers, Sydnor T.
Wright, Wayne L., Jr.
Zarriello, Jerry J.
Zorn, George G., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adams, John L.
Adams, Robert N.
Adamson, William M.
Aicken, John E.
Aitken, Douglas G.
Alexander, Charles C.
Allison, Sidney C.
Amundsen, Melvin S.
Anderson, Paul L.
Appleby, Dan P.
Ard, James H.
Armlin, James F.
Aull, Herbert H.
Bahl, Donald W.
Baisden, Russell H.
Baker, Conway C.
Baldwin, Frank E.
Barger, Conrad A.
Barrett, Henry T.
Barton, Alton W.
Bates, Raymond H.
Baumann, Cornelius
Baumgartner, Donald F.
Bayer, John F.
Beausoleil, Arthur N.
Beilock, Philip
Bell, Adrian D.
Bell, George E.
Bennett, Keith
Bentley, Paul N.
Bergen, Richard
Berkshire, William S., Jr.
Bevans, Thomas W.
Bevill, Andrew F.
Blandin, Sherman W., Jr.
Bond, Harold A.
Bordwell, James D.
Bouchard, Roland H.
Bramhall, Edwin E.
Breault, Roland W.
Bridges, Richard K. M., Jr.
Brown, George E.
Brown, Richard C.
Brown, Roger W.
Brown, Thomas M.
Brown, Zack F., Jr.
Browne, Peniston E.
Bryson, William L.
Burk, John
Buzzele, Stanley A.
Caraveau, Loren E.
Carpenter, William O.
Casey, John J.
Cassin, Thomas A.
Chamberlain, Whitney A.
Chamberlin, Lewis C.
Christensen, Gordon P.
Clark, Edward H.

Clark, Franklyn L.
Clement, Earl G.
Clift, John W.
Coffey, Eldon O.
Cohn, Murry
Collier, William W.
Comstock, Foster F.
Conry, William H.
Cooil, Robert W.
Cooksey, Francis S.
Creel, Clarence A.
Crosby, Philip
Dale, Oscar M.
Daley, Edward J.
Daniel, Charles, Jr.
Daniels, Reginald E.
Danko, John J.
Darrow, Robert W. H.
Davis, Richard M.
Denne, Clemens J.
DeYoung, Warren R.
Dinkel, Julius C.
Dobbs, Lewis
Dowell, Lawrence L.
Duke, Edwin L.
Dunlap, Glen L.
Dunn, John M.
Eldridge, Paul W.
Emmett, Thomas J., Jr.
Endorp, Rae D.
Ewing, Ray S.
Farley, William B.
Fink, William W., Jr.
Fitch, Paul B.
Fitchett, George L.
Foil, John L.
Fossum, Earl G.
Foster, William L.
Foulkes, William O.
Fox, Roy W.
Galliher, Homer G.
Gardner, Charles A., Jr.
Gascoigne, Richard F.
Geneste, Elmon A., Jr.
Gertiser, Paul
Girard, Leo P.
Goolsby, Loyd
Gottschall, Levi T.
Grad, Charles F.
Graham, Rupert E.
Green, Gerald W.
Grego, Anthony
Groover, Gordon L., Jr.
Grover, Albert E.
Gwynne, Harold C., Jr.
Hackmeyer, Herbert J.
Haddock, William N.
Halley, Harry J.
Harvey, Milton W.
Hawkins, Noble "T"
Hebert, Paul W.
Henderson, Wayne S.
Henderson, Robyn H.
Henn, Carl L., Jr.
Herb, James W.
Higgins, Vincent H.
Hightower, James I., Jr.
Hilderbrant, Earl F.
Hoffman, George P.
Holmes, John W.
Hopkins, Warren G.
Hubert, Ross P.
Jenne, Frank L.
Johannesen, William A.
Johnson, Carl M.
Johnson, George A.
Johnson, Herbert L.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Orville A.
Johnson, Robert C.
Johnson, William H.
Jones, Russell A.
Keever, Karl N.
Kelleher, John C.
Killion, Clyde D.
Knight, Ernest C.
Knudsen, Louie B., Jr.
Koontz, Richard R.
Kridle, Charles E.
Kroger, Raymond M.
Kronberger, Richard J.
Kurek, Edward L.
Lachmann, Alfred G.
Lamborne, David G.
Lane, Luther R.
Laney, James E.
Langley, William S.
Larson, Jay E.
Lazcano, Arthur W.
Leach, John C.
Lipscomb, John W., Jr.
Little, William D.
Lobaugh, Leslie E.
Long, John J.
Longnecker, Kenneth W.
Lott, George
Lyons, Robert C.
Mackey, Matthew, Jr.
Madden, Howard L.
Madden, Robert H.
Marrin, Alfred V. B.
Mason, Charles M.
Mathews, Adolph
Matthews, Charles A., Jr.
Mattila, Martti O.
Maugans, Frank O.
Maxwell, Lester G.
McClaren, Wesley J.
McCord, Eyrie L.
McCormick, Robert J.
McCrory, Wendell
McCulloh, Merlin L.
McDaniel, Roy M.
McDermott, Thomas J.
McDonough, Edward M.
McGlothlin, Houston W.
McLeod, Gerry N.
McManus, Hugh A.
McNutt, Richard L.
McPike, Howard D.
Meihls, Archie B., Jr.
Merritt, Tadeus T.
Miller, Dewayne C.
Miller, Edward C.
Milliren, Howard C.
Mills, Herbert F., Jr.
Moloney, Albert H.
Moore, Jack J.
Moseley, Francis W.
Murray, Eugene I.
Nash, Finley A., Jr.
Needham, Donald A.
Nelson, Merlyn A.
Neufeldt, Roy E.
Novak, William A.
Nuck, John H.
O'Connor, James V.
O'Keefe, Paul "D"
Ooyman, John G., 3d
Owen, George L.
Paolantonio, John F.
Patton, Gerald J.
Pearce, Frank L., Jr.
Pilkinton, Robert H.
Porter, Robert C.
Post, James W.
Poulson, William M.
Prosch, Edmund J.
Purkaple, Lawrence O.
Purviance, Raymond E., Jr.
Pyle, John C.
Rampey, Alvin H.
Ramsey, Charles P.
Rawls, Elbert S., Jr.
Rezner, Howard L.
Rivers, Vernon G.
Robinson, William J.
Robison, John T.
Romans, Ralph V.
Ruete, Edward S.
Scaturro, Albert V.
Schauffler, Robert A.
Schneider, Willard N.
Schoggen, Joe G.
Schuman, Leonard A.
Shumaker, Paul C.
Siembt, LaVerne L.
Sigman, William E.
Simmer, Max M.
Simpson, James F.
Simpson, Samuel R., Jr.
Skapin, Jack J.
Smith, Bert E.
Smith, James A.
Smith, John McC.
Snapp, Joseph J.
Sparks, Wainard H.
Spillman, Frank L., Jr.
Standish, John C.
Statia, William W., Jr.
Stearns, Lyle A.
Stephens, William E.
Stevens, Hubert W.
Stevenson, Thomas E.
Stringer, Carl J., Jr.
Stumm, Donald D.
Szyperski, John P.
Tabor, Fordham D.
Thomas, Martin K.
Thomas, Toxie A.
Tidmore, Monte F.
Tillman, James O.
Treece, George H., Jr.
Tremblay, Philip A.
Tucker, Eugene L.
Unger, Earl A.
Urquhart, Lennus "B"
Uskievich, Byron
Utterback, Carl W.
VanRiper, Donald G.
Vasey, Charles A.
Ward, David E.
Ward, Jessie J.
Ward, Nephi J.
Webster, Robert B.
Wells, Robert A.
West, William M.
Wheless, William A.
Whitchurch, Frank H.
Whiteside, Charles E.
Whitney, William R.
Whitver, John A.
Wilcox, George K.
Wilcox, Joe J.
Wilcox, Marion E.
Wiley, Everett B.
Williams, Harold J.
Wilson, Bentley L.
Wilson, Robert W.
Wilson, Wilbur A. G.
Wohlschlaeger, John J.
Wood, Clarence S.
Woodfin, Kenneth L.
Woodhead, Paul W.
Wright, William H.
Wright, William D.
Yarborough, William H.
Zych, Felix S.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Brewerton, Peter H.
Carpenter, Malcolm A.
Cummings, Harold H.
Cusack, Joseph P.
Danielsen, John M.
Day, Edgar A.
Dominy, Arthur L.
Doyle, William F.
Elwood, Carl
Emerson, James E.
Fenning, Robert C.
Grygiel, Andrew J.
Harrison, Robert M.
Hawkins, Elmo M. T.
Heyl, Richard P.
Kennedy, Deane W.
Lang, Robert F.
Martin, George L.
McDonnell, Bernard J.
Metzger, Ernest W.
Oglesby, Glynn A.
Palmer, Wendell S.
Sobel, Samuel
Swanson, Eugene S.
Tennant, William G.
Uber, Thomas B., II
Weber, Oscar
Weidler, Edwin R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, William C., Jr.
Bannister, John M., Jr.
Bednarck, Stephen J.
Besmen, Henry C.
Bowman, Harlan L.
Conners, Francis F.
Daniels, John M.
Dennis, Johnnie C.
Dibble, Benjamin T.
Diberto, Edward T.
Ellis, William A., Jr.
Gibbons, Earl F.
Graff, Charles W.
Grahl, Ralph B., Jr.
Grauten, Henry S.
Hill, Roland D.
Jarvis, Robert B.
Jones, Richard O.
Krickenberger, Custer F., Jr.
Lalor, Foster M., Jr.
Liberman, Leo
Manning, John J., Jr.
Marschall, Albert R.
Marshall, Robert W.
Phillips, Cushing, Jr.
Pyles, LaVern, Jr.
Quinlan, O'Neill P.
Reese, William R., Jr.
Roloff, Jerome W.
Rowson, Russell J.
Shepard, George R.
Stephens, Henry E.
Stephenson, William B.
Waters, Allen S.
White, Ervin E.
Williams, John P.
Wilson, Joe R.
Wynne, Sidney J., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Anderson, Robert A.
Bernhausen, Elwood R.
Bishop, Ralph M.
Braxmeier, Luke J.
Brown, James J., Jr.
Bucher, John F.
Caldwell, Warren C., Jr.
Carmen, Marvin
Castner, David V., Jr.
Chudzinski, Joseph G.
Conglis, Peter C.
Elder, Stewart T.
Enke, Loren F.
Gunther, Lewis L.
Hancock, Joseph G.
Hutton, Edward G.
Kaller, Charles E.
Lyon, Harvey W.
Manhold, John H., Jr.
Mayo, Thomas H.
McGee, Glen H.
McNett, Roy C.
Mitchell, James A.
Mueller, Ray B.
Mumme, Henry T., Jr.
Nelson, Wayne A.
Newman, Dwight W.
Pape, Thomas J.
Ralls, Walter E.
Ruff, Henry J.
Scofield, Henry H., Jr.
Scott, Marvin H.
Sedlacek, James W.
Sheppard, John R.
Sochowski, Richart T.
Steinauer, Jerome J.
Suehs, Leon G.
Thimes, Carl B.
Valentin, Enrique, Jr.
Wilhelm, Carl L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Andersen, Albert L.
Balog, John X.
Bergstrom, Hugo B.
Brooks, Carter G.
Brown, Jess C.
Calhoun, Carl P.
Chilcutt, Booth
Curtis, Charles E.
Curtis, Ned B.
Dominguez, Edward
Donovan, Harold G.
Dutcher, Clinton H.
Dyer, Thomas J. A.
Edington, Benjimen F., Jr.
Flynn, Francis H.
Fowler, Thoms G.
Gallagher, Matthew F.
Gooden, Donald R.
Griffith, Philip M.
Grover, Ernest N.
Guilbault, Elie A.
Hewitt, Wayne B.
Horne, Daniel F.
Hudgens, Archie R.
Hull, William B.
Johnson, Arthur E.
Kadow, Eugene V.
Kelly, William E.
Kinder, James W.
Kirkland, Lorne P.
Lee, Charlie W.
Lee, George S.
Marcus, Samuel C.
Meek, Charles B.
Mibeck, Albert E.
Morgan, Guy H.
Nance, Russell S.
Patterson, Clair L.
Pflagg, Solomon C.
Rice, Charlie A., Jr.
Richard, Guy A.
Richardson, Richard C.
Rigg, Robert F.
Sarsfield, John J.
Shirley, Jack M.
Spotts, George W.
Stuckey, Ross M.
Thompson, James E.
Thompson, Lester K.
Van Landingham, Emmett L., Jr.
Wannemacher, Charles R.
Weinstein, Sidney
Whalen, William F. C.
Worthen, Chester D.
Zumbrun, Sylvester H. N.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

LINE

Abbott, Dean D.
Abell, William J.
Adams, Ralph J.
Adamson, Douglas C.
Adkins, Frank G.
Albrecht, Keith F.
Alkire, Jay
Allan, Robert A.
Alsop, Lawrence V.
Altmann, Richard G.
Amerau, Harold F.
Amirault, Robert C.
Anchors, Francis
Anderson, Earl W.
Anderson, William R.
Andreen, Robert F.
Andrews, Ellis D.
Andrews, Joseph E.
Aney, John L.
Ard, Shelby W.
Armstrong, William L., Jr.
Arthur, John K.
Ashford, Robert L.
Atherton, Charles
Babbish, Chester J.
Bailey, George D.
Ball, Eddie H.
Barbero, Eugene M.
Barefoot, Marvin B.
Barfield, Charlie H.
Barrow, Lonnie M.
Barteluce, John J.
Barth, David B.
Bartol, Robert G.
Basquin, Edmond A.
Bates, Robert M.
Bauer, Carl E.
Baulos, Clyde W.
Baylor, Warner L.
Beatty, Kenneth R.
Becker, Harold J. R.
Beigh, Clyde H.
Bell, Edward N.
Bell, Omer C.
Bement, Herman H.
Bender, George B.
Bennett, Hershal E.
Berend, John J.
Berg, George E.
Bernlehr, Robert L. H.
Berrian, George W.
Berry, Louis "S"
Bibby, "J" "T"
Bierman, Harvey E.
Birchall, James E.
Bird, George B., Jr.
Black, Benjamin F.
Black, James M.
Black, Raymond J.
Blackwell, Enoch D.
Blackwood, Martin S.
Blair, George W.
Blank, William
Boettcher, Arland R.
Bogosian, Armand E.
Bolar, Lloyd L.
Bonvillian, John G.
Bott, Alan R.
Bouldry, John M.
Boulware, James R.
Boyd, James W.
Boyle, Edward G., Jr.
Boyle, Francis R. L.
Bradshaw, John P.
Brady, Julian H.
Brannen, Rupert G., Jr.
Brennan, Donald R.
Brewer, William E., Jr.
Bridges, Richard C.
Broha, Leo M.
Broman, Clifford G.
Brooks, Wilbur R.
Brown, Alan F.
Brown, Emmet
Brown, Eugene R.
Brown, Foster K.
Brown, Frederick M., Jr.
Brown, Loren L.
Bruce, John C.
Brus, Henry H., Jr.
Bryan, Richard E.
Buettner, Victor T.
Burdett, Fletcher H., Jr.
Burkett, Raymond M.
Burley, Ernest J.
Burnett, Ralph W.
Burns, Donald F.
Burttschell, Simon J., Jr.
Bush, John M.
Bush, Ward A.
Byers, Keith R.
Byrd, Harold E.
Calhoun, Truman D.

Callen, William T.
Carew, Robert C.
Carey, Charles J., Jr.
Carlson, Jack W.
Carlson, Richard G.
Carter, Leland B.
Casucci, Americo J.
Chambliss, William M., Jr.
Chandler, William
Chapin, Frederi P., Jr.
Chapman, Edward D.
Chapman, James F.
Chappell, Glen M.
Chase, Howard T.
Childers, John B., Jr.
Christensen, William A.
Cislo, Louis
Clark, Allen L.
Clark, Austin W., Jr.
Clark, Robert A.
Clark, Robert P.
Clark, Thomas M.
Clarke, William "R"
Clayton, Irving B., Jr.
Clayton, Oramel
Cobb, Ted W.
Coffey, Roland W.
Cole, Robert A.
Cole, Russell W.
Colebank, Forrest R.
Coleman, Kenneth D.
Collins, Robert E.
Collins, Wayne
Conaway, Robert E.
Conklin, Wayne A.
Connell, William L.
Conrad, Wilbur E.
Conroy, Thomas J.
Cook, Lawrence "E"
Cooke, Robert S.
Cope, Samuel D. B.
Cornwell, Hubert R.
Costanza, Charles
Cousins, Frederick H.
Cramer, Robert J.
Crawford, John K.
Crider, Kenneth M.
Crist, David H.
Crites, Simon, Jr.
Croft, William E., Jr.
Crouch, Richard G.
Crow, Paul B.
Crumbo, Hal
Culbertson, James F.
Currier, Joseph J.
Cush, James A.
Cusick, James A.
Dagley, John C.
Dahlby, Philip C.
Dahms, Kenneth J.
Dailey, William J.
Danz, Edward R.
Daschbach, John C.
Davi, Harold L.
Davies, Robert
Davis, James B.
Davis, Raborn L.
Davis, Tom M.
Davison, William T.
Deely, Thomas M.
DeHart, Turner
Dembkowski, Alexander E.
Denby, George W.
Devers, Donald S.
Diaz, Richard J.
Dickman, Robert H.
Dillon, Billy H.
Dixon, Boyd R.
Doden, Louis J.
Dodgen, Florence D.
Dohrer, Stanley W.
Donahue, Dennis F.
Dordahl, Joseph P.
Doss, Wallace M., Jr.
Dowdey, George "L", Jr.
Drake, George L.
Dreis, Thomas G.
Drexel, John B.
Dritz, William A.
Duke, Billy S.
Dunroe, John H.
Dunstane, Arthur D.
Durrett, Charles E.
Dwyer, Francis P.
Dyer, Donald P.
Easterling, Albert E., Jr.
Eaton, Ralph H.
Echard, Charles H.
Eckert, James O.
Eden, Herbert W.
Edwards, Thomas H.
Eldersveld, Alvin M.
Elliott, Edward C.
Elliott, George B., Jr.
Erb, William H., Jr.
Ernst, Andrew "M"
Evans, Freddie L.
Evans, William H.
Eve, Lincoln
Ewers, William E.
Faulconer, Hillery L.
Felden, Marvin O.
Felton, Henry D.
Fender, Gordon
Ferguson, James R., Jr.
Field, Wallace R.
Fix, Jack W.
Fletcher, Gordon G.
Flohra, Howard L.
Floriani, Herbert E.
Forbes, Richard F.
Forbus, Durward D.
Forman, George E.
Forsberg, Virgil F.
Fortin, Harvey E.
Foshee, Herman L.
Fox, James H.
Franco, Franklin A.
Fuderer, George A.
Gagner, Warren E.
Gailey, Morton H.
Galbraith, Leonard D.
Gallagher, Hugh F., Jr.
Gallagher, Joseph
Gallaugher, Daryl L.
Gamache, Gabriel J.
Gard, Donald K.
Garrett, Lehman M.
Gaskin, Daniel J.
Gass, Bert A.
Gattis, William M.
Gatton, Donald L.
Gauche, Eugene W.
Gausta, Lloyd T.
Gay, Hobart H.
Gee, William S.
George, Robert C.
Giblin, John J., Jr.
Gieron, Lewis
Gilfillan, Gordon A.
Gill, Carol G.
Gilmore, Allen G.
Gipson, Samuel W., Jr.
Goad, John H.
Godfrey, Alfred
Godwin, John J.
Goldstein, David A.
Goodwin, Lyle M.
Gool, Charles F.
Gorder, Merle H.
Goss, Richard M.
Grady, John A.
Graham, Walter E.
Grahn, Robert V.
Grams, Rodney L.
Gray, Robert E.
Grover, Leon R., Jr.
Grover, William A.
Gugert, Francis A.
Guthrie, Gene E.
Gutshall, Lester L.
Guy, Arthur G., Jr.
Haff, Wilson M.
Haffey, Edward D.
Hagerty, Patrick H.
Haigler, John D.
Hail, Benjamin C.
Hajek, John W.
Hall, Albert T., Jr.
Hall, Harold A.
Hallberg, Earl G.
Hallock, Leward A., Jr.
Hamilton, Richard D.
Hamlin, Marvin
Hamm, Charles G.
Hammonds, Howard W.
Hand, Thomas E.
Hanson, Oscar W.
Harding, William P.
Harmon, James E.
Harouff, Monte D.
Harpole, Edward B.
Harrison, James F., Jr.
Hart, Billy R.
Hartland, John B.
Hartwick, Gordon "J"
Harvey, Alan B.
Hattersley, Julian
Haugen, Edward S.
Hauser, Lawrence J.
Hauser, William F.
Hawkins, Benjamin A., Jr.
Hawkins, Marvin A.
Hayden, William G.
Hayes, David E.
Hearne, Willis R.
Hemann, Herbert A.
Henderson, Robert A.
Henning, John A.
Henrikson, Norton W.
Hepfinger, William J.
Herbig, Robert F.
Herman, Louis R.
Hevenor, Gloster P., Jr.
Hewitt, Warren H.
Hiner, Walter E.
Hirsch, Stanley M.
Hitpas, Henry R.
Hodges, King E.
Hoff, Matthew J.
Hogan, Robert B.
Holland, Lewis P.
Hollenbeck, Gordon W.
Hollingsworth, Russell "K", Jr.
Holmes, Oliver W., Jr.
Holmgren, Wilton
Hooper, Raymond F.
Horton, Kenneth B.
Houser, George "H", Jr.
Howard, Raymond B.
Hubenette, Edward R.
Hubler, Vernon R.
Huckabee, Thomas
Hughes, Philip C.
Hunt, William H.
Hunter, Jack S.
Hurley, Charles P.
Hurnblad, Jack W.
Hurt, Robert M.
Hutchings, Cecil
Ingalls, Albert L.
Inzer, William E. F.
Isselhardt, Calvin L.
Jachimowicz, Julia J.
James, Oliver B., Jr.
Jandebeur, Harold E.
Jayson, Paul
Jenkins, Charles D.
Jenkins, Lawrence W.
Jensen, William P.
Johnson, Eddie W.
Johnson, John P.
Johnson, Maurice L.
Johnson, Terry J.
Johnson, William A.
Johnston, Sage M.
Johnston, William J.
Jolly, James A.
Joseph, George A., Jr.
Joyce, Larry D.
Juraschek, William D.
Jurash, Andrew
Kaetzel, Robert H.
Kantjas, John
Kearns, William E.
Keenan, John W., Jr.
Keifer, Thomas H.
Kennedy, Frank L.
Kenney, Paul
Kenyon, William A.
Keppel, Bruce H.
Kernan, George A.
Kinder, Maryln E.
King, Carlton W.
King, George
King, Paul E.
Kirby, Donald L.
Kirk, Robert "L"
Kitchel, Donald V.
Kleder, John E.
Klenk, Harold N.
Klinger, Dan R.
Knutson, Charles R.
Konopisos, Konstantine A.
Koontz, Ralph M.
Korbein, James R.
Kornegay, Perry R., Jr.
Kreig, Walter H.
Kryspin, Edwin
Kunz, George T.
Lacher, Lloyd L., Jr.
Laing, Alan
Lamb, Carl H.
Lamoureaux, Torrence C.
Lane, Ira D.
Langelle, Russell A.
Langford, Willis S.
Larson, Robert C.
Lavenau, Arthur A.
Lawrence, Henry G.
Lawrence, William H.
Leach, Charles A.
Leber, Edmond E.
Le Blanc, Paul E.
Ledford, Charles W.
Ledger, Eugene
Lee, Irvin H.
Lejeune, Roch A.
Leon, Patrick A.
Lewis, Harold L.
Ligon, Ernest R.
Lindsay, Buford S.
Little, Horace
Littleton, Artrey D.
Lobdell, William F.
Long, William O.
Lorenz, Edward G.
Lovern, Morris F.
Low, Lawrence J.
Lowe, Fred B.
Lucas, Robert L.
Luce, Raymond E.
Lunaas, Peter E.
Lurker, Elmer R.
Lyttle, Ray W.
MacDonell, Rieman A., Jr.
MacMullen, John W.
Madden, John, III
Magnuson, Gardner E.
Maguire, Edward T.
Mahar, Ralph J., Jr.
Mahncke, William H.
Maki, Arnold M.
Manegold, Stuart R.
Manning, Stanley J.
Marks, Harold M.
Marshall, George L.
Martin, Jack A.
Martin, Linwood F.
Martin, Robert E.
Marts, Kenneth I.
Mason, John L.
Matthias, Jack M.
McCannon, John R.
McCarthy, Robert T. P.
McClure, Andrew J., Jr.
McConnell, Frederick
McCoy, Scribner W.
McCready, Roy A.
McCue, Francis A., Jr.
McDaniel, Charles O.
McElhinney, James F.
McElroy, Francis P.
McElwain, Richard S.
McGill, John C., Jr.
McGonigle, Edward F.
McGreevy, Walter C.
McIlroy, Edward E.
McIntosh, George R.
McKee, Wendell C.
McKinney, Forest O.
McLean, Clifford C.
McMillan, James M.
McMurray, Robert E.
McMurry, Thomas R.
McNabb, John W.
McNulty, James F.
Meagher, John J. Jr.
Mehringer, Sylvester J.
Mehus, John H.
Mellin, Richard W.
Mench, James F.
Merrill, Harold P.
Mettes, Anthony M.
Metzger, Donald X.
Meyer, Howard J.
Miklebost, Stanley M.
Miller, Charles T.
Miller, Daniel A., Jr.
Miller, Johnnie G.
Milligan, Robert L.
Mills, Warren B.
Mims, Don A.
Minard, Harold "R"
Mitchell, Harvest B.
Mitchell, Henry P.
Mochelski, Ludwig J.
Moe, James H.
Mollard, Norman W., Jr.
Monaghan, James E.
Monaghan, James F.
Monaghan, Phillip L.
Monnes, Bernard C.
Montgomery Edward E.
Moody, Dean C.
Moore Charles B.
Moore, Donald
Moore, Donald W.
Moorhead, Kenneth W.
Morelewski, Stanley R.
Morris, Sidney, Jr.
Morrow, Homer A.
Morton, John A., Jr.
Mrgudich, John
Muehlen, Paul W.
Mularski, Leon S.
Mulkey, Donald R.
Mulock, Richard B.
Mulvihill, Paul
Murdoch, James R.
Murphy, Charles "B"
Murphy, Thomas B.
Murray, Lloyd B.
Myers, Eugene L.
Myers, John R., III
Nadler, Alfred I.
Neese, Marvin F., Jr.
Neher, Paul E.
Nellis, John D.
Nelms, Charles W., Jr.
Nelson, Elvin
Nelson, Kenneth D.
Newcomb, Mark N.
Newsome, William R.
Nihan, Leo V.
Noland, James "E"
Noll, Robert C.
Normoyle, Robert H.
Norris, Arthur J.
Norris, William H.
Norris, William S.
North, Frank R.
Northridge, Robert T.
Norton, Harold J.
O'Brien, Billie E.
O'Connor, David L.
Oddo, Phillip W.
O'Donnell, James E.
O'Donnell, John
Ofer, Hubert L.
Olson, Frederick G.
O'Malley, Edward
Opitz, Paul F.
Orbeton, Maurice C., Jr.
Orndroff, Howard J.
Ortmeyer, John E.
Ouilliber, Walter L.
Owens, Thomas "P"
Palermo, Carlo
Parker, Donald V.
Parker, Ralph N.
Payer, John L.
Pearsall, Arthur E.
Peek, Allen L.
Perdue, Robert A.
Perry, Robert J.
Peterson, Wayman T.
Peth, Carl L.
Phillips, Gerald L.
Phillips, Gordon R.
Pierceall, Marion F.
Pilgrim, Samuel W., Jr.
Plank, John P.
Plowe, Harry S.
Poes, Aron
Polkowske, Max I.
Ponrick, Edward D.
Poor, Leonard F.
Post, Ralph E.
Powell, Rolan D.
Prassinos, George
Proctor, Loey P.
Proctor, Philip K.
Pulaski, William E.
Purnell, John S., Jr.
Quigley, Stephen T.
Quinlan, Edward J.
Radlinski, Victor S.
Ray, Harry H.
Ray, Leslie E.
Reardon, Lester L.
Redman, Benjamin H., Jr.
Reese, William A.
Reh, Donald E.
Reher, Laurence W., Jr.
Reid, Robert M.
Reilly, John F.
Reneau, Russell L.
Repine, Robert T.
Richardson, John P.
Riding, Jack
Rinke, Herman A.
Ripley, William C.
Rizy, William A.
Roach, Fred B., Jr.
Roberts, Allen G.
Roberts, Clifford O.
Roberts, Wayne L.
Robinett, Everett R.
Rodgers, Robert L.
Rogers, Gerald B.
Roggensack, Bartley E.
Romeka, Frank R.
Roop, Jack H.
Root, Irving L.
Rosenbaum, Byron W.
Ross, Edward F.
Ross, Joseph E.
Rosser, Warren A.
Rothbart, Jack B.
Rouen, Edward H.
Royce, Frederick S.
Rudd, Todd D.
Rund, Lowell W.
Rutherford, James A.
Rutherford, Oren B.
Rutledge, Carleton, Jr.
Rutledge, George E.
Ryan, Emmett J.
Sabo, Paul, Jr.
Sakes, James C.
Sanders, Dean H.

Sandness, Earl A.
Sanford, Leslie M.
Schad, William L.
Schappert, Robert J., Jr.
Scharfschwerdt, Edward, Jr.
Schiesser, John J., Jr.
Schleeter, Hartzel D.
Schloer, Eric G.
Schramm, Carl T.
Schroeder, Henry, Jr.
Schroeder, Martin O. F.
Schulden, Warren G.
Schwab, Albert N.
Scott, Dale L., Jr.
Seaton, James R.
Seaward, Robert S., Jr.
Secrest, Samuel W.
Seidel, George H.
Sellner, Thomas J.
Senger, Pius J.
Severns, Charles R.
Seymour, George H.
Shade, Howard M., II
Sharp, "E" Jackson
Sharpe, Kenneth H.
Shaw, Emmett "A", Jr.
Shinn, William G.
Shively, Eli G.
Shockley, William E.
Shoemaker, Charles
Shoff, Carl M.
Shroyer, William C.
Shuey, Wallace S.
Sill, James P.
Silvis, Donald G.
Simmons, Julian R., Jr.
Simonini, Thomas
Sippel, Joseph T.
Sirdevan, Donald J.
Sirmons, Smiley B.
Sjodin, Robert F.
Slye, Walter C.
Small, William A.
Smiley, Robert W.
Smith, Frank W., Jr.
Smith, Howard G.
Smith, Robert H.
Smith, Thomas G.
Sneden, Joseph S.
Snider, Leonard A.
Snyder, Kenneth E.
Snyder, Kenneth P.
Spencer, Curtis W.
Spies, William G.
Sporer, Joseph F.
Spracklen, Paul
Staats, Samuel E.
Stacer, Richard K.
Stachow, Michael
Staight, Walter
Stamatis, Robert B.
Steffen, Henry
Stello, Albert P.
Stephens, Walter E.
Stephenson, Luther
Stevens, Joseph M.
Stevenson, John E.
Stewart, "C" "V", Jr.
Stillwell, Edward P.
Stinson, Gordon M.
Stinson, Nelson M.
St. Lawrence, Robert F.
Stokke, Russell L.
Stoltenberg, Charles J.
Stretz, Robert H.
Strong, George T.
Sullivan, Edward S.
Sullivan, Elmer D.
Sullivan, John V.
Sunde, Merle L.
Sunley, John F.
Swarthout, Neil F.
Swisher, Ralph E.
Switzer, David
Taylor, Cecil O.
Taylor, Lewis J., Jr.
Taylor, Mark R.
Taylor, Robert W.
Thomas, Frederick B., Jr.
Thompson, Samuel M., Jr.
Thweatt, Robert C., Jr.
Tierce, Gilbert L., Jr.
Tillman, Robert L.
Todd, Thomas P.
Toomey, John B., Jr.
Topliss, Samuel K.
Totten, Clifford H.
Trahan, Paul K.
Trammel, Joseph W.
Trecartin, Allen L.
Troy, Robert F.
Tucker, Louis R.
Turpin, Dana "A"
Twomey, James J., Jr.
Tye, Arthur R.
Ulam, Frederick A.
Usey, "J" "T", Jr.
Van, Robert E.
Vanbiesbroeck, Edwin
Virgo, Glenn D.
Volk, John A.
Wade, Howard M.
Wagner, William H.
Walker, Robert T., Jr.
Walker, William C.
Wall, Raymond F.
Walther, Stephen P.
Warwick, Wallace R.
Watt, Robert
Wauchope, Stanley S., Jr.
Waxman, Arnold L.
Weaver, Keith B.
Weber, Robert P.
Wegener, Harold W.
Weir, Malcolm S.
Wellener, Robert L.
Wells, Bradford
Wells, John B.
Wendell, William D., Jr.
West, George K.
West, Waldo W.
West, Washington, III
Westerfield, Harry D.
Westfall, James E.
Wheeler, James H.
White, Robert E.
Whitelaw, Robert G.
Widener, Homer W., Jr.
Wiggins, George H.
Wightman, Robert B., Jr.
Wilder, Hubert B., Jr.
Wilhelm, Anthony F.
Wilkerson, Roland A.
Wilkin, William L.
Williams, Eldon M.
Williams, James T.
Williams, Robert B., Jr.
Willis, Berry D., Jr.
Willis, David H.
Willmert, Vernal O.
Willsie, Robert A.
Wilson, Glenn A.
Wilson, James F.
Wilson, Joseph H., Jr.
Wolf, John H.
Wolking, Harry E.
Woodward, Clifford P.
Woolley, Bruce
Wright, Cleon B.
Wright, John J.
Wright, Leonidas R.
Wuttke, John H., Jr.
Yanoshik, Francis
Young, John S.
Yount, William J.
Zeigler, Luther L.
Zeola, Pantaleo "P"
Zettel, Ralph A.
Zimbeck, Walter R.

MEDICAL CORPS

William Aldis
Leon H. Alexander
Sydenham B. Alexander
Newton W. Allebach
Richard C. Ames
Donald C. Anderson
Harold C. Anderson
Keith Aull
Charles B. Bartell
Eugene H. Bastien
John M. Bell
Charles C. Benton
Henry C. Benzenberg, Jr.
Thomas P. Berry
Howard R. Blackburn
Harry A. Bliss
George F. Bond
George C. Bourne
Henry H. Boyter
Franklin T. Brayer
John N. Bryan
Ralph W. Buddington, Jr.
Charles J. Burnham
Thomas E. Burrow
John D. Casey
Sam Cassara
Thomas R. Clemons
Donald J. Cluskey
John D. Coffey, Jr.
Graham M. Coffman
Harold N. Cogburn
Edward L. Cole, Jr.
Maurice E. Conway
James W. Correll
Wyndon D. Cranney
David H. Cunningham
Robert E. Cunningham, Jr.
Leo V. Curtin
George Danis
Tudor B. C. Davis
Pierino F. Delia
Richard Derby
John J. Driscoll
Robert O. Dubpernell
Earl H. Eaton, Jr.
Edwin G. Eby
Marcus E. Eichman, Jr.
Ervin Ellison
Ira L. Faith, Jr.
Robert K. Fankhauser
Martin E. Flipse, Jr.
Glen Floyd
William P. Folck
Richard C. Fowler
Gerard J. Frederic
Perry Futterman
Thomas F. Gallagher, Jr.
Joseph I. Garcia, Jr.
MacRoy Gasque, Jr.
Peter J. Gauder
Robert F. Gobar
James E. Goodman
Allan L. Goulding, Jr.
Edgar D. Grady
Oscar Gray, Jr.
Frank D. Green
James D. Green
Roy R. Greening
John J. Gregowicz
Joe J. Griffin
Paul V. Gustafson
William A. Hall
Wilford R. Hansen
Donald H. Harwood
George W. Haugen
Carl J. Hauptmann
Fred W. Hauser
James B. Havron
Emmett M. Heiligman
Frank R. Hendricks
George V. Hering
George M. Himadi
James C. Hodges, Jr.
Frederick W. Holcomb, Jr.
Winthrop C. Hopgood
Thomas C. Horton, Jr.
Grant B. Hughes
Wayne P. Hyatt
Thomas C. Iden
William B. Ingram
Edward P. Irving
Robert B. Isham
Samuel C. Iwig
John Jacobs
Rodney M. Jarvis
Harry A. Jenkins
Charles H. Jessup
Ben B. Johnson
Gordon S. Johnson
Wendell A. Johnson
Peter H. Jones
Robert E. Jones
Thomas R. Judd
Louis Kagen
Oscar B. Kahn
Marshall Kanter
Robert E. Keating
Charles E. Kee
Edward A. Keenan, Jr.
Alpheus T. Kennedy
Edward L. Kinder, Jr.
Clare E. Knouf
John D. Krafchuk
Henry F. Kramer, Jr.
Harvey Kravitz
Leonard J. Kreissl, Jr.
Joseph J. Lambert, Jr.
Frederick R. Latimer
Joseph H. Latona
George C. Lawrence
William R. Lee
Daniel B. Lemen
Frederick Lerman
Charles W. Lewis
Jack "J" Lewis
David M. Little, Jr.
Willard A. Litzenberger
Glenn W. Lotz
Alexander D. Lowy, Jr.
Edward C. W. Lum
Charles H. Lupton, Jr.
Robert H. F. Lynch
Angelo J. Maniglia
Raymond J. Mann
Wayne B. Martin
Wilford E. Martyn
Raymond G. Mathewson
Don E. Matthiesen
Francis D. McCarthy
John J. McDonald
Thomas R. McDonnell
John H. McEvers
Louis R. McFarland, Jr.
John S. McKee, Jr.
Charles J. McPeak
John F. McVay
Woodrow W. Meier
Abraham A. Mekelburg
Karl F. Menk
Keith Merrill, Jr.
Dexter Meyer, Jr.
Stanley J. J. Mikal
David R. Millard, Jr.
John P. Miller
William J. Mogabgab
Herman R. Moore, Jr.
Paul W. Morgan
Richard K. Morgan
Herbert S. Morrison
Thomas L. Morrow, Jr.
Simon D. Murray
Luther Q. Myers
Marvin J. Naman
George L. Nardi
Robert A. Neely
Robert L. Nelson
John R. Newkirk
Marvin Nierenberg
James B. Nixon
Edward P. Norris, Jr.
Richard W. Olmsted
Martin J. O'Neill
Calvin R. Openshaw
Joseph Padovano
Harold P. Pariser
Anthony J. Parisi
Roy W. Parker
Matthew M. Patton
James P. T. Pauly
Maurice F. Peril
Harvey H. Perman
Otis M. Pickett
John W. Pickren
John S. Pierandozzi
John D. Pinto
Harry W. Pitcaithley
John B. Plauche
George A. Poda
George H. Powers
John E. Pulaski
Adrian Recinos, Jr.
Robert E. Rice
Herbert Rifkin
George H. Riley
Paul Rizzo
James S. Robertson
Alan M. Robertson
Bernard W. Robinson
Henry N. Rogers
Julius C. Rosch
Solomon Rosenberg
Charles E. Rossell
Arne D. Rydlani
Ralph E. Samuelson
Eugene W. Sausser
Anthony T. Scafa
Jenaro G. Scarano
Joseph A. Schaefer
Peritz Scheinberg
Arthur L. Scherbel
Paul R. Schloerb
Frederick K. Schmidt
Robert G. Schultz
Richard H. Sears
Virgil E. Seibert
Paul O. Shackelford
Herman S. Shapiro
John E. Sharts, Jr.
Edward S. Shelley
John H. Shelley
Haynes W. Sheppard
Mervin C. Silverthorne
Daniel S. Simon
Charles G. Smith
David S. Smith
Leonard K. Smith
Marsh H. Smith
Elwyn M. Smolen
James T. Spencer, Jr.
Norman W. Staker
Arthur Stiffel
George C. Sutton
Edward C. Svec
Chester S. Svigals
Mervin Tatar
George W. Taylor, Jr.
George P. Thomas, Jr.
Walton D. Thomas
Charles R. Thompson
Donald P. Todd
Bernard Tumarkin
Alston C. Twiss
Jacob J. Vargish
John L. Vicorita
Herbert Volk
John W. Wahl
Duard L. Walker
Philip H. Walker
Bernard J. Weinfurtner
Elton G. Welke
Beverly H. White
Robert B. White
Byron V. Whitney
Edward N. Wiggins
Francis P. A. Williams
Calvin W. Woodruff
Millington O. Young
Charles M. I. Zeigler

SUPPLY CORPS

Leslie R. Allan
Arthur L. Bieser
Arthur R. Edsall, Jr.
Robert G. Fabian
Joseph M. Farrell
Robert L. Gifford
Irving Gordon
Herbert L. Gurnee
Calvin H. Jenkins
Glenn W. Meyer
David C. Oliver
Harrison G. Packard
Emil J. Rohwer
Leslie H. Steele
Odie B. Strickland
Harry P. VonKemmel, Jr.
Richard A. Wier
Wesley J. Wiggin
Robert D. Zaniboni

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Clarence C. Bachmann
Peter Bol
Warren L. Bost
Robert E. Brengartner
Beryl L. Burr
James T. Callahan
David J. Casazza
Samuel D. Chambers, Jr.
Thomas A. Clayton
Alvin O. Collins
Leonard B. Dohrmann
Thomas V. Edwards
Carlton C. French
William R. Griswold
Oscar J. Harris
Richard J. Holmes
Carl O. Jensen
Gilbert A. Jensen
Warren H. Johnson
Joseph A. Kelly
William J. Kokoszka
James A. O'Donnell
Joseph D. O'Leary
Charley L. Peeples
Raymond J. Reed
Stanley R. Reiber
William "A" Swets
Edward M. Tulley
Ralph H. Walters
Frederick A. Winkler
John L. Wissing

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Andrew F. Key, Jr.
Kenneth C. Knight
Lawrence J. Kollath
William F. Nutting
Wesley W. Phipps
Herbert C. Sauter

DENTAL CORPS

John G. Alley
Ralph N. Alparone
Lloyd M. Armstrong
Warren J. Boutreis
Robert G. Bult
Amos W. Cave, Jr.
Sun R. Cloud
Angelo D. Colombo
Israel Cooper
Raymond W. Dolph
Grady D. Donathan, Jr.
Ernest Ensing
Edward C. Fabrizio
Donald F. Foit
Paul Foreman
Irving Frankel
Kenneth M. Gillroy
Irving S. Glasner
Herbert W. Gooding

Porter H. Gott
David Green
Robert L. Greene
John R. Gunderson
Harrie L. Hall
Harold Halpern
John R. Hammond
Seymour Hoffman
George W. Johnson
Collin M. Kinsey
Mortimer G. Klein
Edward A. Kotz
Donald S. Kranov
Bertram Kronen
Earl L. Lampshire
Gustave Lasoff
Robert J. Lawrence
Lawrence K. Low
Van D. McCool
Robert D. Meyer
Ubaldo L. Monteleone
Masato Morimoto
James E. Morrison
Max B. Musicer
Francis X. Pelka
Jack A. Rampton
Robert G. Robb
Gordon H. Rovelstad
Aaron Schlecter
John K. Schroeder
William Segal
Delman Smith
Armand M. Stella
Wallace Y. Tanaka
David I. Tauman
Charles P. Thom
Felix T. Trommer
Olin B. Vaughan
Edwin E. Weinfield
Charles L. Williams
Guy A. Woods, Jr.
Seymour H. Yale

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Russel R. Frew
Charles H. Fugitt
Arthur N. King

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to chief warrant officer W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Alwin, Charles L.
Ashworth, Calvin A.
Baldwin, Algia M.
Baldwin, Homer J.
Ballauf, Charles
Beezley, Joy W.
Bishop, Ralph E.
Boatman, Harold B.
Boomer, Grattan C.
Brewster, Charles E.
Britt, Thomas B.
Brown, Charles R., Jr.
Brown, Harold S.
Brown, Robert M.
Bryan, William J.
Bryant, Forrest H.
Bryant, Marvin H.
Carrolli, Harry
Caughman, Adam F.
Chambless, William H.
Chastain, Orvia L.
Chivington, Thomas E.
Chrupcala, William J.
Cico, Anton A.
Conner, Charles S.
Davis, Clarence L., Jr.
Davis, Earl W.
Davis, James A.
Daw, Hurbert A.
Delacey, John B., Jr.
Eastman, Albert J.
Elliott, James O.
Ezell, Louis S.
Ezell, Van W.
Fields, Robert C.
Ford, Raymond J.
Fowler, Elbert W.
Freeman, Harold O.
Fry, William E.
Gauthier, Leon A.
Gentile, Leo E.
Gould, Robert E.
Graham, Robert E.
Greene, Clifford F.
Hair, Kirby
Harnagel, Harvey H.
Harris, Robert E.
Harrison, Robert O.
Henderson, Paul R.
Holland, Kenneth W.
Hollingworth, Willis S.
Honadle, Robert K.
Jackson, Elwood G.
Jacobs, Gerald M.
Kelsey, Wilbur H.
Kraft, Lester
Lang, George W.
Lee, Haman L.
Leonhard, John S.
Lewis, Everette G.
Lindstrom, Leonard L.
Lorenz, John
Luppino, Salvatore A.
Lusk, Trubie C.
MacDonald, Robert J.
Marfleet, Albert H.
Marples, Ellis, Jr.
Martin, John W.
McCool, Francis H.
McCloskey, Albert P.
Melin, John C.
Mickey, John M.
Miller, Hugh M.
Mongelli, Frank C.
Morgan, Joseph A.
Morris, James E.
Mowder, Harry A.
Murphy, Gerald W.
Nalley, Joseph C.
Nelson, Willie R.
Newhouse, Delbert C.
Nicholson, Louis L., Jr.
Oddone, Raymond
Ohmart, Waldo P.
Oliver, George A.
Pasanen, William J.
Penick, James L.
Pierce, George F.
Plapp, Francis G.
Powell, Vincent N.
Proback, Nicholas
Reckless, John
Reese, Orville F.
Robinson, Sylvanus B.
Rueber, Gerhardt W.
Salter, William S.
Scheurer, Donald B.
Schmahl, Vallen R.
Schwarz, Robert J.
Seeberg, Reuben
Sessions, Herndon T.
Shepherd, Newell
Sholar, Marvin E.
Short, Henry L., Jr.
Shurtleff, Edmund J.
Siebenthal, Stanle A.
Sims, George O.
Skinner, Walter L.
Smith, Charles E.
Spotts, George W.
Stalker, Harold L.
Sutton, Harold L.
Swinson, Bruce Q.
Thrush, Thomas W.
Turner, Maurice R.
Vanliere, Robert E.
Webster, "D" "L"
Williams, Lindley
Wise, Wyman W.
Woelfle, George C.
Wojcik, Joseph J.
Wright, Richard E.
Wright, William H.
Young, Herschell B.
Young, Vincent J.

Warrant Officer W–1 Byron O. Nielson, United States Navy, for permanent promotion to chief warrant officer W–2, subject to qualification therefor provided by law.

Ensign Kenneth E. Wolfe, United States Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named ensigns for transfer to and permanent appointment in Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy confirming ad interim appointments:

Donald A. Morton.
Joseph P. Trunz, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abbott, Charles W.
Abraham, James W.
Abrams, Lewis H.
Ackerman, Walter G.
Adair, Harold F.
Adair, James T., Jr.
Adams, Birney A.
Adams, Carl C.
Adams, Frederick L.
Adams, Nate L., II
Adams, Rayford K., Jr.
Adams, Robert K.
Addis, William J.
Addison, George B., Jr.
Adrian, Billy M.
Aichele, James R.
Ainsworth, Clarence L.
Aird, Vernon J.
Aitken, Hugh S.
Akerley, William K.
Albert, Alan D., Jr.
Alcorn, Murrie G.
Alderman, Harry L.
Aldridge, Jack B.
Alexander, Maurice H.
Alexander, John C.
Alexander, Richard D.
Alexander, George M., Jr.
Alexander, Leland G.
Alison, James C.
Allemann, James G.
Allen, Bill H.
Allen, George W.
Allen, George C.
Allen, George M.
Allen, John H., Jr.
Allen, Lacy J.
Allen, Merle W.
Allen, Robert B.
Allen, Robert L.
Allen, Warren H.
Allen, Wilburn C.
Aller, John K.
Alsop, William F., Jr.
Altekruse, Ernest B.
Ambrogi, Richard T. F.
Ambrosia, Eugene J.
Amend, Robert G.
Ammer, Henry G.
Amos, Raymond L.
Amundsen, Edwin A.
Andersen, Earl R.
Andersen, Frank R.
Andersen, Richard C.
Anderson, Donald W.
Anderson, Elmer J.
Anderson, Everett L.
Anderson, George B.
Anderson, Hugh L.
Anderson, Leroy H.
Anderson, Robert V.
Anderson, Richard R.
Anderson, Tilton A.
Anderson, Thomas E.
Anderson, Wallace E.
Anderton, Richard L.
Andrews, John J.
Andrews, Marion A.
Androsko, William E.
Andrus, Cowles, Jr.
Anello, Ben
Anker, Harold R.
Annas, Themistocles T.
Anthony, Arthur W., Jr.
Anthony, Robert J.
Anthony, William S.
Anton, David R.
Arbacas, William V.
Arford, Jack O.
Arkadis, Nickolas D.
Arkland, Ezra H.
Armbruster, Charles R., Jr.
Armitage, George L.
Armstrong, Robert L.
Armstrong, Marshall B.
Armstrong, Peter F. C.
Armstrong, Leonard O.
Arnold, Kenneth G.
Arrington, Raymond O.
Arthur, Charles L.
Aschenbeck, Theo F.
Ashcraft, Milton S.
Ashley, Maurice C., Jr.
Assad, Albert J.
Atcheson, George S.
Atchison, Jere L.
Atkinson, Harry Eugene
Atkinson, Harry Elwood
Austin, Conway L.
Auvil, Arthur H.
Aycock, William B.
Baar, Stuart P., Jr.
Babe, George A.
Bacas, George A.
Bacauskas, Withold J.
Bacher, Louis J.
Badger, Guy O.
Baeriswyl, Louis, Jr.
Bagley, Floyd C.
Bahner, Robert H.
Bailey, Alva S.
Bailey, Edward A.
Bailey, James D.
Bain, Herbert J.
Baites, Lonnie P.
Baker, Charles E.
Baker, Edward S., Jr.
Baker, Herbert M.
Baker, John M.
Baker, Kenneth
Balakas, Joseph, Jr.
Bald, James E.
Balderston, Francis G.
Baldwin, Benjamin H., Jr.
Balzer, George T.
Bandyk, Walter A.
Bannan, James M.
Banta, William
Baranski, Walter J.
Baratta, Thomas F.
Barbour, James L.
Barcus, Paul W.
Barde, Robert E.
Bardin, James N.
Barker, David B.
Barker, Hunter C.
Barnard, John R.
Barnes, Cletus, Jr.
Barnes, Lewis S.
Barnes, Robert O.
Barnidge, James L., Jr.
Baron, Harvey W.
Barr, James C.
Barr, John F., Jr.
Barr, Walter W.
Barrett, Howard L., Jr.
Barrett, James B.
Barrett, Richard C.
Barrett, Roscoe L., Jr.
Barrett, Wallace C.
Barrie, Raymond L., Jr.
Barritt, Oliver R.
Barry, Richard S.
Barth, Olav
Bartleson, Thomas P., Jr.
Bartlett, George E.
Bartlett, George L.
Bartlett, Harold
Barton, Robert J.
Bartyzel, Henry R.
Bassett, William D., Jr.
Batchelder, John M.
Batchelder, Merton J., Jr.
Bates, John T.
Bates, William G.
Bath, Lynn E.
Baugh, Milton H.
Baughman, Prentiss H.
Baumgartel, Thomas W.
Baxter, John E.
Baxter, Monta G.
Bay, William R.
Baylor, John D.
Bazinet, Lester E.
Bean, Paul C.
Beard, Wendell O.
Beattie, George E.
Beatty, Donald J.
Beatty, James N.
Becker, Robert C.
Bednarsky, Vincent H.
Bedwell, Everett D.
Beeler, William R.
Beith, Rolfe H.
Belant, Bernard B.
Belbusti, Albert F.
Belden, John G.
Bell, Jack L.
Bell, Van D., Jr.
Belli, George S.
Benavage, Peter
Bench, Arnold E.
Bendell, Lee R.
Bennett, Cecil J.
Bennett, Nalton M.
Benskin, George H., Jr.
Benson, Carl H.
Benson, Leroy H.
Benson, Robert E.
Bentley, Loren D.
Benyo, William J.
Berg, Norman J.
Berling, Raymond R.
Berry, Norman
Berzon, Samuel P.
Best, George M.
Beverly, Arthur C.
Bevers, Burl B.
Bey, Robert T.
Beyerle, Garland T.
Bickley, Roy W.
Bishop, Ray H.
Bixby, Ralph L.
Bixler, James A.
Bjorklund, Darrel E.
Black, James L., Jr.
Blagg, Russell E.
Blaha, Herbert J.
Blair, George G., II
Blake, James F.
Blakslee, Robert R.
Blalack, Robert L.
Blanchard, Joseph E.
Bland, Kenneth R.
Blandford, Richard P., Jr.
Blandy, John F.
Blank, Howard G.
Blaydes, Aquilla M.
Blaz, Vincente T.
Bledsoe, Harley E.
Blessing, Ralph M.
Bley, Paul R.
Blough, Foster W.
Blue, Daniel M., Jr.
Blyth, Charles W.
Bodley, Charles H.
Bogue, Douglas W.
Bohonak, Nicholas C., Jr.
Boicey, Charles G.
Boles, Jack F.
Bollinger, William D.
Bond, George C., Jr.
Bond, Willard K.
Bonds, William E.
Bonin, Louis A.
Bonney, Richard A.
Borden, Thomas G.
Boreman, Gilbert H.
Bormann, William P.
Bott, William J.
Boudreaux, Donald L.
Bouldin, Billy D.
Bourbeau, Richard T.
Bourne, Frank L., Jr.
Bousquet, Arthur R.
Bouvy, Jack W.
Bowen, Oscar T.
Bowen, Virgil G.
Bowie, Frederick R.
Bowman, Albert R., II
Bowman, Daniel W.
Bowman, James L.
Box, Robert S., Jr.
Boyd, Clarence W., Jr.
Boyle, Daniel J., Jr.
Boyle, Martin
Boynton, William W.
Boze, Robert E.
Bozek, John J.
Brackett, William D.
Bradley, Bobbie B.
Bradley, John R.
Bradley, Lawrence J.
Bradley, Willie W.
Brady, Byron F.
Brady, Eugene R.
Bramel, Raymond E.
Branch, Tillman A.
Branen, Wade E.
Brannaman, James M.
Brannon, Stanley H.
Brassette, Maurice, Jr.
Breau, William W.
Breckinridge, James T.
Breeze, John R.
Breeze, Robert W.
Brening, John W.
Brennan, Robert B.
Brent, Joseph M.
Brewton, Dallas P.
Briden, Derrell C.
Bridgers, Joseph C.
Brier, George R.
Brierly, Kenneth V.
Brierton, Thomas J., Jr.
Brill, William J.
Brimmer, Donald R.

Brinkley, Joseph C.
Briscoe, Everard D.
Britt, William C.
Brixey, Perry T.
Broadus, Harry A.
Broadwell, Franklin C.
Brockman, William A.
Brogli, Samuel L., Sr.
Bronars, Edward J.
Brooks, Edward E.
Brooks, Stephen L.
Broome, Norris C.
Brothers, William Q., Jr.
Brower, Frederick F., Jr.
Brown, Arthur M.
Brown, Bruce G.
Brown, Dale L.
Brown, Eugene H.
Brown, George H.
Brown, James R.
Brown, John H.
Brown, John E.
Brown, Joseph B., Jr.
Brown, Ralph H.
Brown, Robert M.
Brown, Robert G.
Brown, Ronald A.
Brown, Travis D.
Brown, Vance E.
Brown, Warren M.
Browne, Gordon S., Jr.
Bruce, Horace A.
Bruning, Howard A.
Brunnenmeyer, Sherwood A.
Bruser, George L.
Bryant, George G., Jr.
Bryson, James H.
Bucci, Arthur A.
Buchanan, Fitzhugh L., Jr.
Buchanan, Richard K.
Bucholz, Edwin B.
Buck, John A.
Buck, Robert
Buckland, Irving F.
Buckler, Robert E.
Buckley, Clement C., Jr.
Buckley, Roger D.
Budge, William J.
Buergey, William L.
Buethe, Richard N.
Bugg, John S., Jr.
Bulger, Thomas E.
Bullard, Lyle W.
Bulwer, Lytton E., Jr.
Bumpas, Hugh R., Jr.
Bunker, Wallace B.
Bunnell, Charles F., Jr.
Burch, Carrol B.
Burch, Harrison F.
Burckell, Thomas J.
Burger, Donald J.
Burgin, Henry N.
Burhans, Robert N.
Burin, Michael
Burke, Charles W.
Burke, Robert L.
Burke, Thomas W.
Burkett, Claude L.
Burnett, Loren E.
Burnett, Richard H.
Burnett, William L.
Burnette, Lowell R., Jr.
Burns, Edwin A.
Burns, John L.
Burns, Rezin D.
Burns, Thomas R.
Burri, Alvin W.
Burroughs, Charles R.
Burt, Floyd R.
Burton, John R.
Buschman, Billy F.
Buschmann, Conrad P.
Bush, Clayton O.
Bushe, Eugene A.
Bushwitz, Henry W.
Buss, Kenneth M.
Busse, Richard A.
Bussing, Sylvester F., Jr.
Butler, Arthur S.
Butler, Edward L.
Butler, Harrison M.
Butler, Jack H.
Butler, Jerry K., Jr.
Butler, John K.
Butner, John C., III
Butterfield, Clyde U.
Butz, Peter P.
Buynak, John E.
Byers, Kenneth L.
Byle, Robert E.
Bynum, Arnold F.
Cahill, Edward D., Jr.
Cahill, John J. H.
Cain, Jack W.
Cairns, Melburn W.
Calcagno, Martin J.
Caldwell, George L.
Callaham, Joseph W.
Calvert, Robert W.
Cameron, Dougal H.
Cameron, Raymond A.
Caminiti, Louis J.
Campbell, Frederick H.
Campbell, Henry C.
Campbell, Jack N.
Campbell, Joseph L.
Campbell, Richard E.
Campbell, William W.
Camporini, Edward E.
Candler, Orville G., Jr.
Cantrell, Herbert G.
Canzona, Nicholas A.
Canzonieri, Jack V.
Carcelli, Thomas
Carey, Richard E.
Cargill, Milton C., Jr.
Caridakis, George
Carlon, Francis B.
Carman, Walter J.
Carney, Robert B.
Caron, Alfred C.
Carpenter, Harry U.
Carpenter, Stanley H.
Carper, Esten C., Jr.
Carr, Ira T.
Carr, John B., Jr.
Carr, William C.
Carrubba, Harry D.
Carter, David I.
Carter, Ray N.
Carver, Ivil L.
Case, Kenneth K.
Casey, Charles R.
Cashion, Dana B.
Cashman, James G.
Caslin, William E.
Casper, Jay H.
Castro, Frank M.
Cervin, Michael V.
Chadwick, Robert J.
Chamberlain, Clement C., Jr.
Chambers, Alton B.
Chambers, Franklin R.
Chambers, George G., Jr.
Champion, Robert J.
Chaney, Robert P.
Chapin, Charles H., Jr.
Chaplin, Duncan D., III
Chapman, Clifford O.
Chapman, Donald B.
Chapman, Fred B.
Chapman, Leland L.
Chapman, Robert D., Jr.
Chapman, Winston D.
Charlton, Arthur L., Jr.
Charron, Daniel H.
Cheatum, Lawrence E.
Chellis, Thomas W.
Chen, Byron T.
Cherry, Robert C.
Chiappetti, Donald A.
Chidester, Charles M.
Chisholm, Charles C., Jr.
Chisman, Duane W.
Chrisinger, Edward L.
Christensen, Jack R.
Christian, Robert L., Jr.
Christian, Leo
Christie, Martin S.
Christolos, John N.
Ciaburro, Michael A.
Cicala, George
Cieszynski, Frank M.
Cinko, Leo P., Jr.
Cizek, Gregory J.
Clabaugh, John W., Jr.
Clancy, William S.
Clark, Allen B.
Clark, "C" "P", Jr.
Clark, David A.
Clark, Ralph H.
Clark, Stuart T.
Clayborne, John W.
Cleeland, David A.
Clegg, Donald L.
Cleland, Grover, Jr.
Clemens, William E.
Clement, David A.
Clements, Frederick D.
Cliff, Donald K.
Clifton, William R.
Cline, James, Jr.
Clinton, Melvin J.
Clipper, Charles H.
Cloninger, Mervin F.
Closson, Robert E. L.
Clyde, Denton P.
Clydesdale, Robert, Jr.
Cobb, John H., Jr.
Cockrum, James E.
Coffeen, Albert E.
Coffman, Harold L.
Coffman, John W.
Coffman, John L.
Coffman, Raymond P., Jr.
Coggins, Jerry D.
Cohoon, Jack A.
Cole, Charles A., Jr.
Cole, Doyle H.
Cole, James E.
Cole, Philip J.
Colella, Roland L.
Coleman, Ernest E.
Coleman, Joseph E., Jr.
Colia, John
Colleton, Francis X.
Collin, John R.
Collins, Edward E.
Collins, Harry L.
Collins, Jessie R.
Colvin, Harold C.
Commiskey, Henry A., Sr.
Compton, John G.
Conard, Jack W.
Condra, James E.
Conlin, Henry J.
Connell, Richard F.
Connolly, Howard J.
Connolly, James P., II
Connolly, Martin F.
Connor, Fred W., Jr.
Connors, Joseph E.
Connors, Walter J.
Conrad, Billy D.
Conroy, John F.
Constantine, Edward L.
Coody, James K.
Cook, Andrew B.
Cook, Gorton C.
Cook, Henry T.
Cook, Robert E.
Cooke, Morris D.
Cooley, Donald J.
Cooley, Richard A.
Cooley, Sidney W.
Coon, Elvin R., Jr.
Cooney, Orville D.
Cooney, Robert W.
Cooper, Charles G.
Copeland, Frank E.
Copp, Alan G.
Coppins, Frank B.
Cormier, Clifton J.
Corn, Clifford D.
Corning, William C.
Cornwallis-Stevenson, Cyril H., Jr.
Corrigan, Edward B.
Corson, William R.
Corvi, Joseph A.
Cory, Orie E.
Constanza, Frank Vincent
Constanza, Frank Vito
Costello, Frank P., Jr.
Costigan, James G.
Cothran, Charles A.
Cotreau, Gerald S.
Cotton, Joab, Jr.
Cottrell, Harold E.
Coulter, William L.
Counselman, John D.
Courchesne, Burton Y.
Courtney, James R.
Couto, Louis
Covert, Bert R., Jr.
Cowart, Vernon E.
Cowie, Franklin G., Jr.
Cowie, William K.
Cowing, Harry O., Jr.
Cowling, David R.
Cox, Charles W.
Cox, John D.
Cox, Lemoin
Cox, Reginald J.
Cox, Robert E.
Cox, Samuel A., Jr.
Coyne, Richard J.
Craig, Clarence C.
Craig, Raymond W.
Craumer, Luther C.
Crawford, James R.
Crawford, Lamar G., Jr.
Cremonese, Nick J.
Cresswell, Charles W.
Crispen, Richard W.
Critchett, Edward W.
Croasdell, Theodore P.
Crocker, Ernest, Jr.
Crocker, William G.
Croft, Alfred J., Jr.
Crook, Rex W.
Crookham, Perry E.
Crosby, Hiram B., III
Cross, William E., Jr.
Crosswait, Philip M.
Crowley, John F.
Crowley, Richard W.
Croyle, Fred K.
Cruse, Riley E.
Culkin, Thomas J.
Cullinan, Joseph M.
Cullum, Charles H.
Culpepper, Theodore T.
Culver, Asa B., Jr.
Culver, Ralph K.
Cumiskey, Francis P.
Cummings, Brian J.
Cummings, James M.
Cummings, William M.
Cunard, Earl M., Jr.
Cunard, Edward J.
Cuneo, John E.
Cunliffe, Bruce F.
Cunningham, Ralph L., Jr.
Curry, Richard L. E.
Curtis, Thomas L.
Curwen, Bertram H., Jr.
Cushing, Francis C., Jr.
Cusimano, Joseph
Cutler, Jesse T.
Daane, Marion J.
Daggett, Stanley P., Jr.
Dahl, Clarence G.
Dailey, Leroy E.
Dale, Frederick H.
D'Alesandro, Louis W.
D'Alessandro, Joseph J.
Damm, Raymond C.
Damon, Robert K.
Dangelo, John J.
Dangerfield, George B. C., Jr.
Daniel, Eddie L.
Daniels, Edward B.
Daniels, William S.
Dant, James K.
Darbyshire, Leslie L.
Darling, Max L.
Darnell, James B.
Darr, Leslie R., Jr.
Darracott, Charles M.
Daskalakis, John A.
Dausman, Jack E.
Davi, Charles V.
Davis, Baylus B.
Davis, Dale N.
Davis, David A.
Davis, Donald R.
Davis, Ernest M.
Davis, Ernest K.
Davis, Eugene C., Jr.
Davis, Harold R.
Davis, Hugh C.
Davis, John K.
Davis, John A.
Davis, Joseph L.
Davis, Jules E.
Davis, Kelly J., Jr.
Davis, Kenneth E.
Davis, Merle C.
Davis, Paul L.
Davis, Robert L.
Davis, Thomas G.
Davis, Walter B.
Davis, William J.
Dawe, Harold L., Jr.
Dawes, Henry T.
Dawson, Thomas E.
Day, Francis L.
Day, James L.
Day, Marvin E.
Dayvault, Nevin E.
Deal, Carroll T.
Dean, Harold G.
Dean, John L.
Dean, Paul R.
Deatley, Hillmer F.
De Barr, John R.
Debenport, Marque C.
Deden, Leonard W.
Deen, Thomas J., Jr.
Deering, Claude E., Jr.
Defenbaugh, Neil F.
Degener, Walter E.
Degernes, Mayhlon L., Jr.
Dekle, Curtis C.
Dekle, Ralph G.
Delahunt, Remes E.
Delaney, Francis L.
Delaney, Robert E.
De Long, Earl R.
Demaree, Ralph G.
Demas, John G.
Dement, Loomis L.
Dempsey, Ralph P.
Dennis, Carl R.
Dennis, John H., Jr.
Denormandie, Frank R.
Denstad, Durward A.
Deptula, Edwin A.
Dermako, Louis L.
Derning, Edmund G., Jr.
Dero, Joseph C.
Derr, Norbert M.
Desmond, Robert C.
Desselle, Albert M.
Detroy, John W.
De Vilbiss, Leonard E.
Devine, Lewis H.
De Witt, Birchard B.
Dezer, Charles N., III
Diamond, Donald L.
Di Cillo, Frank, Jr.
Dickey, Robert R., III
Dickison, William
Dickover, Floyd A.
Dickson, David E.
Dickson, John R.
Dicus, William A., Jr.
Diehl, John J.
Dierickx, Phil A.
Dietz, Luther F., Jr.
Dilberger, Louis P., Jr.
Dillard, Jack N.
Dillberg, Warren J.
Dillman, George E.
Dillon, James W.
Dillon, Jimmie L.
Dimick, George D.
Dinardo, James J., Jr.
Dindinger, Jack W.
Dinegar, Wilbur W.
Dinse, William J.
Dion, James W.
Dittmar, Robert W.
Dixon, Frank L., Jr.
Dixon, Richard R.
D'Lamater, Robert J.
Dlugos, Thomas S.
Dodds, William H.
Dodson, Melvin C.
Doering, John H., Jr.
Does, William B.
Doezema, Richard M.
Doherty, John P.
Dolan, John E.
Domina, Walter E.
Donabedian, Haig
Donahue, John J.
Donahue, Leo J.
Donahue, William F., Jr.
Done, Howard P.
Donnelly, Thomas E.
Dooley, Leonard
Dooley, Philip J.
Dorgan, Alfred V., Jr.
Dornan, John E.
Dorsa, Lawrence R.
Dorsey, Clarence M.
Dorsey, Joshua W., III
Doss, James G., Jr.
Doster, Grover C., Jr.
Doty, Duane J.
Doud, Francis E.
Douville, Charles G.
Dowd, John J., Jr.
Dowdy, Robert B.
Dowell, Sidney C.
Dowlearn, Donald W.
Downen, Robert E.
Downs, Willard C.
Doxey, Oliver E.
Drago, Alfred N.
Draper, Fryar E.
Draper, William H.
Dresbach, Earl C., Jr.
Driscoll, Edward J., Jr.
Drummond, Milton D., Jr.
Drumright, William C.
Drury, John W.
Dryden, Weldon J.
Du Charm, Roy M.
Duffy, Leroy M.
Dukes, Robert A., Jr.
Dunbar, Michael J.
Duncan, Edward F.
Duncan, Jimmie W.
Duncan, Louis E.
Duncan, William B.
Dunnagan, Cecil G.
Dunphy, James C.

Du Puy, Robert M. H.
Dura, Andrew
Duran, Jacob H.
Durkin, William L.
Durning, Robert H.
Duvall, Raymond L., Jr.
Dwiggins, William M.
Dwyer, Joseph M.
Dwyer, Maurice F.
Dyer, Charles A.
Dyer, Robert W.
Dyroff, William F.
Dzialo, Edward W.
Eagle, Joseph N.
Eareckson, John L.
Eason, Raymond S.
Easter, Edward V.
Eastman, Robert E.
Eaton, Byron A.
Eaton, Harvey M.
Eberhart, John W.
Ebert, James R.
Eccles, Raymond E. W.
Eckmann, Ronald P.
Eddy, Roger I.
Edler, William S.
Edmunds, Merritt S.
Edson, Merritt A., Jr.
Edwards, Allan R.
Edwards, David E.
Edwards, Fred T.
Edwards, Paul M.
Edwards, Roy J.
Edwards, Thomas C.
Edwards, Veston
Eidson, Robert E.
Eiler, Randolph E.
Elder, Robert A.
Elkins, Jim T.
Elledge, Raymond J.
Elliott, George F.
Elliott, Harry R.
Elliott, Robert V.
Elliott, Thomas M.
Elms, Harry D.
Elstner, Earl T.
Ely, Oscar L., Jr.
Ely, Richard O.
Eme, Richard J.
Emma, Carl J.
Endicott, Goodwin P.
Engemann, Ralph A.
Engesser, Robert B.
Englehart, Samuel E.
Englisch, Henry
Enley, William M.
Ennis, Albert E.
Enos, John A.
Epperson, Robert J.
Epps, Thomas B., Sr.
Erbland, Robert M.
Erickson, Loren T.
Erway, Douglas E.
Erwin, Jack
Eschholz, Theodore S.
Esslinger, Dean E.
Estes, Donald E.
Etheridge, Marion M., Jr.
Ettenborough, Robert B.
Etter, Richard L.
Evans, Donald L., Jr.
Evans, Eddie E.
Evans, Jack W.
Evans, Ray O.
Everett, James, Jr.
Evinger, Martin
Eyer, Clyde L.
Eykyn, Richard G.
Faber, Donald R.
Fagan, William S.
Fahey, John E.
Faraklas, Tom, Jr.
Farley, William F.
Farmer, Herbert L.
Farmer, Martin E.
Farnsworth, Francis W., Jr.
Farrell, Frederick L., Jr.
Farris, William D.
Fasano, Theodore
Fay, Charles D.
Fees, Fred J., Jr.
Fegley, James E.
Fellows, Lawrence E.
Feltman, James D.
Fennessy, Mark P.
Fenton, Clayton C., Jr.
Ferguson, Gilbert W.
Ferguson, James J.
Ferrell, Doyle M.
Fiander, William A.
Field, Francis J.
Fields, Paul R.
Fields, Thomas C.
Fillingim, Perry R.
Filosa, Robert W.
Fimian, Charles
Finney, Henry F.
Fischer, Henry, Jr.
Fischer, Herbert G.
Fischer, Paul H.
Fisher, Joseph R.
Fisher, Sidney
Fitzgerald, Garret J.
Fivel, Ernest J., Jr.
Fleming, William B.
Flood, James H. A.
Florence, Harry A., Jr.
Flores, James R.
Floyd, Donald S.
Floyd, Wayne R.
Fly, Jerry D.
Fogarty, Herbert L.
Fogle, Rupert L.
Foley, Kenneth S.
Folkes, Robert W.
Follendorf, Robert E.
Folmar, Jesse G.
Folsom, Allison G., Jr.
Fontaine, Winston F.
Ford, Aubry P.
Ford, Charles T.
Ford, Thomas F.
Ford, Truett W.
Forde, John E., Jr.
Fordham, Palmer B.
Foreman, John N., Jr.
Forgash, Edward M.
Forman, James R.
Forsberg, Nils B. E.
Fort, William P., Jr.
Fortin, Victor G.
Fortney, Roy H., Jr.
Foster, John E.
Foster, Leslie L.
Foster, Robert E.
Fournier, Marvin J.
Fowler, Charles C.
Fox, Ambrose F.
Fox, George C.
Fox, Jean T.
Fox, John R.
Foxworth, Eugene D., Jr.
Foyle, Robert A.
France, Kenneth E.
Francis, David D.
Francis, Richard H.
Franklin, Joseph P.
Franz, Edgar R.
Franzman, Freddie L.
Fraser, Warren H.
Frasier, Harrison G.
Frazier, Arthur C.
Frazier, Kenyon J.
Frazier, Louis S., Jr.
Frazier, Philip N.
Fredericks, Harold D.
Freeman, John G.
Freeman, Thomas R.
Freeman, Wilton K.
French, Harry D.
Freudenberger, Victor D.
Frey, Eugene C.
Frey, Hubert I.
Friar, Elton V.
Friend, Victor S., Jr.
Fries, Robert T.
Frison, Homer D.
Fritz, Martin F.
Froelich, Anton
Frye, Robert A.
Frye, Robert W.
Fuchs, Leonard E.
Fuller, George E.
Fuller, Robert A.
Fulton, Samuel J.
Funderburk, Ray
Furst, James S.
Gademsky, Leonard C., Jr.
Gaffney, Gerald T.
Gagne, Walter A., Jr.
Galbraith, Thomas H.
Gallant, Raymond A.
Gallman, James R., Jr.
Galyon, William J.
Gambardella, Joseph J. N.
Gant, Virgil R.
Garcelon, Frederick F.
Gardiner, Joseph C., Jr.
Gardner, Marvin D.
Gardner, William R.
Garlick, Ewing D.
Garm, Philip J.
Garman, William E.
Garner, Kenneth C.
Garrett, James T.
Garrett, Willard D.
Garrison, Gerald W.
Garvey, James M.
Gary, Harry L.
Gastrock, Joseph K., III
Gately, William F., Jr.
Geddes, David G.
Geister, Herbert H.
Gelzer, Edward D., Jr.
Gemske, Joseph R.
Gentry, George H., Jr.
Genung, Byron G.
George, Marshall E.
Gerard, James C.
Gerard, Louis E., Jr.
Gerard, Thomas I.
Gerber, Donald A.
Gestson, Johan S.
Gibbs, Randolph M.
Gibney, Jesse L., Jr.
Gibson, George E., Jr.
Gibson, Gerald W.
Gibson, Herbert S.
Gibson, Tom L.
Giddens, Jacques J.
Giesel, Joseph R.
Gifford, Cederic C.
Gillespie, Leonard M.
Gillmore, John H.
Gilman, Cooper L.
Gilman, Donald E.
Gilman, George L., Jr.
Giovingo, Salvador
Girard, David D.
Glancy, Robert F.
Glasgow, Joseph M.
Glass, Hollis W.
Glenka, John M.
Glodowski, Raymond J.
Gloshen, John R.
Glover, William R.
Glowicki, Walter F.
Gober, James R.
Goen, Sargent
Goggin, William F.
Good, George F., III
Good, Robert N.
Goodiel, Carlton D., Jr.
Goodson, Joseph P.
Goodwin, Clanie W.
Gordon, George O., Jr.
Gordy, John C., Jr.
Gore, Francis A., Jr.
Gore, Willis L.
Gorham, George F.
Gorski, William P.
Gorter, Russell T.
Goss, Joseph A.
Gover, Robert L., Jr.
Grabowsky, Fred
Grace, John J.
Grady, Robert J.
Graeber, William G., Jr.
Graham, Ernest H.
Grant, Harley L.
Grant, Walter W.
Grattan, Edward V.
Graves, Frank E.
Graves, Leon A.
Gray, Dennis K.
Gray, Harold Z.
Grayson, Edward F., Jr.
Green, Carleton M.
Green, Frederic A.
Green, Harold A.
Green, Harry
Green, Melvin K.
Green, Thomas N.
Green, William L.
Greenstone, John R.
Greenstone, David I.
Greenwald, Jacob
Greenwood, John E.
Greer, MacDonald
Gregory, Virgil C.
Gresham, John F.
Grey, Richard P.
Grier, Samuel L.
Griffis, Joseph K., Jr.
Griffith, Jack K.
Griggs, Richard W.
Grimes, Doyle
Grimes, George H.
Grochowski, John
Groome, Roland C.
Groover, James E.
Grounds, James D., Jr.
Grubaugh, William R.
Grube, Frederick E.
Gruenler, Robert E.
Gryder, Kenneth W.
Guice, Henry B.
Guidera, Richard T.
Guidone, Frank J.
Gulliford, Charles T.
Gulling, Louis A.
Gumienny, Leo
Gunning, Thomas I.
Gunter, Robert L.
Gustafson, Warren H.
Gustafson, Oscar D.
Habash, Lewis C.
Haebel, Robert E.
Hagarty, Patrick J.
Hagedorn, Elvyn E.
Haggard, Robert G.
Haggerty, John W., III
Halgwood, Paul B.
Hall, Leslie R.
Haines, George C.
Hajtun, Paul
Hale, Edward W.
Haley, Philip W.
Hall, Chester L.
Hall, Clifford D.
Hall, Donald L.
Hall, Edward H.
Hall, Edward C., Jr.
Hall, James E.
Hall, John C.
Hall, Joseph S.
Hall, Lawrence A.
Hall, Lowell N.
Hall, Wayne L.
Hall, William D.
Hall, Willis P., Jr.
Hamilton, Ralph H., Jr.
Hammond, James W., Jr.
Hampton, Everett
Hancock, Fairley A.
Handey, Jack L.
Haney, James M.
Hanifin, Robert T., Jr.
Hanker, James W.
Hanlon, Edmund W.
Hanlon, Edward S.
Hanna, Clarence M.
Hansberry, Dean R.
Hansen, Elmer R.
Hansen, Harold V.
Hansen, Jack R.
Hansen, Sigmund P., Jr.
Hansen, Wilbur V.
Haralson, Percy J.
Hardwick, Homer A.
Hare, Andrew E.
Hare, Casper P.
Hargett, Ernest C.
Haring, Robert A.
Harmon, Autrey B.
Harmon, Henry L.
Harpe, Lilburn L.
Harper, Esmond E.
Harper, Francis R., Jr.
Harrell, James E.
Harrell, John E., Jr.
Harrington, Warner P.
Harris, Allen S.
Harris, Charles W.
Harris, Frank W., III
Harris, Howard H.
Harris, Jack W.
Harris, Jesse R.
Harris, Leroy C., Jr.
Harris, Robert G.
Harris, Robert E.
Harris, William A.
Hart, Elwin B.
Hart, Herbert M.
Harter, Robert H.
Hartman, Richard S.
Harvey, Ewing B.
Harvey, Milwood C.
Haslam, Charles B.
Hatch, Harold A.
Hathaway, Wayne A.
Hatlin, Richard T.
Haughey, Everett W.
Haught, Harold E.
Havlik, John
Hawes, Richard E., Jr.
Hawkins, Lawrence R.
Hawley, Richard L.
Haws, Virgil B.
Hayden, Clark D.
Hayden, Dale L.
Hayes, David B.
Hayes, James M.
Hayes, John C.
Hayes, John L.
Hayes, Winford D.
Haynes, Albert B., Jr.
Haynes, Carl P.
Haynes, George A. P.
Hayward, George E.
Hazard, Gilbert C.
Hazen, Charles E.
Heacox, William J.
Head, Samuel
Hearns, Paul A.
Hecker, James S.
Heffernan, Neal E.
Heiland, John F.
Heim, William P.
Heinemann, Hermann
Heintz, William H.
Heinz, Lester, Jr.
Helgeson, Donald H.
Helm, Wallace H.
Helms, Jonee L.
Helms, Keith H.
Henderson, Richard F.
Henderson, James Y.
Hendrick, Rudolph R.
Hendricks, Leo, II
Hendricks, Clayton V.
Hendrickson, Arvil B.
Hendry, James E.
Henetz, Michael
Hennelly, John A.
Henry, Cullen O.
Henry, Ernest C.
Henry, Kenneth W.
Henzel, Hans W.
Heppert, John R.
Herald, Charles D.
Hergert, John C., Jr.
Herich, Emil W.
Herman, Stanley A.
Hermes, Jack M.
Herndon, Wilber N.
Herod, Jack
Herrin, William M., Jr.
Hershey, Gilbert R.
Hertling, Eugene F., Jr.
Hess, John J.
Hetrick, Lawrence W.
Hewlett, Marvin M.
Heyer, Wallace A.
Hibbard, Roscoe C.
Hice, Kenneth J.
Hickey, Robert E.
Hickman, William T.
Hicks, Norman W.
Hicks, Ray C.
Hielscher, Dalton W.
Hiett, Charles O.
Higginbotham, Robert L.
Highhouse, Laverne D.
Hilderbrandt, Walter J.
Hilgartner, Peter L.
Hill, Billy J.
Hill, Franklin A.
Hill, Malcolm A.
Hill, Robert E.
Hill, Twyman R.
Hill, William P. T., Jr.
Hilliard, Sidney H., Jr.
Hillmer, Donald F.
Hise, Howard L.
Hissom, Irven A.
Hitchcox, Leonard W.
Hittinger, Francis R., Jr.
Hoch, Kurt L.
Hodge, Roy B.
Hodges, Thomas A.
Hoff, Frank X.
Hoffman, James L.
Hoffman, John J.
Hoffman, Robert C.
Hoffmann, James L.
Hogan, Clarence E.
Hogsett, James F., Jr.
Hohlt, Ernest C., Jr.
Hohmann, William F.
Holben, Donald E.
Holcombe, Voline P. J.
Holden, John W., Jr.
Holder, Frank M.
Holdren, Wilfred D.
Holdridge, Forrest B.
Holicky, Joseph J.
Holl, Frederick L.
Hollaway, Charles E., Jr.
Hollaway, Eugene R.
Hollen, Kent D.
Holliday, John H.
Holliday, Winans D.
Hollier, Louis S., Jr.
Holman, John E.
Holman, Ottie P., Jr.
Holmberg, Harry H.
Holmberg, William C.
Holmes, Gilbert H.
Holmes, Joel H.
Holmes, Page H.
Holmes, William C.
Holt, Edward Y., Jr.
Holt, Thomas J.
Holthus, Elmer H.
Holthus, Herbert A.
Holtz, William L.

Homola, Charles S., Jr.
Honeycutt, Paul F.
Honeycutt, James H., Jr.
Hood, Virgil B., Jr.
Hoogendam, John
Hoot, Robert S.
Hoover, Miles M., Jr.
Hopkins, Delos M.
Hopkins, Donald R.
Hopkins, Frederick W.
Hopkins, Travis W.
Horn, James A.
Horn, William K.
Horner, Leonard M.
Horstmann, Theodore
Horton, Jake
Hoskins, Robert E.
Hoskins, Truman B.
Houck, George W.
Houle, James L.
House, Arthur E., Jr.
Howard, Dwight E.
Howard, Eugene R., Jr.
Howard, Frank L.
Howard, Robert E., Jr.
Howard, Thornton M.
Howard, William H.
Howe, George W.
Howell, Preston E.
Howland, Robert W.
Howland, Willis T.
Howle, William O.
Hubbs, Howard L.
Huber, Frederick E.
Hudson, Floyd G.
Hudson, Herman D.
Hueston, Clifford M.
Huffman, William C.
Hufford, Clifford H.
Hughes, Robert C. V.
Humbard, James H.
Humphrey, Frederick M.
Humphrey, Lewis H.
Humphrey, William N.
Humphreys, Richard D.
Hunt, Forest J.
Hunt, Robert G., Jr.
Hunter, Clyde W.
Hunter, Daniel B.
Hunter, David J.
Hunter, Glenn R.
Hunter, Paul R.
Hunter, Robert E., Jr.
Hunter, Samuel F.
Huntzinger, Henry J.
Hurley, Nicklos F., Jr.
Hurley, Robert J.
Hurtig, Marlow B.
Hutcherson, Roger G.
Hutchings, William K.
Hutchinson, Edwin G.
Hutchison, William E.
Hutchisson, William R.
Hutson, James B.
Hutton, Clayton W.
Hyde, Emmett J.
Hytrek, David J.
Imer, Oscar A.
Ingalls, Jack F., III
Ingraham, Charles H.
Ingram, Alfred L. V.
Ingrando, Raymond B.
Inman, Joseph F.
Ireland, Jack J.
Irving, Eugene O., Jr.
Irwin, John W.
Irwin, Robert J.
Ittner, Ernest L.
Iungerich, Stevan
Ivanson, Kenneth J.
Iverson, Rhonald D.
Iverson, Ronald L.
Ives, Merton R.
Ivey, Aaron C.
Ivins, Maurice H., Jr.
Izzo, Robert E.
Jablonski, Raymond C.
Jacks, Edgar K.
Jackson, Armond B.
Jackson, Charles E.
Jackson, Joseph D.
Jackson, John M.
Jackson, Mallett C., Jr.
Jackson, William N.
James, Curtis A., Jr.
Jameson, Robert D.
Janiszewski, George
Jannik, Joseph J.
Janus, Dean G.
Jarman, Charles V.
Jaworski, Edmund W.
Jenkins, Clarence E.
Jenkins, Morris N.
Jenkins, Robert C.
Jensen, Charles C.
Jensen, Donald L.
Jesse, William L.
Jessen, Jesse A.
Johansen, Carl, Jr.
John, Edward S.
Johns, Fred E.
Johns, Fred D.
Johnson, Addison J.
Johnson, Albert D.
Johnson, Brooks, Jr.
Johnson, Charlie P.
Johnson, Claude K.
Johnson, Corbin J.
Johnson, Harold H., Jr.
Johnson, Harvey B.
Johnson, Joe L.
Johnson, John M., Jr.
Johnson, Lee R.
Johnson, Richard Miller
Johnson, Richard Myles
Johnson, Richard P.
Johnson, Roy K.
Johnson, Robert T.
Johnson, Roy M.
Johnson, Robert L.
Johnson, Russell E.
Johnson, Tracy N.
Johnson, Warren R.
Johnston, Howard J.
Jolley, Malcolm S.
Jones, Aubrey T.
Jones, Barney D.
Jones, Charles M. C., Jr.
Jones, Charles F.
Jones, Chester T.
Jones, David E., Jr.
Jones, David G.
Jones, Donald R.
Jones, Edward H.
Jones, Herschel B.
Jones, Richard E.
Jones, Richard K.
Jones, Robert W.
Jones, Warren B., Jr.
Jordan, Branch
Jordan, Howard V.
Jorgensen, Eric I.
Jozwicki, Henry S.
Juba, George
Judge, Clark V.
Judkins, Spencer P.
Justis, Eulas F.
Kaasmann, Bernard A.
Kader, John, Jr.
Kagan, John J.
Kane, Douglas T.
Kane, John J.
Kapetan, Nick J.
Karukin, David S.
Kasch, Lewis C.
Kauffman, Thomas M.
Kavakich, Nicholas
Kay, Willis L.
Kean, Owen A.
Keane, Timothy J., Jr.
Kearney, Jack R.
Kearns, Timothy J.
Keating, Weldon L.
Keefe, John J.
Keenan, Lawrence W.
Keister, Charles F.
Keith, John H., Jr.
Keith, William C., Jr.
Keith, William H.
Keller, Don L.
Keller, Gene S.
Keller, Matthew L.
Kelley, David D., Jr.
Kelley, Paul X.
Kelly, Guy M.
Kelly, Hercules R., Jr.
Kelly, James P.
Kelly, Thomas R.
Kelly, Walter H., Jr.
Kelly, Walter C.
Kelly, William D.
Kenneday, Charles D.
Kennedy, Daniel F., Jr.
Kennedy, Hugh T.
Kennington, Charles R., Jr.
Kenny, Donald S.
Kent, William D.
Kenyon, Joris F.
Kenyon, Ralph F.
Kephart, William R.
Kerr, Charles R., Jr.
Kerr, John, Jr.
Kerrigan, William E.
Keshka, Elmer H.
Kessler, Paul
Keyes, Edward B., Jr.
Kibbee, Roy F.
Kidd, Arthur F.
Kieswetter, Gerard M.
Kilduff, Carroll E.
Killeen, Calhoun J.
Killian, Edwin W.
King, Charles F., Jr.
King, Edwin C.
King, Ethmer W.
King, Homer
King, Jack W.
Kirby, Edward K.
Kirchmann, Charles S.
Kirk, James W.
Kirkman, Donald I.
Kirstein, Lee A.
Kiser, Charles E.
Kiser, Harrol
Kitterman, Warren P.
Kleess, George J.
Kleppsattel, Frederick M., Jr.
Kletzker, Robert L.
Kliefoth, George C.
Kluckman, Wilson A.
Kluth, George J., Sr.
Knack, Frederick J.
Knapp, Charles W.
Knapp, Glenn L., Jr.
Knight, Frederic S.
Knight, Ordeen M.
Kniseley, William J.
Koehler, Robert F.
Koesterer, Albert G.
Koethe, Frank R.
Kohagen, Wayne W. J.
Kohler, Alfred G.
Koler, Joseph, Jr.
Koontz, Grover C.
Kopecky, Kenneth J.
Korstange, Herbert J.
Koste, Raymond A.
Kouba, Joseph
Kozlowski, John
Krajnyak, Richard A.
Kramek, Stanley E.
Kratzert, William A., Jr.
Krause, Burnell H.
Kreider, Robert N.
Krentzlin, Laurence D.
Krepps, Edward H.
Krider, Robert H.
Krist, Chester J.
Kritter, Eugene J., Jr.
Kronberg, William A.
Kruck, Frederick H.
Kucharczk, Valentine J.
Kucharski, Charles R., Jr.
Kuchler, Lester W.
Kuehl, Russell W.
Kuhlmann, Fred D.
Kuhn, James R.
Kuhn, Robert P.
Kull, William M.
Kunkle, Frank P., Jr.
Kurowski, Anthony R.
Kurth, Harold R., Jr.
Kutz, Richard E.
Labahn, Louis E.
LaFond, Lucien J.
Lahendro, Stanley A.
Lahr, Robert J.
Laine, Elliott R., Jr.
Lamb, George R.
Lamm, Mack A.
Lancaster, James T.
Landers, James H.
Landis, James E.
Landrigan, James M.
Lane, William F.
Laney, Joseph M., Jr.
Lang, Walter L., Jr.
Langley, Charles F.
Langley, James F., Jr.
Langston, Isaac C.
Lanning, Clarence G., Jr.
Laperriere, Edward W.
Larghey, Peter J.
Lark, Scott E.
LaRocque, Edward A.
Larouche, Charles R.
Larsen, Robert J.
Larson, Harold V.
Larson, Lavern W.
Larson, Robert N.
Larson, Roger R.
Laseter, James W.
Laskowski, Charles J.
Laubach, Richard C.
Lauck, John H.
Lawler, Gerard E.
Lawrence, Donald W.
Lawrence, George M., Jr.
Lawrence, Randlett T.
Lawrence, William A.
Laws, Robert J.
Lawson, Jewell H.
Lawton, Fred, Jr.
Layne, Gerald J.
Leach, Robert D.
Leader, Samuel F.
Leath, James G.
LeBlanc, Leo J., Jr.
Leder, Frederick D.
Lee, Harry J.
Lee, James E.
Lee, William C., Jr.
Leeseberg, Phillip K.
Leffler, Benjamin
Leidy, Alfred L.
Leigh, Philip A. E.
Lemoine, Levy P.
Lendon, Richard
Lenffer, Guenther W.
Lennon, Thomas P.
Lepp, Joseph R.
Lerond, Jack M.
Le Roux, Paul K.
Le Roy, Howard F.
Lesser, William
Levan, Richard W.
Levert, Harris J., Jr.
Levy, Nathan
Lewandowski, Thaddeus F.
Lewis, Claude R.
Lewis, Elmer M., Jr.
Lewis, James L.
Lewis, Winslow E.
Libbin, Eugene L.
Lichtenwalter, Eugene
Lieland, Edward L., Jr.
Light, Paul L.
Lillestrand, Earl H.
Lilley, James W.
Lillich, Gerald L.
Lilly, Roy A.
Lindell, Alan M.
Lindenmuth, Donald L.
Lindfelt, Haldon E.
Lindquist, Frank W.
Lindsley, Robert A.
Link, John F.
Linman, "L" "G"
Linn, Joseph W.
Lippard, John B.
Lipscomb, Nathan A.
Lipscomb, William R.
Lisi, Frank
Lisicky, Joseph F.
Little, Charles G.
Little, Eldon L., Jr.
Livingston, Gordon M. B.
Livingston, William J.
Lloyd, Paul V.
Lockaby, Prince L.
Locke, John L.
Locke, Orville C.
Lockhart, Oscar L.
Lockhart, Robert L.
Loesch, Robert J.
Loferski, Stanley J.
Logan, Charles P., Jr.
Logan, Raymond E.
Longshaw, William J.
Lorence, Herbert M.
Lorentzen, Paul A.
Losten, John
Lotz, William W.
Love, John R.
Love, John C.
Lovell, "J" "T"
Lowdermilk, Theodore, Jr.
Lowe, John L.
Lowery, Herschel D.
Lubka, Basile
Lucy, Robert M.
Ludwig, Verle E.
Lueckel, Eugene F. W.
Lueders, Carl R.
Lund, John B.
Lundin, Herbert V.
Lundquist, Carl R.
Lundy, Havard F.
Luther, Alexander F.
Lutsko, Ronald G.
Lynch, Joseph B., Jr.
Lynch, Maurice B.
Lynch, Walker R.
Lynk, Edward H. P.
Lyon, Howard
MacDonald, Wilbur L.
MacDonald, James A., Jr.
MacGillivray, John J.
Machin, James E.
Macho, Dean C.
MacKay, Chris
Mackelprang, Justin J.
Mackey, Harold R.
Mackin, Frank J.
Macklin, Daniel K.
Macklin, William H.
MacLean, Fred D., Jr.
MacLean, James H.
Madden, Paul J.
Maddock, Arthur J.
Maddox, Fletcher B.
Mader, John F.
Madore, Norman C.
Magness, Byron L.
Magruder, Bruce, Jr.
Mahan, Daniel L.
Mahoney, Edward R.
Maiden, Robert F.
Malch, Robert L.
Maloney, William R.
Manley, Thomas F.
Mann, Clyde R.
Mann, Vernon O.
Manning, James L.
Manning, Paul A.
Marafine, Victor
Maranville, Evan H.
March, Robert B.
Marchette, Donald E.
Marciniak, Richard H.
Markham, Edward J., Jr.
Marks, Billy C.
Marks, Michael M.
Markus, Howard M.
Marlowe, William H.
Marohn, Howard E. K.
Marousek, Lawrence A.
Marquette, Jacob H.
Marron, Joseph J.
Marsh, Billy E.
Marsh, James W.
Marsh, Richard C.
Marsh, William J.
Marshall, Magness W.
Martel, Romeo G.
Martin, Clarence R.
Martin, Galen R.
Martin, Henry V.
Martin, John D.
Martin, Lee D.
Martin, Lorenzo F.
Martin, Reginald G.
Martin, Robert L., Jr.
Martz, James G., III
Marusak, Andrew V., Jr.
Marushok, Andrew G.
Maskall, Walter D.
Mason, Jan
Mason, Robert G.
Mason, Ronald A.
Massey, Emmett B.
Massey, Lonnie M.
Massey, William W.
Masterpool, William J.
Mathis, George M.
Mathis, Jerry F.
Matthews, Drew I.
Mattimoe, Thomas E.
Maxwell, Edward K.
May, Charles H.
May, Donald L.
May, William L., Jr.
Mayhall, Temple R.
Mayse, Stewart G.
Maysilles, David J.
Mazzuca, Paul, Jr.
McAlee, George E.
McAlinn, John H. P.
McAnally, Marcus D.
McArthur, Robert J.
McCaffrey, Joseph J.
McCain, Gene M.
McCallum, Charles P., Jr.
McCann, Hilton N.
McCarthy, Frank D.
McCarthy, Harold S.
McCarthy, John F., Jr.
McCarthy, Robert C.
McCarthy, "R" Michael
McCarty, Stewart B., Jr.
McCarty, Ted R.
McClanahan, Paul G.
McClelland, William A.
McClintic, Richard D.
McClintic, Arnold L.
McClintock, Bain
McCloskey, Raymond F., Jr.
McCloskey, Donald V.
McClung, Harry S.
McClure, Mack R.
McClure, Robert J.
McClure, Val R.
McCluskey, William T.
McColm, Harry A., Jr.
McComas, Glenn E.

McConnell, George L.
McCool, William G., Jr.
McCormick, Charles A.
McCormick, Gerald D.
McCrary, Norman B.
McCreight, James K.
McCreless, Tom G., Jr.
McCullough, J. D.
McCullough, Aubrey L.
McCurdy, William B.
McCutchan, Robert C.
McCutchen, Richard S.
McDaniel, John H.
McDaniel, Roland L.
McDonald, Edward B.
McDonald, Francis J.
McDonald, James D.
McDonald, James E.
McElheny, Charles L.
McElravy, Doane W.
McElroy, Robert L.
McEnaney, James R.
McEwen, Charles E., Jr.
McFarland, Robert L.
McGarry, James P.
McGee, James H.
McGee, John J.
McGinley, Ervin G.
McGinn, Arthur F., Jr.
McGlynn, Raymond J.
McGrail, Arthur F., Jr.
McGuigan, John R.
McGuire, James L.
McIntosh, John C.
McIntosh, Robert B.
McIntyre, Philip G.
McKain, George E.
McKay, Charles I.
McKean, Edgar A.
McKelvey, Robert E.
McKeon, Donald N.
McKinney, Harold E.
McKonly, Norman E.
McLane, Benjamin V., Jr.
McLaughlin, James J.
McLaughlin, Frederick C.
McLellan, Robert
McLendon, Luther A., Jr.
McLennan, Kenneth
McLernan, Joseph V.
McMahon, Clare R.
McMahon, Paul G.
McMahon, William A.
McMath, James B.
McMichael, Charles D.
McMillan, Alexander P.
McMillian, William F.
McMullen, Harold J.
McNabb, Herbert E.
McNair, Audrey P.
McNally, Charles E.
McNamara, Frederick T., Jr.
McNaughton, George C.
McNeely, Robert L.
McNees, Charles J.
McNerney, R. J., Jr.
McNicholas, Robert J.
McNulty, John S., Jr.
McNussen, Ned E.
McNutt, Russell W.
McPheeters, Thomas A.
McPoland, Edmund C.
McQuinn, Donald E.
McShane, "H" Clint
Mead, Howard R., Jr.
Mead, William D.
Medeiros, Manuel
Meeker, Ermine L.
Meeker, Robert R., Jr.
Megna, Phillip E.
Mehargue, David G.
Mehlinger, Marion F.
Meinke, Theodore
Melanson, Richard C.
Meloy, Donald L.
Melton, Merrill J.
Mericantante, John C.
Merrell, Edward L., Jr.
Merriam, Burton A.
Merrill, Charles A.
Merrill, George A.
Merrill, Willard D.
Merritt, Max A.
Mervish, Nathan
Messina, Anthony V.
Metcalfe, Robert B.
Metz, George F.
Metz, John G.
Metzger, Theodore E.
Meyer, Edward B.
Meyer, William A.
Meyers, Bruce F.
Meyers, George F.
Meyers, James F., Jr.
Meyers, William P. G., Jr.
Michael, Harold J.
Michaud, John B.
Michaux, Alexander L.
Mickelson, Richard D.
Middleton, Austin B., Jr.
Miesse, Maxmillian W.
Miille, Robert J.
Milbert, Alfred N.
Miles, Calvin C., III
Miles, Jack L.
Millar, Stanley G.
Miller, Carl R.
Miller, Donald C.
Miller, Edward A.
Miller, George H.
Miller, Harold C.
Miller, James D.
Miller, John H.
Miller, Martin A.
Miller, Merton M.
Miller, Norman V.
Miller, Richard Robert
Miller, Richard Reid
Miller, Robert T.
Miller, Samuel W., III
Miller, Victor V.
Miller, William R., Jr.
Milless, Elmer W.
Millhauser, Charles F.
Milliken, Samuel T., Jr.
Mills, Dan L.
Mills, George R., Jr.
Mills, Neil B.
Mincey, Andrew V.
Miniclier, John F.
Minko, Steve
Miranda, Anthony
Misiewicz, John
Mitchell, Donald L.
Mitchell, John A.
Mitchell, John F.
Mitchell, Joseph P., Jr.
Mitchell, Orville L., Jr.
Mitchell, Sumner T.
Mitchell, Thomas R.
Mitchell, Weldon R.
Moak, Stanley T.
Moehle, Albert B.
Mogensen, Paul C.
Molesky, Richard V.
Molsberry, Dale M.
Monagle, Edward J.
Monahan, Edward J.
Monroe, Richard D.
Montagne, Arthur B.
Montague, Hodgen P., Jr.
Montague, Paul B.
Montgomery, Robert R.
Montgomery, Benton R., Jr.
Monti, Anthony A.
Montrief, Alfred E.
Mood, Charles G.
Moody, Clarence G., Jr.
Moody, Robert R.
Moog, Carl W.
Mooney, Arthur R.
Mooney, Thomas G.
Moore, Ben A., Jr.
Moore, Derilas A.
Moore, George D.
Moore, Karl E.
Moore, Marc A.
Moore, Max W.
Moore, William L.
Moran, Roy W.
Mordecai, Leon
Morgan, Ira L., Jr.
Morgan, James L.
Morgan, Pat
Morin, Donald E.
Moritz, Andrew B.
Mork, Kenneth E.
Morley, Dean H.
Morocco, Carmen P.
Morris, Frank B.
Morris, Harry L., Jr.
Morris, John L.
Morrison, Eugene M.
Morrison, George E.
Morrison, Karl D.
Morrow, Richard C.
Morrow, Samuel M.
Morton, Peter G.
Mosher, Charles M.
Moss, Roddey B.
Moss, Roy E.
Mousetis, Roy
Mouvery, George J.
Mueller, Richard A.
Muir, Joseph E.
Muir, William B.
Mulford, Ross L.
Mulholland, Frank J.
Mulligan, Bernard J.
Mulrennan, Timothy C.
Munn, Charles R., Jr.
Munsell, Vernon S.
Murphree, Thomas E.
Murphy, Edward J.
Murphy, Edward S.
Murphy, Gordon S.
Murphy, John J.
Murphy, Louis A., Jr.
Murphy, Richard F.
Murphy, Walter F., Jr.
Murray, Frank J.
Murray, George S.
Murray, James M.
Musgrove, Edgar F.
Myers, James W.
Myers, Paul H.
Myzienski, Stanley A.
Nagrodsky, Leo N.
Nasin, Edward R.
Nastasi, Joseph
Navorska, Donald R.
Neal, Ralph B.
Needham, Robert C.
Neef, Robert L.
Nelson, Albert O.
Nelson, Clayton C.
Nelson, Keith W.
Nelson, Neil A.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, William L.
Nesbitt, Cleon E.
Neshyba, Victor P.
Nesmith, Joseph Q.
Nester, John J.
Netka, William
Neuman, Max L.
New, Noah C.
Newmark, Charles C.
Newsom, Rollie D.
Newton, Charles O.
Newton, George L.
Newton, Minard P., Jr.
Newton, Orbin D.
Nicholas, Charles E.
Nichols, Robert L.
Nicholson, Charles P.
Nicholson, Robert E.
Nickel, Frederick J.
Niekowal, Michael J.
Nielsen, Jack R.
Niesen, Paul W.
Nilsen, George H.
Nims, William H., Jr.
Niolet, James W.
Nix, Grover H., Jr.
Nixon, Dalbro R., Jr.
Noble, Richard F.
Nolan, Harry J.
Nolan, Jack L.
Nolte, Herman
Nooney, Edward J.
Norfolk, Ira P.
Norman, Jack L.
Norris, Edward S.
North, Olin K.
Norton, Robert J.
Norton, Willie E.
Novak, Anthony
Nowak, Teddy W.
O'Brien, Martin W.
O'Connell, John P.
O'Connell, James P.
O'Connell, Lawrence G., Jr.
O'Donnell, Andrew W.
O'Donogue, Arthur
O'Dowd, Richard C.
Ogilvie, Gordon F.
O'Grady, Walter H.
Ohanesian, Victor
O'Hara, Philip T.
Ohina, Joseph S.
Ohlgren, Arthur S.
Ohlhaver, William G.
O'Keefe, Gerard P.
O'Keefe, Keith
Oldenburg, Forrest A.
O'Leary, Raymond J.
Oliver, Jesse W.
Oliver, Milton P.
Oliver, Robert W.
Oliver, Verne L.
Oliver, William M.
Olliff, Charles K.
Olmstead, Stephen G.
Olmsted, Vernon
Olney, Orville N.
Olsen, Martin P.
Olson, Frederic O.
Olson, Stanley H.
Olszewski, George M.
Oltermann, John J.
O'Mara, James R.
O'Mara, John F.
Omasta, Carl
Ondek, Joseph P.
O'Neal, Robert P.
O'Neill, Patrick J.
Opacic, George
Opfar, Charles H., Jr.
O'Reilly, Thomas M.
Orr, James H.
Orth, Willard G.
Osborn, Charles L.
O'Shea, Robert J.
Osserman, Stanley J.
Osterhoudt, Peter C.
Overby, Eber V.
Overmeyer, Gerald D.
Owens, Morris C.
Owens, Owen L.
Owens, Thurman
Owensby, Archie F.
Packard, Guy C.
Padgett, Norman L.
Palatas, Michael V.
Palmer, Charles W.
Palmer, Kenny C.
Palmer, Robert E. B.
Palmer, Thomas A.
Palmer, Wayne G.
Paluszak, Joseph A., Jr.
Pangburn, Charles E.
Papale, Frank
Pape, Richard A.
Papke, Marshall E.
Paradis, Eugene J.
Paraskos, Peter G.
Paratore, Joseph F.
Parcell, William K.
Parchen, John W.
Paredes, Oswald O.
Paris, Euclid P.
Park, Charles E.
Park, Herbert E.
Parker, Barney W.
Parker, Eric B.
Parker, Landon W.
Parker, Roy L.
Parnell, Edward A.
Parrish, Darold D.
Parrish, Robert G.
Parrott, Robert E.
Parsels, Fred A.
Parsons, Harvey L.
Parsons, Harold L.
Parsons, Tom D.
Pates, Bruce A., Jr.
Patrick, Cecil L.
Patrick, Charles E.
Patrick, John M.
Patterson, Ray W.
Patton, William C.
Paubel, Vernon E.
Paulson, Raymond C.
Pavlicin, George A.
Pawelski, Clarence B.
Peabody, Clifford J.
Pearce, Garry M., Jr.
Pearce, Jacob M., Jr.
Pearce, Robert H.
Pearcy, Eddie E.
Peard, Roger W., Jr.
Pearson, Martin
Pearson, Paul E.
Pechar, George
Peck, Robert O.
Peck, William H.
Pedersen, Eric T.
Peeler, John J.
Pegues, Dock H.
Pelletier, Phillip L.
Penico, Edward F.
Penley, Virgil R.
Peppin, David D.
Percival, Richard E.
Perdue, John R.
Perkins, Frank A.
Perrich, Robert J.
Perrin, Frank G.
Perry, Alfred L., Jr.
Perry, Samuel C., Jr.
Petersen, Arthur R.
Peterson, Robert A.
Peterson, Willard S.
Peterson, William M.
Petska, Jack J.
Petty, James D.
Phelan, Don G.
Phelps, Laurence M., Jr.
Philbin, William
Phillips, George R.
Phillips, Joseph V.
Phillips, Jack B.
Pickett, Philip G.
Pidgeon, George J.
Piedmont, Joseph A., Jr.
Piehl, Robert H.
Piercy, Samuel E.
Pierson, Edward J.
Pieti, Jerome N.
Pifer, Adrian C.
Pieno, Ray D.
Plante, Donald P.
Plaskett, William, Jr.
Platt, Robert M.
Poillon, Arthur J.
Poindexter, Gordon W., Jr.
Poirier, Edward C.
Polidori, Joseph A.
Pollak, William F.
Pollock, Edwin A., Jr.
Pollock, Warren R.
Pommerenk, Albert C.
Poole, Eugene F.
Poorman, Donald W.
Poppe, Charles R., Jr.
Porter, Darrel D.
Porter, Kenneth R.
Porter, Ollie B.
Porter, Robert H., Jr.
Post, Carlton L., Jr.
Post, Raymond A.
Post, Robert L.
Post, Robert J.
Pottebaum, Linus F.
Powell, Cluese T.
Powell, David D.
Powell, "J" "B"
Powell, Lester E.
Prater, William T.
Pratt, Lawrence H.
Preis, Reagan L.
Prendergast, Donn J.
Presson, Robert E.
Preston, Herbert, Jr.
Price, Chester W.
Price, Gordon I.
Price, James C.
Priddy, James R.
Primrose, Richard A.
Prisby, Daniel D.
Probst, Arthur E.
Pross, Vincent J., Jr.
Protz, Albert L.
Proudfoot, Ronald M.
Pryor, Bertram H.
Pryor, Richard E.
Puckett, Charles R.
Puckett, Eugene R.
Pullen, George D., Jr.
Pulliam, John S.
Purcell, Robert D.
Purdum, Frederick K.
Pytko, Albert R.
Qualls, Thomas F.
Queen, Felix E.
Quigley, John E.
Quinn, Charles B.
Quinn, Francis X.
Quinn, James W.
Quisenberry, James R.
Rabe, Leroy D.
Radjeski, Theodore G.
Radwell, Francis J.
Rafi, Paul H.
Ragsdale, Evieo
Rall, Raymond R., Jr.
Randall, Harry B., III
Randolph, Richard J., Jr.
Rann, Louis A.
Raper, Clarence H.
Raphael, Milton L.
Rapp, David A.
Rapp, Ray E.
Rasmussen, John H.
Ratliffe, Estes N.
Rauh, Stanley H.
Ravensberg, Elmore F.
Ray, Charlie L.
Ray, Edwin A.
Rea, Robert H.
Read, Brooke F., Jr.
Ready, James S.
Reaka, Kenneth E.
Reames, John A.
Recker, Herbert J.
Reddy, John J. P.
Redfield, Heman J., III
Redman, Charles B.
Reece, John M.
Reece, Lee C.
Reed, Jack L.
Reeder, James H.
Reep, Maurice A.
Rees, Grover J., Jr.
Reese, Charles L.
Reese, Chester E.
Reese, Howard E.
Reeve, Frank M.

Reeves, Charles D.
Regan, Frank C.
Rehberg, Louis J.
Rehfus, James R. A.
Reid, Calvin C.
Reid, James H., Jr.
Reid, Willard J.
Reilly, Martin B.
Reilly, Walter J.
Reissner, Pierre D., Jr.
Reogas, Wylie W.
Reville, John T.
Reynolds, Maurice V.
Reynolds, Thomas H., Jr.
Rhoads, Earl F.
Rhodes, William C.
Rhykerd, Clarke A.
Rhymes, Thomas R.
Rice, Donald L.
Rice, Keith M.
Rice, Kenneth E.
Rice, Knowlton P.
Rice, William H.
Rice, William R.
Rich, John E.
Richard, James L.
Richard, Roy
Richards, John B., IV
Richards, Lee O., Jr.
Richards, Wayne E.
Richmond, James C.
Ridderhof, David M.
Riddle, Robert G.
Rieder, Alvin R.
Riegert, Theophil P.
Rigby, Edward J.
Riggin, William H., Jr.
Riggs, James L.
Riggs, Joseph E., Jr.
Riggs, Thomas W.
Riley, James M., Jr.
Riley, Leon C.
Ringwood, Thomas E., Jr.
Risinger, Robert O.
Ritchie, George W.
Ritchie, Robert F., III
Rixey, Presley M.
Robb, Allan H.
Robbins, Jack W.
Robbins, Raymond B.
Roberson, Clinton
Roberts, Charles D., Jr.
Roberts, Clyde R.
Roberts, Dwight E.
Roberts, Erastus W.
Roberts, James F.
Robertson, Robert L.
Robertson, John W. P.
Robinette, James A.
Robinson, Andrew J., Jr.
Robinson, Dayton, Jr.
Robinson, Eddie L.
Robinson, Frank C., Jr.
Robinson, Howard P.
Robinson, Kenneth L., Jr.
Robison, Donald G.
Rocheleau, Adolph A.
Rochford, Thomas F.
Rockey, William K.
Rodes, Nye G., Jr.
Rodney, Glenn W.
Roe, Patrick C.
Roebuck, George H., Jr.
Roeder, Raymond E., Jr.
Roessle, Palmer A.
Rogal, Edward R.
Rogers, Harry L., Jr.
Rogers, Hillman G.
Rogers, William M.
Rohde, Alfred W., Jr.
Roland, Harold E., Jr.
Romanak, John F.
Ronsvalle, John
Ronzone, Philip H.
Roobian, Lowery L.
Rook, James A.
Roosen, Paul J. G.
Roothoff, John J.
Rose, Maurice
Rose, William W.
Rosecrans, Robert D.
Rosenfeld, Charles A.
Rosenthal, Kermit E.
Ross, Ferdinand J., Jr.
Ross, Robert G.
Rossi, Robert J.
Rossman, Harry
Rote, Keith M.
Roth, Earl F., Jr.
Roth, Harold B., Jr.
Roti, Salvatore P.
Rourke, Rodger E.
Rowe, Ben C.
Rowe, Edward J.
Rowlett, Lon F.
Rowley, Jack D.
Rozycki, Edmund V.
Rubin, Norman
Rudy, Rylen B.
Rudzis, Edwin M.
Ruggiero, Alexander S.
Rumble, Gerould M., Jr.
Rump, William S.
Runyan, Clair F.
Ruos, George V., Jr.
Ruse, Clark
Rush, Marvin R.
Russ, Donald M.
Russ, William S.
Russ, William M.
Russell, Frank H.
Rutty, Edward J.
Ruud, Howard A.
Ruvo, Victor A.
Ryan, James E.
Ryan, Raymond M.
Ryan, Sidney J.
Ryan, William J.
Ryckman, James B.
Ryder, Ted J.
Sadeski, Adloph G.
Sadler, Lester J.
Sadowski, Joseph L.
Sagar, Harry L.
Saine, Presley K.
Saitta, Frank H.
Salvo, Victor A., Jr.
Sample, Edward J.
Sanborn, Don L.
Sanders, Paul E.
Sandifer, Lonnie B.
Santee, Robert E.
Sanzo, James
Sargent, George T., Jr.
Sasser, Ruthledge S.
Saucier, William A.
Sauls, Reginald G., IV
Saunders, William F., Jr.
Sauter, Arthur E.
Savage, Cornelius F., Jr.
Savage, Richard A.
Savard, Robert D.
Sawin, Dwight H., Jr.
Sawyer, George P., Jr.
Scarboro, Don
Schaefer, Philip W.
Scharfen, John C.
Scharnberg, George R.
Schatteman, George C.
Schauppner, Ernest G.
Schels, John K.
Schening, Richard J.
Schied, John P.
Schiffman, Earl R.
Schimmenti, Joseph A.
Schiweck, Kenneth W.
Schlef, William K.
Schlick, Joseph K.
Schlueter, Stanley R.
Schmitt, Grover P.
Schneeman, Charles J.
Schneider, Arthur C.
Schneider, Leo M.
Schoen, James R.
Schoenberger, Leonard
Schrader, Bernard J.
Schramel, Raymond F.
Schreiber, Milton W.
Schreirer, William J.
Schrier, Harold G.
Schryver, Gilbert D.
Schryver, Hugh C., Jr.
Schueler, Robert
Schultz, Gerald F.
Schultze, Edward W.
Schulze, Carl H.
Schwab, Charles F.
Schwartz, John L.
Schwindt, Louis W.
Schwinn, David K.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Scott, Louis B.
Scott, Robert G.
Scott, Wilkins M.
Scott, William A., Jr.
Scribner, Robert G.
Scruggs, Robert L.
Seaman, Donn E.
Seaman, James B.
Seamans, Floyd B.
Seamon, Lawrence R.
Searles, Robert M.
Sears, Redford D.
Seaton, Baxter W.
Seaver, Roy A.
Sebilian, Robert C.
Sedinger, James P.
See, Charles M.
Segner, Donald R.
Seissiger, John E.
Seitz, Frederick H.
Self, John L.
Sellers, Donald L.
Selmyhr, Garlen L.
Selvitelle, Benjamin B., Jr.
Serrin, Dalvin
Settle, Ray W.
Severson, Ronald I.
Sewell, Charles A.
Seymour, Rufus A.
Shadrick, Ural W.
Shanahan, Thomas C.
Shane, Leo A.
Sharon, Donald W.
Sharp, William T.
Sharpe, Whitlock N.
Shatzer, Dale E.
Shaw, John W.
Shaw, Milton
Shaw, Thomas J.
Shea, James F., Jr.
Shea, John R.
Shea, Joseph C., Jr.
Shea, Paul E.
Shea, William E.
Sheehan, Charles I.
Shelby, Alfred C., Jr.
Sheldon, Jack D.
Shellhorn, Melvin W.
Shepherd, George E.
Shepherd, Lemuel C., III
Sheppe, Richard W.
Sheridan, Richard B.
Sherman, Warren C.
Shewman, William W.
Shields, William B.
Shifflette, Carl F.
Shifter, Ernest
Shinka, Michael J.
Shippen, William D.
Shortsleeves, Vernon C.
Shoup, John D.
Showalter, Charles E.
Shrader, Paul A.
Shuford, Robert L.
Shugert, Ralph W.
Shull, Robert E.
Shuman, William H.
Shutler, Philip D.
Shutt, George H., Jr.
Siegfried, William G., Sr.
Siegmund, Paul L.
Sigmon, Emmett B., Jr.
Silva, Donald A.
Silverthorn, Eugene A.
Silverthorn, Robert S.
Simanikas, William C.
Simms, Burt C.
Simonis, Robert L.
Simpson, Parks H.
Sims, John B.
Sinclair, Robert B.
Singer, Frederick D.
Singleton, Benjamin S.
Singleton, Kenneth W.
Sisson, Donald D.
Sivert, Patrick G.
Skaugen, Carl W.
Skelt, Ernest P., Jr.
Skinner, Benjamin B.
Skinner, James D.
Skotnicki, Anthony J.
Skvaril, Warren J.
Slack, Larue C.
Slack, Robert K.
Slagle, John W.
Slawter, Louis Z., Jr.
Sleger, Joseph, Jr.
Slenning, Bradford N.
Sloan, Clyde
Sloan, James A.
Slusarz, George A.
Smiley, Hubert A.
Smith, Albert C., Jr.
Smith, Alfred E.
Smith, Arthur D.
Smith, Calhoun
Smith, Charles S.
Smith, Chester L.
Smith, Donald H.
Smith, Edward E.
Smith, Elmore G.
Smith, Erin D.
Smith, George W.
Smith, Gordon N.
Smith, Grady F.
Smith, Herbert O.
Smith, Hugh L.
Smith, Hulon C.
Smith, Jack C.
Smith, Joseph T.
Smith, Joseph
Smith, Lloyd A.
Smith, Louie J.
Smith, Luther S., Jr.
Smith, Patrick D.
Smith, Richard E.
Smith, Richard J.
Smith, Richard W.
Smith, Robert A.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert N.
Smith, Thomas C.
Smith, Wallace
Smith, Wendell P.
Smith, William L.
Smith, Windsor R., Jr.
Smoke, Frank R.
Smola, John K.
Snelling, Edward W.
Snipes, Thomas G.
Snow, Melvin W.
Snyder, Billy H.
Snyder, Elmer N.
Snyder, Joris J.
Snyder, William E.
Soderbergh, Peter A.
Soehner, Russell S.
Soltys, Frank M.
Solze, Robert L.
Sonneborn, Melvin D.
Soper, James B.
Sorley, Elmer H.
Sowell, Lucion N., Jr.
Spangler, Donald E.
Spangler, James E.
Spark, Michael M.
Sparks, Thomas, Jr.
Sparks, William F.
Spaulding, Jack D.
Spears, Hugh S.
Speckart, Eugene O.
Spence, Morgan L.
Spencer, Cecil C.
Spencer, Donald E.
Spencer, George D.
Spencer, Justin A.
Spencer, Richard T.
Spicer, Raymond B.
Spiller, James O.
Spina, Leonard C.
Spiro, Michael E.
Spithaler, Paul W., Sr.
Springfield, William B.
Spry, William R.
Sroufe, Robert C.
Staffney, Robert G.
Staley, Newbert B.
Staley, Newell D., Jr.
Stallknecht, Edward S.
Stamps, Clyde H.
Stanaro, Chester J.
Standley, Billy R.
Stanhouse, James W.
Stanley, Clarence R.
Stanley, Ralph B.
Stansberry, Richard E.
Stansel, Edward H.
Stanton, Andrew W. J.
Stanton, David R.
Stanton, Donald C.
Starek, Robert H.
Start, Raymond J.
Stavridis, Paul G.
Stcherbinine, Youry A.
Steed, Robert E.
Steele, Kenneth R.
Stein, Samuel W.
Stein, William E.
Steiner, Clifford D.
Steinway, Robert A.
Stemple, James W.
Stephens, Glenn A.
Stephens, James C.
Stephens, Reuel W., Jr.
Stephens, Robert W.
Stephenson, Charles R., III
Stephenson, Paul F.
Sternkopf, Frederick R.
Stevens, Glenn B.
Stevens, James A.
Stevens, Marvin H.
Stevens, Thomas J.
Stevenson, Robert L., Jr.
Stewart, Allan M.
Stewart, Alexander M.
Stewart, Gerald H.
Stewart, Howard D., II
Stewart, Hugh W.
Stewart, Jesse L.
Stewart, Kenneth R.
Stewart, Roderick M.
Stewart, Robert F.
Stewart, Warren L.
Stewart, William H., Jr.
St. Germain, Donald C.
Stidham, Howard E.
Stiles, Charles R.
Stiles, Hugh A.
Stiles, Otto G.
Still, Richard L.
Stine, Harold E.
Stiver, Donald R.
St. Jeor, LeRoy A.
Stockton, Richard C.
Stoddart, William D., III
Stoetzer, William H.
Stoffa, Joseph J., Jr.
Stone, Earnest H., Jr.
Stone, Lester M., Jr.
Stone, Robert R.
Stonebraker, Donald W.
Storm, William W., III
Stout, Dale E.
Stowers, Henry B.
Stowers, Robert M.
Strahan, John
Stranahan, Jerome W.
Strandquist, John H.
Strauley, Wesley E.
Strickland, James A.
Striegel, Bernard Q.
Strong, Hubert R.
Strope, John H.
Stuart, Thomas R.
Stuart, Vaughn R.
Stupay, Robert A.
Sturgell, Charles B.
Stutler, Earl C.
Sudduth, Joseph F.
Sudhoff, Richard I.
Sugg, Joel D., Jr.
Suits, Willard J., Jr.
Sullivan, Arthur J.
Sullivan, Charles H.
Sullivan, John E.
Sullivan, John J.
Sullivan, Lawrence F.
Sullivan, Ralph E.
Sullivan, Robert C.
Sullivan, Vincent C.
Summers, Henry A.
Summers, Theodore
Svenson, Otto L., Jr.
Swallow, Judson J.
Swanda, Donald F.
Swann, Clarence R.
Swartz, Joseph A., Jr.
Swigart, Oral R., Jr.
Swilley, Charles R., Jr.
Swords, John J.
Sylvester, Vernon L.
Taber, Richard B.
Taft, Leonard C.
Takach, Frank S.
Talbert, Aubrey W., Jr.
Talbott, Richard B.
Tallentire, Gilson A. D.
Tanguay, Raymond G.
Tanner, Fred L.
Tanzler, Warren G.
Tapley, Willis C.
Tardif, Donald W.
Tart, Mangum H.
Tate, Albert L.
Tate, James D.
Tatem, Lloyd E.
Tatum, William M., Jr.
Taves, Alfred C.
Taylor, Eugene A.
Taylor, James G. G.
Taylor, John R.
Taylor, Joseph Z.
Taylor, Laurence A.
Taylor, Robert W.
Taylor, Roma T., Jr.
Taylor, William W.
Taylor, Wilber F.
Telmanik, Andrew
Terry, John M., Jr.
Terry, Mabry A.
Terry, Robert A.
Thayer, George F.
Thomas, Alfred I.
Thomas, Donald B.
Thomas, Fred L.
Thomas, Frederick S.
Thomas, Gerald C., Jr.
Thomas, Harold A.
Thomas, Hasil S.
Thomas, Holcombe H.
Thomas, Jay J., Jr.
Thomas, Johnny W.
Thomas, John C.
Thomas, Milford J.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Robert J.
Thomas, Robert E.
Thompson, Carl B., Jr.

Thompson, Elmer M.
Thompson, James S.
Thompson, John S.
Thompson, William A.
Thomson, Robert P.
Thornton, Dale
Thousand, William H.
Thro, Clinton J., Jr.
Thuesen, Ralph
Thursby, Gilbert E.
Thurston, Francis H.
Thyrring, Arthur J.
Tief, Francis W.
Tillis, James G.
Tilton, Robert C.
Timerman, Roy P.
Timme, William G.
Timmes, Edward A.
Tinius, David H.
Tipton, Wiley E.
Tipton, William L., Jr.
Tobias, James W.
Todd, James A.
Tolle, David S.
Tomkinson, Robert H., Jr.
Toner, Edward R.
Tonnacliff, Charles W.
Tooker, Donald K.
Tootle, James A.
Topley, Frank D.
Toth, William, Jr.
Toups, Thaddeus J.
Townsend, Jack E.
Townsend, James V.
Townsend, Kyle W.
Trahan, Francis J.
Trainor, Bernard E.
Trapnell, Nicholas M., Jr.
Travis, Willis S.
Traywick, Wayne H.
Treado, Marshall J.
Tremmel, Robert M.
Trepagnier, Wade H., Jr.
Trepas, Ronald
Trevino, Rodolfo L.
Trisler, William F.
Troen, Luther G.
Trout, James A.
Troutman, Dudley J.
Trowbridge, Clyde A.
Troxler, George W.
Trumble, Frank C.
Tryon, Clifford G.
Tubbs, Henry W., Jr.
Tubley, George F.
Tucker, Chester E.
Tucker, Lenard E.
Tucker, Taylor J.
Tufts, Ralph W.
Tullis, Newton C.
Turner, James S. G.
Turner, Kenneth E.
Turner, Richard D.
Turner, Roland L.
Turner, Thomas W., Sr.
Turner, Thomas W.
Turpin, Charles A.
Tuszynski, Ervin J.
Twohey, Richard B.
Twomey, David M.
Tworek, Joseph A., Jr.
Uffelman, Paul R.
Uhlemeyer, Ted, Jr.
Ulf, Richard M.
Umphrey, William G.
Unger, William T.
Unkle, John W.
Unterkofler, John J.
Usher, Edward G.
Uskurait, Robert H.
Usrey, Joseph C., Jr.
Utley, Edward H.
Utter, Leon N.
Valdes, Edmund
Valencic, Ralph F.
Valentine, Ira S., Jr.
Valentour, James V.
Vamosi, Joseph S.
Vanairsdale, James B.
Van Camp, Philip A.
Van Cantfort, Rollin F.
Vance, Carlton V.
Vance, Robert N.
Van Cleve, Roy R.
Van Dalsem, Robert R.
Van Den Berg, Oliver W., Jr.
Vanderbeck, Jack L.
Van Deusen, Larry R.
Van Fleet, Thomas R.
Van Hekken, Peter J.
Van Liew, Willard J.
Van Meter, Jo M.
Van Winkle, Archie
Van Zuyen, William M.
Varnado, Wilmon
Vary, Roland D.
Vaughan, Buckner T.
Venable, James C.
Vernon, Thomas E.
Vest, Wendell N.
Vetter, William J., Jr.
Vickery, Wallace E.
Vielhauer, William C.
Vincent, Hal W.
Visage, Billy F.
Vnencak, Paul A.
Vogler, Frank L.
Vogt, Timothy S.
Volney, Frank, Jr.
Volz, Fritz
Vomorde, Ewald A., Jr.
Vosmik, Joseph M.
Voss, Herbert F.
Vrabel, Michael J.
Vroegindewey, Robert J.
Vugteveen, Harold L.
Vuillemot, Floyd L.
Wachter, John A.
Wadsworth, Richard M.
Wadsworth, Thomas B.
Wadzita, Cyril
Wagenhoffer, Martin T.
Wagner, William F.
Wahrer, Maurice S.
Walbert, Herman H.
Walden, Denzil E.
Waldrop, Floyd H.
Waliszek, Stanley F.
Walker, Charles B.
Walker, Charles H.
Walker, Dan C., Jr.
Walker, Emerson A.
Walker, Lloyd W.
Walker, Paul D., Jr.
Walker, Phillip C.
Walker, Robert A.
Walker, William T.
Wall, Theodore R.
Wall, Warren G.
Wallace, Charles M., Jr.
Wallace, Ralph D.
Wallace, William T.
Wallach, Albert W.
Waller, Littleton W. T., II
Walsh, David W.
Walsh, John J.
Walsh, John J., Jr.
Walsh, Walter V.
Walters, Harold L.
Walters, Russell W.
Walton, Leo E., Jr.
Wann, Charles M., Jr.
Warner, Charles N.
Warren, Goodell P.
Warren, Harry H., Jr.
Warshawer, Alan J.
Waryek, Henry
Watson, Clarence E., Jr.
Watson, Edward R.
Watson, John E.
Watson, Robert T., Jr.
Watson, Theodore H.
Watson, William L. B.
Watts, Ivan L.
Watwood, Marshall
Wayerski, Joseph R., Jr.
Weaver, Charles A.
Webb, James O.
Webb, John N.
Webb, Lewis R.
Webb, Marshall A., Jr.
Weber, Raymond J.
Webster, Charles A.
Webster, Charles B.
Webster, Willard K.
Weddel, Charles R.
Weed, Alton C.
Wehrle, Robert E.
Weidner, John P.
Weiland, Joseph K.
Weiler, Paul
Weimer, Samuel A., Jr.
Weitekamp, Lawrence E.
Weitz, Frank E.
Weizenegger, James A.
Wells, Richard P.
Wells, Robert W.
Wenger, Justin H.
Wentworth, William
Werner, Francis R.
Werner, Robert F.
Wessel, Wallace
West, Richard H.
West, Wilbur E.
Westcott, Charles T.
Westenberger, Paul H.
Westerlind, George L.
Westerman, Jack
Westling, David Y.
Westmoreland, Robert H.
Weston, Walter A.
Westphall, Howard A.
Whisman, Ermil L.
White, Cyrus N., Jr.
White, Harold T.
White, Howard J.
White, Jack D.
White, James H.
White, Leo T.
White, Roger J.
White, Thomas B., Jr.
White, William C.
White, William J.
White, William V. H.
Whitebread, Robert C.
Whitehead, Arthur T.
Whitehead, Charles F.
Whitehurst, Kenneth
Whitesell, William A.
Whitesell, Robert D.
Whitfield, Charles K.
Whiting, Charles S.
Whitney, Robert L.
Whitten, Carson D., Jr.
Whitten, Earl W.
Whitten, Orrin S.
Wickwire, Peter A.
Wiese, Edward F.
Wightman, David J.
Wightman, Gene F.
Wilcox, Edward A.
Wilder, Gary
Wildey, Robert L.
Wiley, Charles J.
Wilkerson, Herbert L.
Wilkinson, Henry E.
Wilkinson, James B.
Wilkinson, Bobby R.
Wilkinson, Deronda A.
Will, Kenneth E.
Willers, George H.
Willett, William E.
Williams, Clifford W.
Williams, Carl D.
Williams, Estas L.
Williams, Floyd C.
Williams, John O., Jr.
Williams, Kenneth C.
Williams, Ralph
Williams, Tom W.
Williams, William G.
Williamson, Charles T.
Willis, Coyle H.
Willis, Joe E.
Willis, Maxey A.
Willis, Theodore J.
Willoughby, Raymond D.
Wills, Daniel
Wilson, Charles W.
Wilson, Daniel M.
Wilson, Douglas H.
Wilson, Harold B.
Wilson, James J.
Wilson, James S.
Wilson, Paul E.
Wilson, "R" "B"
Wilson, Robert H.
Wilson, Wesley L.
Wilson, William T.
Wilson, William Berry, Jr.
Wilson, William E., Jr.
Wilson, William Bennett, Jr.
Wines, Edward J.
Winfield, Charles R.
Winn, Robert D.
Winstead, Malcolm E.
Winter, Robert M.
Winters, James E.
Wirth, Leroy K.
Witkowski, Henry J.
Woeller, Frederick M.
Wofford, Ivon D.
Wold, Henry E.
Wolfe, James F., Jr.
Wolff, Warren F.
Womack, Carl G.
Wood, Carl J.
Wood, Frederick S.
Wood, James W.
Wood, Leonard E.
Wood, Paul A.
Wood, Ralph C.
Wood, Stanley J.
Wood, Thomas T.
Wood, William O., Jr.
Woodard, Reece J.
Woodbury, Levi
Woodcock, Cecil E., Jr.
Woodham, Tullis J., Jr.
Woodland, Douglas G.
Woodruff, Paden E., Jr.
Woodruff, Richard L.
Woods, Harry D.
Woods, John L.
Woodul, Charles E.
Woodward, Ray, Jr.
Word, John G.
Work, Robert G.
Worley, Kermit M.
Wornham, Thomas V. A.
Worster, Lyle H.
Wozencraft, Clark R.
Wray, Richard E., III
Wright, Edward A.
Wright, Herbert L.
Wright, John A.
Wright, William J.
Wright, Willis M.
Wyatt, John R., Jr.
Wyatt, Richard B.
Wygal, Keneth E.
Wyman, John C., Jr.
Yackel, Robert A.
Yama, Edward R.
Yeater, Otto L.
Yerger, William P.
Yezierski, Peter P.
Yingling, James M.
Yoder, Walter A.
Yon, Veo S.
Yost, Russell W.
Young, Andrew M.
Young, Donald P.
Young, Edwin M.
Young, Fred F., Jr.
Young, George A.
Young, Henry H.
Young, James R.
Young, Leonard R.
Young, Robert F., Jr.
Young, Robert E.
Young, Robert G.
Young, William F.
Young, William J.
Youngs, Clifford A.
Yount, Vance L., Jr.
Ypelaar, Bernard J.
Yundt, Gary L.
Yunko, Albert L., Jr.
Zamojc, Walter T.
Zarling, Joseph A.
Zaudtke, Wilbur K.
Ziegler, Arnold G.
Ziegler, Leland E.
Ziegler, Paul E.
Zimmerman, Cullen C.
Zimmerman, Harold A.
Zlamal, Albert J.
Zlogar, Albert J.
Zorack, John L.
Zuern, Robert L.
Zwetzig, Gerald B.
Aaron, Albert V.
Adamczuk, Russell W.
Adams, Floyd W.
Albert, Charles L., Jr.
Anderson, William J.
Andre, John W.
Andrews, Leon B.
Anthonisen, Norman C.
Antle, Elmer M.
Anton, Alfred J.
Arney, Jackson C.
Arundel, Arthur W.
Baeck, Alfred J.
Baker, Freddie J.
Ball, William L.
Ballard, James P.
Barnum, Elton A.
Barrow, Allen R., Jr.
Beckwith, Bruce W.
Beetle, Thomas M.
Behnke, Harold E.
Bender, Lawrence W.
Bennett, Bruce K.
Berlo, Andrew J.
Bitzer, Clarence W.
Blake, Baird L.
Blos, Richard B.
Bostick, Orren K.
Botsford, Harry G., Jr.
Brace, Ernest C.
Brandon, Joseph L.
Brill, Marvin L.
Brimberry, Doyle L.
Brogdon, "J" Whit
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Robert
Brunworth, Louis W. C.
Butler, William O.
Campo, Guy R.
Carlson, Carl R., Jr.
Catron, Leroy E.
Cawthorn, John C., Jr.
Celley, Howard F., Jr.
Chop, Casimir J.
Clelland, William M.
Clemons, Girard L., Jr.
Clifton, James A.
Coles, Gordon L.
Conger, David P.
Cook, James E.
Cook, Wilson L.
Coone, R. V.
Corey, Jules W.
Corley, Winon E.
Croninger, Conrad D.
Dahl, Wayman A.
Dannehl, August
Davis, Dallas L.
Davis, Lucius O.
Davis, Melvin R.
Davis, Robert G.
Dean, Benjamin T.
DeBoever, Vaughn L.
DeCamp, Larry W.
DeCarlo, Ludoruco L.
Delahunt, Thomas K.
Dixon, Roy N.
Dobbratz, Joseph R., Jr.
Dodds, Chauncey Y., Jr.
Donaldson, Joseph R.
Dopp, Paul S.
Douglass, Wilford D.
Ducker, Robert O.
Duncan, James H.
Eastman, Everett A.
Edmondson, Phillip A.
Ellis, Frank B.
Esterbrook, James W., Jr.
Euckert, Donald E.
Fernane, John J.
Ferrel, Robert W.
Fickel, Frank C.
Fielden, Lewis C.
Finnegan, John J.
Fitch, William E. H., III
Fite, John C.
Fithian, James E., Jr.
Foster, William J., Jr.
Francisco, Dale
French, Paul S.
Gaughf, Orvis O., Jr.
Gee, Alvin H.
Gehrsitz, Richard N.
Gentry, Billy J.
Gibson, Edward G., Jr.
Gillette, Robert J.
Gillis, Lewis W.
Gillmor, Richard H.
Glen, Robert A.
Glithero, John C., Jr.
Goldberg, Leslie H.
Goodsell, William J.
Goold, Richard T.
Gott, Abbott T.
Grabowski, Edward Z.
Graham, Harry M.
Graham, Wallace H.
Granlund, Robert A.
Grogan, Joseph R., Jr.
Grue, Lawrence, Jr.
Guell, Edward M.
Haden, Frederick M.
Hand, Herbert G., Jr.
Hansen, Marion S.
Harper, Harvey M., Jr.
Harrell, William T., Jr.
Harrison, Gordon V.
Hatch, Robert D.
Hatcher, John W.
Hemmingway, Richard E.
Henning, Berthal H., Jr.
Henrich, Harold J.
Hess, Donald E.
Hodges, Mark P.
Holicky, Edward
Hopkins, Lawrence W.
Hopkins, Richard A.
Hornbacher, Kenneth D.
Horner, Manley L., Jr.
Hornstein, Joseph
Houge, Martin S.
Houser, John J.
Hoyt, Mitchell
Hughes, Carey S.
Hughes, Harry J.
Huglin, Frank M.

Hutson, Henry C.
Jackson, William H., Jr.
Jackson, William A.
Jacobson, Earl E., Jr.
Janssen, Paul G.
Jensen, Perry D.
Johnson, George A.
Jordahl, Joseph S.
Kaiser, Edward J.
Keller, Arthur E.
Keller, Robert J.
Kellogg, Willis D.
Kendall, William M.
Kerr, John D.
Kimball, Alan B.
King, Robert V.
Kirincic, Joseph J., Jr.
Knott, James E.
Kovach, Andrew J.
Kozachik, Andrew H.
Kriss, William C.
Lahti, Martin T.
Lamothe, Lloyd G. A.
Lang, William C.
Larson, Thomas B.
Leister, Frank L.
Lewis, Cecil P.
Lovelady, Clyde H., Jr.
Lyford, John H., Jr.
Lynch, William C.
Mabrey, Donald H.
Machuderski, Thaddeus Z.
Maddox, George F.
Manis, Joseph V., Jr.
Manning, Harleth H.
Marshall, John E.
Matteson, Warren J.
McCracken, William J.
McGrath, Robert A.
McHardy, George
McRae, Clarence C.
Meehan, Joseph F., Jr.
Meek, Donald L.
Millar, Douglas F.
Miller, Edison W.
Miller, George R.
Mitchell, Jerry J.
Moore, Robert B.
Morris, Stanley S., Jr.
Morse, Robert D.
Mullins, Charles L.
Musser, Lewis C.
Natuk, Walter
Newman, Bruce W.
Newton, Donald E.
Nicholas, Preston G.
Noel, Roth N.
Norrbom, Alonzo L.
O'Brien, Joseph F.
O'Connell, Paul F.
O'Connor, Richard P.
Olsen, James U.
Olson, Robert C.
Omdahl, William H.
Orchard, Samuel J.
Overgard, Wilford E.
Page, Joe A.
Panasuk, George
Papa, Charles J.
Parmenter, John N.
Pedersen, Carl, Jr.
Pedersen, William D.
Penney, Jean M.
Perrone, Robert G.
Peterson, Earle W.
Peterson, Frank C.
Pflugler, Joseph E.
Phillips, Bruce M.
Pike, Earl A.
Pinkston, Ewell B.
Poe, William A., Jr.
Quagliotti, Donald
Quick, Ralph T.
Quinn, John J.
Rae, Earl F.
Reed, Oral W.
Reen, John J.
Reese, Donald R.
Reese, Louis
Reeves, Victor E.
Reid, Ernest R., Jr.
Reitz, Charles M.
Rick, Robert F.
Rilling, Fred C., Jr.
Ringer, Gerald J.
Robbins, William L.
Roberts, Corlett K.
Roberts, Horace F.
Roberts, Lloyd S.
Robinett, Henry M.
Robinson, Richard L.
Rogers, Walter F.
Rooney, Edward J., Jr.
Rozinski, Frank
Rubenstein, Arthur C.
Ruroede, Walter O.
Russell, Earl W.
Ruyle, Donald E.
Saari, Mauri
Saas, John A.
Sagehorn, Joyce K.
Schultz, Harold N.
Schumacher, Max H.
Schwarz, Charles F.
Scott, Darwin H.
Sealy, Byford G.
Seaver, George F., Jr.
Shea, William J., Jr.
Sheehan, William F.
Shepherd, Wilson E. D.
Sherwin, John M.
Slagle, Mark F.
Smith, Howard M.
Smyth, James P.
Soltes, Anthony J.
Sprague, Zane E.
Sprowls, Walter C.
Stanfill, George
Stanfill, Herman F.
Steele, Richard
Stehle, James A.
St. Georges, Laurent M.
Stillwagon, Ralph R.
Stowell, Douglas V.
Stull, George W.
Sullivan, Harold M.
Swan, Christopher M., Jr.
Taylor, Golden J.
Taylor, Lee H., Jr.
Thayer, William D., Sr.
Traut, Earl W.
Urquhart, John C.
Vanderkolk, Bernard J.
Van Diver, Charles H., Jr.
Vaughan, Gerald W.
Voorhees, Robert E.
Wagner, Arthur J.
Waide, Merrill, Jr.
Waite, Anthony G.
Walker, William M.
Wall, Donald T. M.
Ward, Fred D.
Warren, Harold R., Jr.
Washam, Frank W.
Weatherly, James G.
Weaver, Vonda
Webb, John B.
Weems, George W.
White, Wayne A.
Whitehead, Richard G., Jr.
Wiers, Irving A.
Wilkes, Lester E.
Williams, Robert
Willmon, Will H.
Wolcott, John A.
Wood, Allan T.
Wood, Rondell K.
Wright, Ernest B.
Yeaman, James H.
Young, John C., III
Youngs, Eugene E.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abernathy, Thomas R.
Albers, Vincent A.
Alexander, Dan C.
Allen, Albert D.
Allen, Albert N.
Allen, George M.
Allen, Terence M.
Altman, George F.
Ammentorp, Warren L.
Anderson, William D.
Anderson, Andrew J.
Anderson, Robert L.
Anderson, Wilburn C.
Andresevic, William
Andrews, John W.
Andriliunas, Francis
Andrus, Kermit W.
Applegate, Frank A.
Armentrout, James R.
Arneson, Richard B.
Aspinwall, Glen S.
Austgen, Donald R.
Austin, James L.
Aycock, James F.
Badamo, Frank J.
Bailey, Earl W.
Bailey, Garnett R.
Baker, Charles E.
Baker, William H.
Ballek, Fred J.
Balogh, Howard G.
Bancroft, John V.
Barlow, Glen H.
Barnes, Barry P.
Barrett, Richard C.
Barth, Olav
Batchelder, Sydney
Bates, William H.
Beach, Andrew D.
Bell, Ray H.
Bellamy, Richard E.
Bengele, Charles M.
Benton, William D.
Berckmans, Bruce, Jr.
Berg, Donald R.
Bergmann, Henry C.
Berthoud, Kenneth H.
Bethel, William F.
Bicknell, Ralph L.
Binnion, William E.
Bird, James H. J.
Birdwell, Tom R.
Bivins, George E.
Bjerke, Duwain E.
Blackstone, George
Blanton, Harold L.
Blasko, William A.
Bodnar, Nicholas K.
Boles, Robert D.
Bolton, James H.
Bolves, Rudolph W.
Bookwalter, Joanne
Booth, Frank R.
Booth, Lewis H.
Borjesson, Stanley
Bowron, Walter F.
Bowser, James R.
Boyd, Clarence A.
Brennan, James J.
Brenneman, Wilmer E.
Brewer, Arnold J.
Brewster, Albert E.
Brown, Thomas S.
Brown, William R.
Brownell, Richard L.
Bruce, Richard O.
Bucher, William E.
Buckman, John G.
Budd, Talman C.
Buran, Philip F.
Burgin, Henry N.
Burin, Michael
Burritt, Richard R.
Buss, Herbert F.
Butler, Larry R.
Butler, Owen J.
Cable, Wiley R.
Cahill, Edward D.
Calhoun, Gussie R.
Campbell, James A.
Carpenter, John W.
Carson, Richard H.
Cash, Richard A.
Catallo, Merico L.
Catt, Jack R.
Chapell, Donald R.
Charon, Larry P.
Cheatham, Willard E.
Chesla, Edward J.
Christopherson, James
Cignotti, Louis J.
Clark, Frank A.
Clark, William H.
Clements, Frederick
Click, James C.
Coates, Franklin W.
Cobb, John L.
Cohn, William A.
Colby, Dwain A.
Coleman, Joseph E.
Coleman, Daniel C.
Colleton, Francis X.
Comer, Andrew G.
Conlon, James F.
Cook, Gorton C.
Cook, Howard L.
Corliss, Gregory A.
Cornwall, Gerald B.
Costello, Frank P.
Cottom, John W.
Couch, Wallace M.
Coughlin, Richard L.
Coulter, Richard W.
Cox, John V.
Crews, Eugene E.
Crist, George B.
Crist, Raymond F.
Critz, Richard L.
Crosby, Allan R.
Crouse, Richard T.
Cull, Albert L.
Culpepper, Richard
Cuppy, Will C.
Curran, Thomas L.
Daigle, Chester J.
Daley, Richard F.
Danielson, Darrell
Davis, Jack W.
Dawson, William A.
Day, James L.
Day, Richard L.
Dean, John M.
Dean, Roland H.
De Fazio, Ernest L.
De Laine, Louis, Jr.
Delahunty, William
Dell, Melvin E.
De Long, Clyde S.
De Long, George J.
Dent, Robert H.
De Prima, Joseph
De Schuytner, Victor
Detroy, John W.
Diamond, Donald L.
Dickson, Robert E.
Dignan, George J.
Dion, Robert F.
Dittmann, Wayne R.
Dolan, Eugene T.
Dondey, Leon
Donnelly, Thomas E.
Dore, Robert P.
Dorman, John F.
Doty, David S.
Douglass, William E.
Doyle, Donald A.
Draper, William W.
Drescher, Herbert W.
Drovedahl, Robert
Duffield, Daniel M.
Dugan, John W.
Dunwell, Ronald P.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Eckmann, Ronald P.
Edebohls, Hans G.
Elkins, Jim T.
Elmwood, Robert E.
Elstner, Earl T.
Enderle, Rodolfo R.
Enoch, John T.
Erickson, William F.
Ermatinger, Paul J.
Farnsworth, Francis
Farrington, Norman
Faulk, Samuel G.
Fear, Norman B.
Fein, Louis I.
Fenenga, Gerit L.
Fernandes, Edward F.
Field, Harold J.
Field, Wells L.
Fink, Arden L.
First, Ralph D.
Fisher, Lawrence W.
Fitzgerald, Edward
Flint, Nancy S.
Florence, John W.
Folsom, Charles A.
Fontenot, Karl J.
Ford, Charles T.
Fortmeyer, Raymond
Fournier, Norman D.
Franz, Edgar R.
Froncek, Richard A.
Fry, Raymond S.
Fulks, Jack D.
Fulham, Donald J.
Fuller, Thomas C.
Fulton, Samuel J.
Gaffen, Malcolm C.
Gagliardo, Joseph P.
Gale, John R.
Gallagher, John O.
Galloway, William M.
Galloway, Jack J.
Gamble, Ross M.
Gantt, Robert B.
Garrett, Elmer T.
Gartin, Luther E.
Gartrell, Craig B.
Gaut, Donald L.
Geiger, William J.
Gentile, Vincent J.
George, Gus J.
Gerichten, William
German, Paul K.
Gibson, Charles R.
Gillen, John P.
Gillick, Richard O.
Gillis, James E.
Gillum, Donald E.
Giordani, Paul R.
Glancy, Robert F.
Glendrange, Theodore
Goar, John W.
Goggin, Thomas P.
Goodson, George O.
Gordon, Alexander J.
Gould, John F.
Graham, Edward T.
Graham, Raymond H.
Graney, Thomas E.
Gravel, Marcus J.
Gray, Alfred M.
Gray, Dwayne
Gray, James C.
Gray, John S.
Gray, Thomas F.
Green, Billy R.
Greer, MacDonald
Greer, Thomas N.
Gregerson, Johnny O.
Gregory, Rawley M.
Gregory, Richard K.
Griffin, Thomas L.
Grooms, Bernard D.
Grunwald, Harry H.
Guay, Gerald F.
Gunther, Donald E.
Gustitis, Bernard V.
Hagaman, Harry T.
Haggard, Robert G.
Hahn, Billy N.
Haley, John A.
Hall, Bobby R.
Hallisey, William J.
Hardee, Lee H.
Hardin, Harley S.
Hargadine, Walter W.
Harkey, Herbert J.
Harper, Francis R.
Harris, John B.
Harris, James B.
Harrison, Richard F.
Harrison, Charles L.
Hawkins, David H.
Hayden, William K.
Haydock, Robert A.
Heath, Francis J.
Hedin, John A.
Hefty, Milton T.
Heidkamp, George L.
Helsel, James F.
Henderson, Walter J.
Henley, Robert J.
Henn, Howard R.
Hennegan, Joseph E.
Henry, Charles W.
Herbert, Clayton G.
Herndon, Gerald G.
Herriotts, Charles
Higgins, James G.
Higgins, James H.
Hill, Billy J.
Hippler, Rollin E.
Hissong, John D.
Hittle, Kenneth E.
Hodges, Ervin E.
Hoffmann, John G.
Hoffner, Charles W.
Hofstetter, Robert
Holden, John F.
Hollingshead, John
Hollis, John S.
Holmes, Lee M.
Hopper, Richard F.
Hossli, Carl C.
Hovde, Leroy L.
Howarth, Darrell L.
Howell, David W.
Huerlimann, Ernest
Huerta, Genaro
Huguenin, Sidney A.
Humphreys, Richard
Hunter, Maurice
Hutter, Harold H.
Hyland, Richard L.
Hyndman, Gerald H.
Hyslop, Kenneth D.
Ihli, Leo J.
Illg, Harvey G.
Irion, John W., Jr.
Irish, James F.
Iverson, Rhonald D.
Iverson, Ronald L.
Jellison, Harold M.
Jenkins, Robert E.
Johnson, Lee R.
Johnson, Oliver K.
Johnson, Edward C.
Johnson, Howell J.
Johnson, Frederick
Johnson, Peter G.
Johnston, Paul M.
Jones, Franklin H.
Jones, Joseph F.
Jones, Robert F.
Jones, Robert I.
Jones, Vernon E.
Jorgensen, George N.
Kaasmann, Bernard A.
Kansier, Raymond H.
Karker, Floyd A.
Keeling, Harold J.
Keenan, William M.
Keister, Charles F.
Kelly, David A.
Kelly, Thomas E.
Kelly, Thomas J.
Kennon, John W.
King, Charles A.
Kinniburgh, John A.
Klinedinst, James C.
Knapp, Charles W.
Knobel, William H.
Koethe, Frank R.
Kramer, Milton C.
Kramer, William K.
Kirkpatrick, Richard
Kuci, Richard A.
Kummerow, Ray G.

Kyle, John S.
Laning, Edward A.
Laporte, Alphonse A.
Larson, Roger R.
Latempa, Henry J.
Lavigne, Arthur W.
Lawler, George P.
Leathers, Robert L.
Lebas, Maurice A.
Lebherz, James E.
Lee, Thomas I.
Lemley, William A.
Lester, Jimmie D.
Lindell, Clifford A.
Lindsay, Prentice A.
Litzenberg, Homer L., III
Lloyd, Elroy E.
Lonergan, Harold S.
Looney, Thomas A.
Loughlin, Donald J.
Love, Ernold G.
Luley, Ronald E.
Lutz, Theodore J.
Lynch, Barry E.
Lynch, Daniel F.
Lynch, Ronald J.
Lyons, Robert J.
MacDonell, Angus G.
MacInnis, Joseph A.
MacMichael, David C.
Macy, Arthur A.
Macy, William T.
Madigan, William J.
Malmgren, Everett L.
Mandery, John C.
Manning, Martin F.
Marshall, Henry R.
Martin, William Q.
Massanopoli, Paul
Matthews, Jeter R.
McAneny, Alan M.
McBrayer, William L.
McCaffrey, Joseph J.
McCamey, Robert E., II
McCandless, John R.
McCann, Henry J.
McCarthy, Theodore
McCaslin, Donald G.
McCauley, Bertram W.
McCauley, Eugene H.
McDonald, Richard C.
McGillicuddy, Paul
McGlone, Vincent P.
McGrath, Cletus P.
McInnis, Robert W.
McIntyre, Philip G.
McKay, Conrad L.
McKee, Roland D.
McLane, Donald C.
McLoughlin, Hubert
McManus, Walter J.
McMillan, David R.
Meier, Robert H.
Meloche, Donald L.
Metzko, John J.
Mickle, Don A.
Milbrad, Robert L.
Miller, Hubert E.
Miller, Robert B.
Miller, Thomas L.
Minor, Lewis D.
Monahan, Paul A.
Morgan, Thomas R.
Morgenthaler, Wendell
Morrill, David W.
Morrin, Wardell C.
Morris, Wilbur J.
Moser, Charles F.
Moser, Edgar S.
Mullen, Arthur L.
Mullin, Edward A.
Munson, James D.
Murray, John D.
Mushett, Howard F.
Neilson, Roger B.
Nesbit, Charles L.
Newmark, Charles C.
Nielsen, John M.
Norwood, James T.
Novak, Lawrence A.
Nugent, Edward O.
O'Brien, John A.
O'Brien, William J.
O'Connor, Karl W.
Oden, Thomas S.
O'Donnell, Harold F.
O'Holleran, Ruth J.
Olds, James H.
Oliver, Joseph H.
Olney, Herbert F.
Olsen, Herbert F.
Olson, Milton J.
O'Rourke, James K.
Ostlund, Donald P.
Otott, George E.
Otteraaen, Robert M.
Parker, Evan L.
Parker, John K.
Partridge, Richard
Pastorino, Edward T.
Peck, Kenneth D.
Peirson, Frank H.
Pelletier, Phillip
Penny, James R.
Perea, Horacio E.
Perry, Aydlette H.
Perry, Victor A.
Peterson, Carl D.
Peterson, Burdette
Phillips, Rhys J.
Phillips, John
Phillips, Russell G.
Phillips, Bernard P.
Pickett, Bayard S.
Pickford, Thomas M.
Pierson, Earl F.
Pinfield, George W.
Pirhalla, Paul P.
Pirman, Frank E.
Pittman, Gary E.
Plimpton, Hollis W.
Plummer, James R.
Pohlman, Jack R.
Polakoff, Gerald H.
Poorman, Donald W.
Powell, Rollin R.
Pribble, Harry A.
Price, Joseph V.
Price, Kenneth R.
Proctor, Louis G.
Pullar, Walter S.
Quick, Daniel J.
Quinn, Francis X.
Radtke, Paul G.
Ralph, Kenneth E.
Ralson, Lesley L.
Randall, Heaton H.
Reddick, Cleveland
Reddick, Dorris A.
Reedy, Thomas M.
Rehfus, James R. A.
Reich, Nathaniel N.
Reinholz, Ruth F.
Reynolds, Eddie F.
Rice, Wesley H.
Richardson, John A.
Ricketson, John H.
Riley, William E.
Ripley, George H.
Riseley, James P.
Ritter, Anne S.
Roach, Colin D.
Robbins, Laurence B.
Robbins, Morris G.
Roberts, Stanley G.
Roberts, William C.
Roberts, Richard T.
Robertson, Duncan J.
Roche, John F.
Rochford, Edward J.
Rogers, William W.
Rohlman, Walter C.
Romano, Carlo
Roque, I. Low M.
Rudolph, William E.
Ruete, Alfred W.
Runkle, Harry M.
Ruthazer, Warren C.
Sandy, Allen D.
Saul, Jacque L.
Sawyer, Harold L.
Schlarp, Jack E.
Schlichte, Miles J.
Schroering, Charles
Schuberg, Richard E.
Scoppa, Joseph, Jr.
Scott, John A.
Scott, Joseph W.
Searle, Richard H.
Seitz, John E.
Seymour, Rufus A.
Shaklee, Harold G.
Shanahan, James L.
Shelton, Thomas R.
Shelton, Allen C.
Shilan, Arthur B.
Shore, Bruce J.
Shoults, Eugene B.
Simmons, John E.
Simpkins, Billie D.
Skagerberg, Alan E.
Slack, Robert K.
Small, Robert S.
Smith, Conway J.
Smith, Jean V.
Smith, Robert H.
Smola, John K.
Snell, Bradley S.
Snyder, Theodore O.
Sobol, Harold
Solbach, Harry G.
Spring, Carlton J.
Starbuck, William E.
Stark, Clifford M.
Stark, Robert W.
Staton, Thomas H.
Steinberg, Melvin J.
Stevens, Joseph W.
Stewart, Billy F.
Stewart, Robert A.
Stillwagon, James E.
Stone, James E.
Stover, Frank B.
Summers, Harry E.
Taber, Richard D.
Tarr, James G.
Taylor, Robert M.
Thomas, Spencer F.
Thomas, William J.
Thompson, James P.
Thompson, Alva F.
Thornbury, Billy D.
Till, Joseph P.
Tobin, Thomas L.
Toller, William M.
Tomlin, James E.
Tonetti, John S.
Topalian, Theodore
Townsend, Edward J.
Townsend, Donald B.
Travers, Thomas R.
Trebon, Iver W.
Trescott, Eugene H.
Tryon, Raymond L.
Tucker, Leland W.
Turner, Frank P.
Valentine, Herbert
Vandyke, Richard P.
Vanek, Kenneth D.
Van Gaasbeek, Leonard
Van Winkle, Archie
Vaught, Richard H.
Visage, Billy F.
Vorhauer, George F.
Vugteveen, Harold L.
Wade, Ray B.
Wagner, Douglas A.
Waldow, Richard E.
Walker, Dallas R.
Walker, Phillip C.
Wallace, Charles F.
Wander, Robert E.
Ward, Guy W.
Watts, Elwood J.
Watts, Ivan L.
Weatherspoon, James
Weber, John E.
Weiland, Joseph K.
Weinert, Frederick
Weir, Kenneth W.
Weise, William
Weisser, Lawrence M.
Wenrich, Jay H.
West, Hugh S.
Westerman, Ronald M.
Whaling, Robert W.
Whelan, William L.
White, Michael E.
Wickersham, William
Wiita, John W.
Willcox, Clair E.
Williford, Milton D.
Williams, Justin, Jr.
Williams, Earl L.
Wills, Daniel
Wilson, Donald W.
Wilson, Richard O.
Wilson, William C.
Winfield, Charles R.
Witt, Lewis C.
Woodring, Willard J.
Wray, Desmond C.
Wright, Herbert L.
Wynn, Neal B.
Yant, John T.
Young, Robert G.
Yourishin, George P.
Zience, Walter J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abbot, Victor S.
Accardo, Philip J.
Ackerman, Thomas E.
Adams, Frederick J.
Adams, James F.
Adams, John Q.
Adams, Richard B.
Adams, Thomas L.
Adcock, Cyrus S.
Addiego, Biagio J.
Adrian, Donald H.
Affenit, Richard V.
Ahearn, James P.
Ahearn, Joseph W.
Albanese, John B.
Albanese, Joseph A.
Albright, Allan C.
Alexander, Allen E.
Alexander, Clay W.
Alexander, Daniel I.
Alexander, Lloyd D.
Alford, Charles D.
Alfredson, Richard
Alger, Richard J.
Alison, Jefferson I.
Allen, Glenn E.
Allen, John W.
Allen, Joseph N.
Allen, Louis A.
Allen, Terrence M.
Allison, Richard L.
Alter, Louis W.
Althoff, David L.
Altman, Jesse L.
Alvord, Clark, II
Ambrosio, Michael R.
Ammermuller, Herbert T.
Amsbaugh, Allen
Amstadt, Ervin C.
Anadale, George A.
Anastasia, Robert L.
Anderson, Arthur R.
Anderson, David H.
Anderson, Donald E.
Anderson, Glenn R.
Anderson, John A.
Anderson, Morris S.
Anderson, Neil R.
Anderson, Richard J.
Anderson, Robert H.
Anderson, William E.
Andes, James S.
Andrews, Jackie L.
Andrews, John R.
Andrews, Roi E.
Andrews, Thomas E.
Androlewicz, Aloysius
Anglim, Thomas D.
Anslow, James W.
Antonio, John C.
Apker, Neil D.
Arbogast, Charles H.
Arcieri, Michael S.
Arciero, Donald V.
Arkell, Robert B.
Arles, James E.
Armistead, Walter L.
Armstrong, Richard
Armstrong, Robert W.
Armstrong, Russell
Arnhoelter, Frederick
Arnold, Charles E.
Arnold, John D.
Arnold, Merlyn R.
Aronson, Howard A.
Arthur, Richard C.
Ashlock, Thomas E.
Asper, Merle W.
Asperheim, David B.
Attaway, Fred J.
Augee, Hollis L.
Augustine, Paul C.
Ausburn, Ross B.
Avant, Grady, Jr.
Avignone, John J.
Ayer, Randall P.
Babb, Richard D.
Babbit, George H.
Babcock, Burt A.
Babcock, Kingman K.
Baca, Eddie J., Jr.
Backer, Frederick N.
Badeker, Roger W.
Bader, Sidney R.
Baggett, John C.
Bagley, Frank V.
Bailey, Charles D.
Bailey, Dudley V.
Bailey, Francis L.
Bailey, Howard J.
Bailey, William N.
Bain, Robert A.
Baird, Briskel B.
Baird, Harry J.
Baker, Guthrie
Baker, Jesse G.
Baker, Peter W.
Baker, Ray L.
Baker, Richard F.
Baker, Thomas
Baldridge, Charles
Baldwin, Henry D.
Baldwin, Henry F.
Baldwin, William O.
Baldwin, William T.
Ball, Kenneth J.
Ball, Lawrence R.
Ball, Robert A.
Ballard, Doyle R.
Ballard, Hugh H.
Balogh, Howard G.
Balthrop, Carlton L.
Balzer, Richard A.
Banghart, Roger C.
Banker, Peter A.
Banker, Vincent C.
Bannister, James R.
Bannon, Richard J.
Barber, Robert W.
Barbi, James J.
Barden, John J.
Barger, Ronald M.
Barham, Jerry N.
Barhydt, Dirck
Barlow, Edgar D.
Barnard, Charles R.
Barnette, Robert D.
Barno, Robert D.
Barr, Charles R.
Barr, Thomas D.
Barrell, Robert F.
Barries, Joel L.
Barrow, Brudge B.
Barry, George R.
Barry, James J.
Barry, John H.
Barstow, Charles A.
Bartell, Bruce G.
Bartels, Roger J.
Bartholomae, John J.
Bartlett, Stephen W.
Bartley, Edward J.
Baskett, Vincent D.
Bass, Arthur C.
Bass, Eugene M.
Bassett, Arthur T.
Bates, Raymond E.
Batliner, James E.
Battista, William G.
Bauer, Alan H.
Bauer, Andrew F.
Bauer, Richard B.
Baukus, Duane A.
Baum, Gerald H.
Baum, Morton I.
Baumann, Herbert J.
Baur, William W.
Baxley, Willard K.
Bayless, Freddie P.
Beach, Berton E.
Beach, Richard J.
Beachler, George A.
Beal, Donald F.
Bearer, James F.
Beason, Lawrence L.
Beatty, Henry M.
Beatty, Richard A.
Beaty, Forest C.
Beaver, Carl J.
Beck, Lee M.
Beck, Robert W.
Becker, Bruce F.
Beckley, Neil E.
Beckman, Kent M.
Beer, John W.
Beglan, John L.
Begley, Leo R.
Begley, Thomas J.
Begnaud, Pierre H.
Behan, Dennis J.
Behren, Richard L.
Bell, David W.
Bell, James H.
Bellamy, Richard C.
Belli, Roy L.
Benak, Edward J.
Benczkowski, John J.
Benet, Peter E.
Bennett, John N.
Bennett, William G.
Benstead, Daryl E.
Bentley, Frederick
Bentz, David M.
Berg, Albert H.
Berg, Laurence G.
Berger, Donald J.
Berger, Edward H.
Bergey, Hugh W.
Bergfeld, Elliot W.
Bergstrom, Carl F.
Berney, Edmond J.
Bernhart, James A.
Berry, Bernard R.
Berry, David L.
Bessent, Joseph M.
Bethel, James H.
Bettes, Lawrence W.
Beyer, Gordon R.
Bibb, William J.
Bickerstaff, Robert
Biegler, James L.
Biery, Richard L.
Biggs, Michael H.
Bigley, James F.
Bingham, Donald D.
Bingham, James W.
Biocca, Peter M.
Birdwell, William L.
Bishop, Daniel G.
Bishop, Howard M., Jr.
Bittner, Barry N.

Bivins, Earl M.
Bjorlykke, Arthur J.
Black, Charles H.
Black, John R.
Black, John W.
Blagden, George
Blaha, Donald L.
Blake, James H.
Blakely, Bryce E.
Blakley, Gilbert B.
Blakeman, Wyman U.
Blanc, Richard J.
Blasi, John F.
Blaty, Donald
Bleier, William H.
Blevins, Richard C.
Bliesener, Carl B.
Block, Charles A.
Block, Ephraim L.
Block, William E.
Blocker, Joseph W.
Blomquist, Thomas W.
Blum, Richard J.
Bluthardt, John A.
Boalch, Dennis F.
Boardman, Robert C.
Bobkier, Charles A.
Boehling, John G.
Boehm, Jack A.
Bogard, Richard E.
Bogardus, Paul H.
Boggio, Henry R.
Bogle, Mord, III
Bohan, Walter
Boleski, Lawrence M.
Bolesky, Richard C.
Bolger, David L.
Bolin, Charles P.
Bomar, Oliver B.
Bond, Henry J.
Bond, Thomas G.
Bonfer, Gene C.
Bonin, Daniel J.
Bonner, Walter T.
Boomershine, Donald E.
Boozman, Paul G.
Bordenaro, Ronald J.
Borders, Robert E.
Borelli, Vincent J.
Borg, Clayton E.
Borelli, Cono R.
Bosley, Robert D.
Bosley, William R.
Boso, Kinsman G.
Boucher, Leopold A.
Boule, Gerard H.
Bourbeau, Richard L.
Bourne, Robert B.
Bouton, Donald H.
Bove, Richard L.
Bowen, Dale J.
Bowen, Donald P.
Bowers, Richard S.
Bowie, Alan J.
Bowling, Lloyd S.
Bowling, Thomas B.
Bowne, Frederic M.
Boyd, Donald E.
Boyer, William D.
Bradburn, Larry L.
Bradin, Richard E.
Bradish, William F.
Bradley, Robert J.
Bradshaw, Harvey D.
Brady, Harry S.
Brady, Richard J.
Branan, Arthur J.
Branch, Thomas H.
Brandes, Norman J.
Brandlin, John E.
Brandon, Jack A.
Brandon, Virgil B.
Branim, Willie L.
Branstool, Lee C.
Brattebo, Donald D.
Brauer, Charles A.
Braun, Erwin G.
Bravo, Alex
Bray, Warren R.
Brebner, Elliot J.
Breitbeil, Fred W.
Brems, William U.
Brennan, John P.
Bressler, Alexander
Brewer, Lawrence A.
Bridgers, Harvey C.
Bridges, Robert L.
Briggs, Donald C.
Briggs, Josiah A.
Briggs, Raymond E.
Brink, William A.
Britt, Harvey E.
Britt, Louis
Brittain, James E.
Broadbridge, Don C.
Brockman, David C.
Brockway, Thomas H.
Broda, Harold A.
Brodigan, Charles T.
Brodrick, William G.
Brog, Edward R.
Brogan, Clark W.
Bronson, James A.
Brooke, Leonard M.
Brookshire, Phil E.
Brosnahan, Daniel T.
Brothwell, Edward F.
Broussard, Nicholas
Brown, Byron B.
Brown, Daniel W.
Brown, Eldon M.
Brown, Ephraim H.
Brown, Ernest L.
Brown, Fred I.
Brown, Frederic N.
Brown, James C.
Brown, James J.
Brown, Jerome W.
Brown, John W.
Brown, Joseph E.
Brown, Rangeley A.
Brown, Ronald B.
Brown, Thomas L.
Browne, Joseph E.
Browne, Theodore D.
Bruce, Alfred D.
Bruckner, Nicholas
Brunner, Michael M.
Bruno, Joseph R.
Bruton, Robert A.
Bryson, William C.
Buchanan, Arlen B.
Buck, Jerry D.
Buckels, James O.
Buckley, John C.
Buckley, Louis E.
Buckner, Gordon H.
Budd, Leroy G.
Budlong, Adrian E.
Buehl, Louis H.
Buell, Dickinson
Buhl, Alfred B.
Bulick, William F.
Bunch, William J.
Bunger, Paul E.
Bunt, Richard L.
Buoy, Richard A.
Burcher, George F.
Burd, Robert S.
Burdick, Harold P.
Burkart, James E.
Burke, Brian T.
Burke, Daniel M.
Burke, Michael C.
Burke, Michael J.
Burke, Raymond G.
Burkly, John J.
Burnaugh, Buddie E.
Burnheimer, Charles
Burns, Clark R.
Burns, Thomas J.
Burris, Douglas W.
Burroughs, Rodney M.
Bursvod, Donald L.
Burt, Richard L.
Burt, Wayne F.
Burton, Walter T.
Burum, David Y.
Buschhaus, Ernest W.
Busey, Keith A.
Bushman, Thomas D.
Bustin, Joe C.
Bustos, Robert G.
Butler, John S.
Butler, John W.
Butler, Ray F.
Butler, Roy E.
Buttolph, Richard D.
Buurma, Hilbrand, Jr.
Buzzell, James H.
Byerley, Walter E.
Byrd, James C.
Byrne, Joseph A.
Cadoret, Warren J.
Cafer, Glenn E.
Cagle, James H.
Cahill, Edward F.
Cahill, John W.
Caimi, Anthony A.
Cain, Charles C.
Caiola, Hector D.
Caldwell, Dale R.
Caldwell, Harvey H.
Caldwell, Jack A.
Caldwell, Jack V.
Caldwell, Samuel D.
Cale, John J.
Calhoun, David W.
Calton, Dennis L.
Camas, George G.
Cammack, Charles F.
Camp, Clifton C.
Camp, Earnest S.
Camp, John F.
Campbell, Baker D.
Campbell, Garland C.
Campbell, George C.
Campbell, Ralph L.
Campbell, Robert D.
Campbell, Thomas J.
Canepa, August, Jr.
Canfield, Norman E.
Cannon, Dorman A.
Cannon, William H.
Cantine, Kenneth J.
Cantrell, James M.
Canty, John M.
Caporale, Arthur H.
Capps, Ronald A .
Carchia, Michael, Jr.
Cardon, Anthony J.
Cardone, Fortunato
Carelli, Leo S.
Cargill, William S.
Carlow, Sterling K.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carlson, Kenneth S.
Carlton, James D.
Carman, Billy D.
Carmichael, Richard
Carpenter, Jack R.
Carpenter, Norman R.
Carr, Fay I.
Carr, Gerald P.
Carr, John B.
Carr, Richard D.
Carr, William F.
Carragher, Francis
Carrington, Richard
Carroll, Charles C.
Carroll, Daniel I.
Carroll, Donald C.
Carroll, Donald M.
Carroll, John N.
Carroll, Maurice M.
Carson, William G.
Carter, George F.
Carter, Phillip L.
Carter, Richard W.
Carter, Sterling W.
Casada, Howard O.
Case, Roger E.
Casey, Charles L.
Casey, Kenneth C.
Casey, Robert K.
Cash, Theodore R.
Cashman, James M.
Casile, Joseph P.
Casinelli, Anthony
Casler, Raymond L.
Cason, Charles R.
Cassidy, Joseph W.
Castranio, John
Caswell, Francis P.
Catena, William J.
Catlin, William L.
Catrambone, James J.
Cave, Thomas A.
Caveness, Gerald W.
Caveney, Lewis R.
Cellum, James L.
Centlivre, Charles
Ceraglioli, Raymond
Cerilli, Alex N.
Chaffee, Ronald C.
Chagares, William
Chamberlain, Bruce
Chamberlain, Elmer
Chambless, Burr T.
Chambon, Theodore S.
Champion, Stevens
Chandler, James D.
Chandler, Nicholas
Chapman, Charles T.
Chapman, William S.
Chaput, Roger U.
Charbonneau, Raymond
Charles, Robert P.
Charlton, Albert K.
Chase, Gordon
Chauvin, Junior E.
Cheripka, Michael R.
Chesley, Eugene D.
Chester, Paul R.
Chevalier, James H.
Chiacchia, George E.
Chickey, Robert F.
Childress, Richard
Chinello, John D.
Chinner, John W.
Chisholm, James A.
Chittenden, Duane J.
Christensen, Ralph
Christman, Karl F.
Christow, George A.
Christy, John J.
Cicatko, Joseph G.
Clancy, Robert J.
Clappier, Dennis P.
Clarchick, Charles
Clark, Arvel B.
Clark, Chauncey F.
Clark, James R.
Clark, John W.
Clark, Julian H.
Clark, Layne H.
Clark, Lewell H.
Clark, Ronald A.
Clarke, Thomas P.
Clarkson, Walter L.
Clary, Orville R.
Clay, Richard F.
Clayson, Holly
Cleaves, Eugene L.
Clements, Edward L.
Clewes, John E.
Cline, Burr D. J.
Clines, Joseph E.
Clough, Frank J.
Coats, William D.
Cochran, James R.
Cochran, John K.
Cockerille, James F.
Cocks, Robert L.
Coggeshall, Kenneth
Cohen, Martin
Cohen, Stanley L.
Coit, Francis E.
Colangelo, Nicholas
Colbourne, Richard
Cole, Frederick M.
Cole, Howard F.
Cole, William S.
Cole, Wilson M.
Coleman, Charles P.
Coleman, Ellsworth
Coleman, Richard F.
Coley, Bobby E.
Collie, Marion L.
Collier, James G.
Collins, Alvin L.
Collins, Edward L.
Collins, Harold R.
Collins, Jack R.
Collins, John A.
Collins, John J.
Collins, John R.
Collins, Mark M.
Collins, Richard J.
Collins, Robert E.
Collins, Robert T.
Combs, Ralph G.
Compton, John C.
Comstock, Burton D.
Condon, Edward V.
Condon, James M.
Condon, John J.
Conklin, Peter G.
Conkling, Thomas H.
Conlon, Robert J.
Connell, James R.
Connelly, Joseph W.
Conner, Everett L.
Connolly, Bernard J.
Connolly, Eugene F.
Connor, James H.
Connor, Michael J.
Connor, Richard M.
Connor, William D.
Connors, Peter A.
Conroy, Mickey R.
Conroy, William D.
Contardi, Otto M.
Converse, Richard L.
Cook, Philip B.
Cooke, Goodwin
Coolidge, Nicholas
Coolidge, Robert E.
Coombe, Donald E.
Cooper, John T.
Coppola, Samuel M.
Coram, John H.
Corcoran, Paul R.
Corcoran, Timothy J.
Corken, Michael J.
Corkery, Gerard T.
Cornish, John F.
Correnti, Anthony R.
Corry, Francis B.
Cortese, Anthony A.
Costello, Anthony H.
Cote, Normand A.
Cotrell, Robert J.
Coughlin, George J.
Coulter, Robert O.
Councilor, Theodore
Cousland, John P.
Covert, John N.
Cowan, Robert H.
Cowan, Talmadge R.
Cowden, Joseph M.
Cox, George D.
Cox, George W.
Cox, Robert F.
Cox, Ron K.
Cox, Thomas C.
Craig, Alvin L.
Crain, Morris W.
Cram, Harkness W.
Crandall, David H.
Crandell, John E.
Crane, Arthur C.
Crane, George W.
Craven, Wales
Crawford, Robert Duff
Crawford, Robert David
Creighton, Robert W.
Creighton, Ronald L.
Cressey, Gary M.
Crevar, George E.
Cromer, Willie V.
Cronin, Jerome P.
Cronin, Timothy F.
Cross, Billy W.
Crossen, Francis W.
Crouch, James R.
Crowe, Donald L.
Crowley, Herbert M.
Crowley, James A.
Crowley, Richard M.
Cruise, Francis A.
Crumbley, Walter S.
Cryan, Brendan E.
Csik, Tibbott G.
Cull, Fred S.
Cullen, Eugene T.
Cullen, Frederick P.
Cullington, George
Cumming, John C.
Cummings, Terence R.
Cummins, Billy R.
Cunneen, James T.
Cunningham, Francis
Cunningham, James H.
Cunningham, John R
Cunningham, Joseph
Cunningham, Richard
Cunningham, Ronnie
Cunningham, William
Cunningham, William K.
Cuozzo, Robert J.
Cupery, Peter L.
Curtis, Jack O.
Cusack, James J.
Cutsogeorge, George
Dale, James M.
Dale, John H.
Dalton, Lawrence A.
Dalton, Robert E.
Dalury, Robert G.
D'Amiano, James J.
D'Andrea, Thomas M.
D'Angelo, Samuel E.
Daniel, Allen K.
Daniel, James E.
Daniels, Claude M.
Daniels, Wayne B.
Danielson, Andrew W.
D'Arcy, Alfred B.
Darden, William A.
Daugherty, Ben D.
Daugherty, James C.
Davenport, Travis E.
Davinroy, Thomas B.
Davis, Allan D.
Davis, David B.
Davis, Donald L.
Davis, Gail G.
Davis, Hal A.
Davis, Jefferson B.
Davis, Joseph S.
Davis, Leonard A.
Davis, Marion L.
Davis, Ralph E.
Davis, Ray E.
Davis, Rees F.
Davis, Walter H.
Davis, William F.
Davis, William L.
Davison, Robert W.
Davy, Philip C.
Dawson, John C.
Day, David L.
Day, Douglas T.
Day, James R.
Day, Peter H.
Daylor, Francis L.
Deakin, Richard W.
Dean, Clyde D.
De Bell, William F.
De Cicco, James M.
Decker, Marvin C.
Decota, Walter J.
Deeter, Billy J.
De Ford, Henry L.
De Grandpre, David O.
De Graw, Barton K.
Deitrich, Richard E.
De Klotz, Donald A.
Delaney, James J.
Delaney, Robert E.
De Laughter, Carl W.
Del Balzo, Ronald A.
Delehanty, Gregory
Del Guercio, Ferdinand
De Loach, James D.
De Lorenzo, William
De Marco, James J.

De Martino, Pasquale
Demas, Nicholas K.
Demos, George S.
Dempster, John R.
Deniston, Orville L.
Denning, Jerome T.
Dennis, Richard L.
Dereng, Chester P.
Derrick, William B.
Dery, Marvin L.
Desmond, James S.
Deutschlander, Herman C.
De Waters, Clarke
Dewey, Earle T.
Dewey, Henry C.
De Witt, Arthur W.
De Witt, James Q.
De Wolf, Laurin
Diaz, Odilio M.
Di Carlo, Joseph L.
Dick, Harvey F.
Dickens, William L.
Dickerson, Gerald A.
Dickerson, John A.
Dickey, Dwight R.
Dickenson, James A.
Dickson, Edwin L.
Diebels, William L.
Diederichsen, Mathew
Diehl, Jack L.
Dierkes, Thomas P.
Dietz, Ronald L.
Dillon, Lloyd C.
Dillow, Walter R.
Di Lorenzo, Robert
Dilworth, Clarence
Dilworth, Warden
Di Marco, C. Andrew
Dinnage, Merritt W.
Dinan, John V.
Diorio, Philip A.
Di Palma, John V.
Dirlam, James E.
Ditmer, Daryl D.
Dittmeier, Arthur A.
Dittrich, Raymond J.
Di Vinere, Angelo E.
Dixon, Howard V.
Dixon, Lloyd D.
Dixon, Richard E.
Dixon, Wales S.
Dobbs, Robert W.
Dobson, William C.
Dodson, Gordon D.
Doglio, Joseph A.
Doherty, Charles L.
Doherty, Emmett E.
Doherty, Robert W.
Dolan, James J.
Dolezal, Richard M.
Dolmayer, Michael B.
Dolson, Philip J.
Doman, Lewis A.
Donaldson, William H.
Dondlinger, William
Donnelly, Joseph A.
Donnelly, Robert B.
Donner, Robert, Jr.
Donohue, Francis M.
Donovan, William D.
Dooley, Joseph F.
Dooley, Vincent J.
Doran, Arthur C.
Doran, Peter T.
Dorsey, Frank J.
Doser, Joseph G.
Dottor, Lawrence J.
Dougherty, Daniel L.
Dougherty, Hugh L.
Dougherty, James T.
Dougherty, John F.
Dougherty, Terence
Douglas, Jay D.
Doverspike, Daniel
Dow, George E.
Dowling, James H.
Downer, John T.
Downes, William J.
Downey, Edward J.
Downey, William, Jr.
Doyle, James L.
Doyle, Luke F.
Doyle, Thomas W.
Draayer, Lloyd J.
Drake, Donald L.
Drake, Paul L.
Drake, Sherwood A.
Drake, William M.
Drebushenko, William
Dressler, Stanley E.
Drew, Leonard M.
Driggers, William E.
Drivas, Peter
Drury, James W.
Duato, Robert S.
Dubinick, Harry J.
Duda, Edward R.
Dudley, Everett H.
Duffy, Vincent R.
Dufrane, Stanley J.
Duggan, Elmer F.
Duggan, John E.
Duggin, Thomas L.
Duke, Frank H.
Duncan, John S.
Dundon, Paul E.
Dunham, Robert D.
Dunlap, Donald G.
Dunlap, James A.
Dunlap, Thomas S.
Dunn, Charles E.
Dunn, David L.
Dunn, George H.
Dunn, James E.
Dunn, James L.
Dunn, James R.
Dunn, John D.
Dunn, Russell M.
Dunne, Donald J.
Dunning, Frederic P.
Duque, Henry M.
Durham, Donald D.
Durham, James E.
Durham, James P.
Durkin, John E.
Durrington, Gordon
Dury, John L.
Dwight, Donald R.
Dyal, Thomas L.
Dyer, Russell E.
Dyson, Frederick W.
Earles, Marcie J.
East, John P.
Eastland, Thomas A.
Eastman, George H.
Eaton, George H.
Ebbitt, George F.
Echols, Alonzo M.
Eckert, Glenn W.
Eckhardt, William E.
Eddings, Oren G.
Edmondson, George M.
Edmondson, Orville
Edwards, Frederick
Edwards, Raymond W.
Edwards, Thomas L.
Egan, Charles J.
Egan, Martin J.
Eggleston, Donald W.
Ehrhart, Robert R.
Ehrle, William L.
Eibler, Herbert J.
Eisenhauer, Stephen
Elam, Billy J.
Eldridge, Ray
Eldridge, Robert B.
Ellard, Bruce W.
Elliott, Henry, Jr.
Elliott, John R.
Ellis, Roy B.
Ellison, Robert C.
Elms, Richard A.
Elvira, Richard P.
Elwell, John W.
Elwell, Richard B.
Elwood, William A.
Emde, George W.
Emerson, Sheldon M.
Emery, William D.
Enders, William H.
Endres, David C.
Engelhardt, John W.
Engelking, Ralph A.
England, Monroe B.
Engleson, Gerald L.
Ensley, Charles R.
Epling, Karl D.
Erdman, Calvin P.
Erdman, Kenneth J.
Erickson, Eugene W.
Erickson, Richard H.
Ernst, John L.
Ernst, Vincent M.
Ernst, Walter N.
Ertlmeier, George J.
Erwine, Sheldon, Jr.
Escalera, Daniel C.
Eschmann, Jerome H.
Esckilsen, Larry A.
Eslick, Fred T.
Esparza Jesus
Estep, Arthur L.
Estep, Bradford C.
Evans, Ernest E.
Evans, Richard M.
Everett, Hallie H.
Everett, John W.
Eversole, Charles W.
Ewing, Jesse R.
Ezell, Franklin B.
Fails, William R.
Fain, Carroll G.
Fairman, David B.
Falk, Howard
Fanjoy, Thomas A.
Fant, John E.
Farber, Daniel
Farley, Bob W.
Farley, Clifford
Farley, Robert C.
Farney, William A.
Farrar, Perry L.
Farrell, Louis E.
Farrey, Leonard X.
Farrington, Frank J.
Fay, Robert G.
Feaster, James R.
Feeney, Thomas J.
Feist, Richard S.
Fekaris, Steve
Fell, Bernard J.
Fellows, Warner H.
Felter, Joseph L.
Feltes, Norman N.
Fenlon, Fred J.
Fenstermacher, Denton
Fenton, Norman H.
Ferguson, Kenneth A.
Ferguson, Robert C.
Fernandes, Edward F.
Fernicola, Anthony
Ferretti, Lewis C.
Ferrone, Frank A.
Festa, Jerry J.
Ficca, David R.
Ficke, Neil B.
Field, Frederick H.
Field, Roland B.
Filipski, Eugene C.
Fillmore, Walter D.
Finch, Kenneth P.
Fink, Conrad C.
Finlayson, Alexander, II
Finnegan, Richard G.
Fischer, Charles R.
Fischer, John J.
Fischer, John L.
Fischer, Robert N.
Fisher, Donald W.
Fisher, Edward J.
Fisher, James E.
Fisher, Martin W.
Fisher, Robert D.
Fisher, Thomas R.
Fite, Jerry R.
Fitzgerald, James E.
Fitzgerald, Robert
Fitzhenry, Richard
Fitzmaurice, Walter
Fitzpatrick, John C.
Fitzpatrick, John F.
Fitzpatrick, Leonard
Fitzpatrick, Peter
Fitzsimons, Patrick
Fivel, Gerald
Flaa, Charles M.
Flaherty, Arthur F.
Flaherty, Edmund D.
Flaherty, Paul M.
Flaherty, Simon R.
Flaherty, William C.
Flanders, Thomas E.
Fleck, Charles H.
Fleetwood, Allison
Fleming, Patrick J.
Fleshman, Norman M.
Fletcher, Harold J.
Fletcher, Richard F.
Fletcher, Richard L.
Fletcher, Robert L.
Flinchum, Harold S.
Fling, James T.
Flood, George W.
Florio, Louis A.
Flory, Stanley C.
Flynn, John M.
Flynn, Richard L.
Fogo, Wallace E.
Fogt, Don R.
Foley, Chester J.
Foley, James J.
Foley, John M.
Foley, John W.
Foley, Patrick J.
Foley, Ronald G.
Folsom, Daniel P.
Fontaine, George W.
Foote, Thomas E.
Forbes, David T.
Ford, Charles R.
Ford, Harold J.
Ford, James A.
Ford, Jeremiah, III
Ford, Kenneth L.
Ford, Thomas A.
Ford, Thomas E.
Forderhase, John A.
Fordyce, John R.
Forhan, James F.
Forsyth, David
Forte, James R.
Fortune, William F.
Foss, Lee D.
Foster, David L.
Foster, John R.
Foster, Norman E.
Fowler, Thomas M.
Fox, Peter C.
Foy, William H.
Frain, Adnah K.
Frame, James H.
Frame, Ronald
Franco, Frederick J.
Frank, M. P., III
Frank, William C.
Franklin, Harry
Franz, Gerald A.
Frase, Kenneth A.
Fraser, Ronald L.
Fratesi, Richard
Frear, Richard C.
Frederick, Charles
Frederick, Ronald J.
Freeman, Edward P.
Freese, Donald E.
Frei, William R.
Freidman, Michael R.
French, Donald A.
French, Hugh J.
French, William P.
Frey, Francis X.
Frey, Gerard R.
Friebel, Virgil R.
Friedrich, Gerald E.
Friedrichs, Phillip
Fries, Bobby C.
Frisinger, John F.
Frola, Francis R.
Frost, James W.
Frost, Stanley
Frymire, Richard L.
Fuentes, Ralph B.
Fuetterer, Paul W.
Fulkerson, Clarence
Fullam, Donald M.
Fuller, Kenneth D.
Furgurson, Ernest B.
Gable, Maurice W.
Gaenzler, Peter P.
Gage, Peter W.
Gaither, Joseph M.
Galardo, Armando M.
Galifianakis, Nick
Gallagher, Gerald F.
Gallagher, John E.
Gallagher, Patrick
Galligan, Pat S.
Gallo, Francis J.
Galloway, Marvin M.
Galpin, Herbert M.
Galvin, William
Gangsei, David S.
Gannan, Henry R.
Gannon, Gordon, Jr.
Gant, Ronald A.
Garbee, Edmund G.
Garcia, Arthur P.
Gardiner, David A.
Gardner, Carl E.
Gardner, Grady V.
Gardner, Murray C.
Garlington, Julius
Garner, William D.
Garner, William G.
Garner, William T.
Garrett, Charles A.
Garrett, John J.
Garrison, Marvin T.
Garvey, Robert M.
Gascoigne, Donald G.
Gaskill, Frank W.
Gasparello, Michael
Gasparine, Louis, Jr.
Gates, Charles R.
Gatti, David M.
Gavin, James B.
Gebsen, Clarence U.
Geiger, Robert J.
Geisler, Richard M.
Geldert, Franklin D.
Gellman, Richard A.
Gentzler, Gordon E.
George, Leslie R.
Geruson, Richard T.
Getman, Frank W.
Getman, Ralph G.
Gey, Theodore L.
Giannone, Jack J.
Giannos, William A.
Giannotti, Ronald M.
Gianopulos, George
Giardino, Frank R.
Gibbons, Richard N.
Gibbs, Carl, Jr.
Gibbs, Frederick W.
Gibson, Robert E.
Gielow, John L.
Giglio, Joseph J.
Gilbert, Donald C.
Gilbert, Paul R.
Gilbert, Wallace C.
Gildersleeve, Leo A.
Gill, James W.
Gill, Walter W.
Gillespie, Edward T.
Gillespy, Robert S.
Gilligan, John
Gillis, Colin W.
Gillispie, John F.
Gillman, John C.
Gillon, Robert A.
Gillum, James E.
Gilmartin, Raymond
Gilmore, Charles R.
Gilmore, John T.
Giorgio, Frank J.
Gipson, Thomas J., Jr.
Giubilato, John J.
Glader, George F.
Glander, Roger L.
Glasberg, Robert
Glascock, William W.
Glassmeyer, Richard
Gleason, John P.
Glick, James R.
Gobat, Charles W.
Godby, Lawrence J.
Godfrey, Edwin J.
Goedken, Ronald E.
Goff, Volney B.
Goffi, Henry J.
Golden, Thomas J.
Goldheir, Albert
Goldstein, Bennett L.
Golla, Harold G.
Goller, Winston O.
Good, Joseph R.
Goodall, George E.
Goode, Ruben J.
Goodenough, Kenneth
Goodman, Bobby C.
Goodman, Edward C.
Goodrich, John D.
Goodspeed, James F.
Goodwin, Elmer W.
Goodwin, Thomas A.
Goodwine, Lloyd E.
Gorczyca, Louis F.
Gordon, Harvey J.
Gordon, Henry C.
Gore, Robert F.
Gorham, Francis W.
Gorman, George S.
Gorman, Robert W.
Gorman, Vincent J.
Gould, J. Howard
Govoni, Richard A.
Gowdy, Richard J.
Grady, James M.
Graeser, Richard L.
Grafton, Richard W.
Graham, Charles W.
Graham, Ed W.
Graham, Fred P.
Graham, James H.
Grande, Gordon J.
Graney, John F.
Granger, Charles J.
Grant, John P.
Grant, Robert E.
Grassey, Richard R.
Grattan, Roland N.
Gray, John B.
Gray, Robert L.
Gray, Thomas A.
Graziano, John J.
Greco, Anthony R.
Greek, Donald D.
Green, Edwin S.
Green, Robert C.
Green, Robert P.
Greenberg, Robert T.
Greene, James C.
Greene, Richard E.
Greenleese, William
Greenough, Barry E.
Greenway, Joseph A.
Gregg, Robin E.
Gregory, David A.
Gregory, Royce D.
Gregory, Wayne T.
Greig, William A.
Grennan, Barry W.
Gress, Howard D.
Grey, Schuyler E.
Gridley, Timothy H.
Grieco, Thomas A.
Griffin, John H.
Griffin, William J.
Griffith, John W.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, Jimmie D.
Grindler, Thomas J.
Grinstead, Robert A.
Groce, Donald E.
Groeschel, Charles R.
Grohne, Richard R.
Gromme, Robert W.
Gronewold, Harley J.
Groome, Jerome J.

Gross, Robert W.
Groven, Overseth J.
Grover, Ronald G.
Grune, Harold K.
Grzesiak, Anthony S.
Guerin, Richard V.
Guilland, David S.
Guinee, Vincent J.
Guinn, Patrick A.
Gulbransen, Jerry G.
Gulliver, Arthur C.
Gunderson, Edward C.
Gunnels, Allen
Gurges, William H.
Gusciora, Eugene L.
Guth, Roger A.
Guthrie, Franklin P.
Gutknecht, John E.
Gutshall, William E.
Gutterman, John D.
Gutzler, Charles H.
Habenicht, William
Haberle, Walter C.
Haberman, Daniel J.
Hadley, Hunter B.
Hagan, Donald F.
Hagen, Jeffrey M.
Hageney, Gerard A.
Hagerty, Roger C.
Haims, Arnold B.
Haines, Chester J.
Haines, Frederick S.
Haines, Harold W.
Haise, Fred W.
Haislip, Richard E.
Hajdukiewicz, Leo P.
Hale, Richard A.
Hale, Robert O.
Halen, James F.
Haley, Edward D.
Haley, Emmett R.
Haley, Forest L.
Hall, David W.
Hall, Jackson O.
Hall, Tommie G.
Hallam, William J.
Hallisey, Roger A.
Halperin, Warren R.
Hamilton, Carl W.
Hamilton, Jack I.
Hamilton, Walter G.
Hamlin, Thomas M.
Hammel, Joseph J.
Hamrick, Larry D.
Hamrick, Nathan G.
Hanes, William P.
Haney, Glenroy M.
Hanna, Maxwell, Jr.
Hanner, Lawrence D.
Hansen, Roy B.
Hanson, Robert D.
Hanson, William V.
Hapeman, James B.
Harbold, Dean R.
Hardie, Robert E.
Hardin, Ralph N.
Hardin, Samuel A.
Hardy, Gordon H.
Hardy, James M.
Harman, John W.
Harman, Philip D.
Harrington, Joseph
Harris, Albert M.
Harris, Claude G.
Harris, Melvin G.
Harris, William T.
Harrison, Bernard R.
Harrison, James L.
Harrison, Jerry M.
Harrison, Stanley C.
Harrison, Wentworth
Hart, Franklin A.
Hart, Henry R.
Hart, James J.
Hart, John C.
Hart, Leo B.
Hart, Vincent P.
Harter, Richard A.
Hartert, James E.
Hartley, Tom D.
Hartman, Melvin J.
Hartmeier, William
Hartway, Gordon E.
Harvey, John A.
Harvison, Harold V.
Harwell, Robert W.
Haskel, Merwin R.
Haskins, Jack
Hassler, Vernon M.
Hastings, Norton R.
Hatfield, Milton A.
Hatlestad, Leif E.
Hauer, George S.
Hauser, Glenn T.
Haviland, Dean P.
Havill, Reginald W.
Havlek, William J.
Hawk, William D.
Hawkins, Dale C.
Hawkinson, Frederick
Hawley, Robert R.
Hayden, Michael E.
Hayes, Bruce J.
Hayes, Lawrence J.
Haynes, Alfred C.
Haynes, Frank E.
Haynes, John W.
Haynes, William H.
Hays, Frank M.
Hazard, Don E.
Hazelbaker, Vincil W.
Head, James W.
Headley, William A.
Heady, Donald R.
Healey, Robert J.
Healy, Donald R.
Healy, William L.
Heath, Joseph A.
Hebert, Richard F.
Hecht, Duvall Y.
Heckathorn, Donald
Hedrick, Joseph C.
Heflin, James R.
Hehir, Henry J.
Heiden, Carl W.
Heier, Carold C.
Heim, Donald C.
Hekker, John M.
Hellett, Hussain R.
Helmintoller, William
Helsel, Jack L.
Helsing, Duffern H.
Henderson, Gerald O.
Henderson, Jerry D.
Henderson, Ted R.
Henderson, Walter G.
Hendon, "J" "C" Ruie, Jr.
Heneghan, Martin J.
Henkleman, Charles
Hennessey, John J.
Hennessey, Richard
Hennig, Richard W.
Henry, Burton E.
Henry, James F.
Henry, Thomas G.
Henward, Debanks M.
Herber, John A.
Herbert, James A.
Herbert, John K.
Herget, Robert L.
Hering, John B.
Herman, Bernard
Herndon, John W.
Herold, Thomas M.
Herrera, Wilfred
Herring, Shannon D.
Herriott, Michael A.
Herschend, John R.
Herson, John E.
Hertberg, Edward C.
Hertel, Carl F.
Herther, Herbert M.
Heslop, James G.
Hess, Andrew C.
Hess, David L.
Hessel, John A.
Heth, James B.
Heuer, Grant H.
Hewitt, Eldon B.
Heyl, Royle J.
Hickam, Edward E.
Hickey, William M.
Hickok, William H.
Hicks, Dilliard D.
Hicks, Martin J.
Hicks Robert L.
Hicks, Vernon J.
Higgins, John G.
Highet, Gilbert K.
Hilbert, Charles J.
Hilbert, James R.
Hilbrunner, William
Hildreth, Robert G.
Hill, Dale L.
Hill, David W.
Hill, Frank R.
Hill, Harold H.
Hill, Robert J.
Hill, Welton R.
Hill, Whayne B.
Hillman, William H.
Himes, Paul A.
Himmelheber, Joseph
Hinchclift, Raymond
Hinton, Robert P.
Hipple, Thomas E.
Hitchman, Robert W.
Hitt, Frederick A.
Hobbs, Edward J.
Hobick, Laural D.
Hocking, Roger W.
Hodges, Julian C.
Hodges, Marion W.
Hodgins, Robert A.
Hoefferle, George H.
Hoff, Robert G.
Hoffman, Leonard L.
Hoffman, Robert J.
Hoffman, Robert S.
Hoffmann, Carter A.
Hofmann, Charles G.
Hogan, Theodore T.
Hohenstein, Henry J.
Holder, George R.
Holland, John E.
Holler, Ralph E.
Holles, David V.
Holley, Robert E.
Hollingsworth, James
Hollingsworth, John
Hollister, Slover K.
Holm, Gordon W.
Holmes, Henry A.
Holmes, Jack L.
Holmstrom, James R.
Holt, Thomas J.
Holtgrewe, Theodore
Holzapfel, William
Holzweiss, Fred L.
Honsaker, William G.
Hook, Augustine L.
Hook, Lawrence J.
Hooker, Alfred F.
Hopballe, Kenneth D.
Hope, Harry H.
Hopkins, Deward K.
Hopkins, Joseph E.
Hopkins, Richard L.
Horgan, Daniel W.
Horn, Francis M.
Horton, Egbert, Jr.
Hosford, Joseph R.
Hotis, John B.
Hotte, Robert W.
Hougaard, Hugh M.
Hough, Bruce L.
Houle, Richard F.
House, Edgar A.
Houseman, Charles A.
Hoving, Thomas P.
Howard, Henry R.
Howe, Robert D.
Howell, Louis P.
Howlett, Ronald J.
Hoy, William E.
Hoyt, Eugene C.
Hubbard, William D.
Hubert, Bernard J.
Hubner, John
Hudson, Edmund L.
Hudson, John I.
Huffman, Earl V.
Hughes, Donald E.
Hughes, Ralph L.
Hughes, Rodney R.
Hull, Walter D.
Hummel, James D.
Humphrey, Hobart R.
Humphrey, Ray O.
Humphrey, Robert S.
Humphreys, Donald H.
Humpstone, Charles
Hungerford, Richard
Hunt, Donald J.
Hunt, Earl B.
Hunter, Don C.
Huntley, Billie H.
Hurst, Elbert L.
Huston, Richard M.
Hutson, Donald R.
Hutton, John E.
Hyde, Maurice J.
Hyde, Nelson C.
Hyde, Robert O.
Hyland, Richard M.
Ingraham, John D.
Ingram, James M.
Ingram, Samuel W.
Irgens, Richard M.
Irwin, John P.
Isbell, Charles M.
Isbill, James B.
Isherwood, Charles
Isola, Joseph V.
Israel, Jay W.
Israels, Lloyd I.
Ithurburn, Fred B.
Ives, Alan H.
Ivey, Mattison R.
Jackson, Bobby J.
Jackson, Thomas B.
Jacob, Charles H.
Jacobs, Arthur C.
Jacobs, Charles F.
Jacobson, Morton J.
Jadick, Theodore S.
Janney, Tyson L.
Jansen, George A.
Jaross, James
Jarrell, Charles T.
Jarrell, Maxie W.
Jarrett, Fred E.
Jasica, Raymond A.
Jasper, John G.
Jaycox, Warren I.
Jefferson, James R.
Jefferson, Thomas K.
Jenkins, Clarence W.
Jenkins, David C.
Jenkins, Homer L.
Jenkins, Robert L.
Jenkins, William K.
Jennings, John A.
Jensen, Arthur E.
Jensen, Brooke D.
Jensen, Kenneth K.
Jensen, Michael R.
Jess, Ronald C.
Jira, Lee P.
Johannsen, Kenneth
Johannsen, Richard
Johnson, Carl A.
Johnson, Gerald L.
Johnson, Jacob E.
Johnson, James R.
Johnson, John E.
Johnson, Joseph B.
Johnson, Leroy E.
Johnson, Olef M.
Johnson, Ralph P.
Johnson, Richard J.
Johnson, Robert B.
Johnson, Russell E.
Johnson, Victor J.
Johnson, William F.
Johnston, Kevin M.
Johnstone, Erickson
Jones, Bertie M.
Jones, James P.
Jones, Jerald E.
Jones, Landon R.
Jones, Leroy M.
Jones, Paul R.
Jones, Richard Herbert
Jones, Richard Hoyle
Jones, Richard M.
Jones, Robert
Jones, Robert C.
Jones, Robert E.
Jones, Thomas W.
Jones, Vaughn A.
Jones, William B.
Jordan, Donald J.
Jordan, Francis B.
Jordan, Frank W.
Jordan, Michael
Jordan, William L.
Jorgensen, Robert S.
Jorgenson, Conrad A.
Joseph, Edward A.
Joseph, Roland W.
Joy, John F.
Joyce, Carl W.
Joyce, Clayton
Joyce, Dennis K.
Joyce, Donald V.
Joyce, John P.
Juedeman, Harold E.
Juergens, Jerome P.
Jurancich, Joe M.
Kaiser, William R.
Kaltinick, Paul R.
Kane, Francis J.
Kane, John M.
Kane, Joseph J.
Kane, Louis I.
Kapa, William L.
Kargol, Raymond C.
Kariger, Robert L.
Karp, Arnold L.
Karr, James E.
Kashmerick, Robert M.
Kasting, William L.
Kastner, Theodore A.
Kaufman, Clarence E.
Kavanaugh, James J.
Kayhoe, Matthias E.
Kayser, Julius C.
Kazmierczak, Leon F.
Keale, Edward T.
Keane, Frank E.
Kearney, Donald J.
Keating, Donald F.
Keating, John R.
Keck, Louis K.
Keeler, Ralph L.
Keenan, John F.
Keenan, John J.
Kehrle, Jerry E.
Kehs, Henry H.
Keith, Alexander M.
Kelaher, Thomas F.
Keleher, Arthur M.
Kelleher, William J.
Keller, Billy J.
Keller, Donald E.
Kelley, Francis L.
Kellogg, Preston P.
Kelly, Brian J.
Kelly, Edward A.
Keltner, Donald H.
Kemp, Kenneth E.
Kendall, John P.
Kendall, Leonard J.
Kendig, William F.
Kennard, Albert L.
Kennedy, Donald D.
Kennedy, John C.
Kennedy, John R.
Kennedy, Paul A.
Kennell, Richard E.
Kenney, Leroy S.
Kenney, Samuel M.
Kennicutt, Orlis E.
Kenny, William P.
Kent, Gary D.
Kerber, Charles P.
Kessenich, Richard
Ketch, Clair V.
Ketner, Gerald M.
Ketterson, Robert C.
Kiely, Edward J.
Kiffney, Vincent R.
Kilby, William H.
Kilduff, Thomas C.
Kimbrell, Harrison
Kimpel, William J.
Kinderman, Robert W.
King, Appleton
King, Donald W.
King, Homer L.
King, John D.
King, Robert A.
King, Robert J.
King, William C.
Kinghorn, Jon R.
Kinney, Byrne G.
Kiraly, John, Jr.
Kirby, Frank E.
Kirby, Gerald M.
Kirby, Robert W.
Kirkman, Donald E.
Kirkpatrick, Carlos
Kiser, Roy G., Jr.
Kish, William A.
Kisner, Paul E.
Kitchens, Harrell C.
Klein, Douglas G.
Klements, Henry D.
Kline, John R.
Kling, George M.
Kloefkorn, William
Klopp, David A.
Kloppenburg, Robert
Kloster, John E.
Klug, Robert L.
Kluglein, Fred G.
Klyce, Paul C., Jr.
Knapp, Billie L.
Knapp, Donald R.
Knauer, Leon T.
Knebel, Wesley J.
Knitz, Walter W.
Knope, John K.
Knopic, David M.
Knowles, Charles H.
Knutson, William R.
Kocornik, Richard W.
Koehler, Fred W.
Koehler, Lawrence D.
Koehlinger, Donald
Koenen, Paul R.
Koenig, William A.
Kohl, John F.
Kohlway, John M.
Kohne, Kenyon K.
Kolinski, Stanley C.
Kolk, Leo E.
Koller, George B.
Kolligian, Gregory
Komar, Paul J.
Kommers, Donald P.
Kondelik, Gene F.
Koozer, William C.
Kopf, Perry W.
Koprivica, Preston
Kops, Myron S.
Kosednar, Francis J.
Koski, Gene W.
Kostelecky, John R.
Kothe, Kenneth R.
Koval, Louis A.
Krabbe, Frederick R.
Kramer, John L.
Kratoville, Harry J.
Kratz, John F.
Krause, Charles F.
Krause, Walter E.
Krause, William P.
Kray, Leonard J.
Kress, Herbert W.
Kress, Peter N.
Krietzman, Sheldon
Kroeck, Robert H.
Krog, John A.
Krogius, Tristan E.
Kron, Ronald W.
Kruse, John E.
Kruse, Ronald H.
Kuhn, Donald W.
Kuhn, Herbert S.
Kulak, Raymond
Kuntz, Louis L.
Kunzmann, James F.
Kupets, James A.

Kupillas, Edgar A.
Kurber, Larry L.
Kurek, Knute P.
Kussman, Richard L.
Kuykendall, Edward
Labas, Raymond
Lacey, Fred E.
Lacy, Robert E.
Ladd, Bobby T.
Ladd, Herbert W.
Ladwig, Harold J.
Lafferty, William L.
Laidacker, John S.
Laidman, Daniel H.
Lakis, George S.
Lamb, Allan W.
Lamb, Richard W.
Lambert, Thomas L.
Lambert, Kingman B.
Lamberth, Bennie J.
Lamphere, Robert G.
Landolfi, Donald A.
Landon, James C.
Lane, James H.
Lane, John P.
Lane, Lester D.
Lang, Richard H.
Langford, Ted L.
Langley, Edward T.
Langseth, Gary O.
Lantier, John D.
La Porte, Todd R.
Lapton, Stephen T.
Lardner, John J.
Larkin, Patrick J.
La Rossa, James M.
Larsen, Ronald L.
Larson, Alan L.
Larson, Donald E.
Larson, Eddis R.
Larson, Eugene E.
Larson, John R.
Lascher, Donald P.
Laster, Robert E.
Latall, Raymond F.
Latawiec, Ronald S.
Laude, David A.
Laughlin, James B.
Lauler, John W.
Laun, Harry C.
Laurent, John E.
Lavanture, Raymond
Lavelle, John B.
Law, David R.
Law, John J., Jr.
Lawson, Curtis G.
Layton, Brent G.
Layton, Charles W.
Layton, Willard T.
Lazzaro, Charles A.
Leader, Charles R.
Leahy, Albert M.
Leahy, John I.
Leaird, David C.
Leary, Albert D.
Leavell, Thomas P.
Lecos, Demosthenes
Ledbetter, Edward E.
Ledbetter, Walter R.
Ledeaux, John K.
Ledet, Rodney H.
Lee, James T.
Lee, Preston R.
Lee, Ralph R.
Lee, Richard P.
Lee, Robert E.
Lee, Stimson S.
Leeper, Thomas N.
Leervig, Thomas N.
Lehmann, Jerad W.
Lehrer, Harry F.
Leineke, Ronald D.
Leipold, Robert D.
Lembo, Lawrence W.
Lenihan, William O.
Lenze, Gerard E.
Lenze, John R.
Leonard, Charles B.
Leonard, Jerry P.
Leonard, Peter M.
Leonard, William R.
Leonhardt, Francis
Lernihan, Patrick J.
Lerps, David A.
Lesperance, Louis K.
Lever, Richard N.
Levin, Arthur D.
Levis, Joseph M.
Levy, Lee I.
Lewis, Julius M.
Lewis, Kenneth E.
Lewis, Marion E.
Lewis, Stanley P.
Lewis, Wayne
Lewis, William E.
Lex, Francis J.
Liberatore, James H.
Liebscher, Arthur E.
Lighter, Abbott W.
Ligus, Michael
Likins, Anthony W.
Lilley, Robert V.
Lincoln, James F.
Linde, Elwood N.
Lindlief, James L.
Lindner, Raymond A.
Linker, Louis E.
Linkskey, Edward M.
Little, Charles D.
Llewellyn, Thomas E.
Lloyd, James F.
Lloyd, Russell, Jr.
Locke, Glen B.
Lockhart, Vernon L.
Lofroos, William N.
Logan, Edward F.
Logan, Robert L.
Logan, William J.
Lonergan, John J.
Long, David M.
Long, William F.
Longsworth, Charles
Looper, Charles B.
Lord, Edgar B.
Loretan, John T.
Lorick, Bruce L.
Loshbaugh, Edward C.
Lottsfeldt, Peter F.
Loughnane, William
Loughran, David P.
Loughran, James A.
Lovejoy, James D.
Lovelace, Robert S.
Lovell, Earl F.
Lowe, Ray A.
Lowndes, William S.
Lucas, Bobby J.
Lucas, James D.
Lucero, Candido H.
Lucia, Vincenzo, Jr.
Lukeman, Anthony
Luten, Joseph H.
Luther, Ronald B.
Luther, Ronald L.
Luttrell, James G.
Lutz, Robert H.
Lux, Thomas J.
Lyman, Edward P.
Lynam, William L.
Lynch, Peter J.
Lynde, Robert E.
Lynn, Frank E.
Lyons, Kevin H.
Lyons, Peter H.
Lyttle, Dan J.
Maag, Eddie R.
Maas, Michael
Mabry, Richard D.
MacArthur, Douglas
MacBeth, Farquhar
MacCallum, Robert H.
Macchia, Emanuel J.
MacDonald, George N.
MacDonald, John K.
MacDonald, Paul M.
Machado, Louis E.
MacKenzie, James B.
MacKeraghan, Lysle
Mackey, Robert W.
Mackler, Herbert A.
MacLaren, Bruce M.
MacNulty, William D.
MacPherson, Robert
MacRae, Edward C.
Madden, Edward L.
Madden, Francis J.
Maddock, Thomas R.
Mader, William C.
Maggard, Enzor L.
Maguire, George O.
Maguire, Nicholas L.
Mahnke, Jack A.
Mahorney, David B.
Mahorney, William R.
Maier, Alois H.
Maier, Thomas
Main, Donald L.
Malcolm, Donald F.
Malinich, Frank, Jr.
Malone, James F.
Malone, Robert R.
Malone, William H.
Maloney, John F.
Malush, Bernard S.
Mamo, Joseph E.
Maney, Samuel A.
Mankowski, Richard
Mann, Marvin P.
Manning, Charles B.
Manning, Dennis D.
Manning, Edward M.
Manning, Francis C.
Mannix, John F.
Manos, James A.
Mantell, Robert G.
Mantia, Bart
Maples, James W.
Marahrens, Jack R.
Marangon, Frank L.
Marfia, Samuel J.
Mariasy, Richard S.
Marks, Samuel B.
Markuson, Willard J.
Markwitz, Leonard R.
Marmion, Harry A.
Marosek, Joseph R.
Marquardt, Richard
Marseilles, William
Marsh, Rubert R.
Marshall, Floyd F.
Marshall, John A.
Marshall, Robert R.
Marshall, Thomas C.
Martin, Gene H.
Martin, Ivan J.
Martin, James E.
Martin, James J.
Martin, James W.
Martin, Robert G.
Martin, Thomas
Martin, William B.
Marum, James E.
Marvin, Richard C.
Mason, Barry J.
Mason, John J.
Mason, John W.
Mason, Robert B.
Masterson, Robert C.
Matera, Joseph A.
Matheson, Gerald G.
Mathews, Frederick
Mathieu, Leo G.
Mathis, Bobbie G.
Matoian, George
Matteson, Thomas L.
Matthews, David W.
Matthews, Frank G.
Matz, Franklin P.
Maucieri, Nicholas
Maughan, William L.
Mauney, Eugene S.
May, David B.
May, Paul F.
May, Rex H.
Maybank, Joseph, III
Mayer, James E.
Mayfield, Joseph F.
Maynard, Charles G.
Maynard, Walter, Jr.
Mazzei, Louis F.
McAdams, Robert L.
McAferty, Elmer E.
McAlister, Reed L.
McAllister, John T.
McAllister, Thomas
McAloon, Robert L.
McAndrews, Robert T.
McAnena, James D.
McBride, James P.
McCabe, Thomas R.
McCallister, Basil
McCann, Lewis R.
McCarthy, Donald C.
McCarthy, Donald J.
McCarthy, Edward T.
McCarthy, John H.
McCarthy, John Joseph
McCarthy, John J.
McCarthy, John S.
McCarthy, Lawrence
McCarthy, Robert H.
McCarthy, William J.
McCaughey, Douglas
McCluskey, Charles
McCombs, Richard L.
McCormick, Homer L.
McCormick, Thomas S.
McCormick, William
McCulloch, David A.
McCulloch, Richard
McCulloh, Robert M.
McDaniel, James W.
McDermott, Frederick
McDermott, Martin D.
McDermott, Peter D.
McDermott, Thomas A.
McDonald, Malcolm D.
McDonald, Oliver G.
McDonald, Robert L.
McDonnell, Gerald F.
McDougal, Charles W.
McDowell, Thomas R.
McEniry, James M.
McEwan, Donald R.
McFadden, John J.
McFerren, Kent A.
McGill, John P.
McGinn, William P.
McGlone, Forrest G.
McGoldrick, James R.
McGookin, Hugh R.
McGovern, John P.
McGovern, William C.
McGovern, William D.
McGowan, Michael P.
McGuire, George A.
McGuire, Gerald F.
McGuire, William D.
McGuire, William G.
McInnis, John W.
McIntire, Cornelius
McIntyre, Walter, Jr.
McIntyre, William E.
McJunkin, Kenneth M.
McKay, Donald R.
McKee, Dennis T.
McKee, John B.
McKenna, Donald J.
McKenna, George X.
McKenna, James P.
McKenna, John T.
McKeon, Edwin M.
McKernan, Peter J.
McKie, Paul S.
McKillip, Franklin
McKillop, William M.
McKinney, Clarence
McKinstry, William
McKoy, James E.
McLane, Robert E.
McLaughlin, Francis
McLellan, Ernest W.
McLister, Thomas F.
McLoughlin, John T.
McMahon, John T.
McMahon, Peter J.
McMenomey, Charles
McMillan, Martin L.
McMullen, John F.
McNally, Peter J.
McNamara, David J.
McNamara, James J.
McNamara, James W.
McNamara, Michael M.
McNatt, Marshall W.
McNichol, Thomas F.
McNulty, Frank W.
McNulty, William J.
McPartland, Harry F.
McPhee, Frank M.
McPherson, Charles
McRoberts, William
McSorley, David C.
McVicker, Norman P.
McVitty, Albert A.
Meacham, Jack D.
Mead, John E.
Meade, David G.
Meagher, David E.
Meagher, John A.
Meagher, Thomas F.
Mealhouse, Richard
Meaney, John J.
Meaney, Martin M.
Meanwell, Walter A.
Medina, Thomas J.
Meehan, Carl E.
Meek, Charles R.
Meekins, Wayne E.
Meenan, Dennis A.
Meharg, Hobart F.
Meier, Ernest U.
Meier, Henry G.
Melhuish, Peter W.
Mellish, David A.
Melser, William C.
Mendenhall, James A.
Meredith, George G.
Merrick, Robert G.
Merrill, Donald E.
Mertz, James G.
Merwin, Robert L.
Mesics, Joseph E.
Meston, Richard D.
Metcalfe, Thomas R.
Meyer, Charles H.
Meyer, Franklyn E.
Meyer, Paul F.
Meyer, Robert C.
Meyer, William J.
Meyers, Tedson J.
Michael, Stanley J.
Micheels, Herman M.
Michelsen, Edwin F.
Middleton, Louis L.
Mikraut, Bruno H.
Millard, Jerry W.
Millard, Leon C.
Miller, Arthur H.
Miller, Charles A.
Miller, Clarence B.
Miller, James H.
Miller, James K.
Miller, Morris A.
Miller, Robert D.
Miller, Robert Gene
Miller, Robert George
Millett, Roger V.
Milligan, Gordon W.
Mills, Charles W.
Mills, Rudolph W.
Milone, Edward G.
Milton, Virgil W.
Mingle, Edward B.
Minion, Robert C.
Minor, W. D., Jr.
Minter, Albert K.
Misegades, Maurice
Mitchell, David H.
Mitchell, John G.
Mitchell, Robert E.
Mitchell, Robert F.
Mitchels, William L.
Mitrione, Robert F.
Mixon, William A.
Modjeski, Robert L.
Moeller, Roger R.
Moersch, Donald H.
Moffitt, Forrest L.
Molder, Joseph L.
Mollin, Charles F.
Molloy, Frederick R.
Mollusky, Robert S.
Molnar, George E.
Molwitz, Henry R.
Monahan, Philip C.
Monath, John R.
Montague, Phillip A.
Montgomery, Charles
Montgomery, Wallace
Moody, Donald W.
Moon, Robert L.
Mooney, Daniel T.
Mooney, James J.
Mooney, Robert K.
Mooney, Thomas F.
Moore, Austin F.
Moore, Britt T.
Moore, Dudley L.
Moore, James P.
Moore, Neil E.
Moore, Richard M.
Moore, Robert H.
Moore, Thomas R.
Moore, William A.
Moossmann, Arthur E.
Moran, Norman C.
Morgan, Donald R.
Morgan, Jimmie G.
Morgan, Robert I.
Morgan, Roger G.
Morgan, William E.
Morgan, William S.
Moriarty, James F.
Moriarty, James M.
Morin, Bernard A.
Morin, Paul L.
Morley, Eugene K.
Morris, Charles F.
Morris, Gene S.
Morris, James S.
Morris, Robert L.
Morris, Roger D.
Morris, William B.
Morrison, Daniel H.
Morrison, Gary C.
Morton, Emmett L.
Mosby, James M.
Moseley, Lasse O.
Mosely, Earl F.
Moses, James B.
Moss, James S.
Moulton, Arthur C.
Mowbray, John F.
Moynahan, Bartholomew
Mueller, Darrel J.
Mueller, John H.
Mueller, Wilfred
Muffi, Domenick
Mufson, Donald H.
Muise, Wiley E.
Mulcahy, John R.
Mulik, Steve J.
Mullen, Eugene C.
Mullen, Paul X.
Muller, Theodore C.
Mullin, Robert J.
Mullins, Joseph F.
Mullowney, Richard
Multz, Rudolph M.
Mundell, Wilbur L.
Munger, Bruce U.
Mura, Michael
Murdoch, George F.
Murphy, Dennis J.
Murphy, Edmond J.
Murphy, George W.
Murphy, James L.
Murphy, John M.
Murphy, Patrick E.
Murphy, Richard R.
Murray, Gerald H.
Murray, Joseph M.
Murray, Max D.
Murray, Michael P.
Murray, William D.
Murtha, James L.
Musgrove, William T.
Musial, Joseph J.

Mutch, Bryce A.
Muzdakis, John D.
Muzzo, Vincent D.
Myers, Edward W.
Myers, Harold S.
Myers, Lloyd R.
Myers, Louis B.
Myers, Richard M.
Myers, Robert D.
Nachazel, James W.
Nagel, William P.
Nangle, David J.
Nash, Paul L.
Nastasi, Aldo A.
Nathan, Peter W.
Naylon, Thomas D.
Neale, Edwin B.
Nelson, Donald H.
Nelson, Donald O.
Nelson, Frank G.
Nelson, Paul A.
Nelson, Robert H.
Nelson, Ronald K.
Nelson, Thomas W.
Neuberger, Harold T.
Neubig, Philip H.
Neuenfeldt, Richard
Neuhard, Sheldon P.
Neuwirth, Archie B.
Newcomb, Fred G.
Newlan, Philip W.
Newlon, Samuel O.
Newman, James H.
Newsome, Clynch, Jr.
Newton, Duane F.
Nicastri, Dominic C.
Nicholas, Hercules
Nicholas, Preston G.
Nichols, Alan G.
Nichols, Bobby J.
Nichols, Don A.
Nicholson, George S.
Nickos, Louis
Nicoll, Kenneth J.
Nielson, Clayton A.
Niemann, John R.
Nipp, Carl D.
Niver, James M.
Noack, Kenneth B.
Noble, Lawrence M.
Nolan, Edward J.
Nolan, Joseph W.
Nolan, Robert D.
Noone, Dennis J.
Nordling, Ronald J.
Norman, James R.
Norman, William D.
Norris, Donald R.
North, James A.
Northwick, Kenneth
Northwick, Kermeth
Norton, Jerome L.
Norton, Paul F.
Noska, Robert E.
Notar, Joseph
Novak, Richard E.
Novy, Frederick L.
Nugent, Lawrence E.
Nugent, Richard E.
Nuss, Thomas F.
Nussbaum, Paul R.
Nutter, Edward L.
Nutter, Kenna A.
Nystrom, Thomas L.
Oakes, Robert C.
O'Beirne, Patrick G.
O'Brien, Dean W.
O'Brien, Joseph G.
O'Brien, Richard J.
O'Brien, William D.
Ockuly, Eugene J.
O'Connell, John E.
O'Connell, Robert A.
O'Connell, William J.
O'Connor, Patrick L.
Oehl, Harold J.
Ogden, Stanley K.
Ogilvie, George G.
O'Hagan, Peter J.
O'Hanlon, Thomas W.
O'Hara, Cyril M.
O'Hare, John T.
Olander, Carl H.
O'Leary, Arthur D.
Olivares, Roberto
Olney, Thomas R.
O'Laughlin, John B.
Olsen, Carl B.
Olsen, George A.
Olson, John C.
Omdahl, James N.
Omdahl, John R.
O'Neal, Billy D.
O'Neal, George A.
O'Neil, Robert E.
O'Reilly, Gerald J.
O'Rourke, Francis E.
Ortman, Thomas J.
Orton, John E.
Osborn, Arthur C.
Osborne, Curtis L.
Osborne, Herman C.
Oslund, Richard D.
O'Steen, Frank L.
Osterberg, Robert P.
Ostrander, Keith E.
O'Sullivan, Jerome M.
O'Sullivan, Timothy
Otis, Paul J.
O'Toole, Brian J.
Overholtzer, Willard
Overman, Richard E.
Overturf, Charles D.
Owen, Jack W.
Owens, James L.
Padula John F.
Padway, Marvin J.
Page, James C.
Page, Matthew F.
Palczak, Claude J.
Palka, Bronislaw A.
Pallai, Michael
Pallesen, Nils E.
Palmer, Leonard E.
Palmer, Richard G.
Palmiotto, Michele
Pannone, Bernard V.
Parker, Alfred R.
Parker, Cecil N.
Parker, John J.
Parker, John R.
Parker, William H.
Parkerson, William
Parrish, Edwin, II
Parsons, Thomas C.
Pascal, Peter K.
Pate, Kenton L.
Patino, Clayton
Patrick, Max E.
Pattee, Donald P.
Patterson, Frederick
Patterson, Grover O.
Patterson, Kenneth
Patterson, Robert B.
Patterson, William
Patton, Robert F.
Paul, Homer, Jr.
Paup, Everett P.
Pavey, Ronald A.
Payne, John C.
Pearson, Howard E.
Pease, David L.
Pech, William F.
Peck, Matthew B.
Peck, Robert R.
Pell, Stuyvesant B.
Pellegrino, Nicholas
Pempel, Ralph J.
Pennick, Joseph J.
Penza, Donald F.
Pepperdine, James
Perkins, Gordon V.
Perry, Ernest B.
Perry, Phillip G.
Perry, Richard K.
Pesce, Augustus J.
Peter, Sheldon
Peterka, Bert W.
Petersen, Carl V.
Petersen, Marven R.
Peterson, Bruce A.
Peterson, Duane M.
Peterson, James R.
Peterson, Karl E.
Peterson, Perry M.
Peterson, Russell P.
Petruzillo, Michael
Petty, James W.
Petty, Richard W.
Pfeifer, John A.
Pfeifer, Joseph W.
Phelps, George A.
Phifer, Howard E.
Phillips, Charles L.
Phillips, David M.
Phillips, George C.
Phillips, Robert B.
Piccione, James M.
Pierce, Charles G.
Pierce, Edward R.
Pierce, Hugh J.
Pierce, James D.
Pierce, Lawrence J.
Pierce, Robert L.
Pierce, William H.
Pietz, Ludwig P.
Pilkington, James W.
Pinkerton, Stevens
Piper, James R.
Pitt, William H.
Pittet, Edward R.
Pitts, Charles O.
Pitts, Howard T.
Pitts, Wayne W.
Pitzer, Verl K.
Plattner, Clemens M.
Pleasants, Harry, Jr.
Plohocky, Dennis E.
Plunkett, Michael A.
Plymire, David E.
Poley, Charles R.
Policano, George J.
Polk, Robert F.
Pollock, Ronald G.
Poole, John R.
Poor, James G.
Pope, Bill J.
Popovich, Melvin M.
Portner, Jack
Posey, Robert G.
Pound, Frank R.
Powell, Peter B.
Powell, Raymond R.
Power, Albert E.
Power, Gerald B.
Power, James B.
Powers, Richard F.
Powers, Richard H.
Pozza, James B.
Prather, James E.
Prather, Richard L.
Pratt, John A.
Pratt, Thurston B.
Prendergast, Robert
Presny, Richard W.
Pressgrove, Dean W.
Prestridge, James A.
Presutto, Joseph A.
Price, Richard M.
Price, Robert E.
Price, Stanley H.
Price, Ted N.
Pridgen, Edmond W.
Pringle, James R.
Proctor, Ralph D.
Prospero, Michael J.
Provence, Edwin D.
Prudhomme, Daniel
Pryor, Samuel F.
Publicover, Robert
Puckett, William F.
Puffer, Thomas R.
Pugh, Robert L.
Purkerson, Raymond
Purtill, Joseph J.
Pyeatt, Frederick E.
Pyle, David A.
Queen, George P.
Quevedo, Henry J.
Quick, Alan J.
Quick, Richard F.
Quigley, Richard B.
Quinlan, Timothy J.
Quinn, Herbert M.
Quinn, John S.
Quinn, Joseph J.
Quinn, Patrick A.
Quinn, William J.
Radakovich, Robert
Radcliffe, Thomas R.
Radzavage, Robert G.
Rafferty, Philip A.
Rago, Samuel T.
Raines, Richard M.
Raisler, John N.
Rakosky, Marshall E.
Raleigh, John T.
Rammelsberg, Marvin
Ramsey, William T.
Randall, Robert E.
Ranney, Delbert G.
Ransom, Richard E.
Ransone, Morris A.
Raphael, Thomas W.
Rash, Kenneth A.
Rassley, Thomas E.
Rattray, Richard L.
Rawley, James E.
Rawlins, Eugene W.
Raymond, Edward A.
Raymond, Richard, II
Read, James A.
Ready, Bobby J.
Reardon, Edward P.
Reckling, Thomas R.
Redelfs, John E.
Redman, Carroll G.
Redmond, James E.
Reed, James M.
Reed, John A.
Reed, Richard W.
Reed, Robert S.
Rees, Edward C.
Reese, Clifford E.
Reese, David H.
Regan, Francis A.
Regan, Richard E.
Regitz, Eugene J.
Reich, Peter B.
Reichert, Elwin, Jr.
Reichert, John P.
Reid, Arthur M.
Reid, Robert D.
Reiff, Harold E.
Reiland, Harold P.
Reilly, Charles J.
Reilly, Lawrence K.
Reilly, Thomas F.
Reilly, William J.
Reinert, Joseph A.
Reinsdorf, Walter D.
Reinthal, James E.
Reisinger, Frederick
Reister, Henry C.
Remley, Richard Y.
Rennie, Richard W.
Renz, Donald A.
Reschar, John V.
Reuter, Erland, Jr.
Revie, Richard D.
Rexilius, James A.
Reynolds, Andrew J.
Rhoads, David C.
Rhodes, Benjamin T.
Rhodes, James C.
Rhymer, Roy H.
Ribbeck, Alvin F.
Rich, Robert A.
Richard, Donald F.
Richardson, James R.
Richardson, Richard
Richardson, William
Richie, David A.
Richmond, Winslow T.
Ricker, Edwin D.
Riddell, William R.
Ridge, Donald E.
Riebe, Jimmie C.
Rieber, Donald W.
Riendeau, James M.
Riney, Francis
Ring, Duane J.
Ringo, George K.
Riordan, Edward J.
Ripple, Eugene G.
Risch, Ernest H.
Risner, Marion T.
Ritch, Eugene, K.
Ritchie, Richard G.
Rittinger, Howard J.
Ritter, Charles S.
Ritts, Robert O.
Robbins, Stuart
Robbins, Walter A.
Robbins, William J.
Roberts, Norman E.,
Roberts, Robert L.
Roberts, William J.
Robertson, Edward S.
Robertson, Gavin D.
Robertson, Jack S.
Robinson, Arthur D.
Robinson, Arthur I.
Robinson, Charley
Robinson, Donald D.
Robinson, Jay L.
Roblee, George L.
Robson, Edward J.
Rocha, Anthony V.
Roche, Michael J.
Roden, George R.
Roder, Henry W.
Rodgers, John H.
Rodgers, Joseph W.
Rodriguez, Richard
Roe, Timothy K.
Roehl, Howard S.
Roemer, Edward H.
Roesch, Jack E.
Rogers, Edward A.
Rogers, Edward S.
Rogers, John R.
Rogers, Robert F.
Roggeman, Thomas J.
Rohr, Gale W.
Rohrbough, Malcolm
Roland, Richard W.
Roland, Robert N.
Romasko, Walter J.
Rome, Leonard M.
Romero, Fred E.
Ronan, John J.
Roney, John H.
Roos, Donald A.
Rosandich, Thomas P.
Rosas, Rene M.
Rose, Donald M.
Rose, Douglas H.
Rose, Edward A.
Rose, Jimmy M.
Rose, Robert P.
Rose, William W.
Rosenfeld, Stephen
Rosenthal, Joseph S.
Ross, Donald
Ross, Lawrence R.
Ross, William H.
Rotelli, Lionel J.
Rothell, George B.
Rourke, James P.
Rowe, Donald L.
Rowe, Evan W.
Rowe, William F.
Rowley, John T.
Roycroft, Howard F.
Rubia, John F.
Rubinson, Herschel
Rubrecht, William W.
Rudd, John J.
Rudisin, Andrew R.
Ruhling, William R.
Rundquist, Norman G.
Runyan, Richard D.
Runyon, John L.
Runza, Joseph G.
Rush, Richard S.
Rushing, Edwin K.
Rushing, William P.
Rusmisel, William L.
Russell, Bryce W.
Russell, Joe L.
Russell, Norman A.
Russell, Ronald G.
Rutherford, Bruce B.
Rutherford, John W.
Rutledge, Gary L.
Rutty, John G.
Ryan, John Q.
Ryan, Matthew J.
Ryan, Michael J.
Ryan, Patrick J.
Ryan, Paul M.
Ryan, Robert J.
Ryan, Ronald R.
Ryder, James N.
Ryder, Norman E.
Sacket, Gordon F.
Sackett, William H.
Sadowski, Robert P.
Safford, Newell B.
Salamida, Richard D.
Salesses, John J.
Salley, Richard J.
Salzmann, Richard E.
Samartano, James A.
Samley, Charles E.
Sanders, Donald G.
Sanderson, Norman C.
Sands, Benjamin F.
Sanford, George J.
Sanford, Glen
Sanford, Robert T.
Sangster, William L.
Sanguinetti, Kenneth
Santa Barbara, Joseph
Santangelo, Francis
Santell, John R.
Sarna, Edward
Sarratt, Victor S.
Sassano, James F.
Saunders, Sanford M.
Saunders, William B.
Savage, John C.
Savage, Walter J.
Sawicki, Theodore J.
Sawyer, Howard J.
Saxton, Patrick J.
Sayes, Davis
Saylor, William D.
Sbrocco, Leonard S.
Scanlon, John A.
Scarboro, Edwin M.
Scarbrough, George
Scarpato, Eugene E.
Schaefer, Clifford
Schaefer, Donald A.
Schaeffer, David P.
Schaeffer, Howard F.
Schahczenski, Vernon
Schell, James H.
Schell, Lawrence H.
Schellenger, Charles
Schenk, James B.
Scherer, Edward D.
Scherer, John R.
Schiavone, Ralph L.
Schlegel, Richard E.
Schlesinger, Norton
Schlueter, Leo J.
Schmidlin, Thomas J.
Schmidt, David A.
Schmidt, George R.
Schmitt, John F.
Schmitt, Nicholas L.
Schmitt, Peter E.
Schmuck, Raymond R.
Schnell, Herbert L.
Schnippel, Norbert
Schnobrich, James E.
Schoder, Barron W.
Schoelzel, Charles
Schoenhardt, Richard
Schoenlein, Henry W.
Schooley, William E.
Schore, David D.
Schoshinski, Robert
Schreiber, John S.
Schreiner, Charles
Schubilske, Martin
Schubmehl, William
Schulman, Dale C.
Schulte, John B.
Schultheiss, Arthur
Schultz, Larry G.
Schuster, Howard L.
Schutts, Alan A.

Schwantz, Fred L.
Schwendiman, Lawrence
Schwertner, Paul A.
Schwob, John G.
Sclafani, James
Scofield, Gerald A.
Scott, Angus A.
Scott, Hugh L.
Scott, Robert C.
Scott, Thomas D.
Scrimenti, Mario A.
Scullion, William J.
Seabrook, Charles C.
Seal, Robert E.
Secord, Alan H.
Sederman, Ronald J.
Seger, Peter J.
Self, William R.
Sell, Marion D.
Sellers, Jay G.
Sellers, Leon R.
Sende, John E.
Senghas, Robert E.
Service, Walter C.
Sexton, Harry E.
Seymour, Rufus A.
Shanahan, Charles E.
Shanahan, Robert E.
Shanks, John E.
Shantz, Thomas A.
Shapiro, Aubrey E.
Shapley, John J.
Shaw, James W.
Shaw, Richard A.
Shea, David T.
Shea, Martin F.
Shea, Richard E.
Shea, Robert N.
Shea, Speed F.
Shea, Terence J.
Shea, Thomas D.
Sheehan, David A.
Sheeks, Paul P.
Sheeran, James J.
Sheridan, Arthur R.
Sheridan, John J.
Sherman, James R.
Shermeyer, Raymond
Shewmake, Harlan A.
Shiffler, George M.
Shimonek, Stephen P.
Shine, Thomas E.
Shirk, Robert J.
Shirley, Howard L.
Shirley, Joe W.
Shively, James H.
Shoop, Charles W.
Shore, Harold E.
Shorts, Richard C.
Showalter, Howard G.
Sibbers, Charles W.
Sickler, Harry K.
Sigwald, Sidney F.
Siler, Joseph A.
Sills, Claude R.
Silver, Stuart J.
Silverii, Louis W.
Simmons, Clarence B.
Simmons, Donald L.
Simmons, Jack B.
Simmons, James A.
Simmons, James E.
Simon, Richard G.
Simpson, Christopher
Simpson, John G.
Simpson, Robert T.
Sims, Robert A.
Simutis, Frank W.
Singletary, William
Sinkhorn, Lloyd J.
Sipple, William L.
Sirlouis, Irvin S.
Sitter, Charles R.
Sizelove, Jerry L.
Skidmore, James A.
Skinner, Howard W.
Skinner, Richard E.
Slade, George P.
Slater, Andrew P.
Slattery, Edward W.
Slawinski, Edward F.
Sledge, Lavern F.
Slepicka, Alis A.
Slonaker, Adam C.
Sluder, Gary A.
Smale, Russell S.
Small, Dean E.
Smillie, Charles V.
Smith, Allen E.
Smith, Charles G.
Smith, Charles L.
Smith, Charles W.
Smith, Clarence E.
Smith, Clifford A.
Smith, David L.
Smith, Donald E.
Smith, Donald G.
Smith, Donald W.
Smith, Edgar J.
Smith, George S.
Smith, Gerald H.
Smith, Harry E.
Smith, Henry J.
Smith, Jack P.
Smith, James T.
Smith, James V.
Smith, Joe A.
Smith, John F.
Smith, John H.
Smith, Joseph L.
Smith, Kent E.
Smith, Leonard D.
Smith, Lloyd W.
Smith, Myron C.
Smith, Park B.
Smith, Paul F.
Smith, Philip T.
Smith, Ray F.
Smith, Roland E.
Smith, Wallace S.
Smith, Warren D.
Smith, William Horace
Smith, William Hahn
Smith, William L.
Smugor, Carl D.
Snodgrass, Lynn A.
Snow, Kenneth W.
Snyder, Robert L.
Snyder, William J.
Sodelski, Leon J.
Soden, William G.
Solazzo, Daniel G.
Soley, John P.
Somers, Robert D.
Sorrentino, Frank J.
Sottile, Guy T.
Souter, Sydney S.
Southgate, Robert H.
Sowa, Edward J.
Sowell, Douglas E.
Sowers, Leonard N.
Sowinski, Gerard T.
Spangler, Claude E.
Sparano, Carl J.
Spearman, Cecil E.
Spears, Frank H.
Spears, James C.
Speidel, Robert G.
Spencer, Frank R.
Spencer, John
Spencer, Noel W.
Spengemann, William
Spicer, Rolf L.
Sprain, Marlowe L.
Spratt, Harold M.
Spreitzer, Richard
Springer, John K.
Springman, Frank R.
Stanford, Stanley L.
Stankard, Francis X.
Stanko, George F.
Stanley, Lowell D.
Stanley, William W.
Stanton, John J.
Stanton, Richard M.
Stapleton, Cleo P.
Starenko, Ralph E.
Stark, Alfred E.
Stark, John D.
Stark, Theodore E.
Starke, George S.
Stashis, Alfred J.
Staskewicz, Philip
Stauffacher, Rudolph
Stauffer, George F.
St. Denis, Donald E.
Stebbins, George B.
Steel, John
Steelman, Somers K.
Steger, James L.
Steiner, John L.
Steiner, Nicholas P.
Stelling, Morton A.
Stendahl, Walter R.
Stensaas, Lawrence
Stephani, William D.
Stephens, Arthur C.
Stephens, George A.
Stephens, John D.
Stephens, Willard M.
Stevens, Alexander
Stevens, Leonard E.
Stevenson, Donald E.
Stevenson, James C.
Stewart, Benjamin B.
Stewart, Daniel C.
Stewart, James R.
Stewart, John D.
Stewart, Ray N.
Stewart, Robert W.
Stewart, Roger B.
Stiglets, James C.
Still, Kim
Stimets, Edward M.
Stiver, Earl M.
Stobbie, Robert L.
Stockard, Kenneth F.
Stoddart, Edgar R.
Stoedefalke, Karl G.
Stokes, Thomas M.
Stolfi, Russel H.
Stone, Joe L.
Stoneman, James V.
Stoner, John H.
Stover, Kenneth H.
Stratford, William
Straton, Carter A.
Straub, Ralph R.
Straughen, Thomas E.
Streed, John C.
Strehle, Charles R.
Strinden, Earl S.
Stritzinger, Robert
Stuart, Robert P.
Stuber, Richard M.
Stucki, Benjamin J.
Stuhr, Robert G.
Sturdevant, Carl G.
Sturdevant, Weldon
Sturges, Frank E.
Suchoff, Martin L.
Suedes, Robert E.
Sugg, Alfred R.
Sullivan, Eugene G.
Sullivan, Joseph M.
Sullivan, Phillip M.
Sullivan, Theodore
Summers, Bennie W.
Sump, Donald D.
Surdoval, Donald J.
Sutherland, Paul F.
Sutphin, Robert C.
Sutton, Charles J.
Sutton, Roger F.
Suwalsky, Adelbert
Svoboda, Theodore D.
Swartz, John, Jr.
Sweatman, James B.
Sweeney, Edward B.
Sweeney, James E.
Sweeney, Terrence E.
Sweet, Howard C.
Sweet, Robert M.
Swezey, Robert J.
Swiatowy, Anthony J.
Swiger, Louis A.
Swigert, William G.
Switzer, Dan G.
Switzer, John K.
Swope, Alfred W.
Sykes, William G.
Syle, Herbert D.
Sypniewski, William
Szczerbowski, Arthur
Taber, Mason M.
Taffe, Jack W.
Tafjen, Donald P.
Tague, Thomas F.
Tait, David C.
Talbot, Douglas E.
Talle, Herman L.
Talleur, William R.
Talley, Robert B.
Tallman, Robert H.
Tanner, Ray U.
Tapley, David A.
Tarantelli, Ernest
Tarbert, Richard E.
Tate, William L.
Taub, Sylvan S.
Taveniere, James
Tavernier, Ernest M.
Tayloe, Hinton L.
Taylor, Hosea E.
Taylor, James O.
Taylor, John J.
Taylor, Kenneth E.
Taylor, Richard E.
Taylor, Vern M.
Tearse, William D.
Tedesco, Eugene B.
Teeter, Thomas H.
Teichmann, David A.
Terrell, James A.
Terry, James L.
Terwilliger, Harold
Theisen, Gerald P.
Theirault, Neyle C.
Thiesse, James L.
Thoma, Paul A.
Thomas, Don L.
Thomas, Kyle D.
Thomas, Robert D.
Thomason, Everett D.
Thomley, Robert R.
Thompson, Arthur B.
Thompson, Charles E.
Thompson, James A.
Thompson, John G.
Thompson, Joseph R.
Thompson, Kenneth G.
Thompson, Milton G.
Thompson, Page
Thompson, Roy L.
Thompson, William A.
Thomsen, Paul E.
Thorfinnson, Romaine
Thorkelson, Thomas
Thornton, Edmund B.
Thornton, Jack W.
Thornton, Leonard H.
Thorsen, John E.
Thull, John J.
Thurman, Wesley M.
Tickle, Howard L.
Tierney, Raymond M.
Tierney, Richard H.
Tillotson, Clive H.
Tilson, Joseph F.
Timmons, Dwight R.
Tinnon, Carl U.
Tipshus, Edward C.
Tirk, Eugene R.
Tirrell, Joseph C.
Toalson, Robert F.
Tobin, Frank T.
Todd, Christopher
Todd, James R.
Todd, Larrance M.
Todd, William L., Jr.
Tollefson, Dean E.
Tollens, James F.
Tom, Lyle C.
Tomeny, Thomas J.
Tomko, Paul B.
Toohey, Edward J.
Toole, William C.
Topp, Edward J.
Topping, Larry M.
Topping, Robert W.
Tornesello, Michael
Torrey, Lyle B.
Totolis, Theodosis
Tower, Joseph F.
Towle, John M.
Townsend, George B.
Townsend, Thomas A.
Toyeas, George E.
Trainor, William F.
Traupman, Frank H.
Treat, Robert B.
Tredinnick, Richard
Treece, Donald C.
Treleven, Joseph T.
Trenning, Herbert E.
Trew, James L.
Trobak, Neil I.
Tronoski, John W.
Trotter, James P.
Troxell, Howard
Troy, Donald T.
Trucano, John R.
Truitt, Richard H.
Trump, William D.
Trundy, Richard T.
Tucker, Robert D.
Tulloch, George S.
Tummillo, Peter F.
Tuohy, Joseph P.
Turco, John E.
Turcotte, Walter F.
Turner, Charles R.
Turner, Leon B.
Tutschek, Gilbert S.
Tuttle, John D.
Twitty, William T.
Uhlhorn, Kenneth W.
Unger, Robert A.
Urgo, Donato J.
Urianek, Charles W.
Ussery, Ira R.
Vail, Delmar D.
Vanden Berghe, Raymond
Vander Hoop, Laurens
Vandever, James H.
Van Dusen, John R.
Van Hatten, Hugh J.
Van Hook, William K.
Van Hoomissen, Richard
Van Manen, Charles M.
Van Ness, John N.
Van Note, Duane R.
Van Zandt, Edwin J.
Vasconcellos, Gaylord
Vass, Richard G.
Vaughan, Lemuel F.
Vaughn, James N.
Veek, Warren L.
Velie, Jay E.
Velliotes, George
Venables, Charles R.
Verkler, Jerry T.
Verling, Richard T.
Vernon, Thomas T.
Verrone, Raymond P.
Vetare, Gabriel A.
Viellieu, Walter R.
Vihlen, Hugo S.
Virga, Robert A.
Vogel, Anton, Jr.
Vogel, William P.
Volin, Martin L.
Vonglahn, Theodore
Voorhees, Thomas J.
Vosbeck, Robert R.
Voss, Bethel A.
Voss, Fred J.
Voss, William L.
Wacklin, Elmer F.
Wade, Bryan O.
Wages, Robert T.
Wagner, Bruce V.
Wagner, Edward R.
Wagner, Frank B.
Wagner, Thomas J.
Wagner, William D.
Waldele, Robert H.
Waldvogel, Donald L.
Walker, Bruce
Walker, Elmo K.
Walker, Harold M.
Walker, Philip W.
Walker, Richard K.
Walker, Richard W.
Wall, Kingsley T.
Wallace, Samuel E.
Wallace, Stanley C.
Wallack, Lester C.
Wallbrown, Robert E.
Wallen, Merton
Waller, William A.
Walsh, Charles M.
Walsh, John P.
Walsh, Joseph P.
Walsh, Thomas J.
Walsh, Thomas M.
Walsh, William S.
Walter, George H.
Walters, Billie G.
Walters, John K.
Walters, Richard L.
Walters, Roy F.
Ward, Clifford B.
Ward, Sam D., Jr.
Warden, William F.
Wardzala, Edward M.
Ware, Richard M.
Warn, Lars R.
Warn, Lloyd K.
Warnack, Joseph E.
Warner, Clark A.
Warner, Harmon K.
Warner, James W.
Warner, Ross L.
Warnik, Eugene L.
Warrington, Henry G.
Washington, John F.
Waskowski, Bernard
Wasser, Burton K.
Waterman, Donald M.
Waterman, James R.
Waterstreet, John R.
Watkins, John C.
Watkins, Peter W.
Watkins, Richard F.
Watson, Gerard P.
Watson, Page B.
Watson, Royce A.
Watt, Robert L.
Watto, Eugene M.
Watts, Kenneth E.
Waunch, Donald S.
Wayburn, Barrett S.
Weatherford, Edwin
Weaver, George C.
Webb, Earl H., Jr.
Webb, John H., Jr.
Webb, Richard F.
Weber, Weldon L.
Webster, Charles D.
Webster, Kale R.
Webster, Peter
Weeks, Jay D.
Wehner, James A.
Weidle, Alfred E.
Weikart, David P.
Weimar, Robert J.
Welch, Bernie B.
Welding, Allen E.
Weller, Cleland N.
Weller, Weston D.
Wells, Don W.
Wells, Frank E.
Wells, James A.
Wells, John F.
Wells, Thomas C.
Wendt, James G.
Wenner, Charles N.
Wentz, Robert W.
Werber, William W.
Werk, Douglas L.
Werlinich, Joseph S.
Werner, Fred W.
Wertis, Robert J.
Wester, Joseph R.
Westergaard, Dennis
Weston, Bruce L.
Weyant, Terry P.
Whealn, Robert P.
Wheaton, Wilbur D.
Wheeler, David A.
Wheeler, Larry M.
Wheeler, William A.
Whelan, Richard V.
Whipple, Earl F.
White, Bruce S.
White, Donald R.
White, Gordon W.
White, Henry G.
White, James C.

White, Kermit E.
White, Robert B.
White, Ule A.
White, William R.
Whiteside, William
Whitfield, William
Whitlock, Jim B.
Whitman, Frank E.
Whitmore, John S.
Whitney, William A.
Whittemore, John T.
Wickman, Robert W.
Wiegand, Leroy H.
Wieland, Richard A.
Wight, Daniel E.
Wilcox, Kenneth H.
Wilcox, Richard E.
Wiles, Harry W.
Wiley, Thomas W.
Wilhelm, Wesley G.
Wilkin, Roy O.
Wilkins, Maurice G.
Wilkinson, Billy G.
Williams, Aubrey L.
Williams, Clifton C.
Williams, David R.
Williams, Donald G.
Williams, Evan L.
Williams, Graham
Williams, James P.
Williams, Philip G.
Williams, Richard D.
Williams, Robert E.
Williams, Russell O.
Williams, Stanley M.
Willman, Tom E.
Wilson, Charles C.
Wilson, Jerrold D.
Wilson, Willis E.
Wilt, Morgan L.
Windham, Aden D.
Winkel, Gordon L.
Winninghoff, Robert
Winslow, John H.
Winslow, William T.
Wireman, Billy O.
Wise, Robert C.
Wislar, George R.
Witt, John W.
Wizbicki, John J.
Wnek, Nicodemus N.
Wodeshick, Eugene A.
Woefel, Ernest J.
Wojciechowski, Daniel
Wojciechowski, Walter
Wojcik, Donald
Wojtys, Joseph M.
Wolniak, Leonard A.
Wood, James D.
Wood, Jerome C.
Wood, Joseph M.
Wood, Vernon A.
Woodall, Russell D.
Wooden, David R.
Woodrow, Fitz W.
Woodruff, Watson B.
Woods, Theodore R.
Woodward, Melvin L.
Woodward, Robert F.
Woolson, John D.
Wootten, Rike D.
Worth, Harry R., Jr.
Wraith, Charles L.
Wren, Clifford C.
Wright, Frank H.
Wright, Jesse H.
Wright Marshall O.
Wright, William J.
Wyatt, William R.
Wygant, Robert M.
Wylde, Robert
Wynne, Howard A.
Yacone, Enrico F.
Yadeau, Richard E.
Yadlowsky, Peter
Yakushi, Ralph S.
Yandow, Maurice E.
Yanke, Richard L.
Yarnell, Martin A.
Yates, John R.
Yeager, Ira E.
Yeam, Arden W.
Yester, Martin A.
Yetter, Miles M.
Yingling, Francis H.
York, Billy J.
York, Thomas O.
Young, Hollister R.
Young, Martin V.
Young, Paul J.
Young, Richard H.
Young, Richard W.
Zagaroli, Robert E.
Zander, Hans A.
Zangas, Charles L.
Zapatka, Francis E.
Zavertnik, Otis V.
Zay, Thomas C.
Zeitler, Sanford
Zeno, Paul L.
Zervas, Christ
Ziegler, Frank W.
Ziegler, Harry H.
Ziemann, James R.
Zimmerman, Charles
Zobel, Richard C.
Zoch, Floyd V.
Zongker, Merle J.
Zotti, Richard M.
Zuk, Peter P.
Zustovich, Victor J.
Zych, John T.
Zytkewicz, Walter

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Holmes, Charles A.
Reynolds, Jesse L.
Kurner, John D.
Klein, Charles
Bales, Harold L.
Lenn, Stanley C.
Reynolds, Robert B.
Gilb, Ralph H.
Beicke, Walter H.
Whitaker, Earl W.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Nelson, George S.
McCarty, John M.
Curtis, John E.
Gibbon, Edward E.
Wightman, Gene F.
Adams, Robert K.
Weatherby, Frederick
Blalock, Buford
Sweetser, William B.
Reaves, Thomas E.
Schroder, Henry H.
Allen, Arnold V.
Amos, William H.
Plumbley, Robert J.
Myers, William R.
Omasta, Carl
Stogner, Arnold W.
Harper, John A.
Graham, Ray
Kates, James H.
Edwards, George T.
Hoffman, James L.
Overby, Richard C.
Merrill, Daniel W.
Carlson, Richard A.
Alexander, George
Johnson, Charlie P.
Embrey, Almon D.
Fillingim, Perry R.
Kohl, William B.
Scarborough, John A.
Cicala, George
Llera, Jose
Griffin, Beauford
Roberson, Frank R.
Green, Harlice H.
Gidlewski, Aloysius G.
Smith, James C.
Ridenour, Audra F.
Reed, Lawrence W.
Warthen, Meade H.
Fields, Clifford J.
Arnold, Kenneth G.
Needham, Edward C.
Eiland, James C.
Treadwell, Arthur E.
Rains, Novis I.
Butler, Jerry K.
Jones, Warren B., Jr.
Lloyd, Paul V.
Lynch, Walker R.
Nielsen, Jack R.
Goen, Sargent
Therrien, Clyde D.
Kemp, Glenn L.
Norris, Edward S.
Taylor, Thomas G.
Sparrow, James F.
Edmondson, William B.
Collins, Jessie R.
Beard, John B.
Jensen, Charles C.
Jensen, Kermit R.
Vary, Roland D.
Lewis, Raymond E.
Fisher, Claude A.
Smith, Edward O.
Dejong, Hans
Wright, John A.
Clement, Joseph E.
Heacox, William J.
Honeycutt, Paul F.
Sketoe, Clayton D.
Dowler, Murray G.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Friday, February 11, 1955.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

George T. Moore, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE PROMOTION

To be a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and consul of the United States of America

John A. Armitage, of Tennessee.

APPOINTMENTS

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Stephen P. Dorsey, of the District of Columbia.
George Mason Ingram, of Tennessee.
S. Houston Lay, of Illinois.
Francis A. Linville, of Maryland.
Samuel T. Parelman, of Pennsylvania.

To be consuls general of the United States of America

Robert G. McGregor, of Massachusetts.
William L. S. Williams, of Wisconsin.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Miss H. Alberta Coldaser, of Ohio.
Alton L. Gillikin, of Virginia.
John W. Halderman, of Oregon.
Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi.
Gilbert E. Larson, of Illinois.
James A. McDevitt, of Illinois.
Adrian T. Middleton, of Texas.
John Patterson, of Maryland.
Samuel E. Perkins IV, of Indiana.
William G. Vale, of New Jersey.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Joseph B. Alexander, of Virginia.
Arthur P. Biggs, of California.
William B. deGrace, of Massachusetts.
Miss Nyal C. Dokken, of California.
Norman H. Grady, of Maryland.
Carl O. Hawthorne, of California.
Milan W. Jerabek, of Maryland.
Charles K. Johnson, of Virginia.
John A. Lacey, of Maryland.
Miss Anita C. Lauve, of Maryland.
Dean B. Mahin, of Maryland.
Melville E. Osborne, of New York.
Wendell A. Pike, of Washington.
Albert Post, of the District of Columbia.
Henry W. Prentice, of Minnesota.
Robert M. Sayre, of Virginia.
Walter W. Sohl, of Illinois.
George D. Tibbits, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Edith C. Wall, of California.

To be a consul of the United States of America

Charles C. Carson, of Mississippi.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Carl E. Forkel, Jr., of Texas.
Robert F. Griggs, of New York.
Donald C. Mansfield, of Virginia.
Earl R. Michalka, of Michigan.
Richard W. Ogle, of Indiana.
Monteagle Stearns, of New York.
Roger Steinkolk, of Virginia.
Miss Cherry C. Stubbs, of Minnesota.
Harold C. Voorhees, of New Jersey.
Miss Julia L. Wooster, of Connecticut.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Eugene H. Bird, of Oregon.
Carl A. Bischoff, Jr., of Missouri.
Miss Jane A. Culpepper, of Louisiana.
David R. Gottlieb, of New York.
J. Daniel Loubert, of Maine.
Robert E. Mangan, Jr., of Minnesota.
Gerald F. Nollette, of Washington.

The following-named Foreign Service Staff officers to grade indicated:

To be consul of the United States of America

Miss Norah Alsterlund, of Illinois.
John R. Bartelt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Elizabeth L. Engdahl, of New Hampshire.

The following Foreign Service reserve officer to grade indicated:

To be consul of the United States of America

Herbert M. Hooker, of Minnesota.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following officers to the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Ernest Lee Murdock
Paul Nichiporuk

To be chief warrant officer, W–4

Samuel Henson, Jr.
Birney Fullington
Dewey W. Bowling
Otto A. Tregner
Bernard S. Loebig
Raymond A. Fraley
Russell R. Hiatt
Ray E. Brown
Harold T. Jackson
John W. Ballman
Charles A. O'Reilly
Aubrey Rogers
James Galante
Herbert E. Schwalbe
Edward E. Helfst
Wendelin B. Sonntag
Henry J. Burness
Anthony M. Spiri
Hobart W. Means
James W. Winchester
George R. Pearce
Erich Raschack
Harry W. Midgette
Donald S. Talfourd
Burt H. Kilmer
Samuel H. Howell
Sidney F. Schweppe
Paul Ward
Andrew Ramstad
Ralph H. Amon
Floyd J. Coulter
Donald A. MacLean
Earl F. Rickman
James A. B. Hay, Jr.
Leon R. Duclos
George E. Bohannon
Robert M. Bruce
Peter R. Thompson
Julian L. Gray
Earle A. F. Verry
Philip F. Stone
Robert V. McLaughlin
Arthur W. Cloves
Lawrence W. Farnsley
William G. Schaefer
William R. Echols
Clemens H. Brendle
Albert D. Stumpff
James T. Sandwich
Floyd Bieri
Alford C. Atkinson
Bernard S. Koffler
George R. Donald
David W. Herr
Ralph A. McCurdie
James Harrison, Jr.
Jalmar Sortland
Eilif H. Tobiason
George A. Tardif
Hannibal H. Hilliard
George R. Homan
Harold E. Major

To be chief warrant officer, W–3

Victor Koll

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be commissioned lieutenant commander, subject to qualifications provided by law

John O. Boyer

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. George H. Bender, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 11, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] at the Lincoln Day meeting in Portsmouth, Ohio, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be here this evening.

Anyone who has ever gone through a statewide election campaign can never forget it. And when you have gone through a campaign, an unofficial count, an official count—and then a recount—never seems too short.

I am most grateful to you for your help during the difficult weeks before, and after, November. You may be sure that I shall work my hardest to show my gratitude.

We Republicans have good reason to observe our Lincoln Day tradition every year. It serves to remind us of many fundamental truths. First, and perhaps most important, is the reminder that crises are nothing new to the American people. There is no war more shattering to a nation than a civil war. Lincoln led us through the valley of the shadow of death to a new understanding of the Union. Division and disunity have become unthinkable in our country since his time. We may differ, we may disagree violently, but we shall never again divide.

There are other reminders, too, in the Lincoln story. We have almost forgotten that the War Between the States was also a time of international tension. We had enemies overseas in the 1860's. They were ready to do everything in their power to disrupt the Federal Union. They encouraged rebellion and hoped for American weakness. With civil war raging, they planted a foreign emperor upon the soil of Mexico. This fantastic episode in our continent's history has faded from sight, but it was a major threat to our peace and security then. Foreign problems are nothing new to our people. We have met them and we have overcome them before. We shall do it again.

I think of still another lesson from the Lincoln legend. No man in the pages of history was ever a more direct example of Micah's Biblical injunction: "Do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God." Lincoln never strayed far from these guides to human conduct. He showed in his life that men can achieve greatness without violence, without injustice, and without arrogance.

We know all these things. I emphasize them because there is a strong similarity between our own times and the troubled days of the 19th century. There is a strong similarity between the man who leads our country today and Lincoln.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower is a great man. He is a humble, God-fearing man.

There are people who disagree with him. There were many who disagreed with Abe Lincoln. That is as it should be. There is room for honest division of opinion on the policies and the program of any President. But there can be no disagreement on the absolute integrity, the single-minded devotion, and the firm determination of President Eisenhower.

This is the 166th year of our Republic. We are just beginning the second century of the Republican Party. Our country's greatness is just beginning.

The times are difficult. When were they ever otherwise?

I am an optimist. In the midst of our trials, I look to the future with confidence. There are some people who have little faith in the future of our country. They call themselves Democrats. During the difficult years of the 1930's, these Democrats told us to plow under our crops, to destroy the little pigs, and throw in the towel. America was through. Some new form of socialism was going to sweep the land.

Last year, these same Cassandras were out in full cry, scaring up a depression which never occurred, looking for the age of darkness under every burned-out electric-light bulb. They closed their eyes to the real wave of the future, the tremendous new age which is almost here.

In the last few weeks, I read the report of the Atomic Energy Commission. They have a tiny atomic device, only a few inches square, which can generate the same amount of cancer treatment as $20 million worth of radium. They have a new atomic plant which will preserve food for as long as 2 years without a trace of spoilage. I don't know if you will like this one, but they say they can turn out women's stockings that will never wear out. We know that atomic energy will drive ships, fly planes, heat cities, and do almost everything we can think of except find a place to park our car.

Maybe there won't be too many cars. The next generation may be flying the family plane exactly the same way we have been driving the family auto. You can sit down and start thinking of the most incredible new inventions you can imagine. Somebody already has it on a drafting board. We have come to take these things for granted.

I don't think we ever should. Look back with me for a moment into this whole amazing period. How did our side win the atomic race? Before World War II, German scientists were as far advanced as our own—perhaps further advanced. Yet, somehow, thanks to the policies of Hitler and Mussolini, the greatest minds of Italy and Germany and Central Europe were driven to our country at the most critical moment of modern history. Enrico Fermi, possibly the master mind of all the great minds in atomic physics, came to America because of his wife. Albert Einstein and Niels Bohr fled from Europe because they could not breathe in the stifling atmosphere of fear and hatred. These were not accidents. They were the hand of destiny. The outcome of World War II might have been far different without this divine intervention.

Abraham Lincoln was always aware of God's presence in human affairs. One time a delegation of northern clergymen came to see him in the White House. One of them said, "I pray that the Lord will always be on our side." Lincoln looked up and said, "I would like to modify that prayer. Let us pray that we shall always be on the Lord's side."

Our President today is the same kind of man. He is a fighter who prays for guidance. We need it today. Let there be no mistake about the facts before us. The administration in Washington has not created the problems we must solve. We have inherited them. They were the legacy of those New Dealers who dealt the cards from marked deck under the table at Yalta. No one has yet analyzed fully the significance of that infamous conference. It was a sellout of China. Personal, secret agreements were entered into by Mr. Roosevelt, by Stalin and Churchill. Roosevelt approved all of Russia's encroachments upon China. He approved Russia's claim to preeminence in Manchuria. In 1951 Dean Acheson admitted to a Senate committee that the Government of China knew nothing of this secret agreement.

At this same conference, we sanctioned the occupation of North Korea by the Communists. These were the two big decisions at Yalta. They have been the root of all the problems in Asia ever since. Because of Yalta, we found ourselves fighting an undeclared war in Korea.

Because of Yalta, we find ourselves in a desperate dilemma today in the Straits of Formosa.

This is by no means all of the story. We made other deals, unknown to the American people, involving all of Europe. Poland was not turned over to the Communists by action of the Polish people. A few men sitting around a table made the decision. They did not consult with the leadership of the countries involved. They did not even consult with the leadership of our American Congress, much less the full membership. When Roosevelt reported to Congress on March 1, 1945, after the Yalta meeting, he said that the formula for the future of Poland was "agreed to by Russia, by Britain, and by me."

The decisions on East Germany, turning over the great industrial centers of Silesia, Saxony, and Bohemia to the Soviet Union, were made by a few individuals. They were not produced by bipartisan agreements or even by partisan consultation with one party.

Lenin once wrote that communism would conquer Europe in a bypass through Asia. They are trying; they have seized China; they have seized Korea. Now they have taken the northern part of Indochina. The battle for Formosa is already on. Let us not deceive ourselves or permit others to deceive us.

Some people ask why we are concerned. They say that we should not be fighting in a Chinese civil war. This is not a civil war. It is a war between international communism and the free world. There can be no misunderstanding of this fundamental issue.

Formosa in the hands of Red China would be exacty what President Eisenhower described—a dagger thrust into the heart of the Pacific.

For half a century our lines of defense have been committed to the Philipine Islands. We saw how our own country could be endangered in 1941. An air attack based from Japan came within a hair's breadth of destroying our Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. That destruction would have opened the whole of our Pacific coast to the threat of invasion.

Thanks to President Eisenhower, we are far stronger today than we were in 1941. We have learned the realities of life the hard way.

Our country wants peace. We know that in a new war there will be no victors. Albert Einstein has said that he does not know all the weapons which could be used in world war III. But he does know the kind which will be used in world war IV. They will be bows and arrows.

This terrible paradox confronts us today. We have arrived at a moment when we can look forward to a new era of tremendous human progress—at exactly the same moment when we have discovered the means of wiping mankind from the face of the earth. Our scientists are frightened at the

Frankenstein they have created. They tell us that the "fall-out" of atomic radiation from a hydrogen bomb can impair life for hundreds of miles away from the spot where the bomb hits. What sane men will risk war with this knowledge?

These are the serious facts of life today. The next 25 years will be filled with crises. When we analyze them, they always come down to the same basic issue. Each one represents the fight of the State to own our souls. Communism says, "Give me your birthright, and I will feed your stomach. Let the state run your life for you."

In America the Republican Party is still fighting for the rights of the individual. We know what happens when governments take over the responsibilities of the people. They surrender their birthright of freedom for a mess of pottage. In our day we have seen how this works. Here in our own country the Democratic Party is offering us the same bait. Turn to Washington for everything you need. We will take care of you. All we want in return is your vote, your taxes, and your soul.

The Republican Party has never followed this theme. We fight the belief that there is some magic in a mysterious thing called the state. We object to the theory that the people of this country are members to be manipulated for political purposes, like puppets dangling from a string. We believe in free men, living in a free economy, leading a free world.

Look back at the record of our service. From 1860 until 1900 only one Democrat was elected President. In that span of time our population grew from 23 million to 76 million. Our railroads crossed the continent. American unearthed the treasures of our natural resources. They developed mines; they poured out a never-ending stream of inventive genius. America became a world power. It was an unmatched period in history. All that has happened since that time has been an extension of this magnificent effort.

Republican leadership, Republican foresight made the system of free enterprise a symbol of creative skill. They made free enterprise a living force throughout the world.

When he came to the crucial questions, he understood how America had become great back in 1860. "We are a great empire. We are 80 years old," he said. "We stand at once the wonder and the admiration of the whole world, and we must inquire what it is that has given us so much prosperity, and we shall understand that to give up one thing, our free government, would be to give up all future prosperity. This cause it is that every man can make himself. It has been said that such a race of prosperity has been run nowhere else."

That is the story. The words are just as true as they were when Abraham Lincoln said them. The only way to improve our condition is to increase our business by investing more money and making more jobs for more people. If we kill the goose there can be no eggs. We are not going to kill our geese, and there are going to be enough eggs for everybody.

I think that we have made long strides forward in the past 2 years in Washington. Lincoln would have approved our efforts. He was a man who abhorred violence and bloodshed, but he was not afraid to use all the power at his command to fight for what he believed right.

He enjoyed peace and quiet, but he fought one of the fiercest wars ever fought for principles—not power.

In our own time, too, Americans have been called upon to perform repugnant tasks. We have done them well. I like to think in terms of parallels. History does not ever really repeat itself. We like to interpret it in terms of the past, so that it has meaning and continuity.

President Eisenhower, like Abe Lincoln, stepped into the White House after years of Democratic supremacy. He too has been forced to clean the stables. In the very short space of 2 years, people have forgotten what we endured before. This is a tribute to our Republican administration. The stale odor has gone and a fresh spirit moves into Washington.

No one can tell us what the future will bring. A few months ago, President Eisenhower used a neutron wand in Denver, Colo., to break ground in Pennsylvania for the first commercial plant powered by atomic energy. The first atomic battery has already been manufactured. Think of what a small atomic generator in your home would be able to do. All of your heat, light, and fuel will be provided for as long as you can foresee. Salt water will be converted to fresh in quantities sufficient to feed the deserts into life.

Those are some of the miracles before us tomorrow, if only we have the courage and the wit to overcome the problems that plague us today. Here in our country, we have the technical know-how, the scientific skills, the manpower necessary to realize these dreams.

Political parties and their programs have played a tremendous part in the development of our Republic. The Republican Party has always stood for stability. We do not believe in the quick shortcuts, or in the planned utopias of the New Deal intellectuals.

The WPA, the PWA, the CCC, and all the rest of the alphabetical agencies never achieved security, or stability or prosperity. They were emergency measures designed for the moment only. When they ended, we were as badly off as we were when they began.

We Republicans differ from the Democrats in much of our outlook.

In the field of public spending, there is a basic difference between Republicans and Democrats. The Democrats like inflation. Republicans abhor it.

We have seen what happens when money declines in purchasing power. Every man and woman who plans ahead and saves for the future knows that he has been cheated when our dollar is worth only 35 cents.

The Republican Party does not believe in controls. We want to keep the system of free enterprise which built this country. The Democrats are split into two groups on this vital issue. Many of them are conservatives. They want to keep the system. But the leadership of the Democratic Party today has been captured by the leftwing group which does not like our system. They are the Americans for Democratic Action, the professional labor leaders who are using the Democratic Party as a handy vehicle. They want to turn the Democrats into a party patterned after the British Labor Party. No matter how loudly they protest, this is the record of the Democratic Party. It is one thing in the North and another in the South. It is one kind of party when it calls on Harry Truman.

It is quite another when it calls on Adlai Stevenson.

Let me call your attention to still another major difference between the two parties. In the field of taxation, the Democrats are trying one of the greatest feats of magic ever conceived. They have suddenly discovered that taxpayers are voters. For 20 years, no Democratic Congress ever thought of a tax cut.

Suddenly, when the Republicans come up with a real cut for everybody, they decide that we didn't cut enough. But, interestingly enough, although they criticize us for not cutting down on taxes more heavily, some of them are demanding bigger military spending.

I think the American people know what we want. We want consistency. We want firmness. We want a prosperous economy. We do not want to walk through the world with a chip on our shoulder. But we don't want anyone to think we're afraid to fight for our beliefs.

We have a President who is committed to these principles. He does not compromise with them. He has made them clear not only to us but also to those who challenge us.

I admire his courage. I regard him as a great man. Some folks have been asking me if I think he will seek reelection in 1956.

Back in 1864, a reporter asker President Lincoln the same question. He did not want to answer, so he told him this story of an old friend back in Springfield, Ill.

It seems that a very mild-mannered little preacher came to see him one day to rent a hall for a series of lectures. "You can't rent any hall in this town," he was told, "until we know who you are and what you propose to preach about." The preacher looked at him and said, "My subject shall be the Second Coming of Our Lord." "Then you're wasting your time. If the Lord has been to this town once he knows better than to come back a second time."

Mr. Lincoln did choose to come back a second time. And you know there were people who opposed his renomination. Some of them were Republicans and they held a convention in Cleveland. They wanted to nominate General Fremont. The convention was a complete fizzle. Only about 400 people attended, and when President Lincoln heard about it he called for his Bible and opened it to the First Book of Samuel, chapter 22, and he read it out loud: "And everyone that was in distress, and everyone that was in debt, and everyone that was discontented," he read, "gathered themselves unto him, and he became a captain over them, and there were with him about 400 persons."

I don't think any opponent to Dwight D. Eisenhower would do any better.

Address by Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, Before Lawyers Association of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to address the Lawyers Association of St. Louis, Mo., on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of its founding. My speech was devoted to the problem of establishing proper standards for the conduct of congressional investigations. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of that speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE LAWYERS ASSOCIATION OF ST. LOUIS, DECEMBER 3, 1954

Mr. Susman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored to be invited to address you on this occasion as part of the 20th anniversary celebration of the Lawyers Association of St. Louis. In the 20 years since the formation of this distinguished society of lawyers on April 24, 1934, you have achieved a record of which you may be justifiably proud. To review the list of the many accomplishments of the Lawyers Association of St. Louis, would, I think, consume the better part of the time

which you have so graciously allotted me. Moreover, most of you well know the record, having shared in these achievements.

We have had the pleasure of participating this evening in ceremonies honoring the service of past presidents of this association, among whom I have had some of my closest associations and friendships in my practice at the St. Louis bar. These 19 past presidents, together with Bernard Susman, your present presiding officer, would constitute a distinguished bar anywhere in the land or wherever Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence is a shield and a bulwark. Beyond this, the Lawyers Association of St. Louis has numbered among its members many of our State's leading lawyers. In short, this a society in which any lawyer or counselor-at-law is very proud to claim the honor of membership.

This evening I am going to talk about something we all recognize and believe deeply—the importance to our country and our civilization of an independent and fearless bar and incorruptible judiciary as the foundation of constitutional democracy. With this theme in mind, I think it fitting that I repeat tonight the preamble of the constitution of the Lawyers Association. As you know, it reads: "To promote the study of law as a science and its practice as a learned profession; to defend the courts, their officers, and the administration of justice; to maintain the honor, dignity and worthy traditions of the profession of law; to encourage general improvements of conditions among lawyers in the practice of their profession; and to secure reasonable reforms and improvements of law and procedure." In these words, the Lawyers Association has set for itself high standards and worthy objectives. In the past, you have fulfilled these standards and met these objectives. I am confident that in the trying years ahead, you shall continue, as an association and as individuals, to make these precepts dynamic and vital.

I think we can take it as axiomatic, and especially so among lawyers, that liberty of person and security of property cannot be said to exist without impartial justice, adequate juridicial defense and proper representation.

For Anglo-Saxon lawyers almost from the 13th century, it has been a tradition that to provide a fair trial and an adequate defense for one accused of crime is the highest dignity to which the law can attain. As stated by Thomas Erskine on the 18th of December, 1792, in his defense of Thomas Paine then being tried, in absentia, for libel and sedition, "If I were to ask you gentlemen of the jury what is the choicest flower that grows upon the tree of English liberty, you would answer security under the law. If I were to ask the whole people of England the return they look for at the hands of government, from the burdens under which they bend to support it. I should still be answered, security under the laws; or, in other words, an impartial administration of justice." Erskine, you will remember, later to become Lord Chancellor, was, at the time of his defense of Thomas Paine, the foremost advocate in England and, even though only 42, had already made a fortune at the bar handling civil as well as criminal matters, and had behind him a distinguished record of successfully defending in a hostile atmosphere many persons accused of crime.

But, to have liberty of person and security of property based on the impartial administration of justice we must have stable and orderly government. Indispensable ingredients for justice are an independent and incorruptible judiciary and an informed and fearless advocacy. We lawyers often bear the brunt of heavy criticism for being conservative, for resisting change, and for defending the status quo. Our basic conservatism is our tradition and our heritage. It flows naturally from our knowledge of history, from our intimate acquaintance with legal institutions, and from our deepfelt realization that liberty and security are, at best, precarious. Our training and our traditions at the bar insist that, in spite of calumny that may be heaped upon us, we must do everything within the law to preserve our ancient rights, including the right of one accused of crime, however heinous, to receive an adequate defense.

Lately, in this country, we have been witness to certain reprehensible tendencies toward disorderly government. To you, my friends, who have been trained in and daily practice the orderly procedures of our law courts, to you I do not have to expand in great detail concerning the tendencies to which I have alluded. You are all aware that some congressional committees have tended with increasing tempo to go beyond the restraints dictated by orderly procedures.

Congressional investigations have been the subject of increasing concern among thoughtful people for two reasons. First, in some instances they have amounted to unconstitutional attacks on the authority and prerogatives of the executive. And second, they have failed, in some cases, to provide due process of law.

Insofar as unlawful attacks upon the executive branch are concerned, it seems to me that we must look to the President to provide the proper checks and balances by asserting his authority. Members of the Congress can assist him by speaking out, as they have done in recent attacks on his authority. Insofar as congressional committees have failed to provide due process of law in their investigations, the Congress, and the Congress alone, has full responsibility.

To the charge that some congressional committees have, at times, used star-chamber methods and have denied due process of law by refusing to persons whose integrity or loyalty are impugned the right to present evidence, to be represented by counsel, and to cross-examine adverse witnesses, we have heard the argument that these investigations are being conducted to get the facts. To the charge that some committees have, at times, conducted inquisitorial investigations on the premise that one is presumed guilty until proven innocent, we have heard the reply that such investigations are not judicial trials to which "due process" applies. And we hear repeatedly, in answer to these charges, that these investigations are conducted to expose Communists and that, therefore, the niceties of fair procedure are irrelevant.

This last-mentioned defense, of course, calls to mind a basic doctrine of the Communists—that "the end justifies the means." It is this concept which threatens the core of our personal liberties—the liberties for which our Republic was founded. We have been shocked with the thoughtless comments of those who assert: "I don't like the methods, but I approve of the end result." As lawyers, we know that there can be no liberty without due process of law.

We have also heard the argument that to compel congressional investigating committees to meet the minimum standards of due process would add unduly to the burden of these committees, that it would be time-consuming and would impede the work of the committee in getting at the facts. In this connection, we may recall that one of the reasons set forth for the establishment of the court of star chamber in 1487 was that the convictions by the regular courts of justice were so slow as to enable felons to break the peace with impunity. In fact, statute 3, Henry VII, chapter I, creating the court of star chamber, provided that the body should punish misdoers "as they should and ought to be punished if they were thereof convicted after the due order of the law."

In considering what standards should govern the conduct of congressional investigations, we should bear in mind that congressional investigations or hearings, in general, fall into 2 fairly distinct types; 1 is what I would term the legislative hearing, the other I would call an inquisitorial hearing. It is the latter about which we are disturbed. The procedures that are quite appropriate for the legislative hearings are not appropriate for the other type. One of our principal difficulties with inquisitorial investigations, I think, stems largely from our failure, until very recently, to note the basic difference between the two types of hearings and our consequent failure to apply different rules to them.

In legislative hearings the purpose is to develop concise and adequate information in order to formulate intelligent legislative policy. Such hearings often involve the wisdom of actions that Government officials have taken and invariably explore questions of governmental policy and the administration of particular programs. Such hearings seldom, however, explore the integrity or loyalty of individuals and the committees holding such hearings have not had to concern themselves with the problem of providing persons under attack with an adequate opportunity to defend themselves. When the problem presents itself, however, I think committees ought to give it special attention.

In the case of inquisitorial investigations to ferret out disloyalty or dishonesty, the purpose is, or at least it should be, to supplement the extensive investigative machinery at work in the executive branch and to provide information on which to base legislation, that is, to strengthen our laws dealing with crime and corruption generally, and, in particular, with acts and conspiracies against national security.

The inquisitorial investigations have affronted our standards of fair play and fair hearing. They have at times caused irreparable damage to loyal and innocent persons. However, even for persons who may not be honest or loyal, there must be fair hearings in the legislative branch as well as in the courts. We cannot have one code of procedure for innocent people and another code of procedure for guilty people. The abuses that have been practiced in congressional inquisitorial hearings must be brought to an end as quickly as possible.

In coping with this problem, it would be well for us to bear in mind that no Senator or Representative of the Federal Legislature has any power to investigate on his own beyond that enjoyed by every citizen. The same is also true of congressional committees. They hold their powers at the pleasure of the Senate or the House acting as a body. They have only the power which the Senate or the House delegates to them. And, likewise, subcommittees, whether they consist of one or more members, may enjoy power only as it is delegated from the parent committee. The Senate and the House may at any time take away the powers given to a committee.

What I have just said is, of course, a simple truth that is obvious to everybody. I think, however, that many persons, including Members of the Congress, have at times overlooked these basic facts. From these facts we may conclude that it is within the power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, to deal with abuses of its committees or its own Members. With this in mind, a good many Members of the Congress in both Houses have introduced measures that would establish mandatory codes of fair procedure for committees. I, myself, have been a cosponsor of one or more already introduced in the Senate.

While some changes are apparently needed in the rules governing investigative committees, the problem with which we have recently been confronted in the Congress, cannot, in the end, be reached by rules. It is a matter which, in its basic elements, involves moral standards, self-restraint and

ideals of fair play. Can any of you imagine the kind of scenes which we have so recently witnessed occurring in a court of law? It is offensive to us. It is unthinkable. And while for obvious reasons, the rules of procedure governing the conduct of cases in our law courts cannot be carried over into legislative matters, it is our duty to be ever vigilant and to have one eye on the traditions and the standards of our law courts as a guide to orderly procedure and fair conduct in legislative matters.

Our present day difficulties with congressional investigations would not have reached the present point of crisis if Russian Communist conspiracy and treachery were not abroad in the world.

The convictions of Klaus Fuchs, in England, and of the Rosenbergs and others here for espionage in connection with atomic secrets; the conviction of the top Communist leaders in this country; the charges of Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley leading to the conviction of Hiss and Remington—these dramatic events together with other developments including the seeking of refuge in the fifth amendment by many witnesses before various congressional committees, set the stage for abuses of committee power. The point I am making is that without the Communist conspiracy, congressional committees would not have had occasion to take on the inquisitorial aspects which I have just discussed.

In this era of the hydrogen bomb—in this period of neither peace nor war so aptly called the cold war—all loyal Americans are concerned about our national security and bitter against traitors. Some loyal citizens have even become hysterical and stand ready to pillory those who insist on orderly democratic government, on the preservation of constitutional rights, and on lawful procedures even in the exposure and conviction of traitors.

In this period of tenseness, lawyers have a great opportunity and an equal responsibility to lend a steady hand to the course of public affairs and to bring the full pressure of their wisdom and sound judgment to bear against disorderly and illegal extremes.

So far, we have come through this period fairly well and with reasonable dignity, but, at times, I have felt that the atmosphere of public affairs was in danger of being permanently polluted by fear, intolerance, and hysteria. During this period, altogether loyal and usually restrained Americans have felt impelled to employ such epithets as "witch hunt" and "book burning" to describe some of the excesses.

In pondering our present problems, I have searched for a period of history which, while not on all fours with our own—no two periods are ever identical—would contain some of the elements of tension and world unrest that we are now experiencing. I wanted to consider what fearless advocates did to meet the crises of their times. My thoughts turned to the events in England and France, during the French Revolution, beginning with the fall of the Bastille on the 14th of July 1789. Conservative Englishmen, in that day, viewed the atrocities committed by the Paris Commune with its Committee of Surveillance and its mob rule with a horror and a fear even as great as that with which we view the conspiracies and the treachery of the men in the Kremlin. The French revolutionists, it is true, did have many sympathizers among the British people, and even distinguished defenders in the House of Commons, such as Charles James Fox, the great Whig leader. On the other hand, we will recall that it was Fox's former friend and colleague, Edmund Burke, who after his dramatic appearance in the House of Commons dressed in the blue and buff of revolutionary America to defend our War of Independence, was now so shaken by the terror in Paris, that he wrote and published his historic philippic against the French, Reflections on the French Revolution. You will remember that this bitter controversy ended the long association and friendship of these two great titans of the Whig Party.

William Pitt, the Younger, then Prime Minister of England, decided that Thomas Paine should be indicted for libel and sedition against the Crown for having written part II of his famous essay The Rights of Man as an answer to Burke. In November of 1792, the trial of Paine was commenced before the Court of King's Bench. Paine was at the time in Paris, having been elected a member of the National Convention, and he was tried in absentia, the laws of England at that time permitting the trial of criminal defendants without their presence before the court. Friends of Paine urged Thomas Erskine to take Paine's case. Erskine, at the height of his career as England's ablest advocate, was faced with a hard decision. Should he provide, for Thomas Paine, charged, in effect, with treason against the British Crown the best defense possible in England—not just an ordinary defense which Paine might otherwise get—but a defense in the hands of this master of the English juries, or should he heed the cautious warnings of his friends not to be identified with this defendant who was anathema to British conservatism and respectability? As you all know, Erskine took Paine's brief and stood before the King's judges while his client, as a member of the French Revolutionary Government, remained safely beyond the reach of the court. You will also remember Erskine's magnificent address to the hostile jury in the face of what he knew was certain defeat for his client.

This case was soon followed by the trial of John Frost, a London solicitor of great eminence and respectability who was pronounced guilty of sedition on the evidence of a copy of The Rights of Man found in the pocket of his greatcoat. This case Erskine likewise took in the face of an almost certain verdict of guilty.

Erskine, intrepid advocate that he was, continued to act as counsel for persons accused of sedition and in December 1793 won an acquittal before a jury for the owners of the Morning Chronicle. Soon after, Erskine successfully defended Thomas Walker, of Manchester, who likewise had fallen victim to an oppressive zeal to prosecute anyone who dared to question government policy. And there were many others. This period came to be known as England's reign of terror. But in the end, fearless, resolute British advocacy won through. As you know, Erskine on April 7, 1806, became Lord Chancellor of England and took as his motto for his peerage Trial by Jury.

My friends, I have dwelt at some length on the history of Lord Erskine not so much because he was an exception to the rule—I think he was not. He merely took his place among the many before and after him who have maintained the highest tradition of the British and the American Bar. You and I can cite cases much closer to hand if there were need to do so. I think, however, I have illustrated my point.

As lawyers in this great democracy we have a public trust and a responsibility that falls more heavily on us, perhaps, than on any other group of our citizens—to cherish our independence of judgment, to champion just causes without fear or timidity, to remain vigilant against any inroads upon our basic freedom of person and security of property, and to defend with all our vigor the principles of justice under a government of laws and not of men.

As members of the Lawyers Association of St. Louis, I am confident there will be no shrinking from this obligation, but that, true to the high standards and noble traditions of this great organization, we will meet this continuing challenge with courage and with honor.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 11, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in today's RECORD the text of an address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] on February 10, 1955. The occasion was a Lincoln Day dinner in Hagerstown, Md., given by the Washington County Republican State Central Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

I am sincerely grateful for the privilege of addressing this splendid meeting of true Americans and loyal Republicans.

It is an honor and a real pleasure to come to the Free State of Maryland and to join you in tribute to one of the greatest of all Americans—the first Republican President of the United States—Abraham Lincoln.

First, let me tell you that in the Keystone State of Pennsylvania we have the highest admiration of our fine Maryland neighbors.

We know how much of the spirit of America has gone into the building of your great State.

We share your pride in its glorious history and its steadfast record of loyalty and patriotic sacrifice.

Like Pennsylvania, Maryland is the home of many faiths and creeds living in tolerance and good will. One of the great landmarks in religious liberty was the Maryland Toleration Act, passed by the Provincial Assembly more than 300 years ago.

It was the first law in the American Colonies granting freedom of worship to everyone who professed belief in the Christian faith.

In my own State we are proud that the same principle of religious liberty was established by William Penn in founding the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I am happy to be here tonight to tell you of my high regard for my distinguished friends and colleagues—JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER and GLENN BEALL. They are both great Americans and great Republicans.

Both served their country with honor and distinction as soldiers in time of war. Both serve their State and Nation with the highest degree of statesmanship in these days of troubled peace.

I am proud to tell you that the State of Maryland is represented in the Senate of the United States by two forceful, vigorous, fighting American patriots who battle with tireless energy to protect the American system of government and the American way of life.

I want to make special mention also of your distinguished Republican Congressman, DEWITT HYDE, and to offer my praise for his able, courageous, and patriotic service.

He came to the House of Representatives in the 83d Congress with a valuable background of legislative experience in the general assembly as a member of the house and of the State senate.

The people of the Sixth Congressional District gave proper recognition of his outstanding ability by sending him back to Congress for a second term.

The fame of your great Governor has spread far beyond the borders of Maryland

and has made him an outstanding national figure.

Maryland is so fortunate to have the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin. His statesmanship is in the historic pattern of Maryland's greatness. His stanch Republicanism is in line with the highest standards of political integrity.

I congratulate the people of Maryland on retaining Governor McKeldin in office for a second term.

Your Republican Senators and Representatives and your Governor believe in freedom of the individual, freedom of enterprise, and freedom of opportunity.

These are American principles. They are the principles of the Republican Party. They were the principles of Abraham Lincoln.

In commemorating the birthday anniversary of the Great Emancipator we recall his steadfast courage, his inexhaustible patience, his lofty spirit of tolerance, his deep humility, his enduring devotion to the ideals of our Republic, and his faith in God.

It is therefore fitting on this anniversary to reaffirm our allegiance to the heritage passed on to us by the Founding Fathers, preserved for us by Abraham Lincoln, and strengthened by the high principles to which President Eisenhower and the Republican Party are dedicated.

We honor Lincoln as one of the founders of the Republican Party.

It was his suggestion that the delegates to the first national convention of the Republican Party unite on the principles of the Declaration of Independence and hostility to the extension of slavery.

Lincoln put it in these memorable words:

"Let us, in building our new party, plant ourselves on the rock of the Declaration of Independence, and the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail against us."

The political wisdom of Abraham Lincoln grows more impressive with the passing of the years.

The Declaration of Independence stands as a firm, immovable rock, symbolizing the Republican Party's dedication to freedom of the individual, human dignity, and human integrity.

Throughout the 100 years of its existence the philosophy of the Republican Party has been based on the sacred principle that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Let me read to you the first resolution adopted by the first Republican National Convention in Philadelphia in 1856. It is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States, must be preserved."

My fellow Americans, that ringing declaration has been the watchword of the Republican Party ever since. The words are timely and true. They apply to the issues which confront us today.

Lincoln called upon every American to accept a full share of responsibility for the preservation of our liberties.

On February 11, 1861, when he was on his way to Washington to assume the office of President he made a speech at Indianapolis in which he said:

"In all trying positions in which I shall be placed, and doubtless I shall be placed in many such, my reliance will be upon you and the people of the United States. * * *

"It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves—and not for me.

"I appeal to you to constantly bear in mind, that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with officeseekers, but with you is the question:

"Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?"

Those words of Abraham Lincoln are a challenge to all of us in this present day.

They are a warning that the people alone can save America from the dangers that can bring us to national disaster.

Our system of government is based on the fundamental principle that people can manage their own affairs better than government can manage for them.

One hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities. In all that people can do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere."

Lincoln recognized that interference by government in the lives of its citizens is a dangerous encroachment upon individual liberty—contrary to the plan of the Founding Fathers.

Only the people can rise up in their might and enforce relief from the evils of big government—high taxes and excessive debt.

It is frightening to realize that the public and private debt of the American people has climbed to a point so high that it is a serious threat to the safety and security of the Nation.

Uncontrolled debt, rising higher and higher year after year, places a crushing burden on the economic structure of our country, and points the way to financial collapse.

It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us that the American people now owe a total of more than $600 billion, three times as much as the debt of 15 years ago.

In the last 5 years alone the total public and private debt has increased by $50 billion.

Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today.

At the top of the list is the Federal debt of $278 billion—an increase of $20 billion since the end of World War II.

Twenty-three years ago, when we were fighting the worst depression we ever had, the Federal debt was less than $20 billion.

The debts of State and local governments have increased 16 percent in 1 year alone, reaching a total of $38 billion on June 30, 1954.

In terms of national income public debt stood at 34 percent in 1929, rose to 102 percent in 1933, declined to 69 percent in 1941, and rose again to 147 percent in 1945. It has since declined to 86 percent, largely because of the rise in income.

There is real cause for alarm in the tragic fact that while the debt burden is increasing by millions every day, the great majority of our people don't seem to be worried about it.

They take the position that we are a strong nation, we are prosperous, our people have a backlog of savings, times are good, the national income is high, why worry?

But the danger is all about us.

If for any reason we should be forced into a decline—even a slight decline in business activity, jobs and income, the staggering burden of debt could prove too much for our economy to sustain and could bring us to disaster.

I ask you to remember that the debts, which so many people hold so lightly, are not mere bookkeeping items. They will have to be paid by generations far in the future, out of the earnings of Americans who had no part in creating the debts.

The question that naturally arises is: Are we going to drift into bigger debt, or are we going to begin thinking about reducing it.

I bring this serious situation to your attention because I believe we Republicans should be concerned with the problem of government grown too big and too costly.

Yes, my fellow Americans, we have too much government, and government is involved in too many functions in which it does not properly belong.

The future of our Nation depends upon the course of action we take and the principles for which we fight.

Let us—like Lincoln—call for a new dedication to our country's cause and resolve that this Nation, founded to sustain the God-given freedom of the individual, shall not perish from the earth, but shall live forever, and grow stronger with each passing generation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the beneficent and mighty Ruler in all the affairs of our human order, may it be our supreme ambition to serve Thee daily in faithfulness and humility.

Grant that in times of national peril and crises we may know the way of how best to measure up to the overwhelming obligations of our high vocation.

Wilt Thou evoke within our minds and hearts those capacities and powers of insight and understanding which will enable us to find the right answers to our many needs.

May men and nations everywhere be baptized and inspired with a more generous and magnanimous spirit, for history and experience teach us so clearly that selfishness always defeats itself and self-seeking is self-losing.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whose spirit of love and good will is the only bond of unity, amity, and fraternity among the members of the human family. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1955, was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

INCREASED CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I notice on Wednesday's calendar the bill to raise congressional salaries by $10,000 a year.

This bill would also increase the salaries of United States district judges and United States court of appeals judges by $7,500 a year, and United States Supreme Court Justices by $10,000 a year.

I regret that those in charge of the bill have seen fit to tie congressional salaries and judicial salaries together. They are separate items; they involve different factors, and should be considered separately. It is not the practice to lump together unrelated groups of employees in the same salary bill. Legislation is pending now to increase the salaries of Federal employees, but one bill deals with postal employees and another and separate bill deals with classified Federal employees.

I shall oppose this congressional salary bill as it is now written for these and other reasons. What I have to say here concerns mainly the proposed congressional salary increase.

I think some increase is justified, but not $10,000. This is a two-thirds increase over the present salary. The amount of the increase alone is more than twice the salary the average worker in private industry receives. I have before me a table showing by industry divisions the average annual wage and salary payments in private industry. This average annual salary in all private industries is $3,590. In House bill 3828 it is proposed to give Representatives and Senators, at one jump, a raise of $10,000.

I realize that the grave and important decisions which Congress must make, and the handling of the tremendous budgets of the Government each year, require that congressional positions be filled by persons of good judgment, wide experience, great ability, and high integrity. Members of Congress ought not to be required to serve here at a financial sacrifice. However, it is all out of reason to jump these salaries from $15,000 to $25,000 in one bill.

I think that we here in Congress, whose responsibility is to appropriate money and to levy taxes upon the citizens to pay the expenses of government, owe a duty to the people of the United States to set an example of economy and thrift.

I have heard some of the stories told by Members of going in debt thousands of dollars each year while serving here. I think the question as to whether one goes in debt or lives within his income of $15,000 a year depends to a great extent upon the manner in which he lives. That is no princely salary, it is true, but statistics show that more than three-fourths of the people in this country live and care for their families on less than one-third of that amount.

In considering this question I cannot keep out of my thoughts the fact that in 20 of the last 23 years the Federal Government has spent more than it took in, and that in each of those 20 years our national debt has continued to increase. Our Government now owes $278 billion. We all know that Congress had to increase the debt limit last year by $6 billion. Our Government is going to spend $2 billion more this year than it takes in in taxes, and the time is not yet in sight when the Federal budget will be balanced.

When I think about this increase and the kind of example it sets insofar as Federal spending is concerned, I cannot help thinking of the fact that in 1953 the people of my home State of Georgia sent to Washington the enormous sum of $708 million—nearly three-fourths of a billion dollars—as their contribution to Federal Government expenses.

This is nearly 50 times the amount of Federal taxes which Georgia sent to Washington in 1929, just 25 years ago. In that year our total internal revenue payments were $14,056,000. It is more than 20 times the $34 million which Georgia sent here in 1939, just 15 years ago.

Every increase in Federal spending is a tendency toward inflation. Inflated prices have already reduced the American dollar to less than 50 percent of the purchasing power it had in 1939.

This continual upward trend in Federal spending and Federal taxing must stop somewhere. It will never stop if we continue to pass such legislation as this.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this bill is unreasonable, and I shall vote against it.

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION BUILT MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in the barrage of Lincoln Day speeches by Republican orators, perhaps none was more ridiculous and none so lacking in foundation of fact than the one delivered by Attorney General Herbert Brownell before the National Republic Club.

Only the most naive audience could agree with Mr. Brownell that President Eisenhower and his administration were entitled to credit for the military strength the United States possesses today. It is true that our defense is improved today over 1, 2, or 3 years ago, but credit for this new strength cannot be given to an administration which has, for the most part, sponsored cutbacks in military strength in all branches—the Air Force, the Navy, the Army, and the Marines—which has reduced appropriations and cut the defense budget to the point where military leaders, before congressional committees, openly state our national security is jeopardized thereby.

When Attorney General Brownell said, "Our offensive striking power is outstanding in the present world situation," he was, in effect, paying tribute to the planning and appropriations of a previous administration. Not a single plane that flies, not a single new scientific development, not one atom of our atomic potential in the field of weapons, can be credited to the present administration. All of these were inherited from the planning of others.

It has always been amazing to me to observe the breast-thumping of the present administration on increasing national military strength, while actually this administration has done little to bring it about.

I agree with Attorney General Brownell that our present military strength is not an accident, but it has not been the extraordinary knowledge of military affairs on the part of the present administration that has brought it about. It was the foresight and vision of the Truman administration that brought us our present strength.

Time alone will tell how good is the existing administration judgment which has consistently made cutbacks in our military programs—even in research and development—and has withheld what many military leaders believe to be necessary appropriations that would insure a continuation of adequate military strength.

It is utterly stupid for Mr. Brownell or anyone in the Eisenhower administration to attempt to take credit for the scientific and technological developments which are today the key to our military strength. All these things were in the making, and many of them in production, before the present administration took over and before Mr. Brownell and Mr. Wilson knew the difference between a Springfield rifle and an atomic cannon.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today on the anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. S. *Maine*, following any special orders heretofore entered and to withdraw special order that he had for 1 hour on tomorrow.

LITHUANIA FREEDOM ANNIVERSARY WEDNESDAY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week I have a special order for 60 minutes to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It will be the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. During that 60-minute period I shall be glad to yield to any Members of the House who wish to make statements regarding the fight that this great nation has waged during the centuries for liberty and freedom.

Lithuania is one of the countries that today is a Soviet captive nation. In 20 years it entered into three different

peace pacts, agreements and treaties with the Soviet Union.

On July 21, 1920, it signed a peace pact with the Soviet Union.

On July 1, 1933, Lithuania signed a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union.

On October 10, 1939, it signed a mutual assistance pact with the Soviet Union.

All three of these pacts, agreements or treaties were thrown out of the window when it served the purposes of the Soviet Union to take over Lithuania and place that nation in communistic slavery. Lithuania has been the victim of the same type of so-called peaceful aggression which the Kremlin inflicted on other Iron Curtain satellite nations.

The same creeping infiltration is slowly working under Soviet supervision in free countries in Western Europe, Asia, South America, and throughout the globe.

The Committee on Communist Aggression in the last Congress recorded sworn testimony of over 330 witnesses revealing the Communist pattern for world conquest. Every Member of Congress should read that report.

PRINTING OF COPIES OF HEARINGS ON TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, held by the Committee on Ways and Means for the use of the said committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Tennessee state whether he took this matter up with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. COOPER. I have conferred with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and he and I are in full agreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO: HERO OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (1746–1817)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Thaddeus Kosciusko was one of those brave and restless Polish fighters for freedom who was so strongly motivated by a love of liberty that we would go almost anywhere and take part in any battle provided it was for a righteous cause. It was this feeling which brought him to America not long after our revolutionary war had begun. He arrived in Philadelphia in August of 1776 and immediately applied for military service. He was admitted, and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware River. The success of this work earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of the following year he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga. Later the fortifications he erected at Saratoga contributed greatly to the brilliant victory of our forces there. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he took part in the battle of Charleston, and was among the first of the Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British. On October 13, 1783, Congress made him a brigadier general.

Having served this country and its cause successfully and brilliantly, in July of 1784 he returned to his native land, hoping to carry on the fight for her freedom. For more than 20 years he continued his brave but unfortunately futile efforts for Poland's freedom and died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

Today on the 209th anniversary of his birthday we solemnly honor his noble memory. We do this not only because he fought for our independence, but also because he was a vigorous champion of the universal cause of human freedom as long as he lived.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

POSSIBILITY OF INUNDATION OF LONG ISLAND BY THE ATLANTIC OCEAN

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the incredibly realistic possibility that the flat, low plains of Long Island may be inundated by the Atlantic Ocean must be recognized. Despite the fact that we have had a series of hurricanes, starting with the great storm in 1929, including the hurricane of 1938, another in 1944, and concluding with Carol and Edna in 1954, the danger to this sand peninsula, which juts 150 miles out from New York City, is not understood. Those who would seek to save the land operate within a difficult legal framework which, also, is not understood. I am setting forth, here, not only the problem but the solution agreed upon by all concerned.

The Weather Bureau has unequivocally stated that Long Island is now in the hurricane path. What does this mean? Every few years, and possibly several times a year, a devastating storm will strike the south shore of Long Island. Protecting some 50 miles of this south shore is a sand barrier known as Fire Island. At the present rate of erosion and storm destruction Fire Island will be split and broken within 15 years. Corrective action can stop this. What happens if no action is taken? The Atlantic Ocean will jump 3 or 4 miles, will cross the Great South Bay, and begin its dreadful erosion work on the mainland proper.

At the east end of Long Island there is no sand barrier other than beach dunes. These, too, are being eroded, destroyed, and eaten away at a rapid rate. And once the high bluffs are leveled, there will be no impediment to the ocean rolling inland.

Long Island's north shore also suffers from serious erosion conditions. It receives a full share of any storm damage. Thus, any action taken to save the island must be comprehensive.

In ages past every shore front owner was required to protect his own property. The local community, State, and Federal Government did not contribute to the protection of a man's individual property. This philosophy is still good. However, on Long Island a different situation exists. Very few people are able to pay the high price of bulkheads and jetties for protection of their own property. It is often true, too, that where an individual property owner builds a defensive bulkhead, he will unwittingly damage the property of his neighbor. This is one of the most important reasons why the entire program must be comprehensive.

Because of the necessity for community approach villages first became interested, recognizing that protection of the shorefront benefited the area directly behind the raging seas. Soon the county took an active part, and before long the State of New York took the lead under the guidance of the Duryea Commission in the early forties.

Now, however, the situation has become so serious that the Federal Government must, I repeat, must take an active

role. The responsibility for shoreline protection rests with the Army Corps of Engineers, under the Secretary of the Army. No comprehensive plan can be undertaken without their approval. They are ideally suited by experience and equipment to conduct the necessary survey of Long Island. They are also aware of our plight on Long Island. They are aware of the fact that this sandy peninsula can be completely eroded in several generations, within the life span of an individual.

Yet, there exists on the books today Public Law 727 of the 79th Congress. This prohibits the Federal Government from participating in shore protection except in front of publicly owned property such as a Coast Guard station or a public beach. And even then the Federal Government is limited to the extent of one-third of any cost for work done to protect that publicly owned property. Consequently, the Federal contribution to erosion control on Long Island would be infinitesimally small. At the present time the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman JAMES AUCHINCLOSS, and I have introduced identical bills in this session of Congress—H. R. 31 and H. R. 3146. These proposals would allow the Federal Government to contribute up to one-third of the total cost of protecting the shores of all property, public or private. Such a bill would produce a joint venture: the county, the State, and the Federal Government would participate in the overall program as partners.

There is one more phase which must be examined. Before any work can be done, a survey must be made of every foot of the shore front to be protected. This survey must be in the form of a detailed, comprehensive, technical study. It is not something that can be accomplished in a few days. The present length of time required for a survey of Long Island's south shore is estimated at a 6-month minimum and probably far closer to a year. The Federal Government cannot participate without such a survey, nor can any money be authorized or appropriated without this survey.

Last year the United States Army Corps of Engineers was allocated in the budget, $100,000 for all survey work on beach erosion. This pitiful amount was a drop in the bucket in comparison to total requirements. We, on Long Island, were allocated a cash outlay of approximately $3,000, but the survey for the south shore would cost $50,000—50 percent to be paid by the State and county, and 50 percent by the Federal Government. Suffolk County advanced $12,500 and the State of New York advanced $12,500, but the Federal Government was not in a position to match these funds. There was a proposed arrangement whereby the State or county would advance the required funds to the engineers under a repayment agreement. This would have meant that the engineers could have started their program late last fall. Tragically, though, these negotiations seemed never the have materialized.

Fortunately, due to the excellent teamwork of our legislators in Albany, a new approach may be in the offing. Edmund R. Lupton from my own district has had a great deal of experience in this field. There is no lack of understanding.

Last week I introduced a bill, H. R. 3811, which will authorize a special study for what I call the "hurricane" area. This includes New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey. Funds would be authorized and appropriated to the Beach Erosion Board to allow them to make the necessary studies and survey in the affected areas. This is in the nature of an emergency proposition and should not in any way detract from the requests made by the Beach Erosion Board for other funds. Senator BUSH, of Connecticut, has introduced a similar measure in the other body. I hope the committees to which these bills are referred—both the Senate and House Public Works—will act as soon as possible so that we may present our case to the Appropriations Committee at once.

One of the criticisms usually leveled at parliamentary governments is that they are slow to act in time of crisis. This criticism has proved to be unfounded if we are to use as examples the last two Great Wars and the Korean conflict. We have also risen quickly to the occasion of revitalizing the threatened economies of many free nations throughout the world who would have gone under. Well, Long Island can go under, too. It can go under the Atlantic Ocean. We are faced with an unbelievable crisis. The terrible burden of responsibility rests squarely upon the Congress, the Corps of Engineers and the governors of the several States. Let us prove that we can act when an emergency strikes at home, that we can act now, that we will act now.

ANNIVERSARY OF ARIZONA'S ADMISSION TO THE UNION

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in 47 States of our Nation February 14 is St. Valentine's Day. But in the State of Arizona it is Admission Day. It is the anniversary of that day in 1912 when the State of Arizona became a member of this Union.

I respectfully submit to the House that this is the anniversary of a great day not only for the State of Arizona but for the United States of America. The baby State of Arizona has literally grown out of its three-cornered pants in the last few years and with the fine help which we have received from our sister States we have certainly made the desert bloom like a rose. The foundation has been laid for even greater growth in the future.

All that is needed to make this promise become reality is water. With water, the productivity of our soil and the production of our factories will continue to add ever-increasing bounty for the needs of our people and the wealth and security of our Nation. I hope and pray that the obstacles both technological and legal now in the path of the development of water for the arid West, will soon be removed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The State of Arizona sent some very distinguished men here to be helpful, too.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentlemen, assuming that he refers to me.

THE LATE GEN. BREHON B. SOMERVELL

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened by the news of the death of Gen. Brehon Somervell yesterday in Ocala, Fla. General Somervell was born in Little Rock, Ark., in 1892. He won an appointment to West Point in 1910 and graduated 4 years later, sixth in the class of 106.

I am sure we all know of his fine leadership during the Second World War as the head of the Service of Supply. His achievements in that branch of the service were impressive and received worldwide recognition. In the First World War General Somervell won the Distinguished Service Cross for a daring reconnaissance in the Meuse-Argonne offensive as a Corps of Engineers lieutenant colonel. He also won a Distinguished Service Medal for vital construction of gas and ammunition depots under fire in France.

In 1925, General Somervell assisted in a navigation survey of the Rhine and Danube Rivers for the League of Nations and late in 1933 conducted a comprehensive economic survey of Turkey. Between his colorful foreign and Washington assignments he completed many important engineering projects.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] in his remarks concerning General Somervell. General Somervell had relatives in my hometown. We were all very fond of him and I should like to join the gentleman in expressing deep regret at his untimely passing.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman. In the passing of Brehon Somervell the Nation loses a great public servant, a great patriot, and a distinguished leader in many fields of human endeavor.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—will the gentleman please inform the House of the program for the week?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to do that. The program, as I announced last week, is for Wednesday, the pay raise bill. On Thursday, although no rule has yet been reported out, H. R. 1. I am scheduling that for Thursday, and Friday if necessary. If it is brought up this week, I expect that it will be completed this week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in Michigan, we have a very important meeting coming up the last of the week. I was wondering how many of us would be able to get away for that meeting. As you will recall, the labor movement up there, in the persons of Walter Reuther and Gus Scholle, took over the State administration. Will we be able to get away to attend what might be called the funeral services up there?

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume the gentleman will admit that Walter Reuther is one of the outstanding Americans of today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to get that admission. I am sure Walter Reuther will be very glad to read in the RECORD here that the gentleman does admit that he is an outstanding American.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not say what for.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the serious inquiry my friend is making?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The serious point is: How many of the few remaining Republicans in Michigan can get away to attend that State convention Friday and Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a parliamentary inquiry that is outside of the House. The gentleman is just being facetious.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What are we going to vote on on Friday?

Mr. MASON. H. R. 1.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. H. R. 1?

Mr. McCORMACK. We expect to vote on that on Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that a Republican or Democratic measure?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is for the gentleman to decide.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE ALLISTER COCHRANE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House appreciate very much the cooperation given us by every employee who constitutes a part of the organization of the House, from the page boys up, and we are deeply grieved when we read of the death of any employee of the House, particularly one who has rendered long years of honorable and trustworthy service to the House and its Members.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce to the House the death on October 20, 1954, of Allister Cochrane, who for over 50 years served this House as an Official Reporter of Debates.

Mr. Cochrane was born in Brampton, Ontario, and studied law at Detroit College of Law. For several years he was a court reporter in Detroit. On January 31, 1902, he came to the House of Representatives as a substitute reporter, and shortly thereafter was appointed by Speaker Cannon as an Official Reporter of Debates. He served in that capacity during the tenure of 11 Speakers, until his retirement in June 1953.

Gifted with great skill in his profession, expert in the use of the English language, and learned in the history and traditions of the House, he filled his position with distinction. Few men have had the honor to be associated with the House of Representatives for so long, yet in his devotion to duty, his ability, and his integrity, Allister Cochrane typified many persons who have devoted a large part of their lives to the service of this body, and upon whose experience and knowledge of its procedures the House relies so much for the orderly carrying on of its functions.

Those of us who were his friends will miss him, and we mourn his passing.

HALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement on the use of the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Rule XXXI reads:

> The Hall of the House shall be used only for the legislative business of the House and for the caucus meetings of its Members, except upon occasions where the House by resolution agrees to take part in any ceremonies to be observed therein; and the Speaker shall not entertain a motion for the suspension of this rule.

A great many Members have asked the Parliamentarian and the present occupant of the chair about the use of the Hall of the House of Representatives. At any time in the future when any Member desires to entertain a group except Members of the House of Representatives it will be held that the caucus room is open for that purpose, but not the Hall of the House of Representatives.

ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for 20 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 I introduced House Joint Resolution 180 proposing that the Government of the United States, in cooperation with the Government of Japan, provide for the construction in the city of Hiroshima, Japan, of a nuclear reactor dedicated to the advancement of peace and progress through the production of power for industrial purposes.

The reception given this proposal by my colleagues has been most encouraging, and I am grateful to my distinguished friend from Mississippi, Representative FRANK SMITH, for filing a similar bill, House Joint Resolution 210.

In the brief period since I last addressed the House in support of the resolution, significant events have occurred which have confirmed the validity of the resolution and underscored the tremendous impact of its underlying thesis upon contemporary international relationships. A few days ago there occurred in the Soviet Union another of those mysterous and precipitate convulsions of government whose import is shrouded in as much secrecy by the Soviets as the explosions of their thermonuclear devises. The change of leadership it produced served as the background for one of Foreign Minister Molotov's periodic major pronouncements.

Mr. Molotov first boasted of the success which has crowned Soviet efforts in the field of hydrogen weapons.

Such success—

He said—

> that the United States could appear backward.

Mr. Speaker, it is known, of course, that Russia has thermonuclear weapons, and while it is open to conjecture that its efforts in this field are as far advanced as Mr. Molotov asserts, one wonders whether the question is really important. For there is a certain stage in the preparation for atomic warfare beyond which only a theoretical advantage is gained, a point at which the potential for mutual extinction is reached. It is possible that the United States and Russia already have reached this point, and the prospect of atomic warfare between the great powers conjures up such horrible visions as to raise serious doubts as to the sanity of those who might consider it a means for the settlement of disputes. Certainly, all possible efforts should be taken to prevent the test which would determine which has the more potent collection of atomic and hydrogen gadgets.

But it was another statement by Mr. Molotov that I found much more interesting and significant:

The Soviet Union—

Declared the Russian Foreign Minister—

> wants competition with the United States, not in the production of atomic weapons, but in using atomic energy for peaceful aims.

With this apparently noble pronouncement, the enigmatic actions for more than a year of Soviet representatives in the United Nations suddenly take on form and content, all of them directly related to the meaning of Mr. Molotov's word "competition."

It all began in the summer of 1953 when Mr. Eisenhower dispatched a memorandum to Chairman Lewis Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission, in which he suggested the possibility of the initiation by the United States of a joint venture with the other nations of the world for the purpose of developing the peaceful use of atomic energy for the benefit of mankind. Mr. Strauss first expressed doubt, but with the President's insistence, he submitted the question to members of his staff, and to the Department of State for their consideration. After extensive consultations, it was concluded that the idea was feasible. The President penciled several preliminary drafts of a speech he proposed to make on the subject, and then finally he was ready. On December 8, 1953, Mr. Eisenhower delivered his magnificent message before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

He spoke of universal peace and human justice, of the "fearful engines of atomic might," and the "awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb." He protested the "hopeless finality of a belief that two atomic colossi are doomed malevolently to eye each other indefinitely across a trembling world."

My country—

He declared—

wants to be constructive, not destructive. It wants agreements, not wars. * * * It wants * * * to live in freedom * * * in the confidence that the people of every other nation enjoy equally the right of choosing their own way of life.

For the attainment of these ends the President proposed the creation of an international atomic energy agency. This body, he said, would be responsible for receiving contributions of fissionable material from its member states and for devising methods of utilizing this material for peaceful purposes. Experts could be mobilized to apply atomic energy to the needs of agriculture and medicine. Ways could be sought of providing abundant electrical energy in power-starved areas of the world. Such a program, declared the President, would prove to the world our primary interest in human aspirations, rather than in armaments of war.

This was the atoms-for-peace plan of the President of the United States. It was imaginative. It was bold. It was positive. It opened up the vista of an original and thrilling relationship between countries, and a new way of life for the world. The members of the United Nations were inspired; all except the Soviet Union, that is, which seemed to be momentarily stunned.

Subsequently the Department of State drafted a plan of action which it submitted to representatives of various governments, including the U. S. S. R. All of these except the Russians indicated their desire to cooperate. On April 27, 1954, came the inevitable answer from Moscow. The answer was, "No; we won't talk about a plan for peaceful use of the atom until the United States has agreed to an unconditional prohibition, without any safeguards, in the use of atomic weapons."

That was April 1954. Months continued to roll by; and when September arrived without solution, Secretary Dulles determined he would raise the issue at the opening session of the General Assembly. When Soviet leaders were advised of this several days before the speech, they immediately evinced a more friendly attitude. "Of course," they murmured, "we are ready to talk further about the President's plan." Hopes rose again; but then, in the face of Soviet recalcitrance, conversations once more bogged down.

That was September. On December 4, despite several unsuccessful Soviet attempts at amendment, the U. N. General Assembly passed a resolution commending the United States for its initiative in promoting the atoms-for-peace plan and providing for an international atomic-energy conference in the summer of 1955. Plans for this conference, to be held beginning August 8 in Geneva, had not been made public until last week, not in this country, at least. Until last week this information had been made public in only one place—in the Soviet Union, an action which was an outright breach of the promise of secrecy on the part of the Soviet delegate to the Planning Committee. In violation of the confidential nature of the committee's deliberations, articles, in which these proceedings were carefully distorted, began to appear in Pravda and Tass during the meetings of the committee last month. The remarks by the United States delegate, Nobel prize-winner Dr. I. R. Rabi, were so misconstrued that he was forced to object publicly.

It is the conviction of the United States delegate—

He said—

that to interject into the technical conference political questions and political controversies of any sort would be to seal the doom of the conference.

And Mr. Speaker, that is apparently what the Soviets intend—they intend to seal the doom of the conference. Every action their representatives have taken in the U. N. since the President presented his atoms for peace plan has been directed toward that purpose, of sabotaging the proposal rather than helping to make it effective. The meaning of Mr. Molotov's word "competition" as the Soviets conceive that term, now becomes clear. It means bitter, unrelenting obstructionism of every kind, shape, and form.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Molotov has refused to consider the possibility of cooperation with the United States in what must be man's greatest mission of modern time, but this he refuses to do. His words are plain enough: He wants competition—not cooperation, Mr. Speaker, but competition with the United States in the use of atomic energy for peaceful aims. It was my impression when I read his speech, and when I prepared my remarks last Friday, that with his pronouncement began the latest Russian offensive of the cold war.

This is still my impression, Mr. Speaker, despite a report in yesterday's paper that the U. S. S. R. desires an easing of world tensions. That report, based on an interview of the new Russian Premier, Nikolai Bulganin, with William Randolph Hearst, Jr., would offer hope, if Mr. Bulganin's remarks could be accepted at face value, of greater cooperation by the U. S. S. R. in the peaceful use of atomic energy. We would welcome wholehearted evidence of Soviet desire to ease world tensions. But based on previous experience with such cooperation, however, I would say that unless these declarations are followed by positive deeds—such as a contribution of fissionable materials by the Soviet Union to the international atomic pool to which the United States has already given 220 pounds and Great Britain 44—they offer little hope for a reversal of Russia's noncooperative behavior. Bulganin called Molotov's speech "an objective appraisal of facts" which "fully reflects the views of the Soviet Government." One has difficulty in reconciling this approval of Molotov's statements with the Premier's own remarks expressing the desirability of a lessening of tensions. However, this is not the first time that Moscow has played a contradictory theme in counterpoint.

Unless there be a drastic change in Kremlin policy in tune with Mr. Bulganin's interview, we anticipate that having placed every possible roadblock in the path of America's atoms-for-peace plan in the United Nations, the Soviet Union will seek in the next few months, to convince the world that the U. S. S. R., rather than the United States is the initiator and the real protagonist of the atoms-for-peace program. Not only will opposition to the American proposal be continued, but Russia will make every effort to appropriate it bodily and send it out to the world labeled: "Made in the U. S. S. R."

This newest thrust in Communist world strategy took form as early as last July, when Moscow announced that the Soviet Union had put into operation the first atomic plowerplant. This untrue statement, untrue because both we and the British have been generating small quantities of atomic power for several years, was followed by a belated announcement on January 14, that the U. S. S R. intended to reveal to the Geneva Conference some details about this reactor. Three days later, Pravda stated that atomic development data and equipment were going to be given to China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and East Germany, to enable these countries to construct their own cyclotrons and reactors. Assistance to other countries, presumably including nations outside the Iron Curtain, was reported to be "under consideration."

On January 19, Pravda editorialized that the offer of reactor information to the Geneva Conference, and of data and equipment to the five satellite nations, was proof of the good intentions of the U. S. S. R. "The Soviet Union," it asserted, "is seeking consistently and persistently to make atomic energy serve

man" whereas "the ruling circles of the United States of America have not only put atomic energy to the service of military purposes but have also begun working out specific plans for preparing an atomic war."

Last week, this "peaceful use" campaign was carried a step further by the Chinese Communists. Flaying the alleged use by the United States of "the threat of atomic weapons to achieve its goal of the forcible occupation of our territory," they hailed the Soviet Union's "glorious, historic contribution to the peaceful use of atomic energy in establishing the world's first atomic powerplant in 1954."

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this newest Soviet counteroffensive, what should be our attitude? We must not permit ourselves to be deterred by Russian roadblocks or irresponsibility. We must continue along the bold course charted by the President. It is not enough to have told the world we seek peace, and the peaceful use of the atom. We must keep alive, and revive where necessary, the imaginative planning which characterized the original presentment, and take action to carry it out. We must act within the United Nations itself, but more than that we also must take action on a direct, nation-to-nation level, just as we did in the case of the Marshall plan and point 4.

This will supplement cooperative efforts undertaken through the U. N., for it must be recognized that multinational bodies of this type, particularly those with sharp ideological cleavages, function better as instruments of consultation and facilitation, than as actual operating units. This was recognized by our own Government in connection with the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency. Originally the President thought such a body would directly receive and dispense radioactive source materials. Now, however, the administration envisions a clearinghouse structure, which could facilitate, rather than become an operating part of, steps toward international cooperation. Something of this same problem, as well as the related problem of security, was recognized by the Congress in the 1954 Atomic Energy Act. Section 124 of the act, providing for participation in an international atomic pool, stipulates that collective arrangements can be accepted by the United States only on the basis of single nation agreements pursuant to section 123.

Separate, bilateral agreements between nations are already being negotiated by our Government, notably proposed agreements for power reactor construction in Canada, and Belgium, as well as greater exchange of information and assistance between us and the British. Various other exchange information arrangements, as well as training-school plans, are either in the process of creation or presently functionnig. They are commendable, as far as they go. But we need to do more. We can do more.

The President's message spoke of the necessity for providing abundant electrical energy in power-starved areas of the world. This was one of the reasons which impelled me to file House Joint Resolution 180, to make the atom an instrument for kilowatts, rather than killing. In a country such as Japan, which has a critical power shortage, the opportunity is offered to us of making a significant contribution to the well-being of its people. As I stated on January 27, speaking in support of my bill, Japan is a country about the size of California. It has arable land amounting to only 17 percent of its total. It has a population of 87 million people, increasing at the rate of 1 million per year. With available farmland completely occupied, more people are moving to the cities wherein industry must expand in order to permit them to live. Even an expanded power development based upon present type electrical generation will be inadequate for many years to come to provide necessary fulfillment of Japan's power needs. An atomic reactor, occupying a small area and generating large quantities of power would be a logical answer to this problem.

But more important than these is the message to the people of Japan. We would be telling them for the first time in the potent language of the atom that we in the United States come in peace, not in war.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the United States desires no domination over the economic life of any nation. We know this, but sometimes—for one reason or another—our motives and actions are misconstrued. Let us be careful, therefore, in our discussions and dealings with the peoples of other nations for the development of the peaceful atom, that we do not provoke animosities and burning resentments through improvident and unnecessary limitations. It is desirable that they be permitted to build their own industry as they see their best course, and we must not unduly restrict such self-development and progress.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

> Not in our day, but at no distant one, we may shake a rod over the heads of all, which may make the stoutest of them tremble. But I hope our wisdom will grow with our power, and teach us that the less we use our power the greater it will be.

Mr. Speaker, the world stands upon the threshold of a new and wondrous era. We would welcome Mr. Bulganin's cooperation, rather than Mr. Molotov's competition. That choice, however, is the Soviet Union's. As for our part, let the script of history show that it was the United States which led the world toward the renaissance implicit in the promise of the peaceful atom. We have the means within our grasp. Let us move forward now.

I urge prompt consideration of House Joint Resolution 180.

DEADLINE ON DIXON-YATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, permit me to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], for his fine presentation and explanation of the resolution which he has introduced in this Congress. I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Illinois in his well-chosen explanation, and I want to compliment him on the work he is doing in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission has until tomorrow, February 15, to withdraw from the Dixon-Yates contract without further cost to the Government. That is the agreement made between the Government and Dixon-Yates at the time the contract was signed.

The Government can cancel the Dixon-Yates contract at any time, but cancellation would subject the Government to the payment of costs to the company. February 15 is the deadline date for withdrawal without need to pay any cancellation charges.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Atomic Energy Commission to exercise its privilege before it is too late and to rid itself of this festering sore known as the Dixon-Yates plan.

So long as the AEC remains a party to the Dixon-Yates contract it can never hope to restore its lost prestige in the eyes of the public and the Congress.

With Dixon-Yates on its neck, AEC can never hope to devote full time and attention to the development of atomic energy for national defense and peacetime uses, the mission for which it was established.

Members who are interested can read the documented story of the Dixon-Yates deal, so far as the records disclose, in the report prepared by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and myself. The Holifield-Price report appears in a print of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy dated January 1955 which contains the majority—83d Congress—and minority views on a committee resolution last November to waive a 30-day waiting period prescribed in the law in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract.

The Holifield-Price report begins at page 22 of the joint committee print of January 1955. In 80 printed pages we have set down the whole complicated, sometimes dull and sometimes fascinating, story of Dixon-Yates.

This is the story of a scheme first hatched by Joseph M. Dodge as Director of the Budget Bureau, matured by Dixon-Yates, and executed by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the AEC. The architects of the plan in its developed form were Edgar H. Dixon and Anthony G. Seal, two executives who received their training in Electric Bond & Share Corp.

Indeed, we say in our report that the Dixon-Yates deal, with its interlocking holding companies, its complicated contractual devices, its devious arrangements for supplying power to TVA through AEC as an intermediary, all smack of the genius of utility executives long associated with intricate maneuvers of Electric Bond & Share Corp.

We state in the report our regret that agencies of the Government allowed themselves to become instruments for the promotion of this enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, an opportunity remains for the Atomic Energy Commission to cut short this disgraceful episode and to withdraw from the Dixon-Yates contract without further cost to either party. AEC Chairman Strauss, who did so much

to bring about this deal, can act quickly to set it aside.

If Chairman Strauss fails to act, he must accept the further responsibility of embroiling AEC in political controversy and diversion from its main tasks for years to come.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that testimony given under oath to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by General Nichols, the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, showed that this would cost the taxpayers $3,850,000 a year minimum more than if the same amount of energy were purchased from the TVA?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; that is the fact as developed in testimony by our committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Totaling $90 million over the 25 years of the contract, I believe.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And is it not also true that Mr. Wessenauer, of the TVA, testified that their computation of the excess cost to the taxpayers was more than $5 million a year or a total of $140 million?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; the gentleman from California is absolutely correct. On that point I might state that the Atomic Energy Commission has never satisfactorily disproved Mr. Wessenauer's statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And unless this contract is cancelled within the next 2 days—either today or tomorrow—the taxpayers of the United States will be burdened with this excess cost for power from the Dixon-Yates plant?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; that is true. But the more serious thing is the fact that we find the Atomic Energy Commission, which is the most important agency in our Federal Government, embroiled in political disputes and forced to accept a directive which places them in a responsibility far remote from the functions they were established to perform. I think that is the most serious objection to the Dixon-Yates contract. It is a subterfuge; it is a use of the atomic-energy law to force the Atomic Energy Commission into the position of being a power broker to provide industrial power for the Memphis area, power which the Atomic Energy Commission itself does not need and not 1 kilowatt of which it will use now or in the future, as far as we can see.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the gentleman. I expect to address my remarks to that point in just a few moments.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Suppose the Atomic Energy Commission refuses to act. May the Congress cancel that contract?

Mr. PRICE. The Congress could by resolution take action; for instance, that it was the sense of the Congress that this is something remote from the responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission and is not in the public interest. Also it could take action by denying appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in the future to fulfill this contract.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. ASHMORE (at the request of Mr. FLYNT) asked and was given permission to transfer his special order for Thursday, February 17, to Wednesday, February 16.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the past year and a half I have watched with growing concern the deterioration of the Atomic Energy Commission. This Commission composed of five men (when fully constituted) has in my opinion the most important managerial function of all of our Federal Commissions. We have depended on this Commission to produce plutonium and other fissionable and fusionable materials for atomic and hydrogen weapons.

We have depended on this Commission to promote the engineering and testing of these weapons—weapons which in my opinion give the free nations the strength for defense or retaliation against Communist aggression. If it had not been for this strength in my humble opinion the Soviet wave of aggression would have long ago inundated the free nations of all Europe and all of Asia. It would in such an event, have inevitably threatened the shores of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception I want to pay tribute to all of the men who have served on the Atomic Energy Commission—including the present incumbents—for their years of dedication and service to their Nation. In the main they have done a good job. We stand today pre-eminent in the field of atomic-hydrogen weapons. If freedom and liberty is to prevail on this earth, we must maintain that position of strength until sanity prevails, and men realize that self-preservation demands the elimination of atomic-hydrogen war.

If our position of increasing progress and strength is to be maintained in the weapon field, we must take no chances of confusion, obstruction, or diversion of the attention of the Atomic Energy Commissioners from their important and primary mission. This is one Commission which must function efficiently and smoothly or our national interest will be jeopardized.

As of today the Atomic Energy Commission is not functioning smoothly. It is torn by dissension and bitterness. It has been diverted from its statutory function by Presidential directive. It has been plunged into the hot boiling caldron of partisan political controversy which is fired by the public versus private power debate. It has lost its statutory independence and has become subservient to direction from so-called higher authority. The Commission has lost the high regard of many Members of Congress in both legislative bodies. No longer does it occupy a special high level of consideration and confidence, in the minds of the legislators. It has fallen from its high position because it deserted the high mission assigned to it by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946—a nonpartisan, nonpolitical, noncontroversial mission which had as its great objective the production of nuclear weapons for the protection of our Nation.

What are the factors behind this undesirable and undeniable condition of deterioration of the former unity in the Commission? Why has the Commission become embroiled in partisan political controversy?

Why has the Commission been diverted from its primary mission and ordered to assume duties which are strange and unrelated to its atomic duties?

These are the questions which must be answered. These pose the problems which must be solved if the Nation's best interest is to be served.

My speech today will be directed to the evaluation of these problems. I hope that my remarks are objective as I have no personal animosity or bitterness toward any individual officially concerned. I have a high personal respect for their integrity and the contributions of time and thought which they have given in the past to the almost insoluble problems presented. Their present situation is not entirely of their own making by any means, neither can the blame be laid solely at the door of any individual. Nevertheless the situation is serious and unless drastic measures are taken now, the momentum due to past harmonious administration will soon be lost and future progress will undoubtedly be retarded.

To understand the present disunity in the Commission—it might first be in order to explore the reasons why Congress deemed it proper to set up by statute the commission form of administration of the atomic energy development.

The debates and hearings on the Atomic Energy Act of 1946—McMahon Act—show conclusively that Congress realized that we were embarking on a new and revolutionary project. Men of most conservative political and economic views realized that old rules must be suspended in this instance. The military authority was subordinated to Government direction. Government financing only was instituted. Restrictive security provisions were given statutory status. Exclusive Government ownership of atomic plants, nuclear source and finished materials, and many other special legislative authorizations were enacted.

A great deal of thought was given to the type of management of this great new enterprise, which would eventually spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers' funds. It was finally decided that a Commission of five men should be the managerial authority. It was thought then and as late as June 1954, when the revision of the original McMahon Act of 1946 was made, that the Commission form of management was best.

I believe a wise decision was made in 1946 and in 1954 on this point. The scope of duties, the magnitude of the operation and the potential field of development and application in weapon and peacetime uses is indeed beyond the capacity of time and intellect of one person, gifted though he might be.

A great advantage of having a five-man administrative board is the opportunity to bring to bear on major problems the composite judgment of five individuals plus the specialized skill and experience of one or more highly qualified men in the specific field of the problem. Another advantage is that each of the five men can be selected from the major fields of private enterprise which are prominent in the atomic development activities.

In the past, Commissioners have been selected from widely diversified activities, such as management, finance, science, engineering, industrial production, public relations, and so forth. As far as I know, political affiliation was never the requisite for appointment. As a result of representation from these various fields of endeavor and experience, I believe that well-rounded Commissions were appointed. The formula has been successful and has operated, until recently, in a harmonious manner.

During the consideration of the 1954 revision of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act, however, a new and what proved to be a discordant note, was struck. A provision of the new law sought to make the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission the principal officer. This was new language. Either it meant something or it was unnecessary.

Subsequent debate and testimony made it clear that this provision was designed to give the Chairman a special position above the other four Commissioners.

The Chairman appeared in public hearings and testified on behalf of the language and offered a recommendation of a task force of the first Hoover Commission, which in his opinion, justified the language. His close friend, Commissioner Joseph Campbell, went further than the Chairman in his testimony on this point. Mr. Campbell, although he had accepted a position on the 5-man commission previously, testified that he doubted if the 5-man commission form of management was the proper one. He preferred a 1-man management.

When I sought to write into the law an amendment to provide equal access to information by each of the five Commissioners in matters pertinent to their atomic duties, it was defeated in committee. Later the same amendment was introduced on the House floor by the then minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack]. It was again defeated. I recount these incidents to show that the seeds of disunity and resentment were being planted as far back as early 1954.

Of course the other three Commissioners resented this attempt to subordinate their positions on the Commission to that of the Chairman. They resented the failure to provide a guaranty of equal access to information necessary in the performance of their duties.

Coincident with these matter concerning the prestige and coordinate privileges of Commissioners, the Dixon-Yates controversy was forced upon the Commission.

I do not intend to discuss this controversy in detail at this time. Suffice it to say that the President, through letters and budget directive, forced the unwilling majority of the Atomic Energy Commission into the position of abdicating their independence, as members of a statutory commission—its members approved by the Senate for fixed terms—to follow his directive or to resign.

Mr. Zuchert's term expired about this time. Dr. Smyth subsequently resigned, and Mr. Murray has continued to resist this intrusion on the Commission of a matter foreign to its mission. All of the three last-named Commissioners objected vigorously to this intrusion by higher authority in their regular duties and functions.

The Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Strauss, and Mr. Campbell—since resigned—supported this directive, although they knew then and know now the disruption it caused and will continue to cause.

Small wonder then that the unity and harmony formerly existing between Commissioners under the two former Chairmen, Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Dean, no longer exists.

This is not to say that differences of opinion have not existed among Commissioners before. This, of necessity, must exist between strong and capable men.

But never before, to my knowledge, did such differences go so far as to be matters of consideration by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in executive or public session.

Never before did such differences, if any, result in violent charge and countercharge in public session.

Never before has the Commission's primary mission been interfered with by Presidential directive, and never before has the Commission been forced into taking sides in a political controversy.

Let the blame rest where it deserves to rest. I do not seek to pillory any individual. I am pointing out the facts today as I see them, let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. Speaker, if the Commission will not rid itself of the extraneous function of acting as power broker for the city of Memphis, Tenn., by canceling the Dixon-Yates contract; if the President will not sanction such withdrawal and refrain from imposing additional duties unrelated to the Commission's primary mission; if the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission is unable to participate as part of a five-man team of coequal Commissioners, and participate in such manner as will restore harmony and unity to the Commission's functions; then I cannot see how this situation can be solved. No single solution seems adequate.

Personality clashes between the present Commissioners might be solved by the resignation of the present Commissioners, but if this should occur, we would lose the benefit of men of experience in an already sadly depleted group of experienced Commissioners. Mr. Strauss and Mr. Murray are the only two commissioners left with years of experience in this complicated field. This is no reflection on the other Commissioner, Dr. Libby, an eminent physicist recently appointed.

If one or all resigned, the new Commission would still be involved in the Dixon-Yates controversy.

The transfer of supervision of the Dixon-Yates contract to the Tennessee Valley Authority would not be a complete solution as the 25-year contract rests on the action of the Atomic Energy Commission under section 164 of the new act. It would relieve the Atomic Energy Commission of administrative duties, but the political and economic burden would still remain.

Mr. Speaker, I make this speech today without bitterness or vindictiveness. I make it because I have reluctantly been forced to the conclusion that drastic steps must be taken if this deplorable situation is corrected.

The welfare of the Nation, the public interest, is paramount over persons and personalities. The function of this commission must be restored to its former efficiency.

Unless this can be done by a complete change in relationship between its present membership, then I fear, a change must be made.

The men who are now on the commission are strong and able men. In each case they have rendered valuable service to the Nation. If their differences can be resolved and if they can be relieved of strange and awkward duties foreign to their primary mission, then I believe each of them can render additional valuable services to their Nation.

If the present vacancies on the commission can be filled with competent men with diversified backgrounds of experience, men who are willing to work together, then we can go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I confess I do not have the solution for all the problems posed by this situation.

This much I do earnestly believe:

The Atomic Energy Commission has the most important function today of any Federal Commission;

The Atomic Energy Commission must operate smoothly and efficiently if the public interest is to be served;

The Atomic Energy Commission must devote its function to its principal mission, the production of nuclear materials and the promotion of their statutory uses;

The Commission should be composed of strong, reasonable men with diversified backgrounds of qualifications and experience, so that this project will have the type of management intended by Congress;

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission must be willing to be part of a five-man team of coequal Commissioners. He must be capable of resolving differences of judgment between members of the Commission and himself, without bitterness and clash of personality.

In conclusion, I hope such measures, as are necessary, will be taken soon. The responsibility for a solution is not

legislative, but executive. It lies at the door of the President and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The public interest demands immediate action.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman state whether the position he has just referred to which, in effect, gives the Chairman access to information not available to other members of the Commission is still in effect?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is no such language in effect, but testimony before our committee has shown that other members of the Commission have been denied information which was available to the Chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My attempt was to put language into the bill to prevent just such usurpation of authority as I consider has occurred.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy on its recent action when it voted its disapproval of the controversial Dixon-Yates powerplant contract.

It is my conviction that this contract is indefensible and should be canceled.

I have spoken several times against the Dixon-Yates contract and in support of the Tennessee Valley Authority program.

I think it would be in the public interest for a full and complete congressional investigation to be made of the private power companies and the rates being charged the people of the country.

I want again to thank the distinguished gentleman from California for the outstanding contribution he has made and the great public service he has rendered in this important activity.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his kind remarks.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to express my agreement with the statement made by the distinguished dean of the delegation from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. The gentleman from California, who is a very distinguished and certainly a most important member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the House and the Senate, has rendered valuable service on that committee, and last year led the fight on a very important matter which is continuing in controversy. I think that the gentleman has proposed a proper solution to this matter, that the members of the Atomic Energy Commission should address themselves to the nuclear problem and the atomic-energy problem rather than getting into a field foreign to their principal purpose. I am referring to the foreign field of being a power broker.

It would not be necessary for the members of the AEC to resign if they would divorce themselves from that undesirable and improper function. I agree with the gentleman in that regard, that these gentlemen should address themselves to their most important function rather than devoting their time to this field.

I might say further to the gentleman that I think the Atomic Energy Commission has lost national prestige and national standing in the eyes of the people of this country by their continuing bickering and the internal controversy that is continuing to go on because they got into the political field and economic field rather than staying with the important subject of atomic energy to which this Nation wishes they would address themselves in proper fashion.

I want to commend the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Let me say that my first interest in this matter was that the Atomic Energy Commission was being diverted from its primary function; this is still my primary interest in the matter. I believe this Commission's function is so important that it should not be drawn into the highways and byways of political controversy. It should continue its primary function and devote itself to the examination of new steps and new fields of weapon improvement for the defense of the free world and for peacetime application. Developments this past year have been so fast and comprehensive that I fear that even with the five-man Commission devoting all its time to the subject it could not cover this field.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. According to information the gentleman has, based on his study does he believe that the Dixon-Yates contract would have been approved without any pressure from the top executive of the country in this matter?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sure that it would not have been. Three members of this five-man Commission spoke out against this matter. They objected to it on two grounds: That it involved strange and awkward duties for them to perform and to which they were not accustomed or set up to perform. They said, nevertheless, if the President directed it or the Congress directed them to do so, they would do so.

The directive was issued by the Budget Bureau at the instance of the President, and later a letter from the President to the Chairman of the Commission asked that this matter be concluded. Since that time, I might say, while there are only three acting members of the Commission at this time, they have refused to take action on canceling out by a vote of 2 to 1. Mr. Strauss and the new member, Dr. Libby, the physicist, voted, as I understand, against canceling out; Mr. Murray, who has led the fight in the Commission against this strange and awkward mission that they have been asked to perform, offered the motion to have the contract canceled. This 3-man Commission in place of a 5-man Commission finds itself in next to the last day of their grace period; and unless they cancel this contract today or tomorrow, the sworn testimony before our committee shows it will cost the taxpayers of the country between $90 million and $140 million minimum over the period of the contract of 25 years.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. So we can place the responsibility directly on the doorstep of the White House?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That responsibility must be placed on the doorstep of the White House, because it was the directive which was given to the Atomic Energy Commission which caused them to depart from their original mission.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I think it would be helpful to the House if the gentleman would point out, in answer to the oft-used defense of the Dixon-Yates contract on the basis of private enterprise, that when they say although this contract will cost the Government more, private enterprise pays taxes. Actually in this case the Dixon-Yates Co. pays no taxes. The Government sets up a fund to pay taxes for Dixon-Yates. So the question of taxation is not involved in this matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to comment on that. The Government sets aside $600,000 a year in a special fund to pay the taxes of the Dixon-Yates firm. This is done by a very circuitous method of procedure, but it effects the objective of paying for the first time that I know of, the taxes of a private corporation engaged in civilian service to civilians.

It is a very dangerous precedent, it is a precedent which all of private enterprise should be interested in, because if private enterprise can be established in its capital investment, in this case close to $107 million, by using a contract with the Government to fund its capital-plant investment in this instance, then that same credit of the Government can be issued to grocery-store chains, to clothing-store chains, to filling-station chains, or to any other civilian function.

The argument which is frequently made that this contract is just as good as the Ohio Valley Electric Corp. contract and the Electric Energy, Inc., contract of the previous administration completely passes the point at issue. It is not a question of whether this is as good a contract or a worse contract or a better contract; the real question is, For what purpose does the contract exist?

In the first two instances, the Ohio Valley Corp. contract and the Electric Energy, Inc., contract, it was to make atomic material for weapons for the defense of the Nation. They were defense contracts. In this latter instance, in the instance of Dixon-Yates, it is for a civilian company to render a civilian service to civilians in the Memphis area. It has nothing to do with contracts for defense. Not one kilowatt of it will be used for defense. That is the point at issue.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman from California anticipated another question which I was about to ask. He has already answered it. I refer to the fact that this contract is not a defense contract, whereas the Ohio Valley and the Electric Energy contracts were for the purpose of supplying atomic energy for defense purposes. In this contract there is not one kilowatt that will actually go into AEC operation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is right. This is a devious administrative method to put the cloak of national defense around a civilian contract, for civilian purposes, for civilian profit.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. If the purpose of the Dixon-Yates steam plant costing $107 million, according to the estimate, to be built in the vicinity of Paducah, or nearby, were to furnish power for a defense need directly to the Atomic Energy Commission, it would be in quite a different category?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And I would not be on this floor objecting.

Mr. PRIEST. Neither would I.

Mr. PRICE. Is it not a fact that the closest atomic installation is at least 200 miles from the Dixon-Yates proposed plant?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe that Paducah is something like 200 or 250 miles north. There has been no testimony that the electricity which would be generated in the Dixon-Yates plant will be transmitted anywhere else than to civilian users in the city of Memphis and the surrounding area.

FIFTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Habana in Cuba. It is an anniversary always observed by the veterans of the Spanish-American War and by patriotic societies. We shall ever revere the memory of the 266 American sailors whose lives were sacrificed in the diabolical explosion that was the prelude to the march toward destiny of these United States of America.

Since I have been a Member of this body I annually have requested and most graciously have been granted unanimous consent for a special order on February 15 that here in the Congress of the United States this anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* should have proper observance. Some weeks ago I asked unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on February 15, intending after some brief introductory remarks to yield to other Members.

I was especially interested in the 1955 observance of this anniversary in this body because the present commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans is the Honorable Lloyd Thurston, who was a Member of the 69th Congress and the six succeeding Congresses.

He served with great distinction in this body as a Representative from the district in Iowa now represented by Mr. LECOMPTE, and during this outstanding service of 14 years he had the unusual honor, an honor enjoyed by only a few in our entire history, of serving on the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Rules Committee. In 1938 he was narrowly defeated for the United States Senate. He is a great American, one of the most distinguished of the sons of Iowa, and the United Spanish War Veterans are proud and happy that he now is giving the great contribution of his genius and of his warm personality to the cause of our organization as commander in chief.

NOT IN SESSION TOMORROW

Unfortunately, the House will not be in session tomorrow. On Wednesday, when we next meet, there will be a special order on the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and most of us will wish to join with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] in paying our tribute of appreciation and affection to the people of Lithuania. For this reason I am making my remarks on the *Maine* anniversary occasion today.

Declaration of war with Spain quickly followed the sinking of the *Maine*. That was 57 years ago. I was then a lad of 15, soon to turn into my 16th year, a sophomore in the high school at Benton Harbor, Mich. With 7 or 8 others from that high school I went to Cuba to participate in the siege of Santiago as a member of the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

Our late beloved colleague, the Honorable Roy Woodruff, was a member of the same regiment. He was a corporal in Company G. I was a corporal in Company I. In those days a corporal was given an appointment parchment signed by the colonel of his regiment. I have mine hanging on the wall in my office. It is signed by Col. C. L. Boynton, countersigned by the adjutant of the regiment, First Lieutenant Harvey.

I am the last Spanish War veteran in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I have been interested in knowing how many veterans of the Spanish-American War later served as Members of this body. Unsuccessfully I sought this information and, finding it nowhere available, requested the aid of the ever-accommodating and always efficient Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Dr. Griffith has furnished me the names of the 96 veterans of the Spanish-American War who later were Members of this body.

SOUTH AND NORTH REUNITED

In the 55th Congress, which ran into 1899, there were 5 Spanish War veterans, including my late beloved friend, Col. James Hamilton Lewis, later for 2 terms a senator from Illinois. Another name of glory among that group of 5 in the 55th Congress, Gen. Joseph Wheeler, of Alabama.

It has been said, and with truth, that it was the Spanish-American War that really healed the wounds of the war of the sixties. General Wheeler was one of the great heroes of the Confederacy, retiring as a lieutenant general. He took part in over 400 engagements, was wounded 3 times, had 16 horses shot under him. Thirty-three years later, 33 years after Appomattox Court House, he was commissioned a general of volunteers, assigned to command a cavalry division of the United States Army on the foreign soil of Cuba.

He was in command at the Battle of Las Guasimas which marked the first victory in our history of troops of the United States Army in an overseas engagement. He engaged in all the conflicts in front of Santiago, was the senior member of the commission which negotiated the surrender of Santiago, and the Spanish Army in Cuba, and later during the Philippine Insurrection was the commanding general in many engagements in the Far East.

TOTAL OF 96 VETERANS

Other names in this list of 96 veterans of the Spanish-American War who have served in this body are names that are part of our history and are deeply bedded in the hearts of our people.

Coming together to the 60th Congress were Richard Pearson Hobson, of Alabama, and Cordell Hull, of Tennessee.

To the 62d Congress came Thomas Spencer Crago, of Pennsylvania, and Leonidas C. Dyer, of Missouri. Congressman Crago was the 1913 commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I, then on my way to Scranton, Pa., where Congressman Dyer was elected commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, spent a day and a night in Detroit at the national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in conference with Congressman Crago, Bob Woodside, Rice Means, and Gus Hartig blueprinting the future of that organization, then of limited membership confined to the veterans of the Cuban and Philippine campaigns and the sailors on the high seas, but now one of the mightiest forces of dynamic patriotism in our country.

To every Congress up to and including the 76th there came new Members who had served in the Spanish-American War. Then came the 77th Congress, the 78th Congress, the 79th Congress, the 80th Congress, and there was no new Member from the Spanish-American War veterans. The years were beginning to catch up on the veterans of this war of 57 years ago. I came to the 81st Congress. I then was 1 of 4 Spanish War veterans remaining in this body. Now I remain alone. No new Spanish War veterans were elected to the 82d Congress, the 83d Congress, or the 84th Congress.

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS

I hope and pray that the 84th Congress will listen with sympathy and with favorable minds to the legislative pro-

posals of the aging veterans of this first overseas war of our country. We are asking nothing for ourselves, but we do feel that something should be done for the widows of our comrades. They are not young women. They are not of a moneyed class. They have lived good lives dedicated to duty, to country, and to God. For the most part they are eking out existences on the pittances given them as pensions.

By designation of the national legislative committee of the United Spanish War Veterans I have introduced a bill to raise the widows' pension to $75 a month. I have the faith that everyone on the Veterans' Committee and everyone in the membership of this body will vote for that measure.

I have also introduced a bill to give a long-delayed recognition to a handful of naval veterans who have been most cruelly discriminated against, all stemming from the fact that in the Spanish-American War there was very little keeping of records and very little adherence to prescribed formalities. These naval veterans served in combat and were in every way wartime servitors of their country as much as were I and other qualified members of the Army.

A third bill I have introduced is to give recognition to veterans in the Philippines who were in actual combat after the date in 1902 arbitrarily set—and I think through an inadvertence—that excluded these veterans from the pension consideration so richly earned by them.

VETERANS WHO SERVED IN HOUSE

Mr. Speaker, thinking it will have some historical interest as furnishing the only list compiled of veterans of the Spanish-American War who have served in this House, I am including in my remarks the following letter from Dr. Griffith:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In response to your request for the names of all Spanish-American War veterans who have served in the House of Representatives, and your subsequent request for the additional information of the Congresses these men served in, we submit the following list of 96 names.

The names are arranged according to the date of the Congressman's first election to the House of Representatives.

FIFTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Joseph Wheeler, Alabama, 47th, 49th through 56th.

David Grant Colson, Kentucky, 54th through 55th.

Charles William F. Dick, Ohio, 55th through 58th.

Edwin E. Robbins, Pennsylvania, 55th, 65th, and 66th.

James Hamilton Lewis, Washington, 55th.

FIFTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

William A. Chanler, New York, 56th.

Bertram T. Clayton, New York, 56th.

Henry D. Green, Pennsylvania, 56th through 57th.

Rufus K. Polk, Pennsylvania, 56th through 57th.

FIFTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts, 57th through 66th.

James M. Moody, North Carolina, 57th.

Ariosto A. Wiley, Alabama, 57th through 60th.

FIFTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Charles E. Fuller, Illinois, 58th through 62d, 64th through 69th.

Butler Ames, Massachusetts, 58th through 62d.

John Lind, Minnesota, 58th.

Benjamin G. Humphreys, Mississippi, 58th through 69th.

George A. Loud, Michigan, 58th, 64th.

Francis B. Harrison, New York, 58th, 60th through 63d.

William Hughes, New Jersey, 58th, 60th, 61st, 62d.

Wyatt Aiken, South Carolina, 58th through 64th.

FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Edwin Denby, Michigan, 59th, 60th, 61st.

Frank S. Dickson, Illinois, 59th.

Newton W. Gilbert, Indiana, 59th.

Joseph W. Keifer, Ohio, 45th through 48th, 59th through 61st.

John W. Weeks, Massachusetts, 59th through 63d.

SIXTIETH CONGRESS

Richmond Pearson Hobson, Alabama, 60th through 63d.

Leonard Paul Howland, Ohio, 60th through 62d.

Cordell Hull, Tennessee, 60th through 66th.

SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS

William Allen Oldfield, Arkansas, 61st through 70th.[1]

Thomas Ray Hamer, Idaho, 61st.

Robert Charles Wickliffe, Louisiana, 61st, 62d.

Charles Edward Creager, Oklahoma, 61st.

Zachary David Massey, Tennessee, 61st.

SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS

William Schley Howard, Georgia, 62d through 64th.

Claudius Ulysses Stone, Illinois, 62d through 64th.

Sydney Anderson, Minnesota, 62d through 68th.

Archibald Chapman Hart, New Jersey, 62d, 63d, 64th.

George Curry, New Mexico, 62d.

Thomas Spencer Crago, Pennsylvania, 62d, 64th through 67th.

Sam Riley Sells, Tennessee, 62d through 66th.

Frank Lester Greene, Vermont, 62d through 68th.

Leonidas C. Dyer, Missouri, 62d, 64th to 72d.

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

Samuel Brashear Avis, West Virginia, 63d.

Robert Gunn Brenner, New Jersey, 63d.

Guy Tresillian Helvering, Kansas, 63d, 64th, 65th.

Willis James Hulings, Pennsylvania, 63d, 66th.

Woodson Ratcliffe Oglesby, New York, 63d, through 64th.

Roy Orchard Woodruff, Michigan, 63d, 67th through 82d.

Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia, 63d through 66th, 69th.

SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

Burnett Mitchell Chiperfield, Illinois, 64th, 71st, 72d.

Franklin Fowler Ellsworth, Minnesota, 64th through 66th.

Richard Patrick Freeman, Connecticut, 64th through 72d.

Reuben Locke Haskell, New York, 64th through 66th.

George Huddleston, Alabama, 64th through 75th.

William Francis James, Michigan, 64th through 73d.

Carl Chester Van Dyke, Minnesota, 64th through 66th.

SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Tom Connally, Texas, 65th through 70th.

Milton Kraus, Indiana, 65th through 67th.

Edward Campbell Little, Kansas, 65th throught 68th.

George Richard Lunn, New York, 65th.

Benjamin Franklin Welty, Ohio, 65th, 66th.

SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Patrick McLane, Pennsylvania, 66th.

Charles Franklin Ogden, Kentucky, 66th, 67th.

William Newell Vaile, Colorado, 66th through 70th.

Earle Cory Michener, Michigan, 66th through 72d, 74th through 81st.

SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Louis Adams Frothingham, Massachusetts, 67th through 70th.

Ardolph Loges Kline, New York, 67th.

John Charles Speaks, Ohio, 67th through 71st.

Harry McLeary Wurzbach, Texas, 67th through 70th, 72d.

SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

John Donnan Fredericks, California, 68th, 69th.

Scott Leavitt, Montana, 68th through 72d.

Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, New York, 68th through 71st.

Joseph Scott Wolff, Missouri, 68th.

SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Edmund Nelson Carpenter, Pennsylvania, 69th.

John Bartholomew Sosnowski, Michigan, 69th.

Lloyd Thurston, Iowa, 69th through 75th.

SEVENTIETH CONGRESS

Joe Crail, California, 70th through 72d.

Henry DeHaven Moorman, Kentucky, 70th.

Conrad George Selvig, Minnesota, 70th through 72d.

SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Robert E. Lee Blackburn, Kentucky, 71st.

Rowland Louis Johnston, Missouri, 71st.

James Lucius Whitley, New York, 71st through 73d.

SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS

William Edward Barton, Missouri, 72d.

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS

Guy Mark Gillette, Iowa, 73d, 74th.

Elmer Ebenezer Studley, New York, 73d.

William E. Traeger, California, 73d.

James W. Wadsworth, Jr., New York, 73d through 81st.

Compton I. White, Idaho, 73d through 79th, 81st.

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

Denis Joseph Driscoll, Pennsylvania, 74th.

Joseph Anthony Gray, Pennsylvania, 74th, 75th.

Samuel Chapman Massingale, Oklahoma, 74th through 77th.

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Wade Hampton Kitchens, Arkansas, 75th, 76th.

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Anton J. Johnson, Illinois, 76th through 80th.

Frank Ogilvie Horton, Wyoming, 76th.

Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania, 76th through 79th.

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

None.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

None.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

None.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

None.

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois, 81st, 83d, 84th.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

None.

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

None.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

[1] Died after being reelected to the 71st Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. Moss and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio).

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOPE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (at the request of Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MACK of Washington (at the request of Mr. TOLLEFSON), for the balance of the week, beginning February 14, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 145. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 11, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 587. An act to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 16, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

414. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on personnel and civil service, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

415. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the task force report on personnel and civil service, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

416. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of December 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

417. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended, and section 2 of the act of February 2, 1903, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

418. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

419. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the Government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

420. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, pursuant to subsection 7 (c) of Public Law 874 and subsection 208 (c) of Public Law 815, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

421. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

422. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, relative to an interstate civil-defense compact entered into between the States of Utah and Nevada together with correspondence attached; to the Committee on Armed Services.

423. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report that no contracts were negotiated during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 2 (c) 11 and (16) of Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

424. A letter from the Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting the ninth report prepared by the Federal Facilities Corporation, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, etc., of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

425. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report of contracts negotiated during the period July 1 to December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 2 (c) (1) of Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

426. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of surplus property disposed of during 1954 by the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, pursuant to Public Law 152, section 404 (d), 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

427. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend to grazing lessees the right of compensation for losses sustained by reason of the use of the public domain or other property for war or national defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mark Hamilton authorizing him to conduct charter-boat service for sport fishing in the Everglades National Park, Fla., during the 2-year term beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

429. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to O. P. Patton, to provide charter-boat service for sport fishing in Everglades National Park, Fla., during a 2-year term beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to the Kings Mountain Little Theatre, Inc., of Kings Mountain, N. C., to authorize the permittee to present a historical drama and sell refreshments at the amphitheater in Kings Mountain National Military Park, S. C., during a 6-month term beginning April 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

431. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Jackson H. Saunders, authorizing him to rent rowboats, sailboats, and outboard motors, make minor repairs to outboard motors, and to provide related boat services, supplies, parts, and accessories at the South Bay and Meadow picnic areas in the Millerton Lake National Recreation Area, Calif., for a term of 4 years, 8 months, from May 1, 1954, and, in addition, to authorize Mr. Saunders to sell food, beverages, ice cream, etc., at the Meadow picnic area only, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

432. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mrs. Clifton D. Rock, authorizing her to sell post cards, souvenirs, photographs, photographic film, curios, and candy bars at Cabrillo National Monument during the calendar year 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital Association to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park for drinking, bathing, and other purposes for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1955, through December 31, 1964, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

434. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to M. E. Nash, authorizing the permittee to conduct sightseeing-boat service in Mammoth Cave National Park during a 3-year term commencing May 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

435. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Jack Huff, authorizing the permittee to operate a lodge, including the provision of lodging and meal accommodations and to rent cabins, sell meals and lunches to take out, provide horses for hire, sell feed for horses of visitors, and provide related services, at the summit of Mount LeConte in Great Smoky Mountains National Park during a 5-year term beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31,

1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

436. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 20th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, covering the fiscal year July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954, in accordance with the provisions of section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934; section 23 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, approved August 26, 1935; section 46 (a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, approved August 22, 1940; section 216 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, approved August 22, 1940; and section 3 of the act of June 29, 1949, amending the Bretton Woods Agreements Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

437. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Glacier Park Boat Co., to provide boat-transportation service in Glacier National Park, Mont., during the 5-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 473. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 607. A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3828. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3989. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that retired pay, disability retirement pay, or disability severance pay shall be granted to certain disabled former members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3990. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3991. A bill providing for the location, establishment, construction, equipment, and operation of a hospital for the mentally ill of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3992. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument to Chief Red Cloud on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3993. A bill to provide for price support for durum wheat (class II) at $4 per bushel for each crop which the Secretary finds is short of indicated market demands and carryover requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3994. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3995. A bill to provide that permanent works to protect certain levees from erosion and damage shall be constructed and maintained by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3996. A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3997. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3998. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 3999. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that retirement systems for members of the Armed Forces shall be considered public retirement systems as defined in section 37 (f); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4000. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4001. A bill to provide for the management and disposition of certain public domain lands in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4002. A bill to provide for issuance of campfire permits and to facilitate the development, maintenance, and operating facilities for public use in the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4003. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4004. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4005. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 4006. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4007. A bill to establish an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4008. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4009. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the appropriations committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 4010. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS (by request):

H. R. 4011. A bill to improve the administration of the civil service by providing for the appointment, reappointment, or reinstatement of any postmaster involuntarily separated without fault to a position in the postal field service of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 4012. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide that local and county committees shall have sole authority to select and dismiss their employees; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4013. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay increase for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 4014. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4015. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 4016. A bill to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4017. A bill to provide that the authority of the Commissioner of Education to contract for research in the field of education shall include the authority to contract for research into the narcotic addiction problem; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 4018. A bill to amend section 11 (a) of the act of June 6, 1933, which provides for a Federal Advisory Council in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4019. A bill to authorize mileage allowance of 10 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 4020. A bill to provide grants to municipalities in those States which are parties to the Ohio River Valley sanitation compact to aid in the construction of sewage treatment works to prevent pollution of waters in the Ohio River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4021. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4022. A bill to provide that school districts which filed applications for payments under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, before November 24, 1953, shall not be penalized on account of school-construction contracts made after that date; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. Res. 140. Resolution creating a position as stenographer to the Postmaster; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution authorizing the Territory of Hawaii to be incorporated in the State of California; and authorizing the Territory of Alaska to be incorporated in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. J. Res. 214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution proposing an Atlantic Exploratory Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 139. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Sugar Act of 1948 be continued in force and the quota of domestic beet sugar be increased; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to making provision to compensate the counties in the State which have lost revenue by the acquisition of title by the Federal Government to large areas of taxable property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that a United States ore-purchasing program be set up in Alaska whereby a substantial partial payment may be made to producers of small lots of strategic minerals at point of production; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to reaffirming its support of the Bricker amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4023. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Schwarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Carlo Palmieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donald A. Howard (nee Miss Elsa Ursula Kuchinke); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 4026. A bill for the relief of James C. Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Yushang Liang Kwok and daughter, Jeanette Chin-ming Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Edward Yousif Obeji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Sofronio Molina DeGuzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 4030. A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4031. A bill to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 4033. A bill for the relief of Clara Hendrika Edwina Judith Tollens Foulkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Andrew M. Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Angel F. Madayag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4036. A bill for the relief of John Soudas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4037. A bill for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Michele Constantino Pastore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Franciska Gruber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4042. A bill for the relief of Sang Ho Lee, his wife, Hi Sook Lee, and minor child, Byung Yun (Louise) Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4043. A bill for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

89. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Tulsa, Okla., asking for appropriate legislation to exempt production and gathering of natural gas and the sale thereof from regulations by the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

90. Also, petition of Marie Bernhardt, Bad Nauheim, Germany, with reference to a claim for release of barred property in the United States, claim No. 46083 Department of Justice, Office of Alien Property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

91. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers recommending that legislation be enacted by the Congress designating the Public Health Service as a component branch of the Armed Forces of the United States on an equal status with the Army, Navy, and Air Force, thereby strengthening the ability of the Public Health Service to maintain its existing personnel and recruit additional personnel to meet its expanded responsibilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

92. By Mr. THORNBERRY: Petition of a group of peanut farmers of Williamson County, Tex., requesting additional acreage allotment to Williamson County for the planting of peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lincoln and Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, February 12, our Nation observed the anniversary of the birth of two great men—Abraham Lincoln, one of our greatest presidents, and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, hero of the Revolutionary War.

The names of these two men shall always remain engraved in the hearts of lovers of liberty and democracy. Both men have fought courageously, in their own ways and in their own times, for the liberty of man and for each nation's right to self-determination. Their nobility of character, devotion to principle, and love of justice shall continue to inspire men of all ages, creeds, and nationalities.

The world is reminded by patriots like Kosciusko—who fought for the independence of the United States and of his native Poland—that the struggle for liberty is endless and that ours is not the only generation that has fought for it and sacrificed in its name. It seems that each period in history has its challenges, its own dictators, and its own despots.

This should not discourage us or lead us to despair. Instead, we should draw courage and inspiration from the example of valiant men like Kosciusko, who defied overwhelming odds and spared no sacrifice where principles in which they believed were involved. Our task, as great as it is, is no more difficult than theirs.

Let us, therefore, rededicate ourselves to the unfinished task to which they devoted their lives.

Questionnaire on Issues Facing the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD my own remarks in the form of a letter-questionnaire, which I am sending to the folks in my district. These questionnaires are helpful in determining the views of my constituents on various problems facing Congress.

DEAR FRIENDS: This is the fifth time I have sent a questionnaire to every boxholder in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. I am seeking your opinion on issues facing the Congress. While I must make my own independent decision as to how I will finally vote on national issues, I do want to say that your answers to the questions listed below will assist me in understanding your views on these national problems.

You will remember that in the off-election years it is my custom to hold government clinics in each of the 38 courthouses in the Fourth District. The first hour is devoted to Youth Wants To Know. I hope to continue that practice this late summer and fall. Here again, I will have an opportunity to meet you personally and to have you ask questions in an open forum. These question-and-answer sessions are interesting and informative.

I trust you will return the questionnaire. You will be taking part in your Government. Your answers will assist me, as a Member of Congress, to do a better job.

Yours truly,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District of Nebraska.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What type of farm program do you favor? Flexible ☐, 90 percent ☐, 100 percent ☐.
2. Would you favor a bushel quota on wheat? Yes ☐, no ☐.
3. Would you favor a two-price system on marketing wheat? Yes ☐, no ☐.
4. Should 18-year-olds vote? Yes ☐, no ☐.
5. Do you favor present social security for farmers? Yes ☐, no ☐.
6. Your choice for President in 1956—Eisenhower ☐, Stevenson ☐, others ☐.
7. Should tariffs be lowered ☐, raised ☐, or kept as they are ☐?
8. Do you favor the present foreign policy? Yes ☐, no ☐.
9. Should we grant more foreign aid ☐ or less ☐?
10. Should there be Federal aid to education? Yes ☐, no ☐.
11. Should there be Federal aid for school construction? Yes ☐, no ☐.
12. Do you favor universal military training? Yes ☐, no ☐.
13. Do you prefer the present Selective Service System? Yes ☐, no ☐.
14. Do you favor raising postal rates to meet the cost of service? Yes ☐, no ☐.
15. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes ☐, no ☐.
16. Should Alaska be made a new State? Yes ☐, no ☐.
17. Should Hawaii be made a new State? Yes ☐, no ☐.
18. Do you favor a State sales tax? Yes ☐, no ☐.

Name_____
Address_____
Occupation _____

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I stood with my four children at the foot of the monument in Lafayette Park which commemorates Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, whose birthday was February 12 and whom the Nation's capital paid tribute to yesterday.

General Kosciusko was an early battler for American freedom. He came to our shores when this Nation was in infancy to take part in the American Revolutionary War.

Under Kosciusko's leadership in 1777 the fortifications at West Point were completed, and he served gallantly in the campaigns at Saratoga and the Carolinas.

After his return to Poland, General Kosciusko continued to fight for liberty in his homeland. He led the Polish people in their struggles against Prussian and Russian oppression.

In Milwaukee, as in many other American cities, there is a monument to the great General Kosciusko which I have often visited with my family. These Kosciusko monuments serve as an inspiration to the children of this generation.

Here was a Polish patriot with a restless hatred of tyranny. He threw himself into the cause of liberty here in the New World, earning the gratitude of countless citizens who have flourished in the freedom he helped to establish.

What practical things can we do to commemorate Kosciusko and the Polish people who have suffered so much for the cause of human freedom?

First, we should liberalize our immigration laws to permit more persons of Polish descent to enter this Nation.

Second, we must wage a vigorous program to keep alive the hopes for a democratic government among the Polish people by expanding our Voice of America.

And third, we should promptly ratify the world genocide convention making it a crime against humanity and international law for any dictator to exterminate whole nations, races, or religions.

These are but a few of the steps our Nation can take now to commemorate General Kosciusko.

Age Discrimination in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there are indications that provisions of law, approved by Congress in 1952, supposedly abolishing all age limits for Federal employment except those essential to performance of the work, are being ignored by the United States Civil Service Commission.

This disregard for employment policy established by Congress on the part of the Commission has come to my attention because of the experience of a constituent, Mr. Nick Mlinarich, of East St. Louis, Ill.

Mr. Mlinarich applied for a position as tax collector for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. His application was rejected by the United States Civil Service Commission with a notation that the age limit for this position has been set at 35 years.

There is no question about Mr. Mlinarich's physical capability to perform this particular type of work. It was to take care of just such cases that Congress itself abolished age limits on hiring of personnel for Government positions.

While it is true that the law does not totally eliminate maximum age limits, it states the principle that age limits should not be imposed generally, and implies that the Civil Service Commission should exercise sound judgment to apply age limits on a practical basis. In my opinion, rejecting applicants at the age of 35 for the position of a tax collector within the Bureau of Internal Revenue indicates that the Commission is not applying the principle of the law in a practical way.

It is ironical that the United States Civil Service Commission has approved age limits as low as 35 years on the hiring for Government positions at the same time the United States Department of Labor has been campaigning against age discrimination by private employers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article on this subject which appeared in the February 17 issue of the Machinist, the official weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists:

IAM INVESTIGATION REVEALS 35-YEAR HIRING AGE LIMIT FOR MANY FEDERAL POSTS

The United States Civil Service Commission has approved age limits, many as low as 35 years on hiring for thousands of Government jobs during the past 2 years, the

Machinist learned this week. This age discrimination in Government employment policies has occurred despite a law adopted by Congress in 1952 supposedly abolishing all age limits except those essential to performance of the work. At the same time, the United States Department of Labor has been campaigning against age discrimination by private employers.

The inquiry into the age-limit policies of the United States Civil Service Commission was touched off by an IAM member, Nick Mlinarich of IAM Lodge, No. 121, East St. Louis, Ill.

Temporarily laid off his job, Mlinarich sought work elsewhere. One of the jobs he applied for was that of tax collector for the Treasury's Bureau of Internal Revenue. Mlinarich is 36 and a bowler and softball player. He was stunned when his application card was returned from the United States Civil Service Commission office at Chicago recently with a notation in red pencil that the top age limit for applicants is 35 years. The job pays $3,410 a year, about $65.50 a week.

Mlinarich has since been rehired at his old job, but is still interested in seeing that other over-35 jobhunters aren't discriminated against as he was. He wrote The Machinist:

"The Government has been preaching antidiscrimination in employing people and has requested that employers hire handicapped and older people and the like. Unless my conception of a tax collector's job is all wrong, I can't see what age would have to do with fulfilling the requirements. If 36 is too old for job hunting, maybe I should apply for my old-age pension." The inquiry touched off by this IAM member's complaint reveals that, despite the 1952 act of Congress, the Civil Service Commission has chosen to set top age limits on applicants who will be considered for scores of different categories of jobs. These limits are waived only in the case of veterans.

GENERAL RESTRICTIONS

These top limits range from 35 and 40 up to 62 years, which was the general Government age limit for all United States job applicants before Congress passed the 1952 act.

A Civil Service Commission official at Washington told the Machinist that the lower age restrictions were justified from two points of view:

Where the job is hazardous or requires special physical strength or condition, such as various types of Government police work, guard duty, aerial work, and the like.

Where the job is considered to be a trainee-type position in which the individual selected is expected to work up through the service as a career employee.

The tax-collector post which Mlinarich sought falls in the latter category, the Civil Service Commission claims. However, the training period for a career as tax collector is only 6 months.

THIRTY-FIVE OR UNDER

The records show that many other jobs are also restricted to applicants 35 or under, if they are not veterans. These include almost all the so-called GS–5 professional positions including such jobs as agronomist, soil conservationist, physicist, engineer, and historian.

There is also a lower paid category of aids, such as agricultural aid, engineering aid, range management and conservation aid, and similar posts which have the 35-year limit for applicants.

A field assistant trainee in the Social Security Survivors Insurance Division also must be 35 or under to qualify.

Many of the entering jobs in the category of guards, agents, inspectors, and other police-type work have 35-year limits.

OTHER CATEGORIES

Post Office substitute carriers, clerks, and garagemen-drivers are under a 50-year age limit.

At the top of the age scale, the former 62-year-old limit for applicants for a great number of Government clerical positions has been removed. These employees can be hired up to 70, with the possibility of 1-year temporary appointments from year to year thereafter.

However, civil-service records show that this is not true for many of the craft positions—including machinists, still under a 62-year hiring limit. Here are some other categories where jobs are still under the 62-year limit for nonveteran applicants:

Blacksmith, boilermaker, bulldozer operator, carpenter, electrician, laborer, mason, painter, plasterer, plumber, truck driver, welder, sheet metal worker, and many others.

Many jobs, including bookkeepers and typists, in the Panama Canal Zone have a 45-year limit for applicants who are not veterans.

Civil service records show that ever since the law went into effect in early 1953 there has been a steady increase in the number of jobs to which discriminatory age limits have been applied.

NOT CONSISTENT

As frequently happens, the left hand doesn't know what the right is doing. While the United States Civil Service Commission has been placing new age limits on job applicants, the United States Department of Labor is campaigning for the hiring of more older workers. United States Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has said:

"By 1975, according to the Census Bureau, the number of persons 45 and over will total more than 63 million, an increase of 40 percent over 1953. This group will constitute one-half the population over 20 years of age.

"Unless something is done to give them job opportunities, an estimated half of our adult population will be condemned to a life of economic uselessness."

Ten Years After Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Yalta Conference of February 1945 fashioned the Roosevelt peace, which now has tormented all of God's children for 10 long years. Some day, Yalta must be undone.

The principals in that tragic conference were Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill. Stalin and Churchill, though both older than Roosevelt, were in robust health. Roosevelt, as we now know from recent memories, was a dying man. Alger Hiss and Harry Hopkins were intimate, confidential advisers of Roosevelt at Yalta.

Official State Department publications have summarized the accomplishments at Yalta, so far as they are known; but these publications do not tell the story of Roosevelt's physical and mental disintegration during the 15 months immediately preceding the Conference.

Not until Rear Adm. Ross T. McIntire, United States Navy, retired, published White House Physician, in 1946, did the world learn that President Roosevelt's fatal illness first struck him in December 1943, almost a year before the historic fourth-term election of November 1944, and 15 months before the epochal Yalta Conference.

Churchill quickly recognized Roosevelt's tragic physical condition at Yalta and since has commented on that facet of the conference at some length. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt likewise wrote—in 1950—that everybody in the White House family knew that the President was far from well during the summer and fall of 1944. But nobody in the White House ever commented on the President's health because all understood clearly that Mr. Roosevelt felt it his duty to continue in office and those around him could try only to make things as easy for him as possible.

This fixed policy of the court circle was spearheaded by Admiral McIntire, who issued five public statements during 1944 indicating that Mr. Roosevelt was in sound health. These statements by Admiral McIntire were published in the New York Times on March 6, May 8, June 9, September 26, and October 13, 1944.

With the Nation thus reassured on Mr. Roosevelt's robust health, the President was reelected triumphantly for a fourth term on November 7. Immediately after the inauguration, January 20, 1945, he took off on the cruiser *Quincy* from Norfolk, Va., for the fateful Yalta Conference, which saddled Germany with the savage Morgenthau plan for a pastoral economy, betrayed Poland, and delivered China to Kremlin communism. Yalta designed and erected the Iron Curtain.

In The Roosevelt Myth, published in July 1948, John T. Flynn, a competent and respected anti-Communist journalist, meticulously documented Roosevelt's last illness from its inception in December 1943 to the President's death at Warm Springs, Ga., April 12, 1945. Using Mr. Flynn's basic chronology as the framework, I now have buttressed the story with additional details since published in the Churchill memoirs, the Ickes diaries, Frazier Hunt's biography of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and Mrs. Roosevelt's This I Remember, published in 1950.

President Roosevelt returned from the Tehran Conference in December 1943, and after a brief season in Washington, moved on to Hyde Park for the Christmas holidays. There, Dr. McIntire relates, the President suffered a brief attack of influenza, which was followed by a persistent bronchial infection. From this point until his death in April 1945, the President never regained sound health and normal physical energy.

Flynn records that Mr. Roosevelt was away from the White House 175 days during 1944. Some 30 days were required for his junket to the Pacific to confer with MacArthur and Nimitz; he gave 2 weeks to the presidential campaign; about 10 days to the Quebec Conference with Churchill; and spent something more than 100 days at Bernard Baruch's secluded retreat at Hobcaw

Sound, S. C., at Hyde Park, and at the sheltered Shangri La hideout in western Maryland. The true significance of these extended periods of presidential rest and recuperation was obsured by Admiral McIntire's periodic reassurances to the public throughout the year concerning Mr. Roosevelt's health.

Merriam Smith, veteran White House reporter for the United Press, comments in Thank You, Mr. President—1946—that Admiral McIntire never lied about Mr. Roosevelt's physical condition but, on occasion, has told the truth in language that easily could be misleading to the public.

At Hyde Park several celebrated specialists were called in during January 1944 for a consultation on the President's influenza. Their findings, documented through Admiral McIntire several years later, disclosed a moderate degree of arteriosclerosis—the infirmity which finally produced the fatal stroke at Warm Springs, April 12, 1945. While this Hyde Park consultation occurred in January 1944, the findings were not documented publicly until June of 1946.

History thus records that President Roosevelt's last illness began, and was correctly diagnosed, in December to January, 1943 to 1944, but was concealed from the public, to accommodate the urgent political strategems of the fourth-term campaign in 1944, and further concealed during the critical days of the Yalta Conference with Stalin and Churchill—in February 1945—which gave us the Roosevelt peace, the United Nations, and the deliberate betrayal of China to communism after the carefully plotted Lattimore plan.

Under all the customs and usages of international law the question now arises whether, in the circumstances of President Roosevelt's then advanced infirmity in January 1945, his secret deliberations and vocal one-man commitments at Yalta impose in any degree the slightest moral obligation on the part of the United States Government or the American people?

After the January 1944 medical consultation at Hyde Park, McIntire notes, he placed the President on a regime which limited him to 4 hours work a day. With D-day in Europe only 6 months forward, and the fourth-term presidential campaign already well underway, this 4-hour-day regime—not documented for the public until 1946—marked Mr. Roosevelt as no longer physically fit to discharge the heavy duties of his high office. Nevertheless, 11 months later, he was reelected, in November 1944, for another term of 4 years.

Mrs. Roosevelt confirms Dr. McIntire's account of the limited presidential regime, noting that Mr. Roosevelt on June 6, 1944, had only one significant task on his calendar for the day—delivery of his D-day prayer over a worldwide radio network; after which for hours, all hearts in the White House were with the men on the beaches.

Precisely at this point, Mrs. Roosevelt continues, another election campaign lay immediately ahead. She knew, without asking, that since the war was not over, Mr. Roosevelt, if his health permitted, would run again. It was thereupon decided finally that if the President would agree to certain rules set down by the physicians, he could carry on as Chief Executive—Washington Post, February 1, 1950, page 13–B. Mrs. Roosevelt does not record, however, who made this momentous decision in the summer of 1944, nor why it was not disclosed to the American public until February of 1950, almost 5 years after Mr. Roosevelt's death.

About a month earlier, Dr. McIntire, in May 1944, had brought down from Boston a famous heart specialist, arranged his immediate induction into the United States Navy, and assigned him to President Roosevelt's side. Eleven months later, at the scene of the President's death, this heart specialist, Dr. Howard Bruenn, told newspapermen he had never let Mr. Roosevelt get out of his sight. These fundamental facts of 1944 White House history were not made known to the public until mid-1946.

En route to the Pacific in July 1944, Mr. Roosevelt stopped his special train long enough in the railyards at Chicago to issue his historic dictum, "Clear it with Sidney," to Senators Truman, Byrnes, and Barkley. This dictum related to the Democratic National Convention's then pending selection of a vice presidential nominee for the fourth-term ticket, the southern Democrats having earlier informed the President in Washington that Henry Agard Wallace would not be acceptable for another term. From this situation soon emerged the nomination of Harry Truman, the only other considerable candidate before the convention acceptable to the late Sidney Hillman.

From Chicago, Mr. Roosevelt moved on to San Diego, where he made his acceptance speech for the fourth-term nomination, thence by battleship to his war conference with MacArthur and Nimitz, which lasted only a few hours.

On this trip—

Flynn explains—

his appalling physical condition was revealed to the commanders in Honolulu. They were shocked at his appearance, despite the long, restful, sea trip. Here for the first time, we hear of his conversation falling into intervals of irrelevance.

As he was wheeled from his quarters, officers noted his head drooping forward, his jaw hanging loosely. Mr. Roosevelt did not return to Washington until August 18.

Campaigning in the rain in New York City late in October, he rode in a specially equipped heated limousine, with an electric heater under the seat, and another under the heavy fur blankets thrown over his lap. Three or four stuttering lapses in diction during his radio speech that night were attributed jovially by the newspapermen present to possibly a slight excess of before-dinner martinis.

One week later, on election night, Merriam Smith noted at Hyde Park that Mr. Roosevelt "looked older than I had ever seen him, and he made an irrelevant speech."

After the election, November 7, President Roosevelt dropped out of the news until November 28, then went to Warm Springs until December 23, then to Hyde Park for the Christmas holidays. Just 1 year had passed—as we now know—since his fatal illness had been discovered, diagnosed, and suppressed.

On January 19, 1945, the day before inauguration, Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins tarried after the Cabinet meeting to present her resignation and bid farewell.

The physical appearance of the President shocked her. His deep pallor, apoplectic hands, and sagging facial muscles suggested a man gravely ill. Distraught, she hastened to her office, called in her personal secretary, closed the door, and whispered in a frightened voice that the President appeared near death.

Forty-eight hours later, the inauguration over, Mr. Roosevelt left Washington for the Yalta Conference—the most appalling disaster in modern history.

Someday, somehow, Yalta must be undone. God's mankind will not continue forever in the toils and chains there spun by barbaric communism about the broken body and shattered mind of a President recently elected for a fourth term by the most gigantic and egregious public fraud in the history of the world.

The School Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as far as the State of California is concerned, the administration proposal on education is completely inadequate. It will not give any material aid in the area where the schools desperately need emergency assistance.

I fear the plan lacks the imagination and boldness necessary to solve the problems of overcrowded and understaffed schools. The program has been publicized as one to aid schools; as far as California is concerned, the plan presented by the administration could only delay until too far in the future any important assistance for education.

I fear local school districts, under the impression they will get some adequate Federal aid, will delay approval of their own necessary bond issues. The program presented by the administration will call for a great deal of local financial participation—too much, I fear, to make the Federal program workable.

Congress should take the lead in proposing right now an aid-to-education program to provide real aid to local school districts—aid that will end the second-class education too many children are receiving.

At my request, Frank M. Wright, the head of the division of public school administration of California, analyzed the administration's proposal on education. His comments, which follow, point up the fact that the program is little more

than a thin veneer on a ramshackle structure:

Members of my staff and I have reviewed the recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his proposal to aid in financing the construction of needed school buildings throughout the United States. His proposal is divided into three parts.

"Part 1, Bond Purchases by the Federal Government," seems to us to be absolutely unworkable in California due to the fact that we have no difficulty in selling bonds that districts authorize. The current district rate runs between 2½ and 3 percent, and I have never known of a single area in California that has had difficulty in disposing of its bonds.

"Part 2, State School Building Agencies," seems to contemplate a type of operation similar to the Pennsylvania plan which sets up a State school building authority. Under this proposal the districts would have the buildings built for them by some sort of combination between the Federal and State governments and then would rent the buildings and be required to pay an amount equal to principal and interest out of their annual operating funds. In California the law would have to be materially changed to provide for special taxes for this purpose in lieu of bond taxes, or the bond authorization would have to be changed in order to permit bonds to be issued for that particular purpose. We do not believe that this is a workable plan at all. The State program which I have attempted to describe briefly in the enclosed statement covers that operation. We do not believe that there is anything in part 2 that would be of any benefit to California.

"Part 3, Grants for School Districts With Proved Need and Lack of Local Income," does not offer any help to our State. In the first place, we do not have a situation where a district has not reached its legal bonding capacity because it could not sell its bonds. If a California district has bonding capacity it naturally would sell its bonds and would be able to use that money. The second part of the proposal concerns a situation where a district has reached its legal bonding limit and is unable to pay rent and would need to obtain additional aid. That is about the only part of the proposal where it appears that California would receive any assistance. Then the degree of assistance would depend almost entirely upon the language of the act, as to whether or not a State building authority was provided which would provide for leasing and paying rent.

Tariff Reductions Authorized by H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the so-called gradual tariff reductions authorized by H. R. 1.

I have had a list prepared concerning a few items, such as textiles, which shows the maximum rate reductions permissible under H. R. 1.

The list follows:

Extent to which existing rates of duty on specified products could be reduced under the authority that would be given to the President by H. R. 1

Commodity	Ad valorem equivalent [1] of present rate of duty	Ad valorem equivalent [1] of lowest rate of duty permissible under H. R. 1	Extent of reduction which is permissible under H. R. 1 in present rate of duty
	Percent ad valorem	*Percent ad valorem*	*Percent*
Soybean oil	45	23	50
Flavoring extracts, fruit flavors, esters, oils, and essences, containing alcohol	67	50	25
Certain lead pigments	20	10	50
Chrome brick	25	12½	50
Block mica	27	13½	50
Earthenware table and kitchen articles	63	50	20
Decorated china table and kitchen articles	88	44	50
Certain glass containers for toilet preparations	75	37½	50
Lenses with ground or beveled edges (for spectacles)	40	20	50
Certain scientific or laboratory instruments and parts	50	30	40
Thermostatic metal	50	25	50
Power-transmission chains and parts (low-value)	30	20	33
Steel trouser buttons	12	6½	46
Pocket knives (low value)	[2] 85	50	41
Hypodermic syringes (dental)	60	30	50
Slide fasteners (zippers), metal (low value)	66	33	50
Tennis-racket frames	45	22½	50
Scrap tobacco (other than Cuban product)	103	50	51
Cigars and cheroots (other than Cuban product)	116	50	57
Lard compounds and lard substitutes	32	16	50
Turkeys, dressed or undressed	23	11	50
Rosefish, fresh or frozen	49	25	49
Fish, in oil:			
Sardines	[2] 40	[2] 15	63
Tuna	45	38	15
Barley flour	23	11	50
Rice, cleaned or milled	25	12½	50
Cherries, dried or evaporated	39	19½	50
Candied citrons or citron peel	33	25	24
Fresh or dried dates in packages	60	30	50
Raisins	[2] 6	[2] 4	33
Prunes, etc.	14	7	50
Almonds, unshelled	18	9	50
Lemon juice, concentrated	85	50	41
Countable cotton cloth (low value) [3]	[2] 40	[2] 20	50
Cotton corduroys (high value)	30	15	50
Cotton blankets, Jacquard-figured	30	22½	25
Cotton sheets and pillow cases	20	10	50
Gloves and mittens of cotton knit fabric (low value)	60	30	50
Cotton handkerchiefs and woven mufflers	30	20	33⅓
Friction or insulating tape	40	20	50
Cotton rag rugs	75	50	33⅓
Fine clothing wools	30	20	33⅓
Worsteds and woolens (low value)	[2] 60	50	16⅔
Wool blankets, plain or embroidered (low value):			
Hand-woven	64	21	67
Other	63	50	21
Wool felt hats, blocked, trimmed, etc. (low value)	60	42	30
Certain wool tapestries and upholstery goods	48	37	23
Broad silks (wide), Jacquard-figured, bleached, printed, piece-dyed (low value)	65	32½	50
Silk handkerchiefs, hemmed or hemstitched (low value)	60	50	17
Rayon knit underwear (high value)	36	18	50
Copying paper (high value)	29	14½	50
Envelopes, filled or unfilled, lithographed, made from various kinds of paper	[2] 35	[2] 12	66
Wrapping paper, sulfite, machine-finished	20	12½	38
Imitation solid pearls (low value)	60	30	50
Tooth brushes (with handles or backs of materials other than cellulose, etc.) (high value)	31	15½	50
Hair and other toilet brushes (with cellulose handles or backs)	60	30	50
Pearl or shell buttons	[2] 83	50	40
Cork insulation pipe coverings, etc.	22½	11	50
Certain plastic dolls	[2] 90	50	45
Certain abrasives	60	30	50
Dressed furs	12½	7	44
Silver, black, or platinum fox wearing apparel	37½	25	33
Men's and boys' fur or fur-felt hats	[2] 50	[2] 30	40
Women's and girls' fur hats	[2] 45	[2] 30	33⅓
Metal articles, such as compacts, vanity cases, cigarette cases, etc. (low value)	65	50	23
Various kinds of articles (except wearing apparel) in part of machine-made lace	65	45	31
Lace window curtains (except cotton Nottingham lace curtains)	90	45	50
Hat braids (except of straw, paper, grass, ramie, etc.)	90	45	50
Leather footwear (various types)	[2] 20	[2] 10	50
Leather gloves (various kinds)	[2] 30	[2] 20	33⅓
Tobacco pouches (except of leather)	60	30	50
Tobacco pipes with bowls of briar wood or other root, partly finished (medium value)	55	40	27

[1] Based on imports in 1952.
[2] About.
[3] Value bracket established in 1939. Since then, values have increased about threefold, consequently cloth of this value does not exist in normal trade channels.

Opponents of H. R. 1 Outnumber Proponents by 3 to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the public hearings on H. R. 1 held by the Committee on Ways and Means, the opponents of the legislation outnumbered the proponents by approximately 3 to 1.

In spite of this fact, the report of the committee on the bill makes specific reference only to the proponents.

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record clear and to avoid any possible distortion of the facts, representatives of the following industries, labor groups, and organizations testified in opposition to H. R. 1:

General Electric Co., qualified opposition.
California Fish Canners Association.
American Manufacturers of Thermostatic Containers.
The Candle Manufacturers Association.
Collapsible Tube Manufacturers Association.
The Industrial Wire Cloth Institute.
The National Building Granite Quarries Association.
The Rubber Footwear Division of the Rubber Manufacturers Association.
The Toy Manufacturers of the U. S. A., Inc.
The Twisted Jute Packing and Oakum Institute.
United States Potters Association.
The American Manufacturers of Toy Balloons.
American Tariff League.
National Federation of Independent Business.
Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor.
American Coalition.
Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.
Voland & Sons, Inc.
R. Thomas & Sons, Inc.
California Pottery Guild.
Homer Laughlin China Co.
Vitrified China Association.
International Brotherhood of Operative Potters.
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
Monsanto Chemical Co.
Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc.
Dow Chemical Co.
Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association.
Otto B. May, Inc.
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.
American Cyanamid Co.
American Glassware Association.
Kent Metal & Chemical Corp.
American Flint Glass Workers Union.
Ohio Glass and Pottery Workers Protective League.
Pennsylvania Glassworkers Protective League.
Indiana Glass Workers Protective League.
Seafarers International Union of North America.
American Tunaboat Association.
Seafood Producers Association.
Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc.
Northwest Horticultural Council.
Independent Petroleum Association of America.
National Stripper Well Association.
North Texas Oil & Gas Association.
Independent Petroleum Association of America.
Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil Association.
New York State Producers Association.
Bradford District Pennsylvania Producers Association.
Southwestern Pennsylvania Producers Association.
Oil Producers Agency of California.
San Joaquin Valley Oil Producers Association.
Independent Oil Producers Agency of California.
Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association.
West Central Texas Oil & Gas Association.
Lawton Oil Corp.
Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association.
Kentucky Oil & Gas Association.
Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association.
Ohio Oil & Gas Association.
Independent Oil Producers & Land Owners Association.
East Texas Oil Association.
National Coal Association.
Pennsylvania Railroad.
United Mine Workers of America.
American Retail Coal Association.
Foreign Oil Policy Committee.
Anthracite Institute.
Norfolk & Western Railroad.
Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
Southern Coal Producers Association.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Women's Patriotic Conference.
American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.
National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.
Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.
New England Textile Committee and six New England Governors.
National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
Carpet Institute, Inc.
National Wool Growers Association.
Boston Wool Trade Association.
Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association.
National Wool Trade Association.
National Federation of Textiles.
Textile Fabric Association.
Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association.
Forstmann Woolen Co.
CIO Textile Workers.
Linen Thread Co., Inc.
United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union.
National Authority for the Ladies Handbag Industry.
S. Morgan Smith Co.
Pin, Clip, and Fastener Association.
Clothespin Manufacturers of America.
Western Condensing Co.
National Machine Tool Producers Association.
Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America.
American Lace Manufacturers Association.
American Fabric Glove Associates.
American Knit Handwear Association.
National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers.
Underwear Institute.
Work Glove Institute.
United Wallpaper Craftsmen and Workers of North America International Union.
Lapp Insulator Co.
American Fluorspar.
Mica Fabricators Association.
New England Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths Association.
Clock Manufacturers of America, Inc.
Cigarette Lighter Manufacturers Association, Inc.
Lead Pencil Manufacturers Association, Inc.
Tungsten Institute.
Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc.
Okonite Co.
Industrial Fasteners Institute.
American Optical Co.
Shears, Scissors & Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association.
American Manganese Producers Association.
White Sewing Machine Co.
Woven Wood Fabric Industry.
Hardwood Plywood Institute.
Hardboard Institute.
California Almond Growers Exchange.
California Walnut Growers Association.
Northwest Nut Growers.
Oregon Filbert Commission.
Sunkist Growers, Inc.
Cherry Growers & Industries Foundation.
Wine Institute.
Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association of Pennsylvania.
American National Cattlemen's Association.
National Milk Producers.
Cultivated Mushroom Institute of America, Inc.
National Cheese Institute, Inc.
American Dry Milk Institute.
National Creameries Association.
Texas Sheep & Goat Raisers Association.
Western States Meat Packers Association.
California Fig Institute.
National Independent Union Council.
Argus Cameras.
International Allied Printing Trades Association.
Fur Dressers' Guild, Inc.
National Knitted Outerwear Association.
Eastern Metal Products Co.

Twentieth Triennial Congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September last, at Plymouth, Mass., the 20th triennial congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants was held. The attendance of officers and delegates from the forty-odd State societies of the Mayflower descendants, making up the Congress, was the largest in the history of the general society, founded in 1927. There were many interesting features involved in the 3 days of the congress, one of which was the customary Pilgrims' progress, a procession made up of men and women dressed in the costumes of Plymouth Colony days. This picturesque group, headed by a drummer boy, and followed by impersonated Pilgrims: Elder William Brewster, the role assumed by Rev. Cecil Plumb, of Salem, N. Y., elder general of the general society; Governor Carver, John Howland, John Alden, Priscilla Mullins, Captain Miles Standish, Governor Bradford, and others, marched up to Burial Hill, where some of the earliest Pilgrims repose. The procession stopped at the site of the Old Fort of Pilgrim days, and there Elder General Plumb delivered a very fine and appropriate address to the assemblage present, made up of Mayflower descendants, and others.

At the congress, the following officers were elected for the next ensuing 3 years: Governor General Col. Waldo M. Allen, Lake Forrest, Ill.; secretary general, Mrs. Helen S. Peck, Chicago, Ill.; treasurer general, Merriam Davis, Hartford, Conn.; counsellor general, Maurice H. Thatcher, Washington, D. C.; historian general, Mrs. John Kermott Allen, Boston, Mass.; elder general, Rev. Cecil Plumb, Salem, N. Y.; captain general, Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Hudson, Wis.; and surgeon general, Dr. Jay S. Ruldophy, Wayne, Pa.

The new counselor general, Maurice H. Thatcher, was formerly Representative in Congress from the Louisville, Ky., district. He was also chairman of the committee on resolutions at the recent Plymouth Congress, and had served in the like capacity at the 19th triennial congress of the general society in 1951. In addition, he was the author of a proposed amendment to the constitution of the general society on the questions of eligibility and subversives; which proposal was adopted at the recent Congress.

Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States and deputy governor general for Nebraska for the general society, delivered before the 20th triennial congress a fine, informative address on the subject of communism, and narrated the steps being taken by the Congress of the United States and the Federal executive departments in dealing with this grave menace.

Also, the recent congress at Plymouth adopted as the theme song of the general society the composition, Our Mayflower, of Mrs. Marie Rich Rockwood, well-known composer, of Massachusetts, herself a descendant of Gov. William Bradford, of Plymouth Colony fame.

A unique and interesting feature of the program of the congress was the rendition by Harry B. Sherman, of Rhode Island—impersonating Elder Brewster—of the famous fancied speech ascribed by Daniel Webster, at the Pilgrim Festival in New York in 1950, to the spiritual leader of the Plymouth Colony.

The 20th triennial congress, agreeably to long-established custom, was held in the First Parish Church, at Plymouth—an edifice which may be said to be a lineal descendant—the fifth—of the 1st church of the Pilgrims in the Plymouth Colony, which is considered to have been the first Congregational church in the new world.

Under leave accorded, I am very glad to include as a part of these remarks the indicated address of the elder general.

The address of Elder General Cecil Plumb follows:

This representation of Pilgrims who survived the dreadful winter of 1620 is an attempt to honor the memory of the entire company of those immortals whom we hail today. Their endeavors to serve God had large influence in shaping the frame and substance of the America we love. History should make sharper distinction between the fairly tolerant Pilgrim and his more self-righteous Puritan brother.

The object of their pilgrimage was to build a better material living in order to glorify God, preserve ideals, and propagate the redemptive Gospel of Jesus Christ. It was their share of performance in what they regarded as the whole duty of humanity to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. They who earlier had covenanted in a spiritual society to seek God's will and to obey it so far as they saw it, arriving at these ungoverned shores compacted to also form a political society. Through it they planned to choose officers with responsibility to promote the common good. This compact was the earliest written document of constitutional government known to the world. It was an important factor in the establishment of the United States of America, the world's earliest national example of government by and for the people.

Pilgrims departing from Plymouth, England, received a letter from their beloved pastor, John Robinson, in Holland. His advice was most practical. Because of their plan for a civil community, he said, they would find certain things necessary which he urged they never neglect. These were, first, brotherly forbearance; second, placement of the general good above personal advantage; and, third, choosing officers who love and promote the general good, yielding them honor and obedience.

The loftiness of their ideal, the completeness of their investment, the persevering devotion to their calling, the penalty of their sacrifice, the success of their enterprise, the present challenge of its dream is unmatched in the traditional or written annals of mankind.

Our world today is in a sorry state. But we face no greater evil, we have no lesser God, than they knew. Each generation must redeem its liberty, make its own pilgrimage. No discouragement is ours that was not theirs. No resource was theirs that is not ours. Need we be reminded that many times the fortunes of this Plymouth were as like to ebb away as the waves of yonder tide? Here is Bradford's estimate of the considered judgment of his fellows: "The dangers were many, but not desperate; the difficulties were many, but not invincible—all of them through the help of God, by fortitude and patience, might either be borne or overcome."

What a place is this for enlistment of modern Pilgrims. What a time is this for the practice of a Pilgrim's progress in godly faith. Shall we not this day join ourselves to these people of the past whose faith, labors, and memory have enshrined this Plymouth in the hearts of America and the hopes of the world? Shall we not this day join ourselves in spirit with all people who love truth, seek virtue, treasure liberty, and in lowliness of spirit are willing to be led and taught by God their Maker?

This is not a world of chance. This should not be a day of darkness or despair. Men and women who receive God are not vicitims of circumstances, but children of providence. The righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, from generation to generation. The just shall live by faith.

Warning on Geology of Huge Upper Colorado River Dam—Rainbow Bridge Periled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, under title of "Plans for Huge Upper Colorado Dam Uncertain, Says Secretary McKay," I revealed in this RECORD the contents of a letter written November 30, 1954, by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club. The letter concerned the geology of the site of the proposed $21 million gigantic power dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz.

I explained that this dam would be the key structure depended upon to raise power revenues to pay for a substantial portion of the cost of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project, H. R. 270, now before Congress. I quote a portion of Secretary McKay's letter with respect to this geology as follows:

The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet.

As a direct result of those remarks, I have just received a communication from Joseph Jensen, chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, who is himself a trained geologist, born and educated in Utah, and personally familiar with the location. This communication points out that not only is the site on which the dam is proposed questionable, but that the area behind it, which is supposed to provide a reservoir, may be little

more than a sieve. In short the whole project might turn out to be as useless as a waterpail without a bottom.

Mr. Jensen informs me that the rock in Glen Canyon are essentially sandstone. They have been drained of all underground water to the level of the Colorado River.

As a result they are dry. They do not contain underground water which would prevent the migration of stored water from the reservoir. It follows that when the reservoir is being filled, the water will seep out into these parched sandstones for miles. The seepage will be limited only by the dip of the sandstone formation and the effect of the pressure of the head of water which accumulates behind the dam.

No one can tell how long it would take to fill the porous sandstones nor how many millions of acre-feet of water might be thus consumed before any water could again flow down the river.

The reservoir might never be filled, nor usable for major power development. The country might be stuck with the most enormous white elephant in history.

Any dam that is built in the canyon would extend only a short distance into the canyon walls. Therefore, the water migrating out into the sandstone from the reservoir will create an underground body of water vastly more extensive than the reservoir itself, which is calculated to store 26 million acre-feet of water, twice the average annual flow of the Colorado River at Glen Canyon. It is apparent that eventually, as these sandstones become filled with the vast volume of water, it will migrate around the ends of the dam and thus render it wholly or at least partially ineffective for power purposes.

Although Secretary McKay's letter promised more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions after congressional authorization of the project, suppose this more intensive study discloses that no power dam should be built? How then will Congress explain to itself the appropriation of large sums of money for uneconomic projects for which there will be no pay-out from Glen Canyon power?

Further, although the Secretary was quoted in my prior remarks as stating that "appropriate changes will be made in the designs"—of the dam—"prior to construction" if further geological studies warrant, no modifications in the dam or its height can cure the fact that a reservoir built entirely on porous sandstone rock will not hold water.

Certainly this Congress will be well advised not to authorize or appropriate any expenditure on the Upper Colorado project until the safety and certainty of building a dam in Glen Canyon has been fully determined.

The best way of having this determined is to have a committee of three of the best experts in the United States on dam construction, two of whom would be men who have successfully built concrete dams, and the third should be a geologist of national standing and reputation familiar with the texture and character of rocks.

This is precisely what was done before the dam site for Hoover Dam was chosen. Only after three of the best engineers in the country approved the dam site, was that construction authorized.

This committee of experts also should determine whether or not any steps proposed to protect Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir by a barrier dam would provide adequate protection.

There is more than a suspicion that this barrier dam also would be built on nothing other than porous sandstone. Just as the water would seep around the Glen Canyon Dam, so would it seep around the ends of the barrier dam. If the elevation of water in the reservoir is as high as that of Rainbow Bridge, then the water would encroach to the bridge itself. All of these natural bridges owe their lives to the dry climate of the area. Moisture and water in any quantity would be fatal to their future life.

What Nonfarmers Should Know About the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of an article which I wrote for the magazine Successful Farming and which appeared in the February 1955 issue of that publication:

WHAT NONFARMERS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE FARM PROGRAM

The title of this article assumes that nonfarmers are not well informed about the problems of farmers and the various Government programs which deal with those problems. I believe this is a valid assumption.

This is a situation of comparatively recent origin. As late as 1910, a third of our population was directly engaged in agriculture. Many more lived in small rural communities. Under these circumstances, most of our people had a pretty good idea of farming and its problems.

But now, less than 14 percent of our people are farmers. Furthermore, farming itself has changed so much that people who were born and grew up on farms even a few years ago know nothing of modern farming problems.

I am convinced that today perhaps 75 percent of our people have little or no understanding of agriculture as an industry. And worse than that, 50 percent or more have a poor opinion of farmers—to state it in the mildest terms.

Aside from the fact that we don't want people thinking badly of farmers without justification, there is a most important reason at this time why city people should understand farmers and their problems. That is because, like every other industry, agriculture is affected by Government policies more than ever before.

This applies not only to policies dealing with prices but to such questions as export markets, credit policies, conservation, rural electrification and telephones, and research and education programs. And with less than 14 percent of our people on farms, it is obvious that Government policies which fit the needs of agriculture must receive the support of other segments of our population.

I would like to suggest some things which I think you should tell your nonfarmer friends about farming.

What should we tell them? Frankly, the only thing we need to tell them is the truth—the plain, simple truth—about what farmers are up against in these times.

While it isn't the most important point, the first thing that ought to be told is that farmers as a class are not getting rich.

Then there are people who feel that farm prices and food prices are too high and criticize farmers for that reason. These people are obviously mistaken, because no one who has made a fair study of farm prices or food prices can complain that they are out of line with the prices of other commodities.

First, it ought to be pointed out that as far as food prices are concerned, the farmer now gets only 43 percent of the consumer's dollar. The other 57 percent goes for processing, transportation, and distribution costs.

Furthermore, in the case of many commodities, there is little connection between farm prices and prices which consumers pay. In a loaf of bread selling at from 17 to 20 cents, there is 2¾ cents worth of wheat. A cotton shirt selling for $3.95 and up contains about 30 cents worth of cotton.

A study made by the House Committee on Agriculture last July showed that while farm prices had fallen 19 percent since 1951, retail food prices remained right at the postwar peak.

Then there are people who tell me they think farm programs have worked to the disadvantage of consumers. Figures don't bear this out either.

Our first price-support program began in 1929, and if these charges were true, it would mean that consumers were worse off now than they were at that time. Yet the figures prepared by the Department of Agriculture show just the opposite.

In 1929 the average factory worker could buy 6.4 pounds of bread with an hour's earnings. Today these earnings will buy 10.3 pounds. For an hour's wages he could buy 1 pound of butter in 1929 and 2.6 pounds today; 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 and 7.9 quarts today; 17.4 pounds of potatoes in 1929 and around 30 pounds today; 1.2 pounds of round steak in 1929 and 2 pounds today, and so on.

In other words, consumers have gotten real reductions in food prices during the time price supports have been in effect.

Another complaint which keeps popping up is that agriculture is being subsidized in vast amounts by the Federal Government and to a greater extent than other industries. It is true that agriculture has received subsidies. But I think we should point out to our friends in the cities that subsidies began when our Government was first set up in 1789—and that only in fairly recent years have they been used to any appreciable extent to protect agriculture.

The first Congress set up a subsidy to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. Since that time many billions in subsidies—both direct and indirect—have gone to business and industry, as well as to labor and consumers. Among other things, these subsidies covered portions of the postal deficit, aids to the shipping industry, various aids to air navigation, flood control, electric-power projects, housing construction, unemployment insurance, public-assistance grants, and many others, including indirect subsidies like tariffs.

The House Appropriations Committee in 1954 published figures indicating subsidies amounting to about $45 billion were paid to business and consumers since World War II. It is fair to say that a part of this was

in business reconversion payments following the war, but nevertheless, it was a subsidy.

As compared with this $45 billion of subsidies to business and consumers, farm-price supports and surplus removal, operations for the 20 years up through 1953 cost only $3½ billion, or 1 percent of the value of crops and livestock marketed.

In order to fairly inform our urban friends of the problems of agriculture and the need for remedial measures, we must point out the tremendous changes that have taken place in farming in recent years.

There was a time when farmers were very largely self-sufficient; and under those circumstances, the prices received for commodities were not particularly important. Today this situation is entirely changed. In 1953 the total assets of agriculture in this country totaled almost exactly the same as the total assets of all manufacturing corporations.

Even more significant is the fact that in 1953 the average investment per agricultural worker was $16,480. That is almost twice as much as the average investment per industrial worker.

Today even the small farmer must make a heavy investment in land and equipment, and in addition requires a large amount of working capital to pay for fuel, fertilizer, labor, insurance, taxes, and other expenses which must be paid in cash. These expenses are constant, and there is little the farmer can do to reduce them. If he is to meet them, he must have a dependable cash income.

But consider the risks that the farmer must take in getting this income. Drought and floods take their toll somewhere each year. He is subject to the ravages of insect pests, and crop and livestock diseases. And when he finally produces a crop, he has nothing to say about the price he will receive for it. If he ships his cattle to Kansas City or Chicago, he takes what the buyers offer. His alternative is to ship them back home again.

Much of the farm legislation of recent years has been for the purpose of adding to the stability of farming. Crop insurance has been tried to partially eliminate the risks of weather and disease. Cooperative marketing has been developed to give farmers more to say about the price of their products. And price-support programs through Government loans have been set up to bring about more orderly marketing. This prevents farmers from having to dump their crops on the market in such quantities as to depress prices.

And that brings us to the question of surpluses and how they affect prices. "Surplus" is a comparatively new term. We did not hear much about surpluses until after the First World War. But we have always had them—that is, except when we had distress and famine.

In past years, surpluses were in the form of reserves which people kept in their storehouses and cellars. Individual surpluses and reserves now are a thing of the past—but for our own safety and protection we must have on hand more food than can currently be used. And yet these surpluses, so destructive to farmers' prices when we do not have farm programs are simply the reserve people used to have in their cellars.

It doesn't seem right that when this surplus is for the protection of all of our people, the farmer should have to bear the whole expense and loss of carrying it. And yet that is our situation when we do not have farm programs.

Nonfarmers also ought to be told that the fact that less than 14 percent of our people can furnish the food and fiber required for all the rest of us is the principal reason why we have what we refer to as our American way of life and high standards of living.

The energies of the other 86 percent of our people can be released to build our automobiles, radios and television sets, our great highway systems, to maintain our educational facilities and our progress in the arts and sciences, as well as our churches and cultural institutions. In some countries it takes 80 to 85 percent of the people to produce enough food for themselves and the remaining 15 or 20 percent.

Certainly one of the greatest problems confronting the country today is the conservation of our soil and water. That is a responsibility that is very largely in the farmer's hands—and yet there is no way on earth the farmer can carry it out unless he, as a businessman, has sufficient income to do like other businessmen and maintain his plant by conserving and rebuilding the soil.

There is one other point. I don't know that farmers can say very much about it because it would sound too much like bragging. That is that here in this country we have always regarded the family-type farm and the people who live on it as our greatest reservoir of social and moral values. There is no way that we can maintain the family-type farm unless farming is at least profitable enough that people who love the land and want to farm can afford to do so.

These are some of the things that nonfarmers ought to know about farming. You can think of others. But that will not do any good unless in some way we get the story told. I think it is up to the farmer to do it one way or another. Perhaps the big part of the work will have to be done through organized effort—that is through farm organizations, the agricultural press, or farm-minded commentators over radio and television.

But every farmer and farmer's wife has some opportunity to dispel the fog of misunderstanding and misinformation that exists in such a large measure among so many of our people. In your own interest and the Nation's interest, you ought to make use of that opportunity.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1955

The Very Reverend Msgr. John Balkunas, of the American Lithuanian Council, pastor, Church of the Transfiguration, Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Divine Father, who in holy love hast created and art sustaining us, we invoke Thy gracious blessing upon the Members of the United States Senate. Fill every mind with wisdom and understanding, every heart with love and compassion, and every soul with trust and holy purpose to do Thy will.

We lift to Thee our broken cries; we turn to Thee our waiting eyes. O God, there are sounds on earth and signs in heaven that quicken all hearts with expectation: nations that long have sat in darkness and the shadow of death, turning to the light; peoples that long have worn the yoke of tyranny rising to shake themselves free; murmurs of the masses too long chained in slavery; thoughts that threaten the order of all things and predict the shaking of the foundations of the world.

Stretch forth Thy hand, we pray, and deliver the suffering nations from slavery and tyranny. Grant freedom to Lithuania; joy and peace to her people. May she rightfully be restored to her place in the family of free nations.

Make America, Thy chosen channel of blessings to the persecuted, Thy instrument of peace. May all peoples live with hope and assurance that the light of freedom which burns in America will reach every dark corner of the earth.

O God give us strength for our burdens, wisdom for our responsibilities, and insight for our times. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 11, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on February 14, 1955, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 145. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills,

and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, dealing with personnel and civil service, which, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

IMPORTATION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN CATTLE, SHEEP, AND SWINE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended, and section 2 of the act of February 2, 1903, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of December 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPRODUCTION AND SALE OF CERTAIN OFFICIAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a proposed amendment to a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes, transmitted to the Senate on January 7, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LOAN OF SMALL AIRCRAFT CARRIER TO GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS EXECUTED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts executed, by negotiation, for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts were negotiated by that Committee, pursuant to sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Lxchange Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Facilities Corporation relating to the expenditures for repairs, improvements, or maintenance of Government-owned rubber producing facilities, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON FOREIGN DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on the foreign surplus property disposed of by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, for the calendar year 1954; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CONCESSION CONTRACTS

Three letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of proposed awards of concession contracts, in Glacier National Park, Mont., the Millerton Lake National Recreation Area, Calif., and the Hot Springs National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CONCESSION PERMITS

Six letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of proposed awards of concession permits in Mammoth Cave National Park, Everglades National Park, Fla., Cabrillo National Monument, Kings Mountain National Military Park, S. C., Everglades National Park, Fla., and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF MINERAL DEPOSITS UNDER MINERAL LEASING ACT FOR ACQUIRED LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands with respect to the disposal of mineral deposits in which the United States owns a partial or future interest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENDING TO GRAZING LESSEES COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN LOSSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend to grazing lessees the right of compensation for losses sustained by reason of the use of the public domain or other property for war or national defense purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ABOLITION OF OLD KASAAN NATIONAL MONUMENT, ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to abolish the old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF CERTAIN AIDS TO MARITIME NAVIGATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MCFARLAND COCKRILL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of McFarland Cockrill, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF PROVISIONS OF TITLE II OF FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report of the Commissioner of Education, dated June 30, 1954, relating to the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"A joint resolution of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah reaffirming its support of the Bricker amendment and again memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, as proposed by Senator BRICKER

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (both Houses concurring therein):

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Utah by joint resolution, passed December 14, 1953, memorialized the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to treaties and known as the Bricker amendment; and

"Whereas the problems requiring such an amendment still exist: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we do affirm the joint resolution of December 14, 1953, and again petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing the following amendment:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

" 'SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

" 'SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

" 'SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

" 'SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, United States Senate, House of Representatives, and each congressional delegate from the State of Utah."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the considering of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the operation of State schools

"Whereas the National Government, through the use of various funds and agencies has greatly encroached, directly and indirectly, upon the operation of the State schools; and

"Whereas the operation of State schools is, and should remain, an exclusive State function; and

"Whereas the continued exercise of various means and methods by the National Government in controlling the operation of State schools tends to encroach upon an exclusive State right: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the Legislature of the State of Georgia respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any provision in this Constitution, nothing shall, in any way, take away from, or in any manner deprive, the right of the several States of the Union to operate their school systems, and to have exclusive and complete power to regulate and to determine the rules and regulations for the conduct and operation of State schools.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing herein shall prohibit any State from accepting aid in any form from the National Government.

" 'SEC. 3. This amendment shall be effective upon ratification by three-fourths of the several States'; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as to the mode of ratification, that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Georgia.

"MARVIN E. MOATE,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOE BOONE,
"Clerk of the House.
"S. ERNEST VANDIVER,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved this 31st day of January 1955.

"S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision to compensate the counties in this State which have lost considerable revenue by the acquisition of title by the Federal Government to large areas of taxable property within the county bounds

"Whereas the Federal Government has acquired title to considerable areas of land in a number of the counties of the State which have heretofore contributed materially by the payment of annual taxes to maintenance of the governments of the counties; and

"Whereas it is considered that it would be just and equitable for the Federal Government to make some provision to compensate the counties annually for the revenue that they have thus lost: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the matters referred to in the preamble of this resolution be called to the attention of the Members of the Congress from this State and that the Congress be memorialized to make provision to adequately compensate the counties in the State for the loss of revenue which they have sustained by reason of the acquisition of title by the Federal Government of large areas of taxable property in their bounds; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Members of the Congress from South Carolina, to the Clerk of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senators of Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and ORVIN B. FJARE, Representatives in Congress from Montana, and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States requesting the Sugar Act of 1948 be continued in force and the quota of domestic beet sugar be increased

"Whereas under the Sugar Act of 1948 sugar marketings from domestic areas of the United States and its Territories are limited to 4,444,000 tons of a total present national consumption of 8,200,000 tons; and

"Whereas these fixed quotas established for our own domestic production have no regard for increases in the population; and

"Whereas foreign areas, principally Cuba, have been allotted all of the increase in sugar consumption resulting from population increase or other factors, which consumption requirement as determined by the United States Department of Agriculture increased from 7,200,000 tons for the calendar year 1948 to 8,200,000 tons for the calendar year 1955, and may be expected to continue to increase at a rate of more than 100,000 tons per year; and

"Whereas the domestic producers in Montana and in other States are as a result restricted in their privilege to grow sugar beets and sugarcane as indicated, particularly in the determination of proportionate shares allotted to Montana sugar-beet growers for 1955 crops to a total of only 50,980 acres, which has reduced such acreage permitted to be planted by 8.7 percent from the acreage actually planted during the preceding year of 1954 and has created hardship on the farmers of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Sugar Act of 1948 be continued in force, but that the quota of domestic beet sugar be increased to the extent it will have a fair and equitable share of the increased consumption and in the additional sugar required to meet the growth of the Nation and the needs of its people; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States of America, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressman LEE METCALF, Congressman ORVIN B. FJARE, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

"GEORGE GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 5, 1955.

"J. HUGO ARONSON,
"Governor."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House memorial to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Congress of the United States; to Senator James E. Murray, Senator Mike Mansfield, Congressman Lee Metcalf, and Congressman Orvin B. Fjare; requesting the amendment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Status of Forces Treaty

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America did on July 15, 1953, approve a treaty with foreign governments where members of our armed services are serving; and

"Whereas the said treaty is known as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Status of Forces Treaty, and, among other things, provides that members of our Armed Forces may be tried in the courts of the nation and by the nation where the offense was alleged to have been committed; and

"Whereas, because of said treaty, members of our Armed Forces are subject in many cases to cruel and inhuman treatment; and

"Whereas the United States of America should administer military justice through its proper officials and not permit members of our armed services to be tried by foreign governments; and

"Whereas the said treaty is repugnant to the principles of the United States of America in that it gives foreign governments jurisdiction over the liberty of members of our armed services and is causing unnecessary suffering among members of our armed services, all of which is not in keeping with our American way of life: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States of America be respectfully urged and requested to amend and rescind the portion of said North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Status of Forces Treaty which provides for the trial of members of our Armed Forces by governments other than the United States of America, at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the secretary of state of Montana; to the President of the United States of America; to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana; and to the Honorable ORVIN B. FJARE and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Congressmen from Montana; and that they be requested to use all honorable means within their power to bring about the enactment of the necessary legislation.

"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Whereas His Excellency, Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel to the United States, will be the honored guest of the State of Washington on his first visit to the Northwest; and

"Whereas the friendship and understanding between America and Israel are cherished by the citizens of the State of Washington and have inspired and strengthened our mutual love of freedom and the Republic; and

"Whereas the Ambassador of Israel, who is also his country's chief delegate to the United Nations, has been given worldwide recognition as an outstanding spokesman for the young Republic of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That they hereby extend their cordial greetings to the Ambassador of Israel, His Excellency, Abba Eban, and respectfully request that he address a joint session of the senate and the house of representatives on Thursday, February 24, 1955; and be it hereby further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Washington congressional delegation, to the Secretariat of the United Nations, to the secretary of the Israel delegation to the United Nations, to the President of Israel, and to His Excellency, Abba Eban, the Ambassador of Israel to the United States.

"Adopted by the house February 1, 1955.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Adopted by the senate February 2, 1955.

"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the development of the public lands in the United States historically has followed quickly after ownership and possession of these lands by the several States; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is ready and able to assume responsibility of using and developing the public lands therein.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska urges that H. R. 246, now pending before the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be passed and approved.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, January 28, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"To the President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior; United States Bureau of Mines; Defense Minerals Exploration Administration; and Territorial Delegate to Congress:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the mining industry is at a very low ebb in Alaska while it is advancing in Canada and the United States; and

"Whereas the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration program has caused the development of only one mine in Alaska into an economical operation; and

"Whereas there are innumerable deposits of strategic minerals in Alaska; and

"Whereas many of these mineral deposits are of such a size that the tonnage therefrom cannot be economically shipped separately to the States, and the miners cannot survive the lengthy waiting time for payment for their ores; and

"Whereas miners could open and mine these deposits if purchasing points were near at hand where their ore could be exchanged for a substantial partial payment immediately; and

"Whereas the General Services Administration operates ore purchasing depots in the States, but which are too far removed from Alaska to benefit Alaskan miners; and

"Whereas there is an agency ready and willing to perform or assist in performing the sampling and evaluation of such shipments from Alaska for the United States Government, namely the Territorial Department of Mines; and

"Whereas a Federal ore purchasing program in Alaska would give the Federal taxpayers and the United States Government a definite value returned for their money, which at present under the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration in most cases they do not; and

"Whereas the mining economy so much needed in Alaska would be given a definite incentive and boost by such a program.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that a United States ore purchasing program be set up in Alaska whereby a substantial partial payment may be made to producers of small lots of strategic minerals at point of production.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate January 28, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 1, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor February 7, 1955.

"B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the dependency exemption to $1,200 for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Usualdo F. Laguitan, Ormoc City, P. I., relating to compensation of certain guerrillas in World War II (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting a copy of an interstate civil defense compact, entered into between the States of Utah and Nevada (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Petitions, signed by Thomas F. Callahan and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution, adopted by the Long Island General Assembly, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 504

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to act promptly and favorably upon the Canton irrigation distribution system

"Whereas the Congress of the United States did approve and provide funds for construction of Canton Reservoir on the North Canadian River at Canton, Okla.; and

"Whereas the reservoir was constructed to include outlet works and sufficient storage for the irrigation of 16,000 acres of land in the Canadian River Valley; and

"Whereas in 1945 the landowners in the valley below Canton Dam did organize and perfect the Canton irrigation district under Oklahoma law, comprising aforesaid 16,000 acres of land, and have continuously urged the Secretary of the Interior to forward to the Congress project plans and specifications

for the necessary distribution system to bring water to the aforesaid lands; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has, through the Bureau of the Budget, presented to the Congress the Canton project for its consideration and approval: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the honorable Senate concurring therein), That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States of America to consider at the earliest practical date its favorable approval and authorization for construction of the Canton irrigation project's distribution system.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 19th day of January 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate the 24th day of January 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution declaring that the continued excessive importation of foreign oil and its derivatives is inimical to the well-being of the United States of America and the State of Oklahoma

"Whereas Oklahoma for many years has been a leader in the production of oil and gas and an advocate of the conservation of oil and gas; and

"Whereas the economy of the citizens of the State of Oklahoma is closely allied and dependent upon the production of oil and gas in this State; and

"Whereas by reason of continued high imports of oil and its derivatives into this country from foreign markets, Oklahoma has been forced to reduce its current production much lower than its ability to produce oil within the standards of proper conservation of oil and gas, resulting in great losses in taxes which are used for the benefit of the schools, highways, and general revenues to the State of Oklahoma, and resulting in great losses to the economy of the State of Oklahoma and its citizens; and

"Whereas by reason thereof the incentive to discover new reserves in the State of Oklahoma has been destroyed, which reserves are vital to the defense of this country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"That the continued import of foreign oil and its derivatives into the United States is detrimental to the citizens of the United States; and

"That if the importation of foreign oil and its derivatives is continued, it is the opinion of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma that adequate domestic petroleum reserves, which are vital to the defense of this country, will not be discovered and will not be available for use in this country in a time of emergency; and be it further

"Resolved, That in addition thereto great and serious losses are resulting to the economy of the citizens of the State of Oklahoma by reason of foreign oil and its derivatives supplanting the traditional market of oil and gas that can be produced in the State of Oklahoma under sound conservation practices.

"Adopted by the senate the 1st day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 3d day of February 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

SUGGESTED INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF INCOME CERTAIN VETERANS MAY EARN—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Lozar-Mrace-Loushin Post, No. 248, of the American Legion, with regard to the amount of income a single veteran receiving non-service-connected disability pensions may earn.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELY, MINN., *February 10, 1955.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: The following resolution was adopted at the last meeting of our post of the American Legion:

"Whereas certain veterans are eligible to receive non-service-connected disability pensions; and

"Whereas one of the requirements is that a veteran who otherwise qualifies and who has no dependents, is allowed to have other income up to $1,400 per year in addition to such pension; and

"Whereas the cost of living has gone up considerably during the past years and is still rising: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the amount which a single veteran without dependents is allowed as income in addition to such disability pension, be increased to $1,800 per year, as this amount would then enable the veteran to live more comfortably and relieve him from the hardships as is now the case under the present income limitations of the Veterans' Administration regulations as set by Congress."

We respectfully request that you do everything within your power to have this limitation on other income raised to $1,800 per year in the case of a veteran without dependents. Our World War I veterans are now coming to the age where they will be laid off their regular jobs because of age and will then be looking for this non-service-connected disability pension, to help with their social security benefits or other pension to care for them the rest of their lives.

Respectfully yours,

RAY HOEFLER,
Adjutant, Lozar-Mrace-Loushin Post, No. 248, the American Legion.

REHABILITATION OF FEDERAL HOG CHOLERA EXPERIMENT STATION, AMES, IOWA—RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Veterinary Medical Society favoring the rehabilitation and expansion of the Federal Hog Cholera Experiment Station near the city of Ames, Iowa.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our American swine industry represents an animal-husbandry enterprise amounting to over three and a half billion dollars annually; and

Whereas diseases and parasites cause an annual loss amounting to many millions of dollars each year; and

Whereas a great number of these problems traceable to diseases and parasites can only be solved by research: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Veterinary Medical Society urgently request that the Federal Hog Cholera Experiment Station near the city of Ames, Iowa, be rehabilitated and expanded into a fully equipped and staffed national or regional swine diseases research center and that the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture exert all possible efforts in attainment of this objective.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FREAR (for Mr. SPARKMAN), from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 33).

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 14, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 145. An act to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Rosina Livia Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. 1061. A bill to provide for minimum 1955 State rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Renato Noe and Angela Noe; and

S. 1063. A bill for the relief of Masanori Ikebe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 1064. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1065. A bill for the relief of Colette Marie Brown;

S. 1066. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Girdley;

S. 1067. A bill for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Mareanthe Baicou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1069. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1070. A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;

S. 1071. A bill to provide for the preparation of plans and specifications for a museum building for the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 1072. A bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1073. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, etc., on sensitized materials; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1075. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1076. A bill to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health-service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term, interest-bearing loans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 1077. A bill to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie White Houck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (by request):

S. 1079. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1080. A bill for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1081. A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1082. A bill for the relief of Ramon Notario Boytell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 1083. A bill for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1084. A bill for the relief of Santiago Landa Arrizabalaga; and

S. 1085. A bill for the relief of Maria de las Nieves Dufurrena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1086. A bill for the relief of Anna Ilona Purins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1087. A bill to authorize aftercare payments by the Youth Division of the United States Board of Parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1088. A bill to assist the States to return runaway children to their own communities in another State; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1089. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jo E. Inglett and Don Ramon Inglett; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with the cooperative supervision of juvenile probationers and parolees, the return of runaway juveniles, the return of juvenile delinquent escapees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROSINA LIVIA FERRANTE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is unable to be present, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Rosina Livia Ferrante.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1060) for the relief of Rosina Livia Ferrante, introduced by Mr. IVES (for Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for minimum 1955 State rice acreage allotments. The bill provides that the State rice allotment for any State for the crop year 1955 shall not be less than the 1950 acreage allotment for that State. The bill provides further that any additional acreage required to provide such minimum allotment shall be in addition to the Nation, State, and county allotments for this crop year, and that the additional acreage shall be prorated among the counties of the States on the same basis as their initial 1955 allotments bear to the State total.

Finally, the bill provides that the additional acreage made available by this measure to the States shall be made available to the counties, or parishes, and used by the county committee to provide fair and equitable increases in farm allotments.

Mr. President, the bill seeks only to do what is equitable and right, so far as the historic rice-producing States are concerned. As the Senate well knows, last month American rice producers voted overwhelmingly in favor of controlling production of rice, in return for guaranteed high price supports during the 1955 crop year. As a result, a national allotment of some 1,850,000 acres has been prorated among the rice-producing States. In most States this process of prorating has brought about equitable results. However, in the case of the historic rice-producing States—particularly Louisiana and Arkansas—the results have been in the nature of a hardship.

The law presently provides that in computing State acreage allotments for rice, equal weight shall be given to both historical production and trends in production. This provision was written into the law in order to prevent the working of hardships on States whose total rice production during the base allotment period may have been small, but whose rice industry was still growing. It was not the intent of the Congress to penalize the older, historic rice-producing areas. Let me emphasize that the 50-percent weight given to trends definitely invokes a penalty upon the historic rice-producing areas, even as it seeks to do justice to the newcomers. I do not believe that the Congress wishes to, nor that it should, impose an unreasonable hardship on any agricultural area of the Nation in allocating acreage to be planted to any controlled crop. In the case of Louisiana, rice production has remained at a relatively stable level since the 1920's. In the period 1928–32 Louisiana rice producers harvested an average of approximately 465,000 acres; by 1952, this had increased to only a little more than 588,000 acres. Incidentally, the 1952 figure of 588,000 harvested acres is precisely the same as the 10-year average for the period 1941–50. In 1953, about 613,000 acres were planted to rice. A similar situation obtains in Arkansas and in the other historic rice-producing areas, though not to the same extent.

In other words, Mr. President, Louisiana and the other historic rice-producing States receive only half as much consideration as do the newer areas, since, for all practical purposes, our acreage allotments are determined on the basis of history alone. Since the saturation point on plantings has been reached, the trend-factor carries but little weight in the historic rice-producing areas. It is to correct this inequitable situation that my colleague [Mr. LONG] and I introduce this bill.

There is one other injustice which our bill seeks to eliminate. In order to fix domestic allotments, it was necessary for the Department of Agriculture to ascertain the acreage actually planted to rice in the rice-producing States. Unfortunately, this planted acreage had not been physically measured since 1950. The only bases the Department of Agriculture had, upon which this production

could be determined, were, first, acreages as reported by the farmers; and, second, a survey acreage which was determined by the Department of Agriculture on a highly theoretical basis, and subsequently was evaluated on the basis of field surveys conducted in selected areas.

In determining the base acreage of the rice-producing States—that is, the acreage used as the starting point in imposing allotments—the Department of Agriculture did not see fit to accept the estimated production, as submitted by the farmers; nor did it actually measure the planted acres for 1954, at the time when controls for the 1955 crop became necessary. Instead, it accepted the Agricultural Marketing Service estimate, which in effect is an arbitrary and substantial reduction of the acreage figures supplied by our farmers. The basis for the Department's action seems to be that all rice producers of the Nation were guilty of overestimating their plantings. In some cases, Mr. President, acreages may have been overestimated. But I dare say that in the majority, estimated plantings were not too far wrong. The result has been to force an unrealistic allotment upon some farmers who, in good faith, sought to do the right thing by their Government. They are being injured because some of their fellows may have wrongly estimated their plantings.

Of course, Mr. President, at this time it is too late to require a physical measurement of rice acreage; it is too late to attempt to reapportion State allotments. We are faced by a fait accompli; but it is one which can be remedied, at least in part, by the simple expedient made available by the bill my colleague [Mr. LONG] and I have introduced today.

I must emphasize that the total acreage which our bill would add to the national quota is inconsequential when weighed against the hardship its nonenactment would cause and the inequities which would be worked if we were to fail to act. This is not a special-privilege bill. It is not designed to circumvent the acreage allotments proclaimed and approved by the recent farmer referendum. This measure seeks to do only justice to farmers who did not overestimate their plantings, but who had them arbitrarily reduced by the Department of Agriculture; our bill seeks to do only equity to the States which are historic rice producers—the States whose fields have been yielding rice since the turn of the century.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1061) to provide for minimum 1955 State rice acreage allotments, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, be amended by adding a new paragraph (3) to subsection (c) thereof, reading as follows:

"(3) No State acreage allotment for 1955 shall be smaller than the 1950 acreage allotment for such State. Any additional acreage required to provide such minimum allotment shall be in addition to the national, State, and county allotments of rice for 1955 and shall be prorated among the counties in such State on the basis of their respective shares of the State acreage allotment computed without regard to this paragraph. The additional acreage made avilable to counties under this paragraph shall be used by the county committee to provide fair and equitable increases in farm allotments on the basis of such of the factors set forth in subsection (b) hereof as the county committee deems appropriate."

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MARCH 2, 1945, RELATING TO COLUMBIA RIVER, BONNEVILLE, OREG.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on March 2, 1945, Congress passed a law pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg. The law authorizes an appropriation of $50,000 for the benefit of the Indians who lost their fishing rights in that area. It is now deemed proper that the law be amended so as to raise the authorization to $185,000. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to accomplish that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1069) to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg., introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, recently we have been hearing a great many comments on the subject of the highways of the United States. So much has been said on the subject that the Committee on Public Works feels it would be proper and helpful to enact legislation to codify the Federal highway laws of the United States. I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would bring about that result.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1072) to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

LIMIT OF REPRODUCTION OF CERTAIN PAPERS ON SENSITIZED MATERIALS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to limit the acquisition and use by agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1073) to limit the acquisition and use by agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

I am introducing today legislation which would limit the acquisition and use by agencies of the Federal Government of blueprint and photocopy equipment under all unnecessary circumstances and I sincerely hope that this legislation will receive the careful consideration of my colleagues.

As we know, the private, taxpaying blueprint industry of the Nation does not, individually or collectively, make up one of our largest industries. But it is a vital industry—in the production of a battleship or in the building of a home. It has been an expanding industry, growing in importance year by year. As my colleagues know, the blueprinters and photocopymen in the various communities throughout the land are fine citizens, hard workers, and upstanding, taxpaying, civic-minded individuals. Perhaps many Americans would be surprised to learn of the relatively large investment which the blueprinters and photocopy operators of the Nation, altogether, have in their buildings, equipment, and supplies. I assure you it runs into the tens of millions of dollars.

Yet, as we know is true in so many other fields of activity, Federal competition has become a factor—a worry—to these small businessmen, just as truly as it long has been a worry to businessmen in other fields of endeavor. As the Federal Government has expanded, so has the blueprint and photocopy industry inside the Federal establishment expanded. This growth has been marked particularly in the past decade.

While exact figures are difficult to obtain, according to studies made by the private blueprint and photocopy industry, much of the expensive equipment which Uncle Sam has acquired is not being used economically. When it is used, the actual costs involved in Federal blueprinting and photocopying are not taken into account. It seems that no accurate accounting is made of the space used by the Federal blueprinters and photocopy operators, or of the investment in the machinery, which depreciates just as fast in Federal hands as it does in private hands. Many other cost factors inherent in any production job are overlooked when the cost of Federal blueprinting and photocopying is computed by those in the Government itself.

As a result, private, taxpaying blueprinters in all parts of the country, who are able to do virtually all of the work done by Uncle Sam in this country, except for a small amount in the Department of Justice and in the armed services that must be carried on as a governmental activity, have lost much business that rightfully should be theirs. No one ever has argued that there is a lack of capacity in the private industry to do the job.

The private, taxpaying blueprinters and photocopy operators say frankly that they can do this work for Uncle Sam more cheaply than he can do it for himself, and all the evidence gathered so far indicates that this indeed is the truth. They also point out that Federal competition with their industry, besides being a subsidized competition, is an unfair competition. They can see no

reason why the huge Federal Government should try to compete with a relatively small, private, taxpaying industry such as theirs.

There are thousands of these blueprint and photocopy operators from coast to coast. Their plants dot the countryside, as we all know. They believe that if relations between the huge Federal establishment and private, taxpaying businessmen are to be of the best, there must be constant vigilance by both the Congress and by the executive branch to keep down subsidized competition with private business.

As all of us know, the members of the Cabinet, the President himself, and the Bureau of the Budget are of one accord in wanting to get Uncle Sam out of competition with private, taxpaying businesses in every possible way consistent with the public welfare. Certainly, that is the purpose of the majority of us in the Senate, regardless of our party, although I do believe that the Republicans are more anxious to make headway in this direction than some of our Democratic brethren. There is no reason for Congress to fight the executive branch on this issue, or vice versa. The two branches should vie with each other to see which can work most swiftly toward the goal of getting the Federal Government out of the hair of private, taxpaying businesses at every good opportunity.

I believe that if this bill is enacted, it will go a long way toward helping the Bureau of the Budget to get a better picture of the blueprint and photocopy operations of the Federal Government and to chart a better course for cutting the amount of such work which Uncle Sam has been doing for himself, to the detriment of the taxpayer and of the private, taxpaying blueprint and photocopy industry. If the men who are in charge of the Bureau of the Budget then do their duty—and I believe they will—we will see a diminishing of the work along this line done by the subsidized Federal blueprinters and photocopy plants and an increase in the amount of work given to the private, taxpaying companies in all sections of the Nation.

IMPROVEMENT OF MARKETING FACILITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill, to be known as the Marketing Facilities Improvement Act, to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities.

This bill is a companion to a measure which will be introduced in the House of Representatives tomorrow by Representative HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. It is an outgrowth of the long interest and study Mr. COOLEY has made into improved terminal marketing facilities with the cooperation of marketing experts in the Department of Agriculture. While it was my intent to help press for action on this constructive measure by introducing it in the Senate simultaneously with the introduction of the companion bill in the House, I am introducing the bill in the Senate today rather than tomorrow only because the Senate will not be in session tomorrow.

My own interest in seeking improved facilities for the marketing of perishable agricultural products has led me to the conclusion that this measure developed after careful study and research by Representative COOLEY is entitled to consideration and action by this Congress.

It is the purpose of this proposed act to facilitate, encourage, and assist municipalities and political subdivisions of States, public agencies, and instrumentalities of one or more States or municipalities, public corporations and boards, and private enterprise in the creation and development of modern and efficient public wholesale markets for the handling of perishable agricultural commodities in areas where such markets are found to be needed, and where Federal assistance is requested and authorized as prescribed in the bill. Our aim is that unnecessary costs and burdens attendant upon the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities, caused by inadequate or obsolete facilities, may be eliminated and that the spread between the amount received by producers and the amount paid by consumers may be reduced. We hope that purpose can be achieved by the use of insured mortgages under a revolving fund created by this bill.

Marketing of perishable agricultural commodities affects the public welfare, and is quite properly a matter of grave national concern.

Vast quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other perishable agricultural commodities shipped from various producing areas located throughout the United States and foreign countries pass through and are handled in public marketing facilities located in large consuming areas, which are, in most instances, inadequate and obsolete. The handling of perishable agricultural commodities in such facilities results in many uneconomic practices, greatly increasing costs and causing undue losses, excessive waste, spoilage and deterioration, which in turn, cause producers to receive prices far below the reasonable value of their products, unduly and arbitrarily enhances costs of operations in such markets, and increases the price of food to consumers.

The prices of all perishable farm commodities are directly affected by the prices made on these public markets, and are adversely affected by the unduly burdensome costs resulting from obsolescent and inadequate facilities. Such antiquated facilities create an undue restraint and unjust burden on interstate commerce, and make it imperative that appropriate measures be taken to free such commerce from such burdens and thereby protect producers and consumers alike against oppressive costs.

Modern facilities would make possible the saving of millions of dollars annually, by removing the cause of many of the unnecessary costs and burdens.

In spite of the great need for improved facilities efforts in the past have failed to bring about a satisfactory solution to the problem. This failure has been due largely to the inability of farmers, dealers, brokers, commission merchants and others, individually or collectively, to obtain through regular financial channels the relatively large amounts of capital necessary for the construction of modern facilities.

As a result, this bill proposes to confer upon the Secretary of Agriculture power to aid in establishing such public marketing facilities for the wholesale handling of fresh fruits and vegetables, poultry, eggs, dairy products, and other perishable agricultural commodities and seafood, as will be conducive to orderly and efficient distribution, increased consumption, and a reduction in the spread between prices paid by consumers and those received by farmers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1075) to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ASSISTANCE IN PROVIDING VOLUNTARY HEALTH SERVICES FACILITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist voluntary nonprofit, prepaid health service associations by providing for long-term, interest-bearing loans. This is a bill which should be enacted by the 84th Congress and I intend to press for action on it. It is my hope that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will hold hearings on the bill shortly and move it to the floor with a favorable report.

It is a matter of real personal satisfaction to me to note, for the information of the Senate, that during the last Congress the then chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, introduced a companion bill to accomplish the same objective. I am delighted to be associated with him in this bipartisan move to improve health facilities of the American people.

The constant fear which faces many Americans is how to pay doctor bills. Countless Americans also face the problem in their communities, particularly in rural America, of how to find a doctor even if the means for paying the bills are available.

All over America there have been developing the institutions providing prepaid health services and the group practice of medicine. All over the Nation there are American citizens who have found by experience that, if they pool their potential need for medical care and agree to prepay the cost of such care through a medical fund, they can accomplish in a voluntary group what they cannot accomplish individually.

My own State of Minnesota has been the home of many such prepaid services operated on a group and cooperative basis. I have in recent years discussed the question of medical care with many of my fellow citizens. They tell me that there are two prerequisites for an effective and well-operated voluntary health program. First is the need to establish a modern medical office and laboratory which will induce physicians to locate in the community where the citizens need and desire medical service. Second is the necessity to obtain a community pool of funds, derived from prepayments which will insure adequate income for

the physicians in bad times, as well as in good times.

Modern medicine is complicated. It demands good facilities for the doctor. When such facilities are not available, it is difficult to induce good physicians to come to a community and practice medicine. In a number of the smaller communities and even in a number of the larger ones, adequate medical facilities are simply not available; neither are minimum hospital facilities available to care for minor medical and surgical cases.

On December 18, 1952, the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation reported the results of their intensive study. One of their recommendations was that "Federal loans be made to local organizations desiring to institute prepayment plans associated with group practice, for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of group practice facilities." That is the object of the bills I have introduced since the 81st Congress and of the bill which I introduce again today. I welcome the support of the Commission for my bill.

My bill provides that if a group of people in a community where health facilities are inadequate get together and form a voluntary health-plan organization and are prepared to assume the financial responsibility for working out their own problem, then they may apply for low-interest repayable loans from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable them to finance the physician's facilities which their community requires.

This is the essence of my bill and is the essence of voluntary association. Its basic aim is to encourage groups of people to take direct responsibility for the solution of their health-care problems. The plan which these people develop must, of course, be sound and gain the approval of the Surgeon General.

The successful operation of this bill would attract doctors to areas where they are needed and would make it easier for the American people to pay their medical bills. It would bring health facilities to American people, just as the principles of cooperative voluntary association brought electricity to rural America.

Voluntary association is the foundation of a democratic society. We are a nation of joiners. Our citizens belong to churches, Rotary clubs, women's organizations, trade unions, junior chambers of commerce, Knights of Columbus, sewing circles—indeed, to many thousands of religious, fraternal, political, and social organizations. This is what creates the democratic spirit in our country. The process of voluntary association is the essence of freedom. A good government is one which stimulates that kind of association.

If freedom and democracy survive the crisis of today, it will, in my judgment, be due primarily to the vigor of the people directing their own efforts through voluntary organizations for the solution of their pressing day-to-day problems. The partnership of government with people acting through voluntary associations is the inspiration of practical democracy.

We can apply this principle as we seek to solve the health needs of the American people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1076) to assist voluntary nonprofit associations offering prepaid health-service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment through long-term interest-bearing loans, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITED TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN JUVENILES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the Youth Division of the United States Board of Parole to give limited temporary assistance, when needed, to juveniles and youthful offenders placed on parole from the several Federal institutions involved.

In the course of our work over the past 2 years one of the responsibilities of our subcommittee was to examine Federal programs for the handling of juveniles and young people who violated Federal laws. In conducting our investigation, we became aware of certain conditions which handicap the operation of these programs. At least one of these handicaps is subject to remedial action by the Congress. Specifically, I refer to the total lack of funds available for making small advances which many juveniles and youthful offenders need when leaving one of the Federal institutions. Indeed for the want of very limited financial assistance, it is sometimes necessary for paroles to be delayed, or to accept a second or third best plan for a particular boy or girl as the only possible alternative.

This bill authorizes the Youth Division of the United States Board of Parole to make payments out of the appropriation for "Support of United States Prisoners" in order to give juveniles and youthful offenders financial assistance upon placement from a Federal institution. Payments are restricted to a total of not more than $200 to any one parolee and to the first 90 days of parole supervision.

The sum of money needed for this purpose would be quite small, Mr. President. We estimate that not more than $15,000 would be required each year and we recommend that the Congress authorize the necessary expenditure to meet this vital need.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1087) to authorize aftercare payments by the Youth Division of the United States Board of Parole, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CARE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill and a joint resolution dealing with the perplexing and damaging problems confronting and presented by runaway children. These proposals grow out of the extensive explorations of these problems which we have made in the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

It requires no expert knowledge to know that a child loose on the roads is a child in serious danger. The runaway child quickly exhausts his meager funds—if he had any to start with—and, hungry and homeless and usually subjected to wrong companions, he is an easy and ready prey to delinquency. Apprehended as destitute or delinquent, thousands of these youngsters are annually thrown into jail where they are exposed to every form of vice and schooling in crime.

I am not talking about a small handful of children. The survey conducted by our subcommittee reveals that at least 200,000 children become runaways each year. More than half of these youngsters go from one State to another, a factor which complicates the problem and makes Federal action imperative.

The aim of society in behalf of the runaway youngster should be to apprehend him and get him back to his own community as quickly as possible, avoiding jail detention or any other injurious practice in the process. Achievement of this aim is presently defeated by two conditions. The first is a lack of ready funds to pay the costs of transportation and care for the runaway. The second is that of the unresolved legal questions arising out of lack of uniform laws and procedures and reciprocal agreements among the States.

In view of the pressing demands for child welfare funds, it is not surprising that a State is reluctant to spend for out-of-State children, money which is badly needed to help and care for their own children who are in need. The fact is that expenditures for handling out-of-State runaways involve substantial sums for many localities. Some communities receiving large numbers of youngsters spend tens of thousands of dollars to render even poor and inadequate services.

The first measure we are introducing is a bill to provide for financial grants to the States for the development of procedures and services designed to get the runaway child back to his community as quickly as possible, and to provide such interim care as will protect his welfare.

In our judgment, however, the Federal Government should not go on ad infinitum paying these costs. Rather, they should be shifted as rapidly as possible to the States where the youngsters live. For this reason, the proposed program has a 10-year time limitation.

For this reason, too, we are introducing a second measure—a joint resolution giving consent to States to enter into compacts providing for the detention and care of children who run away and cross

from one State to another. We believe that as uniform measures, including reimbursement for expenditures, are developed and agreed upon among the States, the Federal Government can withdraw from participation in the program.

The joint resolution also gives consent to the States to enter into compacts providing that a child on probation or parole in one State and moving into another may continue to be given needed supervision by the authorities of the second State. At the present time, children on probation and parole either are refused permission to leave the State or, more frequently, are, for all practical purposes, discharged from probation or parole irrespective of their need for continued guidance and supervision. This resulting lack of supervision permits many boys and girls to drift quickly back into delinquency.

We believe that both the bill and the joint resolution, if enacted, will contribute immeasurably to better protection for that group of our children who are particularly vulnerable to juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD brief analyses of both the bill and the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analyses will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 1008. A bill to assist the States to return runaway children to their own communities in another State; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The analysis of the bill (S. 1088) presented by Mr. HENNINGS, is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL TO ASSIST STATES TO RETURN RUNAWAY CHILDREN

TITLE I

Authorizes the appropriation of $300,000, to be available until expended, for making payments to States to assist them in (1) surveying their needs for provision to return runaway children to their own communities in another State; (2) studying the adequacy of resources to meet those needs; and (3) developing State plans for programs to return such runaways. The program is to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To obtain funds, a State must, under section 102, submit an application to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such application must, among other things, designate either the State public-welfare agency or a State agency whose primary functions relate to the welfare of children to carry out the above purposes. Allotments of funds appropriated are to be made on the basis of the ratio of the State's child population to the total child population, except that the minimum allotment for each State is to be no less than $2,000. The State is required to match the Federal funds on a 50–50 basis. Provision is made in section 104 for withholding certification from a State by the Secretary for certain specified reasons and for the right of the State to appeal to the United States District Court of Appeals in the event of such withholding.

TITLE II

This title provides for a 10-year program to assist States to return runaway children under 18 years of age to their communities in another State. The sum of $2 million is authorized to be appropriated for the first year and thereafter for such sums as Congress determines. Allotments are to be made on the same formula as under title I, except that they are to be made annually from the sums appropriated and no minimum sum is specified for each State. A reallotment provision is also included so that sums allotted to States which cannot use them may be reallotted to States with need for such additional funds. Provisions for withholding certifications of the Secretary and for appeal to the United States District Court, similar to those in title I, are also included in this title.

TITLE III

The provisions contained in this title deal with general administration, including appropriations, definitions, and regulations.

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with the cooperative supervision of juvenile probationers and parolees, the return of runaway juveniles, the return of juvenile-delinquent escapees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The analysis of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 44), presented by Mr. HENNINGS, is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION TO GIVE THE CONSENT OF THE CONGRESS TO INTERSTATE COMPACTS OR AGREEMENTS DEALING WITH THE COOPERATIVE SUPERVISION OF JUVENILE PROBATIONERS AND PAROLEES, THE RETURN OF RUNAWAY JUVENILES, THE RETURN OF JUVENILE-DELINQUENT ESCAPEES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section I gives consent of the Congress to the several States to enter into compacts to the end that:

1. Juveniles placed on probation or parole by the authorities of one State and moving with the family to another State to be given probation or parole supervision by the authorities of the second State.

2. A child who has run away from one State to another may be returned to his parent, guardian, or agency having custody of such child in such manner as will best safeguard his welfare.

3. A juvenile violating probation or parole while residing in a State agreeing to provide probation or parole supervision for a juvenile from another State to be returned to the sending State.

Such compacts would do much to safeguard the welfare of both runaway juveniles and juveniles who need continuing probation or parole supervision and whose families are leaving the jurisdiction where such supervision may presently be provided.

Section II requires approval of the legislatures of the States entering the compact.

Section III defines "State" to include all States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

PROTECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AGAINST BODILY ATTACK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard.

The bill would extend to members of the Armed Forces the protection of Federal law against unprovoked violence while such personnel are on duty or on account of the performance of their duty. It would amend title 18 of the code, and would give members of all the armed services the same protection that is now accorded to a long list of Federal officers and employees, including members of the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1089) to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in explanation and support of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

I also request that a letter I have received from the Department of the Air Force, outlining the incidents of unprovoked violence against members of the Air Force during the calendar year 1954, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE UNPROVOKED VIOLENCE AGAINST UNIFORMED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, WHILE THEY ARE IN DUTY STATUS, A FEDERAL OFFENSE

We have been working on this bill for almost 5 years. I first introduced a similar measure as an amendment to the universal military training bill in the spring of 1951. During the 83d Congress, this identical bill was introduced as S. 703. A similar measure was introduced in 1944, with the active support of the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. At that time the bill in question was favorably reported out of committee but never acted upon. In its present form this proposal has overcome a number of technical difficulties which arose in regard to earlier versions.

In the past the Department of Defense has formally endorsed this proposal, and I hope that similar endorsement will be forthcoming from the Department at this time.

The simple effect of this bill would be to provide Federal sanctions against unprovoked physical assault on uniformed military personnel if committed while such personnel are engaged in performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty. Persons charged with such assault could be tried in a Federal court.

This bill, if enacted into law, would be especially effective in protecting servicemen belonging to minority groups or who might otherwise be the objects of prejudice in particular localities of our Nation. This law

would make clear that the uniform of our country extends to all its wearers the protection of Federal law in the performance of duty. We already extend such protection to many categories of Federal officers and employees, including members of the Coast Guard. These officers range from marshals and deputy marshals to game wardens and meat inspectors. Certainly we should give our servicemen the same protection we now give food and drug inspectors.

It is common knowledge that in many of our localities where there are large numbers of servicemen in training camps and base installations the police protection which can be provided by the local enforcement officers is very inadequate.

Many local authorities have neither the personnel nor the resources to provide sufficient protection to our servicemen against violence and bodily attack. A military policeman or other military personnel who is on duty to protect servicemen and maintain order must be given adequate legal protection against bodily harm if he, in turn, is to be an effective instrument of law and order. He must be assured that persons assaulting him or other personnel on duty will be promptly apprehended and prosecuted.

The need for this type of legislation seems to me to be increasingly important as we approach the consideration of any modified type of universal military training program or expanded reserve program as recommended by the President.

The evidence over the past few years shows that there is often an increase in incidence of attacks on military personnel in areas where local enforcement is lax in apprehending those who provoke the assault.

I have in mind a small town near a large Army camp where, within the last year or two, a Federal grand jury has accused the entire police force for failing to provide protection for the soldiers on leave in the town, and where unprovoked attacks against military police were frequent. According to press reports, the local police force was involved in importing illegal liquor, protecting prostitutes, and maintaining gambling establishments. The military police were seriously hampered in carrying out their mission in this community, and the final result was the closing of the community to all military personnel.

Such cases are not typical, but a law which would extend the protection of the Federal Government to those officers and men who have been assigned the task of protecting soldiers on leave, seems to us to be only a prerequisite for providing adequate protection to our men and women in the service, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

I have asked the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to supply me with data for the calendar year 1954 on the number of instances of unprovoked attack against their uniformed personnel. I am including with my remarks the report of the Secretary of the Air Force, and expect to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the reports from the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy when they are received.

I should like to point out that this proposal has the support of Senators from all parts of the Nation, and in many of the sponsors' States there are large military installations where the need for this type of legislation constantly arises.

I hope that this year Congress will be able to act swiftly in providing the protection which our military personnel need.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 3, 1955.

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Reference is made to your recent letter concerning unprovoked attacks by civilians against Air Force personnel stationed within the United States.

The attached list includes only those incidents serious enough to arouse public interest, concern, or other reaction. No statistics are maintained on cases which do not cause a reaction to the extent that counteraction by the Air Force is warranted. Incidents that have been invited or precipitated by Air Force personnel have not been included.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

Assaults on airmen by civilians, calendar year 1954

Date	Nature of charge	Location	
		Air Force area	Army area
Feb. 22, 1954	Assault with intent to murder (4 airmen attacked by unknown assailant).	10	5th.
Mar. 23, 1954	Assault, airman hospitalized.	1	1st.
Apr. 24, 1954	Murder of technical sergeant.	4	6th.
May 18, 1954	Aggravated assault with deadly weapon.	4	6th.
June 17, 1954	Manslaughter	14	3d.
July 4, 1954	Assault, airman hospitalized.	14	4th.
July 5, 1954	Murder of airman	1	2d.
July 24, 1954	Assault	1	1st.
Aug. 7, 1954	Homicide, airman killed by deputy sheriff.	14	4th.
Aug. 17, 1954	Assault with intent to murder.	14	4th.
Aug. 27, 1954	Robbery with intent to murder.	14	3d.
Sept. 11, 1954	Murder of airman	14	4th.
Oct. 18, 1954	Assault with deadly weapon.	14	3d.
Oct. 24, 1954	do	14	4th.
Nov. 5, 1954	do	14	4th.
Nov. 6, 1954	Assault with deadly weapon (airman shot trying to prevent robbery).	4	6th.
Nov. 17, 1954	Assault and robbery	1	2d.
Dec. 2, 1954	Assault with deadly weapon (4 airmen assaulted by 3 civilians armed with knives. 2 airmen hospitalized.	14	3d.
Dec. 3, 1954	Felonious assault	14	4th.
Dec. 13, 1954	do	14	4th.
Dec. 14, 1954	Assault with deadly weapon.	4	6th.
Dec. 30, 1954	do	14	4th.

Mr. LEHMAN. I expect to receive similar reports from the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy within the near future. Together with the Air Force report, these reports will indicate the extent of the problem with which this bill attempts to deal.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and at his request, I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to carry out President Eisenhower's program for emergency Federal aid to school construction which was introduced on February 8, 1955.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 362) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF JUDGES OF MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS AND MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 9, strike out lines 2 and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the first day of the first fiscal year—

"(1) following a fiscal year for which the receipts of the Government have exceeded the expenditures of the Government, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

CONDOLENCES OF CONGRESS TO FAMILIES OF OFFICERS AND MEN WHO LOST THEIR LIVES ON THE U. S. S. "BENNINGTON"

Mr. IVES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas the people of the United States have been inspired by the heroic and gallant action of the officers and crew members of the United States ship *Bennington* in combating the emergency created when such vessel was damaged by explosions on May 26, 1954; and

Whereas witnesses of the tragic incident have given numerous accounts of feats of heroism performed by the officers and crew members of the United States ship *Bennington* in carrying out rescue operations following such explosion; and

Whereas clear thinking, positive leadership, and cooperative spirit prevailed among the officers and crew members of the United States ship *Bennington* during such emergency evidencing the fact that such officers and crew members conducted themselves in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Navy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby tenders its condolences to the families of those officers and crew members of the United States ship *Bennington* who lost their lives when such vessel was damaged by explosions on May 26, 1954, and expresses its

appreciation of, and its commendation for, the gallantry and devotion to duty of the officers and crew members of the United States ship *Bennington*.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the next of kin of each of the deceased, and a copy to each officer and crew member of the United States ship *Bennington* who was serving aboard such vessel on May 26, 1954.

REVISION AND REPRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and directed to revise, by bringing up to date, the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government," as set out in House Document 465, 79th Congress.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a Senate document, and there be printed 100,000 additional copies, of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 66,150 copies for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate Document Room, and 6,000 for the House Document Room.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement issued by him discussing the action of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. in circulating Dean Clarence Manion's proposal that the TVA be sold.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Statement prepared by him on the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

Statement prepared by him dealing with unemployment and production.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF TREVOR GARDNER TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on February 8 the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, announced that the committee would hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 17, on the nomination of Mr. Trevor Gardner to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Subsequent commitments have made it necessary for the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, to be absent from the city on February 17. The chairman of the committee has therefore agreed to postponement of consideration of Mr. Gardner's nomination until the following week, Thursday, February 24, and has requested that this announcement be made.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON H. R. 1, RELATING TO THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 83, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, held by the Committee on Ways and Means for the use of the said committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this matter was taken up with me by the acting majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I have also discussed the subject with the ranking Republican member on that committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. He has no objection to the resolution being considered at this time. It is a matter of comity between the two Houses of Congress, and the additional copies of the hearings should be made available. Therefore, I have no objection to the concurrent resolution being acted upon now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The motion was agreed to.

THE COMMUNIST PROBLEM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, portions of the radio broadcast to be made February 19, 1955, before the World Affairs Council of Northern California, on the topic "Is Peaceful Coexistence Possible?" The broadcast gives the viewpoint of Prof. Robert J. Kerner, director of the Institute of Slavic Studies at the University of California, in Berkeley, Calif.

I might say, Mr. President, I believe Dr. Kerner is one of the outstanding experts on Russian history. More than a year ago he wrote me a memorandum in which he predicted that the service of Mr. Malenkov, as the headman in the Soviet hierarchy, would be limited to a fairly short time. He predicted that Khrushchev would rise to power in the Presidium. Over the years I think his observations on the Soviet Union have been as clear as those of any living person, and his remarks are worthy of the attention of all Members of the Senate on this vital subject.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE POSSIBLE?

(Prepared by R. J. Kerner)

(Notes for radio broadcast, February 19, 1955, KGO, World Affairs Council of Northern California on topic "Is Peaceful Coexistence Possible?" Participants: J. H. Adam Watson, Counsellor at the British Embassy in Washington, and Robert J. Kerner, director of the Institute of Slavic Studies and Sather professor of history, University of California, Berkeley.)

1. Is peaceful coexistence possible? On the basis of the Kremlin definition and practice of "peaceful existence," well known to competent students, the answer is "No." According to the Moscow definition of the formula, "peaceful coexistence" is possible only when both sides want it. If, according to Stalin, "one side does not want cooperation, the result will be conflict, war." In other words, if one side does not accept the proposals and terms of the Moscow Presidium or yields enough to satisfy them that they are making progress in their world revolution (Molotov's "our great cause," Malenkov's "invincible cause"), it is lacking in "the desire to cooperate." To put it in still another way, the Kremlin's "peaceful coexistence" means they will coexist with the western powers, until they can subvert them or overrun them militarily. Hence, to cooperate, the western powers must continually retreat, until they have their backs to the wall and until Moscow is ready to fight the third world war, after having previously obtained everything it could by subversion and peaceful coexistence and at last attained such preponderance that it can win that war. The peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, and China, as well as Korea and Indochina, know what "peaceful coexistence" means.

In this cycle of Kremlin foreign policy, begun when Moscow instituted the cold war in the spring of 1945 before the Second World War was ended, the time may come, say in a year, or 2, or 3, when the virile portion of the Western Powers, in desperation and at great disadvantage, will finally stand and fight, while the anemic portion of the Western Powers will seek refuge in neutrality along with the remainder of the still non-Communist world.

2. Under what conditions or terms could there be peaceful coexistence as understood in the West? The answer is also clear. These conditions or terms would presuppose an entirely new Russia which would have to disavow and cease the practice of spreading the world revolution, give up its subversive policies through its controlled 40 to 50 Communist parties all over the world, at least permit really free elections in the satellite countries and give independence to Austria and Germany. Some would go even further and demand that the political monopoly of the Communist Party in the Soviet Empire be abolished and real opposition parties be established.

3. Once any set of conditions or terms is formulated, it is seen that both peaceful coexistence on the Kremlin's terms and peaceful coexistence on the terms of Western democracy are unrealistic and, at best, wishful thinking.

4. Is there a road to durable peace which the Western Powers can take? To this question the answer is still "yes" during the period indicated above—i. e., until Moscow decides upon the final showdown. The formula for this is not only to talk from strength—which among other things means no cutting of the military budget—but a real and effective policy of liberation of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, standing up to indicate that no other free nation or part of it will be sacrificed to the aggressive world revolutionary policies of Moscow or Peiping. In such a vigorous policy a European Locarno or Asiatic Locarno, as advocated by London is a setback, a retreat. To be free of such an obligation that a Locarno-type pact would impose on their known objectives, Moscow and Peiping resolutely rejected the proposal. Such a policy would also oppose what had been done outside the United Nations at the recent Geneva Conference about Indochina and is now being attempted by Britain, India, and Soviet Russia regarding Formosa. Allies, to remain allies, should not deliver ultimatums to each other. By this

behind-the-scenes activity, they have and will do so. This is in accord with the Kremlin tactic for bringing discord among the allies. No ally should fall for that and still insist it is an ally. East-West trade should be regulated with the objective in mind to slow down Moscow's war preparations.

5. One of the sadest observations among competent students of Soviet Russia is to see statesmen and diplomats still unaware after 37 years that the rise of Soviet Russia is an entirely new phenomenon in international relations because of its world revolutionary objectives which are being attained only in part by the old-fashioned conventional diplomacy but largely and chiefly by unconventional or subversive policies. To ignore the latter is the road to disaster. The chief exponents of Western diplomacy still hang on to conventional diplomacy, and wink at the subversive policies or refuse to bring them into their calculations, out of fear or sheer ignorance.

6. The most recent events in Soviet Russia indicate that Khrushchev is fast becoming its No. 1 man, which in turn means the faction which he heads consisting of Molotov, Voroshilov, Bulganin, and Kaganovich, is definitely forging ahead of Malenkov, Saburov and Pervukhin in the nine-man Presidium of the central committee of the Communist Party and in its reorganization of that committee, as well as the regional and autonomous province committees. The party, under the control of the Khrushchev faction, directs the government which is headed by Malenkov, who was deprived of the prize post of first secretary back in March, 1953. The Khrushchev faction, therefore, at this time is supreme and has ended the honeymoon of the government and the populace regarding consumer's goods promised them after the death of Stalin. The transformation of the peasant from collective farm worker and part-time worker on his tiny farmstead to that of day laborer is on the way, while Soviet leaders have visions of the inability of grain production and animal husbandry to feed the populace. Labor productivity in industry lags, while the party steps up heavy industry and tapers off light industry or consumers goods, all in the rush of preparations for a third world war, if that is deemed necessary.

7. Difficult as it is to chart the course of a vigorous American foreign policy these days, the task confronting the British Foreign Office is much more difficult, if not impossible. In the face of nuclear annihilation in England, it is Sir Anthony Eden's task to make a unified and harmonious policy out of widely divergent interests and motives—out of Britain's internal political setup, Britain's security position in Europe, the divergent interests of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and of the British Empire. How effective and vigorous can such a policy be after all? This in spite of the fact that the British have in the past fought successfully in two world wars. One can scarcely blame them, if their policy vis-a-vis Soviet Russia shows signs of weakness and continuous compromise. In spite of our understanding of these difficulties and the definite change since May, 1953, in this direction instituted by Sir Winston Churchill, American foreign policy can scarcely be expected to weaken down to the level indicated. Rather the reverse should be true, for the United States, regarded as the last great bastion which Moscow must subvert or conquer, is also exposed to nuclear annihilation. The American people will not yield to Communist China's recognition and admission to the United Nations or to any surrender or decisive weakening, however covered up, of Formosa. Such policies will inevitably lead to the loss of all Asia and most of Africa. The failure to achieve the West German rearmament in Europe would expose Western Europe to easy aggression. The 12 German divisions called for under the agreement are, in fact, only a token of the hope and the will of Western Europe to defend itself against Soviet forces many times superior.

Moscow is fully informed on the reasons for Sir Winston's shift of policy in May, 1953. Is it likely to become less aggressive when it knows that British policy is inspired by fear of nuclear attack? Actually the experience has been just the reverse and the "change of attitude" which he anticipated has not materialized. Soviet Russia will soon be in a position to deliver nuclear attacks by airplane and submarine, if it is not in a position to do so now.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the printing of the radio broadcast there may also be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a memorandum from the Czech Christian Democratic Movement in Exile, addressed to the administration and the Congress of the United States, pointing out, from the point of view of the Czechs and Slovaks, who ultimately hope to be free of the Communist tyranny, certain views which they have, and expressing the hope that ultimately the people behind the Iron Curtain will be liberated from the oppression under which they now suffer.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CZECH CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT,
New York, October 28, 1954.

To the Administration and the Congress of the United States of America:

The Czech Christian Democratic Movement in Exile expresses its profound conviction that communism, so long as it exists as a political power, will remain a menace to the liberty and security of the free world. We agree wholeheartedly with the Committee on Communist Aggression of the United States House of Representatives that any policy of containment, appeasement, or coexistence must be rejected. Such a policy denies the duty of the Christian toward all those who are victims of slavery, terror, or criminal aggression. As we have learned from the bitter experience of our own country, the attempt to coexist with communism leads inevitably to the destruction of human freedom.

We look to the United States for leadership in a crusade of freedom-loving peoples to restore freedom throughout the world. Since coexistence is morally and politically impossible, measures of mere defense, however urgent they may be, are the best temporary expedients. The fight for liberation is a matter of common interest: in helping other peoples to regain their fredom, the American people will secure their own.

Behind the smokescreen of coexistence, the Communists are arming for a third world war, which they will unleash as soon as they are confident of victory. The only way to prevent this war is through a dynamic program of liberation which will weaken the Communists' warmaking power. Based on our knowledge of political conditions and public psychology in Central Europe, in the Czech lands in particular, we take the liberty of suggesting the following policies which we consider essential:

1. American radio propaganda, such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, should not limit itself to attacking the particular groups of conspirators now in power in Communist countries. Such propaganda, to have more than superficial effect, must develop a broad campaign against the entire system of Marxian socialism. It must show why communism as well as socialism as an intermediate step to communism destroy human freedom in the spheres of politics, economics, sociology, culture, and religion.

2. Such propaganda should not be entirely negative, but should support positively and actively the free-enterprise system. By presenting simple facts it can be shown that free-enterprise countries such as the United States, Belgium, and West Germany have gone farthest toward a classless society and in affording the workers a high standard of living. Conversely, it can be shown that socialism and communism increase class distinctions, and that the poverty and fear in Communist countries is caused directly by the Socialist order.

3. The total aim of American propaganda should be to intensify the dissatisfaction of the workers behind the Iron Curtain with the Socialist order and to make them want a free-enterprise system. Such propaganda cannot, of course, be carried on by those who are themselves Socialists and collaborators of the Communists.

4. Broadcasts for Czechoslovakia should be divided into three sections: Czech, Slovak, and Sudeten German. These broadcast programs should stress the right of the Slovak nation to self-determination, the right of the Sudeten Germans to return to the Sudetenland, as well as the need for the Czechs, Slovaks, and Sudeten Germans to work out a federal solution for living together.

5. As a first step toward actual liberation, military forces of the free world in Europe should be built up until they are at least capable of withstanding available Soviet forces. This includes German armed forces freed from arbitrary limitations as to quantity and quality of armament, as well as contingents from the nations behind the Iron Curtain. The latter should be organized in terms of nationality without regard to existing states.

6. As the balance of military power in Europe is restored, American and other western propaganda can make its objective increasingly specific. The ultimate objective is to cause the enslaved peoples to revolt against the Communist puppets and their Soviet masters. The events of June 1953 in Eastern Germany and other satellites have shown that the victims of communism are quite ready to do so with even the least hope of success.

7. As the first basic step in any program of liberation, it is necessary to decide how much and what kind of help will be given to the enslaved peoples when they make their bid for freedom. American broadcasts already encourage opposition to the Communist satellite governments, and such opposition is senseless unless it aims at the ultimate overthrow of Bolshevist tyranny. Since Americans are now asking the Czechs and other captive nations to resist Soviet terror, we as Czech exiles, ask the American Government and people: what will you do to help us against the puppet governments and against the Soviets should they intervene to quash a revolt which gives promise of success? American psychological warfare can never be more than superficially effective until this basic question has been answered.

8. At the appropriate time, general strikes should be called against the Bolshevist tyrants. As Lenin pointed out, the general strike is a revolutionary weapon and should be used only for revolutionary ends. Therefore, such a strike should not be called until all factors, including the amount and kind of help to be expected from the West, are such that the enslaved people has a reasonable probability of regaining its freedom.

9. Propaganda to Iron Curtain countries is not made in a vacuum. It is part of total policy, and must be related to a long-term program with a definite objective. Since such programs involve commitments which only Congress can make, it is our belief that

more active congressional participation in the shaping of United States propaganda policy would lend the authority needed for effective appeal to the peoples of Czechoslovakia and other enslaved European countries.

JOSEF KALVODA,
Vice President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the memorandum, a declaration on the crisis in the Far East by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, in which there are pointed out some of the dangers involved in certain of the steps which are being proposed in certain countries of the world, namely, the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, and other acts of appeasement. I ask unanimous consent that the declaration be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE FAR EAST—DECLARATION BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The Moscow-Peiping axis continues its direct and indirect aggression on every front. All efforts of the free world to lessen international tension by appeasing the Communist war lords have only served to whet their appetite for more conquest, intensify their subversive activities, step up their drive against democratic collective-security plans, and resort to new frontal military assaults.

While we indorse President Eisenhower's proposal, approved by the Senate and House, for invigorated defense measures to halt further Moscow-Peiping axis aggression in the Chinese theater of conflict, we strongly warn against any attempt, under cover of pursuing the armistice pattern set in Korea and Indochina, to grant the Russian-imposed Mao Tse-tung terror regime American recognition and to smuggle it into the United Nations. The issue in this theater of strife and combat involves far more than the possession of any particular island. The fate of all Asia, and consequently the fate of the entire world, is at stake here.

If the free peoples should yield piecemeal to the Communist aggressors, if retrenchment and retreat, under the guise of disengagement, be the policy of the democracies, then only catastrophe awaits the free world. If democratic governments will be neutral in the struggle between aggressionist totalitarian slavery and human liberty, they will only weaken the freedom-loving peoples and further the sinister aims of the Moscow-Peiping axis. Then the prospects for national independence, improved conditions of life and labor, and the advancement of human liberty and social justice would, indeed, be very dark.

The hour calls for the highest effort by all freedom-loving peoples to increase their military, economic, and political strength and joint action in order to deter and, if need be, defeat Moscow-Peiping military aggression. In the interest of preserving peace and freedom, the executive council of the A. F. of L., therefore, proposes:

1. Toward a peaceful and democratic conclusion of the Chinese civil war, which has been inspired and organized by Moscow and which has become a source of profound international tension, the U. N. should accept and supervise the execution of the following proposal made by Mao Tse-tung, in his pledge to the Chinese people, in 1937, "to submit to a democratic decision of the whole country the question of whether the Soviet system of society is to be adopted by the whole of China or not."

2. Until such time as the entire Chinese people will have the opportunity to elect freely their own government, the Republic of China should be recognized as the only legitimate government and the Mao Tse-tung dictatorship should be kept out of the U. N. as a foreign-imposed regime convicted of military aggression against the United Nations and guilty of violating the basic principles of international law.

3. Toward deterring further Moscow-Peiping aggression against any territory or people in Asia, our Government should (a) step up its economic and military aid to the Republic of China, Republic of Korea, Thailand, Philippines, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia; (b) enter into a mutual aid pact with every country willing to defend itself against Communist aggression and subversion; (c) strive to strengthen and transform SEATO from a consultative into an effective body for joint action in defense of peace and freedom.

4. Toward saving the Republic of Indonesia from losing its national independence and democratic liberties through Communist infiltration and subversion, our Government should invite President Soekarno and Vice President Hatta to visit our country and seek agreement for preparing joint action to preserve and strengthen the democracy, promote the economic well-being and protect the national freedom of the people of Indonesia.

5. Toward advancing the cause of national independence in Africa and Asia and preventing the extension of neutralism as an aid to Communist imperialism in these areas, our country should actively support the aspirations to national freedom by the peoples of north Africa and should immediately seek to have the U. N. set up a permanent commission charged with the task of promoting the self-determination of the colonial people and setting a definite time limit within which they will attain their complete national sovereignty.

6. Toward the free world discontinuing all economic aid—trade, credits, etc.—to the totalitarian dictatorships now facing serious political and economic difficulties caused by Communist policies and the burdens of huge aggressive military establishments, toward replacing such Iron Curtain markets and toward strengthening the free nations' economy by expanding trade relations among them, stabilizing basic raw material prices, improving productivity and raising the purchasing power of the people—thereby, enlarging the domestic markets and the importing capacities especially of countries like Japan, Korea, Pakistan, India, the Philippines, and the population of southeast Asia—our Government should take the initiative in convoking a free world economic conference to establish a 5-year international consumers' credit and installment buying of $10 billion.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this noteworthy occasion, I join with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent in its observance.

The plight of the people of Lithuania and of her Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, suffering under the subjugation of the Soviet invaders, is of deep and abiding concern to every American. As Lithuania looks to the free world for help, we in the United States reaffirm our traditional friendship with this gallant country. Our Government remains firm in nonrecognition of the forcible annexation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

May this independence day bring Lithuania closer to her liberation from Soviet tyranny.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the statement made by the Senator from New York regarding Lithuanian Independence Day. Of the many holidays which are celebrated annually in all countries throughout the world perhaps none are more meaningful, more significant, or evoke more profound human sentiments than the anniversaries of national independence days.

This is because the idea of independence is closely related to, if not synonymous with, certain noble human ideas, the ideas of freedom and liberty. Nations have generally believed that only in complete political independence can they enjoy full freedom and liberty, and for that reason have striven for their independence. Lithuania has been no exception to this rule.

In the past Lithuanians possessed national independence and enjoyed it for centuries, but unfortunately, for more than 100 years prior to World War I their country had been a part of the Russian Empire. One would suppose that in the course of such a long subjection to the Russian Czarist regime these people might have lost their national identity and become submerged in that vast polyglot empire. That might have been the case with some other less steadfast people, but the proud and brave Lithuanians were not the type to abandon their national traditions and their aim of gaining independence.

They reached their goal in 1918 when they proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year. Unfortunately, they were not allowed to enjoy it for long. At the end of only two decades, early in World War II, independent Lithuania became a casualty of aggression. Throughout the war the Lithuanian people suffered under both the Nazi and Communist tyrannies, but their sufferings did not come to an end after their so-called liberation by the Red army. Instead, their liberators made them prisoners in their homeland by sealing them off from the free world. However, even under such severe curbs as the Communists impose, and even under the almost unbearable conditions they create, the indomitable and undaunted Lithuanian spirit for freedom and independence will certainly survive and win against the tyrants.

On this day, in celebrating the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us all hope that that victory will soon be within the grasp of all those suffering under Communist tyranny.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 16, is the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This anniversary focuses our attention on the fact that 3 million Lithuanians continue to suffer under the frightful yoke of Communist domination.

From 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was an honored member of the family of free nations. Great strides were made in its economic development, and the literacy of its people was raised appreciably.

Since the Russians seized Lithuania in 1940, a rigid screen of censorship has concealed developments in that country; but we continually hear rumors of the efforts of the Communists to Russify completely the Lithuanian people. The United States must never be a party to official recognition of the enforced annexation of Lithuania and her neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, by the Soviet Union.

On the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, it is a privilege to join with the 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in paying tribute to the valiant Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain. We all look forward to the day when Lithuania will once again be free and independent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

I should like to take this opportunity to join with the Lithuanians in this country in tribute to the memory of that brave little country, which for over 20 years served as a model of enlightened and progressive self-government.

Today, the Russians are attempting to plow under the spirit and culture of that country by every ruthless device, including mass extermination and deportation. Thus have the Communists proceeded to demonstrate to the world what they mean by liberation.

Yet the spirit of free Lithuania lives on, both here in America and in the minds of those in the home country who cannot today express their feelings publicly.

Today, as we honor this country and its people, let us once again resolve never to recognize the forced annexation of Lithuania and its neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. With prayerful hopes, we look to the day when the flag of freedom will again be raised over this tragic land.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senate was privileged today to have the invocation delivered by the Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, pastor of the Church of the Transfiguration in Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y.

His moving prayer has reminded us all of the valiant history of the Lithuanian people, and has caused us to reaffirm our belief in freedom and liberty for all enslaved peoples.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that February 16, in the State of New York, has been proclaimed Lithuanian Independence Day by Gov. Averell Harriman. It was so proclaimed for many years while I was Governor of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared, noting the commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

February 16 marks the anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence in 1918, after 123 years of Russian rule. Along with independence, there was a great resurgence of national culture and political freedom. The new Republic of Lithuania flourished under its new-found freedom until the tragic occupation and enslavement of its people by the Soviet Union in 1940.

We in the United States must give more than mere lipservice to the cause of freedom and liberty for the people of Lithuania. For example, we must continue to work for the liberalization of our immigration and refugee laws to provide a haven in the United States for some of the escapees and refugees from Lithuania.

We must strengthen the Voice of America, so that the voices of freedom will continue to penetrate the Iron Curtain and bring encouragement to the enslaved peoples.

We must press for the ratification of the Genocide Convention, in order to demonstrate to the world our conviction and determination that the destruction of national, racial, or religious groups must be placed beyond the pale of international law and punished accordingly.

Through these, and many other acts of faith in freedom, we in these United States will be fulfilling the eternal principles upon which our Nation was founded, and to whose advancement the American Republic is dedicated. In this way, America will continue to shed its light—the light of freedom—among all the tragically oppressed people whose hearts yearn for the return of independence and a rebirth of liberty.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, on Sunday I made a brief address to a gathering of Lithuanian organizations in the city of Detroit, and in the course of my remarks I reminded them that after 123 years of Russian rule, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent kingdom 37 years ago, on February 16, 1918, and later in the same year became a republic.

Because of the tenacity of the Lithuanian people to their cultural and political background, there was a fine flowering of progress in the newly constituted nation. But darkness fell again in 1940, when, the Communists fearing the existence of a free nation at the border of the Soviet Union, Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops. So fell the three Baltic States, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

But the desire for freedom and the unfaltering belief that eventually the Red yoke will be thrown off has never departed from Lithuanian hearts. The United States of America has never given the least recognition to Soviet domination of the Lithuanian territory, and we, too, hold in our hearts the hope and the belief that Lithuania will be free again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me in commemoration of the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we view the shifts and changes in personalities in the Soviet regime and speculate as to what this means to the nations of the free world, these same developments are anxiously watched by people beyond the Iron Curtain—people subjugated by the Kremlin dictatorship. Their basic question is: Is there hope? Is there a better future dawning?

On this the 37th anniversay of the independence of Lithuania we must ask the people of that fine country to continue in the spirit which they have exhibited in the past, to hope rather than to give up in despair. Contrary to Marxian theory, it is the Communist dictatorship which carries the seeds of its own destruction within it. As our constitutional government stands, firm and secure, as it has stood for 166 years, Communist rulers topple and fall. Their system cannot bear the strain of intrigue and counterintrigue indefinitely. It must ultimately fall and thus bring the dawn of freedom for the people of Lithuania as well as for all other people now suffering under Kremlin rule.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 16, 1918, or just 37 years ago, Lithuania became an independent country. She threw off the control of Russia and divided the big estates which had been owned by the Baltic barons into small farms with peasant proprietors. Lithuania thus led the way in the great wave of land reforms which followed World War I. A democratic form of government was established which actually worked for the welfare of the people. Schools were created and by 1940 had reduced the number of illiterates from nearly two-thirds of the population to less than one-sixth. Farm cooperatives not only helped the farmers economically in the dairy and other farm industries, but also improved human relations.

Lithuania, like the rest of her free Baltic neighbors—Latvia, Estonia, and Finland—made rapid economic progress during this period, and the standard of living of her people rose markedly. This was a tribute to her democratic political system, her wide diffusion of property, and the general emphasis upon individual drive and initiative, tempered and sweetened by cooperation and by the welfare activities of government.

In sharp contrast to this, Soviet Russia, with its political terror and its deadening of initiative, failed to improve the standard of living of the Russian people after 1928.

Lithuania, like the other eastern European nations, led a precarious political life between the two powerful police states of Soviet Russia to the east and Nazi Germany to the west. The infamous Hitler-Stalin Pact of August 1939 brought about her conquest. In 1940 Russia moved in, while the Nazis in 1941 and 1942 took over the country. Terror was practiced by both states. Toward the close of the war the Russian armies again occupied Lithuania and once again initiated a reign of terror. Thousands of Lithuanians were executed and hundreds of thousands were deported to Siberia. At the same time an equal number of Russians were settled inside Lithuania and the attempt was made to obliterate the national sentiment of the Lithuanians. All the terrible methods of the modern police state are now being practiced by the Russians.

We have reason to be proud of the past record of our Government in its dealings with Lithuania and the other Baltic democracies. President Roosevelt steadfastly refused to recognize the Communist seizure of these countries. This policy has been continued by President Eisenhower. Last year the Senate adopted a resolution which was sponsored by me and which put the Senate on record as being opposed to any such recognition and reaffirmed our dedication to the cause of a free Lithuania.

Russia is now making efforts to have her conquests recognized. I hope we shall continue to oppose any such recognition and that we may stand fast.

GEN. BREHON BURKE SOMERVELL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was with genuine sorrow that I read in yesterday's newspapers of the death of my personal friend and a great patriot, Gen. Brehon Somervell.

I first had the privilege of knowing General Somervell over 20 years ago when he, as Major Somervell, became the operating head of the staff of the late Walter D. Hines, with whom I was associated in the practice of law. Mr. Hines was invited by the Turkish Government, headed at that time by the famous Kemal Atatürk, to make an economic survey of Turkey. Our law firm took over the job; and because of General Somervell's effective and vigorous work in settling some of the disputes on the Rhine and the Danube Rivers after World War I, Mr. Hines asked him to go to Turkey to head the investigation on the ground.

Since that time I have had the privilege of knowing General Somervell intimately, and have watched his rapid rise from a major to a four-star general. Aside from my business connection with him, a warm personal friendship grew up between Mrs. Smith and myself and the general's family, to all of whom we were devoted.

General Somervell's service to his country covered a span of more than 30 years. Graduating from West Point sixth in his class in 1914, he served in the Mexican Expedition and then in France during World War I, where he won the Distinguished Service Cross for reconnaissance behind the German lines.

In 1925 he made a study for the League of Nations of navigation on the Rhine and Danube Rivers. As I have stated, in 1933, at the request of the Turkish Government, he was associated with the Hines mission to make an economic survey of that country. Three years later General Somervell was assigned to head the Work Projects Administration in New York; and he did much to improve the efficiency of that organization. La-Guardia Airport and many roads and parks around New York City remain monuments to General Somervell's engineering and administrative talents.

Early in World War II, under the leadership of General Eisenhower, General Somervell organized the supply of the North African invasion. In 1942 he became commanding general of the Services of Supply, later known as the Army Service Forces. His task was to supply our farflung Armies with every item they needed—from men, food and clothing, to airfields and weapons. Altogether, during the war, General Somervell was responsible for the disbursal of $172 billion worth of supplies. Of this gigantic task he is credited with saying:

> The impossible we do at once; the miraculous takes a little longer.

In March 1945 his nomination as a full general was confirmed by the Senate. The following year he retired from the Army, and at the time of his death he was chairman of the board and president of Koppers Co., Inc., of Pittsburgh.

In 1919 he married Anna Purcell. They had three daughters, Mary Anne, Susan, and Constance. In 1941 Mrs. Somervell died. In 1943 General Somervell married Mrs. Louise Hampton Wartman, of Ocala, Fla.

Mrs. Smith joins me in our expression of deep sympathy to Mrs. Somervell and to his daughters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Brehon B. Somervell," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 15.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREHON B. SOMERVELL

Gen. Brehon B. Somervell was one of the ablest officers the United States Army has produced. In World War II, as commander of the Army Service Forces, he had one of the most complex assignments ever given a military man and his execution of it was brilliant. He was tough and impetuous and impatient. He knocked heads together unmercifully. But he performed the impossible. The success of the Allied effort was made possible by America's industrial strength, and General Somervell was the guiding genius mobilizing that strength for the Army. Under his direction more than $170 billion was spent inducting, feeding, clothing, sheltering, and arming more than 8 million men. He organized the supplies for the North Africa invasion and later for the Normandy invasion.

General Somervell did not seek popular acclaim and he made many enemies. Sometimes he seemed to drive too hard or to insist on too much for the Army. But he was responsible for supplying the Army and he thought very little about the effect on civilians or about the sensibilities of civilian administrators; if he sometimes seemed to run roughshod, it was largely because his civilian counterparts lacked the same force of character. He generally had the backing of the White House, which appreciated his driving energy and ability to cut through redtape. From 1936 to 1940 he had been Works Progress Administrator in New York, and thus had come in close contact with Harry L. Hopkins. This relationship proved of immense value to both men during the war—two men who understood in full measure the meaning of total war.

Like General Eisenhower, General Somervell was a West Pointer and a product of the intensive Army training and staff schools. Because he graduated near the top of his West Point class, he became an Army engineer, and this was the proper training for his wartime assignment. The Nation owes a debt to this distinguished soldier. Without him the Army would not have been fully prepared as early as it was for its main task overseas.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial also entitled "Gen. Brehon Somervell," which was published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 15.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. BREHON SOMERVELL

To Gen. Brehon Somervell was attributed the famous saying of World War II: "The impossible we do at once, the miraculous takes a little longer." This slogan was applied to the Services of Supply, later known as the Army Service Forces, which General Somervell commanded during the war. In a sense it also fitted the general himself, for he was one of the most remarkable organizers and expediters in military history. He was the man charged with setting up and operating the supply lines for the invasions of North Africa and of Europe, with seeing to it that the Allied armies had the equipment, ranging from food and clothing to barracks and airfields, that were essential to victory. And he performed his tasks with brilliant success.

New Yorkers gained a firsthand acquaintance with General Somervell's abilities long before the war, for in 1936, when he was a lieutenant colonel, he was put in charge of the WPA in New York City. He improved its efficiency and tightened its operations so that it left the city many facilities which still endure, such as La Guardia Airport.

General Somervell's busy career took him to Mexico, France, central Europe, and Turkey, as well as throughout the United States. When this country's Army began to expand in 1940, it was General Somervell who had the responsibility of building its barracks, and afterward there was hardly a major war operation in the European theater that did not depend largely upon his contribution. His life was a dedicated and a supremely useful one, and his passing is mourned by the Nation he served so well.

ISRAEL—AN ADVENTURE OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on January 11, 1955, His Excellency, Ambassador Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel, delivered an extraordinary speech at a convocation of the University of Notre Dame at South Bend, Ind.

The speech is a moving expression and exposition of the spirit of Israel and of the motives which led to the establishment of that state.

This speech can be widely read with profit by those who seek to understand the situation in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL—AN ADVENTURE OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT

(Address delivered by Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel to the United States, at the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind., January 11, 1955)

Four thousand years of history have extended their span between Israel's first ascent to nationhood and her restoration to freedom at the turning point of the century. The redemption from Egyptian bondage must be regarded in any serious conception of history as one of the authentic points of climax in the progress of mankind. In the words of Henry George: "From between the paws of the rock-hewn Sphinx rises the genius of human liberty; and the trumpets of the Exodus throb with the defiant proclamation of the rights of men."

These forceful phrases do not overstate the case. The flight across the Red Sea and Sinai preserved a revolutionary idea, which could never have evolved in the idolatrous despotism of the Pharaohs. The idea was the sovereignty of God, the Ruler of the universe, omnipotent, one and indivisible, the embodiment of righteousness and the loving Father of all creation. From this idea there flowed acceptances and rejections which

came to dominate life amongst the children of man. Recognizing this event as the beginning of their true destiny, the descendants of those fleeing slaves have, in all succeeding ages, commemorated the ancient saga. Our tradition exhorts every Jew to recite the story of the Exodus from Egypt at the appointed season as though he personally had experienced redemption from servitude to freedom.

The narrative of this rebellion against idolatry by men charged with the custody of an irreplaceable idea also occurs in the history of thought in a more secular aspect. This is the original and classic episode of national liberation. The memory of Israel's first struggle for freedom has inspired and consoled many subsequent movements of national independence. When Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were consulted on the emblem of the future American Union they suggested that the seal of the United States should represent the children of Israel fleeing across the parted waters of the Red Sea on their way to freedom. This portrayal was to be surmounted by an uncannily Hebraic slogan: "Resistance to tryants is obedience to God."

THE DIMENSIONS OF HISTORY

It is not presumptuous to believe that future generations will conserve the memories of Israel's modern revival with a similar reverence and tenacity. This will certainly come to pass in the particular domain of Jewish history. Nothing since the miraculous redemption 4,000 years ago can compete in that history with this recent transition from martyrdom to sovereignty, this sudden ascent from the depths of agony to new peaks of opportunity and pride. The attainment of Israel's independence 7 years ago is already more than a political or secular event in the Jewish consciousness. The date is bound to be numbered amidst the festivals of a people whose other temporal milestones have endured with rare constancy.

I have come to this abode of Christian faith and learning to suggest that Israel's resurgence is an event to be conceived in the highest dimensions of history. It evokes from the past and may portend for the future a deep lesson concerning the potency and nature of spiritual impulses. The attention which this enterprise has already received in the thought and writing of our age is itself a proof of some special quality within it. It is evident, however, that if Israel's rebirth comes to inherit this eternal renown, it will not be because of the material dimensions which belong to it. There is nothing global, or even massive, about the State of Israel in political terms. The territory in which our independence has been fulfilled is great in history, but pathetically meager in geography. It is the bridge between the three continents of the ancient world. It looks out over the highway across which have marched the fateful migrations and invasions of history's pageant. But in the strategic calculations of this atomic century this piece of earth is of humble measure. The bridge is fragile; the highway is narrow and in the age of air transportation, it no longer obtrudes itself inevitably athwart the paths of conquest and empire.

The population directly affected falls short of 2 million. Even when we portray this event in its true essence, as a collective climax in the history of the entire Jewish people, it still remains true that the direct subjects and objects of Israel's revival are but a small fraction of the total human family. Clearly, if modern Israel is to be regarded as a historic incident of universal scope, this is because of a stature to be ascribed to it in a completely different dimension. If modern Israel is to have any elements of greatness then this quality must be vindicated in the spiritual realm.

THE RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

To say this is not to deny that some of Israel's material achievements are impressive and sometimes deeply moving. The collective survival of the Jewish people is itself a rare event of history. Many other peoples have lost their independence under the heel of invading empires; but no people, other than this, having been so engulfed has shown such a capacity for recuperation as to preserve amid martyrdom and dispersion, all the elements of its union and identity—its language and tradition, its consciousness of attachment to the land of its origin, and the undying hope of eventual restoration. For long centuries this people, whithersoever it wandered, continued to regard its inner life as rooted in a distant land which few could ever hope to see with their own eyes. This connection, which for so many generations was an act of mystic faith, became transformed, against all material calculations, into one of the political realities of our age. The banner of a free Israel now flies proudly again in the family of nations from which it had been absent for so many tragic generations.

There is something here to arrest the attention of those who study history in terms of national politics and international relations. Nor are these the only achievements which may be accounted remarkable in secular terms. There is the pioneering toil and sacrifice which have transformed the wilderness to a semblance of its ancient fertility. There is the epic of mass immigration which has brought hundreds of thousands of returning newcomers to our shores. There are great efforts, and at times, serious results, in the increase of industrial and agricultural resources. There is the formation of a new culture, welding many varied immigrant traditions, tongues, and experiences into the unified tapestry of a distinctive civilization, in the image of the ancient Hebrew past. There is the struggle against the ravages of pestilence and erosion which had debased the physical aspect of the land and degraded its historic reputation as "the perfection of beauty, the joy of the entire earth." There is the adventure of establishing within a region dominated by despotism and autocracy a sanctuary for the democratic way of life and the principles of free government. There are advances in literature, the sciences, and arts, which without yet reaching the peaks of the ancient revelation, are yet significant and promising in relation to the circumstances of time and of space in which they have been accomplished. Nor can we omit from the positive record of Israel's achievement the turbulent struggle for physical security of a small people besieged on all its embattled frontiers by an unyielding and comprehensive hostility. To have achieved so large a volume of international recognition within so brief a time and against such heavy challenge is not the least surprising of Israel's modern victories.

THE POWER OF WILL

If despite all this, we concentrate our gaze upon the spiritual aspects of Israel's achievement and destiny, it is not because we renounce our claim to sympathetic appraisal in political, economic, social, or even military history. But when all is said and done, there have been greater battles, more far-reaching economic upheavals, vaster irrigation projects, broader revolutions of physical power than those which we have recorded, memorable as they are for us. Moreover, even these achievements by Israel, while being political, economic, or social in their outward aspect, are primarily significant as illustrations of spiritual forces. They are spectacular testimony to the power of the human will. Rarely in history has any achievement been recorded against heavier calculations of chance. All the circumstances of time and of place argued against its success. A few decades ago the prospect that an independent Jewish state could be established in its ancient homeland appeared so fantastic, as to bring its advocates under the suspicion of insanity. Statesmen and diplomats to whom the idea was broached in the early years of the First World War were startled at hearing so eccentric an idea even submitted to their official attention. A British Ambassador in Paris to whom our first president, Dr. Weizmann, summarized this project in 1915 reported to London that he had encountered a remarkable contradiction—a man of eminent scientific attainments with a keen power of rational analysis who on this particular issue appeared to have gone completely off his head. Back in London, Prime Minister Asquith expressed surprise that one of his cabinet colleagues of Jewish faith, normally regarded as a man of excessive rationalism, was afflicted with delirium on this special point.

Today, with the third Jewish commonwealth in tangible existence, it is the skeptics and the rationalists who seem incongruous to our eyes. Yet their skepticism seemed then to rest on strong foundations. After all, the Jewish people was dispersed and divided, split up into countless divergent fragments, lacking any element of distinctive political unity. The greater part of them dwelt thousands of miles away from the prospective scene of their national revival. The land itself appeared to be sucked dry of all its pristine vitality and to offer no prospect of successful resettlement. Moreover, it was neither empty nor available. It was controlled by some nationalisms and imperialisms and coveted by others, all of which had a far stronger chance of acquiring it than a dispersed and politically anonymous people. The concept of a Jewish nationhood or of a special link between the Jewish people and its original homeland was completely unrecognized in the law and jurisprudence of nations. It seemed unlikely that the Zionist program could overcome such an accumulation of hostilities and natural adversities.

Yet within a single lifetime we had passed from a world in which the existence of an independent Israel seemed inconceivable into a world which seems inconceivable without its existence. I know of few more tangible testimonies in history to the power of the human will to assert itself against material odds. This is, perhaps, the primary value of Israel's rebirth to all who are concerned with the vindication of faith against the fatalistic or deterministic theories of history, which see the human being not as the primary agent of historic processes but merely as their helpless subject matter. Thus, quite apart from its context in the history and culture of the Jewish people, the rebirth of modern Israel would earn its place in history as a crushing argument in the eternal discussion between the claims of faith and the doctrines which deny the human will any central part in governing the world's destiny. Those doctrines would have an impossible task in trying to explain Israel's revival in material or economic terms.

This belief in the power of the human will is a recurrent theme in Israel's history. The most distinctive attribute of Israel's character, the source of some weakness but of greater strength is this stubborn, tenacious refusal to recognize the distinction between imagination and reality. In the grammar of classical Hebrew there is none of the sharp differentiation possessed by modern languages between that which is and that which shall be. This deliberate confusion between imagination and reality, between the will and the fact, has been illustrated at many stages of our history. In 1918 our first founding father, Dr. Weizmann went up to Mount Scopus, overlooking Jerusalem, to perform the ceremony of opening a new university. In its outward forms this resembled similar ceremonies whereby

universities have been opened and dedicated in many parts of the world. There was only one incidental circumstance which made this particular solemnity in any way distinctive. This was that the university did not exist at all. It was unrepresented even by a cornerstone. There were no plans or means for its erection, and indeed no rational certainty that those who aspired to its establishment would be able to live in the country at all. Yet because the establishment of a university in Jerusalem was for us a matter of intense and passionate will, the absence of the physical conditions necessary for its fulfillment was not an adequate reason to abstain from all the acts and gestures which should mark its dedication. Surely enough, within two decades the university existed, and the ceremony, even in retrospect, no longer appears quixotic. The confusion between imagination and reality marks all our religion and folklore. Alas, there are some who see its traces in our economic and financial planning.

Just as the establishment of Israel proves the dominant power of the human spirit, so is this theme illustrated by many acts which have unfolded themselves within the general process. The most vivid example is to be found in our immigration movement. The dispersed Jewish communities from which this immigration came were utterly divergent in all material things. Their social, economic, political, and linguistic backgrounds had nothing in common. Unity and solidarity existed only in the plane of spiritual allegiance. Here then was a convincing experiment for proving the relative strength of the material and the spiritual forces. If the material elements were really decisive then the influences of division and alienation would prevail. The spiritual unity had not merely to exist but actually to overcome a great aggregate of divisive material forces. That it did so triumph, and that hundreds of thousands responded by immigration to the call of Israel's sovereignty proved that unity will prevail against divergence, provided that the unity is truly spiritual and the divergence only material.

THE HEBREW TRADITION

Thus far I have spoken of Israel's establishment as a general victory for spiritual forces. But we also owe attention to the particular lineage of Israel's spiritual history. The tradition which was here saved from extinction and endowed with a new birth of freedom had played no ordinary role in the evolution of the human spirit. All that is essential and authentic in modern theistic traditions can be traced back ultimately to the achievements and insights of Israel in the previous era of her independent national life. The consciousness that the Hebrew mind had had such a strong impact on human thought caused millions throughout the world to be exalted by the prospect that this tradition was now to be reinstated in the shelter of free political and social institutions. The union of this people with that land, through the medium of its incomparable language, had once given mankind its deepest experience of revelation. Ancient Israel had taught individual morality, social justice, and universal peace. That the conditions in which that florescence had been achieved should once again be restored was a prospect that could not fail to appeal to any sensitive imagination.

THE FAMILY OF CULTURES

The community of nations is also a society of cultures and civilizations. Many modern states, whatever their formal relationship to established religion, exemplify and embody the Christian civilization in its various forms. Some 15 modern states are dominated by the heritage and outlook of Islam. Three or more sovereignties in the Far East are cast in the mold of Buddhist tradition. There are many states, as we know too well, which exemplify the various materialist heresies of our age. But until 1948 there was one culture, and one alone, which had no distinctive representation in the family of nations; one civilization which nowhere on earth had the opportunity to express its ideals by response to the challenge of statehood, society, and international relations. No single state spoke as the conscious champion or exemplar of the Hebrew tradition. When we think of the influence which this civilization has exerted on the currents of historic progress, this was surely an intolerable paradox. In our age, for the first time since the legions of Titus subjugated Jerusalem, the Hebrew tradition has become embodied in free political institutions, on a level of equality with all other nations in the human family. By this act of remedy, the family circle of the world's free cultures has become complete. The community of nations is now a comprehensive symphony of the traditions and cultures of mankind.

It is, of course, true that the concepts of Hebraism continued to affect history after the destruction of the Jewish kingdoms. Working through Christianity and Islam, and within the national traditions of countless peoples, the Jewish civilization continued its creative course. It would be unduly restrictive to limit the story of the Hebrew mind to those expressions of it which were realized in conditions of separate political independence. Nevertheless, it is a fact that it was in conditions of separate nationhood in the land of Israel that the spirit of the Hebrew people rose to levels of inspiration which it never subsequently achieved in conditions of exile and dispersion. The stream of Hebrew civilization nourished the great rivers of Christianity and Islam: but its own native waters continued to flow perennially fresh. We have escaped from the great handicap and reproach of homelessness. No longer need we poignantly recite: "They have appointed me to keep many vineyards, but mine own vineyard have I not kept."

ISRAEL IN INTERNATIONAL EQUITY

There are many aspects of Israel's revival which belong to the domain of political history, but which cannot be denied their place in a spiritual appraisal. The homelessness and martyrdom of the Jewish people was not merely a source of international political tension: it was also a heavy burden upon the Christian conscience. The weight of this burden became heavy beyond endurance by any sensitive mind in the aftermath of the Second World War, when the curtain went up on the burnt and mangled bodies of 6 million Jews including a million children. The Jewish people had fallen victim to the most fearful agony which had ever beset any family of the human race. A whole continent was saturated with its blood and haunted by its unexpiated sacrifice. As the world rose from the ravages of the Second World War, it came perilously near to creating an injustice more heinous than any which had been illuminated by the triumph of the Allied cause. It became horribly but seriously possible that every nation would be granted its freedom, amongst those which had suffered under the heel of Fascist tyranny, except the people which had suffered the most. All the victims of tyranny would be established in sovereignty, except the first, and the most sorely ravaged amongst the targets of totalitarian persecution. If the world order had been established upon this discrimination, it would surely have been conceived with an intolerable measure of original guilt.

From this spiritual peril the community of nations cleansed itself belatedly, perhaps a little too grudgingly, but nevertheless decisively, when it ordained and later recognized the establishment of Israel. A postwar international society including a Jewish state, and an international society excluding any satisfaction of the Jewish claim to equality, would have been two totally anti-ethical concepts from the spiritual and ethical point of view. The establishment of Israel's sovereignty, though ostensibly a fact of political organization, was, in the deeper sense, an act of universal equity.

REGIONAL EQUITY

The same consideration arises with particular force when we examine the problem of equity in its regional aspect. No people benefited more lavishly than the Arabs from the new inheritance of independence bequeathed by the Allies' victory in two world wars and the establishment of the United Nations. In an area where not a single free Arab or Moslem had lived in conditions of political independence 4 decades ago, there were now to be created 7, 8 or 9 separate Arab sovereignties extending over a vast subcontinent from Pakistan to the Central Mediterranean, from the Taurus Mountains to the Persian Gulf. This region of new Arab independence was immeasurably rich in physical power. Great fertile valleys spread out within it. Abundant rivers flowed across its lands. Unlimited resources of mineral and natural wealth lay beneath its soil. Never since the golden age of the Caliphate, a full millenium ago, had the Arab world commanded such elements of power, strength and opportunity as those which now came within its grasp.

Here again the international conscience was faced with a burning problem of equity. Was it considered right for the Arab people to hold sway over a continent, and wrong for the Jewish people to establish its independence in a tiny fragment of that huge domain? Would it be the decree of history that the Arabs must be independent everywhere and the Jewish people nowhere—not even in the land which owed all its luster in history to its connection with the ancient Hebrew tradition? This was the problem of conscience which underlay the turbulent political discussions in international forums and in the chancelleries of the powers. Here again there was the peril of an award so one-sided, so monopolistic, and discriminatory in its nature as to weigh down the international conscience for generations to come. After many hesitations the world community cleansed itself of any such reproach. It rightly established and encouraged the emancipation of the Arab people on an almost imperial scale. But the benefit, nay the elementary right, which is conferred upon the Arab people in such abundant profusion, was also bestowed upon the Jewish people, albeit within meager and austere limits. This picture of an Arab liberation beyond the wildest dreams of recent generations, side by side with an immeasurably more modest satisfaction of the principle of Jewish independence should be before us whenever we consider the spiritual implications of the controversy between Arab and Israel nationalism. It would have been an indelible disgrace to the cause of international justice if a world which had bequeathed this vast liberation to the Arab people had begrudged the Jewish people its minute share of that inheritance. The morality expressed in the parable of Naboth's vineyard would have clouded the constitutional and political structure of the Middle East.

ISRAEL'S CULTURE

As we survey the origins of Israel's independence in spiritual terms, we cannot fail to let our minds linger in speculation on the question of Israel's cultural destiny. In the final resort, modern Israel will vindicate the efforts, sacrifices and longings invested in its rebirth to the degree that it strives toward high levels of intellectual and cultural progress. As a military power, a political force or an economic unit, Israel's horizons are restricted by deficiencies of material power. Much remains to be achieved in political organization, in the

strengthening of security and in economic consolidation. But in these realms Israel will never compete with the might and influence of the continental or imperial powers. The only domain in which we are free to soar to the highest peaks available to any nation are those of scientific, cultural, and spiritual progress. However pressing are Israel's preoccupations with physical security and economic welfare, the challenge of cultural achievement cannot be set aside. Would we not be an extraordinary people if we were to devote all our efforts to those material fields in which, after all, our limitations are inexorable, and stand aside from the only areas in which, at least, the potentialities of greatness lie open before us.

These are the considerations which invite special attention to Israel's efforts and aspirations in religion, literature, science, and art. Our unusually intensive effort in these fields is not something marginal or secondary to our concern: it touches the very core and essence of our destiny.

Three elements are available to us in the formation of Israel's new culture. First, there is the Hebrew Biblical tradition expressed in our incomparable language and evoked by the physical associations of the country itself. This is no new Esperanto nation writing its history on a clean slate. Modern Israel is, in its own consciousness and in that of the world, the direct lineal descendant of the ancient Hebrew civilization which has exercised such a potent influence on the thought and spirit of mankind. It is no small thing for the citizen of modern Israel to speak the same Hebrew language as that in which Amos wrote the prophecies of social justice, in which Isaiah proclaimed the vision of universal peace, and Ezekiel contemplated the process of regeneration and resurrected hope. In our educational process a great source of enrichment is to be found in the historic memories evoked by the very hills and valleys in which our new State resumed its ancient inheritance. The sentiment of belonging, in the most intimate sense, to the great sweep of Israel's history in this immortal land has a far greater influence than is commonly realized in the formation of our national character. Our literary movement and recent discoveries in archeology constantly remind our people of this primary element in their spiritual formation.

A second element in Israel's culture is the accumulated experience acquired by the Jewish people in its wanderings after the period of national independence. The generations of dispersion and persecution were also a period of constant interplay between the Hebrew mind and the cultures of Europe and the New World. The Rabbinical and Talmudical literature, the post-Biblical Hebrew poetry and philosophy, the traditional attachments of the Jewish people to the arts and sciences of the Western World, are all part of the reservoir from which modern Israel draws its sustenance.

The third element available for our cultural development is western civilization, with special reference to its political institutions and its scientific and technological progress. It is Israel's fortune to be the sole representative in its immediate region of political democracy and scientific progress, which are the two most distinctive achievements of European and American civilization. This western civilization is strongly expressed by the Anglo-Saxon tradition with which Israel has two links of special intimacy. First, the great bulk of the free and extant Jewish people is a part of the English-speaking world. Second, the tradition of the English-speaking people is not something alien or external to Israel's life and experience. It is itself morally derived from the original Hebrew tradition of which Israel is the modern representative and embodiment.

From the effervescence of these three elements—the Hebrew Biblical tradition, the broader Jewish experience, Western science and political organization—the culture of modern Israel will emerge. There is no way of insuring that the result will be of universal significance. Still less can we promise a new period of revelation. It is not for us to command by our will the inscrutable sources of inspiration. All that we can do is to create the opportunities and conditions whereby to express the potentialities which lie within our soul, as it seeks communion with the mysteries of intellectual and spiritual creation. We have at least restored to our people the conditions of a creative culture—pride of soil; the sense of continuity; deep roots in a superbly aristocratic cultural tradition; and the special exaltation which attends a people in the formative hours of its national revival. Who can be certain that these conditions will not bring a message in the spirit and quality of our original inheritance.

THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE

I am certain that your invitation to me to discuss these high themes within this Catholic sanctuary reflects your conviction that the unfolding of Israel's new career as a nation is a matter of moment and concern to the Christian world. The great issue in this generation is drawn, not between Christianity and Judaism, or between Israel and the Christian nations. The frontier lies rather between those who assert and those who deny the supremacy of faith and of freedom. You and we occupy different areas of tradition, experience, and outlook; but we occupy them on the same side of that fateful demarcation. Our differences are not insignificant, and we should not be disposed to obscure them. It may well be that those elements of our personality which are separate and distinctive are precisely the most creative elements in our contribution to the common cause. But if the rise of Israel is a victory of the human spirit, a triumph of international integrity, a burden removed from the universal conscience, the addition of a new voice to the symphony of human freedom, then this is a victory for the Christian cause as well as a direct salvation for the Jewish people.

It is memorable and significant that the Christian world lent its sympathy to Israel's revival. The great Catholic countries of Europe and Latin America were amongst those who most ardently sustained Israel's struggle for independence and recognition. Our devotion to a kindred heritage, our common respect for human values, our unremitting resistance to tyranny, are unifying forces which transcend all secondary divergences of judgment or interest. The people of Israel who first in history rebelled against the might of barbarian and pagan empires, which raised the first voice against idolatry—this people in its new life of independence will never bow the knee to dictatorship.

These common ideals of Judaism and Christianity command us to assert our underlying fraternity. A distinguished prelate of the Catholic Church, Msgr. Gustave Franceschi, wrote of his visit to Israel in these terms:

"We understand that the Hebrew people has a spiritual connection with us, that their strange survival goes beyond the customary norms by which the life of an ordinary nation evolves; and we Christians, if we have not lost the sense of Christianity, cannot but perceive to what a profound extent Israel is linked to our own salvation. One merely has to read St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans to see this."

THE HOLY PLACES

These solidarities can serve as a bridge across controversies which sometimes disturb our essential kinship. An understanding of the spirit of the Christian world ranks very high among Israel's chief aspirations. We are fully aware that many causes and assets sacred to Christianity lie within our control and demand our most vigilant reverence. This consideration has led us constantly in recent years to proclaim our readiness to place under international influence the holy places in Jerusalem which are the cradle and inspiration of the Christian faith. By such a solution, reconciling the full political independence of the people of the Holy City with international interest in that which is truly universal in Jerusalem, we could achieve a double purpose. We should prevent an encroachment on the political liberties of Jerusalem's population while, at the same time, acknowledging the moral authority of the world community over the sanctuaries of your faith. Need I remind you that political freedom and national self-expression are themselves spiritual objectives of the highest importance; that Jerusalem, the cradle of democratic thought, is the last place on earth in which citizens should be deprived of freedom and national devotion; and that no religious purpose could triumph over a discontented political community alienated from its national allegiance. These are the considerations which have caused the Governments of the United States and of Israel to cooperate so constantly within the United Nations on behalf of solutions which respect both the sovereignty and secular independence of Jerusalem's population and the rights of the Christian world to see its holy places kept immune from turbulence and desecration. I am satisfied that this attitude is now shared by a majority of the members of the United Nations.

In the same spirit, you will understand how devoutly we have welcomed the warm praise expressed by Msgr. Antonio Vergani, representative of the Latin Patriarch in Israel, by the Very Reverend Father Brunet, and by visiting cardinals and prelates to the efforts of my Government to ease the journeys of pilgrims, to effect a road link to Mount Tabor, and to repair the ravages inflicted by war on some of the buildings and properties of the Catholic Church in Israel. In paying this tribute to the Government of Israel for its "substantial subventions, enabling the rehabilitation of the Hospice of Notre Dame de France in Jerusalem," Father Brunet eloquently and devoutly concludes: "May God vouchsafe to us to see this edifice risen from its ruins and pilgrims coming once again to recite their prayers on the soil of this holy land, where spiritual interests should bring all hearts together in peace."

This is the goal of Israel's spiritual adventure, in the freedom of its ancient home—to live a national life consecrated to the universal vision of fraternity and peace. If we serve this ideal, within the limits of our human imperfection, the new era of Israel's freedom will be not unworthy of the inheritance of the fathers.

POSTAL PAY RAISES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a part of an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, February 10, 1955.

This article which is entitled "More on Postal Pay Raises, and an Apology," was written by John Cramer. It was written as a followup of a previous article by Mr. Cramer which was printed on page 1378 of the RECORD of February 9.

I ask that only the first eight paragraphs of the article be printed since the remainder does not refer to the previous story.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE ON POSTAL PAY RAISES, AND AN APOLOGY

(By John Cramer)

An article in this column Tuesday about the Post Office Department's job classification plan, used the phrases "job classification racket" and "typical classifier's fraud."

Department officials say the individuals responsible for the plan have interpreted this as an attack on their personal and professional integrity.

No such attack was in any way merited or intended. The phrasing was unfortunate.

Your Government reporter is happy to offer this correction—and apology.

MORE HEARINGS

Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee planned to resume its hearings on postal pay raises today with additional testimony from employee unions.

Meantime, the strategy of congressional leaders apparently has shifted—and the tentative word now is that Congress will act on postal and classified (white collar) pay raises before it acts on congressional raises.

This could speed employee raises. It also will give Congress one additional justification for its own raise. And in the long run, of course, the congressional raise will benefit Federal employees, too, because it will pave the way for lifting of the $14,800 ceiling on Federal executive pay.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the most important issues before the 84th Congress is the question of tariffs and trade and America's foreign economic policy. In a television program broadcast this week by Connecticut stations, WKNB, New Britain; WGTH, Hartford; WNHC, New Haven; WICC, Bridgeport; and WATR, Waterbury, I had the privilege of discussing these matters with Mr. Clarence Randall, special consultant to President Eisenhower in this field.

In the belief that this discussion may contribute to public understanding of the problems involved, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the program be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF A DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY BY SENATOR BUSH AND HON. CLARENCE RANDALL

Senator BUSH. Hello everybody. It's good to be with you once more for another Report from Washington, and today I want to consider with you President Eisenhower's foreign economic policy.

We are very much honored to have as our guest, Clarence Randall, who served as Chairman of the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy and is now his special consultant. I know of no one who is better qualified to help us in a discussion of these problems than Mr. Clarence Randall. He is a businessman of broad experience. He is known as the statesman of steel because of his leadership in working out peaceful labor-management relations in that industry and because of his interest in problems affecting the general welfare of our people. He is a man who calls a spade a spade. Clarence, it's a great pleasure to introduce you today to the people of Connecticut.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, thank you, Senator, very much, for the extremely gracious introduction. We're very old friends and it's a pleasure for me to be on this program and say to you and to my friends, and your friends in Connecticut, what a fine job you did as a member of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy last year. We did not have a man that did his homework as thoroughly, worked as hard, or accomplished as much in our total results as you did, and I am grateful.

Senator BUSH. That's very generous of you. You know, foreign economic policy sounds like very high-level stuff. But the facts, when you boil them down, are essentially simple, and we, as citizens, should know them because they have, and will continue to have, a profound effect upon our lives, our jobs, and our future as a nation. Involved in the whole question of foreign economic policy are these things:

First, the survival of the United States of America as a nation of free men.

Second, the maintenance of a steadily rising standard of living in the United States, with increased opportunities for employment.

Now, we in Connecticut have a great deal at stake. As loyal, patriotic Americans, we want our country to be strong in the struggle against international communism in which we, with the other free nations, are engaged. As citizens of a highly industrialized State, we want to make sure that our own economy in Connecticut is maintained at a high level and that opportunities for jobs will increase.

Now, Clarence, in a recent talk with a Connecticut audience I described the President's foreign economic policy as a hard-headed practical way of fighting communism. I said it hits the Communists where it hurts. So, let's start the ball rolling by discussing that part of the problem. Do you agree with——

Mr. RANDALL. I agree with you, Senator, 100 percent and I am sure that President Eisenhower does.

Senator BUSH. That's good.

Mr. RANDALL. I know he regards his program this year in foreign economic policy of top priority to the welfare of our country. In the first place, I don't think that any thoughtful American need to be told that the cold war is deadly serious. And I think Americans understand that in this complex modern world, the United States just can't go it alone. We have to have friends; we have to have allies; and it isn't enough to have friends—we must have friends who are strong, who can bear their burden. Now, postwar, we have helped a great many nations in the efforts they have made in our behalf, and that time has stopped. Now the time has come when the other nations of the world must earn their own way. The President's foreign economic policy, in terms of our own security, is directed toward getting us allies that are strong in the fight against communism.

Senator BUSH. Clarence, that's wonderful. I admire the way you phrase these things. Now, Clarence, you and I know that foreign economic policy includes many things besides the tariff. But most of the controversy over the President's program seems to have arisen because of his recommendations for authority to negotiate tariff reductions. I would like to discuss that for a few minutes—why the President felt it necessary to ask for this authority to reduce tariffs. I would like to have your views on that. As a Senator from Connecticut, I have a very real obligation to the thousands of working men and women in our factories. Many of our industries grew up under tariff protection. Under that protection, guaranteed to them by our Government, they brought people here from Western Europe, brought them from Poland, they brought them from Italy, and they settled down in the Naugatuck Valley and elsewhere and they raised their families. Now, we have families there of first, second, and third generations of people who have their roots in the grounds of these communities. So it is a matter of very, very vital concern to them. Other Connecticut industries, of course, do a substantial amount in the export trade. I think 10 percent of our employment in Connecticut depends on export of goods to other nations. So ours is a highly industrialized economy. We're proud of the contribution to the national defense we made in both World Wars I and II—contributions so great that others have called Connecticut the arsenal of democracy.

My point is this, that we don't want to throw any monkey wrenches into that economy—that sensitive economy. I don't think the President does; I don't think you do, Clarence. The President has insisted—and those recommendations were really based on yours, Clarence—that any tariff reductions be made on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis. I feel certain that the President will not use any permissive authority granted him so as to cause loss of jobs in any industry in Connecticut. On the contrary, I think it is his belief, which I share, that any action taken will have a stimulating effect on our whole economy and create more jobs. I would like you to comment on that.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, it's a great pleasure to comment on that. I have had the privilege of discussing this program many times with President Eisenhower. I know he believes, as you have just expressed, that no President could fail at all times to have close to his heart the welfare of American business and the welfare of the American worker. Now the problem arises from what is called imbalance in trade. The whole world is a potential market for American goods. Other people want our gadgets, but they haven't had the wherewithal to pay. Until now we have given them large sums of money with which to buy products of our farms, and of our factories; but that period of economic aid has terminated. Therefore, they must earn their own way. Of course, it is difficult to bring about in the world a steadily rising volume of trade and production. Just as Connecticut now ships its goods to every State in the Union, Connecticut can find a market in every country in the world. It's trade can become a little freer.

Senator BUSH. Clarence, would you care to comment a little on GATT—General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs—conference which I believe is just about to start or started in Geneva, Switzerland?

Mr. RANDALL. Those mystic letters should become familiar with every American. Because GATT is simply a medium by which all nations—I think there are 31 in the free world that are involved—sit around at a table and trade off concessions. One country will permit more American goods to enter their border if we in exchange do something for them. It is called reciprocal trade. And it's simply a way by which men of goodwill may gradually, in a moderate, and steady way, reduce the barriers to trade.

Senator BUSH. I think we're going to hear more about that subject before the winter is over and I know that what comes out of the GATT Conference will be of great interest to us here in Connecticut.

Clarence, with respect to these recommendations for tariff reductions and the authority which the President has asked for and which the Congress will consider giving him very shortly, how do you visualize that those recommendations will be used—how will they be put into effect, so to speak—and what will be the effect on different classes of American industry?

Mr. RANDALL. Well, Prescott, the essence of the President's program is that it will be gradual, moderate and selective—commodity

by commodity. I suppose that in Connecticut there are the three principal types of industry: First, where little labor is employed; second, where a good deal of it is employed; and third, where the product involves principally labor.

Senator BUSH. When you say little labor—do you mean the mass production industries?

Mr. RANDALL. Exactly. The automobile industry for example, and perhaps the aircraft industry in your State. Now, actually the situation in each one of those industries will be carefully studied. And everyone concerned, in my judgment, will have ample opportunity to be heard. And it will be done selectively, so that the impact upon our domestic production will be the least possible.

Senator BUSH. Well, Clarence, in our State, I think we don't have so much of the mass production industry, but we do have a lot of that middle group that you speak of. How do you visualize that the President will look at that class of industry? That's the one I think will affect us the most.

Mr. RANDALL. In the first place, I think the President will think they're awful smart and that they're first class industries and they don't need any particular coddling. But if they have a problem, you may be very certain they will be thoughtfully considered even before the gradual reductions contemplated here are put into effect.

Senator BUSH. In other words, the President is going to use the determinations of the Tariff Commission respecting the "peril point" with a great deal of consideration.

Mr. RANDALL. In addition to which there will be the same special interagency group in the Government—involving nine different departments—which sits as a committee and the commodity selected must pass that committee; they then must go to the senior level of the Government for consideration. It is a very thoughtful serious approach to the problem.

Senator BUSH. Well, I think that's a matter of very considerable comfort for us to hear that because our people do, in certain areas of our State, we do have a very high unit labor cost, so to speak. And as they see goods that come in from places like Hong Kong where they pay 8 cents an hour instead of $2.08 as we do in Naugatuck Valley, they get worried about the possibility of competition. I think you have given us a good deal of comfort and a good deal of inspiration today, Clarence, and I want to express to you our very real appreciation for being with us. And also for the leadership which you have shown in tackling this great national problem.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, this week the city of St. Louis, the Gateway to the West, celebrates its 191st birthday. Mayor Tucker has proclaimed the week of February 7–13 as Founders' Week, and the entire community, including many business, farm, church, school, and civic organizations, coordinated by the Council on World Affairs, has joined in a citywide celebration of this significant occasion. The week-long series of programs commemorating the founding of St. Louis included, as one of the highlights, a foreign-policy address by André Philip, of France. Because of the long French tradition in St. Louis, the choice of this distinguished French statesman to participate in the program was especially appropriate.

In honor of the great history of the city of St. Louis from its earliest beginnings through the periods of its growth and progress and because of its notable achievements over the years, I should like to say a few words about its founding.

In February of 1764, Monsieur Pierre Laclede Ligueste sent Monsieur Auguste Chouteau and a small company to found a settlement at the St. Louis location. The men selected for that purpose arrived in boats from Ste. Genevieve on St. Valentine's Day, February 14, 1764. Among the papers left by Monsieur Chouteau, who died in 1829, was his personal recital of the dramatic story.

According to his account, Ligueste had said to him:

> You will land at the place where we marked the trees; you will commence to have the place cleared, and build a large shed to contain the provisions and the tools, and some small cabins to lodge the men. I give you two men on whom you can depend, who will aid very much, and I will rejoin you before long.

Auguste Chouteau continues:

> I arrived at the place designated on the 14th of February and, on the morning of the next day, I put the men to work. They commenced the shed, which was built in a short time, and the little cabins for the men were built in the vicinity. In the early part of April, Laclede arrived among us. He occupied himself with his settlement, fixed the place where he wished to build his house, laid a plan of the village which he wished to found (and he named it St. Louis in honor of Louis XV, whose subject he expected to remain for a long time; he never imagined he was a subject of the King of Spain); and ordered me to follow the plan exactly, because he could not remain any longer with us.

Thus it was that on the 15th day of February 1764 the first trees were felled and the first constructive blows struck on the west bank of the Mississippi River at the point called St. Louis.

The site selected by those pioneers was about 18 miles below the confluence of the two great rivers, the Missouri and the Mississippi. The ground rose above the rivers and leveled off toward the west in wide, rolling lands covered with mighty forests. In addition, the beauty of the terrain and the magnificent views in all directions made Monsieur Ligueste and his associates decide that this would be the most favorable location for the development of a settlement and a future great city. That their judgment was sound, as were their predictions that upon this ground a great city would grow, are amply demonstrated by the progress over 191 years during which St. Louis has come of age. From trading post for Indian traffic, from embarkation point leading to the settlement and development of the great Northwest, from the center of river traffic and commerce before and during the Civil War days, St. Louis has grown to be a mighty city, rich in manufacturing, commerce, and finance.

Within its immediate environs dwell nearly 2 million Americans. Over the years it has made important contributions to our Nation, not only in material advancement, but in social, cultural, and religious achievements that strengthen our democracy.

I am sure, Mr. President, that the Members of the United States Senate, and all the people of our country, will join with me in saluting the city of St. Louis on its 191st birthday.

PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION—ARTICLES BY ROSE McKEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a series of three articles on school construction problems in the United States, written by the distinguished Washington correspondent of the International News Service, Rose McKee. I commend the articles to the attention of the Senate for their clarity and for the testimony they afford as to the need for intelligent action if we are to fulfill our responsibility to our children and to our Nation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CHILDREN'S SCHOOLS—KENNELS USED AS CLASSROOMS IN SHADOW OF NEW YORK CITY

(American children in the mid-20th century are going to school in abandoned dog kennels and discarded garages—in such places as Long Island, N. Y. This problem dramatizes the issue of America's classroom shortage which educators and mothers call a national disgrace. The crisis, soon to be debated in Congress, is explained in the first of a series of three articles by INS correspondent Rose McKee.)

(By Rose McKee)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—American children are going to school in dog kennels and in such abandoned buildings as an old laundry or discarded garage.

This is not the state of things in some far-off mountain or desert area. It is happening, for one place, in the very shadow of New York's famous and multi-billion-dollar skyline.

It is what worried mothers and educators mean when they tell Congress that the classroom shortage is a national disgrace and a scandal.

For 6 years they have been telling their alarming story. It may move Congress this year to vote Federal aid to school construction.

Perhaps the most vivid account of mid-20th century school conditions was related to the Senate Labor Committee the other day by Mrs. Edward R. Gray, of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Here are her words:

"In one community a dog kennel had been reconverted into a school and four classes are being held here. That is in New York State.

"To put children in the place that originally housed dogs seems deplorable. Yet the need for classroom space in an adjoining community is so acute that the superintendent was heard to say, 'I only wish that I, too, had dog kennels to use.'

"In another community, it is an abandoned laundry that has become a schoolhouse. In still another, a commercial garage has been turned into a school.

"This is ingenuity, yes, but these conditions are not conducive to the best teaching, nor are such buildings completely safe."

Mrs. Gray told an interviewer that the schools she described were all on Long Island, N. Y. The dog kennels that serve as a school are at West Islip, Long Island, she said. The children who go to school in an old laundry live at Babylon, Long Island. The garage school is at Glencove, Long Island.

She drew on the suburban New York area for examples because the PTA's national legislative chairman lives on Long Island and has first-hand knowledge of conditions.

But Mrs. Gray said information coming to the PTA reveals that the same type of makeshift schools are being used from Maine to California and from Washington to Florida. Other testimony before the Senate Labor Committee confirms her statement.

Back in 1949 Senate hearings told the incredible disrepair of the Nation's schools. The same story—only progressively worse—has been unfolded periodically in the intervening 6 years.

Many lawmakers are now alarmed over the downhill slide of the public schools. The Eisenhower administration wants action.

Bills to provide as much as $500 million in emergency aid for each of 2 years for school construction have started through the legislative mill. The next month or so should spell their fate, though the bills still could be killed by quibbling over how the money is to be divided up among the States or by an antisegregation rider.

YOUR CHILDREN'S SCHOOLS—WINDOWLESS QUARTERS USED DUE TO CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

(By Rose McKee)

(Second of a series)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—The little one-room schoolhouse of yore might look like a splendid structure to some of America's children of today.

At least it had windows.

Testimony before congressional committees on the acute classroom shortage includes various accounts of children trying to learn their ABC's in cramped, forgotten quarters without windows.

Take, for example, the testimony of Walter Jackson, school superintendent at Decatur City, Ala. He said: "We have one classroom under the steps of the auditorium. It is a classroom without windows where the water seeps in when it rains."

The shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation is such that few in Washington are surprised when they hear of windowless schools.

School buses are being used as classrooms in Kentucky, according to information given the National Education Association.

An NEA spokesman said also that he hears that a 1910 lodge hall is being utilized as a school in the Bloomington, Ind., area, and that a shack about to fall down has been turned into four classrooms in the same vicinity.

The Senate Labor Committee heard testimony the other day that one-third of America's children are today in grave physical danger because they are housed in unsafe and unsanitary schools, Selma M. Borchardt, of the American Federation of Teachers, who made the statement, stressed that the danger was nationwide.

Prof. John K. Norton, of Columbia University's Teachers College, testified that "more than a million and a half children are attending school in barracklike buildings, in rented churches, garages, and other makeshift quarters. They are in basement rooms and hallways and obsolete firetraps that are a threat to their safety."

The reason for the incredible situation is easily understood. Construction of schools came to a halt during World War II. The Korean war put a brake on any attempt to get construction going again.

In the meantime the birthrate climbed. Senate Labor Chairman LISTER HILL (Democrat, Alabama), put it graphically when he said: "Every 15 minutes of every day our tremendous birthrate is bringing 30 more children into the population, * * * creating the need for another classroom and another teacher."

States claim they need Federal aid because they do not have the taxing power to get the entire $10 to $11 billion that is needed for new schools.

Schoolmen say also that with Federal aid for new buildings, States will have enough of the burden lifted from their backs so that they will be able to do more about raising teachers' pay.

Congress as a whole has never looked too favorably on Federal aid to education. Some lawmakers fear it will be a foot in the door toward Federal control of what is taught.

But the prospects of Federal aid being voted this year look brighter than they ever have before. Headlines of the next couple of months will tell the story.

YOUR CHILDREN'S SCHOOLS—SOME PUPILS COMPLETE EIGHT GRADES ON PART-TIME BASIS

(By Rose McKee)

(Last of a series)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—"There are children now graduating from the eighth grade who have never been to school except on a part-time basis."

This is the testimony of Prof. John K. Norton, of Columbia University's Teachers College, before the Senate Labor Committee. The date is 1955.

William Hinkley, school superintendent at Aurora, Colo., testified that in the last 3 years the number of children on split shifts has been doubled.

Nassau County, N. Y., has started—according to another witness—running operations on the triple and quadruple shifts. So far, this has affected only kindergarten classes but educators feel it could come to be the accepted thing for other grades.

At Decatur City, Ala., there have been as many as 90 pupils cramped into one classroom.

Overcrowded classrooms is an alarming problem all over the Nation, according to Senate witnesses. It ranks right beside worry over the physical safety of children. The trouble, of course, boils down to the fact that the United States lacks sufficient school buildings for its ever-mounting school population.

What kind of an education are children getting when they are jammed up 50, 60, and even 90 to a room? Senate witnesses said, "Very poor."

Some students do not get called on to recite even once a month. The interest of the brighter pupils fades and their minds turn to other matters. The average student is apt to fall so far behind he just can't catch up.

Selma M. Borchardt, of the American Federation of Teachers, put it this way: "Overcrowded classes tend to mechanize teaching, depriving the individual child of his right to a personal relationship with a teacher and depriving the teacher of the inspiration which comes from working closely with the individual child."

The National Education Association said many good teachers are leaving the public-school system because of frustration. They find no joy in such mass operations.

The Columbia University expert remarked bitterly in his testimony, "And yet there are those who blame the schools for not giving more individual attention to children and for not playing a stronger role in the prevention of juvenile delinquency."

United States Education Commissioner Samuel H. Brownell directly connected overcrowded schools and youth crime.

Many children on the morning school shift have to leave home shortly after 6 a. m. Those on the afternoon shift do not finish their school day until 6:30 p. m.

Mrs. Edward R. Gray, of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, said that mothers in Nassau County, N. Y., are up in arms because their children have to come home after dusk through dark areas that give genuine concern for their safety.

There is no Aladdin's lamp answer to the classroom shortage. But educators feel that with Federal aid, the States can start erecting new buildings. A vast, 10-year construction program is needed. The Eisenhower administration wants Congress to pass an aid-to-schools bill.

Senate Labor Chairman LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, declared that our national strength, indeed, our national security is at stake in the school issue, which should come to a head in Congress in the near future.

THE CHINA LOBBY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore (Md.) Sun entitled "'China Lobby' and All That."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CHINA LOBBY" AND ALL THAT

(By C. P. Ives)

In January of 1950 a Senator from Ohio, named Taft, proposed that the United States Navy patrol the Strait of Formosa to keep the Chinese Reds from seizing that strategic island. At once a derisive voice from high in the State Department denounced Mr. Taft as a backward pupil.

The term backward pupil, as it happened, was among the mildest of the epithets that were tossed at Mr. Taft in this as in other junctures of the foreign-policy debate in those years. Not a few of Mr. Taft's critics then and thereafter resorted to a kind of abuse which Mr. Taft, even in his occasional wrongheadedness, hardly deserved.

Now 5 years later almost to the week the Senate of which Mr. Taft is no longer a Member has voted twice on Formosa. In the first vote it resolved, 85 to 3, to "secure and protect * * * Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack." In the second it voted 64 to 6 for a treaty of mutual defense with the political regime that holds Formosa.

Now examine a press photo of the Senators who surrounded the President when he signed the resolution for the defense of Formosa. Looking concerned and solemn, as is his habit, but at the very center of the tableau, was Senator KNOWLAND, of California.

If anything, Senator KNOWLAND had been on the receiving end of more derision, more contempt, more systematic abuse even than Mr. Taft. The tone of much of this comment was set by the critic who at one point in the Formosa debate expressed his derisive hope that a then pending proposal of caution would not "agitate Mr. KNOWLAND'S bleeding ulcer."

In these later years the myth of the "China Lobby" has been invented as a hammer to use on men like KNOWLAND. KNOWLAND was bent on a witless war in Asia, we were told, he was the tool of secret machinations out of Taipei, he was, indeed, the senator from Formosa. But when the Senate took the Formosa votes, KNOWLAND stood with the majority.

Another key figure in the press photo of the Formosa resolution signing was Senator GEORGE, of Georgia. It was GEORGE who, with a look and a short speech, had silenced Democratic opposition in the debate.

Senator GEORGE had not figured much in the earlier China controversy. But he had sympathized with Senator BRICKER'S wish to limit the Presidential power to make Yalta-type compacts. It was GEORGE'S version of the Bricker amendment that passed the Senate by a majority only one vote short of the two-thirds needed to prevail.

Senator GEORGE had suffered only less name calling than had Bricker, Knowland, and Taft. But the President's request for congressional backing in the Formosa resolution was a clear concession to the Bricker-George point of view. Certainly GEORGE had

stood as firmly as the others against certain recent manifestations of foreign policy.

Of this policy, one responsible and qualified commentator has recently remarked that "from 1945 on the United States suffered perhaps the greatest disasters in her diplomatic history." These were due to "the American Government's confusions, its wishful thinking, its original failure to recognize that the free world was being attacked, its tardiness in realizing that force as well as high principles was needed."

The commentator was Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr.—neither an isolationist, nor a nationalist, nor a primitive, nor a conformist, nor an antiintellectual, nor a China Firster, nor the senator from Formosa, nor a backward pupil.

The moral? Perhaps it is suggested in something Prof. Herbert Butterfield was saying recently about the British constitution. "There is a common error," said Professor Butterfield, "into which the Whig historian is bound to fall as a result of his misconceptions concerning the historical process.

"He is apt to imagine the British constitution as coming down to us by virtue of the work of long generations of Whigs, and in spite of the obstructions of a long line of tyrants and Tories. In reality, it is the result of the continual interplay and perpetual collision of the two. It is the very embodiment of all the balances and compromises * * * that were necessitated by this interplay."

What an American student of recent foreign affairs might gather from Professor Butterfield's words is that foreign policy, too, may be enriched by contributions from more than one school of thought.

Not, obviously, that the Tafts, Knowlands, Brickers, Georges are infallible now or were invariably right in the past. "None of those who have held action posts in foreign affairs through a stormy period can claim a perfect score," wrote Mr. Berle. He added: "Experience teaches those who have, to temper hindsight with sympathy."

Certainly mere recrimination in a situation as grave as our own would be a kind of frivolity. But the Berle survey does suggest that the foreign policy after 1945 gave its architects little license to treat their adversaries with contempt. And that suggestion may have some use from now on out.

ADVERSE IMPACT OF EISENHOWER SCHOOL PROGRAM UPON STATE OF OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is entitrely possible that the present administration's so-called school-aid program may turn out to be a school setback program instead.

I have received a letter from the office of the State superintendent of public instruction in my own State of Oregon, which indicates that the program could result in boosting the interest rates paid to banks and other lending agencies by the hard-pressed school districts in my State.

It is possible that the Eisenhower program may be of greater aid to banks than to school children and their teachers by stimulating a wave of borrowing at higher interest levels. The President mentions 3⅛ percent, but the average school-interest rate in Oregon now is 2.45 percent.

The people of my State of Oregon are enlightened and courageous citizens. They do not agree with any narrow view taken toward our schools.

During the past week a prominent Republican member of the Oregon State Senate, Gene L. Brown, was quoted by the United Press as saying that "Oregon is simply not wealthy enough to support the Nation's best schools." Senator Brown also said that Oregon "will have to be content with some second-rate services for awhile if it is to balance its books."

When we try to synchronize this defeatist attitude with the feeble and utterly inadequate program of school aid proposed by the Eisenhower administration nationally, it looks as if the young men and women of Oregon are being consigned to some sort of educational limbo for the next few years.

Do the national administration and State Senator Brown expect to put a generation of children in the deep-freeze while we have inadequate schools? Are they going to tell these young citizens of Oregon to come back in 15 or 20 years and take refresher courses, providing we have sufficient funds for proper schools by that time?

Our young people come this way but once. I reject the defeatist policies of both the national administration and of reactionary members of the Oregon Legislature. I believe this rich and wealthy Nation—a nation capable of building the world's mightiest war machine—can construct sufficient schools for its children.

This is why I am acting as a cosponsor of realistic and effective bills to provide $500 million in school-construction funds now, and to use the income from the outer-Continental Shelf oil reserves to help support schools in all 48 States. These measures represent the minimum which this vast and resourceful Nation should do for its students, today.

There actually is the grave possibility that the President's program could mean far more Federal interference in our schools than ever before, although the present administration pretends to be opposed to such interference.

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of State School Officers, points out that special State school-building agencies, reliant on Federal funds, could tell local districts what kind of schools to construct—perhaps even the school program itself, warns Dr. Fuller.

Dr. Fuller also claims that a special State agency for school construction, as advocated by President Eisenhower, would violate the traditional educational policy that separate agencies should not be set up outside the regular Department of Education in each State.

It is significant, I think, that such programs as school lunches and school-construction aid in defense areas were carried out during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations without Federal intrusion into local responsibility for schools. Yet the Eisenhower program threatens such intrusion, according to the Nation's leading educational officials.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter I have received from Mr. A. L. Beck, of the State superintendent of public instruction's offices in Salem, Oreg.; my reply to Mr. Beck; also a dispatch from the Medford Mail-Tribune which was received from the United Press in Salem, Oreg.; and a timely article from the New York Times of February 13, 1955, by the educational editor of that newspaper, Benjamin Fine.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
DIVISION OF GENERAL EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., February 9, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: We have received the message of President Eisenhower with considerable interest. One item covered in the message may produce an undesirable effect in our State.

Since June 1954 the average interest rate on bonds to the school districts in Oregon has been 2.45 percent with a low of 1.476 percent and a high of 3.25 percent. This latter figure was on one small issue. We feel that if the Congress should approve a 3⅛-percent interest rate on school loans, regular commercial agencies will in turn increase their interest rates to some figure slightly below this, possibly 3 percent.

During the 1952–53 biennium, Oregon spent $45,556,352.60 on school construction. In case interest rates should be increased to 3 percent, this would mean an added cost to the taxpayers of Oregon of over $100,000 during a comparable biennium.

We felt that this matter would be sufficiently serious to warrant bringing it to your attention. Thank you for the copies of Senate bill 5.

Sincerely yours,

REX PUTNAM,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.
By A. L. BECK,
Director, Schoolhouse Planning.

FEBRUARY 14, 1955.

Mr. A. L. BECK,
Director, Schoolhouse Planning,
Department of Education,
Division of General Education,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR MR. BECK: I share with you the fear that the prevailing interest rate on school-district bonds may rise under the so-called school-aid program proposed last week by President Eisenhower.

This program, I am afraid, promises to contain more benefits for bankers and money-lenders than for schoolchildren and teachers.

I think it is entirely possible that the guaranteeing by the Government of school bonds at 3⅛ percent interest, as envisioned by the President, may help to raise interest rates to a figure higher than the current average rate on school bonds in Oregon, which you state presently to be 2.45 percent.

I think you will recall that a good many of the policies proposed in the past by the Eisenhower administration have had a tendency to increase the interest rates charged by banks and other lending agencies.

The so-called school-aid program of this administration actually amounts to no genuine aid at all. Districts already heavily in debt are merely encouraged to go further into debt. The direct aid is only to really stricken districts and amounts to about $200 million over a period of 3 years—an average of about $66 million annually. When you think that our own State of Oregon, with a mere 1 percent of the national population, needs approximately $100 million for school construction in the next 5 years, it is obvious how weak and feeble is the program now proposed by the President for the entire nation.

You may be sure that I will do all in my power as one of Oregon's United States Sen-

ators to oppose a program that would raise the interest rate on school bonds to the numerous school districts forced to borrow funds in our State.

For this reason, I am supporting, as a cosponsor, not the President's inadequate program, but the $500-million bill for direct aid to school construction drafted by Senator LISTER HILL. I also am a cosponsor of the Hill bill to use revenues from the outer Continental Shelf oil deposits for support of the school systems in all 48 States of the Union.

With good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

[From the Medford Mail Tribune of February 9, 1955]

SPECIAL ELECTION ON OREGON BUDGET BEING DISCUSSED—INCREASED SERVICES, BUILDINGS PROBLEM

SALEM.—The four legislative committees charged with balancing Oregon's budget met in joint session today amidst increasing talk of a special election that would put the State's financial dilemma in the laps of the people.

Oregon must find $65 million in new revenue if it is to maintain increased services and provide the new buildings asked for by State institutions. Senator Rudie Wilhelm, Jr., Republican, Portland, told the senate and house joint ways and means committee and the senate and house taxation committees it was his opinion a tax program of such magnitude could not be built without referring it to the people.

PEOPLE SHOULD DECIDE

Senator Francis Ziegler, Republican, Corvallis, said the people should decide at a special election how many State services they want and then be asked to vote the increased revenue measures necessary to pay for them. Otherwise, he said, the legislature faces the chance that it will have its decisions for raising new money overturned by a public challenge at the polls. But Representative Alfred Corbett, Democrat, Portland, said he thought a referral to the people was an abrogation of the legislature's responsibility.

NOT WEALTHY ENOUGH

Senator Gene Brown, Republican, Grants Pass, told the committees that Oregon is simply not wealthy enough to support the Nation's best schools, top welfare support payments, and the best institutional and public health care. Oregon, he said, will have to be content with some second-rate services for awhile if it is to balance its books.

Meanwhile, there were more indications of greater pressures on State finances. Bills by individual legislators would cost the State in excess of $11 million above the budget requests if they are passed by the legislature.

[From the New York Times of February 13, 1955]

EDUCATION IN REVIEW — EISENHOWER'S SCHOOL-AID PLAN IS CRITICIZED AS INADEQUATE BY MANY EDUCATORS

(By Benjamin Fine)

Although willing to adopt a wait-and-see attitude, most educators and spokesmen for educational organizations reached by this department last week were skeptical of President Eisenhower's plan to help the States meet the school crisis. The general feeling was that the White House program was inadequate and that the local communities would be in serious trouble before any real help could reach them. Many schoolmen expressed fear that the President's plan would bring about more Federal control and interference in education.

In essence the White House proposals are designed to help States help themselves in constructing much-needed school buildings. Although the message called for a $7 billion building program, only a minor portion of this would come from the Federal Government. The bulk of the money would come from the States themselves, and the States, in turn, would, through special agencies, help local communities.

MAJOR FEATURES OF PROGRAM

Here are the four major provisions of the proposed program:

1. The Government would buy school bonds if the communities themselves could not sell them at a reasonable rate of interest—set at 3⅛ percent. The Federal Government would have an appropriation of $750 million to be spent over a 3-year period, for the purchase of school bonds.

2. The Federal Government would encourage the creation of State agencies to build $6 billion worth of schools during the next 3 years. Districts that had exceeded their borrowing powers would, through the new State agencies, be able to get more funds for school buildings. The agencies would build the schools, then rent them to the local communities. The initial Federal and State grants would thus be repaid.

3. The Government would help hardship communities, to the extent of $200 million, over a 3-year period. This sum would be given on a matching basis; the States would contribute an amount equal to that supplied by the Federal Government. However, only those communities that could not finance their own school-building program would be eligible to receive any Federal assistance.

4. The Federal Government would provide a $20 million fund to pay half the administrative costs of special studies by the States. These studies would be designed to plan long-term financing programs free of obsolete restrictions or other outmoded practices.

That President Eisenhower intends to back his program became evident when, at his Wednesday news conference, he read a 600-word statement, reiterating the need for Federal support of education with a minimum of Federal control. He stressed that public schools must always reflect the character and aspirations of the people of the community.

The chorus of disapprovals, voiced by prominent educators and representatives of educational groups, was not against the President's thesis that the schools should be free of Federal control or interference. The educators supported that position wholeheartedly. Rather, the disagreement came with the actual methods by which the plan was to be implemented.

"Too inadequate and too cumbersome," was the general reaction to the White House program.

FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

In the opinion of Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, the President's program meant more, rather than less, Federal interference in the Nation's public schools. He pointed out that the State agencies, supported in part by Federal funds, would be able to dictate to the local communities as to the type of building to be constructed and perhaps the school program itself.

Moreover, the special State-school building agencies, Dr. Fuller said, would violate the generally accepted school policy that agencies should not be set up outside the department of education in each State.

"Out of $2 billion issued in bonds for schools constructed by the communities last year," he continued, "only $76 million worth were sold at more than 3⅛ percent. The Government guaranty, then, would have almost no effect in increasing the number of buildings to be constructed."

The amount of Federal assistance offered by the White House program is totally inadequate, Dr. Hollis L. Caswell, president of Teachers College, Columbia University, declared. The communities, he said, are just barely able to keep up with the tremendous population growth. To meet the needs of an accumulated backlog, substantial Federal help will be necessary, Dr. Caswell declared. The stopgap program, he added, simply will not do the job.

Although New York City has a tremendous building program now underway, the city needs additional help if the obsolete schools are to be replaced, and if overcrowding is to be reduced. This view was voiced by Charles H. Silver, president of the board of education. The suggested program from the White House will prove of little help to the city in actually getting more buildings underway, he said. The problem in New York City, as in many other communities that are not poverty stricken, is not that of selling bonds. Rather, it is one of trying to find means to meet the school crisis without overburdening the taxpayers, Mr. Silver emphasized.

Mr. Silver suggested that the board of education create a committee to study and evaluate the Eisenhower program. He said that the committee might go to Washington to discuss the plan with the proper officials, in an attempt to cooperate still further.

CALLED INADEQUATE

The President's program is inadequate, in the opinion of Carl J. Megel, president of the American Federation of Teachers. Although it is gratifying that President Eisenhower has recognized the need for Federal aid to education, he said, the recommendations for carrying it out are disappointing. Mr. Megel called the plan a "new reconstruction finance project, more for the benefit of bankers than a practical program for the benefit of the Nation's children."

According to Dr. George D. Stoddard, former president of the University of Illinois and now head of the New York University evaluation committee, the proposed Federal aid program will not meet the current school emergency. The communities that most need the money, he said, may not be able to meet the requirements set up in the White House plan.

The President's program does not go far enough, said Dr. Francis J. Brown, staff associate of the American Council on Education. The concern of the Federal Government, he declared, should be in terms of the overall need of the Nation for educational facilities.

Similarly, Dr. Worth McClure, executive secretary of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association, said the President's program is far too limited. He declared that educators would find it hard to reconcile the school plan with the $100 billion road-building program. He expressed the fear that the rental of the buildings to the community would, in effect, put the school system in the position of a lessee.

OTHER NEEDS STRESSED

Every one of those interviewed by this department agreed that the need for assistance could not be ignored. The classroom shortage is critical. A survey conducted by the United States Office of Education showed that the country must build a minimum of 50,000 new elementary and high school classrooms each year to keep up with growing enrollments. There is a shortage of more than 300,000 classrooms today, and at the present rate of building this deficit will not be erased.

But buildings alone do not make a good school system. Teachers are needed, and needed at once. It is difficult to estimate the exact number of teachers that could be used in the schools today. But it is known that 80,000 teachers are on an emergency basis, serving on substandard licenses. The teachers' colleges prepared about 35,000 elementary teachers last year. According to reports from the school superintendents, at

least 135,000 teachers were needed. The deficit is a growing one, again caused by the skyrocketing enrollments. The schools of the Nation are growing at the rate of more than 1 million children a year. This probably will continue for at least another 10 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, morning business is closed.

THE IMPRISONMENT OF AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the United Nations is not to become as impotent and futile as the League of Nations became, I think it is very important that it be able to function in all matters of importance which come before that international body.

Apparently on the basis of its action in seeking a cease-fire in the area of the islands off the coast of China, the United Nations is not prepared to take the necessary steps to see to it that the aggression of the Chinese Communists will be resisted if it is persisted in. I hope that in the discussions which are taking place, since the proposed cease-fire is a subject which has perhaps loomed larger in the public eye in the United States and throughout the world than has the issue of the prisoners of war, the 15 Americans who are still held in the Communist jail in Communist China are not to become forgotten men.

The 4 pilots and the 11 other American airmen who were sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years are all being held in a prisoner-of-war enclosure in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice. They should have been exchanged under the terms of the Korean armistice at the time of the little switch or the big switch of prisoners of war. They were deliberately held back by the Chinese Communists, and no one can be absolutely certain of the number of American GI's or airmen, nor, indeed, of the number of military personnel of some of our allies, still being held as prisoners contrary to the terms of the Korean armistice.

I have checked with the Department of State to ascertain when it was that this Government first received information relative to the specific group of 15 Americans who are being held as prisoners by the Chinese Communists. I understand that while there were indications earlier, and while we had considerable suspicion earlier, that the prisoners were alive and were being held contrary to the armistice terms, the first direct confirmation of such information was received on June 21, 1954, at the Geneva Conference, when the Chinese Communist delegation, through Mr. Wang, who was secretary general of the Chinese Communist delegation, confirmed to the cordinator of the United States delegation, Mr. U. Alexis Johnson, that the Communists were holding the 15 airmen. This number includes, as I have previously pointed out, the 11 who were already sentenced and the 4 jet pilots who presumably are being held merely in a prisoner-of-war enclosure rather than a prison, if there be, in fact, a great deal of difference.

It seems to me that the conscience of the United Nations should be deeply troubled by this clear violation of the Korean armistice terms. Quite properly, the Department of State and our representatives at the United Nations suggested that until Mr. Hammarskjold's visit to Peiping had been completed—a visit the wisdom of which some persons seriously questioned, but the decision as to which, after all, was in Mr. Hammarskjold's hands—there should be a period of relative silence on the part of this Government as to the American prisoners of war.

Considerable time has now elapsed since Mr. Hammarskjold returned and reported on his mission to Peiping. Because it is apparent from the report of his visit that Mr. Hammarskjold did not bring back the prisoners of war with him, and, what is more, did not state an estimated time in the future when it might reasonably be supposed that they would be returned, and also because the prisoners are still being held in violation of the Korean armistice terms, I say on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States that I believe the American people have a right to ask the United Nations as a whole what that organization intends to do about the problem.

Are the men who are being held, clearly in violation of the armistice terms, to be allowed to rot in Communist prisons for from 4 to 10 years, while the United Nations merely continues to debate other subjects? This is a question which, in my judgment, the American people will not allow to remain unanswered. I think the morale of our Armed Forces is deeply involved in this question.

I have had numerous communications from both enlisted and officer personnel, some of them serving in Korea, some serving in other sections of the world, and others serving in the United States. I have also had communications from veterans of the Korean war. All these persons have expressed great concern that the United Nations, under which the Korean action was carried out, has not taken effective steps to secure the release of these men and others who are being illegally held.

Because the attention of the United Nations has been directed to other matters, which perhaps in a sense are more urgent, and which temporarily have caused the subject of the American prisoners to be laid aside, I did not want the occasion to pass without expressing the view that the United Nations should not feel that the Congress of the United States, the Government of the United States, or the American people intend to remain silent while the United Nations is endeavoring to decide that a violation of the armistice is worthy of the taking of some effective steps.

HANDLING OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] for the fine, well-balanced report which has been filed as a result of the Ives subcommittee's investigations into the handling of welfare and pension plans.

It is a report that points up the responsibilities of labor union officials, representatives of management, and of insurance companies in safeguarding funds which have been earmarked for millions of members of labor unions throughout the Nation.

These funds have been set aside as a result of collective bargaining. They are dedicated to the purchase of health and welfare insurance or pensions for the workingmen and their families. It is a serious offense when these funds are depleted through mismanagement, or just plain dishonesty.

The law now provides for trustees to guard these funds—trustees named from the ranks of labor and from management. However, as President Eisenhower stated in his message to Congress of January 11, 1954:

> These standards are not adequate to protect and conserve these funds that are held in trust for the welfare of individual union members. It is my recommendation that Congress initiate a thorough study of welfare and pension funds covered by collective-bargaining agreements, with a view to enacting such legislation as will protect and conserve these funds for the millions of working men and women who are the beneficiaries.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to become familiar with this problem. As chairman of a House Government Operations Subcommittee, I conducted investigations that touched on this problem in Minneapolis, Minn., Cleveland, Ohio, Chicago, Ill., and here in the District of Columbia.

Those investigations were in the broad field of labor racketeering, but invariably our investigators ran across the trail of a new racket, namely, the looting of health and welfare insurance funds and pension funds. Because of a jurisdictional problem, my Government Operations Subcommittee did not find it possible to delve deeply into all of the indications of corruption or loose management of union health, welfare, and pension funds.

I recommend that Senators read the Ives report, as well as the hearings and reports of House committees which went into this subject.

In the investigations to date the surface has only been scratched, but I am sure that any Senator who reads the hearings will be as shocked as I was at the loose handling of these funds.

I was disturbed that insurance agents and brokers would engage in questionable practices to get the job of writing health and welfare insurance policies.

It irked me to find that many employers who were named as trustees were not fulfilling their responsibility, but were allowing the vast sums collected to come under the full control of a few labor leaders.

I was shocked when I found that powerful and influential labor leaders were not doing their utmost to obtain for their union members the maximum benefits from the funds which had been obtained

in collective bargaining for pensions or welfare funds.

The money belongs to the union members—the workingmen. However, a few labor leaders refuse to tell their membership how these funds are handled, who gets the big fees, and who is borrowing money from the funds.

In Minneapolis, my investigators found that Eugene Williams, business agent for Local 544 of the Teamsters, had borrowed $10,000 from a pension fund created for union members. Williams and several members of his family were receiving regular paychecks for administering the fund.

It amazed me when Eugene Williams claimed the protection of the fifth amendment when he was questioned relative to the $10,000 he borrowed from a union pension fund.

It shocked me when an international vice president—Sidney L. Brennan—refused to tell a committee of Congress anything about the positions he held as trustee of pension or welfare funds.

Williams and Brennan were within their rights in pleading the constitutional privilege of the fifth amendment when they felt their testimony might implicate them in crimes. But it is a sorry situation, indeed it is a shocking situation, when highly placed officials of a labor union refuse to testify when there are indications that the pension funds or welfare funds of their union members are being dissipated either by mismanagement or corruption.

It is not a partisan matter when union officials refuse to tell how they are handling the funds established for the benefit of union members. This is not a question of being prounion or antiunion. It is a simple question of honesty.

I am sure that every Member of this body is interested seeing to it that the welfare and pension funds are protected so that they may bring the greatest benefits to the union members.

I am hopeful that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will find it possible to pursue the mismanagement in Minneapolis and in other parts of the country, so that the evil will be dramatized, and labor union members, the general public, and Congress will be able to see the full import of this activity. Then it will be stamped out.

In connection with my statement on this subject, I was pleased to read in the newspapers today an Associated Press dispatch indicating that the A. F. of L. has shown its interest in this question, and that a number of responsible labor leaders have indicated that they want this matter checked fully. That manifestation, which has recently developed, is to be commended, and I hope it will be pursued by the union executives. I trust the matter will be aired fully by proper committees, not only of the other body of Congress but of the Senate as well.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires the floor, I, as the acting majority leader, expect to move that the Senate adjourn until next Friday at noon. I shall withhold the motion for the time being, so Senators who desire to do so may indicate that they wish to speak.

Apparently no Senators now desire to speak. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Louis S. Rothschild, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Boyd Leedom, of South Dakota, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1959, vice Albert Cummins Beeson, term expired.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years from March 4, 1955. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425, United States Army, for appointment as Comptroller of the Army, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion:

To be first lieutenants

×Aiken, Francis J., Jr., O65919.
×Allen, Harry E., O67893.
×Anderson, William D., Jr., O65858.
×Angell, Burrel D., O65843.
×Apostolu, Daniel R., O65910.
×Arnold, Edward L., O66133.
×Attaway, Hubert H., O65852.
Baker, Cyrus E., Jr., O65927.
Baker, Wallace I., O70259.
×Banchefsky, Howard S., O65901
×Barnard, Talbott, O67895.
×Barth, Richard L., O66609.
×Bauer, Frank L., O65886.
×Bechamp, Edward J., O65822.
Beil, James N., O65899.
×Bickley, Nelson R., Jr., O65848.
×Black, Charles S., Jr., O65864.
×Bomar, Lesil S., Jr., O65920.
×Bradford, Edward M., O70282.
×Brouphy, Harold E., Jr., O65841.
×Brunosky, Frank, O66741.
×Calcatera, Kenneth J., O65891.
×Capps, William R., O65898.
×Carr, John M., O67904.
×Carter, Frank A., O65906.
×Cate, William F., Jr., O71456.
×Cochran, William J., O67558.
×Constance, Harbin A., O67909.
×Cornwell, John B., O65902.
×Cosper, Manley H., Jr., O70310.
Cox, Alden LeR., O70312.
×Cullen, Victor A., O66144.
×Danzeisen, William H., Jr., O65935.
×Darnell, Kenneth E., O65929.
×DeBord, Leonard A., O67564.
×Dew, Clifton R., O65914.
×Dukes, Harry L., Jr., O65869.
×Easler, Charles J., Jr., O65877.
×Elmer, Lee N., O69913.
×Fellman, Herbert, O65870.
×Finter, George A., O71492.
×Fiser, Donald D., O70183.
×Flint, Bruce, O65931.
×Flint, Roy K., O68185.
×Fogg, Charles L., O66895.
×Foley, James D., O65876.
×Fooks, Virgil T., O66898.
×Frame, Herbert C., O65895.
×Gardner, Jack J., O66152.
×Gaspard, George W., Jr., O7149ó.
×Gatzka, Charles A., O66153.
×Goodrum, Richard W., O66155.
×Graves, Charles E., O71502.
×Gray, Coy J., O65938.
Grek, Martin C., O65897.
×Grubbs, John A., O68008.
×Guttery, Boyd M., O65845.
×Haley, James F., O65847.
×Hasty, Gerald R., O71507.
×Heinlein, Willard H., O71509.
×Hemphil, Donald F., O65854.
×Hemphill, Paul, Jr., O66015.
×Hermann, Ulrich, O69679.
×Hill, Wiliam C., O65868.
×Hippler, Richard A., O71517.
×Holcomb, Lowell A., O68362.
×Holmes, George T., O67580.
×Hooper, George T., O65857.
×James, William, O65926.
×Jardstrom, Veikko E., O65828.
×Jenefsky, Charles B., O65905.
Johnson, Gerald K., O71527.
×Jones, Frank A., Jr., O65887.
×Kirkpatrick, Joe B., O65908.
×Landry, Robert L., O71543.
×Lepper, Lewis, O66629.
×Liles, Donald E., O66630.
×Livingston, Otis W., Jr., O65896.
×Loshbough, Robert P., O66176.
×Lund, John R., O69731.
×Lutz, Bradley T., O71550.
×Magill, Henry F., O65856.
Mallonee, Paul G., O65832.
×Maples, Floyd M., O70209.
×Matthews, Alfred W., O65917.
×McCaffree, Robert J., O67841.
×McClellan, William B., O67152.
×McJilton, Robert B., Jr., O68031.
×Mennona, Edward, O71561.
×Mensch, Donald H., O65879.
×Meyer, Charles O., O65894.
×Mezo, Joseph T., O65825.
×Miller, Charles B., O67180.
×Moore, James R., O65842.
×Moore, Raymond E., O65923.
×Morris, Lawrence W., O65846.
×Mundy, William E., O65933.
×Neel, Hoover J., O65885.
×Neely, Albert D., O71578.
×Neicoff, Mike E., O66634.
×Parker, Richard F., O65851.
×Parks, John E., O65890.
×Pavlovsky, Gilbert W., O65880.
×Peel, Vernon, O65827.
×Perkins, Thomas C., Jr., O66069.
×Phipps, Henry D., O66635.
×Pierce, William R., Jr., O65882.
×Pim, Benjamin F., Jr., O65928.
×Polanski, Joseph T., O65863.
Powell, Terry E., O65823.
×Pruett, Kenneth E., O65900.
×Quirk, Ronald E., O66076.
Reagor, James L., O67606.
×Renick, Van T., O65916.
×Ritchie, Victor F., O66636.
×Rodolph, Carl P., Jr., O66199.
×Rogers, John P., O68838.
×Rogers, Robert E., O65834.
×Rogerson, William T., O68155.
×Sandven, Conne M., O68047.
×Schaefer, Richard B., O66201.
×Shealy, Edgar L., Jr., O65884.
×Shelton, Cyrus Q., Jr., O65907.

×Shipman, Border A., O65904.
×Shiver, Ivey M., 3d, O65862.
×Smith, Noel M., O70237.
×Stevenson, James R., O65892.
×Stevenson, William M., O67412.
×Stipetic, John J., O65888.
×Storey, William J., O67874.
×Sucher, Edwin G., O65829.
×Sullivan, Richard H., O65874.
×Sweitzer, Harvey C., O66108.
×Talley, Richard P., O66205.
×Tedford, John B., O65830.
×Templeton, Norman T., O67967.
×Thoreson, Dale B., O67447.
×Threlkeld, Donald H., O66643.
×Tombaugh, William W., O70532.
×Traver, Daniel G., O69819.
×Turner, George M., O67970.
×Vavra, Luke A., Jr., O65872.
×Weathers, Robert B., O65936.
×Whigham, Samuel B., Jr., O66209.
×Wilson, Rodney E., O65925.
×Wright, Benjamin C., O65913.
Zenz, Alexander R., O67976.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

×Barnes, William W., O70263.
×Haskins, Stanley R., O70364.
×Johnson, Aaron B., O70392.
×Kilby, Edgar G., O71532.
×Slack, Dana S., O70505.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

×Leiman, Martha L., L446.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

×Aycock, Erline T., N2559.
×Bess, Jane C., N2560.
×Davis, Betty L., N2636
×DeLaney, Ramona E., N2550.
×Fritz, Mildred C., N2561.
×Gilbert, Dixie L., N2603.
×Houdek, Rosemary, N2563.
×Kane, Helen M., N2564.
×Lane, Barbara E., N2604.
×Lundy, Sara N., N2551.
×Reid, Kay M., N2553.
×Rodgers, Marie L., N2654.
×Sammons, Nadine G., N2554.
×Schiffman, Regina H., N2567.
×Trees, Mary B., N2568.
×Watters, Shirley G., N2557.
×Williams, Hope A., N2549.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress.

To be major

Belaval, Gustavo S., MC, O4002641.

To be captains

Campbell, Ralph E., MC, O1775576.
Derse, John J., MC, O991033.
Gastineau, Robert M., MC, O1919764.
Hardie, Philip W., MC, O2103400.
Lam, Gene N., MC O975354.
O'Shaughnessy, Edward J., MC, O473931.

To be first lieutenants

Baker, Floyd W., MC, O4016511.
Burkett, Harry E., MC, O1541180.
Cox, Juana J., ANC, N900331.
Crampton, George H., MSC, O996723.
Drury, Orcutt P., MSC, O2014448.
Dube, Thomas S., MSC, O2263221.
Faulconer, Ernest B., MSC, O1922580.
Fiebiger, Guy E., DC, O4032848.
John, Richard W., JAGC, O2209591.
Johnson, Edward L., VC, O1928904.
Johnson, William R., MC.
Kropski, Lena S., ANC, N792820.
Larrabee, Wayne F., DC, O2048377.
Lask, Alphonse F., MSC, O997938.
Matter, Harlan G., MSC, O2014042.
McKeon, Edward C., MC, O1938356.
Meadow, Seymour, MSC, O998235.
Milian, Helen T., ANC, N805373.
Myers, William J., Jr., MSC, O2014379.
Pond, Nathaniel H., MSC, O1547116.
Rezendes, Ernest F., MSC, O995150.
Schmidt, Howard H., MSC, 1922620.
Schulte, John W., MC, O1928879.
Watkins, Robert E., MSC, O996570.
Wilks, Norman E., MSC, O998579.
Wilson, Kenneth R., MSC, O998409.

To be second lieutenants

Bomberger, Richard W., Jr., MSC, O1891009.
Capozzi, Henry P., MSC, O2265724.
Dyke, Lester M., II, MSC, O2104410.
Ginsberg, David M., MSC, O1893986.
Golobic, Frances M., ANC, N901667.
Lesher, Edward R., MSC, O1928301.
McDonald, Billy A., MSC, O1877928.
Pablo, John T., MSC, O1893922.
Pearson, William G., MSC, O2204727.
Petersen, Donald L., MSC, O1933678.
Reber, John A., MSC, O1118789.
Riggs, Albert C., Jr., MSC, O1061527.
Rigney, Max E., MSC, O1893748.
Schiavone, Albert, MSC, O1933545.
Sullivan, Louise E., ANC, N902234.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be captains

Harvester, James V., O1637627.
O'Neill, John J., O989995.
Roth, John D., O927604.

To be first lieutenants

Burgreen, Charles L., O994185.
Devanny, William G., O2264612.
Eyler, Mervin S., O2012294.
Wakefield, John F., O1333742.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Long, Harold B., O2211780.

To be second lieutenants

Jenkins, William M., Jr., O1887295.
McGurl, Peter W., O1936691.
Pratt, Joseph B., O1932371.
Smith, William F., O1874867.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Isbell, Charles A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Benoski, Joseph J.
Bilyeu, Robert E., O4032696
Burk, Richard K.
Childs, Wendell A.
Cuba, Paul J., Jr.
Foster, Donald G., O4027665
Hill, Frank J.
LoRe, Jesse D.
March, Miles B., O4027822
Martch, William E.
Oblock, Louis W.
Pierce, Wilbur R., Jr.
Rea, Thomas
Silva, David G., Jr.
Talbot, Bailey M., IV
Thames, Peter H., O4032536

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fewer Jobs, the Same Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comment about the sharp decline in employment in manufacturing industries revealed by figures from the Department of Labor and by Federal Reserve Board data. These figures show a loss of more than a million jobs among production workers in manufacturing employment alone in the past 14 months.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCNAMARA

The Federal Reserve Board index of manufacturing production for January of this year was the same as in November 1953, 14 months before. The index number was 132.

The dramatic and challenging thing about this figure is not alone the evidence that manufacturing production is in the doldrums. When this index is placed beside the Department of Labor employment figures for the same 2 months, the data show that this level of production has been maintained with a loss of more than a million jobs among the production workers in these industries. In January 1955, about 12½ million workers were able to produce as much as 13½ million produced 14 months before.

Employment drops while production is maintained, manufacturing industries

Date	Index of production [1]	Production worker employment [2]	Index of man-hours [2]	Indicated output per man-hour
November 1953	132	13,534,000	110	120
January 1955	132	12,528,000	102	129
Change	0	1,006,000	(3)	(4)

[1] Federal Reserve Board of Governors; monthly releases.
[2] Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; monthly report on employment and earnings.
[3] Minus 7 percent.
[4] Plus 8 percent.

Taking into account the number of hours worked, we find that the number of man-hours put into the job has declined by 7 percent. Those who prefer to talk in terms of man-hour output will find that there has

been an increase of about 8 percent during this short time.

I think these figures show very dramatically how fast our technological revolution is moving.

I would like to see evidence that the administration is conscious of what this means, and has the plans to turn this technological progress into higher living standards for all people, instead of for only those lucky enough to keep their jobs. I hope there are plans for protecting the workers whose jobs are melting away, so that they and their children are not forced to pay a heavy price in unemployment and the destruction of their living standards. So far, I have seen no such plans.

The job is not an easy one. If the administration takes it on, it will have the sympathy and help of all of us. If the administration continues to fiddle with optimistic forecasts about increasing production while unemployment continues to grow in our major industries, the cost to all of us will be great.

Why VEPCO Wants TVA Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I issued discussing the action of Virginia Electric & Power Co. in circulating Dean Clarence Manion's proposal that TVA be sold.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

A shareholder of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.—known as VEPCO—has sent me a piece of literature being circulated by the company among its shareholders.

It consists of a printed copy of an address delivered by Dean Clarence E. Manion on last November 28, in which he urges the immediate sale of TVA, recalls that he once before proposed this before he was fired as Chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission, after which President Eisenhower said he was "shooting from the hip," and stated that if this "be treason to the TVA brand of socialism, then Senator KEFAUVER can once more make the most of it."

In their letters to the shareholders J. G. Holtzclaw, president, and D. C. Barner, chairman of the board of VEPCO, refer to Dr. Manion's address as a "forthright statement of facts," and a statement of "the fundamentals of the American way of life."

The statement is not a statement of facts by any means, but I believe the shareholders of VEPCO, and even more the ratepayers of VEPCO, would be interested in why this utility wants the TVA sold.

One can get an inkling of why by examining their rate structure. VEPCO users in Alexandria, for instance, pay $7.25 per 250 kilowatt-hours, while right across the Potomac River in Washington—an actual stone's throw for George Washington according to legend—ratepayers of another private utility pay $5.84 for the same amount.

At the other end of the VEPCO system, the TVA end, the same bill for TVA users is $5. Naturally, along with their allies on the western side of TVA—the Dixon-Yates combination—VEPCO is set on destroying this example of what is a fair bill for power.

Prior to merger of the two companies which formed VEPCO—and took over substantial domination of power in Virginia—the Federal Power Commission required them to write off more than $28 million of inflationary items—mostly water—on their books. "Inflationary items" is another way of saying items used for the purpose of building up a high-rate structure and milking the public.

That the day of inflationary items is not entirely over would be indicated by the fact, which also should be called to the ratepayers' attention, that they pay for the printing and mailing of the misleading and nonfactual propaganda which I am talking about when they pay their power bills. It all becomes a part of the expense of operation.

It might also be mentioned in passing that this propaganda being circulated by VEPCO, while so many of our friends are out making speeches eulogizing Abraham Lincoln, is the statement of a man who says he doesn't agree with Lincoln.

On the broadcast at which Dean Manion proposed sale of the TVA, he was asked by Mr. William Wise, one of the panel: "Dr. Manion, I wonder if you agree with my favorite Republican of all times that the Government should do for the people that which they cannot do for themselves or that which they cannot do so well for themselves; I refer, of course, to Abraham Lincoln."

And Dr. Manion's reply was: "No. I do not agree with Abraham Lincoln."

Apparently VEPCO doesn't either.

It is highly important that the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee, which did such fine work in this field under the chairmanship of Senator WILLIAM LANGER last year, move rapidly ahead with the investigation under Senator HARLEY KILGORE'S chairmanship this year, and I am confident it will.

A thoroughgoing inquiry should be made into possible savings of hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the ratepayers of the Nation.

Fifty-seventh Anniversary of the Sinking of the Battleship "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared on the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine*, in Habana Harbor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON THE 57TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Today is the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor. It was a peaceful Sunday evening when an explosion tore that great ship apart as it lay peacefully at anchor. Two hundred and sixty-six officers and men died in that tragic event.

The *Maine* was in Habana on a friendly visit to protect American interests while the people of Cuba struggled for independence against tyranny.

A great wave of patriotic fervor swept the country. The sinking of the *Maine* aroused and united the Nation to intervene and help the Cubans gain their freedom and independence. The cry "Remember the *Maine*" echoed across the land.

The Spanish-American War was our first overseas war in the cause of freedom. In the past 57 years Americans have fought and given their lives for the cause of freedom in the fields of Flanders and on far off Pacific isles in world wars and police actions.

Today, four veterans of the Spanish-American War still serve in the Congress of the United States. Three are Members of the Senate—the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. One is a Member of the House—Representative BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois.

It is particularly fitting today that we pay tribute to those who lost their lives on the valiant *Maine* and to all those who served in our Volunteer Army in the Spanish-American War. They served the cause of freedom well. Oppressed people everywhere can take courage from the fact that the spirit of the *Maine* lives on in America today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Francis M. Juras, St. Francis Church, Lawrence, Mass., offered the following prayer:

O God, the supreme Lord of the world and the sovereign ruler of mankind, enlighten our minds that we may know the way to Thy peace and strengthen our souls that we may firmly follow in pathways of justice and charity.

Give an abundance of Thy wisdom, prudence, and fortitude to discover what is best for the welfare of our country and of the world.

As the ruthless forces of atheistic communism seek to extinguish the flame of freedom in the hearts of men and the dark clouds of war threaten to black out our entire world, when the freedom loving people of Lithuania and many other enslaved nations mourn under the bondage of heartless communistic regime and many souls are disturbed by fear and uncertainty of the future, we pray Thee, O most merciful Father, to direct our President, presiding officers, Members of Congress, and all others, who share with them the responsibility of leadership, to bring light to those in darkness, relief to those in chains, and freedom, peace, and happiness to our troubled and tortured world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 14, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 15, 1955, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 587. An act to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 1.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–7.

TRUE INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it seems appropriate, on the 37th birthday of Lithuania's emergence as a free and independent nation after many years of subjection, to pay a deserved tribute to the brave men and women of that noble country now behind the Iron Curtain, as well as to those in our country who are bound to Lithuania by ties of blood and affection.

The tragic facts about the impressment of the Baltic countries in the orbit of Soviet imperialism, some of which are known in many details by families in the United States who have loved ones in the homeland, are about to be brought out for all the world to know by a committee of the House of Representatives.

We know, in general, what has been done. We can suspect the details of what is going on in Lithuania today.

We know, too, that the wicked and shameful acts which are but a small part of the whole story of aggression by Soviet imperialism are piling up a debt, not in dollars, but in human misery, which must be discharged on that day of reckoning which surely is to come.

I am sure that I speak for the people of my district, as well as for the people of my State, where those who are of Lithuanian birth represent the ninth largest group of foreign-born citizens, when I express assurances of continued sympathetic interest in the cause of true independence for Lithuania, and the determination of our people, as well as those of Lithuania, to strive with every practical resource to achieve it fully at the earliest date.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, as we recall the early history of our own country, however great were the hardships the early settlers endured, however unbearable were their sufferings, the idea that at one time America would be a fine country was never eradicated from their minds.

We are sure that such thoughts run through the minds of the Lithuanian people today, and years of oppression have never dimmed their desire for freedom.

Taking this page from our history, today we send our warm and heartfelt greetings to our Lithuanian friends, and we bid them take courage, for one day with God's help and the prayers of their American well-wishers, their aspirations will be realized.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS FIVE-POINT PROGRAM

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress enjoyed the annual congressional dinner sponsored by Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. It was my honor to be one of the guests of the Missouri Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and enjoy the dinner at the table with the Missouri delegation composed of Primus F. Majda, State commander; J. C. Bosch, adjutant quartermaster; Steven Maravick, of St. Louis; John Skriski, of St. Louis, and Eugene Wilder, of Ste. Genevieve.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present to Congress the following five-point national security program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS FIVE-POINT NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Without adequate security, all other American values, including representative government, individual freedom, social benefits, and economic resources would be jeopardized.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as citizens and taxpayers, insist on intelligent economy in the operation of government but oppose pinch-penny economy at the expense of security for the United States and care for those who have borne the brunt of battle, and their widows and orphans.

The following VFW five-point program is themed to that objective:

1. Security for the United States: A free economy, social benefits, and economic resources—

(a) To adopt a system of universal military training or, in lieu thereof, a workable reserve program by amendments to existing law.

(b) To maintain the most powerful offensive and defensive Air Force in the world, together with an adequate Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

(c) To promote stockpiling of strategic and critical materials.

(d) To support the National Guard plan of defense against sneak enemy air attacks.

(e) To enforce the Monroe Doctrine if and when any foreign nation intervenes in the internal affairs of any nation of the Western Hemisphere.

(f) To develop a strong merchant marine.

(g) To encourage participation in civil-defense programs.

2. Veterans' rights: Recognition for service to security—

(a) To maintain and expand the VA hospital and medical program so as to insure to veterans of all wars adequate hospital care and medical treatment.

(b) To develop plans for educational and vocational training for dependent children of deceased veterans.

(c) To increase rates of compensation and pensions; liberalize pension eligibility requirements, including VA regulations on unemployability; and reaffirm the traditional VFW demand for liberalized World War I pension.

(d) To protect and strengthen veterans preference in Federal employment, together with a demand for sufficient funds, properly allocated, to be made available for public employment agencies.

(e) To establish a standing committee on veterans' affairs in the United States Senate.

(f) To liberalize and protect housing loan programs.

3. Armed Forces personnel: Adequate and competent personnel, with good morale, promotes security—

(a) To renegotiate any treaty with a foreign nation under which members of the United States Armed Forces serving therein are subject to criminal laws and trial in foreign courts with respect to offenses committed against foreign citizens or foreign property.

(b) To restore benefits previously granted members of the Armed Forces and to expand hospital and medical care for their dependents.

(c) To seek release of all Americans held as prisoners of war by the Communists.

(d) To study benefits provided under Federal law for the surviving dependents of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces.

(e) To effectuate a program to fortify servicemen against enemy brainwashing.

4. Americans: Promotes internal security—

(a) To maintain the sovereignty of the United States through opposition to all efforts to convert the United Nations into some form of world government or Atlantic Union.

(b) To use vigilance in combating Communist infiltration and subversion in all phases of American life.

(c) To tighten Government regulations on security risks.

(d) To oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations.

(e) To prevent international treaties and executive agreements from superseding the United States Constitution and domestic laws unless implemented by legislation approved by both the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

(f) To designate, by Federal legislation, May 1 of each year as Loyalty Day.

5. Domestic economy: A strong domestic economy depends upon and promotes security—

(a) To provide full productivity and employment through the construction of highways, schools, hospitals, and other projects in the public interest.

(b) To conserve and develop the natural resources of the United States.

(c) To provide for the creation of a self-liquidating Veterans' Employment and National Development Corporation for the purpose of creating jobs and economic opportunities through broad lending powers and technical service to self-liquidating projects and business that will agree to employ veterans and to qualified veterans themselves.

(d) To provide adequate loan funds and personnel to enable a greater number of worthy and qualified veterans to become established on farms.

THE CONGRESSIONAL SALARY ISSUE

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the provisions in the bill H. R. 3828 which will increase the salaries of Members of Congress by $10,000 per year, and I shall vote "no" on this bill when it is considered in the House of Representatives.

I shall also vote "no" on any proposal to increase congressional salaries when so many of our people are overburdened by heavy taxation and so many persons are struggling to support themselves and their families on reduced incomes due to the agricultural depression and industrial unemployment.

I realize that many cogent arguments can be made in support of some salary increases for Members of the legislative branch of the Government, but the amount of salary increase specified in the bill H. R. 3828 for Members of Congress seems to me to be very extravagant.

I am well aware that the cost of living has increased substantially since 1946 when the present congressional salary schedule was established. However, the cost of living has not increased by an amount sufficient to warrant the very substantial salary increase carried in this bill.

The portion of the bill which relates to the salaries of judges of Federal courts and United States attorneys, I believe should have been considered separately and apart from congressional salaries.

From the information I have, judicial and attorneys' salaries are presently far too low and I have no objection to the parts of the bill which relate to salary increases for Federal judges and United States attorneys.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of the House to the serious nature of the cotton acreage allotment program and the way in which cutbacks in cotton acreage allotments are being made. Many of the cuts which are being made, though perhaps small in the total number of acres, represent a very big loss to the small farmers and are resulting in a serious social problem.

This problem is caused partially by the fact that the Department of Agriculture in making acreage cuts is taking some of the cutback from the planted acres of 1954 instead of only from the allotted acres of 1954.

As an example, let me use a county in my own district—Talladega. Talladega's allotted acres for 1954 totaled 18,000. Its planted acres in 1954 totaled 14,500. The Department of Agriculture has now allotted it 14,000 acres for 1955. In my opinion the cut should have been taken only from the allotted acres figure of 1954—18,000—instead of taking some cut in the actual planted acres of 1954—14,500.

The average cut in the Cotton Belt has been about 12 percent. If a 12-percent cut were taken from the figure 18,000, it would result in 15,840 instead of the 14,000 which the Department has allotted. This would mean an increase over the present allotment of 1,840 acres. The sum of 1,840 acres divided into the 4- and 5-acre farms would mean that about 300 farms in Talladega County could get some cotton and it would alleviate the present necessity for these destitute farming families to depend on Government rations. The extreme cotton acreage cuts which the Eastern Belt has had forced upon it are resulting in an unpleasant social problem of displaced farmers.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] and his colleagues on the Agriculture Committee for the action taken in reporting out favorably a bill to insure a minimum of 5 acres to each cotton farmer.

It is my understanding that the Gathings bill embodies the principles of the bill which I have introduced, House Joint Resolution 130, along with other Members from the South, which would increase the 1955 cotton allotments on farms receiving 5 acres or less. I feel that this resolution may do much to help the small, suffering farmer and I sincerely hope that it will soon have the favorable consideration of the Comittee on Agriculture and the full House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT TO ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT—EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, January 5 of this year, I introduced H. R. 11, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act. Forty-six Members of the House joined me as coauthors and cosponsors. My statement concerning the new bill and the list of coauthors and cosponsors appear on pages 128 and 129 of the January 6 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On January 6, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, on behalf of himself and 29 of his colleagues, introduced an identical bill, S. 11, in the Senate.

Since that time, interest in this proposed legislation has increased daily. From every section of the country I have received communications favoring the bill and urging its early passage. Many Members of Congress have assured me of their full cooperation.

Following is an additional list of Members of the House, who have joined us as coauthors and cosponsors: JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Alabama; WALTER ROGERS, Texas; B. F. SISK, California; and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey.

The following Members have introduced similar bills themselves: LESINSKI, H. R. 2611; HOLIFIELD, H. R. 2850; WILLIAMS of New Jersey, H. R. 2690; CURTIS of Missouri, H. R. 89; ROGERS of Colorado, H. R. 1840; and DAWSON of Utah, H. R. 2577.

Additional lists will be inserted in the RECORD as the names are received.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BASS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 141) providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except proposals to strike out any of its provisions or to increase or decrease the amounts authorized therein. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time, 30 minutes, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM]. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 141 makes in order the bill H. R. 3828, the salary-increase bill. This bill provides increases for our Federal judges, for the Members of Congress, and for other committee members. The rule provides the right to raise or lower the amounts included herein, and also to strike out any

section in the bill. I do not have to extoll the merits of this bill. An independent committee appointed to fix salaries of Congressmen and judges came back with the findings that the salary of Members of Congress and Federal judges should be $27,500. However, the bill calls for a salary of $22,500 for Members of Congress and Federal judges. For members of the United States Supreme Court it goes as high as $35,000.

It also provides for salary increases for members of the Department of Justice, mainly United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys, on a sliding scale.

I know of no objection to the rule. It provides for 2 hours' general debate. I urge the adoption of the rule and I urge the final passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

As the able gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has said, the provisions of this bill are very simple and very clear. They provide increases for Federal court judges and for attorneys general, and for Congressmen. I think the membership of the House, at least in this instance, is presumed to have some degree of familiarity with the terms of the bill, because they have been discussed in the newspapers, and no long discussion about them is required at this point.

Certainly in the case of Federal court judges, this Congress has been lax for many years in not raising their salaries. In New York a State judge, with corresponding jurisdiction, receives $32,500 a year, while Federal court judges receive a mere $15,000. We all know that attorneys general of the United States who represent the United States in the courts of our land must be able men, and should be adequately compensated for their work. They have to face in the courtrooms some of the best and highest-priced lawyers in the country.

As far as congressional salaries are concerned, we know that the expressed opinion of most newspapers, and of the special Commission appointed in the last Congress, and of the President himself, has been almost unanimous that the Congress should tackle the problem of congressional salary increases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any particular reason why I should be among the first to take part in this debate except possibly because in the last Congress I was majority leader when we enacted legislation that provided for the creation of a commission to make recommendations on this very important matter.

Another reason that would be of interest only to my colleagues and my side of the aisle is that I am going down to the Statler Hotel with some of our folks who raise the money to help Republicans win elections. So I hope you will approve of my leaving, although I will be back for the vote.

It is an unfortunate fact, in a way, but true, that the Congress of the United States as the legislative branch has the responsibility of fixing the pay of all of the people in the Government, including our own. We fix the pay of the President, the Vice President, the people in the executive department, and the people in the judicial branch. Because we have that responsibility of fixing our own pay, of course any time we seek to increase it there will be those who will say, "You should not do it."

There was one well-meaning person, who does not even live in my district, who wrote me saying that this matter should be submitted to a referendum of the people of the United States. I do not think it would take much calculation to figure that that would cost more to the Government, or to somebody, than this increase would cost if it were in effect for a hundred years. So of course that is a completely unreasonable attitude to take.

However, we know that the people in the State legislatures confront the same problem. I have noticed on many occasions they have met the issue with fairness and, may I say, with courage; and I have not noticed any particularly bad repercussions in any direction.

Another thing that has been said is that the percentage increase is greater than some other percentage increase of somebody else in the Government. I have done some checking on that. The clerks in our offices have had 4 or 5 of those percentage increases since we have had any. Most of the people in the Government likewise have had increases. I know within my own personal experience that the congressional pay has not kept pace.

We also know that in recent years many, many people in responsible positions have recommended this action. Presidents have recommended it; President Eisenhower has very vigorously recommended it, and has said to us many times that he is perfectly willing to do anything that is necessary to bring about a proper understanding if that should be necessary.

The Hoover Commission is one of the bodies that favors an increase in pay for Members of Congress. Labor organizations, farm organizations, and all people, so far as I can discover, who have given serious consideration to the matter have come to the conclusion that an increase should be voted. We recognized that last year. There were some who thought we should meet it with direct action, but finally it was decided that it might be well, since the initial responsibility is on us, to bring about the creation of a Commission of public-spirited citizens, people with no ax to grind, who would thoroughly go into the matter and come up with a recommendation. That Commission was appointed; it did a magnificent job. They held exhaustive hearings; they had people from all walks of life, all segments of the economy from all over the country appear and testify; and this Board made the recommendation that the pay be increased to $27,000 a year.

The committee having this matter in charge has given it careful study. They have not seen fit to recommend an increase to the extent that the Commission recommended—and I find myself in no position to quarrel with that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], has spoken of the necessities of the judges, and I think there, too, we must be very well convinced that their pay scales have fallen below what they should be.

If you will pardon just a personal reference, my district in Indiana honored me 20 years ago by sending me down here, and I have been here through the years since. Our twins then were 5 years old; they had not started school. I know something of the struggle it is to maintain two homes, to educate your children. You get to the point after they get in the fourth or fifth grade where you cannot have them in school part of the year in Indiana and the rest of the year in Washington; you have got to have them in school one place or the other, and that further complicates the matter. Those youngsters, of course, are grown now, but as I consider this matter I do look at it from my own personal position. I was fortunate enough to buy a couple of good farms out in Indiana years ago, when property was cheap, and I can make a few speeches for a fee now and then—but there are lots of people who do not look with too much favor on that—so Mrs. Halleck and I can make out. But I look around here and see this Chamber filled with young fellows who are facing the same problems that we faced, and for them, certainly, the doors of the Halls of Congress of the United States should not be closed.

The salary was $10,000 when I came here. I got out one of my returns to see the taxes I paid then. Why, it was a revelation. I had forgotten. I am not going to quote the figure except to say that the increase to $12,500 has been more than cancelled out by the additional taxes that I have to pay. We all understand and know that our costs have gone up as have the costs of everybody else. With two homes—I have one in Indiana and one in Washington, and every winter the fires burn in both and I pay the bill—some people might say: "Move to Washington, give up your Indiana house." Well, that would mean I would not come back here. A Member has to have a home in both places.

Finally, I do not think our people expect us to live in any sort of manner except one in keeping with the position we hold. I do not object to spending a little money on my constituents—I like to, I am happy to do it—but the plain fact remains it does cost a little money.

I do not think our people want this to be a rich man's club. I think they want the salaries to be somewhere near commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of our job and the necessities of our job and the expenses incident to the carrying on of our jobs.

Again referring to the time 20 years ago when I first came here, we had difficult problems to face in the Congress, but the sessions were much shorter. However, they lasted long enough that I had to completely forego my law practice. I have not made a single fee for legal services since I came to Congress

and I had been doing pretty well before I came here. Even at the risk of inviting somebody to run for this job of mine on the basis of what I have said—I think about everybody here could make a pretty good living doing something else, and most of them did before they came here or they would not be here—it just gets down to this: I do not believe we should devalue our own services to the Government. I think we ought to be fair with ourselves as we have tried through the years to be fair with everyone else.

As far as I am concerned, I propose to vote for this legislation. I take it that the bill is open for amendment if there are provisions which are not acceptable. As I understand the rule, any such provisions can be eliminated from the bill. But for myself, I sincerely hope that insofar as these principal provisions are concerned, the pay for Members of Congress and the judges of the United States District Courts, there shall be no departure from the recommendations that have been made.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that it is somewhat difficult for Members of Congress to vote in favor of raising their own salaries. It is not a pleasant thing to do. But the responsibility is placed upon us by the Constitution of the United States. The only question is whether we believe that it is in the best interest of the country that the salaries of the men and women who represent this great Nation in Congress shall be raised.

Personally, I think that the salary ought to be at least $25,000 a year for a Member of Congress. I wrote an article in October last for the Saturday Evening Post in which I set forth my reasons for believing that Members of Congress should receive $25,000 a year. The letters I received were all in support of the views which I expressed. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people of the State of Texas that I have the honor to represent in this body expect me to vote for a living salary.

I came here first in 1931, at which time we were paid $10,000 a year. My income tax at that time was about $200 a year, which left me $9,800. That was equivalent to about $25,000 a year today in terms of the purchasing power of the dollar. I bought a home for $8,800 at that time which would cost $25,000 or $30,000 today. Unfortunately, when I left Congress in 1945 I sold it for a small profit.

During the 14 years I served in Congress, I never received a dollar's contribution from any source. I had made some wise investments before I became a candidate for Congress, and I made some money, and, fortunately, while I was in this body I was able to supplement my income by lecturing and by writing. But I know what the average Member of Congress faces. I know what a Member with 4 or 5 or 3 or 2 children and a wife faces in an attempt to live upon the salary today.

Now, if you raise the salary to $25,000, that is, $22,500 and $2,500 expense, you are simply placing the Member of Congress in the same financial position he was in in 1931. In fact, I think that the dollar has depreciated more than 50 percent in respect to some things—houses, food—and perhaps, on the whole, 50 percent as stated by the Government is correct.

Now, I know there are those who hesitate to vote because they fear some demagog in the district will take advantage of it. Well, I am not the best politician in the world, but I think the way I am going to answer that is to say, "Well, I think I am worth $25,000, and the man who does not think he is worth $25,000 should not vote for the bill and should not take the increase." I do not want this House to become a rich man's club or the stooges of rich men. I think the interests of this Nation will be promoted by giving the Members of Congress a living wage.

Now, there are many in this House who are worth far more than $25,000. I never did consider myself a very great lawyer; as a matter of fact, I am not. But, when I left the Congress, the first year I practiced law I made four times as much as I did in this body, and I know there are many Members in this body who are abler than I am. There are men with whom I have been associated many years who, in any industry, in any corporation of this country, would be a tremendous asset; men who have devoted their years, their efforts, their abilities to the understanding of great public issues, and I do not pretend that we ought to pay those men what they are worth. No one expects us to make a lot of money in politics. We cannot do it honestly. It is like a preacher's profession. If you are going to preach or try to follow a political career, you ought to expect simply a decent living. But, when I see young doctors in my hometown the third year of their practice make 2 or 3 times more than I am paid for representing a great State, perhaps the greatest in the Union, I feel, Mr. Speaker, sort of an inferiority complex, and I know that the people of my State expect me to exercise some courage and some decency in casting this vote.

Now, if I have got to demagog on a question as important as this to our Republic in order to stay here, then it would perhaps be better for the people of Texas to select someone else, though I think it would be most unfortunate for the State. To you Members who fear that this may be a bad political vote, I can assure you that the people will have very little confidence in you if you lack the courage to place your salary commensurate somewhat, not wholly but somewhat, with the tremendous responsibilities that are on your shoulders.

Now, I know some of my friends will say, "Well I am not going to vote for a raise until you balance the budget." I am as much in favor of balancing this budget as any man who serves in this Congress. If every Member had voted as I voted in the last session, this budget would be balanced, and I will support a program of reductions or of increased taxation, whatever is necessary, to balance the budget and prevent inflation, because I believe that of all the evils which face free government, inflation is the worst. But, you and I know that the four or five million dollars involved in this bill is not going to affect the budget one way or the other. We vote for assistants to secretaries and Cabinet officers to receive more than our own salaries.

We vote billions of dollars out of the Treasury to build things all over the world. To say that we shall not place ourselves economically in the same position we were in 15 or 20 years ago seems to me so uttery ridiculous that I am convinced that any man who votes that way will be condemned rather than praised for his action.

This is not a selfish vote on my part, because I happen to have a substantial income in addition to my congressional salary. I may not serve here long, because the Legislature of the State of Texas may redistrict the State. I am not actuated by any ulterior motive in making this speech. But I want this House to attract the best men possible. I want young men who have vigor and imagination and ability, to aspire to serve in Congress. I want it to be the greatest job in every congressional district and if, by my vote, we attract someone to succeed me, while I shall regret it very much, nevertheless I shall feel that I have served my country by making it possible to replace myself with someone who is abler than I to serve this great Nation.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will pass just as it is written and that we will provide the $2,500 expense allowance, which you and I know is a very small amount. There is not a corporation in the country that pays such salaries to their executives. Most excutives of corporations and businesses have fat expense accounts and they have offset the depreciation of the currency by tremendous increases in salaries and bonuses. There is not a section of this country where our people are not receiving, in terms of dollars, if not purchasing power, substantial increases; some far more than others. So I think that this is a measure that is in the public interest, and I shall vote proudly for this bill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] such time as he may consume.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a 66⅔ percent pay raise above present salary plus allowance, or an 80-percent boost if figured on the basis of salary alone, is a leap that would arouse resentment among our constituents.

I want to make it plain, at the start, that I favor comparable increases for judges of the United States courts, and for United States attorneys, because their situation is different from ours.

We find ourselves in a position where we have the power to raise our own salaries, which is unique, to say the least.

The fact that we authorized an impartial commission to study the facts and make recommendations for an adjustment in congressional salaries, was an effort to make it acceptable to public opinion. I have nothing but the highest praise for the honesty and sincerity of the public-spirited citizens who served on the Commission. With this face-saving maneuver completed, however, we find ourselves right back where we started from. To raise or not to raise our own salaries, that is the question.

All the objective facts may be on the side of those who will vote for this measure, but the psychological reaction will not.

A number of us represent labor-surplus areas, where thousands have no income whatsoever.

Mindful of the Government's glacial indifference toward their bread-and-butter needs, we cannot, in all fairness, put our self-interest first.

If the Government had been as considerate and as prompt in supporting measures to relieve unemployment among textile workers, fishermen, miners, among others, and if it had put its weight behind a pay increase for all Federal workers, without making it contingent upon another issue, then there would be understanding and approval of a reasonable increase for Members of Congress.

As long as these conditions have not been met, we cannot go blithely forward to take care of ourselves with a king-sized pay hike.

We are not owners of a private business, or engaged in an enterprise where salaries may be increased without any regard for what outsiders may think.

Public office is a public trust.

We are servants of the people.

Of course I realize that no Member of Congress can make financial progress, or set aside something for his future, from the modest salary that he presently receives.

But I submit that our position is not similar to that of a man who is trying to make a fortune in private enterprise.

We have a duty. We enjoy the honor that goes with it. And we are receiving compensation that must seem very large to most of our fellow citizens.

As I said before, this is subject to rebuttal on the facts, but I doubt if it can be explained to the satisfaction of a husband and wife who are trying to raise a family on $5,000 a year or less. And it will not sit well with the unemployed who consider that the Government is unconcerned with their elemental problems.

I have no hesitation in saying that there has not been sufficient education of the public as to the merits of a reasonable raise for Members of Congress.

Until this is done, I believe that we should make haste slowly.

Perhaps the better approach would be to increase travel allowances, provide for extra office expenses, and legislate a formula that would set aside funds to cover a portion of election campaign costs.

To my way of thinking, the question of judicial and congressional salaries should be considered separately.

Within the field of Government itself, it can be shown that one State—New York—pays its judges more than the Federal judges receive, and by this comparison I believe that United States judges and attorneys are entitled to a substantial increase.

No similar comparison can be made concerning legislators, to demonstrate that Members of Congress are underpaid.

Therefore, I must go on record as supporting the proposal to increase judicial salaries, but must oppose the recommendation to increase the personal budget for Members of Congress.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what there is a justification for an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and the judges of the Federal courts. I do not think there is any Member who will take issue with that statement. The question is whether or not we are going to exercise that degree of judgment and courage by voting for the passage of this bill which represents justifiable legislation and which is supported by all elements of our citizenry.

On three occasions in past years I have taken the well of the House urging an increase in our salaries to $25,000.

Last year I offered an amendment to an appropriation bill to increase our salaries to $22,500 a year. When I offered the amendment I knew it was subject to a point of order on that particular bill. The point of order was made and of course was sustained; but if the point of order had not been made the amendment would have come before the Committee of the Whole.

I have complete confidence in the judgment of the American people. I have complete confidence that the great majority of our people recognize the justice of an increase in salary for Members of Congress and for the judges of the Federal courts.

I might also say that in supporting an increase as carried in the bill reported out I do not do so from any angle of complaint on my part but because I think there is a complete justification for such action on the part of the Congress.

I have been a Member of Congress for 27 years. I like public service. I like public service in the legislative or judicial branch. I prefer it to service in the executive branch. That is the way my mind thinks and operates. I like the consideration of broad legislative questions concerning our people and concerning the world. I like to feel that I am a part of it. I thank God that I have been a Member of this body for the past 27 years, and I am grateful to the people of my district for permitting me to be here. I am not afraid to go back to the people of my district in favor of a salary increase.

As a member of both branches of the Massachusetts Legislature and as a Member of Congress I have yet to vote against any bill increasing my salary, because each time it came up, whether in the legislature or in Congress, I felt that it was justified and I had confidence that the people of my district would recognize that fact.

The total increase for Members of Congress amounts to $4,527,000 a year and for members of the judiciary $2,981,000 a year. The total amount is one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

The last time the salary of the Members of Congress was increased was in 1946, nearly 9 years ago. I do not think I have to argue that the cost of living has increased since then, and I do not believe I have to argue that the people of the country generally recognize that fact.

When I first came to Congress 27 years ago I did not assume office, unless a special session was called, for approximately 14 months after I was elected. When I was elected in November of one year I actually took office, as far as being physically present in the House of Representatives was concerned, a year from the following December.

We are now sitting throughout the entire year. The sessions are now continuous. We will probably sit here until sometime the latter part of July, no matter how speedily we may perform our business. When we leave here and go home, we all have our problems, not only legislatively, not only public questions, but the problems that confront us when we are at home.

I doubt that there is a Member of Congress who works less than 12 hours a day, and most of us work 16 hours a day.

The Members of this branch and the other branch, as the years progress, become experts in the different legislative fields. We must legislate on everything and be conversant with everything. In practical operation, by reason of the committee assignments we receive, we become experts in the fields of finance and revenue as members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and on agriculture in the case of the Committee on Agriculture. In connection with all the other committees, we become specialists.

We do not expect to receive the salary or the compensation of the specialist in private industry. Certainly we are entitled to receive reasonable, fair, and adequate compensation consistent with the situation which confronts us and in the interests of the country generally. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that sometime in the future unless Congress votes its Members adequate salaries that this might well become, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has said, "a rich man's club." I always want to see the House of Representatives representing a cross-section of American life and American thinking. I am proud of this body. In this chamber are represented all shades of opinion and thought in American life, and that is as it should be. We get a cross-section of American thinking in the House of Representatives. In our consideration of important legislation in this body, compromises are almost always made recognizing that there is logic to the positions advanced by different schools of thought represented in

this great body, schools of thought representing 165 million Americans. Thus is progress made by justifiable and reasonable compromises brought about by honest men and women honestly differing in their opinions. I never want to see the day that this great legislative body represents substantially only one line of thought in America no matter what that line of thought might be.

You and I are aware that the cost of campaigning has increased tremendously, and while that has nothing to do directly with our salaries, there is a relationship because every 2 years Members of this body must go before the people of their districts both for renomination and reelection. I would regret exceedingly if the day ever arrived when only those of substantial wealth—or another group subsidized from the outside—constituted the majority of this great body. And yet that is within the realm of reasonable probability unless we have the courage to take the action and to do the things that we ought to do, and which I respectfully submit the great majority of the people not only expect us to do but want us to do. As a matter of fact, if the bill were before the House today providing for $27,500, I would be supporting it. It is before the House today for $22,500. This is a conservative figure when compared to that which was recommended by the special commission appointed by the last Congress, and which has made its report and recommendations to the Congress of the United States. The figure of $22,500 is a compromise in committee, and I am supporting the committee report although personally I would support just as vigorously a bill carrying with it a salary of $27,500 for Members of Congress. So there is our case. There is no case against it. Under the Constitution, we should do it. I have too much confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the courage of my colleagues to think that with the justifiable case that we have, this bill will not pass this body today.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think my position on this bill is known. At no time have I hesitated in my support of this legislation, which has for its purpose salary increases for the judiciary and Members of Congress. I do not believe that the American people would want the highest offices in this Government jeopardized by the loss of men and women of proper ability to adequately and faithfully serve them nor do I believe that the American people would want these high offices of honor to be bestowed upon only the very rich. I am a poor man, and I like to serve the people of my district.

Both Republican and Democratic administrations and the special Commission appointed by the President and the Congress to study and make a report on this situation have recommended the enactment of this legislation into law.

In my present district I have taken over what was formerly represented by three Members. I have 800 communities surrounded by 5 other States and 10 other Congressmen. Some of you have similar problems either in area or in population. Most of the people feel that a Congressman gets his transportation paid to and from the departments of Government on official business in behalf of his constituency. He does not. Most people think surely that a Congressman gets his printing done for nothing. He does not. Out of the $15,000 annually I have received, in the last 2 years I have had to spend all that, plus $4,900 a year, to pay the necessary expenses of running my office, without one dime of take-home pay.

Along with many other of you Members, I work 80 hours a week. I receive 9,000 letters a month. I am at the service of my people all the time, and I like to serve my people. In my case, I get the equivalent of about 1 long-distance telephone call every other day and 1 wire a day paid for by the Government for the 500,000 people I represent. It usually takes about 6 long-distance telephone calls a day and at least 6 wires a day to properly serve my constituency only in emergency matters. These 6 extra calls per day and 6 wires per day must be paid for by me personally out of my salary. Members of Congress receive an allowance for only one trip home each year. I make nine trips home a year in order to keep myself informed and to better serve my district.

In my case, I represent two-thirds of the cotton-growing area in Oklahoma, two-thirds of the grain sorghums, one-third of the cattle, one-third of the wheat, 50 percent of the soya beans, 12 Indian tribes, a big irrigation district, soil-conservation districts, a big artillery schools, 2 big Strategic Air Command bases, 211 towns and 650 farming communities, hundreds of oil wells, dozens of refineries and other strategic natural resources, as well as nearly one-half million of the finest people in the world.

During the time I have advocated this legislation in the last few days I have received very few unfavorable letters on this matter. I have received twice as many for it as those against it. One of those against it was one who thought I was using $15,000 a year for living expenses. I wish to reiterate that $15,000, plus $4,900 yearly, has been used to serve the people of my district in the last few years, and I have no private business. Consequently, I have gone into debt.

In closing, I again wish to call to your attention that the congressional district which I now represent was formerly represented by three different Members of Congress concurrently. However, due to redistricting legislation by the Oklahoma State Legislature, 2½ districts were combined into 1, and I was chosen by the people to represent this area which comprises over one-third of the State of Oklahoma and one-fourth of its population. Upon assuming the additional responsibilities that came with this enlarged territory, formerly represented by 3 Members of Congress, I did not receive any part of their official allowances, nor any additional salary or office help, even though my duties were extended almost 3 times their former scope. It has always been my policy to serve my people beyond the call of duty, and I freely tell them, "When I may be of service, just phone, wire, or write."

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 13)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1955.*

JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3828, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule general debate is fixed at 2 hours. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, by this bill in general we raised the salaries of the judges of the United States courts and the Members of the House and the Senate $7,500 with few exceptions. We do not disturb the allowance made to us for expenses involving $2,500.

I herewith set forth our various salaries since 1795 to date. As standards of living and living costs advanced, our salaries were increased:

Seventeen hundred and ninety-five: $7 per day for Senators, $6 per day for House Members.

Seventen hundred and ninety-six: $6 per day for both Senators and House Members.

Eighteen hundred and sixteen: $15 per day. This sum repealed in 1817 and salary went back to $6 per day.

Eighteen hundred and eighteen: $8 per day for both.

Eighteen hundred and fifty-six: $6,000 per Congress; i. e., $3,000 per year.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-six: $5,000 per year.

Eighteen hundred and seventy-three: $7,500 per year. Repealed 1874. Salary went back to $5,000 per year.

Nineteen hundred and seven: $7,500 per year.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-five: $10,000 per year.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-three: $8,663 per year.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six: $10,000 per year.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six: $12,500 per year plus $2,500 expense allowance.

As has been indicated, the cost of all these present increases is comparatively minuscule: They would be less than one-one hundredth of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget. The salary increases of judges would be about 2¼ million dollars, whereas the congressional increase would be a trifle over $2 million. There would be little unbalancing of budgets.

The question has often been asked: Can the Members of the House and the Senate increase their own salaries applicable to the terms of their service? To set at rest a lot of misinformation on the subject I wish to indicate that the only provision in the Constitution with reference to increasing salaries or setting salaries is to be found in article 1, section 6, which reads:

> The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

"Ascertained by law" means that we have the right to increase or decrease our salaries at any time. We "ascertain" and pass the law.

It is interesting to note that 12 constitutional amendments were submitted way back in 1789; 2 were rejected and 10 passed, and became the Bill of Rights. One of those rejected amendments read as follows:

> No law varying the compensation for services of Senators and Representatives shall take effect until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

The mere fact that amendment was rejected is proof positive that we have the perfect right to increase our salaries during our term of office to cover that particular term of office.

This bill has been universally accepted. The President has approved the increase, as have the President's Commission, the CIO, AFL, the railroad brotherhoods, and the leadership on both sides of the aisle. Industry all over the land approves. Chambers of commerce, North, East, South, and West, agree to these increases. I have just been handed a wire from the American Farm Bureau Federation, addressed to me as chairman, reading as follows:

> The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that the best qualified persons should be elected to office and that they should be adequately paid. We recommend that congressional salaries be increased.
>
> CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
> *President,*
> *American Farm Bureau Federation.*

Mr. Chairman, I have lived through debates in this Congress involving two distinct increases. In 1925 we increased the salary from $7,500 to $10,000 and in 1946 from $10,000 to $15,000. I advocated the increases then, I voted for the increases at that time, and no harm came to me whatsoever in my district. I can assure you no harm will come to any Member of this House if he votes for the increase involved in the instant bill.

It has always been as hard as pulling teeth to get the membership to realize that they are entitled to additional compensation. There has always been difficulty. The occasions are piled high with difficulties, as is the situation now. But we must rise high for the occasion. I am sure all of us believe that the laborer is worthy of his hire. The Congressmen, the judges are worthy of their hire. If we deny ourselves increases, if we assume a pinch-penny attitude toward ourselves, we deny the addage that we are worthy of our hire.

Compare our work with similar work of men in industry and men in labor, and you will find we are woefully inadequately paid. In a way, we sort of treat ourselves like harridans. Such treatment must cease, and our salaries no longer should be a matter of untouchability.

We must have action now. It is either now or never.

Some say, "Let us wait until next year"; others say, "Let us wait until the 85th Congress"; others say, "Let us wait until the budget is balanced."

> "If it were done when 'tis done,
> then 'twere well
> It were done quickly."

I remember the story told about Alice in Wonderland. Alice, you may remember, attended the Mad Hatter's tea party. Alice asked the White Queen for some jam. The White Queen stated: "Jam? Jam yesterday, jam tomorrow, but never jam today."

So it is with the objectors to this bill. They want to give us a salary increase tomorrow, they want to give it to us yesterday, but they never want to give it to us today. Well, we want it today.

Who are the objectors? Objectors in and out of the House? There are always some timid souls, some Milquetoasts. They are always unduly alarmed. They are constantly seeing ghosts under the bed. There are the cynics who oppose, who always inveigh against salary increases. They weigh the cost of everything but know the value of nothing. This is what I say of those cynics who oppose: It is high time we understand the value of our own services. There are some who object out of sheer demagogery. To them I will say it is a question only of lots of sound and fury signifying nothing. Finally, there are those who are sincerely and honestly disturbed. Well, we should not be disturbed at justice to ourselves or to the judges. We should not be disturbed when we try to deal fairly with the judges and with ourselves, and to them, those who honestly fear and are disturbed, I say this—I tell them what their mother knows: "The baby that never cries never gets suckled." It is high time that this membership did some crying; otherwise they will never be suckled.

Some of these objectors remind me of a Scotch story. Jock said to his wife one night, "Well, Maggie, I think I am going to pay my respects to the neighbor on the hill"; and upon returning somewhat later, Maggie said, "Well, Jock, what kind of a man is the new neighbor?" He said, "He is a verra guid mon; a guid mon and very liberal with his liquor, but very bad quality; in fact, Maggie, the quality was so bad I nearly left some." I can assure you that those who object to this bill are not even going to leave any of the increase; they are going to take it and they are going to enjoy it; they will not leave any, I assure you.

We must adequately compensate ourselves, otherwise in time—I say in time—we shall have only two classes of Members: political hacks and the very wealthy—and then all the benefits of a cross section of democratic representation of the people will have been lost, and so with the judges—they too, finally, will only be hacks or millionaires.

Finally, a Congressman and a judge must receive such a salary as to prevent suffering of financial loss and to be able to resist severe economic pressure. The bill is a real series of compromises to enable the judge or the Congressman to resist the blandishments of pressure groups and, as well, so that finally they can have security for themselves and security for their loved ones. I personally, would want the salaries of judges fixed higher. I am realistic enough to know, however, that all progress is the result of compromise. We just could not succeed finally in getting more for the judges.

You know as well as I do that the 1954 dollar, comparing the statistics of 1939 with today, buys only about 50 percent of the value of that dollar in 1939, so in effect the judges and the Members of Congress a decade or so ago were actually receiving more money, receiving more money in purchasing power, then, than they are receiving now. We should not be able to say that the Members of Congress in 1939 or 1930 actually received more purchasing value in dollars then than they are receiving today, I hope therefore that this bill will pass intact.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and as the sponsor of a companion bill, I am in favor of this bill, H. R. 3828, and I hope that it will receive favorable action.

When the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries filed its report at the last session of the Congress I intro-

duced a bill to effectuate that report. Despite the fact that the Commission recommended more substantial increases than are set out in the present bill, the public reaction to my bill was phenomenally favorable. Of all the letters of comment that I received, only one—I repeat, only one—was not in accord with the proposed adjustments, and that one was from a person who did not reside in my district; in fact, was not a resident of my State.

It is important that we consider this bill in an objective manner, in an atmosphere divorced from untoward fear and pressure, in conformity with our obligation as members of this great legislative body. Without exception, so far as I know, every legislative body in the United States from the Congress of the United States to municipal councils is charged with the responsibility of fixing the compensation of its own members. This responsibility is almost invariably approached with trepidation that is unbecoming to Members of the United States Congress. We must exercise our obligations as legislators without fear or favor regardless of whether the proposed legislation affects the executive, the judiciary, or the legislature. As Edmund Burke once said:

> There is a limit at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue.

Our Constitution provides that the Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law—article I, section 6. Can we refuse to enact such a law any more than we can refuse to enact some other needed legislation merely because it concerns us personally at this moment? An outstanding commission carefully studied the situation and strongly called attention to the validity of such legislation. It is our duty to act upon the proposed legislation.

This is not a hasty or unsupported proposal. The Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries—from whose recommendations this bill stems—was appointed by the President with meticulous regard to representation of all facets of the American economy—agriculture, labor, the professions, and business. Few commissions have ever entered upon their task with greater talent or with more care to achieve a true understanding of the situation which would be reflected in their recommendations. The Commission deserves the gratitude of the people for a painstaking and forthright performance of its assignment.

One of the members of that Commission, Loyd Wright, is now the president of the American Bar Association, and in the current issue of the American Bar Association Journal he expresses concern because the pending bills set forth compensation less than that recommended by the Commission.

Throughout history, as today, the Congress has lagged considerably behind the rest of the national economy in adjusting its own compensation and that of the judiciary. As the Commission pointed out, in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, the compensation for all other employees of the Federal Government has been adjusted upward no less than five times since the last increase for Congressmen and members of the Federal judiciary. A similar situation, as everyone is aware, exists with relation to increases by labor and business.

Recently, in reading about the time when Abraham Lincoln was a Member of this House in the 30th Congress, more than a hundred years ago, I learned that while his compensation was $8 a day there was a movement to transfer the Capital from the District of Columbia to Georgetown because at Georgetown room and board could be obtained for $8 a week instead of the prevailing $10 a week in the District. Except for 1 year, the post-Civil War congressional salary of $5,000 per year remained in effect from 1866 to 1907, at which time it was increased to $7,500, so to remain until 1925, when it was increased to $10,000. The current compensation was established 21 years later, in 1946. It seems to me quite obvious that this eloquently bespeaks the reticence of the Congress to adjust its own compensation in keeping with the rest of the national economy.

Why this reluctance? If a Member refuses to accord justice to the legislative and judicial branches in this matter solely out of fear of the reaction of his constituents I say that he is doing an injustice to those constituents. For my part I have more faith in my own people. I believe it is highly significant that, at the time of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the States refused to ratify a proposed amendment that no law varying the compensation of the Congress shall take effect until an election shall have intervened. The rejection of that proposed amendment has, I believe, two meanings. First of all it reflects the recognition on the part of the people that occasion may arise requiring adjustments in compensation without procrastination. That situation is here today. Further it removes the baseless conception held by a few persons that it is unconstitutional to increase compensation during the term. That misconception that has been voiced on several occasions is, of course, unsupported by any provision of the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that no Member need have any undue fears regarding a forthright affirmative vote on this bill. It is a just bill; it is a needed bill; it is long overdue; and I urge the support of the Members with the view of obtaining speedy enactment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying my respects to the Commission on Congressional and Judicial Salaries, under the exceptionally able leadership of the great Philadelphia lawyer, my friend, Bernard G. Segal. The members of the Commission and their Chairman have worked with devotion to solve a problem with which we have been struggling for several years.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very delicate question. I am sure, for most of you, but I ask you to look at it objectively, remembering that in 1954 the Congress adopted a resolution directing the erection of a commission to study this question.

I think we could safely approach the question by assuming that the major premise is that we are entitled to an increase in compensation and that the judiciary of the United States is entitled to additional compensation.

As the only Member of the House to have served on that commission, I am going to ask you to sit as a jury in judgment of the work that body did.

In the first place, I should like to call your attention to the personnel of the Commission. There were representatives of agriculture, six of them. There were five representatives of business. There were six representatives of the great labor organizations. This group of 18 people conducted many hearings throughout the United States for the purpose of determining what in their judgment our compensation should be.

Of course, we are not bound by the findings of this Commission. But, it certainly seems to me that any other approach to this problem might well lay us open to the charge of attempting to justify a position. This Commission found among other things that the type of work done by the Congress, our duties and responsibilities, were of such an unusual, extraordinary character that we should be compensated commensurate with the decisions we are called upon to make. It was not until I served on this Commission, I say this quite frankly, that I realized exactly how much of a responsibility is attached to this position—which I have never taken lightly I assure you. In the first place, the Congress has the power to levy and collect taxes; the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States; the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and so on. The powers are all enumerated, of course, in the Constitution. But, until you look at those powers and think the whole matter out, you do not realize that the type of person called upon to make these decisions must possess unusual qualifications. Both the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] touched on the political phase of this problem. With that, I am not disturbed in the least, and I say that because the leaders in every walk of life recognize the fact that the judicial and legislative branches of our Government are underpaid and have been underpaid for a long while.

I shall place in the RECORD with my remarks editorials taken from the length and breadth of the Nation not with any ideal of making out a case because they were all selected haphazardly. As a matter of fact, this morning our distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] made available to me an editorial from a small town which I had never even heard of in which the writer expressed the hope that the Congress would have the courage to correct this untenable situation. I think this provides the most effective argument as to the attitude of the people coming from communities where $15,000 is regarded as a large salary. I think that runs through all of the editorials the Commission on Judicial and Congressional

Salaries got together throughout the period when the problem was under consideration.

It has been interesting to me to compare the purchasing power of the dollar with the purchasing power in 1939. I shall place in the RECORD some tables showing just exactly what that means. I do not know of any real opposition to this bill. Of course, you are going to have demagogs in your political campaigns. We have all had them, and they are going to pick this up and use it as an issue. But we have all weathered such storms, and it has been my experience that people of that kind do not make much of an impression on the thinking of people who, after all, are the people who send you and me to the Congress of the United States.

The report of the Commission covers this problem fully. It is available to all of you, and the report of the Committee on the Judiciary has carefully gone into all of the factors. I call it to your attention so that you may be fortified with the kind of arguments that can be attacked. I ask you to support this bill as it was reported, so that the injustice that has existed for too long can be corrected.

The editorials and tables are as follows:

[From the McMinnville (Oreg.) Daily News-Register of February 11, 1955]

A WORRISOME STEP

Congress, encouraged by general sentiment in the upper echelons of officialdom in Washington that pay for top Government positions is too low, is rather timidly leaning toward an increase in the stipend, now $15,000 a year. A Senate committee proposes to raise it to $22,500. The figure most widely favored in the House is $25,000.

Timidity springs from congressional fear that the voters might react with hostility to such a move, despite the fact that the $25,000 figure, converted into terms of buying power, would be much lower than salaries paid by the Government 50 years ago.

It is the misfortune of Members of Congress that their pay can only be increased by congressional action. This is why salaries of Members has lagged far behind general increase in incomes over the years.

Members of Congress should display the courage needed to vote themselves the pay their way of life demands to make ends meet. Voter demands for services from Senators and Representatives is great, and these lawmakers should not be asked to engage in a myriad of extracurricular activities for their constituents without adequate recompense.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, 1955]

UNDERPAID OFFICIALS

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, January 25, 1955)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 1, 1955:

"UNDERPAID OFFICIALS

"The amazing disparity between the salaries of Federal and New York judges has been referred to on this page in recent weeks; and we are glad to see Attorney General Brownell advert to it once again in urging an increase in the compensation of both United States judges and Congressmen.

"Judges of the United States district court now receive $15,000, exactly half the salary in this area of judges of the somewhat comparable New York State Supreme Court. Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court receive $25,000, while judges of the highest New York tribunal, the court of appeals, are paid a total of $37,500 each. The point isn't that New York judges are overpaid, but that Federal judges are underpaid. The rise in the cost of living has of course had the effect of reducing their income even below the levels at which it had been set. It has been calculated that the purchasing power in 1939 dollars of a Federal district judge's salary after taxes amounts to less than $6,500.

"Members of Congress receive a total of $15,000 a year. The commission that investigated these matters correctly observed a year ago that 'Members of Congress and the judiciary have responsibilities as great as those of top executives in business or industry or greater.' Yet the top officials of 100 of America's largest corporations average over $100,000 a year in salary. No one is recommending anything like that for Congressmen, but surely the proposed $27,500 is reasonable compensation for so onerous a job. The difficulty in granting adequate pay to Congressmen comes from Congressmen, who fear the political effects of giving themselves even an entirely justified increase. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, with whom we do not often find ourselves in agreement, has urged on his fellow Members an end to their 'timidity' on this matter; and we think he is right.

"Increased salaries obviously will not guarantee better judges or better Congressmen, but public freedom from economic pressures will prevent some good public servants from leaving their jobs for private life and will indicate to all of them that their Government is not really trying to get something out of them for nothing."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1955]

OUR CONGRESSMEN DESERVE A RAISE

(Extension of remarks of Hon. WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon, in the House of Representatives, Monday, January 31, 1955)

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., the largest afternoon newspaper in the State:

"OUR CONGRESSMEN DESERVE A RAISE

"Under a bill proposed by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, the salaries of Congressmen would be boosted from $15,000 to $22,500. He also proposes that Supreme Court Justices be given a $10,000 raise, and other Federal judges a $7,500 boost.

"Congressmen always have been supercautious about raising their own salaries. They are afraid, of course, that the voters will throw it up to them at the next election, and that it will cost them votes—perhaps even defeat. Political opponents of the Congressmen are almost certain to bring it up at the next election.

"But the fact remains that a salary increase is justified. The Walter bill is a compromise, running $5,000 a year less than the amount recommended by the special salary commission.

"Now, $22,500 sounds like a very nice salary for Congressmen. But when it is realized that most of them must keep 2 homes—1 in Washington, D. C., and 1 in their hometown, are subjected to the extremely high living costs of Washington, and have uncertain tenure, the take-home value shrinks considerably. Some Congressmen have maintained they could not stay on the job unless they had other income.

"Well, they probably could with a few economies. It isn't quite that bad. One thing is sure, these are important jobs that should have salaries commensurate with the activities, abilities, and demands of the job.

"Congress should vote a substantial increase, as suggested by Representative WALTER. We think that most people, looking at the problem fairly, will approve."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26, 1955]

CONGRESS DOES EXCELLENT JOB, MEMBERS DESERVE SALARY HIKE

(Extension of remarks of Hon. EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, in the U. S. Senate, Wednesday, January 26, 1955)

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD comments by Roscoe Drummond in an article entitled "Congress Does Excellent Job, Members Deserve Salary Hike."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printedd in the RECORD, as follows:

"WASHINGTON.—It is time somebody stepped up and said a good word for Congress. When cartoonists and columnists need a filler, we find it pretty easy to draw a short bow and let Congress have it. This permits us to attack everybody in general but nobody in particular. What I am saying is that while Congress is criticized more often than it deserves, it rarely gets the praise it deserves.

"It seems to me that the 83d Congress does deserve praise, does deserve to be put down as a Congress with a record of accomplishment substantially above average.

"I would cite two major attainments:

"It has been a 'do-something Congress.' It has to its credit a sizable, significant, budget of important legislation and it has worked hard to produce it. No Congress of recent memory has been as productive as the 83d.

"Congresses as narrowly divided as this one, with a whisker-thin Republican majority in both Houses, have usually ended in legislative stalemate. To have avoided stalemate under such circumstances is a considerable achievement. Both parties deserve credit. On any compartive basis, the Democratic opposition conducted itself responsibly. It disagrees on some bills, like amending the Taft-Hartley law. That makes a two-party system. The opposition rarely voted captiously, seeking to block the administration merely as a partisan tactic.

"It strikes me that on the basis of this record and after the midterm elections, Congress ought to come back and do something for Congress. I mean put something in the pay envelope as former Presidents Hoover and Truman, President Eisenhower, and a Commission of distinguished citizens recommended earlier this year.

"You don't have to agree with everything Congress has done to agree that Congress has done a good job and an expeditious job. You may not like parts of this bill or that, or think, as I happen to think, that it seriously botched the anti-Communist law in a frantic partisan boxing match in the frenzied hours of preadjournment. But the solid accomplishments of the 83d Congress remain and are clearly visible. To mention only a few:

"It approved the St. Lawrence Seaway after a 30-year delay.

"It produced a 1,000-page modernization of the whole Tax Code—a careful, constructive, monumental streamlining of the whole internal revenue structure for the first time in 78 years.

"It enacted basic changes in the atomic energy law primarily to take account of the fact that we no longer have the monopoly we possessed when the McMahon Act was passed. The new law permits sharing of information with our allies on the use of atomic weapons, offers private industry opportunities to develop atomic power.

"It passed, with bipartisan support, the most wide-ranging social security and unemployment insurance measures since the early days of the New Deal.

"A pay raise for Congress is long overdue. The case doesn't rest on what Congress has done in any particular session but its record this year would make action by Congress to raise its salaries more politically graceful.

"Senators and Representatives are now paid $15,000 in salary and expenses. The Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries recommended that the figure be increased to $27,500. Such an increase would add only $0.00717 to the budget and cost the country only 3.4 cents per capita. Members of the Cabinet receive $22,500 and some ambassadors' salaries are $25,000.

"Congressional salaries have never kept abreast of inflation. Because of inflation Congressmen actually receive a lower compensation than they did in 1939, when salaries were $10,000."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1955]

AN EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO AMERICAN

(Extension of remarks of Hon. BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Monday, January 31, 1955)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial from the Chicago American of January 31, 1955. The editorial follows:

"TIMIDITY OF CONGRESS

"We've contended that Members of Congress, and Federal judges as well, deserve an increase in pay.

"Men of good caliber should not have to serve their country at financial sacrifice. Or, to put it more significantly, these important jobs should pay enough to attract men of great ability and not just the independently wealthy or broken-down hacks who want to get in out of the rain.

"But the timidity of Congress. Its fear of the voters. These factors have prevented action in past Congresses. Now, as it seems probable a raise will be voted, they emerge in a ludicrous way.

"It is reported that proposals will be made for a $10,000 pay hike (from the present $15,000 to $25,000) so that, on the floor, Members may humbly vote to reduce the increase and wind up with $22,500.

"For goodness' sake, men, the people aren't that dumb. They know Congressmen have to maintain two homes and contribute to everything from the smallest raffle to the party campaign chests.

"They know Federal judges, at $15,000, make only a fraction of what they could command in private practices.

"Please, gentlemen, just fix a fair figure. The people will understand and respect."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1955]

JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE PAY INCREASES

(Extension of remarks of Hon. BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, January 6, 1955)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include editorial comment from the two morning newspapers of Chicago on the legislation to increase judicial and legislative salaries proposed by the Citizens' Committee.

The Chicago Sun-Times of December 31, 1954, said:

"Pay raises for the legislators, and especially for the judges, are long overdue. Congress should have the courage to do something about it in 1955."

The Chicago Tribune of December 31, 1954, said:

"In our opinion, it is a good idea. * * * The incomes of a body of men and women who can vote themselves a raise any time they feel like it have rather lagged behind the average increase in a period of rising salaries and wages. * * * It proves that they (men in public office) are timid. In this matter, we suspect, they were needlessly alarmed, because the great majority of the voters will approve the proposed increase."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1955]

PAY RAISE FOR CONGRESSMEN

(Extension of remarks of Hon. EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, in the Senate of the United States, Friday, January 21, 1955)

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pay Raise for Congressmen," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PAY RAISE FOR CONGRESSMEN

"Of all the melodies piped by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, none could have come more sweetly to congressional ears than this: 'I also urge the Congress to approve a long-overdue increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary, and in my opinion this raise should be substantial because I believe it should be to a level commensurate with their heavy responsibilities.'

"This part of the Eisenhower program seems certain to enjoy full, bipartisan backing, especially the congressional feature. Congressmen are very touchy about voting themselves raises, fearing the scorn of those at home. But the President has graciously given them an out; they can vote themselves a raise and say in truth it was the President's idea.

"Actually, they deserve a raise, and a good one. Lawmakers in the House and Senate get a little over $15,000 a year, practically all of it taxable. That doesn't go far, what with their heavy expenses. They have to maintain two residences; they have to entertain; they have to pay campaign expenses; they have to keep fences mended, which means, among other things, trips to and from home at their own expense; they have to kick in to all sorts of political and community causes. No wonder the New York Times found 2 years ago that the Congressman's pay falls short of his job expenses by at least $3,000 a year.

"Obviously, Congressmen have to get other income. The Times found that 80 percent of the Representatives and 67 percent of the Senators carry on a private business or profession back home or have income from investments. Some Congressmen add to their income—but detract from their legislative time—by writing articles or lecturing.

"The Congressman, for all the public's jokes and jibes, is an important man in our society. He ought to be paid accordingly. He ought to get enough to keep well ahead of the dogs of debt, so that he can think more about his legislative job and, above all, devote more time to it. He ought to get enough so that he can more easily withstand proffered bribes—or should we say contributions—by special interests?

"Last year, mainly because it was an election year, Congress turned down a pay raise for its Members. This year it should not be so skittish. Every reasonable voter, including the President himself, appreciates that the lawmakers have long deserved a healthy hike in pay."

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye Gazette of June 29, 1953]

PAYING FOR BRAINS

Brains always have and always will command higher wages than brawn.

So Uncle Sam has found. Faced with all of the Truman administration's scandals over 5 percenters, mink coats, refrigerators, and diamond necklaces, President Eisenhower set out to surround himself with Cabinet members and other advisers who would not be financially dependent on current governmental salaries as such. In other words, most of them had already made their wads and could afford to work for Uncle Sam for far less than they had been accustomed to in business life.

However, this brought forth some criticism. Democrats attacked the Republicans with the cry, "Big business is running our Government. Eisenhower is catering to the rich."

But it's a well established fact that few men in key Government positions such as Cabinet posts, Congress or diplomatic jobs can live on their incomes unless they supplement such with other income or from savings. A very frugal Member of Congress told us once that he hadn't been able to save a cent while in Congress 10 years, although he and his wife lived very frugally and seldom entertained guests. The scale of living men in public have to maintain in keeping with protocol is outlandish, but it can't be escaped.

This subject was dealt with at length in the famous Hoover report which was prepared and submitted by the former President Herbert Hoover, during the term and at the request of President Truman. Higher salaries were recommended to attract more capable men rather than mere political hacks looking for something better than they ever knew before.

A bill is now in Congress providing various salary increases. Justices of the Supreme Court would get a $10,000-a-year boost—from $25,000 to $35,000 annually. The Chief Justice would be upped $14,500 to a total of $40,000 a year.

Other members of the judiciary also would come in for higher salaries. Federal judges of the circuit and district courts, the court of claims, customs, and patents appeals judges, and the jurists of the military appeals court would draw $27,500 instead of $17,500. Customs and tax court judges would go from $15,000 to $25,000.

In the Justice Department, salaries of United States attorneys would not be less than $12,000 nor more than $20,000, except the Deputy Attorney General who would receive $21,000.

Members of Congress—both Senators and Representatives—now receive $12,500, plus $2,500 for travel expenses, annually. Under the proposed new rates, they would be advanced to a gross of $25,000.

Prior to 1939, Federal officers were exempt from State income taxes. Now they pay. However, a new act just adopted this year exempts them, up to $3,000 annually, for living expenses. Even so, no Member of Congress can possibly approach a living expense as low as $3,000 a year. When an MC gets his Federal and State income taxes paid, after living as he is forced to do, he can't have much left out of the present $15,000.

Democrats are trying to make some hay out of the proposed increases. However, they, too, hiked salaries of Federal officers and, furthermore, jumped the number of people on the Federal payroll from 502,000 in 1930 to more than 2 million 20 years later.

Perhaps it would be wiser and far more economical to pay stiff salaries for fewer able men than to have a horde of low-priced hacks not really qualified for what has been paid in the past.

As we said in the beginning, brains always command higher rates of pay than mere muscle.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Record Herald of August 26, 1953]

JUDICIAL SALARIES

Among the important unfinished tasks confronting the 83d Congress when it returns in January is that relating to salaries

of the Federal judiciary and Members of Congress.

In neither case are the salaries commensurate with the responsibilities involved and the abilities required to do the job well.

Let's take the case of Federal judges by way of illustration.

The American Bar Association has noted "an alarming increase in resignations of experienced judges from the bench" because of inadequate salaries. That's a serious situation. The American judicial system requires the highest type of judge. It has difficulty getting or keeping enough such judges under the conditions which now exist. It has the effect of weakening the judicial system.

The prestige, tenure, and desire to serve cannot offset the loss of income entailed through sacrifice of lucrative private practice.

The salaries of Federal judges, ranging from $15,000 for Federal district judges to $25,000 for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, probably look pretty good to the average person. It should be noted, however, that while the incomes of most people have kept pace with or exceeded the rapid rise in the cost of living, the incomes of Federal judges have been taking a beating ever since 1939 when their salaries were ruled subject to the Federal income tax.

Despite a raise from $10,000 to $15,000 for district judges and increases for other judges accordingly in 1946, a district judge's salary today is worth but about $6,000 in terms of the purchasing power he had in 1939.

The situation is such that various members of some State judiciaries receive more than Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court. That serious imbalance is without justification.

Legislation introduced in the first session of the 83d Congress (S. 1663) proposed to increase the compensation of United States judges and Congressmen by $10,000 a year, boost the salary of the Chief Justice to $40,000 and create a salary range for United States attorneys from $12,000 to $20,000 annually. The measure has the unanimous approval of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

It is hoped that with the support of the public that or similar legislation is brought to final passage in order to make it possible to obtain and keep the best qualified people in the Nation's service.

[From the Butte (Mont.) Standard of August 29, 1953]

ON RAISES FOR JUDGES

The Senate is considering a bill, supported by the American Bar Association, which would raise the salary of Federal judges from $15,000 to $25,000. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court would get $40,000 instead of his present $25,000. His associates would receive $35,000. Judges of lower Federal courts would have their salaries raised from the present $15,000 and $17,500 to $25,000 and $27,000.

To many the present salary scale for judges seems adequate. But witnesses at Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on the new bill told of Federal judges who had to write magazine articles or teach in night law schools to supplement their incomes and support their families. It would seem that such were living on a lavish scale, but the fact remains that if they found outside earnings necessary they would be unable to devote their entire attention to the task of interpreting the laws and performing their important judicial functions.

No branch of our Government is more important than our courts. The decisions made there are the safeguards of our liberty. We need the most able and experienced men in the country as judges. But it is argued that the bench cannot hope to attract such men when places in industry or private law practice carry a much higher financial reward.

In a sense a man who sits as a judge is rewarded with the knowledge that his work is one of the highest forms of public service. But his fellow citizens have no right to expect that he will sacrifice his own financial security and that of his family in addition.

(Same editorial in Decatur (Ind.) Democrat of August 31, 1953.)

[From the Newport News (Va.) Times Herald of August 13, 1953]

BAR GROUP BACKS BILL TO RAISE JUDGES' SALARIES

BOSTON, August 13.—Unless salaries are raised, Federal judges in the future must be selected from two groups:

1. The independently wealthy.

2. Lawyers so unsuccessful in private practice that they cannot earn the equivalent of the present salary.

That's what the American Bar Association's standing committee on judicial selection, tenure and compensation reports in the advance program for the 50th annual meeting of the association here this month.

The ABA committee backed a bill before the 83d Congress for $10,000 a year salary increases for all Federal judges, except the Chief Justice of the United States for whom a $14,500 raise was proposed, but Congress adjourned without approving the bill in its entirety.

Congress passed only part of the bill giving more moderate increases to assistant United States attorneys.

The bill backed by the ABA also proposed $10,000 a year increases for United States Senators and Representatives along with the Federal judges.

"It became apparent during the year to those interested in Federal judicial salary increases, that the best means of accomplishing this objective was to support a bill which included increases in the salaries of United States Senators, Representatives, and United States attorneys, as well as increases in Federal judicial salaries," the committee's report said.

The committee, in its supporting memorandum filed with a Senate judiciary committee hearing, said there had been "many instances in recent years where skilled, experienced and highly qualified National Legislators have been forced to leave their legislative service in order to make a living for themselves and their dependents."

"This is not in the interest of the national welfare," the committee commented.

The report asserted that Federal judges are facing the same income problems that plague Members of Congress: Their salaries have remained static while the cost of living has risen 92 percent since 1939.

"The result has been (1) to cause financial hardship to many Federal judges; and (2) to make it difficult to get first-rate lawyers to accept appointment to the Federal bench," the report said.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe of July 11, 1953]

SHOULD CONGRESS GET A RAISE?

How much pay a Member of Congress should receive has provided arguments among the electorate almost every decade since our Government was instituted. It still does. And when the pending recommendations of the Senate Judiciary Committee for salaries of $25,000 a year reach the floor, it is probable that the ancient debate will be resumed.

Reasons behind the timidity of Members of Congress on this matter of voting themselves a raise are not difficult to identify. Every legislator recognizes that the issue is strewn with hazards; these, exploited by an opponent in the next elections, migh cost him his job.

When the First Congress decided each Member should get $6 a day while on duty in the Capital, irate citizens denounced the idea. It would, they insisted, permit a man to stay away from home, go to the theater, and "drink fine wines." The first attempt by Congress in 1816 to put itself on an annual salary—$1,500 a year—brought similar protests, and the law was repealed.

In 1873 public wrath over what was termed "a salary grab" brought defeat to the party sponsoring it in the next elections. And only a dozen years ago another attempt to adjust congressional pay rates elicited a "bundles for Congress" movement, forcing repeal.

This sensitiveness of National Legislators has found expression in the caution which Senator Taft and leading members of the minority party have displayed toward the latest attempt to raise congressional pay schedules. Mr. Taft's comment was: "Somebody outside Congress better make a study."

The staggering deficit facing the Government today is not likely to moderate this attitude of caution among Members of our National Legislature.

Yet the hard facts of life which the Members face in this matter merit more consideration than they commonly receive. Were the total maximum pay of Members set at $25,000 a year, as proposed, the cost to the Eisenhower budget would be but .00717 percent, or about 3.4 cents per capita for the Nation.

During the thirties, Members spent an average of but 198 days on duty in Washington. Since 1950, the average exceeds 279 days. Congress has not had a pay raise since 1946, when compensation was fixed at its present rate—$15,000; and in terms of actual purchasing power, given present depleted dollar values, the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives are actually getting today about $1,000 a year less than their predecessors received in 1907.

While a $3,000 tax deduction for living expenses was added by the 82d Congress, and proposals for total exemptions covering all living expenses in Washington have been offered, this approach to the problem leaves much to be desired. Large special tax exemptions for Congressmen and Senators are not likely to sit well with a hard-pressed citizenry.

The better approach would appear to be the direct one of dealing openly with this problem through an impartial body. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has proposed exactly that step. He seeks to have a commission instituted, the 18 members of which would be named by the President, the Chief Justice, the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House. This group would study the question and make recommendations next year.

The traditional attitude of the public—and it is sound—is that election to Congress is a privilege and not a right; and that Members should not expect luxury salaries. There is little evidence, however, that any do. Analysis of typical Members' budgets made recently show them running more than $3,000 a year into the red.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) Journal of July 20, 1953]

PAY FOR CONGRESSMEN

As a result of the publicity given the NIXON "political contribution" issue last summer and the subsequent explanation by the vice presidential candidate, it was clearly demonstrated that most Congressmen, unless wealthy, have a hard time making ends meet on the present $15,000-a-year salary. This is especially true of Senators who have more expenses campaignwise ordinarily than do Congressmen.

To alleviate this situation, a bill has been introduced in Congress which would give Senators and Representatives a yearly pay of $25,000. It has been unanimously reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and is now on the Senate Calendar.

However, there is one element that plagues the bill's supporters. It is public opinion, the kind that would say, "They voted to give themselves a pay raise. What a soft deal."

To date there has been a great deal of congressional timidity on the issue and this public-opinion factor probably accounts for it. As far as economy is concerned, there is no big question involved. It would add only .00717 percent to the Eisenhower budget of 74 billions, and would cost the country 3.4 cents per capita.

President Eisenhower and both former Presidents Truman and Hoover have endorsed the pay raise on the theory that it would encourage more highly qualified men to seek legislative careers. Many high-caliber persons, who would make good lawmakers would rather work for private organizations now because the pay is higher and security better. Some inducement must be offered this type to try for office. Congress would be strengthened, surely, if more of this type were to come to Washington.

[From the Walla Walla (Wash.) Union Bulletin of July 5, 1953]

FEDERAL SALARIES

The Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the Federal Government recommended, in 1949, that there be substantial increases in the pay of employees in all three branches of the Government.

This was followed by action in Congress increasing the executive salaries. Those in the judiciary and in the legislative branches were left unchanged and to this day are at old levels.

The American Bar Association, which supplies a considerable amount of legislative timber and all of the judicial material, recently came out in favor of higher pay, as recommended by the Hoover Commission, in both categories.

The salary scale proposed in the recommendation, the bar contends, would produce better government, better administration of our courts, and better enforcement of our criminal laws. The last-mentioned point is particularly pertinent in connection with the suggested higher scale for United States attorneys, the broad inference being that a realistic schedule of pay would attract stronger men to the position, and tend to discourage mediocre chaps from becoming applicants.

Some comment has previously been carried regarding the proposed higher compensation for our Senators and Representatives, and the same general line of thinking prevails. Under today's living costs, service in behalf of the public is sharply limited. Because it is difficult to make ends meet, there are, to some types, constant temptations to take on outside commitments which might not be for the best interest of the public. Conscientious men of limited means are frequently unwilling, as well as financially unable, to make the sacrifice that their idea of public service entails.

Experience indicates that we seldom scale down much from a standard attained after a long period of rising costs and prices. If that holds good, there is little danger that, in considering higher salaries for Federal judges, attorneys and legislators, we shall be fixing a scale which, in a short while, might be unreasonably high.

[From the Albany (Oreg.) Democrat Herald of July 21, 1953]

MORE PAY FOR CONGRESSMEN

One of the problems occupying the attention of Congressmen is the matter of their own salaries, which, they generally agree, are too low. Members now draw $15,000 a year, with a deduction from income-tax basis, of $3,000 for living expenses.

This indirect method of hiking pay is not particularly popular among the Members, who would prefer a straightout salary boost. The proposed salary is $25,000 a year. This may look pretty high to a man irregularly employed at day wages; but for the nature of the job it isn't out of line. Men of the needed ability and experience are reluctant to subject their private affairs to the interruption involved in a term in Congress. This involves, not infrequently, a risk to an established business or practice.

The work itself if done as it should be done is well worth the $25,000. (Extreme partisans might contend that the blundering of members of the other party could be valued at a minus quantity.) The proposed advance, it is figured, would cost the country 3.4 cents per capita. President Eisenhower and both of the living ex-Presidents favor the advance.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois has proposed, with the backing of Senator Robert Taft, legislation to create an outside commission to study the problem of congressional salaries. Report could not be expected before 1954, an election year. Objection to this hints a fear that the general citizenry would not be warm to the increase.

Another plan, suggested by the Committee for Strengthening Congress, proposes a commission of 3—Herbert Hoover, Bernard Baruch, Adlai Stevenson—to study the problem and report to Congress. The report could be adopted without a vote after submission to the presiding officers of the 2 Houses—unless one or the other of the Houses just rose up and voted it down. We like the other way better and don't think the Congressmen ought to be afraid to up their pay in an election year.

We can't prove that the quality of service would be improved by a hike in pay, but the advance should be made because it is due the hardworking Congressmen—and we do mean hardworking.

The proposed $25,000 is $2,500 more than is paid members of the Cabinet. Probably the Cabinet men themselves could be upped to $25,000 without our having to cut down the amount of foreign aid.

[From the New Martinsville (W. Va.) Republican of July 10, 1953]

CONGRESSIONAL PAY

Congress controls its own purse strings. The only way Members of the House and Senate can get more pay is for Congress itself to authorize the increased payments.

Too, each Member of the House and Senate is a politician. Each 2 years House Members are elected; each 6 years Senators are chosen. Perhaps that explains the somewhat devious and underhanded method the House recently employed in whooping through what amounts to a pay raise.

The House passed a bill which would let Congressmen deduct their full costs of living in Washington from their taxable income.

We personally feel that, in accordance with the findings of the Hoover Commission, executive, judicial, and congressional salaries be increased. Congressmen now are paid $12,500 per year. In addition, they receive $2,500 which is not subject to income tax for expenses. Congressmen also are allowed to deduct up to $3,000 for their costs of living in Washington from their taxable income.

There is no question that expenses of Congressmen are heavy. Most must mainmain 2 residences, 1 in their district and another in Washington. They are expected to live in keeping with their rank.

However, we feel that the way to correct the situation is for Congress to increase its pay, honestly and openly, without monkeying with the tax laws. Nobody else is allowed to deduct living costs from taxable income. Congressmen should not be granted special privileges over other taxpayers.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of August 7, 1953]

GETTING CONGRESS OFF SPOT

Reluctance of Members of Congress to increase their own salaries is understandable. With taxes being extended, spending only moderately reduced, and an effort made to increase the national debt limit, Senators and Representatives do not want to go home and face such comments as, "Well, I see you raised your pay."

The Senate and House have approved a method of deciding the issue which may settle the problem in fairness to all concerned. The matter of salaries for Federal judges is also hanging fire, and so a nonpartisan commission has been proposed to make a report to Congress.

The commission would be composed of 18 members, 6 appointed by the President, 6 by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, 3 by the President of the Senate, and 3 by the Speaker of the House. No present or former Congressman or judge could serve on the commission. Members would be selected from leaders in business, labor, agriculture, and the professions.

An advisory committee composed of legislators and judges would help the commission determine salaries for the Vice President, Speaker of the House, Members of Congress, and Federal judges. And Congress, in appropriating funds for higher salaries, could fix salaries at any point between the present level and those recommended by the commission.

Although this method is complicated, as Congressmen have admitted, it would free Senators and Representatives from tackling a subject on which they are vulnerable. The merits of pay raises for Members of Congress have been debated for many months, and fairminded citizens agree that higher salaries are necessary unless congressional service is to be limited to those with independent means.

[From the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion, July 14, 1953]

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

One of the chief recommendations of the Hoover Commission 4 years ago was that Federal Government salaries be increased to bring better men into Government service. Salaries were raised at that time in the case of key officials in the executive branch, but not in the cases of judges and Members of Congress.

A bill is pending in Congress now to carry out the Hoover Commission proposal by raising judicial and congressional salaries $10,000 a year. The same bill would allow the Attorney General to set the compensation of United States district attorneys between $12,000 and $20,000 yearly. It has been approved unanimously by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

The bill has been free from partisan controversy. It isn't a partisan issue. The sole issue involved is whether higher salaries would attract stronger, abler men to the Congress and the bench. The American Bar Association, and various other organizations supporting the bill, believe it would. They argue that Government service should not be confined by economic circumstances to the independently wealthy, or to incompetents. President Eisenhower said much the same thing in his press conference recently when he observed that, with taxes what they are, we are approaching a time when only people of independent means could enter public life.

What would the proposed increase cost? The net cost, after taxes, would be $3,465,000 in the case of Members of Congress, and $2,240,000 in the case of Federal judges, a total of $5,700,000 a year. That figures out as only a tiny fraction of 1 percent of the total cost of the Federal Government.

That would be a small price to pay for more Government efficiency and better courts. If the present level of congressional salaries is, actually, a deterrent to getting top-level men into office and the mere elevation of congressional pay would be all that is necessary to accomplish that and keep them there, then there is absolutely no question that the increase should be authorized as soon as possible.

And, even if it will only help produce such a result, it is still well worth while. And probably it would.

But no one should be deceived that we can procure the kind of service we want and which the country assuredly always needs merely by paying higher salaries. There are many other factors which enter into the practical politics of electing public officials, than just the remuneration they will receive. There are other motives than monetary reward which inspire men to seek congressional office and serve in the Senate and House.

Let's pay our public servants in Congress what they need and should have to make it possible for them to undertake public service without too great material sacrifice. But let's remember, also, that the greater the material reward, the more seekers there will be, and among them will be many who will place personal material gain ahead of consideration for the national and public welfare.

When compensation is adequate—and it should be—we still must remain forever vigilant to carefully evaluate the candidates for office, to see that names of the "right kind" of men get on the ballot and that those of the highest integrity and understanding of our philosophy of government and the public welfare are elected. That is the eternal responsibility of the American voters as well as to provide the compensation that the office and its duties merit.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette of July 7, 1953]

HIGHER SALARIES FOR CONGRESS

A bill to increase the annual salaries of Members of Congress to $25,000 has been bypassed for the current session. There is but little doubt that most of the Members favor the increase but are fearful that, should they vote for it, they might be subjected to criticism when they come up for reelection. The House Members sought to obtain some relief by passing a bill exempting them from provisions of the Federal income tax on all of the living expenses incurred while living in the National Capital. They are already accorded a $3,000 exemption but this covers only a portion of the cost of a residence in Washington, where living expenses stand near the peak for the entire country.

The American Bar Association, of which the well-known Billings attorney, W. J. Jameson is the upcoming president, has gone on record favoring the bill to increase Government salaries in many higher level brackets. They would up the pay, not only of Members of Congress by $10,000 annually, but of Federal judges as well. They would also add $8,000 a year to the salaries of United States district attorneys. The association believes it is "false economy, and dangerous to the country's future, if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of Government."

During a recent press conference, President Eisenhower made the observation that, with taxes what they are, we are rapidly approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best men to remain in Government unless they have independent financial means. Former President Truman referred to the same difficulty before he relinquished the office. It isn't a question of getting people to fill the jobs at the present salaries but of getting men and women of the required ability and sufficient experience.

(Same editorial in Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, July 15; Havre (Mont.) News, July 8; Lewiston (Mont.) Daily News, July 9.)

[From the Duncan (Okla.) Banner of July 6, 1953]

We don't care for the plan proposed by Congressmen to allow all of their expenses in Washington to be tax free. It is subterfuge for a salary increase which the Congressmen apparently do not have the courage to ask at this time.

The pay for Congressmen probably isn't enough. It amounts to $15,000, of which $2,500 is a tax-free expense item. That is only half as much more than Congressmen used to get, and it undoubtedly doesn't cover living costs today. Expenses probably have doubled.

Consider the plight of a Congressman. He just about maintains two homes, one in Washington, and one back in his district. The Representatives make frequent trips home, and run for office every 2 years, against every 6 years for a Senator.

A $10,000 salary back in the depression days of 20 years or so ago may have been enough. Most of us have to have twice as much now to meet our living standards, and we do not have to entertain visitors from our district and State who are constantly coming to Washington.

But there is another bill before Congress to do something about salaries of Congressmen and Federal judges. The judges are in the same plight as the Congressmen. This bill proposes to increase their salaries by $10,000 a year. Perhaps it would be better.

We dislike the idea of special tax concessions to any group of people. Somehow the taxpayer feels that, if his Congressman is to be allowed certain tax-free expenses, then the taxpayer who foots the bill should have concessions, too. It's hard to argue against that.

Let Congress pass a bill to pay its Members, and Federal judges, a reasonable salary. And let the same tax exemptions apply on that salary as those which any other persons with the same amount of income would have to pay. That comes nearer putting all on the same basis.

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Review of July 14, 1953]

SENATOR WILLIAMS RIGHT

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the Delaware Republican who has done such good work in exposing irregularities in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and other departments of the Federal Government, has come out four-square against Members of Congress voting themselves any salary increases under the disguise of tax-exempt allowances or expense accounts which they can pocket.

He is not opposed to Members of Congress getting higher pay, but he says it should be in the form of salary raises and subject to the income tax. And he is right. Members of Congress should be saddled with the same burden as they have imposed on other people. And when they are so saddled, they know the tax problem of other people at first-hand. Explaining his stand against Members of Congress voting themselves any tax-exempt raises, Senator WILLIAMS said:

"I think that anything Congress does for its Members in the way of salaries should be on a straight salary basis, with whatever the amount is to be 100 percent taxable.

"I believe that the salaries of Members of Congress should be sufficient so that a man need not to have outside income to be able to afford to serve his constituents. I think we should do all we can to prevent Congress from becoming a rich man's club.

"With that in mind, I am making a study of salaries and allowances from congressional records back to the time of George Washington. Undoubtedly, some of the present allowances are outmoded and should be corrected. When I have completed my investigation, I intend to offer legislation to correct the inequalities and injustices—to everyone, including the taxpayers."

One of the injustices, he says, is the way allowances are figured for clerical salaries of a Senator. For example, he said he, as a Senator from Delaware, has an annual allowance of $39,540 for clerical salaries and it figures out to more than 12 cents per capita in his State. He adds: "But Senators EDWARD MARTIN and JAMES H. DUFF, from Pennsylvania, with more than 30 times Delaware's population, get only $49,680 each, which figures out to slightly less than one-half cent per capita."

[From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican of July 9, 1953]

HIGHER PAY FOR FEDERAL JUDGES

The Journal of the American Judicature Society, in endorsing the McCarran bill to increase salaries of Congressmen and Federal judges, has this to say:

"Of course, Federal judges could get along on their present salaries, or on lower ones. Millions of people live on less. One reason most of them do, however, is that they do not have the ability to earn more. The men to whose judgment is entrusted the disposition of our properties, our liberties, and even our lives surely ought to be men of superior attainments. Unless we spend on judicial salaries the amount of money necessary to get that kind of men, we need not expect the caliber of the Federal judiciary to remain at its present high level. To fail to spend that money, even in these times, would be a false and dangerous economy."

The legal Journal is merely saying what we said before. You can't get good men without paying good salaries.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times of July 13, 1953]

SO CONGRESS ISN'T GOING IT ALONE IN THE MATTER OF PAY

Through its president, Robert G. Storey, of Dallas, the American Bar Association is warmly and persuasively advocating the passage of Senate bill 1663. We are glad to see the organized lawyers working for this measure, and we are certain that the Members of Congress are glad, too. The fact is that Members of Congress planned it that way.

Senate bill 1663, already unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee of the upper House, is a proposal to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, Federal judges and Federal district attorneys. The proposal is wholly meritorious. But do you ask why pay raises in two separate branches of the Government—legislative and judicial—are not presented as separate matters? Then you do not know with what delicacy the lawmakers approach the question of voting larger incomes to themselves.

Thus Senate bill 1663 is a package deal, contrived to enlist the support of the lawyers, who naturally have a professional interest in maintaining high standards on the Federal bench and elsewhere in that branch of the Government. The argument for better judicial salaries is quite as impressive and unanswerable as the argument for better congressional salaries. In other words, this is a sound package all the way through.

And it serves to illustrate the fallacy, in congressional opinion, of the principle: He travels the fastest who travels alone.

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth of July 1, 1953]

DOLLAR LURE FOR BETTER OFFICIALS

Businessmen often say you have to spend money to make money. Perhaps you have to spend money to save money, sometimes.

At any rate that is the contention of the American Bar Association, and others who have come out strongly for Senate bill 1663.

This bill would increase annual salaries in the legislative and judicial branches of Federal Government.

Congressmen, who now get $15,000 (which includes a $2,500 expense allowance) would get $25,000. Federal judges would also get $10,000 more apiece; for instance, Supreme Court Justices would go from $25,000 to $35,000. United States attorneys and assistants also would get more.

Such increases were recommended for executive, legislative, and judicial branches 4 years ago, by the Hoover Commission on Economy in Government. Congress, at the time, raised executive salaries only.

It is always a question exactly what attracts qualified persons to the public service.

We like to think it is primarily patriotism and a sense of duty. In many cases this is certainly a factor.

On the other hand, it is also probable that many other qualified persons have not felt they could make the sacrifice.

Elkhart has seen one example of this, for our post of county health unit director has gone unfilled more than 2 years, even though the position pays more than other local government jobs.

It is likely the Federal Government also faces this dilemma.

Looking at it negatively, we may wonder to what extent Government inefficiency has been due to substandard officeholders.

Would some of the log jams in Federal court dockets be cleared up, for example, if we had an influx of more qualified judges and attorneys?

Would we even be able to avoid establishing some of the proposed new court districts? Would Congress act with greater dispatch and efficiency if it consisted of better qualified personnel?

We don't know that these things would happen. But it is significant that the economy-minded Hoover Commission thought so.

[From the Fort Atkinson (Wis.) Daily Jefferson of June 29, 1953]

CHEAPER GOVERNMENT BY BIGGER SPENDING

The American Bar Association has come out in support of President Dwight Eisenhower, who made the observation the other day that, with taxes what they are, we are rapidly approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best men to enter and remain in Government unless they have independent financial means.

The President added that he believed that Government salaries should be raised so that the best qualified people, poor or rich, could enter and stay in public life.

The American Bar Association agrees emphatically with that view. The association believes it is false economy, and dangerous to the country's future, if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of government.

Furthermore, the association believes it would be entirely consistent with the President's program of Government economy if the Congress were to enact, at this session, the pending bill (S. 1663) to increase by $10,000 per year the salaries of United States judges and Members of Congress, and to authorize the Attorney General to establish district attorneys' salaries between $12,000 and $20,000 per year.

The association points out that the cost of such an increase would be a minute fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget, and adds that it is confident the future benefits, in terms of better government, better administration of our courts and better enforcement of our criminal laws, would far outweigh the comparatively small cost.

Four years ago the Hoover Commission recommended substantial increases in Federal salaries in all branches—executive, legislative, and judicial. The Congress did raise executive salaries, but not those in the judicial and legislative branches. We believe the time has come to put into full effect the Hoover Commission salary recommendations, which the pending bill would do.

It doesn't sound logical to cut expenses by raising salaries, perhaps. Yet, higher pay could save billions at the cost of thousands.

[From the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel of July 3, 1953]

ON THE RIGHT TRACK

The American Bar Association is making a concerted effort to have the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of United States courts and United States attorneys increased.

The bar association agrees with a statement made recently by President Eisenhower that with constantly increasing taxes, it will be more and more difficult to get good men to leave better paying positions in private business, the professions, and industry to take Government jobs.

The Sentinel can agree with President Eisenhower and the bar association. For years it has contended that the pay offered for critical positions in governmental affairs is inadequate, especially in our courts and in our law enforcement departments of our Government.

United States attorneys, State attorneys, county and city attorneys often are forced to face lawyers who get as much for a single appearance as they do for an entire year's services. There isn't much argument to the claim that underpaid officials are easier prey for crime syndicates, gangsters, crooks, politicians, influence peddlers than would be a well-paid, financially independent official.

There was a time when $10,000 a year wasn't too bad for a Congressman or a Federal judge, even though they had to maintain 2 residences and run for reelection every 2 or 4 years. But that time has passed.

Those interested in breaking and evading the law pay more. The American people, whose security and well-being depend upon having incorruptible representatives, prosecuting attorneys and courts can't afford to pay less.

The McCarran bill should become law.

[From the Belleville (Ill.) Advocate of July 1, 1953]

SALARY INCREASES FOR JUDGES, SENATORS, AND REPRESENTATIVES

United States Senate bill 1663 proposes a substantial salary increase for Members of Congress and United States judges.

The increase in each category, by terms of the bill, would be $10,000 annually. The only exception is in the case of the Chief Justice of the United States, whose salary increase would be $14,500, bringing his salary to $40,000 annually.

Associate Judges would receive $35,000; United States circuit, Court of Claims and Custom Patent Appeal and Military Appeals Court judges, $27,500; United States district Customs Court and Tax Court judges, $25,000.

The proposal, which has the endorsement of the American Bar Association, does not seem unreasonable.

In every instance the duties of office are of the utmost importance to our welfare.

To be sure, a higher salary does not necessarily mean better men will be named to the offices. But there is this to be said for it that men who have achieved outstanding success in their professions and business will find the offices more attractive.

There are many instances where men who seek congressional posts actually have no business or profession but depend upon politics for their existence. These have found any emoluments of office attractive.

Is is not possible that men and women who have been successful outside of politics would find being a Representative in Congress or a Senator worth while under such conditions? Not that they would make more money, but that they would at least be compensated in part for lending their energy and their talents to the enactment of legislation which so often falls under the spell of the mountebank.

It might even give them heart for the rigors of an election campaign.

Judges, of course, do not face this ordeal.

Do not be deluded, however, that it is possible to buy talent and integrity in one package as you might get a double bargain in breakfast food and chewing gum.

Talent and integrity combined sell for only one price in the market place: The sole satisfying conviction of the necessity for doing well whatever comes to hand regardless of emoluments and honors.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Daily Record-Herald of June 30, 1953]

A BETTER WAY

The manner in which the Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to increase the remuneration of the Nation's lawmakers is a much better and more straightforward way of doing it than that voted by the House.

The Senate group proposed raising the salaries of all Members from $15,000 to $25,000. The House voted to allow its Members to deduct from their taxable income the total cost of living expenses in Washington.

The purpose in either program is laudable. The job is an extremely important one and the remuneration should be adequate if not munificent. The $25,000 salary suggested by judiciary group would give the lawmakers but slightly more purchasing power than the $10,000 salary in effect in 1939, considering the great drop in the value of the dollar.

The public, however, would prefer that it be done openly and aboveboard, we believe, rather than through the device of avoiding taxes.

Presumably, the House preferred to be coy about the matter because of the economy drive. However, failure to provide proper compensation for the Nation's lawmakers is an instance of false economy. Increased pay for lawmakers and others in highly responsible positions in Government is consistent with the President's program of economy and has his support.

The American Bar Association has pointed out that salary increases for Congressmen, United States judges and others under the Senate Judiciary Committee proposal would amount to but a small fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

The small cost of such pay increases would be far outweighed by the future benefits in terms of better government and better administration of justice.

[From the Newton Kansan Republican of June 29, 1953]

BAR ENDORSES PAY HIKE

The American Bar Association agrees with a recently expressed view of President Eisenhower, that with taxes what they are, we are approaching the time when it will be difficult to get the best men to enter and remain in government, unless they have independent financial means. The association construes that he was saying he believes Government salaries should be raised so that the best qualified people, poor or rich, could enter and stay in public life.

A statement by Robert G. Storey, president of the ABA, in part, follows:

"The American Bar Association agrees emphatically with that view. The Association believes it is false economy—and dangerous with the country's future—if salaries are not realistic enough to attract the wisest and ablest men to assume the immense responsibilities of government.

"Furthermore, we believe it would be entirely consistent with the President's program of Government economy if the Congress were to enact, at this session, the pending bill (S. 1663) to increase by $10,000 per year the salaries of United States Judges and Members of Congress, and to authorize the Attorney General to establish district attorneys' salaries between $12,000 and $20,000 per year. The cost of such an increase would be a minute fraction of 1 percent of the Federal budget. We are confident the future benefits, in terms of better government, better administration of our courts and better enforcement of our criminal laws, would far out-weigh the comparatively small cost. As one editor recently put it, higher pay could save billions at the cost of thousands.

"Four years ago the Hoover Commission recommended substantial increases in Federal salaries in all branches—executive, legislative and judicial. The Congress did raise executive salaries, but not those in the judicial and legislative branches. We believe the time has come to put into full effect the Hoover Commission salary recommendations, which the pending bill would do."

[From the Huron Plainsman of September 4, 1953]

ADEQUATE PAY FOR RESPONSIBLE POSTS

The present salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States on down through the hierarchy of circuit judges, district judge, lower Federal court judges, district attorneys, and Members of Congress, when they were established were adequate salaries.

But in these inflated times they are not.

The law of the land rests upon the interpretation placed upon it periodically through court cases by Federal judges applying the Constitution to the cases. It is essential that these arbiters not have financial worries. Naturally, that does not mean either that they should be wealthy men as a prerequisite to the position. The solution is adequate pay.

The same logic applies to the Federal district attorneys, who handle the governmental prosecution of cases. It is essential that they not be paid so inadequately that they are targets for temptation. It becomes even more necessary now because district attorneys are not allowed to have any other private business.

The makers of our laws, the Members of Congress, the ones who not only legislate but debate the fundamental political and economic issues of our day, also need adequate pay so as to reduce the influence of pressures from without.

Congressmen, both Senators and Representatives, receive a gross salary of $15,000 a year. The average net after taxes is about $13,000. That must support a residence in Washington and one in the home State. It must finance reelection campaigns. It must finance trips between Washington and the home State, and the entertainment of home State visitors to the Capitol. It is amazing how so many people who visit their Congressmen in Washington seem to assume that he has an unlimited expense account for lunches. The Congressman is usually quite hospitable, as home folks have the votes, but it becomes a constant financial problem, too. Thus, it is obvious that $13,000 a year is inadequate.

The answer to all these inadequacies lies in Senate bill 1663, which provides for salary raises as follows:

Supreme Court Justices: Chief, from $25,500 to $40,000; Associates, from $25,000 to $35,000.

Circuit judges, from $17,500 to $27,500.

District judges, from $15,000 to $25,000.

Members of Congress, from $15,000 to $25,000.

District attorneys: To a range of not less than $12,000 or more than $20,000, to be fixed within that range by the Attorney General.

It is certainly beside the point to say that there are always plenty of people willing to serve at present salaries.

The point is that the Government needs good men and adequate salaries are necessary to get and hold them. Ability is needed in responsible posts and ability must be remunerated or it will stay in the private fields.

It is difficult, despite the logic in the proposal for higher salaries, for Congress to pass such a bill. The reason it is difficult is that some Member of Congress, who is usually well enough fixed financially and independently, who wants to make a political pitch to the home folks argues that he is for economy and that goes for congressional salaries including his own.

It is for that reason that the great majority of men in Congress are men who have attained either wealth or financial stability before they run for Congress. Only a few young men study political science and take the legislative end for their career. We would be better off if more men were in Congress because they chose political science and the art of representation as a career. Yet that is impossible if the pay is not high enough.

The net cost of the increase of such recommendations, for Congress and Federal judges, would be $5,878,000 a year. That is peanuts. More exactly, it is less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the proposed annual budget.

The Senate proposal would improve the standard of our republican form of government. Congress should pass it.

Otherwise, what with the higher cost of living and high campaign expenses, Congress will become a haven only for the independently wealthy who can afford to run for and remain in Congress without salary. That would mean a concentrated narrow viewpoint on economics that would soon be reflected in legislation.

[From Rept. No. 49, 84th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives]

The following table sets forth a comparison between the amounts recommended by the Commission and those provided for in the bill H. R. 3828:

	Commission's recommendation	Provisions of H. R. 3828
Chief Justice of the United States	$40,000	$35,500
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States	39,500	35,000
Vice President of the United States	40,000	35,000
Speaker of the House of Representatives	40,000	35,000
Members of Congress	27,500	22,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Appeals	30,500	25,000
Judges of the U. S. Court of Claims	30,500	25,000
Judges of the Tax Court of the United States	27,500	22,500
Judges of the Court of Military Appeals	30,500	25,000
Judges of the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	30,500	25,000
Judges of the U. S. Customs Court	27,500	22,500
Judges of the United States district courts (including the United States district courts for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the district court for the Territory of Alaska, and the district court of the Virgin Islands)	27,500	22,500
Chief Justice of the United States	$25,500	$35,500
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court	25,000	35,000
Judges of the United States courts of appeals	17,500	25,000
Judges of the United States Court of Claims	17,500	25,000
Judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	17,500	25,000
Judges of the Court of Military Appeals	17,500	25,000
Judges of the United States district courts	15,000	22,500
Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia	15,500	23,000
Judges of the United States Customs Court	15,000	22,500
Judges of the district courts of the Virgin Islands, Alaska, and the Cana. Zone	15,000	22,500
Judges of the Tax Court of the United States	15,000	22,500

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will conduct my argument on this bill in such a way that I do not have to reflect upon anybody who is opposed to me. I do not have to say that those who are opposed to my views are timid souls; that they are cynics and demagogs. If 16 years of service in this House has demonstrated that I am a timid soul, I do not know where they got that information. Many a time for 16 years I have been the only vote opposed to my own party. I have supported the President of the United States when he was a Democrat, and I support the President of the United States when he is a Republican, if I think he is right. So that if I come to be a timid soul I would like to have the gentleman from New York come out to the Badlands and see what timidity is.

A demagog? I do not have to demagog. I do not spend any money in campaigns. The last time I received for campaign purposes exactly no dollars. I spent in campaign expenses exactly no dollars. If I had to demagog, I would like to have the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] define what a demagog is. The only ones that ever approached it in my estimation came from the great State of New York.

You have heard some great men speak on this subject—men whom I admire. Probably I admire the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] more than anybody else in this House because he has ability and he has courage. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] I admire, but I was disappointed in our chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary when he called me a timid creature.

Now you are not fooling me any, and I am not trying to fool you. This bill is going to be passed. I was not opposed to an increase in the salary for judges, but you lined this up so that if I was in favor of an increase in the salary of judges I would have to say I was in favor of an increase in the salary for Congressmen. It is not divided. So if I take one I must swallow the other. And you expect me to stand up here and say that

an increase in congressional salaries is not necessary. That is not my position at all. If there are young men in this House who have families and maintain 2 homes, a reasonable increase in salary is necessary. Once in a while newspapermen say that "Of course Burdick is rich. Oil. Uranium. One of the big cattle barons of the West." Well, up to this very minute I have not received pay for a single quart of oil. I have not received a dime for uranium. I do not know whether we have it or not. The scientists say it is there, but I have been walking over it for 20 years and did not know it. "Cattle baron." "I have no dependents." I venture this prediction, that out of my salary I help more dependents than the average man in this Congress, and I am glad to do it. About all that we who oppose this bill can do—I don't suppose there are very many; at least if there are they are like the gentleman from New York said, they are timid. They have not spoken to me about it. About the only thing we can do is to cut down the amount. I want you to be thoroughly honest about it, however. I would like to see you come out in the open and give me a chance to vote "No" and give you a chance to vote "Yes." Don't slide in behind the curtain and say, "It wasn't me. It was the other fellow." You say we are getting $12,500 a year. Why do you not tell the truth about it? I have often said in lawsuits, when a defendant wanted me to defend him, "For God's sake, boy, tell me the truth, because if there is any lying going on in this case I want to do it myself."

The fact is that we are getting $15,000. Let us put that down. Period. That is what we are getting. My proposition is, if you increase that $5,000, you increase it enough to take care of these young men who have all of these dependents so that they can provide two homes. I wonder if we will have enough to stand up here for a rollcall vote. I hope so. If I were of your opinion, I would not be afraid to vote. The fact is I am not afraid of anything in this House.

One Congressman said he lost $400 a month every month he was here. That does not surprise me any. You can lose more than that if you plan it. I tried it a couple of months, and it has taken all of my salary and the proceeds of two of the best Black Angus bulls you ever saw. But I have noticed something funny about these Congressmen who lose $400 a month. When their term has expired they come right back to lose $400 a month more. Let them proceed with it. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to lose as much as I have the last 2 months.

Everyone around Washington is for it. The President is for it. I ought to support the President, but when he asks for too much I am against him. The Speaker is for it. He is a man I admire, one of the greatest men I have met in Washington. Everybody else seems to be for it. Labor is for it. Well, if we put it through and get $27,500 or $25,000 or $22,500, and the question of the pay for the rest of the country comes up and we vote that down, what position are you and I going to be in when we say "No." Will the sky be the limit? Now, just because we can do it, is that controlling?

Some of you Members here—I see Mr. LANE in a front row seat—remember when Chief Justice Hughes stood on this platform at the 150th anniversary of the birth of this Nation and made a remarkable statement. He said:

> It is a good thing for the Supreme Court of the United States to know the extent of its power, but it is a far greater thing for the Supreme Court to know its limitations.

We have the power to do it; there is no other group of workers in the United States that has the power to raise their salaries. When we have that power, should we not exercise it with justice and with fairness?

How then can you face anybody and say you voted for a 70 percent raise? I do not know what kind of people you have in your districts, but I know that in North Dakota they would feel that a 70-percent raise was just a little bit large when compared with the raises they have been receiving: They have lost on their cattle, their wheat, and everything else. I am inclined to think if I met a blind man in Williston who is getting $40 a month and he asked: "What are you getting?" and I said, "$25,000 a year," I am afraid he would say: "What did you do for us?" "Well, we have not done anything yet but we are going to."

I would not be fair if I said that you are getting too much, because when your last salary was raised the earning power of the dollar was 77 cents, but today it is only 51 cents. So today on the salary we are receiving in comparison with what the situation was when we had the other raise we are not receiving $7,650. If I wanted to be intellectually dishonest I would not say that, but that is the true situation. This devaluation of the dollar, however, applies to everybody in the country as well as to Congressmen.

Those old people who were getting $40 a month when the dollar was worth 77 cents are getting $29.92 now.

It seems to me that before any group of people you cannot justify a 70 percent raise.

You say you are going to get better men if you raise the salary. I do not want to condemn any of you for being against me, but if you agree to that doctrine and vote for more, you agree that you should not be here, because we are not the best. Is not that logical? Are you going to get better men? Why, the best men in the United States never saw this Congress, and they never will, because you cannot get many good men to run. That is the reason I am here. They do not want their names and the names of their ancestors dragged through the political mud until they believe what is said about them. They do not run for office.

You notice that the one who has been here a long time remains a long time longer, because when the opposition has used up all the adjectives they can drag out against them they give up and he is elected and reelected under this slogan: "Well, hell's fire, we can't do anything about it, so let him go."

I want you to remember this thing: That some newspapers played up this idea that I am well-to-do. The only thing I need to say to you is that the people of Williston know that is untrue, and when the people of my home county know it the rest can howl.

I propose to offer an amendment if no one else does. Where in the bill it says "$22,500" I am going to offer just a mild, fair amendment to reduce that figure to $17,500. That will give you $20,000 a year. Remember now, I want to bring this hidden $2,500 up so the people can see where it is.

I am going to offer another amendment, if no one else does, to strike out the clause that makes this retroactive. If you are going to have it retroactive, I am in favor of putting it back to 1934 when I came here. I think that is the greatest piece of injustice that has been done.

Finally, I am just going to pleasantly and politely ask you for a record vote and I think you will all comply, because you have experienced now how fair I have been in this argument. Just give us a record vote.

I have enjoyed being with you while I have been here and I hope that relationship continues. Just remember that this is the only body that can raise the salaries of its own Members. If you are going to do that, do it under the precepts of Chief Justice Hughes when he said: "Understand our limitations."

If you do that and give us a record vote, then the rest of the story I can read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope you will all be back here in the 85th Congress.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I realize I am in a pretty difficult position following the gentleman who has just preceded me. There is no humor in what I have to say. I just want to talk a little cold turkey. I think we should face up to this issue squarely.

It is probably an unfortunate thing that an increase in salaries for judges and Members of Congress are tied together in the same bill. I know there are Members of Congress who would favor an increase in the judges' salaries but who will not vote for this bill simply because an increase in their own salary is contained in it. In my opinion, it is highly important that the salaries of our Federal judges be raised. I know able and qualified judges who have had to leave the bench and return to private practice because they just could not make ends meet. We must have the best possible legal talent on our benches and with the present high cost of living we simply cannot continue to get them or even keep those we have unless we are willing to pay them.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the pay raise for Members of Congress is concerned, I want to make it perfectly clear at the outset that what happens to this bill today is not vital to me personally. I happen to have some outside income, the earnings of which in no way interfere with my services as a Member of Congress. However, there are many Members of Congress whose only income is

the salary they receive here and they are vitally concerned. Many of them are not even going to be able to vote for this bill today, and I say "not going to be able to vote for it" advisedly. I have no quarrel with them. They know their own districts and they have their own local problems. Counted in this group, however, are some of the ablest and most valuable Members of Congress. Whether they vote for this bill or not I know they are "hurting" financially. Many of them are just hanging on by the skin of their teeth. This Congress cannot afford to lose their services.

Not only does the inadequate pay of Congressmen affect sitting Members but it discourages otherwise highly qualified persons from even seeking the office. I know of instances where districts have been created and extremely well qualified people have been importuned to make the race for Congress. Some of them have asked me whether a Congressman could live on his salary in Washington, and I had to tell him that he could not if he had a family.

To a degree, certainly membership in the Congress is a labor of love. I do not know any Member who expects to get rich out of his salary here in Washington, but he does want to break even. Some Members can break even. A person with no family can probably make out all right. There are a number of Members of Congress, valuable Members of Congress who are in this category, but I certainly would not want to make it an unwritten requirement that all Members of Congress be without families. Neither should membership in the Congress be an exclusive club, membership in which is open only to those who are independently wealthy or who have outside incomes. This is a representative body and should truly be representative of all the people of the United States. It should be a fair cross section of our population. It should contain men and women who know from actual experience the problems of every segment of our population. This can be achieved only by paying the Member enough money to meet the extraordinarily high living expenses of a Member of Congress. I like being a Member of Congress; I like my job, and I expect to continue to seek it, regardless of what happens to this bill. But, there are other Members here who like their jobs just as much as I do, and they are doing splendid jobs of representing their people at this time, but they are not going to be able to continue if we do not do something so that they can make both ends meet.

So, in the interest of good government, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to vote for this bill.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, the subject of congressional salaries has been before Members of this body for some time—at least in an informal manner. There are few who do not believe that some increase is highly deserved, if not essential to their continuance in the House of Representatives. Disagreements usually center around the amount of such an increase that should be granted. The present bill would raise salaries to $22,500 per annum, with an expense allowance of $2,500, making a total of $25,000.

Informal conversations lead me to believe that many Members feel this figure is too high. They are somewhat afraid of reverberations back home. The reason is given, also, that as long as the budget is unbalanced, increases of salaries of Members of Congress are not in order. The first reason given is understandable, but the second one seems to be somewhat shallow.

Let us look at the budget for a moment. It has been unbalanced most of the time by many billions. The total amount of the unbalance is more than $275 billions. The deficit in many cases is caused by our extensive giveaway program. Such items as $700 million to Tito's government; $700 million to Indochina; $88 million to Sweden; $2 million to Switzerland; $713 million to countries of Central and South Americas; and gifts to countries whose budgetary situation is better than our own. Much of our deficit in the budget is due to the money we have given to countries which have not stood by our side in the case of war, and not to congressional salaries.

It is estimated that the increase in expenditures which would be caused by the passage of this bill amounts to $3.2 million. How are we going to balance the budget by saving $3.2 million if we are going to continue to give away such lavish sums to various parts of the world? If we are going to balance the budget we must attack the main arteries of expense and only in that way will the budget be balanced.

Now I am not in favor of the amount of increase proposed in this bill. The jump is too big. There is an attempt to make up all at once for neglect in years gone by. I do believe, however, that some increase is amply justified. I believe this Congress should at least pay salaries comparable with those received by school superintendents in medium-sized cities. In 1939, when the dollar was worth 100 cents, I received $10,000 as superintendent of schools. With the value of the dollar cut approximately in half, the amount of pay received then is equivalent to $20,000 today. If we are going to keep pace with the salaries of school superintendents, and that is not unreasonable to expect, the salaries of Representatives in Congress should be $20,000. Of course, the added expenses of keeping up a home in two places, running for office every 2 years, traveling expenses back and forth, donations to various churches, clubs, and philanthropic organizations of all kinds, constitute another drain that perhaps should be taken care of in some way. A basic salary of $20,000, however, appears to be in reason and one which we can in all conscience support.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering a bill which if enacted into law will have a far greater effect upon this country than the amount of money involved would indicate. In H. R. 3823 it is proposed that the salaries of many Federal officials be not only brought up to par with the increase in the cost of living, but that they go far beyond. Passage of this bill will be some indication to the country that the Congress has removed all restraint and is now proceeding to open the floodgates. It will signal the beginning of another round of price, wage and salary increases which will again set in motion the inflationary forces which have temporarily subsided. It will be even more difficult for the Congress to say no to the many demands for funds. The hope of a balanced budget will be dashed to pieces against the force thus set in motion.

I feel confident that the American people desire their public officials be paid a fair and decent salary, but they do not care to set up a special or favored group. Representative government is founded upon the principles that public office is a public trust. To render service to one's country should be the primary motive of all public servants. Should that motive become personal financial gain, our system of government cannot long endure. To us as lawmakers and public servants is given an unusual power—the power of setting our own salary. Few Americans enjoy the privilege of setting their own pay. To exercise such a trust requires in all good conscience the use of great caution and restraint. An abuse of that trust can do irreparable injury to representative government. In the long run it matters little what it might do to our individual political careers but the damage to our system of government could be everlasting.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to believe that a majority of the American people will agree that the members of the legislative and judicial branches of our Government are entitled to some increase in compensation. There has been no change in congressional and judicial salaries since 1946, but the cost of living during that time has increased substantially. However, in all good conscience, I do not believe we are entitled to the increases called for in the bill under consideration. I do not believe you can justify these increases for the members of the legislative or the judicial branch of our Government.

Let us examine the bill in detail to see just what it does. It is proposed that the salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court be increased from $25,500 per year to $35,500 per year, and that Associate Justices be increased from $25,000 to $35,000 per year. This is a $10,000-per-year increase. I realize that these are responsible positions and that the men who exercise this trust should be properly paid, but I submit that a $10,000 increase on top of a $25,000 salary, together with all the other benefits available to them, is entirely out of line. A Justice of the Supreme Court is appointed for life. Under the Constitution, his salary cannot be lowered during the tenure of his office. So when these salaries are increased as proposed in this bill, this Congress will be powerless to decrease those salaries during the tenure of office of the present members of that body. This would be true not-

withstanding the financial condition of our country. Upon reaching retirement age, a Justice draws full pay for the rest of his life. Upon his death his widow draws $5,000 per year for the rest of her life from the taxpayers of this country. The Justice and his widow pay nothing into this retirement system. Estimate, if you please, just how much money a private citizen would have to earn and invest in order to pay such annuities to himself and his widow. It would be a huge sum of money, and yet all of this and more is provided for these Justices without cost to them and in addition to the salary.

Other Federal judges are the beneficiaries of a retirement system of full pay without cost to them. The same constitutional provision applies to all Federal judges relative to the prohibition against diminishing their salaries during the tenure of their office. So that when the Congress enacts this bill the salary so set cannot be diminished during the tenure of office of the present members of the Federal judiciary. Notwithstanding all of these benefits, it is now proposed to raise these salaries by from $7,500 to $10,000 per year. I readily agree that our Federal judges are entitled to increased compensation, but I do not believe we can justify such an increase.

The bill also proposes to raise the salaries of district attorneys, assistant district attorneys, and several other officials in the Justice Department. These increases, as in the other instance, are entirely out of line and should be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, the bill has another purpose—that is, to increase the salary of the Senators, Representatives in the Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. The increase provided for in this bill for the Members of Congress amounts to $10,000 per year. As in the case of the judges, I am firmly and sincerely convinced that such an increase cannot be justified, and that it would be a serious mistake for the Congress to pass such a measure. This is particularly true when we find that the national average annual salary is far below the amount of the increase called for in this bill. The budget is unbalanced and the public debt threatens to reach an all-time high. It behooves us as representatives of the people to ponder all of these things well before enacting the measure under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which considered this bill, I offered several amendments to reduce the proposed increases. At the proper time today, I perhaps will offer amendments reducing these proposed figures. Some of my amendments will leave the salaries higher than I think they should be but, in light of my experience in the committee, it seems to be the only way these figures can be reduced any amount.

Mr. Chairman, again let me say that I firmly and sincerely believe public office to be a public trust. I shall make no effort to judge the manner in which others perform that trust, but my conscience compels me to vote against this measure.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot support this salary bill, because I know from personal experience a reasonable increase is needed. What I honestly believe to be reasonable is a maximum increase of $5,000.

In the polls of the House taken last year, I stated I would vote for a top salary and expense allowance of $20,000. That was my appraisal of the need then, and I have not changed my mind this year.

To me, we as Congressmen are in a unique position in that we are the only Federal body which must appraise its own worth as a group and fix its own salary. For this reason, we must lean over backward to be fair and conscientious in this appraisal of our own contribution to the Government as a whole.

We must set an example of economy if we are to encourage economy elsewhere in the Government. I thought last year we made Herculean strides toward a balanced budget; but from what I have seen so far this session, Congress is leading the way toward extravagance in the matter of our own salary and expenses which should be separated as well as housekeeping expenses, in the passage of this bill, and we are setting an example which will return to haunt us in the consideration of every appropriation bill.

For years the salaries of board and commission members have been tied to congressional salaries. I somewhat doubt if any of those voting for this bill are ready to vote the same increase in the salaries of these board and commission members. I for one am not prepared to do so, but would be willing to vote for an increase to $20,000 for these same individuals.

I am sure no one on this floor decided to run for Congress because of the salary, nor do I think the salary increase here proposed would encourage or deter anyone from running in the future.

To be representative, this body should contain a cross section of our population, as I believe it does and always has. Changing the salary in the past has not affected this representation, nor will it in the years to come.

I see no objection to the judicial salaries, and only regret that they are not contained in a separate bill.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the bill before us. Congress is placed in an odd situation, it being the only vehicle that can provide an increase in the pay of its Members. I would have preferred to have had the bill written so that our salaries would be increased to commence with the opening of the next Congress.

This viewpoint would comply with the provisions of the California law which provides that the pay of an elected official may not be increased for the term for which he was elected.

However, after carefully considering the matter, I think the bill is justified and that the pay suggested by the Judiciary Committee, which wrote the bill, is reasonable, considering the responsibilities of Congressmen. The Members of Congress now have tremendous responsibilities. In the uncertain world in which we live our decisions as to legislation must be seriously pondered and our vote must be objective and strictly in accord with what we think will be for the best public interest.

In my book the statesmanlike Congressman is one who loves the public service and is not primarily concerned with the salary which he receives. If we make the salaries too high we will encourage politicians of the cheap type whose primary interest will be the amount of money the job pays.

I think I may say that to me personally it is immaterial whether the pay is raised or not. My wife and I have lived comfortably on the salary I now receive. This pay is adequate for the standard of living which we think proper for us. Our children are grown and we no longer have the expense of taking care of their needs and providing for their education.

In the present Congress there are a great many young Members. Most of them that I know have small children. For them the present salary is too low. They have the responsibility of caring for their children and of giving them a proper education. The timetable of Congress does not dovetail with the school timetable. Some of these couples use the Washington schools exclusively to educate their children. Some keep their children in school at their home for part of the year and then bring them to Washington to enter school here for the winter and spring terms. Obviously this is a very unsatisfactory arrangement. Also, it separates the family for part of the year, as the Congressman must go home to his district when Congress is not in session. Being in Congress has gone from a part-time job to a full-time job as in most county constituencies the people expect the Congressman or someone representing him to be in the district when Congress is not in session.

We must not forget that inflation has cheapened the dollar. When I arrived in the House of Representatives in 1944 the salary was $10,000 per annum. Those dollars bought a lot more than the dollars of today. I have had my life-insurance policies analyzed to determine how much the dollar has shrunk in purchasing power by the inflation following the war, in comparison with the purchasing power of the dollars invested in my life-insurance policies in the 1920's, 1930's, and the early 1940's. It has lost about half of its buying power, I was informed by a study made by the Congressional Library to whom I presented the facts.

So while we get many more dollars, we do not get near the purchasing power that the dollars did before inflation. We all realize now, after experience with inflation, that it is not how many dollars one has but how much they will purchase that really counts.

For these and other reasons that I could enumerate I believe that this bill is fair and just and should be passed.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the bill (H. R. 3828) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress and those in the judiciary branch of the Government. I regret that these two subjects are combined in one bill as I think congressional salaries and judicial salaries should be considered separately.

I agree that congressional salaries are too low. They have not kept up with increases in the cost of living nor with the increased work and responsibilities which go with the position of a Member of Congress in these days. Many students of government as well as many authorities in the field of business, labor, and agriculture have advised Congress that it should increase the salaries of its Members. Perhaps a reasonable increase should be made at the proper time.

I do not believe that this is the proper time. The Federal Government is today spending more than it is taking in; that has been true most of the time during the past 20 years. Our national debt is still increasing and as long as this situation prevails we can make no substantial reduction in our heavy burden of taxes. Nor can we overlook the disturbed world situation; even if it gets no worse it will require large and possibly increased expenditures in the field of national defense for many years to come.

There is another factor which I hesitate to mention and yet I think it must be considered. That is if Congress votes to increase the salaries of its Members by 60 percent as proposed in this bill it puts every Member and especially those who vote for the increase in a more difficult position when it comes to voting on the many demands which are constantly being made for additional Government expenditures. We know that if only a small part of these demands are met it will further unbalance the budget and contribute to inflation.

These times of cold war constitute a trying period, a trying period which may continue for many years to come. As long as it does continue the American people are going to have to steel themselves to make more sacrifices, financial and otherwise. They have a right to look to Congress for leadership in this matter. How effective will our leadership be if we vote to increase our own salaries by 60 percent at a time when our national debt is growing larger.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want it understood that I share the feeling that is universal among hard-working people. Like everyone else, taxpayer, Congressman, and judge, I feel I am worth more than I am getting. But the question is, have we earned it?

I say no, Mr. Chairman. I will not vote for a salary increase for myself and my colleagues in this House until the budget is balanced and a further tax reduction has been granted.

There has been a lot of testimony taken about the difficulty of obtaining competent men to serve in our Federal district courts and in Congress at the present rate of compensation. As a Member of Congress I resent this implication. I do not consider myself incompetent and I have found that there is no shortage of competent men in Utah who would be willing to take my place here in Congress if I decided not to run for reelection in 1956.

Let us look at the record in the pay matter.

When I testified in opposition to this increase before the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries last session, I suggested to the Commission that it examine the salaries paid our State officials. I had expected their fact-finding crew to list the salaries paid governors of the 48 States as well as that paid members of State courts of general jurisdiction. Unfortunately, they only examined and listed the latter.

These salaries, however, are significant and should be considered in the light of this legislation which would increase the pay of Federal district judges by $10,000 as it was reported from committee.

How does the present Federal district judge's $15,000 salary, with retirement at full pay at the age of 70, compare with salaries paid equivalent or superior court officials in the 48 States? Well, gentlemen, it compares very favorably.

As a matter of fact, the 2 Federal district judges in Utah are—at the present $15,000 salary—the highest paid public officials in the State. And there is no dearth of applicants for the job when 1 becomes vacant.

Compare this salary with that paid our five State supreme court justices in Utah. They earn $9,000 per year and have to run for office—on a nonpartisan ballot to be sure—every 10 years. Yet this $9,000 has attracted outstanding public servants to our highest judicial body in Utah.

Lest you think Utah is unique in its judicial pay scale, let us look at the record.

At the present $15,000 salary, Federal district judges are being paid as much or more than the members of the supreme courts of 33 of the 48 States. And who is there here who believes that a Federal district judge's duties are more important than those of the members of the States' courts of last appeal?

A more valid comparison—one in which the duties are more comparable—would be to weigh the present salary being paid Federal district judges with that paid State judges having general jurisdiction. Here we find that the present $15,000 salary is greater than the salary paid State district judges in all but 5 of the 48 States. And I venture to state that the retirement provisions of State judges having general jurisdiction are nowhere comparable in liberality with those of the Federal district judges under the present pay scale.

At $25,000, Federal district judges would be paid more than the supreme court judges of any State except New York and no State judge with similar responsibilities and duties would make anywhere near that amount, except in New York where the salary for trial judges having general jurisdiction ranges from $23,000 to $28,000.

I regret that I do not have the comparable figures for State and governors, but again I venture that they are rather conservative when compared with the $25,000 salary this bill proposes.

I strongly believe that any increase in congressional or judicial salaries should be held in abeyance until more than a token tax reduction has been granted and until the budget is balanced. If this is not acceptable, the effective date of the increase should be postponed until January, 1957.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration provides increased salaries for the Federal judiciary, Members of Congress, United States district attorneys, assistant district attorneys, committee professional staffs and clerical staffs.

In my opinion it is most unfortunate that so many differing classifications have been joined in this one bill. There may be reasons to justify some increases and there may be others that are not justified. However, under this bill as reported to the House it is necessary to vote for all whether they are all entitled or not, or vote against all even though some may be entitled to an increase. The unsatisfactory way in which this works is illustrated in my own case. I am in favor of that portion of the bill that increases the salaries of the Federal judiciary, but I am opposed to the increase of congressional salaries as provided for in the bill. Thus, to effectuate the latter I must vote against the entire bill. I regret to be placed in this position.

Now, as to my reasons for opposition to increasing the annual salary of Members to $25,000. Under present conditions it seems to me this would be unconscionable. The Federal Government is running a deficit each year. The Congress could and should have remedied this situation before this time. If this had been done, and, a balanced budget resulted, then there would have been some justification for giving consideration to increasing the salary of Members of Congress. However, until that is done Congress should not add to the deficit by voting itself a $10,000 annual increase.

The people of this Nation want further reduction in taxes. How can this be done if Congress is to add to the expenses of government? Congress should be seeking ways and means of reducing expenses instead of increasing the cost of government. Let us first balance the budget and reduce the cost of Government, then the people will gladly show their appreciation and support a reasonable increase in salary to Members of Congress to meet the increased cost of living and the decreased purchasing power of the dollar that have taken

place in the years that have intervened since the congressional salary was fixed at its present level.

While this same reasoning could apply to the judiciary, yet, we should not overlook the fact that our judges are greatly underpaid. We owe it to them to see that they are fully compensated. For a long time they have been underpaid. As a result too often we have been denied the services of men who could not assume a judicial position because of the inadequacy of the compensation. We must give salaries that will attract the highest type of character and ability to our courts of justice.

There is also another matter that should be given serious consideration before we vote ourselves a $10,000 increase, namely, what about the case of the postal workers and Government employees in general. While they have had several wage increases since an increase was given to Congress, yet, nevertheless these workers are being hard pressed to make ends meet. We have been quibbling over a 5 percent, a 7½ percent or a 10 percent increase for them and then by this bill, if adopted, vote ourselves an increase of nearly 70 percent. Where is there any justification in this? I cannot bring myself to be a party to such an unfair proposal of first taking care of ourselves and leaving the demands of deserving Government employees unanswered.

I am frank to admit that there may be instances where Members of Congress find it difficult to get along on the present salary. The necessity to maintain two homes, entertain visiting constituents, meet heavy election expenses, and, the many other demands, charitable and otherwise, made upon a Member of Congress, make it especially difficult for a young Member with a growing family to meet expenses, with little or no opportunity to save anything for the rainy day. It is strange that some in the face of all this persist in running for reelection. It would seem natural and certainly justifiable if they should turn their attention to more lucrative opportunities. Meritorious though these considerations may be yet, there is an obligation that we owe to our people that must be given first consideration.

It is for these and other reasons that I feel it is necessary for me to vote against the legislation at this time.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I have great admiration for the Members of this House. No doubt many could earn incomes far in excess of the salary of Congressmen. Some of our outstanding Members have spoken in favor of this bill, but, I find I cannot in good conscience support the measure as it comes before the House today. It seems to me we are presented with a peculiar situation. In the 16 years that I have served in the House, I do not recall a rule that is quite like the rule we are operating under at this moment. We have had gag rules, we have had open rules, and we have had partial gag rules, but here is a very peculiar rule indeed. You can change figures and you can strike out, but I see no way of adding new sections to this bill. I believe the folks in this Congress, if they would undertake to sample the opinion of the folks at home, they would find that the vast majority of the taxpayers are not in favor of an increase in salary in such proportion as this bill provides. An increase for ourselves that amounts to substantially 66 percent of the compensation we are getting at the present time and yet we have not yet gotten around to the consideration of even a very modest 5- or 10-percent increase in salaries of the thousands of folks who are employed in the post office and under the civil service generally. Mr. Chairman, this bill goes altogether too far, in my opinion, in undertaking to raise the salaries and compensation of the Members of Congress by 66 percent or thereabouts, and while I have great admiration for the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from North Carolina, the committee has gone too far in raising the salaries of the members of the judiciary. I was very much surprised to find a section in this bill beginning on line 22, page 4, and continuing to and including line 9 on page 5, which represents to me a deliberate invasion by the Committee on the Judiciary of the functions and authority of other committees of the House. I would like to have someone on the Committee on the Judiciary tell me just where in the rules, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to handle the salaries of the committee staffs of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call attention to the fact that the authority is in the Reorganization Act. This does not provide additional compensation but is legislative authorization and is an amendment to the Reorganization Act.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have before me the Reorganization Act. I cannot see in it anywhere any authority for the great Committee on the Judiciary to handle the salary schedules of employees of the House. This function is vested in the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. Chairman, my opinion in connection with this bill is very much along the lines of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. If representative government is to prevail and succeed, I think every man in this House ought to stand up and be recorded with respect to his feelings about this matter. I have heard it whispered around that we might be able to slip this bill through without any record vote. A record vote is fundamental in representative government. There should be no talk, in my opinion, of slipping this bill through without a record vote. I have the highest respect for those who are in favor of this bill. Certainly they will want a record vote on the measure. Those who have already spoken are on record. All other Members realize that a record vote is fundamental to good public policy and to the maintenance of representative government.

There are many other objections that I have to this bill. In the State of Iowa it would be unconstitutional, I am quite certain, for the Iowa Legislature to increase the salaries of the members of the General Assembly for the session in which they are serving. The increase in salary would have to take effect at the next session, after another election had been held. We ran for office last fall knowing the salary. This bill proposes a big raise and makes it retroactive to January 3, when Congress met. The voters will not like this idea.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to reassure the gentleman with respect to a record vote. There will be a record vote.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman very much.

In my opinion that is the correct procedure in a representative body; if we are going to maintain representative government in all of its finest traditions, we must have a record vote. I think it is very wrong for the Members of this House to vote themselves an increase in salary for this session of Congress when every Member knew the salary when he became a candidate last year. If a salary increase is necessary, it should by all means take effect in the next Congress, the beginning of the 85th Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to have to vote "no" on the record vote on this bill.

I have every respect for the sincerity and judgment of those who are in favor of this salary increase. I am willing to confess that I served 2 years in the 81st Congress, and if I count the expenses of my campaigns, which came out of my own pocket, I donated my time, and the job owed me $3,000 when I went home. But notwithstanding that fact, we have to look back to conditions that prevail in my district at the present time.

Maybe some of you people who come from where it has been raining in the last 3 years do not realize what has happened out along the Kansas border where I live and where Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE lives. We have farmers driving 70 and 75 miles into Kansas City to work in the defense plants there, or at Bendix, Westinghouse, or John Deere, at from $1.60 to $1.87 an hour, in order that they may make a little money off the farm to keep foreclosure from making them homeless.

We are cattle people out in my country, dairy cattle people; there are some beef cattle, but mostly dairy cattle. We have had our price supports on dairy products slashed from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity, and that made the price of milch cows drop from $300 a head to whatever they would salvage at the packing house, which is about $100 apiece.

There is a small lens factory in my home town that makes eyeglass lenses. Because of the fact that they can be made in Puerto Rico, bootlegged into the

country and sold here, that little lens factory may be forced to shut down.

People are unemployed in my country. Remember, we have had 1 year of flood, 3 years of drought, and 2 years of Ezra Taft Benson in Missouri; a farm out there is a liability.

I cannot vote for this measure and go back and face my people.

We have old-age pensioners out there who are very deserving. They are being taken off the pension rolls because perhaps they have a son or a daughter or some other relative who owns a home. They say to the old-age pensioner, man or woman, "If you will move into a little log hut somewhere and live by yourself we can continue to pay you your little stipend, but if you live with any of your relatives we will assume that they are able to take care of you." When conditions are thus in my district I cannot demand a vote to raise my own salary. You must remember that the per capita income of farm people is only $914 per year, and unemployment in my district is widespread. I am going to have to vote in the negative on the rollcall.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am making this statement for the purpose of making my reasons for voting for the judge and congressional salary increase clear to everyone concerned.

The first reason is the fact that congressional salaries have been raised but once during the past 27 years and that was a 25 percent increase in 1946. During the past 27 years living expenses in the city of Washington according to Labor Department's figures have increased 316 percent. We have increased the salaries of Government employees on six different occasions since 1941, amounting to more than 100 percent, and have recently voted at $325 million salary increase for Army officers.

When I came to Washington as a Member of Congress, there were only approximately 20 people connected with the Government who received higher salaries than the Members of Congress. The President, Vice President, Supreme Court Judges, Cabinet Officers and 2 or 3 other officials connected with the Government were the only people receiving higher salaries than Congressmen at that time. Now I understand there are approximately 5,000 employees connected with the Government receiving higher salaries than Congressmen. I am certain that all my constituents and everyone realizes that Members of Congress are compelled to retain 2 homes and they are the only class of people, that I am aware of, connected with the Government who are required to continuously maintain two homes.

I had some cash reserve when I came to Congress; however, during my tour of duty here, I have spent that reserve and found it necessary to borrow on my insurance policies. Actual figures show that I am receiving $2,904 less in salary today than a Congressman was receiving on September 13, 1938 when I was elected to Congress.

One great expense is official trips to and from his district. Last year I made 13 official trips to my district and the Government paid only 1 trip.

I would like to insert the enclosed figures for the record which show that after income tax and other deductions have been made on the proposed $25,000 salary increase, the Members of Congress will be receiving only an approximate $3,000 increase under the bill now being considered.

	1939	Now	Proposed
(Present pay of Congressmen, $12,500 plus $2,500 expense)	$10,000	$15,000	$25,000
Federal income tax	$372	$2,394	$5,836
Net paid after income tax	$9,628	$12,706	$19,164
Cost of living index	100	0.53	0.53
Actual purchasing power of salary less tax	$9,628	$6,724	$10,157

In comparative purchasing power, Congressmen now are getting $2,904 less than in 1939. S. 462 would bring an actual take-home pay increase, in present buying power, of only $529 over 1939 or a raise of $3,433 over the present salary basis, which went into effect January 1947.

I am making this statement as I do not want to be considered a demagogue by voting against a salary increase bill and then accepting the benefits of same.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, since coming to Washington I have had a rude awakening in regard to what can happen to a Congressman's salary. With the experience of only a few weeks I can see that it might be even harder to put savings aside out of a Congressman's salary than from the salary of a college professor.

I might favor a modest increase. At the same time, I do not think I should vote myself a sizable increase within 6 weeks after taking office. In the teaching profession, where I have been all my life, we treat the question of salary with a modest hopefulness. I have never asked for a raise in pay—although I certainly do not think that is necessarily to my credit.

In this matter, therefore, I have voted against the pay raise for Members of Congress.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to a pay raise for Congressmen at this time, particularly one of the size which is suggested here today. Although I think that there are many things that could be done to increase the attractiveness of the job of a Congressman, for instance reducing the cost of campaigning, I cannot feel that the present legislation is proper, particularly in view of the unbalanced Federal budget, other prior needs for Government funds, and the currently very heavy burden on the average taxpayer. For these reasons, among others, I am voting in opposition to this legislation. I wish to make it clear, however, that in so doing I am in no way challenging the good motives of those who differ with me on this matter.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE].

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill for several reasons.

I am primarily opposed to it because the amount of the increase is exorbitant. It is completely out of line with salary increases in the business world in general. The fact that Members of Congress and Federal judges have not received an increase in salary since 1946 does not justify an annual $10,000 raise. If past Congresses have slept over their rights and failed to gradually increase compensation of Members and Federal judges, then that is water over the dam. If increases were in order at intervals during the last 8 or 10 years, as many claim, they should have been granted when due. But now it is not right for this Congress to vote an increase sufficient to satisfy both present and past needs.

I do not believe the voting public will look favorably upon such action. I realize that the special commission appointed to study the question recommended an even larger increase, but notwithstanding that, all the national polls I have seen show that the public is about 2 to 1 against this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, do you know that this increase alone is more than the annual wage of the average voter. We should consider all angles of this case before it is too late. Let us not fool ourselves, because we are not going to fool the taxpayers. If this bill passes, several Members will be defeated in the next election on the strength of it—and probably a great many will fall by the wayside.

The public probably would accept a raise of three or four thousand dollars per year, because that would be more in keeping with the general policy of both private industry and other branches of the Government. But I am satisfied that a raise of more than three or four thousand dollars will be resented by the people back home. One Member who appeared on television a few nights ago is already receiving "bundles for the aid of underpaid Congressmen." This is sarcasm, of course, but it reflects the contempt of the people.

Furthermore, if we raise our own salary, then all the people on a salary will feel perfectly justified in demanding more money. It will open the door of inflation for more Federal spending. It will be just another step away from a balanced budget. It will make it almost impossible for Congress to say no to many unncessary and unreasonable demands for increased appropriations. It is awfully hard to refuse your friends when you have just cut yourself a large slice of pie—and at the same time, it is certainly bad manners.

I have said on numerous occasions, the only sensible and reasonable way to reduce taxes is first to reduce spending. I repeat that again, with the reminder that the average citizen wants both taxes

and the national debt reduced. Increasing our own salary 66⅔ percent will tend to enlarge these burdens, when the great need is to reduce them.

We should not only preach economy, but remember that it is far more effective if we also practice it. Briefly, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I feel we should kill this bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and Members of Congress. I realize I am probably in the minority today, but nevertheless, I believe I am right.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet so that there will be no doubt about my position with respect to H. R. 3828, to adjust the salaries of judges of the United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

In the little more than 2 years in which I have been privileged to represent the First Congressional District of Connecticut in this body, I have had some experience with respect to the responsibility and work involved and reasonable and just compensation for the job.

I am glad to publicly state that I will support the salary increase proposed in this bill.

As to the judges, it is absurd to ask competent, properly trained lawyers to assume the high responsibility of the Federal bench at the present salary rate.

Our judges make up the finest judicial body in the world, and this Nation, on the recommendation of every qualified investigation that has been made, should pay them a salary reasonably commensurate with the responsibility which they carry.

Membership in Congress today is, for the most of us, a full-time, all-year-around job.

For many of us, it requires that we maintain 2 homes and that is particularly true of those who live within a radius of 500 miles of Washington, D. C. In addition to the burden of maintaining two homes, practically all of the Members are required to make several trips to their districts during each session of Congress.

All of these round trips excepting one, are paid for out of our own pockets.

My own experience, which from conversation with others I understand to be common to the entire membership, is that I am called upon to make a great number of contributions to worthy causes in the district which I have the honor to represent. The demand is very heavy.

But for the purposes of this discussion, let me exclude from consideration the contributions, donations, expenses involved in maintaining two residences, and the heavy cost of frequent transportation.

If none of these factors were present, and in certain isolated instances they may not be, it is my considered judgment that the job of representing a congressional district is worth the increase recommended by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

Mr. Chairman, I do not state that I, as an individual, am worth this much money, but I do state that the position is worth the money.

The voters of my district will have an opportunity to decide whether I am the one who should continue to carry this responsibility and the one who should be paid the salary recommended.

Unless this salary increase is voted, sooner or later, the Congress of the United States will be made up of 1 or 2, classes of people.

You will have in the Congress only the well to do, who because of material wealth alone, can afford to serve in this capacity.

Or you will have in Congress a group of representatives not capable of earning the present $15,000 a year in any other walk of life.

Thus, it is possible that in the very near future, the Congress will be divided between the rich and the incompetent, with a sprinkling of struggling, sacrificial souls.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it will be a poor day for the United States when its Congress, the greatest legislative body in the world, falls to that low estate.

Men and women with families, particularly with young and growing children, will disappear from this Congress. And when this happens, we will have lost something of great value.

Because of the limitations of time I do not now try to spell out every benefit that can be brought to this House by men and women who are living day to day with the problem of raising children and of preserving family life.

Suffice it to say that these are the people who really know what is meant by the cost of living, who come to grips every day with the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker.

They do not need the expert advice of economic statisticians in order to understand the problems of the average citizen.

Besides, as we face from day to day in this body the problem of peace and war, I think that no man or woman is as qualified to vote on this issue as those who have children of their own who will be called upon to carry the guns or if necessary, to spill the blood.

It is unnecessary to take the time of the House to spell out the dreadful consequences which would attend this Nation if this body ever becomes a body attractive only to incompetents.

I have no fear about the willingness of the American people to pay a salary at which the average man and woman can decently and reasonably support himself as a Representative of Congress.

My only fear is that all of our people may not be fully informed as to the factual situation which makes this salary increase a necessity.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 35 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York, 28.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I did some reading last night on the subject of congressional salaries. I was surprised to learn that Members of the 1st Congress were paid $6 for each day while Congress was in session. My first thought was "Why those early Congressmen must have thought of themselves as rather cheap help to accept such a compensation." They had to pay some farmhand to take their place back home. It was a great distance to Washington and they had to maintain themselves while in Washington. Then it occurred to me that they had a different concept of what their duties were under the earlier interpretation of the Constitution. It was not that they were servants of the Government. The Government was merely an agency to defend life and property—nothing else. So they got their pay from the farm for defending their farms. I got this idea from rereading the oath that they took then—the same oath we have all taken—which says:

> I, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

Then, in considering the value of my own services in defending the Constitution, it was obvious that I have failed. The $150,000 that I have received thus far in salary has been paid for services in a case that I have lost. I have been a witness to further and further disintegration of the constitutional limitations on Government and the incredible extension of unlimited functions and powers of Government. I have witnessed the transfer of a quarter of all our citizens' property to the Government itself. That has increased the power, tyranny, and functions of unlimited government. At the same time, it has reduced proportionately the capacity of the individual to take care of himself. If I feel that way about myself as a failure, you can imagine how I feel about the other fellow. Besides all that, since I have voted against all the groups feeding at the public trough and have received my share of the condemnation for that, how can I benefit myself by my own vote when I was so eager to deny all others?

Apart from the question of the value of the services, who is going to pay for the raises proposed? It does not seem democratic to charge the general taxpayer. We have done nothing but reduce his estate. We cannot hit the Government, because it is broke. Indeed, we cannot charge the Republic which we took the oath to defend, because everyone agrees that we are operating as a democracy, and as a democracy we are violating the Republic. Would it not be more appropriate for us to congregate in rump session on the grounds somewhere outside of the Chamber and vote a raise in salary to be paid by those who have received the benefits? Or perhaps we could operate more purely as a

democracy by letting the people themselves vote for our raises.

Perhaps I could vote for this raise if we had even made a start toward a reaffirmation of the constitutional limited functions of Government under the Republic and a repeal of the unlimited power to tax and borrow and spend and go in debt and run deficits. The House tried that, too, and failed.

The corn boys near the end of the last session in a burst of conscience said: "We have got to do something to reverse the trend—reduce taxes, and so forth." So the tallest of the corn said: "Yes; we must do something. We must find the group to be sacrificed. Which one will it be?" It never occurred to corn how appropriate it would be for corn to offer itself as the first sacrifice and deny itself the subsidies it has been receiving for 17 long years. So they picked on lowly peanuts to be thrown out and denied its subsidies. The debate went on for nearly 2 days. Corn said: "Why our country would get on just as well if we never raised any more peanuts. Why let them feed in the public trough? Peanuts are sort of indigestible anyway." Then with a fury that was wonderful to behold peanuts rose up on the floor from everywhere—Virginia, Carolina, Texas—and they said: "Why of all the pretense, the crust; of all the groups feeding in the public trough the one that ought to get on its knees and ask forgiveness is corn." They so shamed corn and frightened all the other feeders around the trough who might be affected if peanuts lost, that when the vote was taken, it was 228 to 170 that peanuts should stay in.

You know how impossible it is to kick one group at a time out of a feeding trough. They simply keep coming in some other place with more than before. That leads to confusion, contention, and is certain ultimately to lead to violence. Now on what theory are the corn Members entitled to a raise for that job? Certainly not from the taxpayers. Maybe corn is entitled to something from corn, pigs, cows, mules, and chickens. For certainly if corn is to be subsidized and communalized and owned by the Government those that feed on corn cannot remain in the free market. They must be taken in, too. So it is doubtful if corn is entitled to an increase because they lost to peanuts.

The peanut Members might be entitled to a raise at first blush but on examination we can see they did themselves no permanent good. Winning their case merely uncovered other groups—endless numbers of groups—entitled to the same treatment. For certainly if peanuts are entitled to subsidies everything growing under the sun can qualify. You must have noticed that the vegetable group at their last convention of the Farm Bureau Federation has organized to present their claims. So that those who are entitled to extra compensation for this kind of business are fully prepared to get smeared by spinach.

"Oh," but you say, "we have done many things besides subsidize foodstuffs and houses and power. We have done some good even if you call all this evil." Well, that debate can be ended by striking a balance to see whether the sum total of what is right exceeds the total of what is wrong.

During the 10 years of my service here I have found few opportunities to present the conservative point of view. It seemed such a waste of your time, that my speeches were delivered to the Appendix. Some of you have been good enough to tell me that you have read them. What has shocked me more than anything else has been our inability to see what everybody else can see, especially those witnesses abroad that we are so concerned about. After World War II was over, Goering and Ribbenthrop and others were behind bars. Henry J. Taylor, a great war correspondent, went to see them. Some of the most startling reports of their conversations appeared at that time. One of them was this quotation from Goering:

> Your America is doing many things in the economic field which we found out caused us so much trouble. You are trying to control people's wages and prices—people's work. If you do that, you must control people's lives. And no country can do that part way. I tried it and failed. Nor can any country do it all the way either. I tried that too and it failed. You are no better planners than we. I should think your economists would read what happened here.
>
> Germany has been beaten, eliminated, but it will be interesting to watch the development of the remaining great powers, the stupidities they practice within their homelands, their internal strife, and their battles of wits abroad.
>
> Will it be as it always has been that countries will not learn from the mistakes of others and will continue to make the mistakes of others all over again and again?

There is not a Member in this House who could have voted for a raise in the salary for the members of the Parliaments of Germany or Russia or Italy or England at the peak of the Socialist management of their economies. If we are doing the same thing, my fellow Members, and they all say that we are, then, why should we pretend any further that we are serving the Republic and are entitled for good performance to a raise in our compensation? It has not been shown. Our hesitation, our timidity in this business, now and in the last session, must be explained by the fact that we know in our hearts that we are doing those very things that Goering calls so tragically to our attention.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to be the first to vote for an increase in compensation the moment we take the first steps to reverse, honestly and permanently, the trend toward unlimited government and reaffirm the constitutional limitations on the functions of government.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill.

I feel that there is no justification whatsoever for an increase in basic salary for Members of Congress or members of the judiciary at this time. I further feel that an increase such as is recommended is out of perspective, unreasonable, and unfair to the American taxpayer.

Our objective should be a balanced budget, and this is an example of some of the fat that can be eliminated.

We must rebuild our financial reserves and develop a strong economic America.

There may, however, be some justification for additional mileage expense to and from the District on urgent matters, but, for the most part, Congressmen should be on the job here during the session.

I do not intend to betray the trust placed in me by my constituents by supporting unrealistic measures to increase the cost of government when our objectives should be to economize.

I can find no basis to support H. R. 3828 as it has been reported from the House Judiciary Committee, and I intend to vote against it.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHASE].

Mr. CHASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHASE. Mr. Chairman, as I announced several weeks ago, I shall not vote for an increase in the salaries of the Members of Congress or Federal judges.

In seeking election to Congress I vigorously stressed the crying need of the American taxpayer for relief in his tax burden.

Reducing nonessential spending is the most effective way to reduce our taxes. Necessary spending is a must, but unnecessary spending should not be indulged in these critical times.

I knew what my salary would be when I applied to the voters for the job of Congressman. In a sense, I represented to them that I would be glad to work for the prevailing salary. In view of my public utterances on the all-important task of reducing the cost of government in all items, large and small, I feel that I am personally pledged to oppose a salary increase. Should I vote for an increase in my own salary, my many protests against the continually mounting cost of government would seem hypocritical.

The present salary of Congressmen, which far exceeds the salaries of many other Government employees who have dedicated their lives to Government service—some of which salaries are inadequate and should be increased—is sufficient to meet the needs of a Congressman who limits himself and family to a fair and reasonable standard of living.

As to judicial salaries, I regard the present scale as sufficient. The average Federal judge has attained such age that, considering his present family responsibilities and assurance of life tenure, he is quite fairly compensated as far as salary is concerned. If the volume of Federal judicial work has been so unduly increased as to result in crowded dockets, and so forth, raising the salaries of the judges will not relieve

the situation. More judges should be appointed. A judge can properly dispose of only a limited amount of judicial business in a given period. Increasing the salary will not increase the output of the judge.

And I cannot agree that we should increase judicial salaries in order to attract into the judicial ranks lawyers who, in private life, have the highest earning capacities. From my observation over the years, some of our outstanding jurists were drawn from private law practices which were not outstandingly lucrative. The financial standing or moneymaking ability of a lawyer, in my opinion, has slight relationship to his qualifications as a jurist.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, during the 83d Congress, I made the statement on the floor of the House that I felt we should balance the budget and reduce taxes before considering salary increases for Members.

The 83d Congress made the greatest tax cut in history and it was a tax cut that was equally beneficial to all groups. However, the budget was not balanced and there seems to be no chance to balance it this year. It is true that my vote and the votes of many Members would have reduced expenditures, balanced the budget and even would have reduced the public debt. We were in the minority but I shall join these same colleagues again in an attempt to work for economy and efficiency in the Federal Government.

When this result has been accomplished, I then feel that we shall have earned the increased salary that has been proposed in House Resolution 3828. After all, we were elected to represent the people of our districts and to think first of them.

It is true that the present salary is inadequate especially for those who have no other business or source of income. At the same time, I feel that all of the Members of the Congress have devoted themselves to their work from the viewpoint of service. That is the way I sincerely feel about it. After all, if we stop this deficit spending and secure greater economy and efficiency in Government, then the dollars that we are paid will have more value. Thus, it would be possible to help ourselves and all of the people in our respective districts, instead of adding to the inflationary process by greater spending and the resultant increased deficits.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative at Large from the State of Connecticut, having the largest constituency on this side of the aisle, I am very much in agreement with the remarks made during the debate on the rule by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who represents the largest constituency on the other side of the aisle.

I rose primarily, Mr. Chairman, to make this observation, although I am unqualified for this bill; and it is this. The one Member from my hometown of Rockville, Conn., who had previously served in this Chamber 50 years ago, Mr. E. Stevens Henry, I noted in my local hometown paper 2 weeks ago, was one of those Members of the House of Representatives who did not collect any of his salary until the 2-year term to which he had been elected had been served.

Mr. Chairman, I find as the other Member of Congress from my hometown that I cannot cope in my expense budget with my distinguished and eminent predecessor, Mr. E. Stevens Henry, who was a man of great wealth. He represented the First Connecticut District at that time, and I now represent the State at large.

If this bill as it emanated from the Committee on Rules had provided opportunity to reimburse Members of Congress for the trips they would make to their districts for official business, then I would propose that each Member be reimbursed for the trip made each weekend to his district, provided he or she signed a voucher that such trip to the district for official purposes had been made. The total salary could then be accordingly decreased.

There I find myself having the greatest difficulty, inasmuch as I return to my district every Saturday and hold office hours and meet with my constituents. I have never said "No" to an invitation to a meeting where my constituents desired to tell me of their problems.

Mr. Chairman, I am in complete accord with this bill and shall vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, under which the bill is being considered, no amendments will be in order to the bill except proposals to strike any of its provisions or to increase or decrease the amounts authorized therein.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Chief Justice of the United States and to the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$35,500", and by striking out "$25,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000."

(b) Section 44 (d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,000."

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500", and by striking out "$15,500" and substituting therefor "$23,000."

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,000."

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting "$25,000."

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500."

(g) The first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, relating to the District Court for the District of Alaska, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500."

(h) Section 3 of the act approved May 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 220), as amended, relating to the judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500."

(i) Section 7443 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Salary: Each judge shall receive salary at the rate of $22,500 per annum to be paid in monthly installments."

(j) Article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,000."

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of North Carolina: On page 1, line 7, strike out "$35,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500", and in line 8, strike out "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000."

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. What it does is to reduce the figure carried in the bill for the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court from the figure of $35,500 down to the figure of $30,500 and to reduce the figure carried in the bill for Associate Justices of the Supreme Court from $35,000 down to the figure of $30,000.

Mr. Chairman, this reduces the amount carried in the bill by $5,000 per year, but it is a $5,000 per year increase for the members of the Supreme Court. I submit that is all that can be justified, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly to recite in opposition to the amendment that the Lord Chancellor of England receives the equivalent of $40,000 a year, and the chief justice of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York receives $35,000 plus $3,000 expenses. Certainly, we would not want to treat the judges of our highest court in a way indicated by this amendment in comparison to what the English do and in comparison to what the State of New York does.

The dignity and importance of our highest court demands greater respect than is indicated by the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of North Carolina) there were—ayes 27, noes 161.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to read a telegram dated today which I received from our former President, Harry S. Truman. It is as follows:

Hon. JOHN McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I have been asked for my opinion on the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. I am heartily in

favor of the salary raises. Senators, Congressmen, and judges have always been underpaid. The people are perfectly willing that these important servants of theirs should have adequate compensation. I hope you will push the bill through to a successful conclusion.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Page 2, line 2, strike out "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500."

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this reduces the figure calling for an increase for circuit judges, from $25,000 to $22,500, or a reduction of $2,500, leaving a $5,000 increase for these gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment to section 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of North Carolina: On page 2, line 5, strike out "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000"; and in line 6, strike out "$23,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,500."

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces the amount carried in this bill for the Federal district judges by $2,500, leaving those judges with a $5,000 per year increase in salary.

Mr. Chairman, I have amendments here to reduce the figures carried in this bill for all the other judges. These reductions would be the same as contained in this amendment. In view of the sentiment of the House, I would be wasting my time to offer them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 508. Salaries.

"The Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title within the following limitations:

"United States attorneys—not less than $12,000 or more than $20,000; and

"Assistant United States attorneys and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title—not less than $6,000 or more than $15,000."

(b) The salaries of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys for the districts of Alaska, Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands are subject to the provisions of section 508 of title 28, United States Code.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything about this bill. This is the old familiar tune they are singing around here today.

In my younger days I had a good job in a sawmill. I was earning the handsome salary of $1.25 a day. One evening the employees decided to have a meeting to see if we could persuade the boss to give us a small raise of 25 cents a day, which would make us receive $1.50 for an 11-hour day. We almost had to swap our beds for a lantern to get to and from the sawmill. In the fall of the year we went to work before daylight and we came home after dark. After some argument pro and con, one of our number got up and said, "You fellows are fixing to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. We are getting too much already and should have a reduction. A dollar a day is all the money that any man here is worth."

My opinion is that a lot of Members who have spoken here today who feel that we are not entitled to a salary raise—my advice to these Members would be, "Go back home and help elect a better man to Congress to take your place; one that will be worth the money."

As for me, I came here to do a good job and I am putting in all my time in an effort to give my district the kind of representation that I believe they are entitled to. My telephone is open 24 hours a day. I invite my constituents to call on me. If I had flood or drought in my district, they would need me much more than they do now. I think this argument that somebody has had a misfortune in some parts of our country and that for that reason he ought not to ask for a salary raise, is out of line. Wait until the farmers make a good crop in the West is what the argument boils down to. I think that argument is out of line. They need a good man to represent them here if they have a distressed condition in the district more than they would during good times.

We are working hard to help our constituents get relief during floods and drought; we are working to get money to build new schools; many good things that go to your district and mine for the interest of all of our people is because they have a good Congressman here looking after their affairs.

I would like to ask all those who are going to vote against this salary raise because they do not think they are worth it to just give me the increase in their salary which this bill grants. I could use some of it handsomely.

This bill will pass and I want to make an observation. How many of these Members who talk against this pay raise will refuse to take the money when the time comes. There is not in my humble opinion a single, solitary one. Most of them are talking to hear themselves talk. They know that a majority of the people in the Congress need this salary raise and I am not talking for myself alone. I know them. I am looking at many young men right here in the Congress. Some of the best men in this Congress can hardly stay here because they do not receive enough salary.

We heard the argument here a while ago that because George Washington or somebody else served for $6 a day we ought to. There is no sense in that kind of argument. This is not the 18th century. We have the richest country in all the world. We are here making laws to protect the oil industry and all the other large industries of our great country. We are taking care of their business and, my friends, the governmental affairs is their business. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that they ought to be willing to pay for it, and furthermore they are willing.

Do you know what it would cost the people of my district to keep me here at $25,000 a year? It would cost 1½ cent per capita. I ask any man in my district if that is not little enough to pay for your Congressman's services. Figure that out. It is a pittance compared to the service rendered. It is ridiculous for us to come here today and argue against a small salary raise for Congress and our judges. Yet if you should stop the giveaway program, or foreign aid, for 8 hours it will pay the entire raise for our Congressmen for a full term and have money left.

The majority of the Members here today who are talking against this bill are just timid and are afraid to tell the truth. They want this raise as much as you or I and they are going to take it when the time comes. I wonder how many votes we would find against this measure if those Members who voted against it would receive no increase. Let us be honest with ourselves. This is the only place that the Congressman can receive a salary raise. The Constitution puts it squarely up to us to raise our own salaries when the time comes that it is necessary. Let us not quibble further about this matter. Let us have the temerity to speak out the things that we know are right and do the right thing, vote this salary increase.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

SEC. 4. (a) The matter preceding the semicolon in section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows.

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$30,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000."

(c) Subsection (e) of section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U. S. C., sec. 72a), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The professional staff members of the standing committees shall receive annual compensation, to be fixed by the chairman, ranging from $5,000 to $10,000, and the clerical staff shall receive annual compensation ranging from $2,000 to $10,000."

(d) Subsection (b) of section 2 of the act of October 24, 1951 (5 U. S. C., sec. 932b), is amended by striking out "$11,646 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the maximum scheduled rate of the highest grade established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,".

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: On page 4, line 15, strike out "$22,500" and insert "$17,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not want 5 minutes.

The effect of this amendment is that the $17,500 and the $2,500 expense allowance will make $20,000 salary for Congressmen. I do not care to argue the matter; I am just submitting it because I think it is the right thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee) there were—ayes 63, noes 176.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 4, line 22, strike out line 22 through line 25; and on page 5, line 1, strike out line 1 through line 9.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment takes out the personnel included in subsection (c) of section 4 which serve the various committees of the House of Representatives.

I call your attention to the Reorganization Act, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, in which the Committee on House Administration is charged with the responsibility and has the jurisdiction for the employment of persons by the House, including the clerks for Members and committees, reporters of debates, and so forth.

This is not a matter of claiming jurisdiction for the Committee on House Administration, but, rather, it is a matter of orderly procedure, which I do not think we will have as provided in this bill. I am aware, of course, that there are a number of chairmen of committees of this House who have requested that they be permitted to raise the ceiling of pay for professional staff members of their committees. If you will give the Committee on House Administration the opportunity, I can assure you that we expect to review the entire salary structure of this House in the very near future. We shall do it just as soon as we have the opportunity. We have had it in mind and we have already discussed it in the committee. A subcommittee will be appointed to review the entire structure, including employees from the bottom to the top. It may be possible that the ceiling will be raised. Under present limitations, clerks who receive the basic top salary of $8,000 per annum receive a gross of $11,646. Under this arrangement, it would raise their salaries to $14,800. When the Congress approves a reclassification of Federal employees, which it is scheduled to do, salaries of these employees in the professional category will increase still more under the automatic provisions. We cannot know at this time how much that will be.

I take no pleasure in offering this amendment, and it should not be construed that I would oppose the raise in some instances of professional people working for committees. I understand that this is not an automatic raise. But there are some 65 to 75 people now employed by committees who are receiving the top salary. It is assumed they will be raised if the ceiling now in effect is increased to $10,000.

It is entirely possible, I repeat, that they should be raised, that the ceiling should be increased, but I do not think this is the way to do it; and, I repeat further, if you will give the Committee on House Administration the opportunity, we will try to work these things out and endeavor to adjust salaries, whether they are for janitorial people or whatever they may be, up to the top professional people. We will do our best to correct some of the inequities which I am sure do exist.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield, I have practically the identical amendment on the Clerk's desk. I do not think that the section as it refers to the professional staff members of standing committees has any place in this bill, and I agree with the gentleman that it should not be in the bill, but should be left to the Committee on House Administration to work out.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is it not a fact that if we leave this provision in the bill, we will be in the position of raising salaries piecemeal without an overall survey of the situation at all?

Mr. BURLESON. That is true. Furthermore, it widens the gap between these top professional committee employees and the top administrative employees, whom I think have just as great responsibility. Further, by a blanket arrangement of this kind the elected officials of the House are not considered. The appointed officers are not receiving any consideration. Where do they stand, they must wonder?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. As the chairman of your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to concur wholeheartedly in the timely observation of the gentleman from Texas. This provision has absolutely no place in this bill and should be taken out.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me again make it clear that the Committee on House Administration will, as early as possible, give its careful consideration to all these matters. An overall survey will be made and the results and recommendations presented to you.

Mr. Chairman, I must also express myself on the pending bill. For reasons which are not expected to influence anyone except myself, I am unable to support this measure on final vote. Be that as it may, I hope you will support this amendment, because I feel it will be a serious mistake to include this provision should the bill be passed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to disagree with my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, but he is in error when he states that the committee of which he is chairman has jurisdiction over the committee personnel. Section 202 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act—and, after all, what we are discussing now is an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act—provides that each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives—other than the Committee on Appropriations—is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and so on.

Now, this amendment applies to those committee staff members who are appointed under section 202 (a) as I just read it and to nobody else. The Committee on House Administration has no concern whatsoever with those people on each committee staff, except those serving on their own committee, of course. This legislation is the appropriate place and the only place for dealing with their salaries unless we were to consider another amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act. But, as I said, we are amending the Legislative Reorganization Act when we raise our own salaries. One of the reasons, the principal reason, if you please, why this provision was included in my bill was because of the representations made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Armed Services, and so on. Most of the chairmen of the standing committees of this House recognize the fact that it is unfair to keep committee staff salaries at the present level. Some of the professional staff members have been employed for a long time without any possibility of a raise, and certainly those people are entitled to consideration. This is the only way we can deal with this problem, and I trust that you will reject the amendment. The letters we received read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has been considering a bill which, among other purposes, makes possible an upward adjustment of the salaries of congressional employees, and that this legislation will be considered in the near future by your full committee.

The salary limitations now imposed with respect to our top committee employees is

seriously out of line with similar limitations applicable with respect to career civil-service personnel. I believe that this discrimination against our own congressional employees should be eliminated. The problem of obtaining and retaining highly trained and technically qualified personnel to staff our committees is an ever-growing one.

I note that the increase in the maximum limitation on staff salaries is not mandatory but is discretionary in nature. Under this circumstance, I believe that we should have no hesitation in adopting the proposal as it will permit committee chairmen to reward long service or exceptional merit, or both, as they deem best in the interest of their own committees.

As a past chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and as present ranking minority member of that committee, I earnestly hope that your committee will give this proposal its favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, February 7, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing this letter to urge your committee to retain, in the bill relating to the salaries of Members of Congress and the Judiciary, the provision reported by your subcommittee providing for an increase in the maximum base which can be paid to members of committee staffs.

It is my understanding that the increase in the maximum base of committee staff personnel is being recommended to bring the pay scale into line with that of civil service employees of the executive department as was the case at the time of the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act. In the intervening 9 year period the salary range of executive department personnel has increased, and the subcommittee recommendation would authorize on a permissive and even selective basis conforming increases for committee staff personnel.

As a result of my long experience on the Banking and Currency Committee I recognize the necessity for skilled technical committee personnel, and likewise I recognize the value to the committee of retaining a competent experienced staff. In my opinion the recommendation of your subcommittee bringing the permissive range of committee staff compensation in line with that of the executive departments will aid materially in these respects, and I therefore urge its favorable consideration by your committee.

Sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: It is my understanding that your subcommittee, which has had under study a bill to increase the salaries for Members of the House and of the judiciary, has decided to include in the bill which they plan to report to your full committee a provision which would raise the maximum base which can be paid to members of committee staffs.

I am advised that this increase is being recommended so as to make the maximum gross which can be paid to members of committee staffs conform to the maximum which can now be paid to civil-service employees in the executive departments. I understand that when the present maximum base of $8,000 was established, it did conform to the maximum which was being paid by the executive departments, and that the increase in base which may be recommended will merely restore the relationship as it existed when the $8,000 base was established. I am also advised that this provision does not provide an automatic increase in the maximum pay which can be given to committee staffs, but merely raises the ceiling so that the individual committees can, if they so desire, on a selective basis, recommend an increase for any members of their staffs that they may feel are deserving of an increase.

In my opinion, this increase in the ceiling is very desirable. I know from my long experience on our committee that we have often lost experienced and talented staff members to the executive departments of the Government, private industry, and private practice, because we were unable to pay them a salary which they deserved and which they could command and did receive in other places. I believe that it is highly important that the committee staffs of the various committees be staffed by persons who are experienced and who have proved their ability.

I urge favorable consideration of legislation which will increase the maximum ceiling for committee staff personnel so as to bring it in line with the maximum permissible ceiling which can be paid by the executive departments.

With my kindest personal regards, I am

Very cordially yours,

JERE COOPER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to commend and endorse the action of your subcommittee which has been considering H. R. 5, including the amendments to section 4 thereto, which relate to the pay status of committee employees and the latitude of respective committee chairmen in establishing their salaries.

If my memory is correct, it was originally intended that committee employees would have a pay status comparable to those who are governed by the provisions of the Classified Pay Act of 1948, but the inadequacy of congressional salaries interposed a practical bar to the attainment of that objective. The enactment of H. R. 3828, with the amendments to section 4 thereto, would remove that bar and I, therefore, feel that it is not only proper but just that we place our own committee employees, at the discretion of the respective committee chairmen, in a position of equality with their contemporaries who are governed by the Classified Pay Act.

There can be no doubt that this is the proper time to accomplish this action of equality of treatment. I commend your committee for its initiative in taking this action and want you to know that you may rely upon my unqualified support in this regard.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: It is my understanding that your subcommittee, which has had under study a bill to increase the salaries for Members of the House and of the judiciary, has decided to include in the bill which they plan to report to your full committee a provision which would raise the maximum base which can be paid to members of committee staffs.

I am advised that this increase is being recommended so as to make the maximum gross which can be paid to members of committee staffs conform to the maximum which can now be paid to Civil Service employees in the executive departments. I understand that when the present maximum base of $8,000 was established, it did conform to the maximum which was being paid by the executive departments, and that the increase in base which may be recommended will merely restore the relationship as it existed when the $8,000 base was established. I am also advised that this provision does not provide an automatic increase in the maximum pay which can be given to committee staffs, but merely raises the ceiling so that the individual committees can if they so desire, on a selective basis, recommend an increase for any members of their staffs that they may feel are deserving of an increase.

In my opinion, this increase in the ceiling is very desirable. I know from my long experience on our committee that we have often lost experienced and talented staff members to the executive departments of the Government, private industry, and private practice, because we were unable to pay them a salary which they deserved and which they could command and did receive in other places. I believe that it is highly important that the committee staffs of the various committees be staffed by persons who are experienced and who have proved their ability.

I urge favorable consideration of legislation which will increase the maximum ceiling for committee staff personnel so as to bring it in line with the maximum permissible ceiling which can be paid by the executive departments.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman stated that this section only applied to four professional members.

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Does it not also apply to the entire clerical staffs of these committees?

Mr. WALTER. It does in the chairman's discretion only.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The bill provides that professional staff members of the standing committees shall receive annual compensation to be fixed by the chairman ranging from $5,000 to $10,000 and the clerical staff shall receive annual compensation ranging from $2,000 to $10,000, and a $10,000 top for the clerical staff would be $14,800.

Mr. WALTER. It could be $14,800, but I would like to call attention to this fact, that the salary ceiling now, the $11,646 as a maximum, was not fixed by the Committee on House Administration. That salary was fixed under another act entirely.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true that these salary increases are not mandatory;

this paragraph only creates a ceiling, and it is up to the chairman to fix the salary between the minimum and the maximum?

Mr. WALTER. That is right, of course.

Mr. CELLER. Which may not mean a penny increase.

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not true also that in addition to the committees that the gentleman has mentioned, the Committee on Banking and Currency asked for this change, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Armed Services, and many other committees?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not also a fact that this change will bring the staff members of the committees of this body in line with those of the other body?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, it will do that; and in addition to that, it will bring their salaries in line with people performing comparable services in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a further observation, it seems to me that while the gentleman and I are in some difference about some phases of this bill, this amendment should be defeated and the provision referred to should stay in the bill because we all know that there are very able staff members on a number of our committees who are deserving of the top as fixed in this provision.

Mr. WALTER. Of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BURLESON), the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] was extended for 2 minutes.)

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. I should like to make it clear that I make no claim, of course, that the Committee on House Administration has jurisdiction of the appointment of the personnel of the committees. We do, however, have some responsibility for the payment of the cost of the personnel. But be that as it may, the arrangement here is all the more ill since it does not include administrative personnel; since it does not include the elective officers of the House of Representatives; since it does not include a great many other personnel whose salaries are all out of kilter.

Mr. WALTER. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that their salaries come under different legislation. If their salaries are to be considered, it certainly seems to me that the gentleman's committee might well bring in an amendment to the proper legislation and have it considered in a proper manner.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman does not contend that the committee does not have the authority to set these salaries. Certainly the chairmen of committees have the responsibility of selecting their personnel and along with their committees set their salaries.

Mr. WALTER. I think the gentleman again is mistaken. The chairman of a committee does not have authority to select the personnel. The committee elects the personnel and the chairman fixes their compensation within the limits of the law.

Mr. BURLESON. Approved by the Committee on House Administration, I might add.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 126, noes 123.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WALTER and Mr. BURLESON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 5, lines 2, 3, and 4, strike out the last 2 words on line 2 and all of lines 3 and 4 and substitute a period for the second comma in line 2.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, you approved the wording in the bill when you had to decide on whether you wanted to strike out the professional staff members from this compensation. I think probably the gentleman from Pennsylvania was correct in his first statement about the professional staff. However, I think most of us realize it is not practical to include the clerical staff of the committees in with this. I think if you do that you are not only discriminating against the other employees of the House, but you are settting a salary range here that is not practical at all. I think the House would do well to eliminate the clerical staff and let the Committee on House Administration handle that when we are considering the other salary scales.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 77, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) The provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 shall take effect on the 1st day of January 1955.

(b) The provisions of section 4 shall take effect as of the commencement of the 84th Congress.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POFF: On page 5, line 13, strike out "84th" and insert in lieu thereof "85th."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Under the rule, House Resolution 141, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, is not germane, and therefore not in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). As stated by the Chair before the reading of the bill, under the rule by which the bill is being considered, no amendments are in order except those raising or lowering the amount, or striking out some portion of the bill.

Therefore, such amendment changing the effective date of the bill would not be in order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, had the amendment which I offered to defer the congressional salary increase until January 1957 been held in order and had it been passed by the House, I would still have voted against the bill. It has been said that two classes of people in the Congress are opposed to the measure: First, those who are so rich that they do not need their congressional salaries; and, second, those who could not earn as much as their congressional salaries in an outside job. It happens that I do not fall into either of those classes. Before I came to Congress, having practiced law for only 5 years, I was earning more than I earn today. I am not a rich man. I will venture the prediction that there is no more impecunious Member of Congress than the one who is now addressing you. Be that as it may, the fact remains that I am without any outside income, having practiced practically no law since I came to this body; and for that reason I am not opposed to the bill because I am a rich man or because I am a poor man; I am opposed to the bill in principle, and I invite the proponents of the bill to do me and the other opponents of the measure the credit of not impugning our motives, purposes, and good faith. My budget certainly is not in balance, but it is at least in far better shape than Uncle Sam's budget; and as long as I hold an elective office and serve here I do not intend to vote to add more black ink to my budget at the expense of more red ink for Uncle Sam's budget. I intend to keep inviolate the contract that I made with my people on November 2, 1954, to serve them for 2 years at a stipulated salary.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I know the gentleman is perfectly sincere, because he has made the observation that after 5 years of practice he was able to make more money than a Member of Congress. Is that not convincing argument and proof we ought to raise the congressional salary?

Mr. POFF. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that would be true if the only thing which actuated those of us who seek membership in the House were the dollar remuneration.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

It is regrettable to me as a new and perhaps overly idealistic Member of this

body that certain Members of the House for whom I have the highest respect have chosen to use some rather reckless language in characterizing those of us who have opposed the measure. They, the proponents, have called us the opponents, demagogs, and political cowards. If I am a political coward in opposing this bill I submit that I am going to find myself in some pretty good company, not within the ranks of those who oppose the measure but within the ranks of those who will refuse to support an effort to obtain a record vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: Page 5, strike out section 5 and insert a new section 5 to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1957."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under the terms of House Resolution 141, this amendment is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that this amendment falls within the same class as the one previously ruled on with respect to this section.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I am not going to take any 5 minutes, but my friend the gentleman from Virginia thought it was pretty tough to be called a coward. I was sitting here when I was called a coward by the gentleman from Louisiana. You know I made a very careful observation of the gentleman when he made that statement: He smiled when he said it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, much has been said, is being said today, as a matter of fact, on this matter of pay raises. In this House, of course, we are acting on the House bill dealing with the question. I have these words to say because I am glad to see that the House bill, unlike the bill on this issue recently reported by the committee handling said bill in the other body, includes in the provisions for pay raises the vital and essential and overworked United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys. If and when the bill before us passes this House in the vote to be taken in the next few minutes, then it will go to the other body for action. I hope and trust that the leadership will take pains to see that it is the House bill that is acted on in the other body instead of their own bill which excludes the United States district attorneys and their assistants. I understand that in the other body these officials were left out on the argument that they should be included in a later bill dealing with such and similar officials in the administrative and executive arms of the Government or in a general pay-raise bill for Federal employees. I have heard some timid souls even argue that no action should be taken on the bill now being considered until the Congress first acts on the general-pay-raise bill. That is specious reasoning—either the people, of all categories, in this bill merit the pay raise or they do not and we should vote on that issue head on with no hidden meaning or subterfuge course of action worthy of this House.

If and when this bill passes the other body as well as this House, I now sound this admonition to the House managers on this bill who will be named by you, Mr. Chairman, on the part of the House, to sit with the managers of this bill on the part of the Senate at the conference on the bill—that our managers stand firm and not yield to the Senate version insofar as the United States district attorneys and their assistants and the Department of Justice officials also named in this bill are concerned—and I urge in advance that this House stand by its action at that time, the same action, I trust, it will affirmatively take today. I would not like the House, or the Congress, for that matter, in order to get through a pay raise for its membership, deal out the public servants I have mentioned.

I take for granted there is no intelligent debate against the pay raise for the Federal judges as herein provided—I cannot imagine any proper question with reference to the judges' salary increase; and frankly anyone against this item, to put it bluntly, just do not know what they are talking about; and not if they wish to keep the best possible number of our best judges on the bench—and if we wish to obtain other judges of proper ability and stature—and retain their services.

With reference to the United States district attorneys and the assistants, I take the position that the same unquestioned arguments offered in behalf of the judges can very well be presented, and I do now present them, in behalf of the United States district attorneys and the assistants. By all means we must keep in mind that, today, by administrative action, the United States district attorneys and assistant district attorneys are not permitted to engage in the private practice of law—this will lose to the Nation the highly desirable services of many, many highly desirable lawyers for these key positions in the Department of Justice operations.

I have in mind, as a classic example of having our best lawyers serve us, the United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania. I am sure there are a legion of like cases but I know about the middle district of Pennsylvania because I live there. Here is this renowned and distinguished trial lawyer and most active practitioner, giving the best of his unusual talents in the law to this Government as United States attorney. As a brother lawyer, though from a different county bar association, I state as my personal judgment that Mr. Levy is worth many times double the pay he receives. I know of no one in the district who could do this important job better and few could do it as well—and let me say here that in Pennsylvania we yield to none in the high quality of our lawyers, in all fields. I am not here to shower bouquets on Mr. Levy, politically we are on opposite sides of the aisle, but following the message of a TV program on the subject of law enforcement, all I want you to hear, Mr. Chairman, are the facts.

Why under the sun a lawyer with the lucrative practice enjoyed by Attorney Levy would or could give that up for the comparative pittance he gets as United States Attorney, only he can answer. I know he has a high reputation for public service—I know nothing of his financial status other than his salary—and I do not think that should be our yardstick in considering this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I feel so keenly on this subject that I would like to speak at length but I realize that under the 5 minute rule on amendments, that is not possible. But I offer as exhibit A this case of Mr. Levy to show that the pay raise provision in this bill for the United States attorneys and the assistant United States attorneys and the Department of Justice officials named are integral parts of this bill, belong in this bill, and shall stand or fall with this bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to vote for an increase in judges' salaries. I think congressional salaries should be increased. But I think this bill provides too much too soon for Congressmen. I protested when Congress rushed through an increase in the President's salary before inauguration day in 1949 so that it would apply to the new presidential term beginning on January 20. Amendments to postpone this congressional increase are held out of order. I voted for the Burdick amendment to reduce the increase for Congress to $5,000, but this was defeated. All kinds of salary increases for various groups of Federal employees are before us for action at this session.

I think we should delay action on our own salaries until we have passed on these bills. I fear that by acting first on congressional salaries we will start a parade of salary increases. Many of those increases may be justified. We make it hard for ourselves to consider such increases impartially when we take care of ourselves first.

I am therefore voting to recommit this bill; and if this fails, I shall vote against it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is not what a Member might earn were he employed in business or in the active pursuit of his profession.

Members of Congress are engaged in performing the very highest type of pub-

lic service. A large part of the reward is in the knowledge of a job well and conscientiously done.

To me it is very distasteful to even try to measure service here in terms of money. I sincerely wish it were possible for me to serve without any pay whatsoever.

These are some of the thoughts I have as I cast my vote against the pay-raise measure.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill calling for an increase in the salary of Representatives and Senators. I sincerely believe that it is wrong for us to pass such a bill affecting the present term of office, particularly making such salary increase retroactive. I believe this to be unwise as a matter of principle. I am against this salary increase at this time because of the inflation which is running rampant in America today.

I think we could give ourselves an increase in salary and the American people an increase in wages simply by making the American dollar more valuable. I predict that if this bill passes there will be a clamor for increased salaries in all departments of the Federal Government. If passed, this will mean higher rent, higher food bills and then we will be right back where we started. The worst kind of depression is a depression of inflation. We can help guard against this kind of depression right now by defeating this bill, balancing our Federal budget and cutting out excessive foreign aid.

I believe this House today should put first things first. Let us balance our Federal budget and stop this inflation of our currency. I have heard a lot of argument here today about how much we are worth. Mr. Chairman, I submit that we should put more emphasis on the honor and privilege of serving this Nation. We should put less emphasis on monetary and materialistic reward. Frankly, I did not offer for Congress for the salary involved. I hoped that I could be of service to this country at a time of great national and international crisis. My chief concern today, Mr. Chairman, is not how much money that I draw every month but my mind is constantly on the grave problems confronting the United States and the world. This proposal is simply too much at the wrong time.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not be present on the floor of the House today during this debate because of my incarceration in the hospital. Nevertheless, because I feel so strongly on this subject, I do want my thoughts included in the RECORD of the debate. It will be impossible for me to vote on the various amendments which are made on the floor, but I know that when the bill comes to a vote the basic question will be whether or not Congress and judicial salaries shall be increased, for if this bill is defeated, the question will die for at least another session of Congress.

I must say at the outset that I hope that an amendment will be offered and adopted which will make this pay raise not applicable to the present Members of Congress, but rather to become applicable to the Members who will be elected to the 85th Congress and those who follow.

I will grant there is much logic in the position that if the Members of the next Congress are worth an increase, so are we. Nevertheless, it goes against my grain to some extent to vote an increase in my own salary when I went before the people of my district willing to take office, if elected, at the present salary rate.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, even though this provision may remain in the bill and the raise become effective immediately, I have requested my whip pair me, if possible, in favor of this legislation for several reasons.

It has been my privilege to be closely associated throughout my adult life with Members of Congress. I knew before I was privileged to join this body of the sacrifice required. I do not feel that to all the other sacrifices and pressures which the job entails should be added an impossible financial burden.

Certainly the people of my district and of my State do not want independent means to be a prerequisite of service in the Congress. Regardless of race, creed, color, or station in life, the only criterion of service here should be ability. Members of Congress should not be forced to rely on outside sources of income, whatever they may be, to make ends meet.

I know $15,000 a year sounds like a tremendous amount of money and yet, I wonder how many of our constituents realize that our trips home to report to them come out of our salary; that the cost of living here in Washington is higher than in almost any other area of the country; that there are a myriad of little expenses that build up to a large tab which we must pay, and above all that we must not only move our families back and forth but also maintain two homes at the same time, one here and one back home.

Unless this legislation is passed, I sincerely believe that in all too few years we may well see the time when the Members of this body are either bachelors, men or women of independent wealth, or men or women who are forced to obtain additional income from some other source.

The job of a Congressman today is far different than it was 20 years ago. No longer is it a part-time avocation. Rather it is a full-time, complete year-around job for most of us. If we are to continue in the years ahead to attract men of ability from all walks of life in all types of background and experience, it is imperative that we pay a salary which will permit each Member to give service to his district and to do his job as well as that of a man with independent means.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, since I was not privileged to be on the floor of the House during the debate on the bill to adjust the salaries of Congressmen, I avail myself of your leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD in favor of the $10,000 increase.

Much has been written and said in these times about the advisability of Congressmen increasing their own salaries. It is unfortunate that we must be faced with the decision to enact legislation which on the surface seems to benefit only this body of legislators. Since it is our decision, I feel that we should face it as we do all other issues before us and judge it on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number.

This precept has long been the foundation of our democracy. I am certain that it applies here as it does in other issues. Adequate pay for Congressmen is as much a part of good government as any of the other tenets to which we hold. It is a sound business principle, and the progress of this Nation is marked with the application of these principles.

Do my constituents benefit because I receive more money? Is the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number being served because I have a few more dollars added to my monthly paycheck? I am sure that it does.

True, I knew what the salary was when I ran for the office. I accepted that salary when I accepted the mandate of the people to serve them in the office. My will to serve is not affected by the amount of money I receive. It would not be less if the salary were less. I have an obligation to the people of my district, just as does every Representative here, and we put service above all else.

Why, then, do I favor an increase in congressional salaries in order to perpetuate the greatest good for the greatest number? Because all of us believe in being fair. The American people are noted for their fairminded approach to problems that confront them. Our reputation for fairmindness stands out in the day-to-day activity of the family of nations.

The people of my district are fairminded Americans, too. They want their Congressman to receive adequate pay for what he does. It is part of their pride as Americans that in this country a man is worthy of his hire. They know that they will get better men as Congressmen. They know that they will be better served and that, in the long run, their country will be better served. When their lawmakers are paid on a basis commensurate with what their contemporaries receive in business and industry, the entire business of Government is on sound footing. The people of America know this and they will support that which is fair and just. For these reasons, my vote is in favor of the $10,000 increase in congressional salaries.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, this debate regarding pay raises for ourselves gives me an opportunity to say something that I could not say at any other time.

During the past few days, as I thought about this raise, I was able to build up a good case for it. But our constituents are not aware of all the things we do. The folks back home just do not know how tough the modern legislator's job is. Of course, they know about our campaigns and all the work and sacrifice that entails. They know too of all the

letterwriting, speechmaking, handshaking, and backslapping a Congressman must engage in. Some of them realize, I am sure, that banquets, cocktail parties, political dinners, and the like can become an awful bore. However, the folks that send us here figure that is all part of the job, and if we are not satisfied with the pay we can stay home the next time and let the other fellow come and take our place.

But as I say, there are a whole lot of things we legislators do that the home folks never hear about. For instance, how could they ever know how many hours we discuss, debate, and labor over just how much money we will give each year to the folks in Tennessee so that they can get electric power at half price? Or what do our constituents know about the time and effort we devote arriving at wonderfuly complex formulas which spell out for us what price we can guarantee to the corn and wheat farmer for their produce? The public is not conscious of the great amount of testimony we must hear or the literature we must read before we can determine what wages an employer must pay his employees. Unless they sat in the galleries each day, the home folks cannot begin to realize how difficult it is to provide homes for the folks in the city, electricity for those in the country, and social security for everybody.

And then there are taxes. The folks that elect us always complain about the taxes. But all they have to do is to pay them. We must figure out whether taking nine-tenths of a man's income or over three-fourths of his estate leaves him too much money.

Another thing the folks at home do not know much about is the added duties we have taken on in the last few years. We not only provide money for dams in Tennessee but also in France; we authorize school construction in California and Ethiopia; we appropriate money for our own Army and one in West Germany; we build airfields in Texas and in French Morocco; we pay our own salaries and those of the United Nations. In short, we Congressmen legislate not only for ourselves but for all of Adam's children.

When you stop to think about it, Congress is in much the same position as a father. He arranges for his children's shelter, food, electricity, education, and the other necessities of life. But they never comprehend how much he is doing for them and they always demand more. One of his toughest jobs is to see that all get their share, for if any are not included in the distribution of his bounty, he is not a good father.

And as I have pointed out the family of Congress has grown awful big and the job of taking care of them all is tremendous.

One difficulty is,whom are we going to soak to provide the money for this raise? It doesn't seem democratic to charge the general taxpayer since at least one quarter of his estate has already been conveyed to the Federal Government. We can't hit the Government because it is heavily in debt and broke. I don't see how we can assess the folks at the subsidy trough because how could we decide who to pick on? Perhaps the thing to do is to ask all the foreign folks whom we have helped when they were in need, to return the favor by digging into their pockets now to help us out. They are our constituents too and it is to their own interest that the legislators of the world's greatest democracy are sufficiently paid for their labors and good works.

Some Congressmen have qualms about this raise. There might be some people in the Nation who would look at it as an attempt by Congress to elbow its way into the public trough to get its share. But on reflection, their earlier fears are unfounded because the people for whom Congress provides food, shelter, power, education, loans, gifts, pensions, and so forth, make up the majority of the voters in the country. In case any one is not sure about that I refer him to the January 25, 1955, issue of Look magazine where it is shown that 76,276,110 people receive $60,688,037,000 annually from the Government. Now, these people are not going to begrudge Congressmen a few thousand dollars more a year. In fact, they will be glad for Congressmen to get theirs as long as they get theirs. Besides our checks will not be noticed in the 300 billion that are written annually by the Government and rushed out at the rate of 400 a minute.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, on the showing made above that all the folks the Congress supports are getting theirs, how can there be objection to Congress getting theirs?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 141, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KEATING. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEATING moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 3828, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 118, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—283

Adair	Fountain	Morgan
Addonizio	Frelinghuysen	Moss
Albert	Friedel	Moulder
Alger	Fulton	Multer
Allen, Calif.	Gamble	Murray, Ill.
Anfuso	Garmatz	Nelson
Arends	Gary	Nicholson
Ashley	Gathings	Norblad
Aspinall	Gavin	Norrell
Auchincloss	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Granahan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baker	Gray	O'Hara, Ill.
Barden	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Minn.
Barrett	Gregory	O'Neill
Bass, N. H.	Griffiths	Osmers
Bates	Gubser	Ostertag
Baumhart	Hagen	Passman
Becker	Hale	Patman
Belcher	Haley	Patterson
Bell	Halleck	Pelly
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Philbin
Bentley	Hardy	Phillips
Betts	Harris	Pilcher
Blatnik	Harrison, Nebr.	Pillion
Boggs	Harvey	Poage
Boland	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Bolling	Hébert	Preston
Bolton, Frances P.	Herlong	Price
	Heselton	Priest
Bonner	Hess	Quigley
Bosch	Hiestand	Rabaut
Bow	Hillings	Reece, Tenn.
Bowler	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Boyle	Holifield	Reuss
Brooks, La.	Holmes	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brooks, Tex.	Holt	Riehlman
Brownson	Holtzman	Rivers
Broyhill	Hosmer	Robeson, Va.
Buchanan	Hull	Rodino
Buckley	Hyde	Rogers, Colo.
Burnside	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.	James	Rogers, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jennings	Rooney
Canfield	Jensen	Roosevelt
Carlyle	Johnson, Calif.	Rutherford
Carnahan	Jones, Mo.	Sadlak
Carrigg	Karsten	St. George
Celler	Kearney	Scherer
Chatham	Kee	Scott
Chelf	Kelley, Pa.	Scudder
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Cole	Keogh	Shelley
Cooley	Kilburn	Sheppard
Corbett	Kilday	Sieminski
Cramer	Kilgore	Sikes
Cretella	King, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Crumpacker	King, Pa.	Sisk
Cunningham	Kirwan	Smith, Miss.
Dague	Klein	Staggers
Davidson	Kluczynski	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Knox	Sullivan
Davis, Wis.	Krueger	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Deane	Lanham	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Lankford	Thomas
Denton	Latham	Thompson, La.
Derounian	Lesinski	Thompson, N. J.
Devereux	Lipscomb	Thompson, Tex.
Dies	Long	Thomson,Wyo.
Diggs	Lovre	Thornberry
Dingell	McCarthy	Tollefson
Dodd	McConnell	Trimble
Dollinger	McCormack	Tumulty
Donohue	McCulloch	Udall
Donovan	McDonough	Utt
Dorn, N. Y.	McDowell	Vanik
Doyle	McIntire	Van Pelt
Durham	McMillan	Velde
Eberharter	Macdonald	Vinson
Edmondson	Machrowicz	Wainwright
Engle	Madden	Walter
Fallon	Magnuson	Westland
Fascell	Martin	Wharton
Feighan	Matthews	Wickersham
Fenton	Merrow	Widnall
Fernandez	Metcalf	Williams, N. J.
Fine	Miller, Calif.	Williams, N. Y.
Fino	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Calif.
Fjare	Miller, Nebr.	Withrow
Flood	Miller, N. Y.	Wright
Flynt	Mills	Yates
Fogarty	Minshall	Zablocki
Forand	Mollohan	Zelenko
Ford	Morano	

NAYS—118

Abbitt	Dowdy	Poff
Abernethy	Elliott	Polk
Alexander	Evins	Rains
Allen, Ill.	Fisher	Ray
Andersen, H. Carl	Forrester	Rees, Kans.
	Frazier	Rhodes, Pa.
Andresen, August H.	Gentry	Richards
	Grant	Riley
Andrews	Green, Oreg.	Roberts
Ashmore	Gwinn	Robsion, Ky.
Bailey	Harden	Rogers, Fla.
Baldwin	Harrison, Va.	Saylor
Beamer	Hayworth	Schenck
Bennett, Fla.	Henderson	Scrivner
Berry	Hill	Seely-Brown
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	Selden
Bray	Hope	Shuford
Brown, Ga.	Huddleston	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Smith, Kans.
Burdick	Jenkins	Smith, Va.
Burleson	Johansen	Springer
Bush	Johnson, Wis.	Taber
Byrd	Jonas	Thompson, Mich.
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	
Chase	Jones, N. C.	Tuck
Chenoweth	Keating	Van Zandt
Christopher	Knutson	Vorys
Church	Laird	Vursell
Clark	Lane	Watts
Colmer	LeCompte	Weaver
Coon	McVey	Whitten
Cooper	Mack, Ill.	Wier
Coudert	Mahon	Wigglesworth
Curtis, Mass.	Marshall	Williams, Miss.
Curtis, Mo.	Mason	Willis
Davis, Ga.	Mumma	Wilson, Ind.
Dawson, Utah	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Dixon	Natcher	Wolverton
Dolliver	O'Konski	Younger
Dondero	Perkins	
Dorn, S. C.	Pfost	

NOT VOTING—33

Avery	Hays, Ark.	Prouty
Bass, Tenn.	Hoeven	Radwan
Bolton, Oliver P.	Horan	Schwengel
	Jackson	Short
Budge	Judd	Siler
Cannon	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Chiperfield	Kearns	Spence
Clevenger	McGregor	Talle
Dempsey	Mack, Wash.	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Mailliard	Young
George	Meader	
Gross	Morrison	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Hoeven against.
Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Gross against.
Mr. Kean for, with Mr. George against.
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Judd against.
Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Siler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Spence with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Cannon with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Armed Services on H. Res. 136, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 136

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

1. (a) Approximately how many military installations employing five or more individuals who receive compensation or maintenance from Federal funds are now maintained by the Department of Defense outside the continental limits of the United States of America?

(b) (1) Approximately how many individuals are employed in such installations and (2) at approximately what cost?

2. (a) Approximately how many individuals eligible to be assigned to combat service and who are compensated from Federal funds are in the service outside of the continental limits of the United States of America?

(b) Approximately how many individuals eligible to be assigned to combat service and who are compensated from Federal funds are in the service within the continental limits of the United States of America?

3. What is the approximate cost of the civilian employees who are supporting those named under section 2 (a) and (b)?

4. What is the approximate (a) volume in long tons and (b) value in dollars of the supplies, both military and nonmilitary, needed per year to maintain those named in section 1 (a) and (b) and in section 2 (a) and (b)?

REQUESTING THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO FURNISH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN INFORMATION AS TO THE EXTENT AND COST OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following adverse report:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1955.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request dated February 8, 1955, concerning House Resolution 136, a privileged resolution introduced February 7, 1955.

The resolution proposes that the Secretary of Defense be requested to furnish to the House of Representatives answers to a number of questions concerning operations of the Department of Defense. The answers submited herewith bear the same numbers as the questions presented in H. Res. 136.

1. (a) Approximately 950 military installations.

1. (b) (1) Approximately 167,000 civilian employees outside the United States, plus approximately 218,000 civilians who are employees of foreign governments engaged under contracts with the United States. The 218,000 does not include 124,000 Germans paid from Deutschemarks.

1. (b) (2) Approximately $601,699,000 per annum.

2. (a) Approximately 1,370,000 military personnel. This figure excludes female military personnel.

2. (b) Approximately 1,602,000 military personnel. This figure excludes trainees with less than 4 months' service, seriously hospitalized personnel, female military personnel, and conscientious objectors.

3. Approximately $4,530,276,000 per annum. This figure excludes costs for an average of approximately 25,000 employees of the Corps of Engineers and excludes costs in relation to the 124,000 Germans referred to in 1 (b) (1) above who are paid from Deutschemarks.

4. (a) Approximately 4,100,000 long tons.

4. (b) Approximately $3,300,000,000.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE,
Director, Legislative Programs.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with as the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has no objection to its being printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, since the information requested has been furnished, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEGOTIATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I realized that, presumably through inadvertence or purposeful act, the President had omitted in his annual message, any reference to the retroactive extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 which by its terms expired on December 31, 1954. In view of the general tenor of the President's message which was to oppose any tax reductions and indirectly, not to permit the cessation of revenues to flow to the Government at this time, I prefer to attribute his omission to inadvertence.

A few remarks on the nature of renegotiation might be apropos; how and why it was conceived, how it functions—herein I am constrained to simplify and summarize as time would not permit a detailed and thorough dissertation—what it has accomplished heretofore and the reasons why it is just as important today and in the immediate future as it was in the past.

Renegotiation as prescribed in the Renegotiation Act and implementing regulations is simply a retroactive review of Government contracts to prevent the realization of excessive profits by business and to provide for the recapture of such profits as may be determined to be excessive, using recognized economic and business formulae as translated and interpreted by sound business judgment. This is calculated to remove profiteering from war, defense, or national emergency and scotch the imputation or practice of cancerous fraud by a few businessmen on the United States taxpayer, or John Q. Citizen.

How does renegotiation operate? Defense contractors are required to file an annual report with the Renegotiation Board listing all of their renegotiable business and resulting profits. If the

annual renegotiable business exceeds a certain amount—currently the figure is $500,000—the contractor is then subject to renegotiation. The profits of contractors with defense business over the statutory limit are reviewed, and if excessive profits are found, the Board seeks to recapture them—either by getting the contractor to voluntarily agree to refund, or by issuing an order.

In simple words, renegotiation means that our Government rightfully takes a look at the business of its suppliers to ascertain whether they are realizing more than a reasonable profit from the misery of war or national emergency. To illustrate simply, if contractor A agrees to manufacture 10,000 units of his product at $100 per unit or a total price of $1 million and this is a product which is used for defense and not specifically exempt; at the end of the year the Government reviews these sales, related costs and profits in the light of his efficiency, reasonableness of costs, pricing, risk, and so forth. The renegotiation may determine that his profit of 25 percent or $250,000 in the light of all factors and sound business judgment is excessive. In effect, the Government will say to Contractor A, we are going to rewrite the price—retroactively—in your contract to $90 per unit or $900,000 and we find that $100,000 of your profits are excessive and must be returned to the Government. The contractor who has been given every opportunity to present his views and arguments before this will then either voluntarily agree to refund the determined amount or be subject to an appropriate order being issued against him. This may be over-simplification but time does not permit further elaboration.

Now, gentlemen, why renegotiation? The history of our country and deep understanding of human nature will furnish the answer. The temptation to excess in profiteering at times using fraudulent and even criminal means to achieve it resulting in scandal at times of war or emergency when the lives of our citizens and our sacred democratic institutions are in jeopardy, is well known and fully attested to in the annals of history.

The propensity for honest human error in such times of war or emergency is tremendously increased. In such times haste and immediate results are the main objectives. These are certainly not concomitants of accurate pricing and prudent use of the tax dollar. Error and the unscrupulous opportunism of a few Macchiavelian businessmen can conspire to produce an unnecessary and unjustifiable cost in meeting with the requirements of defense, emergency or war.

It is true that renegotiation was born and thrived in the environs of world war III, the Korean affair. But who among us has the capacity and intensity for wishful desire to say that we are living in an era of peace or one which even distantly resembles it? We live in a world of cold war whose heat from time to time achieved the intensity of incandescent heat. Witness in this condition the burning national and international issue of this very day and this very hour. Does anyone seriously believe that the frigidity of the cold war will ever cease or perhaps provide any solace or comfort beyond that which Arctic living would afford. Without the proper clothing of defense cold war can ultimately achieve what a hot war will, except perhaps that it be more insidious and agonizing.

What I am trying to say, gentleman, is that the reasons for previous renegotiation laws exist today. And in my humble opinion Formosa merely heightens the situation which I cannot see abating in the foreseeable future—certainly not in 1955 anno domini.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, that I introduced H. R. 2004 to extend renegotiation retroactively from January 1, 1955 through December 31, 1955.

I introduced the extension bill after I learned, to my astonishment that the Renegotiation Act has lapsed, with the result that the Renegotiation Board can do nothing about profits under defense contracts that accrue after the beginning of this year. Certainly if renegotiation was needed during the calendar year 1954, it is at least equally needed for 1955.

Our appropriations are going down, but we appear to be forgetting the extent to which money appropriated in years past is now being spent. As an example, I have figures showing that on July 1, 1954, the staggering sum of $55 billion remained available to the Department of Defense for expenditure out of prior year's appropriations. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission and numerous other United States agencies whose contracts have been subject to renegotiation likewise have additional unexpended billions.

Why stop renegotiation now? Certainly the emergency is not over, as witness the Formosa situation.

Renegotiation is the most effective method by which we can protect our huge defense expenditures, and prevent profiteering. To drop it now will, in my opinion, cost the United States Government more than $200 million during the calendar year 1955. Can we afford to lose such a vast sum?

By reviewing on a fiscal year basis the profits of defense contracts in the past several years, the Renegotiation Board has recaptured excessive profits in the amount of $232,005,643, a figure that may double by the time the Renegotiation Board completes renegotiation proceedings in cases through 1954.

In conducting the renegotiation proceedings, the Renegotiation Board does so on a confidential basis; it does not make public results in individual cases. As a consequence, the Board's activities gets little publicity, with the result that the public is not too well acquainted with either the renegotiation process, nor the reasons for it. The fact that the Government may recapture several million dollars from a defense contractor, as it is doing in so many cases, is extremely important because it eliminates profiteering. Fortunately, as a result of renegotiation, profiteering on defense contracts is virtually nonexistent. By permitting the Renegotiation Act to lapse, are we not letting our guard down?

Perhaps you would be interested in the reasons for renegotiation in the first place, and also an explanation of how renegotiation operates.

As to the reasons for renegotiation, I would like to quote from an official report made after World War II by the War Contracts Adjustment Board, commenting on the use of renegotiation during that war.

The Board, in its report to the President, emphasized that the $11 billion recovered through renegotiation was not the major benefit derived from renegotiation.

In a very real sense—

The report stated—

The refunds shown represent only a by-product of the renegotiation process. The major product was price reduction. Many voluntary refunds of so-called excessive profits were made by contractors prior to the institution of renegotiation proceedings. These occurred outside the renegotiation process, without formal determinations, and so did not constitute refunds of excessive profits in the strict sense.

Such voluntary refunds were sometimes treated as retroactive price reductions on existing contracts. At times they are not so designated, some contractors being reluctant to identify them as specific price reductions which might afterwards become a depressant factor in the postwar pricing.

The savings which resulted from reduced prices on reorders, continuing contracts, and successive contracts are not even approximately measurable. Some price reductions were effected independently by procurement personnel, others by cooperative efforts, and others by specific repricing agreements accomplished in the renegotiation contract. In all these circumstances the imminence of renegotiation improved the atmosphere in which price reductions could be mutually agreed upon. Contractors, apprehensive of public opinion, had no zeal to accumulate excessive profits which would soon be given back in to formal renegotiation proceedings.

Previous renegotiation acts, and the Renegotiation Act of 1951, clearly provides for favorable recognition to contractors who price reasonably and foster the traditions of business risk. This is a statutory incentive designed not only to reduce prices but to induce the lowering of costs.

The Board told the President that it was not the purpose of renegotiation to produce revenue for the Treasury. They said the renegotiation laws "operate primarily to forestall the realization of unreasonable profits rather than to recapture such profits after they have been realized."

The Renegotiation Act of 1951 follows along the same lines of the previous renegotiation acts. One of the principal differences today is that renegotiation proceedings are now conducted by an independent civilian board, reporting direct to the President. Previously the same agencies which let the contracts renegotiated the contractors.

It is a tribute to the Renegotiation Board that in renegotiation proceedings under the 1951 act only a small percentage of orders have been issued. Refunds are being obtained through voluntary agreements. This means that the Board is doing a highly competent review job, and is not experiencing difficulty in getting contractors to agree to refunds.

Certainly if the Board was acting unreasonably, if the Board was allowing fair and reasonable profits, contractors would be protesting. Less than 5 percent of renegotiation cases result in Board orders, and of this number less than 10 of the contractors have appealed to the Tax Court.

How much does renegotiation cost? So far, through December 31, 1954, the Board has spent $14,851,643—it has recovered 16 times that amount, and the money continues to come in.

The records of the Renegotiation Board for the years 1951–55 indicate that some $275 billion will come under review. This work will take some time to perform and complete.

Keeping in mind that it took time to set the renegotiation machinery into operation; that constantly changing personnel at top levels, budgetary restrictions, and other administrative factors, as well as the fact that case involving no renegotiation because of being below statutory minimum, exemption, nonexcessive profits are normally disposed of first, the recovery of excessive profits amounting to about $232 million as of December 31, 1954, may well represent a very small portion of the recoveries, reasonably expectable in the future, and the bigger and more complex cases are resolved. This must be judged in the light of the further fact that the cost of recovering these profits has been only $14,851,268 as of December 31, 1954.

The foregoing are perhaps not the biggest benefits to accrue to the Government and the taxpayer. The indirect increments which come about from the mere existence of renegotiation and its effect on the pricing policies of would be Government supplies is incalculable and invaluable. Who can say whether contractor A sold his item at $10 less because he realized that otherwise his excessive profits would be subject to recapture? Who can say how many contractors voluntarily reduced their prices as they progressed in the performance of their Government contracts. These amounts do not show up in any figures. Surely, the yardstick or big-stick theory of renegotiation has logically and defensibly caused the savings of countless millions of dollars. Without renegotiation there would be no incentive for such action nor a deterrent to excessive profits.

Again, I say we cannot revert to the times, conditions, and rationalizations which predated the preparation for World War II. Much as we would like to curl up in the comfort and solace of peace, we must face it—we do not have it now, and whether we have it in the future is highly problematical. If there was ever a reason in the public interest and in the interest of national defense for renegotiation—and I believe there was—it exists today, with equal or even more compelling force.

Even though the Renegotiation Act has lapsed, the Renegotiation Board still has power to clean up old cases. As an example, the Board has not yet acted on any cases involving contracts in effect during calendar year 1954. But the Board can do nothing about profits under defense contracts that accrue after the beginning of this year.

It does not make sense to fail to coordinate the impact of renegotiation with the time of maximum actual expenditure, merely because the paper figures set down in new appropriation bills show a slight falling off.

From the standpoint of private industry, the lapse, if not corrected, will mean that it can no longer assure Congress and the world that defense contractors are not profiteering from the national emergency. Nor can Congress, from now on, rest easy, knowing that it has dropped its guard in protecting the Government's money, thus possibly opening the way for profiteering.

Furthermore, the lapse of renegotiation will mean the automatic reinstatement of the profit limitations of the old Vinson-Trannel Act. These, built around fixed percentages, are not an effective way of controlling excessive profits, but have a nuisance impact far exceeding that of renegotiation, and, moreover, tend to discourage efficiency and economy.

In summary, gentlemen, H. R. 2004 is deserving of your immediate attention and expeditious enactment because:

First. It assures the elimination of excessive profits and unjustifiable profiteering at the taxpayers' expense.

Second. The millions of defense dollars it has saved during World War II and Korea far exceed the reportable figures.

Third. The conditions of world unrest and emergency of which its need is predicated exist today.

Fourth. It is an effective antidote to fraud and scandal which often follow in the wake of hysteria and haste which are the unwanted products of the troubled world in which we live.

I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will call on members of the Renegotiation Board in a hearing, and have them outline—without revealing names—the number of renegotiation cases in which they found inordinate profits, or what would be profiteering if renegotiation was not involved. I would like them to tell about such cases and also give the committee some estimate of what the future holds with renegotiation out of the way.

Gentlemen, I therefore respectfully seek your endorsement and wholehearted cooperation to enact H. R. 2004 into law.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Lawrence, Mass., are proud of the fact that one of their fellow citizens has been chosen to give the invocation at today's session of the House of Representatives.

February 16 is notable because it is the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day.

Lawrence is one of the most cosmopolitan of American cities, embracing people from almost every land, who came here seeking opportunity and freedom. We are proving how people of diverse cultures can work together, sharing in the contributions made by each to the life of our community, and united by the common denominator of the dignity of man.

When the people of Ireland were struggling to be free, and the people of Israel were winning through to self-government, they were helped by the sympathetic understanding and financial contributions of Lawrencians who were not of Irish or Jewish origin.

Because, in the best American tradition, our people believe in freedom for all.

True to that faith, we are now concerned for the future of those nations that have been enslaved by Communist imperialism.

On this 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we declare our unyielding opposition to the conquest of that Baltic State by Red Russia. We publicly affirm our moral support of Lithuania's cause, and our promise to work unremittingly for the liberation of Lithuania.

By one of those happy circumstances where the right man is chosen for the right occasion, the Very Reverend Monsignor Francis M. Juras, pastor of St. Francis' Church in Lawrence, has been given the high honor to deliver the invocation as the United States House of Representative recognizes Lithuanian Independence Day.

Monsignor Juras is one of the outstanding clergymen of our city, whose sincerity, and dedication to duty, have earned him the blessings of the Catholic Church, and the affection in which he is held by neighbors of all creeds.

His larger parish is the world, and particularly those human beings in it whose spiritual life is being persecuted by atheistic communism.

Monsignor Juras knows how the people of his motherland are suffering.

He knows that good men and free men must stand together, no matter what country they live in or what religion they profess, in order to overcome the cruelty, the cunning, and the contempt for God and man, that is the real and dangerous evil of communism.

In listening to Monsignor Juras' invocation today we become aware that faith in what is right, is the inspiration that we need to give us the strength and the courage that will inevitably erase communism as the last and final obstacle in the way of peace for every man.

HOME LOANS TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill to extend to veterans of World War I the

same provisions as to home loans now available to veterans of World War II.

The home-loan provisions have proved to be a most valuable and successful project for veterans of World War II. This measure has created homeowners who are the backbone of American democracy. It has created healthy business activity in the construction of homes. The record of payments on their loans by these veterans has been so good that the program has been of little cost to the Government.

Many veterans of World War I are now reaching the retirement age and desire to change their living arrangements and secure new homes. The great advantage to them of this bill would be that it enables them to purchase a home without the amount of down payment required under ordinary circumstances. This benefit may well be just enough to make the difference between a new home or no new home.

Various officers of the Boston Real Estate Board, who recently visited Washington, expressed enthusiastic support. Veterans organizations have gone on record in favor of it. Although the home-loan privileges expire on July 25, 1957, if not extended, this legislation is still timely.

Many veterans of World War I feel that they were somewhat less fortunate in regard to veterans benefits than their sons and others who took part in World War II. Here is a benefit that can properly be extended to them and which will be appreciated.

I sincerely hope that other Members will feel inclined to lend this legislation their active support.

INDUSTRIAL TRADES UNION OPPOSES H. R. 1

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an advertisement sponsored by the Industrial Trades Union of Woonsocket, R. I., and carried in the Woonsocket Call of February 11, 1955.

This advertisement is an excellent presentation of the serious effect the passage of H. R. 1 would have on our textile industry. It points up the fact that the American workman cannot hope to compete with the unfair competition of imports produced in low-wage and substandard working-condition countries without some form of protection. Such protection is not to be found in H. R. 1.

I urge all of my colleagues to read this message. I further urge that they give it deep and serious consideration before recording their votes on the bill which will be before the House this week.

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR WOONSOCKET TEXTILE WORKERS?

President Emil Rieve, of the CIO Textile Workers Union, has announced that his organization will seek no wage increases this year because of continuing depression in the textile industry.

The Rieve statement, made in advance of collective bargaining, has caused some speculation in this area as to the probable attitude of the ITU.

We don't believe in crossing a bridge until we come to it. ITU policy will be determined in due time by the ITU membership, and executed at the collective-bargaining table.

No one can doubt Mr. Rieve's claim of continuing depression in textiles. On the other hand, we cannot be sure now what conditions will prevail 2 months hence.

The ITU has no crystal ball for the anticipation of future events. We shall deal with conditions and events as they occur. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

We agree with Mr. Rieve that textile workers need and deserve more money. That is putting it mildly. There have been no pay hikes in recent years, only pay cuts. Only worker productivity has gone up.

Contracts in April are important. However, we are more concerned right now at what is happening in Congress. There is a danger that the textile depression may be enacted into law and made permanent.

A hint of things to come was contained in an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, dated February 4. It was a story buried in some papers and ignored by others.

"NEW TEXTILE MILL

"WASHINGTON, February 4.—Representative DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, said today a southern textile-mill owner has built a plant in India to compete with Japanese textiles in United States markets.

"DORN said the millowner, whom he did not identify, will bring goods from India—where labor is paid 9 cents an hour—for distribution from a plant in this country, now closed.

"Textile labor in South Carolina, DORN said, is paid $1.29 cents an hour, and Japanese labor about 11 cents.

"DORN's remarks were to the House Ways and Means Committee, which is considering extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act."

What is the significance of this news item? We are wondering if it indicates a new, ugly, global pattern for the textile industry. We quote now from the ITU brief, entered at Washington last December:

"If continuing tariff concessions are granted cutrate competitors in Japan, or anywhere else, what's to prevent the bulk of American-invested capital from moving abroad for the specific purpose of flooding American markets with the produce of human slavery?"

The poignant words of Omar Khayyam come to mind:

"The moving finger writes:
And having writ, moves on;
Nor all your piety nor wit shall lure it back
to cancel half a line;
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

The moving finger of a new global slave trade seems about to begin writing. Unless it is stayed by Congress, American textile workers may soon find themselves back in the jungle of 25 years ago.

There is no point in trying to kid ourselves or anyone else about future prospects. They are grim. The administration has the votes to legislate American textiles to the brink of bankruptcy.

If this happens, American textile workers will be pressured to take larger and more frequent cuts in pay. They will be expected to keep domestic mills competitive with foreign subsidiaries paying at little as 9 cents an hour.

We are very frankly concerned at the prospect of seeing our workers made pawns in an international rat race to aggravate human suffering and exploitation around the world.

For several years now, organized labor in textiles has fought to hold the line on good wages and decent working conditions in this country. How can we combat cutthroat competition outside the country?

Each new contract season has found American textile workers increasingly on the defensive. The situation has gone from bad to worse. Instead of holding the line, we may very soon be holding the bag.

The continuing depression in textiles during an era of rising wages and unprecedented national prosperity is senseless. Our people are becoming fed up with paying prosperity prices on a depression income.

The acceptance of maximum workloads, the foregoing of earned benefits, and the taking of pay cuts has not improved the competitive position of our mills. How could it, under the circumstances?

The protective tariff on competitive textile imports is already woefully inadequate. If it is reduced further, how many union contracts in textiles will be worth the paper they are written on?

We are not unmindful that April and contract time are just around the corner. We do not minimize its importance. Right now, we are concerned with a more immediate matter.

A sharp legislative knife seems about to be drawn across the throat of the domestic textile manufacturing industry for the profit and edification of political adventurers in global slavery.

If American markets are further flooded with low-wage textiles, there will be less local business. If there is less business, there will be fewer jobs. If there are fewer jobs, where will that leave you?

Incidentally, friend, have you written to your Congressman recently? Why not do so today? The job you save may be your own.

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD, INDUSTRIAL TRADES UNION.

THE CORE OF THE BERN INCIDENT—RUMANIAN PATRIOTS VERSUS THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRATORS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a small group of Rumanian patriots took possession of the Communist occupied Rumanian Legation in Bern, Switzerland. According to accounts in the press, they took this action as a means of forcing the Rumanian puppets who now control the Communist police state in Rumania to release a number of patriots now languishing in prison in Rumania. They have stated to the Swiss police that they intend to keep possession of the Legation until their wishes are met and that other Rumanian patriots in the free world are prepared to take similar action with respect to Rumanian Legations in other countries. The Swiss police, up to the present, have refrained from using force in removing them from the Legation and have stated that the only sensible way to handle the matter is to talk it over with the Rumanian patriots. I, too, believe this makes sense, particularly since the patriots have made it clear they will keep possession of the Legation at all cost until their demand for the release of

their fellow patriots imprisoned in Rumania are met.

This incident raises a number of questions of interest to the American people. There are, of course, the legal considerations from the point of view of international law. These are being examined by the proper Swiss authorities. There are then the practical questions such as—should free men allow themselves to be used against the patriots of any nation when they are engaged in a fight against their Communist oppressors. It also raises the question whether the Communist conspiracy which holds a total disdain for the laws of civilization, should be granted the benefits of those laws, or be allowed to use those laws to maintain their illegal occupation of Rumanian territory.

It has long been maintained as a basic part of diplomacy that embassies and legations enjoy sovereign rights precisely the same as the nation they represent. The grounds and buildings of embassies and legations have been regarded as territorial islands of the respective nations. This fact raises the fundamental question as to whether the Communists who had occupied the Rumanian Legation in Bern until they were driven out yesterday were legally residing on that territory. It also raises the question as to whether the patriots have more legal right to possession of the Legation than the Russian stooges they drove off the grounds yesterday.

From the legal point of view, it is necessary to establish whether the Communists who now occupy Rumania, do so legally. This is at the core of the many questions raised by the Bern incident. Accordingly, I would urge all the Members of the House and all interested Americans to read a Special Report, No. 11 of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, which is titled "Communist Takeover and Occupation of Rumania." This short report which is less than 30 printed pages, tells the story of the Rumanian people and their struggles against Russian communism as well as telling the conspiratorial and criminal methods used by the Communists to seize and maintain control over the affairs of the Rumanian nation. To understand the rights as well as the motives of the Rumanian patriots who have made their stand in Bern, Switzerland, this report is a must.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following are elected members of the Committee on Public Works: Mr. BUSH, of Pennsylvania; Mr. NICHOLSON, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, is the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and I would like to say a few words in commemoration of this event.

The history of Lithuania goes back to 1009 when this small state was composed of approximately 12 independent principalities. In the 13th century it was united into a kingdom. However, from that time until 1918, Lithuanian independence was continually threatened and many times nonexistent. Yet, in the midst of many adversities, this small, brave country maintained its dignity and character.

Even after proclaiming its independence in 1918, Lithuania did not know peace. Before it was officially established as a state, it was invaded by the Bolshevik Army. The Lithuanian National Army, hastily called together, repelled its attackers successfully, and in 1920 the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania was officially recognized by the Soviet Union.

From that time until 1939, Lithuania prospered, socially, economically and politically. Then, in 1939, with the beginning of German aggression, this country again faced threats to its security. In 1940 the Lithuanian Government was dissolved and the Soviet Union quietly and bloodlessly entered into control of the country. Until this day the Lithuanian people are prisoners of the totalitarian, godless hordes from the East.

We cannot but decry the base, inhuman treatment to which the freedom-loving peoples of Lithuania have been subjected. The claims of the U. S. S. R. that the Baltic States of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia should be recognized as an integral part of the Soviet Union are but a mockery. The United States has not and will not give credence to these false claims. We will stand by our State Department's declaration of November, 1953, reasserting our recognition of the last independent government of each of these Baltic states.

I feel sure that the sufferings and indignities of the Lithuanian people have not been in vain. I am proud to join with the 1 million Lithuanian-Americans in saluting their brothers behind the Iron Curtain. May they keep the lamp of freedom burning in their hearts. May they preserve their faith in righteousness. May we all soon see the day when evil is overcome by good.

ARITHMETIC OF THE DOLLAR GAP

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to speak on the arithmetic of the dollar gap.

After 20 years of the reciprocal trade agreements, United States tariffs are now at their lowest point in 100 years and among the lowest in the world. Advocates of further reductions, rest their case in part on the theory that, even at present rates, other countries are still not able to buy the goods and services they need from this country in order to prosper.

This deficit is supposed to be visible in the so-called dollar gap—that is, the difference between United States exports—said to represent what other nations require from us—and United States imports—what they ship to us in return. A high point in this gap, it is claimed, was reached in 1953, when exports reached a grand total of $15.6 billion, compared to imports of $10.8 billion, leaving an alleged gap of nearly $5 billion.

This is nonsense. Competent analysts long ago pointed out that the bulk of this alleged gap consists of defense supplies. For example, of the $15.6 billion exports in 1953, some $3 billion is officially listed as special category items, the details and destination of which are concealed for security reasons. Such shipments have little if anything to do with the normal economic needs of any country. They represent simply this country's contribution to the common defense pool of the democratic nations.

What proportion of the balance is related to this $3 billion of secret exports is not easy to ascertain. It must be substantial. A Senate subcommittee which studied the problem for weeks last spring concluded that, in 1953, after deducting such items, the real trade gap—that is, the excess of ordinary commercial exports over ordinary commercial imports—amounted to no more than half a billion dollars.

But the truly deceitful aspect of this theory lies in the fact that, in addition to ignoring defense supplies, it completely—and conveniently—neglects to mention other ways people in foreign countries obtain dollars. The shipment of physical goods to the United States tells only part of the story. In addition, foreigners realize dollars—by the billion—out of the truly enormous expenditures by American tourists and businessmen traveling abroad, out of our soldiers stationed overseas, out of charges for transportation, and other services, out of special grants and loans, and out of income remitted on investments they have been canny enough to make in the United States.

There is, of course, a corresponding flow of dollars back to the United States on account of similar expenditures by foreigners in this country and, to the extent other countries permit it to escape, the yield on investments made by Americans abroad. But the difference in these accounts is so abundantly in favor of foreigners that it more than offsets any imbalance in the simple export-import figures.

Two recent reports demonstrate this fact beyond any reasonable dispute.

First, on January 18, 1955, the balance of payments group of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., filed its estimates of payment transactions between the United States and the rest of the world during 1955. These figures reveal that, from all sources, an amount of $19.9 billion is expected to become available to foreigners during the year—$10.7 billion as the proceeds of imports, $2.8 billion from American expenditures abroad on transportation, travel, and miscellaneous services, $2.7 billion from United States military expenditures abroad, $1.5 billion from unilateral transfers representing chiefly private remittances and governmental economic aid, $500 million from income payments on investments held by foreigners in United States enterprises, $1.2 billion as the net realized from United States private capital investments abroad and $500 million in Government loans and short-term assets.

Against this availability of $19.9 billion the group expects foreigners to use only $18.8 billion during the year—$13.4 billion for merchandise exports, which seems to be a high figure; $2.9 billion on travel in this country, transportation, and miscellaneous services; and $2.1 billion to pay income on United States investments abroad.

In other words, the groups says:

> Foreign countries will close out the current year with a further improvement of $1.1 billion in their gold and dollar reserves.

The balance of payments group of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., describes itself as "composed of American exporters, importers, and investors, and representatives of banks and transportation companies." Heretofore the Foreign Trade Council, Inc., has been counted as a staunch advocate of lower tariffs.

Second, in the New York Times for Sunday, January 2, Michael Hoffman reports from Geneva that studies by the secretariat of GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—are upsetting all prior assumptions about the so-called dollar gap.

He says:

> The irresistible urge of foreign capital to employ itself in the United States emerges as the chief cause of whatever dollar shortage [may exist] * * *.
>
> This conclusion—

The report goes on to say—and it must be quoted in full to realize its impact—

> This conclusion has been reached after an extensive new look at the pattern of payments between the United States and the rest of the world in four periods: 1926–30 (boom), 1931–37 (depression), 1946–49 (postwar), and 1950–53 (postdevaluation of many currencies in relation to the dollar).
>
> In all except the period 1931–37, the United States had a substantial surplus on current account, excluding unilateral transfers such as Marshall aid. In 1931–37 the total of world trade was drastically curtailed by depression and the United States surplus dropped to practically nothing.
>
> But in the periods during which there was a surplus on account of trade, tourism, and other items, net private capital exports from Canada and the United States or Government-aid expenditures supplied all or more than the dollars necessary for the rest of the world to balance its dollar accounts.
>
> Were these factors alone considered, no dollar shortage would have arisen.
>
> It is generally known that in the period 1931–37 there was a tremendous flight of European capital to the United States. The GATT economists find strong evidence that the disturbing influence of such movements extends over the whole period and is a dominant factor in the periodic difficulties other countries have in procuring enough dollars.
>
> DATA ARE DYNAMITE
>
> The policy implications of these new studies, some of which are based on new data, are substantial and highly controversial. Indeed, they contain so much dynamite that it is highly unlikely the study will ever be published as an official paper.
>
> The studies emphasize, for one thing, that the very countries that assert the duty of the United States to help them with capital investments have been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars a year of their own investment funds into the politically secure United States capital market.
>
> The studies also throw considerable doubt on the thesis that lowering the American tariff is essential to the establishment of better balance in world trade. Larger American imports would, of course, make more dollars available to the world for whatever purpose the world wanted to use them.
>
> But if capital movements into the United States rather than the trade in balance are the chief cause of so-called dollar shortages, they could easily be made out as the villain responsible for the economic disorder by those interested in maintaining or increasing barriers to competitive imports.

Whatever justification the dollar-gap theory may have had in the past, it is now an exploded myth.

By subtracting defense supplies, which have no place in any discussion of normal trade, the so-called dollar gap evaporates from $4 billion or $5 billion to $1 billion or less.

By taking into account other factors, like transportation and tourism, it not only disappears: it suddenly turns into a net increase of $1.1 billion in gold and dollar reserves held by other countries.

And, according to the Hoffman report, not only do foreigners have enough gold and dollars to buy whatever they truly need from this country—except defense supplies for which the American taxpayer pays—they also have, and have had all along, enough surplus to send money here for investment in important volume.

It is not intended here to deny that specific other countries have encountered severe difficulties in meeting dollar payments since the end of World War II. But the root cause for these difficulties lies in economic forces almost entirely unrelated to United States tariffs.

Great Britain, for example, has concentrated the bulk of her exports within the sterling area, where British products are protected from outside competition. Having little or nothing left to send to the United States in exchange for imports liberally ordered from this country, Britain inevitably fell behind in her dollar payments.

In 1952, however, following the collapse of the Korean boom, some of the countries in the sterling area were compelled to impose restrictions on even British products. Great Britain quickly shifted direction and, despite United States tariffs, was able to ship an offsetting volume of goods to the dollar area. Her dollar deficit disappeared almost over night.

Qualified observers believe that the dollar-gap fiction and the campaign for lower tariffs are doing real harm.

More than a year ago Bernard Baruch said the agitation about United States tariffs was serving only as an excuse to other countries "for blaming their troubles on the United States and, by feeling sorry for themselves, to overlook what they ought to be doing on their own."

In his column for January 13, 1955, Walter Lippmann said:

> I wonder whether this—
>
> The campaign for lower tariffs—
>
> puts the real problem in its proper focus. Perhaps we can reach a clearer definition of that problem by saying that the main trouble today is not the level of the tariff rates. In the United States they are by and large not exorbitantly high any longer.
>
> The real problem is economic warfare. All the governments have armed themselves with legal powers which they use to interfere with the international markets for goods. They use them offensively and they use them defensively to cut down, to cut off, to divert, to penalize, to subsidize buying and selling so that the pattern of transaction is different from what it would be under the free operation of supply and demand. * * *
>
> The characteristic of these weapons of economic warfare is that they are not fixed rules and laws of trade but are operated by administrative decisions made, often under political pressure, by bureaucracies. * * *
>
> * * * The essential condition of economic peace is that trade among friendly nations should not be subject to the arbitrary acts of administrative and political officials, that trade should be subject to laws enacted deliberately and openly and after debate and not changeable except by equally careful deliberation.

Samuel Lubell, who has successfully predicted the course of American policy and politics in previous works, has written a new book called The Revolution in World Trade. In this book, to be published February 23, he points out that—

> At the root of the dollar mystery lies the curious optical illusion that Europe's trouble has been the fault of her customers.

Mr. Lubell goes on to say:

> Yet—at least through all the years in which a sellers' market prevailed. Europe's trouble could not have been a lack of markets. What really limited Europe's ability to pay for American goods was that she did not produce more and how her exports were spread around different parts of the world.
>
> As Europe's productivity did increase, and her domestic inflation was brought under control and her exports were redirected, her dollar deficit did shrink steadily until it (has now) disappeared. * * *
>
> Whatever is done or not done about United States tariffs will not affect Europe's crucial need to improve her competitive earning power. * * * The adjustments to improve Western Europe's competitive efficiency must be made by the Western Euro-

peans themselves. * * * Since none of these is easy, it is not surprising that so many Europeans should fasten tenaciously upon the alibi that rich Uncle Sam is to blame for what they lack. But there is no reason why we should feed these anti-American resentments by encouraging the belief that American tariff policy is to blame for things it cannot possibly correct.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special order granted to Mr. PHILBIN.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we people who are interested in the liberation of our friends and relatives in Lithuania and the countries of Eastern Europe again note with pride Lithuania's 37th anniversary of independence, February 16, 1955.

This is in evidence of our continued concern and our remembrance of these fine friends who have been cut off by an iron curtain and held down by the iron hand of dictatorship. We celebrate this occasion on this day this year with renewed hope and certain of the fact that the citizens of Lithuania and the Eastern European countries will again be free and independent and peaceful nations dedicated to friendly progress and cooperation with the citizens of the free world.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, wishing to associate myself with the remarks of the many Members of this House who are celebrating the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter which I have written to my very fine constituents of Lithuanian descent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

FEBRUARY 7, 1955.

Mr. JONAS F. DAUGELA,
President of American Lithuanian Council in Cleveland,
Cleveland, Ohio.

MY DEAR MR. DAUGELA: I deeply regret that I cannot join in the solemn observance of the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. But I sincerely hope you will convey to my many friends in the American Lithuanian Council in Cleveland the depth of my feeling on this occasion.

After more than a century of domination by Russia, the Lithuanian people—who trace their heritage back seven centuries—declared their independence at Vilnius on February 16, 1918. For 22 years the Republic of Lithuania took its rightful place in the family of free nations and made marked contributions to the culture of Europe. But in 1940 the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact forced Lithuania back into chains.

For the past 15 years, the Communists have murdered, tortured, and deported the freedom-loving people of Lithuania, but still they have not been able to snuff out the fires of freedom that burn deep within their hearts. The Russians know that, because while they permit foreign travelers into many Iron Curtain countries, they have not dared to allow a non-Communist westerner into the Baltic States for many years.

Meetings such as yours, held by the million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent, keep those fires burning. You may be certain that word of these observances get back to the Lithuanian people and assure them that some day in the future a free Lithuania will hold public celebrations of its independence day.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON.

MEET MR. REPUBLICAN: JOE MARTIN

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to adrress the House for 1 minute and include an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday there apeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer an article written by the distinguished Washington corespondent, Walker S. Buel, entitled "Meet Mr. Republican: JOE MARTIN." It is an article calling attention to the many great achievements of the gentleman from Massachusetts. It is an excellent article.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a period when we celebrate the birthdays of many great Americans. Last Saturday we celebrated the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Next Tuesday we will observe the birthday of George Washington. Mention of many other notable birthdays has been made on this floor.

But there is one notable birthday that will not be mentioned this month or even next month. This birthday has seldom been alluded to on the floor because it falls on November 3—a time when the House is usually adjourned.

This birthday of a truly great American belongs to our beloved minority leader, who in more favorable times is our Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

It seems only fitting to me that when we are paying tribute to revered statesmen on the aninversaries of their births, we should include our praises to the gentleman from Massachusetts, even though it is not his birthday.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to the gentleman from Massachusetts and pay tribute to his steadfastness, his strength of purpose, and his courage. I salute "Mr. Republican."

MEET MR. REPUBLICAN: JOE MARTIN

(By Walker S. Buel)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—That title of "Mr. Republican" borne by the late Senator Robert A. Taft has been awarded, in at least one public instance, to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, GOP floor leader of the House, where he has been either Speaker or minority leader since 1939.

He was so introduced last Sunday afternoon on a Washington CBS TV panel show, Face the Nation, by its moderator, Ted Koop. Koop explains that when he and his coworkers were arranging the program the week before, it struck them that MARTIN'S impressive record and his 30 years in Congress made him almost the "legal" heir to the title, and so that was the way Koop addressed him.

GOT START IN 1912

The Martin record is notable. He is 70, and has been in public life since 1912, when he entered the Massachusetts Legislature, serving first in the house and then in the senate. He was elected to Congress in 1924 and has been there ever since. He is publisher of the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle and a weekly newspaper, the Franklin (Mass.) Sentinel.

He was elected chairman of the national Republican congressional campaign committee in 1937, succeeding the late Chester C. Bolton, of Cleveland, and for 2 years was chairman of the Republican National Committee. He was permanent chairman of the last four Republican National Conventions, a record exceeding that of the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, who served in that capacity three times.

He was born November 3, 1884, in North Attleboro, where his father was a blacksmith. The father died in 1934, but the Congressman's mother, 93, lives with him in a home only a few blocks from where he was born—the family never moved "uptown." The Martins had slender means in Joe's boyhood and he began work as a newsboy at the age of 5 or 6. Later he worked in jewelry shops and as night telephone operator in the North Attleboro exchange. He was educated in the public schools.

He declined a college scholarship to go to work as a reporter on North Attleboro newspapers at $10 a week. He has never gone into debt, and still has his first savings account opened in 1902. After 5 years' newspaper work he saved $1,000 and persuaded local citizens to join him in purchasing the Chronicle. He became the youngest publisher of a daily newspaper in the United States at 24. His newspaper enterprises are managed by a brother and a nephew. Oldest in a family of 8, he sent 2 younger brothers through Dartmouth College.

ALWAYS ACCESSIBLE

JOE MARTIN is a medium-sized, compact man with a strong but pleasant face and brow always overhung by one lock of dark hair. His talk is straightforward. He gives direct answers to questions. He is always accessible at the Capitol, even when Speaker. He has no regular recreation, except walking for exercise. His favorite sport is baseball. He was a sandlot player when a boy, and afterward a semipro.

He is one of the most modest of men. He has not yet had his portrait painted to hang in the Speaker's lobby of the Capitol, although the 80th Congress appropriated the money for it. However, a group of his friends in the Capitol Hill Club, where Republican Congressmen gather, finally persuaded him, after years of effort, to let them have a portrait for the club, and it has been done. Plans are under way for a great unveiling ceremony.

NEVER TEMPTED TO MARRY

One of the most popular men in Washington, Representative MARTIN is a bachelor. Asked on television how he has managed all these years not to marry, he replied: "It's because I haven't had any great temptation."

Next week he expects to be a stage-door Johnny, undoubtedly for the first time in his life. Ever since her girlhood Tallulah Bankhead has loved JOE MARTIN, who for long years was a colleague and friend of her adored father, the late Speaker William B. Bankhead.

When arrangements were made for the great Tallu to come to Washington with her play, Dear Charles, opening at the National here Monday night, she wrote the Representative that he must be in the front row on the

first night. Joe replied that because of too much work he could not be there opening night, but would attend in midweek, and after the show would go backstage to her dressing room, when they could have a long visit.

Politically, MARTIN belongs to the conservative Republican school—he probably would be rated by many as more conservative than the late Senator Taft, so that wing of the party need not wince if the appellation of "Mr. Republican" sticks. However, he believes the renomination of President Eisenhower and his reelection in 1956 are inevitable.

Typically, Representative MARTIN is making Lincoln Day speeches this year in Florida and Texas—in the hope of enabling the GOP to get more Republican Congressmen in that traditionally Democratic territory. Each of those States broke the tradition by electing one Republican last fall.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that any other Member who desires to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the same subject may be permitted to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, with a deep feeling of pride, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues in extending congratulations to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

His simple and earthy qualities have earned for him an enviable standing in the minds and hearts of all Americans.

I admire his genuineness, sincerity, forthrightness, and warmth.

These attributes of character have brought him the affection and respect of all who know him.

Mr. CHASE. Mr. Speaker, the fine tributes paid to my esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, whenever and wherever heard by me—and I hear many, and in many places—are always sweet music to my ears. And I know that I express the sentiment of my good friends of Nebraska who over the years have attentively and admiringly watched the career of this great American in his untiring and unselfish service to our country. And surely the sovereign State of Massachusetts should be proud to have given to our Nation such a son. May he have many more birthdays for his friends to honor.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOE MARTIN, our beloved minority leader, has made several, but altogether too infrequent, trips to Wyoming during the entire period that I have been active in politics, and even before. We in Wyoming think a great deal of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We consider him one of the outstanding Americans of our times.

It has been brought to our attention that the gentleman from Massachusett's birthday falls on November 3, when the House is usually not in session.

We from Wyoming would like to join in recognition of this outstanding American citizen at this time when the observance of birthday anniversaries of other great Americans is included in the order of business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize in this American the strength of character, and the devotion to duty and principles which makes us proud to be Americans. It is my pleasure to join in this tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, often referred to as "Mr. Republican."

EXCISE TAX ON CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill designed to assist in remedying a very serious national problem. This bill if passed would remove the excise tax from television receiving sets capable of receiving all of the ultra-high frequency band. The American people have a vital interest in nationwide, competitive television services. According to the best available testimony of experts—both from the Government and those representing private industry—the only way these two objectives of nationwide TV facilities and competitive TV programing can be realized is to utilize both the very high frequency portion of the communications spectrum for channels 2 through 13 and the ultra high frequency portion of the communications spectrum for channels 14 through 83.

To the layman this sounds like a relatively simple problem. Actually it is a very complicated one, and unfortunately there is no cure-all solution in sight at the present time. Virtually all have agreed on one point of procedure relating to relief for the general public, and for the telecasters who are pioneering the use of ultra high frequency television. That solution is to remove the burden of excise tax on sets which can receive all the UHF band.

The historical development of this problem is related to the uncertainties and unknown factors usually associated with all industries growing out of rapidly evolving scientific discoveries. When the UHF band was first set aside for experimental use, certain ideas were held about its engineering characteristics which have proven to be somewhat at variance with actual experience. Not only that, but when the Federal Communications Commission first licensed UHF television stations, the American public had already purchased over 17 million television sets which were engineered so as to receive only the VHF television signals, and UHF programing could not be obtained without an additional investment by the user to place a UHF tuner in the existing television set. There are now more than 30 million receivers in the hands of the public, of which 80 percent are unable to receive anything but VHF signals.

Again, all the experts seem to agree that as the relative imbalance of VHF and UHF television sets in the hands of the public is corrected, the major problem relating to nationwide competitive television programing will have been solved. The ultimate desirable situation would be to have all television sets equipped with both VHF and UHF tuning devices so that programing could be received equally well from both types of transmitters. Program diversity would be enhanced and the resulting competition would work to the advantage of the people.

This bill will assist in removing the disadvantageous position in which a prospective buyer finds himself when he is confronted with the choice of buying a VHF-only television set at one price and a set capable of receiving all of the television channels both VHF and UHF at a higher price. It is to our national interest to make the choice for the all-channel tuning sets more attractive to the buyer. The passage of this bill will obviously provide an additional incentive to manufacturers of television sets to produce more UHF receivers.

This bill will also offer concrete evidence to the many television operators who are struggling along with loss UHF television stations, that their plight is recognized by the representatives of the people, and that the inequity of their opportunity to have their programs viewed and heard by a prospective audience along with the signals of VHF stations is being adjusted more favorably. I am informed that of the 318 UHF construction permits granted by the Federal Communications Commission, some 118 UHF operators have found it necessary to turn in their permits for construction with substantial financial losses. This is a convincing index of the real seriousness of this problem.

SEATTLE-HAWAII AIRLINE RUN

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, you will recall the observations made in this House on Monday, February 7, in connection with the President's order of February 1. That order reversed a unanimous decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board granting Northwest Airlines the certificate on the Seattle-Hawaii run, and instead cut Northwest Airlines out and attempted to give the route to Pan American World Airways. Protests from every State from Wisconsin to the Pacific poured into the White House against the President's unexplained action. Then, on Monday night, February 7, the President issued another order saying he was reversing his February 1 reversal. This was accompanied by White House statements that new information had come to the President. The new order indicated that both Northwest and Pan American would be given 3-year temporary certificates on the Seattle-Hawaii run.

At the President's press conference on Wednesday, February 8, the President was asked about this reversal of his reversal. His answer was:

It is very simple in this case. There was information came to my attention that convinced me I had made an error. And so I tried to correct it. The actual facts were these:

I am directed by the Congress to cut down subsidies in this air business, which means that when you have unprofitable competition on lines, you had better look at it very, very closely, because this occasions a greater deficit.

I am also directed to preserve competition and, in accordance with the American system, preserve competition so far as this can be done, but always with this other conflicting consideration of cutting down the subsidies.

In this case, it looked like we should get rid of one line on the Hawaiian run and get the line that was—had the most of the traffic and in which it had the smallest subsidy last year on that line, or at least as far as figures showed, that was the one I was going to go with. And I made that decision.

Now, what happened then was the Chairman of the Board came over to see me and pointed out that all of their calculations showed that within 2 years they believed that the entire subsidy would be eliminated from the Pacific runs.

He showed, therefore, that, even if you did have to have a new subsidy, since now you have your computations for subsidies made on the operations of the full line, that here we had a case where we could well afford to go ahead with the competitive system for a while and still believe that we would come out of the subsidy area.

So I said, in that case we will renew this for a short period, which I did for 3 years.

We have all been waiting with great interest for the publication of the original CAB decision, in order that we may know just what it was that the President was reversing by his order of February 1. Today that decision has been finally released. It makes interesting reading.

Had the President read the CAB's decision dated November 26, 1954, he would have seen it clearly set forth that—

In connection with the choice of Northwest as the carrier to operate the Pacific Northwest-Hawaii route, one further matter should be mentioned. At the close of the argument before the Board Northwest expressed its willingness to operate the route at a compensatory mail rate without subsidy. * * * We accept the carrier's statement of its willingness to operate the route without subsidy as one made in good faith and as such we believe that in the future in establishing mail rates for the route we will be justified in reaching our decision in the light of the carrier's offer. (Decision, pp. 15–16.)

Even without this offer by Northwest to operate the route without subsidy, the Board indicated that there were other good and sufficient reasons to award the route to Northwest—decision, page 15. Both the record and the decision are barren of any suggestion that Pan American was willing to operate the route without subsidy. The taxpayers last year paid $27,291,503 in subsidies to Pan American.

Yet, despite all this, the President on February 1 reversed the CAB, threw out Northwest, and put in Pan American. Now, what was the new information which caused the President on February 8 to reverse his reversal of February 1? Our only clue to this is in the CAB's press release of today, in which it is set forth that—

Acting Chairman Chan Gurney declared that in the course of conversations with President Eisenhower regarding the final decision in the West Coast-Hawaii case, he had provided the President with the following statement:

"Mail rates for both Pan American and Northwest over the entire Pacific operations of the carriers, and separate figures as to the Seattle-Honolulu operations can only be determined by calculating the subsidy support per revenue plane mile. These figures, however, being system figures, are not truly representative of the local operations between Seattle and Honolulu. In theory, both carriers should approximate the same cost levels over a period of time.

"The subsidy support provided for the entire Pacific operations of the 2 carriers during the 12 months ending September 30, 1954, was as follows:

"Pan American	$6,740,000
Northwest	3,656,000

"The subsidy support per revenue plane mile equalled:

	Cents
"Pan American	49.28
Northwest	62.48

"The subsidy separation report for November 1954 forecasts that Pan American may be off subsidy entirely in fiscal 1956, due to the military mail movement in the Pacific, and that Northwest would require only $1,483,000 in subsidy support. However, the most recent estimates as to the division of mail between the carriers in the Pacific and the volume which will be tendered to them indicates that, on the basis of existing mail rates, both carriers may be subsidy free in fiscal 1956. It should be stressed, however, that the military mail situation is not entirely clear and that the volume of mail, its distribution between carriers, and the rate which the Board ultimately establishes for its transportation, may directly affect this calculation."

Let us examine this new information. We will find that part of it is not new, and part of it is not information. The part that is not new has to do with Northwest's prospective lack of subsidy. As the CAB's decision of November 26, 1954, clearly points out, Northwest was ready to go to it unsubsidized, not in 2 years, not in 1 year, but right now. The part that is not information is the suggestion that, according to the most recent estimates, both carriers may be subsidy free in fiscal 1956. There is not a word in the record or decision to indicate that Pan American will be in this happy state of affairs by 1956. We are not enlightened as to who made these most recent estimates and on what he based them. What is the point of an elaborate hearing before the CAB, lasting many months, and with the exhaustively analyzed testimony of experts spread upon the record, if it is to be swept aside by some casual conversation about most recent estimates?

Putting Pan American into the Seattle-Hawaii run is not going to help competition, because Pan American already has a permanent route into Hawaii from California. It is not going to save taxpayers' dollars. Under the CAB's November 26 decision, Northwest would have made the run without a penny of subsidy. As a result of the President's order of February 7, Pan American will continue to be subsidized for the run, and so will Northwest, since Northwest's no-sudsidy offer was conditioned on being the sole line certificated for the route. According to the new information, these subsidies may end in 2 years' time. As far as the taxpayers are concerned, 2 years' unnecessary subsidy is 2 years too much.

But, waste aside, the whole case is a shocking illustration of how not to administer civil aeronautics. If you will look at the history of the case, you cannot escape the conclusion that somebody has been trying to pull the wool over the President's eyes. Despite the order of February 7 reversing the reversal of February 1, the CAB's original decision of November 26, 1954, as now revealed, is a sound, dollar-saving, antimonopoly, and unanimous decision. If the President will read it, I am sure that he will wish to order a reversal of his reversal of his reversal.

A PARTIAL STATEMENT OF OUR OVERSEAS ARMED SERVICES COMMITMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, last, House Resolution 136 was introduced by me. That resolution asked for certain information, and a reply came to the House through the Armed Services Committee earlier today.

The questions asked and the answers are as follows:

Question:

1. (a) Approximately how many military installations employing five or more individuals who receive compensation or maintenance from Federal funds are now maintained by the Department of Defense outside the continental limits of the United States of America?

Answer:

1. (a) Approximately 950 military installations.

Question:

(b) (1) Approximately how many individuals are employed in such installations and (2) at approximately what cost?

Answer:

1. (b) (1) Approximately 167,000 civilian employees outside the United States, plus approximately 218,000 civilians who are employees of foreign governments engaged under contracts with the United States. The 218,000 does not include 124,000 Germans paid from deutschemarks.

1. (b) (2) Approximately $601,699,000 per annum.

Question:

2. (a) Approximately how many individuals eligible to be assigned to combat service and who are compensated from Federal funds are in the service outside of the continental limits of the United States of America?

Answer:

(a) Approximately 1,370,000 military personnel. This figure excludes female military personnel.

Question:

(b) Approximately how many individuals eligible to be assigned to combat service and who are compensated from Federal funds are in the service within the continental limits of the United States of America?

Answer:

2. (b) Approximately 1,602,000 military personnel. This figure excludes trainees with less than 4 months service, seriously hospitalized personnel, female military personnel, and conscientious objectors.

Question:

3. What is the approximate cost of the civilian employees who are supporting those named under section 2 (a) and (b)?

Answer:

3. Approximately $4,530,276,000 per annum. This figure excludes cost for an average of approximately 25,000 employees of the Corps of Engineers and excludes costs in relation to the 124,000 Germans referred to in 1 (b) (1) above who are paid from deutschemarks.

Question:

4. What is the approximate (a) volume in long tons and (b) value in dollars of the supplies, both military and nonmilitary, needed per year to maintain those named in section 1 (a) and (b) and in section 2 (a) and (b)?

Answer:

4. (a) Approximately 4,100,000 long tons.
4. (b) Approximately $3,300,000,000.

The information just given should aid in voting on appropriations and in determining foreign policy.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution from the American Lithuanian Council, Lake and La Porte Counties, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, 37 years ago today, Lithuania made known to the world that it was an independent nation, exercising the right of self-government and self-determination. This declaration of Lithuanian independence was one of the great milestones in the history of a liberty-loving people whose struggle for self-government continued over centuries. From the 16th century on, Lithuania was almost in a constant battle against aggressive neighbors, but never gave up hope to preserve the Lithuanian tradition for freedom. During 120 years of Russian domination, no less than five distinct major revolts took place in Lithuania. Back in the early 1800's, Czar Nicholas the First invoked a sweeping policy to Russify Lithuania. Repressive measures were taken against all forms of Lithuanian culture, literature, language, schools, religion, and governmental offices. In 1863 and 1864, another revolt took place which failed after a struggle of 18 months. Another revolution in 1905 brought fresh hopes for independence, but failed. During World War I, the German armies overran the country and remained there until the end of the war. During this time, uprising, negotiations, and minor rebellions did not cease.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council unanimously adopted a declaration calling for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania on a democratic basis, with Vilna as the capital and the severance of all political ties which linked it with other nations. This declaration became Lithuania's proclamation of independence.

After the evacuation of Lithuania by Germany in November and December, 1918, Russian troops arrived at the border of Lithuania and again made an effort to subjugate the nation. The last battle with the Red army was fought late in 1919 which culminated in a peace treaty signed July 12, 1920.

On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations, thus Lithuania became a full member of the international powers. The permanent constitution was adopted August 1, 1922. It was an instrument which followed the blueprint of western democracy. The state of Lithuania was an independent democratic republic; the people were accorded the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly; the constitution guaranteed freedom of religion; the independent Lithuanian Government instituted land reform; industrial production proceeded to ascend; neglected railroads were rebuilt and transportation improvement was inaugurated throughout the land; social legislation and education were expanded and it did not take long before the new independent democracy was functioning with the precision of nations much older. The Lithuanian people proved, during the period of time from their declaration of independence up until the Hitler-Stalin menace devastated Europe, that its people could give the world a practical example of true democracy in action. During the period from 1920 to 1939, the Lithuanian Government entered into peace treaties, nonaggression pacts and mutual assistance agreements with the Soviet Union. By reason of typical and well-known Communist duplicity and treachery, every one of these agreements was discarded and nullified by Russia when they saw the opportunity was ripe to enslave the Lithuanian people.

I will not take up the time in these remarks to repeat on the floor of this House, the treachery, mass murders, prison incarcerations, and tortures that the Soviets inflicted upon the brave and liberty loving people of Lithuania. This history is vividly set out in the summary and final report of the Committee on Communist Aggression filed December 31, 1954, only a month and a half ago. Every Member of Congress should read that report and learn from former leaders of Lithuania and other witnesses who were victims of Soviet treachery what Communist tyranny can inflict on innocent human beings. This report also reveals facts containing similar inhuman aggression upon other captive nations now under the Kremlin iron heel. The basic findings, conclusions and recommendations set out on pages 3 to 9 of that report will startle millions of people throughout the free world when they learn of the true facts concerning the Communist conspiracy. Lithuania, along with other captive countries and all free nations must keep up the fight against Communist aggression and expansion and the day will eventually come when freedom will be restored to Lithuania and other captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks a resolution which was adopted last Sunday, February 13, 1955, by the American Lithuanian Council of Lake and La Porte Counties at a banquet held at St. Casimir's Parish Hall, Gary, Ind.:

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL,
LAKE AND LA PORTE COUNTIES, IND.,
February 13, 1955.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Member, House of Representatives,
First District of Indiana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: On February 13, 1955, citizens of Lithuanian descent residing in the Calumet region of Indiana met at the St. Casimir Parish Hall, 1390 West 15th Avenue, Gary, Ind., to observe the 37th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

The following is a resolution which was unanimously adopted at this gathering:

"Whereas Lithuania was a self-ruled country for several hundred years before Russia's first occupation in 1795; and

"Whereas Russia enslaved Lithuania for 123 years; and

"Whereas the yearning for self-rule and freedom existed throughout these years, and on February 16, 1918, severed its ties with Russia by announcing its independence; and

"Whereas Soviet Russia renounced for all time its rights to the territory of Lithuania, and recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state; and

"Whereas the United States of America and other nations recognized and continue to recognize Lithuania's rightful independence and sovereignty; and

"Whereas the free and independent Republic of Lithuania made remarkable progress in every phase of its life, and was acknowledged as one of the most cultured, progressive, and industrious countries of the past World War I period; and

"Whereas Lithuania's independence was suspended and achievements destroyed when it was occupied by Russia for the second time in 1940, and followed by the Nazi's occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944, when the Soviets reoccupied the country and continue to occupy and rule it by force to this day; and, therefore

"*Resolved,* That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent and ancestry shall continue to support the efforts of Lithuanian people to regain freedom and reestablish an independent Lithuanian Republic;

"*Resolved,* That we appeal to the Government of the United States to denounce openly the Soviet policy of destruction of native population, and take effective steps to make Russia respect the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights; be it further

"*Resolved,* That we urge the Government to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the charter of the United Nation, and not to make any peace settlement with Soviet Russia until this has been achieved; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Indiana, and the press."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE,
JOSEPH PETRITIS, *Chairman*.
JUNE EVANSECK, *Cochairman*.
GARY, IND., *February 13, 1955*.

American Lithuanian Council, Lake and La Porte Counties, Ind.: Albert G. Vinick, president, East Chicago; Antionette Nenios, vice president, Gary; Rev. Dr. Peter Celesius, secretary, East Chicago; John Skierys, treasurer, Gary; board of directors, Msgr. Casimir Bickauskas, East Chicago; Rev. I. C. Vichuras, Gary; Mary Micksis, Michigan City; Joseph K. Matuck, East Chicago; John Ambrose, Gary; Ted Mason, Indiana Harbor; Frank Groach, Michigan City.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been closely acquainted with a great number of residents of my home community of East St. Louis, Ill., who are of Lithuanian extraction. No group has contributed more to the civic life of the community. They reflect the firm foundation in loyalty to their country and morality in everyday life which they inherited from their parents who came from their native Lithuania. Many of these parents still carry on and those who have passed on have left a new generation of fine American citizens.

We know how dearly these people love America. It is easy to understand this loyalty, because no people have fought more valiantly for so long to establish the independence of their homeland and to bring to it freedom and liberty, than have the Lithuanians.

Today we celebrate the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is not a joyful celebration because it is observed in the knowledge that Lithuania is now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain—enslaved by Russian communism.

Today the Communist tyrants oppress a great Lithuanian people by deporting them under the guise of volunteers for work elsewhere, compelling collectivization of her prosperous agriculture, and by systematically attempting to sovietize every segment of Lithuanian life.

Russian treachery delivered control of Lithuania to the Reds, and by the typical Communist method of terror 3 million Lithuanians are held slaves behind the Iron Curtain.

We pay deserved tribute today to these Lithuanians, whose perseverance and continued resistance to communism and the Russian tyrant will one day restore their homeland to the status of a free and independent nation.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call the attention of the House today to the 37th anniversary of independence of the Baltic Republic of Lithuania.

During my work on the Congressional Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression in the last Congress, I had occasion to acquire a great deal of information concerning the fate of Lithuania and her sister republics of Estonia and Latvia. Although these three small countries have today been incorporated into the Soviet union as so-called Soviet Socialist Republics, they have not been forgotten by this Government in view of the fact that diplomatic recognition is still extended to their representatives here in the United States. This is clear proof of the fact that this Government has not and, I am sure, will never acquiesce in the enslavement of these peoples by the Soviet communists any more than it has acquiesced in the enslavement of hundreds of millions of other captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

It should be brought to the attention of the House, the people of this country and all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world that a keynote of the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration is the peaceful liberation of the captive peoples everywhere. This administration has committed itself to make no deal or arrangement with the Soviet Union which would tend to confirm or acknoweldge the present unhappy status of the captive peoples.

In paying tribute to the free government and the people of Lithuania on this day, therefore, I wish to reassert my own hope and belief that they will again one day enjoy freedom and the right to self-determination in a government and institution of their own choice. As long as we continue to call attention to these facts and to remind the people of Lithuania that they are not and never will be forgotten by the Government and the people of the United States, we can confidently hope that the day of freedom will again come for them in the not too far distant future.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, the 16th of February 1955, Americans of Lithuanian extraction throughout our country are celebrating the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I think that I can speak with some authority upon the independence of Lithuanian descent.

Firstly, because the historicity of the country of their origin is like that of the country of my ancestors—a struggle for independence and liberty against obstacles that at times seems to be insurmountable.

Secondly, many of my closest personal friends and neighbors are Americans of Lithuanian extraction.

And, finally, a large number of my constituents are Americans of Lithuanian extraction.

I have found in my friendship and contact that Lithuanians are a devout people with an intense love of God and liberty. Americans of Lithuanian extraction, with their faith in Almighty God and their great love for America, carry in their hearts and with their prayers seek for the day of liberation of the country of their origin from the hands of a godless oppressor.

On this day of the 37th observance of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, I would like to lend my prayer to the Almighty and my hope that the day draws near when Lithuanians everywhere can see their desire and prayers fulfilled with the deliverance of the people of their homeland from slavery and the return of their country to a free nation dedicated to liberty under God.

When that day arrives, as it will, and captive nations the world over are free from the yoke of their oppressors, I feel that the world will be at the dawn of an era of peace, prosperity, and the pursuit of happiness.

I would like permission to insert in the RECORD a resolution which has been adopted at the observance of Independence Day for Lithuania by the Lithuanian Council of Chicago. A very close personal friend of mine, Judge Alphonse F. Wells, is president of the Lithuanian Council of Chicago, and he kindly forwarded this resolution to me prior to its adoption. It states:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED, AFTER DUE DELIBERATION, BY AMERICAN CITIZENS OF LITHUANIAN DESCENT OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF CHICAGO, AT THE ASHLAND AUDITORIUM, ON THE 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1955

Whereas the Soviet Union, spurred by its vicious ambition to conquer the world, has embarked upon practices of propaganda, fraud, subversion, and aggression in international relations to an extent unheard heretofore;

Whereas the Communist conspiracy which, in the course of 37 years, has succeeded in enslaving over 800 million people on almost one-third of the surface of our globe is now feverishly advancing its ultimate end by deep infiltrations into the still free countries, using any deceit or stratagem to further its ideological, psychological, and subversive attack upon the free world society;

Whereas the continued enslavement of the captive nations by Soviet power is the basic cause of the growing menace of war and stands as a threat to the security of the United States;

Whereas this threat is increased in direct proportion to the time and opportunity given the Communists to consolidate their conquests and to prepare for the final showdown with the still free nations; it can be diminished only if the Communist hold on the captive peoples is weakened by the positive policy that promotes the forces of national independence in the countries now enslaved: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the patriotic Lithuanian Americans of Chicago, Ill., reaffirming their adherence to the moral and political principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence and pledging their loyalty to the Federal Government, call upon the President, Secretary of State, and Congress of the United States to inaugurate an aggressive, vigorous, and positive program of foreign policy to thwart the global and totalistic Communist conspiracy; be it further

Resolved, That it is the consensus of the Lithuanian Americans, gathered here today, that the following steps should be undertaken as a part of such a program:

1. That the Government of the United States formulate and submit to the United Nations Organization a resolution, based upon the findings of the recent investigation by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the Communist takeover of Lithuania and other formerly free countries, with the purpose of accusing the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all these nations;

2. That the said investigation of Communist aggression be continued during the

present Congress in order to complete the picture of all phases and methods of Communist aggression in areas not yet covered by the committee of the 83d Congress;

3. That the psychological warfare against the international communism be intensified by expanding the present media of transmitting the truth behind the Iron Curtain and by enlightening the American people and the people of the whole world as to the true nature of communism and its techniques;

4. That the Genocide Convention designed to curb annihilation of the Soviet-enslaved people be immediately ratified by the Senate of the United States and this ratification implemented by decisive efforts by the United States Government in the United Nations to make the Soviet Union criminally responsible for all the atrocities committed in Lithuania and other subjugated countries;

5. That the existing liberation movements of the enslaved nations and the private organizations or groups that have natural bond with the enslaved people be given encouragement, maximum opportunity, and support through use of funds already authorized by Congress for such purposes; be it finally

Resolved, That this meeting voice its heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the administration and Congress of the United States for many past considerations in and sympathy with the cause of Lithuania's fight for her independence.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF CHICAGO,
ALFONSE F. WELLS, *President*.
Mr. J. LINKUVIENE, *Secretary*.
CHICAGO, ILL., *February 13, 1955*.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, as in past years, I received a warm letter from the Lithuanian Information Center, reminding me of the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence. Among other things the letter says:

> The occasion will be observed solemnly by Americans as you are aware that it will pass unnoticed in the homeland.

Speaking for myself and for all those whose ancestors have come from countries presently occupied by the Soviets, this date, February 16, cannot pass unnoticed. As a matter of fact it was marked months ago on my calendar in order that I might devote some time today to this small and gallant nation, which throughout its history fought off foreign aggression, only to be conquered once again. This time it was the most brutal conquest the world has known. First there were the masses of little people sent by the thousands to slave labor camps in Russia, and when Hitler's Army came to Lithuania, thousands of others were shipped off to German concentration camps. The Soviet liberation of the Baltic States was marked by the most bloody path in the history of mankind. Up until last year some several hundred thousand men and women were deported and moved deep into the Soviet Union. It is their sweat and blood which counts on the fraudulent Soviet statistics, hailing Russian production in the industrial and agricultural fields.

How many Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs, Rumanians, and Hungarians have contributed to the growth of power of the Soviet industrial output, only God knows, because so far as the leaders of the Kremlin are concerned, this figure is their top secret and it is for this reason that they have hidden themselves behind the Iron Curtain. We may well estimate that slave labor has reached well over 15 million men and women. They are people who have been degraded into the most wretched human beings, who live like animals, receiving for their 14 hours' work a watery bowl of soup and 300 grams of bread. They are people who have been torn away from their families, separated from their loved ones, and have lost contact with their husbands, mothers, and fathers, not to mention their children who have been taken away from them and indoctrinated to believe what the Kremlin wishes them to believe.

I do not doubt for 1 second that there is any person in this country, who on a day like this, will not stop to think how happy he is, living in a democracy which has been founded on righteousness and the good will of the community. For us Americans, it is inconceivable to imagine that there are places in the world where peace-loving men and God-fearing people have to suffer so much as those under the Soviet orbit.

Symbolic as it is, February 16, being celebrated by all free Lithuanians, is a paradoxical situation. On the one hand we hail a day, perhaps the greatest in the history of Lithuania when independence was returned to their wonderful nation, and on the other hand we celebrate the day which at this moment is only part of a glorious history.

I must admit that when I stopped to think what to say today to all my Lithuanian friends, I realized it was somewhat of a problem, solely because of the knowledge and realization that encouragement alone would not be sufficient and that there must be a concrete plan to achieve the desired goal and that is the liberation of all those oppressed.

A great deal has been said about coexistence with one another in order to avoid a military showdown. But, will mere coexistence save the rest of those behind the Iron Curtain who have somehow managed to stay alive and away from slave labor? With the rate and speed of deportations and the misery which deprives nations of its most vital materials necessary for survival, under the best of circumstances, coexistence is no remedy and it is this remedy which we just have to find in order to help the millions in the Soviet orbit to survive, to see them through these darkest years of their entire history. A remedy must be found to help these unfortunate people to throw off the chains of slavery. It is our moral duty to see to it that the job will be done as soon as possible so that countries like Lithuania, as well as others, can freely celebrate a day like this in their own country, with their own Government, freely elected by the people.

On the other hand, the experience of Lithuania should be a lesson to us here, whose situation, as long as we shall stand idle, will become more and more endangered. That is why today we should pause for a moment and think and bow our heads to this brave and glorious Lithuanian nation which on its own soil is unable to commemorate its own anniversary of independence.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, and that following that I may extend my remarks on this same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana and also to the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY]. The gentleman from Indiana has long taken an active lead in the efforts of our Congress to explore the reasons and the story behind the oppression of the people of Lithuania by the Russian Communists. He has contributed a great deal by his work, and he took the lead in the investigation of the Katyn massacre. I want to pay tribute to him personally, and I want to join with him and my other colleagues of the House in paying tribute to the heroism of the people of Lithuania.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are countless millions of persons whose only misfortune was that they were born in one of the countries behind the so-called Iron Curtain, who hate the oppressor, who have an intense love for freedom under God and under the law; who at one time or another enjoyed their independence and, as in the case of Lithuania, enjoyed their independence in recent years after World War I.

We know of the results that have followed when the Communist hordes took over any territory or any people; slavery—compelled outwardly to obey as a result of the use of force.

Behind the so-called Iron Curtain is a great strength that those of us who believe in liberty and freedom possess. Not only in the so-called satellite countries but in the Soviet Union itself there are tens of millions of persons who want to be free men and free women, who want to enjoy the inherent right

of freedom, who want to enjoy those God-given rights which all of mankind have through God's natural law, who want a little sanctity in their home life, who want some of the fruits of their efforts. Those are God-given rights that man may suppress but can never destroy. That is a spiritual force. It is a force which exists there and which is a powerful reservoir for us to capitalize on at the proper time if the circumstances should occur when the influences of the natural law upon men and women in those suppressed countries may come into operation again.

The brave people of Lithuania are simply a symbol of the brave people of other countries. We honor Lithuania on this occasion, but in honoring Lithuania and its brave and liberty and religious-loving people, we also honor the people of other lands whose independence has been temporarily destroyed and whose liberties have been temporarily denied.

They are looking to America, the leader in the world of today of a future decent world, the leader among the free countries of the world of today, to achieve their hopes and aspirations. America cannot fail them, because we have a rendezvous with destiny. Whether we like it or not, we have that rendezvous. On one side of the troubled world of today is the United States; on the other side is the Soviet Union. Our country is the leader of the forces of decency and progress and the Soviet Union is the leader of the forces of evil and destruction.

So it is well that the House pause today to refresh its memory, and to pay tribute to the brave people of those countries—in this case Lithuania—and by our remarks carry to those brave people over there the hope that in the near future their liberty and their independence will be regained.

We need military strength. We need to be militarily powerful. But we need also to be spiritually powerful. To be militarily powerful alone, while that is necessary, is not enough. Fortunately, we in this country have that great reservoir of spiritual strength in the minds and hearts of our people. And fortunately in Lithuania and in other oppressed countries there are countless millions of people who are possessed of the same spiritual strength.

I want to congratulate my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], and also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], for having had this hour allocated to them by unanimous consent of the House, because it shows the feeling of all of the Members of the House respecting this occasion, so that we could pay tribute to the brave people of Lithuania and by our voice carry to those in that country today a feeling of confidence and of hope.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on this 37th anniversary of the independence of the brave and progressive people of Lithuania may I say that I am as certain as there is a sun in the heavens that God the Father of us all, will one day, and soon, reward the patience and fortitude of the good Lithuanian people by restoring their freedom and independence with an assured blessing and perpetuity which only He can give.

As for America, we have never for one moment forgotten, and we shall ever remember, the struggle and suffering of Lithuania. We shall never recognize the bestial attack of Communist Russia upon a helpless little nation which is bound in chains and shackles as a consequence of the German-Nazi conspiracy and blood bath. The world of today suffers in abysmal travail because of the arch conspiracy of the two criminal fiends run riot among free and liberty loving people.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I too join my colleagues who have addressed the House on the subject of Lithuania's independence. I too am delighted to see my colleagues from Indiana reserving this time to conduct these ceremonies.

I am pleased as well that today the invocation was said by the Very Reverend Monsignor F. M. Juras, who is present with us on the floor at this moment, and who served his calling in a parish in my district.

I am especially interested to add my contribution to these words regarding the history of this interesting ancient people and their struggle for liberty.

I am concerned for the point I make today with the insistence by both Imperial Russia and now Soviet Russia that Lithuania be to all intents and purposes annexed to Imperial Russia and now Soviet Russia.

Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of this House know that as a matter of fact and as a matter of law that is not the case. I am proud as an American to say and as a citizen of the United States to know that my country has never recognized any such annexation and has consistently refused to recognize any such annexation. I am satisfied, regardless of what administration may be in power in this country and regardless of who may be the Secretary of State, that the United States of America will never, under any circumstances, recognize the annexation by any foreign power of the Republic of Lithuania.

It has often been said by the Communists or their fellow travelers that the Soviet Union had an historic right to force Lithuania to join the U. S. S. R. because Lithuania had once been a part of the Russian empire. Thus, they have argued, the legacy of the Czars has justly been passed on to the Soviets.

No statement advanced in an attempt to justify the destruction of Lithuania's independence could be farther from the truth. It is so, primarily because it displays a fundamental lack of knowledge of Lithuanian history. Lithuania had been part of the Russian Empire—that lamentable fact no one will deny. But this period of forced adherence was for only 123 years. Prior to subjugation by Russia, Lithuania had a glorious history of national independence, reaching far back into the distant past.

In the 13th century King Mindaugas, one of Lithuania's great kings, succeeded in defeating the Knights of the Sword, the Ruthenian princes, and the invading hordes of Tatars. A baptized Christian, Mindaugas was crowned King of united Lithuania. In the 14th century Lithuania, under the kingship of Gediminas, consolidated the Lithuanian state, succeeded in maintaining an effective defense against the predatory Teutonic Order, and expanded eastward into the Slavic lands conquered earlier by the Tatars. The successors of King Gediminas, the brothers Algirdas and Kestutis, ruled for a period of 32 years from 1345 to 1377. They expanded further the Lithuanian domain until it extended throughout nearly the entire area of the Dnieper and Dniester, stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. And then, under the rule of Vytautas the Great, the Lithuanian Empire, which comprised a geographic area equivalent to the combined area of modern France and Germany, reached the height of its glory. Christianization and westernization were advanced with remarkable success, and thus Lithuania became an integral part of the Western European cultural-religious community.

Prof. Clarence Manning, of Columbia University, has made this observation of Lithuania in the Middle Ages:

> The Lithuanians had established a power- and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tatars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Muscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

After the close of World War I, Lithuania again declared her independence and established a republic. Throughout the entire interwar period the Lithuanian nation prospered; and Lithuania took her place in the family of nations as a free and independent state. Having established diplomatic relations with the leading powers of the world, Lithuania played an active role in international relations. As a member of the League of Nations she joined with other nations in furthering world peace. Among her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania had the most cordial relations, which culminated eventually in the conclusion of the Baltic Entente.

Politically, the Lithuanian people proved their ability to govern themselves and to determine their own destiny. Economically, the Lithuanians prospered, expanding efficiently their economy to suit the needs of the nation. Nor were the Lithuanians wanting in social progress, for the Lithuanians were aware of the need for maintaining a strong social structure if freedom from want was to be achieved. In every respect, therefore, the Lithuanian people

marched far along the path of establishing a vigorous and prosperous state.

There are no grounds, therefore, for the argument advanced by Moscow's propagandists justifying incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union on the ground that Lithuania was formerly Russian property, and that the Soviets had a right to claim their lost heritage.

Lithuanians have had a glorious history of national independence; and while today we behold this unfortunate people bound in the chains of Soviet serfdom, we raise our voices in the hope that one day their nation will enjoy the freedom they once knew. In this people there is an inestimable quality of greatness—history has proven that. Let them, therefore, not be denied the destiny which they deserve.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and also commend him for the outstanding work he did as a member of the special congressional committee which in the 82d Congress investigated the Katyn massacre.

Mr. FLOOD. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, and wish to observe that the chairman of that very fine committee investigating the Katyn massacre was my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. May I state further that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], who just addressed the House, was a member of the special committee in the last Congress investigating the Communist aggression, and he contributed a wonderful service in the work of that committee.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Indiana on his untiring and effective work in exposing the menace—the inhumanities of the international Russian Communist conspiracy. The gentleman from Indiana is one of the strongest voices advocating a positive political offensive based on moral and political principles, which, I am convinced, is the only way that we can avoid an all-out world war III. We must pursue a true, forceful policy of liberation of the nations enslaved by Russian communism, if we are to achieve the goal of peace and freedom.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to thank the gentleman from Ohio. I might state that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] was a member of the special committee investigating Communist aggression in the 83d Congress and contributed magnificent service on that committee.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, all of us, of course, owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Indiana for making the proper arrangements today and affording us an opportunity to speak this afternoon on this anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, I do not want to take all the credit for reserving this time because the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] also had time reserved to pay tribute to Lithuania.

Mr. LANE. Yes, and I too, want to give him deserved credit which is due to him and to you also for your thoughtfulness in arranging this program here this afternoon so that we might have this opportunity afforded to us to say something in behalf of Lithuania.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to you and to the majority leader of the House today for having as Chaplain for today's session a Lithuanian-American, Very Rev. Msgr. Francis M. Juras, of Lawrence, Mass., who has served his flock for many, many years and who is familiar with the history of Lithuania and the struggles of the Lithuanian people. We are pleased that today when we are having this hour of tribute to Lithuania that the Chaplain who offered the prayer at the opening of today's session should be of Lithuanian extraction.

Like the early Christians who were true to their faith in spite of all the persecutions of the Roman Emperors, the people of Lithuania are loyal to their religion, their national independence, in spite of the Red terror.

Like imperial Rome, imperial communism wields temporary power, but it lacks the eternal spirit, which is bound to prevail.

The 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is celebrated in the catacombs of the human heart in every Lithanian who is living under the Communist occupation.

One million Americans of Lithuanian descent, and millions of others in the free nations of this earth, honor this anniversary in public affirming the right of Lithuania to be sovereign and self-governing.

This Baltic country is small in size, but large in character.

From its great and glorious past it draws strength to endure the trials of the present, and confident to prepare for the day of its inevitable liberation.

To the gallant people of Lithuania we send this message:

"You have legions of friends in the free world who have not forgotten, who will never lose sight of your just claims which are interwoven with our own goal of independence for all men.

"The overlords of the Kremlin do not trust each other. They are fearful of their own people, as well as the people of other nations that they hold in temporary captivity. The day of retribution will certainly come when their instruments of material power will be turned against them.

"People of Lithuania, be brave, be patient.

"Each day that passes brings your country closer to inevitable independence."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity of joining with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] in giving expression to my affection for the noble people of Lithuania. As chairman of the special congressional committee investigating the Katyn Forest massacre, the gentleman from Indiana performed one of the most prodigious and far-reaching missions in the history of the Congress of the United States. More than any one man in our times was he responsible for bringing into the daylight, where all the world could see, the dastardly deeds of savage tyranny. Today the name of Madden is a household word mentioned in affection and in reverence wherever, both in our own country and in foreign lands, men and women and children of the blood of Lithuania, Poland, and the other enslaved nations now reside. The great service that the statesman from Indiana has rendered in this field is shared by all in Congress since it was by the unanimous vote of this body that the special committee headed by Mr. MADDEN was created. I want to take this occasion to say publicly that which is in all our minds, the gentleman from Indiana by the masterful and courageous manner in which he performed his mission as chairman of the Katyn Committee has brought honor upon all of us who go to make up the membership of the Congress of the United States.

I am glad, too, that joining with the gentleman from Indiana in these observances of today is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] who represents the district in the city of Chicago in which reside more persons of Lithuanian blood and descent than in any other district in the great metropolis of Chicago. Congressman MURRAY's devotion to the cause of a free Lithuania is so well known among the Lithuanian-American population of Chicago that on Sunday last he was summoned back to his district to be the featured speaker at a monster mass meeting celebrating the Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, it is good not only for the cause of a free Lithuania, for the cause of a free Poland, for the sacred cause of bringing freedom to all the lands now enslaved, but it also is good and heartening to all those in these United States regardless of the countries from which our forebearers came that we have in the Congress of the United States such men as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY].

This is the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. What did the Lithuanians accomplish during the brief period in which they were their own masters and the government of Lithuania was of, for, and by the people of Lithuania? Let me give you a few figures: In two decades when Lithuania was free the number of primary schools was increased from 677 to 2696. There were constructed over 100 secondary schools, including 2 years of college; and 4,000 advanced students were enrolled at the great university at Kaunas. Every city in Lithuania of more than 5,000 population supported opera seasons with the world's great operas, many of them translated into Lithuanian, given under conditions making it possible for all who so desired to attend. Everywhere there were special schools for music, art, and ballet. Industry and commerce reached peaks never before attained in a country of a population of not many more than 3 million. Practically everyone owned

his own home or his own farm. This is the record made in 22 years when the people of Lithuania were free and the government of Lithuania was of, for, and by the people of Lithuania. No people in all the history of the world ever made a record surpassing that of the people of Lithuania when Lithuania was free.

There is something in the Lithuanian blood that will not tolerate injustice and that can withstand the most savage inroads of tyranny. The source of the spirit of freedom that is in the Lithuanian people goes back many, many years. It was 1,500 years before the birth of Christ that the Lithuanians came to settle themselves in Europe. It is said that the origin of the Lithuanian race is lost in the mists of time. Probably it came from the Himalayan Mountains of north India, one of the tribes belonging to the Aryan group of thousands of years ago. The settlement of Lithuanians in Europe was on the rolling plains along the shores of the Baltic Sea, a land of rich and fertile earth, heavily forested, and with wide rivers and many lakes. In modern times, it is described as a heart-shaped land of 33,000 square miles, lying between Russia and Germany, like a walnut in the jaws of a nutcracker.

From 1500 B. C. to this year of A. D. 1955 the Lithuanians have been a vital force for freedom in Europe and their descendents now numbering over a million who came to the United States of America have in this land of ours been a vital force for freedom.

When Tatar hordes swept out of the East, their objective being the overwhelming of Europe, the Lithuanians rallied to beat back the invaders. When to the west the Huns and other Germanic tribes came with fresh threats, again the Lithuanian people rallied and beat back the invading hordes.

In the first centuries after the birth of Christ, the worship of the Lithuanians was that of a pagan mythology. Perkunas was the god of thunder and lightning, Zemininkas the god of earth, and Vieshpats the god of life. Then came Christianity. One of the first of a long line of powerful Lithuanian leaders was King Mindaugas, who succeeded in gathering the other Lithuanian dukes under his banner and who 700 years ago was crowned King of Lithuania. For three centuries the unconquerable legions of Lithuania held the balance of power in eastern Europe. The word of the Lithuanian was law through much of what is now Poland and Germany and beyond Moscow in Russia.

In 1572, the Polish throne was given up and in 1795 the country was overwhelmed by the legions of Russia. There followed the tide of diplomatic intrigue, the Napoleonic wars and the oppression of the czars. Always did the Lithuanians refuse to accept their conquerors. Three times in the 19th century they rose and revolted against overwhelming odds. Again at the dawning of the 20th century they revolted, their spirit still beyond the power of tyranny to crush. Loyal freedom-loving Lithuanians were torn from their homes and thrown in the hell-holes of Siberia, but no power, no torture could quench their spirit.

Then in 1918 freedom came again to Lithuania. Again she was free to form her own government and take her place in the family of nations. In the 22 years of Lithuanian independence a record was written in successful self-government of which any people could be proud.

Today again Lithuania is in the enslavement of a brutal tyrant but the spirit of freedom, which centuries of oppression has never succeeded in crushing, lives on among the people of Lithuania.

On this anniversary day I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in sending across the seas to the enslaved people of Lithuania this message:

Be not discouraged, be not down-hearted. The night may be long and dark but the sun of the morning is soon to break upon you, your homes, and your land. We shall not fail you.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join with my fellow Representatives here today in paying tribute to the great people of Lithuania and our own Lithuanian-Americans who are celebrating the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Thirty-seven years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

In this year of 1955, our observance here is, unfortunately, shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that the Kremlin is using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and, perhaps, even for war, and a substantial part of the slave force has been kidnaped from Lithuania.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

We must dedicate ourselves today to the continuing revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania, so that the United Nations shall accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania. May God grant that this will be accomplished within the year.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today Americans of Lithuanian descent or origin, and Lithuanians all over the world, celebrate the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, which was proclaimed 37 years ago. But there is no celebration in the homeland, except perhaps clandestinely, for Lithuania has fallen a victim to the expansive thrust of Soviet Russian imperialism. This ancient and proud land, once a powerful kingdom, and between the 2 world wars a self-supporting, progressive, and enlightened republic, was occupied and betrayed by the Russian dictatorship during the period of Nazi-Soviet collaboration. There followed 3 years of harsh German occupation, and then the Soviet yoke, under which Lithuania still languishes, was again imposed.

But Lithuanians have never ceased resisting their Russian oppressors, and the United States has never recognized this cynical Russian absorption of a friendly smaller nation. Today the Russians have established a military zone for 50 kilometers inland from the coast of Lithuania, in an effort to terrorize the people into compliance, and to seal off the escape of Lithuanians who will not live under dictatorship. They have deported thousands, and they have liquidated thousands. They have despoiled property owners, they have persecuted religious believers, and they have subjected the Lithuanian people to incessant propaganda and political oppression.

But terror and brainwashing have thus far failed. The Lithuanian people are no more ready today to accept Russian tyranny than they ever were. Their example can serve as an inspiration to those other unwilling peoples who groan under Soviet servitude, and an object lesson in fortitude and courage to those of us fortunate enough to be free.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE LITHUANIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the Lithuanian declaration of independence of February 16, 1918, three important principles are clearly established. In the first place, the declaration called for "the reestablishment of an independent Lithuanian state." Secondly, the declaration made it clear that this new state was to be founded on a democratic base. And, finally, the declaration proclaimed "the abolition of all political ties which have existed with other peoples."

In 1918 Lithuania reclaimed for herself the status of a nation-state as a right

based not only upon the democratic principle of self-determination of peoples but also upon historical fact. Centuries before the period of Russian domination Lithuania was an independent state and at one time had an empire stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Thus, when Lithuania declared her independence in 1918, she could point to a glorious historical past as substantial evidence of her right to national independence.

Moreover, the new Lithuanian state was to be founded on a democratic base. During the period of independence the Lithuanian people, despite some internal difficulties, maintained a high regard for not only the forms but also the ideals of democracy and endeavored to put into practice these forms and ideals.

Finally, by their declaration of independence the Lithuanians cut all the ties that bound them to the Russian Empire. Significant is the fact that the Soviet Russian Government recognized the independent status of Lithuania in the treaty of peace July 12, 1920, and, moreover, pledged its word in this treaty and in subsequent engagements to respect the territorial integrity and national independence of Lithuania.

The pledged word of Soviet Russia, the Lithuanian people found, could not be relied upon. For in June 1940 the Soviets broke every treaty engagement they concluded with Lithuania with utter disregard for international law. As a consequence, Lithuania lost her cherished independence; the democratic base of the Lithuanian state was replaced by Soviet totalitarianism; and finally, the ties that Lithuania had cut loose and denounced in February 1918 reenveloped her, reducing the Lithuanian people to the most abject servitude.

On this 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the free world takes notice of the gravity of Soviet aggression and Soviet oppression in Lithuania. In the case of Lithuania the free world sees Soviet imperialism in its most outrageous form. Today the Lithuanian people are held in the grip of the greatest tyranny of modern times. For these courageous, but unfortunate people, all the free world raises its voice in a common plaint of righteous indignation. It is problematical what the future has in store for Lithuania; but of one thing the Lithuanian people can be sure: They have the sympathy and good will of all the free world.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to salute the spirit of courage and hope exemplified by the people of Lithuania, who have vowed that some day they will be free again. Today marks the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is appropriate that we should take occasion on this anniversary to observe that, while the people of Lithuania may be enslaved physically by the Communists, the Soviets have never succeeded in imprisoning their souls. They have never succeeded in destroying their determination to regain their freedom.

It has been well said that the Russians are in possession of satellite governments, but they are not in possession of satellite peoples. Therein lies the fatal chink in the Communist armor. As long as the fires of freedom burn in human hearts, as long as the passion for escape from the Soviet yoke lives in the souls of the oppressed, Communist dictatorship is in peril.

No European people better demonstrate the determination to be rid of Communist oppression than the Lithuanians. These people want their freedom. They are entitled to it. The annexation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia should not be recognized by the free world.

Soviet attempts to beat the Lithuanian spirit into line have been miserable failures. They have failed in spite of continuing deportations under the guise of volunteering for labor elsewhere; collectivization and slave labor camps. Not even wholesale murder of resistant groups has beaten Lithuania into spiritual submission. Nor will it do so, because these are people who treasure freedom more than life itself.

As one who assisted materially in the passage of the Baltic resolution through the House 2 years ago, I express my appreciation of the fine work it accomplished. It exposed for all to see the oppressive spirit that the Soviets displayed to the Baltic States.

The people in Lithuania, suffering under the heel of Communist oppression, are unable to fittingly observe this anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

They must know in their hearts, however, that the more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in this free land are observing what their forebears are denied under the ruthless Soviet dictatorship.

And as they express renewed determination and hope that the land of their fathers shall eventually be free again, they must be comforted by the knowledge that their aspirations are shared by the great masses of the people of America, and, indeed, by freedom-loving souls everywhere in the world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, 37 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania joined to establish an independent republic for themselves. Today that republic lives only in the hearts of those who have survived the crushing oppressions of enslavement by the Communists, and in the firm resolve of the sons of Lithuania, and her many friends, in other parts of the world. But it is a living thing nonetheless, and on this anniversary it is fitting for us once again to assure the Russian conqueror that the cruel distortions he has wrought upon the face of Europe will not be forever tolerated by the community of free men.

The history of these small and peaceable nations that were launched so confidently in the aftermath of World War I is fraught with great tragedy. They were innocent victims, caught from the very outset in the middle between wicked forces which they could not hope to withstand. They have been the victims of every tyranny that has emerged around them.

Mr. Speaker, we are the great Nation which has never gobbled up a small neighbor or ally. We have stood resolutely for the principal of self-determination for all peoples, for the proposition that all men are created equal. It is important that we keep affirming this principle, and that we miss no chance to demonstrate that we have not forgotten our friends who are enslaved by the Communist monster at this moment. We shall never forget them. And we shall never waver from the high purposes and the great resolves which have made the United States of America a symbol of light and hope and liberty throughout the modern world.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD at this point regarding Lithuanian independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, 37 years ago today the valiant peoples of Lithuania proclaimed their independence.

Within that period of time, they have twice been under the domination of ruthless invaders and even now they are struggling to throw off the cloak of tyranny imposed by the Soviets.

The indomitable spirit of this freedom-loving country will continue to survive, and I am confident Lithuania, together with the many other countries behind the Iron Curtain, will one day again live and work under her flag of freedom.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 37th anniversary of the establishment of Lithuania's freedom.

While it is not possible for the people of Lithuania to celebrate this occasion openly, many Lithuanians throughout the free world, and Americans of Lithuanian descent will observe the anniversary of that independence day. In publicly honoring this anniversary we give renewed hope and determination to those now enslaved and deprived of their fundamental rights and liberties.

Human dignity can be suppressed for so long, but the spirit of freedom still burns behind the Iron Curtain, and the quiet force of resistance is at work awaiting the day when Communist domination can be swept from the face of the earth.

Lithuania's history indicates that she has endured aggression and domination before, and has survived her conquerors. Soviet tyranny cannot outlive the desire of the Lithuanians to be free, and the day is not far distant when the cause of justice will triumph over the forces of oppression and terror, and Lithuania will be numbered once more among the family of free nations.

We in the United States treasure our independence and recall the bitter obstacles which had to be overcome before we could establish ourselves as a free Nation.

We feel that Lithuania is entitled to self-determination and with continued fortitude and patience will reestablish herself as the free and independent Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a message sent to the Lithuanian Ameri-

can Information Center upon the occasion of the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence:

I am glad to join with my colleagues in Congress to send greetings to you on the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Freedom is indivisible. No man can be truly free unless his fellowmen are equally so. Out of this awareness we Americans who, by the grace of God enjoy the benefits of freedom, must express our warmest sympathy for those deprived of that blessing and extend our hope that this deprivation will not, with God's help, long endure.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] for having reserved this time today to mark the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

I also congratulate the gentleman from Indiana for the splendid statement which he has made.

Last Sunday it was my high privilege to address the Lithuanian-American Council of Greater New York and I ask that my remarks on that occasion be included at this point in the RECORD.

I should also like to have included in the RECORD at this point, a splendid address delivered by the Honorable Jonas Budrys, the Consul General of Lithuania, who also spoke in New York last Sunday before the Lithuanian-American Council of Greater New York:

We are meeting this Sunday to celebrate the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence day—which actually occurs this coming Wednesday, on February 16.

It is one of the saddest commentaries of our time that this anniversary of the establishment of the Lithuanian Republic is being celebrated only in the free world, outside of Lithuania. Inside the stricken land to which our thoughts are turned this week, independence day can be celebrated only secretly, and only in the hearts of the brave people who still continue to endure the black night of slavery which has befallen all who exist behind the Iron Curtain.

So, this is not a day for celebrating; this is a day for remembering.

It is now 15 years that the survivors of the Lithuanian people have endured the Soviet aggression that robbed them of their freedom. It moves me to wonder how many of them today—after a decade and a half—are remembering with us that this is an anniversary of independence day, that this was the day for which the Lithuanian people had yearned and dreamed and fought for 120 years under Czarist Russian oppression. Or, do they only remember it today as a lost and beautiful dream of long ago?

Where are the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain today? A few months ago, those of us who were in Europe with the House Committee on Communist Aggression heard the answer from a lady who escaped to freedom just 12 months ago.

From the cities and large towns of Lithuania, she told us, Lithuanian names and Lithuanian faces have largely disappeared. In the farming areas, Lithuanian faces are still a majority, but a dwindling one as the deportations continue. It almost can be said that Lithuania is no longer Lithuanian.

If you would find the Lithuanian people today you would have to seek all over the vastnesses of Siberia and central Asia to which those who lived have been deported.

Why this genocide of the Lithuanian nation? Why this inhuman deed against humanity? Compare the map of 1940 with the map of 1950, and in the changes you will see how close the Soviet Union already is to its goal of turning the Baltic Sea into a Soviet lake.

This was a dream the Czars of Russia also had—to turn the Baltic into a domestic lake. This lay behind the Russian invasion and conquest of Lithuania 155 years ago.

But as long as the Lithuanian people remained on Lithuanian soil, the dream of the Russian Czars was frustrated. They could not Russify the Lithuanian people, and so the Russian Czars could never feel secure in their toehold on the Baltic Sea.

But the Soviet Communists knew a brutal answer to the stubborn love of the Lithuanian people for their soil, their nation, their language, and their culture.

That brutal answer was made 15 years ago by NKVD Gen. Ivan Serov, who issued the infamous Serov order which deported hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians from their homes and native soil and dispersed them all over the wastes of Siberia.

A few days ago the name of Serov was heard again as another struggle for power convulsed the snake pit in the Kremlin. The same Serov, having succeeded the late and unlamented Beria as head of the Soviet secret police system, has now emerged as the close henchman of Khrushchev, the new Communist tyrant, and today Serov stands as one of the top less than half a dozen masters over the hundreds of millions who live today under the Communist yoke.

Fifteen years ago the world was too preoccupied with other troubles to take note of the words of an obscure Soviet emissary to occupied Lithuania—a certain Professor Kirsanov who told Lithuania's intellectuals to give up their resistance and submit to the Soviet Union.

Professor Kirsanov's words, which live today in the evidence gathered by our recent Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression, should have been heard and heeded by the whole world. For this is what he said:

"Peter the Great was the first monarch who understood the interests of Russia: to occupy the Baltic countries and to come nearer to the Atlantic Ocean. Some people may call the Soviet Union an imperialist country. Yes, we are the vanguard of the proletariat and in this sense imperialists. But destiny or by its spirit the peoples of the Soviet Union are marching by way of revolution and communism in order to save the world. The Baltic countries were occupied by force because they were not ripe for bolshevism, but we Bolsheviks, we shall not consider and we do not consider what means are to be used until every foot of land and every person is under the shadow of the red flag. The early and at the same time honorable incorporation of the Baltic peoples into the Soviet Union is not an accidental event but a logical consequence of the Communist-Bolshevik policy and its liberation of peoples. Drop your dream of liberation. The Soviet Union will march through the world even through ruins and fire."

Fifteen years ago this ominous cloud, the world thought, hovered only over the Baltic States. Today, the world knows that same ominous shadow hovers over the whole earth.

During the past week this ominous shadow, it seems to me, has grown more portentous. During the past week Malenkov, who succeeded Stalin, was stripped of his power and was succeeded in the real seat of power by Khrushchev, the first secretary of the Soviet Communist Party—the position, it should be remembered, from which Stalin also rose to the pinnacle of power.

The heresy which apparently tripped Malenkov was the policy he advocated of building up the consumer goods industries of the Soviet Union so as to enable him to give more material satisfactions to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

To those of us who had heard witnesses by the hundreds testify before our congressional Committee on Communist Aggression last year and who, thereby, had learned of the widespread spirit of disaffection that exists everywhere behind the Iron Curtain, Malenkov's policy of bringing more material satisfactions to the people was most meaningful.

It meant, obviously, an effort to woo and win the subject peoples under the Communist heel. This might have promised an amelioration of the suffering for the people who today must live under that Communist heel. And it even might have meant a long period of peace in the world.

But this policy has now been rejected. The demotion of Malenkov and the elevation of Khrushchev means that the soulless fanaticism of the Communist Party has emerged triumphant again.

For the people behind the Iron Curtain it means that they must go hungry, ill shod and ill housed again while the heavy industry that produces the weapons of war is given priority. And for the people of the free world it means they must continue to live under the Damoclean sword of Communist aggression. It means that the echo of the words of Professor Kirsanov, as he spoke them 15 years ago in the Lithuanian capital city of Kaunas, rings louder even than the day he spoke them.

We must remember his words in this sentence: "Some people may call the Soviet Union an imperialist country. Yes, we are the vanguard of the proletariat and in this sense imperialists."

And we must remember his words in still another sentence: "The Soviet Union will march through the world even through ruins and fire."

In these words reigns incarnate the real spirit of Communist fanaticism, from which has germinated as one of the flowers of evil Soviet imperialism and Communist aggression.

Had the world taken deeper heed of the experience of Lithuania 15 years ago, had the world listened and understood the words I have just quoted to you, think how much better off the free world might have been today. And there is still much the world can learn from the tragic experience of Lithuania.

As I said before, this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day is not so much a time for celebration as it is a time for remembering.

Let us remember these facts; that:

Lithuania was occupied by the Soviet Army upon the expiration of a 9-hour ultimatum on June 15, 1940.

Faced with an alternative of either opposing the unprovoked Russian aggression or of salvaging the vestiges of independence by accepting the ultimatum, the Lithuanian Government elected to attempt a full-scale collaboration with Russia, still being hopeful that the Kremlin would respect at least some of its solemnly pronounced international obligations.

In taking this line of action, the Lithuanian Government was fully aware that any armed resistance against the overwhelmingly stronger Red army would only lead, sooner or later, to an internment of the Lithuanian army in East Prussia and its surrender into protective custody of Nazi Germany—a perspective which Lithuania regarded with even greater dread.

In scarcely more than a month, Moscow once more turned Lithuania into a Russian province.

And the United States, first among the free nations of the earth, uttered the words of which every American can be proud today. The statement was made by Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles, and he said:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small republics—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors,

have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known.

"The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force.

"They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relationship between nations, the rule of reason, of justice and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved."

And I say to you that we cannot do better than to repeat these solemn and ringing words of Sumner Welles today as expressing the unchanging and unshakeable position of the American people.

ADDRESS BY JONAS BUDRYS, CONSUL GENERAL OF LITHUANIA, AT A GATHERING COMMEMORATING THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, WEBSTER HALL, NEW YORK., SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1955

Once again, we have come to our most important and meaningful national day, and we commemorate it solemnly. For 22 years, this was a carefree holiday, the day of your deepest joy.

Our happiness was justified; each year, our Lithuania had grown more beautiful, more endowed in all the attributes that make a nation rich. Our future course always seemed easier, and the pace of progress to be accelerating. Easier because, each year, we gained several tens of thousands of new workers, idealistic and patriotic, deeply devoted to their country and determined to apply their newly acquired education and all their skills in her cause. These workers were not simple drudges; through their awareness of their goal, their creative energy, the faces of our cities and villages transformed themselves with astonishing rapidity, and our nation began to flourish.

Now it has been almost 15 years since our Lithuania was enslaved, but the Lituanian world has not stopped commemorating the 16th day of February. In Lithuania, in the mines and on the taigas of Siberia, Lithuanians mark it in their hearts. The free world, and we, the Free Lithuanians, are their hope and aspiration.

Lithuania is an old nation; possessed of a great past—a cultured nation, with a free history of over 700 years, entitled to Europe's credit for her defense against the Tatars; a nation which has demonstrated her quality of mind in sheltering within herself the refugees from neighboring oppression, in having provided haven for persecuted Jews from Europe's farthest reaches, and in having given these people not only homes but land and occupations.

When Lithuania once again returned to the fellowship of free nations, she warmly cooperated with other nations, fulfilled her duties, honored her treaties, and met her obligations.

Can such a nation, such a people, in this age, be permitted by the free world to disappear—to be cruelly exterminated?

The free world is ruled by justice. Does not the simple security of the free world demand the liberation and return to Western Europe, where they belong, of all the independent nations possessed of western culture and civilization? Nations which, from the Baltic to the Adriatic, have fallen into the captivity of the twentieth century Khans?

What of the hopes that suffering Lithuania places in us, Lithuanians, who are free? Do we not have debts, obligations, and duties toward our brothers and sisters? Our duty is not only to boast of and hearten ourselves with our great past, but to demonstrate, with our works and our lives, that that past is still, today, a fit measure of our nation's worth. Scattered through all the continents, it is the duty of Lithuanians to speak to the world of suffering Lithuanians.

The majority of those of us who are refugees from oppressed Lithuania have graduated from or availed themselves of the education provided by Lithuania's schools. Free Lithuania encouraged education, gave it to all who sought it, and even provided for finished educations abroad. He to whom much has been given has also incurred an obligation, and it is good to see that our people understand this, and follow the course of their duties.

This is why, even now, the 16th of February retains its meaning, and its commemoration continues to hold a grave purpose. Through today's observance, we express our solidarity with oppressed Lithuania, we strengthen our will and her will to be faithful to the ideals of the 16th of February, we swear to keep vigil over and fight for our homeland's liberation, and we hold the sacred hope that Lithuania shall be free.

On this occasion, the Minister of Lithuania to the United States, Povilas Zadeikis, conveys his sincere greetings to all of you assembled here.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. As an American of Polish descent, I know something of the history of the Lithuanian people, since it ties in so closely with the history of its neighbor, Poland. This is particularly true about the time the Jagiello dynasty started in Poland.

The people of both of these great nations are well known for their love of freedom. As days go by, we read in the papers of a flier escaping from Poland, families leaving Lithuania in small boats to cross the treacherous seas, to get away from Communist oppression.

Time and again the people of Lithuania, as those of Poland, have had to face and resist invaders from other countries. Their homes have been destroyed, their families separated, churches desecrated, farms devastated by barbaric hordes. Today is no exception. Today Lithuania suffers under the heel of Soviet tyranny. Lithuania has become a vast concentration camp for its liberty-loving but helpless inhabitants. Thousands of its people have been deported to distant areas of the Soviet Union. All means are being used to destroy the will and love of freedom of the Lithuanian people. I know these people, however. They will not let this happen, for they love their liberty above all other values.

We who are familiar with the plight of the people behind the Iron Curtain should do all we can to bring their plight before the other peoples of the world. There are many who do not want to believe possible all that is going on behind the Iron Curtain. To show these people just what is occurring, the Kersten committee should be revived. This committee should investigate the Communist occupation of all nations in Europe. This is one way in which we can fight the Soviet Union and expose the methods of genocide that they are practicing in the occupied countries. What the modern day needs is to be shocked into the realization that the tactics of Attilla the Hun have become the common order of the day in the story of these nations.

In celebrating the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we are showing those people that we aim to keep alive their hopes for freedom. We know that they will continue to resist in every practicable way at their disposal and with courage and fortitude the ones who would enslave them. I know they will, and can, survive, and their will to be free will, in the end, overcome the guns and tanks of the oppressors.

I can assure you that all of us who are aware of what these great people are suffering are thinking of them, and our prayers are going out to them.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud to join my colleagues today in this commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

With their country still writhing under the heel of the oppressor, the people of Lithuania commemorate today with all the fortitude and hope of that ancient land the 37th anniversary of their declaration of independence.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council—Taryba—in consultation with American Lithuanians, proclaimed their country to be free and independent.

It has been said that down through the centuries the Russians have been to other countries of Eastern Europe something like a locust plague that would always return from time to time. In 1940 the locusts returned to the fair land of Lithuania but with a far greater capacity and skill in oppression. Through the use of the purge and mass deportations the Russian commissars have done their best to accomplish their mission from the Kremlin. But they have failed to conquer the spirit of freedom that has been nurtured for centuries by the Lithuanian people. The sad years of Communist domination have confirmed what the world has long known about the indomitable spirit and faith of this ancient people.

Russian occupied and oppressed Lithuania has given America more than a million sons and daughters of the best stock of her nation. I have seen how they have helped to build America's industrial might in the great arsenal of democracy in the Pittsburgh area. They have made important contributions to the cultural, civic and professional life of the community.

Let us look forward to the day when Lithuania will once again be free and we will celebrate as well as commemorate the anniversaries of her independence.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on this 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence our hearts go out to the persecuted Lithuanian people. On this oc-

casion I would like to focus attention upon one phase of the persecution which they have endured since the forced annexation of their country by the Soviet Union during the war—and that is the persecution of religion. Since the Red army occupied Lithuania in a ruthless and calculating manner the Soviet authorities have persistently carried on a campaign to destroy religion, to wipe out every manifestation of it, and to transplant in its stead the atheistic, materialistic philosophy of communism.

Lithuania, a nation rich in religious traditions, prior to the Soviet annexation was largely Roman Catholic with over 80 percent of the population of nearly 3 million adhering to that faith. The remainder was comprised of Lithuanians professing the Lutheran, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox religions. Mindful of the need for a strong religious foundation to insure the moral and ethical vitality of the nation, the Lithuanian people had the wisdom to establish constitutional conditions conducive to the growth of a vigorous religious outlook. In independent Lithuania freedom of religion was guaranteed by the constitution. Religious groups were free to propagate their faith, conduct religious services, maintain places of public worship, and administer educational institutions. In 1927 a Concordat was concluded with the Vatican in which Lithuania established diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Such was the wholesome religious atmosphere in Lithuania in the period following her declaration of independence. Such was the religious character of the Lithuanian nation. By constitutional guaranty, freedom of religion prevailed. In every way the practice of religion and its development within the nation were encouraged. Thus, the Lithuanian people were grounded in a strong and virile religious and moral ethic.

The Soviet conquests of Lithuania in 1940 and again in 1944 have threatened the heart and core of Lithuanian religious life. As a consequence of the corroding processes of Sovietization the soul of the Lithuanian nation has been exposed to the gravest peril.

Bishop Vincentas Brizgys, the former Roman Catholic Bishop of Kaunas and presently a resident of Chicago, has given a vivid account of the extent to which religion is persecuted within so-called Soviet Lithuania. On June 25, 1940, 10 days after the first Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Moscow abrogated the Concordat with Rome, and the Papal Nuncio was ordered to leave the country by August 25. Thus the Lithuanian link with the Vatican was broken and the Catholic Church was isolated. Shortly thereafter, Bishop Brizgys stated, all private hospitals, schools, kindergartens, charitable institutions, orphanages, and the like were seized and the personnel arrested by Soviet authorities. Furthermore, the religious press was suppressed within the first week of the occupation; and religious books and other printed matter were banned or destroyed. All seminaries were seized, and monasteries taken over. All bishops and chancery staffs were expelled from their residences. A drive commenced on the observance of religious feast days. And then on April 25, 1941, the teaching of religion was absolutely forbidden throughout the entire nation.

Probably the most ruthless measure taken by the Soviet authorities in their anti-religious drive was the attempt to liquidate the clergy. According to Bishop Brizgys, 150 Roman Catholic priests were arrested in Lithuania during the first Soviet occupation. Within 1 year 16 were killed and 6 have since been missing without a trace of their whereabouts. The remainder were liberated by the Lithuanian partisans when the Russo-German war began in June 1941.

When in 1944 Lithuania was again forceably brought into the Soviet Union, the Soviet military authorities displayed some toleration of religion while the war continued. After the war, however, anti-religious measures were again imposed with the same thoroughness and brutality as they were during the first occupation. Bishop Brizgys declared that during the first 2 years after the war 4 Lithuanian Catholic bishops and 89 Lithuanian priests were arrested, and subsequently many additional priests were arrested.

With unrelenting determination the Soviets have continued and even accelerated the process of Sovietization in Lithuania. Nor has the Communist attack been solely centered upon the largest religious group, the Roman Catholics. Communism is uniformly hostile in theory and practice to all religions. Only for tactical reasons does it sometimes differentiate between Protestants, Catholics, Jews, or members of the Orthodox church. In Lithuania all religious groups have felt the heavy hand of the Soviet oppressor.

On this 37th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence we of the free world ought to reflect for a moment upon this time of troubles which has come upon the Lithuanian people. The Lithuanians are a people in jeopardy; they are a people fighting for their identity as a nation; they are a people struggling to keep alive even a spark of their religious spirit.

To this great people, let us, therefore, extend our hand in a symbolic gesture of everlasting friendship; let us raise our voices with those who like ourselves seek justice for the oppressed; and let us join with all the free peoples of the world in prayerful supplication that the soul of Lithuania shall always remain unconquered by its ruthless oppressors.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, not very long ago there flourished in the Baltic countries a modern democracy, Lithuania. It was a prosperous and vigorous industrial and agricultural country. Lithuania today does not enjoy that freedom.

This year, on February 16, will be the 37th anniversary of her independence, and nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent will hold commemorative services of the tragic plight. Today the enslaved people of this nation are pleading to the free world for the restoration of their freedom and the removal of the shackles of the communistic rulers.

At Vilna on February 16, 1918, after over a century of domination by the Russian czars, the independent Republic of Lithuania took its rightful place in the family of free nations, a place it enjoyed for 22 years until, with the advent of World War II, Lithuania was overrun by, in turn, Russian and Nazi aggressors. And in 1940 the Soviet Union began the systematic program, which we have come to recognize all too well—planned starvation, collectivization, and physical enslavement, which program continues to the present day.

The tightly guarded borders permit no chance of escape, or bring to the free world what deplorable conditions those gallant people must bear. Word has come from returning German war prisoners that annihilation of Lithuania is still going on, also the many deportations which began in 1941. The Communists have invented youth volunteer battalions to dispose of unwanted people and many are shipped to deep Siberia.

The so-called Communist land reform, the kolkhozes—theoretically peasant-owned farm operatives—now have been changed into Government-operated farms, or sovkhozes, consisting of from 2,500 to 12,000 acres each. The land is now 100-percent collectivized.

There are many more women than men employed in agriculture. For instance, on 1 kolkhoz consisting of 10,000 acres, there are about 500 women and about 200 men, most of them old. All the young men are recruited into the army, and after their service never seem to return to the kolkhozes.

Through social and material oppression, the peasant class has become the lowest in the country. They are hungry. All they produce they must give to the Government. Their own pay keeps them on the brink of starvation. All the farm produce goes to Russia, primarily to the Leningrad region, and the one-time very high production of farming in Lithuania has dropped more than 50 percent. Collectivization of the land, lack of interest, and deportations are the main reasons for agricultural disaster.

As the time passes, the Russian language becomes practically the official language of Lithuania. The youth is pressed to join the Communist youth and pioneer organizations, and there is intensive indoctrination of the youth through the schools. There are many special ideological schools for selected students; for instance, in 1 region with a peasant population of about 30,000, the Communists this autumn opened 9 political schools with 500 pupils.

The commissars and other high officials for almost every institution in Lithuania come from Russia.

The history of this brave and gallant little nation is written in the blood of its valiant patriots whose only desire was for freedom and independence and never reaching out to grab or annex neighboring territories. Today the same spirit of sacrifice is a dominant characteristic of the Lithuanian people.

It is a proud privilege that I can freely stand before you in this House of Representatives and join with you in saluting the Lithuanian people on their national independence day, and I pray that

it will not be too long before peace and freedom will be restored to Lithuania and the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, it is a year since last we met in this Chamber to commemorate an anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For all of us the year has passed altogether too rapidly—vanished into history. But for the men and women and children of Lithuania, it was a lifetime, an eternity of continued oppression under the heels of Communist invaders and rulers. There has been the watchful waiting for a break, as we Americans term developments along life's path as also in games and in politics. But the break has not appeared. If anything, the newest changes in the Kremlin will increase their anxiety and more hopefully will this God-fearing nation look to us for succor. I join with my colleagues today that a break, a changed attitude of promised independence and freedom, may somewhere be found and the Lithuanian people and their neighbors, the Poles, Estonians, and Latvians, may observe the next anniversary under better circumstances, under lessened hardships and encouraged hope that freedom and independence can again be realized.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as it has done each year in the past, the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore again celebrated the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This year, the 37th anniversary, was celebrated several days early—February 12—at Lithuanian Hall in Baltimore, and it was my privilege to be present at the observance.

With their fellow citizens throughout the country, Baltimoreans of Lithuanian descent mourn the continued enslavement of the Lithuanian nation and yearn and pray for its early liberation from the yoke of its Communist oppressors.

The history of Lithuania is one of constant struggle for freedom against invading forces, in many of which they successfully defeated their enemies. Their history again proves that no nation can take its liberty and freedom for granted, but can maintain them only by constant vigilance and strong national defenses against enemies from within and without. During its periods of enslavement, the flame of freedom was never extinguished, but continued to burn brightly until the nation was again free and independent.

During the periods of liberty and freedom, the nation made great strides in its economic, educational and cultural growth, and we, in Baltimore, are grateful for the many civic and cultural contributions which its peoples have made to our city. This observance gives us an opportunity to pause and reflect on the suffering of the enslaved Lithuanians and to consider what we, with other free nations, can do to encourage them during this time of oppression, and to bring about their eventual liberation. It also gives us the opportunity to study ways and means of helping them by liberalizing our immigration laws, arranging to accept displaced persons, and investigating further the seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Government and the crimes committed against them by that Government.

Mr. Speaker, I will extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the speech made at the anniversary banquet in Baltimore by the Honorable J. Kajeckas, counselor of the Lithuanian Legation, a resolution adopted on that occasion, and a brief outline of Lithuanian history.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 37th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. This memorable anniversary has been observed year in and year out by the Lithuanian people, and by all Americans of Lithuanian descent. In this manner, they have kept a spark of hope burning in their hearts—the hope that the day will soon come when an independent Republic of Lithuania will once again assume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is only fitting that we, the Congress of the United States pause for a moment in our deliberations and express our admiration for the staunch faith and undaunted courage of the Lithuanian people who have been suffering so greatly under the ruthless Soviet occupation, but who, in spite of this totalitarian oppression, have maintained their spirit and their devotion to the principles of freedom and democracy.

Let us, on this occasion, bolster their hopes in the eventual realization of their aspiration to resume their existence as an independent republic. The conscience of the free world will not be at rest until liberty and justice shall reign over the lands which are today enveloped by the dark clouds of Communist totalitarianism. To this end, we shall continue to devote our efforts.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to the gallant Lithuanian nation on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the independence of that country. My experience on the special Katyn Massacre Committee, and subsequently on the Kersten Committee on Communist Aggression, has given me access to facts which give astounding testimony to the great love for liberty and freedom of the Lithuanian people, and of their brave resistance to Communist aggression.

Those who still believe in the possibility of peaceful coexistence with brutal Communist tyranny, and with a regime which has no respect for solemn agreements, should read carefully the testimony and evidence submitted to the congressional Committee on Communist Aggression. They will learn that the occupation of Lithuania by the Communists began with a peaceful coexistence which soon was replaced by armed occupation, murders, and mass deportations.

On this 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania let us look realistically upon the situation as it exists in the world today. Appeasement and acts of weakness on our part can only bring closer to our doors the menace of Communist occupation as it is known today in Lithuania. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant Lithuanian nation and pray that we may have the wisdom and courage to face the future with faith and confidence in our ideals and in our way of life.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, several million Lithuanians—some in their homeland, others scattered throughout the world—are commemorating the anniversary of their national independence today, February 16. Many of them, because their government was seized in 1940 and because they are now in the tight grasp of the Soviet dictatorship, can celebrate it only quietly in their hearts. Others, although they can celebrate it freely, do so only with sadness, because they are exiles from their native country and, as such, are cruelly cut off from family and friends in their homeland.

Lithuania is so completely shut off from the free world by the Iron Curtain that it is difficult to obtain information about conditions there in recent years. It is known, however, that the Soviet system of collectivization and communization continues and that there has been deportation of large numbers of Lithuanians to remote parts of the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, in our own country, there are many Americans of Lithuanian descent and friends of Lithuania who work constantly to let the captive peoples know that they are not forgotten and that we in America are not reconciled to their fate. Our own President and our own Congress have decried, in ringing words, the heavy despotism of the Soviet rule and have brought a renewal of hope to the Lithuanian captive people and their families and friends abroad. The 83d Congress created what was called the House Baltic Committee, which studied the origin, development, and seizure of the Baltic States. This committee heard numerous witnesses and discovered new evidence of the ruthlessness of the Red regime in Lithuania. In this and other ways the Congress is exposing the harshness of Red rule and is vigorously stimulating men of good will to oppose the Communist tyranny.

The universal hope of all Lithuanians, in which we in America join, is that their small country will again be free and will again be able to pursue with renewed vigor and determination its democratic way of life. We congratulate loyal Lithuanians, in whatever part of the world they may be, on the steadfast spirit which has held them, month after month, and year after year, to the vision of a free homeland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as we pay tribute to the Lithuanian people today I wish to include a message which I sent to Mary M. Kizis, director, Lithuanian American Information Center, 233 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y. The message follows:

Throughout the United States today, Americans of Lithuanian descent are celebrating the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this occasion, I wish to extend warmest greetings and my very best wishes to the Lithuanians everywhere in their continued fight for freedom. Because of our common devotion to freedom and national independence, we in America feel a close tie with the people of Lithuania and are deeply sympathetic with them in their present distress. In the past I am grateful to have had the opportunity to express by

direct action by unwavering support of their cause and you and the members of your organization can depend upon my continued vigorous efforts and support of that legislation which will bring about liberalization of the Baltic Republics. I favor, and pledge my active assistance, in the setting up of a committee on Communist aggression when this matter comes before the House to investigate.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today as we commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day, I think it is appropriate for us to make a short review of some of the findings of the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of which I had the honor of being a member. For example in the third interim report of the committee which deals exclusively with the plight of the Baltic States, and which, therefore, has special application to Lithuania, the following two conclusions are reached:

First. The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U. S. S. R. Any claims by the U. S. S. R. that the elections conducted by them in July 1940 were free and voluntary or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal are false and without foundation in fact.

Second. That the continued military and political occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R. is a major cause of the dangerous world tensions which now beset mankind and therefore constitutes a serious threat to the peace.

I should like to emphasize that the reason for the world tensions today and the increasing threat of war rests squarely with the continued occupation of the Baltic States by the Russians. These tensions will undoubtedly continue to increase until the Russians get out of the Baltic States and all the other nations which they now enslave.

I am more convinced today than ever before that Lithuania shall regain its national independence and that that happy day is not far distant. I say this because the fate of Lithuanian independence is irrevocably tied to the fundamentals of the crisis which now faces civilization. That crisis is best described as the conflict between the forces of freedom and the forces of human slavery, the outcome of which will determine whether the world itself shall be all free or all slave. It is not possible for any period of time for the world to survive as half free and half slave. One or other of the forces now engaged in conflict must win.

The cause of Lithuania is tied to the cause of all the other non-Russian nations enslaved by the Russian Communists. I speak not only of Estonia and Latvia, but I mean Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and all the other non-Russian nations now within the tyrannical grip of the Russian autocrats. It is inconceivable to me that we, the people of the free world, can turn our backs on the terrible inhumanities that are now taking place within the modern-day empire of the Russian Communists. If we do make the terrible error of deserting these people to a fate which is worse than death itself, we shall surely be punished and would eventually have to face up to the strong possibility that we, as a Nation, ourselves would be very shortly in the chains of Moscow. I am sure that we, as practical-minded Americans, as well as being a free people, motivated by the highest moral and political principles, will never be contented until all the nations enslaved by communism regain their national independence and their complete sovereignty.

The events which have happened in the Kremlin during the past few days clearly show the tremendous unrest within the empire of communism occasioned by the resistance of the enslaved people. It has been said that the master criminals of the Kremlin are sitting on a powder keg. I believe this is an understatement of the facts. In my opinion these tyrants are sitting on an explosive force many times more powerful than the hydrogen bomb. I speak of the tremendous spiritual force that is pent up in the enslaved millions; I speak of the tremendous political force which is represented by the healthy nationalism which these millions of enslaved people represent. I speak of the explosive human force which is represented by the enslaved non-Russian nations and their people. This is the real powder keg within the empire of the Russian Communists. The masters of the Kremlin cannot get themselves off this powder keg and it is only a matter of time until it explodes in all its fury in the cause of human freedom.

I believe the time was never more opportune nor the situation more demanding for an all-out political offensive against the conspiracy of communism by the people of the free world. Such a political offensive, in my considered judgment, is the only course of action which gives reasonable hope of avoiding world war III. All of us seek the common goal of peace and freedom and we must, therefore, do everything in our power to prevent all-out war while at the same time maintaining and strengthening the forces of freedom.

I join in the hope that we, as a nation, may soon launch a real crusade for freedom in the form of a positive political offensive against the Kremlin as the only way to bring about the liberation of all the non-Russian nations and to avoid world war III.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the freedom-loving people of this world rejoice and weep over the plight of the Lithuanians—rejoice for their independence day and weep for their plight at this time.

It is one of the tragedies of modern time that Lithuania, among her sister countries, finds herself under the ruthless heel of one of the fiercest aggressors ever to curse the earth.

I am also sure that the American people feel as I.

Our only hope is that someday in the near future, by the intervention of divine providence, Lithuanians may enjoy again that freedom which is so close to their hearts.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the fine remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The 3 million Lithuanians, the millions of Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and Hungarians and others behind the Iron Curtain must draw some hope and confidence from what this Congress is saying and doing today.

I hope that our very serious problems in the Pacific do not distract and deter us in our effort to in a more substantial way help these entrapped peoples of Europe. Our most important product is our spirit of democracy. For it we must develop a stronger world market. The most effective market is among those peoples of the world who have sampled and loved its advantages and social benefits. Let us try in this Congress to do something more positive, something more concrete to restore democracy where it so fruitfully thrived.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this is the 37th year since the people of Lithuania declared their independence of Russia. Unhappily, once again they are in the grip of the savage Russian bear. But his grip is not mortal. Throughout her history Lithuania has known foreign tyranny, and she has survived. The tenacity of her people, their devotion to their culture and way of life, has been truly remarkable.

In 1919, by their own efforts, the Lithuanians drove Russian invaders from their soil. The Soviet Government then recognized Lithuanian sovereignty and independence, and renounced all rights there. But in a pattern that was to become all too familiar they unscrupulously broke their word, invaded the country, and incorporated it into the Soviet Union as the 14th Soviet Republic. A short period of German rule then ensued, and then the Russians returned in 1944. Since that time the Soviets have confiscated private property, they have persecuted religion, they have deported thousands of Lithuanians to Siberia, and killed thousands more. But they have not broken the spirit of the Lithuanian people, nor their desire for freedom and independence. The people of Lithuania look with hope, and we join them in that hope, that the day will come when Lithuania will once again be free, and resume her rightful place among the nations of the world.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today while Americans of Lithuanian origin are enjoying the pleasures and rights of a free society, their relatives and friends still living in the nation of their native rootage suffer under the leash of tyrannical communism. Approximately 5,000 miles, or 10 hours by modern jet time, separate those who exist in the little Baltic nation from those with similar national backgrounds living in the climate of free America.

Yet this separation of so few hours as judged by modern speeds is minute compared to the wide crevasse in their freedom and rights to live as men should. These people bearing the same nationality backgrounds, the same pride, ambitions and abilities which enable one to carve out the best life for himself and

those close to him are yet so far distant in opportunity and human liberty.

I think Lithuania, so small geographically yet so big in spiritual determination, symbolizes the struggle against oppressive bullies. This isn't the first time or the first nation so tenaciously picked on by one so drunk with power and ambitious with designs as Communist Russia. I hope and pray it will be the last.

Only the people of Lithuania know the burdens, the heartbreak and suffering which have been endured since Soviet Russia lowered the yoke of oppression on their shoulders. Their story is too long to forget and too solemn to lack inspiration. Let us hope that soon the great Lithuanian nation can again be restored to their rightful heritage of liberty and independence which was theirs 37 years ago.

I am happy to join those who today are sending their warmest regards and sincerest sympathy to those persons who through no fault of their own are not able to enjoy the fruits of individualism and independence.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Arvydas Kudirka, president, Waterbury chapter, of the Lithuanian Student Association:

LITHUANIAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION,
Waterbury, Conn., February 13, 1955.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you may know February 16, 1955, is the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

The people of Lithuania have been fighting communism since 1917, when they had to defeat its new forces to establish a free country.

Again this fight in blood against communism was renewed when Russia occupied Lithuania in 1940. For 15 years now Lithuanians have been fighting the Red demon with blood and word and will continue to do so until the Red aggressor is destroyed. We all know that Communist goals are to destroy the free world and establish despotism throughout it.

We, therefore, join forces with the free world so that together we can defeat the evils of communism and again restore peace and freedom of our native country, Lithuania, and the world.

The Lithuanian students of Waterbury, Conn., would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all your past considerations you have given us and our native country Lithuania.

We would be very grateful if you would continue to remember us and our cause in the future.

Respectfully yours,

ARVYDAS KUDIRKA.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to say that any nation that has withstood for more than a century and a quarter continued foreign domination and oppression from a ruthless and tyrannical neighbor and still survive, certainly deserves the praise of mankind. Such praise Lithuania deserves; for in spite of the fact that Lithuania has been occupied and ruthlessly dominated by Imperial Russia and Soviet Russia for periods totaling over 125 years this nation still lives.

In many respects the Lithuanian people today are ruled by a far more ruthless master than in the days prior to the foundation of the Lithuanian nationality when it was relegated to an inferior status in the days of czarist Russia; but the suppression exercised by the czar might well be termed moderate when compared to the suppression imposed by the Soviets.

In this 20th century our language has taken on a new word "genocide," which means the willful destruction of a nation and people. Genocide is the long-range objective of the Soviet rulers; it is to destroy the Lithuanian nation. Deportations of thousands of Lithuanian people and the resettlement of Russians and other Soviet peoples in Lithuania have thus far done much to change the ethnic character not only of that country but also of the other Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia. As part of its scheme of communization Soviet Russia had laid down a plan calculated to eradicate the Lithuanian national consciousness. Along with their plan to destroy the idea of Lithuanian nationality, the Communists are seeking to remold this once free and happy country in the image of the Soviet State.

That Lithuania is going through an epoch of great trial goes without saying. But the Lithuanian nation is a virile nation. It is a nation with a glorious historical past and a sense of national destiny for the future. It is a nation which has survived other oppressions and shall survive this one.

On this occasion commemorating the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the message of America is a message of hope that one day the Lithuanian people shall fulfill their national destiny and that they shall again enjoy the natural right of every nation to be free, as they once were, so that they can once more resume their tasks of development and progress, and pursue the happiness they once enjoyed as a free and independent people.

When I contemplate the friends I have of Lithuanian origin and their loyalty to the causes of freedom and justice in the United States, I know that by personal example they keep burning the flame of freedom in their native land.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1955, marks the 37th anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania, and I join with 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in saluting and encouraging the 3 million Lithuanians in that distressed country as they suffer under the iron heel of their Russian masters.

Lithuanians down through the centuries have dearly loved liberty and freedom, but it has been their unhappy lot to be deprived of such God-given rights under the mailed fist of one conqueror after the other as they were ruthlessly subjected to partition, devourment, and bitter persecution during the centuries of the existence of their beloved Lithuania.

History is replete with bloodcurdling accounts of the cruel persecution of the Lithuanian people who through their long and admirable history as industrious and peace-loving people have exhibited at all times a burning desire to live their lives in liberty and freedom.

In the great State of Pennsylvania, we have thousands of Americans of Lithuanian descent. Many of them, especially in my congressional district, have parents living here who have become naturalized citizens and with their American-born offspring constitute a virile and vibrant segment of the America we all love. Therefore, it is only natural that all Americans sympathize with the plight of the Lithuanian people in the homeland because our hearts are attuned to the spirit of liberty and independence purchased for us by the blood of our forefathers.

Mindful of the turbulent conditions of world affairs we join our prayers with those of the patient, brave, and persevering Lithuanian people in commemorating the 37th anniversary of their independence—an independence that was short-lived and wrested from them by cruel tyrants.

We realize that the future of all liberty-loving nations is threatened by the ruthless forces of world communism. Nevertheless, we know that all of us must cling firmly to our unshakable belief in almighty God and His mercy, confident that He will not desert us but will grant our supplications that the scourge of communism be erased from the earth so that human dignity among men and nations may be restored and that all God's children may live in the peace and harmony embodied in His teachings and reflected in His daily salutations while He dwelt on this earth—"Peace be to you."

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day, February 16, 1955, which is the 37th anniversary of the Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, it is fitting that we pause to pay tribute to the freedom-loving spirit which has always motivated that small nation, and give voice to our belief that such a spirit has not and will never be crushed by foreign tyranny.

Lithuania's independence came as a blessing for its people won after centuries of subjugation under a staggering succession of alien despotisms. For 22 years thereafter, the people of Lithuania knew the, to us, commonplace pleasures of self-government and experienced the pride which citizens of a state entitled to an honored place among other free nations may justly feel.

In 1940, however, as a result of a secret conspiracy with Nazi Germany, and taking advantage of the collapse of political and military order in Europe, the government of the U. S. S. R. forcibly invaded the Republic of Lithuania. Following the Soviet imperialistic plan, the legal government was supplanted by Communist-controlled puppets, and in due course Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thereby began a new and more infamous era of foreign tyranny and oppression for this heroic people.

The Government of the United States has steadfastly refused to recognize the cowardly usurpation of the sovereignty of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and in so doing we continue to reaffirm our belief that the many years of struggling and suffering which the people of Lithuania have endured without abandoning their hope for the eventual restoration

of their nation's independence have not been in vain.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to extend my greetings in honor of the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania this February 16.

The plight, the privation, and the hardships endured by those nations swallowed up in the shadows of the Iron Curtain remind all of us in the free world that we must continue to recognize the Soviet plague for the cruel design it cuts in the face of humanity and decency. No one knows better of these tyrannies than those enslaved in such countries as Lithuania.

The reports we receive from these countries tell us of forced labor, murdering of anti-Soviet resistant forces, the collectivization of prosperous farmland, and in short, man's inhumanity to man. Truth again becomes stranger than fiction in this tragic russification of the brave once free Republic of Lithuania.

As a Member of this great Congress, I join with others paying tribute to the cause of freedom and independence and in the prayer that Lithuania, through the continued spirit of her citizenry and the unwavering voice of America and the free world, will once more cast off the shackles of this bondage.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is being observed on February 16. The little Baltic state was established as an independent nation in 1918, only to have its freedom and existence snuffed out in 1940 by the Soviet Union which has since enslaved its people and destroyed every vestige of their independence.

In the years since 1940, the people of Lithuania have paid a tremendous toll in human suffering and destruction at the hands of a ruthless oppressor. The culture of this little Baltic country is gradually being wiped out, its churches destroyed, and its people are subject to mass purges and deportations. Yet, despite all this suffering and subjugation, the spiritual and moral resources of the Lithuanian people have not been exterminated, nor has its indomitable desire for national freedom been extinguished.

The fake annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic states has never been recognized by the United States. The American people have followed with great sympathy the plight which has befallen the Lithuanian people and we have on numerous occasions raised our voice in their behalf.

On this occasion, the 37th anniversary of their independence, we extend our greetings and encouragement for their righteous cause. The American people hope and pray for their early liberation from Communist tyranny. We renew our solidarity with this heroic people in their struggle against the forces of evil.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the House to the fact that today is the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

The small but fiercely proud Baltic country won her independence after World War I, to the plaudits of the whole world. For 22 years her people enjoyed the fruits of freedom, and under freedom Lithuania became an outstanding member of the family of free nations. A successful land reform program, coupled with the intelligence and industry of her farmers, converted the country from a merely self-sustaining nation to an exporting nation; universal education swiftly reduced illiteracy from 64 percent to 15 percent, as the number of children in grammar schools rose from 45,000 to 300,000. Her state opera, the theater, and the ballet added cultural luster to her economic and commercial development.

In 1940, the Soviet Government drew the Iron Curtain down on Lithuania, thinking to snuff out the people's will to freedom.

It has not succeeded. The Lithuanians, like their Baltic neighbors, the Latvians and Estonians, have never ceased to resist subjugation. It was a proud day for our own country when we determined not to recognize the conquest of these three republics by the voracious Soviet bear, but to sustain the spirit of freedom within them by continuing recognition of the republics. All of us share with them the hope that the spirit of freedom will not die, and that the day of liberation is not too far distant.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1955, marks the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Although the freedom that once belonged to Lithuania has been taken from her by Soviet Russia, the Lithuanian people are united in their determination to again establish their complete independence.

There are 3 million Lithuanians living in their rugged and admirable homeland. Here in America we have over 1 million Lithuanian citizens who have greatly proved their quality, their fineness, and their strength as citizens of our American Republic. All Lithuanians are united today, including those in the homeland and those here in America, in the celebration of this 37th anniversary of their independence.

During her independence, 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was an exemplary nation and an honored member of the family of free nations, honorably fulfilling all her obligations. Her land reform act of 1922, the first in all Europe, was one of the most important events in her history as 73 percent of her population was engaged in agricultural pursuits. This land reform act lessened greatly the influence of Communist propaganda. Universal compulsory education—1930—reduced the illiteracy from 64 to 15 percent. From 1919 to 1939 the number of pupils in grammar schools alone rose from some 45,000 to nearly 300,000. Economically, her great progress in dairying and hog production transformed Lithuania from a self-subsisting nation to a commercial type one. Her rapidly developing cooperatives raised the standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry. Lithuania's state opera, the theater, and ballet attracted internationally famous conductors and artists and added luster to the culture of this ancient nation.

Then came the Soviets on their drive to world domination. Today a rigid censorship conceals from the world the continuing deportations under the guise of volunteer work elsewhere, collectivization, the slave labor camps, the russification and colonization by Russian elements, the systematic efforts of the Soviet occupational regime to merge Lithuania organically into the Soviet system, the extermination of the hostile native anti-Soviet element by killings of the resistant groups.

In this great struggle for independence, Lithuania has not given up. She still fights on. Little does Communist Russia realize the strength of heart and determination of the spirit of the Lithuanian people. These stalwart people know they have a friend in America. They know the Government and the people of the United States are with them all the way. Never has the Government of the United States recognized the annexation of Lithuania by Communist Russia, just as the United States Government has never recognized the annexation of Latvia or Estonia under their rule and domination. It is my view that the United States Government will stand firm in this position, and that the people of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors may rest assured the United States will never recognize the incorporation of these wonderfully fine small Baltic countries into the Soviet Communist Union.

On this anniversary day I extend my congratulations to the people of Lithuania. In doing this I say to them, "Hold fast to your faith, and hold fast to your hope and courage, for with these necessary qualities I am positive the sun will again shine on an independent Lithuania and a happy nation of Lithuanian people living in freedom."

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, and I am happy to have the opportunity of paying tribute to the people of that gallant little nation. During her brief period of independence, from 1918 until 1940, she made great progress in economics and education, and outstanding achievements in commerce, agriculture and industry. It was with a deep sense of satisfaction that we watched this young republican government honorably fulfill her obligations as a member of the family of free nations.

Unfortunately, this period of freedom came to an abrupt end when, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Army marched in and took over. Since that day, her people have endured untold hardships at the hands of the aggressor. The American people have never recognized the incorporation of the free Republic of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We have the highest respect for this noble people who are deprived of so many freedoms as a country behind the Iron Curtain and a genuine interest in her welfare. Her spirit has not been crushed, and her present bondage will be an inspiration for future generations to carry on with that indomitable spirit that has brought her through so many trying situations in the past. It is the hope of all of us that one day soon Lithuania will again throw off the yoke of the oppressor and take her rightful place among the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, today is a memorable day for all people of Lithuanian descent. It is Lithuanian Independence Day.

It is a day of mixed emotions for these gallant and freedom-loving people.

They are happy at the thought that on February 16, 1918, after 123 years under Russian rule, the people of Lithuania cast off the Russian yoke and proclaimed Lithuania an independent kingdom, and proceeded to organize their own government.

Nine months later, in November 1918, Lithuania became an independent republic and continued to enjoy happiness and freedom for more than a decade.

All this was accomplished as the result of a great nationalist political and cultural revival which took place in spite of all Russian efforts to obliterate Lithuanian national sentiment.

The people of Lithuanian descent are sad today because Lithuania's hard-won freedom was again taken from her in 1940 when Soviet troops marched in and, again by force, placed Lithuania under the Russian yoke and have held her people in practical slavery ever since.

We in America, and I am sure all other freedom-loving people, have not forgotten the unfortunate plight of the Lithuanian people.

We want them to know that we support them in their fight for freedom. We are not unmindful of the fact that under present circumstances they can do little for themselves; that the present government of their country is not one of the will of the people but rather one that has been imposed upon them by force.

We have not forgotten their valiant fights of the past against tyranny and dictatorship and we entertain a fervent hope that the day will soon come, as it did in 1918, when the great people of Lithuania will rise in their wrath and again break the Soviet yoke that has been placed around their necks.

It is up to us, who enjoy freedom and liberty, to do all we can to help Lithuania regain her independence; to ratify the Genocide Convention without further delay; to help her displaced people find asylum in the United States and other free countries; to bring them hope through the Voice of America and other available means; and to continue investigation by congressional committees of Soviet seizure of Baltic States and Soviet crimes against the Baltic peoples.

This we should do as all of these means lead ultimately to the restoration of Lithuanian independence.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this privilege to pay tribute to the Lithuanians on the 37th anniversary of their Independence Day.

There are certain things we value so highly that we carefully preserve them from the erosion and forgetfulness of time. There are certain events which we consider of such great significance that we take care always to preserve their memory. Time and time again we advert to these events for inspiration. Time and again we find ourselves drawn to them with a solemn sense of awe and reverence, because we realize that they are milestones of vital significance in man's struggle toward a higher and better life.

Such an event is the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. And such are our feelings when we celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day, the national holiday of all Lithuanians.

After February 16 of 1918, the day on which Lithuania was proclaimed an independent republic, the history of that land was first a happy one, but then, when the Nazis and Soviet Communists decided to destroy its freedom it entered into a time of serious troubles. Thus, since the proclamation of independence in 1918 Lithuania has experienced both happiness and misery, prosperity and poverty, progressive democracy and totalitarian dictatorship.

The first two decades of Lithuania's independence were a blessing to its peace-loving, hard-working, and patriotic inhabitants. In the course of that short time, from 1919 to 1939, the country was definitely on the road to prosperity and progress, and the people were happy in rebuilding the economic and political life of their reconstituted country. They were not only learning the hard but useful lessons of democracy, but they were also practicing it in their daily communal and national life.

In those relatively calm days when the cold war was unheard of and World War II was not even thought of, Lithuania seemed to be safe and secure. However, as it turned out, the Lithuanians were not masters of their country's fate, nor could they assure its peaceful destiny. There came a turn of international events that has proved disastrous and quite tragic to Lithuania since 1939.

Lithuania's independence was one of the first casualties of World War II, and now, for almost 16 years, the unfortunate Lithuanians have been suffering under the worst of tyrannies. In 1940 their country was annexed to the Soviet Union; in 1941 it was overrun by Nazi forces; in 1944 the Nazis were evicted by the Red army, which came and took over Lithuania in the name of the Soviet Union.

Since those dark days Moscow's agents have turned the country into a prison. Just what the exact situation is in Lithuania we in the West have no way of knowing in detail, because for more than a decade the country has been sealed off from the West. We often get reports or rumors to the effect that there is considerable underground resistance to the Communist regime. Unfortunately, however, a totalitarian dictatorship, once imposed, is difficult to dislodge.

We who understand the plight of the Lithuanians and sympathize with them think of that historic day when they proclaimed their independence and ardently hope that soon they will be able to celebrate in freedom this national holiday in their homeland.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians throughout the world observed the 37th anniversary of their homeland's independence.

Though burdened with grief over the oppression which has overtaken their country, Lithuanian people nevertheless demonstrate each year their undying will to be free.

It is such sustained spirit which 1 day will result in freedom for all peoples whose hearts cry for liberty.

The Lithuanian spirit may well be the beacon light to rally all of the temporarily oppressed, to lead the broken peoples on waves of hope to the self-government they so dearly cherish.

It is a courageous thing they do—celebrating an independence which exists only in their minds and hearts. But it is only by such zealous devotion to freedom that independence is achieved.

In this quest the Lithuanian people have our wholehearted support and admiration.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1955, Lithuanians in all parts of the world observed the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

For Lithuania independence was short-lived. Lithuania gained freedom in 1918, and as a nation great strides were made to advance the standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry, and to improve the economic status and the physical welfare of Lithuanian citizens. As an honored member of the family of free nations, Lithuania fulfilled all of her obligations.

In 1940 tragedy struck the young nation, and the Red tide of communism swept across Lithuania wiping out the freedom and liberty so dear to the hearts of Lithuanians at home and abroad.

The people of Lithuania have not despaired, but look hopefully to the West trusting that the miracle of liberation will once more bring independence to their land.

All the people of the United States who cherish individual freedom and national liberty as their most priceless possession join with Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians in the homeland on the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence in the prayer that liberation may not be far off.

The Lithuanians have displayed courage and fortitude in their valiant and ceaseless fight against the enslavement of communism, and they have earned the admiration of the free world which joins them in the struggle to defeat the Communist aggressor everywhere.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3952.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

WORLD-TRADE TRENDS IN OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1954, I addressed the House at length on the subject of world trade trends in oil. I then expressed the opinion that excessive imports of oil, by the

United States, were dangerous to the Nation's security.

Regrettably, nothing has happened since that time to change my opinion. If anything, the events of the past year have only served to make this danger even more apparent. Oil imports have continued to take an increasing share of the Nation's market for oil.

In the summary of my earlier address on this subject to the House, I concluded as follows:

One thing is certain. The domestic oil-producing industry cannot continue to maintain a large excessive capacity to produce, while foreign oil enters the country without the need for a similar responsibility. It cannot conserve, while foreign oil plays wastrel. It cannot exist while foreign oil acts in the role of court favorite. Something must give, and unless the Congress acts, it will be the domestic oil-producing industry.

The Congress has not acted, and the domestic oil market has been doing the giving.

It is because of these facts that I have asked for time here today, to discuss the continued threat to the Nation's security and economy which is presented by excessive oil imports, and to suggest to my colleagues that something can and must be done soon about this problem. It is a problem which, if left unsolved, contains the implications of disaster.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I am sure the Members present on the floor would appreciate it if the gentleman would tell us something about what these oil imports are doing to the economy of the gentleman's State of Oklahoma. What is it doing to your State's revenues? And how are you carrying out your ordinary State services?

Mr. JARMAN. I will be happy to develop that.

Mr. Speaker, this is no academic problem as far as my own State is concerned. Oil is Oklahoma's lifeblood. According to the Daily Oklahoman of February 6, 1955, the State produced its seven billionth barrel of oil during the month of December. Only Texas and California have produced more oil. Oklahoma grew up with oil. Its first production came just 2 years after the run of '89, which opened Oklahoma to general settlement. Of the State's 77 counties, 62 produce oil. Petroleum accounts for 90 percent of the value of the Sooner State's mineral production. More than 43,000 people are employed there in the production of oil alone, not to mention the many more who are indirectly employed as a result of oil production. Every county in my own district is an oil producing county. Anything affecting oil production is of real concern to the people in my district.

I cite these figures only to illustrate that Oklahoma's economy is greatly benefited by oil production. A substantial reduction in that production causes Oklahoma direct injury. Excessive oil imports have sharply restricted Oklahoma production. In 1954, the State produced about 16 million barrels less oil than in 1953, despite increased production capacity. Future increases in the importation of oil may cause even further injury.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. It is a fact that a certain percentage of tax going into the treasury of the State of Oklahoma is for the support of schools. What is the effect of this necessary reserve you are forced to hold back because of the imports of foreign oil? Has it impaired your State treasury funds so that you may not be able to carry out your school program?

Mr. JARMAN. I would say to the gentleman that it has had a decided effect economically upon the school and highway programs and on the general finance structure of Oklahoma; and if I may, in just a moment, I will give specific figures to back that up.

Inasmuch as Oklahoma possesses more than 6 percent of the Nation's proved oil reserves, I hope that adequate market outlets will exist to assure the production of this oil for the use of people all over the Nation. The high rate of oil imports gives little cause for optimism.

Mr. Roy G. Woods, president of the Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association, described the impact of oil imports on Oklahoma in graphic terms recently before the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Wood's testimony of January 28, 1955, included the following comment under the heading, "Effects of Present Policy of Imports on Oklahoma's Economy":

(a) Reduced unallocated oil allowables from 75 barrels to 15 barrels in a year, with a comparable cut in take-home pay per barrel to the operator.

(b) State average of unemployment of oilfield workers has increased 156.25 percent in 1954 over 1953, while in some counties there was as much as a 400 percent increase in unemployment. (Oklahoma Employment Security Commission, December 31, 1954.)

(c) Gross production taxes on crude oil during fiscal year 1954 in Oklahoma were $26,900,000; during the first 6 months of the fiscal year, 1954 gross production taxes were $13,794,368, during the last 6 months of the year 1954 gross production taxes declined to $11,399,950—a decrease of $2,395,368, which, if continued (and it's getting worse) will show a decrease in gross production taxes of approximately $5 million per year in Oklahoma. This will seriously curtail the vital functions of Oklahoma government, and this does not count the drop in income and other tax sources, such as the sales tax, all of which depend on the oil economy of the State.

(d) Supply houses, services companies, independent producers, drilling contractors, and countless other small enterprises that serve the oil industry are dying on the vine.

Mr. Woods has, in my opinion, ably listed some of the very specific and injurious effects of oil imports on the Oklahoma economy.

It is the consensus of those most concerned with Oklahoma's welfare that excessive oil imports should be curbed. The Oklahoma State Legislature, by joint action of both of its branches, has passed a resolution which urges that oil imports be restrained. I would like, at this point, to insert, into the RECORD, this resolution, which stands as a recent and unanimous action of the Oklahoma State Legislature:

Whereas Oklahoma for many years has been a leader in the production of oil and gas and an advocate of the conservation of oil and gas; and

Whereas the economy of the citizens of the State of Oklahoma is closely allied and dependent upon the production of oil and gas in this State; and

Whereas by reason of continued high imports of oil and its derivatives into this country from foreign markets, Oklahoma has been forced to reduce its current production much lower than its ability to produce oil within the standards of proper conservation of oil and gas, resulting in great losses in taxes which are used for the benefit of the schools, highways, and general revenues to the State of Oklahoma, and resulting in great losses to the economy of the State of Oklahoma and its citizens; and

Whereas by reason thereof the incentive to discover new reserves in the State of Oklahoma has been destroyed, which reserves are vital to the defense of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

That, the continued import of foreign oil and its derivatives into the United States is detrimental to the citizens of the United States; and

That, if the importation of foreign oil and its derivatives is continued, it is the opinion of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma that adequate domestic petroleum reserves, which are vital to the defense of this country, will not be discovered and will not be available for use in this country in a time of emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That, in addition thereto great and serious losses are resulting to the economy of the citizens of the State of Oklahoma by reason of foreign oil and its derivatives supplanting the traditional market of oil and gas that can be produced in the State of Oklahoma under sound conservation practices.

It is obvious from this material that those who best know Oklahoma have no doubt as to the effect of excessive foreign oil on the State's economy. Excessive oil imports are now impairing the ability of the oil producing industry in Oklahoma. They should be curbed before they cause greater harm.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma who has been active for many months as I well know in raising an alarm in reference to excessive imports of oil. He has done a splendid job in the past and he is making a fine contribution in the figures he gives us this afternoon in his very able address.

Coming from Illinois, I want to associate myself with this crusade, with this effort or whatever you want to call it, to try to bring about a limitation of excessive imports that is doing such great harm to the entire economy of our country. In my judgment, these imports may have reached the point now where they are threatening the defense of our country. I am hopeful that through the efforts of the gentleman from Oklahoma and others from the Southwest and other areas of Illinois, who know the

importance of the oil economy to our Nation and to our national defense, that combined, our efforts in cooperating with one another may hurry an urgent solution to this problem.

I am hopeful that something may be done in this session of the Congress that will limit these imports to about 10 percent of our total consumption rather than to allow them to continue to permit these big companies in our own country to import this oil, and that those imports will be cut down to something like 800,000 barrels a day. It is a matter that I think the Congress and the parties interested otherwise in Government must come to grips with and help us find a solution, because it is doing great harm to the far-flung independents in the oil exploration and development of our country. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I am in thorough agreement with him as to the seriousness of the situation. I am in hopes that the matter can be further emphasized in the discussion tomorrow and the next day on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman from Oklahoma is making a good statement. He is well acquainted, as well as the rest of us from the Oklahoma delegation, with Mr. Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. The other day Mr. Brown made a statement before the Committee on Ways and Means in which he said this:

> The essentiality of oil and the dangers of becoming dependent upon uncertain foreign sources have been recognized by our national leaders, both civilian and military.

He pointed out statements by other gentlemen, including President Eisenhower, who said this:

> The Russians produced last year something less, probably, than half a billion barrels of oil. We produced two and a quarter by ourselves. We produced something over twice as much steel as they produced. Now these are strong elements in our economy, when you are going to use so much of your production to wage a war, particularly a war of exhaustion.
>
> Now all of these things are deterrents upon the men in the Kremlin. They are factors that make war, let us say, less likely.

It is clear that the President believes accessible oil is not only vital to defense, but more important, is also vital to the maintenance of peace.

Then Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, former Chief of Naval Operations, was quoted in the December 6, 1954, issue of Newsweek as follows:

> Oil is the lifeblood of our Navy, Air Force, and mechanized Army. Without it we are sitting ducks for aggression. The year 1942 was a critical one for the Allies primarily because of German submarine sinkings of our oil tankers. America's oil industry, however, can take great credit for meeting Allied needs despite these losses.

Then we have the statement of Mr. J. P. Coleman, president of the National Stripper Well Association. He resides in Wichita Falls, Tex., just below the district served by the gentleman from Oklahoma now speaking and myself, and he said this:

> For several years, the domestic oil producers of the United States have watched with growing alarm the steady increase in foreign imports of petroleum and its products. Since the end of World War II, we have seen imports of petroleum increase from about 300,000 barrels per day to 1 million barrels daily in 1954.

Then one final statement by Mr. W. M. Vaughey, president, Independent Petroleum Association of America, in which he said:

> Since 1948 excessive imports of crude petroleum and refined products have constituted an increasingly serious problem, which was only temporarily relieved by the needs of the Korean war in 1950 and the shortage of oil in foreign markets resulting from the Iranian dispute in 1951. Otherwise, there has been a growing surplus of foreign oil, particularly from the Middle East. This has not only pushed American oil out of the world market but has resulted in foreign oil taking an increasing share of the market in this country, with corresponding restrictions on domestic production. With total imports exceeding 1 million barrels daily in 1953 and 1954 and with more and more domestic capacity "shut-in" for lack of market, it became increasingly clear that imports had gone beyond proper levels, and were violating all rules of equity.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he agrees with these statements by gentlemen who are well versed in the oil situation?

Mr. JARMAN. I thank my colleague, and I am in complete agreement with what he has quoted.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should also like to ask if it is not true that anything affecting the oil industry in any location in Oklahoma affects us throughout the whole State. We have 62 out of 77 counties in Oklahoma producing oil; is that not true?

Mr. JARMAN. Certainly. The entire State is affected by any segment of the industry that is hurt.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should like to say, too, that it was a privilege for me and the gentleman who is speaking [Mr. JARMAN] to appear before the Rules Committee with our chairman, Mr. TOM STEED, with Mr. CARL ALBERT, the secretary of the Oklahoma delegation, with Mr. EDMONDSON and Mr. BELCHER, yesterday to urge an open rule on H. R. 1 so the House could consider an amendment limiting the importation of foreign oils to not more than 10 percent of our domestic needs.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we dealt in some degree here today with the problem as it affects Oklahoma. It also affects our Nation.

While I am concerned with the injury that oil imports are causing my State, I am even more vitally disturbed at their implications to the national security and welfare. This is a matter of real concern to every American.

Foreign oil has little to offer in the way of security. By contrast, oil produced in Oklahoma and the other producing States is virtually immune to enemy sabotage and attack. It can be moved safely through underground pipelines. It is not subject to attack by submarine.

Increasing amounts of the oil imported into this country come from the Near East. This oil would be a primary Russian target in any emergency, and its availability to this Nation at such a time is extremely doubtful. On February 8, the Washington Evening Star carried an Associated Press article out of Moscow which quoted the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. V. M. Molotov. Mr. Molotov dropped a thinly veiled hint as to Russia's aims in the Near East. A part of Mr. Molotov's quoted comments are as follows:

> In the Near East we can say that the Arab countries have not progressed as much in development as the countries of the Far East. But it is obvious that soon it will be impossible to strangle the national liberation movement in the Near East as freely as they [the Western Powers] are doing it now with the peoples of Africa.

It seems to me that Mr. Molotov is here boldly threatening what he terms the "liberation" of the Arab countries of the Near East. Since he speaks favorably of the situation in the Far East, the implication seems to me to be strong that Russia is now looking with hungry eyes at the Near East, and would like to force this area into the same sort of so-called liberation that has shackled China. The fact that one of these oil-rich countries, Iran, actually adjoins Russia lends credence to such a possibility. Whether Russia actually does have such intentions remains to be seen. Whether she is capable of carrying out her aims is also debatable. Whether she can win over such countries as Iran, which was only a short time ago controlled by the Communist-dominated Tudeh Party, is open to question.

One thing is certain, however. Near Eastern oil offers very little in the way of reliability, as compared with domestic oil. One military expert recently commented that our chances of defending Middle Eastern oil are about like Russia's chances of defending Mexican oil. This may be a tragically accurate comparison.

Even more unfortunate, if we become dependent on foreign oil, we hurt our own traditional national independence as to oil. Unless a market outlet exists for domestic oil, the wells cannot be drilled; the reserves cannot be found and the needed supply of domestic oil will not be available for use in an emergency. A strong domestic oil industry is vital to the Nation's defense. Excessive oil imports can chain that strength and independence as to oil. They must be prevented from doing so.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to join in the commendations of Members of the House who represent States with oil production, of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] for his very fine presentation of this problem. It is a problem of vital concern to all of us who live in and represent States where oil is a principal source of income to our people.

I might add that the problem is by no means confined to oil. In the Second District of Oklahoma, which I have the privilege to represent, we are today seeing disastrous effects of excessive imports on our lead and zinc industry, on our glass industry, and on our coal-mining industry, as well as in the petroleum industry. I think the time is certainly here for facing up to this problem. Like the gentleman from Oklahoma, who represents the Fifth District, I, too, am in favor of the principle of reciprocal trade, but I agree with him that the time has come to place safeguards in that law to see that the escape clause is no longer a blind alley, and to see that American industry receives the recognition and the protection to which it is entitled in the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his able presentation, and I appreciate his additional reference to the lead and zinc, glass, and coal-mining segments of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, domestic oil offers the real security. It was here in adequate supply yesterday. It is here today. And, if markets are assured for its development today, it will be here, in plentitude, tomorrow.

I am at a loss to understand the failure to adopt a national policy which would prevent us from becoming even more reliant on foreign oil. In view of Mr. Molotov's aggressive statements, and in view of the obvious tension which now prevails all over the world, I am fearful that we are in great need of a national policy as to oil, and other strategic defense materials, which would assure that excessive imports would not impair domestic production of strategic materials. A policy is needed which would give emphasis to the discovery and production of accessible supplies of strategic materials, so that we are assured of adequate supplies of such materials in any emergency. Priorities as to such sources should be established and they should be established with the greatest possible speed. As a nation, we should take an analytical look at the political reliability of some of the countries upon which we have become increasingly dependent for our oil supplies. It seems apparent to me, for example, that we can ill afford to look to countries in the Middle East for our supply of oil. Countries in the Western Hemisphere, may be relatively dependable. This is personal speculation, however. I don't know the real facts. It seems that no one knows the true facts, and it is apparent that no formal study has been made to ascertain all of these facts.

Therefore, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I intend to suggest the creation of a special subcommittee of that committee with the responsibility of investigating these matters, ascertaining the facts and reporting its findings back to that body. It seems to me that such a study would provide an invaluable key to the formulation of a national policy regarding world trade in strategic materials.

If world trade affects defense, and it does, I believe that our trade policy should include defense considerations. As the trade agreements program now stands, this is its most serious omission. This omission should be corrected at the first possible opportunity.

Oil is by no means the only commodity affected, although it is certainly one of the most important. Domestic producers of chemicals, electrical equipment, lead, zinc, and many other commodities can be seriously damaged by excessive imports of strategic materials.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, introduced an amendment to the 1954 Trade Agreements Act which established the legislative principle that essential domestic industries should not be injured by excessive importation of strategic materials. This amendment was a wise addition to the act and the philosophy of the Symington amendment should be extended. I believe that the implementation of the Symington amendment would be consistent with the Trade Agreements Act and with reciprocal trade. I feel strongly that some safeguards must be provided in our trade program to assure adequate domestic production of defense materials.

Because of Oklahoma's position as a leading oil-producing State, I am more familiar with the impact of excessive oil imports on domestic productiotn than I am with the effect of imports of other commodities. I know that oil imports have increased in the postwar period from about 377,000 barrels daily to their present level of more than 1,200,000 barrels per day. An increase of this volume could not have failed to be injurious to the domestic oil industry. It has resulted already in a restriction of the industry's potentialities and it will cause even further harm unless something is done.

Congress can do something about oil imports. It must do something if the domestic oil industry is to maintain the strength which is necessary to the Nation's defense.

The House of Representatives is now considering H. R. 1, a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act for three additional years. This bill, as it now stands, contains none of the safeguards which I have mentioned above as essential to protection of the national defense. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4005, which I feel will provide the necessary safeguards as to oil. I believe, too, that such safeguards are necessary as to other commodities and I feel that a study of this whole matter will reveal specific information necessary to provision of such safeguards.

I intend to vote for the extension of H. R. 1. I am for reciprocal trade. However, I also feel that it is consistent with reciprocal trade to provide for the national defense. Where the two are in important conflict, I believe the Nation's defense to be paramount.

The Congress will soon be faced with a decision on this vital problem. I hope and believe that it will resolve the issue in such a manner as to solidify both our trade program and the national defense.

Such a solution may be ultimately essential to national survival.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the strangest thing in every consideration given to the problem of reciprocal trade is the brazen assumption that those who would curb or curtail imports into the United States are motivated by greedy, selfish, and shortsighted self-interest, while those who espouse freer trade have only a grand and altruistic cause to serve.

Nothing can be farther from the truth. Sooner or later, it must become apparent to everyone, it seems to me, that these great clashes of interest that confront us every time Congress takes up the matter of extension of the Trade Agreements Act are motivated almost entirely by selfish interest on the part of all, not just the so-called high tariff bloc.

The issue comes to the House in its usual gagged and bound form this year, and the propaganda for this flagrant giveaway of American self-interest has proved itself again most effective. More than ever before, those who fight to retain some protection for American domestic industries are branded as the crass self-servers, while those who espouse this even greater surrender of trade power march under a halo of altruism.

The truth is that all around us are undeniable signs of growing danger and distress to American industry which, if the trends continue, may well become deadly to the American economy. Another truth is that any final decision on the matter of world trade now before us that is not fair, is no solution at all but an undeserved victory for one self-interest group over another.

Six years ago these same signs were all about us. The outbreak of fighting in Korea temporarily set aside the dangers. We are just now again approaching the situation that had developed alarmingly after the end of World War II. There is no better example of this recurrence of trade danger than in the oil industry.

The accelerated importation of oil has caused all oil-State Congressmen to become acutely aware of trends in world oil trade. More foreign oil has meant less oil produced in Oklahoma. More foreign oil must inevitably weaken our Nation's security as to oil.

My district, which probably contains more independent, domestic oil producers than any other in this country, has directly felt the impact of increased oil importation. The economy in my area is closely related to the welfare of the oil-producing industry there, and is very much affected when that industry is hurt.

In 1954, my State and my district felt the heavy impact of foreign oil. While imports rose to an all-time high, and while the Nation's consumption of oil continued to rise, Oklahoma's oil production was down by an estimated 18 million barrels. In my district, drilling rigs were stacked and oil workers were idle in 1954, because Oklahoma's oil allowables were cut back to make room for foreign oil. This decreased activity has a direct effect on the general business volume. Now I am quite aware of the need for international good will and

of our compelling need for national progress in that field, but I am also, concerned with the impact of oil imports on the Nation's defense and on the many towns in my district that are greatly helped by oil production in their vicinities.

I believe that the oil produced in my district has proved its value to the Nation's defense, but I am not quite so sure about the security value of some of the imported oil that is now displacing this Oklahoma oil. I am disturbed by the threat of economic injury which would occur if my State were to suffer a simultaneous injury to both its oil and agricultural production. We are told that Oklahoma may possibly be faced with the return of the days of the drought and the dust storm. At the same time, we see oil imports continue to cause a decline in the State's oil production. The combination of these events could be catastrophic. It is not a pleasant thought, but it is a thought that leads me to commend caution to my colleagues, insofar as a trade policy for oil is concerned. I do not believe it is the intended goal of national trade policy to weaken the production of a product which is vital to the health of my State. I do not believe that a national trade program should promote national insecurity as to oil and other strategic materials. It is the effect that counts, however, and not the intent.

The potential effects of excessive oil imports are, to say the least, alarming.

Much has been said of the value of reciprocal trade to other nations. It is very doubtful whether world trade in oil bears out this theory. It is clear, however, that certain large companies are being greatly benefited by increased imports of oil.

Take the Creole Petroleum Corp., for example. On February 10 this Venezuelan production subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey proposed a 3-for-1 split of capital stock, with the par value of the stock to remain at $5 per share. The directors then declared a dividend of $1.95 per share. It does not take a financial analyst to tell you Creole is doing quite well, even after you deduct her costs for propaganda and lobbying during the last session of Congress.

Some idea of these costs may be gained from the fact that one of Creole's registered representatives here in Washington, Steven Fitzgerald & Co., listed expenditures of more than $73,591, in the first three quarters of 1954. At the same time, local chambers of commerce all over the country were being besieged with propaganda. Full-page ads were placed in large metropolitan and business newspapers, proclaiming the wonders of Venezuelan oil. Speeches were made and pamphlets were written along similar lines. All the stops were out in this expensive and extensive campaign.

No mention was made of what this oil was costing this Nation in terms of future United States oil production capability. No mention was made of the impact of excessive oil imports on oil-producing areas.

It has been costly, this propaganda barrage. Despite this, however, the firm was able to split its stock, 3 for 1, and pay a large dividend.

I hope I will not be regarded as cynical when I look askance at some comments, within the past month, of Creole's president. In an appearance on January 20, before the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Harold W. Haight, commented, in part, as follows:

> The continued success and growth of my company depend upon the continuation and expansion of international trade. Therefore, I am happy to appear before this committee to support H. R. 1, in particular, and, in general, the reciprocal trade program recommended by President Eisenhower, which I believe will mean more prosperity and greater security for the people of the United States.

I think Creole's stock split makes it evident that Creole's own prosperity is also, somewhat involved in this question of world oil trade. Very much involved, I would say. I am not so sure, however, that what is good for Creole is good for Oklahoma.

Mr. Haight also, refers to the President's position on reciprocal trade. As far as oil imports and their impact on the domestic oil industry are concerned, it has been exceedingly difficult to ascertain President Eisenhower's position as to the problem. Many months ago, he appointed a special Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. This Committee's study is supposed to have embraced the oil imports problem, but apparently, it has been unable to agree. At any rate, although the subjects involved in its investigation were of vital importance, the Committee has delayed its report for months. The President, in a recent press conference, was quoted as saying that the Committee's report was not ready, but was not being held up. While the President did, in answer to questions, make some general remarks as to oil import restrictions, these probably should not be regarded as significant, in view of the fact that the Committee which was officially delegated the responsibility to carefully study the problem has still not made its report. I am sure this Committee will ultimately make its report and I hope that it will become a valuable addition to the Government's archives even if not received in time to help in the actual formulation of policy.

It is to be regretted that the Cabinet Committee's report is not ready. One would almost think it was being deliberately delayed by this Administration so as to avoid facing up to some very live and difficult issues. Such so-called studies have occurred with disturbing regularity in the past 3 years, and they seem often only to constitute the preface to further indecision. Sooner or later, some issues must be met. There are times when it is extremely unwise to get there latest with the leastest. This is such a case. A report was needed from the Cabinet Committee, not an epitaph.

We shall have to make out without it, I suppose. The problem of oil imports, after all, is one that requires a decision now, and cannot be deferred until further studies are made.

Oil imports are at an all-time high, averaging more than 1,200,000 barrels each day. This compares with an average of less than 400,000 barrels daily at the end of World War II. The rapidity of increase in foreign oil use has come at a time when our domestic production capacities were far more than adequate. Today, we are capable of producing more than 1,750,000 barrels per day of United States oil which is being left dormant. Yet, we are using record amounts of foreign oil.

We are sometimes urged to save our own oil and use foreign oil. This is foolish. The more oil we have used in this country, the more we have found, with the result that the Nation's oil reservoir has grown steadily over the years.

Nor can you conserve know-how. This was stated in entertaining terms recently, by Mr. Roy G. Woods, president, Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association, in an appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee on January 28. Said Mr. Woods:

> This idea of saving our domestic crew is as fallacious in its reasoning as another situation which I have in mind. In Oklahoma we have a great football team which has on its schedule in September of 1956, the University of Notre Dame, which, as you gentlemen all know, is also, a great team. What man among you gentlemen present here today would advise our great coach, Bud Wilkinson, not to schedule any scrimmage, not to have any tackling or blocking practice, not to play any more football games, but to keep the Big Red under wraps and save them for the game with Notre Dame in 1956. Come 1956, the Big Red would not be ready. This is an illustration of a typical situation. Do the same thing to the domestic oil team, and then an emergency arises, the oil team would not be ready.

Sooner or later, unless oil imports are restrained, the United States market outlet for oil will be restrained to the point that drilling will be sharply reduced, and the discovery of new sources of oil will decline. The seeds for future dependency on foreign oil are now being sown by the increased importation of foreign oil. Our lack of a policy restraining oil imports will some day bear us bitter fruit unless we do something to change it.

Much is said about the benefits derived from world trade. As concerns oil, a large part of those benefits stay with the importing oil companies. I have cited the case of Creole.

The Middle East offers some even more dramatic examples. There the oil reserves are fabulous. There, under the desert palms, lie huge deposits of oil that can be cheaply produced, without responsibility to American jurisdiction, but with ever-growing access to American markets. There a few importing companies are waxing fat and happy.

Russell B. Brown, general counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association of America, told the House Ways and Means Committee on January 28, that, and I quote:

> 1. About 82 percent of the free world's oil reserves, outside the United States, are in the Middle East, within a few miles of Russia.
>
> 2. About 70 percent of total imports into the United States are brought in by 5 large

international American oil companies, and by 1 of foreign control.

3. These six importing companies have their principal interest in Middle East oil reserves.

Then, Mr. Brown added what I feel to be a very astute comment. I quote again:

The concentration of ownership of foreign oil in the hands of a few, and its long-range effect upon the American consumer and the national security, is a factor which we believe this committee should carefully consider.

The six companies which import most of the oil into this country are: The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Gulf Oil Corp.; the Texas Co.; the Standard Oil Co. of California; Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.; and the Royal Dutch Shell group.

These 6 companies import about 70 percent of the foreign oil used in this country.

The five American firms listed have become increasingly un-American in character, as far as their oil reserves are concerned. Taken together, 89 percent of their total proved reserves are located outside the borders of this country. About 64 percent of their oil production is outside this country. These companies are global in nature and global in perspective. I believe that, should these global activities be surveyed in the light of this Nation's interests, the two will not always be found to coincide. The national interest must, of course, take precedence, however painful this may be to the importing oil companies.

Excessive oil imports present a real defense problem. At the same time we become more dependent on more distant sources of oil, we injure our own capability to produce oil. This is a policy of folly, or rather, it is no policy at all.

My views on this problem are well known. I have spoken many times about the need for legislative restraints on oil imports. That need has increased over the years. The problem is fast approaching a point of crisis. The importing oil companies have, in the last year, shown a complete lack of concern for the domestic oil industry. They have increased their volume of oil imports again and again, not only halting the domestic oil industry's traditional growth, but actually causing the domestic industry to reduce its production. In some areas, the problem has become acute. Unless something is done, we may someday be a "have-not" nation as to oil. It will be a matter of choice, not necessity. Not every nation has the chance to decide whether it should be self-sufficient as to oil. I believe that the Congress is wise enough to take the steps that will insure national oil self-sufficiency. The opportunity to do so now knocks at our door.

H. R. 1, the bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act, as recommended by the House Ways and Means Committee, should be amended to safeguard essential domestic industries, including oil, against injury from excessive imports.

Regardless of what happens to H. R. 1, as it moves through the legislative channels, I urge that it be so amended. I am a long-time supporter of reciprocal trade, where that trade is really reciprocal. Let me say here and now, however, that reciprocal trade is no sacred cow, as far as I am concerned. It is not the only concern of Government. Some of the proponents of free trade approach the subject wearing blinders, as if they felt that deviation, however wise, would be fatal to the trade program. These blinders have obscured their vision to the point where they are unable to see the threat that some imports present to certain domestic industries producing strategic materials. Nor are they seemingly aware of the fact that imports can injure other domestic industries. They just do not seem to want to think about it.

The Congress cannot escape this responsibility, however. Its duty is clear. Where trade policy impinges on other policy considerations, the Congress must resolve the conflict.

I urge that the Congress provide, by law, those restraints that are essential to the protection of essential domestic industries. Unless it does so, the Trade Act will be extended for 3 more years and vital and essential industries may be fatally exposed. And eventually, though the coming of such disaster, the justified interest in reciprocal trade may be destroyed. Today's victory well may be tomorrow's defeat. Free traders might well ponder this omen.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the gentleman think that the best procedure to face the situation which will develop tomorrow in the consideration of the bill, H. R. 1, would be to have a serious attempt made to defeat the ordering of the previous question in order that we can have an open rule under which amendments can be offered by various segments of industry that are being injured.

Mr. JARMAN. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman. I hope that we can defeat the rule and, if we are unsuccessful in defeating the rule, that we can recommit H. R. 1 to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions to protect those segments of our economy which so badly need protection.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, a matter of utmost importance to the American economy, the American people and all of us here will shortly come before this House for decision. I refer to H. R. 1, aimed at reduction of existing tariffs and extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

As a representative of the great textile State of South Carolina, I view with particular apprehension the inherent threats toward textile manufacturing and cotton agriculture contained in this bill. I know many of my colleagues feel similar alarm over what could happen to the textile industrial system of the United States if this bill were to be enacted in its present form.

I wonder if all my distinguished colleagues fully realize the exact nature of the textile industry—made up primarily of many small businesses—how it operates, what factors are involved in its pursuit of business and what we of the Congress must face in order to preserve it.

The American cotton goods industry, from the grower to the customer, is based primarily on future operations in sales, mill production schedules and in buying of raw materials. Cotton is purchased in the futures exchanges months in advance of its use. Mills must figure the demand for goods sometimes as much as a year ahead. Yes, the entire system is based on futures; and we, Mr. Speaker, hold its future in our hands.

A tiny drop of uncertainty in such a sensitive system might very well have the effect, in time, of a rushing torrent. Those who do not understand fully the practices of the cotton business cannot envision what damage the doubling or tripling of foreign imports might cause, even though the inflow remained less than exports.

Proponents of this bill are wont to say that if imports in the past have not been very sizeable, why should the industry fear some moderate reduction in tariffs? Or they argue that if American exports continue to exceed foreign imports, so that there is a substantial net for American mills in the export-import ratio, what adverse effect could increased imports have?

Mr. Speaker, I have made inquiry into such questions and believe the answers are important to our understanding of the textile problem. In regard to exports there are 1 or 2 very significant points. First, large as it may seem to some people—500 million yards or thereabouts—the volume of United States textile exports has declined alarmingly. Only a few years ago it was 3 times as much, 1½ billion yards. Thanks to trade concessions and tariff cuts under so-called reciprocal trade, the American textile industry has lost two-thirds of its export business. That meant the loss of at least 10,000 American jobs, reckoned conservatively—a sizeable sacrifice to the free-trade idea, as great a sacrifice as any major industry has made.

What export business remains is carried on, for the most part, with a few countries with which the United States enjoys trade on a preferential status or under special circumstances such as fast train deliveries to Canada, America's biggest foreign market.

Now as to the import side of the picture. While it is true that imports have never reached the rate of exports, it is my firm belief that under conditions which I shall outline they could expand very sharply in volume, and that by enacting H. R. 1 we would be adding to the temptation of other countries to increase that volume.

It seems to me that proponents of this measure are apt to be misled by what has happened in the past. They should look toward the future rather than the past.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that many do not realize how rapidly the textile industries of foreign countries like Japan are advancing, in technology, in worker skills, in all-round efficiency. No longer can we use the past as a yardstick for measuring probabilities of business and production volume. We face a rehabilitated world wide textile industry which in some cases—again, such as Japan—not only equals the capabilities of the United States industry on the average but in instances of individual mill comparisons actually exceeds ours.

In recent months qualified experts who have visited Japan have described that nation's brand new mills and machinery, the heavy assignment of machines per employee, and the long work week in Japan's mills. Looking to the future instead of the past, we must understand that the efficiency of which America's industry is so proud can no longer serve as a potent weapon in competitive world trade. Nor does the United States industry enjoy any advantage in raw material, because cotton can be obtained and is obtained by Japan's mills at the same prices American mills pay, owing to the low cost of ocean transport.

And what of the largest item of cost in making textiles, the wage factor? Here, as well we know, the foreign countries have a huge advantage because the average wages paid in Japan and India are only one-tenth and one-twelfth, respectively, of the prevailing American hourly rate. Thinking of the future, how long can a textile company or any other type of small business hope to work against 10 to 1 or 12 to 1 odds, unless it has some kind of safeguards to maintain its home markets?

Mr. Speaker, I am sincerely dedicated to the principle of true reciprocity in trade. I hold no brief for protecting those manufacturers who are monopolistic in tendency, or who hold special patents or have highly specialized machinery of their own. But when the people of my State and the entire textile industry are asked to compete in the American home markets against goods that can enter this country for one reason only—that reason being because they were made under conditions of cheap and unfair wages—I think my people have every right to be given reasonable tariff protection.

Even under the present tariff structure, Mr. Speaker, that protection is small and no real deterrent to a sudden inflow of foreign goods. Only in recent months it has been proved that Japanese-made goods can easily enter the United States market and sell competitively here, despite the tariff and the currently low level of American prices.

For the great bulk of textile products, the American cotton goods market is an open market; and it is almost as sensitive to price influences as the raw cotton market. Price changes on any given day permeate the entire cotton textile system. Sales representing only a small fraction of current supply or production determine the values for the whole. On several occasions, a mere flurry of Japanese cloth sales in the central market at prices below the American market level served to paralyze general sales activity for weeks.

This disturbance happens because the inflow of competitive imports is an attack from the dark. No one can tell at the moment how large and swift the current may become, how long it will last, or whether it will in time engulf the market. That is the danger, the uncertainty and doubt which would result if our gates to foreign imports were opened wider. Just now, when the textile industry seems to be beginning to pull out of a serious depression, any such action on our part would certainly prolong the industry's difficulties.

We are dealing here with one of this country's basic industrial enterprises. Measure it in any way, its employment of hundreds of thousands of men and women, the million and more people who work in allied industries such as knit goods, hosiery and apparel manufacture, its huge capital investment, its essential products of cloth and clothing, its critical role in clothing our military forces—by any standards, this is far too important an industry to be handed over to the domination of foreign countries.

What are we trying to do in this country today—put the foreigners first and let our own people and their industries take the hindmost? Sometimes I fear that we are going overboard to help questionable friends thousands of miles from America at the expense of our own people. I know that those who favor H. R. 1 do not desire or expect such results. But I am firmly convinced that if we continue to follow the theory and philosophy of those who sponsor this bill we shall reap calamity. And after our small industries are bankrupt and their laborers unemployed, it will then be too late to change our foreign-trade policy.

And let us make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. The sole purpose and result of tariff reduction is the surrender—in part, or all—of American production and American jobs to foreign countries. There is no avoiding the conclusion that for some reason, the textile industry of the United States seems to be earmarked for that kind of surrender. This very month a new round of trade bargaining gets underway in Geneva. The textile industry heads the list of the so-called expendable industries, because fully 90 percent of its entire range of products has been put out on the bargaining table by our State Department. This, mind you, is being done under existing authority. And in addition, H. R. 1 as now presented would remove a great deal more of the American textile industry's protection. Yes, again I say, where are we heading to?

The consequences would be calamitous, to put it mildly, in my State where 1 out of every 2 industrial employees are textile people; where the mills besides producing a major portion of industrial payrolls and tax revenues, are the providers of schools, hospitals, churches, recreation centers, and in many other ways sustain the very economic and social life of hundreds of communities.

We know from bitter experience, recalling the era of the 1930's when Japan staged a large-scale invasion of the American textile market, what lowered tariffs will do to employment, industrial stability, and the economic health of the South. We know very well, also, that if mills were to shut down, thousands of people in addition to the mill employees would be bound to suffer. We know the process of readjustment would be long, costly and indeed impossible. Mr. Speaker, the South has no relish for another period of reconstruction.

Before I close, I urge my distinguished colleagues to consider with utmost care this entire problem of foreign textile competition, and the need for keeping the mills of America operating as prosperously as possible. Keep in mind that a thriving textile industry is a multimillion dollar a year customer of America's transportation system, chemical industry, financial institutions, textile machinery industry, fuel and power industry and many others—not the least of which is our great cotton agricultural industry. Two out of every three bales of cotton grown in the United States are bought by America's mills. In a year's time the textile industry pays out $2 billion for the home-grown cotton it consumes. The mill industry not only represents the biggest customer of the American farmer, but his best customer—his most secure and reliable market.

These are a few of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I feel these questions of tariff, foreign economic policy and agricultural policy cannot be divorced. It is why I join with so many of my friends in urging the greatest caution possible in our consideration of measures such as H. R. 1, and why I especially oppose further textile tariff reductions at this time.

In my opinion the American textile industry has contributed its full share, and more, to the reciprocal trade effort. In my opinion this industry has sacrificed more than any other American industry of comparable size in helping Japan's mills get back on the road to recovery. In my opinion, Japan's current economic plight—centered largely around her own textile industry since that happens to be the major Japanese industrial business—cannot be disassociated from the whole world problem of declining, unbalanced textile trade.

To solve that problem, and Japan's, will require a courageous attack on the real heart of the trouble, and not an attack on any fringe issue like the tariff. As I have said, I fervently hope to see trade restored on a truly reciprocal basis. I should like to see the other nations cooperate in bringing about currency convertibility, a lessening of their many import controls, a reduction in the exorbitant and discriminatory tariffs they have imposed against one another and against the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that the Congress will develop a forward-looking trade policy in place of the warmed-over programs which for 20 years now have accomplished little else than to penalize

American industry. I urge that we work together for a policy which will lead the way toward restoration of Japan's natural markets, toward increased consumption of cotton and manufactured textiles in the destitute regions where clothing is needed, so that American mills and all the world's textile industries can look to a future of expanding trade and growing prosperity.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. I wish to commend and congratulate my distinguished friend from South Carolina upon the presentation of his remarks on this subject, for by the very wording of his remarks he shows that he is thoroughly familiar with this subject which is of vital interest to all of us who live in a section of the country where the textile industry forms an important part of the economy.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina, and if I may, make a few observations in direct line with what the gentleman has just said.

In this connection all of us are aware that the textile industry has not yet suffered terribly damaging blows, yet, based absolutely on figures released by the Department of Commerce, the rate of increase of foreign textile imports is alarming. These increases amount sometimes to as much as 20 to 30 percent from one month to the next. How long can this rate of increase continue before the peril point is reached in the American textile industry?

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, all of us agree with the gentleman from South Carolina when he says he is for reciprocal trade. Basically, I think all of us are for it. We realize the necessity of international trade and commerce among the nations of the world, yet we must take into consideration the wage-cost factor and the differential in wages which exists in this country and in such countries, for instance, as Japan where the wage-cost factor is about only one-tenth what it is in this country and where the cost of production of textile goods is geared almost entirely to the wage-cost factor. It is necessary that the textile industry in America have some assurance in the form of an amendment to H. R. 1, or else we stand on the threshold of seeing the American textile industry and a great many other American industries sacrificed completely on the altar of so-called reciprocal trade.

This reciprocal trade idea I think is good; I think all of us agree that it is good, but it must be a two-way street. If we are going to make concessions to the other nations of the world, it is necessary that these other nations in good faith make equal concessions to the United States. Too many times in the past, Mr. Speaker, we have been confronted with artificial embargoes, with inconvertible currencies, and with protective devices like licenses and import permits which have had the effect of destroying the importation of American goods by other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I think that on tomorrow and on Friday the Members of this House should give very careful, thoughtful, and prayerful consideration before they vote into law a 3-year extension of a piece of legislation which could completely wreck not only the textile industry but also other industries which form a vital part of the American economic life.

Mr. ASHMORE. I certainly thank the gentleman from Georgia for his most timely remarks. I agree with him completely in his statement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the distinguished Member from South Carolina propose to tell the Members present on the floor of the injury to the textile industry and what effect that injury would have on the domestic demand for raw cotton?

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes. I have a statement in respect to that.

Mr. BAILEY. I would be interested to know because the injury to the textile industry would cut off the demand for domestic cotton and would injure the cotton industry of the South as well as the textile industry.

Mr. ASHMORE. It certainly will.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. ASHMORE. I am very glad to yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The point that I raised when I asked the gentleman to yield previously was this. At present approximately one-third of the raw cotton produced in this country is exported. Approximately 90 percent of the remaining two-thirds goes into the textile industry.

Mr. ASHMORE. The American textile industry uses two-thirds of the cotton grown in the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. If the new trade agreement with Japan should result in destroying 50 percent of the textile industry of this country, it would also take away 50 percent of the demand for raw cotton and also destroy the cotton industry.

Mr. ASHMORE. There is no doubt about that. I was getting to that in just a moment.

Mr. BAILEY. I was not sure whether the gentleman had covered that point particularly, but I want the record to show that not only is the textile industry in danger, but the cotton industry is in danger because that which hurts textiles hurts the cotton industry.

Mr. ASHMORE. It most positively does. I appreciate the contribution of my friend.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the record should show that under our foreign-aid program the bulk of the cost of building some irrigation projects in Egypt is coming out of the pockets of the American taxpayer.

What is the prime product of Egypt when that irrigation project is completed? It is cotton, and a far better grade of cotton than we can ever hope to grow in the United States. Under this same policy of reciprocal trade, this enlarged program is all tied in to that idea of point 4 aid to foreign countries which will furnish competition to American cotton growers.

Mr. ASHMORE. The gentleman is entirely correct. They can produce as fine cotton in Egypt and Brazil and other countries as we can and at much lesser cost.

Mr. BAILEY. What is the use of spending millions of dollars to irrigate land in Egypt unless they can find a market for Egyptian cotton?

Mr. ASHMORE. If we do that, it will soon take our own American cotton market, I am afraid.

FOA PROGRAM HURTS DOMESTIC COAL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House a gross abuse of high office, a shocking breach of faith with the American people, and a cruel hoax perpetrated upon a hard-pressed, vital industry and its thousands of unemployed workers.

There is no need for me to dwell at length, here, upon either the plight of our coal industry, the effect upon our economy, or, in the event of war, the extent to which its reduced capacity would endanger our national security. These are facts with which the Members of the House are well acquainted.

But a fact that may not be so well known concerns the shameful way in which these circumstances were seized upon by the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, Mr. Harold Stassen, for political exploitation of the most flagrant sort.

Last August 5, 1954, at a press conference held in the Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C., Mr. Stassen made the announcement that FOA would purchase 10 million tons of coal from the United States as part of its foreign-aid program for the fiscal year 1955. The date of this announcement is significant. It marks the eve of the opening of the 1954 congressional election campaigns. I ask you to bear in mind that the principal coal-mining States are—in the order of their importance—West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Illinois, and that in each of these States there were close political races.

Mr. Stassen's statement, very understandably, received wide coverage by the press, especially in these coal-producing States, where great numbers of jobless coal miners began to hope that their Government was not indifferent to the plight of the unemployed.

But after this preliminary and, I have reason to believe, wholly premature announcement by the FOA Director, there followed nothing but silence. No details of when this coal-purchasing program was to begin, how it was to be handled, where this coal was to be bought, or to what countries it was to be shipped were forthcoming. And this despite the fact that anxious coal operators, equally anxious officials of the United Mine Workers, and somewhat skeptical but still hopeful Members of Congress from

the coal-bearing regions literally haunted Mr. Stassen's office.

For 6 long weeks all that happened was that the coal-export market was disrupted so that even less coal moved from United States docks. Then, on the 21st of September, when the political campaigns were in full swing, the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration issued another statement to the press. This one came from the President's summer headquarters at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo. Mr. Stassen had flown there to confer with the President, and, he announced, the President had approved his coal-purchase program to "relieve unemployment in distressed coalfields in the United States." Under the President's direction, the FOA Director said, the coal is to come from the most critical unemployment areas.

This was especially welcome news to West Virginia where, due principally to our idle coal mines, the rate of unemployment was the highest in the Nation, and had been so since the previous April. Moreover, our hopes that relief was in sight were further raised when Mr. Stassen informed us, in this same September 21 statement, that the purchase of the whole 10 million tons of coal was to be allocated: 2 million tons, each, from West Virginia, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania, 1½ million tons from Illinois and 2½ million tons to be generally distributed through other coal-producing regions.

Again, Mr. Stassen made the headlines.

And now, some 6 months later, the FOA Director and his coal program are once more in the news. But this time the words are not sweet nor are the accompanying comments laudatory.

On Monday, February 14, this past Monday, the Fairmont Times, published in my home town of Fairmont, W. Va., carried a front-page story charging that the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration have under consideration a plan to purchase approximately a million tons of coal for the use of United States military forces in Japan and Korea from mines operated under the Chiang Kai-shek government. If consummated, this purchase, it is charged, would deprive 800 United States miners of 1 full year's work. The story is accredited to Mr. Chester Potter of the Pittsburgh Press, who originally broke it on Sunday, February 13.

The scheme, this news story states, is credited to Mr. Stassen, whose bogged-down foreign coal export program was labeled, at the time it was announced last fall, "as being a strictly political maneuver in the hope of swaying key States or districts where there was a heavy mine vote in favor of Republican candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives."

I have not checked the accuracy of the report about Mr. Stassen's latest sortie into coal. In all likelihood he would disclaim any knowledge of the plan, anyhow, and I say this as one who has experienced some of the FOA Director's expert technique in failure to know when the questions become embarrassing.

But I can attest to the accuracy of this news article when it describes the bogged-down aspects of Mr. Stassen's coal-for-foreign-export program. This program would have afforded a measure of relief from the critical unemployment from which we suffer in the First Congressional District of West Virginia. I have therefore made it my business to follow it closely and to know how it was being handled.

Seven months have now elapsed since Mr. Stassen first announced his program to help our coal industry and to relieve unemployment in the distressed coal fields of the United States. What is the status of this program today?

As of today, I am reliably informed that the total purchases by FOA in the 7½ months since this program was announced amount to 1,423,000 tons, that is at the rate of slightly less than 200,000 tons per month. And only 690,000 tons are presently authorized.

This means that in the remaining 4½ months of the fiscal year covered by the program, contracting must be done on the basis of 1,911,000 tons per month, a feat which all of us accept as obviously impossible of accomplishment. In 1948, the year in which FOA made its largest purchases of coal, the total amount bought in the entire 12-month period was 9 million tons. And conditions then were of course quite different from what they are now, when most of the coal-producing nations have largely recovered from the devastation of World War II. It is also interesting to note that up until the time of the announcement of this program, our purchases under the FOA program were being carried on at the rate of 70,600 tons per month.

Even this amount now is being considered and included as part of the much-publicized emergency program to relieve unemployment in distressed labor areas.

It would therefore seem that the ambitious announcement made by Mr. Stassen last August was made without previous planning, or even the remotest idea how the program was to be carried out. This might be due to lack of executive and administrative ability on the part of Mr. Stassen, which would be regrettable but not necessarily reprehensible.

But Mr. Stassen's failure to carry out this program is not limited to his inability to find overseas sources for the use of United States coal. He has also failed to carry out the President's directive that the coal purchased was to come from the most critical areas of unemployment.

West Virginia's unemployment rate last fall was the highest in the Nation and still continues among the highest. In coal mining alone, there has been a drop of 25.7 percent in employment in 1954 over 1953. In the First Congressional District, total unemployment in the coal industry is as high as 40 percent according to the latest figures available. But not so much as 1 pound of coal has moved from this district under Mr. Stassen's 10-million-ton coal-purchase program. For the entire State of West Virginia, we have shipped less coal under this program than we have done in previous years on an open competitive-bid basis under the regular FOA program.

Furthermore, over the past several months, it has become increasingly apparent to me that the FOA Director, having achieved whatever political benefits might have derived from his announcement of this program at the time it was made, would now like to have us forget the whole thing.

But I feel certain that this House will agree with me that it has now become incumbent on the Director to keep faith with the coal industry and its unemployed workers. To the fullest extent of his abilities and the resources of his agency he must continue to give them the token assistance which he promised with so much assurance last August. Within the coal-producing areas of the United States unemployment is almost as high now as it was during the depression of the last Republican administration. The very least the FOA Director can do is to stop playing politics in order that he may discharge his responsibilities to the American people in a manner consistent with the tradition of the high office to which he was appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the article which appeared in the Fairmont Times on February 14, 1955:

EIGHT HUNDRED IDLE MEN SEEN IN GOP COAL PLAN—PROGRAM FOR MILITARY PURCHASE OF MILLION TONS FROM FORMOSA CALLED BLOW TO UNITED STATES MINERS

Having bogged down on a foreign coal export program which was labeled when it was announced last fall as politically-inspired, the Republican national administration now has a plan which if adopted would mean the loss of a year's work for 800 American coal miners.

Such was the disclosure made by Chester Potter, Washington correspondent of the Pittsburgh Press, in a copyrighted story appearing in the Press yesterday.

Potter said that the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration had under consideration a plan to purchase approximately a million tons of coal for the use of United States military forces in Japan and Korea from mines in Formosa operated under the Chiang Kai-shek government.

The Press story said that "all of this coal is now being or could be purchased in the United States" and that it approximates the production of 800 miners for a year. Coal industry and union officials contend that the Formosan coal is inferior to that produced in this country's bituminous mines.

The copyrighted article asserts that miners, railroaders and others would lose by the purchase of coal in Formosa and that the United States Treasury also would be deprived of taxes resulting from the business.

The scheme is credited to Harold E. Stassen, head of the FOA, whose plans to purchase 10,000,000 tons of coal for export was announced last August.

At that time the FOA coal purchase plan was labeled as being a strictly political maneuver in the hope of swaying key States or districts where there was a heavy mine vote in favor of Republican candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives.

Among those who charged that the plan was politically-inspired were Senator Matthew M. NEELY and Congressman Robert H. MOLLOHAN, both of this city, who noted in a joint statement that the first orders for coal were being directed to States in which the Republicans felt they had a chance to influence close elections.

The Pittsburgh paper's Washington correspondent said that the FOA program

appears to have bogged down almost completely. Six months after the plan was announced, only a million and a half tons have been shipped or authorized for purchase, and it is generally believed that the extent of future orders will not exceed a million tons. That would make 2,500,000 tons actually bought, a quarter of the total the GOP high command announced with a fanfare of publicity as the 1954 election campaign was at its height.

After detailing the FOA purchases to date, the Press' copyrighted story said: "Industry and the United Mine Workers looked askance at this program when Mr. Stassen first announced it. They said they were not consulted about it at any time.

"However, they hesitated at first to openly criticize it, though the UMW felt strongly that it was an administration measure aimed at getting the votes of miners in last fall's election. The UMW felt that if it did put some miners to work, then they shouldn't criticize the program.

"Significant, perhaps, is the fact that on the record no coal has been purchased from West Virginia mines, the country's largest soft-coal producing area. Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, a Democrat, was up for election last year but realistic minds in GOP politics felt pretty certain he couldn't be licked.

"So coal was first purchased from Kentucky, where Senator John Sherman Cooper, a Republican, was up against tough opposition—former Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY. The purchases of coal in Kentucky didn't save Senator Cooper from defeat."

Northern West Virginia coal producers and union members are expected to make a vigorous protest against the purchase of coal outside this country for the use of United States Armed Forces and to the economic detriment of the industry here.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Fairmont Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 years I have spoken many times on the subject of civilian defense. I have again and again pointed out that we have failed to establish a realistic program for citizen survival in the atomic-hydrogen age.

My speeches have stressed two major points: one, that the people should be informed by a source no less authoritive than the President, of the terrible effects of these new weapons; two, that the Federal Government assume the national obligation of directing and financing an adequate program of civilian defense.

I am pleased to note that my repeated requests seem to be having some effect. The Atomic Energy Commission yesterday, February 15, released some very important information on the factor of radioactive fallout of past bomb explosion substances. This information is long overdue in my opinion. The people can now begin to comprehend the hazards of atomic-hydrogen war. I have often said that an informed citizenry is necessary if the democratic form of government is to survive. The citizen must know the hazards of modern life if he is to be equipped to meet those hazards, both physically and financially.

Now that some of the hazards relating to radioactive fallout of atomic-hydrogen explosions have been made known, I hope that the executive branch of our Government will proceed to the next step in their responsibility to our citizens. That step is a reevalution of our civilian defense program.

My remarks will be brief and blunt. They concern the problem of civil defense against nuclear attack.

Today, the rulers of the Soviet Union have in being a growing stockpile of both atomic and hydrogen bombs. They have in being the planes needed to deliver these bombs against our American cities. Today, not next year, but today, we must go on the assumption that the Soviet dictators have it in their power to attack every major center of population within the United States. Today, not next year, but today, the costs of such an attack would probably be reckoned, not in millions, but in tens of millions of American casualties.

I have consistently advocated the strongest possible continental defense, the most effective program attainable for detecting, intercepting, and destroying enemy bomber formations. But our existing continental defenses, according to official and publically released Air Force testimony, could not turn back more than a fraction of an attacking air fleet. Enough planes would penetrate our defenses to inflict ruinous damage upon our Nation.

Within a relatively few years, in addition, the Soviets will in all likelihood produce the intercontinental ballistic missile. Such a weapon could travel from Russian bases to the heartland of America in a matter of minutes, at speeds and altitudes making interception almost hopeless. Future planning must consider this prospect.

A realistic policy for national survival in the atomic age must assume that a large-scale enemy nuclear attack—resolutely pressed home—would reach the majority of its intended targets—either today, or in the future. We need the strongest possible continental defenses—yes. But let us realize that such defenses can do no more than blunt the edge of an enemy attack.

In the preatomic age, our national military strategy could be built around a first and second line of defense. The vast stretches of the Atlantic and Pacific stood between the cities and industries of America and the military machines of our potential enemies. If attacked, we could trade space for time. We could use our forces and munitions in being to blunt the armed spearheads of an aggressor while, protected by two oceans, the tremendous industrial capacity of America—our second line of defense—could be turned to the output of the tanks and planes and guns needed by our Armed Forces.

Not so today, however; today, our industries would be exposed to direct attack from the very outset of a conflict. In a matter of a few days, or even a few hours, our cities and factories could suffer more destruction than was inflicted on England or Germany throughout the 6 years of World War II. With our industries largely destroyed, the flow of munitions to our fighting forces would quickly become a mere trickle, and then stop completely, leaving our fighting men armed only with raw courage.

In this age of nuclear weapons and jet bombers, there can no longer be a first and second line of defense. There is only one line of defense—total defense. It is a line that involves both military and civil defense. It is a line that runs through the cities and industries of America. We are all part of this line—civilian and military, Eastern and Western Hemispheres. Wherever free men live, work, or man the domestic machinery or military outposts we are one—one in exposure to danger, one in responsibility to defend our institutions.

This is the reality confronting us today. What are we doing about it?

Our existing civil-defense program—our program for minimizing casualties following an enemy attack, and for restoring defense production as quickly as possible—is tragically inadequate. We do not have today—and there is today no prospect of us having—the bare minimum of protection our cities and industries would need to keep a nuclear Pearl Harbor from dealing us a terrible, possibly mortal, blow.

Why is this? The Congress—on both sides of the aisle—does not lack for wise and patriotic legislators, ready to adopt the programs, and vote the appropriations, needed to keep us alive and free. Yet the Congress has appropriated only token sums for civil defense. The American people have time and again demonstrated their willingness to support the policies required for national survival, no matter what the cost in dollars and sacrifice. And yet their attitude toward civil defense is one of boredom, skepticism, and indifference. Why?

Here is my own answer to this question. I am convinced that most Americans—and most of their elected officials as well—do not now begin to appreciate the appalling vulnerability of our cities and industries against atomic-hydrogen attack. They do not understand the present danger because they have not been given the facts which would enable them to understand it.

Those who do know the true nature of the Soviet air-atomic threat also know that our existing civil-defense program could not begin to cope with it. Many in the Congress, let us acknowledge it, frankly, now feel that voting appropriations for civil defense is the equivalent of throwing good money after bad.

Now the American people and their elected officials are not cowards, and they are not stupid. If you tell them that our present civil-defense effort, or anything like it, can meet the challenge of Soviet air-atomic power, do not be dismayed or surprised if they appear skeptical. Give them no facts, or sugar-coated facts, concerning the present danger, and they will reach wrong conclusions. Give them the hard facts concerning this danger, and what is required

to meet it, and they will reach wise conclusions. Come before the American people with a real—rather than a token—civil-defense program, and they will support it.

Let me be specific regarding one vital area of information now withheld from the American people. You will remember that during the hydrogen tests held last spring in our Pacific proving grounds a group of Japanese fishermen on a trawler situated far from the test island of one of the shots were exposed to radioactive fallout. The same fallout forced the evacuation of Marshall islanders and United States military personnel from atolls located more than one hundred miles from the ground zero of the test. The implications of this for civil defense should be obvious to all. If a hydrogen test held in the Pacific forced us to evacuate an area covering thousands of square miles, does it not follow that radioactive fallout from a Soviet hydrogen bomb exploded in Washington might require us to evacuate Baltimore and Philadelphia? This conclusion is based, not upon military secrets, but upon a simple exercise in geography. It is a possibility which should be apparent to any person reading the public accounts of last spring's tests.

To my way of thinking, there is nothing mysterious or complicated about the shortcomings of our present civil defense effort, and there are constructive things which can be done to remedy them. Our existing civil defense program depends primarily on local resources and volunteer workers. A realistic program, in my opinion, must depend largely on Federal resources, and a vastly increased full-time civil defense corps. It must also be based on regional planning and unified coordination with vital military functions.

When the biggest weapon in the arsenals of the world was a two-ton blockbuster, a civil-defense program run primarily by our cities made real sense. When we thought in terms of Hiroshima-type atomic weapons, it was still possible to argue that the burdens of a civil-defense program should be borne primarily by our cities and States, with the Federal Government lending minor financial assistance and simply playing the role of an overall coordinator or adviser.

But this is an age of thermonuclear weapons. If a single hydrogen weapon were dropped on New York City, all the resources of New England and the Middle Atlantic States would have to be mobilized in minimizing the effects of the attack.

We do not ask the city of New York to purchase, maintain and operate the fighter squadrons charged with defending the local New York area. Neither do we ask the citizens of my own city, Los Angeles, to purchase and operate the Nike batteries which will be used for its military defense. Instead, we recognize that the program of providing active defense for our individual cities is properly a national—Federal responsibility.

The same logic calls for making civil defense primarily a national responsibility. Local resources and volunteer workers must naturally be used wherever possible, and no sensible person could propose creating a huge Federal civil defense bureaucracy. Let us face it, however. Our cities and States—without major Federal assistance—simply cannot provide emergency housing, feeding and medical services to survivors in target areas, after an atomic-hydrogen attack. Federal coordination of civilian defense and production problems, with military functions in a given target area, is imperative. The alternative is chaos for both. The Soviet air-atomic menace is a national danger—and we must meet it on the national level.

Simple logic should carry us a step further. We do not expect part-time volunteer workers to man our interceptor aircraft, our guided missile battalions, or the antiaircraft guns which ring our critical target areas. We realize instead that these are highly skilled activities, requiring the service of full-time fully trained personnel.

An equal degree of skill would be required to minimize casualties and damage following an attack against our cities. It it is no discredit to the thousands of Americans now serving as civil-defense volunteers to say that the problem of civil defense is simply too vast, and too complex, to be dealt with by an organization based primarily on volunteer help and local funds.

The concept of Federal responsibility for civil defense embraces far-reaching programs for utilizing national resources to provide emergency shelters, vital supplies of food, water, and medicines, protection of industrial facilities, and trained manpower.

Trained manpower to cope with widespread disaster is crucial in civilian-defense programs. All Americans will be called upon to make sacrifices and to discharge their individual responsibilities in a plan for national survival. We need no less than a universal system of training for civilian defense.

Those who are unable to serve in the military forces may be called upon to serve in the Civil Defense Corps. Each year many thousands of young Americans are rejected for military services because of minor physical handicaps. But a handicap disqualifying a young man for possible frontline combat duty need not disqualify him for an extremely vital role in our civil-defense effort. I say that we should ask such men to render a special service in our civil-defense program. They should be paid, of course, for the value of services rendered. This is the obvious way to lessen present inequality of sacrifice by giving such rejected draftees an opportunity to render our Nation services of great value. Here is the obvious way to create a full-time trained civil-defense organization without ruinous expenditure. At the same time, it would provide professional guidance to our indispensable volunteer workers.

One final point. Last year, the Congress appropriated almost $50 billion for the military defenses of our Nation. It appropriated little more than $50 million for the civil defense of our Nation. If civil defense is worth anything at all, I say it is worth more than one out of every thousand dollars we spend for national security. We are not going to create an effective civil defense through the kind of appropriations which the Congress has been voting for this purpose over the past 5 years. Military defense in the atomic age cannot be bought in bargain basements. Neither can civil defense.

It is crystal-clear, however, that the Congress will not vote larger sums for civil defense unless both our legislators and their constituents understand why these expenditures are necessary. To say this is to say again that the heart problem of civil defense is a problem of education—a problem of getting the facts home to the American people, so that they will not only passively support, but actively demand, a real civil defense. Suppression of the facts regarding atomic-hydrogen weapon effects is not only an insane policy of self-deception but it is a threat to national survival.

All our history shows that the American people do not want to be spoon fed or mollycoddled by misguided, even if well-intentioned, public officials. All our history shows that our people will support adequate national security programs, and the expenditures required for them, once they understand why such programs are necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission's report of February 15, 1955, should be read by every American citizen. This report is judicious and restrained. It is not exaggerated. If anything, it could be termed an understatement of the known facts.

I include this document as part of my remarks:

A Report by the United States Atomic Energy Commission on the Effects of High-Yield Nuclear Explosions

1. Considerable information on the effects of the explosions of atomic weapons has been made public by the Government since the first nuclear detonations in 1945. The handbook, The Effects of Atomic Weapons, published in 1950, is being revised and brought up to date to include the effects of thermonuclear weapons, as a result of the most recent tests at the Pacific Proving Grounds. References to the effects of thermonuclear explosions have been made in several official statements, beginning with Chairman Strauss' description of the phenomenon of fallout at a White House news conference on March 31, 1954. The following statement is designed to condense and correlate information, some of which already has been made public and other portions of which have been of a classified nature until now.

2. The effects of nuclear tests are evaluated for civil defense planning as well as for military and technological purposes. So long as nuclear weapons are in possession of any unfriendly power, the Commission believes the American public will wish to be as fully informed as possible as to the nature and extent of the dangers of nuclear attack and of the protective measures that can be taken by individuals and communities to avoid or minimize those dangers if we should be attacked.

3. Test conditions, which must necessarily form the principal basis of evaluating the effects of nuclear explosions, may differ markedly from those which might be expected if nuclear weapons were used against our population in wartime. It would be difficult to predict the size or kind of bomb an enemy might use against us in event of war, the exact means of its delivery, the

height at which it would be exploded, or the number of bombs which might reach a given target. Nevertheless, the facts to follow are the fundamental ones at this time.

FOUR EFFECTS OF DETONATIONS

4. A nuclear detonation produces four major characteristics—blast, heat, immediate nuclear radiation, and residual radioactivity. Of these, the first three are essentially instantaneous, while the fourth has a more protracted effect. The phenomena of blast, heat, and nuclear radiation from the detonation of a thermonuclear bomb are of the same nature as those of earlier and smaller atomic bombs. The nature of the phenomena is, in general terms, standardized whether the bomb be a 20,000-ton (TNT equivalent) atomic weapon or a thermonuclear one of many times that power. The intensity and area of the blast, heat, and nuclear radiation increase in relation to the greater energy yield of the explosion. Information on these effects has been extensively publicized; therefore, this report deals principally with effects other than heat and blast.

5. Residual radioactivity, although in no sense exclusive to high yield thermonuclear detonations, does become a matter of major concern when a large thermonuclear device of the type used in the 1954 tests in the Pacific is exploded on or near the ground. The fallout of radioactivity from such an explosion may, under certain conditions, settle over wide areas. Therefore, the extent and severity of this radioactive fallout has been a subject of continuing study since the first full-scale thermonuclear tests at the Pacific Proving Grounds on November 1, 1952. The results of these studies and of our evaluation of data obtained from the latest tests in the Pacific in March 1954 are described in subsequent parts of this report.

6. It should be noted that if we had not conducted the full-scale thermonuclear tests mentioned above, we would have been in ignorance of the extent of the effects of radioactive fallout and, therefore, we would have been much more vulnerable to the dangers from fallout in the event an enemy should resort to radiological warfare against us.

BLAST AND HEAT EFFECTS

7. The effects of blast and heat from a nuclear explosion are relatively localized. One A-bomb of the earliest type equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT (20 kilotons) would produce blast sufficient to destroy or damage seriously residences within a 1-mile radius. Within a radius of about a mile and a half, residences would be so damaged as to be unusable without repairs. A principal hazard to human beings would come from flying and falling debris and from fires due to such causes as broken gas and electric lines or overturned stoves. The area in which injuries to human beings would be caused by blast, therefore, would be about the same as the area of damage to structures.

8. The United States, as announced previously, has developed fission bombs many times as powerful as the first A-bombs, and hydrogen weapons in the ranges of millions of tons (megatons) of TNT equivalent. For these larger weapons, the blast effects can be calculated approximately by means of a scaling law, namely, the distance at which a given blast intensity is produced varies as the cube roots of the yields of the explosions.

9. Similarly, the heat and burn effects of nuclear explosions can be estimated from accumulated data. These effects, of course, are influenced by prevailing atmospheric conditions. The time element also is a prime factor. Very large weapons deliver heat over an appreciably greater period of time than smaller weapons. A given quantity of heat from a high-yield weapon, delivered over a longer period of time, will produce somewhat less severe burns than the same quantity of heat from a nominal detonation.

PROTECTION AGAINST BLAST AND HEAT

10. The hazard from both burn and blast effects in the outer affected areas would be reduced greatly by shelter. Clothing or almost any kind of shelter would reduce the danger of direct burns, although there might be some danger of clothing and structures becoming ignited. Shelter would materially reduce the hazard of blast injury by affording protection against flying or falling debris. The Federal Civil Defense Administration has made extensive studies of shelters and has issued plans for several simple and inexpensive types which can be utilized by householders. However, the Federal Civil Defense Administration recommends evacuation of the central areas of target zones on early warning of approaching attack.

RADIATION EFFECTS

11. The immediate nuclear radiation, i. e., the neutrons and gamma rays released instantaneously with the explosion of a large weapon on or near the ground, does not present a serious hazard beyond the area where heat and blast are of great concern.

FALLOUT RADIATION

12. However, particles with residual radioactivity produced by a detonation (as opposed to the immediate nuclear radiation) may fall out over an area much larger than that affected by blast and heat, and over a longer period of time. All nuclear detonations produce radioactive materials, but the nature and extent of the radioactive fallout depends on the conditions under which the bomb is fired. The main radioactivity of a bomb's fallout decreases very rapidly with time—for the most part, within the first hours after the detonation.

FALLOUT FROM IN-THE-AIR DETONATIONS

13. An in-the-air explosion where the fireball does not touch the earth's surface does not produce any serious radiological fallout hazard. The radioactivity produced in the bomb condenses only on solid particles from the bomb casing itself and the dust which happens to be in the air. In the absence of material drawn up from the surface, these substances will condense with the vapors from the bomb and air dust to form only the smallest particles. These minute substances may settle to the surface over a very wide area—probably spreading around the world—over a period of days, or even months. But they descend extremely slowly with the result that, by the time they have reached the earth's surface the largest part of their radioactivity has been dissipated harmlessly in the atmosphere.

FALLOUT FROM SURFACE DETONATIONS

14. If, however, the weapon is detonated on the surface or close enough so that the fireball touches the surface, then large amounts of material will be drawn up into the bomb cloud. Many of the particles thus formed are heavy enough to descend rapidly while still intensely radioactive. The result is a comparatively localized area of extreme radioactive contamination. Instead of wafting down slowly over a vast area, the larger and heavier particles fall rapidly before there has been an opportunity for them to decay harmlessly in the atmosphere and before the winds have had an opportunity to scatter them.

15. The area of hazard from radioactive fallout from a surface or near-surface explosion of a thermonuclear weapon is much larger than the area seriously affected by heat and blast. The large radioactive cloud of a thermonuclear explosion rises with great rapidity to the highest levels of the atmosphere and spreads over hundreds of square miles in the first hours. During this time the winds toss the extremely radioactive particles about and the pattern of the radioactive fallout is determined by the size of the particles and by the direction and velocities of the winds, including those up to 80,000 feet and above. The nature of the surface of the earth on which the bomb is fired also must be taken into consideration. Because of these variables, it is impossible to apply a single fallout pattern to all thermonuclear detonations, even test explosions conducted under selected conditions. However, with adequate knowledge of atmospheric conditions, including wind directions and velocities up to high levels and meteorological reports, the fallout region for any detonation usually can be predicted with considerable accuracy. In general terms, the region of severe fallout contamination from the detonation of a thermonuclear weapon fired on or near the surface can be described as an elongated, cigar-shaped area extending downwind from the point of burst.

FALLOUT PATTERN OF PACIFIC TESTS

16. The thermonuclear device fired at the Bikini Atoll on March 1, 1954, was exploded on a coral island. Coral consists of calcium carbonate, thus the detonation's radioactivity was spread by particles consisting largely of unslaked lime which, during the hours of descent, was slaked by moisture in the atmosphere. These particles ranged between one-thousandth and one-fiftieth of an inch in diameter and were, on the average, somewhat adhesive. The prevailing winds were westerly so the bomb cloud moved generally to the east and deposited the radioactive particles in varying amounts over an elliptical or cigar-shaped area. About 160 (statute) miles downwind from the point of burst the early fallout was observed in the form of fine particles which looked like snow. It began to fall about 8 hours after the detonation and continued to fall for several hours.

17. The roentgen is the commonly accepted unit of measurement of radiation dosage. A dose of about 25 roentgens of radioactivity received by a person over a brief space of time will produce temporary changes in the blood. A dose of some 100 roentgens received in a short interval may produce nausea and other symptoms of radiation sickness. About 450 roentgens delivered over a day or so might be fatal to approximately half of the persons so exposed. However, because of the body's repair processes, a total radiation dose which would be serious if incurred in a few minutes would produce much less effect if spread over a period of years. These statements may be helpful in understanding the data which follow.

18. The very large thermonuclear device exploded at ground surface during the tests in the Pacific on March 1, 1954, contaminated an elongated, cigar-shaped area extending approximately 220 statute miles down-wind and varying in width up to 40 miles. In addition, there was a contaminated area up-wind and cross-wind extending possibly 20 miles from the point of detonation. Data was collected from 25 points on 5 atolls located from 10 to 330 miles downwind (generally east) from Bikini Atoll. Due to an unexpected shift in the direction of the prevailing winds in the higher altitudes, the fallout missed the observation rafts that had been placed farther north previous to the test firing. The estimated contour of the pattern of fallout is, therefore, based only in part on data obtained from actual measurements and partly on extrapolation, i. e., calculations based on known data, including factual information obtained during previous tests of smaller devices.

19. Data from these tests permits estimates of casualties which would have been suffered within this contaminated area if it had been populated. These estimates assume: (1) that the people in the area would receive the maximum dose, (2) that they would not take shelter but would remain out of doors completely exposed, and (3)

that they would ignore even the most elementary precautions. Therefore, it will be recognized that the estimates which follow are what might be termed extreme estimates since they assume the worst possible conditions.

20. On the basis of data collected from the March 1, 1954, thermonuclear test in the Pacific, it is estimated that there was sufficient radioactivity in a downwind belt about 140 miles in length and of varying width up to 20 miles to have seriously threatened the lives of nearly all persons in the area who did not take protective measures. During the actual tests, of course, there were no people in this zone. Inside Bikini Atoll at a point 10 miles downwind from the explosion it is estimated that the radiation dosage was about 5,000 roentgens for the first 36 hour period after the fallout. The highest radiation measurement outside of Bikini Atoll indicated a dosage of 2,300 roentgens for the same period. This was in the northwestern part of the Rongelap Atoll, about 100 miles from the point of detonation. Additional measurements in Rongelap Atoll indicated dosages, for the first 36-hour period, of 2,000 roentgens at 110 miles, 1,000 roentgens at 125 miles, and, farther south, only 150 roentgens at 115 miles from Bikini.

21. Some distance farther from the point of detonation, at about 160 miles downwind and along the axis of the ellipse, the amount of radioactivity would have seriously threatened the lives of about one-half of the persons in the area who failed to take protective measures. It is estimated that the radiation dosage at that point was about 500 roentgens for the first 36-hour period.

22. Near the outer edge of the cigar-shaped area, or approximately 190 miles downwind, it is estimated that the level of radioactivity would have been sufficient to have seriously threatened the lives of 5 to 10 percent of any persons who might have remained exposed out of doors for the first 36 hours. In this area the radiation dosage is estimated at about 300 roentgens for the first 36-hour period.

23. Thus, about 7,000 square miles of territory downwind from the point of burst was so contaminated that survival might have depended upon prompt evacuation of the area or upon taking shelter and other protective measures.

24. At a point of 220 miles or more downwind, it is unlikely that any deaths would have occurred from radioactivity even if persons there had remained exposed up to 48 hours and had taken no safety measures.

25. The estimates cited above do not apply uniformly throughout the contaminated area inasmuch as the intensity of radioactivity within a region of heavy fallout will vary from point to point due to such factors as air currents, rain, snow, and other atmospheric conditions. Because of this and because most persons, if given sufficient warning, probably would evacuate the area or take shelter and other precautionary measures, the actual percentage of deaths could reasonably be presumed to be considerably smaller than these estimates.

PROTECTION AGAINST FALLOUT

26. In an area of heavy fallout the greatest radiological hazard is that of exposure to external radiation. Simple precautionary measures can greatly reduce the hazard to life. Exposure can be reduced by taking shelter and by utilizing simple decontamination measures until such times as persons could leave the area. Test data indicate that the radiation level, i. e., the rate of exposure, indoors on the first floor of an ordinary frame house in a fallout area would be about one-half the level out of doors. Even greater protection would be afforded by a brick or stone house. Taking shelter in the basement of an average residence would reduce the radiation level to about one-tenth that suffered out of doors. Shelter in an old-fashioned cyclone cellar, with a covering of earth 3 feet thick, would reduce the radiation level to about 1/5000, or down to a level completely safe, in even the most heavily contaminated area. Designs of shelters of simple yet effective construction have been prepared by the Civil Defense Administration and are available to the public.

27. Radioactive material deposited during fallout may or may not be visible but would be revealed by radiation detection instruments such as Geiger counters. Any falling dust or ash that can be seen downwind within a few hours after a nuclear explosion should be regarded as radioactive until measured by a radiation detection instrument and found to be harmless.

28. Care should be taken to avoid the use of solid foods or liquids that may contain fallout particles.

29. If fallout particles come into contact with the skin, hair, or clothing, prompt decontamination precautions such as have been prescribed by the Federal Civil Defense Administration will greatly reduce the danger. These include such simple measures as thorough bathing of exposed parts of the body and a change of clothing.

30. If persons in a heavy fallout area heeded warning or notification of an attack and evacuated the area or availed themselves of adequate protective measures, the percentage of fatalities would be greatly reduced even in the zone of heaviest fallout.

FALLOUT FROM NEVADA TESTS

31. Only relatively small nuclear test explosions are conducted at the Nevada test site, in contrast to the tests of high-yield thermonuclear devices at the Pacific proving grounds. In Nevada, as well as in the Pacific, all tests are planned for times when forecast weather conditions minimize the possibility of fallout hazard. Methods of forecasting weather patterns in these areas are improving steadily. High air bursts at the Nevada testing grounds have produced no significant fallout and heavy fallout from near-surface explosions has extended only a few miles from the point of burst. The hazard has been successfully confined to the controlled area of the test site. The highest actual dose of radiation at an off-site community has been estimated to be less than one-third of the greatest amount of radiation which atomic energy workers are permitted to receive each year under the Atomic Energy Commission's conservative safety standards.

INTERNAL RADIATION EFFECTS

32. Several basic facts should be kept in mind in evaluating the hazard from fallout radiation. First, radiation is not a new phenomenon created by the explosions of fission and thermonuclear weapons. Since the beginning of life, living things have been exposed constantly to radiation from natural sources. Cosmic rays from space constantly pass through our bodies. We are exposed to "background" radiation from radium and radon in the soil, water, and air. Our bodies have always contained naturally radioactive potassium and carbon.

33. As pointed out earlier, detonations of all atomic weapons produce radioactivity, a portion of which is carried to high altitudes and over great distances in the form of fine particles. The percentage of this radioactivity which travels beyond the relatively near area of the explosion depends largely on the conditions under which the bomb is fired, the percentage being higher for in-the-air bursts where the fireball does not touch the earth's surface. The most widespread radioactivity is produced only by the longer-lived fission products, since the radioactivity of the shorter-lived products decays and disappears before the particles come down to earth in a matter of days, weeks, months, and even years. The longer lived radioactive products may be distributed over the entire earth. However, as the particles are carried farther and farther to remote aeas, the possibility of significant amounts of fallout decreases.

RADIOSTRONTIUM FALLOUT

34. One of the most biologically important radioactive substances found in fallout is strontium-90. It has a long lifetime—nearly 30 years on the average. Radiostrontium has a chemical similarity to calcium and, therefore, when taken into the body it has a tendency to collect in the bones. Radiostrontium can enter the body in two ways—by inhaling or by swallowing. Normally, the amount inhaled would be small compared with the amount one might swallow. Fallout material deposited directly on edible parts of plants may be eaten along with the plants, but washing the plants before they are eaten would remove most of this radioactive material. However, rainfall carrying the radiostrontium down to earth may deposit it in the soil where it can be taken up, in part, by plants and incorporated into plant tissues, later to be eaten by humans or by grazing animals which, in turn, provide food for humans.

35. Since the start of nuclear tests, careful measurements have been made of the distribution of radiostrontium in the United States—in the soils, in plants and animal tissues, in rain, in the atmosphere, and in all forms in which it might be expected to occur. The results of this study are reassuring. The amount of radiostrontium now present in the soils of the United States as a result of all nuclear explosions to date would have to be increased many thousand times before any effect on humans would be noticeable.

RADIOIODINE FALLOUT

36. Among the shorter-lived fission products involved in the study of internal radiation, the most biologically important is radioiodine–131 with an average life of only 11.5 days. Even though this product may be widely spread after a nuclear explosion, the possibility of serious hazard is limited by its relatively short life. Like the nonradioactive form of the element, it concentrates in the thyroid gland and, in excessive quantity, conceivably could damage the thyroid cells.

37. Scientists of the AEC have estimated that the average exposure of people in the United States from radioiodine in the fallout from the entire series of tests in the spring of 1954 was only a few percent of the annual dose that can be received year after year and still have no noticeable effects.

38. These two isotopes—radiostrontium and radioiodine—constitute the principal internal hazards from the radioactivities produced by the detonations of atomic weapons, both fission and thermonuclear. The Atomic Energy Commission has been engaged for 3 years in a broad study of the radioactive forms of these isotopes and conducts year-round monitoring of these radioactivities in many locations. Any accumulation of these materials can be detected with great sensitivity so that ample warning of potential hazard could be given long before any actual danger occurred. The amounts of radiostrontium and radioiodine which have fallen outside the areas near the test sites as a result of all atomic tests up to now are insignificant compared to concentrations that would be considered hazardous to health.

GENETIC EFFECTS OF RADIATION

39. One other effect of radiation must be considered in evaluating the long-range possibilities of hazard from nuclear detonations. This is the possible genetic effect upon the germ cells which transmit inherited characteristics from one generation to another. At our present stage of genetic knowledge, there is a rather wide range of admissible opinion on this subject.

40. In general, the total amount of radiation received by residents of the United States from all nuclear detonations to date, including the Russian and British tests and all of our own tests in the United States and the Pacific, has been about one-tenth of one roentgen. This is only about 1/100th of the average radiation exposure inevitably received from natural causes by a person during his or her reproductive lifetime. It is about the same as the exposure received from a single chest X-ray.

41. The medical and biological advisers of the Atomic Energy Commission believe that the small amount of additional exposure of the general population of the United States from our nuclear weapons testing program will not seriously affect the genetic constitution of human beings. Nevertheless, we are continuing our thorough study of the entire question and will continue to report our findings to the American people.

SUMMARY

42. The Atomic Energy Commission hopes that the information on nuclear weapons effects contained in the foregoing report will never be reflected in human experience as the result of war. However, until the possibility of an atomic attack is eliminated by a workable international plan for general disarmament, the study and evaluation of weapons effects and civil defense protection measures must be a necessary duty of our government.

43. Inevitably, a certain element of risk is involved in the testing of nuclear weapons, just as there is some risk in manufacturing conventional explosives or in transporting inflammable substances such as oil or gasoline on our streets and highways. The degree of risk must be balanced against the great importance of the test programs to the security of the Nation and of the free world. However, the degree of hazard can be evaluated with considerable accuracy and test conditions can be controlled to hold it to a minimum. None of the extensive data collected from all tests shows that residual radioactivity is being concentrated in dangerous amounts anywhere in the world outside the testing areas.

44. It must be recognized that in the event of war involving the use of atomic weapons, the fallout from large nuclear bombs exploded on or near the ground would create areas of hazard to civilian populations far greater than heretofore experienced. However, as mentioned in the foregoing statement, there are many simple and highly effective precautionary measures which may be taken by individuals to reduce casualties to a minimum outside the immediate area of complete or near-complete destruction by blast and heat. Many of these protective measures, such as shelter and decontamination procedures, have been detailed by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the gentlemen who preceded me for the excellent discussion they gave of this very important question presented to the Congress by H. R. 1.

H. R. 1: AN ECONOMIC CONFUSION

The number of industries whose existence and prosperity are challenged and endangered by the reciprocal trade treaties is literally legion and I will not attempt here to set forth a complete enumeration. Available statistics incontrovertibly indicate that the largest unemployment and the greatest distress in the Nation occur in areas where there is greatest import competition. Textiles, critical materials and minerals, fabricated steel products, synthetic organic chemicals, plastic bases, carpet goods, electrical manufacturing, bicycles, motorcycles, wood products, and optical instruments together with many other domestic-produced commodities and products are seriously affected by foreign imports.

A vivid illustration is found in the textile industry, where textile imports have risen steadily and textile employment has declined by some 300,000 persons during the operation period of the treaties. Spokesmen for both northern and southern branches of the textile industry keenly aware of the perils of foreign imports have joined in urging adequate tariff duty. Managers and union-labor representatives have come together in efforts to forestall this ruinous competition.

Critical and strategic metals like lead, zinc, and copper are being progressively affected by foreign competition. Steady drops have occurred in employment in lumber and wood-products industries. Foreign chemical cartels are flooding American markets with competitive goods.

Scientific-instruments industries possessing vital critical skills are so sorely beset by cutthroat foreign competition that the supply of these skills so essential for defense and warfare is steadily but surely diminishing. Unless desperate efforts are taken to conserve these vital skills in American scientific-instruments industries a national emergency or war would witness shortages and deficiencies in this type of worker that might well spell disaster.

This situation was admirably and effectively outlined by a great industrial statesman from my own district, eminent businessman and economist and student of critical industrial skills, Mr. Henry Woodbridge, vice president of the American Optical Co., whose cogent remarks and timely warnings I am especially inserting in the RECORD.

Some New England textile cities have been deluged and swamped with unemployment, distress, and hardship arising in no inconsiderable measure from the impact of the trade treaties. For example, employment in the city of Lawrence, Mass., a beautiful community, so ably represented by my distinguished and amiable friend and colleague [Mr. LANE] dropped from over 20,000 in September of 1950 to 8,700 in September of 1953 and it is estimated that at present perhaps over 15,000 people in that city are out of work.

In Lowell, more than half of the area's jobless workers are displaced textile workers. About the same condition obtains in New Bedford where the textile industry has been steadily declining and unemployment is marked. Similar conditions obtain in many communities throughout the country where, despite the generally high economic and prosperity levels, there are many spots where there is extensive unemployment.

In my own district several communities are affected. Workers have been thrown out of work and established industrial concerns existing for over a hundred years have been forced to curtail their operations or go out of business. Several of these local areas have been designated as employment distress areas by the Government but as a consequence have not thereby been materially helped in securing necessary business through Government procurement, and in some instances are facing desperate conditions.

In textiles, despite the fact that raw material and labor operations have become relatively identical throughout the world, there are vast, existing wage differentials in the industry between this and other nations which completely nullify the normal competitive advantage of the high productivity and efficiency of American industry. These differentials are truly colossal. The gap between the modern American worker and his European or oriental counterpart is so astonishingly wide that it cannot be bridged alone by the superiority of our modern scientific methods and mass production efficiency.

The statistical evidence on this point is both voluminous and undeniable. It overwhelmingly demonstrates that the reciprocal trade treaties are slowly strangling many basic American industries to death. The celebrated economist of Harvard University, Professor Seymour E. Harris, rendered most significant testimony on the question before the Committee, the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This acknowledged expert, a painstaking and able student of economic problems generally and the textile industry in particular, so far as this testimony is concerned, drew some very startling conclusions about the unfavorable prospects for the textile industry under existing Treaty laws and national economic policies.

Professor Harris cannot be regarded as a reactionary, in fact, he is widely recognized as forward-looking and progressive in his thought. Nor is he a trade isolationist or a stagnated classical economist. On the contrary, he is a man of broadest learning and viewpoint, possessed of keen awareness of national and international problems, particularly as they relate to economic factors and developments. He is a detached, impartial and disinterested witness who contributed his time and testimony without compensation as a public service. After setting forth certain basic statistics indicating trends in the textile industry, Professor Harris concluded, in effect, that if current unemployment trends continue, this great industry would be out of business in the Nation in 15 years and in New England in 8 years.

He effectually exploded the theory that under protective meaures the United States would be restricting free trade. Pointing out that the dollar is the only major world currency that is convertible and the relative absence of quotas and exchange control restrictions by this country he minimized the influence of treaty tariff policy in solving

dollar shortages and promoting free trade. The high level of economic activity in the United States, he asserted, is a factor of greater importance than tariffs in determining imports and emphasized the discriminatory aspects of the trade-treaty system excessively burdening the textile industry. Branding the liquidation of the textile industry as "cruel," he sternly opposed the view that trade-treaty tariff policies could solve dollar-shortages problems. We are much indebted to Professor Harris for his discerning and brilliant analysis.

Of course the bare statistics completely support the views and concern expressed by Professor Harris, by prominent industrial and labor leaders and others. In New England alone textile employment has fallen by 48 percent since 1951 and by 267 percent since September a year ago in cotton and rayon mills. The gravity of this situation is focused more clearly when we consider the facts that in New England 1 out of every 6 industrial jobs is in textiles. Textile workers displaced by foreign competition or other factors either remain unemployed, are forced to take lower paying jobs, or as a last resort, are compelled to seek public relief.

The evidence is to the effect that these displaced workers are not being absorbed in large numbers by other industries. The record shows that they are being displaced to a great extent because of foreign competition of workers whose wages are, at highest, about a third and, at lowest, about a 15th of what American workers receive. The wages of American workers are 210 percent of those paid in Great Britain, over 1,000 percent of those in Japan and 1400 percent of those in India.

To admit goods produced at such wage scales into this country in continuing and larger amounts will merely serve to promote a worldwide competitive struggle based on paltry wages and lowly living standards and can only damage, perhaps irreparably, the industrial structure of the United States and, in time, the free world. The American flax manufacturing industry, indeed, all soft fiber and hard fiber textile industries, are confronted under existing treaties with this threatening situation. Unless relief is soon granted, it is clear that the position of many of these industries will be entirely insupportable. They will have no recourse but to go out of business. Hundreds of thousands of loyal workers would lose their jobs.

Now I would like to discuss briefly what other countries are doing regarding the admission of American-made goods to their markets at a time when we are so generously opening up the doors to our markets to foreign-made goods under the reciprocal-trade treaties. The dictionary defines reciprocal as "done or given by each to the other—mutual—mutually interchangeable—expressive of mutual relationship or action." Legally the word "reciprocal" is similarly defined as carrying the implication of mutual and reciprocal responsibility and obligation in accordance with written instruments or protocols. The United States under the so-called reciprocal-trade treaties has implemented these laws in a manner which has been, I reiterate, extremely generous to foreign countries and as a consequence a steadily increasing flow of foreign products is reaching American shores and moving into American markets.

What are other countries doing by way of reciprocal action to implement the agreements and to carry out the spirit and letter of these laws? Many American manufacturers know why it is difficult to sell United States goods abroad. For example, in Britain import of most goods is limited by quotas, licenses are required on imports, dollars needed to buy in the United States are rationed, goods from the rest of the Empire get special, preferential, low tariffs. In West Germany a similar situation obtains. In France, a strict quota system admits only essentials, a strict import licensing system exists, tariffs have been raised and its colonies are induced to favor French goods. In Japan, a system of high tariffs, complex, tangled bureaucratic custom rules, quotas and permits, make United States goods very costly.

In a special report not long ago U. S. News & World Report editors around the globe compiled and listed the barriers generally and specifically set up abroad against American products and goods. There is scarcely a country in the world, they stated, that is not operating under systems of tariff, import and dollar controls, quotas, licenses, and other restrictions on American import.

What is worse, foreign industries financed, constructed and guided by American grants, technical advice and assistance have entered the world markets on a huge scale in competition with American goods. The trend overseas is toward eliminating all American goods except extreme essentials. The automobile industry and household-appliances industry, machine-tool industry, cotton industry, and others supporting H. R. 1 and favoring foreign imports on the theory that low tariffs and high imports here will make foreign exchange available for the purchase of their products, are living in a fool's paradise and I want to tell them right now that they are not going to live in that paradise for very long. As the special report indicated, in practice, foreign controls become protectionist. In setting quotas, foreign officials try to fill their needs from home industries and to eliminate imports by building local manufactures.

European markets for American automobiles are being drastically and steadily limited. Some of the companies have anticipated this development by locating huge factories overseas but this is not helpful, but harmful, to American labor and to the American economy. Indeed, because of blocked exchanges and other restrictions the investors in these industries, generally the only American beneficiaries of American foreign manufacture programs, in the long run are going to find it very difficult, if not impossible, to get any of their money out of these countries.

European nations are gradually tightening rules on imports of autos and parts. In time, the automobile imports overseas will be virtually barred, and the same is true of most other American products, if present trends continue.

Mexico junked a reciprocal trade agreement with the United States it is stated, in order to raise her own tariffs although she continues to benefit munificently from most of the tariff cuts we have made. Germany slapped a 12-percent duty on aluminum as soon as her own industry recovered. Australia set higher rates on canvas, internal combustion engines, and other items. New Zealand is planning to raise tariffs. The Portuguese are studying proposed tariff raises. Practically everywhere American goods are facing exclusion or greatest difficulty in being admitted to foreign markets. Throughout the world, trade barriers remain very high. Many governments find controls suitable for their radical economic planning programs. India allows cars to come in only "knocked down," but she now plans to eliminate assembly plants and eventually make all her own cars. Thus, not only American goods, but American assembly plants and manufacturing establishments are being excluded or slated for drastic regulation in many countries.

Free trade was the dream of some classical economist. But like the automatic gold standard, it has gone the way of all flesh and not only is no longer a reality in most parts of the world, but has become virtually an impossibility to achieve. Only the Pollyannas of our State Department, the do-good, bleeding heart, world-state elements that have already done so much damage to our foreign policy and our economy, some definitely left-wing propagandists, also wedded to radical theories and, unfortunately, some international bankers and industrial business tycoons who are long on ready cash but short on judgment of long time economic trends in the world, are enthusiastically pressing for this policy of lop-sided reciprocity which is, to be sure, no reciprocity at all, since this Nation is making practically all the concessions and doing all the reciprocating while many other nations are tightening their imports controls and inaugurating drastic restrictions. The reciprocal trade treaties were sponsored, implemented, and promoted by some who neither believe in our economic system or our free way of life.

You do not have to be a professional economist to know that this course is going to lead this Nation to perdition. If we keep the door open for cutthroat competition by foreign goods and products produced at a fraction of our domestic cost, it is only a question of time—and not a long time at that—before our economic system will be shattered and wrecked.

I am willing to help impoverished nations and people solve their governmental and living problems and get back on their feet economically, socially, militarily, and spiritually. I have voted for many proposals to carry out this laudable objective within reason and our capacity. But I think that it is time now to make a complete, careful reappraisal of our economic position in the world, to study existing economic trends, to analyze existing trade policies directed against our foreign and domestic mar-

kets, and to recognize the need—yes, the urgency—for keeping our own economic structure and system strong, vital, and vigorous.

Because the present administration has thrown its weight and influence behind this free-trade policy, there is little prospect for materially changing or defeating the present bill. Nevertheless, I regard this measure not only as unsound and unwise, but I warn that it contains the germs of disintegration and dissolution of our great and matchless economic system. It could well bring our great economy down to ruin.

One of the most disturbing features of this bill is the speed with which it has been catapulted through the committee and the Congress. The subject matter of this bill is of vital importance to the Nation and the economy. It presumes to deal with extremely complex economic and political questions. It is a measure, not only of great importance, but of far-reaching, deep-seated ramifications.

In my humble opinion it should have been considered over a much longer period of time. Since it is not an emergency measure, it should have been considered without the fervor, haste, and sense of urgency that characterized its legislative course.

I have concluded, as one consequence of my long experience in public life, that there is nothing in the legislative branch so calculated to produce definitely bad results, confusion, and uncertainty as legislation which is rushed through the Congress. Such legislation merely complicates our long-run task as lawmakers because subsequent sessions of Congress must invariably seek to undo what has been unwisely done in haste and under pressure.

The recent history of Congress is replete with instances of measures hastily adopted, which have had to be altered and materially changed to avoid harmful results of one kind or another. Haste makes waste, and that is just as true of legislation as it is of everything else.

I am very sorry that this measure could not have been given more extensive consideration so that a moderate approach and mature judgments might possibly be substituted for overzealousness, fervor, and preconceived theories.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. In connection with the point the gentleman is making of restrictions set up by foreign countries, may I remind the gentleman that of the imports coming into this country 65 percent are on the free list. So far as America is concerned that is double the amount of items on the free list of other nations that are parties to the reciprocal trade agreements program. These restrictions that they set up against our exports are completely out of line with the restrictions here in America, because only 35 percent of the foreign imports are on the duty list whereas the other 65 percent are on the free list.

Mr. PHILBIN. The gentleman has made a very cogent point.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is making a very fine statement. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks the farmers realize what will happen to their markets if our mills are further closed down? There will be no market for the milk, butter, eggs, and all of the farm products that they produce. I think the farmers sometimes do not realize what closing the mills and putting all of these thousands of people out of work will do to them.

Mr. PHILBIN. The gentlewoman has as usual put her finger on a very vital point. I hope that the farmer does realize the implications of this legislation. It will result in chaos for the farmer if the textile market is closed down or retarded any further.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Farm Bureau does not realize what it is going to do to them. Workers from all over the country have been getting in touch with me in protest, as well as manufacturers. The farmers do not realize what it will do to their domestic market which they are now assured of.

Mr. PHILBIN. I hope that the farmers will take a realistic position in reference to this bill and I want to thank the gentlewoman who is always so much interested in these problems, especially those affecting her own district.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked and received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Lowell Sun. I should like to quote just briefly from this advertisement:

I like living in the United States. I like living in Massachusetts. I like my home and job here in Lowell because these are matters of my own choice. But here is a point which bothers me and my wife. It's this rumbling in Washington about a new bill coming up Thursday of this week in the House of Representatives which will lower the tariff. It seems to me this is going to make a big difference in my job, my home, and my future.

If you vote to pass this bill to lower the tariff, it means that people in England who work for 45 cents per hour; also people in France who work for 43 cents per hour, Italy at 30 cents, and Japan at 14 cents, they will all be working steady but I won't.

It's just as simple as that.

I'm just one of many workers all over the country, whose homes and jobs will be affected by the passage of this bill. If you are interested in me, my family, my home, and Lowell, please do not approve this bill.

Respectfully yours,

A WORRIED WORKER.

Then it is signed by many of the biggest manufacturers of the cotton-woolen textile industry in Massachusetts.

It says:

If you work for wages, own a store, run a business, or are a housewife, you have a deep interest in affairs in Washington during the coming few days. Along about Thursday your Congressmen will be asked to vote on a bill to lower the tariff. Congressmen are sent to Washington to represent the people back home. But you've got to let them know how you feel.

Once again our jobs and homes are in danger because of the tariff. They are in danger because some people—the free traders—are trying to pass a bill in Congress to cut United States tariffs 15 percent in the next 3 years. The free traders don't worry about your job.

Tariffs actually are supposed to even up the big wage gap between your pay and that in foreign mills. Our tariffs now are too low as it is. That is why imports coming to the United States can undersell the goods we make here.

You are competing with England, where mill pay is about 45 cents an hour. You are competing with France, where it is about 43 cents; with Italy, where it is 30 cents; and with Japan, where it is only 14 cents an hour. Our low tariffs now are no bar to imported goods, yet the United States Government is willing to cut tariffs again on many kinds of textiles to aid Japan.

The people who want to cut tariffs say you can learn a new kind of work if imports kill your job. They say you can move some place else and try to find work.

Bear in mind, and tell your Congressman, that if H. R. 1 becomes a law, it means Congress once more, and to a greater degree than ever, will have given up its constitutional obligation to control our foreign trade. The State Department will continue in the saddle. If H. R. 1 passes, there is nothing your Congressman and Senators can do to help you combat imports. They might protest to the State Department, but it would be too late, because the Department again would have the power Congress surrendered.

All of the people in the city of Lowell and the surrounding towns are asked to write to their Congressmen. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] and I have had several letters on this subject. I am glad to have the additional letters coming in. I saw some workers today from Pennsylvania, and they made some very fine statements.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I want to compliment the gentlewoman on the excellent speech she made and particularly upon those splendid, pertinent remarks she read from the paper that she is evidently going to include as part of her remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Masachusetts. Yes.

Mr. PHILBIN. It was stated very succinctly and vividly sets forth the true situation that is presented to the country. There is no way to meet the situation that confronts the people as the result of these tariff cuts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

And, they talk of a number of other related industries in our district and all over the country that will be affected and closed down when our textile mills close down. Many do not seem to realize what it is going to do to the farmers who will not have their local markets to sell their agricultural products, their butter, their eggs, their cheese, and other commodities. It is going to ruin a lot of those farmers. Also, there are a good many farmers who have mortgages at

the banks, and if the money is not forthcoming on the sale of their products, they will not be able to pay off their mortgages. I do not think some of the farmers realize that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a week's leave of absence be granted to my colleague the gentleman from Nevada, Mr. YOUNG, on account of illness, for the week ending February 19.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), on account of official business.

Mr. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), on account of serious illness and death in family.

Mr. PROUTY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 10 days, on account of illness of his wife.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. MAGNUSON.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include a reply to the statement of Charles Taft before the Committee on Ways and Means and the Joint Economic Committee on the coal industry.

Mr. LANE and to include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $260.

Mr. MASON on the subject of the Eisenhower school program and to include an editorial.

Mr. SCOTT and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $400.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Illinois and to include a speech.

Mr. REED of New York.

Mr. RABAUT, in two instances.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. HALE and include an editorial.

Mr. ALGER and include a speech delivered by the minority leader, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., in Dallas, Tex.

Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. MCCULLOCH).

Mr. LESINSKI in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 17, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

439. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1956 involving a reduction in the amount of $3,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

440. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

441. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of records proposed for disposal pursuant to the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

442. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, for the period January 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

443. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation and a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

444. A letter from the Deputy Maritime Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1954; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

445. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Act of June 27, 1942 (ch. 453, 56 Stat. 461), as amended, to make permanent the exemptions from duty of personal and household effects, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 14, 1954, the following resolutions were reported on February 15, 1954:

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 141. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3828, a bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 142. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1, a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the House Calendar.

[*Submitted February 16, 1955*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2123. A bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2581. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 55. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VELDE: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities pursuant to House Resolution 5, 84th Congress (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3952. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 136. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Defense to furnish the House of Representatives certain information as to extent and cost of military installation (Rept. No. 56). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 4045. A bill to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4046. A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4047. A bill relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 4048. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 4049. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4050. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4051. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4052. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 4053. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4054. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4055. A bill to appropriate $3,460,000 to carry out the authorized project for the development of New Haven Harbor, including construction of a channel in the Quinnipiac River with a turning basin at the mouth of the Mill River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 4056. A bill to provide for the construction of certain flood-control works along the east bank of the Mill River near New Haven, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4057. A bill to provide for a determination by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the advisability of modifying the existing project at New Haven Harbor, Conn., in view of changed shipping and economic conditions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4058. A bill to extend the home-loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to veterans of World War I and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 4059. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 4060. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to allow compensation to counsel assigned by the court in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4061. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4062. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 4063. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4064. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4065. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 4066. A bill to amend the act of August 23, 1954, relating to reimbursement to postmasters of discontinued post offices for equipment owned by the postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4067. A bill to provide that equipment for use in post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 4068. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the county of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILLINGS (by request):

H. R. 4069. A bill to extend the benefits of the pension laws to certain male nurses who served under contract with the United States between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 4070. A bill to exempt ultrahigh frequency television receiving sets from Federal excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 4071. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4072. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4073. A bill to improve the enforcement of laws pertaining to gambling by suppressing the transmission of certain gambling information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4074. A bill relating to the definition of the term "bond" for purposes of determining amortizable bond premium under section 171 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 4075. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4076. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4077. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for the payment of annuities thereunder to the widowers of female employees who die in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4078. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide a uniform rate for the computation of all annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4079. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that the surviving widows or widowers of retiring employees shall automatically be entitled to an annuity equal to 50 percent of the annuity earned by the retiring employee without requiring the retiring employees to elect to take reduced annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4080. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave over 90 days be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4081. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide optional retirement at 60 years after 25 years of service with full annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4082. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide equal benefits for surviving children of female employees as are provided for surviving children of male employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4083. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to eliminate reduction in annuity made for surviving spouse, if spouse does not survive; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4084. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide a full annuity compensation for employees involuntarily separated after having rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4085. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that annuities shall be adjusted simultaneously with general adjustments in Federal employees salaries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4086. A bill to extend the time within which local educational agencies may complete applications for payments under Public Law 815 in certain hardship cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4087. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4088. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide optional retirement at age 55 with 30 years service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4089. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4090. A bill to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 4091. A bill to amend section 812 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to the deduction of inheritance, succession, or other death taxes imposed by law other than Federal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4092. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4093. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4094. A bill to provide certain decorations for outstanding and heroic conduct or

service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4095. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4096. A bill to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4097. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity, and relating to railway property; to the Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4098. A bill to provide for studies of the methods of determining the amount, distribution, and effects of illness in the United States and for conducting periodic inventories of illness by the best methods developed through such studies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4099. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new chemical additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4100. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new chemical additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 4101. A bill to provide that school districts which filed applications for payments under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, before November 24, 1953, shall not be penalized on account of school construction contracts made after that date; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4102. A bill to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4103. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4104. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4105. A bill to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R 4106. A bill to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4107. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4108. A bill to provide for minimum 1955 State rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4109. A bill to establish an advisory board to assist the Commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 4110. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4111. A bill to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 4112. A bill to provide for minimum 1955 State rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4113. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4114. A bill to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 4115. A bill to define the surface rights vested in the locator of a mining claim hereafter made under the mining laws of the United States, prior to issuance of patent therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4116. A bill to authorize and direct the Indian Claims Commission to determine the liability for the engagement in the vicinity of Wounded Knee, S. Dak., on December 29, 1890, and make recommendations in respect thereto; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4117. A bill to authorize the construction of a sewage-treatment plant to serve the St. Joseph's Indian School, Chamberlain, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4118. A bill to amend section 606 (5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the computation of the 10-year recapture period; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 4119. A bill relating to farm-acreage allotments for burley tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4120. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4121. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4122. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4123. A bill to provide for the refund of the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits lost, or damaged by the hurricanes of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 4124. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for widows of officers and employees separated from the service with title to deferred annuity who die before having established a valid claim for annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4125. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4126. A bill to encourage a stable, prosperous, and productive dairy program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 4127. A bill to exempt courses leading to standard college degrees offered by nonprofiit educational institutions of higher learning from the provisions of section 227 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 prohibiting the enrollment of eligible veterans under that act when such courses have been in operation for less than 2 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 4128. A bill to amend section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the disposal of surplus property to State health departments and publicly owned water districts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that Congress shall have power to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 216. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that the people of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to vote in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to require the flag to be flown at certain foreign service posts during daylight hours; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YATES:

H. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 3 of each year as Dorchester Day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the pamphlet, Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function? to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 144. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Public Works to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under clause 15 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 145. Resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 210, 83d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF: Memorial of the Montana Legislature relating to irrigation canal seepage, mosquito control, and land development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint resolution of the New Jersey Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 and subsequent Federal-aid highway acts to provide for the elimination of provisions which would deprive those States of Federal highway aid which are spending motor fuel and motor vehicle tax receipts for nonhighway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial memorializing the Congress that the continued excessive importation of foreign oil and its derivatives is inimical to the well-being of the United States of America and the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 and subsequent Federal-aid highway acts relative to the use of motor fuel and motor vehicle tax receipts for nonhighway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4129. A bill for the relief of Pearl Luba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4130. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4131. A bill for the relief of Joe Penovich, Lorenzo Laconi and Joseph Laconi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4132. A bill for the relief of Bayazit Taygan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 4133. A bill for the relief of Rem-Cru Titanium, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (by request):

H. R. 4134. A bill for the relief of Moses Aftergut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 4135. A bill for the relief of Edoardo Maria Filippo Baldassare Perrone di San Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4136. A bill for the relief of Ada M. Funk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4137. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4138. A bill for the relief of Harilaos G. Tsironas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 4139. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Focas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 4140. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Sho-Tse Tsiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 4141. A bill for the relief of Vivencio Fernando Raymundo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 4142. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ulysses M. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 4143. A bill for the relief of Adib Farid Tabri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 4144. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4145. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isolina Alvarez Groton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4146. A bill for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Giessner (nee Schega); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 4147. A bill for the relief of Angelo De Vito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4148. A bill for the relief of McFarland Cockrill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 4149. A bill for the relief of On Saik Chiang and Mrs. Nena Tabongbanua Yee Chiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 4150. A bill for the relief of Wong Ma Chee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4151. A bill for the relief of Pietro Pipitone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4152. A bill for the relief of Maria Pintos and her daughter, Eugenia Pintos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of Romilos Sarri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4154. A bill for the relief of Alzbeta Katerina Szwabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4155. A bill for the relief of Rosa Daschner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4156. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Henri Revilliod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4157. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw (John) Waz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4158. A bill for the relief of David Kehsin Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 4159. A bill for the relief of Maria Pas Singson Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4160. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Glen Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4161. A bill to authorize former Maj. John R. Brown, Jr., United States Air Force, to accept the Air Force wings and supporting documents conferred upon him by the Government of Pakistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 4162. A bill for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 4163. A bill for the relief of Kocci-mides Nicolas Katsibris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4164. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

93. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Wisconsin Cooperative Wool Growers Association meeting at Madison, Wis., urging the Department of Agriculture and the directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide for assignments by wool growers of the incentive payments to banks, credit institutions, and marketing agencies, including cooperatives, who have financed wool for growers in the past; to the Committee on Agriculture.

94. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of supervisors, San Diego, Calif., relative to the observance of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. Also, petition of Vachel Davis, Eldorado, Ill., requesting that the action of the Joint Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in 1949, that gave the Postmaster General full powers to select and authorize issuance of all special commemorative postage stamps, be repealed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

96. Also, petition of the executive director, the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., Chicago, Ill., urging the United States to continue its support of the international technical assistance program of the United Nations and its associated agencies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

97. Also, petition of the secretary, National Association of State Racing Commissioners, Lexington, Ky., urging careful consideration be given the result of imposing additional taxes on parimutuel wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

98. Also, petition of the grand knight, Parkway Council, No. 1433, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., expressing support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N. Y., requesting enactment of legislation so that all individual persons be allowed an exemption of $1,200 instead of the $600 now allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

100. Also, petition of the secretary, Lithuanian Americans of the City of Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y., voicing gratitude to the United States for its sympathy and support extended to the cause of independence of Lithuania and her neighbors, Latvia and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

101. Also, petition of the president, Dallas Geological Society, Dallas, Tex., requesting the enactment of legislation providing that the Natural Gas Act does not apply to the production and gathering of natural gas, the local sale of gas by producers or gatherers, and the price received by the producer or gatherer from such sale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

102. Also, petition of the secretary, Hudspeth County Farm Bureau, Dell City, Tex., condemning the practice of using wetback labor as demanded by the United Immigration and Naturalization Service, in order to keep our organization from being blacklisted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. By Mr. MILLER of New York: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, State of New York, memorializing the 84th Congress of the United States to enact such necessary legislation so that all individual persons be allowed an income-tax exemption of $1,200 instead of the $600 presently allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The United States Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are proudly congratulating a great conservation agency—the United States Forest Service—in celebrating, this month, its golden anniversary.

The accomplishments of this fine organization as it pioneered in improving, maintaining, and protecting our forests and streams have benefited our people from coast to coast. We are proud of this quiet, hard-working, competent group.

It is my pleasure here to throw a little light on one of the many outstanding groups in the Forest Service organization. The headquarters of the Forest Service's Southern Forest Experiment Station is located at my home, New Orleans. The southern station was established in 1921 when only a few visionary people looked upon timber as a replaceable resource. The station has been, and continues to be, a sturdy guidepost for good forestry in the loblolly- and shortleaf-pine forests of the mid-South, the hardwoods of the Arkansas and Tennessee uplands, the delta hardwoods, and the longleaf- and slash-pine lands of the lower South.

Research at the southern station has helped make possible the tremendous pine-planting program underway in the South. The contribution of the forest survey in determining the extent, volume, and condition of southern forest lands and in appraising probable future timber requirements has been of inestimable value to wood-using industries and in stabilizing communities. Research in the growth and economic possibilities of farm woodlands is showing the way toward an improved standard of living for thousands of small farm-forest landowners.

Yes; the foresters of the southern station are doing a great job—but they have an even greater job yet to do.

The census people say that as a nation we are now using more industrial wood and wood products than ever before. We sometimes forget that in addition to lumber, plywood, poles, crossties, and piling, many of our everyday commodities come from wood—paper, boxes, rayon, cellophane and plastics, to name just a few. And each year new products are added to the list. The census people further tell us there are 164 million people in the United States, and that in less than 20 years the figure will be raised to 210 million. Forty-six million more Americans will be demanding more and more wood.

Where are we to get this wood? There is no doubt about it, our forests from Oregon down to Louisiana and up to Maine must be managed at their best to meet the demand. Within our Southland, the region with one of the greatest forest potentials is the Longleaf Slash Pine Belt. This region blessed with high rainfall and long growing season lies across the lower South from east Texas and Louisiana to Georgia and Florida—50 million acres of some of the best timberland in America, but 50 million acres growing trees at less than one-fourth capacity. These capable lands are growing 20 good trees where they should be growing 100.

America can no longer afford the luxury of idle, or even half-idle, land. America needs the wood and the people of the forest commmunities need the steady jobs—steady jobs that productive forests can offer.

The lower South supports a growing population of 10 million people—people who have lived on the land in the past—people who are inseparable from the land in the future. Yet, in this era of general prosperity there are still many unstable communities in the Longleaf Slash Pine Belt—communities with submarginal incomes.

Good forestry and forest research are making great strides. Much has been accomplished, but many tough problems remain. The extensive planting of southern pines has been a real help, but the problems go much deeper. For example, we need better ways of using or removing low-quality and worthless weed trees now encumbering southern forests. Important forest management research in the longleaf-slash pine forests of Louisiana, Mississipppi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida must be continued and strengthened to keep pace with the requirements of southern industrial development.

More and more people are becoming familiar with the many pine seedling nurseries throughout the South, with the tremendous job they are doing and have left to complete. Last year 60 million pine seedlings were grown in Louisiana alone, yet at the present rate of planting it will take more than 50 years to do the job. Research and industry together must find ways to speed the task of reforestation—perhaps by planting seeds directly on areas needing restocking instead of seedlings grown in nurseries and by finding ways of making our best trees produce more seed.

Another problem is the growth of longleaf pine—one of the finest timber trees in the world. Longleaf seedlings often grow less than a foot in height during their first 10 years. This delay costs the South colossal volumes of wood annually—wood that could provide steady jobs for the people in the forests and in the mills. If research can solve the problem, the solution will be a spectacular achievement with Southwide application.

Most of the beef cattle in the lower South graze part or all of the year on forest ranges. Although these forest ranges produce tons of grass and good grazing, meat production per animal is too low. We need more efficient ways to convert this grass to beef, and we must also learn how to profitably raise timber and cattle simultaneously.

Forestry is not the mere growing of trees. If America is to remain strong, our forests must produce high-quality materials—both timber and forage, and in large volumes, in the shortest possible time. Pulp and paper mills are playing a greater and greater part in the southern forest economy. Less than 20 years ago, only 31 paper mills were operating in the South. Today there are 67 and more are under construction. What is the impact of these mills? We must learn how to grow and how to use our forests to supply the demands of both pulp mills and sawmills.

These are just a few of the problems that we are counting on the Forest Service to help solve. Forests mean jobs and payrolls. The history of the world has shown that depleted forests and depleted nations go hand in hand. But thanks to men of vision, America's forests are a renewable resource managed for permanency. We congratulate the Forest Service at its golden anniversary—and we expect even greater accomplishments during the next 50 years.

Residual Oil Versus Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Charles P. Taft, president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, testified before the Committee on Ways and Means and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, he took it upon himself to act as the champion for the entire foreign trade program, and in doing so belittled the effects which the importation of oil and glass in competition with domestic industry and labor was having upon our national economy.

Mr. Taft, in his appearance before these committees as president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, although he did not mention it, was not entirely unselfish in his presentation. Mr. Taft, if he is not now, has been in the past, registered as the agent for a foreign government representing the government of Venezuela and the Venezuelan Chamber of Commerce. Therefore, when, in Mr. Taft's statement, he devotes some very specific, pointed remarks to the efforts of the coal industry to obtain relief from the damaging imports of foreign oil which have greatly reduced coal's market on the east coast, he joins in a very well organized and highly financed campaign being conducted by

some of the richest and most powerful oil companies, to destroy vital segments of our industry.

Mr. Taft, as well as other spokesmen for the major oil companies, seven of whom control the entire world petroleum market, attempt to belittle, discredit, and destroy an industry that supplies the Nation's biggest source of energy that keeps the electric power and steel industries operating, and which is the keystone of the prosperity of the railroad, chemical, and other related industries.

The coal industry, in an appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee which is now considering a proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, testified that the coal industry must have a quota limitation on residual fuel oil imports if it is to remain competitive in the large east coast energy market. The coal industry has not asked for absolute elimination of the imports of foreign oil. The request has been modest and only asks that the House committee write into the Trade Agreements Bill, and that Congress vote it, an amendment limiting foreign oil imports, including residual oil imports, to 10 percent of the domestic demand for petroleum products in the corresponding quarter of the previous year. Such a formula would mean only that the level of imports that would be permitted would be the same as the level of imports which prevailed during the postwar period from 1946 to 1951.

I support that request as reasonable—so do a growing number of my colleagues.

The reaction of the oil industry spokesmen, including Mr. Taft, has been one of hysterical denunciation of the coal industry. In addition, the oil industry spokesmen and Mr. Taft have made statements and quoted figures, in attempts to disparage the coal industry's contention, which are deliberately misleading.

In his statement before this committee, Mr. Taft asked for all the facts, "not the selected ones which coal spokesmen and their auxiliaries bring to this committee." Then Mr. Taft cited facts of his own which add up to half-truths and untruths. Mr. Taft asks for facts. Well, let us have the facts about the amount of coal displaced by oil imports. Coal producers and coal shippers, shipping to industries and public utilities on the east coast, know the reason for the discontinuance of these shipments to their East customers. As an example, a coal producer or shipper has an order with an industry for a certain tonnage of coal. He is notified that shipments must be discontinued. He is given the reason; if not, he requests it. Now, by simple addition, the total number of tons of coal displaced, added up, totals approximately 32 million tons per year. It is just as simple as that, and it is accurate.

The coal industry does not need the juggling of figures as to railroads and natural gas and light fuels, and the tonnage lost to other industries. I do not know what "other industries" mean, nor do I know what he means by "light fuels." But the facts are as I have stated above about the loss of tonnage.

Does Mr. Taft think for one moment the amount of residual oil being shipped to the United States is not displacing coal at all? What is being done with it? What is the purpose of shipping it then?

He said that heavy residual fuel oil consumption increased by only 11 million tons coal equivalent in the United States between 1947 and 1953. Actually, the increase of foreign residual fuel oil—including that refined from foreign crudes—increased from 17 million tons coal equivalent in 1946 to 47 million tons coal equivalent in 1954, or an increase of 30 million tons.

The fact is that foreign fuel oil represents a type of competition without end or limit, with the capacity—through dump pricing and shifting the cost to other oil products—to drive coal completely off the east coast. Foreign oil has taken over approximately 50 percent of the coal competitive energy market on the east coast.

Mr. Taft said shutting out residual oil would definitely hurt American manufacturers in 30 States employing 30,000 people in manufacturing for export to Venezuela. But the damage already done to the coal industry has contributed to a decline of employment in American coal mining from 400,000 men in 1950 to 214,000 in 1954, has cost the coal miners $81 million in wages or the equivalent of 25,000 jobs for 1 year, and cost railroad labor $44 million in wages. Approximately 75,000 miners went off the payrolls in 1954 alone.

Mr. Taft said that the real employment problem in coal mining is the turn to strip mining which he said accounts for fully 25 percent of total bituminous production. Actually, strip mining production in 1953—the latest year for which statistics are available—represent only 23.1 percent of the total national production of bituminous coal. In 1947, strip-mine production represented 22.1 percent of the total national production—an increase of only 1 percent in 6 years. These facts are certainly far different from those presented by Mr. Taft in support of his misinformation that "the real employment problem in coal mining is the turn to strip mining."

The number of strip mines has declined from 1,750 in 1947 to 1,554 in 1953; production has declined from 139,395,000 tons in 1947 to 105,448,000 tons in 1953 and the number of men employed in strip mines has fallen from 43,338 in 1947 to 31,088 in 1953.

Mr. Taft says, "This is a technological change opposed as vigorously by the United Mine Workers as is the importation of residual oil, but with less publicity."

The United Mine Workers do not oppose, never have, technological changes. Their vigorous opposition of strip mining has been against the nonunion strip miners. Historically the United Mine Workers have encouraged technological improvements in coal mining. It is exemplified by the fact in the United States the average production of coal per day is 8 tons. In England and on the Continent where these changes were opposed by the union, the average is 1½ tons per man per day.

At the mine the cost is lower than it is abroad.

Mr. Taft in his statement, implied that with a bituminous coal production of 400 million tons in 1954, the addition of only 70 million tons would be ample for this country's war needs. The actual facts do not support Mr. Taft's statement. In the first year of World War II, the requirements for coal rose 130 million tons and coal supplied 82 percent of the grand total added energy needs in the first year of the war. Likewise, Mr. Taft failed to mention that in World War II the supplies of foreign oil on the east coast received by tanker, dropped 93 percent as a result of submarine sinkings.

Seemingly, Mr. Taft attempts to present himself as a technical expert in coal production when he says "existing mines by going to a full week without overtime, could add 150 to 200 million tons a year." Mr. Taft assumes that the current production capacity of the bituminous coal industry is 670 million tons annually. That figure is for 1953 and it ignores completely the current availability of manpower and the condition of the necessary machinery and equipment to produce coal. Between October 1953 and October 1954, according to the Bureau of Mines, there was a reduction of 74,000 miners. The Bureau of Mines figure of capacity is directly related to days worked and number of employees. With the indicated reduction of employees by 27 percent, the potential capacity is cut proportionately. On that basis mine capacity as of October 1954 would have been more nearly at less than 500 million tons.

As a matter of fact, as of now the anticipated coal mine production for 1955 is much less than 500 million tons—more nearly 400 million tons.

Mr. Taft makes the categorical statement "that there is no evidence that shutting out residual oil helps coal," and then he continues with a personal observation that he personally found "that the mines in southern Kentucky and Tennessee on the Southern Railroad at least, had no competition from residual oil since the last reduction in freight rates down there." These statements are wholly untrue. In the first place, foreign oil today potentially displaces 32 million tons of coal equivalent, principally in the east coast energy markets. In fact, through operation of various price understandings and market agreements within the oil cartel, bituminous coal is now virtually wiped out of the east coast energy market, and if the flood of imported oil continues, it will be wholly eliminated. The present coal displacement by foreign oil represents approximately 25 percent of the total production of coal in the principal coal mining States of West Virginia and Pennsylvania, and such a tonnage reduction sponsors a chain reaction which affects the entire coal producing areas.

Mr. Taft's statement regarding the mines in southern Kentucky and Tennessee is contradicted by the President of the Southern Appalachian Coal Operators Association, which is made up of the coal mine owners in southern Kentucky and Tennessee, who in a telegram

to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, says:

Regarding Mr. Taft's testimony that coal mines Southern Appalachian area particularly those located on Southern Railway have been materially helped in competition with residual oil by reduction in freight rates. Reduced freight rates have helped a few cases in competition with natural gas but cannot find in any instance of help in competition with residual oil sufficient to regain or hold coal in these seaboard markets.

The record shows that residual fuel oil imports are being dumped primarily in one geographic area, namely the east coast, the heart of our industrial arsenal. This foreign residual oil originates in the main from Venezuela, which today is living on a level of prosperity unequalled by any section of the United States, principally because the majority of the income in Venezuela is derived from taxes amounting to 50 percent of the value of the petroleum products which it exports—90 percent to the United States.

It is time for the Congress to end the folly of destroying a major portion of our domestic industry, namely coal mining and domestic oil production, with unreasonable and excessive importations of foreign oils. Further, it is time for the oil industry spokesmen, including Mr. Taft, to temper presentations, such as that made before these committees, with some factual research and reasonableness so that the consideration of their own selfish interests might be leavened somewhat by a respect for American businessmen and workers, who today are being seriously and vitally affected economically by trade advantages granted to foreign nations.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD the following statement in opposition to the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements:

TWELVE KEY FACTS ABOUT H. R. 1

H. R. 1, introduced by Representative JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, proposes to extend the Trade Agreements Act. In the process it would grant the State Department, via the President, broad new powers for lowering United States tariffs and firmly committing the United States to GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

This bill has unleashed an intense debate. For this debate to produce results in the national interest all the pertinent facts must be squarely considered. Herewith are summarized 12 facts which are compellingly pertinent.

NOTE.—The content of H. R. 1 may change or become entangled with other bills during the legislative process. The references here are current as of February 12, 1955.

I. RIGHT NOW UNITED STATES TARIFFS ARE AMONG THE LOWEST IN THE WORLD

United States tariffs, now at their lowest in history, average only 5.1 percent of the value of imports. This represents sharper reductions than have been made by most other industrial nations; a 68-percent reduction of the 1937 average.

By comparison, Switzerland's tariffs average 8.1 percent of imports, and have been reduced only 47 percent since 1937; France averages 10.6 percent, 43 percent of 1937; and Great Britain averages 25.6 percent, which is 20 percent above 1937.

Among the industrialized nations of the West only Denmark, Sweden, and Western Germany have reduced their average tariff level since 1937 by as large a percentage as the United States. However, even in 1937 the United States had a lower average than Sweden and Germany. Denmark is the only one which was lower then and remains lower now.

NOTE.—Tariff comparisons tell only half the story. Import quotas, currency restrictions, monopolies, government trading, cartels, and other devices are far tighter barriers to free trade than tariffs. Because, except with respect to quotas on agricultural products subject to price supports, the United States does not engage in these practices; it actually permits freer trade than any other industrialized country in the world.

II. THE FULL IMPACT OF THE RECENT UNITED STATES TARIFF DECLINE HAS NOT YET BEEN FELT

The first cuts, following the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934, came while the world was still struggling with the effects of a worldwide depression. Since then World War II, the fighting in Korea and Indochina, the continuing cold war and repeated injections of economic aid by the United States have distorted the historical patterns of trade. Only now are other nations approaching full production.

But even during this disturbed period United States imports reached a sustained level of nearly $11 billion—four times prewar value, twice prewar volume.

III. TARIFFS AFFECT LESS THAN ONE-THIRD OUR TOTAL IMPORTS

Foreign countries earn dollars, and the United States buys its needed imports, for the most part, without any tariff interference at all. In considering the effect of tariffs on imports it must always be remembered that tariffs affect less than a third—$3 billion out of a total imports of $10.8 billion. A pertinent section of the United States tariff policy statement by the Committee for Economic Development—November 1954—it follows:

"Only a part of our imports are subject to tariffs or other import restrictions. Of our total annual imports of approximately $10.8 billion in 1951, some $6 billion consisted of products which enter free of duty or quota restrictions. The rest—some $4.8 billion annually—were subject to tariff duty or import quotas. This $4.8 billion included some $2.5 billion of finished and semifinished manufactures, $1.8 billion of agricultural products and $500 million of metals and minerals. Of this $4.8 billion of imports, however, only about $3 billion were subject to import quotas or to tariffs sufficiently high to have an appreciable effect on the volume of import. This $3 billion consisted for the most part of agricultural products and finished manufactures."

IV. OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE NOT RECIPROCATED

Though foreign countries have made some nominal concessions American exporters still face such barriers as—

Automobiles, charged 63 percent duty in India, 30 percent to 40 percent in Japan, 15 percent to 33⅓ percent in the United Kingdom, and 15 percent to 30 percent in France.

Machinery, charged 10 percent to 25 percent duty in Britain, 6 percent to 30 percent in France, 15 percent to 30 percent in Japan, 5 percent to 40 percent in Italy.

Synthetic textiles (including rayon), charged 20 percent to 35 percent in France, 25 percent to 27 percent in Italy, 22 percent in Norway, 17 percent to 24 percent in Belgium, and 50 percent in India.

Cotton manufactures, charged 15 percent to 30 percent in the United Kingdom, 7 percent to 30 percent in Germany, 15 percent to 25 percent in Italy, 18 percent to 30 percent in Indonesia, and 15 percent to 27½ percent in Canada.

Grains, charged 15 percent to 30 percent in France, 15 percent to 20 percent in Germany, 25 percent to 30 percent in Italy, 10 percent to 15 percent in Sweden.

In addition, many countries employ side devices which effectively limit, or even ban, the import of United States goods into their markets.

These devices, perfected by the Nazi economist, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, include: Import quotas, currency restrictions, state trading, monopolies, barter deals, and cartels. The use of such devices has increased markedly during the so-called reciprocal trade period.

There has been much talk about relaxing such restrictions but little "do."

For example, Great Britain has at last agreed to admit a few United States cars on trial—650 to be exact—but subject to duties and taxes which bring the price of an American-made Chevrolet in the British market to about $6,000.

France recently announced liberalization for certain selected items—e. g., cotton yarns (but not fabrics), threshing machines (but not tractors), and so on. But at the same moment France turned around and imposed a special import tax of 10 to 15 percent on the items thus liberalized. And even these concessions did not apply to imports from the United States, only to imports from other European countries.

NOTE.—Although Great Britain employs such devices freely, and in addition maintains tariffs at a level 20 percent above 1937, the New York Herald Tribune for January 3, 1955, quoted R. A. Butler, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, as saying:

"We expect some improvement in their (United States) trade practices before there is any question of lowering our barriers any further or indulging in any further nondiscrimination."

V. OUR FREE WORLD ALLIES DO NOT NEED LOWER UNITED STATES TARIFFS TO PROSPER

Congress was told a year ago that further cuts in United States tariffs were needed then to foster world trade and bolster the economy of our allies.

Congress refused. Instead it obtained an agreement by the State Department to make no further cuts for a year.

Here are examples of what actually happened in 1954, without the benefit of additional tariff cuts by us:

1. Italy's national income rose 4 percent, and its exports 10 percent.

2. Austria's income rose 10 percent as a result of increased trade and production.

3. The Netherlands' prosperity lured capital from all over the world; securities on the Amsterdam Exchange are now at their highest point since World War II.

4. West Germany anticipates an 8 percent rise in the gross national product in 1955, and a continuing expansion of exports. Between 1949 and 1953 exports more than quadrupled, while imports doubled; credit not tariffs has been the exporters' main problem.

5. "Britain Is Tasting New Prosperity As Exports Spurt"—headline from New York Times, January 3, 1955.

6. "Persisting Boom Is Seen by Swiss"—"Prosperity Based on Demand for Manufac-

tures, Credit and Domestic Building"—headline from New York Times, January 9, 1955.

7. "Rise in Finn's Timber, Paper Exports Helps Puncture Pessimistic Forecasts"—headline from New York Times, January 9, 1955.

8. A flourishing export trade gave Portugal an exceptionally prosperous year; as expressed in a New York Times headline—January 4, 1955,"—Nation Goes on Buying Spree."

In contrast, the United States experienced a temporary falling off in 1954.

VI. LABOR RATES IN OTHER COUNTRIES REMAIN AT ONE-THIRD TO ONE-TENTH UNITED STATES SCALE

Here are comparative average hourly earnings for industrial workers in the United States and other countries (1952–53 figures):

United States	$1.79
Switzerland	.57
United Kingdom	.47
France	.46
West Germany	.44
Italy	.35
Japan	.19

Notes.—At one time better machines and more skilled workers enabled the United States to compete with low labor costs imports. Now—largely due to United States aid and assistance programs—other industrial nations have machines as modern and efficient as any we own, and for the most part their workers are as skilled as ours. A recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board indicates that at the same time the real wage gap is spreading, not narrowing.

VII. IMPORTS FROM CHEAP LABOR AREAS DO HURT

Industries already affected include coal, textiles, footwear, glass pottery, and china, electrical equipment, lead and zinc, ship building, fishing, and dozens of others. In the textile industry alone, which has been severely affected by competition from Japan and other low wage countries, the number employed declined by 260,000 in 3 years. New England mills took the brunt of this loss; but even in the South, where the most modern mills are located, there was a loss of 40,000 jobs.

State Department negotiators not long ago cut the rate on watches. Last fall the President had to restore the old rate. Too many workers in the United States watch industry, whose precision skills are needed for defense, were losing their jobs—and skills—because of imports.

Workers in the following industries are also threatened: chemicals, radio, and electronic equipment, machine tools, synthetic fibers, plastic materials, and—looking at the list proposed for the next round of negotiations by the State Department—literally hundreds of others.

N. B.: H. R. 1, in fact, excepts nothing. It invites a reduction of from 15 to 50 percent in every single rate now in effect, no matter how often or how deeply cut in the past.

VIII. THE "PERIL POINT" AND THE "ESCAPE CLAUSE" ARE VIRTUALLY MEANINGLESS

Under the "peril point" the United States Tariff Commission is required to determine whether or not a proposed cut will injure domestic industry. But such a finding does not bind State Department negotiators. In the past the Commission's findings have been ignored in favor of a hoped for and often meaningless concession from foreign governments. H. R. 1 would make possible the continuation of this practice.

Similarly, the much talked of "escape clause" is no sure remedy for injury to American producers and workers. The Tariff Commission's recommendations of relief can be, and usually are, rejected on advice of the State Department which fears the resentment of other countries.

IX. GOVERNMENT HANDOUTS ARE NO SUBSTITUTE FOR JOBS

Some H. R. 1 supporters have introduced bills to provide Government aid, at the expense of the general taxpayer, for workers thrown out of their jobs by import competition—after the injury has been done. Even the Randall Commission, which originated the H. R. 1 plan, could not go along with this idea. It substitutes a Government dole for a man's wage, or requires workers to move from their homes to strange areas—much as is done in totalitarian countries. There is no way to estimate the cost in advance—it could and probably would run into billions.

X. H. R. 1 WOULD ESTABLISH AN ENTIRELY NEW NATIONAL POLICY ON TRADE AGREEMENTS—THE UNITED STATES MAKES CONCESSIONS BUT GETS NONE IN RETURN

Heretofore our trade agreements have required foreign countries to make concessions to us, no matter how nominal, in return for any concessions we make. H. R. 1 abandons this principle.

Right now the State Department is rushing plans for round-robin negotiations with 33 other countries beginning in Geneva next month. It has openly announced its intention to offer wholesale concessions in United States tariffs as a means of inducing these other countries to open their markets to Japan. H. R. 1 expressly permits this one-sided deal.

XI. H. R. 1 CAN INVOLVE THE UNITED STATES IN GATT (GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE(WHICH SUBJECTS THE TRADE OF MEMBER NATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CONTROL, DESPITE OPPOSITION BY CONGRESS

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade provides for a new international organization empowered to sponsor and police a comprehensive code of trade practices among member nations. These rules would cover the whole range of trade, including farm products and minerals as well as manufactured goods.

The Constitution assigns responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce to Congress. By previous Trade Agreements Acts Congress has delegated a large part of this responsibility, via the President, to the State Department. It has always refused, however, to allow the State Department to redelegate such power to an international body, in which we would have only one vote.

H. R. 1, although amended by committee to appear neutral on GATT, still contains language which permits the State Department to commit the United States to GATT without congressional knowledge of that agreement's changing provisions.

XII. UNITED STATES TARIFFS DO NOT CONTROL UNITED STATES IMPORTS

The policies of foreign producers, much more than present United States tariff rates, determine when, what, and how much they export to the United States. Since the war, for example, British manufacturers have sent most of their exports to countries in the sterling area, where they are protected from outside competition by tariffs, import licensing systems, and currency restrictions.

In 1952, however, when some of the sterling area markets closed up following collapse of the Korean war boom, the British quickly shifted. England's exports to the dollar area jumped 50 percent almost overnight—without any United States tariff changes.

United States tariffs, in fact, are now the least obstacle to world trade. Changeable policies of other countries, reflected in changeable import quotas, changeable currency restrictions and the like, are the real difficulty.

NOTE.—More than a year ago Bernard Baruch said the agitation for lower tariffs in the United States is serving only to provide other nations "with an excuse for blaming their troubles on the United States and, by feeling sorry for themselves, to overlook what they must do on their own."

In his column on January 13, 1955, Walter Lippmann pointed out:

"I wonder whether this (the campaign for lower tariffs) puts the real problem in its proper focus. Perhaps we can reach a clearer definition of that problem by saying that the main trouble today is not the level of the tariff rates. In the United States they are by and large not exorbitantly high any longer.

"The real problem is economic warfare. All the governments have armed themselves with legal powers which they use to interfere with the international markets for goods. They use them offensively and they use them defensively to cut down, to cut off, to divert, to penalize, to subsidize buying and selling so that the pattern of transactions is different from what it would be under the free operation of supply and demand. * * *

"The characteristics of these weapons of economic warfare is that they are not fixed rules and laws of trade but are operated by administrative decisions made, often under political pressure, by bureaucracies. * * *

"The essential condition of economic peace is that trade among friendly nations should not be subject to the arbitrary acts of administrative and political officials, that trade should be subject to laws enacted deliberately and openly and after debate and not changeable except by equally careful deliberation."

Pay Raise Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Tuesday morning, February 15:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JAMES M. QUIGLEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 19TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 15, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and express my views on legislation affecting the welfare of Federal employees.

I submit these propositions:

Postal employees deserve an increase in pay.

All other classified employees deserve an increase in pay.

Neither pay bill should be dependent upon the other; neither should be dependent upon an increase in postal rates; and neither should be dependent upon action relating to reclassification.

Employees of the Federal Government, who must give up their right to bargain collectively when they enter the service, are dependent upon special wage legislation. As a result Congress has frequently looked upon Federal salaries as largess, rather than upon experience and the laws of labor supply and demand.

As a result, the wages of Federal workers have lagged behind the wages paid in private industry. For instance, in the case of postal employees, their spendable income is more than $600 a year behind the 1939 level.

I could cite similar examples regarding the classified employees.

Therefore, I believe that an adequate salary increase is in order for all postal employees. On the basis of my study of the matter and in the light of the increase in the cost of living since the last general wage increase was given in 1951, $800 per annum in base pay would be proper. I recognize, however, certain immediate factors which might tend to delay any early readjustment of postal salaries, so I therefore support, as a bare minimum, provisions of H. R. 1826 by Mr. Moss, and companion bills by Mr. RHODES, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORRISON and Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

I believe that bills now before the committee granting similar minimum 10 percent pay increases for classified employees should also be acted upon favorably.

In connection with the postal pay increases, I should like to state emphatically that it is my firm conviction that the right of postal employees and their families to a decent standard of living should not be contingent on what it costs me to mail a letter or upon any other political consideration. Much as we might desire to see the postal system operated on a business-like basis, we should not overlook the fact that this means of mass communication is a service of the Government to the people, necessary to human welfare and to the national economy.

While I recognize the need for periodic review of and, if studies justify, reorganization of the functions of the various governmental agencies, I would oppose any scheme whereby, in the name of efficiency, the fate of every civil-service employee is placed in the hands of Mr. Summerfield or any other politician.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, and this does not directly bear upon the issue immediately before the committee, I would like to see a law enacted under which the properly designated representatives of the Federal employees will be given recognition at the bargaining table under a workable arbitration system for settling grievances concerning wages, hours, and working conditions. My Pennsylvania colleague, Mr. RHODES, has introduced such legislation, and I was pleased on yesterday to join his effort by introducing a companion bill.

The Late Robert Peter Tristam Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay an all-too-brief tribute to Robert Peter Tristam Coffin, of Brunswick, Maine, who died suddenly on January 20.

Bob Coffin, as he was known to his friends, was born in Brunswick on March 18, 1892, and in Brunswick he was destined to spend in happiness the greater part of his life. He passed his youth on a salt-water farm on Sebascodegan Island in the town of Harpswell, which adjoins Brunswick. He commemorated his youth in Lost Paradise, published in 1934. He was graduated from Bowdoin College in 1915 with summa cum laude honors. After leaving Bowdoin he took a master of arts at Princeton; thence he went to Trinity College, Oxford, as a Rhodes scholar from Maine, where he spent the years 1916 to 1917 and 1919 to 1921. The intervening period he served in the American Army.

Life at the English university made a deep impression on him and his first books, Christchurch and Crowns and Cottages, reflect the influences of his English experience.

He taught in Wells College, Aurora, N. Y., from 1922 to 1934. Here he founded and carried on the Oxford idea of honor work in English literature. In 1934 he returned to Bowdoin College as professor of English literature. There he spent the remaining years of his life, though he lectured and taught from time to time in Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, and several other American universities. The academic year 1952–53 he spent as Fulbright special lecturer at the University of Athens, Greece.

In the interstices of his teaching career, Bob Coffin wrote and published more than 30 volumes of fiction, biography, autobiography, and verse. His Strange Holiness won the Pulitzer prize for poetry in 1935. It is as a poet that he would doubtless choose to be remembered, and as such he will probably be best known. Like most poets, his work was uneven in merit. Had he been primarily concerned with his standing before posterity, he might have been more self-critical and published more sparingly. But he wrote incessantly whatever feeling prompted him to write and no one can fail to be moved by the sincerity of his feeling. His best poetry is not likely to be forgotten.

As with many other Maine writers, his creative faculties were shaped by the heritage of the country in which he was born. He was a son of Maine as Longfellow, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Edna Millay, and Sara Orne Jewett—to mention only a few—were the children of Maine. Like Caledonia, Maine has been a "meet nurse" for poetic children.

The odors of rockweed at half tide, bayberry, spruce, and fir spoke to Coffin in a various language, but a language constantly in praise of their Creator.

Some may compare Coffin to Carl Sandburg and the two men have a bardic quality in common, but Coffin couldn't have written the Chicago Poems, any more than Sandburg could have written Kennebec and Saltwater Farm. They were as different as New England is different from Illinois.

Bob Coffin was beloved by all who knew him and his death which follows closely on that of his close friend and fellow townsman, Kenneth Sills, is widely mourned in and out of Maine. He was a friend to me and I shall ever cherish his memory.

[From the Brunswick (Maine) Record]

BOWDOIN COLLEGE SUFFERS GREAT LOSS

Bowdoin College in particular, the State and all of New England in general, suffered a great loss this past week when Robert Peter Tristam Coffin, Pierce Professor of English at the college since 1934, died suddenly in Portland where he had gone to give a lecture at Westbrook Junior College, last Thursday evening. Born in Brunswick March 18, 1892, he had travelled extensively both here and abroad but his New England roots were deep—he was always a New Englander.

Professor Coffin was graduated from Bowdoin with the highest possible honors; he spent 3 years at Trinity College, Oxford University, England, receiving there the degrees of bachelor of arts and bachelor of letters (literature). His first book of poems was published in 1924.

This publication was followed by more than 35 others. In explaining his literary credo—whether it be poetry or prose—Professor Coffin once said, "The things that matter most, love, faith, babies, roses, pride, friendship, death, have not been submerged by science or the industrial revolution; they keep the old splendor like the stars. And we can still have the happiness of walking and being alone to think."

It was because of these beliefs, and his adherence to same in his writings, that he became so greatly beloved—his works having wide appeal. No one who had ever heard him read some of his poems could ever forget him. Professor Coffin was instructor of English at Wells College, N. Y., before his alma mater, Bowdoin, called him back in 1934; while there he was the recipient of numerous honors; in 1936 he won the Pulitzer prize for poetry; he was Phi Kappa Beta poet at many colleges including Harvard, the College of William and Mary, and Tufts.

Funeral services were held on Sunday in the First Parish Church in Brunswick.

Golden Anniversary of Jewish Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is a great satisfaction to record a communal achievement in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent, which deserves to be known widely and which can serve as an example for similar institutions throughout the country.

I refer to Jewish Memorial Hospital, a voluntary supported, nonsectarian institution, with a staff and with patients from all races and creeds, located at Broadway and 196th Street, which has rendered invaluable communal services to one of the fastest growing areas in the city of New York. This year it is celebrating its golden anniversary, the 50th year of its founding, marking a milestone in its history. The hospital is noted not only for its unusually high standards in medical and nursing services, but also for significant researches in medicine, for its program of community health education, and as a pioneer in programs for children.

The hospital has developed from a small institution to one that now has over 200 beds and bassinets, with a program approved by the Hospital Council of greater New York to increase its capacity by 140 beds, based on increased requirements of the area served by the institution.

As I have indicated, the hospital is currently celebrating the 50th year of its founding. In the course of its history it has secured approval of all of the important hospital and medical associations and has attained a distinctive reputation for its high standards, its unsur-

passed administration, its fine medical staff, and its dedicated board of trustees, a group of philanthropically minded citizens, headed by one of our city's outstanding businessmen, Mr. David Schwartz, of Jonathan Logan, Inc.

Research at the hospital has included important work, including: Work on the Rh blood factor—a dramatic achievement some years ago was a complete blood transfer to save a new-born baby; on leukemia—you may recall the Louis boy story, a Sing-Sing prisoner who offered himself for experimentation to save the life of 6-year-old Marcia Slater and who was later pardoned by Governor Dewey; with radioisotopes—Jewish Memorial Hospital is one of the few in New York City authorized to work on radioisotopes by the Atomic Energy Commission; and on trypsin—again, you may remember the dramatic last-minute call to the Jewish Memorial Hospital from Australia in an attempt to save the life of Sister Kenny.

I particularly emphasize the extraordinary research done at this hospital, because it paves the way for what can be done in other parts of the country.

Research at Jewish Memorial Hospital expanded to such a point in recent years that it was necessary to add a new wing to the present hospital building. Last fall the new research laboratory was dedicated and provided an occasion for community celebration and for tributes from outstanding Americans.

It may be of interest to recall some of the statements made on that occasion.

One of the main speakers was Dr. Ralph Bunche, the distinguished Nobel peace prize winner, who said:

This dedication signals a new advance in the development of a distinguished institution which for nearly half a century has rendered invaluable service to the community. Its portals welcome the needy. Its staff and facilities are open to all races and creeds. Its standards are among the highest.

The new research laboratory building will augment the facilities and expand the horizon of service of this hospital. Within these new walls, over the years, will be carried on the work of dedicated men and women which inevitably will bring new and greater benefits to humanity in its constant struggle against disease and suffering and untimely death.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, felicitated the institution in these words:

My congratulations to you, the board and all those who have made possible this auspicious occasion, the dedication of the hospital's new research laboratory building. The addition of this important new facility for the expansion of the many noteworthy services provided by the Jewish Memorial Hospital is in keeping with the magnificent tradition of progress and contribution to our community's welfare that has been continuous since the hospital's founding almost a half century ago. As I advised, I greatly regret I cannot be with you to express personally my warm admiration for your objectives, and how grateful we all are for your cooperation in providing the means to carry on important research so vital to the health and welfare of us all.

The president of the board of trustees, Mr. David Schwartz, explained the origin of the new Research Laboratory Building when he said:

From the first day of my association with Jewish Memorial Hospital I urged and fought for the extension of our research work. We, of this hospital, believe that our services to the community should consist not only of curing the sick but of doing what is possible to study and to prevent illness and disease. We achieved some success toward our goal within the limited facilities at our disposal up to this time. This is evidenced by a number of major contributions in the field of medicine and research by the members of our staff, as for example with radioactive isotopes, in the study of cancer, leukemia, and the Rh factor in the newborn. With the magnificent expanded facilities which we are dedicating today, we have every reason to hope for even greater advances and achievements in the field of research. This is not something abstract. It is of direct benefit to patients, patients in our hospital and in other institutions. This is our pride: That we are being of direct help to those who suffer from illness and disease. And we are also proud of the fact that no one seeking treatment in this hospital is asked about his race, religion, or origin. A disease germ does not recognize those distinctions. Neither do we. A glance at our staff and at our patients will show the nonsectarian, universal character of our hospital services.

Last, the building itself was dedicated by one of our city's most distinguished spiritual leaders, Dr. Israel Goldstein, rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, who said:

It is a source of special pleasure to me that my participation in these ceremonies today is an encore to my participation in the ceremonies at the dedication of your main building some years ago. The participation of clergy of several denominations then as now is no doubt a triple-clad guaranty of your success. Actually, it is a tribute to the broad character of your ministry of healing which does not ask whether a person is Christian or Jew; black or white; but only whether he is in need of the service you have to offer.

It is a sign of strength and progress that, between the dedication of the former building and the dedication of this building, new forces have come into your work, and into the carrying of the responsibilities. This is a tribute to the older men who have recognized the need for new reinforcements and have made room for new people. It is also a tribute to the younger men who so ably and generously have stepped into the noble tradition of their forebears.

This building can be dedicated because men have been dedicated, giving their time, their energy, and their resources to this institution. Yet, in every group, there is always one who stands out among his colleagues—primus inter pares—the one to whom recognition gravitates because his colleagues recognize in him unusual endowments of heart and spirit, in sight and foresight, sound judgment seasoned with courage and a dash of daring, and extraordinary business success which has not spoiled the humanity of the man. The Jewish Memorial Hospital is fortunate in having such a leader in David Schwartz, its president.

Efficiency must not necessarily be accompanied by austerity. A stern manner is not necessarily a sign of great skill. Though I am only a layman in this field, I venture the opinion that the doctor's affability and the nurse's smile do not retard convalescence. A pleasant manner does not hurt even in international relations, witness the success of Dr. Ralph Bunche who honors us with his presence today. To doctors and nurses, of course, the illness and suffering of patients are part of their daily routine, but not so to the patients themselves. Fortunate, therefore, is the patient who receives the ministry of skill seasoned with kindness. I trust that this community will always think of Jewish Memorial Hospital as the hospital with a smile, where skill is sweetened with kindness.

This building which we are dedicating today has untold possibilities for the well-being of men, women, and children everywhere. In the age of the atom, when we are hoping that the secrets of atomic energy may serve the purposes of peace and not of war, it may be that this building will have much to do with applying some of the results of these researches to the healing or the prevention of disease.

Thus we dedicate the research laboratory wing of the Jewish Memorial Hospital. Recalling the phrase of the prophet, Malachai, I pray that, like the son of righteousness, the Jewish Memorial Hospital may bring healing in its wings.

Mr. Speaker, this is a singular occasion for all of us to join in our tribute to this invaluable institution that for 50 years has striven earnestly and effectively to save lives, to restore health, to cure, and in other ways to serve the people in the community.

The hospital is marking its golden anniversary with a dinner, to be held on April 16 in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel under the chairmanship of another distinguished New York philanthropist, Sol Rosenblatt.

I know that the community and my distinguished colleagues join with me in felicitations, in grateful appreciation for services already rendered and in hopes that the next half century will see a continued flowering of the precious values that Jewish Memorial Hospital is bringing to its community, to the city of New York, to America, and to all the world.

A Liberal Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if you have been thinking of a tax reduction, a balancing of the budget, a reduction in the national debt, the end of the broadcasting of your dollars abroad, forget it.

While my efforts to accomplish all of the above will not only be continued, but increase, the facts of life might just as well be recognized. Nothing will be gained by fooling ourselves as to what is happening here in Washington.

Postal employees have renewed their demand for an increase in compensation. Unless their union officers overreach themselves, they will get it. The only question is how much.

Other Federal employees have joined in the demand for an increase in wages or salaries. They will get it. Again, the only question is, how much. United States district attorneys, Federal judges, Senators, and Congressmen are insisting upon a pay raise. It will be given. How much, no one knows. The raise will be substantial.

Increases in industrial wages—and they are certain to be given—will be paid by consumers; and wage earners and salaried people—dirty overalls, white shirt, nylon waist, or silk-tie wearers—all will pay a part of all of the above.

The administration is asking for an increase in pay and special benefits for those in the armed services. That will go through. Again the only question is as to the number of dollars authorized.

Additional appropriations for the armed services will increase the total by billions.

The national debt will increase, as will the interest charge, which is now over 6 billion.

Russia has told us to get out of Formosa. Chou En-lai declares he intends to take it. President Eisenhower has said we will not get out, that Chou En-lai cannot have it. The situation makes easy another world war, which certainly no intelligent individual wants.

Will we all live better at less cost? Has everybody been taken care of?

No. Some have been forgotten. They are among the most worthy.

What is to happen to those past 45 who cannot get jobs in industry, who are barred from employment by the minimum wage, which is to be increased from 75 to 90 or additional cents per hour? What about those who have had no opportunity or are unable to provide for their own old age, who through no fault of their own are either unable or incapable of earning a living wage?

They have no politically powerful, well-financed lobby. Apparently they will find themselves taking what, if anything, is left.

The remedy? At home just a little more thrift on the part of the Federal and other governments. Just a little willingness on the part of each of us to, for a short time, do without nonessentials, no matter how enjoyable or desirable.

Abroad? The adoption of a foreign policy which will keep us out of wars in which we have no vital interest.

A little more willingness to give people in other countries the opportunity to "paddle their own canoes."

This, I think, is the greatest country on earth. We have more of everything, including leisure—spare time—than people throughout the world have ever desired, sought, or enjoyed.

Why thoughtlessly continue inflation—get a ruinous depression? There must be—there is—a way out of the trouble abroad other than through war.

The 57th Anniversary of the Sinking of the "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 15, we observe the sinking of the battleship *Maine* which cost the lives of 2 officers and 258 men and resulted in the war with Spain in 1898.

This is an occasion when we pay annual tribute to the gallant Spanish-American War veterans who defended the Stars and Stripes, fighting in the cruel heat of San Juan and battling pestilence and disease in the steaming jungles.

When President McKinley issued the call for volunteers, the United States had an Army and Navy of only 2,143 officers and 26,040 enlisted men; while Spain had one of the largest navies in the world and an army of 500,000 with over 192,000 in Cuba alone.

There were some 483,000 American youths who served in the Spanish-American war and of this number nearly 20,000 lost their lives either in battle or by yellow fever contracted in the disease-infested jungles.

The feat of Admiral Dewey on May 1, 1898, when the Spanish Fleet was destroyed is one of the glorious pages in American naval history.

Yet while we salute the United States Navy for its stellar role, let us not forget that the valiant foot soldiers and daring cavalrymen fought against great odds in heavy clothing in hot weather that sapped the vitality of the sturdiest men.

Let no man underrate the soldier of the Spanish-American War. Facing the perils of yellow fever and with poor rations and contaminated water, his life was made more difficult by disease-carrying insects that 57 years ago were uncontrolled and a plague to mankind.

Medical progress has made stupendous strides in the past 57 years yet the boys of '98 had no miracle or wonder drugs with the result they were virtually guinea pigs in the desperate attempts made to halt epidemics of every known variety.

These were the young men who carried the American flag in America's first crusade for the liberation of mankind.

Many of them again served their country on foreign soil together with their sons in World War I; while in World War II and the Korean war their sons and grandsons carried on in the noble cause of defending humanity by thwarting the ambitions of power-crazed dictators.

Truly, the American Nation owes an undying debt to those who fought in the Spanish-American War for they were pioneers in the battles waged on foreign soil in defense of liberty and freedom.

Today, on the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, I should like to describe briefly the battleship *Maine* and the scene of that eventful evening February 15, 1898, when two terrific explosions sank the ship in Habana harbor resulting in a terrible disaster.

To begin with, in the winter of 1897–98 mobs of Spanish loyalists, namely, those inimical to the United States and fiercely resentful of the well-known sympathy of the American people for the oppressed Cubans, became so formidable that the American consul general at Habana, Fitzhugh Lee, appealed to this Government for moral support in the shape of a naval force in Cuban waters. This request, made often before, was at last heeded. In January 1898, orders were issued to the North Atlantic squadron to assemble at the Dry Tortugas, within 6 hours' steaming distance of Habana. On the 25th of the month the *Maine* was ordered to Habana itself. A second-class battleship, she had, nevertheless, for that day, certain formidable aspects. She had an extreme length of 324 feet; beam, 57 feet; displacement, 6,650 tons; indicated horsepower, 9,290; and trial speed, 17.45 knots. In addition, she had an armored belt extending 180 feet at the waterline on each side, over which was a flat, armored deck. Joining the two forward ends of the belt was a heavy steel bulkhead, at the bottom of which was an armored deck which continued to the stem. The flat steel deck above armor dipped down abaft the belt, and was continued to the stern, one deck below, with a slightly diminished thickness. The barbettes and turrets were of heavy steel.

As for armament, the Maine had two "winged" turrets, each containing two 10-inch breech-loading rifles. She carried six 6-inch breech-loading rifles, besides seven 6-pounder and eight 1-pounder rapid-firing rifles. Finally, she had four above-water torpedo tubes on her berth deck, all in broadside.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the Spanish authorities having been previously notified of her advent, the *Maine*, Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, steamed into Habana Harbor and was duly assigned a berth 500 yards off the arsenal.

No United States vessel had visited Habana during the previous 3 years and meanwhile tension had been steadily mounting between the Spanish and American Governments.

There was much doubt as to the nature of our reception—

Wrote Captain Sigsbee—

for I was not aware of the character of the diplomatic exchanges. I was sincerely desirous of a friendly reception, but it was my affair to be ready for all emergencies. The *Maine* was in such a state of preparation that she could not have been taken at much disadvantage; nevertheless, she presented no offensive appearance, and meant no offense. On board United States men-of-war—

The Captain added thoughtfully—

it is commonly only a short step from peaceful appearance to complete readiness.

The Spanish port officials behaved with punctilious courtesy and the social amenities between American and Spanish authorities proceeded according to naval protocol. Then at 9: 40 p. m., on the night of February 15, the blow fell. At that fateful moment two terrific explosions threw parts of the *Maine* 200 feet in the air and illuminated the whole harbor.

The first dull explosion had been followed by a second, much more powerful, probably that of the forward magazine. The forward half of the ship was reduced to a mass of twisted steel; the after part slowly sank. The *Maine* carried 26 officers and 328 men, all of whom were on board when the explosion took place, except an assistant engineer, 2 naval cadets, and a gunner. Two officers and 250 men were killed at once and 8 men died afterward.

Captain Sigsbee's own immediate impressions, set down in his book, the *Maine*, are of interest. I quote:

At taps ("turn in and keep quiet"), 10 minutes after 9 o'clock, I laid down my pen to listen to the notes of the bugle, which were singularly beautiful in the oppressive stillness of the night. The marine bugler, Newton, who was rather given to fanciful effects, was evidently doing his best. During his pauses the echoes floated back to the ship with singular distinctness, repeating the strains of the bugle fully and exactly. A half hour later Newton was dead.

I was enclosing my letter in its envelope when the explosion came. The impression made on different people on board the *Maine* varied somewhat. To me, in my position, well aft, and within the superstructure, it was a bursting, rending, and crashing sound or roar of immense volume, largely metallic in character. It was followed by a succession of heavy, ominous, metallic sounds, probably caused by the overturning of the central superstructure and by falling debris. There was a trembling and lurching motion of the vessel, a list to port, and a movement of subsidence. The electric lights, of which there were eight in the cabin where I was sitting, went out. Then there was intense blackness and smoke.

The situation could not be mistaken—the *Maine* was blown up and sinking.

Within half an hour, having ascertained that the ship was doomed, Captain Sigsbee sent his famous dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy from the steamer *City of Washington*. After reporting the terrible disaster he added sober words of caution that public judgment should be suspended until further report. The rest, as the saying goes, is history.

As to the final chapter of the story of the *Maine* herself, I take the liberty of quoting William B. Norris' brief but admirable summary in his article, The Destruction of the *Maine*, which appears in the Dictionary of American History:

Investigations were soon made by the American and Spanish authorities separately. Their decisions differed. The Spaniards reported that an internal explosion, perhaps spontaneous combustion in the coal bunkers, had been the cause; the Americans that the original cause had been an external explosion, which in turn had set off the forward magazines.

News of the disaster produced great excitement in the United States, and accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed by certain newspapers. Without doubt the catastrophe stirred up national feeling over the difficulties in Cuba, crystallized in the slogan "Remember the *Maine*." The wreck remained in Habana harbor until 1911, when United States Army engineers built a coffer dam about the wreck, sealed the after hull of the ship, the only part still intact, and floated it out to sea. There, on March 16, 1912, appropriate minute guns boomed as it sank with its flag flying. The remains of 66 of the crew which were found during the raising were buried in the National Cemetery, Arlington.

During the removal of the wreck a board of officers of the Navy made a further investigation. Their report, published in 1912, stated that a low form of explosive exterior to the ship caused the first explosion. "This resulted in igniting and exploding the contents of the 6-inch reserve magazine, A–14–M, said contents including a large quantity of black powder. The more or less complete explosion of the contents of the remaining forward magazine followed." The chief evidence for this was that the bottom of the ship had been bent upward and folded over toward the stern. European experts, perhaps influenced by several internal explosions in warships in the intervening years, still, however, maintained the theory of an internal explosion. No further evidence has ever been found to solve the mystery.

One visible token of the *Maine* still remains. Before her shattered hull sank forever in 1912, her remaining mast was removed, and now it stands in Arlington Cemetery, its conning tower and shrouds still in place, watching over the gallant old ship's honored dead who lie all around its base until the next and last reveille.

Pay Adjustments and Reclassification for Employees in the Postal Field Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide an immediate 10 percent salary increase, with a minimum of $400, for all officers and employees in the postal field service. The amount of each employee's salary will be rounded out to the next highest $100 figure, so that as a practical matter in most instances the minimum increase will be $430.

My bill also will provide for a reclassification of positions in the postal field service, thus establishing a modern classification and pay structure suitable for present and future needs of the service. The reclassification provisions of my bill incorporate the essential principles recommended by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, modified to the extent which hearings before our committee have indicated is necessary to insure adequate protection for all officers and employees while at the same time allowing management full latitude to operate the postal service with maximum efficiency.

The reclassification provisions in my bill eliminate the so-called nullifying clause which appeared in the administration's proposal in some 21 places. This clause would have allowed workers to be assigned, without limitation, to perform work at a lower level than the level of their jobs, thus leaving the way open for downgrading and loss of pay. The clause also would have permitted assignment to higher level work without increase in pay.

In my judgment, a 10 percent immediate increase, to be followed by reclassification, is the absolute minimum increase which our postal employees have earned. Representatives of employee organizations have conclusively proved that postal salaries lag far behind increased living costs and pay rates in private industry, and that no recognition whatever has been given to tremendously increased productivity and efficiency by these employees. As a matter of fact, if proper recognition were given to these factors, a greater increase would be provided.

I have introduced this bill in a spirit of friendly compromise and cooperation. It is my belief and hope that it will provide a common ground for a meeting of the minds between the employees and the Postmaster General. It will be a very fair and effective pay and reclassification statute, under which the Department can operate with maximum effectiveness and all employees will be assured of fair treatment and of real incentives for ever greater productivity.

Security Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, never before in our time have we had such a need for an adequate air arm as we have in this atomic air age of today.

The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas D. White, recently made a very worthwhile report on this subject to an outstanding patriotic organization assisting the Air Force in its current recruiting efforts, the junior chamber of commerce. I am proud of General White, who happens to be a constituent of mine, as he is recognized as one of the greatest authorities on air power in our country. General White called his address Airpower: Everybody's Business. But his theme was not merely airpower, it was security. There is nothing that should be of greater concern to all Americans today than security. It is the business and the responsibility not only of the Congress, but of the entire body of American citizens. But only superior airpower can give such security to us.

The Jaycees—the members of the junior chamber of commerce—are assisting the Air Force to recruit the men needed to man the 137 wing, 975,000-man Air Force which we are told is the minimum Air Force necessary to guarantee the security of the United States, and which we hope to have by the end of fiscal year 1957. General White stressed public understanding of the Air Force and its needs as fundamental to any effort to enlist the men, and to create such a framework for their activity as will persuade them to make a career out of service with the Air Force.

In times of war the American people are wonderfully patriotic and willing to make any sacrifice to insure victory. Today, with the threat to our cities and people and our civilization many times greater than it ever was even during World War II, the American people are not showing the same kind of fervent patriotism. They do not see the dangers in the current perilous peace, which are just as real, though not as apparent as the dangers in war.

During this period of so-called peace, the Soviets have made amazing progress in the building of nuclear weapons and long-range bombers. We were surprised

to learn during the Korean war that the Russian built MIG–15 was almost as good as our F–86 Sabrejet; we must realize, before another war emphasizes the fact, that Russian technology is excellent, and quite capable of engineering our destruction. As General White says:

The Soviets are building a stockpile of tremendously destructive nuclear weapons. They have built the world's largest air force, including a sizable fleet of long-range bombers. They have built several hundred light jet bombers, and are producing a new jet bomber similar to our B–47. Aimed directly at our sources of strength at home is a new, heavy jet bomber similar to our B–52. They designed and built this bomber for one primary purpose—to be able to strike this continent. * * *

It would be thoughtless of anyone to needlessly scare our people. Nevertheless, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not call attention to the urgency and terrible reality of the situation. Only if our people are intelligently aware of the threat, can they share our security burden. Ignorance leads to ultimate panic and confusion.

We find it easy to accept the new concepts of war brought on by the nuclear-air combination. But one of our main problems is that nuclear weapons mean not only a new kind of war, they mean a new kind of peace. This is a peace that can be kept only through strength.

Acceptance of this fact and an understanding of Air Force needs will help the Air Force to get the men it needs, and the legislation it needs in order to retain those men after they have been trained, and become experienced, and developed their greatest usefulness to the Air Force.

The ultimate goal of the Air Force is not 137 wings, or 975,000 men; it is public understanding of the true nature of airpower, and appreciation of the inexorable need for air superiority over any possible enemy. Unless we hold the lead we now have, numbers of wings or men will have no meaning. If we are to hold the lead, who can say now how many wings or men we may require tomorrow? But understanding is the fundamental thing. We must have it because security is everybody's business, security for ourselves and our institutions, and our beloved United States.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include General White's stirring call for understanding in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The text of his address follows:

AIRPOWER: EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

(Address by Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff, USAF, before the junior chamber of commerce, Air Force recruiting assistance kick-off dinner, Dayton, Ohio, January 26, 1955)

Thank you for those kind words, Milton Caniff. I also want to thank you for something else. On behalf of the United States Air Force, I want to thank you for getting Lieutenants Pipper and Murphy off the ice. Along with your millions of other readers, I was getting worried about those boys. Your rescue plan showed imagination.

Seriously, I want to thank Milton Caniff for the job he is doing. Through Steve Canyon, he is telling the Air Force story and paves the way for greater public interest and understanding of the Air Force.

Tonight the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is launching a nationwide campaign to bring the Air Force and our citizens more closely together. This campaign will strengthen the link between the man in uniform and his civilian supporters. The stronger this link, the stronger our national security.

I am certainly happy to be here with you tonight and to have the opportunity to participate in this kick-off ceremony. I can think of no better group than the Jaycees to conduct this program. You have a reputation for dynamic action and for getting results. Your goals are cast in terms of general good, and not in terms of individual gain. As a result, you have gained wide public acceptance and nationwide support.

Your organization is composed of young men and is devoted to the development of young men. For this reason you share with the Air Force an intense interest in training and equipping our young Americans to keep our country safe and strong.

Just last Saturday the junior chamber of commerce paid a unique tribute to one of our better known young Air Force officers and in doing so you honored the Air Force. I refer to your including Maj. Chuck Yeager in your list of the 10 outstanding young men of 1954. We in the Air Force are very proud of Major Yeager—not only because he has flown faster than any other man in the world, but also because he typifies so many others like him in the Air Force. They do their jobs as a matter of duty. They do these jobs whether they be dangerous or routine, dramatic or dull, exciting or safe. We are particularly proud of the fact that there are thousands of young pilots in the Air Force who literally envy the opportunity Yeager has had. They would give their eyeteeth to have the job he had as a test pilot.

I have reviewed your program and I am glad to see that you have recognized the need to make it much broader than a mere recruiting drive. Your objective is to develop a better understanding of our Air Force and to acquaint the public with the men and women who are playing such a vital role in keeping our Nation free.

This is exactly what needs to be done. Success will not only result in helping to solve our reenlistment problem, but will also result in better guided, understanding support of Air Force objectives.

Why is understanding so important? We are an airminded Nation. Very few people in the Nation would disagree that our Air Force must be supported as a matter of high priority. What more do we need?

The Air Force needs a lot more than mere acceptance. It needs the kind of active support that, in a democracy, comes only after real understanding. In fact, in the United States, getting understanding is the key step to getting support.

The fact that our military forces must have the support of the people is one of America's most important democratic characteristics. It is one we are very proud of.

There is a related characteristic of which we are equally proud. It is that during a war the security of our Nation is everybody's business, and not the exclusive province of people in uniform.

The American people are doing a magnificent job of maintaining strong armed forces during these days of tension. However, World War II and Korea are fresh in our minds. Our people, like all others in the free world, are sick of strife. Recognizing the need for security, they are willing to pay the cost of preparedness by taxes; but they are reluctant to contribute to preparedness by personal interest and participation.

This attitude certainly has been normal in the past. For centuries each nation of the world has had its citizenry and its armies. The citizenry paid the cost of the armies, but stayed aloof. The army was paid to worry about wars as well as to fight them. Wars were strictly the army's business.

Our revolution and evolution as a democracy tended to change those old concepts. We could not afford an army of mercenaries, nor did we want one. The citizen soldier had won his freedom and the citizen soldier would safeguard it. But as time went on he developed this inevitable and understandable attitude:

"All right; I will be a soldier when there is a war on. But in peacetime I am strictly a civilian."

The citizen soldier, with this attitude, became the basis for the American tradition of nonaggression, small forces in peacetime, and so on. When we became involved in war, no nation's people ever responded more magnificently. However, when peace was won again, no nation's people ever were quicker to lose interest in their armed forces.

For this reason the history of our armed services in America has been one of high peaks of strength followed by almost bottomless valleys of weakness. The last valley we passed through was right after World War II.

These peaks and valleys of strength and weakness were tremendously expensive and wasteful, not only in money but in lives. Had we been ready for World War I and World War II, we might have prevented them entirely. It is certain that we could have ended them much sooner with far fewer casualties. However, we seemed willing to pay a high price for the privilege of ignoring danger until it was upon us.

The last valley we passed through could have been disastrous, because World War II ushered in a new weapon, the atomic bomb. This new weapon, combined with the capabilities of long-range airpower, has revolutionized warfare.

We felt fairly secure as long as we held a practical monopoly in long-range bombers and an absolute monopoly in nuclear weapons. However, there can be no monopoly in science and this has been demonstrated by the remarkable progress the Soviet Union has made in the building of nuclear weapons and modern long-range bombers. Communist possession of this combination has put us in what our President has termed "an age of peril."

The Soviets are building a stockpile of tremendously destructive nuclear weapons. They have built the world's largest air force, including a sizable fleet of long-range bombers. They have built several hundred light jet bombers, and are producing a new jet bomber similar to our B–47. Aimed directly at our sources of strength at home is a new, heavy jet bomber similar to our B–52. They designed and built this bomber for one primary purpose—to be able to strike this continent.

The masters of the Kremlin have not deviated one whit from their goal of communism worldwide. The United States is the principal obstacle which confronts them in their path to this goal. The Reds are well known for their utter ruthlessness in removing obstacles.

It would be thoughtless of anyone to needlessly scare our people. Nevertheless, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not call attention to the urgency and terrible reality of the situation. Only if our people are intelligently aware of the threat, can they share our security burden. Ignorance leads to ultimate panic and confusion.

Our traditional attitudes must change. As long as this threat exists, security can never again be considered as solely military business. This threat is not in the future, it is here today and it is real. Today security is everybody's business, not just during an actual war, but all the time.

We find it easy to accept the new concepts of war brought on by the nuclear-air combination. But one of our main problems is that nuclear weapons mean not only a new kind of war, they mean a new kind of peace. This is a peace that can be kept only through strength.

This means that we cannot continue any old habits of huge build-ups followed by

drastic cuts in the Armed Forces. We can no longer wait until we are sucked into a whirlpool of war to begin building our strength. Our new weapons can give us the strength to prevent a war if we will but develop them, but to be effective they must be maintained. We can no longer derive any strength from a program characterized by fits of stops and starts resulting from shifting political and diplomatic sands.

I mentioned America's magnificent responses in times of war. It seems paradoxical to me that our people are willing to sacrifice less now than they were during a period when our land was in little danger. During World War II, no enemy had any great capability of damaging the United States. Our children, our schools, our hospitals, and our cities were not attacked. Yet even when it was clear that we were winning, all our men, women, and even children were still pitching in cheerfully. Even after V–E Day they continued to give up their butter, their meat, their tires, and their gasoline. Our women stayed on their jobs as war workers. Our sons and fathers stayed on duty as servicemen. There were inconveniences, shortages, and tragedies, but no reluctance.

There was also no serious threat to our homeland.

Today the threat to our cities and people is many times greater than it ever was during World War II. Yet among our people there is little evidence of the same kind of fervent patriotism that there was 10 years ago.

The reason for this, as I indicated before, is that the dangers in this new kind of peace are not as apparent as the dangers in war, but they are just as real. As I see it, this job you have set for yourselves is to explain how the Air Force fits into this kind of new peace and how it can guard that peace.

We have a head start. Most of our people realize modern technology has made the Air Force truly the first line of defense and our hardest-hitting, longest-reaching arm of protection. The defense program now before Congress clearly shows the Nation's emphasis and reliance on airpower. This program shows that our planners have recognized the real nature of the threat and the most effective counter to it.

This is one kind of support which is certainly essential. Legislation and appropriations can solve our weapons and equipment needs. Congressional action can go a long way toward helping us to get the other vital element—men. But to get and keep good men, we must have more than laws and money. An additional essential is public understanding and public support.

Last week we held our yearly conference of all the top Air Force commanders. We discussed many problems, but one was common to all. Each commander asked this question:

"Where am I going to get the men to keep my organization going?"

Our number one problem within the Air Force is the current and future shortage of trained, experienced men. At the present time our reenlistment rate is down below 30 percent. This figure does not reflect the worst part of the situation. Among the men we need the most—the trained, skilled, experienced technician—the rate has sunk below 15 percent. We cannot hire ready-made radar technicians. We have to train them ourselves and it takes a lot of time and costs a lot of money. This problem is not confined to technicians. We are also losing veteran pilots and experienced staff officers.

We need the kind of support that will help our young men to realize that an Air Force career is a valued opportunity. We have high hopes that Congress will approve a substantial pay raise this year, as well as other legislation designed to improve service attractiveness. Considering what it costs this nation to train a man, his pay could be increased by many, many dollars before it would equal the cost of losing him.

In addition to pay raises and improved conditions, we need the same kind of support for the airman that he enjoyed during World War II. He must be encouraged to serve. His community must be proud of him for serving. The Air Force job is so big and our equipment is so complex that we need numbers of career men to man our units. Only in this way can we get the best out of the weapons and resources provided us.

To achieve the kind of support that will solve our personnel problem, the public must understand much more than the mere details of this one problem. They must understand air power and the Air Force. I will mention a few of these goals of understanding.

First, our people must realize the part that nuclear weapons play in our defense. There is still some resistance to their use and this is understandable. Nevertheless, they are the results of progress and are the weapons of today.

We can solve no problem of national security by ignoring them. Instead, we should be thankful that we have them in ever-increasing numbers. These weapons are the sole means we have to counter the overwhelming Communist superiority in manpower. So far they have deterred the Communist from all-out war but for only one reason. The Communists have felt that if necessary we would use our most effective weapons against them. Our power will be no deterrent at all if the Communists ever get the idea that we will hold back.

However, despite all our efforts to prevent war, the Reds may strike. We must prepare against that possibility. The two main elements in our preparations here at home for a possible attack are civil defense and air defense. Public support of civil defense is lagging. I emphasize that this is through no fault of our Civil Defense Administration. They have found it almost impossible to jar the general public out of its complacency.

Again I draw a parallel to World War II. Then, when no enemy had long-range bombers, we cheerfully cooperated in blackouts and civil-defense drills. Today when the enemy is capable of launching large-scale attacks on this country, the majority of our people pay lip service, but no effort, to civil-defense preparations. However remote we may believe the possibility of an attack to be, we must be ready. In case of attack, how could we hope for military success if our home front collapsed?

Our air-defense picture is brighter. Our warning systems are progressing. Our airplanes are getting better, and our network of air-defense bases is spreading. There has been one bothersome byproduct of our air defense. This byproduct is noise. To defend an area, the interceptors must be based centrally in the area they are to protect. This is one of the reasons that some of our jet bases are near cities.

Although our scientists are searching for ways to eliminate or reduce disturbances of high-performance airplanes, it looks as if we must face the fact that jets are loud. Our people must also realize that this is one of the minor, but troublesome prices of security.

We are doing all we can to avoid bothering the people whose lives we must protect. We have changed flight patterns, and approach altitudes, and in some areas, we have relocated airbases. Nevertheless, our people must learn to be grateful for the whine of our jets, it means protection.

This is, of course, only one of many small irritations that the Air Force unavoidably inflicts upon our public.

We crowd the public schools, we glut the roads around the bases. Seldom do we have the opportunity to live in one community long enough to be accepted as solid citizens.

All of these things are elements of what we call public relations. The Air Force realizes how important these relations are, and so do you. Your project "top flight" is evidence of that. All the things I have talked about are goals of understanding that we must shoot for. We must achieve these goals if we are to remain strong enough to keep our freedom and honor.

The kind of help your project brings to the Nation means a great deal to us all. This is exactly what we need.

I hope that this kickoff dinner tonight is typical of what will be happening in cities and towns across the Nation throughout the next year. It is a great thing you are doing. I wish you all the success in the world.

The Need for Increasing the Salaries of Postal Workers and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a copy of my statement which was submitted yesterday to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I believe it to be imperative that we immediately pass legislation which will provide an increase in the salaries of postal workers and classified Federal employees. The facts and figures contained in my statement will support my contention that such action should be taken now. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this opportunity to appear before your distinguished committee today. I am making this appearance in behalf of increased salaries for postal and classified Federal employees. These deserving people cannot be here to speak for themselves and we, as their Representatives, bear the responsibility of presenting and studying their problems and arriving at solutions thereto.

Almost 4 years have passed since postal and classified civil-service employees have received their most recent pay increase. During this period the faithful and loyal Government employees have seen their take-home pay eroded by increasing costs of living and rising tax burdens. While the earnings of postal and Federal employees have been deteriorating, the living standards of practically all other groups of the economy have been rising. Construction workers have increased their hourly rates since July 1951, when Federal employees received their last increase, by 20 percent, and employees in trade and manufacturing have enjoyed average hourly increases amounting to 14 percent. Workers in agriculture have also received wage increases which compensate for the rising cost of living.

It may be well, in considering a salary increase for postal and Federal employees, to study the average hourly earnings in certain selective industries.

AVERAGE HOURLY EARNINGS, SELECTED INDUSTRIES

Hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries averaged $1.83 in December, the same as in November, and 3 cents more than in December last year.

For production workers or nonsupervisory employees

[Current prices]

Period	All manufacturing	Durable goods manufacturing	Nondurable goods manufacturing	Building construction	Retail trade
1939	$0.633	$0.698	$0.582	$0.932	$0.542
1944	1.019	1.117	.861	1.319	.731
1946	1.086	1.156	1.015	1.478	.893
1948	1.350	1.410	1.278	[1] 1.848	1.088
1949	1.401	1.469	1.325	1.935	1.137
1950	1.465	1.537	1.378	2.031	1.176
1951	1.59	1.67	1.48	2.19	1.26
1952	1.67	1.77	1.54	2.31	1.32
1953	1.77	1.87	1.61	2.48	1.40
1954:					
January	1.80	1.91	1.65	2.58	1.43
February	1.80	1.90	1.65	2.59	1.43
March	1.79	1.90	1.65	2.59	1.43
April	1.80	1.90	1.65	2.58	1.43
May	1.81	1.91	1.66	2.58	1.45
June	1.81	1.91	1.66	2.58	1.46
July	1.80	1.91	1.66	2.58	1.47
August	1.79	1.91	1.65	2.60	1.47
September	1.81	1.93	1.66	2.62	1.47
October	1.81	1.93	1.66	2.63	1.47
November [2]	1.83	1.94	1.67	2.62	1.46
December [2]	1.83	1.95	1.67	[3]	[3]

[1] Data beginning with January 1948 are not strictly comparable with those for earlier periods.
[2] Preliminary estimates; only manufacturing for November charted.
[3] Not available.

Source: Department of Labor.

Postal and classified civil-service employees depend upon us for an increase. They cannot bargain collectively on salaries and other working conditions as do workers in private industry.

Last year I supported the legislation providing a salary increase for these faithful workers, even though I felt that the increase Congress recommended was inadequate. I voted for the increase as a stopgap measure with the hope that the present Congress will deal with the problem justly and fairly.

The Presidential pocket veto of our pay-increase measure was a shocking disappointment to me as it was to most of you who voted for the bills.

We must correct the pay inequity to which the loyal postal and classified Federal employees have been subjected as expeditiously as possible. The efficiency, hard work, and sincerity of purpose which the distinguished members of this committee have shown toward solving the problem since the opening of the 84th Congress is most gratifying, and I am sure that this committee will recommend a fair and equitable bill. Obviously, a just bill will require more than mere compensation for increases in cost of living since July 1951. Sound public policy would require that the faithful servants of the people should share in the rising standards of living and increased productivity of our economy.

No study of this problem would be complete without taking a look at Consumer Price Indexes over the 1939–54 period. These figures are given in the accompanying table.

Consumer price indexes, 1939–54, for city wage-earner and clerical-worker families

[1947–49=100]

Monthly average:	All items
1939	59.4
1940	59.9
1941	62.9
1942	69.7
1943	74.0
1944	75.2
1945	76.9
1946	83.4
1947	95.5
1948	102.8
1949	101.8
1950	102.8
1951	111.0
1952	113.5
1953	114.4
1954	114.8

Productivity measurements of white-collar and professional workers are difficult to obtain. But where measurements are available, there is incontrovertible evidence that the productivity of postal employees has increased over the years and is constantly moving upward. During the past 15 years, employment in the postal service has increased by about two-thirds but the volume of pieces of mail handled has almost doubled. This means that the average post-office employee handles about 20 percent more mail today than he did before World War II. The 1956 budget indicates that the trend in rising productivity is expected to continue. In 1954 the average mail clerk handled 142 units per man-hour. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that during the current year the average will increase to 146 units, and in fiscal 1956 to 150 units per man-hour. Similar increases are expected in the productivity of collecting and delivery of mail.

Sound public policy as well as fair play would dictate increases for postal and classified Federal employees. Turnover in Federal employment is exceedingly high, and training of new employees is costly. Passage of a fair wage increase to these employees is, therefore, in the public interest, because it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Federal Government to retain the most qualified employees and to attract the promising young men for a career in Federal employment.

A fair and justified increase for the devoted and faithful postal and classified civil-service employees would have to consider the increases in cost of living since July 1951, the prolonged period during which no increase was granted, the increased productivity and the general rising standard of living in our great country. Furthermore, owing to the fact that the salary increase has been long overdue, it should be made retroactive to the date when the wage increase, voted overwhelmingly by the 83d Congress, was unjustly vetoed in August 1954.

Faithful men devoted to duty and their country have been considered rare. In the Bible the wise man asked: "A faithful man who can find?" Our country is fortunate to find them in abundance in the postal and Federal employment. We should recognize their faithfulness and loyalty by granting them the pay increase which is long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge your committee to report legislation which will provide for at least a 10-percent salary increase for these workers. I believe that Congress would look with favor upon such a measure.

Soviet Faithlessness at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, basic to the ultimate success of any agreement or contract is the existence of the will to fulfill in good faith what has been stipulated. The will to act honestly and faithfully is the heart and core of any agreement in international relations.

At Yalta in February 1945 an agreement was reached between the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States; Winston Churchill, the present Prime Minister of Great Britain; and the deceased Soviet dictator, Marshal Stalin. This agreement concluded in the Crimea contained many elements that were intended to insure lasting world peace. Among these elements were: The projection of the basic concept of the United Nations Organization; a declaration on liberated Europe, based upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the declaration by the United Nations; the occupation and control of defeated Germany; war reparations; treatment of major war criminals; an agreement relating to prisoners of war and liberated civilian nationals; agreement on policy toward Japan; settlement problems in Eastern and Southeastern Europe bearing upon Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Italy, Greece, and Rumania; consideration of the question of Iran; the establishment of permanent machinery for periodic conferences between the foreign secretaries of the three powers; and, finally, consideration of the question of the Turkish Straits.

In the conclusion of the Crimean Agreement President Roosevelt exercised the constitutional power invested in the office of the Presidency. And in like manner Prime Minister Churchill exercised the equivalent constitutional power invested in his office. As a supreme dictator Stalin was not governed by any such constitutional principles. Both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill entered into this agreement in good faith, and with the will to carry out the stipulations laid down. But, unfortunately, Stalin, the third party to this agreement, had no intention of fulfilling his obligations.

As a consequence of Soviet bad faith we have seen time and again willful violations of the Crimean Pact. No violation, however, could be more distressing to witness than the one that bore upon Poland.

At Yalta, the Polish eastern frontier was delineated roughly along the old Curzon line. Thus, Poland lost a large amount of her eastern territories. But further stipulations provided that Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west. Another stipulation was made in the agreement calling for the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot.

At the Potsdam Conference, the western frontier of Poland was moved to the Oder-Neisse line in Eastern Germany pending final delimitation at the peace conference which, incidentally, was never held. However, free and unfettered elections were never held in Poland, and here in this display of bad faith on the part of the Soviet Union, the hopes of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill for a free, independent, and democratic Poland vanished.

Seldom before has the world seen such a display of bad faith as in the farcical elections that brought Poland under Communist domination. Every device of terror, imprisonment, and intimidation was used to destroy the effectiveness of the Polish democratic forces. Such were the free and unfettered elections that Yalta promised for Poland. We have long since discovered, much to our woe, how little good faith and good will we can ever expect from the Soviet Union.

On this 10th anniversary of the Yalta Agreement let us, therefore, recall to mind the diabolical dishonesty of the Soviet Union; let us remember the terrible consequences that this breach of faith has brought to the world; let us remember also the unhappy fate of Poland as a result of this breach of faith.

In the Polish people, who stand today before the world swathed in chains but with souls unconquered, there is exemplified the spirit of heroism in resistance, resolution in adversity, and faithfulness to the cause of freedom.

The Federal Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in years gone by the civil-service retirement system was considered a model and as such was used as an inducement to attract the better qualified citizen to choose the civil service as a career.

Recent official research proves that on the average the Federal employee contributes more to his pension fund than is exacted by private industry; that the retirement benefits enjoyed by people belonging to private pension funds are superior to those enjoyed by civil-service employees; and that an increase in benefits is practical.

So as not to befuddle any issue and allow for free discussion of individual inconsistencies, each inequality is being corrected by an individual bill. If adopted, the bills will not make the Federal retirement system a new model for private industry but will increase benefits commensurate with employee contributions and put the governmental retirement system more in line with that of private industry.

The Eisenhower School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message to the Congress outlining a school-construction program took note of the fact that our system of public schools has always been—and we hope it always will be—a school system based upon State and local control. Then the President proceeded to assume that certain States and local communities were unable to raise the money necessary to provide adequate schoolrooms to properly take care of the children; and, therefore, such States and local communities required Federal aid in the shape of Federal funds, aid to help pay the building costs of the new buildings or to underwrite local school building bonds.

Of course we all know that there are certain impacted areas, where defense plants have been built, that have more children than schoolroom space. Since these impacted areas were created as a result of Federal action and Federal needs, then of course such impacted areas should be given Federal aid—and that has already been provided for in previous legislation.

For the President to propose Federal aid for school buildings on a national scale is something else. In the first place, is it necessary? Why is such a step needed today more than it was 20 to 30 years ago, before Uncle Sam became such an all-wise, beneficent person to whom States and local communities might turn for fiscal aid for any and all purposes?

Mr. Speaker, in the first place Uncle Sam has no money to give out that he does not first get by levying taxes upon the State and local communities. Twenty years ago the Federal Government was satisfied by taking 25 cents out of every tax dollar paid in the United States, leaving 75 cents for the support of the States and local communities. Today, the Federal Government takes 75 cents out of every tax dollar paid in the United States, leaving only 25 cents for the States and local governments to exist upon. If the Federal Government did not rob the States and local governments of their tax dollars they could and would provide proper school facilities for their children without calling upon Uncle Sam for help.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, that should be given serious consideration before the Congress approves the President's request for school construction funds is the fact that our schoolrooms today are not as crowded as they were 20 or 30 years ago. They got along then without Federal aid; why can they not get along now without Federal aid?

In 1920–21 the average teacher load—number of pupils per teacher—for the Nation was 31.7. In 1950–51, according to United States Department of Education figures, the average teacher load was 24.1—7.6 fewer pupils per teacher than 30 years ago. The situation, therefore, so far as crowded classrooms are concerned, has actually improved. It has definitely not become worse. Why, then, all the furor? Why must the Federal Government rush to the aid of the States and local communities?

Mr. Speaker, a careful analysis of the school situation is contained in the following editorial taken from the Chicago Tribune of February 11, 1955. I include it as a part of my remarks and recommend it to my colleagues for careful consideration:

THE EISENHOWER SCHOOL PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's message on Federal aid for building schools sets forth sound principles and then proposes action that flies directly in the face of the precepts he has just uttered.

"Diffusion of authority among tens of thousands of school districts is a safeguard against centralized control and abuse of the educational system that must be maintained," he told Congress. "We believe that to take away the responsibility of communities and States in educating our children is to undermine not only a basic element of our freedom but a basic right of our citizens."

Having voiced these traditional arguments against Federal aid, the President asked Congress to vote for more than a billion dollars' worth of undermining. His proposals for Federal participation in financing of local school construction took three forms, under each of which States whose districts were helped would have to match Federal funds, dollar for dollar.

The first category of districts to be aided would be those that cannot sell their building bonds at a "reasonable" rate of interest. A White House aid put the limit on "reasonableness" at 3⅛ percent. To buy these bonds the Federal Government would put up $750 million and the States the same sum, to be used within 3 years.

The Dow-Jones index of school-bond yields stands at 2.42 percent. Probably then, only a small proportion of school districts have been unable to sell bonds yielding 3⅛ percent or less. But Mr. Eisenhower would provide funds to buy a half billion dollars of these bonds annually, one-fourth of the cost of all school construction in the Nation during this school year.

The second form of aid would go to districts that cannot borrow because of constitutional or statutory debt limitations. Federal and participating State governments would put up a total of $300 million. This would be used, Mr. Eisenhower proposed, as a revolving fund to advance the first year's rent until the districts could levy and collect taxes for the purpose. So used, the fund would permit the construction of $6 billion worth of schools within 3 years.

The Nation is building $2 billion worth of schools in the present school year. This rate of expenditure is the highest in history. In the last 5 years the country has built $7 billion worth of schools to accommodate 6,750,000 pupils. The increase in pupil population has been only 5,500,000; so the country has, until now, kept well ahead of the growth in school population. But by the President's calculations, school districts unable to borrow another cent need as much money annually to build new schools as all the districts in the country have ever spent in a year.

In the final category of districts that supposedly need Federal aid most desperately are those that can neither sell bonds nor raise taxes to rent a Federal-State school building. For these, Federal and State governments together would provide $400 million in outright gifts, spread over 3 years.

Illinois has distressed school districts. The legislature seems likely to adopt a scheme for a school building authority almost identical with that in the second Eisenhower proposal, except that no Federal aid is contemplated. The suggested capitalization for this authority is $15 million. This sum, it is expected, would provide building funds for all the districts unable to sell their own bonds. By comparison, this State's share of the $6 billion Eisenhower build-rent scheme would be $114 million, half contributed in Federal income taxes and half raised by the State.

The poverty of school districts portrayed by Mr. Eisenhower doesn't exist anywhere in the Nation in the proportions he alleges. It will no doubt manifest itself if the Federal purse is opened. Why should States that have been stingy with their schools tax themselves to make amends when they can pass half the bill on to taxpayers in States that have made more nearly adequate provision for educating their children?

Mr. Eisenhower relied, for proof that a serious shortage of classrooms exists throughout the Nation, on a survey prepared by the Federal Office of Education. Its figures have already been exposed as unreliable.

The Eisenhower message also expressed concern over the low compensation of school teachers. The local taxpayer is charged for paying off school bonds and for paying teachers in the same tax bill. Encouragement of extravagance in construction would be the unkindest act possible to underpaid teachers. It would leave that much less for salaries.

A Decent Break for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented by me to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Tuesday, February 15, 1955:

I appreciate this opportunity to present my views to this committee in support of a substantial pay raise for postal employees.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2158, which would provide for an increase of 10 percent or $400, whichever is greater, for all employees in the field service of the Post Office Department retroactive to August 23, 1954. This bill, as you know, is similar to H. R. 1592, introduced by Congressman MORRISON, and a number of other bills introduced by Members of Congress both on and off this committee.

I do not believe anyone seriously can question the need for adequate pay increases for employees in the postal field service at this time. The simple fact is that they are underpaid. They are underpaid in contrast with employees in private industry discharging similar duties. They are underpaid in contrast with the rates of pay prevalent in the postal field service prior to the Second World War. The pay scales of the loyal, hard-working men and women carrying out the vital but unsung tasks of the Post Office Department have not kept pace with the rapidly rising cost of living. In fact, postal workers have fallen further and further behind in the struggle to have and enjoy decent food, decent housing, and all of the many things that go into the standard of living of the average American of which the Nation justly is proud.

I have read persuasive statistics describing the plight of the mail clerk, the letter carrier, and all of the many other postal workers endeavoring to make ends meet, and the figures are impressive. But, more than that, I have talked to many of them personally, and I have received their letters by the hundreds, each telling a personal story of the ever-pressing grip of financial need. In my own State of Washington the fact is that almost two-thirds of rank-and-file postal workers are so hard put to make ends meet that they either hold outside part-time jobs or have found it necessary to put their wives to work.

Postal workers, like other Government employees, cannot strike to back up their claims for adequate pay scales, as can employees in private industry. They cannot go to work for a competing firm which offers higher salaries, because no such firm exists. They must come to us, the Members of Congress, lay their case on the table, and ask for fair treatment. This they have done. This committee held extensive hearings last year, in which every phase of the postal-pay problem was explored thoroughly. Additional hearings are now in process this year, and again the story is being told. I think it incumbent on us to act, and act promptly; each day's delay merely prolongs the need. We know the facts; we have only to make up our minds as to what rates of compensation are fair in the light of the facts and act accordingly.

I support the formula of a 10-percent increase or $400, whichever is greater. And I think the increase should be made retroactive to the end of the last session of Congress, which is when a pay-raise bill should have taken effect.

A higher increase than this formula provides could easily be justified by any standard normally used in determining a reasonable wage rate—by comparison with workers in other industries, by contrast to the relative purchasing power during some earlier period, by studying the change in productivity and average workload. Application of the formula would not restore, for example, the purchasing power of the average postal employee to the level of 1939. A higher increase could be justified in good conscience; to grant less, in my opinion, would be unjust.

The principal alternative proposal before this committee is contained in H. R. 2987, introduced by the distinguished chairman, and similar bills. I think the increase in salary scales which would be provided by this bill are not enough, particularly in the lower grades, where the need is greatest. While I recognize the need for increasing the level of remuneration for those assuming the greater responsibilities for the operation of the postal service, I think that our first and basic obligation is toward those in the lower grades who are struggling to keep up the pace. I think the formula I support will help to accomplish both objectives.

My principal concern today is with the problem of providing adequate pay scales for postal workers, but I should like to add the additional comment on H. R. 2987 that I feel it hands over to the Postmaster General too sweeping an authority in the matter of postal reclassification, job assignment and the employment of substitute and replacement personnel. Congress has, in my opinion, certain obligations in these areas which cannot be abdicated in favor of the judgment of the politically-appointed head of the Post Office Department, whoever he may be.

We often are inclined to take the postal worker for granted. The letter we drop in the mail chute or deposit in the convenient corner box always reaches its destination. The letter carrier always delivers our mail and our periodical reading matter. The clerk always is at the window to sell us stamps or to provide any one of a hundred other services. Their very competence puts them out of mind. They come to us now asking for a decent break. I think they have earned it; I think they deserve it; and I think in good conscience we have no choice but to give it to them as rapidly as possible.

Twenty-three Years of Experience With Our First Socialist Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, we have had 23 years of experience with our first socialist experiment—that much-touted TVA. I have been criticized for characterizing TVA as socialistic. However, my opinion conforms with that of the authorities. The Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of February 15, 1934, quotes Norman Thomas as saying:

> The TVA is the only genuinely socialistic act (in the New Deal)—a flower in the midst of weeds.

TVA is owned and operated by the United States Government; that is to say, TVA is a communal or public-owned property acquired by taking private property amounting to $2 billion mostly from the people of 41 States, for the alleged communal benefit of the people in parts of 7 other States. Such immoral taking of private property never fails in the end to blight a people who take it. The proof is already apparent in Tennessee. She has suffered a reduction in production and commerce and, therefore, in the well-being of her people since the advent of TVA.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has compared Tennessee with 10 Southeastern States which use private power. In 1930, before the advent of TVA, the population of Tennessee ranked fourth among the 10 States. In 1950 she still ranked fourth.

In 1933, just a year prior to operation of TVA, the receipts from farm marketing ranked Tennessee fifth, while in 1950 she dropped to eighth place.

The retail sales payroll in 1935 put Tennessee in third place; in 1948 she had dropped to fifth place.

Retail sales in 1929 had Tennessee in second place; in 1948 she had dropped to fifth.

In value added by manufacture Tennessee ranked third in 1933; fourth in 1947. In gross postal receipts she ranked third in 1933; down to fourth in 1951.

In all the categories examined Tennessee has fallen behind in productivity. In only one area has Tennessee improved her rank among her neighboring States and that was in per capita income and per capita taxes paid. But that increase was caused by subsidies and doles paid by the United States Government; not from improved production. One hun-

dred and eight million dollars have gone down there annually mostly from other States to pay 22,796 TVA employees an average of nearly $5,000 apiece plus millions in doles granted by the Federal Government. Without the Federal payroll and subsidies and doles Tennessee would not have enjoyed an increase in per capita income but would have suffered a serious decline. She is now a taxeater and not a growing tax producer as compared to the other States.

The most startling failure of TVA is that it does not produce sufficient power for the people it serves. So TVA never will be able, selling electricity at half price, to earn enough to expand to meet the need of a growing community. That's why Tennessee growth is slowed up. There is a shortage. What value is low-priced electricity when it cannot be had at any price? This is the universal characteristic of socialism everywhere.

Besides all this, TVA is completely exempt from all taxes. It does not contribute a dime to national defense, not even toward the salaries of the President and the Congress that does all these nice things for it. Finally, TVA was made ashamed by the complaints of the local people in the adjoining municipalities that educated the TVA children, provided police and streets and hauled away their garbage free of taxes to them. So TVA condescended to volunteer to make a contribution of about a tenth of what it should toward the expenses it had thrust on its neighbors. But it may decide to quit at any time.

Had TVA paid taxes at the same rate paid by private power companies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, such taxes would have amounted to about $80 million; resulting in a loss in operations of about $57 million. If TVA were required to pay interest on the appropriations granted it by Congress that loss would have been increased by another $24 million, which figure does not include the $10 million more for amortization. Thus if TVA were run as an honest business enterprise, its books on June 30, 1953, would not show a credit balance of $19 million but a deficit balance of $91 million. Yet, even with that deficit representing a subsidy paid by the Nation's taxpayers, the TVA system cannot produce enough cheap power to satisfy the demands of the consumers it was designed to serve.

There is no similar shortage of power in other parts of the country where private companies are the suppliers. The reason for this is that the private power companies, being run on sound and honest business principles, have anticipated the increased demand for electrical energy. At this time the private power companies are undertaking a $2.5 billion expansion program of their facilities.

The original excuse for the law creating TVA, viz, to control floods and to aid navigation on the Tennessee River, has turned out to be a joke and a fraud of extensive proportions. Instead of stopping floods it has actually permanently flooded 660,000 acres—an area as big as Rhode Island—out of a million acres it owns and controls. This great Tennessee River bottom, according to Army engineers, would not seriously flood more than once in 500 years. The bottom lands did sustain some overflow in the spring, as most river-bottom lands do. It benefited the land by leaving a fertile sediment. Crops thrived. Annual production was about $27 million. That is now all destroyed, and there is water, water everywhere.

Let us not dwell in detail on alleged improved navigation by deepening the Tennessee River, except to say that this was also a device to hide vast sums that should have been charged to cost of power. As a navigation scheme it has failed because it is cheaper to ship by rail.

There is another loss that is even more important than the $2 billion that have been poured into this monumental blight on Tennessee and drain on the other States. The people of Tennessee lost their political freedom when they became dependent on TVA. Their Governor is compelled to come to Washington, hat in hand, predicting dire consequences for his people if the dole is shut off. The people of Tennessee must live under whatever rules Congress promulgates and those rules affect not only the rates charged for power, but touch every aspect of the State's economy as has been pointed out. They have lost their productivity. They may not buy power elsewhere as private companies are excluded from the TVA reservation. They have lost their economic freedom, their know-how to provide power for themselves—competition is dead. In the words of Herbert Hoover:

> They have surrendered the control of their resources and energy to a Federal bureaucracy.

TVA cuts the price of power to a loss figure so as to buy the votes and support of its consumers in the rankest kind of political corruption. It exempts itself from taxation and by more political corruption forces its competitors to pay approximately 23 cents out of every dollar to help pay taxes TVA customers should pay but do not.

Even the little schoolboys now define TVA as "a river that flows through 7 States and drains 41." They were drained again in 1954 for the 22d year. TVA will be coming up to the public trough again in 1955. But Tennessee knows that no scheme to buy votes as crazy and incredible as TVA can last. This administration has already given fair warning. So Mr. Robert M. Metcalf, Jr., vice president of Guaranty Mortgage & Trust Co., of Memphis, Tenn., comes up with this remedy.

He suggests that the power-generating facilities of TVA be sold to the people in the area which it serves. This would result in relief for the taxpayers of the remainder of the Nation and at the same time give to the people of the TVA reservation exclusive control over the agency upon which they are completely dependent for their power. Perhaps even more important than these immediate tangible gains, is the fact that such a sale would represent a reversal of the largest, most clear-cut Socialist step the United States has ever taken.

Let Us Protect American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this Congress take action to protect our domestic industries. I recently appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and urged that H. R. 1 be properly amended to provide this needed protection. On Tuesday of this week, I appeared before the House Rules Committee and opposed the granting of a closed rule on this legislation, because a closed rule would not permit those of us who are Representatives from industrial areas to amend the bill so as to afford relief to the mining industry, the chemical industry, the glass industry, and others. Yesterday on the floor of this House, I again spoke in opposition to a closed rule. Our forces were out-numbered by a very narrow margin, and we lost the battle. I, therefore, hope that this House will take action today to retrieve that which we lost yesterday, and I urge the membership to support a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee to bring the bill back out under amendments which will provide the kind of protection our industries need and deserve.

My district is the largest coal-producing district in America. The largest chemical plants in the Western Hemisphere are located in my district, as is one of the largest window-glass plants in the world. These industries are basic to the defense of this Nation, and they have suffered under the present law, largely because the escape clause is treated as a joke and trade agreements are used as pawns in the field of international diplomacy.

A case in point is the plight of the chemical industry, one of tremendous importance in both peace and war. It faces serious problems from foreign competition and many of its leaders have protested any reckless across-the-boards cut in tariff rates on chemical products. Because it is a very large industry which provides substantial payrolls and an important outlet for investment, its spokesmen deserve a hearing. I do not ask you to reject H. R. 1 in its entirety, but I do suggest that the chemical industry is typical of those groups in the country that are worried about foreign competition. An examination of their problems in specific form may well suggest that very specific answers to tariff problems are required, too. Generalizations are not enough basis to form a national policy. By this I mean that across-the-board cuts in tariffs represent a superficial approach. It would be more scientific and show better deliberation to study the needs of individual products and industries, adjusting each rate to specific requirements. This is not too much to ask in so important a matter.

The spokesmen of the chemical industry have come before the hearings of the Randall Commission and have released

statements to the press which suggest in unmistakable form the problems they face as a result of foreign competition. They suggest that if the present uncertainty over possible reductions in tariffs continues, then the expansion of the industry at home will be threatened, and new investment important to the growth of the industry will be lost. Because the chemical industry has been growing at something like four times the national average of all industries, its continued progress is of concern. If its high growth rate is continued without interruption, some hundred thousand new jobs in this industry will be created during the next 10 years. If this kind of progress is threatened by foreign competition made possible by tariff cuts, it is important that these facts be given the same careful consideration as the proposals to create export trade and economic solvency abroad through our tariff reductions. Any one-sided review of all the aspects of trade policy is a guaranty that all of these problems will have to be reconsidered by every succeeding Congress. For fatal weaknesses written into our laws make themselves felt inexorably. Let the decision of this Congress be so carefully laid as to avoid at least the obvious flaws of past acts in foreign trade policy.

Can we afford to be without a strong chemical industry? That question answers itself in the negative, for a great country such as ours with its variety of needs for an advanced technological society and its grave responsibility for the defense of the free world must have an assured supply of a wide range of chemical products. Many of these are products whose very names seem strange to the layman, yet any engineer, chemist, or specialized consumer could explain to us how these seemingly obscure substances, processed and combined, give us dyes, drugs, plastics, fuels, and the advanced materials of military armaments, without which our high standard of living and military survival would be impossible.

It may seem a long way back in history to some of us, and yet it was not many years ago that the First World War ravaged Europe. One of its early effects, long before we became involved in the fighting, was to cut us off from a variety of essential supplies previously turned out by German industry. It was at great effort that we painfully constructed a chemical industry of our own and learned enough secrets of research to make it possible to fulfill our needs. It is indicative of the progressive nature of the chemical industry of America today that it spends $200 million a year on research. This is obviously not the hallmark of a moribund segment of the economy. If it can continue to enrich American life with the marvels of the laboratories as it has in the past, its contribution will be one to recognize with pride.

Let us pause to consider the plight of the glass industry, and I would like to direct your attention to the adverse effect upon one of the glass plants in West Virginia. The rapid increase in imports of European window glass made under low-wage conditions resulted in shutting down of a production furnace and an experimental furnace last year at the Charleston plant of Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., and 240 employees lost their jobs as a consequence. This condition followed the closing down of 2 tanks at the end of 1953, and brought the total layoff to 500 seniority employees directly due to the increased glutting of the window-glass market by foreign glass.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three imports of window glass totaled 100 million square feet of glass, as contrasted with imports of less than 1 million square feet in 1948. In other words, 1953 imports of window glass were equal to 1,020,000 man-hours of work in modern window-glass factories.

The average wages of the American window-glass industry run about $2.40 an hour. European manufacturers pay from 37 cents to 45 cents an hour for the same type of work, and I am told that almost identical machines are used in European and American plants. Low-cost water transportation enables cheap European window glass to reach American cities on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts with lower freight rates than those prevailing from Charleston, W. Va., to markets in this country. I am told that the freight rate from Charleston, W. Va., to Miami, Fla., is three times that from Antwerp, Belgium, to Miami. These figures should be enough to convince anyone that a further lowering of tariffs will be disastrous to our own industries, and that they cannot meet such competition without some reasonable protection.

Let me, in conclusion, make my position clear. We are engaged in an important review of our international trade policy. As previously on the floor of this House, I have made a strong plea for adequate protection of the coal and textile industries, I here state that the chemical industry is yet another of critical importance to the livelihood of the American worker and to the prosperity of the Nation. These important industries must not be destroyed nor can we afford to see them seriously injured. It is up to the Congress to prevent such a catastrophe.

I urge the Members of this House to support the motion to recommit. If we are successful in our efforts to recommit H. R. 1, it will be brought back with safeguards included, after which we can all conscientiously support the bill.

The Regaining of Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in 1918 when the Armenians had succeeded in regaining their national political independence after some 600 years of subjection to alien oppressors it was thought that they were destined to enjoy a measure of peace and freedom in their historic homeland. With great feelings of joy lovers of freedom throughout the world were glad to see long-oppressed Armenians win their independence. As it turned out, however, Armenians were not for long to have their national independence. During the short period of just a little over 2 years that Armenia possessed its freedom, its existence as an independent state was in constant jeopardy. The small and weak country had to fight for its life on many fronts. Finally in December of 1920 Armenia was overrun by its enemies and most of it fell to the Communist Russians. They had come as saviors and liberators, but immediately they established a despotic regime.

The people of Armenia were unwilling to accept this without a fight. In mid-February of 1921 an uprising was under way, and by the 18th it proved so successful that in a few days nearly all the unwanted invaders were expelled. For a brief period of only 6 weeks Armenians again enjoyed freedom.

This uprising is historically significant because it is an instance in which communism was successfully repelled and defeated, and the Armenians regained, even if only temporarily, their political liberty. That is the reason we celebrate this memorable day.

Washington: Cultural Center of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in his program Person to Person, Edward R. Murrow interviewed, last November, the distinguished American, Lillian Gish. She devoted practically all of her time to advocacy of the establishment of a Ministry of the Fine Arts as a department of the Federal Government with a Secretary of Cabinet rank. She argued that we are now coming of age in cultural matters, and such an agency is a part of the government of practically all British and European countries.

In his message on the state of the Union the President declared that—

> In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal advisory commission on the arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation. I shall also propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country.

A number of bills have been introduced in the 84th Congress to advance the proposals outlined above, some of which have already reached the hearing stage.

The gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; the gentleman from New York, ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE M. RHODES; and myself have offered the American National Arts Act, which was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee for its consideration.

A second bill, creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, theater and fine arts, and mass communications center, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives. Hearings have already begun on this bill before a special subcommittee whose chairman is the able gentleman from Louisiana, JAMES H. MORRISON.

The broadest kind of support has developed for this bill which would give the Nation's Capital the cultural facilities it has lacked for 155 years, facilities possessed by large and small European cities and by many cities in our own country.

Legislation to make Washington the cultural center of the world has been introduced by the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE M. RHODES; the gentleman from Minnesota, ROY W. WIER; the gentleman from Connecticut, ALBERT P. MORANO; the gentleman from New York, ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.; the gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN A. BLATNIK; the gentleman from Arkansas, OREN HARRIS; the gentleman from New Hampshire, CHESTER E. MERROW; the gentleman from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.; and myself.

Among the many distinguished witnesses who have testified in support of the proposed legislation are Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, legislative chairman, General Federation of Women's Clubs, and Robert W. Dowling, chairman, board of directors of the congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy. I include excerpts from their testimony here for its great informational value:

EXCERPT FROM THE STATEMENT OF MRS. A. PAUL HARTZ, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, WAVERLY, VA.

If the cultural endeavors of a people are a measure of their stature, the passage of H. R. 1825 brooks no delay. This bill which would create a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the Nation's Capital of a civic auditorium with connected facilities making it a center for music and the fine arts is a first step toward overcoming a serious cultural lag.

Appreciation of fine arts knows no national boundaries. It is in this realm that we can hope for the greatest understanding among the peoples of the world. A building dedicated to the purpose and living expression of fine arts in the District of Columbia might well symbolize the cultural bonds which give the greatest promise of lasting peace.

In this day of uncertainty there is a continuing battle for the minds of men and we must properly gage not only our military and economic strength but our cultural strength as well. If the final victory is to go to the forces of freedom, we must not ignore this significant endeavor. Our failure to project to other countries our appreciation of our cultural heritage is a serious handicap as we compete with the Soviet Union in the cold war.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the passage of H. R. 1825.

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT W. DOWLING, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

Mr. Dowling. It is a privilege to speak with you about this. It has been very dear to my heart and to the interests of ANTA for many, many years.

I would like to call attention to something pertinent to the question of whether we cannot have a place where foreign visitors, painters, sculptors, and others can exhibit their works here in America.

This year the State Department gave me the privilege of organizing an exhibit of American art in Paris during April, May, and June.

The French Government put at our disposal 5 national theatres, their opera house, Comedie Francais and others, where we display American painters' works and sculpture and where our Philadelphia orchestra will perform in the opera house, the ballet of New York and 2 plays and the musical comedy "Oklahoma."

There is no proper place for such a performance in Washington. If we were to have reciprocal visits—and I am frequently asked when I have visited national theater groups from Salzburg, Austria, and all the way to Scandinavia and through the rest of Europe, "Where would we play if we came?" or "Where would our works be shown—our paintings and sculptures?"

We have the privilege of owning some theatres in New York and I am familiar with the problems of booking and I think we plan to bring the Shakespeare Theatre from Stratford next fall.

It is very difficult to know whether we can play them. They cannot play in Washington because the National Theater has an open system of booking which takes place for 2 weeks at a time but when they come to us they will have performed in New York where theaters are customarily booked from October or November to June and July and sometimes longer.

It is very difficult to hold out the 2 or 3 weeks that a national company visiting from Europe can perform. We brought the Greek National Theater to New York and we would like to get a theater—the right kind of a theater—and every single seat was taken for every performance.

I call your attention to the fact that although we may have 30 theaters in New York and 2 in Washington and other cities have 1 or 2 or 3 theaters, there is no comparable place where foreign artists and companies and national theaters can visit and perform. And as our State Department has now placed in the hands of "ANTA" the International Exchange Program in which we are sending performers to Asia, South America, Central America, and Iceland, and European countries, we have no place to invite them in returning our visits. It is very vital to our cultural exchange program that we have such places.

Therefore, we urge you gentlemen to guide this bill through to a point where it can have the benefit of the Commission's more thorough study of the problem.

I have no other point to raise unless you have some questions.

Mr. MORRISON. I understood you to say there was a private program the United States was putting on in Paris and that they wanted to reciprocate and wanted to come to Washington but that the facilities were not here to receive them.

Mr. DOWLING. That is true. Not only for Paris but for European countries, countries even that are semibehind the Iron Curtain—Yugoslavia, where we are now sending our ambassadors and culture. If they were to come here we would have no place for them to use.

Mr. MORRISON. I was quite impressed with the point you raised that we were sending entertainment to different parts of the world. It is just as important in one sense to have them go there and to have theirs come to the United States. You made that point and they cannot come here because we do not have the facilities to house them here?

Mr. DOWLING. That is right. They always ask me when I visit those countries. While we would like to play in your National Theater and I have to say, There is not any except one we lease in Washington which is not a national theater but just a commercial venture.

Mr. MORRISON. It is national in name only.

Mr. BROYHILL. No questions.

Mr. MORRISON. Thank you very much for your contribution to the committee.

The Summerfield Reclassification Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, we in West Virginia, have suffered mass unemployment and the misery that comes with that economic illness.

The current depressed economic conditions have not made things easier for post-office employees. Let no one make any mistake about that.

On the contrary, the economic problems of the area have closed the possibilities of self-help that the postal workers had formerly turned to. The West Virginia post-office employees had sought to supplement their meager incomes by getting additional part-time jobs and by having their wives work. But when the bad unemployment situation developed, the part-time jobs disappeared and the opportunity for large-scale employment of women ended.

The additional income upon which the post-office employees have had to depend for so long, therefore, ceased to exist.

West Virginia and the post-office employees in the State have some peculiar economic problems, but the need for an adequate postal wage increase is nationwide. It is up to us in Congress to meet that need.

When I say an adequate wage increase, I mean one that will really help post-office employees out of their really bad economic situation. Such an increase, I believe, is the 10-percent increase contained in several bills which have been introduced during this session.

I sincerely hope that Congress will approve the 10-percent increase for the postal workers, and I also want to urge that we flatly reject the Summerfield reclassification plan. This bid for extra powers by an appointed official is dangerous, not only to the post office employees' rights but also as a giveaway of congressional powers.

Last year Congress was assured in some of the most determined lobbying that

has ever been carried on by a Government department that the Summerfield reclassification plan, then offered, carried no dangers. Yet, according to press reports, the Postmaster General in testimony a few weeks ago, in effect, admitted that many of the charges made against the 1954 plan had basis in fact.

The present plan, the Department assures us, removes all these problems. But we had assurances from the same people last year that no such problems even existed.

The present plan is still shot through with loopholes for downgrading of employees; it still involves the surrender of authority over tens of thousands of postal positions by Congress; it still provides meaningless raises of $210 a year to the rank and file employees and munificent grants of $4,000 a year to some top officials.

Even the postal positions which Congress would continue to control would suffer under this scheme. A Washington newspaper recently called the job descriptions of the Summerfield plan "frauds." It said that these descriptions are written so as to justify the salaries the Department wants to pay.

Any plan that has this type of unfairness to it, should be rejected at the outset. But the Summerfield job reclassification plan has the distinction of not only being unfair—in part a "fraud"—it is also dangerous.

It merits the same rejection that Congress accorded to its parent plan last year.

Hon. Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart and much regret that I belatedly learned of the passing of a colleague and friend, the Honorable Pete Jarman, Congressman from Alabama for the years 1937 through 1949.

Despite the great distance separating our respective constituencies, I found that the common ground of this House afforded me the privileged opportunity of knowing this great American. The tribute I wish to pay him, on the advent of his passing on February 17, is best told by way of the following anecdote:

It seems that at this particular time, Mr. Jarman was a member of the committee having jurisdiction over the Public Printer and, hence, the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In those days the RECORD was printed in two columns instead of the present three columnar arrangement. The then Public Printer, Mr. Augustus E. Giegengack, had sought for some time to change the format of the RECORD so as to effect a sizable economy of some $200,000 per Congress; but for some reason had not been too successful in selling his idea to the committee. Mr. Giegengack brought the matter to my attention which I, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, pursued in a statement on the floor when the matter came before this House. After presenting the case for revision of the RECORD, I was forcefully asked by Mr. Jarman if I would yield—which I granted. He consumed the first 5 minutes excoriating the Appropriations Committee's position in concerning itself with a matter not properly their primary concern. His indignant objections were interrupted by the Speaker's gavel giving notice that his time had expired. I immediately asked if the gentleman from Alabama desired additional time; for I felt that he had not touched on the merits of the question in his preoccupation of reprimanding the Appropriations Committee. The next 5 minutes were spent in the same manner as the first 5; for he was exercised greatly by what he considered an imposition on his committee's rights. But at each additional grant of time his vindictiveness waned until he culminated some 45 minutes later somewhat spent. He never honored my question on the floor, but was later instrumental in revising the RECORD to its present form and effecting the great savings.

Some time later I encountered the lovely Mrs. Jarman in a casual social gathering where, in her inimitable charming manner, she assured me that Pete intended nothing personal in his remarks. Strangely enough, I had felt no personal abuse from Pete Jarman's comments; instead, I was struck by the vitality of his manner in standing up to what he considered an encroachment of authority. It was principle, not personality that brought his verbal wrath upon our heads. This misunderstanding was the beginning of a long and memorable personal friendship with a truly great American who jealously guarded the principles of Jeffersonian democracy with uncompromising dedication.

In this day when expediency is sometimes confused with principle, the absence of men like Pete Jarman shall be noticeable. His service to country has been recorded here; his spirit, I pray, shall always permeate the proceedings of this House.

I tender to Mrs. Jarman deep sympathy in this time of her great bereavement and sorrow.

The Federal Service: Its Problems and Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am submitting herewith copy of an address entitled "The Federal Service: Its Problems and Its Future," delivered by the Honorable James C. Worthy, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, before the American Society for Personnel Administration, Society for the Advancement of Management, and the National Capital Chapter of the Civil Service Assembly, on January 28, 1955:

THE FEDERAL SERVICE: ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS FUTURE

(Address by Hon. James C. Worthy, Assistant Secretary of Commerce,)

I. INTRODUCTION

I am very proud of the opportunity to address this joint meeting of three distinguished organizations. Whatever differences there may be in the membership, professional specializations, and systems of concepts and techniques as between your three groups, all of them have one characteristic in common—a focus on and a concern for the human problems of running the Federal Government. Each of your organizations has made significant contributions to the efficiency of Government operations and to the integrity of the career service. Your membership rosters constitute a "Who's Who" of leaders in the field of management and administration. I salute you for what you have done, and wish you Godspeed in your continuing efforts.

I appreciate your inviting me here today to discuss some of the problems of the Federal service as they appear to a relative newcomer to Government who is now on his way back to private business. My status in this respect gives me a perspective which may have a certain value. For whatever they may be worth, I would like to share with you some of the observations I have made during the past 2 years.

Personal point of view

I want to be perfectly clear that what I shall have to say represents solely my own thinking and that none of the proposals I shall make are to be considered as in any way official. They represent merely the ideas of one individual on the verge of reentering private life. I trust you will view them in that light and accept them as sincerely directed toward improving the Federal service.

First of all, let me say it has been a great privilege to be a member of the Eisenhower administration and an officer of the Department of Commerce. I accepted the invitation to come down to Washington because I believed so implicitly in the principles represented by the President and by Secretary Weeks. I have never had occasion to regret that decision. Friends at home have commented on what they sometimes refer to as my willingness to accept the sacrifices of public service. I have always assured them that no sacrifice was involved. Quite the contrary: these 2 years have been the most stimulating and rewarding of my entire life, and I shall always be thankful that this opportunity was given to me.

I shall always be thankful for the friends I have made here, in high positions and low; friends who have made my task easier and my life richer. I have come to have a tremendous respect, not only for the appointive officials of this administration but for the members of the career service. I hope that as I go back to private life I will be able to help correct some of the mistaken impressions which prevail in certain quarters about the kind of people who work for the Government. I can say in all sincerity that for hard work and patient devotion it would be hard to find their equal in any line of endeavor.

II. SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVERNMENT WORKERS

The question is often asked of me as to how people in Government differ from those in private business. By and large, of course, they do not differ: Government people are a representative cross section of the American people as a whole, with all their diver-

sity and all their strengths and weaknesses. But in the professional and higher administrative levels of Government service I think there are certain characteristics which at least in respect to emphasis tend to distinguish the typical Government employee from his counterpart in private industry.

Generalizations about people are always hazardous, but I think it can be said that the typical upper level career employee tends to look somewhat more to the satisfactions of the job itself and somewhat less to the monetary rewards of that job than the typical employee in private industry carrying comparable burdens of responsibility. Whereas the business executive defines his status and measures his progress to a considerable extent in terms of his income, his opposite number in government is inclined to give greater relative weight to his job as such and to his professional achievement on that job.

I do not mean to imply that the government worker is not interested in the size of his paycheck. In many cases, in fact, his somewhat sharper focus on job satisfactions may represent an adaptation to a situation in which financial rewards are more difficult to achieve than in private industry. Whatever the origin of the attitude, the fact remains, I think, that there is a difference, at least in degree, in the respective orientations of the man in government and the man in industry.

Implications for administrators

This generalization has important implications for the government administrator, particularly to the administrator who comes into government from private industry where he has been accustomed to rely heavily on monetary rewards for energizing and directing the efforts of his organization. For one thing, the government pay system is too cumbersome and inflexible to permit it to serve as a useful tool for this purpose, and the businessman cum administrator must learn to rely on other means.

Of greater significance is the fact that failure to appreciate the extent of the government worker's ego-involvement in his job may lead the new administrator inadvertently to destroy or seriously impair the primary incentives available to him to promote high-level performance and efficient operation. The government worker will exert himself to the utmost, if necessary under severe difficulties, if he feels that those in authority recognize the importance of what he is doing and are giving him the support he needs. But if the value of his work is questioned—or, worse, if he is attacked directly or by implication as an unnecessary burden on the public payroll—he is deprived of the chief incentive he has for diligent, conscientious effort.

This does not imply by any means that a new administrator should accept without question all the activities he may inherit; neither does it imply that functions once established need be continued indefinitely. Indiscriminate approval loses its value here as in all human affairs. What is needed is a selective, judicial approach; an attitude of evaluating functions on their merits, of seeking to eliminate the less essential in order to strengthen the more essential, of concentrating on the most important things to be done and providing the circumstances, the atmosphere, the support which will enable them to be done better. This is the kind of approach the Government employee will understand and respond to, and the administrator who uses it can count on a loyal, enthusiastic, and productive organization.

Efficiency in Government

Because of the many impediments to efficient operation in Government, it is important that this characteristic of the Government employee be recognized and utilized. Most of these impediments to efficiency are inherent in the nature of Government service.

There is, for one thing, the high rate of turnover at the top. I was looking the other day at a picture taken about 2 years ago of the secretarial officers of the Department of Commerce. Of the 7 men in the picture, 4, including myself, are no longer there and have been replaced by newcomers. The situation in other departments, I imagine, is fairly comparable and is not by any means unique to this administration. I could not help wondering as I looked at that picture what would happen to a private business concern if it experienced a like degree of turnover in its top staff.

This kind of turnover places a severe strain on any organization. Government, as an on-going institution, has adapted itself over the years to absorb this strain. It has built-in resiliencies that enable it to weather the comings and goings of those at the top. Experienced civil servants develop techniques of self-protection that help them adapt to change in policies and personnel; those who fail to develop such techniques are not likely to survive for long.

These are natural adaptations to the realities of Government life; they are essential to a reasonable degree of continuity of function. But they take their toll in efficiency. When so much of the organization structure has to be designed to provide resiliency to change, when so large a part of the efforts of key personnel must be devoted to self-protection—or equally important, when so much initiative is stifled for fear of unnecessary exposure—it is little wonder that Government operations are often inefficient as compared to private industry.

Challenge to Administrators

The Government administrator, however, has it within his power to offset these impediments in substantial degree. He has available, for the tapping, a tremendous source of energy and enthusiasm in the job-oriented attitudes of the typical career employee. Give the career employee leadership as to the direction you want him to go, recognize the importance of what he is doing, see that he has the support and facilities he needs, do what you can to remove roadblocks and encumbrances in his way—and you will be amazed at the effort and productivity you will call forth. Under these circumstances Government operations can more nearly approach the efficiency of private industry. But the task requires high orders of understanding and administrative skill.

III. COMMONSENSE IN ADMINISTRATION

In this general connection, I would like to say a few words about the organization of administrative functions in the Federal Government. There has been a vast proliferation of administrative activities in recent years. Budget and management staffs, personnel staffs, organization and methods staffs, general service staffs, and so on have often grown more rapidly than the agencies of which they are a part. Typically, too, when cut-backs have been necessary the administrative staffs have been cut back less severely in proportion to the professional and program staffs. Both the growth of the administrative staffs and the tenderness with which they are treated when appropriations are reduced are justified in terms of the presumed contributions of such staffs to efficiency of operations.

Expansion of administrative staffs

It is easy to argue that an extra budget analyst can save many times his salary, or an extra personnel man can help improve employee morale, or the centralization of common services can save payroll. All these things may be true—in balance and moderation. But I have the feeling that in some cases we may have gone too far. The pendulum has swung widely since the reports of the first Hoover Commission called attention to the need for improved administrative management in the Federal service. The organizations represented here today have greatly aided in that swing. And because of the strategic position the administrative staffs have come to occupy in most major agencies, they have been able to expand and strengthen their functions, often at the expense of the program areas.

I think a time has come for stock-taking. Above all, I think the time has come for a reevaluation of the role of the administrative functions.

One reason administrative staffs have grown as they have has been the tendency to elaborate and extend administrative controls. A parallel factor has been the tendency to centralize functions. If the approach is in the direction of control and centralization, there is no limit to the extent to which the administrative staff can grow; but the cost in terms of the effectiveness of the organization as a whole can be very great indeed.

A service approach

In the Department of Commerce we have tried to develop a different point of view. We have tried to minimize the control aspects of administrative functions and to promote maximum decentralization. In particular, we have tried to emphasize the service aspects of the administrative jobs. We have tried to get across the idea that none of the administrative functions—whether personnel, budget and management, organization and methods, or whatever—has any value in its own right, that it is useful only to the extent that it contributes to the achievement of program objectives.

In our view, the purpose of the administrative staff is not to devise and police controls, except as positively required by law or regulation, but rather to assist program staffs in finding their way around difficulties and to provide them with the professional advice and services they need to do their jobs more effectively. Under this concept, administrative staffs can be kept small but their value to the organization can be greatly enhanced. And the job satisfaction of the administrative people themselves can be enriched and deepened accordingly. I submit there is far more basis for pride in helping a bureau or a division solve a knotty problem than in issuing a reprimand for deviation from some procedural detail.

As professionals in the several functional branches of administration, I urge you to consider carefully the role and orientation of your administrative organizations. I feel very definitely the need for strengthening administrative management in the Federal service, but I think we ought to consider carefully the means we employ for that purpose.

IV. THE PROBLEM OF PATRONAGE

I should like to turn now to another subject which also, in my view, requires considerable reevaluation. I refer to the subject of patronage and its relation to the career service. No other topic—except possibly that of security—has generated so much heat and so little light during these past 2 years.

Whatever other fruits it may have enjoyed from its victory in 1952, the Republican Party has been bitterly disappointed in the matter of jobs. The party had been out of power for 20 years. There had not only been little or no Federal patronage during all that time, but party leaders and workers recalled vividly what happened in 1933 when the Democrats succeeded the Republicans in office.

Recollections of 1933

They recalled the arbitrary dismissals of career employes suspected of the taint of Republicanism—such as the removal from the civil service of 376 "higher paid technical and professional positions" in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and the en bloc replacement of encumbents by loyal

Democrats. They recalled the thousands of Democrats who found their way into Federal employment in the years following 1933 and the difficulty of getting a job without Democratic endorsement.

They recalled the vigor with which Jim Farley handled his job as patronage boss and his frankness about what he was doing and why. They recalled that as late as 1948 Jim Farley had written: "While many criticize the spoils system, I have always felt that it is just as easy to find a good Democrat as a good Republican or vice versa and that the party in power should reward its own."

Disappointments of 1953

Remembering these things, the leaders and workers of the Republican Party looked forward to the turnover in office 2 years ago with relish and anticipation. But they were sorely disappointed; and if they have grown bitter, they can be understood. It does little to assuage their bitterness to point out that there are a number of very important differences between 1933 and 1953. But if we are to deal intelligently with the problem, we had better understand what those differences are.

I had the fortune—or misfortune—of serving in the first years of two new political administrations: with the NRA and its successor agencies from 1933 to 1936 and with the Department of Commerce from 1953 to 1955. I am therefore in a position to see quite vividly some of the sharp contrasts between the two periods.

Greatly extended civil service coverage

For one thing, the coverage of civil service is much more extensive in the latter period than it was in the former. When the Democrats took office in 1933, 80 percent of all Federal jobs were under civil service. But by 1936 civil service coverage had been reduced to about 60 percent, partly through removing certain jobs from civil service but more importantly through specifically exempting the newly created emergency agencies. As against about 40 percent of all Federal jobs available for patronage purposes before the end of President Roosevelt's first term, only 15 percent are so available now. Whatever this may represent in the way of a desirable strengthening of the merit system, it also represents a formidable restriction on freedom of appointment.

Growth of Government under Roosevelt

Of much greater importance, however, was the fact that 1933 saw the beginning of the rapid buildup in the size of the Federal establishment, whereas 1953 saw the initiation of a sharp trend in reverse. During President Roosevelt's first term, new agencies were created in quick succession and the need for Federal workers grew by leaps and bounds.

I can remember the hectic buildup period of NRA during the summer of 1933. We had few administrative regulations in those days, but I can remember one of them: No hiring on Fridays. This rule was necessary simply because the recordkeeping machinery could not keep pace with the rate of hiring. So each Friday people from the chief clerk's office went through the organization taking a census of all those hired during the preceding days of the week. Other agencies faced with similar problems of rapid growth no doubt employed a variety of expedients, but I have always thought of this one as illustrating vividly the great wealth of jobs available at that time. And I can assure you from having lived through it that the party then in power made full use of the political opportunities thus afforded.

Contraction of Government under Eisenhower

The situation faced by the new Republican administration when it took office in 1953 was sharply different. Instead of entering on a period of great expansion, President Eisenhower set in motion the economy program which had been one of the important Republican pledges in the preceding campaign. Instead of more jobs there were fewer. Instead of rapid, large-scale recruitment, widespread reductions in force were the order of the day. During the first 2 years of the Roosevelt administration, Federal employment increased by 141,000. During the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, Federal employment decreased by 200,000. In the Department of Commerce alone, regular, full-time employment was cut back 23.3 percent during our first year in office. Thus, even in the relatively few job categories which remained outside civil service the opportunities for patronage were meager indeed.

Buildup of pressure

But memories of what had happened in 1933 persisted, and discontent within the Republican organization rose to fever pitch. Pressure on the administration became extreme. I think it is to the everlasting credit of the President and the men around him that, in the face of this pressure, they have kept and maintained their strong position of safeguarding the merit system. I shudder to think of what might have happened had less courageous and less forthright men been at the helm.

But the pressure remains and the problem persists, and the entire subject is becoming increasingly confused. I think the time has come for a fresh and objective reappraisal.

A large part of our present confusion comes from failure to distinguish between two quite different things: the need of a new administration to gain control of the machinery of Government and the need of the party in power for jobs to reward the party faithful. These two needs have only in common the fact that both involve jobs and both involve people. Otherwise, they are entirely different in nature and must be satisfied by entirely different means. Let us consider each of them in turn.

Controlling machinery of government

In order to gain control of the machinery of Government, it is necessary for a new administration to control only a relatively few jobs. These are the key positions in the organization, the positions which are truly policy determining or policy influencing and the incumbents of which are close enough to the working processes to insure the faithful adherence of the staff to the program directions laid down.

In this connection, it is important to remember that by far the greater part of all governmental activities are devoid of partisan content. What has the work of the Bureau of Standards or the Patent Office or the Bureau of the Census or the Office of Business Economics to do with which party is in office? The level of their appropriations may rise or fall in accordance with the dictates of administration policy, the scope of their activities may expand or contract accordingly, and there may be certain changes in program emphasis. But the work itself is nonpolitical.

So long as the top staff in such agencies is professionally competent and properly cooperative with the new administrative group their personal politics is beside the point—assuming, of course, that they comply fully with the restrictions of the Hatch Act. In considering the number of jobs a new administration needs to have at its disposal to insure control of the governmental machinery, this largely nonpartisan nature of by far the greater part of the federal establishment needs to be kept in mind.

Support for administration policies

Even in activities where there is an appreciable degree of partisan content, the number of jobs that must be controlled still is relatively small. It has been my observation that the great majority of Federal workers—I can say this confidently at least with respect to the employees of the Department of Commerce—are conscientiously supporting the policies and programs of this administration—as I am sure they conscientiously supported the policies and programs of our predecessors in office.

Unfortunately, there has been a certain amount of confusion on this point, and it has sometimes been overlooked that, if people are to support a particular program or policy, they have to know what that program or policy is. One of the difficulties faced by the new administration when it came into office 2 years ago—and I am sure it is a difficulty experienced by any incoming administration—was that many of the new officials had to learn their way around in their new jobs. They had, of course, a general idea of the kinds of work performed in the bureaus and offices for which they were responsible and they had fairly clear-cut notions of the directions they wanted to go. But they often were not familiar with detailed issues and it took time for them to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the pros and cons of various alternative lines of action.

Under these circumstances, in the early months of this administration people down the line were sometimes lacking in clear-cut policy direction. But the work had to go on, and in the absence of specific instructions to the contrary they were likely to continue along much the same lines as under the prior administration. Thus it happened that the new administrators were sometimes confronted with actions or proposals for action with which they were in disagreement, and it is easy to understand that in some cases they developed the feeling that their career staffs were undercutting and second-guessing them. But this was only a passing phase. As the new administrators gradually worked out their own policy positions, as they made clear to those under them the directions they wanted to go, the career staffs swung in solidly behind them and are giving them their loyal, wholehearted support.

Few jobs required for control

Thus, even in activities with substantial partisan content, it is necessary to control only a relatively few jobs to control the machinery of government. Effective control is not secured by reaching far down into the organization, but by making sure that the few really key jobs are filled, not merely by people loyal to the administration but by people with a sure grasp of the problems of the organization and the ability to provide clearcut goals and positive leadership. Given this, there need be no fear of lack of control.

By and large, I think the schedule C system has proved reasonably adequate to assure effective control of the governmental machinery. In the Department of Commerce we have not been granted all the schedule C authority we asked for, but, for the most part, we are fairly content. It might interest you to know that of our approximately 41,000 permanent full-time jobs only 86 are in schedule C. I think this gives some indication of the quite small number that are needed for purposes of control.

V. SUSTENANCE OF THE PARTY SYSTEM

But there is another and quite different need that must also be met. This is the need for jobs to nourish the American party system. For this purpose greater numbers and quite different categories of jobs are required than those embraced under the schedule C concept.

Nature of party system

The genius of this country is political. That genius is expressed in our unique party system no less than in our unique Constitution. The distinguishing characteristic of American political parties is that they are nonideological—there are far greater differ-

ences of ideological position within each of the two great parties than there are between them. This characteristic has important implications for our political system. It means, among other things, that many conflicts are resolved within the framework of the parties themselves rather than in struggles between the parties.

In countries when parties are largely ideological, as in England, the conflicting ideological principles of the parties makes the resolution of issues difficult. Under our system where the differences are chiefly within and not between the parties, issues can be debated much more clearly in terms of their individual merits; precisely because the ideological factors are fuzzy they interpose fewer difficulties to the reaching of agreement. The American process is seldom neat and orderly and few interest groups are ever entirely satisfied with its results. But neither is any interest group ever wholly alienated. The American party system is probably the most effective means ever devised by man for handling the political problems of organized society.

Necessity for patronage

Under ideological party systems, the common interest of ideological position helps hold the party machinery together and keeps it functioning. Under the American system, some other unifying and sustaining factor is necessary. Historically, this factor has been patronage.

I think we have failed in this country to appreciate this peculiar characteristic of the American political system. I think that in our enthusiasm for extending the scope of the merit system we have come dangerously close to denying our political parties the sustenance they need to retain their health and vitality.

We have been misled, I think, by false analogies between our and the English civil service systems. We have gone on the implicit assumption that if the merit system is good it should be continually expanded until, ideally, it covers all Federal employment. But we have failed to realize that the English can afford a universal merit system because their parties are ideological and consequently have little need for patronage whereas there is serious doubt that our parties could survive for long in their present form without adequate patronage. Many of the difficulties of the Republican Party today are directly traceable to what may be best described as 20 years of malnutrition.

In our indiscriminate pursuit of the ideal of a universal civil service we may have gone too far. I think we need to take another look at what we have done in terms of its implications for the party system.

Characteristics for political recruitment

Let me make this very clear: I am not suggesting we turn the clock back; I am not suggesting we expose either Government employees or the public to the evils of a revived spoils system. What I am proposing (and remember, I am speaking only for myself) is that we make a careful analysis of Federal employment for the purpose of identifying certain jobs whose nature is such that they can be filled without material loss of efficiency, and perhaps even with gains in efficiency, by the selection of applicants referred by the party in office.

I am not suggesting that such jobs be filled by Republicans simply because they are Republicans (or by Democrats simply because they are Democrats) but that they be filled by properly qualified persons referred by the political party in office. The emphasis, in other words, is not simply on party label but equally on fitness and capacity.

One requirement would be that jobs designated for this purpose be such that their effective performance would not be seriously impaired by fairly frequent turnover. Most of them should be in the field, close to the grassroots for these have by far the greatest political value. They should be the kind of jobs which lend themselves to efficient recruitment through the channels of party organization. For certain kinds of jobs, in fact, it should be possible to secure just as well qualified people through political referral sources as through competitive civil service examinations, often with a definite improvement in efficiency of recruitment and quality of selection.

Quite definitely, jobs designated for this purpose should not be those requiring specialized technical or professional skills; not only are such jobs of little value politically, but it is essential for orderly and efficient government that they be filled entirely without reference to political considerations. For the same reason, jobs involving special public trust, such as those in the Internal Revenue Service, should be excluded for it is essential that the public have confidence that the decisions of such officials are not susceptible to pressures of any kind, political or otherwise.

Other specifications, both of inclusion and exclusion, could be spelled out but these, I think, suggest the general approach.

Need for study

I shall not be so unwise at this time as to try to identify any specific jobs which might be set aside in this kind of special reserve. It is the essence of my thought that the problem be studied very carefully with the needs of the party system in mind as well as the requirements of efficient management. I venture to suggest that in the interests of contributing to the strength and vitality of the party system we could afford to risk a slightly lower level of efficiency on certain kinds of work than we might otherwise try to achieve. On the other hand, I am convinced that if we have capable management, and if the jobs are properly selected for the specific purpose here in mind, filling them with applicants referred from political sources may well result in increased efficiency and better performance. The competitive civil service is not necessarily synonymous with maximum efficiency.

Also, let me be clear that I am not necessarily talking about a large number of jobs. Actually, the number which might remain outside the merit system might very well be no more than the total outside the merit system today. But they would be better distributed. They would be excluded from the merit system because they have characteristics which peculiarly fit them for this special purpose. Their status would be well-defined and the conditional tenure of their incumbents well understood.

Benefits to merit system

Such a program would not only greatly strengthen our very special party system, it would also be a boon to the merit system itself because it would channelize along safer lines the tremendous political pressures which otherwise build up whenever there is a change in the party in power.

We have seen something of such pressures during the past 2 years. You can be sure that they will recur with equal or greater force the next time there is a change in party. If these pressures are not relieved by wise and well-considered measures there is always the danger that they may reach a point where "something has to give," and the resulting explosion may do irreparable harm to the merit system.

There is no necessary conflict between the merit system and the selection of politically referred applicants. Both serve highly essential purposes, and their roles can be reconciled. The two are in conflict now because we have failed to take into proper account the very real—and, let me emphasize, legitimate—needs of the American party system. But this can be corrected by identifying certain carefully selected jobs and making it quite clear that there is nothing wrong in filling them with applicants referred by the party in office.

It should be made equally clear that appointments to all other jobs, except those in the schedule C category, would be made absolutely without reference to political considerations of any kind. By carefully distinguishing between the characteristics and methods of administering the two system, they could work side by side in much greater harmony than now prevails and could serve their respective purposes much more usefully.

VI. REORGANIZATION OF PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

I should like to turn now to another subject which likewise, I think, needs reappraisal. I refer to the need for more effective organization of the executive branch for efficient management of personnel, especially in the higher levels. I recognize that I am venturing onto controversial ground and repeat that the opinions expressed, whatever they may be worth, are entirely my own, and I accept sole responsibility for them.

Administrative difficulties

Many of the administrative difficulties of the Federal service have their origin in three main points:

1. The Civil Service Commission, over a period of years, has been called upon to perform two quite different and in many ways basically conflicting functions. On the one hand, the Commission is called upon to protect the interests of career employees; on the other, it is called upon to serve as the staff arm of the Chief Executive in personnel management matters. The first is an employee interest. The second is a management interest.

2. The President, as Chief Executive, is responsible for providing central leadership in the executive branch in personnel management. To date, however, no President has ever had an adequate staff for positive and progressive personnel management, nor one with full jurisdiction over all executive personnel matters.

3. Personnel management in the departments and agencies needs to be strengthened through strong central executive leadership within the framework of regulations established for the career service and through almost complete decentralization of authority and responsibility for actual personnel operations to the departments and agencies themselves.

Let me elaborate these points a little further.

Conflicting functions

First of all, the combining of two basically conflicting functions in the Civil Service Commission is an open invitation to schizophrenia. In this respect, the experience of private industry is illuminating. Some companies have established personnel departments for the stated purpose of representing the interests of workers to management and the interests of management to workers. Where serious efforts have been made to apply this concept, the results have been highly unsatisfactory to both workers and management, and the personnel director has usually wound up with a bad case of ulcers and thoroughly discredited on both sides.

It should be axiomatic that no single individual and no single agency can properly represent both management and workers. At some point the wholly legitimate requirements of management come into conflict with the wholly legitimate interests of workers, and regardless of whether the personnel director takes a stand on one side or the other or seeks to temporize, his effectiveness is loss and his influence dissipated.

Second, it seems to me essential that all functions involving central executive leadership in personnel management in the departments and agencies be vested in the

Executive Office of the President and that the President be given a staff adequate to discharge his responsibilities in the important field of personnel management.

Realinement of responsibilities

This requires, in my opinion, a far-reaching realinement of responsibility for personnel functions. As I see it, the Civil Service Commission can best achieve its historic mission of establishing and maintaining a strong career service if it is relieved of responsibility for administrative operations and concentrates on providing the framework for the career service principally through (1) establishing appropriate regulations and standards for such a service, (2) inspecting personnel management activities in the agencies, and (3) adjudicating employee appeals. These functions are the very heart of establishing, maintaining, and protecting the career civil service.

A proper realinement of functions also requires, in my opinion, a strong executive personnel agency in the Executive Office of the President. The functions of such an office should be: (1) to develop and formulate general personnel policies within the framework of laws and regulations established by Congress and the Civil Service Commission, (2) to stimulate, assist, and review personnel management in the departments and agencies, and (3) to carry on certain types of personnel activities, especially those involving high-level executive positions, which can only be conducted effectively from the Office of the President.

Bureau of Personnel

Such an agency might be called appropriately the "Bureau of Personnel." It should be a part of the Executive Office of the President, should report directly to the President, and should have a status coordinate with the Bureau of the Budget.

Some of the functions which should be performed by the new Bureau of Personnel are now performed by the Civil Service Commission. Others are now performed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in his capacity as the President's Adviser on Personnel Management. Still others are now performed by a variety of individuals and offices scattered about in various places. Finally, some of the functions which should be performed in the interest of effective personnel management are not now being performed at all or are being performed only on a rudimentary level. Grouping all of these phases of personnel management into a single strategically located agency in the Executive Office of the President would unify and strengthen personnel management in the executive branch and provide the President the facility he needs for exercising leadership in this crucial area of governmental operations.

Progress in other areas of management

Such a realinement would be in keeping with the best developments in organization in the recent history of other phases of management. The Bureau of the Budget has been able to do a far more effective staff job for the President since its reorganization in 1939 and transfer from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President. Great improvements in administration have been achieved in a number of agencies through adoption of corporate forms of organization, business-type budgets, and comptrollership systems of controls. Accounting systems have been greatly improved under the joint accounting program of the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the General Accounting Office, and commercial-type audits represent a big step forward over the traditional Government-type audits.

In a number of subject-matter areas, moreover, rulemaking, inspectional, and appellate activities have been separated from operating functions with a substantial improvement in organization and operations. I need only refer, for an example, to the very desirable clarification of functions and organization in the field of civil aeronautics, where we have a Civil Aeronautics Board (the CAB) to establish the framework of regulations for civil aviation activities and a Civil Aeronautics Administration (the CAA) to carry on necessary operations such as aviation safety, Federal airways operations, airport engineering, and the like.

Personnel arm of President

As I see it, the Bureau of Personnel in the Executive Office of the President would serve as the personnel arm of the President, with no confusion as to its orientation toward more efficient management practices. It would develop and formulate general policies within the framework of civil-service laws, regulations, and standards; and provide central leadership, assistance, and review for the personnel organizations and programs of the various departments and agencies in terms of the needs of efficient management.

The Bureau would engage only such activities as cannot be efficiently decentralized to operating departments and agencies. Personnel operations should be streamlined and decentralized to departments and agencies far more than they have up to the present time, particularly in the field of recruitment, examination, and related matters. With more effective guidance from a Bureau of Personnel in the Office of the President, it could be expected that better personnel management would develop in the departments and agencies. The improvements thus achieved should in turn make possible a far greater delegation of authority and responsibility than perhaps would be wise at the present time.

In addition to providing strong leadership and guidance to operating departments and agencies in the executive branch, the Bureau of Personnel would perform various functions of a staff nature for the President. I need not catalog all the useful functions the Bureau might perform, but I would like to mention 1 or 2 which may be of special interest.

High-level executive placements

One of the most important of such functions is that of executive placement in high-level jobs of a policy-determining or policy-influencing nature. In general, these jobs are about equivalent in type and level to schedule C jobs and above. Jobs of this nature obviously have important implications not only from the standpoint of executive management but also from the standpoint of political relationships.

The first requirement for effective organization of any kind is that key positions be filled with people properly qualified to perform their tasks. A related requirement is that adequate means be provided to assure orderly replacement with equally competent people in face of the turnover that always takes place.

I have been struck, these past 2 years, not only with the great difficulty of securing properly qualified people for higher level Government positions but also with the problem of assuring effective utilization of the personnel available. An agency head, faced with the loss of one of his top officials, is in a very difficult position. He is an extremely busy man. The demands on his time and attention are such that he can give little thought to locating a good replacement, and the probabilities are strongly against the right man just happening to come along at just the right time. In consequence, many important positions are in danger of being filled on a basis of accident or expediency, and many good men are passed over merely because no one happens to think of them in a particular connection at a critical moment.

One of the primary functions of the Bureau of Personnel as I see it would be to provide an executive placement service to the President and to high officials of the Government. Suitable rosters should be developed and kept up to date of persons within the Government and of persons outside the Government who are well qualified for various types of key positions and who should be considered for them and if necessary persuaded to accept them. Very often, the person needed for a particular job is a most reluctant candidate indeed.

Optimum use of talent

Executive talent is always a scarce commodity, and one phase of the executive placement function should be to assure optimum use of the talent actually on hand. I am very sure that many of the people already serving in this administration are qualified for higher responsibilities than those they now hold. Means should be provided for identifying such people and for indicating the kinds of higher responsibilities for which they should be considered. The bureau of personnel should periodically appraise the work of all policymaking officials, not only to bring to light any hidden talents already on hand but to discover weaknesses and inadequacies which should be corrected by replacement or other suitable administrative action.

With rosters thus developed, the Bureau of Personnel would be able to render a highly useful service to the President and to the heads of the various executive agencies. As vacancies occur, the director of the bureau could do the staff work of reviewing the qualifications of all potential candidates, both from within government and without. He could then present a small but highly select list to the agency head, who would make the final selection. Without in any way restricting the range of choice of the agency head or encroaching on his responsibility, a service of this kind would save him an appreciable amount of time and worry. And it would tend to greatly improve the quality of selections. The basis of selection would be considerably broadened and there would be greater assurance that the best qualified person available is actually appointed. The resulting improvement in management and direction of the key affairs of government could be very great indeed.

Orientation of new officials

One of the serious needs of Government is some more effectively organized means for instructing new high-level appointees on the problems they will face in taking over their new responsibilities. Any retail store on F Street does a better job of making sure that a new salesgirl gets a good start than does the Government with respect to a new assistant secretary. Every secretarial officer of this administration with whom I have talked has expressed the wish that some way, some how, he could have been warned about some of the pitfalls he had to discover the hard way or could have been given certain basic information about how government works and about how he could most effectively take hold of his new responsibilities.

The Bureau of Personnel, as I see it, would not only play a key role in the selection and appointment of new high-level officials, but would also be responsible for seeing that they get off to a good start.

Closely related to executive placement and orientation is executive training and development. The Bureau of Personnel should undertake to plan out and operate a governmentwide, interagency program of training and developing promising young executives for key positions in the future. Unless we do this, we are failing to make maximum use of the potential talent we already have available in the Federal service. Drawing on the experience of industry, I think it can be safely said that the only successful way to run such a program would be from the Office of the President.

College recruiting

Another function of the Bureau of Personnel should be the direction of college recruiting, on which the quality of future management depends in large degree. From my experience in private business, I know that we must keep a continuing influx of promising young college graduates each year, in order to maintain competent management. In the company to which I am about to return, it takes about 8 years to train a good store manager through various intermediate assignments and positions. The company relies heavily on recruiting able young college graduates each year. It knows from experience that if it fails to recruit sufficient trainees in any given year, it is in for trouble 8 years or 10 years later, when it will be looking for good store managers and can't find them to the extent it needs them.

Shocking deficiencies

On a conservative estimate—to my mind unrealistically conservative—about 8,000 new college graduates a year are needed in Government service. Currently, I understand, we are actually recruiting only about 2,000 a year. I can imagine what such a deficiency would do to a private industry; its implications for the future competence of Government operations are shocking.

The Government's whole college recruiting program must be completely overhauled, with a view to competing more effectively with private business firms and professional organizations in attracting a better share of the cream of each year's crop of college graduates. This means, among other things, that we must be able to offer them not only a decent salary, but recruitment without burdensome procedural requirements. We must also provide a carefully managed program of opportunities to show what they can do, promotion as rapidly as they show their ability and as rapidly as they would be advanced in private industry, and reasonable protection from the vicissitudes of reductions in force and similar disturbances of tenure for a stated period of years (perhaps as long as 10), provided, of course, their performance and progress are satisfactory.

Strengthened functions

There are many other ways in which the Bureau of Personnel could strengthen personnel management in the executive departments and agencies. The main point is simply this: As a management agency, it should—and could—focus attention more sharply on the several problems with which government is faced in achieving efficient and economical personnel management. It should—and could—help us to distinguish mere tradition and form from real and current operating needs, and thereby help us to devise more realistic and effective solutions to our personnel problems.

I have tried to give some indication of the broad lines along which, in my view, the personnel activities of the Federal Government should be reorganized. I think our present arrangements are inadequate because conflicting roles and responsibilities have been allowed to grow up over the years within the Civil Service Commission which compromise it in its function as a regulatory agency and severely handicap it as a management arm of the President and the executive branch. I have tried to suggest a means for eliminating this conflict and for strengthening both functions. I do not expect ready acceptance of these proposals, but I hope they may provide a basis for further thought and discussion, out of which may come an effective solution for one of the really serious problems of government administration.

VII. CONCLUSION

I fear I have talked much too long. But I had some things I wanted to say, and I am grateful to you for providing me the occasion to say them.

I want to say only one thing further.

It has been a great privilege to serve under the leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary Weeks. It has been a great experience to be here in Washington these last 2 years. One of the fine things about that experience was getting to know the people in the Department of Commerce and people such as yourselves in this room with a common interest in the problems and the future of the Federal service. I shall think of you often. Good luck to you all.

Address by Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., at Dallas, Tex., February 14, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call the attention of my colleagues to an occasion of great importance to my district of Dallas County. Our most admired and respected colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN, addressed a large gathering in Dallas February 14 as a part of our Lincoln weekend celebrations.

The response of those present left no doubt as to the affection and high esteem of the people for Mr. MARTIN. We Texans were most appreciative and proud to have him with us to benefit from his vast experience in the Federal Government and to hear his underlying concepts of the function of government.

So that others may also enjoy his remarks of that evening, I include in the RECORD the following speech which he delivered at that time:

Texas friends and neighbors, this is a visit I have anticipated for many weeks. We hear a great deal about Texas in Washington—some of it even from Texans themselves—and almost everyone winds up by saying that you have to be in Texas to see what is going on in order to believe it.

Any doubts about your growth and progress have vanished as a result of this visit. In fact, I am somewhat surprised that your fine committee could persuade this many Texans to sit still long enough to hear a speech—because only people who are very busy could have brought about what you have accomplished in recent years.

No man, I am sure, could in one evening talk about all of the wonderful things I have seen in this great State since my journey to Dallas. I have managed to absorb some of the highlights of your progress, however. In taking note of some of them, I cannot refrain from thinking that if all of our people could come to Texas for a visit, there would be no fear for the future of the Nation.

The Dallas story is one of which all of you can be justly proud.

I note that your annual payroll is over $1 billion for the third year in a row.

That the income for all of your people in 1954 set a new record of $12½ billion.

The census people tell us that the population of Dallas is expected to increase by 30,000 people in 1955; that the State population is growing at a rate that exceeds the national average.

Your employment is increasing steadily; your wage earners are sharing an ever-increasing amount of your prosperity; your markets and farms are prospering; and your construction records for homes and factories reach new peaks with the dawning of each new day.

Texas banks are bulging with the savings and investments of her people; Texas farm marketings are at a new high; Texas agriculture is now the most diversified in the history of the State.

Yes, even the baby business in Texas is booming. In fact, 1 out of every 16 babies born in the United States is now born a native Texan—a notable contribution on the part of Texas mothers, among their many other amazing accomplishments in the building of a bigger and better Texas.

Yes; I am now convinced; Texas is an amazing place; her people top go-getters; her future bright with the promise that peace, progress, and prosperity are here to stay.

I want to congratulate you on electing BRUCE ALGER as the Representative in Congress from Dallas.

He is a credit to your judgment and a welcome addition to the National Legislature. Already he has established many warm friendships for the benefit of his home State and district, and we respect the intelligence and integrity he has displayed since joining us.

He has demonstrated an energy and alertness that, combined with experience, will make him an outstanding Member of the House. He will be a credit to his State and to his district.

I hope that Mr. ALGER is the first of many Republicans that Texas will send to Congress. I hope that Texas—first in so many things—will also be the first in this part of our great country to really and truly develop into a two-party State.

Had I been borne a Texan, I would be one of your best salesmen.

The fact that I was not, however, does not prevent me from sharing in the pride that is rightfully yours because of your accomplishments.

Texas and the rest of the Nation, I am firmly convinced, have prospered and grown in part because of many things that have been done in Washington during the past 2 years under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower—a native Texan.

The Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress have set many records of progress.

First, we wiped out the economic controls which had kept our people in a state of constant irritation for more than a decade. These controls handicapped the growth of our country. Business has gone ahead faster because these controls were eliminated.

We settled for good the question of whether Texas and other States were to enjoy the constitutional privileges of managing and exploring their own lands or whether the Federal Government would be allowed limitless encroachment of the rights of our people, and, incidentally, the Federal Government prospered through the legislation.

We ended the Korean war—not completely on our terms, but in a manner at least befitting the dignity of a government determined to build a defense and a security for the long haul to peace.

We abolished certain agencies competing with private business and we sold or are selling the competitive Federal operations which thrived on tax dollars to the detriment of free enterprise.

The administration also created a new department of Government—Health, Education and Welfare. And the President selected the best-looking Cabinet officer in history to run the Department—Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, a Texan—and she is doing a splendid job.

Many useless Government jobs were abolished, but there was no wholesale patronage firing of employees. On the contrary, the complaint was because some were not removed.

We cut taxes a total of $7,400,000,000—the biggest reduction in history; and we reduced appropriations in 1954 and 1955 a total of $64 billion below the 1952–53 level.

This reduction helped us in our efforts to bring about a prosperity based on peace rather than war.

Recognizing the need for a rapid expansion of the Nation's road system, the 83d Congress provided funds of almost $2 billion for highway and farm-to-market road improvements for 1956 and 1957. In addition, the President has presented to Congress a long-range, multibillion, pay-as-you-go highway program. This is the first modern appraisal and plan for our highway needs in many years, and one that is long overdue.

The St. Lawrence Seaway was voted a go-ahead in the past year, so that our eastern and midwestern waterways can expand to meet the needs of a growing population and an expanding economy in that area.

We extended social-security coverage to 10 million additional people and unemployment compensation to 4 million more Americans, recognizing as we did the need for a long-range approach to the problems and needs of a vastly increased number of older citizens.

The men and women who built up our country must not be neglected in their old age.

At the same time, we moved speedily into the field of health and hospitalization for our older people. We redesigned the construction program from a theory of building hospitals for the sake of building hospitals to a program of construction tailored to the need for rest homes and clinics. In this way, so long as the Federal Government can serve a purpose in the area of health and hospitals, we are meeting the needs of those least able to pay for proper care.

This, I might emphasize, is not a New Deal program, a Fair Deal program or a socialist program. It is a human program, as the President so consistently reiterates. It is designed to lift the burden from deserving citizens who face the misfortunes of age or illness without adequate funds. It is but a small measure of the debt we owe those who have worked as good Americans toward the better life we enjoy today.

On the defense front, we made ourselves much stronger militarily, with the full utilization of atomic weapons.

We are living in critical days. We must not minimize the threat to our way of life. Both inside and outside the country there are people who seek to undermine and destroy the freedoms we hold precious. These people must not be allowed to succeed. They cannot succeed if we are alert and vigilant.

Asia is the scene of an unfolding explosive drama. Soviet Russia and its pawn, the Chinese Reds, seek to dominate all Asia. If this could come to pass, it would eventually mean the Red domination of Africa, Asia, Europe, and perhaps eventually the United States.

This threat makes it essential for us to build our defenses so strong that we are invincible. Over $30 billion is planned to be expended this year on defense alone, and each succeeding year will require equally large sums until the danger is over.

Wisely we are specializing in atomic weapons and atomic defense, for these instruments of warfare present the only way our shores can be attacked. Supremacy in the air and in atomic weapons as planned by President Eisenhower means security. This we must have.

President Eisenhower knows thoroughly our defense needs. When he says we can save $2 billion for the taxpayers without impairing our defense, I say to you I am for his proposal. This cold war we are in could go on for many years, and we must have economy in our spending for armaments. We must not forget a demoralized financial condition and wild inflation could destroy our country.

The Soviet leaders are no longer a mysterious group. Their aims are as clear as the noonday sun. They seek world domination, and they steadily push to accomplish their objective.

The Red plotters will resort to arms only if they are sure they can win. They know they cannot win now, and therefore they are stalling until they think the time is ripe.

We must keep our defenses strong so that this day will never come.

Let us think about the forces that threaten us. Red China is the immediate foe, but back of her is Red Russia supplying the hardware of war.

When we hear the threatening talk of the Soviet and the Red Chinese let us not be led astray.

We all want peace. We will go a long way to secure peace. But let it be understood we are not going to be bluffed into permitting the Soviets to dominate the world. We will not be coerced into abandoning the free world to servitude and poverty.

We also have the problem of communism and subversion at home. Much has been accomplished by the Eisenhower administration to arrest subversion and bring the Red rats to light. We silenced with harsh facts those who denied the menace existed. We did this by the swift enactment of legislation designed to plug the loopholes in our security.

We stripped the Communist Party of all legal rights.

We denied Government comfort to Red-infiltrated labor unions.

We sent 50 Communist leaders to jail.

We deported more than 100 lingering subversives, who plied the Communist intrigue for years without bothering to apply for citizenship while they planned the destruction of this Nation.

Why the alien subversives were accorded the freedom of this Nation—some for more than a decade—we have yet to learn. We still seek the answer to the question of who built the barrier of illegal protection around them.

When you hear the rattling disputes over the administration's security program, keep these questions in mind. Many have not been answered as yet, many may never be. But so long as I remain in the House of Representatives, an answer to all the questions will be sought.

As a nation, we cherish individual rights. Each of us is entitled to a complete and fair appraisal of our lives at the bar of public opinion as well as in our courts.

Let us retain that freedom without the tarnish of personal restrictions—but let us retain also the commonsense that recognizes the ability of some to use it as a shield while subverting the very heart-beat of personal liberty.

Never forget that once we relax our vigilance, the Communists will seize again upon the same pattern of manipulation, infiltration and spying that worked against us before.

We do not seek revenge against those who blundered in the past. Nor are we seeking silence from those who deny the blunders or are blind to the dangers we face. Let them speak. But let us weigh their words against the facts as we know them. And I believe when we do, responsible Americans will support with vigor continued efforts to stamp out the Red evil in our time.

Now, what of the future on other fronts?

As I said, last year we gave the largest tax reduction in the history of the country. It is on that solid foundation we will make 1955 a year of prosperity. You may recall how some political partisans were saying last year that we were in a depression. Well, they were just as wrong as men can be. That depression was averted by wise leadership—1953 and 1954 were the 2 most prosperous years in our history, and 1955 will also be a great year for America.

Official Government statistics show that for automobiles, furniture, appliances, food, clothing, personal services, and traveling, our people will spend more—by many, many millions—than they did in 1953 and 1954. In addition, industry alone will spend a record-breaking $27 billion for construction this year.

The President envisions, and I heartily concur, that a long period of great expansion, stretching to new horizons of peace and plenty, is ahead for us all.

The President's concept of the future is based on the conviction that private citizens must have the widest latitude to contribute to the development of the economy—an opportunity consistent with the needs of all our people, one in concept with the enterprise and ingenuity that built the great Nation we serve today.

This means for the future more good homes, more good schools, better health facilities, and lessening of the impact of disaster upon our citizens in all walks of life.

Our people are self-reliant. They always have been. Thus we build to strengthen that self-reliance instead of weakening it with paternalistic governmental interference in our daily lives.

With this in mind, the President has presented to Congress a program of progress. Designed to supplement the accomplishments of the 83d Congress, this program consists of:

An adjustment of trade regulations to promote the flow of trade and capital between friendly nations and to protect American industry.

A continuation of policies to ferret out and neutralize subversion.

A further cut of $4½ billion below Government spending in the fiscal year which ended last June 30.

Improvements in the partnership development between Government and private enterprise in the utilization, conservation, and development of our natural resources.

Extended development of a modern highway system in keeping with the growth of our population and the expansion of our towns and cities.

More than $12 billion for the development of flood control, navigation, harbor improvements, construction of roads, schools, and other utilities.

Improvements in programs to provide better care for our mentally ill, our crippled children, and voluntary health insurance coverage by private concerns.

And, finally, but not the least in importance, the continuation of policies which meet the broad requirements of a growing nation, dedicated to the needs of our steadily increasing standard of living.

Our chances of success on the legislative front are great if our legislators meet the challenge before us. Politically we have a divided house, but the problems this presents should not blind us to the human needs of our people in the days ahead.

I cannot help but be enthusiastic about the future. Just recently—if you will grant me a personal remark—I completed 40 years of public service. At no time in those 40 years has America ever looked more strong, more abundant, or in better shape to grasp the opportunity for progress that lies ahead.

We have a way of life that is the envy of the world. We have never faltered in sharing our bounty, nor will we now blight our future by selfish motives.

Two global wars have thundered across the vistas of our dreams for peace and plenty. These wars have claimed too many of our courageous young.

More than ever today the world is aware that wars settle nothing, that man's search for peace must be fruitful or we perish.

Let us resolve that in the days ahead we will be strong and steadfast, yet patient and prayerful, and as dedicated Americans work toward the goals we all seek.

Abundance is bulging on the horizon of our lives. The sum of man's knowledge in science, art, and religion mounts steadily toward the rising star of permanent peace and freedom.

The decades of desolation of spirit and wealth lie behind us if we move with confidence and inspiration in the days ahead.

We must work together as Americans; we must unite to help those who lead us.

Our great President, Dwight Eisenhower, has dedicated much of his life to public service.

If we falter in our support of his hopes and ideals, we add to the burden he carries for us all.

Let us as free men take up our share of the task ahead. Let us walk together with buoyant confidence that in God's will the pathways of peace and plenty will climb to the pinnacle of man's faith and spirit that rests in the hearts of men of good will everywhere. By striving thus we will reach the goals of peace, progress, and prosperity for all mankind.

Exchange of Letters With General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had an exchange of correspondence with Gen. Douglas MacArthur which, I am certain, will be of utmost interest to all Members of Congress and to the Nation as a whole.

On January 26, General MacArthur delivered an address in Los Angeles which aroused deep national interest. In it he urged the United States to proclaim its readiness to abolish war, in concert with the other powers of the world. After reading his address in the newspapers, I wrote to him on February 3 and offered to introduce a resolution in Congress declaring that "it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes."

On February 7, General MacArthur replied to my letter saying it would require more than congressional expression "to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war." Instead of a resolution, he suggested that I present the matter on the floor of the House and from here "build up gradually to more aggressive action to implement the basic concept."

Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to take up General MacArthur's suggestion and I hope to bring this matter to the attention of the House in the near future at which time I will be ready to discuss it in greater detail and to present my views on the subject.

I am extremely interested in the idea of developing a people-to-people approach to the problem of international peace, and I shall utilize all efforts in that direction. I welcome the views and suggestions of anyone who can contribute constructively toward the furtherance of this idea.

In the meantime, I desire to place into the RECORD the exchange of correspondence between General MacArthur and myself:

FEBRUARY 3, 1955.

Gen. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR: I was very much interested in your statement which I read in the New York Times, urging the abolition of war. This is very commendable on your part and certainly you, as the greatest living soldier, are qualified to speak on this subject.

What do you think of my introducing a resolution in Congress declaring that it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes? The approved resolution of the Congress, signed by the President of the United States, should also call upon all other nations to adopt similar resolutions.

I am not sufficiently convinced that the United Nations is doing the job intended for it. I favor more of a people-to-people approach to the problem.

Before doing this I would be most appreciative of your views and any further suggestions.

In high esteem, I remain

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 7, 1955.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANFUSO: I am grateful indeed for the support of my views on the futility of war as reflected in your thoughtful note of February 3.

It has always been my opinion that war's abolition can only come about through the emergence of a leadership in world affairs with the strength and vision and moral courage to proclaim a readiness in concert with other major powers, to enforce it as a matter of constitutional doctrine by specific constitutional proscription. There is no doubt in my mind but that the great masses of every nation in the world, whether on this side of the Iron Curtain or on the other, would, as a matter of self-interest and protection, fully support such a constitutional limitation upon political power and zealously guard it against any despot's violation or abuse. For even in totalitarian regimes the leaders show at least token respect for the constitutional rights of the citizenry. This because all people, even those partially enslaved under oligarchic rule, have grown to look to their constitutions as the final repository and safeguard of their remaining liberties. Thus today, even the Soviet leaders do not so defy the will of the masses as to openly nullify their constitution. They may fool them. They may ignore rights to individual protection. They may sugar-coat many of the constitutional provisions to make them appear to give to the people rights and liberties which they do not in fact give, but they do give them a body of constitutional laws as something they have grown to expect and to demand, just as they constantly prate about peace being the ultimate objective of all public policy because they fear the masses will revolt against any course openly leading to war.

So in my opinion, it would take more than the congressional expression which you suggest to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war. It would take a ringing affirmation of a dedicated leader commanding universal respect, capable of arousing the conscience of mankind into a crusade against lagging leaders who in the mad lust for ever increased political power willfully ignore the realism that war as an instrument of political power has been outmoded by the advance of science. I do not know when this Nation will be blessed by such a leadership but I pray that it will be before it has been drawn through the tragedy of another and infinitely worse cataclysmic conflict.

I would therefore suggest that instead of submitting a resolution, that you limit yourself initially to presenting your basic views on the floor of the House. From such a beginning you could build up gradually to more aggressive action to implement the basic concept.

With every good wish,

Most cordially,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

The Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I arise to congratulate Robert Post, of Pittsburgh, whom we all know as Bob Post, on the production of his motion picture The Law of the Land, which is doing so much to explain to the people of the United States the method of the making of the laws in the United States, as well as the practical working of the United States Congress.

We who have known Bob Post for many years, are pleased with the recognition which is being given both to the picture and the producer. On Tuesday, February 22, 1955, at Valley Forge, Pa., Bob Post has received Freedom Foundation's award for producing the picture which they say is "an outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a greater understanding of the American way of life during 1954." I believe that Freedom Foundation has made a wise choice in naming as one of the recipients of the George Washington Honor Medal for 1954 both my good friend Bob Post as well as the fine motion picture The Law of the Land.

Another individual who has by his support contributed much to the success of the picture is David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America with headquarters in the Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. David McDonald is to be complimented for recognizing the value of the picture The Law of the Land and arranging for its distribution and showing among the members of the United Steelworkers, in order to bring to the working men and women a fine view of the working of the United States Congress and our United States Government.

Mr. McDonald knows the eager interest with which our working people are learning and taking new part in our local State and National Government bodies, which is making for an informed and intelligent electorate among the people. The action of labor leaders in our labor relations in developing an informed and

experienced electorate, will make for efficient and stable Government in the future, and contribute to the stability of our system of Government.

We hear many cries against various groups in this country, but there is one point on which we can all unite, and that is the development of an intelligent and informed, free electorate. We are proud that David McDonald and the United Steelworkers of America have seen fit to purchase copies of this picture that will give the congressional story national distribution. In its preface Mr. McDonald states:

Unselfishly, this picture is available to other labor unions, schools, church groups, fraternal and civic organizations—in fact, anywhere that Americans congregate.

This is labor statesmanship.

Address of Secretary of Labor Before the New England Governors' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, before the New England Governors' Conference, Boston, Mass., on November 18, 1954:

I appreciate this opportunity to speak before this distinguished group. Your conference is in the best tradition of our American heritage. It is an effort through cooperative endeavor to promote the well-being of the people in your area. This approach commands the respect and admiration of all of us.

The great natural resources of New England, the ingenuity and industry of its management, and the skill and resourcefulness of its workers would seem to make it a most attractive and profitable place for industrial enterprise. In addition, the high degree of labor-management harmony and the maturity of the relationships between workers and employers would seem to be conducive to high production and successful operations. Consequently, when some companies closed their New England plants or let them become obsolete and built or expanded in other areas, you tried to find out why and to correct your difficulties and attract new industries.

I have reviewed many of the studies of the New England economy. From this I have concluded that you are trying to solve problems with the intelligence, initiative and resourcefulness for which you have always been noted. As a result of the work of conferences such as this, the efforts of the New England council, the studies which you are promoting, and the local efforts to attract and expand industry, I see a bright future for this region.

The whole history of our country has been one of change, growth, and progress. That is the process now going on in New England. I note that you are diversifying your industries and shifting into production of the new products of this electronic age. No longer is the future of your area tied as closely to its traditional industries, some of which are experiencing a long-term decline.

You lost the village blacksmith to Detroit, and some of the textile mills to the South, but in their place you are expanding your transportation equipment industries, your electrical machinery manufacturing, your jewelry and silverware industries, your aircraft plants, your fabricated metal products factories, and your recreation and resort facilities. Each new age has found you meeting its challenge. You may be justly proud of your past and fully confident of your future.

The industrial transition which you are undergoing will undoubtedly be faced by other sections of the country from time to time. The problems you are meeting as employment in some industries declines and the lessons you are learning to increase employment in other industries can be studied with profit by every region of the country.

The entire country has recently been going through a period of changeover from high-level defense production to a more normal economy. This changeover has been superimposed in New England on a regional transition which had been building up for a long time and which has been accelerated since the end of World War II. In 1939 two-thirds of the region's manufacturing employment was in the soft-goods industries, but in 1954 just over 50 percent of the workers are producing nondurable goods. There has been a great increase in the production of electronics and other electrical equipment, fabricated metals, and transportation equipment, and considerable decline in the textile industry which employed 281,000 workers in September 1939 and only 173,000 in September 1954.

Since the end of the war there has, as you know, been a nationwide decline of employment in the textile industry, although not as great a drop for the country as a whole as for the New England region. The overall decrease has been due in part to the shift to the synthetics and in part to improvement in techniques of producing the conventional cottons, woolens, and silks which began in the 1920's. Output per man-hour in the decade 1929–39 increased by 41 percent in woolens and worsteds, by 46 percent in cotton goods, and by 131 percent in silk and rayon. Increases in productivity slackened during World War II, but the recent installation of new types of textile machinery has greatly increased output per worker since 1947.

The essence of the New England economy is its ability to utilize its outstandingly able labor force and its mature labor-management relations. New England's record in labor-management relations, as measured by the number of man-days lost through strikes, continues to be excellent. For example, in 1953, only 4.9 percent of the Nation's man-days of idleness from work stoppages were in New England, whereas New England has 7.1 percent of the Nation's nonagricultural employment. This same favorable record has existed in nearly every postwar year.

New England, in common with the rest of the country, has an interest in taking steps to eliminate unemployment. This is a problem which can best be solved at a local level. The Federal Government can make some contribution but cannot do the job alone.

Like other areas, New England has benefited from the procurement activities of the Federal Government. For example, from July 1 through November 13, 1954, at least 70 contracts, each of one-half million dollars or more, were awarded to firms located in New England. These large contracts had a value of over $208 million. They covered such diverse items as cartridges, propeller assemblies, helicopters, aircraft engines, barracks, woolen cloth, sonar sets, electronic equipment, mine sweepers, parachutes, shoes, wire, chemicals, amplifiers, antennas, rifles, coal, plastic dinnerware, automatic screw machines, a hospital, a radar gunnery trainer, a warehouse, a submarine, and spare parts for aircraft.

In the first 10 months of 1954, the value of Federal contracts awarded for highway construction was over $5¾ million in Connecticut, over $4¾ million in Maine, over $16½ million in Massachusetts, almost $6 million in New Hampshire, over $2¼ million in Rhode Island, and over $4½ million in Vermont.

I cite these figures only to indicate that I believe New England is getting its share of Federal expenditures and to express the hope that this has been helpful to your economy.

While there has been a recent decline in unemployment, we in Washington are not complacent about the unemployment situation. We are determined to take all possible steps to promote job opportunities. We are trying to make sure that all of our policies—legislative and administrative, financial and operating—promote the economic welfare of the American people. I am sure that you in your own areas have the same objectives and are working toward the same end.

There are many areas in which we can work together for the benefit of the people of your region and the Nation as a whole. These include the Federal and State programs to promote the social and economic welfare of the American people.

Many Americans are concerned about the growth of Federal bureaus and programs in recent years and the pressures to add still more functions that will make the Government bigger.

No one seriously suggests that the role of Government in today's dynamic economy should fail to keep pace with the changing times and the altered needs of the American people. But we must continually ask ourselves whether the governmental action that will do the job best may not actually be, in many instances, that of the State or community which is most familiar with the particular problems of the citizens who live there.

In a letter to the Congress, on March 30, 1953, President Eisenhower pointed out that "the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary responsibilities of State and local government. It has led to duplication and waste. * * * The maintenance of strong, well-ordered State and local governments is essential to our Federal system of government."

However, until our State and local governments take positive and well-considered steps to meet the demands of their own citizens for the performance by government of necessary functions, the pressures on the Federal Government to do what the local governments could do but have not done will continue. As in the past, such pressures will encourage the further expansion of Federal regulation and control in these areas.

Consequently, it will be to our mutual advantage to explore today those areas in which further State action is desirable.

The New England States pioneered in State minimum-wage legislation. Massachusetts passed the first law in 1912. Currently, all of your States but one have minimum-wage laws, although one is limited to its coverage to a single industry. New England not only set the trend in minimum-wage legislation, but also in covering men under such laws. Connecticut was the first State in the Nation to take this action. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island soon extended their laws likewise to cover men. The pattern set by the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act in giving wage protection to both men and women has been more commonly accepted in this New England area than anywhere else in the United States. Of the 5 laws now covering man, 4 are in this area. Likewise, this area has followed the pattern of the Federal act in establishing a statutory minimum. Three of your State laws estab-

lish a statutory minimum rate; and Connecticut was the first State to meet the 75-cent minimum rate set by the Federal act.

Despite the great progress that has been made, there is still work to be done in this area. I hope that this region will work toward having in every State minimum-wage legislation that sets a realistic statutory minimum rate and covers men as well as women workers.

Workmen's compensation is one of the areas in which this Department is intensely interested. Under the leadership of Under Secretary Larson, who is an expert in this field, we hope, with the cooperation of the States, to make real progress and to strengthen this most important program for working men and women.

When workmen's compensation laws were first passed, they contemplated benefits approximating two-thirds of the worker's wages when he was incapacitated from an occupational injury. Now due to rising wages and increased cost of living, weekly benefits fall far below this standard. Likewise, many employees are not covered at all because of the exemption of small employers. In the 6 New England States, for example, all laws exempt employers with less than a specified number of workers, ranging from less than 3 to less than 8. The average weekly earnings of factory workers in the United States are over $72. Only 2 of the 6 New England States—Connecticut and Massachusetts—provide a maximum weekly benefit of $40 or more for temporary total disability. For the other 4 States, the maximum ranges from $25 to $33.

In many other areas, we need to strengthen our workmen's compensation laws. The need for coverage of occupational diseases as well as injuries resulting from accidents is obvious. Three of your States (Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine) limit such coverage to a specific list or schedule of diseases. With new industrial processes constantly being developed and exposing workers to new hazards, it is essential for workmen's compensation laws to provide for full coverage of occupational diseases, as is now done in more than half of the States.

This is another area in which there is still room for progress in New England.

By and large, the unemployment insurance laws of the New England States compare favorably with those in other jurisdictions. The basic maximum weekly benefit amounts range from $25 to $30. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, where recognition has been given to family responsibilities, the maximum weekly benefit is greater for the individual with dependent children—up to $45 in Connecticut, and limited to the individual's average weekly wage in Massachusetts.

Of the New England States, New Hampshire is the only one which nearly approaches the President's recommendations for an improved unemployment insurance program so far as duration of benefits is concerned. All eligible individuals may receive benefits for 26 weeks if they continue to be unemployed through no fault of their own. In Maine and Vermont, all eligible olaimants are entitled to uniform duration of 20 weeks. The remaining 3 States provide for a maximum of 26 weeks but many workers are entitled to fewer weeks of benefits, depending on their earnings in the prior year.

In the New England States other than New Hampshire, the percentage of maximum weekly benefits to average weekly wages ranges from 38.1 to 45.2; in Connecticut and Massachusetts, individuals with dependent children receive a higher percentage of their average weekly wage. The majority of claimants in New Hampshire would receive benefits up to one-half of their average weekly wage only if its benefit formula were changed from one in which the weekly benefit is based on a fraction of a full year's wages. This is due to the fact that use of a fraction of a full year's earnings tends to depress the weekly benefit because of the inclusion of weeks of less than full-time earnings as well as weeks of no earnings. Maine, with a maximum weekly benefit of $27 and uniform duration of 20 weeks, is hampered by its type of benefit formula so that only 21.6 percent of insured claimants in 1953 were eligible for the maximum weekly benefit amount.

As you can see, this is another area deserving of your careful consideration. This is particularly true because of the increasing attention being given to stabilization of income. This type of income security is sometimes called the guaranteed annual wage. Actually, in many cases unions demanding a guaranteed annual wage are really looking for supplementary unemployment compensation. Improved unemployment-insurance systems would help alleviate this problem.

One of the major problems in the field of economic security is maintaining the income of individuals and families when the wage earner is ill and unable to work. The need of workers for income maintenance during periods of unemployment caused by illness is possibly even greater than their need for income when the unemployment is due to lack of work.

Yet while all States have statutory provisions for unemployment insurance, only four provide their workers with statutory protection against loss of wages due to nonwork-connected disabilities. Of the 4 States, the one in New England—Rhode Island—is the pioneer. In other New England States the legislatures have considered disability insurance. Connecticut and Massachusetts have given it active consideration over quite a period. Vermont is one of the 6 States which has modified its unemployment insurance law to permit an unemployment claimant to continue to receive benefits even though he becomes unable to work during an uninterrupted period of unemployment, provided that he does not refuse work which would have been suitable if he had not become sick.

The importance of disability benefits to the workers in a State is indicated by the fact that in 1953 Rhode Island paid $12.6 million in unemployment insurance benefits and $6.2 million in disability benefits.

The field of temporary disability insurance is worthy of further attention. It is an area in which protection is needed and State action is warranted.

I should like to stress the importance of a strong, coordinated State labor department to the States' efforts to meet their responsibilities to the wage earners within their borders. A State labor department should administer labor laws, but it should do much more. It must provide the planning and leadership that are vital to achieving the objectives of a growing economy, good labor standards, safe work places, and the minimizing of industrial disputes. Only through such a strong labor department can these objectives be carried out with the flexibility required by our changing social and industrial developments.

A labor department is the agency of State government to which workers and employers should be able to turn for advice and help in meeting everyday problems of employment and in planning for the future. The New England area is fortunate that it has had functioning labor departments over a very long period. I can think of nothing that I would consider more important in terms of the welfare of the wage earners of your States than to strengthen that agency of your State government that gives leadership in the conservation of the State's human resources.

There is a great need for State facilities to provide effective mediation and conciliation services in labor-management disputes. Generally speaking, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service limits itself to labor-management disputes which threaten a substantial interruption of interstate commerce. Unless the States step in, there is a no-man's land in other labor disputes where no mediation services are offered.

State agencies are particularly well qualified to help settle labor disputes. They are in the best position to understand the local problems and the local interests involved. The local community suffers the toll of labor disputes more than any other area and, therefore, settlement is primarily the interest of the State.

Unfortunately, many States do not provide active mediation services, making it impossible for them to bear the responsibility which is properly theirs. The active services include certain New England States, but there is room for improvement here as in other areas. Three of the States in your region have what could be called fully effective State mediation and conciliation services. In the other three States, you obviously have room for some progress.

All of the New England States have basic safety laws and an agency charged with administering those laws. Four (Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont) have delegated full authority to the administrative agency to draft rules and regulations to carry out the intent of your basic safety law and to provide the flexibility required to keep pace with rapidly changing industrial processes. One State (Connecticut) has no such general authority, and in the other one (Maine) the authority appears to be somewhat limited.

Experience shows adequate industrial safety for employees can never be achieved unless regulatory authority is given to promulgate safety codes, and that authority is actually used to build a solid foundation on which a safety structure can be erected. Now, I do not mean that safety code enforcement is all that is involved in a good safety program. If that were so, your inspectors would only need to be good policemen. They must be much more than that. They must be highly trained technicians, skilled in the best accident-prevention methods and able to put their knowledge to use.

Every worthwhile safety program is based on the premise that a safe and healthy place to work is provided the employee. Everything else—training, supervision, and employee cooperation—that enter into the program must follow. And a trained staff, working with an adequate safety code structure, can do a great deal to show the employer how to provide a safe work place.

I believe you will wish to look into this problem. Where you lack basic legal authority to carry on good safety programs, you will want to remedy that as soon as possible and strengthen your State resources for the promotion of occupational safety on every front. Every dollar spent in accident prevention will yield high dividends in reduction of costs resulting from occupational accidents and in the conservation of the Nation's greatest resource—its workers.

The Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship is charged with promoting apprenticeship and industrial training. I have instructed this Bureau to encourage management and labor to expand their efforts in improving the skills of the Nation's work force. All of us know that this is extremely important to our economy at all times. I have also directed the Bureau of Apprenticeship to encourage State agencies to assume more leadership and more responsibility in the promotion of sound apprenticeship programs.

As you know, each of the New England States has an active apprenticeship agency. However, improvements can be made. Two-thirds of the New England States do not have active State staffs and therefore are

not in a position to give the necessary promotional and technical assistance to the people in their industries.

I strongly urge you to evaluate what is currently being done in your States and to improve and intensify training efforts to expand the skills of the entire New England work force.

I particularly urge you to consider the importance of adequate training programs for the young people of your States who are for the first time entering employment. Attention should be given to the special supervisory problems involved in their training and emphasis should be placed on application of safety rules.

All levels of Government should be concerned not only with apprenticeship training but also with the many other very important types of training. We in the Labor Department are in the process of launching a new program to encourage effective training for all workers. The responsibility for developing the skills of employed workers lies with management and labor. The role of the Federal, State and local governments is only to assist and help. This role is important, however, and deserves our fullest support.

We have gone a long way in the United States in correcting child-labor evils since the early days when so many workers in mines and factories, including the growing textile mills of New England, were young children. New England was the pioneer in seeing the evil of child labor and in enacting legislative remedies. It was in Connecticut in 1813 and Massachusetts in 1836 that the first child-labor laws were passed. But as child-labor protection has become a nationwide movement, New England as a region has lost its lead. The nationally accepted standard of a 16-year minimum age for employment during school hours has been met by only 4 of the 6 New England States (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island). Rhode Island is the only State in this area to set a maximum 40-hour workweek for boys and girls under 16 and Connecticut the only one with a maximum 8-hour day and 48-hour week standard for those 16 and 17 years of age.

In the early days of our Nation farmwork was a family activity, but now the widespread practice of depending upon seasonal hired laborers has made the protection of children working in agriculture one of our greatest needs. We have made too little progress anywhere on this front. For example, among the New England States not one applies to agricultural employment a 16-year minimum age for employment during school hours, and only Connecticut has a 14-year minimum age for limited agricultural work outside school hours.

Much remains to be done by the New England States to provide the basic child-labor protections that are generally accepted today as necessary to safeguard the educational opportunity of our youth and advance constructive employment opportunities for young people when they are ready to join the Nation's work force.

We all know that despite our professed beliefs in the equality of man, certain groups among us are discriminated against because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. When this discrimination affects a person's opportunities for employment, it is particularly pernicious. The freedom to earn a living without being discriminated against is as important to the individual as the better-known civil rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. Freedom of speech, assembly, and religious worship may seem to be empty phrases to a person who is deprived of his chance to make a living because of the color of his skin, or the way he worships God or because his ancestors were members of a particular national group.

As you know, there has been a long struggle for the enactment of Federal legislation to meet this problem. One of the arguments against Federal legislation in this field is that this matter should be dealt with by the States. To lend validity to this argument, however, the States must take some action to eliminate this injustice to large numbers of their people.

Here in New England three of the States, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island have acted. These States have statutes against discrimination in employment which have demonstrated that State action along this line can be effective. The annual reports of the State agencies administering these laws indicate that they have succeeded in reducing discrimination in employment. They have opened up employment opportunities where members of some groups have previously been barred.

I commend to the attention of other States the experience of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island in meeting the problem of discrimination in employment.

There are two significant population trends which I believe I should discuss with you before closing. First is the bumper crop of World War II babies now going through the school systems of the Nation and soon to be candidates for their share of employment opportunities. Second, and of real concern to the New England area, is the increasing representation of older workers both in the general population and in the labor force. People 45 and older have increased from 17.8 percent of our population in 1900 to 28.4 percent in 1950. They will comprise nearly 50 percent by 1975.

Studies conducted in selected areas through State employment security agencies have established clearly that, in spite of the present high levels of production and employment, older workers are at a distinct disadvantage in obtaining new employment. Unless the economy achieves considerable further expansion, the large number of young people born in the 1940's who will reach working age in the 1960's will create much heavier competition for jobs.

It follows, then, that unless hiring and retention practices of employers detrimental to the interests of older workers change before the 1960's, an excessive number of older people will suffer unemployment and dependency. In this respect, New England faces a particularly acute situation. Great concentrations of older people tend to be found in the older industries. This is true in the case of textiles, which have in the past represented such a large part of New England's industrial endeavor, and it is true also in the metal trades, which account for much employment in this region.

In recognition of the impact of these problems in your States, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut have established committees on the aging which are giving earnest attention to constructive actions that may be taken. I share their concern. We at the Federal level are also working on this problem. It will take the best cooperative efforts of all of us to find the solution.

Thank you for permitting me to discuss with you some matters of mutual interest. These are some of the many areas in which we can work together for the benefit of the people of New England and the country as a whole. I hope that you will call upon me whenever the Department of Labor can be of assistance. You may be assured of our earnest desire to cooperate with you on behalf of the general welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, and in whom they trusted and were not confounded, we rejoice that Thou hast been the God of all their succeeding generations.

May our own life, with its manifold trials and temptations, problems and perplexities, daily become richer and stronger in the realization of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Show us how we may add strength and beauty to our moral and spiritual stature and find in Thee those reinforcements and durable satisfactions which will enable us to carry on courageously and victoriously.

Grant that, in the sphere of our human relationships, we may never fail to manifest the virtues and the courtesies of considerateness and patience, of kindness and love.

Help us to hasten the dawning of that blessed day when men and nations everywhere shall rise out of the hatreds and enmities of the jungle and seek to live and labor together in the spirit of friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LOUISIANA MARDI GRAS BALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today the Louisiana Mardi Gras flags are flying from the mast of the Mayflower Hotel. The Louisiana State Society again this year brings to Washington a little of Louisiana by way of a colorful Mardi Gras ball, which is to be held in the grand ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel tomorrow night.

The ball this year is dedicated to our great rice industry, and here for the occasion is the pride of Louisiana's finest resource—its youth, represented by 21 of our most beautiful girls, each a queen of one of Louisiana's many festivals.

The tableau of the ball, Mr. Speaker, will depict the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana, in this the bicentennial year of that historic event. This tableau will be produced by Mr. William Graham, of Catholic University, with a cast of students of the university's school of speech and drama. The guest narrator for the occasion will be Mr. Tony Marvin, of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The pageant of queens will follow, with each queen in full regalia, and finally, the queen of the ball, her majesty, Alice Gay Soileau, will be escorted by none other than Mr. Democrat of America, to her king.

The king, Mr. Speaker, whose identity has been a closely guarded secret until now, will be Mr. Harry G. Chalkley, of

Lake Charles, La., who truly represents Louisiana's rice.

We of the Louisiana delegation are proud that our folks back home have again honored us by the visit of this fine group who are with us today.

FACTS ON THE LOUISIANA STATE SOCIETY'S 1955 MARDI GRAS BALL

PARTICIPANTS IN THE BALL

Queen: Alice Gay Soileau, 22-year-old daughter of Mr. Audley J. Soileau of Ville Platte, La., an old town founded by one of Napoleon's lieutenants, is a descendant of the Acadian French who migrated to Louisiana from Nova Scotia 200 years ago. She is a graduate of Sacred Heart Academy of Grand Coteau, La. She speaks French fluently and is presently teaching school in Louisiana. Her twin brother is serving with the United States Army. Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, Seventh District, Louisiana, is the queen's godfather.

King: Harry G. Chalkley, a native of Lake Charles, La., is a rice grower and cattleman. He is vice president of the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association; a member of the Secretary of Agriculture's Advisory Committee on Rice, the Committee on Research on Rice, and the Commodity Credit Advisory Committee on Rice. He is past president of the Louisiana Farm Bureau and is presently chairman of the Louisiana Farm Bureau's Rice Committee. He is president of the Sweet Lake Land & Oil Co., and is a member of the agriculture committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Chalkley is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy and is a retired captain in the United States Naval Reserve.

Maids: Miss Corinne Boggs, Miss Lynn Prescott, Miss Andrea Anderson, Miss Patti Bean, Miss Barbara Boggs, Miss Catherine Bourg, Miss Amelia Ann Broussard, Miss Elizabeth Coulon, Miss Sarah Foret, Miss Myrtis Mixon, Miss Mercedes Ann Prudhomme, Miss Barbara Rubenstein.

Princesses from rice areas of other States: Miss June Dodd, California; Miss Anne Eastland, daughter of Senator and Mrs. James O. Eastland, Mississippi; Miss Catherine Kilday, daughter of Representative and Mrs. Paul J. Kilday, of Texas; Miss Martha Mills, daughter of Representative and Mrs. Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas.

Acadian bicentennial representative: Miss Hattie Maraist.

Tableaux presented by speech and drama department of Catholic University of America under direction of Mr. William Graham.

Her majesty, the queen, presented by the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Queens: The following queens from Louisiana and their representations are: Miss Betty Burgess, Louisiana Shrimp Festival, Morgan City, La.; Miss Elizabeth Carter, Louisiana Forest Festival, Winnfield, La.; Miss Lucille Cassidy, Paper Festival, American Legion, Bogalusa, La.; Miss Georgia Alice Cayer, Domino Festival, Chenneyville, La.; Miss Grace Delcambre, Louisiana Yambilee Festival, Opelousas, La.; Miss Gail Dugal, Camellia Festival, Lafayette, La.; Miss Cindy Gardiner, International Rice Festival, Crowley, La.; Miss Janice Hayman, Southeastern Louisiana Rose Festival, Bogalusa, La.; Miss Janice Hebert, Cotton Festival, Ville Platte, La.; Miss Jan Johnston, Louisiana Peach Festival, Ruston, La.; Miss Jane Kerne, Louisiana Sugar Cane Festival, New Iberia, La.; Miss Lois Leblanc, Iberia Parish Festival and Agriculture Fair, Delcambre, La.; Miss Marcie C. Mizell, American Legion Post, Bogalusa, La.; Miss Martha Richards, Livestock and Pasture Festival, Marksville, La.; Miss Jeanette Patin, Louisiana Dairy Festival and Fair Association, Abbeville, La.; Miss Myrna B. Soileau, Tournoi Festival, Ville Platte, La.; Miss Nancy Joe Theriot, Southwest Louisiana Mardi Gras Association, Lafayette, La.; Miss Linda Thompson, Holiday in Dixie Festival, Shreveport, La.; Miss Delores Vaughn, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Baton Rouge, La.; Miss Ruth Elizabeth Wall, Queen of the Spirit of Mardi Gras, New Orleans, La.; Miss Sally Ware, Northern Louisiana Delta Festival, Bastrop, La.

Officers of the Louisiana State Society: Felix M. Broussard, president; Representative T. A. Thompson, first vice president; Representative Edwin E. Willis, second vice president; Paul E. Jones, treasurer; Barbara A. Rathe, secretary; J. W. Hanley, sergeant at arms.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, February 8, it was necessary for me to be out of the city due to the grave illness of a member of my family. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on the bill H. R. 3005.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, like other Members who represent textile areas, I am very much disturbed about the legislation we are about to consider and I speak as a friend and supporter of reciprocal trade. Most certainly I shall be opposed to a closed rule precluding any amendments from the floor.

I represent a textile area. The textile industry in the United States is an essential industry, but the textile industry is sick and foreign imports are contributing to that sickness. In my area some mills have been forced to close in recent months. Thousands are unemployed. There have been wage reductions. I find no encouragement in the bill we are about to consider today, no assurance of any kind.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the House is going to consider H. R. 1 today. This bill was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and, among other things, extends the authority of the President of the United States to enter into trade agreements with other nations of the world under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. To the general public, this legislation is known as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

It is my view this legislation constitutes one of the most important responsibilities facing the Congress of the United States in many years. This legislation is far reaching. It reaches way down to the very heart of the American economic system. It involves international relations, it involves international politics, it touches the lives of all of the American people.

This Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 is concerned with international trade. International trade can be considered from many viewpoints. In the strictest theoretical sense, it can almost be reduced to a mathematical formula. In an economic sense, it spreads itself from a scientific theory clear across international, political, and social considerations to the doorstep of a home in our community wherein the family has lived and depended for years upon one type of work in one type of industry; so much so this family is beyond change. In an international sense, this subject is indeed very, very large and great.

It is well to keep in mind, and may I say that I try to do so, the fact that all legislation, regardless of subject matter, is conceived in human need and human requirements. The world in which we live has reached its present position in a constant process of movement from one factor or consideration in relation to another. In other words, we are not at the point of the beginning of life and living on this earth. If we were, we might then accept and adopt certain laws and methods relating to human endeavor based upon the completely theoretical concept of international trade operation. But, as you know, this is not the case. We must accept the world as we now find it and we must do the best we can in trying to keep things orderly as well as beneficial for our country and our people in their life and living in the community of international society.

Because of the very great importance of this legislation to the American people, I feel compelled to make this appeal to the distinguished Members of this great House of Representatives here in the United States Congress. Before making your decision regarding this legislation and casting your vote, I appeal to every Member to search his or her own mind and knowledge as to whether or not this legislation delegates to the executive branch of the Government powers of the Congress vested in the Congress and only in the Congress by the Constitution of the United States. As Members of Congress, we do not possess the authority or the right to delegate our powers to another division or branch of the Federal Government.

In your thinking about this problem, I appeal to you further to think very seriously as to whether or not it is wise

for the Congress to give the authority provided in this legislation to the executive department of the Government. To be sure, our executive department of Government is now fortunate to have as its Chief Executive one of the really great Americans in our distinguished history. However, as Members of Congress, I think you will agree with me we cannot afford to consider legislation which grants additional powers to the Executive based upon our great and distinguished leadership of the hour. This legislation is far-reaching and there may be a time when the Congress as well as the people of the United States will greatly regret any such extension of power.

Furthermore, I appeal to every Member who may possess in his home district one of the fine old basic fundamental industries of America—an industry which down through the years has helped to establish the great American system of life and living so envied by so many other nations. If you possess one of these industries in your district, I appeal to you to think about all of the effects this legislation—this Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955—might visit upon this industry and upon the many in your district so dependent upon this industry and who have been dependent upon this industry for so many years.

In my district, in my Massachusetts community, where American freedom was born, and where the free way of life was first established, there is one of these great basic fundamental American industries. It is the textile industry which has done so much for so many; it is the textile industry which has been the backbone of the American economic system during the days when our country was striving on to maturity.

Within the boundaries of this Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, there is the opportunity, there is the authority, there is the power to transfer the greatness of the American textile industry into the hands, if you please, of foreign textile barons who do not provide their employees and their labor with a living wage, but, on the contrary, capitalize upon their slavery.

This legislation, I say, contains the power to destroy the American textile industry. If this industry is destroyed, it will carry with it the destruction of business of all kinds, small and large, in our community. It will affect our banking institutions. Yes, it can even destroy the local domestic market of our American farmers for their milk, butter, and eggs.

No American industry, my colleagues, and no American community, should be subjected to this possibility. The high standard of living now enjoyed by the American people certainly should not be lowered, should not be destroyed, and should not be placed in competition with economic systems of foreign countries having no similarity in structure or relationship.

In conclusion, I appeal to every Member of this House to think, to think hard and accurately, and oppose the granting of powers here in this legislation which will permit our great basic industries and our high standard of living, and our way of economic life to be bargained away by international politics and politicians, using the subferfuge and the propaganda that to do so we will provide the big brother aid to the economic systems of foreign nations. A study of these systems, if you care to make them, will disclose that such a sacrifice on the part of America cannot result in a lifting up of the standard of living and life in these countries. All it can possibly do is make rich men in those countries richer and result in throwing millions of Americans out of their jobs and in the end forcing a fundamental change in our way of life, a change which will plunge us head on into socialism.

Oh, I appeal to you, my fellow Members, think, think tonight, think long and hard, for this is important legislation for your country and mine.

CHINA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there are nearly 400,000 barbers, beauticians, and manicurists in the United States and many schools and colleges exist to train these workers, but I cannot find out how many schools, colleges and universities, or any other source of instruction teach the Chinese language to Americans at a time when we are evincing great interest in China. China is the world's most populous nation and we apparently are under the impression that we should have nothing to do with anything Chinese. I cannot imagine a more ridiculous point of view, and if there ever was a time when the educational institutions and other sources of information should develop an interest in and teach the Chinese language outside of the Armed Forces, but particularly to the men in the armed services, this is the time.

DOMESTIC COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, in the light of today's discussion by the House of H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act, much comment is coming from the textile industry on the effect of this bill upon that segment of our national economy. Likewise, cotton farmers are interested in the outcome of this bill and in increasing the export of raw cotton from this country. It is indeed true that unless we can find overseas markets for the cotton we grow which is surplus to our domestic needs, the price of cotton will continue depressed and will affect textile manufacturing.

During recent weeks, I have been conducting research into the status of our cotton textile industry and into our cotton exports, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the results of my study of these two matters will prove of some benefit to the Members of this House as we take up H. R. 1 for consideration today.

STATUS OF DOMESTIC COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Looked at as a whole, our domestic cotton textile industry is generally strong. Its total production of cotton cloth in 1953 was 10.2 billion yards; production in the first 9 months of 1954 was at an annual rate of 9.7 billion yards. Imports in 1953 totaled 62 million yards, little more than one-half of 1 percent of United States production; imports in the first half of 1954 were at an annual rate of 59 million yards, about the same proportion to production as in 1953. While exports have declined from their postwar peak, they totaled 621 million yards in 1953, 10 times as large as imports. Exports during the first 9 months of 1954 were at an annual rate of 597 million yards, also about 10 times as large as estimated imports.

While raw cotton consumption dropped from the peak of 10.5 million bales in the 1950-51 cotton year—August 1 to July 31—to 8.6 million bales in 1953–54, the Department of Agriculture expects domestic consumption to reach 9 million bales during the present cotton year.

The changes in levels of cotton consumption and textile production in the United States undoubtedly reflect the operational adjustments being made by the cotton textile industry—like many other industries—resulting from the expansion brought about by World War II and the Korean hostilities. Nevertheless production in 1953 was within 1 or 2 percent of its output in 1943 when more than half of the year's production of cotton textiles was utilized for war purposes.

RAW COTTON

Raw cotton exports by the United States are expected to reach 4.5 million bales during the current cotton year. This compares with a postwar peak of 5.8 million bales in 1949–50 and a low of 3 million bales in 1952–53. About 500,000 bales of the 4.5 million bales are expected to be sold abroad for local currencies under title I of Public Law 480, 83d Congress.

Thus far in the cotton year only the United States and Mexico are ahead of the export level of a year ago. All other major cotton-producing countries are believed to be behind their 1953-54 rate of exports.

THE LATE HONORABLE PETE JARMAN

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must announce to the Members of the House of Representatives the death this morning of Hon. Pete Jarman, a former Member of the House from the State of Alabama, and

former Ambassador to Australia. Mr. Jarman served with distinction the district which I now have the honor to represent from 1936 to 1948. In 1949, he was appointed Ambassador to Australia and diligently performed the duties of that office through 1953. With his passing today, Alabama and the Nation have lost an outstanding leader and statesman.

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a shock to learn that our former colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable Pete Jarman, has died quite suddenly and unexpectedly.

Death comes to us all sooner or later—but somehow a man of Pete's geniality, his friendliness, his humor, seems such a part of active living that one finds it difficult to accept the fact that he has gone from among us. My heart goes out to his delightful wife who has companioned him down the years—may strength and courage be given her in her devastation.

My association with Pete Jarman in and out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was a most delightful one. We sat on opposite sides of the committee table; but one of the privileges of service on this great committee is lack of party thinking, and the never-failing determination to work for just one thing: the best interests of our Republic.

When Congressman Jarman became Ambassador Jarman he went to Australia with the blessing and the good wishes of the committee on which he had served so well. Those same good wishes go with him as he starts on the road one cannot see. May the Infinite welcome him as he moves out into the larger life.

A PARADOX

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting a few moments ago to hear the gentlemen who represent districts where there is unemployment, state their opposition to the bill H. R. 1, on which we will be called to vote tomorrow.

They want protection for local industries and the employees of those industries.

Yet some of these same gentlemen have been consistent and ardent advocates of aid to other countries, the purpose of which was to train employees, finance industries, whose products are now in direct competition with those of our own industries, and whose protection they now seek.

To me it does not seem logical to tax our people, to send our dollars, our machinery, our technicians abroad to establish an industry and then, when that industry is born and has become efficient, deny it the right to sell its products in this country without restriction.

I shall be paired against the bill, because I believe that we should first consider the interests of our own people.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, long before H. R. 1 was placed on the calendar for consideration by the House I had made a very important engagement for February 18, 1955, which will take me out of Washington and which I feel I cannot break.

Unfortunately that will make it impossible for me to be present if a vote is taken on the bill on that date, which seems likely now.

However, I have obtained a live pair so the outcome of the vote will not be changed by my absence. I would, if present, vote "no" on the bill and "aye" on a motion to recommit, if one is offered. If the bill is recommitted with instructions I would vote for the final passage of the bill.

TRADE EXTENSIONS AGREEMENT ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 142) providing for the consideration of H. R. 1, a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ashley	Hays, Ark.	Meader
Belcher	Hébert	Morrison
Bentley	Hess	Phillips
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hill	Powell
Budge	Hillings	Prouty
Burdick	Hoeven	Radwan
Clevenger	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Cole	Horan	Richards
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson	Shelley
Dawson, Ill.	Johansen	Short
Dempsey	Judd	Sieminski
Diggs	Kean	Siler
Dingell	Kearns	Smith, Wis.
Eberharter	King, Calif.	Spence
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Talle
Gamble	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Garmatz	McConnell	Vorys
George	McGregor	Wolcott
Green, Oreg.	Macdonald	Yates
Gross	Mack, Wash.	Young
	Mailliard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit this afternoon after the adoption of the rule, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, when the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was passed, we were led to believe that it would succeed in overcoming domestic unemployment.

As far as the textile, and a few other sick industries are concerned, this law became an enemy, instead of a friend.

The only spinning and weaving being done in many New England mills is by the spiders on their webs that signify the absence of human activity.

The hard-core facts of unemployment in textiles, among fishermen, and miners are pushed out of sight, under the table, while the State Department conducts experiments in international goodwill to the tune of billions of dollars extracted from Americans.

Judged on its record of recent years, I would say that we do not have much confidence in what it now advises us to do.

If the State Department has no other solution to the problem of providing export markets for Japanese textiles than to dump them in the United States at the sacrifice of our own textile industry, we are forced to the conclusion that it is confused, and does not actually know what it is doing.

International communism will not be stopped by throwing more Americans out of work.

The State Department would be better occupied in devising practical means to save the remainder of Asia from communism, and in restoring trade in the area embracing Japan, the Philippines, what is left of Vietnam, Malaya, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, India, Pakistan, and Formosa, than in surrendering our domestic market to an invasion of Japanese textiles.

Substitution of foreign for American cloth in our home market would deepen unemployment in textile communities that have had the unfortunate distinction of leading the labor-surplus parade, and for years.

The Government would have some defense, at least, if, during all that time, it had come forward with some program to help alleviate the distress of the tens of thousands of textile workers who are unemployed.

It has done absolutely nothing.

But now, exalting international above domestic relations, it plans to add insult to injury by opening the gates to a flood of foreign imports to rescue the Japanese while letting our own people drown.

Japan has a newly rebuilt cotton textile industry that is capable of producing billions of yards of goods at wages averaging 11.9 cents per hour, compared with our New England average of $1.38.

How, in spite of all the camouflage and sidestepping, can the Government keep a straight face in suggesting that the American textile industry and others will not be disastrously affected by the proposal to enter into negotiations with Japan, looking to a further reduction of tariff rates.

For years we gave away billions to foreign nations.

Apparently this was not enough.

They want us to give away our jobs.

Even now, before the full impact of lower tariffs will hit us like a hurricane, those people still working in the textile mills of New England are being conditioned to take a cut in wages.

I ask the Government to come clean, to put it on the line, and dare to tell millmen, union representatives, stockholders, the employees and the unemployed of our textile industry that extension of reciprocal trade will not harm them.

I do this in order to fix responsibility.

Before the Congress votes on this measure, it must face the irrefutable facts of the following wage differentials and be prepared to answer those Americans who will be displaced by foreign imports.

Gross hourly earnings in some of the principal textile-producing countries:

	Per hour
Northern States of the United States	$1.41
All United States average	1.28
Great Britain	.45
France	.39
Italy	.24
Japan	.11⁹⁄₁₀

Gentlemen, do you want to kill off the American textile industry?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. H. R. 1 is vital to the interests of my district. Already, without any further tariff reductions, the principal industries of Rhode Island are menaced by competition from cheap-labor imports. Many thousands of workers have already been thrown out of work in the lace manufacturing industry, in other textile mills, in jewelry-making plants, and other factories. The tariff has already been cut below the peril point.

H. R. 1 would not only authorize the President to make still deeper cuts in the tariff, it would grant him virtually unlimited powers to regulate our foreign commerce through the medium of trade agreements. These agreements under the authority of this bill could contain provisions relating to tariffs, to import quotas, customs formalities, and other matters relating to trade.

This would represent virtually a complete abdication by the Congress of its constitutional powers and responsibility in the regulation of foreign commerce. I am not willing that this be done. There is too much at stake here to pass lightly over. There is too much at stake to put the House under the extreme limitation of a closed rule.

The hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means demonstrated the widespread and serious opposition to the bill as it is drawn. Over a hundred witnesses from some of our most important industries expressed great concern over the consequences of the bill's enactment. These industries included textile manufacturing, chemicals, electrical equipment, wool growing, the fisheries, scientific equipment, coal, oil, cattle raising, cordage, carpets, and a long list of others.

Great concern was expressed over the proposed Japanese trade agreement. I join in that concern. A way must be found to limit and contain the disastrous effects of a further tariff reduction on imports from Japan. No other competition is more difficult for our industries to meet. The bill as it has come from the Committee on Ways and Means has not provided any proper and practical method of coping with this problem. It would simply throw our industries into the struggle without more to look forward to than escape-clause action. The record in this clause as a defense and remedy is very poor. Fewer than 10 percent of the applicants have gained relief.

The serious defects of H. R. 1, including unheard of powers proposed in it for the Executive, and its failure to make it possible to live with the trade agreement with Japan which it specifically authorizes, combine to make an overwhelming case against a closed rule. The House should be given a chance to fit the bill to the vital needs of our industries and their workers.

I strongly urge, therefore, that the rule be defeated.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once again the duly elected Members of the House find themselves under a threat of an un-Democratic and un-American gag-rule procedure.

House Resolution 142, the rule in question, would make in order H. R. 1, and tie the hands and bridle the tongues of 410 Members of the House who are not members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Only in an extreme emergency could there be any justification for such flagrant violation of the ordinary rules of procedure. No such emergency exists here.

The travesty of it is that legislation will be jammed through the Congress, that was conceived in Geneva, given the official O. K. at the State Department, and written by the Randall Commission. It is handed to you today with the weak apology that 20 members of the august Ways and Means Committee heard your protests but decided that your welfare and the welfare of those constituents should be sacrificed on the altar of world politics.

Not one word do we hear about the welfare of America; about the economic deserts that have already developed; about the ruin that lies ahead for large segments of American industry.

Whether you are seated on the right of the center aisle or on the left of the center aisle, may I plead with you my colleagues to resent this violation of your right and your privilege to participate in the deliberations of the Congress.

It is my plan to demand a rollcall vote on the previous question. You should remain in the Chamber ready to stand and be counted in support of this request. You will then have a chance to say whether you approve or disapprove this violation of your rights.

Once more may I plead with you, my colleagues, to turn a deaf ear to the propaganda of the floor leadership on both sides of the aisle, that you will have an opportunity to recommit this bill. Here and now is the place to make your fight. Let us stand and be counted; let us vote for the interest of America and of our constituents.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. If we had not had an open rule, we would not have the escape clause in the law at the present time, would we?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for calling

that to our attention. That is the only way I was able to write the escape clause in the law in the beginning.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. There are certain sick industries in our country today, and one of them is the textile industry. Is the textile industry mentioned in this bill?

Mr. BAILEY. They are not, and there will be no chance to amend the bill unless we have an open rule. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I will be satisfied if you open this up and give the Members who want to offer amendments a chance to do so. I will take a licking, if it is necessary, but let us make the bill at least agreeable to a majority of the Congress, which it is not at the present time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we always admire and appreciate the sincerity of our good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, who just spoke. I think we all appreciate that in his district and in his State as a consequence of the coal situation, he does have a problem and, I repeat, we are all pleased to hear from him at all times. But, while he might be opposed to this bill because he feels that the importation of residual oil is the cause of so many miners being out of work, I question whether that is truly the fact. In my considered judgment, the reason why the coal industry is in a bad way is because of the desire of many, many people, millions of people, who want to use oil and gas.

As an illustration of that, only last year there were 9 million barrels of residual oil used in this country. Eight million barrels were produced locally, and 1 million barrels were imported. The gentleman may feel that in the event 1 million barrels of residual oil which was imported had been kept out of the country, the coal industry would have gotten that share. I am frank to confess that I am not an authority on the matter; but, on the other hand, the residual oil people do not want it to come in because they feel they would get that additional amount and that the coal industry would not get any of it. So I do not think anything this Congress can do with regard to exports and imports can help the coal industry. I think the cause is that a great majority of the people want to use gas and oil. The representative of millions of farmers spoke for this bill. Can anyone conceive that if this bill would bring chaos or ruin to the farming industry that the Farm Bureau and the National Grange would be here testifying for this bill? If the American Federation of Labor felt that millions of their employees would be thrown out of work, would they have come in and testified in favor of this bill? If it is going to bring chaos to business, do you think the United States Chamber of Commerce and scores of other business organizations, with billions of dollars invested, would be coming before the Ways and Means Committee supporting this bill?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman observes that coal is no longer looked upon with favor because most people want to use gas and oil. I am sure the gentleman would be glad to know that in case, and God forbid, this country gets into general mobilization or partial mobilization, you will be on a coal fuel potential within 24 hours, and no gas or oil will be used for that purpose.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I agree that would probably happen. But what I am saying is that I have seen so many people who continually used coal are now using oil and gas. I am not disagreeing with the gentleman, but I think the gentleman will agree with me that I have stated the facts.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield for one short observation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman agree that if and when the time comes that all subsidies and all advantages given to liquid and gaseous fuels are permitted to be enjoyed by the coal industry, the situation in your district may even change?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Of course the ideal condition would be if we could only export and not import. Yes, that would probably be the ideal situation. But unfortunately that just cannot happen. For instance, last year we imported between $10 and $11 billion worth of goods and we exported $16 billion worth of goods. When you do import coal and other products you are going to throw some people out of work, but it is likewise true that when you ship $16 billion worth of goods out of the country that gives more people work than the $10 or $11 billion worth that is brought into the country. Just think of how many people are used in the transportation of those $26 billion worth of products. So from that standpoint, perhaps when we ship out $16 billion worth of goods it is true that some of them are going under lend-lease, but nevertheless it does happen that many more people are employed. The record shows clearly that $16 billion went out of the country last year and $10 billion worth came into the country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that the President of the United States intends or would possibly do anything to hurt business or any individual in the entire country. I am certain he has advisers who are competent and sincere, like the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the United States Chamber of Commerce. I am sure these advisers and counselors of the President are not going to advise anything to bring our country into chaos or into a ruinous condition.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. There has been some suggestion, as I understood, that there might be an effort to vote down the previous question and amend the rule to make it an open rule. As far as I am concerned I think everyone ought to understand, and certainly the new Members, that throughout the years without regard to which party has been in power we have brought measures of this kind to the floor under closed rules. Experience has shown that when you throw the matter open to amendment on the floor you generally wind up with the bill getting in such shape it has to be recommitted. Under the pending rule as drawn there will be opportunity for the minority side to present a motion to recommit, and on that motion a separate vote could be had. I therefore asked the gentleman from Illinois to yield in order that I might say I am supporting the rule and will vote for the previous question in order that we may proceed in the way that we have through the years in the consideration of such bills.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed at the domestic injury suffered by the mining and railroad industries of my district as a consequence of the prevailing policies which permit unlimited quantities of foreign residual oil to be unloaded into the fuel markets of the east coast.

I am sure that none among us will question the vital role which must be assumed by the coal industry in time of war. During World War II demand for bituminous coal rose by 74 percent from the time that the conflict erupted on the Continent until the year that our troops went ashore in France. All military experts agree that there will be no such time to reach peak industrial activity in the event of further hostilities. In 1954 the bituminous-coal industry produced less than 400 million tons. Our mobilization base requirements call for a minimum of 650 million tons of annual production if an emergency develops. To achieve that output, the coal industry should be producing at least 500 million tons per year in the interim period. Because of the world tension existent at the present time, we must stay on the safe side militarily and industrially. I consider it foolhardy to permit our coal industry to remain at a low level of production when it could at any time be called upon to accelerate production far beyond its current capacity.

Unfortunately, Maryland's mines were among the first to suffer from the inroads of foreign residual oil. Until this product began to deluge the Atlantic seaboard, Maryland was producing in excess of 1½ million tons of coal annually. Last year our total output dropped below 400,000 tons. Whereas our labor force at the mines was made up of more than 2,000 men in 1948, today we have less than 500 employees. In 1948 residual oil imports amounted to 53 million barrels; last year the total was 131 million.

I am reminded of an article appearing in the Washington Star in 1950. A reporter who visited Maryland's mining communities described the destitution that enveloped that region as a result of the competition that came from foreign refineries. Since that time conditions

have worsened fourfold. A comparative few of the miners are still holding on, working 1 or 2 or 3 days a week. Some have left their homes to seek employment elsewhere. Others have found part-time employment in other industries.

Railroaders who depend upon coal traffic for employment are confronted with a similar situation. The Baltimore & Ohio, whose lines extend through some 200 miles of my congressional district, reports that total personnel in this company declined from an average of 65,000 in 1946–48 to only 50,000 at the present time. The devastating effects of foreign residual oil are emphatically reflected in these figures, for much of the coal tonnage picked up in the northern West Virginia and western Pennsylvania fields goes to tidewater or directly into the utility plants of the east coast. Production in mines on the B. & O. lines dropped from 42 million tons in 1948 to 31 million tons in 1954. The Western Maryland Railway which also juts into both the northern West Virginia and western Pennsylvania regions and has a western terminus on the Chesapeake Bay, experienced a decline of from 7,484,000 in 1940 to less than 5 million last year.

The mines of Maryland were a vital force in the industrial progress of this Nation. For that matter, one of the attractions of Washington as the Nation's capital was its proximity to the coal fields near Cumberland. In 1789 a group of citizens in Alexandria and Georgetown issued an advertisement calling attention to this advantage in the campaign to have the seat of the Federal Government moved from Philadelphia to this city. From the time the B. & O. completed its line to Cumberland in 1842, coal shipments provided the bulk of traffic, and throughout the years this commodity has been the greatest single source of revenue for all the other great roads of this section of the country.

Since 1800 more than 260 million tons of coal have been produced in Maryland, yet there are 3¾ billion tons of recoverable reserves remaining. Today many of our mines are flooded with water, and railroad cars are rusting away on siding because the market for coal has been usurped by foreign residual oil.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I am so optimistic as to hope that in due time most—or even all—of our trade restrictions will have disappeared. I also hope that there will come a day when immigration barriers will be unnecessary. But neither is practical at the present time, nor in the foreseeable future. I believe that H. R. 1 must be amended, in the interest of the domestic economy and the national security, to provide for a restriction on importation of residual fuel oil to at least 10 percent of the domestic demand, based on the corresponding quarter of the preceding year.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule in its present form.

This is a representative body. Every one of us is here as a representative of the constituency that elected us. It is inconceivable that under such circumstances that every one of us will be denied the right to offer an amendment to the pending bill if the rule now before us is adopted.

The rule gives the right to offer amendments only to the Ways and Means Committee. That means that a mere majority of that committee can dictate what this entire membership can vote upon. We know that the committee is divided in its views on this legislation, but, even the minority members of that committee cannot offer an amendment to the bill. As long as there is a majority of the committee, though it is only a majority of one, in favor of a particular viewpoint, then that viewpoint prevails, and there is no power given to us to change it by an amendment. Thus, it could be said that one vote in the Ways and Means Committee could under certain circumstances control the action taken by the committee, and the committee can limit or determine what the membership of the House can vote upon.

This is wrong in principle and it is particularly wrong in a representative government such as ours. The fullest opportunity should be given to permit the House to work its will in all matters of legislation that come before it for decision. This rule prevents such. It is a gag rule of the worst type. It is un-American and should be defeated.

The legislation which this rule brings to the House for consideration is one of the most important matters that will be presented during this entire session of Congress. The purpose of the bill is to extend the reciprocal-trade-agreement law for 3 years and to permit the President to reduce tariffs in a substantial degree.

There are in our Nation thoughtful persons who are deeply concerned as to the effect the enactment of this bill might have on certain industries that employ thousands of workers. The effect of this bill could mean that the products of certain of our industries will be brought into direct competition with similar articles produced abroad by under-paid workers. Workers in foreign countries do not receive wages of the kind we pay in this country. There is fear we cannot meet such competition successfully with our present higher standard of wages. This is a real danger to our workers.

The bill now before us does not give the protection it should to the workers in this country. It should be amended to do so, but the rule that now brings the bill to the floor of this House precludes any such amendments being offered unless offered by the Ways and Means Committee. It is folly to expect it to offer any such amendments. If the committee had been agreeable to this viewpoint, then such a protective amendment would have been put in the bill before it was reported to the House for action. The fact that such was not done by the committee is evidence that the committee has not, and will not, look favorably upon such an amendment. Thus, it will not be added by the Ways and Means Committee, and no Member of the House can offer such an amendment if the rule now before us is adopted.

This is all wrong. The rule should be amended so as to give the Members of this House the right to offer an amendment such as I have mentioned or any other amendment that is deemed necessary to protect our workers. It is only in such manner that full expression can be given to the real spirit and intent of representative government.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule because it will not permit amendments to H. R. 1 when it is read under the 5-minute rule.

This closed rule is a gag rule and denies me as a representative of some 300,000 people to offer amendments to the bill that will protect their interests as American wage earners.

We who lived in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, have made every effort possible to obtain relief from the adverse effects of the unlimited and unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil which is one of the main factors in wrecking our economy. Unless those of us from coal-producing States are permitted to offer amendments to H. R. 1 curbing the flood of foreign residual oil, we have no other means of stopping it.

The unemployment in my congressional district is mounting daily and as of January 1, 1955, there were 18 percent of our employables unemployed. It is in the name of the unemployed in my district who are today living on public assistance and surplus food commodities, that I ask that this closed rule be defeated.

I am sure that the membership of this House if given an opportunity to vote on an amendment providing for a 10 percent quota limitation on the importation of foreign residual oil that such an amendment will be approved overwhelmingly, since it will restore employment and also protect the jobs of those presently employed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the gag rule recommended by the Rules Committee for the consideration of H. R. 1, the act which would extend the reciprocal trade agreements for a period of 3 years, and carrying with it language which I do not feel is strong enough to protect the American workingman and our American industries.

I have always felt a free discussion of all legislation to be very necessary in our legislative processes.

The Constitution plainly spells out the responsibilities of Congress in tariff matters. I feel there has been too great a delegation of these responsibilities during the past several years, and I believe it is time to take a new look into the laws regulating the commerce between our country and the other countries of the world.

I do not believe in a high tariff, but I do believe that tariffs should be so set as to make up for the difference in the production of goods manufactured in countries where substandard wages are paid. I believe that foreign goods which go on sale in our country should be based on quality and not on price. Some equalizing legislation is highly necessary. I believe in a strong peril point and escape clause being written into tariff legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to, and shall vote against the rule and trust that a majority of my colleagues do likewise.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, much of the pottery which is manufactured in the United States is made in my State of West Virginia, and a good percentage of it is made in my district.

The manufacture of pottery is not a large industry when compared with some of this country's mass production manufacturers, but in my district and in the State of West Virginia, the industry is most important. It furnishes employment to many of our people. It flourishes in small towns where it is often the sole employer. It uses materials native to the locality which are valuable only for production of pottery. The loss of this industry in our State would be doubly unfortunate; not only would raw materials abounding in West Virginia be wasted, but even more important, the already critical unemployment situation would be made even worse, and the widespread human suffering in West Virginia would be intensified.

Loss of this industry is the result which we may expect from further tariff cuts on imported pottery. Domestic pottery has already been hard hit by tariff reductions. I understand since January 1951 employment in pottery plants has decreased about 30 percent. It is further understood that profits from 1951 to 1954 have decreased about 50 percent. During this same period, the amount of pottery imported into this country has increased, even above the very high 1951 levels. The pottery people I have talked to think that reductions in import tariffs already effected under the Trade Agreements Act have brought much of this trouble into being. They feel definitely that further injury now threatens them by the three proposed reductions in tariff, authorized by H. R. 1. Their fear is especially directed to Japanese importations.

The pottery industry in this country feels that it has done everything within its power to streamline the industry. Of course, the American chinaware industry is the most highly mechanized of its kind in the world. Since the people of the industry have made their industry the most efficient, they feel that the acts of their government proposed here, will be a method to rob them of their livelihood.

I am sure that further tariff reductions would eventually eliminate practically all manufacture of pottery in the State of West Virginia. I am convinced that lower pottery tariffs are completely unjustified because domestic-made pottery is prevented from competing with foreign pottery, not because of the competence of foreign manufacturers, not because of the inefficiency of American methods, not because of the superiority of foreign goods; but solely because of the dangerously low wage scales prevalent in pottery manufacturing abroad. Labor in the United States is well paid and should be well paid in order to preserve our high standard of living. It is completely unfair to require an industry which does pay fair wages to compete with industry in foreign countries paying starvation wage scales.

I am a Representative of the State of West Virginia, which is the worst hit State in the Union, because of unemployment. My people feel that further tariff cuts will be a major irritant to our economic structure. Gentlemen, in proposing to destroy an industry of this nature, some of you have suggested that we can transfer its workers to other activities. But unemployment resulting from such destruction would be most hard to alleviate because pottery workers have a peculiar skill that cannot be absorbed by other industries. Many of them have spent years learning a highly skilled craft, so you are taking away the livelihood of these people and building up a frustration by putting them on charity.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally conceded by all those who are familiar with the textile industry that it is in a nationwide state of depression. I understand that production has been curtailed throughout the industry so that there is widespread unemployment, or part-time employment. I know that in the American Viscose Co. plant in Parkersburg, which formerly employed more than 3,000 people, only about 900 employees are now at work. I understand from the Textile Workers Union of America that about 200 mills have been closed down in the last few years, and 75,000 workers have been laid off since 1951. In Parkersburg, as in many other cities, I am sure, the closing or near closing of a textile mill is an economic catastrophe, the effects of which are felt by every resident of the entire area. The rayon plant in Parkersburg, a city of 40,000, was the city's largest source of employment. Its limited operation at the present time has injured every small-business man in Parkersburg. It has, in addition to the unemployment directly created, caused widespread unemployment in other business activities. Numerous people who might otherwise have sought employment in Parkersburg, have been forced to leave their homes and families to seek employment elsewhere. Many, many more of the employees are attempting to exist in Parkersburg, as best they can. Hundreds are still drawing unemployment compensation. Hundreds more have exhausted their benefits. From statistics furnished me by the West Virginia Department of Public Assistance, I learn that over 2,700 people in Wood County, of which Parkersburg is the county seat, are on surplus food.

As you might expect from this, Parkersburg has been classified by the Department of Labor as a severe labor surplus area. Since their textile plant was so large an employer, its displaced workers, and those displaced because of its economic effects, cannot find other jobs. This situation is doubly complicated by the fact that other local industry is also depressed at the present time. Nearly every other employer in Parkersburg has been injured by recent tariff reductions.

From this I think it is clear that the present condition of the textile industry, particularly the manmade fibers division, does not warrant further tariff cuts which would increase textile imports. Much of the present distress in the industry has been caused by our unwise importation policy. Much more distress will be created if there are further tariff reductions on manmade fibers.

The chief beneficiary of such reductions would, of course, be Japan. Japanese rayon plants are as efficient as those in the United States. They are capable of producing and have produced fibers of as fine a quality as can be made in the United States. Their industry has rapidly recovered from the effects of World War II. I understand that the productive capacity of the Japanese rayon industry at the close of World War II amounted to approximately 360 million pounds per year. As of 1950, that capacity had been raised 32 million pounds, to a total of more than 390 million pounds. This restoration of rayon production capacity was made against the recommendation of the Textile Commission to Japan. It was made with the help and cooperation of the United States. But the fact is that the rayon industry in Japan is overbuilt. Its capacity for production at the close of World War II was adequate to supply the internal needs of Japan. I can see no fairness in a policy which permits the overbuilding of a foreign industry and then provides for lower tariffs in the United States to take care of the excessive foreign production.

I do not deny the fact that Japan must import foodstuffs in order to survive and that it must export materials in exchange. But the foods which Japan needs can be obtained in southeast Asia, where she can trade her manmade articles for rice. Burma, Thailand, Indochina, the Philippines, and Indonesia all have, or could have, rice for export. Our policy should direct Japan's trade into these channels rather than directing it to the United States, where irreparable injury can be done to our entire economy.

In conclusion, let me say that I am firmly convinced that there would be absolutely no benefit to be derived from further reductions in tariffs on textile imports as authorized by H. R. 1. On the contrary, every indicator capable of measurement indicates that nothing but harm will result if textile tariffs are lowered.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago this spring I appeared before committees of the Senate and House to protest trade policies that were responsible for creating unemployment and poverty in my congressional district and in other areas throughout West Virginia. I was particularly concerned with the growing

threat imposed upon our national economy by imports of oil from South America and the Middle East. I presented figures to show that the increasing amounts of crude oil and its products shipped from foreign lands were usurping America's fuel markets to the detriment of our own coal and oil producing industries.

Today—almost 5 years later—I find that the destitution brought about by this foreign menace has increased in intensity and has extended its perimeter of disaster. More mines are closed, more miners and railroaders are unemployed, and business throughout the coal and railroad centers of the Appalachian region has steadily declined. The domestic oil industry has likewise experienced serious injury and is losing its incentive to develop new fields and new wells in the midst of this otherwise prosperous economy in the United States. Unfortunately, many wells are being pulled in West Virginia today.

Let me give you an example of the past and continuing disregard of the national welfare and security arrogantly exhibited by the importing oil companies. Committees of Congress undertook to look into the problem after 75 million barrels of residual oil were imported into the United States in 1949. Our distinguished legislators were rightfully alarmed not only because these imports were bringing destitution to coal-producing areas, but also because this country was building a dependence upon a source of supply that would not be available in an emergency period.

A representative of the United Mine Workers of America testified before the Senate committee that each time a huge new tanker tied up at an American dock, it brought not only a quarter of a million barrels of fuel oil, but also job discharges for 63 American miners for a full year. We import not only low quality oil, he explained, but unemployment.

A representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen testified that residual oil imports were responsible for what he termed enormous increases in railroad unemployment. An official of the National Coal Association warned of the danger of permitting utilities on the Atlantic seaboard to rely upon a fuel which cannot be stored in large quantities and which would be unavailable in time of snorkel submarine action in ocean shipping lanes.

The Governor of the State of West Virginia testified that foreign residual oil was creating general economic chaos in our State, for it not only threw thousands of mineworkers and employees of related industries out of jobs, but also deprived State, county, and local governments of much-needed revenue from direct and indirect taxes.

I ask you, gentlemen, to keep in mind that these statements were made following the year that a record 74 million barrels of residual oil entered United States markets from abroad. Naturally, we, who have an interest in the coal industry and its employees, the independent oil producers and their employees, the railroad industry and its employees, and in other affected fields, were deeply concerned with the unnecessary damage that was being inflicted upon our economy. Those 74 million barrels of residual oil were equivalent to 18 million tons of bituminous coal. The loss of that tonnage deprived mineworkers of 2,806,000 man-days—representing $43,549,000—in 1949. More than 15 million tons of that coal—the coal which was never produced because its markets were stolen away by a foreign product—would have been shipped by rail. The resulting loss to railroad workers amounted to $23,331,000. That, gentlemen, is what a Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare learned when it made a study of unemployment in the coal and other specified industries 5 years ago. That committee issued a report which included this terse statement:

> The committee, on the basis of all the evidence before it, is convinced that the importation of foreign oil has had a substantially injurious effect on the coal, oil, and railroad industries of the Nation.

Is there any wonder why we who represent coal, railroad, and domestic oil companies were deeply concerned with what would happen if the deluge of oil from abroad were not checked? We realized that in addition to the losses sustained by wage earners in these industries, the flood of foreign residual and crude oil would impair the capital investment of the coal industry, reduce domestic exploration and development of new oilfields, cause pulling of producing wells, and imperil the national safety. We sought immediate action to correct the unfair and dangerous situation then existent. Pressure and promises from importing oil companies, however, were so great that our efforts at that time were hopelessly in vain.

Now let us review what has happened in the intervening years. Here are the residual oil import figures for the succeeding period:

	Millions
1950	120
1951	119
1952	128½
1953	136¼
1954	131¾

Representatives of importing oil companies insisted time and again that it was their policy to supplement rather than supplant domestic fuels. Though it was proven by a Senate committee that the amount of foreign residual oil then being imported into the United States was already causing serious harm to American industries and American workers, shipments rose beyond the expectations of even the most pessimistic of us, the aggregate for the last 5 years amounting to more than 635 million barrels. Now Mr. Speaker, to me it is inconceivable that any group of international operators would be so disrespectful and disdainful of the elected Representatives of the people of the United States as to ignore completely the findings and recommendations of an officially appointed committee of the Congress. Not content to disemploy thousands of wage earners in this country, these world oil manipulators have intensified the weakness which their exploits have created in our defense structure.

Fuel experts have learned that, in order to have our coal industry produce the 650 to 700 million tons of bituminous coal that would be required in the first year of a national emergency, the mine output in the interim should be at least 500 million tons per annum. I remind you that in 1954 the bituminous-coal industry produced only 392 million tons. With the consequent decline in coal tonnage, railroads have laid off an ever-increasing number of workers and of necessity have neglected rolling stock that would be needed to transport coal in an emergency.

You gentlemen realize, of course, that when a mine is closed, as has been the the experience with so many of our operations in West Virginia since foreign residual oil began to take over our markets, all the equipment, steel rails, and such are pulled out, and the mine fills with water. If a mine is reopened, the water must be pumped out and all the material must be replaced—a slow, costly process taking many months. Inasmuch as we are now living in an atomic age, how much time would we have to get these mines ready?

Somewhat the same situation is applicable in the case of domestic oil production. If foreign oil takes over the domestic markets, there is no reason for American oil men to develop new fields or to explore for new wells. The wells pulled in West Virginia are gone forever. Our State of West Virginia has lost a vast amount of income because of these dangerous practices. The State now finds itself short some $7 million in revenue. We are told that we are facing a deficit for the coming year of about $15 million of needed revenue.

Thus, you see, this problem of foreign oil is not a matter of concern merely to a small group. Its economic consequences affect every one of us, particularly everyone in West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, a telegram of February 9 points out succinctly the strain under which the Porcelain Products Co. of Parkersburg, is operating. It appears useless to belabor the point that this industry is severely injured by tariff reductions. This West Virginia company has been faced not only with just one reduction, but now with almost constant reductions. Faced with this constant threat to their existence not only from tariff cuts by the present administration, but with deliberate orders by this administration that are threatening their corporate life, they ask, when will this stop? Gentlemen, I ask you to put a stop to it. This is the telegram:

> Deprived 39 people of 9 months' work, at average of $2.20 per hour, equals wage loss this plant only of $130,000; equal loss by our suppliers. This occasioned by one Bonneville order placed with Japs. Additional Government requirements placed with Japs created additional losses to company and men of at least a million dollars. Tariff cut would be suicidal for our depressed industry whose billing has decreased 28 percent over 1952. Your assistance and help to correct this urgently required.
>
> G. M. RUOFF,
> *Vice President and General Manager, Porcelain Products, Inc.*

Mr. Speaker, in my district and throughout the State of West Virginia, there are many plants which manufacture handblown glassware. Some of the most beautiful glass in the world is produced in my district. I am sure that you are aware that the art of producing handblown glass is very intricate and requires great skill. I think I can safely say that glass manufacturing is more than just an ordinary industrial process. It is a highly specialized craft or art.

Irreparable injury has been done the handblown glass manufacturers of this country by repeated reductions of tariffs on imported glassware.

Since the Second World War, handblown glass imports have consistently increased. Stark evidence of the effects of these imports on the domestic glassware industry is revealed by the fact that as these imports have gone up, domestic sales have declined. If tariffs are cut even further, as authorized by H. R. 1, the only result to be expected is complete elimination of the American industry. I submit that this would be most unwise. I can see no net benefit to the American economy to be gained by elimination or near elimination of our handblown glassware industry. Many, if not most, of the plants in the industry are located in very small towns or villages. They are usually the most important local employer and often offer the only local employment. The closing of these plants would practically wipe out many small West Virginia communities. I cannot think of this havoc as a necessary short-term period of readjustment, as the exponents of free trade term it. It may be well to say that at some future time our economy would readjust, and the younger displaced workers would find other employment. But all of us with any common sense know that a handblown glass worker who is over 45 years old cannot get a job because his skill is in an industry specialty not used by other manufacturers. I am not aware of any other products which could be manufactured in our present glassware factories; but even if that were possible, further reductions in tariffs mean a serious loss to West Virginia. Our State income, already rapidly declining, would be reduced even further. Many people now gainfully employed would be forced to leave the State or to join the thousands of unemployed people now suffering in West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress what I believe is the most important factor to be considered in relation to glassware tariffs. That is simply this—the major factor in production of handblown glassware is obviously labor costs. It has been pointed out time and time again to you that cheap labor in foreign countries is solely responsible for the low prices of imported glassware in this country. Since the United States cannot control the internal domestic policies of foreign countries, and since we cannot prevent exploitation of labor in certain countries, further liberalization of our tariff policies will not even benefit the people of foreign countries. Certainly it can only create extreme hardship for the handblown glass industry and its workers in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there are 7 toy glass marble factories in the United States, 6 of which are in the State of West Virginia, engaged primarily or solely in the production of toy glass marbles. These factories which normally employ around 878 persons, exclusive of sales representatives, are as follows:

Vitro Agate Co., Parkersburg, W. Va.

Champion Agate Co., Pennsboro, W. Va.

Heaton Agate Co., Pennsboro, W. Va.

Ravenswood Novelty Works, Ravenswood, W. Va.

Marble King Incorporated, St. Marys, W. Va.

Master Glass Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.

Peltier Glass Co., Ottawa, Ill.

Import of toy glass marbles from Japan within the past year has caused these factories to lose 60 percent of their sales within the United States. Employment is now reduced to 294 persons. Based upon information furnished by United States purchasers, 90 percent of the remaining business will be lost to Japanese suppliers within the next year.

The reason for this recent loss in United States business is not difficult to explain. The cost of production for manufacturers of toy marbles in the United States is 200 percent more than the cost of production for their counterpart manufacturers in Japan. The low cost of production in Japan is due primarily to the low cost of labor and raw materials and to low Japanese taxes. These cannot be offset by more efficient methods of production in the United States. The average monthly wage of a skilled machine operator in the Japanese marble factory is 15,000 yen—$41.66—and the average monthly wage of an unskilled adult laborer is 6,000 yen—$16.66. There are no unions in the Japanese marble factories, and child labor is sometimes utilized. In marble factories in the United States, machine operators average approximately $300 per month, and the unskilled laborers, approximately $200 per month. Laborers in the United States work only 40 hours per week, while their counterparts in Japan work 50 to 60 hours per week. The low cost of labor and low taxes, which average about 15 percent, result in proportionately cheap raw materials. Conference United States-flag lines advise that Japanese toy glass marbles are loaded as ballast and the cost of shipping from Japan to the United States is only $10 per 2,000 pounds. Shipping costs on nonconference United States-flag vessels and on Japanese-flag vessels are considerably lower.

Under the present tariff rate, it is almost certain that the entire marble industry in the United States will close down. Gentlemen, this industry, as I have said, is not large, but it is a source of employment to people in West Virginia. Why must their jobs be sacrificed? Why must the already devastating unemployment problem in West Virginia be made worse?

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you know, West Virginia, particularly that part of the State lying in the Ohio and Kanawha River valleys, has been blessed with vast deposits of elements used in the manufacture of many vital chemicals. For this reason, the State is one of the centers of the chemical industry of the United States. Many of the people in my district, the Fourth Congressional District, are employed by chemical manufacturers, and a very great number of these people have informed me of their fear that further reductions in tariffs on chemical imports will jeopardize their jobs and the plants in which they work. Manufacturers, too, feel that further tariff reductions will jeopardize the industry they have developed. Some are considering moving to other countries. Therefore, I would like to bring to your attention the need for protection of this vital industry.

I need not, I am sure, point out to you the national importance of the industry about which I am speaking. We all know that without it our national-defense effort in our two latest wars would have been crippled. I think it fair to say that this industry played as important a part in our victories as any other in the land. I am sure, too, that you are aware that chemical manufacturing was developed during the First World War precisely because it was then found that this Nation depended to too large an extent on chemicals manufactured in foreign countries, particularly Germany.

Today we find the coin reversed. We have a strong national industry which has served the Nation well, but it cannot survive in the face of cheap foreign imports. I think that our national-defense interest alone is sufficient ground for not permitting further reductions in tariffs on chemical imports. But there are many other cogent reasons for retaining a protective tariff in this industry.

In the first place, statistics show that our chemical tariffs have already been reduced so that they are among the lowest in the world. I am not prepared to say that further tariff reductions would close down our chemical industry entirely, but I am sure that it would cause a considerable readjustment of the industry. Many chemicals now manufactured in this country would be discontinued. Many plants would be closed down and much of the money now spent by the industry in research and development of newer and better chemical products would not be spent. I am sure that many West Virginians would lose their jobs. I know that many of them have already felt the effects of imported chemicals, and I am not prepared to say that these people can be regarded as mere elements of the labor force to relocate and readjust themselves as best they can.

The unemployment situation in West Virginia is already severe. If we make it worse by further reductions in tariffs, the distress already rampant throughout the State will be intensified, and the chance for eventual recovery will be lessened. In terms of human beings, lower tariffs on chemicals will only create further misery.

In addition to its immediate present effects, an unwise tariff policy in regard to chemicals will vitally affect the future of the industry and our Nation. Chemical production requires highly trained

professional people. Chemical research is an important part of the industry. Our national supply of trained chemists is an important national asset. If we take any action tending to curtail the industry, we will destroy some of the incentive for young people to go into the field. The shortage of specialists which may result could do irreparable future harm.

Foreign chemical industries have rapidly recovered from World War II. They are daily increasing their production. We must maintain a tariff policy nurturing our own industry and the jobs of its workers because of the natural advantages of production abroad. Not only are foreign labor costs far beneath those in this country, but construction, operation, and maintenance costs are far less in foreign countries than they are here. In addition to this, chemical manufacturers abroad enjoy tremendous tax advantages. Obviously we must either offer some protection for our own industry or prepare to lose much of it. I, for one, think we have no real choice. We must retain a protective chemical tariff to protect our own national interest.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I intend to make on the bill and include therein letters, resolutions, and newspapers articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the closed rule on H. R. 1 Such a rule leaves us no opportunity to submit to the House amendments that would protect segments of our economy seriously in need of protection. For example, a strong case can be made for protection of our domestic oil industry. Oil imports furnished 8 percent of our national demand in 1946. Today oil imports furnish 14 percent of the United States market. In the same period of time imports of oil have risen from 377,000 barrels per day to over 1 million barrels per day. In the same period oil imports have increased 179 percent, whereas domestic production has increased only 36 percent. The welfare of our Nation, in its domestic and foreign policy, demands congressional action against the flooding of our Nation by foreign oil. Under this closed rule, we are barred from even submitting this important matter to our colleagues of the House. Fairness of parliamentary procedure should give the House an open rule, under which rule the House would have a real opportunity to work its will.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule in its present form. It is manifestly unfair to bring in this H. R. 1 under a closed rule.

Nearly all of us want a reciprocal trade act, but we want one that at least resembles a two-way street—one that bears some reasonable relation to the dictionary definition of "reciprocal."

For too many years the United States has been making bona fide trade concessions all over the world, and in return we have been met with restrictive import licensing requirements, artificial embargoes and outright violations of standing agreements.

We who oppose the rule in its present form and who oppose H. R. 1 as reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, want and believe we have the right to expect a reasonable amendment to assure American industry and the American wage earner that not a single American industry and not a single American's job is expendable.

We want and we have a right to expect an amendment which will make the peril-point and escape-clause provision mandatory when so recommended by the Tariff Commission. This is fair; it is reasonable; it is honest, and, above all, it is American.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule. I am against any gag rule any time, any place, anywhere—and this is a gag rule. It is a mockery to point to this forum as the great place of free speech and find this rule before us. I speak for the anthracite-coal industry, the great basic fuel potential of America. We only ask at this point in the parliamentary situation for the right to present our case to the House. Let me speak for my amendment seeking a quota on residual fuel oil. If the House knows the facts, I believe in my heart we will get this so badly needed protection, little as it is we need it desperately. I repeat, in case of the outbreak of hostilities of any magnitude, this Nation will be on a coal-fuel basis within 24 hours after the first shot is fired; make no mistake about that. Promises of help, many assurances of aid, much sympathy from all for the coal people but none of the support given to all other segments of our economy. This residual, cheap imported fuel oil strikes at the heart of our coal industry. This means loss of jobs in the mines and on the railroads of this Nation.

But, at this time, let us defend our rights as Members of this House to represent the districts which sent us here. And for one that I intend to do in this vote.

In the American way, let us open this vital matter to free discussion, amendment, and debate.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my opening words; I am opposed to the rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak briefly in opposition to a closed rule on H. R. 1, because I believe the matter is of utmost importance to many of my constituents who have had little opportunity to look into the possible effect of the measure as reported out of committee.

In the first place, I am strongly in favor of the reciprocal-trade program and an adequate extension of authority to negotiate agreements under it. I also strongly favor retention of provisions of the program to insure against destructive dumping of foreign agricultural products on the American market, in other words, the escape-clause and peril-point provisions of the act.

More than 100,000 persons in my district can be seriously affected by this legislation because they are in agricultural industries which may be subjected to destructive foreign competition. Their representatives feel the provisions of H. R. 1 as reported by the committee may not contain adequate escape-clause and peril-point provisions. They are also concerned with the manner in which these provisions are administratively handled.

I have had no opportunity to study the reported bill in sufficient detail to determine its handling of these vital matters. Undoubtedly, the effect of the bill will be fully revealed during debate on the floor, but in the event the debate reveals the need for strengthening of these provisions, I would feel it most unfortunate if a closed rule should prohibit amendments which would enable me to vote for a program which I strongly support.

I am sure many other Members favor extension of this important program if it contains adequate safeguards. I am sure proponents of the committee's bill do not want to be in a position where they may be accused of railroading it, nor do I feel they want to place friends of the measure in a position of being forced to oppose it. I appeal for an opportunity to hear discussion of H. R. 1 and to vote for amendments if I then believe they are needed. I hope the Members will refuse a closed rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule in its present form. The action which this House takes with regard to H. R. 1 will directly affect every man, woman, and child in this Nation. Their bread and butter—the standard of living they enjoy—the extent of their economic security is irrevocably tied to the question of whether business continues to flourish and industry continues to expand in this country.

With a question so vital therefore to the well-being of the American people, how then shall we dispose of it in a few hours of limited debate—yet still honorably discharge our sacred responsibility to our constituents?

Largely as a result of the vast imports of foreign residual oil which flow unrestricted into our eastern seaboard, unemployment in our West Virginia coal fields increased 25.7 percent in 1954 over 1953. The low rate of the duties imposed upon imports of glass and pottery has opened so wide the doors to our domestic markets—that the doors of our glass and pottery plants in the First

Congressional District of West Virginia are, one by one, slamming shut. The consequent unemployment in these industries exceeds even the high rate which now prevails in the coal fields, while similar conditions prevail in our important chemical and textile industries.

With due respect to my distinguished colleagues who sit upon the Ways and Means Committee, I still must protest that upon so grave an issue as that which H. R. 1 encompasses, we cannot permit ourselves to be guided solely by the conclusions of only 25 Members of this House. The margin of error is too great—the consequence of error too costly.

Moreover, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of international trade is too complex for us to proceed, with balanced judgment, to consider H. R. 1 until we are possessed with fullest possible information upon all of the many ramifications which are involved.

It was never the intent of the Founding Fathers of this Nation that a few men, only, should write the laws of this land. I most earnestly urge that only under free and open debate shall we be able to determine, with equal justice for all, the course of action we should pursue in disposing of the grave issues with which H. R. 1 is involved.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of an open rule.

I should like to make it clear that I have always supported the principle of reciprocal trade, and shall continue to do so.

The reason I urge the open rule is to permit open debate on the question of whether we should have any trade relations with the U. S. S. R. or the nations controlled or dominated by communism. There is no special prohibition against such trade in H. R. 1 as it now stands.

The main objective of the Trade Agreements Act is to increase foreign trade in a manner so as to be helpful to the economy of the United States and to expand and strengthen the economies of certain other nations of the world. There can be no valid argument against the need for an expansion of international trade, but there are substantial points of difference, I believe, on how this trade should be expanded, what we should trade, and with whom we should trade.

Perhaps the most important question involved in H. R. 1 is whether we should have trade with any of the nations of the Communist bloc which I shall hereafter refer to as the Russian Communist Empire; and if so, how this trade should be regulated. It is to these two critical questions that I wish to present my observations and some basic facts which, up to today, appear to have been overlooked.

The Kremlin has recently stepped up its psychological warfare offensive against all free men and all free institutions. This psychological warfare offensive is being carried out under the false banner of peaceful coexistence. In this offensive against the free world trade between the Russian Communist Empire and the nations of the free world plays a very important part. The Kremlin expects to attain the following objectives as a consequence of this offensive:

First. To lull the free world into a deep slumber of false security;

Second. To cause us to cut back drastically on our defense preparations;

Third. To secure from the free world food and consumer commodities required to subdue the restive nations and peoples held within their empire;

Fourth. To lay the groundwork for a system whereby the nations of the free world will be caused to compete against each other in the field of trade under rules calculated to bring complete economic victory to the Kremlin;

Fifth. To cause as many nations of the free world as possible to develop an economic dependency upon the Russian Communist empire—particularly with respect to raw materials;

Sixth. To provide a better cover for infiltration and internal subversion of nations through the media of business and trading fronts which the Kremlin is anxious to establish in key spots in most of the free nations.

There is no such thing as trade in nonstrategic or noncritical materials with the Russian Communist empire. Anything they choose to trade for or with the free world you may be sure they need critically. Every type of intercourse carried on by the Kremlin with the free world is a calculated one in their unceasing warfare against human freedom and free institutions. Trade with the nations of the free world is clearly one of the major devices by which the Kremlin calculates to further its objective of world domain.

Recently we have read in the newspapers a great deal about the benefits which would accrue to us by trading our surplus food with the Russian Communist empire in exchange for valuable resources such as manganese. I recall that early last spring a trial balloon was put up on the subject of selling surplus butter to the Russians. When word got out that this butter would be sold at a price less than the American housewife has to pay for it, the promoters of this scheme ran for cover and pulled down their trial balloon. Now it appears as though these same promoters have put a slogan on that old trial balloon so as to disguise it. The new trial balloon has a banner on it which reads: "Barter butter for manganese." The joker in this proposition is that while we might get a small amount of manganese for a very large amount of surplus butter—as a token demonstration of how we can outbarter the Russians, we should not be fooled into believing that a consistent trading program will be built up in which we will receive only manganese and other needed raw materials in exchange for butter, wheat, and our other surplus commodity stocks.

We must never forget that the masters of the Kremlin are in a state of constant warfare. At this moment their warfare is primarily directed at the many nations and millions of people enslaved within the Russian Communist empire. What the Communist masters are now seeking to do is to break down or remove all possible opposition within their empire, and to bring about an economic, political, and military consolidation of the vast areas and millions of people they control. They must accomplish this first task of consolidation before they can engage in an all-out showdown with the nations of the free world.

In the war of the regime against the people now taking place within the Communist empire, it is no secret that the weakest economic link in the arsenal of the Kremlin is its food production program. Over the past approximately 10 years, the food production program within the Communist empire has been a notable failure. There are undoubtedly a number of reasons advanced for this failure, but I believe they can all be summed up as follows:

First. Because of the forced collectivization of the rural areas and the peasants, together with the resistance and opposition which this has brought from the people themselves.

Second. Because so much of the available manpower within the Communist empire has been put on war production work, thus depriving peaceful industries of needed manpower.

Events of the past week in the Kremlin have made it abundantly clear that the leaders of the conspiracy of communism are faced with tremendous internal problems. Among these problems is the acute shortage of food and other consumer goods. Some competent observers of these events point out that one of the main reasons for this acute shortage in food and other consumer commodities is the fact that the majority of available manpower in the U. S. S. R. has been deployed in the production of war materials, which are referred to as heavy industries. Khrushchev, the latest czar, is the advocate of allout development of the heavy industries as against the deployment of manpower for the production of food and other consumer commodities. As a consequence, it should be clear to us that now more than ever the masters of the Russian Communist empire need our food and other consumer commodities.

Common sense tells us that if we trade food for any item with the Communist empire we will be helping them to keep their war-production work at its present high level. If they are unable to trade for the food they so badly need, eventually they will have to drastically reduce their war-production work in order to provide manpower for the rural areas or be faced with the alternative of large-scale famines and mass uprisings by the people.

The same can be said with respect to a large number of consumer commodities which are usually in long supply in the United States. The enslaved people within the Russian Communist empire are demanding more shoes and clothing, more household appliances, and more of the gadget type of commodities which are so common and inexpensive in the United States but so rare in the Communist empire. Again, one of the basic reasons for these shortages within the Russian Communist empire is the deployment of vast resources of manpower to war-production work.

I believe the time has come for us to regard our position with respect to surplus food commodities and surpluses in other consumer commodities as being a distinct asset in the arsenal of the United States and the free world as a whole. The Communists have long considered food as a weapon for war. Why do we not look upon our surplus foods as weapons for attaining true peace and freedom? There are many areas of the free world, some of them now being subjected to heavy Communist propaganda, which could benefit by having reasonable quantities of our surplus foods. In those areas of the world where human want is the greatest, Communist propaganda has made the greatest gain. Our surplus foods, and to the extent possible, certain other consumer commodities in long supply, should be directed to those areas. These steps, together with an increase in technical assistance to those areas, would be a death blow against Communist propaganda.

I strongly recommended to the Ways and Means Committee that the question of trade with the Russian Communist empire and trade with the nations of the free world be considered as separate measures. I do not believe that we can advance a program of international trade which will bring real and lasting benefits to the free world unless we do separate these issues. Moreover there is the grave danger that in our laudable efforts to increase trade with the nations of the free world, we will open the door to critically needed materials which the masters of the Russian Communist empire so badly need today. Specifically I recommended that a prohibitive clause against the possibility of any trade with the U. S. S. R. and the nations controlled or dominated by communism be included in H. R. 1.

The Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression authorized by the 83d Congress, on which I had the privilege of serving as a member, conducted a large number of public hearings here in the United States and in Europe. It had before it a number of recent escapees from the Russian Communist empire. They testified that within the Communist empire there is seething discontent and hatred of the regime. Many of them urged that the United States not trade food or consumer commodities of any type with the Kremlin because by so doing we would be giving the Kremlin the weapons to control and hold captive our most dependable allies—the nations and people enslaved by them. Other recent escapees from the Soviet Union have publicly stated that the masters of the Kremlin are sitting on a powder keg which might explode any day. The exploited people enslaved by communism who are denied the essentials of life make up the powder in that keg.

There are an increasing number of people showing an interest in the possibilities of making not only a fast dollar, but rather large bundles of them through a program of trading our surplus foods and consumer commodities with the Communist empire. These are the same kind of people who saw nothing wrong in selling scrap iron for the manufacture of bombs to the Japanese just prior to the outbreak of World War II; they are much like the people who, during World War II, did not hesitate selling high-grade ballbearings to the Nazis through neutral channels. This kind of people would like to put the American farmers "over the barrel" by getting them to sanction the trade of surplus foods with the Communist empire. They hold out the possibility of financial gain to a farmer who is worried about prices for his farm products when he sees a large surplus of these same products accumulating in Government warehouses. These same people would make the American farmers into a propaganda weapon for the masters of the Kremlin, just because it would mean a bundle of fast dollars for them.

I repeat what I have said previously—there is no material—whether it be raw or manufactured, which is not considered strategic by the Communists in their never-ending war against freemen and free institutions. I urge an open rule. I wish to offer an amendment to H. R. 1 to prohibit any trade whatsoever with the U. S. S. R. or any nation under its domination or control. Such an amendment is in the security interests of the United States because it is clear, beyond any doubt, that trade of any kind with the Communists increases the possibilities of war.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill strikes at the heart of the American industrial system upon which we must depend to promote general prosperity and provide employment for millions of our citizens. In operation it will open still wider the import gates through which a steadily increasing flow of cheaply produced foreign goods can flood our American domestic markets, undermine many industries, and cause serious unemployment in the country.

The rule under which the bill comes to the House has been referred to as a "gag" rule. It shuts off all amendments to the bill. It strictly limits debate and thus denies this House the privilege of giving adequate consideration to the measure.

We can all take notice, if we will, of the fact that the so-called peril-point and escape-clause clauses of this organic law, inserted into it originally to provide some measure of protection for our great productive machinery and workers, have not been functioning effectively. They are virtually inoperative. They urgently need revision and implementation.

This bill favors foreign interests. It is contrary and hostile to American interests. It threatens our workers, our people, and our whole economic structure. It is a monstrous misnomer to call this bill reciprocal. It reciprocates nothing to this country. It grants to foreign nations wholesale permission in many instances to load up American markets with products produced under sweatshop and coolie conditions which will in time wreak even greater injury and damage to the industrial strength and scientific resources of this Nation, so necessary to the national defense and well being.

I am unalterably opposed to this most unjust and unsound bill and to the closed gag rule which brings it before the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I like many of my colleagues, am in the unenviable position of opposing the rule and thus opposing consideration of the bill under a closed rule. I have supported the Reciprocal Trade Act continuously up to this time; however, I now find myself in the position where I cannot get relief for glass and coal industries. We cannot get any consideration to relieve the industries which are being badly injured throughout the country and in various areas of the country. I refer particularly to those industries with which I am familiar, namely, the glass and coal industries. We have been down on our knees figuratively speaking praying for relief for those industries, particularly the coal industry.

The dumping of residual oil in the eastern part of the United States has damaged the coal industry and will continue to do so. The residual oil that comes from South America, particularly from Venezuela, is the residue that remains after the oil has been refined. Let me make this emphatic: The coal industry can compete with the oil and gas industry of this country. But I am told that residual oil is placed on the shores of our country at the quite low price of 2½ cents a gallon. That is ridiculous. How is coal going to compete with that price?

Residual oil is good for only one thing in this country. With the millions of tons of residual oil that have been dumped here it is only good for one thing and that is for heavy industry.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The residual oil that comes out of the Caribbean area is sold on the eastern seaboard market for whatever price they can get?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the coal miners dug the coal for nothing and the railroads hauled it for practically nothing, the Venezuelan oil would still undersell American-mined coal.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I know the gentleman has led the fight in this House on the question of dumping residual fuel oil on the eastern seaboard. He is the great spokesman for the bituminous coal industry. May I say to the gentleman that he knows I have the privilege of speaking for the anthracite or hard coal industry. We join with you folks of the soft coal industry in this resistance to the dumping of residual fuel oil from the Caribbean area and from Venezuela. The economy of Venezuela is now at its

highest peak in the history of that country. It is one of the most wealthy and one of the most expensive places to live in in the world.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from his observation.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of figures presented to the House Ways and Means Committee and before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report trying to disprove the contention of those who are interested in the coal industry in this country that residual oil has done any damage to the coal industry. I do not know where they got their figures but they are erroneous. It is a simple matter of arithmetic.

The coal operators or coal shippers have a contract, let us say, using this as an example, with some industry using coal. They are suddenly cut off and denied further shipments. The reason is stated to them. So it is an accumulation of all these coal shippers losing their contracts and then adding them up. It is a simple matter of arithmetic. It shows that 35 million tons of coal per year are being lost to residual oil, cheap giveaway oil, from Venezuela. The 35 million tons of coal mean 24,000 miners are out of work. It means that the mines are closed down. It means some of them are closed down only partially. Now, you do not revive the coal industry, you do not revive mining operations overnight. Full mobilization would put this country in desperate straits for coal if the mines remain idle very long. I think we should take stock of that fact because after all it is a matter of national defense to preserve and nurture the coal industry of this country. It is a basic industry, it is a natural resource, and should not be neglected. We have appealed for aid but we have not found it. We have talked long and we have been listened to with deaf ears so far as the committee is concerned.

We cannot do anything under this rule, and therefore I must oppose the rule. I am compelled to do so. I am also opposed to the bill. The glass industry has suffered greatly from imports, and the bill offers no relief. It occurs to me that a rule should permit some avenue where an industry that is damaged could seek relief. Now, you might say to me, "Well, the escape clause offers that." It does in words, but it does not in action. Appeal to the Tariff Commission is no help—at least, for these two industries. We think that the committee should have taken some cognizance of the difficulty of these two industries. I am sorry that I am in the unenviable position because I believe reciprocal trade over a long period is beneficial to the country. I believe relief should be given, not permanently but temporarily, so that industries can adjust themselves to changing conditions.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a coal operator for many years.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes; I am sorry to say.

Mr. PERKINS. And in the past 2 years or 2½ years your operations, I believe, are no longer in operation.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Well, they are idle.

Mr. PERKINS. I think that my colleague from Pennsylvania will agree that the importation of this residual oil is one of the major reasons for our high rate of unemployment in the coal areas.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. That is exactly right.

Mr. PERKINS. One reason why this is a difficult problem is that our own people are carrying on this dumping program—in most instances are using old and obsolete machinery which makes the volume of residual oil great. This is particularly true in Venezuela. Day after day we kick the seriousness of our coal industry aside by saying residual oil is not a cause. There must be a commencement point, and why should a basic industry be denied protection from this dumping program?

The amount of this waste oil coming in from Venezuela during the past calendar year and dumped on the eastern seaboard amounted to 350,000 barrels per day, or the equivalent of 90,000 tons of coal each day. With the daily coal production approximating 1.1 million tons, this amounts to oil importation equivalent to 8 percent of our national coal production. The Reciprocal Trade Act which we now propose to extend prohibits any action that would stop this increased importation of residual oil.

I believe in free trade, and am in accord with the general principles of the Reciprocal Trade Act. However, free trade should not be considered as a license for special interests to dump by-products into this country at the expense of one of our essential industries—coal. This basic industry must be given an opportunity to survive and a limitation on imports of residual fuel oil is a necessary step for that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this measure and hope that the House will give us an opportunity to offer an amendment to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to a closed rule is based on the fact that this Congress of the United States—a Congress elected by people from all the Nation and dedicated to representing the will of all the people—must have the fullest possible opportunity to express all views on a matter so important as the reciprocal trade program.

I realize, of course, a completely open rule to debate the program would lead only to endless discussion as each Representative puts forth the point of view of his area. I believe, instead, we should have a rule permitting discussion of substantive amendments to the bill before us.

Only a few areas of the Nation are represented by the members of the Ways and Means Committee which worked so long and hard to report the bill before us. I know they considered all the many pages to testimony presented to them, but their views are, of necessity, based on the wishes of the people they represent. On legislation of such worldwide importance as reciprocal trade, the widest practicable debate should be permitted so that the final bill will have the benefit of all shadings of meaning and opinion from representatives of all the areas of our Nation.

The bill, I fear, sticks too closely to the recommendations of the Randall Commission, and that Commission is not without fault in spite of the long hours of hard work put into developing its proposals. There is, for instance, mention of peril-point provisions in the legislation before us, but too often in the past regulations to implement peril-point legislation have been ineffective.

The people in my congressional district believe trade with other nations of the world should be as free as possible. They recognize the value of economic exchange of goods as an arm of international relations. We do not believe, however, free trade should be permitted to wipe out the standard of living enjoyed by factory and farm workers in our Nation. When the governments of other nations sets up false barriers, we must protect the interests of our people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution and the adoption of the rule contained therein. I shall vote against the motion to move the previous question. I shall do so because I do not believe that this is the type of legislation upon which a closed rule or a so-called gag rule is either wise or necessary. We are told, of course, many, many times by many people that we should be progressive and forget the past and look only to the future; yet in another breath we are told that we should think only of the past and follow established precedent and vote for a gag rule on a tariff bill when actually the question before us is not that of individual tariffs but rather great questions of broad policy.

Now, I can understand why a gag rule or a closed rule might be considered necessary if you were bringing in a tariff bill which contained thousands of items, such as are also contained in many tax bills, like the recent Tax Revision Act. But when you bring in a bill such as this, that deals with certain fundamental principles and the question of the delegation of power and of congressional responsibility, if you please, to the executive branch, then I believe that the Members of this House have the right, the duty, and the responsibility to work their own will. Remember, Mr. Speaker, when this bill finally leaves the House and goes to the other body across the Capitol, the Members of that body will be permitted free and unlimited debate and will have the privilege of offering any and all amendments that they may desire on this bill.

I believe that the average Member of the House is capable of passing judgment upon the principles that are included in this bill, the principles of government that are involved. They

talk about precedent; that we ought to gag ourselves, that we ought to vote to gag ourselves because of precedent.

Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that all of these bills were not brought to the floor under a gag rule; that in 1951 the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was brought to this floor under an open rule, a rule which permitted the offering of amendments from the floor. It was then, and then only, that the escape clause provision was written into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

It is entirely possible, with all due respect to the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means, that there is some Member of this body—certainly not myself, but some other Member who is wise enough to offer an amendment that the majority of this House will think will help to carry out the intent and the will of the people.

Each and every one of us has an equal responsibility to represent our people. It is not easy for me to oppose this rule, yet I have a responsibility to speak for my constituents, for the people of my own district and to do what I can to protect the interests of the people of my State and finally to do that, which in my judgment and conscience, with what little intelligence God gave me, I think is in the best interests of the American people. To say to me and to say to the Members of this House that we should meekly and weakly surrender that privilege, that right, I think is wrong.

So I am hoping the House will vote down the previous question so that we may have an open rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out, in response to the question raised by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], that the escape clause was already included in practically all the trade agreements in existence at the time that amendment was adopted in the House. The amendment to the act simply copied the provision that was already included as an escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday I appeared before the Committee on Rules in support of an open rule on H. R. 1.

I am in favor of the reciprocal trade-agreements program. We in Greater Cleveland, with the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway, are becoming increasingly aware of our role in international commerce, and we are cognizant of the favorable effect increased trade will have on the security of the free world. However, I am opposed to placing the gag rule on a measure of such great importance to the American people. I am sure that opinion is and will be most evenly divided which only serves to stress the importance of abolishing the closed rule.

It is my opinion that matters so important to the American people as foreign trade, tariffs and reciprocal agreements should be discussed openly and freely by the entire membership of the House of Representatives. It is my feeling that if the discussion and debate here on the floor should prove to a majority of us that H. R. 1, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, should be amended or changed in any way, we, as Members of this Congress, should have an opportunity to do so. I urge the Members to reject the closed rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and the bill. The rule, which eliminates the possibility of amendment, makes the Congress merely a ratifying body—a rubber stamp, at most.

This bill, as it stands, is harmful to my district and even with amendment possibly will present a serious threat. Southeastern Ohio depends greatly on coal, glass, and pottery, each of which is in a perilous position as a result of already reduced tariffs and lack of restrictive quotas. If this bill is passed, I would like to see it revised in such a way that at least the coal mines in Ohio, the pottery industry, the glass plants, the floor- and wall-tile industry, and the people dependent upon them for their livelihood might be served by the first principle of Government: Protection from foreign invasion—invasion by cheap inferior products. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule which would prevent this Congress from setting up such a line of defense.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am against this rule. I am against the bill anyway. I believe in protecting the business of this country. I think, after raising our pay yesterday $10,000, we can meet these issues and pass the laws ourselves instead of letting the State Department make the laws for us. It is about time we got up here and made the laws in this country, and not have the State Department or anybody else make them for us. The Constitution provides who shall do it, and it is about time we started following the Constitution, our Constitution, instead of the constitution of every other country in Europe and in Asia.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would the gentleman agree with me that there is nothing reciprocal about this Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, that only the United States provides the reciprocity?

Mr. NICHOLSON. There never has been any reciprocity. It has always been one way.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman agree with me that practically all foreign countries have higher tariff barriers than does the United States?

Mr. NICHOLSON. There is no question of that. They do not permit a lot of our products to get in over there at all.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule recommended to control the parliamentary situation for this important piece of legislation.

I do not believe in these gag rules.

I believe in free and open debate with power to make changes in proposed legislation.

This rule allows us to talk our heads off for 2 days but denies us a chance to do anything else.

We cannot even change a punctuation mark in the bill.

We are told: "Here is the law. You can take it or leave it. And you will have only one opportunity to do that."

This is getting pretty close to puppet parliamentary practice.

It appears to me that there is an interesting relationship between these closed rules and the delegation of congressional responsibility to the executive branch of our Government.

Those who urge the adoption of a tight rule believe that this body, because of its size and the conflicting interests here represented, cannot write good tariff legislation. I believe the Congress is capable of handling tariff legislation.

Because I believe that we are capable of exercising that restraint and that self-discipline which are essential to the operation of successful representative government.

As for the time element, what difference does it make if it takes us 6 days or 6 weeks to hammer out a good tariff law on the anvil of free debate.

The other body has been known to take more than that length of time in considering a specific piece of legislation. And the other body will talk about this proposal at great length and will allow a free opportunity for amendment of it.

If the other body is capable and responsible enough to permit open debate, isn't it about time that the Members of this body claim for themselves the same high sense of responsibility and the same degree of efficiency?

There is always time to do things right. The interesting relationship between gag rule and delegation of constitutional responsibility becomes more clear as we examine into the reasons suggested for this kind of procedure.

For once it is conceded that this body has neither the time nor the proper disposition to write intricate legislation, it is simple to proceed to the delegation of constitutional responsibility to the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, these are compelling enough reasons for opposition to this rule.

But if more are needed, let me suggest that the extension of the authority delegated for 3 years is, under all existing circumstances, impractical and unreasonable.

In the posture in which the United States of America stands today there is a critical necessity for frequent examination and reexamination of our international trade and tariff situation.

This Congress can find the time once each calendar year to examine what has happened and to correct mistakes.

No executive needs a 3-year license arrangement with the legislative branch of this Government.

If we are to continue down the road of delegation of our constitutional responsibility, let us do it on a short-term basis.

Mr. Speaker, I have not attempted to point out the economic tragedies which may befall the people of my district and of my State under the name of reciprocal trade agreements.

But lest there be those who think that no such problems exist, let me state here and now that a great number of industries and a vast number of employees look to me to help preserve the industries and these jobs until some provision can be made for them.

I believe in the improvement of world trade and in reciprocal trade agreements, but not to the extent of destroying ourselves because of too much haste and insufficient planning and preparation.

The call of the hour, Mr. Speaker, is that America preserve herself as that we may help preserve others.

I ask my colleagues to defeat this rule and to instruct the Rules Committee to give us a parliamentary situation where we can strike a blow for a free international economy and a healthy and ever-growing free-enterprise system in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I take this time to remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that they cannot defend a vote against this rule and still take the position that they favor the extension of a sound reciprocal trade program.

I want to remind those who represent districts where the commerce of the area knows the value of a forward-looking American trade program that you cannot appease some small minority in your section by voting against this rule and at the same time claim to work for the interests of the great majority of the people of your district and of this country.

I remind my colleagues who represent agricultural areas where we have staggering surpluses of commodities that can be taken off the surplus list only by some sort of trade arrangements with the rest of the world that you cannot appease some small industry in your district, some small selfish interest, and at the same time vote against this rule and in a sense thereby vote against the reciprocal trade program, and by that little device think you are riding both sides of the fence. You know that the purpose of defeating this rule is to destroy the Reciprocal Trade Act insofar as possible.

We have reached here the historic situation where for the first time in the history of the United States we have an intelligent view, an intelligent leadership on the part of a Republican President on this matter of trade policy. I appeal to my Republican colleagues to support their President in putting this into effect, and I appeal to my Democratic colleagues to do what they can in this bipartisan sense to take advantage of this great opportunity a Republican President has given us.

I have been shocked and disappointed and dismayed at the attitude of so many of my friends from areas where the viewpoints of great Americans like John C. Calhoun once prevailed. John C. Calhoun must be revolving in his grave today as he sees the views about trade legislation of some of his successors from the part of the South he fought so hard for during his years in public life.

I hope we will realize that the vote on this rule today is decisive. If you believe in the reciprocal trade program, you will defeat this effort to slice it up into small pieces. An effort is being made to slice up the reciprocal trade program, just like many other programs that are in effect. There is no effort to try to repeal it completely, at least no open effort. They want to cut it to pieces and knife it in the back to do whatever can be done to destroy it, just as has happened to so many other programs. But I want to emphasize to all of my colleagues today that the American farmer who has a stake in the production of surplus commodities and the staggering cost of maintaining those surpluses wants to sell his goods, and the American farmer will realize in the long run that if this reciprocal trade program is cut back here today, as a result of our action in opening this up to every type of trade sell-out that can be conceived of, your responsibility in voting against this rule will be acknowledged and accepted. This is an important issue. I think this bill is the greatest issue which will come before the Congress within the next 2 years, during which we will be Members of the 84th Congress. The overall issue will be decided, as the President said 2 years ago, on whether we fail or succeed in solving this trade problem.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, at times I cannot understand the attitude of the Members of the House. I cannot understand your thinking—whenever there are any economic difficulties in any areas of any country in the world, why you get all worked up about it; but when there are any difficulties in any particular areas of the United States such as in the coal industry in the various States where mine after mine has been closed down and thousands of miners have been thrown out of employment, nobody is seemingly concerned or gets excited over the problem of how the Federal Government can step into the picture to afford relief from the deplorable conditions that exist. I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that he is not well informed on conditions in the coal areas of Pennsylvania. For his information, I want to point out to him that the importation of residual fuel oil and crude oil has had a devastating and tragic effect upon the production of coal in Pennsylvania. I might call to your attention that in 1947 we were importing approximately 350,000 barrels of oil and today we are importing 1,200,000 to 1,300,000 barrels of oil a day. I might call to your attention that this has seriously affected not alone the coal industry and oil industry but killed the incentive of the American independent oil producers to find new reserves of oil. Our own oil production in the United States which was 6,500,000 barrels a day last year at this time is at the present cut back to approximately 6,100,000 barrels.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield since he mentioned my name?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We all sympathize with the problems of the coal industry. I do not know of any American industry which deserves more of our sympathy. The gentleman from Pennsylvania must be well informed about the coal situation because he said that I did not know but little about it. I ask what was the production of coal, let us say, 2 years ago? How many tons of coal were produced?

Mr. GAVIN. I cannot give you the exact figures right now.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Can anyone give us the figures?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. About 2 years ago, the production of coal was 630 million tons.

Mr. GAVIN. And what is it today?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. About 400 million tons.

Mr. GAVIN. In other words, production of coal has gone down 230 million tons.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Now my question is this: 630 million tons of coal were produced. If we kept out of this country the million barrels of residual oil which is imported how much coal would be consumed in place of that oil providing coal was used entirely?

Mr. GAVIN. I regret that I am not able to give you those figures at this time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Can anyone answer that question? Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is on his feet can answer the question. In other words, how much coal is displaced by this 1 million barrels of residual oil? If 1 million barrels of residual oil were not imported, how much more coal would be used?

Mr. MASON. It amounted to 43 million tons last year.

Mr. GAVIN. Did the gentleman say 23 million tons?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is 23 million tons out of 640 million tons.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman stated that it was 43 million tons.

Now, I might say to the gentleman from Illinois, the coal industry is not looking for sympathy; the men working the mines cannot live on sympathy; they want a solution to this problem, and cutting back oil imports would help. The facts are that the American oil industry has cut back, because of the importation of crude oil, approximately 400,000 barrels a day.

Now, here is the point. Today our daily production is cut back because there is a flood of crude and residual oil coming in, devastating and tragic to the coal industry, and impairing and eventually would seriously affect the oil-conservation programs of the various States, and killing the incentive of independent oil producers to find new reserves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Suppose for the sake of argument we accept this present situation, and suddenly we are catapulted into an emergency somewhere in the world. Our supplies of oil are cut off from Venezuela and the Far East by submarine warfare, and we have not been giving the American independent producers incentives to build up our oil reserves because of present heavy importation of foreign oil. We are going to be in a very trying position to fight any kind of a war unless we have oil. We floated to victory on oil in World War I and World War II and the Korean war. The petroleum industry turned in a magnificent performance. They should be encouraged and not discouraged.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Apropos of what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] said a moment ago, it depends on whose congressional district is affected by this bill whether we are for it or against it. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] comes from the South, and I will wager he has no industrial mills of any importance in his district. I will wager that he does have a big cotton-producing area and he is completely protected by quota for the particular business in his district. I say to all of you, if we vote our own districts we will vote for what is good for the workingmen in our district, and that means that we have to have protection more than we have today.

Mr. GAVIN. I was in Europe in November and December and let me tell you the people of the European countries are doing well for themselves. They are well fed and well clothed and well housed. American business has produced the money to pay into the Federal Treasury to make possible the various programs to bring about their economic and industrial rehabilitation. Today they have, with our help and money, the latest and finest of all types of industrial equipment. With low-paid labor in Europe and in their amazing recovery we are now asked to let down the bars to flood this country with cheap merchandise and materials which will crucify American industry and the worker who by the sweat of his brow is trying to maintain a respectable living. We had better think very carefully about this whole program. I want to be recorded as opposed to this rule because it will have a tremendous impact on the economic and industrial life and welfare and well-being of the American workingman, particularly in the coal fields, which are in a deplorable condition at this time.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. First of all, I do not like the word "flood" connected with oil; but, to be serious, I would like the House to know that many of my colleagues in the coal fields and I have never voted against a foreign-aid bill rule or final passage since 1945. All that we in the coal business have been trying to do is to have this new law permit some consideration. I have never opposed a foreign-aid bill or any bill dealing with foreign aid since I have been here. This time I oppose the rule and the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has again expired.

Mr. GAVIN. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee to give me 3 additional minutes, because some of the Members on that side have used a great deal of my time.

Mr. COOPER. I do not have the time.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to be recorded as opposing the rule, and I hope your American pride in your country will manifest itself today and you will oppose this rule for the welfare of the American people and protection of the American workman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this closed rule.

On Tuesday I went before the Rules Committee along with a number of other Members of the House and urged that an open rule be given on this bill. We are confronted here today with statements by members of the Rules Committee and the Ways and Means Committee that if this closed rule is voted down and an open rule adopted, consideration of this tariff bill may continue for days, and great numbers of amendments may be offered to the bill.

What, may I ask, is wrong with that? Is it not our principal business here to give adequate consideration to all legislation, even though it may require days to do it? Is it not the proper function, as well as the duty, of each Member of the House to offer amendments to every bill which comes up, if in his judgment the bill needs amending?

Furthermore, is it not the right of each Member who is here representing the people in his district to offer such amendments to all legislation which in his judgment may be needed or required? These are not matters of grace or sufferance.

We have been told that the Ways and Means Committee carefully considered this bill, and that as the bill is drawn, it embodies the best thought and judgment of the Ways and Means Committee. I have no doubt that that is true. However, the members of the Ways and Means Committee do not either collectively or individually represent my district in Congress. I was elected to represent it, and I want to exercise my own judgment, not the judgment of the Ways and Means Committee, in giving that representation. I have not deposited my proxy with the Ways and Means Committee, and I do not want to legislate by proxy through the Ways and Means Committee. I want the right to take just as much time as needs to be taken in the consideration of this bill, and to offer amendments to the bill, discuss them on the floor of the House, and give the House membership an opportunity to accept or reject any amendments which I may offer.

A closed rule is a gag rule. It deprives the membership of the opportunity to give full and free consideration to pending legislation. The fact that it may require considerable time to give this consideration is no argument against it. What have we been doing here since Congress convened on January 5 which makes time such a precious element now? Most of the time we have been meeting just 2 days a week, and staying in session only a short time on those days. We are not pressed for time. We have all the time necessary to consider thoroughly this bill and all amendments which may be offered to it, even though it may require the balance of this week and all of next week.

This is one of the most important bills which will come up during this session of Congress. Whatever it may contain when it is finally voted upon, it is going to have a lasting and far-reaching effect upon our economy, our industry, our agriculture, and our working people.

In my judgment, this bill grants too much authority to the Executive. It enlarges to a great extent the authority previously possessed by the Executive. I think it goes too far. I think it should be amended to include safeguards and afford protection to certain of our industries which are threatened with great injury through the flooding of our markets with articles manufactured in foreign countries by cheap labor, which, in some instances, is paid only one-tenth the average hourly wage paid to workers in similar industries here in America. This kind of cutthroat competition is ruinous to our workers and to our industries.

I voted to extend the reciprocal-trade legislation last year. I would like to vote to extend it again. But if this closed rule is adopted, and the bill, as it is now written, comes up for adoption on the final vote, I shall vote against it. I cannot support the bill in its present form, although I would like to see it amended in certain particulars so I would be able to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of H. R. 1 and opposed to amendments which will in any way cripple its purpose of increasing our two-way trade with the rest of the world. But I believe that the closed rule, House Resolution 142, is too tightly closed, and that some measure of amendment should be permitted. I have confidence that the Committee on Rules can come up with a rule which, without allowing unlimited amendment, nevertheless permits a debate and a vote on the major issues of policy presented by H. R. 1. I am equally confident that the valid principle which H. R. 1 expresses will prevail over such amendments.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the whole trouble with our reciprocal trade program is that it is not reciprocal.

Today, United States tariff rates are at the lowest point in our history, averaging only 5.1 percent of the value of affected imports. In fact, today's average tariff is 68 percent lower than it was in 1937. To cite a few examples for comparison: the average French tariff is 10.6 percent; Switzerland's tariff averages 8.1 percent of imports; and Great Britain's average is 25.6 percent. This last figure is actually 20 percent higher than it was in 1937.

The average individual in America today thinks that America has a tariff on every article imported from a foreign nation. This is not the case. In point of fact, of the some $10.8 billion 1951 imports, over $6 billion consisted of products which entered this country under no tariff or quota limitations whatever. Of the remaining $4.8 billion, only $3 billion were subject to import quotas or tariffs high enough to affect in a substantial way the import volume. Most of this $3 billion consists of agriculture products, which fall within the price-support program, and finished manufactures.

One of the domestic American industries most seriously affected by this lack of reciprocity is the textile industry. In a 3-year period, the number of textile employees has declined approximately 260,000 of which some 40,000 were in the South. The United States 1953 tariff rate on imported cotton manufactures was 21.55 percent and on synthetic textiles, 19.7 percent. On imports of cotton manufactures, the United Kingdom, on the other hand, charges a tariff up to 30 percent; Italy, up to 25 percent; Germany, up to 30 percent; and Canada, up to 27½ percent. To further compound the inequity, the average hourly wage of an American industrial worker is $1.79; the average hourly wage of a French industrial worker is only 46 cents.

Compared with America's 19.7 percent tariff on synthetic textiles, India charges 50 percent; Italy, 25 to 27 percent; Norway, 22 percent; and France, 20 to 25 percent.

Another glaring example of how other nations with which America trades have failed to reciprocate on tariff concessions is found in the automobile industry. America's tariff on foreign automobile imports is 10 percent. Japan charges 30 to 40 percent; India, 63 percent; France, 15 to 30 percent; and the United Kingdom, 15 to 33⅓ percent. However, the tariff imposed is not the only restriction to automobile importation in England. Additional duties and taxes bring the consumer price in the British market of 1 of the 3 low-priced American cars up to approximately $6,000.

Not only is the American tariff lower than that of most of her trading Allies, but the wage differential works a serious competitive handicap on the American workingman. As noted before, the average hourly wage of an American industrial worker is $1.79. In France, it is 46 cents; in Switzerland, 57 cents; in West Germany, 44 cents; in the United Kingdom, 47 cents; in Italy, 35 cents; and in Japan, only 19 cents. So it is that three factors operate in concert to the detriment of the American businessman and American workingman; namely, first, a low American tariff; second, foreign commodities produced by foreign labor with substandard wages; and, third, high foreign tariffs which restrict America's export volume in the foreign market.

I fully realize that those who support the theory of completely free international trade do so under the conviction that America ultimately will gain economically by importing on a duty-free basis, all those commodities which can be produced cheaper in foreign countries than they can be produced in America, and that America should produce for domestic consumption and foreign export only those commodities which she can produce more cheaply than a foreign nation. Such a philosophy, to my mind, is a little heartless, because it envisions the ultimate extinction of many small American farms and industries in which the principal cost factor is skilled or unskilled labor.

We, in the United States, have, in recent years, fostered high labor standards and high wages. We outlaw child labor and sweatshops. We prohibit interstate shipment of prison-made goods. We insist upon fair competition through antitrust laws. We impose social-security and unemployment-compensation taxes. We establish minimum wages. We require workman's compensation. We enforce a variety of other rules and regulations designed to enhance the lot of the American workingman. These laws have contributed much to our national welfare but, at the same time, they have necessarily increased the sale price of our American commodities in the foreign market.

Those free-traders who profess such a vital interest in the consumer will have to admit that America could produce goods cheaper and in greater abundance if we permitted child labor and sweatshop conditions. The question is whether it is morally right for us to sanction such conditions abroad by lowering or removing the tariffs on foreign commodities produced cheaper with substandard wages. Such a policy not only encourages a continuation of lower labor standards in foreign countries but lowers the labor standards in America by forcing American labor to compete with underpaid foreign labor.

The international free traders do their best to minimize the impact of their policy on the individual American industry directly concerned in a particular tariff structure. Occasionally, they will go so far as to admit that their policy will annihilate a certain American industry. But they never seem to be willing to consider the secondary repercussions of their policy.

Perhaps the best example of these secondary repercussions is to be found in the American transportation industry. To the uninitiated, the unrestricted importation of cheap foreign residual fuel oil might seem to have no bearing on the railroad industry. But it does. I will try to translate the total number of barrels of residual fuel oil imports in 1954 into railroad wages lost in Virginia's Sixth Congressional District.

The three Pocahontas railroads, the Norfolk & Western, the Chesapeake & Ohio, and the Virginian, have some of their most important terminals in Roanoke and Clifton Forge. Of the some 386.4 million tons of domestic bituminous coal production in 1954, about 92 million tons were originated by these 3 railroads. This amounts to 23.8 percent of the total. Total importation of foreign residual oil in 1954 was 134.8 million barrels, most of which was dumped along the eastern seaboard, capturing important coal markets. Total coal displacement was approximately 31.6 million tons. Applying the 23.8 percent ratio, the three Pocahontas lines lost over 7½ million tons of coal cargo. At the rate of $3.56 per net ton, the total freight revenue loss was $26.7 million. On the N. & W. line, approximately 47 percent of operating revenue goes into wages. Using this ratio as an average, the total loss in wages to the 58,541 employees of the Pocahontas railroads was about $10.6 million. Approximately 10,000 of these employees work in our sixth district, which means that the total wage loss in the sixth district was about $2 million.

Like the ripples from a rock dropped in a pond, this wage loss spreads across the entire surface of our economic lake. Farmers, grocerymen, barbers, theater owners, professional men, wholesalers, and retailers feel the shock. Railroad workers unemployed swell the welfare rolls and dislocate the job picture in other industries.

Now what is the rock that is dropped in the pond? What is causing this loss of wages and disrupting our economic life? Nothing more complicated and nothing more simple than the unrestricted importation of a foreign commodity produced as a waste byproduct by foreign interests through the exploitation of cheap foreign labor. The international do-gooders, proclaiming pious platitudes about opposing quota limitations to help our less fortunate neighbors in foreign lands, may as well admit that the only ones this policy helps are the big foreign oil men and that this help is given at the expense of our own American industry and our own American workingman.

While the American coal industry and associated industries naturally have a personal interest in supporting a quota limitation, we as legislators have a broader interest which, I submit compels us to agree with their position, and that interest is the national interest. Our national economic strength and military security depend in large measure upon our natural resources and our capacity to transport them from point of production to point of consumption. In the event of enemy attack, our mobilization potential will be gaged, not by coal in the ground but by coal in the furnace. Coal in the ground cannot become coal in the furnace unless we continue to maintain and further refine the technical know-how and operating skill of the mining and transportation industries. This cannot be achieved unless we are willing to protect these industries from unfair competition from abroad.

Out of a sincere and abiding conviction that the House, as well as the other

body, should have a free and unabridged right to work its will on this legislation, I shall vote against the closed rule. If the rule is passed and individual Members are given no opportunity to amend the bill, I shall vote to recommit the bill to committee for further study and amendment. If the bill is not recommitted and amended, I shall vote against the bill in its present form.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to considering the questions of reciprocal trade agreements under a closed rule.

The matter of reciprocal trade agreements is of great importance to our Nation as well as the other nations of the world. We must have a wise and proper program of foreign trade. It is very important that we work out programs of both imports and exports which will benefit our Nation and all our citizens.

That the people of the Third District of Ohio, which district I have the honor to represent in this House, are deeply interested is attested by the very heavy mail I have been receiving on this subject.

It seems to me, therefore, that because of the extreme importance of this legislation that full opportunity should be given the Members of this House to fully and properly consider each and every amendment that may be offered. It is also my conviction that this legislation is too important to be rushed. Sufficient time should be taken so that the resulting legislation will have been fully and carefully considered and therefore will be sound.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues said that Calhoun would turn over in his grave if he knew what was going on here today. I am telling you that the framers of the Constitution would turn over in their graves if they knew that the men and women elected to represent the people of this country were delegating their authority to the State Department, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Rules Committee.

We should take into consideration the fact that we represent the interests of the people and not turn that power over to somebody else.

I am opposed to this closed rule. Those who advocate it have not come forward with one proposal to help the distressed areas of the United States; not one proposal. If they would come up here and say: "We are going to do something for the coal, glass, and textile industries," it would be different.

We who are opposed to the closed rule hope that should an emergency come upon us we would be in position to meet it. Formosa is at a critical stage. Nobody knows what is going to happen tomorrow. We must accept our responsibility, look at the facts and say we are going to take care of the coal, glass, textile, and our other major industries in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to voice my opposition to this rule, which would prohibit amendments to H. R. 1. I wish first to emphasize that I wholeheartedly support the basic purpose of H. R. 1. Like so many others my age I learned the hard way, by being in combat in World War II, that this Nation cannot be isolationist, cannot go it alone, and cannot bar its doors to the flow of trade. I know that we must act in full concert with all the other free nations of the world, so that the economic and social health of all trying to stem Soviet expansion and designs will be strong. I fully understand that we are but one in a family of nations, which like any family group has its individual members interdependent on each other. Our own great land is more blessed in many respects than some other members of the family of free nations, and I accept the great moral obligation we have to those less fortunate.

However, it is one of the most basic tenets of familial relationship that each household in a family group has certain obligations to its own members, obligations which in the nature of things are primary. These involve matters essential to their welfare and survival. I must therefore, Mr. Speaker, speak up on behalf of such members; they are the people of southern Illinois. It is my duty to do so; that is what I am here for.

In southern Illinois we have an area in our own great Nation that is suffering such acute distress that it is beyond my capacity to describe it to you. Suffice it to say that it is classified IV–B by the Department of Labor, which means a very substantial surplus of labor. This means over 30,000 unemployed, over 24,000 families on food relief. Why, Mr. Speaker, why should this happen in our land of plenty? Because the source of their livelihood, the coal and fluorspar industries of southern Illinois, is being strangled by competition from beyond our shores.

We have a most serious obligation to our own people. We must assure them the means to a decent living. It is for this reason that I am against this rule, it is for this reason I seek amendment to H. R. 1, which this rule would prohibit, to provide my own people with the opportunity to earn their living and to provide our own native industry a chance to survive. Mr. Speaker, unless this rule is defeated, I will be compelled to vote against the entire trade bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the difficulty of many Members of the House on this bill; we all have our own problems in our own districts, but this is a question that affects the whole country. When the chips are down, I think certainly Members will exercise the right to do what we think is in the best interests of the country as a whole.

It has been recognized ever since I have been on the Rules Committee that bills of this type should be considered, as a practical matter, under a closed rule. The original bill setting up this program, as I recall, and the extensions in 1953 and 1954 were considered under closed rules. Nobody seemed to object at that time; as a matter of fact, both the majority and minority members of the Ways and Means Committee came before the Rules Committee and joined in the usual request that that committee makes of the Rules Committee for a closed rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's statement is absolutely correct; it has always been understood and accepted. And I might make the further observation that as I sit here and see men from New England and other sections in the North rise and say they are going to vote against ordering the previous question I wonder if they realize that if the previous question is voted down they are faced with having a quota on imports of oil voted into the bill. They are going to be faced with that. If they are against the rule, they should vote for the previous question and then vote against the rule.

It is my belief that the rule ought to be adopted, because it has been the custom and the practice without regard to which party has been in control to consider bills such as this under closed rules.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the gentleman from Virginia ever known of a tax or a tariff bill that was not considered under the same type of rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have just stated that it has been the uniform practice since I have been on the Rules Committee, and I have been on it many years. That is done as a matter of practical necessity.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, and then I must decline to yield further.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will agree, I think, that in 1951 the same type of bill was brought up under an open rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I believe that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the practical situation and the reason why the rule is brought in here in this way. The members of the Ways and Means Committee know it, the Members of the House who have been here for some years know it. If you bring a bill of this type in and permit as many amendments as could be offered from every section of the country, to suit the special need of every district, by the time you got through with the bill you would have it loaded down with so many amendments you would have to recommit it to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Now, that is the practical situation and it is a practical situation. I am told that there are some 350,000 items subject to the tariff law, which means if you carried the thing to its ultimate absurdity there could be 350,000 amendments of-

fered to this bill. Many of them would probably be voted up.

What are you going to do? There seems to be some intimation here that maybe the Ways and Means Committee is arbitrary about this matter and wants to govern the House or rule the House. There has been the same intimation that the Rules Committee wants to do the same thing, that the Rules Committee wants to run the House. Let me say, and I think this ought to be said once and for all, that the Ways and Means Committee cannot do anything to this House that a majority of the House does not want done. The Rules Committee also cannot do anything to this House that a majority of the House does not want done.

What the Ways and Means Committee does and what the Rules Committee does is that on the best judgment that we have, considering all the practicalities of the situation, we present to you our recommendation, a recommendation that as a practical matter this bill should be handled in this manner. If the House does not like it, if a majority of the House does not want it, you do not have to take it, you can vote it down. But that is the democratic way of doing it, that is the way the rules of the House provide it shall be done.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has said as to the practice in the past. He has referred to the immediate past 2 years during which on this side we had the responsibility, and I had the responsibility as the majority leader. If my memory serves me right, in the Republican 80th Congress when we extended the Reciprocal Trade Act we likewise had a closed rule. I also agree with the gentleman that experience has indicated that that is the proper way to proceed. Certainly, speaking for myself, we followed that practice when I had the responsibility and I am not going to be inconsistent now and reverse my position because at the moment the responsibility has shifted to the other side.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The Members of the House may be surprised, I suppose, when I say that I shall vote for the closed rule. Last year when I had a desperate fight on tax revision and other legislation, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] was in the minority. I asked him to cooperate with me for a tight rule to get that legislation through. He did it. I told him I would reciprocate. I am doing that on this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from New York confirms what I have said that he and the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee appeared before the Rules Committee with the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee and recommended this type of rule which is the customary type of rule in connection with bills of this kind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the House Rules Committee on Tuesday in opposition to the granting of a closed rule on H. R. 1, and I am objecting to a closed rule today. Such a rule deprives the membership of the opportunity to work its will upon a piece of legislation that is of the most vital importance to our country. Time after time, we Members who represent districts in which are located chemical plants, glass plants, pottery plants, and coalmines have spoken about the serious problems confronting those industries. We have begged and pleaded and importuned for recognition of the disastrous conditions which prevail in many areas, and our efforts have been in vain. As a consequence, I believe, and I know that my belief is shared by others, that the only way relief and protection will be given to our domestic industries and the American people will be by sheer force of numbers in amending the bill that is before us. We can only do this under an open rule which will permit us to go over the bill piece by piece and word by word and amend it in such a way that the escape clause will no longer be a joke as it has been under the prevailing setup. We must not dare, in the face of critical world conditions, to permit the continued destruction of our domestic industries.

The present Trade Agreements Act does not expire until June. We have ample time in which to study this legislation. We are not facing an immediate deadline, and it behooves us to assume the responsibility which is ours under the Constitution.

I urge the Members of this House to take a firm stand against a closed rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 207, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—178

Addonizio	Cannon	Fountain
Albert	Celler	Frazier
Alger	Chase	Frelinghuysen
Allen, Calif.	Christopher	Friedel
Allen, Ill.	Church	Gary
Anfuso	Cooley	Gathings
Arends	Cooper	Gordon
Ashley	Coudert	Gregory
Avery	Cramer	Griffiths
Ayres	Crumpacker	Gubser
Bass, N. H.	Cunningham	Hagen
Bass, Tenn.	Curtis, Mass.	Hale
Bates	Davidson	Haley
Bennett, Fla.	Deane	Halleck
Blatnik	Delaney	Harden
Boggs	Derounian	Hardy
Boland	Diggs	Harris
Bolling	Dingell	Harrison, Nebr.
Bolton, Frances P.	Dollinger	Harrison, Va.
	Dolliver	Harvey
Bonner	Dondero	Hayworth
Bowler	Donovan	Herlong
Boyle	Dorn, N. Y.	Heselton
Brooks, La.	Durham	Hinshaw
Brooks, Tex.	Evins	Holifield
Brown, Ga.	Fallon	Holmes
Brownson	Fascell	Holtzman
Broyhill	Fine	Hope
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford	Hull
Ikard	Martin	Rutherford
Johnson, Wis.	Matthews	St. George
Jones, Ala.	Merrow	Schwengel
Jones, Mo.	Miller, Md.	Scott
Karsten	Miller, Nebr.	Sheehan
Kelly, N. Y.	Mills	Sheppard
Keogh	Morano	Sikes
Kilburn	Moulder	Simpson, Ill.
Kilgore	Multer	Smith, Miss.
King, Calif.	Murray, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Kirwan	Murray, Tenn.	Springer
Klein	Norrell	Teague, Tex.
Kluczynski	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas
Knutson	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, N. J.
Krueger	O'Neill	Thompson, Tex.
Lankford	Passman	Thornberry
LeCompte	Patman	Trimble
Lesinski	Pelly	Udall
Long	Pillion	Vanik
Lovre	Poage	Vinson
McCarthy	Preston	Weaver
McCormack	Price	Wharton
McCulloch	Priest	Wier
McDowell	Rabaut	Wigglesworth
McVey	Ray	Williams, N. J.
Macdonald	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Machrowicz	Reuss	Wright
Madden	Rhodes, Ariz.	Younger
Magnuson	Rodino	Zablocki
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Zelenko
Marshall	Rooney	

NAYS—207

Abbitt	Fernandez	Osmers
Abernethy	Fino	Ostertag
Adair	Fisher	Patterson
Alexander	Fjare	Perkins
Andersen, H. Carl	Flood	Pfost
	Flynt	Philbin
Andresen, August H.	Fogarty	Phillips
	Forand	Pilcher
Andrews	Forrester	Poff
Ashmore	Fulton	Polk
Aspinall	Gavin	Quigley
Auchincloss	Gentry	Rains
Bailey	Granahan	Reed, Ill.
Baker	Grant	Rees, Kans.
Baldwin	Gray	Rhodes, Pa.
Barden	Green, Oreg.	Richards
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Riehlman
Baumhart	Gross	Riley
Beamer	Gwinn	Rivers
Becker	Hand	Roberts
Bell	Hays, Ohio	Robeson, Va.
Bennett, Mich.	Henderson	Robsion, Ky.
Berry	Hiestand	Rogers, Colo.
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Bosch	Holt	Roosevelt
Bow	Hosmer	Sadlak
Boykin	Huddleston	Saylor
Bray	Hyde	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	James	Scherer
Buchanan	Jarman	Scrivner
Burdick	Jenkins	Scudder
Burleson	Jennings	Seely-Brown
Burnside	Jensen	Selden
Bush	Johansen	Shuford
Byrd	Jonas	Simpson, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, N. C.	Sisk
Canfield	Kearney	Smith, Kans.
Carlyle	Keating	Staggers
Carnahan	Kee	Steed
Carrigg	Kelley, Pa.	Sullivan
Cederberg	Kilday	Taber
Chatham	King, Pa.	Taylor
Chelf	Knox	Teague, Calif.
Chenoweth	Laird	Thompson, La.
Chudoff	Landrum	Thompson, Mich.
Clark	Lane	
Colmer	Lanham	Thomson, Wyo.
Coon	Latham	Tollefson
Corbett	Lipscomb	Tuck
Cretella	McDonough	Tumulty
Curtis, Mo.	McIntire	Utt
Dague	McMillan	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	Mack, Ill.	Van Zandt
Davis, Wis.	Mason	Velde
Dawson, Utah	Metcalf	Vorys
Denton	Miller, Calif.	Vursell
Devereux	Miller, N. Y.	Walter
Dies	Minshall	Watts
Dixon	Mollohan	Westland
Dodd	Morgan	Whitten
Donohue	Moss	Wickersham
Dorn, S. C.	Mumma	Widnall
Dowdy	Natcher	Williams, Miss.
Doyle	Nelson	Williams, N. Y.
Edmondson	Nicholson	Willis
Elliott	Norblad	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winstead
Feighan	O'Hara, Minn.	Withrow
Fenton	O'Konski	Wolverton

NOT VOTING—49

Belcher	Hays, Ark.	Morrison
Bentley	Hébert	Powell
Bolton,	Hess	Prouty
Oliver P.	Hill	Radwan
Buckley	Hillings	Reece, Tenn.
Budge	Hoeven	Shelley
Chiperfield	Horan	Short
Clevenger	Jackson	Sieminski
Cole	Johnson, Calif.	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.	Kean	Spence
Dempsey	Kearns	Talle
Eberharter	McConnell	Wainwright
Ellsworth	McGregor	Wolcott
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Yates
Garmatz	Mailliard	Young
George	Meader	

So the previous question was not ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Dempsey against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.
Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Cole against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Reese of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Spence with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Yates with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Jackson.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Mr. PASSMAN, and Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MILLER of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I have offered simply provides for an open rule which will permit the time on the bill not to exceed 2 days of general debate. It is exactly the same sort of rule as the one we had before us except it strikes out the gag or closed rule portion.

The adoption of this amendment will permit the House to work its will and to offer any amendment that is germane to H. R. 1 when it is considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Actually this is the same as the 1951 rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This is practically the same as the 1951 rule. It is an open rule. The 1951 rule, if I remember correctly, provided for 5 hours of general debate. The amendment I have offered permits the time on the bill not to exceed 2 days of general debate.

Mr. FLOOD. Outside of that, it is the usual rule?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Outside of that it is the usual open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman going to yield time?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia require time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know that I desire to say very much about it except that as a practical matter I feel the bill should be considered under the closed rule.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to open this up to general amendments under the 5-minute rule, it would be hardly necessary to have as much as 2 days of debate. I was wondering if the gentleman would not be willing to cut general debate and get on to the final matter of amending this bill which, unless I am very much mistaken, will take you a good many days.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman desires, I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment to reduce general debate to 1 day or to have 5 hours of general debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would suggest the amendment that we reduce it to 1 day of general debate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend my amendment by inserting "5 hours" instead of 2 days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has yielded me a half hour?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman a total of 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the House on this last vote has done a most unusual thing and under the circumstances a very dangerous thing. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is adopted and we go into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of offering and considering amendments, I wonder what kind of situation some Members who are interested in certain amendments are going to find themselves in from the practical standpoint? You may get your amendment on and then you would feel compelled to vote for whatever came out of the Committee of the Whole even though there were a dozen amendments adopted that you seriously objected to.

Only once in the history of the House in 42 years in my memory has a bill of this kind and character been considered except under a closed rule. How long it is going to take, how far afield you will go, I do not know. There are some people who are against any kind of reciprocal-trade arrangements. It is perfectly proper that they should vote for an open rule and cripple the bill just as much as they can. But if a closed rule is adopted, they will have the opportunity to vote on a motion to recommit which may be substantive and they can register themselves at that time. But to proceed in this fashion, in my opinion, is a great mistake.

Let me tell you something about the labor situation. Everybody wants labor employed at good hours, at reasonable wages; but suppose we do not trade with the rest of the world. Money does not cross the ocean to balance trade between country and country; it is surplus goods for surplus goods. And, we are no longer a debtor nation; we are the great creditor nation of the world. We are no longer a small producing nation; we are the greatest surplus-producing nation upon the face of the earth, and we have got to have it so that we can trade freely with the rest of the world, or our factories will close and more thousands upon thousands of laboring men will be turned out of their jobs just because we refused to trade goods for goods with them.

We are living in a complex civilization. We are the leaders of the world as a democracy. We have been challenged for the leadership of the world, and we must assume it and carry it out, or neither the United States of America nor any other place will be a fit place to live. We are the strongest nation upon the face of the earth from an economic standpoint, and we have become that because we have traded with the other nations of the world.

So, as an old friend to all of you, as a lover of the House of Representatives and its procedures, I ask you to vote down this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. If we vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that will bring the vote upon the rule as it was adopted by the committee; will it not?

Mr. RAYBURN. On the original rule, that is correct, and I think that is the

proper procedure, and then everyone can vote as he thinks best and according to his conscience.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. He has been here 42 years, and I have been here only 30 years. But this is not the situation as he portrays it so far as I am concerned. This is a fine opportunity for the House to work its will. Many of you Members here have stood up many times and said, "I am against a gag rule." Now is the time for you to work it out. How can you do it? What can you do here? You can pass the motion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and then we can go to work. There will not be more than 4 or 5 amendments offered. You Members who represent the textile industry can get together; you men who represent the coal industry can get together, and you others who have been sadly abused can get together and offer your amendments, and we can adopt them or vote them down. Then you will have had a chance.

The thing for you to do is to support this amendment and let us go to work and get something done which we can do ourselves.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that before we vote on this amendment that every Member of this body should thoroughly understand exactly what we are doing. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio prevails, it means that for the first time in many, many years we will attempt to write on the floor of this body a tariff bill. It means that the various groups and interests who for one reason or another feel that they have been aggrieved will do just exactly what my distinguished friend from Ohio said a moment ago; they will get together and then have the finest exhibition of logrolling that we have had in this body in many, many a year.

If we want to do that, all good and proper. But I should like to address myself first to my colleagues from the South. To me it is fantastic that in our great section of the country, where we must export 60 percent of our rice, 40 percent of our tobacco, 30 percent of our cotton, where our economy is closely tied in with the trade of our Nation with other nations of the world, that we should lend ourselves to this proposal which can only mean in the ultimate the scuttling of the Trade Agreements Act; because that is what is involved here.

Insofar as my good friends on the left are concerned, I find myself in the position of speaking for the program of the President of the United States. What is the history of this legislation? Two years ago the President said, "Let us study the matter." We continued the trade-agreements program for 1 year. Thereupon we gave him the authority and the power to create a commission, which was created, and known as the Randall Commission. That Commission was made up of Members of this body, of the other body, and of the public at large. That Commission reported back to the Congress of the United States and made its recommendations, last year.

Thereupon, in March of last year, the President of the United States transmitted a message to this body embodying substantially the recommendations of that Commission. They were not considered at that time by the Ways and Means Committee, but we instead adopted another continuing resolution for 1 year.

At the beginning of this session, the first economic message of the President of the United States dealt with this program. He called it a moderate program. Believe me, it is a moderate program. Many people have recommended that we extend trade agreements for at least 5 years. Many, including those who studied the program on the President's own Commission, have felt that the escape clause and the peril point were too broad, not too thin, as some contend.

So we continued that language, with additional safeguards. Now by a series of, shall I call them concerted actions—one industry collaborating or getting together or logrolling, or whatever you want to call it, with another, in order to influence a majority of the Members of this body to defeat the President's program—they want to send a message out to the world that we are turning the clock back and are abandoning the reciprocal-trade program.

I hope the House will vote "no" on this proposal.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], I should like to say that if the gentleman were frank with you he would tell you that the State of Louisiana has an import quota on Puerto Rican and Cuban sugar. He ceased to be a free trader back in 1934. He is a high protectionist now. And he is accusing me and other people here who want a chance of some little protection of their own, of being high protectionists. I think that is all I need to say about the gentleman's remarks.

It is with regret that I have to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of our beloved Speaker. But let me remind the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], whom we have highly honored for many years, that we handled this same legislation under an open rule in 1951. I offered, and we approved, the so-called escape-clause provision that Mr. Dulles and other people justified before the committee, and said, when asked about it, that they thought it should remain in the legislation. There is nothing wrong with the escape clause. The only trouble with it is that the Tariff Commission and the State Department and the President have gone about it to see that the escape clause is not carried out by circumventing the Tariff Commission.

I can assure the distinguished gentleman from Texas that not over 4 or 5 amendments will be offered to this legislation when we go into the Committee of the Whole. We want the escape clause clarified. We want an opportunity to decide whether we are going to have an import quota on residual oil to protect the coal industry. There are perhaps 1 or 2 more major amendments that will be offered, but I can assure you that will be the limit of it. So do not let them drive you into undoing what you have just done. You decided by your vote when you beat the motion for the previous question that you wanted to open this up to give all Members an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill. You are doing that now, and you will do it when you adopt the substitute resolution offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], which is exactly the same rule under which we operated in 1951.

I am willing to trust my colleagues of the House. If we from West Virginia cannot win an import quota on residual oil, we will take our licking, as we always have in the past. This is not the first time we have asked for these things. All I am asking you is that you give us the chance to present our plea before the House. If we cannot convince you of the merits of the case, then do otherwise. In the meantime, stand firm. Let us go through with what we have started.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Why not amend the rule and confine it to amendments that were offered before the Committee on Ways and Means, and have the House vote on that, instead of having a number of amendments offered that were not even considered by the Committee on Ways and Means? I repeat, let us amend the rule so that only those amendments can be offered that were considered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the Speaker of the House. I do not believe that since I have been here I have differed with him more than once or twice. I not only have great respect for him but I hesitate to oppose him on the floor; but I feel that I should make clear my opposition to this rule. However, I have supported the reciprocal trade agreements program in the past. I still think we ought to support it.

I have great respect and admiration too for the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] who is follow- the illustrious Cordell Hull of his State.

However, now that it has come home to me that this peril point and the escape clause are insufficient to protect those industries that are threatened actually with destruction, I simply cannot go along unless this bill is changed so as to make effective those clauses that were intended to protect industries that were about to be destroyed.

I went before the Committee on Ways and Means and very frankly told them of my fears for the textile industry in the

South. In their wisdom they did not see fit to strengthen the protective clauses. The only thing I am interested in here now is strengthening these clauses that will protect our industries. I shall not offer any amendment, and I hope no one else is going to offer an amendment to exempt the textile industry or any other. All I am interested in here is in strengthening these clauses so that if this industry or any other industry is threatened, as I believe the textile industry is, by the importation of textiles from Japan made by cheap labor where the wage scale is about 13½ cents an hour as compared with our wage scale in America of $1.32 an hour. If you will do that, I promise you so far as I am concerned, I will not offer or support any amendment to exempt any special industry. The only thing I am interested in is making these clauses effective, and the only way we can do that, as I see it, is to make the recommendation of the Tariff Commission final in these cases. The executive department has set up what is called a Committee on Reciprocity Information. The purpose of that committee is to gather information which will enable the President to contradict what the Tariff Commission has told him in its findings. It is set up for that purpose. In only 2 cases out of 10, as I recall, has the President followed the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. I say that we ought to stick to our vote and I ask you to vote for this motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat reluctant to take the floor at this time, but in fairness to the men and women who are employed in every industry in America, I feel I must do so. The district which I have the honor to represent is a large textile district, but I would take the same position I am now taking if there were not an industrial plant anywhere in that district today. The position I take is one which I think is fair. I think it is honorable, and I certainly think it is American. I certainly yield to our distinguished Speaker in number of years of service for he was a Member of this House before I was born but I do not yield to the Speaker or any other Member of this House in my devotion to America and to men and women of America who work for a living. On this last vote which was just taken, I think every Member of the House knew the issue which was being voted upon. It was to obtain the right of the Members of the House to once again assume the sovereignty of the legislative body, which we are. This bill, H. R. 1, is favored in principle by all of us. All of us are for it in principle. I know that every Member of the Georgia delegation is for it in principle. I know I am for the basic principle of reciprocal trade, but I am not for this rule, any other rule, or any piece of legislation which would yield the sovereign authority of the House of Representatives to the executive branch of the Government or some international conference at Geneva. The House of Representatives must assert its own sovereignty in matters of legislation and particularly on matters which are close as they were in the Committee on Ways and Means which reported out this bill. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule in its present form, and I ask the Members of the House to have the courage to stand fast on the position which they have just taken.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for permitting me to have 4 minutes. I want to say I listened to your remarks with a great deal of interest and with a great deal of respect. Also to my very good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I might say to you both that your years in this House—your experience, eminently qualifies you to present to us your thinking on legislative proposals, and that I have a very high regard and deep respect for your judgment. However, it is quite evident today, from the action that the House has taken, that we, representing the various districts throughout the United States intend to recapture some of the things that rightfully belong to us, and that is protection of American industry and its workers. This vote today is evidence that the House is not satisfied with the present setup and it is regrettable that we have to resort to the technique we have to secure recognition and consideration from those who are handling these reciprocal-trade agreements. These reciprocal trade programs should work both ways. Those handling these programs seemingly have an utter disregard for the problems of our respective districts and the industries upon which they depend for their existence. You might appeal to them but they pay little or no attention to your appeals. It seems they are just interested in seeing how they can develop and protect the economic and industrial areas all over the world but not those back home. When we come to them with a problem, such as cutting back the heavy imports, well, a study is being made and a report will be submitted relative to coal, oil, and gas, but we still are waiting on the report from the Cabinet Commission headed by Arthur Flemming. Let me say that my State, the great State of Pennsylvania, is having the toughest time of its life for its very industrial existence. Today the Pennsylvania grade crude field is producing only 40,000 barrels of oil, which is a trifling amount in a Nation producing 6½ million barrels a day; we are fighting for our very existence in the petroleum industry. Hundreds of people are gainfully employed in the industry. Continual heavy imports will affect these employees. We have 80,000 wells producing 40,000 barrels of oil, or about one-half a barrel per well per day. We have to compete with the wells in Venezuela that produce several thousand barrels a day which is tough competition. Certainly we are entitled to some protection from this form of competition. For instance in 1947, they were importing some 350,000 barrels a day and today they are up to 1,200,000 barrels a day. So it is about time to cut back on these imports so the American independent producer can exist. This whole program should be developed so that the American workingman and the American people have an opportunity to live. Each year our own national production of oil goes down and imports go up. If we are suddenly catapulted into an emergency, if our supplies are shut off from Venezuela and Iran, we would be in a very serious position. Today we are killing the ambition of our people to increase our production of oil. The other day I received a book about an inch thick on the development of a South American country. I was surprised at the work and study that went into publishing such a volume. Nobody publishes a book on the deplorable conditions in the coal industry or what we can do and how we can do it, to afford relief in the distressed coal areas existing in Pennsylvania and the other coalfields of the various States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the splendid remarks made by our beloved and distinguished Speaker with respect to the question now presented to this House for consideration.

I would like to give my colleagues the benefit of a few facts, especially with respect to the cotton textile industry about which some have spoken here today. The fact is that we export ten times more cotton textiles than we import. The facts show that in 1953 our cotton textile production was 10 billion square yards. Of that amount we exported 600 million square yards and we imported only 50 million square yards. That is an illustration of the facts that prevail with respect to this legislation.

Your Committee on Ways and Means gave thorough and careful consideration to all of the facts that were available and presented, and we have presented this legislation for your consideration.

I strongly urge that the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], be voted down and then that we vote for the rule presented here by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it would be well to clarify the parliamentary situation: If the motion of the gentleman from Ohio is voted down then we still have a vote on the rule.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. And just one other point: The Secretary of Labor appearing before our committee stated that 4⅓ million jobs in this country are involved in our foreign trade.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For a parliamentary inquiry only.

Mr. BAILEY. Was the gentleman's motion in the form of a substitute or an amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It, of course, was an amendment to the rule. The gentleman I think knows that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I regret to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished leadership of the House. I concede that it would be easier to gag ourselves and escape the responsibility which is placed upon us by the Constitution, but I believe that we can trust ourselves better than we can trust any agency of this Government. If we cannot trust ourselves, we cannot trust some agency of this Government.

I believe the House will exercise great restraint and good judgment in deciding the various issues which will be presented in the course of the debate and the amendments to the bill. As for me, I am tired of this argument that we ought to delegate power to someone else because we cannot trust ourselves to discharge the responsibility which under the law we owe this country.

I voted for the reciprocal trade program from the beginning, but I believe it has been abused. I believe they have failed to take into account the will of the Congress as expressed in the act. I think there have been many injustices and I believe the whole question should be opened to the House. We ought to consider the arguments, be guided by the facts, and do that which is in the best interests of the country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. As it stands now, the Reciprocal Trade Act is a one-way street. What we should do is to make it a two-way street to protect the bread and butter of the American worker in competition with the rest of the world.

Mr. DIES. I agree with the gentleman. We have passed through a period of internationalism until some people think more about what will happen to the Hottentots than what will happen to our own people. I think charity ought to begin at home. I am still an old-fashioned American who believes that we ought to consider first the interest of our country. I think some people in our country are suffering as a result of unfair competition and the importation of the products of cheap pauper labor.

I want to hear the facts. If the proponents of an amendment fail to support their position with logic and with argument and with facts, I will be against it, but I think the time has come when the membership has to face the responsibility we owe the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have played an active part in the Committee on Ways and Means as we listened to the dozens upon dozens of witnesses who came in front of that committee either speaking for H. R. 1 or opposing it. I suggested awhile ago that the controlling factor which every person who appeared in front of that committee—and I am going to make no exceptions—was the interest of that Member of Congress or that other individual in what was good for his congressional district or what was good for his industry or his business. That applies to the man who is a Member of Congress or to the man engaged in exporting or importing or the man who manufactures largely for the trade here at home. I do not consider that selfishness. I consider that the American way of conducting business; to look after your own, to take care of the people in your own town, within your own congressional district, and I am not a bit surprised when a Member of Congress stands up here and says that the little business, if you please, in his congressional district has not been able to get the relief which he knows is needed for that industry and for that district.

Frankly, it is ridiculous to have somebody come from a Government agency and tell a committee of this Congress that there is no unemployment in my congressional district or in your district, that there is no industry in your district which is badly affected by the importation of goods coming in here too cheaply. It is foolish on their part, it is unrealistic and to you who know differently it is just absurd, so absurd in fact that given the opportunity which you had a few minutes ago to speak up and say aloud and publicly: "What I want to do is to protect the jobs in my congressional district" you did so.

Now it is being suggested that having marched up the hill you will turn around and march down again, that having made a record which someone can look at and say: "You voted to protect the business of your congressional district, you made that record," now you are going to walk down the hill again. I do not believe you will do that.

Consequently I ask you to support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. What would be the consequences of supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio? In the first place, the chairman in charge of the legislation will be the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. This is my first opportunity as a member of the Ways and Means Committee to express a word with respect to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], who conducted the hearings in which I think I played an important part. He conducted those hearings fairly and he impressed me. So I went around to his office after the hearings closed and said to him as directly as I could: "Mr. COOPER, I want to compliment you upon the fair and diligent way in which the hearings were conducted."

On the Republican side of the aisle is the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] than whom there is no fairer Member of Congress to be in charge of the legislation. Both of these gentlemen are long experienced in the legislative processes. Each of those gentlemen knows that we can handle this legislation, giving every Member of Congress the right to be heard in a constructive manner, not rising to suggest dozens or hundreds of little amendments, about which you have heard this afternoon, but in the 5 hours of general debate to gradually evolve certain categories in which certain amendments will fall and which will be acted on by the House in the Committee of the Whole under the guidance of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

There will be constructive legislation come out of that on problems of greatest importance to your congressional districts. You owe it to the people of your district to know exactly what goes on and not have some committee, and I am referring to my own committee, write this legislation behind closed doors.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman will recall that in 1951 we had an open rule on a similar piece of legislation. Can the gentleman tell the House how long it took to consider that piece of legislation?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Really, I cannot recall so far as the facts are concerned. I recollect I had a part in it, as did many others. I think we did it in one day, maybe 2 days, whatever it was.

Let me tell you this: In that bill to which the gentleman refers we passed on the floor the escape clause on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and the peril-point provision, which are the only two pieces of legislation in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that give any relief whatever. I wish you would listen to this. The escape clause and the peril point are the only sections in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which give any possibility of hope to a businessman who suffers today, and that was written right here on the floor, and that is one of the categories where we must do something, namely, by improving the escape clause, if we are going to protect industry back home.

Mr. COLMER. I think it rather important to clarify that. The gentleman's recollection is that it was one day. Would the gentleman say that it was not more than 2 days?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It makes no difference. It was done here on the floor in an open meeting, a result openly arrived at and satisfactory to everybody.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in an effort to answer the question?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Like the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, it called for 5 hours of general debate.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Let me put it this way: What we did that day gave the one and only way for relief to a business or the man who lost his job as

the result of too low a tariff, and we did that here on the floor, and we should improve it in this legislation before us now.

Someone suggested that this amendment should be changed, that only amendments could be considered which were considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. It would not be satisfactory to limit amendments to those considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, because, as a matter of fact, we were forced to move very rapidly, and amendments of importance were not offered in that committee.

No, gentlemen. Under the guidance of these two distinguished gentlemen, the chairman and the former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I know that this House can and will rise to its responsibility and will perfect legislation properly amending and extending the reciprocal trade-agreement program.

I believe in the reciprocal method of making agreements. I am opposed to the kind of agreements which we have been making, particularly as they have been treated by foreign countries. Do you know that there are more restrictions against free trade today, more restrictions today, than there were back in 1932 when we started this so-called reciprocal trade-agreement program? And, we have traded away the high tariffs we had in that day; but the other countries have imposed barriers after having implied or agreed that they would not do so.

So, gentlemen, it requires a far higher degree of Yankee trading—which is what we were told the reciprocal trade agreement provided for, Yankee trading—we require a far higher degree of Yankee trading than we have had at any time in the past.

I urge that the House adjust itself to this problem and adopt the amendments which will give protection to American industry and the American farmer who needs protection if he is to maintain a market here at home first and after that have a market abroad to sell his produce.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time of the House but for a very few moments. The situation which confronts us is simply this, as I understand it. The House has voted down the previous question on the rule as it came from the Committee on Rules. By that action it made it possible to amend the rule. I am convinced that the House took the action it did in voting down the previous question because of a desire on the part of a majority of the House to have an open rule and an opportunity to offer amendments to H. R. 1 and have them considered on the floor of the House in the usual manner.

Now as I understand the situation, if the amendment which I have offered, an amendment which simply provides for an open rule in the usual manner with 5 hours of debate, should be voted down, then the rule remains exactly as it was when it was introduced; it remains a closed or a gag rule. The question will then arise as to whether or not the House which just a few minutes ago voted down the previous question, thereby indicating its desire to have an open rule, wants to turn around and march down the hill again and vote for a closed or gag rule as it was in its original form.

For the purpose of clarifying the situation, Mr. Speaker, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to ask the Chair whether or not, if this amendment is voted down, the question will then arise on the adoption of the original rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair answered that question when he had the floor, when the question was asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. That is the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood the reason for the opposition to the gentleman's amendment to be that the Members of the House did not have the ability to write an amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know why the opposition arose. But certainly the House did express its will in voting down the previous question. Certainly it did indicate to every thoughtful person that there was a desire here by a majority of the membership of this House to have an open rule. And it was for that reason that I offered this amendment. And if this amendment is adopted, Members of the House will have an open rule and the opportunity to work their will on this bill. If the amendment is defeated, then the only question before the House will be whether the House wants to adopt a closed or gag rule or whether it wants to defeat the rule entirely and send the resolution back to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I was a member of the Randall Commission. I approved its recommendations. I approve the general principles expressed in H. R. 1. But I do not feel that the Randall Commission necessarily possessed all the wisdom in the world or that the great Committee on Ways and Means possesses all the wisdom in the world. I think this Congress is about as good as the Congress was in 1951, when we considered trade agreement extension under an open rule. I am supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I want to repeat—and then I am through—that the only question before the House in voting this amendment, the only point, regardless of all the oratory that has taken place, is whether the House wants an open rule or whether the House wants to reverse itself and go back to the closed or gag rule, which will prevent the Members of the House and other Members of Congress from working their will on H. R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. BAILEY demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 191, nays 193, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—191

Abbitt	Fenton	Nelson
Abernethy	Fernandez	Norblad
Adair	Fino	O'Brien, N. Y.
Alexander	Fisher	O'Hara, Minn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Flood	O'Konski
	Flynt	Osmers
Andresen, August H.	Fogarty	Ostertag
	Forand	Patterson
Andrews	Forrester	Perkins
Ashmore	Fulton	Philbin
Auchincloss	Gavin	Phillips
Bailey	Gentry	Pilcher
Baker	Granahan	Poff
Baldwin	Grant	Polk
Barden	Gray	Rains
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.
Baumhart	Gross	Reed, Ill.
Beamer	Gwinn	Rees, Kans.
Becker	Hale	Rhodes, Pa.
Belcher	Hand	Riehlman
Bennett, Mich.	Harden	Riley
Berry	Hays, Ohio	Roberts
Betts	Henderson	Robeson, Va.
Blitch	Hiestand	Rogers, Mass.
Bosch	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Bow	Hoffman, Mich.	Saylor
Bray	Holt	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	Hyde	Scherer
Buchanan	James	Scrivner
Burdick	Jarman	Scudder
Burleson	Jenkins	Seely-Brown
Burnside	Jennings	Selden
Bush	Jensen	Shuford
Byrd	Johansen	Simpson, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Canfield	Jones, N. C.	Staggers
Carlyle	Kearney	Steed
Carnahan	Keating	Taber
Carrigg	Kee	Taylor
Cederberg	Kelley, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Chatham	Kilday	Thompson, La.
Chenoweth	King, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Chudoff	Knox	
Church	Laird	Thomson, Wyo.
Clark	Landrum	Tollefson
Colmer	Lane	Tuck
Coon	Lanham	Utt
Cretella	Latham	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Lipscomb	Van Zandt
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Velde
Dague	McDonough	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	McMillan	Walter
Dawson, Utah	McVey	Westland
Denton	Macdonald	Whitten
Devereux	Mack, Ill.	Wickersham
Dies	Mason	Widnall
Dodd	Merrow	Williams, Miss.
Donohue	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.	Minshall	Willis
Dowdy	Mollohan	Wilson, Calif.
Edmondson	Morgan	Winstead
Elliott	Moss	Withrow
Engle	Mumma	Wolverton
Feighan	Natcher	

NAYS—193

Addonizio	Bolling	Cooper
Albert	Bolton, Frances P.	Corbett
Alger		Coudert
Allen, Calif.	Bonner	Cramer
Allen, Ill.	Bowler	Crumpacker
Anfuso	Boykin	Curtis, Mass.
Arends	Boyle	Davidson
Ashley	Brooks, La.	Deane
Aspinall	Brooks, Tex.	Delaney
Avery	Brown, Ga.	Derounian
Ayres	Brownson	Diggs
Bass, N. H.	Broyhill	Dingell
Bass, Tenn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dollinger
Bates	Cannon	Dolliver
Bell	Celler	Dondero
Bennett, Fla.	Chase	Donovan
Blatnik	Chelf	Dorn, N. Y.
Boggs	Christopher	Doyle
Boland	Cooley	Durham

Evins	Kluczynski	Reuss
Fallon	Knutson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Fascell	Krueger	Richards
Fine	Lankford	Rivers
Ford	LeCompte	Robsion, Ky.
Fountain	Lesinski	Rodino
Frazier	Long	Rogers, Colo.
Frelinghuysen	Lovre	Rogers, Fla.
Friedel	McCarthy	Rogers, Tex.
Gary	McCormack	Rooney
Gathings	McDowell	Roosevelt
Gordon	Machrowicz	Rutherford
Green, Oreg.	Madden	St. George
Gregory	Magnuson	Schwengel
Gubser	Mahon	Scott
Hagen	Marshall	Sheehan
Haley	Martin	Sheppard
Halleck	Matthews	Sieminski
Hardy	Metcalf	Sikes
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Md.	Sisk
Harrison, Va.	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Miss.
Harvey	Mills	Smith, Va.
Hayworth	Morano	Springer
Herlong	Moulder	Sullivan
Heselton	Multer	Teague, Tex.
Hinshaw	Murray, Ill.	Thomas
Holifield	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson, N. J.
Holmes	Nicholson	Thompson, Tex.
Holtzman	Norrell	Thornberry
Hope	O'Brien, Ill.	Trimble
Hosmer	O'Hara, Ill.	Tumulty
Huddleston	O'Neill	Udall
Hull	Passman	Vanik
Ikard	Patman	Vinson
Johnson, Wis.	Pelly	Weaver
Jones, Ala.	Pfost	Wharton
Jones, Mo.	Pillion	Wier
Karsten	Poage	Wigglesworth
Kelly, N. Y.	Preston	Williams, N. J.
Keogh	Price	Wilson, Ind.
Kilburn	Priest	Wright
Kilgore	Quigley	Younger
King, Calif.	Rabaut	Zablocki
Kirwan	Ray	Zelenko
Klein	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—50

Bentley	George	Mailliard
Bolton, Oliver P.	Griffiths	Meader
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Morrison
Budge	Hébert	Powell
Chiperfield	Hess	Prouty
Clevenger	Hill	Radwan
Cole	Hillings	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Hoeven	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Horan	Siler
Dempsey	Jackson	Smith, Wis.
Dixon	Johnson, Calif.	Spence
Eberharter	Judd	Talle
Ellsworth	Kean	Wainwright
Fjare	Kearns	Watts
Gamble	McConnell	Wolcott
Garmatz	McGregor	Yates
	Mack, Wash.	Young

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Cole for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Bolton for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Spence with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Meader.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Yates with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Wolcott.

Mrs. BUCHANAN changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I call for a recapitulation

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the vote is close enough so that there should be a recapitulation.

The Clerk will call the names of those voting in the affirmative.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to inquire of the Speaker if my understanding is correct that on recapitulation no Member can change his vote. The question is only how they are recorded.

The SPEAKER. That is true because the vote has been announced.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Upon recapitulation, if a Member finds that his vote has been recorded incorrectly, he certainly has a right to correct it.

The SPEAKER. That is the purpose of a recapitulation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is what I thought.

The Clerk called the names of those voting "yea."

The SPEAKER. Are there any Members recorded as voting "yea" who are incorrectly recorded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will call the names of those voting "nay."

The Clerk called the names of those voting "nay."

The SPEAKER. Are there any corrections?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I inquire whether or not the name of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] was called?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

On recapitulation, the vote is yeas, 191; nays, 193.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on this I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the previous question has been moved on the rule as originally reported by the Rules Committee, that being a closed rule; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is the way it stands, the gentleman's amendment having been defeated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question. The gentleman from West Virginia has asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will I be given the privilege of asking for a call of the roll on the adoption of the rule?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may have that privilege, if the previous question is ordered.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 193, nays 192, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—193

Abbitt	Frazier	Morano
Addonizio	Frelinghuysen	Moulder
Albert	Friedel	Multer
Alger	Fulton	Murray, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Norrell
Anfuso	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Arends	Gregory	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley	Gubser	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Hagen	Ostertag
Ayres	Haley	Passman
Baldwin	Halleck	Patman
Bass, N. H.	Harden	Pelly
Bass, Tenn.	Hardy	Pillion
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	Poage
Blatnik	Harrison, Nebr.	Preston
Boggs	Harrison, Va.	Price
Bolling	Harvey	Priest
Bolton, Frances P.	Hayworth	Rabaut
Bonner	Herlong	Ray
Bowler	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Boykin	Hinshaw	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boyle	Holifield	Richards
Brooks, La.	Holmes	Riehlman
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Rivers
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Robsion, Ky.
Brownson	Hull	Rodino
Broyhill	Ikard	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Johnson, Wis.	Rooney
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Rutherford
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	St. George
Carnahan	Karsten	Schwengel
Celler	Keating	Scott
Chase	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Chelf	Keogh	Sheppard
Christopher	Kilburn	Sikes
Church	Kilgore	Simpson, Ill.
Cooley	King, Calif.	Smith, Miss.
Cooper	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Coudert	Klein	Springer
Cramer	Kluczynski	Sullivan
Crumpacker	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	Krueger	Thomas
Curtis, Mass.	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Davidson	LeCompte	Thompson, N. J.
Deane	Lesinski	Thompson, Tex.
Delaney	Long	Thornberry
Deroumian	Lovre	Trimble
Diggs	McCarthy	Udall
Dingell	McCormack	Vinson
Dollinger	McDowell	Vorys
Dolliver	Macdonald	Watts
Dondero	Machrowicz	Weaver
Donovan	Mack, Ill.	Wharton
Dorn, N. Y.	Madden	Whitten
Doyle	Magnuson	Wier
Durham	Mahon	Wigglesworth
Evins	Marshall	Williams, N. J.
Fallon	Martin	Willis
Fascell	Matthews	Wilson, Ind.
Fernandez	Merrow	Wright
Fine	Miller, Calif.	Younger
Ford	Miller, Md.	Zablocki
Fountain	Miller, Nebr.	Zelenko
	Mills	

NAYS—192

Abernethy	Bray	Dixon
Adair	Brown, Ohio	Dodd
Alexander	Buchanan	Donohue
Andersen, H. Carl	Burdick	Dorn, S. C.
Andresen, August H.	Burnside	Dowdy
Andrews	Bush	Edmondson
Ashmore	Byrd	Elliott
Aspinall	Byrne, Pa.	Engle
Avery	Canfield	Feighan
Bailey	Carlyle	Fenton
Baker	Carrigg	Fino
Barden	Cederberg	Fisher
Barrett	Chatham	Flood
Bates	Chenoweth	Flynt
Baumhart	Chudoff	Fogarty
Beamer	Clark	Forand
Becker	Colmer	Forrester
Belcher	Coon	Gavin
Bell	Corbett	Gentry
Bennett, Mich.	Cretella	Granahan
Berry	Curtis, Mo.	Grant
Betts	Dague	Gray
Blitch	Davis, Ga.	Green, Oreg.
Boland	Davis, Wis.	Green, Pa.
Bosch	Dawson, Utah	Gross
Bow	Denton	Gwinn
	Devereux	Hale
	Dies	Hand

Hays, Ohio	Minshall	Schenck
Henderson	Mollohan	Scherer
Hiestand	Morgan	Scrivner
Hoffman, Ill.	Moss	Scudder
Hoffman, Mich.	Mumma	Seely-Brown
Holt	Natcher	Selden
Hosmer	Nelson	Shuford
Huddleston	Nicholson	Sieminski
Hyde	Norblad	Simpson, Pa.
James	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sisk
Jarman	O'Hara, Minn.	Smith, Kans.
Jenkins	O'Konski	Staggers
Jennings	Osmers	Steed
Jensen	Patterson	Taber
Johansen	Perkins	Taylor
Jonas	Pfost	Teague, Calif.
Jones, N. C.	Philbin	Thompson, Mich.
Kearney	Phillips	Thomson, Wyo.
Kee	Pilcher	Tollefson
Kelley, Pa.	Poff	Tuck
Kilday	Polk	Tumulty
King, Pa.	Quigley	Utt
Knox	Rains	Van Pelt
Laird	Reece, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Landrum	Reed, Ill.	Velde
Lane	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
Lanham	Reuss	Walter
Latham	Rhodes, Pa.	Westland
Lipscomb	Riley	Wickersham
McCulloch	Roberts	Widnall
McDonough	Robeson, Va.	Williams, Miss.
McIntire	Rogers, Colo.	Williams, N. Y.
McMillan	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Calif.
McVey	Rogers, Tex.	Winstead
Mason	Roosevelt	Withrow
Metcalf	Sadlak	Wolverton
Miller, N. Y.	Saylor	

NOT VOTING—49

Bentley	Griffiths	Meader
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ark.	Morrison
Buckley	Hébert	Powell
Budge	Hess	Prouty
Chiperfield	Hill	Radwan
Clevenger	Hillings	Shelley
Cole	Hoeven	Short
Davis, Tenn.	Horan	Siler
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson	Smith, Wis.
Dempsey	Johnson, Calif.	Spence
Eberharter	Judd	Talle
Ellsworth	Kean	Vanik
Fjare	Kearns	Wainwright
Gamble	McConnell	Wolcott
Garmatz	McGregor	Yates
George	Mack, Wash.	Young
	Mailliard	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Dempsey against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Cole against.

Mr. Spence for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Yates with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, is it not necessary for each Member to qualify on this vote?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the well of the House be cleared.

The SPEAKER. Members will please retire from the well.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What are the qualifications to permit a man to vote?

The SPEAKER. He must have been in the Hall listening but failed to hear his name.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When his name was called?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was in the Hall and heard my name called, but the Clerk went on to the next name before I could answer. I vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the vote of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. He was not on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is out of order. The Chair always takes the word of Members.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the floor on a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair would have to recognize the gentleman, but the Chair believes that he properly answered the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall withdraw my request, but I shall renew it at a later time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to inform the House that therein will be a proposed motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole and to include certain material and information I may deem appropriate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill embodies the trade agreements recommendations of the President and it has been listed by the Speaker as the first major piece of legislation to be considered by the House.

The bill would continue from June 12, 1955, until June 30, 1958, the President's authority to enter into trade agreements. Under present law, his authority ends on June 12, 1955.

In addition to extending the President's authority to enter trade agreements, the President would be authorized by the bill to negotiate tariff reductions by any one of three alternative methods, which may not be used cumulatively:

First, the President would be authorized to reduce by a total of 15 percent tariff rates existing on July 1, 1955, in stages of not more than 5 percent in each of the 3 years of the extension of his authority. Describing this authority in another way, it would mean that the President would be authorized to arrive at a rate which is 85 percent of the rate existing on July 1, 1955. Under this 15-percent authority, the President could not make any decrease after June 30, 1958, with one minor exception, having to do with cases where the President has initiated the reductions under this provision but there has been a nullification due to some other action on his part—such as escape-clause relief, or there has been legislation enacted by the Congress which temporarily nullifies the reduction. In using this authority, the President cannot put into effect a successive step in the up to not more than 5 percent per year reductions until after the previous step has been in effect for at least 12 months. This authority is not contained in existing law.

A second alternative would permit the President to reduce duties by not more than 50 percent of the rate prevailing on January 1, 1945, only in the case of products which are normally not imported, or are normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities. This, in effect, is a limitation on the authority now granted the President, because at the present time the President can reduce rates of duty by 50 percent of what they were on January 1, 1945, without any limitation as to whether or not the products are being imported into the United States. In the case of negotiations which have already been announced and in which Japan will be a party, the President would under the bill be authorized to reduce rates of duty by 50 percent of those existing on January 1, 1945, if the trade agreement with Japan is not entered into until after June 12, 1955. The President already has the authority under present law to make such reductions up to June 12, 1955, and the provision in the bill merely continues this authority for the 3-year period of the extension. However, the authority granted is limited specifically to those negotiations which were announced in November of 1954 and in which Japan is a party. Except in the case of these negotiations, the authority

granted under this alternative is actually a limitation on that granted the President under present law.

The third alternative authority which would be given the President by the bill is that under which he could negotiate reductions in rates of duty which are higher than 50 percent of the value of an imported product and reduce them to 50 percent of such value.

In the case of these three alternatives, the President may decrease a rate to the lowest of the rates which could be arrived at by applying any one of them. However, as I have already stated, he would be prohibited from making cumulative reductions. Also, under these alternatives the President can only make the reductions gradually, because if the total amount of reduction is 15 percent or less, the reduction during any 12 months cannot exceed 5 percent; and if the total amount of the reduction is more than 15 percent, then no more than one-third of the reduction can be given effect during any 12-month period.

As an example of how gradual these reductions would be, take the case of a rate which is 20 percent on July 1, 1955. The President under the 15 percent alternative could reduce this rate of duty to 17 percent. However, he would be permitted to make this reduction by no more than 1 percent at a time, and only after the previous 1 percent reduction had been in effect for 1 year. It can be seen that in addition to permitting only gradual reductions in rates of duty, the bill only permits moderate reductions in rates under this alternative.

The bill requires the President to submit to the Congress an annual report on the operation of the trade-agreements program. This report is to include information on new negotiations, modifications made in duties and import restrictions of the United States, reciprocal concessions obained, and other pertinent information on the trade-agreements program.

The bill contains a proviso that its enactment shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of organizational provisions of any foreign trade agreement entered into under the authority which it grants, such as the organizational provisions of the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

The bill continues the so-called most-favored-nation treatment whereby trade agreement concessions apply to imports of goods from all countries. Under present law it is stated that the President may suspend the application of this treatment to the products of any country or countries which discriminate against our products or engage in other conduct tending to defeat the advantages which we gain in our trade agreements. The committee amended this provision so as to make it mandatory that the President withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from a country after he has had reasonable time to make efforts to get the particular country to cease its discriminatory treatment against American commerce or to rectify other acts or policies on the part of such a country which in his opinion, defeat the purpose of our trade agreements. As under existing law, the most-favored-nation treatment would remain subject to the requirement that the President not extend trade-agreement concessions to imports from Russia and from other nations or areas dominated by the Communists.

The bill requires the President, to the maximum extent that he can, consistent with the purpose of the bill, to avoid the subdivision of classification categories. This provision is designed to prevent further complications of our existing tariff structure, and it does not authorize the reclassification of any article. It merely refers to the breaking up of existing classifications into additional subdivisions in trade agreements.

The bill leaves unchanged the safeguards under the present trade agreements program. This means that full public notice, including a list of products on which concessions may be made by the United States, will be published before negotiations are entered into, that public hearings will continue to be held, and that the peril-point provision and the escape-clause provision of present law will continue in full effect. There was considerable discussion of the escape-clause procedures under existing law during committee hearings and executive sessions. The committee carefully considered all phases of the operation of this provision. It was decided that it is neither necessary nor desirable to make any changes in the law. It was our opinion that discretion should be left in the President to make his decision based upon the findings and recommendations of the Tariff Commission, considerations of our national interest, defense and security, and any other relevant factors which he alone has primary responsibility for under present law. The committee did decide, and we so stated in our report, that we intend to keep the administration of the escape clause under continuing study.

The President would continue to have to report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate whenever a reduction which he makes in a rate of duty exceeds the peril-point finding of the Tariff Commission. Also, the present law, which requires that no reduction shall be made on any article if the President finds that such a reduction would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements, is not affected by this bill. In addition, the President—pursuant to the recommendation of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy—has instructed the Trade Agreements Committee that in its negotiations no tariff concessions should be granted on products made by workers receiving wages that are substandard in the exporting country.

The bill also provides that no provisions in a trade agreement can be given effect in the United States in a manner which is inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States. This provision insures that provisions of existing law such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act cannot be impaired by any provision in a trade agreement.

At this point, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a typographical error in the report on the bill. On page 63, in the table setting forth the estimated value of United States exports in 1937 and 1953 to countries with which trade agreements are now in effect, in the last column—having to do with percent increases from 1937 to 1953—opposite "United Kingdom and dependencies," the figure should read "20.5" instead of "205."

Since 1934 the reciprocal trade-agreements program has been an essential part of our foreign economic policy. Our foreign economic policy and our overall foreign policy cannot be disassociated. As President Eisenhower has stated:

> If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all. Our domestic employment, our standard of living, our security, and the solidarity of the free world—all are involved.
>
> For our own economic growth we must have continuously expanding world markets; for our security we require that our allies become economically strong. Expanding trade is the only adequate solution for these two pressing problems confronting our country.

An expanded foreign trade is in our own enlightened self-interest just as much as it is in the interest of the peace and security of the other nations of the free world.

As the Secretary of State declared:

> The failure, at this stage of world affairs, to rededicate our Nation to liberalize trade policies, and to do so for a 3-year term would have grave consequences.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have heard some speculation on the floor of the House as to what the effect would be if no trade legislation of any kind were passed in this session of the Congress. To what would we revert and what would be the effect? The gentleman has partially referred to it but I think not completely.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the gentleman's bringing that up. If we abandon our trade-agreements program now, we would eliminate any opportunity that the President would have to negotiate any further trade agreements.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am getting at this fact: Would the Smoot-Hawley tariff remain in effect? Is it in effect, in other words, as a backer-up of this bill and previous legislation, or would we revert to something else?

Mr. COOPER. We would continue to operate under trade agreements that are now in existence.

Mr. HINSHAW. So long as they existed?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; so long as they existed, but there would be no authority for the negotiation of any other trade agreements.

Mr. HINSHAW. What is the approximate average time limit on these trade agreements? Is it 2, 3, or 5 years?

Mr. COOPER. They continue under the terms of the agreements until notice is given by one of the contracting parties of a desire to alter, change, or terminate the agreement.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the answer I wanted.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. What greater authority is given in this act than has existed heretofore?

Mr. COOPER. No greater authority except the additional discretionary authority to the President that I pointed out before with respect to the 15 percent over a period of 3 years, not to exceed 5 percent a year, and the other alternative provisions I mentioned earlier in my statement. In some instances, as I pointed out, the President's authority actually would be eliminated. But all of the safeguards, such as the peril point, escape clause, and the provision known as the Symington amendment of last year with respect to the national defense—all those provisions are continued, and are not affected in any way by this bill.

Mr. BONNER. They are retained in this bill?

Mr. COOPER. They are continued as the law of the land and in no way affected by this bill.

Mr. BONNER. Well, how far did the President have the authority to go—to the degree of 15 percent?

Mr. COOPER. Of course, under the original act in 1934, he had authority to reduce rates not to exceed 50 percent. Then, in 1945, additional discretionary authority was granted to the President to reduce rates by not more than 50 percent of the rates in effect at that time.

Mr. BONNER. So, altogether, it could have been as much as 15 percent or more?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, yes. This 15-percent authority is very moderate.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. What definition does the gentleman put on the words "substandard wages in foreign countries"?

Mr. COOPER. That is a direction by the President to the trade-agreements committee.

Mr. DURHAM. Who makes that determination, the Tariff Commission?

Mr. COOPER. No. The committee which makes recommendations to the President as to concessions which might be made in a trade agreement with another country.

Mr. DURHAM. Whether that country is using substandard wages in the production of an article in competition with ours?

Mr. COOPER. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask whether that is a substandard wage in that country or substandard wages to us?

Mr. COOPER. Substandard wages in the country seeking to export goods to us.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand the history of this legislation, there has never been any extension in which the power to negotiate was as limited as in this extension in that there was never any extension where there was a limitation of 15 percent, not more than 5 percent in a given year, in a trade negotiation. Am I correct?

Mr. COOPER. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the United States Tariff Commission send a report to the committee making some critical references about this bill?

Mr. COOPER. The Tariff Commission sent a report to the committee which was read in full to the committee in executive session. This is our usual procedure in the case of such reports.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any part of it in this report?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know that there is any part of it in the report on this bill, but the entire report of the Tariff Commission, at the request of our distinguished friend from New York [Mr. REED] was read to the Committee on Ways and Means in executive session. It is my recollection that each and every suggestion of the Tariff Commission was taken care of. As you know it is usual for all committees of Congress to consult with interested departments and agencies in drafting legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Can I read that report?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Is it a secret report?

Mr. COOPER. It was reported to our committee. That is also the usual practice.

Mr. GROSS. Well, in other words, is it a secret report? Is it available to Members of Congress?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know that it has been released. We do not usually release to the Members or the public reports which we have requested.

Mr. GROSS. Will it be released?

Mr. COOPER. As a matter of fact I think it was carried almost in full in the Wall Street Journal, or at least was commented upon rather fully in that paper.

Mr. GROSS. I do not happen to take the Wall Street Journal, but I certainly would like to see this report.

Mr. COOPER. I have not read it here, but I have heard that it was carried in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me why it is in the nature of a secret report?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know that there is anything secret about it. It is just a report to the Committee on Ways and Means, and it is still there. As I stated, we do not usually release such reports.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Who makes the determination as to substandard wages in another country?

Mr. COOPER. The committee which includes representatives of the Department of Labor makes the determination before making recommendations to the President as to the concessions which will be included in a trade agreement with that country.

Mr. MORANO. In other words, our committee then determines whether or not a substandard wage is being paid by another country?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. If we so determine, there is no reduction in the rate?

Mr. COOPER. That is under the instruction of the President to the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. In the report it itemizes the commodity and the product of each country that is exported. Is there any information available as to commodities, outlined in each one of these countries under the Trade Agreements Act, imported into this country?

Mr. COOPER. When proceedings are started looking to the negotiation of a trade agreement, our various departments of the Government that constitute the Committee on Reciprocity Information, listed in the report, from all of the information available, make up a list of products on which the United States might possibly make concessions in the negotiations. That list is published, and full public hearings are held and all available information is secured before any negotiations are undertaken at all.

Mr. HARRIS. I notice in the report here, I assume for the information of not only the Members of the House but anyone interested, on page 64 the statement:

United States exports of products subject to trade agreement concessions.

I assume this is for comparative purposes; it shows United States exports for 1937 and 1953. Then it lists the commodities exported. Is there any such table of commodities imported, for the years 1937 and 1953?

Mr. COOPER. I do not recall that we did at the moment, if I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. As I recall, that information is not in the committee report.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not find it there.

Mr. MILLS. There are publications that the gentleman may obtain from the Department of Commerce which give full and complete information on imports for any year in which he may be interested; classifications of imports, the country of origin, and so on. All the information the gentleman may seek can be obtained from the Department of Commerce. The committee does have those publications in its possession.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the committee must have that. It occurs to me that it would be enlightening for the Members of the House if that information were included in order that we may have the information for imports as well as export.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will come by the desk, I shall show him one of these publications and he will understand why we did not include them in

the report. They are rather voluminous and very detailed.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure our distinguished colleague will observe that the report is 86 pages long. We were a bit concerned whether we had not already made it too long and whether we would be able to get our colleagues to read it for that reason. Of course, if this considerable volume of additional material were added, it would have been that much longer.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I might say, from the action that we have seen here today that the Members are more interested apparently in imports than they have been interested in exports. I think that is a very vital point. I think this is a very informative report on the effect that the program is having in our country because of exports of our own products.

Mr. COOPER. That is important, and I would invite attention of the Committee of the Whole in passing that on page 12 of the committee report, under "E. Appendixes," they will see we have included quite a number of appendixes to this report, and each one of those includes very vital and valuable information on this program.

It has been my privilege to have been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means ever since the inception of the reciprocal trade agreements program. I have always fully supported the program, and it is my firm conviction that it is one of the most important programs ever established by the Congress in the field of international relations, and that it has at the same time contributed materially to our own domestic well-being.

This program as extended and improved by the pending bill will contribute just as much to the stability and security of all the free nations in the world, including ourselves, as our military alliances and international organizations, because it takes a strong economy before any nation can be a strong ally. As the Secretary of Defense stated in his testimony before our committee:

> The stronger our allies are economically and militarily the better for both them and ourselves. * * *
>
> International trade must be a two-way street. Such trade provides the most effective way to improve our relations with our allies on a long-range basis. It is just as important as any military agreements which we might work out.

The United States, as the greatest creditor nation in the world, should, and must, take the leadership in enlarging world trade.

The main impediment to an expanded market for our own production is the shortage of dollars on the part of friendly foreign nations. The most affirmative way of helping to reduce and eventually eliminating this shortage is the lowering of trade barriers on a collective basis by the free nations of the world. The trade and tariff restriction policies of each country in the free world have an effect on free world trade.

We must realize that although it seems to be a common belief in this country that we are self-sufficient this is not a fact. We were to a great extent in days gone by; however, that situation has changed. The reason for this change is due to the growth of our population, our ever-increasing per capita consumption, and the consequent depletion of our resources. To the extent that we use tariffs unnecessarily, we accelerate the exhaustion of our resource reserves, and our dependence on foreign supplies is thereby progressively increased.

Even though we may be able to produce many of the essentials which we need, other nations in the free world cannot. The things which they can produce are limited, and they must trade in order to exist. If we do not trade with them, they will be forced to trade elsewhere, and in most cases this can only mean with Communist-dominated areas. We need allies who will cooperate with us, not because they feel that it is necessary in order to secure our economic and military aid but as free and equal partners in a united front against communistic subversion from within and aggression from without. The most shortsighted thing we could possibly do is to isolate our allies between a tariff curtain and the Iron Curtain.

We must remember also that from our own selfish interest we have a greater stake in expanding world trade than any other country in the world. We export around 20 percent of the goods in world trade and import about 15 percent. There is no segment of our economy which does not benefit from this world trade. In the case of agriculture, we are exporting the products of our farms which represent the production of from fifty to sixty million cultivated acres. This is an area equivalent to the combined cultivated land of Mississippi, Tennessee, Louisiana, Kentucky, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

The produce of about 1 out of each 10 acres of our cropland is exported. In 1953, we exported almost 50 percent of our total production of rice, 26 percent of our total production of tobacco, 24 percent of our total production of cotton, 21 percent of our total production of soybeans and products, and 19 percent of our total production of wheat—and in 1953 the exports of these items had fallen off considerably from what they were in 1951, when even higher percentages were being exported.

We all know how important exports are to our farmers. We also know that when these exports are reduced, there follows lower prices, increased surplus problems, and there can follow acreage restrictions and marketing controls. These are some of the direct effects. In addition, cropland is diverted from the production of agricultural products for export to the production of other agricultural products for domestic consumption. This means that even those farm products which are not exported suffer due to increased competition in our domestic markets. There is probably no segment of our economy that has a greater stake in an expanded foreign trade than agriculture.

In the case of another very important segment—labor—it was estimated by the Secretary of Labor in his testimony before our committee that 4⅓ million jobs are attributable to work generated by our foreign trade, both export and import. Some have estimated that not over 100,000 workers would be threatened with the loss of their jobs from increased imports, even if we should provide a hypothetical reduction across the board of 50 percent in all our present tariff rates. I do not know the accuracy of either the figures of the Secretary of Labor or of this estimate; however, I am firmly convinced that whatever may be their accuracy, they do give an approximate indication of the net stake which labor has in our export and import trade.

Our commerce and industry also has a vital stake in expanded trade among the countries of the free world. We exported in 1953, 45 percent of our production of our tracklaying tractors, over 12 percent of our total production of refrigerators, 6 percent of our total production of cotton cloth and duck, and similar percentages of our total production of many other of our manufactured products.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] inserted in the daily RECORD at page A953—which the Members have available to them—a reprint from the Foreign Commerce Weekly of June 28, 1954, published by the Department of Commerce, entitled "Producers Have a Big Stake in Exports." This reprint shows over a period of several years, what the percentage of exports of our total production of both agricultural and nonagricultural commodities have been. A study of these tables indicates that our country indeed has a big stake in exports.

I would like to again point out to this Committee that all the safeguards of existing law are maintained by this bill, such as the peril point and escape clause procedures, the provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1954 that no reduction shall be made in the duty on any article if the President finds that domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements would be threatened, and in addition the President, pursuant to the recommendation of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, has instructed the Trade Agreements Committee that in its negotiations no tariff concessions should be granted on products made by workers receiving wages that are substandard in the exporting country.

In addition to the maintenance of these safeguards, the bill itself provides that the reductions authorized can only be made gradually.

There are three main ways in which we can deal with the problem of our export trade, which trade is vital to our prosperity: First, we can make outright gifts of dollars to foreign countries with which to buy our goods; second, we can decrease the sale of our goods to foreign countries; or, third, we can expand import trade and thereby expand our export trade. There seems to be only one choice which any reasonable person could make, and that is to continue and moderately liberalize our present trade-agreements program, as would be provided in this bill.

The enactment of this legislation will mean increased prosperity here at home and rising levels of economic activity abroad.

Never before have we needed allies who will join with us as equal partners in our common front against Communist aggression as we need them today. An expanded foreign trade to back up our military treaties is an essential part of the common defense of the free world.

I urge that the bill be enacted.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemena yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman has given the House a very clear explanation of the measure. Today there was great concern about the Congress losing control of the measure, once it was enacted. Since this measure will be administered by the Tariff Commission, is not the Tariff Commission an independent agency?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, yes.

Mr. DURHAM. And is it not subject only to the Congress then?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. That is true. It also furnishes information to the President, of course.

Mr. DURHAM. What I am getting at is the point that we are not losing control of this. The Congress still has control of it by the fact that it is an independent agency, subject only to the control of Congress?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly. The Congress under this bill retains all the control it has today and has had all along.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to take this occasion to commend the distinguished dean of the Tennessee delegation, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for the very splendid address which he has given the House. His statesmanlike approach to this whole problem is typical of the gentleman. I think he has made a most forthright and able presentation of this very important question, and he has been the champion of freer trade advocated by Cordell Hull, the father of the Reciprocal Trade program, and the gentleman is a worthy successor to that great statesman. I commend him.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. And I have noticed the rapt attention which Members of this House have given to the gentleman's able address.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. The resolution which we adopted this afternoon provides that after the adoption of the resolution general debate shall start and shall be confined to the bill and shall continue for not to exceed 2 days. My question is, Starting debate at 4:15 in the afternoon, as we did today that the adoption of the resolution, does that constitute a legislative day?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would answer the gentleman that this would be a matter for the committee to decide. The present occupant of the chair understands that the day is not divided by the House or by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Then this would or would not be called a legislative day so far as general debate upon this bill is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chair that when the Committee of the Whole rises after concluding debate on this subject today that would constitute 1 day.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] consumed 44 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Can the Chair inform us what time it is proposed to meet tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. The House will meet at 11 o'clock.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 1.

I will not dwell on the reasons for my opposition in any great detail. They are set forth starting on page 23 of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on this legislation. I recommend the minority views expressed therein to your attention.

I would like to discuss at some length what I consider to be a very alarming aspect of this bill. Whether this bill passes or not, I say this to you—not a single Member of this House can say with any certainty what are the powers that H. R. 1 grants. Not a single Member of this House can say with any certainty what the ultimate effects of H. R. 1, if enacted, will be. I do not intend that statement to be in any sense a reflection on the intelligence of this House. You could not be expected to know the answers to these questions because none of the witnesses before our committee were able to provide them.

You have been told that this bill grants authority for an across-the-board cut of 15 percent in any existing tariff. You have also been told that it authorizes cutting in half any existing tariff on commodities being imported in negligible quantities. Finally, you have been told that the bill authorizes a reduction down to 50 percent of any tariff above that figure.

No evidence was produced before our committee as to the articles which will be affected by these proposed reductions. Not one single attempt was made to explain why 15 percent is an appropriate general reduction. Absolutely no information was given our committee as to why 50 percent as distinguished from some other percentage is the proper amount to which all rates in excess of that figure should be lowered. Nor were we given one iota of information as to what commodities are deemed to be imported today in negligible quantities. Nor were we told what tests would be employed in determining negligible imports. Nor were we told why a reduction in the tariffs on such imports by 50 percent was appropriate. Mr. Chairman, in all its hearings on this vital legislation our committee obtained no facts from the proponents of the bill as to the likely effect of these proposed tariff reductions upon our imports or exports. Mr. Chairman, I have looked in vain in the majority report for an explanation of these matters. To my great concern, I have found not a word—not one single word—to explain the need and justification for these specific reductions.

However, let us assume for the sake of argument that these reductions are appropriate, although the reasons may be obscure to us, at this time. I make this further statement—not one single Member of this House can say with any certainty what are the ultimate limits of the tariff reductions authorized by this bill. The Randall Commission and the President in his foreign economic policy message both recommended authority to reduce existing tariffs. Now, you might reasonably suppose that that means authority to reduce tariffs as they exist today. But that is not the case, Mr. Chairman, with respect to H. R. 1. H. R. 1 grants these broad powers to cut tariffs, not with respect to the rates now in effect, but with respect to the rates which will be in effect on the 1st of July of this year—almost 5 months from today. Why is that significant?

It is significant because negotiations are now about to get underway with Japan. It is contemplated that those negotiations will result in significant tariff concessions by the United States. Secretary Dulles expressed the hope to our committee that those negotiations would be concluded prior to July 1. Moreover, you must understand this—every tariff reduction granted to Japan in these negotiations will be extended automatically to every other non-Communist nation of the world. As a result, it appears probable that we will have an entirely new tariff schedule, affecting textiles, chinaware, glassware, chemicals, and a host of other items, before July 1. It will be those new rates which no one can predict with any certainty whatsoever today to which the new 15 percent reduction authority granted in H. R. 1 will be applied. That is why I say, Mr. Chairman, that not a single Member of this House can say with any degree of certainty what the reductions are which H. R. 1 authorizes. Certainly, no member of the State Department or the Tariff Commission can give you such information. It is not available. We have never before, in previous extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Act, delegated authority whose scope was so completely unknown.

For the first time, in addition to a simple extension of the President's existing authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign governments, H. R. 1 grants these broad additional powers—to make agreements relating to tariffs, to most-favored-nation standards, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and—listen carefully to this—to any other matters relating to trade designed to promote purposes similar to any of the foregoing.

Mr. Chairman, what does this new language mean? I do not know. I do not think any member of our committee knows. We were told that this new language simply expresses what the State Department considers its present authority to be. If that is the case, what

is the necessity for it? We were told that it was designed in order to clarify any existing uncertainties. In my mind, this new language creates much more uncertainty than it lays at rest. We have gotten along for 20 years without this new grant of authority. We have entered into trade agreements with some 42 other countries of the world without it. What is the sudden need for this new authority which no one—I repeat, no one—has explained the need for?

Let me speak for a moment about GATT, an international agreement to which the United States is a party. The contracting parties to GATT bind themselves with respect to tariff rates, quotas, countervailing duties, and so forth. In areas in which Congress has not already acted, an agreement within GATT—for example, as to agricultural import quotas—would in practice preclude future congressional action in the same area if such action would be in violation of the GATT agreement.

GATT has never been submitted to the Congress for approval. I am concerned that the sweeping grant of authority which I have just discussed can be interpreted as constituting such approval. The majority included an amendment to the bill providing that its enactment would not constitute either approval or disapproval of the organizational features of GATT. Does not this provision leave a clear inference that the language be construed as constituting approval of the substantive provisions of GATT? I believe this can only be answered in the affirmative, particularly in view of the fact that the majority objected to an amendment offered by me along the lines of the provision included in every recent reciprocal trade act extension to the effect that the act would not constitute approval or disapproval of GATT as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, this is another example of the extraordinary lack of certainty inherent in almost every provision of this piece of legislation. Few Members of this House know what GATT is. Even fewer Members, including myself, can say what H. R. 1 accomplishes with respect to GATT.

There are other aspects of the bill which deserve detailed comment. For example, it was recommended in our committee that the bill be amended to insure that no trade concession could be granted which might impair the national security and that no concession already granted would be permitted to remain in effect if impairment of the Nation's security resulted. This was rejected by the majority.

However, I would like to address myself to the present operation of the so-called escape clause. As you may know, there have been 59 applications for relief under this section. In 15 of these cases the Tariff Commission found injury or the threat of injury, and so reported to the President. In only five of these cases has the President taken action in response to the report of the Commission.

Escape-clause proceedings before the Tariff Commission are lengthy and involve exhaustive public hearings. Every available fact is laid before the Commission. However, in his rejection of escape-clause recommendations, the President has frequently expressed his disagreement with the finding of the Commission as to the fact of injury. This disagreement over the facts has been based upon several grounds.

For example, the President may decide that injury has occurred, not because of imports, as found by the Tariff Commission, but as the result of a nontrade factor, such as a shift in consumer demand. Or the President may base his decision on evidence supplied to him by other agencies, including foreign governments. Or the President may decide that some overriding consideration of the national interest may require disregarding of the fact of injury. It is obvious, therefore, that there is considerable uncertainty in the outcome of escape-clause procedures.

I believe this to be particularly unfortunate when a domestic industry, typically a small industry, goes to great expense of both time and money to pursue its claim before the Tariff Commission, secures a determination by this bipartisan agency that serious injury as a result of imports does in fact exist, and then discovers that the recommendation of the Commission has been disregarded on the basis of other evidence not presented in the proceedings to which it was a party and with respect to which it has had no opportunity to rebut or otherwise explain.

The domestic industry has no appeal from the findings of fact of the Tariff Commission. It has no further forum in which to pursue its case. I believe, therefore, that our legal traditions, as well as elementary principles of justice, require that the findings of fact by the Tariff Commission be conclusive on the President as well as on all other interested parties. I cannot believe it desirable that these findings of fact be set aside on the basis of evidence produced, for example, by a foreign government or a foreign industry and channeled through the State Department outside of the public proceedings and beyond the public forum contemplated by the law.

I was glad to note that the majority in their report on the bill recognized this problem concerning the findings of fact. I think it unfortunate that the majority found no solution to the problem, other than to suggest that the President should give the fullest consideration to the facts as determined by the Tariff Commission. This suggestion is indefensible to me because it suggests that the President does not give such full consideration today. I reject such an implication. The majority suggests that it would be inappropriate to make the findings of fact final because, they state, "in practically every field where administrative or judicial findings are involved the Congress has provided for some review of those findings." This statement overlooks the fact that the courts never admit to overruling an administrative finding which is supportable by the evidence. Nor does a court in its judicial review consider any facts or any evidence not considered by the administrative agency.

The question is not whether the President should be precluded from any review of Commission findings; it is solely whether Commission findings should be set aside regardless of the fact that they are based on substantial evidence, or even regardless of the fact that the finding is the only possible finding from all the evidence in the record.

Therefore, while I also recognize many other inadequacies of the escape-clause procedure, it would seem that, as a very minimum, the findings of fact by the Tariff Commission as to the existence of injury be conclusive. It may well be, and I personally agree, that the President should even in this case not be bound by these findings if he decides that considerations of the national security are overriding.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer a motion to recommit at the appropriate time. The motion to recommit will be with instructions. These instructions will be designed to carry out what I am convinced was the original intent of the Congress with respect to escape-clause procedures. It will be a motion to recommit with instructions. It should be clearly understood by those who are not familiar with this procedure that such a motion, if it carries, will in no way delay consideration of the bill. It is my understanding that a vote on final passage of the bill as amended by the recommittal motion would follow almost immediately. Every Member would thus have an immediate opportunity to cast his vote on the bill as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the language of the motion to recommit which I intend to offer at the appropriate time. It should be understood that this language may be subject to further refinement or addition before it is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to call attention to the fact that there are only about two dozen Members of the House of Representatives on the floor to listen to the excellent presentation by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means on this tremendously important legislation. I want also to again call attention to the unfairness of the rule which made this bill in order for it provided 2 days of general debate. One of those days is now practically consumed and there has been only a little more than an hour of debate. Thus the rule is most unfair in its application to general debate on this occasion. I want the RECORD further to show that I would have made a point of order that a quorum was not present before the gentleman now addressing the House began to speak, were it not for the fact that would only have penalized others who wish to speak in the matter of time.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to thank the gentleman, and I want to

thank the gentlemen on both sides of the House. I realize the hour is late. I recognize how inconvenient it is for many Members, but things so shaped up here that this is the only time I could take without cheating other Members, who are not here, of their opportunity to address this House on what I consider the most important subject that has been before this House.

I should like the Members to think this thing over. All my life I have been a great respecter of the Constitution. I had a great professor on the Constitution in college, and I got very much interested in the Constitution as a charter of liberties which we should all support.

I want to call the attention of the Members to the fact that the commerce clause was considered by the fathers of the Constitution and by the great jurists ever since as the second most important provision in the Constitution. Of course, if we look back and see how they tried to hamper our trade—that is, all the major countries of the world of that day—it is perfectly understandable why they proposed to protect the very heart of this Nation, which is its markets. I want the Members of the House to think this thing over before we, as the Congress, abdicate our responsibility on the second most important clause in the Constitution, according to the jurists and to the framers of the Constitution.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. DORN of New York. Would the gentleman at this time read his motion to recommit?

Mr. REED of New York. I can; it is not very long. It is technical, but I am perfectly willing to read it.

It is as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves to recommit the bill H. R. 1 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 11, line 21, after "SEC. 4.", insert "(a)."

Page 11, after line 24, insert:

"(b) The second sentence of subsection (c) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows: 'If, as a result of investigations and hearings, a majority of the commissioners voting find that a product on which a concession has been granted is (as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession) being imported in such increased quantities (either actual or relative) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or competitive products, such finding shall be final and conclusive and the President shall take action to prevent or remedy such injury unless he determines that the national security requires that no such action be taken. If the President does not, within 60 days, take the action referred to in the first sentence of this subsection, he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating why he has not made such adjustments or modifications, or imposed such quotas'."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, in the extension last year there was some provision that if there was a tie vote in the Tariff Commission the President would break the tie. Would the gentleman's amendment have effect on that provision, or is that provision still carried in the law?

Mr. REED of New York. I think that is in the present law.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The item to which the gentleman from Ohio refers is not affected by this motion to recommit. That determines that where there is a tie vote in the Tariff Commission, both sides of the controversy to which the tie applies shall be sent to the President, and he determines which one of the two he may consider. This refers to a majority vote.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, the tie-vote provision which was a matter of compromise last year is continued under H. R. 1?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is not touched in H. R. I.

Mr. REED of New York. It does not touch it at all.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have very little to add to the excellent remarks of the distinguished chairman of our committee and to the remarks which I have made on previous occasions on trade-agreements legislation, beginning with the establishment of the program and on each extension since that time. I have always stated that this is very good legislation. It has proved itself, and it has been very beneficial to our country. These statements need no proof, because they are predicated on facts and figures based on the operation of the trade-agreements program.

I would like to point out to this Committee that those who claim that this program has harmed them and the country have become so repetitious each time this legislation is under consideration that but for seriousness of the misinformation of these false prophets, it is almost amusing. They return to the hearings held by our committee over and over again, after telling us the last time that if we do not kill the program they will most assuredly perish. The facts indicate that they, generally speaking, become more prosperous year in and year out.

Many of the statements made before the House Ways and Means Committee opposing H. R. 1 have had such a familiar ring that I was led to look back to the debate on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1945 10 years ago.

In 1945, I gave this summary of the testimony before our committee:

Throughout the hearings the minority (opposition) failed to make out a case. Such instances as appeared against the extension of the trade agreements were, for the most part, trying to reinforce the minority with arguments which were based upon unfounded fears. Repeatedly they admitted that thus far they had not been hurt, but they insisted they could not be sure about the future.

Today, 10 years later, I begin to wonder if some of these witnesses have never heard the old fable of the little boy who cried "Wolf." I wonder how gullible they believe we Members of this great Congress are? For example, one of the associations in the chemical industry has testified since 1943 that if the Trade Agreements Act were not amended to give more protection to the chemical industry that that industry would suffer. A few days ago the same association again appeared predicting dire things if the President were granted authority to reduce tariffs further. These fearful words came from spokesmen for an industry that has grown 50 percent in the past 6 years—those years during which we were warned that the effect of the Trade Agreements Act would be seriously detrimental to the industry. American industry as a whole has grown at the average of 3 percent every year for 25 years. The chemical industry has grown at more than 3 times that rate.

Another Cassandra is the independent producer's segment of the oil industry. Since 1940 they have objected to the trade agreements program. Although they have prospered with assistance of a 27.5 percent depletion allowance, they still ask for additional protection for the industry. And they ask for additional protection at a time when the domestic crude oil industry is operating at a near all-time peak. Is it not time for these groups to learn that fallacious cries of "Wolf" soon cease to be believed?

I have consistently supported the trade-agreements program since it was first proposed under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and that great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. I support H. R. 1 with great confidence. During the past 20 years, this program has demonstrated conclusively its positive advantage to the United States economy and to our relation with the rest of the world. It will have the same positive effect in the years ahead.

I regret to see that the critical state of world affairs is now being used by almost all opponents of the trade-agreements program. National defense is too serious a question today to have it used as an argument for special protection to give industries higher profits and less competition. The President and his Cabinet tell us that this bill is essential to our national defense and security, and who is in a better position than they to judge?

I pointed out in 1945 that considerations of our national safety had already been provided for in the administration of the act by the inclusion of representatives of the Defense Department on the group administering the act. Additional safeguards have been added since 1945. Section 2 of Public Law 464, 83d Congress, extending the Trade Agreements Act provides that no action shall be taken "to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds such reduction would threaten domestic production needed

for projected national defense requirements."

If there is a true problem of preserving particular industries or skills for national defense there are ways of meeting those problems that are more precise and effective than restrictions on imports.

I am proud that the representatives of my own great city—the thriving metropolis of Detroit—have not appeared before the Committee as members of the Cassandra chorus opposing H. R. 1. Quite the contrary. Experience has proved to them the value of the trade-agreements program. As the representatives of the Detroit Board of Trade stated before the committee, "dollars earned in the United States by foreign exporters will either directly or indirectly return home through the purchase of goods of United States manufacturers." The Detroit Board of Trade representative stated that they estimated 1 out of every 7 employed in manufacturing in Detroit owed his living to foreign trade to a substantial degree.

I know that Detroit is not unique in the benefit it obtains from foreign trade. Every city and State in the Union benefits to some degree. United States exports reached over $15 billion in 1954. This was at a time when our foreign-aid program had dropped substantially. In fact, as a recent Federal Reserve Board study shows, foreign demand for United States exports in 1954 kept business activity in the United States from declining as much as it would have had it been solely dependent upon the domestic market. Foreign trade acted as a cushion to soften the impact of the recession we had last year.

Over 4⅓ million jobs in the United States are provided by exports and imports by the handling and processing involved. This is a significant contribution to employment in the United States.

Naturally, in carrying out a program of this size there do develop some bruises and minor errors. One instance which I have in mind particularly involves the beverage industry. More specifically, it relates to the discrimination on the part of the Canadians because of their provincial taxes on beer. During the hearings I discussed this situation with the Secretary of State. These provincial taxes have been superimposed upon an already high Canadian tariff on American beers. The result is that it is next to impossible to obtain American beer in Canada.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House not because I feel that the program, by and large, has not operated as we intended it to, but because of the fact that this is one of those instances—admittedly a rather minor one in the overall picture, but of great importance to the beer industry—in which we have had, in my opinion, some errors. This is more of a case of the principle of the program not being carried out than it is a case of the program being carried out. I have, of course, an interest in each and every industry in the country being treated fairly and as intended under this program. I point out the situation in the case of the beer industry because there is a matter of principle involved which illustrates my point very specifically.

I might say that as a result of this violation of principle, I have introduced a resolution which I frankly consider an extreme action, but even as such I feel it is justified. I do not propose that this resolution be adopted now, because traditionally such legislation has not been a part of our trade-agreements legislation, and I do not want to nullify or impair the extension of this program. However, this resolution is pending and is subject to being called up should our committee decide that no other course can or will be pursued to eliminate this discrimination. My reason for introducing this resolution is to strengthen rather than weaken our trade-agreements program.

I am pleased that the bill amends the most-favored-nation provision of existing law so as to make it mandatory that the President, as soon as practicable, withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from a country where reasonable efforts on his part to get a particular country to cease its discriminatory treatment against American commerce, in those cases where such treatment, in his opinion, defeats the purpose of our trade agreements, are unavailing.

I am also pleased that the bill specifies the type of provisions which may be included in trade agreements so as to make it clear that the President has authority to deal with discriminatory treatment and devices against our products. This, in my opinion, should strengthen the hand of the President in dealing with such situations.

There is another matter which has to do with our trade about which I have expressed concern, and that is the 3 cents per pound processing tax on coconut oil. Originally this tax was covered into the Treasury of the Philippine Islands; however, upon our giving those islands their independence in 1946, we in my opinion failed to recognize this and continued to collect the tax, turning it into our own Treasury. The very purpose for the establishment of this tax was violated when this was done. This tax is unfair to American industry, such as the manufacturers of soaps and candies, to whom coconut oil is an essential ingredient of their products, and above all it is an unjustified burden on American consumers. This tax, contrary to expanding trade and promoting friendly relations between us and the Philippines, does just the reverse. If we are to continue collecting this tax, the least we should do is to turn it over to the Philippine Government. The best thing to do would be to repeal it.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the time has long past when we should be satisfied with periodic extensions of the trade-agreements program of from 1 to 3 years. I would like to see the act made permanent, without any loss of advantages or protection whatever to the people and industries in this country. If it were permanent, we all know that Congress always has the power to revise, amend, or repeal in part or whole whenever a law becomes obsolete or is not carrying out our intent. However, I am satisfied with a 3-year extension and I intend to vote for the bill.

I again say that this is a most beneficial piece of legislation, and we ourselves stand to gain more from it than anyone else.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KING].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Maryland and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS and to include an address.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include a statement.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

Mr. BUCKLEY (at the request of Mr. MILLS).

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania) and to include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 1 day, February 17, 1955, on account of official business.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. SCHENCK), on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 18, 1955, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

446. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide running mates for certain Staff Corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

447. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

448. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

449. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

450. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4165. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Thomas Paine; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit employees to deduct their contributions under private unemployment compensation disability benefit plans where such contributions are in lieu of contributions otherwise required by State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4167. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4168. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 4169. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4170. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system of child's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18 but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4171. A bill to permit certain officers and employees of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration paid on a monthly or per annum basis to acquire civil service status; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 4172. A bill to repeal the provision of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, which requires recoupment of certain Federal funds spent for school construction, and to provide for the return of amounts heretofore recouped under such provision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4173. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4174. A bill to provide for grants to teachers' colleges so that teachers may be better prepared to assist in the prevention of narcotic addiction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4175. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to allow containers for certain petroleum products and derivatives to be temporarily imported without payment of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4176. A bill to provide that feed furnished in disaster areas under Public Law 115, 83d Congress, shall be made available for feeding working stock and hogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4177. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require that a farm worker perform full-time agricultural labor for an employer on at least 90 days in a year to be covered under the old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4178. A bill to further define self-employed individuals for purposes of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4179. A bill to amend the Vinson-Trammell Act of March 27, 1934, as amended, to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 146. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to investigate certain practices in administration of acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 147. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 144; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD: Joint Resolution No. 14, Laws of 1954 of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 and subsequent Federal-aid highway acts relative to the use of motor fuel and motor-vehicle-tax receipts for nonhighway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to implement and execute plans and recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers relative to the dredging of Bullock Cove in the town of East Providence; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to pass legislation granting educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II and in Korea; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider revision of the Sugar Act of 1948 in regard to sugar quotas established for domestic sugar-beet production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation granting educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II and in Korea; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting passage of H. R. 247, relating to moneys received from mineral lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4180. A bill for the relief of Mary Ishii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4181. A bill for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting & Decorating Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 4182. A bill for the relief of the Highway Construction Co. of Ohio, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 4183. A bill for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 4184. A bill for the relief of Vera Agnes Dupuis Voorhies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 4185. A bill for the relief of Zabel Vartanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE (by request):

H. R. 4186. A bill for the relief of Emanuel M. Snyder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Leonides Glynos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Jackson Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4189. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Johanna Van Hassel (Glenn) Banks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 4190. A bill for the relief of Wadih Saleh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4191. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4192. A bill for the relief of Yahya Rafi Mayeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 4193. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski, his wife, and their three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4194. A bill for the relief of John Soudas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4195. A bill for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4196. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Nellie Brent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4197. A bill for the relief of Fouad Mikhail Zada, his wife, Sabat Zada (nee Leon or Laoun); and their minor child, Michel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4198. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

104. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Racine, Wis., February 13, 1955, expressing gratitude to our Government, which has never recognized the Soviet occupation of Lithuania and has always demonstrated a favorable attitude toward her cause for independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

105. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dusan Grgas, San Pedro, Calif., relative to her son being admitted to the United States from Yugoslavia as a citizen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

106. Also, petition of Bernard Gelles & Co., New York, N. Y., regarding denial of equality in compliance with Public Law 480; to the Committee on Agriculture.

107. Also, petition of the chairman, Americans of Lithuanian Descent, Portland, Oreg., expressing gratitude to the United States for the constant support extended to the cause of independence for Lithuania and her neighbors of Latvia and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

108. Also, petition of the secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Inc., Racine, Wis., expressing gratitude to the United States for its favorable attitude toward Lithuania in her cause for independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

109. Also, petition of the employees of shipfitting department, Maryland Drydock Co., Baltimore, Md., relative to reducing from 65 to 60 the age for social-security retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the objectives of the joint resolution introduced recently in this House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], seeking to promote the teaching in American schools of the differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism.

This joint resolution proposes to establish a commission to study the testimony relating to the theories and practices of communism taken under oath by the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and by any agency of the executive branch of the United States Government, and, on the basis of this study, to prepare material for a book to give the fullest possible information on Communist theories and practices. The commisison would also be authorized to prepare suggested curricula of studies suitable for use in the teaching of courses in schools, colleges, and universities in order to show the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism.

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is need for instruction in our public schools as well as colleges and universities regarding the encroachment upon democratic institutions by the Communist world conspiracy. Communist techniques have long been employed to capture the mind of our youth. The principal defense of our democratic institutions remains to counteract this menace with the teaching of the truth. Indeed, one of the best means for inspiring confidence in our American Republic is to compare it with such police states as Soviet Russia or Communist China.

The Pennsylvania Bar Association has led the way in urging the teaching of the differences between democracy and communism in our schools by a commendable resolution adopted in the year 1954. The American Bar Association also has taken this problem under advisement. In its 77th annual meeting in Chicago, in August 1954, Judge Walter M. Bastian, of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, then chairman of the standing committee on citizenship, proposed the following resolution:

> Whereas the American Bar Association believes that enlightened citizenship requires intelligent understanding of world problems, free discussion, and courageous thinking: Be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the facts of the theory and practice of communism be taught in appropriate forms at all levels in all educational institutions of the United States in conjunction with the teaching of the theory and practice of the Government of the United States of America under the Federal Constitution; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That this association stand ready to implement the purposes of this resolution by aiding in the preparation of suitable material and otherwise through its standing committee on American citizenship.

Action on Judge Bastian's resolution is still pending before the American Bar Association.

Not only the legal profession, but also the teaching profession has recognized the need for instruction which will compare democracy and communism. In 1953 Dr. Erling M. Hunt, professor of history in Teachers College, Columbia University, declared:

> Since the demobilization that followed World War II there has been widespread conviction, somewhat uncertainly implemented, that young Americans should understand the contrasts between democracy and communism.

In supporting instruction to this effect in the public schools, Professor Hunt further said:

> So far as communism is concerned, the schools are, I believe, basically responsible for inoculating young citizens against it.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has well said, there are no generally acceptable textbooks on communism available for use in the public schools. It is difficult to teach a course in the public schools without a textbook on the subject. Lack of adequate textbooks is one of the reasons why the task of alerting students to communism has moved slowly in our elementary schools and high schools. Another reason for this lack of progress has been the hesitancy of teachers to engage in what some critics call indoctrination. Furthermore, the already overcrowded curricula of our public schools seems to defy the introduction of any new subject. In spite of these obstacles, however, the time has come when educators should find space in the curricula of our schools for a serious comparison of American democracy with communism.

In view of the reluctance of commercial publishers to contract for publishing a high-school textbook on communism, the board of trustees of the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education, in November 1954, voted to arrange for the preparation of such a textbook. This project was undertaken as a public service.

The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education holds an absolute charter granted by the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, which was obtained through the good offices of John W. Davis, former Democratic candidate for President of the United States.

The purpose of the institute, as outlined in its charter, is to promote, solely in the interests of higher and secondary education, the broadest possible public understanding of technical and practical problems in fiscal and political fields by preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins, pamphlets, studies, charts,

and other sources of information and also by disseminating such information through public discussion, through collaboration with institutions of higher learning, by radio and otherwise.

The President of the institute is John Marshall, former First Assistant Attorney General of the United States under President Coolidge and President Hoover. Serving on the board are such educators as Dr. Wilson M. Compton, former president of Washington State College; Dr. Felix Morley, former president of Haverford College; Dr. Forrest H. Kirkpatrick, dean of students, Bethany College; Dr. O. Glenn Saxon, professor of economics, Yale University; and, Dr. John Lee Coulter, former president of North Dakota A. & M. College. Former Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane is on the board as well as such eminent counselors at law as Donald R. Richberg, Lowell Wadmond, and Henry A. Wise; together with R. A. Hummel, chairman of the board of the Lone Star Cement Corp.; John Payson, vice president of the International Bank of Washington; former Congressman Charles S. Dewey, eminent banker and known, no doubt, to most of you; W. Royce Powell, prominent public relations director; and, the managing director, Harry G. Marquis.

The institute has engaged in several educational projects such as a program known as Washington Service—a series of pictorial booklets on political economy. Among the authors were the late Senators Robert A. Taft, Pat McCarran, and Burnet R. Maybank. Other Senators who expressed their views in this service were HARRY BYRD, STYLES BRIDGES, HOMER CAPEHART, PAUL DOUGLAS, EVERETT DIRKSEN, KARL MUNDT, ESTES KEFAUVER, and ALEXANDER WILEY. I, too, prepared a booklet for this series.

Another interesting and valuable educational program which the institute has undertaken is known as Operation Freedom. This is a series of full color, pictorial booklets dramatizing each section of the Bill of Rights. These pamphlets are used as collateral text material in the study of American history and the American way of life, and are recommended for use in the seventh and eighth grades of elementary schools. They have been approved by municipal school systems in many parts of the country.

I heartily agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] that a great service can be performed by the Commission To Make Available Information as to the Basic Differences Between the Theories and Practices of the American Way of Life and the Theories and Practices of Atheistic Communism. There are, however, two considerations which require attention. First, the study of the Commission is to be limited to the evidence taken under oath before the Congressional committees and the agencies of the executive branch of the United States Government. But there is a vast reservoir of information regarding the theory and practice of communism aside from evidence taken under oath. Such information includes the writings of Communists and ex-Communists, the reports of many reliable scholars, newsmen, and other observers, and documents of foreign governments. A textbook for the public schools should draw on all these sources.

Second, American education has been, since the founding of the Republic, in the hands of local authorities. Textbooks prepared by a central government are alien to American tradition. Under our American system, each school board in each school district should be free to determine the textbooks which are to be used in the public schools. In other words, competitive scholarship and competitive professional skill should guide the selection of textbooks for the American youth.

The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education proceeded with considerable care in arranging for the preparation of its experimental textbook. In view of the fact that many teachers are unprepared to teach a comparison of democracy and communism, the institute decided to issue both a textbook and a teacher's guide or handbook. Again, in view of the fact that high-school curricula are already overloaded, the institute decided to publish four textbooks; one designed for schools that can give an 18-week course, and 3 other textbooks for courses respectively of 9 weeks, 6 weeks, and 3 weeks. In other words, the institute has attempted to meet the needs of every high-school curricula in the country.

The institute gave careful consideration to the selection of the scholar to whom the task of preparing the textbooks and teacher's guides should be entrusted. It eventually selected Dr. Kenneth Colegrove, professor emeritus of political science of Northwestern University. Several considerations guided this choice. Dr. Colegrove is a distinguished scholar. His professional degree of doctor of philosophy was taken at Harvard University. In recognition of his book on the American Senate and World Peace, Columbia University in 1944, conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of letters. His books and articles in learned journals on comparative government and international relations are universally esteemed. His record as a teacher of young men and women has been noteworthy. His service to the discipline of political science as secretary of the American Political Science Association has endeared him to the teaching and scholarly profession. In addition, he has had practical experience in the affairs of the Republic, having served as consultant in the Office of Strategic Services during the Second World War, as consultant to Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo immediately after the war, and later as consultant to the State Department.

In another respect, Dr. Colegrove is unusually competent to prepare textbooks comparing democracy and communism. For the past 15 years, he has written the articles on Asia, Communism, Civil Liberty, Democracy, Dictatorships, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the World Book Encyclopedia and its annual supplements, volumes which are widely used in the high schools of the United States. In fact, his comparison of democracy and dictatorships has long been one of the features of this popular encyclopedia for young students. In the yearbook of Collier's Encyclopedia for 1954, another publication extensively used in high-school libraries, he has a leading article on Techniques of Communism.

Dr. Colegrove has brought to the preparation of the textbooks and teacher's handbook a keen appreciation of the needs of high-school students, partly acquired when, before completing his university training, he began his professional career by teaching in an Iowa high school.

At the outset of his project, Dr. Colegrove made a survey of the literature which should be drawn upon in preparation of a textbook and teacher's handbook. Seeking to conform the textbook to the best pedagogical methods, Dr. Colegrove was fortunate in securing the continuing advice of one of America's outstanding educators, Dr. Erling M. Hunt. Dr. Hunt is professor of history and head of the department of the teaching of social studies in Teachers College, Columbia University. He is past president of the National Council of the Social Studies, and former editor of Social Education. He is also coauthor of the World's History, published in 1947, with a revision in 1954, by Harcourt, Brace & Co. This is one of the most successful history textbooks for high schools.

I would like to quote a recent statement by Dr. Colegrove. It reads:

> Anyone who undertakes to write a textbook on democracy and communism should approach his task with humility and a deep sense of responsibility. He should always bear in mind that no one person has a monopoly on wisdom. He should seek advice and consultation at every stage of the project.
>
> American young men and women must be taught the truth. Accuracy is paramount. At the same time, indoctrination must be avoided. Our American democratic process should extend into public-school education. The essential characteristic of a representative republic is the fact that the citizens actively participate in government. By the same token, in our educational system, our boys and girls should participate in the learning process. In other words, they should be led to draw their own independent conclusions from data presented in a textbook or by the teacher in the classroom. Instead of confronting pupils with iron-bound maxims they should be induced to weigh the evidence and to form their own judgments.
>
> At the same time, teachers and textbooks should not neglect the spiritual values. This precept is more easily uttered than carried out, particularly in case young students are to be induced to form their own value judgments. Perhaps the most approved method is to emphasize American history and traditions as a basis for comparison with other systems. In any event, the character and personality of the teacher is far more important than the content of the textbook.
>
> In comparing national systems, every effort must be made by both teacher and textbook writer to avoid engendering hatred of other peoples. Textbooks that inculcate hate of potential enemies have been one of the causes of war. While maintaining loyalty to truth and freedom, textbooks should inspire sympathy for and understanding of all peoples.
>
> It is sometimes said that teachers in the public schools refrain from making comparisons between democracy and communism because of fear of entering into a con-

troversial subject. The existence of any such fear is probably exaggerated. Many able teachers are already giving instruction in a comparison of democracies and totalitarian regimes. America has a million loyal, courageous, and devoted teachers. Any hesitancy on their part to teach a comparison of democracy and communism has been largely due to the fact that school boards and school administrators have not been in general agreement as to the necessity for including this subject in the curricula.

The issue is clear. Shall such an important educational project be carried out by a privately supported, tax-exempt organization which is known for its historical and objective approach or shall it be done by the Federal Government, which then will be making further inroads into the field of education instead of leaving it to the State, county, and municipality where it rightfully belongs.

I do not believe, and I am sure you will agree, that the Federal Government should go into the textbook business.

The outline of the complete textbook which is serving as the basis for discussion of the proper content of the textbook is as follows:

DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM—A HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Why study democracy and communism:
(1) Citizens of a republic should be well informed.
(2) Dangers of ignorance.
(3) World conflict between communism and democracy.
(4) Suppression of liberty.
(5) Dictatorships and war.
Chart: Map of the democratic and Communist worlds.
2. What is democracy?
(1) Our form of government.
(2) Participation by the people.
(3) Respect for human beings.
(4) Respect for law.
Chart: Four aspects of democracy.
3. What is communism?
(1) The promise of the good life: Theory and practice.
(2) The deception of citizens.
(3) The people in a dictatorship.
(4) Destruction of constitutional government.
Chart: Four aspects of communism.
4. What is liberty?
(1) Protection of human rights.
(2) Promotion of justice.
(3) Justice through law.
(4) Freedom of opportunity.
Chart: Four fundamentals of liberty.
5. Is American liberty worth fighting for?
(1) Experience of the Pilgrims and Puritans.
(2) Views of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Lincoln.
(3) Declaration of Independence.
(4) Constitution of the United States.
(5) Price of liberty: Eternal vigilance.
Chart: History of liberty in the United States.
6. Communism and liberty.
(1) The police state in Soviet Russia.
(2) Loss of liberty in Poland.
(3) Destruction of freedom in Czechoslovakia.
(4) Slavery of the Baltic Republics.
(5) The Red Terror in China.
Chart: Loss of liberty in Communist countries.
7. How America encourages independent thought.
(1) How Americans won freedom of speech.
(2) Guaranties of free speech and press.
(3) Education for all.
(4) The American people control the public schools.
(5) What the public schools teach.
Chart: The American public schools teach freedom.
8. How communism controls thought.
(1) Obedience to the "party line."
(2) Teaching hate in Communist schools.
(3) Discipline of young Communists.
(4) Censorship of newspapers, books, and art.
(5) Education of the "Soviet man."
Chart: Communist control of thought: Behavior of the "Soviet man."
9. Why some men and women become Communists.
(1) Communist promises to slum dwellers.
(2) Promises to unemployed.
(3) Appeals to minority races.
(4) False idealism.
(5) The urge for power.
Chart: Communist inducements for recruits.
10. How a Communist cell works.
(1) Daily life of a Communist member.
(2) Study of Communist doctrine.
(3) Teaching the party line to novices.
(4) Obedience to the party leader.
(5) Sabotage and espionage.
(6) What is the compensation for this hard work?
Chart: Workday of a Communist.
11. Democracy in action.
(1) Practice conforms to theory.
(2) Representative government.
(3) Free elections.
(4) The right to oppose.
(5) The two-party system.
(6) The making of law.
Chart: The democratic process.
12. How Soviet Russia deceives the Russian people.
(1) The U. S. S. R. constitution is a delusion.
(2) Faked elections.
(3) The people have no voice in government.
(4) False propaganda.
Chart: Methods of deception in the U. S. S. R.
13. How Red China deceives the Chinese people.
(1) Imitation of Russian communism.
(2) No free elections.
(3) False propaganda.
(4) Brainwashing in Red China.
(5) Deception of the peasants.
Chart: Methods of deception in Red China.
14. The Communist Party in Soviet Russia.
(1) Limited membership in the Communist Party.
(2) The grades of leadership.
(3) The Politburo or Presidium.
(4) Party discipline.
(5) The purges.
Chart: Organization chart of Communist Party.
15. How the Communist Party runs the Russian Government.
(1) The Council of Ministers.
(2) The Supreme Soviet.
(3) Dictatorial control by the Politburo or Presidium.
(4) A false federal system.
(5) Secret government.
Chart: Organization chart of the U. S. S. R. Government showing the party controls.
16. The Communist Party in all countries.
(1) The World Revolution.
(2) Local Communist Parties.
(3) Direction by the Politburo or Presidium in Moscow.
(4) The former Communist International.
(5) The Cominform.
(6) Enforcement of the "party line."
Chart: World control of the Communist conspiracy.
17. The Bolshevik Revolution.
(1) The Communist manifesto of Marx and Engels (1848).
(2) Lenin as world strategist.
(3) Seizure of military power in Russia.
(4) The dictatorship of the proletariat.
(5) The Red terror.
Chart: The life of Lenin.
18. How the Red terror operates.
(1) Purpose of terrorism.
(2) Destruction of classes.
(3) The police state.
(4) Use of famine to conquer independent peoples.
Chart: Types of terrorism.
19. Preparation for revolution in other countries.
(1) Infiltration and propaganda.
(2) Communist training schools.
(3) Preparation for seizure of power.
(4) Strategy in Western Europe and America.
(5) Strategy in Asia.
Chart: The Communist prepares for revolution.
20. Moscow-directed revolutions.
(1) Communist-inspired revolution in Poland.
(2) Capture of the Government of Czechoslovakia.
(3) The Balkan States.
(4) The Red conquest of China.
(5) Guerrilla war in Indochina.
(6) Latin America.
Chart: Maps of revolution.
21. How the Communists treat political opponents.
(1) The one-party system.
(2) Membership in Communist Party is strictly limited.
(3) Death or slavery for political opponents.
(4) Purges of members for "deviation."
(5) New forms of assassination.
Chart: Political executions.
22. What America has accomplished for the workingman.
(1) What is the collective bargain?
(2) Freedom of occupation.
(3) Social security.
(4) Old-age benefits.
(5) High standard of living.
(6) Investment of savings.
Chart: Negotiating wage contracts; high standard of living.
23. How communism treats labor unions.
(1) Abolition of free labor unions.
(2) Regimentation of labor.
(3) Labor discipline.
(4) Slave labor.
(5) Delusions of the Soviet workingman.
Chart: Slave-labor camps.
24. How communism treats the peasants.
(1) Deception of land-hungry peasants.
(2) Destruction of independent peasants.
(3) Creation of collective farms.
(4) Plight of collectivized farmers.
Chart: Methods of Sovietizing peasants.
25. Why millions submit to communism.
(1) Hard life of the workingman in overpopulated countries.
(2) Case study of the railway worker in East Germany.
(3) Case study of the peasant in Red China.
(4) The kind of security afforded by communism.
Chart: Dilemma of the workingman in Communist countries.
26. The democratic and the Communist treatment of racial minorities.
(1) Civil liberties in the United States.
(2) Removal of racial restrictions.
(3) Communist propaganda to attract racial minorities.
(4) Soviet enslavement of Baltic peoples.
(5) Soviet extermination of Jews.
(6) Soviet suppression of Moslems.
(7) Racial murder.
Chart: Deportation and enslavement of minorities.
27. The democratic and the Communist treatment of religion.
(1) Freedom of religion in democracies.
(2) Emphasis on spiritual values.

(3) Materialism versus religion.
(4) Communism condemns religion as a capitalist trick.
(5) Soviet persecution of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.
(6) Soviet control of the Orthodox Church.
(7) Religious persecution in Red China.
Chart: Soviet antireligious strategy.
28. How the U. S. S. R. rules satellite countries.
(1) Political control by the Moscow Politburo or Presidium.
(2) Economic profit from subject countries.
(3) Soviet imperialism.
(4) Revolt of Yugoslavia.
(5) Abuse of East Germany.
Chart: Map of Soviet imperialism.
29. How communism promotes war.
(1) The Communist doctrine of violence.
(2) The Red Army.
(3) The false peace crusade.
(4) Wrecking peace conferences.
(5) Use of Asiatic peoples to fight free states.
(6) The effects of Soviet imperialism.
Chart: Soviet promotion of war.
30. The Korean war.
(1) Soviet Russia blocks unity of the Korean people.
(2) Inciting Korean Communists to attack South Korea.
(3) American leadership in resisting Red aggression.
(4) Soviet support of Red China for invasion of Korea.
(5) Obstructing peace efforts.
Chart: Korea, the battlefield of Soviet aggression.
31. Achievements of the capitalist system.
(1) The American competitive enterprise system.
(2) Value of independent initiative.
(3) American invention.
(4) American mass production.
(5) The small-business man in the United States.
(6) The rising standard of life.
Chart: American industry.
32. Economic planning in the U. S. S. R.
(1) State ownership of all means of production.
(2) The gosplan.
(3) Drafting the 5-year plans.
(4) Results of the 5-year plans.
(5) Producer's goods at the expense of consumer's goods.
(6) Depression of standard of living.
(7) Real wages in Communist Russia.
Chart: The 5-year plans; comparison of worker's real wages in Soviet Russia and in the United States.
33. How economic planning destroys liberty.
(1) Control of all economic life.
(2) Police control of officials and workers.
(3) No choice of occupation.
(4) No freedom for workers in the factories.
(5) No freedom for peasants on collective farms.
(6) Use of false propaganda.
Chart: Economic planning and the Soviet workingman.
34. The Soviet claim of a classless society.
(1) Communist doctrine of a worker's dictatorship.
(2) Trotsky's charge that Stalin betrayed the revolution.
(3) New classes in the Soviet state.
(4) Inequality of income among workers, factory managers, bureaucrats and army officers.
Chart: Bureaucrats and Red Army officers constitute the new economic class in Soviet Russia.
35. Communist fallacies.
(1) That communism has a monopoly of the scientific method.
(2) That Marxian dialectics is infallible.
(3) That communism is inevitable.
(4) That collapse of democratic governments is inevitable.
(5) That the workingman is becoming poorer.
Chart: A graph of fallacies.
36. Relation of socialism to communism.
(1) Definitions.
(2) Split between the Social Democrats and the Marxian Socialists.
(3) Views on private property.
(4) Trend of socialism toward communism.
(5) Where is the dividing line?
Chart: Trends toward communism.
37. Communist attack on constitutional government.
(1) The general strike.
(2) Obstruction in European parliaments.
(3) Infiltration of American organs of public opinion.
(4) Infiltration of American Government.
(5) Subversive activities.
Chart: Illustrations of infiltration.
38. The Communist Party in the United States.
(1) History of the Communist Party.
(2) Communist-front organizations.
(3) Function of the Daily Worker.
(4) The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1952.
(5) The party goes underground.
Chart: Organization and operation of the Communist Party of the United States.
39. The American Republic as a bulwark against communism.
(1) Ideals of the American Republic.
(2) Love of liberty.
(3) Sound traditions.
(4) American contributions to human progress.
(5) American leadership by example.
Chart: American institutions.

APPENDIX

1. Definitions of terms.
2. Problems of democracy and communism.
Reading lists.

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide for a 10-percent pay increase for postal workers, and I have spoken to individual members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to urge that they act promptly on this or similar legislation. On Tuesday, February 15, 1955, I submitted a statement to the committee in support of my bill, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, during the last Congress legislation was passed providing for an increase in the salaries of postal employees. There is no doubt but that this legislation merited more consideration than it received. The increase it provided was totally inadequate, but because the bill was vetoed by the President, the postal workers did not receive even this small measure of relief. I believe we owe it to these employees to take prompt action at this Congress to increase their salaries and make the effective date retroactive. If the bill is vetoed then we should vote to override.

I have introduced a bill which would provide a 10 percent increase in the pay schedules of postal employees. I am very much aware of the need for such increases since in my district and in the New York area generally there are a number of postal workers and other Federal employees, and I know from conversations with them that they have all they can do to make ends meet. Many have suffered income losses from the various reorganization and reclassification programs and from reductions in grade brought about by post-audit actions of the Civil Service Commission. There is reason to believe that very often employees are forced to take reductions in grade because of reduced appropriations.

The Government worker today is called upon to carry an extra workload due to the policy of the administration to reduce Federal payrolls through attrition, which means that vacancies occurring through retirement, death, and resignation, are not filled. These are conditions over which employees have no control. If after 2 or 3 years a man in private industry had his pay reduced because some supervisor had made a mistake in allocating his job to the proper pay scole, the unions would call a strike of all employees. Yet this can happen to a Government employee and there is little or nothing he can do about it. If the Budget Bureau imposes a ceiling on an appropriation for a Government agency and employees have to be laid off through reductions in force or transferred to another post or reduced in grade as a result of it, there is nothing the Federal worker can do but accept it. He may have to readjust his standard of living, he may have to run his old car for another year or two, and cut out some of the little things in life he and his family have learned to enjoy, but there isn't anything he can do except appeal to Congress for an increase in pay.

The postal worker is underpaid. This is truth, not fiction. I marvel at the fact that postmasters are able to recruit qualified men at the extremely low rate of pay at which new employees must start.

I urge you gentlemen to approve an increase in pay which will be equitable and proper. Let me also urge you to proceed with haste since this matter has been pending for a long time and we must keep faith with those who have been waiting so patiently for us to act. I hope this committee will report a bill and send it to the floor before the end of this month. It is the only way in which we can demonstrate that we mean what we have said, that we do intend to keep our promises, that we will make this one of the first legislative enactments of the 84th Congress.

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service urging postal pay increases:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, believing as I do that our postal employees are entitled to at least a 10-percent wage increase across the board, I have introduced such legislation and am again appearing before your committee to urge favorable consideration of such an increase in the hope the committee in its wisdom will concur.

I also believe that consideration of a postal salary increase should be completely dis-

associated from the postage-rate increase. In my opinion, there is no basis for controversy on the wage increase whereas there will be serious controversy on the postage-rate proposal.

During the greater part of the last 2 decades, postal and other Federal employees have been unable to compete with increased prices. Wages of a worker, including Federal employees, must be considered in the light of cost of living. In a period during which our nation as a whole enjoyed unprecedented national prosperity, Federal workers have been stepchildren of our American economy.

Inadequate wages for Government workers can lead only to an inferior caliber of personnel, expensive recruiting and training experience, decreased efficiency, and, in the final analysis, poor Government operation. The combination of these undesirable conditions inevitably results in more costly Government to every taxpayer.

The cost of Government is properly the concern of each of us. No one advocates useless spending or the waste of our Public Treasury. However, in the matter of wages for Federal employees, there is involved a very human question as well as a moral obligation on the part of those responsible for determining salaries. The human question can be satisfied only if the worker is given a wage that will enable him to provide proper and adequate care for his family. A moral responsibility exists as long as Federal employees do not have collective-bargaining rights and in the absence of economic privileges accorded workers in private industry in a given wage dispute.

These two responsibilities should weigh heavily on those charged with establishing Federal salary schedules. They were completely ignored last year in the veto of the wage legislation approved by the 83d Congress. The current attitude of some persons in the executive branch of Government seems to be a take-it-or-leave-it offer, without reference to the needs of the employees or the justice of their case for better wages. This amounts to a callous disregard of more than 2 million Federal workers and their families and a complete evasion of the moral responsibility on the part of our Federal Government to pay fair and adequate wages.

In my judgment, a pay raise is long overdue for our deserving postal employees and I trust the committee will promptly and favorably report a substantial increase in their compensation.

Postal Salary Increase Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement submitted by me to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of an adequate and realistic salary increase for postal workers:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to state my views in support of legislation providing an adequate and realistic wage increase for postal workers. Such an increase is long overdue and I respectfully request your favorable consideration of H. R. 1592 and H. R. 2183 introduced by Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON and GEORGE M. RHODES, respectively.

There is general agreement that there should be an increase in the salaries of postal employees. H. R. 1592 and H. R. 2183, providing an increase of 10 percent, represent, I submit, an absolute minimum for those workers who have been underpaid for so long despite a constant rise in our standard of living. The last salary increase was in 1951 and the rise in the cost of living since then makes it imperative that the pending adjustment not only be adequate but that it be made as soon as possible.

As I stated to this committee during the postal pay legislation hearings last year it is a grave reflection on our Government that many employees of our Post Office Department, one of the largest businesses in the world, are forced to supplement their inadequate salaries with outside work in order to meet the increasing cost of living today.

I know what it is to be a housewife. I can understand the frustration of the wives of postal workers in attempting to make ends meet on salaries which are far removed from the real needs of the family.

The postal system is a vital part of our Government and the Government has an obligation to see that it is operated as efficiently as possible. One sure way of undermining this efficiency is by continuing to pay salaries which are grossly inadequate. Postal employees are entitled to a decent wage that will enable them to care for their families.

The bill proposed by the Postmaster General embodying his reclassification plan is completely unrealistic and delegates power to the Postmaster General that is both unwarranted and unnecessary, and does not provide a fair and reasonable salary increase to postal workers.

I sincerely urge this committee to report out H. R. 1592 or H. R. 2183 and give the Congress an opportunity to pass this long needed legislation as early as possible.

Lincoln and Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last evening one of my fine Maryland colleagues in the other body, Senator J. GLENN BEALL, spoke before the Republican Club of Prince Georges County, Inc., at the Prince Georges Golf and Country Club. Senator BEALL's remarks were characteristically to the point and of particular interest at this time. Under leave granted, I here include his address:

What would Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, say today of this land of 162 million Americans. Perhaps he would not today express himself any differently than he did in 1856 when he said:

"We are a great empire. We stand at once the wonder and the admiration of the whole world, and we must inquire what it is that has given us so much prosperity, and we shall understand that to give up that one thing—free government—would be to give up all future prosperity.

"This cause is that every man can make himself. It has been said that such a race of prosperity has been run nowhere else."

Lincoln started life as a laborer and never ceased to love those who worked by hand to better themselves and their nation. His implicit faith in the ability of those who were willing to work for their own good and for the good of their neighbor has been an abiding principle of the Republican Party ever since.

On the other hand, he did not fear property and wealth as some have feared and even tried to destroy it in the recent past. He recognized the need for capital so that the means for building a better nation would be available to the bold planners who shared his faith.

Lincoln warned that the heavy hand of government could stifle economic growth as well as the growth of equality and personal liberty. He wanted more than anything else for the individual man to have his fair chance to improve his lot—to build a home, a business, to be free to fulfill his individual destiny.

As a party, we Republicans have held to those beliefs. We have fought to retain the meaning they have for the Nation.

Although our world is vastly different from what it was in Lincoln's day, the essence of our problems is little changed. We face the same issues of freedom, of the relation between levels of government and individuals, of subversion and loyalty, and of the future course of our Nation.

Storm clouds were gathering when Lincoln entered the White House nearly 100 years ago. But he did not flinch. Through the terrible years that followed his leadership held the Nation together.

When President Eisenhower took office, the sky once more was overcast. And he has not flinched.

He has acted as Lincoln did before him. He has cut beneath the party battle to eternal truths. He has stated principles, defined differences, and clarified issues.

And, as was demonstrated by the overwhelming vote of confidence of both Houses on his Formosa resolution, the country is united behind him.

Now, let us see what the administration has done—and what it proposes to do.

The record for 1953 and 1954 shows that—

1. The Korean fighting and bloodshed was ended.
2. Honesty, integrity, and efficiency were restored to the Government.
3. Peacetime prosperity was achieved with 1953 the best and 1954 the next best in history.
4. Truman's spending plans were cut by $10 billion and taxes reduced nearly 7½ billion dollars a year.
5. Inflation was halted—the dollar stabilized.
6. The 20-year trend toward centralization of power in Washington was reversed.
7. Highest security standards for Government jobs were set and 2,400 risks removed.
8. Social-security and railroad-retirement benefits were extended and improved.
9. Equality of treatment was promoted and racial segregation ended in many areas.
10. United States and free world defenses against Communist aggression were strengthened.
11. Wage and rent controls ended.
12. A start made on the peacetime use of atomic energy.
13. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established and hospital building and vocational rehabilitation expanded.
14. Record Federal aid for highways was voted.
15. Housing aids to help more families own better homes were enlarged.
16. Tidelands restored to the States.
17. Flexible farm-price-support and surplus-disposal programs provided.
18. Postal service was improved.
19. Veterans and civil-service employees benefits have been increased.

An impressive record indeed. But what is past is prologue. Now let us look at our party's program for 1955 as proposed by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message on January 6.

Highlights of the program include:

Tireless labor to make the peace more just and durable, sufficient military strength to discourage resort to war, encouragement of United Nations efforts to limit armaments, mutual and gradual reductions of foreign trade tariff barriers, extension of the Selective Service Act.

Strengthened Reserves and increased benefits for career servicemen, continuation of present tax rates, looking to a reduction in 1956, a nationwide water-resources policy firmly based in law, a new program to meet pressing national highway needs, establishment of a Federal coordinator of public works.

Alleviation of problems of low-income farm families, strengthened Federal disaster-insurance programs, extension of the Small Business Act of 1953, continuance of the 83d Congress' housing program, challenging private industry to meet housing problems fully after 1958.

A program to improve existing health services, including Government reinsurance, Federal Government coordination in school expansion, assistance to States to cope with juvenile delinquency, a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts in Health, Education, and Welfare, establishment of a 90-cents-an-hour minimum wage, extension of coverage, and Taft-Hartley Act amendments.

The modification of immigration laws, Hawaiian statehood, reduction of the voting age in Federal elections, District of Columbia self-government and suffrage, protection of voting rights of overseas servicemen, and extension of the Reorganization Act and Intergovernmental Relations Commission.

I think the first President of our party would agree that this is indeed a comprehensive, forward-looking program in the best Republican tradition.

Now, although our history has spanned nearly a century between Lincoln and Eisenhower, we still have today the same standards of republicanism held aloft by the party and the American people—the same standards of fair play.

These standards of fair play, I'm afraid, do not always apply to the Democratic Party. I have here a column by Mr. Gould Lincoln of the Washington Evening Star with which I am heartily in accord. I quote:

"The concentrated Democratic attack on Vice President NIXON which began immediately after the 1954 campaign and is now continuing with almost daily sniping, apparently has two basic and impelling reasons," the reporter says. "The first is to rid the Democratic Party of the Communist issue—the Red issue—which has plagued the Democrats for years and has hurt them in a number of States. Not having the courage to attack the President himself, their second aim is to strike at the man closest to him—the Vice President of the United States.

"So beginning with former Democratic National Chairman Stephen A. Mitchell and continued by Adlai Stevenson, Speaker Sam Rayburn, Senator Richard L. Neuberger, and by other freshmen Democrats in Congress, the drive is on to picture the Vice President as merely a smear artist and as such, entirely unworthy, a man who hits below the belt. Their theme song is that he made the Democrats out to be a parcel of traitors over the last score of years, and disloyal at the very least.

"The facts in the case, as revealed by a perusal of the Vice President's campaign speeches, are that the Vice President did no such thing. What he did was to accuse the Democrats of stupidity because they did not recognize the Communist menace; that they did not take the steps necessary to check infiltration of the Reds, and that when cases were called to their attention they did nothing about them. For example, the cases of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White.

"The Vice President said repeatedly that communism should not be a political issue, and that there was no difference between the loyalty of Democrats and Republicans. But, he added, some misguided officials of the Truman administration were blind or indifferent to the danger from the Communists.

"That is the kind of criticism which hurt—and which was effective against the Democrats in the 1950, 1952 and 1954 campaigns.

"The Democrats don't want any more of it.

"They have, they think, disposed of Senator JOE MCCARTHY of Wisconsin in such a way that he will not be effective in his attacks on them. He took no real part in the last campaign. Now they have turned on Mr. NIXON, who made effective use of the Red issue and is capable of doing so again.

"Senator NEUBERGER, without mentioning the Vice President by name, but plainly indicating Mr. NIXON was his target, recently criticized the latter's campaign against him, Senator NEUBERGER.

"As a matter of fact, Senator NEUBERGER was 1 of the 5 leftwing Democratic candidates singled out by Mr. NIXON in his Pocatello address on October 25, 1954, when the Vice President asserted that the gains that the Democrats would make, if they took over the 84th Congress, inevitably would come from the ADA wing of the party.

"The other four were Glen Taylor, of Idaho, who ran for Vice President on the Henry Wallace ticket in 1948; former Representative John Carroll, of Colorado; Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, and former Representative Yorty, of California.

"Whether it was Mr. NIXON's campaigning or not, 3 out of these 5 Democrats were defeated in their races for the Senate.

"Mr. NIXON is for the present, at least, holding his own fire. His defense is being made by other Republicans, among them Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall. Mr. Hall said it should be clear to every one who reads the papers and hears the TV and radio that there is now underway a 'highly-organized campaign to besmirch the Vice President. The technique is to smear him by falsely accusing him of smearing others. This is one of the lowest tricks in politics and in this instance destructive only to its perpetrators. DICK NIXON is one of the most effective campaigners in history. It is because he tells the truth and is effective that he is under attack.'

"But should Mr. NIXON find it necessary to reply, he is quite capable. Further, he knows a lot more about the Communist activities in this country than do his detractors. He was mainly responsible for the conviction of Alger Hiss. No one is going to say to him, 'You never got a Communist.'

"Nor can the Democrats get away from the fact that they were blind to what was going on when Hiss and White were active in the Government."

Now without exception, Mr. NIXON approached his discussion of the security question by establishing the loyalty of the vast majority of Democrats. In my opinion he never questioned the loyalty of any Democrat. He did repeatedly question ignorance, blindness, or carelessness on the part of some of the leaders of the previous administration.

Then he demonstrated that it was these people who were most interested in the election and an anti-Eisenhower Congress. Here are a few more of his actual quotes:

In Houston on October 4, 1954, "I have found that the great majority of Republicans and Democrats approve of the way the Eisenhower program is restoring standards of loyalty, honesty, and integrity in government."

"The issue in 1952 was not the issue of the relative loyalty of Democrats and Republicans. That was never the issue then—it is not the issue now," he stated in Philadelphia.

In Norwalk, Conn., the Vice President said, "The great majority of all of our people regardless of the party to which they belong are loyal Americans. And I have found that Democrats are just as interested as Republicans in developing an effective program for dealing with disloyal elements."

Then, in a Fresno speech, he said, "The ADA leftwing which is calling for the election of an anti-Eisenhower Congress is not truly representative of the principles of the Democratic Party. Its spokesmen and its policies are unworthy of the traditions of that great political party. There is no question but that millions of Democrats completely disagree with this group in its attacks on the President's loyalty program."

Those do not sound like the words of a smear artist.

They do not sound like the words of a man who would make out the opposition party to be a parcel of traitors.

No, they have more the tone and strength of a man who was a great force in cementing to our future the constitutional freedoms and personal liberties which emerged from the dreams of our Founding Fathers.

They sound more like the words of Abraham Lincoln, a man who worked with the commonsense of Christian humility and the political wisdom to perpetuate the principles of the Republican Party—even as we are working here tonight in Prince Georges County.

The Christian in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during a conference last fall of the Blair County, Pa., ministerium held in the city of Altoona, Pa., it was my privilege to deliver the following address on the subject the Christian in Politics:

THE CHRISTIAN IN POLITICS

(Address by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania)

In speaking to you on the subject the Christian in Politics it is appropriate to consider briefly some of the definitions or statements defining politics.

We are told for example by Webster that "politics is the art and science of government."

James Freeman Clarke says: "A politician thinks only of the next election—a statesman of the next generation."

And finally Daniel O'Connell admonishes that "Nothing is politically right that is morally wrong."

To these definitions I wish to add the following statement attributed to Andrew Oliver of Boston and written over 155 years ago. It summarizes, in telling fashion, what I think is a brief and comprehensive word picture of the term "politics" and is as true today as when uttered over a century and a half ago. Andrew Oliver said "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures. Neither is there any in which by mere loss of nerve he may do widespread harm. Nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul. Nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult.

"But danger is the inseparable companion of honor."

With all the temptations and degradations that beset it politics is still the noblest career any man can choose.

When I decided to become a candidate for Congress I was told in a jovial manner, and then again by some serious minded friends that in entering the political arena I was choosing a career in life that has been described by careless slanderers as a cesspool of inquity.

How often have we heard the caustic remark, "that politician," or "its just politics," or "I'm not going to vote for any of them, they're just a bunch of politicians."

Such unworthy remarks are directed daily at persons in public life by thoughtless people that it is little wonder that many good men and women shun public office.

President Eisenhower in a public pronouncement, warmed the hearts of the great army of honest public servants when he admonished those who have an active interest in political affairs "to wear their political badge with considerable pride." He continued: "For politics ought to be the part-time profession of every citizen who would protect the rights and privileges of free people and who would preserve what is good and fruitful in our national heritage."

"Politics," said the President, "must be the concern of every citizen who wants to see our national well-being increased and our international leadership strengthened. In that combined sense politics is the noblest of professions."

The Chief Executive of this great Republic seems to have echoed the thoughts of Andrew Oliver, of Boston, uttered 155 years ago, thoughts that are as applicable in this hydrogen-atomic age as they were in the infant days of the Republic.

It is a serious setback to the millions of American citizens interested in good government to reflect upon the widely publicized results of a Gallup poll published in 1953. This poll revealed that 70 percent of the persons interviewed stated they would not like to see their sons go into politics as a career.

This attitude is disturbing because the poll was not sectional or confined to any group of partisans.

The expressed opposition to politics as a career was nationwide and extended to all walks of life. Since politics should be, and essentially by nature is, an honorable profession inseparable from the welfare of society, such a nationwide indictment is not to be dismissed lightly.

When it is revealed that a profession that touches the life of every man, woman, and child is regarded as having fallen into disrepute, it is imperative that an explanation must be sought for such an unwholesome situation.

It is true that in politics there are found weak-kneed persons who are not as Ceasar's wife "above suspicion."

Yet considering the constant temptations that confront even the most virtuous, it would be too much to expect that in the field of politics all men would be paragons of virtue endowed with infinite wisdom and actuated by a sincere desire to fully justify the confidence placed in them.

In all segments of American life we have misfits who do not measure up to their responsibilities. Yet we refrain from denouncing their profession or vocation in life and charging it as being wholly responsible for harboring such misquided mortals.

By the same token we should, in exercising Christian charity, recognize the frailties of human nature and refuse to be stampeded into subscribing to the wholesale indictment of corruption and moral degradation leveled collectively at all persons in political life.

We should, on the other hand, examine such a sweeping indictment and try to find the reason for such widespread criticism. In so doing, we will find that among the chief causes for the scornful attitude directed toward those in political life is the fact that some unscrupulous and irresponsible politicians, by their conduct, have reflected discredit on all public servants and have cast the stigma of suspicion and distrust on them as a class.

In addition to corrupt public officials who are few in number, due to the high and exacting standards required of men in public affairs, there is the regrettable tendency on the part of the public to characterize every politician as demogog and a knave, thus judging all of them by the misconduct of a relatively few who have fallen by the wayside in violating the public trust. Such sweeping criticism is unjust and can serve but one purpose, and that is to discourage good men and women from entering politics.

For the few corrupt politicians that are exposed from time to time, there is a vast army of loyal and faithful public servants who should not be made to suffer by careless criticism directed at the sins of the few.

A Senate committee report on ethical standards of Government published in 1951 contains the testimony of Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, recognized as a militant crusader for higher moral standards in the public service. While testifying before the Senate committee he expressed his opinion that "an overwhelming majority of Government people are honest, capable, and conscientious."

The Senate committee, in its conclusions, went so far as to say "the ethical standards of public officials are probably higher than those prevailing in business and other walks of life."

It is convincingly evident from the results of the Gallup poll and the tendency to degrade politics that it is time the American public must begin to discriminate between the good and bad politician. This is difficult to do, however, when public apathy is so prevalent on election day, that only about half of the American people qualified to vote exercise their precious franchise.

Herein lies the solution to this distressing indictment of those in political life who, in Webster's definition, are engaged in a career in that lofty profession defined as "the art and science of government."

Undoubtedly many interviewed in the Gallup poll exercise their right to vote. Yet when we realize that a recent report stated there would be over 100 million Americans privileged to vote on November 2, based on the previous voting records of the American people, it will be a modern miracle if the 1952 vote which was recorded at 61½ million will be equaled, let alone surpassed.

The point I wish to make is that when only about half of the American people go to the polls are we not guilty, by comparison, of only a half-hearted effort in electing capable and honest public officials to administer the affairs of government? Are we not indicting ourselves when we complain of "that bunch of politicians" when half of us refrain from exercising the precious privilege of voting for public officials who literally hold our future as American citizens in the palms of their hands?

If we cry out against "stuffed ballot boxes" are we not aiding the culprits in political life by "starved ballot boxes"? Clean and honest government will never be achieved by half-hearted efforts on our part.

When only half of us vote it shows that we only half care about how our Government is operated. Such an attitude of indifference is certain to permit the election of persons we later criticize.

Yet, if we spent an hour on election day in casting our vote we could have helped to avert such a calamity.

The churches of the Nation are of utmost importance in the crusade for good government because they are eternally dedicated to the seemingly endless struggle against the forces of evil. Therefore, as spiritual laboratories, they watch over, nurture, and develop the inner man from the time his name is inscribed on the cradle roll until the day that he is summoned for a final accounting by the same God who made him.

In the interim the Christian mode of living becomes ingrained on his heart and in his soul as he absorbs the eternal truths taught him regarding his purpose here on earth. Fortified with the Christian way of life it follows that any man devoted to his faith in Almighty God is certain with the help of divine grace to lead an exemplary life, and in so doing merit the respect of his men. Such a man is an asset to his community and a force for good in its civic life. If he has the inclination and the will to enter politics the community, State, or Nation is richer by his presence for he is capable of rendering public service of the highest order based on the Christian ideals which have been indelibly inscribed on his heart and in his soul.

How often in recent years when the very foundation of our form of Government has been menaced by sinister and atheistic forces, have we heard repeated over and over again the stirring prayer of the poet as he implores divine providence:

"God give us men!
A time like this demands strong minds,
great hearts, true faith and ready
hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor;
Men who will not lie."

The churches of America from their spiritual reservoirs of manpower, have supplied such men and will continue to do so.

From personal experience I know that the thousands of God-fearing men I have met have elevated public life by their services to mankind. Their edifying conduct and spotless reputation have served to rout the scoffers who jokingly, or in earnest, regard politics as a questionable and disreputable means of making a living.

The church can gain nothing from becoming engaged in partisan politics, yet it fails in its mission if it hesitates to take an unmistakable position on any moral issue affecting the spiritual welfare of its members. Such a solicitous attitude does not require that the church identify itself with any particular political party for it would be folly to attempt to destroy the freedom of its members to select the political party of their choice.

The point is that a good Christian will practice his faith in everyday life and by so doing, he transmits his sense of moral responsibility to others, regardless of whether he is an elected public official or prefers to portray the role of the average American citizen.

With the granting of the franchise to women in 1920 and since some 30 million of them voted in 1952 as compared to over 31 million men, the family now plays an important part in deciding political issues. The Christian family, therefore, can wield the balance of power in any election, provided its members become informed on the issues and above all vote.

It is inspiring to realize that there is a mounting interest in Washington in the spiritual side of official life. Such increased interest is edifying and is a good example to the rest of the Nation. Prayer breakfasts attended by President Eisenhower are held at frequent intervals in the Mayflower Hotel and the response to the invitations extended greatly exceed the fondest expectations of the sponsors. In addition, a prayer room has

been erected in the United States Capitol where Members of Congress may retreat to a chapel-like atmosphere and engage in silent meditation.

During the 83d Congress legislation was approved adding the words "under God" to the pledge of allegiance to the flag. This spiritual attitude that is being publicly displayed in official circles in Washington, reveals that despite the stereotyped and baseless slanders against politicians as a class, there are countless men in public office who are concerned not alone for the material needs of the Nation but they are convinced, like our forefathers, that Almighty God has dominion over the affairs of this Nation. They know that the inscription on the great seal of the United States when translated from Latin says: "He has favored our undertakings." They know, too, that on our coinage the founders of this Republic inscribed, "In God we trust," and that Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, expressed the same basic idea when he said that this Nation's "new birth of freedom" would be "under God."

Holy Scripture also reminds us of the Master's majestic and dramatic words in defining our duty to God and to the state, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's."

Our Divine Lord was making it crystal clear that the church and state should work in harmony—each in its proper field for each has rights over man and both have common origin in God.

With this divine interpretation of the relationship of government to God, Christian men and women, because of their dedication to the religious ideals upon which this Nation was founded, can serve their country well in political life because they are aided by their love of God and love of their neighbor.

With such an abiding faith in their country, their neighbor, and their God they are the instrument through which, by their interest in politics, public office can be elevated to its proper place in our everyday lives, thus refuting the accusations of those who degrade it when they speak of it as a career to be shunned.

The Late Senator Burnet R. Maybank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1954, I was on an official military inspection trip with my then chairman of the Armed Services Committee, DEWEY SHORT. Our duties carried us to the Headquarters of the United States Army in Europe located in Heidelberg, Germany. On the particular evening of this date we had just finished a dinner given in our honor by the High Commissioner of Germany, the Honorable James B. Conant, when a note was handed to me by the Department of the Army telling me of the untimely death of Senator Burnet R. Maybank. I was shocked and grieved at this tragic news and immediately dispatched my condolences to Mrs. Maybank.

I knew it was impossible for me to return in time for the funeral, accordingly I continued my trip and completed my responsibilities incident to the itinerary set by the chairman.

Upon arriving home in late September, I released to the press my feelings on the tragic loss which South Carolina suffered as a result of Senator Maybank's death.

No South Carolinian whom I can recall had more important assignments as a United States Senator than did Maybank at the time of his death. When the Democrats were in power, Maybank was the chairman of the very important Banking and Currency Committee. This committee has jurisdiction in the Senate over almost every phase of our economic life—the banking, the housing, the money market, the securities business—and those things which vitally touch the living mechanism of our breathing economy. Consequently, the working man and the financier alike were affected by the deliberations of this committee.

It was not unnatural that Maybank should head this committee. He distinguished himself early in life at my alma mater, the College of Charleston, as one peculiarly adept in mathematics and economics. He was awarded the mathematics prize at the College of Charleston for excellence.

In the early 30's, Maybank gained national prominence when he solved the financial problems of the city of Charleston during the early days of the greatest depression ever to hit this Nation. For this unusual feat he was called upon to perform important tasks throughout South Carolina during this era when the New Deal was in its infancy. Maybank was loyal to the precepts of the New Deal throughout his political career. He was a liberal in the true sense of the word, but he was a constitutional liberal. However, he never let his enthusiasms for the new order dim or alter his basic philosophy of believing in States rights.

At the time of his death, Maybank was also a member of the important Appropriations Committee of the Senate. He was a member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. He was my greatest help on money for our military, when the Committee on Armed Services authorized projects for the Nation and South Carolina particularly. I recall, vividly, last year it was Maybank alone who assisted me in getting the Navy appropriation raised, thereby assuring the money for the important Navy construction program in South Carolina, notably the Beaufort Air Base.

Mr. Speaker, there has to be teamplay between the House and the Senate. Neither branch can operate effectively without the aid of the other. Each branch is a coequal of the other; unless the House acts, the Senate is helpless; and, conversely, without the Senate's aid the House is powerless.

Mr. Speaker, despite the great work on the committee on which I hold membership, the obligations and authorizations for construction of the vast military enterprises in my State without the money to carry these on, they would never become realities. In the partnership necessary to effectuate these worthy objectives for our national security, I lost a comrade in Burnet Maybank, whose place it will take many years to fill.

Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy task to serve in the Congress today. The manifold duties and multiplying demands made on Members of Congress in and through all the vast ramifications of this complex and intricate modern day government increasingly draw upon our strength and endurance, adding yearly to the terrific toll of human genius and human life. Anyone who, like Burnet Maybank, survives a political campaign in which his life's history is reviewed in detail and during which he moves constantly and uninterruptedly under the pitiless searchlight of publicity, must of necessity possess some virtue. Maybank remained sweet when accused falsely. He was silent to the tongue of slander. He never once, despite the heat of the campaign, dignified his opponent by answering him according to his kind. He rose to distinction in the Senate because of his personal worth, his mental capacity, untiring industry, and absolute honesty. On such an ascent to the top, the path is steep and rugged. Thorns instead of roses, Maybank endured them all.

Out of this turbulent strife and clash of opinion, out of the heat of debates and conflicting interests, out of the atmosphere of uncertainty which we are all forced to breathe, there come the priceless compensation and the immeasurable joy of mutual confidence and respect, of lasting friendships. In no other body of men do I believe one could possibly find such a fine spirit of generous and wholesome friendships in such a splendid feeling of comradeship.

I suppose this is due to the fact that each of us realizes the baptism of fire which we all daily endure in the performance of our responsibilities in the public interest. When death comes, jealousies are forgotten, individual interests and purposes are buried with the comrade whom we memorialize today. Beneath it all, personalities and eccentricities are subordinated to unity and interests of mankind.

Maybank died at his post of duty, as he would have it. In the words of the poet he would have said:

Let me live out my years in heat of blood
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine
Let me not see this soul-house built of mud
Go toppling to the dust—a vacant shrine.
Let me go quickly like a candlelight
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow
Give me high noon—let it then be night
Thus would I go.
And grant me, when I face the grisly thing,
One haughty cry to pierce the gap, perhaps
O let me be a tune-swept fiddle string
That feels the master melody—and snaps.

He "felt the heat of blood" and went "quickly like a candlelight snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow." At last he has gained rest from his exacting labors and has gone to his reward for having served God and country well.

Mr. Speaker, to Burnet Maybank, in life's relentless journey to the sunset:

But such a tide as moving seemed asleep;
Too full for sound and foam
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turned again home.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God and Father of us all: From all the traditions which separate us and write our names in different camps of thought and conviction, we pause for the upward look which makes us one in solemn yet glad communion with Thee. When together we face the things that matter most, and a revealing sense of Thy eternity seizes us, we pour contempt on our pride of opinion and accomplishment; we lay aside our haughty self-sufficiency, and humbly pray that we may keep step with Thy will for us and for all Thy children.

In this night of human tragedy, no matter of what else the ebbing years may rob us, grant us courage in the midst of fear, faith amid the mists of doubt, and hope like a beacon amid the encircling gloom of despair. Teach us so to live and so to toil and so to play our part in this age on ages telling that, doing the right as Thou dost give us to see the right, we may face with clear conscience the gaze of our contemporaries and the judgment of posterity. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 15, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 15, 1955, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ANNUAL REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1955.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Luther V. Taylor, Sr., to be postmaster at Belmont, Miss., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate next week to attend the atomic energy tests in Nevada.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent that she be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the period of her absence during her visit in the Far East.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that while the Senate is in session the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to meet during the next 2 weeks as frequently as may be necessary in order to conduct hearings on the bill (S. 669) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ENTITLED "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT"

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on that fund, for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialist, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its construction of multiple-purpose projects, has become a major supplier of electric power to the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas the present and continuing growth of the region, including Oregon, requires the further and immediate development of its low-cost power potential in order to provide the energy base for industries, job opportunities, and the needs of its people; and

"Whereas the John Day project on the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington is one of the major integral units in the overall plan of comprehensive development of the Columbia River and has already been authorized and approved as such by the Congress of the United States (81st Cong., 2d sess., House Document No. 531); and

"Whereas its construction will complete slack water navigation from the mouth of the Columbia River to Pasco, Wash., a distance of some 328 miles; and

"Whereas it will provide approximately 500,000 acre-feet of storage for flood-control purposes and will also provide irrigation and recreational benefits; and

"Whereas such project will produce in excess of 1,100,000 kilowatts of low-cost power, fully integrated with the Federal grid and the Northwest power pool and close to Oregon load centers; and

"Whereas the growth of the region requires over 500,000 kilowatts of new power capacity annually and such multipurpose

projects as John Day must be started immediately in order to be completed and to avoid a serious power shortage by the early 1960's; and

"Whereas various local public utility agencies have offered to advance funds toward the preliminary engineering and planning costs of John Day and have indicated a willingness to advance over one-half the estimated cost of the project to expedite its construction by the United States as a Federal project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to (a) appropriate immediately the funds necessary to enable the Corps of Engineers to complete the preliminary investigations and planning for the John Day project; and (b) indicate its intention to build the John Day project promptly and solely with Federal funds by making the necessary appropriation to start construction immediately upon completing the preliminary planning or, in the alternative, enact without delay such enabling legislation as is required to permit local agencies to advance funds, under appropriate arrangements with the United States, so that construction of such project by the Federal Government can be initiated immediately; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

"Adopted by house January 28, 1955:

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate February 8, 1955:

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate.

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the control of floods in the Willamette River Basin has long been recognized by the Congress to be necessary and desirable; and

"Whereas certain river control projects have been built by the United States and are in service within the Willamette drainage area; and

"Whereas the early construction of other flood-control facilities on certain tributary streams is urgently needed to balance operation of already existing facilities and thereby check recurring and aggravated damage to lands and property adjacent to the principal uncontrolled streams; and

"Whereas the Green Peter flood-control project on the Middle Fork of the Santiam River and the Cougar project on the McKenzie River are among the most urgently needed to round out the Willamette Basin river-control program; and

"Whereas full utilization of the hydroelectric power potential of the Green Peter and Cougar sites would add 120,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity at strategic points in an area where power requirements are rapidly increasing; and

"Whereas local electric utilities, 1 municipal and 1 private, have shown willingness to finance and construct such electric facilities as an integral and coordinated part of the desired flood-control plan, thereby relieving the United States Government of that part of the costs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorializing to make available funds to begin the planning and construction of the flood-control facilities needed at the Green Peter and Cougar projects and, at the same time, authorize the licensing by the Federal Power Commission of hydroelectric installations to be financed and constructed by local agencies in harmony with the overall Willamette River Basin development plan; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

"Adopted by house January 25, 1955:

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate February 8, 1955:

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate."

By Mr. LANGER:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 5

"Resolution requesting procedures by the Commodity Credit Corporation when belt run sampling is had on grain for terminal storage

"Whereas flax is one of the most important cash crops in this State; and

"Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation apparently may arbitrarily determine to have Federal inspection based on a belt run sample of grain for terminal delivery, resulting often in a much greater percentage of dockage than was evident at the country elevator by usual tests, resulting in a loss to the country buyer: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That when such belt run sampling is had by the Commodity Credit Corporation and there appears to be substantial disagreement with the country elevator test, the Commodity Credit Corporation be requested to advise the shipper, and hold such grain shipment, pending negotiations with the shipper for tests to be made by other accepted trade methods; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of Agriculture, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to the Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution S

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States to continue service of Northwest Airlines to Honolulu

"Whereas the State of North Dakota has enjoyed a growing volume of trade and commerce with the Hawaiian Islands through the direct one-carrier service of Northwest Airlines to Honolulu; and

"Whereas the elimination of said service will abruptly halt this development and adversely affect the economy of North Dakota and the upper midwest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the President of the United States be respectfully urged to reconsider his decision to discontinue such service in the light of the best interests of the people of the State of North Dakota; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States and the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions, presented by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE), were received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take the proper steps necessary to protect and preserve the Rhode Island lace-manufacturing industry

"Whereas the American lace-manufacturing industry, 54 of whose 80 plants are located in Rhode Island, has suffered and still suffers increasingly serious difficulties as a result of tariff reductions effectuated under the trade agreement with France which became effective June 15, 1936; and

"Whereas reductions in tariffs since that date have driven the manufacture of veilings in America completely out and badly handicapped the manufacture of bobbinet and all other products of lace machines; and

"Whereas in addition to the above circumstances under which the industry has suffered grave injury, there is at present before the Congress a bill, H. R. 1, which would grant the Executive the right to reduce to 50 percent all tariffs that are over 50 percent of the value of the imported goods and reduce all other tariffs 15 percent at the rate of 5 percent per year for 3 years; and

"Whereas French and other foreign officials are already drawing up lists of duties they wish cut, including lace duties, in the event of passage of H. R. 1; and

"Whereas any further reduction in duties on lace may well mean the annihilation of the American lace-manufacturing industry and the loss of employment by its thousands of skilled employees, many of whom are located in Rhode Island: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby urgently requested to take the proper steps necessary to protect and preserve the Rhode Island lace-manufacturing industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to implement and execute plans and recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers relative to the dredging of Bullock Cove in the town of East Providence

"Whereas the Corps of Army Engineers has submitted plans and recommendations to the Congress of the United States for the dredging and improvement of Bullock Cove, so-called, in the town of East Providence to the end that a protected mooring basin may be created at such site; and

"Whereas the implementation of the aforesaid improvements and protection of said Bullock Cove would be useful and instrumental in protecting property of citizens of the town of East Providence who reside adjacent to the shoreline of said cove, which said property has been severely damaged and its very existence threatened by the depredations of hurricane Carol; and

"Whereas if said cove is not protected in accordance with the recommendations of the Army engineers, it is feared that much of said property could not withstand the onslaught of additional storms of gale or hurricane proportions; and

"Whereas Bullock Cove has been, during previous world wars, a center of defense, vessel construction, including warships of the minesweeper class, and is now the site of two boat-construction yards; and

"Whereas said cove will no longer be suitable for such important industrial and defense uses in the event that the said recommendations of the Army engineers are not speedily implemented; and

"Whereas said Bullock Cove has been and now is a center for a sizable fishing fleet which has now been deprived of facilities for fueling, loading mooring by the effects of said hurricane; and

"Whereas said fishing industry, which is centered in said Bullock Cove, will be seriously impaired in the absence of the dredging and improvement of said cove; and

"Whereas it is feared by numerous citizens of this State and particularly of the town of East Providence, that Congress may not appropriate sufficient funds to implement and execute the plans and recommendations of the Army engineers relative to the dredging of Bullock Cove in the town of East Providence: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the State of Rhode Island, through the general assembly, now requests the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the implementation and execution of the plans submitted by the Corps of Army Engineers relative to the dredging of Bullock Cove and the improvement thereof and the creation at said site of a protected harbor of refuge; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress be, and they hereby are, earnestly requested to use their concerted effort to bring about the implementation and execution of said plans and recommendations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA TURKEY FEDERATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the North Dakota Turkey Federation, relating to the turkey industry.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Whereas turkey production has been unprofitable due to the fact that the turkey producers have been caught in a squeeze between supported grain prices and unsupported turkey prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, The North Dakota Turkey Federation strongly urges the Secretary of Agriculture to make available directly to all turkey, poultry, and livestock growers light weight wheat and supported feed grains at a price 50 percent lower than the loan value.

Resolution 3

Whereas the turkey growers of North Dakota believe in free enterprise and individual initiative; and

Whereas there is agitation from certain quarters for price supports and quota controls: Therefore be it

Resolved, We of the North Dakota Turkey Federation request the Secretary of Agriculture to refrain from interferring with the turkey industry in any manner. We ask that he do not apply quotas or price supports of any kind.

IRVING J. MORK,
Executive Secretary, North Dakota Turkey Federation.

RESOLUTION OF ASSOCIATION OF CLERKS OF THE DISTRICT COURTS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Association of Clerks of the District Courts of Minnesota, relating to the enforcement of judgments in certain cases.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CLERKS OF THE DISTRICT COURTS OF MINNESOTA

Resolution for the amendment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended

Whereas, under the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, the period of limitation for the enforcement of a judgment is extended for a period depending on certain factors in the case in question; and

Whereas the records and files of the office of the clerk of the court, in which such judgment is entered, does not contain information to indicate which judgments are so extended, as to the period of limitation by reason of this act, makes it necessary to continue all judgments as unexpired as to the limitation period and to search such judgment records and to certify as to existence, or nonexistence, of such judgments for the statutory limitation period prior to the enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; and

Whereas for the reason above stated, the judgment dockets in the clerk of court offices have become voluminous, as a result of the vast majority of such judgments not affected by the provisions of such act, but which are continued in the judgment dockets for lack of information in the files and records to indicate which affect military personnel, although they have, in fact, expired under the statutory period of limitation; and

Whereas an amendment to said act, to require the filing of affirmative information, in the specific file concerned, as to the military service of the judgment debtor, or creditor, would retain the protective features of the act, and enable the clerks of court to remove the judgments, which have in fact expired from the current judgment dockets, and would permit more accurate and practical searching for and certification of such judgment dockets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of Clerks of the District Courts of Minnesota, in convention assembled in the city of St. Paul, Minn., on the 21st day of January 1955, That the Congress of the United States so amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that in all cases where the period of limitation for the enforcement of a judgment in any State is extended by reason of the military service of the judgment debtor, or judgment creditor, such judgment shall not constitute a lien against any property of the judgment debtor beyond the normal period of limitation unless within such limitation period, the judgment creditor shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office of the clerk of the court where such judgment is entered an affidavit affirmatively setting forth the facts, as to the military service of the judgment debtor, and, to the best of his information and belief, the date of his entry into such service, length of such service, date of discharge or other termination of such service, and any other material information.

EDNY D. DIBBLE,
President.
OLIVE PETERSON,
Secretary.

ELIMINATION OF APPENDIX VOLUME FROM BOUND SET OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Washington director of the American Library Association, relating to a resolution adopted by the Joint Committee on Printing on June 22, 1953, pertaining to the elimination of the Appendix volume from the bound set of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The resolution passed by the Joint Committee on Printing in the 83d Congress which eliminated the Appendix volume from the bound set of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is causing grave consequences to libraries in their service to the public. According to the resolution "all extraneous matter, including but not limited to newspaper and magazine articles, editorials, addresses, radio programs, commentators' stories, resolutions from organizations and individuals, letters from constituents, etc., together with Members' remarks preceding same, appearing in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shall be omitted from the permanent form of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

Libraries are responsible for the preservation of material and the subsequent recourse to it. The deletion of material from the bound volumes after once being printed in the daily RECORD requires a library to retain both the bound volumes and the daily for the complete record. The paper backed daily RECORD is not easily preserved for library use. Too, the necessity for having two sets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on hand to serve the public poses a terrific housing problem for

libraries, not to mention the added expense of binding the daily RECORD.

The bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 2d session of the 83d Congress were printed with no listing of the material deleted. There is no way by which you can locate this information unless you could have access to a set of the daily RECORD. Since this printing is completed, it is the suggestion of the American Library Association that a separate index of this material be prepared and sent to subscribers of the bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Material should not be deleted after printing without some record of what happened to it.

It would also be the hope of the American Library Association that the Joint Committee on Printing might again consider the question of amount and kinds of material which go into the daily RECORD. Once printed in the daily RECORD libraries feel that all material should be retained in the bound volume. To librarians this is a vital problem. It is our hope that you can assist in bringing about a reconsideration of the resolution of June 22, 1953, by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sincerely,

JULIA D. BENNETT,
Director, ALA Washington Office.

PENSION BENEFITS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the contents of a letter I have received from the chairman of the fourth district service board, Minnesota department of the American Legion, together with a resolution adopted by the fourth district post service officers relative to establishing pension benefits for widows and dependents of deceased World War II and Korean veterans on the same basis as are now available to widows and dependents of veterans of World War I.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *February 11, 1955.*

Senator EDWARD THYE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I am writing you at the request of the American Legion post service officers in the fourth district. There are 40 Legion posts in this district each of which is represented by a service officer whose primary responsibility is to assist disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents.

The service officers report that they are running into many dependents of deceased World War II and Korean veterans, in their particular neighborhoods, who are suffering hardship because of their inability to qualify for pension. Many of these dependents are convinced that the deceased veteran was suffering from a service-connected disability at date of death but their conviction is almost valueless in view of the difficulty of establishing service-connection when the only man who knows all the facts is gone. There are also a number of cases where it appears the veteran's death was probably caused by a service-connected disability. The difficulties of proof are the same in these cases, though explanation to the dependents is more difficult.

The service officers solicit your support of this legislation and request that you do everything possible to secure its passage.

You will find a resolution enclosed which expresses the views of Legion members in the fourth district of Minnesota.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS MALONE,
Chairman, Fourth District Service Board.

Whereas widows and children of World War II and Korean veterans are not entitled, under existing laws and regulations, to a pension from the United States unless the deceased veteran was suffering from a disability established as service-connected; and

Whereas many widows and children of World War II and Korean veterans are in need of this pension but because of existing laws and regulations their applications for such are denied forcing them to forego the necessities of life and accept public relief in order to exist, and

Whereas the people of this Nation through their elected representatives have granted the right to pension to widows and children of World War I veterans even though such deceased veterans did not protect the rights of their dependents by proving the existence of a service-connected disability: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the post service officers, fourth district, American Legion, Department of Minnesota, That they favor and strongly urge that the Congress of the United States pass legislation giving to widows and children of World War II and Korean veterans the same rights to a pension as are now posessed by widows and children of World War I veterans.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. BENDER, Mr. THYE, Mr. DUFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. BUSH):

S. 1091. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe work places and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1092. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Illinois State Normal University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1093. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1094. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1095. A bill to extend the time within which local educational agencies may complete applications for payments under Public Law 815 in certain hardship cases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer; and

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Clorimondo Mancia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 1098. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947, as amended, to provide for the disposition of certain materials on lands within national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1099. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to correct injustice and to provide for the payment of certain amounts of compensation to officers who were found under the provisions of that act to have been removed from the active list of the Army without justification and who were subsequently restored to the active list or advanced on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Helmholz;

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of Martino Palmeri;

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of August Cohn;

S. 1103. A bill for the relief of Frank Novacek and Zore Novacek; and

S. 1104. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Klar and his wife, Vilma Hartmann Klar, and their minor son, Tibor Klar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 1105. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lieselotte Emilie Dailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1107. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1108. A bill for the relief of Sada Zarikian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1109. A bill to amend subsection 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1110. A bill for the relief of Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1111. A bill for the relief of Eric A. Cummings;

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Luca Saltarelli;

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Andreas Gerassimos Grigoratos;

S. 1114. A bill to waive any claims of the United States for the repayment of loans made by the Department of State to Harry H. Thomas and Jeanne A. Thomas;

S. 1115. A bill for the relief of Ursula Ann McFarland; and

S. 1116. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth M. Casey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL (for himself and Mr. BUSH):

S. 1117. A bill to amend section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deduction of trade or business expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1118. A bill for the relief of Katharine Schneeberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1119. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1120. A bill to enlarge and extend the special school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1121. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a monetary allowance in lieu of providing a headstone or marker for the unmarked grave of a soldier or a member or former member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1122. A bill for the relief of Szloma Kleidermacher and his wife Sarah Kleidermacher and their children Ruchla, Abram, and Toba Kleidermacher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and re-evaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to designate the musical composition by John Phillip Sousa, known as The Stars and Stripes Forever, as the official national march of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION OF INDUSTRIAL SAFETY PROGRAMS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist the States in the development and expansion of industrial safety programs. The important objectives of this bill are a part of the current legislative program of President Eisenhower and the Department of Labor. The President requested $2 million in his budget message for this program in fiscal 1956.

During the year 1953, 15,000 deaths and 2,034,000 injuries occurred in the course of industrial employment. The cost, direct and indirect, of these accidents has been estimated by the Department of Labor to be approximately $4.5 billion.

While the regulation of industrial safety is a proper function of the States, except where the national interest is directly affected, the current resources of State agencies for safety development programs have been so limited that they preclude even one inspection per plant annually in more than three-fourths of the States.

This bill would provide substantial impetus to State industrial safety programs by allotting funds to States on the basis of the number of wage earners, industrial hazards, financial need, and other relevant factors. Each State would get a minimum of $15,000. States would be required to supply matching funds of not less than 25 percent of the total expenditures in the first 2 years, 33⅓ percent in the second 2 years, and 50 percent thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1091) to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe work places and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Industrial Safety Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the establishment and maintenance of safe work places and practices in industry reduce human suffering and financial loss and increase production through safeguarding available manpower. The purpose of this act is to assist the several States in their efforts (1) to develop and promote the acceptance of standards for establishing and maintaining safe work places and practices in industry through the voluntary cooperation of labor and management, and (2) to prepare and promulgate regulations for the purpose of requiring safe work places and practices and to foster the observance of such regulations.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Secretary State plans under section 3 of this act, and (2) such sums as may be necessary for administrative and other expenses of the Department of Labor in administering this act: *Provided, however*, That no funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended and no plan under section 3 shall provide for a safety program as to coal mines and coal mining subject to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, as amended (55 Stat. 177, U. S. C., title 30, secs. 451, et seq.).

SEC. 3. (a) To be approved a State plan for carrying out the purposes of section 2 (a) must—

(1) Delegate a single State agency, which must be the State agency administering labor laws for the establishment and maintenance of safe work places and practices in industry, to administer such plan;

(2) Provide such methods of administration as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan, including after June 30, 1956, (a) methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods; and (b) a training program for the personnel necessary for the administration of the plan;

(3) Provide for fostering the observance of State laws or regulations respecting safe work places and practices in industry; and for the development of standards for establishing and maintaining safe work places and practices in industry;

(4) Include a program for the promotion of observance of safety precautions through the voluntary cooperation of employers and employees in industry, which program may include cooperation with any nongovernment safety organization active in the State;

(5) Provide for financial participation by the State in all parts of the State plan and such distribution of funds for enforcement and promotional functions as to assure the application throughout the State of standards necessary to the establishment, promotion, and maintenance of safe work places and practices in industry; and

(6) Provide that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 4 (a) The funds appropriated for the purposes authorized in section 2 (b) shall be allotted by the Secretary among the several States annually in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by him providing for such allotment on the basis of (1) the number of wage earners, (2) the special hazards in industry, (3) the financial needs of the respective States, and (4) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make reallotments from time to time where the amount allotted to any State has not been absorbed by that State and he finds that any other State is in need of additional funds to administer its plan. The Secretary shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this section and he shall thereupon prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office pay to the State the amount so estimated. The annual payment to any State during the first and second bienniums after July 1, 1955, shall not exceed 75 percent and 66⅔ percent, respectively, of the annual expenditures under the State plan during those periods. The payments to any State for any subsequent year shall not exceed 50 percent of the expenditures under the State plan for each year: *Provided*, That the annual payment to any State under this section shall not be less than $15,000.

(b) Amounts paid to a State under this section shall be expended solely for carrying out the purposes set forth in section 2 (a), in accordance with the State plan. When any part of the amount so paid to any State for any fiscal year is not so expended for carrying out such purposes within such fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized, in such manner as he may determine, to adjust subsequent amounts to be paid by the amount not so expended.

SEC. 5. In the case of any State plan which has been approved under this act, if the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such plan, determines, on the record, that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any requirement of this Act or any provision required by this act to be included in the plan, he shall notify such State agency

that further payments will not be made to the State until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is further authorized, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act, to utilize the services of experts and consultants, as authorized by section 55a of title 5 of the United States Code. Such experts and consultants may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in connection with their work for the Department in accordance with section 73–b–2 of title 5 of the United States Code.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is further authorized to issue such regulations governing the administration of this act, cause to be made such investigations, and appoint, subject to the civil-service laws, such employees, as he deems necessary to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix the compensation of such employees in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 8. As used in this act "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 9. The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

SEC. 10. The Secretary shall include in his annual report to Congress a full account of the administration of this act.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN MATERIALS ON LANDS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to amend the laws governing the acquisition of certain minerals on the public lands of the United States.

This bill is designed primarily to accomplish two objectives.

First. It provides that common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, cinders, pumice and pumicite be acquired under the Materials Act, and that these materials shall no longer be the subject of any mining claims.

Second. The bill proposes to amend the Materials Act so as to give the Secretary of Agriculture the same authority under the act as to public lands administered by him as the act presently gives to the Secretary of Interior.

I believe that this proposed legislation is necessary in order to avoid the unnecessary acquisition and possible misuse of public lands by interests which desire only to exhaust the supplies of these common minerals, which are generally located on or close to the earth's surface, and also to substitute the certainty and simplicity of contractual purchase for the complexity and controversy of proving a valid mining claim. A similar proposal has previously passed the House of Representatives with the support of the executive agencies concerned. I believe that the public policies to be served by it are so obvious and uncontroversial as to justify the hope that this proposed legislation may be enacted by the 84th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1098) to amend the act of July 31, 1947, as amended, to provide for the disposition of certain materials on lands within national forests, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE PROCUREMENT OF HEADSTONES OR MARKERS BY NEXT OF KIN OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a monetary allowance in lieu of providing a headstone or marker for the unmarked grave of a soldier or a member or former member of the Armed Forces. I desire to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The bill would allow the next of kin of deceased servicemen to be paid the amount which it costs the Government to provide a headstone or marker, so that such persons may make purchases of their own choice.

This is important, I believe, because sometimes the next of kin desire something more than the plain stone or marker furnished now at Government expense.

The bill would also permit the next of kin to deal directly with monument makers in their own communities, many of whom are old family friends.

I commend the bill to the attention of the committee and the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1121) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a monetary allowance in lieu of providing a headstone or marker for the unmarked grave of a soldier or a member or former member of the Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

HUMAN AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in explanation of the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

I am today introducing a joint resolution aimed at encouraging a thorough-going, nationwide analysis and reevaluation of every aspect of the problem of mental illness.

Certainly the one most shocking and frightening of the health problems which confront the Nation today is the appalling cost, both in human and economic terms, of mental illness. When one realizes that over 47 percent of all the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by mental patients and that the direct economic cost of mental illness to the taxpayers of the Nation is over $1 billion a year and is increasing at the rate of $100 million a year, it should be obvious to all that we must develop some new departures in our attempts to meet this problem.

The governors of the 48 States, through the Council of State Governments, have been working together in a vigorous attempt to cope with these problems. Now the American Medical Association's Council on Mental Health and the American Psychiatric Association, together with other professional organizations in the field, have decided that our best hope to find a solution to this staggering problem lies in a thorough-going, nationwide analysis and reevaluation of our entire approach to the problems of mental health. They believe, and I agree, that every aspect relating to present methods of diagnosing, caring for, treating and rehabilitating the mentally ill, as well as methods of preventing mental illness, should be objectively reevaluated and new approaches sought. I agree with the organizations mentioned that such a review and reevaluation of the problem can best be conducted by such nongovernmental agencies and organizations as those cooperating with the AMA's council and the APA. I believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to offer financial assistance in the conduct of such nongovernmentally directed undertaking. The bill I have today intro-

duced would carry out this desirable concept by making available over a 3-year period a substantial grant to be made upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council to qualified nongovernmental agencies, organizations or commissions composed of representatives of leading national medical and other professional associations for the kind of survey and reevaluation needed. The sums which would be authorized in the bill are designed to supplement and not replace similar funds which it is hoped will be made available from private sources. Hearings on the bill will, I believe, bring out an accurate estimate of the total cost which will be involved in such an undertaking.

The council of the American Medical Association and the American Psychiatric Association are to be commended for the initiative and fine sense of public responsibility they have shown in formulating plans for this most important undertaking. They and the other professional groups which have offered to cooperate with them in carrying it out deserve to receive such measure of help from the Federal Government as may be found necessary. The results of their undertaking may well prove as important in the field of mental health as the Flexner Commission report was in the field of medical education at the turn of the century.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the desk until the first meeting of the Senate after its meeting on Tuesday next, for the purpose of enabling other Senators, who may wish to do so, to join in the sponsorship of the joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to join in the sponsorship of the resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, RELATING TO INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. EASTLAND, himself, and Mr. JENNER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the limitation of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, agreed to December 21, 1950, is hereby increased by $260,000, and such sum together with any unexpended balances of the sums previously authorized to be expended under such resolution and Senate Resolution 172, 83d Congress, agreed to January 27, 1954, Senate Resolution 46, 83d Congress, agreed to January 30, 1953, Senate Resolution 314, 82d Congress, agreed to May 29, 1952, Senate Resolution 198, 82d Congress, agreed to September 27, 1951, and Senate Resolution 7, 82d Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee and covering obligations incurred under such resolutions on or before January 31, 1956.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE JUDICIARY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THYE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 462, to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table. The purpose of the amendments is to separate the question of congressional salaries from the consideration of judicial salaries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1119) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

Lincoln Day address delivered by him at Glastonbury, Conn., on Saturday, February 12, 1955.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Address delivered by him before the Executives Club of Chicago, Ill., on February 16, 1955, relating to the United Nations commission on international commodities trade.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by him at Lincoln Day luncheon, in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1955.

By Mr. ERVIN:

Statement prepared by him relative to Rinaldo Burrus Page.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Address entitled "The Challenge to Public Power," delivered by him at the 13th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 16, 1955.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Report by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, concerning certain foreign shipyards and other questions of interest to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES IN RE FALLOUT FROM HYDROGEN BOMBS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Tuesday, February 22, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the room of the Committee on Armed Services, a hearing will be held to review the civil defense operation, particularly in reference to information recently published relative to fallout after the explosion of hydrogen bombs.

The hearing is being held pursuant to instructions of the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. At the hearing a number of witnesses from the Atomic Energy Commission and the Office of Civil Defense will be heard.

This is a matter of great interest and will set forth some of the problems confronting those who are charged with the responsibility of civil defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following these remarks, an editorial entitled "Defense Against Fallout," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Thursday, February 17, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE AGAINST FALLOUT

The Atomic Energy Commission and the administration have acted wisely in making public a summary of the radioactive after effects of nuclear explosions. Hard facts are the basis for intelligent planning; and Chairman Strauss' measured statement about the fallout seeks to give the facts in perspective. We suspect that the apprehensions about public panic as a result of this sort of disclosure will prove wholly unjustified. Most of the present information about the fallout, although never before released officially, has been known for some time through various printed stories. Such stories may have caused some alarm, but they also have been greeted with a considerable degree of apathy; perhaps because people simply do not want to think about a cataclysm they feel they can do nothing about. This feeling of futility is, if anything, more deadly than fear.

Full understanding of the great dangers about which Mr. Strauss spoke remains essential. Radioactive fallout from a hydrogen explosion could contaminate an area the size of New Jersey and make it uninhabitable for weeks if not months, even if the bulk of the population managed to survive the blast effects and the immediate lethal dosage of radioactivity. The use of the H-bomb to deny territory could be as significant strategically as the destructive effect itself. Nevertheless, there are many relatively simple precautions that can be taken by way of shelter and discipline, as the Atomic Energy Commission points out, that would greatly reduce the loss of life from radioactivity.

Why is there apathy to even the most gruesomely realistic accounts of the H-bomb danger? Because, in this newspaper's opinion, the people have not been presented with a convincing alternative to the paralyzing prospect of being roasted or gamma-rayed to ashes if hydrogen war should start. Surely it is time for a radical new look at the status of civil defense.

The sad fact is that in its net impact civil defense still is in an appalling state of disorganization—not for lack of effort on the part of persons working in it, but because of insufficient attention at the top levels of

Government. Congress has treated civil defense more or less as a joke, in part, no doubt, as the result of a "can't happen here" complex, but also in part because legislators have not been satisfied that the planning is practical. Despite the hard work of many persons, the program is rife with contradictory assumptions and outmoded instructions. For example, in the District of Columbia, which presumably would be one of the major targets, the air-raid warning system so far is of little value; it is impossible to distinguish between the feeble siren tests and an ordinary two-alarm fire. There is little point in recruiting air-raid wardens and ground observers unless they can be instructed realistically in what will be expected of them.

Apathy and futility are luxuries the country cannot afford. Even in the event of all-out hydrogen attack, estimates are that 65 percent of the population would survive; with adequate civil defense as much as 95 percent would survive. But an adequate program will not come about accidentally. It can only be obtained if men of stature will attach serious importance to the program and if the makeshift expedients are replaced with consistent, hard-headed planning at the top level. Such planning ought to envisage specific instructions to cities as to the kind of blast and fallout they could expect and the practicable evacuation and shelter measures they ought to prepare. It ought to be related to the amount of early warning that may be provided—the present stage, when the margin of warning would be small and immediate shelter ought to be sought; the period in which 1 to 4 hours of warning would be possible and large-scale evacuation would be feasible; and, finally, the era of the awesome intercontinental ballistic missile if it should be developed.

None of this is in any way a substitute for enforcible disarmament. The only sure defense against the H-bomb is to control it (and this newspaper reiterates its proposal of last Friday for an internationally monitored moratorium on H-bomb tests as a starter). But even in the absence of international control Americans can do a great deal to protect themselves, given some more vigorous planning and leadership. It is absurd for the country to be spending hundreds of millions of dollars on continental defense and an early warning system and then to permit the necessary follow-through at the civil defense level to be dissipated in lethargy and confusion. Americans have a history of responding sensibly if they are told frankly and realistically what is necessary. The administration and Congress bear a joint responsibility to provide this leadership and the money that will be required to make it effective.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 16, our Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, delivered an important address before the Foreign Policy Association at the Waldorf-Astoria, in New York City.

The subject of the address was our foreign policy in Asia.

As a member of the Foreign Policy Association for many years and a former active trustee, I had the privilege of attending this dinner and heard Secretary Dulles deliver the address. The address was noteworthy for many reasons. Secretary Dulles, after rapidly reviewing the collective security treaties we have entered into with the countries of the Far East during the past couple of years, pointed out that treaty pledges, no matter how sound, "will never restrain powerful and ambitious rulers who do not accept the restraint of moral law."

In another part of his speech he said:

We dare not relax, because the moment of relaxation is the moment of peril. Treaty declarations must be backed by a purpose that is ever sustained by an intelligence that is ever alert and by power which is ever ready and able to punish aggressors so that aggression will not pay.

Also in another part of his speech he drew a distinction between the people of the Russian state and the Communist Party itself. Mr. Dulles said:

We should keep that distinction in mind. The time may come—I believe it will come—when Russians of stature will patriotically put first their national security and the welfare of their people. They will be unwilling to have that security and that welfare subordinated to the world wide ambitions of international communism. If their point of view should prevail—

And by that Mr. Dulles meant the point of view of the Russian people as distinguished from the Communist Party—

then, indeed, there could be a basis for worthwhile negotiation and practical agreements between the United States and the new Russia. Then there might be reactivated the historic friendship between our countries and our peoples.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this is one of the most important suggestions the Secretary of State has made. If we could only reach through the Iron Curtain of the Government of Russia to get at their people, reach behind the Red Chinese Government in Peiping to get at the Chinese people, who have always been our friends, we possibly could begin to see the dawn of the day when world peace might be in sight.

But, Mr. President, this can never be brought about by appeasement or by further yielding to the inroads of Communist demands.

After pointing out the reasons why we collaborated with the Nationalist forces on Formosa to evacuate the Tachen Islands and to regroup their forces, Secretary Dulles said:

It has been suggested that Nationalist China should go further and surrender to the Chinese Communists the coastal positions which the Communists need to stage their announced attack on Formosa.

Mr. President, I am personally aware of these pressures to have us take this negative appeasement position, and I am happy to call the attention of my colleagues to the firm and yet statesmanlike way Mr. Dulles met this issue. He said:

It is doubtful that this would serve either the cause of peace or the cause of freedom.

The Chinese Communists have been the initiators of violence in this area. They have already formally declared their intention to take Formosa by force. If the Chinese Nationalists now oblige by making it easier for the Chinese Communists to conquer Formosa will they (the Chinese Communists) be less apt to do so?

Secretary Dulles answered his own question by saying:

I doubt it.

Those of us who have been watching this situation heartily commend the Secretary of State for these positions which he has taken in this important address. He develops this thought further later in the speech:

It should not, moreover, be carelessly assumed that peace and security will be promoted merely by the non-Communist nations indefinitely granting one-sided concessions of the Communist Nations.

A great danger in Asia is the fear of many non-Communists peoples that the United States has no real intention of standing firmly behind them. Already that fear has mounted to the danger point. We accepted in Korea an armistice which the Chinese Communists boisterously misrepresent as a "victory" for them. We acquiesced in an Indochina armistice which reflected the defeat of the French Union forces at Dien Bien Phu. We aided the Tachen evacuation. The reasons were compelling, nevertheless the result added a few square miles to the Communist domain.

If the non-Communist Asians ever come to feel that their Western Allies are disposed to retreat whenever communism threatens the peace, then the entire area could quickly become indefensible.

As the situation now exists, neither the cause of freedom, nor United States security, nor world peace and security, would be promoted by undermining the faith of the free Asian peoples in our strength and in our willingness to use that strength to restrain those who violently menace liberty. The American people have, through the Congress, made their own resolution clear. That is a verdict which the Government accepts as sound and which it will soberly execute.

I am quoting these excerpts from the Secretary's statement because it seems to me that the press is completely confused as to some of the things he said, especially his insistence on continuing the policy we have followed up to this time.

Mr. President, on the question of the defense of the islands to which these quotations have referred, I should like to add one more thought. It has been suggested to me that if the United States defends the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, it would only be for the purpose of giving Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist Army two steppingstones to the attack of the mainland of China. We made it abundantly clear in the debate on the recent resolution and the China Treaty that we would not participate in any program for the invasion of the mainland, or permit the Nationalist forces unilaterally to make any such attempt. But it must be borne in mind that the maintenance of a strong Nationalist Army on Formosa with a real threat to the mainland of China, which threat would need the islands of Quemoy and Matsu to make it effective, is a very clear and necessary deterrent to any aggressions by Moscow-supported Red China in violation of either the Korean Armistice or the Armistice in Indochina. It is my considered judgment that the forces of the Western powers, represented by the ROK's in Korea, and the Nationalist Army on Formosa, and the Vietnamese in Indochina, must be maintained in full strength and in a posture ready for action in the event of any further Communist aggression in Asia, or for that matter, in Western Europe as well.

Mr. President, our Secretary of State, speaking of course for the President of the United States, has very firmly and

convincingly told the world of our interest in the freedom, independence and self-determination of the peoples of the Far East, and other parts of the world. The very heart of this policy is a free and independent China, really liberated from the exploitation or domination of any outside power. If and when the Communist Chinese people, or the Russian people, for that matter, are able and eager to speak for themselves, they will find a warm welcome in the hearts of the people of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Dulles' significant speech be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 16, 1955

OUR FOREIGN POLICIES IN ASIA

I am glad to be again with the Foreign Policy Association. I first spoke before you 35 years ago. So this is, in a sense, an anniversary. I know well of your work. It is good work and I am glad that it is going on, bringing to our citizenry a better knowledge of our foreign policy.

I

The broad goal of our foreign policy is to enable the people of the United States to enjoy in peace the blessings of liberty. Under present world conditions we cannot achieve that goal by thinking of ourselves alone. We must help other peoples to be free. Thus, enlightened self-interest combines with high principle to lead us to do for others what, if conditions were reversed, we would want them to do for us.

Our task is not an easy one; nor one that can be discharged without sacrifice and risk. Stormy winds blow from Moscow and Peiping.

In Moscow, Foreign Minister Molotov pours 17,000 words of abuse upon the western powers. In Peiping, Foreign Minister Chou bitterly attacks the United States and threatens to use all the force at his command to capture Formosa.

A heavy responsibility devolves upon the President daily, and upon the Congress, in making delicate decisions which may spell the difference between peace and war.

All of us would like to see peace permanently assured. We long for some simple and certain formula which would relieve us of the present anxious tasks. But perhaps we are learning a needed lesson, that there is no easy way to win peace.

Twice in our generation efforts have been made to secure peace by broad agreements to abolish war. The Pact of Paris of 1928 binds over 60 nations to renounce war as an instrument of international policy. But shortly after it was made, the nations fought in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The United Nations Charter of 1945 binds 60 nations to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. But there has been armed aggression in Korea which was promoted by Soviet Russia, and later Communist China was found guilty of armed aggression there.

It is good that mankind should by great pronouncements demonstrate its hatred of war and its determination to outlaw war. Idealism is indispensable. But it would be dangerous to assume that treaties or pledges alone would relieve us of the burdensome tasks we undertake in the struggle for peace.

Treaty pledges, no matter how solemn, will never restrain powerful and ambitious rulers who do not accept the restraints of moral law and who are not responsive to the will of the people. As against such despots there must be other and further restraints.

Thus the struggle goes on. We dare not relax, because the moment of relaxation is the moment of peril. Treaty declarations must be backed by a purpose that is ever sustained, by an intelligence that is ever alert, and by power which is ever ready and able to punish aggressors so that aggression will not pay.

Whenever the advocates of peace seem to lack these qualities, then peace is in jeopardy. On the other hand, so long as those qualities are manifestly present, then we can have good hope that the battle for peace will be won.

That hope is the more justified because modern weapons possess such immense destructive power. That fact is frightening. But the very fact that it is frightening means that even the most reckless will pause before taking action which would bring modern weapons into play.

During these days the Soviet and Chinese Communists are probing deeply the intentions of the free nations. But we need not feel worried or despondent, for what the despots will discover from their probing ought to restrain them.

In Europe there seems no retreat from the basic resolve to create the Western European Union and so to end the disunity of Western Europe. To replace that disunity and weakness with unity and strength will be the greatest single contribution which could be made to the cause of peace.

In Western Europe there are over 200 million highly civilized people. They possess in the aggregate the intellectual and material resources to be both prosperous and safe—provided only that they are united in spirit and properly organized to work together. When this unity is achieved, great things will come about. Western Europe will not only have the strength to solve its own internal and external problems but will be a mighty force to preserve world peace.

II

In the Far East the United States has responded to the desire of others that we join with them to assure their security. During the last 4 years, the United States has become party to security treaties with Korea, Japan, the Republic of China on Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. Also we have joined the 8-power Manila Pact for the security of Southeast Asia.

The total of these treaties is a mutual security system which, starting from the Aleutian Islands in the north, runs in a great arc to the South Pacific. This constitutes a defensive bulwark for freedom in that part of the world.

What has thus been done by many n- ·ions is important. Also important is the manner in which the United States has played its part, particularly during recent days.

When the Congress convened last January, it was organized by the Democratic Party. So when the Manila Pact and the China Treaty were submitted, they were submitted by a Republican President to a Democrat-controlled body. The same was true of President Eisenhower's request for congressional authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the Formosa area.

Nevertheless, the two treaties were ratified and the congressional authority was granted. This was done promptly and with virtual unanimity.

These events demonstrate a national unity and capacity for action which is needed in the world today. Too often representative processes lead to such partisanship and such consequent delays that hostile forces are encouraged to believe that democracies are inherently ineffective. The Government of the United States has shown the contrary. Partisanship was wholly subordinated to the national good, so that action of great importance could be taken with deliberation, but with decisiveness.

For this the Nation can be grateful to the leadership and to the general membership of both parties in the Congress. I know that they would expect me to pay special tribute to WALTER F. GEORGE, who, as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, carried the heaviest aggregate burden of responsibility in relation to the three acts to which I refer.

We can all take pride, as Americans, in this demonstration of national unity and capacity. Because of it, free men throughout the world can face the future with better hope and new confidence.

III

While the capacity of the representative form of government has been recently demonstrated in the United States, there has been occurring in Moscow an extraordinary demonstration of despotic disarray. The Prime Minister of the Soviet State was peremptorily summoned to a high Soviet session in the Kremlin and subjected to the public humiliation of hearing another read his resignation and his confession of "my guilt."

With that Communist verdict we need not quarrel. But the full significance of what has occurred is still obscure and perhaps the last act of the drama has not yet been played.

Undoubtedly, we see an elemental, personal struggle for power. But also one can perceive the outlines of a basic policy difference. There must be those who are primarily concerned with the welfare, security and greatness of the Soviet Union and its people. There are others who would have the Soviet Union and its power serve primarily as a tool of international communism and as a means of achieving its worldwide ambitions. These two ends, the one symbolized by the state, the other by the party, do not always coincide.

To us, the party and the state in Russia usually seem indistinguishable, because many individuals serve in dual capacities. But Lenin and Stalin constantly emphasized the distinction between the two. "The party," said Stalin, "is not and cannot be identified with the state power."

We should keep that distinction in mind. The time may come—I believe it will come—when Russians of stature will patriotically put first their national security and the welfare of their people. They will be unwilling to have that security and that welfare subordinated to the worldwide ambitions of international communism. If their point of view should prevail, then indeed there could be a basis for worthwhile negotiation and practical agreements between the United States and the new Russia. Then there might be reactivated the historic friendship between our countries and our peoples.

IV

Let me turn now to deal with some of the substantive problems which arise out of the two Far Eastern treaties to which I have referred—the China Treaty and the Manila Pact.

The United States is firmly committed to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. These islands became part of the Japanese Empire in 1895. They continued as such for half a century, until they were relinquished by Japan as a result of her defeat in war—a defeat principally wrought by the efforts and sacrifices of the United States.

These islands form an important part of the Western Pacific defense system which I have described. The people of the islands eagerly seek our help.

Thus Formosa and the Pescadores have been properly a matter of concern to the United States.

In 1945 our long-time ally, the Republic of China, was entrusted with authority over these islands. In 1950, when the aggression against Korea occurred, President Truman ordered our Pacific Fleet to defend Formosa against possible Chinese Communist attack. Now, that determination has been converted into our Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China.

It is important to note that the treaty, except as it relates to United States territories, covers only the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores, and an armed attack directed against those islands. The congressional authority is to secure and protect Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, and to make secure and to protect "related positions and territories" as the President judges "this would be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores."

The President did not use our Armed Forces to help the Chinese Nationalists to hold the Tachen Islands and Yushan and Pishan, lying some 200 miles north of Formosa. These islands were virtually unrelated to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. We helped the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate these islands and regroup their forces, so as to avoid a bloody and wasteful battle which would have inflamed public emotions. Thus, Nationalist China and the United States have made an important contribution to the cause of peace.

It has been suggested that Nationalist China should go further and surrender to the Chinese Communists the coastal positions which the Communists need to stage their announced attack on Formosa.

It is doubtful that this would serve either the cause of peace or the cause of freedom.

The Chinese Communists have been the initiators of violence in this area. They have already formally declared their intention to take Formosa by force. If the Chinese Nationalists now oblige by making it easier for the Chinese Communists to conquer Formosa, will they be less apt to do so? I doubt it.

The United States has no commitment and no purpose to defend the coastal positions as such. The basic purpose is to assure that Formosa and the Pescadores will not be forcibly taken over by the Chinese Communists. However, Foreign Minister Chou says they will use all their force to take Formosa and they treat the coastal islands as means to that end. When the Nationalists voluntarily evacuated the Tachen Islands, the Chinese Communists' comment was: "the liberation of these islands has created favorable conditions for our People's Liberation Army in the liberation of Formosa."

Thus the Chinese Communists have linked the coastal positions to the defense of Formosa. That is the fact which, as President Eisenhower said in his message to Congress about Formosa, "compels us to take into account closely related localities." Accordingly, we shall be alert to subsequent Chinese Communist actions, rejecting for ourselves any initiative of warlike deeds.

It is hardly to be expected that the Chinese Communists will renounce their ambitions. However, might they not renounce their efforts to realize their goals by force?

Such renunciation of force is one of the basic principles of the United Nations, and the United States had hoped, and still hopes, that the United Nations may be able to effect a cessation of the present hostilities. President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress dealing with this matter, made clear that the United States would welcome action by the United Nations which might bring an end to the active hostilities in the area. The Government of New Zealand has brought this situation before the Security Council, and the United States, in the interest of peace, went to the length of voting to invite the Chinese Communists to come to the Security Council to discuss the matter.

In 1950 the Chinese Communists had accepted a Security Council invitation in relation to Korea. However, this time the Chinese Communists contemptuously rejected the invitation.

We sincerely hope that this decision of the Chinese Communists is not irrevocable and that they will abide by the principles of the United Nations rather than challenge by force the defensive obligations of this country. In any event, we believe that their attitude toward the United Nations Security Council has not ended the responsibility of that body which by the charter, has the "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security."

It should not, moreover, be carelessly assumed that peace and security will be promoted merely by the non-Communist nations indefinitely granting one-sided concessions to the Communist nations.

A great danger in Asia is the fear of many non-Communist peoples that the United States has no real intention of standing firmly behind them. Already that fear has mounted to the danger point. We accepted in Korea an armistice which the Chinese Communists boisterously misrepresent as a victory for them. We acquiesced in an Indochina armistice which reflected the defeat of the French Union forces at Dien Bien Phu. We aided the Tachen evacuation. The reasons were compelling, nevertheless the result added a few square miles to the Communist domain.

If the non-Communist Asians ever come to feel that their Western allies are disposed to retreat whenever communism threatens the peace, then the entire area could quickly become indefensible.

As the situation now exists, neither the cause of freedom, nor United States security, nor world peace and security, would be promoted by undermining the faith of the free Asian peoples in our strength and in our willingness to use that strength to restrain those who violently menace liberty. The American people have, through the Congress, made their own resolution clear. That is a verdict which the Government accepts as sound and which it will soberly execute.

V

Let me turn now to southeast Asia. In a few hours I shall be going to Bangkok to attend the first meeting of the council created under the Manila Pact for the security of southeast Asia.

We shall at Bangkok deal with the problem of organizing the treaty council. Also we shall begin to deal with the three substantive problems assigned to the council, namely military security, security against subversion directed from without, and economic welfare. I cannot anticipate what the decisions will be, but I am confident that our gathering will show the advantages of cooperation between the East and the West.

Some Asians retain a fear, derived from past colonial relationships, that close ties with the Western powers will lead to their being dominated by the Western powers. It is essential that that fear should be dispelled.

An important step in that direction was taken at Manila when, at the inspiration of President Magsaysay, the eight powers there signed the Pacific Charter. Thereby we dedicated ourselves to promoting self-government and to securing independence for all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities. Also, we agreed to cooperate in the economic, social, and cultural fields in order to promote higher living standards, economic progress, and social well-being.

However, words are not enough. It is necessary to infuse these words with the breath of life. That, I hope, will be done at Bangkok. Those who gather there will meet as equals. We shall, I think, find ways to diminish the risk of armed attack against the treaty area and the danger of subversion from without. Also we shall begin to study economic problems. These are not capable of any dramatic and spectacular solution, but they do respond to steady, painstaking, and sympathetic efforts.

The first task is to deal with fundamentals. That we are already doing, particularly in the basic realm of education. United States universities and colleges are cooperating with Asian institutions in Thailand, the Philippines, and Pakistan. Many United States technicians are serving in Asia in economic, educational, and health tasks, and the number is being increased. Our cooperation is already beginning to show results in better food and better health, and we are together taking the first steps to expand trade, to increase private investment, and to raise standards of living.

In such ways, we can justify man's faith in freedom.

There should indeed be no cleavage between the Western and Asian nations. Our concept of the nature of man had its beginning in Asia, where East and West met. We believe that all men are the creation and concern of a universal God and that He has endowed every person with a right to develop in accordance with the dictates of his individual reason and conscience.

That religious faith, politically translated into the Magna Carta, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, and our own Declaration of Independence, was, as Lincoln said of our Declaration, nothing exclusive but designed to provide liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time.

We also realize that, if human liberty is to be a reality, there must be an economic as well as a political foundation. The impoverished and the destitute cannot be truly free. So we recognize that economic values are essential to give reality to the moral and political values that we cherish.

Such a philosophy is indeed very different from that of Soviet communism.

Soviet communism denies the principle of human equality and instead substitutes the principle of class rule.

It denies that men are capable of self-government and substitutes the principle of dictatorship, the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat.

It denies nationalism, except as it can be used as a slogan to drive a wedge between East and West and prepare the way for an absorption of the peoples by international communism.

It preaches a new doctrine of segregation. The peoples of Asia, it is said, must be segregated from the peoples of the West. The new nations of Asia must be segregated from association with others.

The guile behind this is obvious. The Soviet and Chinese Communists know that their combined power can dominate the Eurasian Continent. If the other nations of Europe and Asia stand alone, they will be unable to resist the iron embrace of international communism.

At the Berlin Conference last year, Mr. Molotov denounced NATO and proposed a European security system which would exclude the United States. Now, the Soviet and Chinese Communists denounce the Manila Pact, because it may bring to Southeast Asia the strength needed to resist Communist aggression.

The Bangkok Conference will enable the free nations of the West and of the East to begin a vital demonstration. They can show that, through association as sovereign equals, they can each help the other to independence, security, and well-being.

That result accords with the high ideals with which our Nation was founded. It is in keeping with what our people have sought throughout their history. So our delegation goes to Bangkok with confidence, because we know that our mission is sustained by national faith and national purpose.

RESULT OF SCIENTIFIC POLL ON MINNESOTA FEPC LAW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the result of a scientific poll on Minnesota's Fair Employment Practices Commission law, which appeared in the February 6, 1955, issue of the Minneapolis Tribune. The result of the poll is further evidence of the growing support in the United States for the principle of equal opportunity of employment.

There being no objection, the result of the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC LAW FAVORED BY 85 PERCENT OF STATE ADULTS

Minnesota men and women strongly favor the passage of a State FEPC (fair employment practices) law.

In a survey just completed by the Minnesota Poll, 85 per cent of the people interviewed throughout the State are in favor of such a measure.

Eleven percent are opposed, and 4 percent are undecided.

Some of those opposed (3 percent of the State sample) say they would support an FEPC law that applied "just to jobs on the public payroll—that is, jobs paid from tax money."

Fifty-four percent of the entire group interviewed believe that if the 1955 legislature does adopt an FEPC law, it should be "quite strict" so far as penalties for violations are concerned.

Thirty-one percent would prefer that the law be "quite mild." The rest give qualified answers or are undecided on that point.

Gov. Orville L. Freeman last month urged passage of "an enforceable fair employment practices act which will give assurance that there will be no economic discrimination against anyone based on race, color, creed, or national origin."

Interviewing in the Minnesota poll survey was conducted between January 19 and January 24, with more than 60 field reporters in all parts of the State putting this first question to a representative cross section of Minnesotans aged 21 and older:

"Some States have laws providing that everyone is to have an equal chance to get a job on his own merits, regardless of his race or religion. Such laws are often called FEPC, or fair employment practices, laws. Do you think Minnesota should have a State FEPC law, or should not?"

The replies:

	All adults	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Should have	11	82	87
Should not	11	14	7
Other	(1)	(1)	1
No opinion	4	4	5
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

In February 1953, a similar survey showed 84 percent of the State's adults in favor of an FEPC law.

The latest study shows these proportions of Minnesota groups endorsing the idea of an FEPC law:

Eighty-six percent of the city residents, 85 percent of the people in small towns, and 82 percent of the farmers.

Eighty-eight percent of the independent voters, 86 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, and 81 percent of the Republicans.

Seventy-seven percent of the people in the upper economic group, 87 percent of those in the middle group, and 85 percent of those in the lower economic group.

Eighty-two percent of the labor union members.

Ninety percent of the men and women in the 21–29 age bracket, 84 percent of those in the 30–49 age group, and 83 percent of those 50 years and older.

"We're trying to overcome racial segregation, and this seems a good way", a Marshall man said. "Everyone should have an equal chance to work", a Solway farmer observed. "If all men were honest we wouldn't need FEPC, but all aren't", a Pine City man said.

Opponents of FEPC made comments like these:

"That is not a law which can be enforced" (an Eveleth man); "it would bring too many Negroes up north" (a Fairmont man); "it would be inviting trouble" (a Red Wing man).

Those against a Minnesota fair employment practices measure were asked:

"Would you favor or oppose an FEPC law in Minnesota that applied just to jobs on the public payroll—that is, jobs paid from tax money—but not to jobs in private business?"

These were the answers of the 11 percent of the total sample who were asked the question:

	Percent
Would oppose that too	6
Would favor that	3
Other or undecided	2
Total	11

The final question was asked of the entire cross-section, including proponents and opponents of FEPC:

"Suppose the Minnesota legislature does adopt an FEPC law this year. As far as penalties for violators are concerned, do you think the law should be quite strict or quite mild?"

The replies:

	All adults	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Quite strict	54	52	56
Quite mild	31	36	27
Qualified	2	2	1
No opinion	13	10	16
Total	100	100	100

Among people who favor an FEPC law, 57 percent think the penalties should be quite strict, while 30 percent would prefer them to be quite mild. Opponents of the measure are evenly divided on the matter of penalties.

One of the frequent comments of people favoring the stricter form of law was, "There's no use having an FEPC law if it cannot be enforced."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, which tragically proved to be short-lived, occurred this week.

During her period of independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was an honored member of the family of free nations, faithfully fulfilling all her obligations in the international community.

The contrast between those happy days and the present is deplorable. It has been described by the Lithuanian American Council in these words:

Today, a rigid Soviet censorship hides from the world the continuing deportations under the guise of "volunteer" work elsewhere, the collectivization of a once most prosperous nation, the slave labor camps, the systematic efforts of the Soviet occupational regime to organically merge Lithuania into the Soviet system; the extermination of the hostile anti-Soviet element by killings of the resistant groups; by russification and colonization by Russian elements.

But the spirit of freedom remains alive in Lithuania. As this proud and virile nation survived other oppressions, so shall it survive this one. On the occasion of this 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, America sends a message of sympathy to the Lithuanian people in their hours of trial, and of hope that one day they may again enjoy the happiness they once had as a free and independent nation.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the celebration of Lithuania's independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

On February 16, 1955, nearly 1 million Lithuanian-Americans celebrated the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

During her period of freedom, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was an exemplary nation and an honored member of the family of free nations, honorably fulfilling all her obligations.

Laws passed during that period greatly lessened the influence of Communist propaganda. Her land-reform law of 1922, the first in all Europe, was one of the most important as 73 percent of the population was engaged in agriculture.

Universal compulsory education (1930) reduced the illiteracy from 64 percent to 15 percent. From 1919 to 1939 the number of pupils in grammar schools alone rose from some 45,000 to nearly 300,000.

Lithuania's state opera, the theater and ballet attracted internationally famous conductors and artists and added luster to the culture of this ancient nation.

Now, under Soviet domination, a rigid censorship conceals from the world the continuing deportations under the guise of "volunteer" work elsewhere; the collectivization; the slave labor camps; the systematic efforts of the Soviet occupational regime to merge Lithuania organically into the Soviet system; the extermination of the hostile native anti-Soviet element by killings of the resistance groups.

But Lithuania has not succumbed. She still fights on.

So it was fitting that these Lithuanian-Americans, these descendants of an ancient race, should solemnly observe an independence denied in the home country.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him on the subject of Lithuanian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

I am proud to join with other Members of the Senate and House in noting February 16 as the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

The commemoration of the freedom of this valiant nation continues to be a bleak one, with Lithuania still enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Americans of Lithuanian descent retain an indomitable determination to continue the battle for the freedom of their homeland. I am sure that spirit is reflected in the hearts of their countrymen imprisoned in the iron grip of the Soviets.

The enslavement of Lithuania was another milestone in the Soviet march toward world domination or chaos. It should serve as a determined resolution for all Americans to stand firm against Soviet aggression spearheaded by bullets or by the creeping infiltration which has served the masters of the Kremlin so well.

One of the blackest marks in the black history of the Soviet dictators is the 30-year long trail of peace treaties and agreements violated to serve their purposes. Three peace agreements with Lithuania, signed by the Red rulers in 1920, 1933, and 1939, now serve as no more than monuments to the ruthlessness of the Red rulers.

It is small encouragement that these violated agreements have served a purpose. Piled on top of other treaties torn to shreds by the Kremlin, they have alerted the free world to the contempt in which international law and order is held by the Soviets.

The submergence of Lithuania into the Soviet regime has served to put other free nations on their guard. The Soviet aggressors are being thwarted by ever more effective barriers to their tactics of creeping infiltration as well as naked military aggression.

May the increased vigilance of the free world reaffirm the hope of Lithuanians everywhere for celebration of unblemished independence days in the future.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, the day before yesterday, February 16, marked the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

I wish to present a brief tribute to the Lithuanian nation on the 37th anniversary of their national independence.

Commemoration of this 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence ought to remind all the free world of one important fact, and that is the brutal character of world communism, and in particular of the Soviet Russian regime. Destruction of Lithuanian independence in June 1940 was by itself an act criminal enough for the world to long remember. But certainly one of the most brutal aspects of Soviet activity in Lithuania—one which the world will never forget—was the well-calculated, methodical plan of deportation of Lithuanians from their native land to distant parts of the Soviet Empire.

Deportations from Lithuania and her sister Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia, did not come about until after the Soviet occupation in June 1940. However, this diabolical scheme for destroying all anti-Communist Baltic peoples was devised in October 1939, perhaps even before, and at a time when all three Baltic States had concluded pacts of mutual assistance with Moscow. These pacts, far from being "mutual," were imposed upon the Baltic States and opened the door for Soviet domination in the Baltic region. On October 11, 1939, immediately after the pacts were concluded, the Soviet secret police, the NKVD, issued the notorious order No. 001223 which set forth detailed instructions for the arrest and deportation of all "anti-Soviet and antisocial elements" in the Baltic States.

Thus, it is clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that long before Lithuania was forcibly annexed to the Soviet Union an order had already been issued which was designed not only to destroy Lithuanian independence but to destroy as well the Lithuanian people. Soviet infidelity with regard to the mutual assistance pact is further underscored by the fact that order No. 001223 was officially given and remained in effect at the same time the Soviet Government promised to respect the territorial integrity and national independence of Lithuania.

In May 1941 preparations were made by the People's Commissariat for State Security of the Lithuanian S. S. R. for the deportation of all the "hostile and criminal and socially dangerous element." Between June 14 and June 21, 1941, 34,260 persons were deported to distant areas in Siberia and the Arctic. Since the second Soviet occupation in 1944, there have been several waves of deportations from Lithuania. In 1948 and 1949 about 10 percent of the Lithuanian population was deported by the Soviets to Siberia in an effort to break the resistance of the Lithuanian farmers against forcible collectivization of their land.

Such is the brutal character of the Soviet regime. Lithuania has felt the full force of this Soviet brutality and the Lithuanian people have undergone indescribable hardships in their efforts to retain their dignity and identity as a people. A lesser people could not bear the tremendous burdens imposed by Sovietization. But the Lithuanians are a great people. They are a people who have known Russian oppression before and survived, and today they shall survive as a nation and a people in spite of the intensity of Soviet oppression, for resistance, patriotism, and hatred of oppression are virtues rooted deep in the Lithuanian soul. The Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian nation are not forgotten. The Lithuanian national aspirations will not be forgotten.

CZECH STUDENTS INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him on the subject of the Czech Students Information Service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

We sadly note today that it has been 7 years since free Czechoslovakia was perverted into a Communist satellite. But it is with pride that we also commemorate the symbol of hope that the Czech student has become in the world's resistance to Soviet aggression.

We, of Czech descent in the free world, are responsible for saluting the now-obscured struggle these students are making against oppression of the mind, because there will be no such observance behind the Iron Curtain.

The gallant stand of the students of Charles University, as the Communists choked off freedom in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, remains to the world a milestone in the struggle for the liberty of man. Subdued by clubs and guns, the Czech students sank into the iron grip of the Communist aggressors. But hints of their determined battle against the Red regime leak out through the Iron Curtain. The Reds have admitted the arrest of hundreds of student leaders and more thousands have been expelled from the universities. Some have slipped through the barbed wire to freedom, some 1,000 of them now living in the United States.

To us, who live in freedom, the sacrifice of the Czech students has not been in vain. The Communists learned 7 years ago this month, that although they strangle every source of independent opposition from leaders of the nation, they also must conquer youth's determination to resist although it may be against hopeless odds.

By this dynamic action, the Czech students forged a kinship with youth everywhere, dedicated to reaffirming the world's faith in freedom and truth.

Once proud institutions of study and free research in Czechoslovakia now are only part of the Communist machine to stamp out well-machined, robot minds which will not question the dictates of the Kremlin. But the student remains the spearhead of freedom.

By Czechoslovakia's Red masters, the student has been branded "the most reactionary element in today's Czechoslovakia." The number of "nonreliable" students expelled from Czech schools probably has reached some 20,000 since the Red coup.

Youth continues to demonstrate its faith in the free thought that is the cornerstone of our democratic systems. February 25, 1948, has become a symbol that generations to come, tomorrow's leaders, have learned the price that must be paid for freedom. And they are determined to continue the search for freedom and truth, whatever the sacrifice.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, when the Senate meets following the adjournment today, the call of the calendar, provided for under the rule, be dispensed with.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I did not understand the request of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I asked unanimous consent that the calendar call be dispensed with on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky be kind enough to advise the Senate what his plans are with respect to the legislative program of the Senate? Several Senators have made inquiry along that line.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I shall be happy to do so.

No legislative business will be transacted today, and the Senate will adjourn whenever the Members of the Senate desire that it adjourn.

On Monday it is the intention of the acting majority leader to ask the Senate to consider the following measures, although they will not necessarily be called up in the order in which I shall list them:

Calendar No. 26, S. 462, to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution 20, authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on

Post Office and Civil Service and appropriating funds therefor.

Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 40, continuing the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to investigate employee welfare and pension plans and funds subject to collective bargaining.

Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 41, authorizing additional expenditure and employment of further temporary assistants by the Committee on Government Operations.

Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 56, to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters."

Calendar No. 33, Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments.

Calendar No. 34, S. 913, to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate.

Calendar No. 35, S. 456, relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

Calendar No. 36, Senate Joint Resolution 42, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

I wish to repeat, Mr. President, that these measures probably will not be taken up in the order I have announced them today. It is likely however, that the three measures to be first called up will be Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution 20; Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 40; and Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 41.

REGISTRATION BY SENATOR MORSE AS A DEMOCRAT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is the right of every citizen in a democracy to change his political allegiance according to the dictates of his conscience.

The Democratic Party of Oregon and of the Nation welcomes the enrollment in its membership of WAYNE L. MORSE, the distinguished senior Senator from my State. I should like to add that last night, in Lane County, Oreg., the senior Senator from Oregon registered as a Democrat. He is now officially a member of the Democratic Party.

As the junior Senator from Oregon, I say to Senator MORSE that we respect the long period of soul searching and study which led him from the political party of his original choice and to the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman.

As a Democrat, Senator MORSE still can be an independent, although with a small "i" rather than a large "I." Our party is the party of men and women who are independent in viewpoint, humanitarian in outlook, and unfettered in action. It is the only political party which has endured since the founding of this vast Nation. It has survived because it has represented all Americans rather than any narrow segment of our society. It is the party of true independents like WAYNE MORSE, of men who put ideals above any label or superficial identification.

CHANGE OF PARTIES IN UNITED STATES TRADITION

In my State, some of Senator MORSE's political enemies have criticized him as fickle. Yet many of the greatest of Americans have changed political parties. This illustrious list includes such men as Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, George W. Norris, Wendell Willkie, and others.

So far as my wife and I are concerned—and in Oregon Mrs. Neuberger and I operate as a team—we intended to support Senator MORSE for reelection in 1956 whether he ran as an Independent or as a Democrat. Indeed, I said as much at a luncheon at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 16, 1955, with which I was honored by Oregon's delegates to the 13th Annual Convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. On that recent occasion I declared:

> A political party is not sacred. It is merely a means to an end. Its purpose is the expression by a large number of people of certain principles of government. When a party ceases to stand for those principles which satisfy the ideals of an individual citizen, he is entitled as a free man to seek some other party.

I should like to add that the delegates to the rural electric conference, representing many Oregon counties and farming areas, concurred heartily.

DEMOCRATS THE PARTY OF ALL PEOPLE

Naturally, I rejoice that Senator MORSE has decided to associate himself with the Democratic Party—the party that stands for the welfare of the average man and woman. For example, Senator MORSE has advocated conservation and use of our natural resources in the interest of all the people. The Republican Party, as now constituted, has turned its back upon that program—a program, incidentally, which dates back to such Republicans as Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Hiram Johnson, and Charles L. McNary. The Democratic Party, conversely, has fought to preserve our public-power and conservation programs. Where else could Senator MORSE go except into the Democratic Party?

In 1956 Senator Morse will be reelected as a Democrat. Issues, rather than political partisanship, will decide the votes of Oregon's people. I look forward to informing the men and women of Oregon of the high regard with which my senior colleague is looked upon in the Nation's Capital, by political foe and friend alike. I have never heard a person speak against Senator MORSE's integrity, honor, scholarship, or capacity for faithful public service.

These qualities will loom large in the Oregon senatorial election of next year. The number of Americans who give their allegiance blindly to one party or another, without thought of the fundamental principles at stake, is happily declining. A spirit of genuine political independence—an independence in the best American tradition—will rule in Oregon in 1956 when the people again go to the polls. This will be to the advantage of our new Democratic Senator, WAYNE L. MORSE.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that Senator MORSE's very dear and close friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who is unable to be present today, asked me to say that he is proud and pleased and that he shares in our satisfaction that the senior Senator from Oregon, of whom he is a very close friend, as I am also, has decided to be formally and officially a member of the great Democratic Party.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from Oregon in his welcome to the senior Senator from Oregon on entering the fold of the Democratic Party. It is another example, to cite the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, of good commonsense being shown. But it is also proof that the Democratic Party is big enough and broad enough for all Americans who wish to see this great country grow and prosper.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as one Member of the Senate on the Democratic side, I wish to express my great pleasure at the decision which the senior Senator from Oregon has made. In my opinion, the senior Senator from Oregon is a great, courageous, and able Member of the Senate, and one of the finest with whom I have ever had the pleasure of serving. He stands by and fights for his convictions, regardless of party affiliation, and I am certain he will continue to do so. I think it should be said that he has tried very, very hard to get the Republican Party to take a forward look, to be interested in the proper development of the Nation's resources, and to evince a proper appreciation of civil liberties. It cannot be said that he has made the decision to join the Democratic ranks without having done everything humanly possible to persuade the Republican Party to adopt the attitude which many thought it would have taken when it returned to power. I can well understand how the senior Senator from Oregon has been disappointed in what has happened in the Republican Party.

I know that as a Democrat he will be enabled more forcefully to present his views and to be an even greater Senator from the great State of Oregon. I wish to congratulate not only our party, but the people of Oregon, upon the decision which Senator MORSE has made. It will be a great pleasure to work with him as a Democratic Senator. I know that as a Democrat he will accomplish even more for the people of his State than he has accomplished heretofore.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as one who is licensed by the Democratic Party to exhort political sinners to righteousness, I should like, on behalf of the Democratic Party, to extend to our erring brethren on the other side of the

aisle an opportunity at this time to confess their past political misdeeds and get right with the Lord and join the Democratic Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there is only one Member present on the Republican side of the aisle. I am sure we should be glad if he would accept the invitation just offered. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks to be associated with the welcome to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on his becoming a member of the Democratic Party.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the words of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon, welcoming into the Democratic Party the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. Whether or not we agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon on different questions, we all recognize his great ability, his magnificent courage, his devotion to our country and its institutions, and his indefatigable efforts for the maintenance of peace for ourselves and for all peoples.

As the acting majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has so well said in welcoming the senior Senator from Oregon into Democratic ranks, the Democratic Party is big enough, broad enough, and great enough for all Americans. Certainly we welcome this outstanding American, the senior Senator from Oregon, to the Democratic Party.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very curious to know who is going to be the senior Senator from Oregon. Will it be Senator NEUBERGER or Senator MORSE?

Mr. HILL. I may say to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that since the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been in the Senate a longer period of time, I should say he would be the senior Senator from Oregon.

LOCATION OF THE BONES OF SITTING BULL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there has been some discussion as to where Sitting Bull is buried. Some time ago a number of persons from South Dakota came to North Dakota and stated that the bones of Sitting Bull were buried in South Dakota. I have a record showing that the bones of Sitting Bull were auctioned off in the North Dakota Legislature a short time ago and are scattered all over the State of North Dakota. They are not in the State of South Dakota. As a matter of fact, they are in the State of North Dakota; and the so-called statue erected to the memory of Sitting Bull in the State of South Dakota is a fraud.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Russ Greenlee, published in the Devil's Lake (N. Dak.) Journal of February 5, 1955, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL BONES OF SITTING BULL AUCTIONED IN NORTH DAKOTA SENATE

(By Russ Greenlee)

BISMARCK.—The end of this Sitting Bull business is not yet.

In the senate Wednesday, Senator Carroll Day, of Grand Forks, came up with a box of bones sent him, he reported, by E. C. Christie, of Cavalier County as "the real bones of Sitting Bull."

Day's explanation was that some North Dakotans had been tipped of a raid by South Dakotans on Sitting Bull's grave at Fort Yates, and had salvaged the relics of the Sioux leader and substituted the remains of a bobcat.

Day handed over the box of bones to Senator Ole Johnson, of Cavalier County. Johnson delivered the trophy to President Pro Tempore Oliver Bilden.

Ray Schnell, of Dickinson, a former lieutenant governor, had been called to speak to the senators. Schnell is an auctioneer, and someone proposed that he auction off the bones to raise funds for the March of Dimes.

A total of $225 was obtained from the senators for various bones, all of which were returned to the box.

Schnell, by the way, prefaced his remarks with a declaration that he had appeared only as a Senate visitor.

"I am not here," he emphasized, "to look for an appointment to the board of higher education."

Schnell, who recently made a tour of several southwestern range States, where drought had been pronounced, said North Dakota appears lush by comparison.

The haystacks in this State look especially heartening to him as a cattleman.

"Some of the States I visited," he said, didn't produce enough grass for a jackrabbit."

NEW EVIDENCE IN DIXON-YATES DEAL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, during the past week we have witnessed a building up of the Dixon-Yates campaign to label all opposition to this improvident arrangement as partisan politics in its worst form. The barrage continues almost daily.

The other day, Mr. Dixon hailed the decision of the Securities and Exchange Commission with a boast that even the closest scrutiny has not turned up anything. Apparently the gentleman meant that no one has uncovered any wrongdoing or questionable conduct on the part of those who are responsible for the Dixon-Yates deal.

Mr. President, I am taking the time of the Senate this afternoon because I am convinced that there do exist certain essential facts concerning this deal which have not been made public. There is definite indication that these facts have been deliberately concealed from the Congress and the American people. These facts strongly suggest important and substantial questions which must be investigated to the fullest. The facts and circumstances I am about to describe make it essential and necessary that the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission be called upon to make a full and complete disclosure of the part played by certain individuals and the corporations they represented in the development of the Dixon-Yates arrangement.

Mr. President, a vice president and director of the First Boston Corp.—one of the country's largest and most influential banking institutions in the utility field—was acting as a consultant to Mr. Dodge, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, during the very period when the Dixon-Yates deal was being put together. There exists persuasive evidence that this man participated in conferences and meetings on the Dixon-Yates matter, which were held in the Budget Bureau at the very time when the First Boston company was making arrangements for financing the Dixon-Yates plant. The same company, the First Boston Corp., also helped arrange the financing for the OVEC combine, which was put together to supply power for AEC's production plant near Portsmouth, Ohio.

In the Dixon-Yates case which was tried before the Securities and Exchange Commission, two rather important items emerged in the course of the hearings.

Mr. Dixon, president of Middle South Utilities, testified that he had had conversations with representatives of the First Boston Corp. concerning the debt financing of the Dixon-Yates proposal, sometime prior to February 25, 1954, the date when Middle South and the Southern Co. made their first proposal to the Atomic Energy Commission. There was also produced in that proceeding—that is to say, the proceeding before the Securities and Exchange Commission—a "confidential" memorandum dated March 2, 1954, which Mr. Yates, the chairman of the board of the Southern Co., had circulated to all the directors of the Southern Co., as well as to certain other persons. This "confidential" memorandum related to the Dixon-Yates proposal to AEC of February 25, 1954; and in the memorandum, Mr. Yates stated:

> The First Boston Corp. had advised Mid-South and Southern they can sell $114,000,000 of 3½-percent bonds to insurance companies under present market conditions.

Other testimony which also was brought out in the proceeding before the Securities and Exchange Commission, shows that the participation of the First Boston Corp. in the Dixon-Yates matter not only began at an early date, but also continued as the proposal developed. From the evidence to which I have just referred, it is clear that the First Boston Corp. has had a hand in the arrangements for providing Dixon-Yates with somewhere between $99 million and $120 million.

There was also produced in that proceeding—I refer to the same proceeding before the Securities and Exchange Commission—a memorandum dated March 3, 1954, prepared by T. G. Seal, who, I am advised, is a vice president of Ebasco Services. Ebasco, it will be recalled, is the large utility service company which works hand-in-glove with Mr. Dixon and his Middle South Co., and was responsible for the "Ebasco fiasco" at Paducah, which cost the Government so many millions of dollars.

The memorandum was obtained from the Dixon-Yates people, and was also introduced in evidence in the SEC hearing. At this point I should say it is clear that Mr. Seal and others affiliated with Ebasco Services have played an important part in the development of the Dixon-Yates arrangement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I should like to proceed with my statement, that I might get it into the RECORD in orderly fashion. However, if the subject the Senator from Tennessee has in mind is germane to the matter now under discussion, I shall yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it is germane, if the Senator from Alabama will yield to me.

Mr. HILL. Yes, I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Alabama has been discussing the connection between Dixon-Yates and Ebasco Services. I am sure the Senator from Alabama is familiar with the conclusion or the statement appearing in the report of the Langer Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust Matters—a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee—which indicates that Ebasco is the wholly owned service company of Electric Bond & Share; that Electric Bond & Share, instead of receiving a percentage from the operating companies, now receives a percentage of the revenues of the operating companies, through the services performed by Ebasco; that, as a matter of fact, Ebasco—Electric Bond & Share—is still left intact; and that that should have been one of the considerations taken into account by the Securities and Exchange Commission in passing upon the legality of this whole deal.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and, of course, Ebasco is the company which the Mid-South Co. and other companies used in what is called the Ebasco fiasco, which was the building of the plant near Joppa, Illinois, for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not also true that originally the Dixon-Yates group had intended to use Ebasco as the contractor for the building of the plant at West Memphis, Ark.; but upon the public criticism of the bad showing that Ebasco had made at the Paducah plant, the Dixon-Yates group finally decided not to use that company as the contractor, but to use it only as the engineer or supervisor, or something of that kind?

Mr. HILL. I think the record to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred confirms exactly what he has just said.

Mr. KEFAUVER. So Electric Bond and Share, through Ebasco, the holding company which was ordered to be broken up, is being reinstituted and is having a larger control or hold over the manufacture and distribution of electric power in this region, through Ebasco, which is connected with the Dixon-Yates?

Mr. HILL. Yes. There, again, I think the record of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Tennessee is a member confirms the facts he has just stated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in order that Senators may have this picture clearly in mind, I shall repeat a few of the last things I have stated in the course of my remarks.

There was also produced in the proceedings before the Securities and Exchange Commission a memorandum dated March 3, 1954, prepared by T. G. Seal, who, I am advised, is a vice president of Ebasco Services. Ebasco, it will be recalled, is the large utility service company which works hand-in-glove with Mr. Dixon and his Middle South Co., and was responsible for the Ebasco fiasco at Paducah, which cost the Government so many millions of dollars. The memorandum was obtained from the Dixon-Yates people, and was also introduced in evidence in the SEC hearing. At this point I should say it is clear that Mr. Seal and others affiliated with Ebasco Services have played an important part in the development of the Dixon-Yates arrangement.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I am interested in what the Senator from Alabama has said about the Ebasco fiasco. That designation had escaped my notice. I have not heard any such expression as that before. I had not heard that there was any fiasco in connection with the activity. I presume the expression referred to the Ohio Valley Electric Co.

Mr. HILL. It refers to the Joppa plant built by EEI. It was called a fiasco because of the many millions of dollars which it cost the taxpayers of the United States above and beyond what the estimates of the cost had been.

Mr. BUSH. Whose estimates?

Mr. HILL. The estimates made by the AEC and the companies which were engaged in supplying the power for the AEC.

Mr. BUSH. During what period of time was that plant built?

Mr. HILL. The plant was built 2 or 3 years ago. I do not recall the exact date, but it was 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. BUSH. If that be true, then the plant was built during an inflationary period, when costs were rapidly rising. Is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. No; that is not correct. The plant was built afterward.

Mr. BUSH. Was the plant built during the Korean war?

Mr. HILL. There was no excuse or justification for the excess cost. The cost of the plant far exceeded the estimates which were made at the time the contract was let.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Was not the matter handled so badly and expensively that the Government finally took the contract away from the company and discharged it?

Mr. HILL. That is my understanding. The whole story has been put into the record of both the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure the story has been put in the record of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

In this connection, I might say that while the costs for the Joppa plant, which was being built by EEI, went far beyond the estimates, the Shawnee plant which the TVA built for the Atomic Energy Commission at Paducah, Ky., was built well within the estimated costs.

I wish also to say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, because he raised a question about inflation, that the plant built by EEI and the plant built by TVA at Paducah were constructed at the same time. The EEI plant cost far beyond the estimates. The TVA plant was constructed well within the estimates of costs.

Not only that, Mr. President, but the delivery and the time of delivery of power for our great nuclear program for the development of atomic energy, were very important. The power from the TVA-built plant was delivered ahead of time. The EEI was far behind the schedule which had been fixed.

Mr. President, the particular memorandum to which I wish to refer—and I am speaking of a memorandum from T. G. Seal which went into the record of the proceedings before the Securities and Exchange Commission—is an account of a meeting which was held at the Bureau of the Budget on March 2, 1954, attended by various representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Seal, and a Mr. Wenzell. The memorandum is interesting on a number of counts, but for present purposes I shall refer to one item in particular.

First, it is now clear that the Mr. Wenzell referred to in the Seal memorandum is Adolphe H. Wenzell, a vice president and director of the First Boston Corp., the banking house which Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates testified had undertaken to arrange the debt-financing for Dixon-Yates. In the memorandum Mr. Seal did not identify Mr. Wenzell as an officer of the First Boston Corp. Instead, he listed his name along with the names of other representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, leaving the impression that Mr. Wenzell was a part of the regular Bureau of the Budget team. In the next to the last paragraph of the memorandum Mr. Seal stated:

> Following my visit with Mr. Cook—

He was evidently referred to the Mr. Cook who was deputy manager of the Atomic Energy Commission—

> Mr. Wenzell rejoined me in our office.

That evidently means the office of the Ebasco. I understand it has an office in the Cafritz Building in Washington. They did not meet in the office of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Wenzell went to the office of Ebasco to meet Ebasco's vice president and representative in this matter, Mr. Seal. It was evidently a private conversation between the two.

I shall read from the beginning of the last paragraph of the memorandum:

Following my visit with Mr. Cook, Mr. Wenzell rejoined me in our office about 5 p. m., when he had finished his day with the Budget Bureau people and told me that the memorandum had been finished and that Mr. Clapp of the TVA and General Nichols of the AEC and the Budget Bureau people were to get together today, March 3, in Mr. Hughes' office at 9 a. m., for further intra-Government discussions. We hope to hear how these discussions eventuate later today.

Last Friday morning I telephoned Mr. Hughes, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to obtain from him the facts concerning Mr. Wenzell's employment by the Bureau of the Budget. I was unable to reach Mr. Hughes—I was told he was at the time at the White House—so I discussed the matter with Mr. McCandless, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He told me that Mr. Adolphe H. Wenzell had served as a consultant to the Bureau, but said he would have to talk to Mr. Hughes before he could supply me with any information with respect to the period of Mr. Wenzell's employment, the nature of his duties, and the work he performed for the Bureau. I asked Mr. McCandless to have Mr. Hughes supply me with the information as quickly as possible and in writing.

Saturday I received a letter from Mr. Hughes in which he confirmed Mr. Wenzell's employment as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget beginning May 20, 1953, and ending March 2, 1954. Mr. Hughes stated that Mr. Wenzell had served intermittently during that period for a total of 34 days, and that he had been retained by Mr. Dodge to serve without compensation as a consultant on various phases of the TVA power program. The letter discussed in some detail the nature of Mr. Wenzell's work on the TVA power program but Mr. Hughes did not see fit to mention Mr. Wenzell's participation in the Dixon-Yates matter.

Nowhere in the chronology released by the Budget Bureau on August 21, 1954, and which was supposed to contain all the facts about the Dixon-Yates deal, did Director Hughes make any reference whatever to the First Boston Corp. or to Mr. Wenzell.

I am sure that every Member of this body will recall the fanfare with which these releases were made and the statements by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission which accompanied the releases. The American people were told that the chronologies provided a full and complete account of the Dixon-Yates deal. When Mr. Hughes testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on December 4, 1954, he said:

All basic information that I have on the subject is already public knowledge. * * * the complete facts on the background of this problem have been publicly available for more than 2 months. Nevertheless, misstatements and misrepresentations have continued almost daily. The facts have been told, but evidently seldom heard. Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to review those facts before your committee.

Even in the letter which I received from Budget Director Hughes on Saturday, which letter I shall place in the RECORD, Mr. Hughes did not make any reference to Mr. Wenzell's part in the Dixon-Yates proposal. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Seal's memorandum frankly states that the purpose of the March 2 meeting, which was attended by Mr. Wenzell, was to brief the Bureau of the Budget officials in anticipation of their meeting with TVA officials the following day. Mr. Seal's memorandum makes this pertinent statement with respect to the Dixon-Yates proposal and the comments of the Bureau of the Budget officials:

Their comments (of the Budget Bureau officials) were not critical so much as they represented an effort to get thoroughly posted on the reasons for the figures, anticipating an argument from TVA, etc.

Mr. President, it is startling indeed to find that an officer of the First Boston Corp., who presumably that very day was serving as an adviser and consultant to the Bureau of the Budget, later the same day met with Mr. Seal to discuss the status of the Dixon-Yates negotiations. But even more startling is the fact that the First Boston Corp. was arranging the financing on a deal in which one of its officers was advising the Government, and apparently the same officer had access to important confidential information concerning governmental policies and actions concerning the same transaction—the Dixon-Yates deal.

Last summer the President directed the Bureau of the Budget and the AEC to make a full disclosure concerning the origins and development of the Dixon-Yates contract. It is clear that important facts and circumstances surrounding the transaction were concealed. It is now essential and imperative that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy obtain access to all available records and data, in order that the full story surrounding the role played by these individuals and the corporations they represented may be thoroughly investigated and all the facts revealed to the American people. I urge the joint committee to act, and to act as quickly as it can.

EXHIBIT A

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1955.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in reply to your inquiry of earlier today as to whether Mr. Adolphe H. Wenzell had ever been employed by the Bureau of the Budget and, if so, the nature of his employment.

Bureau of the Budget records show that on May 20, 1953, Mr. Wenzell was invited to serve as a consultant without compensation, to Mr. Joseph M. Dodge, then Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Wenzell's consultative services were used intermittently for a total of 34 days between May 20, 1953, and March 2, 1954, when he completed his work.

Mr. Dodge advises me that Mr. Wenzell was engaged as a technical expert to advise the Director of the Budget regarding the accounting system of the Tennessee Valley Authority, particularly as to comparison of its annual reports of earnings with those of private industry, which has differing requirements as to taxes, interest, etc. Mr. Wenzell was requested to analyze and explain the differences in the two types of accounting systems and their significance in measuring real results. Mr. Wenzell was also asked to review the allocation system for distribution of costs between power, navigation, flood control, and other purposes, concerning which the Bureau of the Budget makes recommendations to the President.

I trust that this provides the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee, who has been so deeply interested in all matters concerning the Dixon-Yates contract, and who also is a distinguished member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am delighted to yield to him.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the generosity of the senior Senator from Alabama.

First, I wish to congratulate him upon his able presentation of a strange set of circumstances, only now brought to light.

Mr. HILL. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will confirm all I have said, to wit, that it was proclaimed to the people throughout the land that all the facts about the Dixon-Yates deal had been presented.

Mr. GORE. I was present when Mr. Hughes made the statement the Senator from Alabama has quoted.

I find it strange and shocking that the vice president of one large corporation, namely, Ebasco, and the vice president of another large corporation, namely, the First Boston Corp., are in the role of briefing the Bureau of the Budget as to what the Bureau of the Budget presumably should say to the TVA, when next the TVA presented itself.

Mr. HILL. That is certainly the very definite conclusion to be drawn from Mr. Seal's memorandum.

Mr. GORE. What would the Senator from Alabama understand the term "briefing" to mean?

Mr. HILL. I should say they were to present to the officials of the Bureau of the Budget the arguments and everything else which they thought would be helpful to those officials in trying to put over the Dixon-Yates deal and in trying to get the TVA to go along with the deal.

Mr. GORE. In other words, those two vice presidents of large corporations—one of them wearing both the hat of a consultant of the Bureau of the Budget and also his hat as vice president of his own company—were in the role of telling the Bureau of the Budget what it must do and what it must say. This goes a long way toward proving what the able senior Senator from Alabama said earlier, namely, that the large financial

houses of the country dictated the Dixon-Yates deal.

Mr. HILL. The evidence is certainly here, I say to my distinguished friend, the able Senator from Tennessee; and I wish to thank him for the contribution he has made in connection with the presentation of this matter today.

THE FUTURE OF THE PRESIDENT'S ATOMS-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Raw Materials Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I recently had the pleasure of heading a five-man group on a tour of some of the countries off the beaten path. Our primary purpose was to learn at firsthand what action is best calculated to advance the President's atoms-for-peace plan.

The subcommittee has submitted its official report on the trip. But since I was the only Senator in the group, I am taking this opportunity to express to the Senate some purely personal conclusions. First, however, it might be well to trace briefly the development of President Eisenhower's proposal in the United Nations and in the Congress.

President Eisenhower unveiled his atoms-for-peace plan on December 8, 1953. In that historic address to the U. N. General Assembly, the President said that atomic weaponry "must be put into the hands of those who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace." The President concluded on this note of hope and challenge:

> Against the dark background of the atomic bomb, the United States does not wish merely to present strength, but also the desire and the hope for peace.
>
> To the making of these fateful decisions, the United States pledges before you—and therefore before the world—its determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma—to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

The President's magnificent address placed the atom in true perspective. It exploded the growing myth that America seeks to monopolize an inherently dangerous force. No presidential address in many years has been more widely or more deservedly praised. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I shall do all I can to help make the President's hope a reality.

As a first step toward harnessing the atom for peace, the 83d Congress amended the Atomic Energy Act. The 1954 amendments authorize the President to make agreements for cooperation with other countries concerning the nonmilitary applications of atomic energy. Under this authority, and subject to appropriate safeguards, the President may make agreements involving distribution of fissionable materials and disclosure of atomic energy information.

In his speech to the General Assembly, President Eisenhower recommended that a U. N. international atomic energy agency be created. This agency, said the President, "could be made responsible for the impounding, storage, and protection of the contributed fissionable and other materials." The President described as "the more important responsibility" of the proposed U. N. agency the power to allocate contributed fissionable material among the nations of the world. Finally, the President conditioned his proposal on Soviet participation.

In amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the Congress provided, however, that the agreements for cooperation could be made only on a bilateral basis. The President was not given power to transfer nuclear materials or classified atomic energy information to the United Nations or to any other group of nations. It is now clear that the Congress acted wisely in not fully implementing the President's original plan. Viewing the matter with the benefit of hindsight, we may all be pleased with the modifications in the President's plan which have been inspired, at least in part, by the prudence of the last Congress.

Ambassador Lodge discussed this new approach in the last session of the U. N. General assembly. He said that the U. N. agency, instead of being an atomic bank, would be a clearinghouse for information. Speaking of the original plan, Mr. C. D. Jackson said in the General Assembly debate last year:

> Therefore, the United States, consulting with the other nations willing and eager to participate, realized that the bricks, and steel, and concrete, and real estate, and scientists, and technicians, and instruments, and workers, and guards required to set up and maintain the physical custody of the fissionable material would not only entail a great delay in getting the plan into operation but would also be needlessly expensive to the United Nations. These producing and processing nations do not feel they need this complicated and expensive machinery, and they can move faster without it. (Department of State Bulletin, November 29, 1954, p. 832.)

Everything that I saw and heard on my recent trip supports that statement by Mr. Jackson.

Of course, the United States can participate by treaty in an international atomic energy agency having the powers outlined by the President in his original proposal. I would oppose any such treaty, because it would hinder progress toward the bold and imaginative goal set by the President.

There are many advantages in basing an atoms-for-peace plan on bilateral agreements as opposed to vesting primary responsibility in a U. N. agency.

First, we avoid Soviet obstruction by dealing with other nations individually. Even a veto-proof international atomic energy agency could be tied up in knots by Soviet propaganda, by dilatory tactics, and by the many apples of discord at the disposal of the Communists.

Second, U. N. energies in the atomic field should be concentrated on disarmament. That work, however hopeless it may seem at times, is far more important than the so-called atoms-for-peace plan. It is foolish for the U. N. to undertake work which sovereign nations, acting independently, can do better. It is worse than foolish for the U. N. to attempt such work at the expense of more important work which only an international body is competent to perform.

Third, implementation of the President's program requires prompt action. After the program is underway, prompt decisions will be essential to its success. We cannot afford to wait on some 40 to 60 nations to act as a group. President Eisenhower's bold program demands swift and decisive leadership. The United States is uniquely qualified to provide that leadership. Let us assume this great responsibility instead of dissipating it in the United Nations.

Finally, Mr. President, agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy must be tailored to the needs of individual countries. For example, the recent sale of heavy water to India ties in admirably with the program of that Government. The Indian Government will be able to go ahead with its plans for a large research reactor without being held up until it completes its own plant for heavy water production. No two countries are exactly alike in terms of economic development; resources, scientific and material; tradition and culture; and benefits sought from this fabulous source of energy. Each country I visited has a different scale of priorities in the development of atomic energy; a different capacity to contribute to the common fund of knowledge and experience.

While we were in India we discussed with the atomic energy commission of that country the possibility of the United States selling heavy water to that commission for the development of their reactor, or lending it to them in advance of their ability to produce this needed facility for their reactor. At that time they were willing to accept an advance, with the assurance that they would return an equal amount once they got into production.

The world will never realize the full benefits of the atoms-for-peace plan if it relies on the U. N. Its divided counsel cannot provide leadership in this field. Its zeal to compel universal conformity in all the affairs of life through multilaterial agreements would stall, and eventually discredit, a plan that is both generous and practical.

Having recently seen some of the problems at firsthand, I agree fully with the editorial conclusion of the Wall Street Journal on September 8, 1954—that the U. N. connection with the atoms-for-peace plan should be kept as nebulous as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Lighting the Light," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHTING THE LIGHT

"Our many proposals for peaceful use of the atom have so far been cynically blocked in the councils of the world, but we shall proceed onward. We shall proceed now—under safeguards set forth in our law—to share atomic technology with others of good will."

With these words President Eisenhower launched the country's first commercial size

atomic powerplant. And with them he also set in motion the simplest, and what is very likely the best, of all plans for an international sharing of the benefits of atomic energy.

Our Government, the President disclosed, is beginning negotiations with Belgium on building an atomic reactor in that country. Tomorrow talks begin with Canada on an exchange of atomic information. Negotiations with other friendly nations, including Great Britain, are to follow.

Here is a design for progress with a promise of success. For it begins with the application of atomic energy to peacetime purposes here at home and it proceeds abroad on the principle that we will negotiate individual exchanges with individual nations fitted to their own and our respective needs. We do not have to wait any longer for a meeting of minds of a great array of nations.

That, it seems to us, is its great advantage over the other proposals that have been put forward. And it is, ironically, an advantage for which we are partially indebted to Russia, the very nation which cynically blocked all the other programs from the Baruch plan to the United Nations pool proposed by the President himself.

If the Russians had agreed, the Baruch plan would probably have been adopted and instead of being now in the process of relaxing restrictions on atomic technology we should have the whole buried under a supranational monopoly which could be, and undoubtedly would be, hamstrung by those self-same Russians. And who could hold out much hope for a U. N. pool arrangement where such decisions as a reactor plant for Belgium or some other country would be subject to political decisions of a body in which the Soviets had a prominent voice?

That would have been at least a clumsy way to do some simple things. Now we can go ahead with more direct measures. Decisions need not wait on action by governments not directly involved.

There is still some talk of setting up an international agency to coordinate the efforts of the nations that do join together and perhaps giving this agency some nebulous U. N. connection. Past experience would certainly suggest keeping this as nebulous as possible.

When President Eisenhower launched the construction of the atomic power plant this week he explained that his task was simply to "light the light and the project will be started."

The world has waited a long time, in fear and hesitation, to bring the benefits of atomic energy to peaceful purposes and to find a way of sharing them. We have waited so long because we waited on complicated and grandiose schemes. Perhaps the better way is simply to light the light and let the project get started.

Mr. BRICKER. I should now like to comment briefly on the trip itself. The purpose of our trip was twofold. First, we wanted to visit Australia and see for ourselves just how the multi-million-dollar American investment in uranium resource development is getting along. Second, as I have already indicated, we wanted to find out at firsthand some of the things we need to know if we are effectively to follow up the President's atoms-for-peace plan. Through its revision of the Atomic Energy Act, the 83d Congress last July both permitted and encouraged closer collaboration with friendly foreign nations in peaceful uses of atomic energy. That was, of course, only a first step.

It is generally known that most of the development in the atomic field has been carried forward by nations which are advanced in science and in industry. United States cooperation with such nations should result in early benefits for the entire free world.

But apart from the nations advanced in science and industry are many others, for the most part non-European, who are notably friendly to the United States. They have a longer road to travel if they are to achieve economic and political stability and to become bulwarks of freedom. In many of these nations, the United States is already spending much money by way of foreign aid and military assistance programs. The atoms for peace plan also calls for spending. How much is needed? Where can the funds best be employed? How ready are the nations we visited to begin cooperation in peaceful atomic programs? These are some of the questions we tried to answer through our trip.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks part I of the report of the Raw Materials Subcommittee.

There being no objection, part I of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RAW MATERIALS SUBCOMMITTEE ON ITS VISIT TO AUSTRALIA

The Raw Materials Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy accepted an invitation received during the fall of 1954 from the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia to visit their uranium mines and refineries and discuss with them the progress being made in the field of atomic development in Australia, particularly as it relates to the activities of the United States in this same field. Since this required a long journey, the subcommittee sought to combine with its Australian visit discussions and inspections of atomic activities involved in peaceful atomic development in a substantial number of southeast Asian and middle eastern countries.

In the 5 weeks between November 15 and December 20, the subcommittee visited and held conferences with Government, scientific, and industrial leaders in the following countries: New Zealand, the Commonwealth of Australia, the State of South Australia, the Philippines, Formosa, Thailand, India, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Spain.

The majority of the subcommittee's time involved discussions of peaceful atomic developments with a particular view to exploring at firsthand how bilateral agreements for cooperation, made possible under the provisions of the new Atomic Energy Act of 1954, might be achieved rapidly in the countries which we visited. Eight days of our trip were spent in Australia where our time was devoted about equally between uranium raw material and peaceful atomic developments.

A detailed discussion of our observations regarding the raw-materials situation in Australia and the prospects for peaceful uses of atomic energy in all the countries which we visited are set forth in this report.

PART I. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. In Australia the committee found a flourishing and rapidly expanding uranium mining industry. At Radium Hill and Rum Jungle we found the most modern mining and milling plants actively producing large quantities of uranium concentrates for the free world. Geologic exploration and prospecting is active over large areas of the Northern Territory, Queensland, and South Australia, and numerous uranium finds are being made. We think it is important to note that in Australia, as in Canada, South Africa, the Belgian Congo, and the United States, the prospecting is done and uranium is mined and refined under a private enterprise system, and that in those areas where the system is most free, development has been most rapid.

2. The response which we met everywhere to the announcement of the willingness of the United States to participate directly with foreign countries in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy is far more overwhelming than we had heretofore appreciated.

3. Every country we visited has some competent scientific and engineering talent already at work in the atomic field, but all countries need direct assistance in evaluating how fast and how far they can go in this application of atomic energy, in setting up training programs within their own country to supplement existing personnel, and training programs in the United States for key personnel so that they may return to their countries and train others.

4. The plans and programs which were presented to us appeared uniformly realistic. Nowhere did we encounter government officials or scientists who underestimated the size of the job involved in peaceful applications and the period of time over which these can be achieved. Despite the widespread belief throughout the countries we visited that atomic power applications will come on a wide scale earlier than is practical in most cases, the government and scientific leadership in these countries has correctly evaluated the prospects.

5. It is our conclusion that all United States cooperation in the field of peaceful atomic application must be coordinated within some formal structure. As hopeful as are the prospects for an international atomic development agency, it is our observation that bilateral agreements for cooperation tailored to meet the needs of the individual countries can and must be entered into promptly so that peacetime atomic development may get underway on a broad scale, despite any delays which may be encountered in the establishment of the international agency.

6. We were impressed in every country by the fact that the details of the opportunities for atomic contributions to the local economies are inadequately understood by United States representatives abroad. As a result, we recommend that the full committee take whatever steps it can to urge the Executive to establish a program which would include as a minimum creating small teams of diversified talent which could be sent on request to countries such as those we visited for the purpose of assisting in an evaluation of the ways and means by which peaceful atomic applications could be realized. Out of such evaluations there should arise agreements for cooperation based on firsthand knowledge of the needs and capabilities of each country.

7. In the interim, prior to precise evaluation and formulation of the programs in these countries, and others like them, a general minimum agreement for cooperation might profitably be drawn up by the Executive as a basis for initial atomic relationships with such friendly countries. The subcommittee is of the opinion that official United States assistance should flow within the framework of such agreements for cooperation and that these minimum-term agreements should be entered into promptly with as many friendly countries as is possible. The subcommittee observed repeatedly that if the United States fails to come forward with some concrete and formal way of demonstrating its willingness to get on with atomic cooperation immediately with these countries, some substantial portion of the good will inherent in the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which envisages such cooperation will be lost.

8. And, finally, the subcommittee would like to point out that in most cases United States atomic aid to countries such as those

which we visited need not involve large financial assistance during the early period of cooperation. In fact, we observed in many places that basic laboratory equipment, such as Geiger counters and scalers, costing only a few thousand dollars, would make it possible for the small groups of competent scientists already in these countries to begin making substantial contributions to their own countries as well as to science generally. This is especially true in the fields of uranium exploration, agricultural experimental work, medical activity—including clinical work, biology, and basic research.

An outstanding example of the assistance which the United States can render at little or no cost was encountered in India. There the Government has plans for the construction of a large research reactor which will use heavy water as a moderator. The Indian Government is already beginning construction of a heavy water production plant which it has every reason to expect will be able to furnish the quantity necessary by the time this first large research reactor is ready to start operating. What the Indians need is an assurance from the United States that, in the unlikely event that their own heavy water production plant falls behind schedule, they can rely on a loan of heavy water from the United States to get their reactor in operation promptly. In the first place, the Indian production schedule appeared to us to be realistic; in the second place, even if the United States should have to loan this material to India, it would certainly be for a reasonable time. The total cost of our assurance to India would be no more than the theoretical interest on the heavy water inventory which might be tied up for a few months in their reactor. Such an assurance from us would constitute the kind of genuine cooperation from the United States that is needed to prove our good intentions.

The members of the subcommittee deeply appreciate the opportunity afforded them in making this trip to discuss these matters with responsible individuals in the various local settings and found it of immeasurable value. We know of no substitute which could give the kind of understanding we believe we have acquired. We believe that an opportunity has been created to speed up bilateral agreements for cooperation with the nations which we visited, and that this opportunity alone is sufficient recompense for the arduousness of the trip which we undertook.

PART II. RAW MATERIALS

The original basis for planning the committee's trip to Australia was an invitation from the Commonwealth of Australia to visit the uranium mines and the uranium processing plants which had recently been constructed in the northern territory and in the State of South Australia.

Sydney: In Sydney, Australia, discussions were held with Gen. J. E. S. Stevens, Chairman of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, and members of his staff. These discussions covered both the raw-materials picture and the atomic-energy research picture. That same evening the committee held discussions with Hon. O. H. Beale, Q. C., Commonwealth Minister of Supply, to whom the Atomic Energy Commission of Australia reports.

Canberra: The next day the committee visited Canberra. Further discussions were held with Mr. Beale; Senator W. H. Spooner, Minister for National Development; Dr. H. G. Raggatt, secretary of the Ministry for National Development, who is one of the world's outstanding geologists; and the members of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission concerning uranium developments in the Commonwealth of Australia, with particular reference to the activities in the Northern Territory where the famous Rum Jungle deposits are located.

Melbourne: In Melbourne the committee talked with Mr. P. B. Nye, Director of the Commonwealth Bureau of Mineral Resources, and his staff. The discussions related to the general geology of Australia and the areas of Australia considered favorable for uranium occurrence from a geologic standpoint and a résumé of recent uranium discoveries in the Northern Territory and in the State of Queensland. The committee was much impressed with the large number of uranium occurrences which have recently been found near Rum Jungle, in a new area about 200 miles north and east of Rum Jungle, and in the Mount Isa area in the State of Queensland. The Commonwealth Bureau of Mineral Resources is vigorously pursuing a geologic program designed to aid the uranium prospector. We were impressed with the similarity between its operations and those of the United States Geological Survey in the Colorado Plateau area.

Adelaide: In Adelaide the party had the pleasure of being escorted on its visit to the uranium properties and production plants by Hon. T. Playford, Premier of the State of South Australia, assisted by Sir A. Lyell McEwin, Minister of Mines for the State of South Australia, and Mr. S. B. Dickinson, Director of Mines for the State of South Australia.

The State of South Australia operates the Radium Hill mine and mill, a uranium refinery at Port Pirie, and a large ore-dressing laboratory and pilot plant in Adelaide.

The committee visited the pilot plant and laboratories during its first day in Adelaide. These two facilities compare favorably with similar laboratories in the United States and have done an excellent job in developing and pilot planting the uranium-refining processes used at Radium Hill and Port Pirie and the new processes which were recently installed at Rum Jungle. The excellence of this laboratory and pilot plant is attested to by the fact that the Commonwealth Government of Australia contracted for the Rum Jungle pilot plant work with the South Australian government and several of the large mining companies in Australia are currently having uranium work done for them at this laboratory. We were pleased to note that that laboratory has close working arrangements with the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

The second day in South Australia the committee journeyed to the Radium Hill mine, which is located about 150 miles north and east of Adelaide. The committee went underground in the Radium Hill mine and also visited the mill and the townsite. The entire Radium Hill project is a model of modern mining practice and compares favorably with the best mining camps in the world.

Broken Hill: The committee stayed over night at Broken Hill, in New South Wales, just over the line from South Australia. Broken Hill is one of the world's great zinc-lead deposits.

This overnight stop gave the committee the chance to talk with executives of the Zinc Corp., Ltd., which recently set up a subsidiary to operate the Rum Jungle properties under contract with the Commonwealth of Australia. The personnel to staff this new subsidiary, known as Territory Enterprises, was drawn in good measure from the Broken Hill operations. The committee was most favorably impressed with the managerial ability of the Zinc Corp. staff in Broken Hill.

Port Pirie: The committee next visited the Port Pirie refinery, which is nearing completion, and should go into operation in the spring of 1955. This plant will refine the uranium concentrates produced by the mill at Radium Hill and make a high-grade product suitable for shipment to the United States. This refinery, like the Radium Hill plant, is owned and operated by the government of the State of South Australia.

Rum Jungle: Following the committee visit to the South Australian Uranium Properties, we flew directly across Australia to the capital of the Northern Territories, Darwin, where the committee met with the Administrator of the Northern Territories, Hon. F. J. S. Wise. The next day the committee drove with Mr. Wise 60 miles south of Darwin on a fine paved highway to the Rum Jungle mine, mill, and townsite. The Rum Jungle property has a small exploration shaft, but actual mining will be done through an open pit. We visited the open pit, where excavation of the overburden is well under way. This work was being carried out with the most modern American excavation equipment under a subcontract with a large English construction contractor. The party also visited the Dyson mine, which is just a few miles from the Rum Jungle mine, known locally as White's mine.

The new mill at Rum Jungle had just recently gone into operation and the committee was pleased to see that it was running smoothly and efficiently and fully living up to its design criteria. We also visited the brand new townsite for the Rum Jungle properties known as Batchelor, and were very favorably impressed with the modern housing and up-to-date shopping center in what had been a wilderness 5 years ago.

The committee came away with the strong conviction that the money which the United States had advanced on loans to the Government of the Commonwealth and of South Australia had been prudently and efficiently expended and that Australia now has two large producing uranium properties which are daily adding to our uranium supply. The high degree of activity in uranium prospecting and the number of uranium strikes in the past 2 years gave every indication that Australia will become one of the world's great sources of uranium in the next decade.

PART III. PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

New Zealand, as part of the British Commonwealth of nations, is already beginning to play an important part in the integrated atomic-energy program organized from London. One type of atomic powerplant which promises commercial power at an early date will require heavy water, a material which we are using in the new production reactors at Savannah River.

In New Zealand there is what the scientists call a geothermal zone which runs diagonally across North Island. These extensive hot springs can provide a cheap source of the heat necessary to produce heavy water in commercial quantities as well as low-cost electricity. Development of this natural resource is under way. We spent a day high in the mountains of New Zealand inspecting the experimental work going on there and talked at length with their works manager.

We also talked informally with members of an advisory team who had been sent to New Zealand from the Harwell Laboratories in England and learned certain things of interest about the British program which have not been available to us through other channels. It should be pointed out that no information was discussed which the United States holds classified, but the collective working knowledge of the party made many things which were said by those with whom we talked throughout the trip meaningful—far more meaningful than those same statements can be expected to be to United States diplomatic representatives abroad.

In addition to inspecting the geothermal area in New Zealand, we talked to Government and scientific representatives in Wellington with particular regard to their electric power needs in the future and their agricultural and medical research programs. We found that radioisotopes are already being used in New Zealand to improve grasses and dairy products.

We were particularly intrigued with a radioisotope experiment performed in New Zealand a few years ago. In a research project

employing radioactive cobalt it was found that much of the soil of New Zealand was deficient in cobalt. This cobalt deficiency adversely affected the growth of grass and seriously reduced the nutritional value of the pasture grasses. As a result of this discovery the New Zealand farmers undertook to spray their pastures with cobalt. This spraying was done from airplanes. The New Zealand grass is now among the finest in the world. The committee observed eloquent evidence of this fact in the millions of sheep and cattle we saw grazing on every side as we drove through North Island. Here is one dividend from the peaceful atom which has meant much to the New Zealand economy and has awakened the interest of every New Zealander in atomic energy.

There are many similar developments in the field of agriculture in the United States which offer great potential benefits to the New Zealand economy. If an agreement for cooperation authorized in our new Atomic Energy Act could be entered into promptly it would benefit both of us. It is clear that New Zealand is so far from the existing sources of radioisotopes in the United States and England that an effective experimental peacetime atomic program will require the construction of a research reactor capable of producing isotopes somewhere in that part of the world.

New Zealand does not face an electric power shortage within the next 20 years, for she has adequate hydro and geothermal energy sources to take care of her growing industrial economy up to 1975. However, New Zealand does not have an adequate supply of fossil fuels and in the period beyond 1975 her demand will exceed the potential capacity of these hydro and geothermal resources. Beginning in the seventies, New Zealand will have to depend on atomic energy to meet her additional electric power needs. New Zealanders are therefore anxious to learn about atomic power and follow its development in the United States and throughout the world so that they may be in a position to build and operate their own atomic powerplants cheaply and efficiently.

We had the good fortune of meeting and talking with Dr. Watson-Munro in Wellington. Dr. Watson-Munro is New Zealand's leading physicist. He was about to go to Australia to head the scientific atomic effort in that country. We were therefore able to get a projection of his thinking with regard to the Australian program.

Australia

In Australia, there is vigorous public, political, scientific, and industrial interest in all phases of atomic development. The Commonwealth Government has plans for the construction of a major research reactor within the next 3 years. Our group met with the Australian Atomic Energy Commission in Sydney and talked at length with both the administrative and scientific members of the organization. Their Atomic Energy Commission, headed by General Stevens, is a small, compact and purposeful organization. Their first major atomic laboratory is nearing completion. Increased atomic activities are finding support not only in the capitol at Canberra but among industrialists throughout the country.

There are both Government and private plans for the construction of large research reactors in the Commonwealth of Australia. It appears likely that the first of these will be under construction within the next 2 years. From these machines the Australians hope to learn more about reactors generally and get on with designing and building their first atomic powerplant. Because the United States has been unable, due to statutory restrictions in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, to give active assistance on reactor development to the Australians, most of the assistance so far has come from England. Now that the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is in effect and not only permits, but encourages, the cooperation of the United States in this field, the Australian Commission is looking forward to similarly close cooperation with the United States. We believe the Joint Committee would find it a pleasure to join other American groups in being host to representatives from the Australian Commission later this year. There is every reason to believe that an initial agreement for cooperation with Australia can be entered into promptly and profitably, so that when such representatives arrive in our country there will be a legal framework to implement our cooperation with them.

We also met with Prime Minister Menzies and his Cabinet at Canberra, and with the Minister of Supply, the Honorable O. H. Beale, on several occasions. There is every reason to expect that atomic energy can make great contributions to the Australian economy in the fields of agriculture, medicine, and electric power. This is a nation of 9 million people living in a land larger than the United States. They are ambitious and have a high standard of living, but they are beset with the economic problems of a rapidly expanding economy. They deeply appreciate the fact that the United States is their strongest partner in the Pacific and that they must rely on United States leadership and aid to protect them against the advances of communism in the Orient. The Australians showed themselves to be a resourceful people with an understanding of what can be achieved by self-help and hard driving organization. Despite the close ties which exist between Australia and Great Britain, we sensed everywhere that Australia looks to the United States as a close and warm ally.

We spent 3 days in South Australia conferring with Premier Playford and the members of his government and their various industrial organizations. It is important to bear in mind that Australia is a federal union and that they have a degree of autonomy far exceeding that to which we are accustomed. It is truly a confederation of states though this in no way diminishes the prestige of the Commonwealth Government. It is important to bear this in mind when dealing with the Commonwealth of Australia and with the individual states. South Australia contains a substantial portion of the uranium resources of Australia and is a proud and separate entity with a rapidly growing industrial complex. We were deeply impressed with the efficiency and substantial character of the entire atomic energy program in South Australia.

South Australia needs atomic power. The state is now planning to supplement the conventional electric resources available to its electricity trust with atomic energy in the early 1960's and is looking to the United States for extensive technical guidance in achieving this goal.

We had an opportunity to inspect the laboratories which have been built outside of Adelaide by the South Australian Government and members of the party met with the electricity trust for a detailed discussion. Plans are now going forward to equip existing powerplants to burn either coal or oil, in order to make maximum use of the recent oil discoveries on the west coast of Australia. Another project is going forward to make use of the brown coal deposits which exist in South Australia. But these resources are not sufficient to meet the long-term needs of the rapidly expanding industrial complex in this state. Therefore, the electricity trust is planning on supplementing its electricity resources with atomic power beginning in 1963. This is a realistic plan which will require hard work on the part of the South Australians and considerable technical assistance and guidance on the part of Great Britain and the United States. We were impressed by the fact that the South Australians have managed to work out the plan for meeting their electric power needs in such a way as to bring atomic power into their picture at approximately the same time as we have been informed here in the United States it is reasonable to begin to place reliance on this resource.

As a first step the South Australian government plans to build a research reactor of modified United States design at the University of Adelaide. They hope to have this machine running sometime in 1958 or 1959 and are prepared to finance it themselves. Of course, they will require outside technical assistance. Their total program appeared to us to be most well-conceived. These people are stanch allies of ours in a critical part of the world and are earning our equally warm support.

From South Australia we traveled north across the great Australian desert, stopping on the way for a brief visit at the joint Australian-British guided missile test range known as Woomera. It was on this range not many months ago that the British conducted their second series of atomic weapons tests.

On the northern coast of Australia we stopped and went back into the hinterland to inspect the famous uranium mining area known as Rum Jungle.

The Philippines

From Australia our subcommittee went north to the Philippines. We met with President Magsaysay at Manila and talked with him and his staff about the prospects of peacetime applications for atomic energy. We were all impressed with the fundamental grasp which the top Government leaders of the Philippines have on what atomic energy can do for their country and the modest and realistic attitude which they take for its achievement. The general standard of living in the Philippines today is far too low and the amount of industrialization which has been possible thus far is insufficient for a modern nation. Atomic energy can do much to improve both of these areas. There are many young Filipinos trained in American universities who are familiar with varying aspects of atomic energy. There is basic research going on now at the great university in Manila.

The Filipinos have an excellent agricultural college and several fine agricultural experiment stations. Dr. Paul B. Pearson, of the Biology and Medicine Branch of the Atomic Energy Commission, who closely follows the agricultural program of the Commission, visited the Philippines and toured their agricultural stations just a week after the committee's visit. We met with Dr. Pearson after his visit and found ourselves in agreement with him as to the challenge offered by their interest and competence. Here obviously is a case where the early signing of an agreement to cooperate would make it possible to put the peaceful atom promptly and effectively to work.

Our Filipino friends are ready to cooperate with us both to the end of improving their agricultural and industrial lot and to the advancement of a science still too little understood. They would make valuable allies in our common war against the scientific unknown.

Formosa

Formosa was our next stop. On Formosa our subcommittee met with representatives of both the American missions there and the Governments of Free China and of Formosa. We explored ways in which radioisotopes could be used to improve the agricultural production on Formosa and to raise the standards of health there. This island economy could profit from such experimental atomic work.

Thailand

One of our most thrilling experiences occurred during our visit to our friendly and warm allies in Thailand. Until the word

went out several months ago of our plan to visit Bangkok, there was no organized government activity in the field of atomic energy in Thailand. This is not to say that there were not a number of interested and competent individuals at work individually and in small groups, but they lacked any cohesive plan and any specifically directed Government support. We found upon our arrival that a new atomic energy committee had been formed, headed by the deputy prime minister. The third meeting of their committee was with our subcommittee. It was an impressive meeting—impressive because of the realism and directness of their statements. The people of Thailand can be benefited, especially in the fields of medicine and agriculture, through the use of radioisotropes, and they might profitably use a small research reactor. We understand that they will shortly make proposals to our State Department for an agreement for cooperation. The United States would do well to seize upon this opportunity quickly and demonstrate to the people of Asia that the peacetime benefits of atomic energy which the United States stands ready to offer are real and in many instances can be of almost immediate benefit to their economy.

India

India has a large and rapidly expanding atomic energy program. Its nature is not well understood outside India, and we ourselves found that we had arrived with some misconceptions. Particularly in the fields of physics, chemistry, and biology the Indians are making outstanding contributions. This is no backward nation when it comes to modern science. Indians of all ages in their laboratories are earning their rightful place in the scientific and engineering fraternity. We visited first in Calcutta and then in New Delhi to talk with some of the people, both government and scientific, about what they are doing and what they hope to do.

Calcutta: Our visit in Calcutta, though brief, we felt was an important one. It gave us an opportunity to talk at firsthand to people who are actively working in the field of atomic energy. It was our pleasure to meet again with Dr. Saha, of the University of Calcutta, with whom the full joint committee had the pleasure of meeting here in the Capitol last year.

We found particularly interesting the serious commentaries we obtained in India on the hollowness of the offers which have been made by the Soviet Union to assist this part of the world. We were given well founded testimony on the complete unwillingness of the Soviet Union to bring any real benefits and contribute any real scientific and engineering knowledge to the end that the people of India may enjoy the benefits of atomic energy.

New Delhi: In New Delhi we had the pleasure of meeting with many representatives of the Indian Government, though unfortunately Prime Minister Nehru was not in the city. We met with the Indian Atomic Energy Commission and learned much more about their program than had been available to us previously. We came away with the distinct impression that the Indian atomic effort is an important one not only to India but to the advancement of science. Concrete plans are actually going forward and some construction is underway looking toward the first of two large research reactors, both on modified, unclassified American design.

We visited the National Physical Laboratory, which is renowned for its development of the so-called solar cooker which uses the heat of the sun to cook food and heat homes. Here in this institute Dr. K. S. Krishnan, director of the laboratory, and a member of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission, took members of our party on a tour of one of the finest scientific laboratories we have ever visited. This institute is well equipped and well staffed to do work in basic science. Work is nearing completion on the construction of a large particle accelerator.

There are ways in which we can assist in the prosecution of this program at little or no dollar expense to the United States, yet in ways which would be deeply appreciated by the Indians, and would be of real assistance to them. It is our own hope that ways can be found in the near future, again through an agreement for cooperation, to extend this assistance.

Pakistan

In Karachi we had the very real pleasure of meeting first with Prime Minister Mohammed Ali, and later with the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research for Pakistan. Long and hard though the road ahead is for the people of Pakistan, they see and are attempting to grasp the opportunities to make their passage along that road both faster and better through the use of atomic energy. They have already established a central research laboratory in Karachi and will shortly open three regional laboratories.

We noted with interest upon our return to the United States an announcement of the intentions of those in the Briitsh atomic-energy program to assist in the development of these laboratories. Scientists and Government administrators alike made it clear to us while we were there conferring with them that they must have assistance and would welcome it particularly from the United States.

We flew north to Peshawar near the Khyber Pass in order that we might meet with the faculty of the university there, since it is on their campus that the first regional laboratory is to be established. In the barren foothills of the Himalayas we talked long and earnestly with men trained here at our own Oak Ridge and Argonne and at Princeton—men of scientific and technical stature who are trying already with their limited resources to bring their country the beenfits of this most revolutionary science.

Iran

In Teheran we met with Prime Minister Zahedi and his Minister of Foreign Affairs, as well as other members of the Iranian Government. The economic difficulties of Iran have been much eased by the recent settlement of the long oil dispute. The ways and means by which atomic energy can help raise the standards of living in Iran and improve health are not unlike those everywhere, but the problems of organizing such programs are not as far along as those in most countries which we visited. It is entirely possible that a small United States task force—3 or 4 men—for a few months might be able to give real assistance on this score. Again we wish to emphasize that we are not suggesting multi-million-dollar-foreign-aid programs but the carefully selected, prudent expenditure of $5,000 or $10,000 here and there in the way that will do the most good and at the most propitious moment. Large sums of money too late are no substitute for timely assistance on a modest scale.

Turkey

At Ankara we were all impressed by the large assembly of learned scientific ladies and gentlemen who were brought together to meet with us. We had no prior knowledge of the extent of the scientific talent available in Turkey which can be devoted to bringing peacetime atomic benefits to that country. What we learned was most encouraging.

It was an unexpected pleasure to meet Professor Alisbah, professor of higher mathematics at the University of Ankara, who is also a member of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. He was only one of those whom we met in Turkey who are tangible evidence that here is a country which is able to make contributions in this field of science. We always have too few really competent minds tackling the problems of the scientific unknown. We personally found the Turkish plans for an atomic cancer institute of special interest and were impressed that there are more than just plans, that the first laboratory is already in operation. Our countries could benefit mutually from a program of closer cooperation in peacetime atomic pursuits.

Greece

In Greece, as in Iran, we found the need for atomic agricultural and medical benefits to be very great indeed and the present means of bringing them to the people far too limited. The American taxpayer has spent large sums to aid the Greeks in repelling the Communist threat, and the Greeks have made wise use of this help. The country is today a vigorous member of the free world. However, it still faces grave economic problems. Food production is primitive by our standards. The country's power resources are quite limited. To the long-range goal of raising the Greek standard of living and achieving a stabilized economy, atomic energy—if wisely used—can contribute and even provide short cuts both in dollars and time. Here also our responsibility is great, out of humanitarian as well as ideological kinship.

Spain

Our meeting with the Spanish Nuclear Energy Commission in Madrid was a highlight of our trip. This aggressive group is carrying out its basic nuclear development program primarily through grants to existing institutions. For example, they have a large electronics and instrument development group at the University of Madrid, as well as a reactor development group there. They have concrete plans for building a reactor which they seriously hope can be of the swimming-pool type which has been successful here in the United States. They recognize their need for a larger number of trained people, particularly in the field of reactor engineering. General Vigon, president of the Commission, and Dr. Otero were especially anxious to learn how the new provisions of the Atomic Energy Act would permit them to enter into an agreement for cooperation with the United States. The Spanish experience in recent months with the United States technical-assistance program under our new treaty and agreements has convinced them that the kind of assistance they need in their nuclear program can best be obtained from the United States. They need direct technical assistance from Americans who have built and operated research reactors of the sort the Spanish Nuclear Energy Commission is planning to build. They need assistance in setting up a training program in Spain as well as an opportunity to send Spanish scientists and engineers to the United States for training. They are interested in much more than just electric power. Spain has an agricultural extension service and good central medical facilities which could effectively use many of the things the United States has learned in these fields.

RAW MATERIALS SUBCOMMITTEE,
(83d Cong., 2d Sess.),
JOHN W. BRICKER,
Acting Chairman,
STERLING COLE,
CARL HINSHAW,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I concur fully in these general observations. Since the subcommittee report relates in considerable detail the places we visited and the people we met, I shall not go into the details of this pleasant, though arduous, journey.

To sum up our trip, I should like to make three general observations. Many of the nations we visited have enormous problems and limited resources. These are the very nations which need the atomic shortcuts to improvements in standards of living, in agricultural and industrial output, and better health. These atomic shortcuts can be provided at a modest cost in dollars, material, and manpower. We found no country on our itinerary devoid of scientific talent in the atomic field. All of us on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have had to struggle with the problems of getting adequate scientific personnel to tackle all the basic scientific research tasks at hand. Here in these countries are energetic and competent people, anxious to use their talents to our common advantage. The last Congress provided the legal basis for making such cooperation possible. We must do everything in our power to see to it that these provisions of the law relating to international agreements for cooperation are used to the fullest without delay or redtape.

Secondly, I was impressed by the relatively small investment that such an atomic-aid program would involve. Time after time I talked with eager men and women well trained in atomic science whose energies would be available to contribute both to their own nations and to science generally if they had but a few radiation instruments. They could be bought for from $5,000 to $25,000 per laboratory.

If I might hazard a guess, a quarter of a million dollars spent today promptly, and in the right places, can do more good than $250 million appropriated all at once 5 years from now. I would use the quarter of a million for 25 grants in the 12 nations we visited, giving each laboratory $10,000 worth of radiation instruments.

I must say that I returned deeply impressed with the value of face-to-face conversations with the scientific and governmental leaders in their own countries. All of us who made the trip returned with a better sense of what is possible; how our atoms-for-peace program can be advanced; and what is needed to make it of real benefit to the common people on whom free government depends throughout the world. I shall not soon forget how much can be done for so little in many parts of the world where the potentialities of the atom remain untapped.

In conclusion, I should like to point out what I regard as the most dangerous pitfalls in the administration of the President's atoms-for-peace plan.

The first is that of overselling a good program. The deserts of the world are not going to bloom overnight. For many nations cheap atomic power is decades away. False expectations raised by hucksters on the Federal payroll can benefit only the Communists.

The second great danger is that administration of the program will be entrusted to giddy humanitarians, to doctrinaire Socialists, or to callous bureaucrats. This is a practical program for practical men of science. There is no place in this program for the social worker or the socialistic planner. And I sincerely hope that negotiations for agreements for cooperation do not become ensnarled in a mass of redtape or in the niceties of diplomatic protocol.

The third pitfall is an all too common American failing. We are naturally, and I think justifiably, proud of our own traditions, culture, and economic system. However, we seem to be infected with an irresistible urge to force American political, economic, social, and cultural institutions on other people. It is not at all certain that the underdeveloped countries want a degree of efficiency which means that small villages, small farms, and handicraft industries must be sacrificed. It is presumptuous to think that no people can be happy, or that they are necessarily inferior, if they do not possess, or do not aspire to, the American standard of living. There are many things vastly more important. Nothing is more certain, however, than that an effort to transplant unmodified all the distinctive aspects of our civilization on foreign soil would bring down on us the hatred of the world. This obsession to improve other people whether they like it or not was revealed, unwittingly, in an article appearing in the February issue of American Mercury. This was the concluding paragraph of a story on the discovery of a tribe of people in an unexplored region of New Guinea:

> Whether the lost people of Lavani like it or not, they are about to be whisked thousands of years through time—from the darkest stone age into the middle of the atomic age.

Let us pray that the atoms-for-peace plan will never be used to lift people, whether they like it or not, from what they have to what we think they should have.

And, finally, I hope that the atoms-for-peace plan, both at home and abroad, will not become just another bauble with which to excite the avarice of mankind. If we live only for an ever-rising standard of living, we shall never know freedom from want. Our wants will be unlimited, far beyond the power of the atom to satisfy. To secure for ourselves and others the benefits envisioned by President Eisenhower in his atoms-for-peace plan, we must adhere to values which spring from sources higher than the appetites of man.

Mr. President, on this trip I was impressed with an expression I heard in one country. It was that the government of that country was trying to lift the standard of living of its people, and could utilize atomic energy to fulfill that purpose. I could not help think that governments alone do not lift standards of living for their people, but create an atmosphere in which the standards of living of the people can improve. The people must do it for themselves. There must be an individual yearning and an individual ability to lift one's own standard of living. When we put the matter solely on a control basis, we do not fulfill the yearnings of the people.

There cannot be a lifting of the standard of living of a people by material resources alone. It must be accomplished by a spiritual uplifting of the people, by a higher degree of freedom, and by individual creative ability, enhanced and encouraged in an atmosphere of freedom brought about by the government.

In this problem, complex as it is, the United States can take a leading role, by helping the nations of the world to attain better health and better industrial conditions, and, finally, an opportunity for development generally.

We found everywhere—and this fact is reported in the bulletin which I have submitted for the RECORD—a desire for better health conditions, and a great interest in the availability of and the possibilities that will arise from the use of atomic energy.

We found everywhere a desire to increase agricultural production. In many of the countries we visited, people live just above a bare minimum standard of living. In many places there is today actual hunger. If the soil, which has been bleached out and eroded and washed out, can be brought back to production by new scientific processes, certainly much will have been contributed to the happiness of these countries, and ultimately of the world.

In the field of industry there is everywhere a desire for more and more power. In one of the countries we visited the power had become depleted, and one of their production centers had been closed down. As a result, in the hotel at which we were staying the elevators were not operating and the lights were cut off during a part of the time. In all the countries we found a desire for more production of the things that their people need. Essential for such production is the source of energy and power that might ultimately come from atomic reactors.

As I said before, Mr. President, in this program we do not wish to overencourage, but we desire to be practical in our approach.

I wish to express to the Members of the Senate the gratitude I feel for the opportunity to make this trip, to observe the needs of various countries of the world, and to get a glimpse of the possibilities which confront the United States in the great program of helpfulness which I know is inspired by the leadership of this Nation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Ohio on his most enlightening address on the subject of his recent very important trip. I compliment him highly and very sincerely. I hope those Senators who were not present this afternoon to hear the Senator from Ohio will read his address in the RECORD, because he has told us something which we all should know and appreciate.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I wish to say, in response, that we have here, I think, possibly the greatest opportunity available to us in any single field for building good will and helping the other peoples of the world to a better way of life. Their resources are, of course, limited. We have spent from $12 billion to $13 billion on the program, and if we can turn it

now from the destructive aspect, which it has been, primarily, up to this time, toward peaceful uses, I think not only will we strengthen our position in the world, but we will be doing more than we could possibly do with many times the amount of dollars sent abroad.

There was another very encouraging aspect which came from members of governments with whom we talked, namely, that the United States has an adequate supply for defense purposes and that our program has advanced to such a point that we can contribute 200 or more pounds to international use. England has contributed some 40 pounds for that purpose. The people have learned that now we can turn what has been a threat to the world to the help of the peoples of the world. To me, as an American citizen and as a Member of this body, that was one point of encouragement which emphasized the possibilities for the future in this great field.

THE BONN AGREEMENTS OF 1952 AS AMENDED BY THE PARIS PROTOCOL OF 1954 (S. DOC. No. 11)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the so-called London-Paris accords, which have the effect of amending the contractual agreements with Germany which the Senate approved in 1952, are now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee—Executives L and M, 83d Congress, 2d session.

Unfortunately for purposes of clarity, the protocol to the German agreement is in the form of substitute language for provisions in the earlier protocol. Thus, it is virtually impossible for the Senate to get any clear idea of the action it is expected to take without reading the 1952 convention as amended by the 1954 protocol.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have the Convention on Relations Between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, as amended by the 1954 Protocol on Termination of the Occupation of Germany, printed as a Senate document. It will thus be possible for the Senate and the Committee, when they consider the London-Paris accords, to have before them a document which will embody the actual agreements as they will be in effect if approved by the parties thereto.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. How many copies will be printed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The law provides for a definite number.

Mr. GEORGE. The law provides for a definite number. I am not able to give the Senator that information. It will be an indispensable document when it is printed. Otherwise, the subject is not understandable. The document will not be so large as the manuscripts before me would indicate, because many of the pages in this manuscript are only half pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES VERSUS CAPPS—THE "POTATO CASE"

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in United States of America, petitioner, against Guy W. Capps, Inc., on writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, together with an article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Potato Case," and another article from the Wall Street Journal headed "Supreme Court's Silence on Spuds Gives New Ammunition to Treaty Curb Backers."

There being no objection, the opinion and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 14, OCTOBER TERM, 1954

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PETITIONER, *v.* GUY W. CAPPS, INC.

(On writ of certiorari to the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit)

(February 7, 1955)

(Mr. Justice Burton delivered the opinion of the Court.)

In this case the United States district court directed a verdict for respondent because petitioner failed to present evidence of either a breach of contract or resulting damages sufficient to sustain a verdict for petitioner. The court of appeals, however, affirmed the judgment on the ground that the alleged contract was unenforceable. For the reasons hereafter stated, we agree with the district court that the evidence was not sufficient to sustain the alleged breach of contract. Accordingly, we do not reach or pass upon the other grounds discussed by the court of appeals.

In 1948 the crops of Irish potatoes in the United States and Canada were among the largest on record. As a result, the United States, in section 1 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1948 (68 Stat. 1247, 1248), obligated itself to support the sale of such potatoes at 90 percent of their parity price. This program was carried out through agreements of the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase, from eligible growers or dealers in the United States, all Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, provided such potatoes could not be sold commercially at 90 percent of parity. As the unsupported Canadian prices were lower than the supported prices in the United States, it became profitable to import Canadian potatoes despite the tariff and freight charges. Recognizing that fact, Congress authorized investigations by the Tariff Commission, under the President's direction, which might lead to imposing quantitative limitations on imports or to increasing import fees. (62 stat. 1248–1250, 7 U. S. C., sec. 624.)

However, without resorting to that procedure, the United States acted through diplomatic channels. Its Acting Secretary of State and the Canadian Ambassador exchanged notes on November 23 1948, purporting to consummate an executive agreement effective at once. (For their text see appendix, infra, at 10–14.) Of special significance to this litigation are the undertakings made by Canada, in its note, to place its Irish potatoes under export control, to withhold export permits for the movement of table stock potatoes to the United States, and to issue export permits for the shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes to the United States only under specified circumstances. Those circumstances were that the shipments be limited to specified States where there was a legitimate demand for certified seed potatoes and to a short period before the normal seeding time. Permits were to be granted only to exporters having firm orders from legitimate United States users of Canadian seed potatoes, and those exporters were "to have included in any contract into which they might enter with a United States seed potato importer a clause in which the importer would give an assurance that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes" (Appendix, infra, at 11). The agreement terminated June 20, 1949.

In December 1948 Guy W. Capps, Inc., a Virginia corporation, respondent herein, bought 48,544 one-hundred-pound bags of Canadian certified Irish seed potatoes from H. B. Willis, Inc., of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, a Canadian exporter. Before the exporter's shipment of them on the steamship *Empire Gangway* to respondent at Jacksonville, Fla., respondent wired the exporter as follows: "Certified seed potatoes loaded on steamship *Gangway* are for planting in Florida and Georgia." The shipment arrived at Jacksonville January 9, 1949.[1] On January 11, the potatoes were all invoiced by respondent to the Atlantic Commission Co. at Jacksonville as "48,544 Sax Canada No. 1 seed potatoes at $3.35 f. o. b."[2]

In January 1951 the United States filed the instant action against respondent in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, claiming that the above circumstances constituted a contract between the exporter and respondent for the benefit of the United States. The complaint alleged further, upon information and belief, that, in January 1949, respondent, in violation of such contract, "sold the 48,544 sacks of seed potatoes for table stock purposes" to the damage of the United States in the amount of approximately $150,486, "in that for each quantity of potatoes so imported from Canada and sold for table stock in the United States, a substantially equivalent quantity of potatoes produced in the United States was offered for sale to the Department of Agriculture, and had to be and was purchased by the Department under the Agricultural Act of 1948."

Respondent's motion to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted was denied. (100 F. Supp. 30.) However, at the close of petitioner's case and after argument of counsel, the court directed a verdict for respondent.

[1] January 10, 1949, the Acting Chief of the Potato Division, Fruit and Vegetable Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, wired respondent:

"Have been informed ACCO (Atlantic Commission Co.) representative, Jacksonville, Fla., claiming you have special permission from Department to sell Canadian seed for edible use, if no demand for seed. Please advise basis for claim. Account such disposition is contrary to the intent of United States-Canadian agreement and to Canadian requirement regarding diversion or reconsignment."

January 11, 1949, respondent wired in reply: "Have not made such statement. Only put seed (potatoes) Jacksonville for seed purposes" and, later, on the same day:

"I realize fully the agreement with Canada, its intent, and want to and expect to cooperate with the program. I am only bringing in seed for seed purposes. Canadian dealers are now quoting seed same territory I am selling. Have had quotations as low as 365 hundredweight delivered Norfolk, past week."

[2] "Less 10,000 Sax Canada No. 1 seed potatoes at $3.65 f. o. b." These 10,000 sacks were immediately resold by the Atlantic Commission Co. to respondent. Of them, 8,730 were invoiced by respondent on the same day as "Canada No. 1 seed potatoes" in 7 lots to 4 separate dealers in Florida and Georgia, at prices between $3.75 and $4 per hundredweight. There was no evidence as to the disposition of the remaining 1,270 sacks.

Judgment was entered accordingly. The court's findings of fact and conclusions of law were contained in its oral opinion. That opinion, which has not been published, included the following highly significant statements:

"The action here is for breach of contract made between a Canadian exporter and Capps, the American importer, and specifically of a stipulation placed in that contract which the court has held was for the benefit of the United States.

"The expression constituting that stipulation is that certified seed potatoes loaded on the S. S. *Gangway* are for planting in Florida and Georgia. Now, assuming that the court is correct in holding that that stipulation is an agreement within the meaning of the Executive treaty or an assurance, as it is called in the Executive treaty, to the effect that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes—I say assuming that the court is correct in holding that this provision is an assurance—there is no proof here sufficient to go to the jury that there has been such a diversion or reconsignment, or that there has been a lack of diligence or care on the part of this defendant to see to it that its assurance was carried out.

"In the first place, the only diversion or reconsignment was from the defendant to the Atlantic Commission Co. Now that was not a diversion or reconsignment for table stock purposes. Nor does it evidence any want of care on the part of the defendant to see that the assurance was kept, because the evidence shows that this defendant had from year to year sold to Atlantic potatoes exclusively for seed purposes. The evidence does not justify or would not justify the jury in drawing a conclusion that it was a reckless abandonment by the defendant of its obligation to see to the use of these potatoes because the defendant had the right to rely upon its previous experiences.

"But going further, and assuming that it was incumbent upon the defendant to follow up and see that this reconsignment did not lead to the use of the potatoes for table purposes, we find that the A. & P., to whom Atlantic sold, did sell seed potatoes. It is true that it was not its entire trade in potatoes, but it did sell a large amount, described as its secondary function, for seed purposes, and the other sales by Atlantic to wholesalers or to the trade, as it is spoken of, were to firms which used potatoes for seed purposes or disposed of them for seed purposes, so that the sales by the defendant here were equally consistent with the compliance as with the violation of the assurance."

The court of appeals disagreed with the district court on the above points.[3] However, it affirmed the judgment on the ground that the international agreement, which the contract between respondent and the exporter sought to carry out, was void. The court regarded it as not authorized by Congress and as contravening the provision for procedure through the Tariff Commission. The court also held that the suit must fail because no cause of action had been created by Congress for this type of injury (204 F. 2d 655, 658–661). We granted certiorari to determine whether the significant constitutional and statutory questions discussed by the court of appeals were necessary for the decision of the case and, if so, to give them consideration (346 U. S. 884).

We have first examined the record in order to pass upon the preliminary questions on which the court of appeals disagreed with the trial court. (See *Walling* v. *General Industries Co.* (330 U. S. 545, 547, 550), and see also, *Story Parchment Co.* v. *Paterson Parchment Co.* (282 U. S. 555, 560, 567–568).)

Respondent's alleged obligation is stated in its first telegram, which must be read in the light of the above-mentioned correspondence between the United States and Canada. That correspondence recognized that importations of Canadian seed potatoes, as well as of Canadian table stock potatoes, might displace eligible American potatoes in American commercial markets and thus might add to the burden of the American price-support program. The correspondence, nevertheless, did not seek to exclude Canadian seed potatoes. On the contrary, it provided for the continuance of shipments of seed potatoes to specified States in the United States, during a short period immediately prior to the normal seeding time. In addition, Canada agreed to require its exporters to secure assurance from each importer of Canadian seed potatoes that such potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes. In effect, this agreement stopped the regular Canadian-American trade in Canadian table stock potatoes, while preserving such trade in Canadian seed potatoes. There was no suggestion that each importer, during the short open season for Canadian seed potatoes, had to take any new or extraordinary affirmative steps to see to it that the ultimate purchasers never ate their seed potatoes, or that each American retailer of Canadian seed potatoes, in its usual course of business, segregated such potatoes from table stock potatoes in any manner not customary in the sale of seed potatoes.

The undisputed evidence showed that the entire shipment to Jacksonville was made in containers with markings and tags identifying the potatoes as "Canadian No. 1 seed potatoes." There was no showing that this identification was separated from the potatoes at any point short of the ultimate offering of some of the potatoes at retail. There was, in short, no evidence that any of the potatoes were at any time reconsigned or otherwise treated except as had been customary in prior commercial dealings in seed potatoes.

At Jacksonville the entire shipment was invoiced by respondent to the Atlantic Commission Co. as "Canada No. 1 Seed Potatoes." Most of the 10,000 sacks (which, at the time of their delivery to that company in Jacksonville, were resold by it to respondent) were invoiced by respondent to other customers in a like manner.[4] The Atlantic Commission Co., in turn, invoiced to its purchasers, in the same manner, the sacks which it received from respondent. Of them, 13,627 sacks were invoiced by the Commission Co. to its parent company, the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., at 3 points in Florida and 1 in Georgia, but 1,641 sacks were invoiced to points in Alabama. The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. primarily sold foodstuffs but also dealt in vegetables for planting purposes, such as seed potatoes, onion sets, and cabbage sets. It sold seed potatoes not only to home gardeners but to planters of small commercial acreages. The Commission Co. invoiced the remaining 24,926 sacks to over 30 separate dealers in Florida and Georgia, but invoiced 2,309 to points in Alabama. All of the consignees were dealers in vegetables and groceries, and the primary volume of their trade was in articles for food. But there was testimony that some of these dealers customarily handled seed potatoes for planting purposes and there was no evidence that any of them did not. Respondent previously had sold seed potatoes to the Atlantic Commission Co. and that company had used channels of distribution comparable to those used in this instance. There was no evidence of the reconsignment of any of these seed potatoes for table stock, or of the diversion of any of them from the commercial channels theretofore usually used for sales of seed potatoes in this area during the planting season. Exception has not been taken to the States designated or to the times when the sales were to be made.

The evidence also did not support the suggestion that some of these potatoes were unsuitable for planting in the areas designated. It was not enough that one witness said that only 20 percent of the original shipment consisted of potaoes belonging to the three most popular varieties grown in Florida in that year.

There was no evidence of bad faith, neglect or carelessness on the part of respondent in performing its contractual obligations. There was no evidence of any intent of respondent that the potatoes be sold for table use. It freely acknowledged the existence of the international agreement and declared its purpose to cooperate with it.

It was conceded that these potatoes were specially suited for use as seed but also that they were of high-grade edible quality. There was, however, no evidence that any substantial part of these potatoes ultimately was eaten. The most that appeared was that 10 pounds of the seed potatoes were sold by a grocery in St. Augustine, Fla., to two women who appeared to be housewives buying for home use. There was also evidence that a few potatoes, probably from the shipment, were sold to customers of the same type by a Jacksonville store and by an A. & P. market in Atlanta, Ga.

In sum, all that respondent did was to sell seed potatoes, labeled as seed potatoes, in seeding time to concerns which normally dealt in seed potatoes. Under these circumstances, the district court was not clearly in error in making the findings it did or in directing the verdict for respondent on the ground that no breach of contract was shown (*Walling* v. *General Industries Co.* (330 U. S. 545)).

In view of the foregoing, there is no occasion for us to consider the other questions discussed by the court of appeals. The decision in this case does not rest upon them.

Affirmed.

APPENDIX

EXCHANGE OF NOTES BETWEEN THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES, NOVEMBER 23, 1948

THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to refer to the discussions which have taken place between the representatives of the Government of Canada and of the Government of the United States of America regarding the problems which would confront the Government of the United States in the operation of its price support and other programs for potatoes if the imports of Canadian potatoes, during this current crop year, were to continue to be unrestricted. After careful consideration of the various representations which have been made to the Canadian Government on this subject, the Canadian Government is prepared to:

1. Include Irish potatoes in the list of commodities for which an export permit is required under the provisions of the Export and Import Permits Act.

2. Withhold export permits for the movement of table stock potatoes to the United States proper, excluding Alaska.

3. Issue export permits for the shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes to the

---

[3] "We have little difficulty in seeing in the evidence breach of contract on the part of defendant and damage resulting to the United States from the breach" (204 F. 2d, at 658).

[4] See note 2, supra.

United States, but only under the following circumstances:

(a) Export permits will be issued to Canadian exporters for shipments to specified States in the United States and such permits will only be granted within the structure of a specific schedule. The schedule is designed to direct the shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes into those States where there is a legitimate demand for certified seed potatoes and only during a short period immediately prior to the normal seeding time. A draft of this schedule is now being jointly prepared by Canadian and United States officials.

(b) Export permits would only be granted to Canadian exporters who could give evidence that they had firm orders from legitimate United States users of Canadian seed potatoes. Canadian exporters would also be required to have included in any contract into which they might enter with a United States seed potato importer a clause in which the importer would give an assurance that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes.

(c) The Canadian Government would survey the supply of Canadian certified seed potatoes by class and consider the possibility of giving precedence to the export of foundation and foundation A classes of certified seed.

(d) The names and addresses of the consignees entered on the export permit would be compiled periodically and this information would be forwarded to the United States Government.

In instituting a system which has the effect of restricting exports of Canadian potatoes to the United States, the Canadian Government recognizes a responsibility to the Canadian commercial grower in certain surplus potato areas and is prepared to guarantee a minimum return on gradable potatoes for which the grower cannot find a sales outlet. Although the details of such a program have not been finalized, it is anticipated that the Canadian Government will announce, at approximately the same time as potatoes are placed under export control, a floor price which will be effective April 1, 1949, for certain carlot shipping areas in the East. To implement this program the Canadian Government would inspect the potato holdings of commercial growers in Prince Edward Island, and several counties of New Brunswick, on or after April 1 and would undertake to pay a fixed price for every 100 pounds of Canada No. 1 potatoes found in the bins. It is not anticipated that any actual payment would be made at that time and it would be understood that, if any of the potatoes examined were subsequently sold or used for seed purposes, the owner would forfeit any claim for assistance on such potatoes. In other words, the Canadian Government would make no payment on potatoes which move into export trade or which are used for seed purposes.

It should be noted that the Canadian proposals to institute export permit control on Canadian potatoes and to inaugurate a price support program are contingent upon assurances from the United States Government that:

(a) The United States Government will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop exported to the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes from Canada to the United States outlined herein.

(b) The Canadian Government proposal, as outlined herein, to guarantee a floor price to certain commercial growers in the Maritime Provinces would not be interpreted by United States authorities as either a direct or indirect subsidy and that in consequence there would be no grounds for the imposition of countervailing duties under section 303 of the United States Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 687).

If the United States Government in its replying note accepts the Canadian proposals and gives to the Canadian Government the assurances required, as outlined above, this note and the reply thereto will constitute an agreement on this subject.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

H. H. WRONG.

THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE TO THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR

NOVEMBER 23, 1948.

His Excellency HUME WRONG,
Ambassador of Canada.

EXCELLENCY: The Government of the United States appreciates the assurance of the Government of Canada contained in your note No. 538 of November 23, 1948, that the Government of Canada is prepared, contingent upon the receipt of certain assurances from the Government of the United States to establish the controls outlined therein over the exportation of potatoes from Canada to the United States.

In view of the adverse effect which unrestricted imports of Canadian potatoes would have on the potato programs of the United States and the fact that it is anticipated that the Canadian proposal will substantially reduce the quantity of potatoes which would otherwise be imported into the United States, and in the interest of international trade between the United States and Canada and other considerations, the United States Government assures the Canadian Government that it will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop imported into the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes to the United States outlined in the Canadian proposal.

The Government of the United States also wishes to inform the Canadian Government with respect to that Government's proposal to guarantee a floor price to certain commercial growers in the Maritime Provinces, that in the opinion of the Treasury Department, the operation of such a proposal as outlined by the Canadian Government would not be considered as a payment or bestowal, directly or indirectly, of any bounty or grant upon the manufacture, production, or export of the potatoes concerned and no countervailing duty would, therefore, be levied, under the provisions of section 303, Tariff Act of 1930, as a result of such operation of the proposal on potatoes imported from Canada.

The United States Government agrees that your note under reference, together with this reply, will constitute an agreement on this subject.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

Treaties and Other International Acts, Series 1896, Department of State, Publication 3474.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 15, 1955]

THE POTATO CASE

Last week the Supreme Court decided *United States* v. *Capps*, litigation known among lawyers as "the potato case." In doing so, the High Court left unanswered the question of the legality of an executive agreement placed squarely before it by the fourth circuit court of appeals.

There were two questions before the High Court in the potato case. One was whether a man named Capps had violated a contract—flowing from an executive agreement—which prohibited him from selling Canadian potatoes in this country for table use. The other was whether the executive agreement itself was legal. The High Court exonerated Capps on the ground that he had not violated the contract. But it passed over the question of whether the executive agreement was legal even though the court of appeals held that it was not.

Now the High Court had a right to act thus and we certainly impute no wrong motive to what was done. Courts are reluctant, and in most cases doubtless rightly so, to decide a case on a constitutional question when it can be decided on a question of evidence.

Still, it seems to us that, as an article on this page today points out, the High Court's decision adds up to an implication that this particular executive agreement was all right.

For the evidence and the executive agreement are inextricably mixed in the Capps case. How can a contract based on an executive agreement be valid if the agreement is not valid? Or, said another way, if the contract was valid the executive agreement must also have been legal. It seems to us that that is the only inference to be drawn from the High Court's silence.

If, however, it was a valid agreement, where do the prerogatives of the executive department begin and where do the powers of the Congress end?

Many learned lawyers have inferred from other Supreme Court decisions that there is small limit—if any at all—to what can be done through treaties and executive agreements, even to the point of overriding the Constitution.

It is puzzling to us why there is so much opposition to spelling out in exact language just how far such international agreements should go. It is even more puzzling why such a basic question as safeguarding the Constitution should be, politically, such a hot potato.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 15, 1955]

POTATOES AND PACTS—SUPREME COURT'S SILENCE ON SPUDS GIVES NEW AMMUNITION TO TREATY-CURB BACKERS

(By William H. Fitzpatrick)

Less than 12 months ago the United States Senate was in steamy debate about some Missouri ducks and a need for amending the Constitution. This year, when the debate about treaties and executive agreements begins again, the ducks will be dished up with some Irish potatoes grown in Canada and sold in Florida.

If all this sounds like an improbable legislative potpourri, there's some reason for it. The ducks and the potatoes figured in United States Supreme Court cases which many lawyers think have stretched the power of treaties and executive agreements to the point of overriding the Constitution.

In the duck case (*Missouri* v. *Holland*) the danger comes, as some lawyers see it, from what the Court had to say. In effect the Court said that Congress, through a treaty, acquired powers that Federal courts previously had said the Congress did not have through the Constitution. This and subsequent cases led to proposals to amend the Constitution so that some restraints would be placed on treaties and executive agreements. Senator BRICKER's amendment was whittled away bit by bit, but 60 Senators voted for the amendment by Senator GEORGE to spell out more plainly the limits of the treaty and executive agreement powers; it lost by only one vote.

Now just the other day the United States Supreme Court decided the potato case—*United States* v. *Capps*. The proponents of new constitutional safeguards see dangers in that decision not from what the Court had to say but from what the Court did not say.

This case reached the High Court this way: In 1948, Congress supported Irish potatoes at 90 percent of parity. Canadian potatoes were unsupported, and their price was lower despite tariff and freight charges. A great many Canadian potatoes found their

way into the United States and United States potatoes sought the shelter of 90 percent of parity. As a remedy the Congress authorized investigations by the Tariff Commission, under the President's direction, looking to a limitation of imports or to an increase in import fees.

Instead of following the directive of the Congress, the executive department acted through diplomatic channels and an executive agreement was signed by the Acting Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett and Canada's Ambassador Hume Wrong. The agreement was that Canada would restrict export of potatoes to the United States with the exception of seed potatoes and the American importers of the seed potatoes would be obligated to guarantee that the potatoes would be planted and not eaten.

MR. CAPPS' TROUBLES

Subsequently, Guy W. Capps, Inc., a Virginia importer, brought in for use in Florida and George 48,544 sacks of certified Irish seed potatoes which Capps sold to a commission house. The United States Government then sued Capps for $150,000 on the ground that the importer had sold the potatoes for table use in violation of the agreement between Canada and the United States.

The amount of damages was arrived at by Government attorneys who reasoned that every sack of imported potatoes which found its way into the food market displaced an equal amount of domestic potatoes—so this meant the Government had to buy that many more domestic potatoes under the price support program.

The case was tried in the Eastern District Court in Virginia and the Federal judge there decided against the Government, saying that there was not sufficient proof that Capps had sold the potatoes other than as seed potatoes.

The Government appealed the case and the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals also decided against the Government—but on different grounds. The judges of the Fourth Circuit found that there was some damage to the Government because of breach of contract on the part of Capps, but they said that the executive agreement entered into by the State Department and the Canadian Ambassador was void.

These judges said that this agreement was void because it had not been authorized by the Congress and that it contravened the provision set up by the Congress for procedure through the Tariff Commission.

Thus a far more important question than the Government's loss through any contract breach was posed—and answered—by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. The question was whether the executive department could evade a clear Congressional directive designed specifically to carry out an act of Congress and attempt to settle an issue in its own way. The appeals court judges said "No."

The United States Supreme Court, when the case finally reached its docket, chose not to look at the question of executive agreements at all. The high court decided that the District judge was right when he ruled there was insufficient evidence of a breach of contract.

But in its choice between the two different rulings it is fair to infer that the high court did not want to touch on the question of executive agreements overriding Congressional directives. It is, in fact, the practice of the court not to decide a case on a Constitutional question where the decision may be found in some other question. And in the potato case it was not necessary to do so since the high court could agree with the District Court that evidence of breach of contract was lacking.

However, in this District Court decision there seems to be an underlying assumption that there was a valid executive agreement between the United States and Canada.

NOT ENOUGH FOR A JURY

The district court's opinion said in part: "Now, assuming that the court is correct in holding that that stipulation (to sell the potatoes only as seed) is an agreement within the meaning of the executive treaty or an assurance, as it is called in the executive treaty, to the effect that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes—I say assuming that the court is correct in holding that this provision is an assurance, there is no proof here sufficient to go to the jury" that any wrong was done.

So the questions raised are: Could a contract limiting the resale use of Capps' potatoes have existed under the circumstances without the executive agreement? And if the State Department was not empowered—as the appeals court said it was not—to make such an agreement, then how could any contract based on the agreement be valid?

While the Supreme Court did not specifically say the executive agreement was valid it went on to answer the question whether Capps had violated it, and answered that question by agreeing with the district court. Thus by logic and implication the Supreme Court's silence on this question of the power of executive agreements to override the will of Congress is a tacit admission that such power exists.

In any event, those who support the proposals to limit the treaty and executive agreement powers will certainly assume exactly that until the High Court does speak out directly on the subject.

Indeed, the assumption is a reasonable one, for there is small basis for believing that the High Court would hold otherwise in the case of a congressional mandate when a previous decision has held that a treaty (in *Missouri* v. *Holland*) can override the tenth amendment and grant power to enact legislation which would be unconstitutional in the absence of the treaty. Also, the Supreme Court has held (in *U. S.* v. *Pink*) that an executive agreement could override the part of the fifth amendment protecting property rights.

SIGNIFICANT LETTERS

The Court said: "If the President had the power to determine the policy which was to govern the question of recognition (of Russia), then the fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment." The Court even held that the exchange of letters between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Litvinov had the stature of a treaty.

In view of what the courts have said and not said, it may be fairly asked whether any other part of the Constitution can stand in the way of giving full force and effect to other executive agreements or treaties. It is a question which not only lawyers but Senators will soon be asking themselves.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, since there does not appear to be any further business at this time, I move that that Senate adjourn until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Chester R. Davis, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Charles C. Finucane, appointed Under Secretary of the Army.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Charles Noah Shepardson, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1954, vice Paul Emmert Miller, deceased.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Ben F. Cameron, of Mississippi, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Edwin R. Holmes, retired.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

I. FOR APPOINTMENTS, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, TO BE EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be assistant surgeons

John W. Glotfelty — John F. Ice
James D. Tovey — Inez L. Ice

To be assistant dental surgeon

George J. Yocum

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate Friday, February 18, 1955:

POSTMASTER

Luther V. Taylor, Sr., to be postmaster at Belmont, Miss.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1955

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Francis J. Blake, Holy Family Church, Nutley, N. J., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and eternal God, supreme and perfect Lawmaker, to know whom is to love, to serve whom is to reign, look graciously upon these Thy servants, the chosen representatives in their Government of the people of the United States of America. Strike their memories, so that they may be ever grateful for Thy past blessings; illumine their intellects so that they may increasingly know Thy truth; strengthen their wills so that they may always seek Thy and Thy people's good. Grant that the silvered oratory of their deliberations may ever enjoy the golden sunshine of Thy blessing. Grant that these who govern Thy people may always be governed by Thee. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Respectfully submitted.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. KARSTEN.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday, February 23, 1955, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 148), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday a colloquy ensued on the floor in which my right to qualify and to vote on the pending legislation was questioned. At that time I withdrew my request for an opportunity to address the House under a question of personal privilege and I do not seek that at this time. I do believe, however, in the interest of keeping the RECORD straight, and in view of the fact that this colloquy appears on page 1684 of yesterday's RECORD, that I should make a simple statement of the facts.

I was seated in the righthand side of the Chamber between two of my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], when my name was called. Due to the confusion of our conversation, I failed to respond until the next name was called. Immediately thereafter my colleagues from California [Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. KING] called me from my seat and I stepped outside the door to confer with them on a matter concerning our delegation. I stepped back in and waited until the end of the rollcall when I appeared in the well and qualified. I have been informed that my action was taken in full accord with the rules of the House. I will say, in justice to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] that he immediately came to my side and apologized for his challenge, telling me that some of his own colleagues from West Virginia had informed him that I was present.

I bear no malice or ill will, because I consider the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] as one of my close friends of many years' standing, and it was simply a mistake. However, in view of the closeness of the vote, I felt the House deserved this explanation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from West Virginia is one of the hardest fighting Members of the House, and we all respect him. Of course, we know that in the heat of battle many things happen; we all do things that on mature reflection we would not do. But I can testify to the fact that my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] was around here all day on the floor of the House. I had one conference with the gentleman for at least 10 minutes on a matter concerning our Committee on Government Operations. The gentleman was here all day.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was here all day, and I thank the majority leader.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I can also testify to the fact that the gentleman from California was in the Chamber during the rollcall, because he was sitting beside me during most of the call. I remember his going down and talking to Mr. SHEPPARD, and I know that he was in the Chamber during the rollcall.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. As I said before, I bear no malice or ill will toward the gentleman from West Virginia because we know how earnestly he is involved in this bill and how earnestly he fights for the things he believes right. We all make mistakes at times; I make them myself.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Chairman it will be my purpose to speak in favor of the enactment of H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. It will also be my purpose to discuss with my colleagues here in the House a particular industry with respect to which I do not believe the trade agreements authority has been either properly or wisely used. I refer to the American tunafish industry.

The bill, H. R. 1, which is before us today, was introduced by our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. It would extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements to June 30, 1958.

I support H. R. 1 because I realize that our foreign economic policy is an integral part of our overall foreign policy. To attempt to disassociate the one from the other would be most impractical. The President of the United States has stated, "If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all." During the committee's public hearings held on H. R. 1, 6 members of the Cabinet and the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration appeared before the committee and reiterated this theme as expressed by the President. In expressing their endorsement of this measure, these officials from the executive branch of our Federal Government assured the committee that the trade agreements program would be administered in such a way as to give proper recognition to the well-being of our domestic economy and the best interests of American agriculture, labor, and industry.

I am impressed by the persuasion of the President of the United States and his Cabinet officers that this authority will be used to improve the prosperity of the United States and to strengthen the free world alliance against communism. I respect their commitment that this expanded authority will be administered in such a way as to foster the interests of all segments of our economy.

There can be no question that the United States is today the most potent economic force in the world. Whatever foreign economic policy the United States may adopt will greatly influence the activities of other nations in this respect. However, it is essential that if a liberalized foreign economic policy on the part of the United States is to be a success we must see to it that the other nations of the free world similarly liberalize their trade programs. There are but two ways to combat communism throughout the world, either economically, or by violence.

Without referring to any specific data, a study of any statistics of American production, exports and imports clearly indicates America's essential need for foreign markets in which to sell our surplus production. To be paid in dollars

for our exports we must be ready to pay dollars for our imports. With 4.3 million jobs attributable to work created by our export and import trade, it is obvious that the best interests of America lie in expanding rather than contracting the volume of trade we do with other nations. The United States now has trade agreements relations with 42 countries. The vast preponderance of the total volume of our foreign trade is done with nations with whom we have existing trade agreements.

Thus, I support the continuation of the trade agreements program and the enactment of H. R. 1. In doing so, I would like to express my concern with the manner in which the peril-point and the escape-clause provisions of existing law have been administered.

It was clearly the intent of Congress at the time these safeguards were adopted that they should be used to stave off the threat of injury or to correct actual injury to our domestic industries. In my opinion, proper consideration has not been given to the congressional intent in using the peril-point and escape-clause safeguards. I believe I can properly assure my colleagues in the House that the Committee on Ways and Means will take a very active interest in regard to these matters in the future.

In my great State of California we have a tuna-fishing industry that is now struggling for its very survival because of the manner in which the trade agreements program has been conducted by the executive branch of our Government. There exists today widespread unemployment in the domestic tuna-fishing industry. Many small-business men with substantial investments in ships, which can be used only for fishing for tuna, find themselves confronted with operating losses which jeopardize their investments. I will not detail the present tariff status of tunafish but merely state that tariff reductions have been substantially accomplished to the extent possible under the law and that certain categories of tunafish are on the free list. Some of the tariff concessions were made in negotiations with countries who were not even principal suppliers or even substantial suppliers and then other more important sources of American imports took advantage of the most-favored-nation clause to swamp our markets.

In the face of this tariff reduction the imports of fresh or frozen tuna have increased from 9.1 million pounds in 1948 to an estimated 103.3 million pounds in the first 9 months of 1954. Imports of canned tuna have similarly increased. Because of these rising imports and the threatened destruction of our domestic tuna industry I introduced remedial legislation in the 82d Congress which passed the House of Representatives and which was reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee. To my regret and to the detriment of our tuna-fishing industry this legislation failed to pass in the Senate.

In the 83d Congress I again introduced remedial legislation but no consideration was given to it during that time with the result that our domestic industry further deteriorated. With the convening of the 84th Congress I introduced H. R. 674 to again aid the tuna-fishing industry.

Mr. Chairman, it is my prediction that if the Trade Agreements Authority delegated to the President is not more wisely administered so as to properly safeguard the interests of our domestic industries, the Congress will find increasingly numerous instances in which congressional action will be necessary to prevent the destruction of American jobs and investment. The time has already come when such congressional action is needed with respect to the American tuna-fishing industry.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, it is a pleasure for me to join with our distinguished chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER, and my other colleagues on the committee in presenting to the House the bill H. R. 1.

The pleasure I derive from joining in the support of this important and far-sighted legislation stems from the fact that I am convinced the enactment of this measure will represent a substantial contribution to the prosperity of our American agriculture, industry, and labor, and at the same time strengthen America's foreign policy.

During the course of the committee's extensive public hearings and thorough executive sessions on H. R. 1 I have been interested in determining whether or not our efficient American industries might be hurt by this modest liberalization and extension of the trade agreement's authority of the President. I did not wish to support legislation that would cause damage to a segment of our economy or an important industry.

To be frank, I was somewhat concerned about the effect this legislation might have on the cotton textile industry which exists in the southeast region of our Nation. I want to see America's textile plants flourish. I want more manufacturing establishments and businesses to come not only to the South but to arise in all the other areas of our country.

Thus, in spite of the fact that foreign trade is a necessity for the industries of my own State and is essential to the South's tobacco farmers, cotton growers, and fertilizer producers, to cite only a few, I wanted to get the facts on what this legislation would do for all America. I wanted all the facts, so that I could assure myself that, if I supported H. R. 1, I had done what was best in the national interest, as well as what was best for the Southeast and for Florida. The facts were a revelation, and those facts are why I support H. R. 1.

A lot of my southern friends were concerned about the effect of this bill on textiles. They had been hearing from people in the cotton textile industries with all manner of complaints about what this bill would do to them.

I found that, although spokesmen for the cotton textile industry had been appearing in opposition to the Trade Agreements Act since before World War II to claim that the industry would be ruined if the program continued, production of cotton cloth was actually higher in 1954 than in 1939. Production was higher by more than a billion square yards. I found that, though these spokesmen told of how the program would force our wage levels down to that of oriental countries, the witness of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute stated that the "cotton textile industry is proud of the fact that over the last 20 years it has succeeded in raising the average wage rate paid its employees by roughly 500 percent." That 20 years, by the way, is the 20 years in which the reciprocal trade agreement program has been in operation.

I found that, although all the ills of the cotton textile industry were attributed by these witnesses to imports, actually we only brought in about one-half of 1 percent of our domestic production last year.

I found also that our cotton textile industry has an important stake in the export market. The United States exported to foreign markets over 6 percent of our entire production of cotton cloth in 1954. Now, you cannot have your cake and eat it, too. To anyone who investigated the facts, it is apparent that our textile industry's best interests lie in insuring that we maintain and expand our export markets without too much concern over insignificant imports which were only one-tenth of our exports.

In the absence of outright dollar grants there is no way that the Nations of the free world can buy our exports unless we are willing to import. Because of our dominance in world economic affairs, it is a safe assumption to make that United States policies in fields connected with tariff are of key importance both to the American and the foreign public. The pattern of trade policy that the United States adopts will certainly be carefully observed and probably emulated by our allies in the free world. Therefore, it is almost certain that the adoption of a stringent and unduly protective foreign economic policy on the part of the United States would result in increased trade barriers to our American exports.

How would the cotton textile industry fare if we stopped all imports but in the process lost our export markets? That additional 6 percent of production thrown on our domestic market if they could not export it would have an infinitely greater impact on the industry than imports of one-half of 1 percent could conceivably have.

I am concerned that our cotton textile manufacturers have apparently let the protectionist advocates in their industry appear as their spokesmen. I am worried that this attitude toward international trade will help the protectionist elements in Cuba, Venezuela, and Canada get barriers imposed on our exports of cotton textiles to these, our main foreign markets.

The Canadian Minister, C. D. Howe, recently stated that an industry can not pursue two self-contradictory goals—unrestricted access to the markets of others, combined with freedom to keep out imports. I hope the statesmen in

our cotton textile industry will assert their leadership and protect the true interests of their industry.

My investigation also showed that despite efforts to attribute the 22-percent drop in employment between 1951 and 1954 in the textile mills to import competition, production of cotton textiles was 200 million square yards greater in 1953 than in 1951. The drop in employment was not due to imports. It was due to technological progress in the industry itself.

I also found statements from the industry that the peril-point and escape-clause provisions have not been effective in protecting the industry. How they know that is beyond me. In the first place, the peril-point findings of the Tariff Commission have never been breached by any President in the administration of the Trade Agreements Act. In the second place, the cotton textile industry has never petitioned for an escape-clause investigation.

If I were not convinced that H. R. 1 provides all reasonable assurance of adequate protection to the cotton-textile industry, as well as to other efficient American industries, I would not support it. Secretary of State Dulles, Secretary of Commerce Weeks, and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey all assured the Ways and Means Committee that the interests of American industry, as well as of labor and agriculture, would be carefully taken into account in any tariff negotiations.

The program outlined in H. R. 1 is, as indicated by the Secretary of Defense, important to our national security. It is also a program to protect the interests of American workers and producers.

The bill before the House avoids any precipitous changes which would disrupt our economy. Only a 5-percent-a-year reduction is permitted. The peril-point and escape-clause provisions remain unimpaired. The Committee on Ways and Means has stated in its report that careful attention will be given to the administration of the escape clause. Every opportunity is given interested persons and organizations to present their points of view for the guidance of the President. Furthermore, any reductions in tariff rates must be done gradually over a 3-year period. This will provide an adequate period to permit adjustments to be made, if any are required.

In conclusion, I want to point out that a most important part of our leadership in the free world's efforts to deter Soviet aggression is to provide an economic foundation for a strong mutual defense. We must find a way to increase strength and security to counter both the Communist threats of aggression and the Communist efforts to foster disunity among the free world nations. This problem is more important today than it has ever been.

The President of the United States has warned, "If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all." To my many Republican friends on the left side of the aisle, I would say that our President is also the political leader of at least 50 percent of your party. In this matter of such great national importance he deserves the support of all of us here today. For these compelling reasons I urge the enactment of H. R. 1.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am really happy for this chance to say a few words today because of what transpired here yesterday. The show put on here yesterday was the finest manifestation of political freedom I have ever seen. Men on both sides of the aisle listened to the voice of conscience and also to the voice of their constituencies. I hope they will do the same thing today. I hope we will stick together, because we, working together, have a chance to do yet what the people want us to do.

How can we do that? We can do that by voting for the motion to recommit. I think that motion to recommit which is difficult to draw will probably answer the wishes of every constituency everywhere in the country. At any rate, that is the last chance we have to do justice to our constituents and to our great country. I shall vote for the motion to recommit and if we lose I shall vote against the bill. If we do not win this afternoon, we have to go down before this on-rush of one-worldism. For myself, I do not want to be part of any one world program. The only one world that I will approve is the one that will come with the millennium I repeat that yesterday we made a fine showing, and I hope that the same forces that manifested themselves yesterday against political leadership and against congressional leadership and so forth, and who came to the front so magnificently, can stay together today. It is unfortunate that in a matter like this in which so many people are interested that we have to have some politics. I would prefer, if we could divorce ourselves from that, if possible, because the people back home who need this help and who do not know everything about congressional politics should not be deceived. I know the 200 or 300 or maybe 500 miners in my district who have not worked for a long time are not going to take any excuse that it is political—they want to know where their bread and butter is coming from and they would like to have a job and do an honest day's work like they have always done. I say, again, today is our chance to deliver to them what they are entitled to have.

With reference to this matter of reciprocal trade agreements—that has been before us on many occasions. It has been before us entirely too long. We had a chance last year to dispose of it, and we had what I thought was a fair bill which had been reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means. I mean it was fair from the standpoint of effort on our part and from a literary point of view and so forth. I do not know that I was so enthusiastically for it all, but anyhow, we had a pretty fair bill. But, somehow or other, they divided that bill—they split that bill into two parts and pressed both parts on for a vote in the House. We came on first with that part which I called a joke. It was not a substantial part of the bill. What did it provide? It provided for the appointment of a commission. That commission later became the Randall Commission. I said on the floor of the House at that time, when we went off on that tangent, that we were making a mistake and that I would not be in favor of that, and I was not in favor of it. I stated further, on this floor at that time, that the chances were, if a commission were appointed, because of my seniority, I would be appointed to the commission. I served notice at that time that I would not serve on any such commission because we did not need it. I did not know then what I know now or else I would have spoken even more vigorously than I did at that time. I thought that this group down here in Washington, which are supposed to work on these tariff matters and peril-point problems and on our tariff schedules and things like that, would not be more than a group of 25 or 30 people. The Committee on Ways and Means functions with less than that number as well as all these other big committees in the House and Senate. They function with less than that number. I was terribly surprised the other day when I asked how many of them there were on the payroll. How many do you think there were? About 350 of them. Three hundred and fifty of them working down there. Then, in spite of all this, they appointed a commission of I do not know how many to go around the world at $75 a day and their expenses, and what do you think they did. I think that the first thing they did was to name themselves the Randall Commission. I wish you would listen to me now. Do you know who this man Randall is? I have never seen him. I do not know him. He probably is a nice man. He never came before our committee. He is the man who is supposed to have written this bill. Why do you suppose he never came to see the Ways and Means Committee?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman. I know he is most firm in his convictions, many of which I share. But, I would like to say that Mr. Clarence Randall, the president of Inland Steel, is one of the most honored civic-minded people in my district, a gentleman of high repute, and a man whose love for his country is second to none. I assure the gentleman that his efforts on the Randall Commission, on which he did a magnificent piece of work, whether we agree with the results or not, were in an utterly sincere attempt to help his country.

Mr. JENKINS. I am very glad that the gentlewoman has pointed that out, but I want to stay on this subject. That probably is all true and I do not doubt it at all, but we are now passing important legislation and we needed somebody to come before the committee to tell us what he meant by this bill which everybody said had been prepared by him. But when he did not come—do you know we asked a man over there who apparently was a close associate of Mr. Randall and who was from the commission, to see Mr. Randall and invite him to come to see us. This man came back and reported. What did he say? He said,

"Randall said the President would not let him come." Now then, gentlemen, let us think about that. Our great President, I do not think that he said that. Anyhow between them, whoever said that, or whatever happened, we never got a chance to see Mr. Randall. We never got a chance to ask him any questions. Just think of that. And that is not right. If he was so capable as to name a commission after him he should be anxious to show his appreciation. At any rate we ought to do things right. Until they are done right, they are wrong as far as I am concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any rough figures on the amount of steel that is imported into this country from foreign countries, and what is the tariff on steel?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not have the exact figures. However, except for a few specialty items, imports of steel are negligible as compared to domestic production. I believe that the tariff ranges from 10 to 15 percent.

Now, there is one thing I have heard so often that I am really getting tired of it. They say "trade and not aid." Trade and not aid. If you could work that thing that would be all right. How are we going to work it when we have already given away millions and millions of dollars. We have given about all we have got to spare. I just returned from a trip around the world. Whenever you talk about aid that these foreign people need, when you talk about aid down in Calcutta for instance where I dare say that a thousand poor deserving women sleep on the pavements every night with their little babies nestled to their breasts, when you give aid to people all over the world who need it you have taken about all we have got and a whole lot more than we can spare. It just cannot be done.

You can get some people everywhere who will say that we ought to do this or we ought to do that. We ought to do whatever is right under all the circumstances. Where do I get my impression as to what is right, now? We are dealing with business people. We are not dealing with a lot of theorists. There was a man from Cincinnati who came before us, a fine gentleman, Mr. Taft, one of the finest people in the country. He has been coming before us year after year and he represents some organization. I do not know who it is exactly, but no doubt he represents some fine people. He comes from Cincinnati. He testified before the Ways and Means Committee for about 5 or 6 hours but I don't remember that he made any reference to any Cincinnati people as being among the list whom he represents. When I am talking about a business matter, I like to know what businessmen think about the matter. I have a report from the Chamber of Commerce in Cincinnati about this important matter. Here is what they say. They say, "We do not propose any attitude but one of friendly cooperation, with encouragement to other countries, but we believe the future prosperity of all can best be obtained by retaining a strong position for ourselves." They indicated strongly that they were opposed to H. R. 1.

That is what they say in Cincinnati. Who are they? There are about 25 or 30 officials of the Chamber of Commerce. Among them are the chief officials of some very large industries of Cincinnati. Also there are a number of the leading bankers of the city and a number of very big businessmen. In that list is the name of Mr. Charles Sawyer. That would be interesting to some of you Democrats. He is one of the finest men in the country in spite of the fact that he is a Democrat. He is a fine gentleman. That is the only thing wrong with him that I know of.

Now let us go a little further. Let us talk about some of these things. The gentleman from Florida said that nobody in his State was very much opposed to this measure. Mr. Chairman, it was pathetic that day after day, fine big-business men came before the Ways and Means Committee and testified positively against this bill. If you do not believe that, you just take this book of testimony and read it over. They came from every part of the country, from every place, and from every community they came. I was impressed with a man who came here from way down in Texas. He was a great wool producer. He almost made tears come to my eyes. I used to raise a few sheep myself, but he was a great raiser of sheep. You folks who need wool and woolen garments, you folks in the textile industry should read his testimony. That was testimony from a man direct from the field, a great producer of wool. His testimony was the same as all the sheepgrowers in the country. You surely are not going to turn them down. You cannot afford to do that, in order to do a little trade before aid.

Now let us talk about pottery. That is produced in great quantities in our section of the country. We have some of the finest pottery-producing plants in the world in my district. Eighty-six percent of all the dinnerwear purchased in the United States in 1953 came from some foreign country. Now think of that. All of these fine pottery producers in my country are faced with idleness. Some of them already are idle. I wish you would read the testimony of Mr. Joe Wells, of Newell, W. Va., who represents the United States Pottery Association of East Palestine, Ohio. He is to me the best authority on pottery in the whole country. He has appeared before our committee many times. I shall not worry you with many figures which I can supply easily. I shall only say that Mr. Wells said:

> Something like 86 percent of the present consumption of china tableware in the United States is imported.

He further says:

> We—
>
> Meaning the pottery business—
>
> have been steadily going down for years.

Men are going to be without work because our people are buying the pottery made in Japan, where people work for 6, 8, and 10 cents an hour, while in our potteries our men get $1.20 an hour. That is an old story, and I will not bother you with a lot of statistics like that. But figures count and so do the voices of my people back home. I hear the voice of my people, and I see them when I go home. I want to be able to go back home and tell them I have done the best I could for them and for my country. But we are not going to do the best we can for our country if we listen to the voice of aid and not trade; we had better aid ourselves first and then talk about aiding somebody else.

Let us get down now to glassware. We have, I think, in our district probably the finest glass plant in the United States—I am not sure about that—but it is a magnificent plant, located at Lancaster, Ohio. I am going to quote the word of one of the leading men in the world on facts relating to the glass business. He is the president of that plant himself, a fine, magnificent gentleman. His name is William Fisher. I will not read you all the letter. He says:

> We have from time to time indicated to you that we do not believe foreign manufacturers who pay their employees one-tenth or one-third of our wage rate should be given the special advantage this legislation would permit.

There is Mr. William Fisher, and he speaks for one of the finest glass factories in the United States. He has probably 2,000 men working in his plant and in his employment. This information came from him. I did not write to him, but he wrote to me and gave me very convincing figures.

I do not know much about textiles, but I know we had a great many people come in and talk about textiles, especially from the South—from the section of the country where Judge DAVIS comes from. We had some of the most lucid and the most convincing testimony about textiles. I do not see how many of the Members from the South can be for this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman for what he is saying and to tell him that I concur in his remarks.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad to have the concurrence of the gentleman, because everybody knows there is no finer man in the whole Congress than our distinguished friend, Judge DAVIS, who has shown his high character on so many occasions here in our deliberations.

Now I want to talk for just a minute about oil and coal. We produce a lot of coal in my district and the surrounding area. I know there are a lot of fellows who think that the coal miner is someone kind of beneath somebody else. I was raised around the coal mines and used to work in the coal mines, so I know a little more about it than most of you. I want to tell you not to underestimate the coal miner. I will give you the story of one coal miner I knew who back in the old days worked a 10-hour day for a dollar a day. He raised his children, a large number of them, until 7 or 8 got to be schoolteachers and 2 or 3 got to be

lawyers. Some of them are fine businessmen. I tell you when you underestimate the coal miner you are just fooling yourself, because he is just as good a citizen as we have in this country.

Let me tell you a little also about the mineowner, about the man who owns the mine. I daresay that three-quarters or even nine-tenths of the Members of this Congress have never been inside of a coal mine. Many of these coal mines might cost as much as a million dollars. The owner has his works in there and his machinery in there; he has built houses for his people near his mines. He has made many plans and spent much money, and here comes somebody along and drops a lot of oil over here in the eastern coast, oil that comes from Venezuela, heavy residual oil that is dumped here for practically nothing. What has it done to the coal mines in West Virginia, in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, and other places where there are coal mines? It has practically ruined them. It is almost a shame that the Government has not taken notice of this long ago.

I say to you again, Mr. Chairman, you cannot dismiss this question by saying, "Trade, not aid." You cannot dismiss our people by telling them that kind of a story.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. It is strange to hear the arguments made by the proponents of the oil industry in reference to the damage done the coal industry. They try to point out that the coal industry has not been injured. I wonder what they think is being done with the residual oil that is being brought into the United States? They bring it in to seek a market and the only market they can get is that which displaces coal. They certainly do not bring it in to sell as food. The only thing it is used for is to displace coal.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one thing that has not been mentioned here today or yesterday, either. The Committee on Ways and Means is not altogether an unwise committee. Sometimes our members are criticized. But do you not know that those members of the Ways and Means Committee who believe in this bill, H. R. 1, have convinced me of one thing. Here it is—they are scared to pass this legislation. They know H. R. 1 will not work. Why do I say that? Because one member of our committee has introduced a bill to provide that in all of these sections where there is going to be a lot of unemployment, in all those sections, the Government is going to come in and take those people away and teach them some new trade, or some other foolish notion like that. What do you think about that? That has been the most revolting idea that has come to me since I have been a Member of Congress all these years. They say they are going to send people in to take your people away. Do not send them into my section of the country because my coal miners will not go away. I serve notice that we are going to stay where our families are, where the fathers and mothers are buried. We live in America. We do not agree to anything like that. Just think about that. They have prepared that kind of a law. They are going to come in and take all of our people. They will try to come in and take your textile people, they may come in and take some of your farmers. They had better not come into our section because we are not going to go. We are going to stay where God put us and we are going to stay where we have a right to stay.

This is yet America.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the enactment of the bill, H. R. 1, introduced by my friend and beloved chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER.

I cannot support any measure which, in my opinion, will strike at the jobs and payrolls of the people from my great section of the United States, I refer to New England, and particularly my home State of Rhode Island. In my sincere and considered opinion that is what is at stake in the legislation that is before us today. In New England we are very much concerned over what consequences will flow to our textile, lace, jewelry, and rubber footwear industries if H. R. 1 is enacted.

In the past I have supported trade agreements program legislation every time it came before the House for consideration, and the record shows that in supporting such legislation, I have always maintained and insisted that in administering the program, the Executive should take appropriate steps to insure that he does not trade away an industry essential to our national welfare and security. I have always insisted that proper recognition be given to the line of distinction that exists between competition under free enterprise and destruction resulting from excessive imports of goods produced by sweat shop labor.

I was instrumental in having the escape-clause provision written into the law, at the time the Congress was writing the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 and long before that to see that an escape clause was written into every agreement that was made. As a result, I am somewhat familiar with the congressional intent associated with the escape-clause provision of present law.

The intent of Congress was that the escape clause would be invoked by the President when it was shown that under an existing agreement imports of a particular article were of such quantity as to seriously injure or threatened to injure an industry.

The record of the Tariff Commission shows that the 59 applications made by industry for invocation of the escape clause were disposed of as follows: Pending 3, dismissed at applicant's request 3, terminated unanimously, without formal findings 2, dismissed after preliminary inquiry 8, Commission voting 3 to 3 on 3 cases, Commission split on 3 other cases, 5 to 1, 4 to 2, and 4 to 2.

The Commission decided againt escape action and made no report to the President in 22 cases, Commission decided in favor of escape action and sent a report to the President in 12 cases, and in 3 other cases, when the Commission voted 3 to 3 a report was sent to the President.

Out of 59 applications for relief under the escape clause filed with the Tariff Commission, 15 reports were sent to the President. In only 5 cases was the escape clause invoked, the President refusing to act on the other 10.

It is not surprising, therefore, that I am very much disturbed over the way in which this intended safeguard to domestic industry has been administered since its enactment.

At the time Secretary Dulles came before our committee in the recently completed public hearings on H. R. 1, I discussed with him the matter of the administration of the escape clause. In response to a question from me, Mr. Dulles indicated that the escape clause has had a psychological value in that it tends to cause foreign countries to cut down exports to the United States.

I will state categorically that the escape clause was not written into the law by the Congress of the United States for any psychological value it may have on foreign exporters but was instead included in the law to afford a safeguard and a measure of protection to our domestic industries.

Is it any wonder then that past experience prompts the question: "Who is to take the rap as a result of the new tariff powers given the President under the provisions of H. R. 1?"

The textile industry, including lace and narrow fabrics, is greatly concerned, and justly so, because textiles seem to be the principal item considered every time that a new agreement is considered. Tariff rates on textiles have been reduced to a point where any further reduction may well spell the doom of that industry.

This is very serious, particularly to my home State of Rhode Island where textiles furnished more than half of the job opportunities in the State a few years ago and today we find that this has been cut to about one-third, resulting in serious unemployment. Since 1951 the textile industry in New England has suffered substantial losses in production despite the fact that in the same period—from 1951 through 1954—all industrial production rose by 10 percent in the United States. The downward trend in the textile industry resulted in a reduction of 268,000, or 20 percent in the number of jobs in the textile industry. This loss in job opportunities in textiles is especially serious when it is considered that they have been heavily concentrated in relatively few communities. In 1950, 20 percent of all jobs in Rhode Island were in textiles. And let me point out to my colleagues that this loss of jobs is not limited solely to the New England area. In the 1951–54 period total textile jobs in the South declined by 41,000, or 7 percent.

An area or community stranded by the loss of one of its principal industries,

such as textiles, finds it extremely difficult to attract other industries. In New England the textile industry is still the largest manufacturing employer with 170,000 jobs. In each of the States in the area it is an important economic factor. It is virtually axiomatic that one textile job lost and not replaced means a loss to the community of twice the textile-wages cutoff. Many other New England industries such as trucking, railroads, textile machinery, utilities, and the innumerable suppliers of goods and services, are dependent upon the well-being of the textile industry for their existence.

The enactment of H. R. 1 could give to the Japanese textile industry the power to destroy our domestic industry. The cost of producing various cotton fabrics in the United States exceeds the cost of producing the same fabrics in Japan by 43 to 70 percent and permits the Japanese textile industry to undersell American manufacturers in the American market even under the present tariff rates. I would direct my colleagues' attention to page 1646 of the printed hearings on H. R. 1 and refer them to the table comparing production costs in the United States and Japan.

Under present tariff conditions America's textile industry has already sustained serious reductions in employment, production, and markets. Any further tariff reductions that may be made under existing authority or under the authority which would be granted by H. R. 1, will surely represent the trading away of our American textile industry. The fact that our textile industry has been prosperous in the past cannot be construed to indicate further tariff cuts are in order. The pattern of imports in the past, during the abnormal postwar period, is not as significant as the trend of more recent years where we find United States imports of cotton textiles from Japan increasing from a level of 30.6 million square yards in 1953 to 50.3 million square yards in 1954.

A segment of the textile industry is the American lace industry comprised of some 80 manufacturing plants located in 9 States. The principal part of the industry is concentrated in my State of Rhode Island. I say to you, my colleagues, that I speak from personal knowledge when I say that in many of the communities in which these plants are located, the textile and lace factories provide the principal payrolls in those communities. Those payrolls provide American homes, schools, and taxes.

Principal foreign competition for our American lace industry comes from France. It is estimated that the American wages are approximately eight times those paid by the French in the lace industry. The American lace industry holds no significant technological advantage in efficiency or equipment. The decisive factor in the ability of foreign competitors to undersell domestic producers is the wide disparity in wages. It is therefore apparent that reductions of tariffs in this area will surely constitute the destruction of a small but great American industry.

I invite your attention to another industry whose very existence would be threatened by the enactment of H. R. 1. I refer to the low- and medium-priced jewelry industry. Nearly 75 percent of this industry is found within 20 miles of Providence. It is the second ranking industrial employer in the State of Rhode Island. Approximately one-third of the people of Providence depend solely upon this industry for their livelihood as do entire communities in southeastern Massachusetts.

It is a characteristic of the industry that it has a high labor cost factor. It is an industry in which American technology cannot be converted into production efficiency. Wages in this industry range from 40 to 60 percent of manufacturing cost. Principal import competition comes from Japan and Germany. Prewar imports of $1.5 million a year have increased in the postwar period so that imports in 1953 amounted to nearly $15 million.

This rise in imports matches, in timing and proportion, the rejuvenation of the Japanese and German jewelry industries. Price comparison between the foreign and domestic producers readily explain this import increase. Japanese products are often landed, with duty paid, at 25 to 40 percent of the price of a similar domestic product. Imports from Germany are sold at 50 to 60 percent of domestic price.

A comparative study of the wages of our principal foreign competitors readily provides the basis for this extreme price differential. American jewelry production workers average about $1.47 an hour, German workers about 32 cents an hour, and Japanese shop workers about 12 cents per hour. In view of these figures, it is apparent that further tariff concessions in the area of low- and medium-priced jewelry will result in the elimination of another American industry.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no disagreement that the passage of H. R. 1 will inevitably increase imports, with the heaviest burden falling on those industries already struggling to survive. I submit to you that this is not the time to authorize further tariff reductions. We have not had adequate opportunity under normal competitive conditions to study the consequences of the tariff concessions that have already been granted. It is essential that we have a considerable period of time in which to determine whether our present tariffs, under conditions which might be termed "competitively normal," are too high or too low to afford an appropriate measure of protection to our American standard of living. I am also concerned that safeguards are not written into the bill which will assure that tariff concessions will be granted on a selective basis with proper recognition given to the objective that we do not trade away any American industry. Our American standard of living is part of our American heritage and must be guarded as zealously as the other American virtues.

Mr. Chairman, the views I expressed here today are widely shared by the people I have the honor to represent in this Chamber and in the testimony of that statement here follows a letter I wrote to the Randall Commission over a year ago. I sent similar letters to the Secretary of State and to the Tariff Commission. I also offer a letter I addressed to the President of the United States.

Also, I offer for the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Woonsocket; an article appearing in the Pawtucket Times of December 17, 1954; an editorial appearing in the Pawtucket Times of February 1, 1955; an article by John C. Quinn appearing in a recent issue of the Providence Journal; and a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island approved by the Governor on February 11, 1955:

JANUARY 8, 1954.

CLARENCE B. RANDALL,
Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, Education and Welfare Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The administration's slogan of "Trade not aid," plus recent newspaper reports that the Randall Commission looks with favor upon the idea of further reducing tariffs is causing a great deal of uneasiness and worry to many workers in my home State of Rhode Island, where unemployment is mounting every day, through the reduction of working hours in some plants, the laying off of a part of the work force in others, and even the outright closing down of still other plants where the companies go out of business.

Several reasons are given for this change, which is having a dire effect upon our economy, and in practically every case the adverse effect of the tariff on our industries is given as the major factor. This applies to textiles, rubber footwear, and laces.

The lace industry is a small industry. It employs only a few thousand people, and apparently is looked upon by some as the type of industry that can be sacrificed on the altar of "Trade not aid," in an effort to help bolster the economy of friendly foreign countries.

I cannot accept that philosophy and respectfully urge your Commission to reject it.

Many so-called small industries are located in Rhode Island. They mean much to us and must not be sacrificed. Instead, they should be encouraged and given protection.

The Lever lace industry, which comprises some 80 mills, has 53 of these mills in Rhode Island and furnish employment to nearly 10,000 workers.

The low wages paid foreign workers, as compared to the wages paid for comparable work in the United States, is so out of proportion that unless proper tariff protection is provided our plants may have to close and our workers forced to join the ranks of the unemployed.

The argument that workers displaced in this manner could be retrained and the manufacturers given financial assistance in a changeover to other lines is not a sound one in my opinion. This presents several questions.

The first question is: What wages would be paid to the trainees? I am sure it would be far below what these experienced lace workers are now earning. The second question is: What would happen to the aged and other workers who would not be amenable to retraining? How many of them would be forced to go on relief? The problem this would present is a most serious one, not only of economics, but also of morale, and should receive most serious consideration.

The cost of the readjustment of these people, plus whatever financial aid might be given to the manufacturers could well exceed the amount of aid now given foreign countries.

In the name, and on behalf of these workers in the lace, rubberwear, and textile industries, I strongly urge your Commission to give these workers most serious consideration before you recommend any reduction in existing tariffs on these items.

Sincerely yours,

AIME J. FORAND,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—For your information, I am enclosing several samples of the hundreds of letters I have received on the subject from lace workers in my district.

FEBRUARY 4, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I add my voice to those of several others who have already communicated with you relative to the possible further reduction in tariffs on textiles, both under the provisions of the bill H. R. 1, which is now under consideration by the House Committee on Ways and Means, and also in the pending treaty negotiations going on between the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan.

I am sure you are aware of the fact that the textile industry is one of the largest industries of this country and that its welfare is essential to the health of our economy, as well as to our national defense.

Textiles, including lace, constitutes the majority of the basic economy of our State of Rhode Island and, like other areas in New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and the South, where the textile industry is the chief industry, it is looked upon as the lifeblood of those communities. The industry has been depressed now for quite a long time and I am informed that in New England some 117,000 textile jobs have been lost, while in the Middle Atlantic States the figure is in excess of 25,000, while the figure for the South is around 52,000. All this in the space of about 2 years.

I realize that the vast majority of the people believe in reciprocal trade, but I feel that this program should not be carried on at the expense of a few industries, especially those like textiles, jewelry, lace, and rubber footwear, upon which the tariff rates have been constantly reduced. There is a point beyond which we should not go and I feel that that point has been reached, and it is for that reason that I join with others in requesting that you recommend to the Congress that the textile industry be excluded from the provisions of H. R. 1 and also from the negotiation with the Government of Japan.

With assurances of my highest esteem, I am

Very respectfully yours,

AIME J. FORAND,
Member of Congress.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Providence, January 19, 1955.

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FORAND: I am directed by the general assembly to transmit to you the enclosed certified copy of House Resolution 514, introduced by Representative Samuel Azzinaro, entitled "Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports," passed by the general assembly at the January session, A. D. 1955, and approved by the Governor on the 14th day of January 1955.

Very truly yours,

ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

"H. 514

"Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports

"Whereas textile, jewelry, and rubber goods manufacturing are three of Rhode Island's major industries, employing over 54 percent of Rhode Island's manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas manufacturing is the foundation of the Rhode Island economy whereby over one-half of the entire State's population is directly or indirectly dependent upon such industries; and

"Whereas in all of these industries labor and labor costs are vital factors representing about 60 percent of the value of the manufactured product; and

"Whereas such products can be and are manufactured today in many parts of the world, often with the aid of the latest types of American equipment; and

"Whereas the consequent threat of price competition from low-wage countries abroad is very real; and

"Whereas recent studies by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate the large wage differentials which place American manufacturers at a decided competitive disadvantage; and

"Whereas the Rhode Island textile industry, including lace goods, represents about 30 percent of all manufacturing employment, and a total investment of $300 million; and

"Whereas the jewelry industry employs about 19 percent of Rhode Island manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas the manufacture of rubber products represents a substantial portion of industry in this State; and

"Whereas this tremendous percentage of Rhode Island industrial workers would be forced into the ranks of the unemployed upon the closing of the mills and factories of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States insist on increasing and maintaining proper tariffs on the imports of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the United States enter into no agreements and make no concessions to any foreign nation which would affect adversely the manufacture and sale of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States, and more particularly the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, take every legislative precaution in enacting proper legislation to insure the creation and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Tariff Commission of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to bring about the enactment and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports, to the end that the manufacture and sale of such goods in the United States are not jeopardized."

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Armand H. Cote, Secretary of State of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, hereby certify that the aforegoing is a true copy of resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports, passed by the general assembly at the January session, A. D. 1955 and approved by the governor on the 14th day of January, 1955.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Rhode Island, this 19th day of January, A. D. 1955.

ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

CITY OF WOONSOCKET, R. I.,
February 3, 1955.

Congressman AIME FORAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution which the City Council of the City of Woonsocket, R. I., had before it at its regular meeting held February 2, 1955. The council then took the following action:

It was voted that this resolution be passed.

This copy is sent to you in accordance with instructions contained in the resolution.

Very truly yours,

W. CHESTER ROSE,
City Clerk.

Resolution in protest against lower tariffs on foreign-made textiles imported into this country

Whereas it is common knowledge that the entire textile industry in the United States has been in a depressed condition since 1952, even though other industries in this country have been prosperous; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill proposing to give the President additional powers to adjust tariffs on imports into this country; and

Whereas the well-being and prosperity of the entire New England region is dependent on a solvent and active textile industry; and

Whereas textiles can be manufactured in foreign countries at a much lower cost than can be manufactured in the United States because of the much lower wages paid in said foreign countries and because of the much lower standard of living there prevailing; and

Whereas the productive capacity of foreign textiles has greatly increased in the recent past because of the installation in said foreign countries of modern textile machinery, said installation having been made possible under the foreign-aid program of the United States; and

Whereas because of said increased productive capacity, thousands of yards of foreign-made worsted and woolen goods are now being imported into the United States even under present tariff rates on foreign textiles; and

Whereas it is apparent that the present tariff rates on foreign textiles should be increased and not lowered in order to prevent the ruin of the entire textile industry,

the existence of which industry is so vital to the prosperity of New England and to the prosperity of the United States as a whole: It is hereby

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Woonsocket as follows:

SECTION 1. That the city council of this city hereby records its protest against the further decrease on present rates on foreign-made textiles.

SEC. 2. That the city council of this city hereby records its stand that the present tariff rates on textiles should be increased to a point sufficient to protect the textile industry of the United States.

SEC. 3. That forthwith upon the passage of this resolution a certified copy of same be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Rhode Island, and to the members of the Tariff Commission of the United States in Washington.

SEC. 4. This resolution shall take effect upon passage.

[From the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of December 17, 1954]

ROBERTS FORMALLY PROTESTS ANY TARIFF CUTS ON TEXTILES

Governor Roberts today sent a formal protest to Secretary of State Dulles against making any tariff concessions on textile products on the ground that it would be disastrous to Rhode Island industry, business, and workers.

Textile production, the Governor pointed out, is the largest single industry in the State and employment in that field has already shrunk nationally because of the cutback in Federal military procurement and failure of citizen demand to take up the slack.

In the declining domestic market and intense price competition, the Governor added, many mills have been forced to close down and Rhode Island, as a consequence, now has 20,000 unemployed textile workers. Any action further reducing the domestic market, he said, would be disastrous to the State's economy and additional tariff concessions on textiles would necessarily have such an effect.

The Governor's letter follows:

"I am advised that negotiations involving possible tariff concessions on textile-mill products are to be conducted in Geneva early next year.

"Since the production of textiles is Rhode Island's largest single industry, employing at the present time over 38,000 workers, or 30 percent of total manufacturing employment, this is obviously a matter of grave concern to our State. In 17 of Rhode Island's 39 cities and towns, the textile industry represents the major part of industrial employment. Rhode Island industry produces virtually all types of textile products.

"As you are probably aware, the textile industry nationally has suffered from a serious slump in the past 2 years, due to reduction of Federal military procurement and the failure of civilian demand to take up the slack. Shrinking domestic markets have been accompanied by intense price competition which has forced many mills throughout the country to close their doors. In consequence, Rhode Island already has some 20,000 unemployed textile workers.

"In the face of this situation, any action which would further reduce the domestic market for American textile products or intensify the present keen price competition would obviously be disastrous for Rhode Island industry, Rhode Island business, and Rhode Island workers. Additional tariff concessions on textiles would necessarily bring about one or both of these highly undesirable results.

"I cannot urge you too strongly not to grant concessions on textile products at the forthcoming conference in Geneva."

[From the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of February 1, 1955]

NEW ENGLAND MILLS NEED TARIFF PROTECTION

In the interest of the textile industry the Governors of the six New England States have made known to Congress their opposition to reduction in tariffs on textiles. Their special concern is with the proposal to permit President Eisenhower power to reduce by 50 percent tariffs on textiles made in Japan.

Attempts to solve one phase of the Japanese trade problem at the expense of the extremely vulnerable New England textile industry calls for the strong opposition of the six governors and the States' delegations in Congress.

A reduction in textile tariffs would cause great hardship. Such action is contrary to the interests of New England workers as well as to the national interest. Concessions to Japan would cause unemployment. That is matter of great concern. New England cannot afford more textile job losses. In the last four years more than 100,000 textile workers lost jobs in New England. Less than 50,000 of them found reemployment.

The textile industry is not a "growth" industry. It has substantial over-capacity and has no growing market. That it has no growing market is demonstrated by the following figures: per capita consumption of textiles has dropped 20 percent, cotton consumption is off 12 percent, sales are down 29 percent and prices down 44 percent.

That is the situation in the domestic market. Consider the damage inherent in concessions to Japanese textile operations. At this time Japanese combed ginghams are landed in New York at prices 5½ cents per yard below the cost of production in New England. In New England broadcloth production costs 29.7 cents a yard without profit. It is made in Japan for 20.7 cents a yard. Lawns which cost 26.4 cents a yard to manufacture in New England cost 15.6 cents a yard to make in Japan.

The New England-Japanese cost differential is much greater than the North-South textile differential, under which New England lost 75 percent of its cotton-synthetic textile industry and more than 250,000 jobs in the last 30 years. That experience in the domestic market manifests the greater injury which can be inflicted on the New England industry if the product of 12 cents an hour Japanese workers is allowed to flood the American market.

If in the interest of foreign policy and foreign trade tariff cuts must be made they should be put on the growing industries where increased imports can be absorbed in rising markets, and not on a vulnerable and declining activity, the textile industry of New England.

THE MILL CLOSES, AND 63.7 PERCENT OF WORKERS STILL LACK JOBS

(By John C. Quinn)

How are Providence area textile workers, made idle by mill liquidations, making out in tracking down new jobs? The answer would seem to be not too well.

Dr. William H. Miernyk, director of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research at Northeastern University, has just finished studying the case histories of 132 such displaced mill hands in the Providence labor market. His report paints this picture:

Forty-eight of the former workers—that is 36.2 percent of the cross-section interviewed—were working when questioned by the study group.

Of this group 34, or 25.6 percent, still were holding the same jobs they landed after the mills closed while the other 14, or 10.6 percent, had had to change jobs several times to stay on a payroll.

The remaining 84 idled workers—63.7 percent—were unemployed.

NINETEEN QUIT JOB HUNTING

That jobless figure includes 17, or 12.9 percent, who had held jobs at some time since their lay-offs; 48 or 36.4 percent—the largest single category—who had been out of work ever since the mills closed, and 19, or 14.4 percent, who had quit job-hunting and technically were withdrawn from the labor force.

The reemployed rate of 36.2 was lower than Dr. Miernyk recorded in Lowell, Lawrence, or Fall River studies, but was higher than New Bedford and a nontextile town which forced displaced workers to choose between new lines of work or new communities.

The Providence labor market sampling of 132 former mill workers was the smallest in the six-community analysis, but the report noted that the findings on practically every count followed the same ratio as was recorded throughout the area.

In this project, the Providence labor market coincides closely with the city's metropolitan area, taking in the Massachusetts towns of Attleboro, North Attleboro, Bellingham, Blackstone, Millville, Seekonk, Franklin, and Wrentham.

As background, it was noted that of the nonagricultural workers in this area in 1953, 33.2 percent were in textiles, 16.1 percent in jewelry, 11.1 percent in nonelectrical machinery, and all other categories run under 6 percent each.

For this area's survey, a sample of 10 percent of the displaced workers from each of three liquid mills was selected at random from lists provided by the CIO textile union. The mills were not named, but were identified in this way:

Mill A was a century-old dyeing and bleaching plant that closed in the spring of 1952 after its payroll shrank from a normal 350 to 200 workers.

Mill B. 1 of 3 Providence area subsidiaries operated by a large textile concern, produced fine-combed cotton goods. It was liquidated in December 1952, after its payroll dropped from 650 to 350.

Mill C was an integrated mill with combing, spinning, weaving, dyeing, and finishing operations. It closed in December 1953 with a loss of 2,000 jobs. This shutdown was the only surprise of the three because the plant had had a $5 million modernization just 2 years before.

ONE HUNDRED AND THREE QUESTIONED IN PERSON

The random selection of the three union lists gave a sample of 246 former workers. Of these 103 were interviewed in person and 29 replied to mail questionnaires for a study tally of 132.

The average age for this Providence sample was higher than in most of the other studies. About 80 percent of the women and 55 percent of men were more than 46. And there was also the highest proportion of men here, partly expected because of their prominence in dyeing and finishing work.

Table 1 included here pinpoints this distribution.

Table 2 speaks for itself in further detailing the luck of these displaced workers, according to sex, in hunting up new jobs.

As in all of the other study areas, the older workers ran into the toughest trouble in seeking reemployment, although the Providence age average was slightly higher.

Nevertheless, Dr. Miernyk found that all employed workers were under 55 years of age, two-thirds of the employed men were under 45, 53 percent of the employed women were between 46 and 55, and 75 percent of those not employed were past age 45.

Table 3 tells this story in detail.

TABLE 1.—*Age and sex distribution of the sample workers*

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 25	5	6.6	------	------	5	3.8
25 to 35	15	19.7	4	7.1	19	14.4
36 to 45	15	19.7	8	14.3	23	17.4
46 to 55	11	14.5	22	39.3	33	25.0
56 to 65	19	25.0	16	28.6	35	26.5
66 and over	11	14.5	5	8.9	16	12.1
Unknown	------	------	1	1.9	1	.8

TABLE 2.—*Experience of former millworkers*

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Employed, 1 job since layoff	23	30.3	11	19.6	34	25.6
Employed, several jobs since layoff	10	13.2	4	7.1	14	10.6
Unemployed, had job since layoff	27	35.5	21	37.5	48	36.4
Unemployed and out of labor market	7	9.2	12	21.4	19	14.4

TABLE 3.—*Age distribution by employment status*

EMPLOYED

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 24	5	15.2	------	------	5	10.4
25 to 35	11	33.3	1	6.7	12	25.0
36 to 45	6	18.2	4	26.7	10	20.8
46 to 55	2	6.1	8	53.3	10	20.8
56 to 65	9	27.3	2	13.3	11	22.9

UNEMPLOYED

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25 to 35	4	9.3	3	7.3	7	8.3
36 to 45	9	20.9	4	9.8	13	15.5
46 to 55	9	20.9	14	34.1	23	27.4
56 to 65	10	23.3	14	34.1	24	28.6
66 and over	11	25.6	5	12.2	16	19.0
Unknown	------	------	1	2.4	1	1.2

It will be noted there is no listing under employed for ages above 66 nor for unemployed under 25 because none of the 132 displaced workers were in these categories.

S. 163

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to take the proper steps necessary to protect and preserve the Rhode Island lace manufacturing industry

Whereas the American lace manufacturing industry, 54 of whose 80 plants are located in Rhode Island, has suffered and still suffers increasingly serious difficulties as a result of tariff reductions effectuated under the trade agreement with France which became effective June 15, 1936; and

Whereas reductions in tariffs since that date have driven the manufacture of veilings in America completely out and badly handicapped the manufacture of bobbinet and all other products of lace machines; and

Whereas in addition to the above circumstances under which the industry has suffered grave injury, there is at present before the Congress a bill, H. R. 1, which would grant the executive the right to reduce to 50 percent all tariffs that are over 50 percent of the value of the imported goods and reduce all other tariffs 15 percent at the rate of 5 percent per year for 3 years; and

Whereas French and other foreign officials are already drawing up lists of duties they wish cut, including lace duties, in the event of passage of H. R. 1; and

Whereas any further reduction in duties on lace may well mean the annihilation of the American lace manufacturing industry and the loss of employment by its thousands of skilled employees, many of whom are located in Rhode Island: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby urgently requested to take the proper steps necessary to protest and preserve the Rhode Island lace manufacturing industry; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand what the gentleman refers to as the escape clause, when these conditions are found to be true, then that part of the agreement is nullified.

Mr. FORAND. The President notifies other countries that as of a given date—and I believe it is a 6-month lag—they will have to reduce the amount of merchandise sent in, or they will discontinue the agreement. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what is meant by the escape clause?

Mr. FORAND. Correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT].

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 1. In my opinion the reciprocal trade agreements program has proved harmful to industry, to agriculture, and to labor. In the brief time allotted to me I shall tell briefly why I think so.

Granted that our industry is more efficient than any in the world; still many of our smaller industries are no more modern than those of foreign countries. The cost of raw materials and the efficiency of workers is about equal. Consequently, wages constitute the chief difference in costs of production. As you know, wage rates in Europe and Japan range from one-third to one-tenth those paid in this country. Overtime pay abroad averages 25 percent above regular pay; here it averages 50 percent. Thus our costs are from 3 to 10 times as high as our competitors. How can we compete without protection?

Our industrial economy has reached its present status under a protective tariff. Costs have been geared to such a system. To remove tariffs entirely would seriously injure many industries.

It seems to me that the object of our tariff is to prevent our wage and labor standards from crumbling under the onslaughts of cheap foreign products.

Proponents of reciprocal trade claim that we must import in order to export. I believe that we do not need to expand exports and imports as much as other nations do. Our home market is extensive. To increase our export trade would be injurious to many of our allies. They must depend on foreign trade far more than we do. If we increase our exports we injure industries which are vulnerable to import competition.

Numerous industries vital to our defense literally have their backs to the wall. Cheap foreign imports have cut deeply into their markets. Trained personnel is drifting from the industries. Costs are mounting. Removal of present tariffs would force many out of business. Yet we must rely upon them in emergencies or bank on uncertain foreign sources.

In agriculture we face a serious problem. Under the price-support programs, farmers have enjoyed the protection of reasonable tariffs and import quotas. In order to maintain our price-support policy, it seems necessary to restrict the importation of farm products. It is self-evident that if agricultural products are imported into a domestic market already adequately supplied prices will be driven still further below the parity price. Any reduction in tariffs would unleash a flood of agricultural products which would further hamper any farm program the Government undertakes.

Proponents of increasing imports state that all that is necessary to carry out their program is a retraining of workers who are made redundant by increased imports. However, many more workers are employed in industries and agricultural pursuits that are exposed to injury from imports than are employed in producing and servicing all our export goods. The ratio is probably about 5 to 1. About 25 percent of our work force is employed in import-vulnerable industries. This group is found in all States. It seems to me that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to retrain one-quarter of our total work force. Not only is it not a feasible project economically, but it is even less desirable socially. Think of the forced retirement of older workers; of the disruption of social ties; of the ghost towns which would be prevalent in one-industry areas. This is too large an order for our economy to undertake.

In conclusion, I have tried to show that the reciprocal trade agreements program has not helped industry, agriculture, or labor. Of necessity, my remarks have been brief. I believe, however, that they can be buttressed by a wealth of factual information.

Like other Members of Congress I have received many letters from manufacturers describing the problems which they already face from foreign competition. As a part of this statement, I extend and revise my remarks and include

a number of typical letters I have received concerning H. R. 1:

The DIAMOND MATCH CO.,
Oshkosh, Wis., January 28, 1955.
Hon. WILIAM K. VAN PELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN PELT: Tariff-making policy is a function of the legislative branch of the Government which should not be given up readily.

National policy for years has been wholesome competition, and the Congress has enacted many laws to maintain fair competitive measures.

Congress has enacted legislation to give the American workingman minimum hourly wage rates, 8-hour day, workmen's compensation, safety measures while working, collective bargaining, old-age pensions, child-labor laws, and many other benefits enabling the American employee to improve his status.

In other words, as in sports, lightweights do not compete with heavyweights, amatures do not compete with professionals, high schools do not play colleges, and all along the line recognition is given to the circumstances surrounding the competitors.

Business is somewhat similar. An American firm must follow the laws laid down by Congress. We cannot compete with the foreign producer who produces a low-cost product by ignoring methods prevailing here.

The laws and regulations governing employment make jobs better but do not produce them. They are inoperative to a man who does not have a job.

Trade agreements which do not recognize these factors may throw men out of work because of unfair competition.

Immigration laws are very strict, and many undesirable aliens are kept out of our country for various reasons. On the other hand, if the alien is admitted, he immediately comes under our laws, and the product of his endeavors has no advantage over fellow Americans.

If he stays in his own country, he often contributes to a product low in cost, because the safety measures used in America, do not prevail in many foreign countries, and their product is low cost not because of efficiency but rather because they ignore those factors believed to be essential here.

The American sense of fair play should not be ignored, and Congress is the protector on tariff issues.

It would be very unfortunate if the laws to protect the American workingman are a contributing factor in reducing his opportunity for employment.

Yours very truly,
THE DIAMOND MATCH CO.,
By FRANKLIN MOORE, *Manager.*

RIPON KNITTING WORKS,
Ripon, Wis., December 29, 1954.
Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN PELT: In accordance with our telephone conversation this morning, I am enclosing the testimony submitted by the president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers before the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to tariffs on Japanese wool hosiery and slipper sox. I also submitted a table showing the extent to which the Japanese have taken over on slipper sox, the item which we conceived, originated, merchandise, nationally advertised, and successfully popularized with the American people. It seems totally unfair to us that Japanese labor earning 10 percent of what we are forced to pay, should with our Government's sanction and approval, force a 75-year-old company such as ours, to liquidate.

Three years ago there were some 60 manufacturers of slipper sox and today to my knowledge all but two of them have been forced out of business because of Japanese competition.

This is a crisis as far as we are concerned. Rather than drop the import duty as has been suggested by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, we feel that the duty should be raised to 100 percent unless we want to throw American men and women out of work to give jobs to the Japanese.

Anything you can do in behalf of our company and our employees will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
RIPON KNITTING WORKS,
STANLEY M. HERLIN,
President and General Manager.

THE HOUGH SHADE CORP.,
Janesville, Wis., December 30, 1954.
Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN PELT: It is hoped that this letter, together with other material which we are enclosing, will acquaint you more thoroughly with a small but relatively old industry which in many respects has its roots in Wisconsin.

The woven-wood-fabric industry manufactures woven-wood-slat porch shades, interior window shades, decorative floor screens, and ventilating folding doors for wardrobe closets. These products are sold direct to department stores and to dealers and builders through distributors.

Over 95 percent of the domestic output of these products originate in the factories of five small companies. These are: Hough Shade Corp., of Janesville, Wis.; Consolidated General Products with plants in Houston, Tex., and Waukesha, Wis.; Warren Shade Co., of Minneapolis, Minn.; the Columbia Mills, Inc., of Syracuse, N. Y.; and Williams Manufacturing Co., of Constantine, Mich. These 5 companies employ about 800 people in their factories. Their total capitalization last year was just over $3 million. Two of these companies have plants in Wisconsin and all of them buy their most important raw material from Wisconsin sawmills.

After many years of quite successful operation, the industry is now facing foreign competition which is absorbing more and more of the domestic market. The competition of imported bamboo products in extremely crude form, has gone on for many years. The domestic industry has been able to live with this situation, and up until about 3 years ago there appeared to be little change in the amount or quality of the imported products. There has, however, been a drastic change in this situation in the last 3 years. Figures submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the United States Tariff Commission on December 21, 1954, showed that during the past 3 years, there has been a tremendous increase in the rate of importation of competitive products from Japan. This increase has reached the point where this year 85 percent of the square footage sold in the domestic market was supplied by importers. Further it was demonstrated that during that same period there was a net decrease in that portion of the domestic market which the United States industry supplied. It is becoming increasingly obvious that present tariffs on woven-bamboo and woven-wood products are proving no deterrent to the importers of the competing foreign products.

As is pointed out in the enclosed statement of the Woven Wood Fabric Industry, the Japanese foreign competition consists of both bamboo and woven wood products. The entry into this country of woven wood products from Japan is a startling and recent development. This is a matter of special interest to the State of Wisconsin because the woven wood fabric industry is uniquely a Wisconsin industry. We say this because of the fact that the source of our chief raw material is basswood. As we have already stated, the whole industry relies on Wisconsin as a source of northern basswood, since this important forest product has been long recognized for its superiority in woven wood products.

The woven wood fabric which is now coming into this country from the Orient is manufactured largely from Tilia Japonica or Shina Wood. This species of tree belongs to the basswood family and the importers and retailers can and do represent the imported product as being made of "basswood." The words "northern basswood" have been used in conjunction with national advertising of our products for so many years that our customers and the general public think of woven wood fabric products and northern basswood as closely associated terms. The unlicensed use of the word "basswood" together with no labeling of the foreign product when it comes into the country in rolled-goods form and is partially assembled into the finished product here is misleading. The Federal Trade Commission has been asked to check on this aspect of the problem since it is obvious that herein lies a situation in which the buying public can be deceived. Such a deception takes place when a consumer buys a product made from this imported material. He will find it below the standard of quality established by the domestic manufacturers but has no way of knowing that it is of Japanese origin.

The extent to which foreign woven wood fabric and woven bamboo undersell our domestic products was stated in considerable detail by the writer in appearances before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Tariff Commission earlier this month and also in our industry statements filed with both the committee and the Commission. Copies are enclosed.

The plain fact is that Japanese labor costs permit underselling in spite of existing tariffs. This is due to the fact that the Japanese wood products worker averages about 11 cents per hour or $23 per month in wages as compared with $219.12 per month for the average worker in our industry.

We cannot emphasize too strongly the danger we see for our industry from this vast new enterprise which is apparently just getting underway in Japan to flood the American market with woven wood fabric products which apparently are going to be represented as basswood. We have been informed by importers that American woodworking machinery has been moved into Japan and it is from this machinery that the woven wood fabric products are being produced, which are of a much higher quality than the old product of woven bamboo. Consider if you will, the advantages of the Japanese industry as compared with the domestic industry, now that modern machinery is available to Japanese manufacturers and their labor costs remain less than one-tenth that of the domestic industry.

We are told that the matter of general tariff reduction is to come up for discussion in the House of Representatives early in the 1955 session. This we understand is in connection with the forthcoming negotiations concerning the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. We earnestly urge you to consider the comments in this letter together with the material contained in the statements which have been submitted to the CRI and the Tariff Commission. As a representative of the State of Wisconsin, we believe that you will feel as we do, that this is a matter of urgency with disastrous potential more far-reaching for our State than in any others.

Cordially yours,
HOUGH SHADE CORP.,
JOHN E. HOUGH, *President.*

Madison, Wis., February 11, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VAN PELT: We here at Ray-O-Vac have been very much concerned for sometime, for ourselves and for industry in general throughout the country, because of the influx of low priced merchandise, often copying specifically, and competing with the products of this country made by labor with a high standard of living thereby creating a higher cost and a bad competitive situation with the cheap foreign goods.

Our own experience is in the flashlight case field. In the year 1948 there were 12,000 flashlight cases imported into the United States from Hong Kong and for the year 1954 this had increased to 6,874,000, or in the neighborhood of from 15 to 20 percent of the consumption of flashlight cases in this country. Cases which are copies of our own sell for 39 to 49 cents where we must get over a dollar at the distributor level. This has directly affected the operations of our flashlight case plant in Clinton, Mass., and we now are employing approximately 200 less people than were employed heretofore, this being a reduction of approximately one-third of our normal employment.

We are further concerned when we read in the morning's papers that bill H. R. 1 has been voted on favorably by the Ways and Means Committee and is now going to be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives. This bill, we understand, continues the program of negotiating reduced tariffs and may give additional latitude in this direction.

Free trade makes a good theoretical goal but until the concepts, business practices, and the elements which create the basic standard of living of peoples in various countries are in some measure comparable to ours, the employment of people in this country is going to suffer by a general influx of foreign goods made under low standard of living conditions.

My colleague here in Ray-O-Vac, Mr. J. C. Ryan, executive vice president, presents three basic American concepts of political and economic philosophy which differ greatly from those held by all the rest of the world:

1. Our attitude toward labor. We honor labor; the rest of the world debases labor.

2. Our attitude toward competition. We insist upon it; the rest of the world refuses it and holds tenaciously to the cartel system.

3. The idea of statism. We reject it; the rest of the world accepts it.

Don't you agree with me that our position in connection with the three items above is the basis for our high standard of living and our freedom for the individual?

It appears quite clearly to us that until there has been some change in general foreign attitude on the three concepts listed above, the standard of living will not be raised in other countries of the world and until this standard is raised, working people of those low standard countries will be unable to purchase a portion of the goods which they themselves manufacture and therefore these goods will be shipped to the United States at low prices to compete with our own production.

As manufacturers in the foreign field for foreign markets, we have firsthand experience with this subject. I request, in the interest of the American people and their standard of living and in the interest of American industry, that you oppose the continuance of the negotiating of tariffs as proposed in H. R. 1.

Yours very truly,

D. W. TYRRELL,
President.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the issue before the committee today is a matter of grave concern to the industries and people of the 15th District of Ohio, where the provisions of H. R. 1 are well known and understood. I must inform my colleagues today that these provisions are most vigorously opposed by the people in my district, who recognize in them a direct threat to their economic welfare. They believe, as do I, that the passage of this legislation would signal the flooding of our markets with products on which the prosperity of my district is so vitally dependent. Coal, glass, and pottery are among the principal products of the 15th Congressional District, and in the case of each of these products there is a long and unhappy conflict with the wares of cheap foreign labor which have entered our market places because of low-tariff policies in the past. Further tariff reductions of the type authorized by H. R. 1 would spell economic disaster.

I must point out that the pottery and glass industries have been major sources of employment and income in southeastern Ohio. Likewise, these industries have for years suffered from the effects of lowered restrictions upon imports.

I believe that it is imperative that the consequences of this legislation be discussed clearly in this debate in terms of their effect on American prosperity. Since the pottery industry is an important component in the economy, I should like to point out what further tariff reductions on pottery products will mean. By way of explanation, the pottery industry includes not only producers of small household products but also a wide range of ceramic items. All members of the industry have been similarly affected by the problem of foreign competition. For instance, in my district the Mosaic Tile Co., a foremost manufacturer of floor and wall tile, with plants in several other American communities, must meet competition from the same foreign sources as producers of other pottery products.

Among the principal pottery-producing nations of the world, the hourly wage paid in foreign pottery plants is less than one-fourth of that received by American pottery workers. Since almost 65 percent of the total cost of products in the manufacture of pottery represents labor costs, the meaning of this basic fact is clear to any reasonable person who wishes to determine why American pottery so often cannot be competitive price-wise with foreign production.

I believe that the Congress must always be guided by the welfare of the American consumer. In this regard, some of the proponents of this bill have contended that the importation and sale in the American market of cheaper foreign products would create consumer demand and thereby strengthen our economic fabric. To my mind, such a superficial answer to this problem is economic woolgathering. Our economic welfare cannot be strengthened by a calculated policy which would destroy the purchasing power of any section of our Nation or segment of our productivity capacity.

The American standard of living, standing tremendously higher than the standards achieved in any Nation in the world, is based upon continued high purchasing power. No member of this Chamber, including the proponents of H. R. 1, wishes to create an economic climate of lowered wage rates and reduced spending power in this Nation. Nevertheless, I believe in the passage of this legislation as it is presently drawn, we may be taking a direct step toward that end. This conviction is necessarily based upon my intimate knowledge of the economy of southeastern Ohio and its long struggle with the tariff question.

Likewise, the coal industry in my district has suffered greatly from the importation of foreign residual fuel oil. The forced exodus of coal miners from our mining communities may be principally ascribed to oil imports. That such a process should occur has wrecked great personal hardship to our mine workers. I do not wish to minimize what this hardship has meant in either personal or economic terms. However, in an even larger sense, it may be calamitous, since our industrial strength is dependent upon coal to support the factories and utilities which are the sinews of America's military might. Should we have need to mobilize our economic forces, the closed mines and the decimation of our groups of skilled workers will constitute a problem of paramount gravity.

It has been alarming to me to hear the theory advanced that by some process of planned economic osmosis, workers in plants displaced by competition from abroad will be absorbed in other industries in other communities. It is even suggested that the Federal Government might lend assistance in this process. In other words, it is envisioned that the full exercise of the authority granted in this bill could create a situation akin to a gigantic chess game in which many of our established industrial facilities and the people and communities which depend upon them could be the pawns. This kind of State control through the creation of economic conditions necessitating it would be repugnant to me. If it is now believed that the Federal Government must minister to great domestic ills created by our tariff policy, then it would seem to me that our tariff policy itself must receive greater study. I believe the Congress should eliminate the necessity for such contrived largesse through the enactment of legislation which will protect and enforce our domestic and industrial strength on which the freedom of so much of the world has been dependent for almost two decades. Our policies must stimulate the prosperity of the free world, but let us not forget that it is America's industrial arsenal which has defeated tyranny in two world wars and stands today as the ultimate bastion of world security against Communist aggression.

Certainly, tariffs can be reduced in many instances without harming domestic producers. When this may be accomplished, I wholeheartedly favor such action in the belief that barriers to

trade among nations should be eliminated whenever possible. Yet, I cannot favor congressional authorization of any measure which will reduce American economic strength.

Mr. Chairman, I have received a great volume of communications from the people of the 15th district expressing their opposition to H. R. 1. These messages represent the concern of the operators of industrial and commercial enterprises, labor organization, and private citizens who recognize the threat this legislation poses. In conclusion, I wish to submit a petition signed by more than 1,000 men and women in the 15th district expressing this concern. This petition reads as follows:

To Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
Representative from Ohio.

Whereas the Congress of the United States is currently considering a measure to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and permit reduction of tariff restrictions on pottery, glass, and residual oil; and

Whereas the manufacture of pottery and glass is a very vital source of income in southeastern Ohio, as well as the source of millions of dollars in revenue for the Government; and

Whereas the existing low tariff has already proven most disastrous to the economy of Roseville, Crooksville, Cambridge, Newark, Lancaster, and other pottery communities in this section; and,

Whereas any further reduction of this tariff would spell utter ruin for pottery and glass industries, as they cannot compete on a free-trade basis with countries producing pottery and glass who pay a wage of less than one-fourth of the American standard.

Therefore, we the undersigned (1) pottery and glass manufacturers and employees. (2) suppliers, transportation companies, wholesale and retail dealers, jobbers, and their salesmen and employees, all incident to the manufacture and sale thereof. (3) tradespeople and employees, whose income and livelihood is dependent thereon. (4) property owners, taxpayers, and all others who would suffer untold loss from the ruin of the principal industry in this section of Ohio, do hereby humbly petition you, our representatives to heartily oppose this measure, and thus preserve these American industries for the American people.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, in my careful study of President Eisenhower's proposal to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act, and its probable impact upon the economy of New Hampshire and New England, I have been much disturbed by the harm this bill could cause our textile industry, should textile tariffs be further lowered. This industry with all its related products is the second most important manufacturing industry in New Hampshire. Recently it has been facing serious problems of adjustment and is currently in a depressed condition. It is important to the economic health and prosperity of New Hampshire that everything possible be done to prevent further decline in this important business. A further general reduction in tariffs on textiles might well cause a substantial increase in textile imports, particularly from those countries such as Japan whose wage rates are only a fraction of our own. This would make for even more intensified competition and might well be the straw to break the camel's back of our New Hampshire textile industry.

With this in mind, I have been in direct contact with the White House for the past month to obtain reassurances from the President and his advisers that they are aware of this problem as it peculiarly affects our textile business, and further that tariffs on textile products will not be further lowered.

I have had frequent conferences with Dr. Hauge, the President's economic adviser, Sherman Adams, and others. I have written the President directly on this problem asking such assurance. I have been definitely advised that the President is well aware of the textile problem as it relates to foreign competition, and that he will not further lower tariffs, should the Reciprocal Trade Act be extended. With this assurance and with this knowledge that our textile industry in New Hampshire and New England will thus be adequately protected, I can in good conscience support H. R. 1 as amended by the committee. This is probably the most important part of President Eisenhower's whole program. I am in agreement with the basic objectives and purposes behind this bill, providing as it does for moderate, gradual, and selective reductions on certain tariffs on a reciprocal basis only. We must maintain and expand our foreign trade for many reasons vital to the security and prosperity of this country.

First. Unless we help keep the economies of our friends abroad strong and healthy, their will and ability to resist Communist aggression will be seriously impaired. For instance, if we deny Japan the right to trade with us, she has no recourse but to turn to China and Russia for trade in order to survive.

Second. Our own economy and prosperity to a large extent depends on our export business. Approximately 4,500,000 people in this country have jobs that depend directly or indirectly on our exports. But this is a 2-way street. Unless we enable these countries to obtain dollars by allowing them to sell their goods to this country, they cannot buy our exports. The alternative is to continue huge sums of money for foreign aid, which no one advocates.

Third. Agriculture in particular is very dependent on exporting its surplus products. In New Hampshire our egg, poultry, and milk products are in surplus and must find a market abroad. New Hampshire agriculture has a vital stake in this bill.

Fourth. Even our textile industry has a big interest in our exports. Actually we export far more textile products than are imported. For example 1952 and 1953 exports of cotton cloth were about 4 times imports.

Fifth. Nor should we forget the consumer who is too often forgotten. By expanding our foreign trade the consumer benefits in not having to pay high prices for those products otherwise protected by trade barriers eliminating competition from abroad. Competition is generally a healthy thing in our free economy.

For these reasons very briefly stated, and with assurance that the President is aware of the textile situation and will not further lower textile tariffs, I am supporting H. R. 1 and will vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to you this morning on behalf of three divisions of the glove industry, namely, the leather dress-glove industry, the fabric dress-glove industry, and the knitwool glove and mitten industry, all of which are located in my district and, for the most part, are concentrated in the county of Fulton, New York State.

The fine leather dress-glove industry is largely confined to the Fulton County area, where practically 100 percent of ladies' leather dress gloves are manufactured, as well as about 50 percent of men's dress gloves.

Supporting this industry in this same area we have tanners who process raw skins into finished leather, all of which goes into the manufacture of gloves. Besides this, we have other industries, such as box and thread manufacturers, and many others who are solely dependent on the glove industry for their business.

In the Fulton County area we have better than 6,500 workers who devote their entire time to the manufacture of gloves, and who are dependent upon this industry for their livelihood.

The problem of the leather-glove industry has been one of imports ever since its inception; and, from year to year, it has never known where its source of competition would be.

Back in 1934, France was the principal supplier, only to be driven out of the market by a lower-cost producing country, Czechoslovakia.

Since the war new countries have come forth; and today we have Italy, France, and Germany, all competing in the domestic market with our American manufacturers.

Glove manufacturers have never scorned the idea of sharing a portion of their market with foreign sources, and the nature of the business is such that it lends itself to good, healthy competition. On the other hand, we are aware of the fact that wage rates in the glove-producing areas of this country are almost five times higher than those of foreign producers.

To expect us in a handicraft industry to be five times more efficient than our foreign competitors is to expect the impossible, and is a goal that can never be attained.

It is the hand labor in the manufacture of a fine dress glove that gives it its value and prestige characteristics; and no one as yet has found a way to handle the skin of an animal, which varies in shape, size, and weight, just as the skins of human beings would vary, by mass-production methods.

It is because of this fact that so much hand labor is involved; and, with labor accounting for 40 percent of the cost of the direct manufacture of leather gloves, you can well understand why we need a

compensatory tariff to overcome the difference in the wage structure.

The same situation is true in tanneries. Glove leathers in foreign countries can be produced much cheaper than we can make them; and, inasmuch as we all buy in the same markets and have access to the same raw materials, it is this differential in labor rates that injures the earning power of manufacturers and depresses wage rates.

I would like to point out here that the leather-glove industry, as a whole, is a large international trader, purchasing over 90 percent of its raw materials from foreign sources, and 100 percent of its raw materials for fine leather dress gloves from foreign countries.

I ask you to visualize for a minute communities such as the cities of Gloversville and Johnstown, N. Y., where we have approximately 37,000 citizens; and almost every one of them dependent in one way or another on the fortunes of the leather-glove industry. You can well understand why I am so concerned about H. R. 1, which contemplates further reductions in our tariff rates over a period of the next 3 years.

For the most part the industry is made up of small units, located strategically throughout the cities and the county of Fulton, with each area depending on the local factories for their work.

Labor and management are constantly in a state of uncertainty, due to the fact that neither one knows from month to month just what foreign countries are going to do to their production, and labor never knows what they are going to do to employment. The result is that management never dares to take upon itself a forward planning program, and a worker is never sure just how many weeks of employment he is going to get from year to year.

It is time, in my opinion, for Congress to permit these industries to survive which so well typify the American way of life, and which have made such great contributions not only to the local economy, but to the national economy as well.

The glove industry was called upon during the war years to meet superhuman demands and to develop specialized gloves for every branch of our services. What a ridiculous position we would place ourselves in if we were to continue building planes, guided missiles, and so forth, and not be able to provide the men with the hand covering so necessary to give them maneuverability.

It has been called to my attention time and time again how foreign countries get around our tariff rates, and the many abuses that are taking place today without the proper authorities taking action against them.

In the same Fulton County area which we have mentioned, we have developed since 1945 another branch of the glove industry, namely, the manufacture of fabric gloves. Today this industry is being jeopardized by having one portion of its production cut 50 percent, and that is the manufacture of gloves made from synthetic fabrics. At the same time, our negotiators are considering further reductions on cotton-fabric gloves.

This industry is new to our community and asks nothing but a chance to survive; but nothing puts a damper on expansion more than the possible threat of being put in deathly competition not only with European countries, but with the lowest wage-earning country of them all, Japan.

It is well known to this committee that our living and wage standards are the highest in the world; and to expect us to compete with the low standard countries that exist in the Orient, where they admit paying less than 12 cents an hour, will place our industries in a hopeless position.

In the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., the home of the carpet industry, in my district, the 32d District of New York, the industry is practically at a standstill. Since the hearings were first scheduled on H. R. 1, from the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., alone, I have received approximately 4,000 letters and cards protesting the passage of the bill. In addition to these, a petition was forwarded to Washington signed by 16,000 residents of the county of Montgomery, N. Y., of which Amsterdam is the principal city.

The carpet industry is on a par compared with the leather-glove industry and the knit-glove industry as far as competition with foreign-made products is concerned. Under the present conditions, under present laws, American men and women cannot be kept at work. This is why I am opposed to the passage of this bill. I understand that today there are approximately 4,000 people out of work in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y.

The knit handwear industry was founded in my constituency late in the last century. It prospered until the mid 1930's. Oriental competition stepped in and pressed it to the wall. It was granted relief under the flexible provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. The relief was nullified by the import fraternity, but the industry sustained itself by virtue of the then consumer boycott of Japanese goods resulting from the China invasion, which tempered the volume of imports.

Following World War II, the knit handwear industry, with typical American initiative, improved its product, for which it attained greater consumer acceptance and a wider market. However, American initiative, know-how, and greater efficiency were not enough to maintain the industry's position in the market, once Japanese imports reappeared, starting in 1948.

By 1950, unemployment was widespread, and the early demise of the industry was averted by the sudden outbreak of Korean hostilities. The industry then became heavily engaged in the production of military handwear, and orders for civilian merchandise suddenly came to life from distributors who feared their import resources might be cut off.

Nevertheless, knit glove imports mounted each year, steadily preempting more and more of the market at the expense of American labor, until last year more companies went out of business and more people were unemployed than at any time in the history of the industry.

The prospects for the future are even worse. Obviously, the need is for greater, rather than less, tariff protection. I doubt, in such conditions as this, whether even tariff rate increases would offset the inequities between American and oriental wages. I am positive that only a quota, equitably arrived at, may be the answer—such as is provided in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

My deep concern for the knit handwear industry is keenly augmented by one cardinal consideration which transcends the social and economic factors in such a case. That is the importance of this industry to our national welfare.

Two major products of this industry are listed as critical items by the Quartermaster General of the Army: Glove inserts, wool, and mitten inserts, wool, which rank Nos. 5 and 11, respectively, on the Quartermaster's list of essential cold-weather clothing for class A troops who habitually operate in the forward lines. Only this industry makes those two essential items. No other substitute items are available to take their place.

It is a matter of public record that this industry is suffering an economic hemorrhage due to inadequate tariff protection. I leave it to your better judgment whether this or any similar industry is worth maintaining as part of the economic life of this Nation. By one means or another, I submit respectfully, its case should be given the most serious consideration in the consideration of this bill, which I oppose.

Surely, in view of the economic conditions existing in the 32d Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, no one in his right mind could expect that Representative to support H. R. 1.

In the city of Schenectady, just to give you a further indication of our economic conditions, let me say to you that the big American Locomotive plant is practically closed, with 9,000 American working men and women out of work, and the General Electric plant has laid off many workers.

I ask that the bill be defeated.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, there is probably very little new that can be said about this proposed legislation from the debates that we have heard in the past. There is one thing that I find that is somewhat new. We find the proponents of this legislation at this time suggesting that it is the legislation of a very distinguished and very great President of the United States. In the past when we have heard debates on this subject, the debate on the other side has apparently been the eulogy of a very distinguished former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned you cannot change a product or its quality by changing the label on the package.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1, the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program, is a violation of constitutional principle as well as of common sense economics. I am opposed to this measure, as I have been to the preceding measures that established and continued the trade agreements program.

The authority to levy duties and collect tariffs is granted to the Congress in the Constitution. Section 8, article 1, states:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

It is, in my opinion, a violation of the Constitution for Congress to delegate this authority to any other branch of government or individual.

Congress has abdicated its authority and responsibility in many ways during the past 20 years, and in every instance the difficulties that have followed upon the act have served to demonstrate once again the wisdom of those men who, with divine inspiration, conceived the great document upon which our Government rests.

The grant of authority to the President to establish the conditions of international trade was wrong constitutionally, and experience proves that it was wrong economically as well.

It is wrong economically because it ignores the economics of international trade. It seeks to make international trade an appendage of the political relationships between countries, and it gives the diplomats life-and-death control over American industries and jobs while they pursue what, to them, are more important questions of national advantage.

We are living in an era when Americans seems to feel that they must in some way atone for the energy of their ancestors and the natural resources which together have given us a preeminence among nations. We atone by giving away billions of dollars worth of our resources—and now, when only the diplomats are still in favor of this cash giveaway—we are asked to subject ourselves to another sort of giveaway—a giveaway of jobs and investment by permitting unlimited competition with our own products. It is said that we must take the lead in establishing a closer understanding—a mutual good feeling—and that to do so, we must bolster the economies of foreign nations. We must make them more nearly our economic equals.

This is a fine and generous approach to international affairs. And we have come a surprising long way toward the objective. I do not believe we have had our money's worth from the $57 billion in grants and credits we have lavished upon former foe and friend alike since June 1, 1945.

We cannot argue with the statistics that show their amazing economic recovery. In every major industry the nations that received our aid are producing at rates far greater than they ever achieved before World War II. Agricultural production also has advanced to levels never reached before or during the war. The economic recovery of Europe, due in large measure to our assistance, is an accomplished fact. I append hereto a chart showing this progress. There is every reason to believe that these nations—if they abandon internal bickering—if they establish sound domestic economic policies—if they work hard—can continue their progress without further assistance from us.

Certain of our internationalists, recognizing that it is politically impossible to continue the aid program, succeeded in selling the slogan "Trade, not aid."

Americans—overburdened with debts and taxes—assumed to give away $50 billion in 10 years—found an appealing note in the suggestion that by encouraging trade we could dispense with the aid. Few stopped to consider that we should and would dispense with aid in any case. The quid pro quo idea caught their fancies.

This was not the case in the hundreds of American communities where the damage done by former trade concessions are apparent. Here the reaction has been different.

Here there are people out of work, factories closed, investments lost, because the fatuous policy of the free traders is destroying American enterprise, and in these communities we can find two reactions.

The first: Continue aid if necessary because aid is a debt upon all the American people, as the expense of any foreign policy should be, rather than a penalty on those whose products are in competition with cheap imports.

The second: Bitter rejection of both programs and a suggestion that the policy of our country must deal first with the welfare and prosperity of our own people.

If your job is gone, if your investments are lost, if the principal industry of your small town is out of business—if this occurs and seeking the reason, you are told by an official of the United States that it was necessary because America must encourage imports of a foreign competitor, some bitterness surely is excusable.

If, in addition, the representative of your State Department, a servant of your Government paid by the taxes you will no longer be able to pay, tells you it happened because you are an inefficient producer, bitterness is a mild reaction.

This is going on in America. As a result of 20 years of State Department and Executive interference with our tariff program, factories and shops are closing, jobs have vanished, investments are worthless, and many a small industrial city is left without support.

The representatives of these industries trooped before the Ways and Means Committee, along with representatives of other industries that are just beginning to see the handwriting on the wall. The mail of every Member of this House has contained factual examples of small American businesses in dire distress, or out of business, because they were stripped of the protection they are entitled to have from their own Government.

Read the list of industries adversely affected by cheap imports under the trade agreement program. Consider the farmers whose products are being forced into the surplus commodity cellars of our Government because the diplomats want to encourage competitive imports. There are few men in this House who cannot find a producer back home who is economically distressed by reason of this program.

The most distressing aspect of the situation is that this list grows longer each year. Depression and war-inspired markets disturbing the normal order, concealed for long years the full import of free trade. The first 15 years of the reciprocal trade agreement program, a period of abnormal world conditions, postponed the effects of reduced tariffs and inadequate protection. But, as time goes on, and as the recipients of our aid grow in economic capability, the damage to our own producers is becoming greater and more apparent. We are beginning to realize the full extent of the sacrifice we are asked to make in the name of free trade.

This is the sacrifice that we are making and continue to make each time we ignore the Constitution. No true and devout Christian will attempt to live his life outside the precepts of the Holy Bible. No true and patriotic American will attempt to preserve the liberties and freedoms of this Nation while violating and ignoring the Constitution.

Every man here knows what has happened to the price of eggs in the face of Canadian imports. Eggs are produced in every county in America, and almost everywhere they are the pin money of the farm wife. Eggs are one of the many commodities that have been stripped of protection by reciprocal trade agreement. Imports of eggs during the past several months have been a factor in driving the price down to a point where American farmers can ill afford to continue their production.

Our coal and oil industries similarly are victims of imports encouraged in the name of good-neighbor relations. Foreign dumping has cut production of oil in my own State of Ohio—it has inhibited the development of the vast new oilfields in North Dakota and Montana—and it has thrown thousands of coal mine workers out of work all over the Nation. Yet we are told that this is less important than the policy of maintaining good relations with Venezuela.

Metal mines all over America are closed. I believe there is not a single mercury producer in operation in this country today. Lead and zinc, copper and manganese are in dire straits. Subsidy programs are proposed to keep a bare minimum of these mines in operation against the day when their production may mean the difference between victory and defeat if the cold war becomes hot. The simpler, the cheaper, the natural solution, as the Tariff Commission recommended in fact—in the case of lead and zinc—would be the imposition of a reasonable duty upon imports.

I have copies of the testimony presented to the Ways and Means Committee by the pottery industry. This is an industry that comes close to home for me. Yet, I read that 86 percent of the china tableware purchased in the United States is imported and that the domestic pottery industry has changed from a profitable enterprise in 1948 to a losing business in 1954, with many fac-

tories closed and men out of work. It is interesting to note that nine separate reductions have been made in the duties upon china tableware since Congress abdicated its authority over tariffs and authorized the negotiation of executive trade agreements.

An interesting letter was received from the manufacturers of shears and scissors. Apparently this industry is just waking to the full import of trade agreements. We were furnished with copies of letters dated last October and November from the sales manager of a scissors firm who has just learned that Macy's in New York is able to sell foreign scissors at prices one-half or less than the minimum price he can offer. This industry is on the rocks. It is very nearly lost.

Needle files. Perhaps there are some who will think that needle files are not important. But here is another American industry that employs American men and women and that contributes to State, county, and Federal tax revenues. Last fall the United States Navy placed invitations to bid on 19,440 sets of 5½-inch No. 2 needle files. The lowest American bid was $4.45 per set. The contract was awarded to a British firm bidding $1.85. This sale directly affects workingmen in my district. They cannot makes the files at a profit even at the $4.45 figure. Are they to be sacrificed and their tax dollars spent to import competitive British products? Under present Executive orders, that is the only outlook they have.

I am in receipt of a very clear and concise statement of the plight of another American industry, from Mr. Robert G. Patterson, vice president in charge of sales for the Lamson & Sessions Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, manufacturers of bolts and nuts, which I include as part of my remarks:

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Operating three plants in Ohio as we do, the writer is concerned with the administration expressed free trade policy and the fact that Congress has, in effect, relinquished its control of this vital problem. This preliminary statement is made in connection with the bolt, nut, headed, and threaded products we produce.

Export of our products, except in emergencies, has never been of great importance, approximately 4 percent, and up until 1954 imports were small. Lacking authentic figures, it is impossible to define the impact of imports to our industry. However, the following figures would prove of interest and point up the possible dangers of unrestricted importations.

Foreign bolt and nut products are now made on equipment equal to that of United States of America producers at wage rates approximating the amount per day we pay for 2 hours. Our finished product required in 1954 51.4 hours per ton produced, thus each ton of imported product reduced the work for industry employees by 1.28 weeks.

For the week ending January 5, 1955 the Import Bulletin of the New York Journal of Commerce reported imports of our industry products from Austria, Belgium, England, Germany, Holland, Japan, Switzerland, and Sweden. The exact weight is not obtainable, but using our average container weight on the reported containers, we find an imposing figure. The developed figures in the week ending January 5 show products amounting to 444.16 weeks of American production or a full year of employment for 8.88 men or women. A continuing import rate of like proportion would mean 444 less employees in our industry.

The State Department would, no doubt, consider these figures insignificant, but our industry is relatively small. Using only 2 percent of the United States of America steel production, there probably are not over 25,000 people employed in the industry. If these workers in our industry would be reduced by 17.7 percent—for safety let's call it 10 percent—such a figure applied to employed personnel in this country would be a severe jolt to the much discussed unemployment figures.

The writer does not have a patent answer to the problem discussed herein. Tariffs cannot be adjusted to meet the growing problem, but certainly some equitable limitation of allowed imports on a percentage basis could be applied. No doubt some other industries are threatened in a similar manner and it would, therefore, appear that Congress should take a realistic viewpoint toward the overall subject leading to recovery of lost powers and establishing suitable controls.

I would like to register violent opposition to H. R. 1 now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT G. PATTERSON,
Vice President, Sales.

Here is a case history by a sound and conservative executive, showing exactly what free trade means in terms of prospective unemployment.

The sponsors of the reciprocal trade agreement program do not deny these facts. Some of them, of course, complain that the American victims of free trade are inefficient producers who should either improve or turn to other fields of endeavor. Others have gone so far as to develop proposed programs for the relief of distressed American producers. Such programs include Federal aid to relocate workers, Federal training courses to give them new skills, Federal loans to industry to convert to other products. In other words, the Government of the United States shall set about to destroy certain industries and then spend Federal funds to alleviate the distress. Can anything be more ridiculous?

Apparently certain industries have already been judged and found eligible for destruction. Pottery is one. Hand tools are another.

Whoever it is in the State Department who has this heady responsibility has determined that it is more important to be friendly with the Japanese potters than to maintain American industry—more desirable to have amicable relationships with German tool makers than to keep a thriving American business alive.

Oh, what power the Congress has given this arbiter of the fate of American business. Picture his deliberations; consider his vast authority; gaze with awe upon the functionary who can say that the American textile industry is inefficient—it must be sacrificed—off with its head.

Some may say that we do not have protection in the escape clause and peril-point provisions of the law. What flimsy excuses for the protection this Government owes itself and its citizens.

Consider that of 59 escape-clause proceedings, only 15 have resulted in decisions favorable to American industry, and in 10 of these the President has seen fit to override the advice of the experts in favor of the foreign producers. What protection is this that relies upon the verdict of one man? It is no protection at all.

I know that some of our people have been sold the free-trade bill of goods on the basis that it means lower prices for consumers. Completely ignoring the loss of jobs, of taxes, and of other advantages that result from local industry, people are led to believe that if they can buy Japan's pottery cheaper than our own, for example, that is to their advantage.

These arguments are heard time and again in relation to every commodity about which a question is raised. One sometimes wonders who will be left to buy the imports, when free trade is an accomplished fact and we find that cheap labor and lower taxes all over the world have put all American industry out of business.

Even before that may come to pass, American consumers may learn a hard lesson about prices and the friendliness of foreign nations. We almost learned it a few years ago when, with a withering wool industry, the victim of cheap imports, we found the British Commonwealth holding a virtual monopoly of the world's wool supply. Acting in unison through the empire pool, the British were then in a position to destroy our wool industry, and thereafter to set the world price at whatever figure they chose.

Do you suppose we would realize low prices on wool if we had none of our own? Do you suppose the foreign traders would be gracious and lenient and sell it to us for whatever price we might offer? Or do you think, as I do, that the end result of dependence upon any foreign source without competitive home industry will mean soaring prices and far greater cost to all of us. If for no other reason than to maintain a degree of independence and self-sufficiency, we need protective tariffs for our producers.

Others have been sold the free-trade bill of goods on the false impression that the United States is a high-tariff country and that we are the obstacle to greater exchange between nations. This is a completely falacious ideal.

We are now a low-tariff nation. Thirty-five of the forty-three principal trading nations have higher tariffs than we. Not only do other nations of the world have higher tariffs, they have a great variety of impediments to trade ranging from internal currency manipulations to outright embargoes against American products. I include herewith a list of the products which are almost completely banned by the 17 most important trading countries. It should be a revelation to some who feel that Uncle Sam is the evil genie of trade obstructions.

IMPORTANT UNITED STATES PRODUCTS, IMPORTS OF WHICH ARE EXCLUDED OR SEVERELY RESTRICTED BY THE OPERATION OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Recent experience has been that while their importation from the United States is not specifically prohibited on a priority basis,

the operation of day to day import and exchange quotas and/or other licensing policies has resulted in no more than small or infrequent licensing of the following:

COUNTRY AND COMMODITY

Brazil: Assembled automobiles, textile fabrics, shoes, hosiery, steel files, and rasps.

Colombia: Grains; certain dairy products; fruits and vegetables; certain meat products; certain vegetable fats and oils; sugar; certain tobacco products; hides and skins, certain leather products; assembled automobiles over 1,240 kilograms in weight, except those of 4-wheel drive and except those for public transportation; rubber tires for vehicles, casing, except specified sizes; coal, except anthracite; certain textiles and textile manufactures; certain paper products; certain soaps.

Cuba: None.

Mexico: Cellophane, powdered eggs, powdered milk, sulfonated oils.

Venezuela: Leather footwear.

Canada: None.

Belgium-Luxembourg: Assembled automobiles, nylon stockings, coal, automotive replacement parts, dressed leather, certain machine tools, certain pharmaceuticals, manufactured tobacco products, coated abrasives.

France: Certain fresh fruits; prunes (dried) and raisins; typewriters; radio receiving sets, household; vacuum cleaners; amateur box-type and folding cameras; motion-picture projectors; motion-picture films (not exposed); dental metals, precious; mechanical pencils; fountain pens; office machine ribbons.

Germany, Federal Republic: Coarse grains; flour and milling products; fruits, other than citrus and tropical fruits; fish and fish preparations; oil cake; leather; furs; wax and paraffine; assembled automobiles; certain rubber articles; certain iron and steel products.

Italy: Tires (inner tubes and casings).

Netherlands: Electrical and mechanical refrigerators, washing and wringing machines, cash registers, assembled automobiles, used bags (jute), compressors, automobile tires and tubes, walnuts, dried apples, salmon, soaps and soap powder.

Switzerland: Trucks, nylon hosiery, parts for watches.

United Kingdom: Assembled automobiles, typewriters, canned fruit, canned fish, fresh citrus fruits, small tractors, dictating machines.

India: Assembled automobiles; motors and generators of certain types; certain textile machinery; industrial sewing machines; certain precision and measuring tools; dairy, poultry, and farming appliances, optical and other lenses; sheet and plate glass; electric bulbs and fluorescent tubes; powdered milk in bulk; canned fruits, vegetables and fish; cigars, cigarettes, and unmanufactured tobacco; belt dressing, belt preservatives, and leather belting; coal-tar dyes, soaps.

Japan: Luxury-type consumer goods, luxury-type food products.

Philippines: Edible oils and fats; beer, soap, fresh vegetables, rubber-soled canvas shoes, cotton weaving yarns, certain cotton manufactures, certain paper products, incandescent and fluorescent bulbs, nails.

Union of South Africa: Canned foodstuffs, fruit juices, beverages, tobacco products, certain textile manufactures, certain electrical manufactures, assembled automobiles, certain glass products, rubber tires, certain paper products, furniture, certain leather manufactures.

(NOTE.—The foregoing list covers the 17 most important trading partners of the United States which cumulatively account for about 75 percent of our exports and imports alike.)

Mr. Chairman, other arguments are used. For example, it is said we must assist Japan by finding markets for her products. But, does this mean that we must find those markets in America, at the expense of our own industry? Are there not many regions of the world where the products of Japanese industry could be used, and more satisfactorily, than here?

If we have a duty to Japan, let us find means of developing her trade in the Far East, in South America, in Africa—but let us give a measure of protection to our own industry—and indeed to our own consumers who will never really be satisfied with the inferior imitative products of the Japanese.

I am privileged to represent the 16th Congressional District of Ohio, the same district represented by our late president, William McKinley. Looking back, I find that many of his ideas on the subject of tariff protection are just as valid today as they were in his time. The issue has changed but little.

If anything, the increasing trend toward a higher standard of living in America as contrasted to the standards abroad has accentuated the need for protection since McKinley made the following speech on the floor of this Chamber on May 18, 1888:

What is a protective tariff? It is a tariff upon foreign imports so adjusted as to secure the necessary revenue, and judiciously imposed upon those foreign products the like of which are produced at home, or the like of which we are capable of producing at home. It imposes the duty upon the competing foreign product; it makes it bear the burden or duty, and—as far as possible—luxuries only excepted, permits the noncompeting foreign product to come in free of duty. Articles of common use, comfort, and necessity—which we cannot produce here—it sends to the people untaxed and free from customhouse exactions.

Tea, coffee, spices and drugs are such articles, and under our system are upon the free list. It says to our foreign competitor: If you want to bring your merchandise here, your farm products here, your coal and iron ore, your wool, your salt, your pottery, your glass, your cottons and woolens—and sell alongside of our producers in our markets, we will make your product bear a duty; in effect, pay for the privilege of doing it. Our kind of tariff makes the competing foreign article carry the burden, draw the load, supply the revenue; and in performing this essential office it encourages at the same time our own industries and protects our own people in their chosen employments. That is the mission and purpose of a protective tariff. That is what we mean to maintain, and any measure which will destroy it we shall firmly resist; and if beaten on this floor, we will appeal from your decision to the people, before whom parties and policies must at least be tried.

We have free trade among ourselves throughout 38 States and the Territories, and among 60 millions of people. Absolute freedom of exchange within our own borders and among our own citizens is the law of the Republic. Reasonable taxation and restraint upon those without is the dictate of enlightened patriotism and the doctrine of the Republican Party.

Free trade in the United States is founded upon a community of equalities and reciprocities. It is like the unrestrained freedom and reciprocal relations and obligations of a family. Here we are one country, one language, one allegiance, one standard of citizenship, one flag, one Constitution, one Nation, one destiny.

It is otherwise with foreign nations, each a separate organism, a distinct and independent political society, organized for its own, to protect its own, and work out its own destiny.

We deny to those foreign nations free trade with us upon equal terms with our own producers. The foreign producer has no right or claim to equality with our own. He is not amenable to our laws. There are resulting upon him none of the obligations of citizenship. He pays no taxes. He performs no civil duties—he is subject to no demands for military service. He is exempt from State, county and municipal obligations. He contributes nothing to the support, the progress and glory of the Nation.

Why should he enjoy unrestrained equal privileges and profits in our markets with our producers, our labor and our taxpayers? Let the gentleman who follows me answer.

We put a burden upon his productions—we discriminate against his merchandise because he is alien to us and our interests, and we do it to protect our own, defend our own, preserve our own, who are always with us in adversity and prosperity, in sympathy and purpose, and, if necessary, in sacrifice.

That is the principle which governs us. I submit it is a patriotic and righteous one. In our country each citizen competes with the other in free and unresentful rivalry—while with the rest of the world all are united and together in resisting outside competition as we would foreign interference.

Free foreign trade admits the foreigner to equal privileges with our own citizens. It invites the product of foreign cheap labor to this market in competition with the domestic product, representing higher and better paid labor. It results in giving our money, our manufacturers and our markets to other nations, to the injury of our labor, our trades people and our farmers.

Protection keeps money, markets and manufacturers at home for the benefit of our own people. It is scarcely worth while to more than state the proposition that taxation upon a foreign competing product is more easily paid and less burdensome than taxation upon the noncompeting product.

In the latter it is always added to the foreign cost and, therefore, paid by the consumer; while in the former, where the duty is upon the competing product, it is largely paid in the form of diminished profits to the foreign producer. It would be burdensome beyond endurance to collect our taxes from the products, professions, and labor of our own people.

When McKinley made that speech, the Congress still retained its constitutional authority over tariffs. Constituents whose industries were threatened could come to Congress and could get assistance and relief. This is no longer the case.

We have given away our authority. We have deprived our constituents of the avenue through which they could get assistance. We have given our authority to the President and hedged him around with diplomatic advisers upon whom our American producers can exert little, if any, influence.

What should be a matter of business and commerce has been turned into a matter of international politics and diplomacy. Who can be surprised that business suffers.

I believe that Congress should defeat H. R. 1. We should regain our ancient and rightful authority in these matters. I can see plainly that if this program continues the day will soon come when so many American industries are facing destruction—when the devastation is so

widespread—that the majority here will have no choice but to embrace again the theory of protective tariffs.

I feel that the situation today is so serious that the division in this House may be very close, indeed, between those who can still theorize about the advantages of friendly intercourse and those who are face to face with the facts of ruinous foreign competition. Why wait? Why increase and prolong the damage to our economy?

We are under no obligation to perpetuate the errors of 1934. Indeed, we have a mandate to correct them. This is our opportunity. The defeat of H. R. 1 would be a great accomplishment for the future welfare of America.

The European industrial production chart follows:

European industrial production, 1938–53 [1]

[Index: 1950=100]

	1938	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
Product:							
Crude steel	88	79	92	100	111	121	119
Coal	108	90	98	100	105	107	106
Chemicals	71	72	84	100	117	113	130
Electric power	57	82	88	100	112	119	125
Textiles	90	80	89	100	194	93	102
Automobiles	63	41	74	100	108	112	127
Country:							
United Kingdom	76	87	93	100	104	101	106
France	83	90	98	100	111	114	112
Italy	79	79	87	100	113	116	127
Germany	107	55	79	100	120	128	139
Netherlands	72	81	91	100	104	106	117
Belgium	81	97	98	100	115	112	112

[1] Complete 1954 figures not yet available. 1st 9 months indicate 1954 totals exceed 1953.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman, from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Randall Commission and joined in the recommendations which are the basis for H. R. 1.

My particular interest was the foreign-aid phase of our foreign economic policy. There are still a number of countries that cannot maintain the military forces they are willing to raise and we think they should have, without military and economic aid. Korea and Formosa are examples. I want to reduce our aid as soon as possible without weakening those countries. One way is by increasing their trade with us and other countries in ways that will not hurt any of us.

The Randall Commission met for 28 days and made 55 specific recommendations. A number of them are being put into effect without congressional action.

Our tariff recommendations are the most moderate ever made by such a Commission. Certain groups in this country, and many foreign countries, wanted us to recommend elimination of the peril point and escape clause, saying these subjected would-be importers to uncertainties about their future trade. We recommended retention of both, to reduce uncertainties for American businesses about their future trade.

We recognized that, as long as we have protective laws for wages, agriculture and commerce, we must retain proportionate tariff protection. We therefore put limits on tariff reductions such as have never before been included in a trade agreements extension. These suggested limits were accepted by the President and are contained in H. R. 1. In general, 85 percent of the present rate must be retained; only 3 annual reductions, of 5 percent each, are permitted.

The President has promised, as we recommended, that any reductions will be moderate, gradual, selective, and reciprocal. Now some of you may not believe President Eisenhower when he says that. I believe him. I do not believe that he wants to wreck our industries. I think he wants the power to negotiate for better trade practices among the free nations of the world, for the mutual benefit of all. We are not a high-tariff country, net. We do not use barriers to trade, such as quotas, embargoes, blocked currencies and other devices, in the way many other countries do. However, our foreign trade is so gigantic, compared with other countries, that small adjustments in our trade can be very influential on the rest. Above all, our position of world power and leadership gives us tremendous leverage, if the general direction of our policy for a period of years is made clear. That is what H. R. 1 does.

We have some industries that are being hurt by foreign competition now. They are losing some exports, and imports are cutting into their domestic business. I do not think we will help them by defeating this bill. I doubt if there is any special trade law we can pass that will help them without doing more harm than good. Higher tariffs, quotas, or embargoes might bring prompt retaliation on their products, on other United States products, by other countries.

I think we need to leave such cases to the Tariff Commission and the President, as provided by H. R. 1. The peril point and escape clause will help, but a country that believes in competition cannot eliminate all competition, foreign or domestic, by passing a law.

It has been said that we have a constitutional question here. Congress has the power to levy taxes and tariff imposts, and has exercised that power. I have long ago decided that the Trade Agreements Act, authorizing adjustments in tariff rates by the President and Tariff Commission, is constitutional. There are many fields of Government activity which have become too complex and complicated for Congress to regulate directly in detail, so Congress sets up statutory standards, and delegates administration of details to executive agencies. I have heard Senators and Congressmen who participated in the last tariff act say, regardless of how they feel on reciprocal trade, that never again should Congress attempt a general tariff revision such as Congress made in 1930, because the subject has become too complicated.

In the Randall report, Senator BUSH and I filed a statement—page 63—as follows:

> We believe that in negotiating trade agreements, our negotiators should consider not only substandard and depressed wage levels, as described in the Commission's report, but also wage differentials, in order to protect American labor.

We have got to think about our workers. But in this complex problem, we have got to think, not only about imports, but about our exports. Four and one-third million workers are involved in our foreign trade, mostly on exports.

Ohio industries export about a billion dollars of products per year. About 300,000 Ohio workers make their living, directly or indirectly, from foreign trade. About 70 percent are in industries whose export sales exceed similar imports by 4 to 1 up to 20 to 1. About 6 percent are in industries, like glassware, in which imports exceed exports. In Franklin County, Ohio, my own district, workers in businesses and industries that profit from exports and imports far exceed those in businesses and industries hurt by imports. Of course, we are all part of the same community, the same economy, and whatever affects one segment affects another. We have to think about our consumers. There are 164 million of them in the United States. Every tariff rate which is effective, which holds prices up, is a price support we pay to American producers.

On balance, I feel H. R. 1 will furnish as much protection as Congress can give to all the people of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor primarily to discuss a basic amendment I proposed in committee to H. R. 1, the extension of the Reciprocal Trades Act. Unfortunately with the closed rule under which the House in its wisdom, or lack thereof, saw fit to consider this far-reaching and important legislation, I will not be able to offer this amendment for consideration of the Committee of the Whole House. However, I am hopeful that by the time this bill reaches the other body my amendment will be well understood by the Congress and the people of the country, and that the other body will adopt this amendment. I am hopeful by this time the executive branch of the Government will begin to understand this amendment and adopt its principle and help instead of hinder its passage. If this happens, then it is important that the Members of the House know what the amendment is, so that if it is part of the conference report, they will be aware of what they will be called to vote upon.

Before I proceed to the amendment itself I want to discuss briefly some of the procedures that have been used in considering H. R. 1 in the House Ways and Means Committee and here on the floor of the House. I dislike the task of criticizing my own committee for the procedures it has followed, but if such procedure is improper and not conducive to good legislation, as I believe is the case, it will be only corrected in the future if it is pointed up in the present.

The House Ways and Means Committee finished lengthy and rather exhaustive hearings on H. R. 1 at 7:30 p. m., Monday, February 7, 1955. On Tuesday, the chairman of the committee called an executive session of the committee and, without explaining his program, proceeded to start reading the bill for explanation. On Tuesday, February 8, 1955, the House had on the floor for

passage one of the most important bills of this session, the extension of the Selective Service Act. I was deeply interested in this piece of legislation and felt as a Member of Congress I should be on the floor to follow it. In spite of the suggestion that the committee suspend its executive session during the House session the chairman announced that not only was it his intention to not suspend but that he fully expected to have the bill passed out of committee by Wednesday evening. As most Members will recall, the House and Senate were to be in a period of agreed recess from Wednesday, February 9, to February 16, so that the Republican Members could fulfill their commitments to speak around the country at Lincoln Day observances in accordance with custom and tradition. The bill was rushed through and passed out on Thursday.

There was no reason for rushing the passage of H. R. 1 without full consideration by the committee. The Reciprocal Trade Act has several months left before expiration and even an interim period between extensions has no actual effect. There could not possibly be proper consideration without the Members having the opportunity of reviewing the hearings and in particular reviewing the statements that were to be supplied for the hearing by various members of the administration as requested by members of the committee at the time these administration spokesmen testified. I had requested considerable additional data from the various Cabinet officers and other high administrative officials about important details of the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act and how it had operated over a period of time. The hearings will show the type of information I requested and the value of the information that was so supplied. Yet this information was of no possible value to the commitee in its executive session because of this undue haste.

Furthermore, without proper notification to the members of the committee of what the procedure was to be in marking up the bill, many members, myself included, were not ready with amendments they had in mind. I had intended discussing the amendment I did offer and the one which I will discuss here today with the proper officials in the executive department, but due to the shortage of time I had no opportunity to do so.

I want to call the Members' attention to the data contained in the committee's report from pages 36 to 86 under the heading "Appendixes." This data is important data which should have been available to the committee before we began questioning the administration witnesses so that we could ask questions concerning it. The first I, and I believe any member of the committee, saw of this data was when we read the committee report along with the other Members of the Congress. However, this data placed in the report carries the implication that it was matter considered by the committee and about which the committee asked questions of the administration witnesses. As a matter of fact, it was just this type of information I asked to be provided by the administration witnesses because their statements before the committee were couched in the most general terms with little or no specific information. Having to ask the witnesses to supply the information later, of course, prevented the members from interrogating the witnesses about the accuracy or meaning of the information. Certainly the data in the appendix was never subjected to scrutiny nor questioning by the committee.

There have been considered statements made to the effect that the Randall Commission study and report was not so much a study as it was a procedure to bring together such evidence as might be available to support the preconceived notions of the majority of the Commission. Having read the Randall Commission report carefully and what testimony was available, I regretfully come to the conclusion that these charges are well founded. I say regretfully because I have the highest regard for the individual members of this Commission and I am convinced of their sincerity and their profound belief that they are acting in the best interests of our country. However, I am convinced that the best interests of our country are only served by fairly and honestly studying the issues of the day and by not reaching conclusions before studies are made. Certainly the best interests are not served by a commission directed to make a study and report when it fails to do so.

I mention the Randall Commission study and report because the identical pattern has been followed by the Ways and Means Committee in its hearings and executive sessions on H. R. 1. It is important that the Members of this Congress, to whom we as a committee are responsible, know that we as a committee did not make a real study of these problems. The approach was one of preconceived notions and the hearings, as nearly as I can judge, were mere window dressing so that the majority of the committee could state that everyone who wanted to be heard was heard. But, my colleagues, it is no hearing if the ears are deaf, it is no executive session writing up the bill if you have to spend your efforts trying to persuade 13 proxies instead of 13 colleagues present and paying attention to the language of the bill.

There is a deadening and dangerous attitude in the Government here in Washington which has us go through the motions of the constitutional legislative process when what truly has occurred is that a very small group of persons in the Executive Department have already made the decisions and written the legislation. We are then just going through the formalities or the ritual, if you please, of a Republican society.

What, indeed, was the purpose of the closed rule? Was it indeed as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said, when he stepped down from the Speaker's chair to exercise his prerogative as a Member to discuss the issue, because it was traditional and necessary to have a closed rule on a piece of legislation like H. R. 1? I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Texas. It is true that tax legislation and tariff legislation have come out under closed rules and, much as I dislike closed rules, there is reason and understanding behind this tradition. The gentleman from Texas gave the reasoning—it is to prevent logrolling. Bitter experiences in the long ago past when taxes or tariffs came out under open rules were called to our attention. But, my colleagues, the Reciprocal Trade Act is not tariff legislation in the true sense of the word. It is procedural legislation setting up the manner in which tariffs are to be written. It is legislation delegating power to the executive branch of the Government and to the Tariff Commission—an arm, I might state, primarily of the Congress. Now in writing procedural legislation there is no reason for a closed rule. Certainly the reasons applicable to tax and tariff legislation have no bearing on procedural legislation. There is every reason why procedural legislation indeed should always come out under a very open rule. Now it is no argument to say that specific tariff or quota amendments could be offered to H. R. 1, because it would have been quite easy for the Rules Committee to have given a rule with that specific restrictive feature in it. No, my colleagues, the reason for the closed rule, in my opinion, is the same as the reason for the closed minds of the majority of the Randall Commission and the closed minds of the acting majority of the Ways and Means Committee. The reason is that these people whose directions are being followed, whoever they are, think that they know what is best for our beloved country, and, I say, perhaps they do. But I say if what they think is best for our country is so surely right why are they unwilling to submit their reasons and their facts to honest study and public scrutiny and true debate?

I personally think that this group, whoever they are, are tragically wrong and in their willfulness truly dangerous to the welfare of our country. Sooner or later the people of this country must rise up and ask that honest forthright studies be made and true debate be had on this matter or else I fear we will end up in disaster.

I think I can bring out these thoughts in discussing the amendment I had proposed to the bill and which the administration spokesmen stated was right in objective, as had the Randall Commission, but so delicate to handle that nothing could be done about it. I hope you will consider it and make up your own mind upon its practicality.

You will notice that the plea for my amendment is largely based upon the same premises professed by those who want H. R. 1, as is, unchanged, that is, to increase world trade, to build the economies of the nations outside the Iron Curtain, to make friends of the people of these nations and to check Communist infiltration into those countries. I charge that the policies we have followed in the immediate past have not increased world trade as it could be increased, have not built the economies of these nations as they should have been built and, indeed, have not generated the real friendship of the peoples of these countries, nor have they stemmed Communist infiltration into these countries.

I had the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress collect some data for me about the countries abroad from which I derive the following conclusions. There are 71 countries outside the iron curtain which we erroneously refer to as the "free" world. Of these 71 nations 49 of them are outwardly or actually dictatorships or close oligarchies and the majority of them cannot even pass under the term benevolent dictatorships. Of the remaining 22 nations, most of them truly have some claim to the adjective "free" as far as their political governments are concerned, but, certainly as far as the economic control of several of them is concerned, it is oligarchic and a small percentage of the nation is living off the backs of the other 99 percent. Fifteen of the dictatorships of the 49 have a per capita gross national product of less than $100. Eleven less than $200; 10 less than $300 and only 2 more than $500. Compare this with the United States per capita gross national product of $2,233 and you begin to get the picture. Of the 22 nations which have some real claim to freedom, eliminating those which are tied up in an economic oligarchy, there is not 1 with a per capita gross national product below $500. And many of them are above $1,000. The highest is Canada with $1,625.

Now I wish we had the studies available of the internal economies of these allegedly free countries just to see what the spread of wealth actually is as far as the bulk of the people of each country is concerned. This is the data we must know if we are truly going to do something to raise the economy of these countries. This is the kind of data the Ways and Means Committee should have been getting and studying.

Surely we should know by now that merely increasing trade with country X which goes into the pockets of dictator Y and his henchmen does not make friends of the people of country X for us. Quite the contrary, the people could say, and with some truth, that we help keep dictator Y on their backs and the Communists you may rest assured play this theme for all it is worth. And a look at the world today should surely tell us that this line has met with some success. "Yank go home" has a basic meaning which we are foolish to ignore and not try to understand.

My amendment proposes reciprocal trade in the purest meaning of that phrase. For, in this plan, reciprocity means that all participants in trade agreements—the nations, the industries and the workers—share the benefits.

It is a simple plan. The exact language of the amendment is as follows:

On page 1 at line 5 after section 2 insert "A"; at line 9 after the period insert the following:

"(B) No reduction in any rate of duty or binding of any customs or excise treatment or other concessions hereafter proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, or under section 5 of this act shall apply to any import within the product class on which the concession has been granted, in the production of which any employee was employed at wages at an hourly rate less than the minimum rate in effect in the United States under section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 sec. 206), at the time of the production of said import provided, that the President may provide by Executive order with respect to a trade agreement that during the first 36 months after such agreement becomes effective it may apply to imports in the production of which employees were employed at less than such minimum rate by the rates prescribed therein which shall be not less than 60 percent of such minimum rate for an initial period of 12 months, not less than 70 percent of such minimum rate for an immediately ensuing period of not more than 12 months, and not less than 80 percent of such minimum rate for the remainder of such 36 months or such part thereof as the President may prescribe.

"(C) The President is hereby authorized to delegate to such Federal official or officials, or agency or agencies, as he deems appropriate all functions incidental to carrying out subsection (B) of this act, and to promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for its administration. The determination of the United States equivalent of wages paid in foreign currencies shall be calculated on the basis of the paying rate on New York as proclaimed by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

"(D) With respect to foreign trade agreements entered into prior to the effective date of this act under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, any reduction in a rate of duty, or binding of any customs or excise treatment or other concession shall be made only in conformity with the policy established in subsection (B) of this act, unless authorized by the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as such provisions existed on January 1, 1955."

But let us translate that a little differently.

In effect, the amendment states that foreign producers who want to reap the lush benefits of the United States markets must qualify by passing on a part of those benefits to their workers by paying wages pegged to the legal minimum wage scale of American workers—the workers with whom they are competing.

It is that simple. It requires no charts or graphs for complete understanding. No high-domed economists are required to explain its operation. It is a 2+2=4 equation.

A CHAIN REACTION OF BENEFITS

The idea embodied in the amendment is simple, but it has the ability of setting off chain reactions that could affect the economic and political welfare of the world. One needs to dwell only briefly upon the far-reaching implications of the amendment to understand the contributions it could make toward perpetuating the American way of life at home, and to disseminating its advantages abroad.

Let us take a look at what happens when you raise the wages of foreign workers so they are more in line with the legal American minimum scale. The chain reaction is something like this:

First. American business and labor get protection from the unfair competition which stems from foreign manufacturers' Dark Ages policy of paying sweatshop wages.

Second. Foreign workers, with their wages increased, have greater buying power, can enjoy a standard of living more like our own.

Third. Foreign manufacturers feel the effects of the increased buying power, find an overexpanding market among the workers who now must spend most of their wages for bare necessities of life.

Fourth. United States manufacturers also benefit from the increased income of foreign workers, finding broader markets for exported goods.

Fifth. Communism, which feeds on the unrest caused by the unfulfilled desires of the have-nots, finds its economic doctrine has little appeal in nations where workers are well paid and share more of the fruits of their own labor.

WILL THE PLAN CHANGE THE FOREIGN PICTURE?

You may ask: "Why do you think the plan would work in foreign countries just because the capitalistic system has proved so successful in raising the living standard in the United States?"

Why not? America's high living standard today is based entirely upon the basic principle provided in the amendment: The principle that only by providing the vast majority means of buying products it produces can a society experience a high level of prosperity.

It might be said that Americans learned this the hard way. Today our workers ride to their jobs in automobiles, while those of foreign lands either walk or ride bicycles. Per capita, our ownership of telephones, radios, televisions is the greatest in the world; Americans enjoy better housing, more food, a greater variety of clothing and other goods than our foreign friends.

But this has not always been so. The system that now spells prosperity has not always existed, nor did it flower overnight. A century ago the disparity between great wealth and miserable poverty was as great here as anywhere. Men were exploited and the fruit of their labor was scant. But gradually, in response to the efforts of far-sighted labor leaders and with the aid of constructive legislation, there emerged a new day when workers began to share more equitably in the goods they produced. There evolved a new way of life. It should be safeguarded; it should be shared.

WHAT KIND OF PROTECTION?

Americans have no monopoly on productive brains and inventive genius. Those who believe that efficient and highly mechanized production techniques are unknown anywhere else should stop deceiving themselves. The truth is that dozens of blue-chip American manufacturers are adopting foreign-developed processes and methods because of their efficiency.

Since foreigners employ the same production techniques and machinery that our manufacturers do, they suffer no disadvantage on a competitive basis—nor do they have any great advantage in production costs, except in the wages paid the people who produce the goods.

"But," you may ask, "can foreign manufacturers afford to meet the United States legal minimum wage?"

The amendment would work no hardship. It does not even insist that foreign manufacturers pay the current United States legal minimum of 75 cents an hour—the amount now held fair in this country for the unskilled services of a messenger boy—much less the much higher wages voluntarily paid by most

American industries. The amendment provides that the first year the plan goes into effect, foreign manufacturers could qualify for trade concessions by paying only 60 percent of the American minimum, and that the scale would rise to 70 percent of the legal minimum wage the second year and to 80 percent the third year.

Does not that seem fair? Is there any reason why a foreign manufacturer, selling in the American market, should not pay at least 60 percent of the American legal minimum wage when he is making products on the same machinery and using the same methods employed by our industries?

America's belief in a high standard of wages is written into law. The Fair Labor Standards Act prescribes that all concerns doing business in interstate commerce must pay a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. The law does not state that only companies located in a high-rent area must pay such a wage. A company located in Mississippi must meet that minimum wage just the same as a company located in New York. The law does not say that only companies who can afford to pay workers 75 cents an hour need pay it. If a concern cannot afford to pay the minimum, it must close its doors, or restrict its business within boundaries of the State.

HOW FOREIGN WORKERS WOULD BENEFIT

Trade agreements based on conventional provisions—those of raising or lowering the rate of tariff—invariably work a hardship on at least one of the participants. Under a protective tariff imposed by the United States, foreign exporters are frustrated in their efforts to expand into our markets; under a low tariff scheme, United States industry suffers.

Under neither plan, however, do any of the benefits go to labor.

Under the plan proposed in this amendment, labor would reap all the benefits. Wages would be increased in industries which make products to sell in the United States. As the income of workers rose and buying power increased, the benefits would be passed on to management.

It took a great American industrialist, Henry Ford, to drive home the logic of that truism—that higher wages created more buyers for his own products. One day he announced he would pay his workers the unheard of minimum wage of $5 a day. The whole idea was denounced as impractical and ruinous. It was prophesied freely that Ford would go broke. In answer to all the criticism, Mr. Ford simply said:

> If I pay my men at least $5 a day, they can buy my Fords.

Perhaps he would have gone broke if it had not been for the labor shortage brought about by World War I. Certainly it is risky business for one manufacturer to be far out of line in his costs with others. But the plan worked, and it gave other manufacturers a new idea. And sales managers suddenly discovered millions of prospects who had more money than that required for subsistence.

Today our supersalesmen of television and radio do not air their pitch at the few who live in high-price neighborhoods, but to the millions who earn their living in factories and offices and live on medium-bracket streets.

One of the greatest fallacies of our day is held by those who advocate giving foreign businessmen even freer access to our markets by yet more reductions in our tariffs. For some unsupported reason they seem to believe the profits will somehow filter down as higher wages and better living standards to foreign workers. Business history has not borne this out. The truth is that the employers, themselves, reap the benefits. Profits of 30 percent and even more are not uncommon. But the workers—the producers—are compelled to subsist on sweat-shop wages, the prey to any arguments made by Communist agitators who hold out hope of improved living conditions.

To conclude, it appears that the solution to many of our problems is simple:

Let any further concessions in United States tariffs be made contingent upon a foreign producers willingness to pay the prescribed percentage of the legal minimum wage which American manufacturers must pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Randall Commission Report said it was too difficult and too delicate a matter to handle. The administration's approach as expressed by its spokesmen before our committee was the same. The Assistant Secretary of State in charge of trade treaty negotiations, statements in executive session before our committee clearly revealed that the State Department does not put the question of labor differential on the agenda for discussion in negotiating our trade agreements.

The Assistant Secretary of State said in answer to my questioning of whether they consider the wage differential in their negotiations: "Oh, yes; we consider it."

I said: "Well, do you discuss it with them?"

He said: "No; we do not discuss it but we consider it."

I said: "How can you consider something if you do not discuss it?"

He had some reply which, frankly, made no sense to me then nor, on reflection, now.

My answer to the State Department is, The only difficulty is that apparently they have done no thinking on the subject and no attempt has been made to find a solution. I think the amendment I propose is practical, sensible, and will produce results. Let them spell out why it is not. I think this amendment, if passed, would be hailed worldwide, even behind the Iron Curtain countries, as the first real indication in some time that the United States is really concerned about exporting liberty and the freedom to pursue happiness beyond her borders. If this is interference with foreign countries' affairs, as the State Department suggests, I say let's have more of this kind of interference and less of the kind of interference we have been indulging in in the past few decades.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I seldom take the time of this House but, upon a few occasions, I have tried to call to the attention of the membership the conditions which are prevalent in my district, the largest coal-producing district in the United States, and which exist throughout West Virginia and, likewise, in the other coal-producing States. There is a written law, however, in the book of Ecclesiastes which says:

> To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven; a time to be born, and a time to die * * * a time to keep silence, and a time to speak.

If there were ever a time to speak, it is upon an occasion such as this when we are considering legislation so vital to the interests and the welfare of our country and its people.

I am sorry that H. R. 1 has been brought before the House under a closed rule, depriving the membership of the opportunity to work its will and its way upon what might very well be the most important piece of legislation we shall consider during this session. During the hearings on this bill, I appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means and urged that amendments be adopted so as to provide protection for our industries and the people who work in them. I also appeared before the House Committee on Rules and asked that H. R. 1 be brought to the House under an open rule. It is here before us under a gag rule.

Today we shall make a decision, and it will be a decision from which we cannot retreat. It is one with which we shall have to live for a long, long time.

Brutus in the great tragedy, Julius Caesar, said:

> There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows, and in miseries.
> On such a full sea are we now afloat;
> And we must take the current when it serves,
> Or lose our ventures.

Today we are upon that very sea, and either we shall pass this legislation which will continue to deny protection to our own people and our industries, or we shall stand with the courage we should have as men and vote to send this nefarious piece of legislation back to the committee, where there can be written into it provisions which will adequately protect our industries and which will terminate, once and for all time, the present setup under which the President is making a joke out of the escape clause.

I have listened to the arguments of those who are in favor of passing this bill in a hurry. I say there is no hurry. The present act does not expire until June. There is plenty of time. Other less important bills have come before this House under an open rule. Why can we not have an open rule upon this most important piece of legislation? We Members of this House should assume the responsibility that is ours under the Constitution and take the time, because so very much is in the balance.

Someone said yesterday that the great John C. Calhoun would turn over in his grave if he could know the arguments

of those Members who were pleading for an open rule, and if he could hear those who were opposed to passing this legislation in its present form.

Now, if we are going to invoke the spirit of those great statesmen who have joined "the innumerable caravan which moves to that mysterious realm," we might detect some uneasy stirrings "in the silent halls of death" and across the years Webster's words which appear upon the wall of this Chamber might fall upon our ears in thunderous tones;

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

But let us not dwell in the dying embers of the past. "No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." Jesus said, "Let the dead bury their dead." I exhort you to "choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood," or the America and the people of today and the days to come.

Those who maintain that H. R. 1 should not be amended make the argument that to amend the bill would endanger the economies of our allies. I agree that our allies must be strong economically if they are to be strong militarily, but I am not in favor of strengthening their economies if by so doing we weaken the economy and the military potential of this Nation.

Who is there in this Chamber today who can assure me that in the event of atomic war, our allies will not proclaim themselves neutral in order to avoid total destruction? I believe that in the event of another war, America will have to, in the final analysis, defend its own shores with its own guns and its own blood. I, for one, am in favor of looking after America's defenses and the economy of this country first, last, and all the time. But I am persuaded to believe that our country's military might is being imperiled as a result of the threat posed to our industrial mechanism by excessive imports of cheap foreign gas.

Our production techniques have been the envy of the world, and in less than 200 years this Republic has become the brightest star in the galaxy of nations. This ascendancy to supreme greatness did not come about by chance. It was the result of God-given resources which could be developed through the wisdom of men and women who placed the welfare of their country above all else. Their vision, their talents, their fortunes, and their patriotism have all blended to give this generation the most wonderful country in any age. But, my fellow countrymen, America's sun may be swept from its zenith to set forever beyond the hills of time if we act carelessly and unwisely during one of destiny's golden moments.

I saw them tearing a building down.
A group of men in a busy town.
With a hey, hi, ho, and a lusty yell,
They swung a boom and the side wall fell.
I said to the foreman, "Are these men skilled,
The type you would hire if you had to build?"
He laughed and then he said, "No, indeed,
just common labor is all I need.
I can easily wreck in a day or two
That which takes builders years to do."
I said to myself, as I walked away,
Which of those roles am I going to play?
Am I a builder who works with care,
Building my life with the rule and square?
Am I shaping my deeds by a well laid plan,
Patiently building the best I can?
Or am I a worker who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?

Through the long years, the American people have built the greatest Nation on the face of the earth, the greatest in any age, and it takes only a day to ruin that magnificent edifice. I sincerely believe that the building is being threatened today by legislation such as the bill before us. Shakespeare, in that eminent work of genius, MacBeth, placed upon the lips of Malcolm these words:

I think my country sinks beneath the yoke. It weeps, it bleeds, and each new day a gash is added to her wounds.

As I think about my great State of West Virginia and the other industrial States of this Nation, I hope that we today will not add to their wounds a mortal blow.

Throughout the coalfields of my State, and of Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and all the other great producers, are idle tipples, idle railroad cars, deserted shafts, and mine after mine closed down. During the past 3 years at least 150 commercial mines have closed in the State of West Virginia, idling thousands of miners. Add to these the thousands who depend on coal for a livelihood—railroad workers, storekeepers, service-station owners, and a host of others, and we begin to get some picture of a real depression in coal-producing areas.

I live in the Beckley area of West Virginia, and in that area alone, the percentage of total employment as represented by mining has declined 43 percent from that of 1 year ago. Practically all of the unemployed are men who are over 45 years of age, with none other than mining experience, a fact which in many instances precludes them from finding employment elsewhere. A recent report shows 3,500 persons a month exhausting their unemployment benefit payments in my State, and many individuals passed this point of exhausted benefits months ago.

On January 1 of this year, 223,847 people in West Virginia were depending upon the Government surplus food commodities for survival, and the figure is increasing at the rate of 10,000 each 2 weeks, I have been informed. School lunch programs have been seriously affected in these mining areas, as more and more children of unemployed workers are forced to depend upon free school lunches. Many requests are being received by teachers for clothing to keep children warm. The situation, in many instances, is desperate, to say the least.

Mr. Chairman, throughout many months, I and other Members of Congress have offered evidence of rising unemployment, hunger, and destitution in coal-producing States. Our arguments have gone for naught. If the attitude we have met continues to prevail, I assume that to offer further evidence would be "love's labor lost." Some may say that the difficulties confronting these people are so provincial as to be excluded from consideration in a program devoted to international trade policies, but there are other aspects of the damaging impact of foreign residual which cannot be looked upon sectional problems. Coal mining and railroading are as essential to the conduct of a mobilization program as are aircraft industries, munitions works, and shipbuilding. Coal mines and railroads cannot survive under a system which demands that they operate like a stop-and-go traffic light—on again, off again, on again, gone again. The caution light is now burning and, unless the rail and coal industries are given consideration in the immediate future, the red light may be on when this Nation's security is in jeopardy and these great basic industries are called upon once more to deliver the goods.

My friends, the time has come when we must think uppermost of the welfare of our native land, and the well-being of its people, the men and women who with their sweat and blood and tears and fortunes have made this country the land of the free and the home of the brave. If we must be our brother's keeper, let us think of our brothers here before we think of our brothers abroad who may or may not be counted upon to help us in our hour of need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman on my left, in charge of the time, permit me to have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, perhaps my thoughts can best be illustrated by Edwin Markham's Parable of the Builder in which he told the story of a certain rich man who had it in his heart to do good. One day he was walking over his broad estate and he came upon a little hut in the valley in which lived a poor carpenter with a large family. The rich man out of compassion summoned the carpenter to his home the following morning and laid before him the plans for a beautiful building. The rich man said, "I want you to build me a house just like this one, over on the mountain, overlooking the sea. I want you to put into it the finest of materials and the best of workmanship, because I want it to be a good house."

With that he went away and left it all to the builder. After he had gone, the builder thought it over, and he said to himself, "This is my chance." So he put into the building the cheapest of materials and the poorest of workmanship, in order that he might have more money for himself. At length the rich man returned. The carpenter walked up to him and offered him the keys, and as he did so, he said, "That is a fine house I built for you over on the hill."

"Good," said the rich man. "I am glad that it is a good house, because I have intended all along to give it to you when it was finished. The house is yours."

The carpenter walked away broken-hearted. How industriously he had been cheating himself. As he walked away, he said over and over again to himself, "Oh, if I had only known that I was building for myself."

Each of us is working on a building. It is the building of America. Shall we build wisely or foolishly? Let us build carefully lest in the end we find, like Edwin Markham's carpenter, when it is all too late, that we have been cheating ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I offer the following poem in no vein of lightness, but, rather, in a spirit of sincerity and deep purpose.

May it leave an indelible impression upon the minds and hearts of all as we prepare to make our decision:

When you get all you want in your struggle for pelf,
And the world makes you king for a day,
Then go to the mirror and look at yourself
And see what that has to say.

For it isn't your father, your mother, or wife
Who judgment upon you must pass,
But the fellow whose verdict counts most in your life
Is the old boy looking back from the glass.

He's the fellow to please, never mind all the rest
For he's with you clear down to the end,
And you've passed your most difficult, most dangerous test
If the man in the glass is your friend.

You may be a Jack Horner and chisel a plum
And think you're a wonderful guy,
But the man in the glass will just say you're a bum
If you can't look him straight in the eye.

You may fool the whole world down the pathway of years
And get pats on the back as you pass.
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears
If you've cheated the man in the glass.

Mr. Chairman, let us not cheat the man in the glass. I urge the Members of this House to support the motion to recommit. If we can recommit H. R. 1, it will be brought out of the committee with adequate safeguards included for the protection of the coal, chemical, glass, and other industries, after which we can conscientiously support the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, during my 15 years in the Congress as a Representative of the 22d District of Ohio, I have supported extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act each of the eight times that it has come before the Congress. I am supporting it again.

President Eisenhower, in his message to the Congress on January 10, 1955, gratified many of us concerned with this Nation's trade when he described his program as "moderate, gradual, and reciprocal." I have often said that I believe in tariff reductions if they are truly reciprocal—if they prove equally beneficial to both signatory parties. Both buyer and seller must gain.

All too few people realize that while the principles of the trade-agreements program are basically international, the application of those principles—as far as my constituency is concerned—is entirely a local matter. In the greater Cleveland area there are hundreds of large and small businesses which manufacture upwards of 1,000 products, a large proportion of which has long been marketed at home and abroad. Thousands of persons find gainful employment in the production of that merchandise and on the periphery of Cleveland we have hundreds of farms. These farmers engage not alone in dairying, and stock feeding, they cultivate their lands and orchards in the production of wheat, corn, apples, grapes, pork, and other crops, of which we in America are at this very hour producing exportable surpluses. To keep our local industries in production, our farms prosperous, it is imperative that we find foreign markets in which to dispose of these products economically and profitably.

This can best be accomplished by trade that is truly reciprocal, where we dispose of our surplus products and accept in payment thereof those products not native to our soil—coffee, tea, bananas, crude rubber, and silk, to name but a few. We need also those products so vital to our defense industries which are in short supply in our country—strategic products such as nickel, tungsten, cobalt, manganese, mica, and many others.

At another point in this statement, Mr. Chairman, I make particular reference to other phases of our national security.

MY STUDY OF THE TRADE ISSUE

It is because the trade issue is so vital to our domestic and foreign economy and to our national security that year after year I have made a separate study of the subject before casting my vote.

Last year, in anticipation of this legislation, I decided to go further in my analysis of world-trade problems. I began a very extensive correspondence with persons throughout the country who are conversant with the problems of trading in foreign countries. My letters read:

MY DEAR MR. ———: For 15 years, as Congressman of the 22d District of Ohio, I have tried to support sound legislation in the Congress that would aid in furthering the economic welfare of the American people. The needs and desires of my constituents in greater Cleveland and my membership on the House Foreign Affairs Committee have made me particularly aware of the need for an intelligent trade policy for the United States.

In preparation for the 84th Congress, I am giving serious consideration to the kind of action the Congress might take in the area of foreign trade. Discussions in the 83d Congress on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act made it apparent that the question of trade and tariffs will come in for some very serious deliberations in the coming 84th Congress.

President Eisenhower will probably renew his request for a 3-year extension of that act and the Committee on Ways and Means is expected to delve into all aspects of our tariff policy. In addition, many reputable national organizations have urged the Government to take forthright action on foreign trade.

For that reason, I am writing to you and a few other experts in the fields of business and international trade to secure your own best thought as to the specific area in your field which might profit most from Federal legislation. I should be delighted to have your opinions and I will give them the most serious consideration, although you know that it is impossible to make any specific commitments as to just what I can do, or what the Congress may do.

It is my feeling that only by intimate and close consultation of this kind can we legislators effectively serve the national interests. I hope I may hear from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Member of Congress.

The 135 replies I received contained the considered opinions of some of the best minds in this country, both pro and con of this vital issue. They were invaluable to my fuller understanding of our foreign economic policy, and in the body of this statement I have drawn freely from these opinions to illustrate my position.

NEED FOR OTHER TRADE METHODS

Mr. Chairman, whereas I offer support of H. R. 1, I feel we should not stop there. H. R. 1 would extend for 3 years the Presidential authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements and—subject to present peril point and escape clause provisions—it gives the President authority to—

First. Reduce selected tariff rates by not more than 5 percent per year for 3 years.

Second. Reduce, by not more than half over the 3 years, the January 1, 1945, rates on articles not now imported or imported in negligible amounts.

Third. Reduce to 50 percent any rates in excess of that level.

However, among those with whom I corresponded an impressive number emphasized the fact that reduction of American tariffs alone would not remove the many serious obstructions which now exist—within and without our borders—to a healthy two-way trade.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest to the distinguished members of the committee that they consider also the many other methods by which we can stimulate international trade to the general advantage of the citizens of the United States.

Let me cite a few:

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION NEEDED

Among the biggest stumbling blocks to our buying from abroad are the customs procedures of our own country. Some of those with whom I corresponded would attack that situation before all others, as Mr. John J. McCloy, chairman of the board, Chase National Bank, wrote:

I also feel very strongly that constructive legislation should be adopted which would have the result of cleaning up the rabbit warren of regulations which importers now have to go through and that more certainly be introduced in the administration of our tariff policies. I think at this stage it is considerably more important than reduction in tariff.

There is a good example of this problem in my own area. Mr. R. W.

Gresham, secretary-treasurer, the A. W. Fenton Co., Inc., points out:

For instance, in our Cleveland customhouse they are presently handling 100 percent more business than they handled in 1946, with 10 percent more people than they had at that time. We have a customs warehouse which is crowded, and in busy seasons merchandise must be held back at freight terminals because it cannot be readily processed. * * * Quarters are so cramped and old-fashioned in the basement of our Federal building that modern mobile equipment is unable to drive up to the customs loading platform to pick up freight and deliver it over the road to importers.

FOREIGN IMPORT QUOTAS NULLIFY TARIFF CONCESSIONS

American exports are frequently more limited by other countries' import quotas than by their tariff rates. As Mr. Arthur S. Armstrong, president of the Cleveland Twist Drill Co., said:

The reason the value of duties levied on manufactured goods is so small is the fact that there is 100 percent embargo on the importation into the United Kingdom of any goods which are manufactured in sufficient quantities within the Commonwealth. This is accomplished by the denial of import licenses for any such goods—a trade weapon not used by our country.

The Committee on Economic Development and others have urged that the President be authorized to exchange reductions in our tariffs for other kinds of benefits to the United States than merely tariff reductions abroad.

DOUBLE TAXATION DISCOURAGES INVESTMENT ABROAD

Then there is the question of American profits made in foreign countries being taxed both in the country in which they are earned and again in the United States. Mr. John W. Houser, executive vice president, Hilton Hotels International, said:

We know from experience that working abroad involves unbelievable problems and a real capital risk. * * * I believe that a great incentive can be created through reduction or elimination of taxes upon possible earning abroad which would offset the hazards and difficulties of engaging in such work.

ANTITRUST LAWS NEED STUDY

There are also the complications of legal requirements. Mr. Leo D. Welch, treasurer of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, writing for himself and for Mr. P. T. Lamont, a director of that firm, pointed out:

The United States investors operating abroad should be protected from undue extension of the United States legal requirements. Where the United States-owned enterprise in a foreign country complies with the requirements of local law, it is hard to see that any additional requirements should be imposed, and it is extremely confusing when these requirements differ from those imposed by the Government in whose area the business is conducted.

Many other businessmen are asking for our reciprocal trade treaties to include provisions which would protect them from the threat of expropriation and other factors which discourage investment.

EFFECTS ON 22D DISTRICT OF OHIO

In my own 22d Congressional District, it is difficult to gather figures which indicate the great extent to which we are dependent upon export business. We produce paint, enamels, automobile parts, and many other items which go into making a complete machine, and this machine is ultimately exported but is never registered as an export from Cleveland.

True, some of our industries are adversely affected by foreign competition, especially those manufacturing bicycles, sewing machines, and—to a degree—steel. But many more companies are buying and selling abroad in large quantities and several businessmen have told me that they depend on foreign trade for their margin of profit. One president of a large Cleveland corporation perhaps oversimplified the problem when he said:

We feel that low tariffs stimulate international trade which, although hurting some specific businesses, is nevertheless in the best interests of the world at large.

A good indication of our dependence upon foreign trade is shown in a recent Ohio industrial study by the United States Department of Commerce. It showed that about 30 percent of Ohio workers are in industries whose export sales on a national basis are more than 20 times as large as the corresponding United States imports; and another 40 percent of Ohio's workers hold jobs in industries which sell to foreign markets from 4 to 20 times as much as imported to this country in comparable goods.

But the maximum effects on Ohio will be in years to come when the great St. Lawrence Seaway will be bringing new markets to our doors and new products for our people. The seaway may transform the whole Great Lakes area into another coastline, and those of us who look toward the future see that our best interests lie in an enlightened world trade policy.

VITAL INDUSTRIES AND NATIONAL SECURITY

But above all else, Mr. Chairman—and apart from considerations of economics and diplomacy—we must safeguard those domestic industries essential to our national security. There is concentrated in the State of Ohio almost one-third of the entire machine-tool industry of the United States—the backbone of any peacetime industrial or wartime armament program. The capacity of this industry has been seriously damaged by gradual reduction in tariff protection and because contractors and industries generally went to Europe to import machine tools during the Korean war.

But representatives of the machine-tool industry tell me they are not opposed to H. R. 1, nor are they requesting tariff protection.

This dire situation can be alleviated through the use of carefully planned Government purchases. The past Congress authorized the Secretary of Defense to grant $100 million in contracts for "long lead time" machine tools which would be required in a national emergency. This equipment—periodically modernized to meet current weapons design—will be held in storage. Having received such contracts the factories will be kept in production. The Secretary of Defense is expected to ask for another $100 million authorization for this year. I urge that he be granted that authority.

But the machine-tool builders are deeply concerned by the implications of President Eisenhower's recent Executive Order 10582 on administration of the Buy-American Act. It would be appalling if the Defense Department felt constrained to buy machine tools from foreign producers solely because their price is about 6 percent lower. Not only would foreign machine-tools plants be in close proximity to the probable enemy, but they would not be able to offer the engineering service which is just as important as the original machine. Machine-tool users must be in constant contact with their builders, for attachments, tooling, and repair parts. We do not go 3,000 miles away to build our fighter planes and neither should we go such a distance for the machine tools which are the seeds from which these planes grow.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the world of today—the world to which the United States must give courage and leadership—is a world of confusion, of turmoil, and dissension. It is a world of insecurity in which there is very real danger, not only for ourselves but for all mankind. It is for us—free citizens of a free land—to open up the way of hope, of high morality, and of unselfish action.

Were there no other reason for broad reciprocal policies in international trade, this alone would be reason enough to go forward in the development of such policies as will give greater opportunity not only to ourselves but to freemen everywhere. This alone gives meaning to our action at this time. The extension of these reciprocal trade agreements is one step along the way.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration—H. R. 1—to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 will probably be the most important legislation to come before Congress this session.

The act now before us not only extends existing law but expands it. The language used in this latter aspect is technical in the extreme. There has been no satisfactory clarification of the meaning of the language given to the Committee. This can therefore mean much or little according to the interpretation that is subsequently given to it in its administration. It can be readily realized that it will be given the broadest possible interpretation as the bill was drawn by those who are interested in having the reciprocal-trade policy given the widest possible use. Therefore the interpretation to be given will be broad rather than restricted.

The language to which I refer reads as follows:

To enter into foreign-trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof containing provisions with respect to international trade, including provisions relating to tariffs, to most-favored-nation standards and other standards of nondiscriminatory treatment affecting such trade, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and to other matters relating to such trade designed to promote the purpose of this section similar to any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no such provision shall be given effect in the United States in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States.

A reading of this new language, inserted into this bill, is sufficient to cause inquiry as to, first, what does it mean; and, second, if it is not intended to change the meaning of the present law, and, which does not contain this particular language, then, why was it inserted in the present act?

The uncertainty created by the language to which I have referred, plus the additional power given to the President to reduce tariffs has created a genuine fear upon the part of some thoughtful persons who see the possibility of expanding the present policy and thereby resulting in harm to some of our industries and the thousands of workers they employ.

The fundamental purpose of this legislation is to make it easier for foreign-produced goods to enter this country. The philosophy that has heretofore prevailed in this country and supported our giveaway program to foreign nations now finds expression in legislation such as this, that would give away our American market to the nations of the world. For several years we have taxed our people and given billions of dollars collected from them to foreign nations. Now we seek to take our consumers market away from our own workers and give it to workers abroad by giving foreign-produced goods easy entrance into our country in competition with our own products.

The result of such a policy is not hard to predict when we consider that foreign wage scales are only one-tenth to one-third of the wages paid in this country for similar work. Our workers should not be expected to compete with the low wages and low living standards that prevail abroad. Our workers cannot succeed in such an unequal struggle without surrendering their higher standard of living, based upon the higher wage scales now enjoyed in this country.

In the very near future in addition to other negotiations, we are to enter into negotiations with Japan for a trade treaty. Upon the list of possible concessions to Japan are such items as textiles, organic chemicals, cameras, chinaware, pottery, glassware, porcelain, optical instruments, fish products, and a great variety of other articles. Any concessions to Japan will, of course, be extended automatically to other countries under the most-favored-nation clause in these reciprocal trade agreements. This latter principle is one of the most unjust principles ever written into law because it gives advantages to others without anything in return. But, as if this is not enough, the bill adds insult to injury by providing a most unique provision, namely, a provision specifically authorizing the United States to grant concessions to third countries in return for their granting concessions to Japan. What logic or reason is there in such a provision? How can such a provision be justified? There is no sound basis to sustain it, and, yet, with the rule that has been adopted in the House by a majority of 1 vote, a member of the House cannot offer an amendment to strike out such a ridiculous provision. What are we coming to in this giveaway program? How long before we awaken to the danger that will confront us if it is not restricted?

The support that is given to this bill would seem at times to be based upon the theory that the United States is blocking the cause of good will in the world by maintaining unreasonably high tariff rates, and therefore we owe it to the world to open our markets to them. It is not true that the United States is guilty of any such practice. An examination of the record will show that since the passage of the original reciprocal trade agreements legislation in 1934, average tariff rates of the United States have been reduced by 70 percent. Already, the United States stands 7th from the bottom of a list of 45 nations with respect to the average level of their tariff structure. Cetrainly in view of this it cannot be said that the United States has not done its fair share already in reducing trade barriers.

Furthermore, an examination of the economies of the European nations will show that they have reached a highly satisfactory condition. Great Britain is reported to have had its best year in history, in 1954, and anticipates even a better year in 1955. West Germany has far exceeded anticipations. Other European countries show similar improvement. The time has come when we should call a halt in the give-away program of America. The giving away of our market to the nations of the world can only result in disaster to the standard of living of our own workers.

It is highly important that we stop and give careful consideration to the adverse effect that legislation such as this now before us can have on our own economy. The time for sentimental considerations, alone, in formulating our foreign policy is fast passing. The time for practical and hard-headed consideration is upon us. Do not let us overlook the necessity of keeping American industry alive if our workers are to be kept at work.

Whatever may be said as to some of the good features of a reciprocal policy, nevertheless, the fact remains crystal clear that there are provisions in this bill that should be changed to protect American industry and our workers. To accomplish this the bill should be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means for further study, clarification, and amendment.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I voted against the rule that would not permit amendments to this proposed legislation. It is my opinion that Members of the House should have a right to propose amendments to this measure whether they are for or against the legislation. If they do not see fit to support such amendments, they can vote them down. I think the House of Representatives should have a right to work its will in dealing with this far-reaching proposed legislation.

When it goes to the other end of the Capitol it will be open for full and complete discussion and debate. Members of this body are just as reasonable and just as fair as the Members of the other body. Suppose it would take a day or two longer. We have no pressing program ahead of us. I think more Members will feel a whole lot better about this situation if they, at least, had a chance to give consideration to amendments that many of us think should be considered.

I would not be misunderstood; I am not one who believes in so-called high tariff walls. I am in favor, however, of protecting the American producer and the American workingman against importations of materials at such cheap prices as to injure their economy and earning power. I had hoped to have a chance to submit an amendment that would provide against excessive imports of crude oil from foreign countries. I know consumption of crude oil is growing in the United States, but not nearly in proportion to the amount of imports from foreign countries.

At the end of World War II, the United States was supplying all but 377,000 barrels per day of the oil which it consumed. It was also exporting oil. Today it imports about 1,200,000 barrels of oil daily.

On the surface this increase in the importation of oil would seem to indicate that the United States is running out of oil, and that it has no choice but to use oil from foreign sources. This is not the case, however. This Nation is today capable of producing at least 1,750,000 barrels of oil each day more than it is producing. This excess capacity to produce, however, comes at a time when the use of foreign oil is at an all-time high.

Much of this increased importation can be explained by the fact that the same firms that are importing the oil, are producing it overseas at much lower costs than are prevalent in this country. Five American firms own or control most of the oil that is brought into this country. Taken together, these firms form a huge international oil-trading group. About 9 out of 10 barrels of their proved reserves are located overseas. Nearly 2 out of 3 barrels of their production lies outside this country. Much of these companies' reserves lie in the Middle East. This oil is within the shadow of Russia.

If this Nation uses more of this imported oil it will at the same time encourage further concentration of control in the hands of a few companies. It will also stimulate increased oil production capability in the Russian orbit. The most disheartening aspect of in-

creased foreign-oil use, however, is that it impairs the capability of the domestic oil-producing industry. Imports have already made serious inroads on markets for domestic oil. Further increases in imports could cause serious and permanent injury to domestic oil exploration activity, and could cause a reversal in the Nation's traditional ability to be self-sufficient in oil.

Independent producers of oil, and incidentally 75 percent of oil explorations are by small independent producers, are not asking that importation of crude oil be entirely suspended. They do ask for a fair chance at the American market. They ask only for reasonable restrictions to protect them in that market.

It hardly seems right that foreign imports be permitted to increase every week and every day. They run at the rate of approximately a million and a half barrels a day. While that is going on oil wells in the great Midwest are throttled to where they are allowed to produce at about 15 percent of their capacity. That cannot be right. It is unfair to thousands of American citizens engaged in discovery and production of oil.

Congress should act to restrain oil imports. It should be done by legislative means. Other methods have been tried and found wanting. Congress, in this matter, is the court of last resort. This Congress should act before it is too late.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I support H. R. 1, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, the question of foreign trade is inexorably intertwined with our foreign policy. In this critical period of history, the United States must be strong, and it is imperative that we be supported in our aims and ideals by nations whose economic structure is sound and whose military power is strong.

The fall of France in World War II allegorically illustrates the futility of the theory of attempting to build strength by the erection of a protective wall.

Behind the wall must be a stable economy. A nation militarily mighty must be buttressed by similarly economically stable and mighty nations who share an affinity for freedom and the dignity of man.

International trade provides the most effective way to improve our relations with other nations on a long-range basis. Military alliances are worthless unless they are augmented by realistic trade agreements benefiting both ourselves and our allies.

Expanded foreign trade is vital to the perpetuation of international peace, and to the peace and security of our own Nation. It cannot be a one-way street. We cannot woo allies on the one hand and erect barriers to their legitimate trade interests on the other. Naturally, they will turn to the nations who are more receptive to their trade problems, and that is handing over to the Communists a victory which they could gain by no other means.

By expanding our foreign trade in a selective and moderate and reciprocal manner, we can actually increase employment in this country while mantaining the friendship and support of our allies.

As the Representative of a manufacturing district, the problem of liberalizing our trade laws has long been of great concern to me. I have searched my conscience thoroughly. I have decided that there are situations which arise in the course of a Congressman's career wherein he must weigh the influences of his immediate constituency against the broader problem of the best, self-enlightened interests of the Nation as a whole.

Although I may be the only member of the Connecticut congressional delegation to have voted yea on H. R. 1, I am convinced that by so doing I am acting in the best interests of my constituency and my State, for in the long run, what we believe to be the welfare of our Nation is our utmost concern, and what most benefits our country, benefits every district, every State, and every citizen in the final analysis.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, the hearings on H. R. 1 among other sources reveal to me great concern by representatives of industry and their workers that the faith and confidence which appellants had in the Tariff Commission has greatly been shaken.

Time and money are required in the preparation of a case to be presented to the Commission and when the matter, after having been presented and studied by the Tariff Commission, is turned down by a majority, then naturally there is disappointment but there is not resentment. It is following the determination by the Tariff Commission when their decision concludes that there is an injury to the industry and the workers in that industry, that the difficulty ensues. Appellants feel that intervening information, which is submitted to the President by the various Government departments after the findings of the Tariff Commission, not only influences the ultimate decision of the President but tends to deny that actual injury does exist as was decided by the Tariff Commission. It would seem that if the findings of fact by the Tariff Commission as to the existence of injury are made conclusive, the faith and confidence which industry should have in presenting cases to the Tariff Commission, will be encouraged.

In 15 cases of the 59 applications for relief since the escape clause procedure was provided, the Tariff Commission found injury or the threat of injury and so reported to the President. There was not, however, the acknowledgment of this injury accepting the factfinding of the Commission that there actually was injury. To me, this acceptance can have a very helpful effect on those who appeal to the Commission, will bolster the morale of the many industries that feel that the provisions of H. R. 1, if enacted and carried out, will definitely cause injury and loss of work before the expiration of the 3-year period provided in this bill even though this may not be the case at present.

In this group are included the employees and manufacturers of bicycles, carpets, chemicals, clocks, fiber fabrics, hats, lace, machine tools, electrical equipment, lead pencils, pins, needles, shears, scissors, toys, optical and surgical instruments, and textiles. Outstanding among these are so-called one-industry communities: for instance, Norwich, where the manufacture of vacuum bottles is the prime industry; Thompsonville, where the manfacture of carpets is the prime industry; and Stafford Springs, where the manufacture of textiles is the prime industry. In these industries are found special skills and I for one want very much to provide for a reservoir of jobs to protect these skills in the event of immediate need in emergency. Continued concessions to manufacturers outside of the United States of like products can eventually lead to the closing of these industries and the loss of the skilled employees who, because they will not be keeping up with their learned trade, would not be available on short notice.

Incidentally, I had proposed an amendment in committee, the purpose of which was to keep these skills and to set up standards which would guide those entrusted with our defense and selection accordingly. Very favorable comments on my idea were made by Secretary Weeks of the Commerce Department who revealed during questioning that the Department is endeavoring to work out a plan along these very lines which I had suggested but because the plan is still being discussed and has not as yet been finalized, it was recommended that my amendment would more properly be attached to the Defense Production Act when the Congress again takes action on that legislation. I proposed the amendment in committee because I was of the belief that protection to these skilled employees, to these industries affected by our national security, really tied in with the trade agreements and an excellent backing was given to me by those who would handle these provisions. Again it was thought more appropriate to have the amendment attached to the Defense Production Act where it would be most effective. I am determined to follow this through and continue to urge as expeditious action as possible, realizing full well that a very short time ago, we had voted for a resolution in connection with the protection of Formosa and the very serious and highly explosive situation that confronts us there.

Let me at this point stress to you, my colleagues, that though my constituents are worried about the effect of present Japanese manufactures on our economy,

they are much more concerned about the products the Japanese will be manufacturing 2 or 3 years hence. I mention this because many of you may have had letters from your constituents informing you that teams of Japanese visited American plants a year ago under the auspices of the Foreign Operations Administration and most carefully examined the machinery in the visited plants. The industrious Japanese are very capable imitators and duplicators and most assuredly they are now making plans and designs of the identical machinery used in our domestic plants and will soon be flooding the market with like products produced at a much lower cost.

Another amendment which I was very happy to support in committee was suggested by my colleague, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman's amendment which he undoubtedly will explain in detail when he speaks on this legislation proposes that any concessions in United States tariffs be made contingent upon foreign producers' voluntary observance of minimum wage laws comparable to those of this country. The increase of pay for foreign workers will give them a better standard of living, will provide moneys to purchase essential goods, and will affect the vast differential between our wages and will help combat communism.

The motion to recommit which has been printed and made available to us provides one outstanding safeguard and assurance which I find is very desirous and imperative and I shall, therefore, mindful of all of those in my State of Connecticut, vote for it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at the close of the debate on the pending bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to congratulate my colleague from West Virginia on his talk before the House a while ago. I thought it was very good and I hope that everyone here listened attentively to it.

May I say in starting my few brief remarks that when I first came to Congress and had the opportunity to vote for reciprocal trade I did vote for the Reciprocal Trade Act. I agree to a great extent with the principles of reciprocal trade as laid down by President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull.

There are lots of Members in this House who would have you believe today that this bill agrees with the principles of Roosevelt and Secretary Hull. But it does not and let me quote from President Roosevelt in 1934 when he was advocating the Reciprocal Trade Act, when this Nation was in dire circumstances and something had to be done to help the distressed areas of the United States:

> The authority must be carefully weighed in the light of the latest information so as to give assurance that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed. The adjustment of our foreign trade relations must rest on the premise of undertaking to benefit and not to injure such interests.

I would like to ask the Members who are advocating this bill today: Is this hurting any of the industries in America today? If it does, it does not then coincide with the statement of President Roosevelt in 1934.

President Roosevelt at that time indicated that it was only an emergency program, stating, "It is part of an emergency program necessitated by the economic crisis," and that the request was, "an essential step in the program of national economic recovery."

I will agree with a lot of the statements made here that we do have some surpluses and that we need to deal with other nations—I agree with that—but I believe if our leaders and the administration would sit down and try to work out a program that would be equally distributed among our industries instead of letting certain industries take all the rap for the benefit of a few, it would be the wise thing to do. And, I believe, if we get the true facts, it will not be denied that 2 or 3 of our great industries are benefiting principally and almost wholly by our reciprocal trade program as we now have it.

Now, we have a Tariff Commission that is supposed to protect our industries. Let me tell you the latest report they have, that we brought in handmade glassware from back of the Iron Curtain in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland, and we did it this past month. Why are we dealing with Communist nations? Because they are outsmarting America. They have to have American dollars to pay their agents who operate in the United States, and when we are dealing with them and buying their products, they are getting those dollars which enables them to send their men in here to help undermine the American Government. I believe this administration should say now, once and for all, that no American dollars shall go behind the Iron Curtain.

Now, our coal industry has been hurt to a great degree. The textile industry has been hurt, and the handmade glass industry has been hurt. We are in an international crisis today. If tomorrow we had to go to war—and who knows, we might because of the Formosan situation—God help us, because we do not have time and distance on our side today. I hope my words will never become prophetic, because if they do, history will record that the Members of the 84th Congress were alerted to some of the dangers that might happen to this Nation, and the administration, with the help of this Congress, has ignored some of those warnings. They have not made one proposal; not one have I seen in the newspapers or heard in the well of this House to help alleviate this situation.

Yes, we have a Tariff Commission, as I said before. Do you realize what some of the articles are on which they invoked the escape clause? Let me give you the instances, and they are only five: the dried fish industry; fur felt hats; hatters fur; filberts or soft-shelled almonds, and, as all of you know, this past year the watch industry. I am not saying that all of them did not need help; no; but we have some basic industries in this Nation today that need help badly. I have yet to see one concrete proposal to help them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill should be recommitted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the program of our Republican President. I am supporting his program. I regret that the ranking Republican of the Committee on Ways and Means, in charge of the time, suggested to me that I should get time to speak from the Democrats. As a Republican, I do not like to accept favors from the Democrats. However, in the face of the incomprehensible attitude of the gentleman from New York, I have no other alternative.

Mr. Chairman, in the last session of Congress, it was my honor to introduce H. R. 8860, a bill to implement the President's foreign trade policy. I stated on the floor of this House then that our primary thought in this, as in all other legislation, must be to serve the best interests of the American people. I am pleased to see H. R. 1 now being considered for passage by this body. As the Members know, I introduced a companion bill to H. R. 1 myself, H. R. 536, on the first day of this session.

Both bills are similar to the original Kean bill, H. R. 8860, of the 83d Congress, second session. They, too, recognize that we must maintain and strengthen our country's industrial might, and that we must maintain the fullest possible employment. They, too, recognize that to do both, we must also do all we can to strengthen our friends in the free world, so that they may enjoy a sufficient measure of economic stability to be able to take rational measures to maintain their freedom and independence, without which they could benefit neither themselves nor us.

I would not want to give anyone the false impression, however, that H. R. 1, because it serves our foreign policy primarily for the benefit of the United States interests, it not a hard-headed business measure. Nothing makes better business sense than to let other nations pay for what they buy by selling their products here. Since 1918 we have been selling much more abroad than we have been buying, over $80 billion more in all. If we do not import the goods of other countries, they cannot continue to buy from us the products of our farms, of our machinery and implement factories, of our chemical, automobile and electrical industries.

Countless industrial, farming, and mining activities depend to a major degree on exports. It can be said accurately that exports are keeping many plants and many farms from closing. Let me quote some facts.

They are based upon 1953 statistics, since the figures for 1954 are not yet available. In that year, our rice growers shipped over half their total harvest abroad. In that year our wheat, cotton,

and tobacco farmers shipped one-fourth of their production overseas. Over one-third of the 1953 raisin and prune crop was exported. These are but a few of many examples that could be cited.

Similarly, American industry has a big stake in export markets. In 1953 we exported nearly 25 percent of our lubricating oil, nearly half of our track-laying tractors, and 1 out of each 10 motor-trucks and machine tools produced. In addition, 9 percent of our anthracite coal, 11 percent of our tinplate, 10 percent of our steel rails, 12 percent of our refrigerators, and 31 percent of our construction and mining equipment found overseas markets last year.

Even small local businesses share in the benefits of a high level of foreign trade, because of the extra purchasing power placed in the hands of workers in export industries.

Of course, import competition does create problems, just as does domestic competition. Yet our industry has grown strong under competitive conditions, and the tremendous and still growing productivity of United States labor has usually been more than sufficient to offset lower wage standards in other countries. In any event, industries threatened with serious injury from imports have powerful machinery in existence to protect their interests. I refer to the peril-point and to the escape-clause provisions.

Many of you have asked why I feel so strongly about this bill. I do feel strongly about it. I feel strongly about it because of my deep conviction that all of us stand to gain from increased international trade. As I stated in the summary of my speech introducing H. R. 8860 in the last session, our gains from that increased trade can be counted under five different headings:

First, as taxpayers, because more imports help reduce the need of other countries for our aid;

Second, as consumers, because we can then purchase foreign-made goods that we need;

Third, as producers, because imports help foreigners earn the dollars they need to buy more American goods which they need and want but cannot afford;

Fourth, as investors, because increased dollar earnings by foreigners selling to the United States means more chance for profitable American investments abroad;

Fifth, as American citizens, because increased international trade creates a stronger free world, and so contributes to the possibilities for maintaining world peace.

Often I find myself wondering just what opponents of this measure fear. My constituency is in a portion of New Jersey that serves as home for many thousands of workers. I would not think of sponsoring a measure such as H. R. 1 if I felt it would react to their disadvantage.

In this connection I have fully satisfied myself that the administration will seek a tariff reduction formula that will have little impact on industries now faced with heavy foreign competition.

The administration intends to proceed cautiously, always keeping in mind the best interests of the country in using any of the discretionary powers that this bill might give to the President. The President himself has characterized the program as moderate, gradual, and reciprocal. The authority of the President would still be subject to the present peril-point and escape-clause provisions. We have been assured by the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce that, in Secretary Dulles' words:

> It is the administration's intention to exercise powers contemplated by the bill in such a manner that the legitimate concerns of United States business will be fully taken into account.

In view of these assurances, I am completely satisfied that the administration will not attempt to breach peril points. As a matter of fact, no President since the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 has breached a peril point. The one time that there was some question about a possible breaching of peril points, President Truman sent a special message to the Congress to inform it of the action taken with respect to petroleum products in the signing of a trade agreement with Venezuela, and justifying such action in the light of the situation prevailing.

Now for those of us who fear the discretionary powers given the President on this point, I want to underscore the fact that Congress was fully informed in that one case where a peril point might conceivably have been pierced, even though the Tariff Commission was evenly divided in its finding, and therefore the President may reasonably have considered himself not bound by the provisions of the act to inform the Congress. In other words, the President leaned over backward at that time to fulfill not only the letter but the spirit of the peril-point provision. We have the solemn word of this administration that it will do the same.

I am opposed to the proposed motion to recommit this bill which was outlined by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] on yesterday.

Members are being asked to support this recommittal on grounds that only minor changes will be involved. The changes proposed are not minor.

The proposal is to make the Tariff Commission's findings binding on the President, not only their findings of fact but their evaluation of these facts and their judgment as to whether an industry has been seriously injured by increased imports due to a tariff concession.

Of course the Tariff Commission's findings of the facts as to the amount of imports, their percentage as compared with the American production of such a product, and so forth, should be final.

But what the recommittal motion seeks to do is very different. It seeks to make final the evaluation of these facts by the members of the Tariff Commission. This is a question of judgment by that body, not merely factfinding. Such judgment is a question of opinion, which is quite a different matter.

We must also note that if the recommittal motion becomes law, the President must increase duties under the escape clause unless the national security is at stake. He canot give consideration to his judgment as to the national welfare.

Evaluation as to the facts of such an increase should be done from the widest viewpoint. Only the President is charged with responsibility for the national welfare. Only he is responsible for the balancing of all interests at issue in a controversy, including the wider interest of the Nation in achieving foreign policy objectives and expanded foreign markets for farm products, minerals, and manufactures—without doing serious injury through import competition to established American business interests.

The responsibilities of the Tariff Commission in evaluating the facts are much more restricted, being limited almost entirely to a judgment as to the injury that could be done by imports.

The Tariff Commission, even if charged by law with wider responsibilities, could not and should not be expected to do the job now done by all the other executive agencies in advising the President of the effects of any proposed measure. The Secretary of the Treasury, for example, may submit an evaluation to him concerning the costs and revenue effects of a proposed change in the tariff law, in the light of budgetary plans; the Secretary of Agriculture would describe its effects upon our plans for disposing of agricultural surpluses abroad; the Secretary of State may advise the President of its effects upon our international commitments and our foreign policy objectives; the Secretary of Commerce, on the other hand, may comment on the relative and long-run effects of the proposal on all domestic producers and upon United States business activity as a whole. Often the many aspects of a problem thus presented call for difficult and soul-searching decisions as to which considerations must be given greater weight in arriving at a solution which is best for the people as a whole. Only the Chief Executive is responsible for, and should be expected to make such decisions under our form of governmental organization.

We cannot afford to recommit this bill now. All the nations of the free world are following these debates tensely to see whether the President is speaking for our country or only for himself when he speaks of the vital need for expanded international trade, and of the reciprocal tariff reductions that the United States is ready to enter into with other like-minded nations. We should pass this bill as it stands for, in President Eisenhower's words, it "can add immeasurably to the security and well-being of the United States and the rest of the free world."

This is the program of our Republican President. I am supporting his program. I regret that the ranking Republican of the Ways and Means Committee, in charge of the time, suggested to me that I should get time to speak from the Democrats. As a Republican I do not like to accept favors from the Democrats. However, in the face of the incomprehensible attitude of the gentleman from New York I have no other alternative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman in his remarks used the words "national welfare, national security" and I will add national interest. Does he distinguish between those words?

Mr. KEAN. Yes, I would. I would think national security had chiefly to do with our national defense.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Would you say that national security includes national interest?

Mr. KEAN. Well, that is something for the lawyers to decide.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Would you say that national security includes national welfare?

Mr. KEAN. Not necessarily, but again that is something for the lawyers to decide.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman referred to the fact that the various departments of the Government including Agriculture, Commerce, and so on passed on their comments regarding the rulings of the Tariff Commission. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the lead-zinc hearings, which were held before the Tariff Commission, there was a finding that the industry was in a distressed condition, and that relief should be granted.

Mr. KEAN. Which industry was that?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The lead-zinc hearings. I am informed when the matter went before the various executive branches of the Government, each branch of the Government backed up the finding of the Tariff Commission with the execption of the Department of State, and yet the President followed the advice of the State Department alone and refused to follow the Tariff Commission.

Mr. KEAN. Because he believed it was for the national welfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, in statements on the floor of the House and before the Ways and Means and Rules Committees, I have argued that tariff rate negotiations should not be made a pawn or a bargaining point in international politics.

Rather, they should be based solely upon economic conditions existing in the countries involved and should be equitable from the standpoint of the importing country and our American economy.

The bill before us today does not provide for an equitable approach to the tariff problem from the standpoint of American industry, labor, and agriculture.

I cannot go along with the idea of making further American tariff reductions, even indicating to the rest of the world that we can absorb their surplus production.

Year after year we have been a world leader in reducing tariff rates to a point where, at the present time, United States tariff rates are among the very lowest in the world—5.1 percent on the average.

By contract, 37 other countries maintain higher tariff rates than the United States.

But that is only half the story. On top of higher tariff rates, many other countries maintain import license systems, quotas, currency restrictions, monopolies—and various other devices which decrease or actually prohibit sale of American products on their markets, despite the existence of so-called reciprocal trade agreements.

For example, the United Kingdom imposes a tariff rate amounting to 25.6 percent on the average, including revenue duties. In addition, imports of most goods are limited under quotas; licenses are required on imports; dollars are controlled and special low tariffs are allowed Empire goods.

A perfect example of how these embargoes work is the case of motorcycles. A few years ago the British duty was reduced under a reciprocal-trade agreement with this country. It sounded good. But, under their import license system, no American-made motorcycle may be sold on the British market—even though their motorcycles are flooding the American market under the low-rate tariff agreement.

Similar restrictions are imposed in varying degree on lumber products, TV sets, home appliances, bicycles, dresses, cosmetics, and numerous other items.

France, with an average tariff rate of 10.6 percent, maintains strict quota and import license regulations.

Mexico, on top of a 20.6 percent tariff rate maintains quotas, permit regulations, and recently has levied heavier tariffs on things like handbags, wines, sewing machines, and tobacco.

In Japan trade restrictions make trouble for United States merchants. Tariff rates are high in many cases: 50 percent on watches, 40 percent on toys and phonographs, 40 percent plus a 30 percent tax on United States automobiles.

It is very apparent that United States tariffs are much less than the world average. Maybe we are overselling some of our products. Perhaps thought should be given to the curtailment of excess exports with a view of encouraging foreign countries to produce for themselves which would help to balance trade.

Very few American producers enjoy import quotas or restrictions. Cotton is one, imports of which are limited to 1 percent of domestic production under section 22 of the Agricultural Readjustment Act. This bill continues the protection to cotton in relation to trade agreement negotiations.

The answer to the trade problem does not lie in the relatively simple approach of reducing American tariff rates which, in many instances, are already dangerously low. While the request for further reductions may seem slight, it may mean a shutdown of some of our industries and a further expansion of unemployment.

As Americans, we are justifiably proud of our standard of living. American industrial workers receive an average of $1.83 an hour, based on December 1954 figures.

In Japan, the hourly wage is 19 cents; in France, it is 46 cents; in the United Kingdom, 47 cents; in West Germany, 44 cents; and so on.

Domestic producers cannot compete with products from cheap labor areas because, largely due to United States aid and assistance programs, other industrial nations now have machines as modern and efficient as any we have and for the most part their workers are just as skilled as ours.

Without protective tariffs, the end result will be the tearing down of our hard-earned wage standards.

Unfortunately, that condition is existing right now in many sections of our country. Our domestic economy cannot stand the loss of jobs in industries such as lumbering, fishing, viticulture, horticulture, bicycles, crockery, glassware, textiles—and many others.

In my own district—the First Congressional District of California—the price of domestic crabmeat has been driven to such a low point by imports that it is almost financially impossible for fishermen to operate. Several plants have already closed down, and others are threatened.

Many of those people, losing their jobs because of low tariffs, will have to be supported by the Government in the form of unemployment insurance or relief. Meanwhile the Government will lose the income tax which these workers would normally produce, and the investments in plants and equipment will become a total loss. Just how unrealistic can we get?

The obvious answer is that no reduction should be made, or even contemplated, in the crabmeat tariff, especially in view of the fact that 60 percent of the crabmeat consumed in this country is imported from Japan.

Certainly, 60 percent from a given country is a very liberal concession.

Workers in the wine industry are similarly threatened. They do not oppose importation of high-grade, quality wine with which they are in a more competitive position on the domestic market. It is the low-grade surplus wines flooding local markets under low-tariff rates which are creating havoc in the industry.

We have the same condition in plywood. In 1951, despite protests and facts presented by myself and others before the Tariff Commission, the State Department entered into trade negotiations with 17 foreign countries and brought about a 50 percent reduction in the tariff on imported plywood.

Another inequitable instance concerns hardboard. One of the largest hardboard plants in the country is located at Ukiah, Calif. It provides the main payroll of this community—a payroll which is now threatened by imports. Hardboard has been erroneously classified under the Tariff Act as a paper prod-

uct. We are attempting to have it reclassified as a wood product which it actually is. Canadian producers have been fighting this change because they export hardboard under the paper products classification and thus benefit from 7½ to 15 percent tariff rate. If reclassified, hardboard would come under the 16⅔ percent wood tariff schedule—still considerably below the Canadian tariff of 22½ percent on American-produced hardboard.

I most certainly am not against trade between friendly nations of the world. I believe it to be a healthy thing. However, I do firmly believe that too much emphasis is being placed on international politics in respect to trade agreements and that American industries and job opportunities are being needlessly sacrificed.

Tariff rates should be based wholly on the findings of a bipartisan Tariff Commission. After receiving testimony from representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture, the Commission should announce peril-point findings—based on economic conditions as they exist. Those findings should be final and if they are to be varied in any manner it should not be done without prior congressional approval.

In this way the constitutional responsibility of Congress in determining trade policies would be maintained, and adequate protection should thereby be accorded our economy.

Certain American industries have established manufacturing plants in many countries of the world. When they get into full production, employing people living under an economy substandard to ours, then the impact is inevitable and will spell ruin to our American standard of living.

We had better take a new look, and establish a policy in international trade of live-and-let-live. America, with 7 percent of the world's population, cannot absorb the surplus from 93 percent of the world producers. It would be better if we would be more realistic and curtail some of our exports. As long as we send high pressure salesmen throughout the world preaching the philosophy that all people should have the same standards which we enjoy, without their having earned those standards, we shall be adding to the chaos and continue to expand the jealousy of the other nations toward the United States—thereby encouraging international turmoil.

Congress cannot ignore its constitutional responsibility. It is our duty to regulate trade. The Tariff Commission should be responsible to the Congress, and trade agreements made should be based on economics and not placed in the hands of the State Department to be used in the field of international politics.

I trust that the recommittal motion strengthening the peril point and escape clause is adopted by this body.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the arguments brought forward in defense of free trade are admirable. We all realize that in the past, economic barriers have, in many cases, lead to a difficult situation. Unreasonably high and unfair tariffs have fostered illwill and created tensions throughout the entire world. These tariff walls have prevented the flow of goods and services to many areas that were in dire need of them. Unnecessary tariffs have created islands of prosperity surrounded by a sea of poverty and abject want. And the moralist often shouts that many tariffs are the products of selfishness and greed. But these are all arguments against high tariffs. The cold facts are that the United States is no longer, by any stretch of the imagination, a high-tariff country. On the contrary we are among the lowest of tariff countries. In fact, we rank 7th from the bottom on tariff rates.

My concern of H. R. 1 is not on the grounds that there should be a general increase in tariff rates. We all recognize that in selective areas further reduction in existing tariffs might be to the advantage of our entire economy. To permit such adjustments is of course the overall objective of H. R. 1.

My concern is that any tariff policy of the United States should at least place foreign producers, having lower costs, in a reasonably comparable competitive position with efficient domestic producers. Such a policy certainly should not discriminate in favor of foreign products.

My concern is in connection with the effectiveness of the provisions of H. R. 1 for safe-guarding domestic industry and local workers from injury during expansion of world trade. Such protection from serious injury is supposed to be provided through the peril-point and the escape-clause provision of the bill. These provisions in H. R. 1 are the same as were carried in former legislation.

The peril-point and escape-clause provisions are rather technical and cumbersome, but I will try to state simply what they are and how they are supposed to work.

The peril point provides that before any reduction in a tariff rate on a specific product can be made, the President must obtain the advice of the Tariff Commission as to the point below which it believes a reduction could not be made without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industries producing the product. Such a point, designated by the Commission, is the peril point.

Should a tariff concession in any trade agreement made by the President under this legislation result in serious or threatened injury to a domestic industry, the concession may be withdrawn or modified in accordance with a provision known as the escape clause, which must be included in every agreement.

To use the escape clause, any interested party, by petition, may request the United States Tariff Commission to make an investigation and report to the President whether or not a concession has caused or threatened serious injury to a domestic industry.

To date, the use of the peril point, and the escape clause, has not provided the mechanism whereby domestic industries and workers have been sufficiently protected.

Since the institution of the escape clause in 1948, there have been 59 applications for relief to the Tariff Commission. In 15 of these cases the Commission found injury, or the threat of injury, and so reported to the President. In just five of these cases has the President taken action. These were: Women's fur felt hats and hat bodies, October 30, 1950; hatters' fur, January 5, 1952; dried figs, August 16, 1952; alsike cloverseed, June 30, 1954; watches, movements, and parts, July 27, 1954.

Among serious criticisms of the present "escape clause" provisions are the fact that proceedings before the Tariff Commission are lengthy, involving exhaustive hearings, and are often too expensive, especially for smaller industries. And further, the Commission may reach a decision on other evidence which was not presented in the hearings, thus not giving the interested industries an opportunity of rebuttal. And further, the domestic industries have no appeal from the findings-of-fact of the Commission, nor are such findings conclusive or binding on the President.

Yesterday, during consideration of the rule, I supported the attempt to amend the rule to permit amendments to H. R. 1, in a hope of strengthening the necessary protective mechanism of this legislation. I sincerely hope that under the rule permitting amendment only by the Ways and Means Committee, that action will be taken to correct these deficiencies. I will support any such amendment.

Over 3,000 American workers at Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Crystal City, Mo., have the specter of unemployment hovering over their families because plate glass importations have risen alarmingly in the past few years. The plate glass industry, which is so vital to the economy of Jefferson County, gets a greater adverse impact from foreign imports than do many other industries.

According to a report prepared by the Department of Commerce, the importation of plate glass in 1937 was 2,060,000 square feet. This figure has risen to 26,876,000 square feet by 1953. Yet, exports of this product, which totaled 3,281,000 square feet in 1937, has increased to only 15,961,000 square feet as compared with 26,876,000 square feet of plate glass imports in 1953.

If this trend persists, what is to become of the American plate glass industry? What is to become of the tens of thousands of glass workers and their families throughout the country? Will they, in the words of a high Government employee, "have to go South in the winter"? These are questions that are a burning issue with these affected workers.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the consideration of this bill has suffered because of extreme statements made by both those who support it and by those who are opposed to it. The problem of trade arrangements, we must acknowledge, is an extremely complicated one. Those who oppose this measure and those who seek to modify

the trade program are, I am sure, as sincere in their intentions and as concerned about the general welfare of our nation as those who support the program. I do not believe that we should approach it by distinguishing its supporters as men concerned with the national interest and its opponents as men from groups worried about some particular product or some particular segment of their industry in the manner of Mr. Charles Taft before our committee.

The extremist opponents of reciprocal trade state that it will ruin the American economy. On the other hand, supporters of the bill in some cases have made statements which, in my opinion, attribute greater power and significance to the trade program than it deserves. President Eisenhower, for example, has said that "if we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all. Our domestic employment, our standard of living, our security, and the solidarity of the free world— all are involved." Other members of the administration spoke in a similar vein. The same tone prevailed in statements by the Administration's Committee on Foreign Economic Policy and the Committee for a National Trade Policy. The passage of H. R. 1 is neither a great threat to American industry, nor is it a final answer to international economic problems.

"Trade not aid" was a widely used slogan in the campaign of 1952 and has been continued in use since the election of that year. Through the use of this slogan and accompanying statements, the impression was given that the mutual assistance and aid programs previously carried out under the Democratic administrations were somehow unjustifiable, if not unnecessary, and implied also that a trade program was a possible alternative. As a matter of fact this was not the case. The economic conditions of the nations of Europe in the immediate postwar years were not such as to permit the exchange of commodities of equal value. The labor forces of these countries were severely reduced. Much of their livestock had been destroyed and their whole agriculture set back. Their capital goods, machines, and factories were in many cases destroyed and generally worn out. These nations could not engage in international trade by exporting surpluses since, except for a few commodities, they had no surpluses. What they needed was not trade opportunities, but an aid program such as was provided. The economies in most of these countries has improved to a point where the aid program can be reduced. This is not true in every case. A slogan "Trade and aid" would better describe what is needed in international economic policy today. Countries such as India, for example, do not need foreign markets for their goods in any absolute sense, for India's present production is wholly inadequate to meet the potential needs of its own people. India does not need technical advice—there are Indian engineers and technicians—so much as it needs capital goods to make a reality of the plans of these engineers and technicians.

Certainly, to the extent possible, it is desirable that we receive a fair return for what we export to other peoples. I think it is true to say also that the people of foreign countries and their governments prefer such an arrangement to one in which we give to them direct aid.

In these past 20 years in which we have had a reciprocal trade program, particularly in the period since World War II, there has occurred what has been described as a revolution in world trade. There has been a reshuffling of the commodities being imported and exported by the different nations and areas of the world. The days when the United States and Europe were mutually interdependent are gone. The fact is that the European nations, as well as the Japanese, now export goods which we no longer want to buy and which in fact compete with our own products. The advantages for the most part are relative ones resulting from the fact that one nation or the other may be able to produce particular articles more economically than the other. This duplication of products by the United States and the countries of Europe existed even before World War II. Commerce in that period was principally through the medium of third countries: the United States selling in Europe; the Europeans selling in Latin America or Asia; and the United States in turn receiving such things as rubber, tin, coffee, and similar commodities from these countries.

In recent years even the so-called backward countries have pursued the path of economic independence and have made great strides toward achieving such independence. The development of industries in other parts of the world has altered trade patterns and to some extent has driven us economically apart from our allies, particularly in Western Europe. Yet while we have been separated from our allies economically, we have become increasingly involved with them strategically in view of the threat of Soviet aggression.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, appearing before our committee, pointed out that it was a part of the administration's policy to establish abroad plants which would produce materials which are important in war and which are difficult to transport. The particular example he cited was that of munitions. As this principle is applied to other needs either by our own policy or by the policy pursued by allied nations, economic interdependence will be even further reduced. We cannot expect a trade policy to carry the whole burden of responsibility for carrying out the strategic demands of the day. Not all of our allies are able to bear in every respect a proportionate share of military preparedness. In some cases the most strategically located country may be the least able by virtue of the weakness of its economy to support defense facilities. In these cases, obviously trade will not solve the problem. On the other hand, an economically strong nation may not be so located as to be of particularly strategic value. In this case other arrangements and agreements are called for. The theme is mutual defense.

Trade policy must be a part of our over-all policy. In practice there have been indications that the Administration realizes this. However in public utterances and in declaration of program and policy, this fact has not been clearly admitted. There has been a tendency to publicly over-simplify the problem as well as the solution. The simple proposition of "Trade not aid" is not adequate in the complexity of international economic and political relations today.

The tariff as an instrument of international trade control is not as effective today as it was 20 years ago. One writer has described the tariff as an economic "tank or artillery piece in the day of atomic warfare." The reduction of tariffs is not expected by economists to stimulate trade to any great extent. The English economist Julian Amery said that it is not at all "certain that Europe would greatly increase her dollar earnings even if the American tariff would be drastically reduced and simplified." Since the present bill contains no provision for any drastic reduction, it seems we must anticipate the limitations of its effects on international trade.

If the trade changes likely to result from putting into effect the program permitted by the passage of this legislation are not likely to have any significant effect on international trade, neither are they likely to greatly injure American industry as has been suggested by some of the opponents of this bill. The overall effect is likely to be slightly advantageous to American industry. In their testimony the representatives of segments of certain industries generally did not take into account the overall position of their industry in international trade. For example, the chemical industry is producing goods at an annual rate of $20 billion. For the first 9 months of 1954, exports were running at an annual rate of $894 million excluding special military items. For the first 9 months of 1954, imports of chemicals were running at an annual rate of $242 million. This import figure is just a little over one-fourth of chemical exports, and it is a very small fraction, as you can see, of the total production of the chemical industry. This total picture indicates that the United States chemical industry has fared well in international trade. Spokesmen from the electrical industry also opposed this bill. Again the record shows that the production of this industry reached seventeen billion in 1953; its exports were eight hundred million, and its imports slightly over $50 million—approximately one-third of 1 percent of the total production and less than one-tenth of the exports of electrical goods and equipment. Similarly the cotton industry in 1953 produced 10 billion square yards of cotton goods, exported over 600 million square yards, while only 45 million square yards were imported.

If trade relations were so changed as to seriously interfere with the export of these goods, it is quite possible that former exporters as efficient producers would concentrate more intensely on the domestic market and that the position of some of the firms, especially those asking for tariff protection, would be

even more seriously endangered by the intensified competition from other American producers.

The fact that the general evidence indicates support for this program does not excuse us from attention to the difficulties of industries which may be particularly hard hit. We must not subordinate considerations of social welfare and of the measure of stability in society to a purely economic question and consideration. Efficiency is not the only standard for the conduct of human affairs or of political affairs. When decisions with regard to international trade are made principally on the basis of national policy or international policy, a particular industry and the employees of that industry should not be called upon to bear the whole cost and to suffer all the consequences. But, rather, this cost should be borne by the whole of the American political community. It was not within the jurisdiction of our committee to consider all of the actions that might be necessary in order to provide an adequate program to take care of this difficulty. In my opinion, however, the administration should give attention to this problem and should propose a comprehensive program involving legislation in addition to the trade program. Such a program should include proposals for a more adequate unemployment compensation, reeducation of workingmen, relocation and rehabilitation of industrial areas, and encouragement of reinvestment in areas which have been particularly affected by international trade policy or by drastic changes within our own domestic economy. The need is for a comprehensive program which is adjusted to the needs of our own time. We have come to realize that we cannot conduct our international affairs according to the methods of the last generation. I think that we should also realize that perhaps the reciprocal trade program which was good 20 years ago may be somewhat outdated today.

The greatest fear of Europe in recent years has not been over our trade policy, but rather over the state of our own economy. Statistics on international trade for the United States show that our foreign trade comprises about 7 percent of our gross national product. This percentage has held fairly stable despite the condition of recession, readjustment, depression, improvement, prosperity, or stability in our economy. Economists and business people alike are generally agreed that the best hope for an increase of imports and exports depends on the continuously expanding economy in the United States itself. Imports and increase of international trade would likely to be encouraged more from full employment and a nearly 100 percent operation of our American economy than from the passage of H. R. 1.

If we proceed from the best year to the second best year, and from that to the third best year or worse, international trade is likely to suffer despite any action to liberalize trade policy. The successful conduct of foreign policy generally and the American effect upon international economic affairs depends upon the health and vitality of our own economy. There is a danger that through progressive moderation we may get back normalcy. I will say that normalcy is synonymous with mediocrity. In times such as these our response must be, I think, somewhat above the level of the mediocre.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In respect to what the gentleman says about the possible effect of the bill on international trade, is it not possible that as a result of the action of the Congress this bill is changed so as to make it possible to more sharply limit the trade by increasing certain tariffs, there will be some check upon international trade as it existed without the possibility of increases in amount?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that the bill provides adequate controls and adequate checks to give the protection which is justified and demanded by American industry. There is no reason to believe, either on the basis of the language of the bill or the actual international trade situation that any great increase in trade will result.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, thousands of my constituents engaged in the textile industry are terribly concerned about what we do here today. Inasmuch as we cannot amend the bill under the closed rule, I am hoping that the recommittal motion will offer to that great industry, an essential industry, and its workers, some measure of hope and comfort.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] for providing a recommittal amendment that will come up later. I had hoped that we might go farther, but it appears that that is about the best solution and probably offers the best opportunity to bring some aid to distressed industries throughout this country.

I should like to take the very few minutes I have to discuss very briefly the effect on the independent oil industry that has come under our present program with respect to reciprocal trade. It is well known that we have not been able to get any relief, though we have tried for the last number of years. I should like to bring to the attention of this Congress the fact that about 90 percent of foreign oil is controlled outside of Russia by 5 or 6 of our big, major companies here in the United States; that they are devoting more attention to foreign oil now, with greater reserves, than they are to the domestic trade. So, we must rely more heavily on the independent oil industry of the Nation.

I should like also to point out that we have been trying to get a limitation of oil imports for a number of years. It might surprise the Members of the Congress to know that at the close of World War II we were importing only about 300,000 barrels of oil a day. The figure has gone up precipitately until we are importing 1,065,000 barrels a day and the major companies, all with their headquarters in the United States, have projected their figures for imports for the coming 6 months of this year to about 1,250,000 barrels of oil a day, an increase of over 400 percent. They have failed to cut back imports even though they have at times indicated they would do so. They will not cut back imports voluntarily in the future.

The result has been a compelled cutback of local production monthly and yearly, for lack of consumer demand, and we shall have to continue to cut back and to cut back and to lay off hundreds of thousands of men, and at the same time taking away from the Federal Treasury many millions of dollars which otherwise would be brought in taxes into the Federal Treasury, if the independent oil industry of this country were permitted to produce and expand in a normal way.

I think the question of national defense has a very important place in our consideration. We know that at the beginning of World War II our reserves were greater, of oil above the ground and oil known to be ready for production, than they are today. We know that the submarines then cut off much of the importation of foreign oil. We know that had we not been strong and virile in this country in production by independents, as well as by the majors, we would have been in very dire circumstances at that time. We are in a worse position today than we were then. The world is uneasy. We might be driven quickly into another world war. Then we would find that in the last few years we have been placing too great a dependence on foreign oil. We would find great swarms of submarines developed by Russia and other countries in cooperation with her sinking oil tankers greatly reducing, and perhaps almost cutting off from our country, the necessary oil and oil products that we must have. We know that the trucks and tanks of the Army, and the planes of the Air Force that will girdle the earth, and the ships of the Navy that will prowl the seas, if we get into another war, all necessary if we are to succeed, are powered by oil and gasoline. We know, in addition, that we have suffered a serious economic impact. For instance, in my own district—and I am speaking today for three States, known as the tri-State area—the situation is this. At the close of the war we were producing over 500,000 barrels of oil a day. Now, with an extended reserve, we are only producing about 250,000 barrels of oil a day. The rigs are being stacked. The men are being laid off. All over the United States, wherever we find a great oil-producing area, they are suffering from the same economic impact. And we are suffering from the same danger to our national defense if we should have the bad luck of finding ourselves someday thrust into another war.

We cannot say that this is a trade-instead-of-aid proposition, because two-thirds of the oil that is coming into this country is coming in large part from Saudi-Arabia, one of the richest nations per capita in the world; from Venezuela, which is a very rich nation per capita compared with ours. We cannot say that this comes under the trade-not-aid proposal. It is just as simple as that.

There are many other industries throughout the United States that need protection. We have found by experience that the escape clause has not worked sufficiently to give relief to those various industries that are in distress, when we have given away something like $50 billion to help rehabilitate those countries and now they are in competition with us.

I think it is time that this Congress go as far as it can by adopting this recommittal motion and give some aid to our own people, rather than, after giving away $50 billion, continue to give away our markets to foreign countries. I hope this body will approve the recommittal motion that will give some additional aid to domestic industries that are in distress.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the opposition expressed by a great many members of this House to the gag rule now in effect on H. R. 1 reveals the feeling on the part of a great percentage of the American people that this legislation should be open for amendments.

I opposed the gag rule yesterday, and shall vote to recommit the bill. If the motion to recommit the bill fails, I shall vote againt H. R. 1 on final passage because the interests of American wage-earners are not protected.

After all, it is only through appropriate amendments that the jobs of American wage earners can be protected.

As the printed hearings on H. R. 1 will show, a long list of Members of Congress as well as spokesmen for numerous industries appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee pleading that H. R. 1 be amended in order that relief might be provided to many of our basic industries which have suffered because of the unfair competition resulting from a flood of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

Many Members of Congress who appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in protest against the damaging effects on the jobs of American wage earners resulting from reciprocal trade agreements have supported the principle of reciprocal trade in previous Congresses but to use their own words—they could not continue to do so any longer unless appropriate amendments were adopted.

When I first came to Congress in 1939 I opposed reciprocal trade agreements on the grounds that they were destroying the jobs of coal miners in my congressional district in Pennsylvania. At that time, imported Russian coal had captured some of the eastern seaboard coal markets from coal producers in my congressional district.

During the early part of World War II and before resigning my seat in Congress to return to military service, I supported the extension of reciprocal trade agreements in the 78th Congress because we were at war and the demand for coal revived our coal industry.

When I was elected to the 80th Congress I voted in favor of extending reciprocal trade agreements with the understanding that American industries would be protected from unfair competition resulting from a flood of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

For example, in Pennsylvania residual oil from Venezuela was beginning to flood the eastern seaboard, thus destroying the market for Pennsylvania-mined coal.

During the 82d Congress I voted to extend reciprocal trade agreements because there was contained therein the so-called peril-point amendment which was designed to provide a checkrein on imports that could destroy the jobs of American wage earners.

During the 83d Congress I joined many of my colleagues in an effort to stop the uncontrolled flow of foreign goods. Many of you will recall that we were supporting the Simpson bill. My special interest was in regulating the flood of foreign residual oil by placing a quota limitation on the importation of such oil. As many of you will recall, the Simpson bill was returned to the committee.

During the early part of 1954 the so-called Randall committee was created and took testimony from spokesmen for industries adversely affected by the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign goods. I regret to state that the coal industry was denied the opportunity to present its side of the case. Consequently the Randall report ignored the increasingly serious situation existing in the coal-producing States of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, by my votes as a Member of Congress there is ample proof that I believe in the principles of reciprocal trade agreements and that I supported them until I found a wholesale disregard for protecting the jobs of American workmen.

It became evident that the so-called peril-point amendment was meaningless and that the Randall committee merely performed a window-dressing job and actually by their recommendations threw American wage earners to the wolves.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the extension of reciprocal trade agreements last year and I intend to continue to do so until the interest of the American working man is protected.

As a means of attaining the objective of protecting the jobs of American workmen, I have 3 bills pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, namely: H. R. 345, H. R. 864, and H. R. 3019.

H. R. 345 is designed to provide a 5-percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil; while H. R. 3019 would increase the limitation to 10 percent.

H. R. 864 provides a permanent procedure for the adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis and regulates the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles. H. R. 864 also contains a 5-percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 1 because it will continue the disastrous effects on our economy by the reckless importation of foreign goods manufactured at a fraction of the wages paid American workmen.

For several weeks the House Ways and Means Committee has heard expert testimony from spokesmen for various industries regarding the adverse effects reciprocal trade agreements are having on our industrial economy. These experts produced facts showing that the employees of the industry affected not only lost their jobs but many of the manufacturing plants have been driven to financial distress, and in some instances were forced to close their doors.

Spokesmen for the coal industry told how the flood of foreign residual oil from Venezuela has destroyed the domestic coal markets of the miners in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia.

Back in 1939 when I first voiced my opposition to the importation of slave-mined Russian coal and other cheaply manufactured foreign products, I predicted that such a reckless policy would create ghost towns out of many communities in my congressional district and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, my prediction in 1939 has become a reality. Practically all of our deep mines in central Pennsylvania are closed and thousands of miners have been out of work for several years. In fact, many mining towns have been abandoned and their empty and dilapidated rows of houses stand as a monument to the destructive effects of the importation of foreign residual oil. Because they have nowhere to go, there are only a few of the unemployed in the coal fields of central Pennsylvania that have left the area. The result is that today, according to the United States Department of Labor, my congressional district is classified as a critical area because of the fact that nearly 18 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed.

This unemployment is not confined to coal-miners but includes those employed in affected related industries such as the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, in my home city of Altoona, Pa., nearly 10,000 people are unemployed, 6,000 of whom are railroad employees with 4,100 of this number having exhausted their rights on January 10, 1955 to railroad unemployment insurance benefits. A similar condition exists among coal miners and others who have lost their right to unemployment compensation benefits from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, every community in my congressional district has an active committee engaged in trying to attract new industries and millions of dollars have been raised by voluntary subscription to finance this long-range program of rehabilitating the industrial economy of the area.

While this united community effort goes on, thousands of my constituents—all good Americans and victims of this reckless foreign-trade policy—are today dependent for their existence upon public assistance and surplus food commodities.

I regret that every member of this Committee is unable to talk to these unemployed Americans as they stand in line to pick up their food coupons. If it were possible for you to talk to them, you would hear the pitiful story of their plight as citizens of a nation that boasts of its high standard of living.

As I mentioned a moment ago, communities affected by unemployment in cooperation with the State and Federal Government are endeavoring to rehabilitate their economy by attracting new industries. The unemployment situation, however, is getting worse as mines continue to close and more miners and railroaders are losing their jobs.

While this unfortunate situation prevails in the United States, residents of Venezuela, which is the chief exporter of residual oil, are enjoying unbridled prosperity.

Let me read you excerpts from Hal Boyle's syndicated column of January 24, 1955, titled "Venezuela Seen as the Texas of South America":

So much money is being made here (Venezuela) that visiting Texans actually get an inferiority complex and the United States dollar feels like 50 cents. * * * The visitor has a dazed sensation he is caught in a mid-century Klondike gold rush. The atmosphere of quick money is overwhelming, and tales of riches made overnight are a Bolivar a dozen. * * * Venezuela is bigger than Texas and Oklahoma combined and larger than any European country except Germany. * * * Its chief income is from oil—no land except the United States produces more. * * *

Although the nation has a population of only 5½ million, the Government spent half a billion dollars in 1954 on vast public-works projects and still ended up with $80 million left in the till. * * * Foreign investors from the United States and Europe are pouring untold millions into the industrialization of the country. It has taken in more than 100,000 immigrants from Europe the last 10 years. * * *

Caracas, the 388-year-old capital, is now one of the world's greatest boom cities. Fifty years ago milkmen herded cows through its ancient streets. Today they are jammed by thousands of new high-priced motorcars. * * * Nearly a million people live in the metropolitan area, and so many new buildings are going up construction workers have no time to even take Sundays off to go to the bullfights.

But the city has abysmal poverty as well as tremendous wealth. The shanties of the poor still crowd many of the raw red hills that stud Caracas. The Government has torn down thousands of these eyesores and replaced them with forty 15-story apartment buildings at a cost of $24 million. Workmen can rent the apartments for $6 to $30 a month, own them after a period of 20 years.

In 1955 the Government plans to tear down 6,500 more shacks and spend $25 million more on apartment projects for low-income workers.

Mr. Chairman, what a contrast it is to compare living conditions in Venezuela with the coal fields of Pennsylvania.

May I add that the prosperity enjoyed in Venezuela is to a great extent at the expense of the misery and suffering of residents of the coal-producing States of our Nation and especially of my congressional district.

At this very minute a quarter of a million ton tanker ship is tied up at an east coast dock carrying disaster to the coal, railroad and related industries of this Nation, in much the same manner as rat-infested vessels brought disease into our port cities in years gone by.

This foreign tanker with its bunker space filled with residual oil is dumping it in violation of every American concept of fair competition. As a matter of fact, even if the miners of our Nation would work for nothing and the railroads transported the coal for practically nothing, the coal industry could not compete with this unfair competition from foreign residual oil because its price is continually manipulated downward to capture the eastern seaboard coal market.

Mr. Chairman, it is being said in defense of residual oil that the oil companies have been requested to restrict voluntarily the amount of residual oil imported quarterly.

It has also been said that if any restrictions are placed on the importation of foreign residual oil that we will offend Venezuela.

Let me state, Mr. Chairman, that every time a coal miner loses his job because of the unfair competition from foreign residual oil a railroader has also been added to the list of the unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent coal-producing States recognize foreign residual oil as the arch-enemy of our industrial economy.

Therefore, I plead with you that H. R. 1 be returned to committee so that appropriate amendments can be adopted.

As far as I am concerned, it is about time we start adopting some of the policies foreign nations apply against us in protecting the jobs of their industrial workers.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1 without appropriate amendments will not correct the unemployment situation and afford the necessary relief to distressed industries and therefore I cannot conscientiously vote for it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, during the last session of the Congress—the 2d session of the 83d Congress—when we were then debating and giving consideration to the bill to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I felt the occasion was ripe to quote an old saying which was this: "O, defend me from my friends; I can defend myself from my enemies."

The occasion for this remark, we may recall, Mr. Chairman, was the weak, inadequate and watered-down measure which the Congress was called to act upon in this regard—a so-called extension of the Cordell Hull Trade Agreements Act.

The bill which the Congress then reluctantly passed called for a 1-year extension of this great program for peace and international amity and prosperity. That measure was placed before the Congress by the President's own party leaders in the Congress and was in direct conflict with the President's own expressed wishes with regard to what was needed in a trade act. The compromise which was accepted by the President was forced on him. His friends, as we know, knew what was best—they did it their way.

It is a strange thing, in the political life of our Nation, that the President should only now be getting out of the committee the kind of trade bill he has always favored and advocated as necessary to the furtherance of our international relations and foreign policy. In this instance, his political adversaries have proved to be his friends—he has been put in the position of depending upon the Democratic Party to do what his own party would not do for his administration.

I may say to the President that the Democratic Party is glad to do it—inasmuch as the trade policy on which he has wisely set store is a keystone in the philosophy of the Democratic Party.

I am grateful for the opportunity to vote upon a measure which calls for extending this great act for a proper period of 3 years.

I will not go so far as to say that those who oppose this bill have taken a lesson from the Dark Ages—but some of the arguments which we have heard both on and off the floor and by the blizzard of propaganda leaflets which have almost flooded our offices remind us that some would turn the clock back to the days of McKinley.

History records that the Smoot-Hawley high-tariff act was passed in the 1920's—in the midst of world economic exhaustion following World War I. We then erected a Wall of China around our Nation to carry out the McKinley philosophy that we "sell everything and buy nothing."

This was assuredly a lapse into the ox-cart age—a tragic lapse we now know in viewing the havoc and wreckage of World War II into which the world was plunged from the depths of a world-wide depression and economic suffocation.

As a matter of practical fact, we know today, any businessman knows that it is not possible to achieve such a state of economic bliss as some would propose, namely, "sell everything and buy nothing." Trade is a two-way street—from the corner drug store to the largest corporation.

It cannot be all "gimme" and no give and take.

It is this philosophy, this belief, Mr. Chairman, in the necessity and importance of reducing tariff barriers and making trade a two-way street which served as the guilding principle in the life of Judge Cordell Hull, of Tennessee—the author of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

This great act is an immortal, living monument to my distinguished predecessor in Congress and the inspiration of many who strive for service in the Congress. No monument which Judge Hull erected for himself through his brilliant, tireless, and far-visioned efforts—including even his historic service to the Nation as Secretary of State during the Roosevelt administration during

World War II—stands as a greater tribute to this statesman than the measure which we are called upon to extend today.

Judge Hull had the vision to foresee the modern concept of a world growing progressively smaller—a more closely allied and interrelated—and that in such a world it was essential to break down the protective walls of high tariff that our Nation had erected. This wall was built up—high and unsurmountable, at first—to protect an infant American industry. It has taken many years to bring our Nation to the realization that trade, low tariff commercial intercourse between nations, is in our Nation's best interest economically—and, more important for America to realize, one of the greatest deterrents to war and one of the greatest promoters of peace that could be possible.

Judge Hull's vision foresaw peace without vast armaments—but through the means of friendly relations and friendly and peaceful and profitable trade between nations.

Some advocates, forgetting what we have already built in international amity through the means of friendly trade, argue that such a trade policy cripples American industry. Certainly, I cannot and would not support any measure that would do that—and I do not believe that there are any crippling features harmful to American industry and agriculture and our way of life in this act. I think the opposite is true.

I have the greatest confidence that American industry which turns out and produces the greatest products in the world can meet the competition from any source in the world and be stronger for it. Our Nation was not built on handouts and monopolies—but on competition which brought forth the best in the man and in our chosen way of life.

I believe that the quality of American products, the desirability of American products, the durability of American products—the ingenuity of the American producer—can not only keep our own domestic markets vigorous but create greater, more extensive markets in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, to clamp down restrictions of trade at this time of prevailing crisis and uncertainty and tension would be to slam the door in the face of a good neighbor—a neighbor who might one day be in a position to help one put out a fire in one's house.

We cannot deal in any such unfriendly, hostile, and provocative manner with our friends, or those whom we wish and need to have as our friends.

Trade barriers must be reduced and kept down. Let us sell our products abroad and make it possible for other nations to sell their products abroad. Herein is the answer to those nations who have not full assurance in their own minds of our backing and support in the dismal prospect presented by Communist propaganda. Full cooperation, economically, and militarily, is the answer to the problem presented by Communist imperialism.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the path to eventual peace. Herein lies our hope for lasting peace. Herein lies the hope of other nations—that they may engage in commerce with our great Nation and with other nations without unreasonable and insurmountable barriers—that they may have hope for their own industrial and agricultural development and progress.

Mr. Chairman, we must do nothing as a nation which deprives ourselves and other nations of our innate right to hope.

We must take those courses of action which promote peace, prosperity, and better understanding.

Trade is the international language. It speaks the words of peace and prosperity throughout the world. Let us extend this act and serve notice to the world that America's aim is still and always will be peace.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, during my two previous terms as a Member of this House, I have always voted for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. I was convinced then—and I still am convinced—that we must have a healthy foreign trade program not only for the prosperity of this Nation but for the prosperity of friendly nations overseas.

In voting for these extensions previously, I did so with some reservation, perhaps a "minimum of enthusiasm" would describe my feelings. But I always felt confident that if a trade agreement turned out to be in error, there was always the escape-clause proceedings to protect our domestic industries from serious injury.

My confidence in the efficacy of the escape clause, however, has been shattered by events of the past. Fifteen times the Tariff Commission has found that a trade concession was causing injury to a domestic industry. Yet, only in five of those cases has the President taken the corrective action recommended by the Commision.

Let me review the record of the past 2 years in regard to one of our vital domestic defense industries—the mining of lead and zinc.

Approximately 2 years ago, the House Ways and Means Committee opened hearings on a measure introduced by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. His bill proposed a sliding tariff to protect our domestic lead-zinc mines which were in serious difficulty due to the dumping of foreign metals on the United States market.

This measure, moderate as it was, ran into heavy opposition from the Department of State.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told the committee that the Simpson bill was, first, contrary to our trade policies; and, second, unnecessary.

There is of course machinery provided by the present act which permits of relief in special situations of the kind you refer to. I see no reason why the industry that you have in mind should not have recourse to the provisions of the present act—

Secretary Dulles testified.

He was referring to the lead-zinc industry and the provision he recommended they take advantage of was the escape clause provision.

Thus encouraged by the administration, the industry sought relief under the escape clause provision. An application was filed and hundreds of pages of expert testimony were taken in hearings before the Tariff Commission. In April 1954, after nearly 9 months of study, the Commission rendered a unanimous decision to the President to the effect that the domestic industry was being damaged and relief was necessary.

From the reports I get, apparently the decision of the Tariff Commission was approved by all but one of the executive departments—the Department of State. Nevertheless, the State Department's views prevailed and the President chose the alternative of stockpiling. This alternative has not worked and the mines that are continuing to operate in this Nation are struggling for their existence.

Metal can be stockpiled. Mines cannot. They fill with water. Their roofs cave in. The miners reluctantly drift away. Exploration for new sources of metal ceases. This is happening with ever increasing frequency throughout the rich metal producing States today.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. With respect to the matter of stockpiling of the products of the mines to which the gentleman refers, do I understand that imports of those materials increased in this time during which we have been stockpiling the metals?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. That is correct, imports have increased, and I think I can explain to the gentleman why they have increased. The result of the stockpiling has been this: The Government took the newly mined domestic ores and put them into the stockpile, and that left a vacuum in the market which permitted the foreigners to move in and take advantage of the increased price that was made possible by the stockpiling.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Then, in reality, our stockpiling, which many thought was for the purpose of helping the American producer, for the purpose of increasing the consumption domestically, and the keeping up of the American mines, redounded to the benefit of the foreign producer to an equal extent to which it helped the American producer.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is correct. That has been the effect of it.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Is it the gentleman's conclusion that stockpiling has been a solution for the lead-zinc situation in the West?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. My opinion is that the stockpiling is merely a palliative which offered some temporary relief. At the time the announcement was made, lead went up 1¼ cents a pound and zinc went up 1¼ cents a pound, but zinc has never gone up one penny since that time, and the stockpiling program is just simply a stopgap move-

ment. It offers no permanent relief for a sick industry.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The net result has been to completely reverse the relative share of the domestic lead and zinc market supplied by American workers in American mines.

In 1949 the domestic lead-zinc miners had 62.2 percent of the total domestic market. By 1954 the foreign producer was supplying 61 percent of the metal used in the United States.

In H. R. 1, as reported from committee, we have a bill that not only continues the President's broad power to negotiate trade agreements but expands it. No provision is made in the bill to strengthen the Tariff Commission's hand in escape-clause proceedings.

The amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], in his motion to recommit should not be an onerous requirement. It appears to me that it is at most a minimum strengthening of the escape-clause provision. The President still will have the right to overrule the Commission's findings if he believes such action is necessary for the national security.

I had hoped that this amendment would be stronger and I proposed that the Congress, not the President, be given final authority to decide what action if any should be taken after the Tariff Commission finds that a trade agreement entered into by the President is putting a domestic industry out of business. Instead of reporting its findings under the escape clause to the President, under my proposal the Tariff Commission would report to Congress and in the absence of a majority overriding vote by either House the findings would become effective at the expiration of 60 days.

It is not good government to have a man sit in judgment of himself.

If an industry can convince the Tariff Commission that it is being injured by an agreement negotiated by the President, the recommendation of the Commission should carry all the weight we can give it legislatively within the framework of our Nation's security.

I will support H. R. 1 with the inclusion of the Reed amendment. But I cannot vote to expand the power of reducing tariffs—and by extension of the power to export jobs of affected industries—without providing for the concurrent strengthening of the Commission's decisions in escape-clause proceedings.

Without this minimum protection for the Nation's working people and businesses, I cannot support this broadening of the already broad powers of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the full debate upon this important measure cannot be heard by all the Members of the House who will be called upon to vote on this issue in a few minutes. I realize that about half the Members of the House are out in the corridors being buttonholed by the various lobbyists who are working for the recommittal motion.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. In answer to that I will say to the gentleman that he can go right out here and find his registered superlobbyist, Mr. Taft, working on his people.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think any comparison of the number of lobbyists involved in this fight will show, if it is made by any fair-minded group, that the lobbyists on the protectionist side outnumber the people on the other side by about 1,000 to 1; and the funds involved would be about 100,000 to 1.

As to the amount of pressure put upon one individual Member of Congress who has only one vote, I can only say as to my own personal experience that it has been something like this and on those people where there has been an opportunity to influence a vote one way or another, the number has been even greater.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

As to my colleagues in the Congress from the Southern States and from some of the New England and Atlantic Seaboard States, there has been great pressure on behalf of the textile industry to provide some type of protection in this bill. I thought, after hearing these stories about the textile industry's hardship, that practically every textile establishment in the country was on the verge of bankruptcy and that their situation must be desperate. So I picked up the current issue of the U. S. News & World Report a couple of days ago and I found there a list of American industries showing how they will prosper in 1955. And what did I find heading the list of industries that will prosper in 1955, in this very conservative publication of business, but the textile industry; a statement that textile profits will be higher than that of any other business in the country in 1955. I submit that the textile industry is working a fraud upon the Congress of the United States and upon the people of the United States in the exorbitant claims that have been made in this regard.

I think this matter should be brought to the attention of the House, because a lot of us have been so gullible as to accept the statement that the textile industry is in dire straits. Something is wrong. Who is telling the truth about this situation? I do not believe that the U. S. News & World Report is an unreliable magazine on business matters. It has been proven correct year in and year out. It now states that the textile industry of the United States is not merely prosperous, but that it will be the most prosperous industry in the United States for the coming year. Does that industry need protection?

I have been especially interested in the attitude of some of my good friends in the debate on this matter, and I have been sorely disappointed in the attitude of some of my friends from the South who have taken the position that they are going to defend the poor, starving textile industry which, according to this report, for the coming year, will be the most prosperous industry in the United States.

CONSUMER INTEREST

I have also been interested in the viewpoint of some of my friends who, 3 or 4 years ago, when we were fighting the battles of the OPS and OPA, from California and Pennsylvania and Rhode Island and some of the New England States, fought, bled, and died to protect the consumer, to save the consumer from an increase in the price of any product even one penny.

Yet when we come down to this great issue where the consumer has the greatest stake, where the decision will decide the price levels of the products involved, we find that the consumers are being deserted by those friends they had a few years ago in the fight between the producers and the consumers.

The gentlemen who have been protesting the provisions of the bill today as it stands have, every one of them, made the protest because they say the bill will enable people to buy cheaper goods than what they are able to buy now. In other words, if you vote to weaken this bill in any respect you are going to increase the price of goods that some consumer has to pay. Do not forget that.

HARDSHIPS

We have had a lot of questions here today and a lot of talk from everybody about the dire hardship that exists in certain districts. I know dire hardship exists from unemployment in the various parts of the country, in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, the lead and zinc mining areas, and various other parts of the country. I know what that hardship is, because I think that in the district I have the honor to represent today we have the greatest percentage of unemployment in the labor force of any congressional district in the United States. In my congressional district today a very conservative estimate has been made that there are perhaps 60,000 unemployed. That is a greater percentage of unemployment, I am sure, than has been mentioned by any person making a hardship complaint here today.

Why are these people unemployed? They are not industrial laborers, who have a chance to draw unemployment compensation. They do not have any type of thing to draw on except a surplus commodity ration distributed by the United States Government, due to the fact that we are in a drought condition and also due to a lack of markets for the products we produce.

MORE TRADE NEEDED

These people are unemployed because there is no market for the commodities from which they make their living, and from which those people have been making their living in that manner over a hundred years. Ours is a far longer established industry than any of the others that are making claims of hardship today.

They are unemployed because their export market has been diminished. That export market is not there because the countries we would normally want to trade with are not able to have enough trade with us in other lines of business to pay for the commodities we produce.

We have hardship not because of any liberal trade policy but because our trade policy is by no means liberal enough.

RECOMMITTAL NO ANSWER

We have had a lot of talk today about the motion to recommit to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] which I am sure was designed with the idea that it will offer the most to everybody here. If you will look about a litle bit, I am sure any one of these lobbyists we have been discussing can offer any one of us assurance of all sorts of help in whatever we are interested in in connection with that motion.

Let us look again at the situation in 1951, when a similar motion was offered. At that time everybody promised that it would solve everybody's problem. It did not solve the problems. The motion here today is not going to solve those problems. It is going to make it harder for us to solve the problem of carrying on a trade policy, but that is as far as it will go. It is not going to give any benefit to any industry that has a basic interest in prospering through the overall prosperity of the United States.

We have had criticism after criticism in the discussion on this bill of action taken in regard to Tariff Commission recommendations.

AFRAID TO CRITICIZE THE PRESIDENT

But I notice all of my friends here when they criticize this action, they blame it on the State Department or somebody like that. Why not blame it on the man who takes the action—the President of the United States—President Eisenhower. I think he did perform his duty properly in making the rulings that he did, but I think in the interest of fair politics when a Democratic President is involved, you said it was President Truman who did something or President Roosevelt or whoever it was who was involved. I think in your criticisms of the action being taken on the findings of the Tariff Commission, it is only fair that you should criticize the President of the United States and not these various executive departments. The action is taken by the President of the United States, signing a piece of paper, and it is his individual responsibility. I do not question whether he should be criticized for something else, but do not try to shift blame to the State Department.

This overall issue is important beyond this matter of individual hardship in each congressional district. It is important, and I believe part of the importance is reflected in the suggested recommittal motion that is going to be made. We are asked to make mandatory that a finding shall be put into effect if there is a finding of hardship with regard to any industry. We are asked to overlook the national interests, and I think our duty and our responsibility as Members of the Congress, when we take the oath of office, is to act in the national interest. If we here today put into effect legislation which says that the interest of one particular industry is more important than the national interest then we will be failing in our duty. We would be violating our oath of office if we changed the present escape clause or peril point provisions of the bill with only the thought of some special interest. The bill provides that any such decision can be overriden in the national interest, and not that such a decision has to stand merely because it in some way makes competition a little bit tougher for one particular industry.

FREE ENTERPRISE?

You gentlemen on my left pride yourselves as the representatives of the political philosophy of free enterprise. I think I pride myself too in that respect, but why are you not standing up today for fair competition—for competition? This is what we are asking for—we are asking for any competition. If free enterprise means anything, it means competition. What you are asking for is not competition, but for a subsidy which is taken right out of the pockets of the people even more so than under a so-called Brannan plan or under socialized medicine or anything else. Competition is something that is the basis of the good, old historic American tradition. But you are saying here that it is all right to subsidize business and to subsidize the profits of industries that today have the greatest profit potential of any other industry in the country, but you do not want to do anything to help the American consumer in this regard.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised at my rotund and usually jolly friend and colleague from the South, Mr. SMITH from Mississippi. I cannot quite understand what has gotten him so wrought up and excited unless he is afraid we are going to recommit this bill and provide some protection in it for our industries which are really threatened and get it in shape so that we can vote for it. I think I know the trouble with him. You know he is an author. He has just written a book called the Yazoo. Was it the psalmist or somebody in the Old Testament who said, Oh, that my enemy would write a book? Well, our friend has written a book, and I understand it is a fine book. But you know he is one of these cloud riders, these idealists. You know he would ride in the clouds if he did not weigh quite so much.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, would he allow me to point out that the book which is published by Rhinehart and Company may be obtained at any book store for $4.

Mr. LANHAM. I am glad to give the gentleman's book a boost. You know our good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, DICK RICHARDS, at one time accused our lovable friend, BROOKS HAYS of being a cloud rider. He said he rode down to his office every morning on a cloud. I defended Brooks on that charge, and I think I was right. I said, "BROOKS did have his head in the clouds where the winds of God's truth could blow upon him, but had his feet firmly planted upon the ground." Because of the vote of my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] I am almost convinced that his long and distinguished service on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has made him into a cloud rider and stargazer.

Now my friend from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is one of those idealists who can write a book, but he is an idealist, and he has no idea of the practical matters involved in this idea of free trade. He does not have his feet on the ground.

I have always been a free trader. When I first came out of school I had been reading Adam Smith and some of those economists who believed in free trade and a free market. I still believe we have got to work toward that end; but, my friends, we just cannot get ourselves into it suddenly and without regard to the realities involved.

Now, so much for my friend from Mississippi. I am glad that all of his delegation are not cloud riders, and they have their feet firmly on the ground, and I am sure they are going along with us in trying to make this bill one that will protect our threatened industries.

Mr. Chairman, at the very outset, I want to make it clear that I do not oppose the principle of expanded foreign trade as involved in H. R. 1, though I do oppose its present form. I want also to pay tribute to that great Tennessean, Cordell Hull, for his vision and farsightedness in first suggesting the reciprocal trade agreements principle and bringing it into successful operation. Now another great Tennessean is carrying forward the work begun by his illustrious predecessor. The gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. JERE COOPER, is my warm personal friend, and I am proud of him as a southerner and one who is obsessed with an idea and an ideal that in itself is sound. Furthermore, I have no criticism of the Rules Committee for sending this bill to the floor of the House under a closed rule though I tried on yesterday, unsuccessfully, to get the rule amended.

It is well and good to have ideals and to pursue them for, as the Scripture says, Without a vision my people perish. Vision and idealism we must have and I am sure that the idea of expanded trade with other nations is a sound one if properly applied and administered.

Keeping one's head in the clouds as one follows an ideal is splendid but at the same time the cloud rider and stargazer ought to keep his feet on the ground and come down from the mountaintop and out of the clouds on occasion to get again the vision of those who must plod along life's weary way. As I recall the story of the Transfiguration, the three apostles who went up to the mountaintop with the Great Teacher were so enthralled and entranced with the vision they had seen that they wanted to build a tabernacle and dwell forever with the Master on the mountaintop. In all the history of mankind there has, of course, been no greater idealist or follower after the gleam than the Christ, yet he was too wise to accede to the wishes of His apostles and leave them to dwell forever in the rarefied atmosphere of the mountaintop. He brought them down from their exalted position to get their feet on solid ground again for He knew that they

must live among men and develop their vision and test it by the realities of human existence.

Today I implore all of you who are obsessed by the magnificent vision of free and untrammeled trade to come down from the mountaintop and modify your vision by present-day realities.

What I am trying to say is that I have always supported the principle embodied in the reciprocal trade agreements program although I have realized that many problems arise in connection with its administration. It has, in the past, been my belief that the peril point and escape clause provisions in the act protected our American industries and their employees from a reduction of the tariff below a point at which the industry could continue to operate profitably.

There is no doubt but that in the past, tariff rates have been so high that the American consumer was plundered for the benefit of a few great corporations who, protected by such tariffs, made inordinate profits. It must be remembered, however, that our reciprocal trade program has been in effect now since 1934 and that our tariffs have been gradually reduced over the years so that there is no longer the question of the plundering and exploitation of the consumer for the benefit of the producers in America.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Gladly.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the splendid talk he is making and I want to join him in stating that we do need further protection insofar as the peril point provision and escape clause are concerned. We just heard the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] point out that out of 15 times when the Tariff Commission recommended action in only 5 instances was action taken. The gentleman from Georgia is certainly correct in his conclusions on this subject. I want to concur in those conclusions, and thank the gentleman for the splendid talk which he is making.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman very much and appreciate his contribution.

I was just about to say that my friend from Mississippi is living in the past. I do not know whether he writes history or not—he probably taught history and he is probably living it again, living back in the days I have just been talking about when tariff rates were far too high and protected industry so it could make inordinate profits. But we have left those days; we have come a long way since those days and our tariff rates have been reduced to the point where our industries have now grown—the big industries—so that they do not need protection, and they do not want it.

The truth is that our huge corporations who used to profit by the tariff are now exporters and need world markets in order to dispose of the products they manufacture. For this reason, we see now the huge industries such as the automobile, iron, and steel companies supporting the lowering of our tariffs; for they are so efficiently operated and need foreign markets so badly that they do not fear competition from abroad. So that now it is the small manufacturers of America who are being adversely affected by the reciprocal trade agreements policy. It is now a struggle between the huge mass production industries of America and the smaller producers.

I am deeply concerned about the textile industry which, while in the aggregate is a massive industry with investments involving over $8 billion, is nonetheless made up of small individual components. This industry is now threatened by the negotiation of a trade agreement with Japan which would further reduce the tariffs on textiles. Previous trade agreements have already imposed tariff reductions on about 91 percent of the industry's production. The cuts have averaged about 37 percent. On many individual items they have amounted to as much as 50 percent.

The proposal to further lower the tariff on textiles includes such a comprehensive list that it leaves one with the conclusion that the entire cotton textile industry of the United States is regarded as potentially expendable.

Tariff concessions on synthetic yarns are also proposed and constitute another danger. The competitive effect would be to compel the cotton mills of the United States to switch from cotton to rayon. This would sound the doom of the American cotton farmer as well as of the cotton manufacturing industry.

I want to point out right here that no other major industry is to such an important degree exposed to the potential sacrifice considered for the cotton manufacturing industry.

The argument is made that the great mass-production industries of the United States are so much more efficient than foreign industries as to be able to compete without difficulty with foreign producers. Consequently, we should expect that the articles proposed to be considered for tariff reduction would include the products of the huge mass-production industries. Such is not the case, however. For instance, the great iron and steel industry comes under "Schedule 3—Metals and Manufactures of." Here we find listed thumbtacks, needles, nail files, surgical and dental instruments, shotguns and pistols. Also included are bicycle bells which is all that is left of the bicycle industry in America.

And so it goes. An examination of the various schedules will show that in the huge mass-production industries few reductions in the tariff are proposed, whereas, among the products of the smaller industries a long list of items is included.

It is significant that the labor unions representing the huge industries of America, who are now exporters and to a large extent dependent upon the export trade, favor the further reduction of our tariff, whereas, the unions representing the employees of the small corporations are opposing this reduction which would result in the extinction of those smaller industries.

As I say, I appear before you not in opposition to H. R. 1, so much as to express to you the concern I feel about the textile and other small industries of America. As I have already told you, the tariffs on cotton textiles have already been drastically reduced so that the average tariff rate is now, I believe, approximately 22 percent. Any further reduction in the tariff rates, I am convinced, would mean the extinction of the textile industry. Wages in Japan and in other Asian countries that would flood our country with textiles are notoriously low. In Japan the average wage is 13.6 cents an hour, just about one-tenth the wage scale in our American industries. At this point it is worth noting that at the very time we are proposing to enter into a trade agreement with Japan to lower the tariff on practically the entire range of cotton products as well as synthetic yarns, the proposal is made to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents to 90 cents or $1. This I favor and am told by leaders in the textile industry that even marginal producers can pay the 90 cents minimum wage and manage to survive provided the tariffs are not further lowered. But to raise the minimum wage and at the same time to lower the tariff schedules with the resulting flooding of the American market with goods made by low-paid foreign labor would destroy the textile industry.

It is a well-known economic fact that the textile industry has for the last few years been in a highly depressed state and is only now beginning to recover. To further reduce tariffs at this time would be a shock to the industry which I believe it could not survive.

Statistics have been brought to you to try to make it appear that imports of textiles from Japan and other favored nations are insignificant. I warn you that these figures which in the aggregate may be accurate are nonetheless deceptive. It illustrates the old saying that figures do not lie but you had best watch the figurer. I know those who have quoted them on the floor believe them to be true and to support their contentions. It is those who have supplied them who are responsible for their misleading nature.

In the first place, the imports that have been coming from Japan are in the staple goods including the countable cloth goods which compete with only a segment of the entire textile industry. Moreover, the figures quoted to try to show that imports are insignificant are for the year 1953, whereas, during the year 1954, especially the last quarter, these imports increased in geometrical proportion and indications are that the same increase will take place during the present quarter of 1955. The result is that instead of being 1 or 2 percent of the competable American production of textiles, they really amount to from 10 to 20 percent of such competable American-made goods.

I warn you that if this bill is adopted without amendments that will strengthen the peril point and escape-clause provisions, the State Department is all set to expend the American textile industry when it meets in Geneva during the spring of this year with the other members of GATT to negotiate a new treaty of trade with Japan. My recollection is that we have never won anything at the

conference table at Geneva. Our memories must be very short if we do not have in mind what occurred there only last year when our representatives at a conference there took a back seat and washed their hands of the whole matter of Indochina while "Sonny Boy" Anthony Eden and Mendes-France surrendered Indochina to the Communists. Now Mr. Dulles and the bright-eyed boys of the State Department go back to Geneva to enter into an agreement with Japan with proposals to permit that country to increase its exports of cotton goods and other textiles to the United States in return for some imaginary benefits that we may get from keeping Japan from trading with the Communists. Of course, Japan is going to trade with the Communists in spite of all we can do. It is just a natural trade area and market for the cheaply made goods of Japan.

And lo and behold, we are told the President must have the power which would be given him in this bill to further lower tariffs at the rate of 5 percent a year for the period of 3 years. This, in addition to the power he already has and which he proposes to exercise or which Mr. Dulles and his boys propose to exercise for him at Geneva this spring.

But it is said the President has exhausted his authority to give away our American markets. He seems to be in the position of a man playing strip poker who has lost everything but his undershirt and must have a pair of shorts and possibly a pair of socks that he may gamble some more with the welfare of the small manufacturing enterprises of our country. If Mr. Eisenhower, himself, were doing the trading, possibly he might save our undershirts and shorts and socks but can we expect that much of the kibitzers from the State Department who are playing the game for him?

To come down to cases, let me say plainly that the trouble with our present law which is to be greatly expanded by H. R. 1, is that the peril point and escape clauses as now embodied in the law are wholly inadequate to protect American industries threatened with extinction by too drastic tariff reductions.

Of course, I do not believe that the Congress should again undertake the tremendous task of writing tariff laws. Yet, I do find it difficult to explain to the textile workers of my district why I cannot be of much help to them in their fight for their jobs. Very wisely, I think, we have set up a Tarriff Commission supposed to be composed of men skilled in the problems that must come before the Commission and learned in the matters with which they must deal.

Yet, we are no longer willing to trust the Tariff Commission to perform the duties imposed upon it by our tariff laws and by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and have permitted the President and his advisers in the State Department not only to disregard the recommendations of the Tariff Commission but actually to deny the truth of the findings of the Tariff Commission on the peril point and escape clause cases. It is inconceivable, but the fact remains that the boys in the State Department have set up a committee called the Joint Committee on Reciprocity Information whose purpose and authority is to furnish facts to the President to contradict those found by the Tariff Commission to exist so as to enable the State Department to ignore the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Naively I supported the Trade Agreements Act in the past because I believed the peril-point and escape-clause provisions were adequate and thought that their administration would be such as to protect industries threatened with extinction but the record does not bear out my belief in the adequacy of these provisions or rather that their administration would be effective.

Consequently, I cannot vote for the extensive powers granted the President in H. R. 1 unless these peril-point and escape-clause provisions are made really effective to protect threatened industries. A motion to recommit will be made, I believe, with instructions which will contain a provision that will make the recommendation of the Tariff Commission controlling in the administration of the peril-point and escape-clause provisions. Apparently this is the only chance we will have to get this bill in shape so that some of us who favor the reciprocal-trade program in principle can vote for it. Surely even the most visionary and idealistic among you would not want to pursue the ideal of free trade if you realized that such a course meant the destruction of many of the small industries of America that are so vital to our continued prosperity. These industries just cannot compete with the low-paid labor of Japan and other Asiatic countries. Here is your chance to make certain that the provisions in the present law intended to protect such industries are made really effective. How can you afford to vote against the motion to recommit, the real purpose of which is to make sure that these industries are protected from a flood of cheaply made goods that will flow into this country to compete with our highly paid American workers?

I ask your serious and thoughtful consideration of this entire problem which is truly a dire threat to the textile industry, the plywood industry, and the barites industry of my district as well as many similar small industries located throughout America and probably in your very own district.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this subject by Members on both sides of the aisle. It was not my intention to come to the floor to make a political speech; but after listening to the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], a Member on the other side of the aisle, I am prompted to express an opinion that was conceived after the 83d Congress and the recent campaign, then again after observing the action taken on this floor yesterday and listening to the tirade of some of the opponents of this bill. I must say that I am firmly convinced that the Republican Party is making a "political sucker" of the President of the United States. Yes; they took a heroic war record, a winning personality, and a pleasing smile and parlayed it into a position in the White House. Yet in the Congress of the United States, when the President comes here and recommends his first domestic issue, the very men who were out campaigning less than 6 months ago and having the big billboards spread about that "Ike Needs Joe Bloak" come on the floor of the House, take his first recommendation, and try to not only wreck it but the welfare of our country as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to come on the floor of the House and indorse this bill which extends the Reciprocal Trade Act. Being a Tennessean, I am proud of the reciprocal trade program. It was conceived by a fellow Tennessean, a great statesman, Mr. Cordell Hull, a man who served this Nation of ours longer as Secretary of State than any other individual. Then, again, on the floor of the House today this bill is being sponsored by another great Tennessean, my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee [Mr. COOPER]. Therefore, as a Tennessean, it gives me a personal pride to have the opportunity of speaking on behalf of this great piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard on several occasions today that this bill destroys the interests of the working people; that it destroys the free-enterprise system of industry. Well, nothing would displease me more than to have to come on this floor and do anything to injure the welfare of the working people of America. Yes; I have industry in my district. Through misapprehension and being misinformed about the intent of H. R. 1, they oppose it strenuously. But I do not believe that it will hurt any industry in America today. It merely gives us the opportunity to trade with other nations. We cannot ask for the privilege of sitting down and negotiating an act or peaceful treaty with any nation in this world of ours if we do not extend to them the opportunity of trade. That is nothing more than an extension into the other parts of the world the good-neighbor policy that my distinguished fellow Tennessean, Cordell Hull, extended to the Western Hemisphere when he was Secretary of State.

I have heard here today the American workingman being made the whipping boy on this floor by opponents of this bill. I have been surprised to see some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle come down and raise their voices in behalf of the workingman of America when we all know that some of these very people, when legislation is introduced on the floor of the House in the interest and for the advancement of the cause of the working people of America, are the ones that work against and shout the loudest against legislation which is for the interest of the working people.

I have also heard much talk about the escape clause today. Well, I, as a freshman Member of this great body, wish that it would be possible for us to have an escape clause in every piece of legis-

lation that has some political significance. Yes; nothing would please me more, but there is no escape clause today. This bill is in the interest of the free economy of our Nation. Therefore, we must stand up and be counted and on this day show the world that the wisdom of this House will be upheld and that we will extend to the other nations of the world the privilege of trading with America.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I, as most of you know, have spent most of my time that I have been in this House since 1945 trying to point out to you members of this committee that there still remains in the United States a coal industry. Now, the only time that the House has seen fit in the last 10 years to say a kind word to me about the coal industry of America is when war breaks out, and as soon as the shooting starts, then every man in this House wants to open the door for me to be sure that I am well fed, to be sure that I am in good health, and that I will come up here and do all I can to tell them about the coal industry of America, because, as you know—and I have been here through two shooting wars with you—within 24 hours after the first shot is fired you are going to be on a coal fuel potential. Now, you know that. I am not down here trying to be impertinent or presumptous or to lecture my colleagues on this committee. Every word that I say you know well. You have been through it with me. And yet, you are laboring under the impression that if, God forbid, war breaks out, as it well might, before I sit down, everything will be perfect with the coal industry—now, I have only got 5 minutes and it could happen this afternoon; the President of the United States has on his desk an Executive order, prepared at the direction of the Congress, made a number of years ago, all ready for some clerk to hand to him to sign, which will restrict and in most cases eliminate the gas and oil fuel potential in this Nation. And that could happen 10 minutes from now.

I should like to say this. Nobody in this committee is more reluctant than I to say what I am going to say, but when I first came here, I served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs; I went from the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the Appropriations Committee and served on their subcommittee for the Department of State. All of my experience here has been in the field of foreign relations, foreign affairs. I have never cast a vote against any legislation which in any way dealt with the matter of establishing more favorable foreign relations—not one vote. My vote today will be my first of that kind. I cannot take any more. This House has treated the coal industry like a stepchild.

There has not been an agricultural bill, a bill before this House since 1945, when I became a Member of the House, to subsidize or support the agricultural economy of this Nation, that I have not voted for. I voted for everyone without exception, and yet when I come here and ask this committee to do something, not on a question of tariff, but on a question of an import quota on Venezuelan fuel oil, this committee turns its deaf ear. I should like to see a little reciprocal trade in this committee and in this House. All of the reciprocal trade that I have seen has been one way as far as the coal industry of this Nation is concerned.

Many of my colleagues, especially my Pennsylvania friends—and I see several of them here—have always supported the reciprocal trade bill starting in the old days. I stand here reluctantly to say that we feel we have been discriminated against badly. We feel we have been treated improperly. We feel we have been ignored. And within 200 miles of where I stand today, on the threshold of this Capitol, under their feet back home and at your doorstep is the greatest fuel potential remaining in America—coal.

So, Mr. Chairman, I find myself unhappy in this failure to hear from you, and I must record myself now, as I shall when the roll is called for the motion to recommit and, I am sorry to say, I shall vote against this bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting and pleasing to note that some of the mist has been cleared from the eyes of many of the Members of this House and especially some of those from along the eastern seaboard. I only hope that it will continue to clear away, and when we get to the foreign giveaway bill, and especially the offshore procurement features of the foreign giveaway bill, all the mist will have by then evaporated and they will support some of the rest of us in cutting that proposition down to size.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to compliment the four members of the House Ways and Means Committee who signed the minority report accompanying H. R. 1. They are to be highly commended for the clarity of their dissenting views and I support the position they have taken.

I am sure everyone in this House would say that he or she is opposed to importing a depression into this country but that is the hand-engraved invitation that will be extended if this legislation is approved.

Imports right now are at the highest level in history, and have already caused great injury in several areas of our domestic economy. Countries in all parts of the world are becoming industrialized for the first time. Business is booming in almost every country in Western Europe. Many have passed prewar levels.

These nations will demand greater and greater trade concessions from the United States, and from past performance, will be able to convince our State Department that we must accept more and more of their products. By reason of this, the potential of further harm to additional segments of our economy is enormous.

I, for one, am fed up with the propaganda emanating from the free traders in the State Department that it is the duty of the United States, allegedly the richest nation, to give more and get less in return than any other country; to give and give until our standard of living is reduced to the level of the rest of the world.

This Nation did not grow strong and did not become the greatest constitutional republic in the world on this premise. We built our standard of living on reasonable tariff protection.

I am equally fed up with the State Department propaganda which portrays the United States as the culprit primarily responsible for world restrictions on trade. This is ridiculous. United States tariffs actually are lower now than during any other period in our history, and we have made sharper reductions in our tariffs than have most other industrial nations. They average only 5.1 percent of the value of imports. We have had a 68-percent reduction of the 1937 average.

Compare that with Great Britain, which has bitterly attacked United States tariffs, low as they are, British tariffs average 25.6 percent of imports, which is 20 percent above the 1937 average. In other words, the British scream for us to reduce tariffs, and yet increase their own.

And the British admit there will be no reductions. R. A. Butler, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, has been quoted as saying:

> We expect some improvement in their (the United States) trade practices before there is any question of lowering our barriers any further or indulging in any further nondiscrimination.

The only way we could make the British happy would be to remove all tariffs. That is their idea of a reciprocal trade program.

Actually, there is nothing reciprocal about our trade program. Instead, it has been a program of give, give, and give some more to appease our so-called free world friends, and we have received little or nothing in return.

In addition, these nations have used many devices to restrict our exports—by the use of import quotas, currency restrictions, state trading, monopolies, barter deals, and cartels. And the record shows that the use of these devices by other countries has increased during the so-called reciprocal trade period.

As an example, Great Britain has agreed to admit, on a trial basis only, the grand total of 650 automobiles from the United States. However, duties and taxes bring the price of an American-made Chevrolet on the British market to about $6,000. What a great concession our British friends have made in our direction to the cause of expanded world trade.

The truth of the matter is, no nation has been prevented from selling to the United States because of our tariffs. American tariffs have been reduced in some instances as much as 75 percent. Today, the United States is among the lower seven countries in average tariff rates. In what position does this place us when attempting to gain concessions from other countries? We don't have much bargaining power left.

If other nations feel they cannot compete for sales in the American market, when our tariffs have already been drastically cut, and after we have handed

them billions of dollars, then something else is wrong.

In attempting to sell the American people on the merits of free trade, the advocates of such a scheme have come up with any number of sweet-scented slogans.

Back in 1937, it was "world peace through world trade." Then along came World War II. In 1943, they told us our trade program was an "acid test of our future intentions respecting the peace." In 1951, they told the American people that we must "reduce worldwide barriers to international trade." By then plenty of American blood was being spilled in Korea and the peace slogan was out of the window. In 1954, they employed the slogan, "Trade, not aid." This year, they tell us the program is necessary for the "containment of communism."

That is a good one, "Containment of communism." The free traders in the State Department tell us it is the duty of the United States to allow more and more products from slave-labor nations to enter this country, even at the expense of American industry, labor, and agriculture, because it is an effective way to win friends and influence people.

We all believe in containing communism, but how is this to be reconciled with the fact that we are allowing millions of pounds of pork to be imported into this country from Communist Poland, and at a time when our own farmers are receiving less and less for their hogs.

I call attention to the fact that the average price for barrows and gilts at Chicago on February 4 of this year was the lowest since April 1950. The average price for all swine at Chicago on February 4 was $9.11 per hundredweight below that paid a year ago.

And when we look at the import figures for pork products, we see that in 1952, the United States imported $6,888,000 in hams, shoulders, and bacon from Poland. In 1953, the total had shot up to $10,546,000. During the first 9 months of 1954 only, imports of these products from this Kremlin-controlled nation amounted to $11,366,000 or more than the total figure for the entire year of 1953. But in that same first 9 months of last year, we permitted to come into this country from Communist Poland a total of $14½ million worth of various products, $11,366,000 being pork products. In the same 9 months, we shipped to Poland $1,286,000 of our products. In other words, we shipped these Communists $10 million of our money. And that is called reciprocity.

We shipped these Communists American dollars in return—almost nothing in the form of American products.

Is this the State Department's idea of containing communism through expanded world trade? I wish someone would step forward and explain to me how you contain communism by pouring millions of American dollars into the coffers of a Communist nation—dollars to be used to purchase war materials from some of our so-called free-world friends.

The majority report accompanying H. R. 1 says on page 7:

> The main economic impediment to an expanded foreign market for our own production is the shortage of dollars on the part of friendly foreign nations.

What evidence does the committee have on which it based this statement? To the contrary, the Department of Commerce reports foreign countries received so much material help from various types of American business and foreign aid, in the period 1950–53, that these countries had a surplus, over and above what they purchased from us of $7,800,000,000 which has been added to gold and dollar assets of the foreign countries.

And according to a report in the New York Times, the Secretariat of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has under lock and key a study showing that foreign countries, far from being short of dollars, are actually pouring their own investment funds into what they believe is the politically secure United States capital market. In a recent Geneva dispatch, the Times says that the report contains so much dynamite that it is highly unlikely the study will be published as an official paper.

There is no question that the State Department is aware of the contents of this secret report. Why has not the information been released to the general public? It could have an important bearing on our discussions here today.

Of course the reason is obvious why the State Department would not want such a report made public. It would no doubt serve to explode the myth that a huge dollar gap exists, and would reveal how ineffectual United States tariff cutting is as an approach to world trade problems.

I am one Member of this House who is convinced that Congress must repossess its constitutional responsibility to regulate the foreign trade of this country.

We have had 20 years of the trade-agreements program as shaped by the State Department hierarchy which is guided by considerations of international politics rather than by a concern for our domestic economy. In that 20-year period we have suffered almost every ailment the program was ballyhooed to prevent.

Cordell Hull, to whom belongs the dubious honor of being the father of the program, asserted it was an emergency measure to deal with a dangerous and threatening emergency condition. That was back in 1934. The time is long overdue for this emergency measure to be given a quiet burial. And let the free-traders mourn its passing.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to call attention to one of the planks in the platform adopted by the Republican Party at its 1952 convention. I'm not consulted on the size and shape of these planks but a few of my Republican colleagues are and I want to remind them of the pledge they planked down to the public. I quote:

> Our reciprocal trade agreements will be entered into and maintained on the basis of true reciprocity, and to safeguard our domestic enterprise and the payrolls of our workers against unfair import competition.

The bill before us today contains no assurance that trade agreements will be entered into and maintained on a basis of true reciprocity. In fact, the word "reciprocal" is mentioned only once in the entire bill. Neither does it contain any provision to safeguard our domestic enterprise and the payrolls of our workers against unfair import competition.

The only decent and effective answer to this most vital problem is legislation providing for tariffs, that represent cost of production differentials on all imported products which are in adequate or surplus supply in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is a dangerous piece of legislation. It is not in the best interests of American industry, labor, or agriculture, and I have no choice but to vote against it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Quite a few references were made yesterday to John C. Calhoun. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is on the floor, because he said something about John C. Calhoun turning over in his grave, finding all this opposition to these reciprocal trade agreements. It is my honor to represent in this House John C. Calhoun's old congressional district, and I would like to commend to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] a book by Clarence M. Wiltse, in which he characterizes John C. Calhoun as a great nationalist. In fact, the title of the book is "John C. Calhoun, the Nationalist, 1782–1828." During this period of American history John C. Calhoun was Secretary of War and a Member of this House, and during that time he advocated a high protective tariff. Why? To protect the infant industries of this country, so in case of war America would not be dependent upon some foreign ally for its utensils of war.

I rise here today not as a member of the legal profession, although I have a very high regard for that profession. I am not a lawyer-farmer. I stand before you today as an active farmer, living at Route 1, Greenwood, S. C. My father, my grandfather, and my great grandfather grew cotton in that section of South Carolina. Who buys most of the cotton produced on the cotton farms of South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and the other States of this Union? I tell you today, the men who buy most of that cotton are the textile manufacturers of the United States of America. They buy 70 percent of the cotton grown in California, Texas, and throughout the length and breadth of this country. I say to the gentleman from Mississippi, which he probably does not know, that it is the Cannons of North Carolina, the Haynes of North Carolina, the Springs, Abneys, and Selfs of South Carolina, the Fall River men in Massachusetts who buy this cotton on the Delta in Mississippi, and not the textile people of Japan, India, or some other foreign manufacturer of cotton. I defy him or anyone else to repudiate the facts in this case. Let me say again, 70 percent, or more, of the cotton grown in the United States is purchased by our own textile manufacturers.

In the interest of the American cotton farmer, who is it that we should protect first? The manufacturer in Japan, in Germany, Italy, or England, or should we protect the men who really buy the cotton grown on the farms in

this country? Of course, our first obligation should be to protect that man who buys our cotton. Last year Japan imported 2,400,000 bales of cotton, 800,000 bales of which were imported from the United States. Less than one-third of the raw cotton imported by Japan was imported from America.

So under any reduction of the tariff on textiles, finished cotton goods coming back into the United States from Japan will not be made from cotton grown by the cotton farmers of the United States but by the cotton farmers of Mexico, Egypt, Brazil, or somewhere else in the world. Therefore the American cotton farmer is being misled when he is told that our importation of Japanese textile goods is greatly benefiting him.

I want to call to the attention of these gentlemen who have argued so eloquently yesterday and today for the reciprocal trade agreements that in 1933, the year just prior to the adoption of the Reciprocal Trade Act the cotton farmers of America exported—listen to this—exported 8,300,000 bales. Remember, gentlemen, that is the year immediately prior to the adoption of the reciprocal trade agreements.

Since reciprocal trade went into effect in 1934, did our cotton exports increase? No my friends we exported less cotton and have had to resort to acreage controls. After 19 years of reciprocal trade what was the true picture?

In 1952 how much cotton did we export from the United States? 2,800,000 bales. Mind you this was the year America was giving foreign countries the money to buy our cotton. There is the story for the farmers of America, not just cotton farmers only—that is the real true story for us all to see. I rise here today as a farmer pleading for the farmers of this country who have been misled by this high-sounding phrase, "reciprocal trade," just as they were fooled by the phrase, "a war to end all wars," and by the phrase, "a war for democracy." This is just another one of those one-world star-gazing phrases. The real effect of the reciprocal trade agreements policy, as has been demonstrated, has been to hurt many of the farmers of the Nation, and is threatening the textile worker, the coal miner, the fishermen, the glass worker, and many others with unemployment and distress.

The great textile industry of America is operating today on a very narrow margin of profit. After taxes on each sale dollar there was a profit in the third quarter of 1954 of only 1 percent. In the average American industry the profit was 4.4. Any reduction whatever in the tariff on Japanese textile goods will result in curtailment and unemployment among textile workers in this country. The textile worker has worked and struggled hard for his standard of living. He must not be thrown in direct competition with skilled labor in Japan being paid 13 cents per hour. Our textile industry should not be placed at the mercy of textile labor in India receiving 9 cents per hour for its labor. The textile worker, the farmer and all related business will be seriously threatened if the State Department succeeds in camouflaging its plans in the form of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself for a moment now to the argument we have heard time and again that American industry has the know-how, the technology, and the skill to outproduce Japan. Let me tell you something: The average textile worker in Japan can tend to more looms in a textile plant and do it just as efficiently as our textile workers in the United States. Japan is a nation that with a little more strategic materials might have conquered the world. Remember, that the greatest battleship ever built was one built by the Japanese during World War II. The Zero was a pretty good airplane too, I might say to the gentleman from New York.

We talk about Japan. They have the greatest pool of skilled labor outside of the United States itself. With her industry destroyed during World War II, she had to rebuild. Her textile plants today are the most modern in the world, and they can and are producing as efficiently as any textile mills in the United States; in fact, the effect of this kind of legislation will be to give the Japanese textile industry a shot in the arm. Within 3 years they will come back to this country and say, "We need a still further reduction of the tariff. If we do not get it we will go communistic."

I came here today to tell you the truth, and not mislead you with phony optimism about our ability to cope with a growing streamlined Japanese textile empire. I saw 16,000 Japanese skilled workers at the Tachitawa Airbase, and the American general in command told me they were among the most skilled workers in the world. All you had to do was to show them a blueprint of a machine they had never seen before and they could fix the machine to perfection.

We talk about outproducing a nation like that with 13 cents an hour labor. Why, Mr. Chairman, these one-world proponents are willing to destroy the industry of this country in the false hope of buying foreign friends.

One other thing that may astonish you. A man came to my office week before last. He was forced by circumstances aggravated by reciprocal trade to close a plant in this country built with RFC money, a brandnew plant built indirectly with your money to make cotton bagging. He closed it 6 months ago. Two hundred and twenty-five employees are idle. He built a plant in India, which he told me is already in operation. There he probably gets labor for 9 cents an hour. He is importing the cotton bagging right back to America and is selling it through the same distribution points as he did the bagging formerly made in America. That, Mr. Chairman, is the story.

He said, "I did not want to do this. I would rather run my plant in the United States and give employment to Americans, but I will have to go where I can make a reasonable profit."

This and similar conditions are resulting from the fantastic dreams of the one-worlders, and the do-gooders. They want one world currency, and no tariff; they want world trade regulated by the United Nations. The earnest desire of these textbook idealists is to whittle away the constitutional power of the American Congress. If and when our sacred Constitution is destroyed and the unemployed and bankrupt American people finally stand before the despotic commissars of the United Nations we might well look back upon this day as the beginning of the end. Let us stand up today and recommit this bill back to the Ways and Means Committee. Let us retain our power under the Constitution to regulate foreign trade and levy a tariff to protect our people. This House should resolve today to surrender no more of its power to the President, the Supreme Court, or any agency of the evermore centralized Federal Government.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina and some of the others who have spoken in opposition to the President's program have used the terms "do-gooders," "one-worlders," and they have left the implication and the impression that this is a program unanimously opposed by American business and American agriculture, one destined to wreck our shops and our farms, and having the support of no one except people who are interested in the development of other areas of the world.

Let us take a look at the record. In the first place, this program was recommended by the President of the United States. Testifying in support of the program were practically all of the members of his Cabinet, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Defense. Those are just a few.

Who speaks for business, agriculture, and labor in the United States? Who generally does? Well, normally, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the CIO. What position do they take?

Let us take a look at the American Farm Bureau Federation. The gentleman from South Carolina would have you believe that all the farmers are opposed to this program.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I am a member of the Farm Bureau, I am a member of the Grange, I am a member of practically every farm organization the gentleman has mentioned. I know of my own personal knowledge that this issue has not been voted on at the grassroots level down in South Carolina. These national leaders do not always represent the little fellow back home.

Mr. BOGGS. Is the gentleman saying he speaks for the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange and the National Farmers Union, or does he represent them?

The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation said:

> Our wheat, cotton, tobacco, soybeans, feed grains, rice, and animal byproducts and certain fruits and other products are among the most efficiently produced in the world.

Our exports of farm products have run as high as $4 billion in 1951–52. They accounted for roughly one-third of our production of wheat, cotton, rice, and soybeans. This provided a market for the produce of more than 1 out of each 10 acres of cropland. This amount was equal to $1,000 for each commercial farm.

Does that sound like do-goodism?

Now, the National Grange. Maybe it is a do-good organization. I do not know. You know, it is a funny thing about this word "do-good." I hear people using that phrase "do-good" all the time. Well, I do not see why that is such a bad thing to call a man. Suppose you call him a do-badder. I just wonder what a do-gooder is. Some say when you want to say something real bad about somebody you call him a do-good.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. All I am trying to do is to do good by the farmers and the textile workers of the district that I represent.

Mr. BOGGS. I am certain the gentleman is, and he does a splendid job.

Now, the National Grange. What do they say?

There is no single segment of American economy that has greater stake in achieving the objective of a sound United States economic position and policy, which would provide the basis for a constantly expanded level of trade in the world on a profitable basis, than has American agriculture.

The National Farmers Union in effect says the same thing.

Now, let us take a look at the American worker. I do not claim to speak for any of these groups, but I am citing people who do claim to speak for them. Well, certainly they would not occupy the position they occupy if they did not speak for them.

What does the CIO say about it?

The United States cannot pick and choose and deal only in the items that we need to import and export. Instead, the United States must engage in gradual, continual, and, in many instances, reciprocal reduction of the barriers to international trade. Reciprocal trade is essential for the maintenance of production in many of our own basic industries and equally essential for the preservation of sound international relations with our allies.

I do not know whether that is a do-gooder talking.

Take the American Federation of Labor. Maybe it is a one-worlder. I do not know, but here is what they say:

We are mindful of the fact that a significant number of American workers are employed in industries facing foreign competition. We are definitely concerned lest the trade-agreements program operate to deprive these workers of employment opportunities at their present trade or occupation.

At the same time, we are equally mindful that many American workers are dependent for their employment on American exports or on the handling, transportation, or storage of imports. In 1952, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that the employment of 4,376,000 American workers depended on foreign trade.

Let us take business for a moment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, the gentleman should bring out the fact that we pumped about $100 billion into Europe in the last 10 or 15 years, and the question is now, if we discontinue these foreign-aid programs or these giveaway programs, whether or not they are going to continue to buy American merchandise.

That is a question, too, that will not be determined until the foreign-aid programs cease. But it has been American money pumped into the economic and industrial life of Europe that has been responsible for these heavy export programs that have been going on.

Mr. BOGGS. I would say to the gentleman that within the last several years the number of dollars coming from various mutual programs used in foreign trade with this country has been steadily reduced so that as of today it is about 15 percent as compared with as much as 70 percent at one time.

One of the main objectives of this program is to make it possible for the other nations of the world to trade without any additional foreign-aid appropriation. That is one reason I stand here in support of this program now.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder how much the CIO packinghouse workers got out of the $11½ million worth of canned ham and bacon that was shipped into this country in the first 9 months of the last year.

Mr. BOGGS. I do not know the answer to that question. But if the statements made by the gentleman are correct, I say that it demonstrates the position of an organization taking the national point of view rather than looking at one specific situation and using that in order to completely wreck a program vital to the national security. As a matter of fact, in all of these matters you must expect some sacrifice in behalf of the national interest. Nobody will deny that there must be some sacrifice somewhere down the line in all of these matters.

Now, what did business say about this? Let us take the United States Chamber of Commerce. I do not believe that is a one-world or a do-gooder bunch. Here is what they said:

Through increased trade, the Nation's economy benefits. That is true just as much in world trade as in domestic trade. More goods at lower prices has been the very heart of the American competitive-enterprise system. The trade-agreements program can contribute to the health of that system.

I think it is pretty generally established that this program has sound, substantial support from sound, substantial people all over the United States.

The issue before us today is whether or not we are going to adopt a motion to recommit which will be offered by my distinguished friend from New York and which is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD out today. Let us analyze that motion to recommit, for a moment, before we each make up our minds and decide whether or not we are going to vote for it.

Let us first analyze it from the point of view of coal. It has been the contention of the spokesmen for coal that the only relief or benefit to it will be by an imposition of import quotas. This motion to recommit does not permit the imposition of import quotas. It has no bearing upon that situation whatsoever. From the point of view of the representations which have been made in respect to coal this motion will be of no benefit whatsoever to those gentlemen.

Looking at it from the other point of view—that is, what it does do, what its implications are—they are very far-reaching indeed, and do not let anybody tell you otherwise. This motion, if adopted, will change the entire concept of the power of the President of the United States with respect to negotiating these agreements. I am not a bit sure that it will not cut across existing agreements. It will establish the Tariff Commission in a role in which it has never been established before. It will make the decisions of the Tariff Commission absolute and final except in a case involving national defense. National policy, national interest, economic policy, effect upon other segments of the economy, upon other sections of the country, all of those are eliminated.

What we are saying is this, that we will no longer trust the President of the United States to administer this program. Someone said, and I believe it is in the report, that a few weeks ago we passed a resolution in which we trusted the President of the United States to determine when and if and under what conditions he would send the young men of this Nation to war involving Formosa, but today we are saying that in a matter involving a tariff concession or in the negotiation of a tariff treaty we will not trust the President of the United States.

As I said on yesterday, I find myself in the role of defending the President's program, and I do so because I think the President is eminently correct. I have done it under Democratic Presidents and I am very happy to do it with a Republican President.

If you adopt this motion to recommit, and somebody writes to you and says, "Are you for reciprocal trade?" please be honest enough to write back and tell him, no, that you felt that it had gone too far, it had lasted too long, and that on February 18, 1955, you voted to end the program, because that is what you are going to do if you adopt this motion to recommit.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I made my speech on this floor 3 or 4 weeks ago on this matter, and I did not expect to speak today, but I feel impelled to clear up some of the things and some of the misrepresentations that have been made on this floor today.

Charlie Shuman, president of the Farm Bureau, comes from my State. I know him well. He did say that there were $4 billion worth of exports of farm products in 1952, but his attention was called to the fact that $5 billion of farm

imports were made in 1952, giving the foreign farmer a billion-dollar advantage over the American farmer.

Charlie Shuman also said in 4 or 5 different statements in his appearance before us that he wanted the escape clause strengthened. He said, "This has been too much of a one-way street." That has not been brought out. In the motion to recommit that is what we expect to do, strengthen the escape clause, say that when a majority of the Tariff Board says, after due examination, that injury has been done, the President must do something to correct and alleviate that injury unless the national defense is impaired; and Charlie Shuman would be for that. There is nothing wrong with that, and that does permit the 100 or 120 Members of this House whose industries have been affected to go back home and say, "Well, we did change the rules. We have made it sure now that if you can make your case before the Tariff Commission you can expect to have your injuries corrected." Then, there is another thing about this matter of trusting the President. Let me ask you this. Would any of you farmers in this audience, would any of you people who run an industrial plant hire the best doctor in Washington to go out and run your farm or to run your industry? Why, of course not. You would hire him to take care of your medical needs or surgical needs, but not for something else. When we hire the greatest military expert in the world, of course we trust him in military affairs. Of course, we trust him on the matter of Formosa. Of course, we believe he knows what he is doing there. We have faith in him in that field. But on this matter of dealing with foreign nations and trade restrictions, that is a different question. He does not do that. We give him the power to do it, but he delegates it to the State Department. When we do not trust the State Department, we cannot give the President the power to do this. For that reason, I say I trust the President of the United States in military matters but not in these other matters, in which he never has had 1 minute of actual experience in handling, and, as a result, he must depend upon outside advice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in the 6 years that I have had the honor and privilege of serving in this body, I find myself in agreement with the gentleman who preceded me when he said that he had no intention of speaking because I, too, had no intention of speaking on this bill. After that agreement, that is where our agreement ends.

I am moved to take this time to answer a few of the charges or allegations made during debate that those of us who are for the continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements are less patriotic and less considerate of their districts than those who are opposed because of certain interests in their districts are fearful that there may be foreign competition.

The legislation before us, providing for a 3-year extension and modification of our reciprocal trade agreements program, is one of the most vital measures that will be considered by this Congress. This legislation is of utmost importance to our own Nation and, in a larger sense, to the entire Western community. In my sincere judgment, the passage of this bill would serve our interests. It is my hope, therefore, that the bill will receive prompt and overwhelming support from the membership of this body.

The entire issue of our foreign economic policy has often been obscured and beclouded by arguments steeped in emotional prejudices, and in fear of injury. Many of our businessmen, under fire from foreign competition and urged by proponents of liberal trade to leave their tariff-protected shelters, have feared hardships and found it difficult to believe that, in the long run, they too, would benefit from freer world trade. Some of them have held steadfastly unto the doctrine of protectionism not out of any stubbornness, but simply because they were genuinely afraid that the reduction of import barriers would bring hardship to their firms, and to the people employed by them.

The fact is that tariff reductions are bound to adversely affect certain numbers of American firms and their employees. This is the entire point, the basis of the argument that international exchange of goods and services benefits all participants. Tariff reductions are worth striving for simply because we assume that there are some products that other countries can make better and cheaper than we can. By reducing our tariff barriers, we make it possible for those goods to enter our country and thereby we help to stretch the purchasing power of our consumers' dollars.

On the other hand, there are many products which we can make better and cheaper than the industries of other countries. If this were not the case, we could not have exported over $16 billion worth of goods and services in 1953, and a similar amount last year. These exports produce income for our workers, and income for our industries and for our agriculture.

If we, therefore, look at the overall picture, we must come to the conclusion that foreign trade is beneficial both to our Nation and to our friends abroad. If this were not true, there would be no foreign trade: each country would merely try to become self-sufficient and trade as little as possible with its neighbors.

The question that remains to be answered, then, is how many American firms and workers would be hurt by tariff reductions, and how much. Secondly, we must evaluate those potential hardships in terms of the overall benefit of freer trade to our economy and to our national security. Thirdly, we must try to find some ways of assisting those American firms and workers who may be subjected to hardship because of tariff reductions.

Let us briefly examine these three questions, and see if there are any answers to them.

In the first instance, let us turn to the issue of how many United States firms and workers would be hurt by a reduction in our tariff barriers, and how much.

In his excellent and informative study of the probable impact of free trade on our domestic industries, entitled "Aid, Trade, and the Tariff," Dr. Howard Piquet, of the Library of Congress, estimated that the suspension of all United States import duties would have increased imports in 1951 by a maximum of $1.8 billion—which amount was equivalent to less than 1 percent of our gross national product.

Using some of Dr. Piquet's figures, the Randall Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower to study our foreign trade policy, came to the conclusion that a 50-percent cut in our present tariffs might displace the total of 100,000 United States workers.

More than twice that number of our workers are laid off every month in the United States, even in periods of rising employment, and most of them find other work without any prolonged delays.

While the above-cited estimates do not purport to be more than informed guesses, and while this particular subject requires further attention and study, it would appear that a moderate reduction in our tariff rates—such as that envisioned in the bill before us—could not be expected to produce the drastic results forecast by some ardent protectionists.

Now let us turn to examine the potential effect of the extension of the reciprocal agreements program, and of moderate reduction of our import tariff rates, on the overall economy and security of our Nation.

Fortunately, much has been written on this subject, and the issues involved have received thorough study over a number of years. The Draper report, the Harriman report, the Paley report, the Bell report, the Randall report—these are but a few recent documents which state clearly that the liberalization of our foreign trade would be in the best interests of our national economy, and of our security.

In addition, there is a wealth of information and evidence in support of this conclusion that has been gathered by the League of Women Voters of the United States, the National Farmers Union, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National Foreign Trade Council, the National Grange, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, and many other civic, professional, business, and labor organizations.

All these reports and studies lead to this conclusion: the growth and expansion of our economy, and the well-being of our people, can be greatly furthered by our continued efforts to promote the liberalization of trade within the Western World. They also point out that the economic strength and unity of the free world may well depend on the way in which we shall face this issue: if we choose to maintain trade barriers between the free countries, and if we exclude the products of our allies from our markets, we shall be driving them to trade with the Communist bloc. We

shall be thereby undermining the very foundations of western unity which we have been trying to build up with so much effort and sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the third point of this discussion: since the overall interests of our Nation demand that we continue to work for the liberalization of foreign trade, what can be done to assist those particular firms and workers who may be seriously affected by tariff reductions?

There are several firms in my district, and in the entire metropolitan area of Milwaukee, which are confronted with serious foreign competition. There are other firms throughout the country which find themselves in a similar predicament.

Some suggestions have already been made that the Government extend interim assistance to firms and workers adversely affected by foreign competition, in order to aid them in the rechanneling of their productive facilities and energies into different fields of production. I earnestly hope that these proposals receive thorough consideration from this body, and that the most feasible and practical of them receives favorable action. I shall continue to work for early action on such legislation.

Before closing, I should like to bring up one more point:

Last year, acting on my request and with the full cooperation of my office, the Library of Congress conducted an important survey of the impact of foreign trade on the city of Milwaukee. The study was conducted under the general supervision of Dr. Howard Piquet, and the final report was written by Mr. Harold Lamar, both members of the Legislative Reference Division of the Library of Congress.

In the belief that this report would prove of great interest to Members of this body and to people throughout the Nation, I had inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1955. For that reason, I shall not at this point go into the details of that document, since it is readily accessible to all of us.

I believe, however, that it is proper to point out that the Foreign Trade and Milwaukee study revealed that the majority of our manufacturing industries in Milwaukee, and of the workers employed by them, are greatly interested in foreign trade, and largely benefit from it. This is a very revealing point. The study further showed that only approximately 3½ percent of the manufacturing workers of industries answering the Library of Congress questionnaire were being adversely affected by foreign competition.

Similar local studies have been and are being made in other parts of our country. They should be of great help to us by showing how foreign trade affects our communities, and by indicating the industries and the specific firms which suffer from foreign competition.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes allotted to me, I have endeavored to show why the legislation before us warrants speedy and favorable action. It is my hope that the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program will be approved without delay.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to announce that we have only one further speaker on this side, so the gentleman from New York may finish up on his side.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, at this point in debate, probably none of us is helping anyone make up his mind how to vote. Perhaps some of us are saying things which we do not really mean or which should not be said. At the same time, I intend to vote in favor of this bill because I believe it will strengthen the economy of the United States. I believe also that it will strengthen the economies of our allies, which will be of direct benefit to us. Passage of this bill, furthermore, will help the American consumer. Such foreign competition as this bill envisages should foster greater efficiency within our own industries. Competition, we can all agree, is a vital part of a healthy free enterprise system. I have faith that America's engineering and merchandising genius will enable us to compete effectively without the subsidy of high tariffs.

Each Member of Congress, I am sure, has received material from his district regarding certain industries which feel they would be injured by any further reduction in tariffs. In some cases they claim injury under present rates. If my office is typical, Congressmen may have received more material from industries opposed to this bill than they have from those favoring it. As so frequently happens, it is the opponents of a measure who make the most noise.

For this reason the easy course for many Members may be to oppose the bill before us. Such action, at least, would satisfy the vociferous and articulate opponents of trade liberalization. The Member could claim to be fighting to protect his district's interests and no one would question his sincerity.

Unfortunately, the more difficult course for each of us is to rise above the purely parochial interests of our constituency. On a major piece of legislation such as that before us—a bill which has tremendously wide potential ramifications both nationally and internationally—I believe our votes should be determined by a broader consideration than our own immediate constituencies. The test should be the test which President Eisenhower so frequently refers to, "Is it in the enlightened self-interest of the United States? Will this strengthen America?"

In his special message to Congress last month, the President said:

> The Nation's enlightened self-interest and sense of responsibility as a leader among the free nations require a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for the fuller operation of the forces of free enterprise and competitive markets. Our own self-interest requires such a program because (1) economic strength among our allies is essential to our security; (2) economic growth in underdeveloped areas is necessary to lessen international instability growing out of the vulnerability of such areas to Communist penetration and subversion; and (3) an increasing volume of world production and trade will help assure our own economic growth and a rising standard of living among our own people.

The bill before us will strengthen the United States both at home and abroad. The United States must take the leadership in encouraging high levels of trade. I hope that my colleagues will cast their votes on the basis of the national interest rather than any special or local interests.

I wish, in closing, Mr. Chairman, to make a special point: Regardless of the outcome of the vote on this particular bill, we should recognize that the reciprocal trade program is only one part of the complex field of foreign economic policy. Despite the importance of this program we must bear in mind that the real problems in the field of world trade lie far deeper than the tariff question.

The problems stem largely from the basic disruptions and dislocations in trade patterns which first came about following World War II and which have continued up to the present time. A number of specific factors could be listed:

First. The center of world trade has shifted from Britain to the United States. This has created definite economic adjustment problems for Great Britain and other Western European nations.

Second. The drive of former colonial people for economic independence has considerably altered traditional trade patterns between Western industrial nations and so-called third countries of the underdeveloped areas.

Third. Scientific and technological change have tempted more nations to pursue a policy of economic independence and self-sufficiency. The result has been an undercutting of the traditional advantages of international specialization, and an increase in international trade competition.

A revolution in world trade patterns has resulted from these and many other factors. Solutions to the dislocations which have taken place cannot be found in tariff adjustments alone. In many cases the economic problems of our allies have nothing to do with the United States tariff. For one thing, our European friends must further increase their production and improve their merchandising techniques.

Along with our efforts in the field of reciprocal trade, the Government of the United States will continue, I hope, to work closely with its allies in an effort to attack the more basic causes which have led to the problems facing us in the field of international trade.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. And, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make my position crystal clear on the action which took place yesterday. Due to the fact that I was confined to my

bed with the flu, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 8. Had I been able to vote I would have supported the closed rule and voted "yea." On rollcall No. 9, I would have voted against an open rule, against the Brown amendment, I would have voted "nay." And on rollcall No. 10, the previous question, I would have voted for the original rule, I would have voted "yea." It is thus apparent that I intend to support the President of the United States today and vote against recommittal, and in favor of the bill. Enough has been said on both sides, but I would like to add that the motivating, driving force in my vote is this: "Trade, not aid."

For example, it is a ridiculous thing to build up West Germany as a nation, to revitalize her industrial capacity, to put her on her feet as a free-enterprise nation, and then to set trade barriers in the path of German enterprises. Similar situations exist in free, friendly countries all over the world. I believe that H. R. 1 will further revitalize these nations by the "trade, not aid" principle.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak with special reference to that part of the trade-agreements program dealing with protection of commodities and skills vital to our security and national defense. In my judgment, this is the program's weakest link. It should be substantially strengthened, if we are to give this program our full approval. To do otherwise is to deliberately strike at the jobs of skilled American craftsmen, and to jeopardize the safety of our country, if and when the time comes that their skills are vitally needed. I cannot believe that our international relations or the international economic climate requires any such sacrifice from an important segment of American industry, and, indeed, from the American people themselves, upon whom the burden of this unwise step would eventually fall.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that, in voicing this plea for strengthened protection of defense-supporting industries, I am not opposing the objectives of the President's program. I believe the American people generally are in accord with its objectives. I believe most of the industrialists of my district share the view that a prudent extension of the reciprocal trade program would be good for the world economy and good for world understanding and amity.

But the bill does not, in my judgment, make adequate provision to protect certain classes of skilled workers, whose skills are vital to our own safety, and in that respect I believe it should be revised.

Let me illustrate, Mr. Chairman, by citing what is already happening to the optical workers in my district.

The optical industry is, of course, essential to our defense. We rely on it for optical and photographic equipment, bombsights, gunsights, tanksights, periscopes, telescopes, binoculars, cameras of all types, and many other instruments, without which our entire Defense Establishment would be blindfolded.

But despite so-called safeguards already existing in the trade agreements act, which are supposed to protect such industries, the optical industry is today operating with its back to the wall. The American market has already been opened up to a flood of foreign optical goods, and substantial numbers of American workers have already been laid off as a result. Thus, for example, in 1947 imported laboratory microscopes accounted for slightly more than 1 percent of total sales in the United States. In 1953 they accounted for more than 43 percent of the total sales. In 1948, imported binoculars valued at $25 or more represented 46.2 percent of domestic sales. In 1953 they represented 86.7 percent of our sales.

What does this mean, in concrete terms, to American industry? It means that certain vitally important industries must either go out of business or go into other lines of business in which they can remain solvent. They find themselves between the upper and nether millstone, with their own Government grinding them into oblivion.

Let me illustrate my point more specifically from the experience of a fine optical and instrument company in my district, one of whose specialties has been camera shutters.

Here is the case history of that company, under our present trade agreements program, as described to me by one of its officers:

> During the past year our shutter business has dropped 75 percent, forcing us to lay off 76 of our 110 skilled shutter makers, and another 390 of our 1,000 regular factory employees from our various other departments, which layoffs have been entirely due to the present low tariffs. In some departments we have reached the point where we are employing only 1 person. These layoffs are continuing at the present time.
>
> Between 1949 and 1953 our shutter production averaged well over 100,000 units per year. In 1954, due to the imports of photographic shutters, this production dropped to 34,000 per year, and is still continuing to decrease. The amount of labor necessary to manufacture a shutter represents 85 percent of the unit cost per shutter, and at our average rate of $2.25 per hour, it is quite impossible to compete with $.35 to $.50 per hour labor which exists for skilled shuttermakers in Germany and approximately $.15 to $.20 per hour labor which exists for skilled shuttermakers in Japan.
>
> In 1939 and 1940 when Germany was cut off as a source of supply for photographic shutters, we were very urgently requested by the United States Army Signal Corps to develop a shutter for their military requirements, which we did in a very short period of time. However, if it were not for the fact that we had been able to maintain reasonable shutter production and as a result of this production of our own engineering and experimental departments, we could not have developed this urgently required military shutter.
>
> Our shuttermakers are highly skilled people with many years of experience. It takes 2 to 3 years to train one, and only a small percentage of people to whom we give training succeeded in becoming shuttermakers. Shutters are not items that can be mass-produced. Each is built individually. Our Repax shutter has 186 parts, many of them so small they must be handled with pincers.
>
> * * * * *
>
> To sum it up, the impact of imports on our company is disastrous. Naturally, we are considering steps to keep this company in business, but we do not see any way of keeping skilled help on the payroll.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Our industry is an imported industry. It was built up by imported skilled craftsmen who came from Germany. They brought the skill and taught it to others. When World War I came along, it was only a small industry, but suddenly German imports stopped, and efforts had to be made to substitute American-made products for German imports. There was lots of time, however—3 years, 1914 to 1917—before we got into the scrap, and even then we weren't ready. It took another year to equip an army. The optical industry was one of those that was not ready, but it grew fast during and after World War I, when photography became of such tremendous importance in peace and war. We were ready in World War II and in Korea. Optical and photographic equipment, bombsights, gunsights, tanksights, periscopes, telescopes, binoculars, cameras of all types, all needing lenses and instruments that only the optical industry with its skilled help could supply, all these and many others too numerous to mention, flowed in a never-ending stream to the Armed Forces. Again, however, we had time to do training, to enlarge our facilities, to plan, to produce, but even then we could not do it without exempting from military service those who had the skill to do the work.
>
> What is the situation today? The industry is losing a large part of skilled help, and those that remain are the older workers. They have never done anything else, and many of them are expert craftsmen, but they are not getting any younger. Within a few years, these skills will be gone. They tell us that in the next war we will not have time to prepare. How, then, can we produce precision equipment without trained help? How good is a camera without a lens or shutter, how good a pair of binoculars without prisms, how good an atomic submarine without a periscope, how good a bombsight without an optical system? Are we going to fight the next war blindfolded? That is exactly what we are going to do, unless something is done to keep optical plants going.

Mr. Chairman, I have received similar information from virtually every optical instruments manufacturer in my district, and we all know it is a situation which prevails throughout the country. I will take the time of the House to cite one more illustration, however. There is in my district one large manufacturer of optical goods who specializes in binoculars. In 1946, the company manufactured 41.5 percent of the quality binoculars sold on the American market. Only 1 percent were of Japanese origin. In 1949, this company's share of the domestic market had dropped to 9.3 percent, and by 1952 its share was only 2.8 percent. This, of course, amounts to ruinous competition, and ruinous economic war, waged against American manufacturers and American workmen by their own Government. In my judgment, there are no considerations of international relations sufficiently important to justify an international trade program maintained at so critical a cost to our own manufacturers and workers.

I should like to add one additional ironic fact to this statement: in more than one case in my district, the manufacturing plants which are being so critically hurt by our present foreign trade program are, in more than one sense, the victims of their own Government. When World War II and the

Korean war broke out, the Defense Department went rushing to these manufacturers, pleading for urgently needed optical goods of many kinds. The manufacturers embarked on the necessary expansion programs, tooling up their plants, enlisting and training the craftsmen necessary to do the job, and turning out the goods which were vital to our security.

Mr. Chairman, there is a heartening note in connection with this problem and I refer to plans to amend the Defense Production Act to provide the necessary authority for the protection of commodities and skills vital to our national defense. In a conversation earlier today with Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, I was assured that the administration will recommend an appropriate amendment to the Defense Production Act in connection with the proposed extension of this law. Although the details of the proposal have not been determined, it is expected that an interagency task force within the ODM will soon submit a report and recommendations on the subject for the consideration of the Director who in turn will report to the President. This approach appears to be a practical solution to this knotty problem and I am glad to have the assurance of the Director that this matter will be brought to a head within the near future. Such an amendment to the Defense Production Act should give the President appropriate authority to protect the industries and skills essential to our national security and defense.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, after yesterday's demonstration as to the temper of the House regarding H. R. 1, it would seem to me that it is very clear that any extension of time made should not exceed 1 year.

For years the frightful conditions existing in the anthracite and bituminous coal industry of the United States has been pretty generally known. To we who live with the problem it is disheartening to say the least.

It therefore becomes necessary for me to oppose H. R. 1 because of the insistence of our administrations, present and past, to permit the importation of millions of barrels of dump, residual oil into our eastern seaboard.

This importation of residual oil—136 million barrels last year—is the equivalent of 35 million tons of coal—means that the loss of production and sales fall on the mines which normally serve the eastern seaboard.

Unemployment in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania has been persistent over a number of years. We have tried to cope with this situation locally and through the State.

We realize that there are a number of factors which go to make up our trials and tribulations and which I will not discuss at this time.

However, one of the greatest factors, such as the importation of cheap residual oil, displaces so much of our coal production that it becomes necessary to protest the passage of H. R. 1 in its present form.

I was one of a great many Members of this body who brought attention of this problem to the committee with the introduction of H. R. 428 which would have limited such importation to some degree.

Since we have no other recourse to cut down on this dumping of residual oil into our country, I shall vote against H. R. 1.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I cannot possibly vote for the bill as now written. I hope to be able to vote for recommittal.

Believing very earnestly as I do that H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, represents extremely far-reaching and important legislation for our country, I appealed to the Members of the House yesterday to think very accurately about all of the facts involved before committing themselves to a decision on this bill this afternoon.

After a careful examination and exhaustive study of the facts involved and the far-reaching powers granted in this legislation, I have reached a conclusion to oppose and vote against H. R. 1.

In reaching this conclusion, I want to make my position perfectly clear. I am not opposed to international trade, and I am not opposed to international trade by negotiation or agreement. A great nation such as ours must, of course, do business with the rest of the world, and the American people certainly receive many benefits from the fact that the rest of the world is anxious to do business with us. The principles and objectives, as well as the operation of international trade are not involved in the consideration of this legislation at this time. That which is involved in this legislation and which has a significant influence upon our trade relations with other countries, as well as a serious effect upon our domestic economic life, is the important factor of method.

In the course of the debate here this afternoon, the very able and distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee have presented arguments for and arguments against this legislation in the course of their excellent analysis of so much that is involved. As a result, it is not my purpose to duplicate arguments already made or that will be made. Instead of presenting, on the contrary, an exhaustive analysis of this legislation, it is my purpose to address my attention to one very important element involved in this bill. In doing this, I hope to emphasize a consideration involved here which surely must command the attention and thought of every Member of this House.

On many occasions down through the years during times of great crises, I have come here to the tribune in this great House of Representatives in Congress to express my views for whatever they may be worth. I believe firmly that although this legislation is not of a crisis nature, it is equal in importance to the people of America, to those great decisions made here in the past which have hewed the path of our destiny.

Among other things, this legislation extends the power and authority of the Executive over the entire economic life of America. It is my view that this power should not be delegated away from the Congress of the United States. The representatives of the people in the Congress assembled should always have this responsibility if our constitutional system of government is to continue to have its full meaning. It is my view that the Constitution of the United States should be the law of the land at all times and not only when it is convenient.

One of the principal features of H. R. 1, involving this question of power, is that in addition to the extension of the trade-agreements authority, the Chief Executive is authorized to negotiate tariff reductions, and I emphasize, I say tariff reductions, by any 1 of 3 alternative methods.

Under this legislation, the President is authorized first to reduce tariff rates that exist on July 1 of 1955 by a total of 15 percent, a reduction of 5 percent per year for each of the 3 years covered in this extension of authority.

The other two methods of tariff-rate reduction authorized in this legislation are alternative in nature and provide the power to reduce rates by 50 percent of the rate prevailing on January 1, 1945, in the case of those products normally not imported, or imported in negligible amounts. The third alternative involved in the power granted here in this legislation gives the President the authority to negotiate reductions in tariff rates which are higher than 50 percent of the value of a particular product imported to a rate equivalent to 50 percent.

Now it is my contention this grant of power to the executive department of the Government transfers from the Congress or the legislative branch of the Government the control over the economic life of America. This I consider to be bad legislation and bad law, for under our system of government the Congress does not have the authority to delegate this power which is obviously a legislative function. Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution specifically places the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations in the Congress and only the Congress.

My opposition to the granting of this authority in this legislation is not based upon any desire on my part to build and maintain a high tariff wall around the United States for the purpose of preventing trade with foreign nations. I believe I am more realistic and sensible to the necessity for the flow of goods between nations than to even suggest such a policy. I believe in a flow of trade between nations for their mutual advantage. My opposition, on the contrary, is based on the principle that in view of the fact the United States of America is already among the very lowest tariff nations of the world, and already has some of the lowest tariff rates on particular products of any nation in the world, that any new tariff policy, and this is the important point, that any new tariff policy of the United States should at least place for-

eign producers, having lower manufacturing costs in a national economy of a much lower standard than America, in a comparable competitive position with our own domestic producers for the United States market. In other words, I am completely opposed to any trade policy or to a granting of the power to formulate any trade policy which, upon establishment, would discriminate in favor of foreign producers against American manufacturers, and American labor. I am opposed to any trade policy which could result in a drastic lowering of the fine and great standard of living enjoyed in America.

In this respect, I agree completely with President Eisenhower, with his statement in his first state of the Union message, which is:

> This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture, and labor standards.

Also, I agree with the statement issued by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, which declares:

> American labor should not be subjected to unfair competition as a part of any program to expand our foreign trade.

In this legislation, however, I fail to find any evidence of safeguards which would guarantee the observance of these expressed views.

It is argued by the proponents of this legislation that this granting of power to the executive department of the Government to negotiate this drastic lowering of tariff rates over the next 3 years is absolutely necessary, in order to construct and build up the economic position of our allies and friendly nations.

It is argued this is absolutely necessary for the preservation of peace and for the protection of the free world.

If these arguments are valid, surely in the building of the economic strength of our foreign friends, it is not necessary for America to sacrifice complete industries and particular labor skills long the backbone of our economic and industrial life. If we must make such a sacrifice, obviously we are defeating the very objective we are trying to achieve. Surely, you will agree with me that a sound, prosperous economy in the United States, based upon our American standard of living, constitutes the most important single factor in the building of a sound economy everywhere in the world.

The tremendous rate of consumption of world products as a result of the high standard of living in America cannot be sacrificed for the building of economies elsewhere, for in doing so, the building of these economies would terminate and they would collapse to the extent the American market was destroyed.

In addition to this very important fact, is the fact that if peace is to be maintained throughout the world it can only be assured if the United States of America remains industrially strong.

It is my contention that this legislation we are considering here at this time discloses no evidence whatsoever for the need to sacrifice particular American industries upon which the American people are dependent in order to produce economic well-being and economic strength for our foreign friends. To be specific, is there any Member in this House who here and now would stand up and vote to abolish the American textile industry in order to increase the economic strength of any of our foreign friends? I do not believe there is a single Member here today in this House that would favor any such action. Yet, I say to you, the possibility of this eventuality is contained in this legislation and in this grant of power.

Let us look at the facts in regard to the economic strength of some of our foreign friends. A study of foreign economic conditions discloses that business conditions are improving, that national income has increased, and that the national economy has materially progressed during 1954 in Italy. If the basic economic factors continue to show progress in 1955, Italy reports that conditions there will be far above average. In England, production, profits, wages, are at higher levels than at any time since the war. The Ministry of Economics for Western Germany reports that 1955 will disclose an increase in the gross national product of approximately 10 percent. In spite of its domestic political difficulties, the Ministry of Economics in France reports that France is headed for a very good year. Japan reports, production increasing at a rapid rate. Similar reports of expansion and gains in the national economy are reported in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, Spain, Canada, and South Africa.

In view of these facts, why is it necessary to grant this overwhelming power today authorizing drastic, detrimental reductions of our tariff rates in order to strengthen the economic well-being of the nations of the free world? These nations today, already have experienced a marked increase in their national economic life. At this very moment, we must recognize factual conditions and keep in mind that imports are already flowing into the United States in some cases of sufficient quantity to actually threaten our domestic economy and to threaten the economic life of certain communities within the country. Encouraged by American gifts and grants of capital, the industrial capacity of our friendly foreign nations has tremendously increased. It has not yet reached its full capacity. When it does, we can expect a larger and larger flow of products to the great American market which will more and more compete with our American industries.

In conclusion, again it is my purpose to emphasize the fact that the economic structure of many foreign countries is so dissimilar to that in the United States that increased flow of goods to the American market would not alter the standard of living in those respective countries and would not change the economic structure or increase the standard of living. All such an additional flow of goods would accomplish would be to make manufacturers in those particular countries more wealthy. It would make rich men richer and have no effect whatsoever upon raising the hourly wage rates for labor or the standard of life and living in those countries. Labor in those countries would continue, regardless of the expansion of trade, to exist in practical slavery with a very low standard of living based on slave wages and long hours of toil.

Now my time is up, so I want to leave this thought with you. Make sure that in the action you take today in regard to this legislation, you are thinking of the welfare of the American people and of the greatness and fineness that is America. Make your decision beneficial and helpful to your country. As is recognized everywhere, America has many times over, done her part to help other nations. We will continue to help other nations to the best of our ability, but it is high time that we begin to think of the welfare of our own country and our own American people. I know in your hearts you agree with me and that you will not here today favor action which might prove detrimental to the strength and well-being that is America.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I think that the time has come when every Member of Congress should resolve the question of whether he is to vote in the exclusively selfish interest of his own district or whether he is to vote in the general interest of the United States. I have always contended that the national interest should at all times take precedence when a conflict of conscience is involved.

We are about to vote on a bill that perennially emphasizes the tendency for some of those among us to expect special treatment for their own constituencies while denying the same consideration to other areas of our Nation. Yes, the annual showdown is here again. We are about to go on record with our vote on the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

A large number of our Members have already declared in favor of this bill. We must have world trade, you say, and the only way we can do it is to liberalize further our tariff barriers. But how many of the proponents of this bill are willing to have their own districts subjected to the type of foreign competition that is existent and would be intensified under this bill?

Industry and labor in my district have long suffered as a consequence of the influx into this country of such products as residual oil, plate and window glass, and clay and ceramics products. Speaking for this district and other districts confronted with a similar situation, I have proposed that H. R. 1 be amended so that it will provide a safeguard for the American coal industry and for the glass and clay and ceramics industries.

In the past we have made little headway in this crusade for equitable treatment. Too many Members of Congress are too willing to continue the illicit application of tariff principles responsible in the double standard for the various regions of our country.

I would appreciate some frank explanation by proponents of this measure as to why my district is not entitled to enjoy the same protective measures as those provided for other districts. Can

anyone explain the moral reasoning that impels a Member of Congress to demand a quota limitation and/or tariff on agricultural products while rejecting parallel safeguards for mining industries? I realize that it is easy to speak reverently and impassionately of the necessity for free trade when your own little kingdoms are safely sheltered under an umbrella of quotas and insured with price supports, but I do not understand how anyone who is guilty of this incongruous practice can sleep at night knowing that there is widespread hunger and destitution among American people as a consequence. If anyone in this House is not aware that those conditions exist in this land of ours, then let me assure you that at this very moment there are thousands of coal miners and railroaders who are without work because foreign oil imports have taken their jobs from them. Their families are undernourished and are not properly clothed, and there is little hope for a better life unless this Congress forgets sectionalism and selfishness and join together as an American legislative body.

Last evening I went back through some CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the past several years, and I was distressed to find so many statements appealing for price supports, quotas, and tariffs by many of the same Members who yesterday voted against giving citizens outside their own counties and parishes even an opportunity to be heard in respect to the tariff issue. How can this attitude be defended?

Fortunately, there is a chance to make amends for this unfair treatment of our people. I ask only that the do-unto-others precept be given a place in this legislative Chamber when succeeding votes on foreign trade are undertaken.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am vitally concerned with this measure because I think we should look at it from the point of view of the people of our district. This is not a rubber-stamp Congress.

Mr. Chairman, habits often get deep rooted—even in the Congress. Great concern was expressed that certain authority will be taken away from the President in tariff matters if H. R. 1 is recommitted with certain instructions. This is no rubber-stamp Congress and I feel that each Member is obligated to represent his district and the varied interests in the State that has sent him to represent them in the United States Congress.

I voted against concentration of too much authority in the Federal Executive when a Democrat was President, and I see no reason to change my vote when a Republican is President. In fact, the consideration of the reciprocal trade agreement has no political implication.

In the 83d Congress I submitted H. R. 9682 and in this 84th Congress I have submitted the same bill, H. R. 2095, in behalf of the glass industry. In this specific industry, the workers in the factories have appealed to me. The same is true of the tile and ceramics manufacturers and for those who are interested in the bicycle industry. These workers and their employers are entitled to be heard by the United States Tariff Commission in the hope that relief will be afforded them if injury is inflicted by unfair foreign competition.

May I make it clear that neither I nor these people in Indiana ask for high protection. They ask for equalization. Reciprocity is a satisfactory program but reciprocity must work both ways. That is all that our people ask and it certainly seems to be a fair request.

Free trade is a magnificent concept. It is a beautiful thought, and when the millennium comes, when all men and all nations are of good will, then a free trade concept may become a reality. We are living in two worlds. We are engaged in a cold war. To strengthen our economy is the greatest factor in our all-over defense program. This concept will encourage trade with friendly nations. They, too, are protecting their industries and we certainly will be following their and our good-neighbor policy by enacting legislation that will provide equalization in tariffs.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, there is no problem, outside of those associated with my legislative committee, that has consumed more of my time or interest than the matter currently before us. I have appeared before many committees of the Congress in this regard, as well as before the Committee on Reciprocity Information and the Tariff Commission.

While I have repeatedly supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I am convinced that some of its machinery should be strengthened and clarified.

Like many Members of Congress I have been approached by representatives of industries claiming injury as a consequence of concessions. Certain of these claims are legitimate and others are not. When I have been satisfied that the appeals could be substantiated, I have pressed for relief on these concessions.

The first case I presented to the Tariff Commission was in 1950 on the question of imports of women's fur felt hats and hat bodies. The Commission held that the hat industry was injured and recommended withdrawal of concessions. This position was sustained by the President.

Two years ago, I again appeared before the Tariff Commission concerning the imports of frozen groundfish fillets. While I was completely satisfied that the hat industry, in the previous case, had been injured, it appeared to me that the import of fillets were having an even more disastrous effect upon the fishing industry. In 1941, imports of this type amounted to only 9 percent of domestic production but increased to 81 percent in 1952. In actual figures this represented an increase from 9 million pounds in 1941 to 107 million pounds in 1952. The Tariff Commission recommended relief but this decision was not sustained. It is a frustrating experience to lose such a battle when the facts seem so evident. I predicted at that time that there was nothing to prevent the imports from absorbing all but a negligible amount of the groundfish industry. Here is the situation today. During 1954, imports amounted to 135 million pounds, an increase of 48 percent over 1953 and 26 percent or 28 million more pounds than at the time the Commission made its decision.

The case indicated above is an example of what can happen unless in some way the escape clause can be strengthened. In my judgment, the position of the President would then be made much easier. While I recognize some inadequacies in the motion to commit which is directed toward this end, I do hope that appropriate language can be found to convey these purposes before this measure becomes law.

The feelings expressed here on the floor during the last 2 days should not go unnoticed. It may seem strange that these feelings should develop during a record period of economic prosperity. Envision, if you will, what the situation would be if we were in bad times. While we have cut our tariffs 70 percent since 1934, and inflation has reduced them further, many countries have raised tariffs or prevented goods from being imported into their own countries by devious means and at the same time subsidized exports.

We are currently proceeding through a transitional period in world trade and it is quite impossible to know what the future pattern of relationships may be. We must be careful not to do something today that we must undue tomorrow. In the meantime, we must establish a policy of relationships that blend together not only the economic aspects but all problems relative to this relationship.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, during my entire period of service in Congress I have supported reciprocal trade legislation. I believe in the fundamental soundness of the reciproal trade concept. However, I have long felt that the administration of the reciprocal trade programs, particularly with respect to proceedings under the peril-point and escape-clause provisions, has been seriously deficient.

Therefore, I believe some changes in H. R. 1 are necessary to protect adequately American labor and industry.

Mr. Chairman, President Eisenhower has urged enactment of comprehensive legislation that would make possible the further development of our country's foreign economic policy.

The President has pointed out most clearly that—

> The Nation's enlightened self-interest and sense of responsibility as a leader among the free nations require a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for the fuller operation of the forces of free enterprise and competitive markets.

However, the President also has endeavored to make it equally clear that

the program which he recommends is moderate, gradual, and reciprocal.

I believe that H. R. 1—the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955—substantially fulfills the President's request for authority to make possible the further development of a comprehensive and effective reciprocal trade program.

But the real test of the wisdom and effectiveness of this legislation will come only in the years ahead when the gradual lowering of selected tariffs and the selective granting of other trade concessions pose problems for many segments of American industry which must compete with foreign producers.

Already, many industries, some in my own congressional district, such as the chemical industry; makers of china, pottery, cutlery, and candles; the electrical machinery and electrical apparatus industry; the machine-tool industry; makers of precision and optical instruments; and domestic producers of some essential raw materials; and countless other industries can present graphic examples of ruthless foreign competition from producers in countries with labor wage standards far below those of the United States.

All of these industries employ substantial numbers of American workmen at American wage levels, and many of these industries would be undeniably essential to our national defense should foreign sources of supply be cut off during wartime.

This is no mere plea by inefficient domestic industries for protection from fair competition by more efficient foreign producers. In such cases, genuinely more efficient foreign competitors will eventually capture world markets in spite of any efforts at protection by our Government.

No, this is a very justified complaint by many segments of American industry and labor against unfair competition from foreign producers who are able to compete in American markets only because of wage levels which would be regarded as substandard in the United States.

I do not believe that it is possible or practical for the Congress to continually investigate each such instance and legislate specific tariff rates for the many thousands of product classifications. Furthermore, it would be questionable wisdom for the Congress to try to dictate so specifically the detailed administration of our country's foreign economic policy.

However, past experience convinces me that our administrative machinery in the executive branch of the Government has not operated so responsively as to guarantee for the future that the foreign economic policy program will, in fact, be developed and administered moderately, gradually, and selectively.

One of the most notable criticisms of the reciprocal trade program in the past has been the relative ineffectiveness of the peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the act as administered by the executive branch of the Government. Industries complain, with much merit, that such relief provisions can be effective only if rapidly and decisively employed. Unfortunately, such has not been the administrative history.

The peril-point provision requires that the Tariff Commission survey all commodities on which the President proposes to negotiate agreements with other countries, and to specify rates of duty below which tariffs cannot be lowered without injury to United States industry. The President is permitted to reduce tariffs below the peril point, but is required to communicate to the Congress his reasons for doing so.

A further check on the President's power is found in the escape clause which appears at the present time in almost all United States trade agreements. It allows the United States to withdraw a concession given to a foreign government if that concession has led to an increase in the quantities of imports which causes or threatens to cause serious injury to United States industry. Complaints concerning increased imports are directed to the Tariff Commission which, after investigation, reports its findings within 9 months. If three or more members of the six-man Tariff Commission find that serious injury threatens or has occurred, the President must either reject or accept their recommendations. If he rejects the recommendations, he must report his reasons to the Congress within 60 days.

An industry can suffer severe damage from unfair foreign competition resulting from unwise trade concessions allowed to continue in operation during the prolonged initiation and pursual of such escape-clause proceedings.

I would recommend most strongly that the present bill be amended to make mandatory the more rapid and more decisive administration of these provisions.

The time allowed the Tariff Commission for consideration of complaints from parties under the escape-clause provision should be considerably shortened. And the Tariff Commission should be enjoined by the Congress to solicit even more vigorously the views of all interested parties before reaching their decisions, in both the peril-point and escape-clause procedures.

Likewise, the time allotted for Presidential consideration should be considerably shortened since such appeals to the President have already been extensively studied by the Tariff Commission.

Furthermore, I support the principles of the Reed amendment which would provide that the findings of a majority of the Tariff Commission, to the effect that a concession on any product is causing or threatening serious injury to an otherwise efficient and productive American industry, should be final and conclusive. The President would then take action to prevent or remedy such injury unless he determines that the national security dictates otherwise, and, failing to take such action, the President would report to the Congress the reasons for his decision.

Certainly, our long-range foreign economic policy could not be permanently harmed by more rapid, decisive action in such questions, with any reasonable and substantial doubts resolved in favor of domestic producers. Even though, thereby, some inefficient domestic industries might possibly be unnecessarily protected at temporary expense to our economy, appropriate trade concessions could later be extended in such instances with relatively little interim harm to the long-range foreign policy objectives of the Government's reciprocal trade program. On the other hand, belated rescission of harmful trade concessions will never repair the damage unjustifiably caused essential American industries.

Such amendment would not destroy the essential validity of the act's declared objectives—and would do much to minimize the possibilities of injustices to healthy, legitimate, and freely competitive American industries that contribute immeasurably to our national economic and defense potential.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disturbed over the maneuvers originating in the House of Representatives yesterday, being on the question of the closed rule.

I fully realize that questions concerning taxation must have careful consideration as far as the closed rule is concerned. However, this very important piece of legislation dealing directly with the trade agreements is one of so great importance to the entire Nation. Many Members of the House of Representatives represent districts that are directly affected by the provisions of this bill.

It is difficult for one to understand why a body here in a great Republic such as the United States of America, should decline to give the right to the duly elected Members of Congress, the American privilege of being free and the right to speak and offer amendments to any bill dealing with issues of such major importance as H. R. 1.

I represent a district in northern Michigan that formerly was one of the greatest lumber sections of our Nation. Naturally many woodworking plants followed the cutting of the virgin timber. These woodworking plants had provided a medium of work for the people who live there.

In my district of Michigan, in the little town of Munising, there used to be a clothespin plant. It was one of the principal mainstays of the town, employing approximately 60 workers in the production of clothespins. This plant was operated by the Munising Wood Products Co., which is also engaged in the production of a number of other wood products, including salad bowls and other wood turnings. The company made a real contribution to the town—paid a goodly share of the property taxes and paid them every year without the necessity of tax foreclosure proceedings—paid a good living wage to a large number of workers who otherwise would have been unable to find employment in the area—made it possible for retail merchants to keep their heads above water by selling their wares to the workers in the clothespin plant.

All of this was before we hung that sign on the Statue of Liberty saying: "Imports Welcome." This sign and

the competition of low-priced spring clothespins which it encouraged, forced the Munising Wood Products Co., about 3 years ago, to discontinue the production of spring clothespins and to discharge 60 of its employees.

We are faced with the undisputed importance of assisting foreign countries in finding a market for the goods which they produce—in acquiring the dollars which they need to buy merchandise from this country—and in helping them improve their standards of living. These things this country should do. At the same time, we know that several million workers in this country are unemployed—trying desperately to find jobs which will enable them to provide for their families. We know that many of these workers are out of work solely because the companies for which they worked have had to close their doors due to their inability to compete with foreign imports.

We listen to innumerable advocates of free trade and recognize the merit in the theories which they present. At the same time, we listen to representatives of domestic industries, and of labor, who present conclusive evidence that they cannot exist under free trade.

We are told that there are millions unemployed in foreign countries and that we could help them by providing a market for merchandise which could be produced in such countries. At the same time we are reminded of the millions unemployed in this country. We are told that there are some 800,000 young men and women graduating from high schools and colleges every year, who are entitled to employment opportunities; that some 200,000 immigrants arrive on our shores annually in the hope that they can find employment. We are told that we must take care of these unemployed—of these high school and college graduates, of these immigrants—that we are responsible for them and must absorb them into our industries and provide them with jobs so that they may live the kind of lives we consider the right of every American.

We are told that we must help foreign countries so that they may become strong and be in a position to bolster our fight against communism. At the same time we are told that we must keep our own industries in a sound financial condition so that they may pay the taxes necessary to build up our Army, Navy, and Air Force, and keep America strong.

These are only a few of the tasks which are dumped in the laps of the Congress. But we are denied the right to offer amendments to this important bill, H. R. 1.

Our first and primary obligation is to the American people. I believe that as long as we expect and require the American businessman to live up to certain standards, such as the minimum wage, we must protect him against unfair competition from any source whatsoever—particularly from low prices charged for foreign goods produced by poorly paid labor.

It is against the law to go out and take a man's home away from him without compensating him for it—even under the right of eminent domain, and even though there may be an imperative public need for that home. How then, can we justify taking a man's job—or his business—away from him without compensating him for it—even though there may be an urgent need in the public interest to give that job—or that business—to a worker or a businessman in some other country.

It seems to me that we have a moral, if not a legal, obligation to the American businessman who has provided employment, abided by the rules which we have laid down, and has paid his fair share of the cost of keeping this country strong and to the American workman who has paid his fair share of the taxes and who has produced the goods which have made country what it is today.

I am cognizant of my obligations to the American working man, the farmer and the businessman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from my congressional district where I have some 7,000 men out of work because of this great influx of foreign materials into the markets of the United States. I want to say to the committee and to my distinguished fellow Members of the House that I am not against reciprocal trade, however, I feel most keenly, Mr. Chairman, that it is about time in these United States of America that we go back to the old McKinley form of tariffs, whereby we protect American industry and the American payday in the United States of America and the man that we must protect is the man who has his home and who has reared his children, and has the great privilege of living in free America.

Mr. Chairman, let us recommit this bill, let us do the job that we should do as good Americans here and protect the people of the United States so that they can have a payday and prosperity in this great country of ours.

There is a song in America, Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians play it. "Where in the World but America." If we are not careful it will be: "Anywhere else but in America."

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, when the rule on H. R. 1 was submitted to the House yesterday, I voted three times in a manner which indicated my opposition to an open rule.

I voted for a closed rule because I am convinced that an open rule would have resulted in log-rolling and emasculation of the bill and in effect the killing of reciprocal trade. I acted in support of the administration, and in support of an idea that far transcends party-political considerations. I voted for what I believed to be the cause of peace.

My action in voting as I did has been greatly misunderstood. A number of my constituents, many of them growers of specialty crops such as cherries, wines, and walnuts, have been led to believe that my vote would deny the right to insert safeguards against the ruination of their industries into the bill. I knew yesterday that this just is not so, and that the real issue went much deeper than that. What was at stake was whether reciprocal trade should be emasculated by amendments and killed off on the floor of this House.

Some time ago, I had been reliably informed of the likelihood that a motion to recommit would be submitted to strengthen the escape-clause provisions of the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], a colleague in whom I have the greatest confidence, caused the text of such an amendment to be printed in the RECORD of yesterday. As recently as the day before yesterday, I told the growers of my district that I would lend every support I could to the strengthening of the escape-clause provisions if the motion was offered. The Reed motion will soon be a reality and I will support it.

Nevertheless, in spite of my previously announced position, a professional lobbyist has seen fit to convey to my constituents the erroneous impression that I voted against their best interest. I had asked this same lobbyist a few days previously whether the position of the industry he represented would be improved if the escape-clause feature were strengthened in the amendment to recommit. He agreed and conceded that this was true.

Mr. Chairman, I do not consider strengthening of the escape clause the slightest deviation from my support of the President in this matter of Reciprocal Trade. The Tariff Commission is a respected body, appointed by our President and evenly divided among members of our two great parties. I am sure that this Commission is acting in the very best interest of our Nation. We have constituted it to give advice. We have decreed that each distressed business should make its case for relief before that body. And yet, we allow other departments of Government to oppose the case of these businesses without appearing before the Commission.

Where the national security is involved, the amendment clearly states that the President may overrule the Commission. The cause of peace will not be endangered by the amendment—in fact, all it will do is cause all parties to the case to present their evidence in the open, except where national security is involved. I can think of nothing fairer than the motion which Mr. REED will present.

We have lacked an effective escape clause to prevent disaster to any domestic business. Distressed businesses are not allowed time to convert to other fields and liquidate their investments. The Reed amendment will cure this defect.

I endorse reciprocal trade because I am convinced that without stimulated international trade, peace is illusory. In supporting the amendment which will be before us, I feel that I uphold the spirit of the President's program for

reciprocal trade, that I detract nothing from the cause of peace, and add a needed help for our own people. I urge the passage of the amendment to be presented by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of the House I voted on the matter of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in some form or other on six separate occasions. In looking through the record of those occasions I find that on four of them I voted in favor of the legislation. On two occasions I voted against.

When this matter was before us in the 79th Congress, it contained no provision to safeguard the American producer and workman against unwise reductions of duties. There was no provision for escape clauses and no provision providing for a finding by the Tariff Commission as to the limit to which a modification or binding of duties and other import restrictions may be made without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers. I voted against this legislation.

In the 80th Congress, with a Republican majority, we were successful in writing into the law a provision requiring escape clauses in trade agreements and also the provision providing for a finding by the Tariff Commission of the points below which it would be perilous to our domestic economy to go in reducing tariffs. With these provisions in the bill, I voted for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

Then came the 81st Congress. The control of the Congress had shifted to the Democrats and one of their first acts was to repeal the provisions adopted by the 80th Congress. The escape-clause and the peril-point provisions were completely eliminated. I voted against this bill.

In providing for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act in the 82d Congress, the Congress reinserted the escape-clause and peril-point provisions over the vehement objections of the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and President Truman. With these protective provisions in the bill, I voted for the legislation.

The matter of extending the Trade Agreements Act was before us on two occasions during the 83d Congress. It must be said to the credit of the present administration that they did not then, as they do not now, request the elimination of the escape-clause and peril-point provisions. I voted for both extensions.

Mr. Chairman, this brief history of the recent actions of Congress in connection with the Trade Agreements Act shows that the question at issue has not been so much the matter of authorizing the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries, but rather the extent to which the position of our domestic producers would be recognized and the extent to which they would be protected against unfair competition in international trade.

We all agree, I believe, that our prosperity is tied up with the exchange of goods and services. The greater the velocity and volume of this exchange, the greater is our prosperity. That is true whether applied to domestic trade or to international trade. The more goods you can move back and forth between people, the more prosperous everybody is going to be. We must, therefore, have some machinery, some mechanism, some authority, to make possible the elimination of unnecessary restrictions and burdens on that exchange of goods. The President must have the authority to enter into agreements with other countries which will eliminate unnecessary restrictions. The basic purpose of the Trade Agreements Act is to provide this authority. I support this basic purpose.

Please note that I used the word "unnecessary" in referring to the restrictions and burdens which we should attempt to eliminate. I use the word "unnecessary" because I think we must recognize that circumstances can and do exist which require a nation to place certain restrictions on the goods or services entering into that country. I think we are most unrealistic and make a serious mistake when we criticize either our Government or a foreign government for imposing a restriction on the flow of goods into that country in order to meet some conditions then existing in that country.

The proponents of free trade speak loud and eloquently about the virtues of open unfettered competition. We have heard some of their speeches today. Given their way, we would completely repeal the Tariff Act of 1930, and any of our other laws which regulate the flow of goods into this country.

I, too, believe in competition. I would remind my colleagues, however, that what we in this country have always strived for is fair competition. We have many laws written on our statute books to assure that our domestic commerce will be based on fair competition. With respect to our domestic economy, we recognize that Government has an obligation to assure an environment which encourages fair competition. In 1914 we established the Federal Trade Commission. Look at its basic objectives. Let me quote briefly from the United States Government Manual of 1954–55 concerning the duties and purpose of this Commission:

> Although the duties of the Commission are many and varied under the statutes, the foundation of public policy underlying all these duties is essentially the same: to prevent the free-enterprise system from being stifled or fettered by monopoly or corrupted by unfair or deceptive trade practices. In brief, the Commission is charged with keeping competition both free and fair.

Yes, that is our governmental policy in the field of domestic commerce—to keep competition both free and fair. The question I would ask my friends who advocate free trade is, "Should we have any less concern about assuring fair competition in the area of foreign commerce and foreign trade, particularly when that competition arises from foreign producers who are outside of the scope and application or our other domestic laws?" In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, we should be more alert to assure fair competition when the threat is from foreign producers outside of the jurisdiction of our basic laws.

Let it always be remembered that we, as a Government, impose burdens on our domestic producers which we do not and cannot make applicable to foreign producers. Let me call your attention to just a few of them. I have already mentioned the Federal Trade Commission Act. In addition, there is the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Labor-Management Relations Act, and, of course, the various States' fair-trade laws. In addition, there are the various Federal and State taxes imposed on domestic producers. There is also the social-security law, the Unemployment Compensation Act, and the various States' workmen's compensation acts. Those are just some of the burdens which we have placed on our domestic producers by law which do not apply to foreign producers of similar commodities.

I am certainly not suggesting that these laws should be repealed. I do say that we must, however, be fair to our domestic producers and recognize that these laws can place them at a distinct disadvantage in competing with foreign producers.

There is no question but what we would all be horrified if anyone were to suggest that the minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act should apply to only a small section of the country, such as New England, and that the rest of the country would not be subject to this law. There is no one who would not recognize that this would place the New England producers at a decided disadvantage in any effort to compete with producers in other sections of the country. We would hurl all of the derogatory adjectives in the book at such a proposal. Yet, if it would be unfair and unreasonable to discriminate between domestic producers, is it not just as unfair and unreasonable when we require a domestic producer to comply with such laws and at the same time require him to compete in our domestic market with foreign producers whom our laws do not reach. Certainly the answer must be "Yes," unless we provide some other compensating device to protect against the unfairness. Our tariff laws and import regulations must perform that function.

I have emphasized the need to protect our domestic producers from unfair competition because I am very fearful that there have been times when this fact has not been recognized in negotiations and agreements entered into under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act. I share the concern of many in this House that those who administer the act under Presidential directive are sometimes overly anxious and overly enthusiastic about befriending some foreign country and, in their enthusiasm, lose sight of their fundamental obligation to be fair and honest with our own people. That is why I have long been an advocate of the escape-clause and peril-point provisions of the act. That is why I also feel that there is a need for strengthening the present escape-clause provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this extension. I voted to report this bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means and I will vote for its passage today. If I could vote to give the authority referred by this bill to a Democrat administration, as I did in 1948 and in 1951, I certainly can vote to give it to the present administration.

Because I believe we must take every precaution to assure protection for our domestic producers against unfair competition from foreign producers, I intend to vote for the motion to recommit, which has as its objective the strengthening of the escape-clause procedure.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, many of those who have spoken today in favor of this legislation have sought to leave the impression that the issue here is between those who believe in an expanding international trade, and those who would erect a high tariff wall around this country and have us withdraw behind it. That is unfortunate, because it does not correctly state the issue involved and is, therefore, misleading. Those who make that contention are simply erecting strawmen in order to knock them down.

Of course, it is safe to say that every believer in free trade supports H. R. 1, but many support it who do not favor the complete elimination of tariffs. Likewise, I am sure that every protectionist opposes H. R. 1, but there are many of us here who have misgivings about this legislation, but who, nevertheless, are firm supporters of the concept of reciprocal trade.

I find myself in the latter category. I would not favor going back to the old procedure of writing tariff bills on the floor of the House of Representatives. I also believe that we must permit foreign-made goods to be sold here if we expect to export our own surpluses.

The argument to which I have referred ignores three important points:

First. Existing tariff rates are the lowest in our history.

Second. They permit vast quantities of goods to enter our country—currently at a rate of $11 billion worth a year. Approximately two-thirds of all our imports enter this country duty free.

Third. No one is seeking to raise tariff rates.

It would appear from these three points that current tariff rates are not unreasonably restrictive of imports, and within the framework of existing rates ample opportunity exists for the executive department to negotiate trade agreements with other nations. All that should be necessary to extend this authority, and thereby continue the reciprocal trade program, would be to extend the termination date of the existing authority for 1, 2, or 3 years.

However, H. R. 1 is more than an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It contains authority to further reduce existing tariff rates which are already, as I have stated, at the lowest point in history, and so low that they do not present any serious obstacle to the expansion of trade.

In the case of textiles and other articles on the agenda for consideration at Geneva, the provisions of H. R. 1 would give the executive department authority to reduce tariff rates 65 percent under 1945 levels. So, with respect to the articles which will be the subject of the approaching Geneva Conference, which will include approximately 90 percent of all cotton countable cloth, we face the possibility not of a tariff reduction of 15 percent over a 3-year period, but a substantially higher reduction below existing rates.

As a matter of fact, the starting point for proposed reductions in tariff rates on textiles is unknown at the moment and will not be known until after the Geneva Conference, and that conference is not even scheduled to end until June or July of this year.

Although some of those who will vote against H. R. 1 will do so because they are generally opposed to reciprocal-trade agreements negotiated by the Executive, my own misgivings about the wisdom of the legislation as it now stands stems from the broad extension of additional authority to the Executive over and beyond the authority now provided in existing law, and from the uncertainties I have just mentioned.

The great textile industry of this country is too important a part of our economy to be liquidated. I do not believe the people who are engaged in this field will permit it to be liquidated. The units which will be hardest hit by further drastic tariff reductions are the small, independent textile plants scattered up and down the Atlantic seaboard. Many of them now are in a life-and-death struggle for survival. They are barely able to keep operating now, because they have to compete with giants in the domestic textile industry and also with foreign-manufactured goods which are entering domestic markets today over the lowest tariff rates in history. To increase that competition will either do 1 of 3 things: First, force many of them to liquidate; second, force a reduction in wages to employees; or, third, force them to merge with others similarly situated and form additional giant textile organiztaions.

Already the trend toward concentration is alarming. I would certainly hate to see the textile industry, which has meant so much to the people of my State, follow the pattern set by the automobile industry. I would hate to see the great textile industry dominated by a few giant organizations as the automobile industry is today.

I cannot vote for H. R. 1 in its present form. I have supported every effort to modify it so that at least some of these objectionable features might be eliminated. I would like to vote for an extension of the present act, just as I did a year ago when it was extended, and would do so if it were not for the uncertainties I have mentioned which, in my view, constitute the gravest sort of situation for the great textile industry which means so much to my part of the country.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have arrived at the point in attempting to purchase foreign good will with tariff concessions, where we had better turn around and look inside the boundaries of our own country and determine how much more whittling we can do and yet keep our own mills, mines, and shops running as they should operate.

We have heard the argument advanced that we should have "Trade, not aid" and that by lowering tariff rates the products of foreign labor will come into this country and with the dollars received the foreign countries will be able to buy more American products.

That all sounds well and good up to a point.

If the products of foreign labor flow into the channels of American trade and displace the products of American mills, mines, and shops, and wipe out the jobs of the workers producing those American products, then who is going to buy the foreign imports?

For many years now we have had this reciprocal-trade program in operation. We had reductions during the war years to help our friends of the free world, then in the postwar years we had reductions in the interest of economic recovery in friendly foreign nations.

WE HAVE OUT-HORSETRADED OURSELVES

We have just about come to the point where we find we are scraping the bottom of the barrel for concessions to use. In other words we have just about outhorsetraded ourselves.

I say it is about time we take a look right here at home and see what has been happening with respect to foreign competition and then ask ourselves how much more whittling we want to do.

At this very minute, while we are debating this bill, the leaders of the wool growers' group, including a group from my own district, are meeting at the Department of Agriculture concerning their plight.

The wool growers of this country are confronted with increased production costs on the one hand and competition from wool imports from low cost areas of the world on the other.

Consideration was given to raising the duty on wool but that brought screams to the effect such action would be contrary to the aims for an expanding foreign trade and so the tariff was not raised. It is true that the National Wool Act of 1954 was designed to help wool growers by continuing the little remaining protection and by using the import duties to compensate wool growers for the higher tariff needed to protect the industry.

IMPORTS AFFECT WOOL GROWERS

There is no question but that the imports of wool from low-cost areas has been a determining factor in discouraging our own growers to the point where our own production of wool has fallen off more than 40 percent since the beginning of World War II.

Mr. R. N. McLachlan, of Evart, Mich., in my own district is here today repre-

senting the Michigan Co-op Wool Marketing Association at these meetings with officials of the Department of Agriculture. He has pointed out that the benefits of the 1955 program to aid and encourage producers will not reach them until mid-1956 and as the result the incentive value for more production will be lost. They are seeking other forms of relief. That is only one example of our low tariff problem.

CHICORY INDUSTRY THREATENED

I have here a postal card which chicory farmers of my district are receiving from the E. B. Muller & Co., of Bay City, Mich. The company is a chicory processor.

These postal cards read as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1955.

To Our Chicory Growers:

Due to the low-priced chicory coming from behind the Iron Curtain and lowering of tariffs by our Government, we will be unable to contract for the growing of chicory in the United States for the current year.

E. B. MULLER & Co.

I am taking this matter up with the Department of Agriculture and the Tariff Commission but here again we run into this stumbling block of a liberal trade policy for our friends abroad.

I might also say that within recent months one of the small manufacturing plants of my district was consumed on this same altar of liberal-trade policy. This factory, one of the lively industries such as keep our small towns humming, made wooden salad bowls and kindred products. That factory advised me it had to close because of the products of cheap foreign labor flooding our American market under our ultraliberal trade program.

Now I ask you when we put our chicory farmers out of business, when we wipe out sheep growing, when we close up dozens of small-town plants in your districts and mine, and otherwise displace American workers with products of cheap labor then who is going to buy the imports we are encouraging by this trade program we are constantly liberalizing?

Mr. Chairman, the people of the 10th Congressional District of Michigan, whom I represent, are genuinely disturbed at this latest attempt to further liberalize our trade policies.

DISTRICT 50, UMW UNION, CITES THREAT

I have here a letter from one of the large labor unions in my district—local 12,075, district 50, United Mine Workers of America:

DISTRICT 50,
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL NO. 12075,
Midland, Mich., January 24, 1955.

Congressman ELFORD CEDERBERG,
10th Congressional District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CEDERBERG: Local 12075, district 50, United Mine Workers of America comprised of the employees of the Dow Chemical Co., in Midland, Mich., are protesting any reenactment or extension of the reciprocal-trade agreement now being considered.

The importation from Europe and other countries of manufactured chemical products produced by cheap labor and sold in competition with chemical manufacturers in the United States seriously threatens both the job security and living standards of the workers employed in the industry in this country.

We respectfully request that you give serious consideration to this protest and refrain from recommending for legislative enactment any agreement that would tend to stimulate the importation of foreign chemical products which due to low labor costs can be offered for sale at prices completely unfair in light of the existing competitive price structure of American products.

Any act in furtherance of the unfair competition referred to herein must ultimately adversely affect the welfare of the employees of this country's chemical industry.

Sincerely yours,

H. J. BOWERS,
President, Local 12075, District 50,
United Mine Workers of America.

These instances which I have cited are only a few of the back home problems involving reciprocal trade which concern me.

During these discussions I have failed to be shown in a convincing manner that there is any trade involved, let alone reciprocity.

When we look at the record and see some of the high tariffs charged by foreign countries on our Michigan-made automobiles—tariffs running from 15 percent to 65 percent on a car and when we see the high rate of duty charges on machinery, textiles, grains, and other products, I am wondering wherein we find ground to call it reciprocal trade.

I am informed that the average hourly earnings for industrial workers in Switzerland is 57 cents; United Kingdom, 47 cents; France, 46 cents; West Germany, 44 cents; Italy, 35 cents; and Japan, 19 cents.

Furthermore, as the result of American bigheartedness many industries in some of these countries are now utilizing efficient American methods and American know-how to further speed up production of low labor cost imports.

Mr. Chairman, I again say that before we further imperil our economy by further reducing tariff rates that are already among the lowest in the world we should turn from looking beyond the horizons to foreign countries and survey the situation at home.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of fairness and protection to industry, labor, and agriculture and without any feeling or desire to oppose the best intentions of President Eisenhower in his foreign trade policy I will support the motion to recommit H. R. 1, because I believe the peril point should be strengthened and made clearer and that we should assure labor that we will not permit the flood of foreign goods to seriously affect their jobs nor will we permit foreign goods to seriously affect the economy or the industrial production in the United States.

I fully realize that we need reciprocal trade with our foreign allies. I know that foreign trade without restrictions could wreck our economy, lower our standard of living and create widespread unemployment. It has already had very serious effect on certain industries in many parts of the Nation. I also realize that without foreign trade we would bring about unemployment seriously affecting a great deal of our industry and create serious unfriendly relations with many of our foreign allies.

I agree with President Eisenhower when he said in his state of the Union message on foreign trade and trade agreements:

This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industry, agriculture and labor standards.

I have great confidence in President Eisenhower and believe that he would do his utmost to do what he says, but this bill extends reciprocal trade agreements for 3 years and he may not be President for part of that time. I want to be sure that the industry, agriculture, and labor has the full protection of the peril-point clause and for this and other reasons I shall vote to recommit this bill and I urge all other Members to vote likewise.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 1 and against the motion which will be made to recommit. I believe the bill should be passed. I believe it is in the interest of the national security and the national welfare that it be passed because we in this country need a real reciprocal-trade program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he represents a coal area.

Mr. FULTON. I represent one of the large soft coal and industrial districts in this country. There are in it about 20 or 22 mining towns and thousands of miners, as well as part of the city of Pittsburgh and the entire city of Clairton. The people in our great industrial area know that our prosperity depends not only on the products we make in Pittsburgh for consumption within Pittsburgh and that area, but that we depend for a good many of our jobs on what we sell abroad. Our coal miners, in our district, are smart enough to know that we just cannot Balkanize our United States and that we cannot Balkanize our free world into small self-sufficient and antagonistic economic units. We have to give and take. We know that if we can sell some things abroad, we can buy other goods that come into the United States cheaper and save money, which will mean money in our pockets to buy other American goods, instead of having to pay high prices. We know that a broad market is the making and strength of America and each community in America.

I am one of those who yesterday voted for an open rule because I wanted to give these complaining industries a chance, those who felt that they were hurt, to

speak on this floor and have full opportunity to state their case to this House, the President, and the country. I voted against the motion to order the previous question to permit amendments, and then I voted for the Brown amendment which I felt was fair. But when it came to the point of defeating this legislation finally and sending it back to the Committee on Ways and Means by voting against the rule, I changed my vote and voted for the closed rule because I must put principle and policy above method. I am sorry that the gentleman from Ohio in charge of his amendment would not compromise to get an agreement along the lines recommended by Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, and myself.

May I say further, if the motion to recommit is passed, it will have no further effect than we have now because it leaves whatever action is to be taken to the discretion of the President.

May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] if he would look at his proposed motion to recommit, because it says that the President "shall take action," without saying, first, what kind of action the President shall take; second, it does not limit the President from delegating the action to the Department of State, the National Security Council, or any other board or agency in this Government.

The gentleman from Illinois brought up the fact that the President has delegated some of his powers on foreign policy to members of his Cabinet, particularly the Secretary of State and the State Department. What is wrong with that? It has been customary with every President to do the same. Under the motion to recommit the same thing can be done because the motion leaves it in the discretion of the President without limitation to take whatever action the President shall see fit. If anybody can show me the limiting provision on the President's action under the motion to recommit, I would like to hear it. I do not believe it is there and I hear no response.

Let us go a little bit further. I stand here as one of the minority of two of all the Congressmen—Republican and Democrat—in Pennsylvania because 28 out of the 30 Pennsylvania Congressmen voted against the final and decisive 193-to-192 vote on the rule yesterday, and just the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. SCOTT] and I stood with the administration for the reciprocal trade bill. Nevertheless, I stand with the leadership of both Houses of Congress—with the Speaker; with the former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]; the Republican whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]; the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. These are the men that have led the policy of this House. I think it would come with ill grace for any of us to say that they are acting against the best overall interests of the United States or the best interests of our national security, or that we are not standing with this administration for the best policy for all the American workers.

When I stand up and say I am with the United States Chamber of Commerce and our local chambers of commerce, and with the farm organizations and all the major union organizations except one in the United States, by their authorized leaders saying that this is the overall policy for the United States, I believe we from our own districts should rise above these sectional interests. We should say that we have to look at the United States policy as a whole, and not raise high walls and restrictions among industries by log-rolling nor yet go back to the old high-tariff-law days that we had in this country at one time.

We want a friendly Nation. We want a country that lives among friendly nations. If you look back in history you will find the nations such as Rome, Greece, Syria, and the other nations that rose up with a much higher standard of living than other nations, were cut down from the outside. We should continue to be one of the nations who have stood as peoples who are friendly and cooperative, and have helped other free nations defend themselves, such as we have done over the past few years. We now should not turn our backs on these allies and friends in the free world, but should ask them to stand with us in prosperity in the free world as a whole, rather than have a tremendously prosperous America and allies who are on the breadline.

So I ask you today please to consider the point of view of the free world, to consider the point of view of the chambers of commerce, the labor unions, the administration, the President and all the Cabinet officers, and the leadership of both Houses on both sides in this Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to something I called to the attention of the House last night:

Under article I, section 8, subdivision 3 of the Constitution of the United States it is stated that the Congress shall have power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes."

Famous jurists of this country have held that that is the second most important provision of the United States Constitution.

In 1780, 7 years before this Constitution of the United States was drafted, Massachusetts put into its Constitution what became the classic statement of the American theory of the division of governmental power:

> In the government of this commonwealth the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them—to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men.

There is not the slightest question in my mind that the pending bill is unconstitutional. I can prove that very definitely. The Members on the floor know that that is true because we are eventually going to be in this international GATT organization in which the gentleman has taken such a vital interest, and after the 3 years are up, we will have abrogated that second most important provision of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FULTON. May I disagree with the gentleman and say that I, as a lawyer, believe the bill is constitutional.

Mr. REED of New York. I expect you to disagree, my dear friend. I would like to say this for the benefit of the people and the rest of the Congress here because I sincerely believe that the most important thing we can do for the welfare of this country is to adhere strictly under our oath of office to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman from New York a question. Why then under your motion to recommit is the power given to the Tariff Commission, which, although set up by Congress, is a branch of the executive or administrative part of the Government, when you say we should feel it should be administered only by the legislative branch—the Congress? There you are likewise giving it to a part of the administrative and executive branch of the Government just as we, who want to give it to the President, are doing that likewise. We are doing just what you are doing except that I disagree with the gentleman from Illinois—I trust the President of the United States on this trade policy, too, as well as the narrow ground of security alone.

Mr. MASON. The Tariff Commission is an arm of the Congress and was so set up; and it never should have been relinquished. It will be the Congress that would be acting when the Tariff Commission sets rates.

Mr. FULTON. But you do give it to the Tariff Commission administratively to be the last word in making a decision, and Congress is not overruling it by any reserved power in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I know that in the heat of debate sometimes a little politics is played. It has been intimated here, of course, that I am against the President. I think the best proof of where I stand with the President was made last year on a program which went through with the opposition on the other side fighting him to death. I do not propose to be pushed into any such position. I am a friend of the President. I want to make it perfectly clear that all you have to do is to look at the record which was made last year by the Committee on Ways and Means, and I also want to say that what I am saying is not criticizing the distinguished chairman on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as it comes out of the Committee on Ways and Means. This subject has given me great concern, as, indeed, I know it has given all of you great concern. I come from a great industrial district. I come from a district that is very strongly in support of the tariff, and, I might add, all my life's savings and earnings are invested in this home community. That community has been good to me. I would be the last one to do anything which I thought would be detrimental to them. I rise in support of the legislation because I believe the national interests require that this bill be extended. I believe, too, that instead of impairing any of our industries it will stimulate trade to the end that we can have what we all seek—a busy America and an American economy based on peace rather than war. All industries must of necessity benefit from a prosperous America and a prosperous world.

Our country is now very closely associated with the other countries of the world. We can eat our lunch in New York and our dinner in London. This shows how closely the world has become knitted together. Therefore, we must recognize the value of trade with each other.

This legislation contains the peril point and the so-called escape clause, which properly enforced will give protection to the American industry.

I have had several talks with the President relative to this legislation. I have expressed to him the deep concern that many of us have for the industries in our districts. I specifically spoke to him about the great textile industry, which employs 2,400,000 people, as well as the jewelry and silverware industry. The result of those conversations convinced me that President Eisenhower has no intention of destroying any industries in this country. He knows that if America is to fulfill the destiny I believe is ahead for America, we must have a prosperous country. He knows that stagnant industries, idle workers, and distressed conditions do not help bring about what he plans, and neither would it help the rest of the world which depends upon our country pushing ahead, a prosperous and a united people.

A little while ago the President sent to me a letter, which, with your indulgence, I shall read to you:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 17, 1955.

The Honorable JOE MARTIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: I was concerned to learn from you that there are Members of the Congress who are not wholly familiar with my philosophy respecting H. R. 1 and with my concept of the administration of this program. I send you this letter to eliminate any misunderstanding that may exist.

This point I should like especially to emphasize: Few programs will contribute more fundamentally to the long-term security of our country than the foreign-economic program submitted to the Congress on January 10. This program, built around H. R. 1, will powerfully reinforce the military and economic strength of our own country and is of the greatest importance to the well-being of the free world. The program underlies much of our military effort abroad and promises our people ultimate relief from burdensome foreign-assistance programs now essential to free-world security. It recognizes the creditor status of America in the world and assures leadership of our people in the easing of unjustifiable trade barriers which today weaken all who are joined in opposition to the advance of communism. These considerations underlie my earnest advocacy of H. R. 1. I deeply believe that the national interest calls for enactment of this measure.

I wish also to comment on the administration of this legislation if it is enacted into law. Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our own country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be, and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve. This plain truth has dictated the retention of existing peril-point and escape-clause safeguards in the legislation.

I want to say further that this same philosophy of administration will govern our actions in the trade negotiations which are to begin next week at Geneva.

You are aware, of course, that by law this program will be gradual in application. A key provision of the bill limits to 5 percent of existing tariff rates the annual reduction in these rates permissible over a 3-year period, and unused authority will not carry forward from year to year. You know, too, that this program will be selective in application, for across-the-board revisions of tariff rates would poorly serve our Nation's interests. The differing circumstances of each industry must be, and will be, carefully considered. The program, moreover, provides for reciprocity, and in the program's administration the principle of true reciprocity will be faithfully applied. Americans cannot alone solve all world trade difficulties; the cooperation of our friends abroad is essential. With such cooperation, this program provides the means for doing our part to help emancipate free-world commerce from the shackles now holding back its full development.

For the reasons I have here outlined, I hope that H. R. 1, which is so important to every American citizen and to the free world, will receive the wholehearted support of the Congress.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

In previous years it has been the custom to give authority to the President in the revision of tariffs. I see no reason why that rule should be changed at this time. I have faith in Dwight D. Eisenhower. I think he is a great American; I believe he is honestly and genuinely interested in but one thing; that is, to build up this great country of ours. He is not President for any material or personal gain; he was elected President in order that he could bring this country through safely to better days.

He realizes, as you do, that there are some countries in this world that need trade concessions. I understand, too, if we are to hold Japan in the fold of the free world and prevent the extension of communism, we must give them a chance to live. The only way we can give that nation a chance to live is to trade with her.

I also understand that the price of national security which I believe is contained in that trade should not be borne by any one industry or any one country. Our national security is that of 160 millions of people and we all should contribute as well as the other free nations of the world in keeping that nation on the side of the free world. President Eisenhower knows this. He would not permit a basic industry like the cotton industry with its 2,400,000 workers to suffer. To do so would be for his own administration to suffer.

So, Mr. Chairman, believing as I do in Dwight Eisenhower, and having full faith in his loyalty to American industry, I favor this legislation, and I hope it will be adopted by an emphatic vote.

We can trade with the rest of the world to the mutual advantage of all.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not my intention to consume 10 minutes of the committee's time, but I do want to remind you of a few things that happened in the last 24 hours on the floor of this House.

Yesterday, when the leadership, both on the Democratic and Republican sides, was face to face with a defeat in ordering the previous question, their plea to you was: "Do not make your fight here. Wait and vote to recommit the bill." That is what they told you. Today they are telling you a different story. Now they do not want you to recommit the bill. It is an altogether different situation today.

Mr. Chairman, the only time I desire to take is to remind the Members that we lost the fight yesterday and this is our last opportunity to defeat what has been referred to yesterday as a gag rule. This will be a motion to recommit with instructions, and it will cover some of the major items that you wanted to put in the bill in the form of amendments yesterday.

So my plea to you today, as it was yesterday, is to stand firm. It was nice to listen to the very excellent reading by the minority leader of the letter from our President. He cannot be too much concerned about this matter because the ticker just now carried the information that he had gone out to the Burning Tree Club to play golf. While my Democratic friends are pleading and bleeding for him, he is playing golf.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the partisans of trade restriction and economic isolation are men who have little faith in the true meaning of free enterprise and in the great strength of an energetic and adaptable America. They have filled the press with their impassioned statements and delivered to committees of the Congress their frightened warnings of the collapse that threatens us if we pass the bill H. R. 1 in substantially its present form.

Long hearings have been held to listen to these pleas and to weigh them dispassionately in the light of national interest. All the evidence of experts in the field who did not have some private claim

to expound have agreed that this Nation needs a bold and forward-looking program of international cooperation in economic affairs. This does not represent a giveaway of American strength; rather it is an acceptance of the fact that we do not want to live alone in this world, that in truth we cannot, and our trade policies must take this into account. Our standard of living, our military defense, and our employment depend upon access to foreign sources of supply and foreign market outlets.

The Trade Agreements Act represents a minimum step in the direction of the kind of trade policy that is required. There are few who now are going to change their position on the measure or who have not been heard. Let us move with decision; let us put national welfare above narrow interests; and we shall have done what is within our power to keep America pointed toward prosperity and progress. Of course any change in trade policy creates its problems, and they must be met individually in the interest of justice. But the best service that can be done any community or any industry is to have all America strong, and liberalized trade in keeping with the free-enterprise system is important to that strength.

I urge that the full 3-year extension of this act be approved.

It is unlikely that conditions will change so materially in that span of time that annual review is required. And if it should be required, it would be the privilege of the Congress to undertake a review of our needs. Only a 3-year minimum period will give the stability to business arrangements that is required if useful trade is to develop. Having gone to the trouble to investigate so thoroughly this grave issue, and having prepared a program that offers hope for the future, the least we can do is to determine a firm policy to put before the world and before our own trading and business interests for the period of the next 3 years. America needs a positive program for its foreign trade relations, and the Trade Agreements Act offers the guidance which is required.

PROTECTION FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY NATIONAL TRADE POLICY

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the need of some followup legislation to protect those who might be adversely affected by economic conditions created by our national trade policy.

Many sectors of American agriculture are dependent upon selling a large part of their output abroad. Between a quarter and a half of our entire production of cotton, corn, and wheat is exported. Farm products representing about 30 percent of the value of farm marketings are highly dependent on export markets.

Other countries are anxious to buy more from us, but they are limited by their dollar earnings. Increasing the demand for United States exports depends upon increasing the supply of dollars abroad. The main way of doing this is by increasing United States imports. Trade is a two-way street. The vast demand for American products abroad assures us that most dollars spent in other countries will come back here in one way or another in the form of increased orders for United States exports.

Most other countries of the free world are a great deal more dependent on foreign trade for their economic health than we are. Because of this, their future economic growth and health depend on whether they have sufficient opportunity to expand their trade with each other and with us. Our tariff policies are a vital part of an intelligent foreign policy.

I do not believe that United States farmers—and this includes all types of farmers from the cotton to the dairy farmer—who produce for export or who produce commodities that must compete with imports should be asked to bear the full cost, in regard to this production, of an intelligent and realistic foreign policy.

Incidentally, other domestic and raw material and industrial producers should have this same consideration. The benefits of better international economic cooperation accrue to all the people; therefore, temporary costs involved should be borne by all the people. This means that in the case of both export and import, programs and policies should be established—as they have in the case of the International Wheat Agreement and the Sugar Act program—to spread the costs to all people instead of putting all of them directly on the small number of producers concerned.

No United States farmer or other producer—whom we expect to remain in production—should be required to produce for export or to meet the competition of imports at any price less than full parity prices. Furthermore, no business enterprise, industry, or laboring man should suffer adverse effects from the enactment of this act.

Therefore, immediate steps should be taken to put into effect not only adequate price-support legislation for the protection of the farmer, but also legislation to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in the adjustment of their productive activities to the economic conditions created by the national trade policy.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I speak in behalf of industry and labor in the Second Congressional District of Rhode Island—confronted with severe and in many cases unfair import competition.

The industries concerned principally are textiles, lace, costume jewelry and rubber products.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on January 18 said:

> Considering that rates on most manufactured products range from 10 to 35 percent ad valorem, a 5-percent reduction in the existing rates means, in the case of an item subject to 20 percent duty, a reduction of only 1 percentage point ad valorem per annum for 3 years. I am sure that a reduction at this rate over a period of 3 years could not work serious harm on efficiently managed United States industries and, if perchance our generalization is ill-founded, the damaged industry has recourse to "escape clause" action.

Secretary Weeks further said:

> And in addition we have the President's words in his first state of the Union message to the effect that this objective "must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture, and labor standards." I am completely confident that in this respect his views have not changed.

Apparently the President's views have changed, because the record shows that since his first state of the Union message to January 7, 1955, the President only approved 2 cases out of 9 recommended to him by the United States Tariff Commission for remedial action under the escape clause referred to by Mr. Weeks. One was the watch case, and the other, alsike clover seed. In the latter case the Commission's recommendation was accepted only in part by the President.

Secretary Weeks also said:

> I should be the last to suggest that the present level of our tariffs is an important deterrent to imports. As a matter of fact, despite the remaining high tariffs on some products, our tariffs are among the lowest in the world.

Mr. Weeks is right in saying this. Thirty-four out of forty-two countries have higher average tariffs than the United States. This country is therefore the eighth lowest among leading trading nations of the world.

The Secretary of Commerce made another significant statement:

> This is only another way of saying that we should continue the trade agreements legislation for the same reason as it was started in the first place—as an important export promotion measure.

I think this statement needs no explanation—he hit the nail on the head.

There is the argument that is brought out by the proponents for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act that we must lower our tariffs further in order to encourage increased imports so that our foreign friends will obtain the necessary dollar exchange to pay for our exports. This is colloquially known as the dollar-gap hoax.

The following, for what it is worth, is a reproduction of a news item that appeared in the New York Times on October 7, 1954:

> DOLLAR GAP IS LAID TO FUGITIVE CAPITAL
>
> PARIS, October 6.—Prof. Robert Mosse, of the University of Grenoble, in an article published in the October number of the financial magazine Banque, concludes that the dollar gap in Europe has become a problem of fugitive capital from Europe.
>
> The dollar gap, says Professor Mosse, has been the dominant economic question in foreign trade for the last 10 years. It was originally a question of lack of dollars, owing to Europe's deficitary trade, and became the classic explanation for all Europe's ills.
>
> Professor Mosse says his studies show that though the dollar gap still persists, it is mainly because of the fact that European capital continues to take refuge in the United States.
>
> "Statistics show," he says, "that foreign capital in the United States that figures in the balance of payments amounts to $8,100,000,000, and that $4,100,000,000 has been considered not to be regularly noted owing to errors and omissions.
>
> "It can, therefore, be estimated that $12 billion or $13 billion has been invested newly in the United States from sources abroad.

By deducting capital that has been withdrawn, amounting to $6 billion or $7 billion, this would mean that foreign investors have now $6 billion to $7 billion more invested in the United States than they did in 1946.

"The problem," concludes Professor Mosse, "is in reality no longer the lack of dollars abroad, but the abundance of dollars that have sought refuge or are exiled in the United States. European policy should, therefore, be turned toward attracting this capital back to the countries of origin."

This state of affairs appears to be substantiated by a study made by the International Monetary Fund dated August 31, 1954, entitled "The United States Payments Position, 1953–54." The study says that the outflow of gold and short-term dollar assets from the United States to other countries since 1951 through the first half of 1954 has amounted to approximately $6,300,000,000.

In my State, unemployment is mounting every day. Working hours are being reduced in some plants, others are laying off part of their work force, and in other cases plants have had to shut down. The situation is acute in the lace and jewelry industries—and it is caused chiefly by imports that are taking away the United States markets for these domestic products.

More than 60 percent of the Nation's lace industry is located in Rhode Island, giving employment to some 10,000 workers. The lace industry in Rhode Island represents a $35-million-a-year business, with a payroll of approximately $15 million. These figures show how important a role the lace industry plays in the index of prosperity in this comparatively small State.

Today our lace manufacturers and their employees face a struggle for survival against competitive imports. The greatest competitive factor in lace manufacture is wages. The machinery used in the worldwide lace industry is all made in England. Production techniques are generally the same. Consequently, when an American manufacturer pays $3 an hour in wages, the British manufacturer pays 59 cents for similar work, and the French manufacturer pays 39 cents, naturally the British and French have an almost insurmountable advantage.

Foreign producers receive additional subsidies and encouragement for exports from their governments. For example, France rebates to her lace producers the social security taxes paid in behalf of French workers whose products go into export.

The only way to offset such a marked competitive advantage for foreign lace is through an equalizing or compensatory tariff. This would enable American manufacturers to meet this unfair price competition on an equal footing.

In 1938 and 1939 and the early part of 1940 our industry was being exterminated by a tremendous influx of French imports, made possible by tariff reductions in trade agreements with France in 1936 and Great Britain in 1939.

The fall of France in May 1940 ironically saved the industry from certain annihilation.

H. R. 1 would authorize additional reductions under conditions in which the industry already has found itself defenseless.

The only way of meeting this competition would be through wage cuts. Is that what this bill is actually up to? Wage competition is at the very heart of this import trouble.

Pressure on wages is the natural result. Further tariff reductions would increase this pressure.

Ninety percent of the Nation's costume jewelry industry is located in Rhode Island, providing jobs for 25,000 wage earners. Here, too, the workers are troubled and uneasy over the threat that unfair foreign competition holds for their future.

The original 1930 rate on costume jewelry was 110 percent ad valorem. This rate was reduced in 1943 in the Mexican Trade Agreement, since abrogated, to 55 percent ad valorem. The 55 percent rate was bound at Geneva in 1948 under GATT.

This item—paragraph 1527 (a) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930—is on the proposed list of products to be negotiated next month with Japan within the framework of GATT.

The only reason for having it on the list is for further binding since it has been reduced to the maximum 50 percent under the present trade agreements act. However, if H. R. 1 is passed in its present form, it would give the Executive authority to reduce this rate further by 5 percent a year for 3 years or by 15 percent.

Imports of costume jewelry principally from Japan have increased steadily since 1939. Imports during 1939 amounted to only $100,000, while in 1953 they amounted to $6,629,000. These figures speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons outlined, I object to the passage of H. R. 1 in its present form.

H. R. 1 would delegate such complete powers to the President that he could enter into any type of trade agreement he should deem expedient.

H. R. 1 is much more than a tariff or trade agreement bill. It contains provisions that would go far to strip Congress of its authority and responsibility to regulate our foreign commerce.

This delegation of power would soon pass, under the manipulation of the Department of State, to an international organization, namely, GATT and thus destroy our autonomy and the responsiveness of Congress to the voters.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, because I am convinced that it will serve the long-range best interests of our people, our Nation, and the entire free world.

As reported, the bill retains safeguards in the present law—the so-called peril-point and escape-clause provisions—which I feel will afford protection to American workers and to American manufacturers from the mass flooding of our markets with foreign goods produced under lower wage levels and corresponding lower standards of living. I am wholly in accord with the objectives of these safeguarding provisions and will oppose any effort to eliminate them from the bill.

We cannot forget, Mr. Chairman, the tragic consequences of worldwide depression which followed the shortsighted protectionist policy of the Republican administrations of the 1920's and the enactment of the high-tariff Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements program, originally initiated 20 years ago in the Roosevelt administration under guidance of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, has resulted in tariff reductions throughout the world and in unprecedented increase in world trade.

We are now at the crossroads of our national trade policy. In 1953 President Eisenhower requested that an impartial study of our foreign economic policy be undertaken. Distinguished Americans from business, labor, and agriculture, as well as Members of the House and Senate were appointed to serve on the bipartisan Commission.

This so-called Randall Commission issued its report in January 1954. In the area of foreign trade policy, the Commission recommended that the President's powers to negotiate trade treaties under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be extended to 3 years and that he be authorized to reduce existing tariff rates by not more than 5 percent a year. Adequate provisions for public notice and hearings procedures for interested parties were recommended. Retention of the peril-point and escape-clause provisions was also urged. H. R. 1 does much to implement the trade recommendations of the Randall Commission.

There can be no doubt that there are many American workers employed in industries which face competition from foreign-made goods. On the other hand many other Americans are employed in industry equally dependent on our exports to other countries of the world. In a minority statement on one aspect of the Randall Commission report, David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, proposed a program of Government assistance to communities, workers, and employers in cases of injury due to tariff changes necessary in the public interest. I am in accord with legislation introduced this session by Representative WILLIAMS, Democrat, New Jersey, H. R. 229, to provide such assistance to alleviate hardships caused by trade policy adjustments.

However, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the problems created by expanding foreign trade cannot be solved by the reestablishment of high tariff barriers which would ultimately drive our allies into the arms of the Soviet trade bloc; neither is the complete answer to be found in periodic reductions in our own tariffs to reciprocate similar reductions by other free nations with whom we trade.

The only positive solution lies in the expansion of our own economy in order to create enough new job opportunities to absorb the growing labor force and to provide the necessary goods and services for our ever-expanding population. A healthy, full employment economy has little to fear from expanding world trade.

In fact, the overall strengthening of our domestic economy is a necessary corollary to a liberalized trade program.

Under the Employment Act of 1946 the Federal Government is charged with the responsibility of maintaining maximum employment. It was a great disappointment to me that the President, in his economic report to the Congress, failed to recommend policies and action necessary to discharge that responsibility.

Unemployment in many industrial areas of this country continues to be a grim specter which blights the lives of millions of American workers and their families. In addition to the hardships inflicted, the continuing unemployment of well over 3 million of our potentially productive citizens has deprived our Nation of an estimated $30–$40 billion in gross national product in 1954 alone. The Republican big business fear of abundance has been revealed in the ill-fated hard-money policy of the Eisenhower administration in 1953, the 1954 trickledown tax philosophy granting relief for upper income groups, and is now shown again by Old Guard reactionaries opposing the 1955 reciprocal trade bill.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1 has received the overwhelming support of a vast number of spokesmen for business, labor, farm, veteran, consumer, and other public-spirited groups. I would like to conclude my remarks by quoting witnesses from a few of these representative American groups who testified in favor of this legislation.

Mr. Charles H. Percy, president of Bell & Howell Co., Chicago:

I believe with the utmost conviction that a gradual liberalization of our foreign trade policy will help to further improve the efficiency of American industry, will increase our productivity, lower our unit costs of production and increase our standard of living. At the same time, it will strengthen our allies, weaken our enemies, and provide a greater measure of security to our country.

Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

The United States cannot pick and choose and deal only in the items that we need to import and export. Instead, the United States must engage in gradual, continual, and, in many instances, reciprocal reduction of the barriers to international trade. Reciprocal trade is essential for the maintenance of production in many of our own basic industries and equally essential for the preservation of sound international relations with our allies. Improved economic well-being of the countries throughout the world is one means by which Communist aggression can be stopped. Economic well-being and improved international trade relations go hand in hand.

For these reasons we are happy to support H. R. 1, which will extend and continue the Hull reciprocal trade program.

Statement by American Federation of Labor:

The American Federation of Labor does not endorse either the extreme position of free trade or the extreme position of protection. We believe that trade policy can prove a useful tool for reducing the dollar gap, for persuading other countries to lift their trade restrictions, and in general for strengthening the economic basis of the free world. We believe that to achieve these objectives, this country should continue its policy of negotiating tariff adjustments, to use the President's phrase, "on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis." The importance of the terms "gradual" and "selective" must be emphasized. * * *

We believe that if the adjustments negotiated under this proposed program are, to use the President's words, "gradual, selective, and reciprocal," they need not operate to curtail employment opportunities for American workers.

Mr. David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, CIO:

If I had the slightest feeling that increased trade, particularly imports, would be injurious to the American workingmen, I would not be here today supporting a policy of trade liberalization. It is precisely because I believe that it is in the interest of the American workers and our people generally, that I am happy to continue to support a liberal trade policy at this critical juncture of American history.

Statement by United States Chamber of Commerce:

Through increased trade, the Nation's economy benefits. That is true just as much in world trade as it is in domestic trade. More goods at lower prices has been the very heart of the American competitive enterprise system, the trade-agreements program can contribute to the health of that system.

By continuing the trade-agreements program, the United States can lead from strength—the strength of a growing, dynamic, resilient economy.

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation:

We are expanding our domestic markets. We must expand our foreign markets.

To maintain a prosperous agriculture, we need export markets of around $4 billion per year at present prices. We have the capacity to supply an even larger foreign demand.

We think our foreign economic policies should be geared to these export needs. Enactment of H. R. 1 is an important step to gear up to this need.

Mr. James S. Patton, president, National Farmers Union:

Many of us produce products which have traditionally entered into export trade, like cotton, wheat, tobacco, hogs, and certain fruits. We know that the export market for these crops is important to us and that it depends on low trade barriers abroad, on prosperity and buying power in foreign countries, and especially on foreigners' supplies of dollars. We know that foreigners can obtain dollars chiefly by selling goods and services to citizens of the United States and that the amount they can sell depends in part on how much we are willing to buy.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 1 and support the motion of the gentleman from New York to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means. I want it understood that I am not a protectionist and I believe in a trade policy that stimulates the markets of the world. In the 83d Congress, I voted to extend the Trade Agreements Act for another year. I did this in the belief that a trade program would be developed that would meet the legitimate complaints of those industries that have been unduly injured by the Nation's present trade policy. Those complaints have not been resolved and the Tariff Commission in some instances has ignored the protests of industries that are slowly on the way to certain death.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind as to what my particular responsibility is on this important matter. I have the obligation to speak for my constituents and in their best interests. Where the welfare of my people is vitally concerned, it is incumbent upon me to protect, by adequate and proper legislation, their health and their livelihood. I must do so in this instance.

The industry of my locality is greatly diversified. There are thousands gainfully employed in the textile, chemical, machine tool and electrical goods industries. They are vitally affected by the importation of foreign made goods. The record clearly indicates that it is becoming increasingly difficult for these industries to meet the growing competition of imports. The reports are saturated with the effect that foreign goods, cheaply manufactured, have upon local industries. It takes no imagination to realize for it is already established fact that a domestic company paying an average of $1.79 an hour cannot continue to compete with foreign plants paying hourly wages of 46 cents and lower.

Mr. Chairman, one of the outstanding authorities on the economy of New England is Mr. Seymour E. Harris. Mr. Harris is a professor of economics and a member of the graduate school of business administration faculty at Harvard University, where he has taught for more than 30 years, in which 20 of those years have been in international economics. He was chairman of the New England Textile Committee appointed by the conference of New England governors and was responsible for the report on the New England textile industry. In his appearances before the Ways and Means Committee, he gave an excellent summation of the problems that face New England. A reading of his brief which appears in the committee hearings details the effect that a lowering of tariffs would have on our New England economy. I am indebted to him for many of the facts which have assisted me in resolving my attitude on this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, further relaxation of tariffs in the textile industry could very well be its complete undoing. Continued reduction of tariffs in this field cannot be defended when the facts disclose that, if the decline in the textile industry in New England persists, it would disappear from New England within 8 years. Government policies have increased the higher prices of food and raw materials and in like manner have depressed the prices of manufactured goods through removal of tariff restrictions. In New England, we are further injured by Treasury operations that have taken from our locality over $1 billion net, about 7 percent of its income. Under the accelerated amortization tax relief, the main competitors of New England profited at the expense of New England. Since 1919, we have lost over 200,000 jobs in the textile industry. No wonder we are concerned. The question we ask is, Is it fair to impose additional losses on New England textiles in the light of the problems? It does no good to tell us that we ought to adjust to other industrial fields. That is one of the arguments

used by proponents of legislation leading toward tariff reductions. The geographical location of New England in the northeast corner of the United States, the problem of distribution, the unwillingness of industrialists to establish new industry involving the transportation of bulky raw materials, all of these are factors that place New England in a difficult position to adjust to other industries. And so, it is absolutely necessary to keep and protect what we have. We cannot long do this if we legislate today in a manner that does injury to New England. I trust that this House will vote to recommit this matter to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I have never been, nor am I now, opposed to the basic principles underlying our trade agreements program.

Nevertheless I am conscientiously constrained to look upon this measure here today, of vague language and sweeping new grants of Presidential authority, with grave doubt and serious question that has, so far, not been convincingly resolved by any evidence offered by the proponents of the bill.

The attempt to bring this bill before the House under a closed, or gag, rule to prevent the introduction and democratic disposition of remedial and clarifying amendments is to be regretted. The limitation of two days of debate on a subject of such vital importance to the nation and the world is, in my opinion, an unfortunate reflection upon the interest and understanding of the membership, well intentioned as such action might have been. This reflection was vividly revealed, and the resentment manifested, when the closed rule prevailed by the very narrow margin of a single vote. For these reasons alone one would be inclined to vote against the measure in order to obtain the opportunity for the longer and more detailed discussion and consideration the subject merits. However, there appear to be much deeper grounds to question this bill in its present form. Certainly it does not completely conform with the sentiment expressed in the President's own statement on trade policy contained in his state of the Union message February 2, 1953, when he declared:

> This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture, and labor standards.

Nor does it conform with the statement contained in the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy that—

> American labor should not be subjected to unfair competition as a part of any program to expand our foreign trade.

Even the advocates of this bill admit it will inevitably visit great hardships upon great numbers of employees and many industries in certain sections of the country, such as New England, where textile manufacturing and innumerable other products will be hardest hit. Yet there are no provisions or proposals, nor are we permitted to offer any for adoption, in this measure to prevent the imposition of serious economic suffering upon such American workers and industries.

My main objection therefore, to this bill before us, is that a fair and just trade program should not deliberately discriminate in favor of foreign producers and against American labor and manufacturers.

It is indeed well to help other people and encourage the loyalty of our allies but we are impelled to ask of what lasting benefit will that be if in the process we generate widespread deterioration of morale among our own wage earners in large sections of the country.

Therefore a great many of us here, trying to conscientiously represent our people, very deeply feel that the tariff cutting features of this bill, should be wisely held in abeyance until, with Government assistance, new industries are encouraged and developed for areas that would be so disastrously affected and proper precautions are taken to safeguard the employment opportunities rightfully belonging to so many patriotic American working people. Toward that objective labor, industry and all levels of government should sincerely cooperate.

It is truly not a simple or easy problem to solve but it is just as truly our representative responsibility to work out a fair trade program that will be fair to Americans as well as our foreign friends. I earnestly hope the House will vote to recommit this bill for the sole purpose of writing in new provisions designed to prevent great hardships from falling upon many regional industries and workers, not to mention other provisions to retain and preserve essential defense resources that we can ill afford to dissipate in the face of threatening Communist aggression.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, although I am unable to be present during floor debate today because of my incarceration in the hospital, I have asked my whip to pair me against further extension of the reciprocal trade agreement program. I have done this only after long and serious consideration and much study, particularly over the past 2 months. I am so voting, not because I do not believe in foreign trade, because I do, but rather because I believe the reciprocal trade program as it is now constituted is not truly reciprocal nor does it tackle the heart of the problem.

I would be the first to admit, even to suggest, that if we are to build a strong, free world, we must build strong trade relations in it. But, I do not believe this bill and this program, based as they are on the multilateral lowering of tariffs, accomplishes this objective. To put it another way, it weakens the hand of our negotiators in dealing with other nations. It does not give them an opportunity to bargain effectively.

The way I understand that the so-called reciprocal trade policy has functioned in the past, both under the present administration and its predecessors, the tariff policy of the United States has been considered far more as an arm of United States foreign policy than as a part of our domestic economic policy. It does not take into account that foreign trade, though perhaps tremendously involved with foreign policy is, nonetheless, a part of our domestic economic policy and that trade decisions should be made first from the standpoint of their impact upon our economy at home. In other words, tariff changes should be made only where they will not substantially affect our domestic economy.

Moreover, this policy does not take into account the limitations other than tariffs placed upon our exports by other nations; nor does it take into account products imported into this country on which there is no tariff control and on which some other type of protection must be evolved.

Were the United States a high-tariff nation and were the dollar gap in international finance large, I might vote to continue the present program. But we are not a high-tariff nation, compared with others, and the dollar gap is narrow.

I voted last year for a 1-year extension of the reciprocal trade program because I hoped that out of it would come a restudy on a broad economic front which would introduce some new answers to the whole trade question. I cast my vote today only after much soul searching for I not only have tremendous admiration and respect for President Eisenhower and his concern for the welfare of our country and of the free world, but I also have equal admiration and regard for the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, whose capacity and good judgment I have learned to respect over many years. Nonetheless, I was elected to represent the 11th District of Ohio and to support my own judgment and convictions, and this I must do. Therefore, my vote against this bill is not a vote against reciprocal trade but rather against a program which I am unable to see is either reciprocal or fair to the American businessman or worker.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the people of my State and of the whole Northwest are gravely concerned with several aspects of tariff legislation. I trust the House will give serious consideration to our problems when it undertakes to vote on the pending measure. I should like to say to the Members the same things I mentioned to them in March of last year. At that time I stated that a great number of our important industries and their employees are dependent on the production of goods and products which are being driven from the domestic market by cheap imports, made possible largely by low wages paid abroad.

Among these are the raising of tulips, iris, and daffodils; the tuna and Pacific groundfish industries; the hardboard and plywood producers; the cherry growers; and the Northwest tree nut growers. And now imports of cheaply produced red raspberries from abroad are beginning to threaten red raspberry growers in my district. Let me read a letter which I have today received from a berry growers association in my district.

PUYALLUP, WASHINGTON,
February 14, 1955.

Hon. CONGRESSMAN THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are appealing to you in behalf of 350 grower members in the Puget Sound area (Washington major raspberry producing

area) and 60 growers in the Snohomish county area.

You may not be aware of the desperate situation in which the raspberry growers find themselves. (Eighty-five percent of the total production of this nutritional fruit is grown in the Pacific Northwest, with approximately sixty percent being grown in the State of Washington.)

The carry-over of red raspberries is exceptionally large. Prices are declining daily to a ridiculously low level—far lower than that at which we can produce them.

The predicament of the raspberry industry is largely due to the foreign imports of processed and frozen raspberries offered to the trade during harvest time at prices lower than Washington growers were receiving at the packers' platforms prior to processing and freezing. (The finished import product sold for less than the raw product in the States.)

You will recall that we appealed to you in June, of 1954, for aid to stop the foreign imports of raspberries. We realize, because of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without a provision for an "escape clause", that nothing can be done at present to increase tariffs on these foreign imports to put them in a competitive market with our own fruit.

To alleviate this condition somewhat, would it not be possible to contact the Armed Services and request their purchasing raspberry products such as jam and fresh frozen whole berries? Although in the past the Armed Services followed this program, in recent years very little has been purchased. Jammers, at present day prices, can buy new Washington and Willamette varieties (which represent the accepted standard for TOP quality) cheaper than strawberries, pears, peaches, or apricots, therefore purchasing raspberries for the Armed Forces would be a good economical move. We have been informed that the Army is letting out a bid for a small quantity of raspberry jam in March. If the quantity could be considerably increased, we are sure it would greatly stimulate the movement of our surplus commodity.

The red raspberry is not only attractive to the eye and taste, but is rich in thiamin and vitamins A, B and C.

We, as growers, through promotion and publicity programs and calling upon our Chambers of Commerce for assistance, are doing all in our power to remedy the situation.

The industry is in a distressed condition. Won't you please do all within your power to help us? We await your reply at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

PUYALLUP VALLEY
BERRY GROWERS ASSN.,
Mrs. Norbert Alexander, Secretary.

The thousands of people directly dependent on these industries for their livelihood face critical times unless this Congress faces up to its responsibilities and realistically revises our foreign trade and tariff structures to afford them needed protection.

Just let me cite a few examples.

The two States of Washington and Oregon are the center of the production of daffodils, iris, and tulips in the United States. In my district, alone, are grown some 30 million King Alfred daffodils annually—more than are grown in all of Holland. But faced with growing imports of foreign flowers, produced at the low-wage rates prevailing there, the growers of the Northwest are facing bankruptcy. An excess of foreign bulbs are being dumped on the United States market at prices below the cost of domestic production.

As a result, in 1952 domestic growers, even after selling most of the crops below cost, were forced to destroy their unsold surplus amounting to about 25 percent of all their iris and 20 percent of their top-quality narcissus.

The reason for this depression is not hard to find. A March 1953 report by the United States Tariff Commission showed that between 1937 and 1952 the import duty on narcissus bulbs from the Netherlands was lowered from $6 per thousand bulbs to $3, and the number of bulbs imported jumped from 6 million to more than 28 million. Likewise, between 1950 and 1952 the ad valorem duty on iris bulbs was reduced from 10 to 7½ percent, and the total of bulbs increased from 50 million to nearly 70 million, or about 40 percent.

Another important industry to the Northwest which is being seriously hurt by cheap imports is the manufacturing of hardboard. Six of the nine domestic producers of this vital national-defense item are located in Washington or Oregon, and of 7 more domestic plants under construction under the target-expansion goal set by the Defense Production Administration, 3 are in Washington and 3 are in Oregon.

Now, at the very time that this tremendous Government-encouraged expansion of domestic hardboard capacity is being completed, and when current domestic markets are shrinking and a buyer market is being encountered, the domestic industry is facing constantly increasing imports of foreign hardboard from Sweden, Finland, and Canada.

Particularly the Scandinavian hardboard has been coming into more and more ports and is being sold at lower and lower prices—far below the prices domestic producers can afford to charge.

As a result of the reciprocal-trade agreements program, the United States duty on foreign hardboard was reduced from 30 percent ad valorem in 1930 to 15 percent in 1936, and since 1947 has been cut to $7.25 per ton, or not less than 7½ percent nor more than 15 percent ad valorem.

Census Bureau figures I have recently seen indicate that through the first 8 months of 1953 imports of hardwood increased 65 percent from Canada over the like period of 1952, that they were 3 times greater from Finland and 8 times greater from Sweden.

These vastly increased imports have already had a serious impact on the domestic industry. One producer has been forced to lay off more than 350 employees; another reports production cutbacks of 50 percent, and others have gone on 2- to 4-day workweeks or have cut down on shifts.

Another industry in the forestry field which is of prime importance to the people of the Northwest is the manufacture of plywood. The industry, likewise, is suffering from a lack of adequate protection, and plywood made in Japan, at wage rates drastically below those of our own workers, is now coming into this country in greater and greater volume.

Another great and vital industry to the Northwest, as well as to the whole west coast, is the taking and processing of fish. This includes the taking and distribution of tuna, salmon, halibut, and otter-trawl and drag fisheries. There are several thousand ships and an estimated 20,000 or more fishermen employed directly in the taking of these fish, plus many thousands more who make a living from the processing and distribution of them.

And, yet, with imports from Japan and South America growing at an alarming rate, these American ships will be driven from the seas and the American factories closed up unless relief is granted soon.

In 1953, more tuna was imported from Japan than was produced domestically. Other import threats are comparable, and will continue to become more dangerous unless protection is granted the domestic producers.

It is simply impossible for American fishermen or processors to compete with the Japanese. The average American fisherman, for example, in order to live must earn at least two times as much as the Japanese fisherman is paid. Cost of boat construction, gear, repairs, and so forth, are all much higher in this country. Foreign competition has already forced a number of our fisheries and processing plants out of business or compelled them to greatly reduce operations. With many of our seacoast towns depending on the fisherman and his earnings, this depression in the fishing industry has a far-reaching and serious effect on entire communities.

The groundfish fleet in the Pacific Northwest has shrunk from some 250 boats a few years ago to only about 40 today, and imports have increased 1,100 percent since 1940, from 9 million pounds in 1941 to 102 million pounds in 1952.

Canadian fishermen and processors earn an average of 98 cents an hour, while their American counterparts make an average of $2.04 per hour.

The industry must have immediate tariff and quota protection if it is to survive, and its thousands of workers continue to earn a living.

There are many other industries, such as the raising of tree nuts, including filbert which are important to the Northwest, where tariff and trade policies are critically hurting Americans.

The nut industry has consistently sought relief from the Tariff Commission under existing provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and under the countervailing duties and antidumping laws from the Treasury Department. But this relief has just as consistently been denied them.

We in the great Northwest believe firmly in trade and commerce among the nations. We will encourage it whenever it is fair trade and in the best interests of America. But we do not believe this Nation should deliberately follow a trade policy that forces American businesses to close and puts American citizens out of work; that opens up our domestic markets to goods produced at substandard wages which would be illegal in the United States.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to bear these facts in mind when they vote on the pending measure, H. R. 1.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, in order to determine the impact of foreign

trade on the Rochester, New York, area, much of which lies within my district, I have requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to conduct a survey which will highlight the extent of exports and imports in the area. The survey is being directed by Dr. Howard S. Piquet, senior economic analyst of the Library.

In addition to questions covering the type and volume of business in the area, the questionnaire sent out in connection with the survey was designed to determine the extent to which Rochester industries rely upon raw materials from abroad; the extent of their imports and/or exports; the degree to which their business is affected by imports; the amount of export business which results from United States foreign economic and military aid programs; the effect of a 15-percent reduction in tariffs over the next 3 years; and, finally, the anticipated effect on business in the Rochester area of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The survey has not yet been completed, but it has gone far enough to indicate certain significant factors and trends.

As of February 16, 130 firms, with a total of 74,306 workers had responded to the survey. Of that total, about one-third of the firms, employing about one-fourth of the workers, have an interest and a stake in exports. One-fifth of the firms are dependent upon imported raw materials. Seven firms, with 2,830 workers have no interest in imports, insofar as dependence on raw materials goes, or in exports, insofar as selling their products abroad is concerned, but foreign imports are making substantial inroads on their markets.

A dozen large firms in the area have mixed interests in the foreign trade program: That is, they have foreign markets, but they are also confronted by competition from imports, and thus, in some measure, there is a dichotomy in their interests.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the preponderant number of firms—although they cover only a minority of the workers—expressed no interest in either imports or exports, their businesses being wholly concerned with the domestic market.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the reciprocal trade bill for two reasons. First, because I believe that America's trade policies abroad should be determined in relation to the cost of manufacture in the United States and, secondly, the decisions must be made by the Congress as required by the specific provisions of the Constitution. Its responsibilities cannot be shifted to a single person, not even to the President. I want as most Congressmen want, reciprocal trade instead of aid with the other nations. But nearly half of Congress voted against the present bill and voted to send it back to committee for correction.

We want free trade among the nations somewhat as we have it between the various States of the Union. Free trade has undoubtedly made a great contribution to the tremendous prosperity and high living standard enjoyed by the American people. The constitutional prohibition of trade barriers between the States has benefited both business and the public.

Our success as free traders amongst ourselves is proof that free trade is the best trade in the conduct of commerce. We all believe that. But before it can be applied to international trade, certain political conditions must be present. These are: First, there must be peace among the trading parties so that none is denied vital raw materials and manufactured products. The United States could well have used a tariff-protected synthetic-rubber industry during the Second World War after the Japanese had gained complete control over most of the world's supply of natural rubber; second, there must be a common currency, unrestricted in flow and not subject to political manipulation that stops much of our world trade today; and third, there must be a reasonably uniform wage and hour scale, which determines the cost level of all goods produced entering into trade. These conditions are met, of course, within the United States. But they are not met as between the nations of the world. Because of the grave danger of war nearly all countries are building up their own defense industries and they are protecting those industries with tariffs and other trade barriers against goods from the United States. Many nations restrict international movement of their currencies so that if we sell goods to them we cannot get paid. The fixed rates of exchange are frequently punitive in effect against us. Trade with them is on a one-way street. There is no uniformity of wage and hour standards throughout the world and that results in a great variety of cost and price levels. As long as the foregoing conditions exist, free trade among the nations like that enjoyed among our States is impossible.

The most objectionable feature of the 1955 tariff legislation is the delegation of arbitrary, unreviewable and absolute authority to the President to fix tariffs. We do not mean President Eisenhower. We mean any President before or after him. This was the original objection in 1934 to the first Reciprocal Trade Act. Prior to that time Congress had always fixed tariffs. Tariffs have been considered more as matters of local concern than of national policy. As a practical matter, the Congress better reflects the attitude of the people than the Presidency does because the Congress is closer to the people. Accordingly, it makes sense that Congress should retain its powers to control the tariff level. Besides all this, the Constitution itself provides that Congress must do so.

Reciprocal trade legislation has been on the books for 20 years. It has not accomplished much as an incentive to lowering trade barriers of foreign countries as pointed out above. On the other hand, considerable injury has been sustained by American industry. Some firms have gone out of business such as the Alexander Smith Carpet Co. has done in Yonkers. Others are operating on a marginal basis, and in some cases, whole industries are threatened with extinction. There were 10,000 skilled watchmakers employed in the United States in 1948. Today there are only 4,000. Whole States, such as West Virginia, where coal mining is the chief industry, are prostrate because of the importation of cheap residual oil. In New York State, the glove industry, the hat industry, and others are practically out of business. The chemical industry has testified that it has been hurt by previous tariff cuts and that any more may finish them off. The necessity for a strong domestic chemical industry was demonstrated in World War I. At that time the United States was completely dependent on Germany for chemical products, and when the war broke out, our only source of supply was gone. The pottery industry in the United States and in New York State is virtually extinct. Since 1948, imports of China tableware has increased 138 percent so that 86 percent of all China tableware purchased in the United States is foreign made. Since 1950 imports of foreign bicycles has increased 1,300 percent and now absorbs more than one-third of the American market.

In theory, the reciprocal trade legislation provides an opportunity for relief to these stricken industries. Under the law a lowered tariff may be raised if it is found the domestic industry is being severely hurt. Upon an application from the aggrieved industry, the Tariff Commission holds public hearings and then may report to the President with recommendations for relief if it finds relief is necessary. The President may or may not act as he sees fit and there is no appeal from his decision. This provision for relief is called the escape-clause procedure. However, relief by this procedure has seldom been realized.

Since 1948 there have been 59 applications by American firms for relief. The Tariff Commission, the agency set up by Congress to act as a court in tariff disputes, took action on 15 of these applications and made recommendations to the President for relief. In only five of these cases did the President take action to protect the domestic industry against injury from foreign competition. In the remaining cases, the President, acting on the advice of some State Department bureaucrat, ignored and overruled the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. This is permitted under the past and present proposed law. The President can make his decision on facts that were never before the Tariff Commission and which the industry involved has had no chance to refute. And, as I have already pointed out, there is no appeal from the Presidential ruling.

Now consider what that means. The jury, which in this case would be the Tariff Commission, hears the pleadings and the evidence and then renders a verdict. The judge, viz the President, can then, on the basis of facts not presented to the jury, reverse the verdict and no appeal is permitted. This is bad law, bad procedure and outrageous politics in dealing with American industry. It is in utter violation of all the basic tenets of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and of the concept of constitutional representative government. The American tradition prefers the wisdom and experience of jury verdicts instead of verdicts by a single judge.

There is another danger inherent in this unprecedented procedure. Those who may have access to the President's ear through some State Department bureaucrat, may ignore the proceedings before the Tariff Commission and present their case directly to the President. This amounts to government by personal rule rather than by law. This is not intended to be derogatory of the present Presidential incumbent. My use of the word "President" is entirely impersonal.

When tariffs are subject to congressional control; when tariff disputes are resolved by court procedures; and when American businessmen whose business lives are threatened, may have their day in court, then I shall vote for reciprocal trade legislation. I believe in the principle of it.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, the problem to be discussed herein is simply whether H. R. 1 should be accepted as a sound measure in the national interest or rejected as an unsatisfactory solution to world-trade problems in light of its effect upon the United States economy.

For practical consideration the problem is divided into three basic elements: First, economic: What effect will the United States tariff policy have upon the economies of the free world nations? Second, world political: What effect will the United States tariff policy have upon the political and military unity of the free world nations? Third, domestic: What effect will United States tariff policy have upon the domestic economy and particularly upon industries affected by lower tariffs and international competition.

ECONOMIC

In terms of a long-run solution to the trade and payments problems of the world, the basic difficulty seems to be that of a continuing necessity for nations to adjust the allocation of their resources. This readjustment is necessary in order to keep pace with the constant increase in world production and reshuffling of world trade among the free nations. Three separate factors seem to be affecting the long-run distribution of national resources:

(a) The increasing integration of industries within each nation so as to gain the advantages of manufacturing their own basic raw material. Most important in underdeveloped areas although significant in Europe.

(b) The strong drive of all the free nations for strength and the highest degree of independence possible.

(c) The trading nations of the world have had a great tendency to develop into trading blocs with each bloc having somewhat divergent and competing interests and limited self-sufficiency.

Sterling bloc, European Payments Union, dollar area.

Assuming the above facts to be sound and accurate we present the question of what effect the United States tariff policy will have upon the problems confronting nations with regard to trade and payments. The facts indicate that the current problems have had little connection with the United States tariff policy and therefore any change in this policy will have a negligible effect upon the important problems of international trade and payments. The facts from which this view was formed are as follows:

(a) Import tariffs are only one factor to be considered in judging whether or not the American consumer will buy foreign goods.

(b) The factors of taste, technology, and new inventions, distance and shipping costs, competing price reductions by domestic producers as a result of import threat have been largely omitted in considering the issue.

(c) In actual fact most evidence points to the fact that in the event that United States tariffs were completely removed there would be little change in the trade throughout the world. Dr. Howard S. Piquet, Senior Economic Specialist in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in his book Trade, Aid and Tariffs, expressed a well-founded opinion that in the absence of any tariffs, imports into the United States would rise no more than $2.6 billion annually.

We are left with the conclusion that most of the foreign claims that a lowering of United States tariffs would remedy all the free world's economic and balance of payments difficulty simply are not true and that arguments in favor of freer trade based upon this concept of the international economic effects of such trade increases forthcoming through tariff reductions have been greatly overstated. A much more sound theory explaining the international trade and payments difficulties of the free world can be based on the three factors affecting the long-run distribution of national resources named in this discussion.

WORLD POLICY

The long-range United States foreign policy centers around one basic objective—a strong domestic economy in a peaceful community of nations. In order to fully realize this objective it is assumed that the United States must have strong, economically secure allies. This Nation has taken the dominant role in postwar politics and in the establishment of sound prosperous economies among the free nations. The free nations of the world now look to America as a leader and attach greater importance to United States action than is justified by fact. This exaggerated sensitivity is confirmed by almost every foreign reaction to United States policy. Thus, through the assumption of leadership in international affairs and through the natural internal economic strength of this country, the United States has become the leading actor on the free-world stage.

Coordinating the above statements and consideration of H. R. 1, we present the question of what effect United States tariff policy will have upon the political and military unity of the free world.

It is immediately apparent that the failure to accept the President's tariff proposal, H. R. 1, will cause violent objection among the free nations of the world, particularly the European trading nations who form the bulwark of our Western European defense perimeter. In short, it is obvious that this kind of objection is economically, completely unjustified, but it is nevertheless a political reality. It must be analyzed as a reality.

The basic question then becomes a very broad one involving United States strategic policy. Should this Nation disregard the opinions of other free world nations because we know that the opinions had little basis in fact? The answer to this is "No". Because of the fact that most of our allies are keenly interested in United States tariff policy and regard it as a primary index as to whether or not we intend to practice on the economic front what we preach on the political front, we must attach considerable importance to this phase of the trade problem. We must weigh the political realities alongside economic fact in setting forth the trade policy of the United States.

DOMESTIC

The effect of lower tariffs upon the domestic economy of the United States has formed the battleline for both the proponents and opponents of H. R. 1. Basically, this factor in isolation from other considerations is an insufficient foundation for a final conclusion. However, because of the tremendous publicity given this phase of the problem many misconceptions have been formed and many opinions drawn upon this factor alone. Those proponents of H. R. 1 who believe that low tariffs will act as a veritable panacea to the domestic economy must ultimately face the same disillusionment as those friendly nations who have in the past made the United States tariff policy the whipping boy for all their economic problems. The various pressure groups who by necessity or by choice have selected their belief and are now trying to utilize every conceivable rationale in favor of their original opinion do not come to grips with the basic question of the effect of United States tariff policy upon the prosperity of the domestic economy.

In general it is recognized that some economic gains accrue to a nation from such tariff reductions. This tends to reduce the price to consumers of the products imported in greater quantity and to increase the financial ability of foreign nations to buy United States produce. However, to put the tariff question in proper perspective, it should be made clear that the proposed changes set forth in H. R. 1 will have an insignificant beneficial effect upon the overall national economy.

In recent years exports have averaged approximately $15 billion and imports $11 billion per year which amounts to roughly 4.5 and 3.3 percent of the gross national product during the same years. Approximately $6 billion of the annual import figure enters the country free from duty. This means that a reduction in United States tariffs would affect only the goods presently being imported into this country at an annual rate of $5 billion or less than 2 percent of the gross national product. Reliable estimates of the probable increase in imports in the absence of any duties place the range at $1.2 billion to $2.6 billion. Judging from this estimate, the maximum effect of H. R. 1 upon the economy as a whole

would be less than 1 percent of the gross national product.

The bare fact is that certain domestic industries have a long history of operation under tariff protection while other industries foresee a good possibility of expanding their sales and profits if tariffs are reduced. Just how much either group would be damaged or helped by the passage of H. R. 1 is impossible to determine since both sides constantly overstate their position. Nevertheless, herein lie the two sides of the argument.

Objective tests show that the industries which would be most affected by increased competition from foreign producers are the textile groups—wool and cotton manufacturers as well as textile fibers—and the machine and vehicle group—bicycles, autos, lawn mowers, sewing machines, and many types of other machinery. There would be a substantial rise in imports in the areas of animal fats and oils, vegetable products, and chemicals.

Is it in the national interest to continue tariff protection in industries where such protection now exists in order to prevent dislocation of production? This question must be answered on a case-by-case basis and not by a general policy as set forth in H. R. 1. Congressional action on this bill will merely set the trend for future changes.

There is no doubt that some controls are essential to prevent other nations from pushing the burden of worldwide economic adjustments onto the United States as world productivity capacity increases and changing factors force a reshuffling of resources throughout the world.

CONCLUSION

The tariff question boils down to this: We must weigh the effects of H. R. 1 upon, first, the free world economies; second, the political and military unity of the free nations; and, third, the domestic economy and protected industries.

Absolutely nothing the United States might do in the way of lowering tariffs can solve or even substantially aid the economic problems of the free world. The first step to be taken in solving national and international economic problems is a realistic insight into the actual difficulty by the countries involved. There can be no successful solutions to the problems so long as nations refuse to do this. It must be stressed that the role of this country should not be one of nurturing all the misconceptions which exist among the allied nations who continue to use United States tariff policy as a "scapegoat" for their own unsolved economic problems. We cannot make our laws and justify them on the basis of unsound opinions voiced by friendly nations.

The same basic principle of economic reality must be followed in coping with the strong foreign objections forthcoming from a United States policy to maintain tariffs at their present level. Legislation such as H. R. 1 must be based upon and justified by full considerations of domestic interests.

The full impact of further tariff reductions upon several of our domestic industries has not been stressed here. However, it is generally known that the textile, bicycle, lawnmower, and many other industries will be further depressed by a continuation of tariff reductions. Should we cease to protect these industries because of the good accruing to the consumer and the economy as a whole? The answer to this would be "Yes" if such general economic benefits were a probable result of a lower tariff policy. This is simply not the case. In fact, H. R. 1 will have the effect of helping one small group of producers at the expense of another small group of producers for the general benefit of no one, except the latter group.

Looking once more to the realities of the allover problem, it seems that a low-tariff policy has become the popular symbol of an economic cure-all. People and nations have attached themselves to this symbol in the hope of something better for themselves. The mysterious economic curing power attributed to a lower United States tariff policy is pure mythology. Sooner or later all nations must solve their economic problems through their own efforts and by facing up to the real problems. The time for this action is now and United States tariff policy is not the real problem.

The rational balance in the allocation of traded resources between nations cannot be expected to happen automatically. There must be tariffs and standby measures for the protection of all countries from dislocations in their internal economies. United States tariffs are now the eighth lowest in the world and the facts simply do not justify further reduction.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time to express my approval and endorsement of the recommittal motion which will be offered in due course and upon which we will have a chance to vote.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully as our distinguished minority leader read a letter from the President of the United States, a carefully worded letter, a letter written after great thought unquestionably, yet a letter which in no-wise stated opposition, if you please, to the motion to recommit to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. I suggest that the reason for this is that the recommittal motion, when it passes, will lead to bringing the bill back immediately for passage with the amendment as provided. I suggest, further, that inasmuch as the administration had full and complete knowledge of what the recommittal motion will be, the President, had he been fully determined that the bill should not be amended, would have stated so in the letter which he wrote and sent here.

When this bill came before the Committee on Ways and Means—and I was there for practically every day of the hearings—I repeat, when the bill came before the committee, it contained, among other things since stricken from it, a proviso that the President, this man whom we all honor and respect, the bill then contained a provision that the President might in one of these reciprocal trade agreements trade off and in effect abrogate or cancel the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; that barrier, if you please, that tariff which properly protects the farmers of the United States as we proceed to conduct farming in our country with price supports of which I approve. So I say to you, there is no stigma attached to any proposal which removes from the President one of the most onerous and difficult jobs that a past Congress imposed upon a former President of the United States. Having made a mistake some years ago in empowering another President, forcing upon him the obligation of changing a decision reached by a Tariff Commission—that in itself should be no objection to our subsequently correcting that error. That is what we are trying to do in this recommittal motion.

Think well for a moment of your own congressional district. Perhaps it is a district wherein, as the gentleman from Mississippi who spoke this morning said, the major operation of his district is completely protected by an embargo, or because you produce some goods which cannot be produced elsewhere in the world, or perhaps has a tariff protecting your industry which is not among the thousands that will be cut in these Japanese negotiations starting next week, or perhaps there is some other barrier protecting, generally speaking, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, where there is a quota upon the importation of the highly competitive products from Cuba with a product of that gentleman's district. Oh, it is easy for those gentlemen to come in here in the interest of their own constituency and advocate that the tariffs be cut somewhere else in the world. There are some Members here who have congressional districts where right today little factories in the textile field or oil or coal mines or the manufacture of bicycles or scarves or any one of a dozen different items—you know what they are—where those factories have shut down or are going to shut down in the near future because of what has happened under existing law with respect to tariff cuts. They are afraid of what may happen in the immediate future in further cuts which they anticipate in the tariff.

Mr. Chairman, those industries—and you know what they are in your own congressional district—have come to you repeatedly in past years and have said, "We need relief." And what have you told them? You have told them to go to the Tariff Commission and, in accordance with the law of the United States, under the escape-clause provision—perhaps you said "a clause for which I voted to protect you, my own neighbors in my own congressional district"—to go to the Tariff Commission and make out a case and prove that the injury which caused them to shut their plant down was due to tariff cuts, and they would get relief.

And those people have been coming in here, unless there were some who realized that perhaps no good would come by their coming here, for the decision reached by the Tariff Commission

would be overruled by the action of the President.

Yet, acting in good faith, you advised them to come, and they have come to Washington and they have made out their cases. They have hired attorneys, which has meant $5,000, $10,000, $15,000, $20,000 of expense or more, to present their cases to the Tariff Commission. They did the very best they could.

They make out a case and they persuade the Tariff Commission—yes, unanimously—that the Tariff Act, by reason of changes in reciprocal trade agreements, has caused them injury or threatens to put them out of business. The Tariff Commission makes a recommendation that assistance be given to that industry, and then—and this is the unjust part of this escape clause—some competitor of that man, some importer, some man who makes his money by bringing goods in from abroad, goes around to some other agency, perhaps to the Department of Commerce, or in some way or other he gets word to the President of facts which were not in front of the Tariff Commission and which may be compelling and effective and true and should have been and would have been grounds for the Tariff Commission to make a different decision. But he brings them in, and the President, acting properly at that time, overrules the Tariff Commission's findings. Then the situation is that the constituent of the Member of Congress, having been told that he would have a fair hearing here in Washington, has not had a fair hearing, because he has had no opportunity whatever to reply to the word that came in by the back door, if you please; that word that never went to the Tariff Commission, that word which influenced the President to overrule the Tariff Commission.

We are undertaking to correct that. We are undertaking in this motion to recommit to provide that when your neighbor comes to Washington to appeal to the Tariff Commission for relief from unjust and unreasonable cuts in the tariff which are threatening his existence—we are saying to him, "You are going to get a fair hearing in Washington. No longer will there be a back-door approach by your competitor, because the Tariff Commission will be the sole source of the information upon which the decision whether to help you or not will rest, unless it is a national security matter. And then every one of us bows to the decision of the President, if he is willing to state that irrespective of the finding of the Tariff Commission, the Nation's security requires some action other than that recommended."

That is all we are doing in this. Oh, there will be those who will rise and point out a lot of technicalities and allege that we are doing things that we think we are not doing. But, my friends, if you want to be able to stand up and tell any of your constituents that you have done the least little thing, one minor thing, anything, if you please, to help him, to help that unemployed worker, to help the man who complains about the imports of any product, whatever it may be. If you want to provide him with the proof that you have tried to help him, you have got to vote for this recommittal motion. If you do not, you are telling him in effect, "We want you to continue under the same method of partial relief that has been followed up to date, a method by which your opponent can come in through the back door and make arguments which he should have presented to the Tariff Commission."

That is what we are up against. I urge respectfully that those who want to do right by their friends and neighbors back home support this motion.

I was on the Randall Commission. I did not agree with their findings. While I have the chance, I should like to point to one suggestion they made with which I am not in complete disagreement. That is, that the escape clause and the peril-point provision—and it is printed here in heavy ink in their book of recommendation—should be retained. However, the statute should be amended expressly to spell out the fact that the President is authorized to disregard findings under those provisions whenever he finds that the national interest of the United States requires it; a recommendation, if you please, that we spell out the limits of the authority within which the President should be able to disregard the findings of the Tariff Commission. They use the words "national interest" in this, and I say that "national security," the words used in the recommittal motion to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], are likewise words which include the national interest of the United States.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for so ably presenting our cause here today.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Could the distinguished gentleman tell us this: Can we tell our constituents and our industries and the men who work in the plants that they can have the utmost faith in this Commission and the President, that when an industry is threatened in the United States of America they are going to have protection?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The President of the United States names the members of the Commission. All the witnesses will then come in before the Tariff Commission. Those who presently go around to the back door, who do not even go to the Tariff Commission, when they know they are going to be bound by the findings of the Tariff Commission will present their evidence direct to the Tariff Commission.

Mr. KEARNS. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. What benefit would this amendment have for the coal industry?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for bringing that matter to my attention. It is a very vital matter.

In the law, where authority is provided to the Tariff Commission to act under the escape clause, the Tariff Commission is permitted to make recommendations as to the kind of remedy it thinks should be given and which, if given, would give relief to the complainant or the applicant.

Assume that the coal industry makes a case before the Tariff Commission so that the Tariff Commission wants to help. Then it has the authority to say, "We direct that a quota be imposed upon the importation of that product"—namely, residual oil, which is in the gentleman's mind—"which is causing the injury to the coal industry."

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. It is my impression that the Tariff Commission has taken the position heretofore that the complaint of the coal industry should not be given attention because there is no importation of coal to compete with our own coal, and that oil is another product.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is true it is another product, but it is competitive, and the law permits the competitive phase to come into the matter. I am sure that given the finding of facts by the Tariff Commission, namely, the injury to the coal industry as the result of the importation of residual oil, the Tariff Commission could recommend the imposition of a quota.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think it would, under the amendment?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I certainly would urge it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is it not true that a vote to recommit would in effect be a tightening up of the procedures under this law, while a vote against the bill itself would not in any way affect the treaties that are already in existence? In fact, they go on into perpetuity.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The reciprocal trade agreements already in effect remain in effect irrespective of what we do here today. Should we approve the recommittal motion, we would be writing into the law a provision which would apply to the tariff cuts already made under existing trade agreements.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire whether the gentleman from New York has any further requests for time?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] to close debate on the pending bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I find myself today on the side of some very

illustrious people in support of the bill, H. R. 1, introduced by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], to carry out the trade program recommended to the Congress by President Eisenhower. I find on the floor the Speaker of the House and the former Speaker of the House in support of the program, and I always welcome an opportunity when I can side with those two gentlemen when they are joined together in any undertaking. I think it is worthy of consideration by any Member of the House that these two very outstanding Americans who have served so long and so eminently in the House of Representatives are joined together on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitated to trespass upon the time of the House, but after over 3 weeks of hearings in the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill, I came to certain very definite conclusions and impressions about what we ought to do in this very trying time, and I wish my colleagues would permit me the opportunity of taking just enough time to give you some of those impressions.

These hearings, it is universally agreed, offered the committee an opportunity to learn fully the views of both the proponents and the opponents of the legislation. As my colleagues on the committee know, I devoted a considerable amount of time to hearing the testimony offered and I made every effort to understand and appreciate the views of those who appeared before us. I feel that the time was well spent and that the committee and this Congress have benefited from this review; that in a truly constructive sense, it has made a contribution to the legislative process.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to listen to 3 weeks of testimony on a piece of pending legislation that is of such considerable importance to the welfare of the Nation, without coming away with some fairly vivid impressions. I should like to share with you the major impressions that I have gained and that have led me to the conclusion that passage of H. R. 1 without amendment is essential to the national interest.

The importance of this legislation to the national interest was evidenced by the weight of testimony in support of the bill on the part not only of the Cabinet officers of the administration, but also of the major public and civic organizations representing every sector of the economy. There was universal recognition that an expansion of foreign trade has been good and will continue to be good for employment and production, for the consumer and the taxpayer, and for our international relations. And this was not denied by most of the witnesses on the other side. They usually agreed that an expansion of trade was good for the country—provided their own industry was protected.

The wide geographic representations in support of the bill gave evidence that these gains have been spaced across the economy, to the advantage of every State and county. The pervasive nature of the effect of foreign trade on our economy was illustrated by the information we received on the relationship of foreign trade to other component parts of our gross national product. With a gross national product of about $360 billion in 1953, exports of merchandise alone accounted for 4.3 percent of the total and exports of merchandise and services for 5.8 percent. Now 5.8 percent may not by itself bulk very large. But compared with the other expenditure items that go to make up the gross national product and which, therefore, sustain employment and account for our high standard of living, this 5.8 percent is important indeed.

We think of cash receipts from farming as being crucial and they are; yet this element accounted for 8.6 percent. Residential nonfarm construction is often regarded as a bellweather of our economy, yet its percentage share was 3.3 percent, less than the 5.8 percent accounted for by exports. Business purchases of capital equipment, another important and dynamic contributor to the gross national product, made up 6.7 percent. Should there be any proposal to restrict or hamper the growth and development of any of these sectors of the American economy, the hue and cry raised would be very vigorous indeed, and rightly so. Yet to endanger our exports is viewed in certain quarters as not dangerous at all. We are not talking about something infinitesimal.

Five and eight-tenths percent of a gross national product of $360 billion is $20 billion and with a total employment of 65 million, we can conclude that close to four million jobs depend on this export trade. In some instances, for individual firms and enterprises, export trade is far more important than the average of 5.8 percent. One-third of our exports were accounted for by products which rely upon foreign markets for more than 25 percent of their sales. Agricultural products are important of course. For example, in the crop year 1952–53 which was a year of low exports, we exported one-fourth of our wheat and one-fifth of our cotton, and over one-fifth of our tobacco. But export sales are no less important for the industrial sector of the economy. We do not often hear, for example, that 6 percent of our cotton textile production is sold abroad as against imports equal to one-half of 1 percent of production. Exports of synthetic fabrics are 7.1 percent of total production, while imports were only one-fifth of 1 percent. Actually, 70 percent of our total exports consist of manufactured goods, produced with highly paid American labor and with American capital and know-how.

This fact alone bears examination. How can we continue to sell abroad $20 billion worth of goods and services in competition with lower wages abroad? How is it that foreigners are so anxious to buy our goods that they have not as yet been able to earn all the dollars that they want in order to satisfy this demand for our products. The answer came out sharp and clear. It is because of our greater productivity, our ingenuity and the wealth of our resources. These have contributed to the amazing growth of our economy over the past 20 years, just as they have contributed to the expansion and increased competitiveness of our exports. It was surprising to me to learn, as I sat and listened to the testimony of the opponents of this bill, that almost all the industries that appeared in opposition to H. R. 1 had participated in this growth. Not only that, but many of them had a sizable stake in exports; certainly in my judgment more of a stake in exports than they had reason to fear imports. The chemical industry was well represented in opposition to the bill, yet its total sales have grown by 10 percent a year until they reached $20 billion in 1954. It exported $900 million of its products, while imports of chemicals were less than one-third as much. And not more than a fraction of these imports could be regarded as competitive with domestic production. The cotton textile industry exports 6 percent of its production, above the national average, and exports are 10 times the amount of imports. We were told by representatives of the industry that our domestic textile mills are the most efficient in the world and many of their products can compete anywhere and the record proves it.

Our coal producers have not participated in the growth of the economy in recent years. Since 1947, the peak year of bituminous coal production, demand fell off by 155 million tons, of which export demand fell by 35 million tons. Yet the coal industry still sold abroad in 1953, 34 million tons of coal and we were told by representatives of that industry that American coal can outsell European coal in the European market, if only Europeans could earn enough dollars.

The committee heard about a dozen representatives of the domestic petroleum-producing industry. They opposed H. R. 1 and urged the committee to impose a quota on crude-oil imports. Yet this is an industry which has increased its production from $1.3 billion in 1939 to $6.4 billion in 1953. Their proposal would drastically reduce oil imports from the Middle East and Indonesia and create the gravest of problems in our relations with those areas.

And then the committee heard some representatives of the electrical equipment industry express their concern about foreign competition in the field of United States Government purchases of heavy electrical equipment for powerplants. This industry produced in 1954 $17 billion, exported in 1953 $800 million, while imports were $35 million. In heavy electrical equipment, imports amounted to 2 percent of United States production. The most important recent Government contracts for this type of equipment have been awarded to United States manufacturers by virtue of their low bids. This demonstrates to me, taken in the light of their export figures, that they are perfectly able to compete with foreign manufacturers if they have to, but if they can avoid it by opposing this bill they will be happy to do so.

We also heard from the photographic industry. One gentleman, president of a very successful firm, stated he was prepared to accept competition from any quarter because he felt it was in the national interest. Another gentleman, president of another firm, stated that he feared the effects of future competition, yet his firm has had perhaps the

most phenomenal expansion in sales and assets in the last 10 years in the entire industry.

By what distortions of economic logic, we may ask, do the representatives of these great and dynamic industries arrive at their opposition to H. R. 1? How can they reconcile their opposition to imports with their own important economic interest in continued and expanded exports abroad? We can fairly conclude that this defies reason. This is nothing but fear. Time and time again we learned, through inquiry, that it was not the present which troubled them but it was only the future they feared. And in many cases, it was this same fear that prompted their opposition to the trade-agreements program throughout its long and successful history.

Can we assume that these people are better prophets today than they have been over the past 20 years? Can we afford to make legislation of such importance to the Nation on the basis of the unreasoned timidity of a few? Can we safely undercut and circumscribe this modest bill by making exceptions for each and every commodity that alleges fear of future injury?

We cannot. We dare not do that if we seek to serve the interest of the Nation. And I would add that neither would it be serving the real interest of those who oppose the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I resent as an affront to commonsense the proposition that imports are bad. Aside from the fact that the simple arithmetic of foreign trade tells us that we cannot export if we do not import, we must recognize that imports themselves are employment creating and add to our standard of living. The bulk of our imports, I should say 80 percent, enter this country in raw or semifinished form. A large part of their final value is added by American industry here at home. This sustains production and employment and results in a flow of cheaper goods to the consumer.

What we are concerned with in this legislation are the imports that now enter the United States over the duty. Out of a total of merchandise imports of $11 billion in 1953, there were almost $5 billion of dutiable imports. We are concerned with $5 billion of imports compared to a gross national product of $360 billion. For these imports, it is proposed in H. R. 1 that the authority be given to reduce duties by 15 percent over a 3-year period, that duties be reduced by a maximum of 50 percent where there are no imports or imports are negligible, and that those duties which exceed 50 percent ad valorem can be reduced to 50 percent ad valorem. This is very modest authority.

Compared to the authority of the 1945 act which permitted a maximum reduction of duties by 50 percent, H. R. 1 is indeed moderate. In the case of about one-third of all dutiable imports, the 50-percent authority has been exhausted. In the case of another one-third, it has not been used at all. For the remaining third, something less than the full 50-percent authority has been used.

In this last case, the authority that remains under the 1945 act exceeds in many instances that contained in H. R. 1. We can conclude, therefore, that if the maximum authority contained in H. R. 1 were used, it would represent an increase in authority to reduce tariffs, as compared with the present authority, for perhaps only one-half of all dutiable imports.

By giving up the authority of the present act for H. R. 1, we are substituting, in effect, the ability to make selective reductions in duties on commodities which can bear these reductions. Moreover, we are providing that these reductions take place gradually over a period of 3 years. Retained also in the bill are the peril-point and the escape-clause provisions which, before the fact of a tariff reduction, as well as after, afford a restraint on the extent of that reduction. We must conclude that, by any test, this is minimum legislation which would mark modest progress along a well-tread path.

The fact that this bill contains adequate safeguards needs emphasis. I have given this matter much thought. I am convinced that the peril-point and the escape-clause provisions of law are adequate as they now stand. We have in operation today machinery to implement both these provisions; machinery which provides an opportunity for the careful review of all issues and the interests of all parties. In the crucial area of safeguarding our defense-essential industries, I am satisfied that the so-called Symington amendment to the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1954 expresses clearly the intent of the Congress in this vital area. We must recognize that the responsibility for administering our national defense programs resides in the Executive, and that, accordingly, the national defense aspects of our foreign-trade policy will be given due consideration. We certainly have no reason to assume that this has not been the case in the past or that it will not be the case in the future.

But there is a larger and broader problem of national security bound up in the passage of H. R. 1. That is the contribution that can be made to the growing strength and solidarity of the free-world community. Not the least important of the considerations that fall under this heading is the need for expanded trade within the free world as an alternative to the expansion of trade with the Soviet bloc. Passage of H. R. 1 would serve an essential need, therefore, of our foreign policy.

By failing to enact this legislation or by seeking to amend it we would be running the risk of undercutting our bipartisan foreign policy. This is the real issue of national security involved in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we have made in the postwar period a substantial investment in the economic strength and military security of the free world. The $32 billion of economic aid alone that we have given our friends and allies has been described by Sir Winston Churchill as "the most unsordid act in human history." We can begin to secure, for our benefit, the good returns on that investment by enacting the legislation that is now before us.

Mr. Chairman, a fair question is—has anyone proved a case against enactment of this bill? The record will indicate that none has.

During the hearings I heard testimony from some of the great industries of the country talking about what would happen to them under this program. For 12 years, my friends, I have heard the same argument time and time again by the opponents of the bill. All of those industries, without exception, have enjoyed a growth under this program, almost without exception. They have all enjoyed a part of this export trade.

I heard the textile people say, "We are fearful of what will happen in the future to the textile industry." I heard them say it 12 years ago. I heard the chemical industry, which is enjoying a ratio of 3 to 1, exports as against imports, say to the committee, "We are fearful of what will happen in the future." I heard them make the same statements 12 years ago. Yes. We heard the oil people talk about what is happening to them, an industry that has grown from $1,500,000-000 in 1939 to in excess of $6 billion in 1954. During all these years we have all heard that over and over again. Then we heard the coal people tell us, "If you will put a quota on the importation of residual oil, and deprive the people on the Atlantic Coast of enough residual oil to permit us to produce 11 million more tons of coal, it will go a long way toward a solution of the problems which we have."

I ask my friends from the coal industry who have seen, as I have already pointed out, the consumption of coal drop since 1947 by 155 million tons, 35 million of it in losses on exports, if that is all they have to hold out as a ray of hope to the people involved in this great industry. It is not all the hope that I have in mind for them. The great thing that the coal industry wants today to restore itself is an increase in exportation of coal. That is what you need. Are you going to get it by opposing this legislation? Are you going to get it in this amendment that will be offered in a motion to recommit? I have been told that the coal industry has not found a way to go to the Tariff Commission to make a case under the escape clause. I have been told that by people in the coal industry. The only thing you could put in this bill that would have done one scintilla of good, if even that, would have been an import quota on residual oil, and that is not in the motion to recommit with instructions that will be made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. What would have happened to the oil industry, according to your own statement? Nothing but a quota on the importation of crude oil, but there is nothing in the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from New York that would permit the imposition of quotas. The Department of Defense has always said that the importation of crude oil is necessary in the national interest.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that the Tariff Commission could have recommended a quota on the importation of oil, if it saw fit to do so?

Mr. MILLS. Exactly. But you say in your motion that the President does not have to follow the Tariff Commission when the national security is involved.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. You spoke about crude oil.

Mr. MILLS. I was talking about both.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Crude oil is dumped on the eastern shores——

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman means residual oil?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I mean residual oil.

Mr. MILLS. I have spoken of residual oil.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly the gentleman knows that in our defense it is necessary to maintain the production that we now have and build up tremendous reserves so that in event we did get into an emergency as we are now, we would have a reserve. You are permitting the importation of 1,200,000 barrels a day and killing the incentive of the independent producers to go out and find new reserves of oil, so that if we get into an emergency where we are cut off from South America and Iran, where would we get the oil to fight a war?

Mr. MILLS. I understand the gentleman's position.

Friends of mine in the oil industry have all in the last several years assured me that our reserves of oil in the United States have grown, that they are not declining.

Let me get down to a specific discussion of this question in our committee if I may. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think, left the impression, or tried to, with the membership of the House that the President himself was not opposed to this motion to recommit today. I ask my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader, this question: If in his knowledge the President of the United States is for or against this motion to recommit? Would the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. MARTIN. The letter stated that the President is in favor of H. R. 1 as it came out of the committee. I have no direct knowledge as far as the motion to recommit is concerned, but from all the information I get, he is opposed to the motion to recommit.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Massachusetts read a letter dated yesterday.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. That was before the debate reflected that there was a specific motion to recommit and the President could not have known of it at the time he dictated the letter.

Mr. MARTIN. I think in all honesty to the Members of the House it can safely be said that he is opposed to the motion.

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman is entitled to speak for the President on any matter, and I take his view that the President is opposed to it.

Let us look now briefly at the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because he did not believe it was a mistake to give a former President of the United States discretion in removing these concessions under the escape clause provision. He voted for such at the time it was offered here, he voted to allow a Democratic President, mind you, to have discretion. Whether or not he would follow the recommendation of the President of the United States, the gentleman voted for it. Today the gentleman says that I cannot—and if I misquote the substance of the gentleman's statement I apologize—the gentleman in effect said today: "I cannot bring myself to believe that it is safe to turn over to the President of the United States responsibility for deciding whether or not the concession in a trade agreement shall remain in effect or be removed; I want that responsibility turned over completely to some commissioners who are not elected by the people of the United States. I want to turn it over to some people who are appointed to office."

I daresay that there is not a Member of the House who can get on his feet today and give the name and let alone the background of the 6 members of the Tariff Commission, or even 3 or 4 of them, who are now serving. What is so sacrosanct about the Tariff Commission as compared to the man who occupies the highest position not only in the land but the highest responsible office within the gift of man in the world today? I certainly do not mean to imply that we do not have capable men on the Commission.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman. Have I misquoted his position?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I hope everyone will listen exceedingly carefully as to what I said a bit ago. I said that there was a back-door approach, namely, that complainants would not go and testify before the Commission but would go to other departments of government and get their case in where the complainant had no opportunity to object or to repeat their statement.

I say that every one of those words was used. This amendment was brought to our attention and was made by the gentleman who now objects to it.

Mr. MILLS. Wait a minute. Now, the gentleman knows I did propose an amendment in committee; and the impression has been spread around over the House that my amendment was the same as now being proposed by Mr. REED. I will read my amendment so everybody can hear.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The amendment to which reference has been made was considered in the committee and the vote was 12 to 12.

Mr. MILLS. I will read it if he has not a copy and ask if it is in any respect like that in the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I was referring to the gentleman's argument. I did not use the words that were read out.

Mr. MILLS. Let me read the amendment. There has been some doubt expressed about it. This is the sum and substance of it:

> The findings and conclusions of a majority of the Commission respecting injury shall be given the fullest consideration by the President in making his determination.

What are you doing in your motion? You are telling the President that his judgment shall not prevail, you are telling the President only at a time when the national security is involved you will rely upon his judgment. Any other time it has got to be that of the Tariff Commission.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] let the cat out of the bag. He said that you could trust the President of the United States in military affairs. Is that the prevailing thought behind this motion? I hope it is not. I have greater confidence in any man who occupies the White House than to say that in some things I will trust him but in other things I prefer to trust somebody I may not even know, whose background and qualifications I may know nothing about.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will make a grievous mistake. We do not just affect this program as it relates to the future if we adopt this motion to recommit. What the gentleman from New York is doing by his motion is to strike the heart and the core out of everything that has been accomplished under present agreements. I say to you advisedly that I would much prefer to have no extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at all than to give the authority which they propose in this motion to recommit to hit at everything that has been done to now. This would undo our present agreements. Do not be misled, those of you who have come into the Congress for the first time, this is not a new fight. These fears are not newly expressed. Let me leave this thought with you, whether or not you want to look to the fears of something that might happen or do you want to look to the fears of doing some irreparable injury to our national interest itself at a time when the President has said he can cut down on some phases of our Armed Forces because we intend to emphasize the economic aspects of this fight in the cold war.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. What would the gentleman do to help the unemployed or the industries which are suffering back in his own State? What will he tell them?

Mr. MILLS. I hope the gentleman is not going to take a position that you can

help somebody who is unemployed by making somebody else unemployed through the elimination of the opportunity of exporting the surplus products that come from the farms and the factories of the United States, and I call your attention to the fact that 70 percent of all that was exported in 1954 came from our factories. It did not all come from the farms.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to announce that there will be no committee amendments other than those appearing in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 7, after the word *"Provided"*, strike out the balance of the line down to and including the word "paragraph" in line 8 and insert "That."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert *"Provided further,* That the enactment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of organizational provisions of any foreign trade agreement entered into under this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 20, strike out "not being" and insert "normally not."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike out the word "being" and insert: "normally."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 24, after the period insert "This clause shall not apply with respect to any article unless it is identified in the list required by section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1360 (a)), for possible consideration as an article which is normally not imported into the United States or is normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 23, strike out the word "may" and insert "shall, as soon as practicable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 3, after the word "intention", insert "to negotiate."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out all of line 25 down to and including all of line 7 on page 13.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 142, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves to recommit the bill H. R. 1 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 11, line 21, after "SEC. 4.", insert "(a)."

Page 11, after line 24, insert:

"(b) The second sentence of subsection (c) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows: 'If, as a result of investigations and hearings, a majority of the commissioners voting find that a product on which a concession has been granted is (as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession) being imported in such increased quantities (either actual or relative) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or competitive products, such finding shall be final and conclusive and the President shall take action to prevent or remedy such injury unless he determines that the national security requires that no such action be taken. If the President does not, within 60 days, take the action referred to in the first sentence of this subsection, he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating why he has not made such adjustments or modifications, or imposed such quotas'."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 206, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—199

Abbitt	Engle	O'Brien, N. Y.
Adair	Fenton	O'Hara, Minn.
Alexander	Fernandez	O'Konski
Alger	Fino	Osmers
Allen, Calif.	Fisher	Patterson
Andersen, H. Carl	Fjare	Perkins
	Flood	Pfost
Andresen, August H.	Flynt	Philbin
	Fogarty	Phillips
Andrews	Forand	Pilcher
Ashmore	Forrester	Poff
Aspinall	Gavin	Prouty
Auchincloss	Gentry	Quigley
Bailey	Granahan	Ray
Baker	Gray	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Green, Pa.	Reed, Ill.
Barrett	Gross	Reed, N. Y.
Bates	Gubser	Rees, Kans.
Baumhart	Gwinn	Rhodes, Ariz.
Beamer	Hale	Richards
Becker	Haley	Riehlman
Belcher	Hand	Rivers
Bell	Harvey	Robeson, Va.
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ohio	Rogers, Colo.
Berry	Henderson	Rogers, Mass.
Betts	Hiestand	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Hill	Rutherford
Boland	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
Bosch	Horan	Saylor
Bow	Hosmer	Schenck
Bray	Hyde	Scherer
Brown, Ga.	James	Scrivner
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Scudder
Budge	Jenkins	Seely-Brown
Burdick	Jennings	Selden
Burnside	Jensen	Shuford
Bush	Johansen	Sieminski
Byrd	Jonas	Sikes
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearney	Smith, Kans.
Canfield	Kearns	Staggers
Carlyle	Kee	Taber
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Taylor
Carrigg	Kilday	Teague, Tex.
Cederberg	Knox	Thompson, La.
Chenoweth	Laird	Thompson, Mich.
Chudoff	Landrum	
Colmer	Lane	Thomson, Wyo.
Coon	Lanham	Tollefson
Corbett	Latham	Tuck
Cretella	Lipscomb	Tumulty
Curtis, Mass.	McConnell	Utt
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	McDonough	Van Zandt
Davis, Wis.	McIntire	Vursell
Dawson, Utah	McVey	Walter
Devereux	Macdonald	Wickersham
Dies	Mack, Wash.	Widnall
Dixon	Mason	Wigglesworth
Dodd	Meader	Williams, Miss.
Dolliver	Merrow	Williams, N. Y.
Dondero	Metcalf	Willis
Donohue	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Dorn, S. C.	Mollohan	Withrow
Dowdy	Morgan	Wolverton
Durham	Mumma	Wright
Edmondson	Nelson	
Ellsworth	Nicholson	

NAYS—206

Abernethy	Burleson	Evins
Addonizio	Cannon	Fallon
Albert	Celler	Fascell
Allen, Ill.	Chase	Feighan
Anfuso	Chatham	Fine
Arends	Chelf	Ford
Ashley	Chiperfield	Fountain
Avery	Christopher	Frazier
Ayres	Church	Frelinghuysen
Baldwin	Clark	Friedel
Bass, N. H.	Cooley	Fulton
Bass, Tenn.	Cooper	Gamble
Bennett, Fla.	Coudert	Garmatz
Blatnik	Cramer	Gary
Boggs	Crumpacker	Gathings
Bolling	Cunningham	Gordon
Bolton, Frances P.	Dague	Grant
	Davidson	Green, Oreg.
Bonner	Deane	Gregory
Bowler	Delaney	Griffiths
Boykin	Denton	Hagen
Boyle	Derounian	Halleck
Brooks, La.	Dingell	Harden
Brooks, Tex.	Dollinger	Hardy
Brownson	Donovan	Harris
Broyhill	Dorn, N. Y.	Harrison, Nebr.
Buchanan	Doyle	Harrison, Va.
Buckley	Elliott	Hays, Ark.

Hayworth	Madden	Robsion, Ky.
Herlong	Magnuson	Rodino
Heselton	Mahon	Rogers, Fla.
Hillings	Mailliard	Rooney
Hinshaw	Marshall	Roosevelt
Hoeven	Martin	St. George
Holifield	Matthews	Schwengel
Holmes	Miller, Calif.	Scott
Holt	Miller, Md.	Sheehan
Holtzman	Miller, Nebr.	Sheppard
Hope	Mills	Simpson, Ill.
Huddleston	Minshall	Sisk
Hull	Morano	Smith, Miss.
Ikard	Morrison	Smith, Va.
Johnson, Wis.	Moss	Springer
Jones, Ala.	Moulder	Sullivan
Jones, Mo.	Multer	Teague, Calif.
Karsten	Murray, Ill.	Thomas
Kean	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson, N. J.
Keating	Natcher	Thompson, Tex.
Kelly, N. Y.	Norblad	Thornberry
Keogh	Norrell	Trimble
Kilburn	O'Brien, Ill.	Udall
Kilgore	O'Hara, Ill.	Vanik
King, Calif.	O'Neill	Velde
King, Pa.	Ostertag	Vinson
Kirwan	Passman	Vorys
Klein	Patman	Wainright
Knutson	Pelly	Watts
Krueger	Pillion	Weaver
Lankford	Poage	Westland
LeCompte	Polk	Wharton
Lesinski	Powell	Whitten
Long	Preston	Wier
Lovre	Price	Williams, N. J.
McCarthy	Priest	Wilson, Ind.
McCormack	Rabaut	Winstead
McDowell	Rains	Yates
McMillan	Reuss	Younger
Machrowicz	Rhodes, Pa.	Zablocki
Mack, Ill.	Roberts	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—29

Bentley	George	Riley
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hébert	Shelley
Clevenger	Hess	Short
Cole	Hoffman, Mich.	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson	Smith, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Spence
Dempsey	Judd	Steed
Diggs	Kluczynski	Talle
Eberharter	McGregor	Wolcott
	Radwan	Young

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Cole for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Bentley against.

Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Oliver P. Bolton for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Wolcott.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, MR. VELDE, and Mr. HOLT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by misunderstanding, when the name of Mr. PRIEST was called, thinking it was my name I answered "yea." His name was called on the second rollcall. There is a possibility that my response was recorded after Mr. QUIGLEY'S, and I wish just to call the attention of the Clerk to that possibility.

I voted "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 295, nays 110, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—295

Abbitt	Evins	Marshall
Abernethy	Fallon	Martin
Addonizio	Fascell	Matthews
Albert	Feighan	Meader
Alger	Fernandez	Merrow
Allen, Calif.	Fine	Miller, Calif.
Allen, Ill.	Fino	Miller, Md.
Anfuso	Ford	Miller, Nebr.
Arends	Forrester	Mills
Ashley	Fountain	Minshall
Aspinall	Frazier	Morano
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	Morrison
Avery	Friedel	Moss
Ayres	Fulton	Moulder
Baker	Gamble	Multer
Baldwin	Garmatz	Mumma
Barden	Gary	Murray, Ill.
Barrett	Gathings	Murray, Tenn.
Bass, N. H.	Gordon	Natcher
Bass, Tenn.	Granahan	Norblad
Bates	Grant	Norrell
Becker	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, Ill.
Belcher	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Bell	Gregory	O'Neill
Bennett, Fla.	Griffiths	Ostertag
Blatnik	Gubser	Passman
Blitch	Hagen	Patman
Boggs	Haley	Pelly
Bolling	Halleck	Pfost
Bolton, Frances P.	Harden	Pilcher
	Hardy	Pillion
Bonner	Harris	Poage
Bosch	Harrison, Nebr.	Polk
Bowler	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Boyle	Hayworth	Price
Brooks, La.	Herlong	Priest
Brooks, Tex.	Heselton	Quigley
Brown, Ga.	Hiestand	Rabaut
Brownson	Hill	Rains
Broyhill	Hillings	Rees, Kans.
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Reuss
Buckley	Hoeven	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burdick	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Pa.
Burleson	Holifield	Richards
Byrne, Pa.	Holmes	Riehlman
Byrnes, Wis.	Holt	Rivers
Cannon	Holtzman	Roberts
Carlyle	Hope	Robeson, Va.
Carnahan	Horan	Robsion, Ky.
Celler	Hosmer	Rodino
Chase	Huddleston	Rogers, Colo.
Chatham	Hull	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Hyde	Rogers, Tex.
Chenoweth	Ikard	Rooney
Chiperfield	James	Roosevelt
Christopher	Jarman	Rutherford
Chudoff	Jennings	Sadlak
Church	Johnson, Wis.	St. George
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Schwengel
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Cooley	Karsten	Selden
Cooper	Kean	Sheehan
Corbett	Keating	Sheppard
Coudert	Kelly, N. Y.	Shuford
Cramer	Keogh	Sikes
Crumpacker	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Cunningham	Kilgore	Sisk
Curtis, Mass.	King, Calif.	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mo.	King, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Dague	Kirwan	Springer
Davidson	Klein	Sullivan
Deane	Knutson	Teague, Calif.
Delaney	Krueger	Teague, Tex.
Denton	Landrum	Thomas
Derounian	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Devereux	Latham	Thompson, N. J.
Dies	LeCompte	Thompson, Tex.
Diggs	Lesinski	Thomson, Wyo.
Dingell	Lipscomb	Thornberry
Dixon	Long	Trimble
Dodd	Lovre	Tuck
Dollinger	McCarthy	Udall
Dolliver	McConnell	Vanik
Dondero	McCormack	Velde
Donovan	McDonough	Vinson
Dorn, N. Y.	McDowell	Vorys
Dowdy	McVey	Wainwright
Doyle	Machrowicz	Walter
Durham	Mack, Ill.	Watts
Edmondson	Madden	Weaver
Elliott	Magnuson	Westland
Ellsworth	Mahon	Wharton
Engle	Mailliard	Whitten
Wickersham	Williams, N. J.	Yates
Widnall	Willis	Younger
Wier	Wilson, Ind.	Zablocki
Wigglesworth	Winstead	Zelenko
Williams, Miss.	Wright	

NAYS—110

Adair	Forand	O'Hara, Minn.
Alexander	Gavin	O'Konski
Andersen, H. Carl	Gentry	Osmers
	Gray	Patterson
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Perkins
	Gwinn	Philbin
Andrews	Hale	Phillips
Ashmore	Hand	Poff
Bailey	Harvey	Ray
Baumhart	Hays, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Henderson	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Berry	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Betts	Johansen	Saylor
Boland	Jonas	Schenck
Bow	Jones, N. C.	Scherer
Bray	Kearney	Scrivner
Brown, Ohio	Kearns	Scudder
Budge	Kee	Seely-Brown
Burnside	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Bush	Kilday	Simpson, Pa.
Byrd	Knox	Smith, Kans.
Canfield	Laird	Staggers
Carrigg	Lane	Taber
Cederberg	Lanham	Taylor
Coon	McCulloch	Thompson, Mich.
Cretella	McIntire	
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Tollefson
Davis, Wis.	Macdonald	Tumulty
Dawson, Utah	Mack, Wash.	Utt
Donohue	Mason	Van Pelt
Dorn, S. C.	Metcalf	Van Zandt
Fenton	Miller, N. Y.	Vursell
Fisher	Mollohan	Williams, N. Y.
Fjare	Morgan	Wilson, Calif.
Flood	Nelson	Withrow
Flynt	Nicholson	Wolverton
Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—29

Bentley	Hébert	Riley
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hess	Shelley
Clevenger	Hoffman, Mich.	Short
Cole	Jackson	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.	Judd	Spence
Dempsey	Kluczynski	Steed
Eberharter	McGregor	Talle
George	Prouty	Wolcott
	Radwan	Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Prouty for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Riley against.

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Cole against.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Siler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Spence with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. George.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO TUESDAY NEXT AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, will the gentleman please inform the House as to the legislative program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to do so.

Of course, there will be no session on Monday next if the unanimous-consent request is granted.

On Tuesday, which is George Washington's birthday, the Farewell Address will be read, and there will be no legislative business on that day.

On Wednesday, we will take up the bill, H. R. 3952, the cotton-acreage allotment bill, and H. R. 2581, a bill providing for the construction of aeronautical research facilities. It is understood that if there is a rollcall in connection with either one of those bills, whether on recommittal, which I do not expect, or on the passage, such rollcall will go over until Thursday. The leadership has an agreement to that effect.

On Thursday, we will take up the bill H. R. 4048, the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, and there is the understanding that any rollcall, of course, will be had on Thursday.

There are several committee investigations and resolutions which have been reported out of the Committee on Rules, which will be taken up not before Wednesday, and other resolutions may be reported between now and that time.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I regret exceedingly having been so busily engaged here on the bill which has just been passed by the House that I have not had time to confer with the Speaker, or with the leadership, but I hope that consideration might be given sometime next week to the bill for the extension of certain existing excise, present corporate tax rates in the event that action can be taken and it can be ready for consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course with that notice, next week is so scheduled that the bill could be considered if it comes out of committee, but I want it distinctly understood that there will be no legislation before Wednesday and that if there is any rollcall in connection with legislation that is considered on that day it will go over until Thursday.

Mr. ARENDS. Then it is possible that the bill referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] could be considered on Thursday or Friday of next week.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to that unless the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is consulted.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, will recognize that the gentleman from Tennessee is just giving me information.

Mr. COOPER. I am just trying to give notice that something may possibly come along about taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is glad to get the information. There is nothing that the gentleman from Massachusetts has announced that will be inconsistent with the bills coming up next week.

Mr. JENKINS. All I am trying to do is to protect our committee and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who has not been consulted.

Mr. McCORMACK. The committee is thoroughly protected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. This bill is a matter of considerable importance. It is essential in extending excise taxes to do it as quickly as possible before people go on a buyers' strike. So I think it is very important.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's committee has a meeting on Monday.

Mr. REED of New York. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tuesday is Washington's Birthday. The gentleman would not be ready to bring it up before Thursday anyway.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, I cannot say what will happen now.

Mr. McCORMACK. I knew, of course, that excise taxes were expiring, but I had no knowledge that there might be such immediate action by the committee. But the situation next week is such that of the committee reports it out the leadership can very easily cooperate with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in bringing the bill to the floor, but it would not be before Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 149, Rept. No. 62) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4048) to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COTTON MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 150, Rept. No. 63) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1954, I wrote the President and asked that he consider filling the vacancy on the Federal Reserve Board and also to appoint a vice chairman so that we may have a duly constituted Board of Governors, including a chairman and vice chairman.

This morning I was notified by a spokesman for the President that he was appointing on the Board Charles Noah Shepardson, of College Station, Tex., to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Nothing was said about the appointment of a vice chairman. I sincerely hope that a vice chairman is also appointed by the President.

Section 242 of title 12 of the United States Code under the subject of Selection of the Board of Governors it is stated:

Of the persons thus appointed, 1 shall be designated by the President as chairman

and 1 as vice chairman of the Board to serve as such for a term of 4 years.

I sincerely hope that if the President has not already done so he will appoint a vice chairman of the Board.

A GLORIOUS RECORD

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in four instances at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was highly privileged recently to receive an invitation to the exercises at Leominster in my district, celebrating the Jewish tercentenary observance.

It is of course most appropriate that loyal Jews and loyal Americans of Fitchburg and Leominster should set aside a time to hold exercises commemorating this historic and inspiring occasion.

The history of the Jewish people in America is one that cannot be read without profound emotional reactions of unbounded pride and deepest gratitude. Like the history of your people in other parts of the world it is marked by struggle and painstaking, unselfish work, though unlike your experience elsewhere, it has happily never been accompanied by persecution, and that is surely to the glory of America just as your great and unexcelled contributions to our peerless Nation is to the glory of the Jewish people.

I wish that time and space permitted me in this communication to deal extensively with this soul-stirring record of religious loyalty, racial advancement, and public and patriotic contributions. History shows that there were Jews in the originial colonies before 1650. In the year 1654 a company of Jewish refugees arrived from Brazil and settled in New Amsterdam, now New York City, where though they were enjoined by the Dutch authorities from holding public religious assemblies, nevertheless established their own worship upon their arrival in the town which then embraced only 800 persons.

Like people of my own faith and other faiths throughout history, pursued by narrowness and prejudice, the Jews of New Amsterdam gathered among themselves in their homes in accordance with time-honored, age-old customs of your people just as soon as there were enough people to hold public worship. And it can be said to their everlasting credit that they scorned and ignored the threat of oppressive action against the profession of their religious beliefs.

In 1656 this gallant band established the first Jewish congregation in North America, Sheerith Israel—Remnant of Israel. These early beginnings have grown into the proud edifice of Judaism which we behold in America today. Strangely enough its first Rabbi was one Saul Brown who came to the congregation from Newport, R. I., and he officiated regularly at the synagogue. It was not long before other Jewish communities were formed—Rhode Island in 1658; in Savannah, Ga., by the Jews who came to this country with Oglethorpe; in Charlestown, S. C.; Philadelphia; Richmond, Va.—all in colonial times—so that in 1877 there were at least 277 congregations in this country. Of your own knowledge you realize how that number has grown, so that the number of congregations in America today probably embraces in the neighborhood of 5,000 congregations or even more.

It would be pertinent for Americans who treasure liberty and cherish the personal freedom guaranteed by our American institutions to ask the question, Why did these Jews come to America and where did they come from? The answer is one which could as well be given by other races and sects in our country whose members came here principally to escape tyranny and persecution.

While the Jews came to New Amsterdam from Brazil, they had fled from Spain and Portugal and they came so that they could worship the God of their choice in the traditions of their noble ancestors. As we can imagine, this first small company of Jews who came to America were destitute, and their personal belongings were seized by the shipowners to pay their passage and two of their number were taken into custody until all had been paid. As I pointed out, the authorities were hostile, but in time they were won over by the exemplary conduct of the new visitors and finally declared that Jews were legally allowed to reside and trade in New York. How well they have resided and multiplied and how well they have traded and become wealthy and powerful is a matter of record.

Now there was one condition under which the Dutch authorities admitted the Jews to New York and that was that the poor among them should be supported by their own group. Such a provision was not necessary as we know in order that Jewish people would take care of their own, because throughout all history they have lavishly responded to the call of family and loved ones and friends and fellow Jews, as well as human brethren of every faith, every nation. But at once the shining result came in the form of societies to care for the orphan, the sick, the helpless, the poor, and to provide education.

These were some of the early Jewish contributions to the spiritual, economic, and social life of early America. It is gratifying to note that 2 years before the arrival of the first Jew in New York, Rhode Island passed a statute to the effect that "all men whatever nation soever they may be, that they be received inhabitants, not only of the town but receive the same treatment as Englishmen and any laws to the contrary notwithstanding," and of course that was one of the first, if not the first great charters of religious freedom in this country, in fact it was a classic declaration of the political and legal equality of man.

As a result, Newport, R. I., became the favorite refuge of Jews in North America and they honorably busied themselves with the development of the town, and though they had religious liberty, they could not be admitted to citizenship but that right was soon to follow and the steps by which the Jews secured equality of rights and political power in the various colonies is one of the most inspiring chapters of our history. Not long ago I personally attended an historic observance at the original synagogue at Newport, a most impressive experience.

Let it be said to the eternal credit of our early American founders that the Jews appeared nowhere to have been ill-treated. In some parts of the country, they met with prejudice and discrimination, and, Lord knows, such baneful and reprehensible feelings are still expressed, though fortunately in greatly decreasing and negligible measure.

On the whole, the early Jews found early America during the Colonial days a veritable paradise in comparison with European countries with their visitations of confiscation of their property, and ruthless persecution driving them from pillar to post and across the face of the earth as hapless, almost hopeless wanderers who, thank God, never lost hope and courage.

Then came the war for independence or the great American Revolution, and in the great epochmaking event which shook the world and securely established free institutions for the first time in history, the Jews rendered services of inestimable value. They contributed most generously of their means. Though but a small minority, they were found in military contingents from all the colonies and their records as soldiers were brilliant.

In the financing of the war we should hardly expect the Jews to be unheard from, and we can proudly assert that in 1776 when credit for the cause of freedom was greatly lacking, the names of Jews were conspicuous among the subscribers—Benjamin Levy of Philadelphia, Benjamin Jacobs of New York, Samuel Lyon of New York, Isaac Moses, Hyman Levy and others.

One of these early financial bulwarks of the Revolution was a Polish Jew, Haym Salomon, of cultivated people, liberally educated, an accomplished linguist speaking several languages. While he preceded his famous fighting countrymen, Pulaski and Kosciusko, to this country, when the Revolution began he early demonstrated his love of independence and his loyalty to the cause. He was chosen Paymaster General of the Army and Navy of France in America, Financial Adviser to the French Minister and other European governments. He took a foremost part in transferring foreign subsidies to this country when there was a pressing need for money and successfully negotiated advances upon these funds before they actually arrived here.

For these many vital services he would not accept compensation and he died a poor man because of his patriotism and unselfish donations of his own fortune. His monetary gifts to the Government were probably greater than that of any other person, but not one penny of the gigantic debt which the country owed him has ever been paid.

It could well be said, therefore, by the great historian Lecky that "Hebraic mortar cemented the foundations of American democracy," and this not only pertains to Jewish spiritual ideals but also to Jewish contributions in blood and treasure.

Someone has said that "the Jewish faith is predominantly the faith of liberty," and indeed the history of mankind and America eloquently gives testimony to this fact. To do their full part as citizens in building, protecting and sustaining the Nation, zealously to enlist in its defense in every war, energetically to promote its material advancement, boldly and industriously to plan and work for its progress, its betterment, its prosperity—that has been the aim and the lot of the Jew since he first laid foot upon these sacred shores.

Sustainer of patriotic causes, supporter of charity and humane benefaction for his fellowman regardless of race or creed, devoted to his family, his community and the betterment of American life, the Jew has never been found wanting when the call has come for help and assistance for any worthy humanitarian cause.

The gallantry of Jewish fighting men is indelibly inscribed in the annals of every American war. In Flanders Field where lie our heroic dead, the Star of David is mingled with the Cross in beauty and everlasting marble. In remote places of the world, where heroes sleep who gave their all in defense of America, that Star and that Cross are intertwined in a bond of immortal affection and loyalty enshrined in the hearts of Americans forever—a gleaming example of sacrifice and utter devotion for all the world to behold.

It is another historical fact of more than ordinary moment that Jews were financial backers of Columbus, the discoveror of the Western World. Little did they think then that in years to come their contributions to his cause would open the doors of the world's greatest Nation as refuge for the oppressed, the afflicted, the down-trodden and the persecuted of so many lands. Thus the Jews played a significant part in laying the deeper foundations for America and in building the great Nation of which we are so proud to be citizens.

History rolls out its scroll and the Jews now reside in every part of the United States. They embrace every section, every part of the fabric of America. They have penetrated into all realms of American life. They are leaders in business, in manufacturing, in merchandising, in finance, in all phases of our economic life. They are preeminent in law, medicine, pharmacy, teaching, the stage and the theater—and in spiritual callings. They grace the arts, sciences, music, public service. They are inextricably bound up with every human activity in the Nation.

The voices of doctrinaires of hate, prejudice and antagonism have at times been raised against them, but these voices have been only as the beating of a tiny feather upon a giant rock. The corrosive, soul-consuming poison of malice and envy has been neutralized and rendered inert by the tidal sweep of fair-minded, tolerant American public opinion which, true to our Constitution and its noble principles conclusively rejects the ignoble preachments of bias and prejudice and accords to the Jew, as to all other persons living under our flag, that toleration, understanding and feeling of human brotherhood which forms the unalterable precious cornerstone of American liberty.

The storms of passion and hatred may rage. The fury of soulless materialism and communism may sound throughout the world. The forces of evil may conspire and act to undermine and overthrow the blessed freedom we enjoy. But they will all go down to defeat. The Cross and the Star will endure because they are the symbols of strength of the Almighty, and the indomitable purpose of our forebears. If we but persevere in the faith of our Nation, determined to protect it from all danger and at any cost, He will continue to bless our great land and hasten the day of universal peace and amity among men and nations.

It is a special privilege and honor for me as your Congressman to laud and commend you as Jews and as Americans upon the excellence of your citizenship and the magnificence of your contributions to our beloved Nation. For your achievements and accomplishments, your unstinted charity, your public spirit, your devotion to community, State and Nation, I am proud to express my own humble pride and gratitude.

And to those of you in my district, and more especially tonight to those of you in this congregation, whose loyal friendship, unwavering support, and inspiring cooperation have so greatly lightened my burdens, I wish to express my particular and most sincere thanks.

To Solomon Rosenbaum who extended your kind invitation to his brother Felix, both of whom I am greatly indebted to for unceasing interest, stalwart friendship, and invaluable assistance with the duties and tasks with which I am charged in these critical days, I am anxious to make most sincere and heartfelt expression of my appreciation. To all of you I pledge my continued friendship and understanding.

This anniversary is joyous, prideful, and rewarding for all of you. It has been justly earned and richly deserved by you and your illustrious predecessors. May there be many more celebrations in the years to come to mark the tireless vigor of your great and ancient people and its memorable contributions to our glorious country.

And in closing, my greetings, best wishes, and kindest regards to all.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly privileged to join with my distinguished colleagues on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence to hail and salute the gallant people of that afflicted nation.

Although the Iron Curtain is drawn across this great nation and presently shuts out its people from the rest of the free world, the day will come when the tyranny, oppression, and persecution Lithuania now suffers will be banished. The day of liberation will come and free institutions will again be reestablished.

One who dwells briefly upon the glorious history of this nation realizes full well the struggle and sacrifice it has made throughout the centuries to maintain its freedom. Subjected to cruel and unjust oppression and domination, visited with every species of tyranny, denied by force of arms of the ordinary rights of free men, the Lithuanian people never lost heart. They struggled, they bled, they fought and died to preserve or to regain their independence and free way of life. Their indomitable spirit and will to be free was never suppressed and time and time again they threw off the yoke of the oppressor.

Their present plight is sad and tragic. Oppression again stalks their land and holds them in unspeakable bondage. But the lamp of freedom still burns in their hearts and will not be extinguished. Their will to be free will never be suppressed, their struggles to achieve independence will ever continue until the great goal of liberation is finally won.

In this epochal struggle, in this brave, gallant battle for independence, our own great Nation must continue to give the Lithuanian people encouragement and assistance. We must never fail them. We must let them know and understand that we share their aspirations and that we intend to do everything in our power to speed the day when their nation will again enjoy the fruits and blessings of freedom.

Hail to this great people. May they soon regain their precious liberties.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, February 7 marked the 10th anniversary of the infamous Yalta agreement wherein the rights, liberties and very lives of millions of free peoples were cynically bartered away for the nerve-wracking armistice of today.

This anniversary serves to remind all Americans that most of our current foreign problems stem from the unconscionable concessions made at Yalta—concessions which have resulted in fastening tyranny and dictatorship upon so many struggling, helpless peoples, who desperately seek their freedom.

It was at Yalta that China, North Korea, the Baltic and Balkan nations and the heroic nation of Poland and others were taken into the orbit of communistic oppression.

Let us realize on this 10th anniversary of the Yalta debacle that there can be no lasting peace any where or any time that is based on tyranny, exploitation and injustice. The history of mankind demonstrates that fact. The liberation of oppressed nations behind the Iron Curtain is, therefore, not only imperative on moral grounds. Until freedom is restored in these unhappy lands, there can be no real order and no lasting peace in the world. A peace movement based on oppression, the continuance of insidious Communist infiltration and the appeasement of those working for the destruction of freedom can only end in disaster.

This Nation must stand for its principles, it must protect its rights, its interests, and its liberties. It must defend the cause of freedom. It can never waver or retreat before the forces of Red aggression. Our Nation must stand fearlessly for security and peace predicated upon principles of justice and morality—confident of our great strength—military, economic, and spiritual—united in our determination, come what may, to protect our cherished way of life.

To the great historic Polish people, we send today a very special message of our sympathy, our faith in them, and our intention to work for their early liberation. Victim of a perfidy so base and black that it indelibly stains the escutcheon of world diplomacy, ruthlessly deprived of their blessed birthright, the Polish people fight on.

Their fight is our fight because it is the fight for liberty, democracy, justice, morality, and human decency. It is the fight for every precious value of the free world and the free way of life.

I plead with our great President and his counselors to renew and intensify the work he began some time ago for the liberation of nations like Poland—all nations bereft of body, liberty, and soul by Soviet terror and force. Thus, free Poland will rise again.

SYNTHETIC HYSTERIA AND NATIONAL COURAGE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is belief in many quarters that the diplomatic path has been cleared for the admission of Red China into the United Nations and the abandonment of Nationalist China and the acknowledgment of complete Red domination of the Chinese mainland and adjacent islands, including Formosa.

I hope sincerely that no such commitments have been made by this Government because, if carried out, they would sound the death warrant for democratic institutions and free governments in Asia. They would represent crass appeasement of aggressors and the Soviet bloc.

During the time that I have been privileged to serve in this body, I have witnessed several repetitions of the so-called crisis technique in foreign policy and defense matters. The pattern is always the same, usually based on arousing American public opinion by spreading fear and hysteria among the people concerning the dreadful things that will happen if certain policies are not followed.

We were told not too long ago that the Chinese Communists were merely harmless agrarians seeking land reform, not connected with Moscow in any way. Subsequent events demonstrated the untruths and fallacies embodied in these statements. The harmless agrarians blossomed as full-blown Marxists controled by Russia mounting ruthless aggression in Korea.

First, the atomic bomb, and now the hydrogen bomb, has been used to excite the people and prepare the way for appeasement of Communist nations. We were constantly reminded of the vast destructive power of these atomic and fusion weapons. No well-informed person would deny their awful power. But we are regaled almost ad nauseum with commentary and descriptive maps of areas that purportedly could be destroyed in this country. We are constantly reminded of the terrible fate that awaits us in the event of atomic attack. The press sometimes abounds with lurid accounts of possible atomic catastrophe based on reports by the Atomic Energy Commission, the military or civil defense.

In these reports, so far as I know, there has never been any reference by commentary, maps or otherwise to show the damage that could be inflicted by our tremendous striking force upon the potential enemy. The implication would seem to be that only this Nation could or would suffer from such devastating attacks, although we well know of our large supply of these dread weapons and our ability to deliver them. We also know the importance of proper precautionary civil-defense measures even though they may be only partly effective.

The American people well understand the horrible nature of the atomic and fusion bombs. They are not deluded either about their power or about the prospect that they would be used if the potential enemy believed the time was ripe. But Americans are not given to easy fears or futile hysteria. They appraise international and domestic dangers calmly and with reasoning eyes. Although aware of the dangers, they are not obsessed by irrational fears. They realize that they have to live with this reality regardless of what may come. They will have to live in the world of these dreadful weapons until some way can be found to outlaw them. Only the Soviets can open that door. So long as they refuse to negotiate honestly on universal disarmament and atomic control, we must be adequately prepared.

Americans have always possessed the courage to stand up for their rights and fight for their Nation and this generation of Americans is no exception. This is a God-fearing country and it ill becomes those who are spreading hysteria stories about these new weapons to launch constant horror reports depicting the frightful consequences of modern weapons far beyond the scope or need of legitimate civil defense plans and preparations.

These are facts already known to the American people and while hysteria is promoted by these tactics in some places, the rank and file of the people are far from terrorized into surrender of their judgments, but rather tend in the other direction of developing sharp suspicions concerning the motives of those who are spreading such horror stories in the country. In a word, the people understand the presence and tactics of "crisis" psychology.

If the purpose of these stories is to justify appeasement of world communism, it is destined to frustration and defeat because the American people will never willingly give up their legacy of freedom. They would rather die than to abandon their free institutions. The atomic, the hydrogen bomb, and the terrible new modern weapons all put together can never swerve them from this inflexible purpose because, so far as Americans are concerned, death is preferable to the loss of their liberties and they will never be dragooned by Russia or any other nation into surrendering their precious birthright.

Americans are not afraid of the atomic bomb or of any other force save the living God in whom we place our trust and faith. Their aim is not "peace at any price," but peace through justice, security, and strength.

Let all would-be aggressors note and all subversives realize that America has the means and the indomitable will to protect its sacred soil and way of life against aggressors and conspirators.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. VAN PELT the remarks which he expects to make in Committee today and include several letters.

Mr. COON.

Mr. BOW in the remarks he will make today in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous material.

Mr. CHUDOFF.

Mr. DOYLE and accompany the same with appropriate material.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and include a statement he made before the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service on postal pay raises.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) and to include certain tables.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. BOW) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject Value of Irrigation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 22, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

451. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force's semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to section IV of Public Law 557, 82d Congress was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the

Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 148. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2581, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 4048. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 103. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; with amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 149. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4048, a bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 150. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3952, a bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4199. A bill to include the fees for issuing money orders as a part of the gross postal receipts of post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4200. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4201. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 4202. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army, to erect, at Dunn, N. C., a suitable memorial to the late Maj. Gen. William Carey Lee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4203. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to eliminate the provision by which United States citizens born in Puerto Rico are denied certain benefit rights assured under such act to other United States citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4204. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4205. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4206. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4207. A bill to extend benefits under the civil-service retirement system to certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 4208. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal-income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4209. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal-income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness): to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 4210. A bill to provide a method whereby wartime service can be established in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War whose records cannot be found; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4211. A bill to amend subsection 12 (f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to provide for relinquishment and disposal of farm labor camps; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 4212. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of certain radiological detection instruments, devices, and equipment, and the leasing to the States for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4213. A bill to extend wartime rates of compensation to veterans and their dependents for service-connected disabilities incurred during periods when individuals may be inducted for training and service in the military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 4214. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to require the sale of natural gas for irrigation purposes in certain instances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4215. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 4216. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of 1948 in order to constitute the Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service as ex officio member of the Board of Directors of that Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4217. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes to the former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 4218. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4219. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong.), so as to require the consent of the Indian tribes to the assumption of jurisdiction by States over civil and criminal actions arising in Indian country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 4220. A bill to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4221. A bill to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 4222. A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAND (by request):

H. R. 4223. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 4224. A bill to permit the disposal of surplus property to publicly owned water districts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4225. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of North Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4226. A bill to promote the economic use of Indian lands, alleviate and adjust the heirship problem involved in Indian trust or restricted allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4227. A bill to amend section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to permit a veteran who has received a direct loan for the construction or improvement of a farmhouse to repay such loan in annual installments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4228. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to, technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4229. A bill to provide running mates for certain Staff Corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4230. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 4231. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 4232. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4233. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the age at which individuals may become entitled to benefits thereunder from 65 to 60 in the case of men and from 65 to 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4234. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY (by request):

H. R. 4235. A bill to amend Public Law 2, 73d Congress, to provide care for disabled veterans having neuropsychiatric ailments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4236. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 4237. A bill to amend section 503 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to allow certain veterans to file claims for mustering-out payment prior to July 16, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COON:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary lock and dam in the Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash., as Lake Aldrich; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to restore to the States certain rights affected by recent Supreme Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. J. Res. 224. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the period August 21–27, 1955, as American Law Student Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the appropriation of funds necessary to enable the Corps of Engineers to complete the preliminary investigations and planning for the John Day project, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that funds be made available to begin the planning and construction of the flood control facilities needed at the Green Peter and Cougar projects, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 4238. A bill for the relief of Spiros Kaloniktis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4239. A bill for the relief of Pavlos Michael Campourelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Miss Susana Clara Magalona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4241. A bill for the relief of Domenico Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Petkov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4243. A bill for the relief of Bernard Ellbogen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Micich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Morris Plevin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alphonsine Keller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Miguel Angel Guzman Nunez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of Leong Man Faye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4251. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Arthur J. Laib, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 4252. A bill for the relief of Asher Ezrachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Henry M. Lednicky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of the Warrensburg Foundry, Midway, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4255. A bill for the relief of Barnett Warner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of Dragutin Krize Kurich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4257. A bill for the relief of Sisters Bianca Capasso, Caterina Giudice, Giuseppa Capone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 4258. A bill for the relief of Luigia Pelella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Report of Foreign Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there was appointed last year a subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the purpose of making an inspection in many countries of Europe concerning shipping, shipyards, and others matters of concern to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] were appointed on the subcommittee, and accompanying them was the subcommittee counsel, Mr. Webster.

They made a report to me as chairman of the committee at that time, which I think contains very valuable information for the Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
December 30, 1954.

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRICKER: You will recall that by letter dated July 29, 1954, you authorized Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, our subcommittee counsel, Mr. Webster, and me to visit various European countries for the purpose of inspecting certain foreign shipyards and investigating other matters of concern to this committee. Accordingly, I am writing you in behalf of our group to report on our European trip.

On August 20, 1954, we sailed from New York aboard the S. S. *United States*.

We arrived in LeHavre on August 25 and proceeded directly to Paris. As you know, Senator PURTELL had a previous commitment to meet various United States Senators and Congressmen in Vienna on August 27 for the purpose of representing our country at the interparliamentary conference held in that city until September 2. As a result, we parted that evening after a final conference in Paris, Senator PURTELL taking the train to Vienna and Mr. Webster and I taking another train to Bremen.

However, before we parted we mapped out our itinerary. Since I had to be back in the States by no later than September 8, 1954, we decided I should spend my entire time in Germany; at Bremen, Hamburg, and Bonn. We also agreed that when I left Germany on or about September 1, 1954, Mr. Webster would go on to Rome in order to meet Senator PURTELL when he arrived from Vienna on or about September 3, 1954. On leaving Rome they planned to visit Genoa, Italy; Rotterdam, Holland; London, England; Clyde, Scotland; and Dublin, Ireland. If all went well—as in fact it did—they intended to return aboard the *United States* when it sailed from Southampton on September 23, 1954.

Of course, I am very sorry that previous commitments would not permit me to revisit the splendid shipyards in Holland and Italy, or to see for the first time the world-famous yards on the Clyde or in Belfast. However,

in view of the scope and importance of German shipbuilding, I am not sorry that I refrained from trying to visit yards in other countries. To the contrary, my only regret is that I did not have more time to spend in Germany.

It seems to me that it would be burdensome to weigh down the body of this letter with a multitude of statistical information. Therefore, while now and then I will allude to a statistic or two worth noting, I will include most of that type of material in various accompanying enclosures.

This is not to say that I consider the enclosures routine or meaningless. Indeed, I have reason to believe that some of them, especially those dealing with current costs of building ships in various European yards, may prove to be of value to the Maritime Administration, the General Accounting Office, and the Appropriations Committees. While I am not so naive as to believe that Senator PURTELL and I, in the limited time at our disposal, were able to turn up complete answers to any or all of the intensely complex questions involved in the determination of construction differential subsidies, I am sure that some of the material we gathered has not been made available to our Government before.

After you have finished examining the enclosures, with your permission I will invite the Maritime Administrator, the Comptroller General, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to review and make appropriate use of them. In view of the fact that much of this information was supplied to us with the understanding that it would not be used in any way which might embarrass the supplier, I will request those who are permitted to use it to do so discreetly.

On August 26, Mr. Webster and I arrived in Bremen, where we were met by Consul General Edward D. McLaughlin. That afternoon we conferred at his home with him and the following people: Mr. Hermann Helms, Jr., director of Hansa Line; Mr. Manfred von Oheimb Hauenschild, director of Norddeutsche Bank A. G.; Dr. Gustav Adolf Theel, head of Bremen Institute for Shipping Research; Mr. Fred Riddle, Lykes Lines representative; Mr. William Amoss, Jr., Lykes Lines representative.

Among the subjects we discussed in addition to Germany's shipping and shipbuilding industries were various experiences which American companies such as Lykes have had in serving Bremen. We also had an opportunity to invite the views of these leading Bremen shipping authorities on the so-called 50–50 or cargo-preference bill (Public Law 604). Dr. Theel, in particular, is a noted authority in such matters and authored the Bremen World Shipping Yearbook 1952–53.

Because Public Law 664 was so new—in fact it was not signed by the President until August 26, 1954—it was to be expected that there would be a certain amount of misunderstanding concerning its provisions. However, I was gratified to note that these gentlemen recognized that the United States as a sovereign Nation cannot afford to rely on foreign shipping to meet its ocean transportation needs; and further, that our country must maintain a healthy, privately owned, and operated merchant marine. It was also gratifying to discover that they recognize that in order for us to maintain an adequate privately owned merchant marine we must to some extent subsidize it directly, or indirectly, in order for us to be somewhere near par with our low-labor-cost foreign competitors. Nor did they take exception to the premise that it is only reasonable for a nation which must subsidize its merchant marine to a substantial extent to require that at least 50 percent of the ocean cargoes owned or financed by the government of that country be carried in merchant vessels flying its flag.

Here, as in certain other places visited by Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster, we found that the main concern which our foreign competitors have about the cargo-preference bill is based on a misunderstanding, i. e., that the bill requires that at least 50 percent of all United States exports and imports be carried on United States-flag ships. Of course it does not, applying as it does only to cargoes in which our Government has an interest as owner, financier, or guarantor. It affects in no way those transactions which are commercial rather than governmental in nature.

As in other countries, we here observed a certain amount of anxiety that we would extend the cargo preference principle to cover commercial, as well as Government-owned or financed cargoes. We did our best to dispel these fears and I feel that in large measure we succeeded.

We also observed a certain amount of concern lest other countries use our cargo-preference bill to justify them in discriminating against the ships of other nations by giving their own vessels a monopoly of all exports and imports. We pointed out that the fact that other nations might selfishly misinterpret our bill was not sufficient reason for us to repeal it; and on this score we heard no persuasive rebuttal.

That afternoon (August 26) we visited the A. G. Weser yard (Aktiengesellschaft Weser). There we were cordially received by Mr. H. W. Schliephake, vice president, who escorted us on a tour of the yard. Before mentioning a few of our observations I believe it might be helpful if I set forth some general information concerning the A. G. Weser Co. and its yards in Bremen and Bremerhaven:

Prior to 1945, the A. G. Weser Co., with shipyards in Bremen and Bremerhaven, was one of Germany's largest shipbuilding companies. However, it suffered a severe setback as a result of the war. The Bremen yard was almost completely dismantled and delivered to the Soviet Union as reparations. However, buildings and foundations of shipways, which had not been destroyed by bombing, were left intact so that an astoundingly quick reconstruction was possible after the company obtained permission to resume shipbuilding in the Bremen plant in April 1951. The Bremerhaven shipyards were not dismantled and could resume shipbuilding in 1947.

Today the company again is 1 of the 4 largest shipyards in Western Germany. In shipbuilding capacity it probably ranks third or fourth (after Deutsche Werft, Hamburg; Howaldtswerke, Hamburg; and probably also behind Howaldtswerke, Kiel); in number of employees it may rank second or even first. Employment as of June 30, 1954: Bremen yards, total, 6,000, 2,600 thereof in shipbuilding; Bremerhaven yard, total, 3,230, 2,970 thereof in shipbuilding.

The relatively high number of employees as compared with shipbuilding capacity is explained by the fact that a considerable percentage of labor force is engaged in machine construction work (turbines, diesel engines, oil tanks and containers, coupling gear, etc.).

Germany's largest and fastest prewar passenger liner, the SS *Bremen*, was built in A. G. Weser's Bremen shipyards.

The Bremerhaven shipyards, known as A. G. Weser, Werk Seebeck, specialize in fishing and whaling vessels, but they also construct passenger and freight vessels up to 16,000 deadweight tons. There are 2 shipways in Bremerhaven.

Due to the fact that shipyards and machine construction plants in Bremen had to be rebuilt completely after dismantling, the Bremen shipyards today are reportedly equipped with the most up-to-date installations. A large new shipway with travelling cranes has recently been completed. It has a length of 175 meters, width of 35 meters, and a height of 52 meters. The other four shipways in Bremen are equipped with large luffing and slewing cranes. A large hall has been erected for welding sections.

The shipbuilding capacity of the company is reported to be back to the prewar level, although only two-thirds of the former space is occupied due to more efficient production methods and layout. The company owns several floating drydocks for repair work. The largest has a lifting capacity of 16,000 tons; two smaller ones located in the Bremen free-trade zone have lifting capacities of 1,500 to 2,000 tons. The construction of the fourth floating drydock of 12,000 tons lifting capacity is nearing completion. The present equipment enables the company to construct vessels of the largest known size, including tankers, up to 60,000 (d. w. t.). The only limitation will be set by the depth of water at the shipway which is 38 feet in Bremen. The output of the Bremen yard in 1954 was 6 vessels totaling 39,200 (gr. t.), the Bremerhaven yard produced 16 units with a total of 24,800 (gr. t.).

During our visit to the A. G. Weser Bremen yard we found it very busy. In relation to the state of physical condition it must have been in at the end of the war, the yard seems now to be in excellent shape. Many new buildings already exist and others are under construction. These new structures facilitate the building or prefabrication of many ship components which would otherwise have to be constructed in the open, perhaps on board ship and subject to the impediments of weather.

Large tanker construction, for the account of various American owners and others, seemed to be the cause of much construction activity.

I was pleased to see that in spite of all the war damage, and in spite of the intensity of effort to rebuild and improve their yard, the German workers have not lost their sense of humor. For example, all that remains of one building in the yard is a large smokestack. On it is painted the German equivalent of "no smoking."

We also visited the offices of Captain Daehne, Director of the Bremen Port Authority. He showed us a magnificent mechanized model of the port. From our discussions with him and our personal observations of the port itself it was plainly apparent that Bremen has not only reconstructed many of its facilities which were damaged or destroyed during the war, but it is well on its way to making it a better and busier port than ever before. In fact their facilities for loading and unloading grain are as fine as any I have ever seen.

Of course in speaking or thinking of the port of Bremen, it would be improper to leave the impression that Bremen stands separate and apart from Bremerhaven. Indeed the ports of Bremen are a series of 5 ports, running from Bremerhaven (where the Weser River joins the North Sea) up the Weser, past Bremen-Farge, Bremen-Blumenthal, Bremen-Vegesack to Bremen. The sister towns of Bremen and Bremerhaven make up what some refer to as the "Free Hanseatic Town of Bremen."

On August 27, 1954, Mr. Webster and I left Bremen and traveled to Hamburg where we were met by representatives of the United States consulate in that city. Shortly after arrival we conferred with Dr. Roerhrike, local representative of the Germany Shipowners Association. Thus we had an opportunity to discuss with him and members of the consulate staff the cargo-preference bill. Our impressions were very much the same as those we had received from similar discussions in Bremen.

During our altogether too short weekend stay in Hamburg we made an extensive tour of the harbor in the company of Mr. Widenmann, chief of the Harbor Construction Of-

fice. We went into the areas of the port covered by the following shipyards:

1. Deutsche Werft Aktiengesellschaft: This yard has an annual output capacity of about 65,000 (gr. t.). It specializes in the construction of motor and turbine tanker vessels, motor cargo vessels, and refrigerated ships.

2. Howaltdswerke Aktiengesellschaft: This yard has an annual output capacity of approximately 50,000 (gr. t.) and builds all types of vessels. As in Bremen, we noticed a great deal of ocean-going tonnage, mainly of the tanker variety, under construction. Especially memorable was the 47,000 (dw. t.) tanker, *Ibn Saud*, being built by Howaltdswerke Aktiengesellschaft for the Greek shipping magnate, Onassis.

In Hamburg, too, we were shown an excellent model of the port. Dr. Scholvin, of the Federal Ministry of Transportation, shipping section, discussed with us the task of rebuilding the port after the war and how it has progressed.

Here, too, as in Bremen, it seems to me that this port is rapidly becoming better and busier than ever before. In particular, I was impressed with the extensive number of new dockside cargo cranes. Whereas in Bremen the semiportal type of crane has been used for many years, Hamburg, in reconstructing its port, decided to employ the full-portal type. I was informed that because of the traffic handled through Hamburg, the port organization was compelled to extend the rail-track system on the water side of the sheds which line the wharves; and that this modification entailed an alteration to the crane system. If semiportal cranes had been installed they would have had to have much larger spans than the full-portal variety. I concluded that Hamburg seems to be proceeding on the premise that it can expedite turn-around time of ships by installing more lower-priced cranes rather than fewer of the more expensive type.

Of course the strict competitive rivalry between Bremen and Hamburg is as intense as ever. Indeed it is understandable that the German officials, with whom we discussed maritime matters in both ports, radiated pride in their respective cities.

On Monday morning, August 30, 1954, Mr. Webster and I left Hamburg and arrived in Bonn that afternoon. We were met by Mr. Emerson M. Brown (Chief of the Transportation Section of the Office of Economic Affairs, HICOG) and spent the remainder of that day and evening consulting with Mr. Brown, Mr. John W. Tuthill (Acting Director, OEA, HICOG), Mr. Wier Brown (Chief of the Finance and Program Division, OEA, HICOG, and U. S. Treasury representative), and Mrs. Charles H. Breecher (Acting Chief, Industrial Services Division, OEA, HICOG). That evening we also had the honor of dining and conversing with not only these gentlemen but also with Dr. Westrick, State Secretary of the Federal Ministry of Economics; and Dr. Bergmann, State Secretary of the Federal Ministry for Transportation. I was extremely pleased to have this opportunity to talk with Drs. Westrick and Bergmann for, as you probably know, the positions which they hold are similar to positions held by members of our President's Cabinet. I understand that Dr. Westrick plans to be in the United States in the near future and I am looking forward to the honor of a visit from him.

On August 31, Mr. Webster and I conferred with Drs. Hubner and Schmid of the Shipbuilding Office of the Federal Ministry of Economics. Although we had discussed elsewhere in our trip throughout Germany the cost of vessel construction, I was especially gratified by our conference with these eminent German officials.

That afternoon we had the honor of lunching with Ambassador and Mrs. Conant at their home. Indeed, among the most pleasant and profitable experiences I had abroad was the time I spent that afternoon with the Conants. In view of the fact that EDC had just been defeated in the French Assembly, it is understandable, I believe, that our discussion was not limited to maritime matters. Naturally, I was pessimistic and skeptical about the EDC developments. However, after talking with Ambassador Conant, I felt I had a much better understanding of certain key issues and alternatives. I came away from this meeting with immense confidence in the Ambassador's judgment.

That evening Mr. Webster departed for Genoa, Italy, for the purpose of making arrangements for various conferences and meetings to be held in that city by Senator PURTELL and him when they returned from Rome. The next morning I boarded the Ruhr-Paris express for Paris, and after less than a day in that beautiful city, I left for Cherbourg where I boarded the SS. *Queen Mary*. As you know, there were no American-flag vessels whose schedules would have permitted me to stay in Germany as long as I did and still be back in the United States by September 8, 1954.

In reflecting upon our altogether too short visit to Germany, I believe that certain maritime matters are worthy of additional mention. I have not tried to set them forth in any particular order, but just as they come to mind. They are as follows:

1. In 1953 the German shipyards constructed 66 vessels for foreign account. I was informed that this was 41 percent of their total construction and amounted to 299,500 (gr. t.).

2. The German merchant fleet, as of December 31, 1953, was made up of 2,111 vessels with a total tonnage of 1,930,215 (gr. t.), an increase of 95 vessels of 411,815 (gr. t.) over the level at the close of 1952.

3. The German fleet at the close of 1953 was a little less than one-half of its prewar size of 4 million (gr. t.).

4. The *Gripsholm's* sailing on February 2, 1954, from Bremen to New York under the colors of Norddeutscher Lloyd, and the inclusion of that line in the reorganized Continental North Atlantic Westbound Freight Conference are matters of international interest and significance.

5. The total volume of cargo carried by the German fleet (including cargo carried between foreign ports) in 1953 amounted to 34,200,000 tons as compared to 28,100,000 tons in 1952, an increase of about 22 percent.

6. Passenger traffic carried by the German merchant fleet in 1953 was negligible. German freighter-passenger accommodations were limited to between 6 and 12 passengers. However, German shipowners have started to construct a new type of combined passenger/cargo vessel capable of carrying approximately 86 passengers.

7. German shipbuilding costs increased in 1953, due primarily to higher prices for steel plates and higher wages for German shipyard workers.

8. The main form of national subsidy or aid extended by Germany to encourage merchant vessel construction in that country is found in section 7D of the German income-tax law. This section has enabled German shipowners to accelerate the depreciation of their vessels. More than that, it has authorized German taxpayers receiving excess income to deduct from their taxable income, as operational expenses or business promotion costs, sums of money which they have granted or loaned without interest for the promotion of shipbuilding.

Although this income-tax provision has apparently done much to revive and promote German shipbuilding, I was informed that such tax privileges probably would be abolished effective January 1, 1955. A speech to that effect was delivered to the Bundestag on March 11, 1954, by Dr. Fritz Schaeffer, Federal Finance Minister.

After conferring with Counsel General Cloyce K. Huston, and his assistant, Mr. Alfred Dennis in Genoa, and after making arrangements for Senator PURTELL to confer with local shipping authorities, Mr. Webster joined the Senator as the latter came through Florence bound for Rome. Upon arrival in Rome, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster were met by representatives from the American Embassy. They were disappointed to learn that Ambassador Luce would not be in Rome during their visit. However, they had the benefit of conferring with her immediate assistant, Minister Counselor Elbridge Durbrow.

In Rome they conferred with Mr. John M. Kennedy (the Embassy's commercial attaché), Mr. Thomas A. Lane (the Embassy's labor attaché and chief of the MSA Labor Division), Captain Ralph S. McDowell (Bureau of Ship's representative in charge of offshore procurement) and Mr. Harry H. Phelan (the Embassy's minerals attaché). Their discussions covered matters such as offshore procurement, the labor situation, unemployment, costs, etc., relative to shipbuilding and ship repair.

On September 9, 1954, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster arrived in Genoa. That morning they visited the Ansaldo Shipyards in Genoa, where they conferred with Mr. Fredrico Lombardi, general manager of the entire Ansaldo Co., and Mr. Giuseppe Carnivale, general manager of Ansaldo's Genoa yard. They learned that this yard has 8 shipways, 2 of which are masonry and 6 of which are movable. The yard's construction capacity was reported to be between 8 and 10 merchant ships of 9,000–10,000 d. w. t. While this yard has employed approximately 6,000 workers, it was employing approximately 4,300 on September 1, 1954. Ansaldo is rightfully proud of the fact that it constructed Italy's newest luxury liner, the *Cristoforo Colombo*, in its Genoa yard.

That afternoon Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster attended a luncheon given by the Genoa Propeller Club. In addition to having an opportunity thus to meet most of the Genoa shipping fraternity—particularly the representatives of American shipping concerns—Senator PURTELL took this occasion to express our committee's most sincere and intense interest in merchant marine matters of all sorts and kinds, wherever they arise or exist. As we had in other places throughout Europe, he invited questions concerning the part our Government plays in merchant marine affairs; and generally held himself open to answer any questions concerning our maritime policies. He emphasized the fact that we as a nation are not interested in having the largest merchant marine in the world. He stressed, however, that we intended to maintain a healthy privately owned merchant fleet of adequate size and strength to prevent a recurrence of the disastrous state of unpreparedness in which we found ourselves at the beginning of World Wars I and II.

After lunch a prearranged meeting was held where he and Mr. Webster conferred at length in the American Consulate with the following people present: Mr. Basil A. McLean, local representative of American Bureau of Shipping; Mr. Harold Vinick, local representative of Stevenson Lines; Mr. Max J. Wolfson, local representative of Lykes Lines; Mr. Alphonse Sasseville, local representative of American Export Lines; Mr. William Sharron, local representative of American President Lines; Vice Consul John H. Barber; Consul General Cloyce K. Huston.

This was a lengthy, rather comprehensive conference during which the representatives of American shipping aired freely many problems which they knew would be of interest

to Senator PURTELL. This meeting was revealing and most worthwhile.

The next morning, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster went to the main office of the Ansaldo Co. where they conferred with Dr. Giuseppe Rosini, managing director of the entire Ansaldo Co., and Mr. Federico Lombardi, whom they had met at the shipyard the day before. After their conference, they visited the office of the Industrialists Association of the Province of Genoa. There they conferred with Mr. Alessandro Dufour, prominent Italian industrialist and Mr. Antonio Cerruti, head of OARN, one of Genoa's finest ship repair yards. During these meetings shipbuilding and ship repair problems were discussed.

On Friday, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster went to the home of Prof. Antonio Giordano for the purpose of discussing with him his views on our recent cargo-preference bill. He was recuperating from a recent illness. Members of the United States Consulate staff had brought to their attention the fact that Professor Giordano was in charge of the Genoa office of a well-known and influential economic and financial newspaper published in Milan known as "24 Ore." He had recently written for that paper an article critical of our cargo-preference bill. Since "24 Ore" is highly regarded and carefully read by many thousands of Italians, it was Senator PURTELL's desire to obtain a better understanding of the professor's point of view and so afford him an opportunity to better appreciate our point of view.

Because Professor Giordano had not received a copy of the Commerce Department's Maritime Subsidy Report, they left with him 1 of the 2 copies which they then had in their possession. In addition, they assured him that should he at any time desire additional information about our maritime program, we would give him what we had available. They observed, as we had in Germany, that the main concern our foreign competitors have about the cargo-preference bill stems from some misunderstanding of its provisions and a lack of information as to the size merchant fleet which our Government believes we must necessarily maintain. Here, too, they found a certain amount of concern that other nations would use the cargo-preference bill as an excuse to enact discriminatory maritime legislation.

To summarize certain of the more important conclusions reached by Senator PURTELL as a result of his various meetings and discussions in Italy, the following:

1. As of September 1, 1954, generally speaking, the Italian shipyards were facing a serious crisis due to lack of work. They were working at approximately 30 percent of full capacity. The major shipbuilder, Ansaldo, is government-owned and controlled.

It is apparently true that material cost in Italy is higher than in any other European country. Some sources estimate that a Liberty ship could be built in Great Britain for approximately 30 to 35 percent less than in Italy. However, other sources estimate that this difference is less, between 10 to 27 percent, leaving aside subsidies in effect and the new Italian law hereinafter discussed. Some sources estimate that at least one-half of this difference is due to Italy's higher material cost, with the remainder attributable to higher labor cost.

2. One of the most disturbing things brought to the attention of Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster was the large number of Communist labor leaders employed in Italian shipyards. The Communists apparently had received little discouragement from management. Evidently it was the thought of some segments of Italian management that this hands-off policy would insure labor peace.

Without elaborating in this report, suffice to say that the domination of labor unions by Communists in shipyards where offshore procurement orders have been placed did not pass unnoticed.

3. On July 17, 1954, an Italian subsidy law, known as the Tambroni law became effective. It is designed to encourage the building of oceangoing tonnage in Italian yards. Its benefits are extended to people of other countries, as well as to Italian nationals. Because of its recent enactment, there is considerable doubt as to the details of how it will operate. Nonetheless, it is expected that the Tambroni law will encourage many people who would have built ships in other countries to place their orders in Italy.

The Italian Government seems to believe that in the next 10 years Italy can modernize her merchant fleet, while at the same time raising her gross tonnage from the present figure of 3.7 million tons to 5 million tons. This would be an increase of 1.5 million tons over that which she possessed before World War II. This would require constructing 2.3 million tons of shipbuilding for Italian account in the next 10 years, or approximately 230,000 tons per year. At present the capacity of all Italian shipyards is rated at 300,000 tons per year.

Mr. Tambroni, the present Minister of Merchant Marine, apparently hopes to attract a substantial amount of foreign contracts in order to keep the Italian yards at the necessary level of business activity. In considering his approach to the problem, it should be noted that the Italian Government controls 80 percent of Italy's shipbuilding industry and is saddled with 12 billion lire per annum carrying and other charges. With this background, one can better understand why Italy enacted the Tambroni subsidy law (No. 522 of July 17, 1954). The Government seems to have calculated that at 66 percent of capacity Italian yards can revise their cost factors toward a set of lower unit return figures which will not only make the yards competitive with their foreign counterparts but will also absorb the Government's burden.

The Tambroni law is designed to stimulate orders for ship construction and ship-repair work within a specific period of time. Shipowners will be granted exemptions from custom's duties on imported raw materials and finished and semifinished products used in building and repairing ships. Exemption from the Italian general sales tax on internal business transaction will be granted. As a spur to speedy utilization of this program, the subsidy will be decreased 10 percent each year.

Under the Tambroni law the subsidies will be given directly to the shipyards, not to the shipowners. The law states that there is no limit to the amount of repair or building contracts which will be aided by its provisions. Any unused subsidy funds set aside by the Government in any particular year may be carried forward to succeeding years.

4. The effect of the McCarran Act upon seamen and therefore upon the Italian merchant marine was the subject of frequent discussions held by Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster while they were in Italy. Generally speaking, there appears to be a great deal of resentment by the Italians concerning this law. I am attaching as enclosure H copies of 2 articles which appeared in Italian publications in July and August 1954 dealing with the McCarran Act's seamen visa provisions.

Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster left Genoa Friday evening, September 10, for Paris. Sunday morning they boarded the North Star Express and arrived at The Hague late that afternoon. They were met by Mr. Andrea G. Ronhovde (the Embassy's Deputy Chief of Mission), Mr. Howard R. Cottam (the Embassy's Counsel for Economic Affairs), Mr. Thomas McCraine (maritime attaché for the American Embassy in London), and Mr. Peter Abeille (maritime attaché for the American Embassy in London).

That evening during and after dinner at the Cottam residence, they received a general briefing on the Dutch shipbuilding picture from Mr. Elvin Sibert (United States consul general, Amsterdam), and Mr. Paul J. Reveley (United States consul general, Rotterdam).

On September 13, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster, accompanied by Consul General Reveley, Mr. McCraine, and Mr. Abeille, visited the Rotterdam Drydock Co. (the Rotterdamsche Droogdock Mij). In 1953, 593 vessels of 2,315,000 gross tons underwent repairs in this yard. The flagship of the Holland-Amerika Lijn, the *Nieuw Amsterdam*, was constructed in this yard, which is hoping to construct a new passenger vessel for the Holland-Amerika Lijn at a cost roughly estimated to be approximately 100 million guilders. This yard is presently operating at close to full employment, 5,000 workers being on the job.

In their tour of the Rotterdam Drydock Co.'s magnificent yard they were accompanied by its director, Mr. Knape. Senator PURTELL'S broad background in American heavy industry and in the allied fields of metallurgy and machine tooling was remarked on several times by Dutch officials. More than once they volunteered their appreciation of his understanding of their production processes and problems.

That afternoon, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster visited the C. Van der Giessen & Sons yard near Rotterdam. This yard has 5 building berths capable of handling up to 32,000 deadweight tons. Its activities are limited to new construction, although occasionally it has done some reconditioning work. Since World War II some 30 vessels have been delivered and another 15 are in the course of construction or on order. The bulk of the yard's output consists of medium-sized cargo and passenger vessels. As with many of the other Dutch yards, it has constructed vessels for owners in other countries, including Argentina, Finland, France, Norway, Switzerland, and the United States.

That evening at the home of Ambassador H. Freeman Matthews, Senator Purtell and Mr. Webster met the following people, many of whom hold positions of great influence in Dutch maritime affairs:

Dr. D. G. W. Spitzen (Secretary-General, Ministry of Transport and Waterways).

Dr. J. Q. Bas Backer (Director, Western Hemisphere Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

Mr. W. L. de Vries (Director-General of Shipping, Directorate General of Shipping).

Mr. E. A. Plate (Chief, Directorate Industry and Wholesale Ministry of Economic Affairs).

Mr. Th. van der Graaf (Secretary of Directorate for Shipbuilding and Repairs).

Mr. J. W. Hupkes (director of the Kon. Mij "De Schelde" N. V.).

Comdr. J. W. A. Langenberg (Kon. Mij "De Schelde" N. V.).

Dr. P. van der Toorn (director, Holland-America Line).

Mr. S. van West (managing director, Dock & Shipyard Co., "Wilton-Fijenoord").

Mr. E. A. Vreede (secretary to Netherlands Shipowners' Association).

Mr. F. E. Straatemeier (United States Lines).

Mr. Peter van der Giessen (director N. V. C. v. d. Giessen & Zonen's Shipyards).

Mr. A. Knape (director of the Rotterdam Drydock Co.).

Dr. D. A. Delprat (director Shipping Co. "Nederland").

Mr. J. van Tilburg (deputy to Rotterdam burgomaster).

Mr. Frank C. Grismer (Director FOA Mission).

Mr. Andreas G. Ronhovde (Deputy Chief of Mission).

Mr. Howard R. Cottam (Counselor for Economic Affairs).

Mr. Elvin Sibert (consul general, Amsterdam).

Mr. Paul J. Reveley (consul general, Rotterdam).

Mr. Harold H. Rhodes (first secretary).

Mr. Thomas McCraine (maritime attaché, American Embassy, London).

Mr. Peter Abeille (maritime attaché, American Embassy, London).

Mr. Robert A. Brand (second secretary).

Mr. Robert Donhauser (Public Affairs Office).

Commander M. B. Davis (assistant naval attaché).

Mr. Oliver M. Marcy (second secretary).

This reception provided Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster an excellent opportunity to discuss with these leaders in Dutch shipping our cargo preference bill, their ship construction costs, their maritime labor situation, and other shipping problems. We understand that this was the first Embassy gathering at which so many major Dutch shipping interests were in attendance.

As a result of their visit to Holland, brief as it was, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster concluded:

1. From a competitive point of view, the shipyards of Holland appear to be ready, willing, and able to compete on at least an equal basis with the yards in any other European country. However, it should be noted that Holland has lost some business to Germany and appears to consider that country its strongest European shipbuilding rival. In view of the fact that the Tambroni law is so new, it is conceivable that Italy might well establish itself as a strong competitor for the position of shipbuilding supremacy presently held by Holland.

2. The labor situation in Holland, in relation to that in other European countries, is very good. Labor strife is relatively rare; the labor force apparently is receptive to improved productive processes; and Holland's quantity of skilled and experienced shipbuilding labor is large. In this connection, it should be noted that Dutch shipbuilders are somewhat concerned about the difficulty of obtaining apprentices or trainees. Their labor problem appears to be one of shortage rather than surplus.

The stability of the Dutch labor situation is evidenced by the fact that apparently some yards are willing to enter into fixed-price contracts if they can be completed within 18 months.

3. In addition to vessel construction and repair, most of Holland's shipyards are extensively engaged in performing work for other industries. Thus, these yards which are reported to be the best equipped in Europe, are apparently using their ingenuity and initiative in order to obtain maximum utilization of plant and facilities.

On Tuesday, September 14, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster sailed from Holland for England. They arrived in London that evening. The next day they conferred with Rear Adm. A. L. P. Mark-Wardlaw, R. N. (retired), (president of the executive committee, International Cargo Handling Coordination Association), Mr. Rex. B. Shepheard, C. B. E. (director, the Shipbuilding Conference), Mr. Winthrop G. Brown (deputy to the Minister for Economic Affairs, American Embassy) and Mr. Thomas McCraine. Among the matters they discussed were the International Cargo Handling Coordination Association Conference recently held in Naples, Italy; the McCarran Act's seamen visa provisions; the cargo preference bill; and the state of shipbuilding in the United Kingdom. Rear Admiral Mark-Wardlaw gave Senator PURTELL various publications relating to the Naples Conference. * * * I call your attention in particular to the following articles which appear in the attached copy of the Journal of Commerce, International Cargo Handling Conference number, published June 25, 1954:

1. Some Impressions of the Naples Conference, by Charles Birchall.

2. A Stevedore's Point of View, by G. Sirtaine.

3. Some Problems of Administration (of the Ideal Port), by B. Nagorski.

4. New Cargo Cranes at Hamburg, by Dr. Hans Neumann.

That evening, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster left London and arrived in Glasgow the next morning. There they visited two of the United Kingdom's finest and best-known shipyards, the Fairfield Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd., and John Brown & Co., Ltd.

At the Fairfield yard they conferred at some length with the managing director, Vice Adm. A. W. Longley-Cook, C. B., C. B. E., D. S. O., managing director, Fairfield Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd. At the John Brown yard that afternoon they met and conferred with the following gentlemen: Mr. J. W. Begg, financial director; Mr. John Rannie, shipyard director; Mr. J. H. Johnston, general manager, engine works; Mr. A. N. Benson, secretary; Mr. J. B. Bucher, head of gas turbine department.

Unfortunately, Sir James M. McNeill, K. C. V. O., managing director of the John Brown yard whom they had hoped to meet, was absent.

The Fairfield Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd., has six berths. It is capable of constructing vessels up to 1,000 feet in length. Over the years, it has excelled in the production of warships, passenger and cargo vessels, tankers and ore carriers. John Brown & Co., Ltd.'s yard has seven berths and is capable of constructing vessels exceeding 1,000 feet in length. Its annual output capacity is approximately 90,000 tons. Some of Britain's finest passenger vessels have been constructed in this yard, as well as high-grade refrigerated cargo vessels, tankers, cross-channel steamers, and train ferries.

On Friday, September 17, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster left Glasgow for Dublin. They arrived in the latter city Saturday morning. That afternoon during lunch with Ambassador and Mrs. William Taft they not only discussed various maritime matters, but also many others in which the two countries have mutual interests. The seamen visa provisions of the McCarran Act and our cargo-preference bill were, of course, the subject of extensive discussions between Senator PURTELL, Ambassador Taft, and members of the Ambassador's staff.

While Senator PURTELL was in Dublin he met and conferred with various high-ranking members of the Irish Government, some of whom he had worked with at the Interparliamentary Conference in Vienna.

I am attaching as enclosure K certain material gathered by Senator PURTELL concerning shipping and shipbuilding in Ireland. It is, indeed, worthy of note that the Harland & Wolf yard in Belfast, the largest shipyard in Ireland, has recently constructed the *Southern Cross*, a beautiful 20,000-ton liner. You might recall that this fine vessel was built for the Shaw Savill Line and was launched by the Queen last August. This vessel is somewhat unique among passenger vessels in that her boilers and engines are installed aft. She is designed to carry 1,200 passengers in tourist-class accommodations. She will carry no cargo on her four voyages around the world each year. It is planned that she will link Britain with South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster returned to London on September 21. While there they conferred with Ambassador Aldrich. They also held a brief conference with Mr. J. Hancock, London representative for the South Pacific Steamship Lines.

Later that afternoon, accompanied by Mr. Thomas McCraine, they visited the offices of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom. There they conferred at length with its president, Mr. J. C. Denholm, C. B. E. president; its vice president, Mr. A. I. Anderson (chairman, Orient Steam Navigation Co.); its general manager, Mr. H. E. Gorick, C. B. E.; and its assistant manager, Mr. R. G. Malloch Brown. These gentlemen were deeply concerned about our cargo-preference bill. Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster tried to answer all of the questions raised by these gentlemen. However, they were unable to answer to their own satisfaction one or two of the matters raised by the representatives of the Chamber of Shipping and gave assurances that the Department of Commerce would be asked to supply the information desired. Steps have been taken to secure this information and upon its receipt it will be forwarded to Mr. Denholm.

As Senator PURTELL discovered when he was in Genoa discussing the matter with Professor Giordano, the representatives of the Chamber of Shipping had not been furnished copies of the Commerce Department's Maritime Subsidy Policy Report. Copies of this important document have been forwarded to Mr. Denholm.

Senator PURTELL reports that after visiting the British Isles he reached the following conclusions, among others:

1. Shipbuilding costs are now about 4 times as high in 1939 and approximately twice as high as in 1945–46. There are no signs of a reduction or even of stabilization; and increases in shipyard wages and steel prices further aggravate this problem. Britain's budget in 1954 made some concessions to shipowners as to other industrialists by the introduction of the 20-percent investment allowance.

However, as in this country, the accrued tax-free depreciation goes but a little way toward meeting replacement costs, and the balance must come from borrowing or from profits, if any. British shipowners seem agreed that the solution to their problem is to revise the existing system of taxation, and particularly the system of assessing depreciation allowances on the basis of original cost without referring to higher replacement cost.

2. Britain's merchant fleet, while not as obsolete as this country's, is nonetheless composed of many vessels of 20 years of age.

3. In an article appearing in the September 13 issue of the Times, the following statements seem pertinent and authoritative:

"Although British shipowners are having to meet increasing competition from foreign flags, including those of countries with 'artificial fleets' either State-subsidized or financed by foreign nationals, and although British shipbuilders now face severe competition from foreign shipyards—particularly in Germany—some significant comparisons may be made from the figures set forth in Lloyd's Register shipbuilding returns. In respect of the amounts of work under construction in the United Kingdom and abroad at the end of June (the most recent date for which figures are available) it can be seen that the British figure of 2,195,000 tons gross represented 38 percent of the world total—an increase of 3 percent over June last year. Germany was still the leading foreign competitor, with 12 percent of the total, followed by the Netherlands, Sweden, France, the United States, Japan, and Italy, in that order.

"Tonnage under construction overseas showed a substantial fall of 260,000 tons from the previous midsummer, compared with a rise of 72,000 in the United Kingdom during the same period. This divergence may be attributed to the fact that the world-wide decline in the placing of new orders has had a more immediate effect on foreign yards, particularly those in Western Europe, since they have a higher productive tempo—largely due to three-shift working—and a smaller backlog of orders than most British yards * * *

"While foreign shipyards are now bidding more keenly for new orders than at any time since the end of the war, some of them are helped substantially by various economic

devices. In France and Italy there are direct State subsidies, while in Western Germany there are taxation reliefs and low rates of interest on loans. In some of the Scandinavian countries and in the Netherlands there are long-term credit provisions backed by the State or by municipalities. British shipbuilders enjoy no such artificial aids and their existence elsewhere makes competitive pressure all the stronger. The shipbuilding conference has stated on behalf of the industry as a whole that while it has never sought direct State assistance it looks to the Government of the day to create conditions in which private enterprise can flourish.

"Since the war British shipbuilders have spent heavily on the modernization and re-equipment of their yards. Some of them are now as well-armed for the competitive struggle as their foreign rivals. But on the labor side of the industry the situation is somewhat different. On the continent longer hours, lower real wages and piecework rates, shift working round the clock, and an absence of strict demarcation between various jobs are the general rule; and foreign shipbuilding employers can therefore make the fullest possible use of their physical equipment."

In closing, let me express for Senator PURTELL, Mr. Webster, and myself our appreciation of the opportunity afforded us to visit the various countries we did and participate in the many interesting events which I have discussed in this letter. We feel that as a result of our trip we have a much better understanding of the views of our friends in the various European countries we visited. In addition, we believe that those with whom we discussed America's maritime policies have a better and more sympathetic appreciation of the many serious problems we face in this field.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee.

Rinaldo Burrus Page, a Man Devoted to North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement regarding the late Mr. Rinaldo Burrus Page, of Wilmington, N. C., and his valuable contribution to his adopted State. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RINALDO BURRUS PAGE, A MAN DEVOTED TO NORTH CAROLINA

On February 2, 1955, death marched into the ranks of North Carolina's most useful citizenry and claimed a distinguished business and civic leader, Mr. Rinaldo Burrus Page, publisher of the Star-News newspapers of Wilmington.

He was the first chairman of the North Carolina State Ports Authority and a Wilmington civic leader for 25 years.

A native of Columbus, Ga., Mr. Page began his newspaper experience on his father's paper, the Columbus Ledger. He attended Emory University and the University of Georgia. After service in France in World War I, he returned to the newspaper business, coming to Wilmington in 1927 as president and publisher of the Wilmington Morning Star, later acquiring the Wilmington News.

Following years of undivided interest in the development of his city and the Cape Fear region, Gov. R. Gregg Cherry named Mr. Page to the chairmanship of the newly created ports commission in 1945. Mr. Page had long been a leading spokesman for the development of better ports in North Carolina, and with the passing of time, my State will realize even more the wisdom and courage that he possessed.

His contribution to his fellowman was not limited to the newspaper and ports fields. He devoted himself to progressive civic duty in many areas.

Once convinced that a cause was just, Mr. Page was never satisfied with anything less than complete success—a clear-cut challenge and priceless heritage for his lineage and associates.

He wrought well and left a lasting impress upon the annals of our generation.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire I sent to the citizens in the 17th Ohio District. I am proud to represent this district in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with major national and international problems facing Congress today.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to each of my constituents in the district, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of a cross section of those I represent.

Question sheets were sent to almost every occupational group: Republican and Democratic committeemen and women, laborers, attorneys, housewives, public office holders and government employees, salesmen, retired men and women, ministers, college and high-school students, and their instructors. Also included are those working in business and industry, newspaper, radio and professional positions.

Blanks were mailed to individuals and reproductions of the questionnaire were published in nearly all of the 20 daily and weekly newspapers in my district.

A large percent of the completed forms contained comments on the questions which proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the vital issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them. I am very pleased so many took the time to write and attach letters and notes to the questionnaire enlarging upon their answers.

The population in my district is composed of about half rural and half urban residents. Nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented as well as large and small business. There are also 2 colleges and 2 universities.

It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of such an evenly divided district, but through the questionnaire method, I feel I have gained the majority opinion of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE IN AN ENDEAVOR TO LEARN THE VIEWS OF THE FOLKS BACK HOME

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Which is your choice on the farm program relative to price support and crop control?		
(a) 100-percent price support and rigid crop control	8	92
(b) Flexible price support and medium crop control	64	36
(c) No price support and no crop control	30	70
2. Should women qualified for social security be eligible for benefits at age 60?	68	32
3. Realizing the need for a strong national defense, which do you prefer?		
(a) Extension of the present draft law	57	43
(ff) Universal military training	42	58
4. Do you believe that our present foreign policy program is proving effective and promoting world peace?	55	45
(If your answer is negative write your own suggestions on the back of this questionnaire.)		
5. Do you favor continuation of:		
(a) Technical assistance to Europe?	75	25
(b) Economic assistance to Europe?	38	62
(c) Military assistance to Europe?	53	47
6. Do you favor continuation of:		
(a) Technical assistance to Asia?	76	24
(b) Economic assistance to Asia?	46	54
(c) Military assistance to Asia?	49	51

Signature _____
Street _____
City and State _____
Occupation _____

Please fill out and return this questionnaire to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 1434 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire

	Yes	No
Question 1. Which is your choice on the farm program relative to price support and crop control?		
(a) 100 percent price support and rigid crop control:		
Total replies	8	92
Attorneys	18	82
Business, industry, and salesmen	7	93
Farmers	11	89
Housewives	2	98
Labor	5	95
Ministers	0	100
Newspaper and radio	0	100
Occupation not given and organizations	15	85
Professionals	5	95
Public office holders and Federal employees	7	93
Retired	15	85
Teachers	6	94
Students	9	91

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
Question 1.—Continued		
(b) Flexible price support and medium crop control:		
Total replies	64	3
Attorneys	58	42
Business, industry and salesmen	52	48
Farmers	41	59
Housewives	60	40
Labor	56	44
Ministers	75	25
Newspaper and radio	57	43
Occupation not given and organizations	60	40
Professionals	73	27
Public office holders and Federal employees	56	44
Retired	33	67
Teachers	72	28
Students	83	17
(c) No price support and no crop control?		
Total replies	30	70
Attorneys	38	62
Business, industry and salesmen	47	53
Farmers	50	50
Housewives	35	65
Labor	40	60
Ministers	25	75
Newspaper and radio	38	62
Occupation not given and organizations	29	71
Professionals	23	77
Public office holders and Federal employees	44	56
Retired	37	63
Teachers	25	75
Students	12	88
Question 2. Should women qualified for social security be eligible for benefits at age 60?		
Total replies	68	32
Attorneys	49	51
Business, industry, and salesmen	60	40
Farmers	52	48
Housewives	63	37
Labor	78	22
Ministers	50	50
Newspaper and radio	100	0
Occupation not given and organizations	67	33
Professionals	53	47
Public officeholders and Federal employees	66	34
Retired	62	38
Teachers	75	25
Students	79	21
Question 3. Realizing the need for a strong national defense, which do you prefer?		
(a) Extension of the present draft law:		
Total replies	57	43
Attorneys	46	54
Business, industry, and salesmen	49	51
Farmers	50	50
Housewives	56	44
Labor	57	43
Ministers	85	15
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations	45	55
Professionals	56	44
Public office holders and Federal employees	50	50
Retired	54	46
Teachers	60	40
Students	55	45
(b) Universal military training:		
Total replies	42	58
Attorneys	42	58
Business, industry, and salesmen	47	53
Farmers	32	68
Housewives	38	62
Labor	50	50
Ministers	11	89
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations	44	56
Professionals	43	57
Public office holders and Federal employees	47	53
Retired	54	46
Teachers	41	59
Students	45	55
Question 4. Do you believe that our present foreign policy program is proving effective and promoting world peace?		
Total replies	55	45
Attorneys	52	48
Business, industry, and salesmen	55	45
Farmers	39	61
Housewives	51	49

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
Question 4.—Continued		
Labor	51	49
Ministers	72	28
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations	51	49
Professionals	56	44
Public office holders and Federal employees	50	50
Retired	40	60
Teachers	68	32
Students	60	40
Question 5. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) Technical assistance to Europe?		
Total replies	75	25
Attorneys	74	26
Business, industry, and salesmen	72	28
Farmers	70	30
Housewives	68	32
Labor	65	35
Ministers	83	17
Newspaper and radio	57	43
Occupation not given and organizations	67	33
Professionals	85	15
Public office holders and Federal employees	69	31
Retired	59	41
Teachers	86	14
Students	81	19
(b) Economic assistance to Europe?		
Total replies	38	62
Attorneys	38	62
Business, industry, and salesmen	31	69
Farmers	33	67
Housewives	44	56
Labor	35	65
Ministers	54	46
Newspapers and radio	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations	39	61
Professionals	35	65
Public office holders and Federal employees	41	59
Retired	32	68
Teachers	52	48
Students	38	62
(c) Military assistance to Europe?		
Total replies	53	47
Attorneys	54	46
Business, industry and salesmen	48	52
Farmers	42	58
Housewives	30	70
Labor	42	58
Ministers	61	39
Newspaper and radio	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations	41	59
Professionals	57	43
Public office holders and Federal employees	48	52
Retired	43	57
Teachers	60	40
Students	65	35
Question 6. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) Technical assistance to Asia?		
Total replies	76	24
Attorneys	76	24
Business, industry, and salesmen	75	25
Farmers	69	31
Housewives	70	30
Labor	65	35
Ministers	85	15
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Occupation not given and organizations	63	37
Professionals	80	20
Public office holders and Federal employees	69	31
Retired	54	46
Teachers	85	15
Students	82	18
(b) Economic assistance to Asia?		
Total replies	46	54
Attorneys	40	60
Business, industry, and salesmen	42	58
Farmers	41	59
Housewives	44	56
Labor	44	56
Ministers	64	36
Newspaper and radio	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations	44	56
Professionals	44	56
Public office holders and Federal employees	59	41
Retired	40	60
Teachers	66	34
Students	40	60

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
Question 6.—Continued		
(c) Military assistance to Asia?		
Total replies	49	51
Attorneys	54	46
Business, industry, and salesmen	45	55
Farmers	38	62
Housewives	36	64
Labor	35	65
Ministers	60	40
Newspaper and radio	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations	32	68
Professionals	57	43
Public office holders and Federal employees	53	47
Retired	47	53
Teachers	54	46
Students	58	42

A Memorial to the Late E. B. Aldrich, of Pendleton, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1953, I introduced a joint resolution entitled, "To Designate the Lake To Be Formed by the McNary Lock and Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg., and Wash., as Lake Umatilla"; however this bill was not acted upon. Today I am introducing a bill asking that this body of water be named Lake Aldrich as a memorial to the late E. B. Aldrich, of Pendleton, Oreg. This action is taken after a great deal of thought on my part. The Umatilla Indians have been immortalized in our State, as well they should be, and it is unnecessary to name anything more for them in order to accomplish this. The Umatilla Indians can never be forgotten in eastern Oregon.

The West is loaded with Indian names, practically every State has counties, lakes, and rivers named after the Indians but very few counties, lakes, or rivers are named after our pioneers. Those men and women who had the fortitude to make this wilderness and sagebrush country into one of the most productive areas in the world. I think it is high time that we publicly recognize these fine men and women who made the West what it is today.

The lake which I am asking be named for Mr. Aldrich came into existence largely because of his efforts. Ed Aldrich was untiring in his work for the civic welfare. He has left in the Northwest, monuments as great as the pyramids. It was he who was head of the organization that made the first survey of the Columbia River for its potential powers. It was Ed Aldrich who went to Washington and lobbied a few hundred thousand dollars for the first Army engineers' survey. As a result of that survey numerous locations were found along the river for damsites. The final result

of that survey is Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and now McNary Dam. Ed was the man who turned the first spade in these gigantic enterprises.

Mr. Aldrich was a stanch, energetic, and active Democrat all of his life. I was born, have lived, and will always be a Republican. Therefore it may appear strange to some people that I would sponsor legislation to immortalize this man's name. Politics has nothing to do with it. Mr. Aldrich loved eastern Oregon just as I do, and no one man has done more for his community than he did during his lifetime. He and I may have differed often as to what we thought was good for our people, but I never doubted his sincerity, his loyalty to country, or his integrity, and I am certain that he never doubted mine. I believe that the vast majority of the people who benefit from this lake, and the project which formed it, will subscribe wholeheartedly to the sentiments which I have expressed today, and will be with me in asking Congress to make into law the bill which I am now introducing.

Postal Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL CHUDOFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement submitted by me to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of an adequate and realistic salary increase for postal workers:

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I greatly appreciate this opportunity of presenting my views on pending legislation to provide much-needed and well-merited increases for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

I had the pleasure last year of supporting increases which, while admitted small, would have given at least some measure of relief to these employees and I regret that this legislation was given a pocket veto by the President.

I hope that this committee, after consideration of the bills before you, will find it possible to report the bill H. R. 1592, by Congressman MORRISON, of Louisiana, and I hope that action will be taken promptly so that, in the event a further veto results, the Congress may have the opportunity to override such veto.

I am sure I don't have to remind the members of this committee that it has been almost 4 long years since postal employees have received a salary increase. As I recall it, the last increase granted was effective July 1, 1951, and we now lack only 4 months of the complete 4 years during which time postal employees have received no increases whatsoever, while the salaries of those in private industry have been increased twice and in some cases three times during the same period.

I am sure I don't have to remind this committee that postal employees generally have earned an increase at this time. All of us that have had the opportunity to look at the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, must have been impressed, as I was, with the story of efficiency which is carried on page 885 of that weighty document. I note that mail volume is expected to increase another 3 percent in 1956 over the current year and this increased volume, like the increases which have preceded it, will be largely absorbed by the employees of the postal service. I don't think it is at all unreasonable that these employees expect to be paid for their increased efficiency. That is a standard operating procedure in private employment and might well be adopted by our Federal Government.

Last year in announcing the withholding of his approval of the postal and Federal employees' salary increase, the President stated in effect that his action was predicated upon the fact that no postal-rate increase was provided to pay for the salary increase and that the bill failed to contain provisions for a reclassification of postal positions. Insofar as a rate increase is concerned, I believe that the question of proper salaries for the employees of the postal service is a matter entirely independent of postal rates and that there is no justification whatever for tying these two questions together.

With respect to the need or desirability of a reclassification of postal positions, postal employees with whom I am familiar and who have an adequate knowledge of the problem have convinced me that the proposal of the Postmaster General as contained in the bill H. R. 2987 is at least as unsatisfactory as the proposal of last year and I cannot help but believe that the only way a solid reclassification of postal positions can be arrived at is to refer this matter to a joint committee composed of Members of both the House and the Senate, with representatives of the Post Office Department and the employee organizations. I am confident that such a committee would arrive at a solution which would do justice to the public, the Post Office Department, and the employees.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will report the bill H. R. 1592 at an early date so that justice for postal employees may no longer be delayed.

Value of Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am calling to your attention the value of irrigation to the future growth of our country.

Last year a drought much worse than that which caused the Dust Bowl in the thirties parched the lands of Colorado and surrounding areas. Soil moisture content had shrunk to approximately 15 percent of normal; precipitation averaged about 50 percent of normal; natural runoff from the usually abundant snowpack in the mountains dwindled to 40 percent of normal, and the streams fed thereby became trickles. Crop failures and financial ruin seemed inevitable, and prayers for rainfall went unanswered.

Northern Colorado is normally a rich, fertile, and productive agriculture basin. Its economy and well-being depend almost entirely upon agricultural crops, which, in turn, depend upon the water supply from natural precipitation and from irrigation. To those farmers in this area who were not equipped to irrigate their croplands, this drought meant the loss of an entire year's work, the hardship and privation of at least a year with no income, the necessity of depleting their investment and retirement savings, and in some cases, complete failure. To those farmers in the 615,000 acre area served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project, the drought of 1954 was a challenge that could be met and beaten. Because this project water was available, nearly normal farm production was attained by these users. Had the project water not been available, less than one-half a crop would have been harvested; and translated into dollars and cents, the value of this project water was $22 million.

Weather Bureau officials predict the record-breaking drought will continue throughout 1955, but the people within the area served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project know they will have over 300,000 acre-feet of water, brought from the other side of the Rocky Mountains, available to meet their needs.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

The rich agricultural lands served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project, an area half as large as the State of Delaware, slope eastward from the foothills of the Rockies in the northeastern part of Colorado. Intensive irrigation development in this area during the half-century between 1860 and 1910 brought the inevitable over-appropriation of the available natural stream-flow, and growth of these facilities reached a stalemate. The Colorado-Big Thompson project was initiated in 1938 to overcome the problem.

This project is one of the most complex and spectacular the Bureau of Reclamation has ever undertaken. For many years, the 14,000-foot granite barrier of the Continental Divide presented an insurmountable obstacle to the dream of tapping the water-wealthy headwaters region of the Colorado River, which lay only a few miles to the westward. American ingenuity and energy went to work. The Divide was pierced by a tunnel 13.1 miles long, more than 9 feet in diameter, and sloping gradually from west to east in order to carry the diverted water by gravity flow from West Slope to East Slope.

After emerging from the east portal of the tunnel, the diverted waters drop nearly 3,000 feet down the mountain slopes, spinning the turbines of hydroelectric plants on their way into 2 major storage reservoirs to be held until needed on the farmlands below, and sending out 179,000 kilowatts of critically needed electric power to large areas in Colorado, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Kansas.

Although the project was not yet completed in 1954, the major portion of construction had been finished when the irrigation season began. The system was ready to serve some 400,000 of the 615,000 acres which ultimately will be served when construction is completed in 1956. Total cost of the finished project will be $159.8 million.

Unlike flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers and public works

projects of other departments of the Government, irrigation and reclamation projects pay back the major share of their costs with revenues realized from the sale of water and hydroelectric power. In 1954 alone, sale of power from the Colorado-Big Thompson project brought in a gross revenue of $2.8 million, and it is quite safe to assume that this annual income will increase yearly as the project is completed and the functions expand.

FAILURE AVERTED

This storage water meant the difference between success and failure to these Colorado farmers. What might have been in 1954 without project water at hand can best be appraised by comparing what did happen with the effects of the worst previous drought year in the same area, 1934. In most respects, 1954 presented greater handicaps to successful crop production than did the 1934 season, and estimates based on 1934 losses provide a conservative view of what might have happened in 1954.

In 1934 crop yields totaled approximately $19 million.

In 1954 crop yields from lands irrigated under the project totaled $41 million.

Translating this $22 million differential into terms of buying power, multiplied by the number of similar irrigation projects sprinkled throughout the 17 reclamation States, and the impact upon our national economy is terrific. Practically all manufacturing, trade, and transportation involves agricultural commodities; an irrigation water shortage affects the entire economy.

BENEFITS UNLIMITED

Irrigation has contributed directly to the building of cities, to the development of fertile acres, to the homes of more than 35 million Americans who supply nearly half of the entire Nation's demand for choice vegetables and truck crops; to the development of a $40 billion annual retail market, averaging $1,139 per capita—retail sales for the Nation during the same year averaged $1,023 per person—and to the development of a new outlet for the products manufactured in our bustling industrial areas of the East.

What has this new market, this new development, this growth of our dynamic country cost the American taxpayer?

Money spent by the Department of Defense during the month of January would pay for all reclamation since it was started in 1902.

Money spent to finance our foreign aid program for 6 months would pay for all reclamation since it was started in 1902.

On the other hand, money spent on reclamation during fiscal year 1953 would have financed the Department of Defense less than 3 days, or the foreign assistance program or the Veterans' Administration less than a month.

Actually, the cost to the Federal Government is negligible. Money appropriated for power aspects of the projects is paid back to the Treasury with interest. Money appropriated for irrigation aspects is paid back without interest. The only outlay from the Treasury is for nonreimbursable features, that is, flood control, stream-pollution abatement, recreation, and fish and wildlife propagation.

The cost of these nonreimbursables is more than compensated by the additional Federal tax revenue created by reclamation. Based on a sample study of 15 selected reclamation projects, individual income taxes paid directly by irrigation farmers and by persons directly affected by the project were estimated at $800 million. Corporation and excise-tax revenues collected from the same area total nearly $500 million. Cost of these projects totaled $269 million. In other words, Federal taxes collected have exceeded the Federal investment in irrigation features in these projects by about five times.

Now let us take a look at irrigation and reclamation expenditures from the standpoint of their justification in our budget. Many billions of dollars have been spent for flood control, harbors and docks, and agriculture conservation payments. This money is not returned to the Federal Government. I have no arguments against these projects, for I feel they are an essential part in building a greater America for ourselves and our posterity.

However, the comparison should be drawn so that all will know that the biggest share of money appropriated for irrigation and reclamation projects is returned to the Federal Treasury.

The Corps of Engineers has spent, since its inception, more than $7.245 billion on water-conservation and flood-control projects—nearly 4 times the total spent on irrigation and reclamation. Money spent by the Corps of Engineers is nonreimbursable.

Total Federal investment in irrigation and reclamation projects is about $2.2 billion. It should not be forgotten, however, that local citizens have been active partners—paying partners—in each of the projects, and repayment contracts are negotiated before work on the project is started.

Reclamation is paying its own way.

The crops produced on these projects add very little to our present surpluses. We never seem to have enough vegetables and fresh fruit to meet our diet requirements. These products, together with alfalfa and sugarbeets, essential to the livestock industries, are the principal irrigated farm crops. They are not on the surplus list.

Our investment in irrigation and reclamation has paid special dividends. We should continue to invest in this field as long as there are feasible projects to be developed.

Need for Postal Service Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the proposed increase in postal service pay. Such an increase is overdue not only in justice to the postal employees but also for the sake of long-range economy in the handling of mail.

Postal employees need a salary increase to give them as much real income as they received prior to World War II. Since 1939 such factors as the increased cost of living, higher income taxes, and larger deductions for retirement have combined to reduce the purchasing power of many classes of postal workers. In spite of a series of pay increases, the most recent of which took effect in July 1951, the average postal worker's take-home pay today buys less than it did 15 years ago. This is especially true for supervisors and other employees in the higher-income brackets.

In the past decade and a half the pay of the largest groups of postal workers has tended to increase less rapidly than the pay of production workers in private industry. A year ago the Postmaster General submitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service information indicating that between 1939 and 1953 the average weekly earnings of all full- and part-time unskilled and skilled workers in manufacturing industries—up to and including lead foremen—rose at a considerably faster rate than the earnings of regular clerks and letter carriers. In addition, it is generally agreed that the salaries of executive-level employees in the postal service have lagged behind the salaries of top-management staffs in private enterprise.

To the extent that differences between postal salaries and pay in private industry result from the fact that Federal Government employees cannot apply certain economic pressures—for example, strikes—available to workers in private industry, Congress has a special obligation to view generously the postal workers' needs.

Adequate postal service pay contributes to long-range economy in the handling of mail through attracting better employees, reducing turnover, and improving the efficiency of people on the job. Little question exists as to the value of increased pay in the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. Although salary constitutes only one of several factors affecting whether or not a person takes a job, the Nation cannot reasonably expect good workers to accept or remain in positions in the Post Office if they can earn more money or have more opportunity for advancement in similar employment outside the Government. When postal salaries fall too low, the Post Office must employ less efficient workers and devote excessive time and energy to the training of replacements.

While we have yet to develop methods for measuring with precision the effects of pay levels on the efficiency of workers who remain on the job, commonsense suggests that services to the public will suffer when postal workers must secure additional part-time employment, put their wives to work, or borrow excessively to meet their normal living expenses. It is worth noting that of 800,000 postal and civil service employees surveyed by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor last year, about half

had outside jobs; and about 40 percent of those who were married had wives who worked.

Last year Congress approved an adjustment in the salaries of postal employees, but the form of the adjustment failed to satisfy the President of the United States. This year no barrier must stand in the way of the needed increase in pay.

Pennsylvania State University, at State College, Pa., Will Observe Its 100th Birthday on February 22, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, February 22, will be an important day in the history of the Pennsylvania State University when the centennial of the Nation's 11th largest university will be observed.

Established under an act of the General Assembly in 1855, the Pennsylvania State University this year celebrates its centennial with a program emphasizing its services to the Commonwealth during 100 years of educational advancement.

The movement for establishing the institution, first called the Farmers High School of Pennsylvania, was started by farm leaders who realized that progress in agriculture involved the application of scientific methods as well as labor and fertilizer.

Thus they planned a school that would give instruction in the sciences bearing on agriculture and that would operate an experimental farm on which the students would do all the labor.

At the time the project for combining practical and theoretical education was a startlingly new concept. Dr. Evan Pugh, the school's first president, described it in his inaugural address:

> We are here for the avowed purpose of trying an experiment which has never been successfully performed in any country in the world.

Four years after the Governor signed the charter, the school opened its doors to 69 students in an incompleted building rising from the fields of Centre County.

Those 4 years had been marked by discouraging setbacks. The trustees had contracted for a 5-story building costing $55,000 to accommodate 400 students.

In addition to a State appropriation of $25,000, they had in cash $10,000 received from the Pennsylvania State Agricultural Society, $10,000 raised by Centre County residents, and $5,000 willed by a Philadelphia benefactor. The school was located on 200 acres donated by James Irvin of Bellefonte.

The legislature promised an additional $25,000 if the trustees could raise a matching sum by subscription throughout the State.

The building was costing more than expected and crop failures and a money panic prevented the raising of the money needed to get the second $25,000 installment from the State.

The first students who arrived on February 16, 1859, found only one wing of the school building completed. Living conditions at first were crude: lighting was by lard-oil lamps and construction shacks converted into dining halls were cold and drafty.

There were few books in the library and apparatus for instruction in science was negligible. Students worked 3 hours daily on the school farm and at such tasks as clearing stones from the campus and making the main building livable.

Pugh arrived to assume the duties of president 9 months after the school term opened. A native Pennsylvanian, he had conducted a boys' academy before deciding to go to Germany to study. At the time he was chosen to head the school, he was in England where he had spent 2 years in agricultural research.

Wholly dedicated to the idea of education of the founders of the school, Pugh worked without stint to put theory into practice, to win support from over the State, and to get money from the General Assembly.

In spite of the disruptions of the Civil War, Pugh graduated his first class of 11 students in 1861, won an appropriation from the General Assembly and completed the main building in 1863, and secured for the school recognition as the land-grant college of Pennsylvania under provisions of the Morrill Act signed by President Lincoln in 1862.

Pugh and the school's trustees were backers of Representative JUSTIN S. MORRILL in his efforts to get Congress to pass his bill, and in anticipation of success changed the name of the Farmers High School to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania early in 1862.

Weakened by overwork, worries and an injury suffered in an accident, Pugh died in 1864. The next 20 years were to be a period of drift and disillusionment during which the college had five presidents who put into effect different programs in futile attempts to stabilize the institution so precariously started in 1855.

The problem was developing a program that combined practical and theoretical training. Since this goal of education was almost entirely new, there were no models to go by. Pugh's early description of the school as an experiment was too true. A lot of experimenting had to be done before a successful formula could be evolved.

Pugh was followed as president by William H. Allen, head of Girard College. Allen fought off before the legislature efforts of other State schools to be named land-grant beneficiaries and obtained permission for an $80,000 loan for the college to pay its debts.

Allen left to his faculty the job of working out an instructional program that, to comply with the Morrill Act, should include training in the "mechanic arts." But discouraged by the school's prospects, he resigned in 1866 and returned to Girard College.

His successor was John Fraser, who had headed the faculty committee working on the reorganization of the curriculum. The enrollment decline that had set in after the Civil War continued, dropping to 30 in 1868. Fraser, differing with the trustees on policy, resigned.

Fraser's innovations in starting courses in technical subjects as well as in agricultural science and in abandoning the requirement of student labor on the farm were dropped by his successor, Thomas Henry Burrowes.

Burrowes, making fun of the "parade of the long list of 'ologies,' 'onomies,' and 'ographies' which grace some catalogs," restored the emphasis on agriculture and turned his students out to work the farm as provided for in the college's charter.

A popular State figure and for years a leader in the establishment of the common-school system, Burrowes succeeded in checking the enrollment decline and in winning friends for the college. He talked up the college in speeches over the State and instituted a Harvest Home which in its second year in 1870 attracted more than 2,000 persons to the campus.

After Burrowes' death in 1871, the trustees brought in James Calder, of Hillsdale College in Michigan, as the new president. He remained 9 years.

In his first year Calder secured the permission of the trustees to open the doors of the college to both sexes without distinction as to qualifications or privileges, and six women attended classes in 1872.

Calder's administration also saw a change in name from the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania to the Pennsylvania State College, enlargement of the board of trustees to include representatives of the alumni and of the State's manufacturing industries, and amendment of the charter to drop the student-labor rule.

A growing emphasis on classical studies and neglect of the scientific, agricultural, and mechanical arts studied led to growing criticism that the college had lost sight of the goals of the founders and was not living up to the Morrill Act.

Calder resigned to be succeeded by Joseph Shortlidge, head of a boys' school at Concordville. Shortlidge did not get along with the trustees, his faculty, or students and resigned after 9 months.

Not since the school's beginnings had the fortunes of the school been at such a low ebb, Gov. Robert E. Pattison himself remarking that—

> The past history of the State agricultural college is not such as to induce the belief that any practical good has or ever will come from it.

But though no one realized it at the time the college was at a turning point. The trustees chose as the new president George W. Atherton, head of the political science department at Rutgers University. He was to head the institution for 24 years of steady growth.

Against a proposal of the governor that the college's faculty be cut in half and that the course of study be made exclusively agricultural, Atherton was able to persuade the trustees that the school's future depended upon developing a program in the mechanic arts.

Within a few years the wisdom of his program was seen. The college's enrollment picked up, reaching 244 in 1892. In 1887 Atherton won a $100,000 appropriation from the legislature for new buildings and by 1892 the State had spent $305,500 for new buildings and $102,000 for equipment.

A few years later, in 1896, fulfillment of the goals of the founders and of the Land-Grant Act was seen in the reorganization of the college into 7 schools—School of Agriculture, School of Natural Science, School of Mathematics and Physics, School of Engineering, School of Mines, School of Language and Literature, and School of History, Political Science and Philosophy.

A college spirit was also developing. School colors were chosen in 1887 and a school song in 1901, the first intercollegiate football game was played in 1887, a yearbook was begun in 1889, a student handbook appeared in 1895 and a weekly student newspaper was started in 1904.

Toward the close of Atherton's administration trustee Charles W. Schwab donated money for an auditorium and trustee Andrew Carnegie money for a library building. Other new buildings at this time included a men's dormitory, a dairy building and a main agricultural building.

When Atherton died in 1906, the president of the board of trustees, former Gov. James Addams Beaver was chosen acting president. Beaver saw the enrollment grow within 16 months from 800 to 1,151. Beaver turned over the administration of the college in 1906 to Dr. Edwin Erle Sparks, University of Chicago historian.

No advocate of the ivory-tower theory of education, Sparks embarked on a program of enlarging the college's services to make them statewide. His oft-repeated slogan was: "Let us carry the college to the people."

He fought for funds for setting up an extension division, getting his first appropriation for this purpose in 1913. Though a strong supporter of the college's practical education program in agriculture, engineering, and technology, Sparks urged more courses in the liberal arts. As a result of his efforts, the present School of Liberal Arts was formed in 1909.

The steady progress of the college educationally was disrupted by the entrance of the United States in World War I. It made major contributions to the war effort, training 1,500 Army and Navy trainees in the Students' Army Training Corps, in addition to regular students enrolled in military science and tactics; turning over laboratories and scientific equipment to wartime research; and dedicating other resources of the college to boosting civilian morale.

His health broken by his own war efforts Sparks resigned in 1920. His successor, Dr. John Martin Thomas, of Middlebury College in Vermont, launched an immediate program for more buildings desperately needed because of the cessation of construction during the war.

In a 2-year drive for building funds, the college secured $1,727,272 in pledges by 17,000 alumni and friends of the college.

Besides the building program, the Thomas administration saw the establishment of a graduate school and a school of education, a reorganization of the school of agriculture and the formation of a school of chemistry and physics from the former school of natural science. When Thomas resigned in 1925, the college's enrollment had reached 3,854 students.

The new president, Dr. Ralph Dorn Hetzel of the University of New Hampshire, headed the institution during the boom days of the late 1920's, the depression of the 1930's and the war and postwar readjustments of the 1940's.

Two large-scale building programs took place during the Hetzel administration and a third was planned when he died in 1947. The first received its impetus from President Thomas' drive for funds. When it ended in 1932, the college had spent about $5,500,000 for buildings. The second, from 1937 to 1939, involved the expenditure of about $5 million by the general State authority.

The depression was a difficult period because of cuts in appropriations for maintenance and teaching, and World War II meant a greater tax on Hetzel's administrative and leadership powers.

Adopting a year-round schedule, the college trained thousands of soldiers, sailors, marines and aviators in special programs requested by the military services; put in special courses for training women for work in industry; gave instruction to more than 140,000 civilian workers in extension classes held over the State; and carried on extensive research to meet the needs of the war effort.

At the war's end the college was faced with a stack of 22,853 applications for admission to classes, most of them coming from veterans.

The need was met by utilizing every useful nook and cranny for class and laboratory space, by using war-surplus materials for emergency dormitories and classrooms, and by overloading professors with classes and students.

These devices were those adopted by all colleges and universities to handle swollen enrollments, but Penn State developed another that received nationwide attention.

This device was that of enrolling first- and second-year students at Penn State centers, at the State teachers colleges, and at private schools in order to make space available on the campus for upperclassmen studying professional and technical subjects. Twenty-two schools cooperated with Penn State in this program.

After Hetzel's death in 1947, James Milholland, president of the board of trustees, served as acting head of the college until the election of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower as president in 1950.

Milholland started the long-range building program that was designed to meet the college's needs for the enrollment increases predicted for the postwar period. This was a $10 million program to be carried on under the general State authority.

Reporting on the campus plant in 1954, Eisenhower said that the buildings were valued at $66 million, and that 58 percent, or $38 million, was new construction since 1946. Seventy percent of the new construction was accomplished without the use of tax money.

For many years there had been a growing sentiment that since the Pennsylvania State College was a university in size and in the broad scope of its work the word "college" in the name should be replaced by the word "university." This was accomplished in the fall of 1953.

Under Dr. Eisenhower, the onetime Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania enters its second century as the Pennsylvania State University—the 11th largest institution of higher learning in the Nation.

In its 100-year span the institution has awarded 53,000 degrees, beginning with 11 granted in 1861. The institution now grants about 3,000 annually. It has seen its student body increase from 119 to 14,000 and its faculty from 4 to 1,400. Its research program has grown from a few dollars spent on nursery stock to one costing about $6 million annually. Through its extension program, its instruction is now given on a campus that may be considered statewide.

The untried experiment of the founders of the institution in 1855 is now acclaimed a resounding success, as evidenced by the following accomplishments of which Penn State is proud:

The first use of the practicum method of instruction on a wide scale, 1866.

The first soil fertility experimental plots in the United States, 1881. The only prior fertility plots were in Rothampstead, England.

The first correspondence instruction in agriculture. Chautauqua home reading courses begun in 1892. Formal correspondence courses begun 1898.

The first organized extension instruction in mining in the United States 1893–94. First mining bulletin published January 1, 1894.

World's first respiration calorimeter for domestic animals, 1902. Prior ones were adapted for use with human beings only.

The first college forestry building in the United States—Fergie's woodshed, 1906.

The first formal training program in industrial engineering, 1908.

The first establishment of student gardens as regular practicum training 1909.

The first mineral industries experiment station, 1910.

The first organized curriculum in fuel technology, 1931.

The first institute of local government in the United States, 1935.

The first organized curriculums in meteorology, mineral economics, mineral preparation engineering, 1946.

The first climatometer for studies in dehumidification, 1948.

The first department of biochemistry accredited by American Chemical Society's committee on professional training, April 26, 1950.

The first establishment of a foreign training center by an American institution for industrial education, Formosa, June 1, 1953.

The first conference of insurance buyers held on a university campus, 1953.

Pioneer work in chemical engineering. A course in industrial chemistry was taught in 1890.

Pioneer work in safe-driving instruction. The first driver-training course for high-school students was taught in the State College High School in 1933. The first training course for teachers of safe driving was offered during the summer session of 1936.

Pioneer conference of dentists and oral surgeons, March 15–17, 1943, which led to the founding of the American Academy of Cleft-Palate Prothesis, April 4, 1943, which in turn became the American Association for Cleft-Palate Rehabilitation.

Only mineral industries art gallery in the world, established 1930.

Only mineral industries museum in Pennsylvania, established 1930.

Only university in the world offering courses in Pennsylvania German language, culture and folklore, 1946.

Only institution in Pennsylvania giving work in home economics leading to the Ph.D. degree.

Only institution in Pennsylvania giving work in hotel administration.

Only home economics research center in Pennsylvania.

Largest enrollment in home economics in the State, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Largest enrollment of nonhome economics majors in any land-grant institution in the United States.

World's largest water tunnel—Garfield Thomas Memorial Water Tunnel, test chamber 14 feet long, 4 feet in diameter; dedicated October 7, 1949.

Largest engineering, science, and management defense and war training programs, 1940–45—155,000 enrolled.

One of the largest university film libraries in the East, established 1941.

Largest flower test gardens in the United States; first approved by All-America Selections Committee for testing of new flower varieties before they go on the market, spring 1941.

A low-temperature laboratory second only to that of the United States Bureau of Standards.

Foreign Operations Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a matter which I believe has extremely important ramifications.

Being a firm believer in a bipartisan foreign policy, I regret that the situation I describe below has arisen. The fact that issues in this field can be alleged to have acquired partisan overtones does not contribute to the building of unity in our Nation at this critical time. I have engaged in lengthy correspondence regarding the question of partisanship in FOA without bringing the matter to the attention of the Congress. Only because of the complete failure of the FOA to provide a satisfactory reply, do I now feel compelled to make the situation known.

As a member of the International Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee last year, numerous allegations of systematic patronage clearances in the Foreign Operations Administration were brought to my attention. As a result, I introduced an amendment to the Mutual Security Act prohibiting the application of political tests or criteria in the filling of nonpolicy positions in FOA. While my amendment barely failed in the House, a similarly worded amendment introduced by Senator HUMPHREY carried in the Senate and through conference and is now a part of Public Law 665, 83d Congress, 2d session.

At about the same time as I introduced my amendment, I wrote to the Director of FOA about a fellow New Jerseyite who had come to me and had called to my attention an example of what he felt was unwise and unjust personnel practice in FOA. I quote my letter to the Director. Incidentally, I have deleted the gentleman's name for obvious reasons:

I am writing you with respect to a fellow New Jerseyite, Mr. W., who was formerly in the employ of the Foreign Operations Administration. Mr. W. has business connections in my district and was in to see me with respect to a private matter. During the course of our conversation he relayed a story to me which sounds fantastic. It is as follows:

On December 12, 1952, Mr. W., left for The Hague, Netherlands, as a $50-a-day consultant for the Foreign Operations Administration. The original arrangement was for 3 weeks' work as marketing consultant to the Dutch Government. At the conclusion of the 3 weeks, Mr. W.'s appointment was extended for a 3-month period, ending April 1, 1953. At the end of this period the appointment was renewed for 2 more months, to June 1, 1953; and then there was a third extension to July 1, 1953. At the conclusion of this time, Mr. W. returned to the United States. I understand that during his stay in the Netherlands Mr. W. worked 6 days a week and many more than 8 hours a day in his efforts to help the Dutch in improving their marketing techniques. I am enclosing mimeographed copies of the letters of commendation received from a few Dutch organizations which would indicate that Mr. W.'s stay in the Netherlands was highly successful.

Mr. W reports that sometime during July he was approached by an official of the Foreign Operations Administration and asked to take a job as marketing consultant to the Italian Government. He was personally interviewed by a staff member of the Rome mission who requested that the appointment be made immediately. During the course of waiting for this appointment, which to Mr. W appeared to be assured, he took the highly responsible step of attending a language school at his own expense to learn Italian. The contract between him and the Italian Government was prepared, salary was agreed upon, and the Italian Government and the American mission accepted his appointment—in fact, eagerly approved it. Mr. W further reports that his loyalty and security check came through. At the final moment when Mr. W was all prepared to leave, had obtained a passport and doctor's certificate, he was not appointed. He was informed that all the clearances necessary could not be obtained but was given no indication of which clearance was withheld.

I have suggested to him that perhaps another candidate with equal or higher qualifications may have been selected for the position and that this might have accounted for the last-minute decision by the Foreign Operations Administration. However, Mr. W insists that he was the only candidate for the job at the time, which was proven by the fact that no one was appointed to fill the position for several months after he was turned down.

Mr. W has submitted to me a statement of all his allegations regarding the facts of this case, and they go much further than I have done in this letter. However, the principal assertion he makes is that the sole reason he was not appointed to the technical assistance project was the fact that he is a member of the Democratic Party.

I am a very firm supporter of the technical cooperation and foreign-aid programs and believe they constitute one of our really positive answers to Communist propaganda. I believe that the technical assistance program is an outstanding example of America's free world leadership. It therefore disturbs me greatly that members of my party are apparently discriminated against in appointments to nonpolitical technical assistance projects. It is my recollection that under the previous Democratic administration, the first two Administrators of ECA were members of the Republican Party. It is my understanding that every Administrator from Mr. Hoffman to Mr. Harriman has conducted the technical assistance program free of partisan considerations in the appointment of personnel. I am absolutely convinced that this is the correct policy, not only because technical assistance should not be a partisan program but also because it seems to me to be the most efficient way to obtain top qualified personnel. If Mr. W's statement that systematic political tests are now conducted as part of personnel practice in the Foreign Operations Administration, I believe we in the Congress should know about this fact. Such a practice would, of course, cut the recruiting potential for technical assistance projects in half and would, therefore, make for less efficient operation of the Administration.

I do not believe Mr. W desires the position mentioned above any longer. This letter, therefore, is not about his personal situation but rather about the general practices of your agency.

You will note that this letter stated that in this case all necessary clearances had been obtained for Mr. W's appointment, but that for unspecified reasons he was not appointed to a technical assistance job which had no political aspects. In response to the letter quoted above I received a letter from the Foreign Operations Administration which indirectly implied that Mr. W. was not appointed because the position for which he had applied had been abolished. I have strong reason to believe that was not the fact and that while the position was not filled, recruitment for it continued for many months after Mr. W. had been turned down. The question I raise is this: If Mr. W's allegation that he

was not appointed because he is a Democrat is not true, why did the Administration find it necessary to deviate from fact in replying to me and to assert a position which has not been and probably cannot be substantiated?

I answered the letter I received from FOA and I quote my reply of August 5 below:

Thank you for your letter of August 3. I must say I was somewhat disturbed by the fact that my letter of July 6 remained unanswered and unacknowledged for almost a month.

Apparently there is some misinterpretation as to the questions I raised in my letter. I specifically said that Mr. W. was no longer interested in the position and, therefore, my question was whether or not his allegations were true. As you recall, he alleged that in technical assistance projects a systematic political patronage arrangement prevailed in FOA. My question was, am I supporting a program which systematically discriminates against people who are identified as Democrats in obtaining positions of nonpolicy levels as well as on purely technical jobs under the technical assistance program?

I did not receive a reply to the above letter. On December 28, 1954, I again wrote to the Foreign Operations Administration on this problem, as follows:

As you undoubtedly recall, Senator HUMPHREY and I sponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of last year which made the provisions of section 1005 of the Foreign Service Act applicable to the overseas personnel practices of the Foreign Operations Administration. This amendment carried and is now part of Public Law 665, section 527, subsection C (1).

Would you please advise me of the administrative action you have taken to assure the implementation of this legal requirement of your personnel practices. I would appreciate copies of any amendments or additions to manual orders which may have ensued or administrative memoranda to operating personnel which assure the implementation of this amendment.

I have discussed this matter with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, and he is also vitally interested in the question and would appreciate a copy of your response to me on this matter.

I received the following response from the FOA, under date of January 12, 1955:

In response to your inquiry as to what administrative action this agency has taken as a result of the application of section 1005 of the Foreign Service Act to our overseas personnel practices, we are pleased to inform you that we have not found it necessary to take any specific action by way of amendment or addition to existing manual orders.

Section 1005 of the Foreign Service Act provides in part that in the hiring of personnel for overseas assignments "no political test shall be required and none shall be taken into consideration." Since it is the practice of this agency to select applicants for overseas employment purely on the basis of professional qualifications, subject, of course, to necessary security clearances, it has been felt that specific administrative implementation of the prohibition in section 1005 against political discrimination was not required. Our key employment personnel, on the other hand, are fully conversant with the provisions of this section.

The implications of this exchange of correspondence are that if there were applications of political tests prior to the passage of the amendment I sponsored with Senator HUMPHREY last year, this practice still continues, since no steps have been taken to implement the no-political-tests amendment. I submit that political tests were applied to appointments before the passage of the amendment and that they have continued to be applied. Evidence of this, in addition to the above-cited case of Mr. W.—which, from the material I have at hand, appears to be clear-cut—is the report by the Republican National Committee quoted in the Congressional Quarterly of February 11 on page 132:

The largest number of placements (by the Republican National Committee) have been made in the FOA (79).

In a 6-month period, 79 people have been placed in the FOA by the Republican National Committee. The fact that a program exists to apply political tests to nonpolicy jobs is a violation of the amendment I sponsored. The additional fact that the FOA has been the most lucrative source of patronage positions is further evidence that laws are being violated in spirit, if not in letter.

I intend to present this material to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and have merely submitted the record here, since I feel that the answers I have received from the FOA have, through their deviousness, been insulting not only to me but to the Congress.

During my recent trip abroad I gathered a great deal of information which shows that the continuation of this patronage practice in FOA is having a serious impact not only on the morale of overseas personnel but on the ability to recruit technical experts for service overseas—a job which is very difficult even under the best of circumstances.

In the near future the Congress will be considering the continuation and, according to recent statements, the expansion of vital economic and technical assistance programs. I feel strongly that such programs are imperative to the United States position in the free world and to the preservation of freedom and democracy in the face of the widespread and unabating Soviet imperialist menace.

But to be successful our economic aid and technical assistance programs must be administered with wisdom, courage, imagination, and complete integrity. Congressional action can make success possible but only the best type of administration will make it probable. And yet, as of this very moment there is within the FOA an office whose function it is to place Republican political nominees and to apply political tests and criteria to all proposed appointments and nominations. Such a breach of faith with the Congress certainly fails to ensure the kind of administration which is absolutely essential to the continuing success of our foreign aid programs and should no longer be tolerated.

Lincoln's Philosophy Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Lincoln Day luncheon in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN'S PHILOSOPHY LIVES ON

Across our country this week, people are meeting to commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, martyred American president who saved our Nation and emancipated a race. His era in history was one of trouble and tribulation. But it was also one which beckoned to him to provide an unselfish and devoted leadership to a high cause, and he provided it to the benefit of his country in full measure. His was a martyrdom of sacrifice to the cause of freedom.

Abraham Lincoln's words come hurtling down the years: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Mr. Chairman, our work remains unfinished, and our goal remains the same: peace among ourselves and peace with all nations. The burden of those labors is being borne today by a patient, devoted Christian leader, dedicated, as Mr. Lincoln was, to peace at home and throughout the world. With deep religious conviction, with humility, and with native commonsense, President Dwight Eisenhower is presently engaged in arming America morally, strengthening her economically and militarily, conducting her foreign policy skillfully and firmly, all in the forward march toward the attainment of the selfsame goal which our Civil War President set for our Nation.

Many significant changes have been wrought in the past 2 years by our Government in the conduct and direction of our national affairs.

I believe, and I have often said, that the people of our country want clean, strong, honest, American Government. Republicans want it. Democrats want it. So do our independent citizens. I can give you the assurance, though I know you do not need it, that that is exactly what President Eisenhower and his administration are giving to all of us.

The record of these last 2 years is studded with examples of bipartisan approval of presidential recommendations. This is true both in the domestic field and in foreign policy. It is a record which, I believe, will continue in the future.

On some legislation of singular interest to California, I am always proud to remember that when the roll of Senators was called on passage, Democrats joined Republicans in approving our State's request, and we triumphed over scattering but vigorous partisan opposition.

As a Senator from California, as well as a Senator of the United States, I am grateful for this chance to summarize and highlight a variety of actions that will further our progress and brighten our promising future.

In the past year alone, Congress enacted laws that protected the interests of our cotton farmers, whose crop now is California's leading agricultural commodity; it cushioned

the impact on seriously congested schools in scores of our communities where thousands of additional families were drawn by reason of Federal activities and programs. It has contributed toward the solution of our continually pressing water problem, undeniably a matter of greatest concern to our expanding economy and development; and it has facilitated our commerce through improvement of ports along the whole stretch of our coastline.

As a sample of what has been done to safeguard our lands and help us utilize our resources, let me cite part of the record of the 83d Congress:

Increased funds were appropriated to speed the pace of flood prevention projects in Los Angeles, the northern section of the bay region, and in the lower Sacramento Valley.

Dams were authorized to bring about greater use of waters in several widespread areas of our State, for the benefit of farmers and city dwellers alike.

Construction of additional distribution systems was made possible, to carry benefits of the Central Valley project to more farm areas in the central valleys of our State.

The outlook for the future is encouraging.

Recognition of the continuing problem of our schools will be made in the present Congress and hearings on the matter are now in progress in Washington. Progress will be made in our water and power problems. In line with the recommendations of our Governor, I have introduced legislation for the multiple-purpose Trinity-San Luis project in northern California. Also, in conjunction with colleagues in both Chambers, I have proposed Federal assistance for the so-called Tri-Dam project in San Joaquin and a bill to assist the people of Ventura County in efforts to satisfy their acute water demands.

As a member of the Public Works Committee I look forward to playing an active part in shaping legislation to carry out a comprehensive long-range highway program. This measure will enable the Federal, State, and local governments to tackle the neglected problem of expanding and modernizing roads of all types so our highway network may better meet demands of our highly mobile population.

The Federal Government, at long last, has become an ally in the fight against a menace which endangers an increasing number of communities, air pollution. Just this month President Eisenhower again acknowledged that the complex problem of checking and, we hope, ultimately eliminating smog, requires positive participation by national agencies. They will make a tremendous contribution chiefly in the field of scientific research and should speed the efforts already under way in various metropolitan areas. I shall endeavor to broaden the program of Federal assistance in this field, and I feel hopeful that aid will be forthcoming to clean up the atmosphere in the cities and towns of California and across the Nation.

Production and employment are increasing on a broad front. President Eisenhower has prophesied that, within a decade, our current annual production level of three hundred and sixty billion dollars will increase to five hundred billion or more, expressed in dollars of the same purchasing power.

In the first 2 years of the present administration, Federal appropriations have been reduced, Federal personal income taxes and excise taxes were cut, the excess-profits tax was repealed, governmental controls on business were abolished, and 1954 was one of the best years, economically, in our history.

We've made magnificent strides in the field of human rights and equal dignity among our people in a fashion that would make Abe Lincoln proud of us. In this free republic of ours, the brotherhood of man becomes an increasingly accepted standard of decency, and the leadership of our Chief Executive has supplied the idealism and the intelligence to bring to more of our people a rising standard of living in this country of free men and free government.

The cloud on the horizon is the world situation.

With the most painful and heartfelt regret, the American people are aware that there are those in the world who oppose freedom and who have been measurably successful in stamping it out in great areas. Human slavery, in its most cruel form, is practiced today as a Government policy by those countries chained down by Red communism. Their current activities, placed in the background of their self-proclaimed desires, are cause for sober concern by free America and by the free world. And it is to this question that I desire now to direct your attention.

Basically, the American people today and their Government concern themselves with the security of our Nation and an honorable peace in our world. Perhaps never before have they turned as soberly to the contemplation of our Nation's needs to preserve freedom, as they have today.

We live our lives in a whole new era. Solving the problems of freedom in that era depends upon our acceptance and understanding of the new energies which men of science have brought forth in our time. The needs of the American people in securing their freedom must be, and have been, set in this background.

Several months ago I listened to Admiral Carney in Vallejo suggest that the American Navy is on its way to complete atomic power for its propulsion. Thus, since 1789, we have passed successively through periods of sailing ships, and steam ships, and diesel ships, to atomically-propelled vessels. Our gallant air force is expanding almost daily, and piston planes give way to jet-powered aircraft. Whereas at the outbreak of the Korean war the United States Air Force had but 42 effective wings out of a projected 70, it has today 121 effective wings out of a projected 137, a goal which will be attained before too many months have passed, with the approval by the Congress to recommendations of the administration. Our airmen have long since penetrated the sonic barrier, and one of their experimental planes has flown 1650 miles per hour, and how much faster is the Defense Department's secret. An American airman has flown to an altitude in excess of 85,000 feet, and again it is a secret how much further up he may have gone. The United States Army and the Marine Corps likewise have entered upon a modern atomic posture of readiness and mobility, testifying, without equivocation, to our determination to safeguard American security.

Every citizen of this country and his family may give eternal thanks that the Commander in Chief of our defense forces is an unselfish and enlightened leader devotedly dedicated to peace in the world, partly by reason of his own experiences over an almost entire lifetime as a skilled professional soldier.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress early in January, the President of the United States again stated that our national goals continue to be a just and enduring peace, and a realistic worldwide limitation of the implements of war. "We maintain powerful military forces," he said, "Because there is no present alternative—they are forces designed for deterrent and defensive purposes, able to strike back with destructive power in response to any attack." The defense plans of the United States have been under the personal direction of the President after his own long and contemplative study. His recommendations for our country's defense will, I prophesy, be given the same bipartisan congressional approval in 1956 as they were these last 2 years. There are a few professional disagreements on emphasis, but here again we can be thankful for the experienced counsel which the Chief Executive can give as a military man. His recommendations include, among others, an emphasis on modern airpower and new weapons, the elimination of duplication and overstaffing, the acceleration of a program for our own continental defense, and the build-up of a military reserve. Incidentally, they include increases in compensation for service personnel. When I tell you that only 15 percent of the Regular Air Force personnel are expected to reenlist when their present terms expire, I underline the importance of increasing the attractiveness of peacetime military service.

Meanwhile, in existence or on the drawing boards are weapons so appallingly destructive as to chill one's imagination. International ballistic missiles—euphemistically termed IBM—will, we are told, travel across oceans at unthinkable speed, addressed to targets thousands of miles away, with considerable precision and accuracy. And while the science of destruction continues its deadly progress among the free countries of the world, there is no question that international communism, with the brains it has from varying sources at its disposal, likewise makes progress in this same field.

Recently, the former Chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee said:

"Today, atomic and hydrogen bombs exist in growing numbers on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Today—not next year, or the year after, but today—the Soviets have both the bombs and the planes needed to launch a devastating nuclear attack against the cities of North America."

Listen to Winston Churchill as he comments on current history:

"Mankind has never been in this position before. Without having improved appreciably in virtue or enjoying wiser guidance, it has got into its hands for the first time the tools by which it can unfailingly accomplish its own extermination. That is the point in human destinies to which all the glories and toils of men have at last led them. They would do well to pause and ponder upon their new responsibilities. Death stands at attention, obedient, expectant, ready to serve, ready to shear away the people en masse; ready, if called on, to pulverize, without hope of repair, what is left of civilization. He awaits only the word of command. He awaits it from a frail, bewildered being, long his victim, now—for one occasion only—his master."

There you have a glimpse of the background in which nations of the world may decide upon the course to follow in dealing with one another. And it is against that background that the American people must determine the course of their own policy as respects our neighbors. Our Government is seriously concerned with such a question, and the Senate, and the House of Representatives as well, have sat in judgment upon phases of it these past several weeks.

On January 24, President Eisenhower sent to the Senate and the House a message in which he reiterated that this country's basic goal is safeguarding the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable peace. He then described, in considerable detail, the serious and darkening situation in the Straits of Formosa. Suffice to say here, since 1945 the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores have been occupied by the Republic of China, a loyal ally of the American people. Communist China, which incidentally still incarcerates innocent American citizens, anaounced its determination to invade and conquer these islands and bring them under the aegis of Red Chinese communism. The President emphasized the importance to the American people that these islands remain in friendly hands. He requested the

Congress to adopt a resolution authorizing him to employ our Armed Forces as he might deem necessary to secure and protect these islands against armed attack.

What, my fellow citizens, is the importance to the American people of Formosa and the Pescadores? In the words of the President of the United States, those islands, in unfriendly hands "would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance, of moral, economic, and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes, for the United States and other free nations, the geographic backbone of their security structure in that ocean. With that, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States agree."

I want to recall the words of another great American citizen who was a guest of the people of Los Angeles a very few days ago. Speaking to the 82d Congress on his triumphant return to our country, Gen. Douglas MacArthur described the Pacific Ocean as a vast moat to protect the United States as long as we held it. He spoke of a chain of islands in the Pacific which constituted for Americans a protective shield. It was his powerfully-stated conviction that a breach in that littoral defense line by an unfriendly power would make vulnerable each remaining segment of it. And then he said, "Under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control. Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan and might well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

In the considered judgment of such American patriots who are qualified to speak, Communist occupation of Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously endanger the security of the people of the United States and would undermine the cause of peace.

The resolution was debated in the House of Representatives and it passed almost unanimously with only three Members opposing it. It was debated at considerable length in the Senate. All manner of amendments were offered to delimit or restrict the President's responsibility. I listened to those Senators who advocated restrictive amendments or who advocated, indeed, no resolution at all. I listened also to the distinguished Democratic Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who urged the adoption of the resolution exactly as the President had recommended it. On the basis of all the background and of the Senate debate, I say to the people of my State of California, there was only one course in my judgment to pursue in the cause of American security and peace in the world. That was to uphold the recommendation of the President of the United States. And the Senate did uphold the President's recommendation, and did so overwhelmingly.

Thus, for all the world to see, the President of the United States and the Congress, representing the American people, have taken an unequivocal position. It is a position in line with our basic foreign policy and completely in consonance with our American goal.

That action was followed a few days later by overwhelming ratification in the Senate of the Southeast Asia collective defense treaty. By that commitment the United States, together with Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, France, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand, combined to create a protective network of mutual defense, to promote security and to strengthen the fabric of peace in Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific. This treaty is designed to deter aggression, which means Communist aggression, in that area of the world by warning potential aggressors that an open armed attack upon the territory of any of the parties will be regarded by each signatory nation as dangerous to its own peace and safety. In such contingency the parties agree to meet the common danger in accordance with their constitutional processes. They also agree to consult on measures for their common defense whenever the territory or integrity or political independence of any of them is threatened other than by armed attack, which might endanger the peace of the area. Thus it is indicated to communism that its techniques of internal subversion would be dealt with effectively. If communism fails to understand anything but force and might, then communism is forewarned that retribution lies in store for it for breaching the peace in the future.

This is the foreign policy of the Government of the United States. We have now added a mutual defense treaty with Nationalist China. The SEATO treaty in Southeast Asia balances our NATO treaty of mutual security in Europe. It is a policy based upon coming into firm agreement of those who, like ourselves, love freedom. It is designed to deter Communist aggression and the onslaught of Communist slavery. It is an enlightened policy of our own self-interest consistent with our goal of freedom and of peace. There are some in California and some in the Nation who, for varying purposes, oppose this policy. They are a vociferous minority and they are wrong. For my part, my friends, I shall continue to support that policy as it is carried out by the President of the United States.

When Abraham Lincoln was about to become President of the United States in 1861, and as he was traveling en route to Washington, he made a statement to the American people which I repeat as I conclude:

"If the people shall be lost, it is little to any one man * * * but a great deal to the * * * millions of people who inhabit these United States, and their posterity in all coming time. It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind, that not with politicians, not with presidents, not with officeseekers, but with you is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?"

Mr. Lincoln answered history in the affirmative. So must we.

The Challenge to Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 16, 1955, it was my privilege to address the annual meeting of one of the most useful groups in our Nation—the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. This is the organization which has done so much to bring the blessings of electricity, with an attendant higher standard of living, to hundreds of thousands of farm families in rural America.

Other Members of Congress, of both great political parties, who spoke to this highly successful meeting were the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa.

I addressed the convention, assembled in Convention Hall at Atlantic City, N. J., on the subject of The Challenge to Public Power, reviewing the efforts undertaken during the past 2 years by the present administration to eliminate or destroy the public power program in the United States. I had the honor of being introduced by my old friend, Lee Wooden, of Jewell, in Clatsop County, Oreg., the president of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association in our own State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address to the delegates attending the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO PUBLIC POWER

(Address by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

One of the great moments of my career was to stand with George William Norris, the father of public power in America, when he saw Bonneville Dam for the first time. He watched the Columbia River surging inexorably through the Cascade Mountain Range, before it thundered over the spillway of the long, low dam.

"I don't think you people in the Northwest realize what a marvelous resource you have in this wonderful river," said Uncle George. "Is there any other bounty which produces so much good for mankind and yet never diminishes in quantity?"

George Norris is gone now, and the public power program which he helped to build confronts a major crisis. Yet many times I have thought of what he said. What other resource can light farms, turn factory wheels and operate businesses and, at the same time, continue in as great an abundance as ever before?

The lighting up of rural America was born of the same forces that started major multipurpose projects. The first real electric co-op came into being under TVA. Today about 300 of the 1,000 REA's receive all or part of their power supply from Federal power projects. Truly, rural families have a tremendous stake in future resource policies, not only because of potential power supply but because of the great impact of TVA and Bonneville on the rates of private power companies.

When Bonneville and TVA were started, it was like dropping a pebble into a pond of high-power-company rates. The effect of an abundant, low-cost power supply was immediate and far-reaching. The public-power yardstick was felt in ever-widening circles, forcing down the padded rates in adjacent areas.

For 20 years, the United States Government promoted a program to make the rivers of America the servants of the people. I use the term advisedly. I live in a State where only 27 percent of our farms had electricity in 1933. By 1952, this figure had soared to 98 percent. It is practically impossible to measure this gain other than in terms of increased creature comforts, greater purchasing power, a higher standard of living. These are the only proper measurements.

Mrs. Neuberger's mother, Ethel Kelty Brown, is one of the farm women who had no electricity until the programs were begun which symbolize the work of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Mother Brown has told me what it was like to live on a farm without power. It meant no refrigeration for the food which was cooked. It meant doing that cooking on a wood stove, with the women splitting kindling while the men were at their chores.

It meant hand-washing farm clothes—which get excruciatingly dirty—on a corrugated washboard. It meant carrying a Coleman lantern from room to room at night when children were sick.

POWER CHANGES FARM LIFE

Electricity on the farm has changed all this. The vast majority of the farms of our country have power today because of the Federal power program, because of the Rural Electric Administration, because of the watchful vigilance and persistent crusading of groups like the National Electric Cooperative Association. And all this benefit has occurred without diminishing the natural resources of America. The late J. D. Ross, first administrator of Bonneville, used to call that dam "an oil well which will never run dry, a coal mine that will never thin out. * * *"

Although I am only (sic) 42 years old, I come before you today as a man who has seen the public power program revolve in a full cycle in my region, the Pacific Northwest.

I witnessed the program begin a little more than 20 years ago. It was a bipartisan program—a program advanced by far-sighted men in both major political parties. By every possible standard, it was a success. As you know, electricity was brought to the farms, and at rates which the farmer could afford. Industrial payrolls came next, and this meant a steady market in town for the farmer's crops. Although the Pacific Northwest has historically lagged behind the rest of the Nation in manufacturing, its expansion led the land during the first decade that Bonneville power was available. Between 1939 and 1948, the national increase in manufacturing employment was 284 percent but in the States of Oregon and Washington it was 329 percent. Furthermore, this program has been generously paying for itself. Indeed, the annual reports of the Interior Department actually admit that the Columbia River power program is far ahead of the amortization schedule in repayments to the Government.

And auxiliary benefits of incalculable value were occurring simultaneously. In 1933, the year Bonneville Dam was started, a mere 85,000 tons of cargo moved upstream into the reaches of the upper Columbia River. In 1953, the tonnage was 1,375,000. This was merely a bonus from the power program. And what are we to say of the thousands of irrigated homesteads now being wrested from the arid upland desert near Grand Coulee, homesteads where ex-GI's and their families are making a new start in life?

I stress these benefits that have taken place in my own part of the country because I can be a little more poignant, a little more dramatic, a little more specific about it. These things I have seen with my own eyes. I was at Grand Coulee when the world's biggest dam was started. I saw the first water gurgling through canals amidst the sagebrush and tumbleweed. I saw the first transmission lines stretching out across the wasteland like a steel-legged centipede.

CALCULATED SCHEME STOPS PROGRAM

This was a program dedicated to the welfare of the United States, yet you of the NRECA know what has happened to that program. In 1953, the present national administration stopped it—deliberately, calculatingly, grimly.

The onslaught has occurred on many fronts:

1. Appropriations have been reduced for agencies devoted to the wider use of low-cost power.

2. Key waterpower sites, like Hells Canyon, have been pledged by the administration to private power companies for piecemeal, high-cost development.

3. New Federal starts have been choked off.

4. So-called wheeling agreements with utility corporations have given them control of the power supply in many areas.

5. Attacks upon the public-power preference clause have imperiled the electric supply of rural electric co-ops and other nonprofit systems.

6. A nationwide barrage of propaganda, some of it stemming from the White House and executive departments, has sought to indict such undertakings as the Tennessee Valley Authority and Bonneville as "creeping socialism."

7. A so-called partnership with private utilities has been proposed, whereby these companies would monopolize the revenue and energy at Federal power projects.

I emphasize the partnership because it represents today the spearhead of the current attack upon public power. The word "partnership" peppers the President's budget message. It is an appealing word. Yet what kind of a partnership is it? It is a partnership in which the Government relinquishes to private monopolies the powerhouses at Federal dams, while the Government continues to finance the nonreimbursable features, such as fish ladders, floodgates, and navigation locks.

THE MONOPOLY PARTNERSHIP

We had a partnership in operation. It wasn't this kind of partnership. It was a legitimate partnership between the Government and its citizens. Clyde T. Ellis, your executive manager, described this partnership in a masterful address which he delivered a year ago last month at your 1954 convention in Miami. Mr. Ellis referred numerous times to the Federal-local partnership, under which kilowatts were being sold at low cost to whatever distributing agency the residents of a particular area preferred.

It might be a municipal system as in Seattle. It might be a private power company as in Portland. It might be a public utility district as in Clark County, Wash. It might be a rural electric co-op as in Benton and Lincoln Counties, Oreg. These various methods of distribution represented the democratically chosen preference of the men and women living in that part of our Nation. They made the choice without interference by politicians in either the State capital or the National Capital, and then the Federal power system made available energy from the dams constructed on key river networks.

This was a bona fide partnership, as Clyde Ellis made clear. But what is proposed today as partnership is no partnership at all. It is monopoly and special privilege. For at least 50 years, a private stranglehold will be given legal sanctity at a great power site, and there will be nothing that the men and women in that area can do about it, through half a century of time.

We are told the abandonment of public power is necessary in the name of Americanism. Yet the preference clause, which safeguards the power supply of our rural electric co-ops, goes all the way back to the administration of Theodore Roosevelt and the Reclamation Act of 1906. I refuse to believe that the man who led the Rough Riders up San Juan Hill was a creeping Socialist. The inclusion of the preference clause in the Bonneville Act was principally the work of Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon. Does the present administration want to accuse of socialism the man who was Republican minority floor leader in the United States Senate for well over a decade?

In the barrage of propaganda being fired at the people over the Hells Canyon question, these overtones of patriotism again appear. Is it patriotic to abandon the greatest hydroelectric site left on our continent to the absentee-dominated corporation, which will tap only a segment of the available kilowatts?

PLAYBACK OF HISTORY

Historians tell us that no issues are really new. They all have arisen before—perhaps in different guise and other settings. Yet almost half a century ago, Theodore Roosevelt and his illustrious Chief Forester, Gifford Pinchot, confronted a Hells Canyon problem of their own.

Utility companies were grabbing off power sites on the mountain rivers of the West. Although the Nation had recently set aside the forest reserves, no legislation existed for the specific protection of these hydroelectric power sites. Let Pinchot describe what happened, in his autobiography Breaking New Ground:

"A certain number of forest-ranger stations were applied for which were needed less for rangers than to give the Government a temporary hold on some power site and prevent the power octopus from sucking it in. * * * Some of these ranger stations we deliberately located on water power sites, in order to insure some form of government control. * * *"

Contrast this action by Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot with the shameful relinquishment of Hells Canyon by the present masters of the American Government. Roosevelt and Pinchot contrived extra-legal machinery to save these power resources for future generations. They relied upon a subterfuge. This national administration refuses to use the machinery long ago created for the purpose—it seeks to hasten the abandonment of Hells Canyon, John Day, Green Peter, and other sites.

Nor can this be called in any sense of the word a partisan issue. Theodore Roosevelt and Pinchot were lifelong Republicans. The program which this administration has jettisoned was, in many of its concepts, a program originated by Republicans of the past—Roosevelt, Pinchot, Hiram Johnson, Norris, Borah, McNary, and many others. In my own State, I am a Democrat, but thousands of Republicans, on farms and in the cities, assured me that they were loyal to a publicly motivated program of resource development that had its roots within their own party.

Under this administration, engineering and scientific knowledge have been bent to political whims. The 308 report of the United States Army Corps of Engineers is the master plan for development of the Columbia River Basin. Surely if the Army ever errs, it is on the conservative and cautious side. But the 308 report recommends without reservation the erection of a high multipurpose Federal dam in Hells Canyon.

Yet this national administration assures us that the 308 report is wrong at Hells Canyon. Of course, the 308 report, according to the administration, is right at Libby Dam up along the Canadian border, where the prospects for construction are so clouded by international disputes that no private power company covets the site. So, here, the administration is willing to promote a Federal dam. How can the same engineers, with the same transits and the same diamond drills, be wrong on the Snake River and right on the Kootenai River? It is as if a patient told his doctor that the doctor was right about one lung, but wrong about the other.

INTERIOR POLICIES THREATEN REA'S

One of the serious blows suffered by REA's under the new policies was abrogation of 40-year contracts between the Interior Department and cooperatives in the southwest. As a result, the REA's were threatened with the bankruptcy or high rates, or loss of their independence. As you know, the original destruction of the continuing fund vital to these contracts was put through by a former Senator from Oregon. I assure you the new Senator from Oregon will do everything in his power to undo the damage.

Other corrective measures are also necessary, especially against the conspiracy to rewrite the formula for allocating power costs to make the price of Federal power as high as private power.

I cite these things to indicate how politics and greed are intruding into programs

which, until the last year or so, were decided by the needs of the American people and not by the selfish desires of 1 or 2 utility corporations.

ATTACK BY STEALTH

As you are well aware, REA funds have been cut but not abolished by Congress. You have been successful in maintaining reasonably adequate loan funds and services during the past 2 years. But this was to be expected. It was forecast at your first annual convention by the late George W. Norris. He said: "The attack upon REA will not be an open assault. The attack will be by stealth and treachery because REA is too popular to be attacked openly."

I don't own a crystal ball, but occult powers are not needed to predict that the Hoover Commission will probably recommend that REA—as you now know it—be abolished. Out of respect for your political potency, they will try to put forth some plausible substitute like a Federal REA corporation forced to borrow money from bankers at high-interest rates, and run by a board of directors and not by the Congress, which is now REA's board of directors.

THAT FEDERAL POWER MONOPOLY

For nearly 2 years, the administration has defended its abandonment of the Federal power program by contending that the Nation was in dire peril of being suffocated by a Federal power monopoly.

Secretary McKay has uttered this warning on many occasions. At McNary Dam on September 23, 1954, the President himself warned against Federal operation of "a gigantic, overwhelming nationwide power monopoly."

On November 4, 1954, Budget Director Rowland R. Hughes warned against committing the country to "a policy of establishing a nationwide power monopoly."

Yet this entire argument was refuted by the President in his state of the Union message of January 6, 1955, when he flatly declared to the Congress that "Federal hydroelectric developments supply but a small fraction of the Nation's power needs."

On this occasion, the President definitely asserted the true facts. Only about 13 percent of the energy used in the Nation is generated by the Federal Government. Approximately 6 percent spins off the turbines of municipal systems, and the remaining 81 percent from private utility corporations.

What is monopoly—13 percent, or 81 percent?

Yet for months the American people were told solemnly by their highest government officials that they couldn't have any more dams like Grand Coulee, Shasta, and Bonneville because of the imminent dangers of a Federal power monopoly.

Wasn't it Bernard M. Baruch who said that every man had a right to be wrong as to his opinions but that no man had a right to be wrong as to his facts?

SUBSIDIZED POWER: ANOTHER MYTH

Ever since the present national administration went into office, a conscious and deliberate effort has taken place to convince the people of America that the energy generated at Federal hydroelectric projects does not pay for itself. These projects are portrayed as vast drains on our national Treasury.

For example, Secretary of the Interior McKay appeared on the CBS Capitol Cloak Room TV program October 23, 1953. This colloquy took place between him and Mr. Bill Costello, one of the CBS panel:

Mr. COSTELLO. "Well, it's your philosophy, then, that the citizen generally should not pay the cost of keeping power rates low but that the individual consumer should pay the actual cost of producing that power."

Secretary MCKAY. "That's right. I don't think it's right to subsidize power out in my country—for instance in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and that country. We shouldn't ask for power to be subsidized by the people in New England."

Now if anyone should realize that this is a plain and outright misrepresentation, it should be Secretary McKay. In the first place, his own annual report for 1953 declares (at p. 326) that "the repayment (on Bonneville) is substantially in excess of scheduled requirements." As a former Governor of Oregon and as a resident of the Northwest, the Secretary ought to know that the great Government power projects on the Columbia River are returning to the Treasury not only the original investment in hydroelectric facilities, but also interest and operating costs.

Consider the repayment record on the Bonneville Dam project alone. The Government has invested $128,549,822 in construction costs and operating expenses for Bonneville Dam. Although its full span of generators have been in operation only 11 years, the project has put $48,825,959 into Federal coffers from sale of power. In fact, the whole Bonneville system—marketing the output of all Federal dams on the Columbia—has collected gross income of $340,565,589 through the sale of kilowatts.

Yet these fiscal facts are not known today throughout the Nation. The other day I engaged in a brief and friendly debate on the floor of the Senate with Senator NORRIS COTTON, a fine Republican Senator from New Hampshire. He was of the opinion that our dams in the Northwest are a drain on the taxpayers of his State. In other words, the propaganda put out by Mr. McKay and others has taken root. Senator COTTON does not realize that the Columbia River projects actually, in the long run, will be an ultimate source of financial profit to the Federal Government. And I know he is not aware of the innumerable products manufactured in New England—products like alarm clocks, ice boxes, stoves, washing machines, and shoes—which have been purchased because thousands of rural folks in the Northwest have a higher standard of living and increased purchasing power through the abundant and low-cost electricity made available to them on their farms.

THE BETRAYAL AT HELLS CANYON

The adage that history repeats itself was never more dramatically brought home to me than when I was asked a year ago to review a book detailing the fight to build Grand Coulee Dam, called Hail Columbia. This book, written by George Sundborg, a former Northwest newspaperman, impressed me with the deadly parallel between the fight for Grand Coulee and our present day struggle for Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. Sundborg could not have had the Hells Canyon case in mind when he wrote the book because he started the work before the Hells Canyon struggle commenced.

But the situations are such close parallels they might have been poured from the same mold—like the Gold Dust twins that used to adorn the soap flake boxes.

Kettle Falls was a place on the Columbia River about 117 miles upstream from the proposed Grand Coulee damsite. In March of 1921—just after the appropriation had been secured to core-drill the Coulee site—the Washington Water Power Company began to show interest in Kettle Falls as a site for development. On June 20, 1921, a contract for exploratory drilling on the Grand Coulee site was awarded. Ten days later, Washington Water Power filed an application with the Federal Power Commission to construct a dam at Kettle Falls. The Kettle Falls dam, located in the proposed Coulee reservoir pool, would have lopped off a hundred feet from the height of Grand Coulee—with consequent reduction of a million horsepower in the big dam's power output.

A long public debate ensued in which spokesmen for a number of Federal and State agencies were enlisted to support the power company. The pattern included such official statements as that of the then secretary of the Federal Power Commission. This gentleman said a dam at Grand Coulee—and I quote—"would involve an excessive initial investment", which, he said, it was "extremely doubtful could be secured for the purpose from any resource." This official went on to say of Grand Coulee that the FPC license to the power company would be granted only for a period of 50 years. "If at the end of that time or even before, it should become evident that the high dam would be a desirable step, the net investment of the Kettle Falls development could readily be absorbed by the Grand Coulee development." And, he added, "further investigation of this plan does not seem to be necessary."

It was not until June 23, 1936, that the FPC issued an order formally denying the Kettle Falls dam permit—nearly 14 years after Washington Water Power made its first move to block Grand Coulee construction.

I detail this background only for purposes of comparing some of the developments in the Grand Coulee and Hells Canyon fights. On June 9, 1947, the Army Corps of Engineers announced a public hearing would be held on plans for development of the Middle Snake River. These plans included Hells Canyon Dam, which was a key part of its famous 308 Report on Columbia River development. Thirteen days later, the Idaho Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit for a new run-of-the-river dam at Oxbow site, some 35 miles upstream from the Hells Canyon site. Granting of the Oxbow license would forever bar construction of Hells Canyon Dam, but would preserve the barony which the Idaho Power Co. holds in Idaho.

Since the Oxbow application was filed, the battle has raged on. We have seen spokesmen for Government agencies and company-front groups pressured to back the company scheme, just as in the days of Grand Coulee. Hells Canyon Dam and the whole plan for full development of the Columbia Basin was hit hardest by action of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay in withdrawing his Department's opposition to the Oxbow license.

As recently as last spring we, in Oregon, heard the Secretary repeat that the Federal budget was too precarious to start new dams. He was especially insistent about expenditures for Hells Canyon Dam, although when campaigning in the Colorado River Basin he never mentioned this fiscal situation. In Oregon, it was like listening to a hollow echo from the corridors of history—shades of that former FPC secretary who said Grand Coulee involved "excessive initial investment."

McKay never mentioned that, although Grand Coulee has had its full quota of generators in operation only since 1951, it has paid into the Federal Treasury over $51 million toward retiring an eventual power debt of $221 million.

POWER-COMPANY SLOGANS REVIVED

The parallel between Hells Canyon and Grand Coulee is significant. It shows that the situations and the arguments are not new. The ideas espoused by the Interior Secretary on Hells Canyon were merely revived from the Grand Coulee fight. It would appear that the public-opinion formers thumbed back through their book of tricks and slogans to pick out the present-day arguments.

But what if the arguments used by McKay and other administration spokesmen had prevailed in the embryo days of Grand Coulee? What would have happened to the energy which activated the Hanford works and made plutonium available for our knockout punch in World War II? Where would the power have come from for the aluminum

to make 50,000 planes a year for our Nation's defense? How would we have started to wrest from the desert 15,000 farmsteads for ex-GI's and others in the Coulee region?

Fortunately, the views of those who ridiculed Grand Coulee as a "white elephant" did not prevail. As a result, America has been a better and more secure place in which to live. There were men of vision, integrity, and courage—men like George Norris, of Nebraska, and Tim O'Sullivan, from the plateau of eastern Washington—who were willing to carry on in the face of ridicule, deception, and pressure. To prevent the warmed-over arguments of the 1920's from being used against the public-power program today, we must keep alive their traditions of battle. They knew not the meaning of surrender, nor did they compromise when faced with discouragement.

Many of you may feel that the picture of the moment is bleak. But you should feel optimistic and proud. You have been in the front lines, blunting the attack. You have been hurt in some areas but not beyond recovery.

It is a far road from a damsite on a tributary to the Columbia where Norris stood that day long ago, with the fine spray drifting into his face. The prophecy and admonition which Norris gave applies today, as it did then. He said: "We will come some day, perhaps within our lifetime, to the great electric age. * * * Since Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden, there has never been discovered an element in nature with so many possibilities of usefulness and pleasure as electricity. We ought to guard with jealous care the concentration of water-power in the hands of any combination of men."

This is Norris' challenge to us. He is gone. We are here. Can we fail this man—and the hosts like him—who fought for public power when it was considered a lost cause, when the movement was in infancy? The illustrious Jefferson said, "Each generation must make its own fight for liberty." Because Norris and his contemporaries won their battle, we cannot rest content. Our own Armageddon lies ahead.

The outcome is in our own hands.

Lincoln, Eisenhower, and a Republican Philosophy for Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address which I delivered last Saturday night at Glastonbury, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN, EISENHOWER, AND A REPUBLICAN PHILOSOPHY FOR OUR TIMES

(By United States Senator PRESCOTT BUSH)

In every public speaker's life there come two reactions after he receives an invitation to address a meeting such as this. First, there is the warm, happy glow when the invitation arrives, and he feels that after all this time someone is still interested in what he has to say. Later, unhappily, comes the descent to the depths, as the time by which he must prepare his remarks inexorably approaches, and he wonders what new message he can bring his audience.

In this latter mood, back in Washington a few days ago, and thinking of Abraham Lincoln, whom we honor tonight, 90 years after his death, my eyes fell on a newspaper clipping I keep below the glass on my desk. It's a prayer which James Reston of the New York Times reprinted in his column some months ago. Let me read it to you:

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great heart, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.
God, give us men. Amen."

As I read those lines again one night last week, they gave me one part of the message I want to bring to you tonight:

The Republican Party can be eternally proud that in two times of crisis in the history of our Nation it gave America two Presidents of the stature of Abraham Lincoln and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Both men, in truth, of "strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands." Both above the fog in public duty and in private thinking.

There have been other great Republican Presidents. The name of Teddy Roosevelt, to mention only one, comes automatically to mind. But between Lincoln and none of our other great Presidents, including the Oyster Bay Roosevelt, have there been such similarities as exist between the Great Emancipator and Dwight Eisenhower.

Many parallels between Lincoln and Eisenhower could be pointed out. I will mention but a few.

First, most obviously, are the times of national crises in which each bore the burdens of office. Lincoln, in his day, was confronted with a nation half slave and half free; Eisenhower, today, struggles with the many grave problems created by a world half slave and half free.

Outstanding, next, are their similar great qualities as spiritual leaders of the American people, leaders with a reverent faith in God and in the Divine inspiration which gives life to the great documents of our history, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Both men came at times in our history when there was need for the flame of that faith to burn brighter.

And then there is their leadership in stating the philosophy of the Republican Party to which we give our allegiance.

Political conditions in our times, as in Lincoln's day, envelop the political battle in a thick smog. Differences between our major parties are blurred. Factions mark splits within each party. Slogans and labels today are used much as they were in Lincoln's time to create differences where none exist, or to cover up the real differences which honest reason and discussion would expose.

Facing similar conditions in his time, Lincoln did something about them which we are only now beginning to understand. He cut beneath the party battle to eternal truths. He stated principles, defined differences, and clarified issues. No one can read the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates or the Lincoln campaign speeches without being impressed with his patient determination to draw the line between the emerging Republican Party and his Democratic opponents.

The same thing is being done today by President Eisenhower. A careful reader of his state papers and public utterances will find within them a growing body of political philosophy, a philosophy suited for our times and the Nation's manifold problems of the day.

As modern Republicans, we believe with Lincoln that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. And, as our case is new, so must we think and act anew."

And President Eisenhower, while holding fast to the fundamentals of our American system of government which our opponents sometimes forgot and still forget, is thinking and acting anew as we come to grips with the sometimes bewilderingly complex problems we face.

It is significant that our President has so often quoted Lincoln's famous statement on the nature of government:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

And Dwight Eisenhower has added to that statement his own—one which I venture to suggest will one day become as famous:

"In all those things which deal with people, be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy or their form of government, be conservative—and don't be afraid to use the word."

Together, those statements form the central core of the philosophy of our modern Republican Party—a party which is alive and sympathetic to the human needs of the people, and a party which, unlike our opponents at times, is aware of the dangers to the people's freedom which lie in overly paternalistic, centralized government.

It is a philosophy of progressive moderation, as the President has called it, or of moderate progressiveness as others name it. Whatever it be named, it is a philosophy which strikes a responsive chord in the minds and aspirations of the American people, who find a steady advance along the middle of the road to our future more sensible and more attractive than frenetic zigzaggings from left to right and vice versa.

The Republican Party has come a long way in improving its political philosophy since I first voted for Charles Evans Hughes in New Haven in 1916. It has profited by its own mistakes. It has profited by the mistakes of its political opponents. And, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, it reflects the best understanding of the real obligations and duties of government that we have yet seen in the history of the United States.

Our philosophy recognizes that in this complex industrial civilization of modern times, the problems of government are more complicated and more comprehensive than they have ever been before.

We recognize that there has grown to be a greater degree of interdependence among our people than ever before.

We recognize that the security and happiness of the American home is the most important basic asset in American economic, political, and social life.

We recognize that the happiness and security of those homes depends upon jobs. It depends upon opportunities and incentives to work.

We recognize that there can be no prosperity in the truest sense unless there are jobs available for all who are willing and able to work.

So, with these basic facts in mind, the Eisenhower administration has undertaken, in the past 2 years, to unleash the forces which will create this indispensable situation. It has adopted a policy of incentives, rather than a punitive attitude, toward labor,

capital, and management. It has passed legislation designed to loosen up the savings of the people and put them into constructive job-creating enterprises. It has been unashamed to state the doctrine that just as labor is worthy of its hire, so are the savings of the people.

In matters of taxation, it has adopted an incentive rather than a punitive attitude. And in dealing with private business, it has adopted a helpful and understanding attitude rather than one of punitive vindictiveness. And taken all in all, these attitudes and policies have resulted in more jobs—more jobs than we have ever had before in any peacetime period in American history.

But that is not all. Our policies have created a situation and an environment which gives tremendous confidence for the future. No one could read the President's Economic Report of January 19, 1955, without being inspired with confidence for the future. We recognize our Government's obligation to serve the basic human needs of our people, to encourage and promote personal and family security, and we point the way to accomplishment of those ends by encouragement and stimulation of jobmaking private enterprise.

I have referred to factional splits within the 2 major parties today. I sometimes think that we Republicans worry so much about our own differences of opinion that we blind ourselves to the very serious cleavages which drive apart the Democrats. From observation in the Senate, I can assure you that those cleavages exist, although I must reluctantly confess that the Democrats, perhaps smarter politicians than we, gloss them over as much as possible. And when the chips are down, their party discipline takes command.

Nevertheless, we can't blink the fact that there are divisions in our Republican Party, differences which are particularly apparent in the Senate. There has been encouraging progress in the early days of the 84th Congress towards increasing the unity among Republican Senators. I hope that progress will continue.

And to my Republican friends in Connecticut, I say that we are in need of greater unity—greater unity and a spirit of confidence. The shock and disappointment of losing the Governorship in the most recent election has caused some to doubt and despair. There are some, I regret to say, who fail to realize that in Dwight D. Eisenhower and the record we are making under his leadership the Republican Party has its greatest asset since the days of Lincoln.

Let us look to the future instead of the past. And our future as a party is bright. I see an overwhelming victory ahead for us in 1956. I see that victory because the record we are making will be unbeatable—the record both in national affairs and in the zealous attention to the interests of Connecticut which is being given by your entire Republican delegation in the Congress.

The President has the trust of the American people. I confidently expect that he will run again. In his messages to the 84th Congress, he has outlined a program and expressed a philosophy which we, as modern Republicans, embrace and in which we can take pride. It is a program and a philosophy for our times, reflecting the hopes and aspirations of a great majority of the American people.

The enactment of the program for the 84th Congress—and I believe most of it will be adopted, although not without heel-dragging and querulous quibbling by our opponents—will add luster to the record made by the 83d.

So look ahead.

Cast off the chains of fear and doubt. Be proud of our party and its great leader who will surely restore it to the hearts and affections of the American people.

United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on February 11 I had the honor of addressing the Executives Club of Chicago. This is an exceptionally fine group, and I was more than pleased to have the opportunity to speak to them. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks I made plus the full documentation of the speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last month a new United Nations Commission, known as the Commission on International Commodity Trade convened in New York. Our Government took a momentous step in December of 1954 when the Honorable Nat King, Acting United States Representative in the United Nations Economic and Social Council released the following statement:

"At the last session of the Council I stated that my delegation hoped to be able to announce at this session whether my Government would participate in the Commission on International Commodity Trade. In this connection I am now authorized to make the following statement:

" 'The United States Government is not now prepared to participate in the work of the Commission on International Commodity Trade. It wishes for the present to keep in close contact with the Commission's work as it develops in the hope that it might be able to be of possible assistance. The United States Government will be prepared to reexamine the question of its eventual participation after the Commission's terms of reference and its scope of activities have been defined'."

I wish to commend the Secretary of State and his associates for this action. I regard it as the first step in reversing some of the unfortunate economic trends within the United Nations which were originally promoted by our own Government.

Our present able delegation to the Economic and Social Council, headed by the Honorable Preston Hotchkis, has had to devote a great deal of its efforts to combat proposals which originated in our own State Department many years ago. This is unfortunate as the Iron Curtain countries are presented with an opportunity to sow dissension among the free nations when it becomes necessary for us to cast votes in opposition to proposals sponsored by friendly countries in the United Nations. Yet, if we are to remain true to our own economic philosophy, we can take no other course. Our sins of the past have now returned to haunt us.

This Commission on International Commodity Trade is 1 of 2 groups established by the Economic and Social Council whose activities can have a very profound effect upon our economy. The other is the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices. I now intend to trace the establishment of these groups to concepts originally formulated by our own Government.

Our State Department published a document entitled "Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment" in November of 1945. The foreword to this publication read as follows:

"Developed by a technical staff within the Government of the United States in preparation for an International Conference on Trade and Employment and presented for consideration by the peoples of the world."

The thesis of this document was that international trade was kept small by four factors:

(1) Restrictions imposed by Governments, i. e., tariffs and quotas.

(2) Excessive price fluctuations in the markets for primary commodities.

(3) Restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels.

(4) Irregularity and the fear of irregularity in production and employment.

This State Department document proposed the formation of an International Trade Organization to make recommendations for the removal of the impediments to expanding world trade enumerated previously and to implement such recommendations.

The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, at its first session early in 1946, adopted a resolution to call an International Conference on Trade and Employment as suggested in the United States proposals. The council also established a preparatory committee to prepare an agenda and a draft charter for consideration by the conference. This preparatory committee held its first meeting in London in the fall of 1946. Subsequent meetings were held in New York and Geneva.

The international conference, to consider the charter, convened at Habana, Cuba, on November 21, 1947, and remained in session until March 24, 1948. The document which emerged from these deliberations is now familiarly known as the Habana Charter. It was submitted to the Congress in April 1949, and was strongly supported by President Truman and the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted extensive hearings on this agreement in April and May 1950. No report was ever made by the committee. The State Department announced in December of 1950 that it would not ask the 82d Congress, which convened in 1951, to again consider agreeing to United States membership in the proposed International Trade Organization.

Although the basic concepts for the charter had originated in our own Government, it is quite clear that the Congress never accepted the document which emerged from this series of meetings under United Nations auspices. In fact, the State Department, by its announcement in December of 1950, clearly showed that it realized the futility of asking the Congress to consider this subject again.

I shall now show how the four restrictive factors enumerated in the United States proposals were incorporated into the charter.

The first obstacle to the expansion of world trade outlined in the State Department's proposals was the restriction on trade imposed by governments including tariffs, quotas, and exchange controls. Chapter IV of the Habana Charter entitled "Commercial Policy" dealt with procedures to reduce tariffs and to extend the most-favored-nation treatment in trade agreements. It also covered quantitative restrictions and currency controls.

Chapter VI of the Habana Charter was entitled "Intergovernmental Commodity Agreements." This chapter recommended the use of such agreements to eliminate excessive price fluctuations in the markets for primary commodities and implemented the State Department proposal

dealing with this subject. The preamble to this chapter stated, and I quote:

"The members recognize that the conditions under which some primary commodities are produced, exchanged and consumed are such that international trade in these commodities may be affected by special difficulties such as the tendency toward persistent disequilibrium between production and consumption, the accumulation of burdensome stocks and pronounced fluctuations in prices. These special difficulties may have serious adverse effects on the interests of producers and consumers, as well as widespread repercussions jeopardizing the general policy of economic expansion. The members recognize that such difficulties may, at times, necessitate special treatment of the international trade in such commodities through intergovernmental agreement."

Chapter V of the Habana Charter was entitled "Restrictive Business Practices." It provided for procedures to eliminate the restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels in the original United States proposals. In effect it proposed an international antitrust law.

Chapter II of the Habana Charter was entitled "Employment and Economic Activities." This chapter dealt with the irregularity and the fear of irregularity in production and employment and, again implemented the State Department's proposals dealing with this subject.

The proponents of these proposals did not wait for the nations of the world to ratify the charter for the International Trade Organization. Steps were taken during the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the Habana Conference which met in Geneva in the spring of 1947 to implement some of these proposals.

This Preparatory Committee sponsored negotiations for the reduction of tariffs and conducted discussions which led to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade familiarly known as GATT. Although these tariff negotiations were sponsored by the Preparatory Committee for the Habana Conference to implement one chapter of the proposed charter and were finally incorporated in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the countries concerned established a separate organization, which is not an operating unit of the United Nations, to carry on this work. Other succeeding sessions were conducted at Annecy, France, and Torquay, England.

The GATT organization differs from the other groups which trace their origin to the original State Department proposals. In the first place, of the Iron Curtain countries, only Czechoslovakia which became a signatory to the GATT before she went behind the Iron Curtain is a member. The activities of GATT, by its very nature, are directed at the removal of trade barriers and not to the imposition of new controls and restrictions.

There was much criticism in the Congress of the GATT because many of us felt that no authority had been granted by the Congress through the Trade Agreements Act to enter into any such negotiations. The Eisenhower administration has scrupulously followed the practice of submitting agreements to the Congress so that the Congress and the executive can work together as independent and coordinate branches of our Government.

The provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade currently are being renegotiated at Geneva. The President has assured us that they will be submitted to the Congress for our consideration. For the first time an opportunity will be afforded for this agreement to receive consideration on its merits by the Senate of the United States.

I am confident that the Congress and the President working together in this way can come up with a workable solution to expanding our foreign trade which is the objective that we are all seeking.

The Economic and Social Council proceeded to implement another of the United States proposals without even waiting for the convening of the Habana Conference. This was the proposal which dealt with excessive price fluctuations in the markets for primary commodities.

This United Nations group, at its fourth session, recommended, and I quote from the resolution:

"That, pending the establishment of the International Trade Organization, members of the United Nations adopt as a general guide in intergovernmental consultation or action with respect to commodity problems the principles laid down in chapter VI as a whole, i. e., the chapter on intergovernmental commodity arrangements * * *; and

"Requests the Secretary-General to appoint an Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements to keep informed of and to facilitate by appropriate means such intergovernmental consultation or action with respect to commodity problems."

The Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Agreements was not sanctioned by the Congress. The interim referred to in the title for this organization was presumably the time interval between the formation of this group and the ratification of the charter for the International Trade Organization. The interim has continued through 1954, although the United States decision not to join the ITO was made known in 1950. This organization which was established at Geneva, has now been supplanted by this permanent new Commission on International Commodity Trade, which met in New York last month. While some may feel that this action is unimportant, as we were not bound by any decisions made by this interim committee, in the opinion of the President's Materials Policy Commission, popularly known as the Paley Commission, this is not the case. Page 87, volume I, of its report, which was issued in 1952, contained the following statement:

"The United States has not ratified the treaty, but under a resolution the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a general guide."

This clearly indicates that, even though Congress refused to give its assent to United States participation in the International Trade Organization, the Paley Commission believed we were bound to accept these concepts. I shall now read from page 90 of the Paley report:

"By resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, a review of chapter VI of the Habana Charter is called for some time in 1952. This code serves as a general guide for efforts of the free nations to stabilize materials markets."

Now let us review together the developments which took place starting in the General Assembly late in 1952 which culminated in our decision not to participate in this new Commission on International Commodity Trade.

In November of 1952 the Argentine Government presented a resolution of far-reaching significance to the seventh session of the General Assembly, which was then meeting in New York. This resolution was a new implementation of the original proposals of our State Department which had been embodied in chapter VI of the rejected Habana Charter. I shall now read the operative part of this draft resolution. It provided that the General Assembly should recommend to member states—and I quote—that—

"(a) Whenever governments adopt measures affecting the prices of primary commodities entering international trade, they should duly consider the effect of such measures on the terms of trade of countries in the process of development, in order to ensure that the prices of primary commodities remain in an adequate, just and equitable relation to the prices of capital goods and other manufactured articles so as to permit the more satisfactory formation of domestic savings in the countries in the process of development and to facilitate the establishment of just wage levels for the working population of these countries with a view to reducing the existing disparity between their standards of living and those in the highly industrialized countries;

"(b) Their governments should refrain, unless unavoidably required by national security in times of war and without prejudice to technological research and progress, from encouraging the production of any synthetic or substitute materials that unnecessarily affect the international demand for natural primary commodities;

"(c) Their governments should intensify their efforts to reduce restrictions on imports of primary commodities."

It is quite obvious, from what I have just read that the purpose of this resolution was to establish fixed, rigid international parity prices for all of the world's materials which could only be supported by heavy outlays on the part of the United States. It is also apparent that this resolution was aimed at discouraging the development of synthetic products, particularly synthetic rubber and synthetic fibers within the United States. This provision directly affects our national security. I know that none of us wish to again struggle with the problem of providing rubber from distant sources which confronted us in World War II.

Representatives from Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom opposed this resolution as too general in scope and open to dangerous interpretations. The 1952 yearbook of the United Nations summarized the objections voiced by these countries. Among them were:

"(1) That a system of international parity prices such as that implied in the draft could not be instituted unless foreign trade were controlled by the state; (2) that such a system would make the economic structure more rigid and would not be conducive to increased productivity; (3) that there were no objective criteria for determining an adequate, just, and equitable relationship between prices of primary commodities and those of capital and other manufactured goods; and (4) that it would be better to deal with the problem through individual commodity agreements as the need arose.

"They also objected to the recommendation that governments should not encourage the manufacture of synthetic or substitute materials. Such action, they held, would harm the interests of both underdeveloped and industrialized countries; it would also stand in the way of progress, from which all, in the long run, would benefit. The latter point was also made by the representatives of Cuba, Ecuador, and Peru."

After considerable debate within the General Assembly and the adoption of several amendments, the Argentine resolution was put to a vote. It was approved on November 29, 1952, with 29 countries voting in favor of it, 16 opposing it, and 9 abstaining. I am happy to say that our Government was among the 16 countries opposed to the adoption of this resolution. The amended resolution contained the following provision which was not a part of the original Argentine draft resolution:

"Recommends that governments should cooperate in establishing multilateral international arrangements relating to primary commodities for the purpose of—

"(a) Insuring the stability of the prices of the said commodities in keeping with a reasonable, fair, and equitable relationship

between these prices and those of capital goods and other manufactured articles; and

"(b) Safeguarding the continuity of the economic and social progress of all countries, those producing as well as those consuming such raw materials."

You will note that this provision again urges the member governments to establish multilateral commodity agreements.

The amended resolution further provided that the Secretary General was to appoint a group of experts to study the entire problem and make recommendations for further action to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Pursuant to this resolution, the Secretary General appointed five economists whose recommendations were transmitted to the Economic and Social Council in a report released in November of 1953. This report is entitled "Commodity Trade and Economic Development."

The report suggested the establishment of world buffer stocks and a new international currency which would be based upon the monetization of these stocks. It also proposed the negotiation of multilateral commodity agreements to cover a group of commodities rather than a single commodity. There were many other strange proposals which were totally incompatible with American free-enterprise economic concepts. The most important recommendation of the committee of experts was that a new trade Stabilization Commission be established. Now I shall read exactly what the experts proposed in this connection. They said:

"It seems to us that there is at present no effective international procedure for discussing and proposing action on the general problem of stabilization—a matter which transcends the problems of particular commodities. The present organization is directed toward piecemeal action, commodity by commodity. We do not think that this is sufficient; a general and simultaneous approach to the problem of stability in its many aspects is required. It is possible that a gap in international organization has here arisen unintentionally, through the absence of an international trade organization as envisaged in the Habana charter."

This so-called gap in international organization to which the experts refer, had not arisen unintentionally insofar as the Congress of the United States was concerned. I shall continue reading from the recommendations of the experts:

"We therefore propose that the Economic and Social Council should establish an intergovernmental commission, which we will refer to as the Trade Stabilization Commission. In order to provide permanent representation for the most important trading countries and an adequate rotation of representation for others, it would probably be necessary to have eight or nine member governments."

"The work of the Commission would involve exchanges of views between governments on possible types of action to which they may not wish to appear publicly committed; and there is a very real risk that premature knowledge of the Commission's deliberations would produce harmful effects in the commodity markets. We therefore recommend that, contrary to usual United Nations practice, the Commission should meet in closed session except when it decides otherwise. We would expect that, in addition to the formal meetings, occasions would be required for informal exchanges of view among the representatives of the member governments, meeting in private."

Our Government should not establish an international organization in which governments would make proposals to which they may not wish to appear publicly committed. I subscribe to President Woodrow Wilson's doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at. I am opposed to private meetings to "rig" commodity markets. This is essentially what the experts propose. We must all realize, in discussing these proposals that representatives of the Iron Curtain countries would be eligible to participate in this Commission.

The report of the experts and its recommendation for this new commission was placed on the agenda of the meeting of the Economic and Social Council which convened in New York in April 1954, and a resolution was introduced by the Argentine Government to establish this new commission. The comments of our representative to the Economic and Social Council, Mr. Preston Hotchkis, are most illuminating. I shall now read his statement regarding these proposals:

"The problem of marked price instability in primary commodity markets is, therefore, one with which my Government and all governments of the free world must be greatly converned. As to the desirability of reducing this instability, there can be no disagreement. The problem to be faced is how this can be safely accomplished. Devices that serve temporarily to reduce price fluctuations must be judged by their potentialities for contributing to healthy economic growth. They may retard rather than promote such growth if they interfere with long-term price trends and introduce rigidities and restraints that impair the elasticity of economic adjustment which is fundamental to economic progress.

"This is a danger which must be faced in the consideration of proposals for governmental commodity arrangements. This danger and the great practical difficulties involved in reaching accord on the details of any contemplated arrangement largely explain why so few international agreements involving consuming as well as producing countries have hitherto been reached. The experts recognize this situation and see little prospect of any substantial increase in the number of agreements. My delegation shares this view.

"The experts also believe, however, that commodity agreements, if properly drawn and operated, may be an effective means for preventing excessive price fluctuation. This they hope might be obtained if the attempt were made to cover several commodities in a single agreement instead of relying on the inevitably slow and uncertain increase in single-commodity agreements.

"I must confess, Mr. President, that I find no ground to justify this hope. The difficulties experienced in negotiations relating to a single commodity would in my judgment be greatly multiplied if we attempted to deal with many commodities at the same time. Moreover, any agreement covering many commodities would involve widespread interference with the workings of a free-world economy. It would magnify the danger of diverting production, consumption and trade patterns from the channels they would be likely to assume under a more healthy, competitive and free-enterprise system. The net result of such arrangements, even if it were practicable to conclude them, would, I firmly believe, be detrimental and not beneficial to economic development.

"The experts extend their proposals for comprehensive commodity stabilization arrangements by recommending for further study a 'commodity reserve currency scheme.' If this were an academic seminar we might, Mr. President, find some interest in discussing the complexities of this by no means novel proposal. This, however, is not an exercise in which I would care to engage in this forum. I see no likelihood whatever that my Government would be disposed to give this scheme any serious consideration in the foreseeable future. I feel sure that other delegations will share my view that the scheme is impractical. I hope therefore that the Council will not devote time and energy which might well be spent in more useful activities to detailed examination of a proposal that would seem to have no chance whatever of acceptance by governments.

"The experts recommend—and this is their most specific proposal—the establishment by the Council of a Trade Stabilization Commission. This commission would be concerned with proposals for dealing with the problem of stabilization generally. It would leave undisturbed the existing international machinery, such as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and its associated study groups, which provide mainly for action, on commodity by commodity.

"My delegation is unable to support this recommendation. The proposed commission would inevitably exercise the same general responsibilities as the old Economic and Employment Commission of the Council and might be expected to suffer from the same defects. The establishment of a commission charged with responsibility for considering broad questions of economic policy would simply invite duplication of discussion, since these are questions which the Council itself must necessarily debate."

The resolution introduced by the Argentine Government established the terms of reference for this proposed new Commission. I shall now quote from the resolution:

"The main task of the Commission shall be to examine measures designed to avoid excessive fluctuations in the prices of and the volume of trade in primary commodities, including measures aiming at the maintenance of a just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and the prices of manufactured goods in international trade. * * *"

This resolution is designed to establish a system of international parity prices which is totally incompatible with our approach to foreign economic relations.

This resolution was adopted on April 30, on a rollcall vote of the 18 nations comprising the Economic and Social Council. The United States was joined in opposing the establishment of this new Commission by Belgium, Norway, France, and the United Kingdom. The Australian delegation abstained from voting. The resolution was supported by 12 countries, the Argentine, Free China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Turkey, U. S. S. R., Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The formation of the Commissison had the support of Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia whose concepts of stabilizing commodity markets would certainly be quite different from our own. The resolution as adopted deferred the actual organization of the Commission until the 18th session of the Economic and Social Council which convened at Geneva in June of 1954. Our delegation at Geneva continued its opposition to the formation of this Commission and indicated that even if we were elected, we might not be willing to participate. In spite of United States opposition, the Council voted to proceed with the organization of the Commission with the first session scheduled for January 1955.

The United Kingdom and France voted with the United States to delay the organization of the Commission. However, following the vote in the Economic and Social Council both these countries announced that they would participate in spite of their opposition. The resolution adopted at Geneva transferred most of the functions of the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements to the new Commission on International Commodity Trade. The Interim Committee, which was only to be in existence until the Habana Charter was ratified, thus has now become a permanent United Nations organ under a new name.

The announcement of our Government in which we declined to participate at the first session of this new Commission included this statement: "The United States Government will be prepared to reexamine the question of its eventual participation after the Commission's terms of reference and its scope of activities have been defined." I am glad that this is the case as we have no desire to minimize the seriousness of the problems of price instability. Our Government is opposed to the present terms of reference which imply Government action to stabilize prices through international agreements and international parity prices. I can see many possibilities for useful work by this Commission in compiling statistics and studying market problems, thus making it possible for the free markets of the world to operate more effectively. My interpretation of the statement by our representative is that we will always be prepared to assist in such activities that do not compromise free enterprise economic principles.

The history I have related follows the progress of this concept from 1945 to 1955, a 10-year period. Our State Department deserves great credit for having successfully extricated the United States from a creature of its own creation which has untold potentialities of causing economic chaos. The New York Times of January 11, in reporting the forthcoming meeting of this new Commission made the following significant comment:

"The United States will pass up a delegate's seat, but will send an observer to the first session of the newly-established Commission on International Commodity Trade. The Commission will open its meetings here next Monday.

"Although United States opposition to the Commission is nothing new, this is the first time that Washington has given a diplomatic cold shoulder to a United Nations organ."

It has always seemed to be a paradox that those who advocate free trade and the removal of Government restrictions on our economy should, at the same time, have been fostering commodity agreements. There is probably no more restrictive device than such an agreement as it interjects Government controls throughout the production and marketing process.

During previous administrations, our State Department was apparently most sympathetic to the commodity agreement concept. I am happy to see that this is no longer so.

The Randall Commission, in both its majority and minority reports condemned such agreements as restrictive devices. Following the release of the report by the Randall Commission, our Government declined to participate in the International Tin Agreement. We have also resisted efforts to establish commodity stabilization groups within the Western Hemisphere at the Rio Conference. Let me again compliment the Secretary of State and his colleagues who have credibly performed a very difficult task in reversing this trend toward Government controls over the world's economy.

Unfortunately, all our problems are not behind us. The original State Department proposals of 1945, included measures to deal with restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels. As I have already indicated, chapter V of the Habana Charter was drafted to implement these particular proposals.

This chapter, dealing with restrictive practices by private business, was in sharp conflict with the philosophy of chapter VI which fostered Government price-fixing and cartel operations. Many apparently believe that actions taken by governments in concert with other governments or in cooperation with certain industries should escape the condemnation imposed by chapter V of the charter. In a sense chapter VI was really a modification or loophole in chapter V.

Professors Stocking and Watkins in their book Cartels or Competition define a cartel as "* * * an arrangement among, or on behalf of, producers engaged in the same line of business, with the design or effect of limiting or eliminating competition among them. * * *"

They also say "rival business enterprises may set up cartels by direct negotiation and mutual commitments, or governments may establish them by treaty."

The commodity agreements provided in chapter VI are, of course, cartels established through government negotiation and commitment. The evils of cartels were dramatically shown during the Hitler and Mussolini regimes in Germany and Italy where private cartels were taken over by these governments to strengthen their economies for war. The entire Habana Charter concept, as embodied in chapter V, was to curb private international cartels but to tolerate the government cartels provided in chapter VI. In retrospect, let me remind you of the extraordinary economic power developed by the Nazi Government through intergovernmental commodity agreements after it came to power in Germany.

Prof. Edward S. Mason, of Harvard University, was deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Economic Affairs in 1945. Presumably, he was quite familiar with the proposals issued by our State Department at that time.

He published a book under the sponsorship of the Committee for Economic Development entitled "Controlling World Trade" in June of 1946. I shall now read two paragraphs from the introduction of this book:

"This divergence between American and other experience with cartels and commodity agreements must be borne in mind in the ensuing discussion. There is a school of thought in the United States that abhors cartels as private treaties restrictive of trade but embraces commodity agreements as intergovernmental arrangements inevitably serving the public interest. Cartels may, and usually do, restrict trade but so do commodity agreements—and much more effectively. Nor is the range of interests served necessarily very different.

"The general line of policy defended in this report is that, when international controls relating to a commodity or industry are demonstrably necessary, they should be intergovernmental in character. It does not follow that intergovernmental commodity agreements should be numerous or easily justifiable on grounds of public interest. If the agreement, moreover, lies outside the field of agriculture, it is likely to involve a type of governmental relation to industry with which the United States has as yet had little experience."

Mr. Mason concluded his 265-page treatise with this statement:

"To enable the machinery to function, it will be necessary to reshape not only commercial policy but policies hitherto considered as belonging to the field of domestic regulation, and such action as is proposed can only be taken with the cooperation of other governments and with due regard for their interests."

We are now confronted with exactly the situation portrayed by Professor Mason if the report of the so-called Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices is adopted by the Economic and Social Council.

The United States delegation to Habana was opposed to restrictive business practices per se. This is consistent with all of our economic concepts. In reviewing the Habana Conference I find that there were three points of view which were compromised in the final draft of chapter V. As I have already indicated, our point of view was that cartels were bad per se. Some believed that cartels were useful devices and that action was required only to cope with flagrant abuses. The Luxembourg delegation took this position. Others took a middle ground. The United Kingdom delegation took such a point of view. There was actually very little support for the stringent action recommended by the United States.

Chapter V of the Habana Charter dealt only with restrictive business practices when, and I quote: "Such practices have harmful effects." The definition of harmful effects was to be left to the new international agency to determine. No sanctions for failure to comply with the Charter were imposed. This philosophy is also incorporated in the new United Nations proposals.

I shall now trace the steps since the rejection of the Habana Charter by the Congress of the United States which have resulted in this report of the United Nations ad hoc committee on Restrictive Business Practices presently on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council.

Our antitrust laws are of the utmost importance in promoting a free-enterprise economy. The Sherman Act was adopted in 1890 during the administration of President Harrison, a Republican President. The Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Acts were adopted during the administration of President Wilson, a Democratic President. The spirit of our antitrust laws is truly bipartisan and they have a vital role in maintaining a competitive economy in this country. I believe in them and I am in favor of strengthening these laws if such action is shown to be necessary and in a vigorous enforcement of the laws now on the statute books. I am opposed to all cartels. There are no good cartels as far as I am concerned.

Unfortunately, our antitrust laws have sometimes been used to harass legitimate business by those whose paramount interest has not been the preservation of free enterprise. I am afraid they may have been deliberately used to bring it into disrepute and to lay the groundwork for a socialist economy within the United States. Those who conceived such improper uses of the antitrust laws are, I am sure, no longer on our Government payroll.

It seems strange that almost immediately after the rejection of the Habana Charter by the 81st Congress, and the decision by the State Department not to resubmit it to the 82d Congress, the United States Government took the lead in attempting to implement chapter V through the United Nations.

In 1951, the United States delegation submitted a resolution to the Economic and Social Council asking that the question of restrictive business practices should be placed on the agenda of the 13th session of the Council. The United States draft resolution recommended the establishment of an ad hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices charged with formulating and submitting to the Council, proposals on appropriate methods to be adopted by international agreement to deal with harmful restrictive business practices.

Perhaps, the purpose of establishing this international machinery was to be able to proceed against American companies doing business abroad because of our inability to apply United States statutes in the jurisdiction of other sovereign nations. We must remember that these same companies were bound to conduct their activities so as to comply with the laws of the country in which they were operating. Since our antitrust laws are free-enterprise laws, I see no way that an international body, including Communist and Socialist states, could establish appropriate methods to deal with antitrust violations on a universal basis. It would seem to me that treaties by the United States and other countries with the same type of

economy and with similar judicial procedures might be more fruitful. The United Nations approach can only lead to chaos.

The United States proposal was debated at length during the 13th session of the Economic and Social Council held in the summer of 1951 at Geneva. The Yearbook of the United Nations for 1951, reports this debate and I am particularly interested in the comments which appear in this official document on the attitude of other countries who have no concept of our antitrust laws. I shall now quote from the United Nations Yearbook:

"The representatives of Belgium, France, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay, while agreeing as to the harmful effects of many restrictive business practices and believing that far-reaching private agreements constituted a political danger, felt nevertheless that international producers' agreements were not always to be condemned and that in certain cases they met urgent needs connected with economic progress.

"The representative of Peru stated that, in South America, public commercial enterprises were operated in the interests of the State and of the community, many of them being accompanied by measures to protect the individual's social rights. These enterprises, he said, should not be confused with private monopolies.

"The representatives of Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay also emphasized the important part played by public commercial enterprises in their national development. The Chilean and Mexican representatives stated that they would abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution. Representatives supporting the resolution believed, however, that studies and investigations were necessary to distinguish between good and bad restrictive practices.

"The representative of the International Cooperative Alliance referred to a recent survey by his organization which had revealed the widespread use and the harmful effect of restrictive business practices. He described the manner in which his organization had been fighting such practices and urged the Council to undertake an authoritative investigation in this field.

"In the view of the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the U. S. S. R., the United States proposal was designed to camouflage the real objective of United States monopolies. Figures were cited in order to show that these monopolies controlled the United States foreign trade and investments. These monopolies, those representatives said, in their struggle to gain domination of world markets, engaged in extensive restrictive business practices to remove any competition; they earned immense profits in underdeveloped countries, and were powerful enough to obtain a stranglehold on European trusts, secure markets for their excess production in Europe, and influence the political life of other countries through economic control. United States exports were being used as instruments of discriminatory policies applied against the peoples' democracies. American big business, those representatives maintained, fostered the creation of monopolies which it could dominate, but opposed the creation of those over which it had no control."

After extensive debate and the adoption of amendments the United States resolution was approved and the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices was appointed. It consisted of Belgium, Canada, France, India, Mexico, Pakistan, Sweden, the United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay.

The terms of reference of the ad hoc committee provided that, and I quote: "The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations recommend that the measures adopted in the cases and the purposes stated in the preceding paragraphs shall be based on the principles set forth in chapter V of the Habana Charter concerning restrictive business practices."

Thus, entirely at the initiative of the United States Government this ad hoc committee was established under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to implement chapter V of the rejected Habana Charter.

The United States representative on this committee was Corwin Edwards, the former chief economist of the Federal Trade Commission. The secretary of the ad hoc committee itself was Sigmund Timberg, formerly with the Antitrust Division in the United States Department of Justice. The committee assembled in January of 1952 and presented its report in March of 1953. During this period, the committee held 77 meetings, a great majority of which were closed to the public. The report of the committee was filed with the United Nations Secretary-General in March of 1953.

It was considered briefly at two sessions of the Economic and Social Council who requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to refer this report and the analysis by the Secretariat to the member states and to specialized agencies for examination and comment. The Council also decided that consideration of the report would be resumed not later than at its 19th session which will convene at United Nations headquarters in New York at the end of March of this year.

It is important that the people of the United States be familiar with this report and the pitfalls into which we can be led should it be adopted. An article by Samuel K. C. Kopper which appeared in the Virginia Law Review of December 1954 gives a complete analysis of this report. This article is a revision and expansion of a paper originally presented by Mr. Kopper to the Fourth International Congress of Comparative Law at the Faculte de Droit, University of Paris, on August 6, 1954.

Mr. Kopper has an unusual background which uniquely qualifies him to review the report of this Committee. After graduating from Princeton University in 1937, he obtained his law degree at the University of Virginia in 1940. Subsequently, he studied at the Academie de Droit, Internationel de la Haye. From 1946 to 1949 he was an adviser to the United States delegations to the United Nations Security Council and to its General Assembly. He was a special consultant to the Assistant Secretary of State during 1952–53. He has also been the officer in charge of North African Affairs, the Deputy and Acting Director of the Office of Near East Affairs, and is presently counsel for the Arabian-American Oil Co. in New York City. He is also the chairman of the Near East Committee, Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association.

I shall now read the relevant sections of Mr. Kopper's article.

"EXCERPTS FROM THE INTERNATIONAL REGULATION OF CARTELS—CURRENT PROPOSALS

"(By Samuel K. C. Kopper)

"A. The draft articles

"The report of the ad hoc committee contained draft articles of agreement,[1] which were based largely on chapter V of the Habana Charter. The draft articles of agreement call for the establishment of a United Nations organization composed of all United Nations members, the basic objective of which is to coordinate national and international action to prevent and eliminate restrictive business practices whenever such practices have harmful effects on the expansion of production or trade.[2] It is provided that there will be a 'representative body' composed of all members of the United Nations, and an 'executive board' which is to carry out the functions and duties of the representative body and exercise its powers. Membership on the executive board will be determined by the extent to which a nation participates in international trade, and by a geographical balance.

"The draft articles of agreement contain a preamble, 20 articles, and an appendix which describes the share in world trade of individual countries. The preamble states that national and international action is required to attain: (1) A reduction of governmental and private trade barriers and the promotion on equitable terms of access to markets, products, and productive facilities; (2) encouragement of industrial and agricultural development, particularly in underdeveloped areas; (3) balance and expansion of the world economy through greater and more efficient production, increased income and greater consumption, and the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international trade; and (4) the promotion of mutual understanding and cooperation to solve problems arising in all aspects of international trade. The preamble concludes with a recognition that national and international action in the field of restrictive business practices can contribute substantially to the attainment of such overall objectives.

"Article 1 sets forth the general policy toward restrictive business practices. Each member of the Organization shall take measures and cooperate with other members to prevent restrictive business practices that have harmful effects on the expansion of production or trade. The Organization is empowered to determine whether a particular practice is restrictive and has harmful effects whenever: (1) It receives a complaint; (2) the practice is engaged in or made effective by one or more private or public commercial enterprises; and (3) such enterprises possess effective trade control among a number of countries in one or more products.

"Restrictive business practices are defined as (1) Fixing of prices, or of terms or conditions to be observed in the purchase, sale, or lease of any product; (2) exclusion of enterprises from, or allocation or division of, any territorial market or field of business activity, or allocation of customers, or fixing of sale or purchase quotas; (3) discrimination against particular enterprises; (4) production limitations or quotas; (5) prevention of development or application of technology or invention, whether patented or not, or withholding of same with the result of monopolizing an industrial or commercial field; (6) illegal extension of rights under patents, trade-marks, or copyrights; and (7) 'any similar practices which the Organization may declare, by a majority of two-thirds of the members present and voting, to be restrictive business practices.

[1] Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices E/2380, E/AC.37/3 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 16th sess., Supp. 11) 12 et seq. (March 30, 1953).

[2] The ad hoc committee was not specifically instructed to prepare the draft articles. It appears clear, however, that the Committee considered this the most satisfactory way to implement ECOSOC's recommendation. The Secretary-General of the United Nations had been instructed to obtain information on the type of organization which could implement the Committee proposals. See note 26, supra.

However, he explained in a note to ECOSOC that this could not be done by July 1953, because one of the most important of the intergovernmental bodies, the Contracting Parties to GATT, had had no regular meeting. Note by the Secretary-General concerning the report requested under Council resolution 375 (XIII) E/2443 (1953).

"The breadth of this article can be fully appreciated only by a careful study of its precise language. It clearly appears at a glance, however, that the article is not only broad but vague. Furthermore, it is questionable whether the criteria set forth are adequate for an international organization to determine whether specific practices are restrictive or not. Perhaps the most fundamental question raised by this article is whether its basic philosophy is generally accepted in the family of nations. It presumably represents the philosophy of the United States, but in the United States there is no clear agreement as to just what this philosophy really is.

"The confusion about the application of American antitrust laws in foreign commerce could hardly be greater.[3] Not only is there confusion about the application of these laws but there is also little agreement about the meaning of some of the terms used in article 1. The Attorney General of the United States has established a committee to reexamine our antitrust laws.[4] Particular attention is to be paid to their extraterritorial application. Pending the completion of this study, it is doubtful whether other nations will be eager to accept the terminology and philosophy of this article. Certainly an international organization composed of nations having widely differing concepts of law would have an exceedingly difficult time implementing or interpreting it.

"Article 2 provides that any member may consult directly, or ask the Organization to arrange a consultation, with other members in any instance in which the member thinks it has been affected within the meaning of article 1. If the Organization considers action justified, it will arrange for and assist in such consultation. This article gives the Organization very broad authority without any checks. It could open the door to frivolous cases which might very well be considered by the Organization for political reasons.

"Article 3 concerns investigative procedure. It provides for the presentation of written complaints to the Organization which must contain minimal information (prescribed by the Organization) as to the nature of the practice complained of. The Organization determines whether the complaint is justified. If, however, the Organization is satisfied that the practice in question was specifically required by governmental measures in existence prior to the complaint, no further investigation shall be undertaken, provided that any practice found to exist in more than one country may be further investigated in the Organization's discretion, if such practice is not specifically required in all countries in which it is found to exist.

"Reasonable opportunities for being heard shall be afforded the complainant and the commercial enterprise alleged to have engaged in the practice complained of. All members are to be informed of the complaint. Any member can be asked for information on the complaint. The Organization shall decide whether there has been a violation, and shall inform all members of its decision and reasons therefor. If there is a violation, the Organization has the power to request the members concerned to take remedial action in accordance 'with their respective laws and procedures.' The remainder of the article deals with reports which the Organization shall make on the matter.

"This article clearly indicates that there is discrimination in favor of public enterprises and against private enterprises. The ad hoc committee frankly admitted that 'special difficulties arose, however, in connection with restrictive business practices which were sanctioned by governmental statutes or regulations.'[5]

"This is a fundamental defect in the whole plan. A further defect which appears in this article is the provision that members will be requested[6] to take remedial measures in accordance with their respective laws and procedures. Nations like the United States, which has rigid and enforced laws, will be placed at an obvious disadvantage vis-a-vis countries with less rigid and frequently unenforced laws. If this disadvantage were temporary it might be tolerated. It is perfectly clear, however, that it might last for years, or decades, and hence would be unacceptable. It is obvious that laws and procedures vary widely in the various countries of the United Nations.[7] When, if ever, they will come to resemble those of the United States is uncertain.

"A final observation about article 3 should be made. The investigation, trial, and adjudication of cases involving restrictive business practices are extremely intricate and complicated tasks. The patient and painstaking efforts of trained people are always required to bring about a fair and just settlement of such cases. The proposed United Nations plan does not spell out how these difficult tasks will be performed. Will there be an investigatory staff, or is the advisory staff provided for in articles 13 and 15 to conduct investigations? What information will be used? Can judicial proceedings and committee investigations in this country be used? What power and authority will an investigatory staff have? Or if the investigations are left entirely to the individual member nations, what assurance can there be that investigative procedures will be reasonably similar? The answer to the last question clearly semes to be that there can be no assurance because of the wide differences in approach to this whole subject among the member nations of the United Nations. It should be noted in conclusion that it would be possible under article 3 for the Organization to publish reports on charges even though the latter had been proved false.

"Article 4 authorizes the Organization to make studies of all aspects of restrictive business practices. It may request members to supply information in connection with these studies. Thus, the burden may fall on nations with a great deal of commerce to receive recommendations from countries whose basic motives are political.

"Article 5 provides that each member shall take all possible measures to insure that within its jurisdiction private and public commercial enterprises do not engage in restrictive practices as previously defined. Members are to comply promptly with requests from the Organization for information regarding complaints. They are to take action in accordance with their constitutions or systems of law and economic organization. Nothing in the agreement shall be construed, however, as requiring a member to give information contrary to its essential security interests.

"The obligations imposed on the members contain no safeguards against frivolous complaints. The criteria upon which the Organization will base its decision as to whether a complaint is justified are unclear. The burden may frequently be on the defending country to prove that it is innocent under its own laws. Furthermore, the paragraph requiring members to take action under the constitution or system of law and economic organization is meaningless in view of the wide diversity of such systems. There is no equitable basis for international conduct or action.

"In article 8 it is recognized that certain services, e. g., transportation and telecommunications, are substantial elements of international trade, and that any restrictive business practices by them may have harmful effects. If any member thinks that such harmful restrictive business practices exist, it may submit a written statement on the situation to those whose private or public enterprises are involved, and sympathetic consideration shall be given to effecting a satisfactory adjustment. If no adjustment is made and the matter is referred to the Organization, it shall be transferred to the intergovernmental body concerned if one exists. If there is no such body, the Organization may make recommendations.

"Article 9 contains four paragraphs which empower the Organization to bring to the attention of members measures taken by other members or intergovernmental bodies or agencies regarding business practices; to make arrangements with other intergovernmental bodies or agencies which will provide for effective cooperation with respect to restrictive business practices; and to make suitable arrangements for consultation and cooperation with nongovernmental organizations.

"If it is anticipated that the Organization will do these things, as well as all of the other things provided for in preceding articles, on a worldwide basis, it will have to maintain an astonishingly large staff of highly trained personnel.

"Article 10 provides that the representative body is to consist of all members of the agency. Each is to have one vote. Decisions are to be made by the majority of the members unless otherwise provided in the agreement. The representative body is to meet regularly and can be convoked by the executive board or by one-third of the members of the representative body. It is to establish its own rules of procedure, and final authority to determine the poliices of the agency shall be vested in it.

"This article underscores what has been pointed out in comments on previous articles—the policies with regard to restrictive business practices might very well be determined by a group of nations having only a small percentage of world commerce, and whose motivations might stem from political, ideological, or other reasons to the detriment of more highly commercial nations. The proposed program is, to say the least, a novel one. The procedure for adjudication is nonjudicial, and might easily become political or partisan. Yet various articles of the proposal refer to what the Organization may decide, or to decisions of the Organization.[8] Are these decisions to take on the aura of judicial decisions? With no appli-

[3] See Searls, Trade or Commerce Among the Several States or With Foreign Nations, proceedings at annual meeting, section of antitrust law, American Bar Association 58 (Aug. 26, 27, 1953). See also Hale and Hale, Monopoly Abroad: The Antitrust Laws and Commerce in Foreign Areas, 31 Texas L. Rev. 493 (1953); see note, Foreign Subsidiaries in Antitrust Law, 4 Stan. L. Rev. 559 (1952).

[4] See 21 U. S. L. Week 2651 (June 30, 1953).

[5] Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices E/2380, E/AC.37/3 (U. N. Economic Social Council Official Records, 16th sess., Supp. 11) 4, par. 22 (March 30, 1953).

[6] The Organization's power is limited to "requesting" members to take remedial action and "recommending" possible remedial measures.

[7] This conclusion is based on the findings in Analysis of Governmental Measures Relating to Restrictive Business Practices E/2379 and E/2379/Add.1, E/AC.37/2 and E/AC.37/2/-Add. 1 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 16th sess., Supp. 11A), (April 29, 1953), and Foreign Legislation Concerning Monopoly and Cartel Practices (report of Department of State to Subcommittee on Monopoly, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, subcommittee print No. 5, 82d Cong., 2 sess.) (1952).

[8] E. g., art 2, pars. 3, 5, 8; art. 5, par. 4.

cable law and no agreement about basic principles, confusion unbounded might easily reign.

"Article 11 concerns the executive board. The executive board is to carry on the functions of the representative body. Its size and composition are to be determined by the body. The selection of members is to be made with due regard to 'the objectives of including members from the different types of economies and degrees of economic development to be found among members of the agency, from the broad geographical areas to which the members belong, and from countries of chief economic importance, for which last criterion particular regard shall be paid to members' shares in international trade.'

"On the basis of previous experience in the United Nations, one could anticipate a Board composed roughly of 25 percent from Latin America, 25 percent from Europe, 25 percent from Asia, and the remainder from the United States, the Iron Curtain countries (if they should join the Organization), and the British Commonwealth. In the absence of a clearer definition of the powers and limitations of the Organization, the countries having rigid laws on restrictive business practices would be placed in a disadvantageous position in dealing with nations having looser or unenforced laws.

"Article 13 provides that the chief advisory officer of the agency, who is appointed by the representative body, shall be the director of the advisory staff. He is to select the staff. The advisory staff shall exercise its functions with complete independence in the general interest of all members, and shall neither solicit nor accept instructions from any government. Article 15 assigns to the advisory staff almost entire responsibility for evaluating the substance of each complaint. The staff is to arrange for the analysis of the information, and to prepare the report. It can call for additional information, and do whatever is necessary to obtain information to prepare the report of the representative body.

"Articles 13 and 15 make it obvious that the position of the director of the advisory staff is important. Likewise, the staff will have considerable latitude in light of its "complete independence." The director has a substantial amount of power. His position should not be underestimated. He is in effect both prosecutor and judge. This, coupled with the fact that there are no rules of law to guide him or within which he should operate, produces a unsatisfactory and unacceptable system.

"Article 16 provides that the representative body 'shall take full account of reports of the advisory staff.' This emphasizes the importance of the work of the advisory staff.

"Articles 17, 18, 19, and 20 make provisions for the content of reports; entry into force of the agreement; and amendment, withdrawal, termination, interpretation, and definition of the agreement. The agreement is to come into force on the 60th day after—

"'(a) The number of governments which have deposited instruments of acceptance shall reach 20 or more and shall cover 65 percent or more of the total value of world imports and exports, as set forth in appendix A; [or]

"'(b) The number of governments which have deposited instruments of acceptance shall have reached 20 or more and shall cover 65 percent or more of the total value of world imports and exports as set forth in appendix A, and shall include six countries which individually have 3 percent or more of such total value.'

"Amendment of the agreement can be effected by a two-thirds majority of the members of the Organization. Any member may withdraw at any time. Withdrawal is to become effective 6 months after receipt of the written notice by the executive secretary. The agreement can be terminated by a three-fourths vote of the members.

"The provisions for the coming into force of the agreement are sound. They do prevent it from becoming effective without the concurrence of most of the important commercial countries.

"The appendix of the agreement points up the fact that only seven countries in the world have trade over 3 percent of the world total. These are:

	Percent
"(1) United Kingdom and dependencies	17.57
"(2) United States and dependencies	17.22
"(3) France and dependencies	8.04
"(4) Canada	5.15
"(5) Germany (Federal Republic)	4.47
"(6) Netherlands and dependencies	3.91
"(7) Belgium-Luxembourg and dependencies	3.77

"The total of these 7 countries is 60.13 percent. There are 57 countries each with trade under 3 percent of the world total.

"B. International Reaction to the Draft Articles

"In light of the foregoing objections to the ad hoc committee's report, it seems remarkable that none of the delegations or the nongovernmental organizations pointed out the defects of the plan.[9] Furthermore there has been no indication yet that these difficulties will be taken into account. One is forced to conclude that the fear of being branded a 'procartelist' has muted the voices of organizations and individuals. This is a regrettable situation, since we are not concerned with the merits or demerits of cartels and restrictive business practices, but only with the wisdom and validity of plans to handle them.

"The Belgian representative to ECOSOC did observe that cartels were not necessarily evils in themselves. Their evil springs from the general economic situation that calls them into being. Turkey questioned whether there was any point in the Council's discussing only one part of the ITO Charter. The French representative felt that the proposals might well be expanded so that there would be a comprehensive coverage of all restrictive practices. The United States and the United Kingdom were noncommittal.[10]

"The other members of ECOSOC and the nongovernmental representatives seemed for the most part to be favorably disposed toward the committee's report. The Soviet Union, which is the largest and most ominous cartel in history, abstained after making some snide remarks about the same American industry which had contributed so much to Russian success against nazism. The Russian representative and Mr. Boson, the representative of the International Cooperative Alliance, referred to the antitrust suit of 1952 against a number of American oil companies. Boson hardly paid a tribute to the American system of law when he stated:

"'In the United States of America, the grand jury investigating the international petroleum cartel had failed to establish a prima facie case. There was no doubt that an investigation by an international body would have been more successful.'[11]

"This conclusion is as unjustified as it is revealing of exactly what the International Cooperative Alliance really wants.

"C. General Considerations

"Aside from the specific objections to the ad hoc committee plan outlined in earlier paragraphs, there are a number of general observations which ought to be taken into account:

"(1) Chapter V of the Habana Chapter, upon which the ad hoc committee plan is based, was only one part of an overall proposal to deal with barriers to the free flow of trade. To attempt to implement only a part of the plan would be a mistake;

"(2) The committee's plan does not rest on a sound basis of agreement as to what is or is not an objectionable business practice;

"(3) The language employed in the plan is not sufficiently precise, but is vague and ambiguous;

"(4) The plan purports to deal with matters normally handled by the courts in the various countries covered by it, yet there are no provisions which would insure the use of judicial processes by the Organization. On the contrary, it would appear that there is no guaranty of due process of law, and that enforcement would be obtained by indictment;

"(5) Members of the Organization would be such on different bases inasmuch as the laws of the participating nations all differ in some respects;

"(6) There is no reference to the important question of the right of each sovereign nation to handle restrictive business practices in its own territory in accordance with its own laws and ideologies.[12] The committee recognized the difficulty, but stated that 'the issue [of overlapping jurisdictions and conflicts of laws] has, however, far-reaching implications which raise serious difficulties of substance; moreover, the question arose whether the matter came properly within the committee's competence. For these reasons, and having regard to the limited time available to the committee, most members felt it would not be profitable to pursue the matter.[13]

"III. Domestic laws and conditions in the nations concerned

"Any consideration of proposals for the international regulation of cartels must take into account national legislation on the subject. With world trade and business activity expanding, the private-law aspects of international industrial combinations become of increasing interest to the student of conflict of laws. The ad hoc committee made an analysis of the constitutional provisions and laws of a number of countries on the subject

---

[9] The International Chamber of Commerce has subsequently indicated its opposition to the plan. Resolution adopted by council of International Chamber of Commerce, Doc. 225/23, Rome, Italy, April 13, 1954. Likewise, the National Association of Manufacturers has indicated its lack of agreement. See Restrictive Business Practices. Comments * * * E/2612 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Document) (May 28, 1954). But there has not been any analytical survey of the implications of the plan.

[10] The summary of attitudes is taken from Official Records (U. N. Econ. & Social Council, 16th Sess.) 742d meeting E/SR.742, p. 239 et seq. (July 30, 1953), 744th meeting E/SR.744, p. 257 et seq. (July 31, 1953).

[11] Id. at 244. The views of other nongovernmental organizations like the ICFTU seemed to spring from a genuine apprehension of restrictive business arrangements. Unfortunately, they do not seem to have recognized the dangers of an unworkable plan. Possibly time will permit a more thorough examination of the proposals.

[12] See Haight, International Law and Extraterritorial Application of the Antitrust Laws, 63 Yale L. J. 639 (1954); Whitney, Sources of Conflict Between International Law and the Antitrust Laws, 63 Yale L. J. 655 (1954). The conflict of laws could not be more clearly illustrated than in the recent cases of *United States* v. *Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.* (105 F. Supp. 215 (S. D. N. Y. 1952)), and *British Nylon Spinners, Ltd.* v. *Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.* ((1953) 1 Ch. 19).

[13] Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices E/2380, E/AC.-37/3 (U. N. Econ. & Social Council Official Records, 16th Sess., Supp. 11) 6, ¶ 36 (March 30, 1953).

of restrictive business practices. The conclusions of the committee are of interest.

" 'The documents have confirmed in the minds of the committee three broad propositions which underlie Resolution 375. These are:

" '1. That opinions differ from country to country about restrictive business practices and about governmental policies towards them;

" '2. That restrictive business practices affecting international trade may in some circumstances have harmful effects on the fulfilment of widely acceptable objectives of international economic policy;

" '3. That it may be difficult in such cases for appropriate action to be undertaken solely by governments acting individually.' [14]

"Paragraph 1 of the preceding quotation is, if anything, an understatement of the present situation. In a number of European countries cartels have been quite acceptable to governments.[15] In the United States, Congress passed the Webb-Pomerene Act,[16] authorizing exporters to combine to form export corporations so they could match their foreign competitors. The question has been raised whether the European Coal and Steel Community might end in a superinternational cartel. Whether it does or not, the plan proposed to the United Nations simply does not cover arrangements like these.

"The ad hoc committee plan takes no appreciable account of the problems which confront private enterprise seeking to do business abroad under laws which are all too frequently different from those at home. The risks involved in such ventures are often enormous. At the present time, the petroleum industry is in the forefront of American investors abroad. The industry is concerned about the implications of the extension of American antitrust laws to operations being conducted within the sovereign territory of another State.[17] There must be a clarification of the national laws before any international action based on national law can be undertaken.

"In the United States there is a confusing lack of clarity as to where the Attorney General's jurisdiction should logically end, and where that of the Secretary of State should begin. While it is very true that the Sherman and Clayton Acts have been strong links in the chain of the free enterprise system,[18] efforts to extend their application extraterritorially to foreign operations of American concerns may in certain instances work a positive disservice to national security interests of the United States. In nations unaccustomed to American antitrust law, reactions to antitrust proceedings against American companies frequently range from surprise and incredulity to suspicion and hostility—particularly where criminal proceedings are instituted.

"Space does not permit a detailed analysis of all governmental measures which have been taken relating to restrictive business practices. The recent reports of the United Nations ad hoc committee and of the United States Department of State to a Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly [19] contain a review of constitutional provisions and legislation in a number of countries. There are certain significant deductions which can be drawn from these reports when a comparison of the various laws is made.

"We have noted that the ad hoc committee found that opinions differ from country to country about restrictive business practices.[20] The Department of State report comes to the same conclusion:

" 'As might be expected, the type of statutes as well as the degree of effectiveness of their provisions and of their administration has varied greatly from country to country. These factors are a function of a number of complex considerations, such as the type of government in the particular country at the period in which legislation was adopted; its economic, social, and political aims; and the fundamental philosophy of the government and the people of a country toward the part the business community should play in the economic and political structure of the country. It is accordingly difficult to reach any generalizations as to the trend of development in the group of countries as a whole.' [21]

"Comments from the State Department report on selected countries are also of interest:

" 'The Austrian economy is characterized by an absence of free competition, caused in large part by the concentration of economic power. This concentration results from such factors as (a) the dominant influence of a few firms in the principal areas of private industry; (b) the dominant position of the larger banks; (c) a complex network of interlocking directorates by means of which a few leading groups control a large part of the private industrial economy; and (d) the nationalization of a major sector of industry.[22]

" 'Industrial federations form the principal basis of the strong ties that exist among individual Belgian firms. * * *

" 'Existing Belgian legislation is favorable to the formation of cartels and imposes but few limits on their operation.[23]

" 'There are in France few large industrial firms in a monopoly or nonmonopoly position. There has, however, been a trend to the uniting of business firms in cooperative agreements or associations. The comptoir system of doing business often involves restrictions on the right of the individual firm to take independent action as to prices, quantity and type of production, and areas of sale.

" 'At the present time, there is no legislation in existence in France directly relating to restrictive business practices which can be effectively employed to control or eliminate such practices.[24]

" 'Germany's industrial development has been characterized by a high degree of economic concentration during the entire period of the existence of the country as a modern industrial state.

" 'In general, the economic structure of Germany has been characterized by industrial combinations based on financial and legal interrelationships such as trusts and combines, and by cartels.[25]

" 'The political and business climate in Western Germany is generally unfavorable to a program for the elimination of restrictive business practices.[26]

" 'Swiss industry is highly organized into trade associations which regulate the terms of sale and prices in practically all sectors of the economy.[27]

" 'There are no laws in Denmark which actually prohibit business enterprises from organizing cartels or engaging in other arrangements designed to restrain competition.' [28]

"The selected comments quoted above clearly indicate the wide variety of ideas and concepts on how to deal with restrictive business practices. It should be noted that both the Department of State Report and the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee's Report discuss only a relatively small number of countries. Important though these countries may be, there is still a large group of countries which have virtually no interest in the whole subject.[29]

"Conclusion

"It is true that there has been much interest manifested in some countries, particularly in Western Europe, about the problem of restrictive business practices. However, it would seem abundantly clear that even the proponents of United Nations action in the field recognize the great variations in national approaches to the problem.[30] Furthermore, while constitutional and statutory provisions may exist in many countries, whether they are really enforced is quite another matter.[31]

---

[14] Analysis of Governmental Measures Relating to Restrictive Business Practices E/2379 and E/2379/Add.1, E/AC.37/2 and E/AC.37/2/Add.1 (U. N. Econ. & Social Council Official Records, 16th Sess., Supp. 11A) 1 (April 29, 1953).

[15] Examples: Cement Entente of 1935 in Belgium; Zinc Rollers Entente of 1933; syndicate of Belgian Manufacturers of Machine Tools. In Austria virtually all industry is organized through trade associations. See note 49 infra.

[16] 40 Stat. 516 (1918), 15 U. S. C. §§ 61–65 (1952). 49 Stat. 1526 (1936), 15 U. S. C. § 13 et seq. (1952) (Robinson-Patman Price Discrimination Act) further complicates American antitrust law.

[17] Joint Oil Producing Ventures in the Middle East—Their Status under United States Antitrust Laws (Submittal by Standard Oil Co. of N. J. to Att'y. Gen.'s Nat'l. Comm. To Study the Antitrust Laws) (Dec. 13, 1953). See also the defendants' answers in *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of N. J.* (Civil No. 86–27, S. D. N. Y.); defendants' answers filed Sept. 1, 1953; amended answer filed by Texas Co., Sept. 21, 1953.

[18] The importance of the antitrust laws to United States foreign trade was clearly stated by the Honorable Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in an address before the Washington Board of Trade, entitled "World Trade and the Antitrust Laws" (Sept. 27, 1954).

[19] See notes 10, 25 supra.

[20] See note 40 supra.

[21] Foreign Legislation Concerning Monopoly and Cartel Practices (report of Department of State to Subcommittee on Monopoly, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee Print No. 5, 82d Cong., 2d sess.), 1 (1952).

[22] Id. at 6.

[23] Id. at 15.

[24] Id. at 20. A bill for the surveillance of economic agreements to ensure freedom of production and trade was submitted to the Assemblee Nationale at the second term, 1953, No. 5704. See texts of National Legislation and Other Governmental Measures Relating to Restrictive Business Practices E/2379/Add. 2. E/AC.37/2/Add. 2 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 16th sess., supp. 11B) 76 n.9 (March 13, 1953).

[25] Id. at 31.

[26] Id. at 43. Despite the stringent allied decartelization program, there are numerous signs that German industry much prefers to do business by the old methods.

[27] Id. at 58.

[28] Id. at 62.

[29] Recent comments from member nations, specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations, and nongovernmental organizations regrettably reflect little additional analysis of the problem, particularly as it involves the efficacy of the ad hoc committee's proposals. Restrictive Business Practices. Comments * * * E/2612 (U. N. Economic and Social Council document) (May 28, 1954).

[30] This is the writer's conclusion with respect to such informative articles as Timberg, Restrictive Business Practices, 2 Am. J. Comp. L. 445 (1953). Mr. Timberg was secretary of the ad hoc committee on restrictive business practices.

[31] Id. at 465:

While the constitutional texts and statutory provisions of many other countries show on their face a similar hostility against monopolies, these have no history of practical enforcement.

"This brings us to the conclusion that no matter how strongly one may feel about restrictive business agreements, action in the international sphere which is predicated on national law is questionable policy. There can be little doubt that the ad hoc committee was confronted with a most difficult task.[32] Valiant though its efforts were, the great differences of opinion were an exceedingly difficult problem to overcome.

"It can only be concluded, therefore, that the answer to the question raised by Prof. Corwin Edwards as to whether the United Nations proposals 'afford a useful basis for a beginning of multilateral action'[33] is that they regrettably do not appear to be satisfactory in their present form. Whether any plan can be developed in the absence of uniformity in national laws is extremely doubtful. In the meantime, based on his experience attending United Nations sessions in official and semiofficial capacities, the writer believes that it would be a positive disservice to the United Nations organization to attempt to give it a somewhat nebulous responsibility based on an ambiguous plan to attain a hazy objective in the field of restrictive business practices. On the other hand, a heavy responsibility rests on governments and business to see that business practices are not harmful or disruptive of the free flow of international trade, and to make any constructive suggestions toward this end which the United Nations and its members might consider."

The principal conclusion I derive from what I have just read is that it is impossible for an administrative body established within the United Nations to act as a court and determine violations of restrictive business practices. The laws of the sovereign nations differ so widely concerning this subject that it is impossible to frame an agreement predicated on national law which would be meaningful. Without a uniformity in national laws which, in turn, presuppoes some common agreement on the type of economy under which the different countries shall operate, it is impossible to conceive of any useful purpose resulting from the implementation of chapter V through a new United Nations organ.

The resolution establishing this ad hoc committee, which was adopted in September of 1951, also provided—and I am quoting from the resolution:

"Determines further that the committee shall:

"(a) Obtain information from governments, specialized agencies and other sources, on restrictive business practices, whether based on cartel agreements or not, that affect international trade and international economic cooperation generally, and on legislation adopted and measures taken by individual member States in connection with restrictive business practices and with the object of restoring the freedom of competition; and

"(b) Present to the council analyses of this information together with the proposals mentioned in paragraph 4. * * *"

Pursuant to this resolution, two United Nations documents were issued, known as supplements 11A and 11B to the official records of the 16th session of the Economic and Social Council. These documents analyze governmental measures relating to restrictive business practices. While these documents clearly show that there is no uniformity in the approach to restrictive business practices by the nations of the world, they also raise another problem which has disturbed me. They review our antitrust laws and refer to criminal proceedings which are meaningful to those familiar with American jurisprudence, but place American free enterprise in an unfavorable light in a forum such as the United Nations with its Iron Curtain members who do not adhere to our judicial concepts.

Our Government has just recently furnished another report to the United Nations pursuant to this resolution. This report assumes a complete understanding of the philosophy underlying our antitrust laws by the reader of a United Nations document. Unfortunately, few foreign readers possess such understanding. It proceeds to describe various antitrust cases which have been initiated in the United States and cites the complaints in detail. Many of these cases have not been brought to trial, and I am sure that those who wish to impugn the motives and philosophy of American business enterprise will have a field day with this document. I wish to read just one page from this report, which clearly shows the unfavorable light in which American enterprise is placed. I shall now read from page 3 of the document:

"3. ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

"During the course of the period since January 1, 1953, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice had brought through July 1954, a total of 55 new cases, of which 29 have been criminal proceedings, and the remaining 26, civil cases. These cases cover a broad variety of industries as well as of types of restraints. A majority of them have been directed at traditional violations of the antitrust statutes such as price-fixing, allocation of customers or territories, and boycotts. As an example, a criminal case and a separate civil action were filed against four pencil manufacturers charging a price-fixing conspiracy, including collusive bidding on Government contracts.[34] In another instance, four distributors of toilet goods, perfumes, and cosmetics were charged, in a separate action filed against each company, with attempting to restrain trade, through misuse of the United States trademark laws, by preventing goods produced by their foreign affiliates from being imported and sold in this country through competitors.[35]

"Several important cases having international as well as domestic significance have been brought against monopoly or monopolistic practices of dominant companies in their respective fields. One of these, filed on October 9, 1953, charges the American Smelting & Refining Co. and St. Joseph Lead Co., with a conspiracy to monopolize and restrain trade in primary lead.[36] The case charges the companies with collaborating to preempt supply sources of raw material, to limit the marketing opportunities of competitors and to restrict overall domestic production of lead ore. On April 21, 1953, a complaint was filed against five leading United States oil companies charging unlawful agreement to secure and exercise control over foreign production and supplies of petroleum and its products, to regulate imports into the United States in order to maintain an agreed level of domestic world prices, and to divide foreign producing and marketing territories.[37] The complaint charged further that some thirty jointly owned companies were created to give effect to these arrangements."

You will note the reference to a price-fixing conspiracy, collusion, and the statement that a criminal case was instituted. I am sure that the representatives from the Soviet Union will be happy to have this official report of our Government to use for propaganda purposes.

This report also recites actions recently instituted under the 1950 amendments of section 7 of the Clayton Act. This statement is meaningful to those of us who are familiar with this legislation, but in the form in which the report is presented, it has no meaning whatsoever to other countries who will receive it through the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Our present able delegation to the Council has sufficient difficulty in presenting the merits of the American free-enterprise system without having to be confronted with a report placing American business enterprise in a most unfavorable light in such a forum.

On October 21, 1953, I testified before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada was the chairman, and reviewed the steps which led to the convening of the conference at Habana. After outlining the State Department's 1945 proposals, I said that they represented a bold move in the direction of world government and threatened the measures of security in which I have been particularly interested throughout my entire adult lifetime.

The report of this ad hoc committee on Restrictive Business Practices, which will be before the Economic and Social Council this spring, included this statement which confirms the fears I expressed at that time:

"Governments have long since come realistically to accept the concept that different types of trade barriers must be dealt with at a different pace and through different organizational arrangements. For example, the International Monetary Fund, which is charged with the problem of dealing with exchange restrictions, was established several years before any organization had been set up to deal with the problem of import restrictions, the close companion of exchange restrictions; and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs was established without any parallel organization with respect to restrictive business practices. Both the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement, in turn, were created at a time when no formal arrangements had been developed for continuous consideration of commodity agreements and commodity allocations, problems which are intimately related to trade-barrier problems. In each of these fields, notwithstanding their interrelationships, machinery for international action was developed at its own pace and in its own form. The problems of liaison and consistency of pace have proved far less difficult in actuality than in the abstract. A common core of membership in these groups, supplemented by the enterprise of the secretariats, by arrangements similar to those provided in article 9 of the draft agreement, and by a few formal ties, have created a reasonably workable system."

I am confident that the steps which have already been taken by the Eisenhower administration to repudiate chapter VI of the Habana Charter through our nonparticipation in the Trade Stabilization Commission will be repeated at the forthcoming session of the Economic and Social Council when,

---

[32] Having participated in a number of international conferences, the writer is deeply aware of the painstaking effort and negotiation necessary to achieve workable agreements.

[33] Edwards, Regulation of Monopolistic Cartelization, 14 Ohio St. L. J. 252, 278 (1953).

[34] *U. S.* v. *American Lead Pencil Co., et al.* (Civ. 73–54), civil complaint and final judgment, 2 copies enclosed; criminal action, copy enclosed.

[35] *U. S.* v. *Parfums Corday, Inc.* (civ. 93–268), complaint, copy enclosed. *Lanvin Parfums, Inc.* (civ. 93–269), complaint, copy enclosed. *Guerlain, Inc.* (civ. 93–267), complaint, copy enclosed. *Empro Corp.* (civ. 93–270), complaint, final judgment, copy enclosed.

[36] *U. S.* v. *American Smelting and Refining Co. and St. Joseph Lead Co.* (civ. 88–249), complaint, 2 copies enclosed.

[37] *U. S.* v. *Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) et al.* (civ. 88–27) complaint, copy enclosed

I sincerely hope, we will withdraw from any further participation in this group designed to implement chapter V of the rejected Habana Charter.

Aircraft Carrier Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to set forth in the RECORD a most significant and enlightening article by James H. Smith, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Air), which appeared in the February 1955 issue of United States Naval Institute Proceedings:

MOBILE SEA BASE SYSTEMS IN NUCLEAR WARFARE

It is increasingly evident that nuclear warfare is refocusing attention upon the need for a military force based on the high seas. Rather than diminishing the future value and need of a Navy, the advent of the atom, like that of the airplane, has reemphasized the importance of seapower.

In modern warfare the offense has taken a commanding lead over the defense. This lead is a product of the nuclear weapon and its sharply increased lethal radius. Even so, a reasonable defense against nuclear explosives might be devised, were it not for the tremendous increase in the speed of the vehicle delivering the explosive. The speed of these vehicles—whether they are today's supersonic jet bombers or tomorrow's long-range missiles—reduces the warning period before an attack and, consequently, the time in which we can bring our defense to bear. The destruction of the attacker is therefore up to defenses that are already in place.

A handful of men operating offensive nuclear weapons today can do more damage than an entire army in the past, and they can do it at a distance of thousands of miles from their home base and within hours (ultimately, minutes) of the decision to attack. Even against a 90 percent effective defense—an almost incredible effectiveness level—they could probably achieve a rate of destruction critical to the defender.

It would be hard to estimate what percent of effectiveness could be achieved by the defense against an enemy jet bomber attack. It is known that against future missiles of the improved V-2 type there is no practicable defense. Against those prospective missiles the only solution—and against today's weapons a more effective solution—is to destroy the bases from which they might be launched.

These facts lead to several conclusions which appear valid for the medium-term future:

First: The offensive can inflict devastating results despite any foreseeable defensive effort.

Second: The best defense is an overwhelming counteroffense, directed primarily at the bases and sources of the enemy striking forces.

Third: National security, unless one can be sure of striking first, lies in convincing an enemy that even if he strikes the first blow, he cannot prevent an overwhelming and possibly fatal counterattack against his airpower and other nuclear weapons potentials.

Since it is the consistent policy of the United States not to initiate preventive war, it is plain that our determent of war before it starts (and our survival if it does) depends on our ability to counterattack promptly and with great force and precision no matter how severe the enemy's initial attack. Such a defense requires two things: First, the United States long-range weapons and their delivery systems must remain adequate in numbers and second to none in quality. Second, the bases from which these weapons are launched must neither be nor appear to be vulnerable to an enemy's initial attack. This last requirement cannot be overemphasized. The present contest is not a game in which the aces are hidden. The enemy must know and know well that his best calculations and best efforts cannot earn him immunity from a blow of magnitude equal to, or greater than, that which he has attempted.

Therefore the security of the base system from which our retaliatory attack is launched is a major concern of our military planners. To compensate for the limited range of our present bombers and missiles, we now have bases well advanced toward the enemy targets. Yet fixed bases on foreign soil in close proximity to the enemy cannot always be used—because of problems of sovereignty. Nor can they be defended adequately. In these advanced locations they offer the most obvious, immovable, exposed targets for surprise attack by relatively short-range enemy nuclear weapons.

The concentration of all the services on increasing the range of our weapons steadily reduces our dependence on bases near the target. However, a corresponding increase in range of enemy weapons would also make even our immovable home bases vulnerable to sudden overwhelming attacks which could prevent our counterattack.

In a recent magazine article Gen. Charles A. Lindbergh pointed to the vulnerability of airbases as a weak spot in our atomic deterrent potential. He emphasized the importance of decentralizing and scattering our bases to prevent their simultaneous destruction. He assumed quite logically that we cannot conceal the location of our land bases from enemy intelligence agents.

On the other hand, sea bases can be readily decentralized and scattered and their location cannot be predicted by the enemy. This is of great importance because long-range pilotless missiles such as those developed from German V-1 and V-2 types (which will be among the major threats to our fixed land bases in the future) cannot be used effectively against moving targets. This is a fundamental weakness inherent in the guidance problem for very long-range missiles. This weakness confers a very great advantage on the nation that invests a goodly share of its deterrent and retaliatory potential in forces operating from mobile bases.

It is therefore submitted that:

1. Our defense in nuclear warfare must be based primarily on a well-advertised ability and intention to counterattack with overwhelming force.

2. For maximum assurance against a surprise attack, at least a part of the United States counterattack potential must be decentralized and dispersed far and wide on moving bases. This might be called an ultimate or an additional deterrent, supplementing our fixed-base striking forces. In any event it is so important that if we did not have mobile sea bases we should be forced to invent them. Fortunately we have them.

The most practical moving base for an offensive weapon today is that which moves on water. There are several such bases. It can be a surface ship such as the carrier or it can be a submarine from which aircraft or missiles are launched, or simply the sea itself from which seaplanes supplied by mobile tenders operate against the target. Moving bases may eventually shift to the air, but such a development requires endurance in aircraft beyond anything presently in sight. For today's use, inventing an American mobile deterrent force for the atomic age is not necessary. Because the Navy has not lost sight of the strategic and tactical value of mobility which the sea provides, naval power stands squarely in the road to meet future national strategic requirements.

On this faith in the enduring virtues of mobility the American carrier striking force was founded. That force is mobile deterrent power today. Furthermore, carrier forces have the additional virtue, uncommon these days, of diverting enemy intentions and weapons away from our populated areas and out to sea. This is extremely important when considering such things as radioactive "fallout."

The mobile deterrent forces the United States will need must have three characteristics. First, they must have the ability to deal devastating blows precisely—a high rate of destruction against the enemy's striking power. Second, they must be self-sustaining for periods sufficient to render overwhelming injury to the enemy, so that even if our shore bases are destroyed they can still continue from the far seas to hurl destruction at the enemy's military vitals. Third, although invulnerable to long-range pilotless missiles, they must still be defensible against the modern humanly guided weapons.

Those are the three characteristics which must mark the carrier striking forces of today and tomorrow.

Future carrier striking forces can be visualized as a handful of large ships able to maintain high speeds in all sea conditions—say, 3 carriers, 7 guided missile cruisers, and 2 high-speed resupply ships per task force. This small task force may be contrasted with the 100-ship Task Force 58 of World War II and its many dozens of logistic support ships. This handful of a dozen ships will be far more economical, yet more powerful and more mobile. The ratio of punch to overhead will be tremendously improved.

This mobile force will be spread out over an ocean area the size of the State of Maine. It will be so widely dispersed that no single weapon, of any size now visualized, can seriously damage more than 1 ship.

Such a force would pack a very great offensive punch. It would include aircraft able to deliver large yield weapons under all weather conditions against enemy bases 1,500 or more miles distant. It would have other smaller, supersonic aircraft, each able to deliver in the medium ranges a weapon large enough to knock out an opposing air base or missile site. Coordinating with such carrier forces will be advanced forces of nuclear-powered submarines, launching atomic missiles against targets at relatively short ranges.

These forces would be self-sustaining for some 30 days of war operations, a long time in terms of atomic war. Most of the ships would have nuclear propulsion. Aviation fuel and weapons resupply would come from the 2 fast supply ships traveling with each task force.

Because of the dispersion of the force's ships and the range of its weapons, such a carrier force could exert a tight and exclusive control over an area of 60,000 square miles—the 6 New England States rearranged into a circle 275 miles in diameter. An enemy vessel or aircraft would approach that area at its peril and few would live to penetrate even part way to its center.

In the past, fast carrier task forces have been satisfied to have 1 or 2 cracks at the enemy attackers. Antiaircraft and antisubmarine defenses have been tightly concentrated around the carriers for mutual reinforcement. Combat air patrols were dispatched to break up enemy attacks 50 miles

out. Against the Japanese this was enough. In 1 day alone—the Marianas turkey shoot—the Japanese threw 545 aircraft against such a formation and had 366 shot down. Against nuclear attacks even this high performance is unacceptable, even though it is not expected that the mobile deterrent force would face such numbers.

Against air attack, the future carrier force would have a defense system unrecognizable when compared to that of our World War II task force. Short range antiaircraft weapons would be absent because they have been made obsolete by the distance from target to release point in modern high-speed bombing. Instead, defense against air attack would in great part depend on medium range guided missiles carried aboard the cruiser missile ships. Nuclear warheads would be available for missiles fired against large bomber formations, should the enemy be unwise enough to concentrate his aircraft.

Against enemy submarines there would be concentric rings of warning and defense, provided primarily by helicopters based on the guided-missile cruisers. The outer ring would be effective many miles from the carriers. Nuclear antisubmarine weapons would also be available. The use of destroyers will be entirely different from the procedure of World War II and probably none would be employed in a carrier task force.

This exploration of the potential capabilities of future carrier defense has been mentioned in some detail because of the prevailing feeling that carriers are easy to sink. Those who share that feeling fail to distinguish between putting a carrier out of action and stopping the carrier force as a whole. In the defense of the modern carrier task force, the objective will be to stop all attackers before they reach release position. A failure will not sink the entire force, although it may knock out any one ship.

But the unpleasant fact of nuclear war is that today practically everything is vulnerable, particularly airfields. Nuclear tests tell us exactly what size atomic bomb is required to lower the center of any man-made runway in the world to a depth of 100 feet. Any runway so attacked will stay sunk. But it is obvious that of the two bases—fixed and mobile—the latter has a far greater chance of survival.

The sea base, moreover, has other important advantages:

First, it enjoys unobstructed radar vision.

Second, the location of that sea base cannot be predicted. The location of the carrier force will not be a secret, but within its vast dispersed control area the carrier location will be obscure. Moreover, the carrier task force's defense system will be especially designed to limit enemy reconnaissance.

Third, the sea base's offensive punch would be used to stop attacks at their source—the enemy's bases—using the full advantage of our mobile basis against their fixed bases. The ace we do not mind showing is that we will know course and distance to their fixed bases in advance, while they will not know the exact whereabouts of our mobile bases.

Such a carrier task force is the application of atomic capabilities in an exacting blend of air and sea power, of carrier-based fighters relying on warning and control furnished by cruisers, of warning and antisubmarine helicopters operating from cruiser decks, of carriers poised behind cruiser-launched missile umbrellas, and of all ships in turn depending on the effective destruction of enemy forces and bases by carrier-based bombers and submarine-launched missiles. It is the logical development of sea-air power in the atomic age. This would be our primary mobile deterrent force for the age of long-range missiles. It is a force which the Navy must perfect before that age comes, and which, though it would not escape unscathed, would have a most favorable exchange rate in a battle as well as the power of diverting the enemy forces from our homeland.

This future carrier force has been projected to demonstrate that the carrier has not yet reached its ultimate development as a major weapons system. Further, the principle of the mobile air base, which it exemplifies, is, of necessity, experiencing a resurrection among exponents of airpower.

In addition to the carrier, there will be other mobile deterrent forces to strengthen United States strategy in the age of missiles. Very long-range missiles launched from submarines and surface ships constitute one fruitful line of advance. Also promising is the long-range attack seaplane. This has an additional advantage which the carrier force lacks—seaplane forces can be widely dispersed overseas in many small, relatively inexpensive units, in areas where maintenance of other forces would be too costly. The appearance of modern United States seaplanes in an area thousands of miles from American soil could establish a threat to an enemy's flank and require a diversion of his defenses from other fronts.

The seaplane can soon be given the speed and altitude and load-carrying capabilities of land-based jet bombers. It can be given the ability to operate from any sheltered bay, gulf, lagoon, and estuary having water depth of a few feet. It can be given the capability to land in semisheltered sea areas adjacent to the enemy's shore, refuel, rearm, and replenish from a waiting submarine and proceed on its mission. It need not return to the area whence it departed. With these capabilities it could deliver powerful weapons to vital targets, yet operate from a mobile base well removed from threat of heavy attack. The operating base, a seaplane tender far to the rear, can be given missile and helicopter defenses against light air and submarine attack. It can be moved frequently to foil enemy attack; no advance preparation is needed and no expensive facilities are left behind as improvements to someone else's property. Nor are the sabotage and espionage problems as great for a floating base.

With perhaps half a dozen seaplanes, a single tender, and a pair of logistic submarines, an integrated force could be provided that an enemy could not ignore. Once nuclear propulsion can be fitted to the seaplanes—and for this they appear ideally adapted—the submarines could be dispensed with and the tender base moved still farther back out of attack range.

Use of a proper seaplane force is good deployment—an essential to nuclear warfare. It permits tomorrow's Navy to attack from unpredictable directions and to dilute, divert, and divide an enemy's attacking forces.

It is therefore submitted that, first, survival of the United States requires a supplementary reserve of nuclear striking power which can be launched from mobile bases and, second, the Navy's development of weapons systems employing sea and air provides such power in natural course. It is important to note also that such naval forces can be equally effective in both nuclear war and nonnuclear war. This permits us to apply the type and degree of power appropriate to the situation and avoids the predicament of being unable to use force when necessary because the only force available is too great for the circumstances.

Whether or not we become engaged in limited wars in the future, there will be jobs to do which may not involve all-out nuclear assault on the enemy's sources of military strength. Allies must be supported, supplied, and in some cases fed, and our own raw material needs must be met. And so transports, both surface and air, must flow safely across the oceans. Perhaps tactical air support for hard-pressed allies must also be provided, without atomizing a friendly population. It is likewise conceivable that in the later phases of a nuclear war the patterns of a nonnuclear, conventional war may return.

In any event these naval striking forces have the dual capability for both types of war. Most of the existing fleet was designed for the nonnuclear, and successfully so, as the Pacific wars have shown. New construction, modernization, and modifications will continue to be adapted to the atomic. But they will retain their flexibility however the issue may be joined. Mobility makes them irreplaceable as a safety factor today; the same mobility and flexibility spell economy in a world where the exact place and nature of the next threat cannot always be anticipated. They will be replaced only by weapons of greater mobility, speed, and range.

The United States must face up realistically to the problems and requirements of nuclear war. As a first priority, varied types of striking forces must be adequately maintained which alone can deter nuclear warfare, and which alone can be decisive in the first phase of such a war if it comes. A reasonable effort must also be devoted to home defense and to the support of our overseas commitments; even though the defensive is not decisive, the enemy cannot be left an open invitation to move unopposed.

If adequate strength is to be maintained in this critical area while supporting a reasonable civil economy, there must be a constant re-examination of both the kind and the qualities of forces. Those types of weapons which give relatively less security per man or dollar—however useful they may be for specific purposes—must be questioned and reappraised. While the possible requirements of limited war must not be neglected, the maintenance in peacetime of forces which in unlimited war could be useful only in the later stages, and might even be serious burdens in the early stages, must likewise be questioned. It must be appreciated that in nuclear war it takes far fewer men to destroy at unheard of rates, and that it will take more and more men for reconstruction of industry, transport, and essential shelter.

As the nature of war changes many of our present weapons and forces will inevitably become relics of history, including elements of the Navy and of naval aviation as well. All weapons systems must stand the tests of mobility, multi-purpose flexibility, speed and range, lethality, and the other attributes. Our obligation is to discard those which do not measure up and to accelerate the development of those which show promise.

With this approach, the Navy has a future more vital and more demanding than ever before.

Formosa: Risks and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Speaking at the 25th anniversary of the Hoboken Club, Milford, yesterday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, hailed the Formosa policy as a long-overdue favorable change in United States foreign policy.

"There are risks involved in the course we have selected," said PHILBIN. "In fact there are risks whatever course we may follow because we are living in a very dangerous world. But the alternative of appeasement and

vacillation would constitute, in my opinion, a far greater risk. If we stand by, while world communism directed from Moscow conquers one nation after another by force and insidious conspiracy, the time would ultimately come when we would be outflanked militarily, economically, and in every other way. That would be a prospect of real peril.

"The present situation is grave, but we are acting from a position of strength. Our own Armed Forces are in a high state of efficiency and the military and economic resources of the free world plus our power to strike, if attacked, with overwhelming nuclear force will continue to be the great deterrent to Soviet aggression. We must continue to build this great strength for the long haul. It will best guarantee the national security and the peace."

The Congressman also touched briefly on present immigration laws which he said were working great inequities upon many American families and veterans who, despite their fine citizenship and loyal service, are prevented by law from having their relatives join them in this country. "There should be a rule of reason in these matters. These laws should be liberalized," he said.

PHILBIN congratulated the members of the Hoboken Club who, he said, had conducted themselves in the best traditions of the Nation. "Your contributions to Milford and to the Nation in war and in peace represent the highest type of citizenship. And your devotion to the cause of your own people has heightened your allegiance to this country. I wish you many more years of useful service and happiness," he concluded.

They Who Have Sown the Wind—An Editorial Naming Harvey Matusow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore so to do, I present the text of an editorial printed in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, February 17, 1955.

In view of the fact that this editorial deals with Harvey Matusow, and with former Communist and self-styled witnesses, it would appear appropriate that I incorporate in these remarks part of a question and answer period on July 2, 1954, when Harvey Matusow, he being the same person as is identified in the editorial, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the 83d Congress.

Mr. DOYLE. You have enumerated some 7 or 8 boards or committees before which you have testified since February 1952. Before any of those boards or committees were you paid a professional fee for so testifying?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, yes; let me say 1, 2, 3, maybe 4, maybe 5 occasions, and that was the Subversive Activities Control Board, they gave me a fee of $25 a day and once before an Immigration Service had me in New York and I don't remember the individual, but they paid me a fee of $25. On a number of occasions when I received that fee I turned it over to a charity of some sort.

Mr. WALTER. That is the usual fee provided for by law.

Mr. MATUSOW. As the per diem?

Mr. WALTER. That is provided by law.

At the time Mr. Matusow said "I turned it over to a charity of some sort," I regretted I did not have time to have him name the charity of some sort.

Also, his recent swearing that he lied and testified falsely before some Government committees, including the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am a member, further substantiates the position taken by me as a member of that committee; to wit, that said committee and all congressional committees must be increasingly on the alert to search and discover, so far as it is possible, the creditability of all witnesses before congressional committees. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the earning of $25 a day, as earned by Mr. Matusow before various Government boards and congressional committees, together with the fact that he, and also other similar witnesses, had recently testified that they had falsified in testimony before these boards and committees should make us all wary and most cautious about being placed in the position where we are expected to fully believe and give full face to their testimony.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

THEY WHO HAVE SOWN THE WIND

Implications of the Harvey Matusow recantations continue to spread out like the ripples from a stone dropped into a pond.

The admitted former Communist and self-styled professional witness now declares under cross-examination that he was hired to prepare black lists by at least two big advertising agencies and as a consultant on subversion by New York City's superintendent of schools, and that he made false accusations. His testimony as a witness for the Department of Justice in several trials involving alleged Red activities he had previously sworn was false.

We cannot be sure that what he declares to be the truth now can be relied on any more than what he declares was false. That remains to be proved. Nor does the recantation of one ex-Communist prove that all the Red apostates have given false testimony. But dependence upon paid informers is a risky business under any circumstances; retention by congressional committees and the Department of Justice of a string of them for use on call in a semipolitical field has made many people, no friends of the Reds, uncomfortable.

Now to learn that at least one of them has been instrumental, presumably, in hazarding, if not damaging, careers of actors, artists, and teachers confirms something we said over 3 years ago when the question was being asked, "Who's harmed except the Communists?":

"The fact is that we are all harmed. The virus of indiscriminate suspicion has made everyone pause before the costs of free discussion as Americans have known it. It has driven teachers to avoid classroom discussion of controversial subjects. * * * It has frightened legislators and other public officials. * * * It has so blurred crucial distinctions in the thinking of many people that real subversion is often confused with all sorts of useful leavening minority movements."

Those who have sown the wind may now be feeling but the first faint gusts of a whirlwind yet to be reaped.

The Office of the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the following speech I delivered before the Consular Law Society on February 23, 1955:

It is a singular honor to be appearing before the Consular Law Society. I say "singular" advisedly, since here I am facing the soul-chilling scrutiny of the expert. The Congressman envies the expert, and I often believe that the Congressman is called upon to have opinions on everything, conviction on nothing, and the little learning the poet Pope has dubbed dangerous.

Nonetheless, I secretly confess to holding a dozen or so convictions, and it is on one of these to which I would like to address myself tonight. That is, the Office of the President of the United States.

During my 32 years in Congress, I have watched 6 Presidents, each in his own way, define the Office of President: Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. It is in this definition of the line that both weaves together and at the same time separates the executive and legislative branches of the Government, the line that is most generally and, I might add, most loosely, called checks and balances, that each has differed; and it is in this difference of personal definition that has set, and continues to set, the course of the ship of state.

Where the President is fully aware that his office is the governing office of the country, he accepts both the tones and the overtones of power and the awful responsibility that goes with the possession of such power. Particularly is this true in the conduct of foreign affairs. He in the office of the President is charged with that responsibility. The ultimate decisions must be his. You can no more separate the loneness and the loneliness of the man in this office than you could separate the tides of the ocean from the pull of the moon. The President who seeks to divest himself, in all good faith, from the loneness and loneliness of the office, deserts the charges of responsibility that office has placed upon him.

Undoubtedly today we have in our Chief Executive a man with the will to peace. If sincerity were the only quality the office of the Presidency demands, we could then say, without reservation, that the office had found its man. But I have come to believe that the office of the Presidency, as it is being defined by Mr. Eisenhower, has been invested with a much narrower meaning than was ever intended by the Founding Fathers. The office of the President is not that of adjudicator, conciliator, or merely administrator in the sense of delegating authorities and duties. It is not the echo of short-term public opinion. Nor is it merely the coordinate branch of the Government.

In the relationship, for example, with the Congress, the Executive must realize that the Congress has many more explicit ways of curbing the Executive than the Executive has of curbing the Congress. The Congress, through its control of the purse strings, can check the Executive. Another check lies in the investigatory powers of Congress. The Senate can halt the Executive by withholding consent and approval of treaties. The same is true of Presidential confirmable appoint-

ments. While it is true that the Executive can veto a bill, the ultimate power still lies in the Congress while it is in session by the overriding veto. But there is a vast area of power consciously not made explicit by the framers of our Constitution who were aware of the curbs placed on the Executive without corresponding explicit curbs which the Executive could use in its relationship with the Congress, and it is in the use of this area that a President fails or succeeds in the government of his country.

It is because the fathers of this country had an image of what the President must be to match the responsibility of the office—decisive, subtle, informed, and imaginative—that this area of power exists. When the office of the President is filled with a man limited in the exercise of these qualities, the country must suffer. So it is today.

We have had, unfortunately, too many commissions and not enough decisions. We have had a reliance on the resonant phrase: "dynamic massive retaliation"; "liberation"; "agonizing reappraisal", to catch the public mind. We have had to swing around from "liberation" to "containment." We have had an unleashing and a re-leashing of the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. We have had decisions made, remade, and un-made again, from the first decision that the Tachen Islands are vital to our defense to the un-made decision to evacuate the Tachens. We have had the decision of defending Quemoy and the Matsu Islands through the promise of Secretary Dulles to Chiang Kai-shek and again through "implications" in Mr. Dulles' foreign policy statement of last week. Now we are not quite sure what the decision will be since the President's statement to the Senate on the Formosa resolution. We have had the decision to defend Dien Bien Phu and then the decision not to defend Dien Bien Phu. What was at first the relentless decision not to consider the Chinese Communist government as either de facto or de jure, we now seek, through the language of the Formosa treaty and through the efforts of cease-fire, to bring ourselves to the point of acknowledging the existence of two Chinese governments, one for the mainland and one for Formosa.

I do not quarrel with some of the decisions that have ultimately been made; I make only the point of the circuitous, contradictory routes that have been passed through to reach them.

Perhaps the severest test placed upon the office of the Presidency is that of silence. In the delicate operations of negotiation upon which, perforce, the conduct of foreign affairs must hinge, there are changes from day to day which alter or amend earlier decisions. The volume and the complexity of such exchange among governments can be known to the President alone. The public cannot know what they are, nor should they. I am talking, mind you, of the day-to-day exchange among governments. Hence a dramatic announcement of policy must be watched lest it be tainted with the poison of prematurity.

We have seen just such a public scramble relative to the now ex-Premier of France, Mendes-France. It was first the violence directed against him in the repudiation of EDC by France, and then the reassessment upon the completion of the Paris agreements. Our policy in the Far East has been paralyzed by public statements emanating from the White House. Good intentions are not a substitute for firmness, nor overeagerness for public approval a substitute for delicacy and imagination.

This, of course, is not a brief for the withholding of information from the public. It is, rather, a reminder that the hasty jumping into public print carries with it a danger that public opinion, unaware of new and subtle developments, may compel a rigidity in the operation of foreign affairs which new developments no longer warrant. This eagerness for public announcement has already resulted in unnecessary confusion at home and abroad and has left the unwarranted impression that the United States leaps before it looks.

Hamilton has said it well in discussing the powers of the President:

"In the article which gives the legislative powers of the Government, the expressions are, 'All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.' In that which grants the executive power, the expressions are, 'The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States.' The enumeration ought therefore to be considered, as intended merely to specify the principal articles implied in the definition of executive power; leaving the rest to flow from the general grant of that power, interpreted in conformity with other parts of the Constitution, and with the principles of free government."

It is well that those of us who are concerned with the conduct of government become increasingly aware of the relationship between the office of the President and the Congress of the United States. The indispensable factor must be Presidential initiative. There has been—unfortunately, I say, despite the fact I am a Member of Congress—a growing dependency upon congressional support, in the conduct of our foreign affairs particularly. If this tendency develops to too great a degree, we shall find a radical disturbance in the distribution of powers, an imbalance which bodes ill for the country.

This growing imbalance can only be redressed by the man who, by the strength of his visions, understands the responsibilities, duties, and the powers of the office of the President.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose throne is truth, frail creatures of dust serving out our brief day on the world's vast stage, we would set our little lives in the midst of Thine eternity and feel Thy completeness flowing around our incompleteness, and around our restlessness Thy rest.

As we face together the tasks of another week, we come asking that Thou wilt give us a rebirth of faith, because when faith dies the deepest meanings of our lives fold up their tents and disappear; but if faith returns, in ourselves, in others, and in Thee, then life again clothes itself with purpose and significance and we have treasures worth living and worth dying for. And so, pausing by this wayside shrine in prayerful penitence, we do not ask for easy lives, but for great reserves; we do not ask that our path should be smooth, but that we should never lose our direction or become dismayed.

Make us ever mindful that upon the free soil of this continent our fathers, with holy toil, reared a house of faith hallowed by Thy name. Make us so to believe in America and so to add to its strength and stamina by our own characters that we shall covet for the whole world its emancipating truth and light in the midst of today's falsehood and darkness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 18, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 19, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 145) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as a member of the United States delegation to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba, and inasmuch as I shall be leaving for that purpose tomorrow morning, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning tomorrow, and for the remainder of the week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security

Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR THE LATE SENATOR MAYBANK, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, at this time I should like to announce to the Senate that on March 2, 1955, there will be held in the Senate a memorial service for the late Senator Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I announce that at a meeting of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, on Friday, February 18, 1955, the following were elected for the first session of the 84th Congress: Representative OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, chairman; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], vice chairman. I make this announcement in order that the RECORD will show their election.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RUNNING MATES FOR CERTAIN STAFF CORPS OFFICERS IN NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INTERCHANGE OF SUPPLIES BETWEEN THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXEMPTIONS FROM DUTY OF CERTAIN PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 27, 1942 (ch. 453, 56 Stat. 461), as amended, to make permanent the exemptions from duty of personal and household effects, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ON OPERATIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SECURITY PROVISIONS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILLIAM HENRY DIMENT ET AL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment and Mrs. Gladys Everingham (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against the enactment of legislation lowering the tariffs on the importation of rubber products

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress H. R. 1, which provides for the lowering of tariffs on the importation of certain manufactured products, including manufactured rubber goods; and

"Whereas adequate tariffs must be maintained to enable American manufacturers of rubber goods to remain in business and sell their products in the domestic market—the last market left to them; and

"Whereas the rubber manufacturing industry, founded in America and which, at one time, sold its goods throughout the world, cannot fairly compete with foreign manufacturers who have copied the American product but have exploited their one advantage of cheap labor: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to defeat H. R. 1; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress thereof to consider revision of the Sugar Act of 1948 in regard to sugar quotas established for domestic sugar beet production

"Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, provides a statutory limitation upon the quantity of sugar which may be marketed in the United States during any 1 year by the domestic beet, mainland cane, Hawaiian, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands sugar industries; and

"Whereas since the establishment of these inflexible marketing quotas the population of the United States has increased from approximately 150 million to more than 163 million persons and the consumption of sugar has increased approximately 1 million tons since 1948 as a result of the increased population; and

"Whereas sugar consumption in the United States may be expected to continue to increase at a rate of 100,000 to 125,000 tons per year; and

"Whereas under provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, the domestic sugar industry has been prevented from participating in this increase in consumption by the inflexible marketing privileges; and

"Whereas an equitable and participating share of this expanding market is essential to the continued stability and vigor of the domestic sugar industry; and

"Whereas the beet sugar industry is prepared to meet the challenge of an expanding market due to achieved gains in productivity and efficiency; and

"Whereas the welfare of our State and our Nation requires the existence of a strong and vigorous domestic sugar industry, especially during periods of war and national emergencies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That all members of the Congress of the United States are urged to enact legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948 in such manner as to enable the domestic sugar industry to have fair and equitable participation in the growth of our Nation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Interior, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of

the United States, and to each Member from Colorado of the Congress of the United States.

"STEPHEN R. NUNECHOP,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIEA,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"We, representatives of the citizens of Alaska, again appeal to you, the duly constituted representatives of all the people of the United States, that you may recognize us and our constituency as equal citizens under the democratic flag of America;

"We remind you again that the people of Alaska have demonstrated through all their history of Territorial status their adherence to the principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded;

"We remind you that by referendum and by acclamation through our land an overwhelming majority of our people have declared unequivocally their desire for statehood and the right of a free people to govern themselves;

"We recall to you that your own electors, through the platforms of the major political parties and by their popular accord have given you a mandate for statehood for Alaska; and

"Therefore we ask that you, collectively and as individuals, dismiss all partisan concerns, look only to the merits of our cause, recognize and correct the injustice we suffer in not being allowed to govern ourselves or participate in the election of the President or have voting representation in Congress, all of which may be cured by enabling immediate statehood for Alaska.

"Your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 25, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 8, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the Federal Government retains the responsibility for care and treatment of the mentally ill in Alaska; and

"Whereas the existing procedures for the care and treatment of such persons in Alaska are antiquated, inhuman, and cruel; and

"Whereas this condition is a matter of grief and shame to all the people of Alaska, who plead to us, their duly elected Representatives and their Delegate to Congress for immediate correction of this deplorable condition; and

"Whereas H. R. 610, a bill to correct this condition is pending before the Congress of the United States.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska urges that this legislation be passed and approved.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 27, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 8, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas under the law of the United States the States therein receive the benefit of 90 percent of the profits from the leasing of coal and certain other mineral lands therein; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is discriminated against in the benefit of profits from these mineral lands under existing Federal law; and

"Whereas H. R. 247, a bill to correct this discrimination now existing, is pending before the Congress of the United States.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urges that this legislation be passed and approved, thereby eliminating this unfair discrimination.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 27, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 5, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"To the President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the great need for the economy of Alaska is industrial development and use of its natural resources; and

"Whereas an opportunity for a large wood-processing industry at Shoemaker Bay, near Wrangell, Alaska, is immediately available in matured plans of the Pacific Northern Timber Co., which has timber-use rights in this area under contract with the United States Forest Service; and

"Whereas development of this $2,500,000 plant cannot be achieved without ownership and use of certain tidelands, adjacent to and abutting on upland property owned by the Pacific Northern Timber Co., which are presently held in trust by the United States for the State of Alaska and the ownership rights to which tidelands can be obtained only by an act of Congress; and

"Whereas we, the duly elected representatives of the people of Alaska, hereby record our findings and belief that the tidelands involved should be committed to the industrial use here proposed.

"Therefore, we ask that you immediately enact legislation authorizing the issuance of a patent conveying fee simple title to those certain necessary tidelands in Shoemaker Bay to the Pacific Northern Timber Co., the issuance of the patent to be conditioned on the faithful performance by the company of its agreement with the United States Forest Service to construct sawmill facilities at the site by December 31, 1957.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 14, 1955.
"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:
"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 14, 1955.
"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:
"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor February 17, 1955.
"B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation withdrawing all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location, and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Papago Indian Reservation, created by Executive Order 2524 and extended by statute (46 Stat. 1202), is subject to mineral entry and location under the mining laws of the United States.

"Except for the mining laws of the United States and Arizona, the said right of entry is not subject to any control by the United States or by the Papago Tribe.

"Said right of location has caused hardship to numerous Papago Indians in the past by forcing them to move from their homes and fields and by depriving them of desirable lands and waterholes.

"Due to the great interest of the general public in the possibility of discovering uranium ore on the reservation, there is great fear among the Papago Indians that they will be deprived of their reservation piecemeal by mining claimants.

"The Papago Indian Reservation does not have adequate resources to support the population presently living there and the possibility of substantial mineral discoveries seems the only hope that the reservation can provide an adequate economic base for the Papago people.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays:

"That the Congress of the United States withdraw all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation, except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location and directing that the mineral

rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have, through numerous opinions and decisions, invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of Government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts so that the fields of the government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from Alabama, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from Alabama, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers issued, on June 23, 1954, a progress report on the Libby project, which project is located on the Kootenai River, which heads in Canada and crosses the Canadian-United States boundary into the State of Montana and from there crosses the Montana-Idaho line at Leona, Idaho, in Boundary County, Idaho, from which point it runs in a westerly direction to Bonners Ferry, Idaho, and then meanders northerly to the Canadian-United States boundary line and back into Canada; and

"Whereas the Libby project recommended in said report would be a multipurpose project, accomplishing the following, among other purposes:

"1. Power: The firm power capability of Libby Dam's at-site generating capacity will be 292,000 kilowatts. However, total firm power production resulting from the stream regulation by Libby Dam will amount to 1,150,000 kilowatts.

"2. Flood-control protection for 70,000 acres of agricultural and stock-raising lands in the Kootenai Flats region between Bonners Ferry, Idaho, and downstream to Kootenay Lake, British Columbia, Canada.

"3. The 95-mile-long reservoir also will provide incidental navigation and recreational benefits; and

"Whereas this power is urgently needed to relieve the power shortage in the region; and

"Whereas the Kootenai Flats area, which includes 36,000 acres in northern Idaho and 34,000 acres in British Columbia, is the victim of almost annual flooding despite levee work and other flood-protection measures and extensive flood-fighting efforts. The emergency became so great in 1954 that the Governor of the State of Idaho called upon the Army and all other available forces for assistance, resulting in mobilization of a flood-fighting force of 1,000 men, 155 dump trucks, 34 bulldozers, and 22 power shovels. This force went to work on a 24-hour basis over the 50-mile reach of the Kootenai River and about 100 miles of levees. A preliminary estimate of the total damage, including the cost of this operation, but not including the damage in Canada, was $1,400,000; and

"Whereas said dam would improve navigation and recreation benefits on said river: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America that the report of the Corps of Engineers be approved, that the project be authorized, and that funds be made available for its construction at the earliest possible date; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Chairman of the United States section, International Joint Commission, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State and from the State of Montana.

"The senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 29th day of January 1955.

"CARL D. IRWIN,
"President pro tempore of the Senate.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 11th day of February 1955.

"R. H. YOUNG., Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Reprcsentatives.

"I hereby certify that the within Senate Joint Memorial 2 originated in the Senate during the 33d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"ROBERT H. REMAKLUS,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 and subsequent Federal aid highway acts to provide for the elimination of provisions which would deprive those States of Federal highway aid which are spending motor-fuel and motor-vehicle tax receipts for nonhighway purposes

"Whereas the State for many years has been contributing to the Federal Government through the Federal gasoline tax substantial amounts in excess of the amounts of Federal highway aid received; and

"Whereas the Federal Government for many years has been diverting to other than highway purposes substantial amounts of highway user revenues collected in New Jersey and the other States; and

"Whereas for these and other reasons it seems presumptuous for the Federal Government to assume the right to deprive New Jersey and other States of the return of their own tax money in the form of aid because they choose to spend their State tax revenues in a manner not approved by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to amend the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 and subsequent Federal aid highway acts by providing for the elimination of the provisions under which the Federal Government withholds highway aid from States failing to use at least the amounts provided by law (in 1934) 'from State motor-vehicle registration fees, licenses, gasoline taxes, and other special taxes on motor-vehicle owners and operators of all kinds for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways and administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which such revenues have been pledged, and for no other purposes.'

"2. The Secretary of State is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated to the President of the United States, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A resolution adopted by the Yucaipa Valley Real Estate Board, California County, Calif., relating to the processing of FHA applications in that area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, Calif., endorsing Joint Resolution No. 3 adopted by the California legislature, relating to the cooperation of the Federal Government with the celebration of the centennials of the opening of the Pacific Overland Mail (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions signed by William D. Holland and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relative to treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Morning Star Council 294, the Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate joint resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to extend the emergency drought relief feed program

"Whereas the beef and dairy section of the South has suffered a long period of drought; and

"Whereas the severe freezing weather recently experienced, combined with the drought, has generally retarded the growth of grain crops and in many instances completely destroyed winter pastures: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress is memorialized to extend the emergency drought-relief-feed program for at least 60 days beyond the expiration date now provided; be it

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to each of the United States Senators from South Carolina and each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from South Carolina and to the clerk of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing South Carolina's Members in Congress to take whatever action is appropriate or necessary to obtain Federal funds for a survey of the possibilities and practicability of irrigation and drainage in South Carolina

"Whereas farmers and all agricultural agencies are actively participating in a long-range farm program for the betterment of the country, of agriculture, and of the people as a whole; and

"Whereas in a number of States the normal waterfall is not sufficient to provide productive lands; and

"Whereas the economy of South Carolina is basically agricultural; and

"Whereas droughts of recent years have brought great losses to the farmers of this State; and

"Whereas in South Carolina there are often times when the water supply is not normal and, though there may be sufficient total rainfall, it is not certain during the times when needed most; and

"Whereas under modern farming procedures, localities that have resorted to irrigation have succeeded in producing substantial gains in crops and have made certain the time of harvest; and

"Whereas there is a trend toward irrigation in many localities all over the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the two United States Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina be memorialized to take whatever action is appropriate or necessary to obtain Federal funds for a survey of the possibilities and practicability of irrigation and drainage in South Carolina; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the United States Senators and each Member of the United States House of Representatives from South Carolina."

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO CHILDREN OF CERTAIN EX-MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the granting of educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II, and in Korea.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass legislation granting educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II and in Korea

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to grant educational benefits to children of members of the Armed Forces killed in combat during World War II and in Korea; and

Whereas approximately 100,000 children in the United States are now likely to be deprived of the advantages of an education or livelihood that would have been theirs had they been provided for by their fathers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact into law such proposed legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 58. Resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 34); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably seven original resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that they be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration so that that committee may take action upon them, rather than to have them lie over a day on the calendar, as normally required.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 61. Resolution authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect (Rept. No. 35).

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to—

(a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws;

(b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof;

(c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statutes; and

(d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $250,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

S. Res. 62. Resolution to study juvenile delinquency in the United States.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary under Senate Resolution 89 of the 83d Congress to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics, the Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency in the United States is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $154,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

S. Res. 63. Resolution providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary under Senate Resolution 245 of the Eighty-second Congress to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $58,500 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 64. Resolution extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary under Senate Resolution 326 of the Eighty-second Congress to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, the Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Emigration of Refugees and Escapees is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $36,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

S. Res. 65. Resolution to authorize an investigation of national penitentiaries.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to national penitentiaries, the Committee on the Judiciary, or the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $13,600 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 66. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, insofar as they relate to the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending on January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistance, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $102,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 67. Resolution to authorize a study of the narcotics problem in the United States.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the narcotics problem in the United States, including ways and means of improving the Federal Criminal Code and other laws and enforcement procedures dealing with the possession, sale, and transportation of narcotics, marihuana, and similar drugs. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) the extent, cause, and effect of unlawful uses of narcotics and marihuana in the United States, (2) the adequacy, administration, operation, and enforcement of existing laws relating thereto, and (3) the additions and changes which should be made in the laws and enforcement procedures to prevent illicit possession, sale, transportation, and use of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and to combat the increasing narcotic addiction in the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 6. This resolution shall be effective as of March 1, 1955.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1123. A bill to make unlawful certain commercial dealing in minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1124. A bill to establish separate rates of excise tax on automotive glass; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1125. A bill for the relief of Stephen Fodo; and

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1127 (by request). A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Angel Castanedo Del Llano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1129. A bill for the relief of Isako Hardin (nee Shirayama); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1130. A bill for the relief of Theresa Yik Mun Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 1131. A bill for the relief of Taufic Abdaliah Joudeh Khalaf; and

S. 1132. A bill for the relief of Rosario Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 1133. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1134. A bill for the relief of Florence E. McConnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1135. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes;

S. 1136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1137. A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army;

S. 1138. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority; and

S. 1139. A bill to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1140. A bill for the relief of Heui Sik Min and his wife Mary Pu Keui Min and their children David Pyong Wha Min, Susan Pyong Soon Min, Sally Pyong Yun Min,

George Pyong Yu Min, William Pyong Soo Min, and daughter-in-law Gloria Yong Hiu Min; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1141. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie E. Taylor; to the Committee on Armed Service.

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sew Sang, Kee Yin Sew Wong, Sew Ing Lin, Sew Ing Quay, and Sew Ing You; and

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Arthur K. Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1144. A bill for the relief of Carl O. Eck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1145. A bill for the relief of Thomas Marfoe (also known as Tao-Wen Ma); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1146. A bill to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives; and

S. 1147. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. BENDER):

S. 1148. A bill for the relief of Frank B. James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1149. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1150. A bill to include persons engaged in carrying out the provisions of labor laws of the United States within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1151. A bill to make the employment, and related practices, of any alien known by an employer to have entered the United States illegally within 3 years thereof unlawful, and for other purposes; and

S. 1152. A bill to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of any vessel or vehicle used in the transportation of any alien known by the owner thereof to have entered the United States illegally within 3 years thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1153. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; and

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1156. A bill to relieve States, subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, and certain educational institutions of liability to the United States for the value of certain aircraft acquired by them under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1157. A bill to terminate the withholding of Oregon State income tax from the wages of certain residents of the State of Washington who are employed by the Corps of Engineers at Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1158. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a United States Women's Armed Services Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," approved August 4, 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills relating to proposed legislation for the armed services. Each of these bills is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1135. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes."

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1135 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 4, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its its objectives, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This legislative proposal would amend the act of May 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 274), establishing a Civil Air Patrol. It would provide disability benefits for volunteer civilian members of the Civil Air Patrol, other than Civil Air Patrol cadets, who have incurred injuries or disabilities, including those resulting in death, while on active service in the performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Patrol, by extending to them the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

The benefits of the proposed bill are appropriately restricted. The term "performance of duty" for service rendered prior to the date of enactment of the proposal is specifically limited to active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of the Army (War), including the Army Air Forces, or the Department of the Air Force.

For service rendered on or subsequent to the date of enactment of the proposed bill, the term "performance of duty" is specifically limited to active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Department of the Air Force, and under written authorization by competent authority covering a specific assignment and prescribing a time limit for such assignment.

During World War II, members of the Civil Air Patrol, under the direction of the Commanding General, Army Air Forces, performed invaluable services in the accomplishment of coastal patrol, liaison patrol, military courier service, and tow-target and tracking duties for antiaircraft-gunnery training. Civil Air Patrol operation during that period is illustrated by the fact that, incident to coastal patrol activities, nearly a quarter-million hours were flown; 363 survivors were reported; 91 vessels were reported in distress; and 173 submarines were located and reported. Apart from the payment of expenses for the use of privately owned aircraft and a small subsistence allowance, no emoluments were received by individuals for their services as active members of the Civil Air Patrol.

The proposed bill specifically provides that nothing contained therein shall be construed to confer military or veteran status upon any person.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress on January 5, 1953, as part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. It was introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 2275 on January 29, 1953, and in the Senate as S. 2279 on July 2, 1953.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would cause no increase in budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO ESTABLISH CIVIL AIR PATROL AS A CIVILIAN AUXILIARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TO EXTEND AID TO CIVIL AIR PATROL IN THE FULFILLMENT OF ITS OBJECTIVES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

Section 1 amends the act of May 26, 1948 (62 Stat. 274), establishing the Civil Air Patrol by adding thereto new sections 3 and 4, for the purpose of providing disability benefits for members of the Civil Air Patrol who have incurred injuries or disabilities, including those resulting in death, while on active service in the performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol.

Section 3 (a) would provide that members of the Civil Air Patrol, except Civil Air Patrol

cadets, shall, for the purpose of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, be deemed to be civilian employees of the United States.

Section 3 (b) would provide that in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act the monthly pay of such members, for the purpose of computing compensation for disability or death, shall be deemed to be $300, and that the term "performance of duty" shall mean only active service rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol.

Section 3 (c) would provide that the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee shall advise, if so requested, the Secretary of Labor concerning the facts with respect to claims filed with the Secretary of Labor.

Section 3 (d) makes the provisions of the new section 3 applicable as of May 20, 1941; however, no benefits would accrue or be payable in any case for any period prior to the date of this act, except medical or other expenses as authorized by sections 9 and 11 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. This subsection terminates the entitlement to benefits now being extended to members of the Civil Air Patrol and their dependents coincident with the enactment of this act.

Section 4 would specify that the act does not confer military or veteran status upon any person.

S. 1136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1136 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to reproduce, rent, sell, or otherwise dispose of, to interested persons, concerns, and institutions, copies of the official records of the department concerned, including but not limited to, papers, miscellaneous documents, books, photographs, lantern slides, motion picture films, and sound reproductions, consistent with national security under regulations promulgated with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and at such prices and fees (not less than the estimated cost of furnishing copies of such reproductions) as may be prescribed under such regulations. The proceeds of such transactions would be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and would not be withdrawn or reapplied except in consequence of a subsequent appropriation made by law.

The military departments of the Department of Defense accumulated during World War II a large number of technical and scientific documents, aerial and other photographs, motion pictures, sound reproductions, recordings, and other allied publications, many of which are of educational and historical value. A considerable number of requests have been received from private persons and concerns, and from educational and other institutions, for copies of such material.

It is believed to be in the public interest to permit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to comply with such requests from sources whose requirements are legitimate when such compliance would be consistent with national security. Furthermore, the sale of such material would provide a basis for securing similar material and information in the possession of others.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Authority similar to that requested herein was granted the Director of the United States Geological Survey by Public Law 206, 80th Congress. However, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments have not been authorized by the Congress to engage in the sale of such material, although the Departments of the Army and the Air Force have sold copies of still pictures and motion picture film pursuant to directions issued in 1918 by the Secretary of War. The Department of Defense sponsored a similar proposal in the 83d Congress (H. R. 2319). That bill passed the House of Representatives on May 19, 1953, with minor amendments but no further action was taken. The enclosed draft of bill is identical with H. R. 2319 as passed by the House of Representatives.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

FEBRUARY 11, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Reference is made to a draft of legislation, "To authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes," submitted to the Congress on January 7, 1955 as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955.

In order to preclude the objection previously made by the Joint Committee on Printing, it is requested that the proposal be amended by the addition of a second section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall alter, amend, repeal, or otherwise affect the provisions of any law relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications."

The contents of this letter have been coordinated in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense and the Department of the Army has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it has no objection to the proposed section 2 for subject proposal as set forth above.

It is requested that the Congress consider the proposed legislation as amended by this letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1137. A bill to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1137 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would extend until June 30, 1957, the authority to enlist aliens in the Regular Army pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1950 (ch. 443, 64 Stat. 316), as amended (10 U. S. C. 631c). Under existing law, that authority will expire on June 30, 1955. The act of June 30, 1950, authorizes the acceptance of original enlistments or reenlistments, not to exceed 12,500 in number, in the Regular Army of qualified unmarried male aliens between the ages of 18 and 35. An original enlistment is for a period of not less than 5 years and aliens so enlisted must be integrated into established units with citizen soldiers. In addition, aliens enlisted or reenlisted under the act of June 30, 1950, as amended, who subsequently enter the United States, American Samoa, Swains Island, or the Canal Zone, pursuant to military orders, and who are honorably discharged after completing 5 years of service, if otherwise qualified for citizenship, are deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence within the meaning of section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The extension of the authority to enlist qualified male aliens is desirable because it enables the Army to secure certain skilled personnel with special knowledge to fill positions for which citizen soldiers are not normally available. The Army has a continuing need for persons with extensive knowledge of foreign languages and local conditions. From both a planning and a tactical viewpoint, it would be of incalculable value when preparing for or carrying out a mission in a foreign country to have trained men familiar not only with the language of the area, but more important, with the customs of the people, their temperament and frame of mind, and geographical and other local conditions. Inasmuch as few native Americans possess such knowledge, the best available source of supply of such persons having these special qualifications are aliens who desire consideration for United States citizenship and who are willing to enlist in our Army for a period of 5 years or more in order to gain the opportunity to qualify for citizenship.

The proposed legislation would also permit the Army to enlist and utilize the services of alien specialists within technical fields, such as electronics. In addition, it would provide authority for the procurement of a small number of selected individuals of officer caliber with a long future potential to the Army.

While the Department of the Navy and the Air Force have indicated that they concur in the proposed legislation as it relates to the Department of the Army, they have no apparent need for such authority at this time and, accordingly, do not desire to be included within the provisions of the proposed legislation.

Although information relating to the number of aliens now serving in the Regular Army under the authority of this legislation and other aspects of the program is classified, the Department of Defense will, upon request, furnish additional information during closed congressional hearings on the proposed legislation.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1138. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1138 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to its transmittal to the Congress for consideration. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would provide continuing statutory authority for the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to expand and maintain productive capacity in Government-owned and privately owned plants in order to meet current or mobilization military production requirements, with ownership remaining in the Government for those facilities placed in privately owned plants. The present authority for these purposes is contained in the act of July 17, 1953 (Public Law 130, 83d Cong.; 67 Stat. 177), as amended and extended (Public Law 523, 83d Cong.; 68 Stat. 531), which authority expires not later than July 1, 1955. This proposal would extend the duration of the effectiveness of its provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or until such time as may be specified by concurrent resolution of the Congress, or until July 1, 1956, whichever is the earliest.

The present world situation is similar in many respects to that which led to the request of this Department for and the enactment of the act of July 17, 1953, in that it is still considered necessary that there be authority to meet requirements for rapid construction or expansion of production facilities needed to alleviate emergency production shortages which arise under conditions of urgent requirements for end items necessary for defense purposes. The act of July 17, 1953, itself was, to a large extent, a continuation of authority to expedite military production granted by statutes enacted shortly before and during World War II.

As was stated in connection with the request for enactment of the act of July 17, 1953, under normal peacetime conditions, the construction, conversion, or expansion of facilities for the procurement of military items is reduced to a minimum and limited to specific items which may be required during such peacetime periods. Peacetime authority of the military departments is not sufficiently broad to provide facilities that will be needed when an emergency occurs, nor is there any peacetime authority available to the departments for assisting the expansion of privately owned productive capacity for an emergency. Expansion of both Government-owned and privately owned plants became immediately necessary in the emergencies that occurred prior to World War II and with the advent of the Korean conflict.

In the case of construction at military installations, it has been the practice periodically to obtain specific authorizing legislation for known needs. This procedure is clearly not feasible in the case of construction or expansion of plants needed to alleviate unforeseen shortages in defense production. It is not possible to foresee and predict accurately the need for specific authorizing legislation. During World War II and the Korean conflict, authority similar to that contained in the act of July 17, 1953, proved to be of inestimable value for the rapid expansion of productive capacity by the construction of Government-owned and expansion of privately owned plants.

Under the existing international situation, the present emergency may become acute at any time without warning. In such an eventuality, time would be a large and very significant factor in the expansion of urgently needed productive capacity. It is believed that continued statutory authority for a rapid expansion of productive capacity is important to the timely satisfaction of the needs of the military departments for vital supplies. This proposal would continue not only the authority with respect to facilities required for current defense production but also to facilities intended for mobilization reserve purposes. The reserve capacity to be provided will be for essential military items requiring a long-lead production time. In the event of the full mobilization, a lack of adequate productive capacity for such items would create a serious bottleneck.

Authority to maintain production facilities on a standby basis at or near the location planned to be used for production purposes in the event of further emergency continues to be increasingly important as the immediate need for current production decreases. By arranging with contractors for storage and/or maintenance of production facilities at or near the plant site, and by leasing facilities in place to contractors in return for their undertakings to maintain and preserve the leased property or other production facilities as part or all of the consideration of the lease, the services can assure that such facilities will be available as quickly as possible for actual production in the event of a future emergency.

Continuation of the act of July 17, 1953, is considered to be extremely important to the Department of Defense in carrying out its responsibilities.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would cause no apparent increase in budgetary requirements insofar as the Department of Defense is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1139. A bill to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1139 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that the proposal is in accordance with the program of the President. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to obtain specific legislative authority for the continuance of the loan of the small aircraft carrier *Bois Belleau* (formerly the U. S. S. *Belleau Wood*) to the Government of France. Transfer of this vessel was effected under the act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), which authorized the President to loan a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France "until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, as determined by the President, or 5 years after the date of this act, whichever is earlier."

Although no definite proclamation has been made by the President relative to the cessation of hostilities in Indochina for purposes of this act, various official statements have been made by the United States which recognize that the hostilities have in fact ceased. It is therefore considered desirable to obtain a clear-cut legislative authorization for the extension of this loan.

The Government of France has formally requested a continuance of this loan. The Department of the Navy is of the opinion that the loan is in the best interests of the United States. The proposal is drafted with the purpose of creating a new loan authority until June 30, 1958. If this authority is granted, the old loan agreement will be replaced by a loan agreement which more accurately reflects the needs and requirements of the present world situation. Inasmuch as the details of this proposal are, for security reasons, classified, this Department will furnish witnesses upon request who will be prepared to discuss further aspects of this proposal before the appropriate committees in executive session.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposed legislation would cause no apparent increase in budgetary requirements.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

UNITED STATES WOMEN'S ARMED SERVICES ACADEMY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a United States Women's Armed Services Academy, and for other purposes. I have prepared a statement in explanation of the joint resolution. In view of the fact that we are now proceeding under a time limitation, in connection with the morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD, instead of being delivered by me at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) to provide for the establishment of a United States Women's Armed Services Academy, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

In connection with the joint resolution I have introduced, it would seem to be in order to say just a little about the background and the history of participation by American womanhood in the defense of our country and to give a résumé, also, of the

purposes and objectives sought to be accomplished by the proposed legislation.

On May 31, 1945, there were in the armed services a total of women, including nurses, of 266,184, of whom nurses numbered 67,507 and other categories totaled 198,677. Of the latter, 15,193 were officers, and 183,484 were enlisted personnel.

How did it happen that these large numbers of young women were wearing the honored uniforms of soldiers, sailors, and marines?

The answer lies in two factors. The first is the spontaneous patriotism of our womanhood. Women yield nothing to men in that direction. Always and always and always, American women have stood with their men in all things contributing to the welfare and security of our country. The recital of their offerings upon the altar of Americanism would comprehend all our history, from the hazards of pioneer days, with their Indian conflicts, down through the saga of the Revolution highlighted by the personal participation in battle by Molly Pitcher and Deborah Sampson, and thence through the ever-widening vistas of the industrial advances in more peaceful eras.

The second factor is opportunity. As technological progress has made its way not only in the peaceful pursuits of office and warehouse and factory, it has likewise had its impact in the fields of war.

Time once was when actual warfare involved combat which was localized and limited to men engaged in actual fighting, opposing forces within plain view and using weapons of comparatively short range and often under individual control. This made matters of service and supply routine and simple.

Today, we have scientific and total war, where even the fighting men may not see the enemy, where instruments of most intricate character and design are fabricated for purposes of wholesale destruction, and where the service and supply of the Armed Forces involve a host of undertakings, far removed from actual scenes of battle. Aside from, but directly contributing to the conduct of battle, are matters of intelligence, finance, accounting, transport, photography, mapping, and maintenance, to mention but a few of the activities that affect the actual conduct of war in the field. Women have already proven their competence and desire to make their contributions in these and many other fields. Some conception of the magnitude of the areas open to women may be had from the fact that in the Army alone, as of now, WAC officers are assigned to no less than 140 categories of officer positions. In other words, granted the opportunity for service, our women have proven eager to accept it.

Up to the outbreak of World War II, nursing and office typing marked the extent of the official possibilities for women to serve in war and defense. With the advent of total war and the enhancement of opportunities for service, the Navy, the Army, the Marines and the Air Force, in somewhat that order, set up training schools for officers in order to satisfy the critical demand for women capable of the leadership so sorely needed in wartime. A superb job was done, although at times the methods employed savored of improvisation.

In recognition of past contributions and future needs, in 1947 there was introduced a bill (S. 1641) to integrate women permanently into the armed services. In connection with the bill, which became law on June 12, 1948, the Senate received a report from the Committee on Armed Services in which are found the following significant statements:

"The hearings developed the fact that it is highly desirable that the experience gained in World War II in the utilization of women in the armed services be preserved and that their utilization be integrated in future planning by maintaining a relatively small nucleus capable of prompt expansion in time of emergency.

* * * * *

"In addition to the continued use of women in the positions which they filled so successfully during World War II, it is felt certain that further experience will show that their field of employment can be increased materially. Evidence presented to the committee showed quite clearly that the employment of women in the armed services was definitely on the increase when the war ended. Their performance of duty since the end of hostilities has continued at the same high level of efficiency that prevailed during the combat phase of the war. It is, therefore, considered entirely logical that they have a definite place in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments. * * *

* * * * *

"The joint resolution contemplates that, except where obviously inapplicable, the same personnel management policies that are prescribed for male personnel shall continue to govern the treatment of women in the armed services."

The time has now come to move forward by an additional step in line with the expression of policy last quoted. It is now fitting and appropriate that the opportunities for education and training afforded to selected young men in our several service academies be now extended in full measure to our young womanhood with the same purposes and objectives in view. In this way we shall grant full recognition to their contributions and shall broaden their opportunities for leadership in appropriate fields.

I visualize, indeed, the type of institution which will eventually emerge as one modeled along the line of our great universities where basic training will be afforded in the freshman and sophomore years in history, languages, general science, and similar subjects of value in all the services, with the junior and senior years devoted to majoring in special subjects appropriate to the branch of service chosen. Such an academy will then be in a position to grant degrees, so that those who may subsequently terminate their service may return to civil life with education and training on a par with that received by their colleagues and friends who have devoted themselves exclusively to civilian pursuits.

What was said on behalf of the Department of Defense in connection with the establishment of the Air Force Academy is pertinent here. Said the distinguished Assistant Secretary, Mr. Hannah:

"The Defense Department is a huge operation involving the expenditure of vast sums of money. When tens of billions are being spent to assure our survival, it is easy to become so involved in considerations of atomic versus standard weapons, guided missiles, radar screens, remote detection centers, carriers versus land bases, and on and on and forget that as we plan for the future there is no more important consideration than the wisest possible programs for training our future military leaders—Army, Navy, and Air.

"It is the view of some able and sincere educators that the educational needs of the services could be met adequately by institutions under civilian control. They point out that many of our finest military leaders have come from our civilian colleges and universities. They argue that graduates of civilian institutions bring into the services a highly desirable variety of background, training, and experience, and often a high degree of desirable specialization.

"I came to my present office in the Department of Defense with that point of view. I had studied the report of the Service Academy Board, previously referred to, and I remained convinced that undergraduate training of career officers could best be given in civilian colleges and universities, with the academies restricted to postgraduate training in various military specialties.

"My subsequent experiences in close association with large numbers of graduates of West Point and Annapolis and visits to the two academies have led me to a complete change of viewpoint. I am now strongly convinced of the wisdom of establishing an Air Force Academy, believing it to be necessary from the standpoint of national defense, and wholly desirable from an educational point of view.

"I have been led to this complete change of attitude by the personal observation that West Point and Annapolis perform two unique functions which no civilian institution of like rank could hope or be expected to do.

"I am impressed, first of all, with their intense and continued emphasis upon the ideal of service to the country. Nowhere else, so far as I know, are young men exposed to just that sort of influence over a protracted period. Loyalty and dedication to the service are hallmarks of the graduates of the military and naval academies, and we would be in a sorry state if the professional officers' corps did not have a high proportion of men who are motivated by just those ideals. Since such training is available nowhere else, it is not only desirable but necessary that the Air Force should have its own academy where it can teach its own cadets those same lessons.

"Second, I am impressed by the high standards of integrity and personal ethics enforced at the two service academies. No one would claim that their graduates are totally beyond reproach, but I do maintain that few professions, if any, can match the success of the service academies in inspiring their members to live up to such high standards of integrity and ethical conduct."

Every word in this quotation can be made equally applicable to the women in the armed services provided they are given the same opportunities.

An analysis of the joint resolution now offered will disclose that it provides for an institution to be known as the United States Women's Armed Services Academy, to be located at such place as the Secretary of Defense, with the advice of a commission to be established by him, shall select.

In order to establish the academy, provision is made for the acquisition of the necessary land, the preparatory and actual work of construction, permanent and temporary, and for the provision of necessary equipment.

The joint resolution then provides, generally, that all the appropriate legislation dealing with the United States Military Academy shall apply to this institution.

Finally, the joint resolution provides for appointments by Senators and Representatives.

It is a simple joint resolution, but one of immense possibilities. Its enactment will mean that we shall have brought ourselves up to date in the establishment of an officer group calculated to deal ably with the problems of modern warfare insofar as they are already recognized as within the sphere of capable women with the experience and training to do the job.

STUDY OF ISSUANCE OF URANIUM MINING STOCKS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, since the uranium idea came into being, individual companies of all kinds and by the thousands have started selling stock in

various uranium promotional ventures. I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which would authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to make an investigation of that situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. From my State, I have received many letters inquiring whether there is in existence a pamphlet on uranium. Does the resolution of the Senator from New Mexico provide for the publication of such a pamphlet?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I think that is most commendable, because that topic is a very live one. However, apparently there is no place where Members of Congress can obtain such information to be mailed to their constituents.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say that the different varieties of uranium stock being sold today through the mails exceed the total number of stocks listed on the Stock Exchange Board in New York City.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas a large number of issues of uranium mining stocks are being offered for sale to the public through the mails and other instrumentalities of interstate commerce;

Whereas many of these stocks are being issued in relatively small amounts and have been exempted from registration under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended; and

Whereas such exemption from registration may, in many cases, leave prospective investors without adequate information concerning such issues: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the issuance of uranium mining stocks, for the purpose of ascertaining whether any changes are necessary in the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or in the regulations promulgated thereunder, to provide adequate protection for prospective investors in such securities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

STUDY OF NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DANIEL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the narcotics problem in the United States, including ways and means of improving the Federal Criminal Code and other laws and enforcement procedures dealing with the possession, sale, and transportation of narcotics, marihuana, and similar drugs. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) the extent, cause, and effect of unlawful uses of narcotics and marihuana in the United States, (2) the adequacy, administration, operation, and enforcement of existing laws relating thereto, and (3) the additions and changes which should be made in the laws and enforcement procedures to prevent illicit possession, sale, transportation, and use of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and to combat the increasing narcotic addiction in the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to procure such printing and binding, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1956.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INTEROCEANIC SHIP CANAL ACROSS THE ISTHMUS OF TEHUANTEPEC

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the United States there is a considerable school of thought which believes that something should be done to further inter-American defense and Western Hemispheric economic progress and solidarity. Therefore, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution by which the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Republic of Mexico, in order to carry out those purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That in the furtherance of Inter-American defense and Western Hemispheric economic progress and solidarity, the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of ascertaining the willingness of that Government to make a treaty providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an interoceanic ship canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO MAKE EXPENDITURES UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 172

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 69), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the time in which the Committee on the Judiciary may expend funds under the authority of Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954, is hereby extended through March 15, 1955.

CIVIL SERVICE WEEK—PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Governor of Massachusetts, relating to Civil Service Week. A great number of Massachusetts citizens think it will be helpful to have the proclamation published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Federal employees have set high standards of accomplishment and integrity in meeting the responsibilities of public service; and

Whereas these high standards are made possible by a civil-service system based on merit; and

Whereas President Eisenhower recently issued an Executive order that establishes a new appointment system for the Federal Government, effective January 23, 1955; and

Whereas such Executive order provides greater job security for nearly 450,000 present Government employees, who get their jobs through competitive examination, and represents the greatest advance in many years toward providing the American people with a strong and stable career force to carry out the essential and complicated functions of modern government; and

Whereas each year, on the anniversary of the passage of the Civil Service Act of 1883, the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor of Massachusetts sponsors special programs and activities to acquaint the public with the history and principles of the merit system in Government service.

Now, therefore, I, Christian A. Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim January 16–22, 1955, as Civil Service Week and urge the citizens of Massachusetts to join with our Federal employees in a suitable observance of the 72d anniversary of the Civil Service Act.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 26th day of January in the year of our Lord 1955; and of the independence of the United States of America, the 179th.

By His Excellency the Governor:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him in San Francisco, Calif., on February 18, 1955.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered by him at the commissioning exercises of the 12th officer candidate class, United States Marine Corps, at Quantico, Va., on February 19, 1955.

Article entitled "Is Ike Popular Enough To Save the GOP?" published in the Democratic Digest of March 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement prepared by him relating to the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

By Mr. DUFF:

Address delivered by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Representative to the United Nations, at a dinner of the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 14, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to give notice, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a hearing on the afternoon of February 24, at 2 o'clock, in the room of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The purpose of the hearing is to give an opportunity to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and his staff to appear before the subcommittee and make such report as they may desire, and to answer such questions as the members of the subcommittee may desire to propound, with respect to the program, policy, and accomplishments of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in carrying out its duties.

Attention should be called to the fact that on August 1, 1953, the Senate and the House adopted a concurrent resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that all Indians in certain States and certain tribes should be released from the guardianship of the Government of the United States. Some action has been taken under that resolution. During the 83d Congress, certain bills on the subject—approximately 12 in number, I believe—were introduced. However, not all of them were passed.

From the mail being received by the committee, I know there is a great deal of interest in this matter; and I feel that this is the best way to draw the attention of all who may be interested to the fact that the Commissioner and his staff will appear and will discuss the entire problem of Indian affairs on the 24th of February, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to announce that tomorrow no other business will be transacted in the Senate except routine matters and the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in regard to the proceedings today?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Will the acting majority leader give us assurance that there will not be a night session tonight? Some of us have made engagements for tonight which have been planned for a long time. I have been asked to make inquiry of the acting majority leader as to whether there will be a night session tonight.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in a position at this time, 12:05 p. m., to tell my friend from Oregon what the situation will be tonight. It is the hope of the acting majority leader that the Senate may dispose of as many of the measures it was announced last Friday would be considered today as it may be possible to act on. If it should be necessary that the Senate sit until a little later hour than usual in order to dispose of one or two important measures in the group announced on last Friday, it would be my intention to have the Senate remain in session long enough to dispose of them.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the information.

ALASKA AND HAWAII STATEHOOD—HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 49, AND TELEGRAM FROM ALASKA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today hearings on Senate bill 49, to enable Alaska and Hawaii to attain statehood, were opened by the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs. The Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, was the chief witness today; and I urge every Member of the Senate to read the Secretary's testimony.

In connection with these hearings, the Members of the Senate will be interested in a telegram I have received. It is signed by every member of the House of Representatives of the Alaskan Territorial Legislative, who are unequivocally supporting statehood. The members of the House of Representatives of Alaska are, of course, elected by popular vote of the citizens of the Territory, hence, their unanimous views can be said to express the position of the nearly 200,000 loyal and brave American citizens of the Territory of Alaska. Incidentally, Mr. President, the Alaska House consists of both Republican and Democratic members, showing again that the issue of statehood transcends politics both in Alaska and in our Nation as a whole.

I ask that the telegram from all the members of the Alaska House of Representatives appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *February 17, 1955.*

Hon. JAMES MURRAY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We wholeheartedly endorse the efforts your committee is making toward achieving statehood for Alaska and we extend to you our sincere appreciation. May God be with you in your deliberations. We in Alaska stand ready to assume our responsibilities as a State. We feel our loyalty and devotion as citizens of the United States has been proven by performance and action. It is therefore with burning indignation that we observe from time to time the testimony that is tendered to your committee by the great leaders of the administration in Washington. We feel further that a careful analysis of the remarks made by Secretaries McKay and Wilson might well serve as a warning to the American people everywhere for it is clearly evident that their remarks show a complete and wanton disregard toward Alaskan rights as American citizens. Their testimony of late has dwelt upon the loyalty of Hawaiians, with specific omission of Alaskans. We protest such omissions. Their testimony refers to Alaska as a Federal area. From time to time there has been talk of using Alaska as a defense area. To your loyal citizens residing in Alaska this type of thinking is completely repugnant to America's heritage. We are an industrious and freedom-loving people. We intensely dislike being thought of as pawns in a game of chess to be played by high administrative officials. The Congress of the United States might well look further into the thinking and purposes of Secretaries Wilson and McKay. We feel their thinking is a serious matter and that disregard and abuse of Americans anywhere is a matter of concern to Americans everywhere.

E. G. Bailey, Lester Bronson, Seaborn J. Buckalew, Jr., Edith R. Bullock, Charles E. Fagerstrom, Hubert A. Gilbert, Richard J. Oreuel, Ken C. Johnson, Peter J. Kalamarides, Ed Locken, Stanley J. McCutcheon, Joseph A. McLean, George B. McNabb, Jr., Robert J. McNeally, Vernon M. Metcalfe, Harry B. Palmer, Raymond E. Plummer, Burke Riley, Irene E. Ryan, Thomas B. Stewart, Dora M. Sweeney, Warren A. Taylor, Russell K. Young, Wendell P. Kay, Speaker of the House; complete membership, Alaska House of Representatives.

INCREASES IN SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, THE JUDICIARY, AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from the Congress of Industrial Organizations, relating to salary increases for Members of Congress and Federal judges, together with a statement favoring such pay increases.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1955.

To: Members of the United States Congress.
From: Robert Oliver, assistant to the President and director of CIO legislative committee.

Enclosed herewith you will find a resolution concerning the pending legislation to increase congressional and judicial salaries which was adopted unanimously by the CIO executive board at its meeting in Washington, D. C. on February 2, 1955.

This action by the CIO executive board follows the endorsement of the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries which CIO secretary-treasurer James B. Carey earlier forwarded to the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

The CIO realizes that there exists some misunderstanding of the merits of the pending legislation. We will make every effort throughout the country, both through our own membership as well as the general public, to show the rightness and justification of the proposed increases.

We urge you to proceed with the enactment of this legislation as rapidly as possible, confident that in the coming weeks a large segment of the population will be fully informed as to its complete justification.

CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL PAY RAISE

(Resolution adopted by the CIO executive board, February 2, 1955)

The CIO heartily approves the proposal to increase salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges. We urge the leaders of both parties in both Houses of the Congress to unite behind the recommendations made last year by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries to the end that they may be enacted into law as speedily as possible.

It has been 9 years since Congress and the Federal judiciary last received a salary increase. The result, during this period of high inflation and general salary increases for most segments of the economy, has been an increasing number of resignations of Members of Congress and judges to accept other more lucrative jobs in private industry.

The CIO believes that no body of men in the world have a greater responsibility than the Members of our great national legislature and the judges who are called upon to interpret legislative enactments. Such responsibility must be met with adequate recompense.

Not only have congressional salaries never caught up with inflation, but in recent years they have never been entirely commensurate with the high demands made upon Congressmen. Even the top recommendation for an increase currently being considered by the Congress will, if enacted, still leave the pay of Members of Congress far below the salaries being paid to executives of business corporations whose work has far less responsibility to the public interest.

Enactment of the pay increases for Congress and the Federal judges at the top levels recommended by the Commission on Judicial and Cnngressional Salaries will be an investment in good government that is long overdue. It should have the support of all citizens. We urge immediate passage of this legislation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from the American Federation of Labor dealing with Federal pay increase proposed legislation pending before the 84th Congress providing pay increases for Federal employees.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the most part, the history of Government wage legislation is one of shabby treatment of Federal employees. Too often Congress and the executive branch of our Government have considered Federal salaries as a largess, rather than on the basis of the complex of competitive forces laid down by historic experience and the laws of economics.

Wages of a worker, including Federal employees, must be considered in the light of cost of living, productivity of the national economy, productivity of the individual firm and worker, collective bargaining, the American goal of a constantly rising standard of living and the demands of an economy predicated on mass production for a market through mass consumption.

During the greater part of the last two decades, postal and other Federal employees have been denied the ability to compete with increased prices. In a period during which our Nation as a whole enjoyed unprecedented national prosperity, Federal workers have been stepchildren of our American economy. For example, in only 2 years since 1939 have postal employees been paid wages above living costs. In 1952, salaries were a mere 4 percent above Bureau of Labor cost figures published by the Department of Labor; in 1953, there was a 1 percent spread between wages and living costs. Deficits were shown for the remaining years ranging from 1 percent in 1940 to 32 percent in 1948.

Inadequate wages for Government workers can lead only to an inferior caliber of personnel, expensive recruiting and training experience, decreased efficiency and, in the finals, poor Government operation. The combination of these undesirable conditions inevitably results in more costly Government to every taxpayer.

The cost of Government is properly the concern of each of us. No one advocates useless spending or the waste of our public Treasury. However, in the matter of wages for Federal employees, there is involved a very human question as well as a moral obligation on the part of those responsible for determining salaries. The human question can be satisfied only if the worker is given a wage that will enable him to provide decent and adequate care for his family. A moral responsibility exists as long as Federal employees do not have collective bargaining rights and in the absence of economic privileges accorded workers in private industry in a given wage dispute.

These two responsibilities should weigh heavily on those charged with establishing Federal salary schedules. They were completely ignored last year in the veto of the wage legislation approved by the 83d Congress. The current attitude of some persons in the executive branch of Government seems to be a take-it-or-leave-it offer, without reference to the needs of the employees or the justice of their case for better wages. This amounts to a callous disregard of more than 2 million Federal workers and their families and a complete evasion of the moral responsibility on the part of our Federal Government to pay fair and decent wages.

Bills now before Congress providing for a 10-percent wage increase have the support of an overwhelming majority of Federal employees. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor is convinced this is a minimum amount due Government personnel, the majority of whom have had no upward wage adjustment since 1951.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 17, 1955, which I received from Lawrence J. Walsh, dealing with the proposed 66.6 percent salary increases for Members of Congress and increases in the pay of certain other employees.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was stunned to hear of Congress supporting a 66.6-percent raise for Congressmen when GS employees, such as myself, have had no raise since 1951 and even a 5-percent raise vetoed.

It seems at least a 10-percent raise for GS employees should be expedited and made retroactive to the veto of 1954 or January 1, 1955, at the latest.

The fringe benefits make the take-home pay less when the cost-of-living expenses are greater.

An equitable raise is needed soon.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. WALSH.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from a person in Anthony, Tex., dealing with proposed salary increases for Members of Congress and the judiciary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTHONY, TEX., *February 18, 1955.*

Senator WM. E. LANGER,
Patriot, Washington,
District of Confusion.

DEAR SENATOR: Congress votes itself $25,000 per year with perquisites. It is clear Congress feels that as the Republic is being destroyed anyhow its bones should be picked clean before casting them away.

It has been made clear by our modernized courts that an oath to uphold and defend our fabric of government has no power to bind the hands of officials reaching out to the synagogue of Satan, to be filled by those within the shadows who hold the money bags, as Aldrich held them at the stockyards at Chicago.

Every legislature should forthwith pass declarations of independence of the falling Government before the intended military dictatorship can be clamped upon them.

Dare you—even you—as boldly courageous as you undoubtedly are, dare put this message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? It might make you President if you do. Is not an oath of office even less than a scrap of paper?

Of course wine and whisky comes high down there and many of those lads never before had a chance to spread themselves with someone else footing the bill. Anyway, Judas must have his 30 pieces of silver.

HUBERT H. HEATH.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced S. 1120, to enlarge and extend the special school milk program which was authorized in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The provisions of the present act provide for use of $50 million of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation annually for 2 years, ending June 30, 1956, to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under.

Under S. 1120, the amount authorized for such use would be increased to $100 million annually, and the program would be continued for an additional year, namely, until June 30, 1957.

On the basis of the program already undertaken, and the great advantages, from economic and health standpoints, of the increased use of milk, I believe that the investment of additional funds in this program will result in good to the entire country.

I also feel confident that many more schools will participate, and there will be more effective development of the program by all schools, if it is known that the plan will continue for at least 2 years beyond the present fiscal year.

This will enable the Department of Agriculture and the schools to plan their activities beyond the present more or less experimental program.

Every State, through its department of education, has a contract with the Department of Agriculture for the allocation of funds allotted to it.

Although the program was not initiated until September, an allocation of $35 million has already been made.

Funds allocated to the States, on the basis of a formula relating to the number of school children and the per capita income, are used to reimburse participating schools which show increased consumption of milk.

A base of normal consumption prior to the program is established in each school, and the school is then reimbursed at the rate of 4 cents per half pint of milk consumed by schoolchildren above that base.

Where no milk was previously served and a base is not available, the reimbursement is made at 3 cents a half pint for milk consumed by the children.

On February 15, 45,500 schools throughout the Nation participated in this program to increase the use of milk in the diets of our growing boys and girls.

Some States report their schools showing increased milk consumption of more than 100 percent.

While some States have already used all the funds available to them, others have not fully developed their programs.

It is planned, therefore, to make a reallocation of the unused funds for the fiscal year.

It seems to me that an effective program is being developed, and that it should be continued and expanded.

I have received from the Department of Agriculture some reports giving the status of the special school milk program on January 15.

I ask unanimous consent that the reports be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I think the information would be most informative to most Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—STATUS OF PROGRAM AS OF JANUARY 15, 1955, AND ITS EFFECTS ON MILK CONSUMPTION IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

The special school milk program, which was announced to the States on September 10, 1954, is now operating in all States. This report summarizes the current status of the program from the standpoint of number of schools approved for participation and provides preliminary data on the effects of the program on milk consumption.

CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

As of January 15, 1955, nearly 42,000 schools had been approved for participation in the program. This is an increase of approximately 10,000 schools above the number which had been approved as of November 30, 1954. The number of schools approved represents about one-fourth of the 160,000 schools in the Nation. (See table I.)

EFFECTS ON MILK CONSUMPTION

During the month of November the new program was operating in 44 States and the District of Columbia. Preliminary reports received cover operations in 19,535 schools in which 5.2 million children were drinking milk under the program. (See table II.)

In November, these schools achieved a 55-percent increase over normal base consumption of milk. For the 19,535 schools, this represented additional consumption of 32 million half pints of milk, or over 17 million additional pounds. Among the States reporting, the increase in milk consumption in participating schools ranged from 22 percent in the District of Columbia to 123 percent in Montana. Increases in the majority of States ranged between 40 and 90 percent. A few States fell below 40 percent but 7 States reported increases of over 100 percent.

TABLE I.—*Special school milk program—Status of program as of Jan. 15, 1955: Number of schools approved for participation compared to total number of schools in each State*

State	Number of schools approved for special milk program	Total number of schools in State [1]	Number of schools approved as percent of total	Number of schools participating in school lunch program [2]	State	Number of schools approved for special milk program	Total number of schools in State [1]	Number of schools approved as percent of total	Number of schools participating in school lunch program [2]
Alabama	948	3,872	24.5	1,425	Nevada	60	220	27.3	70
Arizona	267	591	45.2	283	New Hampshire	222	683	32.5	318
Arkansas	842	2,278	37.0	964	New Jersey	776	2,303	33.7	704
California	1,760	5,004	35.2	3,181	New Mexico	299	861	34.7	285
Colorado	390	1,693	23.0	579	New York	2,966	7,750	38.3	3,542
Connecticut	350	1,109	31.6	439	North Carolina	1,183	3,502	33.8	1,584
Delaware	81	240	33.8	92	North Dakota	254	3,277	7.8	793
District of Columbia	181	233	77.7	184	Ohio	1,398	4,875	28.7	1,859
Florida	486	1,873	25.9	914	Oklahoma	1,056	3,644	29.0	1,728
Georgia	1,211	3,376	35.9	1,421	Oregon	291	1,457	20.0	642
Idaho	198	750	26.4	406	Pennsylvania	2,431	8,638	28.1	1,489
Illinois	2,139	5,400	39.6	3,382	Rhode Island	178	490	36.3	115
Indiana	878	3,359	26.1	1,286	South Carolina	649	3,421	19.0	1,122
Iowa	970	7,257	13.4	1,017	South Dakota	217	3,775	5.7	301
Kansas	390	4,307	9.1	929	Tennessee	2,157	4,446	48.5	1,953
Kentucky	602	5,301	11.4	1,243	Texas	1,519	7,957	19.1	2,521
Louisiana	444	2,635	16.9	1,627	Utah	376	519	72.4	365
Maine	394	1,658	23.8	628	Vermont	310	938	33.0	425
Maryland	724	1,256	57.6	706	Virginia	744	3,273	22.7	1,316
Massachusetts	1,527	2,770	55.1	1,960	Washington	816	1,617	50.5	918
Michigan	2,010	5,153	39.0	2,302	West Virginia	786	4,157	18.9	1,505
Minnesota	1,267	5,645	22.4	1,253	Wisconsin	2,222	7,146	31.1	1,646
Mississippi	720	4,318	16.7	1,129	Wyoming	101	708	14.3	120
Missouri	1,636	7,500	21.8	2,264					
Montana	185	1,470	12.6	257	Total	41,922	161,497	26.0	55,677
Nebraska	311	6,792	4.6	487					

[1] Source: U. S. Office of Education. Latest data available is for 1951–52. Through consolidation there are currently a fewer number of schools, particularly in some States, than are reflected in the 1951–52 data.
[2] Peak number of schools by States—1953-54.

TABLE II. *Special school milk program—Preliminary report of school milk program operations by States for the month of November 1954*

State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase	State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase
			Thousand ½ pints	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*				*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*
Alabama	411	115,308	1,232	1,690	458	37	Idaho [2]						
Arizona	245	71,543	1,005	1,400	395	39	Illinois	1,295	653,158	4,785	6,851	2,066	43
Arkansas	292	76,019	845	1,577	732	86	Indiana	423	99,334	1,151	1,879	728	63
California [1]							Iowa	663	128,708	1,669	3,008	1,339	80
Colorado	287	44,726	532	886	354	66	Kansas	249	59,616	411	773	362	88
Connecticut [2]							Kentucky [1]						
Delaware	38	10,617	99	135	36	36	Louisiana [1]						
District of Columbia	131	36,982	541	660	119	22	Maine	215	24,327	230	323	93	40
Florida	144	40,381	530	799	269	51	Maryland	28	6,153	68	89	21	31
Georgia	122	30,256	451	679	228	51	Massachusetts	1,360	335,982	4,556	5,611	1,055	23

[1] No programs in operation during November.
[2] Programs in operation but State report for November not yet received.

TABLE II. *Special school milk program—Preliminary report of school milk program operations by States for the month of November 1954*—Continued

State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase	State	Number of schools reporting	Children drinking milk	Normal monthly consumption	Total consumption	Increase above normal consumption	Percent increase
			Thousand ½ pints	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*				*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*	*Thousand ½ pints*
Michigan	1,306	385,048	4,015	5,616	1,601	40	Pennsylvania	844	134,272	1,214	2,450	1,236	102
Minnesota	717	166,293	2,399	4,313	1,914	80	Rhode Island	58	8,509	82	95	13	16
Mississippi	604	138,185	1,909	3,198	1,289	68	South Carolina	399	106,433	1,462	2,168	706	48
Missouri	1,186	171,117	2,138	4,140	2,002	94	South Dakota	136	17,072	205	436	231	113
Montana	70	11,394	102	227	125	123	Tennessee	1,528	281,619	4,101	6,802	2,701	66
Nebraska	234	40,835	559	870	311	56	Texas	780	222,687	2,114	3,259	1,145	54
Nevada	57	12,591	137	284	147	107	Utah	356	69,790	1,029	1,547	518	50
New Hampshire	103	12,942	192	241	49	26	Vermont	142	15,874	210	322	112	53
New Jersey	202	52,537	435	628	193	44	Virginia [1]						
New Mexico	125	35,576	243	488	245	101	Washington [2]						
New York	1,467	610,125	8,655	12,106	3,451	40	West Virginia	398	49,040	461	774	313	68
North Carolina	1,059	567,052	4,448	7,194	2,746	62	Wisconsin	331	57,131	670	1,435	765	114
North Dakota	146	18,768	264	463	199	75	Wyoming	57	9,364	94	193	99	105
Ohio	405	190,486	1,309	1,868	559	43							
Oklahoma	734	97,605	1,042	1,977	935	90	Total	19,535	5,191,017	58,107	90,135	32,028	55
Oregon	188	35,562	513	681	168	33							

[1] No programs in operation during November.

[2] Programs in operation but State report for November not yet received.

ADDRESSES BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER ON EUROPEAN GOOD-WILL TOUR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, former President Hoover continues to serve his Nation with distinction and with lasting impress upon the course of world affairs. In November of last year, he made a good-will trip to West Germany, and during the course of his travels he delivered three major addresses, the contents of which reflect the depth of his understanding of today's difficult problems. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have these remarkable speeches printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME HOPES FOR PEACE

(Speech of Hon. Herbert Hoover before the press club of Bonn, Germany, November 24, 1954)

Mr. Chairman and guests, I am greatly touched by your tribute to my country and to myself. I also am told that I am the first speaker at a press club lunch in the new headquarters. I would not arrogate to myself the right to deliver any message from the press club of the United States, of which I have been a member for several years. Probably a public official is not expected to convey their messages, but, as a private member of the press club of Washington, I am glad to be the first speaker in this new room. Moreover, our press club has become a forum for the more important addresses outside of the halls of Congress. Every returning statesman who came to our country in recent years has addressed the press club to deliver their messages to the American people. So I hope you will grow and particularly will expand your diningroom. I might add that our own press club expanded four times since it was founded.

It appears to be the rule of the executive committee of our press club that the chairman should delicately convey to every speaker that 20 minutes would probably be as long as the press could dissociate itself from its work. So I warn you that I will not be more than 20 minutes.

It is indeed a great honor for me to be an invited guest of the Chancellor and the German people.

I have visited Germany many times over 40 years. My last visit was nearly 8 years ago. In the past 8 years since then, West Germany has risen from the ashes of war; the shackles of stifling and destructive economic policies have been stricken off; famine has been overcome; productivity has been reestablished. And finally sovereignty and full membership in the family of nations has been acknowledged as Germany's right.

I have rejoiced in each of these steps to the restoration of a great people. And these accomplishments are the vivid proof of the genius and vitality of the German people.

When I learned that you wished me to make some sort of an address, I inquired as to what subject within my province might be of interest to you. Your officials suggested that I appraise the hopes of peace as seen through some American eyes.

There never was a time when the Western World was more anxious for peace. All our peoples have had their fill of war. The daily prayer of all freemen is for a lasting peace.

In this 9½ years since the guns were silenced the disordered world with all its aftermaths has made some progress toward stability and peace. And from this progress there is hope.

You will remember the Biblical legend of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, the names of which were War, Death, Famine, and Pestilence. Fighting war and death have abated. Through aroused compassion, famine and pestilence were overcome at that time.

But out of these gigantic tumults has come another horseman to ravish the world with fear, hate, and a passion to destroy Western civilization. The ancient prophet was unacquainted with him, but his name is communism.

The tensions of military conflict with Russia seem to have abated in these recent months and from this abatement I believe we can have at least a gleam of hope. Moscow has made many declarations of peace-loving intent. They speak of peaceful coexistence.

It may be that they want more time to consolidate their gains. They may want more time to promote their infiltration of conspiracies in free nations. It may be that the growth of our deterrents against military aggression has influenced their minds.

It may be that internal forces are working within to restrain them. Every deep-seated social or political revolution has generated within itself a dynamism of military aggression or a crusading spirit to spread their new ideas. That was the case of the Mohammedan Revolution, the French Revolution, the American Revolution, as well as the Russian Revolution. Incidentally, in the American case, we had a vacant continent to invade, but we have been nonetheless crusaders to spread our concepts of freedom.

With time, the original leaders of these revolutions die off and some revolutions have the bad habit of devouring their young. At least their successors are less violent. They become more concerned with their dangers and improvements at home. From all this it may be that the Communist protestations are genuine. All of which possibly warrants a faint hope.

But from our many years' experience with the Communists, we should learn more about what peaceful coexistence means, and we must await works rather than words. The Western World has many times enumerated some of these works to which the Communists might contribute. They could join in the completely free unification of Germany; they could sign the peace with Austria. They could cease their germ warfare of conspiracies directed to overthrowing free governments.

With such steps, we might at least advance out of the thunder and lightning of this cold war into the dawn of a cold peace.

THE DEFENSE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

But all this is too much to expect, and we should not be lulled into the abandonment of our means of defense. The only hope for our safety is the building up of arms and a united front among free nations which will deter Communist aggression against us. The Western World has no intention of military aggression against the Communists. The sole purpose of our alliances and our armament is to have such powerful deterrents as to convince them of the futility of starting war.

In this role of deterrents, the present proposed agreements looking to the arming of Germany and Europe have a very large part. Without the consummation of those agreements, the security of Western civilization in Europe becomes dependent on the malevolent will of the Communists.

NEUTRALISM

The coming of the fission bomb and guided missiles has contributed to the deterrents. But one of its discouraging effects has been that, for fear of its use upon them by the Communists, some nations engage in the futile hope to escape its ravages by neutrality in a great conflict.

Neutralism is no answer to the security of free nations in case of a major conflict. And moreover, it gives comfort only to the spirit of aggression from the Communists.

The only hope of at least relief from military aggression by the Communists is if each one of the powerful nations associates itself in the real building of arms for mutual defense. That is the most powerful of deterrents.

AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN THE DEFENSE OF EUROPE

Our American people have joined in the defense of Western Europe. It is an illusion of some European statesmen that we have joined and spent huge efforts for the selfish

purpose of defending ourselves. I and most of my countrymen have held that this is untrue. We can defend ourselves at much less cost in manpower and money, and build effective deterrents against Communist attack upon us. The fundamental reason for our participation is to preserve Western civilization in Europe and the freedom of nations in the world.

The strength of the West in effective defense is not a goal in itself but only a precondition and guaranty of freedom for unlimited development of our cultural and spiritual life.

Nor is there an atom of truth in the assertion that American action is animated by imperialistic ambitions. The world should know from our many actions in the past there is no imperialism in our blood.

Our people have met many discouragements and frustrations in these efforts. We have greatly reduced our resources with which we could increase the comfort and living of our own people. Europe must realize that many of my countrymen had lost confidence in these projects of European defense.

But the statesmanship of Chancellor Adenauer and your Parliament, through joining Germany in the effective defense of Europe, has done much to restore confidence and hope in the American people. We await similar action by other nations, but our patience is not inexhaustible.

THE UNITED NATIONS

At one time we built great hopes on the organization of the United Nations.

When that temple was built to guard the flame of peace, the world concerned itself with the architecture of the superstructure, but neglected its foundation. When Communists were taken into that structure, the foundation of its major purpose, which was to stop military aggression, was destroyed.

But it has some values as a forum whereby with electronic equipment we can denounce the ways of the Communists in five languages all at once. It does perform useful services in mediating minor conflicts, in public health, in some economic and philanthropic fields. It might also be a place where free nations can promote their unity. But the inability of the United Nations to prevent military aggression has given rise to defensive alliances intended for the protection of the free world.

THE RISE OF PEACEFUL NATIONALISM

One of the real foundations of peace is the rise of what is sometimes derisively called nationalism. There are those who with the organization of the United Nations had further dreams of some sort of world government where the independence of nations would be curtailed or abolished. They denounce nationalism as a sin against peace and progress and as a wicked force.

But the spirit of nationalism in its true sense springs from the deepest of human emotions. It springs from a thousand rills of inspiring national history, its heroes, its common language, its culture, and its national achievements. It rises from the yearning of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themselves.

Nationalism rises from our national sacrifices. Every nation has laid its dead upon the altar of its country. These died with their national flag before their eyes and their national hymns upon their lips. National pride has swelled from their suffering and sacrifice. Within free nations these emotions, added to their religious faith, are their spiritual strength. It sustains their resolution to defend themselves against aggression and domination.

And equally do these emotions flow wide and deep in all free nations. Within them and their religious faith is their spiritual strength. It sustains their resolution to defend themselves against aggression and domination.

Nationalism does not mean isolation from unity of action among nations; rather does internal spiritual strength make common action for defense more secure and more potent.

And we can have some hope that slumbering nationalism in the Iron Curtain nations will awaken to throw off the Moscow yoke as it has in Yugoslavia.

I have rejoiced at the rise of a peaceful and constructive spirit in Germany. It has brought great steps in her independence and her strength. From her full freedom alone can come the common defense and her full contribution to all mankind.

THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

I can well claim that advocacy of German unification is no afterthought of mine for this occasion.

Twelve years ago, just after America entered the war, some of our leaders in a spirit of revenge and as a necessity of peace began to demand dismemberment of Germany. At that time I said:

"The Germans, like all virile races, are cohesive. The history of Europe's wars might be written around her dismemberments and the explosions from her movements to unity. * * *

"There can be no lasting peace * * * with a dismembered Germany.

"Nations cannot be held in chains. * * *

"No people can be punished and at the same time leave any hope of lasting peace. * * * Victory with vengeance is ultimate defeat in the modern world. * * *

"We can have peace or we can have revenge, but we cannot have both."

In my country we hold that unification must be the purpose of free nations; we hold that the work of unification must have their full cooperation; we hold that unification by the hand of Russia alone is not likely to be on terms which preserve Germany's association with Western civilization or which can assure the defense of Germany from Communist domination.

The German peoples have before now been the bastion of Western civilization which deterred its destruction by the Asiatic hordes.

My prayer is that Germany may be given the unity and full freedom which will restore her to that mission in the world.

CONCLUSION

I am not here to offer certain solutions to these dreadful aftermaths of war from which we still suffer, but to indicate the good will of my countrymen.

We must realize that in dealing with these gigantic problems the statesmen of free nations cannot perform miracles. But that they can, by vision, patience, tolerance, moderation, and understanding, abate the dangerous forces which breed aggression, fear, and hate, and they can increase good will among men; nor can we abandon the hope that some time the free nations who believe in God will mobilize in unity against Red atheism and human slavery.

In Germany the rebuilding of prosperity and independence from the demoralization of defeat has of necessity been by the patient laying of stone upon stone.

My countrymen believe that the reconstruction of West Germany, the revival of its economic life, and the respect it has won among nations is due to the great statesmanship of your Chancellor and to the great people he is privileged to lead.

THE SERVICE OF UNIVERSITIES TO FREEDOM

(Address by Herbert Hoover at Tuebingen University, November 25, 1954)

Mr. Rector, representatives of the faculty, and students of Tuebingen University, it is a great honor to come back to a university because, as some of you may know, 60 years of my life has been spent on the campus of a university. I have had interruptions due to the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse having followed me at times, but otherwise my life has been one of association with university faculties and students, and I have had the same refreshment of spirit that I have had today in meeting the students and professors.

You have conferred a great honor upon me by a degree from this, one of the oldest of the world's great universities, to one who is a graduate of perhaps one of the youngest of the universities. I have had, as I have said, many affections for universities but have only one honestly-earned degree to my credit. This event today constitutes my 81st great honor from universities by a degree. I might plead that perhaps life on the campus and some effort trying to find money to pay professors justifies the universities in awarding me some academic attention.

On this occasion, I could not fail to acknowledge the obligations which our much younger universities of America owe to their older German brothers. The structure of our faculties and our methods of instruction were established almost wholly on the pattern of German universities. You will realize that more than 25 percent of the races which have poured into the melting pot of America are of Germanic origin. The very names of many American leaders in every branch of our national life are witness to the value of this inheritance.

There is no better example of this fruitful interchange of intellectual life than the case of Friedrich List. His name especially comes to my mind because I have received the distinguished honor of being made an honorary citizen of Reutlingen, the city of his birth. List was indeed one of the great economists during the first half of the 19th century. As a member of your faculty, his pioneering ideas on economic freedom brought him trouble and exile. He naturally migrated to America where he took part in molding American life. Becoming an American citizen he was appointed American consul at Stuttgart. Over his remaining 20 years he was a frequent visitor to this university. Nor did he cease in his contributions to an understanding of the basis of the successful economic life of nations.

I have been in Germany many times, but one occasion was on a scholastic adventure. Some years before the First World War, together with Mrs. Hoover, we undertook to translate from the Latin the first comprehensive book published on my branch of the engineering profession. That was a work entitled, "De Re Metallica," by Georgius Agricola—being a huge folio of 600 pages with many intelligent illustrations. It was published almost 400 years ago. The author's real name was Georg Bauer, a doctor living among the mines of Saxony and Bohemia. He also held some public offices, among them Burgomeister of Chemnitz. Agricola had a tendril of memory with this university. Although he was a stanch Catholic, he was a lifelong friend of Melanchthon, a lecturer here, who aided in securing the publication of his book.

Previous translators had failed at any adequate translation because Agricola wrote in a language which had ceased to grow on the technical side a thousand years before his time. He therefore invented or adapted a maze of Latin terms for materials and technical processes unknown to the Romans. As a part of disentangling these puzzles, Mrs. Hoover and I visited the scene of his work. She also probed the literature in German libraries on these subjects which began to appear some years after Agricola. Ultimately with these aids, we disentangled some hundred of terms that he had added to the Latin language.

It might interest you to know that this book by a long-since-forgotten German scholar had some responsibilities for the

torrent of gold and silver with which the Spanish Conquistadors of Peru and Mexico flooded the world in the 15th and 16th centuries. It seems highly probable that the processes used in working the mines were taken from Agricola's book. No other text existed at that time, and the particular processes which they needed were not used in Spain. And as a further tribute to this scholar, he was the first to illuminate correctly the principles of many metallurgical processes which we still use today. However, we have improved the machinery.

I have been interested in your library and its ancient setting. Again I can establish a certain comity of action. I began during the First World War to make use of my many opportunities to collect what has become millions of items about this 40 years' tumult of wars, peace and revolutions. In this library at my university we have certain collections of German history of the First World War that were given to me by the Ebert regime which I do not believe are available in Germany. Again after the Second World War with the aid of our American officials and certain Nazis who wanted to be rid of their documents, we formed an extensive collection on the rise and fall of the Hitler regime, which might otherwise have been lost. Some of the First World War documents we agreed would not be disclosed for a term of years not yet expired. Sometime this library may be of use to your students of your own history.

An added burden has fallen upon our universities. The Communists, by infiltration, propaganda, and conspiracy are seeking to corrupt the truth, the morals, the religion and in fact to destroy the freedoms of Western civilization. They use our freedoms to destroy freedom itself, but they do not comprehend the spiritual, moral, and educational force which will defeat them.

I may be rightly accused of carrying coal to the Ruhr, but I might touch upon other of the immense mutual responsibilities of our universities in free nations.

Aside from the primary duty of instruction of the young, our universities have great mutual responsibilities in the generating of ideas bearing upon our great problems of scientific, social, and economic development.

One of the greatest contributions of the universities is to keep open the channels of free exchange of knowledge between all the universities in the world. It is one of the pillars of freedom today.

It is by the free shuttle of ideas between our universities that we weave the great tapestries of knowledge. Our academic traditions have developed a system that is peculiarly effective in spotting outstanding intellects and putting them to work in a climate that fosters creative, original thinking.

From the mutual building by our university faculties and laboratories devoted to abstract science have come most of the great discoveries of natural law. The application of these discoveries through invention and production has been the task of the engineers and technicians whom we train. Applied science dries up quickly unless we maintain the sources of discovery in pure science. From these dual activities of the scientists and the technicians, a great stream of blessings in health, comfort, and good living has flowed to all our peoples.

It may be that at one time scientific discovery and invention were the product of a poverty-driven genius in a garret. Even if that were so, it is no longer the case. The discovery of natural law does not come as a sudden concept. It comes mostly slowly—step by step—through the action and reaction among our university scientific faculties and their laboratories.

For instance, the parents of our radio communications of today were not the broadcasters. Its parents were Maxwell from one university, who by mathematics formulated the hypothesis of electrical wave motion. It was Hertz of another university who experimentally confirmed Maxwell's deductions and carried them further to the demonstration that these waves could traverse the atmosphere. Then university-trained technicians from a score of institutions gave the world mounting inventions which finally handed this great tool to the broadcasters.

We have another mutual duty. For it is our universities which must train the men for leadership in our professions and as executives of great economic institutions. It is they who must guide them away from incompetence and in their social responsibilities. It becomes the mutual obligation of our universities to inculcate in these future administrators morals, rectitude, and their responsibilities to the public.

But our universities have a still greater purpose. From them must come the expansion of the human spirit; with its over-widening penetration into the unknown; and, finally, as Huxley says, "the inculcation of veracity of thought."

But again I return to the fundamental of all—that is freedom itself. The discoveries of natural law can flourish only in an atmosphere of free minds and free spirits. And inventions and production flourish only in a climate of reward for effort.

And, finally, as a tribute to the influence of German universities, I may mention that my own university bears on its seal the words "Die Luft der Freiheit Weht."

It has been indeed the universities of the world which have molded and defended the freedoms of mankind. That has been your greatest mission over 400 years and it is our greatest mutual mission today.

Again, may I express my appreciation for the honor of this occasion.

Resistance to Communism

(Speech of Hon. Herbert Hoover before the Senate of the City of Berlin, November 26, 1954)

Mr. Mayor, I am grateful for your kind statement. I have been greatly honored to be a guest of a great people. It is only 8 years since I last visited Berlin, and today I have witnessed the great transformation of this city, both physically and in spirit, from that which I saw the last time. Outstanding in my eyes is that you have devoted your energies to the rebuilding of homes for the people rather than the repair of ancient monuments. And I have witnessed the tender care with which you attend the children and the refugees who seek sanctuary from the oppression which haunts you next door.

It is a great work, of which you may well be proud.

This city of Berlin is on the front line of the cold war. You are combat soldiers in that war. Should it, which God forbid, ever become a hot war, you would be the first to face the enemy. Thus you more than others have the right to feel a sense of relief that the tensions of imminent war have sensibly decreased during these recent months. We can only speculate upon the outcome of this change in Moscow's protestations.

Whatever the outcome we must remember that the Communists still confront us with three problems.

The first is their declared basis of immoral relations between nations. That must cause us to hesitate to accept their assurances of good will toward men without more particulars. St. James said: "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead."

The second of our problems is that ever since the war the Communists have held to increasing armament. And that even in the period when other nations had demobilized. That does not seem to spell simple defense measures. We have been compelled to resume arming to the teeth in order to deter any possible aggression from them.

The third is their militant promotion of the Communist faith. They incessantly seek by propaganda, infiltration, and conspiracy within all the free nations to destroy the very foundations of civilization.

For 6,000 years, since recorded time, every civilized race has believed in a Supreme Being. They have realized that the laws which control the orderly movement of the stars were not economic materialism. For the first time in this long corridor of human history, a group of men with the resources of a powerful nation and all the modern techniques of communication are seeking to inflict Red atheism on the whole world.

Let there be no mistake about it. Lenin repeated over and over again that "religion is the opiate of a people." And his malign announcements have been ratified before his tomb every year with fanatic zeal. And their agents at work every day in every free country provide ample confirmation of this wickedness. Their crusade would destroy men's belief in God. It would destroy the moral foundations of mankind. It rots the souls of men.

And the dreadful degenerations of 30 years of war have fertilized the soil of even free nations for the growth of these malign ideas.

Those dangers cannot be met by suppressing our own freedoms. Our Governments can take care of definite conspiracies to overthrow them by violence. But the organized infiltration of Communist ideas into disturbed and weak minds can be met only by moral and spiritual resistance.

The first bastion of that resistance is religious faith, whether it be Mohammedan, Jewish, or Christian.

Nothing is more true than George Washington's statement "National morality cannot exist in the absence of religious principle." And that strong bulwark of resistance to communism requires incessant strengthening of the moral foundations of all our people.

The Sermon on the Mount established the transcendent concept of compassion and good will among men.

There was profound confirmation of the validity of religious faith when compassion defeated the scourges of famine and pestilence which were inevitable after these two great world wars, even to the extent of furnishing help and relief to the Communists themselves.

A further stronghold of resistance is the unquenchable aspiration of the human heart for personal freedom and respect for the dignity of the individual man. The free nations hold that the right to this dignity and personal freedom comes from the Creator and not from governments—especially Communist governments.

But freedom does not come like manna from heaven; it must be cultivated from rock soil with infinite patience and great human toil. To assure the resistance of nations to communism, our governments must find solution of many social ills which prepare the soil for its evil growth.

I have faith that the yearning for freedom is not dead even behind the Iron Curtain, for their peoples have tasted the invigorating waters of free men in long centuries gone by.

I do not need to discuss the values of freedom with the people of Berlin. You live cheek by jowl on the boundary over which you daily witness the naked poverty, the inhuman toil, the terror, the repressions of mind and spirit which the Communists inflict upon your own compatriots.

INCREASING PRODUCTIVITY

One of the greatest resistances to communism has been the increase in productivity in the Western World. And among the many discouraging events in the world, it is a heartening encouragement.

Since the war there have been revolutionary strides in scientific discovery and invention.

These improvements have almost wholly come from the countries where men's minds

and spirits are free. It is only in those countries that men have the incentives to strive and where they might receive rewards for their efforts.

To these astonishing scientific discoveries and inventions Germany has contributed a full and perhaps even a greater share.

We of the free world have developed new materials in artificial fibers and plastics.

We have invented thousands of new labor-saving devices and better tools which relieve sweat from the backs of mankind.

We have by new designs immensely increased the power of our older aviation engines. We have invented the turbo jet and turbo engines. We have made huge advances in electronics. All of them have created an enormous expansion of transportation by air.

We have so improved the automobile as to bring it more nearly within reach of every family in the Western nations.

In agriculture, we have improved the quality of animals and plant life. We have improved the farmers' tools and his fertilizers.

We have enormously improved our fuel-produced electric power and its distribution. And now comes the possibility of the greatest source of power yet discovered by man. That is the fission of the atom.

In its benevolent aspects we are already building atomic powerplants, we are improving the health of men with its byproducts. And President Eisenhower has proposed the sharing of these benevolent uses by all nations, even including the Communists.

The discoveries in new drugs and antibiotics have brought relief from a multitude of diseases. They have lengthened the span of life and reduced pressures on our doctors and hospitals.

The sum of all this, and many other improvements, amounts to industrial revolution in only one decade of time.

Without this increase in productivity my country would have been unable to carry the burden of aid to other countries. And in Germany these improvements in productivity and the invigoration of private initiative under economic freedom have enabled you to carry the almost overwhelming burdens of the refugees and ruined industry.

Nor have you neglected the solution of stupendous social problems and the building of moral and spiritual bulwarks of resistance to Communist corruption.

With all this promise of increasing productivity, if the world could have peace, we would find a new Golden Age.

But meanwhile you, the leaders of Berlin, have a great responsibility toward the free world. And may I add the nations of Western Europe have a great responsibility toward you. You face an enemy who lives just across the street. You have seen your duty and have performed it well. Thanks to the spirit and courage of men under the leadership of two great mayors, you can, like the men of ancient Athens, hold your heads high and say: "I am a Berliner."

SENATOR MORSE, OF OREGON

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, to my regret, I was unable to be on the floor of the Senate when the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] announced that his colleague [Mr. MORSE] had registered in Oregon as a Democrat, and is now officially a member of the Democratic Party.

I am glad to have this opportunity to express my deep satisfaction at the decision of Senator MORSE to join the Democratic Party, and to welcome him heartily to the councils of my party.

I have had the opportunity of working very closely with the senior Senator from Oregon in many causes ever since I entered the Senate 6 years ago, even though for a long time we sat on opposite sides of the aisle. During that long period I learned to hold him in great admiration and respect. He undoubtedly is one of the greatest authorities on constitutional law, not only in the Senate, but in the entire country. He is a man of high courage and of sincere convictions, for which he is always ready to do battle, even though he knows that the causes he sponsors may be politically unpopular. I know of no man who has shown greater devotion to our country or who has fought more tenaciously and more vigorously for the peace and security of our Nation and, indeed, of the free world. I look on WAYNE MORSE as one of the most distinguished and useful Members of the Senate. I say this, not because of my long and close friendship with him and my personal affection and admiration for him. I say it with confidence because during the years I have had the privilege of standing side by side with him on many issues, I have learned to know his heart and his mind. He is a great American, and I am proud to be his associate in the Democratic Party and in the Senate of the United States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 20, Calendar No. 29, authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appropriating funds therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appropriating funds therefor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Daniel	Hill
Allott	Dirksen	Holland
Barkley	Douglas	Ives
Barrett	Duff	Jackson
Beall	Dworshak	Jenner
Bennett	Eastland	Johnson, Tex.
Bible	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Ervin	Kefauver
Bridges	Frear	Kilgore
Bush	Fulbright	Knowland
Butler	George	Kuchel
Byrd	Goldwater	Langer
Case, N. J.	Gore	Lehman
Case, S. Dak.	Green	Magnuson
Chavez	Hayden	Malone
Clements	Hennings	Mansfield
Curtis	Hickenlooper	Martin, Iowa
Martin, Pa.	Neuberger	Scott
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Stennis
McNamara	Pastore	Thurmond
Millikin	Payne	Thye
Monroney	Purtell	Watkins
Morse	Robertson	Williams
Mundt	Russell	Young
Murray	Saltonstall	
Neely	Schoeppel	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the employment of additional personnel by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and appropriating funds therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and insert:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of the Government employees security program, and to report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1956, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized until January 31, 1956, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be

paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, in the proposed amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to strike out the word "until", so as to make the resolution read:

That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of the Government employees security program, and to report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1956, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is the Senate now considering Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution No. 20?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution, and also to be advised whether the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction of the subject which is intended to be investigated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I certainly believe the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over the subject. It pertains to Civil Service employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the resolution for the purpose of investigating security cases?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It affects civil service employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will the committee investigate with respect to civil service employees? Under the reorganization act, as I understand, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over the Federal civil service generally. To me, that indicates jurisdiction over salaries and matters of that kind, including anything relating to the civil service. The investigation, as I understand, will relate to security risks in the State Department and other departments of the Government. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Louisiana is correct in part. At the same time, it will deal with civil service workers and their rights under the civil service laws of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what respect?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For instance, when a man is employed he has certain rights under the civil service laws.

Mr. ELLENDER. All the charges which have been made against any Federal employees who have been discharged, as I understand, have been based on matters pertaining to security and whether such employees were qualified from that standpoint.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We think the investigation will bring out the fact that many employees have been discharged because of things which are affected by the civil service laws.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what would the investigation relate, in particular? Can the Senator give us information on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It may relate to whether an employee was discharged because of being late for work. It might also deal with an employee who probably drank too much at home, a fact which did not perhaps affect his work, but was entered on his record.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have any cases involving such questions come to the Senator's attention?

As I understand, what gives rise to this proposed investigation is certain action taken by the executive department in discharging a number of Government employees because of subversive activities. Is that what prompted the Senator to submit this resolution?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like the Senator from Louisiana and all other Senators to understand that I and the committee as a whole do not wish the Government to employ anyone who is connected in any way with communism. What the committee does object to, under our civil-service system of employment, is the discharge of employees on unsubstantiated charges, leaving their characters and names besmirched. We do not wish to have their characters besmirched in any way because of unfounded charges. We think that Executive Order 10450, as presently drawn, is so broad that it acts as a dragnet covering all employees. We do not believe that it treats the individual fairly merely to say, without adequate proof, that an employee is a security risk or is a Communist.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the committee's view that the executive department went too far in discharging workers for alleged security reasons, when, in fact, they were discharged for reasons other than security reasons?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We think that probably the investigation will bring out the facts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Many such cases have been brought to our attention.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it because of those cases that the committee submitted this resolution to the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it is not based entirely on a security question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. We wish to ascertain what laws should be enacted to remedy the existing situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the committee originally requested a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was the overall request. It was suggested by some of the members that the subjects be separated and that $125,000 be requested for this investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the Senator mean by separating the subjects?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Because the original request included holding hearings and investigating the question of what rate of postage should be charged on letters sent throughout the United States, whether it should be 3 cents or 4 cents and whether the second-class mail rate should be increased. That was all within one resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any effort made to separate the two investigations?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That has been accomplished by an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that the request, as I understand, has been reduced by half?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Senator is now asking for $125,000 to investigate certain discharges which have been made recently by the executive department under the so-called Government security program; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. We have been asked to investigate such matters.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that this resolution has been submitted by unanimous action of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from North Dakota is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that one of the complaints is that an employee may be charged with certain things and be given no opportunity for a hearing?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the report which has come to the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that in a great many instances the claim is made that civil-service employees have been discharged without any opportunity to face their accusers, in violation of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Many such reports have come to the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not the belief of the committee, from a preliminary investigation, that when an employee loses his job he is at least entitled to know what the charges are, and is entitled to face his accusers and listen to the testimony against him?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We think that is entirely correct, and we believe our committee is the one to see that the employee is given that right.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee any evidence that that has not been done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Many persons have come before the committee complaining that they have not had a chance to ascertain why they were discharged from the service.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution provides for a period of approximately a year within which the committee may make its report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A little less than a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator assure the Senate that the money now being requested, if granted, will be sufficient to conduct the investigation and enable the committee to report back to the Senate, so that the matter can be closed within a year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee and the staff made a study and came to the unanimous conclusion that it would be necessary to have the amount of money requested, and we think that amount will be sufficient.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us assurance that, with the money requested, the investigation can be made and a report submitted to the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can only promise the Senator from Louisiana that I shall do my best, and I am satisfied that the committee will do likewise.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that, like the old soldier, an investigating committee never dies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee of which I was chairman for 4 years never requested any extensions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope that course will be followed in this instance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the committee returned an unexpended balance to the Treasury. Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) was agreed to.

CONTINUING AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO INVESTIGATE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 40.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 40) continuing the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to investigate employee welfare and pension plans and funds subject to collective bargaining.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000 (inclusive of all sums heretofore authorized but unexpended pursuant to Senate Resolution 225, 83d Congress, agreed to April 28, 1954, as amended), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution? I should like to ask a few questions with respect to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is out of the Chamber at the present time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 40, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 41, authorizing additional expenditures and the employment of further temporary assistants by the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is advised that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who reported the amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate Resolution 40, is present.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Louisiana address his inquiry to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ELLENDER. What I wish to ascertain is the length of time the subcommittee has been investigating the subject matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to observe that the Senator from Alabama is now in the Chamber.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the subcommittee was created at the last session of Congress and began to function last June.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much was requested of the Senate?

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator refer to the original request?

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to the original request.

Mr. HILL. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars was requested originally.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the committee has been at work since last June?

Mr. HILL. Yes, since last June. I am now a member of the subcommittee; I was not a member of the subcommittee during the last session. But the subcommittee has been very hard at work. If the Senator could realize the amount of work which has been done, I think he would feel that the investigation by the committee was more than justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume much work has been done, but what I wish to ascertain from the Senator is this: I notice that the amount requested is $150,000 plus a $40,000 carryover from the last session of Congress.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And also that it is intended to employ five persons as lawyers and investigators at the rate of $11,646 a year. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator state his question again, please?

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice from the report which was submitted in connection with the resolution that five persons will be employed as lawyers and investigators at the rate of $11,646 apiece. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. Some of the employees, such as the actuarial and insurance consultants, are not employed on a full-time basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why, then, is the full amount carried as gross salaries? It is apparent from the report that it is expected that these employees will be engaged for the whole year.

Mr. HILL. It is necessary to make an allowance in the event they are used for the full period. The committee expects to make a study of union welfare funds, and it is necessary to employ actuarial specialists and insurance consultants, as well as lawyers and investigators. It is necessary to be prepared in order to go forward with the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I observe from the report that the distinguished Senator from Alabama is asking for $150,000, which is $25,000 more than the committee received last year; and to that amount another $40,000 has been added. How will the additional $40,000 be used?

Mr. HILL. Last year the work of the committee did not begin until June. The amount now sought is intended to carry the committee through the present session of Congress. The likelihood now is that it may take the whole 12-month

period, the whole period of the present session, to complete the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 2 of the report, the committee has indicated how $150,000 of the amount asked for will be spent. As I have just indicated, five persons will be employed. A chief counsel and staff director, an assistant chief counsel, a chief investigator, an actuarial specialist, and an insurance consultant, each at $11,646.

In addition, there will be administrative and clerical help, all of which, if added together, will necessitate an aggregate amount of $150,000.

How will the $40,000, which the Senator from Alabama is asking in addition to the $150,000, be spent?

Mr. HILL. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is chairman of the subcommittee, is on the floor. I shall ask him if he will answer the Senator's question. The Senator from Illinois, as chairman of the subcommittee, is more intimately associated with the work than is the Senator from Alabama, and has a more detailed knowledge of the activities of the subcommittee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee contemplates expenditures at approximately the same monthly rate as occurred during the start of the committee's work in the 83d Congress. The committee spent $100,000 in 8 months, or at the rate of $12,500 a month.

There was a demand from all quarters, including the present minority, the former majority, that the work of the committee should be continued. So what we are proposing is simply that we be permitted to continue to spend at the same rate for 12 months as was expended during the preceding 8 months; namely, $12,500 a month for 12 months, or a total of $150,000.

The $40,000, to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, is the unexpended balance appropriated for the committee in the previous Congress, but which was not actually spent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question I asked was, How will the $40,000 be spent? The Senator from Illinois has indicated that he expects to spend during this year at the same rate as was spent last year. It strikes me that $150,000 should be sufficient with which to do the job; instead, the Senator is asking for $190,000. Will the Senator not agree to $150,000?

Mr. President, if it is in order to do so, I move that on line 17 the amount "$190,000" be reduced to "$150,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$190,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I may say to my good friend from Louisiana that if he will consult the committee's budget, he will observe that salaries will absorb $130,000, leaving only $20,000 for traveling expenses, hearings, witness fees, and so forth.

Mr. ELLENDER. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars happens to be the amount asked for, and those items are all covered. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would not be willing to have the amount reduced to $150,000, and let it go at that. The committee would be getting $25,000 more than it received last year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but not at a greater monthly rate. I think the committee ought to have some leeway it had last year so as to provide for extraordinary emergencies which may develop.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can make another request of the Senate if he finds that he needs additional funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a good deal of Scotch blood in my veins. I can assure the Senator that the committee will not expend money unnecessarily. I hope that we may be able to turn back to the Senate a large portion of the total sum requested. It is intended to turn back any unexpended balance, and we hope the unexpended balance will be large.

Mr. ELLENDER. The chairmen of the other subcommittees, in discussing their resolutions, have also expressed the same hope, namely, that they would not spend all their funds, but that they would have a large amount left over. But the point is that the actual breakdown of the committee's own budget shows a need for $150,000. Why not let the amount stand at $150,000? Why add $40,000 to the estimated expenditure needs? Why not save this $40,000? It is a small amount, but it is worth saving.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding that last year the committee was so economical that it saved $40,000. Certainly the Senate knows that there is not a Member who has strived more earnestly for economy than has the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. He has a record for trying to effect economies on the floor.

Although I speak from the opposite side of the aisle from the Senator from Illinois, I believe we can rely on the Senator from Illinois not to allow his committee to waste any money. The committee returned to the Treasury $40,000 last year. If they do not need the money, they will not spend it. Certainly the committee should not be limited in its attempts to secure adequate personnel. If they can locate a first class person at a little higher rate, they should not have to say, "We can pay only $9,000 or $8,500."

Speaking for myself, I hope the amount will not be reduced, and that the sum of $190,000 will be granted to the subcommittee, which is headed by a very worthy Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota. I shall try to be worthy of his trust in my economical tendencies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from North Dakota that the committee's budget of $150,000, originally asked for, provides for the employment of 5 persons at the rate of $11,646. I am not questioning that request. All I am asking is that the amount be reduced to the figure submitted in the committee's budget, namely, $150,000—an appropriation which is $25,000 more than the same committee received last year.

Mr. LANGER. I read the budget very carefully. The Senator from Louisiana also knows, because he has been a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration for a long time, that the budget does not confine the employment of personnel to 5 or 6 persons. He knows that if more persons are needed, it may be necessary to employ 6 or 7, because the work of the committee covers the entire United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore.—The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution [S. Res. 40] was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF FURTHER TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 41.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 41) authorizing additional expenditures and the employment of further temporary assistants by the Committee on Government Operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "Resolved", and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

During the 83d Congress, when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] was chairman of this same subcommittee, I asked whether or not there was any duplication of the work done by the subcommittee, which is now headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and the work of the Internal Security Subcommittee, which was then headed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. In answer to my question the Senator from Indiana responded as follows, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 685:

> As I read the Reorganization Act, I think the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is chairman, has a proper field of investigation without going into the field of communism or subversive activities in the Government. That is the view which our subcommittee intends to take of the situation.

I should like to ask the Senator if he agrees with that statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with it substantially. I might say that if the Committee on Government Operations, in the course of investigating in the field of efficiency and economy in Government, should discover that any department had been infiltrated by Communists, I think it would be its duty to investigate the infiltration and expose it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator of the opinion that that subject should be investigated by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, as I have said a good many times publicly, that at the time the Committee on Government Operations was created and its jurisdiction assigned by the rules of the Senate, possibly no one had in mind that the committee was being created for the purpose of investigating communism as such. The Internal Security Subcommittee has a much broader jurisdiction, of course, but I think that under the broad terms of the general rules, and having in mind the duties with which the Committee on Governmental Operations is charged, it would be its duty to investigate Communists in Government, if it developed there were any, during the course of an investigation which it was undertaking. However, I may say to the Senator that, since I happen also to be a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I have in mind having conferences relative to the work of the respective committees. I have already had one conference along that line, and conferences will be held continually, with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee. We shall undertake to see to it that there will be no duplication of work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because of the fact that the distinguished Senator serves on both the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Committee on Government Operations, he will be in a position to detect and avoid any duplication between the two Senate committees.

I express the hope that the chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, as well as the distinguished Senator to whom I am now speaking, will try to take the matter up with the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives with the view in mind of avoiding duplication of the work of that committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], Representative WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Government Operations Committee, have already had a conference with such objective in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has there been agreement among the chairmen of the three committees that duplication should be avoided?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There has been liaison established between all three committees, to the end that we shall undertake to avoid duplication. However, as I am sure the Senator from Louisiana knows, when an investigation starts, and it is anticipated that it will proceed in a certain direction, sometimes facts develop in the course of the investigation which make it necessary for the investigation to go a little beyond what was originally anticipated would be its scope. However, I again assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the chairmen of the three respective committees have already had a conference with the idea and the view of making certain that there will be as little duplication as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, according to the report filed with the resolution, last year the committee spent $213,812.90. The Senator is now asking for $190,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the committee actually spent a little more than what the Senator has read, because certain amounts were used for personnel of the committee who were needed for its work. However, it is our purpose to perform the duties of the subcommittee as economically as possible. I regard the budget as a tight one, and the responsibility of the subcommittee to keep within it. It could very well develop that in the course of the labors of the subcommittee, it might have to come before the Senate and ask for more funds, but it is not my intention at this time to do so. The purpose is to do the best job the subcommittee can with the money for which it is asking.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since there has been a meeting of the chairmen of the three committees, I was hopeful that the subcommittee might be able to accomplish its purposes with an amount less than $190,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would depend on what kind of job the Senate desired done. Forgetting for the moment all about Communist infiltration, there is an unlimited field of work which should be covered and there are unlimited duties the subcommittee should perform. I have stated before, and I say again, that I could very well use another 4 or 5 members as investigators on the committee staff. There is a great deal of work such additional personnel could do. However, after all, there is no point in this subcommittee's going forth and developing raw material, so to speak, if the members of the committee do not have time to refine the raw material into a committee investigation and report. However, I think the committee will do its work, and that the members of the staff will be able to do the work assigned to the committee, within the limits of the amount requested.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Arkansas has about the same number of investigators at his disposal as his predecessor had last year, does he not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think there were probably 24 or 25 staff members at one time last year. I have in mind operating with 16, although the budget calls for 18. I intend to start with a staff of 16.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the number on the staff last year?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish to exaggerate, but I think at one time the staff consisted of as many as 24 members. Of course, I am including clerical help.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; and when the Senator from Arkansas mentions the staff of the present committee, he, of course, includes clerical help?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do include clerical help. That is the number on the staff we intend to start with. I hope that number will be adequate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ENTITLED "THE KOREAN WAR AND RELATED MATTERS"

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 56.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 56) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 56, Calendar No. 32, be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELIMINATION OF NEED FOR RENEWAL OF OATHS OF OFFICE UPON CHANGE OF STATUS OF SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 34, Senate bill 913, eliminating the need for renewal of oaths of office in the case of Senate employees with changed status.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 913) to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 913) to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "section", to strike out "1756" and insert "1757", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person who, upon appointment as an employee of the Senate, has subscribed or hereafter subscribes to the oath of office required by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, shall be required to renew such oath so long as the service of such person as an employee of the Senate is continuous.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF NETS IN ALASKA WATERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 35, Senate bill 456, relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "set", insert "gill"; and in line 4, after the word "stake", insert "gill", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 3 of the act entitled "An act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska," approved June 26, 1906, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 233), is hereby amended to read as follows: "It shall be unlawful to lay or set any seine or net of any kind within 100 yards of any other seine, net, or other fishing appliance which is being or which has been laid or set in any of the waters of Alaska, or to drive or to construct any trap or any other fixed fishing appliance, except a set gill net, stake gill net, or anchored gill net, within 600 yards laterally or within 100 yards endwise of any other trap or fixed fishing appliance."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ENTITLED "THE KOREAN WAR AND RELATED MATTERS"

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar 32, Senate Resolution 56, to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters."

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 56) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is before the Senate. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 28,000 additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters," prepared by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 83d Congress.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PARTS OF HEARINGS ON INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the concurrent resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on interlocking subversion in Government departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 20,000 additional copies of parts 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26 of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 26, S. 462.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of the United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Chief Justice of the United States and to the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$35,000", and by striking out "$25,000" and substituting therefor "$34,500."

(b) Section 44 (d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500", and by striking out "$15,500" and substituting therefor "$23,000."

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500."

(g) The first paragraph of section 4 of the act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, relating to the District Court for the District of Alaska, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and substituting therefor "$22,500."

(h) Section 7443 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Salary: Each judge shall receive salary at the rate of $22,500 per annum, to be paid in monthly installments."

(i) (1) Article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and substituting therefor "$25,500."

(2) Such article is further amended by adding at the end of subdivision (a) (1) thereof the following: "Each judge shall, upon his certificate, be paid by the Secretary of Defense all necessary traveling expenses, and also his reasonable maintenance expenses actually incurred, not exceeding $15 per day, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station. The official station of such judges for such purpose shall be the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (relative to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$30,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000."

SEC. 3. In addition to any amounts heretofore authorized by law for travel, each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, shall be allowed, under regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, respectively, out of the contingent fund of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, the expenses incurred in making not to exceed five round trips per year, beginning at noon of January 3 of a calendar year and ending at noon on January 3 of the succeeding calendar year, between Washington, D. C., and the State, congressional district, Territory, or possession which he represents in Congress.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. What is the request now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for the yeas and nays on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Granting the unanimous consent on that question will not block amendments to the bill will it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. At a later time I shall renew the request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. President, legislation to increase judicial and congressional salaries has been the subject of extensive hearings, thorough study, and deliberation over a period of years.

In addition to the other studies and hearings, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the hearings held before the Committee on the Judiciary, lasting 2 full days. Those hearings have been printed. Witnesses who might be opposed to the proposed legislation were invited to appear and testify at the hearings. No witnesses appeared in opposition to the measure.

Among the witnesses who testified before the Subcommittee on the Judiciary were the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; Mr. Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries; Mr. Lloyd Wright, president of the American Bar Association; a number of judges and Members of Congress who had resigned from the bench and from Congress because of the inadequate salaries; and many other witnesses.

Included in the hearings were editorials from newspapers all over the United States, most of which support the conclusions of the Segal Commission.

On Wednesday, February 16, the House passed H. R. 3828, which is substantially the same as the Senate bill, S. 462, as regards salaries. There are, however, some differences between the two bills. In addition to judicial and congressional salary raises, which, except for the now existing expense allowance, are identical in the two versions, the House bill includes salary raises for United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, the Deputy Attorney General, and the Solicitor General; and section 4 of the House bill raises the ceiling with reference to professional and clerical staff members. That section further provides that the ceiling now in existence for legislative employees be amended to coincide with the highest grade established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

On the other hand, the Senate bill contains a provision not included in the House bill, in that it provides for five round trips a year for each Member of Congress between the District of Columbia and the State, district, or Territory which he represents, to be paid according to rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives. It is contemplated that the allowance for these trips shall be based on the actual expenses incurred, not on 20 cents a mile, which is the basis now used for the one trip a year. The provision for 20 cents a mile contemplated that on one trip the Member would bring his family to Washington.

With regard to the pay of Members of the House and Senators, the two bills differ in the respect that while the salary is the same the House version retains the now existing $2,500 expense allowance.

Now that I have touched upon the differences between the two bills, I should like to point out briefly the history of this proposed legislation. Congressional and judicial salary raises have been the subject of legislation for some time past. In the 83d Congress, 1st session, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably to the Senate S. 1663, which was designed to increase the salaries of judges of the United States courts and Members of Congress, as well as United States attorneys and their assistants. The bill was introduced by the late Senator McCarran, of Nevada. Subsequent to the favorable report of that bill, the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries was established by Public Law 220, 83d Congress. In July 1953 the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] introduced a bill which resulted in Public Law 220, 83d Congress. It was the duty of this Commission to hold hearings on the subject matter and report their findings to the Congress. By Public Law 220 the Commission was to be made up of outstanding members of agriculture, labor, and the business and professions, so that the members of the Commission were selected in equal numbers from the principal segments of the American economy. The President was to designate the Chairman, and of the 18 voting members 6 were to be appointed by the President, 6 by the Chief Justice of the United States, and 3 each by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In addition to this voting group, there were 9 nonvoting advisory members, 6 of whom were Members of the 82d or 83d Congresses, 3 each to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and 3 judges of the courts of the United States, to be appointed by the Chief Justice.

Mr. President, this Commission was an outstanding, able, diligent, and conscientious body. The Senate Judiciary Committee hearings list, at page 48, the names, avocations, and connections of the various members of the Commission who were appointed by the President, the Chief Justice, the Speaker, and the Vice President, from business and professional groups, from labor, and from agriculture. It will be seen that the members came from all parts of the United States and represented an excellent cross section of our people and our economy. It will also be seen that the advisory members appointed by the Chief Justice, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House were distinguished Members of the Senate and the House, and leaders of American business, agriculture, and the professions.

The members of the Commission assembled in Washington. This Commission had no preconceived ideas regarding the question of salary raises, and went into the subject matter with an open mind.

The first thing they did, Mr. President, was to divide themselves into seven task forces, with members of labor, agriculture, and business of the Commission on each task force. Senators have on their desks the reports of the task forces of the various groups. There was a task force on comparative salaries in business. There was another task force on the standard of living evaluation. There was another task force on comparative salaries in the professions and in agriculture. There was another task force on comparative salaries in the field of labor. There was another task force on staff expense, office, and other services furnished by the Federal Government. There was another task force on salaries of the Federal judiciary.

These various task forces undertook to secure from different segments of the American economy information as to what persons in comparable positions were earning. The reports are fully documented. There are many comparisons in the very thorough reports. The conclusion of all the task forces was that district judges and Members of Congress should receive salaries of $27,500 a year.

The Commission held public hearings in Washington. I have here the hearings before the Commission which were held in Washington in the latter part of 1953 and in the early part of 1954. The Commission called before it almost 70 witnesses, whose testimony is contained in the volume I have here. The witnesses were leaders in their fields, and the record is very impressive. Nearly all the witnesses testified in favor of substantial salary increases for Members of the Congress and the judiciary. I think there were only three who testified against the proposal.

Mr. President, the Commission sent out some 10,000 letters of inquiry, not suggesting what the answers should be, but simply asking the opinions and advice of people all over the United States, including the heads of associations, men and women prominent in agriculture, business, and labor, and the editors of all the daily newspapers. The replies are contained in the appendix to the hearings of the joint commission. The letters received indicate that approximately 10 to 1 of the writers were in favor of increases for United States judges and Members of Congress. Of course, they did not all agree as to the amount of the increase, but it was upon all these data that the Commission made its findings.

The Commission recommended salary raises for the various categories under study, as follows:

The Chief Justice of the United States from $25,500 to $40,000.

The Associate Justices of the Supreme Court from $25,000 to $39,500.

Judges of the United States courts of appeal from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the United States Court of Claims from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the Court of Military Appeals from $17,500 to $30,500.

Judges of the United States district courts from $15,000 to $27,500.

Chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia from $15,500 to $28,000.

Judges of the United States Customs Court from $15,000 to $27,500.

Judges of the Tax Court of the United States from $15,000 to $27,500.

Vice President of the United States from $30,000 to $40,000.

Speaker of the House of Representatives from $30,000 to $40,000.

Members of Congress from $15,000 to $27,500.

Mr. President, on page 3 of the report is a list of the recommendations of the Segal Commission, and they are unanimous recommendations. Some members of the Commission were in favor of salary raises higher than $27,500. Some few members felt that $25,000 might be an adequate figure, but the unanimous conclusion of these distinguished persons appointed by the President, the Chief Justice, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House was that district judges and Members of Congress should receive salaries of $27,500.

At this point I think it appropriate to pay a very high compliment to Mr. Bernard Segal, of Philadelphia, Chairman of the Commission, and to the other members of the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. The Commission did its work well and thoroughly. It conducted full hearings. Each member had an opportunity to express his own opinion. I think the Commission has rendered an important public service in trying to ascertain what would be adequate and proper salaries for the positions of which they were making a study.

Mr. Segal testified fully as to the work of his Commission. In hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on the Judiciary, he said he thought the salaries of Members of Congress should be $27,500. This also was the recommendation of the special Commission headed by the former President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover. The Hoover Commission recommended passage of legislation similar to that introduced in the last Congress by the late Senator McCarran, who was a former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Senator McCarran's bill was a little less than the recommendations of the report of the Segal Commission.

Furthermore, the American Bar Association, through its house of delegates, has on two occasions recommended enactment of the bill fixing the salaries as set forth in the Segal Commission report.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I sent telegrams to all the State bar associations, asking their advice about the matter. Most of the replies we received are included in the report of the hearings, beginning at page 295. Some replies were received after the hearings had been printed.

I believe that the State bar association of every State in the Nation has approved generally the salary recommendations of the Segal Commission, or at least has approved a recommendation that the judges should have adequate and substantially increased compensation.

It is my opinion that the conclusion of the Segal Commission was justified in the light of all the hearings. The original bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], carried out the recommendations of the Segal Commission report. The Senator from West Virginia, as chairman of the committee, felt that he should present to the committee for its consideration the exact recommendations of the Segal Commission.

The bill as amended by the committee reduces the recommendations of the Segal report and the amount in the original bill by $5,000 all across the board.

On page 3 of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary will be found the Segal Commission's recommendations. In a parallel column will be found the amounts as set forth in S. 462, as amended. It will be seen that all the recommendations are reduced by $5,000. In my opinion, the salaries thus proposed represent the minimum amounts which should be fixed for judicial and congressional compensation.

The press of the Nation, as is evidenced by editorials included in the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary, and by editorials published subsequent to the hearings, most of which have been printed and are now on the desks of Senators, substantially agree with the conclusions of the Segal Commission.

The Commission pointed out the increased responsibilities of Members of Congress, stating that Members now have to spend more time—indeed, full time—upon their business as Members of Congress; that their expenses are greater because it is necessary to do more entertaining and to see more of their constituents. The Commission also pointed out that problems at home are more acute, making it necessary for Members of Congress to return to their homes more frequently. The Commission further pointed out that it was in the public interest to provide salary increases for Members of Congress, stating that the Nation thereby would be better served.

It was also pointed out in the report of the Segal Commission and in the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary that many capable Members of the Senate and the House and many excellent Federal judges have left either Congress or the judiciary because of the inadequate salaries now paid.

The Senate bill, which is now before us, recommends in each category referred to a reduction of $5,000 from the recommendations of the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. The Committee on the Judiciary was of the opinion that, under all the circumstances, the increase proposed by the bill was a fair, just, and reasonable increase, and should be accorded.

My own feeling is that a $25,000 salary would be fully justified; but there is naturally some hesitation about the amount of increase to be granted, when Members are placed in the unfortunate position of having to vote upon increasing their own salaries. The conclusion of the committee would seem to be fair, in view of the fact that the amounts proposed are substantially less than the figures recommended by an independent, unbiased commission, after extensive hearings on the subject.

So far as salaries are concerned, the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is closer to S. 540, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], than to other companion bills. As a matter of fact, the bill offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from New Hampshire, S. 540, provided for a salary of $22,500 for both Federal district judges and Members of Congress.

A review of the history of judicial and congressional salaries is contained in Senate Report No. 25 on S. 462, which, I believe, is on the desk of every Senator.

That report is detailed and informative as to what has been the past history of congressional salaries and the salaries of judges.

It also points out the increased amount of taxes, the increased cost of living, and the devaluation of the dollar as compared with 1939.

At this point I should like to draw attention to the effect of the proposed increases. Let us take, for example, the salary of a circuit judge. On January 1, 1937, a circuit judge's salary was not taxable either by the Federal Government or a State government. The salary was $12,500 net to the judge. The 1946 act increased the salary to $17,500, but this salary was subject to a Federal income tax, and the same is true of the proposed increase to $25,500. The tax on this figure amounts to $6,534, leaving a balance of $18,966. The net gain to the judge over his 1937 salary of $12,500 is, therefore, $6,466. The cost of living, according to available figures, was indexed at 103.0 in 1937, and in 1954 the index figure had risen to 191.1. If the proposed increase is granted by Congress, the net to the judge, deducting the tax of $6,534 from $25,500, will be $18,966, leaving, as stated, a gain of $6,466 over his 1937 salary. This amount will be an aid in overcoming the increased cost of living, but will still leave the judge with a net spendable salary representing a lower purchasing power than his net spendable salary in 1937, for, in terms of 1939 dollars, the new salary will be only $9,862 net as compared with a former net of $12,500. This is due to the fact that in 1939, giving the value of a dollar to be $1, in 1954 that same dollar had a purchasing power of only 52 cents. For district judges a similar computation, in terms of 1939 dollars, would leave a new net spendable salary of $8,895 as compared with the 1937 spendable salary of $10,000. These same figures and computations run comparably through all of the proposed raises.

The figures will be found on page 6 of the report, and show what the increases will amount to in the case of the various judges who are provided for in the bill, in terms of the present value of the dollar.

In the case of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates, in 1939 the basic compensation was $10,000, with no additional expense allowance. The Federal income tax on that amount was $372, leaving a net salary of $9,628. By the act of August 2, 1946, the basic compensation was increased to $12,500, and by the enactment of June 13, 1945, Members of Congress received an expense allowance in the amount of $2,500, which was taxable. The act of August 2, 1946, made the expense allowance tax-free, but the act of October 20, 1951, again made the allowance taxable, and that is now the law. Therefore, the present compensation of $15,000, including the expense allowance, is subject to a Federal income tax. It is estimated that the tax for 1954 will be $2,148, leaving a net salary of $12,852. This, of course, does not include State taxes. Therefore, the present compensation of $15,000, with the additional tax deduction of $3,000 allowed for living expenses, will produce in 1954 a net salary of only $3,224 more than the net salary in 1939 of $9,628. Increasing the compensation to $22,500, as is recommended, will produce, after deduction of an estimated tax of $4,362, a net of $18,138, or a net gain of $8,510 over the net salary for 1939. As with the judges, if we consider the increase in the cost of living, it is apparent that for each Representative and Senator the purchasing power of this proposed compensation, after taxes, will be slightly less than his purchasing power, after taxes, in 1939. Using the 1939 dollar as worth $1, after taxes the Senator or Representative receives $9,628 as a spendable salary. In contrast, the 1954 dollar was worth 52 cents, so that, after taxes, and taking into account the cost-of-living index, the spendable salary of a Senator or Representative would be $9,432 on his proposed salary of $22,500.

For anyone who may be interested, these facts are set forth on pages 10 and 11 of the report. There is one mistake in the report. It reads that the purchasing power in 1939 would be "slightly higher." It should read "slightly less." So the salary increases proposed in the bill can be fully justified, and a little more than justified, on the basis of the increased cost of living and increased taxes; to say nothing of the fact that in 1939, and before that year, Congress was in session only a part of the year. The duties of Members of Congress were not so heavy as they are now. We have more responsibilities now. We have to spend more time on the job.

I am not going to burden the Senate further with figures in connection with the proposed raises, because the hearings and reports on this subject during the past few years are replete with information on that subject, but I do desire to point out, as the figures I have quoted indicate, that the net effect of these raises will be only to bring the salaries up to near a par with salaries existing in 1937 and 1939.

Some persons may think that such raises would constitute a windfall, but the fact of the matter is that they would only give back to Representatives, Senators, and judges a spendable salary comparable to what they had in years past. While wages and incomes in most categories have increased over the years and kept some semblance of balance with the increased cost of living and increased taxes, congressional and judicial salaries have not kept pace. I believe the figures I have referred to demonstrate that fact beyond any doubt.

As to the cost of this proposed legislation, the report of the President's Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries states that the cost, in terms of the national budget, would amount to only one-hundredth of 1 percent. That figure of one-hundredth of 1 percent was based on salaries of $27,500 for Members of Congress and Federal judges. The cost would be a great deal less than one-hundredth of 1 percent if the provisions of the bill now before the Senate were used for the computation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Tennessee, but when he has completed his statement I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall complete my statement in a few moments.

On the basis of the statement I have just made as to the report of the President's Commission, the proposed legislation would cost less than the figure given, for the reason that in all categories there has been a reduction in the amounts recommended by the Commission. The actual cost of these raises to the United States, after taxes have been deducted, would be as follows: For the judiciary, $2,073,824; for congressional increases, $2,822,090; or a total amount of $4,895,914.

The Federal judiciary, like the Congress, is one of the major branches of the Government, and in many respects its actions more closely affect the daily lives of people than do the actions of either the executive or legislative branch. As Mr. Chief Justice Marshall observed:

> The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all.

Contact with the people by the Federal courts is a daily occurrence, and the regard in which the people hold courts form the bulwark of our American system of government. It is advisable and necessary to have on the bench judges of the highest caliber, and in order to accomplish this purpose they must be paid a salary which is fair, just, and reasonable under all of the circumstances. For the benefit of the citizens who appear before them, they must have some feeling of security, and they must be free from worries, other than those incident to the performance of their judicial duties. The hearings disclosed that on several occasions judges have resigned, not because they had a dislike for their work or position, but because of growing families and the failure to receive a salary sufficient to provide for their wives and children, in case of their demise.

One of those who resigned was a Judge Kennedy, who was an outstanding judge in New York. Recently I talked with another Federal judge in New York, who had made a fine judicial record, and he followed Judge Kennedy's course. Judge Kennedy testified that he left the Federal judiciary because he simply could not make enough money to provide for his family and security in the future. He testified that his income as a practicing lawyer was such that for the year after he resigned from the bench he paid $32,000 in income taxes. His tax alone amounted to more than twice as much as his salary as a United States district judge. It can readily be seen that while the United States Government should not necessarily pay rewards to judges on the bench, at the same time a reasonable living salary should be provided The committee believed, and I agree that such a reasonable salary is provided in the proposal now before the Senate.

A penurious policy which deprives our citizens of top-flight judicial personnel is shortsighted and dangerous. Responsible officers have forewarned us, "pay adequate salaries for quality or be content with less." Public service, for all its attraction, cannot command the services of the best talent if a necessary concomitant of service is financial insecurity.

The same arguments apply to the Congress. There is no business bigger than the business of government. Until modern times it was customary for the Congress to meet for only about 3 months in each session. That is no longer the case. Today adjournments are few and far between, and the session is practically continuous. It is apparent that the Congress of the United States, as a coordinate branch of our Government, is equally as important as the executive and the judicial branches. Obviously its membership is affected by those things which affect also the membership of the other two branches, such as the cost of living and the necessity for meeting their reasonable personal and family demands without fear or worry, so that the Members of Congress may apply themselves to the responsibilities of their office. The Senators and Representatives, like others in the Government, have families to support, and must also maintain themselves in reasonably dignified circumstances, both at home and in Washington, and at the same time be able to devote their energies and their time to their responsibilities.

The emoluments of office, so far as Members of the Congress are concerned, should be such as reasonably to approximate the compensation of those in similar situations in private life, though admittedly the analogy is a weak one because the responsibility of the Congress far outweighs in nature that of any private concern. The committee has been and is of the opinion that the raises in this category provide such a reasonable return to the Members of Congress. Again, let me hark back to the fact that, in essence, this proposed legislation would only bring Members of the House, Senators, and judges close to a parity in spendable salary with that which they received in 1939.

A student of the testimony given on this subject in the past few years must inevitably come to the conclusion that the pending proposals are amply justified, and while there have been individuals who oppose such legislation, for one reason or another, still there has not come to my attention any organized segment of our economy which has opposed the suggested raises.

I might also point out that for the past year or more newspaper editorial comment has been overwhelmingly in favor of these salary increases. I shall, at the conclusion of my remarks, submit a number of editorials for the RECORD.

As a closing remark I should like to call attention to the fact that this proposal has been unanimously supported by all segments of the American economy, and was specifically endorsed and recommended by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message to the 84th Congress.

I have tried to cover this subject generally, from all of its facets, in order to give the Senate a lucid picture of the effect of this bill and the need for it. I shall be happy, however, to try to answer any questions at this time that may be in the minds of my colleagues and which are as yet unanswered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield; or does the Senator from North Dakota wish me to yield the floor?

Mr. LANGER. No; I simply wish to ask some questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then I am very glad to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. LANGER. I do not think the report shows that when the bill was before the committee, I voted against reporting it favorably.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the records of the Judiciary Committee show that to be so.

Mr. LANGER. But the report does not show it, I believe.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct; the report does not show it.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the ranking Republican Member, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], both voted in favor of reporting the bill favorably.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is my understanding. In fact, I know that is true. Of course, the votes in the Judiciary Committee are open for public inspection.

Mr. LANGER. As I recall, the vote was 11 to 1.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I believe there were not more than two votes against reporting the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee know of any State which today is suffering because the Federal judges are not excellent ones?

Mr. KEFAUVER. On the whole, I believe the States have excellent Federal Judges. I also know that many of the Federal judges are making a sacrifice by serving in that capacity. I know that the Attorney General testified that sometimes it was becoming more difficult to interest some of our better and more outstanding lawyers in accepting appointment to the Federal judiciary. But I do not know of any State which today is suffering because of the caliber of the Federal judges. However, I do not think that is any reason why they should not be paid fair compensation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let us consider the Senator's own State of Tennessee. My recollection is that when the last vacancy occurred in the Federal judiciary in Tennessee, there were a great many candidates of excellent character.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that is true.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee know of any choicer plum for anyone who is a lawyer and who seeks appointment to the Federal service, than appointment as a Federal judge, at a lifetime salary of $15,000?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the case of one who seeks appointment to the Federal service, I think that appointment as a Federal judge makes an excellent position. Of course, there are always those who are ready and anxious to be judges. But even though there is a great deal of honor and even though there are many other benefits connected with such appointment, I still believe that such appointments should carry with them reasonable salaries.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee not believe that a mail carrier or a postal clerk or any other person connected with the Federal service requires just as much to eat and is faced with the same necessity to educate his children? So if there is to be a salary increase, should not the Federal workers receive a salary increase that will be proportionate to the salary increase in the case of the judiciary and the Members of Congress? In that connection, I refer to both the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I fully agree with the Senator from North Dakota. As a matter of fact, in the case of the Members of Congress or the judiciary, generally speaking a salary increase or a salary adjustment occurs approximately every 20 years, whereas in the case of other civil servants a salary increase occurs more frequently. As a matter of fact, the Federal employees generally have had, I believe, five salary increases since Senators and Representatives and judges were given a salary increase—which occurred last in 1946, as I recall.

If we consider the 1939 figures, we find that the salary increases for Federal employees generally have been proportionately greater than the salary increase for judges and Members of Congress.

However, I am not arguing that the Federal employees generally are not also entitled to a salary increase or to adequate compensation. In my opinion the Federal Government would be better and would be able to perform its work better if it provided reasonable and just compensation for all its employees. In fairness, such reasonable and just compensation should extend to postal clerks and to all other Federal employees, as well as to Members of Congress and judges.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the President of the United States recommended a 5 percent salary increase for Federal employees; and is it not also true that if the bill now before the Senate is enacted into law, the judiciary and the Members of Congress will receive a 66 percent increase in salary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, that is not entirely correct. Congressmen would receive 50 percent. However, the other Federal employees have had some salary increases in the past, although I am sure they are entitled to some further increase now. The other Federal employees have had five salary increases since the judiciary and the Members of Congress have had any salary increase.

Mr. LANGER. Let me call attention to the mail handlers. In 1939, they received a salary of $1,920. We ask veterans who are married and have one

child to live on that salary—although perhaps subsequently they receive a salary increase in the amount of $500. It is true that is quite a large percentage increase, as compared to the salaries that such employees have received. But today the average salary of the postal employees is between $3,200 and $3,500, with an occasional salary of $4,000.

Does not the Senator from Tennessee believe it to be rather discriminatory for us to raise the salaries of judges from $15,000 to $22,500, whereas, if we follow the recommendation of the President of the United States, we would be raising the salaries of Federal employees generally only 5 percent? Would it not be fair, if we are to raise the salaries of Government employees, to raise all Government employees' salaries alike—including those of judges, Members of Congress, and all other Federal employees? In short, should not all be increased in the same proportion?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it would be fair to do so, if our salaries were raised at the same time, too. But that has not been done in the past. For a long time the salary increases of the judiciary and the Members of Congress have lagged behind, as compared to the increases in the salaries of Federal employees generally. It is more difficult to obtain an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and the judiciary than it is to obtain an increase in the salaries of Federal employees generally.

Let me say that although Federal employees are a loyal and hard-working group, the salary increases they have received have largely been behind the increase in the cost of living. So far as I am concerned, I wish to deal fairly with them.

On the other hand, I think the enactment of the pending measure would increase the salaries of Members of Congress in just about the same proportion or pecentage that the salaries of other Federal employees have already been increased.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, Mr. President; I am very happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Proposals for an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and judges have been before the Congress at various times. I have always taken the position—and I wish to know whether the Senator from Tennessee agrees with me about it—that when a person becomes a candidate for election to Congress, either to the House of Representatives or to the Senate, he knows exactly what the salary will be. As of recent years, he has known the salary would be $15,000. If he did not wish to run for election to a job paying a $15,000 salary, no one forced him to run for election to it. Is it not true that if a Member of Congress is dissatisfied with the $15,000 salary, he can resign at any time he chooses to do so?

Does not the Senator from Tennessee believe that the pending measure should be amended, so as to provide that the proposed salary increases shall apply only to Senators and Representatives hereafter elected? Certainly, when I became a candidate for election to the office of United States Senator, other men and certain women in North Dakota might have been candidates for election to that office, if the salary had been $25,000; and I can envision a situation in which a man or a woman did not run for election to that office because he said, "I do not think the salary of $15,000 is sufficient."

So does not the Senator from Tennessee believe that the pending bill should be amended, so as to apply only to Senators and Representatives who may hereafter be elected to Congress? I may add that I believe the same should be true of judges.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, Mr. President; I do not think the bill should be so amended, for if that were to be done there would never be a salary increase for Members of Congress, in view of the fact that only one-third of the Members of the Senate will come up for election next year, and an additional one-third 2 years thereafter, and the remaining one-third, 2 years thereafter. Thus, any salary increase would have to be put off for 6 years, if the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota were to be put into effect.

Furthermore, if that were to happen—under the philosophy of the Senator from North Dakota—the present salary of Members of Congress would be $1,500 a year, or perhaps $6 a day. Originally the salaries of Members of Congress were $6 a day. Later they were $5,000 a year.

In view of the increase in the cost of living and the increased financial requirements in connection with service in Congress, I think it is the duty of Members of Congress to vote for themselves a reasonable salary; and I do not think there is anything wrong with their doing so, particularly when a nonpartisan commission, most of the members of which were not appointed by anyone connected with Congress, has gone into all these arguments, and has made the recommendation that the salary increase be $5,000 more than the increase provided in the pending bill, as the Senator from North Dakota knows.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee mentioned the fact that the present President of the United States had recommended a salary of $25,000 for Senators or Representatives. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee is familiar with the fact that when Mr. Truman was President, he also recommended a $25,000 salary for Members of Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; President Truman did that. I do not know whether the present President recommended a specific amount. In his state of the Union message, he said he was in favor of the proposal; and I take it that he must have been speaking of the Segal Commission's proposal, although I do not believe the President stated a specific amount.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator from Tennessee believe that at the present time the economic condition of the United States is not so high as some of the newspapers would have us believe?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I think the Nation's economy is in more danger than some of the optimistic newspapers would have us believe.

Mr. LANGER. For instance, I have been in touch with the head of the FHA in my State. He told me that the amount of indebtedness of the farmers of North Dakota is today greater than it was at any time during the height of the depression in the 1920's and 1930's.

Furthermore, only last week, I believe it was, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter showing that the farmers of North Dakota are receiving 6 cents a dozen for eggs. My recollection is that they never received less than that during the depression.

Some Senators disputed those figures; they said there must be something wrong with the figure 6 cents a dozen, and that it could not be correct. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will remember that I then placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD receipts I obtained from the Rutland Hatchery, at Rutland, N. Dak., showing that one farmer there sold 30 dozen eggs, and received $1.80 for the entire 30 dozen.

In view of the present economic situation of our country, does the Senator believe that an increase of 66.6 percent in congressional salaries is justified?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that with adequate salaries we would have better government, and I believe the raise proposed in the bill is fully justified. The raise proposed in the bill aggregates about $4¾ million. When compared with the amount spent in the recent hydrogen bomb tests the other day, the cost is not large. Those bomb tests cost many times the amount involved here.

The annual cost of maintaining the Washington zoo—and I am in favor of the zoo—is I believe at least the amount of the increase proposed here. I believe we ought to pass a bill which is fair to everyone, and I think this is a fair bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell us how much a member of Parliament in England receives in salary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should know, but I cannot answer that question at the moment. The Senator from North Dakota compared the proposed raises with raises given to civil-service employees. My best recollection is that in the task-force report there is a statement to the effect that since 1945 civil-service employees generally have had an 80-percent increase in salary. Since that time Members of Congress have had no raise, or, to put it another way, since the last time we had an increase in salary, the civil-service employees have received an 80-percent increase in their salaries.

Mr. LANGER. I am satisfied that those figures take into consideration promotions also.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; I believe those are percentage raises. That is my best information. However, you may be right and the actual raises would be around 50 percent.

Mr. LANGER. I believe my friend from Tennessee is mistaken about that. However, we will not argue the point. Even if the civil-service employees received an 80-percent increase, many of them were receiving starvation wages. Mail carriers, for example, were receiving as little as $1,950 a year. Therefore, even if they received an 80-percent increase they would still not be receiving sufficient wages to support properly a wife and a child or two.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe that many of the civil-service employees are entitled to increases at the present time. There is a bill before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is chairman, to provide for adequate compensation for civil-service employees.

Mr. LANGER. If I may be permitted to interrupt the Senator again, there is a bill before the committee which was introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to provide for a 5-percent increase. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and several other Senators, of whom I am one, are sponsoring a bill to provide for an increase of 10 percent. However, whatever the amount of the increase is, we have testimony from various postal organizations to the effect that even if we give them a 15-percent increase they will still not get as much take-home pay as they received in 1939, and that in order for them to be able to educate properly their children they should have an increase of 25 percent. That is the record that has been made in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am a member.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am one of the sponsors of the 10-percent-increase bill, as the Senator knows. I am in favor of treating Federal employees fairly. I do not believe, either, that they should wait for fair compensation until the budget of the Post Office Department is in balance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished colleague that Representative USHER BURDICK, of North Dakota, who has been strenuously opposed to any pay increases for Members of Congress, as the Senator from Tennessee knows, stated in his recent newsletter that he would be in favor of an increase of four or five thousand dollars. Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that would be an adequate increase?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; I do not believe so. As I recall, Representative BURDICK offered such an amendment on the floor of the House. I believe the least we can do is to bring our compensation up to the purchasing power, or somewhere near the purchasing power, it had in 1939.

The Senator knows that we must spend more time on our duties and that the burdens of our office are greater than in 1939, and that the responsibilities of Government are greater.

Certainly no one can argue that the 1939 compensation was too low. If we concede that that compensation was fair—and that is the year which is used in making computations for a great number of governmental purposes, and is generally conceded to be a normal year—then $22,500 seems to me to be a little less than fair now.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the Senator to yield once more, if he will.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Finally, I should like to thank the Senator for his courtesy. Perhaps the senior Senator from North Dakota is one of the poorest men in the Senate. However, I feel that I made a contract for $15,000 with the people of my State when I was nominated and elected to this office. Certainly when John Lewis' miners make a contract to work for so much an hour, we expect them to hold to their contract. If they come along after 6 months or so and ask for a raise—and such a thing has occurred in the past—we have almost unanimously felt that the miners entered into a contract for so much an hour, and that they should live up to it. Again I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the point of view of the senior Senator from North Dakota, and I respect his feelings. His position exactly reflects his feeling. I am sorry that I disagree somewhat with the position taken by the Senator. We usually view things pretty much in the same way. I wish to say also to the Senator from North Dakota that whatever amount is fixed as the compensation, whether it be less or more than now, I know he will continue his valuable and courageous service to the people of his State and to the people of our Nation.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope my friend the Senator from North Dakota will listen.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall put my statement in the form of a question and observation. The Senator from North Dakota brought up the question of the percentage of the increase which has been proposed. I have examined the pay scales on which Congress voted. In the Pay Act of 1945, for Federal employees, the increase was 15.9 percent. In 1946 there was an increase of 14.2 percent. In 1948 there was an increase of 11 percent. In 1949 we modified the Classification Act, which amounted to an incidental increase of 4.1 percent. Then in the Pay Act of 1951 there was an increase of 10 percent granted to Federal employees. The total increases amount roughly to 51 or 52 percent. Therefore we are not so far off after all, especially when we remember that increases in salary for Members of Congress come along about once in a blue moon.

Mr. LANGER. I am familiar with each one of the pay increases to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. I sponsored every one of them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The bill making the largest increase was enacted when I was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in 1945. At that time employees of the Post Office Department were working for starvation wages. We had the testimony of one mail carrier's wife that she could not even buy a pair of stockings. In addition, she had to wear a dress made from a discarded uniform of the mail carrier. The testimony showed these people were able to buy meat about once a month and that they did not have any butter at all, and had to rely on oleomargarine. At the same time the price of milk had gone up to the point where the children could not even get enough milk to drink. That was the sworn testimony before our committee. The situation was desperate, and that is why they got that large increase.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sensible of that fact. Certainly I am in favor of giving them an increase, and I hope that it will be reasonably substantial. That matter is now before my distinguished friend from North Dakota and his associates on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I trust that before too long the committee will have completed action on such a bill and will report it to the Senate for action.

Mr. LANGER. We plan to report it to the Senate tomorrow or on Wednesday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make one other observation. I do not concede that our tenure is a contract. I do not concede that at all. The fact is that the Constitution is silent on the pay of Members of Congress. Madison, in the Federalist, I believe, stated that it is rather indecent to make Members of the House and of the Senate vote on their own pay increases.

However, since nothing was done in the Constitutional Convention along that line, we have no choice in the matter. It is certainly not a very pleasant task, because it is regarded as being somewhat self-serving. At the same time, if the Members of Congress do not do it, no one in heaven or on earth can do it for them.

Mr. LANGER. I can understand how the Senator from Illinois finds it hard to live on $15,000 a year, particularly when there are persons in the city of Chicago who make as much as $40,000, $50,000, and even $100,000 a year. I am sure if the Senator from Illinois were in private practice he would make that much money, because he is a man of great ability.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend very much.

Mr. LANGER. In rural areas an entirely different feeling is shown by our constituents. In States which do not have very large cities the people believe that $15,000 is a very large salary. I can show the Senate hundreds of letters I have received, not only from my own State, but from other States, where there are large rural areas, in which the writers suggest that $15,000 is an enormous salary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to allude to the Senator's question about the compensation that is paid to members of Parliament in England. The fact is that some members of Parliament have constituencies as small as 15,000 people, particularly in some of the poorer districts

of London. Those members of Parliament do not maintain any offices, they need no staff, and they have no mail problems. We see the difference in the situation when we compare such a member of Parliament with a Member of Congress who represents as many as 9 million people, as I do, in part, a Senator from the State of Illinois, or with a Member representing States which have even larger populations, such as the States of Pennsylvania, California, and New York. The office has become quite a responsibility.

The point I wish to make—and I believe it ought to be made constantly—is that we must think of the salary in connection with the office involved. The dignity of the office and its station must be measured against every other station in Government today. I may not be here, and the Senator from North Dakota may not be here, but certainly the situation and the position should be considered.

Mr. LANGER. I certainly hope the Senator from Illinois will be here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend from North Dakota. The station itself merits a certain dignity. The other day I met a country lawyer from a little town of 6,000 population.. He said to me, "I have just a little country law practice, but I make three times as much out of my country law practice as a Senator is paid." I have no doubt about that.

When it comes to judges of courts, there must be some parity between the man who sits on the bench and resolves knotty and troublesome questions and the man before him who is presenting the argument. I think there has to be some decent and fair relationship.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first, I wish to compliment and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and his committee. I realize they have not been unanimous in their report, but I think they have been equally zealous in trying to bring forth a measure which is wholesome and fair. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has made a most able presentation of the committee bill. I personally feel that the committee bill is sound, fair, and reasonable, and I should like, without taking the floor myself, simply to comment on 2 or 3 points which, from my own observation, commend the bill for its fairness.

The first thing I should like to say is that since I have been in the Senate we have lost by retirement from the Florida delegation in the House of Representatives 4 able Representatives, 4 highly trained men of great ability and effectiveness. They were all younger men than is the senior Senator from Florida, and presumably had heavy family responsibilities. I know from personal discussions with three of them that the question of inadequate compensation entered into their retirement. I think it is a sad commentary upon the state of affairs in our Nation when able men who are well representing a progressive State find it necessary, because of inadequate compensation and because of their desire to take better care of their families, to return to private life.

Secondly, just a little while ago in my State we were trying to get an able lawyer to become a district judge, but he found, upon balancing the rate of pay against his private compensation, which was more than twice the amount he would receive, that he could not afford to make that sacrifice. It seems to me that it is a sad commentary upon the existing situation when we cannot make high judicial positions reasonably attractive to men of high professional ability.

The third comment I should like to make is that I especially commend the committee for its effort to balance up the situation. In the first place, district judges and Members of Congress have traditionally been regarded as in somewhat comparable positions, and the committee apparently felt it was wise to bring forward together district judges and Members of Congress.

The committee bill also tends to bring Members of Congress and district judges to somewhere near the position of the heads of the executive departments, that is, those who serve in the Cabinet; not entirely to the same position, because while the salaries of Cabinet members are $22,500, they are also furnished private cars, allowances for chauffeurs, and the like, which, of course, do not accrue to Members of Congress.

I think the bill represents a very able and a very successful effort to try to balance off the picture in Government, so that there will be some degree of financial attractiveness to qualified persons to serve in all three of the branches of Government, with some assurance that those serving in positions of high responsibility will receive sufficient compensation to enable them to carry reasonably their family responsibilities.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I compliment him upon his efforts.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certainly grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for his statement, and the members of the committee appreciate it very much.

While we are considering assistance, I wish especially to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for his aid in the efforts which have been made to secure fair treatment for Members and employees of the Congress, not only at the present time, but in years past. I had the pleasure of serving in the House with the Senator from Illinois at the time he was a member of the La Follette-Monroney committee for the Reorganization of the Congress. The Senator from Illinois was then a strong voice in the committee in the movement to bring about adequate compensation for Members of Congress and for the congressional employees. At that time the proposal under consideration was an increase from $10,000 to $12,000 with some allowance for expenses.

As I stated earlier, Mr. President, since it is a delicate matter for Members of Congress to vote upon their own salary increase, the Senator from Illinois, appreciating that fact, was responsible for the passage of a resolution which established the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries in the 83d Congress. That Commission did an admirable job.

The bill which is now before the Senate includes only those who were the subject matter of the findings of the Segal Commission. Others, of course, are entitled to consideration, and they will receive it at a later time. We have tried to limit this bill and have limited it only to those who were considered in the Segal Commission's report.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the American Bar Association addressed to me, as well as letters from a number of other associations, together with resolutions and editorials, in connection with the pay-raise bill.

There being no objection, the letters and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 18, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Thank you for your letter of February 15 in response to my recent letter.

I understand that the congressional-judicial salary bill is scheduled for consideration in the Senate during the week of February 21.

On behalf of the hundreds of lawyers in all parts of the country, and of all political affiliations who have as a public service given unselfishly of their time in support of these salary increases, there are two matters which I think should be called to your attention at this time:

1. We believe that informed public opinion will support Congress in raising both congressional and judicial salaries by at least $10,000 per year. We enclose reprints from editorials which have appeared in recent weeks (most of them during February 1955) from newspapers in all sections, which editorials we believe substantiate the foregoing statement. These editorials are in addition to the 244 editorials which we filed with your subcommittee at the time of the January 25 hearing, and in addition to subsequent editorials which were enclosed with my recent letter.

2. We hope the Senate will concur with the House in including in this bill salary increases for United States attorneys and certain Department of Justice officials. Such salary increases were included in S. 1663 of the 83d Congress, as approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and have been recommended by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. The fact that they were not included in the Senate bill which was before your subcommittee at the time of the hearing was due to the fact that this bill followed the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, and that these United States attorneys and Department of Justice salaries were outside the jurisdiction of that Commission (see printed report of subcommittee hearings, p. 18). Whether the increases for these United States attorneys and Department of Justice salaries should be added to the pending bill on the Senate floor, or should be concurred in by the Senate conferees, is something which the Senate leaders can best determine, but we do feel that increases in these salaries is important in order to get lawyers with the

ability necessary to handle these important jobs.

I am sending a copy of this letter and enclosures to the other members of your subcommittee who were present at the January 25 hearing.

Sincerely,

MORRIS B. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

[From the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal of January 31, 1955]

GRANGE SEEKS TAX RELIEF FOR FARMERS

(By Kenneth Scheibel)

WASHINGTON.—The leader of a national farm organization is hopeful Congress this year will grant tax relief to farmers on gasoline, oil, tires, and other automotive supplies.

National Grange Master Herschel Newsom announced this is one objective in the Grange's 1955 legislative program.

The Grange approves raising salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges.

Newsom puts it this way:

"Members of Congress and Federal judges are the victims of inflation. It has cheapened materially the buying power of their dollar, making it difficult for them to make ends meet. Currently, it is also difficult to interest brilliant and capable men of moderate means to seek these positions.

"By raising congressional and judicial salaries, the public will benefit materially in the longtime run. For instance, a flat $10,000-per-year raise would amount to an annual additional cost of $6 million.

"This is the equivalent of an additional investment of $1 for each $10,000 spent by the Congress."

[From the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times Republican of January 18, 1955]

PAY HIKE FOR CONGRESS SOON?

Congress is more likely to give itself a pay increase this year now that the state of the Union message calls for a "substantial" one as "long overdue." The political hazard always inherent in voting for a pay hike for oneself might be overcome if a Member could get away with telling his constituents, "Who am I to oppose our President on something he insists is in the national interests?"

The present congressional salary of $15,000 (of which a tax-exempt $2,500 is for expenses) was set in 1946. Since then the dollar has depreciated in purchasing power by about 27 percent, and a rise in congressional pay to around $19,000 would be needed to make it equal to $15,000 in 1946 dollars.

However, much more than $19,000 is in the wind. In 1953 the Senate Judiciary Committee proposed $25,000, a proposal that ultimately was shelved in favor of a study on the subject by an outside commission.

This reported in January 1954 that the remuneration of Federal legislators (and judges) had failed to keep pace with the increased responsibilities and workloads of their offices, or with salaries in private business for comparable responsibility. The report, pointing out also that executive salaries had been adjusted upward since 1946 to meet higher living costs, suggested $27,500 for Congress.

However, few Members were prepared, just before facing the voters last November, to give themselves a salary boost of more than 80 percent or to come up against the cry that lawmaking for the people should not be entrusted to men who had voted themselves into plutocracy. So Congress contented itself in 1954 with expanding its pension benefits and its allowances for stationery, postage, long-distance calls, home-office upkeep, and clerk hire.

[From the New York Times of February 1, 1955]

UNDERPAID OFFICIALS

The amazing disparity between the salaries of Federal and New York judges has been referred to on this page in recent weeks; and we are glad to see Attorney General Brownell advert to it once again in urging an increase in the compensation of both United States judges and Congressmen.

Judges of the United States district court now receive $15,000, exactly half the salary in this area of judges of the somewhat comparable New York State Supreme Court. Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court receive $25,000, while judges of the highest New York tribunal, the court of appeals, are paid a total of $37,500 each. The point isn't that New York judges are overpaid, but that Federal judges are underpaid. The rise in the cost of living has, of course, had the effect of reducing their income even below the levels at which it had been set. It has been calculated that the purchasing power in 1939 dollars of a Federal district judge's salary after taxes amounts to less than $6,500.

Members of Congress receive a total of $15,000 a year. The commission that investigated these matters correctly observed a year ago that "Members of Congress and the judiciary have responsibilities as great as those of top executives in business or industry, or greater." Yet the top officials of 100 of America's largest corporations average over $100,000 a year in salary. No one is recommending anything like that for Congressmen, but surely the proposed $27,500 is reasonable compensation for so onerous a job. The difficulty in granting adequate pay to Congressmen comes from Congressmen who fear the political effects of giving themselves even an entirely justified increase. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, with whom we do not often find ourselves in agreement, has urged on his fellow members an end to their timidity on this matter; and we think he is right.

Increased salaries obviously will not guarantee better judges or better Congressmen, but public freedom from economic pressures will prevent some good public servants from leaving their jobs for private life and will indicate to all of them that their Government is not really trying to get something out of them for nothing.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American of January 31, 1955]

TIMIDITY OF CONGRESS

We've contended that Members of Congress, and Federal judges as well, deserve an increase in pay.

Men of good caliber should not have to serve their country at financial sacrifice. Or, to put it more significantly, these important jobs should pay enough to attract men of great ability and not just the independently wealthy or broken-down hacks who want to get in out of the rain.

But the timidity of Congress. Its fear of the voters. These factors have prevented action in past Congresses. Now, as it seems probable a raise will be voted, they emerge in a ludicrous way.

It is reported that proposals will be made for a $10,000 pay hike (from the present $15,000 to $25,000) so that, on the floor, Members may humbly vote to reduce the increase and wind up with $22,500.

For goodness sake, men, the people aren't that dumb. They know Congressmen have to maintain two homes and contribute to everything from the smallest raffle to the party campaign chests.

They know Federal judges, at $15,000 make only a fraction of what they could command in private practices.

Please, gentlemen, just fix a fair figure. The people will understand and respect.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun Times of February 5, 1955]

CONGRESS SHOULDN'T TRIM ON PAY HIKES

If the salary scale for Federal judges and Members of Congress were based on individual merit or time spent on the job, some would deserve substantial pay cuts.

But a majority of the Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary are conscientious, hard working—and underpaid. They shouldn't be penalized as a class for the derelictions of a few dunderheads and laggards who happen to be in their midst.

The arguments in favor of raising the pay of judges and Federal lawmakers are overwhelming. For one thing, higher compensation would be bound to attract candidates for Congress who are well qualified but who now hesitate to run because of the financial sacrifices that would be involved. While few lawyers would turn down an appointment to the Federal bench, it is nevertheless true that many have accepted the posts at a sacrifice far beyond the normal call of duty.

The average Senator and House Member must maintain two homes—one where he hails from and the other in Washington. Some get around this expensive problem by maintaining full-time residences in the Capital and part-time residences, sometimes in a hotel, at home. But even that, or a reverse of it, is not cheap. Moreover, the average Member of Congress is expected to keep in fairly close touch with his constituents and that entails considerable travel to and from the Capital—most of it being paid for out of the lawmaker's own pocket.

He is expected to dine—if not wine—his constituents when they visit him in Washington. Not infrequently, a visting constituent may ask him for a memento, such as a flag which had been flown briefly over the Capitol and which the constituent can boast about after he has returned home. These items are paid for by the lawmakers.

At present, Senators and House Members receive a total personal compensation of $15,000 a year. While many of them could live comfortably on that salary as private citizens at home, they as Members of Congress are unable to make ends meet. As a consequence, many Senators and House Members take to the lecture platform or write magazine articles to increase their incomes to meet family obligations.

Of course, some Members of Congress are men of private means and others have law practices which benefit as a result of their holding congressional office. But wealth or a law practice should not be a requisite for men or women seeking a seat in Congress.

The salary of a Member of Congress should be enough to enable him to live in dignity without going into debt, and to permit him to meet his obligations as a Federal lawmaker as well as private citizen.

Senate and House subcommittees have now approved congressional pay raises that vary between $7,500 and $10,000 a year. We believe that the higher figure, recommended by a special commission last year, is the one that should be adopted. The overall difference between the higher and the lower figure in the Federal budget would be infinitesimal. Congress should have the courage to do right by itself, regardless of what some disgruntled constituents or political opponents at home may say.

By the same token, the boosts in pay for Federal judges recommended by the same committees are generous, but not generous enough. The present recommendation is to raise United States district court judges from $15,000 a year to $22,500, instead of the $27,500 recommended by the special commission last year. Supreme Court Justices would be raised from $25,000 to $35,000, instead of the $39,500 urged by the commission.

As in the case of the congressional pay increases, we feel that the Nation would be better served if Congress were to approve the

higher rather than the lower figures for the Federal judiciary.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald of January 31, 1955]

ATTRITION OF TALENT

It is true, as some opponents of the proposed pay increase for Federal judges and Members of Congress have pointed out, that the Government cannot afford to pay its ablest public servants as much as they could earn in private employment. Public policy demands that there be a reasonable ceiling on official salaries. But it is equally true that the country is poorly served when salaries are so low as to drive many able men out of public life. That is what is happening today. Several of the witnesses before the Kefauver subcommittee told of leaving the bench or Congress because the economic pinch became too severe.

We think it is time for Congress to take a realistic view of this problem. It is clear enough that a great majority of Senators and Representatives think their pay should be increased. They have failed to act because of the unfortunate political inferences that future opponents may draw from the votes of present members to increase their own salaries. But this failure is causing a serious attrition of talent in public life. The Congressman who ignores this cost of standpat-ism may wake up to find that he is out of touch with public opinion. At least editorial opinion over the Nation has been found to be overwhelmingly in favor of more adequate judicial and legislative salaries.

The basic facts to be considered are these: The United States is a wealthy country. It can afford to pay its judges at least three-fourths as much as the judges of New York State are paid. It urgently needs the highest type of men on the bench and in its legislative halls. Consequently, it should not keep legislative and judicial salaries so low as to discourage men of special talent or to limit these positions to persons who are independently wealthy and do not need to live on their salaries.

Every time this issue has been carefully weighed from the viewpoint of the national interest recommendations for higher salaries have been forthcoming. Congress should have no hesitation, therefore, in following this advice. Now is the most favorable time in many years for enactment of a congressional-judicial pay bill. The next elections are nearly 2 years away. More important, responsibility for the measure can be evenly divided between the Republican President, who has spoken up pointedly for a pay increase, and the Democratic Congress.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 10, 1955]

PAY HIKE FOR CONGRESS

Now that President Eisenhower formally has called for pay increases for Congress, Federal district judges, and certain classifications of Federal employees, it is virtually certain that Congress will hike its own pay, probably as one of its first legislative steps in this session.

This seems especially certain since there are no national elections in the offing for nearly 2 years. Many Congressmen, quite willing to hike their own pay, have not been willing in the past to do so and then go home and stand for reelection. That attitude is a false one, for if the pay hikes are needed and deserved, they should be voted, and those who vote them should be willing to stand up before their constituents and state why they did so.

There have been several studies of congressional pay by impartial sources seeking to approach the matter objectively. Invariably the recommendation has been for an increase from the present $15,000 a year—plus certain perquisites which tend to ease some of the essential expenses of being a Member of the House or the Senate. Probably the hike voted will be to $22,500 a year, or perhaps $25,000.

But if Congress does increase its own pay, it had better make certain that it increases the pay of Federal district judges at the same time, and to a comparable figure. A pretty good case could be made that Federal district judges now—on the basis of general Government pay scales—are the most underpaid group in the Federal Government.

A big hike in congressional pay would gain greater public approval if some of the fringe benefits Congress has voted itself in recent years in place of a pay hike were eliminated, instead of maintaining the fringe benefits and establishing the pay hike, too. Fringe benefits in nearly all fields are simply an effort to increase income without actually attaching the increase to regular wage or salary income itself. They are meant, in other words, to be deceptive.

Congress should determine fairly and honestly what the pay of a Member of Congress should be in the light of the expenses involved—particularly the necessity of maintaining two homes in different cities—and then should set congressional pay at that figure and do away with the fringe benefits subterfuge.

[From the Albany (N. Y.) Times Union of January 31, 1955]

NEEDS CORRECTION

A situation that pending legislation in Congress would correct, and that badly needs correction, is that created by the inadequate pay of Federal judges.

Attorney General Brownell brought the matter to a head in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, when he said the prevailing ceiling on salaries for members of the Federal judiciary presents an obstacle to getting men of maximum qualifications on the Federal bench.

The American Bar Association, at both national and local levels, has been saying the same thing for a long time, and since the members of the legal profession are in a position to give the facts about the matter it is time for Congress to listen.

The facts in substance amount to this: That the prevailing salary scale does not adequately compensate a man who has the experience, integrity, and prestige warranting his appointment to the Federal bench, and that if such a man accepts an appointment under these circumstances he has to do it at great personal sacrifice.

Mr. Brownell pinpointed this situation by pointing out that State and local judges in many parts of the country are paid substantially higher salaries than the maximum scale on the Federal bench.

Thus the completely illogical factor in the situation is that when a man has distinguished himself in State or local judiciary he can only step up professionally to a Federal judgeship at the cost of stepping down financially and economically.

It is unreasonable and unwise to ask the most eminent men of the legal profession to accept the vital responsibilities of the Federal judiciary with only the satisfaction of performing a patriotic service as their major compensation.

Many of our most eminent Federal judges actually do serve under these circumstances, but it is inherently wrong that the highest places of responsibility in the American judicial system should be more poorly compensated than inferior posts.

The dangers in this are obvious, as the spokesmen for the bar associations of the country have pointed out; and they are that appointments to the Federal bench may eventually be attractive only to men already rich in the legal profession or to men not notably successful in the profession.

The national interest in this vital field will be best served by making the emoluments of the Federal bench commensurate with the equality of the men on the bench most needed and desired.

[From the Iowa City Iowan of January 28, 1955]

PAY RAISES IN CONGRESS

Of all the melodies piped by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, none could have come more sweetly to congressional ears than this:

"I also urge the Congress to approve a long overdue increase in the salaries of Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary, and in my opinion this raise should be substantial, because I believe it should be to a level commensurate with their heavy responsibility."

This part of the Eisenhower program seems certain to enjoy full, bipartisan backing. Congressmen are touchy about voting themselves raises, but with this nod from Eisenhower, they will probably show no lack of eagerness in approving pay raises.

Actually, they deserve a raise, and a good one. Lawmakers in the House and Senate get a little over $15,000 a year, practically all of it taxable. That doesn't go far, what with their heavy expenses.

They have to maintain two residences, they have to entertain; they have to kick in on all sorts of political and community causes.

Obviously, Congressmen have to get other income. The New York Times found that 80 percent of the Representatives, and 67 percent of the Senators carry on a private business or investments. Some Congressmen add to their income—but detract from their legislative time—by writing articles or lecturing.

Last year, mainly because it was an election year, Congress turned down a pay raise for its Members. This year it should not be so skittish.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, recently introduced a bill which would increase the salaries of the Justices and judges of the United States courts, and Members of Congress.

Under this bill, Members of Congress would receive $27,500, and the Chief Justice of the United States would receive $40,000.

Every reasonable voter, including the President himself, appreciates that the lawmakers have long deserved a healthy hike in pay.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News of February 2, 1955]

CONGRESS TOO COY

Politicians have to love their jobs, or they could never stand the working conditions. For Members of Congress, one of the most deplorable of these conditions is poor pay.

The private citizen is apt to retort that if Congressmen are poorly paid, it is their own fault. But for any politician those elections come uncomfortably close together.

There is always this fear of voter reaction whenever congressional pay raises are mentioned. Yet, it is a poor constituency that would ask its representative to tackle his difficult and responsible job at half pay.

Most pay-raise advocates, including the President, believe Congressmen should receive about twice their present salary. A bill now pending before Congress would increase the annual figure of $12,500 to $25,000. The President also wants raises for judges and a number of other Federal employees.

Naturally, better pay attracts a higher caliber man to public office. Most voters know this. Perhaps Congressmen, themselves, need a little more faith in the fairmindedness of the people they represent.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune of January 24, 1955]

CONGRESSMEN'S SALARIES

Members of Congress will go a long way toward taking some of the sting out of voting higher pay for themselves, if they do, by adopting strict antinepotism rules at the same time.

The recent change in party control of committees of the House of Representatives brought to public attention the fact that the wife of the former chairman of the un-American Activities Committee has been holding an $8,500-a-year job. Mrs. Harold Velde has been official reporter for the Committee. Her husband, as Representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois received a salary of $15,000 a year.

There is no implication that Mrs. Velde was not qualified to fill the position. We assume that she was. It is also true that many other Members of Congress have found jobs for their wives or their children.

Some Members of Congress have defended such employment with the excuse that the expenses of the office are such that otherwise they could not live within the salary. There is increasingly wide public acceptance of the contention that congressional salaries should be raised. (A commission which studied the problem recommended $27,500 a year). We agree that salaries should be higher. But the lawmakers will find that there will be far less public criticism of a pay raise, if they make it clear at the same time that they are putting an end to the employment of wives at high salaries for such jobs as the one held by Mrs. Velde.

[From the Bayonne (N. J.) Times of February 8, 1955]

FEDERAL SALARIES

Federal Judge Modarelli's basic point before the Hudson County Press Club was a good one. It's a pity he had to argue it on the wrong grounds. Mr. Modarelli was insisting that the salaries of Members of Congress and of the Federal judiciary are too low, and in that he is right. The salaries should be raised and raised more generously than is provided for in bills now before Congress. But Judge Modarelli cited the amounts spent by the United States on foreign aid programs and the sums wasted, as he said, in the Nation's Military Establishment. From such material he argued that the raises for the legislators and the judges would be comparatively inexpensive.

The point that eluded Judge Modarelli—and it's odd the way trained barristers manage to miss important points—is that even if we had no foreign-aid program, and even if our Military Establishment were the very last word in efficiency, the Federal judiciary and the Members of Congress should be better paid. It has no bearing on the matter that we have spent much, some of it not well, on foreign aid and arms. Even if we hadn't, at present levels we still would be unwisely parsimonious in relation to some of our most important public servants.

Many capable citizens look upon Federal service, whether on the bench or in Congress, as a major sacrifice in public service. Such persons are overworked, and a great deal of the work lies outside their own special interests. In present circumstances we must ask prospective judges and prospective Members of Congress both to sacrifice their personal interests and make a money sacrifice too. It is more than we have a right to do. Like Judge Modarelli, we hope the present Congress meets the problem and meets it with the error rather on the generous than the niggardly side. And regardless of the Government's other activities, domestic and foreign.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of February 4, 1955]

CONGRESS NEEDS COURAGE TO RAISE ITS PAY SCALE

Congress will have to wait a long time before finding a more auspicious time than the present for raising the salaries of its Members and of Federal judges. A Republican President has recommended increases and Congress is Democratic, so the two parties will be equally responsible.

In addition, higher pay has been urged by a nonpartisan commission of citizens representing business, labor, and the professions. The next elections are nearly 2 years away. All in all, if the Representatives and Senators cannot get up enough courage this session to vote for a raise, they are likely to find even less favorable conditions in the future.

There is always some criticism when higher pay for Congressmen is mentioned. However, an increase is long overdue. The $15,000 a year which Senators and Representatives receive was a fairly high salary when it was first established years ago. Today it is not enough, considering the political risks to continuity of service and the public's need to attract men of the highest ability.

As to Federal judges, it has long been recognized that one bulwark of an incorruptible judiciary is adequate remuneration. While Federal judgeships have the attractiveness of life tenure and professional prestige, United States district judges get the same salary as Members of Congress. That is too little for the responsibilities involved, by present-day standards.

[From the Erie (Pa.) Times of February 2, 1955]

PAY BOOST FOR CONGRESSMEN

Congressmen are expected to raise their pay next year from $15,000 a year to $25,000 according to a dispatch from Washington which says the leaders of both parties are in favor of the idea.

In our opinion it is a good idea if only because its adoption will just about force Congress to do as much for the Federal judiciary who are now very badly underpaid.

Members were timid about voting themselves a raise on the eve of elections in 1954.

There is a fine irony in the situation. Congressmen can't get along on their salaries because inflation has raised the cost of living. And who was responsible for inflation? Nobody but the Members of Congress who forgot how to balance the budget and stay out of expensive wars.

Congressmen who will cut five or ten billion dollars from the estimates that will be sent to Congress in a few weeks will be worth $25,000 a head. It would be wonderful if the raise could be made contingent upon the saving.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Sun-Telegraph of February 3, 1955]

OH, TIMIDITY

We've contended that Members of Congress, and certainly our Federal judges as well, deserve an increase in pay.

Our belief is that men of good caliber should not have to serve their country at financial sacrifice. Or, to put it more significantly, these important jobs should pay enough so that they are attractive to men of high ability and not just to the independently wealthy or broken-down hacks who want to get in out of the rain.

Oh, the timidity of Congress. The fear of the voters.

These factors have prevented action in past Congresses. Now, as it seems probable a raise will be voted, they emerge in a ludicrous way.

It is reported that proposals will be made for a $10,000 pay hike (from the present $15,000 to $25,000) so that, on the floor, Members may humbly vote to reduce the increase so that they will get take-home pay of only $22,500.

For goodness sake, fellows. The people aren't that dumb.

They know Congressmen have to maintain two homes and contribute to everything from the smallest raffle to the party campaign chests.

They know Federal judges, at $15,000, make only a fraction of what they could command in private practice.

Please, gentlemen, just fix a fair figure, stick to it, and the people will understand and respect. No tricks of financial piety are called for.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of January 27, 1955]

QUESTION OF ADEQUATE PAY

If Congress should finally get around to an increase of pay for its Members and the Federal judiciary, it would not be action that had been taken on the initiative of the legislative body itself. Adequate compensation for the two groups has been repeatedly recommended but, with respect to its Members, Congress has held back through fear of the political consequences.

That explains the failure to act last year. But since this is not an election year the matter is up again and the belief is that something will be done. If so, it would be in response to the proposal of a Presidential commission with regard both to Congress and the Federal judges. And 9 years ago, when the congressional reorganization (streamlining) act was being adopted, it had been recommended by an impartial commission that legislative salaries be made $25,000 a year.

At the time Congress Members were paid $12,500 to which later was added an expense account of $2,500. The present pay, and that of Federal district judges, is now $15,000. The Presidential commission recommended $27,500 for both groups. It showed that on the basis of present money values the two would be better off by only about $1,300 compared with the salaries they were receiving in 1939.

Six years ago Congress voted higher pay for the President, Cabinet members, and others in the executive department. Also in the recent years of inflation and increased living costs the pay of Federal employees has been increased several times and further action in their behalf is expected soon.

Under bills shortly to have attention Congress Members would not be in line for the recommended total of $27,500. The exact figure is to be determined but the House measure would make it $22,500 with the present expense account of $2,500 eliminated. Federal district judges would receive whatever amount was agreed upon for Congress itself while appeals court judges and Supreme Court Justices would be granted advances on a different basis.

The purpose is not only just compensation but encouragement to men of competence to serve in offices of great responsibility. Politics ought to be discounted in attaining such important objectives.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of February 4, 1955]

HISTORY IN A PAY HIKE

It appears that Congress at last will vote to increase the pay of its members and that of the Federal judges. Hesitation with respect to itself has come from fear of the reaction by voters at home. That fear has

persisted despite impartial recommendations for an increase.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to determine its own compensation by law. But the public is not left without any power of action and Members of the legislative body are fully aware of that fact.

It doubtless explains why Congress has ventured to increase its pay only 5 times in the last 100 years. And more than 80 years ago there was a warning that perhaps will serve for all time. It arose from action that was unprecedented and may never occur again.

For in 1873 and at a time of numerous scandals about Washington the 42d Congress not only voted itself an increase in pay but made it retroactive for 2 years. It was in connection with a justified increase for the President, the Vice President, and Justices of the Supreme Court. But the action in behalf of Congress itself created a storm of public disapproval. It became known as the salary grab act and the back pay steal.

So violent was the public protest that it raised a big issue in the congressional elections of 1874. The increase was denounced by both parties and some of the Congress Members turned back their added pay while others gave the money to charity. Also the legislative act was repealed by the following Congress with an exception of the provisions relating to the President and the Supreme Court Justices.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) News of January 18, 1955]

BOOSTING FEDERAL PAY

At the current session of Congress bills will be considered proposing goodly pay increases for Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary.

Viewed in the light of how wages for workmen and remuneration for white-collar and professional men have advanced in recent years, and the insistent demand for a minimum wage of $1 per hour for the commonest of labor, the proposal for Congressmen and Federal judges does not seem unreasonable.

There is a reluctance, however, among some Members of both House and Senate because it might be politically unpopular. All House Members and one-third of the Senators will be up for reelection next year, and big pay boosts might well become a campaign issue in the 1956 presidential contest.

But this political angle shouldn't be given too much weight. The pay hike has been recommended by an outside commission and has general public support. Congress can avoid most of the possible stigma of selfishness by making the pay boost applicable only with the next session of Congress. That would require all Representatives and a third of the Senators to be reelected before benefiting from the act. There should be no qualm over raising the pay of judges. When a lawyer seeks a Federal judgeship nowadays, he must be financially able to accept the rather meager pay attached—much less than any good lawyer can earn in private practice.

Possibly the jump from $15,000 a year to $27,500 proposed by Senator HARRY M. KILGORE, of West Virginia, will be subject to compromise; increasing the number of expense-paid trips home from 1 a year to 6 may also be too much. Yet the granting of a substantial increase in the pay of Congressmen is essential to obtaining well-qualified men for the lawmaking posts.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune of February 18, 1955]

A RAISE FOR CONGRESS

Representative WICKERSHAM of Oklahoma has been subjected to quite a bit of "heat" since his highly publicized announcement that he was looking for part-time work to help make ends meet. However one reacts to the Wickersham incident, it does dramatize the question of how well those who represent us ought to be paid.

In January a year ago, a public commission unanimously urged Congress to boost the salaries of Senators and Representatives to $27,500. Substantial increases also were recommended for Supreme Court Justices and other members of the Federal judiciary.

Since then there has been rising pressure for a pay raise at this level. Now the House of Representatives has voted a $10,000 congressional boost and big increases for other top public servants. The Senate appears inclined to follow suit, although it has a smaller amount in mind.

Are such increases justified? We think they are.

Members of Congress, like other men in public life, are subject to heavy demands on their resources. They feel obliged to entertain constituents who come to see them; they must maintain homes both in Washington and in their own State.

A man capable of serving well in Congress would generally be able to earn more money in private endeavor. If salaries are boosted to a figure nearer what men of high quality could earn in private life, more of them will be attracted to politics. The price is little enough for the public to pay to get the best men available.

In its report a year ago the commission said that congressional and judicial salaries "are, and for a long time have been, grossly inadequate." Members of Congress have not received a pay raise since 1947. The arguments for an increase now heavily outweigh those against it.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post Gazette of February 4, 1955]

CORBETT MAIL POLL PROVES IKE'S PROGRAM IS POPULAR—CONGRESSMAN'S QUESTIONNAIRE FINDS VOTERS APPROVE ALL EXCEPT VOTING AGE CHANGE

WASHINGTON, February 3.—President Eisenhower's program, as set forth in his state of the Union message is popular in the 29th Pennsylvania Congressional District of Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Allegheny County.

The Congressman put in the mail immediately after the message was delivered to Congress, a questionnaire of 13 questions, based on the major points of the President's program.

The questionnaire went to every family in the congressional district and the response has been substantial.

VOTE AGE CHANGE LOSES

The replies show a large majority of the residents of the district approved every major point in the program but one. They disapproved lowering the voting age to 18 years by a percentage vote of 65 to 35.

But other issues received these approving percentage votes:

Do you approve the program in general? Yes, 90 to 10.

Should the budget be balanced prior to any important tax cuts? Yes, 83 to 17.

Do you believe that our expenditures for national defense are adequate? Yes, 76 to 24.

Should the Federal Government encourage and guarantee private health insurance programs? Yes, 51 to 49.

Should tariffs be selectively lowered through reciprocal trade agreements? Yes, 72 to 28.

Should the draft law be renewed? Yes, 85 to 15.

Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents an hour? Yes, 77 to 23.

Eisenhower says a salary raise for Members of Congress is long overdue. Do you agree? Yes, 64 to 36.

Should the incentives for men to remain in the military services be increased and the incentives to be discharged be reduced? Yes, 82 to 18.

Do you agree that the flexible price support program is a marked improvement? Yes, 88 to 12.

Eisenhower said "the transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree? Yes, 78 to 22.

Do you think the Eisenhower administration is making satisfactory progress in securing world peace? Yes, 81 to 19.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of February 1, 1955]

UNDERPAID PUBLIC OFFICIALS

(By Ralph W. Page)

What's the matter with Congress? The studies and recommendations for reorganization suggest that its rules, privileges and procedures are archaic and render it incompetent to transact the national business. That is part of the trouble. Even more to the point are the pinch-penny, hopelessly inadequate salaries we give our Congressmen.

These public servants are in charge of the most important affairs in the country. Obviously, then, for these positions we should enlist the best brains and talents. In every other walk of life these brains and abilities are obtained by commensurate pay. Every corporation and enterprise in the country competes for the services of the trained and competent, so that these citizens earn 3 to 10 times the compensation offered our Representatives and Senators. Naturally the result is that these positions are sought by a residue composed either of men of independent means, self-sacrificing individuals with a mission, or those incapable of commanding more remuneration in the market place. Congress knows this, but the Members fear the public reaction to increasing their own pay—and the still prevalent provincial idea that there are plenty of candidates who will be glad to get the place at any price.

It is quite true that there is no dearth of mediocrity ready to continue to legislate for us on the cheap. So the problem is up to the country.

If we desire a competent legislature, the citizens themselves will have to demand that the Congress establish a schedule of compensation that will attract outstanding capacity, or at least relieve the incumbents of the present financial restrictions. This calls for active public support of a measure (S. 462) just introduced in the Senate by ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia.

Following the recommendations of a congressional Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, this bill provides a salary of $27,500 instead of $15,000 for Congressmen, and at the same time raises the pay of judges, ranging from $27,500 for customs and tax courts to $30,500 for the court of appeals and $39,500 for the Supreme Court.

Regardless of the necessity to obtain the best talent for the posts, common justice demands that the services should be paid what they are worth. The burden and responsibility of these posts are enormous, and the amount of faithful and exhausting work done in spite of the handicaps is amazing. Some commentators contend that Congress and the judges deserve the raise on their record. Some certainly do. The rest would if the standard were raised.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 7, 1955]

HIGHER PAY FOR UNITED STATES JUDGES

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Judiciary Subcommittee have each

approved bills for the increase of salaries of Federal judges and Members of Congress. The House bill has still to be considered by the full Judiciary Committee.

Both bills provide for an increase of the salary of United States district judges from $15,000 a year to $22,500 a year, as well as somewhat greater increases in the salaries of judges of the United States courts of appeals and United States Supreme Court.

The proposed increases are, of course, an improvement over the present salary scale for Federal judges. But the proposed increases are still not enough. The bills should be passed promptly, but with the greater salary increases ($12,500 increases for United States district court judges) which have been recommended by the Presidential Commission that studied the problem. The judges of the State supreme court in the city of New York, whose jurisdiction is roughly comparable to that of the United States district court, receive salaries of $30,000 a year.

Service on the Federal judiciary is a great honor and a very rare privilege. In consequence it attracts candidates from among the ablest members of the bar. Concomitantly it is a very demanding service, calling for a very high order of erudition and experience, tireless effort in a rapidly expanding and changing body of law, undiluted devotion directed exclusively to the judicial task, avoidance of entangling commitments to other causes and activities—in short, complete self-dedication.

These requirements must, of necessity, suffer compromising adjustments when judges are obliged to seek supplementary income by teaching or writing, when they are not free from financial anxiety and when their days are clouded by worry concerning the insecurity of their families.

These considerations moved me, in 1950, to resign from the Federal bench despite the fact that I found the work most congenial to my spirit. Other judges have either resigned or have seriously considered that step, and I believe for the same reasons.

After long and careful investigation congressional committees have made recommendations which I believe are subject only to the criticism that they do not go far enough. I urge that the Congress pass a bill raising judicial salaries. If it is at all possible, I urge that the increases be the higher increases recommended by the Presidential Commission rather than the small increases which the congressional committees have thus far approved.

In this letter I have spoken only of judicial salaries because of my intimate interest in the problem. The same considerations are, I believe, applicable to congressional salaries. They, too, call for substantial correction.

SIMON H. RIFKIND.

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1955.*

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
Washington D. C., February 16, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The board of governors of the National Society of Public Accountants, a professional society representing accountants in public practice in every State and the Territories, has adopted the enclosed resolution, endorsing the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

It is the desire of the board that its position with respect to the proposed salary increases be recorded with the Congress. I, therefore, request that you insert the enclosed resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

JAY A. ROBINSON,
President.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Whereas the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries recommended in its report of January 15, 1954, certain salary increases for Members of Congress, the Vice President, Federal judges, and other Government officials; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that present salaries for Congressmen, judges, and others mentioned in the report are grossly inadequate for the qualifications required for these positions and the services rendered by the individuals holding these important offices; and

Whereas most Congressmen are confronted with the necessity of maintaining two homes and are burdened with numerous other expenses in connection with their official duties; and

Whereas citizens of this country cannot continue indefinitely to impose on the patriotic spirit of their public servants while salaries in private industry outstrip those paid legislators and judges; and

Whereas a great number of citizens of outstanding ability are now unavailable for service in these vitally important offices because they are unable to make the necessary financial sacrifices imposed by the existing salary scale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of governors of the National Society of Public Accountants, As professional men in public practice, this body well realizes the unselfish service rendered by Members of Congress and the Judiciary. It is, then, the sense of this board that the present salary scale for these vital posts is grossly inadequate and represents a threat to the quality of our future lawmakers and judges. This board further believes that this "penny-wise and pound-foolish" policy of underpaying men we have selected to carry such a burden of public trust and responsibility cannot be justified on any basis; be it further

Resolved, That this body be recorded as favoring the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries; further

Resolved, That the board of governors of the National Society of Public Accountants urges all Members of Congress to support legislation introduced to accomplish this end.

JAY A. ROBINSON,
President.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1955.

To: Members of the United States Congress.
From: Robert Oliver, Assistant to the President and Director of CIO Legislative Committee:

Enclosed herewith you will find a resolution concerning the pending legislation to increase congressional and judicial salaries which was adopted unanimously by the CIO Executive Board at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on February 2, 1955.

This action by the CIO Executive Board follows the endorsement of the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries which CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey earlier forwarded to the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

The CIO realizes that there exists some misunderstanding of the merits of the pending legislation. We will make every effort throughout the country, both through our own membership as well as the general public, to show the rightness and justification of the proposed increases.

We urge you to proceed with the enactment of this legislation as rapidly as possible, confident that in the coming weeks a large segment of the population will be fully informed as to its complete justification.

CONGRESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL PAY RAISE

(Resolution adopted by the CIO executive board, February 2, 1955)

The CIO heartily approves the proposal to increase salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges. We urge the leaders of both parties in both House of the Congress to unite behind the recommendations made last year by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries to the end that they may be enacted into law as speedily as possible.

It has been 9 years since Congress and the Federal judiciary last received a salary increase. The result, during this period of high inflation and general salary increases for most segments of the economy, has been an increasing number of resignations of Members of Congress and judges to accept other more lucrative jobs in private industry.

The CIO believes that no body of men in the world have a greater responsibility than the Members of our great National Legislature and the judges who are called upon to interpret legislative enactments. Such responsibility must be met with adequate recompense.

Not only have congressional salaries never caught up with inflation, but in recent years they have never been entirely commensurate with the high demands made upon Congressmen. Even the top recommendation for an increase currently being considered by the Congress will, if enacted, still leave the pay of Members of Congress far below the salaries being paid to executives of business corporations whose work has far less responsibility to the public interest.

Enactment of the pay increases for Congress and the Federal judges at the top levels recommended by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries will be an investment in good government that is long overdue. It should have the support of all citizens. We urge immediate passage of this legislation.

MEMPHIS AND SHELBY COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Memphis, Tenn., February 15, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At a recent meeting the board of directors of the Memphis and Shelby County Bar Association considered the proposed judicial and congressional salary increase bill, which has been introduced into the Congress.

The board went on record as approving this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

S. SHEPHERD TATE,
Secretary.

EAST TENNESSEE PACKING CO.,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 15, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: It is our understanding there is a bill before Congress to increase the compensation of all Senators, Congressmen, and Federal judges. We are heartily in favor of any bill that will increase their compensation, as we think it is long past due. It is our belief that all right-thinking people are of this opinion.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

HERBERT J. MADDEN,
President.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 17, 1955]

THE HOUSE VOTES A RAISE

The House yesterday put away its fears of public reaction against a decent pay raise for its Members and voted in accord with the needs of the times and the responsibilities of Senators and Representatives. It is to be congratulated on facing up to the pay problem despite many unfair attacks on the motives of those who have sponsored the pay-raise bill. The House also voted an equally necessary raise for the Federal judiciary. If the raise is finally approved, it will be the first since 1946. Since then the average hourly earnings for manufacturing employees have increased by 70 percent and consumer prices have increased by 40 percent. The raise is essential if for no other reason than to enable Members of Congress and the judiciary to keep financially abreast of the times. Let us hope that the Senate will promptly follow the good example set by the House.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1955]

FAIR PAY FOR IMPORTANT WORK

There are two excellent reasons for raising the salaries of Members of Congress and Federal judges.

First, our Representatives, Senators, and interpreters of the law are worth more. It may be hard to measure responsibility and dignity in dollars and cents, but the people who hold these posts should not have to fret about making ends meet. The pay ought to be high enough so that legislators and judges are able to devote themselves to public duty with an unharassed sense of independence.

Second, almost everybody else in the country has been getting a pay raise. But the pay for Congress and the judiciary has stood still since 1946, when the levels were raised for the first time since 1925. One result is that there have been many cases of able men and women who dropped out because of economic pressure. They felt it was impossible to do their best for country or family on inadequate salaries. Others have struggled along by supplements from writing and lecturing.

This newspaper is delighted to see that the lawmakers are at last overcoming their timidity about voting increases. The House has overwhelmingly approved raising congressional salaries from $15,000 to $25,000, along with an extra $5,000 for the Vice President and Speaker, $10,000 more for the Supreme Court and circuit court justices, and $7,500 for the lower court judges. All this is long overdue; if anything, the judiciary should have fared even better. The proposed salary of $35,500 for the Chief Justice of the United States is decidedly modest, as is $22,500 for district judges.

Still the whole program is bound to attract superior talents to the high places of Government and keep them there. The Senate, we feel confident, will promptly add its approval.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 17, 1955]

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE IS CALLED AMPLY JUSTIFIED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16.—If the conscience of any Member of Congress hurts him about voting for that pay raise of $10,000 a year, there is an easy way out—to give back to the Treasury as much as he likes.

There's precedent for such a gift. Herbert Hoover gave back most of the Presidential salary he received while in the White House. He, himself, never revealed that fact but his friends have told about it. Maybe there are other public servants who have done the same thing and kept it secret.

What a proper salary for Members of Congress should be is a very serious matter and goes to the heart of the question of integrity in Government.

Many of those in the House of Representatives who voted against the proposed increase—which has yet to pass the Senate—did so because of a conscientious belief that the voters wouldn't approve of it. But it is important that the voters should know all the facts. For many Members who voted against the increase really deserve to have the higher salary to cover those expenses they have been trying to meet out of their own pockets. Likewise, some who voted for the increase did so out of consideration for the plight of their colleagues, though they themselves didn't need the extra money.

It all comes down to a simple proposition—the American people certain don't want only rich men in Congress, nor do they want to see Members accepting gratuities from constituents or big campaign contributions in appreciation of services they may have rendered.

NO FEE FOR SERVICES

Members of the House come up for election every 2 years, so they are constantly in need of campaign funds. Many of them supply it out of their own pockets rather than solicit gifts from constituents who seek special privileges. But the worst phase of the matter is the drain on the funds of a Member of Congress by residents of his district or State who feel their Congressman or Senator is something of an errand boy or personal representative in Washington.

Lots of the things done by Members of Congress for people back home are worth thousands of dollars to those who are benefited, yet there is no such thing as a service charge, or fee to be paid. Indeed, it would be highly improper for any such payment to be made.

If, for example, a new postoffice building or a defense installation or some other Federal project involving huge sums of money is brought to an area as a result of the efforts of a Member of either House, there are citizens who profit by the rise in real estate values and in other ways. They cannot and should not pay for that service. Yet, in the doing of that chore for the people, various expenses are often incurred and in many instances it is the Member of Congress who foots the bill rather than become involved in some transaction which a political opponent could some day uncover and use as a smear.

It is odd but members of national legislatures the world over have trouble about the size of their salaries. In Britain the Churchill government almost was overthrown last spring because the Labor Party insisted on a pay raise and the Conservatives opposed it. Many of them are wealthy and carry on extensive business interests. Only after some Conservatives deserted their leadership was the issue compromised. Today the pay of a member of the House of Commons is the equivalent of about $2,800 a year with an extra allowance they may request for each day the House sits. This amounts approximately to about an extra $740 a year. Curiously enough, the House members in London have no private offices or staffs provided by the government.

LEGISLATORS POORLY PAID

In France the pay is equivalent to about $5,000 a year and the 100 Communist Deputies contribute about $3,000 apiece directly to the party fund or approximately $300,000 a year, which is quite a sizable help in carrying on Communist propaganda.

In the State legislatures in this country members are poorly paid and it is a scandal that corporations with business before these bodies often retain as counsel for other services members who are lawyers. The labor unions do the same thing.

Many Members of Congress have outside income. Some earn it by getting large fees for speaking before labor unions and trade bodies of various kinds. Others still practice law before State courts. Some have large business interests or derive a big income from investments.

The raise in pay is needed in order to permit the election to Congress of citizens irrespective of their income status. A total of $25,000 a year, out of which comes $4,500 for taxes, or a net of $20,500, is not too much for a Member of either the House or the Senate to receive if he is honorably to serve his constituency.

TENNESSEE STATE ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Nashville, January 8, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: It appears that soon there will be a bill introduced to increase the salary of the Senators and Congressmen. This increase is far overdue, it is a shame that we the people will elect honest men to high positions to represent us, asking and demanding so many things of them, yet we expect them to exist on such a meager salary. We urge you to do all in your power to have this bill passed without delay.

Respectfully,

HARRY COSBY.

NASHVILLE BAR ASSOCIATION,
Nashville, Tenn., February 17, 1955.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator From Tennessee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed find copy of a resolution adopted by the Nashville Bar Association on January 27, 1955, recommending passage of the judicial-congressional salary increase bill now pending in Congress.

Yours very truly,

E. T. HOLLINS, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Be it resolved by the board of directors of the Nashville Bar Association, That this association endorses the passage of the judicial-congressional salary increase bill now pending before the Congress of the United States, and that a copy of such resolution be sent to the two Senators of the State of Tennessee, and the Representative in Congress from Davidson County.

THE TOLEDO BAR ASSOCIATION,
Toledo, Ohio, February 17, 1955.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KILGORE: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Toledo Bar Association on February 11, 1955.

We strongly urge that you exert your efforts to bring about the passage of legislation to accomplish the purpose of the resolution.

Very truly yours,

ROGER SMITH,
President.

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF TOLEDO BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Toledo Bar Association has on previous occasions gone on record as favoring legislation providing for salary increases for judges of the United States courts; and there are pending in the House and Senate bills which would, if enacted, help to relieve in varying degrees the inadequate salary of judges; and

Whereas the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries created pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, recommended increased salaries for judges and Members

of Congress in accordance with the following schedule:

Chief Justice of the United States	$40,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States	39,500
Speaker of the House of Representatives	40,000
Members of Congress	27,500
Judges of the United States Courts of Appeal	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Claims	30,500
Judges of the Tax Court of the United States	27,500
Judges of the Court of Military Appeals	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	30,500
Judges of the U. S. Customs Court	27,500
Judges of the United States district courts (including the U. S. District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska and the District Court of the Virgin Islands)	27,500

and this recommendation was duly endorsed by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his state of the Union address to Congress in January 1955 strongly recommended that Congress take favorable action toward increasing salaries of Congressmen and judges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Toledo Bar Association endorse and urge the passage of legislation providing the increased salaries as shown in the above schedule; be it further

Resolved, That the Toledo Bar Association urge that appropriate salary increases be provided by legislation for United States attorneys and their assistants; be it further

Resolved, That notice of this resolution be mailed to the Senators and Members of Congress from Ohio and to the Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary; the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER; the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER; the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER; the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE; and the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Is it in order to call up my amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. BUSH. I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, beginning with line 19, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 9 on page 8, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (relative to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$30,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000."

On page 8, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 3." and insert "Sec. 2."

On page 9, line 1, to strike out "Sec. 4." and insert "Sec. 3."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish the amendments to be considered en bloc?

Mr. BUSH. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is simply to strike from the bill all reference to congressional salaries, so that it would then become a bill dealing with salaries for the judiciary, although it would retain increased travel allowances for the Members of the Congress. The amendment would delete all reference to increases in congressional salaries.

Mr. President, this is a subject to which I suppose we have all given considerable thought. My opposition to the bill is not something which I have just developed. In a general way I have always felt about the matter of congressional salaries as I feel today.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I should like to say at this time, inasmuch as I may have to leave the city shortly, that I should like to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which would require that the budget of the United States be in balance before such increases would go into effect. I would vote for that amendment, although I would expect that if it should be agreed to, the question of judicial salaries would be taken up as a separate matter. I see no sense in tying judicial salaries with congressional salaries. I think the two situations are entirely different, and should not be considered together, but should be considered separately.

Mr. President, the bill calls for an increase of 50 percent in the salaries of the Members of the Congress. I think that is a very large increase indeed. It is not a cost-of-living raise. It is a very large compensatory increase in salary.

While we are talking about that, there are in committee bills to which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] referred, proposing to raise the salaries of postal workers and other Government employees 5 or 7 or 10 percent. We cannot make up our minds how much the increase should be, but we are talking in terms of 5 percent up to 10 percent. At the same time, Mr. President, we are talking about raising the compensation of the Members of the Congress by 50 percent. We are talking about an increase of $7,500. That is double the entire salary of many Federal workers whose increase in salary we have been discussing for 2 years, trying to decide whether there should be an increase of 5 or of 10 percent.

In good conscience, I simply cannot vote for a salary increase for Members of the Congress of such a large amount under any conditions, and especially when we have failed to come to an agreement as to what should be done with regard to increasing the salaries of postal and other Government employees and are talking about such a relatively small increase for them as compared with the proposed increase in our own salaries.

Mr. President, there must be reason brought into the discussion of this question. If we vote ourselves a salary increase of $7,500, or, as the House voted, $10,000, how in the world are we going to be able to control all the expenses in the way of salaries? I think we would be put in an almost indefensible position.

To point up that proposition a little more closely, we are talking about a weekly increase of approximately $4 for the postal worker, but have not done anything about it; a $5-a-week increase for the military; and a $200-a-week increase for Members of Congress.

I oppose the bill, therefore, on the ground that the increase is much too large. I shall give other reasons why I oppose the bill.

I said a moment ago that I favor the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I shall support it. I think Congress ought to be able to come to grips with the fiscal disorder which has troubled the Government for a good many years. If we cannot control the finances of the United States well enough to balance the national budget, certainly we should not be talking in terms of a 50-percent compensatory increase in the salaries of Members of Congress.

While I would not favor any increase at this time, for reasons which the distinguished Senator from Delaware will advance, and which, obviously, are behind the purposes of his amendment, I will not say that I would forever oppose an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. I do not say that I would oppose a modest increase after some of the other things I have mentioned were done. But, I definitely wish to state, in case I am not here to record my vote, that I am entirely in sympathy with the philosophy embodied in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

I think that the two questions—of increases in salaries for judges and for Members of the Congress—should be separated. I believe the judges should have an increase in their salaries. I have read carefully the Segal report. A serious situation seems to exist in many States with respect to the law of supply and demand. I do not know the situation in all the States, but in the States with which I am familiar I find that the State judgeships are valued very much more highly than are Federal judgeships. I know that is the case in the State of Connecticut. I know that when there was a vacancy in the Federal district court in Connecticut in 1953, great difficulty was experienced in finding a person upon whom my distinguished colleague [Mr. PURTELL] and I could agree was sufficiently qualified that we, in good conscience, could recommend him for that Federal judgeship. We finally were able to persuade a man of the very highest type, of whom we are very proud, Judge Anderson, to leave the State bench and to accept the Federal judgeship, which he did at considerable personal sacrifice to himself, and as a very patriotic move on his part. At that time I for one assured him that I hoped

that the pay of Federal judges would be increased substantially, so that eventually he, perhaps, would have made no financial sacrifice in giving up his State judgeship to take the Federal judgeship.

So, as I say, I favor an increase in salaries for Federal judges. A Federal judge must divorce himself from any other sources of earned income, and devote all his time—100 percent of it—to the business of the Federal bench.

That is not true of Members of Congress. It never has been true. Many Members hold connections with business and professional organizations of different kinds. While all Members do not do so, at least most of them have been able to retain their interests in automobile agencies, law firms, radio, television, and the newspaper business, and similar kinds of enterprises. I see nothing wrong with that. I think it is good to have in Congress men of affairs, who know what it means to operate businesses, or who practice law. I think that is good. I do not believe it ought to be discouraged. But it does suggest that men need not completely sever themselves from sources of earned income if they enter Congress.

That is not so with the judiciary. For that reason I think the two branches should be considered in separate bills, not in one, and that the situation with respect to the Federal judges should be considered on a different basis.

Fundamentally, as a Member of the Congress, I hold this philosophy: Membership in Congress is a service job. I have read the Segal report. It makes comparisons with corporation salaries of $120,000 and salaries of labor leaders ranging from $20,000 to $50,000, and draws the conclusion from those incomes that congressional salaries are much too low. But I suggest there are other comparisons which are valid. I suggest that the position of a Member of Congress, which I think of as a service job, is more to be likened to the position of the teacher in a school or of the principal of a high school, of ministers of the church, of doctors and lawyers in our small towns. To most persons in those categories, a salary of $15,000 is no obstacle to entering the service of the Congress of the United States. In fact, it would attract most of them, because many of them do not make anywhere near that much money.

So I feel that an entirely different situation exists with respect to salaries of Members of Congress than exists in the case of salaries of Federal judges.

I do not think, frankly and ideally, that Congress is a place for a person to seek a position if he is more interested in making money than he is in performing a public service.

I do not blame anyone who wishes to go into the service of a corporation and to do just as well as he can. I have no objection to that. Such persons render very great service to our country. They manage large and small organizations, which provide jobs for hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of people; and that is what makes this Nation tick. They deserve all the respect in the world. But it is not necessary to have the pay of Members of Congress geared so as to attract such persons into service in Congress.

Therefore, I do not believe that the philosophy of the Segal report is at all satisfactory in connection with the matter of reward and compensation for Members of Congress. I do not consider that the report has drawn valid comparisons.

I think of the principal of the high school in my own town of Greenwich, Conn. I should say, without fear of contradiction by anybody in that town, that he would be very well qualified, if he chose to do so, to sit in Congress. Yet he does not receive $15,000; he gets, I think, $10,000. There are many others like him all over the United States.

So people like him stay in the professions they have chosen, because they want to dedicate themselves to the services of their communities. They are not interested in their work simply to make money out of it. They are interested in it because they like it, and because they get their reward, not from any material return, but from the satisfactions that go with performing work of that kind. I rather hold to the view that that is also the best kind of satisfaction one can get from service as a Member of Congress.

I notice that whenever there have been vacancies in recent years, there has been no great trouble about filling them. There has been no dearth of applicants. Let a Member of the Senate resign—I care not from what State he comes—and immediately there will be several applicants for the position. The law of supply and demand does not suggest that the pay is not sufficiently large to attract persons to these positions. Everyone who has come here, and who is here now, was attracted to the position by a vacancy. I know that in the last election there were certainly many more candidates for the positions than there were winners. Moreover, many candidates were defeated in the primaries within their own parties.

So I do not believe the law of supply and demand suggests that the salary is very greatly out of line, or that it needs anything in the nature of a 50-percent boost.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on this subject. I am sorry to find myself at variance with so many distinguished Senators, whom I hold in the highest esteem. I hope that no Members will feel that what I have said in defense of my philosophy on the subject is in the slightest degree a reflection upon their views. One has to make up his own mind about matters of this kind.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator believe that the Segal report with relation to the proposed salaries for the judiciary is based upon a fair premise and sound reasoning?

Mr. BUSH. I may say to the distinguished Senator, as I said earlier in my remarks, that I think the situation in the judiciary is different, and that there should be a substantial increase in the pay of the members of the judiciary. I do not take much issue with the Segal report so far as judiciary salaries are concerned.

Mr. PURTELL. Since my colleague felt that the reasoning was sound with regard to judiciary salaries, my inquiry was whether that same body, which gave the same amount of time, the same study, and the same investigation to the question of congressional salaries was wrong in its conclusions and recommendations concerning such salaries.

Mr. BUSH. I think the members of the Commission were quite wrong with regard to their conclusions regarding congressional salaries, and I think they made a great mistake in lumping the two groups together, because the two categories are not the same, and yet they came out with the same answer for both groups.

Mr. PURTELL. Would the Senator feel that one of the prerequisites for membership in the Congress, whether it be in the House or the Senate, should be either inherited or acquired wealth before becoming a Member of Congress?

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. PURTELL. I think I had better repeat the question. Is it the Senator's opinion that one of the tests for ability to serve in the House or the Senate should be either inherited or acquired wealth before becoming a Member of Congress?

Mr. BUSH. No; I say to the Senator I would not say there should be any such test.

Mr. PURTELL. Would the Senator agree with me that while it is true the average age of Senators is 57, it is also true that many who have come to the Senate in the past and probably many who are presently Members of Congress, because of their not having engaged in business before becoming Members of Congress, perhaps do not have as much of the world's goods as others have been able to accumulate? My experience has been that many Members of the House of Representatives, with growing families and children who have to be sent to school, find it impossible to make ends meet. Does the Senator agree with me that such persons do have difficulty in trying to make ends meet, in view of the fact that they have two homes to maintain, are trying to educate their children, and at the same time are trying to meet the demands of their constituents by going back and forth between their respective districts and Washington? May I further ask the Senator if he thinks such persons should deny to their loved ones some of the necessities, in the way of education and otherwise, that more wealthy men can give their families and children?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I would remind the Senator that such persons are not compelled by any requirement except their own preference to serve in the House. There is no compulsion for such persons to remain Members of the House if they do not think the reward is satisfactory and they find themselves in a position of hardship such as the Senator has suggested. I think the same argument might be made as to school teachers, school principals, professors in uni-

versities, doctors, and ministers of the church. What I am saying is that I do not think that Members of Congress should necessarily be compensated entirely by their salaries; that their reward should come in part at least from a spirit of satisfaction in rendering service.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator believe that the salaries should be so low as to preclude from an opportunity to serve in Congress many persons who have growing families and who would like to serve in legislative bodies, but cannot because the salaries do not permit them to do justice to their families and also carry on their duties as legislators?

Mr. BUSH. I simply say to the Senator that I do not think the salaries should be fixed at such a rate that anybody who wanted to do so could make money from service in Congress. From what I have been able to observe, I think we would find plenty of qualified applicants to fill the jobs. As I said a while ago, whenever a vacancy exists there seems to be no dearth of applicants to fill the vacancy. We are not in such bad shape. I think the Members of both the Senate and the House present a very good cross-section of the people of the United States. Frankly, I do not believe increasing the salaries as proposed in the bill would result in improvement in the general quality of the Members of either House.

Mr. PURTELL. Has the Senator read, and I am sure he has, some of the statements which were made by Members of the House relative to their inability to make ends meet—not to make money, but to make ends meet—and to give their families what they are entitled to? Has the Senator read some of those statements?

Mr. BUSH. I have read some of those statements. I think the Senator is personalizing an argument which should be looked at objectively. As I said before, if such a person finds it difficult to make ends meet, and he could do better elsewhere, then let him do what he wants to do elsewhere. I do not think the fact that one man cannot make ends meet necessarily means that the salary scale should be changed or increased by 50 percent.

Mr. PURTELL. In other words, the Senator feels that if one with a growing family and having no inherited or acquired wealth finds himself unable to meet the demands of his family, he ought not to run for office?

Mr. BUSH. No; I would not say that.

Mr. PURTELL. Would the Senator draw that conclusion?

Mr. BUSH. No; I would not draw that conclusion.

Mr. PURTELL. If the salaries are not sufficient to sustain growing families of men younger than either my distinguished colleague or myself, are we not denying them the right to serve, because they must make a choice between fulfilling their duties to their families and carrying on their duties to their constituencies?

Mr. BUSH. The same argument might be applied to ministers of the church or school teachers. The point is, What does a man want to do with his life? If he wishes to serve the church, he will go into the church, with the knowledge that he is not going to become rich, but will get a modest reward. If such a person wishes to teach in school, he will go into the profession of teaching for the satisfaction he will get out of it, knowing that his salary will not be very large, but that he will be rewarded by the satisfaction that he gets from teaching. The same thing is true of doctors. In most of the towns in the State of Connecticut, I doubt that there are many doctors, when one considers the number of them, who are making as much as $15,000 a year.

In my judgment the problem should not be looked at personally, because while A, B, and C may be having a difficult time to make ends meet, what should be considered is what is best for the country as a whole. If Mr. A, B, and C find it is difficult, there is nothing to stop them from leaving, so that Mr. X, Y, and Z may fill the vacancies when they occur, as has been done for 165 years.

Mr. PURTELL. If Mr. A, B, and C cannot carry on because they lack other means for sustaining themselves, and Mr. D, E, and F can do so because they have inherited or acquired wealth, we would then have a situation where certain segments of our population would be denied the opportunity to serve because of their inability to sustain themselves on the salaries fixed.

Mr. BUSH. I do not agree with the Senator. It was brought out in the debate last year that many Members of Congress found their salaries to be satisfactory, and even to be larger than what they had been previously earning. I am glad they found that to be the situation, but I do not think the Senator's frequent references to acquired or inherited wealth have anything to do with the question. The answer depends somewhat on the type of job one regards service in Congress to be—whether it is a compensatory or truly a service job. Over the years legislative salaries have not been comparable to the salaries paid in the judicial or executive branches of Government. In our State, the Senator knows that the legislative salaries are very low. Legislators in the State of Connecticut, a group which includes many able men and women, receive $600. Of course, the legislature meets for only a few months, once a year, unless there is a special session. Heretofore in the history of this Government, salaries of Members of Congress have not kept pace with executive salaries, and I do not think it is necessary that they should. I do not believe the circumstances of 1 individual or 100 individuals who may be in the Congress are important. In my judgment, the question is what is best for the country, and what is going to attract a satisfactory quality of person to the Congress. I believe that with the present salary level the Members of Congress are of good quality. I see no reason why we should not have equally qualified Members tomorrow or in the future. While I am not opposed to any reasonable increase in salaries to Members of Congress, I am opposed to the proposal at the present time.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator feel that a person who has family responsibilities, such as providing for youngsters, and at the same time a desire to serve the people in a legislative body, should be forced to make the choice of one or the other, in view of the fact that such a person would find that he would not be able to serve in the legislative body?

Mr. BUSH. I say to the Senator that we always have to make choices to live within our means, whatever they may be. Everyone has to make a choice as to whether he should take a position which is attractive, but which he cannot afford to take but there is no compulsion on the part of anyone to seek office. The seeking of the office is done voluntarily. There is nothing to compel a man either to seek or to remain in office.

Mr. PURTELL. It is not a question of seeking office. It is a question of circumstances being such as to prevent certain persons from seeking office because they would be financially unable to achieve a satisfactory standard of living.

Mr. BUSH. No matter how high the salaries were made, it would always be found that they were too low for some persons. My own judgment is that if the salaries were raised as provided by the bill, there would not be attracted to the Congress a more qualified group of persons than now constitute it.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator agree with me that we might be able to retain many members of legislative bodies who have felt they could not continue in office because of the responsibility they owed to their families?

Mr. BUSH. My guess would be that if the passage of the bill should fail we would not lose, because of the reasons the Senator has set forth, any more Members than we have lost in a typical year. I do not think the failure to pass the bill would have any effect whatsoever on the quality of the membership of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the senior Senator from Connecticut realize that both the CIO and the A. F. of L. have endorsed this bill?

Mr. BUSH. I realize that; but frankly, I am not terribly impressed by it.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Connecticut name one Member of this body who is a laboring man? I am speaking of a man who works with his hands.

Mr. BUSH. At the moment I am looking at a gentleman who, I understand, has represented and represents labor unions; and I assume that he, himself, is a union member. Therefore, in answer to the question of the Senator from North Dakota, I name the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

Mr. LANGER. Since the Senator from Connecticut has named the Senator from Michigan, can the Senator

from Connecticut name a Member of this body who is a farmer?

Mr. BUSH. In response, I name the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. LANGER. I have understood that he raises 1½ million chickens a year.

Mr. BUSH. Yes, he is a chicken farmer.

Mr. LANGER. I am referring to a Member of this body—if the Senator from Connecticut can name one—who gets up at 4 o'clock in the morning and goes into the barn and milks half a dozen cows.

Mr. BUSH. I suggest that possibly the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] might be classified as a farmer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to advise the Senator from North Dakota that I am looking for some cheap labor on Saturdays; so he can come out to my farm and work for me. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. Then I give the Senator from North Dakota the Senator from Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota, but I must say that he is just as wild regarding his estimates on the production of chickens as he is regarding some of the other statements coming from North Dakota. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to make clear the effect of the amendment which our esteemed and distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], has offered. He proposes to strike out the part of the bill which relates to a salary increase for the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and thus leave in the bill only the part relating to a salary increase for the members of the judiciary.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct—plus the travel allowance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; plus the travel allowance.

Mr. President, I do not believe the bill should thus be separated. It seems to me that if that were to be done, the proper time to make such a case was on July 20, 1953, when the resolution creating the salary commission was before the Senate. I have examined the RECORD which was made on that occasion. I find that no objection was raised by any Senator, on either side of the aisle, with respect to that measure. I find that no motion was made to strike from the resolution the reference to congressional salaries. In short, the proposal was to have the commission investigate both the salaries of the judiciary and the salaries of the Members of Congress, including the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate. If there had been a desire on the part of some Member of Congress to strike out one part of that measure, so as to make a differentiation as between the salaries of those who are appointed and the salaries of those who are elected, it seems to me that such a case should have been made at that time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator from Illinois has a good point. However, I should like to say that I filed a statement on this matter with the Segal Commission, outlining about what I have stated today. So I feel at least partially not guilty of the charge my colleague has made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. However, the appropriate time would have been when that debate was occurring on the floor of the Senate, during the calendar call. Every Member had full opportunity at that time to express his views on the matter. However, no such separation as between the judiciary and the legislative branch was proposed.

So the Segal Commission went to work. It did its work excellently. The chairman did a superb job, in my opinion.

The Commission was a representative one; it represented every field of activity—including both labor, business, and the professions. Of course, six Members of Congress stood in the position of advisers to the Commission, although the Commission did the work itself, and the Members of Congress did not share in the ultimate decisions the Commission made. I think the Commission received testimony from approximately 70 persons. Testimony amounting to approximately 800 pages was taken. Very few persons submitted a contrary view.

After the report of the Commission was made, the bar associations of a great many States endorsed it, and made no effort to differentiate as between the salaries of the Members of Congress and the salaries of the judiciary, or to have a separation made as between the two. I note from the hearings that the bar associations of Virginia, Georgia, New York, Texas, California, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Arkansas, North Carolina, Indiana, South Dakota, Delaware, New Mexico, Michigan, Missouri, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and Montana have endorsed the report. I notice that the American Bar Association has also endorsed it.

No effort was made on the part of the Attorney General to bring about a segregration of this issue and to have Congress act separately on a proposal for an increase in the salaries of the judiciary and a proposal for an increase in the salaries of the Members of Congress. The Attorney General appeared before the so-called Kefauver committee and endorsed the report in its entirety. In his state of the Union message, the President of the United States made no endeavor to separate the two.

So, Mr. President, since the matter is here as the result of a study by a Commission which was authorized and empowered to investigate thoroughly both the salaries of the Members of Congress and the salaries of the judiciary, certainly there would be no point in separating them at this good hour, when the bill is before the Senate, and when a comparable bill was passed by a very substantial majority in the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. President, I trust that the amendment submitted by my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], will be rejected by a decisive vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I heard the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] speak several times about the salaries of doctors. If the Senator will examine the task forces reports, he will find in it the following statement:

> The average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432.

Mr. BUSH. On what page of the task forces reports is that statement to be found?

Mr. KEFAUVER. On page 38.

I read further from that page:

> Dr. Murray, of the New Jersey Medical Society, stated that it was his opinion that at the age of 40, doctors averaged between $20,000 and $25,000 a year, and that that average was increased as the doctor became 50 or more.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee about his statement that the average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was reading that paragraph of the reports of the task forces. At that part of the reports, Dr. Murray, of the New Jersey Medical Society, is quoted as stating as his opinion that at the age of 40, doctors average between $20,000 and $25,000 a year.

Mr. BUSH. To what area does that statement relate? Does it relate to the State of New Jersey, only?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is from the reports of the task forces, giving the comparable salaries of the various professions.

Mr. BUSH. Is that statement made, regardless of its application to any particular section of the country?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it applies to all areas of the United States.

Mr. BUSH. Then I should like to say that I wish to see some substantial support of the statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that a good deal of the argument today has actually missed the mark. I doubt very much that the office of a Member of Congress can be compared with any other station. I think the Segal Commission set forth the matter in one short paragraph on page 5 of its report, when it said:

> Finally, there is the overriding factor of justice. The salary adjustments we recommend will, we think, correct inequities of long-standing. We believe they are conso-

nant with the dignity and the stature the citizens of the country attach to these critical offices.

I think that is the point in a nutshell. The King of England may receive $500,000 a year; I do not know. I know that he cannot eat any more than can the junior Senator from Illinois, if my appetite is in good form. [Laughter.] I do not believe the King of England can wear any more clothes at one time than I can. I am confident that he cannot smoke more than one cigar at a time.

So, Mr. President, if the matter is put on a creature basis, I do not know where finally one comes out. But I believe that in the minds of the people of the country, a certain dignity and a certain stature attach to the office of Member of Congress, even though some of our constituents do not always attach that dignity and that stature to the occupant of the office. [Laughter.]

Yet, the fact of the matter is that this stature and this dignity go with the office itself. There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives—no more and no less; and they are chosen from among the 165,000,000 people of the United States. In this body there are 96 Members, according to the Constitution of the United States; and they can be added to only in proportion as other States are admitted to the sisterhood of States, under the Federal Union.

Mr. President, clearly a dignity and a stature go with the office of Member of Congress. Thus it is that I believe that what the commission recommends in this case is quite consonant with the attributes of the office. I think that is the crux of the matter, and I believe we should keep it on that fundamental basis.

So, Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut will not prevail.

The work done in connection with getting these reports to us has been a long-term operation. I confess to you very freely, Mr. President, that even in 1946, when I was on the Joint Committee on Legislative Reorganization, along with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], former Senator La Follette, and a good many other Members of the Congress, we—and I say this frankly—had to provide in the legislative reorganization bill for a salary increase for the Members of the Congress, in order to get that legislative reorganization job done. The expense allowance for Members of Congress was finally written in to it in the form of an amendment submitted on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate; but that was not the contriving of the joint committee.

At the time, I gave a great deal of attention to that matter, feeling that there should be adequate and reasonable take-home pay in connection with this job—and no less than in connection with any other job—because a very wise man by the name of Luke wrote, probably several thousand years ago, that—

The laborer is worthy of his hire.

Mr. President, whether it is in the domain of public service or elsewhere, the laborer is still worthy of his hire.

If there be in the United States persons who today are inadequately compensated that is a tragedy which should be remedied; but that is no reason why our own difficulty should not be resolved when the opportunity to do so arises.

Mr. President, it has been indicated that we should not do this so long as the budget is in a state of imbalance. But, I wish to remind my friend, the Senator from Delaware, and my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that in the past 22 years, the budget has been out of balance in 21 of those years.

Mr. President, since 1945, five pay increases have been granted in the Federal establishment. They aggregate a little more than 51 percent. There was the pay act of 1945 and at that time the budget was not in balance. We enacted the pay act of 1946, and the budget was not in balance. We enacted the pay act of 1948, and the budget was in balance. We enacted the pay act of 1949 and the pay act of 1951, and both times the budget was not in balance.

Must we be in the unhappy position of having to spar around in trying to find a year when the budget is right, when the circumstances are right, when the mental outlook is right, and then suddenly rush in under the tent?

If so, we would have had only three chances in 26 years to repair the salary status of Members of the House and of the Senate. We have been appropriating salary increases for everyone in the structure of government. That does not seem to have bothered anyone in the House or in the Senate. We have raised some of the salaries and have added one or two classifications. It has reached the point where a GSA 18 employee receives a salary of more than $14,000. He does not have to be elected to office.

Whatever is fair, is fair. Therefore, I do not believe there is any substance to the argument that the budget must be balanced before we should do justice to ourselves.

If I must make the bread and butter argument—and I am not too happy about it—and if we measure the proposed increase in terms of 1939, we are still $200 under the purchasing power of the congressional salary fixed in 1939.

Let us consider the depreciation of the dollar. In those days, when a Member of the House and of the Senate received $10,000, his income tax was $372, and he had 9,628 hard, 100-percent dollars with which to buy things. We are still behind the game, so to speak, on the raise in salary of $2,500 in 1946. Twenty-two thousand, five hundred dollars, express in terms of 1939 dollars, is still $200 behind the 1939 level in terms of purchasing power. If we talk about take-home pay, that is what it amounts to. I would much rather talk about what I believe to be adequate compensation, and compensation that is commensurate with the dignity and status of elective office in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. When I received a salary of $7,500 a year on becoming a Member of the House of Representatives—which was the salary the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] received when he came to the Senate in 1922—the $7,500 during those years would buy more than $22,500 will buy today. There can be no question about it.

I am talking about the rent we have to pay in Washington, about the cost of living, and about the income tax we must pay. Therefore, I believe $7,500 in those days was really, in effect, more money than we will get if the proposed increased is voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Arizona is absolutely correct.

Therefore I utter the hope that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], on which we shall vote shortly, which amendment would eliminate congressional pay increases entirely, and let stand in the bill only judicial salary increases, will be voted down with real vigor and with great unanimity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make the first of several speeches in opposition to the pending bill. During the course of the debate I shall discuss a series of amendments to it.

I sincerely hope that after the debate tonight we may have some kind of understanding to vote on the bill on Wednesday, because I believe many of the amendments which are to be offered should lie on the table temporarily and be carefully considered. For the life of me I cannot understand the rush to pass the bill today. It is a bill which ought to receive very careful study by the Members of the Senate, particularly the amendments which are to be offered.

Likewise, Mr. President, I believe it to be important that we have yea and nay votes. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues inform me that there is not a great inclination for yea and nay notes on amendments to the bill. That does not make a pretty record, if it be true. I believe the people of the United States are entitled to have the Senate vote yea and nay on these matters. I shall do my best to urge yea and nay votes. If necessary, I shall do my best to discuss the matter until we do have some yea and nay votes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I know of no Senator who is opposed to a yea and nay vote on this issue. As chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill I shall do my best to have yea and nay votes on the passage of the bill and on any amendment that may be offered to it.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Tennessee join me in asking for a yea and nay vote on the Bush amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly I will.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Bush amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. That is my answer to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It should be stated that not many of the Members of the Senate are on the floor at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. A sufficient number of Members are in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure that if the Senator will renew the request later we shall have no difficulty getting a yea and nay vote.

Mr. MORSE. A sufficient number of Senators are present to order a yea and nay vote if there were a will to do so.

Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I do not share the point of view expressed by my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that 1953, when the resolution was before the Senate, was the time for Members of the Senate to take a position as to whether there should be a separate bill for congressional salaries. The resolution of 1953 was simply a resolution which called for the appointment of a commission to study the subject of judicial and congressional salaries.

Nothing in that resolution directly or indirectly committed any Member of the Senate to vote for a bill combining judicial and congressional salaries. I doubt if any Member of the Senate at the time the resolution was before the Senate had the slightest idea that by voting for the resolution, to use the argument of the Senator from Illinois, we became committed to a procedure for a combined bill, rather than separate bills.

All we did was to vote for the appointment of a commission to study judicial and congressional salaries. It was right that we should do so. I believe it was right that we should have the situation studied. Now the time has come to debate the conclusions of the study. Now is the time to pass judgment on whether we should approach the problem in a combined bill or in separate bills.

Not the slightest obligation is placed upon the shoulders of any Senator to go along with a combined bill rather than separate bills merely because in 1953 he voted for a proposal to study the question of salaries.

I believe the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is quite right in maintaining that the two issues should be separated, and in his amendment he proposes that judicial salaries be considered separate and distinct from congressional salaries. I shall support his amendment, and I shall offer a few amendments of my own.

The first point I wish to make is that in my judgment, Members of Congress are now well paid. In my opinion, they are paid all they are worth.

For the reason brought out by the Senator from Connecticut, when one enters a life of public service, if he is going to represent the best interests of the public, he should not go into it with the idea of making money out of it. I think $15,000 a year, which is what we really receive, $12,500 and the so-called expense allowance of $2,500, is a good salary for the job. I think it is in the best interests of the American people that membership in Congress shall not be made attractive for fiscal reasons; that it shall not be made attractive because the holder of it can make money out of it. We have enough evils in American machine politics without giving political machines other motivating influences, such as highly paid jobs. In my judgment, an increase in salary will not increase the number of freemen in the Congress of the United States. On the contrary, in my opinion, an increase in the salaries of Members of the Congress will enhance a dangerous tendency in American politics by putting undue pressure and influence upon political officeholders. I have always said, and I repeat today, that when we get to the bottom of political financing in America we will be dealing with the primary cause of corruption in American politics. I believe the people will have to do something about that problem, and I do not think we shall be moving in the right direction by increasing the salaries of the Members of Congress 50 percent, to $22,500, as proposed by the Senate bill, or to $25,000, as the House bill proposes.

Mr. President, I am very much interested in the report of the Segal Commission. I turn to page 37 where the Commission uses argument by analogy, which frequently is a dangerous argumentative technique, for often argument by analogy is of itself inherently fallacious. But we read on page 37 of the report that the heads of farm cooperatives received from $20,000 to $50,000, and that the head of the National Grange is paid more than $15,000 a year.

We are told that Farms and Farm People, a cooperative report by the United States Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, shows that the average net money income from class II commercial farms, which include those which sold farm products worth $25,000 or more, was $8,880 in 1949, and, based upon preliminary reports, the 1953 return will be approximately the same.

The report goes on to say:

> To this must be added about $600 for produce consumed in the farm household at farm prices rather than through retail stores, and rental value of farm buildings.

The report goes on to say:

> It is noteworthy that the highest proposed salary for Members of Congress mentioned in the record is the $75,000 in the Farm Journal, the farm magazine with the largest circulation (3 million) in the Nation.

Then it says:

> Most of the lawyers who testified, and those included ex-judges and ex-Congressmen who resigned for reasons of personal economy, were of the opinion that the earning power of either a judge or Congressman in the field of private law practice would range upward from $30,000.

In horse trading we would call that "puffing." It is the old David Harum technique. But, in my judgment, Mr. President, it is not factual.

The report goes on to say:

> This is not an extravagant estimate when the mean net income of all nonsalaried lawyers in 1951 was $8,730.
>
> In the same year the general counsel of 46 American railroads earned an average of $30,590, with a range from $15,260 for the Kansas City Southern to $66,000 for the Pennsylvania Railroad system. Thirty railroads paid their general counsels at least $25,000. The average salary of the general solicitors, the second in rank of counsel, with respect to the 46 railroads was $25,875 with a range from $16,526 for the Virginian Railroad Co. to $44,000 for the Pennsylvania Railroad system.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I shall be happy to yield for a question.

I continue reading from the report:

> The average salary of general counsel in 1939, with respect to those railroads whose president was paid as much as $40,000 in 1951, was $22,529. This represents an increase of approximately 35 percent in 1951 salaries over those of 1939.
>
> The average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432. Dr. Murray, of the New Jersey Medical Society stated that it was his opinion that at the age of 40, doctors averaged between twenty and twenty-five thousand a year and that that average was increased as the doctor became 50 or more.

With all that opinion evidence, Mr. President, I ask the question, So what? What has it got to do with the issue as to whether we as public servants who have accepted public service for the duration of our terms at least, and who have undertaken to serve in the way we think we can best contribute to our fellow men, should increase our salaries 50 percent? The argument, I suggest, is based upon the fallacious premise that public life is some form of private enterprise and that we should have salaries commensurate with making a substantial profit. I say that those who seek profit ought to go into private business.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia, with the understanding that I yield for a question and with the further understanding that I shall not lose my rights to the floor for any period of time used in protecting my rights in case a question should not be asked.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I desire only to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon, whom I greatly love and admire.

I wonder if the Senator from Oregon has studied the trends of the times, and I ask him if he knows that in my State salaries have been raised from 100 percent, in some cases to 200 percent. I am speaking from actual statistics and personal experience when I say that. I am wondering if the Senator realizes that it is impossible to live properly in Washington on our present salaries, unless one owns his own home and has no rent to pay.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that I should love to go back to those dear old days when I first came to Washington, when I could go to the shops and the market place and buy food cheaply, and could also pay for house rental and other things as I did 14 years ago. I ask the distinguished Senator if he realizes

what has taken place in Washington during the past several years. When we removed price controls which existed during the war and immediately after the war, we also gave the profiteers a golden chance. Likewise we removed the surplus-profits tax. Was not the Senator from Oregon in the same status in which I was when the excess-profits tax was stricken from the statute books?

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator that we have been in the same status for many years.

Mr. KILGORE. But we are faced with the results of that action. Price controls were removed and we were hit right on the nose by the situation which ensued.

I wonder if the Senator realizes that the Members of the Congress of the United States face the problem of not being able to live on their salaries unless those salaries are augmented.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the point of view expressed by my good friend from West Virginia, and I give him assurance that before I complete my remarks I will have answered his questions, because I had them all in mind before I began. But I have certain specific suggestions as to the points which he has raised.

I wish to go back to the fallacious argument by analogy, which we find on pages 37 and 38 of the Segal report, and to point out that I do not think it is sound reasoning to argue that because the presidents and general counsel of 46 American railroads earn an average of $30,590, the Members of the Senate should earn $22,500. I do not understand the cause-to-effect relationship in that kind of reasoning. The two classes are not comparable. It is the difference between compensation in private industry, and compensation for public service to the people of the United States, which, in my judgment, ought not to contain dollar signs of excessive profit.

Let me say something about the cost of living in Washington, D. C. I do not know how it developed in American life that a person coming to the Senate could not live up to the prestige and dignity of the position unless he paid $400, $450, or $500 a month rent for a swank apartment in a Washington, D. C., hotel. If he wants to do that, it is his business. But I think it happens to be the people's business when he tries to argue that because he pays that kind of rent, the people ought to pay him a higher salary.

There are many fine homes in the metropolitan area of Washington which are available at very low and reasonable rental, which Senators can rent, if they wish to rent them, or buy, if they wish to buy. I am simply old-fashioned enough to believe that Senators would be much nearer the spirit of the American people if they lived in that kind of domicile than in swank hotels; but that is their business, not mine.

I shall not vote on the floor of the Senate for a salary increase on the basis of the argument that living costs in Washington are high because Senators pay very high-priced rents in very swank hotels. They do not have to live there. If they want to live in such accommodations, let them do so at their personal expense, not at the people's expense. Thus I say that much of the argument based upon the so-called high cost of living in Washington, D. C., is of the making of Members of Congress.

There was a time when I leaned to the idea of a salary increase for Members of Congress. There was a time, before I gave thorough and adequate analysis to the problem, and listened to the pros and cons in greater detail, that I thought a persuasive case had been made for an increase in salary for Members. But I have changed my view in favor of a proposal I shall make before I finish, which has to do with the payment of the legitimate expenses of a Senator's office. In many instances a Senator has to go into his own pocket to pay for services rendered his constituents. I believe that expenses of this type should be borne by the Senate. They should not come out of the Senator's pocket.

I have completely changed my earlier point of view on this salary increase issue. I do not believe that any substantial increase in salary can be justified at the present time.

There are other high-cost items in the living expenses of colleagues in the Senate, which I think are matters of their own personal choice; they are not necessary to the job. If Members wish to come to Washington and live according to that standard of living, that is their business. I do not begrudge it. Each man to his own liking when it comes to his standard of living, within his pocketbook.

But I submit that on the basis of the salary we receive, omitting from consideration for the moment the item of the expenses of our offices over and above what the Government allows, United States Senators can come to Washington, D. C., and represent their constituencies with dignity and prestige on the salaries now paid them. Therefore, I wish to dismiss, so far as my argument is concerned, and very early in the discussion, the contention of the proponents of the bill that a salary increase is needed in order to meet increases in the cost of living. I say respectfully and goodnaturedly, but sincerely, that if this is the primary reason given for the salary increase, our constituencies have the right to ask us to lower some of our living expenses in Washington, rather than to be asked to give us a salary increase which will pay for higher living expenses.

I wish to make this additional comment in connection with the information on pages 37 and 38 of the Commission's report, which states that "the mean net income of all nonsalaried lawyers in 1951 was $8,730."

I should like to see the study from which that conclusion was drawn, because I am satisfied the records will show that between 75 and 80 percent of American lawyers do not gross $15,000 a year; and they are good lawyers. But if the argument by analogy is to be made on the basis of the income of American lawyers, let me say that, in my judgment, we are not entitled to an increase in salary. A good many lawyers in our home constituencies, who are grossing from $7,500 to $12,500 a year, are as able as any of us in Congress who are lawyers. The idea that in Congress is to be found the cream of the legal profession of the United States is a mistaken notion. There are good lawyers here. Some of us might get up to average; most of us are country lawyers. But on the basis of the alleged legal ability of the lawyers in Congress, it is mere puffing when the argument is made that they could earn more money in the private practice of the law. Most of them did not earn more before they became Members of Congress, and they will not when they return, except perhaps for a couple of years when there may be some friends who think that former Members can give them some special service because of their congressional connections. But I have followed the history of such persons. A good many of them have practiced a little in a kind of combined private practice and lobby practice, and then have ended up back in their home States, earning for the most part not more than they earned before they came to the Senate. Usually that was far short of $15,000 a year.

Of course, it is quite assuring, self-comforting, and pleasant, wishful thinking for one, in his imagination, to associate himself with the general counsel of railroads, as we see on page 38 of the report, and with the general counsel of great American corporations, and to seek to leave the impression that because those lawyers earn so much money as general counsel of large corporations, therefore a lowly Member of the Senate or the House, from the standpoint of legal stature, should be similarly paid. I do not accept that argument by analogy. I repeat, there are exceptions, but the speaker is not one, and would be the first to say he is not one.

By and large, the lawyers in Congress would do very well to gross $15,000 a year in private practice. If some of us were to be put on oath in regard to our gross income before we came to the Senate, we would have to testify that we never grossed $15,000.

From that fact, Mr. President, I argue that we ought to cut our budgets and cut down our costs of living to such a point that we can live within $15,000 a year, so far as our personal expenses are concerned, and put our children through school—and it can be done on that salary.

We should then face up to the real problem which I think confronts Congress, namely, the expenses of the office, over and above the budget allowance that is made available to us by the Government.

I wish to reiterate, because I desire that it be made a part of the RECORD, a contention made by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], which I thought was an exceedingly able argument, with which I wish to associate myself by reference, as well as many of the arguments made by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], earlier this

afternoon, and the arguments of other spokesmen in opposition to the bill.

Somehow, there is something wrong—wrong from the standpoint of doing the right thing toward others in our citizenry—for us to sit here considering this bill and proposing to vote ourselves a 50-percent salary increase, when we know, first, the budget problem which confronts our Government; second, the labor problems which confront our Government; and, third, the declining income of the farmers of America.

It has been pointed out that we are having trouble obtaining a 5-percent increase in salaries for postal workers. There is a general Government employee wage increase bill confronting us. It has not been determined what final action will be taken, but the consensus is that Government employees will be lucky if a bill gets through the Congress containing more than a 10-percent increase. There are even persons who think there should not be any increase. When there is talk in the cloakrooms of a compromise on a 5 to 7 percent increase for Federal employees, how do my colleagues think it is going to look, from the standpoint of plain fairness to our constituencies, for us to vote for a 50-percent increase in congressional salaries as provided in the Senate bill or a 66-percent increase as provided in the House bill, and then really have serious trouble getting a 5 percent increase for postal workers and a 5 to 7 percent increase for other Government employees?

Then there confronts the Senate the problem of a minimum wage bill. Some of our colleagues have offered a proposal for a minimum wage increase to $1.05 an hour, and there are reactionary forces in the country which are trying to convince the American people it is a socialistic proposal. I am presently inclined toward a minimum wage bill providing for $1.10. On the basis of the most recent evidence I have received, although I have not completed my analysis, I may suggest a bill proposing a minimum wage of $1.15. But look at the opposition in the Congress of the United States to a minimum wage bill which seeks an increase from 75 cents an hour to 90 cents, or to $1, or to $1.10, or to $1.15, or to $1.25, which are the various proposals in the legislative incubator at the present time. Vitriolic is some of the opposition. Highly excitable some persons become if one suggests an increase in the minimum wage. It is said we would destroy industry, or socialize it.

Then if there is suggested an increase in minimum wage coverage, that is said to be the last straw. We are told we must not do anything which would bring under a decent minimum wage law the clerks in the retail establishments of America. Yet we know, as we study the effect of wage cycles, Mr. President, that when the minimum wage is increased, the tendency is to increase the wage structure all along the line, including the wages of employees not covered by Federal interstate commerce acts. I shall be heard to speak on that subject at some length at a later time, Mr. President, but we ought to enact Federal legislation which would take full cognizance of the fact that setting good Federal standards would increase minimum standards in the States, and that a good many States would in turn enact State minimum wage laws. Of course, in many instances such State minimum wage laws would not be essential, because employers, in order to compete in the labor market, would automatically increase minimum wages to thousands of employees who are not now covered by the Federal law, and who could not be covered by Federal law because they do not fall within the interstate commerce jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, my argument on that point is that I do not think we would look good. I do not think our legislative posture would be very becoming in the eyes of the voters of America, if we voted ourselves a 50-percent increase in our own wages, and then fussed and fumed about legislation which proposes an increase in the minimum wage.

Last week I traveled to my home in Oregon. On the way there, between Tangent, Oreg., and Eugene, Oreg., our automobile ran out of gas. We finally succeeded in having a gas truck supply the car with a little gas, which was sufficient until we got to a small gas station. The station was one of those little family gas stations which husband and wife operate in conjunction with a small grocery store or a few tourist cabins. The proprietor, a man in his sixties, said, "Well, Senator, I see that you are about to vote yourselves a nice, big, fat salary increase." I said, "That is very doubtful." "Well, he said, "the bill just passed the House." I said, "Yes, but it has not passed the Senate yet. It may be that it will, but not with my vote." I gave him some of my reasons why I shall vote against the increase, as I am giving them to the Senate this afternoon. That gentleman said, "I want you to know that in this community the people I have talked to, and many come through here during the course of a day, are very bitter about this proposal." He said, "I don't want to hurt your feelings, but we think the Congress as a whole just does not deserve higher pay." I was inclined to agree with him, and I do agree with him, Mr. President.

If we do not want to represent the will of the American people, we should not be here, and if my colleagues would like to find out what the will of the American people is on this question, let us give the people 90 days of all the special education it is desired to give them. Let us postpone action on the bill for 90 days, with the understanding that we will call upon the media of information in this country to inform the American people about all the alleged supporting arguments contained in the report on congressional salaries—I shall have something to say about judicial salaries in a moment—and then let the people express their will on the question. What a walloping we would take. What a turndown we would have in a national referendum on the proposal, Mr. President.

If my colleagues think that all these editorials which have been bound together, which I hold in my hand, will succeed in changing the viewpoint of the rank and file of the voters of this country, then my colleagues are laboring under the misapprehension that the American people pay much attention to the editorial writers when it comes to political policies. Most people know that too many editorial writers in this country are the fronts of reactionary indoctrination forces in America. The American people are doing their own thinking on political issues, and the editorial writers are not doing it for them. When one tries to tell the American people that a United States Senator is entitled to an increase from $15,000 to a $22,500, or, as the House thought, to $25,000, he will find most of the people laugh and snort at him.

Mr. President, I believe that if I voted for the increase, I would not be voting in accordance with the desires of the people of my State. I am perfectly willing to enter into an understanding that the Senate postpone action on the proposal for 90 days, and wait for the reaction of the people of our States after they have been informed of the facts. When it comes to a question of studying the merits and demerits of the report on the bill, I think an overwhelming majority of the people will continue to hold to what I honestly believe is their present opinion, namely, that they are against the proposal. I think that most of them would be inclined to agree with the views I have expressed here today, that Members of Congress could very well do a little personal financial pruning of their own, and when they can demonstrate that they are living within the brackets of reasonable expenditures in Washington, D. C., and that they need more money in order to meet living costs of the job, the people will be fair about it. But to date a convincing record of that need has not been made either in the Commission's report or, in my judgment—and I speak respectfully—in the debate.

So, Mr. President, because I think the proposed salary increase would be entirely out of line with increases which are even suggested for other economic groups in the Nation, I shall vote against the bill.

I have already had something to say about the salaries of lawyers and the salaries of the heads of corporate organizations, including farm organizations. My statement has been to the effect that I do not think they constitute sound arguments by analogy, applicable to the pending bill.

Now let me say a word about the salaries of doctors. Even the Commission's report points out that the average income of doctors in 1951 was $13,432. The Commission pointed out that when doctors attain the age 40 or later, their income increases to $20,000 or $25,000, on an average; and that after doctors reach 50 years of age, their income is even higher.

Mr. President, are we really taking the position that, because members of the medical profession on the average receive an income close to ours as politicians, and that after years of service in the medical profession they receive larger incomes, therefore our salaries should be greater? I have talked to a

good many doctors about this matter and other matters. When we listen to them speak of their problems of professional expense, over and above their living costs and the cost of educating their children; and when we think of their costs for equipment and laboratories and their costs for technicians and assistants, we know that we are dealing with a substantial private-entrepreneur problem in the American private-enterprise system. When we think of the economic, private-enterprise worries which go along with a typical practitioner of medicine—even though many of us get the idea that all the average doctor does is cut economic clover all the time; but that is not what he does, Mr. President—I wish to say that I believe we are very presumptuous to compare our economic problems with those of the average doctor. For that matter, I believe we are rather presumptuous when we compare ours with those of most of the professions.

But what I wish to stress, above all else, is that we chose to enter public service. In choosing to do that—as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] said earlier in the afternoon—we did it with our eyes open; and we should not have done it if what we expected to make out of it was a financial profit.

Now I come to a discussion—I shall discuss them first, and shall submit them later—of a series of amendments which I propose to submit before this debate is over. These amendments deal with the problem of the legitimate, public-service expenses of operating a Senator's office.

We know what happens; we know that many Members of the Senate cannot meet the expenses of their offices with the budget which is allowed them by the Federal Government. There are various reasons for that situation. Among them are the individual differences between Senators as to the kind of service they undertake to render their constituents. But whatever may be the reasons for the differences among us in respect to the type of service we render our constituents, the fact of the matter is that in a great many instances Senators spend considerable sums of money in addition to the amount provided them by the Federal Government for the operation of their offices. In fact, I must say, although there probably are some Senators who are not in this category—I have not talked to all Members of the Senate—that among all my colleagues with whom I have talked about this matter, I have yet to find one Senator who does not say that during each year he reaches into his own pocket and pays out of his own income certain expenses of his office which are not covered by the budget allowed him by the Federal Government. I think that is wrong. I do not believe our constituents expect that of us. In my opinion, our constituents are perfectly willing to have us vote for ourselves the necessary allowances required if we are to render good service to our constituents. I think the matter should be an open book, and that those expenses should be audited, and should be a public record, and should be subject to the inspection of both our constituents and the press. In fact, Mr. President, some of my amendments deal with the problem of public disclosure.

However, at this time I wish to dwell a little longer on the question of the type of services we render our constituents and the type of services they have a right to expect us to render at a cost over and above the expense allowances which attach to our office.

For example, let us consider the matter of clerical help. Each year, a great many Members of the Senate pay out of their own pockets, for clerical help, a considerable sum of money, over and above the amount allowed them for that purpose by the Federal Government. In that connection, some Senators average, each year, an amount equal to the salary of 1 clerk or 1 stenographer. Some of us pay, each year, an amount equal to the salary of several clerks and stenographers; and I have been told that one Member of the Senate hires as many—although the figure varies from time to time—as from 5 to 7 extra secretaries and clerks, in order to do the job of representing his State, as a Member of the Senate of the United States. He happens to be a very wealthy man, and he can afford to do it and to pay that amount out of his own pocket.

However, I do not think it is wise to have such a state of affairs exist; I do not believe it is in the interest of good government to operate the Senate of the United States on so small a budget for senatorial offices that a Member of the Senate feels required to hire as many as 5 or 7 extra clerks or stenographers or secretaries in order to be able to serve his State in the way he considers to be proper.

Mr. President, I am not taking the position that the matter should be left entirely to the discretion of individual Senators, for that would lead to abuses, and would endanger the system, and would lead to the possibility of the development of corruption in connection with senatorial expenses. There simply is no substitute for public disclosure; there simply is no substitute for auditing. However, Mr. President, the premise on the basis of which I argue on this point is that the people of the country are entitled to receive from their Senator such service as they need, in order to have the public business properly conducted; and they should expect to pay—and I am satisfied they are willing to do so—a sufficient amount to cover the cost of that service. I believe we should provide the people with the facts and information showing that more money is needed, by way of expenses, in order to provide that service. Let us require a public accounting each year, so that Senators will not have to say, as they now say—and with justification, Mr. President—"I have to dig into my own pocket, and pay for from 1, 2, 3, or even as many as 7"—7 is the highest figure I have heard—"extra clerks and secretaries a year, in order to run my office in the service of the people of my State."

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to vote to grant to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jurisdiction to pass judgment, in advance of such expenditures, on the question of whether a Senator can show cause for employing, as assistants in his office, more than the number he is allowed under the present budget.

So, Mr. President, I shall submit an amendment—although at this time I shall state only its essence—proposing a 10-percent increase in the budget item for senatorial office salaries, but without change in the present statutory limits as to the amount of salary per person. The amendment provides for a 10-percent increase in the office budget as the minimum which should be allowed by way of an increase for senatorial office expense. That additional allowance would not go into the pockets of the individual Senator; but would be of assistance, as it should be, to Senators who at present are paying out of their own pockets for extra secretarial help, not for political purposes, but for the purpose of conducting the affairs of their office in behalf of the people of their States.

When we come to the amendment itself—and I shall make a further argument on it at that time—it will be seen that I have protected the public interest by an accountability provision. However, I shall accept any other phraseology or any addition to the amendment, if any Senator believes that greater protection on this point needs to be given to the people.

In addition, there are extra expenses in the offices of many Senators with regard to telephone and telegraph services. I believe it is wise as a rule of thumb to have a limit placed on them, either as to the minutes of long-distance calls per month, or as to the number of calls. I have a similar thought with respect to the number of telegrams and the total cost of the telegrams and the content of the telegrams.

I quite agree with the statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], during the last session of Congress, to the effect that some practices were developing in the Senate in connection with telegraph usage which involved public waste. As I recall, at the time a proposal was made by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the Senator from Arizona was a member, that some limitation be placed on the nature of the contents of telegrams. I have no quarrel with that at all.

Let us take up now a few specific problems which result in many of us paying out of our own pockets money for telegrams and long-distance telephone calls which are justifiable expenditures in transacting public business. I am 3,000 miles away from my constituents. The Senator from Arizona is a good many miles away from his constituents. Let us suppose that a constituent is having passport trouble. He calls his Senator. He calls him collect. Of course, a Senator does not have to accept such a call. However, who among us would not accept it?

The State Department is giving a constituent trouble, and he believes it can be very easily cleared up with the presentation of certain facts, if they are properly called to the attention of the State Department. He feels that is the kind of services he pays taxes for, and he calls his Representative or Senator in an

effort to try to get the hardship alleviated. The Senator goes to the State Department and finds that there is an important fact which the constituent did not tell him. What is the Senator going to do? Will he send a letter by frank to his constituent, or will he send the letter by air mail, or will he use the telephone to call his constituent?

Some constituents talk even longer than Senators, believe it or not, and some of those long distance calls are not very easy to terminate, because the constituent is rather excited. That costs money.

A good many of us in giving that kind of service—and we ought to give that kind of service—dig down into our pockets a good many times each year and pay for such telephone calls, or for sending telegrams in such cases. That is money spent by us over and above what the Government allows us. When the American people come to understand that kind of problem, I believe they will not object to an increase in our allowance for telephone calls and for telegraph services, provided such allowance is subject to inspection, so that it can be made certain that the calls are official calls, made in the transaction of official Senate business.

Let me now refer to the parsimonious policy we have followed with regard to the stamp allowance. A constituent who lives 3,000 miles from Washington cannot understand why he should hear from his Senator by franked mail on a matter of great concern to him, involving his relations with the Federal Government. I am not talking about letters we receive when pressure drives are put on. At such times we receive hundreds of letters from constituents with respect to how constituents think we should vote, or asking questions as to why we voted as we did on some issue.

Of course, we handle many of our replies by franked mail, and many of us even find it necessary to handle some of our correspondence by mimeographed letters, because frequently the correspondence is so voluminous. I am talking about a legitimate problem in connection with which a constituent asks for services. If he lives a great distance away, or even if he lives anywhere where air mail can reach him more quickly than a franked envelope can reach him, I believe it is to be expected that we should air-mail a letter to him. Many of us find it necessary time and time again to supplement our stamp allowance out of our own pockets. We do not have to worry about constituents not being perfectly willing to supply us with a stamp allowance sufficient to take care of our official business by air mail where in our wise discretion—and we always hope it is wise—we decide that an air mail stamp is necessary on the envelope.

This is why I am offering an amendment—and I believe it is the minimum, and I believe it will solve the problem for most of us—of a 10-percent increase not only in the telegraph and telephone allowance but in the stamp allowance as well.

As to stationery, I believe that matter is adequately handled at the present time. However, we know what we do. We get our stationery from our committee. We do not get much of it from our stationery allowance. We also know, because we get our stationery from our committee, that in some instances we have a refund on the stationery allowance. There have been times when I had a surplus and it was refunded to me. As we all know, we report it as income on our income-tax return.

I believe that hole should be plugged. I think it should be stopped. I believe a transfer of funds should be permitted. It should be kept a matter of public record, but if a Senator does not use all the money in the stationery fund, because he is able to get his stationery from a committee, he ought to be allowed to transfer the amount to his stamp allowance or to his telegraph and telephone allowance, provided he can show that he has spent the money for senatorial and not for political purposes.

I do not believe that the refunds which Senators sometimes receive on their stationery allowance are proper refunds. I believe that practice ought to be stopped. I believe the excess ought to be transferred and used in other ways, because we know in advance that we may not use all of it, and therefore we ought to be able to use it for other expenses in our offices, expenses of a senatorial nature, instead of being allowed to take it as a personal refund.

Therefore I have a proposal for a 10-percent increase in the so-called supply feature of Senator's offices with the understanding that it will not cover stationery.

We have another expense, too. It is a delicate issue. These are nip and tuck pros and cons to this expense item, about which I have talked before on the floor of the Senate in years gone by, when I discussed the salary problem. I refer to the matter of receiving a tax credit for the extra living expenses in Washington for maintaining two homes.

I hope Senators will not take offense at a personal illustration, but I cannot prove the point better than by a personal illustration. Some years ago when Miss Strauss was the president of the League of Women Voters and we were talking about legislative programs for the League of Women Voters, I said, "Miss Strauss, why don't you get 3 or 5 Senators and 3 or 5 Representatives to volunteer to be legislative guinea pigs for 1 year, and have them agree to submit to you, or to a committee to be appointed by the League of Women Voters, all their financial problems, public, and personal, such as the cost of the baby's shoes, the cost of educating a daughter or son in college, the cost of living in Washington, and the cost of the senatorial office, and then prepare a treatise which will really present the facts to the American people with respect to what it costs to serve them in the Congress of the United States?"

In my judgment, such a study would have had some value. I speak most respectfully when I say I do not believe the report of the Segal Commission, so far as congressional salaries are concerned, has much value. I say that because it does not give to the American people a breakdown in the expenditure problems which confront Senators and Representatives serving them in the Congress of the United States. Until the American people see it all broken down, item by item, we are going to encounter a great deal of opposition even to an expenditure increase.

Does the Senate think for a moment that I am not aware of the fact that I am going to be criticized by some for proposing an expense increase for conducting senatorial business? If anyone thinks for a moment that my opposition—and there are those, of course, who are always certain to attribute some ulterior motive—is only political opposition, they are dead wrong, because I am offering some amendments with respect to increasing the allowance for expenses in our offices to which many voters will object, just as much as they object to salary increases, because they do not understand the facts in regard to what is involved in such items as I have discussed thus far in my speech.

Certainly, they are not going to understand unless we can get the facts to them, together with the breakdown information with respect to the item I now mention. That is why I say I am willing to make myself a legislative guinea pig in the matter of the cost of maintaining two homes.

As a result of a great deal of thrift over the years and a great deal of hard work, my wife and I succeeded in building a home on a small acreage. It was then, we thought, far out in the country, at Eugene, Oreg. Now our eastern boundary is the city limits. It is a little more than 29 acres, with a rather large house which was built in the depths of the depression at a very economical price. We are renting it furnished for $125 a month. If I had the same house in Washington, on the same lot, I would have no trouble in renting it for $400 a month.

Of course, good family economy called upon me to sell that house when I was first elected to the Senate. But I am not completely stupid politically. There is not a Senator present—and I see smiles on the faces of some—who does not agree with me. I cannot think of a better act of political suicide than to sell a domicile at home and come to Washington and take up a domicile here, and hear the comment, "He does not have a grassroot left in his State."

So we did not sell our home. I am not so sure there is not a little political cowardice involved. I am not particularly proud that I engaged in that kind of economic waste. It is an economic waste, because I took a loss and have taken it ever since I have been in the Senate; I have taken a loss every month on that piece of property. Good economy really would justify my selling it. There was a time when I could have sold it at a pretty good price. Now, with the passage of years, and my not being there to take care of it, it deteriorates in spite of the fact that we have had very careful and cooperative tenants.

Mr. President, that is one of the inescapable costs of service in the Congress. Again, I do not think that if the people of the country understood all of the facts, they would want us to suffer such financial loss. That is why I am

perfectly willing to offer the amendment which I am going to offer in regard to a deduction of the difference between the living costs at home and the living costs in Washington. Such an allowance is common in business. Some Senators live at the Mayflower, the Sheraton, and the Shoreham—and they are very lovely living quarters in Washington—but a good many corporations also keep year-around apartments in those same palatial establishments, and such corporations deduct their cost as business expenses.

There was a time, in the early days of my service in the Senate, before the officials of these corporations were fully apprised as to my political philosophy and policies, when they made very clear to me that if I should be confronted with a situation in which there was a constituent in town, and homeless for the night, I could give them a ring and they would find a place for him in one of those year-around apartments. Let me say that they never received such a call from me. After a little while, when I started writing my record in the Senate, I did not get any more such suggestions.

What I want to point out, however, Mr. President, is that for members of business that kind of a living cost in Washington, D. C., is carried as a tax deduction. Under many circumstances it is a legitimate business expense. I do not quarrel with that. I do not know all the facts about it, I am frank to say, and I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would be a much better witness on this subject that I am; but I have my suspicions, on the basis of some information which has been given to me from time to time, that some of those tax allowances to business are exorbitant and unnecessary, just as are some advertising allowances. It is in connection with a tax bill, and this is not the time, that we should discuss proposals for amendments to the tax law that would at least squeeze a little bit of the water from the expense accounts of some American corporations and businesses which have tended to make a bit of a racket of extra living costs in Washington, D. C., when they engage year-around apartments in palatial hotels.

And here, again, Mr. President, we are dealing with a problem of degree. There is a bracket of legitimacy in the subject matter, and I think it is legitimate when it can be shown that the expenditure is a necessary business expense for American business to be allowed this kind of a deduction. It is also proper for us in the pending bill to adopt an amendment which would permit Members of the Congress to deduct for the so-called double living standard. I hope that phrase will not be misinterpreted. I mean a double living standard because we have to maintain a home in our own hometown and also a home in Washington, D. C. We should be allowed to deduct a reasonable amount for that extra expense in Washington.

It should be an amount that requires proof. Therefore, my amendment proposes a figure of $5,000. In many instances Senators who are living in very modest establishments, as many of us do, find that the extra expenses of living in Washington and the maintenance of a home in the home State amount to much more than $5,000. Where we can show it, where it will meet the requirements of an audit, where proof is established, I think it is only fair and just that it be allowed.

When the people get the facts about that, when they understand the equities and the fairness of it, I do not think they are going to quarrel about such an allowance. I think they will approve of it with enthusiasm.

So I have that amendment, Mr. President, which I shall discuss later at some length, during the night, if necessary, because I think it is important to have a thorough discussion of the subject matter. The Senate ought to have time to consider it and the country should have at least until Wednesday to hear about it. With Washington's Birthday tomorrow, I take it for granted that the leadership would not want to vote on the question tomorrow if we do not vote on it tonight. In fact, I shall pause long enough, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] if he has any plans he can announce as to the disposal of this bill; whether at this hour we can have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Wednesday and adjourn tonight at a reasonable hour. I assure the Senator that I have canceled my New York engagement, so I am speaking from no selfish motive.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader is in a better position now to state what the program will be for tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. And for tonight, too, I hope.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Tomorrow there will be no legislative business. There will be the usual morning hour following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator contemplate having the Senate remain in session an indefinite period tonight, with the intention of voting on the bill before we adjourn?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I know of no decision that has been reached at this time. It would be a little easier to make a determination after ascertaining the extent of the speaking of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am trying to help the Senator with now. That is why I have asked for protection of my right to the floor. I desired to see if we could have this discussion.

I wish to be very honest and frank with the Senator. I do not think it would be in the public interest to vote on the bill tonight. I shall do the best I can to encourage the Senate to vote on Wednesday. Therefore, I think we would probably avoid much unnecessary muscle tension, and would keep ourselves in a jovial, cooperative mood if we could reach some gentleman's understanding now to vote as of a definite hour on Wednesday.

I doubt very much that the Senate would wish to stay in session long into the night, because I have many amendments to offer, and in fairness to the amendments I shall take considerable time to discuss each of them.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Am I correct in my understanding that about the same length of time would be required on Wednesday as on Monday?

Mr. MORSE. No. The Senator is quite wrong about that. Senators can disagree with me, but that is all right. They can disagree with my purpose and my feeling about the matter. I simply do not think it to be in the best interests of the Senate or the country to vote on the bill on the first day it comes before the Senate, and even before some amendments have been printed and are on the table.

I speak most respectfully when I say that I do not believe there is any urgency in the matter. We do not have a calendar which is jammed. We do not face such a situation that it would be against the public interest if we entered into an agreement to vote on Wednesday.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Kentucky would not for one moment question the motive or purpose of the Senator from Oregon in connection with the bill or any amendment he wishes to offer in connection therewith.

The acting majority leader certainly is in no position at this time to make a unanimous-consent request, in view of the fact that a number of other Senators desire to offer amendments, and it would take some time for me to get in touch with all of them. I shall do that as the time passes.

Mr. MORSE. It is likewise my understanding that a number of Members still wish to discuss the matter. It is also my understanding—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—that there is a rather large number of absentees tonight; and although a quorum could be obtained at any time an attempt was made to get a quorum, there would not be a large number over a quorum. I happen to believe that if that is a fact—and I have been advised that it is—then we ought to let the bill go over until Wednesday, although there is always the possibility that on Wednesday there may not be any more Senators present than are present now. But, at least, they will have had due notice by Wednesday that a vote will be taken.

I have been told, I think accurately, that some Senators are away who were not aware, when they went away, that there would be a vote on this bill today.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish to keep the record straight.

Mr. MORSE. I want it to be straight.

Mr. CLEMENTS. All Members have had notice since Friday that the bill would be taken up today. I also wish to advise the Senator from Oregon that it is my understanding that about the same number of Senators will be present on Wednesday as reported for duty today.

Mr. MORSE. But it is true, is it not, that many of those who are away, although they were advised that the bill would be taken up today, were not of the impression that it would be voted on today. At least, those who expected to be absent on Wednesday will have time between now and Wednesday in which to

change their plans, just as I have changed my plans for tonight.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I believe all Members of the Senate were notified as much as 10 or 12 days ago that the first controversial business to be considered after Lincoln week would be taken up today.

Mr. MORSE. But being so advised, and this being such a highly controversial matter, I wonder if they were not almost entitled to take judicial notice of the fact that the bill would not be disposed of on the first day.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader has had no complaint from Members on this side of the aisle up until now.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the Senator's viewpoint. He is having the experience of a complaint for the first time from this side of the aisle. It probably will not be the last complaint, either. [Laughter.] I never deal my cards under the table; they are always face up.

I wish to say that I always love my association with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. If this is to be the insistence of the acting majority leader for the rest of the evening, let us proceed, and may a good time be had by all, because I have much to say on this subject matter.

Mr. President, my amendment in regard to the deduction for tax purposes would be, as I have said, at a figure of $5,000. I desire to tell the Senate how I came to determine that figure. I talked to a good many of my colleagues in regard to their expenses, including the so-called double-home expense, a Senator's expense of maintaining a home in his own State and of maintaining a home in Washington. I satisfied myself that the figure of $5,000 was a reasonable and equitable one.

I then talked to professional staff members, who are familiar with the problem, and without taking any sides on the merits of the issue, but only giving me information as to the figure itself, they said they believed a figure of $5,000 was equitable.

Then I talked to a firm of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, who are familiar with the tax problems of Members of Congress. I was told that in the handling of tax accounts of Members of Congress, the present figure of $3,000 is entirely too low. Some of the members of the firm even thought that a figure higher than $5,000 would be justified.

Then I talked to the certified public accountant who handles my own tax affairs. All I wish to quote him as saying is that he thought it certainly was a fair figure, but he was not passing judgment at all upon the legislative merits or demerits of the general proposal.

I think this amendment would take care of the equities in the whole matter of expense adjustment, and would leave a salary at what I think is a reasonable figure for service in Congress, namely, $15,000 a year.

While I am on that point, let me reply briefly to an argument I heard this afternoon about increases in the cost of living. I have had a great deal to do in my professional life with the studying of wage standards. I shall review very briefly some of the criteria which are taken into consideration in the fixing of wage standards.

The fundamental criterion is that American wage earners are entitled to a wage of health and decency. It is a very general principle; it is a very general measuring rod; but it is a measuring rod which has taken on the meaning of art in the trade. By that I mean in the whole field of industrial relations. The measuring rod or standard of health and decency has come to have very definite limits of meaning. Included within its meaning is the conception that an American is a free man, working under an economic system that protects his economic and political freedom of choice; that he is entitled, in a wage negotiation, to receive a wage award that will permit him to enjoy a wage of health and decency. What is that standard? In each individual case it is determined by the record made before the wage board, the mediator, or the arbitrator. In broad outline, it can be described as a wage that permits him to earn an income sufficient to feed, clothe, and house his family on what is recognized in the community as a level of decency. It is somewhat like the rule of reasonableness in the law courts. No lawyer can define with measuring-rod exactness what the rule of reasonableness is. And yet every lawyer knows that judges use it constantly. They take the whole case from its four corners, study the record, look at the testimony and the evidence, and then they are heard to say, "In applying the rule of judicial reasonableness, the court finds."

That is the way basic wages are determined in a wage case, Mr. President, The arbitrator, or whoever has the solemn responsibility of adjudicating the wage dispute, says, "I am bound to fix a wage that will at least meet the minimum standards of health and decency, so that a worker can clothe, house, and feed himself and an average family." Usually in wage cases the average family is the hypothetical family of four. The arbitrator must say to himself that such a worker must be able to clothe his family, house it, and feed it at the level of decency. Under our system of economic freedom, American wage earners are entitled to that level.

There is always brought into a wage case the old argument whether or not, on the basis of the alleged inability to pay, the arbitrator should hand down a decision which would not permit a wage of health and decency. That was a great contest in the early wage negotiations in America. It is my recollection—I should like to go to the books to check it, but I think my recollection is correct—that there were two great Americans who played an important part in wage negotiations in this country, William Howard Taft and the great Justice Brandeis. These men were among the very first to reject the ability-to-pay arguments on the part of employers, insofar as they concerned a request that the arbitrator or wage board hand down a decision calling for a wage lower than one which would permit a standard of health and decency.

Mr. President, one can well judge that at that time the doctrine was considered a very radical one. But it came to be accepted, and was refined in the years following the great decision of Taft in the War Labor Board report of 1917 or 1918, in which he supported the theory of requiring a wage of health and decency, and rejected the idea that a wage lower than that could be arrived at by a wage board on the basis of an employer's argument of inability to pay.

In some of the refinements which followed the application of the Taft and Brandeis principle on that point, it was pointed out in later decisions that if an employer could not pay a wage of health and decency, it was a negotiable matter between the employer and the workers. The fixing of the wage was a matter of mediation between the employers and the workers, but no representative of the Government, no judicial officer, no officer appointed by the parties to function in a private judicial capacity for them, had any moral right to order that the employees should accept a wage less than one of health and decency.

Of course, that milestone in the development of American wage policy was resisted, and in some reactionary quarters was declaimed as radical, socialistic, and anarchistic. It has come now to be accepted as one of the elementary principles of wage negotiation. Let me emphasize that it is a principle on which the whole theory of minimum wages is based.

Let us consider early minimum wage legislation. I have not done so recently, but I have many times since I have been a Member of the Senate. I read the RECORD, not with amusement, but with some pleasant regard for the almost amusing position in which the reactionaries in the Congress put themselves when minimum wage proposals were first advanced in this great parliamentary body. How I wish that many of them might come back and read the remarks they then made, in view of the great strides for human betterment which have been taken in this country as the result of decent wage standards, which have been developed and have evolved since Taft and Brandeis laid down the very sound economic and social principle that ability to pay should not be considered in the matter of fixing a minimum wage necessary to maintain health and decency. Yet there have been thousands of persons who have simply hated to give up the idea that someway, somehow, the jungle law of supply and demand should be allowed to go on unfettered, unchecked, and uninterfered with by Government even though it would affect the services of human beings who depend upon wages for their very existence.

Had such a philosophy prevailed, in my judgment American labor today would not have the economic freedom of choice which it possesses. Incidentally, business, operating under our system of enlightened capitalism, would not today be enjoying the fruits of a private enterprise system. There would be economic chaos, because business is completely and entirely dependent upon the purchasing power of the mass of the workers.

Great strides have been made since the position taken by William Howard Taft and Justice Brandeis on that point back in the days of World War I. However, I can recall that as recently as 1939, while serving on wage and hour panels, I listened to employer contentions that a 25-cent minimum wage in some industries was all that the Board should have allowed, because the industry did not have the ability to pay more.

Surprising, Mr. President, the readiness with which representatives of industry in those days could make a heart-rending argument about what was going to happen to a business if a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour was allowed under the law, which, of course, is exactly what was done in a great many cases. But proposals for maintaining 25-cent minimum wages occurred as recently as 1939. I remember in 1942, when the laundry case was before the War Labor Board and, believe it or not, Mr. President—it is a public record, and one can read for himself—the argument was made that we should not interrupt or unsettle a 19-cent minimum wage that prevailed in some laundries in 1942. The basis of the argument was that to do so would only cause the housewives of those sections of the country to do their laundry in the cellar. In that decision—which had the unanimous vote of all the members of the board, including both the employer members and the labor members—I was so impolitic as to suggest that the cellar was where the housewives of the Nation should do their laundry, if not doing it there would mean that the laundry workers of the Nation would subsidize the housewives on the basis of a 19-cents-an-hour wage. We substantially increased the wage; and I did not hear that a single laundry went out of business as a result of that wage increase. I do not know it to be a fact, but I simply have a hunch that a good many of the housewives who wrote to me anything but complimentary letters, because of the remark I made about the housewives, kept right on sending their laundry to the laundries. But under that decision the laundry workers got a wage of health and decency. If my colleagues will read that decision, they will find that it revolved entirely around the basic principle of a wage of health and decency, which is the first of the criteria I wish to mention in connection with the fixing of wages.

I now move to the second one, namely, a criterion which deals with fixing a wage over and above one of health and decency. If all the American workers had to look forward to was merely a wage of health and decency, their existence would be a rather dreary one. Moreover, Mr. President, in that event the American economy would be depressed. That is why it is so important for the American employer to understand that it is to his economic interest to pay a wage substantially above one of health and decency.

A wage of health and decency is more than an existence wage, but it is certainly less than a wage which permits the average American family of four to enjoy what we call a good standard of living. Again, that is a flexible criterion. I cannot submit an economic wage ruler, and thus measure this wage in dollars and cents per month or per week or per day or per hour. But here, again, after we have studied all the evidence and all the testimony in the record of a wage case, and when we have the job of making a judicial determination, by applying the rule of judicial reasonableness to the problem before us, we do not have much difficulty in reaching a conclusion as to what wage figure would result in allowing a reasonable wage above one of health and decency, one within the boundary of the ability of the employer to pay, and one which would help promote a good standard of living for the workers involved in the case.

At this point I wish to stress that the only place in the entire wage matter where the ability of the employer to pay is not in any way controlling is in a case involving the criterion of a wage of health and decency. In such a case the ability of the employer to pay is not a controlling factor. That is why it has been pointed out by some of the distinguished wage students I have mentioned—I shall not quote them now from recollection, because I desire to be accurate; therefore, I shall only summarize their position by referring to such great students of this issue as William Howard Taft and Associate Justice Brandeis, of the United States Supreme Court, and the many who followed them, and who accepted the premise I am now discussing—that if the employer cannot pay a wage of health and decency, it is better for the national economy that he go out of business, unless the workers in his plant privately and voluntarily negotiate with him a wage less than one of health and decency; but the Government has no right and an arbitrator has no right and a wage board has no right to say to the worker under such facts, "We will require you to subsidize your employer by accepting wages which result in your living under a standard of living less than one of health and decency."

But, Mr. President, when we reach the second criterion I have mentioned, and when we have to consider a request of the employees that they be granted in such a wage case a standard of living above one of health and decency, the ability of the employer to pay does become an important factor. At that point, the arbitrator or the wage board has to give careful consideration to the ability of the employer to pay.

In such a case what does the arbitrator or the wage board take into account? Let us not forget that I am taking about a situation involving—in the average wage case, if it is one of substance, and if it involves any considerable number of employees—volumes of testimony and exhibits dealing with such factors as comparable wages for similar work in the same area and the labor market, the availability of employees, and competing influences beyond the labor market which are urging upon the community a pirating of the labor supply from a wage market outside the area—in short, a host of such factors. Such a case deals, of course, with the matter of the profits of industry. When we reach that one, Mr. President, we have a "hot one," because in a good many cases the employer is perfectly willing to say, "I cannot pay more." However, when we say, "Let us see your books," we are told that to do so would be a violation of his right of economic privacy.

Mr. President, on that point it has taken time to evolve a change of attitude in American industry. Again I refer to William Howard Taft and Justice Brandeis, who were great leaders in this field. They laid down, in American arbitration law, the very sound principle that when an employer seeks to rest upon the argument of a lack of ability to pay, the wage board or the arbitrator has a right to see his books or to see proof, not merely selected proof, not whatever proof the employed may wish to advance, but all the proof, including the right of the arbitrator or the wage board or the judicial officer to call for all the books, and, if they are not produced, to dismiss the argument that the employer cannot afford to pay; and in the absence of a showing to the contrary, to assume that he can afford to pay.

Although I have a great deal of time at my disposal, I do not wish to take much of it to go into great detail concerning the many conflicts which have developed in connection with evolving a new and accepted point of view in regard to American employers, namely, that if they are to argue that they do not have the ability to pay, then they owe it to the judicial officer who is determining the dispute to give him sufficient evidence of their inability to pay.

On this point we are dealing with a touchy problem of economic privacy, because we must think of the businessman's competitors. I believe we are dealing with a matter of economic privacy when an employer says, "Mr. Arbitrator, I am willing to have you see it, and I am willing, under an arrangement or pledge by counsel for the union or the president of the union of secrecy with regard to the matter, to have the matter considered in executive session, because it is not in the interest of the workers to have all my business secrets from the standpoint of what the books will show made available to my competitors, and it will not help the union to have the matter made public knowledge."

I have always taken the position that under those circumstances I would order an inspection of the books, but not at a public hearing. We would look at the books with only the smallest number of parties present, and only those parties present who would assure the arbitrator getting the full value of the views of the representatives of the labor group from the standpoint of rebutting the contention of the employer in regard to what his books showed.

Under those circumstances, after we have studied the books and the evidence of the ability or inability of the employer to pay a wage over and above a wage of health and decency, we have the problem of evaluating the evidence.

There, again, we have the record from its four corners, and we decide what is a reasonable and fair wage over and above

a wage of health and decency. If our finding shows that the employer has the ability to pay a wage over and above a wage of health and decency, that is not the end. It is not the same as finding that there is a surplus. There are many other criteria to consider. The stockholders must be considered. There are other parties to the wage case, although some labor unions seem to forget it. In many cases which I have considered labor unions seemed to operate on the basis that there were not even 2 parties or 3 parties to the dispute, but only 1 party, the workers. It did not take long for me to dispel that fallacious notion. At other times some labor unions seemed to believe that there were only two parties, the representatives of the workers and the representatives of the employers. They seemed to forget that once they enter such a judicial tribunal there are three parties to a wage dispute, namely, the workers, the employers, and the public, with the public represented by the man in the middle, whether it be the wage board or the Government agency or the private arbitrator, or whoever has been given the solemn responsibility of fixing wages for the industry in connection with the particular case.

Therefore we must give consideration to the rights of the stockholders, and we must give consideration to all the arguments and evidence with regard to what is claimed to be a reasonable and fair profit in an industry, considering the risks that arise in connection with it. We must give consideration, of course, to depreciation allowance needs, and we must give consideration to the need for a reserve, in order to build up the plant from expansion and for greater production later.

All those factors must be considered. However, finally, as Brandeis and Cardozo point out in their discussion of judicial processes—particularly Cardozo in his great work on the nature of judicial processes—we come to the judicial determination which is known in the law as the value judgment of the relative rights of the parties litigant, in view of the full record of the case. Then our judicial sense tells us, "This is the figure." We describe that mental judicial process by such words as "It is a fair figure," or "It is a reasonable figure," or "It is an equitable figure," or "It is a just figure."

We have not evolved in the English language words which are more exact in meaning than the words I have cited for the description of this very solemn and, in a sense—if one is dedicated to judicial processes as we lawyers are—this sacred process of judgment in fixing a wage over and above a wage of health and decency, if the facts warrant it.

We call that a good wage. We call that a wage that takes into account, not luxuries, but entertainment, economic ambitions, and desirable goals, which every man and woman is striving to obtain as we seek to make our system of enlightened capitalism promote the general welfare.

As my colleagues have heard me say before, and although I never like to bore them even in prolonged debate, it is a point that needs to be repeated over and over again, the primary purpose of our great economic system, which we call enlightened capitalism, is to support and always keep strong and high in the arch, without the slightest sagging, that keystone of our whole constitutional system, the promotion of the general welfare.

That is why in years gone by, before many bar associations, when I have discussed the various phases of constitutional law, I have said so many times that the primary objective of our constitutional system is to promote the general welfare. In my judgment we have not even started, in the field of American constitutional law, to give full meaning to the constitutional concepts which are inherent in the general welfare clause of the Constitution. I believe it is the most elastic band in the Constitution. I believe it is the clause which guarantees for generations and generations to come the flexibility and adjustability and adaptability of the Constitution to changing human events in our political society, which we call a representative form of government in a political democracy.

Therefore, as in a wage case we come finally to render a judicial judgment as to what wage should be allowed over and above a wage of health and decency, when the employer is shown on the record to be one who can pay more than a wage of health and decency, we take into account, for example, the need for giving the worker a sufficient share of the profits—oh, what a dangerous phrase that is—in the form of a wage above a wage of health and decency, which will enable him to provide his family with more of the so-called good things of life, which may be a trip to California or Florida or some other sunny clime in our country—a part of the dream world and the justifiable objectives of many American wage earners.

Why not? If the industry can pay it and if the industry is protected by the criteria that I have been enumerating—and I have enumerated only a few of them—such a wage is fixed by the wage board, or arbitrator, the judge, or whoever has jurisdiction to render a judicial determination in the case.

There are other factors which are taken into account in determining that type of wage. It is necessary to consider such matters as reasonable medical care. Under a good wage, or a wage above a wage of health and decency, it is necessary to consider such factors as better medical care and more hospitalization. It does not follow that under a wage of health and decency the worker ought to have his wage so fixed that in case of illness in his family or childbearing on the part of his wife he will be able to pay for a private room in a hospital. However, it does mean that the wage should be sufficiently high to supply medical care and the medical needs of the family.

When we get to the point where the evidence submitted by the representatives of the workers shows that the employer has the ability to pay more than a wage of health and decency, we take these other good things of life into account and recognize that it would be pretty discouraging if every American were not allowed the expectation of an economic livelihood that would permit of the enjoyment of such a wage. But, as I have said, in fixing that wage there are three parties to it: the workers, the employer, and the public. Under those circumstances, also, judicial commonsense dictates that one industry be not moved forward all out of line with other industries simply because it may have an exceptional economic status at the moment.

Believe it or not, Mr. President, when I get toward the conclusion of this speech—and I am a long way from it at the present time; I may finish it tomorrow—I am going to draw it all together and show the direct application of these principles of wage policy to the bill now pending before the Senate, because we happen to be workers for the people, or we should be, and our wage costs, Mr. President, ought to be considered in line with all the criteria which are considered by wage boards, arbitrators, and judicial officers in fixing the amount of income for wage earners generally. Let us not follow the philosophy that we in the Congress of the United States are economic aristocrats. I cannot think of any greater disservice to the American people than for us to adopt the doctrine of economic aristocracy in the Senate of the United States and seek to set ourselves aloof from the rank and file of our fellow citizens. In this field of wage determination and wage adjustment we have no greater economic rights, merely because we are politicians sitting in the Congress of the United States, than have the people in the factories, in the fields, and in the white-collar class of America.

It is nice rationalization for us to try to alibi a 50-percent wage increase for ourselves, to try to put ourselves in an aristocratic class economically when millions and millions of people find themselves subjected to the kind of wage determination criteria about which I have been talking this afternoon.

The reason why I have gone into it in some detail is to try to get the American people—because I am talking to them from this desk this afternoon—to understand that the wage determination criteria which apply to them apply to us also, because we, too, are, or should be, workers in the public interest.

There are some other factors which are taken into account in determining wages under this criterion. I spoke about public hospitalization and more leisure time, and I have pointed out that when industry can afford to pay it, weight should be given to the point raised by the wage negotiators for more money for educational purposes for the average family of four persons.

We hear a great deal from educators of their growing concern because not enough of our young people are going to college to obtain liberal and professional education, or to technical schools for the development of scientific skills. These educators point out, and very rightly so, that we cannot stay ahead of Russia in manpower, but we must see to it that we stay ahead of Russia in brainpower. If we are going to keep America's defenses strong we must keep them strong not only in a military sense, but in a brainpower sense.

So, Mr. President, educators are disturbed about the fact that too frequently not enough of our best young brains have the advantage of higher education. The interesting thing is that heredity draws no distinction among families of the wealthy and families of the poor. History shows very clearly that some of the brainiest of our people come from families of the poor. Of course, Mr. President, it is a terrific national loss whenever we lose a potential nuclear physicist. When we lose the services of a brain that could develop into a great biochemist, it is a tremendous national loss. When we lose the services of a great nuclear engineer, when we lose the services of any potential scientist, or, for that matter, when we lose the brainpower of an individual who could assume leadership in any of the disciplines of learning, it is a tremendous loss. We lose them more in the grade schools. We do not lose them in high schools. In fact, we probably lose them before they start kindergarten. We lose them in great numbers at the home level when the home does not receive an economic income sufficient to start to condition intellectually the brainy child, the child of better than average I. Q., from the time that his propensities can be first noted. Do not forget that if that child is not afforded so-called minimum standards of education in the grade schools that will qualify him for high school education, all that potentiality, all that brainpower will have been lost if he makes a sorry record in high school, if he drops out in high school, or if he becomes discouraged and disillusioned. The interesting thing is that the records of child psychology show that it is the able ones, it is the brilliant ones, it is the ones of better-than-average mind who suffer the most psychologically from discouragement; and we know from our juvenile-delinquency records that a surprisingly large percentage of juvenile delinquents have good I. Q.'s. There are many other causes and many other factors; I mention only one. One of the causes to be found in individual cases is great discouragement because the boy or girl sees no hope for higher education. The family income does not permit of a standard of living in the home above a living of health and decency; it does not permit of the best of education.

Many conditioning factors come into play in the case of the bright boy or girl, as well as the boy or girl of a lower I. Q., which cause him or her, for one reason or another, to leave school early and to take up the economic burden of the family. Thus there is lost the potentiality of a great mind. This is not the way to keep ahead of Russia.

I shall have more to say about this general problem when I come to a discussion of proposed aid-to-education legislation later in this session of Congress. I mention this in passing only because the wage standards and the wage criteria which are applied to American workers determine in no small measure the extent to which we shall protect American brainpower, so far as developing to the maximum the education reservoir of the young people of our country is concerned.

Oh, Mr. President, there are so many interesting facets of this problem that one can be led into a myriad of very interesting channels of discussion when he merely begins to think about the problem of protecting the reservoir of American brainpower to be found in the youth of our land. But all I seek to do at this point in my remarks is to show the direct connection or association of brainpower with an economic income for the average family of our country.

I take the position that where the industry can support it, where the facts show that it has the ability to pay, a share of the profits over and above a wage of health and decency should go to the workers.

But when in a decision one even mentions the phrase "share the profits," he must expect to receive some rather uncomplimentary evaluations of his argument. I do not use the term "profit sharing" in the socialistic sense. We all know there are schools of socialistic thought which advocate a profit-sharing system on a socialistic basis, where the Government operates the industry, in effect, although it may have a managerial entrepreneur service from some so-called industrial group. I am not talking about that kind of profit-sharing at all. I am against it. I am talking about the producers of wealth within private industry, who are the workers as well as the investors.

Too many persons seem to have the idea that it is the owner of the capital who is the producer of the wealth. I do not take the point of view that he is not a producer of wealth, but he is only one factor in the production of the wealth that flows from his industry. The workers produce some of it, too. They are entitled, in that sense, along with the stockholders, along with the owners of the business, to some share of the profits, which would permit a wage above a wage of health and decency. That is the point I desired to stress in connection with the second category of criteria that are taken into account when a wage board, a Government agency, or an arbitrator determines a fair wage.

There is another wage criterion, a third class of wage structure, which sometimes is asked for in wage cases, after a wage of health and decency has been fixed. Even after a so-called good wage has been fixed in an industry, on the basis that the employer has the ability to pay over and above a wage of health and decency, another class of wage cases is frequently involved in wage adjustments. That is a wage which takes care of so-called fringe benefits, a wage that takes care of adjustments in costs of living, about which we have heard so much from our colleagues. So it will be seen that I am gradually getting to the point of the application of these principles to the theory of the pending bill. Just be patient, and I shall get there in my own time and in my own way.

In those wage cases there is a request for an "up" in the wage over and above the so-called good wage, so as to meet the changes in costs of living, or to meet the need for pension benefits, or to meet the need for a so-called security system for the industry or a hospitalization system. The so-called fringe benefits present some perplexing problems to the wage board or the arbitrator or the judge who is called upon to consider the economic rights of employers and workers, and, do not forget, as I said earlier, the public interest as well.

It is very important that we take into account the public interest, particularly when it comes to the matter of fixing so-called fringe benefits over a wage of health and decency and a so-called good wage that takes into account the economic rights of the workers.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, February 23, 1955, after the morning business, during the further consideration of S. 462, a bill to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, debate on the pending amendment proposed by Mr. BUSH, and any other amendment or motion, including appeals, shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover thereof and Mr. KEFAUVER: *Provided*, That if Mr. KEFAUVER is in favor of any proposed amendment, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that it not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received: *Provided further*, That when no further amendment is to be proposed to the said Senate bill, the Senate shall, without debate, immediately proceed to the consideration of the companion House bill, H. R. 3828; that it be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 462, if and as amended; and that the engrossment of any amendment that is not germane to the subordered, and the bill read a third time.

Ordered further, That on the question of the passage of the said House bill as amended debate shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided between Mr. KEFAUVER and the minority leader and controlled by them, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall close my remarks in a few minutes.

I wish to apply the wage theory I have been discussing to the bill before the Senate. Cases involving fringe benefits, such as cost of living benefits, or changes in cost of living benefits, have to be determined by the arbitrator in terms of the ability of the employer to pay—and in our case the people of the United States represent the employer—and also in terms of the need when studied from the standpoint of the wage now being paid.

When we consider those two principles, Mr. President, and apply them to

the pending bill, I wish to say that, in my judgment, with our national budget what it is, the people should not be asked to pay these wage increases in the name of changes in the cost of living, because I submit the wage is adequate to meet the cost-of-living problems of Senators, if they will do their share of economizing. Secondly, Members of Congress asked to come to Washington, and I am sure they would be welcomed back home if they did not desire to stay here and work for a wage which certainly is above a wage of health and decency, and above the criterion of a good wage; and the people would have no difficulty in replacing them.

Lastly, I wish to point out, Mr. President, that I think the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is a sound one from the standpoint of the criterion of ability to pay, because, until the budget is balanced, I do not think that the wages of Members of Congress should be increased.

So what I have had to say in regard to what is really a summary analysis of the criterion that judges, wage boards, and arbitrators are called upon in American industrial dispute law to apply in fixing wages, is directly applicable to the bill before the Senate.

I am opposed to the bill, Mr. President, so far as congressional salaries are concerned. Under the limitations of time fixed in the unanimous-consent agreement, I shall have something to say in regard to the judicial features of the bill. I now wish to say that the present salary of Members of Congress is a good salary, supplies a good wage, under the criterion which I have outlined this afternoon, and that the claim for an increase on the basis of an adjustment for cost of living is not justified at the present time.

For those reasons in the main, and for many more specific reasons which I shall advance as I discuss individual amendments on Wednesday, I wish the record to show that I am unalterably opposed to the proposal for congressional salary increases at this time.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments, some of which are introduced by me in behalf of myself and my junior colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER]. The last one I have not had an opportunity to discuss with him, and I do not know whether he will join in it, so I shall offer it only on behalf of myself. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed and lie on the table, so that Senators may have them available in printed form when we proceed to discuss them on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would say to the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who I am sure very ably represents the minority leader in the Senate, that I deeply appreciate the cooperation which they have extended to the senior Senator from Oregon in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement and further debate on the bill. It is not always pleasant, and it is not easy, as anyone who has tried it well knows, to stand in the Senate and use one's parliamentary rights to protect what one's conscience and judgment tells him is a public interest. I respect the sincerity of those in the Senate who disagree with me at those times, but I respectfully say now that I think it is good for all, for the Senate and for the country, that we have provided for the extra hours that will now be available for a more considerate debate on the pending measure than would have taken place if, with the clock hands pointing at us all the time, it had been sought to push through the Senate tonight to a vote an issue which is so controversial across the land as this issue is. I would certainly be less than appreciative if I did not extend to the majority leader and the acting minority leader my sincere thanks for the cooperation they have extended to me. I hope they will not feel that I unfairly held a parliamentary gun at their heads, because I did not shoot many bullets. I merely pleaded that they would not make it necessary for me to do so.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish to assure my friend, the Senator from Oregon, that the acting majority leader is appreciative of the comment which the Senator from Oregon has made. I was not conscious of any parliamentary gun being held at anyone's head. I wish to assure my friend from Oregon that we had no designs by which we could have had either the hour or the minute hand of the clock directed at him. I think it is very fine that we have had three and a half or 4 hours of discussion on this very important measure this afternoon. By reason of having discussed the bill for that amount of time, I think it has given us the opportunity to have the bill passed on Wednesday at a much earlier time than otherwise. In view of the manner in which the bill has been handled, I do not believe that anyone could point a finger of suspicion at any Member of the Senate and suggest there had not been ample opportunity for the bill to be fully explored by the Members of the Senate and by the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his comments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21, 1955:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provision of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Honnen, O12816, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15063, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, O15897, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Victor Allen Conrad, O15546, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Francis Marion Day, O15614, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Peter Conover Hains, 3d, O15657, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Vonna Fernleigh Burger, O15667, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15693, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Willard Koehler Liebel, O15723, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Henry Maglin, O15812, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Lawrence Marshall, O38593, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Frank Needham Roberts, O12734, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Andrew Thomas McNamara, O17324, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Keith Richard Barney, O16377, United States Army.

Col. Benjamin Branche Talley, O16668, United States Army.

Col. Charles H. McNutt, O16751, United States Army.

Col. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, United States Army.

Col. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113, United States Army.

Col. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, United States Army.

Col. James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218, United States Army.

Col. William Frew Train, O18415, United States Army.

Col. Robert Quinney Brown, O18520, United States Army.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, which was observed on Wednesday, February 16.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, OF MARYLAND, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Today, February 16, is the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, and the free people of the world pause to do honor to these indomitable people who, despite the engulfment of their land by the atheistic forces of world communism, nevertheless, retain their great spirit of freedom and independence.

As one of the earliest independent states in Europe, Lithuania flourished and prospered as a nation of peaceful and freedom-loving people for several hundred years. Yet, in the 18th century the greed of large and powerful neighbors, in a struggle for the control of Europe, eventually resulted in the enslavement of this small country by Czarist Russia. Though these powerful forces erased the nation of Lithuania from the map of Europe, they could not extinguish the spirit of the people of Lithuania and their strong love of freedom. During the years to follow, the desire for liberty and the constant quest to regain the independence of their nation continued unabated, to be fulfilled after World War I by the establishment of the Lithuanian Republic.

For almost a quarter of a century Lithuania thrived as a nation of free and independent people, only to be overcome by the forces of communism at the outbreak of World War II. As in the past, the Lithuanian people are determined to withstand the forces of slavery and subjugation, and to assume again their rightful place among the people of the free world.

They continue to disregard the atheistic teachings of the Communist dictators. They strive to instill in their youth the great love of liberty, the way of life which recognizes the inalienable rights of man as an individual, and the teachings of God that nourish the spirit of all freedom loving people. Irrespective of what further adversity the future may hold, the Lithuanian people will continue to meet their responsibilities. The flame of liberty will continue to burn in their hearts. The soul of this brave nation will be true to the cause of the free world and, eventually, as in 1918, the independence of the Lithuanian nation will again become a reality.

Until that eventful day, these brave people can be assured of the continued steadfastness of their millions of friends in America. We will never forget the importance of this gallant nation to the economy of Europe, or of its many contributions to the culture of the Western World. Furthermore, the courage and the fortitude of these gallant people will continue to inspire us in our struggle to set men free; to make the world a better place in which to live and where future generations of all nations can live in harmony, peace, and freedom in accordance with God's principles.

Address by the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at Dinner of Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which was delivered by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States representative to the United Nations, at a dinner in Philadelphia, on Monday, February 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The size and importance of the State of Pennsylvania and of the city of Philadelphia are in themselves reason enough to make any man proud to be the speaker here tonight, particularly one who, like myself, has seen at firsthand what the influence of Pennsylvania can mean in national politics.

To this pleasure is added the gratification of speaking in a State which is represented in the United States Senate by two men with whom I have served.

The first is Senator EDWARD MARTIN, whose courtesy and patriotism and sincerity are well known to you. I have the finest recollections of my service with him.

And then, of course, it is a unique pleasure to take part in any affair in which JIM DUFF is interested, and Jim has told me of his interest in this dinner tonight. Knowing Jim as we all do, you will believe me when I say that he told me of this interest in no uncertain terms. Jim and I have not only been friends in the Senate, but the closest of fellow workers in the campaign to secure the Republican nomination for General Eisenhower. Without his brilliance and boldness, without his sure political instinct, and his vision, our campaign would not have gotten off the ground.

These then are some of my reasons for being glad to be in Pennsylvania. There is another one, and one which I think entitles all Pennsylvanians to congratulations, which is that our President is making a home for himself in this State in the historic town of Gettysburg.

Gettysburg not only suggests Pennsylvania; it not only suggests President Eisenhower; it also suggests Abraham Lincoln, the anniversary of whose birth we celebrate tonight. One of the things about Lincoln is that he is always up to date. He never grows old or stale. What he says is always modern and to the point.

He guided us through the worst tragedy in our history—for a civil war is the worst of all wars. He can help us today when the big fight in the world is not among ourselves but against the world menace of communism.

To appreciate Lincoln to the full we should realize some fine and unique things about our country—things which we should not take for granted—which were recently summarized by Professor Commager as follows: That we are now the oldest republic, the oldest federal system with the oldest written constitution in the world; that we have avoided a violent revolution from the right or from the left; that we have developed majority rule without impairing the rights of minorities; that we have remained moral without a state church; that we have established a system of universal education without the vulgarization of culture; that we have become a world power without imposing our will on other people; and that we have remained a single nation under one flag instead of fragmenting into a multiplicity of separate—and quarreling—nationalisms.

None of these achievements would have been possible without the leadership of Abraham Lincoln. It is due to him that we are one country today under one flag. It is thus due to him—and to those who laid down their lives at his call—that our country is today the great hope of lovers of freedom all over the world. It is therefore our duty to remember that by our actions, in Lincoln's own words, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

While Lincoln's wisdom and nobility of spirit are timeless and as fresh today as the day he expressed them, the march of science has not stood still. It was Lincoln who said that "all the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

That eventuality today is fortunately still highly unlikely. But we must recognize what modern science means—that for the first time since the Civil War was fought, a future war would be brought to our own soil. Ever since the Civil War our wars were all fought outside of the United States. If the tragedy of another war should occur, we in the United States would be the prime target.

National defense and foreign policy have always been the prime responsibility of the President, and this has never been truer than it is today. In 2 years as a member of the President's Cabinet and as the United States representative to the United Nations, I have been able to see at first hand how the President has discharged this duty, and I would like tonight to review briefly with you just 20 of the most important things that have happened in that time.

1. Last spring, world communism, having moved in on Guatemala, was getting ready for aggression into other parts of Central America. We discovered a 2,000-ton shipload of Communist arms being sneaked into Guatemala from Communist Poland. Then anti-Communist Guatemalans, exiled in Honduras, started a revolt to free their country from Soviet Communist domination.

Immediately, Moscow went into action. They asked for a session of the United Nations Security Council. You could see the close teamwork between the Soviets and their Communist Guatemalan stooges. They tried to get the Security Council to send so-called peace observers to Guatemala—with Communists among them, of course—the idea being to stop the revolt and save the pro-Communist regime. This was a bold Soviet bid to torpedo the Monroe Doctrine, and gain a decisive foothold for communism in our

hemisphere. They wanted to make the United Nations Security Council an accessory to their crime.

But we met that challenge head-on in the Security Council in New York—and we defeated it. Communism in Guatemala, as a result, went down the drain. Today Guatemala is once again securely in the free world, once again a loyal member of the Inter-American system, and the Monroe Doctrine remains intact to shield our hemisphere against any outside aggressor.

2. At Caracas, Venezuela, last March, the American Republics agreed to act together against international Communist subversion in our hemisphere, just as they would against military aggression. Thus the Monroe Doctrine has not only been preserved—it has been applied to cope with the realities of our time.

3. In Costa Rica last month a living reality was made of the provisions of the Rio Pact, the purpose of which is to maintain peace in our hemisphere by common action.

4. Moving across the Atlantic to Europe, we see today a new hope for freedom in the London agreement, which has now been ratified by the French National Assembly, on the delicate and vital problem of rearming West Germany. When the old plan for a European Defense Community was defeated we didn't sulk or despair. We moved at once with the other nations most concerned to find a new way to put German military power on the side of freedom—and to end the Franco-German division which has been called the world's worst fire hazard.

The result is the London and Paris agreements, which will give back sovereignty to West Germany, give her an army to help defend Europe, and make her a member of the North Atlantic team. What an historic achievement it will be to get France and Germany solidly together as effective partners in defending Europe against communism. Now it looks more and more certain that a major start toward that goal has been made, in spite of increasingly frantic Communist maneuvers to stop it. The tact and initiative of Secretary Dulles deserve a large share of the credit for this.

5. Another happy development in Europe is the settlement at last of the quarrel between Italy and Yugoslavia over the port of Trieste—a quarrel in which at one time the troops of both sides were almost ready to march. Italy gets the port city and the two countries divide up the outlying districts. The end of that dispute means a much more solid front against Soviet pressure in the Mediterranean. It's a new element of strength for the free world, and American diplomacy had a big hand in bringing it to pass.

Let us move to the Middle East—a vital area in the struggle with communism. For one thing, it contains the world's biggest reserves of oil—which is vital in our strategy. For another thing, it consists mainly of young nations, most of them colonies of Europe not long ago, whose people are often suspicious of the Western World. Communism would dearly love to get a foothold there. In this area we have had a whole series of successes for the cause of freedom.

6. There is a new defense pact between Pakistan on the east and Turkey on the west. Other nations may join that soon, implementing what Secretary Dulles calls the "northern tier" concept to shield the Middle East from Soviet aggression.

7. We have new agreements with Pakistan and Iraq to strengthen their defense.

8. The knotty problem of how Iran is to sell her oil in the world has at last been solved and thus a chance for Soviet pressure and manipulation has been removed.

9. Then in Egypt, with constant American encouragement, an agreement was reached with Britain last year on defense of the Suez Canal—which means an end to still another trouble spot where, only a short time ago, both sides were getting ready to fight it out if necessary.

10. And meanwhile, in the United Nations Security Council and elswhere, we have worked successfully with both Israel and the Arab countries to see that the peace there is not broken, although all the problems have certainly not been solved. So in the Middle East, which was a dangerously weak link in our defense against communism 2 years ago, we have now a very promising sight—the growth of a strong international structure in which freedom can develop and defend itself.

In the Far East we must cope with an aggressive communism which is still pushing outward from the Soviet Union and Communist China and with the attitude of countries like India which insist that their foreign policy can be impartial between communism and freedom.

11. The first gain in the Orient came when we ended the Korean fighting and stopped communism dead in its tracks. We have as a result been able to take four American divisions out of Korea and put them in our strategic reserve for use wherever they may be needed.

12. We gave effect to the priceless principle that no Chinese or Korean prisoner of war would have to go back to communism against his will, as a result of which the overwhelming proportion of these prisoners, nearly 50,000 of them, are free men today.

13. There has been no final peace settlement in Korea, because the Communists don't want one, as they proved at Geneva this spring, where they frustrated all Korean proposals and vilified the United Nations at the same time. But we have kept the record straight, and in the United Nations we made sure that in any peace negotiations on Korea the Soviet Union would appear where it belongs—on the Communist side of the table and not as a neutral.

14. In Indochina settlement has been reached to end the bloodshed. It was a sad settlement in many ways, but it was certainly better than continuing a war which couldn't be won without American divisions doing the fighting—and we did not want to send our young manhood to fight in those mountains and rice paddies. The situation in that area is still perilous, and is one which cannot be successfully dealt with exclusively by military methods. We are not just standing by wringing our hands; we are over there helping free Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to get on their own feet and stay free.

15. For the first time we have the beginning of a strong free Asia organization in the Manila Pact, which was signed by eight nations last September. The area it defends stretches from Pakistan to the Philippines. This pact is directed against both armed attack and Communist subversion, and it contains an historic declaration for freedom for the peoples of the Asian and Pacific area.

United States leadership played a tremendous part in that historic Manila Pact. In this treaty plus the new defense treaties with free Korea and free China, we have an emerging pattern of real defense for freedom in Asia. But we have more than that. We have a new start toward a community of Asian nations which stand on their own feet. These nations are seeing more and more clearly that the old colonialism to which they are accustomed is giving way to a new age of freedom, and that the great threat to that new age is not from Europe and the West but from the new Communist colonial system that seeks to enslave people under false banners of so-called liberation.

16. Communist China has been put on notice by the President, with the backing of the Congress, that we will not tolerate aggression against Formosa and the Pescadores. This courageous and timely move is our best insurance against a full-scale war in that area.

17. The United Nations General Assembly, by a vote of 47 to 5 last December, condemned Red China's imprisonment of 11 American fliers on false charges, and took the responsibility to seek release of all United Nations Command prisoners still held by the Communists in violation of the Korean armistice agreement. Thus the United Nations has shown that it believes in the elemental decencies and seeks to look after its own. I believe we will get our men back, and I believe that the General Assembly's action will have been a big step in that direction.

18. Communist China's attempts to get into various United Nations bodies have been voted down every time; a total of 25 times since I have been there.

19. Americans employed by the United Nations have been screened in accordance with FBI procedures for the good and sufficient reason that where there are so many good Americans to choose from, there is no excuse whatever for employing one single American Communist.

20. The high point at the United Nations was President Eisenhower's dramatic plan to set up a world pool of fissionable materials so that humanity may receive the great benefits of the peacetime uses of atomic energy. This plan had seized the imagination of the world so strongly that even the Soviet Union didn't dare vote "no"—and the resolution endorsing it passed the General Assembly by 60 to 0.

To sum up—in 2 years, faced with the unrelenting pressure of communism, we have had bold forward steps and great diplomatic successes for the cause of freedom in every quarter of the globe. We have seen success in Guatemala and Costa Rica, in getting a real start on bringing West Germany into the North Atlantic Organization, in settling the Trieste problem, in the defense pacts involving Pakistan, Turkey, and Iraq, in the Iranian oil settlement, in Egypt, in Korea, in the Southeast Asia pact, and at the United Nations—particularly in the world acclaim given to the President's proposal for the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

I often think that the ending of that dreadful war in Korea in itself is enough to cause us to be thankful—even if all these other good things had not been accomplished. Just the thought that our boys are not being killed any more makes me grateful.

It all adds up to this—that for the first time since World War II there is no large-scale fighting going on anywhere in the world. Of course the situation is precarious and peace is not established on a durable basis. But for the first time we and other nations, instead of rushing from one emergency to another, have begun to settle down confidently to the long haul to defend and strengthen peace and freedom.

It is curious in the face of this record to hear voices raised which complain that the United States world position has somehow weakened in the past 2 years. Hearing these voices calls to mind the fact that we have in the State Department and in the White House two Americans who, leaving out of account all their other qualifications, have been thinking about and dealing with America's relationship to the outside world all of their lives.

John Foster Dulles has been working actively in the foreign affairs field since he was a very young man. From the time he was in college his ambition was to become Secretary of State and he has trained himself deliberately for this work. As one of his close associates, I appreciate this opportunity to pay tribute to his wisdom, his cleverness, his patience, and the deep-seated goodness of his nature.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, as a young Army officer in the Philippines, was dealing at the

very highest level with the Philippine leaders of those days and with others on matters which directly affected the United States world position. Later, in World War II and again in the NATO command, as Cardinal Spellman said recently, the American people entrusted him with our two most precious possessions—our liberties and our youth. His success in those great tasks depended directly on his understanding of foreign relations and his insight into the minds of foreign peoples.

Similar thoughts come to mind in connection with national defense. At the present time we have more air groups ready for action than we have ever had before in time of peace—real air groups, not paper ones. We have better than 121 combat-ready air groups today. In 1952 there were 103 groups, but many of them were not equipped with modern aircraft and would not have been effective in combat.

Thanks to the fact that the American people had the good judgment to put our foremost military expert in the White House, we have eliminated much waste from the armed services, yet we are actually getting more defense.

The newspaperman, Holmes Alexander, wrote some paragraphs recently about our President which I would like to quote:

"On a short-term, day-to-day basis, America's best natural resource for 1955 is Dwight David Eisenhower, the good gray rock to which, as it sometimes seems, the Nation's sanity is anchored.

"Only a moderate, as he calls himself politically, could have tapered us off the Fair Deal jag; only a public hero with a puritanical conscience would have accepted the popular power now in one man's hands without abusing it; only a five-star military officer would have the nerve and the knowledge to reduce the Armed Forces—as Ike intends to keep on doing—in the face of real danger and of phony danger—the latter raised like a goblin's head by certain Congress people, the military columnists, the munitions makers, and the Pentagon chiefs, who year after year lobby for more men and more armaments.

"But the vein of gold in this Eisenhower lode is not his politics, experience, or expert knowledge; it's his personal character."

Mr. Chairman, I conclude.

We believe in our wonderful two-party system because competition in politics makes for better politics just as competition in business makes for better business. We in particular are proud of the Republican record of service. But modern Americans do not believe that the party system should be carried to the point where it destroys the national unity.

The big fight today is not between Republicans and Democrats.

In this dangerous world the big fight is between us Americans with our allies who love freedom on the one side and, on the other side, the Communist rulers who would destroy us. This was true when Stalin ruled in Moscow; it was true when Malendov succeeded him; it is true today; and prudence demands that we expect it to be true in the future.

This means unity at home.

But it does not mean monolithic uniformity. It does not mean the suppression of honest disagreement. It means that our disagreements must be sincere and not inspired by political motives. It means that our opinions, whether we agree or not, must be inspired by what Lincoln in his first inaugural address called "the better angels of our nature."

When we see the kind of administration which the President is giving this country—its enlightenment, its generosity, its fundamental decency, and its effectiveness in behalf of our people in our domestic affairs; when we consider its skill, its prudence, and its vision in leading us in the dreadful struggle brought on by world communism, it is natural for us to exclaim that we would like to see Dwight D. Eisenhower as our President without any limit as to time. I predict that the people will not allow him to retire and will surely insist on his serving for another 4 years. In bringing about peace and at the same time preserving prosperity, he has already done what many thought was impossible. The American people know when they have something good, and they have that something good in Dwight Eisenhower.

Just as Lincoln, whose name we revere tonight, was the right man for the tragic crisis of the Civil War, so is President Eisenhower the man to lead us in this perilous struggle with world communism.

The Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech which I delivered at the commissioning exercises of the 12th officer candidate class, United States Marine Corps, Quantico, Va., on February 19, 1955. The address is entitled "The Roll of the Military in American Foreign Policy."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana)

An elected official can hardly expect universal approval of his position on every issue. Almost invariably some people will agree with him and others will disagree, sometimes very vehemently. And I must say that a Member of Congress pricked by public criticism bleeds at least as profusely as any other human being.

In a decade and a half of service in Congress, I have been on sick call for this reason on a number of occasions. I have learned to accept occasional wounds as a part of my job, as an occupational hazard.

There is one issue, however, which I have repeatedly tackled in Congress and have repeatedly come out, not licking my wounds but miraculously unscathed. That issue is the preservation of the integrity of the Marine Corps.

While Members of Congress must out of conviction sometimes run counter to the immediate flow of public opinion, it is not a very pleasant experience. It is always preferable, if you can do so honestly, to find yourself flowing downstream with public sentiment rather than struggling upstream, half-drowned, against it.

Beyond the natural gratification which comes to an elected official when he finds his own heart and the public pulse beating in perfect unison—beyond that, I have a special pleasure in fighting for the integrity of the corps. As a marine, I take personal pride in the marines. Of course, I also take personal pride in the Army and the Navy, as an exmember of each of those services. But I think I may be pardoned if I tend to be a little prouder of my marine background. I was only a private in the Army. I was only a seaman, second class, in the Navy. But with that same perceptiveness which prompted the Marine Corps to recognize your qualities of leadership the corps also recognized mine. I emerged from my hitch in the Marines as a Pfc.

That distinction, I realize, does not, in itself, qualify me to speak to you on the Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy. Nevertheless, I feel that the subject is of such great importance that it should be considered not only by privates—buck or first class—and Senators, but by thoughtful Americans throughout the Nation. I think it is an especially pertinent one for you men who are graduating today into command positions in the corps. The Marines have traditionally operated with high effectiveness as a principal military instrument of this Nation's foreign policy during peacetime just as they have more than once proved their tremendous capabilities when the peace has been violated.

One explanation for this outstanding service may well be that the corps has always maintained a strict professional regard for the American principle of civilian control of military power. That principle, as I am sure you have been taught, is absolutely essential for the proper functioning of our system of government. It is not enough that Congress determines appropriations and organizational arrangements, and that the President and his civilian assistants direct the administrative management of the military. The American concept goes further. It requires that the military shall only be used whenever, wherever, and in whatever manner the politically responsible civilian leadership shall determine, because only that leadership, through elections, can be held accountable to the people of the Nation.

In the present state of world affairs, a system of civilian control is not easily maintained. It is subject to all the stresses and strains that arise from the tense international situation. In a crisis, with the threat of world conflict ever present, it is not unnatural to turn to distinguished military leaders for guidance, to rely heavily on their judgment, and sometimes it is profitable to the Nation to do so. Nevertheless, the principle of civilian control remains essential to democratic government as we know it.

Primary responsibility for the preservation of this principle rests with our civilian leadership; that leadership must be willing to assume the heavy responsibilities of decision in this dangerous world. But I think you will agree that considerable responsibility also rests with the military. They must understand and accept the limits as well as the challenges of their profession in the conduct of the Nation's affairs, particularly its foreign affairs.

Perhaps I can illustrate this point with an anecdote. During the Civil War, the story goes, certain Members of Congress left their desks in Washington and went to the battlefields in Virginia. There they insisted upon assuming the tactical command of the Union forces. After having thrown the campaign into confusion they beat a hasty retreat to Washington where they arrived mud-spattered, trembling, and presumably chastised.

If the story is amusing, it is because it is easy to recognize the absurdity of this escapade. These Congressmen apparently assumed that their training in politics equipped them to run the Army. They also distorted and distended the functions of their office out of all true proportion.

The moral of the story is simple enough: Congressmen ought not to assume that political training provides an automatic background for military leadership and, in military affairs, their role ought not to exceed the constitutional powers of their office.

Let us put the shoe on the other foot. The moral is now this: Military leaders ought not to assume that military training provides an automatic background for politics, whether national or international, and they ought not

in the formulation and conduct of foreign policy exceed the powers of their appointive office.

Just as the distorted behavior of the Congressmen in the Civil War could have produced tragic results as easily as humorous, so too can the distorted behavior of military leaders.

It has never been easy to draw a clear line as to the area of competence and authority of the armed services in foreign policy. Events of the past 15 years have made it even more difficult. First of all, during this period, some among us, civilian and military alike, have developed a distorted sense of the nature of what this country is trying to do in its relations with other nations and how it can most effectively go about doing it. Foreign policy is simply the course by which we attempt to provide for the safety of the Nation and the advancement of its interests in a complex and dangerous world. That is its only reason for being. To carry out our policy we require military strength but we must also bring into play nonmilitary instruments and measures to influence conditions throughout the world. Possibly it is because these nonmilitary measures are less dramatic, less newsworthy, and tend to affect us and our families less directly, that we sometimes lose our perspective and regard them as less important than military actions. Sometimes there is a tendency to view nonmilitary measures merely as supplements of our military policy, when in fact the reverse is closer to the truth.

You men need hardly to be reminded of this fact. If you know the history of the corps, you know that the marines have been sent to foreign territories and to overseas bases only from time to time and only after the failure of other methods to protect American citizens and interests. In countless day-to-day situations arising in our foreign relations throughout the world the military instrument is in no way involved.

As for any large scale use of force, it is only when nonmilitary measures fail to produce situations favorable to the vital security interests of the United States, that such use may become necessary. Even then we have invoked military force only in response to aggression. That we have waited for our enemy to show beyond all shadow of doubt that he intends to strike us, rather than strike the first blow ourselves, does not mean that we are slow-witted or even patient. It means simply that we are following a fundamental American principle: that force is the final, not the first arbiter in the affairs of men and nations. Nothing has done more to toughen the moral fiber of this country than that principle. No other single factor has served to sustain our morale during the long and gruelling wars which we have had to fight. Nothing has done more to turn the hearts and hopes of mankind to this Nation. And I hope the day never comes when this Nation shall use its might in any way other than for protection against the arrogant, the aggressive, and the ruthless.

The role of the military in foreign policy, then, is to provide a reserve of power to support negotiations concerning our just interests in the world and to defend those interests if they are attacked. I want to underline the words "reserve and support." Responsibility for determining what our interests are and when and how they are to be defended is vested in the President and his Secretary of State. The Department of Defense and other agencies of the Government, in the performance of their duties have an influence in this determination, but final responsibility cannot rest in any body other than the Department of State or the President himself.

Since the beginning of World War II, however, the role of the military in American foreign policy has assumed proportions of great magnitude. During the war the armed services inevitably became the foremost element in carrying our American policy. Since the close of those hostilities the services have continued to serve prominently in this connection, due to the nature of postwar diplomacy and developments.

The occcupation of Germany and Japan, and the control of trust territories, among other things, has brought the armed services directly into foreign policy to a degree unprecedented in peacetime. To some extent, the same was true of the so-called Truman doctrine of 1947. Under the Truman Doctrine, the Armed Forces not only ran military training missions to strengthen the security of Greece and Turkey against Communist aggression, but of necessity played a significant role in the formulation of policy with respect to those countries. Subsequently, they have had an enormous influence in foreign policy in connection with NATO, mutual aid and military assistance missions in numerous countries, the Korean war, overseas bases, and treaties with nations in the western Pacific.

I think that one of the chief problems emanating from this chain of developments is that in many instances there has been a tendency to treat individual military programs and policies as separate and distinct military affairs, whereas they actually are parts of the totality of American foreign policy. Responsibility for decision making has at times been vested in military officials rather than in foreign-policy officials. In other instances there has been a failure to define and clarify lines of responsibility for policy formulation. I say this, not so much in criticism as in recognition of the fact. It is unlikely that anyone planned it that way; it has simply happened—perhaps largely because it was not planned.

The obscuring of the lines of responsibility and authority is perhaps best illustrated in the issuance of public statements by leaders of the armed services. Such statements are usually expressed in military terminology. Often, however, much of their substance is of a foreign-policy nature. Perhaps this is unavoidable in view of the complexity of the matters with which they frequently deal. One cannot always draw a clear-cut line between military and political and other factors in a given situation.

The question of rearming Germany will serve to illustrate this point, and this example finds a counterpart in practically every other major foreign policy issue with which we are confronted. There are strong military reasons for urging the rearmament of Germany and it is natural for military personnel to see the need in terms of added divisions of manpower, bases, etc. But Germany cannot be rearmed in a vacuum. Rearmament cannot be divorced from a whole range of problems concerning European unity, the fears of France, the role of Britain on the Continent, the reunification of Germany, and the maintenance of the Western Alliance. It seems to me, therefore, that official statements on this subject under our system of government emanate best from our foreign policy officials. They are presumably kept well informed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the military considerations involved and they in turn are best equipped to view such considerations and to express them publicly in terms of the totality of American interests.

I cite this example merely to illustrate the problem of defining the role of the military in American foreign policy. It is not difficult to see the principal reason for the expansion of military participation in foreign policymaking. As I mentioned earlier, the nature of wartime and postwar developments and diplomacy has required a vastly increased use of the military as an instrument of policy.

There is, however, still another factor. The military emerged from the war with great prestige, both at home and abroad, and this prestige has carried over into the postwar period. On the international scene this has led to widespread use of prominent military leaders in diplomatic capacities. At various periods since the close of World War II three of our foremost military leaders during the war have served in positions which were more political than military and which roughly corresponded to their wartime military roles—General Eisenhower as NATO commander, General MacArthur in charge of the occupation of Japan, and General Marshall as Secretary of State. Each of these distinguished military leaders had earned the respect of foreign nations, as well as the American people, through their outstanding military service. Each made an exceptional contribution in their postwar assignments.

Other military leaders have also been called upon for diplomatic or political services—Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Under Secretary of State, and Adm. Alan Kirk, who served as Ambassador to Belgium and Ambassador to the Soviet Union, are two leading examples. I could name two dozen other former generals and admirals now holding civilian positions in the Federal Government. Countless others of field grade are scattered through the civilian bureaucracies of the Federal Government concerned with foreign affairs and international organizations.

This increased use of military leaders in position of a diplomatic or political nature, of course, has often been due not only to carryover of the military prestige of these men but also to their demonstrated ability as well as their availability for such service.

Without in any way reflecting on the capacity of any individual, I do think that the vast expansion in the employment of military personnel in both the making and carrying out of foreign policy is something to which we should give some serious thought. It raises questions not only with respect to our basic values but also with respect to our basic foreign-policy objectives, including our military security.

First, let me say something about the question which I think this trend poses concerning our basic values.

Military officers are not different from anyone else in this country. They come from representative families all over the Nation; they go to the same grade schools and high schools; they hold the same social and religious values. But the military profession exacts from those who pursue it a higher measure of self-sacrifice in the public interest than most other professions. The military as a group must accept a higher degree of training, conditioning, and disciplining toward one objective—to provide military protection for the Nation. That is as it should be and those who enter the profession, like you men today, understand these conditions.

Like any other professional group the military in their dedication to their primary objective may tend to lose sight of other national objectives. It appears to me, consequently, that when the military in fact make policy decisions or when military techniques are excessively applied to carry out policies which can be more appropriately handled by civilian techniques, we are in danger of having military objectives and values emphasized at the expense of other, broader national objectives and values.

With respect to our basic foreign policy objectives, including military security itself, the expansion of the military role in foreign policy poses some more immediate dangers. Responsibility for our entire foreign policy, which is concerned with international economic, cultural, and political relations, as well as with military affairs, is vested in our Secretary of State. Our military objectives have no meaning in themselves except as

they tend to further our nonmilitary objectives. If they are given an independent meaning, if they become ends in themselves, we could easily be led into costly adventures which would only add to the financial and human burdens of the American people and which might ultimately result in widespread public reaction against the military. The best way to avoid a distorted emphasis on military objectives, the way that is provided under our constitutional system, is to require that final authority in foreign policy decision making remain unequivocally with the Secretary of State under the President of the United States.

In terms of our military security specifically, as distinguished from the wider range of foreign policy, it appears to me that a further danger exists. Our military experts may weaken their professional stature through overanxious acceptance of an increased role in policy matters.

In recent years military leaders have been brought into the limelight of public discussions of foreign policy largely as a result of their well-earned public prestige. Civilian political leaders have tended to rely heavily on this prestige gained through military accomplishments in order to support policies affecting our foreign policy. Generals and admirals have been called upon or sent to testify regularly before congressional committees, not only in connection with military appropriations and matters affecting the individual services, but also in connection with broad issues of policy, such as economic assistance programs and international alliances. Military officials, moreover, frequently discuss political issues—not necessarily partisan political issues, but issues of a political nature—at public appearances and press conferences. I may say at this point that the Marine Corps has been singularly free of this type of affliction. To the best of my knowledge, the leadership of the corps has successfully resisted the temptation to assert its expertness verbally and publicly not only in military matters but over the whole range of human affairs. Only an elected official, constantly beckoned by the siren call of the press, radio, and television, can appreciate the extraordinary degree of self-control that this represents. It is one more reason for me to be proud of my personal connection with the corps.

Now what is the danger to our security inherent in the exposure of military leaders—whether sought or unsought—to the political conflicts of the day? It is this: Military leaders who are so exposed will find themselves in agreement with one side of a political issue and at odds with the other. They will be applauded by political leaders whose position they uphold and looked upon with suspicion by their opponents. When military officers become subjects of partisan politics they are no longer viewed as unbiased, objective career servants, nor will their military judgments be accepted as those of politically disinterested professional experts. From that, it is only one step to the loss of confidence in the military judgment of our military leaders.

This central problem was clearly illustrated prior to the last presidential election when a Senator publicly called for a change in the membership of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He had, he said lost confidence in their judgment. The new administration, moreover, subsequently did appoint new Joint Chiefs of Staff to take a new look at the military program. Surely we cannot have Republican generals and admirals for one administration and Democratic generals and admirals for the next without danger to the national security.

Now, possibly as never before, we cannot afford to play politics with our security. No political party, and no faction of a party, stands in the long run to benefit from military insecurity in this country. Certainly, the armed services as a whole do not.

In mentioning this tendency of some military officers to slip into or to be drawn into the political orbit of our system of government, I do not wish to imply that the military experts should have no contact with Congress. Certainly Congress has a right to know what our military experts think about military matters under consideration in Congress. The danger lies, not in this, but in military officers being employed as experts outside the area of their special competence in support of or in opposition to policy matters concerning which political and not military decision must be made.

There is no easy solution to this problem. Part of the answer lies in the restraint which civilian leaders must exercise to avoid placing military officials on the spot in political issues. Part of the answer must also lie in the fortitude with which military leaders resist the temptation to project themselves into nonmilitary questions.

This problem may seem remote to you men now, but within a short span of years as your careers unfold it may well become for some of you a most pressing and difficult one.

As I mentioned earlier, responsibility for maintaining the proper civilian-military balance in our system of government must be shared by both our military leaders and our civilian political leadership. The military must exercise the utmost restraint in policy matters, and our civilian leadership must be willing to take full responsibility for political decisions.

In foreign relations we need constantly to keep in mind the essential relationship of military force to total foreign policy. Military leaders as well as civilian foreign-policy officials must understand the supporting role of military force. Military resources, like other tools of foreign policy, must be available to our politically accountable civilian policymakers when, where, and under conditions prescribed by those policymakers. It is incumbent upon our policymakers that they should take full advantage of military advice; but when the time for decision-making comes, the civilian policymaker must make the choice and take full responsibility for that choice.

How can we preserve this principle and at the same time provide for our own military security? There are no hard and fast rules. There is only commonsense and a few guideposts appropriate to the present state of world affairs.

First, it is essential that we maintain the necessary military strength to meet the threat of Communist aggression.

At the same time, however, every effort should be made to use nonmilitary measures to conduct foreign policy wherever possible. They are less costly and often they can produce beneficial results that are more lasting in their effects. If we are to pursue them successfully, however, we must learn that every nonmilitary action in foreign policy is not an act of appeasement.

I would also suggest that if it becomes clear that we are tending away, rather than toward, a general war, we profit from long years of experience and place greater reliance on the Marine Corps as the military force to support our diplomacy in foreign policy. In saying this I am fully aware of the basic need for a multiservice fighting force in modern warfare. We share, I know, a great pride in the Marines and believe them capable of extraordinary feats. But we must admit that the corps has not yet rendered the Army, Navy, and Air Force obsolete.

Nevertheless, I still believe that the proper way to fight "brush fires" in various parts of the world is not with the forces trained for general warfare, but with the specially trained self-sustaining, combat-ready forces of the Marine Corps. No other military group is so well suited to immediate service in any part of the world. No other group is more competent to keep the expenditure of force close to the requirements for achieving limited objectives.

Finally, I want to say that the most important element in the preservation of the principle of civilian control of American foreign policy is to require that our civilian foreign-policy officials take full responsibility for decisions affecting foreign policy.

Your share in maintaining the proper role of the military in foreign policy is, it seems to me, to keep in mind that every action you take in your official capacities has a bearing on the foreign relations of the Nation. You will either contribute to the safety and well-being of the United States or you will detract from it; you cannot be neutral. And if you would contribute to it, as I know you wish to do, then you will maintain always a high sense of patriotic and professional responsibility in the fulfillment of your duties. You will find your personal satisfactions in your profession by understanding your part in the perspective of the corps, in the larger perspective of the armed services, and in the perspective of the total interests of our country.

The Decade Since Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I delivered before the Western States Meat Packers Association in San Francisco on Friday last, February 18, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE WESTERN STATES MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, FEBRUARY 18, 1955

THE DECADE SINCE YALTA

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, 10 years ago 2 conferences of far-reaching significance took place. The first was Yalta held from February 4 to 11, 1945. Its locale was the Crimean Peninsula within the Soviet Union.

Three great powers were represented. These were the United States of America, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union.

The second one was the United Nations Conference held in San Francisco from April 25 to June 26, 1945. At that time 50 nations signed the charter and since then 10 additional nations have done so bringing the total membership to 60.

In that same 10-year period of time to which I have referred, international communism has increased its power, its area and its population. Ten years ago at this time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today over 800 million people live under the most ruthless, godless tyranny the world has ever known.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of free men largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government

of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, United States) mutual-defense pact and mutual-defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate this month.

The Manila pact covering Southeast Asia was ratified on Tuesday, February 1, by a vote of 82 to 1, and the one with the Republic of China on Wednesday, February 9, by a vote of 64 to 6. These two ratifications were preceded by congressional action in support of the joint resolution recommended by the President authorizing him to use the Armed Forces of the United States in defense of Formosa, the Pescadores, and additional areas now in friendly hands that might be deemed important for the proper defense of the main bastion of Formosa.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the resolution by a vote of 410 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific and lay the groundwork for a conference which would have all the unfortunate results of a Munich, a Yalta or a Geneva wherein the aggressor gains his objectives at the conference table.

Unfortunately, the history of these conferences has been that it is always the free world that gives up territory and surrenders human beings to the control of the Communists. It is never the other way around wherein the enslaved people gain their freedom.

It becomes pertinent, therefore, to examine the various proposals that have been made and what their implications are.

In order to deal with these matters, however, let us first examine the Yalta conference and the significance it had in the events which followed.

At Yalta without the knowledge or consent of the American people or the American Congress, an agreement was entered into which on its face violated the Atlantic Charter declaration and was fatally damaging to our friend and ally, the Republic of China.

Years later, in testimony, Alger Hiss, who had been one of the members of the American delegation stated:

"It is an accurate and not immodest statement to say that I helped formulate the Yalta agreement to some extent.".

1. The agreement undercut the free Polish Government in exile and resulted in solidifying the power of the Lublin Communist Polish Government.

2. It carved out of Poland a slice of territory and gave the blessing of Great Britain and the United States on this territorial addition to the Soviet Union.

3. It provided for the use of German labor in the Soviet Union and under Kremlin practices this is closely akin to slave labor.

4. It laid the foundation for the turning over of large numbers of non-Communist Russians to the Soviet Union. Vast numbers of these were executed or sent to slave labor camps in Siberia.

5. It provided that certain areas within the Republic of China should be turned over to the Soviet Union as part of a deal to bring them into the Japanese war though they had twice before promised to come in prior to the Crimean Conference. These included the ports of Dairen and Port Arthur; gave the Soviet Union its former economic rights in the China Eastern Railroad and South Manchuria Railroad; guaranteed the status quo in outer Monogolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) and pledged that President Roosevelt "will take measures to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin." It did this without the knowledge or consent of the Government of the Republic of China or its President Chiang Kai-shek. It further pledged "the heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan had been defeated."

With sort of a grim humor the Yalta agreement protocol regarding the Far East concluded by stating:

"For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the Nationalist Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance. * * *"

It was not until many months later that either the Government of China or the Congress of the United States found out the terms of this agreement. The foundation laid by this agreement has contributed greatly to the loss of freedom in Eastern Europe and in China.

Under the terms of the Yalta agreement the Soviet Union did come into the war against Japan. They came in 5 days before the Japanese surrendered and occupied Manchuria and North Korea. In North Korea they promptly laid the groundwork for a divided country and the ultimate events leading to the outbreak of the Korean war which was precipitated by their satellite North Korean Communist government.

In China, despite the Soviet pledges regarding its dealings with the Republic of China, the Soviet Union proceeded to arm and equip the Chinese Communists under the leadership of Chou En-lai and Mao Tse Tung by allowing them to take over the stocks of captured Japanese equipment estimated to have been sufficient to arm and equip 1 million men for 5 years.

While much more could be said, the sorry story of Yalta gives a clear understanding of why the Communist world wants to get us involved in another conference through which they can gain their objectives.

Now let us turn to the San Francisco United Nations conference of 10 years ago.

World War II had not yet terminated. The people of the world did not know that we were on the threshold of the atomic age through those high in Government had reason to believe a vast new power that ultimately could be used for destructive or constructive purposes was soon to be unveiled.

Hopes were high everywhere that the Soviet Union, though a dictatorship, had learned the folly of aggression and of war and because of the vast help given by the free world to them they would be willing to help establish a system of international law and order to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

Unfortunately, both during the San Francisco Conference and in the 10 years that have followed, a vast propaganda effort has taken place to build the United Nations into something which its charter provisions could not or did not permit it to become. In the United Nations different people envisioned different things.

Some envisioned it as a mighty force of collective security that would rally most of the nations of the world to resist aggression and preserve the peace. In moments of oratorical fancy some even suggested that the fact the United Nations was in being would warrant free nations to scrap most, if not all, of their armed forces and place their reliance upon the police power of the United Nations and the collective moral persuasion of that organization. On June 25, 1950, this concept was shattered shortly after it appeared to be confirmed.

When the Communist forces crossed the 38th parallel, the United Nations Security Council promptly acted and first called upon the Communist aggressor to cease the aggression. The Communists, of course, forthwith showed they were not impressed by a United Nations resolution or the adverse moral reaction of that organization. The Security Council next called on the 60 members of that organization to give aid and support to the victim of the aggression, the Republic of Korea.

What is the record on this? After 3 years of the Korean war, of the 60 members of the United Nations, only 17 contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression. Outside of the United States of America, the other 16 contributed armed forces in the amount of 45,000. The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000 and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Korean threater of war. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, supplied over 600,000.

This means that of the United Nations members the United States of America supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources.

When the forces of the Republic of Korea, not being a member of the United Nations (having been kept out by a Soviet veto), are added to those of the United States, it means that our two nations alone supplied better than 95 percent of the manpower.

Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

With that example are you prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer likewise must be in the negative.

Has the time not come for a realistic appraisal of just what part the United Nations is qualified to play and to stop kidding ourselves into believing it is something it is not, and in my judgment, cannot be?

There are some who have envisioned the United Nations as a world state to which openly or clandestinely, individual nations would surrender their sovereignty. Some of the more enthusiastic proponents of this type of superstate compared the San Francisco meeting with that of our own Constitutional convention at Philadelphia. Of course, the two gatherings are not comparable for the building of a government upon which man might depend for the protection of his life, his liberty, his economic, and his intellectual freedom.

In the first place, those who met at Philadelphia spoke a common language and had a common heritage. True, they had come from different areas of the world, but they or their predecessors had come seeking a new way of life, freedom from old-world tyranny or a desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

They had fought a common battle against the mightiest empire of that time. They had carried over from the old country the background of the Magna Carta and of representative government. They had had experience, some of it not too satisfactory, under the Articles of Confederation, and with that background, under what I believe was divine inspiration, drafted the greatest document produced by the mind and hand of man for his self-government and protection of his rights. A little more realistic understanding of the history of the nations gathered in San Francisco should have made it clear that the organization could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government.

There is no common language or common heritage. Nations which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience. Nations of less than 1 million have equal representation with those of over 300 million. The

Soviet Union, which is perhaps the most tyrannical government since Western civilization entered the modern era, sits as an equal partner with nations with long-established constitutions of law, order, and a respect of the rights of man. Now, there are those who urge the admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean war. This, together with the other Communist states, would give that system of tyranny over 800 million people that they claim to speak for.

As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guaranties of freedom under our Constitution being diluted or modified directly or indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions.

Lest we be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late wherein we have been taken, I believe that every candidate for public office—executive, legislative, or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue.

The United Nations, if it does not destroy its moral position by actions which I shall mention, does have a function it could perform. It could be a forum wherein the views of the free world and the Communist world might be aired to the benefit of the peoples of the world, provided that there was assurance the debates in the General Assembly or the Security Council were receiving as widespread coverage behind the Iron Curtain as they do in the free nations of the world. Otherwise it becomes a vast propaganda forum for the Communist world wherein the point of view of the West does not have the equal opportunity to get to the people in the Soviet Union and its satellites because of the strict censorship those governments exercise.

Even in regard to its position of moral leadership, the United Nations has allowed itself to become seriously compromised.

Following the intervention of Communist China into the Korean war, the United Nations, after great hesitation, declared Communist China the aggressor. There had been no such hesitation when the small aggressor Communist Korea crossed the 38th parallel in June of 1950.

To close observers this seemed to indicate that there would be alacrity to pass a resolution and to act against a small aggressor, but there would be procrastination and delay in acting against a large aggressor. This seemed to be an abandonment of principle for expediency.

Later, when the evidence was conclusive that the Soviet Union was not only giving moral support to Communist aggression in Korea but was supplying MIG planes, tanks, artillery, ammunition, and other weapons in clear violation of the United Nations resolution and the charter of the organization no steps were taken to expel the Soviet Union from the United Nations.

Later on, the official representative of the Soviet Union baldly and boldly admitted the fact that such support had been given and in effect defied the United Nations to do anything about it. They did nothing.

Every member of the United Nations knows that the terms of the Korean armistice have been violated on numerous occasions. The Neutral Nations Commission is not allowed to function in Communist North Korea as it was intended though they have complete freedom in the area of the free Republic of Korea. In violation of the terms of the armistice the Communists have brought in equipment and built military air fields.

The most flagrant violation has been the admitted holding of 15 members of the American Air Force, 11 of whom have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years. Under the terms of the armistice it was required that all prisoners of war who wanted to be returned should be allowed to do so.

There is strong reason to believe that there are at least several hundred additional United Nations and United States prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the armistice.

United Nations passed a resolution expressing its concern in this matter. The Secretary General, Mr. Hammarskjold, made a special trip to Peking. He returned without the release of the prisoners and without any date upon which they might be expected to be returned in the future. It is apparent that they are being held for the purposes of international blackmail on the part of the Chinese Communists.

Impotent and paralyzed, the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly has taken no effective steps to enforce compliance in accordance with terms of the Korean armistice.

In the matter of the Chinese Communist aggression against the Republic of China which is a charter member of the United Nations, that Organization invited the Chinese Communists to come to New York to discuss a cease-fire.

Arrogantly, the Chinese Communists laid down terms that a victor would be expected to lay down to the vanquished—namely, that the Republic of China should be removed from the Security Council and that the Soviet Union resolution condemning the United States should be made the order of business rather than the New Zealand resolution relative to a cease-fire.

When this message was received, the United Nations again demonstrated its ineffectiveness by postponing the whole situation while some of the neutralist friends of the Soviet Union and Red China are trying through diplomatic channels to provide for a Far-Eastern Munich whereby the Chinese Communists will be given the key coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu. This, of course, would be another defeat for the free world and throughout all of Asia looked upon as another victory for the Communists, comparable to that growing out of the Geneva conference wherein the Communists gained control of northern Vietnam and 15 million more human beings.

These are not pleasant facts, and there are many in this country and elsewhere who, because of the vast amount of publicity and propaganda, have gotten a distorted view of the capabilities of the United Nations Organization.

Certainly in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, a nation can no more return to isolationism than an adult can return to childhood.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us, will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Master of all good workmen, with reverent hearts this day on which, in the swift current of the year, the Republic pauses in grateful remembrance, we come with but one human name upon our lips: We lift our Te Deum for Thy servant, George Washington, whose unsullied record and towering personality rise still above all that is soiled and sordid, even as the white shaft in the National City which bears his name is lifted above all that is of the earth earthy.

Today, as again in this hallowed Chamber we listen to his wise and deathless parting words, words of moral wisdom and elevated patriotism, may we be conscious that he emerges before us from the crowded years since he fell on sleep. We would see him as he stands in lofty reserve, with impassive dignity that no one dared to violate; yet courteous and considerate, conciliatory and patient; ever ready to listen to reason, seeking light from any quarter; the embodiment of both virtue and power, ever scorning selfish scramble for plunder or place. We would keep his memory and deeds perpetually fresh in the minds of the favored citizens of the great Nation which calls him father.

Like him, may those who serve in the ministry of public affairs be conscious of a divine mission, acting always from the severest sense of duty, indifferent to praise or blame, devoid of jealousy, unswayed by passion or prejudice. Thus may they, like him, labor on valiantly and patiently, through evil and good report, to the final coronation of freedom and of truth. We ask it in the name of the Lord whom he adored. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous request, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 21, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, Washington's Farewell Address will now be read by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who has been heretofore designated by the Vice President for that purpose.

Mr. BUSH advanced to the desk, and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to

me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or

from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are

particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak. towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith: Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign worlds; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to express a word of commendation for the excellent manner in which the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] read Washington's Farewell Address. It was read clearly and distinctly and with a dignity befitting the immortal words of Washington.

THE SPIRIT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his kind words.

Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an address entitled "The Spirit of George Washington," which the junior Senator from Virginia delivered today in Richmond, Va.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON is as follows:

THE SPIRIT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

(Remarks of Senator ROBERTSON at the annual meeting of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of Virginia, Richmond, Va., February 22, 1955)

As we gather tonight to celebrate the 223d anniversary of the birth of one justly called the Father of his Country, we cannot fail to take note of the fact that the more the historians evaluate the personality and the contribution to organized society of George Washington, the higher they write his name on fame's eternal scroll.

As a student of political history and political philosophy I have been impressed by the fact that while George Washington lived in a period that produced the greatest men our country has ever known, he enjoys the almost unique distinction of having been esteemed as highly by his contemporaries as by posterity.

This was in sharp contrast to the difficulties encountered in his day and time by our greatest political philosopher, Thomas Jefferson. The fame of Jefferson is now so secure that many of our generation are quite unaware that some of his contemporaries did not feel toward him as we do. For instance, although Jefferson prepared a resolution for presentation to the Continental Congress in 1776 with respect to congressional action in behalf of independence for the Thirteen Colonies, the Virginia delegation would not let Jefferson present that resolution but voted to confer that honor upon Richard Henry Lee. But Jefferson was a member of the committee appointed to frame the Declaration and upon the insistence of two northern statesmen, John Adams and Benjamin Franklin, prepared the actual draft which, with a few minor changes, was adopted by the Congress, and is now recognized as one of the greatest political documents of all time.

When Jefferson was Governor of Virginia he very properly complied with Washington's request to send to the Continental Army the Virginia Militia which Washington so urgently needed for the major struggle of freeing all of the Colonies. Jefferson, however, was bitterly criticized for leaving the Virginia State capitol unprotected and when the legislature had to flee from Richmond to Staunton to escape capture by the British cavalry under General Tarleton one of its first acts was to consider impeachment of Jefferson for alleged criminal negligence in leaving Richmond undefended.

Again, when Jefferson left the Church of England to push his fight for religious freedom, he incurred the enmity of some of the landed aristocracy and because Jefferson never thereafter joined any church, he was accused of being an atheist, although there could be no clearer proof of his faith in God than his reference in the Declaration of Independence to the fact that all men were created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

And when Jefferson was President he was threatened with impeachment proceedings for buying the Louisiana Territory from Napoleon without previous authority of Congress.

But so far as I can ascertain the only time his contemporaries ever challenged George Washington was when at the age of 21 he ran for the house of delegates from Frederick County on a platform to prohibit the sale of whisky to members of the Virginia Militia during its training periods. He was defeated on that issue.

Probably the most eloquent tribute that has ever been paid George Washington was in 1832 on the 100th anniversary of his birth when Congress adopted a joint resolution to celebrate the occasion with appropriate ceremonies and Daniel Webster was selected as the Presiding Officer and principal speaker. Daniel Webster was 17 years old when Washington died and never personally knew George Washington, but he, of course, knew many of Washington's friends and a number who had served under Washington in the Revolutionary War. He referred to them in what I regard as his greatest speech, at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument 50 years after the battle when, noting the number of veterans in his audience, he turned to them in his opening sentence and said: "Venerable men, you come down to us from a former generation."

In his memorable address in 1832 Webster outlined the true meaning of that generation, but before doing so he said of Washington:

"We are met to testify our regard for him whose name is intimately blended with whatever belongs most essentially to the prosperity, the liberty, the free institutions, and the renown of our country. That name was of power to rally a nation, in the hour of thick-thronging public disasters and calamities; that name shown, amid the storm of war, a beacon light, to cheer and guide the country's friends; it flamed, too, like a meteor, to repel her foes. That name, in the days of peace, was a loadstone, attracting to itself a whole people's confidence, a whole people's love, and the whole world's respect. That name, descending with all time, spreading over the whole earth, and uttered in all the languages belonging to the tribes and races of men, will forever be pronounced with affectionate gratitude by everyone in whose breast there shall arise an aspiration for human rights and human liberty."

It took my beloved friend and Virginia's greatest historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, six volumes to tell the world what he knew about George Washington, and death intervened before he could finish that task. I shall, therefore, tonight attempt to refer to only two qualities of Washington—his faith in God and his unselfish devotion to the public welfare which so clearly illustrated the truth of Pericles' statement that the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men, and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives.

Every schoolchild knows that Washington knelt in the snow of Valley Forge and prayed that God would give him help in the unequal struggle confronting him. Every schoolchild ought to know that the leaders of communism in Russia are firmly convinced that in order to make willing slaves of the masses and to make them accept without question the communistic theory that the state is supreme they must destroy faith in God and the ethical teachings of the Bible.

The recent change in leadership in the Politburo, the situation now existing in Korea, where for the first time in our history we failed to win a military victory, the recent developments in southeast Asia, and the unpredictability of France, which has received billions from our Treasury since the end of World War II, all add up to the fact that if we are to have an end to what is euphoniously called a cold war without ultimately involving us in a shooting war of worldwide proportions something in addition to military strength at home and the distribution abroad of American gold will be required.

Behind the Russian Iron Curtain 800 million people have been organized by ruthless leaders in a program dedicated to the destruction of all capitalistic states. That threat to our cherished institutions and our personal freedom has become so great that since the end of World War II we have loaned without hope of repayment, or donated outright, over $50 billion to the still free nations of the world with the hope that they would stand shoulder to shoulder with us in opposition to further Communist aggression. We have appropriated annually such unprecedented sums for our own defense that our national debt now stands at $278 billion and in the 10th year after the close of the war which we had hoped would bring bona fide peace to a war-torn world our appropriations for military purposes comprise about 65 percent of our total annual budget.

In the early days of the Russian Revolution, when the oppressed people of that vast area were revolting against the tyranny of the Czars, we sympathized with that struggle and sent a military mission to Russia in 1918 to aid the newly formed Kerensky government. But when that effort in behalf of a very limited form of personal freedom was overrun and destroyed by the Bolsheviks, an American observer, after commenting on how the Volga had run red with the blood of the nobility and the intelligentsia had been sent into exile in the frozen wastes of Siberia where the only softness under their feet was that of snow, concluded his appraisal of what had happened in Russia with these prophetic words: "Only in after years, when their sins have taught them charity, and their despair has taught them hope, and their loneliness has led them to faith, they shall listen again to the sound of bells coming across the field and comprehend and reverence the symbolism of the cross."

To many, that change in sentiment among the rank and file of the people of Russia is still a long way off, but it is not beyond the power of God to bring it about. Consequently, I have frequently said that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of moral force.

In a recent speech in Washington, Dr. Billy Graham, referring to that problem said in effect that the essential ingredient in a formula for peace was a change in the hearts of men which could only be accomplished through a revival of the faith of our fathers; the kind of faith, for instance, that Washington had when he knelt in the snow at Valley Forge and prayed for divine help; the faith that Benjamin Franklin had when he appealed for unity among the disagreeing members of the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, saying: "In this situation of this assembly groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of light to illuminate our understanding?" Then after recounting how Washington had prayed during the 7 years of the Revolutionary War, and how everybody had prayed for success when 3 million colonists were arrayed against the then greatest world power, Franklin concluded by saying: "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

The second attribute of Washington, his unselfishness and devotion to duty epitomized in the phrase "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his country-

men," is unique among the great military leaders of the world who have succeeded in establishing new empires.

What a contrast, for instance, with the character of Napoleon, who led a successful revolution in France to destroy the doctrine of the divine right of kings and obtain a larger measure of freedom, equality, and justice for the people, only to turn that successful revolution into a new form of tyranny for the glorification of Napoleon.

No one can stand in that great mausoleum in Paris which the French people have built to the memory of Napoleon and look down upon that pink marble tomb in which his mortal remains lie without recalling the words of Robert Ingersoll when he first viewed the tomb of Napoleon: "And I thought of all the widows and orphans he had made; of all the tears that had been shed for his glory; of the only woman who had ever loved him torn from his heart by the ruthless hand of ambition. And I said, I would rather have been a poor French peasant and worn wooden shoes, I would rather have lived in a hut with the vines growing over the door and the grapes growing purple in the kisses of the autumn sun; yes, I would rather have been that poor peasant and gone down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust, than to have been that impersonation of force and murder known as Napoleon the Great."

Today, we see France, a once great and once-powerful nation and one-time leader in the world for personal freedom, become a major concern to the remainder of the free world. We see a nation in which more than one-half of the population are atheists, and in which the largest single party is dominated by the French Communists.

It was with the vision that characterizes the true statesman that Daniel Webster, in paying tribute in 1832 to the memory of George Washington and the Founding Fathers who had given us American constitutional liberty, said, "Gentlemen, for the earth which we inhabit, and the whole circle of the sun, for all the unborn races of mankind, we seem to hold in our hands, for their weal or woe, the fate of this experiment. If we fail, who shall venture the repetition? If our example shall prove to be one, not of encouragement, but of terror, not fit to be imitated, but fit only to be shunned, where else shall the world look for free models? If this great western sun be struck out of the firmament, at what other fountain shall the lamp of liberty hereafter be lighted? What other orb shall emit a ray to glimmer, even, on the darkness of the world?"

I am proud of the fact that I had ancestors who served under Washington in the Revolutionary War. I am proud of the fact that I am a descendant of the Harrison family of Charles City County that produced a signer of the Declaration of Independence. I am proud of the fact that three of my ancestors served in the Virginia Convention which ratified the Philadelphia Constitution.

But that pride would become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal if, in my service in the Congress of the United States, I did nothing to preserve those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our Founding Fathers. Every man here tonight shares that same rich heritage and the same solemn obligation to answer the question posed in 1832 by Daniel Webster when he said the world was anxious to learn "whether free states may be stable, as well as free; whether popular power may be trusted, as well as feared; in short, whether wise, regular, and virtuous self-government is a vision for the contemplation of theorists, or a truth established, illustrated, and brought into practice in the country of Washington."

Some years ago a grateful Nation erected a monument in Washington to the Father of our Country that was built of stone, and we in Richmond erected one made of bronze, but if we enshrine in our hearts the fear of of God and love of our fellowman which characterized the life of George Washington we will be building monuments to his memory more enduring than those of stone and bronze.

PROPOSED NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 93)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA—JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, two joint resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Oregon. One urges us to enact statehood for Hawaii, the other supports statehood for Alaska.

These joint resolutions, in my opinion, are not so much directed to us of the Congress, Mr. President, but to the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, who is a former Governor of Oregon, and a former member of the Oregon Legislature, which adopted the joint resolutions.

Secretary McKay has dragged his heels on Alaskan statehood, repudiating his onetime support of such a step. He even went to Alaska and scolded the upright, pioneering citizens of that great Territory for crusading in behalf of self-government. He has proposed a kind of twilight-zone plight for Alaska, half military reservation and half state—a sort of centaur, half man and half horse, but actually not a very adequate version of either.

It is my fervent hope that the Secretary of the Interior will profit by this counsel from the legislature of his home State and will become a strong and persistent backer of statehood for Alaska. He is the one person who needs to take heed the most of these memorials enacted by the Oregon State Legislature, a body still, incidentally, controlled by Mr. McKay's own political party, although with a majority greatly diminished by the 1954 Oregon elections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions presented by Mr. NEUBERGER were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 2

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the security and economic welfare of Hawaii are essential to the well-being of the United States; and

Whereas inclusion in the Union as a sovereign State would strengthen the economy and social strength of Hawaii; and

Whereas many business, industrial, and labor groups in Oregon have worked unceasingly to develop increased trade and economic relations with Hawaii; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated their loyalty to the Government of the United States, its traditions and teaching, and a readiness to achieve a status above and beyond that of an incorporated Territory; and

Whereas numerable civic organizations in Oregon have taken a public position favoring statehood for the great Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we definitely go on record as urging early admission of Hawaii as a self-governing State of the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to the Delegates in the National Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

Adopted by the Senate January 13, 1955.

ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
Chief Clerk of Senate.
ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.

Adopted by House February 1, 1955.

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

Senate Joint Memorial 1

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the security and economic development of Alaska are essential to the well-being of the United States; and

Whereas inclusion in the Union as a sovereign State would strengthen the economy and social strength of Alaska; and

Whereas many business, industrial, and labor groups in Oregon have worked unceasingly to develop increased trade and economic relations with Alaska; and

Whereas numerous civic and business organizations in Oregon have taken a public position favoring statehood for the great Territory of Alaska; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska demonstrated their loyalty to the

Government of the United States, its tradition and teaching; and a readiness to achieve a status above and beyond that of an incorporated territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we definitely go on record as urging early admission of Alaska as a self-governing State of the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to the Delegates in the National Congress from the Territory of Alaska.

Adopted by Senate January 13, 1955.

ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
Chief Clerk of Senate.
ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.

Adopted by House February 1, 1955.

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1958, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate to fill the vacancy created by the death of Dr. Compton, and ask that this nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes in order to make a statement on the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the first Chairman of the National Security Training Commission was the late Hon. James W. Wadsworth. Therefore I have always had an interest in this Commission.

So it is with particular pleasure that I report favorably for the Armed Services Committee the name of an old friend, Mr. Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission.

Mr. Hayes was born in Milwaukee, Wis. He has devoted most of his worthy life to the advancement and interests of labor, but at the same time his patriotic public services have earned the respect of people in all segments of our economy.

At the present time Mr. Hayes is International President of the International Association of Machinists.

The record of his union service is as follows: chairman, apprentice boys committee, Milwaukee railroad shops; member International Association of Machinists, president, IAM district 7, covering all machinists lodges on the Chicago & North Western Railway system; IAM grand lodge representative; general vice president of IAM; international president of IAM in 1949 and reelected in 1953; cochairman, United Labor Policy Committee and vice president, American Federation of Labor, 1953.

Mr. Hayes also has a distinguished record of public service. He has been a member, 6th regional War Labor Board, Chicago, during World War II; Special Assistant on Manpower, Department of Defense, member, President's Comission on Health Needs of the Nation; trustee, National Planning Association and director, American Heart Association.

Mr. Hayes also is a member of the National Manpower Council of Columbia University; the Advisory Committee, Senate Banking and Currency Committee; Commisson on Labor-Management Manpower Policy, Office of Defense Mobilization; President's Committee on the Physically Handicapped; National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools; and the White House Conference on Education.

It was my privilege to know Mr. Hayes when I was Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. At that time he was a member of the Board's Advisory Committee.

All those who know this outstanding American are grateful for his willingness to continue his record of public service by accepting this Presidential appointment to the National Security Training Commission.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said:

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the status of the report on the nomination of Mr. Hayes, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination has been placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When is the nomination to be taken up?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It could be taken up at the next session of the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I be recognized, then, for 2 minutes, to speak on the nomination?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have no objection to the nomination or to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hayes, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission. I do, however, wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that on the National Security Training Commission there is no representation by anyone who could remotely be considered as either connected with or having a basic understanding of the personnel and manpower problems in the agricultural sections of the country.

I recognize that, under the statute, the responsibilities of the National Security Training Commission are not connected with the selection of military personnel, but have to do with the training program after the men are selected or inducted.

However that may be, it seems to me important that any board or commission which has to do with broad personnel or training policies should have a basic understanding and appreciation of manpower and personnel problems generally.

Mr. Hayes is definitely a career man in the field of labor. He understands manpower problems in the industrial field. Admiral Kinkaid understands the needs of the Defense Establishment from the standpoint of the Navy. General McLain, who represents the Army, understands the needs of the Military Establishment and the problems of manpower from the standpoint of the Army. Mr. Adler understands the manpower problems from the standpoint of business and of reservists who live in cities. Warren Atherton, a very distinguished member of the Commission, and a former national commander of the American Legion, understands the problems of business and professional men and the aims of the patriotic organizations. He is an attorney. If any one of the group might be suspected of having some understanding of manpower problems from an agricultural standpoint, both before, during, and after military service, it might be Mr. Atherton, because he happens to be a partner in the ownership of a 1,000-acre asparagus farm in California. But none of them suggest any personal experience in the field of agriculture or rural economy.

I have called this matter to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, because when the Armed Services Committee of the Senate takes up the developing of a training program and a Reserve program, I think we should endeavor to consider the seasonal needs of agriculture in planning those programs.

Furthermore, I certainly hope that as we proceed to develop a training program and a reserve program, we will not look merely to the industrial centers and to the large cities to obtain personnel for the nucleus of the Military Establishment. If that should be done in the case of officer procurement, it could mean that the officers of the Armed Forces would come entirely from the centers of large population. That would be unfortunate. In the Military Establishment we need a balanced personnel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks some biographical data on each of the members of the National Security Training Commission, assembled for me by the members of the staff of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the biographical data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON MEMBERS, NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

ALBERT J. HAYES, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Union service: Chairman, apprentice boys committee, Milwaukee Railroad shops 1917–20.

Joined IAM Lodge, 234, Milwaukee in 1919. Transferred to IAM Lodge, 1052 in 1923.

President, IAM, district 7, covering all machinists lodges on the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad system in 1924–34.

IAM grand lodge representative 1934–44.

General vice president of the IAM 1944–49.

International president of the IAM 1949, reelected 1953.

Cochairman, United Labor Policy Committee 1950–51.

Vice president, American Federation of Labor 1953.

Public service: Member of the Sixth Regional War Labor Board, Chicago, during World War II.

Special Assistant on Manpower, Department of Defense 1950–51.

Member, President's Commission on Health Needs of the Nation, 1952.

Trustee, National Planning Association.

Director, American Heart Association.

Member, National Manpower Council of Columbia University; Advisory Committee, Senate Banking and Currency Committee; Commission on Labor Management Manpower Policy, Office of Defense Mobilization; President's Committee on the Physically Handicapped; National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools; White House Conference on Education.

Personal: Born 1900, Milwaukee, Wis.; educated in Milwaukee elementary and high schools and extension division, University of Wisconsin; married, has 1 daughter, 4 grandchildren; Lutheran.

Affiliation: Eagles.

Hobbies: Fishing, hunting, baseball.

WARREN HENDRY ATHERTON

Warren Hendry Atherton, veteran, attorney, farmer, civic leader, and outstanding American Legion official of Stockton, Calif., who served as national commander of the Legion in 1944, was appointed by President Eisenhower to the National Security Training Commission on August 1, 1953, to fill the unexpired term of the late James W. Wadsworth, the Commission's first Chairman. Mr. Atherton was reappointed to a 5-year term June 19, 1954.

A practicing lawyer since 1913, Mr. Atherton is a senior member of the law firm of Atherton & Dozier, Stockton, and is president of the Inland Harbor Storage Co. of that city. He also serves on the board of directors of the San Joaquin Building & Loan Association, and the Lincoln Properties, Inc., a large real-estate development corporation, and is owner of Atherton Island, a real-estate subdivision.

Mr. Atherton is a partner in a 1,000-acre asparagus and truck products ranch in the San Joaquin Delta and serves as special legal consultant to the Stockton port district.

Active in American Legion circles since 1919, when he joined as a charter member of the Karl Ross Post, No. 16, at Stockton, Commissioner Atherton came into national prominence as a legionnaire in 1933 when appointed a member of the organization's national Americanism commission, a post he held until 1936. Three years later he became national defense chairman, retiring from that assignment when elected national commander in 1943.

His Legion travels included many thousands of miles of on-the-spot inspections of American battlefields and installations in the United States, North Africa, Alaska, and, as national commander in 1944, of troops and advance bases in the Pacific.

Mr. Atherton has been general counsel for the department of veterans' affairs of the State of California since 1935. His public service includes 5 years as district attorney of Alpine County, 3 years as member of California State Board of Terms and paroles, and vice-chairman of the defense mobilization service committee of California.

During World War II Commissioner Atherton acted as special consultant to the Secretary of War and in 1944 visited 15 South American and Central American countries as a representative of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

As a private in World War I, Commissioner Atherton served with the AEF in company D, 363d Infantry, 91st Division, later being commissioned a first lieutenant in January 1918. He was promoted to captain in February 1919, and held that rank in the Infantry Reserve Corps for 16 years.

Following military service, Mr. Atherton was president of the San Joaquin County Bar Association, 1921; police judge at Stockton, 1920–25; president of the Kiwanis Club, 1924, and president of the Stockton Chamber of Commerce, 1933–35, in addition to other offices of civil and public trust.

Born December 28, 1891, at San Francisco, Mr. Atherton was graduated from Stockton Law School and admitted to the California bar January 8, 1913. He has 4 children, 3 being sons who all served in the Air Corps during World War II.

GEN. WALTER BEDELL SMITH, UNITED STATES ARMY (RETIRED)

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith was born in Indianapolis, Ind., on October 5, 1895, the son of William Long and Ida Frances (Bedell) Smith, and married Mary Eleanor Cline, also of Indianapolis.

He began his military career as a private in the Indiana National Guard in 1910 and retired from active service in the Army with the rank of general on January 31, 1953. He entered Officers' Training Camp in 1917, was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Officers' Reserve Corps on November 27, 1917, served in France with the 4th Division in 1918, and was wounded in action.

Between World Wars I and II he filled various military assignments, including service in the top Army schools both as a student and as a teacher. In 1932 he graduated from the advanced course of the Infantry School, in 1935 from the Command and General Staff School, and in 1937 from the Army War College. He also served for 2 years in the Philippine Islands and 4 years with the United States Bureau of the Budget.

In 1939 General Smith was detailed to the General Staff Corps and assigned to the War Department General Staff in Washington, serving as Assistant Secretary and Secretary of the General Staff during the critical period between October 1939 and January 1942. In February 1942 he was appointed Secretary of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and United States Secretary of the Combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington.

In September 1942 General Smith became Chief of Staff of the European Theater of Operations, and shortly thereafter was appointed Chief of Staff to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in the north African theater. When the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces was organized on January 1, 1944, General Smith was appointed Chief of Staff and served in this capacity until the end of the war. On behalf of the Supreme Commander, he negotiated and signed the instruments effecting the surrender of Italy and Germany.

In 1946 he was appointed Ambassador to the Soviet Union, remaining in a military status during this assignment. His resignation as Ambassador was accepted by the President on March 25, 1949. After returning from Moscow he served as commanding general of the United States First Army with headquarters on Governors Island in New York City, until October 1950, when he was appointed Director of Central Intelligence. He remained in that position until appointed Under Secretary of State in February 1953. He resigned from this position in October 1954.

General Smith is at present vice chairman of the American Machine & Foundry Co. and is president of American Heritage Foundation. He also serves as member of the board of directors of United Fruit and of Radio Corporation of America.

For services in both wars General Smith holds seven decorations from the United States as well as decorations from Great Britain, France, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Brazil, Morocco, Tunisia, Poland, U. S. S. R., Czechoslovakia, and Thailand. He has been awarded honorary degrees by a number of American and foreign universities.

ADM. THOMAS CASSIN KINKAID, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

Adm. Thomas Cassin Kinkaid, United States Navy, retired, was born April 3, 1888, at Hanover, N. H., the son of Thomas Wright and Virginia Lee Cassin Kinkaid.

Admiral Kinkaid was one of the original Commissioners on the National Security Training Commission, having been appointed to a 5-year term on July 19, 1951.

His entire life has been devoted to the naval service which he undertook upon entering the United States Naval Academy, graduating in the class of 1908. He advanced to the rank of admiral, receiving that promotion in April 1945. Admiral Kinkaid retired from active duty on May 1, 1950, closing a career highlighted by many combat engagements against the Japanese, 1942–45.

Following is a brief résumé of Admiral Kinkaid's service career:

January–July 1932: Technical adviser to American delegation, General Disarmament Conference, Geneva, Switzerland.

November 1938–March 1941: Naval attaché, American Embassy, Rome.

March 1939–March 1941: Additional duty as naval attaché, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

November 1941: Promoted to rear admiral.

February 29, 1942: Commander, cruiser group action, off Bougainville.

March 10, 1942: Salamanca raid.

May 4–8, 1942: Battle of Coral Sea.

June 3–6, 1942: Battle of Midway.

August 7–9, 1942: Commander, *Enterprise* carrier group, Guadalcanal and Tulagi, Solomon Islands, for United States marine landings.

August 25, 1942: Battle of Eastern Solomon Islands.

October 26, 1942: Action at Santa Cruz Islands.

November 15, 1942: Action at Guadalcanal.

January–October 1943: Commander, North Pacific Force, Aleutian campaign.

June 1943: Promoted to vice admiral.

November 1943–September 1945: Commander, 7th Fleet, and commander, Allied Naval Forces, Southwest Pacific area.

October 25, 1944: New Guinea and Philippine campaigns, including Battle of Leyte Gulf.

April 1945: Promoted to admiral.

September 1945: Landed 24th Corps in Korea and with Lieutenant General Hodge, took surrender of Japanese Army and Navy at Seoul, Korea; subsequently followed by landing United States marines under Maj. Gen. K. E. Rockey at Taku and Tsingtao, North China; later transported five Chinese armies from Haiphong, Kowloon, and Ningho to Formosa, Chingwantao and Tsingtao, north China.

November 19, 1945: Detached 7th Fleet.

January 16, 1946: Commander, Eastern Sea Frontier.

May 1, 1950: Retired from active duty.

Admiral Kinkaid's decorations: Navy Distinguished Service Medal, with three gold stars; Army Legion of Merit; Presidential citation; Victory Medal; Atlantic Clasp; American Defense Service Medal; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal (10 battle stars); World War II Victory Medal; Companion Order of the Bath (British); Grand Officer Order Orange Nassau with swords (Netherlands); Army Distinguished Service Medal; Order Al Merito, Gran Official (Chilean); grand officer, Order of Leopold with palm, Croix de guerre with palm (Belgium).

In addition, Admiral Kinkaid is a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Admiral Kinkaid and his wife, the former Helen Sherburne Ross, reside at 2134 R Street NW., Washington, D. C. They were married April 25, 1911, 3 years after his graduation from the Naval Academy.

The admiral is a member of Chevy Chase Club and Army-Navy Club, Washington, D. C., and the Union Club of New York City.

MAJ. GEN. JULIUS OCHS ADLER

Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler was appointed by the President as chairman of the National Security Training Commission on August 1, 1953.

General Adler was born in Chattanooga, Tenn., on December 3, 1892, the son of Harry Clay and Ada Ochs Adler. He was a student at Baylor University School, Chattanooga, and a graduate of Lawrenceville (N. J.) School, 1910 (valedictorian); A. B., Princeton University, 1914. He married Barbara Stettheimer on August 27, 1922; children: Julius Ochs, Jr., Barbara Squier, and Nancy Jean.

General Adler has been with the New York Times since 1914; first vice president, general manager and treasurer; also president and publisher, the Chattanooga Times; director, the New York Times Co.; Times Printing Co. (Chattanooga Times); Spruce Falls Power and Paper Co., Ltd., Toronto, Canada; vice chairman and director, Interstate Broadcasting Co., Inc., New York; chairman board of directors, Chattanooga Publishing Co.; vice president and director, Times Facsimile Corp.

He was civilian aide to Secretary of War, Second Corps Area, 1932–40; commissioned second lieutenant, cavalry, ORC, 1917; served continuously as Reserve officer advancing through grades to major general; World War I, 306th Infantry American Expeditionary Forces; World War II, 44th, 4th, and 6th Infantry Divisions; former commander 77th Infantry Division, USAR, retiring December 31, 1954, with rank of major general. His decorations include: Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star with two Oakleaf Clusters, Order of Purple Heart, New York State Conspicuous Service Medal (both wars), Officer Legion d'Honneur, Crois de guerre with palm (France); Cróce de guêrra (Italy); Legion of Merit, and Bronze Star Medal. A founder of Military Training Camps Association of the United States; chairman, executive committee, Military Training Camps Association of the United States, First Army Area; chairman, national emergency committee, Military Training Camps Association of the United States; president, 77th Division Association, 1945–46; chairman, Armed Forces Advisory Committee for Greater New York (since formation); (Byrnes Committee) Army Committee on Civilian Components, January 1949; president, Senior Reserve Commanders Association Army of the United States, 1949–52; member, Reserve Forces Policy Board (Department of Defense); Committee on the Present Danger; New York State Defense Council.

Honorary chairman, executive board, Greater New York Councils, Boy Scouts of America; president, Tennessee Society in New York, 1929–30; charter trustee, Princeton University; president, class of 1914, Princeton University, 1934–39; Daily Princetonian alumni award, 1939; alumna trustee at large, Princeton University, 1940–44; president, the Daily Princetonian, Inc.

Memberships: Institute of War and Peace Studies' Committee on Public Policy (Columbia University); advisory council, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; board of trustees, International House; board of trustees, National Jewish Hospital at Denver; board of trustees, Institute for the Crippled and Disabled; board of trustees, Grant Monument association; board of directors, American Newspaper Publishers Association; board of directors and treasurer, Bureau of Advertising; board of directors, Better Business Bureau of New York City, Inc.; board of directors, New York Convention and Visitors Bureau; New York City 300th anniversary celebration committee; board of directors, Lafayette Centennial Association.

Clubs: Princeton Club of New York; Advertising Club of New York; Century Country Club; Mountain City Club (Chattanooga, Tenn.).

Editor in chief, History of the 77th Division, AEF, 1919; editor, History of 306th Infantry, 1935.

Home: 2 East 67th Street, New York 21; office: The New York Times, 229 West 43d Street, New York 36.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1159. A bill for the relief of Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1160. A bill to create a Federal Highway Corporation for financing the construction of the National System of Interstate Highways; to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when the above bill was introduced, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1161. A bill to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, South Dakota, and for other purposes; and

S. 1162. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent-in-fee to Nellie V. Compton (nee Not Stampeded); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 1163. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1164. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the southern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1165. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended;

S. 1166. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended, and section 2 of the act of February 2, 1903, as amended; and

S. 1167. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, today the President of the United States has sent to the Congress a special mesage on the subject of highways. The message of the President calls attention to the report submitted by the President's advisory committee on the national highway program, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. I have in my hand a copy of a bill which has been drafted to carry out the recommendations of the so-called Clay committee, the President's advisory committee.

Now, on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] I introduce for appropriate reference that bill with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and myself as cosponsors, in order that the specific recommendations of the Clay committee may be brought before the Senate Committee on Public Works. I do not think I can say, Mr. President, that the bill expresses the personal views of any of the Senators, because we have not had an opportunity to examine the proposal in detail. I think the Senator from New Mexico has some ideas he wishes to express in any highway legislation that may be reported. I belive the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has some ideas and I know that the junior Senator from South Dakota has some ideas of his own. Those ideas we shall each present in due course during the consideration of the bill in the committee. We join, however in presenting this bill so that its bold and challenging concepts may be explored and fully considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1160) to create a Federal highway corporation for financing the construction of the National System of Interstate Highways; to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with my previous remarks regarding the introduction of the highway bill, I should like to emphasize that the bill was introduced on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]; and the bill should appear in his name, with the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and myself listed as cosponsors, under the statement I previously made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I joined with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in the introduction of the bill. We have not had an opportunity to examine the bill itself, but I believe when the President sends a message making a proposal that is in the interest of the country, it deserves to be introduced and to go before a committee for proper consideration. However, I do not wish any inference to be drawn, in any way, shape, or form, that because I have joined the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from South Dakota I am in complete agreement with the proposals of the President. I have definite ideas with regard to the kind of highway legislation which should be enacted, and I wish to make it known at this particular time that I do not agree completely with the proposal of the President.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in conclusion I may state that the views expressed by the Senator from New Mexico are shared to some extent by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and myself. We wish to have the proposed legislation brought before the committee. No one can predict what will come out of the committee's

deliberations, but it is a subject of the greatest importance. It proposes a system of national highways, is a courageous and bold measure, and deserves the careful consideration of the committee which I am sure it will have, first in the Subcommittee on Roads, headed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall be glad to yield if I have time. Perhaps the Senator can speak on his own time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, now that the administration bill has been introduced——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator allow the Chair to have morning business completed, before speeches are made on this matter?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to make only a few brief remarks on the introduction of the bill, and I think I can speak within the prescribed limitation of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. GORE. Now that the administration bill has been introduced, the hearings before the Subcommittee on Roads will encompass the consideration of the bill, along with any other Federal highway bill which may be pending before the committee. The hearings will proceed tomorrow with representatives from the American Federation of Labor, the National Grange, and the American Farm Bureau testifying in accordance with their requests. A list of questions with respect to the bill, including the allocations to respective States, will be submitted to Secretary of Commerce Weeks, and he will be invited to appear to testify with respect to the administration bill as soon as he is ready to answer those questions.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CHARLES NOAH SHEPARDSON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Federal Reserve of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 25, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Charles Noah Shepardson, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1954, vice Paul Emmert Miller, deceased. At the time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MISS SUSAN BALL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today there is seated in the visitors' gallery a young lady to whom I wish to pay tribute. I wish to do so for a very particular reason. She is still a young women, but in her years she has experienced triumph, despair, and a faith that should stand as an example of high courage and constancy of purpose to people young and old throughout the length of this land. She is of the stamina that has made this country great.

The young lady to whom I am referring was born in Buffalo, in my State of New York. Even as a girl she was outstanding in her achievements and determined in her ambition for the future. Unfalteringly she began in early days to carve for herself a career as an actress. With each advance the path ahead loomed more and more promising. When she had scarcely attained maturity this young lady was standing on the threshold of bright success. She was looking forward to happy womanhood as she planned the day of her marriage. Then, without warning, the world seemed to fall apart about her. She was stricken with a crippling affliction that threatened not only to tear down the goal she had so patiently, earnestly, and devotedly pursued, but to strike down her very life.

But a great heart beat anxiously through tortured weeks and months, and that great heart persevered through pain and suffering that would have ended the hopes of a less brave and determined person.

It is for this reason that I wish to honor Miss Susan Ball, a splendid motion picture actress, representing her fine industry. Her brave example should be an inspiration to millions of handicapped people and stimulate them to renewed courage and faith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Ball be invited to stand where she is seated in the gallery so that the Senate may salute her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Without objection, the invitation is extended to Miss Ball.

Miss Ball stood at her seat in the gallery. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are glad to have Miss Ball present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand adjourned until tomorrow, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend B. B. Comer Lile, rector of Christ Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless each and every Member of the House of Representatives here assembled. Guide and protect them in their labor and in their deliberations and grant that in all their work begun, continued, and ended in Thee, they may glorify Thy holy name. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Endue with the spirit of wisdom all of those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 18, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 456. An act relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters;

S. 913. An act to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate; and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize at this time only the gentleman from Tennessee, under the circumstances.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4259, and that the same length of time be allowed for the filing of minority or individual views on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the bill about which the gentleman makes this request?

Mr. COOPER. It is a bill to extend the corporation and excise taxes, as requested by the President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I was wondering if the gentleman might tell us whether he contemplates bringing this bill up for consideration Thursday?

Mr. COOPER. As the gentleman well knows, after the committee reports a bill it is up to the leadership of the House as to when it comes up.

Mr. ARENDS. My thought was to secure information for some of our Members on each side who may not be here today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I may say that if a rule is reported, which is hoped for and expected, it will come up on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 2, 1955, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with humble heart and sincere gratitude that I accept, on behalf of this House and the great State of Florida, this high honor.

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this irea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the

equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits

prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace

often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith: Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope

that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

THE NATION'S HIGHWAY SYSTEM
(H. DOC. NO. 93)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our unity as a Nation is sustained by free communication of thought and by easy transportation of people and goods. The ceaseless flow of information throughout the Republic is matched by individual and commercial movement over a vast system of interconnected highways criss-crossing the country and joining at our national borders with friendly neighbors to the north and south.

Together, the uniting forces of our communication and transportation systems are dynamic elements in the very name we bear—United States. Without them, we would be a mere alliance of many separate parts.

The Nation's highway system is a gigantic enterprise, one of our largest items of capital investment. Generations have gone into its building. Three million, three hundred and sixty-six thousand miles of road, traveled by 58 million motor vehicles, comprise it. The replacement cost of its drainage and bridge and tunnel works is incalculable. One in every seven Americans gains his livelihood and supports his family out of it. But, in large part, the network is inadequate for the Nation's growing needs.

In recognition of this, the governors in July of last year at my request began a study of both the problem and methods by which the Federal Government might assist the States in its solution. I appointed in September the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, headed by Lucius D. Clay, to work with the governors and to propose a plan of action for submission to the Congress. At the same time, a committee representing departments and agencies of the National Government was organized to conduct studies coordinated with the other two groups.

All three were confronted with inescapable evidence that action, comprehensive and quick and forward-looking, is needed.

First. Each year, more than 36,000 people are killed and more than a million injured on the highways. To the home where the tragic aftermath of an accident on an unsafe road is a gap in the family circle, the monetary worth of preventing that death cannot be reckoned. But reliable estimates place the measurable economic cost of the highway accident toll to the Nation at more than $4.3 billion a year.

Second. The physical condition of the present road net increases the cost of vehicle operation, according to many estimates, by as much as 1 cent per mile of vehicle travel. At the present rate of travel, this totals more than $5 billion a year. The cost is not borne by the individual vehicle operator alone. It pyramids into higher expense of doing the Nation's business. Increased highway transportation costs, passed on through each step in the distribution of goods, are paid ultimately by the individual consumer.

Third. In case of an atomic attack on our key cities, the road net must permit quick evacuation of target areas, mobilization of defense forces and maintenance of every essential economic function. But the present system in critical areas would be the breeder of a deadly congestion within hours of an attack.

Fourth. Our gross national product, about $357 billion in 1954, is estimated to reach over $500 billion in 1965, when our population will exceed 180 million and, according to other estimates, will travel in 81 million vehicles 814 billion vehicle-miles that year. Unless the present rate of highway improvement and development is increased, existing traffic jams only faintly foreshadow those of 10 years hence.

To correct these deficiencies is an obligation of Government at every level. The highway system is a public enterprise. As the owner and operator, the various levels of Government have a responsibility for management that promotes the economy of the Nation and properly serves the individual user. In the case of the Federal Government, moreover, expenditures on a highway program are a return to the highway user of the taxes which he pays in connection with his use of the highways.

Congress has recognized the national interest in the principal roads by authorizing two Federal-aid systems, selected cooperatively by the States, local units, and the Bureau of Public Roads.

The Federal-aid primary system as of July 1, 1954, consisted of 234,407 miles, connecting all the principal cities, county seats, ports, manufacturing areas, and other traffic-generating centers.

In 1944 the Congress approved the Federal-aid secondary system, which on July 1, 1954, totaled 482,972 miles, referred to as farm-to-market roads—important feeders linking farms, factories, distribution outlets, and smaller communities with the primary system.

Because some sections of the primary system, from the viewpoint of national interest, are more important than others, the Congress in 1944 authorized the selection of a special network, not to exceed 40,000 miles in length, which would connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, serve the national defense, and connect with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

This national system of interstate highways, although it embraces only 1.2 percent of total road mileage, joins 42 State capital cities and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. It carries more than a seventh of all traffic, a fifth of the rural traffic, serves 65 percent of the urban and 45 percent of the rural population. Approximately 37,600 miles have been designated to date. This system and its mileage are presently included within the Federal-aid primary system.

In addition to these systems, the Federal Government has the principal, and in many cases the sole, responsibility for roads that cross or provide access to federally owned land—more than one-fifth the Nation's area.

Of all these the interstate system must be given top priority in construction planning. But at the current rate of development the interstate network would not reach even a reasonable level of extent and efficiency in half a century. State highway departments cannot effectively meet the need. Adequate right-of-way to assure control of access, grade separation structures, relocation and realinement of present highways—all these, done on the necessary scale within an integrated system, exceed their collective capacity.

If we have a congested and unsafe and inadequate system, how then can we improve it so that 10 years from now it will be fitted to the Nation's requirements?

A realistic answer must be based on a study of all phases of highway financing, including a study of the costs of completing the several systems of highways, made by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the State highway departments and local units of government. This study, made at the direction of the 83d Congress in the 1954 Federal Aid Highway Act, is the most comprehensive of its kind ever undertaken.

Its estimates of need show that a 10-year construction program to modernize all our roads and streets will require expenditure of $101 billion by all levels of government.

The preliminary 10-year totals of needs by road systems are:

	Billions
Interstate (urban $11, rural $12 billion)	$23
Federal-aid primary (urban $10, rural $20 billion)	30
Federal-aid secondary (entirely rural)	15
Subtotal of Federal-aid systems (urban $21, rural $47 billion)	68
Other roads and streets (urban $16, rural $17 billion)	33
Total of needs (urban $37, rural $64 billion)	101

The governors' conference and the President's advisory committee are agreed that the Federal share of the needed construction program should be about 30 percent of the total, leaving to State and local units responsibility to finance the remainder.

The obvious responsibility to be accepted by the Federal Government, in addition to the existing Federal interest in our 3,366,000-mile network of highways, is the development of the interstate system, with its most essential urban arterial connections.

In its report, the advisory committee recommends:

1. That the Federal Government assume principal responsibility for the cost of a modern interstate network to be completed by 1964 to include the most essential urban arterial connections; at an annual average cost of $2.5 billion for the 10-year period.

2. That Federal contributions to primary and secondary road systems, now at the rate authorized by the 1954 act of approximately $525 million annually, be continued.

3. That Federal funds for that portion of the Federal-aid systems in urban areas not on the interstate system, now approximately $75 million annually, be continued.

4. That Federal funds for forest highways be continued at the present $22.5-million-per-year rate.

Under these proposals, the total Federal expenditures through the 10-year period would be:

	Millions
Interstate system	$25,000
Federal-aid primary and secondary	5,250
Federal-aid urban	750
Forest highways	225
	31,225

The extension of necessary highways in the Territories and highway maintenance and improvement in national parks, on Indian lands, and on other public lands of the United States will continue to be treated in the budget for these particular subjects.

A sound Federal highway program, I believe, can and should stand on its own feet, with highway users providing the total dollars necessary for improvement and new construction. Financing of interstate and Federal-aid systems should be based on the planned use of increasing revenues from present gas and diesel-oil tanks, augmented in limited instances with tolls.

I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues, to be paid off by the above-mentioned revenues which will be collected during the useful life of the roads and pledged to this purpose, rather than by an increase in general revenue obligations.

At this time, I am forwarding for use by the Congress in its deliberations the report to the President made by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program. This study of the entire highway traffic problem and presentation of a detailed solution for its remedy is an analytical review of the major elements in a most complex situation. In addition, the Congress will have available the study made by the Bureau of Public Roads at the direction of the 83d Congress.

These two documents together constitute a most exhaustive examination of the national highway system, its problems, and their remedies. Inescapably, the vastness of the highway enterprise fosters varieties of proposals which must be resolved into a national highway pattern. The two reports, however, should generate recognition of the urgency that presses upon us; approval of a general program that will give us a modern, safe highway system; realization of the rewards for prompt and comprehensive action. They provide a solid foundation for a sound program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 22, 1955.*

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 91, Rept. No. 64), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the revolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That effective from January 3, 1955, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

"(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operation, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

"(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

"(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

"(4) relating to the effectiveness of United States programs of assistance and information;

"(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

"*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

"The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

Amend the title to read as follows: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy."

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (on behalf of Mr. TRIMBLE), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 105, Rept. No. 65), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That effective from January 5, 1955, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make such investigations and studies as it deems advisable with respect to any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That effective from January 3, 1955, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into the following matters within its jurisdiction:

"(1) the competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; the preservation of the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation; expedition of the operations of the regulatory bodies; the adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and for the expanding needs of our growing economy;

"(2) the allocation of channels to radio and television stations; educational television; subscription and theater television; the administration by the Federal Communications Commission of the statutes which it administers;

"(3) the treatment of nonscheduled and feeder airline carriers; improvements to air safety; the restrictions placed on American air carriers which impede the free flow of commerce; rates and continuance of subsidy payments; airport construction, and hazards of adjacency to airports; condemnation of air space; aircraft and airline liability;

"(4) the adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure provisions of the Securities Acts measured in terms of the purposes intended and the practice in distribution and underwriting; the adequacy of the protection to investors in investment companies; the adequacy of the current protection to customers of broker-dealers; the expediting of the liquidation of the work under the Public Utility Holding Company Act in the simplification and integration of utility holding companies;

"(5) the availability and adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the expanding needs of our growing economy; the development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; the expediting of rate cases;

"(6) advertising generally, fair competition, and the administration of such statutes administered by the Federal Trade Commission;

"(7) research in weather, including air pollution and smog; artificially induced weather, and the sovereignty of a cloud;

"(8) the effects of inflation upon the benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment provisions; inequities in provisions of the statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the Social Security System; and the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board;

"(9) provision for medical care; the adequacy of supply of hospitals, treatment centers, nursing homes, medical personnel, and medical teaching facilities; research into human disease; the operations of the Public Health Service, and of the Food and Drug Administration;

"(10) research in the basic sciences being undertaken by the National Science Foundation;

"(11) disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act;

"(12) the current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; the current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such production and supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternate source materials.

"Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

"For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session."

Amend the title to read as follows: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction."

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OPERATION INTIMIDATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Committee on Un-American Activities was to hold its first hearing of this Congress. The hearing was scheduled for Fort Wayne, Ind. Witnesses were to include individuals whose Communist activities, over many years, were detrimental to their country and their fellow men. These individuals are leaders of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, a labor union which was expelled from the CIO.

On Thursday of this week, this union is engaged in a bargaining election—along with the IUE-CIO and the UAW-AFL—among the employees of the Fort Wayne, Ind., plant of Magnavox Corp. The fact that this election is scheduled had little to do with our hearing. In fact, in calling this hearing we were completing some of the committee's unfinished business. However, with the announcement of the hearing, members of the committee and Members of the House were bombarded with telegrams and letters demanding that the hearing be canceled. At the request of the UE, I have agreed, not to cancel these hearings, but to postpone them for 1 week, until February 28. This postponement was agreed to very reluctantly, and only after it was feared that false and malicious charges made against the committee by the UE might result in this Communist-dominated union continuing as the bargaining agent in the vital defense plant.

Magnavox, in the Fort Wayne plant, has defense contracts classified as high as "secret" and 95 percent of the production of the plant is under defense contracts. Many weapons of defense, used by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, could not operate without electronic controls made exclusively at this plant.

I sincerely hope that by the time the hearing is called to order next Monday, the people at Magnavox will have representing them a union which holds the welfare and safety of the Nation with the same high regard as they do the worker, rather than the union which has, since its inception, had as its No. 1 objective the protection of the Communist Party of the United States and members of the Community Party.

With respect to the telegrams which many of us received, demanding that this hearing be canceled, I wish to call the attention of the House to a publication which I hold in my hand, titled "Operation Intimidation." It is a publication of the UE. It is a booklet properly named because it tells the Communist leaders of UE how to carry out a program of intimidation against the Congress, the Committee on Un-American Activities, and its members.

This booklet could well have a subtitle such as "False Witness," the title of the forthcoming book by Matusow. Like Matusow's book, it was prepared under the direction of the Communist Party and tells only the story which the Communist Party wants told; namely, a story which helps protect the members of the Communist Party and thereby the Communist Party itself. As Matusow's book attempts to make Americans skeptical of the testimony of all former Communists, the UE booklet attempts to sell the American worker on a theory that, when a Communist is subpenaed before the committee and he happens to hold a union position, the committee is attacking the labor movement.

The committee and the Congress are not alone portrayed as playing this role. Dealing with the 1952 hearings of the committee in Detroit, Mich., the booklet states:

> The main result of the hearings in Detroit is that 60,000 workers were deprived of their legally elected representatives through the teamwork of a congressional committee headed by a poll tax Congressman [Woop], a powerful profiteering company [Ford] and a labor leader [Reuther] who betrays his own membership.

The 60,000 workers are those belonging to Local 600, UAW. But why should the UE be concerned with this UAW local? Because it is controlled by a so-called "progressive" group of officers over whom the Communist Party exercises much control. The UE also defends the officers of Local 600, UAW, because this CIO local union has been used to attack the CIO and support the UE during bargaining elections between the UE and

CIO unions, such as the IUE and the UAW itself.

Under a subsection, "How to Fight the Committees," there are these instructions:

The key to a successful fight against such a committee lies in preparation and organization.

Usually there is advance notice of a committee coming to town, ranging from several days to several weeks. Immediately union leadership should start a campaign to acquaint both membership and the community with the nature and record of that particular committee.

There should be a single center for the fight, possibly a citizens' committee on civil rights, or a united labor committee, or a single local of a union which can issue statements and be the source of the publicity against the witch-hunters.

The first step is simply to inform the union membership and the community that the witch-hunters are coming. Radio spots of 1 minute each, or half a minute, constantly repeated day in and day out, with a catch slogan are very effective.

Carrying out these instructions to the last detail, this Communist group went into action as soon as it was announced that hearings were to be held in Fort Wayne. Immediately telegrams were dispatched from all UE locals in the Fort Wayne area. They were also dispatched from other UE and Communist-dominated unions scattered throughout the United States.

The first I received was from John T. Gojack, president of district 9, UE, and a vice president of the international union. The same John T. Gojack who is under subpena to appear before the committee. The same individual who, at the same time, sent a telegram to the Speaker of the House of Representatives calling for an investigation of me and of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This telegram to me was sent not to register a protest with the committee—as a matter of fact, Gojack did not care if we ever received or read it—but, rather, in order that they have something to file with the newspapers, press services, and radio newscasters. Gojack knew that only through the means of a telegram could he get free press coverage of a smear upon the committee. The telegrams gave him an opportunity to confuse the workers through such false charges as that the committee is a union-busting instrument of the Magnavox Co. In sending the telegrams, Gojack and company were carrying out the instructions which I quoted from the booklet.

Gojack's telegram of February 10 accuses the committee of assisting the Magnavox Co. in its efforts to destroy union representation among its employees. The telegram states that Magnavox, aided by the CIO, AFL, and the committee, "is seeking to oust UE so that seniority rights, higher wages, and other contractual gains under UE can be abolished."

Mr. Speaker, how far from the truth will the Communists stray to deceive the honest, patriotic worker? The truth on these points is that, after the election which will be held Thursday, the Magnavox workers will be represented by a union, and further that, under the CIO or AFL, not only will the seniority rights and higher wages not be abolished, but rather the seniority rights will be stronger and the wages higher than they are today.

Mr. Speaker, the UE does not fool me as they do the workers and, along this line, I charge the UE with making deals with industry to the detriment of the workers in order that industry not put its support behind the CIO and AFL in ridding the labor movement of this Moscow conspiracy.

To support his attack upon the committee, and following the guide set forth in the booklet, Gojack uses a statement of the late Cardinal Mundelein and an editorial which appeared in the Detroit Free Press. He takes advantage of 17 years to support his position. Cardinal Mundelein's remarks were against what this great Catholic leader considered to be irresponsible acts by the Dies committee. His statement was contained in the publication of the Chicago diocese New World of December 2, 1938. The Detroit Free Press editorial was published October 27, 1947.

Gojack could have quoted from the remarks of many great Americans who have, from time to time, objected to phases of the work conducted by the committee. Many Members of this body condemned the subpenaing of former President Harry Truman by the committee last Congress. They could have quoted my condemnation of that act.

Nowhere in this document does the UE advise the workers of the truth of their operations on behalf of the Communist Party. Examples of their treachery have been documented over the years, not only by Government agencies and congressional committees, but by the Congress of Industrial Organizations itself.

Why does not the UE tell the worker of the statements contained in the resolution adopted by the CIO at its convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on November 2, 1949?—

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

1. This convention finds that the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America has fallen into the control of a group devoted primarily to the principles of the Communist Party and opposed to the constitution and democratic objectives of the CIO, and in particular to the following declaration in the preamble of the constitution of the CIO:

"In the achievement of this task we turn to the people because we have faith in them; and we oppose all those who would violate this American emphasis of respect for human dignity, all those who would use power to exploit people in the interest of alien loyalties"; and, in conformance with the provisions of article III, section 6, of our constitution, this convention hereby expels the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America from the Congress of Industrial Organizations and withdraws the said certificate of affiliation.

2. This convention recognizes that the overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America are not members of the Communist Party, and further recognizes the desire of the working men and women in the electrical and allied industries for a free and autonomous union affiliated with the CIO and devoted to the constitutional principles and policies of the CIO.

3. This convention hereby authorizes and directs the executive board immediately to issue a certificate of affiliation to a suitable organization covering electrical and allied workers which will genuinely represent the desires and interests of the men and women in those industries.

4. This convention calls upon the working men and women in the electrical and allied industries to join in the building of a strong, autonomous union affiliated with the CIO that will fight on a sound trade-union basis for the interests of its members as workers and American citizens and which will join wholeheartedly with the CIO in its struggle to obtain the benefits of collective bargaining, including higher wages and better working conditions, to safeguard the economic security and promote the social welfare of the workers of America, and to protect and extend our democratic institutions and civil rights and liberties.

5. This convention calls upon all the affiliates of the CIO to support with all their strength the determination of the electrical workers to free themselves from Communist domination and to create a strong, aggressive, and democratic union affiliated with the CIO.

With the full support of the CIO, the organized workers in the electrical and allied industries will win their campaign for freedom from the degradation of automatic obedience to a foreign dictatorship.

A victory here for democratic unionism will strengthen the constant drive of all American labor against economic monoply and against all those forces which would deny to American working men and women the economic security and the democratic liberties which belong to all Americans.

We salute the rank and file members of the UERMWA as the way is opened for them to walk out of the shadows of Communist conspiracy, doubletalk, division, and betrayal, into the sunlight of democracy to be enjoyed in the CIO and cherish and make equally available to all men and women who prize freedom, honesty, and loyalty to their ideals and their union brothers and sisters.

In this cause and with this faith, we of the family of CIO shall defeat our open and our secret enemies; we shall grow stronger in numbers and in moral stature. Thereby the mission of the CIO, as stated at its founding, shall be realized in happy men and women, secure in their jobs, in their homes, and in their trust in one another.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPEARS POISED TO STRIKE THE SOYBEAN FARMER THIS TIME

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Department of Agriculture is poised to strike again, and this time the victim will be the farmers of the South who produce soybeans, at least those who have been producing a variety of soybeans known as the Ogden.

I am today placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 extensions of remarks dealing with this subject, 1 containing a letter expressing the views of the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association opposing the proposed revisions

of the soybean standards, as announced by Mr. Barr of the Grain Standards Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, and the other extension including an article from a newspaper setting forth some of the highlights of a hearing held at Memphis when it was revealed that not a single person appeared in support of the Department's contemplated action. In fact, every one of the approximately 300 persons in attendance, including farmer-producers, elevator operators, warehousemen, processors, shippers, brokers, terminal operators, and exporters, indicated their opposition to the proposed action of the Department.

I would like now to read from a letter written by a friend of mine who is a farmer and who also is the operator of an elevator which buys and ships soybeans. The writer of this letter, Wilburn L. Davidson, a former secretary of the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association, is familiar with the problems involved in this proposed action and I believe his letter, directed to the Director, Grain Division, United States Department of Agriculture, will give each of my colleagues a better insight into this problem, and I hope will cause them to contact the Secretary of Agriculture and urge that he exercise his authority in preventing this drastic change from taking place. Mr. Davidson's letter reads:

KENNETT GRAIN & SEED CO.,
Kennett, Mo., February 17, 1955.

DIRECTOR, GRAIN DIVISION,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the proposed revisions of the soybean grade standards, we wish to file our arguments as follows:

1. We wish to oppose the proposed revision that would reduce the maximum limits of foreign material 1 percent in each numerical grade.

(a) The present grades are good, and allow huge tonnages of soybeans to move smoothly through the channels of commerce. Modern combines will leave close to 2 percent foreign material under best conditions, and when this crop is handled by two or more elevators, the foreign material (including soybean chips) will run from 1.9 percent to 2.9 percent under the best conditions. Present grade standards reflect this fact, and provide reasonable standards that reflect actual quality. A change in the grade standards would be unrealistic, and provide an artificial standard that would not aid the movement of the soybean crop through the channels of commerce.

2. We wish to oppose the proposed revision that classify soybeans with green seed coats and yellow cross-section as green class soybeans rather than yellow soybeans.

(a) The present classification has worked well since the 1949 change. A complaint by 1 or 2 foreign countries is insignificant.

(b) The Ogden soybean has green seed coat at times and is yellow in cross-section. The Ogden soybean is the best adapted variety for most of the southern United States. The Ogden is bright green generally in appearance at the beginning of the season, but changes to yellow when subjected to rain, frost, or delay in harvest. Normally, Ogdens will range from green to green and yellow to pure yellow at the same time during harvest. In summary, no Federal grain inspector will be able to grade the Ogden on color accurately; such a green classification will be an artificial classification not meeting the facts.

(c) Soybeans are being bought and sold to the foreign markets by origin, and this is a well established fact. Any foreign country can obtain strictly yellow soybeans at any time, with identity preserved. Hard wheat from Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas is traded smoothly in the various market places as well as hard wheat from Missouri and Illinois, and the market prices reflect the quality of the origins. Such an acceptance at the market place is true in soybeans. Soybeans are and can be traced by origins.

(d) Ogden soybeans are high in quality. The oil is high in percentage and is of excellent quality; the soybean meal from Ogden soybeans makes excellent livestock and poultry feed equal to meal from any origin.

(e) New varieties are being constantly introduced, and in a few years a yellow variety, equal or superior to Ogden soybean, will be introduced. Why should the vast southern region of the United States of America be segregated and penalized unnecessarily for a few years?

(f) If the proposed Green classification is established, it will do harm as the Ogdens will be planted from March 1 through June 10, with the majority of the acres planted by May 5. The farmer is entitled to a year's notice before a change is made.

(g) There is no problem in the market place with green and yellow classification. The farmer, the country elevator operator, the terminal elevator operator, and the domestic mills have not called for a change. The foreign buyer can obtain any color of soybeans easily under the present grain standard. Why should one or two complaints by foreign buyers change a great crop and great marketing system in the United States?

We submit our arguments as producers and as elevator operators, and we respectfully ask for your consideration of our arguments in arriving at a decision.

Respectfully yours,
KENNETT GRAIN & SEED CO.,
WILBURN L. DAVIDSON,
President.

COMMISSION ON PATENT LAW AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced legislation to create a commission on patent laws and administration. As set forth in the bill:

The Commission shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the patent laws of the United States and the administration and operation of such laws to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to promote a greater contribution to continued technological advancement by the United States, with particular regard to the problem of how to stimulate an increased contribution on the part of the individual inventor.

The history of invention indicates that truly significant innovations are generally the work of outsiders to a particular industry—individuals far enough removed from an industry to have a fresh viewpoint on its problems.

Today industry ignores the individual inventor and an inhospitable patent system frustrates him. It is time to look at the plight of the independent inventor who made America technologically great. Unless something is done, he may have to quit and the country cannot afford that.

This whole problem was reviewed with detail and thoroughness in an article by Edmund L. Van Deusen appearing in the December 1954 issue of Fortune magazine. So that the Congress may be informed on the subject, I am here setting forth Mr. Van Deusen's article:

THE INVENTOR IN ECLIPSE

(By Edmund L. Van Deusen)

When Percy C. Spencer, president of Sinclair Oil Corp., inaugurated the Sinclair plan in 1951, he thought he had found a way to spice industrial technology with the offbeat yet valuable inspirations of independent inventors. Spencer invited inventive-minded Americans everywhere to send their ideas to Harvey, Ill., where the staff of Sinclair's new $10-million research laboratory would evaluate the schemes and complete the development work on those that looked promising. All Sinclair wanted in return was a royalty-free license under the inventor's patent—and a sense of industrial accomplishment.

As of this date, 3 years later, Sinclair has obtained exactly nothing from its plan. Fewer than 50 of the thousands of inquiries and suggestions pertained to the specified subject (petroleum products), and of these only 3 seemed worth extensive testing. Two proved impractical, and the third, involving a new way to make cement, has been returned for commercial development to the original inventor, a Cleveland consulting engineer. Sinclair's conclusion: "There appears to be little room for the independent inventor in the petroleum industry."

The failure of the Sinclair plan is of deep significance to American industry. In an era of unmatched technological progress, the lone, inspired inventor seems to be playing a diminishing part. At the same time, the rate of American invention seems also to have declined. In 1920 the United States Patent Office received 7.7 patent applications for every 10,000 citizens; today, despite a slight upturn in the trend last year, the rate is 4.6 percent, a drop of about 40 percent.

This does not mean, however, that the inventive Yankee is a vanishing breed. Anyone willing to set himself up as a recipient of ideas can attest to the contrary. During World War II over 300,000 suggestions were submitted to the National Inventors Council, an agency created at the prompting of Lawrence Langner, the eminent patent attorney (and founder of the Theater Guild), to be a clearinghouse for new devices that might be of value to the Armed Forces. One such device, an instrument invented by a treasure-hunting Florida radio mechanic, turned up on scores of beachheads as the familiar mine detector.

After the war the council's experience was duplicated by the Institute of Inventive Research of San Antonio, a nonprofit organization put together by Thomas Slick to provide a connecting link between inventors and industry. In 8 years the institute managed to evaluate over 100,000 inventions submitted by the public, and from this group was culled the lift-slab method of concrete construction used in building the $5-million laboratories of the Radio Corporation of America (Fortune, November). But the costs of development of this and a dozen other promising ideas were so high that the institute, after running through its $1-million endowment, closed its doors to new inventions and became a part of Slick's Southwest Research Foundation.

Where Slick left off, however, the Product Development Corp. of Boston has taken over, and on a profit-making basis. Product De-

velopment is a year-old affiliate of American Research & Development Corp. (reaction motors, tracerlab, etc.), and inventors are already sending their ideas to this new company at the rate of 50 a day.

Certainly there is no shortage of inventors and inventions, but then, that was not the problem encountered in the Sinclair experiment. The trouble has been quality, not quantity, and the reason for this is easy to see. For several decades, the important frontiers of technology have been advancing into the far reaches of chemistry, electronics, and, of late, nucleonics. Independent inventors, inadequately trained and equipped, can hardly hope to follow. The result is that these areas have become the preserve of the hired inventors who work in corporation laboratories. The lone unaided inventor can do little but concentrate on the mechanical-type inventions, the better mousetraps, that were the marvel of the 19th century but today are considered to be only gadgets.

INVENTION IS WHOSE BUSINESS?

Industry is keenly aware that the present quality of independent invention is low (General Electric finds that it is interested in less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the 2,500 ideas and suggestions submitted to it each year). Yet industry also seems to assume that this low quality is none of its business (GE's patent department has three men screening the public's ideas, 70 men processing the 3,000 to 4,000 patent suggestions developed annually by the company's own research laboratories).

Actually, industry's indifference toward the lone inventor and his works is understandable. Modern industrial research, with its fine laboratories, its teams of specialists, and its multi-million-dollar budgets, appears able to provide all the technological progress that the Nation could desire. Indeed, amid this array of inventive power even such an obstinately independent inventor as Thomas Edison would find it hard to locate neglected areas in which to apply his genius. The easy assumption for industry to make is that the best inventors of this generation have all read the signs and are busily inventing within the walls of industry's research laboratories where, in the words of one director of research, "No one ever makes a million, but then, neither, does anyone starve." From this, it is logical to assume that virtually all the important inventions of the future will come out of the major laboratories.

This reasoning, however, is not so airtight as it seems. The history of invention indicates that truly significant innovations generally are the work of outsiders, individuals far enough removed from an industry to have a fresh viewpoint on its problems. Janney, inventor of the automatic railroad coupler, was a farmer, not a railroader. Cartwright, inventor of the power loom, was a minister. Eastman, a bookkeeper, revolutionized photography, but it took two musicians, Mannes and Godowsky, to show Eastman how to make photographs in color. Even television, a modern invention, would have been impossible without the inspired tinkering of generations of amateur inventors. Edward T. Dickinson, executive assistant to the president of Carrier Corp., conducted a study of this sort of intuitive innovation while vice chairman of the National Security Resources Board (the project was prompted by the belief that a creative atmosphere is an important natural resource). Dickinson concluded that such "leaps into the blue," whether by inventive individuals or by a whole population developing a new civilization, occur at the time when those people have become isolated or withdrawn (e. g., the colonial period in America). For lone inventors, such withdrawal comes naturally, but it is extremely difficult to withdraw from one of industry's organized teams of researchers.

THE INDEPENDENT "DOODLE"

Most industrial laboratories are also handicapped because "they think they can't afford to doodle," says Benjamin Franklin Miessner, a successful independent inventor who made good in 1930 by selling 50 radio-circuit patents to RCA for $750,000. Meissner, still vigorously inventing, has great hopes for his latest doodles, a stringless electronic piano and a photoelectric phonograph, neither of which represents the type of project a corporate research director would choose to put in his annual budget.

Miessner's point is aptly illustrated by the inventive career of Edwin H. Land, inventor of Polaroid film and the Land ("1-minute") camera. In 1932 the total market for a cheap source of polarized light (used, at that time, only by experimenting physicists) would not have supported even the most modest of industrial-research programs. It fell, instead, to Land, an inquisitive college boy (Harvard), to conceive and develop a method of orienting tiny crystals in a sheet of plastic. Polarizing sunglasses, camera filters, and 3-D movies came much later—and took Land out of the class of lone inventors. By 1945 he was an industrialist, the president of his own successful company, Polaroid Corp., and director of a large research organization. And when he decided to invent a 1-minute camera, Land proceeded in a typically industrial way. The camera was chosen because it was close to Polaroid's principal field (optics), yet different enough to provide good diversification for the company (no polarization is involved). Market surveys determined the weight, size, and cost limitations that the new camera had to meet. The self-developing characteristic was included because Land knew he could not break into the camera field without an exclusive feature. It took 3 years for a coordinated team of chemists, opticians, and mechanical engineers to produce the 1-minute camera exactly as Land had "invented" it.

The Land camera was an inventive tour de force and a great commercial success. But the camera will never rank as a "great" invention, i. e., one that opens up new avenues of research or helps to build a new industry. For that type of accomplishment, Land must still point to his youthful, independent "doodle"—polarizing film.

THE LOST INCENTIVE

While the long advance of technology has largely contributed to the independent inventor's low estate, it is hardly the complete explanation. Charles Goodyear spent 8 years—and landed in debtors' prison three times—searching for a better way to cure rubber. With only a fraction of that energy and sacrifice, modern inventors could gain proficiency in almost any area of technology they chose. (Expensive equipment is often needed to prove an idea—but not to conceive it.) Few inventors, however, take the time or trouble. Foorman Mueller, a Chicago patent attorney and past president of the American Patent Law Association, observes that "in the past 25 years there has been quite a change in the individual inventor; there is less initiative to carry a project beyond the idea stage, especially in that percentage of the population which in the early days would spend days, weeks, and months, untold energy, and their last penny to bring an inventive dream to fruition."

Mueller, as a patent lawyer, is in a particularly good position to diagnose the cause of it all, for it is the steady weakening of the patent protection that is helping to sap the initiative of the independent inventor just when the complexities of technology are putting an extra strain on his tenacity. The patent system is the independent inventor's traditional incentive system, and when the value of patents drops, so does the drive to invent.

Federal statutes lay the ground rules under which the patent system operates, but these laws are constantly being interpreted by patent-office examiners, by Federal-court judges, and by plain businessmen everywhere. And it is these individuals who in the end determine a patent's value. The Patent Office must decide correctly whether the invention is truly new. The courts, in turn, must decide, in the case of a patent in litigation, whether the Patent Office decision was justified (if they think not, they can invalidate the patent at any time). Finally, the business community must decide, after studying what the Patent Office and the courts have been doing with similar inventions, whether it is safe to invest in the new patents being offered for exploitation.

To hit the jackpot on his invention, the inventor must win all three decisions; it is not enough for him to gain a solid patent from the Patent Office—one that infringers would find it very difficult to invalidate through court action—if the market for patents is unsettled because of uncertainty over the standards by which the office and the courts are operating. Such uncertainty now prevails.

JUDICAL CONFUSION

The uncertain value of patents is largely blamed on the Supreme Court itself, although that august body passes on only 2 or 3 cases involving patents a year. Yet the decisions of the Court have been a marvel of consistency; only 5 times in 15 years has it judged in favor of the patent holders, a record that finally led the late Justice Jackson to predict, in a dissenting opinion, that the day was coming when "the only patent that is valid is one which this Court has not been able to get its hands on."

Even more important than the decisions has been the language used by the justices in their invalidating opinions. Justice Douglas, in a case involving an automobile cigarette lighter, introduced the flash of genius test by writing that a new device, "however useful it may be, must reveal the flash of creative genius, not merely the skill of the calling." And in the famous A & P case Douglas again set a prohibitive standard by insisting, in a concurring opinion written with Justice Black, that "the invention to justify a patent, had to serve the ends of science—to push back the frontiers of chemistry, physics, and the like; to make a distinctive contribution to scientific knowledge." The illustrations on page 133 show that even Thomas Edison's patent, on the electric light would fail these tests.

INFLUENCE OF THE COURT

The Supreme Court decisions have had a profound effect on the lower Federal courts. The most extreme example is the Appeals Court of the Second Circuit, which includes the important New York district court where one-fifth of all the patent cases in the country are initially tried. From 1948 through 1953 the appeals court heard cases involving 38 patents; in 37 instances, the patent was declared either invalid or not infringed; in only 1 case was the finding in favor of the patent holder. Such judicial precedents are not lost on the bargaining agents in a negotiation between an independent inventor and the business interests he is trying to entice.

In 1952 an effort was made to counteract the court decisions by incorporating a more moderate standard of invention into the new patent-law code adopted by Congress that year, but the few courts that have commented on the matter have maintained that the intent of Congress was primarily to codify, and not to modify, the existing patent laws. Another proposal, made by the Patent Equity Association of New York, is to create a system of technically trained judges for the hearing of patent cases. Such judges, drawn primarily from the ranks of

patent lawyers, would preside in all patent cases.[1] But most patent authorities are agreed that little can be done until death or retirement changes the character of the courts; too many of the present judges were appointed during the era when Thurman Arnold was concentrating his antitrust fire on the beneficial monopoly of patents.

JEOPARDIZED QUALITY

Meanwhile the value of patents is being eroded by trouble from a new direction. Indifference and neglect are reducing the effectiveness of the Patent Office itself, and this will eventually have a direct effect on the quality of the patents that the office issues. A patent may be invalidated at any time if someone can prove to the courts that the invention was not new when it was applied for. It is the patent examiner's job to look for prior art, but the Patent Office, unlike a title company, makes no guaranty that this search was complete. The inventor and his backers must proceed with commercial development at their own risk.

It is the quality of the Patent Office search that is jeopardized. Each year an additional 40,000 United States patents are added to the prior art, along with an equally large number of foreign patents, and tons of technical literature in every language. This, plus the increasing complexity of the individual patent applications, has doubled, in the past 50 years, the time and effort needed to process an application. Worse still, the 650 examiners are so rushed in their routine work (they are 200,000 applications behind) that there is no time to do the classifying and collating necessary to make sense out of this mountain of information. And now, instead of giving the Patent Office the help it needs, the present administration has chosen to put the office on a stringent economy regime. The Bureau's budget for fiscal 1955 is $11,500,000, down a half million from the $12 million that it has spent in recent years. To make the office more nearly self-sufficient, the Department of Commerce (parent to the Patent Office) has asked Congress to raise the basic fees for obtaining patents from $60 to a sliding scale that approximates $120 per patent. Yet even this increase will cover only half of the current $6-million deficit.

These efforts at economy come at an inopportune moment. The Commissioner of Patents, Robert C. Watson, a respected Washington attorney appointed by the Republican administration, calculates that the Patent Office needs immediately an additional 200 examiners just to stay even with the incoming work and to effect a small annual reduction (5 percent) in the backlog of waiting applications. This reduction is particularly important because it is the application backlog that determines the length of time, now an average of 3 years and 7 months, between the date of application and the issuance of a patent. As indicated by the chart on page 135, the office is actually working on the application for only 4 or 5 days during the years that an inventor waits for his patent.

An Advisory Committee on Application of Machines to Patent Office Operations has been formed under the chairmanship of Vannevar Bush to study the possibility of mechanizing at least part (possibly 20 percent) of the examiner's work. But this is long term, and of immediate moment is Watson's need for a special fund, possibly $5 million or $6 million, spread over as many years, with which to tackle the growing job of reclassification. (Searches are made by classes of inventions, and some of these groupings have not been brought up to date in years.) Unless there is some radical change in the administration's thinking, however, Watson probably will not get even this short-term aid. And the value of patents will continue to diminish.

INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The independent inventors, as a group, are too disorganized to do anything concrete in their own defense. This raises the question whether it is industry's responsibility to use its weight and influence on the independent inventor's behalf. There are two good reasons why industry should. First, there is a strong presumption that industrial, organized research cannot yet entirely supplant the brain storms, the flashes of genius of the independents. But even more important is the fact that if the lone inventor is allowed to atrophy, the patent system, the institution that makes industrial research economically feasible, may become defenseless against political attack.

In this regard the patent system is already vulnerable. Not since the 1920's, when the patent pool assembled by RCA brought radio out of its infancy, has the protection provided by patents created a totally new industry in the manner exemplified by Bell's patent on the telephone, Goodyear's patent on the vulcanization of rubber, or Hall's patent on the reduction of aluminum. The important developments of the past quarter-century (e. g., television, jet engines, synthetic fibers, detergents, rubber) have served mainly to entrench the established companies with large research staffs. A large portion of the United States population is persuaded that any monopoly, even the temporary one created by the patent grant, is fundamentally evil; and the argument that patents help "the big get bigger" has a particularly convincing ring when it coincides with evidence that the lone inventor is being denied a fair opportunity. If for no other reason than to counteract this charge, industry should give the independent inventor a helping hand.

UNPLUGGED CHANNELS

There are many ways in which industry could help. It could, for example, give financial and moral support to the groups that are trying to strengthen the faltering patent system. More specifically, industry could subsidize adult classes at colleges and universities where independent inventors could take cram courses in the new technologies. But the most effective single act industry could perform would be to review its own attitudes toward the lone inventor.

For example, the channels of communication between corporation and inventor need to be cleared; the deluge of ideas that flood organizations like Product Development Corp. and the Institute of Inventive Research proves that these channels have been, in the past, badly plugged. Improvement, however, will not come easily. The mutual suspicion between inventor and corporation is born of bitter experiences by both. To defend themselves from crackpots looking for a lawsuit, most companies insist that the inventor at least have a patent application in process before they will listen to him. Even the Sinclair plan included this provision, which alone may have doomed the program from the start. If the independent inventor is ever to enter the higher reaches of technology, where extensive laboratory tests are required to establish even the patentability of a nebulous idea, industry will have to find a simpler method of defending its own and the inventor's rights.

Corporations could also reexamine their policies toward their own researchers. In their employer's field of interest, these inventors are hired inventors, but in all other areas of technology, the same men are potential independent inventors. Too many companies hamper initiative by not establishing a consistent policy on the question of the unwanted invention. Researchers should be able to exploit freely any ideas or inventions they develop that are not of interest to the company that is paying their salary.

Finally, the corporations, either directly or through industry associations, could inform the independent inventors of the types of problems that are currently proving troublesome. The National Inventors Council has used this scheme successfully for several years by periodically listing the current needs of the Armed Forces (e. g., a low-temperature storage battery for Arctic troops). The toughest part of this job for industry would be to admit occasionally that its own research programs are not infallible.

A case in point is the electronic industry's effort to find a way to make a cheap and reliable cathode-ray tube for receiving color television. Present tubes cost 10 times their black-and-white equivalents, and it will probably require an entirely new concept of design or manufacture to reduce this ratio substantially. Chances are that when the way is found, it will be so simple and obvious that every television repairman in the country will wonder why he didn't think of it first. But then, that has been true of every great invention—after it has been invented. And that is why, given a chance and enough incentive, independent inventors will always be able to pay their own way.

[1] The present Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in Washington, D. C., is, like the tax courts, organized to adjudicate between the Government (i. e., the Patent Office) and the public. Most patent cases of importance, however, are between two citizens and generally involve a patent infringement. The Government, in issuing a patent, grants a monopoly for 17 years, but the patent holder must defend that privilege on his own.

DEMOCRATIC IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unaimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the action just taken by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee cannot help but shake public confidence in that great committee. The committee, on a straight party line vote, has approved a tax reduction proposal which would cost the Government $2.3 billion in revenue.

It did so without hearings, or even without prior public discussion.

It did so in a most devious way—as though afraid to have the proposal stand on its own merits—by tacking it on a bill which we all know must pass.

It did so in the face of a prospective deficit of $2.4 billion—a deficit we can keep that low only if the Congress exercises the greatest restraint in voting upon appropriations and authorization bills.

It did so at a time when not a single appropriation bill for fiscal 1956 had even been reported to the House for action—at a time when we have no idea of our burden of expenditures during the next fiscal year.

It did so at a time when leading Democrats, and Democrat-run committees, are calling for the enactment of bigger and better Federal spending projects—huge Federal grants for school aid, more Fed-

eral power projects in the West and the South, increased military expenditures, larger salary increases for postal and other Federal employees and mandatory high-level support prices for the basic crops.

This, Mr. Speaker, is irresponsibility—cold, calculated, disastrous fiscal irresponsibility.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 913. An act to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate; and

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary additional copies of certain parts of the hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCRIVNER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH (at the request of Mr. SCUDDER).

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. METCALF) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

452. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on "Paperwork Management, Part I, In the United States Government, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Government Operations.

453. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the task force report on Paperwork Management in the United States Government, pursuant to Public Law 108 (ch. 184), 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

454. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report with reference to reservations from appropriations within Indian reservations, for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to 36 Statutes 858; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

455. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report for the period October 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, of the Maritime Administration, covering transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, pursuant to section 13 of the act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

456. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

457. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish townsites within the national forests, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

458. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

459. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1954, made by Price Waterhouse & Co., 56 Pine Street, New York City 5, N. Y., independent certified public accountants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 91. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; with an amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 105. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to matters within its jurisdiction; with an amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 202. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1573. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1801. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4259. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4259. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4260. A bill to create a Federal highway corporation for financing the construction of the national system of interstate highways; to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4261. A bill to create a Federal highway corporation for financing the construction of the national system of interstate highways; to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 4262. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 4263. A bill to provide institutional on-farm training for the veteran who performs part of his course as the employee of another; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4264. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4265. A bill to amend paragraph 1004 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the importation of certain yarns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 4266. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that any State or county which plants 85 percent or more of its cotton-acreage allotment shall be deemed to have planted its full allotment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4267. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Patent Laws and Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCDONOUGH:

H. R. 4268. A bill to permit local taxation of the private interest in personal property and work in process and inventories of material acquired by the Federal Government for military security and the national defense but in the possession of contractors

with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4269. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to authorize additional market services for livestock purchasers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 4270. A bill to provide for the construction of a water-filtration plant at Bonners Ferry, Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4271. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4272. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4273. A bill to provide for compensating local peace officers who seize vehicles which are forfeited to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4274. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4275. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Wildcat Mountain National Military Park in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4276. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the interception of communications by persons other than public officers and employees in the exercise of their official duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4277. A bill to provide Federal assistance to business enterprises, communities, and individuals injured by tariff reductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4278. A bill to grant an additional income-tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the period August 21 to 27, 1955, as American Law Student Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to authorize transfer of a percentage of tax collections from individual and corporate income taxes to the States and Territories for use for educational purposes only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the period August 14 to 17, 1955, as American Law Student Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. Res. 151. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for a code of fair procedure for committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. Res. 152. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the great contribution being made to blind persons everywhere by the Gospel Association for the Blind; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation withdrawing all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that the Corps of Engineers report on the Libby project be approved, that the project be authorized, and that funds be made available for its construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against the enactment of legislation lowering the tariffs on the importation of rubber products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the emergency drought relief feed program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting immediate statehood for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that House bill 610, now pending before the Congress, be passed and approved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging enactment of legislation authorizing the issuance of a patent conveying fee simple title to those certain necessary tidelands in Shoemaker Bay to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4279. A bill for the relief of John (Janos) Frank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4280. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 4281. A bill for the relief of Joseph Piatkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4282. A bill for the relief of Manuel R. Llamado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4283. A bill for the relief of William T. Collins, also known as Vasilios T. Buzunis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 4285. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 4286. A bill for the relief of Dr. Margaret Galoustian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4287. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nurollah Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 4288. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 4289. A bill for the relief of Vladislav Bevc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

110. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Franco-Belgian Mutual Association of Rhode Island, favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the social security law, so as to enable qualified workers to receive their FICA pensions at the age of 60 years, instead of 65 years of age, as at present; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

111. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Los Angeles-Long Beach, relating to a resolution urging that Federal aid as provided the past year be continued for fiscal year 1956 and thereafter, including necessary appropriations; and that provisions of long-existing law authorizing State maritime academies be fully observed; to the Committee on Appropriations.

112. Also, petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Los Angeles-Long Beach, relating to a resolution requesting that the Congress of the United States enact legislation to alter and correct the fiscal policy of the Panama Canal so as to relieve commercial cargoes transiting the canal of the portions of operating, interest, depreciation, and Canal Zone Government costs properly allocable to other departments or agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

113. By the SPEAKER: Petition from the president of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Federation of America, No. 10, Norwood, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing gratitude to the United States for its favorable attitude toward Lithuania in her cause for restoration of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

114. Also, petition from the grand knight, Morning Star Council, No. 294, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

115. Also, petition from the city manager Anchorage, Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging passage of the Alaska statehood bill, now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] has reported to his constituents on the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the gentleman's statement which is short, lucid, and points up the real facts surrounding this issue which has become the subject of unnecessary controversy.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

I am impelled to make a few simple remarks about the Dixon-Yates contract because it is being used by some as a symbol of evil. It is the bone of contention in the fight of the Socialists to destroy private enterprise. They use it as the offsetting answer to everything that is good. You make the casual remark that inflation has been stopped, and the cost of living is down. The reply is, "Yes, but how about Dixon-Yates?" You continue, "The national income is going up and taxes are coming down." Again the reply is, "Yes, but how about Dixon-Yates?" That reply has become so universal that if you were talking to Chou En-Lai and said, "It is a violation of the Korean Armistice for you to hold our prisoners," he would say, "Yes, but how about Dixon-Yates?"

POWER REQUIREMENTS

Some background is necessary in order to understand how the contract came into existence. The Atomic Energy Commission is the largest single user of electric energy in the United States, and by far the largest customer of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA came to Congress a few years ago and said that by 1957 they would be short of power by some five or six hundred thousand kilowatt-hours. The AEC has first call on energy, and private users would have to be rationed. They asked for $100 million of Federal money to build a steam plant at Fulton, 25 miles north of Memphis, which is nearly 100 miles outside of the Tennessee Valley watershed. Three times Congress refused to appropriate this money as the locale was not within the jurisdiction of TVA.

The Director of the Budget suggested that it might be feasible to find some private industry to supply this anticipated shortage. TVA has long been unable to supply the AEC with needed energy at the Paducah atomic-energy plant, as witness the fact that the Commission under the Truman administration negotiated two contracts for private supplies, three times in excess of the current subject contract. These contracts were negotiated without any of the sound and fury which accompanies the Dixon-Yates negotiations, even though the energy charge was slightly higher than the one now contemplated.

NO GIVEAWAY

The Government can cancel these contracts on 3 years' notice, and the private companies would then have to find a market for the surplus energy so canceled out. This in itself would be no small task. Due to the possibility of cancellation, it was felt that it would not be feasible to concentrate additional power around Paducah, which could not be absorbed by other customers, but that any additional energy should be generated at a point which, if cancellation should come, the supplier could find a reasonable ready market for the energy.

It was felt that a plant located near Memphis could be built, and the energy exchanged with TVA to cover its growing shortage. The AEC would exchange kilowatt for kilowatt with TVA. The contract provides that the Government can buy the Dixon-Yates plant at any time, or can cancel at any time. Here I should say that Dixon and Yates are just names. Each is the head of a large going public utility in the area, and the two companies formed the Mississippi Generating Co. to finance the project which has an estimated cost of $107 million. One hundred million would come from bonds and notes, and the balance would be the risk capital supplied by the two parent companies.

The contract provides a ceiling on what they can earn, but no floor. There is no guaranteed income. The ceiling is less than the national average for public utilities. The energy charge will be less than TVA now charges the AEC at its Oak Ridge plant, if you eliminate the tax factor. And speaking of taxes, it should be noted that the taxes paid by private electric utilities for local, State, and Federal taxes in the United States average 44 percent of the gross income from sale of energy, and while TVA claims to pay taxes, they amount to only 4 percent of their gross income from energy sales.

SOCIALISM OR FREE ENTERPRISE

The question arises: Are the people of this country going to support the Government, or is the Government going to support the people? The attack on the Dixon-Yates contract is not based upon facts, it is a diversionary action, while the real attack is against private enterprise. The Socialist plan is for Government ownership of all capital. Public power is the spearhead of this drive, and because it is the easiest segment of industry to nationalize, the Socialists cannot afford to let the Dixon-Yates contract go unchallenged, even though it would supply the shortage of energy, encourage private industry, and save the Government from borrowing another $100 million.

I am glad that the President is standing firm on the issue in spite of the attacks. The opponents have done a potent job of obscuring the provisions and purposes of the contract and we who support private enterprise should be just as effective in presenting the facts in their true light.

USDA Uses Unique Methods in Soybean Hearing at Memphis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a hearing at Memphis, Tenn., on February 14 when a crowd estimated at more than 300 people were present to listen to testimony in opposition to proposals of the United States Grain Standards Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture to make certain changes both in grades and classifications.

This was a rather unique hearing, Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the only persons in attendance at the meeting who appeared to favor the changes were Mr. Barr, chief inspector of the Grain Division, and the other representatives of the Department of Agriculture. Anyone attending the meeting had an opportunity to be heard, and several of us stated that we would like to know who was sponsoring the changes and that we would like to hear from anyone present who approved or endorsed the changes.

Mr. Barr was the only person who defended the position of the Department of Agriculture in proposing to make changes in standards and classifications which have been in effect and which apparently have been working very well since 1949. However, Mr. Barr was not only willing to indicate his support of these proposed changes in which he would naturally have a pride of authorship, but went so far at one time as to state that his division was convinced, and then immediately retracted this strong language to state that the Division was of the opinion that the changes might properly be considered.

This meeting or hearing was unique in another way, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the lack of notice which the farmer—the actual producer of soybeans—had. Actually, it was rather by accident and certainly indirectly that I learned about the hearing to be held in Memphis—one of a series of five.

When I inquired of the Department of Agriculture about the notice that had been given, I was told that the notice of the meeting had been sent to the Federal Register. Now, of course, some of my farmers do not read the Federal Register. I was told the notice was sent to most of the trade journals. Naturally, those subscription lists do not include any considerable number of farmers—the man who actually produces the soybeans and who would be vitally affected by any changes and who certainly should have the opportunity to express himself before any changes are made.

I was particularly interested in whether or not the Commercial Appeal, the paper that most of the people in the Midsouth area read, was notified of this meeting. If they received a notice, it was not a notice that gained the attention of any editor, for there was absolutely no prior notice of this meeting in the Sunday or Monday morning issues prior to the meeting on Monday.

The crowd that did gather was recruited by some of the smaller elevator operators and through the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association. Naturally, the American Soybean Association had notice of the meeting and this notice was carried in its monthly magazine, but, again, this was not the notice that gets to the actual producer. As an indication of the lack of notice given throughout the section of the Midsouth where the soybean is a major crop,

and where any reclassification will result in millions of dollars loss to the farmers of that area, I am, in another extension of the RECORD, having reproduced an article from the Republican, a newspaper of Caruthersville, Mo., as reported by Mr. Albert Cravens, a secretary-treasurer of the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked to have included with these remarks of mine a copy of a letter, written by the president of the above-named association, directed to the Director of the Grain Division in the USDA, setting forth the views of the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association on the proposed revisions of the soybean standards, which is as follows:

MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN AND
GRAIN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
February 17, 1955.

DIRECTOR, GRAIN DIVISION, AMA,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

VIEWS OF THE MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN AND GRAIN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION ON THE PROPOSED REVISIONS OF THE SOYBEAN STANDARDS

1. On the proposed revision that would reduce the maximum limits of foreign material 1 percent in each numerical grade. As country shippers we are in the middle on this question as we only buy on the grade that we have to sell but as the growers as presented by the American Soybean Association and the processors thought their present buying practices want 2 percent foreign material in No. 2 soybeans, we see no reason why the change cannot be made. We do, however, urge that a study be made to see if some simple method can be found to separate true foreign material from the small broken pieces of soybeans that fall through an 5/64-round-hole screen. Maybe the use of a smaller hole size such as a 5/64 would let enough of the small-weed seed through and leave enough broken pieces on the screen to reduce the buildup of foreign material we now have in soybeans through handling. If such a method can be found we urge its use.

2. On the reduction of moisture we see no reason why the moisture in No. 1 soybeans cannot be reduced to 12 percent. However, we feel that no change need be made in the moisture of No. 2 soybeans as we have found that even in our humid climate 14-percent-moisture soybeans can be stored.

3. We can see no reason why the change in splits should not go through if you in the department feel that it would improve the soybean-grading system.

4. On the proposed special limits on heat damage in each numerical grade. We are against such limits as they would work a hardship on all shippers. Today inspectors are having enough trouble determining total damage or just how much total damage a sample contains. However, if the Department feels that such limits should be put into effect, then heat damage should be more clearly defined. We suggest that it means soybeans that have turned entirely black or brown from heat. The present methods of saying that a small brown spot in the middle of an otherwise sound soybean is heat damage leaves too much room for human error and judgment for such narrow limits of heat damage as have been proposed by the Department.

5. On the proposed reclassification of soybeans with green seed coats that are in cross section yellow from the yellow class to the green class. We cannot say too strongly that we are opposed to this change. We have many reasons for being against the change. Here are just a few of them: 80 percent or more of the Midsouth soybean production would be affected by this change. No evidence was present at Memphis to disprove our conclusion that if the proposed change went through that 90 percent of our Ogden type soybeans would grade as mixed. This was the case before the change in 1949. If they were classed as mixed in 1948 and before what new method has been developed to tell class by the variety predominate color and how could variety purity be proven? In other words how could an inspector tell the difference between a bleached Ogden and a pale S–100 to say that the sample was a mixture of green and yellow varieties or just a sample of Ogden type soybean and therefore are classed green and just happen to have 10 percent or more that just happen to be faded yellow?

We recognize the department's desire and the need to make a grade and class such that it will tell the buyer if he wants that certain quality or not. We agree that under the present standards for soybeans it is not always possible for the buyer to get just what he wants by buying a certain grade and class but as one of the speakers at Memphis pointed out No. 2 Hard wheat does not always describe just what type of No. 2 Hard wheat that a buyer wants. Therefore, a buyer will say that he wants Kansas or Texas No. 2 Hard wheat and not Illinois No. 2 Hard wheat. Today most buyers that need a yellow coated soybean for their special products have found that they can get what they want by saying that they want a No. 2 yellow soybean from Illinois points or maybe Ohio. We feel that since the buyers can get yellow coated soybeans by saying what he wants that it is not right to penalize the Midsouth that has no high yielding soybean that isn't mixed with green and yellow coats. We realize that you cannot sell a person for long something that he does not want so if it was not possible for a buyer to get yellow coated soybeans without changing the standards we would not be opposed but as he can get yellow coated soybeans leave the standards alone.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL C. HUGHES,
President.

Simple, Direct, Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, if you are looking for a simple, direct program for aid to education, free from Government controls, without costly administration, and devoid of any "share-the-wealth" attributes, the joint resolution I am introducing today deserves your consideration and support.

Although most State treasuries are in better shape financially than is the Federal Treasury, there is no doubt but that in many States the demands, especially for education, call for more finances than the States are able to raise to provide needed buildings, maintenance, improved equipment, increases in teachers' salaries, and other items. The combined debt of the 48 States is about $20 billion. Uncle Sam owes over $275 billion.

With the enormous increase in Federal expenditures over the past 25 years the Federal Government has tapped every practical possible source of tax revenue, with little consideration for the tax needs of State and municipal governments. The States are now dependent almost entirely upon direct taxes on real estate and personal property, duplicated income tax and sales taxes which fall heavily on persons of low income. In seeking new revenue the States find available sources already drained by Federal taxation—income taxes, admission taxes, beverage taxes, luxury taxes, transportation taxes, tobacco taxes, excise taxes, to name but a few. Enormous sums, billions of dollars annually, are siphoned out of the States in individual and corporate income taxes. The remaining revenue available to the States is inadequate to meet rising local costs of government and provide adequately for growing educational needs.

It is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums from the States and then have a portion of these funds trickle back under any of the proposed bureaucratic-administered programs of aid to education. If any of the presently proposed and pending programs are adopted, a large overhead for administration is unavoidable, and in some instances the only thing offered the State is an opportunity, lured on by Federal dollars in matching funds, to go into debt, and even this is prohibited by law in some States.

Under the best-intentioned Federal administration, there remains the well-founded objection that the compulsory requirement that each State meet conditions imposed by law and regulations of the administering bureau must be complied with to qualify for benefits. Furthermore, there is a deep-seated fear—also well founded—that with Government intervention in education programs, opportunity might well be found for channeling propaganda into our schools, along with Federal controls which naturally follow Federal dollars flowing from Washington.

With a modest beginning, these programs, with almost no exception, follow a pattern of growing and growing, until it is possible that the training of our youth throughout the Nation could some day be directed from one central Federal bureau, and that bureau would be headed by someone appointed, not elected, and thus not directly responsible to the taxpayers whose funds he was spending.

The prime responsibility for education programs is in the local community and the State. Conditions now existing are not emergency short-time situations, and can be expected to continue for the long indefinite future, as more children are born.

To easily, simply, cheaply, and efficiently provide the States with some financial aid for meeting their needs for the improvement of their respective educational programs, without increasing their debt, without building up a huge Federal bureaucracy, without fear of Federal controls, dictation, or propaganda, without the slightest element of distribution of wealth, I am proposing, by a joint resolution which I am today introducing, a simple, direct, unrestricted plan for aid to the States and the Territories to help them meet the edu-

cational demands within their respective borders.

House Joint Resolution —

Whereas the Government of the United States, through taxes, is siphoning a great part of the wealth of our Nation out of the several States and Territories into the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is collecting taxes from nearly all sources of revenue, including taxes on individual and corporate incomes, admissions, beverages, communications, gifts, luxuries, transportation, and from excises and other taxes, leaving to the States little but real and personal property and consumer sales as sources of tax revenue; and

Whereas at rates approaching confiscation of property, States are still not able to raise revenue sufficient to carry the rising costs of State and local governments, and especially not to meet the demands for needed improvements and higher salaries for the training of our youth; and

Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government grant aid to the States for educational purpose; and

Whereas it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums out of the States and Territories and redistribute funds under bureaucratic regulation from the Federal Treasury, and

Whereas it is desirable that such aid be accomplished by a simple, easy, direct, and efficient method, not hampered with bureaucratic restrictions, directions, or dictation: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate incomes under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

SEC. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an amount equal to 1 percent of the taxes from individual and corporate incomes collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

SEC. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received by said State official.

Under this plan the handling of funds through Washington and back will be eliminated; the amounts available to each State will be determined annually by individual and corporate incomes within that State. The money will remain in the several States where it was collected. The total amount to be thus collected through Federal facilities for the States each year will be automatically geared to the national income for that year. There will be no danger or possibility of Federal control or dictation, and no opportunity for channelized propaganda. It will provide many States with a larger amount than would be available under many other plans which have been proposed. There would be no need for a growing bureaucratic horde with an insatiable hunger for power ready to consume ever-increasing amounts of taxes.

For example, in fiscal 1954 the district director for internal revenue for Kansas collected in individual and corporate income taxes approximately $407,343,360. On this basis there would have gone to the State of Kansas under this plan, for the fiscal year 1954, $4,073,433 every cent of which would be available for use within the State.

This is not a new proposal. I first presented it in 1949—H. R. 1582—at which time several various proposals were pending.

In the 80th Congress—1946—the Senate passed S. 472. Under that measure, the only direct aid to education bill to pass in either House of the Congress, the estimated initial contribution Kansas would have been required to make to the Federal Treasury would have been $2,552,000. From the benefits authorized by S. 472, Kansas could have received back as aid to education a total of $1,960,000—a net loss of $600,000. The other proposals so far advanced would operate to take out of most States more to support the proposed program than would be returned in benefits, and on the whole would provide less in effective aid than is offered by my proposal.

Certainly under the plan I propose, the States, generally, by having this 1 percent of the individual and corporate Federal income taxes paid by its citizens withheld for use within each of the respective States for educational purposes, would be much better able to cope directly, as they deemed best, with their educational problems than they would under any program directed from a Washington bureau.

This proposal will be a step toward retaining our constitutional Republic and a move away from centralized government.

Such legislation will be in keeping with suggestions made by the then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, by keeping the control and responsibility local. He said:

> When financing of schools is turned over to the Federal Government you get bureaucracy, and this is the approach to statism.

Every advocate of aid to education to whom I have talked insists he wants no Federal control, no bureaucracy. This resolution will meet that desire, for it need not add a single person to the Federal payroll and will certainly eliminate all possibility of Federal controls—even those found in most other proposals before the Congress.

From the table below based on tax collections for the fiscal year 1954—approximately—you can see the benefits for your own State. The logical appeal and the elimination of the danger of Federal bureaucratic controls under this plan would enable your State to provide more adequately and more efficiently for the needed enlargement of educational facilities and the necessary increase in salaries of teachers.

This direct use of income taxes is possible. It can be done. Precedent is established by Public Law 630 of the 81st Congress, where it is provided that all of the taxes of incomes earned by American citizens in Guam, while resident there, including stateside Americans, both civilians and military, should be turned over to the Government of Guam. Not just 1 percent, but all of the income tax collected from Americans there—and Guam is merely an unincorporated Territory.

TABLE I

	Income tax collections fiscal year 1954 (including tax for old-age insurance)	1 percent of tax collected
Alabama	$355,904,000	$3,559,040
Arizona	153,119,000	1,531,190
Arkansas	148,110,000	1,481,100
California	4,671,633,000	46,716,330
Colorado	553,265,000	5,532,650
Connecticut	1,168,589,000	11,685,890
Delaware	869,525,000	8,695,250
Florida	599,990,000	5,999,900
Georgia	581,573,000	5,815,730
Hawaii	126,170,000	1,261,700
Idaho	100,902,000	1,009,020
Illinois	4,926,633,000	49,266,330
Indiana	1,205,079,000	12,050,790
Iowa	494,575,000	4,945,750
Kansas	437,870,000	4,378,700
Kentucky	441,333,000	4,413,330
Louisiana	459,357,000	4,593,570
Maine	159,030,000	1,590,300
Maryland	851,777,000	8,517,770
Massachusetts	1,708,884,000	17,088,840
Michigan	4,857,146,000	48,571,460
Minnesota	917,256,000	9,172,560
Mississippi	129,336,000	1,293,360
Missouri	1,472,722,000	14,727,220
Montana	109,285,000	1,092,850
Nebraska	320,620,000	3,206,200
Nevada	70,308,000	703,080
New Hampshire	118,150,000	1,181,500
New Jersey	1,745,232,000	17,452,320
New Mexico	99,351,000	993,510
New York	11,626,091,000	116,260,910
North Carolina	673,436,000	6,734,360
North Dakota	60,929,000	609,290
Ohio	4,147,301,000	41,473,010
Oklahoma	504,416,000	5,044,160
Oregon	403,821,000	4,038,210
Pennsylvania	4,531,795,000	45,317,950
Rhode Island	271,663,000	2,716,630
South Carolina	239,806,000	2,398,060
South Dakota	67,056,000	670,560
Tennessee	463,856,000	4,638,560
Texas	1,969,318,000	19,693,180
Utah	135,924,000	1,359,240
Vermont	70,790,000	707,900
Virginia	641,430,000	6,414,300
Washington	711,456,000	7,114,560
West Virginia	270,198,000	2,701,980
Wisconsin	1,121,973,000	11,219,730
Wyoming	51,764,000	517,640
Alaska	45,843,000	458,430
District of Columbia	707,455,000	7,074,550
Puerto Rico	(9,571,000)	(95,710)
Total	58,578,533,000	585,785,330

NOTE.—Because collections for old-age insurance are not shown separately in internal revenue reports, actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown here when adjustment made for that factor—an average of about 7.2 percent.

Narcotics Addicts Have Been Hospitalized by the District Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as you may remember legislation was enacted during the 83d Congress which provides compulsory hospitalization, by court order, of drug addicts in the District of Columbia. During the hearings on my bill, it was pointed out that there were approximately 2,500 known drug users in our Nation's Capital.

During the past month the first 2 addicts have been compusorily hospitalized under the new law. The first was a young man of 20 years who was com-

mitted last Friday. Monday, a 30-year-old woman, who admitted using up to 8 caps of heroin a day, became the second to be sent to the United States Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky.

In the latter case, the new law proves its effectiveness in helping to eliminate crime in the District. An assistant United States attorney testified that the woman told police she had supported her expensive habit by prostitution.

On the other hand, 22 men and women drug users have voluntarily begun hospitalization under a special provision of the act since it went into effect last year. Of these, 1 man has been cured and has returned to the District. He was hospitalized approximately 5 months.

The law directs the court to commit drug addicts to the Public Health Service hospital until they are cured. After they are released, the patient must make periodic reports to authorities to insure that the person has not returned to the habit.

I believe it is only proper to point out that these persons are not considered as criminals under the provisions of the act but rather as patients. Still, the law provides no haven for those who have committed a crime under some other existing law.

Soybean Producers Face Gigantic Loss if United States Department of Agriculture Carries Out Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal, if not the announced intention, of the Grain Standards Division of the Department of Agriculture to make certain changes in the soybean standards, I have gone on record as opposing these changes for a number of reasons.

Naturally, one of the most compelling reasons for opposing these changes is the fact that any such change would immediately and without question result in a financial loss of many millions of dollars, shared by practically every producer of soybeans throughout a large area of the South and the Midwest.

Furthermore, any change at this time, and without giving the farmers of my area, as well as those of many other States, an opportunity to make a change in their plans for planting, would be doing them the greatest disservice. If such a plan as a representative of the Department of Agriculture said they were convinced was in order, and which he indicated would be put into effect this year, is permitted to go into effect, it would cause confusion and penalize thousands of southern farmers at a time when they have already suffered an irreparable damage due to droughts of the past 3 years.

If such a change is to be made, it should not be made until after our farmers have had adequate notice and an opportunity to adjust their planting plans. It should, in my opinion, not be considered until sufficient notice has been given of the contemplated intentions of the Department to permit the development of a type of soybeans which will meet the requirements of the Department's so-called experts.

I would respectfully call to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as to those who have the responsibility of carrying out the regulations of his Department, that to make this arbitrary change, without due notice to all parties concerned, would be to take a most unfair advantage of the very persons whose interests they are supposed to be guarding.

Furthermore, I would respectfully point out that, at the recent hearing held at Memphis, Tenn., with approximately 300 persons in attendance, not one single person with the exception of the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, expressed themselves as favoring the proposed changes, and in fact all of those present, including farmer producers, elevator operators, and warehousemen, processors, operators of terminal facilities, exporters, and others, all went on record as strongly opposing the proposed change in classification of soybeans, and at this hearing there was no satisfactory answer to the question of Who wants this change?

In connection with these remarks, I am including herewith copy of an article which appeared in one of the newspapers of my district, The Republican, of Caruthersville, Mo., which sets forth a rather complete résumé of the hearing at Memphis, which calls attention to the damage which would be done by the adoption of the proposed change in classification, and furthermore sets forth rather clearly a substantiation of the charges which I have made that there was inadequate notice of this hearing and that the farmers of that area generally had no notice of the great importance of the contemplated change and therefore have not had sufficient opportunity to voice their great opposition to this change.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues, particularly those from the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Louisiana, will join with me in protesting this proposed change in the classifications as they would affect not less than 80 percent and possibly as much as 85 to 90 percent of the soybeans produced in their respective districts.

Herewith is a report of the Memphis hearing as reported by Mr. Albert Cravens, secretary-treasurer of the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association, in the Thursday, February 17, 1955, issue of the Caruthersville (Mo.) Republican:

USDA RECLASSIFICATION OF OGDEN BEAN WOULD COST PEMISCOT FARMERS

Albert Cravens of the Missouri Soybean Co., of Caruthersville, which also has elevators at Hayti, and who is also secretary-treasurer of the Midsouth Soybean and Grain Shippers Association, was among some 300 Midsouth growers, buyers, and shippers who were in attendance at a United States Department of Agriculture meeting held Monday afternoon at the Hotel Peabody, Memphis, Tenn. A. O. "Cap" Acom of Wardell was also present.

The meeting was in charge of J. E. Barr, chief inspector, Grain Branch, USDA, who heard members of the group in testimony relative to a proposed change in classification of the Ogden soybean from a yellow to a green or mixed bean classification.

An interested witness at this meeting was Congressman PAUL C. JONES, of Kennett, the only Congressman from any of the six States present at this important meeting.

Since the soybean, along with cotton, forms the backbone of this area's agricultural economy, the proposed change in classification is of prime importance to farmers in Pemiscot County and throughout this six State area.

The Ogden soybean sometimes has a green seed coating over its yellow meat, making it appear to be a green instead of a yellow bean. The USDA proposes to change classification of the Ogden bean from yellow to green where it appears green. This actually would put the Ogden bean in the mixed classification, since some of the beans bleach out yellow while others retain their green coat at harvest time.

Mixed beans carry a 25-cent penalty when put in the loan and, it is feared here, this change in classification could lead to some discrimination against the bean in the American market.

At the conclusion of the meeting Mr. Barr gave the group little hope and said the USDA grading change, if made, may not be formulated before May 1, which would be well into the planting time in this county and area and would be too late for most farmers to make any adjustment in their planting schedules.

Mr. Barr told the group that "a lot of foreign buyers have complained on some green beans being certified yellow. We think it was a serious mistake when, in 1949, the Ogden was placed in the yellow classification."

In answer to the question of how many complaints had been made to the USDA by foreign buyers, Mr. Barr replied, "We think one is too many."

A representative of the port of New Orleans, who is also an exporter, told the meeting that this proposal is dangerous and will increase our problems tenfold. We think you will be faced with the never-ending problem of determining whether the bean is yellow or green or what.

A surprise visitor at the hearing was Congressman PAUL C. JONES, of Kennett, Representative from the 10th District of Missouri, of which Pemiscot County is part. Congressman JONES is a member of the Agricultural Committee, serving in the fats and oils division. He testified briefly and chided Mr. Barr for not giving more publicity to the hearing.

That no publicity was given this important hearing was indicated by the fact that no press representatives were spotted in the large crowd and no Associated Press or United Press wire story was sent out from Memphis, nor was any mention of the meeting heard here over Memphis radio or television stations. No story was carried in Monday or Tuesday editions of The Commercial Appeal which were distributed here.

According to Cravens, Mr. Barr expressed surprise over the size of the crowd on hand and the outspoken manner which those who presented testimony participated in the meeting. "Reminds me of Texas," Barr said.

W. H. (Bill) Wyatt, who spoke for the Arkansas Bureau, pointed out that the mixed bean, in which classification the Ogden would fall, would draw a 25-cent per bushel penalty under the loan program.

"We believe," Mr. Wyatt told the meeting, "any foreign buyer can get strictly yellow

beans from northern areas without hurting them and without totally wrecking our economy.

"A four- or five-million bushel crop in Mississippi County (Arkansas) alone in 1955, if the price dropped 20 cents, would mean a $1 million loss.

"If the USDA can show us just cause why the bean should be changed, then time must be allowed to develop a comparable yielding yellow bean," he stated.

Most farm bureau groups planned to hold meeting when they returned home to state the situation and make plans to press for some action through their Congressmen.

Welcome to the Catholic Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, there has recently come off the press the first issue of a new professional publication entitled "The Catholic Lawyer." It is published quarterly by the St. Thomas More Institute for Legal Research of St. John's University School of Law, in Brooklyn, N. Y., under the editorship of Rev. Joseph T. Tinnelly, C. M., dean of the law school.

The statement of policy in the first issue contains the following:

> The average attorney is a leader in his community. His opinion is respected, his advice valued, not only in purely professional problems but in a wide variety of subjects having some relation, however tenuous, to law. In consequence, no matter how sound his general and professional education may have been he still feels the need to widen and deepen his knowledge and experience. The success of the Practicing Law Institute, of graduate and post-admission courses in various law schools, and of institutes in taxation, insurance, labor law and other subjects under the auspices of bar associations, gives evidence of this widefelt need.
>
> The Catholic attorney has all the professional obligations of his non-Catholic colleagues. Indeed his conscience may be sharpened by the fact that his confessor will require him to make restitution for any harm which his culpable ignorance or lack of diligence may have caused a client.

The publication is intended to supply answers and information on problems of concern to lawyers by the promotion and publication of legal research in such subjects. It is dedicated to the principles of St. Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England under Henry VIII.

I know that the Members of the House, particularly the lawyer Members, will join me in welcoming this important contribution to the literature of the law, and wishing for it many years of success.

It is particularly appropriate that I should call this to your attention today, Washington's birthday, since this morning, St. John's University of Brooklyn was hailed at Valley Forge, Pa., by the Freedoms Foundation for its outstanding contribution to the American way of life during the year 1954.

George Washington and the $20 Income Tax Reduction Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today this House heard an excellent reading of the Farewell Address of our first President, George Washington, by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. KRAMER]. I congratulate him.

This is a traditional honor we pay to the founder of our country on the anniversary of his birth.

But it amounts to more than that. What George Washington said in that address amounts to a lot of good common sense on how to run a country. We hear a lot of foolishness in this Chamber from time to time and I presume whoever thought up this custom of reading the Farewell Address each year had in mind that such an annual air conditioning would do us some good.

Certainly, this year it could not have come at a better time considering the fact that we are shortly to commence debate on the politically frank and obvious $20 income tax scheme measure.

Now I ask you, my colleagues, isn't it pretty clear what George Washington would say about the thing if he were here today?

Listening to his beautifully worded Farewell Address leaves little doubt he'd go out after it like a mongoose after a cobra.

My only question is what kind of language would he use. It's my guess it would be a lot less formal than the style he used for the Address.

But he isn't here so we have to look to the Farewell Address.

This is what Washington says about the politics involved in this scheme by the Democratic Party to woo millions of votes by putting an extra $20 bill in each of their pockets:

> The common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it. It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration.

As I read the foregoing in light of the $20 scheme, Washington would regard the partisan political purpose behind it as a mischief which sidetracks the Congress from its duty of providing good government for the people of the United States. It would, in fact, weaken the Government of the United States. Further, according to Washington, the people of this country in their wisdom ought to discourage such goings on.

Next, let us take a look at what the Father of our Country has to say about the finances involved:

> As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing on posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.
>
> The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant.

As I read the foregoing in light of the $20 scheme, Washington would abhor it. He says to have a regard for the amount of our public debt. Sure, spend money to meet emergencies, but when the emergency is over, get rid of the debt; do not saddle it on your children and your children's children. And do not forget, unpleasant as they are, taxes are the only way of paying for the expenditures of government.

There, my colleagues, you have the wisdom on this subject of a man much more versed in the intricacies of government than most of us.

But even George Washington was somewhat dubious as to whether or not you would heed it. In the closing portions of his Farewell Address he had this to say:

> In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit * * * this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

As I read the foregoing in light of the $20 scheme, even though Washington mentions the expectation that his advice "may be productive of some partial benefit," I think in this instance he would expect us to do more than cut it down to $10. I think he would expect us, in this situation where there is a choice between doing what is right for a political party and doing what is right for our country, to have the wherewithal to choose to do what is right for our country.

President's Highway Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's highway program repeats his now familiar process of coolly surveying a national problem and advancing a sound means by which the

problem can be attacked and steps taken toward eventual solution.

No responsible person can deny that our Nation is facing eventual strangulation on the highways. For half a century it has been a nip and tuck battle to keep highway construction ahead of automotive progress. We must move ahead with this bold plan in order to expedite the flow of goods and people from place to place. Whether in war or in peace, our highways are vital to the national economy and welfare. If we can reduce the annual carnage caused by traffic accidents, this alone will make our efforts worth while.

I am particularly pleased with the fiscal aspects of the President's scheme. Here again, the planning is based on our anticipated revenues over a specific period of time. The improved highway system will be paid for out of the funds received from increased gas tax revenues as America grows and is not a mortgage on the earning capacity of future generations as has been the case with other half-baked schemes of past years.

This is a blueprint for action which we as legislators should get behind and support.

Señor Miguel Alemán, Former President of Mexico, Encourages Joint Action in Promoting Economic Development of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as a result of several visits to Mexico, the countries of Central America and South America, I have become greatly impressed with the economic future of these countries and the possibility of the extensive development of their resources.

In view of the above I have been a strong and persistent advocate of closer relations between our Nation and those to the south. I regret that the advantage of such a policy has not been recognized as fully as it should have been. I trust, however, that a better understanding and a greater cooperation will grow out of the combined efforts that are finding expression in many different ways.

In this connection, I call attention to the Inter-American Investment Conference opening in New Orleans on February 28, 1955. This conference was initiated in Washington officially; then the idea was taken up unofficially by several parties and sponsored by the city of New Orleans through its International House and by Life and Time magazines. The individuals in charge of promoting the idea are Mr. Edgar R. Baker and Mr. Rudolph S. Hecht.

Señor Miguel Alemán, former President of Mexico, was invited to attend but was unable to do so because of prior engagements in Central and South America. However, he sent the conference a message, as follows:

> Latin America requires capital for development, designed to enlarge her economy on a plan of collaboration with her private capital resources, through sound investments creative of new sources of wealth and of labor, making for the real permanent advancement of each of her countries and of the hemispheric community.
>
> We are all good neighbors and loyal partners and should furthermore be devoted in common to the principles of democracy applied to human fellowship in all its aspects and everywhere.
>
> In the spiritual field, by consecrating ourselves to the service of the fundamental liberties to believe and to think, as well as of the freedom to express thoughts and beliefs.
>
> In the economic field, by joining our efforts in order to make the progress of our countries an exemplary thesis set before the world, conceived in the following terms:
>
> That private investments made for the equitable profit of all concerned do firmly uphold, together with justice, the peace among nations.
>
> That in order to abolish the dire impoverishment which is one of the breeding grounds of communism, it is not enough to aim at a decorous poverty; the decided promotion of a generous and honorable abundance for all is what is needed.
>
> This is now possible in the New World, as proven by the determination that inspires the Inter-American Investment Conference.

The spirit of cooperation and mutual helpfulness expressed by former President Alemán are entitled to serious consideration. A recognition of such principles would help materially in promoting goodwill between the respective nations in the Americas.

Fair Treatment for Mexico Under the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, there are in my district many splendid United States citizens of Mexican descent. Through them and through my experience as a Member of Congress, I have come to admire and respect the Mexican people and our great good neighbor to the south, the Republic of Mexico.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to an urgent problem facing the Mexican people—the present plight of the Mexican sugar industry. That industry, the fourth largest in Mexico, is in danger of being frozen out of its fair place in the world sugar market. Regrettably, that result is being brought about in large part, through the operation of the United States Sugar Act.

In recent weeks there have been discussions, at the White House and the Department of Agriculture, with a view to recommending legislation to amend the Sugar Act so as to insure an equitable share of the United States sugar market for domestic sugar producers. I am heartily in accord with that objective. At the same time, however, if we are to amend the existing legislation at this time, we should certainly use the opportunity to adjust the grossly inequitable division of the remainder of the United States market among foreign producers, which exists under the present law.

Mr. Speaker, the requirements of the Mexican sugar industry are in no sense inconsistent with the promotion of a healthy, competitive sugar industry in the United States. Mexico has no quarrel with the objectives of the United States sugar producers or with their proposals as set forth in recent official discussions. Mexico is merely seeking an equitable distribution among foreign countries, of the market which remains after domestic production is accounted for—a distribution which takes into account the economic facts of life in terms of trade balance with the United States, total sugar production and the impact of the United States sugar program upon the economy of the exporting countries.

In the recent discussions of the reciprocal trade bill we heard many fine-sounding words about trade, not aid, and about the necessity for enabling our friends and allies to purchase our goods and services by purchasing from them what they can best produce. It is time to practice what we preach. I firmly believe in helping those who help the United States.

Mexico is the third largest purchaser of United States goods in the entire world, surpassed only by Canada and Japan. In the past 22 months, Mexican purchases from the United States totaled $1,165,000,000. In the eight classifications of leading United States exports to Latin America published by the United States Department of Commerce for 1953, Mexico is the largest importer and occupies first place in 5, second place in 1 and third place in 2 of the classifications. In that year, Mexico imported from the United States $156.2 million in industrial and electrical machinery, $83.4 million in autos and trucks, $70.5 million in chemicals, $39.4 million in iron and steel mill products and $294.9 million in other products. No other sugar exporting country came anywhere close to these figures.

At the same time, over the past 22 months, Mexico's balance of trade with the United States has been unfavorable to Mexico by $532 million. For every dollar the United States spent in Mexico, Mexico spent $1.84 in the United States—almost 2 for 1.

Even within the sugar industry itself, the balance of trade between the United States and Mexico is overwhelmingly unfavorable to Mexico. Every bit of sugar-processing machinery and spare parts used in Mexico has been purchased in the United States. During the past 5-year period the Mexican sugar industry imported $38 million worth of United States manufactured equipment. During the same period, Mexico was permitted to sell to the United States only $4½ million worth of Mexican sugar.

It is obvious, of course, that in the present dollar situation no nation can indefinitely sustain so great a trade imbalance without a serious deterioration

of its imports from the United States. Mr. Speaker, one of the stated objectives of the Sugar Act is to promote the export trade of the United States. In view of this express language of the statute, one would certainly expect that the export quota allotted to Mexico by the administrators of the act would bear some reasonable relationship to the trade picture and take into account the crucial dollar gap problem of the Mexican people. That has not been done, however. In fact, the quota allotted to Mexico is so small as to be ridiculous.

In the face of the tremendous support afforded the United States economy by Mexican imports, Mexico has been allotted a quota of only 11,445 tons of sugar out of a total United States consumption of 8,200,000 tons. This represents only 1 percent of Mexican production and only fourteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total United States market. Moreover, it represents only thirty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total export quotas allotted all foreign countries.

Contrast the position of other sugar exporting countries. Cuba, which imports from the United States only about two-thirds as much as Mexico, and whose trade balance with the United States is substantially favorable to Cuba, has a quota of 2,667,840 tons. This represents 47 percent of her production, 32.5 percent of the total United States market and 96 percent of foreign quotas, excluding the Philippines.

Peru, which purchases from the United States only about 1/6 as much as Mexico, has a quota of 51,922 tons—almost 5 times that of Mexico. The Peruvian quota represents approximately 8 percent of her production, 0.63 percent of the United States market and 1.4 percent of the total foreign quotas.

The Dominican Republic, which purchases from the United States only about one-fourteenth as much as Mexico, has a quota of 27,634 tons, more than twice that of Mexico. This represents 4 percent of Dominican Republic production, 0.34 percent of the total United States market and 0.74 percent of total foreign quotas.

How did this grossly inequitable situation come about? It came about because of the failure to formulate in the Sugar Act a realistic basis for the continuing establishment of foreign sugar quotas. As a result, the system has broken down and produces outlandish results. There is a crying need for a commonsense approach to the foreign sugar problem, related to the facts of present day life, and divorced from ancient patterns and prejudices. We must recognize the equities and exigencies of today, and we must be mindful of the impact of what we do upon the lives and well-being of our friends and neighbors.

Aside from the simple equities of the situation and the economic self interest of the United States, there are other reasons why a healthy Mexican sugar industry is in the best interests of the United States. Mexico is the only sugar producing country with a border contiguous to our own and the only one in a position to provide uninterrupted, overland supply in the event of an emergency. In time of war, this assured supply for United States industry is a matter of utmost importance to United States industry and the consuming public.

We all want our allies in the free world to be strong as a bulwark against Communist aggression. The economic well-being of our friends and allies is as much a part of our own national security as are arms and armies.

We must not underestimate the tragic effect which failure to correct the inequitable foreign sugar quotas will have upon the Mexican economy. The Mexican sugar industry is the fourth largest in that country. It supports well over half a million people. By dint of diligent and persistent effort, over the years, that industry has raised the standard of living of Mexican farm workers to a reasonable level. The operation of the quota system, as presently constituted, however, spells ruin for that great Mexican industry. With present export restrictions in the world sugar market, if the United States does not allow Mexico a more equitable share of its sugar imports, it can only mean ruinous surpluses in Mexico or crippling acreage restrictions, either of which would deprive thousands of Mexican workers of a livelihood. The social and economic impact of such an eventuality upon Mexico should be obvious. Mexico has already undergone a devaluation of its currency because of the unfavorable balance of its trade with the United States. Surely we should take reasonable measures to prevent additional economic dislocation and possible collapse of United States markets in that country.

Mr. Speaker, it is not as though these people were asking for an increase of millions of tons in their sugar quota. Cuba, which has a favorable balance of United States trade now has a quota equivalent to 32.5 percent of the United States market. A sugar quota for Mexico of only 2 percent of United States consumption would absorb that country's exportable surplus and give the industry the stability it so urgently requires. Such an adjustment would have a minimal effect upon the overall sugar picture. This is a case where so little on the part of the United States will mean so much to our Mexican friends.

Mr. Speaker, this is a situation which cries out for correction and I intend to make every effort to see that justice is done.

Postal Clerk Steals: Judge Is Sympathetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a matter which will soon come up for their consideration: The question of postal pay raises. At the conclusion of my remarks I insert a news item from the Detroit Free Press, dated Thursday, February 17, 1955, and a copy of my letter to Federal Judge Theodore Levin. The news story tells of a veteran post office clerk with five children making $84 per week and pleading guilty in Federal court of stealing $231 of postal funds. Further, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Federal Judge Theodore Levin assuring him that my remarks are in no way intended to influence his duties as a jurist.

In his remarks from the bench Judge Levin states that "Something should be done about it." The implications contained in his statement, I feel, are directed to this body. When a jurist decries the inequities of a socio-economic situation which places beyond his scope of authority a means of applying a remedy I am of the opinion that those in a position to take action should not falter or hesitate. The remedy must be shaped here in the form of adequate postal pay legislation capable of answering not merely the needs of bare existence, but sufficient in scope to make the public servants of our postal system shareholders of a standard of living for which we can be justly proud.

I feel that the President's message on postal pay increases falls short of the mark in supplying the needed solution for this problem. The administration's salary plan, now before committee, calls for a 5 percent increase in basic salary rates. What would this mean to the postal clerk that is responsible for nourishing five children along with himself and his wife? Not enough to pay one-half the milk bill if he is supplying these tots with the recommended minimum of 1 quart per child per day. Since when has this great legislative body considered the basic welfare of its citizens secondary to a dream of making the postal service a self-supporting, going business concern? I do not say this to slur any efforts to make more efficient the operations of our Government agencies, but when human values are being equated with the cold statistics of fiscal policy, I, for one, shall never abide by any resultant that sacrifices humaneness for business expediency. Our responsibility is to the many—as well as the few.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly request my colleagues to join me in support of a 10-percent increase in the basic salary rates; retroactive to the date of the President's disapproval of H. R. 7774 of the 83d Congress.

POSTAL CLERK STEALS: JUDGE IS SYMPATHETIC
(By Charles Manos)

A veteran post office clerk who makes $84 a week pleaded guilty Wednesday in Federal court to stealing $231.

Charged with misapplication of postal funds collected by him on cash-on-delivery packages was Clem Hall, 49, of 1866 Kenmore, Grosse Pointe Woods. He has five children—all under 12 years of age.

Hall's plea immediately drew from Judge Theodore Levin a sympathetic comment apparently aimed at pay scales for postal workers.

"It's a shame a good man like you should be a victim of circumstances," Judge Levin said. "Something should be done about it."

Hall, a clerk in the Grosse Pointe branch, has worked for the post office for 29 years.

Judge Levin released Hall, who will forfeit his job and possibly his pension rights, on personal bond pending sentencing.

FEBRUARY 23, 1955.

Hon. THEODORE LEVIN,
Judge, Federal District Court,
Eastern District of Michigan,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR JUDGE LEVIN: I am enclosing with this letter a copy of some remarks I made this week on the floor of the House of Representatives. I sincerely hope that I have not taken any privileges in my interpretation of your comment in regards to this matter.

Since this individual is a member of my constituency I felt duty-bound to make public mention of the matter with the hope that adequate legislation would evolve therefrom. In no way do I intend my comments to influence you in your duties of administering the justice that our laws require.

I would be most interested to hear whatever further views you might have about the general problem.

Cordially,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Member of Congress.

Smog Can Kill, Claim Experts After Survey and Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress may soon have to give serious consideration to legislation concerning the responsibility of the Federal Government to help eliminate smog in highly industrialized and thickly populated areas throughout the Nation.

Smog and all forms of air pollution which are dangerous to the health and welfare of our people have been increasing steadily in the United States during the past decade, and I am sure that this is a matter in which all Members of Congress are concerned.

The Atomic Energy Commission informed the Nation recently of the horrifying effects and possible death and certainly the detriment to the health of millions of people within the area of an atomic bomb fallout which would contaminate and pollute the atmosphere within a 7,000-square-mile area, if the zero point was located in New York City.

This clearly indicates the urgent need of an immediate study of the effects of the fallout from atomic bombs tested in Nevada over the past several years.

Even if we knew nothing of the atomic bomb and did not have to consider the effects of the atomic fallout on millions of people, we would still have the serious problem of exhaust fumes from millions of motor vehicles which are increasing daily as they are not equipped with efficient carburetors to consume all of the gas delivered to the engine nor are they equipped with filters on the exhaust to neutralize or reduce the unburned gasoline vapors or the noxious products of combustion which is thrown into the atmosphere of thickly populated and highly industrialized areas in various parts of the Nation every day and thus contaminating the atmosphere with poisonous and irritating pollutants.

It is only fair to say at this point that the automobile manufacturers of the Nation are at present studying and experimenting with more efficient carburetors for motor vehicles which will reduce the poisonous gas now released from these machines. However, it is estimated that it will be a considerable time in the future before such a carburetor can be manufactured and applied to the millions of motor vehicles in operation in the United States.

Since motor vehicles are freely permitted in interstate commerce is further evidence that the problem of the elimination of smog and other air pollutants is one which the Federal Government should assume some responsibility for its solution.

Some preliminary studies have been made of the problem of smog and other atmospheric contaminants including a report by the Stanford Research Institute on the nature and causes of smog. This report, published in 1954, considered the growing smog problem of Los Angeles County since 1947, and pointed out that it is a serious problem which cannot be oversimplified. It is a problem which must be thoroughly understood, all contributing causes classified and identified, before effective control can be achieved.

I have introduced H. R. 3630 which would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects on human health of smog and all forms of air pollution, and to investigate the most effective means of eliminating smog.

Many parts of the Nation have been severely affected by the deadly and irritating menace of air pollution, and Los Angeles County and other areas in southern California have had this problem for some time.

As further evidence of the dangerous effect of smog, a survey and study by medical experts was conducted recently which I submit herewith together with a letter to me from Francis M. Pottenger, Jr., M. D., chairman of the smog committee of the Los Angeles County Medical Association:

MONROVIA, CALIF., *February 9, 1955.*

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McDONOUGH: I am sending a copy of the Los Angeles Times of January 21, 1955, which contains the full report of our committee which was passed by the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association. In reply to your letter, my remarks are in clarification of these resolutions.

First, we feel that air pollution can cause death. It has done so elsewhere, including within the confines of the United States.

Air pollution is a continuing problem. It changes from day to day and locality to locality, depending upon meteorology as well as technological problems that apply in a given area at that particular time. For this reason, in the past, the committee has felt that the study of smog must to a large degree be based on the study of local factors. It is for that reason that we have felt that the acceptance of standards of toxicity that might be developed in Buffalo, N. Y., although they might deal fundamentally with the same toxicological studies, that the standard permissible in New York City would not necessarily apply to Los Angeles because there may be other pollutants in the Los Angeles atmosphere that might not be present in Buffalo, and the effect of the Los Angeles pollutants might be additive, so that a far lesser concentration of a given component might be lethal or a serious health hazard, while in Buffalo it could be breathed with more or less impunity.

Likewise, we have realized that the pollutants are continually changing. They are changing as technical advances change, both as elimination is carried on and also as new techniques develop. On the other hand, we are convinced that it is essential that the relative toxicity of each major contaminant in the atmosphere be determined at once. That problem would be the same in any city of the United States, and, therefore, could be a problem of Federal Government.

Definite establishment of toxicological standards would provide the enforcement officer with two primary tools of great leverage. First, it would provide him with a knowledge of what material must first be eliminated from the atmosphere, and, secondly, it would provide him with information that would enable him to act in a legal manner should the accumulation of toxic elements reach a level that could be assumed to be approaching a critical health hazard. It is also essential from our point of view that some biological means of determining the general critical level of toxicity of air pollution must be discovered to supplement purely chemical determinations. A homely example of this was the early observation that poisonous fumes in mines would cause the canary bird to be overcome long before the effect on man was noted. This warned the miners that they must take measures to protect themselves.

* * * * *

As to the effect of your bill on the smog problem, it appears to me that any legislation that will encourage industry to install devices for the elimination of atmospheric pollution, such as a means for tax relief, should be encouraged. Likewise, although not included in your bill for the potential sources of atmospheric pollution, especially those that are associated with the wider use of atomic energy, should make it mandatory that industry determine the public health aspects of its pollutants that are new to the arts.

I certainly wish to thank you for your interest in this problem, and the committee will be very happy to receive further information. I will see that your bill is brought to the attention of our committee at its next meeting.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS M. POTTENGER, Jr., M. D.,
Chairman, Smog Committee, Los Angeles County Medical Association.

[From the Los Angeles Times of January 21, 1955]

AIR POLLUTION CAN KILL, MEDIC GROUP CLAIMS

"Air pollution can cause death."

This was the first of a group of 9 motions submitted to the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association by its smog committee and approved by the council, according to the association bulletin.

The smog committee, headed by Dr. Francis M. Pottenger, Jr., of Monrovia, also noted:

2. That air pollution is a continuing dynamic problem in the Los Angeles area.

SAFETY OF HUMANS

3. That the smog committee proposes that biological as well as chemical indices must be determined for the safety of human beings.

4. That the smog committee approves in principle the establishment of chemical standards of air pollution as proposed and begun by the County Board of Supervisors.

5. That the smog committee feels that present chemical standards do not alone safeguard the health of the public.

6. That the tolerance levels of toxicity for human beings of each important contaminant in the atmosphere must be determined both for acute and chronic exposure, both singly and in combination.

REPORT WANTED

7. That the deans of the three medical schools in the area and the California Institute of Technology be requested to prepare a report to the Los Angeles County Medical Association indicating what program each school would propose to determine standards of toxicity of air pollutants, both acute and chronic, and to prepare an estimate of the cost of such a program.

8. That the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association request each section of the association to send its chairman or representative to meet with the smog committee to make plans for a survey of the membership of the section as to the effect of air pollution on human beings.

9. That the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association request the county board of supervisors to obtain the cooperation of private, city, State and Federal agencies in financing the necessary facilities and salaries for biological research to determine critical standards of air pollution toxicity, utilizing the facilities of all local institutions capable of carrying on such research.

Address by the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of this body an address by the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, on the 160th anniversary of the United States Naval Supply Corps, which was delivered in New York on February 17, 1955.

Secretary Thomas in his speech has presented an excellent review of the Navy's defense program and the role of the Supply Corps in providing logistic support. Our Nation is indeed fortunate to have a man of the background and experience of Mr. Thomas serving in this vital position.

The address follows:

Mr. Jack, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you, Mr. Murrow. That introduction, I trust, shows that I am a Supply Corps man at heart. I hope you will accept me here tonight as one of you.

Six days hence, as most of us know, the Navy's Supply Corps will be 160 years old. An organization doesn't attain that venerable age unless it has survived the old-age tests of service, farsightedness, and progressiveness. This birthday has been achieved by a steady performance which has always been outstanding in the area of military supply. The Nation and the Navy are better and stronger because of its contributions.

For those who may not be acquainted with the Navy's Supply Corps and its far-reaching activities, let me say that it is the Navy's business organization. Its officers are the business experts of the Navy. They manage a huge and complex organization which is responsible for getting the Navy what it needs, where it needs it, and when it needs it. Though complex and vast, the Supply Corps' mission is simply summarized in a single phrase: "Service to the fleet."

As you all know, the Navy has just completed a very delicate and potentially dangerous task in the Formosan Straits. That task has been performed expeditiously and in a most outstanding manner of which every American can be proud. I will hazard the opinion that there will be no immediate war in the Formosan Straits, and my reason for saying so is quite simple. Whenever the Communists are confronted by strength, resolve, and courage but without provocation, they halt. For the first time in this cold-war siege, they came face to face with the harsh realities of seapower at the coastline of the Formosan Straits' 100 miles of open sea. To be an aggressor here required more than an order to violate a frontier—they had to have the ability to control and cross that 100-mile strip of water. And that they cannot do.

Parenthetically, I might point out that our Seventh Fleet couldn't have accomplished this task had there not been an effective supply organization behind it. The food, the oil, the gasoline, the spare parts, the thousands of items which keep that fleet operating 7,000 miles from home—and in this case kept it on the line for many days—is an excellent example of the unseen and often unsung work of the Supply Corps.

Right now, Formosa is current business for us all, and I am afraid we haven't seen the last of it because in relation to the global scene, Formosa appears to be but a part of a pattern for conquest. A year ago, the pressure area was Indochina. Before that it was Korea. Before that it was Iran. Before that it was Berlin. The locale of the tensions are constantly shifting, but the pattern for conquest appears to remain the same.

We all know that the country and our President want a real and lasting peace and are working diligently for that objective. However, until the Communists show some tangible evidence of a like desire, we have no alternative but to keep ourselves in a constant state of readiness.

Therefore, I thought it would be both appropriate and timely tonight to speak about our Navy's defense program for the future and the vital part which the Supply Corps plays in it.

Let us begin by reducing the problem to its basic essentials.

What is the threat which confronts the free world today? It appears to be a very patient and long-range program for world domination. And what is the nature of this threat? There are many answers to this question—the threat is spiritual, it is economic, it is psychological, and it is military. It is a spiritual contest between those who believe in the worth and dignity of the individual and who have faith in God and those who consider man only as an advanced but soulless type of animal. It is a contest of systems—free enterprise versus regimentation. It is a contest of philosophies between those who cherish freedom and those who practice tyranny. And lastly, it is a contest of military strengths. The military threat can be varied and complicated—a cold war or a hot war; a little war or a big war; a nuclear or a nonnuclear war.

Now in analyzing this threat and its danger, we must answer the question:

Is the threat immediate or is it one of extended tension? If the answer is that we anticipate an attack in the immediate future, we obviously should go all out on our expenditures for military defense and get ready to protect ourselves in every possible way.

To do so would cost us over $100 billion every year. But if we miscalculate, spend $100 billion and more 3 or 4 times, and we are not attacked, we would find ourselves in serious economic trouble. We might discover we have exhausted ourselves and allowed Communists to win by default.

On the other hand, if we decide that the danger is one of extended tension—one to test our patience, destroy our economy, and yet one which gives us time and opportunity to work for a real and lasting peace—I submit that the following elements are essential for a period of extended tension:

First. We must have a retaliation capability not only to deter war but to overwhelm an enemy if he strikes.

Second. We must have a hard core of land, sea, and air forces which can be used in a variety of situations and in a variety of places. These forces must be able to handle localized emergencies yet strong enough to withstand the initial onslaught of a major conflict.

Third. We must have sea supremacy.

Fourth. We must have a continental defense program.

Fifth. We must have a potent Reserve system organized for rapid expansion.

Sixth. We must have an industrial mobilization base also designed for rapid expansion.

And lastly. We must continue a strong research and development program to maintain our scientific lead.

In years past our defense program was either feast or famine. The past 20 years are typical of this accordion process. In 1935 our entire military defense budget was slightly more than a half-billion dollars. Then, during World War II, we spent approximately $300 billion. By 1949 our defense budget had fallen back to only $13 billion annually. Then, during the Korean war, we mushroomed again and spent almost $200 billion.

The economy of the United States—or for that matter any nation's economy—cannot stand such violent changes very long. It is elementary that the process of rapidly building up and closing up is wasteful and unsound. It hurts labor because it is a series of hirings and layoffs; it hurts industry because there can be no advance planning; it hurts the military because the Armed Forces are sharply expanded one year, seriously reduced the next.

If this process of sharp peaks and valleys in our military expenditures had been permitted to continue, it alone could have defeated us.

To reach his decision President Eisenhower considered all the factors. After the most careful analysis with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, as he said, after "prayerful study," he concluded that our military defense program must cover an indefinite period of extended tension, be adequate and strong, and yet one which the American taxpayer's pocketbook can support indefinitely. I know of no American better qualified to make that decision than President Eisenhower.

I would now like to examine with you this program of the President's in relation to the Navy. It is concisely summarized in his state of the Union message and can be divided into four major areas.

STRATEGY, AIRPOWER, PROGRESS; AND ADMINISTRATION

Let us take these areas one by one.

The President had this to say about strategy:

"Undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to another * * * we must therefore keep in our Armed Forces balance and flexibility adequate to our needs."

This statement is in sharp contrast to pre-Korean days when our military strategy was drifting toward a one-weapon strategy and to preparation for a single type of warfare. Korea proved this strategy vulnerable and fallacious.

Since our national policy rejects preventive war, a potential enemy can choose the time, the type, the size, the scope, and the location of war. Our defenses, therefore, must be sufficiently balanced and flexible to meet a variety of threats, any one of which could defeat us.

Our offenses too, must be balanced and flexible. By having several systems or methods of retaliation instead of one, we force an aggressor to anticipate retaliation by every one of those methods or systems. By so doing, we accomplish three things:

We force him to increase his defense-offense ratio. In other words, he must translate more of his capacity to strike to self-defense.

We make him dilute his defenses. Instead of defending only one corridor, area, or avenue, he must anticipate reprisal from every direction and every frontier. And we add a heavier burden to his relatively poorer industrial machine.

Having several balanced and flexible offensive systems is a corollary aid in that it increases our chances of being able to deter a war.

The Navy is tailored to provide sea forces embodying these fundamental principles of balance and flexibility. It makes the soundest, safest military sense.

Next airpower.

"The forthcoming military budget," said the President, "emphasizes modern airpower in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps."

How does the Navy feel about this? Well, the Navy agrees solidly. Within the Navy itself, because it is a big contributor to national airpower, the importance of airpower is thoroughly recognized and appreciated. Airpower over the seas, and emphasis upon it, is growing constantly.

For example, the fleet now has airplanes of very great striking potential of many types and sizes which are fully capable of carrying weapons of rapid and destructive striking power. They can deliver atomic weapons to targets 1,000 miles away.

And we have just recently launched the first of a new class of carriers on which these planes are based. We are also developing a new family of jet seaplanes which can use the 70 percent of the surface of the world as 10,000 mile long runways.

These examples certainly highlight the growth of airpower in the Navy.

Third, progress.

"Our military planners," said the President, "must be flexible enough to use new weapons and new techniques."

The numbers of new weapons in the Navy is quite surprising, even since the end of the Korean war. In the subsurface field, we have launched the atomic-powered submarine, *Nautilus*, which has exceeded our expectations. Three more atomic submarines are to be built. We have developed killer submarines to search for and destroy enemy submarines in their own element. We have troop-carrying submarines, tanker submarines, and guided-missile submarines.

On the surface of the sea, the Navy is changing mightily. In addition to the mobile seabases of the *Forrestal* class, two guided-missile cruisers are joining the fleet this year. Three types of guided missiles are now operational in the fleet—an air-to-air missile called Sparrow; a surface-to-air missile called Terrier; and a surface-to-surface missile called Regulus. We anticipate that the guided-missile field will change the Navy quite as much as did the change from wooden ships to metal ships.

In the air, the Navy is developing the helicopter to perform two offensive tasks—to hunt submarines and to transport Marines in an amphibious assault—as well as to perform a host of auxiliary roles. The Navy is also developing vertical-takeoff aircraft, jet seaplanes, bombers, and fighters, all of which we are now testing.

So in the matter of new weapons, the Navy is right in the forefront of progress.

In the matter of new techniques, we feel we are equally progressive. I will mention two new techniques briefly.

To complement our fixed land bases, the Navy is emphasizing a new concept of mobile seabases—carriers, jet seaplanes, and guided-missile ships. These moving bases will be able to prowl an aggressor's coastline. Their use will raise no problem of sovereignty. They will be able to change location at speeds up to 40 miles an hour to any area of the world's oceans and seas where their presence is required. Their locations will be unknown and unpredictable. They will be less vulnerable than fixed bases. These moving seabases will give our reprisal system the flexibility and dispersal it must have in these times when a sudden attack might overwhelm our fixed land bases.

Secondly, atomic propulsion. Naval ships are ideally adapted for atomic propulsion, and we are moving in this field as fast as is practicable. The naval aviation field also offers a great potential for the atomic propulsion of aircraft. Atomic propulsion promises to change the Navy as much as did the shift from sail to steam.

Finally, the President has repeatedly emphasized efficient administration. At a press conference a few weeks ago he said that it is no crime to strive for efficiency and economy in the national-defense program. In the state of the Union message, he said:

"In administration of these costly programs we demand the utmost efficiency."

With 3 million people in the uniformed services, more than a million personnel in a supporting role, and spending approximately $35 billion every year for an indefinite period, the armed services obviously must have the most modern, up-to-date supply systems for efficiently supervising volumes of this size.

As you gentlemen who represent American business know, good administration depends upon modern and efficient organization. It also requires experienced and efficient managers. It means good business methods and systems.

What sort of a business organization does the Navy have to handle its $10 billion annual budget? In my opinion, the Navy's Supply Corps has developed the best and most efficient supply system in the history of any military organization.

First of all, it is composed of a group of officers and men who are specialists and experts in their field. That they are experts is no circumstance. Seventy percent of the corps' officers have undergraduate degrees. Twenty percent have graduate degrees in business administration. This educational process continues throughout their careers, supplemented by periodic 3-month assignments to civilian business.

In regard to organization, the Navy Supply Corps was the first service to adopt financial accounting. It was the first to use industrial stock funds. It developed a cataloging system to handle its 1,350,000 stock items which came to be a model for other organizations. It has adopted whenever practicable the best management systems of business and industry. It was the first to specialize and decentralize its procurement functions to 14 offices around the country. For example, all aviation materials are controlled through Philadelphia; all food is controlled through Washington; all clothing is controlled through Brooklyn; all ships' parts are controlled through Mechanicsburg, and so on. At each of these locations, three key experts sit side by side.

An inventory expert determines how much to buy and where to buy it; a technical expert determines what to buy from an engineering standpoint; and a procurement expert who does the actual buying. This marriage of administrative, logistic, and engineering know-how has given the Navy a sound and economical supply structure and, more important than that, it has made the Navy a more effective fighting force.

In this regard I might mention the Supply Corps' development of the modern supply ship and replenishment-at-sea techniques whereby fighting ships are rearmed, replenished, and refueled at sea. Admiral Nimitz referred to this development as the Navy's secret weapon in World War II. The best example of this is our 6th Fleet which has been in the Mediterranean now for the past 8 years without a supply base nearer than Norfolk—3,000 miles away.

Such things as these bespeak a sound and aggressive organization.

Few people today realize the importance of a modern and efficient supply system. Regardless of how able and well trained the military men, regardless of how fine their equipment, they are completely ineffective unless they can be rearmed and resupplied with all the vital things they need and at the time they need them.

The fine leadership and organization of the Supply Corps can insure, I am confident, that the President's demand for utmost efficiency will be carried out by the Navy.

Tonight I pay tribute to the Supply Corps and the wonderful group of men and women who make it successful. I know that its continued efficiency and performance will give increased strength to the Navy's and the country's defense program in the years to come.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou hast so made us that our hunger of soul can be satisfied only with the bread that cometh down from heaven, and our unutterable thirst can be assuaged only with the clear water from the River of Life. Lead us to the place of still waters and green pastures.

May this moment of prayer be as an open gate to boundless resources of Thy grace, by which our strength may be renewed and our souls restored. Grant us courage, we ask, for the living of these days. We are the children of intrepid sires who, in fearful days, dared the wrath of devils and the scorn of men. Measure us with the challenge of our times and make us worthy of those who in the dangerous yesterdays were strong and unafraid.

Keep our faith steadfast lest for lack of it we lose what Thou dost intend in this prophetic time. As Thou dost punish us for past iniquities and chasten us by present difficulties, strip us of our illusions, humble us under Thy hand, and fit us to be the instruments of Thy will in helping and healing this stricken world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 22, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1955.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I announce that, at the request of the Secretary of State, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] have been appointed to serve as members of the United States delegation to attend the inauguration of General Batista as President of the Republic of Cuba.

The Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Iowa are absent today because of that designation. The Senator from Iowa secured leave of absence from the Senate, but the Senator from Rhode Island failed to do so.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from February 21 through February 26.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate, for the purpose of conducting a hearing on the nomination of John Marshall Harlan, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GIRL SCOUTS FROM RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the President pro tempore and the Senate the fact that this afernoon we are honored by the presence of 16 lovely Girl Scouts from the State of Rhode Island, who range in age from 13 to 16 years, and who are accompanied by 3 of their distinguished leaders. I respectfully suggest to the President pro tempore that they be invited to rise and be acknowledged by the Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The young ladies will please rise and receive the acknowledgement of the Senate.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with applause.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTABLISHMENT OF TOWNSITES WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to provide for the establishment of townsites within the national forests, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRESENTATION OF STATUE OF GENERAL GEORGE WASHINGTON TO URUGUAY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of General George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON PAPERWORK MANAGEMENT BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on paperwork management, part I, in the United States Government, together with a report of its task force thereon (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESERVATION FROM APPROPRIATIONS OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no reservations were made, during the calendar year 1954, of lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7 OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1922, RELATING TO CERTAIN TELEPHONE INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS FROM MINERAL ENTRY—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Memorial No. 2, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution presented by Mr. GOLDWATER was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

House Memorial 2

Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation withdrawing all tribal lands of the Papago Indian reservation except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location, and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The Papago Indian Reservation, created by Executive Order 2524 and extended by statute 46 St. 1202, is subject to mineral entry and location under the mining laws of the United States.

Except for the mining laws of the United States and Arizona, the said right of entry is not subject to any control by the United States or by the Papago Tribe.

Said right of location has caused hardship to numerous Papago Indians in the past by forcing them to move from their homes and fields and by depriving them of desirable lands and water holes.

Due to the great interest of the general public in the possibility of discovering uranium ore on the reservation, there is great fear among the Papago Indians that they will be deprived of their reservation piecemeal by mining claimants.

The Papago Indian reservation does not have adequate resources to support the population presently living there and the possibility of substantial mineral discoveries seems the only hope that the reservation can provide an adequate economic base for the Papago people.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays:

That the Congress of the United States withdraw all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation, except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII—JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the enactment of legislation to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions, presented by Mr. MORSE, were received and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 1

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the security and economic development of Alaska are essential to the well-being of the United States; and

Whereas inclusion in the Union as a sovereign State would strengthen the economy and social strength of Alaska; and

Whereas many business, industrial, and labor groups in Oregon have worked unceasingly to develop increased trade and economic relations with Alaska; and

Whereas numerous civic and business organizations in Oregon have taken a public position favoring statehood for the great Territory of Alaska; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska demonstrated their loyalty to the Government of the United States, its traditions and teachings; and a readiness to achieve a status above and beyond that of an incorporated Territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we definitely go on record as urging early admission of Alaska as a self-governing State of the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to the Delegate in the National Congress from the Territory of Alaska.

Adopted by senate January 13, 1955.

ZYLPHA ZELLA BURNS,
Chief Clerk of Senate.
ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.

Adopted by House February 1, 1955.

E. R. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

Senate Joint Memorial 2

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the security and economic welfare of Hawaii are essential to the well-being of the United States; and

Whereas inclusion in the Union as a sovereign State would strengthen the economy and social strength of Hawaii; and

Whereas many business, industrial, and labor groups in Oregon have worked unceasingly to develop increased trade and economic relations with Hawaii; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated their loyalty to the Government of the United States, its tradition and teaching; and a readiness to achieve a status above and beyond that of an incorporated territory; and

Whereas numerable civic organizations in Oregon have taken a public position favoring statehood for the great Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That we definitely go on record as urging early admission of Hawaii as a self-governing State of the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to all Members of the Oregon Congressional Delegation, and to the Delegates in the National Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

Adopted by senate January 13, 1955.

ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
Chief Clerk of Senate.
ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house February 1, 1955.

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

RESOLUTIONS OF FIFTH DISTRICT, DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the fifth district, Department of Minnesota, American Legion, relating to educational benefits for certain veterans, and the subjection of American citizens serving in the Armed Forces to the jurisdiction of foreign countries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions presented by Mr. THYE were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas American boys who volunteered or were inducted into the Armed Forces on or before January 31, 1955, notwithstanding, and in the face of, the crisis brought about by the decision of the United States to defend Formosa, without allies if necessary, which decision might involve the United States in an all-out shooting war with Communist China and/or Russia, are as much entitled to the educational benefits under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 as are those boys previously inducted or who volunteered into the service subsequent to the cessation of hostilities in Korea; and

"Whereas a bill is now pending in the Congress of the United States providing that persons in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under said act, said bill being Senate File No. 705, now in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the fifth district American Legion, Department of Minnesota, regularly assembled in Minneapolis this 2d day of February 1955, That the Congress be, and it hereby is, urged to enact said legislation without delay; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy hereof be forwarded to EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senators from Minnesota, and WALTER JUDD and ROY WIER, Representatives in Congress from the Fifth District of Minnesota.

"FIFTH DISTRICT AMERICAN LEGION,
"By F. W. AMES, *Its Adjutant.*
"Attest:
"RICHARD GRANT,
"Commander."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas American soldiers stationed overseas in foreign lands are under the jurisdiction of foreign courts under NATO agreements and treaties entered into by Secretary of State Dean Acheson in 1951 and approved by the United States Senate in July 1953; and

"Whereas by reason thereof, more than 400 American citizens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States were sentenced to prison terms in foreign lands by foreign courts during 1953; and

"Whereas the number of American citizens in the Armed Forces of their country sentenced to imprisonment in foreign lands by foreign courts during 1954 is "top secret," about which the American people have not been informed; and

"Whereas the American Legion firmly believes all members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign lands should be tried by United States military tribunals for any offense committed in such foreign lands; and

"Whereas American citizens in the Armed Forces, when so subjected to the jurisdiction of civil and criminal courts of foreign lands in which they may be stationed, are deprived of the protection to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights when charged with offenses against foreign laws, many of which are intolerable to Americans, and contrary to American traditions of law and justice: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the fifth district American Legion, in regular meeting assembled in Minneapolis this 2d day of February 1955, That it deplores and condemns the NATO treaty referred to, and resulting subjection of American citizens serving in the Armed Forces to the jurisdiction of foreign courts in foreign lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and its State Department take immediate steps to regain and retain full and exclusive jurisdiction over all American citizens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in foreign lands to the end and purpose that such citizens be tried under United States military law for any offense committed in foreign lands, thereby retaining for such American citizens their rights under the Constitution and Bill of Rights to preserve which they are serving in such foreign lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Minnesota Department of the American Legion for concurrent action herewith, and to the United States Senators for Minnesota, and Congressional Representatives from the Third and Fifth Districts thereof.

"FIFTH DISTRICT AMERICAN LEGION,
"By F. W. AMES, *Its Adjutant.*
"Attest:
"RICHARD GRANT,
"Its Commander."

LIBERATION OF LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF LITHUANIAN DESCENT LIVING IN WYOMING VALLEY, PA.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which I in part have the honor to represent, is the home of many loyal and patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent. They are joined together in hope that the land of their ancestors may soon be liberated from the cruel burden of Communist tyranny, and that the courageous people of Lithuania may once more live in freedom.

Recently meetings were held in many places in Pennsylvania commemorating the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. At these meetings resolutions were adopted calling upon the United States to support the freedom-loving people of Lithuania in their struggle against enslavement by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous con-

sent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted February 13, 1955, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., by fine American citizens of Lithuanian descent, who are residents of Wyoming Valley, relating to the liberation of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED, AFTER DUE DELIBERATION, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF WYOMING VALLEY, GATHERED FOR THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

Whereas for almost 15 years, Lithuania, one of the Baltic nations, has borne the yoke of slavery as a result of the brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas a campaign of physically exterminating the Lithuanian entity has been conducted by the Kremlin masters on a scale unheard of heretofore; and

Whereas no nation, great or small, can today feel protected from the claim of international communism supported, as it is, by all the destructive weapons that modern civilization has devised for mankind; and

Whereas because of the global and totalistic nature of the Kremlin peaceful-coexistence line is designed primarily to gain time in order to divide and destroy free world alliances and pave the way for world conquest: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this gathering of American citizens of Lithuanian descent of Wyoming Valley pledge their wholehearted support of this great country's efforts to achieve lasting peace and justice in the world, and urge the Federal Government of the United States to respond to the demands of this crucial time by initiating a positive and dynamic political program against the international Communist conspiracy; be it further

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Lithuanian Americans of this valley, the following steps should be undertaken as a part of such a program and with respect to the enslaved nations:

1. That in advancement of the program for world peace and freedom a special stress be laid upon the necessity to hasten liberation of the captive peoples, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected.

2. That the resistance movements of the enslaved nations be encouraged and supported through the funds already authorized by Congress for such purposes.

3. That a new committee to investigate the facts and techniques of Communist aggression be appointed by the 84th Congress, in order to continue and complete the work splendidly done, during the last Congress, by the select Committee on Communist Aggression headed by former Representative Charles Kersten.

4. That the United States Government sponsor a resolution in the United Nations based upon findings and conclusions of said investigation, denouncing the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all the nations now enslaved by communism; be it finally

5. *Resolved*, That this gathering voice its deepest gratitude to the Federal Government and the Congress of the United States for their sympathy with and unchanging favorable attitude toward the eventual restoration of independence of Lithuania.

THOMAS E. MACK, Esq.,
Committee Chairman.
GENEVIEVE B. NATITUS,
Committee Secretary.

CREATION OF PARK IN SLOPE COUNTY, N. DAK.—LETTER FROM AMIDON (N. DAK.) MEN'S CLUB

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the secretary of the Amidon Men's Club of Amidon, N. Dak., relating to the creation of a park in Slope County, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMIDON MEN'S CLUB,
Amidon, N. Dak., February 15, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It was resolved by the Men's Club of the village of Amidon, Slope County, N. Dak., at their regular meeting that they would go on record as being in favor of an appropriation for the creation of a park in the western part of Slope County, including the Burning Coal mine and surrounding badlands, also for the necessary building of roads to promote this as a tourist attraction.

Sincerely yours,
GILBERT E. BUZALSKY,
Secretary, Amidon Men's Club.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

John W. Glotfelty, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Louis S. Rothschild, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Allin H. Pierce, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, vice Arnold R. Baar, deceased; and

Thomas Coggeshall, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice George C. McConnaughey, resigned.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 1168. A bill to provide that the tax on transportation of persons shall apply only if the amount paid for transportation exceeds $1; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1169. A bill to provide that feed furnished in disaster areas under Public Law 115, 83d Congress, shall be made available for feeding working stock and hogs; and

S. 1170. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to authorize additional market services for livestock purchasers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1171. A bill for the relief of Asimina (Mina) Maravela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1172. A bill to amend the Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U. S. C., sec. 669–669i) by providing that the amount of money currently in the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund shall be available for use during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, defining "wildlife restoration project," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1173. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1174. A bill for the relief of Alexander Dunand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1175. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of Hermann Weyl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of desert land entrymen whose entries are dependent upon percolating waters for reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1178. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1179. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act so as to limit the sales and use tax on vendors to the amount of reimbursement authorized to be collected by them if they can establish such amount by accurate records; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1181. A bill for the relief of Wei-Kuan Chang and Su Chun Wei Chang;

S. 1182. A bill for the relief of Haim Cohen (Haim Braun); and

S. 1183. A bill for the relief of Lien Ching Chen and Dr. Rose Hu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 1184. A bill for the relief of Frank R. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 1185. A bill for the relief of Dr. Syed Abdul Qadir; and

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Kassai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1187. A bill to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks;

S. 1188. A bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks; and

S. 1189. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1190. A bill to grant a new 6-month period within which applications may be made to the Secretary of the Navy for donation of the U. S. S. *Olympia*, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1191. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1192. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1193. A bill for the relief of Moosa Ebrahimian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1194. A bill to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1195. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Reisini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Joe Luis Momoitio Uruchua and Vinciete Cortabitarte Uranga; and

S. 1197. A bill for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1198. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide separate matching of assistance expenditures for medical care, to provide gradually for equal matching of old-age assistance expenditures supplementing old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to make clear the purpose of encouraging States to provide services to help needy individuals attain self-support or self-care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1199. A bill to strengthen the Nation by preserving the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, improving the income-earning capacity and standard of living of low-income rural people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1200. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Atomic Defense; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1201. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purposes of pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PARITY PRICES FOR 1955 CROPS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which, if enacted, would guarantee farmers 100 percent of parity price for their 1955 and future basic agricultural crops. This bill would return the fair price guaranty for a farmer's product in relation to his cost of living.

The administration's measure of last year reduced price supports from 90 to 82½ percent of parity for basic farm commodities. In the case of dairy products, Government supports would be as low as 75 percent. Under this flexible program, price supports go down as production goes up. The best interests of farming and agricultural populations demand a strong price-support program, a reversal of the flexible program.

The farmer's income and financial status in our economy continue to be static and less stable. At the same time the remainder of the Nation enjoys prosperity. Consumer prices and cost of living continue to rise, but the farmer's income does not follow this pattern. This, obviously, is not a healthy situation.

A sampling of statistics from the Department of Agriculture gives a great deal of support to the concern I have shown over the farmer's dilemma. The average individual income of persons whose entire income comes from farming is one-third as much as the remainder of the population. The net worth of United States farmers has dropped $10 billion from 1952 to 1954.

The ratio of parity prices received by farmers for their products and the consumer prices paid was 99 percent on October 15, 1952; 1 year later it was 91 percent; and on September 15, 1954, it was 88 percent. The latest figures show that the ratio had dropped to 86 percent on January 15, 1955. We cannot afford to let this trend go on unchecked.

Since October of 1952, farmer's taxes per acre have increased 11 percent; interest payments have gone up 20 percent; and cost of living for farmers has gone up 3 percent. The farmers average income since 1952 has decreased 14 percent. An isolated case, as an example, is the marketing of meat animals, their market price has dropped 19 percent since 1952.

The farmer is the very background of our society. The great cities of this country are not maintaining themselves. Even from the standpoint of population numbers, the great seedbed of the Nation is on its family farms. Our cities would wither and die but for the farm-born children that migrate to them. If, even for only a few days, the abundant flow of food and fiber from the farms were cut off, the cities would be helpless.

The direct relation of the production and prosperity of family farms to general national interest is not confined to the large cities alone. The ebb and flow of economic opportunity and results of the farm people is, also, of direct importance to the people living in thousands of rural towns and small cities and regional market centers all over this great Nation. This is true not only because the farm is the source of such a very high proportion of our food and clothing, but because the processing and distribution of farm-produced commodities and the manufacturing, transportation, merchandising, and sale of farm production and farm family living supplies is a major or contributing source of income to so many people. The production and income of the farms and ranches of the Nation are directly related to continued national well-being and the rise or fall of national prosperity.

In the history of this and other countries great national depressions have almost always been preceded by depression and economic reverses on the farms. Is that where we are headed again? I do not know whether the cause-and-effect relationship is absolute. But, nevertheless, the Nation can ill afford to take the chance.

Mr. President, the bill I have introduced eliminates the sliding scale of price supports for wheat, cotton, and other basic commodities. These commodities and others would be supported at a fixed level that could not fall with production in increased abundance nor with accumulating safety stockpiles.

The bill provides mandatory price supports at 100 percent of the parity price for the basic commodities, namely, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts; for the important livestock, dairy and poultry products, wool, hogs, eggs, chickens, beef cattle, milk and butterfat; for soybeans, flaxseed, dry edible beans, and rye; and a feeding value equivalent to 100 percent of parity for corn to the feed grains—barley, oats, and grain sorghums. These are all commodities that the Nation requires in greater abundance. All are basic to the farm families that produce them.

In addition the bill provides authority for the Department of Agriculture to resume the use of parity payments where needed in conjunction with loans, purchases, and other price-support methods to provide desirable protection to the producers of perishable commodities.

The bill would also add section 421 to the Agricultural Act of 1949 which would be in the form of a $2,500 limitation on the amount of price-support payments any one farmer might receive in any calendar year. Moreover, price-support payments and loans would not apply if an individual farmer's sale of products should be in excess of $25,000 in each year.

Briefly, I wish to comment on the overemphasized phases of subsidy and surplus. These two elements of the farm program have been debated time after time, but in the end I think that it will be found that their seriousness is somewhat inflated. In regard to subsidy, the subsidies which the farmers receive in the form of price supports, are not nearly so large as the subsidies given to Government agencies and private enterprise. Admittedly, we do have large surpluses of certain commodities, but I am sure that we would not feel that they were in excess if the Nation should suffer a long period of drought or be faced with a general mobilization.

The stability of the American economy depends on the prosperity and security of the farmer. The only solution, at this time, which will stabilize the farm-

er's income and prosperity is a program of 100 percent of parity, a high price-support program. Only by preserving and improving the strength of the large group of family-size farms in this Nation can we maintain the conditions necessary for preserving our way of life.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1175) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED NATIONAL BANK LEGISLATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills relating to proposed national bank legislation. Each of these bills is requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from him. I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal and the memoranda accompanying them be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. 1187. A bill to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1187 is as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks."

Section 5221 of the Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C. 182) requires that whenever a vote is taken to put a national bank into liquidation the board of directors shall cause notice of this fact to be published for a period of 2 months in a newspaper published in the city or town in which the association is located, and also in a newspaper published in the city of New York. These publications are for the purpose of notifying the holders of its notes and other creditors to present the notes and other claims against the association for payment. The notes referred to in the statute are the notes formerly issued by national banks which circulated as currency but which are now no longer issued. Because these notes were used as currency and because their circulation was often wide, it was deemed desirable to have notice of a pending liquidation of the issuing bank given in New York, the then financial center of the country, in addition to being given locally. With the cessation of the issuance of such notes, every national bank having circulating notes outstanding deposited lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States to cover the full redemption value of its outstanding notes, and all such notes may be redeemed at the United States Treasury. Therefore, the need for publication in New York and for notification to holders of the notes to present them for payment has passed.

Accordingly, to relieve the banks of the now unnecessary expense of the New York publication, it is believed that section 5221 of the Revised Statutes should be amended to eliminate that requirement, and it is believed that there should also be eliminated from the statute the reference to notifying the holders of the bank's notes to present them for payment. The proposed legislation would accomplish these purposes, and would also make it clear that publication must be made in every issue of the local newspaper. The requirement of local publication notifying creditors to present their claims against the bank is, of course, still necessary and such requirement would be retained under the proposed amendment. The Treasury Department recommends that the proposed legislation be enacted into law.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

S. 1188. A bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1188 is as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks."

Section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 481, 482), requires that the Comptroller of the Currency shall appoint examiners who shall examine every national bank at least twice in each calendar year, and fixes the method of assessing the costs of the examinations against the banks.

It is believed that the Comptroller's bank supervisory responsibilities can be adequately discharged with less than the presently required two examinations per annum in the case of certain banks. In addition, it is deemed desirable that the Comptroller be permitted to assess the costs of examinations upon dates selected by him rather than the dates of examination. The proposed legislation would accomplish these purposes. There is attached hereto a memorandum which more fully explains the proposed changes.

It is believed that passage of this bill is in the best interests of the national banking system. The Treasury Department recommends that the proposed legislation be enacted into law. It will be appreciated if you will lay the enclosed bill before the Senate. An identical proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Similar legislation was introduced during the 83d Congress as S. 3888.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5240 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The first paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C. 481) requires that the Comptroller of the Currency shall appoint examiners who shall examine every national bank at least twice in each calendar year. Examinations may be made oftener if considered necessary.

The experience gained by the Comptroller's office over a long period of years clearly proves that two examinations per annum is a desirable examination frequency schedule for a large proportion of national banks. However, it is apparent to the Comptroller that the statutory requirements of two examinations per calendar year for all national banks is unnecessarily rigid, not conducive to the best utilization of the time and efforts of national bank examiners, and that the requirement could safely be made more flexible.

The proposed legislation would provide elasticity to the requirement of the present law that all national banks be examined twice in each calendar year by permitting the Comptroller, in his discretion, to waive one such examination in justified cases. It would not be the purpose to waive one examination in all possible cases, but rather to adjust examination schedules so as to obtain the maximum benefit from the examination work performed. It would be the purpose to examine a large proportion of national banks twice each year, but if greater benefits would accrue in a particular Federal reserve district through the more thorough examination of national banks of average size than would result from two examinations per annum of a few very large national banks of demonstrated soundness and management capacity, the latter might be examined only once during the calendar year.

The legislation would further provide, however, that examinations may not be waived with respect to a particular bank more frequently than once during each two year period beginning January 1, 1955. In other words, in at least one of the two years of each two year period the Comptroller could not waive an examination but would have to examine the bank twice. It is believed this would permit more thorough examinations which would be of greater value to the banks concerned as well as to the Comptroller.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would result in certain economies in the Comptroller's office which would accrue to the benefit of national banks. The expenses of the Comptroller's office are defrayed by national banks through the payment of examination fees.

The proposed amendment would eliminate references to "member banks" and would make the examination provision applicable only to national banks. This makes no substantive change in the law for by the Act of June 21, 1917 (12 U. S. C. 330), it was provided that State member banks should not be subject to examination under the provisions of the first two paragraphs of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C. 481, 482).

The third paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C. 482) provides that the expense of the examinations of national banks shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency upon the banks examined in proportion to assets or resources held by the banks upon the dates of examination of the various banks. It is deemed desirable that legislation be enacted which would permit the assessments made on national banks by the Comptroller to be in proportion to their assets or resources on any dates the Comptroller of the Currency may select, rather than upon the dates of examination of the various banks. The second section of the proposed bill would accomplish this purpose. If this legislation is enacted, in all probability such assessments will be levied by the Comptroller of the Currency quarterly or semiannually. The annual rate of assessment will be the same for every national bank. However, with respect to those banks which are examined more frequently than twice in each calendar year, each such bank will be assessed, in addition

to the regular assessment, the expense of the additional examinations.

The seventh paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 482), provides that the expenses of examining trust departments of banks examined by the Comptroller of the Currency shall be assessed against the banks examined in proportion to the total assets under administration, and the total bonds or notes outstanding under corporate bond or note issues for which the banks are acting as trustees. This has proved to be impractical since there is no standardization of practice with respect to carrying values of trust assets. A more practical method of charging for trust examinations is to assess a fee based upon the actual cost to the Comptroller's Office of making the trust examination. The third section of the proposed bill provides that charges for trust examinations shall be made in this manner. Of course, included in the cost is a reasonable amount attributable to overhead expenses of the Comptroller's Office.

S. 1189. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1189 is as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans."

The proposed legislation would accomplish two purposes. (1) It would permit national banks to make mortgage loans for periods in excess of 10 years (which is now the statutory limit) but not exceeding 20 years, provided that such loans are amortized and that the installment payments are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within a period of not more than 20 years. (2) It would change the permissible duration of residential and farm construction loans which need not be considered as real-estate loans, from 6 to 9 months.

There is attached a memorandum which more fully explains the recommended changes. It is believed that enactment of the proposed legislation will be beneficial to the national banking system. The Treasury Department recommends that it be enacted into law.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED CHANGES IN SECTION 24 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Under section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C. 371), national banks are permitted to make mortgage loans on improved real estate. The amount of any such loan may not exceed 50 percent of the appraisal value of the real estate and no such loan may be made for a longer term than 5 years, except that any such loan may be made in an amount not exceeding 60 percent of the appraised value of the real estate and for a term not longer than 10 years if the loan is amortized and the installment payments are sufficient to amortize 40 percent or more of the principal of the loan within a period of not more than 10 years. No such loan may be made for a longer term than 10 years. Under current practices in mortgage lending, loans are frequently made for terms of more than 10 years, and thus national banks find themselves at a competitive disadvantage with other lending institutions. It is believed that the maximum term for which mortgage loans may be made by national banks can, with safety, be extended to 20 years and that is what is proposed. The legislation would provide that any loan made for a term in excess of 10 years may not exceed in amount 60 percent of the appraised value of the real estate, and that the terms of the loan must require installment payments sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within a period of not more than 20 years. Those requirements will provide ample safety for the banks.

Enactment of this proposal would bring the mortgage lending powers of national banks into conformity with present-day widespread practice and would enable the banks to more effectively compete with other lending institutions.

The second change which is recommended is a lengthening of the permissible duration of residential and farm construction loans which are not to be regarded as real-estate loans, from 6 to 9 months. Experience has indicated that the 6-month period is unrealistically short, but that a 9-month period will be adequate in most cases. The change can be made without serious consequences.

COMMISSION ON ATOMIC DEFENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the establishment of a Commission on Atomic Defense. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1200) for the establishment of a Commission on Atomic Defense, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I have introduced, for appropriate referral, a bill to create a Commission To Study Atomic Defense. This would be an 18-member Commission patterned along the lines of the Hoover Commission drawing its membership from the executive department, Congress, and outstanding citizens from private life. Because of the urgency of this whole problem, which was underlined in the last few days by testimony from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Commission would submit its final report to Congress not later than January 31, 1956, to permit appropriate legislation to be enacted during this Congress. Although time may be of the essence and a final report before this date desirable, I do not believe a proper survey could be concluded in time for congressional action during this session.

My reasons for expanding membership beyond Members of Congress are aimed at bringing together the private citizens who will be affected by this problem, and upon whom the success of any industrial dispersion or civil defense program ultimately depends.

The dramatic developments in the field of thermonuclear warfare make such a study imperative. Much has been said about the dangers of fallout from explosions of H-bombs. Much has been said about the wisdom or futility of industrial dispersion. The truth of the matter at this time appears to be that no one really knows what should be done or what is feasible. Each of our specialists in his field has suggested certain actions, but coordination for an overall program, if it is to be effective, seems to be the only logical way.

The executive branch of the Government would support such a study and I do not believe the legislative branch can stand by and criticize the executive without "turning to" on such an important problem.

I urge upon the Senate careful consideration of this measure and prompt action that it may bring the desired results as soon as possible.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT, RELATING TO CREDIT FOR CERTAIN SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF PAY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purposes of pay, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to speak briefly in regard to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1201) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purposes of pay, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this bill will allow cadets at the service academies and midshipmen at the Naval Academy credit for their service there, in the computation of their basic pay. This would be, in effect, credit for longevity, but not for retirement purposes.

It is my understanding that National Guard men receive longevity credit for their service, and that V–12 naval college service during World War II counted for longevity in computing basic pay.

This bill would equalize pay for young men who desire to make military service a career. I commend the bill to the attention of the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at the banquet of the Sons of the American Revolution at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on February 22, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before the Rotary Club of Muncie, Ind., on February 22, 1955.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, on South Carolina Day, February 20, 1955, at the George Washington Memorial Chapel, Valley Forge, Pa.

NOTICE OF HEARING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVILIAN DEFENSE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that the meeting of the Subcommittee on Civilian Defense of the Committee on Armed Services which was scheduled for tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock has been postponed. Instead, the hearing will be held on Saturday morning at 10 o'clock. Tomorrow, the full Committee on Armed Services will have before it certain members of the Department of Defense in connection with a briefing.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there was received today a list containing the names of 134 persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States. The list appears elsewhere in the RECORD of today. I give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days in accordance with the committee rule.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF BEN F. CAMERON, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE EDWIN R. HOLMES, RETIRED

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Ben F. Cameron, of Mississippi, to be United States circut judge, fifth circuit, vice Edwin R. Holmes, retired, to file with the committee in writing on or before Wednesday, March 4, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled later.

COMMENT BY FORMER SENATOR RUSH D. HOLT, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD pertinent comments on timely topics by the late former Senator Rush D. Holt, of West Virginia, about whose untimely passing within recent weeks we all know.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS AND FIGURES

(Pertinent comment on timely topics by former United States Senator Rush D. Holt, of West Virginia. Mr. Holt, seriously ill, tells what it means to place trust in God, to forget trivial things of life)

I was shocked when my physician told me my condition. Who wouldn't be? It reaches clear down in one and turns him upside down when he is advised that he has a malignancy. But one cannot afford to waste his time and energy worrying over his condition. It is no time for self-pity, and it is so easy to fall into that way of thinking. One could spend hours and days in wondering why did this have to happen to me. To be defeated is to defeat one's self. It is then one needs to get himself together and have faith.

Without faith there is no hope. With faith in God there is no limit to what one can do.

When one is sailing along and things are going well, one doesn't take time to evaluate the things of life. It is when one is stopped and reverses appear that one is ready to reevaluate.

To become bitter and figure why one is afflicted with such a condition only makes things worse, much worse. It is a part of a vicious circle that makes the physical condition worse which in turn makes the bitterness deeper.

Anyone who has faced such a situation will know what runs through one's mind. We feel we just cannot give up our family and friends. We want to hold on. It does make a lump come to one's throat more than once. But, it is then we must get hold of ourselves and turn over to God how we can best work out the problem before us.

He is one that never fails. Whatever that problem may be, no matter how serious or critical, God is ready to guide and direct us if we just will let Him.

This need to reevaluate the really important things of life becomes more clear than ever. The things we felt important seem to lose their importance. It is not the material things that overshadow as they do in this every day busy life. We wonder why we have so much time in trying to get things that evaporate so quickly.

A setback can be a tremendous education if one will let it be.

The will to live is paramount in practically all of us. We want to live, but if that will to live is not coupled with a desire to live for something, we have failed to really live. But we should couple that will to live with wanting to live for something. There is no greater will than to want to do God's will.

The world, too, has been and is ill. The same guidance that brings health to persons who are sick can bring peace to a sick world. It is amazing how little faith mankind has in calling on God for the answers to our problems in our governmental relationships. The condition of the world proves we do not.

As a personal word to my friends who read this column, let me say this is not an obituary. I have plenty of life left. God has been wonderful to me.

This experience has increased my faith in God's goodness. It has brought to me a lesson of the power of positive thinking. Prayer works wonders. There is no limit to what God can do. The tragedy is that we are failing to connect our lives to that tremendous power of good that He will give us if we just accept it.

With God man can never lose. He will point the way out of darkness if we will just listen and follow. That is what I will try to do.

CIVIL DEFENSE AGAINST ATOMIC ATTACK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the people of the country are justifiably confused and greatly alarmed at the failure of government to take adequate steps for their protection in the event of an atomic attack. The tragic danger which confronts us has been known for several years. Yet, so far as I know, no effective steps have been taken either by the Federal Government, State governments, or municipalities, to provide reasonable civil defense or protection. The failure of the Nation to act is particularly frightening because it indicates either indifference or a fatalistic acceptance of the inevitable. We dare not surrender to either of these moods.

This morning a highly interesting and informative article by the distinguished author and columnist, Roscoe Drummond, appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. This article, entitled "Where Stands Civil Defense?" gives such a graphic description of the situation and its dangers and is so important to the security of our people that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It merits the most careful study by every person in the country and particularly those in every layer of government who hold positions of official responsibility.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE STANDS CIVIL DEFENSE?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The need for Operation Candor is not over because the Atomic Energy Commission has now given the public a full-size picture of what hydrogen warfare really means.

It is of little value to know that the blast and radioactive fallout of a single H-bomb imperils every living being in an area of 7,000 square miles—unless we do something about it.

What we must not overlook is:

That we can do something about it.

That thus far nothing adequate in civil defense is being done about it.

That if the Nation's civil-defense program is not soon taken out of the mothballs of neglect, a mood of fatalism and low vision, it will constitute one of the greatest and gravest omissions of representative government in human history.

That civil defense is not merely a protection against needless enormous loss of life, if attack comes; it can itself be a powerful deterrent to attack because it means that in shielding the civilian population, including defense-industry workers, the power of sustained retaliation is less likely to be knocked out by surprise aggression.

The danger is not that AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss' somber disclosures will create excessive jitters. There is no evidence that long-delayed Operation Candor is having any such effect. I am convinced that the American people want the straight facts, have the right to have them, can take them.

The only danger would be that, possessed of the facts, the Federal Government, the States, the cities, and individuals failed to take action equal to the need on the theory that little, if anything, can be done, that enormous loss of life is inevitable, that we might as well prepare to take fatalistically whatever comes.

Fortunately the opposite is the truth.

Much can be done. Vast loss of life is not inevitable. We don't have to take it fatalistically.

The AEC does not say that survival from hydrogen blast and fallout is unlikely.

The AEC does say that survival is unlikely unless there is "proper evacuation" or "shelter" or "other protective measures."

The realistic estimate is that without adequate civil defense at least 45 percent of the civilian population would be killed in the 7,000 square miles enclosing each hydrogen blast, and that with adequate civil defense at least 95 percent would survive.

That is the difference between adequate civil defense and inadequate civil defense.

Today the Nation's defense is inadequate, woefully inadequate, tragically inadequate—needlessly inadequate.

Admiral Strauss did not overstate it when he said at the end of his stark statement that improvement of our means of self-defense, including civil defense, is today "a paramount duty of our Government."

That duty is not yet being discharged.

Perhaps it couldn't be effectively discharged until the widescreen, 3–D consequences of hydrogen warfare was made common knowledge.

Now it is common knowledge and the actions which are immediately needed, it seems to me, are:

1. A full statement by President Eisenhower to Congress as to what the Federal Government can't afford not to do to bring into being a civil defense program equal to the peril.

2. An early conference between the President, the director of civil defense, and the 48 Governors on the action which the State governments need to take in an integrated Federal-State program.

3. A subsequent meeting in each State of Governor, Federal civil-defense officials, and the mayors of every community to bring about the participation of all units of government.

4. The development of a realistic blueprint of what every individual needs to do and can do personally to be ready to give the best protection to his family and to himself.

Civil defense, it seems to me, needs to be seen not only as a means to guard against prodigious loss of life, but as a means contributing indispensably to deterring surprise aggression.

Civil defense is also military defense. They are inseparable.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WILEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], as we all know, was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee during the two sessions of the 83d Congress. At the opening session of the committee this year on January 13 the committee adopted a resolution recognizing the splendid service Chairman WILEY had rendered during the past 2 years, and an appropriate resolution also was adopted by this year's committee and was then circulated among the members of the committee as it was constituted in the 83d Congress.

It is with real pleasure and gratification that I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD the resolution as adopted by the committee with the signatures of the members of the committee who served under Senator WILEY as chairman in the 83d Congress. This resolution reflects the high esteem and affection in which Senator WILEY is held by his colleagues on the committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1955.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE—RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION FOR SERVICES RENDERED BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

Whereas Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations since 1945 and served as chairman during the 83d Congress in 1953 and 1954; and

Whereas this period has been critical in the history of our Nation; and

Whereas, in the discharge of his arduous duties as chairman, Senator WILEY has displayed a high quality of statesmanship; and

Whereas Senator WILEY has consistently encouraged the development of a bipartisan foreign policy and has tirelessly worked to foster more effective cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government; and

Whereas under Senator WILEY's chairmanship, the committee and the Senate compiled an outstanding record of legislative achievement in the field of foreign policy, including many treaties, public laws, and resolutions advancing the national interest of the United States and the common goals of the free world; and

Whereas Senator WILEY contributed immeasurably to these accomplishments through his energy, vision, good humor, and fairness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations expresses to Senator WILEY its deep appreciation for his courageous leadership as chairman, his devotion to duty, and his great services to the Nation in the cause of freedom and world peace.

H. Alexander Smith, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Homer Ferguson, William F. Knowland, George D. Aiken, Homer E. Capehart, Walter F. George, Theodore Francis Green, J. W. Fulbright, John Sparkman, Guy M. Gillette, Hubert H. Humphrey, Mike Mansfield, Francis O. Wilcox, Chief of Staff.

SAVINGS BY REDUCTION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PAPERWORK

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have read with interest that the Hoover Commission today is forwarding to the Congress a report in which it is recommended that the Federal Government reduce its paperwork and thereby save millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

It is a matter of personal gratification to me as I know it is to all other members of the Appropriations Committee, including the present chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], that this report so closely follows a report on the same subject which was filed on May 7, 1954, by the staff of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Last year the committee provided $300,000, to enable the General Services Administration to start work along this particular line.

So, Mr. President, while I commend the Hoover Commission for its splendid recommendations, I should like to point out that the Senate Appropriations Committee recognized this problem a year ago, and, by unanimous action of the committee, provided the funds with which to inaugurate this activity, which has been in progress for a period of time, and already many tens of millions of dollars are in the process of being saved. Nevertheless, it is nice to know, today, that the very outstanding Hoover Commission, after studying this subject, has come forward with recommendations very similar to those made last year by our committee.

This phase of Federal expenditures is one of many toward which the Appropriations Committee directed its attention during the 83d Congress, as a part of its continuing effort to reduce and minimize Government spending and waste. As a result of our recommendations, the Congress appropriated, during the 2d session of the 83d Congress, a sum of money to initiate surveys of Government practices and record keeping.

It was our recommendation that immediate steps be taken to alleviate the condition now existing, whereby the volume of Federal records now in existence would fill 7½ Pentagon buildings.

It is gratifying to note that the conclusions of the Hoover Commission are in striking parallel with those contained in last year's Appropriations Committee report entitled "Creation and Management of United States Government Records," and that the Hoover Commission's recommendations reflect the recommendations made nearly a year ago by the Appropriations Committee.

For example, the Hoover Commission's report suggests that—

> The General Services Administration be given responsibility for general supervision over all phases of paperwork management with a view to simplifying and improving the quality of forms, correspondence, reports * * * and eliminating nonessential copies.

The same recommendation was made last year by the Appropriations Committee, and a solution is already being effectuated under Public Law 663, in which the 83d Congress provided for a survey of Government records, record management, and disposal practices. This legislation gave to the Administrator of General Services final authority in all matters involving the conduct of surveys and the implementation of recommendations based on such surveys.

Mr. President, I myself do not take any credit for this; but I do give credit to the 23 members of the Appropriations Committee, both Republicans and Democrats, who foresaw this problem, and proceeded to take some action about it, instead of waiting for recommendations from the outside.

Mr. President, I hope that each Member of the Senate will take the opportunity of reading this latest report of the Hoover Commission, as well as the report published previously by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

TRANSFER OF SENIORITY ON THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my position as ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services Committee be exchanged for that of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the next ranking minority member of that committee, for the duration of the 84th Congress, with the full understanding that this arrangement is temporary in nature, and that at the expiration of the 84th Congress I will resume my seniority rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Hampshire does not mean to say, however, does he, that he will not participate in the consideration of any matters which may come before the committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. I intend to participate in committee activities as usual.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The new arrangement is only for seniority purposes; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, so that the senior Senator from Massachusetts will sit 1 rung higher on the seniority ladder, and that much closer to the chairman; and I will sit 1 rung farther down.

I do this for the senior Senator from Massachusetts because last year he served as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and did a very able job in that capacity; and I desire to show him the courtesy of letting him be a rung higher on the ladder, so to speak, temporarily. I ask that this change of seniority be made only temporarily, during the present Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire on what he has done. In my opinion, it is a mark of a very great man and one who loves his country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

INCREASED PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND FEDERAL JUDGES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me from the State chairman of the American Bar Association committee on judicial selection, tenure, and compensation, which favors increasing the pay of judges and, I believe also, that of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *February 21, 1955.*

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This is another followup letter in connection with the proposed increase of congressional and judicial salaries.

Attached to this letter are photostatic copies of a number of editorials from all parts of the country indicating that citizens generally are in favor of the increase.

Both of us realize that our judges have been underpaid for many years and it is quite a surprise to notice that the judges in some of the State district courts are paid more than our Federal judges. All of us realize that these Federal judges have quite a heavy responsibility and are certainly entitled to a substantial increase.

Not only the lawyers but a number of other citizens who are given the facts concerning this problem agree that the judges should have an increase of $10,000. I believe that the people here in North Dakota are in favor of both of these increases. If for any reason you would like us to take a very careful survey around the State, that could also be done, but at this time we believe that you can rely on the statements made in this letter.

We hope that you will support this increase, Senator, and if there is anything further that you would want concerning facts here in the State just drop me a line at any time.

Sincerely,

CARLTON G. NELSON,
State Chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Judicial Selection, Tenure, and Compensation.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, morning business is closed, and, under the unanimous consent order of Monday last, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 462) to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate, in considering the bill, will be operating under the limitation of debate which was agreed to on Monday last.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to the amendment of the committee. By unanimous consent the three amendments offered by him will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I understand that I have 15 minutes allotted to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendments is to require separate consideration of two distinct issues, namely, whether the salaries of judges should be increased, and whether the salaries of Members of Congress should be increased.

The amendments would strike from the bill all provisions increasing congressional salaries, but would leave intact the increase in travel allowance.

As I informed the Senate on Monday, I believe that increases in salaries for members of the Federal judiciary are justified. A judge is in a quite different position from that of a Member of Congress, because a judge must sacrifice all other sources of earned income when he goes on the bench. A Member of Congress retains all outside sources of earned income which he may have. Many Members of Congress have available to them outside sources of income from the practice of law, newspapers, radio stations, and business and professional activities of many kinds. I commented on that point in my remarks on Monday.

Therefore the two issues are entirely unrelated and, in my judgment, should be considered separately. It does not become Members of Congress to hide behind the robes of the judiciary when their own salaries are involved.

In saying that, I fully appreciate the fact that many Members of Congress face a difficult problem, peculiar to the position they occupy, because they must retain dual residences, in Washington and in their own districts or States.

A partial recognition of this problem has been made by the so-called $2,500 expense allowance, and the privilege of deducting up to $3,000 as expenses in computing income taxes.

The so-called $2,500 expense allowance actually, of course, is an addition to salary, making the total $15,000 a year, instead of the $12,500 listed in the law.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has proposed several amendments intended to meet the extra burdens of expense attached to the offce of a Member of Congress. Among them is a proposal to increase the tax deduction from $3,000 to $5,000 for Washington living expenses.

I have not had an opportunity to discuss his amendment with the Senator from Oregon, as I had hoped to do. Therefore, what I am about to say may surprise him slightly. While I am sympathetic with his purpose to relieve the financial burden of those Members of Congress who find the problem of dual living expenses a difficult one to meet, especially of the younger Members with heavy family responsibilities, I do not believe that is the right way to tackle the question.

A tax deduction works to the advantage of those with higher incomes. A man in the 60 percent tax bracket, for example, would profit twice as much as would a man in the 30 percent bracket. A man in the 75 percent tax bracket would save $2,250 out of the $3,000, whereas a man in the 30 percent tax bracket would save only $900.

It appears to me that the proposal does not work out equitably, in that while it may be fair to one it is not fair to another. Therefore, I have some reservation about the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon, although I believe the principle involved in the amendment is right, because the Senator from Oregon is trying to meet the living expense problem by a special allowance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator also have in mind that a businessman is allowed similar deductions for living expenses in Washington, and that when a corporation maintains living accommodations for its executives in Washington it is allowed to deduct such expenses?

Mr. BUSH. I would have to answer the question in this way, that a businessman who is sent to Washington on business has his expenses paid by the organization which sends him to Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the parent organization is allowed a deduction?

Mr. BUSH. There is no question about that. The Senator is correct. But I do not believe an increase in the tax deduction is the fairest and most equitable way of meeting the problem.

Possibly a solution might be to provide per diem allowances to Members of Congress, subject to strict accounting by voucher, to meet reasonable living expenses in Washington while Congress is in session.

That approach, however, together with the various suggestions which have been made for increasing allowances for office expenses, ought to be the subject of thorough study by the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I do not believe the committees of either body have come to grips with that particular problem in considering the pending bill. Instead, I believe the committees of the two Houses have dealt simply with a salary bill.

I am not optimistic enough to hope that my amendments will prevail, in view of the obvious intent of the Senate to pass the pending bill. If, however, we should succeed in striking out the congressional salary increase provision, I would hope that a study of such allowances would be undertaken at once.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The effect of the adoption of the Senator's proposed amendments would be to confine the pending bill to a raise in salary for the judiciary; is that correct?

Mr. BUSH. That is correct; plus the congressional travel allowances, which are provided for at the end of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator believe that the fact that judges hold office for life or during good behavior puts them in a preferred classification, so far as salaries are concerned, as compared with Members of Congress, who, in the case of the House, must run for office every 2 years, with attendant uncertainty, and, in the case of the Senate, must run for office every 6 years, also with attendant uncertainty?

Mr. BUSH. Yes. Of course, the fact that judges hold virtually life appointments has been one of the arguments for holding down their compensation in the past. I frankly believe that the salary level proposed for judges is a very substantial increase, but I find it is impossible to haggle about it too much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Connecticut to say that judges have to cut off their other sources of revenue when they accept appointment?

Mr. BUSH. As I recall, I said earned income.

Mr. HOLLAND. It so happens that I know of judges who have producing farms and livestock operations. Both of those situations happen to be true with reference to district judges serving in my own State. They do not have to forego that revenue. They do not have to forego that type of business as well as many other types of business and investments but they have to forego only their professional connections and certain classes of business connections which might conflict with their duties as judges. Is not the Senator covering too much territory in saying that members of the judiciary are foreclosed from receiving other sources of income?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has proved there are exceptions to what I said. I had in mind judges being required to forego the opportunity of legal practice. I concede that the Senator from Florida has a good point.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that judges forego their normal activities because they wanted to be appointed as judges?

Mr. BUSH. I am sorry; I did not hear all the Senator's question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that men who are appointed to the Federal bench are there because they wanted to be appointed and because they would ask the Senator from Connecticut, for instance, or some other Senator, to support them for such appointment.

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They forego their normal legal activities of their own volition. They receive a life job. They can retire at the age of 70 years on full pay. Does not the Senator think that a Member of Congress, who is responsible to his own constituents, and who can be removed from his office by them at any election, is entitled to additional compensation?

Mr. BUSH. As to that specific question, I should have to differ with the Senator. I do not believe the two are comparable. I discussed it in some detail last Monday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Constitution says they are comparable. It says there shall be three branches of Government. It does not say the judiciary shall be superior to the administrative branch or to the legislative branch. It says that there shall be three branches of Government.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What makes the judicial branch so superior to the other two branches of the Government?

Mr. BUSH. It makes little difference what I think makes a judge superior. I do not think a judge should be superior, but, on the average, they are a very superior group of men. The purpose of raising the judicial salary is to try to improve the quality of men on the Federal bench. In my own State we have had very great difficulty in finding men of the quality we are willing to recommend for appointment. That is true in other States, I suppose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I dislike to disagree with my good friend from Connecticut, but John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and John Marshall, were very competent men. Chief Justice Harlan, the grandfather of the nominee who is before the Senate at this time, was a very good man, as was, also, Chief Justice White. Would not the Senator consider that they were just as good judges as we now have? Would not the Senator consider that they were just as respectable and just as wise in interpreting the Constitution as are the judges we now have?

Mr. BUSH. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am certainly in sympathy with the position of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that we ought to do what we can toward raising the salaries of judges to a reasonable figure, and I join him in the hope that a higher type of men can be obtained than those who are sometimes available. But I am wondering if the distinguished Senator does not think the same argument might apply to Members of the Congress, and that an opportunity to get a better class of Members of the Senate and of Members of the House of Representatives might be afforded by raising their salaries?

Mr. BUSH. I commented on that point last Monday. My general feeling about it is that it is difficult to get qualified men for the Federal courts, but there seems to be no difficulty in getting applicants for the House and Senate. I think I said that if any Member, either of the Senate or the House, should retire there would be plenty of applicants for the position.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I correctly understand the distinguished Senator, he feels that the reasons in connection with the proposal to increase the salaries of Members of Congress have not been sufficiently well established. Does he not think that the record made by the very able Commission which studied the subject and the impressive reports submitted by the Senate and House committees, both of which have studied the subject for a long period of time, support the pending bill and support the case so ably made day before yesterday by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], that the increase in salary for Members of Congress now suggested is appropriate and has been shown to be wise and just and has been just as effectively proved as in the case of the proposed change in the salaries of the judiciary?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired. The present occupant of the chair desires to advise the Senate that the Senator from Connecticut has presented to the Senate a stopwatch, which is now being used to keep the time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut be given a reasonable amount of time in

which to reply to my most recent question. I should not like to be left in the position of asking a question and then not having given the Senator from Connecticut an opportunity to answer it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I stated that I was not greatly impressed with the part of the report which had to do with congressional salaries. I also think it went a little too far in connection with judicial salaries. The salaries are compared with those of corporation heads, and it is said the salaries of corporation heads are an average of $120,000 a year. The report also refers to the salaries of heads of labor unions, from $20,000 to $50,000 a year. What I said about that was that I did not think it was impressive at all, because the report did not go into other fields of endeavor. Many persons engaged in the teaching profession, in the medical profession, and in the clerical field, whose compensation is not anywhere near so high as that which we are now receiving, are well qualified to sit in the Halls of Congress. There are in those professions just as many persons who are well qualified to be Members of the Senate or of the House as there are in the business world.

That is my answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield for one more question. Am I correct in my understanding that the substance of the position taken by the Senator from Connecticut is that he thinks judges are entitled to the raise, but he is not sure Members of Congress are entitled to the raise?

Mr. BUSH. That is almost correct. I said on Monday, and I repeat, that I think further consideration should be given by the appropriate committees to what we call the situation affecting Members of the Congress. I stated that I was in general accord with the philosophy of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that a study should be made to see what is the burden which is imposed, and then to deal directly with the problem. I do not agree entirely with the way in which the Senator is endeavoring to accomplish the objective.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I correctly understand the distinguished Senator, he does not think the fact that a district judge has to maintain but one home while Members of Congress have to maintain two homes, and the further fact that a judge does not have to run for office periodically, as Members of the Congress have to do, bring about any equality between the needs for increased salaries of the Members of Congress and district judges?

Mr. BUSH. I see very little similarity between the two problems.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. Persident, do I correctly understand that the position of the Senator from Connecticut is that he believes if his amendment should be agreed to it might be possible to have better Members of Congress?

Mr. BUSH. No. I do not think I said that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what I understood the Senator to say—that there would be an improvement in the quality and caliber of Members of Congress.

Mr. BUSH. No; I did not say that. I have expressed no disapproval of or dissatisfaction with the quality of the Members of Congress; in fact, I said on Monday I thought they represented a good cross section of the citizenry of the United States and that the membership was very satisfactory.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Connecticut believe that the individual States have the right, under the Constitution, to send to the Senate or the House of Representatives whomever they please?

Mr. BUSH. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is their right; is it not?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is basic; is it not?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There should be no inference whatsoever drawn, should there, that the people of individual States are sending to Congress persons who do not meet the proper qualifications?

Mr. BUSH. I make no such inference. If the Senator from New Mexico has gathered such an idea from anything I have said, I am very sorry, because I never made such a statement. To the contrary, I have said, and I wish to say again, that I think we have a good body, and I do not believe that increasing the salaries of Members, as is provided under the pending bill, will improve the membership.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I apologize, then, for stating what I thought the Senator from Connecticut had in mind. I was going to ask him whether, considering the type of the present Members of Congress, it was senatorial courtesy that prevented the Senator from Connecticut from saying which Senator was not doing his duty.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from New Mexico is trying to put some words into my mouth or to draw some inferences which are not justified. I have said, on the contrary, that I think the Senate is a very creditable body.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is why I wish to apologize.

Mr. BUSH. I certainly accept the Senator's apology.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. How much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the premise of my esteemed colleague from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is that if it is conceded that some Members of the Senate are underpaid, why not keep all Members underpaid?

With respect to Federal judges, I have never had any difficulty, under the present judicial salary scale, in finding competent persons for the judiciary; in fact, I am proud of those whose names I have submitted and who, in my judgment, are performing distinguished service both on the Federal circuit bench and on the District court bench.

It would have been just as logical for the Senator from Connecticut to move to strike out the judicial portion of the bill rather than the legislative portion. But if the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut shall prevail, that will be the end of the proposed salary increase for Members of Congress, notwithstanding the fact that the proposal has the endorsement of the President of the United States, and notwithstanding the fact that it has the unanimous endorsement of a very able Commission representing interests from all areas of the country.

I earnestly hope the amendment will be rejected.

As I examine all the amendments pending before the Senate, it seems to me the situation adds up to a good deal of confusion. So the simple and reasonable thing to do is to vote for the salary increase.

With all deference to my distinguished friend from Connecticut, I hope that his amendment will be rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I believe this is the first time I have ever heard anyone, either in Congress or outside of Congress, say that he thought district judges should be paid more than Members of Congress receive. Indeed, the argument usually has been, and now is, that Members of Congress should receive greater compensation than that received by district judges.

The Senator from Connecticut no doubt knows that the House action, in the overall compensation, provides for $2,500 more for Members of Congress, by way of an expense allowance, than it provides for district judges. I feel that so far as the dignity of the office of Members of Congress and that of district judges is concerned, certainly the office of Members of Congress is as high as that of judges. It cannot be argued that Members of Congress do not make as great a sacrifice as do judges. Indeed, I am certain the Senator from Connecticut would concede that, considering the additional entertainment of constituents by Members of Congress, the necessity of furnishing two homes, the paying of extra sums out of their own pockets for office expense, and the fact, which every Member of Congress knows to be true, that it is impossible to conduct a campaign without having to spend one's own money, many good reasons exist why Members of Congress should be included in the salary classification of circuit judges, rather than that of district judges.

Furthermore, while district judges have great responsibilities, I can think of no higher responsibility, requiring the

best talents and ability that can be obtained, than that which rests on Members of Congress. The responsibility of Members of Congress is certainly greater than it was in 1939. Yet the allowance made in the bill on the basis of purchasing power is somewhat less than the purchasing power of the salary of a Member of Congress in 1939.

If the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will examine the hearings before the Segal commission, he will find that the public has a higher estimation of what the Senator should earn as a Member of the Senate than he himself has.

In the testimony of the seventy-odd witnesses who testified, and in the hundreds of letters and editorials, there has never been 1 suggestion made by any witness or newspaper editor throughout the Nation, from what I have been able to find in the 700 pages of the Segal commission's report, that Members of Congress are not entitled to at least the same compensation as that of district judges.

The Senator from Connecticut has presented a very unusual amendment. It is unusual because this is the first time such a proposal has been made. The salaries of district judges and Members of Congress have stood together at the same level for more than 40 years.

I think district judges have great responsibilities. We want to have in the judiciary the best persons obtainable. Still, I think it is even more important that there be the highest caliber of talent that can be secured for the direction of this Nation, which is in the hands of its Legislature.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be rejected by a large vote, as I hope the other amendments to be presented will be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No time remains for debate on the amendment. The question is——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, has the time which was allotted to the side in opposition to the amendment expired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time on both sides has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the three amendments of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to the committee amendment. By unanimous agreement, the amendments are to be considered en bloc.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic-energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would vote "yea."

I also announce that on this vote the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the ceremonies at the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 80, as follows:

YEAS—3

Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Morse

NAYS—80

Aiken	Frear	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Millikin
Barkley	George	Monroney
Barrett	Goldwater	Mundt
Beall	Gore	Murray
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hruska	Pastore
Bridges	Ives	Payne
Butler	Jackson	Potter
Byrd	Jenner	Purtell
Carlson	Kefauver	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Chavez	Knowland	Schoeppel
Clements	Kuchel	Scott
Cotton	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Lehman	Sparkman
Daniel	Long	Stennis
Dirksen	Magnuson	Symington
Duff	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Young
Flanders	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Humphrey	Thurmond
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Wiley
Green	Kennedy	
Hennings	Smathers	

So the amendments submitted by Mr. BUSH to the committee amendment were rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as 2–15–55–B, to the committee amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9 of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 2 and 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The first days of the fiscal year—

(1) following a fiscal year for which the receipts of the Government have exceeded the expenditures of the Government, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. It merely provides that the effective date of any salary increase authorized by this bill will be the first day of the first July following a fiscal year for which the receipts of the Government have exceeded the expenditures of the Government—in other words, when the Federal Government has a balanced budget.

In short the purpose of this amendment is to prevent any salary increase either for judges or Members of Congress being authorized with borrowed money.

I wish to make clear that I am not debating this issue on the basis of the merits of the proposed salary increase. I recognize that there is much merit to the proposal that some adjustment in judicial and congressional salaries be made. We must never allow the Congress of the United States develop into a rich man's club.

I voted against the preceding amendment, offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to the committee amendment; I did so for the reason that I think all these salary increases should be considered en bloc. I believe that salary increases for the judiciary and salary increases for Members of Congress are equally meritorious, and both should either be agreed to or rejected. However, as previously stated, I am opposed to agreeing to either of them at this time when they can be paid only with borrowed money.

Mr. President, there is ample precedent for my amendment, because identical language is contained in Public Law 361 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, being House bill 6549, which provides for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at St. Louis, Mo. In passing that bill, Congress adopted language similar to the language of my amendment; and in that connection I now read from Public Law 361:

SEC. 4 (b). The authorization for an appropriation contained in subsection (a) shall not be effective until such time as—

(1) the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; or

(2) the budget submitted to the Congress by the President under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, reveals that the estimated receipts of the Government for the fiscal year for which such budget is submitted are

in excess of the estimated expenditures of the Government for such fiscal year.

That provisions of Public Law 361 made it possible for the Secretary of the Interior to expend the authorized funds only after the Federal Government's budget is balanced.

During the past 25 years, on only 3 occasions has the Federal Government lived within its income.

Likewise, many other proposals coming before Congress are equally meritorious, and many of us will be called upon to oppose them on the basis of this same argument; namely, that the Federal Treasury does not contain sufficient funds to pay the expenditures proposed in those measures.

I cite one of those measures which will come to us from the House of Representatives later this week—a proposal for a tax credit in the amount of $20 for every taxpayer and every dependent. I do not think any Member will argue against that proposal on the basis that it is does not have some merit. However, here again we are confronted with the fact it represents a loss of $1,500,000,000 to the Federal Treasury, and every dollar of the reduction would have to be made up by means of extra borrowed money.

Another popular proposal is for a 10 percent across-the-board salary increase for the 2½ million civilian employees of the Federal Government. Again, a good argument can be made to the effect that the Government employees' salaries have not kept pace with the salaries paid in industry. Taken by itself, it would not be possible to build up a good case against the proposal to grant such a salary increase were it not for the fact that it will cost about $800 million; and, again, every dollar of this would have to be borrowed. I read in the press reports to the effect that a 10-percent salary increase would cost only about $200 million on the basis that much of the cost of the salary increases would be absorbed by the various governmental agencies. That sounds very nice, but every Member of the Senate knows that scarcely a dollar of the cost of such a salary increase would be absorbed by any agency by means of laying off employees; and I venture to say that an amendment making such an arrangement mandatory would be rejected.

Those two proposals would represent an additional expenditure of approximately $2,225 million.

Another proposal which will be coming before us is one to extend the social security benefits to the 2½ million Government employees in addition to the benefits they now enjoy under the regular retirement systems. That proposal, too, can be regarded as having merit equal to the proposal contained in the bill now before us. But, Mr. President, if such a social security extension is passed, allowing the civilian employees of the Government to have access to the social security benefits in addition to the retirement benefits they now receive, the result will be that the Federal Government, as their employer, will have to pay a 2 percent tax on the first $4,200 of the salary of every Government employee. This would amount to a cost to the United States Government of another $100 million; and in view of the fact that today the Government's budget is out of balance, the result would be that the Government would have to borrow the money in order to pay its own tax as an employer.

Tax reductions and salary increases are economically unsound and cannot be justified, particularly at a time when our country is enjoying its highest degree of peacetime prosperity.

Likewise, there are many new Federal-aid programs as well as many extensions of existing programs, any one of which taken by itself could be justified on the basis of its merits but which we should not support because we do not have the money in the Federal Treasury with which to pay for them.

We must recognize that after 25 years of living beyond our income, the time has come when we must balance the budget. If the budget is ever to be balanced, now is the time to do it.

As the President of the United States has pointed out, there is still great danger from inflation. The reason we are discussing an increase in salary for Members of Congress and for civil-service employees is because of the depreciated dollar caused by inflation. Inflation, of course, is caused largely by an unbalanced budget.

It is an endless cycle, and must be stopped somewhere along the line by Congress.

Ten years ago the Government sold bonds to the American people on the basis of returning $4 for every $3 invested. However, the $4 received today will not buy as much as $2 would when the original bond was purchased. Instead of giving him back $4 for each $3 invested, the Government is actually taking away one-third of what the investor paid to the Government.

At the same time, as a result of the depreciation of the dollar the Government has destroyed one-half the value of every life insurance policy, retirement fund, and social-security fund.

It is the responsibility of Congress to recognize this condition and to balance the budget. We are closer today to balancing the budget than we have been in recent years. I believe it can be done. There is only one thing lacking—the will on the part of Congress to do it.

I close my remarks with the statement that the increases proposed in the bill could perhaps be justified except for the fact that we must borrow the money with which to pay for them. If my amendment is agreed to, I shall support the bill. If it is not agreed to, I shall oppose the bill.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall request the yeas and nays again after the opposition has spoken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can well understand the viewpoint expressed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. However, I should like to say to the Senate that on the basis of his logic, since the budget was out of balance 23 years in the past 26 years, there would have been only three chances for a pay raise, no matter how necessary it might have been.

If that logic applies, there would have been no pay raise for Federal employees in 4 of the last 5 pay-raise bills, beginning in 1945.

As I go back and read the record of the raises granted to Federal employees in 5 different bills, they aggregate 51 percent, and only once during that time was the budget balanced.

If we follow the logic of the Senator from Delaware, we will have to make up our minds that we will not consider the bill providing salary increases for Federal employees which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will report shortly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we must find some infinite date in the future when a salary increase may become effective, I will say to the Senate that frankly I do not know when that would be.

I believe the bill before the Senate is predicated on justice. It has the endorsement of the President. It is based on the unanimous recommendation of the Segal Commission, which was established by Congress. Therefore, I trust that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware will be defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be happy to yield, if I have the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Might not the adoption of the pending amendment serve as an inducement to Congress to balance the budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That, of course, is wholly speculative.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield, if I have the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator agree with me that Congress could balance the budget within the next 12 months if it had the will to do so?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator agree with me that this is the time to balance the budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If in the past 26 years Congress has not had the disposition to balance the budget, I see no reason why Members of the House and of the Senate should be the victims of that failure on the part of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree with me that the House and the Senate are the bodies which authorize the appropriations which, in turn, bring about an unbalanced budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I respect the sincerity of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in offering his amendment. However, I respectfully submit that the basis of the compensation we are discussing should be somewhere near the worth of the Members of Congress, instead being based on the fiscal condition of the United States with the bringing about of which we have had very little to do. It is not the fault of Members of Congress that events of history many years ago brought about war conditions and the present cold war conditions. Those conditions make it impossible to balance the budget. In any event, they make it all the more necessary to have competent men in the House and in the Senate.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I point out that the pending bill provides for increases which amount to a little less than $5 million. That is a little less than 1/100th percent of the budget, and on that basis it would take 100 years to reduce the budget by as much as 1 percent.

Former President Herbert Hoover, who I am sure the Senator from Delaware will agree is a great economizer, and other persons in business who are interested in balancing the budget, have made reports about the bill and have testified before the Segal Commission. Their position is that Members of Congress should be given adequate compensation, so that they may have some degree of independence. It is urged that if the Members of Congress are given adequate compensation they will not be subject to the extent they now are consciously or unconsciously to the influence of pressure groups who are seeking appropriations for one cause or another. They point out also that we would have a sounder government and better fiscal affairs, as well as a better chance of balancing the budget. All that is being sought is a minimum increase in salary for Members of Congress. It is less than what has been recommended by the Segal and Hoover commissions and the President of the United States. I believe the committee has been very modest in recommending $5,000 less than the recommendation of the Segal Commission.

Certainly the newer Members of Congress have had nothing to do with bringabout the condition in our fiscal affairs which makes it so difficult to balance the budget at this time. As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, we have given five raises in pay since 1945 to Federal employees, in order to provide them with a living wage, and, with the exception of 1 year, during that time the budget was not in balance.

I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be rejected.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Millikin
Barkley	George	Monroney
Barrett	Goldwater	Morse
Beall	Gore	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Ives	Payne
Butler	Jackson	Potter
Byrd	Jenner	Purtell
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Langer	Sparkman
Daniel	Lehman	Stennis
Dirksen	Long	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Thurmond
Duff	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Young
Flanders	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic-energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I again ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic-energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana]Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 71, as follows:

YEAS—15

Bush	Douglas	Langer
Byrd	Dworshak	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Ellender	Mundt
Curtis	Frear	Welker
Daniel	Hruska	Williams

NAYS—71

Aiken	Gore	Millikin
Allott	Hayden	Monroney
Barkley	Hennings	Murray
Barrett	Hill	Neely
Beall	Holland	Neuberger
Bender	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Jackson	Pastore
Bible	Jenner	Payne
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Bridges	Kefauver	Purtell
Butler	Kerr	Robertson
Carlson	Kilgore	Russell
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Clements	Lehman	Scott
Cotton	Long	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Duff	Malone	Stennis
Eastland	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Thurmond
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Young
Goldwater	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Wiley
Green	Kennedy	
Hickenlooper	Smathers	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the amount recommended by the committee to $20,000. If the amendment shall be agreed to, it will be my purpose to place

before the Senate similar amendments so as to reduce in the same proportion all other salaries which have been recommended for increases.

The amount as now provided in the bill raises the present salary of Senators and Representatives by 50 percent, that is, from $15,000 per annum to $22,500. The purpose of my amendment is to increase the salaries of Members of the Congress by 33⅓ percent. I should like to decrease the amount a little more, that is, to something which would be in accord with the increase in the cost of living; but I doubt that such an amendment would prevail. As a practical matter, Mr. President, I know that such an amendment would fail. Nevertheless, I believe the Senate should know that since 1946, the last time this body had an opportunity to vote on a salary increase, the cost of living has advanced only some 14 points. On this basis, salary increases which would meet the cost of living increase should not exceed $2,500 per annum. However, I am convinced that such an amendment would fail of passage, and since I am a practical man, I have offered my amendment with the thought that the amount it provides is practical enough to be approved by this body, and at the same time, is more than ample for our needs.

If the amendment I have offered is agreed to, it will represent a salary increase of 100 percent over and above the $10,000 salary paid to Members of the Congress prior to the adoption of the Reorganization Act in 1946. In other words, even if my amendment is adopted, Senators will have voted to double their salaries in a period of only nine years. Yet, the committee amount represents an increase over 1946 of some 125 percent. Mr. President, I frankly cannot see how this large amount can be justified. Certainly, no other segment of our government has received such treatment.

Let me point out that since 1946 the cost of living has increased, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, by only some 13 or 14 percent.

In the bill we are being asked to increase the salary of Senators, who were paid $10,000 in 1946, to $22,500—an increase of 125 percent.

I should like to vote for a reasonable increase in salary; as a matter of fact, I shall, and I offer this amendment with the firm conviction that the raise it provides is more than ample. If the bill should be passed as reported, with the House having provided in its bill a salary of $25,000 for Members of Congress, there is no doubt that the compromise amount to be agreed on by the conference committee will be in excess of what we are being asked to vote upon today.

Mr. President, this is only a beginning; it only lays the groundwork for what will come in the near future. I feel sure that an increase in the salaries of administrative assistants will next be sought. As a matter of fact, if the House bill should be adopted, there is already a provision included to raise the salary of committee clerks from a ceiling of $11,646 to as much as $14,000. If that salary should be adopted for committee clerks, Senators can rest assured that it will be a pattern for the salary of administrative assistants and others.

Mr. President, it does seem unjust for us to be raising the salaries of Members of Congress by 125 percent since 1946, as I have just indicated, and then refuse to raise by a reasonable sum the salaries of all the clerks who work in Congress and the many fine men and women who are employed by the executive departments, and instead give them a raise of from 5 to 6 percent. I think it is unfair, Mr. President, and I shall not be a party to such a procedure.

This is no time to set a precedent for the unreasonable raising of Government salaries. Our national debt today is $278 billion. Eighteen months ago, when the debt was only $267 billion, I pointed out that it would take all 96 Senators a total of 46 years to count our debt if each Senator counted at the rate of 2 one dollar bills every second—46 years of continuous counting. Eighteen months have passed since that time, and our Nation's debt has increased to the point where it would now take 48½ years for all 96 Senators to count it, if each Senator counted at the rate of 2 one dollar bills every second.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What does the Senator's amendment propose with respect to salaries of Federal judges?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I am successful in having the suggested increase reduced to 33 percent over present salaries, I shall offer amendments to bring about a proportionate decrease with respect to all categories of positions included in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Why does not the Senator offer an amendment which would carry that proposal all the way through in the bill? I would be inclined to support the amendment if it fixed all the increases in proper proportion, but I would not be in favor of singling out Members of Congress and disregarding provisions in the bill to increase the salaries of others.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure my good friend from Arkansas that if I am successful in having the Senate adopt my amendment, I shall immediately propose amendments to reduce proportionately the increases proposed in the salaries of all Federal judges, as well as the Speaker of the House and the Vice President, so that their increases would be in the same proportion as those fixed for Members of Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I feel about the situation as I have stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my purpose to offer amendments as I have stated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe there should be a uniform increase or no increase at all. I shall support such a proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as is well known, for almost 8 years I fought the construction of a new Senate Office Building. Last year Congress decided to have it built. I wish to point out that the erection of the building will result in an additional annual maintenance cost to the taxpayers equal to $10,000 for each Senator. In 1940 the appropriations to operate the whole Senate, including salaries, amounted to $3,936,986. In 1946, at the time the Reorganization Act went into effect, the cost increased to $8,443,002. This year, 1955, the total amount of money appropriated to operate the Senate, including salaries and all other expenses, is $14,665,223.

If there be added the funds which will be necessary to operate the new Senate Office Building, as well as funds to pay for the increases in salaries that are authorized in the pending bill that $14,665,000 annual cost will climb to almost $20 million every year. Mr. President, that is unconscionable, particularly when we consider the condition of the National Treasury. So it is my hope that the Senate will adopt my amendment.

As I have said, if the Senate should vote for an increase in congressional salaries as recommended by the committee, just as surely as God made red apples bills will be introduced to increase the salaries of all clerks, administrative assistants, and everybody else connected with the Senate. If what is now proposed is done, we cannot refuse to increase their salaries. That would also apply to every employee in the executive departments, should their representatives appear before Congress and request reasonable increases in salaries based on whatever the increase in cost of living has been. We could not in good conscience refuse to increase their salaries if we voted ourselves a salary increase of 50 percent, or a total increase of 125 percent since 1946.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. That argument would also apply, would it not, to the proposal to increase the salaries by 33⅓ percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would, yes. I wish to state to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, that if I thought an effort to confine an increase in salaries to the proportionate increase in the cost of living—which is 14 or 15 percent or a total increase in salary of about $2,100—would be successful, I would make an effort to have such an increase put into effect. However, I am a practical man and I am doubtful that I would be successful in any such attempt, so I am asking that the increases be 33⅓ percent rather than 50 percent.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana reminds me somewhat of the story of a proprietor of a fish market who had taken a piece of chalk and scrawled on a large blackboard the words "Fresh fish for sale here today." A friend of his came along and said, "Why do you say 'fresh'? If they were not fresh, you

would not sell them." So the proprietor scratched out the word "fresh." His friend then said, "if they are not for sale here today, then when are they for sale?" So the proprietor wiped out the word "today." Finally, by logic, he wiped out everything except one word, and the billboard just contained the word "fish."

Mr. President, each amendment must be considered in relation to what has happened to the bill thus far. A commission was appointed to study the subject; it took evidence, which is comprised in about 700 pages of testimony, and finally the commission recommended that the salaries be fixed at $27,500. The House committee took testimony, and it recommended that the salaries be fixed at $25,000. The Senate committee took testimony, and it recommended that the salaries be fixed at $22,500. My esteemed friend from Louisiana now proposes to further decrease the recommendations and fix the salaries at $20,000. If there should be about one more amendment of this character, and it should be adopted, we might just well write the word "fish" and then we would be right back where we started, and would have wasted all this time just to have the bill brought before the Senate.

The premise of my friend the Senator from Louisiana is wrong in one respect. He goes back to 1946. Why does he not go back to the base period of 1939? While there was an increase under the Reorganization Act of 1946, it was a token increase and did not reflect the devaluation or depreciation of the dollar one bit. If my friend will examine the report he will find that, despite those increases, the value of the dollar at present levels is still, on the average, behind the 1939 level in terms of purchasing power. So, if the proposed increase is voted for, the salaries will still be $200 below the 1939 level. If that level is good for farmers, if that level is good for persons on the Federal payroll, if that level is good for the Federal Reserve System, then certainly it is good for us. I trust, therefore, that the Senate will not mangle the bill, after all the work that has gone into it, and that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be very respectfully voted down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me 1 minute?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be glad to yield the Senator from California 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He mentioned the fact that he had opposed the construction of the new Senate Office Building, and had been opposed to it for about 8 years. I differed with the Senator from Louisiana, because I think it is important for the legislative arm of the Government to have ample facilities to conduct the public's business. However, is it not correct that the cost of construction of that building will now be about 33⅓ percent more than the amount for which it could have been built 8 years ago? Is it not true that if it had been built at that time it would have resulted in a saving of about 33⅓ percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The cost to construct the building today is about the same as it would have been 2 or 3 years ago, when it was proposed. In fact, the same amount has been asked for.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a brief comment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. I was not present to hear the colloquy completely, but I might say, in connection with the new Senate Office Building, we are informed that the costs for its construction will be approximately 23 percent higher, because 3 or 4 years elapsed since the figures were originally developed, and costs are higher today.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. On page 3 of the committee report Senators will see that the salaries proposed by the Senate bill for Members of Congress, district judges, and all other officers covered by the bill are less by $5,000 than the salaries recommended by an unbiased commission which was appointed by the President, the Chief Justice, the Speaker, and the Vice President. At the time they met the Segal commission members did not have any preconceived idea as to what the salaries should be. But they made a thorough survey of agriculture, labor, business, and the professions, to determine what men and women serving in like positions were being paid. If Members of Congress were to be treated similarly, their salaries would be $5,000 above the salaries provided for in the pending bill. So a substantial reduction has already been made.

Mr. President, I submit that salary increases for Members of Congress come only at infrequent intervals. It is true that the pending bill provides for a substantial increase over the salary provided in 1946. But, Mr. President, between 1939 and 1946 there was substantial inflation and a substantial increase in the amount of taxes. Thus, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has pointed out, and as will be seen by examining page 10 of the report, if the salary of a Member of Congress is increased to $22,500, the purchasing power of that salary, thus coming to a Member of Congress, will be less than the purchasing power a Member of Congress had from his salary in 1939.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the time required for my question be taken out of the time available to me, inasmuch as I believe that 4 minutes' time is still available to me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that when the salaries of Members of Congress were increased in 1946, as a result of the recommendations of the Commission which was then appointed under authority of Congress, the Commission took all those matters into consideration, in recommending a salary of $12,500, plus a $2,500 allowance for an expense account which would not be subject to income tax?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, the La Follette-Monroney Commission did at that time take that into consideration. But, undoubtedly, at that time—in view of the increase in the cost of living over the cost of living in 1939—if the desire was to keep up with the increased cost of living, the salary provided for should have been greater.

Mr. President, Congress is always reluctant to raise its own salary, and Congress was reluctant at that time. So, merely because Congress did not, in 1946, provide for what it was entitled to—and the Senator from Louisiana will recall that at that time a great deal was said to the effect that Congress should be fair with itself in the matter of its salary—and merely because Congress did not receive justice then, is no reason why Congress should not receive minimum justice now.

Mr. President, I suppose that if the Members of the Senate on the Democratic side of the aisle were to select the man whom they most highly respect—although, of course, we respect all our Democratic Members—a man who is conservative in his judgment, and certainly whose every act has always been in the best interest, as he has very conscientiously felt, of the Nation, the unanimous choice would be the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; and if a similar process were gone through, in the case of the Members on the Republican side of the aisle, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would similarly be selected from among the Senators on that side of the aisle, or at least he would be among the 2 or 3 who would be selected. These two distinguished Senators have given consideration to this problem. I am sure that the conclusion they reached was a conservative one, in accordance with their nature, and that they considered the situation of the Federal budget and considered what is best for the Federal Government. So, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to Senate bill 540, introduced by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for himself and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. That bill provides for salaries for Members of Congress and for district judges in the amount of $22,500—or, in general, the exact salaries which are provided for in the pending measure.

Mr. President, it is true that there will be requests for increased compensation for the employees of the Federal Government; and, as a matter of fact, such increases in some amount have already been recommended by the President. Bills have been introduced, both on behalf of the administration and on behalf of others, to give salary increases in varying amounts to the employees of the Federal Government. Regardless of whether the pending bill is passed or is not passed, as a matter of equity there will undoubtedly be provided some increased compensation for Federal employees.

I should like to point out to the Members of the Senate that even if we take

1946 as a starting point—and, as I have said before, congressional salaries were low when they were fixed in 1946—the increases already allowed to Federal employees since 1946 amount to more than 50 percent. When the other increases are granted, as they will be during this session, they will amount to much more than 50 percent.

The increase to $22,500, recommended by the committee and by such distinguished Senators as the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—to whose bill I have referred—will grant to Members of Congress an increase of only 50 percent, which will be less than the overall percentage increase the Government employees have received since 1946.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak at this time. But when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made his statement, I felt constrained to speak. He said, I believe, that $14 million would be the cost of running the Senate as a part of the legislative arm of the Government, as compared with a considerably lesser amount under the LaFollette-Monroney Act.

First of all, I wish to say that the amount of $14 million for the total operation of the Senate figures out at approximately two-thousandths of 1 percent—0.00021542—of the budget of $67 billion for the fiscal year 1954. It seems to me that the American people, as the stockholders of this great corporation, the Government of the United States, would not feel it unreasonable for the Congress of the United States to be properly compensated and to have an adequate staff and adequate facilities, so that this great legislative arm of the Government—which, under the Constitution, is a coequal branch—might be able to perform its duties in connection with the present enormous governmental structure.

I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee—and I speak somewhat feelingly on this matter—that during the 83d Congress we lost 9 Members of this body, or almost 10 percent of our membership. Very few persons are aware of the tremendous burdens a United States Senator carries. A Senator does not have a vacation from his job. When he goes home, his responsibilities then are as great, and his hours are as long, as when he is in the Nation's Capital, at Washington. I speak, not only for myself, but I am confident I speak also for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, when I say that it is very seldom that I, representing in part the second largest State in the Union, do not spend a 12-hour or a 14-hour day, working on the problems before the Senate. I know that Senators from the smaller States are also faced with the same problems.

I do not think the Senate should be merely a rich man's club. I do not think a United States Senator should have to have additional income, in order to be able to serve the people of his State or the people of the Nation.

Any person should be able to serve in the Senate of the United States, even if he does not have a cent of other income, and when it is considered that Senators must maintain two homes a great extra burden of expense is added to the office. Certainly any citizen should be able to serve his State as a United States Senator and should be able to carry the heavy responsibilities of that office. However, there is not one Member of this body who does not know that, in addition to the trips home which from time to time Senators must make, the total job, with the multifarious responsibilities Senators are called upon to assume, constitutes a burden which very few in private life are asked to carry.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from California, the minority leader.

The Congress of the United States has the highest responsibility when it comes to making the laws governing the Nation. The body having the highest responsibility in connection with the interpretation of those laws is the Supreme Court of the United States. Who can say that the responsibility of translating public opinion into public policy, in the form of legislation, is not of equal importance to that of interpreting laws after they have been made? So, on that basis, the work of a Member of Congress is comparable to that of a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, rather than to that of a district judge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, Mr. President, let me close by saying that all we are requesting in this case is the same salary that we are requesting for district judges.

I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a correction of an answer I gave to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in respect to the cost of the new Senate Office Building. The building will cost less than the original estimates, as I have indicated; but that is due to the fact many of the trimmings have been eliminated. So far as the cost of the office building as a whole is concerned, it will be about the same as when the question of its construction was first submitted to the Senate.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Not only will the trimmings be eliminated, but a very substantial portion of the building, the central portion, will not be constructed, because the building as originally designed would have cost 23 percent more than the authorization.

Instead of coming to Congress for a new authorization, we have actually reduced the size of the building quite substantially. Therefore, not only have the trimmings been cut out, but the whole central portion of the building has been eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a moment ago I cited the figures on the increased cost of operating the Senate in order to demonstrate how the cost of Government has increased year by year. I should like to place in the RECORD at this time a table which indicates how the cost of operating the Senate has increased from 1940 to 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate appropriations, including salaries of Senators, by fiscal years

1940	$3,936,986
1941	4,128,884
1942	4,153,374
1943	4,400,585
1944	4,605,005
1945	4,882,103
1946	6,360,385
1947	8,443,002
1948	11,218,625
1949	11,895,698
1950	11,507,772
1951	12,424,781
1952	12,850,183
1953	13,406,396
1954	14,491,768
1955	14,665,223

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS

June 30, 1946 (last full fiscal year before Legislative Reorganization Act)	$6,360,385
Fiscal year 1955	$14,665,223
Amount of increase, 1946–55	$8,304,838
Percent increase, 1955 over 1946	129

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I indicated a short time ago, if the bill is passed, just as sure as I am speaking, within the next few months efforts will be made to increase the salary of every employee on the Hill. If we vote these increases for ourselves, we will not, in good conscience, be able to refuse other salary increases.

Let us be reasonable, Mr. President. Every cost-of-living estimate which has recently been used as a yardstick for measuring salary increases for Members of Congress goes back to 1939. I contend that the real base we should use is not 1939, but 1946. That is the last time we voted a salary increase, and that increase was approved in the light of a thorough study made by a duly constituted commission acting under authority of the Congress. In 1946, the present salary levels were deemed ample, and were so approved. Living costs have gone up only 14 or 15 percent since that time. Yet, we are being asked to increase our salaries by 50, not 15, percent. I believe it would be morally wrong for us to do so, Mr. President. The amount I have suggested in my amendment is ample; as a matter of fact, I frankly consider it more than enough, but I know full well that it is the only amount which has a chance of approval. Let us save the American taxpayers the difference; let us not set a precedent for

sweeping increases for all employees on the Hill, as well as employees of the executive branch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is an amendment to the Ellender amendment in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I offer such an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the Ellender amendment to the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$17,500."

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is my understanding that the language in the bill does not affect the so-called $2,500 expense allowance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill would repeal the $2,500 allowance.

Mr. President, I was going to make a point of order against the amendment, but I shall withhold it for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires whether the Senator from South Dakota offers his amendment to the Ellender amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I offer it as an amendment to the Ellender amendment, to strike out the figure which the Senator from Louisiana proposes, namely, $20,000, and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$17,500."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and is in the third degree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is overruled. The amendment is germane.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I assume that the committee amendment is being considered as original next. If so, my amendment is an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from South Dakota is mistaken about his statement with regard to the $2,500 allowance. That expense allowance is stricken in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The bill strikes it out?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I accept the Senator's statement on that point, and I am glad to have it in the RECORD. However, I feel that the Senate must consider the entire legislative picture. If the bill should pass in the form in which it is presented by the committee, or even as it might be amended by the Ellender amendment, the percentage of the increase would be larger than that which we will be asked to pass on in connection with bills dealing with salary increases for Federal employees. If the bill is passed in the form in which it has been reported by the committee, I believe it will plague the Senate during the consideration of other pay legislation proposed at this session of Congress.

I recognize the fact that there has been a change in the cost of living and that because of the increase in the cost of living a dollar today will not buy as much as a dollar would buy in 1939 or in 1946. However, the increase that is recommended is a very substantial one. For that reason I believe the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on my proposal. I do not believe it is necessary to labor the point, because the issue is very simple. Therefore, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendments lettered "A" and "C," and ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendments, which, without objection, will be considered en bloc.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For what purpose does the Senator from Louisiana rise?

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote on my amendment. I was not in the Chamber when the Senate voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from Oregon has the floor and has offered amendments, which are being stated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to accommodate the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon will yield the floor temporarily.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor for the purpose of having the Senate reconsider the vote by which it rejected the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago. I thought the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] would speak for 15 minutes. When I returned to the Chamber I was informed that my amendment had been voted down. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it rejected my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that the vote by which his amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana was rejected is reconsidered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I again ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that my two amendments, designated "2–21–55–A" and "2–21–55–C," be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 4. (a) The paragraph under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, 79th Congress, as amended (2 U. S. C. 46c), relating to long-distance telephone calls for Senators made to and from the District of Columbia, is amended by striking out "90" and inserting "100," and by striking out "450" and inserting "500."

(b) The paragraph in such act (2 U. S. C. 46d) relating to long-distance telephone calls for Senators originating and terminating outside of the District of Columbia is amended by striking out "$1,200" and inserting "$1,320."

(c) The number of minutes of official long-distance telephone calls, and the aggregate number of words on official telegrams, allowed each Member of the House of Representatives, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner is hereby increased by 10 percent.

(d) The amounts authorized for airmail and special delivery stamps for Senators, the President of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, and the majority and minority whips, of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 10 percent.

In the other amendment, identified as "2–21–55–C," it is proposed on page 7, line 25 (in the provision relating to sal-

aries of Members of Congress) to strike out "$22,500" and insert "$12,500."

On page 8, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive (which repeal provisions of law relating to expense allowances of Members of Congress), and on page 8, line 6, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

On page 8, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 4. The aggregate amount authorized to be paid as basic compensation for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the office of each Senator, and for clerk hire in the office of each Representative in Congress, each Delegate from a Territory, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, is hereby increased by 10 percent.

On page 9, line 1, strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "Sec. 5."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the two amendments be considered en bloc.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I intend to submit a point of order against amendment "A" and against a portion of amendment "C"——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to submit my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, amendment A undertakes to amend the public law relating to contingent expenses of the Senate, and deals with telephone calls, airmail stamps, and so forth.

The pending bill deals only with the salaries of judges and of Members of the House and Senate. Therefore, I submit, Mr. President, that under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Monday of this week, the amendments are not germane to the pending bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit that the amendment is germane because it deals with the question of incomes of Senators and salaries of Senators, and it suggests an increase in expense allowances in lieu of an increase in salary. Therefore, the expense item would be perfectly germane to the question of a salary increase. It proposes that office expenses now paid out of the pockets of many Senators shall be paid for by the taxpayers, and, in that sense, it is a substitute for the proposal to increase congressional salaries and is in lieu thereof.

I respectfully submit that the amendment is quite germane to the subject matter of the proposed legislation which is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it is a rather close question, but the amendment does deal with the amount, directly and indirectly, which Senators receive. Therefore, the Chair thinks the point of order should be overruled.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my remarks on the amendment, because I made my major speech against the pending bill last Monday. I stand upon the arguments set forth in that speech. I summarize only a part of the speech by pointing out that, in my judgment, the fiscal problem which really confronts Members of the Senate in regard to which they are entitled to financial relief is the problem of the expenses of the office in carrying out senatorial duties, which expenses to a degree are now paid out of the pockets of Senators.

In my amendment, for example, Mr. President, I seek to increase the allowance for secretarial help, because there are many of us—I do not know how many—who pay each year out of our own pockets money which goes into the payment of salaries of secretaries whom we hire and have to hire to do the secretarial work of our office over and above the allowance permitted by the official budget.

I do not see the Senator on the floor at this time, but I understand that 1 of our colleagues, who is a very wealthy man, employs from 6 to 7 extra secretaries whom he pays himself, and even rents office space to accommodate them in a private building.

We also pay out of our own pockets each year a considerable sum for air mail stamps, telephone calls, and telegrams in connection with our official expenses. Each year many of us pay out of our own pockets a substantial sum of money to carry on the work of our offices, which should be paid by the Federal Government. I think if we took care of that problem, we would be dealing with the real financial problem which confronts Members of the Senate, rather than the salary problem.

I went into the subject in great detail last Monday. However, I am a stark realist, and I am very much aware of the tempo of the Senate in regard to this proposed legislation. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I want to raise my voice in a final plea that we stop, look at, and consider the equities of the situation. If we do, we shall not vote for a salary increase but for an increase in the expense allowance to our office so that we can do the official senatorial business for our constituents which they do not expect us to pay for out of our own pockets.

I mentioned last Monday the matter of telephone calls. Sometimes persons call us by long distance telephone collect. They feel they should be allowed to do so, because it is in connection with official business. They have a passport problem. It is an emergency to them. What do we do? We go to work at once, because they pay taxes for us to go to work at once on the problem.

We get down to the State Department, as I have on several such cases, and find that the constituent forgot to submit a pertinent fact. So we pick up the long-distance telephone, call the constituent, and get the additional information. Sometimes we may be able to solve his problem to his satisfaction. But when we go into the record of our expenses we find that many of us are out of pocket each month through the spending of a telephone calls in the official work of the Senate, over and above the amount the Government allows. Likewise we find it necessary to pay considerable sums for telegrams, and for airmail stamps.

I think a realistic approach to the problem is by way of voting ourselves the money which is needed to do the official work of the office, not by way of voting ourselves a salary increase which, in my judgment, for the reasons I stated last Monday, cannot be justified on the record.

As I suggested then, I am not at all moved by the argument about the high cost of living for Senators in Washington, D. C., particularly when it comes from someone who is paying $400, $450, or $500 a month rent to live in a swank hotel.

I think we should stay close to the people. Such Senators ought to get back to modest living conditions. I think if we do, we will have a better understanding, in many instances, of the people's needs.

Mr. President, I call attention to a document I hold in my hand called Economic Indicators, February 1955, Prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the Council of Economic Advisers. If Senators want to see the plight of our employers, if Senators want to see the plight of our bosses, the consumers of America, let them take a look at the table appearing on page 28 and see what has happened to the total consumer credit outstanding in this country.

What has happened to the so-called total consumer credit outstanding in this country, starting with 1939 and continuing through December 1954?

The table starts with $7,222,000,000 in 1939. In December 1954, there was $30,125,000,000 outstanding in consumer credit. This means that our bosses do not have the cash today to pay as they go. Our bosses today, the consumers and voters of America, do not have the money in order to meet the fiscal problems which confront them today.

I cannot bring myself to vote for a 50-percent increase in my salary when I know what the salary problem of my bosses happens to be today. But my bosses, I am satisfied, are perfectly willing to have us vote for the expense allowances needed to transact official senatorial business for our constituents and to pay for the operations of our offices, subject to auditing and subject to public accounting, and subject to full public disclosure—and there is no substitute for public disclosure.

Thus I offer this amendment, as I shall a few more, which seeks to approach the problem from the point of view from which I think it should be approached, namely, supplying ourselves with the money necessary to transact the people's business in our offices. Let us give ourselves enough money with which to pay those expenses, subject, of course, to public audit and check.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in

the RECORD the table I have referred to, appearing on page 28 of Economic Indicators, February 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMER CREDIT

Consumer credit outstanding rose $900 million in December to reach a new record. The increase was due largely to a seasonal rise in charge account credit. For the year 1954 as a whole, installment credit extended was $1 billion below that in 1953, while repayments were $2.2 billion higher.

[Millions of dollars]

End of period	Total consumer credit outstanding	Instalment credit outstanding					Noninstallment credit outstanding		Installment credit extended [3]	Installment credit repaid [3]
		Total	Automobile paper [1]	Other consumer goods paper [1]	Repair and modernization loans [2]	Personal loans	Total	Charge accounts		
1939	7,222	4,503	1,497	1,620	298	1,088	2,719	1,414		
1944	5,111	2,176	397	791	119	869	2,935	1,517	4,894	4,854
1946	8,384	4,172	981	1,290	405	1,496	4,212	2,076	8,495	6,785
1948	14,411	8,968	3,054	2,842	843	2,229	5,443	2,713	15,540	13,267
1949	17,104	11,516	4,699	3,486	887	2,444	5,588	2,680	18,002	15,454
1950	20,813	14,490	6,342	4,337	1,006	2,805	6,323	3,006	21,256	18,282
1951	21,468	14,837	6,242	4,270	1,090	3,235	6,631	3,096	22,791	22,444
1952	25,827	18,084	8,099	5,328	1,406	3,851	7,143	3,342	28,397	24,550
1953	29,537	22,187	10,341	5,831	1,649	4,366	7,350	3,411	30,321	26,818
1954	30,125	22,467	10,396	5,668	1,616	4,787	7,658	3,518	29,304	29,024
1953: November	28,760	21,907	10,404	5,587	1,645	4,271	6,853	2,931	2,355	2,214
December	29,537	22,187	10,341	5,831	1,649	4,366	7,350	3,411	2,696	2,416
1954: January	28,724	21,836	10,158	5,697	1,635	4,346	6,888	3,002	1,947	2,298
February	28,140	21,582	10,010	5,588	1,623	4,361	6,558	2,682	1,956	2,210
March	27,833	21,381	9,919	5,443	1,614	4,405	6,452	2,564	2,380	2,581
April	28,095	21,426	9,942	5,413	1,617	4,454	6,669	2,723	2,400	2,355
May	28,372	21,487	10,002	5,370	1,634	4,481	6,885	2,786	2,397	2,336
June	28,666	21,717	10,168	5,367	1,635	4,547	6,949	2,819	2,703	2,473
July	28,725	21,849	10,298	5,328	1,637	4,586	6,876	2,773	2,549	2,417
August	28,736	21,901	10,349	5,294	1,642	4,616	6,835	2,734	2,477	2,425
September	28,856	21,935	10,365	5,287	1,642	4,641	6,921	2,807	2,441	2,407
October	28,975	21,952	10,340	5,324	1,637	4,651	7,023	2,892	2,454	2,437
November	29,209	22,014	10,296	5,398	1,631	4,689	7,195	3,042	2,554	2,492
December	30,125	22,467	10,396	5,668	1,616	4,787	7,658	3,518	3,046	2,593

[1] Includes all consumer credit extended for the purpose of purchasing automobiles and other consumer goods and secured by the items purchased.
[2] Includes only such loans held by financial institutions; those held by retail outlets are included in "other consumer goods paper."
[3] Credit extended or repaid during the period.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.
Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me 7 or 8 minutes?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to make clear to the Senate that I am taking this time to make the record in order and to indicate that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has suffered an interesting change of heart since he discussed this matter at length on the Senate floor in 1951.

First, let us go back to his remarks on Monday of this week. He said then:

The first point I wish to make is that, in my judgment, Members of Congress are now well paid. In my opinion, they are paid all they are worth.

Now the Senator from Oregon presumes to offer an amendment to increase the amount for clerk hire and to increase the stamp and telephone allowance, and so forth, but to let the salary stand where it is at present.

The Senator from Oregon further said on Monday:

I think $15,000 a year, which is what we really receive, $12,500 and the so-called expense allowance of $2,500, is a good salary for the job.

The Senator from Oregon belabored this question in September 1951. I refer him to his own remarks on the floor of the Senate. He said:

My colleagues will take judicial notice of the fact that even on a $15,000 salary, including the $2,500 expense allowance which, as my friend from Delaware said, was really passed by us well knowing at the time that what we were doing was incorporating it into a salary item in the name of a nontaxable, nonaccountable expense allowance, it is impossible to do the job if one has family obligations and if one has the responsibility of sending children to school, which is true of most of us. Certainly it cannot be done on a salary of $15,000 a year. What is being done, Mr. President? The Members of the Senate who find that the salary check at the end of the month constitutes their primary source of income must find other sources of income.

Mr. President, that was not the junior Senator from Illinois speaking; that was my oracular friend from Oregon speaking. He continued:

There are quite a number of us who find ourselves in that position. The Senate is not yet a rich man's club.

The Senator from Oregon in his speech in 1951 further said:

Even then most of us find that a serious illness within our family would put us in the red. Therefore, some of us engage in lecturing. Some participate legitimately in law practice on a State basis not involving Federal questions. Some of us find it necessary to continue legitimately with commercial enterprises. It just happens to be one of the economic realities of serving in the Senate. I am perfectly willing in the spirit of the confessional to say that if during the year I did not average at least two speeches a month with an honorarium, I could not economically serve in the Senate of the United States.

The Senator from Oregon then said:

I must average about $750 over and above the amount of the money I get from my senatorial check to meet expenses.

If I am any good at arithmetic, $750 a month is the equivalent of $9,000 a year. Yet my friend from Oregon said he could not do the job unless he added $9,000 to his income by making speeches—and he is very able and very adept at doing that. That is something that all Members of the Senate, I suppose, including perhaps the junior Senator from Illinois, with his feeble talents, cannot say.

But $15,000 and $9,000 total $24,000. So the Senator from Oregon said to the Senate that he could not do the job unless his income was $24,000 a year. The pending bill provides for only $22,500.

Is it not strange that my friend from Oregon blows hot one time and cold another? The proposal he offers is a rather slender, weak, feeble substitute. If he was right in 1951, he is wrong now; if he is right now, then, of course, he was wrong at that time. So where does he stand? Does it take that amount of money to do the job? If it does, then the Senator from Oregon is as wrong as punch today, and his amendment ought not to be before the Senate.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the Senator from Oregon said on Monday that he had reexamined the matter and that on more mature analysis he thought he would change his mind. But no amount of mind changing can change the figure of $750 a month which he submitted in 1951; $750 a month is the equivalent of $9,000 a year which, added to the present salary, makes $24,000 a year.

The Senator from Oregon cannot be wrong on the facts. He can change his mind, but he cannot be wrong on the facts. He made those representations to the Senate in 1951.

On that basis, he came before the Senate on Monday, when he edified us with a disquisition on the social and economic theories of Justice Brandeis, William Howard Taft, and the Fair Labor Standards Act, and told us:

The first point I wish to make is that, in my judgment, Members of Congress are now well paid. In my opinion, they are paid all they are worth.

That statement does not deserve the credence of the Senate; and the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should be rejected overwhelmingly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to speak about 2 minutes in reply to my friend from Illinois. I always enjoy an argument with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is in the best of spirit.

Mr. MORSE. It always is, and my reply will be, too.

When I appear for final judgment before the Pearly Gates, and it is to be decided which way I am to be sent, I shall say to St. Peter, "If you want my record, go to the junior Senator from Illinois, and to his research department, because he tries to keep up with my record." But the sad thing is that the Senator from Illinois is always taking things out of context, just as he has done today in the very friendly argument with which he has engaged me.

In 1951, before I had studied this problem thoroughly, I thought the approach to it should be by way of a salary increase of $5,000 or $10,000. But also I have always taken, from the very beginning, the position that it is the official expenses of the office that should be paid for by the taxpayers. I have never taken the position that a Member of the Senate should not earn legitimate income on the outside, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to support his family to his liking. But never have I taken the position that I endorsed any specific bill calling for any specific increase in salary for Members of the Senate, in 1951 or any other time. I have never been a party to a legislative proposal for any specific increase in salary, and I suggest that the Senator from Illinois get his research department to inquire into that aspect. I did say in 1951 that I thought we should have a salary increase, but as early as 1952 I had changed my mind and said so on various occasions. I also said in 1951, and I repeat now, that we should not have any of the official expenses of the office taken out of our own pockets. It is true that I constantly have to make money on the outside, and I happen to do it by way of lecturing. Some persons do it by way of legal practice, some by writing, some have enough money invested so that they cut coupons; but I do it principally by way of lecturing in order to be able to pay extra official expenses, as well as political expenses that go along with the job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I have to earn extra money in order to pay political expenses of the office, because I was never the recipient of very much financial political support by party organizations during my 8 years in the Senate, except on one occasion when my good friend from Illinois was very helpful in assisting me with a campaign contribution in 1950 when he was chairman of the Republican Senatorial Election Committee. I appreciated that assistance then, I appreciate it now, and I shall appreciate it in 1956, if the Senator can do likewise. [Laughter.]

I wish to say that, although the Senator from Illinois has tried to point out some great inconsistency in the theory with which I have approached the problem raised by the pending bill, I have always maintained that the first step was to see to it that the official expenses of the office were covered by the official budget. Even in 1951 when I favored a salary increase I stressed my feeling that expenses of the office should be paid by the Government and not by the Senator.

I repeat as I said Monday, and the Senator from Illinois has alluded to it, there was a time when I thought there should be an increase in salary; but I never reached any final conclusion as to what it should be. I have studied the matter since. I am very proud of the fact that I am capable of changing my mind on the basis of facts as they are presented to me. I take no pride in fixed opinions, as some of my colleagues seem to do, because I owe it to the people of my State to change my mind in the last 5 minutes of debate if the debate convinces me that my previously held opinion was an erroneous one. I see no virtue in holding to a wrong opinion in the name of consistency.

Mr. President, I close by saying that there is not the great inconsistency which the Senator from Illinois has tried to point out. I have been standing for years in favor of payment of expenses of the office subject to audit and disclosure. There was a time when I thought there should be an increase in salary, but I never reached any final conclusion as to what the amount should be. After a little study of the problem I recognized that a 50-percent increase in salary could not be justified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me about 3 minutes?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 8 minutes remaining to him, and the other side has 4 minutes remaining to it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad I had the opportunity to assist my friend from Oregon. I trust I shall have opportunity to do so again in the future. I shall pray over the political future of the Senator from Oregon in the hope that he may come back to his native Republican heath in due course.

I may not have the best, most thorough research department in the world, because I have to do so much of the research myself, but I allude to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon that he has made no salary proposal. Let us take a look at the RECORD. I now quote from the Senator's remarks:

> I think we should join at once with the Senator from New Hampshire—

Meaning the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]—

> in facing the question of how much we should increase congressional salaries—

That was not the junior Senator from Illinois talking; that was the distinguished, profound, and scholarly Senator from Oregon. He went on—

> knowing very well the kind and variety of expenses we meet. I do not know whether $22,500 is the proper figure or whether $20,000 is the proper figure—

I remind my colleagues that this was 4 years ago.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon continued:

> But I am satisfied that we cannot justify a figure less than $20,000 if we are going to be fair to our constituents and if we are going to relieve ourselves of some of the extra burdens we have to assume in order to meet the expenses of a Senator's job.

If that is not pretty specific, then I never have seen anything specific.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not less than $20,000, said the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Today he is over on the other side of the fence.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Oregon become a cosponsor of any bill for a salary increase? Did he ever cast a vote or join in a report favoring a salary of $20,000? Or did the Senator from Oregon do no more than agree with the Senator from New Hampshire during a general debate on the legislative appropriation bill in 1951 that at that time he thought we should have a salary adjustment? As I recall the incident no specific legislative proposal was before us calling for a salary increase but we were discussing on the floor of the Senate whether we ought to increase our salaries. The debate was not based on a specific proposal but was a general debate that just developed out of a discussion of points that had been raised in connection with an appropriation bill dealing with other subjects. As I indicated Monday, I at that time thought there should be an increase in salary, but I don't recall that at any time was I in favor of increasing the salary to $20,000. I do not have the record before me. If I indicated I would favor a $20,000 salary I was mistaken. I alluded on Monday to what I said in the RECORD. As I said Monday, there was a time when I felt we ought to increase our salaries, but when I came to study the problem of choosing between increasing salaries or increasing expenses, I decided the thing to do was increase the allowable expenses. I reached that conclusion in 1952 after a careful study of the whole problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute of his time?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield the Senator the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Oregon, on the floor of the Senate in the course of the debate, stated that not less than $20,000 would do. That was his minimum. At the time he also indicated he could not get along unless he had an income of at least $9,000 a year from lecturing fees. If one adds the $20,000 and $9,000, he will see the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon was so far above the level that has been recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary that I think the Senate should very properly, on the basis of the Senator's earlier statement of opinion, vote this amendment down overwhelmingly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am yielding on the Senator's time now.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to receive back just a half minute. Of course, when the Senator adds the $20,000 amount and the $9,000 figure, he does my record an injustice. What I was talking about was trying to earn about $9,000 over and above my Senate salary in order to take care of the official expenses of my office and to take care of additional family expenses that I found I had in putting three girls through college plus additional political expenses. I do not take the position and never did that all of that should be paid for out of the Senate salary paid by the taxpayers of the country. I have never argued that a Senator's salary should cover political expenses. Neither have I argued that it should be large enough to cover living standards far above the average. Neither have I argued that a Senator should not supplement his salary with legitimate outside income. If the Senator will read the whole statement I am sure he will reach that conclusion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I read the whole speech. I always read what the Senator from Oregon says. Apparently what he is saying today, and what he said in his speech on Monday, is that even though the limit of salary should be $15,000, it would take a great deal more than that to do the job. Therefore, a Senator should go abroad, make speeches, and gather in honorariums whenever he could—and the bigger the better—in order to supplement his income. Is that good policy for public service? I am not so sure. I, myself, receive occasional honorarium. When I do I am delighted to have it. I would not deny my friend from Oregon such opportunities, because I think, with his brilliant forensic ability he can edify the country. When he stands on a platform he can do things for people in the way of provoking their thinking. And all power to him. But to take the position which he took Monday and today, Mr. President, is to say, "Here is the clear limit of the salary. To supplement it you must resort to some other line of endeavor or have a personal income." That in itself is not good philosophy, Mr. President.

I hope, therefore, in good course, with high felicity, we can overwhelm the amendments of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the two amendments of the Senator from Oregon, which, by unanimous consent, will be voted on en bloc.

The amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as 2-21-55-E.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER) on page 8, after line 23, to insert the following:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall cause to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 15 days after December 31, and June 30 of each year the name, position, and total salary of each person employed by the Senate and House of Representatives during the period covered by the report. The first such report shall cover the period beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1955, and succeeding reports shall cover the 6 months' period ending on the preceding June 30 or December 31, as the case may be.

On page 9, line 1, strike out "SEC. 4." and insert "SEC. 5."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, against this amendment to the committee amendment, I make the point of order that it deals with matters which have no relationship to the salary of Senators and Representatives, but, instead, is in reference to the salaries of employees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

So far as I am concerned, I think there is room for considerable argument pro and con in regard to this matter; and perhaps I would be in favor of the intent of this amendment to the committee amendment. However, as chairman of the subcommittee, it is my duty to protect the pending bill. Therefore, I respectfully submit that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment is not germane to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the point of order is well taken. Therefore, I withdraw the amendment, with the understanding that at a later time I shall introduce it as a separate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now call up the amendment identified as "D," which is submitted on behalf of my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] and myself; and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 8, after line 23, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) The second sentence of section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of living expenses by Members of Congress) is amended by striking out "$3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

On page 9, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 4. The" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 5. Except as provided in section 4, the."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be brief in explaining the amendment. It is in line with my theory in amendments "A" and "C" dealing with the expenses of Senators, rather than with increases in their salary.

Mr. President, as I said last Monday, it is common business practice for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to allow businessmen and corporations and business houses a deduction for the extra living expenses they incur outside their home towns. As we know, there are a great many business houses that maintain in the city of Washington year-around apartments which are used by their traveling officials, and for which the corporations receive tax deduction allowances.

The matter of maintaining two homes, as I pointed out in my speech on Monday, constitutes a heavy expense upon Senators; and I think the allowance I now propose is a legitimate one; and I believe that this item should be considered in the same classification as the allowance to businessmen who receive similar deductions.

Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that my amendment to the committee amendment is in line with the position I took in 1951, namely, that I believe we should do something about the official expense items of Senators. This amendment is in line with my theory that the expenses incurred in performing the official functions and services of Senators in their official capacity should be paid for by the taxpayers. The amendment would increase the allowance from $3,000 to $5,000. Of course, the expenses would have to be proven, Mr. President; there would have to be an accounting. The deduction would not be allowed without proof.

That is all I have to say regarding the amendment, except, while I am on my feet, to say that I shall withdraw my amendment "B," because in my judgment it is subject to the same point of order as the one which has already been raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. At a later time I shall introduce the amendment as a separate bill. The amendment constitutes, of course, the proposal I have made for many years in the Senate, namely, that there be a public accounting and a public report on all the sources of income of Members of Congress and of other Federal officials who receive salaries of $10,000 or more a year, because, again, I say on this point—as I said a few moments ago—that there is no substitute for public disclosure. But I would quite agree with the point of order that I know the Senator from Tennessee is planning to raise, namely, that the amendment would be out of order in connection with this particular bill.

However, my amendment providing for increasing the exemption from $3,000 to $5,000 in the matter of the living expenses away from home is in order, I submit; and I ask for a vote on it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I know that when the Senator from Oregon submitted this amendment to the committee amendment, he had in mind that his amendments to lower the salary would be adopted. But, as the matter now stands, this amendment to the committee amendment would actually increase the possible benefits which Members of Congress might receive, rather than reduce them, by increasing the deduction for living expenses in Washington.

Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee. it is my duty to oppose amendments reducing the amount. Therefore, I must, likewise, oppose amendments which would increase the compensation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me, to permit me to make an observation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, we have not yet passed the bill. I never give up hope. I hope that if we can be successful in having this amendment to the committee amendment agreed to, we shall then be able to obtain favorable consideration of, at least, an amendment calling for a reduction in the 50 percent salary increase, which the bill itself would allow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The amendments to the committee amendment were rejected.

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer my amendments identified as "B."

The amendments submitted by Mr. Thye to the committee amendment are as follows:

On page 7, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 508. Salaries

"'The Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title within the following limitations:

"'United States attorneys—not less than $12,000 or more than $20,000; and

"'Assistant United States attorneys and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title—not less than $6,000 or more than $15,000.'

"(b) The salaries of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys for the districts of Alaska, Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands are subject to the provisions of section 508 of title 28, United States Code.

"SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum."

On page 7, line 19, strike out "SEC. 2." and insert "SEC. 4."

On page 8, line 10, strike out "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 5."

On page 9, line 1, strike out "SEC. 4." and insert "SEC. 6."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the amendments which I have offered to S. 462 are in line with the provisions of H. R. 3828, as adopted by the House of Representatives, and would increase the salaries of United States district attorneys from $15,000 to a maximum of $20,000 per annum, with a minimum of $12,000. In the case of Assistant United States Attorneys, the amendments provide for a maximum of $15,000 and a minimum of $6,000.

It should be noted that these increases are permissive, and would depend upon the requirements and work of the district attorney's office involved.

In connection with offering these amendments, I wish to draw attention to the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

The committee noted that if our courts are to function adequately, not only should the salary of the judges be increased, but those of the United States attorneys and their assistants should likewise be increased.

The Department of Justice has stated that it has encountered difficulty in obtaining and retaining qualified lawyers in those positions.

The Government is entitled to the best legal representation it can obtain, and such representation necessitates adequate salaries.

The salaries recommended are less than that which the type of lawyer the Government should have representing it would merit in private practice.

In line with the same considerations, my amendments would also increase the salary of the Deputy Attorney General from $17,500 to $21,000, and that of the Solicitor General from $17,500 to $20,500. In the case of the Assistant Attorneys General, the increase would be from $15,000 to $20,000.

Mr. President, I strongly feel that these increases are justified, and that they should be included in the bill under consideration. In the early years, as I understand, it was a common practice, when fixing the compensation for district attorneys and their assistants, to take into consideration the fact that they could maintain their law practice, and thus could afford to have a somewhat modest salary arrangement. However, that is not the present situation; today a district attorney is forbidden to practice law or to be affiliated with a law firm.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the bill we are now considering is to become law, I think it should specifically provide that district attorneys shall have a salary increase commensurate with that given the other judicial positions covered by the bill.

Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendments to the committee amendment; but let me state that I have not heard anyone express any specific objection to the amendments. I believe them to be very good amendments, and I believe they should be accepted by the committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The matter the Senator from Minnesota has just mentioned, in connection with his amendments was specifically considered by the subcommittee when the evidence was being taken on the main bill. After due consideration, we reached the conclusion that although there was no doubt that the district attorneys and the others the Senator from Minnesota has mentioned should be given a salary increase, there was not before us any evidence regarding what the increase should amount to. Therefore we felt that that matter should be left to some other time, when a study could be made or a hearing could be held in regard to that subject, and we could then determine what salary increase should be made.

There was no opposition to providing such an increase; but we were without specific information which would have justified fixing the salaries. Under those circumstances, we rejected any amendment providing for an increase for district attorneys. I believe that is the subject of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. THYE. That is correct. I will say that since the introduction of the pending bill and since the matter has come to my attention, and because the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary is silent with reference to district attorneys, assistant district attorneys, and deputy attorneys general, I looked into the matter and found that we would be as much justified in giving consideration to increases in their salaries as we would be in giving consideration to raising the salaries of judges.

A Federal judge is appointed for life. After his appointment he is no longer concerned about his position in life or about his vocation. On the other hand, a district attorney is subject to the will of the administration in power. He may hold office for 4 or 8 years, and then must proceed to seek some other type of professional employment, or he must establish himself in his own law practice. If we are to have the best type of lawyers seek appointment to such positions, we must pay them in accordance with the same principle we use in fixing the salaries of judges.

For that reason I believe my amendments are entirely proper. I believe it was an oversight by the Committee on the Judiciary that these officers of Government were not included in the bill at the time the committee considered the bill. The House bill does contain a provision for them. However, the Senate bill is silent on the subject. I believe the amendments are desirable and should be adopted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I believe the district attorneys are entitled to be considered in legislation establishing adequate salaries. At the time the bill was reported by the full Committee on the Judiciary, I stated that such consideration certainly should be given to them. I said I hoped it could be done by this Congress.

However, they are not alone in their status. There are many other officers in the executive department—and district atorneys are in the executive department, of course—who deserve such consideration. The bill before the Senate deals only with members of the judiciary, aside from dealing with Members of Congress. There are other officers in the executive department who are also entitled to consideration.

Furthermore, Commissioners of the Court of Claims have appeared before our committee. Some witnesses have appeared on behalf of referees in bankruptcy, as well. Our unanimous conclusion in committee was that we should limit the pending bill entirely to the officials whose salaries were considered by the Segal Commission. District attorneys were not considered. There was no testimony before the Segal Commission about increases in their cost of living.

Therefore, I respectfully ask that we deal in this bill only with Members of Congress and members of the judiciary. If we start to bring in others in the executive department, there is no telling what amendments might be offered.

The district attorneys certainly will be considered in due time. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] to the committee amendment. Without objection, the amendments will be acted on en bloc.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the companion House bill, H. R. 3828, which the Secretary will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the House bill, H. R. 3828, is deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 462, as amended; and the engrossment of the amendment is deemed to be ordered, and the bill read a third time.

Under the unanimous consent agreement, 1 hour of debate on the bill is in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because several Senators have spoken to me about it, I now ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the pending bill is a difficult one. I am fully aware that is raises a question on which reasonable men may reasonably differ. Yet I am also aware that one of the factors entering into consideration of the pending question is a political factor—what will the people say about our raising our own salaries?

This is indeed a most difficult kind of legislative problem to face. Yet there is no one in Congress but us who can face it. No one else can judge and decide the question of salaries to be paid to Members of Congress.

This is the kind of legislative problem which calls for qualities of both judgment and political courage. We must do what is right; what is, in our judgment, not only just, but in the best interests of the country.

There are, it is true, many of our fellow citizens, far too many, who today receive inadequate salaries, wages, and other income, in private industry, on our farms, in Government service, and by way of pensions and social-security payments.

I have supported, and shall continue to support, all reasonable measures for raising the level of wages, salaries, incomes, and social-security benefits. I believe with all my heart that the standard of living of many of our people is tragically insufficient. Many Government salaries are totally inadequate.

It is the duty and obligation of the Congress to do justice to all those who are on the Government payroll. It is the duty and obligation of the Congress to take whatever steps are necessary to raise the incomes and the standard of living of the underprivileged of our country, and to help those who are on fixed incomes—the pensioners and the aged on social security.

But to achieve these objectives, we need the best brains and best talent in Congress that the people can possibly select. There should be a salary level for Members of Congress that will not of itself restrain talented and capable men and women from becoming candidates for this high office. I believe the present level of congressional salaries does exactly that.

Mr. President, I believe most of my colleagues know that the proposed salary increase for Members of Congress is virtually meaningless, as far as I personally am concerned. I do not need, for my livelihood, the extra money proposed to be voted for each Member. My personal income is such that almost all of the proposed increase would be returned to the Government in the form of taxes.

I am very fortunate in this respect. The low level of the congressional salary has deprived me and my family of no comforts or conveniences. I enjoy what is called financial security and independence.

I am privileged to be able to spend a considerable sum each year, out of my personal income, for the expenses of my office, the better to serve my constituents.

There are few of my colleagues, however, who are able to do what I do. There are relatively few to whom the proposed increase in salary would not make a very significant difference in their own livelihoods.

I know that some of my colleagues are having the greatest difficulty in making ends meet, maintaining homes, as so many do, both here and in their home States. The expenses necessary to maintain the status and establishment of a Member of Congress are heavy. Few private citizens are subject to such expenses.

I do not think the public is generally aware of the fact that many Members of Congress are compelled to supplement their official salaries—just to meet their expenses and to maintain a reasonable standard of living—by paid lectures, by writing articles for magazines, and by practicing law or engaging in business. All of this takes time—time away from Washington.

I think it would be well if the congressional salaries were sufficient to enable Members of Congress to concentrate exclusively on their congressional duties and to be free of any sense of dependence upon lecture platforms, magazine articles, and professional or business connections. We all know that salaries of men holding comparable positions in industry and in the professions are much higher than those we receive here in Congress. Yet our burdens and responsibilities are as heavy as are those in any walk of life. In my judgment, they are heavier than most.

Of course I know there are compensations for public life, as compared with private life. The desire to serve the public—and the recognition that comes therefrom—are powerful lures. I suppose all of us here have succumbed to them.

However, I should like to point out that congressional salaries are substantially lower than those provided for comparable public positions in the executive branch of government, both Federal and State.

I think I can speak on this subject with some authority. I need to give only one example regarding which I am qualified to speak. I was Governor of New York during 4 terms—for 10 years. I have been a Member of the Senate for 6 years. It is my judgment that the duties and responsibilities of a Member of the Senate are certainly at least as heavy as are those of the governor of a large State such as New York.

Yet there is a vast difference in compensation, so far as New York State is concerned. The Governor of New York now receives a salary of $50,000 a year. That salary was authorized not only by statute, but by the vote of all the people in New York. In addition, he has the use of the Executive Mansion, a very commodious and comfortable house. He has a full staff of servants, who are paid for by the State. He has a chauffeur and two cars at his disposal.

I would judge that the salary and perquisites of the Governor of New York would amount, in the aggregate, to more than $75,000. Compare this amount with the $15,000 received by a United States Senator.

I believe the proposed salary increases, for both the Members of Congress and for the judges and other public officials proposed in this bill, are altogether fair and meritorious.

Despite the political dangers of which I have been warned, and despite the fact that the salary increase would mean very little to me personally, I feel that in good conscience, in justice to my colleagues, in fairness to the Congress, and in consideration of the best interests of the country, I must vote for the pending measure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, does the minority leader wish to yield any time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, unless there are Members on either side of the aisle who wish to address the Senate. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, I control the time in opposition to final passage. I have had no requests for time, and I am prepared to yield back my time unless there are Senators who desire to use the time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the time in opposition, assuming the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is going to yield time on the

other side. If not, I feel that I shall have to reserve time in case any Senator desires to speak.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield myself one minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on the basis of fairness and justice and on the basis of the best interests of the country, I feel that a good case has been made for the proposed increase in salaries. This conclusion has been reached by disinterested parties, by a commission composed of distinguished persons, by the Bar Association of America, by practically every bar association in the United States, and every organization which has expressed itself upon the subject. It is also the conclusion of the Hoover Commission, even though it went outside its jurisdiction in making the finding, that a salary of even much larger amount than that proposed by the bill would be in the best interests of good government, since it would provide for Members of Congress more nearly what they are entitled to, and would give them independence and afford them more time to devote to the public business.

So, Mr. President, I hope the bill will be passed by a large majority, so that we can take it to conference and do our best to work out the issues within the shortest time that may be possible.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, have not the yeas and nays been ordered on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—62

A'ken	George	McClellan
Allott	Goldwater	McNamara
Barkley	Hayden	Millikin
Barrett	Hennings	Monroney
Beall	Hill	Murray
Bender	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Ives	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Payne
Bricker	Jenner	Potter
Bridges	Kefauver	Purtell
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Clements	Lehman	Scott
Cotton	Long	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Duff	Malone	Stennis
Eastland	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	

NAYS—24

Bush	Ellender	Mundt
Byrd	Frear	Neely
Carlson	Gore	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Robertson
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Thurmond
Daniel	Kerr	Welker
Douglas	Langer	Williams
Dworshak	Morse	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Wiley
Green	Kennedy	
Hickenlooper	Smathers	

So the bill (H. R. 3828) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to increase the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 462 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair) appointed Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the conference on House bill 3828, inasmuch as the names of the conferees on the part of the Senate have been announced, let me say that I am authorized to state that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] desire to resign as conferees. I ask unanimous consent that they may be allowed to resign; and that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be appointed in their stead.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to excusing the two conferees named by the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

In lieu of the two Senators excused, the Chair now appoints the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR FRIDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the program for Friday. It is the intention of the acting majority leader to call up on Friday Calendar No. 36, Senate Joint Resolution 42, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it the intention of the acting majority leader to have a session of the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is not.

Mr. KILGORE. The only reason I have asked the question is that I have set a hearing on the Harlan nomination for tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. I wondered if the hearing might be continued throughout the entire day.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is the hope of the acting majority leader that all committees will take advantage of the fact that there will not be a session of the Senate tomorrow, and that they will conduct such committee business as needs to be conducted at that time.

I also call attention to the fact that following the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 42, which I have just mentioned, it is the intention to call up the treaties on the Executive Calendar, identified as Calendar No. 3, Executive D, the convention with Japan relating to taxes on income; Calendar No. 4, Executive E, the convention with Japan relating to taxes on estates, inheritance, and gifts; and Calendar No. 5, Executive G, the convention with Belgium relating to taxes on estates and successions.

THE IDEALS OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered before the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee rally in Portland, Oreg., on the night of February 17.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IDEALS OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

(Speech of Senator WAYNE MORSE at Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee rally, Portland, Oreg., February 17, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Oregonians, it is always good to be home. My trip back home this time has been for the purpose of carrying out a very solemn obligation which I feel I owe to all the people of Oregon. I wish to thank the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee and the officials of the Democratic Party in Oregon for their invitation to use this forum tonight for a statewide discussion of some major political principles which support a political decision I now wish to announce. Today I registered at the Lane County Courthouse as a member of the Democratic Party.

THE PRINCIPLE OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Ever since I have been in politics I have tried to keep faith with the abiding principle of representative government which has motivated my actions in the Senate of the United States. It is the principle enunciated by Edmund Burke in 1774, namely, that the primary obligation which an elected representative of a free people owes to his constituents is to keep faith with his gift from Providence—his conscience. It was this sound liberal principle of political philosophy which framed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

As every student of American political science knows, our political rights as a free and self-governing people were forged into being in the furnaces of hot political debate. They were hammered out into organic law on the anvil of courageous independence of judgment exercised by constitutional fathers who were dedicated to the spiritual tenet that responsible men owe it to their fellowmen to keep faith with the dictates of their conscience. Students of the great constitutional debates which produced our organic charter of freedom know that this principle of representative Government was the generating force which reconciled many differences of opinion among the delegates to the Constitutional Convention. From this principle emerged our constitutional system of representative Government. Students of biography know that most of our constitutional fathers believed that as delegate-representatives of the colonists they owed the duty to follow the dictates of their conscience after thoughtful study of competing constitutional proposals.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF AN ELECTED OFFICIAL

Probably no man in his time epitomized this principle of representative Government more than Thomas Jefferson. However, the historic writings of most of our other constitutional fathers, such as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, John Dickison, Robert Morris, and James Madison all show that they did not believe that the elected representatives of free people served as hired men of political parties and political machines, but held their offices as the servants of a free people. They shared Burke's political principle of conscience when he said:

"It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure: no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable."

I respectfully say to the people of the State of Oregon tonight that this sound principle of representative Government is also the warp and the woof of the political faith of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and every other great liberal statesman, past and present, who has represented the American people throughout our history, either in executive or legislative position.

THE FUNCTIONS OF POLITICAL PARTIES

Let us not forget that when our representative Government came into being and for a considerable time thereafter, American politics were not organized on a political party basis. When political parties came into being they were not created for the purpose of dictating to the people's elected representatives what their votes should be on controversial issues. It was never considered at the beginning of our two-party system that party officials should turn the American political stage into a puppet show. Rather, it recognized the need for party organization if effective political campaigns were to be waged against ugly forces which were seeking advantages at the expense of the public interest. Political parties came into being because it was recognized by the people themselves that the voters needed party organizations in order to strengthen the hand and support the views of elected leaders. Political parties were organized in order to help administer and conduct effective campaigns against great economic combines that were organized in our country to take selfish economic advantage of the mass of our people. There is no question about the fact that the organization of political parties was in response to a people's movement, and not a political boss movement.

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

As is to be expected in all human institutions, human frailties must be guarded against. Thus the history of political parties is a history of glorious ups and shameful downs. The total record of the two-party system has been a great record, because political assets have completely overbalanced political liabilities. When a political party housecleaning has been needed from time to time, the people have finally taken care of the dirt under the political rug.

Since about 1900 there has been a growing tendency of reactionary economic forces in our country to try to control political parties with party machines. It was against this evil that Teddy Roosevelt fought. There have been repeated attempts to propagandize the American people with the notion that some way, somehow, an elected official becomes the property of his political party.

To the contrary, when a man is elected to a political office he becomes the representative of all the people of his constituency, including those who voted against him, as well as those who voted for him. He takes the oath of office, as I did in 1945 and 1951, to uphold the Constitution of the United States—to uphold it in accordance with what a study of the merits of any given issue convinces him is right—not to uphold it in accordance with the interpretation and dictates of party bosses.

Reactionary propagandists have tried again and again during the last half century to convince the American people that so-called "party regularity" is synonymous with "party responsibility." This is a great fallacy. The highest order of party responsibility is to be found in the exercise of intellectual honesty by an elected official. Whenever an elected official compromises his intellectual honesty, he ceases to be politically responsible. Whenever he compromises what he knows to be a political principle in connection with any controversial issue, he becomes untrue to the political ideals of a sound two-party system in America.

Let me say at this point to the young people of Oregon I would have you always remember that the only practicality you will ever experience in your lifetime is but the practicality of an ideal put to work. Whenever anyone tells you that to be practical in politics you have to compromise your principles at least a little bit, let me tell you that such political sophistry is dangerous political subversion. To the voters of Oregon I would emphasize tonight that when one tries to convince you that doing the so-called expedient is sometimes necessary in politics, he is only trying to get you to swallow political corruption in the form of a sugar-coated pill. That has been true so many times in hours of crisis throughout our history. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that we hold firm to the sound principle of not compromising our political ideals.

TRUE PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

I have tried to apply these principles to my work in the Senate of the United States. In the face of abuse and much criticism I have insisted upon serving the people of Oregon in the Senate as a freeman—free to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as I find them. This was the primary pledge I made to the people of Oregon in my candidacies for the Senate, both in 1944 and 1950—a pledge which I made in both the primary campaigns, as well as the general election campaigns. No Republican Party officials ever had the right to expect me to place so-called party policy above what I considered to be the best interests of my State and my country. I promised the voters of Oregon in both campaigns that I never would place partisanship above what I considered to be a matter of political principle. No Republican Party officials, State or national, ever had the right to assume that in the name of party regularity I would sacrifice my responsibility to the people of Oregon by voting a party line whenever I thought a so-called party policy was not in the public interest.

I have always held to the view that a political party should be big enough to welcome a divergence of opinion on specific issues. A political party should always be big enough to welcome minority views in respect to any party policy unless the dead hand of political reaction is to toll the death knell of the party. Such a tolling occurred once in our history, when reaction killed the Whig Party and the great Lincoln Republican Party arose as a third party movement from its ashes.

Throughout our history differences over great political issues determined the party labels which individual voters wore. It is a mistake for my critics to assume that I do not believe that political parties should stand for and take sides on the political issues of the day. I most certainly think that they should. One of the functions of any political party is to serve as an institute of political education. One of the primary obligations of a political party is to stand for a legislative program which it believes will best promote the general welfare. There certainly would be no incentive for party work if the activities of a political party were to be limited solely to administrative preparation for party conventions and elections. The legislative program and political principles of a party should be so specific that voters of like mind can join forces with enthusiasm under its banners.

However, whenever a political party in the name of party regularity demands that a representative elected under its label vote for legislation which he is convinced is neither in the best interests of his party nor of his country, then that representative has the clear duty of voting for what he believes is in the best interests of all the people of the State and of the Nation irrespective of party affiliation. One of the greatest evils

in American politics today is the growing practice on the part of too many politicians to let party officials and economic pressure groups tell them how to vote. That I have not done, and will not do under any party label. A Senator may vote on some occasions with a majority of his party colleagues and on other occasions with a minority of his party colleagues. It does not follow that when he votes with a minority that he is guilty of any party disloyalty, but to the contrary, he may seek only to stand for what he thinks is best for the public and to attempt to make a record that will lay a foundation for future action which will change the minority into a majority.

PRINCIPLE ABOVE PARTY

However, when an elected official in due course of political events finds himself consistently in a very small minority within his party, and finds himself unalterably opposed to major shifts in party policy which have developed during his term of office, then he comes face to face with the ethical obligation of following the sound advice of Woodrow Wilson when he said:

"I would not for a moment be understood as seeking to lend any color of justification to that most humiliating and degrading precept, 'Party, right or wrong.' This is the maxim of knaves, or of fools."

In the same vein Woodrow Wilson said:

"Is it the party, then, to which men of thought owe and pay allegiance? No. It is to the principles, of which party is the embodiment. The man, therefore, who adheres to any party after it has ceased to avow the principles which to him are dear and in his eyes are vital; the man who follows the leadings of a party which seems to him to be going wrong, is acting a lie, and has lost either his wit or his virtue."

I found myself confronted with that ethical problem in 1952 and acted accordingly, by resigning from the Republican Party. I have no regrets.

THE LIBERAL RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

During the 2 years in which I have been an Independent, I have stated repeatedly that my future course of action would be dictated by what I believed would best advance the cause of liberalism in American politics.

In the 1954 campaign the Democratic Party of Oregon and its candidates presented their program honestly and forthrightly. They demonstrated that the Democratic Party is the party of liberalism. Their program is in the best interests of the independent farmers, small businessmen, working people, white collar, and civil service workers, indeed—the overwhelming majority of the people of Oregon.

Likewise, the economic program of the Democratic Party since the great depression has been in the best interests of the legitimate rights of big business as well. The Democratic Party has never been opposed to the predominant corporate structure of American business. It has only been opposed to the excesses and abuses of big business corporate practices which have attempted to thwart and exploit the economic welfare of our people. Thus the Democratic Party has a record of opposition to monopolistic control of industrial production by powerful financial combines. Under the Democratic administrations since the great depression many pieces of legislation have been passed which have protected the American consumers from exploitation by selfish economic interests, and at the same time have strengthened the competitive rights and advanced the economic opportunities of business—big and small.

It is not true that the Democratic Party is against business. To the contrary, its record is in staunch defense of enlightened capitalism manifested in private enterprise.

In fairness, let me say that there are millions of Republican and independent voters across our land, along with Democratic voters, who are ardent supporters of the major pieces of legislation dealing with economic problems which have been passed since 1932. The fact that most of this legislation has not been repealed is due largely to the bipartisan support it has received in and out of the Congress. In our own State of Oregon, there are large numbers of Republican and independent voters, as well as Democratic, who never hesitate to rise above party considerations when it comes to supporting individual candidates and specific legislative proposals. My own election to the Senate attests to that fact, and it is but one of many examples in the political history of our State. In fact, the voting of the people of Oregon for many years, is a convincing demonstration of a political phenomenon that most professional politicians seem to overlook—namely, that the average voter takes pride in the fact that first of all he is Mr. or Mrs. Independent Voter. The average American today is more devoted to political independence of judgment than to political partisanship. And in the interests of good government we should not want it any other way.

In the last campaign I supported and campaigned for the candidates of the Oregon Democratic Party because of our common belief in the necessity of a bipartisan program of international cooperation with the free nations, and a domestic program for constant expansion of economic opportunities and strengthening of the competitive private enterprise system.

It is my considered judgment that I can best contribute to such a program by working within the Democratic Party. That party, particularly in Oregon, has advocated policies, especially in the important area of comprehensive resource development, upon which the economic future of the Pacific Northwest depends. On these issues, the leadership of the Republican Party in Oregon has worked against the best interests of the people of Oregon as exemplified by participation and acquiescence in the attempted scuttling of the Hells Canyon Dam project.

THE UNSUCCESSFUL FIGHT FOR LIBERALISM WITHIN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

While I was a member of the Republican Party I attempted, with the help and support of many Republicans in Oregon, to advance the cause of liberalism. Their unstinting and devoted efforts will always be remembered and appreciated. A number of these liberal Republicans have reached the conclusion that liberalism is stifled and thwarted by the Old Guard leadership of the Republican Party in Oregon. I came to this conclusion reluctantly but irrevocably in 1952.

For 8 years I received little help or encouragement from Republicans in the Senate in my efforts to further liberal legislation. During this period I did my utmost to cooperate with the Republican Party in the hope of advancing and strengthening the forces of liberalism within it. For example, in 1946 I was a member of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and worked actively for the election of candidates whose subsequent records did not support their reputations as liberals. In the 1948 campaign I made twice as many speeches on behalf of the Republican presidential candidate as any other Republican Senator.

It is well known that Republican Party leaders in May 1952 arranged to have me excluded from all Republican National Convention committees despite the fact that the Republican voters in the presidential primary had given me the second highest number of votes of the delegates elected. The then Republican national chairman, acting behind the scenes, participated in this move. At the Salem, Oreg., meeting of the convention delegation I was openly attacked by Republican leaders because I was supposedly "too liberal." It is clear that I was too liberal for the reactionary politicians who control the Republican Party in Oregon.

Nonetheless, I attended the Republican National Convention and did everything I could to promote the candidacy of General Eisenhower in the hope and belief that he would advocate progressive programs and rescue the Republican Party from its isolationist drift.

The convention platform was a grave disappointment to me and thousands of other liberal Republicans. It was disheartening to see the victorious Eisenhower forces embrace steamroller tactics to push through the nomination of Senator NIXON. At that time I was working with others to advance the candidacy of Senator SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts for the vice presidential nomination. We were told General Eisenhower wanted no nominee in competition to NIXON.

During the 1952 campaign, General Eisenhower's campaign tactics were increasingly disappointing. His Morningside Heights agreement with Senator Taft, in which Taft's program was embraced, made it clear that the Republican candidate's slogan was "anything to win."

Meanwhile, Adlai Stevenson was doing what he pledged to do: talk sense to the American people. As a matter of conscience I felt there was no alternative but to campaign for Governor Stevenson. This I could not do and remain in the Republican Party. Therefore I resigned.

In the last 2 years there has been repeated evidence that reactionary economic forces have taken over the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party leadership on most domestic issues, and particularly in the field of natural resources.

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD IN CONGRESS

On the other hand, the Democrats in Congress proved themselves responsible on foreign affairs and liberal on most of the key issues of domestic policy. It was with Democratic votes that the Bricker amendment was defeated. It was the fighting band of Democratic liberals who carried on the fight against the tidelands giveaway and for the Hill oil-for-education amendment. It was essentially the same group of Democrats who fought against the giveaway atomic-energy bill, and against authorization of the Dixon-Yates contract, and fought for improving provisions to the atomic-energy bill on patents, public generation of power from atomic materials and the preference clause in the marketing of such power. This group has worked for public power development and rural electrification throughout the country and especially in the Pacific Northwest. All but one of the cosponsors of my Hells Canyon bill in the last Congress were Democrats.

This is only a partial catalogue of the measures on which this band of liberals has distinguished itself and, more importantly, provided leadership and made significant gains for the people of the country and of Oregon. Other vital stands include the reciprocal-trade program, unemployment-insurance improvement, extension of social security—in which this group led the way—public housing, adequate loan facilities for small business, and firm supports for agriculture. It is this Democratic band that has fought the policies of scarcity that have characterized the Republican administration from early 1953 when the Treasury embarked on the tight-money program.

It is this group with which I have worked and which has worked with me on matters of special importance to Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. The Democrats in the Senate have made few votes party issues. But when they have, as in the case of the recommittal of the unfair, antilabor amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act and in support of increasing the personal income tax exemp-

tions, their stand has been sound and in the best interests of the country.

LIBERAL PROGRAM OF OREGON DEMOCRATIC PARTY

We see it on issue after issue in our State. For example, in this session of the State legislature, in the House 29 out of 31 Democrats supported a memorial calling for the building of John Day Dam as a federal project. In the Senate the Democrats were unanimous in opposition to the Republican Party's phony partnership scheme.

On many other occasions in the months ahead, I shall speak throughout the State in opposition to the Republican Party's attempt to sell the birthright of the people of Oregon and of the Pacific Northwest in our natural resources for a bowl of private utility monopoly pottage. Here is an issue between the parties which I am convinced will cause thousands and thousands of Republican and independent voters in our State to join forces with us in opposition to the sell-out of the people's best interests in our natural resources by both the State and the National Republican administrations.

There has developed a clear-cut and clean-cut cleavage between the Democratic leadership and Republican leadership in the State of Oregon, not only in the field of natural resources, but also on issues involving taxes, aid to education, labor, agriculture, old-age benefits, public health, and for that matter, almost every legislative issue which draws the political line of difference between protecting the general welfare on the one hand and yielding to economic and political reaction on the other.

There are those Republican leaders who try to fool the voters with the political slogan that they are liberal in human relations but conservative in economic policies. However, more and more voters are seeing through such political mumbo-jumbo. They know from personal experience, much of it sad and costly to them, that human rights and happiness cannot be separated from the economic welfare of the people. When people stop to analyze the political slogan traps of this Republican administration, both State and National, they know that the strength of our private enterprise system is dependent upon a broad and deep mass-purchasing power of all of our people. They know that the keystone of our constitutional system is that clause in the Constitution which dedicates our system of self-government to the promotion of the general welfare. They know that when the general welfare of the people is promoted by our Government through legislation which stimulates greater job opportunities for our workers and wider markets for our farmers, American business generally, including General Motors, is best served thereby.

CAN BEST SERVE PEOPLE OF OREGON WITHIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

It is because I have become convinced that I can make my best contribution to a legislative program that will best serve the people of Oregon, and the Nation, under the banner of the Democratic Party that I now announce my intention to run for reelection to the Senate in 1956 as a Democrat.

As I made clear to Democratic leaders in Oregon months ago when I was first invited by many leading Democrats to join the Democratic Party, I felt I had no moral right to come into the Democratic Party unless such action met with the pleasure of State and local leaders of the party, as well as the clear sentiment of the rank and file membership of the party. Thus for many months past, I have attended a good many meetings of Democratic groups throughout the entire State where I was urged to come into the party. Likewise, an overwhelming majority of the Democratic leaders of the State have invited the decision which I have announced tonight. I want the leaders of the Democratic Party of Oregon, and the many members of the Party with whom I have talked or corresponded, to know that I deeply appreciate the cordial enthusiastic welcome which they have extended to me.

One of the reasons why I am pleased and proud to join the Democratic Party is that I look forward with enthusiasm to working with the liberal leadership of the Democratic Party in Oregon. We worked together in close harmony throughout the 1954 historic campaign which resulted in sending to the Congress of the United States two fine liberal Democrats from Oregon—Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER. The splendid record which they are making in the Congress has already focused favorable attention on Oregon. DICK NEUBERGER has received the best committee assignments of any freshman Senator that I can recall during my 10 years in the Senate. Already, with his brilliance, he has pitched into the battle for the protection of our natural resources. EDITH GREEN has been appointed to the powerful House Committees on Education and Labor, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

She has been elected president of the 84th Congressional Club which is made up of Democratic Party newcomers to the House. Her background of experience in education has attracted the attention of the Democratic Party leaders of the House, and undoubtedly she will exercise great influence.

I wish to express a special word of appreciation to your national committeewoman, Mrs. Lillian Burton, and your national committeeman, Monroe Sweetland. These two Democratic Party leaders have devoted years of hard work to the building up of a program of Jeffersonian democracy in Oregon. Ever since he has been in the legislature, Monroe Sweetland has fought courageously to put into legislative practice the liberal principles which he has always urged within the party.

To the Democratic Party's very able State chairman, Howard Morgan, who led the party to victory in 1954, I want to say publicly what I have said to him privately. He has demonstrated to me time and time again that he places political principle above personal interest. He believes—as Woodrow Wilson put it—that a political party is the embodiment of a set of principles. Oregon democracy is greatly indebted to his leadership.

In accordance with my pledges to the people of Oregon in the campaigns of 1944 and 1950, and in keeping with the principles of representative government, reiterated in this speech tonight, I shall be proud to place my candidacy for reelection to the United States Senate on the Democratic ticket in 1956 in the hands of all the voters of Oregon. I shall campaign on my record, confident that when my fellow Oregonians come to evaluate it, both in retrospect and in perspective, they will endorse it.

I shall always be deeply appreciative of the high honor which the people of Oregon have bestowed upon me, and of the opportunity for public service which they have made available to me. It is my continued pledge to my fellow Oregonians that they can always count upon me to fight for what I think is in the public interest in accordance with the facts as they come before me in the Senate.

Only by dedicating myself to that pledge can my service in the Senate keep faith with the people of Oregon and the ideals of representative government.

Tonight I issue an enlistment call. I issue a call for enlistment in a great campaign fight of 1956. I ask Republicans and Independents and Democrats alike to join it, because in that great campaign of 1956 we are going to draw the line between a progressive campaign conducted by the Democratic Party with the support of Independents and Republicans by the thousands against the reactionary Republican machine that has for too long controlled politics in this State. I want to say to the people of Oregon tonight that I think they are going to select their Senator, and they are not going to have him selected for them by any purge movement that arises in the East, even though it comes out of the White House itself, because we are proud of the fact that in Oregon we, the people, run our own politics and no political machine runs it for us. I shall give you a campaign in 1956 if you want to join under the Democratic banner for a clean, hard-hitting fight that will protect the best interests of the people against the monopolistic combine that has taken over the Republican Party in the State of Oregon.

CONCERN OF CERTAIN CITIZENS OF OREGON ABOUT THE CONTROVERSY OVER FORMOSA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the tense military and political situation in the western Pacific continues to be a matter of great concern to many men and women in Oregon. I have received many letters expressing this concern and the hope that this Government will do everything possible to bring about a peaceful settlement of the present critical controversy over the Formosa area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter which a number of worried citizens of Oregon have sent to the President and to their congressional delegation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE OREGON DELEGATION IN CONGRESS

We, citizens of Oregon, and most of us parents of sons and daughters who would be vitally affected, wish to protest against any action on the part of our Government which would result in a new war in the Far East.

We are particularly opposed to any stand by our Government which would block a cease-fire by insistence in holding onto Chinese off-shore islands, particularly the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. We believe it would be tragic to plunge this Nation into war defending a few rocks, 5 miles from the Chinese coast.

We believe that these islands should be evacuated, and that the future status of Formosa should be determined at a later date by the United Nations.

Bernice Bone, Salem, Oreg.; Alice L. Barnett, Brooks, Oreg.; Marie Cornwell, Woodburn, Oreg.; John A. Rademaker, Salem, Oreg.; Inez Campbell, Clackamas, Oreg.; Henry Geymer, Albany, Oreg.; Wendell Barnett, Brooks, Oreg.; Ethel K. Wickline, Salem, Oreg.; Dewey Cunnins, Monmouth, Oreg.; Merlin J. Bartlett, Corvallis, Oreg.; John Shepherd, Aumsville, Oreg.; Ed. Benedict, Portland, Oreg.; A. C. Heyman, Albany, Oreg.; Paul Youngman, McMinville, Oreg.; Frances Zielke, Salem, Oreg.; Francis Strong, Newberg, Oreg.; W. L. Creech, Salem, Oreg.; Pansy L. Shepherd, Aumsville, Oreg.; Edna O. Brown, Woodburn, Oreg.; Apolonia Beutler; Lloyd L. Beutler; C. G. Gilson, Amity, Oreg.; J. W. Simmons, Salem, Oreg.; Augustine A. Bender, Scio, Oreg.

PROPOSED FAMILY FARM DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the Nation by preserving the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, improving the income-earning capacity and standard of living of low-income rural people, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly concerning the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

The bill (S. 1199) to strengthen the Nation by preserving the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, improving the income-earning capacity and standard of living of low-income rural people, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have just introduced a bill to improve the earning capacity of low-income, rural citizens and to improve their standard of living.

I may add it is my understanding that a similar measure is being introduced in the House today by Representative PATMAN of Texas.

The measure I have proposed is intended to be a new step forward on a course this Nation has followed for the past 20 years—a course of positive action to make family farmers secure on their land, and to insure better standards of living in all of rural America.

Throughout our national history, except for very brief periods, we have recognized that a strong agriculture, with ownership widely spread among family operators, would add strength to the Nation. The earliest Congresses of the United States rejected proposals to sell off the public domain in million acre lots; they voted to make it accessible in tracts suitable to owner operation. They were aware that nations have declined as they became highly urbanized and as land became concentrated in the hands of the few in feudal patterns.

The Homestead Act, the reclamation law with its limitation on land holdings, and the limitations we have written into our modern agricultural conservation acts on benefits, are all manifestations of this consistent national policy of insuring our national strength by encouraging a prosperous family-type agriculture.

During the great depression of the early thirties, when virtually all farmers were faced with bankruptcy and foreclosure, we began to support agricultural prices. But we soon found that price support alone would not save all those who desired to remain on the land. Hundreds of thousands lacked know-how and credit to get into adequate production. So we established the Farm Security Administration to help rural citizens provide as much as possible of their own needs from the land, and to move on into commercial production if they had the competence to do so, aided by credit and technical assistance from their Government.

The Farm Security Administration, now the Farmers' Home Administration, has aided more than a million farm families, in some measure, to avoid liquidation, produce a subsistence from their land, and, in many cases, to become productive, commercial farmers.

Our second step to strengthen rural America was enactment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act. Under that act, 80,000 worthy tenant farmers and veterans have been assisted in achieving farm ownership. As in the case of the Farm Security or Farmers' Home Administration, the use of a combination of loans and technical assistance have made this program highly successful.

Real progress has been made. In the 20 years from the 1930 census of agriculture to the 1950 census, we succeeded in raising the proportion of operator ownership of farmers by 16 percent from 56.7 percent in 1930 to 72.7 percent in 1950. Tenancy dropped correspondingly in the period, from 42 percent to 26 percent.

But despite the gains which have been made, the job of eliminating poverty in agriculture has not been completed. We have demonstrated that with a combination of loans and technical assistance, families that are otherwise unable to obtain credit can be lifted to self-sufficient, independent status with little immediate cost and with long-term gain. But there has never been sufficient authority or sufficient funds to reach thousands of farm families whose standards of living are unnecessarily below a minimum, adequate level.

The 1950 census enumerated 5,379,000 farms in the United States. The census enumerators would not even classify about one-third of these as commercial farms.

It eliminated 1,029,000 from its commercial-farm classification because the value of all products sold in the year was less than $250, and the operators did not have enough off-farm employment—100 days a year—to be regarded as part-time farmers.

There were 639,000 part-time farmers who sold from $250 to $2,000 worth of products annually.

Stepping up into the Census commercial-farm classification, which is the remaining 3,707,000 farms after the noncommercial farms I have just enumerater are eliminated, we find that one-fifth of the so-called full-time, commercial farmers—a total of 717,000—sell only from $250 to $1,199 worth of products annually, far less than enough even if it were all net for an adequate family income. And another fourth—901,000—sell only from $1,200 to $2,499 in products annually.

None of these incomes are in my judgment adequate, but if we exclude the last classification, the $1,200 to $2,499 group, there remain more than 2 million low-income farm families who should be helped to better standards of living.

A survey by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in 1950 revealed that in every State in the Nation there are areas of concentrated low-income population, unable to lift themselves by the bootstraps economically because their capital and their agricultural resources are inadequate. The cut-over timber areas of the South and the Great Lakes area are examples. Poverty also occurs in the marginal land areas of the Nation, where land holdings are too small to support families adequately, and where years of undernourishment have added health problems to the job of rehabilitation.

Out in the Southwest, where the Spanish custom of dividing and redividing inherited landholdings has prevailed, many landholdings have become inadequate and new measures must be adopted if we are to bring about adjustments and higher standards of living.

The staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in a study of underemployment of rural families published in 1951, found that there are four keys to the solution to these problems of low income in the rural areas. I may add it was my pleasure and privilege to be the chairman of the subcommittee which made those studies. The four keys are as follows:

First. Increase the productivity of families on existing farms: Studies of low-income farm operations in the Southern States have repeatedly shown that these families, hard pressed for money to exist, have been unable to buy seeds, fertilizer, foundation livestock, supplies for disease and insect control, and other items which would boost their production. They are caught in a trap. Unable to obtain credit, they have barely subsisted, sometimes for more than a generation. Educational standards are low. In tens of thousands of cases, productivity and standard of living can be increased 100 percent or more, on existing units, by loans, technical assistance, and larger home food production on present acreage.

Second. Enlarge the farm units: Many agricultural economists believe that this is the central problem that must be tackled in a long-range program for low-income families. It is my own hope that the introduction of labor-intensive enterprises, plus the development of off-farm employment in rural areas with which to supplement incomes, will minimize the necessity for farm-unit enlargement and the displacement of a portion of those now on the land. I feel very strongly that every farm family that wants to stay in agriculture should be aided in so doing. But in many areas adjustment in farm sizes, with displacement and relocations, will be necessary if the lot of the citizens is to be improved. This leads to the third basic step necessary.

Third. The provision of assistance to families who desire farm or nonfarm employment outside their home communities: Such assistance will necessarily include job location for such families, the creation of a market for the small landholdings they will leave, and other aid in making their move and readjustment.

Fourth. Increase employment opportunities for low-income, part-time

farmers, rural nonfarm families and hired farm workers: During periods of high employment, we invariably hear it suggested that large numbers of low income farmers should be squeezed off the land, out of rural America and into the urban labor force.

It should be obvious in the present period of serious national unemployment—with adjustments to automation actually upon us—that such a course is sheer folly; that the encouragment of a labor movement from rural areas to urban centers would only be a transferral of the location of the problem.

The need is to increase employment opportunities within rural counties, to encourage sustained-yield forestry and the establishment of forest in appropriate areas, and to encourage the establishment of new and enlarged plants for processing the raw materials of the land in areas where such employment is needed, and will supplement low incomes.

The bill I have introduced proposes that the techniques that have been proved successful by the Farmers Home Administration on rehabilitation and farm ownership loan programs—a combination of credit and technical assistance—be used to tackle the problem of low income farmers in the 500 areas or counties of the Nation where the problem is concentrated from time to time.

The President is authorized to designate the 500 counties of highest concentration of low rural incomes. The Department of Agriculture is then authorized, through established agencies and farmer committees, to put personnel into those counties to deal with the low income problem.

The problems of individual farmers who are approved by the committees will be studied and the cause or causes of low income determined, whether it be health, lack of capital or land resources, lack of modern agricultural know-how, or something else. If practical, these people will be helped to get credit, either through guaranteed private loans or direct Federal loans. Farm plans will be developed for them and technical assistance provided in carrying out the farm plan.

Direct or guaranteed 25-year loans are authorized for the development and enlargement of farming units that are too small. Three to 10-year loans on nonreal estate capital requirements, such as livestock and machinery, are authorized.

Loans for up to 50 years for the establishment of sustained yield forestry are authorized, together with special 10-year loans for purchase of cut-over areas of the Nation, plus the national need for forest conservation and development, in my judgment, justify this program.

There is also authorized 5-year loans to eligible applicants to purchase capital stock in established or new supply, service and marketing cooperatives, including timber marketing and processing cooperatives, which will be essential to the success of the new operations.

In all cases, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to establish a system of variable payments on the loans so payments on the principal in a single year will bear a reasonable relationship to the income of the participating family in that year.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide programs of adult vocational training in the counties where low-income rural people are concentrated, as such programs are needed to train and retrain the people so as to maximize the income and productivity of the citizens within the area.

Cooperation of all appropriate Federal personnel with local communities, to survey their potentialities and assist in the development of new and expanded industries, offering employment opportunities to the unemployed and partially employed, is provided for.

Mr. President, I repeat that this proposal is intended as a new step forward in rural policy—a step along the same course that we have followed for years.

The techniques that I propose have been proved in the Farmers' Home Administration and the Bankhead-Jones farm tenant programs. My measure proposes basically to use those techniques more extensively in areas of concentrated low incomes, to apply them to the inadequate-sized-farm problem, and to encourage new enterprises in the rural areas.

The cost of this program will be slight. Loan collections in the Farmers' Home and Tenant Purchase programs have been excellent, despite the fact that the borrowers could not get private credit when they first came to the Government. A similar collection experience can be anticipated from this program, for there will be the same selection of worthy applicants, and there will be planning, technical assistance, and supervision, to assure success.

I strongly support our technical-assistance programs abroad. They are making us tens of thousands of grassroots friends among the peoples who have been relieved of locust plagues and the scourge of animal diseases, and have been shown new and improved methods of production.

But while extending the advantages of our "know-how" to foreign lands, we must maintain our own Nation as a showcase for democracy: The irrefutable proof that the American way is the best way ever devised by man.

We cannot wipe out, overnight all poverty in our Nation, but we can and we must continue the step-by-step elimination which our farm programs, our educational programs, social security, the full employment policy, and similar measures have gotten under way.

There is currently a great deal of discussion of what to do for the family farmers. Some people believe that price supports are the answer. We need price supports to provide stable farm markets. But price supports alone do not meet the problem of those in the rural areas who have too little resources and little or nothing to sell. These people must be aided in building up their production and their incomes, so they may also contribute their full part to the national economy.

The administration has conducted a year-long study of the problems of the family farmer, and that study was to have been reported to us sometime ago. I do not know why the report has been delayed. I assume it will be forthcoming soon and I hope and trust it will advocate positive action.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has repeatedly studied this problem. This year agricultural leaders testified before the committee that just such a program as this one is needed.

The time for action has come. I have, therefore, proposed authorization of all the steps which I am convinced are necessary in order to strengthen and preserve the family-size farm and to solve the low-income problem in rural America. I sincerely hope that this Congress will see fit to set this program in motion in the near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1199) to strengthen the Nation by preserving the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, improving the income-earning capacity and standard of living of low-income rural people, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this bill shall be known as the "Family Farm Development Act."

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. The low incomes, poor living standards, and insufficient economic opportunity for efficient employment of their full capacity of a large part of the rural population denies the Nation the benefit of greater productivity in agriculture and in local rural manufacturing and service industries, slows down national economic growth and reduces standards of living. The Congress recognizes that rural poverty and low rural productivity can and must be remedied in order to bring the Nation up to maximum strength and that through this example of strengthening democracy at home by providing additional opportunities to low-income rural groups, democracy in other parts of the world also will be strengthened. It is the policy of the Congress to provide for practical assistance to low-income rural families who desire to increase their productivity and incomes and thereby to benefit the Nation's economy and raise their own standards of living.

DETERMINATION OF LOW-INCOME COUNTIES

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to determine from time to time from the latest official statistics available to him the counties or areas of the United States, not exceeding 500 in number at any one time, having the largest low-income farm population and to inaugurate and maintain in such counties a program to effectuate the purposes and policy of this act.

ELIGIBILITY

SEC. 4. The President through existing agencies of the Government will render special assistance to low-income families or single persons living in rural areas who apply for such assistance: *Provided*, That the applicant is recommended by the county farmer committee established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act: *And Provided further*, That the county farmer committee finds that the applicant, with the assistance provided for herein, will develop a farm and home management or family employment plan for increasing his productivity and income that has a reasonable chance to succeed.

In exploring the most feasible and practicable methods for increasing his productiv-

ity and income the applicant, with the assistance of the county farmer committee, will determine whether the cause of low income is due to physical handicaps of the family; the lack of available credit to make needed shifts in farming methods and employment of labor resources of the family; the practice of inefficient farming methods, or practices; lack of practicable diversification in the farming operation; lack of sufficient land; lack of outside employment opportunities to fully utilize the labor of the family in ways that enable it to earn an adequate return at least equal to the established national minimum wage. To assist in the analysis of the needs and in developing the plans with families, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make available to the families and the farmer committee the services of the local and State offices of the agencies of the Department to provide the advice of technicians in such fields as soil conservation, and supervised agricultural credit for agricultural production and for farm enlargement and development. The advice and assistance of other Federal agencies shall be made available and the cooperation of State and local agencies, including the State agricultural extension services and the State employment services, and of private individuals and organizations also shall be solicited.

DEVELOPING ECONOMICALLY ADEQUATE FULL- AND PART-TIME FARMERS

SEC. 5. In case of eligible applicants who wish to remain on the farm now occupied or to become established on another farm in the area, either on a full-time farming basis or in conjunction with off-farm employment of one or more members of the family, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to provide the following services through the county farmer committees:

(a) Employ such full-time employees as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Make a complete analysis of the farm and farm operations and supplemental employment opportunities to determine the most promising ways by which family income and productivity in combination with whatever off-farm employment may be planned can be raised to an adequate level. After completion of such a farm and home plan, the Secretary through the county farmer committee will render every assistance possible to the applicant and his family in putting the new program into effect, including technical assistance on improved farm and home practices, and assistance in obtaining credit needed from private, cooperative, or governmental sources to put these practices into effect.

(c) To effectuate the purpose of this act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon such conditions as he shall prescribe, to insure and make loans of up to 25 years at not more than 4 percent interest for the purpose of financing the enlargement and development of owner-operated family-type farms by acquisition of additional land, establishment of improved pastures and sustained yield woodlots, construction of adequate farm buildings and structures (including drainage facilities, irrigation facilities, and other facilities for the use, conservation, and improvement of soil and water), and such other related farm improvements as will increase the income-producing ability of the farm unit to a more nearly fully adequate family farm.

To make or to insure 3- to 10-year loans at not more than 4 percent interest advanced by production credit associations and by private lenders for non-real-estate capital investment purposes; to make loans up to 50 years at not more than 3 percent interest to eligible applicants to acquire and manage on a sustained-yield basis additional forest or cut-over land; to make loans for periods up to 10 years at not more than 4 percent interest to enable an eligible applicant to acquire needed logging equipment; to make loans of not more than 5 years at not more than 4 percent interest to eligible applicants to purchase capital stock of and pay membership fees to existing or new supply, service, or marketing cooperatives including timber marketing and processing cooperatives; and to make loans to refinance existing indebtedness incurred for any of the above purposes on terms and conditions applicable to loans for such purposes: *Provided*, That creditors will enter into voluntary agreements to make needed adjustments of outstanding indebtedness to realistic income possibilities of the collateral for the existing mortgage or mortgages: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a variable repayment schedule for all of the foregoing types of loans such that the repayment of interest and principal in any single year shall bear a reasonable relationship to the income of the participating family in that year.

PART- AND FULL-TIME OFF-FARM EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 6. Whenever the family determines to seek part-time or full-time farm or nonfarm employment off the farm, the problem shall be presented to the nearest farm labor placement center of the State employment service cooperating wtih the Department of Labor. Information concerning farm labor opportunities also shall be made available to the family by the State and county farmer committees.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide a program of adult vocational training in the designated counties both in farm and home management and in such other farm and nonfarm activities as the family plans of eligible applicants indicate as needed to maximize family income and productivity of family labor within the area.

INDUSTRIAL DISPERSION

SEC. 8. To provide for the national defense, to promote interstate commerce, and to improve the general welfare by assisting in the sound economic growth and development of the country, it is the policy of the Congress to encourage and stimulate the establishment of new or expanded private industrial, commercial, or service enterprises in widely dispersed rural areas as required to reduce vulnerability to modern war risks and in which, over an extended period of time, because of the number of underemployed rural persons with excessively low incomes, the number of existing industrial, commercial, or service enterprises, and the available markets and resources there are reasonable prospects for successful operation of additional private enterprises which would more fully utilize available manpower in rural areas. To effectuate this policy of industry dispersal, the departments and establishments in the executive branch of the Government shall be utilized and coordinated to—

(a) provide technical aid and assistance to, and consult and cooperate with, farmers, businessmen, workers, cooperatives, civic organizations, clubs, and committees, community study and planning groups, and local and State governmental agencies;

(b) prepare and distribute technical, defense, and economic information on opportunities in and necessities of private enterprise in various industries and areas in order to aid individuals, business firms, civic organizations, and local units of government in developing new or expanded industries best suited to local conditions; and the requirement of civil defense;

(c) assist new or expanding industries in finding adequate private financing through local capital or otherwise and where such financing is found to be unavailable, extend Government loans or guaranties under existing authority; and

(d) use all appropriate means and authority to encourage and stimulate the maximum expansion in private employment and private enterprises consistent with the needs for national defense, with a sound, growing national economy, and with the necessities of civilian defense.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I desire to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alabama upon his sponsorship of this measure, and I am glad to know that a similar measure is being sponsored in the House of Representatives by Representative PATMAN.

In the effort in various ways to sustain the family-sized farm may lie, I believe, the answer to the problem of price-supports and the many other problems which have been disturbing American agriculture, and with which the Nation has to cope.

I know some consideration has been given to the matter for a long time, and I am glad that the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama is going to push for early hearings on, and consideration of, the very excellent bill he has introduced.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee. I should like to remind him that the President, in his state of the Union message, said something must be done for the low-income farmers; and we were supposed to have gotten a special message on the subject, as I understand. I am hopeful it will come to the Congress soon.

I regret that I did not have time to invite other Senators who might wish to do so, to join in the sponsorship of this measure. I do not claim it is perfect, but I certainly hope it will start something which will work into a good program. So I should like to invite any Senators who may wish to do so, to join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama please to include my name as a cosponsor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be very pleased to do so; and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be placed on the bill as a cosponsor of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WINNERS IN THE "I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY" CONTEST

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, this week marks the culmination of the annual "I Speak for Democracy" contest. This year, 48 States and 4 Territories were represented. Over 29,000 high schools, parochial schools, and private schools entered the local contests. Over 1,200,000 of the best students of the land wrote speeches.

Four nationwide winners have been selected. I am privileged to note that 1 of the 4 winners is an outstanding boy from Iowa, Dwight David Walker, of Oskaloosa. The other winners are Judy Abramson, of Yuba City, Calif.; Avron Joseph Maletzky, of Schenectady, N. Y.; and Catherine Esther Styles, of Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the four prize-winning scripts in the national "I Speak for Democracy" contest be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDY ABRAMSON, AGE 17, YUBA CITY UNION HIGH SCHOOL, YUBA CITY, CALIF.

I speak for democracy.

And why am I doing so?

Because I am an American, enjoying to the fullest the benefits of democracy. The greatness of this democracy is not to be found in the waters, the mines, the field, or the mills, but must be sought in the hearts and the minds of the people. It isn't something that can be weighed or measured by any device yet known to man. It has a value that cannot be detected—yet has infinite value. We possess it, here in America, in such abundance that we might, at times, display an unpremediated contempt for it. Yet other nations who have lost it—find it impossible to regain.

None of us could describe it in the same terms—yet, each senses its power, its importance, and the conviction that it must be preserved at all costs. For want of better expression, let us call it the American way of life. For it can mean different things to different people. This way of life is like a gigantic tree with many branches extending in all directions. The tree—its branches and its fruit—give comfort and support to the weak, food to the hungry, strength to the small. The tree, like democracy, has fought for survival through the ages, and shows scars resulting from this treatment. When lacking water or sun for survival it begins to wither—and such is democracy. There is no country in the world, nor any human being, who, in its span of duration, has not been affected by the many facets of democracy.

Wars have been fought for it.
Laws have been made for it.
Schools are founded upon it.
Rights have been declared for it.

But in order to benefit the people, it must be guarded and protected by all who wish to share in it. Without help and support, democracy—as the tree—would die. Its many branches offer a hope and a promise to all people. For through democracy we can attain our only hope for lasting world peace—the brotherhood of man.

This brotherhood will come about only through freedom and equality for each person. And so the greatest attribute democracy has is that it releases the full potential of each individual. Our characteristics, as people living in a democracy, show that we strive hard to do this not only because we have the opportunity, but because it is our obligation to ourselves, our God, and our country.

The key to this democracy we possess is our faith in the dignity and the worth of each human life, and our determination that in every phase of our society we shall build from the bottom up, and not from the top down. The only true happiness is that which the individual creates for himself—and values—because it is his own. To fulfill his own ambitions and to satisfy the needs which are his own expression—that is the goal of each human being. And this can be accomplished only under democracy.

It was once said that there is a destiny that makes us brothers, and none shall go his way alone. For that which we send into lives of others comes back into our own. Democracy is our destiny—sending to each one of us, and our coming generation, a free sense of being that brings with it security and a knowledge that each and every man is equal.

This destiny—democracy—has given us a rich inheritance. Our forefathers fought for it. And through them—and democracy—we have been given the richness of the earth and its resources—personal freedom—equality—justice.

Working as a democracy, our Union of States, and Nation of people, can work together to create and to achieve—to make this democracy stronger, constant, and ever enduring. May God will it so.

AVRON JOSEPH MALETZKY, AGE 16, NOTT TERRACE HIGH SCHOOL, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

I speak for democracy—a force that means life, liberty, and freedom for millions of human beings—a force that elevates the dignity of man toward the divine—but a force that defies definition.

Scores of interpretations do not embrace the meaning of democracy, and none of us know where to find the words to express our belief in it. Perhaps the fact that we have not yet achieved democracy is the key to the whole situation—for true democracy is a quality toward which one strives, rather than a concrete object which one encloses in a glass case. Then how is it possible to defend something that is as basic as the world we live in, but must be thought of as a goal never quite attained?

It was not until we faced the possibility of its loss that we began to visualize the meaning of this precious inheritance. It was not until we saw other democratic countries, filled with people not unlike ourselves, submerged and conquered, that we began to appreciate democracy as both a moral ideal and a historical institution.

The theme of democracy goes back much farther historically than the great documents of the American, French, and English revolutions. The idea goes back to the Hebrews with their theories of divine justice; to the early Christians with their ideal of brotherhood; to the Romans with their stress on equality and justice. Those who feel that democracy is young, and thus is an unstable force, forget what a long history it has, and how deeply it is imbedded in the culture of nations.

Today, we are beginning to think of democracy not as a political institution, but as a moral ideal, and a way of living together. The early Christians had an appropriate saying—"We are all," as they put it, "members of one another." We must, if our democracy is to succeed, believe as they did. We must realize that no one can stand alone. True, society recognizes a person as an individual with his individual liberties and freedoms, but only if the person recognizes society as a brotherhood of individuals. To be part of a democracy, one must fight the natural tendency to demand equality and freedom for oneself, and not for others.

Of course, there are those who say that because it opposes, or conflicts with man's natural desire for personal gain, democracy will defeat itself. But democracy has its own peculiar strength. This strength lies in the fact that democracy tends to bring men together into agreement—it satisfies and reconciles all involved. Its strength thus lies in the justice, humanity, and loyalty which are evolved from this agreement between men.

To be sure, as long as democracy exists, there will always be a mild state of confusion and conflict. But what are these conflicts? Conflicts are the instruments of change and progress—they are the propelling force behind democracy.

For democracy there is always a future, and a bright one, too. Its potentialities have never been fully realized, and it would take a person gifted with a fertile imagination to think of all the many possibilities that democracy has in store for a nation of the 21st century.

As the well-known philosopher, Irwin Edman, has written: "It is by the fire of this dream (democracy), that the future is lighted, rather than by the flames of destruction that now, as often in the past, have violated—but never for very long—the faith in the human dignity of each man in a society of brotherhood and freedom."

Democracy is a powerful force. It represents a gigantic struggle towards some unattainable goal. But even if this struggle never succeeds entirely, out of it can come the courage and the faith that will maintain democracy as a dynamic force for eternity.

CATHERINE ESTHER STYLES, AGE 18, SOUTHWEST HIGH SCHOOL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

I am not an American. My people are not American. And yet I, too, speak for democracy.

Not much over a hundred years ago, the race that founded American began to found another nation. Surrounded by the vastness of the Pacific Ocean, a new land had been discovered. The brown-skinned people who already lived there called it Aotearoa the land of the long white cloud. Today we call it New Zealand. It is a young country, a virile and growing country. It is a country of sea and sunshine, of snow on the mountains, of trout lakes and primitive fern forest; of weird pools where the boiling mud leaps and bubbles, cracks in the rock where the steam comes white from the insides of the earth.

The people who live there are a people who love freedom.

The people who live there are my people, and when I speak for democracy, I speak for them.

I have seen something of America.

I have watched the crowds in the streets at night, seeing the advertisement signs flashing on the saw-edge of the horizon saying: "Buy my product; no, buy mine; mine is finer yet." I have seen, back home in the early morning, the man with his horse and his dogs, driving sheep. I remember the jostle and pattering rush of the delicate forefeet, and the clean smell of the bracken, and the sharp barking of the dogs. I remember this, and I know that those crowds with their faces colored by the glow of the advertisements, and that man out early with his flock, although they are 7,000 miles apart, are people, with the same ideals and beliefs, the same love of individual freedom. And I am glad that I can say this, and I speak with all the sincerity in my power. I know that people, these people, all people, are the most terribly important thing in the world. I know that to make as many people as possible as happy as possible is the greatest ideal in the world. And I know that this is the ideal of democracy.

You people of America do not stand alone. Democracy extends further than America. Two thousand years ago the Christian doctrine proclaimed the equality of man. Belief in the equality of man means acceptance of all races, all creeds. Belief in democracy means belief in the equality of man. It means respecting the individuality of every human being.

At home, in the summer evenings, near the time of Christmas, I would sit on the low veranda steps, and hear the baby owls calling in the darkness, and the cows coughing and stamping in the paddock, and see the

white bobs of the rabbits scuttle in the half-light. And by the gate I would hear the voices of a couple murmuring together, the young man and woman. And I would think—this is good; this is good, this life, this land, this people. All this is good; the best that ever was.

I still believe it is good, but I know now it was no single nation I was believing in, but the truth of free people everywhere. And I know that the most wonderful thing in the world is the freedom of the individual—in my country, in your country, and in every country.

Not as an American, not as a New Zealander, but as a free citizen of the world in which I have faith, I am speaking to you now. I am not remembering that you are American and I am British. I am not remembering that our voices are different, and our manners, and the cut of our clothes. I only remember that, together, we believe in the individual freedom and right.

I only remember that, together, we speak for democracy.

DWIGHT DAVID WALKER, AGE 17, OSKALOOSA HIGH SCHOOL, OSKALOOSA, IOWA

My name is democracy. I am the beacon of hope in a troubled world.

I can be found in an abandoned foxhole in Korea; in the Senate of the United States, and at a meeting of the PTA. I am present when you spend a quiet evening at home with your family, and when you go to church on Sunday. Yes, I can even be found in the broken spirit of a Russian peasant as he goes about his menial tasks under the surveillance of his government.

I cannot tell you my exact age, for no one knows just when I was born. First, I was an attitude in the minds, a gleam in the eyes, a hope in the hearts of men who sought a new way of life, free from the oppression of a tyrannical ruler, by divine right. These men were my fathers.

These men brought me when I was still but an idea, with them to found a new land. The land was called America. It is my land—the land of democracy. It was here that my life began. America and I grew up together.

My fathers loved me. They developed me, nursed me, and even fought a war that I might live and continue to grow.

The torment and anguish which my fathers endured for me, left its permanent mark on my history. Guns roared, armies battled, and fires raged through my land, taking an immense toll of blood and human life.

But I lived, experiencing myself and bringing to my people a richer and fuller life. For, from out of the blood which my fathers shed for me, emerged the greatest document ever conceived in the mind of man—the Constitution—which gave substance to the ringing declaration * * * "that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

My horizons widened. Countless people, imbued with the ideals of freedom, braved the wilderness, fought the Indians, endured hardships and death, and all for the sake of me—democracy.

However, there continued to be threats to my security. My history has been blackened by a succession of wars. From the struggle for the emancipation of slaves and the preservation of my Union, to the bloodbath of World War I. I emerged triumphant from all these trials, but my people failed to acknowledge the opportunity that fate had laid in their hands. They looked to idealistic remedies to guarantee peace to man forever.

The result was the rise of Hitlerism, and ultimately, World War II. Now it is communism, and the cold war.

But I have learned through bitter experience. I have grown from my infancy, to take my rightful place as leader of a troubled world. I have seen and assumed my duties. May I remind you of a few of my accomplishments—the Marshall plan, food trains, the point 4 program, the Berlin airlift, and military aid to Greece?

I have grown—until now I am adult. But I shall never become aged as long as my people continue to value the principles for which I stand. As I was the child of my fathers, so am I now the father of my own children. As the minds of men gave birth to a great idea, so has this idea given birth to certain of my principles.

Election of public officials by all the people is one of these principles. Others are our public-school system, the four freedoms, representative taxation, racial equality—countless proofs of my greatness.

This has been my past. But what about my future? It has been said that my greatest enemy is indifference on the part of my people. We have seen that neglect of their duties and obligations led my people into the Second World War. Citizens of America, don't let this happen again.

Speak, act, and think democracy. Live it. Breathe it. Support it. Defend it and believe in it. But, above all, do not take it for granted.

Don't become careless to the point that you lose your most precious heritage.

A great American patriot once said that I am the last, best hope of the earth.

But who am I? What kind of a power am I that I am the hope of the world?

I am democracy. I am the power of the people.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until noon, on Friday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert H. S. Eakens, of Texas.
Henry H. Ford, of Florida.
Merrill C. Gay, of Ohio.
Graham R. Hall, of Arkansas.
Mose L. Harvey, of Maryland.
Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia.
James R. Johnstone, of Virginia.
Clifford C. Matlock, of California.
Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska.
Philip H. Trezise, of Maryland.
J. Raymond Ylitalo, of Minnesota.

Randall S. Williams, Jr., of New York, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 3 to class 2.

Henry C. Ramsey, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John W. Auchincloss, of the District of Columbia.
John A. Chappelear, of the District of Columbia.
John F. Correll, of Ohio.
Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., of New York.
Donald B. Eddy, of Connecticut.
Robert Eisenberg, of Virginia.
John W. Ford, of Virginia.
Leo A. Gough, of Rhode Island.
Stanley I. Grand, of Missouri.
Herbert W. Griffin, of California.
Robert J. Halliday, of New Jersey.
Henry S. Hammond, of Pennsylvania.
William K. Hitchcock, of Virginia.
Russell B. Jordan, of Wyoming.
Abe Kramer, of California.
Stanley R. Lawson, of California.
Edgar L. McGinnis, Jr., of Virginia.
Louis C. Nolan, of Florida.
Richard C. O'Brien, of New Jersey.
Charles E. Rogers, of Connecticut.
Joseph M. Roland, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Tomlinson, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Rodger C. Abraham, of Maryland.
Edwin M. Adams, of Illinois.
Hugh M. Adamson, of Virginia.
John L. Barrett, of Texas.
George A. Berkley, of Pennsylvania.
Keirn C. Brown, of New York.
Robert W. Caldwell, of North Carolina.
Miss Margaret A. Fagan, of Iowa.
George S. Freimarck, of Maryland.
Justie E. Gist, of Iowa.
Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Warren G. Hall, of Washington.
Dwight B. Horner, of Virginia.
Thomas D. Huff, of Indiana.
J. Alfred LaFrenière, of Massachusetts.
John S. Meadows, of Massachusetts.
John G. Oliver, of California.
Harold W. Pfau, of New Jersey.
Harry M. Phelan, Jr., of Tennessee.
Ferdinand F. Pirhalla, of Pennsylvania.
Normand W. Redden, of New York.
Reed P. Robinson, of Utah.
Kenneth J. Ruch, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor W. Sandford, of Massachusetts.
Schubert E. Smith, of New York.
Richard L. Sneider, of New York.
Mrs. Lucille M. Snyder, of Missouri.
William B. Sowash, of Ohio.
Bertus H. Wabeke, of Massachusetts.
William H. Wade, of California.
Frederick S. York, of New Jersey.

Scott George, of Kentucky, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4 and to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4.

Robert M. Beaudry, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Chester G. Dunham, of Ohio, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 6 to class 5.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the

diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Karl D. Ackerman, of Oklahoma.
Joseph P. Bandoni, of California.
William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.
Hampton E. Brown, Jr., of Maryland.
Robert L. Burns, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Bushwaller, of Iowa.
Max R. Caldwell, of Texas.
Everett L. Damron, of Ohio.
John R. Diggins, Jr., of Maine.
George A. Ellsworth, of Georgia.
Miss Helen V. Garrett, of Oklahoma.
John W. Gordhamer, of California.
Miss Anna C. Gustavs, of California.
Arvid G. Holm, of Washington.
Thomas J. Hunt, of New York.
Anthony J. Jay, of Illinois.
John W. Jelich, of New York.
Edward P. Kardas, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary A. Kellogg, of Michigan.
Joseph A. Livornese, of Colorado.
Miss Charlotte M. McLaughlin, of Washington.
Jack C. Miklos, of Idaho.
William D. Morgan, of New York.
Robert L. Mott, of California.
Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
James B. Parker, of Texas.
Richard W. Petree, of Virginia.
John M. Powell, of Illinois.
Ralph C. Rehberg, of South Carolina.
W. Courtlandt Rhodes, of California.
Charley L. Rice, of Texas.
Emery Peter Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Virginia C. Stryker, of Washington.
Miss Margarite H. Tanck, of South Dakota.
Charles P. Torrey, of California.
Miss Irene Toth, of California.
Allen R. Turner, of Missouri.
James M. Turner, of Tennessee.
Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
Leland W. Warner, Jr., of Kansas.
Miss Alice D. Westbrook, of California.
Ralph H. Wheeler, Jr., of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
Robert T. Burke, of New York.
Robert J. Carle, of California.
Charles M. Gage, of Illinois.
Harold E. Grover, Jr., of Florida.
Stanley P. Harris, of New York.
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Johnsen, of California.
Henry G. Krausse, Jr., of Texas.
Franklin O. McCord, of Iowa.
Donald W. Mulligan, of Kentucky.
John Patrick Owens, of the District of Columbia.
James A. Parker, of Maryland.
James G. Sampas, of Massachusetts.
William R. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur H. Woodruff, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Edward J. Conlon, of Tennessee.
Charles F. Edmundson, of Illinois.
Tom A. Noonan, of Kentucky.
Lawrence E. Norrie, of California.
John P. Rhodes, of Ohio.

Thomas J. Needham, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Jack Liebof, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

(This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on November 8, 1954, and confirmed by the Senate on December 2, 1954.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, we thank Thee this day for Jesus, and for His shed blood that made it possible for every man to have eternal life.

Dear God, we pray for the President of the United States, that Thou wilt give him wisdom and strength. We realize as we have studied the history of the rise and fall of great nations that what our President has said is true, America has only one salvation, a return to God.

And now, dear Heavenly Father, we pray for the Speaker and this body of lawmakers. We realize that our own wisdom and their wisdom will be as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals except it be from Thee. Help us as citizens to remember our Government leaders prayerfully instead of critically. Bless each home represented here, in the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has appointed Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on Armed Services. At the present time this committee is considering the national reserve plan and kindred legislation. The committee has been holding these hearings every day for the last several weeks. We have some 50 witnesses yet to be heard.

The committee this morning discussed the matter and suggested that I as chairman of the subcommittee make the announcement on the floor of the House that these meetings are being held so that every Member of the Congress may be fully aware of the hearings and may have an opportunity to attend and listen to any witnesses they are interested in. I take this time this morning for this purpose, to let you know that we are going ahead with the hearings as fast as we can handle them in an orderly manner. We will be delighted for any Member to be in attendance.

UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN THE ALTOONA, PA., AREA

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the acute unemployment situation in the Altoona, Pa., area has had my undivided attention for the past many months. Despite the fact that Altoona has been classified since 1949 as a labor-surplus area, the degree of unemployment has mounted during the past 16 months so that it is now classified by the United States Department of Labor as being in an area having a very substantial labor surplus.

It is encouraging to state that the unemployment situation in Altoona and vicinity has been attacked on all fronts with business and labor groups working collectively while the citizens of Altoona voluntarily contributed better than three-quarters of a million dollars in a "Jobs for Joes" campaign to finance the efforts being made to attract new industries to the Altoona area. This "Jobs for Joes" campaign supplements the program of the Altoona Enterprises, Inc., a subsidiary of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce, which raised in excess of $600,000 for the purpose of assuring continued employment. Already several new industries have been secured because of the splendid response to the appeal of Altoona Enterprises, Inc.

The unemployment situation in Altoona is the result of a sick coal industry which is reflected in a marked decrease in employment in the railroad and other related industries. Nearly 18 percent of the employables in the Altoona area are unemployed, or a total of 10,000 jobless persons, 6,000 of which are furloughed railroad employees. This unemployment situation is attributable to three factors: First, loss of coal markets because of the use of substitute fuels, chiefly foreign residual oil; second, dieselization of the Nation's railroads, which replaced steam locomotives; third, the general effect of unemployment in the coal and railroad industries, which is reflected in allied industries.

Recently I had occasion to write to Mr. Murray M. Gassman, national CIO representative in Altoona, Pa., on the subject of unemployment in the Altoona area outlining the efforts that have been and are being made to relieve the unemployment situation.

My letter to Mr. Gassman follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1955.*

Mr. MURRAY M. GASSMAN,
United Railroad Workers of America, CIO, Local Union 2017, Altoona, Pa.

DEAR MR. GASSMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of February 14, our telephone conversation of February 16 and my telegram to you of February 19 regarding my attendance at a mass membership meeting

of your organization in Altoona, February 23, 1955.

As mentioned in my telegram of February 19, according to the legislative program announced by the House leadership early Friday evening, February 18, a busy legislative program is scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday, February 23 and February 24, 1955. In addition, committee meetings are scheduled for both morning and afternoon on these dates when matters affecting my congressional district will be discussed which require my presence.

Since there is no legislative business scheduled for Washington's birthday, February 22, as mentioned in our telephone conversation on February 16, I am committed to spend the entire day at the Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pa., which is in my congressional district. To keep this engagement at State College which concerns the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Penn State, I will travel by train in both directions because of weather conditions. Therefore, you will understand regardless of the legislative program on Wednesday and Thursday that it is a physical impossibility for me to be in Altoona on Wednesday evening, February 23, as I will not get back to Washington until Wednesday morning.

You stated in your letter of February 14 that the meeting on February 23 was called for the purpose of accelerating efforts in helping alleviate the unemployment crisis and to receive a report from the United States Representative from the 20th (not 23d) Congressional District regarding a program he may have to help the unemployed. Since it will be physically impossible for me to attend the meeting, the following report is presented which contains information which was furnished several weeks ago to the Altoona Community Welfare Council, copies being furnished to your associates of the Blair County United Labor Council as well as to the Altoona newspapers. There is herewith enclosed copies of the information furnished which has been designated exhibits A, B, and C. Copies of the bills mentioned in these exhibits are also attached.

As you will note in my letter of January 7, 1955, to Charles A. Mentzer, executive director, Altoona Community Welfare Council marked as exhibit A, after exhausting all efforts to find legal authority on the part of the Federal Government to cope with the Altoona unemployment situation, the following program was developed as represented by the following bills I introduced on the first day of the 84th Congress, January 5, 1955, all of which are pending before appropriate committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in each bill.

H. R. 860 provides a program of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor and for other purposes.

H. R. 861 provides temporary unemployment benefits to unemployed railroaders whose benefits terminated after January 1, 1955, by extending the period of eligibility for railroad-unemployment insurance to July 1, 1955.

H. R. 862 amends the Social Security Act by prohibiting the several States from taking a lien against the real estate of the recipient of public assistance benefits as is being done under existing law in Pennsylvania.

H. R. 863 provides for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities by use of a food stamp plan.

Since introducing H. R. 863 and as a result of further consultations with the Department of Agriculture and representatives of labor organizations, H. R. 3144 and H. R. 3145 were introduced by me, copies of which are enclosed. Both of these bills place the cost of distribution of surplus food commodities in labor surplus and disaster areas on the Federal Government as well as authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to process these food commodities into a form suitable for home consumption such as wheat into flour, corn into meal, etc. I am informed that H. R. 3144 and H. R. 3145 provide a better approach than H. R. 863 providing for a food stamp plan.

As mentioned, all of these bills that I have introduced are pending before the House committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in them. Each committee chairman concerned has received a letter from me a few days after the bills were introduced requesting that he immediately secure a report from the Government agencies concerned on the bill or bills pending before his committee and upon receipt of such report that hearings be scheduled on the bill at the earliest possible date. In addition to writing each committee chairman, I have had a personal conference with each of them furnishing them full information about the Altoona unemployment problem and urging the earliest possible action on the legislation. In addition to my contacts with the committee chairmen, the White House, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the leadership of both parties in the House of Representatives, all agencies of Government concerned have been fully informed of the unemployment situation and of my program designed to alleviate it.

As you will observe from exhibit B which concerns H. R. 861, a bill designed to provide temporary extension of railroad unemployment insurance benefits, after many hours of research on my part, all available information concerning not only the Altoona unemployment situation but also the national picture was placed in the hands of the Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 22, 1955. Since that date I have had several conferences with Chairman Percy A. Priest whose home town, by the way, is Nashville, Tenn., where there are 2,500 railroaders unemployed. I have also written a personal letter to every member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and furnished the same information I gave Chairman Priest.

In order to develop nonpartisan support of my legislative program, I wrote a personal letter to the Governor of Pennsylvania on January 22, 1955 and a similar letter to the legislative representatives of the CIO, the A. F. of L., the International Association of Machinists, the Railway Labor Executives Association and the Operating Railroad Brotherhoods. I have received replies from the legislative representatives of the organizations mentioned and in addition, I have been in personal contact with each of them. In each instance they have given me helpful suggestions and have agreed to work collectively with me in an effort to enact my legislative program.

With reference to H. R. 861 providing for the extension of railroad unemployment insurance benefits to July 1, 1955, it is only fair to tell you that there is a division of opinion as to the practicability of its provisions. First, because the bill may lead to Federal control over railroad unemployment insurance benefits; second, because of its effect on collective bargaining in the field of wage increases and third, the bill will establish a precedent for other unemployed groups covered by unemployment insurance as administered by the several States.

As you probably know, a new Congress such as the 84th Congress spends the first two months of the year organizing and being brought up-to-date by various agencies of the Government with respect to their legislative requests to Congress which include appropriations. The result is that unavoidable delay is encountered in perfecting legislation since it has to run the gauntlet of the various congressional committees before reaching the floor. In the meantime, you can be certain that I am not leaving any opportunity pass to expedite early consideration of my legislative proposals.

In addition to the legislative program I have described, your attention is called to Exhibit C which concerns the Government's efforts to provide employment opportunities to the unemployed in the Altoona area. This program results from my request which brought a governmental committee to Altoona for the purpose of inventorying the skills of those unemployed and seeking to obtain employment for them. As you know, this program is in full effect at this moment.

With respect to railroad unemployment insurance problems such as delays in certifying claims or the tardy receipt of checks, a complete review of the office procedure in handling these claims was made at my request with the result that through my Altoona office I have given 24-hour service and complaints have been reduced to an absolute minimum. In addition to the personnel of the Cleveland regional office of the Railroad Retirement Board being increased and authority given for overtime pay in processing unemployment insurance applications, at this moment the United States Treasury Department is setting up the machinery whereby authority is being delegated to the regional offices of the Railroad Retirement Board to write their own checks instead of the Treasury Department, thus saving a whole day in issuing them. I have spent hours in contact with officials of the Railroad Retirement Board reviewing every procedure for the purpose of eliminating delays and I feel that we have gone the limit in cutting corners.

In an effort to alleviate the unemployment problem by bringing about a diversification of industry in the Altoona area, I have been active the past several years in cooperating with individuals and groups in Altoona and my entire congressional district in furnishing information, running down leads, and otherwise aiding in trying to attract new industries. A useful information kit compiled by the United States Department of Commerce and containing material designed to assist local groups in organizing for the purpose of securing new industries has been sent to interested persons in this congressional district.

From your knowledge of Altoona, I think you will agree that the organized effort of Altoona Enterprises, Inc., is unequalled anywhere in the United States. This fact is confirmed by the United States Department of Commerce who has commended Altoona Enterprises, Inc., for its initiative and success in raising funds for the purpose of attracting new industries to the Altoona area. At frequent intervals, I have sent a list of industrial firms that the United States Department of Commerce reported as being interested in expanding their facilities mostly as a result of the Government's dispersal order under the civil defense program. This information has been furnished to all community groups in my congressional district where there is a committee organized for the purpose of seeking new industries. As you know, at my request representatives of several Government agencies visited Altoona about a month ago and conferred with officials of the Altoona group to make certain that everything possible was being done to utilize the aid of the Federal Government in diversifying industries in the Altoona area.

Over a period of weeks I have had lunch on numerous occasions with key officials of Government and labor organizations in an effort to coordinate my activities and to develop new approaches to solving the Altoona unemployment problem. In all fairness to

those with whom I have talked, they have been unable to suggest any new approach. In fact, some of these Government and labor organization officials have commended me for the determined and energetic effort I have made the past many months in trying to alleviate the unemployment situation in my congressional district.

There is attached as exhibit D several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 17 and February 18 which reveals an additional effort on my part to relieve the unemployment situation not only in Altoona but also in the central Pennsylvania area by my opposition to the unregulated flood of foreign residual oil from Venezuela that has captured the eastern seaboard coal market thus destroying the jobs of coal miners, railroaders, and those in related industries.

In regard to the series of resolutions adopted by the county and city commissioners, there is no doubt that the unemployment problem is being attacked on all fronts; namely, at the local, county, State, and national levels. With such fine spirit of cooperation, I feel that our collective efforts cannot help but produce results. In view of the activities of so many persons and groups in helping to solve the unemployment situation in Altoona, I am sending a copy of this letter to interested persons.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1955.

CHARLES A. MENTZER,
Executive Director, Altoona Community Welfare Council, Altoona, Pa.

DEAR CHARLIE: For your information, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, furnished me the following information on January 4 relative to the designation of Altoona as a disaster area:

"This has further reference to your inquiry relative to the designation of Altoona as a disaster area. The Surplus Manpower Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization has given very careful consideration to your proposal, and after consultation with the General Counsel of ODM, the Committee has found that the present Disaster Relief Act does not permit Federal assistance for the alleviation of unemployment.

"As you know, the Disaster Relief Act (42 U. S. C. 1855–1855g) authorizing Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters reflects the intent of Congress to alleviate suffering and damage resulting from major disasters, and to foster the development of such State and local organizations and plans to cope with major disasters as may be necessary. As defined in the act, the term 'major disaster' means any 'flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe' in any part of the United States."

With the ODM decision that the provisions of the Disaster Relief Act are not applicable to Altoona, I arranged a meeting with representatives of the Departments of Commerce, Labor, the Small Business Administration, and the Railroad Retirement Board, which was held in Washington this week. At this meeting Mr. Dewey Coates, former resident of Altoona, and community employment consultant, Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D. C., was named as the coordinator of the efforts the Federal Government will make to aid unemployed railroad workers in the Altoona area.

Already the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, as part of the Committee's program, has designated Mr. Merritt Robson, a Railroad Retirement Board representative from Chicago, to proceed to Altoona immediately for the purpose of determining the skills of those unemployed so that the United States Department of Labor and the Railroad Retirement Board may unite their efforts in securing employment for such persons.

Another step in the program will bring to Altoona representatives of the United States Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration, who will make an inventory of the production potential of all industries other than the railroad to aid the Altoona Chamber of Commerce and Altoona Enterprises, Inc., in their efforts to secure new industries. This Committee will function in accordance with the Eisenhower administration's directive that areas like Altoona with a very substantial labor surplus shall be given every possible assistance in rehabilitating their economy.

In addition to the Committee mentioned in the above paragraph, I introduced on January 5, 1955, H. R. 861, a copy of which is attached. This bill provides an extension of the payment of railroad unemployment insurance benefits to July 1, 1955 for the unemployed railroaders whose benefits terminated after January 1, 1955. The bill provides that the sum of $10 million shall be appropriated from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States to cover the cost of all the benefits provided in the bill. Through the extension of railroad employment insurance benefits for the first 6 months of 1955, assistance will be rendered the unemployed while they await either recall to service or obtain employment elsewhere through the united efforts of the Railroad Retirement Board and the United States Department of Labor.

In addition to H. R. 861, I introduced H. R. 860 to provide for a program of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor. This bill which I had pending in the 83d Congress when it adjourned, also provides for an appropriation of $3 billion to cover the cost of my proposed public works program.

To further assist the unemployed and their families, I introduced on January 5, 1955, H. R. 863, to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities by use of a food stamp plan, and requested that the necessary expenses of administering the food stamp plan be borne by the Federal Government.

To protect the property of all those who may be called upon to depend on public assistance from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I introduced H. R. 862, which prohibits the several States from taking a lien against the real estate of the recipient as is being done under existing law.

The legislative program for the relief of the unemployed railroaders in my congressional district outlined in this letter has been called to the attention of the leadership of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress and the chairman of the congressional committees concerned urging immediate consideration of the legislation. In addition, I am personally contacting every Member of Congress and officials of organized labor including railroad brotherhoods, asking their assistance in securing early congressional action.

As you know, the 84th Congress convened this week and it will be the early part of February before the legislative machinery will begin to function. Meanwhile, you can be certain that I shall continue my determined efforts to provide relief for the unemployed by obtaining early action on my legislative proposals.

I am sending copies of this letter to interested persons in the Altoona area for their information.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1955.

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PERCY: You will remember our recent conversation concerning my bill, H. R. 861, a copy of which is attached and which provides temporary extension to June 30, 1955, of railroad unemployment insurance benefits to those who have or will have exhausted their rights under existing laws.

There are 24 areas in the United States where a substantial number of railroad workers are unemployed because of a permanent or indefinite shutdown of railroad facilities. Starting early this month, many of these unemployed railroad workers exhausted their rights to railroad unemployment insurance with the result that there exists a most acute economic problem in these areas.

For an illustration, according to information furnished me by the Railroad Retirement Board, in Nashville, Tenn., 2,500 railroaders are unemployed and the survey reveals that the local industry other than the railroads will be able to absorb only a few of them. The result is that in your hometown of Nashville there are some 2,500 unemployed railroaders and their families who have lost or are about to lose their unemployment-insurance benefits which is their only source of income.

In my hometown of Altoona, Pa., there are 6,000 unemployed railroad workers whose unemployment-insurance benefits began to expire January 10, and in the matter of a few weeks some 4,500 will have exhausted their rights to unemployment-insurance benefits. Since Altoona's basic economy is the railroad industry, the only source of income left for these furloughed railroaders and their families is public assistance because local industries cannot provide employment for them. Therefore, my hometown has a similar acute economic problem to that of your hometown of Nashville.

At my request, the United States Department of Labor and the Railroad Retirement Board have made a survey of the Altoona situation with the result that the skills of unemployed railroaders have been classified and every effort will be made to secure employment for them elsewhere. While this effort is being made to obtain employment for this group, my bill, H. R. 861, will extend their railroad unemployment insurance benefits to the end of the present fiscal year as if they had retained their eligibility. You will observe that I have requested an appropriation of $10 million from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States so as to finance the cost of the extension and not disturb the solvency of the railroad unemployment insurance fund.

As I said in the beginning, there are 24 areas in the United States which include your hometown and my hometown that are faced with this acute economic problem resulting from unemployment in the railroad industry. I have delayed writing this letter to you so as to permit adequate time for perfecting the organization of your committee. Now that your committee is organized, it is my hope that you can give the subject of railroad unemployment top priority and arrange to discuss it at either a full committee meeting or assign it to a subcommittee so hearings can be held.

On behalf of the citizens of Altoona, I wish to inform you that everything possible is being done from a community standpoint to relieve the unemployment situation, and it is hoped that the extension of unemployment-insurance benefits will receive early consideration by your committee.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Twenty-four areas where a substantial number of railroad workers are unemployed because of a permanent or indefinite shutdown of railroad facilities

Area	Number currently unemployed	Number estimated to obtain other employment in the community	Number estimated to remain unemployed
Albany, N. Y.[1]	1,864	38	1,826
Altoona, Pa.[2]	6,000	0	6,000
Baltimore, Md	1,336	[3]	0
Birmingham, Ala	1,300	260	1,040
Buffalo, N. Y.[1]	485	100	385
Columbus, Ohio	1,107	400	707
Cumberland, Md	600	100	500
DeSoto, Mo	500	50	450
Duluth, Minn	1,450	0	1,450
El Paso, Tex	550	100	450
Harrisburg, Pa	1,723	100	1,623
Indianapolis, Ind	1,400	1,000	400
Huntingdon, W. Va.-Ashland, Ky.[1]	1,465	225	1,240
Johnstown, Pa.[2]	400	200	200
Knoxville, Tenn.[1]	700	175	525
Las Vegas, Nev	470	15	455
Nashville, Tenn	2,500	very few	2,500
Philadelphia-Reading, Pa.-Wilmington, Del.[1]	2,000	1,000	1,000
Pittsburgh, Pa. (entire district)[1]	11,642	1,100	10,542
Scranton, Pa.[2]	711	10	701
St. Louis, Mo.[1]	1,100	80	1,020
Terre Haute, Ind.[1]	800	200	600
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa.[2]	508	10	498
Williamsport-Northumberland, Pa	742	50	692

[1] Included in group IV–A areas of substantial labor surplus.
[2] Included in group IV–B areas of very substantial labor surplus.
[3] Practically all.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 25, 1955.*

To: Regional Directors, regions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

From: Director of unemployment and sickness insurance.

Subject: Railroad unemployment, Altoona, Pa.

Please refer to our memorandum of January 18, 1955, on the above subject. In that memorandum we mentioned that unemployment of railroad workers in Altoona, Pa., is attracting national attention and informed you that you would be requested to ask your field offices to develop orders for recruitment in Altoona as soon as information was available from the inventory of unemployed railroad workers then in progress.

Attached is a tabulation showing by age groups the number of unemployed railroad workers in Altoona (Blair County) in each occupation or occupational group listed. A majority of these claimants have already been paid the maximum amount of UI benefits to which they are entitled this benefit year. A high proportion do not have enough 1954 earnings to be qualified next year.

You are requested to forward this tabulation to each field office in your region and ask them to contact all railroad hiring officials who might possibly have need for the services of employees in any of the occupations listed. Any orders developed are to be written up on form ES–113a and forwarded direct to the district manager at Altoona, Pa. All sections of form ES–113a should be carefully completed. Depending on the conditions of the order, particularly arrangements for transportation and physical examination requirements, the district manager at Altoona will either (1) refer applicants in person direct to the hiring official shown on the order, or (2) will forward to the hiring official an application form similar to exhibit A of FOM–III–4.

Please request your field offices to give top priority to this attempt to develop orders for recruitment in Altoona. It is requested that all hiring officials be contacted and all possible clearance orders obtained and forwarded to Altoona no later than February 4, 1955.

H. L. CARTER.

Active claimants, Jan. 1, 1955, Altoona, Pa. (Blair County)

Occupational groups	Age groups						Total
	Under 25	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 and over	
Group 1: Executives, professional men, telegraphers, and clerks	12	34	9	7	1	0	63
Group 2:							
Trainmen and enginemen:							
Brakemen	13	57	20	2	1	0	93
Firemen	0	20	46	41	8	0	115
Switchmen	1	3	1	1	1	0	7
Group 3:							
Skilled trades journeymen:							
Blacksmith	0	3	12	2	2	0	19
Boilermaker	0	2	7	5	2	1	17
Carman	0	45	73	22	6	0	146
Electrician	1	18	49	14	1	0	83
Machinist	0	56	147	56	9	4	272
Molder	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
Mason	0	0	3	1	0	0	4
Painter and Painter B. & B	8	29	9	0	0	0	46
Pipefitter	0	15	41	11	0	0	67
Sheetmetal worker	1	3	22	9	4	0	39
Welder	3	11	31	8	1	0	54
Upholsterer	4	2	0	0	0	0	6
Group 4:							
Skilled trade helpers and apprentices:							
Blacksmith helper	1	23	19	11	5	3	62
Carman helper	3	157	172	67	9	0	408
Electrician helper and apprentice	13	57	52	13	0	1	136
Machinist helper and apprentice	15	43	134	50	10	0	252
Miscellaneous helpers and apprentices	9	45	54	30	8	5	151
Pipefitter helper and apprentices	0	14	33	10	3	0	60
Group 5: Laborers, baggage express and freight handlers	45	684	794	416	115	10	2,064
Group 6: Attendants, cooks, porters and waiters	2	4	6	13	6	0	31
Total	131	1,327	1,735	790	192	24	4,199

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 17, 1955]

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule because it will not permit amendments to H. R. 1 when it is read under the 5-minute rule.

This closed rule is a gag rule and denies me as a representative of some 300,000 people to offer amendments to the bill that will protect their interests as American wage earners.

We who live in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, have made every effort possible to obtain relief from the adverse effects of the unlimited and unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil which is one of the main factors in wrecking our economy. Unless those of us from coal-producing States are permitted to offer amendments to H. R. 1 curbing the flood of foreign residual oil, we have no other means of stopping it.

The unemployment in my congressional district is mounting daily and as of January 1, 1955, there were 18 percent of our employables unemployed. It is in the name of the unemployed in my district who are today living on public assistance and surplus food commodities, that I ask that this closed rule be defeated.

I am sure that the membership of this House if given an opportunity to vote on an amendment providing for a 10 percent quota limitation on the importation of foreign residual oil that such an amendment will be approved overwhelmingly, since it will restore employment and also protect the jobs of those presently employed.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, 1955]

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the opposition expressed by a great many Members of this House to the gag rule now in effect on H. R. 1 reveals the feeling on the part of a great percentage of the American people that this legislation should be open for amendments.

I opposed the gag rule yesterday, and shall vote to recommit the bill. If the motion to recommit the bill fails, I shall vote against H. R. 1 on final passage because the interests of American wage earners are not protected.

After all, it is only through appropriate amendments that the jobs of American wage earners can be protected.

As the printed hearings on H. R. 1 will show, a long list of Members of Congress as well as spokesmen for numerous industries appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee pleading that H. R. 1 be amended in order that relief might be provided to many of our basic industries which have suffered because of the unfair competition resulting from a flood of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

Many Members of Congress who appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in protest against the damaging effects on the jobs of American wage earners resulting from reciprocal trade agreements have supported the principle of reciprocal trade in previous Congresses but to use their own words—they could not continue to do so any longer unless appropriate amendments were adopted.

When I first came to Congress in 1939 I opposed reciprocal trade agreements on the grounds that they were destroying the jobs of coal miners in my congressional district in Pennsylvania. At that time, imported Russian coal had captured some of the eastern seaboard coal markets from coal producers in my congressional district.

During the early part of World War II and before resigning my seat in Congress to return to military service, I supported the extension of reciprocal trade agreements in the 78th Congress because we were at war and the demand for coal revived our coal industry.

When I was elected to the 80th Congress I voted in favor of extending reciprocal trade agreements with the understanding that American industries would be protected from

unfair competition resulting from a flood of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

For example, in Pennsylvania residual oil from Venezuela was beginning to flood the eastern seaboard, thus destroying the market for Pennsylvania-mined coal.

During the 82d Congress I voted to extend reciprocal trade agreements because there was contained therein the so-called peril-point amendment which was designed to provide a checkrein on imports that could destroy the jobs of American wage earners.

During the 83d Congress I joined many of my colleagues in an effort to stop the uncontrolled flow of foreign goods. Many of you will recall that we were supporting the Simpson bill. My special interest was in regulating the flood of foreign residual oil by placing a quota limitation on the importation of such oil. As many of you will recall, the Simpson bill was returned to the committee.

During the early part of 1954 the so-called Randall committee was created and took testimony from spokesmen for industries adversely affected by the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign goods. I regret to state that the coal industry was denied the opportunity to present its side of the case. Consequently the Randall report ignored the increasingly serious situation existing in the coal-producing States of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, by my votes as a Member of Congress there is ample proof that I believe in the principles of reciprocal trade agreements and that I supported them until I found a wholesale disregard for protecting the jobs of American workmen.

It became evident that the so-called peril-point amendment was meaningless and that the Randall committee merely performed a window-dressing job and actually by their recommendations threw American wage earners to the wolves.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the extension of reciprocal trade agreements last year and I intend to continue to do so until the interest of the American working man is protected.

As a means of attaining the objective of protecting the jobs of American workmen, I have 3 bills pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, namely: H. R. 345, H. R. 864, and H. R. 3019.

H. R. 345 is designed to provide a 5-percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil; while H. R. 3019 would increase the limitation to 10 percent.

H. R. 864 provides a permanent procedure for the adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis and regulates the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles. H. R. 864 also contains a 5-percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 1 because it will continue the disastrous effects on our economy by the reckless importation of foreign goods manufactured at a fraction of the wages paid American workmen.

For several weeks the House Ways and Means Committee has heard expert testimony from spokesmen for various industries regarding the adverse effects reciprocal trade agreements are having on our industrial economy. These experts produced facts showing that the employees of the industry affected not only lost their jobs but many of the manufacturing plants have been driven to financial distress, and in some instances were forced to close their doors.

Spokesmen for the coal industry told how the flood of foreign residual oil from Venezuela has destroyed the domestic coal markets of the miners in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia.

Back in 1939 when I first voiced my opposition to the importation of slave-mined Russian coal and other cheaply manufactured foreign products, I predicted that such a reckless policy would create ghost towns out of many communities in my congressional district and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, my prediction of 1939 has become a reality. Practically all of our deep mines in central Pennsylvania are closed and thousands of miners have been out of work for several years. In fact, many mining towns have been abandoned and their empty and dilapidated rows of houses stand as a monument to the destructive effects of the importation of foreign residual oil. Because they have nowhere to go, there are only a few of the unemployed in the coalfields of central Pennsylvania that have left the area. The result is that today, according to the United States Department of Labor, my congressional district is classified as a critical area because of the fact that nearly 18 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed.

This unemployment is not confined to coal miners, but includes those employed in affected related industries such as the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, in my home city of Altoona, Pa., nearly 10,000 people are unemployed, 6,000 of whom are railroad employees with 4,100 of this number having exhausted their rights on January 10, 1955 to railroad unemployment insurance benefits. A similar condition exists among coal miners and others who have lost their right to unemployment compensation benefits from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, every community in my congressional district has an active committee engaged in trying to attract new industries and millions of dollars have been raised by voluntary subscription to finance this long-range program of rehabilitating the industrial economy of the area.

While this united community effort goes on, thousands of my constituents—all good Americans and victims of this reckless foreign-trade policy—are today dependent for their existence upon public assistance and surplus food commodities.

I regret that every member of this Committee is unable to talk to these unemployed Americans as they stand in line to pick up their food coupons. If it were possible for you to talk to them, you would hear the pitiful story of their plight as citizens of a nation that boasts of its high standard of living.

As I mentioned a moment ago, communities affected by unemployment in cooperation with the State and Federal Government are endeavoring to rehabilitate their economy by attracting new industries. The unemployment situation, however, is getting worse as mines continue to close and more miners and railroaders are losing their jobs.

While this unfortunate situation prevails in the United States, residents of Venezuela, which is the chief exporter of residual oil, are enjoying unbridled prosperity.

Let me read you excerpts from Hal Boyle's syndicated column of January 24, 1955, titled "Venezuela Seen as the Texas of South America":

"So much money is being made here (Venezuela) that visiting Texans actually get an inferiority complex and the United States dollar feels like 50 cents. * * * The visitor has a dazed sensation he is caught in a mid-century Klondike gold rush. The atmosphere of quick money is overwhelming, and tales of riches made overnight are a bolivar a dozen. * * * Venezuela is bigger than Texas and Oklahoma combined and larger than any European country except Germany. * * * Its chief income is from oil—no land except the United States produces more. * * *

"Although the nation has a population of only 5½ million, the Government spent half a billion dollars in 1954 on vast public-works projects and still ended up with $80 million left in the till. * * * Foreign investors from the United States and Europe are pouring untold millions into the industrialization of the country. It has taken in more than 100,000 immigrants from Europe the last 10 years. * * *

"Caracas, the 388-year-old capital, is now one of the world's greatest boom cities. Fifty years ago milkmen herded cows through its ancient streets. Today they are jammed by thousands of new high-priced motorcars. * * * Nearly a million people live in the metropolitan area, and so many new buildings are going up construction workers have no time to even take Sundays off to go to the bullfights.

"But the city has abysmal poverty as well as tremendous wealth. The shanties of the poor still crowd many of the raw red hills that stud Caracas. The Government has torn down thousands of these eyesores and replaced them with forty 15-story apartment buildings at a cost of $24 million. Workmen can rent the apartments for $6 to $30 a month, own them after a period of 20 years.

"In 1955 the Government plans to tear down 6,500 more shacks and spend $25 million more on apartment projects for low-income workers."

Mr. Chairman, what a contrast it is to compare living conditions in Venezuela with the coal fields of Pennsylvania.

May I add that the prosperity enjoyed in Venezuela is to a great extent at the expense of the misery and suffering of residents of the coal-producing States of our Nation and especially of my congressional district.

At this very minute a quarter of a million ton tanker ship is tied up at an east coast dock carrying disaster to the coal, railroad and related industries of this Nation, in much the same manner as rat-infested vessels brought disease into our port cities in years gone by.

This foreign tanker with its bunker space filled with residual oil is dumping it in violation of every American concept of fair competition. As a matter of fact, even if the miners of our Nation would work for nothing and the railroads transported the coal for practically nothing, the coal industry could not compete with this unfair competition from foreign residual oil because its price is continually manipulated downward to capture the eastern seaboard coal market.

Mr. Chairman, it is being said in defense of residual oil that the oil companies have been requested to restrict voluntarily the amount of residual oil imported quarterly.

It has also been said that if any restrictions are placed on the importation of foreign residual oil that we will offend Venezuela.

Let me state, Mr. Chairman, that every time a coal miner loses his job because of the unfair competition from foreign residual oil a railroader has also been added to the list of the unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent coal-producing States recognize foreign residual oil as the archenemy of our industrial economy.

Therefore, I plead with you that H. R. 1 be returned to committee so that appropriate amendments can be adopted.

As far as I am concerned, it is about time we start adopting some of the policies foreign nations apply against us in protecting the jobs of their industrial workers.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1 without appropriate amendments will not correct the unemployment situation and afford the necessary relief to distressed industries and therefore I cannot conscientiously vote for it.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title XVI, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation

Commission the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER, and the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. COON.

THE LATE FREDERICK HERBERT BROWN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a great fighter for the cause of right, a doer of good deeds, and a stalwart of the Democratic Party has departed this mortal scene.

Frederick Herbert Brown died a few days ago at his home in Somersworth, N. H., and I cannot let this sad occasion pass without paying my tribute to the memory of this former Member of the United States Senate who was a leader and an inspiration of the New Deal at the height of its power.

His death at the age of 75 recalled his long years of public service in a variety of important and responsible posts on local, State, and national levels.

In his rise Fred Brown carried the banner of the Democratic Party to rare victories in New Hampshire, where he was elected Governor in 1922 and United States Senator 10 years later.

Previously he had served with distinction as city solicitor of Somersworth, a member of the State constitutional convention, and, for 8 years, as mayor of that community. He was, also, during this period, United States district attorney and a member of the electoral college, casting a ballot for the Woodrow Wilson-Thomas Marshall ticket in 1912.

Renowned as an athlete in his youth, when he starred for Dartmouth College and, later, the Boston Braves, he carried sportsmanship from the baseball field into the arena of politics. He fought hard but cleanly for the principles in which he believed.

One of his greatest and most successful battles in the Senate, to which he came directly from the bench of his State's public service commission, was in behalf of legislation outlawing utility holding companies except those essential to operation of single systems.

He fought and helped to win this victory for protection of consumers against the practices of financial jugglers who used the holding companies to siphon off illicit profits at the expense of the rate payers.

Before his long illness struck him down and forced him to relinquish official duties Senator Brown served creditably but briefly as Comptroller General of the United States and as a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

He was a close friend and adviser of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt who found Senator Brown's sagacity, his penetrating humor, and his deep sense of justice a source of invaluable aid.

Frederick Herbert Brown was a man who rose to professional and public eminence to meet the needs of his times on the national scene, yet who never lost the common touch or contact with the New England soil from which he sprang.

Of him it may be said: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 105 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 5, 1955, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make such investigations and studies as it deems advisable with respect to any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That effective from January 3, 1955, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into the following matters within its jurisdiction—

"(1) the competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; the preservation of the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation; expedition of the operations of the regulatory bodies; the adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and for the expanding needs of our growing economy;

"(2) the allocation of channels to radio and television stations; educational television; subscription and theater television; the administration by the Federal Communications Commission of the statutes which it administers;

"(3) the treatment of nonscheduled and feeder airline carriers; improvements to air safety; the restrictions placed on American air carriers which impede the free flow of commerce; rates and continuance of subsidy payments; airport construction, and hazards of adjacency to airports; condemnation of air space; aircraft and airline liability;

"(4) the adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure provisions of the Securities Acts measured in terms of the purposes intended and the practice in distribution and underwriting; the adequacy of the protection to investors in investment companies; the adequacy of the current protection to customers of broker-dealers; the expediting of the liquidation of the work under the Public Utility Holding Company Act in the simplification and integration of utility holding companies;

"(5) the availability and adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the expanding needs of our growing economy; the development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; the expediting of rate cases;

"(6) advertising generally, fair competition, and the administration of such statutes administered by the Federal Trade Commission;

"(7) research in weather, including air pollution and smog; artificially induced weather, and the sovereignty of a cloud;

"(8) the effects of inflation upon the benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment provisions; inequities in provisions of the statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security system; and the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board;

"(9) provision for medical care; the adequacy of supply of hospitals, treatment centers, nursing homes, medical personnel, and medical teaching facilities; research into human disease; the operations of the Public Health Service, and of the Food and Drug Administration;

"(10) research in the basic sciences being undertaken by the National Science Foundation;

"(11) disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and

"(12) the current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; the current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such production and supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternate source materials:

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

"For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a regular resolution reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. It has been amended to conform with the suggestions of the Committee on Rules and has been unanimously approved by our committee. So far as I know, there has been no objection to it.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules if he is referring to the bill which was under

consideration before his committee this morning.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman refer to the tax bill?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, the tax bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, that bill and one other bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Under the circumstances, in view of the fact that the Committee on Rules has not yet reported the rule and not knowing whether or not they will, and because of the fact that this whole matter has been handled rather expeditiously and in the best interests of all Members of the House and probably even of the country, I am constrained to object to the filing of the report at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 91) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That effective from January 3, 1955, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

"(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

"(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

"(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

"(4) relating to the effectiveness of United States programs of assistance and information; and

"(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

"Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

"The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire, and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was acted on by the Committee on Rules unanimously. This is the usual resolution giving the Committee on Foreign Affairs the customary power of investigation. This resolution gives the committee authority to make a survey and investigation of all branches of the State Department and other matters pertaining to our foreign relations. I do not know of any opposition to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress passed the so-called Formosa resolution a couple of weeks ago, by a vote of 409 to 3 in the House and 85 to 3 in the Senate, I think we all believed that our position was clear, that our leaders knew where we were going and that Red China and the men in the Kremlin were being put on notice as to our intentions.

As of today, it seems to me that confusion has replaced determination among some of our leaders in the executive branch and that the Communist dictators, instead of being given notice that we would not acquiesce in any further aggression in the area of Formosa, apparently are being invited to bargain with us for territory held by the Nationalist Government of China.

The key to the whole situation seems to be whether or not we are ready to help Nationalist China defend Quemoy and Matsu.

Evidently Foreign Minister Chou of Red China thinks we are not. He still boldly asserts that he will take Formosa by force of arms; and that the Tachens which we refused to help defend provide the first stepping stone. There are few to deny that Quemoy and the Matsu group will be next unless we dispel all doubt as to what we will do.

Our friends, the British, according to the papers, are dismayed at the harshness of the resolution. They are out to soften us up and Mr. Eden goes to the Bangkok conference, one of his avowed purposes being to convince us that we have no stake in Quemoy and Matsu and to lead us further down the road of appeasement.

Chiang Kai-shek, thinking that we would announce to the world without equivocation that we would help defend Quemoy and Matsu, stands aghast that there is confusion on that point.

The other non-Communist peoples of Asia stand with their fingers crossed, still doubting that we would fire a gun if Matsu and Quemoy are attacked.

I am sorry that our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, did not, in his speech of February 16, make the position of the United States crystal clear in this connection.

With his statement that "the United States has no commitment and no purpose to defend the coastal positions as such" I find no quarrel, but he might have gone further and said that on the basis of our best military advice, if Quemoy and Matsu are lost, the job of defending Formosa will be much more difficult and costly, and we would defend them on that basis.

It is true that it is good military policy not to tell your enemy what points you are going to defend, but where the strategic importance of a defense point is obvious to both sides we lose no military advantage by declaring our intentions.

I am glad that the Secretary called to the attention of the world that "a great danger in Asia is the fear of many non-Communist peoples that the United States has no real intention of standing firmly behind them. Already that fear has mounted to the danger point."

He said further:

If the non-Communist Asians ever come to feel that their Western allies are disposed to retreat whenever communism threatens the peace, then the entire area could quickly become indefensible.

I, of course, cannot speak for the executive department of our Government. I cannot say with authority what our foreign policy and commitments abroad are. I can say, however, and I feel that I am duty bound to say that, as the sponsor of the Formosan resolution and chairman of the committee which unanimously reported it to the House, it was and is my understanding that the United States would defend Quemoy and Matsu as necessary outposts for the defense of the Pescadores and Formosa.

This House in authorizing the President to defend Formosa did not believe that this action was intended merely to provide propaganda or to try to buy a cease-fire agreement with territory held by Nationalist China. When we acted as we did on the resolution, I am sure that it was because we were convinced that it was vital to the security of the United States that Formosa should be defended and that we expected the President to use the authority granted him for that purpose.

The congressional authority to secure Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack said:

This authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

It was made plain that our military experts think that Matsu and Quemoy are among the related positions necessary for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Let me repeat in order to make my own position clear. As the sponsor of the Formosan resolution in the House, I understood after consultation with and evidence from the executive department, bolstered by military opinion, that if we were going to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we would assuredly defend Quemoy and Matsu. It was made to appear just as plain as that to me.

If Quemoy and Matsu were needed for the defense of Formosa 2 weeks ago, it seems to me that they are needed for this purpose today and that they will be just as essential for this purpose next year and the year after that. If these islands are given to Red China as part of the price for a cease-fire agreement, where will we be a year from now, or 2 years from now, if the Communist leaders fail to live up to the agreement?

I believe, and the Congress believed, when we authorized the President to defend Formosa that he was prepared to use the resources of this Nation for such defense. We can easily bargain away our strength in the Far East, not only by our loss of strategtic territory but even more important by the loss of the confidence of the free peoples of that area that they can count on our help.

I do not believe that a cease-fire bought on such terms will lead to peace. I thought we were telling the Communist dictators 2 weeks ago that the United States had taken a firm stand and that we believed that a policy of strength and determination was the surest way to peace. Rubber words by the executive branch can only weaken us at home and abroad in this emergency.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, had made the speech he just made when we were considering the resolution on Formosa. Some of us were complaining that we did not know where the line was drawn. I have stated that apparently the Foreign Affairs Committee knew, the Security Council knew, the military people knew, and the State Department knew, but Members of Congress who represent the people back home were not entitled to know where the line was to be drawn.

Nothing was made clear as to where that line would be, and when we asked if it included the islands of Matsu and Quemoy, we were told, "Hush, hush. You should not know that; do not tip your hand on this thing." Yet the gentleman, who was the chairman of the committee, sponsored a hazy resolution, one which was not clear. He brought it in here before the Congress and said, "This is it, accept it." I voted for it with the understanding that it was going to make clear the position of this Government in relation to the Communist. I think it did just that. The gentleman now has the temerity to blame the administration because he sponsored a resolution which he says was unclear and does muddy the waters. So he comes now and asks, "Why do you not do something about it?" Yet he did not have the frankness and the courage to tell the House of Representatives where that line should be drawn when the problem was under consideration.

I submit to the gentleman from South Carolina that the next time he brings in a resolution that he has the same frankness in his foresight that he has in his hindsight. Then perhaps the Members of the House of Representatives will know something about the resolution upon which they may express their judgment.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from South Carolina made it as plain as he could when this resolution was brought before the House that he considered the spirit of the resolution to cover the defense by arms of Quemoy and Matsu. I made that just as plain as I could. Some other people may be hazy on the subject but I was not and so stated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will read the debates on the subject he will know that Members of the Congress did raise the question of where the line of defense would be. I state again that if the gentleman had made the speech he made this morning at the time we were discussing the resolution, there would be little of which to complain. His resolution was so hazy and confusing that Members of Congress were not quite sure where this mystery line was to be drawn as to the defense of Formosa. I am sure the President will exercise sound judgment in carrying out the provisions of the Formosa resolution. As a Member of Congress I trust future resolutions will spell out clearly our intention. The chairman bringing in resolutions has a duty to make crystal clear where defense lines will be.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, now that this subject has been brought up I think a little plain speaking will do some good. We have heard a lot about bipartisan policies in our foreign affairs.

We had a meeting in April of last year which was very important, one that was called by the Secretary of State. We also had another one. Both of these were high policy meetings where it was expected the legislative leaders would commit themselves or make a commitment—at least that was my impression. Those meetings should have been called by the President. Those were meetings that should have been on the Presidential level. But they were called by the Secretary of State. I remember well what the meeting last April was called for. It was that the leaders in the Congress, you and I, would commit ourselves in Indochina without any assistance from any other country. We were definitely told by the Secretary of State that the President asked him to call the meeting, and if he did not make that statement I would assume he did anyway.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Did the majority leader have the understanding when the Formosa resolution was under discussion that there was a definite line drawn as the gentleman who sponsored the resolution said there was?

Mr. MCCORMACK. My impression is absolutely in line with that of the gentleman from South Carolina on the Formosa resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does he think that expression was definitely outlined here when it was under discussion?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I do not know. I certainly think that the debates clearly show that such an impression did exist. I remember the speech I made where I said it called for unity, and a firm position on the part of the representatives of the people of the United States. Certainly no other construction could be

placed upon such language than that. I know what the conversation was and I know what they said to us, and the gentleman from South Carolina is to be highly complimented for the speech he made today.

Now, coming back to what I started to say, so far as I am concerned, outside of one meeting before Christmas, or several weeks before Christmas, there was really no necessity for calling that meeting, because I knew nothing more after I left than I did when I came down from Boston to attend it. Outside of that, and one just prior to Christmas, which I could not attend, there have been two high policy meetings, one in April of last year and one this year before the Formosan resolution. They were held by leaders of both branches in the Secretary of State's office. Admiral Radford was there. No other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were present at any of those meetings. I thought it very strange that there was not another member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff present last April, and I asked Admiral Radford if the views that he expressed then represented the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to my surprise he said, "No." Then Senator CLEMENTS asked him later, "What was the division?" And he said, "The others did not agree with me." Now, there are four members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and "the others" in number are three.

Now, we had a meeting with the Secretary of State on the Formosan resolution, and the next Monday the Republican Members had a meeting with the President on the contents of the message in relation to the Formosan resolution. It seems to me that the contents of a message are just as much bipartisan as any other part of the consideration which entered into the making of the message. I do not know whether the Speaker knew about the contents of the message on Formosa, but I had a copy of the message, when it was handed to me, when it was about a third through being read and when it was being handed to the Members of the House. I later found out that the Speaker—according to my recollection of what he told me—received a copy of the President's message about 5 minutes before it arrived here or was read. Now, you can do your own evaluating, but my evaluation is that that is not leadership in the White House that results in real bipartisan action, and we Democrats, under restraint and at a great sacrifice, have been giving the country the greatest exhibition of bipartisanship on the part of the Democratic Party that the country could possibly expect. They can continue such course if they want to; I cannot stop it.

On the ticker today there is a statement made by the President about the program of the House. I do not even know when messages are coming up. It is immaterial to me, but we ought to know. The Democratic leadership is still the majority leadership in the House. I do not expect to be consulted by the President on domestic matters or the leadership of the House, but certainly on foreign matters it is a different proposition; at least, we ought to be advised when things are coming up here, because the House looks to the majority leadership to inform them as to the program of the House. Yet, I have never been advised by the White House as to when any message is coming up here. I have to go and ask the Republican leaders as to when any messages are coming up. While I like the Republican leadership, it is rather embarrassing for me to have to go to the Republican leaders as to when a message is coming up to this body from the White House.

Now, on the ticker today is a statement by the President at a press conference that he knows SAM RAYBURN so well that if Sam wants to know what he is going to do, he can call him up or something to that effect. He overlooks the fact that he is talking about the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He overlooks the fact that the initiative ought to come from him. Certainly he ought to keep the constituted leadership of both parties advised. He keeps the Republican leadership advised. At least, he ought to keep some of us advised. I do not expect the President to pick up the phone, but some of his administrative assistants can do it, or the secretary acting for the President. Certainly, they ought to keep the Democratic leadership advised as to matters coming up in this branch.

So far as I am concerned, it does not mean anything personally to me, but from the angle of leadership and coordinated action, from the angle of the country, it seems to me that the White House or someone acting for the President or the President through someone acting for him should keep not only the Republican leadership advised on matters of importance to the House but should keep the Democratic leadership advised.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I somewhat regret that things have taken the turn here that they have. I do not quarrel with the right of the gentleman from South Carolina, who is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to make the statement he has just made, although I do not agree with parts of it. As the chairman of that committee he had the initial responsibility for the Formosan resolution.

I still believe that the action of the President in submitting that proposition to the Congress of the United States was one of the finest things that has happened in respect to our foreign affairs in a long, long time. It demonstrated not only a sincere devotion to the traditional constitutional doctrines of our Government, but I think, more importantly than that, it afforded a way by which we could make known to the world, to our people, and to the peoples of other lands, both potential enemies and friends, where we stood with respect to continuing threats of aggression by the sword-rattling Red Chinese war lords.

To my mind, that resolution was sufficiently definite. Obviously, with various outlying related areas involved, it was not practical, in the nature of our own operation, to try to spell out every little detail of our policy. The thing I think we ought to hold fast to is that affirmative action was taken and a line sufficiently definite has been drawn. I think it is highly desirable that there is yet a certain area where decisions and determinations may be made, may I say, by people who in my opinion, in this most delicate, critical time are eminently qualified to make those decisions.

The situation is so sensitive that I sincerely hope that for whatever reason we may want to speak we do not rock the boat too much. I still believe we are going to win through the difficult situation that confronts us without becoming involved in any war. That certainly ought to be the heart's desire of every right-thinking American.

Now in respect to what the gentleman from Massachusetts has spoken about, concerning bipartisanship in foreign policy and in domestic policy, he will recall with me, I am quite sure, that one day a few years back I was in the position he how occupies. I was the majority leader of the Republican 80th Congress when our President was Mr. Harry S. Truman. I want him to recall with me that as the majority leader in that Republican Congress I was sent for to come to the White House to have there presented to us the Greek-Turkey aid, the interim aid to France and Italy, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact. Will he not agree with me when he speaks of bipartisan cooperation that we there cooperated? It is a matter of record also that after we were defeated in 1948, I was not called back to the White House. I did not get any communication from the White House or anybody down there until things began to go bad in Korea. The gentleman speaks of the meeting last April. I thought it was a satisfactory meeting. He can claim all the credit he wants to, but we have not been plunged into any more Koreas and we were not committed in Indochina.

I was privileged to attend the meeting which was called last December. Possibly the gentleman thought he did not know any more when he left than when he came, but I did not feel that way about it.

I was not invited to the last meeting held before the Formosan resolution. The gentleman from Massachusetts was there. I was not there so I am not in a position to speak as to the conversations at that time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. With reference to that particular point, may I say I was in attendance at this meeting at the State Department, not because I happened to be a part of the leadership of the House but only because of the fact that the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, the ranking Republican member of the committee, was not able to be present. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, was present. We heard for the first time some of the suggestions with relation to what might be done about Formosa. The gentleman from Massachusetts was there. The Speaker was there, CARL VINSON was there, all from the majority side. I do

not recall whether the gentleman from North Carolina, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, was there, but I think he was. We had a free exchange of ideas and opinions at that time with the Secretary of State and Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After that I attended a leadership meeting at the White House, and during a general and usual discussion of matters which regularly come before such weekly meetings we also discussed the Formosa situation, but this was after the initial meeting held at the State Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who went to the White House?

Mr. ARENDS. The Republican leadership went to the White House later on a date subsequent to the meeting at the State Department, when the Formosa matter I have just referred to was discussed, along with other items.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get to the second matter about which the gentleman from Massachusetts talked because I think, first of all, it is highly important that in respect to our foreign affairs we try to avoid political considerations as far as possible. May I remind you again, as one who was in a position similar to that occupied by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I certainly proved my devotion to that sort of operation. Now the gentleman speaks of a separate meeting of the Republican leaders to discuss the message that came up on Formosa. I do not recall any such meeting. I was not present at any such meeting. My recollection is that on the occasion of our regular meetings at the White House, discussing many other things that were properly a matter for discussion, only between the Republican leaders and the President and the people at the White House, there may have been some further discussion about the resolution, but I just want the gentleman to understand that so far as I am concerned and so far as I know the action of the President in connection with the Formosan resolution was wholly and completely on a nonpartisan—I think that is a better way to say it—on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that the newspapers carried the story and the gentleman's name was not among those who were present on the Monday morning that the message came up. I want to say that for the record. That confirms what the gentleman has said. But they did mention the names of those who were there to go over the message. Now I am sure, whether it is a bipartisan or a nonpartisan action, call it anything you want to—I am sure that that would be part of the bipartisan action. Will the gentleman agree or disagree that the contents of a message certainly are a part of bipartisan action?

Mr. HALLECK. I think in any discussion which involves a matter like the Formosan resolution, of course, the resolution would be the thing that you are talking about. I had understood that that was discussed at the meeting which was held by the Secretary of State. As I say, I was not there. But I would say to the gentleman very quickly, speaking for myself, that the content of the resolution we would be asked to adopt certainly ought to be a matter for discussion with the Democratic as well as the Republican leaders.

Under the rules of the House, I understand that messages coming up here are to be transmitted to the Speaker. Of course, as far as I am concerned, and as far as I believe now, that practice will be followed, whatever departure there may have been from that requirement in the past. I have every reason to believe any message properly within those rules will be transmitted to the Speaker, in the manner agreed upon.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not so important. That can be easily adjusted.

Mr. HALLECK. I thought the gentleman made that appear to be quite important.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I did. But I have Members on my side who have come to me and asked me, "John, can you tell me what messages are coming up next week?" I have to tell them, "No, I cannot tell you because I do not know." I telephoned my Republican leadership and asked them if they could let me know so that I could advise the Members. That can be very easily taken care of, and I am sure after this colloquy today, it will be, or at least ought to be. But the gentleman will recognize the fact, at least that if you were majority leader, you would want to know when messages are coming up, would you not?—not as an individual but as representing the leadership in this body.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit me, the important messages——

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I mean.

Mr. HALLECK. The important messages certainly were referred to in the state of the Union message and the dates were fixed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, the President made that. He made that himself.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; and as I remember that timetable was pretty well followed, was it not?

Mr. McCORMACK. The President came up by himself on the message on the state of the Union, but other messages, like the Health Department——

Mr. HALLECK. The dates with respect to those were fixed, and the messages came up here on the days when the President had said in his state of the Union message that they would come up here, I think with few exceptions. In any event, in cases where the original timetable was changed advance notice was given of the new date. The gentleman is much too wise and informed to not understand that certainly the time of arrival of these messages was well publicized.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on House Resolution 91.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Anfuso	Fino	Meader
Avery	Flood	Merrow
Baker	Fulton	Miller, N. Y.
Baumhart	Gamble	Morrison
Becker	Garmatz	Nelson
Blitch	Granahan	Norblad
Bolton, Frances P.	Green, Pa.	O'Brien, N. Y.
	Griffiths	Philbin
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gubser	Phillips
	Gwinn	Prouty
Bowler	Hays, Ohio	Radwan
Boyle	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Broyhill	Hinshaw	Riehlman
Burnside	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Jensen	St. George
Carrigg	Judd	Scott
Celler	Kearney	Scrivner
Chatham	Keating	Sheehan
Christopher	Kilgore	Shelley
Chudoff	King, Pa.	Sheppard
Church	Klein	Sieminski
Corbett	Kluczynski	Smith, Wis.
Curtis, Mo.	Knox	Spence
Davidson	Knutson	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Thompson, Mich.
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	
Derounian	McConnell	Thompson, N. J.
Dingell	McCulloch	Tumulty
Dixon	McDonough	Velde
Dollinger	McDowell	Wainwright
Dolliver	McGregor	Wharton
Dorn, N. Y.	Macdonald	Withrow
Eberharter	Machrowicz	Wolcott
Engle	Mack, Ill.	Yates
Fallon	Martin	Young
Fine	Mason	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have one more Member who wants to speak. I was going to object to ordering the previous question, and I had not used up all of my time.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had not yielded back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois desires, the previous question will be vacated, and without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I think the statements which have been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] rather got away from the point which was being made by the chairman of the House

Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. RICHARDS].

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] was asking where does the administration now stand on the defense of Quemoy and Matsu? Some days ago I listened to the debate by the gentleman from South Carolina on this particular point. It was my understanding at that time, as was stated by the gentleman from South Carolina today, that we would defend Quemoy and Matsu because both were necessary to the primary defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

As the Members of this body will recall, there was raised later that day in the other body the question of the Chinese Nationalists using these two island groups as an invasion base to the mainland of China. At that point in the debate the President issued a statement through the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other body that he, the President, would at all times have control over the military operations in order that the Chinese Nationalists could not get us into a war without our consent. With these reservations it was my understanding, as stated by the gentleman from South Carolina, that we would keep possession of Quemoy and the Matsus.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] have both made excellent statements here this afternoon with reference to the necessity of unanimity on the Formosa resolution, and the necessity also of working closely together in the House of Representatives when matters having to do with foreign affairs arise in debate. After the exchange of views between those two had finished I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle saw that there was not a great deal of political party difference over the matter under question.

Today every nation in Asia is watching us to determine what action we are going to take with reference to Quemoy and Matsu. And more important, whether or not we are going to use those islands as bargaining points with Communist China in order to get a cease-fire over Formosa. I have been somewhat disturbed, as I am sure many of my colleagues have during the past few days, over the activities which some other governments are carrying on to get the United States to yield on this point. It was not my understanding that this administration intended to use these islands as bargaining points to buy peace in the Far East.

In all matters in which I have watched the gentleman from South Carolina he has decried partisanship when it came to foreign affairs on the floor of this House. It seems to me that he is to be commended for the forthrightness with which he has presented this problem here and the sincerity with which he has made this statement because it raises a serious question going to the very heart of the way in which we conduct our foreign relations in the Far East. How we handle Quemoy and Matsu could make all the difference in the world as to whether or not we can hold some of our smaller allies in the Far East. The Formosa issue is the psychological barometer of our standing in Asia. If we yield on this, due to Chinese Communist pressure on our allies, we are in for some real trouble.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies, including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1955.*

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 150) providing for the consideration of H. R. 3952, a bill to amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, making in order the consideration of H. R. 3952, known as the cotton-acreage bill.

I am not going to take a great deal of time to go into a discussion of the merits of this legislation. I simply want to make a few pertinent observations.

No. 1, there is urgent need for the enlargement of the acreage in order to take care of certain hardship cases. When the allocation of the acreage was made last fall on a largely reduced basis over the previous years, some 8 or 9 million acres, it was discovered that many small farmers were practically put out of business. To those of you who are not familiar with the cotton industry, I would like to call your attention to these pertinent facts: In the whole country, in cotton growing belt, it was discovered after these allocations had been made last fall, that there was a total of 291,809 farmers who had less than 5 acres of cotton allocated to them. Of that total there was in my State, largely in south Mississippi, my congressional district, a total of 47,000 farmers who were allocated less than 5 acres for the 1955 crop. You can imagine what that means to the small farmers of my section of the country, men who have to make a living, support their families, pay taxes, and send their children to school on less than five acres of cotton, which in most instances is his cash crop.

I realize that it will be argued that you cannot eat your pie and keep it too. With that I am in thorough accord. I realize that due to the increase in the number of substitutes, synthetics that have been produced in competition with cotton, that cotton consumption is constantly going down. Therefore, if we are going to have supports we are going to have to produce less cotton. With that I can find no fault, and we might just as well face that now.

But I also call your attention to the fact that you cannot do it by one fell swoop overnight. In my section, in the hill sections of south Mississippi, we have gradually been getting away from the production of cotton. We have been converting to other crops, trying to get away from this cash crop of cotton. That has been true over the cotton belt generally.

I call your attention to the fact, in substantiation of that, that 30 years ago there were 45,968,000 acres in the production of cotton in the cotton belt of this country.

If we grant the relief asked in this bill today the total would be 18,656,442 acres.

The figure for last year has slipped me for the moment. I ask my friend the

gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] to tell us what the cotton acreage was last year.

Mr. GATHINGS. Last year the allotment was 21,379,342 acres.

Mr. COLMER. In round figures we had a reduction of from approximately 21 million last year to 18 million, which is a pretty sharp reduction and has resulted in these hardships which have just been recited.

Of course, we all have our troubles, we all hear from our people, but I just want to call your attention briefly to a letter I have which is typical of many others we in the cotton belt have all received.

In Perry County, which happens to be in my congressional district of Mississippi, there are 1,113 farms of which 580 are classed as cotton farms. To the 580 farms there are 1,900 acres of cotton allocated; 113 farms out of 580 have less than 1 acre of cotton allocated to them; 155 farms have from 1 acre to 1.9 acres allotted; 107 have 2 to 2.9 acres allotted; 95 of those farms have 5 acres or more; 150 farms who want cotton acreage cannot get it, for the county has only 50 hardship acres to allocate.

I could read you some of the most heart-rending letters from individual farmers here if time permitted. However, I think it would be more orderly and possibly more beneficial if I pointed out the situation in a few of the other counties in my district. For instance, in Covington County, which is largely a county of small farmers, the following letter graphically describes the situation there:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION
AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Collins, Miss., January 3, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM COLMER,
Representative, Mississippi,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLMER: We, the agricultural stabilization and conservation committee of Covington County realize the strain you must be going through by the receipt of complaints in connection with the cotton allotment received by farmers for 1955. But we feel it is our duty to properly inform you as to the extent the farms in our county are affected by the reduction in cotton acreage for 1955. We realize it is impossible for you to know the conditions that prevail in each county without someone furnishing you with information, therefore, we are submitting figures taken from the Covington County ASC office official records which are available for public inspection in hopes that you may gain more knowledge of our situation and that this information can be used to some advantage by you to help correct the hardships imposed on our farmers. Our sympathy goes out to the small farmer whose efforts are directed toward earning sufficient money from his agricultural products to pay the outrageous price of the vital materials he needs to produce his products. If something is not done we farmers in the hill counties are going to have to quit farming for a living. It is our belief that our county is representative of the hill counties of Mississippi. We appeal to you as one who has been chosen by the people of Mississippi and Covington County to represent us in Washington to find some solution for our problem.

1. Number of farms in Covington County	2,457
2. Number of cotton farms in Covington County	2,028
3. Number of cotton farms receiving 5 acres or less of cotton for 1955	1,343
4. Number of cotton farms receiving 5 1/10 to 10 acres of cotton for 1955	406
5. Number of cotton farms receiving 10 1/10 to 15 acres cotton for 1955	113
6. Number of cotton farms receiving 15 1/10 to 20 acres cotton for 1955	46
7. Number of cotton farms receiving 21 acres or more for 1955	120

Yours very truly,
GUYCETT HUGHES,
W. J. LIGGETT,
CLIFTON KEYS,
County committeemen.

In Jones County there are 3,800 farms with 2,268 of these farms classed as cotton farms. For these 2,268 farms, there are 8,974 cotton acres allocated; 1,704 farms have less than 5 acres; 1,508 have less than 4 acres; and, 358 have less than 1 acre.

Neighboring counties, such as Covington County and Lamar County, have been cut as much as 43 percent from the 1954 allocated cotton acreage. This is the situation generally in the hill section of Mississippi.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my friend from Texas who is very much interested in this subject.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. After reading many critical letters from farmers I think it might be interesting and very pertinent if I would read a short excerpt from a letter that came to me from a vice president of the Second National Bank of Houston, no country bank by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my friend briefly.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. This banker writes as follows:

Many of the small farmers are being turned down daily by the banks for crop loans because their allotted cotton acreage is not large enough to repay the loans they need. I was in a bank in east Texas a few days ago and saw a man who had been borrowing from $500 to $600 per year to make a cotton crop; his acreage for 1955 was cut to 5 acres; he is 45 years old and has a family of 5 children. He has been a customer of this bank for 15 years and repaid his loan each year with the exception of $103 in 1954; this was due to the drought in 1954. He wanted to borrow $600 to make a crop in 1955; the bank could not make the loan because in a normal year 5 acres of cotton in this county would make around two bales and this is not enough to repay the loan.

He goes on to say that the people are getting very tired of this and urges that something be done to make it possible for the little cotton farm to be an economic unit within itself.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman from Texas. We are all conscious of the specific cases that have come to our attention. But I want to reiterate what I said in the beginning, that this is for the purpose of alleviating the hardship cases and softening the blow in the transition period that is constantly going on and yet not try to do it overnight.

I hope that the Members of this House, those who are interested directly in cotton and those who are just merely interested in the economy of the country generally, will go along with this bill.

I understand amendments will be offered to the bill when it is being considered in the committee. I shall not undertake to anticipate any of those amendments. I would like to mention in passing, however, that I introduced my own bill on this subject, House Joint Resolution 105, early in the session and have my own idea as to what should be done. It is in effect the amendment which I understand will be introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. But the thing I am most interested in is getting some relief for my people——

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is rendering yoeman's service to the cotton farmers in the fight he is making. I want to commend the gentleman for the very fine statement he has made, particularly for bringing out the point that in 1954 there was an acreage of something like 21,379,000 allotted as compared to the 17,900,000 acres originally allotted by the Secretary of Agriculture. That is an increase of about 19.8 percent. That is most significant.

I appreciate the fact the gentleman has brought this point out. We are only asking for an increase of 3 percent. In 1954 the increase amounted to 19.8, practically a 20-percent increase over the original allotment. I appreciate the fine presentation made by the gentleman. I am grateful to the gentleman from Mississippi for his kindness and consideration accorded our Agriculture Committee when we appeared before the Rules Committee on this bill.

Mr. COLMER. In other words, to illustrate the transition that is going on, any reduction in acreage will not only reduce the acreage substantially under last year, but we are now reducing the percentage very sharply from 19 to 3 percent that we are asking in order to take care of these hardship cases. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Even after this 3 percent has been added the cotton farmers will this current year take a further reduction of 2,700,000 acres which is in itself a very substantial reduction.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the contribution of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. What I am trying to say is that we all have our own ideas about what should be done here but we cannot all have our own way. We are going to have to take the best we can get and certainly for the moment this bill seems to me somewhat of a compromise that will achieve that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well to go into some

of the background of the bill to be considered. The members of the cotton subcommittee, headed by our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], held several informal hearings, and it was apparent that there was a concensus of opinion that some kind of legislation providing for a reasonable increase in the national cotton allotment was in order, particularly if that increase could be directed toward the relief of certain inequities. Now, we were thoroughly conscious of the fact that the Department of Agriculture had indicated that it was opposed to any increase. However, under the circumstances and the fact that there were some 291,809 farmers who had acreage allotments of five acres or less who in prior years of 1952, 1953, and 1954 had grown that much cotton and who, under the allotments that had been made this year, were reduced below their plantings of those years, we felt that by an addition of less than 400,000 acres we could take care of that many people. Now, we could use only 400,000 acres to give some relief to 291,000 people. So, we were trying to take care of a social problem, you might say, as well as an economic problem.

Then we felt by an additional 150,000 acres that we could alleviate the hardship which was being experienced by the smaller farmers who had been cut more than 60 percent below what they had had the year before. It was on that basis that we felt the justification in making an increase in this allotment.

Then, the next thing, we realized we had to be practical to the extent of trying to have adopted a bill which the Department would approve. While we have no commitment from the Department, I think, by the grapevine, so to speak, we have every reason to believe that this relatively small acreage would be approved. While the bill would add 3 percent to the acreage of each State, it would not add 3 percent to the anticipated production, because much of this acreage would go into areas where the production is below the average. Also, we knew that we would have a difficult time if we tried to disturb the relative positions of the several cotton-producing States, and that is why we put this bill on the basis of adding only 3 percent to each State; not 3 percent to the national allotment but 3 percent to each State, so that the relative standing of the States would not be disturbed.

Frankly, I would agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, who is asking to interrupt me now and I cannot because of the time, that it would please me if we could go along on some plan whereby we could use more of this acreage in some States to alleviate the hardships that exist. But, we might as well be practical and realistic about it.

We are interested not in trying to get a bill that would embarrass anybody or the administration, but we are interested in providing a bill which will bring relief to the small farmers and furnish as much relief as we possibly can. I think every member of the cotton subcommittee, on which our colleague from Arkansas has done such a fine job in bringing together the thoughts on the bill he introduced, can say that this is the collective thinking of the entire committee, and the gentleman from Arkansas introduced the bill at the request of the committee to carry out those things that we felt were needed to be of help. I hope that the other Members of the House who may not have any cotton in their districts but who are interested in trying to help us in a situation that is very trying in many sections, will be very helpful in this regard.

I might say that when we were quoting the figures awhile ago about what the acreage was last year, when it was 21,379,000 plus, and the year before that we had planted 28 million acres. The year before that we had planted nearly 28 million acres. The year before that, in 1951, we had planted more than 29 million acres. So you see that we are confronted with a tremendously great reduction. This is a very important matter to those small farmers, and I hope we may have the sympathetic consideration of all the Members who are interested in extending aid to more than one-fourth of all cotton producers, particularly those who are the smallest producers.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have previously discussed the extreme hardships which are being brought about among cotton farmers of Georgia, the Southeast, and other sections, due to the sharp reduction in cotton acreage allotted for the 1955 crop.

When I introduced H. R. 23, it was my purpose to raise the 1955 cotton acreage allotment up to the level provided by the 1954 law for each State whose 1955 allotment is below this level, the 1955 crop of cotton having been fixed at 18,100,000 acres in comparison with 21,400,000 acres for the 1954 cotton crop.

The Committee on Agriculture has favorably reported H. R. 3952, and the report accompanying this bill sets forth a 3 percent increase in the acreage allotment of each cotton State, thereby adding 543,234 acres across the country to the cotton acreage allotted for 1955.

The increase in the cotton acreage under H. R. 3952 will provide some help; however, H. R. 3952 increases the cotton acreage for 1955 much less than the bill which I introduced, H. R. 23. In introducing H. R. 23, it was my thought that the 1955 cotton acreage should not be less than the 1954 cotton acreage of 21,400,000 acres, for it appeared to me that the extreme drought of 1954 brought about a situation under which there was even more justification for increasing the 1955 cotton acreage than had previously existed in 1954.

The extreme drought in the southeast not only destroyed practically all food crops, but the farmers in my section produced about one-half of a normal cotton crop. The Committee on Agriculture recognizes in its report that no less than 4 years ago our Government was urging these farmers to produce more cotton. Since the cotton farmers in many sections of the Cotton Belt, including my own district, do not produce tobacco or peanuts, those who have attempted to diversify by producing livestock have not had profitable operations, and the cost of manufactured products which the farmers must buy are out of proportion in their relationship with agricultural products, there is in my opinion an obligation to dispose of the surplus cotton gradually and to allow the cotton farmers to remain on the farms rather than to force them to seek employment elsewhere.

I wish to again state that it is a mistake to undertake to dispose of the surplus cotton in a period of 1 or 2 years, for the surplus accumulated over a period of years. It is recognized in the report of the Committee on Agriculture that—

> The condition has come about by no fault of the cotton farmers but results from the sudden and severe constriction of acreage where a policy of gradual reduction over a longer period of years would have prevented the family income problem that now confronts so many of our farmers.

Cotton farmers in my section have never made large profits from cotton and they do not expect to do so, and as the committee report states, many small farmers have had their acreage allotments reduced so low they cannot support their families. The urgency of the situation is further recognized by the committee in the statement that—

> Unless Congress acts immediately the committee fears that many families on small farms, including tenants and sharecroppers as well as owners, will be forced to leave the land.

There are many cotton farmers who have reached an age at which it would be difficult to obtain employment in industry or elsewhere.

I again urge that greater effort be made to produce more tangible results in the administration of existing laws which have as their purpose and objective the sale of more cotton and agricultural products abroad. Cotton and agricultural products are an important part of the economy of the Nation. This is recognized by the Committee on Agriculture by the statement in the report that—

> The recent sudden and severe reduction in acreage has had a serious impact in the Cotton Belt and is sharply depressing the economy of areas where business is based chiefly on cotton.

The economy of the Nation cannot be isolated from the agricultural economy. The impact on business in the Cotton Belt cannot be isolated from the business of the Nation, for the manufactured products of other regions which would find their way to the Cotton Belt will diminish if there is inadequate income with which to purchase these products. It is doubtful if the goal of $500 billion in national income can be achieved if widespread unemployment on the farms is permitted.

As I have previously stated, H. R. 3952 increases the 1955 cotton acreage allotment less than the bill which I introduced, H. R. 23. I have also stated that due to the drought there is, in my opinion, even more reason to increase the cotton acreage allotment to a total of 21,400,000 acres in 1955 than there was

reason to increase the cotton acreage to this figure in 1954. However, I do recognize that there are many small cotton farmers in my section and other sections who will receive some benefit under H. R. 3952. Although the increase of 543,234 acres in the 1955 cotton-acreage allotment is less than that of the bill which I introduced, H. R. 23, I am anxious to secure as much relief for the cotton farmers as we are able to obtain. A vote favoring H. R. 3952 does bring some relief, although less relief than the emergency situation, in my opinion, requires. I hope we can adopt an amendment which will increase the allotment as provided in H. R. 3952.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, personally I feel this bill is not nearly sufficient to take care of the actual minimum needs of farmers. It falls far short of providing sufficient acreage to provide for economical farm operating units. In Oklahoma alone, in the last 14 years, 51,000 farm families have had to leave their farms mainly because of the drought situation and because of insufficient wheat and cotton allotments and the prolonged drought. There is no other area in the country that has been so adversely affected as that particular area. This bill would increase Oklahoma's acreage by only 26,500 acres. Personally, I think Mr. Benson ought to take his Mormon theory out of Government and get down to some real, plain, old horse trading, and get rid of some of our surpluses. Mr. Benson has not exercised his rights and prerogatives under the law to dispose of this cotton on the world market, either by trading or by finding new uses for it. Furthermore, Mr. Benson and this Congress should take into consideration that in all probability we will again be asking the farmers to move into a mobilization effort, if conditions become critical.

Who is responsible for the farmers being in the difficulty they are in today? The Congress, and the Government of the United States, through the President and the Secretary of Agriculture are the ones who asked the farmers to increase production during the Korean war. In Oklahoma we were asked to diversify, and farmers did diversify in that great State, which at one time was about the largest producer of cotton in the United States. We diversified. We raised mung beans. Ninety-five percent of the mung beans raised in the United States of America were raised in my district in Oklahoma. The United States Department of Agriculture removed the price support. We raised castor beans, and Secretary Benson lowered the price support by one-third. We raised peanuts, and the administration lowered the support level. We also raised grain sorghums, and now the Secretary of Agriculture has reduced supports by 25 percent. In my opinion, Mr. Benson does not want the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, to work. The agricultural program was voted by the farmers and by the Congress. The farmers of my district supported it by 95 percent. Ninety-five percent of the farmers voted for the program, but they do not feel that Congress or the Secretary of Agriculture should reduce the farm allotments of the farms below economic operating units. When this is done you have destroyed the livelihood of the farmers. That is what has happened in Oklahoma.

Personally, I think we should run this Congress ourselves by voting in the interest of the farmers and the country, and find out if the Secretary of Agriculture is going to veto our legislation. Personally, I have offered an amendment to raise the acreage allotment to 19,500,000 acres. Furthermore, I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] that we should give consideration to making quotas on bales rather than acreage, should be favorably considered. Again I say that this House, which is representative of the people, should act on its own authority and not depend on the threat of a veto by the President of the United States or Mr. Benson. I believe we should act independently of the Senate and do whatever is right. May I again remind the House that some consideration should be given to the future of this country. The President of the United States himself has said that we ought to set aside a year's supply of cotton. Did the Secretary of Defense or did this committee take into consideration this set-aside in determining the carryover? Again I say that the increase needed, with the increased population, with the possibility of moving into a mobilization program, are important factors worthy of your consideration. I consider this bill about equal to an aspirin tablet when the acreage problem needs a dose of calomel or a major operation.

I should like to read a letter, a wire, and a resolution from a committee representing thousands of western Oklahoma farmers, which expresses my feelings, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION
AND CONSERVATION OFFICE,
Hollis, Okla., February 18, 1955.

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Representative, Oklahoma Sixth District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: We, the members of the Harmon County ASC Committee, make the following request and submit it to you for your consideration and approval.

Because of a total lack of subsoil moisture in this area and as a measure of drought relief for the dry-land farmer, we again request permission for producers to plant 2 rows of cotton alternated with 2 rows of summer legumes or summer fallow and be classed as 50-percent cotton and 50-percent legumes or fallow.

Trusting you will concur with our request and offer any assistance possible in securing its approval, we remain,

Very truly yours,

A. B. BURT,
J. B. CAIRNESS,
J. J. THOMASON,
Members Harmon County ASC Committee.

CORDELL, OKLA.

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Per your request following information: Washita County has 693 cotton farms with less than 39 percent of cropland under cash allotments. County needs not less than 20,000 additional acres cotton. All counties in southwest Oklahoma in same position.

WASHITA COUNTY ASC COMMITTEE.

To Congressman Victor Wickersham, Senator Robert S. Kerr, Senator Mike Monroney, and Congressman Cliff Hope, former chairman, and Harold Cooley, chairman, House Agriculture Committee:

We, the cotton farmers and businessmen of Tillman, Jackson, Harmon, Kiowa, Beckham, and Greer Counties do hereby adopt the following resolutions:

MANGUM, OKLA., *January 5, 1955.*

We, duly elected resolution committee, after listening to the general discussions in regard to the present cotton allotments of this group of farmers, professional, and businessmen of Greer, Jackson, Harmon, Tillman, Kiowa, and Beckham Counties present to you for your adoption the following resolutions:

Whereas the citizens of the above-named counties have met this 5th day of January in the county courthouse, Mangum, Okla., for the purpose of seeking a more equitable distribution of the present cotton allotments for said counties and the great Southwest which has been hard hit by the drought for the past 4 years.

Whereas hundreds of our young farmers have already left the farm seeking employment elsewhere. With little or no crops for 3 years and with the reduced acres, they cannot continue on the farm and feed their families and meet their obligations.

Therefore, we feel that this is the most serious situation that has come our way for many years, and without additional cotton acres for 1955, farmers and businesses alike will be paralyzed in this drought area.

We therefore appeal to you, the Congress of the United States, to secure additional acres to supplement the crop failures that have plagued this area for so long. Our farmers have not contributed to the so-called surplus the past 3 years and feel that since thousands of acres of wheat have never come up, some of this land should be permitted to be planted to cotton. Our taxes must be paid and our families fed. We must have a cash crop to do this with.

Therefore, we recommend that additional acres be allotted as a drought emergency act for the Southwest States. We want to go on record commending our county committees for their untiring work in their efforts in distributing the allotments. While some mistakes may have been made, as a whole their work has been splendid. This present catastrophe can only be corrected by reallocation of additional acres in the drought area, if our farms and businesses are to survive: Be it

Resolved, That each citizen present do all in his power to try to secure the same cotton quotas for their respective counties as were allotted last year and that each respective farm should receive like consideration according to their cropland. We feel that no other State would feel that this is anything but right and just. Our farmers are not asking for charity, but a chance to make a living on our land. We have always come to the aid of our sister States during perilous times, such as floods and tornadoes, and we feel that no dissension would come from them, for after all, we are our brothers keeper. We need help, and now.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

We, the farmers of Tillman, Jackson, Harmon, Beckham, Kiowa, and Greer Counties, State of Oklahoma, hereinafter referred to as "these counties," approve of the basic principles of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, except for its flexible price and modernized parity provisions, which is the law under which we operate our farms. This law provides for

adjustment of production to reasonable market demands through acreage allotments and price supports, marketing agreements, and other provisions designed to place agriculture on a parity with other groups.

In the recent referendum election, the farmers of these counties agreed with other farmers in Oklahoma who voted more than 5 to 1 for cotton acreage controls, and price supports. Cotton producers in the 20 cotton-producing States likewise registered 92 percent of all producers favoring cotton production controls, and price supports, which the Secretary of Agriculture announced would be 90 percent of parity for the year 1955.

However, with this approval, there is the general belief among those who are both directly and indirectly interested in cotton production, that the 18,113,000 acres national cotton allotment was too small for the best interest of all concerned. The approval was given under a limited protest against the allotment. Under present conditions, these same farmers would likewise be opposed to any cotton program which would permit maximum or unrestricted planting. They would prefer that Congress consider and assist in solving this problem on a reasonable, middle-ground basis.

With the above approval of the farm program as a whole, we wish to register the following objections to the administration of the program:

1. Administration of the present program of acreage allotments, through the application of the same reduction factor to all farms alike, has resulted in inequities and injustices to those who have followed good soil-conservation practices, through failure to give proper consideration to crop-rotation practices, and allotments to similar farms in the community.

2. Instructions, as set out in USDA Commodity Stabilization Service Instructions Bulletin No. 1006–1 of December 16, 1953, defines a farm or a farm unit. There have apparently been violations of these instructions by compiling unlimited numbers of farms, as 1 unit, in 1 worksheet without due regard as to whether these farms are adjacent or nearby to each other. If these instructions continue to be violated, it will defeat the purpose and objectives of this program in many ways. Transfer of acreage allotments from distant nonproductive farms, to more productive and irrigated farms, will not only exceedingly increase normal production, and displace many farm operators with a subsequent loss in local buying power, but will greatly encourage land speculators to purchase, or lease, such farms and combine them for speculative purposes.

3. Our attempt to adjust production of basic commodity crops, especially cotton, has set up an uneconomic program on many family size cotton farms, which, if continued without correction, will result in the possible liquidation of such farmers.

4. In recent years, many acres which were formerly classified as cultivated acres have been planted to grass and permanent pasture, yet they are still carried forward on current farm work sheets as cultivated acres, enabling some farmers to get greater consideration in acreage allotments than they should receive.

5. There is a general complaint relative to frozen bases and not enough flexibility in county administration of our program.

To correct these minor objections, and in the interest of the general welfare, we recommend that the present national cotton acreage allotment be increased from the 18,113,000 acres to 19,500,000 acres for the years 1955 and 1956. The above recommendation should be granted for the following reasons:

1. In this year, 1954, the relative position of both supply and demand in the cotton trade has materially changed. Our exports of cotton have increased from approximately 3,500,000 bales in 1953, to nearly 5 million bales in 1954. Our domestic consumption has also increased. Thus the increased demand has unexpectedly diminished the supply and carryover of cotton. Therefore, to have or make possible a continued long-range cotton-acreage adjustment program, we must increase the present cotton acreage in order to avoid a possible short supply in 1955, which would lead to unrestricted plantings, and probable acute overproduction in the next year, 1956.

2. We feel that the present small cotton acreage allotment has not fully considered the high cost of farm operations, the need to keep more people employed, and the need to provide a sustained local buying power, which is so necessary to maintain the continued turnover of goods and services, the basis of our entire economic system.

3. In any program which is added to from time to time, there will be discepancies and unintentional discriminations arise. With the present cotton allotment as small as it is, and present and estimated demand as large as they are, we are in an exceptionally good position to allocate acres to correct some of these discrepancies. These additional acres could be used to satisfy needs that can be satisfied by no other means, by giving the farmer who has been penalized an opportunity to help himself.

This problem merits a reconsideration by Congress. Such reconsideration will justify a more reasonable, middle-ground, solution of adjusting cotton production to reasonable market demands and potential needs. We feel that careful consideration by Congress will justify whatever action is necessary to increase the National cotton acreage allotment to 19,500,000 for 1955 and 1956.

We as cotton farmers and small-business men, have called your attention to the problem as we see it. Furthermore, net agriculture income has declined 13 percent in the last 3 years. In the same period the income of the industrial worker has increased. This has increased the overall cost of operations on the farm. In addition the latest report is that the minimum wage is likely to be raised to $1 per hour, which will further decrease net agriculture income.

The following recommendations are rendered, not as iron-clad rules, but as guides to aid you in your consideration of our problem:

1. We as cotton farmers and businessmen, call your attention to the serious need for a long-range cotton adjustment program on a middle-ground basis. We object to continuation and perpetuation of plans and planners who devise ways of swinging the pendulum of cotton production too far to the right one year and too for to the left the next. A long-range program would permit us to better and more safely plan our farm operations, financially, and otherwise. A program that is changed from year to year does exactly the opposite and keeps us in hot water. Therefore, we recommend that the acreage allotment be set at 19,500,000 for 2 years basis rather than 1 year. We also recommend that the method of factoring the allotment for the separate farms should not be changed from year to year, but maintain on a historical base period.

2. Consideration should be given, when allocating the increased acreage allotment on a nationwide basis, to areas which have experienced subnormal growing conditions.

3. We further recommend and insist that Congress provide the ways and means for extended uses and markets for cotton through development on increased exports, and expanded research to increase domestic use, and market development.

4. After the additional cotton acreage allotment has been granted, and it has been allocated to the respective States and counties, we feel that first consideration locally should be given to correction of the mistakes, inequities, and unintentional discriminations which have been set up against those who have followed diversified farming, and soil and water conservation practices.

5. We do not wish to discriminate, but would recommend that the rule in instructions bulletin No. 1006–1 of December 16, 1953, sec. II which deals with the definition of a farm, be specifically clarified and rigidly enforced, in what constitutes adjacent and nearby.

6. We would recommend that the county office concerned with such data, should build a new inventory of cultivated acres, and eliminate those acres planted back to permanent pasture.

7. We recommend that the county committee be given authority to permit exchange of cotton and wheat acreage allotments between individual farms, where requested, providing that total allotment on each individual farm does not exceed 50 percent of cultivated acres. In doing so the total county cotton and wheat acreage allotment cannot be increased. This authority would enable the county committee to fit the program to local needs, and will not impair the overall national program objective.

8. We recommend the county committee shall give each cotton farmer, or individual operator, notification of his allotment in acres for the year, far enough in advance of planting that he may come to the office of the county committee to declare his intention to plant, or not to plant, his allotted acres. Failure to do so would automatically return his allotted acres to a county pool for redistribution to other qualified operators.

We understand that there is, at the present time, a movement underway to scrap the agricultural program as it now stands, and write a completely new farm program. We farmers of these counties, State of Oklahoma, want to go on record as being opposed to any such movement, and in favor of continuing the present program incorporating the recommendation stated above. We realize that the present day farmer, through the application of the present program, is in the best financial position in the history of agriculture. This program, and present law, properly administered, is a Magna Carta which gives to farmers their economic freedom, and places them on a parity with other groups. Buying power has been sustained, and this program has been a basic support to businessmen and industry in general.

We the farmers of these counties wish to emphasize that the objections and recommendations herein stated, are a result of open meetings, and democratic action on the part of the farmers themselves, and are not proposed by any organized farm group. However, now that these objections and recommendations have been drafted, we seek the aid and assistance of any and all organized farm groups, and affected chamber of commerce and other business groups in bringing these objections and recommendations before Congress for their appraisal and study.

Basically we do approve of the principles of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1954, and strongly oppose any idea of scrapping the entire law. However, we have pointed out some concrete material objections, with specific recommendations for improvement.

We object:

1. Total national cotton-acreage allotment, as being too small.

2. Application of same reduction factor to all farms.

3. Farm work sheet combination practices.

4. County records now in use regarding cultivated acres.

5. Frozen bases on individual farms.

6. Flexible price supports and new parity formula.

We recommend:

1. Increase national cotton-acreage allotment.

2. More consideration to those who followed soil conservation practices before applying reduction factor.

3. Clarification and enforcement of rules set out in USDA Commodity Stabilization Service Instructions Bulletin No. 1006-1 of December 16, 1953 regarding farm designation and who constitutes an operator. Also who is eligible to sign county worksheet.

4. Reappraisal and adjustment of county records pertaining to total cultivated acres.

5. Flexibility of allotments allowing exchanges of allotted acres within the county.

6. Ninety percent price supports for 1955 and 1956.

Your Resolution Committee: Tillman County—W. A. Elsener, Tipton; W. M. Lovejoy, Tipton; Clyde Amyx, Frederick. Jackson County—Carl Ross, Duke; Clyde Doughty, Martha; Ralph Mitchell, Duke. Harmon County—Claud Ingram, Hollis; Marvin Curry, Hollis; Claud White, Hollis. Kiowa County—Fritz Jacks, Snyder; Edgar Portwood, Hobart; W. L. Bock, Roosevelt. Beckham County—A. F. Luthy, Carter; C. D. Mandrell, Mayfield; J. E. Sparks, Sayde. Greer County—Thomas Cunningham, Mangum; Leslie Hogg, Granite; Nathan Moore, Brinkman; Henry Worthington, chairman, Mangum, Okla.

Attest:

WELCOME MEIDHART,
Secretary, Hollis, Okla.

Passed this the 5th day of January 1955, at Mangum, Okla.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3952, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes; and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, members of the cotton subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture very carefully considered the problems with which this legislation seeks to deal. I know they will explain it very fully during this discussion.

Unfortunately, many of the small cotton farmers of the country are suffering great hardship because of the drastic reduction in acreage they have been required to take. This bill does not go far enough to take care of the needs of all the small farmers. Actually, in my own State, for instance, we have more small farmers than any other State in the Union—we actually have more people living on farms in North Carolina than in any other State. It would take 85,000 acres to provide for the small farmers of North Carolina who are producing less than 5 acres of cotton. Under the pending bill we will receive in North Carolina only an additional 15,471 acres.

The situation is somewhat similar in other places. On the back of the report submitted by our committee you will see the figures. It would take 398,316 acres to take care of the small cotton farmers of the Nation. When I say "small cotton farmers" I mean those producing under 5 acres.

The cotton farmers have taken a drastic cut in recent years, as has been heretofore pointed out. The essence of this situation is that cotton acreage has been cut from 25 million acres in 1953 to 18,100,000 in 1955. Even with the added 3 percent which this bill provides they will take an additional cut this year of 2,700,000 acres less than was allotted in 1954.

This bill will add a total of 543,000 acres to the national cotton allotment for 1955. Frankly, I do not know exactly what the views of the Department of Agriculture are regarding this measure, but I do know that officials of the Department of Agriculture sat in with the subcommittee; and I am sure that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], who is chairman of the subcommittee, will be able to advise the committee with regard to Secretary Benson's views—if any views he expressed.

I think the bill should be adopted. There is no real opposition to it.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], 5 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is not a panacea for all the ills of the cotton farmer. This bill will aid many, many thousands of cotton farmers throughout the belt.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out just a little information with respect to the history of cotton production and consumption starting with the 1954 cotton year. In 1954 the national acreage allotment was 17,910,000. This Congress added about 19.8-percent increase over that allotment, making a total allotment for 1954 of 21,379,342 acres.

There was produced in 1954 on the land that was allocated to cotton 13,569,000 bales of cotton. You may want to ask what uses were made of that number of bales. The estimated domestic consumption was 9,100,000, the estimated exports 4,200,000, totaling 13,300,000 bales. So, as a matter of fact, we produced in 1954 approximately 200,000 bales of cotton more than were consumed. That covers our domestic economy as well as the export trade.

There will be, on August 1, 1955, a carryover of 10 million bales of cotton, roughly. To my way of thinking, that is not an excessive number of bales. It is adequate to meet our needs and would probably carry this country for some 10 months. We went into World War II with more than 10 million bales of cotton in the carryover. So this is not an excessive number of bales, in my opinion.

In 1954 the Congress increased the acreage about 20 percent. This bill attempts to increase the cotton-acreage allotment by only 3 percent. Under the provisions of this bill each State's allotment would be increased by 3 percent. The total acreage added would be 543,234 acres.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, stated that he did not have any information from the Secretary of Agriculture as to his views on this legislation. The Secretary of Agriculture has not filed a report on the bill, or on some 16 bills that were pending before the subcommittee. No reports were filed on any of them by the Secretary. However, the Subcommittee on Cotton worked tirelessly for a number of days on this problem, and we had in our deliberations two members of the Department of Agriculture staff who gave us their views and observations with respect to the legislation. We were not told whether the Secretary would recommend to the President that this bill be approved, should it pass both Houses of Congress. It is hoped, however, in view of the fact that so many small farmers, sharecroppers, tenants, and cotton farmers with all sizes of production will be benefited, that the Secretary of Agriculture, and no doubt he should in my humble judgment, will recommend that the bill be approved, should it be placed on the President's desk.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. On behalf of the cotton farmers of the district which I have the honor to represent, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas and members of his subcommittee and the full Committee on Agriculture for the diligent efforts and splendid contribution that have been made with this very difficult problem. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his considered judgment that the enactment of this legislation will definitely assist the small cotton farmers of the country?

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and, in reply to his inquiry, may I say that it will to a great degree. In his State as well as in every other cotton-growing State all farmers with under 5 acres will be taken care of to a great degree. It is not going to be sufficient to go all around, however. For instance, the State of Tennessee would gain 17,816 acres as a result of this 3-percent increase in the State allotment, but 32,881 acres would be required to bring the Tennessee farmers up to a minimum of 5 acres per farm; that is to the 5 acres or to the highest acreage planted in the last 3 years, whichever is the smaller. It would go a long ways, however, in remedying

the situation that exists in the State of Tennessee and other States, but it will not give them the entire acreage that they should receive in order to give them all a minimum of 5 acres as the act of 1949 provided.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That would give the farmers of Tennessee but about half of the acreage that they need to come up to the five.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is just the figure that I put in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It would be about half.

Mr. GATHINGS. The actual percentage would be seventeen thirty-seconds of the amount required to bring them up to 5 acres.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the RECORD the sad situation in this regard that it leaves the State of Alabama in?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. I will say to the gentleman that in the State of Alabama you would gain 33,054 acres under the bill. That would be 3 percent added to the State of Alabama allotment, but 52,284 acres would be required to bring the small 5-acre farmer up to 5 acres.

Mr. RAINS. In other words, this bill as it is now would provide about three-fifths of the amount necessary to give each cotton farmer now about a minimum of 5 acres?

Mr. GATHINGS. It seems to me that he should be entitled to 5 acres. I wish it were possible to bring in legislation that would bring him up to the 5-acre minimum.

Mr. RAINS. I know the gentleman has done a diligent job on it, but does he not know that it is possible to provide by amendment some kind of a device to provide for each cotton farmer a minimum of 5 acres?

Mr. GATHINGS. I will answer the gentleman by saying that there is a breaking point. We wanted to see where we could get a bill that would be approved by this body and the United States Senate and signed by the President of the United States.

Despite the intent of the Congress, under the 1955 cotton acreage allotment program many farm families depending on cotton as their only money crop were deprived of enough acreage to exist.

What is the result of this cutback? The cotton subcommittee held hearings and representatives of the cotton areas came to Washington and testified. They related instance after instance of serious economic hardship. Entire counties, dependent on cotton as the basis of their economy, are destitute. Business men are faced with loss of customers. Banks are worried about the credit structure of their areas. The whole picture is one of gloom.

One group of farmers came up from the coastal area of Texas. There the growing of cotton as the basis of their economy is older than the history of their State. Cotton was grown in that area when the Lone Star State was a mighty republic. Under the drastic cutback in cotton acreages these farmers have been reduced to a state where they can no longer raise cotton profitably.

And, their testimony is borne out by statements from farmers and from the Representatives of districts throughout the cotton belt.

Parallel to their plight is the doubtful future of the tenant farmer—the sharecropper. The landowner also has been cut back on acreage. So far back in many cases that there are no longer acreages to be given to the tenant. There are no acres to share, and the tenant farmer and his family is forced to move away from the farm to a doubtful future in the cities where there may or may not be work for him. He and his family are faced with the problem of becoming public charges because there is no land for him to farm. His method of earning a living for his family has been wiped out.

These conditions have come about through no fault of the cotton farmer. It is the result of a sudden and severe constriction of cotton acreage where a policy of gradual reduction over a longer period of years would have prevented the family income problem that now confronts so many of these farmers. As a matter of fact, less than 4 years ago our Government was asking these same farmers to raise more cotton. It was national policy and these farmers were encouraged to raise more and more cotton. Now, we are requiring them to raise less cotton to the point that these farmers do not have enough acreage to exist.

That is the reason for this bill, we are seeking to increase the national allotment to a point where these small farmers can continue to feed and clothe their families. We are not asking for a large increase which would throw out of balance the national cotton acreage program. We are asking a very little.

But, by safeguards in the bill, we expect that this small increase can achieve economic relief for these families. The bill expressly provides that the additional acreage shall be apportioned first directly to farms to provide, as far as possible, a minimum allotment of the smallest of 5 acres or the highest number of acres planted to cotton on the farm in 1952, 1953, or 1954.

The State committee would withhold up to 10 percent of the remaining acreage should a State have more acreage than is required to satisfy the 5-acre provision. This State reserve is intended by the committee to be used as set out in the report on this bill, "for relief of hardships caused by drought, to correct errors in county acreage data in which differences exist between the reported acreage by the farmers and the adjusted figure made by the Agricultural Marketing Service." It was also intended to be used to relieve hardships among new growers in the State of Arizona.

That is the first apportionment of the new acreage—to the small farmer. Here in Washington we can all agree, as the Congress has agreed previously, that acreage less than 5 acres is not enough for the economic life of the family. So, in the bill we can allocate this new acreage so that it goes directly to this group of farmers.

Now, if the increase in acreage available to a State is in excess of the small farm requirements, this additional acreage shall be given to the counties under the same provisions of law as are now applicable to the States' existing acreage, and this acreage shall be used by the ASC committees of the various counties to alleviate hardships. The bill, and the intent of the committee, attempts to place a definition of hardship on that farm which received a 1955 allotment of less than 60 percent of the acres legally planted, or considered as planted, to cotton on the farm in 1954.

As the Members can see so plainly, it is the thought of the committee that this small increase will not do the whole job. It will not relieve all the hardships and economic distress in the cotton areas, but it will do the best job possible without throwing out of gear the national cotton program.

We were faced with economic pressures at both ends of the problem. We were anxious not to jeopardize the small farmer. We knew that some form of relief must be given him. The many bills that were introduced in the Congress for the relief of the small farmer attest to the desire of the Congress to help this segment of our rural population. Those measures were all studied by the committee. The best parts of each were selected and finally this bill was drafted as the best approach to the problem all the bills were seeking to solve.

Necessarily, in seeking to alleviate the cases other than the small 5-acre farmer, the Congress must place the obligation to administer fairly the distribution to those agencies on the local level who can be fully acquainted with the plight and hardship of each case.

Planting season is fast approaching. This matter is, therefore, urgent. If we are to aid these families we must act now. It can no longer be delayed. I am confident that this was the reason that the Rules Committee acted so speedily to give a rule to this bill for early consideration. That is why the House Committee on Agriculture gave priority to these hearings. That is why the subcommitee moved with dispatch and that is the reason that the Committee on Agriculture voted out the bill and is now asking your immediate consideration and favorable vote.

Time is of the essence. Delays or a failure to vote this increased acreage can mean only that these farm families have no choice other than the breadlines and the relief agencies. And, the pressure of their plight, spread across the great southern Cotton Belt, can be the weight of despondency that can drag down the entire area into economic collapse and depression.

I would like to insert a table at this point showing the effect of this bill on the various cotton-growing States:

1955 State acreage allotments and related data

State	1955 State allotment (1)	3 percent of 1955 State allotment (2)	Required for 5-acre or highest planted (3)
Alabama	1,101,804	33,054	52,284.7
Arizona	333,933	10,018	233.3
Arkansas	1,529,704	45,891	8,465.5
California	778,686	23,361	0
Florida	36,283	1,089	10,152.4
Georgia	950,818	28,525	41,776.4
Illinois	3,056		207.6
Kansas	35		3.8
Kentucky	8,374	251	608.0
Louisiana	648,442	19,453	20,101.6
Mississippi	1,750,852	52,526	68,497.0
Missouri	399,627	11,989	3,048.3
Nevada	2,324		0
New Mexico	182,194	5,466	292.8
North Carolina	515,714	15,471	85,943.2
Oklahoma	872,532	26,176	3,525.7
South Carolina	773,945	23,218	36,042.5
Tennessee	593,868	17,816	32,881.1
Texas	7,612,779	228,383	25,971.1
Virginia	18,238	547	8,281.1
United States	18,113,208	543,234	398,316.1

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill, though I shall offer an amendment to strike out the 3 percent and substitute therefor 6 percent.

I have before me a 3-page letter from the Department of Agriculture pointing out the administrative problems connected with this bill due to the fact that, as has been stated here, acreage in many of the States is not sufficient to meet the minimum requirements. If my amendment is adopted, it will do much to relieve those administrative problems. Not only that, but in a far greater number of States it will provide enough acreage to meet this small farm problem and in addition leave some small amount of acreage to relieve hardship cases.

Here is what I would like to point out. The prime reason to support this bill and to support my amendment is that thereby you keep the production of cotton in the United States; at least, you help in that direction. I had the Department of Agriculture make a survey recently through the State Extension Departments and the county committees, and their own report shows that as a result of a cut in production this year to 18,100,000 acres, that 55,348 farm families were left without any homes—these are the Department's own figures—and 130,603 farm families with less than $1,000 gross annual income will be reduced by more than $100. Now, it may be that in the scheme of things those things happen, but, my friends, that has happened as a result of the Department of Agriculture's order under a law passed by the United States Government. It is the result of law. Not only that, but we do not cure the problem by cutting down United States acreage. If in cutting American cotton acreage you were cutting the world production of cotton it might have some reasoning behind it. But, you are not. We cut down our cotton production last year from 24 million to about 21 million acres, and the rest of the world increased their production by 1,200,000 bales. If you take the figures—and you can find them in the hearings of my Subcommittee on Appropriations just released this week—you will find that as we cut down cotton acreage in the United States, last year India increased her production by 2 million acres. You will find that Mexico increased her production of cotton by 240,000 acres, and you will find that Egypt increased her production over 200,000 acres, and you will find that Brazil increased her cotton acreage by 500,000 acres.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is making a very fine argument, but I wish the gentleman would explain and emphasize just why that situation has happened. It certainly is not due to the acreage reduction alone.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and I was coming to that point. This increase in foreign acreage is coming about in this way: We have a domestic support price in the United States, with which you are all familiar—there have been many arguments about it—but that same law provides that commodities that we produce move in world trade on a competitive price basis. But for a number of years the Government of the United States has fixed your domestic price as the world price. It has left four big financial cotton interests in the United States go into Mexico and Brazil and other countries operating under this umbrella that we fixed, not by law, but by governmental determination, and with almost an assurance of profits they have and continue to expand. Every acre you are cutting out here is going overseas and American financial interests are behind much of it.

I say that in spite of the three pages of trouble that the Department sees in the administration of this bill and the many troubles I see in it, this committee has worked awfully hard to make it workable. I say that if for no other reason it is worth passing, so that at least you will keep a half million acres of cotton in the United States instead of giving it to big financial interests that already have their plans set to go into Brazil and Mexico for further expansion.

If you will look on page 86 of our hearings you will find that when the Department gives the figure showing that under this policy of our Government fixing the world price at our support level, giving that protection and assurance to anyone with the know-how and the capital to go into these low-cost areas, last year when we cut our acreage down there was a 1,200,000-bale increase in foreign production. The Department did not have the figures as to what the outlook is for this year, but they already can see that in Mexico it will be increased 240,000 and they can see that it will be increased in Egypt. The Department knows that in Brazil the increase was 500,000 acres last year but they do not know the figure this year. But I can tell you that private sources say we have American financial interests already set to go into Brazil.

The answer is to put the acreage in the United States and keep it here, and make it possible to keep it here by selling our commodities in world trade at competitive prices, all as is now authorized by law.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the carefully considered joint effort of the House Committee on Agriculture, which is representative of almost every State in the Cotton Belt with the exception of some States in the West. The subject of hardship was thoroughly discussed in the committee and the amount of acreage which could possibly be approved by the executive branch of the Government, and this bill is the result of that considered judgment. I may say that it came out of the Subcommittee on Cotton of the House with almost unanimous approval.

This subject of hardship is a difficult one. In that connection I would like to give a little bit of a picture of farming in the cotton area I represent. I may say that the State of California has suffered an approximate 50-percent cut in cotton acreage in the last 2 years. Our farmers are really hurting because there have been quotas imposed on sugar-beet production and there have been quotas imposed on wheat production. Many things that would provide alternate crops to some of our cotton growers are closed.

Recently in Tulare, Calif., Mr. T. R. Hedges, of the Gianini Foundation, which is a branch of the University of California, said that the most important farm in Tulare County is a farm that has around 40 acres of cotton.

He stated further that 75 percent of the cotton in that county was grown on ranches with 15 to 45 acres of cotton; 28 percent of the farms have from 1 to 15 acres of cotton; 75 percent of the 1954 cotton grown was grown on farms having 15 to 46 acres of cotton. Farms with 40 acres of cotton produced 22 percent of the cotton in 1954. Farms of over 100 acres produced only 8 percent of the crop.

In my home county of Kings there were 60 cotton farms with allotments of less than 5 acres, 259 cotton farms with allotments of less than 15 acres, 750 cotton farms with allotments of from 15 to 30 acres, 186 cotton farms with allotments of from 30 to 50 acres, 41 cotton farms with allotments of from 50 to 60 acres, 91 farms with allotments of from 60 to 100 acres, and only 31 farms with allotments of over 300 acres.

I bring these facts to you to show that we have a hardship problem in California. As a matter of fact, there is a hardship problem all over the United States in the Cotton Belt. It is impossible to equate or to arrive at an exact definition of hardship in terms of acreage because of the methods of production

where the cost of production in one area might dictate a somewhat larger farm as an economic unit than in some other area, for example, where they only have to depend on the natural rainfall, and so forth. The point I am emphasizing is that we have hardships in California. There are hardships in Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Alabama, Georgia, and all over the Cotton Belt. This bill was deemed by our committee to be fair because it treated every State equally on the basis of a 5-year formula which is in the law for an allotment of acreage among the States. That same 5-year base period is applied to every other of 6 basic crops with the exception of wheat. A moving 5-year formula is a recognition that these price-support laws and the quota provisions in connection therewith are not designed to be a straitjacket on agriculture, but are designed to recognize some shift in the trend of planting, and once that occurs to treat everyone equally. That is exactly what this bill does. It achieves complete equity among the States. Then there is a special provision written into the law for 5-acre farms. We recognized the problem of the 5-acre farmer. Our good intentions will apply in those areas where they have a great many of those farms. Actually, in my opinion, a 5-acre definition of hardship is a somewhat arbitrary definition because the question comes up then—what about the 6-acre farmer or the 7-acre farmer or the 8-acre farmer who might be more worthwhile preserving actually than a man who only grows 5 acres or less. But, nonetheless, this bill, rough as it may be in some aspects, is the closest approach to equity that we can achieve and it does achieve complete equity as between the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has after full discussion recommended a bill, which has been favorably reported by the full Committee on Agriculture, that gives some slight measure of relief to the cotton growers who have been most severely pinched by the cotton-acreage allotments this year. I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]. I think he has done a splendid job handling a most difficult problem. When I came back to this session of the Congress, I recognized the serious situation which confronted us, but I had to tell a good many of my friends that the problem seemed almost insoluble.

After the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] was appointed chairman of the subcommittee, he went to work on this problem and with the help of the members of the subcommittee, and they were all most cooperative, he held a series of hearings, listening to the problems of the cotton growers and listening to the Department of Agriculture and to the suggestions as to how we might work out some relief. Of course, nobody came up with a panacea and, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] just said a while ago, this bill is not going to satisfy everybody and I doubt if it satisfies anybody 100 percent.

It is not going to involve any substantial amount of cotton. It is not going to materially affect the production of cotton. If every acre provided for in this bill is planted, and of course it will not be, it would not result in the production of more than about a quarter of a million bales of cotton. That is not going to upset the United States or the world cotton market. But just one bale is going to make a tremendous difference to a great many of our lowest-income farmers. It is not a proposition to help someone to get into cotton on a great commercial scale. That is not the objective of this bill.

The objective of this bill is to keep as many farmers as possible on the farms. We would not ask for this bill if it was simply intended to affect the price of cotton. It is a matter not affecting the price, not affecting the total amount, but a matter of trying to keep a larger number of farmers on the farms, and keep them out of the breadlines and off the relief rolls of our cities. I think we all recognize that as a worthy objective, and I doubt if many of you do recognize what a large percentage of cotton farmers is involved.

It has been pointed out that this bill would provide only 3 percent additional to each State allotment; that that allotment must first be used to take care of those farmers who have allotments of less than 5 acres, to bring them up to 5 acres, or the highest amount they planted in the last 5 years. When considering those men you are talking about one-third of our cotton growers in America. Frankly, I doubt if many of you know it, surely I did not know it, but 291,000 farmers in these United States have allotments of less than 5 acres, and there are less than a million cotton allotments in the United States. So you see the large percentage of cotton farmers that is affected. This bill is going to give great help to a large percentage of the growers.

This bill would, in some States, leave a substantial percentage of the total acreage for use in other hardship cases. As the gentleman from California pointed out, this bill attempts to treat each State with even-handed justice, so that after it is passed there will be no change in the relative position of one State as compared with another. Each State will have exactly the same percentage of the total maximum allotment that it has today. I think that is extremely important.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Is not the reason we are treating every State exactly alike in this bill because some States did a better job taking care of the small farmers than those in other States, and we felt it necessary to treat all States alike?

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman is exactly correct. And I must confess that I feel that the Texas State committee did a very poor job indeed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman knows that I feel our State committee improperly used the 10-percent reserve. Under this bill can they take the acreage that is left over and use that acreage the same as they used the original State reserve?

Mr. POAGE. No. Only 10 percent of what is left over. Ten percent of what is left over will be available to State committees. Frankly, the reason for that is not because all the members of the subcommittee wanted it, because I did not want it, but we felt that we did need much of what is in the bill. But we recognize that the bill does not take care of the situation in all States. In the State of Arkansas there was an error which the State committee recognized and admitted. They said if we gave them this 10 percent, they would correct that error. In the State of Arizona there is a group of veterans that need additional acreage, and the State committee said they would use this reserve for that purpose. I, frankly, dislike to give the Texas State committee any acreage for distribution, but I do feel that we must consider the problems of our neighbors.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Does the gentleman expect the State committee of Texas to use this 10 percent for trends?

Mr. POAGE. We definitely believe that the State committees have no right to use it for trends. That is so stated in our report. We hope our State committee has seen the mistake it has made in the past, and that error will not be repeated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the very fine presentation he has made of this matter, and to express my appreciation as well to the committee for recognizing the particular problem in the drought areas.

Mr. Chairman, we need this legislation to increase cotton acreage, and we need it urgently.

Actually, we need a great deal more additional acreage than is provided for by the bill, and I believe the Committee on Agriculture is aware of this mounting need in the Cotton States.

I can understand the practical problems confronting the committee, however, and the need of writing a bill which will be signed by the President, if possible.

The 3 percent increase, apparently, is the best improvement obtainable, and I intend to vote for the bill.

The subcommittee, under the leadership of the able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], has rendered a real service by its report with its recognition of the special problem prevailing in the drought area—where farmers are leaving the land by the thousands and the need for additional cash crops is im-

perative, if wholesale farmer bankruptcy is to be avoided.

I sincerely hope the State committees will allocate these added acres to the counties where drought damage has been most severe, and the danger to the farm economy is greatest.

Passage of this bill is a much needed step in the direction of rebuilding our farm income, which must be restored and improved if we are to have sound national prosperity.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman. The whole question here, let me say, is whether we are going to get a part of something—some relief, a part of something—or whether we are going to demand something that we know we cannot get and wind up with all of nothing. The whole problem is just that simple. If you want something you had better vote for a bill that has some chance of passing and being signed, and we believe this bill has.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us today has been referred to by a previous speaker as relief for small farmers—in fact he mentioned the fact that there are 291,000 cotton farmers in the country who raise 5 acres or less of cotton. Unfortunately, this bill makes no real attempt to solve the problem of that 5-acre cotton farmer. It has been introduced to the public, to the Congress, and to everybody else as an attempt to provide something along that line, but it does not.

This bill would add to the national cotton allotment for the coming year 543,000 acres. Of that total acreage added more than 300,000 would go to farmers other than these small farmers. Now I ask the question, whether or not the language of the bill as it stands now is going to solve the problem of the small-cotton farmer if that provision stands?

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Later, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed for the time being.

The further point should be made that in the areas where there are 5-acre farmers, something like 150,000, or more than half of the total mentioned by the gentleman from Texas, are not going to get 5 acres under this bill. I propose to offer an amendment at the proper time designed to meet what the proponents of this bill have stated is their definite purpose, to take care of the small-cotton farmer, and nothing else.

My amendment would provide that each State would have added to its allocation sufficient acreage to give each cotton farmer 5 acres, or the average of his planted acres under 5 if it is less. That would require no more than 398,000 additional cotton acreage. This bill would require 543,000. For those of you who are interested in trying to eliminate some of the problems the Secretary of Agriculture has with the cotton surplus, I would like to point out that under the amendment I intend to offer the increased production would probably be only about 100,000 bales as contrasted with what the proponents of this bill advocate, 250,000 bales.

Now I want to go to the heart of the matter and try to take care of the small-cotton farmer. I have no personal interest in the matter; I am disinterested, for my amendment would not benefit a single farmer in my congressional district. I am purely trying to work out a solution to take care of these small-cotton farmers about whom we hear so much every time a cotton-acreage bill comes before Congress. I hope you will carefully consider what I have said and will consider it in the light of the alternatives presented.

I believe the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] asked me to yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I just wanted to make a statement.

In the gentleman's remarks he referred to the 5-acre minimum requirement as 398,318 acres as against 543,000, the total this bill would authorize.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. Or 398,000 against 543,000.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman does not say that this bill would give all the 398,000 acres to the 5-acre farmers. Of course it does not.

Mr. GATHINGS. I did not intend to say that.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman will concede this bill will give 300,000 additional acres to other than 5-acre farmers. That is what the figures in the report show.

Mr. GATHINGS. And the gentleman wants to amend the bill to provide for 398,000 acres?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. This bill provides 543,000 acres now.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. My amendment would knock out the 543,000 and provide for 398,000 acres.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman referred to 100,000 bales a moment ago.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman concedes that the 398,000 acres will take care of the little farmer?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman concede that under the proposal we have now pending every 5-acre farmer will be given 5 acres.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. No. Some 150,000 5-acre farmers will be left out under the bill we have before us.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. As I understand the gentleman, what he is pointing out is that although there are over 500,000 acres to be set aside under the terms of this bill a lot of States in the Union, including the gentleman's State and my State, will not get enough acreage to give as much as 5 acres to each farmer?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct.

Mr. FORRESTER. On the other hand, there are several States that not only get their 5 acres but they get additional acreage?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is exactly right.

Mr. FORRESTER. What the gentleman is trying to do is to make this a real hardship relief bill?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is exactly what I am trying to do.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the acreage allotment proposed in this bill Alabama will get up to approximately 3½ acres while the rest of the States west of the Mississippi will be getting 5 acres.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Most of the States west of the Mississippi will get acreage beyond that needed for a 5-acre farm.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. So it is a 5-acre bill as far as the West is concerned but so far as the Southeast is concerned it is a 3-acre bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is one way of putting it.

Mr. COOLEY. It is a fact that under the bill we have here now it would take 85,000 acres in North Carolina alone to take care of the small grower of cotton, the ones with less than 5 acres?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is right. Under my amendment North Carolina would get 85,000 additional acres.

Mr. COOLEY. We need relief but we get very little. I want to say to the gentleman that I have no right to accept the amendment for the committee but I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN. Does the gentleman's amendment make any provision for the 6-acre farmer, the 7-acre farmer or the 20-acre farmer?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. My amendment does not have any provision for those farmers, and I think I am being fair by leaving them out, for the committee does also in most of the States.

Mr. HAGEN. We have a lot of testimony before our committee of farmers in Texas who farm 15 or 20 acres and I may say that they were in just as much of a hardship position as some of these 5-acre farms.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think every farmer in my district is in just as much of a hardship position.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Does the Government have a market price to support for cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under the reciprocal-trade legislation that the gentleman's party put across last week,

can the President not give you relief and get you these foreign markets?

Mr. COOLEY. The President does not have to do that. We are not complaining about cotton being imported.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is not enough coming in?

Mr. COOLEY. It is the export of cotton.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there anything to this piece I read in the paper this morning about there being at least 2 years' supply of cotton on hand?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I do not think we have a 2 years' supply.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Nothing to that?

Mr. COOLEY. There is something to that. We have an abundance of cotton.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not know anything about cotton.

Mr. COOLEY. We probably have about a year's supply of cotton.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the world has a year's supply on hand other than as a relief measure, there would seem to be no reason for market support by the tax dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A number of gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who supported the Trade Agreements Act the other day, apparently are not worried about imported cotton textiles which destroys the market for their raw cotton.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He said we do not import any cotton.

Mr. GROSS. We import textiles, which destroys the American market for cotton.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That only takes the fellows in the North and the Northeast—Massachusetts and a few in the South—out of their jobs. That has not anything to do with the cotton program.

No—it just gives us unemployment of factory workers.

Mr. GROSS. It is too bad we cannot all cry for those here today who seek to increase cotton production, but who voted last week for what amounts to free trade in textiles.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Those cotton boys are looking for some help, and I am looking for some help for our farmers and workers. I do not want to put anyone out of business, and I think everybody should have a chance to earn a livelihood, but if not able to find a job, some but not all can get social security, old-age pensions, or relief payments—and I would like to see those who have a job and are satisfied permitted to work.

But, I was wondering about this cotton business. We have been appropriating dollars and machinery and technical assistance to other countries and fixed it so that they can grow cotton, then manufacture it into textiles and send it into our markets and throw our employees out of their jobs. Is that not the way it is, as the gentleman from Iowa was telling me?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You see, I have to get this information and education as I go along, but that is the way I understood it.

EXTORTION IN MICHIGAN

I want to talk about the hardships of my own folks for a while. When you cotton fellows want something, I notice you always get it—put peanuts and tobacco and rice in there, too. Now, look. Sometime I would like some help for the folks up in our country. We have people who grow berries—raspberries, huckleberries, strawberries, blueberries, cherries and a lot of peaches, plums and pears and apples as well as other fresh stuff for the markets.

Mr. PATTERSON. Raspberries, too?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, raspberries, too. Though you folks give us a lot of that here, and you folks buy a lot of our fruit—and if you would only help us sell for a decent price, we would like it better.

Now, about this berry business, I imagine some of your people have the same situation. We have market associations, big concerns, and the trucks come in from various places. When your tomatoes are gone down in Texas, they come up and buy from us, as well as peaches and pears, and we ship out West. For example, a couple of weeks ago, we had truckers—owner brokers they are called by some unions—they may have 2 or 3 or 15 or 50 trucks; they do a big business in that market. Some drive their own trucks, some hire drivers—union men. The other day a trucker who has 12 trucks—a broker, he is called by some—he sent out 12 trucks with frozen strawberries. Well, when they went out, these union boys, from the teamsters—you know, they have a contract now that covers 13 Mid-West States where they get a guaranteed weekly wage, where, if they work only an hour in a day, they get a full day's pay—the teamsters men followed the trucks. The union had its cars, radio-equipped, follow each one of those trucks, some loaded with frozen strawberries. The fleet carried $70,000 worth of frozen products—let us say—strawberries. When the trucks got out to their destination, these union representatives that had followed along in their cars said, "You cannot unload." Now, do not forget, the trucks were driven and operated by union members who were fully paid up in their dues and special assessments and in good standing. But, when they got out there to their destination the union business agent said, "You cannot unload." The drivers said, "Why?" "Well," says the extortionist, "We have a new contract coming up, and we want the boys to sign up." The driver said, "Well, here we are with frozen strawberries." "Well," he said, "you can telephone back to the truck owner." So, they telephoned back, and the local union representative says, "Yes, you can unload if the fellow who owns the fleet of trucks will sign this overall contract."

Now, what could the owner do? He had $70,000 worth of berries in refrigerated cars ready to be delivered. He either made delivery or he took a $70,000 loss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have a little more time?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot even get started on this thing in 2 minutes. Do not think this situation is not coming to you boys—pardon me—to you gentlemen of the House, to you Members—my colleagues and to the people who send you here to protect them. So, the truckowner has to sign the contract, the overall teamster contract. If that is not coercion, if that is not a violation of the Hobbs amendment, the Anti-racketeering Act of 1934, then I do not know what that law was enacted to prevent.

That procedure is nothing less than extortion. It will finally get every congressional district where a ton of freight is moved. And that is not the end of this raid on the consumer and the taxpayer. It is what the Justice of the United States Supreme Court once said—before the Hobbs amendment—was highway robbery.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why does the gentlemon not report that situation to the Department of Justice? It sounds as if the Hobbs bill perhaps has been violated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It has. We have a dandy Attorney General with a good enforcement division, but he is so loaded down with similar cases that have accumulated from the last two administrations he just has not been able to get going on all these current cases. That is the only reason I have not reported this case. I am getting the case ready. Just as I readied a few others until the Committee on Government Operations for petty reasons of its own stopped me. I can pay my own expenses and get this and several other cases ready.

There is another little collecting station or two, a cooperative, in this shipping situation. The farmers haul their berries and other products to a collecting station, where they are held waiting for the trucks to come. Then if the big truck from the larger station or market wants to go down to the local co-op and collect a load, do you know what the truckowner has to pay? He has to pay $16 for the privilege of loading the farmer's produce on to a truck.

Nor is that the end of the racketeering by the teamsters. After the produce is loaded there at the local station and on a truck driven by a union driver, the truckowner has paid $16 to get that truck loaded. After it comes up to the delivery point then this truckowner often has to hire what they call a city man at the point of delivery and pay an additional fifteen dollars and some cents to get it unloaded. That cost is all coming back on the consumer eventually. Every unionman who eats any of that farm produce has to pay his share of that $30 of featherbedding.

Nor is that the end of the graft, but this is a long, long story, and you will get more of it as the days come on. The farmer, after he gets the strawberries or

other produce, has to have his pickers join the union and pay another fee. Then if he wants to take them to market he has to have his hired man join the union.

My colleagues have been talking about hardship. I feel sorry about you boys, but do not cry about it. You have not seen anything yet. You will see more of it if you stay in bed with Jimmie Hoffa and his crew.

Later, as opportunity offers, I will try to tell you a little more.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of points in connection with the bill, H. R. 3952, which should be either clarified or emphasized. For one thing, this bill has picked up the name of the 5-acre farm bill. This is somewhat misleading.

We do propose to take care of the group who has the smallest cotton acreage first. In most of the States affected, these are the ones whose economy will be worse upset if we do not provide some additional acreage. However, in my own section, the distressed farms include a great many with up to 10 and 15 acres. These would be materially helped by the bill now under consideration.

If you want to find a name to give the measure, I would suggest calling it the family farmers bill because in practically all the cases the acreage is going to farms which are operated by a farmer and his family.

Another point that needs clarification—when we speak of 5, 10, or 15 acres, we are referring to cotton acreage only and not to the acreage of the whole farm. In most of our States, where a small farmer has cotton acreage, it provides his only money crop. In my own county, for instance, these farmers plant other crops. They grow much of the food that they eat. They probably have a milk cow and a few pigs, chickens, and such as that, which are principally for their own use. They may sell off a few eggs or a little milk, but these do not provide a money crop.

The cotton which they grow is used to pay interest and taxes and buy the things in town which cannot be produced on the farm. Up to now, we have never found a money crop which can be substituted for cotton; and if we make it impossible for our people to farm cotton, then we are certainly going to force them to leave the land and seek employment elsewhere.

Just before Christmas I visited the part of my district which is the most seriously affected by the acreage cuts. For the first time, since I can remember, I saw signs along the highway advertising farm land for sale. I asked if it was selling and learned that it was. The buyers are mostly wealthy people from the cities nearby. They are buying up the land and the former owners are leaving and going to town.

It reminds you of the days just prior to the depression of the late twenties and thirties. We cannot depend on city employment for all of these country folks, and, sooner or later, we will have them to take care of. We submit that it is far better to take a little more time to reduce our cotton surplus, and, thereby, to make it possible for the small farmers to stay on the soil, than it would be to shrug our shoulders and say, "it's too bad, but there's nothing we can do about it."

The bill which is before you would soften the impact of the drastic acreage reductions decreed by the Department of Agriculture, and give the individuals and the communities time enough to work out their destiny. Let me emphasize the necessity for keeping available the production of cotton which could come from these farms. If we get into war or if any of our major allies have a war, the cotton surplus in this country would not last more than a matter of weeks. Very promptly the Secretary of Agriculture would be beseeching the farmers to produce more cotton for the war effort. That is what happened in 1950, and that is a big reason for our present troubles.

Speaking of the Korean war effort, let me point out to you that when the all-out production was no longer necessary, the Secretary of Agriculture did not impose acreage limitations. He did, however, ask the farmers to voluntarily cut their production. Some farmers did cut their production and others did not. Those who cut had every reason to believe that these self-imposed limitations would never react against them in later history computations. However, that promise was forgotten and when they reminded the Secretary of this obligation in Houston a few weeks ago, nobody in his office could remember anything about it. So unless we do something about it now, my farmers and yours are going to be penalized for doing a proper and patriotic job.

I am sorry that some of our colleagues seem opposed to the bill because it does not fully provide for their people. Of course it does not. It is, by no means, satisfying to me. However, it does provide some degree of relief for every State which produces cotton. We have tried to leave enough to the discretion of the State committees to enable them to work out some measure of help to their hardship cases.

The committee studied with great care every known avenue of approach to this troublesome subject. We could find nothing which came as near taking care of everybody and which could merit the support of every State which produces cotton.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I wish to congratulate the Committee on Agriculture for reporting legislation which will, if enacted, give some relief to hardship cases, especially among our small cotton farmers. Secretary Benson's reduction in acreage allotments to the lowest figure in the history of the country has made it practically impossible for many small farmers to provide for their families. I, along with other Members in the Cotton Belt, have introduced several bills to give increased acreage to our cotton farmers. I feel that some of these bills would be an improvement over the one we have under consideration today. However, the provisions of the bill which we are considering will go a long way toward adjusting hardship cases. I have received many letters from farmers, especially small farmers, in my district who are greatly disturbed over the present setup. The following excerpts are only typical of the many communications I have received:

I am writing you for advice on how to make a living. They took all my cotton acreage except 3.2 acres, so can you tell me how I can make a living for my wife and children. I am 56 years of age, cannot get a job at anything. I have three children in school. * * * All the loans have turned me down because I have so few acres in cotton. I can't change over to dairying because I have no money to buy cows. * * *

This is the first time I have ever written to any Senator or Representative. I am a very small farmer, among the smallest. I have 66 acres in cultivation with a cotton acreage allotment of 1.3 compared with 6.5 last year. * * * This is my only cash crop. * * * How can I support my family of eight with such a small allotment?

This is the first time I have ever begged for anything, but it seems like it is time I begged for something to be done about our cotton allotment. I have small farms of 135 acres. I have 2 places in cultivation and was allotted 9 acres of cotton for both places. This being our only money crop, how can we support a family of seven, send the children to school, etc.?

I need some more information as to how I can make a living. I had 11.2 acres in cotton last year and got 7.2 acres this time. I have 8 in my family; 6 children in school. I can't dig up 90 cents a day for lunches. It looks like we will lose our place.

This survey covers the following reports:

Number of counties with 1,000 or more acres of cotton and number of counties reporting

	Number of counties having 1,000 or more acres of cotton	Number of counties reporting
Alabama	67	67
Arizona	7	7
Arkansas	63	54
California	8	9
Florida	11	27
Georgia	138	139
Illinois	0	3
Kentucky	2	2
Louisiana	46	29
Missouri	8	8
Mississippi	77	80
New Mexico	11	10
North Carolina	55	64
Oklahoma	59	74
South Carolina	46	44
Tennessee	35	44
Texas	205	212
Virginia	6	14
Total	844	887

I would like to point out just what faces the small farmers unless we give relief now.

Summary of answers from 887 counties to the following question: How many renter families (tenants and sharecroppers) have been or will be forced off farms due to 1955 reduction in cotton allotments? The question is concerned only with the number of renters (as defined above) forced off farms due to the 1955 reduction in cotton acreage allotments and not for other causes such as mechanization, drought, etc.

State:	*Renter families*
Alabama	7,554
Arizona	127
Arkansas	4,246
California	0
Florida	279
Georgia	8,157
Illinois	40
Kentucky	60
Louisiana	3,395
Missouri	2,202
Mississippi	11,981
New Mexico	137
North Carolina	2,783
Oklahoma	1,477
South Carolina	4,147
Tennessee	3,075
Texas	5,580
Virginia	108
Total	55,348

Summary of answers from 887 counties to the following question: How many small cotton farmers (i. e., those with 5 acres or less of cotton alloted in 1954) will have net income for the farm reduced by $100 or more due to the 1955 cotton-acreage reduction? Do not include in this estimate the number who may have income reduced due to not planting full allotments. The value of crops produced on acres diverted from cotton should be considered in arriving at the net income loss.

State:	
Alabama	17,595
Arizona	38
Arkansas	1,496
California	0
Florida	2,348
Georgia	14,888
Illinois	147
Kentucky	203
Louisiana	6,649
Missouri	1,881
Mississippi	34,414
New Mexico	64
North Carolina	17,397
Oklahoma	378
South Carolina	10,400
Tennessee	14,944
Texas	6,129
Virginia	1,632
Total	130,603

These findings come from an official survey by the Department of Agriculture.

The plight of these farmers is far more serious than many people realize. It is near cotton-planting time in my district. I urge that we pass this bill today. I hope that the Senate will take immediate, favorable action, and that the President will sign the bill, thereby enabling the farmers to take advantage of the increases this year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill which will add 543,234 acres to the amount of farmland that may be planted in cotton this year. This bill is designed to provide a measure of relief to farmers suffering from hardships due to the drastic cut in acreage. Out of this additional acreage the State of Texas will get its proportionate share, which is 228,383 acres. This amount is inadequate to meet many of the pressing needs, but the Committee on Agriculture, which conducted hearings on the measure, feel this is the largest amount that we can hope to get approved by Congress and by the President.

Unfortunately, the State committees in many of the cotton producing States did not use wisdom and good judgment in the allocation of the 10 percent acreage reserve. In Texas most of that reserve went to areas not as deserving as other sections where drought and other hardships have brought great distress to farmers and a drastic reduction in acreage that can be planted this year.

The pending bill will help. But there will remain many hardship cases that this limited increase in acreage will not help very much. But it is either this or nothing, and there is no time to waste. The planting season is approaching, and this bill must go through the Senate and then to the White House. All of that takes time. Therefore, I urge that the bill be promptly approved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the legislation now under consideration is of vital importance to thousands of small farmers. This bill, H. R. 3952, simply provides for a 3-percent increase in each State's 1955 cotton allotment. The increased allotment would go first to small farmers to provide, so far as possible, each farmer a minimum allotment of 5 acres or the highest number of acres planted to cotton in 1952, 1953, or 1954, whichever is smaller.

The committee has estimated that there are 291,809 cotton farmers who will be affected by this bill. In the State of Mississippi alone, there are 47,164 farms which have been allotted less than 5 acres for the 1955 season. Anyone familiar with the hard work, and the indeterminate number of risks involved in growing cotton should realize that the farmer and his family cannot exist on 1, 2, or 3 acres of cotton. The high cost of fertilizer, seed, labor, and machinery make it imperative that Congress take some action to alleviate the hardships which currently confront the small cotton farmer.

The problem facing the small cotton farmer is illustrated by the following United States Department of Agriculture figures with respect to the situation in Lincoln County, Miss. With a total of 1,440 cotton farms, 1,143 farms—or 79.2 percent—have been allotted less than 5 acres in 1955; 312 or 21.6 percent have been allotted 1 acre or less. Producing about 250 pounds per acre and with cotton selling at about 30 cents per pound, it does not take much arithmetic to see that these 1,143 farmers and their families will not have very much income this year. Since Lincoln County is a typical Mississippi hill county, it is readily seen that the agriculture income in 1955 will be greatly reduced. Even now, southern farmers are in great difficulty because of the drought and depressed beef prices. In 1955 Mississippi farm income was $100 million less than in 1953—a decrease of more than 20 percent. If the legislation under consideration is not passed, the southern farmer can expect a further decline this year.

There has been some argument that this bill will, if enacted into law, further add to the present cotton surplus. Of course, any increase in acreage is bound to result in an increase in production. However, the increase which will result from enactment of this bill will be negligible compared with the cotton supply on hand which has accumulated over the years. Moreover, when compared with the benefits to be received by the thousands of small farmers through enactment of this measure, the additional cotton supply is again negligible. The committee estimates that only 250,000 bales will be produced from the additional amount of acreage provided in this bill. Certainly, a quarter million bales of cotton will not destroy our farm program.

Mr. Chairman, there is little resemblance between cotton farmers of the South and those of the Far West. According to acreage-allotment figures of the Department of Agriculture, Mississippi cotton farms average about 9 acres, while California cotton farms average over 90 acres. Relatively few cotton operations in the Southeastern States are large operations, while quite a large portion of western growers are corporations, owning or renting several thousand acres of land, and making use of the latest mechanical equipment. As a result, the cost of production to the little southern farmer makes it extremely difficult for him to compete with western production.

The bill presently before us is far from adequate to meet the needs of the cotton-growing section of the country. It falls far short of alleviating all of the hardships brought about by the acreage cutback. Even so, we accept the fact that half a loaf is better than none at all, and remember the old saying that "a bird in hand is better than two in the bush." I am willing to accept the committee's judgment in the matter, believing that they are better qualified than any others in the House to determine how far we will be able to go in providing additional acreage to take care of these situations.

My able and distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has called to the attention of the House the damage that current policies of Government agencies has inflicted on the cotton industry, by permitting domestic supplies to accumulate, and withholding our cotton from sale on the world market at competitive prices. He might well have gone further, to point out that we have been subsidizing the production of cotton in foreign countries through our ridiculous and costly programs of foreign aid. In effect, we have subsidized our competitors, who are now driving us off the world market. All of these factors, taken into consideration together, must lead to the inevitable conclusion that Government policies have been the chief contributor to the unhappy conditions in which American agriculture, as a whole, finds itself. Congress and the Government agencies must assume their share of the responsibility for these conditions, and Congress will be failing to discharge its obligation to a large segment of its citizens if it neglects to pass this bill and provide this very necessary relief.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made some reference to the supply of cotton, I think it appropriate at this time to comment on that. While the supply in a sense is generally large, it amounts to only 40 percent of a full year's supply over and above the normal carryover. Normally about 5 million bales of cotton are carried over from year to year. Such an amount is regarded as normal. But assuming that no carryover at all is required, still there would only be a 10 months' supply or thereabout on hand. To those of us who live in the Cotton Belt such is a large supply. It is seriously crippling our present farming operations. But insofar as the economy of the country is concerned, it is not a dangerously large supply. From that standpoint, it does not present a bad situation.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed to a few remarks about this bill. As is always the case when a bill of this character is brought to the House, it precipitates considerable discussion and brings forth sundry amendments and varied views. These same discussions heard today took place in the committee. Now as to the members of the committee, I would not say they are absolutely the best informed on the subject but I do say they have studied it as long as anybody in the House. Amendments similar to those to be offered were offered in the committee. Some of them I offered and favored. But the committee saw fit to vote them down. Similar arguments in their support were offered in the committee. Some of those arguments I approved and some I did not. So after compromising all views we finally got a bill and brought it to the floor. As I said a moment ago, we are now hearing more of the same arguments, which is healthy. I am glad we are hearing them but let us not overdo it and thereby kill the bill.

The issue before us is not a question of how much cotton we ought to consume or export. I am glad these points have been mentioned because they are important—nor is the issue how much your State is getting and how much my State is getting because each State is getting identically the same increase percentagewise. The only issue here, as I view it, is are we going to take this last chance. Time is getting late. It is running out. Are we going to take advantage of this last chance to do just a little something for the benefit of my own State involving about 47,000 Mississippi cotton farmers whose allotments have been cut under 5 acres. That is the only issue just now as far as my State is concerned. I know there are some in other States who do not have the small-farm problem. I know, too, they are getting some acres under this bill. I also know if they do not get their share, percentagewise, I probably will not get mine and we need it badly.

I disapproved of the formula adopted in the emergency bill of last year in making State allotments. I thought then and think now it was unfair. But the committee worked its will and so did the House of Representatives. In fact, I offered amendments last year in the committee which would reverse that situation, but the committee saw fit to vote them down. Unfortunately, they would vote them down again today. There is no need of us kidding ourselves about that.

Also there were amendments offered in our committee to make the pending increases even larger than we made them in this bill, and they also were voted down. There was one amendment offered to make the increase smaller.

I have good reason to believe the President will approve this bill. I cannot reveal the source of my information because I have it in confidence. I have good reason to believe that the Departments will approve it and recommend that the President sign it. I cannot reveal the source because that also has come to me in confidence. But I want to say to you, my friends, if you have some farmers who are hurt, I honestly believe—I honestly believe that this is a last chance to help them. Let us not kill this bill with wrangling and too much debate. We need the acreage provided for in this bill and we need it now. It may not be what you want. It isn't what I want, but it will help and, if we act speedily without argument, I believe we will get it.

The hour is getting late. They will be planting in my section of the country in a few weeks. Time is running out. It will take some time to get the bill through the other body and over to the White House to be signed. I do not know how long, but I know it will require considerable time. More time will be required in administration. Time is therefore of the essence. Let us move and move now. Let us not talk this bill to death or load it down with amendments.

We all know what is in it. We are not getting exactly what we want. None of us are. Of course not. But the Committee on Agriculture is pretty well informed about the situation and the need. Its members are very well informed of what can and cannot be passed. We believe we have brought you a bill that can be passed and will be signed by the President. So, let us pass it. Time is running out. Cotton-planting time is on us. This is our last chance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of law the 1955 cotton acreage allotment established for each State pursuant to the provisions of this section (excluding those States which received a minimum allotment under subsection (k)) shall be increased by 3 percent. The additional acreage made available to the States under the provisions of this subsection shall, in order to assist small farmers, be apportioned directly to farms so as to provide each farm a minimum allotment equal to the smaller of (1) 5 acres or (2) the highest number of acres planted to cotton on the farm in 1952, 1953, or 1954. If the additional acreage is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the State. If the additional acreage available to the State is in excess of the total of the farm increases so computed, in order to alleviate hardships, the acreage remaining after making such farm increases shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of their respective shares of the State acreage allotment heretofore apportioned pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, and the additional acreage so made available to counties shall be apportioned to farms in the county so as to provide each farm with an allotment for 1955 equal to 60 percent of the acres planted to cotton on the farm in 1954. If such additional acreage is insufficient to meet the total of the farm increases so computed, such farm increases shall be reduced pro rata to the additional acreage available to the county under this subsection. If the additional acreage available to the county is in excess of the total of the farm increases so computed, the acreage remaining after making such farm increases shall be added to the county acreage reserve under subsection (f) (3) of this section and shall be used by the county committee for the purposes specified therein. The additional acreage made available to States under the provisions of this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to extra long staple cotton."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out all of lines 14 and 15 and insert "as provided in."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 1, line 10, strike out the figure "3" and insert "6."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I repeat in some way the statement I made earlier. We have a system of price supports of which we are all aware, but the law provides that those price supports shall serve, in the case of cotton, that cotton can be sold on the domestic markets at the support-price levels plus reasonable carrying charges, but the same law which creates this price-support system provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell that cotton in world trade on a competitive basis. That refers to surplus commodities, and surplus cotton. I say it is a challenge whether you have got any right to call anything surplus when you will not offer it for sale. That is the situation, and it is uncontradicted in our hearings before the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations. This cotton that is referred to is cotton that we got under the price-support system, but it is cotton which your Government has held for a number

of years and would not offer for sale in world trade on a competitive basis.

Now, that law provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, once the supply reaches a certain level, shall take into consideration first the supply; the expected exports; the domestic consumption; plus 30 percent. In those instances they count cotton which is a part of our supply but which has not been offered for sale on a competitive basis. He figures the export, but he does not figure what we might export if he would offer it for sale at the price level.

It provides that after he has taken those factors into consideration he shall issue an order fixing the number of acres that will produce the number of bales, with one limitation, he cannot go below 10 million bales in a year. Now, that is in connection with your own support system that you shall carry with it acreage reductions and marketing quotas. But the point I make is that with this holding of the domestic support price as the world price by the Department of Agriculture, we give assurances to the big American cotton interests that we are going to hold the world price at our domestic support price; and, Mr. Chairman, every time you have cut the acreage of American cotton farmers you have in reality shifted your cotton acreage to foreign countries.

I offer this amendment striking out the 3-percent increase in this bill and providing 6-percent increase. If this amendment is accepted it will double the amount of increase in cotton acreage and provide approximately 1,086,468 acres to the national acreage allotment, but will still leave a reduction from last year's acreage of 2 million acres. I believe this amendment will do much to make other features of this bill much more workable; but above all it will keep American farmers in the United States in the production of cotton, which I think is essential to our own economy and is certainly necessary to tenant and other small farmers who are being reduced below a subsistence level by the present order.

The Department of Agriculture, after numerous requests, finally made a report to our subcommittee showing that the effect of existing acreage reductions will be to put more than 55,000 renters and sharecropper farmers out of homes. This report, made by representatives of the Department of Agriculture, further shows that more than 130,000 small farmers with incomes of less than $1,000 gross per year will have their income reduced by more than $100.

I know that many people have been led to believe that if firm price supports are to be retained we must take this reduction in American cotton acreage. That should not be true when we will not offer for sale competitively and when the effect is to put many farmers out of business. It is not required by law.

Our hearings, which I have here before me and which I hope all of you will take time to read, clearly show that the support level is one thing under the law, and the sale price of CCC stocks in world trade is another. For the first time the Department of Agriculture agrees that it has full authority to sell CCC stocks on a competitive bid basis to our traders for export and sale in world markets. This authority the Department refuses to use. This cotton which the Department has on hand but will not offer for sale in world trade on a competitive bid basis has been used to bring about this drastic reduction in American cotton acreage, with the devastating effect on many farmers which I have heretofore mentioned; and all the time we move United States acreage overseas.

If the reduction in American acreage resulted in reducing on a permanent basis world supplies of cotton, that would be one thing, but the record shows that we cut down on American production and American acreage, and such acreage is merely transferred to foreign countries, where, I am told, the financing and operations are really foreign investments of American cotton operators.

This is clearly shown on page 86 of our hearings, where, according to the Department's own records, while we reduced our acreage last year by more than 3 million acres, the rest of the world increased its production of cotton by 1,200,000 bales. The records show that while the United States was reducing cotton acreage here Egypt increased her cotton acreage by 240,000 acres. Those records show that while we reduced our cotton acres here, India increased her cotton acreage by 2 million acres, and Brazil by 500,000 acres—because the Department of Agriculture made the United States support price the floor for United States sales abroad. This is not required nor contemplated by the Commodity Credit Corporation charter.

While the Department says that it does not know what producers in foreign countries will do this year, with the exception of Mexico and Egypt, their own figures show that as we reduce cotton acreage in the United States this year Egypt plans to increase her acreage by 340,000 acres and Mexico plans to increase her acreage by 275,000 acres. While the Department says it does not know about Brazil the record does show that last year Brazil increased her cotton acreage by 500,000 acres. Thus, my friends, we should not reduce the United States cotton acreage as provided by the Secretary's order.

The remedy must come from selling American production on a competitive basis. This the rest of the world is doing now. We must retain now and in the future our share of world production. This the Department of Agriculture has the authority to do. Instead of using the authority of the law to sell United States cotton competitively, we have followed the policy which is set forth on page 142 of our hearings in the following words, in a release of the Department of Agriculture entitled "Outlook for American Cotton in Foreign Markets," dated February 17, 1954:

> The present season again finds the United States in the position of residual supplier of cotton to the world, that is, with the demand for its exports limited until other exporters have largely sold out.

That is the policy our Department continues to follow. Notwithstanding that the Secretary and his Assistant Secretaries testified to our committee that in their judgment high United States support prices are pricing the farmer out of his markets. They then accept the responsibility for pricing him out of world markets by not offering his commodities in world trade on a competitive bid basis, as is authorized by law. It would appear then that the Department knowingly, if they believe domestic price support levels price the farmer out of domestic markets, by their determination to make the United States support price the world price are taking the responsibility for pricing the United States farmer out of world markets, with increased foreign production a matter of record.

Certainly there is ample evidence to show that large United States financial interests are taking advantage of the Department's fixing of United States support levels as the world price; and each time you cut out acreage in the United States, and thereby cut out 55,000 farmers and reduce another 130,000 below a subsistence level, you are giving those acres to foreign countries where United States financial interests are moving in where they do not have the high cost of labor and other high United States costs. And just as surely as I stand here, our failure to offer for sale on a competitive bid basis provides an umbrella for this expansion in foreign lands. United States operators in Brazil and Mexico run practically no risks at all.

I am not satisfied with all the provisions of the pending bill. I hope my amendment will be adopted, because at least it will have the benefit of returning to the farmers of the United States the right to farm, and will at least protect him in holding approximately one million acres of cotton which otherwise, according to what happened last year and what is in the offing this year, would be sent overseas. The many administrative problems will be relieved to a great extent because of more acres with which to deal.

May I point out to you that the Secretary of Agriculture agrees that he has full authority to sell cotton on a competitive-bid basis. If he would only move in and sell some part of it on such basis, retaining to the Department the right to determine how much is to be offered and the spacing between offerings he would cause American financial interests to give serious thought before they would continue to plant every acre we cut out here, in Brazil, Mexico, and other countries of the world. It is time we realize that the trouble comes from a refusal to sell our cotton on a competitive basis and not because we are producing more than our share of the world production. If we give it up the other countries take it, and all too frequently it is United States interests taking their finances and know-how into those foreign areas where instead of 90-cents-an-hour wages it is less than that per day.

Unless we pass this amendment and put ourselves back in the cotton business to stay, we will be gradually cut back to the domestic market. This is economically unsound and the only basis that I can see for any continuation of such policy would be to make the cuts so

harsh and the farmers so adversely affected as to get rid of the price-support system. Our Secretary of Agriculture says that is not his intent, but unless that be the intent of the Department there is no sound basis to make the United States price an umbrella over world prices, to cut out cotton acreage and cotton production, and thereby many farmers, in the United States only to send the same production overseas. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Whether you believe in flexibles or firm supports, whether you believe in this or that, there is no farm program that can last if you do not let the farmers farm. It sounds big to talk about adding a million acres to this drastic reduction under the pending order but, after all, if you add a million acres, as my amendment would do, that is still 2 million acres under last year's production. I say that we ought to have, in addition to saving the million acres, a change in the United States Government policy so that our commodity will be offered to the consumers of the world, offered for sale, and the price made competitive. We certainly need to sell the products of the investment that we have in this country. If there is any reason in the world why we should not have done it before, when we see that it is reaching the place of putting thousands of people out of homes and others on a gross income of less than $900 a year, it is high time somebody wakes up to the erroneous policy that we have followed.

I hope that my amendment will be agreed to. There is no statement I have made that is not borne out by the record of the hearings before our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Every last word is borne out. This is the Department's own figures I gave you as to the effect of the present order.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. There certainly is a lot of merit in the gentleman's argument, but we are faced with a practical situation. I am sure the gentleman realizes that. Does the gentleman think the Department would recommend this bill to the President if we increased the acreage by a million acres?

Mr. WHITTEN. I have every reason to believe that the Department will approve it with my amendment in it just as readily as it would approve it with the amount that is in the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has made reference to the fact that more than 50,000 people have been driven out of their homes, leaving the impression that that is the direct result of the acreage allotment and marketing quota law. That is not altogether true. The point that the gentleman is failing to emphasize is that the administration now in power, and officials in the preceding administration, have not competed in the world market to sell the cotton.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to leave any impression of that kind. I say that because we are counting cotton on hand which is not surplus because it has not been offered for sale competitively, the effect of counting this cotton that is not for sale and saying that it is surplus, has brought about the present order, which is erroneous as well as the policy in cutting acreage here. You are merely giving it overseas with a guaranteed profit to American financial interests.

I would like to read to you an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News:

A TRAGIC FARM PICTURE

One of the most ominous phases of our economic picture in this Nation is the steady movement of population from farms to cities.

It is useless, however, to try to make official Washington realize what will eventually be the dire consequences of this migration.

All our cities are growing too rapidly. They cannot provide jobs for rural workers who are leaving the farms. Living conditions in the larger cities are becoming atrocious in spite of federally financed housing projects. School buildings cannot be built fast enough to furnish seats for the influx of rural children.

It is true that farm life in some parts of the Nation does not offer all the attractions people would like to have, but farm life at its worst is far better, and provides more of the comforts of life, than the slums in our overpopulated cities where the armies of jobless are steadily growing.

Yet in the face of this fact Congress is once more curtailing production of standard crops.

The Department of Agriculture whose Secretary is the principal promoter of acreage reduction, frankly admits that the cut in cotton acreage this year will force 55,348 families from southern farms, and another 130,603 families will barely get by because their incomes will be sharply reduced by the acreage slash.

Mississippi will furnish 11,981 of the families driven from farms and 34,414 of our families will be reduced below a decent subsistence level.

In the face of these tragic finds, won't somebody in official Washington please wake up, face the facts, and at least show the gumption that God gave geese?

We either move our farm production in world markets at competitive prices or else we cut back to producing for the domestic market, aggravating the situation my friend Major Sullins so well portrays.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's amendment will not be adopted. There is a reason that the Farm Bureau and the various farm organizations of this country have not come out in favor of any increase in the national-acreage allotment. They are not here this year like they were last year. At that time, if you will recall, the beltwide group of representatives of cotton producers from the Carolinas across to California were right here in this Congress asking for aid and relief to alleviate the situation that existed at that time. This year you do not find that.

We are here because of the appeals of the farmers, the sharecroppers, and tenants who really need some aid. We would like to help them more, we would like to increase the allotment to a greater degree if it were possible to do so.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman realize that when he refers to the big cotton organizations, that the Export Committee of National Cotton Council includes Mr. Fleming of Anderson & Clayton and Mr. Hohenberg, all of whom have large cotton interests in Brazil and Mexico, and who deal in cotton on a world basis?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not have in mind the National Cotton Council. I was talking about the other farm organizations. The National Cotton Council is an overall cotton organization and not a growers' group alone.

May I say that the gentleman from Mississippi is one of the outstanding agriculturists in this Nation. He has studied this problem, he wants to do something to be helpful not only to his people but to cottongrowers throughout the Nation. However, I do not believe that to increase this allotment by 6 percent would get the bill signed by the President.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted Arkansas would receive more than 90,000 acres?

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right, however, if the Whitten amendment defeats the bill, Arkansas and all other States would get nothing.

Mr. COOLEY. Arkansas would only need 8,400 acres to take care of the small farmers of Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. To take care of the 5-acre minimum.

Mr. COOLEY. And the gentleman from Arkansas, in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, is aware of that fact.

Mr. GATHINGS. Absolutely.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to have the gentleman explain if the situation in Arkansas as it exists there now in regard to the little farmer is not brought about by the fact that those in charge of the program in Arkansas have properly administered the program.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. The State committee did a fine job in trying to alleviate the plight of the small-acre farmer. And an even greater work was done by the fine farmers who served on the various county committees. It is a remarkable thing how these men gave of their time and effort in an attempt to give fair treatment to all. If I may deviate at this point, I would like to commend all the farmers who have served on these county committees.

Mr. COOLEY. Whereas in other States they have used the cotton acreage allotment for taking care of the big farmers instead of the little farmers.

Mr. GATHINGS. In the gentleman's State, I would say that his State committee did not look after the small-farm folks and did not look after the new farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not complaining about the way the program has been administered in North Carolina.

Mr. GATHINGS. Since the gentleman mentioned my State, our State committee did a fairly good job, because practically all of the small farmers have been brought up to the 5-acre minimum, and we require about 8,000 acres to bring the rest up.

Mr. COOLEY. I just wanted to get this in the RECORD, that while it appears that Arkansas is receiving 45,000 acres, it is due to the fact that your program has been administered in a certain way different than it has been administered in other States.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Whereas in North Carolina we are only getting 15,000 acres, we need 85,000 acres.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, in the State of North Carolina you need 85,000 acres to bring the small acreage farmer up.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated, because I actually do not believe that the Administration will approve the bill if we double this acreage.

Mr. GATHINGS. It is the straw that will break the camel's back. You can go just so far to get this bill approved.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. It is a fact, is it not, that while your State committee used about 80 percent of its State reserves to take care of the small farmers, the State of Mississippi did not use 1 single acre to take care of the small farmers, and neither did the State committee in North Carolina, and that is the reason those 2 States stand out like sore thumbs, because their committees did not use 1 acre to meet this situation.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I take it it is fair to say that your committee and the subcommittee and the entire committee would have approved an additional allotment even as much as the gentleman from Mississippi proposes if it had been our judgment that it would have been approved by the Department.

Mr. GATHINGS. I really think so. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], who is one of the outstanding cotton proponents in this House, introduced an amendment, as he stated earlier on the floor, and our subcommittee asked that this not be brought back solely to be sure that it would be signed, and we wanted to be sure of that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Did we not give due deliberation and go as far as we thought we could safely go to bring about relief and actually get results?

Mr. GATHINGS. We did in the subcommittee as well as in the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a question for the purpose of clarifying in my own mind his position with respect to the dual or two-price system. Is it the gentleman's position—and I have listened with interest to his discussion of this bill today—that we should have one price for domestic consumers of cotton and another price for foreign consumers?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will put it this way: The whole program of price supports provided the authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation with regard to any farm commodities which might be accumulated above domestic needs to sell such commodities in world trade competitively. This does not necessarily mean reducing sale prices. For your international brokers could buy offerings at the domestic price, and it would not be then reduced. I spent the month of October with cotton importers in Europe who seemed to know about this problem. I learned that without exception every country on the face of the earth which has commodities that they do not need at home is offering them for sale and offering them competitively. We are the only ones who do not, and the law now authorizes sale of commodities in world trade competitively. The Government will not act.

Mr. JONAS. I think that is true, but I wanted to be sure I followed the gentleman's argument. Cotton of course is only consumed by textile plants. You cannot eat cotton. It can only be spun into cloth or other textile products. If cotton brings on the domestic market say 35 cents a pound, it is purchased by the textile plants of this country at that price and spun into cotton goods. If you sell cotton on the world market to the competing textile plants in England, Japan, and France and other nations on the continent for say 30 cents a pound, that puts our domestic textile industry at a competitive disadvantage, does it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. In the first place, in answer to the gentleman, I do not advocate that we offer these commodities at a reduced price but that we start selling on a competitive-bid basis, controlling ourselves as to how much and how often; in other words, ride the market and see the effects from day to day.

Mr. JONAS. The world price is lower than the domestic price today, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, it is slightly above it, because we have held part of the world supply off the world market. The world supply is kind of tight because part of our supply is not for sale on a competitive basis.

The point I would like to make to the gentleman is this: If we make our support price the world price, as the Department of Agriculture has done, then the big cotton operators can go into Brazil and Mexico, where they have low-cost labor, and then the Japanese spinning industry, having a source of cotton in a low-cost area, can run our mills out of all the export market, and the situation would get worse. To do as the gentleman says, to dump it at a given reduced price, might have an effect on the domestic mills if you did not ride it from day to day and watch it. That I have not advocated, but if you did not do something, as long as we continue our present policies and let our acreages go to foreign countries where there is low-cost labor, then our foreign competitors have low-cost cotton from other areas and they can run our mills out of the export market.

Mr. JONAS. I asked the question because it does not seem fair to charge domestic consumers a higher price than foreign ones.

Mr. WHITTEN. When you get to your domestic situation, you have had 13 freight rate increases since World War II. We have a whole lot of fixed costs in the United States which apply, and which have been the cause of the necessity for the price-support program. But if we go into making our own domestic price the world price, we invite the spread to foreign countries. Then the foreign competitors, having a low-cost supply, will have a much worse effect that way than the other.

Mr. JONAS. We are doing it that way right along, not only in the commodities we produce on the farm but in the field of manufacturing. We are doing that in textiles particularly.

Mr. WHITTEN. In so many, many ways, but here again if we just save 1 million acres of cotton for the American farmer to farm, we have at least done that much good.

We must either move American farm production in world markets at competitive prices or else we dry up to producing for the American domestic market. That is it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, none of us likes to oppose an amendment such as that which has been offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. Everybody in this House would like to vote for unlimited production of everything if we could but get a fair price for it when we had produced it. But I think we all recognize that you cannot get anything like a fair price for many of our farm products if we provide unlimited production in the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like the RECORD to show that if my amendment is adopted it would still leave a 2-million decrease in cotton acreage from last year. I do not want any impression to get around that I am advocating throwing away all limitations.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman's amendment does not give us unlimited production but he frankly states it is a step in that direction. Obviously it is. It is a step toward unlimited production. It is a frank step toward the desire to increase production.

The bill that comes from the committee is not primarily for the purpose of increasing production but for the purpose of relieving the hardship on individuals who have been cut so much now that they simply cannot make a living, whether they are growing 2 acres, 20 acres, or 50 acres.

I sympathize with the viewpoint expressed by the gentleman from Mississip-

pi to the effect that it would be fine for the United States to dispose of the cotton that we have in stock competitively. I agree with the gentleman that we should. I think part of our present trouble results from the hesitancy on the part of the Department of Agriculture, and probably more on the part of the Department of State, to actually sell what we now have competitively. But are we not attacking the problem in the wrong way to say that because we are not disposing of what we have on hand on a competitive basis, we, therefore, want to increase our surplus and to pile up more that we are not going to be able to sell either competitively or otherwise Would it not be better to concentrate our attack on the unsound disposal policies of the two departments involved rather than to say because you have not done what we think you ought to do in this respect we are going to create a more difficult situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say there is real soundness in what the gentleman says except for this. That we have reached the crossroads where it is shown that 55,000 farm families are put out of their homes, and 130,000 farm families are reduced to less than $900 a year gross income. And as the situation now stands where the acreage and production is going to be just transferred to foreign countries, it makes us do some things just because we ought to, because it is right.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, there is so much truth in the position of the gentleman from Mississippi that I cannot just take a blanket position against him either. But it does seem to me that it would be a sounder thing for us to do something which would give relief not simply to 54,000 families, as the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned, but 291,000 families in the United States that have allotments of less than 5 acres. There are 291,000 cotton farms with allotments of less than 5 acres and I have an idea that most of them are going to be put off their farms unless we do something to relieve them. The bill we have brought in is going to give them some relief.

I recognize there is a good deal of discussion of the fact that this bill does not give all of these farmers all the relief they want. Of course not. It is not going to make anybody rich, but it is going to save a lot of people from being put out on the street. It is going to do a lot of good. We have a reasonable chance of passing this bill, and I believe we have a reasonable chance of getting it signed. I think the gentleman from Mississippi made it rather clear that he did not believe his bill would be signed. In answer to the question as to whether it would be signed or not, when he said, "Well, I think it has as good a chance as something else has to be signed." He did not tell us and he could not tell us whether it would be signed because no man knows that. He would not tell us he thinks his bill is going to be signed, and I do not think there is a Member in this House who can stand up and say that he sincerely believes that the bill proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi will be signed.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say I have been assured that it has just as much chance of being signed as any other one has.

Mr. POAGE. I heard the gentleman the first time, and I realize the evasion in that answer, and that is exactly what I am calling to the attention of the House. The gentleman does not believe either bill will be signed. I recognize the gentleman's opinion is different from mine with regard to that. I think there is a reasonable chance, and the committee thought there was a reasonable chance of getting the bill that we brought on this floor signed and enacted into law. I repeat, we are trying to get part of something. We are trying to get something here even though it is but a part of all we would like rather than to try to get all of nothing.

All of nothing might look good in the newspapers back home. It would sound good back in Texas to say, "POAGE led a great fight to get 5 million additional acres." My people would like to have it, if they could have the acres, and maintain their price at the same time. But I know perfectly well, and you know, that I would be doing nothing but fooling the people back home. It is just that simple. Do not let anybody fool you. It is just a question of do we want something? Are we willing to take what we have a right to hope to get or are we just trying to get something in the papers back home about what a great thing we did for the folks getting all of nothing?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Since this bill is for the purpose of affording relief in the inequitable situation that exists where farmers are operating with less than 5 acres, why cannot we have a bill which will have universal application to all cotton producers in every section of the United States, guaranteeing them a minimum of 5 acres?

Mr. POAGE. Because if you did, you would either get too much acreage to get the bill passed, or we would so disrupt the balance between the States that the bill could not pass. One thing is that you would get more acreage in the bill than you could have approved—just as the bill offered by the gentleman from Mississippi proposes, or you would be in the position of giving to one section of the country a greater percentage increase than you give to another section of the country. Again, I cannot think the gentleman from Alabama believes we can pass a bill here that will give some 70,000 or 80,000 acres to Alabama, and give absolutely nothing to California, and expect that kind of a bill to be signed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I understood that this was a bill to give relief to people, not to States.

Mr. POAGE. The bill does give relief to people, but we want to pass a bill that will be signed, and we know we cannot give relief to these people if you disrupt the balance that has been established between the States.

In all kindness, the gentleman from Alabama is an intelligent man. He knows very well that he has absolutely no chance of getting a bill signed which gives all of the acreage to States east of the Mississippi and none to California, none to Arizona, and none to New Mexico—I do not have to call the names of the Members whom he knows who would never allow such a bill to pass in the other body. If the gentleman wants any cotton for Alabama he will have, I think, to retain the balance with the Western States, because after all those States have an absolute veto on this kind of legislation.

I want to commend on the floor of this House, as I did in committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], for trying to make a fair and sincere effort to give the people of the Southeast some relief when it did not mean anything to his State. He did not gain anything by it, but he did the fair and honorable thing, and I appreciate it as a statesmanlike action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The purpose of this bill is stated in the report as follows:

> H. R. 3952 aims at bringing some measure of urgent relief to those farmers in America's great Cotton Belt now threatened by severe hardships.

Now let us look at the agricultural picture, as far as people are concerned. Ultimately we are dealing with people and not territorial rights of States or political subdivisions of States. We are talking about people and their entitlement to relief. One-half of all the people who reside on the farms of this country reside in 14 Southern States, from Oklahoma-Texas eastward through West Virginia. One-half of the total number of people residing on the farms of this country obtain their principal source of income from cotton. Now if we are going to pass a measure to relieve the burdens of those farm people whose principal source of income is cotton, and who are the lowest per capita income group of any other group in America, then the way to do it is to provide a minimum allotment of 5 acres for all farmers whose allotment is now less than 5 acres.

If we are going to make acreage allotments just because Texas needs a little more or California needs a little more, then the quality of mercy is certainly strained, for we are dealing, as I said earlier, with the people who live on the farms, who are to produce this cotton.

I am, of course, going to vote for half a loaf if I do not get the full measure of benefits that I think the people of Alabama, the people of Georgia, and so on down the line are entitled to; but why should we not recognize the individual's need rather than the need of the various States.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I was seeking to go along with the gentleman on the 5 acres, as the members of the committee will testify, because I thought it was a social proposition. When it was finally pointed

out to me that this program is administered by States, and that in certain States last year they had this surplus and this would not take care of our farmers, I began to think differently.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And we are here to correct the abuses and mistakes that were made last year at the State level of administration. The 5-acre producer had nothing to do with the lack of judgment that was exercised by State committees. The cotton farmer cannot be held responsible for the errors made in the administration of the law.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. The bill that is pending, in the absence of my amendment would only halfway do the job; it would do nothing for the 55,000 farm families who are left without homes.

Now, let us keep the record straight: Neither group has asked for an opinion from the Department of Agriculture as to whether they will or will not endorse this bill as it is or as it stands. I have in my hand three pages from the Department of Agriculture pointing out the administrative difficulties in the bill as it is. If my amendment is adopted the administrative problems will be reduced, be cut in half. Anyone who doubts that just read the three pages from the Department showing now the hard way they have of administering the bill as printed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under this bill we call it relief to the 5-acre farmers; actually in its application it is not 5-acre relief to the farmers; it is a 5-acre relief in Texas; a 5-acre relief in California; but it is a 2-, and 3-, and 4-acre relief bill as far as the cotton producer is concerned in the States east of the Mississippi River that presently produce cotton.

It seems to me that we could provide for each 5-acre farmer to have a 5-acre minimum. By doing this we increase the total acreage by less than 400,000—almost 120,000 less than is proposed in the pending measure.

I hope that when the Smith amendment is presented it will be passed. Let us make certain that the first consideration will be given to the people who produce the cotton. A 3-percent fixed formula will not provide the relief we hope to see given our people.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(On request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JONES of Alabama was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the county committee in any county in the United States, under the law as it now exists, could declare that the minimum acreage per farmer is 5 acres?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman means that under this bill it is made mandatory?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No; under present law is it not true that any county committee can now declare that the minimum acreage per farmer is 5 acres?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No, that is not my recollection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. There are hundreds of counties where the total amount of acreage for the county is not that much.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in Alabama 80 percent of the State reserve was given in an effort to give 5 acres to each farmer, whereas in States like Texas only 16 percent was given to small farmers of the State reserve? In other words, Alabama made an effort by nearly 2 to 1 to give 5 acres out of the State reserves.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And this increase will still not give them 5 acres of a minimum allotment under the law.

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out one thing to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I have much sympathy for his effort to get more acres. When I first introduced a bill on this subject, I suggested that we base our increase on the estimated underplanting for this year. That would have run 8 percent. It would have been higher than the 6 percent which he has suggested. I say to him, and the others who would like to have more acreage, that we battled that out in committee. We talked with people from the Department. I talked to my people at home and I told them I thought we could get 3 percent but I did not think we could get any more.

I feel that way about it now, and for that reason I express the hope that you will vote down the amendment, much as I myself would like a few more acres.

We keep on talking about minimum acreage. Let me assure the members of the Committee that before we go much further there is going to be a bill introduced which will provide for some kind of minimum production. It may not be minimum acreage. I recognize, as many of you, that unless we can provide a minimum cotton production for each small farm, be it 5 acres, 10 acres, or whatever is necessary, we are going to run into this trouble again. However, it is very complicated and it will require a great deal of committee study that can hardly be done on the floor of this House. True, that is not before us in this amendment, but I have a feeling it is going to be pretty soon, because it has been referred to many times by those who have preceded me.

So I ask you, if you want to help, if you want to be reasonably sure of doing something for these people of ours who need it so badly, then vote down this amendment and pass the bill as it has been presented to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Strike out everything after line 5 and substitute in lieu thereof:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the national acreage allotment established under subsection (a) of this section for the 1955 and 1956 crops of cotton shall be increased to 19,500,000 acres and apportioned to the States in the same manner in which the national acreage allotment heretofore established for 1954 was apportioned to the States. The additional acreage so made available to States shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of their respective shares of the State acreage allotment as apportioned in 1954."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make my statement very brief. I made this amendment apply to the years 1955 and 1956. We should make it possible for the farmers to plan ahead. A part of our present difficulty stems from the fact that the administration requested the farmers to increase their cotton acreage during the Korean war. Another fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has not taken into consideration in arriving at the carryover figure is the fact that the President of the United States asked that a part of 1 year's supply of this cotton be set aside. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has ably pointed out this fact. I wish to call your attention to another fact; i. e., that we are not at ease in this world. There is an event over in the Formosa area which could lead to a difficult situation. We have an international situation in Russia whereby the civilian Soviet leaders have turned over the reins to the military leaders. We have many crises throughout the world, for instance, in Iraq and Iran and Saudi-Arabia, Russia has her eyes on the vast oil reserves. If we are not careful, we may find ourselves in the same position that the Russian leaders say they are in. They have not produced sufficient agricultural products and consumer goods in recent years. Besides having failed to produce sufficient agricultural products, Russia openly admits the lack of production of sufficient forestry products. I trust that we will not get in that condition. If we separate the set-aside from the carryover, then we do not have too great a carryover of cotton. Furthermore, according to the statement of the committee itself and the Department of Agriculture's report on plantings, 10 percent of this 1955 allotted acreage will not be planted because of various conditions. Consequently, we should increase the acreage by 10 percent and still be safe.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, would his amendment to this bill, if adopted, provide a minimum 5-acre cotton allotment to every cotton farmer in America?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This would come very nearly assuring them, because under the present bill farms are not assured 5 acres additional, even in Alabama. They are not assured more than

under the committee bill; under my amendment 3, and they would receive about 6 acres minimum. In Florida they would receive only one-half acre under this committee bill; in Georgia 3 acres, and in Mississippi 4 under this bill, and in North Carolina individual 5-acre farms will probably receive only 1 acre additional. This committee bill does not state that each farm will have a minimum of 5 acres or the average amount in cultivation on the farm in 1952, 1953, and 1954. It reads "whichever is the lesser." And, if the additional allocation is not sufficient to go around, individual farm increases will be decreased. For instance, in North Carolina 85,943 acres are required for 5 acre or highest planted acres, yet North Carolina will receive only 15,471 acres additional under this bill, consequently it would provide only 1 acre additional allotment to each small farm. This would fall considerably below the 1954 allotment.

Mr. ELLIOTT. How much less than last year?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. My amendment would fix the 1955 and 1956 acreage allotment at 19.5 million acres annually. In 1954 we had 21,379,000 planted acres. My amendment still leaves the allotment practically 2 million acres below 1954. In 1953 we had 28 million acres, in 1952, 27 million, and in 1951 we had 29 million acres planted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has expressed great concern for the 5-acre farmer. There is nothing in this bill to require the State to use this for the 5-acre farmer.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No.

Mr. POAGE. And when you get to a State like North Carolina where it would not have enough acreage under your bill to bring it up to 5 acres, there is no requirement that you use 1 single acre for the 5-acre farmer.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The State committee could use it for that purpose.

Mr. POAGE. The State committee had 10 percent of its allotment and did not use any in North Carolina; it did not use any in Mississippi. Is there anything in here to require the State of Mississippi to use any of this for the 5-acre farmer?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Under this bill they would at least receive some more. They already have some acreage.

Mr. POAGE. No. Under the gentleman's bill the State of Mississippi would get some more acreage, but the State of Mississippi had some 50,000-odd acres that they could have given to the 5-acre farmers, and the State committee did not give 1 single acre, and you are giving it right back to the same State committee. What reason does the gentleman have for believing that the State committee would act differently?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am more interested in taking care of any sized farmer. I might say that this bill is a misnomer. The gentleman from Texas has misnamed this bill if he believes it takes care of the little babies, family-sized farmer, or economical operating farm units, because half of the acreage goes to the State of Texas. This measure is not going to satisfy the needs of the country.

I predict the Senate will adopt, in substance, the provisions of my amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment attempts to add 1,387,000 acres to the national allotment for the year 1955 and the year 1956. Just a moment ago we voted on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] which attempted to add 1,086,000 acres, yet now we come up with an amendment to add 1,300,000 acres. Under this amendment the 5-acre farmer gets no priority. I do hope this Committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 3, after line 9, insert the following:

"(o) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in areas where abnormal weather conditions make such practices desirable, the Secretary shall authorize the planting of cotton on allotted acreage in combination with legumes or other crops, or with summer fallow, and the 1955 farm allotments for farms in such areas shall be adjusted upon the written request of the farm operator to allow for such additional gross acreage allotment as will, in combination with such other crop or summer fallow, permit the planting in such combination of the net cotton allotment for the farm."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, that it amends the wheat-allotment law and other allotment laws, whereas this bill relates only to the cotton-allotment laws.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a new section. It does not apply to wheat at all. It does not mention the word "wheat." This is a brandnew section. All in the world it does is this:

In Oklahoma we have had a drought, as the gentleman has had in Texas. This would merely allow the planting of 2 rows of cotton and 2 rows of grain sorghums. In that way it would save the erosion of the land from the blowing. It would also permit the production of both cotton and grain sorghums. As the gentleman from Texas knows, the man who grows cotton is limited. The man who grows grain sorghums is limited to this extent: The present administration has seen fit to reduce the price support on grain sorghums by 25 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment is certainly applicable to other crops than cotton. It seeks to amend another section of the law. It does not apply only to the cotton section which is under consideration.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It applies to other crops which are not under the quotas, like legumes and grain sorghums.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the gentleman brings grain sorghums and legumes into the cotton section.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I might say that these other crops are not controlled. They are not under acreage controls as are wheat and cotton.

Mr. COOLEY. That does not get away from the fact that the gentleman is attempting to put other commodities under the cotton provision of the law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAYS of Arkansas). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman's amendment does bring other crops into consideration. The pending bill is related to cotton acreage control. The gentleman's amendment is therefore not germane, and the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas is sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: On page 1, line 5, strike out all beginning with line 6 and substitute the following:

"(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, farm acreage allotments established under this section shall be increased where necessary so as to provide each farm with the maximum allotment authorized in subsection (f) (1) of this section. The additional acreage so allotted shall be in addition to the national, State, and county acreage allotment established for 1955 pursuant to this section and the production from such additional acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota established for 1955 pursuant to section 342 of this Act."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the committee has just voted down two amendments which would enlarge the additional cotton acreage included in the committee's bill now before the House. My amendment is in the nature of a substitute to the entire bill before us today, and it would strike out the present 543,000 additional acreage included in this bill and substitute the equivalent of 398,000 acres. I call to the attention of the Members of the House who are interested in keeping down surplus cotton production that the amendment I offer would probably result in less than half the cotton yield than the bill which is now before us because the acreage involved in my bill has the lowest production-yield average of any acreage in the country, and there would probably be an additional cotton production of no more than 100,000 bales under my amendment.

Under the committee bill, however, as was mentioned by the proponents of the bill, there would be a production of at least 250,000 bales. So it is important from the point of view of those who may be concerned about the total cotton surplus since my bill would offer less in the way of adding to the cotton surplus.

FOR SMALL FARMERS

Primarily my bill, however, is designed to do what the proponents of the committee bill say they have in mind, and which they grossly failed to do in reporting out this legislation. They say they want to take care of the 5-acre farmer, and to take care of the small farmer, and to relieve the situation

whereby these small producers who under the law have a specific provision written into it so far as some counties are concerned, that they must be given their acreage. This bill entirely fails to give them the acreage that the small farmer needs for this 5-acre minimum.

As I pointed out, something like 150,000 small farms would not get acreage under this bill. Of the 543,000 acres involved in the bill, more than 300,000 go to farmers other than small farmers that we have been talking about. That certainly means that it is not a matter of hardship or relief for these small farmers. I agree that the 300,000 acres would be used for relief of hardship cases, but they would not be cases as hard as those involved for the 5-acre farmer.

I think I can comment on this matter disinterestedly because under my amendment not one single acre would go into my congressional district. I am not asking for anything for my people. In my congressional district, where there was an alternative involved in the county, the 5-acre farmers were taken care of before any other farmers in the county were taken care of, and as one committee member stated, that meant every farmer in the county other than the 5-acre people was a hardship case. But I say those hardship cases are just as bad as the ones we are talking about for the Western States.

My amendment would simply provide that a minimum of 5 acres, or the highest planted average, would be added to the acreage allotment for each State in order to take care of these 5-acre farmers and nothing else would be provided. In other words, the total acreage increase would be just 398,000. That takes care of the 5-acre farmers for whom there can be made a strong humanitarian claim, and at the same time we would be saving, by 150,000 bales, the extra amount of cotton that would have to go into loan and into this national surplus that we are talking about.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Under the provisions of your amendment, is that mandatory?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Under the provisions of my amendment, it is mandatory that the 5-acre farmers be taken care of.

Mr. JONAS. In other words, the State committees could not change that?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The amendment provides that the acreage shall be allotted so as to provide each farmer with 5 acres on the basis of the highest average planted.

Mr. JONAS. I intend to vote for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. That actually means that the State of North Carolina would have 85,000 acres instead of 15,000 acres because it will require 85,000 acres to take care of the small producers?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like very much for that to happen. I would like very much for the gentleman's amendment to be adopted. I hope very much it will be adopted. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not talking for my colleagues on the committee, but we do have a rather unique situation in North Carolina because we have so many small farms.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out before I yield further that the question has been raised as to whether or not any bill that we pass would be signed by the President.

I do not pretend to know whether the President will sign any bill or not, but I know it is good commonsense, in view of the strong fight that he and Secretary Benson and all the other agricultural leaders have made, that they will prefer a bill that will offer the least additional surplus. I think it is good commonsense, in view of the strongly professed humanitarian principles of the President that he would prefer to solve these hardship cases than to provide some formula that everybody is talking about. I do not think anybody can say whether this bill will be signed or not, but I think anyone who uses commonsense in regard to the matter will feel that this substitute which I have offered is certainly more likely to get the support and signature of the President.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making and to say that it seems to me it is the only thing that will really take care of the small farmer, I mean the 5-acre man, and I am supporting the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I would like to associate myself with the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi. I have received a letter only this morning where a man owes $1,200, and he is allotted eight-tenths of an acre. He cannot possibly pay the debts he owes under the circumstances.

I commend the gentleman and I support his amendment.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Should the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] be adopted, would Alabama's 1955 acreage allotment be increased by 52,284 acres rather than 33,054 acres?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at the conclusion of his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am supporting the gentleman's amendment. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the small cotton farmer.

I think the Congress owes to these small farmers, of whom I represent about 34,500, the duty and responsibility to write a law that will provide them with enough acreage that they can at least have some opportunity to keep body and soul together, and the gentleman's amendment is the only proposal before the House that attempts to do that. The minimum should be at least 5 acres. And if the President wants to veto it, that is his responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This means there will be no increase in the allotments to those above 5 acres?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. There will be no increase in the allotments to those above 5 acres, under my amendment.

I would like to point out to the gentlemen on my left, who represent districts where cotton is not a matter of concern, that this amendment I have proposed offers the least trouble to the Administration. It offers the possibility for the Administration and the President to live up to his professed desire to put humanitarian methods above economic matters; to be liberal in humanitarian matters and conservative in economic matters. I hope you will support me in this effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, early in the session I introduced a measure, H. R. 2438, which, had it been enacted into law, would have increased the national acreage allotment for the 1955 crop of cotton from 18,113,208 to 19,500,000 acres. I introduced that legislation because I knew that many of the cotton farmers in my State and district would undoubtedly undergo hardships and suffering due to the sharp curtailment in the 1955 acreage.

As we all know, the cotton farmers of the United States have demonstrated time and time again their willingness to cooperate in a nationwide program which enables them to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demands. There are occasions, however, when sudden and severe constriction of acreage causes such hardships that a policy of gradual reduction over a longer period of time is much wiser. I believe 1955 is a year, certainly in the district I represent, in which our national acre-

age allotment should not be reduced as drastically as 3 million acres.

Our national acreage allotment in 1954 was almost 4 million acres less than the 1953 acreage. In addition, my section of the country as well as other areas suffered the most disastrous drought that can be remembered. Another cut in cotton acreage for 1955 amounting to more than 3 million acres could only mean bankruptcy for some of the cotton farmer in my State and district. I am certain it would be better at this time to spread out our acreage reduction over a longer period of time rather than throw thousands of cotton farmers out of work by another drastic acreage cut this year.

I therefore commend the members of the Committee on Agriculture for taking cognizance of the hardships which the cotton farmers of this country will face unless acreage adjustments are made. At the same time, I regret that the acreage increase contained in the measure now under consideration is not greater.

The acreage in my State of Alabama will be increased under H. R. 3952 by 3 percent of the 1955 allotment, or 33,054 acres. In order to give to the cotton farmers of Alabama a minimum allotment of the smaller of (a) 5 acres, or (b) the highest number of acres planted in cotton on the farm during the past 3 years, 52,284 acres is required.

Under the amendment offered earlier by Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, the total acreage would have been increased by 6 percent of the 1955 allotment. This not only would have brought all farmers in my State up to 5 acres or their highest planted average in the past 3 years, whichever is smaller, but there would have been additional acreage available for the larger farmers who have suffered the severest acreage cuts. I favored this amendment and regret that it failed to pass.

The amendment now offered by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi would make available the acres necessary to give each farmer a minimum allotment of 5 acres or the highest number of acres planted in cotton on the farm during the past 3 years, whichever is smaller. In the case of Alabama this would be 52,284 acres. At the same time, the total number of additional acres to be made available would be reduced from 543,234 to 398,316. I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], and I urge its passage.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to impress upon the House just what is involved in some of these proposals. That Members may better understand just what is involved, let us understand there are certain States that did not use all of the State reserve or any appreciable part of the reserve that they had available to take care of the 5-acre farmers, let us understand that the two outstanding examples are North Carolina and Mississippi. North Carolina did not use one single acre to take care of the small farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to my chairman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say this in behalf of those charged with administering the program in North Carolina: They are not to be blamed. The situation was just this: Had they taken care of the little farmer there would have been nothing left for those who grow above 5 acres.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I am sure I understand why; I do not condemn your committee. I know they faced a difficult problem, but the fact remains that North Carolina did not use any of the 10 percent reserve it had available; they did not use 1 single acre for the small farmers.

The State of Mississippi had a reserve of about 175,000 acres, enough, I believe to have given every small farmer in the State 10 acres, but the State of Mississippi did not use 1 single acre to take care of the small farmers, but it used 170,000 acres "for trend" whatever that means.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think it is exactly the opposite, for I know that in my own congressional district the county committee took care of the 5-acre men.

Mr. POAGE. I have not said one word about county committees nor one word in criticism of the county committees, but I repeat and repeat again my statement that the State committee of Mississippi had available adequate reserves to take care of every small farmer in the State of Mississippi and they did not use 1 single acre for that purpose.

Now we find a strange diversity of opinion amongst the representatives from Mississippi. They come before us and they tell us on the one hand: "Give us twice as much acreage as anyone else proposes to take care of everybody, large and small alike; use a million acres." And the other side Mississippi comes in and says: "Do not give anyone anything except enough for a few small farmers." But that is going to bring Mississippi 70,000 acres, without adding anything to the allotment in California—at least that would be the effect if the proposal were to become a law, which we all know it never will.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. Their attitude was that the county committees should take care of the big farmers and they would come back and let the Congress take care of the small ones.

Mr. POAGE. I do not know whether that is correct or not but I do know the practical results of what some county committees did down in the area represented by the distinguished gentleman who is chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations—it was to take care of the small farmers except in one county, and there were 122 acres there that they needed, whereas in many other sections of the State of Mississippi the county committees did not do one single solitary thing to help small farmers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman says I wanted everything for everybody but that I did not want the bill to be large enough to cover the small farmer because they admitted that the bill as it now stands will answer the needs of only about half of the small farmers.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, and he has made that perfectly clear. He has made it perfectly clear what the case is in Mississippi, but right across the river in the State of Arkansas—and of course similar conditions exist there—we find that this bill is adequate to take care of all the small farmers in Arkansas and that they have them just like they have them in Mississippi. The difference is that the State committee in Arkansas used 80 percent of the State reserve to take care of those small farmers.

Had the State committee of Mississippi used but half of its State reserves it could have taken care of all of the small farmers of Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman poses as a great expert on the State of Mississippi. I want to ask him what the State of Texas did for the small farmer?

Mr. POAGE. The State committee did a very, very poor job, but it did use 120,000 acres of the State reserve for small farmers. It then, very unwisely, I think, used 62½ per cent of our State reserves "for trends." That is what the State committee of Texas did.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does not my amendment provide that it shall be mandatory that the small farmer shall be taken care of and that we solve this problem of whether the State will take care of the small farmer?

Mr. POAGE. Oh, yes, after your State committee used 170,000 acres to take care of the big farmers they rise and champion the small farmer, and the gentleman comes in and says that our State committee has thus far taken care of the big farmer, now let us come in here and have the cotton growers of the rest of the United States pay the bill to take care of the small farmers of Mississippi.

Of the cotton-raising States there are only two which made no effort to take care of the small farmers and those two are Mississippi and North Carolina.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is worthwhile to know what the States did and maybe then we will have a better background as to why we have these complaints from the particular areas that we have. Never let yourselves be fooled, Mr. Chairman, these States that now come in and say: "You make it up for these small farmers" are asking you and everybody else to pay the bill for the negligence or failure of their own State committees to do the things that the law authorized the State committees to do in the first place. They do not come in with clean hands. They come

simply asking that we do the thing that they did not do.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Is it not true that the only forum the small farmer has is right here today?

Mr. POAGE. No.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is the only one?

Mr. POAGE. No, that is not true, because their State committees made these allotments. These State committees had a 10 percent reserve which the State of Arkansas used for the small farmer. But in some other States it was not so used, and I do not absolve my own State committee. You heard me criticize it as loudly as anybody. I think our State committee was in great error. But we did do something. We did make some effort. Texas did use some of its reserve for small farms. In fact it took care of about four-fifths of theses cases.

Let us see about those States that do not have this problem. It has been stated here we were trying to bring in a bill simply to take care of small farmers. That is not true and nobody said that. Nobody said that is the only thing involved in this bill. This bill will give relief to small farmers. If it did not give relief to small farmers we would not be here with it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The report states that the condition has come about through no fault of the cotton farmer.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right, nobody denies that, and I repeat, it comes about through no fault of the cotton farmer. But the small farmer is not the only man who has suffered. The man who has 6 acres has suffered, the man who has 11 acres has suffered. This bill will give some relief to a lot of other people who have been suffering. The fellow who has a cut of more than 40 percent, the man who has been cut from 50 acres down to 25, for example. I do not condemn the bill because it helps a lot of people.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is correct that in Texas that sort of relief will be given, but it will not be given to the other States. Is it not true that under this bill 49 percent of the additional acreage goes to Texas?

Mr. POAGE. Forty-two percent, which is exactly the percentage that Texas has of the total national cotton acreage on the 5-year history. The State of Texas has historically grown substantially more than any other 2 or 3 States and still does. The State of Texas is as big as some five States like Mississippi and, of course, it is entitled to more acreage than those other States. The State of Texas has taken exactly the percentage cut that every other State has, and should, of course, receive exactly the same percentage increase. That is what this bill does from the very beginning. It recognizes that we have to treat everybody alike.

We are saying, "Let us treat everybody exactly alike." When we declare a dividend as it were, let us treat California that has no 5-acre farms, like the other parts of the Nation, let us treat Arizona like we treat Alabama, let us treat Texas just like we are going to treat the Carolinas, let us treat them all alike. That is what this bill does. Then, if perchance your own State committee has done a bad job let the State where the committee has done a bad job pay the bill. We are in the position of a parent with several children. Two of the children have wasted their money. Maybe they suffered sickness. Anyway their money is gone. The parent wants them to have some more money and give not only the unfortunate ones something, but also gives the other children exactly the same. Do the improvident children have any right to complain?

The whole question comes down to this: Who is going to pay the bill for the negligence of certain State committees? Some State committees have not done a fair job. Those States and those States only are being heard here today to complain about this bill which gives a fair deal to everybody. I would just like to suggest that we be fair to everybody, that we give every State the same increase in allotment, and then that we try to pass a bill that we hope can get enacted into law. You are not going to help the small farmer in Mississippi, Alabama, or anywhere else to pass a bill that we know is not going to go through the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. POAGE], has just summed the whole thing up in about 1 sentence. We on the committee tried to be equitable to all cotton-producing States, and we think we were. We did not single out, as the gentleman from Mississippi would do in his amendment, 3 States to get over half of the proposed new allotment to the detriment of other States. We treated them all alike, and that is exactly what this Congress has generally done in any legislation. They have not legislated for just a few.

Now, it is quite significant even my beloved chairman now foresakes and goes along with the amendment. Sure, and so are the others who have spoken in behalf of the amendment. They are from States that directly profit by it, but they do so at the expense of some of the other States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The State of Alabama had 80 percent of its reserves to go into the 5-acre farms. Now, even this 3-percent increase will not provide the minimum 5 acres that we hope to give them in this bill. What is the objection of the gentleman from Texas to having the Alabama farmer receive the minimum allotment which the State of Texas already has?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I have no objection whatever. But what is the gentleman's objection to taking care of the hardship cases beyond the 5-acre group in my State? I think it is unfortunate that we have hung any 5-acre grouping on our acreage, because there are a whole lot of hardship cases in my State, and I think in most of the other cotton-producing States, that are on farms where production is up as high as 10 or 15 acres. I submit to this committee that the bill which was proposed by the Committee on Agriculture will come closer to do it than any which has been proposed as an amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask whether anybody from the northern States, in view of the fact that my State of Pennsylvania helps pay the bill on these various agricultural programs, will be permitted to participate in the debate on increasing cotton acreage? If so, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize all Members in the order they address the Chair. The Chair tries to move from one side of the aisle to the other.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, we have had 4 or 5 speakers from the other side. I wonder if we could have one from my side of the aisle to offer some suggestions which may clarify this situation?

The CHAIRMAN. I will say for the information of the gentleman that the Members on this side addressing the Chair were members of the Committee on Agriculture, and he intended to recognize the gentleman the first moment that no member of the committee addressed the Chair. I am very happy to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAVIN. I move to strike out the last word, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank the Chairman, my very good and able friend from Arkansas, whom we all greatly admire, for the consideration given.

Really, Mr. Chairman, I was rather hesitant about participating in this debate on cotton acreage as it is a little out of my line, however, in view of the fact that in the final analysis we all have to help pay the bill, particularly my State, the great State of Pennsyvania, with its 10 million people. We have been making these contributions in taxes along with the other States for many years in order to carry out these various agricultural programs.

I have some informtion relative to increased cotton acreage which I thought was interesting; a news article, which states that Secretary Benson pointed out that 92 percent of the cotton producers voted to accept the production controls on the basis of last October's estimate, and the crop would be 12,511,000 bales. A revised estimate made last December 4 indicated the harvest will rise to 13,569,000 bales. The Secretary did not see how controls could be eased in view

of this jump of 1,058,000 bales in expected yield. I have every confidence in Secretary Benson. He is a great agricultural secretary and is turning in a fine performance.

He states that 92 percent of the cotton producers accepted willingly these allocations.

What I am concerned about is that you are coming in here today to increase these allocations of acreage after the matter was settled satisfactorily with the cotton producers. Really, it almost brings tears to my eyes to hear the sympathetic appeals here today for the small cotton farmer. Certainly we all want to help the small cotton farmer; he has our deepest sympathy. I certainly would do anything and everything I could to help the small cotton farmer. But the allocations are made. The State committees accepted them, so I understand from this interesting debate. So the matter then went down to the county committees. Therefore, the county committees should have handled their allocations in a fair and equitable manner and given the small cotton farmer the consideration he was entitled to. Did he get it? Certainly not, from what I heard here today.

With all the bleeding hearts here today, I cannot understand why you did not bleed and move in on your State committees and your county committees to give the small farmer his rightful opportunity to participate fairly and equitably in the allocations that were made to your respective States so that he would be taken care of above all others. You now come back to the Congress and want us to iron out that which you could not handle in your own States and that is increase the cotton acreage to take care of the small cotton farmer; all of which will produce a greater surplus of cotton.

It appears to me that this is pretty much of a war now in the southern States, your own States, producing cotton. I say to you champions of States rights, due to the fact that you have States rights and the allocations have been definitely and specifically made to your respective States, why bring this argument into the Congress? Go argue with your own State and county committees as to why they did not make the proper allocations of acreage and respect the position of the small cotton farmers in this program. You all realize the difficulties they have, and recognize the problems of the small farmer, yet you did not give him the consideration he was entitled to at the time and so evidently you heard from him. Now you are back here asking the Congress of the United States to increase the acreage in the interest of the small farmer, all of which will produce more cotton and make it necessary for the American taxpayer to carry the load. You should have thought about the small farmer at the time the allocations were made. I wonder how many stood up for the small farmer with the State and county committees when the allocations were made.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the gentleman know how much the taxpayers pay into this program on this cotton?

Mr. GAVIN. I cannot give the gentleman any figures. I am not an agricultural statistician.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It has not cost them any money since the cotton program has never resulted in a loss.

Mr. GAVIN. Let us leave that argument out of it, and turn it back to your respective States and your respective county committees. Why did not your respective county committees respect the position of the small farmer with five acres or less, and take care of him first and then after he had been taken care of allocate to the big farm producer what was left, if you wanted to be so sympathetic and understanding of the problems of the small farmer? The big cotton farmers are the ones responsible for the big cotton surpluses. If any cutting was to be done why did not your county committee cut the big farmer rather than the small farmer?

I do not think that this cotton acreage problem belongs here. I think it belongs back in your respective States and your respective county committees, and not in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring just 2 or 3 things to the attention of the House and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would like to call your attention to the condition that exists. Some of the States committees and some of the county committees did make mistakes. Affected are 291,000 farmers who produce cotton, and more than one-fourth of all the people who produce cotton do have allotments of 5 acres or less. By this small increase of only 3 percent of the acreage, not 3 percent of the production, we can give some help to every one of those 291,000 people without adding anything to the cost of this program. I think that would be a fair statement. Then we will take care of those people and relieve a tremendous hardship.

May I say just one other thing before I close, in reply to the argument of the gentleman from Mississippi who offered the amendment. It appears that he rather resents the fact that last year we did give a bonus, so to speak; when we added acres we gave a bonus to California. I did not like it at the time, but we realized then it appeared to be necessary to give some relief at that time.

I think he would like to put himself in the position of an umpire or referee who, if he made one mistake, now wants to go on and rectify that by making another wrong decision.

I think it is fair to say that a bill which is passed on the premise of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, and while it would give half of the added acres to, let us say, three States in the South, and would give nothing to some of the States in the West and Southwest, could not be expected to have the support of some Members when it comes to a vote on the passage of such a bill. Certainly, if it is passed here, I do not think it would pass in the other body. I do not think the President would approve the bill because I think he is going to look after his friends out west. I do not blame him. There will be a little politics on this thing. I think we must be realistic about that. So what we are trying to do, and what I would like to impress upon those who may have missed the first part of the debate on this bill, is that we are only asking for 3 percent to be added to each State to add to the acreage—not to the production.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. What I am interested in is this. When the county committees knew about these small farmers and the hardships which would take effect in the event they were not recognized, why did not the county committees first take care of the small farmers so that they would not be in a difficult position, and then later on you could argue about this other problem. Why did they not give consideration to the small farmers first?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman heard the chairman of our committee a minute ago, he explained the situation adequately.

Mr. GAVIN. I am very glad to listen to the chairman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. He explained that if they had taken care of every one of those 5-acre small farmers in the State of North Carolina, that would have been the only cotton produced in the State of North Carolina which would have brought about a bad situation, and which still would not have been equitable. Also, many of these counties did not have sufficient acreage to bring the small producer up to 5 acres. Some of the committees did a poor job and we are here today just as we have come to the Congress before on many other occasions trying to rectify a mistake that has been made. We have held our requests down to a very minimum, but I think if we go ahead now and defeat the amendment which is now pending, and adopt the bill which the committee reported to the House which, while it is not the exact bill that anyone here, individually, would have recommended, it does represent the collective thinking of all the members of the committee. I think it is a reasonable bill, and I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania can go along with us and help us to relieve these people.

Mr. GAVIN. Why did 92 percent of the cotton producers agree to this acreage if they felt it was not sufficient?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not know whether the gentleman understands or not, but they were not voting for that. They were voting as to whether they would have 90-percent supports or whether they were going to have 50 percent. To put the proposition simply, I am in favor of taking a half a loaf and trying to get that rather than have somebody offer me a whole loaf, and not find the loaf there. Here is another point. While 92 percent voted for it, perhaps the 8 percent who voted against it represents more than the 3 percent which we are trying to help now.

Mr. GAVIN. I think you people have a little problem to work out in the county committees to see that the small farmers do get some consideration.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the gentleman is absolutely right, and I pledge myself to try to iron that out and improve it so we will not have to come back here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to this amendment which would upset the exact equality of treatment among the States which exists in the committee bill. If I can, I would like to add a note of humor to these proceedings. In references to the bonuses which the gentleman from Missouri referred to, we from California approach these bonuses with a state of mixed emotions, something like a man who is watching his mother-in-law drive over a cliff in his new Cadillac, because every time something is given out, something is written into the permanent law which takes something away. But I would like to invite your attention to the fact that in 1954, the law relating to the 5-acre farm was changed. Before 1954 the law required first provision for the 5-acre farmer, but apparently someone decided that 5 acres was not a real test of equity and a real test of hardship so in 1954 we amended the law to take out the mandatory protection for the 5-acre farmer and shoved the subject over to the State and local committees to decide in their discretion who was a hardship case. I am not criticising that action, but I say that it indicates that 5 acres is not a fair test of hardship, and we recognize that under the law, as I said before, there is hardship all over the Cotton Belt. Some of these State and county committees have done a very poor job. They have totally ignored not only the interest of their 5-acre-and-less farmers, but all small farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to have the gentleman state to me whether or not the Gathings bill is the one that you think will give most equity to everybody.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman means the Gathings bill without amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. Without the Smith amendment.

I liked Mr. POAGE'S argument. He brought out that this bill would give something to everybody.

Mr. HAGEN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And would offer more equity than any other proposition before the House today.

Mr. HAGEN. That is correct. This bill recognizes that there are hardships in all States, and it will give exactly the same amount of acreage in terms of their 5-year average to every State.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HAGEN. Now, what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is asking us to do is to give a bonus to those States and county committees which did a poor job with respect to their own 5-acre farmers. In other words, he is asking you to compound a felony. I say that should not be done at the expense of those States and those counties which did a good job with respect to their 5-acre-and-less farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I have waited all afternoon to get a minute and a half. I am from a cotton-growing State, too. I have used up a great deal of time trying to study this matter. Last year we called meeting after meeting all over Louisiana trying to work out some program that would be fair to all. Some people have said that some States did not do a good job. I think the Congress failed to do a good job when it did not provide for these little fellows who have only 5 acres of cotton; these fellows who must make a living and support a family on 5 acres. Some of them have been cut down to as little as one-quarter of an acre. Members come here and say that Mr. Benson and the President would not approve so and so. When we listen to that kind of talk we are not doing a good job. Are we, the Congress, not supposed to pass the laws? Do we not represent all the people, the large the small, the wealthy, the poor? The laws we pass are applicable to all, not just a few. Therefore, in passing laws which affect everyone let us consider everyone and be fair to all. Daily I receive letters from small farmers, stating their plight. Only today, I had such a letter from a small farmer who owns 20 acres of new farm land. In past years he has rented cotton land, until such time as he could clear enough to begin planting on his own farm. Now, the rented land is not available and with no cotton history on his new farmland, he is left with only four-tenths an an acre allowance. I represent that man as much as I do the large planter and I feel he should be protected. A minimum of 5 acres should be established for the protection of this type situation. Members of Congress are close to their constituency. We know and understand conditions. Let us stand on our own feet and protect those we represent rather than bow to the dictates of bureaucrats.

I wonder if some of these fellows who said we are not worth $25,000 a year were not right. We ought to come here and do the job ourselves and not depend on Mr. Benson to do it. That is what we are paid to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH]. I think that is a humanitarian piece of legislation, designed to assist the very little cotton farmers of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

As a representative from one of the largest cotton-growing districts in this country, the San Joaquin Valley of California, I feel that the people I represent are entitled to participate fairly and equitably in any increase in cotton acreage allocated by this House. They have their economic problems and hardship cases and they need a just and equitable share of the acreage allotted to the farmers throughout the country. So certainly I shall oppose this amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, my friend, Mr. SMITH. I appreciate fully his feelings; but, after all, I feel that these States that have neglected the proper placing of the acreage already allotted and the placing of it in the hands of the smaller farmers have only the State committees to blame; whereas our California State Committee and many others take care of the small farmer, there are many other growers in the West that present hardship cases; and I might say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, that I have some of his former constituents out in my area in the San Joaquin Valley of California, and they want representation here too. For that reason I want an equitable share of any acreage allowed under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I favor this amendment.

In order to completely solve the problem of the 5-acre cotton farmer in Mississippi we need 68,497 acres. The bill before us gives Mississippi only 52,526 acres. This leaves us about 16,000 acres short of a quantity sufficient to solve the 5-acre problem.

It is true, as some have argued, that the State committee in Mississippi failed to reserve any acreage whatever for small farms or hardships. It may be true that the State committee is subject to some criticism for not doing so, more particularly since all other States did use their reserve for this purpose. On the other hand, these little farmers for whom I plead are not responsible for this situation. They had nothing to do with it. The acreage is now given out. The allotments cannot be withdrawn. The only means whereby this problem can be completely solved is by adoption of this amendment.

The Smith amendment appeals to me for a further reason. There is a reasonably large supply of cotton on hand. The committee bill would provide for an increase of 543,000 acres whereas the Smith amendment would provide for an increase of only 398,000 acres. The Smith amendment would, therefore, result in a great reduction of the surplus. Ordinarily the yield is low in the areas where allotments under the Smith

amendment would be increased. So, when considering the surplus this is another attractive feature of his amendment.

Furthermore, this amendment has a great humanitarian appeal. It provides for increases in allotments to farmers who now have only the barest subsistence. They need this increased acreage very badly in order to support themselves and their families.

I realize that in adopting the amendment some States, and particularly the Western States, would get no acreage under the bill. On the other hand they are not confronted with the problems now confronting small farmers in my section of the South. Last year Western States, through their Representatives, made a particular appeal to the Congress for bonus acreage. Their cause, so they said, was based on economics. They contended that they were being cut so low that the cuts would result in terrific losses and even bankruptcy to some of their farmers. As the bill finally passed the Congress they got their bonus, although I opposed it. In any event, this set a precedent for increasing acreage in certain areas of the belt based on economic reasons. Now the economic problem is actually confined to the South and Southeast where farmers find themselves cut to 1, 2, and 3 acres of cotton. Secretary Benson has fixed the national allotment at the smallest acreage in all history. It presents a case of dire consequences for thousands of small farmers throughout the South. The Smith amendment would go a long way toward healing this problem.

I shall support it and urge you to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, cotton allotment legislation is a very delicately balanced piece of legislative equipment, and if we are to do anything to upset this delicate balance it should be done in the committee on agriculture by serious consideration and not by an amendment from the floor.

The problem now before us has been explained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN], and others. I concur in what they say. I shall vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi and for the bill as presented by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not care to use my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I would just like to point out this as far as the State of Mississippi is concerned and its difficulties with the cotton-allotment program. In 2 years, cotton acreage has been reduced by 7 million acres by our Government. Any State committee in the South tries to meet its problems. If it grants all the small landowner acreages it does not have the acreage it needs to meet the other problems. There are areas in my own district where they took care of the 5-acre farmers at the expense of the 5- to 30-acre farmers and that meant that on those not so large farms, renter families could not grow any acreage at all.

So I do want to say in defense of the southern area that the total amount given to the State has been inadequate for them to take care of all their problems. If they try to take care of the 5-acre landowner they must do so at the expense of the 5- to 30-acre landowner; and, as I said earlier, that means that on those farms, renters are unable to grow cotton; and, certainly, the renters are entitled to consideration just as are the other small growers.

I do not mean to subscribe to the way they are trying to handle the problem because I do not have sufficient detail to do that. If they handled one side of the problem they threw the other out of balance. The trouble is they did not have enough cotton to meet these two problems, and, as I pointed out earlier, the acreage we cut here today by failing to adopt my amendment goes overseas to compete with ours in the world market.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi) there were—ayes 42, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat attentively in the House of Representatives all afternoon listening to the debate on this bill. Early in the afternoon I prepared an amendment which I had intended to offer and which is now at the Clerk's desk. It is now crystal clear that the House will not amend the pending bill in any way, Members having voted down all amendments which have been offered. To be perfectly frank about it, I, myself, have voted against all the amendments which have been offered up to this point.

In the light of these circumstances, I shall not offer the amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk unless I am assured in advance that it will be accepted. To offer it and have it defeated would be hurtful to the idea which I had wanted the House to accept. I have submitted a copy of the amendment to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and to the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. If they, themselves, are willing to accept the amendment, then, of course, I shall offer it. I would like to get an expression from these key members of the House Committee on Agriculture in regard to the problem which I have in mind.

In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture placed into operation a regulation with respect to cotton allotments on new farms and on farms where cotton has not heretofore been grown which I think is unwise. The regulation provides that a farmer cannot get a cotton allotment on a farm not heretofore producing cotton if such farmer has within the county a farm which does have a cotton allotment. I would amend the pending bill as follows:

> No farmer shall be denied a cotton acreage allotment on a farm not heretofore producing cotton on the sole basis that such farmer has a cotton allotment on another farm within the county.

My point is this: The Secretary of Agriculture has deprived the State committees and the county committees of discretion in making allotments to cotton farmers on certain farms which have heretofore not produced cotton. It is true that under the present regulation, if a cotton farmer in one county seeks a cotton allotment in another county for a farm on which cotton has not heretofore been grown, a new grower allotment can be secured. It seems to me that the State and county committees should be left free to decide individual cases on their merits regardless of county lines. To have in effect the present arbitrary rule is not good. I think we all realize that in some cases the county committees would not want to give new grower allotments on land which had not previously been planted in cotton. In other cases, I think the county committees would feel that new grower allotments were thoroughly justified.

My amendment would make the program more elastic and would give the State and county committees more authority to work out the individual cotton allotment problems within the counties.

I realize that, relatively speaking, only a small amount of acreage is involved in the pending bill and that my proposed amendment would have a very minor effect in 1955. My point is, I do think the regulation of which I complain should be abandoned.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] if they would be disposed to go along with the amendment I have submitted to them? Of course, if they are not I am not going to offer it, but I did want to present this important matter.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to say with such a small amount of acreage involved in the legislation now under consideration, it seems to me expedient to permit the gentleman's amendment to be considered at another date, and I can assure the gentleman it will be discussed with the Committee on Agriculture. But, I do not think it is appropriate to consider it now. I would object to it if the amendment were offered. I hope the gentleman will not offer it at this time.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman from Kansas knows from his long experience that there has been a change in the handling of the problem which I present. If he cannot support my proposal I would like to have his assurance that he, too, would give this problem every consideration in connection with the overall picture. My amendment would have but a minor effect on this bill, but in the overall picture and

in future years the amendment would be important.

Mr. HOPE. I will be very glad to give the gentleman that assurance as far as I am concerned. I think it is a matter which should properly be considered by the committee as a part of the overall cotton program rather than as a part of this temporary bill which we have before us today. I would certainly feel that the matter should be considered by the full committee at the proper time.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman, and I shall not now offer the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have learned more here in the last 10 minutes than I learned in the last 10 years. This debate has generated enough heat to be in some way connected with the coal industry of Pennsylvania. I have just discovered, in conferring with some of my colleagues from Pennsylvania, that anthracite coal is actually a derivative of vegetable matter, and all of our coal legislation, with which we get no place around here, should have been referred by the Parliamentarian or by the Speaker to the Committee on Agriculture. I find out that coal, coming from the ground—coal being a carbonization of ancient vegetation—my bills are in the wrong committee. There is no doubt at all from the abilities and the generated heat and the intensity of this argument and the brilliance of its presentation on both sides that had my anthracite coal stockpiling bill been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, had my bill to remove the indecent and damaging 4 percent transportation tax on anthracite coal been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, had the bill which my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], who is now sitting back here, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARRIGG] sponsored, my bill would have received proper consideration. We now have before the House a bill to dewater the mines. I am afraid we are before the wrong committee.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do I understand that the gentleman is suggesting that John L. Lewis should be Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. FLOOD. I can say this, if you want my opinion, as to whether or not you should remove the present Secretary of Agriculture and put in Mr. John L. Lewis, my answer is absolutely. There is no question about that. If you want something done, yes, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We might not have had an average drop of $9.11 a hundred in the price of hogs in the past year if somebody else had been Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is an authority both on the Secretary of Agriculture, and he knows much more about hogs than I do. There is no question about that.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I need to call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that the problem of cotton acreage allotments before us today is a pressing one to the area which I have the honor to represent. My congressional district is and has been for a number of years a cotton-producing area. At one time it produced more cotton than the entire State of Texas and had the leading cotton-producing county in the United States. However, this is not the case today.

When the Department of Agriculture released the allotment figures for the individual States, and the State committees made the apportionment among the counties, it became apparent that many hardships would result. It was not long afterward that I began to receive indications from the district that my fears were well founded. Based on the letters I had received, I addressed a communication to the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1954.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You are quite familiar with the prolonged drought conditions which have persisted during the past several years throughout the Midwest and greater Southwest. While the Federal Government has taken the necessary steps to alleviate the situation through extension of credit and emergency feed programs, none of the programs currently authorized by law are able to alleviate an ever-increasing threat—the economic status of the individual farmer who has suffered from these droughts.

While I do not want to detract from the assistance programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the ultimate end of such programs under continuing drought conditions only tend to place those farmers with limited operations further and further in debt. Unless these farmers are favored with several good crop years in succession they will be bankrupt and helplessly over their heads in debt to the Government or local banks. This situation will not lend to a healthy economic status for our country.

Because cotton is the main agricultural enterprise in my congressional district and for that matter it comprises a large portion of such enterprise in the South and Southwest, it is respectfully requested that in accordance with the authority granted you to make adjustments in cotton acreage account abnormal weather conditions, that you make additional cotton acreage available to the farmers in this drought area for the 1955 crop year.

I would appreciate your favorable consideration of this request and an early reply from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

Under date of November 5, 1954, the Department of Agriculture advised that an adjustment had already been made by them in the planted cotton acreage in cotton for the year 1953 account adverse weather conditions as per the following:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., November 5, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: This is in reply to your letter of October 19, 1954, regarding adjustments in cotton allotments for 1955 on account of abnormal weather conditions.

The economic effect on farmers in the drought areas is recognized and their difficulties sympathetically understood. It is the desire of this Department to alleviate insofar as possible under applicable provisions of law, the conditions caused by drought and other adverse weather conditions in the areas affected.

Section 344 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, authorizes adjustment in State cotton acreages where it is found that the acreage of cotton during any year of the base period was affected by abnormal weather conditions. In order for any State to qualify for such an adjustment, the adverse weather conditions must have been of such intensity and duration as to make it impossible to seed land to cotton and must have continued until the end of the planting season for the area.

On this basis the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees were requested some time ago to study weather conditions for the State during the base years 1948, 1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953, and to recommend adjustments in the planted cotton acreage for any year in the base period when, in its opinion, such adjustment was justified. In the case of Texas the State committee after an exhaustive study of the effect of abnormal weather conditions in 1953 recommended an adjustment of 1,548,030 acres. This recommendation by the Texas State ASC Committee has been approved by the Department.

In apportioning the State acreage allotment among counties, adjustments for abnormal weather conditions are made in the acreages planted to cotton in counties on the basis of recommendations by the State committee. Any such adjustment in the acreage planted to cotton in the county is the amount established by reference to available information and data as the net reduction of planted acreage in the county attributable solely to abnormal weather conditions. The State committee also is authorized to adjust computed county acreage allotments out of the State acreage reserve, which in the case of Texas is 10 percent of the State acreage allotment, for either or both (1) trends in the acreage planted to cotton in recent years, excluding 1949 and (2) abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings of cotton in the county.

The State reserve may also be used for one or more of the following: (1) to make adjustments in the allotments for small farms, (2) to establish allotments for new cotton farms, and (3) to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and if we can be of further assistance, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS RIZLEY,
Assistant Secretary.

Now Mr. Chairman, I should like to include at this point the exchange of correspondence between myself and the State administrative officer of the ASC for Texas. You will note that Mr. Price states despite the adjustment made for the State of Texas, no adjustments were recommended by the committee for the

Sixth Congressional District which I represent:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1954.

Mr. R. T. PRICE,
State Administrative Officer, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, College Station, Tex.

DEAR Mr. PRICE: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter I addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture asking that he take steps under the authority granted him to make adjustments in the cotton acreage in the State of Texas account the abnormal weather conditions experienced by our farmers during the past several years.

Also enclosed is a copy of the reply I received today signed by Mr. Ross Rizley, Assistant Secretary, in which you will note that he states the Agriculture Department has approved recommendations of the Texas State ASC Committee for an adjustment of 1,548,030 acres account abnormal weather conditions in 1953.

I would appreciate very much your advising me how this adjustment will affect the eight counties comprising my Congressional District, namely Brazos, Ellis, Freestone, Hill, Limestone, Leon, Navarro, and Robertson.

I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible and I know that the cotton farmers in the 6th District are appreciative of the action of the State committee in recommending this adjustment.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

AGRICULTURAL
STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION,
College Station, Tex., November 15, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: This will reply to your letter of November 8 in which you requested information pertaining to 1955 county cotton allotments and particularly the adjustments made in 1953 county cotton acreages prior to the establishment of 1955 allotments.

As was stated in the letter of November 5 from Mr. Rizley, Assistant Secretary, the State Committee recommended the adjustment of 1953 county cotton acreages for some 50 counties for abnormal weather conditions prior to the time that the 1955 cotton base acreages for the State and for our counties were computed. The total of these recommendations amounted to 1,548,030 acres, but no recommendation was made to adjust the 1953 acreage for any of the eight counties in your Congressional District. An examination of rainfall records of United States Weather Bureau stations in the District at planting time for the 1953 crop did not support a recommendation to adjust the actual planted acreage upward. On the other hand, in a county like Dawson, where some 375,000 acres of cotton were planted for the 1951 and 1952 crops, only 73,000 acres were planted and measured for the 1953 crop.

We are pleased that the Secretary has accepted the recommendations made by the State Committee to adjust 1953 county and State acreages since the use of such adjusted acreages has resulted in the State sharing in the 1955 national cotton allotment in the manner that it would have shared had the abnormal weather conditions not prevailed. It follows then that all other counties in the State have benefited indirectly since none of them will have to bear the load of adjustments in 1955 cotton allotments computed for the counties in which a normal acreage of cotton was not planted for the 1953 crop. Congressman BOB POAGE has pointed out this latter fact several times in discussions on the authority given the Secretary for making adjustments.

It is our understanding that sections 344 (b) and 344 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, do not authorize or permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make adjustments in county cotton allotments to compensate for any series of years of poor crops brought about by abnormal weather conditions such as drought during the growing season. We understand the provisions of law to mean that the Secretary is authorized to make adjustments in county planted acreages to compensate for acreages that were not planted because of abnormal weather conditions at and during the planting season.

I appreciate having your letter and your interest in the cotton allotments computed for counties in the central Texas area. We will be glad to furnish any additional information that will be helpful to you.

Very truly yours,

R. T. PRICE,
State Administrative Officer.

I wish to point out here, Mr. Chairman, that I hold no malice toward Mr. Price nor the many faithful employees of the Department of Agriculture who work under him for the State ASC Committee in Texas. But I do question the actions of the appointed State committee throughout the entire apportionment of the 1955 cotton acreages.

When the new Texas State ASC Committee was appointed in 1953 under the present administration, not a single member was named from the east central part of the State which has been the historic cotton-producing area. This is the blackland country of Texas and cotton has been their main cash crop for a good many years. In fact, Mr. Chairman, cotton is the major crop of Texas; yet we were given no representation on this State committee.

Recent interpretations of the basic law by the Department of Agriculture and the State committee with respect to the trend feature has proven most detrimental to my area and, if the practice is continued, the historical cotton-producing area of Texas will be adjusted by legislation out of business.

I hold in my hand at the moment an amendment to the bill now under consideration which would provide that the additional acreage made available to counties for the 1955 crop of cotton by reason of adjustments for trends in acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future county acreage allotments. Earlier this year I introduced a bill which, in addition to providing that each farm would receive for 1955 the same amount of acreage they planted in 1954, would have deleted this trend feature from the basic law. I am not going to introduce this amendment, however, as I have been assured by the committee that they intend to give consideration in this Congress to the deletion or modification of this feature of the basic law.

Subsection (e) of section 344 of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, states, in part, that the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 percent of its allotment which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage. I call to your attention the fact that the word "may" is in the law and not the word "will." In any event our Secretary of Agriculture issued a directive to the States to the effect that they would reserve 10 percent unless they could prove to him that they did not need it. Accordingly, the State committee reserve the entire 10 percent which came to a total of 761,278 acres. Heretofore our State committee reserved slightly over 1 percent when such action was left to the discretion of the State committee and not controlled by a directive from Washington.

From this reserve of 761,278 acres, the State committee of Texas used approximately 63 percent or 475,805 acres for trend adjustments despite the fact that the basic law also states that this reserve can be used to make adjustments for small farms, establish allotments for new farms, and to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardships. I should like to include a set of figures for the eight counties comprising the Sixth Congressional District of Texas which will indicate how this trend feature has worked to the detriment of this historical cotton producing area.

County	5-year base history used for determination of 1955 cotton allotment	1955 allotment	10 percent withheld by State ASC committee by directive	Returned under trend feature
Brazos	29,668	19,765	2,119	689
Ellis	208,982	139,539	14,930	5,170
Freestone	29,810	19,724	2,130	557
Hill	185,730	122,534	13,268	3,115
Leon	16,772	11,548	1,198	764
Limestone	111,882	72,469	7,903	532
Navarro	170,437	112,182	12,176	2,596
Robertson	41,058	27,007	2,933	608
Total	794,339	524,768	56,747	14,031

From the above figures, Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that over 40,000 acres were adjusted out of the Sixth Congressional District which is in the heart of the blackland country of Texas and is historically a cotton producing area.

While the bill we have under consideration here today, which I will support, will provide some measure of relief to a great number of cotton farmers throughout our country, the trend feature in the basic law and the interpretation placed upon it for the 1955 acreage allotments is the item with which I am most concerned.

In closing Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Agriculture and in particular the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] whose subcommittee has brought to the floor a most commendable piece of legislation in answer to a complex problem.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith substitute amendment and hope that it will be adopted. It is the only chance for the small farmer to receive adequate relief, and I feel that it is highly necessary that this large segment of our farm economy be protected against further hardship. The Smith amendment is in line with the principles of House Resolution 130 which I introduced, along with other southern Members, early in the session. My bill,

House Resolution 130, would have guaranteed each farmer a minimum of 5 acres.

I have heard a lot of criticism here today about the action of State committees in attempting to consider the plight of the small farmer, and I take this opportunity to say that I am proud of the record made by the gentlemen of the committee in Alabama. The figures show that Alabama had the best record of all the cotton-producing States in this respect and used 80.1 percent of its State reserve to take care of the small farms. It used 9.2 percent to take care of inequities and hardships and 9.8 percent for new farms. The attached table supplied by the Committee on Agriculture shows the fact that our committee went as far as it could go to prevent hardships under the law.

The Smith substitute amendment is the only bill which would make it mandatory that the Alabama small farmer has needed relief. As I pointed out earlier, on February 16, 1955, on the floor of the House of Representatives, the cuts in acreage have created a serious social problem to most of the farmers in Alabama and is doubtless resulting in distress and destitution for many farm families. Many of the farms in the Cotton Belt of Alabama do not possess the degree of fertility found in the western areas and, therefore, a cut below 5 acres simply leaves the small cotton farmer without any cash crop, and he cannot possibly earn a living, nor can he provide his family with the necessities of life.

The amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi will improve or correct this situation.

Percent of State reserve used for

	Percent in State reserve	Trends	Abnormal conditions	Small farms	Inequities and hardships	New farms	Remaining Feb. 4, 1955
Alabama	10	0		80.1	9.2	9.8	0.9
Arizona	10	100.0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	10	50.0	0	41.8	6.0	0	2.3
California	10	85.0	0	10.0	0	0	5.0
Florida	10	20.0	0	55.0	10.0	0	15.0
Georgia	10	26.3	.9	25.1	37.7	8.0	2.0
Kentucky	10	3.0	21.0	57.8	6.3	11.9	0
Louisiana	10	61.7	.1	25.8	0	0	12.4
Mississippi	10	97.2	1.7	0	0	0	1.1
Missouri	5	0	21.0	60.0	1.9	0	17.1
New Mexico	10	27.4	13.6	21.0	36.8	[1]5	1.2
North Carolina	10	83.3	3.2	0	13.1	0	.5
Oklahoma	15	73.1	0	13.6	.7	0	12.6
South Carolina	10	42.3	0	46.7	0	0	11.0
Tennessee	10	42.0	0	40.0	6.3	7.5	4.3
Texas	10	62.5	0	16.2	16.6	0	4.6
Virginia	----------	65.8	0	23.8	2.2	0	8.2
United States	----------	59.4	.7	22.9	10.9	1.3	4.8

[1] Acres.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3952 by Mr. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, is a good bill and should be passed. This bill provides for an increase in the allotment of cotton acreage throughout the United States for the current planting year of 3 percent. Three percent is not a great increase in the amount of acreage available for the planting of cotton. It will not, in my judgment, affect the overall production of cotton for the current year. At the same time, this small increase in cotton acreage allotment will help in thousands of instances to relieve serious hardships which have developed in the State of Louisiana, and especially in my part of the State of Louisiana. The bill provides that each farm shall receive a minimum allotment equal to the smaller of 5 acres or the highest number of acres planted in cotton on the farm in question for the years 1952, 1953, and 1954.

I have received many letters from cotton farmers in Louisiana who are literally cut to pieces by such drastic reductions of small acreages. The small farmer has been especially hard hit and it is my hope that with the passage of this bill, he may receive enough benefit with increased acreage to provide for himself and his family.

While this bill will provide only 19,453 acres of the 20,101.6 needed in Louisiana to bring the total allotment up to a minimum of 5 acres per farm, this increase will aid many of the farmers in Louisiana who were hit by the drought. This additional acreage, together with the 648,442 acres already allotted to Louisiana for 1955, will afford very substantial relief with only a small increase in the overall cotton production.

Since some reduction must be made, I am interested in a fair and equitable reduction. In some instances, in my judgment, the reduction has been too drastic and if this measure will guarantee a minimum of 60 percent of the acres planted in cotton on farms in the year 1954, it will be of considerable help.

The Committee on Agriculture has carefully considered the severe economic strain our farmers experienced due to these adverse conditions and offer this bill as a remedy. I hope it will pass without a dissenting vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 150, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McBride, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3828. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, WALTER, and REED of Illinois.

REVENUE ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 153, Rept. No. 71), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled

by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means or one amendment to strike out all after line 17, page 4, of the bill, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment except pro forma amendments which shall be in order. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 148) providing for the consideration of H. R. 2581, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2581) which authorizes the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which is necessary for the effective prosecution of basic aeronautical research. If enacted, it will involve the expenditure of $8,450,000 of Federal funds. I understand it was unanimously approved by the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Rules and is for the purpose of bringing to the floor the bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2581, with Mr. IKARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, you and many Members of Congress are pretty well familiar with the results achieved by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—we see these results around us every day. And during the Korean conflict, their achievements found dramatic representation in the record of our fighter planes as against the Russian MIG's.

I wonder, however, how many of us are familiar with just how the NACA works—and because I did wonder about this—I suggested that the committee report on this bill summarize in brief form just what the NACA is and how it goes about its work.

Now, if you will look at the report, you find on pages 2, 3, and 4 a great deal of information to which I commend your attention.

You will see, for example, that the NACA avoids wasteful and costly duplication of research and development effort by having a large number of technical subcommittees which range over the whole field of military and civilian aviation. In addition to their own research and development, which, of course, is very extensive, the NACA coordinates and assists everybody else in this field right down to the plane manufacturers themselves.

In addition to this, the NACA sponsors and finances programs of research at 27 nonprofit scientific and educational institutions. In this way, scientists and other research people whose skills and talents otherwise might not be available, contribute importantly to the Government's program of aeronautical research. Also, promising students receive scientific training through NACA programs which makes them useful additions to the country's supply of technical manpower.

You will note on page 3 of the report a list of the institutions which participated in the NACA's program during 1954.

I recommend that all of you Members devote a little time to reading this report, because it describes in some detail the workings of an organization on which our whole airpower development is ultimately based.

The committee had a most rewarding hearing on H. R. 2581 with Dr. Dryden, the Director of NACA, as the principal witness. I want to assure every Member of this House that the position we find ourselves in today with respect to the capabilities of our aircraft is directly attributable to the NACA.

I was particularly impressed, and always have been, with the attitude of the people at NACA. They have but one thing in mind: how to build better airplanes than any other country in the world.

This bill will give NACA authority to construct items totaling $8½ million. The committee examined into each of the items and was fully satisfied that every one of them was needed; that every one of them tied directly into the achievement and maintenance of superiority in airpower; and that not one of them was unnecessary by reason of similar facilities existing elsewhere.

The NACA was established in 1915, under Public Law 271, of the 63d Congress. However, it was not until 1950 that the NACA was placed under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Since that time the NACA has come to the Congress each year for authority to construct facilities and install items at its various installations throughout the United States.

This year the bill as submitted to the Congress involved authority in the amount of $13,300,000. The committee, after reviewing the request, cut it from $13,300,000 to $8,450,000. This cut was made not on the basis that the facility eliminated was unnecessary, but rather because the item is one which is being considered generally by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I have introduced another bill, H. R. 3761, which would authorize the construction of a facility for research in nuclear propulsion. This bill will be considered by the Armed Services Committee and language will be inserted in it which will place the NACA reactor within the general framework of the reactor program which is under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I hope that that bill will be on the floor in the not too distant future, since it is a research tool which is urgently required by the NACA.

I think that a rundown of the specific items which were included in this program would be helpful to a fuller understanding of the bill.

They are set out in rather general terms in the bill itself, but I would like to break them down in somewhat greater detail.

First, at the Langley Laboratory, at Hampton, Va., there would be the following items:

Air-removal system for the 16-foot transonic tunnel	$3,275,000
Improvement of roads	120,000

At the Ames Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif., there would be the following items:

High-speed free-flight facility	$635,000
Range for aerodynamic heating and dynamic stability testing	230,000
Data-reduction equipment for the 1- by 3-foot supersonic tunnel	190,000

At the Lewis Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio, there would be the following items:

Conversion of the 8- by 6-foot propulsion tunnel to transonic operation	$2,595,000
Addition to the high-energy fuels laboratory	310,000
Modification of the air distribution system	490,000
Construction of additional fuel storage tanks	145,000
Alterations to the propulsion systems laboratory shop building	195,000
Repair of No. 9 altitude exhauster	175,000

At the Pilotless Aircraft Station, Wallops Island, Va., there would be the following item:

Fuel-storage magazine	$90,000

The total of the items I have enumerated above is $8,450,000. Virtually all of the foregoing items are extensions or modifications of existing facilities. Actually, I feel that I am belaboring the obvious when I stress the importance of the research programs carried on by the NACA. Any of you who has visited their laboratories knows the magnificent job that they are performing in keeping us one—and we hope several—steps ahead of our potential enemy.

We saw in the press last year photographs of very advanced long-range bombers which the Soviet Union has constructed. Doubtless they have gone on to improve these bombers and perhaps developed new ones since that time.

Run down the list of our bombers, fighter interceptors, fighter-bombers, and you will see that every one of them had many major contributions to its development provided by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

It is not too much to say that our air defense today is a projection of the work done by the NACA. The fighter plane of today was a NACA experimental design a few years ago; the fighter-interceptor of tomorrow is being experimented on today by the NACA.

Research is their mission; adequate air defense is their accomplishment. I urge all members, on both sides of the aisle, to give this bill their full-hearted support in order that this fine organization may take another step forward and further provide for progress toward the maintenance of a free world.

It is headed by Dr. Dryden, an able scientist, with a personnel of about 7,000 people today. It is carried on primarily in these laboratories and in 29 institutions of this country on a cooperative basis. We get much information that is valuable to this organization and also to our efforts and also to the airplane producers from these private organizations which have cooperated in a very fine manner.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to make a further statement. I think the bill is absolutely necessary to keep us ahead, as we have been and will continue to be if we have such fine organizations as this scientific body working for the development of supersonic airplane speeds.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wish to commend the gentleman from North Carolina for the able leadership he has given the committee in this field; and may I ask a question? What has happened to the program of increasing the number of wind tunnels now being operated for research purposes by various educational institutions in the country?

Mr. DURHAM. That program has not advanced as fast as we had hoped it would. It was promoted in the unitary plan, as the gentleman, who is a member of the Armed Services Committee, and I believe was chairman of the subcommittee at the time we authorized the unitary plan, knows. I am not entirely familiar with all the facilities existing today in the institutions of the country. I can secure the information for the gentleman and give him a breakdown of it if he wishes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the subcommittee which considered H. R. 2581. The bill was reported unanimously from the subcommittee and unanimously from the full committee.

I want to join the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and other Members who will speak on this bill in urging the wholehearted and nonpartisan support that a bill of this kind should receive. When it comes to providing the basic research facilities for our military aircraft program there is no difference of opinion between the two sides of the aisle, and I know that all Members of this House agree on that statement. We all have exactly the same thought in mind and the same intention behind that thought, and that is to provide a stronger, better air force than any other in the world. The excellence of our air force today is in very large part the direct result of the unselfish service which has been performed by the National Advisory Committee for Areonautics.

I have no doubt that many of the scientists and other personnel of the NACA could benefit themselves greatly from a financial standpoint by leaving the NACA and going with aircraft manufacturers and private research groups. I am told that this is an extremely rare occurence, and this is a clear indication that service to the country is a prime motivation of the fine group of people who work for the NACA.

I am not one who is prone to forget cost, and, indeed, I am not forgetting costs in this particular instance, but I cannot bring myself to believe that the investment of some $8½ million contained in this bill will not pay dividends of one-hundred fold; dividends not only in a better and more efficient Air Force, but dividends in the saving of the lives of our young men who fly these airplanes.

Passage of this bill is an investment in our future—an investment which I am pleased to make—an investment which I feel every Member of this House is pleased to make. With all sincerity I urge the prompt passage of H. R. 2581, in order that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics can continue to protect our future.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. I think that any of you who have availed yourselves of the opportunity to visit one of the laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics well realizes the great progress that that committee has made in the field of aviation. It has put this country out in front in aviation.

This is merely another and a very small contribution in the matter of dollars to the fine work it has done.

If there is one branch of Government that has fulfilled its obligation without the hurrah or fanfare of publicity it has been the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The men who constitute that committee from top to bottom are dedicated men. They are scientists who work long hours with one thought in mind, that is to fulfill their obligations toward science and toward their country. When one sees the work that has been done you realize what their great accomplishments have been. They no longer measure the speed of an airplane in terms of miles per hour, but have introduced new units of speed strange to the layman. The NACA has pioneered in a new field and licked what at one time seemed insurmountable obstacles in aerodynamics. Transonic and supersonic speeds have become commonplace.

This great institution played a part in the research that made the Nike and other guided missiles possible.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from North California [Mr. DURHAM], and the members of that subcommittee who have worked on this bill and I join with them in urging its immediate enactment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you a very brief example of the vital role played by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in the development of our Nation's military aircraft. In San Diego, Calif., the Convair Division of General Dynamics is building the F–102.

The F–102 is a new Air Force interceptor airplane. It was designed to fly at supersonic speeds. On a given date, the F–102 design was necessarily frozen on the basis of the most current research information available in the country. Subsequent to the freezing of the design, new research information produced by the NACA on the drag at transonic and supersonic speeds indicated the need for design changes if the required speeds were to be obtained.

At about this same time a new design concept was evolved from the NACA's basic research program which pointed the way to the solution of the drag problem on this airplane. A comprehensive series of tests was immediately undertaken by the NACA using one transonic wind tunnel, three supersonic wind tunnels, and rocket-powered flying models. As a result of the NACA's work, Convair was able to incorporate modifications into a production prototype.

The F–102 has successfully flown at supersonic speeds approximately 100 miles per hour in excess of the original design and at altitudes appreciably higher than the original design.

The NACA's work on this airplane is one of many examples of the vital nature of their work. Their efforts in large measure determine the quality and success of our military aircraft.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, it is easy to understand results achieved by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, but it is not so easy to understand how they achieve those results.

Now, what I mean by this is the NACA is probably as highly a technical organization as we have in the Government. It is an independent Government agency, entirely supported by appropriations. It has been in existence since 1915, and since 1950 has been under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

Perhaps the most important function of the NACA is the coordinating of aeronautical research carried on in the United States. There is not a military or commercial plane flying today in this country which does not reflect in some way the research of the NACA.

Because the NACA performs such complicated research, and because its activities are not easily understood by the layman, I think it was a wise decision of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to insert in his report some of the background of this fine organization. He is dealing with this particular matter in more detail than I will at this time.

I believe that the activities of the NACA can be pretty well appreciated through an understanding of the construction items which are in this bill. I will describe them briefly, and I feel that the very nature of this construction points up the kind and the importance of the work they perform. The total of the bill is $8,450,000, all of which is being requested from the Appropriations Committee.

Now let us look at the individual construction items:

At the Langley Laboratory, in Virginia, the one big item is an air-removal system for the 16-foot transonic tunnel. This will provide a simpler and less expensive method for testing large-scale airplane models.

At the Ames Laboratory, at Moffett Field, Calif., the bill will authorize a high-speed free-flight facility. There are today no facilities for investigating the tremendous heat generated by missile speeds of from 7,000 to 14,000 miles an hour. The military possibilities of such a missile are obvious. Also at Ames the bill will provide a steel pipe test chamber, a firing chamber, and an instrument room which will permit the investigation of airplane heating and stability at speeds ranging from about 2,000 miles an hour to 6,000 miles an hour. This will permit research under conditions very closely approximating actual flight. The last item at Ames is the installation of equipment to record data received from the 1- by 3-foot supersonic tunnel. This will result in a saving in time and cost of about 25 percent, and will permit the tunnel to handle at least one more major research program each year at no increase in operating cost.

At the Lewis Laboratory, in Cleveland, Ohio, authorization would be granted for the conversion of the 8- by 6-foot tunnel so as to permit transonic operation. NACA advises the Committee that the next generation of military airplanes will be capable of flying at speeds about twice the speed of sound or some 1,500 miles an hour. In order to achieve this speed and operate efficiently they will pass from a speed less than the speed of sound into a speed greater than sound. This is a highly critical matter and requires intensive investigation. Another item at Langley is the construction of two test cells and installation of equipment that goes along with these cells, in order to engage in research on high-energy fuels for ramjets and turbojets. This is a field in which great progress is expected in the very near future. Three fuel-storage tanks also will be constructed at Langley, each of them with a capacity of 125,000 gallons. A lesser item, from the standpoint of cost, will be the alteration of the propulsion systems laboratory shop building. The last item at Langley is the repair of a facility in the engine research building which was wrecked during an experiment.

Wallops Island, Va., is the location of the Pilotless Aircraft Station. Only one small item is involved here and that is the construction of a reinforced concrete magazine, 37 by 52 feet, to provide storage for the larger rocket motors scheduled for firing in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, we have the finest Air Force in the world today. Probably no other single action can assure us of staying out in front than providing the NACA with the tools it needs to make the airplane of tomorrow as far ahead of those of our enemy as are our planes of today.

This country is faced, and will always be faced, with the choice of going ahead in the development of our military airplanes or falling behind our enemy. There is no such thing as standing still in the development of airpower. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics insists, and I agree with them, that we will not stand still.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time only to inquire of the majority leader about the timetable for tomorrow on the measures that might be called and as best he can to tell us what the Members might expect in the way of final action, because a number of Members on this side have inquired of me as to the possibility of a meeting on Friday, having regard for certain engagements to which they have been committed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad the distinguished gentleman from Indiana asked me.

We meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock. There is a Republican conference at 9:30. Of course, we could not meet before 12. There is 1 hour debate on the rule and 4 hours of general debate and 10 minutes on the one motion that is in order, and pro forma amendments in order. The tax bill will be the first order of business. If we get through with that bill tomorrow and also the GI voting bill, which I do not think will take long, then it is my intention to adjourn over until Monday. It is important that we dispose of that bill as quickly as possible in order that the States whose legislatures are in session might be alerted and act upon it while they are in session. In other words, if we dispose of the tax bill, which we reasonably ought to be able to, or may have to sit a little later, and also the voting bill, then we will go over until Monday. Otherwise we will have to meet on Friday.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

FURTHER LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a short while ago the acting minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and I had a colloquy about the legislative business tomorrow. At the time, I was not aware of the fact that there was a possibility of a conference report coming in this week, which we want to dispose of. If the conference report is available tomorrow, of course, it will be brought up, but if it is not available tomorrow and it is available on Friday, then we will have to meet on Friday to dispose of that particular conference report. I want to advise the gentleman from Indiana and to have the Members so advised and the record clarified that when I made my previous observations I was not aware of the possibility that a certain conference report might be available this week.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and his subcommittee for its considered report.

The promotion of aeronautical research is one of the most vital functions of our Government.

We are pleased in Cleveland that the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory can contribute to this very important work.

If America is to maintain its necessary and proper position in the field of aeronautical research it must give hearty and enthusiastic support to the expansion of these research facilities.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have no further requests, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950 (50 U. S. C. 151b), the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to undertake additional construction, to acquire land, and to purchase and install additional equipment at the following locations:

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: Improvements to an existing transonic tunnel and improvements to roads, $3,395,000.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.: High-speed free-flight facility, range for aerodynamic heating and dynamic stability testing, and data-reduction equipment, $1,055,000.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: Component research facility for nuclear propulsion, improvements to an existing transonic tunnel, additions to two existing laboratory buildings, repairs and modifications to utility installations, and acquisition of not to exceed 500 acres of land, $8,760,000.

Pilotless Aircraft Station, Wallops Island, Va.: Fuel-storage magazine, $90,000.

SEC. 2. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upward 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed $13,300,000.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $13,300,000 to accomplish the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Component research facility for nuclear propulsion, improvements" and insert "Improvements."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "and acquisition of not to exceed 500 acres of land, $8,760,000" and insert "$3,910,000."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "$13,330,000" and insert "$8,450,000."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "$13,300,000" and insert "$8,450,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilites and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, pursuant to House Resolution 148, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A BRIGHT DAY FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD concerning the small-business meeting this morning and include statements and excerpts of the different subcommittees as to their plans and intentions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this has been a cloudy and rainy morning for Members of the House here in Washington—but it has been a very bright morning indeed for 4 million small business firms all across this Nation. The House Small Business Committee met this morning at 9:30 a. m. in suite 129 of the House Office Building to announce its program for the coming 2 years. Despite the bad weather, 35 representatives of the press—representatives of newspapers, magazines and trade associations of all kinds—attended this meeting to hear about our program. A press turnout of this size, as the Members know, is quite remarkable, and it demonstrates a very broad and keen interest in what the Small Business Committee would have to offer. I do not think that the members of the press were disappointed.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE 84TH CONGRESS

WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas, chairman; JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; TOM STEED, Oklahoma; JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., Connecticut; WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Ohio; TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, Illinois.

The chairman of each of our subcommittees made a statement outlining the part of the small business program which each of our five subcommittees will carry out.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittee No. 1, Regulatory agencies: Hon. JOE L. EVINS, chairman; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER; Hon. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH.

Subcommittee No. 2, Small Business Administration and problems related to procurement, loans, disposal: Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, chairman; Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN.

Subcommittee No. 3, Minerals, raw materials: Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES, chairman; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN.

Subcommittee No. 4, Aircraft industry: Hon. TOM STEED, chairman; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT; Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

Subcommittee No. 5, Distribution problems: Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN.

They made important statements, and, as I said in my introductory remarks, they described an important program, and an ambitious program. I think the Members will be interested in hearing these statements. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read these statements in the order in which they were presented following my introductory remarks:

STATEMENT OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, CHAIRMAN, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, TO MEMBERS OF THE PRESS ON THE PROGRAM OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Gentlemen, I invited you here this morning to meet with the Small Business Committee so that you may hear about the program we have planned for the coming 2 years. We have organized five subcommittees, and in a moment the chairmen of these subcommittees will tell you about the part of the program each subcommittee expects to carry out. You may want to ask them questions, too, or to ask questions of other members.

In choosing the topics of our investigations, we have chosen only those which we think are most important to small business. We had a wide selection to choose from, as almost every subject which concerns Congress or concerns an executive agency impinges upon the welfare of small business. Every question Congress decides, and every question an executive agency or bureau decides, or fails to decide, affects the welfare of small business. These actions and failures of action may affect particular firms in a very direct way, as when someone in the Department of Defense decides who is to have a contract; or they may affect the general business environment in which individual firms must succeed or fail. All the laws, regulations, taxes, subsidies, tariffs, and so forth all add together to create an environment which is friendly to one class of business or another. Business environment in this country long ago became one which is friendly to big business and which is unfriendly to small business.

The objective of our national policy ought to be to try to create a business environment which is most hospitable to firms of the most efficient size. But by efficiency I mean only the pure engineering, production, and marketing talents. The ability to influence and manipulate the ways of Government so as to favor particular firms or particular classes of firms is not efficiency in any wholesome sense of the term. Nor does a big corporation's ability to win the competitive game by coercive and predatory tactics have anything to do with efficiency. We cannot assume that a corporation is efficient merely because, some years ago, it got there "firstest" and now has the "mostest."

This generation inherited a great ideal, and a great practical experiment with an ideal, which is relatively new in the annals of civilization. This ideal has been to keep the door of opportunity open: never to let the practical means for carrying on trade become so preempted or monopolized that new generations and new organizations of people cannot enter. What we must do now is to eliminate, insofar as we can, or try to offset, the special, noneconomic advantages which have come to surround big business.

It has been principally for the reason that so many subjects impinge upon the welfare of small business that the House of Representatives has maintained a Small Business Committee during the last 14 years. This

committee's job is to study these subjects from the standpoint of small business and to keep the House advised. For the same reason, however, our committee can hope only to investigate those subjects which are of more pressing importance to small business. Yet, even so, our agenda is an ambitious one. To do even passing justice to the subjects we have chosen will mean a great deal of hard and determined work on the part of every member of the committee, and on the part of every member of our small staff.

Now about our method of investigation. We are keenly aware of the Democratic leadership's determination to restore congressional investigations to a place of usefulness, which is in the realm of careful fact finding, not fact invention. We do not believe, however, that we need engage ourselves in writing down the elementary rules for distinguishing fact from fiction, and for according witnesses fair and dignified treatment. All of the members of our committee are civilized and intelligent men with records of responsible public service. We will not be browbeating witnesses, mixing fact with innuendo, or headline seeking.

This does not mean, however, that we will draw pussyfooting conclusions where our facts warrant strong conclusions. Nor does it mean that we will hide our facts and conclusions under a bushel. On the contrary, we would be failing in the task assigned to us if we failed to make less than candid findings and if we failed to make them known.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE L. EVINS, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, ON FEDERAL REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Our subcommittee will investigate the organization and procedures of the Federal regulatory commissions. These commissions are constantly promulgating regulations, or enforcing laws and regulations, which directly affect small business.

We shall pay particular attention to those commissions which have been reorganized under a Hoover Commission reorganization plan. These regulatory commissions were originally conceived to be nonpartisan, or at least bipartisan, and they were intended to be of a judicial character. Most certainly, they were set up to be independent of the executive branch of the Government. The Hoover Commission plans made a radical change from this original conception. These plans made the chairman of each commission responsible to the President, to serve at the pleasure of the President, and they gave the chairman complete control and direction over the commission's staff. It is now time to find out how these reorganizations have worked out. If it proves to be true, as we frequently hear, that these supposedly independent commissions have become political puppets on telephone wires leading from the White House, or from a political committee, then it is time we made the facts known. Small business will then at least know where to go to plead its causes.

Specifically, we expect to find out if these reorganizations have changed the effectiveness of these commissions in carrying out their responsibilities to small business. And whether there has been reorganization or not, we expect to inquire whether the conduct of these commissions and their officials makes for effective enforcement of the laws designed to protect small business against monopolistic pressures and unfair competitive methods.

In the case of the Federal Trade Commission, I am advised that there have been at least two reorganizations in that agency since the Hoover Commission submitted its recommendations. We believe it is proper for us to inquire into the purposes of those reorganizations and the effects upon small business. Also, it is planned for Subcommittee No. 1 to inquire into the organizations and functioning of other commissions and regulatory agencies for the purpose of determining how they are affecting small business.

In view of the recent actions and decisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission in its handling of the Dixon-Yates financing arrangements, and in view of other reports regarding the Securities and Exchange Commission actions, Subcommittee No. 1 will attempt to find out whether the organization and operations of this Commission are conducive to a fair and equitable treatment of small business.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT, DISPOSAL, AND LOAN ACTIVITIES

For several years now we have had statutes which declare our public policy to be that small business shall have an equitable share of Government procurement contracts, and that small firms shall be given an equitable chance to buy whatever surplus property the Government decides to sell. The question is, then, Is this public policy being carried out and if not what can be done to see that it is carried out?

Of course, we already know many of the answers; the problem is in many respects not new to us. The solution of the problem requires constant attention and hard work. Perhaps our public policy can never be carried out completely but we think that improvements can be made. Great improvements already have been made in past years, largely as a result of the work of this committee.

The Department of Defense alone will spend about $16 billion with private business during the present fiscal year. In addition, this same Department will spend another $1.3 billion on research and development contracts, which expenditures will affect the competitive positions of private firms for many years to come. The business firms that are lucky enough to get research and development contracts not only gain through commercial uses of the new know-how they acquire under these contracts, but they are permitted to take out patents on any inventions they make at Government expense.

In its disposal activities, the Federal Government is also a very big seller of materials, equipment, and finished goods. I don't think I need labor the point that the manner in which these procurement and development contracts are distributed, and the methods by which this public property is sold, are matters of great importance to small business.

One of the things our subcommittee will want to learn is the effect of Secretary Wilson's recent announcement that he is reversing his policy and is now going to spread the defense business around among small and medium-sized companies in order to maintain a broad base of production. We will want to know to what extent this policy has been put into practice.

The procedures and practices surrounding the Government's transactions with private firms are vastly complex. It was largely for this reason that the programs of the Small Business Administration were established. In instituting these programs, Congress created an agent to stay on the job constantly, to work continuously at finding ways to carry out our public policy on safeguarding small business in these procurement and disposal matters, and to provide certain technical and informational assistance to small business of all kinds, so as to build up the Nation's economic strength. These programs have now been in operation for many years. They were created in World War II as an emergency measure.

In 1953, when the RFC was abolished, Congress enacted a new law providing for Government lending operations to be continued for small business, as part of the small business program, the name of which was then changed to the Small Business Administration. On June 30th of this year the legal authority for the Small Business Administration will expire. Consequently, this agency will be first on our list of programs for review. We are therefore scheduling a hearing in Washington to commence March 1, 1955. That hearing will deal with the Small Business Administration and all its operations and it will develop whether the agency should be continued after June 30, and if so, under what form of organization and law. We expect to make a full appraisal of these programs, and to try to find methods to improve them if improvements are needed, so that we can make appropriate recommendations to the House.

STATEMENT OF HON. SIDNEY R. YATES, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, ON MINERALS AND PRODUCTION MATERIALS

In the 83d Congress, the House began an investigation of the mining industry and made a preliminary report on lead and zinc mining. This subcommittee will complete that study and then take up some of the other minerals, including uranium.

Our investigations so far have revealed that our national policy with reference to our domestic minerals industries is not realistic. This policy, or lack of policy, is neither realistic in terms of present strategic problems nor in terms of modern-day trade conditions. Nor is it realistic even in terms of our historic antitrust policy. Small mining companies are forced to try to survive the unfair competition created by cartel action in other countries. Only the international giants can survive under these conditions. We hope to present the facts on these problems, so that Congress will at least have the basis for formulating a considered policy.

Today we are rapidly developing a new mining industry—in uranium. As yet these are mostly small firms. In short, this new industry is at the stage where mining in other minerals was 50 or 75 years ago, before these came under the control of a few giant corporations. Perhaps if we develop an intelligent policy for this industry now, we can avoid the mistakes which have led to monopoly in other minerals.

As for production materials, our subcommittee will look into those that are in short supply. As we know, when there is a shortage of an essential production material, it is the small firms that are denied supplies, or get less than an equitable share of the available supply. We plan to look into natural rubber. This is an essential production material for many small manufacturers. It has suddenly become short, and the price has doubled within the last 11 months. We will want to know what methods are being used for distributing available supplies, and whether small users are getting a fair share.

The country is now faced with another shortage of copper. This shortage results from the strikes and political unrest in Northern Rhodesia, and it is possible that it may continue for some time. We shall want to know what methods are being used in distributing available United States supplies among industrial users. It is apparent that these supplies are being allocated, not by any public agency, but by some private allocation methods of the 3 or 4 big companies which control virtually all of the supply in this country. By what methods, then, are these companies allocating? What standards do they have for deciding which uses of a scarce material are best for the Nation? And how do they decide who the users shall be? How do they allocate between a small company and a big competitor needing copper for the same purpose?

We expect to get the answers to these questions.

We also expect to look into the export controls on copper. At the end of last month the Department of Commerce issued an order which severely limits exports of scrap copper and scrap brass, while at the same time there is no effective limitation on the amount of new copper that may be exported. The people whose business has been interfered with are, of course, the many small scrap dealers. And the reason they would like to export copper and brass scrap is that the copper companies have raised prices of new copper much more in Europe than they have here, and, of course, prices of scrap are higher in Europe. I seriously question the propriety of the Government's interfering with the profit opportunities of one group of businesses when, for the same purpose, it fails to interfere with the profit opportunities of another group.

We have a similar situation in nickel. The International Nickel Co. supplies substantially all the nickel used in this country under a system of allocation of its own. Nickel is in very short supply. This company decides how much nickel shall be used to make nickel-alloy steel, and how much shall be used in electroplating. It decides which steel companies shall make nickel steel, and how much, and it decides which companies shall do nickelplating. Presumably the Department of Commerce maintains supervision over allocations made by this company, but the effectiveness of its surveillance is open to question. We expect to try to find out what this company's allocation methods are. We are not sure who the principal owners of this company are. It was once incorporated in the United States, but later moved over the border into Canada—to escape, it is said, the United States antitrust laws. If we can't get direct answers, then I shall ask the Canadian Combines Commission if they will help us get the answers.

This whole matter of recurring shortages of certain raw materials needs a searching investigation. The small businesses that depend upon these essential production materials cannot survive unless steps are taken to see that they get a fair share of whatever supplies are available.

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM STEED, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, ON THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

We began a study of the aircraft industry last year, and held some hearings. The subcommittee will complete this study and get out a report.

The problems as we see them can be simply stated.

The aircraft parts industry is largely a small-business industry. It is composed of firms which make a countless variety of parts, pieces, components, instruments, and so forth, which go into the assembled aircraft. This is a relatively new industry which was developed, for the most part, of the necessities of World War II. The full productive potential of these firms will be urgently needed if a national emergency arises. But there is a serious question whether they will be killed off, not by any productive problems, but by the military's procurement and paper work procedures.

These firms grew up under a system of direct contracting with the military. The problems incident to this system were always bad enough. The procedures were complicated and subject to arbitrary change by the military. Now the latest thing that has happened is the so-called "Weapons System." Under this system the Department of Defense awards a prime contract with the assembly firm and leaves it up to this firm to obtain the necessary parts by subcontract. This raises a new set of problems. Whereas the small parts maker was formerly plagued by complicated procedures and arbitrary changes by the military, he is now plagued by complicated procedures and arbitrary changes by military, plus arbitrary changes by the prime contractor. The results seem to have been twofold.

First, the prime contractors are negotiating the subcontracts on private deals instead of placing them on competitive bids. This means that the smaller parts makers are getting a smaller share of the subcontracts in the first place. When these big assembly corporations are free to negotiate, they place the subcontracts out of considerations of commercial strategy and cross-ties of financial interest, not where they can get the lowest price.

In the second place, the small parts maker who does get subcontract work can never be sure that he can keep it. Whenever production schedules are curtailed, or the prime contractor has idle capacity for other reasons, he is likely to pull the parts work into his own plants. Thus, the prime contractor stabilizes his workload while the subcontractor may be in production one day and out the next.

There are other problems of course. For example, there is still confusion as to whether the subcontractors can receive progress payments, and if so, under what conditions. And as far as we know, the Air Force and the Navy are still using different inspection systems for the same parts.

Certainly, the small firms in the aircraft industry have shown great flexibility and great adaptability to a rapidly changing technology. In fact, it is their quick adaptability and ingenuity which make them an essential part of a dynamic industry. If and when aircraft manufacture ever becomes unprogressive, with methods and designs long unchanged, then perhaps the parts making can as well be done in huge centralized plants. But as long as small firms are essential, we expect to keep informed on what is happening to them. I hope that we can soon bring ourselves up to date and make a report.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, ON DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS

Our subcommittee is concerned with what, to my mind, are some very serious sore spots in our business system. These arise in the trade relations between numerous small and highly competitive firms on the one hand, and a few big monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic suppliers on the other hand. In the typical distribution pattern today, you find these small companies dependent upon such monopolistic suppliers—either for the products they distribute or for essential production materials—and there is a constant struggle to try to get fair and equitable treatment. If these monopolistic sore spots are not cleared up, not only will the small-business man suffer, but the consumer will be paying higher prices.

We have had some vigorous complaints from retail gasoline dealers about the treatment they get from their suppliers—the large oil companies. We plan to look into this. There are now about 200,000 retail gasoline dealers who are called independent businesses. The majority of them distribute the products of the six top oil companies. It has been alleged that they are free to manage their businesses, however, only on the terms and conditions dictated by the oil companies. If such hard terms are found in our investigation, then this is one area where both small business and the millions who buy gasoline need to be protected through the restoration of free, and independent, enterprise.

We also plan to look into whether there are unfair, coercive, and monopolistic practices in the distribution and sale of automotive parts and accessories, and many of the foods, including dairy products, for which the housewife is now paying the highest prices in the history of our economy. We are disturbed by reports that large processors and distributors of dairy products are extending their controls over marketing and prices by buying up small independents. If this is true, we want to know what effect this will have upon the price of milk at the grocery store.

We have plans for our program to include inquiry into the distribution of electric equipment and appliances. We want to know whether a freer and better distributive system can be evolved which will not only aid the small-business man and the consumer but will also impose no burden or hardship upon the manufacturer. We believe that in many cases the manufacturer will actually find it in his own self-interest to work with the Committee to see that the fullest possible play is given to free enterprise.

We shall be interested particularly in the deleterious effects and results flowing from terms and conditions imposed on purchasers, lessees, and franchise holders by big suppliers. Also we shall expose the facts regarding the practice and the effects of price discriminations in the areas I have mentioned.

Monopolistic prices are bad anywhere. But to my mind they are intolerable when they strike at the consumers' grocery basket. Certainly, therefore, we shall be most unrelenting in our search into these food matters. As we know, the profits of small business—the small wholesalers and retailers—have been going down. And as we also know, the prices which farmers receive have been going down. Yet the prices which consumers have to pay have stayed up, and in some cases increased. We want to know why. We think that the welfare of small business, the welfare of farmers, and the welfare of consumers are all of one piece, and if we can do something to help one we will help all.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BASS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

DISPOSITION OF SITE ACQUIRED FOR CHICAGO, ILL., POST OFFICE, JACKSON PARK POSTAL STATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House today on what may seem to be a matter only of local interest I am exercising the right of a Member of Congress to protest the actions of administrative officers of the Federal Government and to check as far as it is possible an indifference and an arrogance that would not be tolerated in an elected official answerable to his constituents.

It is because the Members of this body are answerable every 2 years to the people, whose Representatives they are, that there is on us this responsibility. In a very true sense, we are the voice of our constituents. If our constituents suffer grievous wrongs from the inattention of public servants, deriving their power of office from appointive sources and not answerable directly to the people, it is properly expected of us that in this Chamber we should raise in pro-

test the voice which we have here, the voice of our constituents delegated to us to use in their behalf.

The relations of the Federal Government with the various local governments, and with the residents subject to those local governments, should be conducted in a climate of cordiality and sympathetic understanding. The determination of where the Federal jurisdiction takes over from State or local jurisdiction is with the Congress and the courts, not with the administrative offices. Nothing is more repugnant to the spirit of love of country in the heart of every loyal American than the assumption of an attitude of "the public be damned" by those who by appointment are vested with a temporary power in the administrative offices of the Federal Government.

Long ago the American people decided they would have no more of "the public be damned" attitude on the part of corporations and rugged individuals. Everyone is happier because of the change that has come with the adoption and development of a policy of good public relations. As I understand our duty and responsibility as Members of the body closest to the people, being answerable every 2 years, it is to protest and bear down whenever in the Federal public service the spirit of "the public be damned" even by inadvertence or with ultimately good but presently lazy intentions manifests itself.

ABANDONED POSTAL SITE

In my district in Woodlawn in the heart of the beautiful South Shore of Chicago is a condition so shocking that it seems beyond belief. For 13 years a property owned by the United States of America and under the control of the Post Office Department, has remained a plague spot, breeding disease and encouraging delinquency. It originally was intended as the site of a new post office building. Changing conditions, with an increased mail burden and demand for a larger building for the necessary handling of the mail, have rendered the original plan impracticable.

Pending release of the property by the Post Office Department the land is being administered by General Services, which admittedly finds it impossible to maintain it in decent condition because the abandoned foundation invites dumping. General Services has recommended that this property be made both serviceable and a source of income simply by leasing it for parking, which is badly needed by business and churches in a congested area. However, this simple solution cannot be achieved without a release from the Post Office Department. This release has been refused on the ground that within the next 2 years they may proceed with a building.

COMMUNITY DEMANDS ACTION

After enduring for more than 13 years an unsightly mess bearing the sign, "United States Property—No Trespassing" the citizens of Woodlawn are up in arms and determined to get action. The Chicago Daily News and community newspapers have taken up the cudgels. Letters from churches, parent-teacher organizations, other civic groups, as well as individuals have poured into my office urging me to take action. Similar protests have been made to the Post Office Department and General Services Administration.

On February 1 I talked with the Honorable Ormonde A. Kieb, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Facilities and with Mr. Edmund A. Mansure, Administrator of General Services.

I confirmed my conversation with letters to both gentlemen and in reply the Assistant Postmaster General states:

Custody of this site is in the Public Buildings Services Administration.

Public Buildings and Services Administration countered:

The property could be leased out for a specified term provided that the successful bidder is permitted to demolish the present floor slab, fill in the excavated portions and pave the site with an asphalt topping.

Assuming that we had a solution, I advised the many who had written me that an alert Government at Washington had listened to their protests and the eyesore they had endured so long would speedily be cleaned up.

February 17 my office called the office of the Assistant Postmaster General to get a report on progress. We were advised to contact General Services to have "the holes boarded up."

February 18 a telephone call from Mr. Cornwell's office informed me that the Chicago police would be ordered to arrest and prosecute violators who dumped refuse on United States property.

Mr. Speaker, the protests of a great Chicago newspaper, the community press, the neighborhood churches, civic groups and outraged citizenry have added up to a heroic gesture of asking the Chicago police to make arrests for trespassing.

PASSING THE BUCK

The good people of Woodlawn are entitled as taxpayers and loyal Americans to something more than a brushoff. Passing the buck to the Chicago police is an affront. They have a just grievance, which they presented in an orderly way and in documental form. The answer is an implied threat that if any of them slips on Uncle Sam's criminally neglected sidewalk and falls into the debris labeled "United States Property" presto he will be yanked in as a trespasser.

The dignity and the honor of the United States require that the Federal Government should set an example in keeping up the appearance of a neighborhood, not in bearing it down to slum conditions. What is required is that the Federal Government immediately should rehabilitate this plague spot, remove the debris and ruins, repair and keep in condition the sidewalk and other parts of its property the same as the nearby church does and the homeowners in the community do as a matter of ordinary self-respect.

If the Assistant Postmaster General cannot make up his mind what he wants to do with the property, and meanwhile he fears that he cannot make a record for economy by spending a little money in making this property at least safe, for goodness sake let him turn it over to General Services.

Fiddlesticks with the heroic solution—end a headache of 13 years by asking the Chicago police to arrest a few trespassers. Then go along to the end of this administration with the Government of the United States of America advertised by a big sign on this plague spot in Woodlawn notifying all the world that the owner is none other than Uncle Sam.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of far larger importance than one having application to but one locality. What is happening in Woodlawn can happen in any city, in any hamlet. Whether there are similar instances in other districts in sufficient number to justify an investigation nationwide by a select committee of the House or a subcommittee of the appropriate standing committee I do not know. I would appreciate hearing from my colleagues as to their experiences.

If the situation in my district, shocking beyond belief, furnishes an index of a general policy, certainly it is a matter demanding immediate investigation and action by the Congress. At a later day, after my colleagues have had opportunity to study the facts as recited in the many letters I am including in my remarks, I shall press, if necessary, for such action by this body as shall seem to be required for the proper upholding of the dignity and the honor of the United States Government.

I now yield to the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and who is familiar with the conditions we are meeting in Chicago, in an effort to rehabilitate certain areas in that great city.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], who represents a district adjoining mine in the great city of Chicago, in so ably calling the attention of the House to this problem.

To my mind the problem of which the gentleman speaks is by no means a problem of a local nature. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], very notably represents a beautiful urban district in the city of Chicago, the residents of which have taken national leadership in the field of conservation of urban neighborhoods by community action. Our Federal administration has voiced a great interest in slum and urban conservation by local action, yet in the district that has taken the lead in this field we find a Federal administration not only failing to conserve its own property, but rather leaving its property in such condition that if joined in by others, would cause slum and blight which the administration itself condemns.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if it is his information that the present plan of the Post Office Department is to build a post office on the site in Woodlawn some 2 years from now?

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. It is a proposed plan, as I understand.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wonder if the gentleman knows whether the Post Office Department has been informed that because of the increased mail burden and the necessity of a much larger

postal building than originally planned, the site on Woodlawn Avenue could not possibly be used for such purpose.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. They have been so informed.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then do I understand correctly from what the gentleman has said, based on information that has been given him in his attendance upon the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with the Post Office Department, that the Post Office Department intends to permit this disgraceful situation to continue to exist for another 2 years, when at the expiration of that period, it can have no reasonable expectation of using the site?

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. It has not been so stated, but they have been asked to state if there was any other plan in mind, and I would gather that was their intention from the information I have received.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his very helpful contribution. The gentleman is heart and soul for everything that is for the welfare of the people of Chicago, and I know that no one in Chicago has a wider or more intellectual grasp of the problems of the people of that great city. This is especially true in the field of urban rehabilitation. It is a fortunate circumstance that the able gentleman is a member of the very important Subcommittee on Post Office Expenditures of the Committee on Appropriations.

MANSURE'S HANDS TIED

Mr. Speaker, I regret that my remarks today were made necessary. I had hoped that a matter so simple in its solution could be worked out amicably, certainly without taking the time of the House. For days running into several weeks I worked to that end. I am sure that I had the sincere and understanding cooperation of the Honorable Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of General Services Administration. Mr. Mansure is a Chicagoan. He personally is familiar with the situation. Moreover, Mr. Mansure is one of the ablest and most outstanding members of the present administration. Chicago, with all the Nation, is proud of the record Mr. Mansure is making in the high position he occupies. The contribution of his intelligence, his integrity, and his industry highlights the Eisenhower administration.

I do not wish any criticism in my remarks to be fixed upon the able Administrator of General Services. His hands are tied. Authority is with the Postmaster General to untie them. If the Postmaster General has one good and valid reason for keeping Mr. Mansure's hands tied, while the entire program of urban rehabilitation in Chicago suffers, he should appear before the proper committee of Congress and make it known.

The people of Woodlawn are in no mood to be pushed around. They have passed the stage of patience. As I came into this well a telegram was handed me. Let me read it:

We urge that you demand the Post Office Department and General Services Administration relinquish the present vacant post-office site and take immediate steps to provide facilities that will replace the inadequate Jackson Park and Kenwood Stations in Woodlawn. A new post office and our projected new police station and new parking facilities are absolutely essential for the prevention of a slum area in Woodlawn. These achievements would give a rebirth to Woodlawn. We hail your personal efforts in this direction and pledge our cooperation in achieving positive actions.

JOHN R. COULSON,
President, Associated Clubs of Woodlawn Association.
JIM EARLE,
President, Woodlawn Business Men's Association.
WALTER MARSHALL,
President, United Woodlawn Conference.

THE DOCUMENTED CASE

Here is the story of how obstinacy, arrogance, or at the best procrastination on someone's part is operating to shame the Government of the United States, to blight an entire neighborhood, to imperil the lives and limbs of children, to spread disease, and to put the Government of the United States in the position which Uncle Sam never should occupy of defying even the ordinances of a great city as regards the maintenance of sidewalks in good and safe repair and the shovelling away of snow and ice:

First. In 1941 the Post Office Department began construction on a new post office on Woodlawn Avenue south of 63d Street in the district in Chicago which I have the honor to represent.

Second. Work proceeded as far as the foundation, then was abandoned because of shortage of materials occasioned by World War II.

Third. Thirteen years passed. The place became a ruin, near the campus of the University of Chicago, in the heart of Woodlawn, close by a church that went to considerable expense in sidewalk repairs while the sidewalk around the site of the property with the large sign "United States Property—No Trespassing" went further and further into delapidation, unsafe for use, with unshovelled ice and snow in wintertime.

Fourth. The Chicago Daily News, the Woodlawn Booster, the Hyde Park Herald, and the South Side News-Courier with other community newspapers took up the cudgels. During the last week of January letters from churches, parent-teacher organizations, civic groups, and individuals poured into my office protesting the filthy, unsightly mess placarded: "United States Property—No Trespassing." The contents of these letters I later will recite in detail.

Fifth. On February 1 I talked with the Honorable Ormonde A. Kieb, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Facilities, and with Mr. Mansure of General Services. On February 4 I received the following letter from Assistant Postmaster General Kieb:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: This will acknowledge your letter of February 2 confirming our telephone conversation relative to the condition of the Government-owned site on Woodlawn Avenue which was acquired for the erection of a Federal building in which to house the Jackson Park Station of the Chicago Post Office.

I appreciate your interest in this situation and your bringing it to my attention. We here have been familiar with the condition of this property and recognize that it presents anything but a pleasing appearance, and are sympathetic with the desire of the local citizens to have the site cleaned up. However, our appropriations are not available for the expenditure necessary to improve this unsatisfactory condition.

Custody of this site is in the Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, and I am taking the liberty of referring your letter to Hon. Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of that Agency, encouraging him to give this subject his personal attention with a view to remedial action.

Ed is from Chicago and I feel that he will be pleased to give this his prompt attention.

I am asking him to communicate with you direct and to forward me a copy of his response for our information and guidance.

Cordially yours,

ORMONDE A. KIEB,
Assistant Postmaster General.

Sixth. Later I was furnished with a copy of a letter dated February 3, 1955, from J. E. Strawser, Acting Commissioner of Public Buildings, to Mr. Kieb. The letter follows:

DEAR MR. KIEB: Your letter of November 3 stated that a decision had not been made at that time with respect to the disposition of the site acquired for the Chicago, Ill., post office, Jackson Park Postal Station.

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA has communicated with this administration concerning the unsightly condition of the property. We are taking immediate steps to place the site in a presentable condition.

Pending a decision as to the disposition to be made of this property, there is an interim measure which could be taken to keep the property from being an eyesore and, in addition, provide revenue. The property could be outleased for a specified term provided that the successful bidder is permitted to demolish the present floor slab, the north, south, and west foundation walls, fill in the excavated portion and pave the site with an asphalt topping, thereby achieving maximum utilization of the entire site for parking and maneuvering of automobiles.

An additional copy of a report dated July 13, 1953, from our regional office in Chicago on this subject is enclosed.

May we have your comments with respect to the suggestion made by the regional office.

Cordially yours,

J. E. STRAWSER,
Acting Commissioner of Public Buildings.

Seventh. In his letter the Assistant Postmaster General had stated:

Custody of this site is in the Public Buildings Services Administration.

Public Buildings and Services Administration had countered:

Pending a decision * * * there is an interim measure which could be taken to keep the property from being an eyesore and in addition, provide revenue. The property could be leased out for a specified term provided that the successful bidder is permitted to demolish the present floor slab * * * fill in the excavated portions and pave the site with an asphalt topping, thereby achieving maximum utilization of the entire site for parking.

In other words the Assistant Postmaster General said action was up to the Commissioner on Public Buildings and the Commissioner on Public Buildings offered the solution.

Relying upon this, I advised the many who had written me that an alert Government at Washington had listened to their protests and that the perilous eyesore they had endured so long speedily would be removed.

Eighth. On February 17 my office called the office of the Assistant Postmaster General to get a report on progress. We were advised to contact General Services to have the holes boarded up.

Ninth. On February 18 a telephone call from the office of Mr. Cornwell, management coordinator under Assistant Postmaster General Kieb, informed me that the Chicago police were to be ordered to prosecute violators who dumped refuse on United States property.

THE EVIDENCE IN THE CASE

Affiliated with the Associated Clubs of Woodlawn are 50 churches, civic, and veteran organizations and clubs in all the various fields of community activity in a metropolitan area. Here is the letter of January 31, 1955, addressed to me by Joseph Wahala, corresponding secretary of the organization:

Members of the Associated Clubs of Woodlawn voted unanimously in their last meeting to appeal to you to use your influence in getting rid of the old post office foundation on Woodlawn Avenue, south of 63d Street.

For 13 years it has been an eyesore. Within sight are churches and hotels. Just 3 blocks to the north is the new $2 million American Bar Center. And across the Midway the beautiful campus of the University of Chicago.

Weeds grow high in summer. Snow and ice cover the sidewalk in winter. The site has become a dumping ground for refuse, garbage, junk, old cars, and refrigerators, and the like, and is a menace to children who play in the vicinity. Two signs proclaim to passersby the property is owned by the United States Government. Federal officials have done nothing to clean up the place. Foundation was started in 1941 and stopped by the war.

May we count on your help in pressing for prompt action? The site should be sold by the Federal Government. Then, the eyesore can be eliminated.

Similar letters were received by me from 12 other organizations of large and representative membership, from 6 churches and from many individuals. I quote from some of these letters:

CIVIC GROUPS AROUSED

Rosalia P. Isaacs, president, John Fiske Parent-Teachers Association:

All the civic organizations in Woodlawn, including the Parent Teachers Associations, who have a vital interest of their children in mind, have banded together to make Woodlawn a cleaner and better place in which to live. The action of the Government in abandoning and completely neglecting this tract of land is at best an oversight; at the worst it is an invitation to crime and delinquency.

Marcia W. Dill, corresponding secretary of Woman's Auxiliary to Woodlawn Hospital:

For 13 years this abandoned foundation for a postoffice has distressed all who passed and it has disheartened all of us who are interested in making the Woodlawn area a credit to ourselves, our city, State, and Nation.

DISGRACE TO OUR UNITED STATES

Carl S. Sholeen, president, Howson Fellowship Bible Class of the Woodlawn Methodist Church:

In addition to the disreputable condition of the foundation and surroundings, the sidewalk adjacent to this property is in a terrible state of repair and has so remained for several years whereas our Methodist Church in the same block was required to spend considerable money only recently repairing sidewalks that already were in much better condition. This property is a disgrace to our community and to our Government.

Mrs. Ruth Schaefer, Woodshore Woman's Club:

Pathetic and deplorable—unsightly and unsafe.

Rev. Walter C. Bihler, rector, Christ Episcopal Church:

It is an atrocious eyesore on a main thoroughfare of our community. There is refuse strewn about, auto wrecks, etc., as well as undesirable loiterers. Furthermore, the sidewalks are badly in need of repair and not cleared of ice and snow in the winter. The citizens of Woodlawn feel that since the foundation is useless it should be removed and the property sold or properly maintained.

FROM THE CHURCHES

Rev. Harold Leonard Bowman, minister:

Representing 1,600 members of the First Presbyterian Church of Chicago, I am writing to plead with you to secure action regarding the unused post office site on Woodlawn Avenue, south of Sixty-third Street.

This church is located just a block from that unsightly discarded foundation, which bears signs, "Property of U. S. Government."

We protest against the filth and rubbish which this neglected plot collects.

We protest further its being withheld from much needed use. This densely populated community is strangled with parked cars. There is a desperate need for off-street parking which this property could help to provide.

We therefore urge you to use your influence, not only to have this property properly cared for, but especially to have it released for sale and for improvement.

Rev. Charles R. Graham, pastor the Sixth United Presbyterian Church of Chicago:

It is a matter of Biblical record that a foundation without a house thereon is a matter which invites ridicule to the builder. This is precisely the situation which prevails on Woodlawn Avenue at the 6300 block south. In the Biblical record, it is implied that the builder may have been lacking in foresight. A foundation without a building daily raises a question as to the sagacity of its source.

As a defender of an inherent integrity in Federal and local government, we recommend appropriate action to remove this altogether embarrassing situation.

Rev. Robert Odean and Rev. Earl Elledge, interim co-pastors, Woodlawn Baptist Church:

Since this is United States property we urge you to press for action. With the foundation removed the ground should be kept in decent condition or it should be placed on sale. This place overgrown with weeds in summer and constantly littered with refuse, garbage and junk would certainly be a much greater asset to the community if it were converted into a playground for the use of the children who play there in all seasons.

Rev. Robert M. Herhold, pastor, Woodlawn Immanuel Lutheran Church:

Many of us are concerned not simply to arrest Woodlawn at the status quo, but in every way, to seek to make it a more desirable place to live.

This abandoned foundation is a collecting place for junk of all kinds and is an increasingly dangerous place for children who play among the debris. Besides the negative physical effect, a community liability like this serves to further demoralize the people of the community.

If this is no longer a proper site for a post office building, cannot the area be cleared for a parking lot or used for some other desirable purpose?

Immediate action on this problem would go a long way toward the renewal of Woodlawn. The United Woodlawn Conference, the churches, and civic organizations as well as citizens of all races and creeds, are united in seeking a satisfactory solution to this problem. Your immediate attention and cooperation would be greatly appreciated.

Rev. J. J. Hitchens, minister Woodlawn Methodist Church:

This site owned by the United States is an abomination and a reflection to the people of the churches near, as well as to the people of the community as a whole.

The churches keep their property in repair, but visitors always comment on this site in question as an insult to the community. Weeds that grow in summer, garbage, bottles, and other litter make this place look like a Gehenna.

Sidewalks are dangerous, a menace to everyone who tries to use them. Surely when the Government is spending lavishly through so many avenues, it should immediately remove this blot on our Woodlawn area.

FROM THE BUSINESS GROUP

Clarence A. Beutel, president the South East National Bank of Chicago:

Recently, with pictures and an article in the rotogravure section, the Chicago Daily News focused attention on the Woodlawn community's No. 1 eyesore, the old post office foundation on Woodlawn Avenue, just south of 63d Street. The foundation was started in 1941 and stopped by the war.

Conditions that have existed for over 13 years have been the subject of widespread disparaging remarks. Two signs reading "U. S. Property—No Trespassing" proclaim to all who pass that the property is owned by the United States Government. Consequently, everybody in the community knows where to place blame for conditions. It seems logical that steps should be taken at once to transfer ownership to other hands so that the eyesore may be removed.

Frank L. Moran, treasurer of the Southeast Safe Deposit Co.:

The site is a menace to the health of the community and a hazard to school kids every day. Who in thunder is in charge of this mess? Who has the authority to do something about it? Not one of our representatives in Government seems to have the guts to do anything about it. It could be turned into a parking lot—city or privately operated. Most anything will be an improvement over the dump that it is. Let's have some action.

FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD

James H. Clardy, 6653 South Minerva Avenue, Chicago:

How long must we put up with this abandoned wreck that the Government refuses to remove, repair, or even attempt to keep in decent and sightly condition. Sidewalks are badly in need of repair and in winter are covered with snow and ice that is never shoveled. The community wants action. The foundation, we are told, has deteriorated and is useless and should be removed. Post-office officials, we are told, no longer consider this a proper site for a large post-office building as (1) there would be little available parking space for post-office trucks, and (2) it is too near the busiest intersection in the community. With foundation removed, the ground should be kept in decent condition, or it should be placed on sale.

C. H. Nibloc, president, Kiwanis clubs of southeast Chicago:

As it now stands with a basement completed and the premises littered with tin cans and junk, it is unsafe for children who sometimes try to use it as a playground, the sidewalks are never kept clear of mud and snow and it is a discredit to the United States property sign which appears on it. We hope the Post Office Department can be prodded into action. If the foundation were removed the vacant lot could be maintained in a decent condition, but if the Government has no plan for its use we can see no point in continuing the property in its present deplorable state.

Nellie M. Hearns, corresponding secretary, the 6600 Blocks Minerva-Woodlawn Civic Club:

It is an eyesore of long standing, and the community wants action.

PTA JOINS IN PROTEST

Mrs. Marshel L. Beason, president, Wadsworth Parent-Teacher Association:

We join with all of Woodlawn in protesting this eyesore we have endured for 13 years. Woodlawn is very much in need of additional space for playgrounds. If the United States has no further use or plans for this site we urge the sale of the property.

Mrs. P. A. Gray, president, Woman's Auxiliary of the Woodlawn Boys' Club:

Thousands of people view this ruin daily. The useless foundation should be removed and the ground kept in decent condition.

Robert H. Chorley, director, Woodlawn-Chicago Boys' Club:

Our boys' club is located a short block away and many of our youngsters play in and around this foundation, which we feel is very hazardous. We in Woodlawn are very much concerned with keeping up the beauty of our property and this eyesore does not help. We would suggest the removal of the foundation and have it converted either into a playground or housing, which are both badly needed in the community.

Mrs. P. A. Gray, president, Woodlawn WCTU:

We join in the protest against this eyesore.

Wilda J. Dailey, secretary, Woodlawn South Shore District Family Service Bureau:

It is a blight on the Woodlawn community, discourages surrounding landlords from keeping up their property and maintaining good standards of living for their tenants. It encourages slum conditions with all their attendant social evils. It is a dangerous place where children can get hurt in their play, where gangs can gather and where vagrants loiter.

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST POWER PROBLEM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the pressure for the development of the nationally needed resources of the Pacific Northwest States of Oregon and Washington has created a situation which cannot be met in the future in the same way we have been endeavoring to cope with it in the past. The availability of raw materials and demand for the products has brought industrial development. Industry must have power—electrical energy. Water flowing to the sea in our beautiful rivers can generate power. It is generating power, but not enough. Power generating capacity must be increased faster than it is being built on the present basis. There is a way to do it, by an act of Congress, and a way that will save added investment of Federal money. That way has come to be known as the partnership plan for financing Federal multiple-purpose projects by using local money.

In the Pacific Northwest is located the last remaining stand of virgin timber in the United States. It takes men and it takes electrical energy to develop the wood products from these great forests.

The Northwest mountains are known to contain vast quantities of minerals. In the southern part of Oregon in the district I represent, a large mining company of Cleveland, the M. A. Hanna Co., has developed a mine and smelter for the production of nickel on a very great scale. The investment to date has been some $28 million. Their need for electrical energy amounts to 60 or 65,000 kilowatts.

On the Columbia River in the vicinity of Portland the aluminum industry of the country is located. These aluminum plants require hundreds of thousands of kilowatts of electrical energy. These plants produce a substantial part of the aluminum used in this country which, as everyone knows, is so vital to the defense of the country.

The natural resource which makes possible the development of the material resources of the Northwest is the electrical energy available from the swift clear rivers that flow to the sea from the mountains in the Pacific Northwest. The development of hydroelectric energy from these rivers has gone ahead at a rapid rate, especially so since 1940. In 1940, the total generating capacity in our area was around 800,000 kilowatts. In 10 years, up to 1950, the installed generating capacity was increased to some 3½ million kilowatts. Engineers and economists who have projected the need of the Northwest power lines into the future state that these two States will need a total of 10 million kilowatts installed capacity by the year 1965.

The Federal Government through the development of multiple purpose projects on the great Columbia River, which flows between the States of Oregon and Washington, now owns and operates many hundred thousand kilowatts of installed electrical generating capacity. The privately-owned and municipally-owned utilities of the area also have built generating capacity as rapidly as possible. In other words, both the Government of the United States and the people locally, have endeavored to meet the power needs of the area. But there is still a gap as between what has been installed plus what can reasonably be expected to be installed under existing conditions over the next 10 years, and what the need actually is.

In the Willamette Valley of Oregon, in the area which I represent in Congress, we have two streams, the Santiam River and the McKenzie River, which are partially controlled under the flood control plan of the Willamette Valley Flood Control Project but which each year run wild over a large area. The flood-control project, as planned and authorized for the middle fork of the Santiam and one of the forks of the McKenzie River, is not completed. The completion of that work is vitally needed in order to protect the valuable soil of the farms which is being washed away by the floods every year. The annual loss from those floods is $2 million.

The Congress has already authorized the construction of flood-control dams on both of these streams. Last year the authorization was expanded to make those dams multiple-purpose projects, including power. The Federal Government Department of the Army through the Corps of Engineers will ultimately build those two flood-control and power dams, but we know also that many years may elapse before that can be done.

The people of the States of Oregon and Washington have studied this situation. We face an urgent need for increased power from our streams. We desperately need the two flood-control dams I mentioned, but we realize it is not reasonable to expect that appropriations for construction of public works in the Northwest will suddenly be expanded to around a billion dollars a year which would be required for the needed construction of these dams and the big Columbia River dams which are authorized. Realizing these things, the people in the Northwest have proposed that local interests be permitted to join with the Federal Government in financing the construction of multiple-purpose dams, which include power facilities. We want to have the right, which must be authorized by Congress, to participate with the Government to the extent of paying for the power facilities in the dams.

Heretofore, the Federal Government has built multiple-purpose dams in various parts of the country and has built many of them in the States of Oregon and Washington. It has always been assumed because the dams provided flood control, irrigation, navigation, and power that it would be impossible to divide up those functions moneywise so that the power part of the dams could be paid for locally. A plan has been worked out so that this can be done.

At the last session of the Congress, I introduced two bills to authorize the partnership construction of dams on each of the two rivers I spoke of earlier. One of them, the bill for the Cougar Dam, was passed by the House of Representatives without opposition. At the present time I am drafting legislation which will, if passed, authorize the Federal Government to enter into contracts with local utilities for financing a portion of both the Cougar Dam and the Green Peter Dam. If this bill is passed by Congress, the Federal Government will be saved approximately $50 million in construction costs, and the local utilities will have the power that they so badly need. The dams will be built years sooner.

The people of the State of Oregon want this program enacted by Congress. Our legislature, in session now, recently passed House Joint Memorial No. 3

which has been sent to the Congress. That memorial specifically requests the Congress to pass the legislation I have spoken of to authorize the partnership plan for the construction of the multiple-purpose dams known as Green Peter on the middle Santiam River and Cougar on the McKenzie River. The legislature spoke with an overwhelming majority in both the house and the senate on the passage of this memorial. Forty-four to sixteen was the count in the house of representatives of the State legislature, and 21 to 6 in the senate. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the people of Oregon, through their own representatives in the State legislature, have formally asked the Congress to let people in the State of Oregon help finance these multiple-purpose projects which otherwise would be built entirely at the cost of the Government. It seems to me a very simple and reasonable request to make, and I am sure a majority of the Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate, will approve this partnership legislation. The memorial reads as follows:

House Joint Memorial 3

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the control of floods in the Willamette River Basin has long been recognized by the Congress to be necessary and desirable; and

Whereas certain river control projects have been built by the United States and are in service within the Willamette drainage area; and

Whereas the early construction of other flood-control facilities on certain tributary streams is urgently needed to balance operation of already existing facilities and thereby check recurring and aggravated damage to lands and property adjacent to the principal uncontrolled streams; and

Whereas the Green Peter flood-control project on the Middle Fork of the Santiam River and the Cougar project on the McKenzie River are among the most urgently needed to round out the Willametter Basin river-control program; and

Whereas full utilization of the hydroelectric power potential of the Green Peter and Cougar sites would add 120,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity at strategic points in an area where power requirements are rapidly increasing; and

Whereas local electric utilities, one municipal and one private, have shown willingness to finance and construct such electric facilities as an integral and coordinated part of the desired flood-control plan, thereby relieving the United States Government of that part of the costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein),

That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to make available funds to begin the planning and construction of the flood-control facilities needed at the Green Peter and Cougar projects and, at the same time, authorize the licensing by the Federal Power Commission of hydroelectric installations to be financed and constructed by local agencies in harmony with the overall Willamette River Basin development plan.

Be it further resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States; to Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate; to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to each Member of the Congress.

Adopted by house January 25, 1955.

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate February 8, 1955.

ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.

However, there is opposition in the congressional delegation from Oregon, to the partnership plan. I will recite the objections that I have heard about the partnership plan. These objections have been widely published in magazine articles, on the radio, and in the newspapers. Opposition No. 1 seems to be that the partnership plan, which, incidentally, has been endorsed by the administration, represents a change in policy and that the administration now has abandoned the traditional all-Federal method of building multiple-purpose projects for flood control, power, and navigation and is about to turn the whole of such construction over to the partnership plan. That, of course, is an absurdity. There is no change in policy by the administration. What the partnership plan does is to provide another way for the construction of multiple-purpose projects in addition to the construction that is going ahead right now in the Northwest by the Government on such projects. It is just a supplement which will expedite this construction for the benefit of the people of the Northwest, stop the flooding which is causing annually a $2 million loss, catch up with our electric power needs a little sooner, and relieve the Federal Government of millions of dollars of additional investment in such projects.

The second objection which these people raise to the partnership plan of constructing and operating multi-purpose-dam projects is that it represents a loss of profit to the Federal Government because, they say, the Federal Government will give away—that is where the give-away phrase came from—the part of the project which makes money and retain to itself, the Federal Government, only those parts of the project which are costly. That statement, although I am sure that it has a lot of political and emotional appeal, because people generally speaking are not able to dig into the facts of these things, is on the face of it not correct. There is no provision in any law of the United States for revenue in the form of net profit furnished by Pacific Northwest flood control and navigation projects in which power generators are located, to go to the United States Treasury. The rates charged for the electricity generated by those plants are based upon the cost of amortization over a period of 50 years, plus maintenance and operation. After the amortization period is completed, the rate charged for the power must be rebuilt on the basis of the remaining cost of operation and maintenance. In other words, when the dam is paid for, the Federal Government has received its money back. Then the Federal Government's financial interest in that project has ended. The Government merely gets its investment back with interest. The people of the area have paid for the project through buying the power, and they will get the benefit of it.

But those who are opposing what we are suggesting now, this partnership plan, would try to have the folks out there and everywhere else believe that in some way we are trying to rob the Federal Treasury. I recommend to those people who are speaking against this partnership plan that they obtain and read a copy of the Bonneville Act, and find out how wrong they are when they talk about millions of dollars being lost to the Treasury.

We in the Northwest and I think generally over the country do not think it is an obligation of the Federal Government to furnish electric energy for the people of this country. If we thought that, we would be advocating a Socialist form of government, because that fundamentally is socialistic. We do not believe in socialism. The Federal Government has gone into the business of generating electrical energy as the result of having built multipurpose dams in which power generators must be located because it would be uneconomic to allow falling water to go to waste without making power from it. It is unreasonable to assume that because the Federal Government has entered into the production of power it thereby has assumed an obligation in the Pacific Northwest to generate all of the power that is generated out there. The Federal Government's obligation is only to do those things with reference to power that are reasonably necessary in the construction and management of the projects which have been authorized by Congress primarily for flood control, and for navigation. The Federal Government has no further obligation than that, nor do we consider that it has. If local money is available to finance the power part of such a project it should be allowed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation for the partnership plan for financing construction of the Cougar Dam and Green Peter Dam will be introduced by me in the very near future. At that time I shall endeavor to further explain the principle involved in this legislation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include House Joint Memorial 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. MORANO and to include a tribute to three young people in his district who have been honored by the Westinghouse Co. for outstanding achievements in the field of science.

Mr. FJARE.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. LAIRD).

Mr. LOVRE and include a speech delivered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. COON and to include a memorial adopted by the Oregon Legislature.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short tribute to our late lamented friend, the Honorable Pete Jarman, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the four prize-winning essays in the Voice of America national contest which has just been completed. The four may be slightly more than the limit, but I believe this is of the utmost importance, so I ask that they be included, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG (at the request of Mr. HOLT), for 1 week, on account of sickness.

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), for the remainder of the week, on account of sickness.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 24, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

460. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

461. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

462. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a proposed amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1956 for the Post Office Department involving a reduction in the amount of $183,000 (H. Doc. No. 94); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

463. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1956 for the General Services Administration involving a reduction in the amount of $169,000 (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3659. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 153. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4259, a bill to provide for a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption; without amendment (Rept. 71). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 4290. A bill to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4291. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to authorize additional market services for livestock purchasers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 4292. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 4293. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Nathan Hale; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4294. A bill to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4295. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 4296. A bill to provide that certain professors at West Point shall not be deprived of certain retirement benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4297. A bill to exempt meetings of associations of professional hairdressers or cosmetologists from certain provisions of the acts of June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 611), and July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622), as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4298. A bill to amend the Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U. S. C., secs. 669–669i) by providing that the amount of money currently in the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund shall be available for use during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, defining "wildlife restoration project," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 4299. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4300. A bill to improve the income-earning capacity and standard of living of low income rural people, to strengthen the Nation by providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, industrial dispersion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 4301. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4302. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 4303. A bill for the relief of desert land entrymen whose entries are dependent upon percolating waters for reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4304. A bill to provide for an annual report of the President on the effect of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 upon labor, employment, and industrial activity in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4305. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to increase by 25 percent the amount of the annuities payable thereunder, and to provide full annuities at age 60 for men who have completed 30 years of service and at age 55 for women who have completed 25 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4306. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to increase the amount of the annuities payable thereunder, and to provide full annuities at age 60 for men who have completed 30 years of service and at age 55 for women who have completed 25 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4307. A bill to amend the joint resolution of May 17, 1938, to provide for the construction and maintenance of a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum on the site set aside for an art gallery thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 4308. A bill for the relief of desert land entrymen whose entries are dependent upon percolating waters for reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4309. A bill to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4310. A bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4311. A bill to provide that school districts which filed applications for payments under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, before November 24, 1953, shall not be penalized on account of school construction con-

tracts made after that date; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4312. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4313. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4314. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning December 8, 1910, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4315. A bill to provide grants to municipalities in those States which are parties to the Ohio River Valley sanitation compact to aid in the construction of sewage treatment works to prevent pollution of waters in the Ohio River Basin and tributaries, such as Monongahela River and others; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4316. A bill relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4317. A bill to amend section 631 of title 28, United States Code, so as to provide that National Park Commissioners shall be appointed upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to proclaim a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution extending the congratulations of Congress with respect to the celebration of the Jewish tercentenary in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 154. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 155. Resolution to provide funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 154; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress against passing legislation reducing tariff rates on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against the enactment of legislation lowering the tariffs on the importation of rubber products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRESTON: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Georgia memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the administration by the several States of their respecive school systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, the Senate of the State of Oklahoma concurring therein, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact necessary legislation giving aid to certain farmers of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, concurrent resolution of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma relating to cotton-acreage control, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass suitable legislation increasing present cotton-acreage allotments and establishing a long-range cotton-acreage program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, the Senate concurring therein, relating to the importing of crude oil from foreign countries, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to curb the imports of crude oil from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against passing legislation reducing tariff rates on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4318. A bill for the relief of certain dependents of the late James Anderson O'Donnell, lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 4319. A bill for the relief of Samuel Turteltaub, Mrs. Lotta Turteltaub, and Adam Turteltaub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Guerdon Plumley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 4321. A bill for the relief of C. J. Pobojeski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Saar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Takae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lyman C. Murphey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 4325. A bill for the relief of Gen. and Mrs. Yeh Nan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Regina Dippold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Lelas Constantinos Tsamopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4328. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Angelo Rapa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Joe Camilleri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Andreau Vincent Joseph Fava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4332. A bill for the relief of John Micallef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of John Grech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4334. A bill for the relief of Doris Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Otto Arild Sletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Z. A. Hardee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Francesca DeStefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4338. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Kienappel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Maria P. Morra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Fissore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of Leopold Danihel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4342. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Edward Constantine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Eno Picou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4345. A bill for the relief of Manhattan Lighting Equipment Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4346. A bill for the relief of Rosario Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 4347. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4348. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Higuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Lucito G. Gamboa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Albert Shanfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4351. A bill for the relief of Stanley John Rybezyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4352. A bill for the relief of Robert Julius MacGavin and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Chung Pang Ja and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Anna Ilona Purins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 4355. A bill for the relief of Cheddid El Kharrat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

116. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Maine State legislative committee, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, protesting any legislation to modify or repeal Public Law 199, 82d Congress, which provided limitations on the weight and size of parcel-post packages; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

117. Also, petition of the Maine State legislative committee, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, protesting the diversion of mail transportation to trucks and airplanes when adequate rail facilities exist; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

118. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Tarrant County Medical Society, Fort Worth, Tex., with reference to going on record as opposing any infringement by the Veterans' Administration on the rights of the Industrial Accident Board of Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

119. Also, petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, Bettendorf, Iowa, requesting the appointment of a special joint committee to investigate the acts of attainder committed against him by the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Personal Income-Tax Exemption of $800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, about this time of year some 60 million taxpayers are struggling over the preparation of their income-tax returns. This mental struggle, coupled with the painful duty of paying the taxes, is not restricted to persons of large or even moderate incomes. It extends to persons of very low income as well. It is my conviction that the law is exacting tribute from millions of persons living far below what we like to think of as a fair standard. I believe that equity and economics both demand that the level of personal exemptions be raised to at least $800.

The tax on income has long been recognized as potentially the fairest tax in the whole lexicon of public finance. It is the one tax which lends itself to manageable progressivity, and measures out its burdens according to the financial capacity of those upon whom its burdens fall. But the Congress has pushed the application of the tax too far. The law now lays a heavy hand on the poor and economically depressed. Reason protests this anomaly. Here we have in the income tax the most perfect tool for distributing burdens according to ability to pay, yet, as it were, we take billions of dollars out of the hides of millions who lack any real taxpaying ability. When personal exemptions under an income tax are so low that the burden of the tax falls on persons whose incomes are below a level capable of supporting a minimum standard of living, then the tax ceases to be levied in accordance with ability to pay.

Economists and sociologists have figured out what is the minimum that any individual or family can receive and still maintain a reasonable living standard compatible with American concepts. These minimums give recognition to the requirements of health, education, decent housing, clean living, an opportunity to share in a minimum of the good things of life. Certainly the Congress, even if it does not guarantee such a minimum, should not deliberately lower the standard of those who already are sub-par. Yet that is exactly what the Congress does when it exacts a toll from the person whose income barely exceeds $600.

The Congress has not always been so niggardly. Except for a single year, Federal personal-income-tax exemptions, measured in terms of buying power, are lower today than they have ever been in the past. When the income tax was first enacted in 1913, a family of 4 was entitled to an exemption of $4,000. In terms of the buying power of depreciated 1955 dollars, that was the equivalent of about $11,000. But actually today, a family of 4 enjoys an exemption of only $2,400. In 1931, the legal exemption was $4,300. This had a purchasing power of around $7,600. Even in 1944, when World War II was at its height, the exemption had a purchasing power in excess of 3,000 of our 1955 dollars. But today, as I said, the exemption is only $2,400. This is at least 50 percent and more below what is held out as being necessary to provide a minimum American standard of living. And every dollar exacted in income tax from persons below that minimum drives them one rung farther down on the economic ladder. My point is: If we cannot help to raise up these poor, the least we can do is to refrain from pushing them farther down.

If we raise the exemption to $800, we will reduce the tax of everybody, and at the same time—and this is the most important thing—abolish the tax on 13.2 million taxpayers with very low incomes. This will give relief not only to these taxpayers, but also it will reduce the tax compliance burdens of thousands of employers who now have to withhold for these low-income taxpayers. Removing some 13 million taxpayers from the rolls will also greatly reduce the administrative burdens and costs of the Internal Revenue Service and permit that agency to apply its personnel in much more constructive and revenue-producing work.

There are those who support tax relief for the wealthy but oppose tax relief for those at lower levels. They protest against removing anyone from the tax rolls. Everybody should pay their fair share, they say. Nobody should be exempt. Happily there are those who read statistics differently, and have a different concept of what is fair. I cannot understand how ordinarily intelligent well-thinking men can argue the justice of all levels of government in the United States taking in taxes more than one-fourth of the income of families with incomes below $1,000, $2,000, $3,000, or even $4,000. Yet that is what the statistics show. To repeat so there will not be any misunderstanding, the combined Federal, State, and local tax burdens on families with incomes of $1,000, $2,000, $3,000, or $4,000 exceed 25 percent of their income. To be sure, much of this burden comes from excise and property taxes, but the Federal Government in taxing their incomes also adds to the burden. It is at least this added burden that I insist should be removed.

I consider all that I have just said to be of great importance, but I have not yet reached what to me is one of the most important economic consequences of increasing personal exemptions. Increasing the personal exemption by $200 will reduce the tax burden of persons in the lowest bracket by a maximum of $160 for a family of four. With taxes reduced, take-home pay will be increased. But much more important is the fact that the tax savings of all these taxpayers will add about $4.5 billion in purchasing power, principally of persons in the low-income brackets. They will spend this money for clothing, better housing, more adequate food, refrigerators, automobiles, and the thousand and one items and services that consumers buy. But the net effect on the Nation's economy will be much greater than simply an increase in retail sales by $4.5 billion. This increased spending will result in higher business profits, higher tax revenues for the Federal Treasury, and greater employment for all. Recognized economists in the country estimate that increased purchasing power of $4.5 billion could raise aggregate income by perhaps double that amount when secondary or induced effects are taken into account.

We should remember that many workers are being displaced each year through technological improvements. We cannot and should not try to fight this. Hundreds of thousands of new workers are also moving into the labor market each year. We certainly cannot fight this. But we must ever be on guard to prevent developing unemployment. I

caution that 3 million unemployed—the approximate figure today—is not to be viewed with complete disinterest and unconcern. I point out, too, that the average period of unemployment toward the end of last year was nearly 13 weeks. We can only view this with the greatest seriousness.

There are those in the United States who seem to think that the way to promote prosperity is to maintain an economic system and policy which favors business, the great corporation, the wealthy stockholder. Their thought is that some of the benefits accruing to these groups will trickle down to the mass of workers and consumers. It is thinking such as this which dominated the enactment of the 1954 tax law. It seems to me to be far more logical to assure a continued prosperity by increasing consumer purchasing power. With increased purchasing power will come increased demand. Investment, production, and sales will rise, and these in turn will promote more investment, more jobs, continued prosperity. Congress should be ever alert to do all that is necessary to prevent economic depression. But the Congress must also realize that one consequence of concentrating incomes in a relatively few hands is a reduction of consumer buying power. Depressions have been born and will continue to be born so long as the mass of the population have a purchasing power inadequate to buy our potential tremendous industrial output. The Congress must realize that failure to give some relief to consumers from heavy tax burdens is depression creating. The 84th Congress has an opportunity to enact an economically sound, and equitably just, tax measure. An increase in personal exemptions to $800 is just such a measure, and I call upon the Congress to act favorably and speedily thereon.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks by way of explanation of my vote against H. R. 1, I am concerned with the protection of America's industrial and agricultural production. During the past 20 years we have seen a tremendous reduction in our tariff barriers, and abnormal world conditions have been such as to make it difficult to assess the full effect of these changes in our tariff structure on our national economy. It is safe to say that the United States is no longer one of the high tariff nations. Our tariffs are now at their lowest point in history, and average only about 5.1 percent of the value of imports. In addition, it is to be considered that actually our tariffs affect less than one-third of our total imports.

There are many factors that affect free trade between the nations of the world. Import quotas, currency restrictions, monopolies, government trading, cartels, and other devices are far tighter barriers to free trade than tariffs. The United States actually permits freer trade than any other industrialized country in the world, because, except with respect to quotas on agricultural products subject to price supports, it does not engage in these practices. The use of such devices by other nations has increased markedly during the past 20 years.

It is my feeling that a sound, stable, and prosperous economy in the United States is the world's greatest hope at this time. The theory that the United States should import those things that can be produced more cheaply abroad and emphasize production of those things which we ourselves can produce more cheaply is not true under present world conditions. We need a broad base of all industries for our Nation's economic strength, and some segments of our economy have to be protected to insure that condition.

Our Government is great because it is composed of a system of checks and balances and I believe that the escape-clause provisions should be strengthened and implemented toward that end. In addition, I feel that H. R. 1 was too great a departure from the time-proven basic American concept that we should have a Government of law and not a Government of men.

Roslyn News Celebrates 75th Birthday—Second Oldest Weekly on Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in congratulating the Roslyn News on its 75th birthday today. The American weekly newspaper, as I have stated previously, is as American as the Constitution of the United States and has contributed much to our progress since the birth of this great Nation. I am proud to claim the Roslyn News as one of my constituent newspapers and I am pleased to present its history.

February 23 marks the diamond jubilee for the Roslyn News of Roslyn, N. Y.

Three-quarters of a century of publication is a long time and in the space of those 75 years many changes have come to both the paper and the area it serves.

The first issue of the paper was published late in the nineteenth century by Pier Keeler and his brother in a small print shop on a winding country lane, now Main Street. They called their paper the Tablet, and since the town had but a handful of residents that, too, was the size of the paper's circulation.

One of the town's early visitors was George Washington, one of its best remembered sons, the poet, William Cullen Bryant. Through the years the sleepy village has changed to a smart and beautiful residential area on Long Island's famous North Shore, but it still houses famous artists, writers—Christopher Morley—television and theatrical celebrities.

A year after the Keelers started their paper, they sold it to William R. Burling who changed its name to the one it now bears. After him there were several other owners who struggled to make a small village weekly pay for itself. One of these was Maj. George M. Robertson, Roosevelt Raceway official and winner of the famous Vanderbilt Cup in 1908.

Today, instead of measuring its readers on the fingers of both hands, the Roslyn News can point with pride to a wide readership in an area that covers Roslyn, Roslyn Heights, Roslyn Harbor, Roslyn Estates, Greenvale, East Hills, Glen Head, Albertson, Williston, and Williston Park.

The Roslyn News is a part of the Griscom Publications, Inc., which consists of seven important Long Island weeklies.

In 1933, the Roslyn News, together with the Great Neck Record and the Oyster Bay Enterprise and Pilot were acquired by Bronson W. Griscom, of Syosset, and Barklie Henry, of Wheatley Hills, to form the Township Press. Two years later, in April 1936, the Township Press had grown to be a chain of nine papers and it then merged with the Woodyard Publications of New York—publishers of seven weekly papers—to form the Griscom-Woodyard Publications, Inc.

Later, Bronson W. Griscom formed the Griscom Publications, Inc., which has been responsible for the publication and growth as a community force of the Roslyn News.

In October 1954 the Roslyn News, under the editorial leadership of James J. Tuite, went into the tabloid format, a move which was hailed by local residents as giving the paper easier readability and a new freshness. Under Mr. Tuite's guidance, the Roslyn News has increased its circulation almost 50 percent.

In celebration of its anniversary, the Roslyn News is planning to move next month into modern and larger offices located at 45 Lincoln Avenue, Roslyn Heights.

The staff of the Roslyn News includes, in addition to editor, James J. Tuite; Harry V. Forgeron as advertising manager; Mrs. Esther T. Jacobs, associate editor; and Mrs. Anne Schlansky, circulation manager.

The Late Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the life and services of the late Pete Jarman.

The untimely death of Hon. Pete Jarman, of Alabama, a former distinguished and very useful Member of this House, brought very great sadness to me, and my heart aches for his charming wife. Mr. Jarman was a Member of Congress and was serving with distinction on the Foreign Affairs Committee when I came in January of 1939. He continued to serve his constituents and the country as a whole for a number of years, gaining in statute each year. After his retirement from the House he was appointed Ambassador to the Commonwealth of Australia where he represented our Government at Canberra in this far-away, but relatively new country. In that capacity he gave his best efforts at all times, and he continued in this capacity until 1953.

In 1951 I was a member of a delegation sent by Congress to Australia to help in the observance of 50 years of free government in Australia, and it was my opportunity to learn at first hand about the outstanding service performed by Mr. Jarman. He was respected by the government officials of Australia and by the representatives of other nations at the Australian capital. Our country gained in prestige as a result of his constructive work.

Mr. Jarman died years too soon, but he left an indelible impression on our foreign service, and in all this his charming wife was an active and splendid participant.

A Tribute to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a tribute to three fine young people from my district who have been honored by the Westinghouse Co. for outstanding achievement in the field of science.

All the people of Fairfield County, Conn., which comprises my district, are proud of the fact that one of 40 winners of the nationwide Science Talent Search, conducted by the Westinghouse Electric Corp., three of these gifted students are from the Fourth District.

This is the 12th year that Westinghouse has carried on this search for scientific ability, a program which has done and will do a large part in helping the United States to maintain its leadership in the field of research. Such a program is indeed both patriotic and beneficial not only for those immediately concerned but also for the security of the United States.

It is a distinct privilege therefore for me to pay tribute on behalf of the people of my district to Edward J. Foster, of Bethel, and Robert A. Buccino, of Stratford, both students of Fairfield Preparatory School and to Miss Alice K. Hartley, of Easton, a senior in Bassick High School, Bridgeport.

These three young people are coming here to Washington to compete for Westinghouse scholarships that may carry them on to even greater achievements in the scientific world.

Young Foster, who hopes to enter MIT, has constructed an oscilloscope, an instrument for showing visually on the face of a cathode ray tube the changes in varying electric current, an instrument he uses in his self-operated radio-TV repair business. Miss Hartley, who aims for Radcliffe College, has carried on unique experiments with vegetables to determine changes in color as the result of immersion in solutions of varying acidity. Young Buccino, who plans to begin his medical studies at Holy Cross College, has built and used a spectrophotometer, used to identify the different elements in a metallic compound by the light given off by their vapors when heated to incandescence.

Their selection among the 40 winners nationally is a tribute to the educational system in my State, especially the teaching of science as carried on by the good Jesuit fathers in Fairfield and by the Bridgeport high school system.

These three young people should be an inspiration to all of us because of their desire for greater knowledge and because of their ingenuity and demonstrated abilities. In the vision and determination of our young people, in their faithfulness to hard work, in their sense of responsibility, in these qualities lies the best hope of the free world. I shall be happy to greet these three young students and to wish them well at a crucial time in their lives. I express the fervent hope that they will continue to succeed in the fields for which they are so well qualified.

Freedom Message to People Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal aims of our post-World War II foreign policy is to gain and hold the confidence of all freedom-loving peoples in our unrelenting struggle against totalitarianism. In this global battle in defense of our beliefs and ideals we need to have all believers in democracy closely united spiritually and morally to our cause. We and our friends and allies are convinced that the cause for which we are prepared to fight with all our might is the cause of humanity; it is the sacred cause of all free men. On that issue there is and should be no question in our mind. There can be no doubts or uncertainties. For when one is girding himself for a bloody battle, he must have no misgivings about the righteousness of his cause.

Today in our struggle against totalitarian communism, that fearsome and godless doctrine whose fanatical adherents have already enslaved almost one-third of the world's population, not only should we help all free peoples, but we should also seek ways of encouraging and inspiring those unfortunate millions in Communist-dominated countries who are being held in servitude against their will.

In this connection our principal task should be to keep alive the spirit of freedom in those peoples. Next to actual liberation, the best thing we can do, and I am sure we can do it effectivley is, to inspire them with confidence and instill in them some hope, to show them some gleam of light, something indicating that they have friends and sympathizers in the free world who are seriously concerned with their fate. That is the purpose for which the Voice of America has been working, an endeavor which our taxpaying citizens are gladly supporting. The broadcasts sponsored by the free Europe group have similar ends in view. These broadcasts have done a good job in enlisting more friends for the cause of democracy. However, radio broadcasts have certain limitations. Many people in the Communist-dominated countries do not have radios, and furthermore radio broadcasts can be jammed. Consequently, alternative methods of reaching the people of Eastern Europe are required. One very effective method of dealing with the situation is by distributing leaflets with freedom messages to Iron Curtain countries by balloons. Of course, there is nothing novel in this suggestion. It has been tried on various occasions in the course of the past several years and has proved to be quite effective. In the resolution—House Joint Resolution 76—which I recently introduced, it is proposed to regularize this system, and thus make it more effective. This resolution also suggests an additional measure. It proposes that not only freedom messages but also food packages be dropped over Iron Curtain countries by balloons. This should prove far more effective than the leaflets alone. Our experience with distributing food parcels in Berlin has demonstrated that this type of psychological weapon has a powerful impact. If we should now use it in conjunction with freedom messages, it would not only give added force to those messages and help to convince the recipients of our sincerity, but the food might also help save many victims of Communist tyranny from starvation.

In view of our past experience, this idea of sending our freedom messages and food packages to Iron Curtain countries by balloons is certainly worth trying. As has been stated in the proposed resolution, the food for this purpose is to come out of our surplus agricultural commodities. The administration of the whole scheme under the Secretary of State, would cost no more than $2 million. It would be one of the cheapest and most effective methods of winning deserving and worthy friends behind the Iron Curtain for the cause of humanity and for free democracy. I sincerely suggest that we try it.

Five Proposals To Amend the Refugee Relief Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there is unquestionably widespread dissatisfaction and no small degree of disappointment concerning the operation of the refugee relief program. Enacted just about 18 months ago—August 7, 1953, to be exact—this law authorized the admission of 214,000 aliens to become permanent residents of the United States by the end of 1956, with preference being given to refugees, expellees, escapees from Iron Curtain countries, and certain close relatives of American citizens.

After 18 months, what are the results?

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the results to date of this refugee relief program are very meager, indeed. Here are the latest available official figures:

Number of visas issued, 18,936—as of January 28, 1955.

Number of refugees admitted, 15,034—as of January 28, 1955.

Such is the dismal result of this program after about half of its effective period has elapsed. It is clear by now that the goal of 214,000 refugees to be admitted will never be reached in the time specified. While I dislike to speculate on the number finally to gain entry under this program, it does not seem to me that we will even fulfill half the program by the time it expires.

Such was not the intention of Congress when it enacted the refugee relief program in 1953. When Congress set a figure of 214,000 to be admitted over a 3-year period, it was done so in the belief that this goal could be reached. Unfortunately, certain sections of the act and administrative interpretations have made the law unworkable and the whole program has become a travesty.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see eye to eye with Judge FRANCIS WALTER, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, on matters of immigration. Yet even Judge WALTER, who is opposed to liberalized immigration, recently stated in a public address:

> I consider the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 a fraud and a phony.

He also referred to it as an example of sloppy legislation, an ill-conceived and half-baked proposal, and an unworkable law. And he is so right about it.

There is also tremendous dissatisfaction among church groups and voluntary agencies which are active in obtaining housing and employment assurances for the aliens and helping them to meet other requirements of the law. In fact, some of them are considering giving up their programs because of the great difficulties involved. On January 30, 1955, the Washington Post and Times Herald published an Associated Press report from New York which stated that church agencies were on the verge of junking huge programs for bringing refugees to this country because they could not get them through the redtape. The report then added:

> So far, church officials said, the requirements for admission of refugees have been so complicated that only a mere trickle have gotten through the maze of checks and doublechecks.

By way of example, the report cited the meager accomplishments of these church groups due to the complications of the act:

> Up to the end of 1954, Church World Service had 115 refugee arrivals. The Roman Catholic War Relief Service reported 147, the Jewish United Hias Service about 50, and the Lutheran Service 9.
>
> This would be less than 500 refugees brought here in the act's first 18 months. In comparison, under the old Displaced Persons Act whose terms were less restrictive, 114,494 DP's were resettled in the first 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 needs to be amended drastically, and it needs to be done as soon as possible while there is still sufficient time to complete the program sucessfully. Each month, each week that we wait will mean the loss of thousands of visas going to waste when the program ends in 1956.

Consequently, I am now introducing a bill containing five important amendments to the act which, I feel certain, will speed up the flow of refugees in the short time that is left and will make possible the successful completion of this program.

The five changes recommended in my bill are the following:

First. Age limit for admittance of orphans: Under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 a total of 4,000 orphans are permitted to enter the country as nonquota immigrants, but they must be under 10 years of age. Because of the age limitation and other difficulties, less than 500 orphans have gained admittance to date. I, therefore, propose to raise the age limitation to 14 years. This should make possible the successful completion of this part of the program.

Second. Elimination of employment and housing assurances: It is generally admitted by all concerned, including State Department and immigration officials, that the greatest factor in delaying the flow of immigrants under the refugee relief program is the requirement that certain assurances must be submitted in behalf of an alien before he is granted a visa. Section 7 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act provides that three assurances must be given by an American citizen on behalf of the alien seeking a visa:

(a) That the alien will have suitable employment without displacing some other person from employment;

(b) That the alien will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing; and

(c) That the alien will not become a public charge.

I propose to eliminate the employment and housing assurances and to leave only the requirement that the alien is not to become a public charge. The housing shortage has eased up considerably in the country and is no longer as acute as a few years ago. Employment, too, is holding up in recent months and the general economic situation does not appear to be threatening. There is no need to retain these requirements in the law. By eliminating them it will be possible to increase greatly the entry of immigrants under the refugee program.

Third. Elimination of readmission guaranties: Another factor contributing to the slowness of the refugee-relief program is the requirement that an alien must present an unexpired passport or other suitable travel document and a certificate of readmission from the country where he obtained the visa guaranteeing he will be readmitted to that country in the event he is later found to be deportable from the United States. This has been a real bone of contention and aroused much dissatisfaction and protests from a number of European countries. I propose that this section be eliminated from the act.

Fourth. Refugee relief commission: Under the present act, the refugee-relief program is administered by the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State. There has been considerable criticism of the Administrator of this Bureau, Mr. Scott McLeod, for the manner in which he is administering the whole program, his rigid interpretations of the act, and his general approach to the problem.

I propose to take this program out of the Department of State and set it up as a separate and independent Government agency to be known as the Refugee Relief Commission. The commission is to consist of three members, appointed by the President, each of whom shall receive a salary of $17,500 annually. The commission shall formulate regulations in compliance with the Refugee Relief Act, and it shall report annually to the President and to Congress on the operations of the program. This commission and its operations would be similar to that of the Displaced Persons Commission which administered the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 with such success.

Fifth. Termination of the act: The termination date of the refugee-relief program has been set for December 31, 1956, after which no visas are to be issued under this program. In view of the small number of visas issued under the act to date and the fact that nearly half of the time has already expired, it is generally conceded that the program's goal of 214,000 immigrants, as envisioned by Congress originally, will not be reached by the end of 1956.

Therefore, I propose that all visas authorized under the Refugee Relief Act which remain unissued after December 31, 1956, shall be redistributed proportionately among the countries and categories established in the act, and that these visas be issued only to relatives of American citizens. I further propose that the time be extended for the issuance of the unused visas for a period of 1 year until December 31, 1957.

My purpose for extending the termination date is twofold: First, so that more time is allotted for the unification

of families; second, so that as many of the unused visas be utilized in the extra time allotted. The unification of families has always been a traditional and humane principle with the American people. The extra time allotted is to make up for the slow start of the program in setting up its administrative machinery, which is another factor in the delay of entries until now.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I feel reasonably certain that if these amendments are enacted the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be administered in the spirit in which Congress intended it to be administered. I also feel certain that these amendments will enable the program to be successfully completed and the full goal of 214,000 immigrants to be reached.

We must correct the early errors committed under this program, particularly the lapse of valuable time and the unnecessary requirements for housing and employment assurances. Let us consider the people who stand to benefit from these changes, the very people for whom the whole program was initiated. I mean the relatives who desire to join their families in this country and cannot do so because the regular immigration quotas in their countries are oversubscribed, the refugees and the escapees who are the victims of religious and political persecution.

I call upon all my colleagues to support these changes. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 was overwhelmingly supported by both parties. Let us amend it so that the Congress and the people of America will be proud of this act and its accomplishments, instead of regarding it as a fraud and a phony. Let us make it a workable act.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent who this year celebrated the 37th anniversary of Ukrainian independence on January 22. Their fervor for liberation of their homeland parallels the faith of all freedom-loving people in the hope that all enslaved nations under the Communist yoke will regain their self-determination.

The Ukraine enjoyed independence a short time before Communist domination placed them behind the Iron Curtain in 1920. However, their hopes for return to self-determination have not waned. It is important that our Voice of America continue to reach them to bolster that hope.

It is appropriate that we reaffirm our strong faith in the aspirations of the Ukrainian people who yearn for independence from totalitarian subjugation. On the occasion of the celebration of the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, all Americans joined in fervent prayer that the Ukraine and all other captive homelands will soon be free again.

New 50-Star Flag Designed by Orpha Klinker, Noted California Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, now that statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is a definite possibility, it is appropriate to give some advance consideration to the necessary change in the design of our flag which must be made when statehood is granted.

Too often while much time is given to the deliberation on the question of so vital an issue as statehood for a Territory, little attention is given to the necessary flag changes until statehood is granted and an immediate change is necessary so that our flag will carry the white star to represent the new State on the field of blue, which represents the whole of our Union.

Miss Orpha Klinker, of Los Angeles, Calif., one of our outstanding artists whose paintings have been exhibited in public and private showings, has become interested in probable change in our flag design, and has developed one of the most appropriate suggestions, in my opinion, to be submitted for consideration since the original design was completed by Betsy Ross.

Miss Klinker is a native daughter of the Golden State of California, from one of the first families of the State. She is established as an artist of great creative ability, and is especially noted for her portrait and landscape paintings.

She is also the creator of a series of paintings of historical events and sites depicting the history of the State of California. Among her famous works is her painting of The Four Freedoms in which freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom from want, and freedom to petition the Government of the United States are represented.

Miss Klinker has conceived a new and unique design of the American flag which includes two additional white stars on the blue field to represent Hawaii and Alaska, when they are admitted as new States in the Union.

The total of 50 white stars are arranged on the blue field to spell the word "Freedom." Nothing else in the design of our flag is changed.

I have seen the design and it is very inspiring, patriotic, and carries a message to the world of the precious freedom the people of the United States enjoy under the United States Constitution and the Government of the United States.

In my opinion, Miss Klinker's design adds beauty and additional interest to the flag of the United States, and it has already been submitted to the Heraldic Branch of the Department of Defense for consideration with any other new designs proposed for the flag when Hawaii and Alaska are admitted to the Union.

The proposed freedom design is most appropriate because the flag of the United States of America is an emblem which stands for freedom from oppression to people of every other land on earth. It represents a Nation where there is equal opportunity for every citizen, where there is complete freedom of religion, where a free press can publish the truth to the people uncensored by Government dictatorship.

We seldom hear of a citizen of the United States renouncing his native land and leaving America to take up citizenship in some foreign land.

But millions upon millions of people from all other parts of the world are constantly seeking admission to the United States, eagerly awaiting the day when they can leave their native lands to come to America where they may enjoy the benefits found nowhere else in the world.

The United States has established in the world a unique experiment in human relations. Here under the Stars and Stripes, the American people established a nation dedicated to the individual liberty of every citizen. This is a far cry from many other parts of the world where men for generations have been ruled by monarchs or dictators, and have never known true freedom.

Today it is of vital importance, if we are to preserve our Nation and our American way of life, that our citizens be aware of the blessings that are our heritage, and that we realize that only through constant vigilance can we maintain the freedoms which were guaranteed to us by our Constitution and Bill of Rights when the United States was founded.

Our flag is the symbol of all that America represents, of the opportunity offered to us in this Nation, of the wealth of our land which supplies our food and daily needs, of the freedom which makes each man the master of his own destiny.

On June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress adopted a resolution which stated that "the flag of the 13 United States shall be of 13 stripes of alternate red and white, with a union of 13 stars of white in a blue field representing the new constellation." This resolution was promulgated by the Secretary of the Congress on September 3, 1777.

Since that date the Stars and Stripes has proudly flown as the official emblem of our great Nation. It was first carried into battle in the Battle of the Brandywine on September 11, 1777, and has gone with our troops into every battle since that day on land, on sea, and in the air, and from our own shores to the far corners of the earth.

Since that day in 1777 when the Stars and Stripes first unfurled as the emblem of our great Nation, the country has steadily expanded, and with each forward step new States have been admitted to the Union, each State a new star in the flag.

The rearrangement of the constellation on the field of blue has followed the admission of each new State, and now, once again the American frontier has expanded so that two more Territories clamor for admission to statehood.

They cannot be long denied, and again we must consider a change in the design of stars on the flag. The design created by Miss Klinker symbolizes the spirit of freedom which has ever represented the guiding principle of our American way of life, and when we again rearrange the stars of the flag, adoption of this design would truly represent within our flag the spirit of America.

Welcome to Premier Mario Scelba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we are anticipating in March a visit to our city by the Premier of Italy, Mario Scelba. Premier Scelba comes to Washington at a time when the friendly spirit and cooperation between our two countries has reached an unprecedented level. We welcome this visit as an opportunity to pay honor to Premier Scelba—for in a short period as head of his country's Government, he has, indeed, won the respect and esteem of us all.

Scelba has been Premier a little more than a year—and in that short time he has guided his Government to notable achievements both at home and in its relations toward Italy's neighbors and allies. Scelba was De Gasperi's Minister of the Interior for 6 years; his experience in that office may be said to have prepared Scelba uniquely for the premiership. As Minister of the Interior for 6 years, Scelba became the scourge of Italy's strong Communist following. On becoming Premier, Scelba ejected the Communist organizations from many of the office buildings they had seized from former Fascist owners after World War II. He has forced their press to conform to libel and slander laws and has transferred many Communists out of sensitive positions in the civil service. He has also reduced Communist Party revenue from such sources as businesses run by Communists for profit. In numerous ways he has met the challenge of Communist subversion and infiltration by practical countermeasures.

Some of the other tasks being tackled by Scelba's government are—a public works program which it is hoped will alleviate Italy's unemployment; an impressive housing program; and new income tax enforcement laws. It is very difficult for the Premier to get such legislation passed in the Parliament, for Communists and fellow-travelers, who hold more than a third of the seats in Parliament, continuously sabotage and delay measures put forward by the center coalition which he heads.

In his government's foreign policy, Premier Scelba has inaugurated a new phase of trans-Adriatic cooperation. For 9 years the Trieste issue set Italians and Yugoslavs against each other and stirred bloody riots and demonstrations. In October of last year, the Italian-Yugoslav agreement returning the port city of Trieste to Italy and giving part of the Trieste territory to Yugoslavia, was signed. Since then Scelba has forthrightly held out the hand of friendship to the Yugoslavs and called for an end to the suspicions and recriminations that long poisoned relations between the two neighboring countries. This was a bold act on the part of Premier Scelba because it brought violent attacks from the extreme right and left in his own country. He has assumed the political risks, however, in order to show clearly his eagerness for peaceful cooperation with Italy's neighbors. The benefits of Rome-Belgrade cooperation extend far beyond the boundaries of the two countries. There have recently been reports that Italy may join the Balkan Entente which already unites Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. Italy's adherence to this group would give the entente additional strength and would add Italy's 10 divisions to the approximately 60 of the 3 Balkan states.

Italy has recently signed the Paris Agreements which bring Italy and West Germany into the Brussels Pact. The Italian Chamber of Deputies has approved ratification of these agreements. This is but one more indication of the marked progress Italy has made in the last year, under the statesmanlike leadership of its Premier, Mario Scelba.

Next month as Premier Scelba visits our city—he may be assured of our high regard and of a very warm welcome.

Eleven-Year-Old Girl Gains Recognition for Work in Scientific Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Lucy Ehrlich, of 100 Thayer Street, New York City, an 11-year-old girl, has recently been notified that her work in scientific research is worthy of recognition and accordingly she received a plaque for her remarkable collection of insects.

Lucy is the granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Ehrlich, old and dear friends of mine, and both they and I are very proud of her.

I took it upon myself to write to this gifted youngster in congratulations and good wishes for her achievement, and in encouragement of her continued interest in science. I wrote to her as an indication of the recognition that I think is due to those young Americans who, by their devotion to science, are strengthening our country and contributing to a more informed world.

Anniversary of the Founding of Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last evening it was my pleasure and honor to address the Rotary Club of Muncie, Ind., on the occasion of the observance of the 50th anniversary of Rotary. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE ROTARY CLUB, MUNCIE, IND., FEBRUARY 22, 1955

When you asked me to be with you tonight to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of the founding of Rotary, I was both honored and surprised. Honored because my friends in Muncie would want me for this important occasion—surprised because you would risk the perfection of the program by exposing it to the usually dull and overextended verbage associated with the office which I hold.

The feeling of honor, though, far outweighed that which bespoke of surprise and, being constantly aware of my debt to Muncie, I accepted. The source of that debt sits by my side tonight, as she has done constantly for the 21 years since she brightened the dull garden of my life by marrying me. The memories of her loving patience and high inspiration, her devotion to our children and her tolerance of the vicissitudes of being a politician's wife, make me look to the future with anticipation and with a knowledge that my debt to Muncie will forever remain an IOU, for it is not within either the material or the spiritual capacities of a man to repay to the full measure a debt of devotion such as the one I hold.

We are gathered here tonight to pay tribute to Rotary—not a tribute that would laud its many fine deeds, but a tribute to the lofty objectives of Rotary which have caused it to be what it is. We can pay homage, also, not so much to the men whose foresight patterned those objectives, but to that foresight itself; for today we, as never before, must draw upon the basic purposes or creeds of our lives for renewed strength and inspiration to meet the trials and challenges of the future.

Objectives or creeds are as much a part of our lives as is the sunshine, but, unfortunately for the ultimate good, too many of us treat them as casually as we do the warm rays of the sun, forgetting that only by storing the warmth of the sun do we stay warm during the cold of night. So must we store within us, by a proper adherence to them, the protection and strength of our credos, so that, come the cold nighttime of trial, we will not be found wanting in the elemental power which their words bespeak.

You and I, as Americans, are not the only people who work and live under the writings of creeds. A constant reminder to a leader of communism in New York City is a placard across his desk that says "A world to win." This glaring creed tells that Communist that his aims are not bound by the corner drugstore or the next street, but that the world must be won. No job is too trivial, no time too long, no risk too great for him and his comrades as they pursue the dedicated task of the Communist, which is to win the world.

Why this devotion? They have been wise enough to their mad hatred of Christ to steal for their own foul purposes His command "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." They have taken this basic instruction and they are using it against the very ideal that gave it to us: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature."

When we do this, as Americans, then I suggest that peace will come. Yet, you might ask, "Where do I start? The world is a big place and I am but one." If that is your question, then it is only proper that we start with ourselves by making sure that we know the tune as well as the words of our objectives of life.

Words alone are not the fullness of the objectives; there is a tune of meaning behind them, so the tune alone will not suffice. The 2 must be 1 and, as we recite our objectives, our mottoes, our beliefs, or our creeds there must be in our hearts the full music of understanding and love and devotion to them, or else we say empty words and we lead neither ourselves nor our friends into belief and following.

The end result of a wordless belief is illustrated by the story of the Pied Piper of Hamlin, who, by playing a tune on his flute, lured all the rats of that city into the death that came with their plunge into the sea. They followed blindly, neither knowing nor caring why. It was a pretty tune, friends they knew were in the vanguard, so they joined in also, to their sad regret. The Pied Piper had no words or reason to offer, only his lilting flute, but he was successful, for they followed who only cared for the tune.

Let me burden you with another illustration. Mark Twain carried the doubtful reputation of being quite profane. His wife was greatly disturbed by this disagreeable leaning and tried in vain for years to cure her husband of it. She tried the pleasant approach and the harsh approach, both of which wives are masters of, but to no avail. Then one morning she put into operation the attack at which she had long worked—Mark had cut himself while shaving, and had gone into a long and garish dissertation, fully embellished by foul oaths, on the distastefulness of shaving. His wife entered the bathroom during the tirade, and when it had finished she looked him calmly in the eye and repeated in exact order every foul oath he had used. Mark smiled at her, at the completion of this approach, and said benignly, "Honey, you have all the words but you haven't got the tune."

To further answer the question "What can I do?," I will put a question to you first concerning this great organization to which you and I pay tribute tonight. Do you want to be a Rotarian? Not just a dues payer or one who attends meetings, but do you really want to be a Rotarian enough to live the meaning of Rotary? Are you willing to live your daily lives so that the people of the world will hear and understand the words and music of Rotary's great objective of service. Stated as the first of the six objectives of Rotary is "the ideal of service as the basis of all the worthy enterprises," and the word "service" appears in four of the remaining objectives of this club.

In fact, we call Rotary a service club, and not without reason. We look to you for service as a unit of our local and international society, but service as a unit or a club does not carry out your individual responsibilities to your accepted creed. To be only a part of it is not enough. It must also be a part of you, for service to man, service to Christianity, and service to your country are the words and music which you and I must preach to the world if free men, Christianity and our country are to survive and, in the survival, stamp out the evil alternative to these, which is communism.

True service is not for one's self. It becomes an unconscious acceptance of our responsibilities to one another and an automatic doing of those things which will be of service to our brothers. Service goes out to all, wherever we see it needed. Unlike the signal station attendant who saw a trainload of commuters stalled in deep snow and did nothing about it because, as he said, "It was not in my territory," it goes out without question or hesitation.

It is easy to lose sight of the true meaning of service and to live exclusively for ourselves and to be interested in service only when it serves us. This habit of forgetting that we are our brothers' keepers is one of the major wrongs of the world today. Shakespeare said something about it when he wrote: "That, sir, which serves and seeks for gain, and follows out for form, will act when it begins to rain, and leave thee in the storm."

We see in service, then, a fundamental creed that not only Rotarians, but all of us must accept if we are to approach our full obligations as Christian citizens of a free Republic. As one who is not a Rotarian, I salute your organization for making the words and the music of service available to so many thousands of men all over the world. Now, if they all really want to be Rotarians, and if those of us who are not want earnestly to emulate you in your decision, then all of us will, together, reap the blessings of this objective.

Having assumed a readiness for service and an understanding of its true unselfishness, we must now go two steps further for its full meaning. In addition to serving men by being our brother's keeper, there is also the responsibility of service to God. This does not mean just service to your church by attendance, or service to your church by donation of your time or money, but it means service to the teachings of God.

Here, again, I will counter your question, "What can I do?" with another question: Do you really want to be a Christian? It isn't hard to be a good one. It merely requires a desire to live by the teachings of the Lord and to practice what we preach.

It's as simple as that, and when you and I have the words and the music of His teachings in our hearts, so that they are reflected in our daily lives, then we will be serving God in the truest sense. "Love thy neighbor as thyself," "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is the creed or objective of Christian living, and it is a creed subscribed to by everyone. Unfortunately, however, it is one that is not practiced devoutly by each person as an individual. Do you want to be a Christian? The answer rests within you and your willingness to be of service to the Christian cause.

As I indicated earlier in my discussion with you, there are three questions that come to mind when we think of the word "service" in connection with our lives. These have not been developed tonight in their natural or normal order because, if they had, I would first have asked you, "Do you want to be a Christian?" Then I would have asked you the question that will come next, "Do you want to be an American?" and lastly I would have asked you, "Do you want to be a Rotarian?" Inasmuch, though, as the creed of Rotary brought the word "service" into tonight's discussion, I purposely started with the question concerning your willingness to assume all of its responsibilities.

I followed that with questions directed at your acceptance of the responsibilities involved in being of service to God, and my third, and final, question is directed at your willingness to assume the full responsibilities to being an American. If you live up fully to the responsibilities of being a Christian and being a Rotarian, then I suggest to you tonight that you will find it easy to live up to the full qualifications called for in an answer to the question "Do you want to be an American?"

Here, again, we must search for a basic objective or creed—we must find it out and understand it, so that we may know fully that which we pledge ourselves to serve. When one thinks of being an American one immediately thinks of the word freedom. One is constantly reminded of the blessings of this freedom: our ability to meet as we meet tonight and to discuss any issue that we care to discuss; our ability to print on the pages of our newspapers and in the chapters of our books words that we know might be disagreed with, but words that we know we will not be punished for printing. We associate freedom with our ability to go to the church of our choice. We associate freedom with our method of business, which we call the free enterprise system. We associate freedom with our ability to travel any place that we can or care to in this broad land of ours, and we associate freedom with our friends—our unrestricted ability to make them or to lose them according to our actions, and not the actions or choice of some dictator.

We associate freedom with all of those things, but do we stop often enough to ponder the source of that freedom, because in the recognition of the source of that freedom is the basic difference between our Republic and all of the governments of history that have come and gone before us. When people came to our shores from Europe, over 200 years ago, they did not come seeking wealth because they left wealth at home. They did not come seeking education because they came to a land devoid of schools from lands that were rich in educational institutions. Rather, they came seeking relief from the oppression of tyranny, and not long after they came they began to realize that the freedom which they sought was not to be obtained from the strength of material things, from the strength of armies and money, but instead, from the strength of something that had never been recognized.

We slowly began to feel the great strength of freedom, but here we differed from other people in history who struggled to their various victories, to their brief moments of freedom. We, through the strength our people had in their great belief in God and their willingness to serve God, realized that we would not become free because of arms or physical might, but that we would become free only when we knew and believed that our freedoms came from God and that we were the free children of God. When that realization came, our wise forefathers worked out on paper those ideals of government which they pledged themselves to serve and which they served so well. For the first time in the history of man's free search for government the answer was found by people who recognized the source of their freedom. Those men wrote in the Declaration of Independence "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This, then, expresses the basic ideal or credo of our Government. On these wonderful words has been constructed this great Nation of free people. On the adherence to these ideals depends our future as free people. I might suggest, also, that on our adherence to these ideals and to the daily living of these ideals, depends the freedom of the world. Without them we become but another government waiting for the sands to run their sure course through the glass of time. With them we remain forever the only government in history to have found the real source of freedom. By living them we become the beacon light that will guide the oppressed of the Communist world to the freedoms of our life. We must show

them by our willingness to serve our ideal, by our belief in our ideals, and by our constant practice of them that we have a vision which they can share.

That, then, becomes your challenge as you answer the question "Do you want to be an American?" To put it simply, it means that you must be as convincingly and as constantly willing to serve our ideals of government as you are to serve the ideals wrapped up in your religion and in Rotary. We must, by our actions, show the darkened world that light and freedom still live. It is a rich challenge, one that man has never before been presented with, because never before has the concept of government been based on the idea that freedom springs from God. It is a thrilling challenge because, by accepting it, we can help change the world from a place of distrust and oppression to a place of trust and freedom. It is a dutiful challenge, for we owe it to our children to live by these ideals so that this which we have might be passed on to them in the clearness with which we received it.

When we talk of service in connection with our country we are too prone to associate that word only with serving the Nation in time of trouble, such as many of you men and women have done during the wars of this Nation. Yet, the kind of service that will maintain this free Republic, and cause it to grow to even greater heights in the years to come, is not confined just to the wearing of the uniform. It applies to our everyday responsibilities, to their perpetuation of our basic ideals of government.

Remember the Communist credo: "A world to win." Remember that communism does not recognize God, so that communism cannot recognize a government whose source of strength stems from the freedom of God. Remember that communism works 24 hours a day to destroy that which is yours and mine. So when we speak of service in connection with our Republic, we speak of service 24 hours a day—the dedicated task of being an American.

Still you say "What can I do? I am only one." Let me start to answer that question by reminding you of what has been said, "The greatest strength of those dedicated to evil lies in the indifference of those dedicated to good." While the good people have been taking care of themselves, the wrongdoers have been taking care of everyone else. We can just as truthfully say that bad politics are caused by good citizens who don't vote.

So, what can you do? Start now to see that in your next municipal or State or national election the dismal record of voter apathy is changed. Start with yourself by registering. Your party affiliation is not important because the majority of America has usually been right, but register yourself and encourage your friends and employees to do so as well.

During a hearing I recently sat through, a witness made what I think to be a very pertinent and timely remark. He said, in the course of the discussion, that he thought we had "been Americans too long." What he inferred by that, of course, was that we, as American citizens, accept all the pleasures and wondrous things that our freedom gives us, but we pay little attention to what can take that freedom from us. It is an amazing and frightening criticism of our bland acceptance of this freedom when we realize that we, as citizens, will fight and die for our Republic, we will pay taxes to keep it going, we will give our blood for our soldiers, but, when it comes down to the question of voting, the question of working at this business of being free, it actually takes a major catastrophe, a revolution, to arouse the American people to the point that they will exercise their franchise. Freedom has never been something that was designed for lazy or indifferent people. It requires a constant dedication, a constant willingness to serve its basic principles if this freedom is to survive.

That, though, is only the first part of this challenge to you in seeking your willingness to serve your America. Voting is not enough. There are other things in the political fields that you can do to serve your country well, and American businessmen must recognize this and be willing to expand their fields of service to include them. There is the active arena of political life, where you engage, either at the precinct level, the district level, or the State level, as an active, working member of your party, or even go a step further and become a candidate for public office.

Remember, though, that in this area the enemies of our Republic not only want but seek the opportunity to serve their army of rottenness in any capacity for which that army calls them. Theirs is an army of vigilance—ours must also be an army of vigilance. Our Army, however, will be vigilant in its dedication to the basic concepts of our freedom, while theirs cannot be dedicated to this same cause because their philosophy does not recognize the existence of God.

It is obvious that there is a relationship between these three fields of service which we have discussed tonight. The relationship is carried through by one concurrent recognition in all fields, and that is that to serve each well one must carry a faith in his God and a willingness to perform His work. In service in these three fields we find a great strength in a common song that has at the same time meaningful words and a purposeful tune.

It is good that this exists, because today as we sail this great ship of freedom through the dark and uncharted seas, we can be reminded of the cruise of Greek mythology that sailed the oceans of that day. You will recall that, as the ships came upon a certain part of the sea, they could hear strange and wonderful voices coming from the shoreline—voices of enticement, voices that spoke of great promise—and the ships would turn from their course and head toward these dark shores. They they would be wrecked upon the uncharted shoals and reefs from whence these voices of the sirens came, and it seemed that no ship's crew could forego the temptation to seek the source of these songs. One skipper plugged the ears of his sailors and then tied his hands to the mast, but he could hear the songs and he directed the ship to its sure course of destruction.

It remained, though, for one Greek skipper to solve this, Orpheus. He was a man possessed of a marvelous voice and he sang a strong and meaningful tune, and as he approached the dangerous part of these seas he began to sing, and he sang in such a loud and wondrous way that the voices of the sirens were drowned out and his ship passed that place safely and sailed on out into the broad seas.

We can liken that story of Greek mythology to our present day, when our ship, sailing as it is through the sea of life, is tempted to deviate from its true course of freedom to investigate the tunes of socialism and communism coming from the black shores that line this sea. If you and I know this great song of freedom, and if we are willing to serve man and to serve God and to serve our country by singing this song daily as we go through our lives, then I suggest to you that we can be as that one successful Greek ship, safe and secure in our passage through these trying times, and that we will emerge onto the great bright sea of freedom and move ahead in our journey through our free way of life.

South Carolina Day Address by Hon. Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on February 20, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] delivered a very interesting address at Valley Forge, in my State. I think his address should be generally read, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON SOUTH CAROLINA DAY AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL CHAPEL, VALLEY FORGE, PA., SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1955

Reverend Hart, ladies and gentlemen of the Washington Memorial Chapel, and friends, the invitation to participate with you in the South Carolina Day observance at this historic shrine so beloved by all Americans is both a pleasure and an honor. It is my lot to have been born near the site where the great Battle of Ninety-six was fought. The greater portion of my adult life has been lived almost within the shadow of Kings Mountain. Cowpens is only 10 miles away. Often from my window have I seen the monument to Gen. Daniel Morgan as the rays of the morning sun clothed it in spendor. These connections attach me by inheritance and sentiment to this place which we are privileged to honor today—Valley Forge.

The encampment here at Valley Forge 178 years ago has been, through the succeeding decades, of great and abiding significance to America. The example of personal sacrifice, privation, devotion, and fortitude of the men who weathered the storms here during the winter of 1777–78 is unparalleled in any other nation's struggle for freedom. The quality of men who were quartered in this valley tempered the mettle of the American Patriot. The zeal of the Patriot was here solidified into an unrelenting determination to proceed with the work at hand and persevere until victory should crown his efforts.

These Sunday commemorative services, assigned to each of our sovereign States, have a larger purpose than merely to recount the suffering and sacrifices of Washington and his Continental Army as they wintered in these surroundings: A review of Valley Forge also quickens within us a deeper sense of our personal obligations to God and country. By recalling the trials which were here met. and resolved by our forebears, we are inspired to a renewing of their high purposes. Except we approach these services in such a purposeful and dedicated attitude, we shall miss the sublime lessons of Valley Forge.

In his centennial address here, Dr. Henry Armit Brown reminded us that "a country is benefited by great actions only so long as her children are able to repeat them."

Not many years ago, the late Dr. Henry Nelson Snyder, president of my alma mater, Wofford College, in making reference to the Memorial Day services each year held at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington

National Cemetery, repeated the same injunction in other words:

"Whenever a people forgets its worthy past, the day will come when it will not have a past worth remembering."

It is well, therefore, that we commune with the past, for we then may better appraise our heritage. As we revisit the springs which nourished our roots, we gird our loins for the present and fortify ourselves for the future.

It has been rather truthfully said that the American Revolution was won at Valley Forge. To this wooded and desolate winter retreat Washington gathered his half-defeated, half-naked, half-starved forces. It was fire-cake and water for breakfast, water and fire-cake for dinner. No battle was fought here. These valleys and hills were not the scene of any military triumph. What then are our special remembrances of this place? Not a military engagement involving technical skill, nor the valor and glory of men sacrificing their lives to cannon and bayonet. That was to come later. Valley Forge is etched indelibly in our memories because here it was that the spirit of the war for independence was rekindled and kept alive. Here the military skill of the army was developed to achieve the glorious victories ahead. Those who survived the encampment emerged as confident, well-drilled, and inspired soldiers—an army of intent, stouthearted, tenacious men with a will to win. And thus the clarion call to arms reverberated and reechoed throughout every colony. With clarity and unity of purpose, the American patriots redoubled their efforts. Moreover, it was here at Valley Forge that the adversity of want from within and evil conspiracies from without met their challenge. Here was born the steadfastness of purpose and will, during the darkest hours of the Revolution, in which the greatness of our Nation as a symbol of freedom was crystallized. At Valley Forge our brave men suffered, sacrificed, and endured that a newly born nation might live.

It is therefore appropriate that we set aside these days—these Sabbath days—for Representatives from our States to reflect in sober contemplation upon the participation of our fathers in the War for Independence. Ours is a great legacy, if we but pause to realize and revere it. Let us not be distracted by the glib tangents in some current writings whose authors lack a deeper appreciation of the significance of these surroundings and the history here made. No sacrifice is recorded in history comparable in magnitude to the trials and experiences at Valley Forge.

The soldiers were not given to much whining, but often glossed over their hardships, as did Richard Wheeler, who reassured his mother:

"We are very comfortable and are living on the fat of the land."

George Ewing modestly entered in his journal:

"Were I to describe the hardships and the difficulties we underwent, no person but those who were with us would credit my relation. Therefore, I choose to pass it over in silence."

Notwithstanding their heroic silence, the record is replete with accounts of the cruel suffering borne so valiantly by the American troops here. In a letter to Clinton of New York, General Washington said:

"Naked and starving as they are, we cannot admire enough the incomparable patience and fidelity of the soldiery."

Lafayette in writing to a friend, said:

"The unfortunate soldiers were in want of everything: They had neither coats, hats, shirts, nor shoes. Their feet and legs froze till they had become almost black, and it was often necessary to amputate them. * * * The patient endurance of both soldiers and officers was a miracle which each moment served to renew."

Bitter indeed was the cup of which they drank at Valley Forge, but oh! how glorious the ideal which sustained and inspired them to ultimate victory! Dr. Brown stated the ideal thus:

"And here, in this place of sacrifice, in this vale of humiliation, in this valley of the shadow of death out of which the life of America rose regenerate and free, let us believe with an abiding faith that to them union will seem as dear and liberty as sweet and progress as gloricus as they were to our fathers and are to you and me, and that the institutions which have made us happy, preserved by the virtue of our children, shall bless the remotest generation of time to come."

Let us, for a moment, get our historical setting in mind. Politically the Continental Congress began its meetings in Philadelphia in September of 1774. I shall refer to the Congress in more detail later. The tea-party episodes in Boston, Mass., and Charleston, S. C., had occurred in 1773. Militarily, the encampment followed Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, and the forced evacuation from Boston of General Howe. The attack on Charleston, S. C., on June 28, 1776, had been repulsed by Colonel Moultrie. John Adams referred to this event as the first real victory of our land and naval forces in the Revolution. South Carolinians glory in the fact that 5,000 pounds of ammunition seized by their militia aided Washington in his siege of Boston. Washington made his successful retreat from New England and New York with his victory at Trenton and Princeton during the Christmas season of 1776. Then, with singular magnitude, followed the occupation of Philadelphia by the British under General Howe during the fall of 1777. Congress moved to Lancaster, settling later at Yorktown (now York), Pennsylvania. The news of the capture of Philadelphia had a depressing effect on our fortunes abroad. Our enemies were rallied. Our friends were stunned. But the sage admonition of Franklin softened the blow:

"Howe," he said, "had not captured Philadelphia;" rather, "Philadelphia has captured Howe."

Later events proved the truth of that sober reflection.

Having these events in proper focus, South Carolina is proud of her contribution to the dividends accruing from Valley Forge:

South Carolina was the first colony to organize and by formal act declare its freedom from Great Britain; in history little noted, representatives duly chosen from every district in South Carolina met in Charleston on January 11, 1775, and organized a provincial congress. On February 1, 1776, its delegates formalized a document declaring that South Carolina was no longer a province subject to the King of England, but "that she was now, by her own act, a free and independent State." At 4 o'clock in the afternoon of March 26, 1776, the members of the provincial congress declared themselves members of the General Assembly or Legislature of the State of South Carolina, with John Rutledge as president and Henry Laurens as vice president. The term "governor" came into official usage 3 years later.

Henry Laurens was born in Charleston, S. C., of Huguenot parents who theretofore proceeded from New York. He became a great leveling influence in the Continental Congress during the American Army's suffering at Valley Forge. Succeeding John Hancock as President of the Congress on December 1, 1777, he was a man of great Christian virtue and charity. He served without salary, working from 18 to 20 hours a day, though physically handicapped by a prolonged attack of gout and fever. He never complained, but rather compared his own physical discomforts as greatly less than those of the estimable leader and his men at Valley Forge. He once remarked that at least his sufferings were beside a fire, whereas the men and General Washington were on the cold ground with little straw and clothing to keep them warm. His son, John Laurens, as a colonel, became a valued and trusted aide to General Washington. Through President Laurens' voluminous letters to his son, we find that Congress maintained the closest liaison with General Washington. When the conspiracy and intrigues of the day were bearing heavily on the cause of the Colonists, President Laurens, in writing to his son, said:

"In (Washington's ruin) would be involved the ruin of our cause. On the other hand, his magnanimity, his patience, will save his country and confound his enemies."

The estimate of President Laurens by John Adams is worthy of note. Adams makes reference also to the first great victory of the Revolution in Colonel Moultrie's preservation of Charleston. Having only a month's acquaintance with President Laurens, John Adams wrote his wife on August 19, 1777:

"I feel a strong affection for South Carolina for several reasons: (1) I think them as stanch patriots as any in America; (2) I think them as brave; (3) they are the only people in America who have maintained a post and defended a fort; (4) they have sent us a new Delegate whom I greatly admire, Mr. Laurens, their Lieutenant Governor, a gentleman of great fortune, great abilities, modesty, integrity, and great experience, too. If all the States would send us such men, it would be a pleasure to be here."

Daniel Roberdeau, of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is credited with saying that President Laurens was a "worthy, sensible, and indefatigable gentleman."

Three great measures affecting the fortunes of the Colonies marked the contribution of South Carolina through the civil service of Henry Laurens as President of the Congress:

(1) The Treaty of Alliance with France;

(2) The conclusion of the proposals for the Articles of Confederation; and

(3) The rejection of the Proffer of Peace with Great Britain in 1778. (Peace without freedom and independence was unacceptable to Laurens.)

The Continental Congress is worthy of a moment of favorable historical recollection. Congress through the years—Continental, under the Articles of Confederation, and under the Constitution—became the whipping boy for all our ills except, possibly, the sudden changes in the weather. Some of the writers of that day failed to realize its origin, its loose association, and the utter lack of constitutional power. That error has been perpetuated by subsequent historians and commentators because of their failure to recognize that the Continental Congress should be immediately differentiated from the constitutional Congresses that have succeeded them.

The colonial governments in 1774, 1775, and 1776 were houses divided against themselves, a condition naturally to be found in colonial governments aspiring to self-determination. The call for a convention of the Continental Congress lacked constitutional or sovereign authority. The British authorities had dissolved the colonial legislatures, and our States had not yet been organized. The selected representatives were not invested by their constituencies with sufficient power to execute either the will of their constituencies or even their own. The Congress ruled more by persuasion and patriotic fervor for a common cause than by any set rules of delegated authority. Therefore, to assess such an association with blame is to overlook its lack of delegated powers. The high resolves passed by the Congress on October 14, 1774, were instrumental in unifying and consolidating the thoughts and actions of the Colonies.

A great historian (Dr. David Duncan Wallace) under whom I had the privilege of

studying put it this way in his life of Henry Laurens:

"Moreover, the situation of the Congress at the best was precarious and difficult. Suddenly placed under the necessity of conducting a war, it was unsupplied with every power, authority, and resource for its task and could rely only on a steady sense of public duty in its constituents—a devotion which it was useless to expect. The war was conducted without any formal constitution, adequate authority, or orderly Government, and in the face of an apathetic or hostile party embracing probably a majority of the population. Yet, under difficulties almost beyond belief of a generation accustomed to well ordered institutions enjoying authority beyond derogation and supported by an ardent patriotism practically universal, the old Congress in one way or another kept the Government going and, with the aid of their great general and a handful of devoted patriots up and down the country, brought it to a successful termination and meanwhile performed a service for which they have received scant recognition in laying the permanent foundations of national administration which endure to this day. A Congressman had a difficult and thankless task, and those who performed it with ability and disinterested patriotism deserve a credit which they have not usually received. The earlier runners in a relay race have been forgotten in the shouts of acclamation for those of the later course who arrived bearing the torch of a completed constitutional system. The final runner could not take even his first step until the previous bearer of progress had arrived, and doubtless the first mile was as dusty and toilsome as the last."

In December of 1777, during the sojourn here at Valley Forge, the Congress consisted of only 14 Representatives. Eight Colonies had 1 representative each, 3 had 2, and 2 Colonies had none. Many of the able men of the day returned to their respective homes to strengthen their local governments. The First Congress met without an agenda. Their sessions were of necessity bound to secrecy. In the absence of constituted authority, a chief executive and departmental heads, it is a remarkable tribute to their common sense, ardent patriotism, and unity of purpose that the Continental Congress was able to carry on foreign affairs, raise an army, conduct a war, and bring it to a successful conclusion. Hence, I deprecate the rather general and unfounded criticism, often gratuitously and never rightfully heaped upon the achievements of the Continental Congress. Let us ever remember that the Congress then was and now is the only spokesman and the last resort in expressing the will of our people. Without such an elected, representative body, we drift aimlessly but certainly into the despotism of a one-man government or an oligarchy of tyrants. The meaning of Valley Forge becomes depreciated if we minimize the real worth of the representatives of the people of that day.

Slowly but in orderly succession the fruits of the sacrifices at Valley Forge appeared upon the American scene. Out of the darkness and despair of the suffering here, victory in time emerged.

From this crucible of hardship General Green was enabled to prepare the artillery and gather necessary supplies. General Von Steuben brought a knowledge of military science and tactics to our determined but untrained Continentals. The lesson of warfare learned and practiced here are reflected in the great result that followed. The first effects of such training appeared at Monmouth. After Savannah and Charleston had been taken by the enemy, important events followed closely in my native State. The strongholds of the enemy had been reduced to New York, Camden, and Charleston. Generals Green and Morgan were deployed to the South because it was there that the British hoped to divide our colonies and later conquer Washington's forces. The battles of Camden, Kings Mountain, Cowpens, and Guilford Court House forced Cornwallis to retire to Wilmington. This led Cornwallis to Yorktown, Va., and the surrender there on October 19, 1781, followed by the signing of the peace on November 30, 1782.

Incidents and events—small and large—form significant links in our chain of recollections of Valley Forge and contemporary happenings:

Henry Laurens fathered for a time the wounded Lafayette. He made him a personal loan of $6,000. Many years thereafter (1825) Lafayette laid the cornerstone of the monument to De Kalb at Camden, S. C.

Col. John Laurens in defense of the honor of his chief, challenged and wounded Gen. Charles Lee because of the latter's disregard of General Washington.

We recollect the capture of Henry Laurens by the British while he was en route to Holland as our ambassador. Laurens' value to our cause was illustrated in his exchange by the British for Lord Cornwallis, and confirmed by his appointment as one of our peace commissioners along with Franklin, Jay, Adams, and Jefferson. Edmund Burke commented in Parliament on the coincidence that Lord Cornwallis upon his surrender at Yorktown was held as prisoner in America by Colonel Laurens while the latter's father was imprisoned in the Tower of London, over which Lord Cornwallis held authority as constable.

History likens Col. John Laurens, the able son of Henry Laurens, to Alexander Hamilton. Being detached from Washington's headquarters and because of his fluent use of the French language he was made Special Minister to France to secure and expedite loans, ships, men and supplies. The several ships filled with supplies, money, men, and sinews of war were testimonials to his ability, zeal, and accomplishments. It will be of particular interest to you to recall that from the funds he brought back, $250,000 was used by Robert Morris, who with his associates added $150,000, to establish and capitalize the Bank of America at Philadelphia. The early and untimely death of Colonel Laurens, on August 27, 1782, on a completely unnecessary battlefield in South Carolina, was the occasion of much grief and a fine expression of regard from General Washington. The English poet, Day, in an epitaph for young Laurens, wrote:

"Beyond the rage of time or fortune's power, remain, cold stones, remain and mark the hour when youthful Laurens yielded up his breath and sealed his country's liberties in death. For injured rights he fell and equal laws the noble victim of a noble cause. Oh! May that country which he fought to save shed sacred tears upon his early grave."

Valley Forge had a great bearing on subsequent events in South Carolina. After Lord Cornwallis and Admiral Parker captured Charleston, they began to overrun the State. They met great resistance at the hands of our militia. General Gates lost Camden to Cornwallis. The riflemen of the State under Moultrie, Sumter, Pickens, Harden, Thompson, Marion, Hampton, and others together with some forces from North Carolina and Virginia under Generals Green and Morgan began a wearing-down process of Cornwallis' forces. He was defeated at Kings Mountain on October 7, 1780; Tarleton's forces were defeated at Cowpens in January 1781. These battles and those in North Carolina forced Cornwallis to Wilmington, whence he left to Yorktown, Virginia, where, as I have said, he surrendered to Washington.

History records 137 battles—large and small—fought in South Carolina; 103 of these were fought by her own troops, and in 20 major engagements other South Carolinians participated.

Turning the pages of history it is easy to recall that great events and noble achievements often are born in moments of seeming despair and periods of depression and hardship. Traditional history relates that the great Homer was blind when he gave the world his Iliad and Odyssey, as was Milton when he wrote Paradise Lost. Dante, while suffering, produced his greatest works, and the music of Beethoven, much of which was written after he became completely deaf, will inspire the world as long as time lasts. Tennyson in the depth of his grief gave us the immortal In Memoriam. Historians credit Gen. Robert E. Lee with even greater stature achieved in his civil accomplishments following the War Between the States than for his brilliant exploits in battle. The French rose to their greatest heights at Verdun. Helen Keller has persevered despite deafness, blindness, and muteness to become a great crusader for others similarly afflicted. Dunkirk is too fresh in our minds for proper evaluation, but in all of these events we find that in periods of doubt and circumstances of greatest stress, men have arisen to their greatest stature. So it was with Washington, his brave generals, and the invincible soldiers at Valley Forge.

The feat of Sergeant Jasper at Charleston, S. C., had its sequel in the flag-raising at Iwo Jima. Such has been the history of the bravery, fortitude, and steadfastness of purpose of America and her fighting soldiers from the very beginning.

From the date of the Stamp Act Congress in 1765 in New York, of which John Rutledge, of South Carolina, was President, when the members were stirred by the plea of Christopher Gadsden, another South Carolinian, that "there ought to be no New Englanders, no New Yorkers known on the continent, but all of us Americans," and running through the services of those I have so briefly sketched, are found the indissoluble links that have bound our fate and fortune to Valley Forge. These events of such historic importance which you have given me the honor to relate today, happenings before and after the winter of 1777–78 and the events forged here, made possible the chain of successes that followed. We are the beneficiaries of the dividends from the despair of that fateful period in American history. May we never fail to recall them. Let us ever cherish them, teach our children to revere them. In a spirit of gratitude to a divine providence which has guided and multiplied our Nation's fortunes, let us all be thankful.

A Political Program To Prevent World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD my address entitled "A Political Program To Prevent World War III," delivered before the annual Conference on Freedom and Peace Through Liberation, at its luncheon meeting held at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 22.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the conference, I am very happy to be able to join with you on this Washington's Birthday anniversary to discuss how we may attain the

goals of peace and freedom through liberation. I want first of all to congratulate you on choosing such an excellent name for the conference because it connotes a positive goal. Equally important, it leaves no doubt that it is not a "me too" organ of Kennanism, containment, and surrender.

On this occasion when we commemorate the anniversary of the birth of the father of our country, soldier, statesman, and patriot, it is appropriate that we ask ourselves the question:—What should we be doing to advance the cause of human freedom at home and throughout the world?

George Washington and the men who joined hands with him in preparing and signing the Declaration of Independence never stopped thinking about individual liberty and the basic human freedoms. We must never forget that the American patriots, though but a handful of men, gave birth to political concepts soundly based in morality and alive to the basic dignity of man which fired the imagination of all mankind. So appealing was the cause they represented that other fearless souls from the four corners of the earth came to the shores of America to offer their personal fortunes and their very lives in support of that cause.

After the independence of the United States of America was won, the cause of national independence, as represented by that victory, was not seriously challenged in the world political arena until 1918. It might be said that the concept of nation and the cause of national independence held an unchallenged hold on the loyalties of mankind for a period of 140 years.

Today we see the cause which the American patriots gave to the world challenged by a new type of imperialism which seeks to turn back the pages of history by thousands of years and to make of mankind some sort of robot, completely devoid of all human feelings. That challenge is a vigorous and dangerous one as attested to by the fact that in the short course of 37 years, Russian Communist imperialism has enslaved over 30 nations, in excess of 800 million human beings, and now occupies almost one-third of the earth's surface.

The so-called Russian experts have offered us a number of catch phrases to symbolize the courses of action open to us in our struggle to survive as a national entity. One of these slogans is peaceful coexistence, which, by the way, is a slogan coined by Lenin, and which has but recently been resurrected by Khruschev the latest czar of the Russian Communist empire. The promoters of this slogan claim loudly that unless we are willing to engage in peaceful coexistence with the empire of communism, all mankind will be doomed because war will surely result. These same advocates maintain that if war breaks out, most of mankind will be wiped from the face of the earth because of the tremendous destructive power of the hydrogen weapons possessed by the free world and by the mad men of the Kremlin. These messengers of doom and despair are telling us that we must accept the realities of communism, that we must learn to accommodate ourselves to it, else we shall surely perish from the earth.

There is only one reward for those who make the fatal error of attempting to make any accommodation with the conspiracy of communism, and that reward is death or slavery. This is the irrefutable, unquestioned record established by communism during the course of its 37 years of tyrannical existence. There is not the slightest evidence at hand which indicates there has been a change in Communist doctrine or objectives. The events of the past 37 years remain as the only reliable index of what happens to nations and people who seek to work out a modus vivendi with Moscow.

Another slogan has been coined to describe what these experts claim as the only other course of action open to us, and that slogan is "preventive war." The creators of this slogan maintain that if the United States takes positive and overt action against the Communist conspiracy, a new world war will surely result. The creators of this slogan also maintain that anyone who advocates positive and overt action against the Russian Communists is per se advocating war of a preventive type. The promoters of this slogan, like those promoters of the slogan of peaceful coexistence, really maintain there is no other course open to us but to submit to the strangling embrace of the Russian bear. When you cut away all their fancy language and tortured reasons you arrive at no other conclusions.

It is my considered judgment the American people are being subjected to a series of brain washing through the constant repetition of these slogans—"Peaceful coexistence and preventive war." These series of treatments which automatically exclude consideration of any other course of action, are calculated to break the American spirit, to destroy our creative initiative as freemen, and to paralyze action of any type that would challenge the right of way of world communism.

Recent events which have taken place in Moscow leave no doubt in my mind that the empire of communism is threatened by powerful internal forces generated by the enslaved non-Russian nations and people. These forces, in my judgment, are so powerful that their impact upon the Russian central authority located in the Kremlin, is such as to make it impossible for the Red imperialists to conduct a successful war against the free world. In the event of open war, these captive nations and people would rise up against their alien oppressor. While this is true today, I am not certain this will be the case for all time to come. I am certain it is true today, and that is a fact we must act upon while we still have time.

The long-winded oration given by Molotov on the occasion of Khrushchev being crowned the Czar should have been entitled "Fear of Freedom." The windy, almost childish, boasting, and bullying of the supposedly suave international diplomat, Molotov, must be regarded as a reliable index of the turbulent storms which now best the masters of the Red colonial empire. All of us recall the story of the little boy who, while walking by the graveyard in the dark of night, whistled loudly in the hope that he could drive away the evil spirit. To say that Mr. Molotov was whistling in the dark would be an understatement. More accurately stated he was shrieking in a hurricane.

Recently this practical appraisal of the situation was made by a committee of Congress:

"That the time was never more opportune or the world situation more demanding for a bold positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world; this is the only course which gives reasonable hope for avoiding all-out war."

This is a quotation from the published Summary Report of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, dated December 31, 1954. This estimate, as you will note, was made before the recent turn of events in Moscow. I believe that this conclusion has even stronger foundation in fact today than it had then, back in December, and I, as a member of that committee, was absolutely convinced, based on irrefutable evidence in possession of the committee, that this conclusion was conservative. Now the question before us is, What should make up that bold, positive, political offensive? Of one thing we may be certain, slogans, catchwords, and speeches do not mean action. What is needed is the launching of concrete steps calculated to return the initiative in the struggle for the minds and loyalties of all mankind to the cause of human freedom, as represented by the United States of America. I would like to offer you some concrete steps which I believe we must take as soon as possible and which are, without doubt, well within our capabilities. I take pleasure in recalling to your attention the 13 recommendations made by the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression as the concrete, starting steps in such a bold, positive, political offensive. Those recommendations are:

1. The committee again recommends that the President of the United States take the initiative in convening an international conference of all free non-Communist nations for the following purposes:

A. To express formal recognition of the fact that the Communist governments, which now control over 800 million human beings, are not representative of the will of the people.

B. To seek agreement whereby the free non-Communist nations acting in concert will withdraw diplomatic recognition from all Moscow-controlled Communist governments.

C. To reaffirm the friendship and solidarity of the people of the free world with the people and nations enslaved by communism.

D. To develop a program for the rapid and complete termination of all commercial treaties and trade with Communist governments and the initiation of a program of trade among all non-Communist nations which will strengthen the security of the free world.

E. To develop an overall, dynamic program for the defeat of the international Communist conspiracy.

2. That Congress establish a joint committee on all United States overseas information programs in order that maximum results may be assured in bringing the full force of truth to all the people of the free world and increased hope to the millions of people enslaved by communism.

3. That Congress by appropriate action reiterate and make clear that the eventual liberation of all the nations enslaved within the Communist empire, together with unqualified support for the principle of national self-determination through free elections and the secret ballot, are firm and unchanging parts of our national policy.

4. That in the advancement of the American program for world peace and freedom all efforts therein be measured against the criteria of whether they assist the captive peoples to hasten the day when they may achieve their liberation, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected.

5. That the spirit of resistance to Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain be encouraged and supported through the judicious use of funds already authorized by Congress for such purpose.

6. That the appropriate agencies of the Government concerned with the threat of world communism give maximum opportunity to those private American organizations, groups, and individuals that have a natural bond with the enslaced nations and people, to play a major role in the restoration of freedom in the lands of their ancestry.

7. That, as a demonstration of our genuine sympathy for the enslaved nations and peoples, and to weaken the will of the armies under Communist rule to fight and support the Kremlin's plan for world conquest, the President immediately direct the establishment of the national military units formed from escapees from the enslaved nations as authorized by section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, thus providing a concrete symbol of a genuine coexistence and unity between the nations and peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

8. That Congress at the next session enact H. R. 8000, known as the Political Asylum Act of 1954, to provide for the rapid and effective restablishment of selected escapees

from communism and to encourage the defection and escape of others.

9. That the Congress give the United States Information Agency full support not only by way of an increase in funds but also by strengthening its role in our Government's political offensive. Similarly, foundations, private organizations, and individual citizens are urged to continue and increase their support to the Committee for Free Europe (Radio Free Europe).

10. That an International Juridical Commission be established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so that Communist crimes perpetrated against humanity may be fully recorded and officially noted for prosecution.

11. That the Department of State transmit copies of this report, together with all other reports of the committee to each member nation of the United Nations.

12. That the Department of State formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions and recommendations of this report, branding the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against all the nations enslaved by communism and that the United States delegation to the United Nations be instructed to take immediate steps to place this resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

13. That the work of this committee be continued in order to complete the investigation of all phases and techniques of Communist aggression in areas of the world not already covered by the committee, together with further inquiry into conditions of life within the Communist empire; a program that lack of time has thus far prevented.

I leave to your judgment whether or not this 13-point program will advance the cause of freedom and peace throughout the world. I believe that we, as a Nation, must initiate such a program because unless we do so, we must face up to the inevitability of all-out war or the alternative of abject surrender to a life of slavery now threatened by the Communist conspirators. We, the inheritors of this sacred heritage of individual liberty, government under law, and dependence upon divine providence, must not fail in the historic mission the enslaved nations and suffering peoples of the world have called upon us to fulfill. Remaining true and firm in the support of our great American ideals, we cannot fail in this historic mission.

Washington's Birthday Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered last night at the Washington's Birthday banquet of the Sons of the Revolution at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the Sons of the Revolution of the State of New York, I am greatly honored to be called upon to respond to the toast to General George Washington.

As the leader of the Army of the Revolution he was first in war and his courage and ability played a major part in the winning of our independence.

After this great service to the new Nation, he felt he was entitled to retire, but we consider him first in peace because he presided over the Constitutional Convention which gave us the basic framework of our Government and then later became the first President under the Constitution.

In the period of our national life since then, he has been truly first in the hearts of his countrymen.

While we are here to pay tribute to George Washington and the service he rendered to our Nation, it is also fitting and proper that we review some of the current problems and the effect they may have upon the institutions he did so much to help create and to preserve.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of free men largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future communist aggression or threat of aggression.

In the past 10-year period international communism has increased its power, its area, and its population. Ten years ago at this time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today over 800 million people live under the most ruthless, godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact and mutual defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate this month.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the resolution by a vote of 410 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific and lay the groundwork for a conference which would have all the unfortunate results of a Munich, a Yalta or a Geneva wherein the aggressor gains his objectives at the conference table.

Unfortunately, the history of these conferences has been that it is always the free world that gives up territory and surrenders human beings to the control of the Communists. It is never the other way around, wherein the enslaved people gain their freedom. We must not permit Gulliver to be tied down by the Lilliputians. There are those, at home and abroad, who seek to advance the cause of world government. Until now it has not been a major threat to our Constitution or our sovereignty. The development of the atomic and hydrogen weapon has caused some persons at home and abroad to believe that world peace and security depend upon some form of world state. This is a fallacy that could cost us our freedom.

This country cannot join its political system with the other nations of the world, including Communist or other dictatorships, without diluting our constitutional guaranties. How can a Communist dictatorship, or any other kind, have an equal voice with this free Nation without compromising our constitutional structure of government and the rights of free men? How can a Socialist or Communist economic system be tied to ours without first compromising and then destroying the free economic system, the rights of private capital, and the unregimented life of our people? How can we join our productive capacity and resources to the unproductive who lack resources without destroying the living standards of our people whose enterprise and thrift helped them accumulate property and capital for new industry? This has been the great incentive that has advanced us from a small colony of 3 million to a great Nation of 165 million people, the most productive the world has ever known.

It is one thing for the American people by deliberate choice, after thorough debate, to amend our Constitution to meet changing conditions. To allow it to happen by default would be a betrayal of our responsibilities.

We must not permit court decisions of Executive agreements to raise such to the status of treaties. Nor will we long preserve our Constitution, drafted at Philadelphia under the chairmanship of George Washington, if we fail to challenge any effort to amend our Constitution by use of a loophole which may provide a treaty or Executive agreement short-cut to what was intended to be a difficult process.

Let us examine the record of the United Nations as an agency for effective collective security as envisioned by some or as a basis for a world government as contemplated by others.

World War II had not yet terminated in 1945 when the United Nations Conference was held in San Francisco. The people of the world did not know that we were on the threshold of the atomic age though those high in Government had reason to believe a vast new power that ultimately could be used for destructive or constructive purposes was soon to be unveiled.

Hopes were high everywhere that the Soviet Union, though a dictatorship, had learned the folly of aggression and of war and because of the vast help given by the free world to them they would be willing to help establish a system of international law and order to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

Unfortunately both during the San Francisco conference and in the 10 years that have followed a vast propaganda effort has taken place to build the United Nations into something which its charter provisions could not or did not permit it to become. In the United Nations different people envisioned different things.

Some envisioned it as a mighty force of collective security that would rally most of the nations of the world to resist aggression and preserve the peace. In moments of oratorical fancy some even suggested that the fact the United Nations was in being would warrant free nations to scrap most, if not all, of their armed forces and place their reliance upon the "police power" of the United Nations and the collective moral persuasion of that organization. On June 25, 1950, this concept was shattered shortly after it appeared to be confirmed.

When the Communist forces crossed the 38th parallel, the United Nations Security Council promptly acted and first called upon the Communist aggressor to cease the aggression. The Communists, of course, forthwith showed they were not impressed by a United Nations resolution or the adverse moral reaction of that organization. The Security Council next called on the 60 members of that organization to give aid and support to the victim of the aggression, the Republic of Korea.

What is the record on this? After 3 years of the Korean war, of the 60 members of the United Nations only 17 contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression. Outside of the United States of America, the other 16 contributed armed forces in the amount of 45,000. The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000, and we rotated more than 1 million men through

the Korean theater of war. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, supplied over 600,000.

This means that of the United Nations members the United States of America supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources.

When the forces of the Republic of Korea, not being a member of the United Nations (having been kept out by a Soviet veto), are added to those of the United States, it means that our two nations alone supplied better than 95 percent of the manpower.

Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

Our associates in the United Nations so tied us down that a stalemate was all that could be gained after 3 years of struggle in Korea.

We were denied the right of hot pursuit and the enemy was protected in his sanctuary across the Yalu.

With that example are you prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer likewise must be in the negative.

Has the time not come for a realistic appraisal of just what part the United Nations is qualified to play and to stop kidding ourselves into believing it is something it is not and, in my judgment, cannot be.

There are some who have envisioned the United Nations as a world state to which openly or clandestinely, individual nations would surrender their sovereignty. Some of the more enthusiastic proponents of this type of super state compared the San Francisco meeting with that of our own Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. Of course, the two gatherings are not comparable when one considers the building of a government upon which man might depend for the protection of his life and his religious, economic, and intellectual freedom.

In the first place, those who met at Philadelphia spoke a common language and had a common heritage. True, they had come from different areas of the world, but they or their predecessors had come seeking a new way of life, freedom from Old World tyranny or a desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

They had fought a common battle against the mightiest empire of that time. They had carried over from the old country the background of the Magna Carta and of representative government. They had had experience as an independent nation, much of it unsatisfactory, under the Articles of Confederation.

With that background, under what I believe was divine inspiration, drafted the greatest document produced by the mind and hand of man for his self-government and protection of his natural rights.

A little more realistic understanding of the history of the nations gathered in San Francisco should have made it clear that such an organization could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government.

There is no common language or common heritage. Nations which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience. Nations of less than 1 million have equal representation with those of over 300 million. The Soviet Union, which is perhaps the most tyrannical government since western civilization entered the modern era, sits as an equal partner with nations with long-established constitutions of law, order, and a respect of the rights of man.

Now, there are those who urge the admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean war. This, together with the other Communist states, would give that system of tyranny over 800 million people that they claim to speak for.

As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guaranties of freedom under our Constitution being diluted or modified directly or indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions.

Lest we be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late wherein we have been taken, I believe that every candidate for public office—executive, legislative or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue. It is later than you think.

The United Nations, if it does not destroy its moral position by actions which I shall mention, does have a function it could perform. It could be a forum wherein the views of the free world and the Communist world might be aired provided that there was assurace the debates in the General Assembly or the Security Council were receiving as widespread coverage behind the Iron Curtain as they do in the free nations.

Otherwise, it becomes a vast propaganda forum for the Communists wherein the point of view of the West does not have the equal opportunity to get to the people in the Soviet Union and its satellites because of the strict censorship those governments exercise.

Even in regard to its position of moral leadership the United Nations has allowed itself to become seriously compromised.

Following the intervention of Communist China into the Korean war the United Nations, after great hesitation, declared Communist China the aggressor. There had been no such hesitation when the small aggressor Communist Korea, crossed the 38th parallel in June of 1950.

To close observers this seemed to indicate that there would be alacrity to pass a resolution and to act against a small aggressor but there would be procrastination and delay in acting against a large aggressor. This seemed to be an abandonment of principle for expediency.

Later, when the evidence was conclusive that the Soviet Union was not only giving moral support to Communist aggression in Korea but was supplying MIG planes, tanks, artillery, ammunition, and other weapons in clear violation of the United Nations resolution and the charter of the organization, no steps were taken to expel the Soviet Union from the United Nations.

Later on, the official representative of the Soviet Union baldly and boldly admitted the fact that such support had been given and in effect defied the United Nations to do anything about it. They did nothing and by inaction underscored their futility when dealing with Soviet charter violations.

Every member of the United Nations knows that the terms of the Korean armistice have been violated on numerous occasions. The neutral nations commission is not allowed to function in Communist North Korea as it was intended though they have complete freedom in the area of the free Republic of Korea. In violation of the terms of the armistice, the Communists have brought in equipment and built military airfields. No effective steps have been taken to require respect for the terms of the armistice.

The most flagrant violation has been the admitted holding of 15 members of the American Air Force, 11 of whom have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years. Under the terms of the armistice it was required that all prisoners of war who wanted to be returned should be allowed to do so.

There is strong reason to believe that there are at least several hundred additional United Nations and United States prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the armistice.

The United Nations passed a resolution expressing its concern in this matter. The Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjold, made a special trip to Peking. He returned without the release of the prisoners and without any date upon which they might be expected to be returned in the future. It is apparent that they are being held for the purposes of international blackmail on the part of the Chinese Communists.

Impotent and paralyzed, the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly have taken no effective steps to enforce the release of our airmen in accordance with terms of the Korean armistice. Again I ask: "What effective steps, if any, does the United Nations intend to take?"

In the matter of the Chinese Communist aggression against the Republic of China which is a charter member of the United Nations, that organization invited the Chinese Communists to come to New York to discuss a cease-fire.

Arrogantly, the Chinese Communists laid down terms that a victor would be expected to lay down to the vanquished—namely that the Republic of China should be removed from the Security Council and that the Soviet Union resolution condemning the United States should be made the order of business rather than the New Zealand resolution relative to a cease-fire.

When this message was received the United Nations again demonstrated its ineffectiveness by postponing the whole situation, while some of the neutralist friends of the Soviet Union and Red China are trying, through diplomatic channels, to provide for a Far Eastern Munich whereby the Chinese Communists will be given the key coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu and membership in the United Nations. This, of course, would be another defeat for the free world and throughout all of Asia looked upon as another victory for the Communists, comparable to that growing out of the Geneva Conference, wherein the Communists gained control of Northern Vietnam and 15 million more human beings.

I am strongly opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

If, as part of a Far Eastern Munich, the appeasers force Red China in I shall devote the balance of my life to taking the United States out.

These are not pleasant facts, and there are many in this country and elsewhere who, because of the vast amount of publicity and propaganda, have gotten a distorted view of the capabilities of the United Nations Organization.

Certainly, in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, a nation can no more return to isolationism than an adult can return to childhood.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

If we as a free people will show the same courage and commonsense that motivated Washington and the others who under divine inspiration gave us our Constitution there are none of our great domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need fear.

The John Day Project on the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a joint memorial I have received from the Senate and House of Representatives of my home State of Oregon. This resolution, House Joint Memorial 2, memorializes Congress to provide the necessary funds for preliminary investigations and planning for the John Day project on the Columbia River, and then indicate its intention to build the John Day project promptly and solely with Federal funds by making the necessary appropriation to start construction immediately upon completing the preliminary planning or, in the alternative, enact without delay such enabling legislation as is required to permit local agencies to advance funds, under appropriate arrangements with the United States, so that construction of such project by the Federal Government can be initiated immediately.

This resolution is of great importance, Mr. Speaker, first because it sets forth the vital interest which the Oregon Legislature has in expediting construction of the great John Day Dam. And may I point out at this time that the Oregon State Legislature is representative of the thinking and wishes of the electorate of the State of Oregon. Therefore this memorial presents the wishes of that electorate. I make this point purposely in answer to certain public statements which were made concerning a "mandate" having been given by the voters of Oregon to their United States Representatives to prevent legislation in support of the administration's "partnership plan" from being passed.

The Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon are necessarily more closely representative of the people, and more sensitive to the views and feelings of the people of Oregon than any one Member of the United States Congress could possibly be. And now they urge that we go ahead with the John Day Dam—in this memorial they say:

Whereas the growth of the region requires over 500,000 kilowatts of new power capacity annually and such multipurpose projects as John Day must be started immediately in order to be completed and to avoid a serious power shortage by the early 1960's; and

Whereas various local public-utility agencies have offered to advance funds toward the preliminary engineering and planning costs of John Day, and have indicated a willingness to advance over one-half the estimated cost of the project to expedite its construction by the United States as a Federal project.

Opposition to new ideas in power development is quick to claim that the people share its prejudices. Those who oppose President Eisenhower's partnership plan are more willing to try to confuse and propagandize the people than they are to lay the facts before the people and let them make up their own minds. They make the fatal mistake of underestimating the intelligence of the voter. The administration's program for construction of power projects shows both imagination and courage in proposing boldly new approaches, and this memorial which I proudly present to this body shows clearly that the people of Oregon, through their elected State representatives, support it.

The memorial follows:

House Joint Memorial 2

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government, through its construction of multiple-purpose projects, has become a major supplier of electric power to the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the present and continuing growth of the region, including Oregon, requires the further and immediate development of its low-cost power potential in order to provide the energy base for industries, job opportunities, and the needs of its people; and

Whereas the John Day project on the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington is one of the major integral units in the overall plan of comprehensive development of the Columbia River and has already been authorized and approved as such by the Congress of the United States (81st Cong., 2d sess., H. Doc. No. 531); and

Whereas its construction will complete slack water navigation from the mouth of the Columbia River to Pasco, Wash., a distance of some 328 miles; and

Whereas it will provide approximately 500,000 acre-feet of storage for flood-control purposes and will also provide irrigation and recreational benefits; and

Whereas such project will produce in excess of 1,100,000 kilowatts of low-cost power, fully integrated with the Federal grid and the Northwest Power Pool and close to Oregon load centers; and

Whereas the growth of the region requires over 500,000 kilowatts of new power capacity annually and such multipurpose projects as John Day must be started immediately in order to be completed and to avoid a serious power shortage by the early 1960's; and

Whereas various local public utility agencies have offered to advance funds toward the preliminary engineering and planning costs of John Day and have indicated a willingness to advance over one-half the estimated cost of the project to expedite its construction by the United States as a Federal project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concuring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to (a) appropriate immediately the funds necessary to enable the Corps of Engineers to complete the preliminary investigations and planning for the John Day project; and (b) indicate its intention to build the John Day project promptly and solely with Federal funds by making the necessary appropriation to start construction immediately upon completing the preliminary planning or, in the alternative, enact without delay such enabling legislation as is required to permit local agencies to advance funds, under appropriate arrangements with the United States, so that construction of such project by the Federal Government can be initiated immediately; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

Adopted by house January 28, 1955.
E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.
Adopted by senate February 8, 1955.
ELMO E. SMITH,
President of Senate.
Filed: February 9, 1955.
EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Earl T. Newbry, Secretary of State of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the Seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the foregoing copy of House Joint Memorial No. 2 with the original thereof adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the Secretary of State February 9, 1955, and that the same is a full, true and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all endorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the Seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 10th day of February 1955.

[SEAL] EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.

Schools of Blaj, Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an address I delivered at a banquet in Cleveland on October 17, 1954, sponsored by the Association of Rumanian Catholics of America, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary commemoration of the inauguration of the schools of Blaj, Rumania:

It is with pleasure that I join in this commemoration of great import for the culture and spiritual life of Rumania. The deep appreciation I hold for my many Rumanian friends and acquaintances, as well as my long interest in the Rumanian cause, have brought closer to me many events of Rumanian history and various aspects of Rumanian national life.

I know well the illustrious place which Blaj holds in the history of Rumania. I was impressed especially by the fact that the spiritual rebirth that is indissolubly associated with the name of Blaj has been fundamentally an expression of Rumanian nationalism. The religious union with Rome came as a manifestation both of Catholic allegiance and of a strong national reaffirmation. For those pious and fiery ancestors of yours, who forged the history of

Blaj, Rome was the true symbol of Christianity, but at the same time it stood as the living reminder of the origins of their people, a people who could never renounce their national freedom and independence.

The great scholars and patriots of Blaj made their pilgrimage to Rome, both to the Vatican and to the Column of Emperor Trajan, the founder of Dacia Felix, their ancient land. The students sent from Blaj to acquire knowledge and wisdom at the "De Propaganda Fide," were driven also by that urge, which led Badea Cartan, to walk from his abode in Transylvania, with his desagi on his back to Rome, in order to give a fresh impetus to those national aspirations.

The consciousness of a heroic national past was strengthened and deepened by this contact with Rome. The Rumanian saga of eternal resistance against the barbaric invasions, their outstanding contribution in the fight to defend Christendom against the Ottoman penetration into the heart of Europe, were thus again brought to the fore in the minds of your fellow countrymen. The epic figures of Stephen the Great and Michael the Brave reminded them again of the days of national pride and independence. It was Michael the Brave, who coming to the "land beyond the forests," at Alba Julia, embodied for an historic moment the unity of all Rumanians.

The Catholic tie thus decisively helped the Rumanian cultural and national revival. This is only natural because Christianity stands for the freedom of all people. So Blaj, through its schools and religious institutions, through the spirit which gave them inspiration, became one of the most revered centers of your nation. The cultural climate of Blaj gave birth to the Latinist current which strongly nourished the national consciousness of your ancestors. In those periods of darkness, when Rumania was under a foreign rule, Blaj stood as a guiding light. It was therefore natural that the national revolutionary movement which swept over the whole of Europe in 1848, found a quick response in Blaj. This famous seat of Rumanian spiritual and intellectual life, which we are honoring today, on the 200th anniversary of the inauguration of its renowned schools, was the rallying point of the Transylvania patriots.

On the Blaj Field of Liberty, as it has been so aptly called, through the voice of Simeon Marnutiu and other patriotic leaders, the human, Christian and national aspirations of a people under foreign rule were forcefully and dramatically expressed. The great national poet, Andrei Muresanu, voiced the significance of this movement in what might be considered as the "Marseilleaise" of the Rumanian people, "Wake thou, Rumanian";

"Wake thou, Rumanian, from your sleep of death
In which you have been engulfed by barbaric tyrants."

More than a hundred years have elapsed since this call was heard for the national resurrection of an oppressed people. And now the valiant Rumanian people, who had at long last regained their freedom, are now crushed as never before by the most ruthless and Godless despotism ever known to mankind. Among the victims of Russian Communist aggression, Blaj, the stronghold of the Rumanian Uniate Church, so closely bound to Rome, of national culture and learning and of the consciousness of Rumania's Latin heritage, stands as a martyr of the Godless tyranny of communism.

The Russian invaders and their agents do everything, from intimidation to assassination, in order to eradicate all the pillars of Rumanian nationalism. Nevertheless, in spite of all their ruthless killings and inhumanities, the Russians have been unable to destroy in the heart of every Rumanian, those lasting forces which Blaj and its Field of Liberty symbolizes.

It is an incontrovertible historical fact that the most powerful and persistent driving force of the ages is that of national consciousness. This has been well demonstrated today by the resistance of the subjugated peoples against the new Red Russian colonialism. It is all the more evident that enlightened nationalism is one of the strongest barriers against communism and a necessary foundation for the establishment of a free and peaceful world. National freedom and independence expresses on the international plane what the dignity and liberty of the individual signifies in a free community. Independent and sovereign nations, however small, are thus the strongest assets for a free and democratic world. Conversely, it is well established that the sacrificing of national entities to autocratic empires constitutes the major cause of internal strife, international restlessness and, eventually, a major war.

If we look with confidence to the immense and invincible forces of the human soul, we who are enjoying freedom and its God-given benefits, we must squarely face up to our own responsibilities for the tragedy of the enslaved peoples. The errors on our part which have been and are being made, either through direct support of the Godless tyranny, or through our lack of support for the victims of that tyranny, throw a dubious light on our own future as a free nation. There is no doubt in my mind that if we persist in ignoring our moral duty toward the subjugated nations, the consequences of such a course will work against our own security and freedom. Those of us who have made a careful study of the problem are keenly conscious of the gravity of the present situation, the fruit of past errors. The hundreds of millions of human souls forced under the tyranny of the Red yoke, if completely abandoned by us, as the so-called policy of coexistence requires, would eventually be reduced to the role of unwitting instruments in the advancement of the objectives of our enemies. Those objectives lead to world domination. On the other hand, we know these peoples are our true allies and that when we recognize and support their moral rights to national freedom and independence, we give fresh encouragement to their will to resist and strengthen their fortitude to struggle on until the day when the foreign occupier of Rumania and all the other non-Russian nations held captive within the Red colonial empire are once again free and independent.

1955 Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege during the period set aside for the observance of Lincoln's Birthday to deliver the following address to Lincoln Day dinners at Keene, N. H.; Indiana, Pa.; New Brighton, Pa.; and Huntington, Clarksburg, and Charleston, W. Va.:

LINCOLN DAY 1955

You have honored me by your invitation to join in this annual tribute to the memory of the immortal Lincoln, our first Republican President.

Lincoln, in all his greatness, was a common man with common attributes, yet by character and self-education he elevated himself to such a degree that world historians acclaim him as one of the six greatest personalities in the history of the human race.

Thus, as the Great Emancipator's soul took flight from his weary body, Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War, proved himself a prophet when he announced his death in these historic words: "Now he belongs to the ages."

Many times the question is asked, Why do we look to the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln for inspiration and guidance in the conduct of public affairs even though 90 years have elapsed since his passing?

The answer is that Lincoln was a common man whose words and deeds enshrined him forever in the hearts of mankind.

But this great Republican President did not reach the heights of world acclaim without experiencing heartaches and bitter disappointments.

A close study of his many reverses in life reveals that few men could have weathered such a series of trials and tribulations.

When you read of Lincoln's life, you are reminded of his statement in speaking of his lack of formal education when he said, "I do not know much—my schooling was limited to reading, writing, and ciphering to the rule of three."

This statement reveals the humility and sincerity of Lincoln, who was not ashamed of his early life and humble surroundings.

This humility of Abraham Lincoln was reflected in his first campaign for a political office when he was a candidate for the State Legislature in Illinois in 1832.

At that time, Lincoln said, "I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal-improvement system, and high protective tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles. * * *"

On clearly defined political principles Abraham Lincoln was content to place his future in the hands of the American people.

It took courage on his part to stand on his principles and to bypass the political magic of promising everybody everything in the hope of garnering a vote, a practice that became so popular with the New Dealers and Fair Dealers.

Lincoln, because of his courage and convictions, went down to defeat in 1832 as a candidate for the legislature.

He was defeated again in business in 1833 and lost everything of a material value.

In 1832, as candidate for speaker, he was again defeated.

In 1840, he lost as a candidate for elector.

In 1843, he was defeated as a candidate for Commissioner of the General Land Office and also as a candidate for nomination to Congress.

In 1848, he lost in his campaign for reelection to Congress.

In 1855, he was the losing candidate for United State Senator.

In 1856, he was defeated as candidate for Vice President.

In 1858, he was defeated as a candidate for United States Senator.

But in 1860, he was elected as the first Republican President of the United States.

What a glowing tribute Lincoln's crowning victory was to his perseverance and to the truth of the old saying, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit!"

Abraham Lincoln refused to quit because he knew in his heart that the principles he espoused must be adhered to if this young Republic expected to become strong materially, morally, and spiritually.

He declined to surrender or compromise his principles with the result that his patience and perseverance have become a national symbol.

By comparison, the Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln can take a lesson from his determined and persistent attitude.

The Republican Party is still smarting over the reverses suffered in the November elections of 1954 when we lost control of Congress and met a similar fate in some State elections.

As members of the Party of Abraham Lincoln, we should honor his memory by abandoning our negative thinking and present a united and militant front behind the forward-looking program of our Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It has been a little more than 2 years since the American people repudiated 20 years of the New Deal-Fair Deal brand of political philosophy by entrusting the affairs of Government to a Republican President.

There is none who can deny that under President Eisenhower remarkable progress has been made in the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

At the same time, a more realistic and firm foreign policy has been formulated with the result that Uncle Sam is no longer being pushed around in the field of foreign affairs.

It is gratifying to realize that this new, firm foreign policy under President Eisenhower is responsible for the following accomplishments, namely:

(a) Brought an end to the Korean war.

(b) The Iranean oil situation has been ironed out.

(c) The explosive problem of the Suez Canal which concerns the British and the Egyptians is being settled in a peaceable manner.

(d) The troublesome problem of Trieste which has been a threat of war for years has been settled.

(e) The Communist-inspired activities have been halted involving countries in Central America.

(f) International relations are improving with respect to the arming of West Germany as part of the defense against Communistic aggression, and finally

(g) In the Middle East, the real desire of the United States for peace and friendly relations is truly understood.

It should be remembered that President Eisenhower inherited the hopeless situation in French Indochina which had deteriorated to the point where it was beyond diplomatic solution.

Yet today in French Indochina, there is hope of saving at least a part of that area from the Iron Curtain.

In true Lincoln style, President Eisenhower redeemed his election pledge to the American people that he would consult Congress before sending United States Armed Forces into conflict.

Unlike his predecessor, Mr. Truman, who sent American troops to Korea on his own initiative, President Eisenhower asked and received from Congress the authority to employ United States Armed Forces in defense of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories in that area.

By consulting Congress regarding the Formosa situation, President Eisenhower clearly demonstrates his bipartisan foreign policy which is a vital factor in uniting the American people.

At the same time, President Eisenhower served unequivocal notice on the Chinese Reds that they will be at war with the United States if they attack the Formosan area.

This bold decision which results from the firm foreign policy on the Eisenhower administration is at the same time a blunt warning to Soviet Russia that its policy of wars by proxy or through its satellites will no longer be tolerated.

This courageous attitude on the part of President Eisenhower will restore not only our dignity as a nation but it also serves notice on Russia that we are sick and tired of her role as an enemy of world peace.

In backing up this bold and courageous decision of President Eisenhower, we have his assurance that every single order concerning the Formosan situation will have to clear his desk before it receives approval.

What a contrast this is to the conduct of the Korean war when the State Department headed by Dean Acheson tied the hands of General MacArthur by preventing American forces from pursuing and destroying the Chinese Reds north of the Yalu River in Korea.

It was this spineless and vacillating foreign policy that prolonged the Korean war, took the lives of 143,000 of the cream of American youth and left us with the irritating and troublesome problems we have now concerning the Chinese Reds.

The result of the futility of the Dean Acheson policy in Korea is demonstrated by the fact that it was America's first military defeat, not because our forces were wanting in valor, courage, or sacrifice, but only because it was a war rigged against victory from the very outset.

This statement is supported by every American field general who served in Korea.

For example, testimony given before a committee of the United States Senate reveals that General Stratemeyer, commander of the United States Air Force in the Far East, complained: "The enemy can hit me where I am based. I cannot hit them."

Gen. Edward M. Almond in answer to a question by a Member of the United States Senate as to how many opportunities did our side have to win the war, answered by saying: "Two * * * First, in November 1950, following the historic Ichon envelopment of the North Korean forces; and second, in June 1951, when some 50 Chinese divisions were trapped and routed clear across the Korean peninsula."

General Almond continued his testimony by saying: "At that point, 2 months after President Truman had fired General MacArthur, the whole American offensive was halted and abandoned on direct orders from Washington."

Gen. Mark Clark, in his testimony, said that Chiang Kai-shek on more than one occasion, had offered General Clark three of his best divisions with supporting air.

General Clark said, "I recommended it shortly after I got over to the Far East, but my recommendations were never answered."

Questioned as to whether he agreed with General MacArthur that the enemy should not have been allowed a sanctuary beyond the Yalu River, General Clark replied, "Yes, sir. I agreed at the time when the Chinese came in."

Continuing, General Clark said: "They came across the Yalu and killed our men.

"I think at that time we should have indicated that we were at war with Red China and should have retaliated with everything we had at our disposal."

General Clark was then asked, "Did you ever fight a war like this before and would you ever want to fight another one like it?"

General Clark replied with an emphatic, "No, sir."

These quotations from the testimony of three of America's great generals prove the oft-repeated assertion that officials in our State Department by their bungling tactics and with the consent of President Truman denied our American forces the opportunity to win the Korean war.

By contrast, President Eisenhower, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and fortified by his outstanding military experience on the field of battle, assures us that the folly in Korea will not be repeated.

We have the added assurance that America with an adequate national defense in this atomic-hydrogen age stands ready to give the American people the maximum of national security even if it requires using atomic and hydrogen weapons.

In support of this firm and realistic foreign policy on the homefront, the Eisenhower administration as the result of action by the Republican-controlled 83d Congress is meeting the problem of Communist infiltration.

This is made possible through a subversive-control program that is proving a mighty weapon to the Department of Justice and its FBI in the all-out effort to combat the Communist threat within our country and the worldwide menace of international communism.

This two-fisted militant anti-Communist program is designed to stop playing patty-cake with the Communists here and abroad.

It permits the granting of immunity to witnesses who are willing to testify concerning subversive activities but who heretofore have invoked the fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

It provides the death penalty for peacetime spies.

It makes bail-jumping a serious crime.

It closes many loopholes in existing laws through which Judy Coplon and others of her kind escaped prosecution.

It provides for the loss of citizenship to persons who knowingly engage in Communist conspiracy.

It requires the registration of Communist-action and Communist-front printing equipment.

It increases the penalty for harboring or concealing a fugitive who is wanted on a felony charge or who has been convicted of any offense irrespective of whether it is a felony or a misdemeanor.

It denies Government pensions to convicted felons like Alger Hiss.

In addition, the Republican-controlled 83d Congress enacted a law which outlaws the Communist Party of the United States.

It likewise applies to any successor organization whose purpose is the overthrow of the Government of the United States or any political subdivision therein by force or violence.

This subversive control law makes it a felony for any person to be a member of such an organization when he has knowledge of the revolutionary activities of such an organization.

In addition to this subversive-control program and our vigilant attitude in tracking down, exposing, and prosecuting Communists one of our mightiest weapons is a strong and solvent America.

For that reason, our domestic economy is of paramount significance because if we allow it to decay morally, spiritually, and financially, we become an easy and certain prey to world communism.

The Eisenhower administration's program designed to transfer the economy of our country from a wartime to a peacetime basis has been acclaimed by friend and foe as being in the best interests of the United States.

Unfortunately, the dove of peace brought with it serious economic dislocations in certain areas of the country where unemployment occurred when the manufacture of war materials was terminated.

In general, however, business is good and the savings and spending of the American people as a whole have increased.

The President's dynamic and progressive legislative program resulted in a revision of the tax structure that brought about one of the greatest tax reductions in the history of the Nation.

In addition, the Federal Government is now being operated at greater economy, with the result that it has been possible to lessen the tax burden on the people by many billions of dollars.

President Eisenhower's program in the field of health, social security, highways, housing, agriculture, and commerce has attracted bipartisan support which is indicative of its real merit.

Ladies and gentlemen, this dynamic Eisenhower program that is building a stronger America is a tribute to the genius and sincerity of our Republican President.

With less than 2 years remaining of his present term in the White House and confronted by a Democratic-controlled Congress, make no mistake that President Eisenhower's dynamic and progressive program is facing the acid test.

With the 1956 Presidential election in the offing, we Republicans cannot afford dissension in our ranks or sulking in our tents.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon us as disciples of Abraham Lincoln to close our ranks and present a united front in meeting Democratic attacks on our President and on the Republican Party.

May I warn you as a battle-scarred veteran of the political arena, that the Democratic Party will leave no stone unturned to lure us into political booby-traps in its effort to recapture the White House.

Frankly, we can expect a knock-down drag-out political fight with no holds barred in the 1956 campaign.

While we listen to loud protests about political smears, I predict that the campaign of 1956 will outsmear the despicable New Deal attack on President Hoover in 1932.

The campaigns of 1952 and 1954 will prove to have been "cream-puff" affairs in comparison to the 1956 campaign already underway and spearheaded by Chairman Butler of the National Democratic Committee.

Chairman Butler's attacks on Vice President NIXON reveal the pattern to be followed in next year's campaign.

These smear attacks make a mockery of the so-called Democratic pledge of bipartisan support of the Eisenhower program.

Fellow Republicans, time is running out on us.

This is February 1955 and already the Democratic campaign to recapture the White House and continue Democratic control of Congress is well underway.

Therefore, I say to you in all sincerity, it is time that we Republicans spring into action.

As I have said before, let us bury our party differences, close ranks and join hands on the firing line.

First. We should recruit more followers, especially among the younger generation.

Second. We should tell the American people of the forward-looking program of the Eisenhower administration and the success of its efforts to restore honesty and integrity to Government.

Third. We should refresh the memories of the American people of the 20 years of Roosevelt-Truman rule whose only means of providing employment was based on two wars with jobs and overtime at the expense of the flesh and blood of American fathers and mothers.

Fourth. We should convince the American people that as a Nation we are at peace and that the transition from a wartime economy cannot be accomplished overnight and without some economic dislocations.

Ladies and gentlemen, as Republicans we have nothing to hide in giving an account of the stewardship of the Eisenhower administration during its 2 years in office.

The Republican Party is leading this Nation out of the valley of destruction by providing real leadership in President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I repeat, we must bury all selfish desires and settle petty differences that if not compromised will divide our ranks and render us completely helpless.

Fellow Republicans, the task before us is to restore to Republican control our city halls, our courthouses, our Statehouses, and the Congress of the United States as well as to retain control of the White House in 1956.

As I have warned, the hour is getting late.

This is no time for party bickering or weak-kneed Republicans who are timid about reshouldering the pack and moving into battle.

Let us never forget that in 1952 after 20 long years of political exile, the American people gave the Republican Party control of Congress and the White House.

At this moment with the Democrats again in control of Congress, further defeats in 1956 could lose us the Presidency and the opportunity to recapture control of Congress.

Therefore, fellow Republicans, I beseech you to guard against any defeatist attitude by meditating on the long 20-year battle we had to regain the White House and Congress in 1952.

In addition, let us not lose sight of the fact that Abraham Lincoln after 10 crushing defeats from 1832 to 1858 finally achieved a glorious triumph in 1860 when he was elected as the first Republican President of the United States.

In commemoration of the 146th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, let us rededicate ourselves to the task before us—the preservation of our form of Government, keeping in mind as the great Emancipator did that, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit."

In 1952 with President Eisenhower as our standard bearer, we promised the American people who were weary of the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophies a new birth of freedom.

We are well on the road to redeeming that pledge under the brilliant and dynamic leadership of our beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Therefore, in the knowledge that our cause is just, let us reconsecrate ourselves to the task before us by presenting a united front.

At the same time, let us recall with pride and confidence that down through the years the Republican Party has faithfully followed the sage advice of Abraham Lincoln.

As we gird ourselves for the 1956 campaign, let us adopt as our battle cry the ringing words of Abraham Lincoln uttered nearly 100 years ago when in 1856, during the formative years of the Republican Party, he said:

"Let us, in building our new party, plant ourselves on the rock of the Declaration of Independence and the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail against us."

District of Columbia Fine Arts Auditorium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House District Committee, Wednesday, February 23, 1955, on H. R. 630, District of Columbia Fine Arts Auditorium:

Progress in a democracy has many and varied faces. Sometimes it has a swift look about it which carries action forward by leaps and bounds. Sometimes it has a stubborn look and great effort is required to relax its hold. At other times it has an indifferent look, and endless patience and resolution must be applied before interest can be sparked in it. It is one of our great strengths as a democracy that will and determination are demanded, required and permitted, so that the strides we make are our own and belong inevitably to us all.

These thoughts have been turning around in my mind as I look at the bill we have before us, H. R. 630, to create a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a civic auditorium in the District of Columbia. This bill is part of a larger program to encourage the growth and development of the fine arts throughout the Nation, which has been the concern of many Members of Congress for the past 20 years. It is only a small part, but a most vital one. And as I consider its provisions, I think of the many times in the past that I have been called upon to speak on the importance of such a program, and the many times I have asked permission to do so. But the patience I spoke about earlier that is demanded of us in a democracy, and the grace that that patience is permitted us, gives me great courage that we are indeed on our way.

We are often spoken of by our many friends from abroad as the country of experts. Give us a material thing and we will plumb the depths of its capacity, and when we have reached those depths we will search even further and our resourcefulness will find greater depths than man could have envisioned. Our friends from abroad respect our known capacity for such imagination and creativity, but in their hearts, and yes, even on their tongues, they belittle our culture and refer to us as crass materialists. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Of course, we have unlimited vision in our industry. Of course, we believe in a high standard of living for all, and of course, we will continue to use our inventiveness to the full in that direction. But we as a Nation love culture. We have respected it since our Founding Fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence in words which ring out forever not only in faith but in beauty as well.

Apparently, we have not had the time as a country to solidify this love of culture into a thing for all to see. But as a people we have demonstrated time and time again that it is deep within our hearts. Our songs are sung all over the world. Our books are read all over the world. But our art, our theater, our opera, our music have not yet found their full rein. They have not as yet become the integral part of our lives which our industrial prowess has already defined. As a Nation so far developed, so great a power on this earth, so responsible to the hope of peace on earth, we cannot afford to dally any longer on our cultural front. It is not only because we need it for our own happiness and fulfillment, but also because we need it to combat forces in our world today which abuse every lack and feed on it like vultures, deadening hope and spirit wherever they can.

It has been said that democracy is difficult to define to peoples who have not lived under it. The arts, however, have an international language of their own. They speak a universal language which all who live on this earth can understand. They speak to the spirit of man—to his hope and his faith and his longing. They can reach out and spark the hearts, where things cannot even touch them.

Let us begin in the Capital of our great Nation, and build a center for all to see. I have traveled all over the world and have found beautiful cities in beautiful climes. When I return to Washington, I feel great pleasure in the physical beauty which meets my eye, and I am proud that it is often called the capital of the world. But if we wish to be a nation which can speak to the hearts of mankind, we must bring together and plant the fruits of our genius, talent and ability in the fine arts, and let them flourish in our Capital.

H. R. 630, and all the other similar bills which are being discussed at this hearing, is a modest one indeed. It asks for an appropriation not to exceed $25,000, for a purpose which can do much toward making this city one of the cultural centers of the world. We can afford this sum. Those of us who have spoken repeatedly of building a national theater, of creating a Fine Arts Commission, and other projects to encourage and develop the fine arts in our land, look to this measure as a significant beginning of a great hope.

United States Surplus Wheat Gift to Russia Sheer Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion about the critical food shortage in the Soviet Union, and some speculation as to the effect this shortage might have upon the stability of the Russian autocrats sitting in the Kremlin. On the other hand, it has been suggested that since we have a wonderful bounty of foodstuffs accumulated as a surplus over a period of several years, that we should turn over a goodly part of this surplus to the Communist masters for distribution by them throughout their empire. The argument is advanced that this would be a great humanitarian act and that we would win many friends and stimulate better understanding between the Communist world and our free society.

Another point of view has been advanced that since one of the principal reasons for the critical food shortage within the U. S. S. R. has been the resistance of the farmers and their refusal to cooperate in the collectivist farming scheme of the Russians, there seems little doubt but that the farmers in the Soviet Union who despise the Russian Communists, have set out to create a crisis by creating a critical food shortage. It is reasoned, therefore, that we, a free people, should not upset the hard-earned gains of the farmers in the U. S. S. R. who are engaged in a death struggle with the Russian tyrants.

On Wednesday, February 23, there appeared in the Cleveland News, an editorial entitled "United States Surplus Wheat Gift to Russia Sheer Folly." This editorial, in my considered judgment, is the most practical analysis I have yet seen on the question as to whether we should give or trade any of our surplus wheat to the Russian tyrants. It expresses a most refreshing point of view and I commend it to the reading of every Member of the House:

The United States Information Agency, which operates the Voice of America network, reports Russia's massive drive to step up farm output has failed so badly that the Soviet population has less grain per person than in 1926.

After more than a quarter of a century of collective farming under communism, says the USIA, the Russian people are still crtically short of foodstuffs, and livestock production is 3 million less today than before the Bolshevik revolution of 1917.

Malenkov walked the Kremlin plank because he failed to improve Russia's agricultural output.

This brings us to the current suggestion of some Members of Congress to President Eisenhower that the United States make a gift of some 350,000 bushels of our surplus wheat to Russia as a "humanitarian act" which would improve relations between the Soviet and this country.

There is no question that there is a serious Russian food shortage, but not so grave but what Russia sold thousands of bushels of its wheat to Iran earlier this month.

The United States has a big wheat surplus, probably enough to supply this country's needs for 2 years. But to make a gift of 350,000 bushels of our surplus wheat to Russia seems to us a dubious proposition. If the Kremlin rulers would tell the Soviet population where the wheat came from, that it was a gift and why such a gift was necessary, then the proposal might possibly be in order.

Such knowledge, however, would never be given the Russian people by the Kremlin dictators. It would spoil their whole international act.

When the Marshall plan was inaugurated after the last war, Russia was responsible for those "Yankees go home" placards that appeared all over Western Europe, if you recall.

It would not pay now for the Kremlin to admit to their victims of terror within Russia that America is a humanitarian nation of people who have no quarrel with the Russian people.

Under the circumstances, it would be sheer folly and fantastic for us to turn over any surplus United States wheat to the Soviet bosses.

Once the gift was made, they'd laugh in our faces.

The Natural Law—The Family: The Basis of All Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the basis of all good government for orderly society, for the greatest good for the greatest number springs from the family unit, which springs from the natural law. Any government that overlooks the family or subordinates it to the state—the state which depends upon its very existence because of the family unit, controverts the natural law and thereby becomes a dictatorship, an oligarchy, an oppressive government, against the family and the natural law.

Communism in the Russian Soviet Union and Red China are classic examples of the type of government which denies the family unit and violates the natural law. In these governments the state is supreme and all family units are pawns of and are dominated by the supreme state.

The United States is the direct opposite, we recognize the family unit as the basis of and the reason for the existence of the state and we also recognize that the family unit permits the state to exist and can abolish it, if the state violates the natural law. Here the family unit is supreme, not the state.

The following statement by Dr. William V. Lawlor is a clear and easily understandable expression of the importance of the family unit and its place in and relation to Government. The United States Constitution recognizes the great power and value of the natural law and the family unit in this free and independent Nation:

There is no authority or agency operated by the State that does not spring from the basic unit of society—the family. There is no organization or agency or power within the State or beyond it that has any claim to validity unless it operates in conformity with that natural law that has dictated the very existence of the family.

Just as the parent has the right to delegate his authority to the various segments of society, so has he the right to withdraw it. When the parent sees the State or any of its segments violating that natural law, he has not only the right to withdraw such authority, but he has a duty to withdraw it. * * * The preservation of the family, operating according to the moral code upon which it is founded, is the only fundamental excuse for the very existence of the State.

Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, many times during each session we are given many opportunities to hear our colleagues speak outside the Halls of Congress. We all receive many invitations, and, time permitting, we usually attend. I had the pleasure yesterday of hearing one of the finest such talks I have heard since coming to Congress. It was delivered by our very esteemed colleague from Ohio, Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, I call this talk to your attention because it serves as a caution to all of us:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, OF OHIO, BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SOCIETY, SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, FEBRUARY 22, 1955, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, when my good friend, Colonel Baxter, extended the invitation to me to be with you here today I broke a rule established some time ago not to make public appearances such as this while Congress is in session and promptly accepted. I did so, not only because of my high regard for the colonel, and my recognition of the Sons of the American Revolution as one of our greatest patriotic organizations, but also because I have reached the place where it has become virtually impossible for me to sit quietly on the floor of the United States House of Representatives while some Member goes through the mockery of reading George Washington's Farewell Address to a legislative body which, in recent years, has consistently failed or refused to heed, or to pay attention, to the advice and warnings given by the Father of our Country in that address.

So, on this 223d anniversary of the birth of the immortal Washington, I shall not devote my time to, or bore you with, repeating the usual tributes to the Father of our Country. Instead I have chosen the subject Then and Now, and shall attempt to give a rather condensed comparison of our beloved country and its Government, as it existed at the end of Washington's first term as President, and as it exists today.

Washington, as you will recall, took office as President, under our newly created system of representative Government as defined by the Constitution, in April of 1789.

At the end of his first term, in 1793, the United States was made up of 15 States, 2 of which had been added to the original 13. They were—Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, and Virginia. Of these only Kentucky lay west of

the Alleghanies. Today, as you all well know, the Union consists of 48 States, embracing all of the land and territory between the Atlantic on the east, the Pacific on the west, Canada on the north, and Mexico on the south. But even now legislation is pending in the Congress to admit into the Union, two additional Territories as States—Hawaii and Alaska—neither of which is contiguous to any of the 48 States. And in addition, of course, Texas has the right, under the Annexation Agreement, to divide into five States any time that great empire may wish to do so.

The first United States census was taken in 1790, and fixed the population of the United States at 3,929,000. By the time the 1800 census was taken the fledgling Republic, had grown in population by 1,400,000—or by more than 34 percent—to a total of 5,308,000 people.

According to the first census and during Washington's Presidency, Virginia was the most populous State, having a population of 748,000, almost twice that of any other. Pennsylvania was next in population, having 434,000 persons within its borders. North Carolina was third, with 394,000, and New York—believe it or not—ranked only fourth, with a population of 340,000.

Back in Washington's time the Federal Government had its national headquarters in Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love, although the Father of our Country was even then planning the establishment of a new Federal City which was later to bear his name, in the District of Columbia—a 10-mile square area to be carved out of the States of Maryland and Virginia—along his beloved Potomac and near his home at Mount Vernon.

Under the Constitution, upon which the new system of government headed by Washington was established, and which, of course, is still in effect, each State has two Senators representing it in the United States Senate.

So, during Washington's administration the membership of the Senate totaled only 30, as compared to the present-day membership of 96. The House of Representatives consisted of 105 Members, based upon the census of 1790. Today, and for more than three decades past, the United States House of Representatives has had 435 Members, also apportioned on a population basis.

During Washington's first term the individual Member of Congress represented an average district population of about 40,000 people. Today each Member of Congress represents an average of nearly 400,000 persons—somewhere around 380,000 to be more accurate.

Back in the days when the new Republic was just getting underway, a Member of Congress did not have as many duties and responsibilities, or as much correspondence to handle, or messenger work to do for his constituents, as during the present time, but he certainly had a great deal more difficulty getting to his job at the Nation's Capital. It may be of interest to know that in journeying to Philadelphia for the meeting of the first Congress in 1790, 1 Member of Congress was shipwrecked, 2—and I quote, "were forced to land with considerable difficulty on Cape May and travel the remaining way to Philadelphia in a wagon"—end of quote; 2 Members suffered grave injuries when a stagecoach upset; and 1 reported he was—and again I quote, "forced to travel by ship for 16 days through perpetual storms with serious and painful effect upon my digestive apparatus."

Those who served in the early Congresses of Washington's time did not need as much clerical help as we do today, for the only means of communication between Philadelphia and the various congressional districts of the United States, as well as the rest of the world, were: (1) The new and negligible postal service, (2) by special messenger, (3) quote, "any trustworthy person who happened to be traveling in the right direction," unquote, and, (4) masters of sailing vessels.

In fact, the postal service was, not only new, but most irregular, in those days. At the very best, according to the records, it took from 4 to 7 days to get a letter from Boston to New York, around 13 days for a letter mailed in Philadelphia to reach Georgia, and at least 20 days for a Kentucky Congressman to get a letter from Philadelphia back to his home district in the blue grass State. Such time schedules were kept, of course, only if everything went right, and quite often there were long and serious delays. For instance, a letter written by Governor Telfair of Georgia to Thomas Jefferson, posted January 2, 1791, did not reach its destination until March 4—61 days later.

Of course, foreign communication was even more difficult, for to complete an exchange of correspondence between America and Europe, back in those days, required an average of about 6 months. And difficulties often arose through capture, pirating or shipwreck, which resulted in the loss of much overseas mail.

While George Washington was President, Members of the House and Senate of the United States received the munificent salary or pay of $6 a day for their services, as compared to the $15,000 annual salary now paid Members of Congress, and to the $25,000 salary provided in the new Federal pay legislation which cleared the House last week.

So, perhaps many of us who now serve on Capitol Hill should be grateful, not only for the difference in pay, but also for the difference in travel conditions, which now permit a Representative or Senator from California to leave his western home in the early morning and arrive in Washington in time for the opening of the Congressional session at 12, noon, of the same day.

But many present-day Members of Congress may be none too appreciative of the great improvement which has taken place in the Nation's postal service since the time of Washington. For instance, our modern postal service brings an average of 400 communications of different types to my office each day, all requiring the attention of myself and my secretarial staff. And believe it or not, there are times when my congressional mail reaches a grand total of 1,500 to 2,000 pieces in a single day.

During his first term as President, Washington had a cabinet consisting of 4 members, as compared to the 10 in the Eisenhower Cabinet. They were the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson; Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton; Secretary of War, Henry Knox; and Attorney General, Edmund Randolph. In addition, President Washington had a Postmaster General, Timothy Pickering, who was not a member of the Cabinet. Vice President John Adams had little work to do, and did not encounter too much difficulty in presiding over the Senate, with a membership of 30, for the short time it was in session.

The executive branch of the Government, under Washington, was made up of three departments—State, Treasury, and War. Today, as I mentioned a moment ago, President Eisenhower has ten members in his Cabinet, representing as many departments, and in addition the Director of Mobilization, the Director of the Budget, and the Director of Foreign Operations Administration, sit with the Cabinet regularly, while the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, frequently join the group.

So actually today, on this Washington's birth anniversary of 1955, our Government is made up of 13 departments and 48 independent agencies, boards, and commissions, which, in turn, include another 2,133 different operating components to which personnel assignments are made.

You may be interested to know that, when Washington was President, the Treasury Department maintained the most extensive establishment, with agencies and officials in every large town, and in every section of the country. There were tax collectors then, even as now, though not in nearly as great a number. Our original Treasury Department, of course, had the responsibility, not only for the routine conduct of the young Nation's fiscal affairs, but also for such diverse functions as the collection of customs and tonnage dues; establishment of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers, registration and clearance of vessels; carrying of mail; surveying of public lands in the western territory; supervision of the banks of the United States; the granting of bounties on fish; and the collection of excise and other taxes.

Washington's War Department, besides operating and managing the Army, handled payment of pensions to disabled war veterans; regulated trade with the Indians; made grants of land to veterans, and regulated the militia of the several States.

The Department of State, then had as its primary duty, the conduct of our foreign affairs, as it does now. But it also granted patents and copyrights, supervised Federal marshals and attorneys, helped govern the Western territories, managed the Mint, took the census, and performed other miscellaneous functions.

The United States Attorney General, although he attended Cabinet meetings, had almost no administrative and few legal duties. It was not until the end of Washington's service as President that the Congress became magnanimous and furnished an office for the Attorney General, and generously appropriated funds to hire a clerk for him.

By the end of Washington's first term the Federal Government had established some nine different field services, outside of the Military Establishments and territorial governments. These services included Customs, Lighthouses, Attorneys of the United States, Federal Marshals, Post Offices, Revenue Cutter service, Indian Superintendents, Commissioners of Loans, and—believe it or not—the Internal Revenue Service.

Even back in those days, the United States had a so-called civil service covering civilian employment totaling 780 persons, not including the Deputy Postmasters of whom about 660 worked for the Department of Treasury. It may be interesting to note that as of last December the total number of civilian employees of the Federal Government, according to our mutual friend Senator BYRD, and his Joint Committee on Federal Expenditures, stood at 2,368,073.

But back in Washington's time the central Government's office staffs, located in Philadelphia remained small, and most Federal employees worked out in the field. For example, the largest Department of Government at that time—the Treasury Department—had only 70 persons employed at its departmental headquarters in Philadelphia. State Department personnel consisted of 5 clerks, 1 interpreter, 1 doorkeeper, and 1 messenger, in addition to the Secretary of State himself.

At the end of Washington's service as President, the War Department had grown to where it had a central staff of 17 people—believe it or not—while Postmaster General Pickering performed all of the duties of his governmental position in 2 rooms of his own home, with the aid of 1 assistant and 1 clerk.

President Washington and the United States had diplomatic representatives in just five major foreign capitals—London, Paris, The Hague, Madrid, and Lisbon.

Most Federal officers of that time received their official income from two main sources, salaries and fees. Today the fee system, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, as well as in most States, has been entirely eliminated. President Washington drew the

highest salary of all the Federal officials of his day—$25,000 annually, plus some expenses, which amounted to much less than his salary. The Secretaries of State and Treasury each received a salary of $3,500 annually; while the Secretary of War drew but $1,500. Perhaps the Secretary of War's low pay was accounted for by the fact that the United States was not then trying to feed, finance, and police the entire world, and uniformed Americans were not serving in more than 75 different lands outside continental United States. Under Washington, who appears to have been a frugal man, the Comptroller of the Treasury of the United States and the Governor of the Northwest Territory, each drew salaries of $2,000, while the Clerk of the House and Senate received the magnificent yearly amount of $500 each.

Most Federal officials of that period—outside of the ones just mentioned—were compensated for their services through fees. Some did quite well. For instance, a number of the collectors of customs had higher annual incomes from fees than the Secretary of the Treasury received in salary. At the other end of the line, however, many postmasters in small towns were paid as little as $25 per year.

As Commander in Chief, Washington had under him an Army of about 5,000 men, but no Navy or armed ships of any kind, until 1794. And I have been unable to find, from sources I believe to be reliable, where George Washington had any kind of an Air Force at all. Today our Army, Navy, and air services consist of well over 3 million men. But when George Washington, in his first term, moved to put down the so-called Whisky Rebellion in western Pennsylvania, he was compelled to enlist the aid of State militiamen, at a time when the States maintained complete control over the activities of their military units.

The Father of our Country, during his two administrations as President, did not have too much money with which to "play around," and certainly not the $60 to $100 billion yearly budgets which have been available to recent Presidents. During the 8 years of Washington's Presidency, Federal revenues averaged $5,717,000 annually, while—believe it or not—annual Federal expenditures during the same period averaged $5,776,000, which indicates that even the Father of our Country had to worry about "red ink," and Treasury deficits.

Most of the revenues of that day came from customs duties, and, later, from the first excise taxes which were imposed by Congress in 1791 on spirits distilled in the United States. It was this excise tax, by the way, which touched off the Whisky Rebellion. The Federal Government received only meager funds from postage, sale of public lands, fines, penalties, and forfeitures. And at the end of Washington's first term, the public debt of the United States totaled $70 million, or perhaps a few dollars more. Today our public debt stands at approximately $280 billion—or, to put it another way—280 thousand million dollars.

But to turn to our Government of today. You may recall it was my original idea and legislative bills which created both the First and Second Commissions on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, better known as the First and Second Hoover Commissions. You may also be aware that I served as a member on both Commissions, and have devoted more than 4 years of my life to the study of the organization and functions of the Federal Government, especially the executive branch.

You may be interested in knowing that, in comparison with the 3 postal workers of Washington's time, the Post Office Department now has 8,688 employees here in metropolitan Washington alone, and a total employment of 508,519 throughout the country; that the State Department now has 5,106 employees in Washington, and a total overall personnel of 21,061; that the United States, through its State Department, maintains 68 embassies and 9 legations in 77 foreign countries, in addition to the 106 consulates, which are administered in 105 foreign colonies, territories, and directorates. The Defense Department alone, including the Army, Navy, and Air Force, employs 1,144,994 civilians, of which some 340,000 are nationals of other nations, working overseas. In addition, of course, we have 3,300,000 Americans serving in our Armed Forces.

The Treasury Department has grown from its original 70 to where it now has 13,115 employees in Washington, and an overall employment of 79,459.

Of course, in addition to all of these departmental employment figures I have given you, the legislative branch of our Government has 4,113 employees, and the Federal judiciary 22,125.

You may also be interested in hearing some other facts which have been developed by our Hoover Commission and its task forces. Earlier I talked of travel in Washington's day. Well, today our Federal officials travel much farther and faster, and in more safety and comfort. According to the best information I can gather, not a single Government employee has been injured recently in a stagecoach upset—at least not during the present administration. But the latest reports do show that we have a little more than 261,000 motor vehicles being used by officials of the Federal Government, with an annual consumption of 29,418,577 gallons of gasoline. These vehicles, according to the General Services Administration, traveled the equivalent of 70,000 trips around the world during the past year—or about 1,800 million miles.

The Federal Government is doing something about the health of our citizens. At the present time we have 26 Federal departments and agencies engaged in one or more health programs, at an aggregate cost of approximately $4,200 million during the present fiscal year. Under them some 27 million Americans are receiving free medical service from the Government. Approximately 10 percent of all American doctors and dentists now work for the Federal Government.

And, of course, we have 104 different Government agencies loaning your money and mine, under one arrangement or another, not only to our own citizens, but to almost every foreign Government or activity in the world, wherever we can find anyone to take our cash. All of this, despite George Washington's warning against foreign entanglements. Yet we are now giving away free to other nations and peoples each year 1,000 times as much money as the entire Government cost to operate in Washington's time.

But before I close my remarks, I think you may be interested in knowing that our public debt, which I mentioned to you a moment ago as standing at $280 billion, equals the value of all taxable property of every kind and description west of the Mississippi River—and then some. Yet, at the same time our Federal Government owns considerable more property than it did when Washington was President. On June 30, 1954, the issuable personal property held and owned by the Federal Government amounted to $66,250,000,000, and this amount, of course, did not include such items as naval vessels, military weapons, vehicles, furniture, and other equipment in use; nor did it include our Government industrial installations—all of which are estimated to be worth an addition $48,500,000,000.

The overall inventory of the Federal Government's personal property actually totals, at cost price, more than the total inventory of our entire free-enterprise system, all combined.

And on top of all this, outside the public domain itself, our Federal Government today owns real property, purchased at the taxpayers' expense at one time or another, having a total estimated value of $30,500,000,000. So, all together our Government owns and possesses some $145 billion worth of property—which is a fairly good offset against our public debt—were it not for the fact that our Government has also incurred secondary obligations, or made promises to pay if someone else does not, an additional grand amount of $255 billion.

So, I cannot help but wonder, as I suspect you may be doing, just what the Father of our Country—the man whose anniversary and memory we honor here today—would think and say if he were to come back to earth this day, and look about him in this city bearing his name—look at the Government and the country he did so much to create and to establish. Would he think we had made real progress and, if so, in what direction? Would he find our present-day life better, more enjoyable, and less troublesome than in his day?

George Washington had his problems, as did the new Republic he headed. Modern-time Americans have their troubles and problems, too. What do you think? Are we, as Americans, doing as good a job of making free and representative Government work, all things considered, as did George Washington and his compatriots of 160 years ago?

Regardless of your views on the questions I have just propounded, I am sure all of you will agree there is a great difference between then and now.

The Ukrainian Insurgent Army: Prime Symbol of Freedom in the Russian Communist Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, students and observers of developments in the Communist empire have for a long time marveled at the patriotic tenacity and national exploits of the Ukrainian insurgent army in its heroic fight against Russian occupation of Ukraine. For 10 years, without any assistance from the free world, it fought the Communist enemy, both militarily and politically.

Since 1952, because of tremendous odds, it has continued its underground, patriotic struggle politically and through various propaganda channels. Periodic reports on its successes still continue to filter through the Iron Curtain. Not so long ago the British veteran soldier, William Piddington, who spent years in the Russian slave labor camps, attributed the widespread strikes in the Vorkuta camps to the Ukrainian underground movement—United Press release, Berlin, July 9, 1954. That such reports amply show the Ukrainian Insurgent Army to be truly in the vanguard of freedom's struggle behind the Iron Curtain, there can be no doubt.

Being intimately familiar with the imposing record of patriotic, national heroism on the part of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, it was my privilege last year to provide the introduction to the fascinating and informative book entitled "The Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Fight

for Freedom." This compact and factually packed work has furnished countless Americans with a genuine insight into the liberation struggle of the large Ukrainian nation against the domination of imperialist Moscow.

It is my pleasure now to insert in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, an address on the subject of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, before the Society of Veterans of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in United States of America, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City:

THE UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY: PRIME SYMBOL OF FREEDOM IN THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST EMPIRE

Anyone who has honestly and objectively reviewed the concrete and tangible evidence provided by the Ukrainian insurgent army in its truly heroic struggle against the tyranny of Moscow-centered communism can arrive at only one conclusion—that the Ukrainian insurgent army is the prime symbol of freedom in the Russian Communist Empire. The imposing record that it has built up in behalf of the forces of freedom behind the Iron Curtain is the object of respect on the part of many leading Lithuanians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Poles, Slovaks, and Hungarians. It is the object of keen interest on the part of numerous West European nations and many leading Americans. Above all, it is a shining tribute to the invincible urge and aspiration of the highly important Ukrainian nation to cast off the yoke of Russian Communist rule for genuine self-government, sovereignty, and independence.

Many notable events and developments over the past 12 years lend themselves to much sober reflection and appraisal of our own political behavior as a nation. It is significant that while the forces of the Ukrainian insurgent army were fighting since 1942 both the German Nazis and Russian Communists, the Western democracies, whether out of necessity or no, were incautiously allied with the totalitarian forces of the Soviet Union which, to add vinegar to salt, were widely publicized by some of our governmental agencies as being essentially democratic. The threat of the Red totalitarian menace had not yet struck home. But those whose national homes had been invaded, pillaged, and ravaged well knew that the struggle for freedom would not cease with the defeat of Nazi Germany and the elimination of its brand of totalitarianism. Those, like yourselves, who joined the ranks of the Ukrainian insurgent army to wage battle against both Russian Communist totalitarianism and the Nazi German type were in every sense of the word in the vanguard of the continued struggle for national and individual freedom. The patriotic sons and daughters of Lithuania, White Ruthenia, Poland, Slovakia, and others who aided and collaborated with the Ukrainian insurgent army, who were inspired by its tremendous truth that the Soviet Union is not and cannot be monolithic, are united in this vanguard of freedom.

In full and essential reality, the glorious Ukrainian insurgent army is the manifest historical projection of the continuous struggle of the large Ukrainian Nation for independence. Its spirit is the spirit of the patriot, the spirit of enlightened nationalism, the spirit that every true, patriotic American can easily recognize, sense, and uphold. Its will is one of natural resistance to a dehumanizing force that through skillful technologic means of systematic genocide is unalterably bent upon the destruction of nations, including our own country. The military battles that it fought during and after World War II, even to the point of necessitating the tripartite agreement among Moscow, Warsaw, and Prague to stamp out its military resistance, are feats of human glory that no historian of the contemporary fight for freedom will be able to ignore. The irresistible force of enlightened nationalism, so brilliantly and heroically crystallized in the unassisted exploits of the Ukrainian insurgent army, cannot be extinguished by the Red empire builders of Moscow. It is the basic force of freedom throughout the world today. It is the natural force that Russian Communist imperialism fears most, and seeks to destroy every form of its evidence, as in the case of the Ukrainian insurgent army. Enlightened nationalism—patriotism for God and country—is the preserver of our own nation. And it should be clearly understood that anyone who deliberately plays down the gallant expressions and evidences of enlightened nationalism in either the free world or in the slave world of the Russian Communist empire deserves to be questioned as to his true loyalty. The freedom of nations is as important as, and oftentimes a prerequisite to, the freedom of persons.

Despite the increasing disclosures of the aboveground and underground operations of the Ukrainian insurgent army in the 1940's, disbelief prevailed in the free world as to its very existence. Much of this was dispelled by the appearance of several of its members in Western Germany in 1947, living proof that under extreme hazards made its way from the depths of the Carpathian forests to convince the skeptical free world of the freedom fight being waged in the very front yard of imperialist Moscow. Still, as you and I know, there were some in this country who continued to disinform the American people as to the existence, no less the performances of the Ukrainian insurgent army. Curiously enough, representing themselves as anti-Communists, they repeated here the denials of Stalin and the Kremlin as to the existence of any such army and its resistance forces in Ukraine and elsewhere. It is this same Russia-first clique in this country, made up of certain Russian emigre writers and politicians, their unwitting American friends, and the most loyal followers of Mr. Kennan, that today argues against any utilization of the powerful centrifugal forces, as represented by the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, for the defeat of Russian communism. By their words and deeds, they appear to be Russia first, in its basic territorial empire and its present power, rather than America first, in its proclaimed universal independence of all nations.

The perseverance and continued existence of the Ukrainian insurgent army, now an underground in political rather than military warfare, is a thorn in the side of Kennanism and its advocates of the myth of peaceful coexistence. Despite the change in the administration of our Government, this breed is still heavily entrenched in the State Department, and influences greatly the foreign policy of our Nation. It would like to see no policy formulated toward the Soviet Union other than the one of status quo. But so long as resistance continues on the part of the Ukrainian insurgent army and on the part of other non-Russian groups in the Soviet Union, the day cannot be long postponed when such a formulation will become necessary. The opportunity and capacity for resistance, as exemplified by the Ukrainian insurgent army, constitute also the basis of justification for a sound policy of liberation which, sooner or later, must come to pass. It it should come to pass too late, it might well fall short of success.

The expansion of national political undergrounds in the Russian Communist empire is in the crucial interest of our Nation. Aid and assistance for such expansion can only be provided through a policy of liberation interpreted solely as a continuous process of political warfare on the terrain of the Russian Communist empire. Given time—the chief commodity they are seeking today with their New Look of peaceful coexistence—the Russian Communists can attain to a superior advantage of position over us, in spite of all of our alliances, in spite of all of our nuclear weapons. Once their empire is consolidated and the sources of national resistance with leadership reduced to a shell, this position will have been formed for aggression with reasonable expectation of success. Present containment facilitates this: the policy of liberation, with its premium on resistance groups, can obstruct this and save nations from destruction.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We pause in this moment, O God, to recognize Thy sovereignty over us. Help us always to remember that we are the sheep of Thy pasture, the people of Thy hand.

We thank Thee for the air of freedom that Americans are privileged to breathe. We thank Thee that among our other freedoms, we are free to worship Thee as we choose. Men have died to prevent Hitler, or any other person, from taking that freedom from us. Help us not to neglect a freedom that has been purchased for us at such an awful price.

We thank Thee that here every person is considered a child of Thine. Help us, therefore, in our efforts to achieve and maintain liberty and justice, not for just a chosen few, but for all. May the decisions that are made here this day be pleasing in Thy sight, and become effective in lifting mankind to new levels of joy and hope. And whether we pray in Jesus' name, or in the name of the religion in which He worshiped, help us to come to Thee humbly, believing that Thou will give guidance to all who sincerely seek it. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Avery	Buckley	McGregor
Baker	Cooley	Meader
Bass, N. H.	Eberharter	Norblad
Bolton, Oliver P.	Engle	Powell
Bow	Gross	Prouty
Brooks, La.	Keating	Robsion, Ky.
	Kee	Scrivner

Shelley Mich. Young
Smith, Wis. Wainwright
Thompson, Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I move that the bills (H. R. 4260 and H. R. 4261) to create a Federal highway corporation for financing the construction of the national system of interstate highways; to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented; and for other purposes, be re-referred from the Committee on Public Works to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 87, noes 131.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was rejected.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report voted unanimously this morning that 15 days be allowed the committee to file the final report on the Economic Report of the President, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until March 15 to file its report.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman say that that was unanimously agreed to by the committee?

Mr. PATMAN. It is a unanimous request. The request is made pursuant to section 5A, Public Law 304 of the 79th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

IN CLOSING MILLS AMERICAN WOOLEN MUST ANSWER FOR HUMAN LOSS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there is no provision for social responsibility in the decision of the American Woolen Co. to close out its three large mills in Greater Lawrence, Mass.

There is no consideration of the human loss.

We deplore the announcement by Joseph B. Ely, president of the American Woolen Co., who was given overwhelming support by these textile workers some years ago when he became a Democratic Governor of Massachusetts, that the Wood, Ayer, and Shawsheen Mills of Greater Lawrence would be liquidated.

These mills had a normal employment of 7,200 by a conservative estimate. Many of these workers have given their lives to this occupation.

Some of them, now middle-aged, will never be able to find jobs to replace the ones they have lost unless the closed mills are taken over by other industries.

My point is that the American Woolen Co. cannot abandon these displaced workers. It cannot just lock up the mills and depart, shrugging off all responsibility for the loyal workers it has left behind.

It should make arrangements to have new industries take over these empty mills before it says goodby.

In the past, we have asked the officials of the American Woolen Co., who are now part of Textron American, Inc., which resulted from the recent merger of American Woolen, Robbins Mills, and Textron, Inc., to act on one of the following alternatives:

First. To keep 1 or all of the 3 mills operating in the production of textiles.

Second. To gradually adapt them to the production of goods other than textiles.

Third. To arrange for the sale of these properties to growth industries that will absorb the displaced textile workers.

But the American Woolen Co. refused to cooperate.

Enlightened American industry does not limit itself to the balance sheet.

Raw materials, wages, plant, machinery, sales, taxes, profits, dividends, these do not end its responsibilities.

There are also the human costs and sacrifices.

The textile industry cannot escape its moral obligations to the workers who have stood by it in good times and bad, investing not merely money, but brain and brawn and skill and faith—the essence of their lives—in an enterprise that they believed would never let them down abruptly and completely.

The challenge of the guaranteed annual wage is coming up from the horizon, to test the partnership between the auto and steel industries and their respective employees.

But what elemental security is available for textile workers who are told by management that there is no hope—not even for a day's work—because mills are posted with no trespassing signs so that runaway management can build pilot plants far away?

Mr. Ely, who will become chairman of the executive committee of the consolidation to be known as Textron American, was quoted as saying:

> You must remember that this is a business operation, and we have a responsibility to our stockholders.

But Mr. Ely made no mention of the responsibility toward displaced workers. And Mr. Royal Little, who is to be the new board chairman, has no comment.

A hint of a solution may be found in the fact that one of the companies in the three-way merger—Textron—has been gradually moving into other nontextile lines. Most of Textron's earnings during the past year came from this new production.

Why cannot Textron American adapt the Wood, Ayer, and Shawsheen Mills of Greater Lawrence to the production of goods other than textiles in order to keep faith with our workers?

Today, February 24, the directors of the new corporation plan to meet in New York.

Since the end of World War II, 640 textile mills in New England have closed their gates permanently.

Mergers are closing others and absorbing those that will continue to operate, thus concentrating control: American Woolen-Robbins-Textron, M. Lowenstein-Wamsutta, and others. In all of these cases, survival through streamlined efficiency and resumption of earnings is given as the reason.

But many of the merged companies, although losing money during the past several years, have considerable assets and reserves which leads us to believe that powerful forces are behind these mergers—a handful of overambitious men who have little or no regard for the human pawns in the game of pyramiding wealth and economic power.

Monopoly? Conceivably so.

These textile giants have demonstrated no concern for the economic and human loss that has been left in the wake of their maneuvers, as they battle for supremacy in the textile field. The situation calls for a thorough congressional investigation, because no financial manipulations that benefit a few, by taking jobs away from tens of thousands of people, can ever be tolerated by the Government of the United States which has authority to prevent or restrain monopolistic practices under the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission.

Therefore, I am introducing a resolution calling for an immediate and searching investigation by a proper committee of the House of Representatives into the motives and the far-reaching effects of monopolistic mergers in the textile industry—mergers that are junking mills and machines and human beings.

A NOTABLE BEQUEST

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Hon. S. W. Arnold, a former Member of the House, calls attention to an article by the widely read columnist, Peter Edson, relative to the bequest left by the late Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. As will be recalled, Justice Holmes, a son of the beloved poet, Oliver Wendell Holmes, one of the outstanding

figures in American literature, served on the Supreme Bench for nearly a third of a century, and on his death in 1935, left a substantial portion of his estate to the United States as a token of his gratitude and appreciation of the Government under which it had been his privilege to live.

When finally probated the bequest amounted to $263,288.20. It is a matter of surprise to learn that this generous and patriotic legacy to the Nation was apparently placed on deposit without interest, and after lying there for approximately 20 years is still $263,288.20.

Had it been invested in Government bonds, the most elementary form of safe keeping, the interest on it would have by this time exceeded $150,000.

Sometime after the receipt of the legacy a joint resolution was passed by the Congress providing for the expenditure of the fund in the establishment near the Supreme Court building on Capitol Hill of an Oliver Wendell Holmes memorial garden. The construction of such a memorial was estimated to cost $400,000 and as the bequest was $136,711.80 short of this amount, the matter was dropped, and seems to have been entirely forgotten. Had this gracious and generous contribution by one of America's great jurists received even the most casual attention, the income from the fund would by this time have more than supplied the amount necessary for the memorial.

Mr. Speaker, no condemnation is too severe for the dereliction which up to this time has completely vitiated one of the most remarkable and inspiring incidents in the history of the Republic.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, in order to inquire about the program for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, it was agreed between the leadership on both sides that in relation to the tax bill the debate will be confined to the rule and after a rule is adopted there will be 4 hours of general debate. Then we will go over until tomorrow for further consideration of the bill as provided in the rule under the 5-minute rule for final passage. In other words, there will be general debate today.

If opportunity presents itself thereafter, we will take up the GI voting bill, about which I understand there is not very much controversy. I would like to bring it up because we want to get through with it as quickly as possible. I understand there are legislatures meeting in 44 States, and it is necessary that they have as early an opportunity as possible to enact State legislation to implement and carry out the Federal act which we will pass.

If the conferees on the pay-raise bill agree in time, that will be brought up after general debate.

EXPENSES INCIDENT TO INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 31) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be made pursuant to House Resolution 30 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs), acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 89) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 88 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Amend the title so as to read: "To provide funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 118."

With the following committee amendment:

Line 2, page 1, following the word "That", insert "effective January 4, 1955."

Line 2, strike "House Resolution 88" and insert "House Resolution 118."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI (8)

Mr. BURLESON. By direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 110) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1955, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $495,000, including employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "January 3, 1955" and insert "January 4, 1955."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 128) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 4, 1955, the expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 35, 84th Congress, incurred by the Select Committee To Investigate and Study the Benefits Provided Under Federal Law for the Survivors of Deceased Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces, not to exceed $35,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held by such select committee in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise engaged.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Ad-

ministration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 129) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 63 of the 84th Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 131) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, in carrying out its duties during the 84th Congress, the Committee on the District of Columbia is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $2,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STENOGRAPHER TO THE POSTMASTER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 140) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective March 1, 1955, one position as messenger, Office of the Postmaster, at the basic salary rate of $1,940 per annum shall be vacated and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic salary rate of $2,300 per annum for the employment of a stenographer to the Postmaster of the House.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVENUE ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 153 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Way and Means or one amendment to strike out all after line 17, page 4, of the bill, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment except pro forma amendments which shall be in order. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule that has just been called up is one providing for the consideration of the so-called tax bill that has been a matter of quite a bit of discussion recently. I hope I may have the attention of the Members of the House because they will all be interested in knowing how this rule will operate. I want to explain this rule because it is a little bit unusual.

Ordinarily the Ways and Means Committee has a fully closed rule. In this case the Rules Committee has reported for your consideration a closed rule with one exception. That exception is that the bill will be subject to one amendment only. That will be an amendment striking out the provision relating to the $20 tax reduction. The amendment will be offered subject to the rules of the House under the 5-minute rule. That is, pro forma amendments only will be in order to that amendment. I hope that is clear to everyone.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to talk a little bit about the merits of the bill itself. It is quite important for the Members here to realize just what we are proposing to do to the country by this bill. I may say that I know it is a Democratic bill and I do not like to oppose the Democratic Party. I have been a Democrat longer than most of the people who sit around me and I do not oppose a Democratic measure unless I think it is in the best interests of my country to do so.

May I state here that this is a very dangerous thing for you to do, and I address myself to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the House particularly. We have been running a deficit in this country for some 20 years or more. We are gradually and consistently and continuously going deeper and deeper into debt for future generations to pay.

What we are proposing to do here by this bill is to borrow money to be paid by future generations for the purpose of reducing taxes for the present generation and I might say—I do not want to be sarcastic—to reduce the taxes for the present generation of voting age. This is too serious a subject for us to play politics with.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, we ought to analyze just what we are doing here in dollars and cents. It has been said that we are going to continue the corporation tax and the excise tax and then we are going to give the people a little sop in the way of a reduction of $20 which will not cost as much and, therefore, the Treasury will gain. That sounds very nice, but what we are actually doing is retaining the corporate and excise taxes for only 1 year with a retention of the $2,800,000,000; but you are reducing taxes and reducing the revenues of this country permanently at the rate of $2,300,000,000 a year.

In other words, for the continuation of one tax for 1 year you are reducing taxes permanently to the extent of $2.3 billion a year. I think that when we sit down with our consciences and think this thing over carefully and think what we ought to do, we are going to say that we ought not to reduce these taxes until the budget is balanced. My friends on the Democratic side, I think between now and the time you vote on this amendment, in your consciences you have got to sit down and study this thing pretty carefully. Yes; I know the Members of the House want to do what is right, and I am not going to criticize anybody for the position that they take. In speaking to you here today I speak only my own sentiments and what I think, and I know that other Members here are just as conscientious about their duties and responsibilities as I am. All I ask you to do is to analyze this proposition that is put before you, and do not think about whether this is going to benefit the Democrats or is going to do harm to the Republicans. I think in a matter of this importance we ought not to be concerned about that any more than we ought to be concerned when we vote on a declaration of war, because unless you have a sound financial system in this country, if you break this Government, it is just as bad as war, if not worse.

All I am saying to you now is, I would just like to ask you to give it serious consideration when this vote comes. Forget politics. There were many of us here last year who, when our friends the Republicans proposed a tax reduction, voted against it. Why can we not forget politics when it is a Democratic proposal and do what is in the best interest of our country? I think when the time comes and the chips are down, knowing the Members of this House as I do know them, and knowing the consciences that guide them in the welfare of their country, they are going to do the right thing; at least, what I think is the right thing.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. As I understand the gentleman, the gentleman does not think that this is a wise thing to do in

1955 and does not think it is the right thing to do in 1956, or any other time, until the budget is balanced. Is that it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is exactly my position.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think we should do it at all until we have the fiscal affairs of this country in a safe position, and God knows they are in the most dangerous position now that they could be, and anything that you do in the way of further unbalancing this budget is going to increase the pressure of inflation. This $20, this little money that we are handing out to our constituents, is not going to buy much when you increase this terrible inflationary spiral.

Let me also say this to you, and then I am through: I have a philosophy about taxation that is probably not shared by many of my friends, and I can respect their beliefs about it. I have the philosophy that in order to have good citizenry, thoughtful citizenry, people who are interested in our Government, every person should pay some tax, however small, in order that he might have an interest in the fiscal affairs of his country. Do you know that if you pass this bill today, you will take 5 million taxpayers off the tax rolls? And do you realize that you take away from those 5 million taxpayers the high privilege of participating in carrying on and sustaining the finances of their Government?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has explained the rule. This rule provides for 1 hour under the rule and 4 hours of general debate on the bill. I do not believe that much can be added to the American philosophy just expounded by that great American. The first section is the title. The second section deals with the extension of the corporation tax rate which will bring the United States Treasury $1,750,000,000; and the third section deals with the extension of excise taxes which will bring the Government another $1 billion.

I know of no one who is opposed to the first three sections of this bill, but there are many who oppose section 4 which gives a $20 credit and would take 4,987,000 income tax payers completely off of the rolls.

It was stated before the Committee on Rules that individuals making as much as $5,000 a year would be exempted from paying any income tax at all.

What is the condition of this country? We owe $278 billion. It has been estimated that we are going to go into the red by another $2,400,000,000 this fiscal year. In addition to that, we know that we are in a precarious world condition. So I ask you on the one hand what possible logic can there be in continuing taxes which would bring in $1,750,000,000 from corporations and continuing excise taxes which would bring in $1 billion, and then on the other hand in the same bill reducing taxes in the amount of $1 billion?

I wish to speak about section 4. Using the simple process of arithmetic, $20 a year means 37 cents a week; that is all it amounts to, just a little more than it costs to purchase a package of cigarettes. With my good friend from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I cannot conceive how any American would be unwilling, in these precarious times, to contribute 37 cents a week for our military, to provide the best equipment possible for those who are in the armed services; to provide good food and clothing; to provide for our disabled veterans and their widows or orphans; to provide for unfortunate, old people.

I repeat, I cannot conceive of any real American who would feel on the one hand that they should have those deserved advantages and on the other hand say, "I refuse, I am unwilling to pay 37 cents a week toward their provision; just let the other person pay."

The press of the country have called section 4 such things as "pie a la mode;" "lack of financial stability;" and "$20 prizes." I am not going into that matter, but I do want to make a few observations.

There were no hearings on this section 4. The Committee on Ways and Means met. I think it was agreed and understood that they would consider the extension of the corporation taxes and the excise taxes. According to the best information I have, not a responsible person on the other side of the Capitol, not one responsible person knew about it, but last Saturday this amendment was hurriedly added.

The bill provides for a reduction of these taxes 6 months from now. It starts next January. The Committee on Appropriations has not brought even one bill before the House of Representatives for consideration. Many of my Democratic friends are always voting for amendments to increase appropriations; to put the Government in the red even more. They want to spend more for everything. All of which would increase that $2,400,000,000 deficit. I repeat no appropriation bill has come before the Congress so we really do not know what the deficit will be.

Some say the President has stated that he hopes to reduce taxes next year. I venture to say that if you appropriate more in this Congress for military purposes and other things the deficit will be much larger than $2,400,000,000, and the President next year will not be coming in here asking for a tax reduction.

I sincerely believe that this body under these conditions should not vote for section 4 of this bill. If we do a good job and cut down expenditures this year, and world conditions change so that we do not need to spend as much as we now contemplate for military equipment, let the leaders on both sides of the aisle, the Democratic leaders and the Republican leaders, come in here together next January and then, if after considered judgment they feel there should be a tax reduction, it could be done.

In conclusion, let me say this. The President of the United States has come out for peace and prosperity. We all hope for peace. We all hope for prosperity. But as long as we do not have financial stability, I think you will all agree that we will not have prosperity.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman said that if there was a deficit this year he did not anticipate the President would ask for a reduction next year, in 1956. Pursuing that, under the facts the gentleman has related, may I ask him if he could possibly envision any state of affairs in the year 1956 where the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would support a tax cut in 1956?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I cannot envision that, if the appropriations this year through the enlargement of the Army, and some on the Democratic side have come out for an increase as high as 100,000 more in the Army, and other benefits and handouts which would increase the appropriations so that the deficit this fiscal year would amount to much more than $2,400,000,000. Speaking only for myself, I certainly would not favor a tax reduction even next year under such circumstances.

Mr. FORRESTER. Would not the gentleman agree that the argument that is advanced by the gentleman now for 1955 would in the very nature of things have to be applicable for the year 1956? If we take that view today we should take it in 1956 also?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman favor tax reduction at any time before we have a balanced budget?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not under the present world conditions.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that in line with the views of the gentleman a year ago?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes. The 82d Democratic Congress in 2 years appropriated $187 billion. The 83d Republican Congress reduced that $187 billion appropriated by the 82d Congress down to $123 billion, a saving of $63 billion. Many of us on this side of the aisle, I am convinced, thought that was a wonderful reduction. We thought we would be able to make further reductions in taxes. Then along came the Formosa situation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest Presidential messages ever sent to this Congress in my lifetime by any President contains these immortal words:

> The Nation is deeply gratified by the immediate response given yesterday by the Congress to the necessity for drastic action to restore and improve our banking system. A like necessity exists with respect to the finances of the Government itself which requires equally courageous, frank, and prompt action.

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was $462 million.

For the fiscal year 1932 it was $2,472,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1933 it will probably exceed $1,200,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1934, based on the appropriation bills passed by the last Congress and the estimated revenues, the deficit will probably exceed $1 billion unless immediate action is taken.

Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of $5 billion.

With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy.

I want to invite your attention to those words which were true when they were uttered, and which are true today, and all history and the experience of all governments has demonstrated time and again the truthfulness and the soundness of this advice:

Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rest the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It, therefore, becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. Too often—

I want you to listen carefully to these words especially you who call yourselves liberals—

Too often in recent history, liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy.

Can there be any question about the lessons of history that governments which lack the courage and the honesty to balance their outgo with their income will ultimately be destroyed? Has not the experiment of extravagance and loose fiscal policy resulted invariably in the destruction of freedom wherever and whenever it has been tried?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman failed to state what President made that statement.

Mr. DIES. That message is by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

If those words were true, when we had a public debt of $5 billion, how much more true is it today with a national debt of $278 billion. The American people should be credited with sense, and certainly with patriotism. Do you believe for 1 minute that the American people who are constantly struggling to balance their budgets in their homes and in their businesses and in their everyday affairs will respect our intelligence and our integrity when, in the face of an enormous public debt and a great deficit, we reduce taxes for political purposes? Not only do we have this debt which our children must pay, but we have the prospect of more deficit this year. It seems to me that the greatness of a generation can be measured by the concern of its people for posterity. A generation which lives solely for itself, which thinks only in terms of immediate advantages and immediate profits, is not worthy of its offspring.

You and I have no moral right to continue to pile up enormous deficits. I voted against the tax-revision bill last year because it provided for reduction. I shall vote against this measure because it provides for reduction. I am not thinking of what will happen to me. I am thinking of my three sons and my grandchildren. I am thinking of the generation that is yet to come, a generation which will inherit a crushing debt as its legacy; and if we continue, what will be the result? The dollar has already lost half of its purchasing power. The dollar is the symbol of our Nation's honesty. When the dollar goes down, it means that the integrity of the Government has diminished. And who loses by it? Not the rich. The rich profit because of their equities, their ownership of stocks, and of lands, and farms, and property that steadily rises in monetary value with inflation. Where there were millionaires 10 years ago there are now billionaires, simply because the price of all lands, all property, and all stocks have skyrocketed as a result of the steady destruction of the honesty and integrity of the American dollar.

What do we face in the future? The greatest crisis in all history. I said on this floor in 1932, I said to this House, that in our age and generation we must struggle for survival; that the insidious forces of communism would not stop until they were either defeated or until the whole world was engulfed in the Red tide. I say to you that those of you who vainly hope that you can prevent the inevitable—I should not use the word "inevitable," because only God can decree inevitability—but a probable showdown between the evil forces of communism, dedicated to the destruction of freedom and liberty, with its heart and core being the conquest of the world, ignore the lessons of history. With such a thing as that facing you and me, with the probability that our cities will be bombed, shall we sit here in apathy, unconcerned and indifferent, and say, "Well, we Democrats have got to beat the Republicans to the draw? We suspect that the Republicans in 1956 will recommend tax reduction, for political purposes. Therefore, we Democrats are going to beat them to the draw."

I wish the President would come out four square and clearly state to the American people, "I will not support a reduction in taxes until the budget is balanced." I plead with him not to evade the issue, but to speak frankly. I believe that if the President will issue such an unqualified statement, the majority of Democrats in this House will oppose reduction, for I know that the members of my party are as patriotic and loyal to America as any one in our land. I know that those who believe in liberalism, in progressive government, who wish to move forward to meet the ever changing needs of the people, understand that the bedrock of all liberalism must be sound fiscal policies. If people demand increased governmental services, as they have during my public career as a Member of Congress, they must be prepared to pay for those services by increased taxes. It is dishonest and wrong that the burden, should fall upon our children and grandchildren.

I plead not for partisanship, not for political advantage, for it is a matter of little moment who wins a political election; those who exalt themselves today pass into oblivion tomorrow. The entire gallery to the rear of us is decorated with the portraits of speakers who have long since been forgotten in the maze of time. Presidents are forgotten, all men are forgotten; the only thing that endures and gives permanence to our lives is the consciousness of duty well done, and I appeal to the Democrats of this House as well as to the Republicans to forget partisanship and political advantage and what will happen to our own little petty political aspirations. This is a great nation given to us by the grace of God. We owe a solemn duty to our children to preserve it for them and for all who are yet to come. America, which has blessed so many of our people, given us an abundance of material and spiritual blessings, America with its goodness and its grandeur—you and I are its trustees; and today let us rise to the stature of statesmanship regardless of what we may think of party; let us remember the glorious heritage of the Democratic Party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIES. I thank the gentleman. Let us remember the immortal words spoken by President Roosevelt in 1933, and before him the words of Grover Cleveland, of Woodrow Wilson, of Thomas Jefferson, of all the great men who have led the Democratic Party, not along the road of bankruptcy and loose fiscal policy, not along the road of cheap politics, but toward the great destiny of our Nation. This is an oportunity for courage and for statesmanship, an opportunity that will not come perhaps again in this session; and I can assure you who may fear political reprisal that if we would only credit the people of this country with more intelligence and more honesty and speak frankly to them and tell them that they can never get something for nothing, that if they want social security and expanded governmental services, they must pay with their taxes, that they cannot get the money from the rich alone but that they themselves must contribute, each and every one of them, to the support of such a vast program, you will have nothing to fear from the voters. We cannot eat our cake and have it at the same time.

I have an abiding faith in the intelligence and honesty of the American electorate; and I for one do not hesitate to say to the people of my great State: I did not come to Congress to be a mountebank or charlatan; I am here to do my duty under God as I see it. I may make mistakes and probably have made many mistakes, but when the welfare and the future of my country is at stake, when its whole progress toward the great and grand destiny which lies ahead is in jeopardy, I shall not hesitate now nor at any time in my career to vote and to speak that which I believe will protect my children and my grandchildren and all the children of this generation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] for a consent request.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday the gentleman from Tennessee and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee [Mr. COOPER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] each introduced identical bills, H. R. 4200 and H. R. 4201, to extend for 1 year the excise and corporation income-tax rate which would otherwise be reduced automatically on April 1. These two extensions have been recommended by the President as necessary to the fiscal stability of the Nation.

On Friday it was first publicly announced that the Ways and Means Committee would meet on Monday morning and be presented with the so-called $20 tax-cut amendment.

The House Ways and Means Committee did meet on Monday and the amendment was adopted to H. R. 4200.

There have been no hearings of any kind on the subject of individual income-tax reduction. No one has had an opportunity to express views on this problem which would reduce the revenue for this year by $815 million and $2.3 billion a year thereafter. This will add almost a billion dollars to the deficit next year alone. It seems to me to be extremely dangerous to make this kind of a reduction without any hearings at all before the Ways and Means Committee. In my time in the House I cannot remember such a far-reaching measure being put through without any hearings of any kind. With the condition of the budget as it is, it means the Treasury would have to go into the market and borrow an additional $815 million in 1956 to finance this tax cut and apparently would have to borrow over $2 billion a year thereafter in order to allow these tax cuts to stay in effect.

Does it seem reasonable to anyone with the least financial responsibility at all that we should take this step without going into the matter thoroughly and giving everyone in our economy an opportunity to be heard?

In the second place, in the orderly process of doing business why should not this tax-cut provision be separated from the extension of the excise and corporation tax bill? That would allow this reduction to be heard on its merit and I am perfectly willing to have it heard in that manner and to give the bill every reasonable consideration.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to insert in the RECORD several newspaper articles upon this important matter in order that the House may have the benefit of thinking on the tax cut, from all over the United States:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 21, 1955]

BARGAIN-BASEMENT CAMPAIGNING

The Democrats, rather desperately shopping around for issues, have picked up a little thing in the political bargain basement that they hope will be cheap and popular. It is an across-the-board income tax cut of $20 for each taxpayer and dependent, to be tacked on to an administration measure extending corporation and excise taxes.

This is about as cynical a piece of petty politics as Washington has seen in a long while. It is certainly not justified by present budgetary prospects—the deficit would be increased from the $2.4 billion now expected to at least $3.1 billion. The impact of the measure would be extremely unequal, wiping out tax indebtedness in the lowest bracket and giving relief of a fraction of 1 percent to those paying the higher rates. By adding the tax cut as a rider to another bill, thus hoping to avoid a Presidential veto, the Democratic leadership is resorting to a device which is unsound in itself and completes a picture of shoddy dealing.

Speaker RAYBURN, after the cut was resolved upon by the Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee, announced that the reduction was aimed to help low and moderate income families. "They are the people who will put the money in circulation," he said. To which Representative REED, the ranking Republican member of the committee, retorted: "This would invite every man, woman, and child to line up in front of the Treasury and get a $20-handout. The American people do not expect or want a handout of this sort especially at the present time of international crisis."

The Eisenhower administration has been working earnestly to reduce the economic burdens which the crisis imposes, without endangering national security. It has endeavored to correct inequities in the tax structure on a sensible basis and, by cutting down unnecessary expenditures, to make possible, an eventual substantial saving to the taxpayer. This approach is not dramatic, but it is essential if the Nation is to have fiscal health, without impairment of essential services. Such an orderly and scientific effort to solve the country's financial problems stands in sharp contrast to the offhand, hasty and dangerous methods of the House Democrats.

Fortunately, one can expect that not every Democrat will join in this raid on the Treasury. Senator BYRD has already attacked the plan. Others may decide that the scheme is too transparent to succeed as a vote-getting device. The American people are wary of politicians bearing gifts. They know they will have to pay the bill in one form or another.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, 1955]

TAX CUTS A LA MODE

Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee engaged in a piece of capricious irresponsibility in approving an income-tax cut of $20 a person. It is dismaying to see Speaker RAYBURN and Floor Leader MCCORMACK lending their prestige to the disruptive kind of politicking. The chagrin of the Democrats over the administration's gambit in holding out hope of a tax cut in 1956 is, of course, understandable. The administration, too, has its eye on the 1956 campaign, and it attempted to steal the Democrats' thunder. The difference is that a cut at the end of this year would play hob with a budget already submitted. It comes with ill grace for the Democrats to be talking about greater defense expenditures and chiding the administration about an unbalanced budget, and then voting to unbalance the budget further.

Moreover, the cut is unnecessary as an economic stimulant. The economy has recovered from the recession, and the pious concern for the plight of low-income taxpayers has far more political than economic justification at this time. All groups benefited from the tax cuts last year. If a further reduction were warranted now, a broad interest in keeping the economy expanding would call for permitting the scheduled reduction in corporation taxes and the elimination of certain excises to take effect. The administration has opposed even these reductions in the current year, and possibly the Democratic strategy is to put the administration over a barrel by giving it a choice of accepting a $20 per person cut or a lapse in the higher corporation rate that could be exploited demagogically. The hope of curbing this jag of irresponsibility seems to lie in the Senate and in the statesmanship of such men as Senators GEORGE and BYRD.

[From the New York Times of February 24, 1955]

POLITICAL HANDOUT

Led by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the Democrats of the House of Representatives seem ready to act on the belief that it's politically smart to offer to every man, woman, and child in the United States a $20 cut in his Federal income-tax bill. This reduction may win a few votes for the Democrats next year; but it is our hope and belief that more Americans will be revolted than pleased by this irresponsible action.

It is irresponsible, as every Member of the House from Speaker RAYBURN down must know, because it would wipe out most of the returns from the proposed extension of present corporation and excise-tax rates. It is irresponsible because this Government is still running at a huge deficit despite valiant efforts of the present administration to bring the budget into balance. It is irresponsible because it is precisely the kind of action that promotes inflationary forces, just at a time when the price level has achieved stability. It is irresponsible because it fosters the idea that we're all getting something for nothing when in actuality we are all obligating our children to pay in the future for our own fiscal cowardice of the present.

Until Speaker RAYBURN and his Democratic colleagues sprang this political trick last Saturday the Democrats had played a moderate and encouraging role in this session of Congress that was bound to strengthen their already great vote-getting power with the mass of independents who are necessary for the success of either party on election day. But how can this $20 prize to each taxpayer and to each member of his family fail to convince those selfsame independents that a large part of the Democratic Party in the House is still bewitched by that disastrous inflationary philosophy that can do more to undermine the basic security of this country than all the security risks between here and Wisconsin?

The proponents of this 100 percent political deal know that it has not enough merit to stand by itself, or they would not have tacked it on to the administration tax-extension bill as a rider—incidentally, a rider going in the opposite direction from the horse that bears it. They know that it is essential to the Government that the corporate and excise taxes be continued at present levels, and they do not oppose that; but if the $20 handout remains in the bill they know that the President cannot kill it without vetoing the entire measure. If the rider goes through the House today it will be up to the Democrats of the Senate to save the Democratic Party from itself, and to save the Nation from as crude an example of playing politics with the Nation's fiscal structure as we have seen in several years.

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 22, 1955]

A THINNING CLAIM

The pre-November claim that a Democratic Congressman was just naturally President Eisenhower's best friend is wearing thin in the rough game of politics. The bill to reduce income taxes by $20 per person, approved Monday by the House Ways and Means Committee, is the newest evidence.

The idea is to tie it to the President's own revenue plan in a way that deprives him of

credit for future tax cuts that may be warranted by reduced spending.

Mr. Eisenhower has asked a year's postponement of the drop in corporation taxes from 52 to 47 percent, now scheduled for April 1. He also wants to keep present excise taxes on liquor, automobiles, and cigarettes. To this bill, the Democrats plan to add their proposal that in 1956 every taxpayer shall receive a $20 tax credit for himself and $20 for each dependent.

The political appeal of this is that it would take about 4 million persons off the tax rolls entirely. It would also give identical treatment to taxpayers in every bracket—a formula that is much more popular when taxes are being cut than when they are being raised.

The revenue loss for the calendar year would be some $2 billion, half of which would come in the 1955 fiscal year ending June 30. Inasmuch as the present estimate is for a deficit of $2.4 billion in the fiscal year, action adding another billion to the debt cannot be justified.

In justification of their political motivation, the Democrats can justly point out that last year's Republican Congress lopped $1 billion off the excise-tax rates over the President's opposition. They also have Mr. Eisenhower's statement that the administration hopes that further tax cuts will be possible next year.

The strategy of tying the $20 credit to the extension of other taxes is designed to make it hard for the Senate to block or the President to veto the combined measure. It should not be too difficult, however, to force the extension through at the last minute, when the choice becomes that or no tax bill at all.

With crucial elections coming up, this sort of jockeying for position is to be expected. There is one Democrat, however, who can be counted upon to back the President in this matter. He is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, and he holds the key post of Finance Committee chairman.

No matter how foxy the House may get, Senator BYRD is sure to take the position that tax bills should be determined by revenue needs and not by political advantages. We wish there were more like him.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 22, 1955]

NOT TIME TO CUT TAXES

Secretary of Treasury Humphrey has made a properly forceful protest against the Democratic move in the House to cut individual income taxes at this time. By his estimate, the proposal to give a $20 tax credit to each taxpayer and dependent would cost the Government $2.3 billion revenue for a full calendar year. Ways and Means Committee officials estimate the potential loss at $2.1 billion and point out further that the proposed credit would result in removing about 7 million taxpayers from the income-tax rolls. Whichever estimate of loss is correct, approximately half of the drop in revenue would occur in fiscal 1956—in which the administration already foresees a budget deficit of about $2.4 billion. Adding a substantial sum to this deficit would increase the inflationary pressures which the administration has succeeded over the past 2 years in bringing under reasonable control, a result which could be greatly damaging to the public interest.

Approximately $7 billion in tax relief has been given during the past 2 years. In the same period, Government spending has been curtailed to bring closer the prospect of a balanced budget. The administration is recommending now that scheduled reductions in the corporation income tax rates and in certain excises—involving an estimated $3 billion in annual revenue—should be extended for 1 year at their present levels in the hope that another "general, though moderate," tax reduction program might be enacted in 1956.

It is unfortunate that political considerations are playing a large part in the maneuvering on tax legislation. For example, the Democratic proposal to reduce individual taxes is attached to the administration plan to maintain current corporation and excise tax rates—a maneuver obviously intended to minimize the danger of a Presidential veto if the combination bill should be passed. Clearly enough, the Government needs the revenue involved in this combination of proposals and it is an act of political irresponsibility to jeopardize it. The Democrats, especially those who are accusing the administration of spending too little on national defense, should not stoop to this kind of shabby politicking with tax revenues.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 22, 1955]

DEMOCRATIC "WRECKING CREW"—MAJORITY PARTY IN CONGRESS ACCUSED OF LAUNCHING MOST VIOLENT ATTACK IN HISTORY ON THE DOLLAR

(By David Lawrence)

The Democratic majority in Congress has apparently decided to constitute itself a "wrecking crew" with the obvious purpose of wrecking the Eisenhower administration even if it means wrecking the Nation's economy at the same time.

The party that promised the electorate in the congressional campaign last autumn that it would uphold the hands of the President and support his measures now has turned on him and on the country, too, and has embarked upon a course of irresponsibility which cannot be justified even on the ground of partisan benefit. For the new proposal to buy the American voters by giving everybody $20 off his tax bill and also freeing nearly 5 million voters from paying any taxes at all is the cheapest form of demagoguery.

The worst phase of it is the way it is being attempted—that is, by a trick of legislative procedure which seeks to tie the President's hands so that, if he wishes to veto the proposal, he will also have to veto the continuance of the corporation taxes at the present rate of 52 percent. The Treasury needs the $1,750,000,000 in revenue which would be lost if the corporation taxes are automatically reduced to the 47-percent rate.

Also imbedded in the tax expiring on April 1—unless extension is voted now—are certain excise taxes which, if not continued, would cost the Treasury another $1 billion. This is all wrapped up in the same package, which the Democrats assume the President would not dare to veto.

But the proposal to cut off $20 from everybody's taxes would mean a loss to the Treasury of about $2 billion. So, if the President vetoes the bill with the $20 tax cut in it, the Treasury stands to lose about $1 billion in excise-tax receipts because the Congress wouldn't care to let the corporation taxes go down to 47 percent. A bill to extend corporate taxes could be passed any time between April 1 and December 31, 1955, and still be made retroactive for the full calendar year.

Mr. Eisenhower, therefore, has no choice. He has to veto the $20 vote bribe, which—because the taxpayers would not get it—the Democrats assume would create widespread resentment at the polls. As between a $2 billion loss on that scheme, however, and a $1 billion loss in excise taxes, it is preferable for the President to accept the excise-tax reduction.

There is no certainty, on the other hand, that Congress would refuse to pass a separate bill, after the veto, which would continue the excise taxes; hence, the loss to the Treasury might not materialize at all. Then, if business conditions are booming and tax receipts increase, it may be that in 1956 a general tax-reduction bill could be enacted in which all taxpayers are treated equitably.

The idea of letting anyone who gets an income of $3,000 a year become exempt from the payment of any Federal taxes at all, including the cost of national defense, is not one that will appeal to the sense of fair play of the electorate as a whole. Yet if the "wrecking crew" have their way, it will mean that many persons in that very income group will be exempt from the payment of Federal taxes.

What may prove to be the most serious damage done by the "wreckocrats" on Capitol Hill, as someone has dubbed them, may be in the effect on the purchasing power of the dollar. If inflation is to be the accepted policy of America for the years ahead—and that's what a continuance of the unbalanced budgets could mean—then the dollar will be driven steadily downward in terms of other currencies of the world.

The Eisenhower administration since taking office has made a heroic effort to work toward a balanced budget. The promise has been made that such a balance can be attained in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, or that it will be so close to a balance as to assure the dollar a sound position. But if the spenders are to take hold then confidence will disintegrate. For if a "$20-for-everybody" doctrine is to be the political device to win elections, then there is nothing to stop the politicians from making it $50 next time and so on. It would be joyful news to the Kremlin, which hopes in one way or another to see the collapse of the private enterprise system in America.

There are some Democrats in the Senate, like Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who are opposed to the idea of any tax reductions until the budget is balanced. But the Virginia Senator will have a hard time blocking the $20 bribe plan unless other Democratic Senators line up with him to conserve the dollar from the most violent attack that has ever been made upon it. The political conspiracy would have no chance of success if it were not assumed by the "wrecking crew" that the people can be and will be deceived.

Mr. Speaker, it can be readily seen that this kind of action here today without any hearings upon the bill is not sound and is not going to be well received by people throughout the country. For that reason I believe it advisable for the House here today to amend the bill. That will give the committee a chance to separate the extension of the excise and corporate levies. In that way we will be able to bring in the so-called tax reduction measure separately and to discuss the matter on its individual merits. However, for us to pursue this matter and pass this bill in its entirety would certainly constitute an irresponsible action of the worst sort. I can assure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I will be glad to consider this matter and to give it every consideration after hearings have been had by the Ways and Means Committee and such a bill is recommended to the House for action.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks certain articles and charts with reference to the importance of this bill and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call attention to one small fact that may be of some influence on the vote that will be taken on this matter after general debate. Since January 2, our gold reserve has shrunken $1,400,000,000. We have gone into debt during this 6 weeks to the extent of $10 billion. So that we are worse off today by $12 billion than we were on January 2.

If I were running my own business, and that is about all I know anything about, is what I run myself, and if my herd of cattle had shrunken by 40 percent and I was going into debt to the extent of double what I had the year before, I would feel strongly that I was headed toward bankruptcy.

It is pretty difficult to understand how the Democrats can make any good politics out of this move because I apprehend when the vote is taken that some of you who voted billions to be scattered all over this world will not be in position then to talk about the reduction of taxes. There is only one good reason I can think of in my mind why I should vote for this bill and that is we should appropriate less so that we cannot carry on some of these great projects. If you would clean out the money you would not have anything to appropriate. But that would be a matter of strategy.

In this case I think it is a dangerous thing for us to hand out $20. I do not see any reason for it. Why did you not hand out $2,000? I have not heard any argument on this bill so far to indicate what the equation is. Why did you make it $20? Why did you not make it $60 or $100?

I do not know anything about the attitude of the President because I do not always follow him, but I will follow the President when I think he is right as I have followed Democratic Presidents when I thought they were right. I got a little bit of condemnation from my own side but that did not seem to hurt me any. In this case, if the President opposes this tax cut I will support him because I think this is no time, when we are skidding down $12 billion in 6 weeks, to talk about a tax reduction. It cannot be that you want to give the people $20 apiece because you got yourselves some money recently. That would not be the reason, would it?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, certainly the speeches that have been made here have been eloquent and they have been enlightening. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] spoke of supporting the President when the President is right. I trust that I shall offend no one when I recall that the present Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives, being the majority, has frequently said that they were ready to support the President when he was right but they reserved the right to oppose him when he was wrong. Now, I am quite sure that those gentlemen, worthy and estimable as they are, must know in their hearts and minds that in this opposition to the President's position they are failing to support him when he is clearly and without question right.

You say to me, "How do you document that? How do you establish that?" All right. I will establish it. In the first place, the very way in which this matter is being handled is to me conclusive evidence of its wrongness. The timing of the action here sought to be taken is further evidence, but if you need concrete evidence, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] in 1947 said this:

> We are unable to know yet just what our fiscal situation will be. Only two of our annual appropriation bills have gone to the President. Considerably more than half of our annual appropriation bills are still pending in the Congress. Nobody knows at this point what they are going to finally amount to. * * *
>
> So it is time for us to try to be certain that we can afford a tax reduction before we rush in here for political expediency and provide a tax reduction before we know exactly what our budget situation will be.

How can the gentleman from Tennessee support this action today? Not the first appropriation bill has even been reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Then, our great Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] in 1948 said a number of things in respect to his being disturbed about the economy. And then he added:

> Those who would recklessly cut taxes at the risk of deficit spending may, indeed, be endangering their country to enemies, both foreign and domestic, against whom they have sworn to protect and defend.

So I ask in all sincerity, much as I love him and respect him, how does the great gentleman from Texas support the action here today?

Then, last year, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], whom, as he knows, I hold in the highest regard, in a colloquy with me when the tax matter was before us, said:

> Does the gentleman clearly understand my state of mind?
>
> Now, the gentleman asked me a further question: Do I think tax reductions should take place?
>
> My answer is "No."

He started out then to help us avoid reducing the taxes by backing the amendment to raise the exemptions $100, which I did not think would help to improve the fiscal situation.

I am glad this thing has developed this way for one reason. It shows what the real situation is. Now, bear in mind we started out to extend the 52-percent tax on corporations. And, would it interest you to know that the other noon, during a speech at the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association in Philadelphia, Pa., they adopted unanimously a resolution saying that they approved of the extension of that 52-percent rate. I thought that was a fine, patriotic statement, and I thought, by the same token, the people who get this $20 are willing to pay their share of the Government in these critical times.

We all know that those excise taxes have to be extended. I thought it was all agreed to and understood, and it was, apparently, until last Saturday, after we had adjourned over the weekend, to be back here for Washington's Birthday on Tuesday, when all at once we read in the paper that a little huddle had taken place, with the result that we now have the $20 arrangement tied on to the 2 things that must be done, the 52-percent corporation tax and the excises.

Now, I suppose blackjacking is a strong word, and if it is unparliamentary I will withdraw it, but coming from Indiana it well looks to me like this is a sort of blackjacking operation to put the President and a lot of us over the barrel by saying, "Well, if you do not take this $20, you are jeopardizing the excise extension and the 52-percent corporation tax." My friends, if it is to be a war of nerves, just let me say this, that I have been in them before, and I think the President has been in them before, and we will see who comes out on that.

No, to me it is perfectly obvious that the expectation here is political advantage.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has referred to the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. I would like to read one line from a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers, addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in which they say:

> I urge the committee to give the most serious study to the dangers of continuing the 52 percent rate to April 1 a year hence.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to that by saying that I am for the 52-percent rate extension.

In any event these times are too serious for monkey business. The word "irresponsible" is also a rather rough word, but I do not think there is any other phrase that more adequately describes this proposal. And may I say to my friends over here on my right who are in control of this Congress that "You have the majority. Ours alone is not the responsibility for sound fiscal management. You share that responsibility with us, and you ought to be willing to accept it."

I just hope and pray, because I am very sure that over here we are going to be very, very solid, that today and tomorrow, as in times past, there will be enough of you who will stand for what I am sure you know is right.

Tax reductions? I do not know when there will be any more tax reductions.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield, if the gentleman would please be brief.

Mr. FORRESTER. I should like to ask the gentleman what is the difference between attacking this problem in 1955 and attacking it in 1956?

Mr. HALLECK. I will answer that. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], in the statement to which I referred previously, made reference to the condition of appropriation bills in order to see what might be done. I do not know whether any tax reduction can be made next year or not. There has been no commitment, no assurance that

there will be any. And yet that deserves the most careful consideration.

And if I may say further to the gentleman, if there is to be a tax reduction measure, it should not be something like this, dragged out of a hat, with no hearings, no careful consideration. Perhaps there ought to be an increase in exemptions. If we are going to have a tax reduction, possibly we should consider these percentage increases, where we went in 1948 from 16.6 percent to 17.4 in 1950; to 20.4 in 1951; 22 percent in 1953, and then dropped back to 20 percent. If we are going to have a tax reduction, perhaps we ought to go back the same way that we went up. At any rate, this is no time to consider the matter, and certainly it is a subject that should be given much more consideration than it has had up to this time.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. FORRESTER. I should like to ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that the gentleman says that we are in the majority here now—and that is true—we will be in the majority next year, in 1956; what would be the gentleman's attitude toward making this kind of reduction in 1956?

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, I will be very honest with the gentleman. As far as I can discover, I see no reasonable prospect for a tax reduction in 1956. But I should like to point out to the gentleman that this is a Democratic Congress, and if there is any political advantage to be gained by a reduction of taxes, the bill will be reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, if and when there is one, and it will have a Democratic name on it and the Democrats will get whatever political advantage there is in it.

Also, as an expert on the subject, I might say that some of us have found out that apparently there is not very much political advantage in a tax reduction. In any event, whatever kind of reduction it ought to be, it ought to have more consideration than this proposal has had. It is true that on occasion we have supported tax reductions. In the 80th Congress, the budget was in balance, because we cut expenditures. In the 83d Congress, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, we made tremendous cuts in the cost of government, and reduced expenditures substantially, to a point where we came within striking distance of a balanced budget. As a result we enacted a tax program, may I say to my friends on the right, that did much to prevent a recession you talk so much about and prospects of which was disturbing all of us. So I do not think anything wrong was done. We are now within striking distance of a balanced budget. The real issue is, How are we going to act on these appropriations? All the talk I have heard from some who seem to be the most vigorous in support of this $20 cut is that we are going to need more money for the Army, more money for the Air Force, more money for the postal workers, more for the classified employees, and we have to spend more money building schoolhouses. All the talk has been for more money.

We have a great battle on our hands to hold down the appropriations. Let us not get the cart before the horse, certainly at this particular time. If Democrats and Republicans go to work through this session of Congress and cut these appropriations enough, then you will balance the budget. You might even be able to have some tax reduction. But, as I say, let us demonstrate first our ability to do something about the appropriations.

Word has been spoken here already of the threats of inflation. You know the position of the people who work for a living, and about everybody does, has been improved because the wage increases many have had have not been gobbled up by the decreasing value of the dollar. We have stabilized the value of the dollar under this program and that is real achievement.

Who gets hurt first from inflation? I know there are people in the gallery today who are employees of the Post Office Department. Some of them came to see me. They ought to know and I am sure they do know that the man on a fixed income is the fellow who gets hurt worse as inflation starts over again.

Heed the words of our great Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, who on another occasion pointed out the dangers of inflation. Let us not make this situation worse instead of better. Let us not rock the boat now.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has forgotten already some of the observations made by the President in his budget message sent up here only a few weeks ago. I quote for his recollection. The President said:

> I hope the tax reductions will be so justified next year.

That is 1956.

> If so, I shall recommend a reduction in taxes to spread the relief fairly among all taxpayers in a way which will be the most effective to relieve individual tax burdens and to increase incentive for effort and investment.

The very fact that he says he hopes to make a recommendation in 1956, which clearly indicates he intends to, because we all know the Republicans might forget that 1956 is an election year, that he is going to spread the relief fairly, would indicate that the Republican tax reduction bill of last year was not fair. That is the proposition. We are undertaking now to rectify the injustice of the Republican tax reduction bill of 1954 when only a small percentage of the $3 billion in reductions—and nobody knows what it will be from the long range angle—goes to a small percentage of the taxpayers and in the main to the large corporations. Twenty-three percent of the immediate tax relief and only 9 percent of the long range tax relief contained in the 1954 Republican tax bill went to taxpayers with incomes under $5,000. Mark that. That violates the heritage of the Democratic Party, which my friend, which has been referred to, and I certainly am imbued with the fundamental principles of Thomas Jefferson, as every other Democrat is. We believe that taxes should be levied on the basis of the capacity to pay, and that when reductions are made, that the low-income tax groups should not be discriminated against. Everyone here knows that there was discrimination against the low-income group in the tax bill of 1954. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] very properly presented the issue in the statement he made the other day to the press. I quote:

> There is one thing which our proposal will set straight right now and that is whatever the President may have in mind in the way of tax reductions next year—

And do not think, my friends, that he has not because he does—

> We will be assured that the low-income taxpayer will be adequately recognized.

Any time anyone stands up in the well of the House to speak for the average person in America where taxes are involved, then we are accused of politics or some other accusation is made against us. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]—and I like him just as much as he likes me—talked about "a blackjacking operation." Why, my dear friend is a past master in the art of "a blackjacking operation." Do you think we have forgotten what happened only a year ago? Do you remember when the Republicans reported out a bill extending certain excise taxes which were expiring and they wanted to make them permanent? We forced them to accept a 1-year amendment. They had to offer it themselves; but what did they do? Did they follow their President? They made him take close to a $1 billion reduction in excise taxes, and they tagged it on to the bill extending the expiring excise-tax law which brought in in the course of a year $2 billion. So, my friend, you are an able master and we are only copying a page out of your book.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Always to my friend. My friend does not deny what I said, there was a nice blackjacking operation last year.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not going to comment on that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. All right, then.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the gentleman if he thinks two wrongs make a right.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, you admit last year was a wrong?

Mr. MARTIN. No, I do not.

Mr. MCCORMACK. What we are trying to do today——

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman will yield—the gentleman is misinterpreting what I say.

Mr. MCCORMACK. What we are trying to do today is to afford relief to the backbone of America, the average person on whom was imposed in the tax bill of last year a grave injustice. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Then the gentleman admits that he is wrong this year?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No, I do not admit I am wrong this year.

Mr. MARTIN. If that is the case, then I might follow the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, of course, the gentleman would never follow me.

Mr. MARTIN. I might be sensible about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman may be correct—the gentleman might be correct. When you raise the question of being sensible, I will agree that my friend is always sensible. Even when I disagree with him from his point of view, of course, he is sensible.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] says times are too serious for "monkey business." Well, it was only the other day when H. R. 1 was under consideration, 65 percent of the Republicans voted against their own leader in the White House. I wonder where the monkey business was then. I exclude the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], but they were the leaders with few followers.

So again, when the question of blackjacking is raised by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I will admit he is a past master at it. When the question of monkey business is raised, I will admit that we Democrats are naive.

Now, let us view the facts in their just light. Is there any objective-minded Member in this House looking over the 165 million people, this great country of ours, who thinks the small groups were treated right last year? The answer is "No." Does anyone doubt that next year the President is going to recommend lowering taxes? My dear friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in an interview in the Boston Traveler, about 10 days ago, stated or strongly intimated that they were going to recommend lowering of taxes next year.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman claim that I made the statement we were going to lower taxes?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I said "intimated."

Mr. MARTIN. We could do that if the gentleman would cooperate with us in making some real economies this year. We will do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes. Last year they put through a tax-reduction bill of about $3 billion. Secretary Humphrey admits it is $1,900,000,000, when they knew there would be a deficit of $4,500,000,000. They are talking about a deficit now, but they did it last year, and they imposed an inequity and an injustice upon the great bulk of America, the backbone of America, the average American and the average American family. Knowing that tax reductions are going to be proposed next year, our intention is to see that there is not another injustice done, by putting upon the statute books this benefit to the lower tax groups, effective January 1, 1956. With the evidence we have, the Democratic leadership and the Democratic Party would be recalcitrant in our duty to the people of America if we failed to do that which is carried in this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that if the people on his side should determine there should be no tax reduction, it is completely within their power to block any tax reduction because of the composition of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear sweet-minded friend, President Eisenhower sends up a tax-reduction recommendation, and we propose a reduction for the lower income tax groups, because they were discriminated against last year. What a brilliant and powerful contribution that is to this job. My friend from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] on one hand comes down here and says in a most pious way, "All it amounts to is 37 cents to each taxpayer each week." But he also says, "It will cost $2 billion" on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Democratic leadership and the purpose of the Democrats on this bill is to correct an injustice that the Republican Party tax bill did last year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill H. R. 4259 may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include excerpts and material that may be appropriate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 4259 at the conclusion of the general debate and include such excerpts and materials as may be appropriate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4259, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] for 2 hours.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

GENERAL

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill carries out the recommendations of President Eisenhower that the present corporate tax rate and certain excise-tax rates be continued for an additional year, from April 1, 1955, to April 1, 1956. It will be recalled that these increases were enacted originally in the Revenue Act of 1951 and were scheduled to drop back to their level before that act on April 1, 1954. They were continued last year to this coming April 1.

In addition to continuing these taxes the bill also would provide a taxpayer a $20 credit for each of his exemptions.

EXTENSION OF PRESENT CORPORATE TAX RATE

The bill would continue until April 1, 1956, the present total corporate tax rate of 52 percent which is now scheduled to be reduced to 47 percent on this coming April 1. This would be accomplished by continuing the corporate normal tax rate at 30 percent which would otherwise be reduced to 25 percent. The 30-percent rate applies to the first $25,000 of taxable corporate income and the 52-percent rate applies to corporate income in excess of that amount due to the application of the surtax rate of 22 percent.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXISTING EXCISE-TAX RATES

The excise-tax rates which will be continued for 1 year, from April 1, 1955, to April 1, 1956, are those on distilled spirits, cigarettes, gasoline, diesel and special motor fuels, motor vehicles, and parts and accessories. This means that on April 1, 1956, the tax on distilled spirits will drop from $10.50 per gallon to $9; on beer from $9 per barrel to $8; on wine, which is subject to various rates depending on their alcoholic content, the increase was approximately 12½ percent and, of course, the reduction will be in that amount; on cigarettes from $4 a carton to $3.50, which is, on a package basis, from 8 cents to 7 cents; on gasoline, diesel and special motor fuels from 2 cents per gallon to 1½ cents; on automobiles and motorcycles from 10 percent to 7 percent; on trucks, buses, truck trailers, and automobile parts and accessories from 8 percent to 5 percent.

TAX CREDIT OF $20

The bill provides a credit against income tax for all individuals of $20, which credit is allowed to the taxpayer for each of his exemptions. This means that a single person would get a $20 credit against his tax, a married taxpayer with two dependents would get an $80 credit against his tax and that a person who is over the age of 65 or who is blind would get a $40 credit against his tax.

An estate which is now given one $600 exemption would be given one $20 tax credit.

The tax credit allowed a taxpayer would not exceed his liability. In other words, if a married taxpayer with 2 children has a tax liability of $60, the

credit allowed him would be limited to this amount even though, without taking into account this limitation, he would be entitled on the basis of 4 exemptions to a credit of $80. The effect would be to eliminate completely the tax liability of a taxpayer where such liability is less than the tax credit to which he is entitled. This prevents a situation arising whereby a taxpayer would become entitled to a refund in an amount of the difference between his tax liability and his tax credit. Similar provisions are now contained in existing law in those cases where tax credits are now allowed, such as for dividends and retirement income.

The present requirement that a declaration of estimated income tax must be filed in those cases where a taxpayer's gross income for a year is expected to exceed $100 from sources other than wages—on which there is no withholding—and is expected to exceed, in total amount, the sum obtained by multiplying $600 by the number of the exemptions to which he is entitled plus $400, would be amended by changing the $600 figure to $700 in order to adjust this filing requirement to the $20 tax credit.

The $20 tax-credit provision would be effective January 1, 1956.

The withholding-tax tables would be revised so as to reflect the $20 tax credit and thereby increase the take-home pay of taxpayers for income which they receive on and after January 1, 1956. The optional-tax table, which is used by those taxpayers who have an adjusted gross income of less than $5,000, would be amended so as to reflect the $20 tax credit.

REVENUE EFFECTS

This bill would increase revenues for fiscal year 1955 by $191 million, and, for fiscal year 1956, by $1.149 billion. The full-year effect would be an increase in revenue of $737 million. The $191 million increase in revenue for fiscal year 1955 would be brought about by the extension of the excise-tax rates, which I have enumerated earlier, through the last 3 months of this fiscal year. The $1.149 billion increase in revenue for fiscal year 1956 would be brought about by the extension of the present corporate tax rate producing $1.075 billion and the extension of the excise-tax rates producing $889 million. The $20 tax credit would reduce revenues in fiscal year 1956 by $815 million, giving the net increase of revenues of $1.149 billion.

In a full year of operation the extension of the corporate tax produces $1.750 billion and of the excise taxes $1.080 billion. The reduction provided by the $20 tax credit in a full year of operation would be $2.093 billion, giving a net increase in revenues in a full year of $737 million.

NEED FOR THE $20 TAX CREDIT

Low-income families who account for the vast bulk of our taxpayers received only token relief in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 last year. The major portion of the relief provided went to businesses and high-income taxpayers. Even those very meritorious provisions such as the allowance for deductions for child care to working mothers, the credit against tax for retirement income, and so forth, by their very terms were selective and this meant that for a low-income taxpayer to benefit he would have to be in exceptional circumstances. The $20 tax credit which this bill would provide will benefit each and every taxpayer in the country. It is equitable in that it is distributed to every taxpayer evenly on a dollar basis for each of his personal exemptions. Regardless of a taxpayer's income he would get a $20 tax credit for each of his exemptions—no less and no more.

The main argument advanced for the selective tax relief which was granted last year was that it was needed to encourage investment in productive capacity. It was my contention then, and it is still my contention, that this is putting the cart before the horse. No sound businessman will expand his productive capacity if he does not envision markets for the goods which he produces. My position has been confirmed by actual evidence. Our gross national product declined from 1953 to 1954 by $8 billion—from $365 billion to $357 billion. We all know that with the increase in our population, labor force, and productivity the level of our gross national product should continually rise just in order to keep pace. Not only did it not rise in 1954, compared to 1953, it slid backward. Investment in plant and equipment has continued to decline since the middle of 1953.

Another reason for providing a $20 tax credit for taxpayers for each of their exemptions is to reduce to some extent the unbalance in our tax system which was brought about by the tax relief provided last year in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for businesses and taxpayers in the high-income brackets.

I would like to bring to the committee's attention a statement by the President in his recent budget message, wherein he said:

> I hope that tax reductions will be so justified next year. If so, I shall recommend a reduction in taxes to spread the relief fairly among all taxpayers in a way which will be the most effective to relieve individual tax burdens and to increase incentive for effort and investment.

Both administration and congressional leaders in the last Congress had the country believing that the relief which they granted in the legislation which they sponsored was spread fairly among all taxpayers. By now those taxpayers who have already filed their returns for 1954 have found for themselves that this was not true. I can think of no better proof of this fact.

The $20 tax credit will make a reality out of the hope expressed by the President in his statement which I have just quoted and we, on our part, by enacting this credit, will insure that all taxpayers, about whom the President finally seems to be concerned, will be given fair and equitable tax relief.

Of the total tax relief of $2.093 billion provided by the $20 tax credit, $1.374 billion, or 66 percent, will go to taxpayers who have an adjusted gross income of less than $5,000. It will relieve almost 5 million taxpayers completely from tax liability, and everyone of these taxpayers have an adjusted gross income of less than $5,000.

I note that it is estimated in the current budget that our deficit for the year 1956 will be $2.4 billion. Since the $20 credit proposed would not become effective until January 1, 1956, this would add approximately $815 million to the estimated deficit, making the total $3.2 billion. I would like to point out that the deficit for the current fiscal year was estimated at $4.5 billion, which is $1.3 billion higher than the estimate for the deficit for the fiscal year 1956 after taking into account the revenue loss involved in the $20 tax credit proposal.

I feel that this tax relief for these low-income taxpayers is justified, and that the amendment which will be offered to strike this provision from this bill should be voted down, and that the pending bill should be passed as it was reported from your committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Were those various figures and estimates, and so forth, considered by our committee at the time this measure was presented? Did we have hearings? Did we discuss this?

Mr. COOPER. Of course, that question hardly does the gentleman from Missouri credit. He was present. He knows there were no public hearings held on the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman explain why there were no hearings?

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman does not have anything more important than that to suggest, I should like to continue. The gentleman knows the full committee agreed to not hold public hearings.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman to explain to the House why hearings were not held?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. COOPER. I do not yield further. If the gentleman cannot make any more contribution than that to this discussion, I do not care to detain the Committee with that kind of a question.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal here about the debt. I wonder who created this debt. Which party created this debt of $275 billion?

I might go back just a little bit here. I made a few notes. I have a little record. Back in the 80th Congress we cut taxes by $5 billion a year. Old folks over 65 years got an extra $600 exemption. Seventy-one percent of the tax reductions went to people earning less than $5,000 per year. We gave the country the largest surplus in history. We pared $6 billion from Truman's padded budget demands and paid off $7 billion on the national debt, the first reduction in 17 years. Eight and five-tenths billion dollars surplus was left in the Treasury in 1948.

There has been a good deal said here with regard to tax policy. I introduced a bill to cut taxes and to revise the laws,

and I followed a sound principle that I do not think anybody can deny; that is, that when your country is moving into a depression business and individuals must have a stimulation so that they can have jobs and prosper.

As the result of those tax cuts, what happened? What is the condition of the country? You have a stable dollar now. You have people employed now. You are having payrolls built up all the time to take up the unemployed that are coming into the market every year. We stopped inflation. The cost of living has been stabilized. What we hope today to do, with your assistance, is to prevent inflation, which means that we do not want to see the cost of living begin to climb again.

Inflation is taxation. It always has been. I followed carefully the condition in Germany under inflation. Long before that I studied in detail the effect of inflation on France. Look at her Government today. She is still suffering from that inflation of more than 100 years ago. The question is whether it will not be another 100 years before she recovers from that inflation. They shake and tremble in France whenever there is the slightest threat of further inflation, even to this day. They became so desperate at one time for cheap money that what did they do? They sacrificed the church property and all the gold that was in the churches at the time. They said that was the finest backing possible for stable money. Now we have to watch our step on this question of inflation, and that is what we Republicans are trying to do.

We stimulated business. As I said, business is prospering. People are at work. Business has confidence, and that is going to create more revenue. What are we doing here? Let me give you a little outline of what I have to say on the Democratic inflationary Mills proposal.

Mr. Chairman, last Friday, Chairman COOPER and I each introduced identical bills, H. R. 4200 and H. R. 4201, to extend for 1 year the excise tax and corporation income-tax rates which otherwise would be reduced automatically on April 1. These two extensions have been recommended by the President as necessary to the fiscal stability of the Nation.

The deficit for fiscal 1956 is estimated at $2.4 billion, assuming that these two tax extensions are enacted.

Last Saturday morning, Speaker RAYBURN had a meeting in his office of 8 of the 15 Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means—a bare majority. They got their orders then to cut the guts out of our Nation's fiscal program.

They announced through the press Saturday night—and that was the first any of us learned about the plan—that our committee would meet Monday morning and be presented with this tax-cut amendment. We met Monday and it was rammed down our throats.

No hearings have been held on the subject of individual income-tax reduction. The public has had absolutely no opportunity to express its views on the problem. No other method of income-tax reduction was even discussed in our committee. No consideration was given to the impact of this proposal upon the fiscal stability of the Nation. Not even a guess was hazarded as to next year's budget and economic situation. Still it was rammed through.

Let us take a look at what is in this bill.

First, it contains the corporation-tax extension.

Second, it contains the excise-tax extensions.

Third, it provides, effective next January 1—10 months away—a $20-tax credit for each taxpayer, his wife, and other dependents.

This proposal will cost $815 million in fiscal 1956 and $2.3 billion a year thereafter. Therefore, it will add almost a billion dollars to the deficit next year alone. It will reduce receipts after 1956 by $2.3 billion a year.

If the majority are honest and sincere in their belief in individual income-tax reduction, why do they not propose such a cut to take effect now? The answer is simply this—even the Democrats realize that present defense and other budget needs make such an immediate reduction unwise and irresponsible. If that is the case, what crystal ball permits them now to foresee the budgets cuts which will justify a $2.3 billion tax reduction next January? Obviously, none.

The Democratic leadership have tied their individual income-tax proposal to the two extensions of the excise-tax and corporation income-tax rates. These two extensions will retain $2.8 billion of revenue. Practically all are in agreement on the absolute necessity of these extensions in order to preserve the fiscal stability of the Nation, and the Democratic leadership is taking advantage of this situation by making their two point three billion income-tax reduction a part of the extension bill. They hope by this legislative device to make responsible consideration of their proposal impossible. I challenge them to answer this question: "If you sincerely believe that your proposal is justified, why do you not offer it separately so that it can be considered on its own merits?" That, at least, would represent orderly process. Of course, the answer to the question is that such a procedure would not serve their purpose of embarrassing the administration and hamstringing its program.

We are told that this proposal is designed to help the little fellow. We are told that the Republican program has not done so. Do not be fooled by that old chestnut. I say to you that the President, by bringing about financial stability, has done more to help the average person in this country than tax cuts such as this can ever do.

Look at the record. Inflation has been stopped. Workers are no longer losing a major portion of their wage increases through price increases. Retired people, widows, and surviving dependents no longer find that hard earned savings are being destroyed by increases in the cost of living. This is an accomplishment of which we can all be justly proud.

Let me quote from press reports of what the staff economists of the A. F. of L. told their executive council recently:

> Unionized labor fared better in 1954 on the wage front than in any other postwar year. Higher hourly wages and stable living costs had given most workers their greatest postwar gain in purchasing power. This was true even though the average pay rise of 5 to 9 cents per hour was modest by comparison with increases in previous years. Last year the wage earner got the full benefit of a fatter pay envelope. In other years inflation gobbled up much of his gain.

That is our real accomplishment. We have no apology to make to the wage earners of the country.

We have given the country a sound dollar. We have stopped the ruinous increase in the cost of living. That means more to the people of this country than any tax reduction. We have given the American people new confidence in the free enterprise system.

That is what this dishonest tax reduction proposal drawn up by the CIO is designed to destroy. It is not designed to help the little fellow. It is designed to destroy confidence in our economy. It strikes at the very heart of the administration program.

Do not be fooled by the propaganda and trickery. The very future of our country and its economy is at stake. If you put your country above politics, you will vote to strike this tax-cut proposal out of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing so important to every person in this country as the great heritage that has come to a free people. We are still in the balance. We are still confronted with enemies at war. We know that our chief enemy has brought within its power something like 800 million people. They are all lined up against us. We have this war in the Pacific. I think too much of my country to do anything that would possibly damage it. We cannot afford to do it. Think of the wonderful system we have under our great Constitution. We ought to be all pulling together now when we know that these foreign nations are doing everything in their power to get us into trouble.

I am looking back a little bit. Before this time we had 19 revenue bills come before the House, one following right on the heels of another, which placed a bigger burden on the people of this country.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to expatiate at length upon the merits of the bill before us because there is no question about it in my mind. It is not even a matter for debate. The President just does not know what he is talking about when he attacks the $20 tax cut for each taxpayer and dependent, and which concession is predicated upon the most pressing of all taxpayers' problems—dependency. Just think of what that will mean. A taxpayer in the medium class with a dependent wife and 4 children will get a tax concession of 6 times $20 or $120 a year. The President derides that and belittles the Congress, or I should say the Democrats, with his reference to

our lacking "courage" because we failed to make this proposal in a separate bill.

I wonder who it was that lacked courage in the 83d Congress, 2d session, when the Republicans made several shifts in the tax law in order to give a very special concession in a tax cut having to do solely with the upper crust among taxpayers who derive most or all of their incomes from unearned sources; namely, dividends. There was no courageous outcry on his part at that time for the President is with big business, and big dividends for big stockholders, first, last, and above all. He did not know, or if he did he was ominously silent, that of the 71 million subject to the income tax approximately 4 million receive dividends, and, mind you Members of the House, about 10 percent of the 4 million or 400,000 receive 80 percent of all dividends paid out by our prosperous corporations. It would take no courage whatsoever for a righteous President to have protested that kind of a move and to condemn it, but this did not occur.

He could have supported the $100 increase in dependency exemptions but our courageous President failed to take advantage of the opportunity which we Democrats advocated and presented. Now, however, granting a $20 concession for each taxpayer and each dependent seems to roil the President until he is unable to rationalize and arrive at the only sensible answer, so he belabors the Democratic leadership and the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means for this just and farsighted proposal. It labels the President clearly as an opponent of the average taxpayer and puts him in the proper perspective and place.

I think this is an opportune time, Mr. Chairman, to insert for the RECORD three exhibits, A, B, and C, which are self-explanatory:

EXHIBIT A

OCTOBER 29, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Do you deny that the 11 percent individual income tax cut of 1954 was provided by the automatic expiration date of December 31, 1953, by the Democratic tax bill which was passed and became the law in 1951 and that therefore neither you nor the Republicans did anything about it but let it take its course? Do you deny that the total estimated tax cuts as provided for by the same Democratic tax bill of 1951 totaled approximately $8 billion as compared with a $7,500,000,000 cut claimed in the rewritten Republican bill which you signed? Do you deny that the Republicans nullified the excise tax cuts we Democrats provided in the tax bill of 1951 which were to expire April 1, 1954, on cigarettes, liquor, beer, wine, and automobiles and that you Republicans set the expiration date a year later to April 1, 1955? Didn't you, Mr. President, in fact recommend making these excise taxes permanent? Do you and the Republicans deny delaying the expiration dates of the excess-profits tax, the excise taxes abovementioned as provided in the Democratic tax bill of 1951, and do you deny opposing higher exemptions for all taxpayers demanded by the Democrats so that an unwarranted tax cut could be given to stockholders whose income derives from dividends? Do you, I repeat, deny this? I respectfully request an immediate simple and unequivocal reply to these pertinent questions so that the people may have the truth before going to the polls on Tuesday, November 2. Your administrative assistant, Gerald Morgan, who is right at your side as a former adviser to the Ways and Means Committee on tax legislation, can give you the answers in less than 5 minutes and you are free to promptly release the facts to which the people are entitled directly from the White House. Either you and the Republicans are wrong in making spurious and unfounded claims which mislead the people about tax reductions or I am. Believe me, I am not wrong, because I am right. I was there and helped write these tax-relief provisions in 1951.

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress, Ways and Means Committee, 15th District of Michigan.

EXHIBIT B

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 16, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Friday, October 29, preceding the election, I sent you a telegram pertaining to the misrepresentation rampant throughout the country relating to claims made by the Republican candidates and their party spokesmen from top to bottom with reference to recent tax cuts. I pointed out that these claims were for the large part in error and untrue and I sought your assistance and cooperation in making the truth known by a statement of fact emanating from you as the President and head of the Republican Party. To date I have not had even as much as an acknowledgment that you received the telegram.

For the benefit of the people I felt I should bring to their attention the truth of my contentions that the Republicans as a party had nothing whatsoever to do with providing that an approximate 11 percent reduction in individual income taxes should take place on January 1, 1954. All they did was to merely extend the date of payment of these and other taxes 1 month to April 15 for 1954, and the ensuing years. I say to you now that there was a serious attempt made to split this 11-percent cut to 5½ percent relief for 1954 and 5½ percent for 1955, but this was defeated because of the attitude of the solid Democratic minority, which expected a sufficient amount of support from Republicans who feared it as a political threat. I contend, moreover, that the Democratic tax bills of 1951 provided automatic expiration dates for a total reduction of $8 billion per annum while the Republicans have, instead of reducing taxes, actually in net effect increased them by $1.4 billion by delaying the expiration of the excess-profits tax and continuing the corporate rate of 52 percent for another year. The Republican claim of cutting excise taxes was spurious because the Korean increases were not permitted to expire as provided for in the Democratic tax bill of 1951 on April 1, 1954. The termination date of these taxes on automobiles, whisky, beer, wine, gasoline and cigarettes was delayed under the Republican tax bill and will take effect April 1, 1955, 1 year later than provided for in the Democratic bill of 1951. I specifically asked whether or not you recommended to the Congress that these excise taxes be made permanent. This in particular I stressed and asked for your verification.

The telegram pointed out to you that the Republicans provided favored treatment for a relatively small and preferred class of taxpayers who derive their incomes from the unearned source of dividends paid to stockholders. It further stated that the Republicans, by a solid party vote in the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, rejected the Democratic substitute proposal to provide additional exemptions for all taxpayers instead of exempting dividends from taxation as income. The Republicans took the same position on the House floor.

I should appreciate an early reply to my questions.

Respectfully yours.

EXHIBIT C

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, December 7, 1954.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is to acknowledge and reply to your telegram of October 30 and your letter of November 16 to the President, relating to the recent tax reductions. The following facts seem to me to be the most significant ones in answering your questions.

When this administration took office, tax reductions involving an annual revenue loss of $8 billion were scheduled to take effect between July 1, 1953, and April 1, 1954. There was also an estimated deficit in the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1954 of $9.9 billion. If expenditures had been allowed to remain at the level planned by the previous administration and the scheduled tax reductions allowed to go into effect, the result would have been a severe blow to the stability of the economy and a sharp stimulus to the further deterioration in the value of the dollar.

By a vigorous scrutiny of the spending programs of the Federal Government, this administration was able to recommend substantial reductions in appropriations and to curtail sharply the disbursement of previously appropriated funds. Actual expenditures in the fiscal year 1954 were $10.1 billion less than the estimate of the previous administration. It was this reduction in expenditures which made it possible for the Republican Congress to permit and enact the $7.4 billion in tax reductions this year.

As you know, the $7.4 billion includes the $3 billion cut in individual income taxes of January 1, 1954, a $1 billion reduction in excises on April 1, and the elimination of the inequitable and repressive excess profits tax. The total also includes reductions of $1.4 billion in the fiscal year 1955 under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Of the $7.4 billion, no less than $4.6 billion, or 62 percent, was for the direct benefit of individuals. Of the $4.6 billion, about $1.7 billion, or 37 percent, went to taxpayers with incomes of $5,000 or less. Previously, such taxpayers paid about one-third of the total take from the individual income tax and those excises which were reduced.

If the so-called automatic reductions had been allowed to take effect as scheduled, more than half of the direct benefit, or $4.2 billion, would have gone to corporations; whereas, corporations received only 38 percent of the $7.4 billion reduction which the economies of this administration made possible.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Preceding the election, on October 29, 1954, I sent a telegram, which is exhibit A, to the President seeking a true statement regarding the automatic tax cuts which were previously provided by the Democrats. I merely sought to correct the misrepresentation of the Republicans during the campaign. I wanted the President to answer whether we Democrats were entitled to the credit, or any part of the credit, or whether the tax cuts were the sole accomplishment of the Republicans. I received no reply whatsoever. My purpose of course

was to get the reply before election because the Republicans were using or misusing the opportunity for their own particular advantage by misleading the people, but the President lacked the initiative or the "courage" about which he now speaks so boldly and remained silent. I was compelled to write him a letter, marked exhibit B, under date of November 16, 1954. Even then I failed to hear from the President. Instead he took the way out so customary in the Army and "passed the buck" to Secretary of the Treasury, George H. Humphrey, from whom I received a letter dated December 7, 1954, and which is marked "Exhibit C." While I will not at this juncture treat the reply as thoroughly as I shall later, I shall, however, refer to the spurious claim of the Secretary that the so-called tax cuts were made possible only because of the Republican record of the 83d Congress and the savings effected. That is the purest kind of bunk imaginable. The tax law of 1951 governed the situation, and the Democratic tax cuts would have become effective on the stipulated dates regardless of whether there were any savings or not. As a matter of fact, there was a tremendous deficit of $3.1 billion for the same fiscal year. There properly was no saving and no tax concession argument could be predicated on the Secretary's claim. One other point I want to stress directly and strongly is that Mr. Humphrey claims that the Republicans have increased the amount of the tax cut to the individual income-tax payer as originally provided for in the Democratic tax bill of 1951. But, deliberately, I am sure, the Secretary of the Treasury fails to admit to me, and I pass it on to you and to the people, that the added percentage to the individual taxpayer is due to the tax cut applicable to the unearned income from dividends to which I so strenuously objected then and still oppose. The Democratic cut accrued to the benefit of all income-tax payers, but the additional percentage was the big bonus that went to the favored coupon-clippers who are fortunate enough to collect dividends. When last I visited President Truman at the White House I remember seeing on his desk a small sign which stated, "Buck passing stops right here." It is too bad that President Truman did not leave that little admonition for the benefit of his military successor, who throughout his lifetime has been so used to the practice, or if President Truman did leave it behind that it was set aside or ignored. When I write a letter to the President I believe, in matters pertaining to taxes at least, I am entitled to a personal reply embodying the President's own ideas or opinions. As I pointed out in my telegram, the President had one of the shrewdest advisors on tax matters, who had served with the Committee on Ways and Means, at his right hand and in the White House where he could have given a straightforward reply to my inquiry in a brief moment. But the President did not want the people to have the requested facts. Thus he who now charges Democratic leadership and the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee with a lack of "courage" failed to give a prompt and a simple answer to an honest question.

My telegram to the President as well as the letter requesting a reply points up and stresses the fact that the Republicans aside from granting extra-special concession for the coupon clippers, who receive so much or all of their income from dividends, in their tax bill of 1954 proposed a delay of the automatic corporation tax cut from April 1, 1954, to April 1, 1955, as well as delaying elimination of the so-called Korean excise taxes. This year the President asked Congress to extend the corporation tax rate of 52 percent instead of permitting the scheduled reduction to 47 percent on April 1, 1955. The President courageously, oh so courageously, recommended that the already delayed automatic reduction of the Korean excises, which are largely borne by the poor, also be continued. For all practical purposes this means the same thing as a similar move made by the Republicans in the 80th Congress, and which applied to the excises levied in 1941; that is permanency. The Republicans are sales-tax-minded and they will courageously do anything to make this type of tax borne by the consumers, which means 97 percent or more of us, bear the burden, with the greatest stress upon the man having the greatest number of children and other dependents. That too, my friends, is an indication of the kind of courage our President has in mind when he charges the Democratic leadership and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means as lacking in courage when we did not provide for a separation of the $20 individual income-tax cut from the extension of the excise and corporation taxes which he recommended and asked for. That to my notion is a contemptible reference and a spurious argument. The President knows, if he knows anything, that the Democratic proposal to grant a concession to those who need it most because of the heavy burdens of dependency is germane and can properly be included along with his recommendations about the continuance of the Korean excise taxes and the 52 percent corporation tax rate. There is nothing courageous about the President's attitude, clothed as it is in Presidential aura, in demeaning the Democratic Members of Congress, and especially the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means, now in majority, who have forgotten more about tax and fiscal matters than he will ever learn. This same group has served to maintain the country in a state of solvency more than 20 years.

The President if he chooses can show real courage by vetoing this bill which the House is sure to pass, with the Senate concurring. Will he do so? I doubt it. The House leadership and the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee propose nothing in this bill which the President did not have in mind when he recommended the extension of the Korean excise taxes and the retention of the 52 percent corporate income tax rate, as well as a tax cut which he did not delineate but mentioned as a possibility in his budget message to the Congress. We Democrats are merely providing for this concession to the taxpayer now; but we make its effective date January 1, 1956.

If the President who spoke so deprecatingly about congressional courage or lack thereof, wants to set an example of courage all he need do, I repeat, is to veto this bill when it gets to him. It is a challenge I know he will not dare accept, even though it is the President's privilege and responsibility to do so in view of his stated convictions. He will learn that the Congress which has the right to propose and dispose will have the courage to overwhelmingly override his veto. Therein lies the test of Presidential and congressional courage.

Anent the excise taxes and other matters let me add that I support fully the enactment of H. R. 4259. I would prefer that the bill not provide for the extension of the Korean excise tax rates. I endeavored to have this extension defeated in committee. However, because I believe it is essential that low-income taxpayers receive tax relief and because I believe a 1-year extension of the 52 percent corporate rate is necessary, I am in favor of the enactment of H. R. 4259.

My voting record will clearly indicate that I have consistently opposed the imposition of excise taxes and any rate increases with respect to excise taxes. My opposition to these Federal sales taxes stems from the fact that they are viciously regressive and have their greatest impact on low-income families. In many cases these excises are imposed on articles that could be considered necessities under our American standard of living. In addition to unfairly taxing the incomes of our small taxpayers, excise taxes have also adversely affected the level of business activities and the jobs of American labor.

In the last session of the 83d Congress, the Republican majority voted to report a bill extending for 1 year the excise-tax increases enacted in 1951 to finance the Korean war. One of the excises extended in this measure was the 10-percent tax on automobiles. This tax was continued at this exorbitant rate at a time when the automobile industry was laying off thousands of persons in my home city of Detroit. The automobile industry was at that time in a depressed condition and the continuation of this high excise tax on automobiles did nothing to alleviate the situation. I fear, Mr. Chairman, that we may soon again find automobile production forging ahead of sales with the result that job layoffs will occur in the automobile industry.

In view of the record of the Republican Party with respect to excise taxes, it does not surprise me that President Eisenhower has again requested that these excise taxes be continued at their present level. I would remind my colleagues in the House that the infamous Republican 80th Congress made permanent the temporary wartime excises that had been enacted to finance World War II. In extending the excise taxes last year the Republicans endeavored to make the Korean war increases a part of our perma-

nent tax structure. The Democratic Members in the House forced the Republican majority to agree to limiting the extension for 1 year. President Eisenhower has now asked the Congress to extend these excises for another year. Mr. Chairman, let us tell the President now that this is the last year we will extend these iniquitous excises. We will not let the Republicans again make temporary war excises a part of our permanent tax structure. Let me again state, Mr. Chairman, that I am opposed to the extension of the excise-tax rate increases because of their regressive effect and the unfair way in which they tax low-income families.

I regret that it is necessary to continue the 52 percent corporate rate but it is my belief that this rate must be continued until such time as the budgetary situation will permit substantial reductions in individual income taxes and excise taxes.

With respect to the sections of H. R. 4259 which extend a $20 tax credit to individual taxpayers, I would like to commend my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee for their meritorious action in granting this fair and equitable tax relief. Much more substantial relief is necessary and must be soon granted but this is an important first step in the right direction.

I can well understand the concern of the Republican Party over this Democratic action. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury termed this tax relief "political." When it is considered that 65 percent of the tax reduction will be realized by taxpayers with adjusted gross income of less than $5,000, I suggest it is the Republican opposition to this measure that is political.

The record clearly suggests that giving the small taxpayer a break is not the Republican Party's idea of equitable tax relief. I would call my colleagues attention to what the Republican 80th Congress did in the way of granting tax relief. That Congress enacted a law that gave the average American family of 4 with an adjusted gross income of $2,400 a tax cut of $1.46. That is an increase in take-home pay of 3.3 percent. However, in that same tax-reduction measure the Republicans gave the $25,000 family a tax reduction of $58.50 a week, increasing the take-home pay for this family by 18.5 percent. The little man got a take-home pay increase of 3.3 percent and the high-income man received a take-home pay increase of 18.5 percent.

The story was no different in the Republican 83d Congress. The Republicans claimed they granted $7.4 billion in tax relief in 1954. What they neglected to state was that $6 billion of that $7.4 billion total came from tax-termination dates which were written into the law by a Democratic-controlled Congress. Actually, the net effect of the affirmative actions of the Republicans in the 83d Congress was to increase taxes by $1.4 billion. This resulted from an increase of $800 million due to the 6 months continuation of the excess-profits tax and an increase of $2 billion due to a continuation of the 52 percent corporate rate for 1 year. The $1 billion increase in excise taxes due to the continuation for another year of the Korean excise increases were in net effect offset by the $1 billion in reductions which were made in excise taxes. So what we have as the Republican record in the 83d Congress on tax reduction is an increase in taxes of $2.8 billion and a reduction in tax for the fiscal year 1955 of $1.4 billion with a net tax increase of $1.4 billion.

What the Republicans did succeed in doing during the 83d Congress was to shift the tax burden from a principle of taxation according to ability to pay to a philosophy of continuing the heavy burden of taxation on low-income families while granting preferential tax treatment to the more fortunate few. It has been estimated that of the claimed $7.4 billion in tax relief granted by the Republicans, 71 percent of it went to approximately one-third of the taxpayers—that group having adjusted gross income of $5,000 and over. The remaining two-thirds was realized by the 66 percent of our American families having adjusted gross income of under $5,000.

The Republican tax relief granted in 1954 ran true to form and took care of the Republicans' friends while doing nothing for the average American. For example, they took care of the coupon clippers in the provision of the 1954 Code which grants an exclusion of a credit against tax for dividend income. When fully operative the coupon clippers will benefit to the extent of $362 million a year. When you realize that only 8 families out of 100 in the United States own publicly held corporate stock, you can see how concentrated the relief for the individual income taxpayer is in favor of the wealthy.

We all recall how the Democrats in the House of Representatives came within four votes of throwing out the provision for the coupon clippers in substituting a provision which would have increased individual income exemptions by $100. I opposed the Rich Man's Tax Act of 1954 in committee, on the floor of the House and in conference. I fought the Republican relief for coupon clippers from the time it was first proposed in committee until the conference report was adopted by the two Chambers. Failing in all my efforts to bring about an equitable and balanced tax relief program, I refused to sign the conference report on the new law.

The irresponsible tax discriminations enacted into permanent law during the Republican 83d Congress has made the $20 tax credit an essential balancing factor that must be enacted into law. The $20 tax credit provided in H. R. 4259 will help to offset the preferential tax treatment granted by the Republicans. It is a source of great satisfaction to me that table 2 on page 6 of the committee report accompanying this legislation indicates that 5 million families will be relieved from income-tax liability. It is also a source of satisfaction to me that 65 percent of the tax reduction benefits coming from this $20 tax credit will be realized by families having adjusted gross income under $5,000.

Mr. Chairman, I have briefly highlighted the Republican record of discriminatory tax relief enacted by the Republican Party and supported by the Republican administration as compared with the fair and equitable tax relief which the Democratic Members of the House are sponsoring today. It is time that the American public received the benefits of a tax reduction program that applies fairly across the board and does not give tax relief exclusively to the wealthy coupon clippers and the large corporations. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues in the House to support the enactment of H. R. 4259.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the debates on the tax bill this afternoon one cannot help but come to the conclusion that the Republicans, as well as the Democrats, favor tax reductions. The major area of Republican disagreement centers around the fear that the Republican Party will not receive adequate political credit if this bill is passed today. This is the main basis for Republican opposition.

The Democratic objective in this legislation is to try to grant some tax relief to the working people who were overlooked in the tax bill which passed last year. That bill carried tax reductions of somewhere around $3 billion but most of this went to coupon clippers and those in the upper brackets.

It is my hope that the bill will have a measure of Republican support. President Eisenhower, in his recent budget message, said:

> However, further tax reduction remains a firm goal of this administration. * * * I hope that tax reductions will be so justified next year. If so I shall recommend a reduction in taxes to spread the relief fairly among all taxpayers in a way which will be the most effective to relieve individual tax burdens and to increase incentive for effort and investment.

I should like to point out that the pending bill does not take effect until next year. That is the time President Eisenhower referred to in his budget message. It might also be said that the bill spreads the tax relief fairly among all the taxpayers in such a way as to most effectively relieve individual tax burdens. That conforms with the President's intentions as expressed in his budget message.

Since the November elections, the responsibility of leadership does not rest entirely upon the President. We must not forget the people repudiated the Republican party at the polls. They were displeased with the Republican 83d Congress. The Democratic majority is expected to furnish leadership along with the President and we are doing so in presenting this bill. In carrying out this responsibility, we feel we should indicate the kind of tax relief that should be granted next year. This bill would make it certain that if taxes are reduced as the President indicates the reductions will go to those in the low-income brackets who are least able to bear the tax burden.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, in his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means thoroughly convinced me that we should pass this bill. He frankly admits he has no program along this line, and it is unlikely he will develop one. He seems to follow the Wilson theory of, "What is good for General Motors and the big corporations is good for the country." Under this theory the little fellow will never get any direct tax relief.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman realizes he is making a quotation that is out of context and was not true; does he not? We have had that up on the floor of the House before.

Mr. KARSTEN. The gentleman knows I have great respect for his views, but I will have to differ with him, because Secretary Wilson did make that statement, and it plagued you gentlemen on that side of the aisle during the last 2 years.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Secretary Wilson made his statement very clear and I read his complete statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during debate in the last Congress. I said at that time that I hoped this would put an end to this misquoting. Apparently, my hopes have not been realized.

Mr. KARSTEN. It plagued you for the last 2 years and I venture to say it is going to plague you for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, the controversy about personal income-tax reductions has obscured the fact that this bill is primarily a revenue-raising measure. It continues the present 52-percent corporate income-tax rate which expires on April 1, 1955. In addition, it extends various excise-tax rates, which also expire on April 1. Failure to continue these taxes will result in a revenue loss of somewhere between two and three billion dollars. President Eisenhower has recommended that they be extended because we cannot afford any further loss of revenue this year. In my opinion if we do not continue these taxes there will be absolutely no possibility of any income-tax reductions next year, or in the foreseeable future. It is imperative, therefore, that we act in this matter and that we do so promptly.

I hope this bill will be passed for it is the only way to insure tax relief to those in the lower income brackets. Many of us are afraid the Republican Party in opposing this bill is following the rule of Alice in Wonderland, "Jam tomorrow, jam yesterday, but never jam today." Pass tax relief last year, pass tax relief next year, but never pass tax relief this year. Now is the time for those who really favor tax relief to make their position clear.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, while it is fresh in our minds, I should like to comment on what my good friend from Missouri has just said with reference to our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee a few days ago. In all of my experience, and I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for nearly as long as any of its members, I do not know of anyone who came before our committee so courageously and defended himself so completely as did our great Secretary of the Treasury. He convinced me that he is a man that knows his business. He came before the Committee just as soon as he heard about this proposal to grant this $20 deduction and really knew what would be the result as to what the Democrats were supposed to do. He knew, and we all knew, that this Congress in this session should pass legislation with reference to a number of commodities upon which the excise tax was expiring and that this had to be done by the first of next month. He had planned everything accordingly. He was away some place for a day or so, but when he came back he found out that the Ways and Means Committee was going to do this thing with reference to this $20 exemption business.

What did he do? Did he hide out? No. He immediately demanded that he be allowed to appear before the committee. He came before the committee and answered every question asked him. He outlined his position and delineated the facts and figures to prove what he had in mind. I thought a whole lot more of him after I heard him testify. He handled himself very ably.

How does this legislation come before us? We would not have this legislation if it were not for the fact that there are a number of excise taxes that are going to expire in a short time and here is a list of most of them—special fuels, motor vehicles, gasoline, distilled spirits, perfumes, liquors and wines, beer, cigarettes, and other similar commodities.

Here was a big, magnificent tax structure that was going to fall down if we did not do something about it. The tax coming to the Treasury from these commodities amounts to $1 billion per year. It was time for us to bring this important tax matter up so as to extend the law. The Democrats brought it up. It was their business to do so because they had the majority and had the responsibility.

Nobody, apparently, up to this time, had any thought about this other business of reducing the taxes on individual incomes by $20. How about this $20 deduction? It has been stated that this is altogether for the benefit of poor people. Whom do you consider to be a poor man? What is usually considered as a poor man is a man who does not pay any income tax. As you know a man who does not earn more than $600 does not pay any income tax. If he is married his wife is entitled to a $600 exemption so he does not pay any tax if he does not earn more than $1,200 per year. Then if he has 3 children he is allowed $600 for each of them. So then if he does not earn more than $3,000 per year he pays no tax. And again if the man and his wife are past 65 years of age they are allowed an exemption of $1,200 each.

So, my colleagues, do not vote for this bill if you think you can claim credit from most of the people that are considered as poor people.

Now, what does this legislation do? If I were doing it I would take off a larger percentage of the small taxpayers and leave a larger percentage on the rich people. I would take a lot of these folks who make 3 or 4 thousand dollars and let them out. But you did not do that. You come on here and with great gesture say that you are doing something for the poor people. You would make those people believe you have done a wonderful thing for them. In my opinion, that somewhat lacks decency, for it is not truthful, it is not the fact, and it ought not to be circulated in that manner.

What did the Secretary of the Treasury say in addition to what I have told you? You know, I never thought that the position of Secretary of the Treasury was such a difficult job. I knew that it was a very responsible position. But Mr. George Humphrey showed us how he and his associates had studied the financial activities of the Government. They found that our Government owed many billions and that there was no definite plan for its payment or its reduction. He and his associates have set up a program that they think will carry us out of this financial forest. Already their efforts have had a remarkable effect on our national financial affairs. It was only natural that Mr. Humphrey was chagrined when he heard about this $20 proposal.

Nobody had told him anything about this $20 business. He quickly saw that it was going to upset his calculations. He saw that this matter could be a terrific setback to the financial program of the Government.

If you are a small-business man, you cannot let anybody fool with your cash register for if you do your day's work will come out wrong. But, the Secretary of the Treasury has a great big gigantic program of figuring out finances, and he is going along with it, and he has brought us good results, as everybody knows. The condition of the Treasury is in much better shape than it was a year and a half ago—there is no question about that—and there is every reason to believe that it is going to get better and more secure. Now, you throw this little thing in, and what does it do? It does not amount to much, but it is enough to throw everything out of its proper perspective, as it were, and I believe it is not right. It does not justify your intelligence and your ability, and furthermore it is not right for all the rest of us. It is not right for the taxpayers of the country; it is not right for the businessman who is planning to work himself out of inflation, and he knows now what he can depend upon.

And, over and around us are the clouds of war that are coming before us, and nobody knows what they are going to bring to us. If you throw this tax matter into the financial plans it is like throwing a money wrench into a delicate machine. You can stop it and maybe you can wreck it. It seems that is what you are trying to do; you are trying to stop the financial program that has been set up by the Treasury. And, the man

came up and defended it, and he defended himself against everybody.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to add this little testimony of mine to help out, if it does, with the people, to have a right appraisal of our big American who knows how to finance this Republic. We should do what we started out to do when the Ways and Means Committee was called into session. We should abandon this dangerous new-fangled proposal to allow this $20 deduction. This is misleading and deceptive.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said here during the last 2 days about politics and irresponsibility in loose and loud terms. As one of those who happened to believe in the principle of this bill last year and for a great length of time, I, at least, plead not guilty to any immediate switch in viewpoint or playing in politics.

In order to get this thing into its proper perspective I think it might be well if we examine what the facts are. Really, what has happened here? What is this bill? There has been a lot of talk about one part of it. What does it do? It does principally three things:

First, on April 1, 1956, it will reduce the corporate income tax 5 percentage points.

On April 1, 1956, secondly, it will reduce the excise taxes on automobiles, liquor, tobacco, and other items by some eight-hundred-million-odd dollars.

And thirdly, there is a proposal which has caused all the heat here, and that is that the taxpayers of this country will be guaranteed a $20 tax credit. That is this bill.

Now, where do we stand? Are we deciding here today whether or not we will have tax reductions? Is that the question? Is the matter of reducing taxes in the face of a deficit the question that we here are debating? My friends, that was decided over a year ago. A year ago the administration decided we would reduce taxes in face of a deficit, and that now is the law. Certain tax laws have expired that brought about the reduction in taxes in excess of $7 billion. If the reductions provided for in this bill go into effect next April 1, we will have reduced taxes over $10 billion in 2½ years without one cent of it having gone to the individual taxpayer. That is the question here. It is whether or not, in this program of reduction that has been embarked upon there will be any assurance to the taxpayers that they will receive their proportionate part of the reduction.

A great deal has been said and probably will be said about whether or not we should reduce taxes in the face of a deficit; and many allusions have been made to good business practice and what a businessman would do under the circumstances. I do not profess to be an expert in the field of business, but I have had some little experience and I know this, that many times to expand a business, to make it grow, it is necessary to borrow capital, and to keep up with expansion it is necessary to expend funds. The President has made a similar recommendation with regard to taxes.

I know that if our economy is to continue to grow, which it has not done in the last year, with our expanding population and increasing labor force, and if we are to provide employment and good business, we are going to have to find new funds to go into the market for consumer goods. Furthermore, we have the capacity in this country at this time to produce almost any amount of consumer goods that is required. This $20 tax credit, most of it, will find its way back into the consumer market.

I have been told and I have heard some illustrious Members of this body argue that a dollar turns over about seven times a year and there is a tax cut taken every time it turns over. So this $815 million that would be provided next year would provide, I believe, additional tax revenues.

I am one of those who believes that our tax burdens and our tax laws have reached the point of diminishing returns. Our tax burden in this country is something like 32 percent-plus of our national gross income. We are told that when it passes 25 percent we have reached the danger point. I think if we reduce that percentage toward 25 percent, we will probably collect as much as or more taxes and I, for one, will support this whole bill to reduce corporate taxes in 1956, to reduce excise taxes in 1956, and to reduce personal income taxes in 1956.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the Democratic Party is so very, very eager to show its unsoundness with respect to the finances of the United States Government; so eager, in fact, that over a year in advance of the time anybody would get any alleged benefit under this bill, and regardless of the situation which will exist a year from now when the bill would become effective, and entirely without regard to the forty, fifty, sixty, or seventy billions of dollars which will be spent by the United States Government during that year, as yet unappropriated and, of course, uncollected at this time; in view of all those facts I cannot, for the life of me see why it is that the Democratic Party is so eager to approve irresponsible and unsound financial practices at this moment.

Evidently there is some belief that they will be able to guide the people into believing that they are getting a real tax concession effective over a year from today, and that it will make friends of people who benefit thereby.

I want the people of the country to know that if there is any more unemployment between now and some time next year, in the event this proposal by the Democrats to cut taxes becomes law, that factor will be one of the major contributing factors in the cause of that unemployment.

I will attempt to illustrate it and prove it in this manner.

The moment this irresponsible type of tax reduction becomes law not one businessman who, after all, is the man who provides the jobs in the United States, will have any confidence whatever but that our financial record being made by Mr. Eisenhower and our party up to date is to be disregarded in the future, certainly to be disregarded so long as the Democratic Party controls the House and the Senate. By that I mean to say that the policy brought about to date through hard work of attempting to balance the budget will be out the window, as the saying goes. In the future any businessman who, I repeat, is the employer, will have every reason to believe that the financial policies in Washington are changed and that no longer are we to be guided by an effort to have a balanced budget and retain the stability of the dollar, but that on the contrary we are going back to the old practices of spend and spend and inflate and inflate the dollar, and thereby kid the American voters.

I have heard people who know better stand up here and say that a year ago we passed a tax bill which did not dollar-wise reduce taxes among all the people of our country evenly, as though it were possible to give a man a $500 tax reduction when the total of his taxes might be less than $100. That kind of argument means nothing. But I say to you that in the tax bill of last year we did those things which permitted us to keep on our tax rolls millions of taxpayers, a substantial number of whom would be eliminated in your proposed bill.

The easiest way to reduce taxes for anybody, to take people entirely off the tax rolls, is to put them out of a job. I tell you that this $20 proposal you have will put people out of jobs by creating a condition of uncertainty in the great employing forces of our country, and instead of having work for the man who expects to save $20 on taxes he may not have a job, as the result of this kind of loose financial policy.

Your corporation, a collection of individuals, gets its dollars somewhere, from selling goods, of course, and having got those dollars what does it do with them? It goes out and buys the materials upon which people work. It spends a large proportion of its money for that. It pays wages. A still greater proportion of its income goes for wages. It pays taxes. Fifty-two percent of all the money that corporation makes comes into the Federal Treasury. Then it pays dividends, rent, if you please, for the use of other people's money, to provide the—what is it?—$10,000, $12,000, $14,000 that must be invested before any man can have a job.

What did that tax bill we passed last year do to make all of the people support it? What did it do? It made possible for the management of business to know that for a while in the future there would be some relationship between income and outgo in our country, that there would be a reasonably healthy atmosphere in which business might hope to expand, in which jobs would be provided, and in which, if the emergency spending for war and the preparation for war gradually tapered off, as the country became more economy- and more efficiency-minded, business might take up the slack.

And so H. R. 8300, 83d Congress, making no pretense of dividing the tax savings among the individuals of the country, but designed to take up the unemployment in our country, designed to provide jobs, became the law of our land. And it has worked. It has worked magnificently so that today, in a day when Government spending is dropping off, where business is taking its place, and private capital is going into the investment field instead of the money being taken from the people by way of taxes, I urge you all to support legislation which will keep our Federal financial stature strong, and to do nothing to lead business to become nervous, to depend upon Government for largesse and kindnesses, and on the contrary let business realize that our Government now and in the future is going to provide a healthy place for expansion and the providing of jobs right here in the United States. If we do that, then this Congress will have made the greatest contribution it can make for the continued financial stability of our country. In this day, as we face the future with uncertainty, we want to be sure, that should the worst come to pass and our country be called upon to face the enemies abroad, we have here at home a healthy economy, an economy capable of providing jobs in the area in which the help of the individuals will be needed in the carrying on of war. We can do that only if we enact sound legislation here which in the final analysis will provide a healthy climate for the expansion of business.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the Republican spokesmen in opposition to the proposal to reduce personal income taxes by $20 per person have made a great point of irresponsibility of action on the part of Democrats and of the unsound economic character of this proposal. I think it is interesting to look back at the economic situation in January 1953, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] reported from his committee a bill to advance by 6 months the date of the 10 percent income tax cut scheduled for January 1954. In the fourth quarter of 1952, the gross national product was running at $362 billion. This was an increase of between $3 and $4 billion over the previous quarter. In 1953, gross national product reached $364.9 billion. If I understood the gentleman from New York here a few minutes ago, he said that he proposed this advance because the country was on the verge of a depression, at the beginning of 1953, and he wanted to head that off—to anticipate it. Unemployment in 1952 averaged 1,524,000 men. At the present time it is averaging 3,230,000 men. Unemployment is twice what it was in 1953 when the gentleman from New York wanted to head off a depression by advancing the date at which the income-tax reduction would go into effect. The cost of living index then was 113.5 and it was moving upward. Yet, the gentleman states that he was afraid a depression was coming upon us; consequently he proposed to reduce income taxes 6 months earlier than they were scheduled to be reduced. The budget deficit in 1952, that is the fiscal year 1952, was $4 billion. In 1953, the year during which he proposed that reduction, it reached $9.5 billion. It is estimated that the deficit for 1956 will be $2.5 billion. Now when the Democrats, under conditions which indicate much more justification for a tax cut of this kind, make a proposal to cut personal income taxes, they are charged with being irresponsible and with having no regard for the economic facts of life. Yet, the gentleman from New York proposed a reduction of twice as much under conditions in which there was much less justification.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman referred to the proposed tax reduction of 1953, a 10 percent reduction. Was that ever seriously proposed by the Republican Party?

Mr. MCCARTHY. It was reported by the Ways and Means Committee which was controlled by the Republicans. That is sufficient for me. It was supported by the leaders in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. In answer to the gentleman from Minnesota that perhaps it was not proposed by the Republican Party, as I remember it neither were the reductions in excise taxes, although the Republican Party, after those things were forced upon them, later took credit for it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Of course. There is more justification for what we are doing today, because this is part of the Democratic program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The criteria for evaluating taxes and tax systems have not changed very much since Adam Smith wrote about them in the middle of the 18th century. There are four recognized standards: First, the standard of justice, including equity of imposition and equality of tax treatment; second, the economic effects; third, the ease of administration and compliance; and fourth, consideration of revenue. It is my intention to examine the legislation which is before us in the light of these standards, particularly the $20 tax credit proposal and to make certain comparisons with the tax revision bill of 1954.

It is well known that the Tax Revision Act of 1954 gave little or no relief to low-income citizens. Its concessions were principally to business and industry and to people in the high-income brackets. It was argued, of course, that personal income tax had been reduced by the income tax reduction which went into effect in January of 1954. This, of course, was true. It was argued further that the tax changes proposed in the 1954 act were necessary for business, that they would have a stimulating effect upon the economy, that eventually everyone would be better off.

Let us consider first the justice of the proposed $20 income tax credit. In the Federal tax system the income tax, individual and corporate, has become an accepted vehicle for the levy of a tax based upon ability to pay. Obviously ability to pay income tax is reduced in low-income tax brackets. One of the arguments frequently used, if not most frequently used, by the opponents of part 4 of this bill is that this provision would have the effect of eliminating approximately 5 million taxpayers from paying any taxes. Some will go further and propose that by being removed from income-tax liability somehow these American citizens lose their sense of responsibility and become second-class citizens. As a matter of fact, they will not escape the payment of taxes. Their tax load other than the Federal individual income tax will continue to bear heavily upon these citizens, who now pay taxes every time they buy a gallon of gasoline, whenever they pay rent or make payments on their home mortgages, almost every time they buy food or engage in any kind of economic activity. Studies show that the lower income groups bear an extraordinarily heavy share of the tax burden over and above their income-tax load. This tax burden consists of excise taxes, shifted corporation taxes, and taxes paid to other units of Government in the United States. One authoritative study reported in the National Tax Journal shows that the income group having an income of less than $1,000 per year pays 23.6 percent of its income in taxes. The proposal contained in part 4 of this bill will give direct and needed relief to people in the low-income groups.

It is particularly important and equitable that the Federal tax load be reduced at this time since the present administration is pursuing a policy which will shift government and other responsibilities to State and local governments, and thereby make necessary higher taxes at these levels. It is well known that taxes at the State and local levels of government are not graduated in the manner in which Federal taxes are graduated and that the burden falls much more heavily upon low-income groups. There is no reason to believe that those citizens who are freed from paying Federal income tax through this amendment will be freed from the payment of all taxes, or become unaware of their tax liabilities. I am satisfied that they will remain good citizens of communities, of States, and of the Nation.

The second important consideration with regard to taxes is their economic effect. It is generally agreed that the productive capacity of our economy is high; that it possesses the potential of producing ample goods sufficient to meet any reasonably anticipated demand. On the other hand, there has been a lag in demand. This $20 tax saving will increase the purchasing power of every taxpayer and the majority of them will use the money either to buy goods, or to make payments on goods already purchased.

The opponents of the bill have argued that the $20 credit will be inflationary.

The President has lent his own support to this view. I assume that Republicans who last week argued that the President's authority should not be given weight on the trade question because he knew little or nothing about tariffs, will argue today that his authority should be given great weight on an even more complicated economic question of taxation. Inflation occurs when the increase in purchasing power is not matched by an increase in available goods and services. There was an inflationary situation existing in 1948 when the 80th Congress passed a tax bill over the President's veto. Under the present bill this tax saving for each taxpayer will be distributed through the year at the rate of about 37 cents a week. This is certainly a gradual increase in purchasing power and should allow for an orderly adjustment on the production side. The result should not be inflation but rather an increase in the gross national product and an increase in employment and business activity.

Supporters of H. R. 8300 in the last Congress argued that the adoption of that tax program would result in the broadening of investment, in increases in production, and in decline of unemployment, and so on. Actually not one of these has been accomplished. It can, of course, be argued that conditions would be worse if the tax bill had not been adopted but this point cannot be proved. Let us look at some of the facts. It was stated that the use of bonds to raise money was dangerous and that through the passage of H. R. 8300 encouragement would be given to the purchase of stocks. Figures from the Securities Exchange Commission show that the ratio of new issues of bonds to stocks has not been materially altered. The so-called little investor for whom the Republicans were so concerned last year has not been moved to purchase shares of stock. There is some reason to believe that the high price of stocks has served as a barrier to the purchase of stock by the small investor. I pointed out last year when the tax-revision bill was being debated that the favored status for dividend income would raise the price of stock to those who then held stock and that it was in effect a windfall gain for those stockholders. High administration and Treasury officials have admitted that in their judgment there is a speculative factor at work in the stock market today. This cannot be explained in terms of anticipated inflation. It cannot be explained in terms of anticipated higher corporate profits since corporate profits from operations declined last year. It can be explained, in my judgment, only in terms of the effect of the tax program of last year and possibly of anticipated tax changes of a similar nature in the future. The weight of economic argument is in favor of the $20 income-tax credit.

The third criterion for a good tax has to do with the ease of administration and compliance. Proposed before us is a model of simplicity. Taxpayers will have no difficulty with it. It will involve no additional administrative attention. Consider this element of simplicity in contrast with the complexity and confusion which has arisen in connection with the administration of H. R. 8300. Complaints have come in from every section of the Nation regarding the complexity of its form. Taxpayers are not able to determine their tax liability with certainty or confidence.

The fourth criterion of taxes is that of revenue. The revenue loss for the fiscal year 1956 resulting from the adoption of this amendment will be $815 million, according to the best available estimates. Some of this should be made up through increased business activity and consequently increased tax collections from other taxes. This tax reduction will not go into effect until January 1956. The action here proposed gives substance to the promise or expressed hope of administration leaders. The postponement of the effective date until January 1956 gives the administration time to consider the possible effects of this reduction and to propose other legislation as a means of replacing this lost revenue if the administration remains convinced that undesirable economic and fiscal consequences will follow the adoption of this proposal. In face of a budget deficit of approximately $4½ billion last year, the administration supported a bill which diminished revenue by at least $1.5 billion. Loss of revenue is likely to increase in the years to come as a result of the use of depreciation allowances, the full effect of the dividend credit, and the cumulative effect of other changes made in the law. Today, with an anticipated deficit of $2.5 billion, the administration opposes as unsound a reduction of $815 million.

The passage of this bill with the $20 income-tax credit serves notice of the determination of Congress to give tax relief to the individual income-tax payer. This should not embarrass the administration since in effect it has promised such relief. Moreover, it gives the administration time to propose and recommend a better tax program or tax changes to replace the income which will be lost as a result of the passage of this bill.

Arguments of opponents that the passage of this act now is dangerous since we do not know what world conditions are likely to be are without substance since the Congress, particularly the Democratic Members, have repeatedly demonstrated their willingness to cooperate with the executive branch of the Government in meeting emergencies of every kind.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, various administration spokesmen have used pretty drastic language in opposing the Democratic move to reduce the income-tax burden of the American people by a small amount. They have called it a maneuver completely contrary to the public interest. They have alleged, "this move is playing fast and loose with the welfare of 160 million Americans."

Last fall Mr. Humphrey and his administration took a different view of lower taxes. "At last we have a tax cut," the President himself told a nationwide TV audience on October 8, 1954. "It brings benefits to every family in every American home," he claimed.

That, of course, was election time and the President was anxious to get a Republican Congress elected. Today the administration considers it "playing politics" to speak of tax cuts.

Tonight and every night until April 15, the lights will be burning late in a great many American homes as people struggle with their income-tax returns. I use the word "struggle" advisedly because these new Republican tax forms are so bewildering and complex, I am surprised they did not tangle up the Government's printing presses. At any rate, a great many American families are discovering right now just who is playing fast and loose with their welfare.

They are discovering, as Democrats told them all along, that the new Republican tax bill of 1954 does not save most of them a penny. It provides little or no benefits for people in the low and middle income groups, people who need a little more money to buy more food, more consumer goods, more services. The lion share of the tax benefits from the Republican tax bill went to the big corporations and those who receive all or part of their income from corporation stock dividends. They constitute just about 8 percent of our population.

"Oh, but don't be disappointed," the administration says to these people. "Our tax benefits for the wealthy and for the corporations will trickle down to you eventually. Our depreciation allowance, for instance, will stimulate new investments. New investments will mean more jobs and greater prosperity."

Mr. Chairman, there have been many excellent speeches presented here today which have properly pointed out the preferential tax treatment given to high income taxpayers under the Republican tax program of the 83d Congress. I will not attempt to repeat the many facts that clearly point out the tax discriminations that the Republican Party made a permanent part of our Federal tax laws. I would, however, like to express my complete endorsement of the remarks made by my Democratic colleagues who have preceded me.

Also, Mr. Chairman, rather than repeating what has already been said in explaining the bill, H. R. 4259, I will merely commend my beloved chairman and friend, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, for his very clear explanation of the provisions of this bill.

I would now like to direct the attention of the Members of this Chamber to a particular aspect of the Republican tax program which I think is typical of the manner in which the Republican Party has given tax preferences to a fortunate few without achieving the successful operation of the Republican trickle-down theory of tax relief. The particular aspect to which I refer is the so-called liberalized depreciation allowances on capital goods and equipment.

Well, let us look at these new depreciation allowances which were written into the Republican tax revision bill last year. Just what has this device stimulated? How many new jobs have been created by it?

Under the old system, as you know, a business firm deducts the cost of plant and equipment for tax purposes evenly over its estimated life. If a new machine has an estimated life, say, of 20 years, its costs is written off as a cost item over 20 years at the rate of 5 percent each year.

Under the new Republican depreciation allowance a business firm is permitted to deduct each year twice the percentage allowed under the old regulations. The double percentage is applied each year, not to the original cost, but rather to the unamortized balance. This has the effect of permitting about two-thirds of the cost of a business investment in a new machine or a new plant to be written off in half its estimated life.

This scheme is supposed to induce business to invest more money in new plant and equipment. Actually, however, this medicine was concocted for an ill which did not exist, at least when the Democrats were at the helm. Business expenditures for new plant and equipment rose steadily up to 1953. Investments of this type were $5½ billion in 1939. They were at an annual average of $19.2 billion in 1946 to 1949. In the following 2-year period they rose to an average $25.1 billion a year. Just before the Republican doctors, or should I say medicine men, forced this miracle pill down our throat, in the third quarter of 1953, total business outlays for new plant and equipment reached $28.92 billion annually.

Since then it has been declining slowly but steadily. It is still going down.

We Democrats said right from the beginning that the fast writeoff provisions of the Republican tax bill would not and could not cure this evil. We said that Dr. Humphrey's pill would not stop the decline in new investments. It did not.

The curve on the chart is still going down. Business outlays for new plant and equipment stood at $27 billion in the third quarter of 1954, at the time the provision went into effect. The fourth quarter of 1954 it was down to $26.59 billion, according to Government estimates. And in the first quarter of this year it is expected to sink still lower, to an estimated $26.03 billion.

When and how are we going to stop this alarming decline in investments? When and how are we going to face up to our responsibility to make possible full employment and an adequate standard of living for all Americans?

The Republican tax policy surely will not do it.

Instead of stimulating more investment and greater expenditures for new machines and more plants, as its sponsors claimed it would, the fast writeoff provision actually scares investors away. That is what many corporation managers themselves claim it does.

I was much interested in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, February 13, 1955, on this subject. According to this article, Willard F. Stanley, president of Corporate Services, Inc., says that the changes in the rules for depreciating new property will cost the Federal Government about $1 billion in taxes this year. And because few corporate managers will use one set of figures for the collectors and another for their shareholders. Mr. Stanley says, the same changes are likely to cut apparent corporate net profits by $450 million.

In fact, the president of Corporate Services, Inc., urges corporations to keep two sets of books. Otherwise, he fears, the investing public may not understand what is happening and that would have an unfortunate effect on the market for securities.

Mr. Stanley says that 80 percent of those planning to use the rapid writeoffs intended to book the rapid rate. They will thus deduct large chunks of money from profit, but to be held as cash. This, he thinks, is quite unnecessary and means not only letting the tail wag the dog but using a tail never intended for that particular dog. Keep a different set of books for your stockholders, he says, to show them profits. He does not say reinvest.

But double books or no, a majority of businesses are not using the new fast writeoff provisions at all. The New York Times of February 17, 1955, reported that only 45 percent of companies recently surveyed are using the new provision. Two-thirds of them hasten to add that it is not affecting their plans for capital spending.

The survey was conducted by the National Industrial Conference Board, a nonprofit research organization. It found that 35 percent of companies have definitely decided against using the new plan. Twenty percent are still undecided. They are still studying the new rules, presumably still looking for the great stimulus it is to give to new investments for making more products—products which people cannot afford to buy because they lack purchasing power.

The plain fact is that this fast tax writeoff provides no incentive to new investments and economic expansion.

We have noted that this new Republican policy has not stopped the decline of our economy. We have noted that it tends to alarm investors and results in double bookkeeping. And now this new survey of the National Industrial Conference Board tells us that a majority of corporations does not even want it.

These firms, according to the New York Times, are apprehensive over the Internal Revenue Service's interpretation of the new law. They would like a stable rate of writeoff. They prefer not to gamble on tax rates which, of course, may go up again in an emergency. They are perfectly satisfied with the old straight-line method.

Most of all, however, the business world is beginning to realize that the way to encourage and stimulate new investment is not by new gimmicks in the tax law but by the proven law of supply and demand. There must be a demand for products and money to buy them.

Here is what George Shea writes in the Wall Street Journal of February 21, 1955:

> The answers that say depreciation methods won't affect spending plans go on to explain that these plans depend, as before, on three factors: demand for products, advantages of technological improvements, and the availability of cash.

The key words in this sentence are, of course, "demand for products." No such demand can be created by the administration's tax policy of 1954. In fact, let us face it, this whole theory of giving the breaks to the big fellow and then letting the benefits trickle down to the little fellow has been a failure. Our entire economy is afflicted by creeping stagnation. The Republican cure did not work.

The only way to create the needed demand is to put more money into the hands of the little fellow who will buy more products. The only stimulus to needed expansion at this time can come from rising consumer purchasing power and sales. This is not playing politics but sound economic thinking, confirmed and reconfirmed by experience.

Our national economy requires a strengthened mass consumption base. That is why I shall vote to cut the taxes of every American by $20. Our people need this added cash in their pockets, not to keep double books but to buy the goods and services to keep our factories rolling and to make certain our men and women are at work.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman from Minnesota did not yield on the point he was making in regard to the purpose of the stock dividend credit. Its purpose was to switch corporate financing. I know, because I personally am very much interested in the provision and have watched it with a great deal of interest. The point is that it did not go into effect from the practical standpoint until after July 1954, so we have little basis on which to observe whether or not what we were hoping to accomplish has been accomplished.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The only basis we have for judgment is what is reported in the Securities and Exchange index; there has been no change.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But the point is, as I have been saying to the gentleman, that the tax has not been in effect long enough to have had any economic impact at all. I might say that there is one specific thing which is a very significant thing. General Motors in their refinancing went to a new stock issue instead of a bond issue just recently; and one of the main factors in their going away from bond financing to equity financing was this very provision in that bill. Whether or not that one isolated case is going to be indicative of what does happen within these next few

months as far as corporate financing is concerned is the important thing; and I personally am most interested to see whether or not that is accomplished; because, as I said on the floor of the House during the debate on H. R. 8300, if our theorizing of its economic effect does not materialize, I would be in favor of going back on that particular thing. My objection at the time was the fact that folks who did not know what the purpose was should argue there were other reasons behind it. I thank the gentleman for pointing out the real reasons, although I do say that we have certainly not had enough opportunity of observing the effect of that law to see whether or not we have achieved anything at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the gentleman has made a fair statement about the need to reserve judgment. My point is that up to this time there is no basis for economic certainty that this provision has had any great stimulating effect upon industry or for saying that it has accomplished the purpose that those who supported it had in mind.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. One significant occurrence is the action of General Motors, which I pointed out. Whether or not there will be other such issues I do not know.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We have had just about enough talk about the 1954 tax reduction bill. It will be recalled that that bill provided an income-tax reduction of $3 billion of which 62 percent went to people who earned less than $6,000 a year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. The gentleman is referring to the 10-percent tax cut that everyone got in this country beginning January 1, 1954.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Under that same bill the excise taxes were reduced $1 billion. We all know those excise taxes were on luggage, travel, toilet articles, hunting equipment, and sporting goods. How can anyone say that that reduction of a billion dollars in excise taxes, when it went for those things—travel, luggage, toilet articles, and so forth—was in a wealthy man's bill? I think it also reached out to people of low income.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman exactly and will go even further than that. Communications and transportation taxes are taxes on business and those taxes are passed on to the consumer of any product, be it a loaf of bread or a bottle of milk. They are the most vicious form of excise taxes because they in effect are a national sales tax.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman will agree with me that when we passed last year the excise tax bill, giving a reduction in excises along those lines, it affected the wealthy and the poor as well?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It not only affected them but it affected a lot more people, people that my Democratic friends are overlooking entirely in this bill. That is the little fellow who does not make enough money to pay taxes. I refer to people on pensions and on social security. They pay these hidden taxes on their loaf of bread and their bottle of milk just as much as the other man does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Another feature of that bill was the reduction of $2 billion in excess-profits taxes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. According to the best information I have, in connection with that reduction of $2 billion in excess-profits taxes, 61 percent of that money was used by the employers to build new factories, to put in equipment, and so forth in order to give work to hundreds of thousands of men. Does the gentleman remember at that particular time there were many gloomy people who were saying there was going to be a recession or a depression and spoke along those lines? So I repeat, the best information I have is that 61 percent of that went to the building of factories to give work to people which in turn brought more taxes back than the amount involved in the excess-profits tax structure.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. He is making a very fair observation. The hearings held by the Small Business Committee under the control of the Democratic Party incidentally and the hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means, indicate that the businesses that were being hit the hardest were the small and growing businesses, those that wanted to expand and build the plants the gentleman refers to. The name "excess profits" was not descriptive of that tax at all. It was really a tax on the "growth" and new companies in this country. I honor those on the Democratic side of the aisle who recognized that and voted with us. We agreed on that and we eliminated that tax entirely.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Another item was the $1.4 billion involved in the tax revision bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Those speaking with authority, agree that the $1.4 billion tax-revision bill was spread out in some form or other to practically every individual in the United States regardless of his income. Will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman. The tax-revision bill was not a tax-reduction bill at all, as was pointed out in committee and on the floor of the House, and has never been contradicted on the floor of the House or in committee. It was a tax-revision bill, it was a bill to correct a lot of inequities that we knew existed. We did give some tax relief, but that was incidental in correcting some inequities.

Let us take, for example, the additional reduction we gave a working mother which has been referred to here. That was not because we singled out working mothers for benefit. It was based upon the argument that the businessman could deduct from his gross income a business expense: Why should a mother not do likewise, who had to pay a baby sitter to look after her 3- or 4-year old child while she worked, deduct the expenses of a baby sitter? We felt that that was a fair argument and it was an inequity that existed in the interpretation of the law. The purpose was to correct the inequity.

Let me illustrate again. Why did we give an additional $1,200, or about $1,000, credit to the people on retirement pensions like teachers who were not on social-security retirement? To give that to them? No. It was because of this argument. It was pointed out that we gave people who had social-security retirement complete exemption from taxation for their social-security benefits, and the argument of the teachers and others was "Here we have paid for our own retirement plan. Why should those who get it through social security get special tax treatment over and above the treatment we are getting?" And the committee felt that that was an inequity, and that is why we corrected it.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and all this is going over the debate we had last year. As I say, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. If this were a tax-revision bill, surely there should be some tax loopholes closed which would get more taxes, and that is exactly what the case was. I think we counted over 50 specific provisions in that tax-revision bill where we closed loopholes and gained revenue.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman not agree that the Republicans will be in approximately the same position in January of 1956 that they were in January 1954 when the 10-percent income-tax provision went into effect? Now, as you know, that provision was included in the law under a Democratic-controlled Congress. There was a deficit of about $9 billion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What is the question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will get to the question.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to correct the gentleman's statement first.

Mr. McCARTHY. All right. Correct it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In committee it was the Republicans who put in the expiration date of that particular bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. In any case, it came out under a Democratic Congress.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, a Democratic Congress passed it.

Mr. McCARTHY. And you had a Republican Congress in control previous to January 1954.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Anticipating a 10-percent cut in the income taxes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. And you had a budget deficit at the end of fiscal 1953 of about $9 billion, so there was ample time for the Republicans to say "This is unsound; we are going to head this

off, and this 10-percent cut will not go into effect because we want a sound fiscal policy."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Republicans did not do that. On the contrary, they claimed that it was a Republican reduction, and the President just yesterday included that $3 or $4 billion in saying the Republicans had reduced taxes by $7 billion under his administration.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now, I will be happy to explain what the facts are. In the first place, the Korean war was in the past, and we had the problem, which so many people failed to recognize, of trying to revert from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy, and that required different economic treatment. And, if you will note, the Eisenhower administration plans at all times were based on this. But, above all, by cutting $14 billion out of the Truman budget, we were able to allow that tax reduction to go in, and I will say to you gentlemen here and now if in these ensuing months you will join with us in trying to cut these appropriations and get this budget in hand, why, of course, we can give tax relief. But, except from the standpoint of one segment of your group over there, you have always been going through the aisle on a teller vote to put money back into the budget, and every time we try to get a reasonable cut in appropriations you are the ones that prevent us from doing it. There is only one way to balance the budget, and that is to grapple with these appropriation problems, in my estimation.

Now I want to say why I took the floor in the very beginning. It was mainly to give an opportunity to anyone on the Democratic side who wanted to take exception, to speak up to anything I said in my supplemental views in this report on this particular bill. In the concluding paragraph I say:

> The procedures adopted by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee make a mockery of orderly legislative process. They bring the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress itself into disrepute.

Now, I can see why the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], did not want to explain to this House why the committee had followed the procedures that they had followed and, in fact, said that my remarks in asking him to explain were not contributing anything to this debate.

I will say to the ladies and gentlemen of the House that every word uttered on the Democratic side of the aisle in behalf of this legislation is so much ashes until you can explain away why you have proceeded in this fashion; not permitting the Committee on Ways and Means even to consider this matter. All of these facts and figures that you are quoting are only your own ideas, nothing that the Committee on Ways and Means has ever had an opportunity to look into to check their accuracy.

I can understand why the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] when I asked him to yield to me and to tell me where he got his figures which applied to H. R. 8300, the tax-revision bill, was reluctant to tell me where they came from. Perhaps at this time he will tell me who computed those figures on the effect of H. R. 8300.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, certainly. My understanding is that Secretary Humphrey has admitted that it would cost $1.9 billion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. I am talking about the tax-revision bill of last year. When the gentleman was trying to point out that people with incomes under $5,000 per year were not getting very much benefit, that it was a rich-man's tax bill, that is when I asked the gentleman to yield and to explain where he had gotten the figures. Did the gentleman compute those himself?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to put them in the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point is who compiled them? I think I can answer the question myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a table here showing revenue effects, estimated revenue loss in the fiscal year 1955 and the number of taxpayers affected by the changes made by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. That will be made a part of the record, and it will show that under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—that is the Republican bill——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, that is the Republican bill, and I am proud of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman may well be. Only 23 percent of the immediate tax relief and only 9 percent of the long-run tax relief contained in the law went to taxpayers with incomes under $5,000.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What are the details behind that? The gentleman is begging the question up to this point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, the gentleman is.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. The gentleman is caught and says that I am evading the question.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am giving the gentleman plenty of time to explain.

Mr. McCORMACK. The income group with incomes of over $5,000 received 38 percent of the immediate relief and 18 percent of the long-run relief. It is estimated that corporations received 39 percent of the immediate relief and 73 percent of the long-run relief.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Those figures are inaccurate, and I am asking the gentleman where they came from and who compiled such figures. I think I can tell the gentleman, and I shall tell him. This morning I came from an executive session of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Under our procedures I may not discuss what goes on in an executive session, other than to say this: I have seen those conclusions from the alleged statistics. They are from the PAC of the CIO. I have had the pleasure—and it was a pleasure, because I respect those gentlemen of the CIO—of sitting with them for over 2 or 3 hours and going over some of those estimates with them last year. And, believe me, I can say this, that at the end of it they said, "Well, we cannot discuss it further. We had better get our tax experts and economists to come in and give you our information," and these tax experts and economists have not appeared to this day, because, gentlemen, they cannot back these figures up. Those are just a lot of figures that mean nothing. That is why I asked the gentleman where he got them. He was just begging the question.

I know you have been saying this has been a rich man's bill, but on the floor of the House no one has dared to try to establish that in honest debate, and no one ever dare to try to establish it in honest debate in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman state what the tax reduction will be in the 1954 tax bill?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean H. R. 8300?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The actual estimate of tax losses over the long range, about which I am mainly concerned, with the exception of things like baby sitters and people not on social security—I have never actually computed all these things—those were losses, but the essential features of the bill that you all have been saying were losses, like depreciation allowance, as a typical example, like stock dividend credit, in my judgment, and the arguments we advanced in the Committee on Ways and Means, were that those were not overall revenue losses although there were estimates of the immediate loss for the next year or two until the losses began bringing back in what your originally anticipated loss might be.

I can illustrate it, for example, on your stock dividends. A corporation, say, borrows a billion dollars in bonds or bank borrowings. It deducts the interest it pays on that billion from its gross income, so that is not subject to the 52-percent tax. If we could get the corporations to finance through equity investment, that is, stocks, then that equivalent amount earned on the investment capital would be subject to 52 percent tax. Take in the case of General Motors, if they will issue, as they apparently are going to, a stock issue instead of a bond issue, we are going to pick up 52-percent tax on the earnings from that capital investment.

As I said in the Committee on Ways and Means when we were discussing this thing, I can understand honest disagreement as to whether that economic theory would work. I thought it would. But certainly the whole measure was passed on that basis, not on the basis that we were giving any tax relief to stockholders or any group of that nature more than in the depreciation allowance that we were giving any benefit to companies, because over the lifetime of the equipment you do not get one cent more from depreciating early than you do from depreciating later. As a matter of fact, we think the Government will gain more taxes.

Many of your Democratic members on the Committee on Ways and Means agree with that philosophy on stock dividends and certainly on depreciation, that there

is no over-all tax loss; that, if anything, there is a tax gain.

That is why it is so important to get into the details of these things and know where your figures came from. That is what the Committee on Ways and Means should have been doing, in studying whether or not this particular Mills amendment was justified. We did not go into one iota of anything, with no public hearings. I was shut off there, I might state, in just about the same fashion the chairman responded to my inquiry here on the floor as to why he would not explain to this membership why the great Committee on Ways and Means had not had hearings, had not even had a discussion of this measure, instead of coming in at night, on Saturday evening with this brand new proposal. I was called in my office. I happened to be working on Sunday. A newspaper reporter asked me what I thought of this tax-reduction bill. I said, "What tax-reduction bill?" That is where I learned about it.

I came here to the Committee on Ways and Means at 10 o'clock on Monday morning. The written notice that we had did not say we were taking up the Mills amendment. I asked in the Committee on Ways and Means that the chairman rule that the Mills amendment was not germane to this bill, and that the procedures were not correctly followed in notifying the members. The chairman full well knew that I was within my rights as a member of that committee in asking that ruling be favorable. His response was, "We have never followed technical procedure in the Ways and Means Committee." That was the reason given for overruling my motion.

I want to say this: It is this kind of procedure, and I would say it whether it is Republican or Democratic, that will destroy the independent legislative branch of this Government.

I would like, and I would hope, that the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, will take the floor, as he did on the other measure last week when he asked us to follow correct procedure on this floor. I hope he will explain to this body why he thinks this procedure is proper, and why he thinks this procedure is conducive to good legislation because, in my judgment, this irregular procedure is what will wreck this country and this is what can very easily wreck this country.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the lucid explanation of the gentleman and his familiarity with the bill. Does the gentleman have any information that he can give to the Committee for our information as to the benefit that the average taxpayer will receive, and in what manner and at what date it will be received if this bill passes?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The taxpayers will receive a $20-cut beginning January 1, 1956. However, I might say that that is a questionable benefit because I predict, as I say in my minority views, that we are going to have 1 cent go out of the purchasing power of the dollar and every $5,000 income is going to be reduced $50 in order to get this $20. The Federal debt for every man, woman, and child, by increasing the debt $2.3 billion in order to get this $20 is increased $15 per capita.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But in your minority views, you indicate the $20 allowance will increase the national debt to the extend of $15 per individual. Is that not so?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then, in addition to that, the taxpayer will receive the benefit of this in his payroll deduction whereby he pays his income tax?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is in the latter part of the fiscal year 1956, as I understand it?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, many people will be given it at the beginning of 1956 because it is a payroll deduction beginning on January 1, 1956, the calendar year. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And if he is only eligible for the full $20, that is, if he has no dependents, the amount per month will be very small beginning the 1st of January until the $20 allowance is granted?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It would be a small amount. It could be computed by dividing 12 into $20. Well, that is not entirely fair—no—because not only does the individual taxpayer get $20, but there is a $20 allowance for the wife and children. We want to be fair about this thing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But if he only was eligible for a $20 deduction.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, that is true.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The offer that is made in this bill as compared to the proposal made a year ago by the Democratic side of the House was a $100 exemption, which they computed in this year evidently as equal in tax credit.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct, yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. So that this year, they are now offering the public $20, and last year they were offering a $100 exemption.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I think one reason for the change was the argument that the rich man who pays 87 percent would get $87 for every $100 credit, while the person with a lower income only gets $20.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. In answer to the gentleman from California, I think it should be pointed out that the $20 per dependent credit is equivalent at least in the first or minimum bracket to a $100 increase in the exemption allowed; is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I believe that is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I want to commend the gentleman for his very constructive, informative, and straightforward and fair presentation, which demonstrates his great knowledge of this entire subject. Apropos of the last question which was asked, of course, the $20 tax credit is the equivalent of the increase in the exemption of $100 only in the lowest bracket; is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. But as to anybody making more than $2,000 a year, it amounts to a discrimination as against the $100 exemption; is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. As to why the position of our friends on the other side of the aisle last year has been reversed in this fashion this year, I would not undertake to guess. However, I think this ought to be pointed out, since earlier in the debate there was much discussion of the tax program enacted in the last Congress. I think it ought to be understood, and why it is not understood I do not know, but, first of all, an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House of Representatives last year on both sides of the aisle supported these various programs, including the 10-percent reduction in personal income taxes which was made possible by savings, as you say, of $3 billion, which went right into the pockets of the taxpayers, and the people in the lowest brackets got the greatest benefit. In that case, we came back from the Korean war, where the tax was cut in the lowest bracket from 22 percent down to 20 percent.

Now, the billion-dollar reduction in excise taxes, I think in overwhelming measure, went likewise into the pockets of the taxpayers, even those in the lower brackets, because they paid less for a telegram or for a railroad ticket or to buy many other things where relief was afforded. We extended the excess-profits tax for 6 months. The gentleman has pointed out that that has been good for the economy. I do not find any objection to it.

There has been a lot of conversation about the big tax-revision bill, $1,400,000,000. There, most of the benefits are going to people—farmers, with a better tax-amortization program; working mothers, with better treatment and more favorable allowances on medical expenses, and so on down the line.

The gentleman from Massachusetts says that this $20 proposition is to overcome all of the inequities of the tax program of the 83d Congress, $7.4 billion. But to me it is significant that there is not one word in this proposal to undo anything that was done with respect to taxes in the last Congress. That amounts to a tacit approval at this time of that program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The vote on H. R. 8300 was 339 to 80. I think the House rather overwhelmingly endorsed H. R. 8300, which, incidentally, was really a codification and revision of our tax laws, which had not been revised for the past 75 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, one of the principal matters discussed this afternoon has been the so-called tax revision bill of 1954.

As far as I have been able to find out, nobody has been able to provide an accurate estimate of what that bill may eventually cost. The fact remains that the President of the United States signed that bill when he knew that it would increase the deficit facing the United States of America. Estimates of revenue losses range to all sorts of figures. Of course, the debate waxes back and forth on recapture, and so forth and so on, but just one provision of the bill, the so-called depreciation provision——

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Did the gentleman vote for the bill?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, I did, after voting for a motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNGER. But the gentleman did vote for the bill?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, sir; I did. And you will find it in the RECORD. There were many very good provisions in the bill which revised the entire Revenue Code and involved very little revenue.

One estimate is that the depreciation provision alone would cost a billion dollars this year. I would like to read a paragraph or two from an article appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, February 13, 1955, just a week or so ago:

Changes in the rules for depreciating new property will cost the Federal Government about $1 billion in taxes this year, one expert estimates. And because few corporate managers will use one set of figures for the tax collectors and another for their shareholders, he says, the same changes are likely to cut apparent corporate net profits by $450 million.

Willard F. Stanley, president of Corporate Services, Inc., is the man responsible for these figures. He holds that corporations should keep two sets of books. Otherwise, the investing public may not understand what is happening, he fears, and the effects on the market for securities may be unfortunate. The new rapid-depreciation rule is a purely artificial device to permit corporations to hold on to more of their cash in their early days—

And so forth. That is one expert's opinion.

I cite that only because of the fact that this legislation was signed by the President in the face of a deficit considerably larger than the deficit he faces at this time or may face on January 1, 1956.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman recall that the President was asking for a $15 billion increase in the public debt at the same time he was accepting this tax cut?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct; nevertheless, that did not deter the Republican leadership in pressing for that bill.

So we are faced with a situation where this administration despite all of the pious platitudes we have heard has actually embraced deficit financing.

The acting minority leader can talk about what he saved and what he did not save, but the fact remains that the budget has not been balanced and that there is no recommendation contained anywhere in the President's budget message that it be balanced. As a matter of fact it was a bit ironical to me last fall to hear some of the spokesmen for the Republican Party talking about the so-called planned deficits of the previous administration. The truth of the matter is that this is the first time we have had planned deficits. We had deficits before, but they were not planned. Let me read a few excerpts of testimony before our committee over a period of years.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman ought to explain that his reference to planned deficits is a planned determination to reduce deficits—which we have been trying to do—as compared with a voluntary deficit spending program, that we have referred to frequently, under the previous Democratic administration. There is a difference, and I think the gentleman will admit there is a difference between involuntary deficit spending and voluntary deficit spending. We believe there has been a lot of voluntary deficit spending in previous administrations, and we are trying to plan to reduce the deficit spending. That is the reference the gentleman just made to what we are attempting to do.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman makes a fine statement. Unfortunately it does not stand up.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is certainly incorrect. Let me give the gentleman a few examples. In the fiscal year 1951, for instance, the spending for nondefense items was $18.5 billion.

In 1952 it was $19.4 billion.

In 1954 it was $19.9 billion.

In 1955, that is this fiscal year, it is estimated at $21.8 billion.

These are your nondefense items. You have done some trimming on defense items. Maybe they have been wise and maybe they have not, but the point I am making is that in each year in the previous administration the representatives of that administration came in here and asked for the taxes to finance it. I will read it to you if you do not remember it. I will read you from Secretary Snyder's statement before the Ways and Means Committee in 1947:

The first requisite of such a tax system is that it should produce adequate revenue to balance the budget and to provide substantial payment on the public debt—

He asked for more than a balanced budget. He asked for payment on the public debt as well—

in order to sustain the confidence of the public in the integrity of the Government's obligations and its financial strength.

In 1950:

As the President stated in his tax message on January 23, 1950, our general objective should be a tax system which will yield sufficient revenue in times of high employment, production, and national income to meet the necessary expenditures of the Government and leave some surplus for debt reduction.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Insofar as deficit spending is concerned, there is not any question but that the deficit spending was much greater under previous administrations.

Mr. BOGGS. That is not necessarily true. As a matter of fact, in 2 or 3 years the budget was balanced and we had a surplus.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If you would follow your own Secretary of the Treasury's advice now you would not bring in a bill to reduce revenue $2,300,000,000 when at the same time the gentleman just read a statement of his Secretary who said that the first obligation is to reduce deficit spending and tax revenues.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I would say to the gentleman this administration has embraced deficit financing and, in addition to that, this administration has said it will reduce taxes next year. This simply anticipates what they have promised and sets up a fair method of reducing taxes.

Let us talk about some of the other positions that have been taken right here in this body. I recall the debate in the 80th Congress on a tax measure advanced by the gentleman's party and I quote from our distinguished former Speaker:

Oppressive taxes have toppled many a government to destruction, and many a monarch from his throne. I urge you to remember three vital facts: First. The tendency of all governments is to continue endless expansion of spending to the point of ruin.

Tax cuts do not necessarily mean corresponding losses to the Treasury. The history of this Nation abounds in evidence that lower tax rates stimulate commerce and trade, which in turn yield greater Federal revenues.

In the other body the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee had this to say:

In the 1920's, after we had come out of World War I and were in conditions that are comparable to those of today, only on a smaller scale, we passed tax-reduction bills, we increased exemptions, we reduced income and corporation taxes. We passed those bills in 1921, 1924, 1926, and 1928, and we did not lose revenue, we gained revenue, through the operation, I suggest, of a simple axiom, that when the economy is loaded down with oppressive rates of taxation, and they are released, there is bound to be a stimulation of business.

Mr. President, I repeat, the likelihood is that this reduction will not destroy surpluses, that it will enhance surpluses, because it will enhance the revenues.

Well, now, the distinguished gentleman from New York, my good friend, the former chairman of my committee, advanced the same argument at the same time when we were considering that bill in the 80th Congress. So, it seems to me that what we are confronted with here today is not an administration which has dedicated itself to balancing the budget. If that had been the case, the administration certainly would not have sponsored H. R. 8300 last year in the form

which they approved. That bill increased the estimated deficit last year by approximately $1.5 billion, making the deficit for this year about $4.5 billion. Now, if that was not inflationary, if that did not do all of the things which my distinguished friends say today our $20 proposal will do, then how can it be logically argued that a $20 across-the-board exemption or tax credit which increases the deficit considerably less than H. R. 8300 increased it last year could possibly have all of these dire effects?

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman spoke earlier of the former chairman of the Committee on Finance. It might also be pointed out that he was chairman of the Republican policy committee in the other body and he advocated in the last session of the Congress the identical proposition which the Democrats are proposing now.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman. Although the proposition was not exactly identical, the proposal which he offered, if I recall correctly, was a $20 tax credit to the taxpayers. Ours is across the board and much more beneficial to the average taxpayer with a family to support.

Now take a look at the economic situation. If all of the arguments advanced in the 80th Congress about the necessity of stimulating the economy, increasing employment, putting more money in circulation, were valid, certainly they are more valid today.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I am somewhat troubled by the gentleman's argument. If they are valid, why are they not valid for the income for 1955?

Mr. BOGGS. They might very well be.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is the point. Why was the bill made for the income for 1956? If all of those dire things that the gentleman pointed out are true, why was not the bill designed to give relief to the income for 1955?

Mr. BOGGS. I will answer the gentleman by saying that it was my hope that such relief would have been given in 1955. That was one reason that I sponsored the $100 exemption in the committee last year.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Is it not true that the committee was attempting to act within the limits of the hope expressed by the President for relief in 1956?

Mr. BOGGS. Exactly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And to be sure that the injustice of last year was rectified by justice for the lower income groups.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if it is an injustice, would it not be better to relieve that injustice now than to wait a year?

Mr. BOGGS. I answered the gentleman's question. If the gentleman wants to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Massachusetts, I suggest he get his own time.

That leads me to a discussion of only one other thing. There have been a lot of words thrown around here. I have heard the word "irresponsible" used. You know, it is a bit interesting to me to be responsible one week when a majority of the Members on our side are passing the President's trade agreement program with only 66 Members on the other side voting with the President, despite all the campaign slogans about how Ike needs so and so and so and so, and then come back a few days later and be irresponsible because we are advocating a tax reduction that the President of the United States says he will do next year except we advocate doing it in a little different way.

I would suggest that it is the function of the Committee on Ways and Means, the constitutional function of the Committee on Ways and Means, to institute tax legislation. And despite all of these convenient epitaphs, the Chief Executive of our country does not look too good when in one breath he accuses us of irresponsibility and in the next breath says, "I will do it myself next year."

Let us look at the economic conditions of the country. I hear all these statements about our great advances. The truth of the matter is that our net national product was $8 billion less in 1954 than it was in 1953. You say that is not very much. But when you consider that our labor force as a whole adds 800,000 young men and women every year, when you realize the advance of technology in contributing to unemployment, then that figure becomes a very large figure indeed.

The hope expressed by the President that he would balance the budget by increasing revenues derived by an expanding economy becomes more of an idle dream than a fruitful hope, because if you continue losing $8 billion a year, instead of ending up with a total gross national product of $500 billion as the President estimated, for I believe, 1965, you could very easily end up with much less than you have now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would it not be consistent with the policy of progressive moderation that this should be the third best year?

Mr. BOGGS. In any event, I think from every point of view, from the point of view of existing economic conditions in our country, from the point of view of justice and fairness, from the point of view of the President's known commitment, this proposal is a fair one and should be adopted by the Members of this body.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle for their continuing and loyal support of the President, in keeping with their numerous promises on this floor and otherwise as exemplified by their desire to increase the national deficit, to increase the national debt, to add to the inflationary pressures in the country, and to give everybody 20 bucks and a mule.

In my city, which is controlled by a Democratic city hall gang, the top price paid for a vote, according to current report, is never more than $1. I am wondering what you gentlemen plan to do with the other $19. Perhaps you are figuring it is cheaper to promise the voter $20 than to pay him $1. This is a sort of government by gimmick rather than responsible government. It is a government by a wrecking crew of "Wreckercrats" rather than members of a responsible political organization. It represents a reversal of every considered statement made by your fiscal and political leaders. Therefore, I wish to congratulate you on the continuing, consistent inconsistency of your party in the hope of befuddling the voters and confusing the electorate, all of which I sincerely believe you will completely fail to do.

Before this $20 income-tax proposal goes any further, I think we ought to consider carefully the unusual conditions under which it was born. The last speaker mentioned the constitutional and legislative functions of the great Committee on Ways and Means, yet, as I understand it, those functions were flouted in this very bill by reason of secret sessions and midnight work and failure to consult the minority and failure to hold hearings, and reliance entirely upon political expediency rather than upon fiscal commonsense. It was not the product of any normal bipartisan procedure.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. May I point out to the gentleman that I submitted the question to the full committee and the full committee agreed not to hold public hearings.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I would be glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri, because again I think I see the gimmick.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not think it was ever submitted. We had a notice for an executive session Monday morning. As to what the gentleman was saying, it was agreed there would be no hearings on H. R. 4200, which was the mere extension of the excise tax and the corporate increase. But as to this Mills amendment, there was never any agreement on that, there was never any full committee decision because it was never presented to us. You all put that through Monday morning, the first day we met and the only day we met.

Mr. COOPER. It was agreed in the full committee on Thursday when we reported the trade-agreements bill that we would not hold public hearings on the extension of the corporate tax and the excise tax.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is exactly right, but where is the Mills amendment in there? Explain why nothing was said about the Mills amendment on Thursday, when we reached that agreement, and also explain why with your agreements with others around here you proceeded to allow an amendment like that even to be considered.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to say that it was just by accident that I learned of this change and this secret meeting in which they were considering the Mills amendment. We had nothing to do with it and knew nothing about it. That is not orderly legislation. That never occurred under our administration.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman. I think in my own committee experience it has never occurred with me.

I think I can understand what happened. I have been reading in the newspapers and magazines a number of statements which say that the Democratic Party leadership has been floundering, that they have been unable to find any issue with which to undermine the President, to attract public attention, to say nothing of the possibility of some electoral greed being inspired. Continually being needled by the press and by the magazines, it is natural that they would come up with something. It is my conclusion, which I think is supported by evidence, that this is the gimmick they thought of in the hope that they could buy the votes of the American people at 20 bucks a head.

I think that does two things. First, you are not going to buy them at $20 a head, and second, I do not think you are going to fool them, because the only people you are going to get by this kind of tactics are the people you have already, because anybody who would buy this kind of a thing has already been buying the kind of stuff you have been laying out for many, many years.

I hear people say, "Tax reduction." I do not recall any previous tax reductions which were sponsored by Democrats. You wait until the Republican President comes along and stabilizes the currency and amasses some kind of competence for Uncle Sam, and then you say, "We would like to have the privilege of giving it away but we don't dare give it away now. We would rather wait until you have amassed a little more competence and gotten closer to an election year. Then we will give it away."

This announcement which was made on February 19 of strategy by the distinguished leader was not made by a committee charged with the responsibility for protecting the welfare of all of the people of the United States, but by a secret meeting of the Democratic Party leaders, as we have heard, and all Democrat members of the Committee on Ways and Means. The exclusion from this meeting of all except the chosen few Democrat Party leaders seems to indicate this is a matter of Democratic Party welfare in which the interests of the people must come second. Taxes have been so high for so long that no one can blame the taxpayers for hoping for some additional relief, but in view of the history of how taxes got so high and the plans of the Democrats to increase Government expenditures, this proposal to increase the Federal debt to provide a $20 handout seems shabby indeed. It looks as if we are being asked to mortgage the future of our children and their children as taxpayers to buy some votes for the Democratic Party. It would appear that a few irresponsible leaders are determined to wreck the program of the Eisenhower administration even if it means wrecking the economy of the Nation at the same time. I do not think, in spite of the burdens on the taxpayer, there is anything wrong with his memory. The press, for example, on the 4th of January 1955, in the New York Herald Tribune contained a headline story entitled "RAYBUURN Against Tax Cut—Backs Eisenhower Stand." In that story, Mr. RAYBURN was quoted as saying:

> I do not think the Government can do without the money.

In the same article, Mr. RAYBURN is quoted as opposing an increase in the $600 income-tax exemption, "unless something is put in its place."

What has happened to these various high resolves? Has our distinguished Speaker found some new source of revenue or has he yielded to the dictates of the Democratic national committee leadership, which seeks some popular issue at any cost. The taxpayers will remember, too, that in less than 8 years, President Truman, a Democrat, collected more taxes than all other Presidents in all of American history. In fact, more than 3 times the amount collected in 144 years by all of the Presidents prior to President Roosevelt and more than double the amount collected under President Roosevelt. You can remember also and realize this concern of the Democratic Party for lower income taxes is not reflected in any past behavior on their part. Under the Republican administration from 1925 to 1931, income-tax exemptions were $1,500 for a single taxpayer and $3,500 for a married man, and from 1932 to 1939 the Democrats cut those exemptions to $1,000 for a single man and $2,500 for a married man. In 1940, they whittled the taxpayers' exemption away still further leaving the exemptions at $800 for a single man and $1,500 for a married man or $2,000 exemption less than he had enjoyed under the Republican administration.

I might interject here that if the taxpayer had even half of the exemptions which were taken away from him by previous Democratic administrations, the amount which you are talking about saving here to him today would be nothing more than peanuts and more people would be taken off the tax rolls by far than you propose to take off by this bill. So you are the people who put these people on the tax rolls. Remember that. You are the people who kept him on the tax rolls. Now you come in and propose this government by gimmick. In 1941 the Democratic spending continued. The single taxpayer was further reduced to $750 and other exemptions took place as I said, and as I will have an opportunity to state at the end of these remarks.

It took the Republican 80th Congress to stop the decline and to raise personal exemptions to $600 and $1,200. This is the only party which has given the people any increase in exemptions. It is the only party that has given the people any tax reduction and the only party which has introduced stability in the currency of this United States. There is every indication that this sudden, grandstand gesture came as a surprise to the rank and file members of the Democratic Party, because in addition to the Speaker's statement in January, there are recorded on February 12, 1955, statements by key Democrat members of the Committee on Ways and Means to the effect that the Formosa crisis had killed off prospects for an early effort to cut income taxes.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], a senior Democrat on the committee, and the author of this motion, said he favored a "wait and see" policy.

> As late as last month I might have been willing to go along with an early move to cut taxes, effective next July 1, 1955, or January 1, 1956, but I would want to be cautious now—

He said.

What has caused the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] to throw caution to the winds and to now adopt a policy which he thought he ought to be cautious about in January? Could it be the insistence of the Democratic National Commitee, people on the Democratic side, to the effect, "Give us an issue. Give us something to talk about. Give us a chance to buy the voters. We cannot reason with them. We do not have anything to say to them which will persuade them to come over to our side, so let us go back to the old city-hall-gang tactics, if you cannot win them by persuasion, buy them. Shell out the cash." The cheapest way to do that is to shell out Uncle Sam's cash. You do not have to make any reports under the election laws or the Corrupt Practices Act.

Only a week before this proposal was announced, the gentleman from Tennessee, who is chairman of the committee, and whom we all love, said he had not given any thought to a tax cut, and yet he has come up with this proposal. I wish that perhaps he had given us something more reasonable with which to contend.

On the 19th of February, 1 week later, the Speaker announced that Democratic leaders had conferred and decided to push for this $20 tax handout, because "It would give economy a boost." This, in spite of the fact that the country is enjoying its greatest peacetime economy in history.

There are several phases of this Democratic proposal which stamp it as the political phony which it is. This is as phony as a $19 bill. I took off 10 percent. That was the Republican 10 percent which the gentleman from New York will recognize, which we gave the taxpayers last year. This is as phony as a $19 bill. First, it proposes to reduce the tax revenues of the Nation by $2.3 billion without providing any new sources of revenue. In the meantime the Democrats are pushing for numerous increases in Government expenditures.

Second, there seems to be little reason to rush the tax cut through at this time, 10 months before it would take effect, when no one knows what conditions may confront us in the next few months.

If the need for increased defense expenditures is as great as the Democrats claim, they can hardly be sincere in asking for this cut of over $2 billion.

Third, the proposed $20 handout would come at a time when wage earners have already made substantial gains.

Fourth, the sponsors of the proposal seem to agree that the measure could not stand on its own merits, and they have therefore resorted to trickery to assure its passage. They seem to agree that the measure could not stand on its own merits, and they added it to the corporate tax rate extension in order to be sure to get it through by device rather than upon its merits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if this is a good measure, as someone has just said, why not make it effective now? If it is not a good measure, why make it effective at all? If it is going to be a good measure 10 years from now, who owns the crystal ball that will tell us——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. If this is going to be a good measure who owns the particular crystal ball that will tell us the state of the appropriations of this Government 10 years from now?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. In just a moment.

I am going to ask the gentleman over there to give us some assurances which we would welcome.

The requests I am asking are these: Are you gentlemen prepared to vote against every increase in appropriations?

Are you prepared to vote to keep the cost of Government down?

Are you prepared to vote against all these boondoggling measures which will provide pork-barrel handouts in your own districts?

What are you going to do about TVA?

What are you going to do about all of the other gravy trains that you seek to ride on?

If you will tighten your belt and keep the cost of Government down and then come back to the people and say you would like to have a tax cut you will have earned it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was not the gentleman repeating the argument used about the tax cut a year ago, that if a tax revision was made it would be inflation and create a desire in industries to continue in that development? Was not that one of the reasons given for the tax bill a year ago?

Mr. SCOTT. No; that was certainly not one of the reasons I recognized.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That was the reason for the tax cut a year ago.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me give you the facts. There was a different basis. At that time there was a declining economy. The cut was made when the gross national product was declining; this bill is up at a time when the gross national product is increasing.

That tax cut was made after we knew what the appropriations were going to be for the most part; this is made in advance.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman agree that a $20 tax cut to each taxpayer or his dependents, given to the great masses of people, they in turn would spend the money as those people who enjoyed tax reduction a year ago, who were expected to invest it in industry?

Mr. SCOTT. I will answer the gentleman's question by asking him a question. Is the gentleman saying to me that this $20 handout would improve the economy of the country?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; all right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman also agrees it will improve the economy of the country and put more money into the hands of people who are ready and willing to spend it.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman then answer me this: If $20 given to the American taxpayer is going to improve the economy of the country, how was the figure of $20 arrived at? If $20 is good why would not $40 be better, or $100, of $1,000? I would like for the gentleman to tell me where he got the $20 figure from.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For myself it was the result of a little reason and logic. If you have a bill in to raise the exemption up to $1,000 it would have the same effect. I think the average of this $20 would just about offset an increase in the personal exemption to about $750 on each taxpayer. That is my theory of it.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman just tell me whether he reached out and picked it out of thin air or from the Democratic National Committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman has had the figures recited as to the amount.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman tell me where they came from?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As far as I am concerned it came from a little reason and logic as to a reduction to the individuals who were entitled to it who did not get it 2 years ago when taxes were reduced.

Mr. SCOTT. But the gentleman's reason and logic never entered into the $20 figure.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Absolutely, because we knew it would benefit the great mass of the people.

Mr. SCOTT. Then the gentleman accepts responsibility for having suggested the figure of $20 and recommended it?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not think it is necessary for anybody to accept responsibility for a little logic on the application of a great tax reduction or at least a fair tax reduction to all the people when they have not been granted it under this administration. As you know when we passed the tax bill——

Mr. SCOTT. I cannot yield to the gentleman for a speech. I will be glad to yield, however, for a question.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But the gentleman asked me a question which I would like to answer.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield briefly for that purpose.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. My response is simply this, that when we had the revision up a year ago there was an attempt to make those tax burdens equal and that any relief granted be applied equally; and it was not done to the great masses of the people.

Mr. SCOTT. Did the gentleman vote for that tax reduction bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I did.

Mr. SCOTT. I want to thank the gentleman.

Now I must yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I was interested in what the gentleman said about the pork-barrel expenditures and so forth. I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. I can fully imagine what is coming after that.

Mr. BURLESON. Pork-barrel expenditures are never justified; but in considering tax measures we must not lose sight of the fact that we have a tremendous highway program before us, something that is almost beyond the imagination to grasp; we have a health program or scheme here, and a lot of other things underway. They must be paid for.

Mr. SCOTT. Are you going to take that money from the veterans or from the mass of the taxpayers through inflationary prices? From whom are they going to take that money?

Mr. BURLESON. The point is we are not going to take it away from anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means, in its action on H. R. 4259 has demonstrated the type of fiscal planning required to insure the stable growth of our economy. By adding an individual income-tax credit of $20 per exemption to the bill, which extends the present corporate and excise tax rates for 1 year, the committee has shown the wisdom and foresight which are essential to constructive fiscal policy.

Although the President's economic report assures us that the present recovery

from last year's recession will result in the attainment of full employment by the end of the year, many of the economic experts appearing before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report during its recent hearings expressed concern that the present recovery rate might not be maintained without fiscal and monetary action by the Federal Government. The $20 per exemption tax credit, which will save taxpayers about $800 million during the fiscal year 1956, is scheduled to take effect at the beginning of 1956, at a time when the economy may well be in need of a shot in the arm to bolster a lagging rise.

Moreover, this type of tax cut, unlike the selective or discriminatory reductions of last year—over 75 percent of which went to upper income individuals and to corporations in the first year and much greater later on—is designed to provide a broadly distributed increase in purchasing power. This increase in purchasing power is necessary if the economy is to avoid developing symptoms of excess capacity which would bring a halt to recovery and to continued growth in our economic potential.

The tax savings effected by this $20 tax credit do not pose a threat of renewed inflation. No one seriously suggests that at the end of this year we shall be operating so close to our economic capacity that we could not accommodate a $2 billion increase in purchasing power without the danger of significant price rises.

Nor need we be unduly concerned about the effect of this $20 tax credit on the Government's budget. The President himself stated in his economic report that the expansion of the economy, in itself, should make possible another step in tax reduction next year, when the $20 credit is proposed to take effect. Moreover, the prospects of a budgetary deficit did not deter the administration last year on tax reductions which totaled $7.4 billion. Apparently the deficit prospect did not evoke the specter of inflation when the tax reductions were for the benefit of corporations and upper-bracket individuals. It is only when a tax reduction which will benefit all individuals across the board is proposed that the Treasury warns us that prices will go through the ceiling, even though the tax reduction is only a third as large as that which the administration unduly boasts of having provided last year.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has expressed the idea that seems to motivate the thinking of so many people in and out of the Congress. First, he suggested that in considering fiscal matters we should add up what we must spend, then after adding up what we need to spend we should determine the level at which we tax the American people. The gentleman asked, "From whom do you take a tax reduction? Do you take it from veterans? Do you take it from education? Do you take it from other sources?"

I am sure the gentleman will remember that, in the first place, we take money from all of the people to constitute the total revenues of the Government. The $20 tax credit is just this simple: It means that after the first of the year 1956 we will just take less from all the people for all the expenditures of the Government. The Congress after seeing how much should be spent in the fiscal year 1956 may act accordingly on those expenditures.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I gather that what the gentleman is really saying is that instead of advocating economy he would take it from the deficit.

Mr. MILLS. No. The gentleman from Pennsylvania understands quite well what I am talking about. I think the gentleman may be guilty of some New Deal thinking about finances. I am surprised at the gentleman, in view of the fact that he has occupied such exalted positions within the ranks of the Republican Party. The gentleman indicates that the people downtown in the executive branch have to tell us how much money we have to make available for their expenditures and then we have to provide the revenues on the basis of what they say they need. That is exactly what he criticized us for in previous administrations.

I am somewhat surprised to find my Republican brethren falling into the same situation about which they crticized us Democrats for 20 years. The people downtown told us, you said, what had to be appropriated for all this boondoggling as you called it, and all this other business, then we had to provide the revenue. Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the former chairman of the Republican National Committee, bases his opposition to giving relief to taxpayers generally throughout the United States on the argument that somebody downtown has asked for the expenditure of certain sums of money and that we cannot reduce taxes and give them the amount of money they want.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. I said that I opposed tax relief under certain circumstances.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is against this measure before us today, is he not?

Mr. SCOTT. I am against what is a phony bill by trickery to buy votes. I am for tax relief based on sound fiscal policy.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman opposes it, he says, because it is phony, but he would be for it if it provided a straight across-the-board 10-percent reduction?

Mr. SCOTT. I would not be in favor of any tax reduction at this time unless we knew from the Appropriations Committee and from the subcommittees what our fiscal situation is going to be.

Mr. MILLS. Why not tell the Appropriations Committee and the other committees handling appropriations how much revenue we may expect to have in 1956?

Now, on that point, I like the philosophy of my distinguished friend, the former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. I like his philosophy a little better than this philosophy you are springing on us here today that you have to determine revenues after you find out what you are going to appropriate. The gentleman from New York has called attention time and time again to the fact that in the twenties the Republican Party succeeded in reducing taxes year after year and that the revenues to the Government under those reduced rates equaled the revenues of the previous year under higher rates, and they kept increasing, and you brought about prosperity that you bragged about for a generation. Now, if it worked then, why does it not work now? If it worked in 1954, why does it not work now? Oh, listen. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], former chairman of the Republican National Committee, do not try to kid us. Do not try to kid us, in the language of the Secretary of the Treasury appearing before our committee, and this is his language. He said, "Don't kid us." Do not talk about your sanctity and your great love for a balanced budget. Do not talk to us about something phony.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will yield when I complete unloading on you.

Now, do not talk to us about those things. Your party is no more aware, no more conscious, no more concerned, than you would have us believe some other party about the desirability of a balanced budget. The gentleman knows that last year his party did not stop a tax reduction because of an unbalanced budget. The gentleman knows that the tax bill last year contributed $1.4 billion to this current fiscal deficit of $4.5 billion, and no one would tell us how much the loss would be in future years. It is billions and billions. Now you attempt to talk to us about something being irresponsible. The gentleman knows that in the fiscal year 1956 the gentleman's own party has contributed through the tax reduction in H. R. 8300 to well over half of the projected $2.4 billion deficit in fiscal year 1956. Yes, the President says we have scaled new heights of irresponsibility. Let him say what he wants to, but neither he nor you nor anyone else has said that this $20 tax credit does not take care of those people in the low-income-tax brackets, the very people we are attempting to give relief to and the ones you hardly nodded to. The bill of the gentleman's party last year, which probably came from the Republican National Committee—he says this came from ours—had in it the thinking, I am sure, of Republican equity in tax reduction, because it provides, we now have been told, 75 percent of its relief for corporations and individual taxpayers with incomes in excess of $5,000, I think it is, and only 25 percent of all the relief involved, went to taxpayers with incomes of less than that figure. All the gentleman has to do is to confer with the staff to get the figures. You would not even give us information on relief by income groups. Anyone can check your report and see that. The gentleman can get the information, if he wants it. Just a small fraction of the relief in H. R. 8300 of last year goes to people with $5,000 or less of income. Our $20 tax

credit gives 66 percent of the total relief to those with adjusted gross incomes of $5,000 or less.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to correct the gentleman by pointing out——

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman likes to be corrected.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to point out, first of all, the gentleman has not mentioned that it was the Republican Party or the administration that made a cut in spending of $11 billion last year.

Mr. MILLS. Seven billion, four hundred million, the gentleman means.

Mr. SCOTT. No. Eleven billion dollars.

Mr. MILLS. Has it gotten up to that figure now?

Mr. SCOTT. Let the gentleman try to be as accurate as I try to be.

Mr. MILLS. We were talking about tax relief, were we not? At least I was.

Mr. SCOTT. Cut in spending. I knew what I was talking about down in the well. Now, the gentleman made a reference about kidding the American public.

Mr. MILLS. No. I was referring to the gentleman trying to kid me.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, all right. Take it anyway the gentleman wants. Let me ask him this question. Has he ever heard of any more expensive way of kidding the American public than to try to grab $2 billion out of Uncle Sam's Treasury right now to give back to the voters in order to buy their votes?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir, on one other occasion less than a year ago I saw an example that far outweighs this present instance in kidding the American people. You tried to tell the American people in 1954 that you were giving them tax relief. The people woke up to the fact that the gentleman's party had not given them tax relief, had not given tax relief to anybody in the lower-income tax brackets, or at most only to a small degree and that most of the tax relief had gone to the people with higher incomes. Now I do not criticize all of that. I criticize the imbalance that existed; the fact that the relief was not balanced and evenly distributed to all taxpayers. I criticize the fact that the Republican Party, as a party, saw fit at a time when the budget was unbalanced, when they could not give relief to the rank and file of the American people, they gave relief to the coupon clippers.

The gentleman knows that every time since World War II the Republican Party has been in charge of the Congress, it has voted a tax-reduction bill and the people have thought so little of the tax reduction provided by that party that they have run them out of office each time.

The whole trouble with the present situation from the Republican standpoint, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], is this: Somebody may have been outmaneuvered. That is the reason the gentleman screamed so loudly. Somebody may have been outmaneuvered and the gentleman criticises this tax relief not on the basis of the equity involved nor on the basis that it is not fair for all taxpayers to have a tax reduction, but because somebody in the gentleman's party did not think of it soon enough.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the many courtesies and compliments he has showered on me. I must have hurt him and his side.

Mr. MILLS. I have talked to the gentleman because he is a former chairman of the Republican National Committee and because the gentleman's speech sounded to me as though he might have had some collaboration in high places in the preparation of it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now I want to get back to these figures.

Mr. MILLS. I might say to the gentleman that a table on page 1253 of the Senate hearings on H. R. 8300 shows that only 31 percent of the relief involved in the 10-percent individual income-tax reduction that became effective January 1, 1954, went to those with incomes under $5,000. This is very different than what I heard earlier today. But the figures I gave on H. R. 8300 are ones I have seen in various breakdowns on that tax relief.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is talking about the 10-percent tax cut that was had?

Mr. MILLS. That is correct. Earlier, I was talking about H. R. 8300. I think that with respect to H. R. 8300, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, that the low-income groups received an even smaller percentage of the total benefits than under the 10-percent individual tax cut. I also point out to the gentleman that in future years the tax benefits realized by low-income groups from H. R. 8300 will be increasingly smaller percentages. I believe I was right on my figures. They can be checked.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I believe the gentleman was not. That is why it is so important to get the figures right.

Mr. MILLS. Even if it applied to that 10-percent reduction, does the gentleman think, with the big heart that he has, that it is all right in the sense of fiscal fair play and of balancing budgets, to give relief in that greater percentage to those getting above $5,000 and leave the low-income families with a paltry handout? Does he not think that something ought to be done by the Congress to equalize the relief that has already been given?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. MILLS. No, I did not ask the gentleman the question.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What did the gentleman do?

Mr. MILLS. I am sure the gentleman would plead guilty to the charge. Does not the gentleman realize that the acting minority leader over there has already called attention to the fact that we ought to go back to H. R. 8300, have a look at it and see if we cannot get some revenue out of it? Does not the gentleman know that our committee will do that?

Do not be misled about this situation. There is not a thing in the world involved here of a controversial nature except on the gentleman's side, the people downtown resent the fact that a Democratic Congress could come up with some idea about reducing taxes for individuals and maybe in the process prevent them from having another bill such as they had in the 83d Congress for the benefit of the high-income taxpayers. Does not the gentleman think that that might be the basis for the concern that exists here today?

I say to my good friend from Texas [Mr. DIES] that the passage of this bill and the addition of $815 million to the prospective deficit for 1956, and the effect of it, can be completely offset by this Congress before it acts upon all of these appropriation bills. It can be completely offset by this committee and this Congress as we proceed with further studies of H. R. 8300; and the gentleman knows it.

No one should vote against this proposal on the basis of its further unbalancing the budget. Give us a chance to do something about that subsequently, but give the people the tax relief that they need so badly.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a strange combination of ideas that we have presented to us in the Revenue Act of 1955—H. R. 4259—the bill now under consideration.

In the first place, we have a bill prepared by the administration for the purpose of continuing certain corporation and excise taxes. The reason advanced is readily understandable, namely, the Government needs the revenue from such to help meet the running expenses of Government. Even with the revenue that comes from this source, plus income taxes, and from all other sources that produce Government revenue, we do not have sufficient to balance the budget. We continue to run a deficit each year, although we can be thankful the deficit is decreasing and each year we are coming nearer to making both ends meet. All of this is agreed to by the Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee that reported this portion of the bill with its approval. If it did not so approve, then, it would not have reported the bill favorably to the House.

Now, we come to the second part of the bill. It proposes eventually to reduce income-tax revenue by approximately the same amount of revenue as the first part of the bill raises. This is done by allowing each taxpayer, large and small, rich and poor, a reduction of $20 in income taxes for himself and each dependent he has. Thus, notwithstanding the acknowledgment in the first portion of the bill that a necessity exists to maintain our level of revenue collections, yet, in the second part a reduction is provided for. What kind of reasoning justifies such a paradox? This is a case where one hand takes away what the other hand gives. It is as fine a case of blowing hot and cold at the same time that anyone could conceive. But, it leaves no doubt that it is purely a case of political chicanery. The fact that the effect is to be withheld until next year only leads to a realization of the insincerity that is

back of the whole scheme. A more honest way would have been to wait until next year and then determine whether our financial standing as a nation would permit it to be done. This latter was the plan that has been advocated by the Republican administration. Evidently the Democratic leaders have sought to take political advantage of it by saying we will enact the reduction now, but even they leave it ineffective until next year. This plan of action may fool the unthinking, but the wise and thoughtful person will say that the sensible thing to do is to wait and see the condition of the National Treasury next year. Then, it will be known whether it is wise to do so, and how much of a reduction can be safely made.

The willingness of the Democratic leadership in the House to step out in the manner they have is a fine compliment to the present Eisenhower administration. In taking the action they have leaves no doubt that these Democratic leaders realize the Eisenhower administration is intent on cutting the expenses of Government to an extent that will probably permit such a reduction to be made a year hence. If they believe otherwise, then there would be absolutely no justification for providing for a reduction a year from now.

To reduce taxes is the aim of the present administration. However, it realizes to do this, it will be necessary to reduce Government expenses beyond what has already been done. Already such expenses have been reduced by many billions of dollars. Each year the administration is making additional reductions and bringing the day nearer when there will be a balanced budget. When that is reached there can be a substantial reduction in taxes. As an assurance to the people that the administration intends to do so the Republican Congress made a tax reduction last year of $7.4 billion. This was commensurate with the savings in Government expenses up to that time.

Last week there were some of us, and I was one of them, who voted against increasing the salaries of Members of Congress by $10,000 for the reason that, notwithstanding there might be merit for a reasonable increase in such salaries, yet it was not proper or justifiable for the Congress to do so in any amount until the budget was in balance, or at least approximately so. While, of course, the savings incident to continuing the present salary level would not in itself balance the budget, yet this and other available sources of savings, when taken together, could have such a result. It has been said, and truthfully said, we could balance the budget by merely cutting down on the moneys we are giving to nations abroad. This latter is undoubtedly a subject that merits consideration.

There is no one in this whole Congress who is more anxious to see a reduction in the heavy burden of taxes. I am anxious and willing to give my support whenever it can be done in a manner that will not destroy the soundness of our national financial structure. To vote for such reduction merely because it is politically popular without regard to the detrimental after effect is neither wise nor patriotic. The excessive spending of previous administrations has brought us to a realization of the truthfulness of the old adage that there comes a time when the piper must be paid. This is our present situation and as loyal patriotic citizens it is our duty to carry on until we can by wise and prudent management of our fiscal affairs bring ourselves to a condition that will warrant the reduction of taxes. I have confidence that we are well along the road to accomplish this. Let us persevere.

Because of the views I have expressed, and, the belief that they are fundamental to a sound fiscal policy, it is my intention to support the amendment to strike out that portion of the bill that relates to a $20 reduction for each taxpayer and dependent, leaving the present corporate and excise taxes in force.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the most objective man who knows something about this problem is Mr. Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury. His flat statement was that this bill, if passed as it is now before the House, would again start inflation; which convinced me that the proposal to pass around $20 tax credits is bad and might start or feed inflation.

The budget is out of balance already. Spending more than we take in is what produces bad fiscal policies and merely adds fuel to inflationary tendencies, by adding $815 million in fiscal 1956 and $2.3 billion a year thereafter.

In 1950 I accidentally came to know something about inflation. It happened that I was in France. I found that when I went to change my money I could get 345 francs for $1, and if you wanted to go down the street you could get 385 francs for $1, in the black market. In the short space of almost 30 years that ratio had dropped from 7 francs in 1918, when we soldiers of the First World War were paid in the coin of the realm so we could spend our money in the French economy, to almost 350 francs per dollar.

Inflation is certainly a deadly thing that has ruined more than one country. It is one of the reasons France is in such bad condition today. It ruined the Roman Empire, it ruined Germany, it ruined other countries.

When I came back from France in 1950 I began to look into the matter of inflation from a personal angle. I had one of my life-insurance policies analyzed by the Library of Congress. This policy was taken out in the year 1921. It was for $2,500, and payable $90.28 on the 14th day of June for 20 years. I paid that policy out completely, having paid $1,805.60. I left in all the dividends. My policy was worth at that time $3,800 by virtue of the accruals of dividends I left in.

However, I found out from the Library of Congress that that policy which I thought would buy $3,800 worth of goods would, when we got to 1950—and the message is dated May 29, 1951—bought only $2,058 worth of goods when measured by the dollars I put in and their purchasing power at the time of payment. It would have bought almost twice as much if the inflation had not set in. Just think that over. That happened in that short space of time. Then I tried to have it applied to the whole life insurance group. To my amazement, I found that in the United States as a whole the thing has been still more deadly than it was in my particular case.

I will read part of this report to you, but I will insert the entire article in the RECORD. It is a statement entitled "Life Insurance and Inflation in the United States in 1950." Here is what they said:

LIFE INSURANCE AND INFLATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1950

The effect of inflation on holders of life-insurance policies is typical of its effect on all recipients of fixed incomes. All such persons whose incomes do not increase as the cost of living rises suffer with every additional point in the cost-of-living index. A policyholder who bought a $1,000 policy in 1940 might well have expected it, 10 years hence, to give him $1,000 worth of goods and services, in 1940 prices. However, he would find that in 1950, on the average, his $1,000 policy, contracted for in 1940, would buy only $588 worth of goods and services.[1]

In 1940 a total of $11,429,000,000 worth of life-insurance policies was purchased. Ten years later, in terms of 1940 purchasing power, this sum had shrunk by more than 40 percent, to $6,715,000,000.

At the end of 1950 there was in force in the United States life insurance totaling $228 billion or about $1,500 per persons. Thus every time there is a single percentage drop in the value of the dollar, due to the inflationary pressure on consumer prices, the insurance held by the people of the United States drops in value nearly $2,300,000,000, or about $15 per person.

Benefit payments to American families reached a record peak of $3,725,000,000 in 1950. In terms of 1940 dollars these benefits, however, had a purchasing power of only $2,188,000,000. This is less than the actual benefits paid out in 1940, which totaled $2,664,000,000. This may be considered particularly striking when it is noted that the amount of life insurance in force in 1950, $228 billion is nearly twice the amount in force in 1940, when it totaled $115,500,000,000.

Since life insurance is held so much more widely today than previously, the impact of inflation in life insurance is much more encompassing. The $1,500 average per capita ownership of life insurance in 1950 compares with $900 in 1940, $400 in 1920, and $150 in 1910. As Holgar J. Johnson, president of the Institute of Life Insurance, states:

"Anything which brings about a material reduction in the purchasing power of dollars, directly affects the family security planning of the Nation's 83 million policyholders and tends to reduce the full effectiveness of the $228 billion of life-insurance protection they have set up. Inflation thus becomes a matter of nationwide family consideration. It is urgent that everyone exert every possible effort to stop inflationary tendencies in their track.

"The life-insurance business is currently directing much of its energies toward urging Government, business, and individuals to join in the fight which will effectively check inflation."

---

[1] All cost-of-living and value of the dollar computations are based on the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index.

Source: All life-insurance statistics are from Institute of Life Insurance publications: Life Insurance Fact Book, 1950, and Life Insurance News Data, December 28, 1950.

When you translate that $2 billion drop, and it dropped 41 percent during that inflationary wave, it amounts to $94,300,000,000 that the people in the United States, who held that purchasing power, have lost because of the depreciated value of the dollar.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he could also put into the RECORD the increased value in real property holdings that have accrued to individual owners of property as a result of this same inflation which may have affected the value of something tied up so definitely to money as insurance.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I can illustrate that by telling you of a home that I sold. I will not tell you in dollars but it doubled in value. Real-estate value doubled because of the cheaper dollars.

Mr. MOSS. Which would more than offset the loss which the gentleman incurred in his insurance cost, is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; it would not because I had more money in insurance than I had in my house. It would not offset it. Furthermore the people who were renting were hit very badly.

Mr. MOSS. Would the gentleman say that he bought a policy entirely with dollars of value equal to the value of the dollar at the moment he took out the policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSS. Was the dollar constant for the entire 20-year period?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; it was constant up until the thirties and then it sagged a little. It sagged a little in the forties and it sagged very much in 1950 and 1951, to 41 percent of the original amount. I am sorry I must decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman should realize the dollar has shrunk to about half of its value as far as earning power is concerned during the thirties.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The main point I want to make is that the people lost billions in purchasing power because of that great inflation and that could be repeated if we are not careful.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, the debate here this afternoon, and I have sat through it and watched it very closely, has not been so much a discussion of this tax bill as it has been a clash between the basic philosophies of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. You know the basic philosophy of those two parties is what makes me a Democrat. To begin with, the two parties have a very different attitude regarding money. To a Democrat, money is a medium of exchange—and only that. A Democrat believes that money should flow freely at reasonable rates of interest to carry on the business of the country and that there should be sufficient credit. The Republican philosophy regards money as a commodity that can be bought, sold, hoarded, cornered, and manipulated for the exclusive benefit of the 3 percent of our population who have it in abundance and to the detriment of the 97 percent of us who are obliged to earn it with our hands or our brains. The bill under discussion today is designed to give a little tax relief to those who have to work for a living. This has been demonstrated here this afternoon very thoroughly. No doubt the gentlemen on the left-hand side of the aisle would consider it very fortunate for the country—and I know I would consider it very fortunate for the country—if we could double our national income in the next 2 years. I think that would be wonderful. There are two ways of looking at the national debt. The national debt will never be paid or even financed by scrimping and pinching and making fewer jobs and reducing wages and keeping a Benson in the Department of Agriculture to reduce our farm prices to from 60 to 75 percent of parity. The national debt will never be paid or serviced that way. The national debt will be paid, if it ever is paid, and I trust that it will be, as the result of legislation passed by men who have foresight and vision; by men who look up and on, and refuse to look back and down.

Why do I think our national income could be doubled? Because the Democratic Party multiplied our national income by nine between 1932 and 1952. This was accomplished during a period that has been characterized by a very notable Republican as 20 years of treason. I submit that was quite an accomplishment under the circumstances. I, myself, am proud of it. That is not all the things we did during that time. We insured our bank deposits: we established the REA; we put a floor under farm prices; we passed the Securities and Exchange Act; we instituted social security and old-age insurance.

Now there has been some talk about the Democratic Party bringing out this tax reduction in order to buy votes. Democrats cannot buy votes. We do not have enough money. The Republicans are the people that have the money, millions and billions of it. It has been said that there was $100,000 of Republican money spent in my district this year in an attempt to defeat me. I have no way of knowing it, but they bragged about having spent that much.

Talk about playing politics, here is a little newspaper clipping that says, "Mr. Stringfellow is going to make a public speech in Utah." I submit that if a Democrat, I do not care who he was, would have gone into a campaign and spoken, as Stringfellow did—incidentally, I am bringing this up because he made a speech in my home town one night, and the next night confessed to his perfidy and untruthfulness over a television station. If a Democrat should do a thing like that he would never have the gall to ever make a public speech in the United States again if he lived to be 102. But evidently Mr. Stringfellow can go right along speaking to the public.

Now, there is no way to handle this subject in the length of time I have, but whether we get tax reduction depends on who gets it. The 83d Congress gave General Motors a reduction of $192 million in taxes last year; General Electric, $73 million; Westinghouse, $72 million; United States Steel, $53 million; Republic Steel, $20 million; Bethlehem Steel, $16 million; and Kennecott Copper, $13 million; Chrysler, $13 million; Sears, Roebuck & Co., $11 million; International Business Machines, $11 million; and Douglas Aircraft, $11 million; and on down through the category. That was not only for this year but for years and years and years into the future unless it is changed. But we are so poor that we cannot give the common man a $20 deduction for each of his dependents. So, whether a tax reduction is right or wrong depends not on the amount of the tax reduction but on who gets it. No Republican administration has come into power in my recollection that has not resulted into five things before it had been in power 4 years:

First. Lower prices for the food and fiber produced on American farms.

Second. Fewer jobs and lower wages for laboring people.

Third. Higher interest rates.

Fourth. Tighter credit.

Fifth. A tax cut for the superrich and our giant corporations.

The present Republican administration qualifies on at least four of these accounts already and still has almost 2 years to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, $20 tax relief for every taxpayer and every dependent in the United States, the same as handing a $20 bill to each of 115 million people, has suddenly been proposed by the Democratic leadership. It is a cold net loss of $2,300,000,000 revenue; and since our cash budget, due to tremendous defense expenditures, cannot quite be balanced this year, that money must be raised somewhere. To pay your bills your Government must resort to what is known as deficit financing, namely, borrowing from the banking system, which is, in effect, the same as printing 115 million new $20 bills. The American public now understands that the more dollars you print the less the dollar is worth in purchasing power.

But that is not all. This $2,300,000,000 added bank deposits—for that is what it is—broadens the banks' lending base, allowing them heavily to increase their loans, thus expanding bank credit. This bank-credit expansion permits added general credit expansion in other lines—merchants, manufacturers, builders, individuals, and so forth—eventually and inevitably creating an added fifteen-or-more-billion dollars' worth of inflation. Inflation, I am sorry to say, is almost invariably permanent, and means increased cost of living.

Years ago, to the average wage earner, "inflation" was only a word. He did not understand how it worked or how it affected him. He found out that, although he was earning more and more money, he was no better off, and his relatives and friends on fixed salaries or pensions were getting tragically worse

and worse off. His wife realized that a 10-cent loaf of bread was costing her 20 cents and more, that the $5 bag of groceries on a Saturday was costing her $10 and more.

But it hit him every other way. His children were not getting proper schooling, due to scarcity of teachers and their low pay scales, which could not keep up with the increased cost of living. He had to help his parents or relatives when the purchasing power of their previous fixed pensions was cut in half between 1939 and 1952. His transportation, rents, and everything cost more.

So, although he did not at that time know what hit him, he was hit every place but the soles of his feet, and he did not like it. He learned the hard way. He now understands that the more money you print the more you devaluate the currency and the less it is worth to him.

Make no mistake about it—it is the little man, the wage earner and the people of small incomes that are going to get hurt. Rich people can afford to pay a little more for their living, but the poor man cannot. This so-called $20-tax refund, would actually hurt the little man far worse than the rich man, and he is the very person they claim would be helped. What a swindle.

And there is that other large group of people whose income is so small they do not pay any taxes, or at least not enough even to get full refund. These are the people that are hurt worst of all. They would pay more for groceries and everything. And there is also the great army of pensioners whose exemptions we raised last year, and they get no refund, yet get soaked more. These two great groups will get badly hurt by the increased cost of living, and they do not even rate these new $20 bills it is proposed we print. Forty-five million people are nonrecipients of $20, but victims of the high cost of living.

But even this is not all. Such an inevitable increase in the cost of living will call for another round of wage and price increases to match it, which, in turn, will start the vicious spiral of inflation all over again. Inflation is the most vicious, most insidious form of invisible taxation.

In other words, for every $20, $40, or $80 we hand back to the taxpayer this 1 year, we would soak him $100 or more per year increased cost of living, year after year, permanently. Is not that the most cruel kind of a hoax? Give a man $20 this one time in tax relief and soak him $100 per year maybe for the rest of his life to pay for it. If we can balance the cash budget another year, we can then give him tax relief without soaking him $100 per year for it.

A leading labor economist reports that the wage earner fared better in 1954 than any other postwar year. Why? Because the Eisenhower administration and this Congress, working together, effectively checked and controlled inflation. The cost of living has remained stable. So his greater take-home pay made the worker better off, and he now realizes it.

This proposition has been called a shrewd political move. But is it so shrewd? First of all, a $20 bill is not so big to a great many workers. It may mean only one or two bags of groceries. And if the worker knows he is paying $100 per year for it, he may realize he is being swindled. Of course, if instead of printing new $20 bills, the majority leadership had advocated printing new $1,000 bills, those who were uninformed might have been delighted, at least until they found that our country and its economy had been completely wrecked, as Lenin predicted would happen as we debauched our currency.

The average wage earner is not dumb. If he sees through this swindle, and I believe he will, would not his wrath against the perpetrators of it be tremendous? Will he fall for this making him pay $100 or more per year for a one-time $20 refund, or will he start talking about the politicians trying to buy votes, tarring us all with the same brush?

Of course, there is still another angle to this swindle. When the Government borrows from the banking system, it does so by selling it bonds. Increased bonds means increased Federal debt, on top of our present $278 billion which obviously we cannot possible pay in our own lifetime. In other words, we are asking our children and our children's children to pay our grocery bills if we make this tax refund. Is that giving them a square deal? It is bad enough to create inflation through ignorance of its ghastly consequences, but to do so knowingly seems the height of irresponsibility.

Remember, you cannot fool all the people all the time.

It is the little man that gets hurt, and you will have an army of millions of angry voters to be accountable to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, we all want taxes cut. We all agree taxes are too high. President Eisenhower has repeatedly stated that he will recommend further tax cuts when such losses of revenue can be borne without substantial increases in our national debt. I myself have voted for tax cuts, in both the 80th and 83d Congresses when we were assured that corresponding cuts in expenditures made such decreases in revenue possible with safety.

But we must not cut taxes recklessly without thought as to their impact upon our national economy—as this $20-tax cut maneuver would. Therefore, much as I would like to make possible any tax cuts that could be made without endangering our Nation's fiscal stability, I feel that I cannot in good conscience support any such tax cut at this time. I intend to support President Eisenhower's position and vote against this amendment when it is presented on the floor of the House.

Passage of this tax-cut amendment would cause the Government to lose $2.3 billion in revenue beginning next January 1. This apparent purely political proposal can have no basis in logic or reason because it is impossible to visualize with any certainty the fiscal picture as it will be at that time.

At the present time, not a single appropriation bill has been brought before the Congress for this year's action—we cannot possibly predict with any certainty what the final total appropriations this year will be. It is never possible to predict exactly what tax revenues will be collected this early in a year because tax revenues depend largely upon national income during the year. Unless the Democrats possess some secret crystal ball that allows them to make these predictions with a certainty that no other fiscal experts would claim, there is no possible way for them to know what the effect of this tax cut would be starting 10 months from now.

In fact, if the proponents were at all certain about the fiscal future, why would not the tax cut have been proposed to take effect immediately? If they do not want to take the responsibility for immediate tax cuts, what leads them to believe that tax cuts in the unknown future will be to the benefit of the country? When the Congress again convenes next January, it will be the same Democrat controlled Congress. Why cannot we wait until then? If the fiscal picture warrants tax reduction next January, the Congress can enact it effective immediately, and I will be among the strongest supporters of such a tax reduction measure. The answer is that the Democrats are simply engaging in obviously irresponsible politics.

If the Democrat's crystal ball is clouded, for every $20 the taxpayer does not pay next year, the Government will have to borrow $20, and that $20 will someday have to be paid back with interest. In the meantime, increased Government borrowing increases inflationary pressures, with the cost of living going up and the value of the dollar going down.

Let us not be fooled by any such tax cuts that we will have to pay back with interest—just to get $20 that can be largely absorbed by inflated prices and devalued dollars.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, last evening I had the pleasure and enjoyment of watching on television the press conference of the President of the United States. I believe that it is a most effective political weapon. I do not in any way begrudge it. I remember well the days of the so-called fireside chats also.

I was particularly interested in the answer to one of the questions which the President gave in that press conference. He stated that tax cuts which are made in anticipation that it will balance the budget are thoroughly justified and he intimated that the Republican tax cuts were of that nature.

We on the Democratic side, I believe, should be given some credit for believing also that the tax cut which we envision for the great mass of the small-income people of this country will do much to do exactly the same thing, by creating additional purchasing power without which business itself will not be able to function. It is upon that broad base that I think many of us are going to support

this measure which has been brought before us.

Now, I would like to call particular attention to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], who was afraid that business would become so discouraged by this tax cut that it would fold up and we would have growing unemployment. I would like to call his attention particularly to some figures of the present time. For instance, with all the encouragement in the world that they have just received, business expenditures for new plants and equipment, which are wholly in the control of business, for the first quarter of 1955 have reached the lowest level since the third quarter of 1952. They are $560 million below the fourth quarter of 1954, and they are $1.43 billion below the same first quarter of 1954. What is this great confidence that we feel or we are told that the big business people feel they should have? Along the same line, on our figures for employment and unemployment, we find that employment in January of 1955 is 53,000 below the same month of January of 1953. In other words, with all this encouragement, we are still going downhill where, if we have a growing country, as we know we have, we have to go forward. What is the answer? The answer is to give something else, a stimulation to the purchasing power to the great mass of the people of this country, and that is what this Democratic proposal seeks to do, and I believe it will do it.

One last word. We have heard an awful lot today about responsibility and irresponsibility. I particularly, out in my district, ran on a platform of doing something in the way of giving tax cuts for the little people of the district, so the people were under no misapprehension whatsoever that when I came to Congress, if they elected me, I would be working for a chance to vote for exactly what I am going to get a chance to vote for here. And, I think we had better right now recognize that that is true. We are shaping up one of the great issues that will be fought in 1956, and I think I can state it fairly simply: To whom is the Republican Party responsible? And, to whom is the Democratic Party responsible? The Republican Party is now and always has been primarily responsible to those people that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was so interested in, the big business interests, the big corporations of this country. The Democratic Party has always been responsible to the great masses of the people of this country, and I, for one, am prepared to go out and help fight the campaign of 1956 on that issue of responsibility.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I did not really intend to get into this debate, because I did not think there was going to be a fight on it. But, when there is a fight going on, I do like to get into it. The reason I did not think there would be a fight is because I thought that this bill was doing what the President of the United States asked this Congress to do on this floor in his state of the Union message. If you will recall, he told us at that time that they anticipated cutting taxes in 1956. Now, that is exactly what this bill does. And, what has been done by this Congress is very simple. We have taken the suggestion of the President, and we are putting it into law so that he will not have an opportunity to be talked out of what he wants to do for the American people. When he said that he wanted to cut taxes in 1956 he was doing 1 of 2 things; he was either playing politics or he was sincere. I prefer to think that he was sincere. I prefer to think that any President of the United States is sincere in what he does.

Now what happens? Immediately after this bill was prepared and brought to the floor—really before that—the newspapers were filled with all kinds of castigating remarks—including some of those by the President—saying that it was fiscal irresponsibility. Well, who suggested it in the first place? He is the man who suggested it. And do you know why it was necessary for Congress to act? If it had not been for some past experiences, this bill probably would not even be on the floor. But you know what happened when the opportunity presented itself to carry out some campaign promises concerning 100 percent of parity that was promised to the American farmer in Minnesota, and several other places. The American people remembered that. They also remembered this, that there was some small print in there that said "At the market place." Of course, the farmers have not found that market place yet. The market place that they have had to go to has very low prices.

But the point that I am making is simply this, that what they wanted to do was to pinpoint this because they did not want to turn up here in 1956 and be told when they thought this was the year they were getting a tax reduction that what the President meant all the time was to give another tax reduction to the coupon clippers who got it last year.

The little people in this country want some relief. They want it on the books so that somebody can understand it. And when you talk to me about fiscal irresponsibility I want to say this: that if it is fiscal irresponsibility to give some tax relief to the overburdened little people of this country, this country could use a lot of it. The truth is it is not fiscal irresponsibility, but on the contrary absolute fiscal and intellectual responsibility.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does not the coupon clipper get $20 under this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. He gets $20 under this bill, he certainly does. And we do not begrudge it to him one minute. I think it is fine that he gets it. What we want to do is to be fair with everybody but we do not want the little people to believe that we are going to do something for them and then later on have them learn that we are doing it only for a few and that we are saying, "Well, you just did not understand what we meant when we said taxes would be reduced. We were talking about the big boys not you little fellows.

If there has been any irresponsibility concerning this measure, it has not been fiscal, it has been vocal if not mental. When anybody says—and I do not care what office he holds or where he is from—when anybody says to me that I am fiscally irresponsible because I want to help a man to buy some shoes for his children's feet and some bread for their stomachs, I do not think he is being honest with himself or anyone else.

I shall never subscribe to the policy that substantial tax relief for a privileged few is "statesmanship" while meager tax relief for the many is fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO].

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure. I believe, as the majority leader said, there are inequities in the Revenue Act of 1954 which must be corrected by this Congress. I do not intend to talk politically. I intend to talk factually. I shall base my remarks upon the actual wording of the Revenue Act of 1954.

I respectfully refer to section 462 of that act and the tremendous windfall it will give to big business for the tax year 1954. This effect, to put it mildly, was totally unexpected by the small taxpayer of the United States but perhaps not by his big business brother.

The average taxpayer, the little citizen, works on what is called a cash-receipt basis. He takes money in and he pays it out. The average businessman, above the level of the small-business man, works on what is called the accrual basis. What that means in my understanding is that it is not only the money he takes in, it is not only the money he pays out, upon which the records are kept, it is also what he expects to pay out and what he expects to take in.

Under the act as it was written last year every big-business man in this country is this year getting a double deduction, and I say that is a tax reduction. It is a tax forgiveness. It adds up to about $5 billions. Here is the way it works, right from the act, and I will give it to you in small figures.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If this is an inequity, and if it contains all of the faults the gentleman suggests, it would seem to me that the proper approach would be for the committee to report out a provision repealing it, and not leave it on the books.

Mr. ZELENKO. Yes; I believe the committee should do that. However, I arose to bring it to the attention of the committee and the House because there has been so much said by the Republican Party about the 1954 Revenue Act not being a reduction act, that it was merely a revision act. I maintain it is a reduction act. The act is inequitable. Briefly, here is the way it works in simple figures.

A business house having an income of $10,000 and expenses of $2,000 before the enactment of this statute would have a taxable income of $8,000. Under the act of 1954, this business can now estimate what its costs will be in the year 1955 in the way of expenses, at least what they were in 1954, another $2,000, making a taxable income of not $8,000 but $6,000, keeping the extra $2,000 in what is called "reserve," which just means the Government does not get it. The Government will never recoup that money because in 1956, if this statute remains on the books, the business house will again estimate its future expenses for 1957, and on and on forever, so that in this particular year of 1954 I say there are $5 billions which the Government will never see because of some hocus pocus, high powered accounting which was written into the 1954 act. The average little man does not even understand the meaning of the word "accrual." So I say that in order to help rectify the inequity of the 1954 act this measure, H. R. 4259, should be passed to give a "cash-receipt" average citizen tax relief that he understands and needs.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from New York is to be commended, in my opinion, for bringing this to the attention of the Committee of the Whole. During consideration of the bill before us on Monday I asked the Secretary of the Treasury if this had come to his attention and gave him a case I had read of in the local newspaper. He said it had not come to his attention. I suggested that it be investigated immediately by the Treasury and recommendation made if recommendation should be needed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELENKO. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman from Arkansas would admit that certainly there was never any intention on the part of any Member on the Republican or Democratic side of the Committee on Ways and Means last year in the House of Representatives to permit a windfall to anybody from this section. It was only intended to put into practice good, sound accounting procedure.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. In fact, this provision was handed to the committee, as I understand, by the Treasury Department, as a device to improve bookkeeping. However, it is one of those things that perhaps had not been thoroughly considered. Certainly it merits further consideration by our committee.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would agree with the gentleman, but I think it is not fair to say that that bill was an inequitable bill and was devised as an inequitable bill and was considered as such because it contains this provision which, if the gentleman is correct, has had these effects.

Mr. ZELENKO. May I say that the effect of section 462 of the 1954 act now has every accountant in America worthy of his salt giving his clients the double deduction windfall. I add also that my constituency, each and every one, is in favor of the $20 deduction except one constituent, the President of the United States. However, I say here and now, and respectfully, he is a minority of one in my district.

I urge the passage of H. R. 4259.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, well, we are back here where we were last year. Last year we came here and they tried to make us believe they were helping the little fellow. I started in, if you remember, trying to get a $1,000 exemption—to raise it from $600 to $1,000. That failed. Then we tried $900 and that failed. We finally got down to asking for a $700 exemption. These Members on my left to a man fought that bill, and I told you at that time there were going to be a lot of new faces here at this session of the Congress because you did not give the little fellow any tax relief—if you remember that. Now I am telling you there are going to be a lot more new faces in 1957.

I want to briefly give you a few figures on H. R. 8300. We have been hearing talk here all day that it did not help the big man any more than it helped the little man. I have just made a few simple figures which almost anybody can understand. In my district we have a lot of people who work with their hands and who earn $3,000 and less. Take a man with a family who earns $3,500 farming. He works with his hands 12 months in the year. His wife works, and all of his children work. They make $3,500 in 12 months—if they do. His tax under this bill approximately is $60. But take the man who uses 12 minutes of his time instead of 12 months. A man who clips coupons in the amount of $3,500—his tax is in the neighborhood of $20. Now have you helped the little man or have you helped the big man? Those are the facts. Let us go into this thing just a little bit. I was talking to my nephew back there a while ago. He gave me a little thought about this being a sort of Easter egg hunt for the big boy. You take this big bill. It has 875 pages. I am referring now to the bill, H. R. 8300. On every page you find help for the big taxpayer. On every page he turns, he finds a golden nugget which takes care of him. But, my friends, for the little fellow in the low brackets, you might just as well send him a Sears Roebuck catalog, which would do him more good than this bill, H. R. 8300, did for him. They say that this $20 tax reduction will not do anybody any good, and that it is a phony. Well, you just do not give $20 to the man. We are giving $20 to the wife and we give $20 for each child. You know, it might be an incentive for a fellow to have a few children in his home if you give him this $20 tax reduction—a family of 5 would get $100 reduction. That $20—do not worry about the phony part of it—you take it to the grocery store and they will give you groceries that you can take home which will fill the empty stomachs of your children. Do not worry about that. No, no, you know what this is. They say this is politics. You bet this is politics. H. R. 8300 was politics. That was Republican politics and it did not help the little man in this Nation. But now this is politics, too—this is Democratic politics that believes in filling the stomachs of the hungry people of America. While I admit that $20 is very small, we did not do like the Republicans did; this $20 goes to every man, woman, and dependent in this great Nation of ours. This will bolster the economy of this country and will put purchasing power in the hands of the people. This is an extra $20 that all of us will have to spend. We do not hesitate to give relief to other nations when they are in need. Then why in all good reason should we not give relief at home? Let me repeat, the only thing wrong with this tax cut, it is not enough. We are just doing today what our Republican friends promised 2 years ago. Let us pass this bill and make them keep their promise.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was amused at my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] pleading for the folks who made $3,500 a year. I want to remind the gentleman that before his party came into power in 1932 and before we got into these past wars, the family that had an income of $3,500 a year was completely exempted from any income tax.

I do not blame the Democrat leadership for trying to give back a few of the crumbs of the many thousands and thousands of dollars they have taken from the pockets of the poor people of America during the postwar years when they were in power. You are just trying to soothe a lot of folks who know just what you have done since 1932; back as far as 1917, when this Nation was thrown into World War I, and then in 1941 we were thrown into World War II, and then in 1951 when the President sent our boys to Korea without even glancing at the representatives of the people, the Congress of the United States, and because of those wars and wasted billions you raised Federal taxes 19 times. So as I said before, I do not blame you for trying to soothe the folks a little bit by giving them just a few crumbs of all the thousands you have taken away from them. You have raised Federal taxes from 4 percent of the people's income in the last 18 years you were in power, to 24 percent when the Republican 80th Congress came into power. That is 20 percent on every thousand-dollar income or $200 on every thousand-dollar income. True, most of it is hidden taxes. The family making $3,500 annually paid in the neighborhood of $870 in Federal income tax before the Republicans reduced their taxes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I yield if you want to straighten yourself out.

Mr. LONG. The gentleman a few moments ago referred to taxes that the Democrats put on. I would just like to go back a little and do a little reminiscing. I am pretty old myself. Do you remember the days of Herbert Hoover when men walked the highways and byways begging for bread? Do you remember that shortly after that time Franklin D. Roosevelt came into power and you had some prosperity?

Mr. JENSEN. If you want to go back I can remember when your party gave 12 million people employment in military uniforms. Are you proud of that?

Now, who benefited by the tax reduction that the Republicans put into effect in 1947 and 1948, and in 1951 and 1952? We Republicans reduced taxes to the tune of over $12 billion, and our expert economic analysts tell us that the ultimate consumer pays all of the taxes in the final analysis and that 64 percent of the American people make less than $5,000 a year. So because of the fact that the ultimate consumer pays all of the taxes, the people whose income is $5,000 or less received 64 percent of the savings of reduced taxes passed by the Republicans, because they represent 64 percent of our total population.

The American people are just now feeling and enjoying the effects of the Republican tax reduction program. No wonder the Democrats want to get into the act. You cannot blame them for trying.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have the opportunity of coming on the floor today and speaking in behalf of a measure which I recommended strongly during my last campaign, a tax reduction bill. The leader of the opposing party, the President of the United States, extended the springboard for the attack on this bill a few days ago when he used the word "irresponsible." I notice that his followers here today have used it many, many times.

I tell you their true objection to this bill, Mr. Chairman, is not the fact that it is irresponsible, but the fact that it is "ir-Republican." It is "ir-Republican" because it was conceived by men who are leaders in the Democratic Party, men who have served long and faithfully and eminently in the party of all the people of the United States, the Democratic Party.

It is also "ir-Republican" because it serves to give some relief to the low-income people of America whom the other party has used only for the purpose of exploiting their meager existence throughout the years instead of making them real independent citizens.

The Republican leaders come here today and say that the Congress of the United States is using poor judgment in considering a tax cut that has not been recommended by the President of the United States. In effect they say this is not the responsibility of the Congress of the United States. I would like to refer my friends to section 8 of that great book, which was conceived and written by the men of wisdom and foresight, our forefathers of many generations ago, the Constitution of the United States. Yes, in section 8 you will find that it is the power and the responsibility of this body to propose and levy taxes and to raise the revenue by which we run our Government.

They say that this tax is unwise and irresponsible because it comes a year before it is to become effective. As far as I am concerned the average family head in America likes to know before he starts planning his budget exactly what his financial situation is going to be for the next 12 months. Sure, I would like to know every year on January 1 just exactly how much money I am going to have to have in my family budget throughout the year, and I feel that every citizen of America should also have that privilege.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you know whether or not this proposal would have an inflationary effect on the economy?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I will get to that; I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question.

Talking about inflation, the economy of this Nation is based on the ability of its citizens to earn and spend money; if we do not have money in circulation at all levels the economy of this Nation is certainly at very low ebb.

Mr. HOSMER. I understand that, but if this bill should result in a rise in price of merely 1 cent on each of six necessary items that any family in this country is going to have to buy, then that $20 relief is going to cause the expenditure of $21.90, leaving a man $1.90 worse off than when he started.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But the gentleman forgets that we are going to put $2,100,000,000 more money into circulation. This money will be placed in the hands of low-income people who will spend it. I have always been of the opinion that an income tax should be paid out of the surplus income. I believe there is enough surplus income in America to pay the tax burden. When you tax a man with one child who is making only $1,800 a year you tax him on money which is needed for the bare necessities of life. When you tax the man who is making $10,000 a year, the $20 you are taxing represents only a small percentage of his income when you base it on the surplus amount of income made by the wage earner, in comparison.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to endorse and support the $20 refund or tax exemption which is given to the taxpayers. I recommended to my people in Tennessee before I came to Congress that I would support legislation raising the personal exemption of the individual taxpayer. This is even better than that. It gives relief to the small wage earner but does not take as much from the Treasury. I support this bill more vigorously than I would the other plan because in proportion of the tax paid it gives greater relief to the low-income people of America.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will agree with me in the statement I am about to make. We are both proud of the fact that we serve on the Committee on Ways and Means. I am proud of that fact and I am also proud of the fact that I had the opportunity of serving for a short time as chairman of what I consider after all to be the greatest committee in the House of Representatives. I believe that both the present chairman and myself would like to do everything within our power to uphold the prestige of that committee and to follow orderly procedure. We cannot afford to sacrifice that committee.

If you will look over the chairmen who have served that committee in the past, not including myself, you will find that they have been men of outstanding capacity and that they have gone on to much higher positions later. The committee should be proud of that fact.

We want the people of this country to respect the committee and to feel that they are safe in the hands of the committee so far as taxation is concerned. Somebody said here that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Of course, that is true. The fact is that each person on the floor is responsible for the prestige of a committee like this.

We are facing a serious proposition and I cannot believe that our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee at the present time fully approved of this method to try to take us by surprise. In all the years I have been here, nothing like this has ever happened before. I am not going to characterize it at all. I just want to leave it in the thoughts of the Members.

Mr. Chairman, we should handle legislation as it should be handled. It should not be handled in this way. It is not fair, it is not just, and all it will do is to reduce the prestige of this great committee before the country. The thing we better do is to think about that seriously at this time.

There has been some criticism here of the 83d Congress. Do not try to tell the people of the country that they received no benefits from that Congress. Every segment of the population has received benefits. You cannot lift a great tax burden of $7,400,000,000 off the people without stimulating interest in those things that helped every man and woman. If you will go through that bill you will see the benefits that have been given, clear down to the babysitter. I am receiving letters on this every day, even in reference to what we have done for the colleges and institutions of the country.

You say that this does not have any effect on the matter of inflation. Do you know that the heads of some of these insurance companies have been to me and that they are on the point of notifying their policyholders what it means to their policyholders, and I refer to loan associations and institutions of that kind. They are all going to be affected adversely by this. You are not going to give the people any benefits by this proposal here. So, I hope you will think it over tonight and take this matter as seriously as it should be done. We have had a great display here. I have enjoyed it very much. I have not taken very much part in it, but I have enjoyed it, except for one thing. I just do not like to see our great committee dragged into the low level which it is possible to do if we demagog on a thing of this kind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for his fine attitude and say just this: He was the author of the tax-revision bill in the last Congress. He worked at it very diligently. So far as I could discover, except for a very few items about which there was dispute, I understood that both the Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means approved of the bill. There were differences about some provisions, but on the whole there was approval of those provisions. And, it must on the whole have been a pretty good bill because 339 voted for it on passage and only 80 against it. I do not know on which side the gentleman from Louisiana voted, but in any event, if he was one of the 80, he was in a very heavy minority, because a majority of 339 went ahead and voted for the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman. I do not think any member of the Committee on Ways and Means on the Democratic side of this House will say that I have not given credit to the whole committee for the work that was done on that important bill, the first revision of consequence since 1875. I received long-distance telephone calls from California and from almost every State of the Union, from outstanding attorneys, saying that they were for the bill because they could not advise their clients on any kind of a transaction because the laws were so confused by reason of regulations, conflicting court decisions, and other reasons. So, this bill was built up in the interest of this Nation.

And, what is more, I have checked to see how many criticisms were coming in on that bill, and outside of a few clerical provisions, and voices heard without anything more to support them than a newspaper article, there have been very few criticisms—less than 100—coming to the Joint Committee on Taxation, which has taken an active part in the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, being a new Member of this great body and especially since being the youngest, I have tried to be a good listener. I must rise, however, and voice my opinion on this measure to reduce individual taxes.

I have heard a great deal of talk thus far about balancing the budget, about reducing our national debt, and establishing our economy on a sound and firm foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is way past due for the present administration to talk about balancing the human budget instead of the monetary budget. Since the present administration seems reluctant to do so and acts so aggravated when the topic is brought up, I believe it is up to this Congress to take the initiative in getting something actually accomplished which will help the plain, ordinary, non-coupon-clipping citizen. In all this talk about balancing budgets, let us look at the human budget. In my district of southern Illinois there are over 30,000 people out of work, walking the streets looking for a job; despite all the high-flown phrases that the party in power puts out concerning rapid decreases in unemployment, where I come from there is more unemployed today than there was last week, there was more last week than last month, and a great deal more unemployment last year than the year before it. Now, I am sure that $20 may not sound like a lot of money to some people, but it means a whole lot to those people in southern Illinois and everywhere in our Nation who can only pick up a few dollars from whatever job they can find from time to time.

In all this talk about reducing debts, let us again look at the human factor. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this administration realizes, knows, or understands that we have distressed areas in these United States, or else it simply is not interested. If it were interested, it would realize that $20 means a lot to a head of a family who has to go and borrow money to buy food to supplement the food relief he is now on so his children can be fed. In southern Illinois we have over 24,000 families on Government surplus food relief and $20 for each tax exemption would go a long way toward buying a few pairs of shoes for children or pay the book rental at school and many other things necessary in raising a family.

In all this talk about firm foundations for our national economy, let us not forget the average American family, the very foundation of our national life. To most of them, $20 means a lot; it means an awful lot to most families in southern Illinois.

It is high time that something was done for the people in those areas of our country who are right now living in a fearful depression. It is high time that the wage earners, the workingmen and farmers had action demonstrated to them instead of all those promises, platitudes, and talk, talk, talk from the White House and the administration about forward-looking programs, leveling-off of the economy that has been going on for these last 2 years. Something must be done, Mr. Chairman, and it certainly looks like it will have to be up to this Congress to have any action accomplished.

I realize that what this bill will accomplish is not a great deal compared to the magnitude of the problem; but it will be the first step in the right direction of actually doing something for our people in distressed areas here in the United States. Mr. Chairman, a 1,000-mile trip is started with the first step. Let us make the first step toward giving our people that break they deserve by passing this $20 tax-reduction bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have a strong and impelling desire to support and vote for a reduction in taxes which will legitimately relieve the taxpayer of the heavy burden he is now carrying when I am sure that the tax reduction I vote for will not reduce the purchasing power of his dollar, will not increase the present deficit in the budget, and will not increase his obligation to paying off the public debt.

I voted for a tax reduction in the 80th Congress, which proved to be the wise and proper thing to do at that time, because the revenues we took in the form of taxes from the people not only balanced the budget, but left an $8 billion surplus and paid off $6 billion of the public debt.

I voted for a tax reduction in the 83d Congress which brought relief to every taxpayer in the Nation amounting to $3,200,000,000, and when we were able to reduce the deficit in the budget from $9.4 billion to $2.4 billion, or a total reduction in the deficit of $7 billion.

The proposal before us, H. R. 4259, instead of reducing the present deficit will increase the present deficit by $1 billion. It has been said that the present bill will provide a $20 tax credit to each taxpayer and his dependents. The truth of the matter is that it will add an obligation of $15 for each taxpayer and his dependents to the national debt. In other words, instead of stabilizing the taxpayers' dollar, the passage of this bill will actually depreciate the purchasing power of the taxpayer's dollar and furthermore increase the present budget deficit by $1 billion, which the taxpayer must pay interest upon.

In my opinion the proposal contained in H. R. 4259 is purely a political move by this Democratic-controlled Congress to give the impression to the average income-tax payer throughout the Nation that he will benefit by the passage of this bill while, in fact, it will add to the monetary burden of the average taxpayer to pay off the increase this will place on the national debt and the increase it will place on the budget deficit.

My public record on supporting, voting, and advocating a reduction in taxes is well known over the years. As a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors before coming to Congress, I fought for and obtained a reduction in taxes on more than one occasion. I have consistently voted against appropriations which I believed to be surplus and unnecessary in order to reduce the tax burden on the taxpayer.

I have, as I previously stated, voted in the 80th Congress and in the 83d Congress to reduce the burden on the taxpayer by reducing his income taxes, but I do not propose to deceive him into believing that this bill will reduce his taxes when it will actually increase his burden, depreciate the purchasing power of his dollar, and add an additional burden on himself and his children for years to come by increasing the public debt.

The people of the Nation should realize that this bill will not take effect until January 1, 1956, and that its full effect will not be realized until January 1, 1957.

I believe we should wait until we know what our actual budget expenditures will be for the next fiscal year, and I am confident that during the next session of Congress when we know what our budget obligations are, a legitimate, honest, and beneficial tax reduction will be proposed and passed by the 84th Congress which I will be glad to support.

We must do everything possible to stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar, reduce deficit spending, and, if possible, pay off all we can on the national debt rather than to do the reverse in all of these essential things which this bill would bring about.

I am confident the public fully realize that this bill, H. R. 4259, is purely a political move and is a very unsound and unsafe fiscal policy to pursue.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of discussion this afternoon about whether or not this proposed reduction in income taxes will benefit the smaller taxpayer, who is the hardest hit by his intolerable tax burden, and who is the least able to pay. Let us look at it percentagewise. A family of 4—husband and wife and 2 children—receiving a net income of $4,000 after deductions but before exemptions, pays now under the Republican tax act, a total of $320 in direct Federal taxes out of this meager income. Under the proposal now before us this same family will pay only $240, which is a reduction of 25 percent. Now take a family of the same size with a net income of $10,000. This family's taxes will be reduced from $1,592 to $1,512, which is only 6 percent. Certainly it is clear that those who need it most will benefit most under this bill—rather than the Republican principle of 1954, designed to benefit most those who need it least.

I am strongly unmoved by the crocodile tears and cries of irresponsibility raised about this measure, designed particularly to help the 5 million families who are hurt worst in the squeeze between rising costs and rising taxes. I recall the cries of glee and triumph, the trumpeting through the press that followed tax reductions for the privileged few, which were then considered the height of responsibility even though they too were thrown into the face of an unbalanced budget.

I came on this floor this afternoon prepared to offer an amendment which would have increased the revenue of the United States Treasury by repealing some of the special tax privileges granted last year by the 83d Congress. As you know, I may not under the rule now offer that amendment to that bill, but may I suggest to the Members that if they are concerned about the effect on revenue of this proposal to help out the little fellow, the way is open to them to realize more than an equivalent of any taxes lost by this measure through repealing of the special tax advantages contained in the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 and I will be happy to help any Member locate and repeal those advantages.

I have a further word to say regarding the economic result of this tax reduction proposal. Let us apply it in my own medium-sized community of Fresno, Calif., where we have a metropolitan population of about 160,000 persons. A $20 tax reduction for each will mean that $3,200,000 additional will be available for spending in that community each year. It means that more goods and services will be purchased, that merchants will do more business and that employment will be increased. It will be a shot in the arm in an economy which is largely dependent upon agricultural prosperity, which I am sorry to say has been woefully lacking under the administration's and Secretary Benson's "wipe out the farmers" program.

We have our chance today to at least partly bring our tax program back into balance and in some measure equalize the tax advantages handed our wealthy friends by the administration last year. I not only urge this proposal, but serve notice I intend to explore further the possibility of bringing more responsibility back into our tax setup on behalf of those least able to pay the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, my keen interest today—and last year—was and is in effecting tax relief for the low-income group. Last year relief was accorded to the well-to-do and a mere trickle was given to the low-income group—one might even say to the poor, because many of these low-income people were actually poor. The injustice perpetrated was acutely felt, and the paramount interest today given to these people does not compensate for the benefits to which they were entitled last year, and did not receive.

It is justice to take care of them now. All the arguments about balancing the budget, high patriotism of the people who made $5,000 or less—all this is beside the point. Of course these matters should be considered but not to the expense of the millions affected.

Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to support this measure to the utmost. It is a matter of conscience with me as it is to many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I repeat it is social justice and these people are entitled to this consideration.

If this is irresponsibility, then make the most of it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned today, not so much by this ill-conceived political $20 tax cut proposal which I feel is bound to fail, as by the continued extension of the excise and corporation taxes which is bound to pass. Under present condtions, I am of course voting against the tax cut, and in favor of the extension of the other taxes. But I had hoped that, by this time, we could eliminate these nuisance taxes and this abnormal corporate income tax. These taxes are ultimately paid by everybody, because excise taxes, sales taxes, are paid by consumers and corporations must pass on their taxes to buyers of their products, or go bankrupt. As Franklin D. Roosevelt truthfully said "taxes are paid by the sweat of everyone who toils." Let us stop talking about the little man and the big man today. Both of them are included in the $20 political gesture that will fail; both of them are hit by the taxes that will pass.

Why do we still need these taxes? Why are we still on an unbalanced budget, after cutting our spending $63 billion in 2 years? The answer is that our defense, our protection, takes two-thirds of our spending. The remaining one-third that we spend on our own peaceful pursuits cannot be cut enough to balance the budget and justify a tax reduction. Previous Democratic administrations must bear their full share of responsibility for mistakes that contributed to this situation but, regardless of the past, it is the present, continuing, grim and deadly threat of communism that is responsible for most of our spending, for our high taxes that cannot now be cut.

As we debate here today there is going on in Bangkok, Thailand, a conference of the SEATO powers, the eight nations that joined at Manila is forming the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Our statesmen are leading in the effort to put life and vigor into that eight-power treaty, under conditions that are being made as difficult as possible by our enemies. Some of our friends are not being too helpful. Success out there will contribute eventually to lasting peace, a reduction of our defense burden and ultimate safe tax reduction. What happens at Bangkok will affect our budget. What happens here today may affect the outcome at Bangkok. Not just what we do alone, but what the free world does together, will meet the Soviet threat in a way to justify safe tax reduction here.

In view of the momentous nature of the Bangkok meeting, in view of the vicious and insidious enemy propaganda aimed at that meeting, and in view of some statements made here in recent days that may be misunderstood out

there, I made a statement today over the Voice of America. I think it may be helpful to quote it to the House in connection with this debate. Here it is:

In the opening session of the Bangkok conference, Mr. Dulles declared once more our American policy of independence laid down in our Declaration of Independence, in the United Nations Charter and in the Pacific Charter. He reminded the nations of Asia that we believed, as Lincoln said, that this principle was not only for Americans, but for all people, for all future time. He said that to us this means that equal opportunity for all peoples shall not be hampered by geography, race, or creed.

On Thursday Mr. Dulles stressed the interdependence of nations that would remain free, and told of the mighty power of the United States assembled and committed in Asia to back up the power of the Asian countries uniting in their common defense against their common foe.

The American people are firmly behind their great Secretary of State in his masterful statements on independence and interdependence, freedom and unity. There is no confusion here as to what the Congress and the people want and expect their Government to do when free men in Asia join in defense against Communist aggression. We know, as Mr. Dulles says, that "freedom cannot thrive in an environment that is hostile to freedom."

Our goal, as he said, is "peace and freedom" for Asia, for ourselves. We know we cannot buy peace for ourselves by bargaining away territory we do not own, trading off the freedom of other men. We are ready and determined to take the steps necessary for the common defense of united free men.

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Chairman, the proposal today contains two provisions. One of these provisions concerns the retention of Federal excise and corporate taxes, which will be reduced by operation of law unless action is taken by Congress to extend them. I strongly favor this provision of the bill. The condition of our Treasury makes necessary the retention of these corporate and excise taxes at the present rates.

The second provision of the bill would give each taxpayer a credit on his income tax of $20 for himself and $20 for each dependent. It would remove 5 million taxpayers from the tax rolls and it would reduce our yearly tax collections $2.1 billion. Both our yearly deficit and our Government debt would be increased by that amount because we already have a deficit. This provision would not go into effect at any time during 1955 but would affect taxes for 1956 and beyond.

Identically the same people who urge the second provision of this bill were just as strongly 1 year ago urging that each taxpayer be given an increased income exemption at that time of $100 for himself and each dependent. That bill would also have removed 5 million taxpayers from the tax rolls and would have cost the Treasury approximately $2 billion in revenue yearly. Everyone knows that it would have been the finest politics imaginable to have supported the bill of 1 year ago and that those of us who did not were made to suffer for it at election time, as we knew we would be. The bill was defeated, however, but by a majority of only four votes.

Has it now been proven that we were right when we opposed that measure and that the proponents were wrong? I believe it has been. The record now shows that every dollar of that tax reduction would have had to be replaced by borrowed money which would have increased the Government's debt. But, actually the proponents of the present $20 provision confirm the unsoundness of their exemption increase proposal of 1 year ago. How do they do that? They do it by admitting that the present proposal should not be made effective as of January 1, 1955, by admitting that it should not be made effective even on July 1, 1955—the beginning of the next fiscal year—and by not even claiming that it should be made effective before January 1, 1956. That is almost a year hence and it is actually 18 months later than the July 1, 1954, effective date of their proposal of a year ago.

There is one thing that this proposal does not disclose but which is just as true as is the statement that the effort to pass a $100 increased exemption 1 year ago was unsound. That is, that if those who supported the increased exemption last year, and those who are supporting the $20 credit today continue to vote on money measures, as most of them have constantly voted in this House since I have been a Member of Congress, we shall not be able to reduce taxes this year, next year, nor any other year.

It does seem that there is irony in the fact that those of us here who support economy in an effort to try to make possible the increase of income exemptions and a reduction of taxes must oppose, out of a sense of fiscal responsibility, the unwise tax-cut efforts by the very ones who, by their consistent voting for more and greater expenditures, would make any tax reduction an absolute impossibility.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor lower taxes because I believe the people are entitled to lower taxes. I have consistently voted to decrease expenditures in order that we might safely and responsibly reduce taxes. I know of no other way we can justify voting lower taxes except by first reducing expenditures.

I am in favor of an increased exemption for income-tax purposes because I think the people are entitled to that. And, in consistently voting for lower expenditures, I have had in mind that it would make possible an increase in the exemption now allowed income-tax payers.

Mr. Chairman, to reduce taxes and thereby make necessary additional budget deficits and additional public debt which would be passed on to the children and grandchildren of this generation, is unthinkable. My sense of public duty impels my decision to oppose such an effort.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, at his press conference yesterday, the President called the action of the Democratic leadership in asking for a $20 across-the-board tax cut fiscal irresponsibility.

Is it fiscal irresponsibility to do something this year which will help primarily low-income taxpayers, after last year's $7.4 billion tax cut, of which taxpayers receiving income less than $5,000 a year got only 9 percent of the benefits with the other 91 percent going to corporations and high-income taxpayers?

Is it fiscal irresponsibility to help the man with the large family struggling to keep up his mortgage payments and buy baby shoes, by giving him a tax break based upon the number of his dependents?

Is it fiscal irresponsibility to give purchasing power to those who need it most, who will use it to buy goods that will cause our factories to put up the "help wanted" signs once again and start putting some of our 4 million unemployed back to work?

Is it fiscal irresponsibility to advocate a tax cut for the fiscal year 1956 which will produce a deficit of only 3.2 million, when the President cheerfully backed a $7.4 billion tax cut for the big fellow last year which produced an actual 1955 fiscal year deficit of $4.5 billion?

The President has said he is interested in a balanced budget. So am I. If he wants to balance the budget for 1956, or come very close to it, let him send up here a bill to raise the revenues by closing some of the more outrageous loopholes in our present tax structure—depletion allowance, family partnerships, gaps in the gift tax and many another. Let him defy the interests which profit by these loopholes and which up to now have held such a firm mortgage on the White House.

I will pledge to the President that I will stand faithfully by him in any sincere attempt he will make to rally the Republicans in Congress toward balancing the budget by taxing those able to pay.

I will go along just as faithfully as I did last week when I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], tell us that the President was asking his friends on the Hill to back him by opposing the recommittal of H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4048) to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, as far as I know the measure now before us has been reported by the Committee on House Administration without any dissension. I see the gentleman from Iowa is here. I do not know of any reason why the measure cannot be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think I can say frankly to the House that H. R. 4048 is a bill that was reintroduced as a clean bill after a previous bill had been considered and was found objectionable in some particulars. I believe all of the objections were removed. I believe there is no part of H. R. 4048 that is mandatory or compels any action. It does invite all of the States to make arrangements to participate in the voting by men in the armed services, men in the merchant marine, civilian employees in foreign countries, and religious groups abroad, by utilizing free air mail service.

That is all there is in the bill H. R. 4048. It is not mandatory in any respect. It is important that it be passed at this time for the reason that action is necessary by the legislatures of some States. Most of the legislatures of the States are now in session, but perhaps will not be in session soon. As far as I am concerned, I should think that this bill could pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4048 has been reported out of the Committee on House Administration with amendments.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4048 would repeal certain provisions of the United States Code relating to the method of voting by land and naval forces and affiliated personnel who are absent from their place of residence.

In place of the existing statutes, H. R. 4048 would provide a formal congressional recommendation to the States to provide a framework through which the armed services and other dislocated personnel might exercise their voting franchise notwithstanding absence due to Federal employment or other occupations specified in the bill.

H. R. 4048 would repeal an act passed by Congress September 16, 1942, that in time of war no member of the Armed Forces shall be denied the right to vote by virtue of failing to comply with registration and other requirements usually applicable to State voter qualifications. H. R. 4048 proposes to leave to the States their historic and constitutional privilege of determining certain voting qualifications.

H. R. 4048 urges the States to cooperate with the plans set up in title II as far as disseminating election information and ballots. The bill also recommends extension of the franchise to civilian employees of the United States serving outside the territorial limits of the States. This title would also recommend the extension of the franchise to the wives of members of the Armed Forces, wives of members of the merchant marine, and wives of civilians outside of the United States officially attached to and serving with the Armed Forces.

Title II of H. R. 4048 would authorize the President to designate the head of any executive department to act as the representative of the executive branch to coordinate and facilitate the actions to be performed by the Federal branch in this matter.

The report anticipates that the President would appoint the Secretary of Defense, in all probability, to coordinate the Federal activities in this field, since the Department of Defense has more personnel away from voting residence than any other department.

Mr. Speaker, it was brought out during the hearing before the Committee on Rules that action should be taken on this bill just as soon as possible during these first few months of 1955 and unless action is taken before the State legislatures adjourn, the machinery cannot be adopted by the States, if they so desire to adopt the recommended voting machinery, in time for the next general election. In view of this I sincerely hope that the House will vote to adopt House Resolution 149, and that we will then proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 4048.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "The Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955."

TITLE I

Recommendations of the Congress to the several States

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends that the several States take, immediate legislative or administrative action to enable every person in any of the following categories who is absent from the place of his voting residence to vote by absentee ballot in any primary, special, or general election held in his election district or precinct, if he is otherwise eligible to vote in that election:

(1) Members of the Armed Forces while in the active service, and their spouses and dependents.

(2) Members of the merchant marine of the United States, and their spouses and dependents.

(3) Civilian employees of the United States in all categories serving outside the territorial limits of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia and their spouses and dependents when residing with or accompanying them, whether or not the employee is subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, and whether or not paid from funds appropriated by the Congress.

(4) Members of religious groups or welfare agencies assisting members of the Armed Forces, who are officially attached to and serving with the Armed Forces, and their spouses and dependents.

SEC. 102. To afford ample opportunity for persons covered by section 101 of this act to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to use the absentee balloting procedures to the greatest extent possible, it is recommended that each of the several States—

(1) accept as applications for absentee ballots under such States' absentee balloting laws, as applications for registration under such States' election laws, and as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws, the form of post card (when duly executed by a person covered by section 101 of this act) provided pursuant to this act;

(2) waive registration of persons covered by section 101 of this act, who, by reason of their service, have been deprived of an opportunity to register;

(3) accept the post card application provided pursuant to this act as a simultaneous application for registration and for ballot;

(4) if a special application is required for registration by mail, provide that the necessary forms will be sent with the absentee ballot and may be returned with it;

(5) make provision for persons eligible to register and qualified to vote, who have been honorably discharged from the Armed Forces, or have terminated their service or employment, too late to register at the time when, and at the place where, registration is required to vote at the election next ensuing after such discharge or termination;

(6) authorize and instruct the State or local election officials, upon receipt of the post card application provided pursuant to this act, to mail immediately to the applicant a ballot, instructions for voting and returning the ballot, and a self-addressed envelope;

(7) provide that there be printed across the face of each envelope in which a ballot is sent two parallel horizontal red bars, each one-quarter inch wide, extending from one side of the envelope to the other side, with an intervening space of one-quarter inch, the top bar to be 1¼ inches from the top of the envelope, and with the words "Official Election Balloting Material—via Air Mail," or similar language, between the bars; that there be printed in the upper right corner of each such envelope, in a box, the words "Free of U. S. Postage, Including Air Mail"; that all printing on the face of each such envelope be in red; and that there be printed in red in the upper left corner of each State ballot envelope an appropriate inscription or blanks for return address of sender;

(8) provide that the gummed flap of the State envelope supplied for the return of the ballot be separated by a wax paper or other appropriate protective insert from the remaining balloting material and that there be included in State voting instructions a procedure to be followed by absentee voters, such as notation of the facts on the back of the envelope duly signed by the voter and witnessing officer, in instances of adhesion of the balloting material;

(9) reduce in size and weight of paper, as much as possible, envelopes, ballots, and instructions for voting procedure;

(10) for the purposes of this act, authorized oaths required by State law to be administered and attested by any commissioned officer in the active service of the Armed Forces, or any member of the merchant marine of the United States designated for this purpose by the Secretary of Commerce, or any civilian official empowered by State or Federal law to administer oaths;

(11) include in State voting instructions express information concerning the type or types of writing instruments which may be used to mark the absentee ballot, preferably pen or indelible pencil; and

(12) provide that absentee ballots will be available for mailing to the applicant not later than 45 days before the last date on which such ballot will be counted.

SEC. 103. It is recommended that each of the several States make available to the officer designated by the President under section 201 of this act appropriate statistical data to assist him in compiling comprehensive information of operations under this act.

TITLE II

Federal responsibilities

SEC. 201. The President is hereby authorized to designate, with provision for redelegation, the head (hereinafter referred to as the Presidential designee) of any executive department or agency to coordinate and facilitate such actions as may be required to discharge Federal responsibilities under this act. The Presidential designee is authorized to request from other executive departments and agencies such assistance as he deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, and shall submit a report to the President and to the Congress in odd-numbered years. Such report shall cover the administration of Federal responsibilities authorized under this title, the progress of the States in carrying out the recommendations contained in title I, statistical data relating to absentee voting, and such other information as the Presidential designee may consider appropriate.

SEC. 202. The Presidential designee shall request, annually or more often when appropriate, each State to furnish him with current absentee voting information for such State. Such information shall include election dates, officers to be elected, constitutional amendments, and other proposals to be voted on, absentee registration and voting procedures, and other relevant data. As soon as possible after receipt of such information, he shall furnish it to the departments and agencies of the executive branch affected by this act. Such departments and agencies are authorized to reprint and distribute such information to the extent necessary.

SEC. 203. All Government officials shall, to the extent practicable and compatible with their primary responsibilities, cooperate with the Presidential designee in carrying out the purposes of this act. All such officials shall as far as practicable, take all reasonable measures to expedite, transmit, deliver, and return post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedures mailed to or by persons to whom this act is applicable. In addition, and as requested by the Presidential designee, it shall be the duty of—

(1) the Attorney General to cooperate and advise with the Council of State Governments in the formulation of drafts of State legislation designed to implement the recommendations for State action contained in this act;

(2) the Administrator of General Services to cause to be printed and distributed post cards for use in accordance with the provisions of this act. Such post cards shall, wherever practicable and compatible with other operations, be made available by the department or agency concerned to persons to whom this act is applicable for use at any general election at which electors for President and Vice President or Senators and Representatives are to be voted for. For use in such elections post cards shall be made available outside the territorial limits of the United States not later than August 15 prior to the election and within the territorial limits of the United States not later than September 15 prior to the election. To the extent practicable and compatible with other operations, post cards shall also be made available at appropriate times to such persons for use in other general, primary, and special elections; and

(3) the Postmaster General and the heads of the departments and agencies concerned, where practicable and compatible with their operations, to facilitate the transmission of balloting material to and from persons to whom this act is applicable. Ballots executed outside the United States by persons to whom this act is applicable shall be returned by priority airmail wherever practicable, and such mail may be segregated from other forms of mail and placed in special bags marked with special tags printed and distributed by the Postmaster General for this purpose.

SEC. 204. The form of the Federal post card application shall be as follows:

(a) The cards shall be 9½ by 4⅛ inches in size and shall be printed on "U. S. postal card paper, 188 pound, cream."

(b) Upon one side, perpendicular to the long dimension of the card, there shall be printed in black type the following:

FILL OUT BOTH SIDES OF CARD

POST CARD APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

State or Commonwealth of _____
(Fill in name of State or Commonwealth)

(1) I hereby request an absentee ballot to vote in the coming election:
(GENERAL) (PRIMARY)* (SPECIAL) ELECTION
(Strike out inapplicable words)

(2) *If a ballot is requested for a primary election, print your political party affiliation or preference in this box: ☐
(If primary election is secret in your State, do not answer)

(3) I am a citizen of the United States, eligible to vote in above State, and am:
a. A member of the Armed Forces of the United States ☐
b. A member of the Merchant Marine of the United States ☐
c. A member of a religious or welfare organization assisting servicemen ☐
d. A civilian employed by the United States Government outside the United States (continental) ☐
e. A spouse or dependent of a person listed in (a), (b), or (c) above ☐
f. A spouse or dependent residing with a person described in (d) above ☐

(4) I was born on _____
(Day) (Month) (Year)

(5) For ____ years preceding the above election my home (not military) residence in the above State has been:
_____
(Street and number or rural route, etc.)
The voting precinct or election district for this residence is _____
_____
(Enter if known)

(6) Remarks: _____
_____

(7) Mail my ballot to the following official address:
_____
(Unit (Co., Sq. Trp., Bn., etc.), Governmental Agency, or Office)
_____
(Military Base, Station, Camp, Fort, Ship, Airfield, etc.)
_____
(Street No., APO or FPO No.)
_____
(City, Postal Zone, and State)

(8) I am NOT requesting a ballot from any other State and am not voting in any other manner in this election, except by absentee process, and have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any other address.

(9) _____
(Signature of person requesting ballot)

(10) _____
(Full name, typed or printed, with rank or grade, and service number)

(11) Subscribed and sworn to before me on _____
(Day, month, and year)

_____ _____
(Signature of official administering oath) (Typed or printed name of official administering oath)

_____
(Title or rank, service number, and organization of administering official)

INSTRUCTIONS

A. Before filling out this form see your voting officer in regard to the voting laws of your State and absentee registration and voting procedure.
B. Type or print all entries except signature. FILL OUT BOTH SIDES OF CARD.
C. Address card to proper State official. Your voting officer or commanding officer will furnish you his title and address.
D. Mail card as soon as your State will accept your application.
E. NO postage is required for the card.

(c) Upon the other side of the card thereshall be printed in red type the following:

FILL OUT BOTH SIDES OF THE CARD

_____
(Name)
_____
(Unit, Gov. Agency, or Office)
_____
(Mil. Base, Sta., Ship or Office)
_____
(Street No., APO, or FPO No.)
_____
(City, Postal Zone, State)

FREE OF U. S. POSTAGE
Including Air Mail

OFFICIAL ELECTION BALLOTING MATERIAL—VIA AIR MAIL

To: _____
(Title of Election Official)
_____
(County or Township)
_____
(City or Town, State)

SEC. 205. The previously authorized Federal post card shall be utilized prior to and in connection with the election for Members of Congress next ensuing after the date of enactment of this act, and the Presidential designee shall initiate action to make such forms available to departments and agencies having a need therefor. Thereafter only the post card form authorized in this act shall be utilized.

TITLE III

Definitions and miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 301. As used in this act—

(1) The term "Armed Forces" means the uniformed services as defined in section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 804), as amended.

(2) The term "members of the merchant marine of the United States" means persons (other than members of the Armed Forces) employed as officers or members of crews of vessels documented under the laws of the United States, or of vessels owned by the United States, or of vessels of foreign-flag registry under charter to or control of the United States, and persons (other than members of the Armed Forces) enrolled with the United States for employment, or for training for employment, or maintained by the United States for emergency relief service, as officers or members of crews of any such vessels; but does not include persons so employed, or enrolled for such employment or for training for such employment, or maintained for such emergency relief service, on the Great Lakes or the inland waterways.

(3) The term "dependent" means any person who is in fact a dependent.

SEC. 302. Official post cards, ballots, voting instructions, and envelopes referred to in this act, whether transmitted individually or in bulk, shall be free of postage, including airmail postage, in the United States mails.

SEC. 303. Every individual concerned with the administration of this act shall take all necessary steps to prevent fraud, to protect voters against coercion of any sort, and to safeguard the integrity and secrecy of ballots cast.

SEC. 304. No act done in good faith under this act by a person serving in or with the Federal or military service of the United States in the exercise of his judgment as to what was practicable and compatible with military, merchant marine, or other Federal governmental operations, shall constitute a violation of any provision of law relating to the elective franchise.

SEC. 305. It shall be unlawful for any commissioned, noncommissioned, warrant, or petty officer in the Armed Forces (1) to attempt to influence any member of the Armed Forces to vote or not to vote for any particular candidate, or (2) to require any member of the Armed Forces to march to any polling place or place of voting, but nothing in this act shall be deemed to prohibit free discussion regarding political issues or candidates for public office.

SEC. 306. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 307. The act entitled "An act to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence", approved September 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 753), as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 308. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 18, strike out "not later than 45 days" and insert "as soon as practicable."

Page 8, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 2 on page 9 and insert:

"(a) The cards shall be approximately 9½ by 4⅛ inches in size."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 149, providing for the consideration of the foregoing bill and H. R. 3406, a similar House bill, was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that conferees on the part of the House on the bill H. R. 3828 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF NEW STATES

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide that hereafter a new State may be admitted into the Union only by established procedure of amending the Constitution. This House joint resolution would require that such a proposal to admit a new State to the Union must be ratified by three-fourths of the States before the new State could be admitted.

Our Government is a Republic, a Federal Union composed of 48 sovereign States. Section 3 of article IV of our Constitution confers upon Congress authority to admit new States into the Union. The only voice given the States upon the question is the provision that no new State shall be formed within the jurisdiction of another State; nor shall any new State be formed by the junction of two or more States or parts of States without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

Under present law it is possible for a statehood bill, such as the pending statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska, to come up for action and be enacted into law through a simple majority of those present and voting. The membership of the House is 435. A quorum is 218. The membership of the Senate is 96, and a quorum is 49. A majority of a quorum can pass a bill. Hence it is possible under present law for a new State to be created by a vote of 110 in the House and 25 in the Senate, which is just slightly more than one-fourth of the membership of the 2 bodies.

The question of admitting new States to our Union now involves some questions which were not involved in the admission of new States in the past.

Up to the present time, each proposed new State has not only been on the continent of North America, but it has been adjacent to the United States and upon admission became a component part of the land area of the United States, which up to this time has been an entire, unbroken land area.

It is extremely improbable that we will have the opportunity to admit any new State which would fill this description. It would have to come from Canada on the north or Mexico in the southwest. So far as Alaska and Hawaii are concerned, Canada lies between our country and Alaska, and the Pacific Ocean between our country and the Hawaiian Islands.

The admission of a new State is a matter of the greatest concern to every citizen of the United States. The admission of a State is an irrevocable act. No State has ever been put out of the Union, and no provision has been made for such action. A State cannot voluntarily separate itself from the Union. The Confederate States undertook to secede during the War Between the States, but were defeated, which established the fact that a State cannot secede. So, once in the Union, always in.

When the present method of admitting new States was adopted I think it can be said with certainty that the framers of the Constitution did not contemplate the admission to statehood of far distant land areas not contiguous to the main body or island areas far removed from our continent.

The admission of a new State lessens the voting power of existing States both in the House and in the Senate. In the present Senate the majority party is in the majority by only 1 vote. The Democrats have 48 Senators and the Republicans have 47. In the last Congress the majority party in the House was in the majority only by 4 votes. The Republicans in the last Congress had 219 Members in the House. The Democrats had 215.

Where the division is so close the admission of 1 new State or 2 new States might well determine the question as to which political party would be the majority party. On legislative questions where there is a close division, and this is frequently the case, the vote of

the Senators or Representatives of a new State might well determine the question whether a bill would be passed or defeated.

Thus the question as to whether a new State should be admitted is of great importance to each of the States now composing our Union, and to the citizens of those States. The granting or refusal of statehood to one or more prospective new States might well chart the future course of our country and our Government. It might well change the course of our Government and set it off in a new direction.

The admission of a new State into our Union amounts to taking that State into partnership with the existing States. It is much the same as taking a new partner into an existing partnership, and always the admission of a new partner is a question to be passed upon by the members of the partnership.

One of my colleagues pointed out last year that Congress under present constitutional provisions may admit a new State to the Union with no more formality than when it permits the District of Columbia to set daylight-saving time for the city of Washington. A two-thirds vote of Congress is required to override a Presidential veto, and a three-fourths vote to amend the Constitution. Yet a new State may be created by a majority vote of a quorum. The trend of constitutional development in the United States has been toward more popular control. Our Constitution has been amended several times to give the people more control over Government, and to bring control of Government nearer home. The 15th and the 19th amendments extended the right of suffrage to two new groups of voters. An amendment providing for popular election of Senators was adopted.

If every State had to act upon a ratification of a proposal by Congress to admit a new State, such proposal would have much wider consideration by the people of the United States. This would open up another channel of popular control of our National Government. It would give a greater understanding to citizens all over our country of the factors and considerations involved, which they could not possibly have when the decision is to be made completely in the Halls of Congress in the Capital City, which in fact is far removed from the citizens whose rights are vitally affected by the action taken.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KILDAY and to include an address.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. QUIGLEY.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BROWNSON and to include a statement.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AVERY (at the request of Mr. HOPE), on account of urgent business matters in the State of Kansas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

464. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing tabulations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations of land made in certain cases for the period from January 1, 1954 through December 31, 1954, pursuant to the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 16 U. S. C. sec. 471, 43 U. S. C. sec. 141 et seq.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

465. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Erwin H. Flother, which will, when approved by the Superintendent, authorize the permittee to operate the Willow Beach Trout Camp on Lake Mohave, Lake Mead national recreation area, Arizona, for the term from January 1, 1955, to December 31, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

466. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Southeastern Power Administration, an agency in the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 31. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 89. Resolution to provide funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 88; with amendment (Rept. No. 73). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 110. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 74). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 128. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 35; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 129. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies to be made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 63; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 131. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 140. Resolution creating a position as stenographer to the Postmaster; with amendment (Rept. No. 78). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. H. R. 3828. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 79). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 4356. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4357. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to establish a Refugee Relief Commission, to permit the issuance of any visas which remain unused at the termination of the program, to eliminate certain requirements in the case of refugees applying for visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4358. A bill to incorporate the Seabee Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4359. A bill to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4360. A bill to establish milk and butterfat as basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4361. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes" approved September 3, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4362. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4363. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4364. A bill to create a Federal highway corporation for financing the construction of the national system of interstate highways; to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4365. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4366. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase, repair, alteration, construction, or improvement of farm property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 4367. A bill to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4368. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public-housing authorities for the admission of elderly persons to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4369. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4370. A bill to amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, so as to permit certain registered holding companies to control integrated public utility systems located in the Philippines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4371. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act to increase the amount paid by the Federal Government for the construction and maintenance of certain highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4372. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4373. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Charles Russell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4374. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4375. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4376. A bill to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4377. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to provide that certain former members of the Polish armed forces residing in the British Isles may be admitted to the United States without presenting a certificate of readmission as required by section 7 (d) of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4378. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, or of the Air Force of the United States, or of any component thereof, retired for physical disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of sufferers of casualty losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4380. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4381. A bill to clarify the deduction for income-tax purposes of allowances for salaries or other compensation for personal services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4382. A bill to allow an exemption of $25,000 corporate income taxes on corporations which has been expended by the corporation for capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4383. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Reserve officers formerly in the Regular Army and Navy and who were appointed prior to August 24, 1912, and March 4, 1913, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4384. A bill to require that one member of the Interstate Commerce Commission be from the New England States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4385. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4386. A bill to provide that preference will be given in the awarding of Government procurement contracts to firms which will perform a substantial proportion of the production on such contracts in areas having a surplus of labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4387. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 4388. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 4389. A bill to provide that a special gold star shall be added to the flag of the United States, in honor of the members of the Armed Forces who have died in the service of their country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4390. A bill to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4391. A bill to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4393. A bill to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4396. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4397. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the Government of Venezuela; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to designate payments to disabled veterans as partial repayment of debt owed and not as gratuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of uniform traffic laws throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 156. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 139; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 157. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that the Committee on Banking and Currency shall have jurisdiction over all consumer problems; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. UDALL: Memorial of the House of Representatives of Arizona concerning withdrawal of tribal lands of Papago Indian Reservations from mining locations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to complete Glendo Dam in 1957; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount of Tongass timber receipts impounded in each preceding year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

to include Alaska in any special Federal-State-local highway program which may be evolved as a result of the recommendations of the Clay committee; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 4398. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4399. A bill for the relief of James E. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Miles J. Irish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Kalle Kalervo Siermala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Maslak (Mayslak); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Edward Salas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4404. A bill for the relief of certain Basque sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4405. A bill authorizing and requesting the President to award the Medal of Honor to Alphonse M. Rigo; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 4406. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Rossin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 4407. A bill for the relief of Herta Nader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4408. A bill for the relief of Kata Genero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4409. A bill for the relief of Leona C. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4410. A bill for the relief of William E. Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4411. A bill for the relief of Hossein Golji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4412. A bill for the relief of Wali Mohammad Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4413. A bill for the relief of the Bethel Pentecostal Tabernacle, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Antonia Martignetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4415. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jou Sheng Tchao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4416. A bill for the relief of Soterios Othon Nasiopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4417. A bill for the relief of Donald Nichols II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 4418. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 4419. A bill for the relief of Muhieddine Abdul Kader El-Kadri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

120. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of members of Tioga Point Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Athens, Pa., in support of the Bricker amendment with no substitute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

121. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national adjutant, Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., Boardman, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing any effort which might be made by any governmental group or commission to in any way associate, relate, or integrate the degree of a disability, or disabilities, for service-connected compensation purposes to a disabled veteran's need for such benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Soil-Conservation District Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, soil conservation is one of the great challenges of our generation. The work of saving the soil, rebuilding eroded and depleted land, and the conserving of water on the ground is a task that is worthy of the greatest honor—and those men and women who are active in their local soil-conservation districts and who serve as supervisors and officers have earned the gratitude of both the rural and the city dweller. For, without their efforts, the basic resources of America would be lost or wasted and the future of our Nation would be doomed.

For this reason, it is pleasing for me to receive and study each year the annual reports of the local soil-conservation districts from the area I am privileged to serve. Eastern Arkansas, and the first district in particular, is fortunate to have strong, aggressive soil-conservation districts with active and able supervisors.

Although the first district did not participate in the district program prior to 1937, today there are 2,650 soil-conservation districts in the United States, covering four-fifths of the Nation's farmlands and almost 90 percent of our farms. Each county in the First Arkansas District is fortunate in that each has an active soil-conservation district.

As an example of the kind of work that they do, let it be pointed out that the Central Crowley Ridge Soil-Conservation District, with offices at Jonesboro, reported:

> Nine group jobs were completed this year. This is a record for us, and we believe for this part of the country. Twenty-seven thousand three hundred and seventy-seven acres were planned for soil and water conservation, and more people learned more about their soil-conservation district than in any other one year that we know of.

This fine report is signed by the board of supervisors, consisting of Chairman Frank Barton, Joe C. Willett, Dr. Ralph Sloan, L. C. Stark, and J. W. Crafton.

The splendid work of the St. Francis Soil Conservation District, headed by Supervisors Homer Towns, W. W. Campbell, V. O. Turner, Burt Sulcer, and Thomas McDaniel, has resulted in great savings on the 407,040 acres inside the district. The 1954 annual report states:

> In 1954 there were 83 new agreements covering 18,461 acres. This makes a total of 913 agreements covering 271,417 acres. Conservation surveys (soil maps) have been completed on 346,726 acres.

The Lee County Soil Conservation District, which covers an area of 396,800 acres under the direction of Supervisors Harvey Wilson, Lon Mann, Tom Gist, R. H. Lindsey, Jr., and Carl Nash, states in the 1954 report:

> During 1954, 80 farms were planned with a total of 13,241 acres, making a total of 887 farms and 199,618 acres under agreement.

The Greene County Soil Conservation District has issued a fine report for 1954 stating their accomplishments and also containing an excellent philosophy of soil conservation. It is a credit to the good men who are supervisors for this district, Chairman George Wadley, King O'Neal, Earl Gramling, Curtis Cruse, and Judge J. Ed Thompson.

The Clay County Soil Conservation District, under the direction of supervisors W. H. Irby, Charles Smart, Fred Ahrent, Ed Bellmeyer, and Roy Barnett, has issued a fine 1954 report which shows that the district now has 1,129 cooperators covering some 159,379 acres. This is an increase during 1954 of 100 new cooperators and 16,137 acres.

The Phillips County Soil Conservation District, under the leadership of supervisors George Brandon, Earl Wells, F. F. "Happy" Kitchens, F. A. Clements, and Weldon Jackson, states in their 1954 report:

> We now have 312 cooperators working with us, and they have 139,642 acres in their farms. Twenty-four farmers signed cooperative agreements in 1954, bringing in 34,032 acres. Sixty cooperative agreements were changed to basic conservation plans during the year. Three farms had 7,946 acres in them.

Space is not available to list all of the districts in eastern Arkansas, but each of them could show, through their reports, the fine work that is being carried on. It must be remembered, that these supervisors work without compensation, each district operates under its own financing, and is a legal subdivision of the State of Arkansas.

I am very proud of the fine men of Arkansas who give their time and effort to the work of soil and water conservation. It is a pleasure to salute them—supervisors, cooperators, and those public-spirited individuals who, by their efforts, support the work of the districts. This list would include the newspapers of the district, the radio stations, the banks, the merchants, and public officials. The crusade for conservation moves ahead.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps difficult for Americans, who enjoy the fruits of religious freedom, to appreciate what life is like under the rule of a regime that denies the existence of God and seeks all ways to destroy religious belief. The 37th anniversary of Estonian national independence provides an excellent occasion to illustrate not only the severe conditions under which the Estonian people live but to demonstrate particularly their energetic efforts to keep alive the faith of their fathers.

In all areas of the world where they rule the Communists have as their long-range objective the complete destruction of religious life. The campaign to destroy religion in Estonia began immediately after the first Soviet occupation and was resumed after the second Soviet occupation in the autumn of 1944. The Soviet attack on Estonian religious life came from all sides. Churches no longer enjoyed protection under law. The economic base upon which all religious institutions were built was undermined by the imposition of such policies as expropriation of land and property, inordinate taxation of the clergy and church institutions, and prohibition of voluntary contributions. Religious institutions were, moreover, stripped of their educational function and all means for propagating religious ideas were curtailed or destroyed. Deportations of many Estonians during the first Soviet occupation and the escape to the West of many clergymen from almost certain persecution or even death as the second Soviet occupation was about to envelop the nation further weakened Estonian religious life.

However, if past experience is any guide, Estonians can look to the future with confidence that, however severe the antireligious onslaught of the Soviets may be, Estonian religious life will survive. So strong is the attachment of the Estonian people to religion that any success the Russian Communists might have can be no more than transitory.

On this 37th anniversary of Estonian independence, let us, therefore, join in spirit with those Estonians now imprisoned within the Soviet Empire and in prayerful solicitation to the Father of us all ask that the strength of this unfortunate people neither be diminished nor their will to resist be abated. We must never lose faith in them, for if we do, where else will they turn?

The Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, a Great Newspaper, Celebrates Today Its 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a tribute to one of the great Democratic newspapers remaining in the United States, the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, which today is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

The first issue of this paper was published on February 24, 1880, by two great brothers, whose names have been marked for their achievements in the fields of journalism, literature, and their contribution to the spread of democratic ideals. They were Charles J. and Edward Bellamy, whose newspaper was one of the earliest selling for a penny. Both were lawyers, but they were much more interested in writing novels and essays than in drawing writs and addressing juries.

Soon after the founding of the Daily News, Edward retired to his home where he wrote Looking Backward, one of the most influential books of all time. Charles remained to build the Daily News into the city's largest newspaper, and one of the most influential Democratic papers published. Edward's son, Paul Bellamy, left newspaper work in Springfield in 1907 to join the staff of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. He recently retired from the editorship of that paper. Charles' son, Charles, Jr., is still a member of the staff of the newspaper his father founded.

In 1915 the Daily News was sold to the Republican Publishing Co. Sherman H. Bowles, a member of the famous Springfield publishing family, became head of the Springfield newspapers, but permitted such complete latitude to the editors that the Daily News never changed its character, nor abandoned the course set by Charles J. Bellamy.

Three great editors have directed the editorial operation of the Daily News since the founder and first editor, Charles J. Bellamy, Sr., died in 1910. They are the late John B. Callaghan and George M. Doyle, and the present editor, Frank H. Kelly.

Mr. Callaghan, who died last July 15, retired in 1939 after an active editorship of 30 years. He was succeeded by Mr. Doyle as editor. Mr. Kelly was named executive editor in 1941, and upon the death of Mr. Doyle on June 21, 1946, Mr. Kelly became managing editor.

The present editor joined the Daily News staff upon graduation from high school at the age of 17. While rising to the top editorial position on the Daily News, Mr. Kelly was also attaining prominence as a Catholic layman. He is trustee of the Republican-Daily News employees beneficial fund, a member of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, and an incorporator and director of several leading civic organizations in the Springfield area.

Under the editorship of Mr. Kelly, the Daily News has not veered from the ideals set down by the Bellamy brothers 75 years ago this week. It is still the people's newspaper, and it has grown rich in esteem with each succeeding year.

Today I sent the following telegram to Mr. Kelly:

Hearty congratulations to the Daily News on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. On this February 24 I salute a great newspaper, one that has lived up to the glorious traditions of the American press. In its span of 75 years the Daily News has given distinguished news service and contributed immeasurably to the public good of our community. My best wishes to your entire organization.

Mr. Speaker, I also call to your attention the following greetings to the Springfield Daily News from LeRoy Keller, vice president of the United Press Associations, New York City, as follows:

DEAR MR. KELLY: It affords me real pleasure on behalf of the United Press to salute the Springfield Daily News on the glorious occasion of its 75th anniversary February 24th.

Noting this, I was prompted to dig back into the files. I discovered with pride that we had begun service to the News on September 8, 1897, nearly 58 years ago, so that together we have recorded all of the history of the 20th century thus far. It goes without saying that there is even greater news ahead for both of us.

Hearty congratulations. Long may you wave in Springfield.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY KELLER.

H. R. 4304

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of the Members of this House who voted for the passage of H. R. 1 did so with the conviction that the advantages which it will bring to labor and industry within the United States, as well as the assistance it will give to

those conducting our foreign policy, outweigh the disadvantages in unemployment and the harmful effect it will have upon certain areas and industries.

However, I believe that Members of the Congress who support the principle of reciprocal trade agreements are not blind to the human problems and the economic difficulties which this act creates. I am equally sure that the vast majority of my colleagues do not want to leave any impression that we are callous or unwilling to try to do something to solve these difficult situations.

It is in this spirit that I introduced yesterday a bill, H. R. 4304, which will, if the matter is not taken care of on the Senate side or in conference, require the President to report to the Congress—by including in his report, provided for by section 350 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930—such data and statistics as will be useful to the Congress in ascertaining the amount of unemployment and economic disability which has resulted from actions taken under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. It would also require him to include such recommendations for legislative action as he may deem wise in order to (a) preserve the vitality of industries needed in the national defense and (b) make the necessary economic adjustments to alleviate unemployment and to assist those industries whose operations have been substantially curtailed as the result of executive action authorized by the Congress.

In other words, if the Government, through its action, creates undue hardships on certain groups within labor and industry, I believe that the Congress will also feel that it has a responsibility to lessen these hardships and to assist in the necessary relocations that have been thus required.

I hope that my colleagues will give their support to this legislation, believing, as I do, that it will make the people of our country far more understanding and sympathetic to the principle of reciprocal trade agreements.

Postal and Federal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I made before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, endorsing legislation providing for an adequate and justifiable increase in pay for our postal and Federal employees:

POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DESERVE A RAISE AND A SUBSTANTIAL ONE

Why the heavy turnover in Federal employment?

Because there is not enough appreciation of the work done by our civil servants and not enough recompense.

There was a time when men and women would devote their lives to a civil-service career, because they saw opportunities for promotion and for gradual increases that would keep them ahead of the rising cost of living.

Consider, for instance, the responsible work done by the staffs working for Members of Congress, and consider what Congressmen would do without the knowledge and dependability of these employees?

The Congress, which is in the favorable position of voting a pay increase for itself, has just done so, and in a very impressive way, while a proposed pay increase for all Federal workers was given exhaustive hearings in the last session of Congress, without overcoming the final hurdle, and is going the rounds again in this session.

All the facts are in, and they make a convincing case, but they are being prejudiced by political maneuvering.

Our only recourse, then, is to hammer away with the facts until reason and conscience break through the artificial logjam that impedes the progress of these bills, and with the aid of public opinion, put into effect pay increases that will boost the income of Federal workers and also boost their morale.

General Motors Corp., pace setter of our private industries, pays an average wage of $96 a week, under a formula that provides for increased productivity and for a cost-of-living allowance.

The Federal Government, which dwarfs General Motors, in number of employees, in its progressive effect upon our economy, and in its worldwide responsibilities, still considers its faithful workers as poor relatives who should be content to work overtime in some cases without extra compensation, and without any bargaining rights.

The average weekly wage paid to Federal employees is far from $96 a week, even though the Federal Government tries to enlist the best brains in the Nation for its service.

Here is a shocking fact.

More than half of our post office clerks cannot get by on their present salaries. Some of them are even giving up their so-called job security in favor of the more rewarding work they find in private industry.

A 10-percent increase is the very minimum that will raise them from a deficit income to a break-even level.

One of the arguments advanced to justify a whopping increase for Members of Congress, is relevant here.

In fact, an $800 yearly increase would be necessary for postal employees in order to regain for them the 1939 standard of living.

Even on a 10-percent increase they are only asking for a part of what is due them.

Because taxes have soared.

Because the living standards of all other workers have improved.

And because the increased productivity of Federal workers has not been given its economic recognition.

Statistics reveal that the post office clerk, since 1939, has received increases ranging from 18 to 135 percent less than the rest of American workers. And this is representative of the economic loss suffered by all Federal employees.

At this life-or-death crisis in our history, a struggle that may go on for decades, we cannot afford to skimp on the wages paid to career personnel of the Federal Government upon whom we depend in the overall picture to service the Nation and to maintain our strength and security.

The leaders of the United States Government, in positions of burdensome power and responsibility, are only as good as the sum of all the talents, and energy, and devotion of our public servants.

To strengthen that essential core of Federal employees with pay incentives that will make them the equal of their fellow Americans who are working for private enterprise, we should authorize a 10 percent across-the-board increase in wages.

The Congress saw fit to make its own major salary increase retroactive to the beginning of 1955.

I believe that this is an additional and compelling reason why a pay increase for all Federal workers should be passed, retroactive to January 1, 1955, and without delay.

We cannot afford the resentment and the loss of faith which failure to take this action will precipitate.

I hope, and I am confident, that the Congress will appreciate and recognize the valuable services of our post office and Federal employees by granting them a generous increase in wages and salaries.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have again received a monthly review of employment developments and prospects for the York, Pa., labor market, covering the situation in January 1955 and issued by Leroy W. Gohn, manager of the York office of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service.

The January data shows that unemployment rose 37 percent to a new high of 7,400, more than double the number of unemployed a year ago. The report states that this high level is expected to be only temporary and will level off to about 5,600 by mid-March.

This would appear to be a scant ray of hope since it represents more than 6 percent of the civilian labor force available.

January unemployment is 2,000 greater than the figure for November of 1954 and the expected leveling off in March will be 200 greater than actual unemployment in November.

Despite the glowing reports about the prosperous condition of the national economy which the Congress continues to receive from the administration, and which the American public continues to receive from administration public statements we have a difficult time convincing the 7,400 idle workers in the York labor market.

It is imperative that the Congress act upon conditions it knows exist rather than upon ephemeral visions of prosperity conjured by the administration hucksters. A step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker, is the proposal to grant income reductions to individual taxpayers. This should add approximately $1 billion to the Nations purchasing power and it should be considered as merely one phase of a program designed to provide a full employment economy.

As I understand the mandates of the Full Employment Act of 1946 the Congress has no choice but to adopt a program for full employment. I believe the administration is also mandated to establish and maintain such an economy. It is up to the Congress then to step into the breach created by administration failure.

The report follows:

TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT REDUCTION

A sudden drop in employment beginning in December caused total employment to fall from 93,150 in November to an estimated 90,700 in mid-January, a decrease of 2,450, or 2.6 percent. However, most of the personnel reductions were seasonal, with mid-March employment levels expected to return within 400 of the November figure.

The following table presents a quick glance at current and anticipated trends:

Item	2 months ago, November 1954	Current, January 1955	Net change 2 months ago	Estimated 2 months hence
Civilian labor force available	99,050	98,100	−950	+250
Unemployed, total	5,400	7,400	+2,000	−1,800
Workers in industrial dispute	500	0	−500	0
Employed, total	93,150	90,700	−2,450	+2,050
Wage and salary workers	78,450	76,350	−2,100	+1,800
Other workers (including agricultural)	14,700	14,350	−350	+250

The decrease in nonagricultural workers was evenly divided between manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries, with a drop of 1,050 recorded in each. Layoffs of a seasonal nature, totalling 2,200, were included with the following industries affected: Food products, fabricated metal (tire chains), tobacco products, roofing materials, construction, and retail trade. A reduction of 400 in furniture was attributable chiefly to insufficient orders. The only substantial gain in any industry was 600 in nonelectrical machinery, of which nearly 500 constituted return of workers who had been out on strike for 3 months.

SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE FORECAST

Based upon reports from 267 establishments, it is estimated that some 92,750 workers will be employed by March 15. This would be a gain of 2,050 over current levels, bringing total employment within 400 of the November 1954 level. Factors influencing this development will be recall of laid-off workers by the tobacco and construction industries, plus moderate expansion in several other industries. Highlighting the latter will be forecast expansion of 600 in the nonelectrical machinery industry, with the resumption of production of domestic air-conditioning equipment.

UNEMPLOYMENT SURGES UPWARD

Unemployment rose by 2,000, or 37 percent, to a new high of 7,400 (2,900 female). This was more than double the 3,600 unemployed a year ago. There are indications that this high level will be only temporary and will drop to about 5,600 by mid-March. In fact, the number of continued claims for unemployment benefits during the week ending February 10 were already 480 below the mid-January level.

Estimated employment, earnings and working time in manufacturing industries,[1] York labor market area,[2] January 1955

	Employment			Average weekly earnings			Average hourly earnings			Average weekly hours worked		
	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago
All manufacturing	42,600	43,850	47,150	$62.15	$62.85	$62.53	$1.55	$1.55	$1.57	40.2	40.6	39.8
Food	3,100	3,250	3,150	58.00	60.17	56.56	1.40	1.40	1.36	41.4	43.1	41.5
Tobacco	2,000	2,600	2,400	41.88	38.77	40.38	1.13	1.09	1.07	37.0	35.7	37.6
Textiles	3,250	3,200	3,150	55.95	55.40	52.23	1.39	1.37	1.35	40.4	40.5	38.6
Apparel	4,700	4,750	4,700	41.55	43.44	40.88	1.13	1.19	1.19	36.8	36.6	34.5
Lumber	550	600	600	47.24	56.94	42.85	1.19	1.16	1.15	49.0	49.0	37.2
Furniture	3,850	4,100	4,150	65.23	70.24	64.74	1.59	1.63	1.58	41.1	43.2	41.0
Paper	2,550	2,500	2,500	89.50	93.41	85.85	1.81	1.83	1.75	49.5	51.1	49.0
Printing and publishing	1,900	1,900	1,850	90.29	86.36	83.23	2.21	2.19	2.11	40.8	39.4	39.5
Chemicals and petroleum	550	650	600	68.26	64.61	65.49	1.64	1.64	1.61	41.9	39.3	40.7
Leather	2,250	2,250	2,150	41.52	41.20	39.67	1.08	1.07	1.08	38.3	38.5	36.6
Stone, clay, and glass	1,100	1,050	1,100	70.89	73.23	67.85	1.67	1.67	1.64	42.5	43.8	41.4
Primary metal industries	550	550	550	60.65	56.84	58.62	1.75	1.71	1.70	34.6	33.2	34.5
Fabricated metal products	4,200	4,350	4,900	68.24	69.50	62.96	1.71	1.72	1.63	40.0	40.5	38.6
Nonelectrical machinery	8,100	8,100	10,300	74.55	76.63	80.87	1.87	1.89	1.92	39.8	40.5	42.1
Electrical machinery	1,000	1,000	850	65.20	62.96	61.07	1.61	1.58	1.55	40.6	39.8	39.3
Transportation equipment, including ordnance	1,100	1,200	2,150	67.97	69.28		1.77	1.78		38.4	38.9	
Other manufacturing industries	1,850	1,800	2,050	59.67	59.72	57.25	1.49	1.48	1.47	40.1	40.3	39.0

[1] Estimates of employment include production and nonproduction workers in non-Government establishments. Average earnings and hours cover only production workers.

[2] County included: York.

NOTE.—Figures for current month are preliminary.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the annual observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, a noteworthy event in the history of human freedom, I desire to extend my best wishes and encouragement to the people of that afflicted land and reaffirm my active faith in the eventual liberation of that nation and all the nations now embraced in the tyrannical Red Communist orbit.

The Ukrainian nation has struggled for centuries against great odds for its freedom and independence. Of impressive historical interest is the old Ukrainian Kivan State which existed from the 9th to the 14th century, the Ukrainian Kozak which extended from the 17th to the 18th century, and of more recent memory, the Ukrainian National Republic established in 1917 and smashed by Bolshevik tyranny in 1920.

The area embraced by this Nation is large and vital to the Soviet Union since it is the so-called breadbasket of Russian economy. Since Soviet domination the people of the area have undergone intensive suffering and trials embracing the destruction of its nation's churches, famines by governmental edict, mass murders of its innocent and helpless citizens, and cruel purges and deportations engineered by Red leaders. This territory embraces Kiev, noted in history and tradition for its rich culture and high state of civilization.

Although the Ukrainian people were visited during the Second World War by the scourge of nazism, their will is indomitable and unshakable, and their courage in the face of oppression and tyranny undeniably tenacious. The mailed fist of communism has descended upon their heads, but the people have never ceased their resistance in spite of the ruthless brutality of tyrants which steadily rains down upon them.

Ukrainia is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain and because of its spirit, independence, and devotion to liberty, it is a natural ally of all nations opposed to dictatorship, totalitarian government, and marxism.

This nation and its suffering, gallant people, is entitled not only to our sympathy and encouragement, but to our affirmative assistance in sharing their aspirations and making every contribution we can to promote and advance them toward the goal of liberation.

Let us hope and pray that the day is not too far distant when all enslaved nations will enjoy the liberation they seek and struggle for, and Ukrainia will again be acknowledged as a sovereign and independent nation associated with that great partnership of free nations which is struggling to forge a free world, unfettered by the shackles of oppression, and untouched by the abominable curse of tyranny.

Shall We Allow Our Schools To Become Overcrowded, Broken-Down Firetraps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, February 19, 1955:

We say that nothing is too good for our children.

We work hard to give them opportunities that we never enjoyed.

In fact, most of our lives are dedicated to this purpose. So that they will become happy and constructive citizens for their own fulfillment and that of the Nation.

As they leave home for school each day, we take it for granted that the classrooms in which they spend so many of their formative years will be fit for this great responsibility.

Like our churches, however, we sometimes expect our schools to get by on spirit alone.

Forgetting that our teachers are entitled to a living wage, and that they and the children have a right to schoolhouse accommodations that will produce the best results.

How long is it since you visited the school where your children are being trained to meet the eventual responsibilities of life?

In some areas you would be shocked to find that our schools are fast degenerating into slums because of public neglect.

Consider these facts.

The school population is increasing at the rate of 1 million each year.

Present elementary and high-school enrollment is well over 30 million students.

There is both a building shortage and a teacher shortage.

States and communities are finding it impossible, for a number of reasons, to meet the problem.

The present building rate is 60,000 classrooms a year, requiring an investment of $2 billion annually, but even at this rate we are falling behind in the job of providing adequate school facilities for our growing population.

How much does it cost us for educational outlays, figured on cost per pupil per year? This varies from State to State, ranging from $83 in Mississippi to $328 in New York.

The average person thinks nothing of spending $800 or $900 a year for the ownership and operation of a motorcar. It would seem that the education of his children would be worth at least half this cost per child.

Our failure to meet the educational obligations we owe to our children is a disservice to them.

Seven hundred thousand are now in schools operating on a 2- or 3-shift schedule; 800,000 are in buildings that are so ancient that they have become firetraps; 300,000 are in flimsy, temporary shacks that look more like hastily assembled military barracks than schools; 400,000 are assigned to garages, halls, and churches that have been rented for school purposes in the emergency that hard-pressed authorities are striving to overcome.

The problem has become so acute that the President of the United States delivered a special message to Congress last week on this subject.

His school-aid plan can be condensed briefly as follows:

1. The Government would purchase school bonds if the communities could not sell them at a reasonable rate of interest, set at 3½ percent. The United States Government would appropriate $750 million over a 3-year period for the purchase of these bonds.

2. The States would be encouraged to build $6 billion worth of schools within the next 3 years. Districts that had gone beyond their borrowing powers, would be able to get additional funds. The State agencies would build the schools and rent them to the local communities, eventually repaying the original Federal and State grants through rents.

3. Hardship communities would be able to draw on a Federal fund of $200 million over a 3-year span. This help would come on a matching basis. The States would contribute the same amount as the Federal Government. Only genuine hardship communities could qualify.

4. The United States would also provide $20 million to pay half the administrative costs of studies by the States to plan long-term financing programs along modern lines.

The President stressed that his program of Federal aid would not result in Federal control or interference.

Educators, Congressmen, and the general public, are grateful for the President's recognition of the problem.

Many of us, however, do not believe that it goes far enough.

We question whether it will bring enough help and in time to meet the school crisis on the local level where the battle for adequate school facilities is being fought.

The situation in many States and communities is not far from desperate. The President's program is little more than a loan fund when direct and substantial aid is imperative.

Apart from overcrowding which handicaps teachers and pupils, a survey of all school plants in the Nation reveals a shocking situation that would never be tolerated by American industry in its buildings. On the basis of structural adequacy, sanitation facilities, and safety, schoolhouses get very poor marks. The ratings show that one-third of all school plants are unsatisfactory, 27 percent are barely satisfactory, and the remainder are only fair.

In Massachusetts, we have always taken pride in our locally administered schools. It comes as a shock to learn that overcrowded elementary schools are forced to use corridors, halls, libraries, and even basements as classrooms for the younger children. Yes, even in Massachusetts.

Eighty percent of the support of our public schools comes from local taxes, which is 20 percent more than the national average. Clearly, the local tax rates cannot be increased to meet the deficit. Aid must come from the Federal Government and from the vast revenues it collects from all citizens. When we think of the tens of billions of dollars that have been given away to other nations, we rightly ask why a small percentage of this cannot be channeled to meet the pressing needs of our schools upon which the future of our democracy depends.

Although this is not the place to go off on a tangent, I sometimes wonder if there is not some possible connection, among other factors, between the increase in juvenile delinquency and the rundown condition of our schools.

A survey by the United States Office of Education reveals that public-school enrollment will be one-third greater by 1965. Due to the bumper crop of babies born since World War II, high-school enrollment will be even greater, up 58 percent.

Recalling that school construction almost reached a dead stop during the years of World War II, we have the double problem of replacement and increase.

Both Government and private studies have come to the following conclusion: "Many communities are finding it impossible to build their share of these classrooms on a current-account basis; and, even though they might be willing to borrow to finance such schools as they need, this would be impossible because of existing debt limits and the difficulties of changing them. Classroom construction is, therefore, being delayed."

Federal aid for education is not without precedent.

In fact, before the Federal Constitution was adopted, the Continental Congress, in 1785, set aside the 16th section of every township in the Northwest Territory for the support of public schools. Over 175 million acres were finally set aside for this purpose in addition to money grants ever since.

Testimony given before Senate and House Committees from all sections of the country agree that a serious situation exists, and the solution for it cannot be postponed.

I want to bring you part of the statement given by Mrs. Clifford N. Jenkins, chairman of legislation, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, before the House committee, on the subject of Federal aid for education.

Mrs. Jenkins, speaking for 9 million members of 39,000 PTA's in every State of the Union, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, said, and I quote:

"All across this Nation communities are faced with makeshift classroom, building shortages, and unsafe structures. This has become a national emergency, and emergencies require special consideration.

"I would call your attention to a headline in last night's paper in my neighborhood entitled 'Children Attend Classes in the Strangest Places.' One was listed as a reconverted garage being used for five classrooms; another is an 1890 frame house which is now being used to house kindergarten classes. There are all kinds of buildings being used today in many areas.

"In this all-important crisis we cannot overlook the health menace nor the safety hazards that are involved in makeshift housing. Many classes are being held in cellars, cellars for children, unspeakable I think. In Buffalo last winter a number of children were burned to death because they could not be reached, nor could they get out of the cellar.

"There are many examples of Federal-aid programs that have been, and still are, going forward admirably, without control by the Federal Government. To name but a few: The land-grant colleges, the school-lunch program, the GI bill of rights, the vocational programs, hospital construction, and many others.

"The shortage of classrooms is an immediate need. Together, you, the lawmakers, the representatives of the people, and we, the parents and teachers of the land, ought to be able to make our efforts count. An emergency is upon us. Let us be alert to the challenge."

The Office of Education reports that the school-facilities survey reveals a current need for public elementary and secondary school facilities equivalent to a single-story structure 50 feet wide extending from the Statue of Liberty to the Golden Gate Bridge.

The Democratic Party believes that the States and the communities are doing their best, but are just unable to do the whole job alone.

We believe that the Federal Government, which collects most of the tax revenues, should make actual grants to finance a big school-building program with a minimum of Federal control.

The needs of our schools, all our children, will permit no delay.

Congressman Horan Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following news release issued by Congressman WALTER HORAN, of Washington, which contains very interesting information about the extension of rural electric light and power to the farm homes of America:

CONGRESSMAN HORAN REPORTS

WE LEAD

The great State of Washington leads the entire Nation in the percentage of our farms that are electrified—99.1 percent. We are still working on the remaining 0.9 percent Moreover, our rural folks have electricity in abundance, thanks to our forward-looking leaders in every farming area.

BUILDERS

In fact, it has been men of courage throughout our State that have helped to banish the treadmill and the lantern. It has not always been easy to extend and expand our transmission lines into the remoter areas, yet it has been and is being done. The paradox of living remotely within an easy horesback ride of great dams like Grand Coulee or Chief Joseph without the blessings of electricity is being overcome. We are even lighting our skiing areas atop our majestic mountains.

This progress is a tribute to our leadership and to the spirit of neighborly cooperation that has seen those in the so-called cream areas help to extend service to those far distant from them. A score of years ago only 47 percent of Washington's farms had electricity, and those were in the more thickly populated sections. In the Nation the picture is also astounding. In Mississippi, 20 years ago, less than 1 percent of the farms had power or light; only 1.2 percent in Arkansas, 2.3 percent in North Dakota, and 2.3 percent in Texas. Strangely, Utah, with over half her farms electrified, was among the leaders then, second only to California and New Hampshire. Today the Nation's average is a little over 92 percent whereas 20 years ago, the national average was 10.9 percent.

NEW APPROACHES

For 20 years the emphasis has been on extending the blessings of electricity farther and farther into the rural areas. A formula still is in the law that requires: "One-half of each year's new (REA) funds for electric loans shall be allotted for loan use among the States in the proportion which the number of unelectrified farms in the State bears to the number of unelectrified farms in the whole country." Thus, in effect, out of all annual new REA funds, each State's allotted funds are reserved for applicants from that State for a period of 1 year.

When only 10.9 percent were electrified that was a wise formula. But when less than 10 percent lack electricity today, that formula stands in the way, as it is presently written, of a wise and flexible use of new funds for the consolidation of present rural systems, for the creation of new sources of supply, the rephasing of outmoded transmission systems and many other improvements that will give better service, more power and lower charges to our rural people.

A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Ancher Nelsen, for nearly 2 years now the Administrator of REA, wants this formula brought up to date. During his administration he has done marvels. One achievement stands out. He found a Hatfield-McCoy type of feud going on among the various rural electrical services in Kentucky. He moved in with his engineers, both electrical and, may we say, diplomatic. Meetings were held in Washington and Kentucky. Differences were overcome, agreements were reached. Integration was established and interconnections were made. Three million dollars was saved. Rates were reduced.

Now Ancher Nelsen is working on rural telephone extensions. More than 50 percent of our Nation's farms still lack telephones. Nelsen plans to carry on an aggressive and effective program to meet the needs.

WASHINGTON

I have served on the subcommittee that supplies funds to the Department of Agriculture for more than a decade now. I have good reason to be proud of the farmers of our great State of Washington for, from my vantage point, I can see the rural progress—or the lack of it—across the Nation. Our folks meet problems honestly and take full advantage of every just and proper opportunity for better, more productive and, therefore, more secure rural living. We will always have our problems but working together we will solve them. Thus we strengthen ourselves and provide a wholesome example for farmers in other sections.

Rotary's 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Rotary clubs around the world are looking forward to continued "service above self" as they observe Rotary's 50th anniversary this month.

The world-encircling nature of this organization, which started modestly a half century ago, emphasizes the growing importance of the advancement of international understanding, good will, and peace through world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service.

It is with profound pride and a deep sense of obligation that I regard my membership in the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J. It is good to know that the same warm, friendly atmosphere, the same high idealism that exists in the Paterson Rotary Club exists in more than 8,400 Rotary clubs with some 400,000 members in 89 countries.

Although Rotary has become worldwide, it has managed to keep its warmth, its helpful community spirit, its ideals of service to others, and a goal of peace.

Recently the board of directors declared that Rotary International "has declared unequivocally for the liberty of the individual, for freedom of thought, speech, and assembly, freedom of worship, and freedom from persecution."

It is obvious—

Said the board—

that everything for which Rotary International stands is the very antithesis of communism. * * * Where freedom, justice, truth, sanctity of the pledged word, and respect for human rights do not exist, Rotary and the ideal for which it stands cannot survive.

Rotarians will not rest on the yeoman service they have performed since 1905, but look forward to another half-century of community aid and promotion of international understanding.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this day, I am anxious to extend my congratulations to the Slovak people upon the birthday of their free nation and also to compliment them for the heroic battle they are waging against ruthless communism.

The oppression of Slovakia follows more or less the same outlines which characterize the various oppressions against other free peoples perpetrated by the Soviet and its puppets. Every form of tyranny and brutality is practiced by the Reds to break down the resistance and insure the complete submission of the native populations. Persecution of organized religion is a cardinal point and unceasing activity of the Soviet campaign.

Although the Slovak people are in virtual slavery, their brutal masters have not been able to break their spirit or destroy their will to be free. These people are God-fearing and liberty-loving and they will never bow to the tyrants even though the yoke of subjugation is fastened tightly about their necks. They prefer torture and death to slavery.

I think it is appropriate for Members of Congress and leaders of American opinion to send them messages of encouragement on this day, which marks their national independence, and I am proud to salute this brave people and to assure them that our great American nation extends them sympathy, encouragement and sincere hopes for their early liberation.

In some way our kind words will be communicated to them and will break through the shadows of despair and grief to bring fresh inspiration and fresh resolve to continue the fight. With courage and tenacity, in time, they will be free.

The knowledge of our interest and willingness to help in every way we can will inestimably strengthen these unfortunate oppressed peoples to endure their sorry plight until deliverance is at hand. To all the Slovak people I humbly tender my most earnest hopes and prayers that they will persist in their unflinching devotion to democracy and self-determination and find early release from the shackles that bind them and be restored soon once again to the free way of life which they have so nobly chosen for their own.

Address by Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, before the brotherhood dinner, sponsored by the Washington region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, February 22, 1955:

There is a synagogue in Washington which bears these words: "To the glory of God and the brotherhood of man." All of us—regardless of our religion—would do well to dedicate our lives in this fashion.

The very discovery of America contains lessons in brotherly cooperation for all of us. In fact, the brotherhood of the New World was quite literally the result of unbrotherly acts in the Old World.

We are all familiar with the fact that many of those who first settled in America were motivated by a yearning for religious freedom. And the great diversity of groups settling in our country was apparent from the very beginning. We had the English settlement at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, the Dutch at New Amsterdam in 1614, the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and the Jews who landed in New York in 1655.

These were among the forerunners of the mass migrations to our shores for 3 centuries. Here millions of people have found the fulfillment of their dreams of freedom, brotherhood and opportunity.

Here we have built a country in which the highest and best aspirations of individual human beings can be realized and rewarded. Here we have everything necessary for people to lead their lives in freedom, with dignity and with charity and brotherhood toward their fellow man.

We can be proud of what we have accomplished, but we cannot be satisfied, even today, with the conditions within our own land. Just this month, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America advised its 35 million members that racial prejudice is sinful and unChristian.

It would be nice if we could say that from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, and from Sandy Hook to the Golden Gate, all Americans were brothers and prejudice, discrimination and intolerance were nonexistent.

Unfortunately, however, despite all the progress of 350 years, we still have far to go. Less than 2 months ago, a leading public opinion analyst estimated that "discrimination in employment wastes $10 out of every $75 paycheck on the phony luxury of indulgence in our prejudices." He estimated that the annual cost of discrimination to American business and industry is $30 billion annually.

We all know of persons who preach brotherhood but do not practice it. Covert *quotas still exist* in some colleges and prep schools. Some businesses drastically restrict the level to which persons from minority groups may rise. One manufacturer will not have a Negro in a secretarial position; a law firm will not permit a Catholic to become a partner; an industrial enterprise will not promote Jews to executive positions; a financial institution will hire only native-born Americans. Some private employment services accept job orders that say "gentiles only," "white only," or "no non-Caucasians."

These forms of discrimination are still prevalent today. Unfortunately they sometimes occur even in firms whose officers or owners claim to practice brotherhood. They protest with indignant self-righteousness that some of their best friends are Jews, or that they have nothing against Negroes, but—

We may properly ask: How come all this at this late date? What is stopping us as a people, individually and collectively, from living up to the principles we profess? Why aren't we translating into daily living those basic tenets which are the foundation of every religion?

In a country in which persons of various races and creeds have served in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal, State, and local Governments, how can we afford to reject any man, upon the basis of his race or religion or national origin? Have we not seen persons of every type make invaluable contributions to the national well-being, both in public and private life? Have not business, the arts, the sciences, the professions, labor, and public service benefited from the contributions of all the highly diversified population of our country? Who can stand before God and say that he is better than his neighbor because of the color of his skin, the way he worships God, or the country from which his ancestors came?

In a world that is one-third yellow, one-third brown, and one-third white, how can America maintain its position of leadership if we consider inferior the non-white, two-thirds of the world's people?

To ask these questions is to answer them. It is obvious that there is neither excuse nor justification for prejudice and discrimination. It is clear that as a Nation, both domestically and internationally, we are injured by prejudice and intolerance.

More than 2,500 years ago, the brotherhood of man became the Jewish fundamental law. As long ago as 500 B. C., Confucius said, "All within the 4 seas are brethren." About 2,000 years ago, Christ taught us that we must love thy neighbor as thyself.

And we here in the United States have the words and actions of our own leaders to teach us the need for brotherhood and love of our fellowman.

When George Washington visited the Hebrew congregation at Newport, R. I., Moses Seixas, the warden of the synagogue, referred with a great sense of gratitude to the privilege of living under a Government which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance; but generously affording to all liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship, deeming every one, of whatever nation, tongue, or language, equal parts of the great Government machine.

President Washington set the theme and direction of our national aims when he replied, "It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoy the exercise of their inherent natural right, for, happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that those who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Thomas Jefferson expressed the epitome of brotherhood when he said, "All men are created equal."

It was for Abraham Lincoln to emancipate the slaves and officially remove this stain upon our democracy. In his life and literature, Lincoln left us a heritage of brotherly love, "with malice toward none; with charity for all."

Our progress toward full democracy for all our people has been slow. Minority groups have had a long and tedious climb to obtain fair treatment. Those who pioneered in breaking down racial and religious barriers showed courage and foresight. Down through the years, one after the other of our Presidents has by word and deed contributed to the forward march of democracy and the greater acceptance of brotherhood.

From President Jackson to President Eisenhower, our Chief Executives have shown that people can be appointed to high office regardless of religion or race.

Since Lincoln's day the Negro has made steady progress. One occupies today a sub-Cabinet position, and another has for several years sat on the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. Segregation has been eliminated in the Armed Forces.

It was in 1948 that the Supreme Court struck down the restrictive covenant on real estate; and it was in 1950 that the Court opened the doors of white universities and colleges to Negroes who could not get equal facilities elsewhere.

In 1954 the Supreme Court found that segregation in the public-school system is repugnant to our Constitution.

The clause in Government procurement contracts which prohibits racial and religious discrimination in employment is being enforced vigorously through the work of the President's Government Contract Committee.

You can see that there is no one person, no one party, and no one era that can claim credit for all that has been done. Sometimes our progress has been greater, sometimes less. The fact that we have moved constantly forward, however, speaks well for the American people. It denotes their determination to take those steps necessary to make our democracy grow and to strengthen our institutions and our people.

If the progress of the past is any key to the future, it is safe to predict that in the lifetimes of many of those now sitting in this room, the last traces of discrimination based on race, color, creed, or national origin will be swept away.

The America free of prejudice which I foresee will not come by itself. It will require the continued efforts and determination of groups such as the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It will require the continued observance of Brotherhood Week on an ever larger scale. It will require patience, understanding, cooperation, and good will. It will require the translation into our daily living—at work, in our schools, and at our places of worship—of all the principles of brotherhood.

In Brotherhood Week we have a great opportunity for the Christian to prove his practical Christianity and the Jew to prove his devotion to the teachings of his fathers. This is not asking too much for people of good will. It is not beyond the reach of those who wish to practice the principles to which we as a Nation are devoted.

We are all aware of the fact that children of every race, color, and creed can play together without difficulties. They even overcome barriers imposed by language differences, and by disparity in age. It is only from their elders that they learn the prejudice which corrodes and warps their spirits and hardens their hearts.

We have shown in many of our houses of worship, in hundreds of thousands of businesses across the land and in the Armed Forces that there is no more reason for adults to discriminate against their fellow human beings than there is for children to do so. We have shown that persons of all races, creeds, and national origins can work and live together in the military forces, in peace and war. Numerous employers and workers attest to the ease with which all types of persons can work together smoothly, efficiently, and profitably. And in thousands

of communities across the land, persons of different races can pray together.

These examples of brotherhood in action have demonstrated conclusively that it can be done and that it should be done. I am convinced that reason and principle will prevail and that we shall continue to make progress until we have achieved our goal.

So far I have discussed only the discrimination based upon race, religion, or national origin. Other types of prejudice are equally costly and equally unjustified.

We are faced with a growing problem of discrimination against those of mature and advanced age. The extreme accent on youth which seems to be a part of our current national philosophy is not justified by the facts. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that the older workers, properly placed, are more steady, more reliable, and at least as productive as their younger fellows. In safety and attendance the records they compile set examples for younger workers to follow to advantage. Management's investment in training them is amply justified by the lower turnover rate among mature and older workers.

As a nation, we are growing older, both with respect to the population as a whole and our labor force. There are 42 percent more workers over 45 today than there were in 1940. There are 40 percent more workers over 65 than there were 15 years ago. This trend seems certain to be accelerated in the years ahead. It is estimated that by 1970 almost half of our people of voting age will be 45 or over.

In addition to the moral wrong involved, we cannot afford the waste that is caused by discrimination against older workers. It is far more profitable to have them productive than on public assistance.

This is another area in which we must work to break down prejudice and promote understanding.

There is still one other form of prejudice which is worth studying, and that is on the basis of sex. While women are accepted as the boss in the home, they are not always accorded the status of equals in the labor market. The affection which we feel for mothers, wives, and daughters is not always translated into an equal break for women workers at the employment office. In addition, we too often pay women less money for the same work than we would pay to a man who did that job.

The brotherhood tradition is to use each and every one of our human resources. The increasing acceptance of women in all phases of this country's activities is evidence of the progress being made in the achievement of the goals for which we are working. Both President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Eisenhower named a woman as a member of their Cabinet. Women have served our Nation as Ambassadors—our present Ambassador to Italy is a woman. Women are Members of the Congress and of State legislatures, and a number of them are serving as judges. Large numbers of women hold important posts in State, county, and local governments. And business and industry depend in large measure upon women workers. The total number of women workers, as of the latest estimate, approached 19 million. This was close to a third of the total working population of the Nation.

We in America have far less manpower than do the Communists. In numbers we stand no chance of matching them. Our effectiveness must be based upon the training and skill of our workers and the utilization we make of the talents they acquire. Those prejudices we still have based on race, color, religion, national origin, age, or sex hamper us in the effective utilization of our manpower. To that extent they weaken our country and impair our chances of survival. As individuals and as a Nation, we cannot afford the cost of this prejudice.

I am glad to see that there seems to be a growing awareness of this fact. There seems to be a real determination on the part of millions of Americans to throw off the blinders of discrimination and prejudice. There seems to be a growing realization that each man and woman is entitled to be judged upon the basis of his or her merits. There could be no better philosophy to guide us in our daily living than that which He enunciated in the Golden Rule 2,000 years ago.

If we are to achieve our goals in the field of brotherhood, all of us must (1) practice brotherhood in our daily lives; (2) teach and train and hire and promote upon the basis of ability alone, without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin; (3) urge others with whom we work, study, pray, or socialize to practice and promote brotherhood; (4) be positive and courageous in our attitude toward brotherhood.

If we will all follow these general rules every day of the year, we shall succeed in making a real contribution toward the strengthening and improvement of our great democracy.

Postal and Federal Pay Increase Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of our colleagues to my statement in support of the Federal and postal pay adjustment bills presently being considered by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very appreciative of this opportunity to present my views in support of a pay increase for Federal and postal workers. My mail and personal contacts with those in a position to know indicate to me that now, more than ever, Congress owes the employees of the Government a fair and living wage.

You are all familiar with the steady rise in the cost of living and the difficulty the average wage earner has in making ends meet. I will not quote the numerous figures that conclusively prove this fact, since I am sure that your committee is already familiar with them.

The last time Federal and postal workers received a pay adjustment was July 1951. It was, in my opinion, inadequate in amount even when granted. The continuing rise in the cost of living has made the condition of Government workers more serious, and makes the need for another pay adjustment obvious.

I have been urging increases of pay for Federal employees of all grades and classes from the lowest to the highest ever since I came to Congress. Regardless of whether or not a campaign was approaching, I have done my best to gain the passage of bills that would close the gap between the cost of living and the inadequate salaries of Federal employees. Increased morale and consequently increased efficiency, in addition to the right of all workers to a fair wage, far outweigh any misplaced demands for Government economy in this field.

In fact, a salary adjustment for Federal and postal employees is one sure method to economize in Government. Such an adjustment generates esprit de corps and higher morale in the jobs affected and would thus improve the quality of the service rendered. It makes for longer tenure and smaller turnover, thus saving millions of dollars for training new personnel.

I urge support for appropriate legislation increasing the pay of Federal and postal employees.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my views.

The Office of the Legislative Branch in the Formulation of National Security Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1955, it was my honor and privilege to deliver an address at the National War College, Washington, D. C., on the subject: The Office of the Legislative Branch in the Formulation of National Security Policy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of that address, as follows:

THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH IN THE FORMULATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

(By PAUL J. KILDAY, Member of Congress)

In discussing the office of the legislative branch of our Government in the formulation of national security policy, I believe it would be of value to review some of the basic principles of political science. The key word in all forms of government is "sovereignty." That is, in whom does it lie? In whom is vested the supreme power of the state? For centuries, because of the doctrine of the divine right of kings, sovereignty reposed in the monarch. In 1776 the colonists, as British subjects, lived under a system of government which recognized this philosophy, except insofar as the power of the king had been circumscribed by historical rights wrung from him in such great accomplishments as the Magna Carta of 1215.

So, in 1776 Thomas Jefferson proclaimed, and the Continental Congress confirmed by adopting the Declaration of Independence, that:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The divine right no longer exists in kings, it now reposes in the people. The sovereign people. This has remained and still is the theory of the American form of government.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

On our subject for today, among the facts submitted to a candid world by that declaration were:

"He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures."

"He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power."

And the Continental Congress also complained of pretended legislation: "For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us: For protecting them by a mock trial from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States:".

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

After an unsatisfactory experience, during and subsequent to the Revolution, the Congress approved the suggestion for a convention at Philadelphia "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures such alterations and provisions therein as shall when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the States render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government and the preservation of the Union."

In accordance therewith the Convention met and, on May 30, 1787, went into secret session, as a committee of the whole, for the consideration of propositions for a plan of government.

This Convention was composed of delegates from the several Colonies fully aware of the causes of the Revolution and fully informed of the facts submitted "to a candid world" by the Declaration of Independence. After approximately 3½ months the Convention produced, not a revision, but a new plan of government.

THE CONSTITUTION

The preamble of this new plan of government declared as one of its objects to "provide for the common defence." By its express delegation of powers in article 1, section 8, this Constitution delegated to Congress the power "to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States;". And thereafter, in that article, committed to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress, in clauses 11 to 16, both inclusive, the following powers in this language:

"To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriations of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

"To provide and maintain a Navy.

"To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions.

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

Notwithstanding the clear knowledge possessed by the members of the Convention, and generally understood by the people through the publication of the Federalist, that this new Government was one of limited powers delegated to it by the sovereign people, fear of an all-powerful Federal Government persisted. Therefore, as a condition precedent to the ratification of it, those same sovereign people demanded the submission of the first 10 amendments which constitute our cherished Bill of Rights. Pertinent to our subject, they provide:

Amendment II: "A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Amendment III: "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

Amendment V: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

I have included all of the fifth amendment simply to keep before us the fact that even in these confused times it contains provisions of great value to all of us.

By article 2, section 2, it is provided that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States;". And by the same article and section; "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, * * *, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; * * *." And by section 3 of article 2 (the President, "Shall commission all the officers of the United States."

It is clear, therefore, that our Federal Government is a government of powers delegated to the Congress and to the President. With each power goes its limitation. It is essential to the orderly process of our Government that each branch of Government know the powers it possesses and the wise limitations placed upon those powers. That each operate within the area provided by this basic charter. That neither attempt to exceed the powers actually granted and possessed by it. In my opinion, it is equally important that each jealously guard the exercise of its powers that there be no usurpation by the other branch. Though I am a member of the legislative branch, I beg that you believe me to be sincere when I state that it is essential to our well being and our continuance as a Nation that there be no trespass upon the powers of the executive by the legislative branch. In comparatively recent times we have heard many protests of usurpation of legislative power by the executive. We have heard little of the intrusion of the legislative upon the executive. Such there has been, as I expect to show. Both are equally to be avoided.

It is now my purpose to consider these various functions, the exercise of which constitutes the office of the legislative branch of our Government in the formulation of national security policy.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

The common defense is stated by the preamble to be one of the reasons for the establishment of the Constitution; the power to provide for it is committed to the Congress. Only Congress can levy and collect taxes, only Congress can pay the debts. Therefore, only Congress can provide those things necessary for the common defense. As with individuals, so with States, self-preservation is the first law of nature. Only the State which can preserve itself can be a State. In this Federation of States, the defense of all of them, the defense common to all of them, the common defense is committed to the Federation of the people. As Joseph Story has said (1 Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, sec. 462), "For example, the preamble declares one object to be, 'to provide for the common defence.' No one can doubt that this does not enlarge the powers of Congress to pass any measures which they deem useful for the common defense." The preamble is, rather, the declaration of basic rights. It does not establish those rights. They already exist. This document then is to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty, the only thing ordained, the only thing established is "this Constitution for the United States of America." Thereupon the Constitution commits the provision of that defense to the only branch of Government which can provide it, the Congress which lays and collects taxes and pays the debts.

ONLY CONGRESS CAN DECLARE WAR

The President is Commander in Chief in time of peace, as well as in time of war. Therefore, the power of Congress to declare war and the power of the President as Commander in Chief, become very closely entwined.

As the people must fight wars, and despots increase their power over their own people and other peoples by war, it is only natural that the sovereign people would express their new-found sovereignty by vesting in the direct representatives of the people the sole power to declare war. Even today the people are quite vocal in their desire that only Congress declare war. On the other hand, a review of the 166½ years since the adoption of the Constitution will show rare indeed have been the occasions upon which Congress alone has declared war. As a matter of fact, Congress has never in its history declared war except as a consequence of the President's acts or recommendations. It has never refused a request from the President that war be declared.

On five occasions this Nation has participated in formally declared wars. However, in four of those instances the declarations of war recognized the prior existence of war. The fifth, being the War of 1812, stated—"War be and the same is hereby declared to exist" (2 Stat. 755).

On May 13, 1846, Congress declared: "Whereas, by act of the Republic of Mexico, a state of war exists" (9 Stat. 9). As to the Spanish-American War, Congress on April 25, 1898, provided: "* * * that war be, and the same is hereby declared to exist, and that war has existed since the 21st day of April * * * between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain * * *" (30 Stat. 364). The First World War was declared to exist by the declaration of war of April 6, 1917, which provided "that the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared" (40 Stat. 1). The day after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Congress, on December 8, 1941, declared: "Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed unprovoked acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it resolved * * *that the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared * * *" (55 Stat. 795). The action of the German Government caused the language of the declaration of war against her on December 11, 1941, to read: "Whereas the Government of Germany has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it resolved * * * that the state of war between the United States and Germany which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared" (55 Stat. 796). On the same day Congress declared war against Italy in the same language (55 Stat. 797).

The courts have recognized the fact that war actually existed from the moment the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and that legally it was not necessary to wait for the formal declaration, the language being: "We can discern no demonstrable difference in the supposition and the actual facts, and we, therefore, conclude that the formal declaration by the Congress on December 8 was not an essential prerequisite to a political determination of the existence of a state of war commencing with the attack on Pearl Harbor." (*New York Life Insurance Company* v. *Bennion* (1946), 158 F. 2d 260.)

PRESIDENT IS COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Turning now, to the occasions upon which the United States has engaged in serious and extended campaigns or uses of force against other nations without a declaration of war, we find that very early in our national life such campaigns became necessary. While we had previously engaged in the undeclared naval war with France during 1798 to 1800, the best known early action of this character was Thomas Jefferson's move against the Barbary Pirates. Even though the Bey of Tripoli declared war on the United States in 1801, and a bitter debate ensued as to the necessity for Congress to declare war, no declaration was made. Jefferson dispatched a squadron of frigates to the Mediterranean, but its mission was limited strictly to defense and the protection of commerce. Even though this debate had such great authorities as Jefferson and Hamilton on opposing sides, Congress took the position that a declaration of war was not necessary. It did actually pass a statute authorizing the President to instruct the commanders of our armed vessels to "seize and make prize of all vessels, goods and effects, belonging to the Bey of Tripoli, * * * ; and also to cause to be done all such other acts of precaution or hostility as the state of war will justify, * * *" (2 Stat. 129).

In the intervening period there have been many instances of the use of the Armed Forces by the Commander in Chief. You, above all others, are familiar with them. I mention such instances as the second Barbary War, 1815; the American-Mexican incidents between 1914 and 1917; the Boxer Uprising in 1900 and 1901; the almost innumerable instances of intervention in Latin America; Haiti; the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. We should not ignore the almost providential presence of our Army in the area which became the Panama Canal Zone, "to protect the American-owned Panama Railroad," when Panama was engaged in the revolution which established her independence, to be followed so quickly by President Theodore Roosevelt's recognition of the new republic and equally quickly by the treaty for the construction of the Panama Canal.

Within my own memory, and area of some responsibility, are those instances immediately prior to World War II, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt dispatched elements of our Armed Forces to many parts of the world. You recall those instances as well, or better than I, because no doubt some of you participated personally in those expeditions. Naturally, as a Member of Congress throughout that period, my interest in the right and power of the President to do those things was more than casual. That interest caused me to give some thought and study to the subject, and lead me to the same conclusion as that reached by the Judge Advocate General of the Army when he stated:

"He (the President) may not raise armies. This the Congress is responsible for doing * * *. Once raised, an Army of the United States is under the sole and exclusive direction of the President. Their movement and implementation is at the President's discretion, limited only by whether or not an intended use would constitute an initiation or declaration of war by the President, if carried through." (Memorandum to the Adjutant General, June 17, 1940).

At an earlier time one able to speak with more experience than even the Judge Advocate General had expressed the same conclusion. Moreover, he spoke at a time when the country was not torn by conflicting views and sharp debate, nor the threat of war. Former President William Howard Taft, after he was President and before he became Chief Justice of the United States (in 1925) stated:

"The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this, he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect." (Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, p. 94).

There can be no doubt of the power of Congress to limit appropriations, as former President Taft recognized. While some commentaries would indicate that Congress has some power to restrict the use of forces in the active service under its power to raise armies, the existence of such congressional power is certainly not clear. The Supreme Court has discussed such varying powers, but has not, to my knowledge, in any instant case enforced any such distinction. (Selective Draft Cases, 1918 (245 U. S. 366); *Cox* v. *Wood* (1918, 247 U. S. 3)).

I would not presume to discuss with this group the nature of the activities in Korea. Too many of you were there. Whether it was a police action, a deployment of the Armed Forces, or war, you will know. In any event we know that Congress did not declare war, that there was much fighting, and there were many battles. We also know that Congress responded with appropriations of billions in money and millions of men.

As I stated earlier, there have been some attempted intrusions by the Congress. In the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, Congress included a provision that none of the persons inducted into the land forces should be used outside the Western Hemisphere, except in the Territories and possessions of the United States and in the Philippines. This provision was subsequently suspended for the period of the war and finally repealed. (Public Law 783, 76th Cong.; Public Law 338, 77th Cong.; Public Law 473, 79th Cong.) However, in the extension of the act in 1945, Congress included a restriction of the use of persons under 19 years of age in combat until they had received 6 months of training. (Public Law 54, 79th Cong.) Also intruding upon the executive branch and of doubtful validity are provisions for coming into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the two Houses on Defense Department acquisitions and disposals of real estate, the submission of certain contracts to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and others.

I know of no instance in which any of these restrictions was violated. Still the power of Congress to raise an army, which must of necessity pass to the control of the Commander in Chief, and at the same time restrict his use thereof, remains most doubtful. The danger of legislation of this character lies in the fact that in some quarters the inclusion of this restriction is being used as precedent for the right of Congress to control the deployment of the Armed Forces by the Commander in Chief. The President's power in this regard has always been essential to our national welfare. Its necessity in these days of undeclared wars and the concept of instant retaliation cannot be overemphasized.

Precedents are all-important to the lawyer, customs and traditions of the service to military men, and our historic and traditional form of government to all of us. The fact that certain things have always been done in a certain way lends sanctity to the form of procedure. It comes down to the fact that because a certain thing was done in a certain way on one occasion, it should be done that way on all occasions. It is difficult for foreign nations, even democratic nations, to fully comprehend freedom of speech and of the press as recognized in the United States. Unlimited subjects for debate in both Houses of the Congress and the freedom with which that debate extends into areas which are not within the legitimate field of activity of the Congress, is bound to be confusing to other nations, friendly or otherwise. Therefore, the value of the display of unity in the prompt adoption of the Formosan resolution after it was requested, was, no doubt, of great value with our friends and potential enemies. It is to be hoped that that display of unity was not bought at a price which might handicap us in providing for our own welfare and safety because of any precedent which it could be construed as forming. My views on this matter are more fully expressed in the debate upon that resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1955, at page 672.

The request having been made by the President, it was essential for Congress to act and act immediately; and it did so. We must hope that President Eisenhower, or any subsequent President, in future instances of necessity will not feel that he is required to submit the question to Congress, and that the free and untrammeled authority of the Commander in Chief will be maintained inviolate. The stationing of our troops in Iceland presented a not dissimilar situation. The occupation of Greenland was of similar character. In the latter case, the Secretary of State announced the conclusion of an agreement signed by himself and the Danish Minister that Greenland would be occupied. As to Iceland, the President concluded an agreement with the Prime Minister of Iceland and transmitted the documents to Congress for information. He asked for no action by Congress. In his message the President said:

"As Commander in Chief I have consequently issued orders to the Navy that all necessary steps be taken to insure the safety of communications in the approaches between Iceland and the United States, as well as on the seas between the United States and all other strategic outposts." (H. Doc. 307, 77th Cong., 1st sess.)

The debate on the Formosan resolution seems to make it clear that had President Eisenhower done as President Roosevelt did in the case of Iceland, and reported to Congress, for its information, the action he had taken would have met with comparable unanimity.

Finally, it resolves itself into the situation that no matter how theorists may discuss the question, what debate there may be or what fine distinctions might be drawn, the Commander in Chief is still the Commander in Chief. Where or how he deploys the Armed Forces, in either peace or war, is limited only by so practical a thing as the availability of money. It also seems quite clear that there has never been a President so lacking in perspicacity that he could not find that filthy commodity in some desk drawer or some appropriation bill if the accomplishment of his purpose depended upon it.

TO RAISE AND SUPPORT ARMIES—TO PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN A NAVY

The Declaration of Independence made complaint against "standing armies" and "armed troops." There was no complaint against "a navy" nor against "sailors." Obviously, the commingling of ground forces with the population produced the irritation. As in the Declaration, so in the Constitution, there is a difference in language as to the two services. For instance, there is the power "To raise and support armies, but no appropriations of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years." There is the power "To provide and maintain a navy," but no limitation of appropriations is included. "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law." If the language be taken at its face value, apparently a sailor can be quartered in any house,

in either peace or war, and the manner thereof need not be prescribed by law.

These provisions serve to emphasize that the Constitution reflects the spirit of the times in which it was written. It provides against the abuses with which the people were familiar. It reflects their knowledge of the history of Britain, of which they had been loyal subjects, until it became "necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." These provisions were not lightly included. They were not simply to give the new plan of government the power to "raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy." There could reasonably have been an inherent power in a sovereign nation, sovereign in that the sovereign people had delegated a portion of their sovereignty to the federation, to have both armies and navies. The overriding reason for these provisions is to make it clear that this power existed in the Congress and not in the President. Blackstone had said that under the British Constitution the king had "sole power of raising and regulating fleets and armies." (I. Blackstone, Commentaries 263, Wendel's ed. 1857.)

Story in his Commentaries on the Constitution, puts the matter in proper perspective when he says:

"Our notions, indeed, on the dangers of standing armies, in time of peace, are derived in a great measure from the principles and examples of our English ancestors. In England, the king possessed the power of raising armies in the time of peace according to his own good pleasure. And this prerogative was justly esteemed dangerous to the public liberties. Upon the revolution of 1688, Parliament wisely insisted upon a bill of rights, which should furnish an adequate security for the future. But how was this done? Not by prohibiting standing armies altogether in time of peace; but * * * by prohibiting them without the consent of Parliament. This is the very proposition contained in the Constitution; for Congress can alone raise armies; and may put them down, whenever they choose." (II Story, Commentaries, sec. 1187, 4th ed., 1873.)

There can be no doubt but that Congress can establish the military policy of the Nation by authorized strengths for the Armed Forces and by appropriated strengths. However, these can only be maximums. It is quite impossible for Congress to establish a minimum. Actual military strengths are completely beyond the control of Congress. Should Congress establish an unrealistic maximum which could not be supplied by the manpower pool available for induction, in time of draft, or willing to enlist when there is no draft, of course that maximum could not be reached. Equally, if the executive branch of the Government should be unwilling to maintain that maximum by failure to enlist, draft, or retain on active duty, Congress has no machinery by which it can impose its will upon the Executive, and it should not have. In only one instance, so far as I am informed, and surely only once in recent times, has Congress attempted to provide a minimum. That is the law of the 82d Congress (Public Law 416), providing that the Marine Corps shall consist of not less than 3 combat divisions and 3 air wings. Though I have great admiration for the Marine Corps, I am afraid I lost some friends therein when I opposed that law. My opposition was based entirely upon my theory of our Government, and that it is a fallacy to attempt to fix minimums. It is an attempt to delude ourselves and, I am afraid, an attempt to delude the Marine Corps.

We all remember quite well the fight during the administration of President Truman as to whether the Air Force should consist of 70 groups, notwithstanding the position of the President that it should have a lesser number. We won that fight in Congress by appropriating more than $800 million more than the President requested. The President signed the appropriation bill, but the same day he froze the extra funds.

Currently we have the question of whether the Army should be reduced by 70,000 men during the present fiscal year; and whether it should be reduced an additional 70,000 men by the end of the next fiscal year. As to the remainder of this fiscal year, the funds are already appropriated, and the numbers they provide are within the authorized strength. If, however, the President should insist upon failing to provide replacements for those whose terms expire, or if he should grant early releases to come within his contemplated reduction, that is his power, and with it goes the responsibility. The Congress and the President in this instance should assume their own full powers and responsibilities. The Congress by making the means available for what it regards as the proper number to accomplish the military policy of the Nation; and the President assuming his full responsibility for the safety of the Nation. Only time will then justify the one or the other.

The fear of standing armies is reflected in the limitation of appropriations to a period of 2 years. There is no other provision in the Constitution limiting the time during which appropriations may remain available. It is true that the vast majority of appropriations expire with the fiscal year for which made. It is not uncommon, however, for appropriation bills to provide that sums appropriated shall remain available for an additional period of time, or until expended. In 1904 the Solicitor General ruled that the appropriations limited by the Constitution "are those only which are to raise and support armies in the strict sense of the word 'support,' and that the inhibition of that clause does not extend to appropriations for the various means which an army may use in military operations, or which are deemed necessary for the common defense, * * *" (25 Opinions Atty. Gen. 105). Thus quarters, ordnance equipment, or anything which could be construed as other than strict "support" are not subject to the limitation. The Navy has never been subject to any limitation in this regard. Under the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495) the Air Force was established as an executive department within the National Military Establishment. In 1948 the Attorney General ruled that there was "no legal objection to a request to the Congress to appropriate funds to the Air Force for the procurement of aircraft and aeronautical equipment to remain available until expended." (40 Opinions Atty. Gen. 555.) Some were apprehensive, at one time at least, that all legislation for compulsory training or service being based upon the power to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy, a question might arise as to the induction of men into the Air Force, should it be construed to be neither an army or navy. No difficulty in this regard has been experienced, but there has been no authoritative disposition of the question. During the 80th Congress (1948) a joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives, proposing a constitutional amendment to provide and maintain an air force, to make rules for its government and regulation, and to designate the President as Commander in Chief. (H. J. Res. 298, 80th Cong.) Congress took no action on that resolution, and some feel such nonaction might be construed as a belief by Congress that the Constitution already conferred ample power for that purpose.

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The military power of the Nation has always had a most intimate relationship to, and connection with, foreign affairs and foreign relations. The power of the President as Commander in Chief and his most sweeping authority in foreign relations complement each other. We have seen that his power to deploy the Armed Forces is limited only by the availability of appropriations for their transportation. We now see that the President makes treaties and appoints Ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls. The only mention of either House of the Congress is the requirement that two-thirds of the Senators present advise and concur in the making of treaties; and that the Senate advise and consent to the appointment of Ambassadors and other foreign representatives. Indeed, past history has shown little participation by the House of Representatives in any matter having to do with foreign affairs. Until the foreign-aid programs were instituted with the lend-lease program of World War II, the House was concerned with the pay of Ambassadors and consuls, provision of Embassies, entertainment funds for the Embassies, and such matters of management only. The use of public funds in international relations has greatly enhanced the role of the House of Representatives in such matters.

In 1936, the Supreme Court, in an opinion by Justice Sutherland, gave expression to the proper view of the powers in foreign affairs and also the war powers, saying:

"As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown, not to the Colonies severally, but to the Colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America. Even before the Declaration, the Colonies were a unit in foreign affairs, acting through a common agency—namely, the Continental Congress—composed of delegates from the Thirteen Colonies. That agency exercised the powers of war and peace, raised an army, created a navy, and finally adopted the Declaration of Independence. * * * It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The power to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality." (*United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304.)

TO MAKE RULES GOVERNING LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

This is the practically all-inclusive power of the Congress. It controls the entrance into the service, promotion, pay, and retirement. These are the provisions which reach the individual as such. They are the ones which require the larger portion of the time, attention, and concern of the Congress. There is practically no limitation upon them. Their proper enactment is committed to the sense of justice, fair play, and a proper concern on the part of Congress for the well-being of our national defense system.

Included in this power, also, is the great body of military law. The Congress has passed and placed into operation a uniform code of military justice. I am fully aware of the view of some officers of our Armed Forces that this code has constituted a severe handicap in performing their duties and functions of command. The code has been in effect long enough now that Congress should take another look at it. We should evaluate how effective it has been,

how restrictive it has been, and what amendments may be necessary or desirable. On the other hand, I know of many criticisms leveled at the code which should be pointed elsewhere. I fear there is a tendency to charge to the code restrictive departmental regulations which were not promulgated because of the code. Likewise, it may be that the code is an easy scapegoat for some deficiencies of command. I make you a fair proposition: While Congress is reappraising the code and its work in formulating the same, you reevaluate the criticisms you have made of it, and determine how many thereof should be directed elsewhere.

OTHER POWERS

Questions having to do with the militia, its calling, organization, arming, disciplining, the power of the States wth reference to it, need little further elaboration. Its favored position under the Constitution might be pointed out and the fact mentioned that the governors of the several States possess unlimited power with reference thereto, should they, or any of them, decide to do without Federal recognition. Provisions with reference to appointing and commissioning officers need no elaboration, except to point out that notwithstanding our many provisions for the appointment of officers, the power of the President to nominate is unabridged, if he can secure the advice and consent of the Senate in any individual case.

APPROPRIATIONS

We now come to the one all-powerful question of appropriations. Other than the limitation of appropriations for the support of the Army to a period of 2 years, there is no restraint on the power of Congress. It can be niggardly or generous, capricious, vindicative, or forthright. Jefferson spoke of the checks and balances of our Government, and here is the all-powerful check of the Congress. Armies may move on their stomachs, but without appropriations they move on empty stomachs and they walk on bare feet, without arms or ammunition, and that captivating word of the military, "logistics," loses its meaning. The great handicap of our military policy has always been our periods of feast or famine and peaks and valleys. The American people are the easiest in the world to frighten; and when frightened the military cannot be expanded rapidly enough, nothing is too good for them. No demand for numbers is ever too large. There should be no limitation of divisions of ground forces, wings for the air or naval tonnage afloat. Unfortunately, our people are reassured as quickly as they are frightened. They seize upon the first moment of relaxation to indulge in wishful thinking that all is right with the world. They demand cutbacks and demobilization. The money we have lost through rash programs of preparation and demobilization, which was actually disintegration, would have maintained an adequate military force for a long, long period of time. But this is a democracy. We can have in Government only what the people will provide. With the present unstable condition of the world no one is in a position to say for what period of time the present tension will continue. No one is so sanguine as to believe that stability in world affairs will return in so short a period as 10 years, many feel that prudence requires that we plan for a period as long as 50 years. We cannot tell and, perhaps, we must take calculated risks, but we must remain strong. Militarily, yes, but economically also.

The national budget for fiscal year 1956 amounts to $58.6 billion. It forecasts expenditures of $2.4 billion in excess of anticipated receipts. Of that budget $32.9 billion is for the military services. That is 56.1 percent of the total. There is demand, yes, insistence, that the budget be brought into balance without delay and that it then be reduced. Experience shows that the people always get what they want in this country; it may take a long time for them to get what they want, but they finally do get it. The people want the budget brought into balance, and they want it reduced. You can be sure they will finally get what they want.

You can neither balance nor reduce a budget of which 56.1 percent is devoted to the military without reducing the amount apportioned to the military. The military budget must be reduced. It should be reduced by the friends of the military and those who know the necessity of the military for our national survival. Therefore, it should be done by the military themselves. But this much I know, because I know the American people. I am in contact with them. I go to them every 2 years for election to the office I hold. I can assure you if the military does not reduce its own budget, the enemies of the military will surely do so. The pacifists, and worse, will seize upon the desire of the people for a reduction. When the enemies of the military and the others go to work on the military budget, they will do a job of it, and they will do it with a meat ax. I don't pretend to know how to reduce the military budget, and do the least harm; I am a civilian. You are not only military men, but the best of our military; we all expect the most of you. You either know or can find out how that can be done. Perhaps it can be accomplished by a number of things, including reduction of the division slice, elimination of numbers from the pipeline, interservice inventories, consolidation of procurement of standard items, standardization of weapons, transport, and other things which are better known to you than to any civilian. What I say here is not in criticism, but in fear of the type of retrenchment I have seen in my own time. This deserves and should have the full attention of the very best minds in all of the services.

CONCLUSION

In discussing the office of the legislative branch in the formulation of national security policy, I have deemed it best to go to the fundamental documents of our Government, rather than speaking in general terms of my own. These grants of power must be construed in connection with the limitations upon them and the actions taken in accordance with them. Precedent and tradition are all-powerful in any government; in fact they constitute the only constitution of our great sister democracy, Great Britain, from whom we acquired our basic ideas of government and its form. By taking advantage of the lessons of history and impingements upon liberty by unworthy governments of the past, our forefathers were able to create here the best form of government yet known. So good in fact that a great Englishman was inspired to say that our Constitution is the most nearly perfect instrument of government ever stricken off in a given time by the mind and purpose of man. It is our sincere desire to keep it that way. You have devoted your lives and your talents to its preservation. Your capacity and your patriotism have been tried in many lands, on many fields of battle, in many forums, and in many pursuits other than the military; you have never been found wanting. You constitute the group in which the American people have the greatest confidence. If at times it seems there is lack of appreciation, or criticism is just a little too barbed, remember that there is no one too high in the democratic system to escape therefrom.

If at times it seems that some of us who constitute the legislative branch fail to understand your problems, remember the opposite is also true; some of the military fail to appreciate our problems. As a matter of fact, the powerful Secretary of War of times past, Elihu Root, said of the great work "Military Policy of the United States," by Gen. Emory Upton: "The work was written from a purely military point of view, and in some parts shows a failure to appreciate difficulties arising from our form of government and the habits and opinions of our people with which civil government has necessarily to deal in its direction of the military arm."

At the termination of World War II, Sir Winston Churchill paid a visit to the Pentagon, and to the officers assembled there he recited some lines he attributed to a veteran of the campaigns of his illustrious ancestor, the Duke of Marlboro; they will bear repeating here:

"God and the soldier we adore,
In time of danger, not before.
But danger past and all things righted,
God is ignored, the soldier slighted."

Does Distribution Cost Too Much?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, at noon on Tuesday, February 8, and again that evening I was privileged to attend the meetings of the National Wholesale Distribution Clinic sponsored by the National Association of Wholesalers and held at the Shoreham Hotel.

I am a small wholesaler myself, president of a very modest size wholesale wallpaper and paint corporation, but as I listened to the greeting from NAW President George Wedemeyer, of Ann Arbor, Mich., and the luncheon address by Warner S. Shelly, president of N. W. Ayer & Son, of Philadelphia, on the subject Advertising and Wholesaling Are Handmaidens, I began to realize how very infrequently we who are in Congress recognize the importance of the wholesaler, or, in fact, of our highly specilized distribution system.

The voices of the representatives of producers, farmers, and manufacturers alike, are often heard in these Chambers. The spokesmen for labor are properly articulate. With the possible exception of the consumer, those engaged in the distributive trades receive the least attention directed to the solution of their problems. As a means of distribution wholesaling involves bringing goods from places too distant or too numerous for the retailer to deal with and in quantities too big for him to handle, in order to bridge the gap between the producers and the consumer. It seems obvious that our economy, based as it is on mass production and mass consumption, could be seriously crippled if a gap existed anywhere along the line between producer and consumer. As Mr. Warner S. Shelly said in his opening address:

The reason for talking about advertising and wholesaling in the same breath is that

they have certain things in common. The most obvious of these is the fact that both are less understood by the public, and more frequently criticized, than almost any other operating parts of our economic system. They are often neglected, frequently criticized, and nearly always given hard chores to do. The wholesaler is often called a grasping middleman, and the shout goes up "Let's eliminate the middleman." Advertising gets the huckster label in some quarters, and the slogan here is: "Let's cut out advertising." The producer blames advertising and wholesaling if sales are poor. The consumer blames them if prices seem high.

It is interesting to explore the reasons why there has been such a limited appreciation of the problem of distribution, especially wholesale. I suppose one reason is that wholesaling with only about 250,000 firms, employs a relatively small number of people. As a minority group wholesalers have not been either consistent or vigorous in keeping their congressional representatives informed of the problems which they face individually. As Mr. Shelly noted, public ignorance of the nature of wholesaling and the confusing terms by which the wholesaler tries to explain his business to the public adds to the difficulty.

He stated:

Public ignorance is intensified by the fact that people have been encouraged to think in terms of stock phrases and pat labels. Thus we have the poor but honest farmer, and the oppressed consumer, both under the thumb of the grasping middleman. As any thinking person knows, these labels do not fit. There are good and bad people in all lines of work and all classes of society. There are farmers and consumers who will steal your eyeteeth and then complain because there aren't any good fillings in them, just as there are advertising men and wholesalers who will do the same. But mostly people of any type are a pretty good sort.

During the evening meeting, after the pointed observation of Herb Shriner, the clinic heard an address, the American Economy Is Cushioned by 250,000 Wholesalers, by Herb R. Askins, immediate past president, National Standard Parts Association, and former Under Secretary of the Navy. I was particularly impressed by this discussion but the remarks of Joseph Kolodny, managing director of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, seemed to me to be those which would be of the greatest interest to Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following address of Mr. Kolodny, a dynamic influence in distribution, whom I have known personally for several years:

DOES DISTRIBUTION COST TOO MUCH?

(By Joseph Kolodny, managing director, NATD)

Let us, at the very outset, endeavor to clear the atmosphere by dissipating the fog arising from the endless and contentious arguments relative to the cost of distribution.

The air has been acridly contaminated ever since the 20th Century Fund stirred up the emotions of both protagonists and antagonists by propounding the question, "Does distribution cost too much?" and thus casting a cloud on the efficiency and proficiency of the distribution instrumentalities.

It seems foolhardy, in a dynamic society, to indulge in vainglorious pronouncements accentuating the ultra efficiencies of any operations, be they manufacturing, distributing, or servicing. Propelled by the impact of scientific and technological creations we are constantly either on the alert or forced to entertain and attune our operations to new ideas, new devices, and new developments. The distribution system, though somewhat tardily, has made notable progress in that direction.

To the "know-it-all" segment of our populace, who may never have taken the time to study the contents and conclusions incorporated in this exhaustive 20th Century Fund document, the question seemingly implied that "distribution did cost too much." It occurs to me, however, that we can consider the subject matter with infinitely more realism if we change the question to, "What does the consumer want or require?" In the final analysis, the consumer—and only the consumer—is the arbiter of our economic destiny. He and he alone dictates and determines the direction of our pursuits. No form of distribution can be superimposed upon him. He accepts that which he approves and rejects—that which does not meet his fancies. In exploiting "consumer appeal" and catering to "consumer demand," the advertising fraternity shows itself to be especially conscious of this phenomenon.

The influence of consumer attitudes has acquired potent significance in recent years. The emergence of 2- and 3-color automobiles, as epitomized by the 1955 models, vividly underscores the lively attention paid by the manufacturer to the wishes of the consumer.

Since the word "distribution" has rather little meaning for us when applied in the strictest "dictionary" sense, and only acquires animation and vitality when wedded to the product and related services, that the whole issue can be more accurately examined by linking the product with the user and determining what sort of service he expects or desires at the time he is ready to acquire it.

At this point, it is essential to dwell, if only briefly, on the circumstances which have contributed markedly toward bringing about a sharp change in our thinking and actions in recent years in relation to the far-flung sphere of distribution. The amazing technological achievement of this Nation in mass production and its corollary—mass advertising—together with its concomitant, "preselling"—have vastly altered the relationship between the entrepreneur and the product. Prior to the fantastic mass production achievements, the product came principally from the hands of the local craftsman. It was a personal activity and the product was closely identified with the man who made it. Today, such local craftsmen are almost nonexistent and the mass-produced article has lost that touch of personal identity.

It is not an exaggeration to assert that the public, except in rare instances, doesn't know and, moreover, doesn't care who heads the firm or who is the directing genius of the manufacturing entity which produces the article. The product itself has become supreme and the consumer is guided in his purchase by what he learns of its quality and dependability. Before embarking upon a shopping trip, Mrs. Consumer has predetermined, to a large extent, what products she intends to buy. When by virtue of modern packaging and display she is exposed to and enticed by the known branded product, she responds almost impulsively. As an inescapable result, the product and the method employed in gratifying the consumer's needs and wishes becomes wholly subordinate to the consumer's thinking and action.

Let's not be unmindful that the consumer, informed or uninformed, influences, controls, and even dictates the cost of distribution. She—and I say "she" advisedly because it is axiomatic that women control the Nation's pursestrings—can make or break any system or method of distribution ever devised or contrived. And, by the amount and extent of service she demands, she controls the factor which, more than any other, determines the ultimate cost of distribution.

Nowhere in the world is the consumer placed on such a high pedestal as in our own country. Not only is she catered to as if she were a queen, but she is shielded on all sides from exploitation. She is served by many agencies of the Federal Government and a multitude of laws protect her from dishonest or monopolistic operations and manipulations, including the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and many others. The States also exercise their police powers in the consumer's behalf, especially in the area of fair business practices, and the local governments control the activities of the predatory schemers through the operation of their license bureaus and racket and bunco squads Add to these the watchdog alertness of the better business bureaus and other organizatitons set up by private business to root out dishonesty and foster ethical conduct

Our being a free economy, the consumer has an unrestricted choice as to what she shall buy and where she shall buy it. The price she pays will be influenced by whether she demands full service, minimum service, or no service at all.

Mrs. Consumer may choose to drive to the market. Although she disregards it, the cost of operating her car is inseparably linked with the cost of distribution. Arriving at the market, she grabs a pushcart and manipulates it interminably up and down the length of the aisles, fetching from the neatly arranged shelves her food and sundry household requirements.

Mrs. Consumer then elects to cart or carry the heavy bags of groceries to her car—as a tacit manifestation of domestic economy. Upon arriving home, and staggering under the burden of her packages, she carries them into the kitchen or pantry—again mindful that she has saved a few pennies.

In sharp contrast, another housewife merely lifts her phone and leisurely speaks to the grocer or other merchants, placing her order for an assortment of products and admonishing the merchant that it must be delivered by a specific time. Upon receiving the call, the grocer or his clerk sets about to assemble the order, which involves a cost of time and effort. They then load it into a delivery conveyance to transport it punctually to the customer's home and, upon arrival, carry the packages into the house or apartment and place them on the kitchen or pantry table. This store-to-door operation involves the cost of the clerk's time, the use of the vehicle, and the services of the delivery man.

How are we to properly differentiate between basic distribution costs and optional service costs? Obviously, certain elements of cost are stationary, such as—

(a) The warehousing of the merchandise, which is prerequisite in both cases.

(b) The transportation of the goods to the retail outlets—again an inescapable cost in both instances.

(c) Placing the merchandise on the shelves for easy accessibility and handling—likewise required in both cases.

At this point, there is a parting of the ways. The cost of conveying the goods to the home must be assumed either by the consumer, who elects to drive her own car or carry her own parcels, or by the retailer who provides delivery service.

Also, in selecting the type of service she desires, the consumer has to choose between—

(a) Allotting time and effort in shopping on a cash basis in nonservice stores, or

(b) Taking advantage of the conveniences of the service stores—including delivery and credit.

Instead of phoning the dry cleaner, she can take the garments to him and earn a discount of 15 to 20 percent. She can have a bottle of fresh milk or fresh bread delivered to her doorstep by the milkman or baker's man, or she can get them cheaper at the store. If she needs a new appliance, and is willing to forego the servicing advantages afforded by her local or neighborhood dealer, she may effect a saving by searching for a discount house. Mail-order houses also offer numerous savings if she is willing to wait an indeterminate period for delivery. If she has the patience, she can also wait for seasonal clearance sales by the department stores.

In the matter of cost, differences are relatively slight. The product costs exactly the same to produce and advertise, whether it is destined for the shelf of the service store or nonservice store. In the item of carrier transportation costs, there is a slight differential in carload versus less-than-carload lots, but this is a very minor factor in the aggregate cost of distribution. For all practical purposes, the cost of goods to merchants is almost identical.

The impact of the consumer is virtually nonexistent until the merchandise commences its movement into the wholesale and retail outlets. It is at that stage that the consumer first begins to exert the terrific force of her power of selection.

There are types of stores and types of services to meet the wants of every consumer. The merchandise may come to rest in a fashionable shop catering to the carriage trade, which relies on this type of merchant to satisfy its whims at a moment's notice. It may involve a rare food delicacy from a distant corner of the earth. It might be a costly item of jewelry or any other product for which the demand is uncertain and inconstant. When the merchant stocks such a product, he does so with the knowledge that he may have to retain it in stock for weeks or months before it is sold. If a large portion of this shop's capital is tied up in slow-moving inventory, there obviously must be an unusually high markup, which translates itself into high distribution cost.

On the other hand, certain merchandise comes to only a momentary halt in the retail store, such as cigarettes, where the frequency of turnover is almost daily and the cost of handling far less. It is almost axiomatic that the ultimate price of any product is governed very largely by the rapidity of its turnover.

The consumer of limited or less-than-average income, who is obliged to seek out sources of supply which will enable him to stretch his dollar farthest, has many avenues open to him. For the most part there are retail establishments which provide a minimum of service and where overhead cost is also kept at a minimum. A typical example may be found in the type of men's clothing store which operates in a low-rent district and on virtually a self-service basis. The customer selects his own suit or coat from the racks with little or no assistance from a clerk. He gets a makeshift fitting or he may find it necessary to take the suit to his own tailor to have it fitted properly. The whole process is a test of patience and fortitude. But he finally gets a suit for what he believes he can afford to pay.

The consumer who is less economy-minded goes to a conveniently located establishment where he knows he can obtain clothing of excellent material and workmanship, where attention is showered upon him by the floorwalker, the manager, the clerk, and the fitter. He can look over dozens of suits at his leisure without being shoved or pushed around. All this comes under the heading of service, the cost of which is incorporated into the price of the suit.

I have mentioned only some of the distribution devices available to the consumer which offer money-saving opportunities. The fact that these channels are able to compete successfully for a share of the consumer's dollar attests to the elasticity of our free economy.

The conventional patterns of distribution, fortunately for us, continue to find by far the greatest favor among the Nation's consumers. America today enjoys the highest standard of living in all the world's history and that high standard is based, in substantial part, on the enjoyment of the conveniences and even the luxuries of service.

The rapid development of the self-service grocery store, notably the supermarket, is perhaps the outstanding merchandising phenomenon of the postwar era. There is nothing basically new in the idea because self-service has been with us ever since the advent of the cafeteria. Do these supermarkets offer customers noteworthy savings? The most detailed study relating to supermarket sales was made recently in 5 Cleveland, Ohio, supermarkets over a period of 13 weeks. Records were kept on every item accounting for five one-thousandths or more of the total store sales.

The 5 stores averaged $45,520 sales per week. Customer purchases averaged $6.83. In round figures, grocery items accounted for 44 percent of total sales, meats 28 percent, produce 13 percent, frozen foods 4 percent, and baked goods 3 percent. The average gross margin of profit was 17.9 percent, but the survey revealed striking variations in the profit rates, ranging from about 5 percent to more than 40 percent. The lowest markups applied to fast-moving staples such as cigarettes, sugar, coffee, butter, flour, soap, baby foods, shortening, gelatines, etc., on which the gross profit ranged from 5.4 percent to 9.8 percent, an average of 7 percent.

While the growth of chains and supermarkets has been huge, it must not be assumed that American consumers are exerting their power to make or break any type of distribution to the detriment of the conventional type of grocer who provides more service. Nothing could be further from the truth. The so-called independent grocer in 1953 accounted for slightly more than half of total food sales, with chains doing about 30 percent and the remainder represented by sales of food products by stores other than grocers.

Quite frequently, in evaluating distribution processes, the claim is made that the multiplicity of distributive outlets, both wholesale and retail, result in a duplication of effort which pyramids distribution costs. Such an assertion belongs to that category of superficial arguments that lack authentic support. In the first place, this Nation is the strongest bastion of free enterprise, preserving the right of any aspiring individual to embark on a business career of his own—with all its attendant risks—and either succeeding or "losing his shirt." Secondly, there is not one iota of evidence that because there are a number of grocers, druggists, or haberdashers in one neighborhood, the consumer is saddled with greater costs. On the contrary, it is the very existence and presence of these coteries of competing merchants that is the best safeguard against unwarranted hiking of prices.

Since I am associated with the tobacco industry, it is, I feel, not inappropriate to use the experience of my industry as a point of illustration. Here are some of the basic facts about the principal tobacco product—cigarettes.

In the 1940–53 period, the combined net sales of the five largest cigarette manufacturers increased from $1,014,000,000 to $3,100,000,000 or 206 percent. At the same time the sale of cigarettes by units expanded from 157 to 391 billion, or 150 percent. But the cost of leaf tobacco soared 337 percent in crop value and Federal excise taxes jumped from $640 million to $1,614,000,000 or 152 percent. Federal and State income taxes spiraled from $33 million to $181 million—an astonishing 444 percent. The result was that net income increased only 39 percent and common dividends only 15 percent, in each case less than the depreciation in the value of the dollar. In short, the industry in 1953 handled a cigarette business which had tripled in dollar volume and increased 2½ times in physical volume, at a profit which was less in actual value than in 1940.

Actually, considering the depreciation in the value of the dollar, cigarettes are relatively cheaper today than 15 years ago. Since 1940, the retail price of standard cigarettes, exclusive of State or local stamp taxes, has increased on the average of only 4½ cents a package and of this 2 cents was made mandatory by increases in the Federal excise tax from 6 cents to 8 cents per package. The other 2½ cents has been entirely absorbed by increased costs of tobacco, labor, packaging, shipping, etc.

In 1940, the prevailing average price of the popular standard brands was 18 cents a package, including all excise taxes. The Government estimates that on the basis of what the dollar would buy in the 1947–49 base period, it would have bought $1.669 in 1940 but only $0.87 in 1954. On a comparative basis, therefore, the same cigarettes should retail for 34 cents, instead of the prevailing average of 23–24 cents. The fact that the operating costs of tobacco wholesalers are approximately 5 percent, coupled with a very modest retail profit, is another item on the credit side of the consumer's ledger. This, therefore, is a sound explanation why the consumer today is spending less, proportionately, for cigarettes than in 1940.

What about the availability of these cigarettes to the consuming public? Notwithstanding the shrinkage of profit to the manufacturer, the modest and barely-break-even margins to wholesalers and retailers, cigarettes are more easily available and more readily accessible than at any other time. They are handled and dispensed by 1,300,000 retail outlets, which accounts for more than two-thirds of such outlets.

The portrayal of the cigarette picture does not even remotely imply that the experience depicts any outstanding exception. To a larger or lesser extent, a similar example can be applied to drug toiletries, blades, many confectionery products, and chewing gum, numerous food products, including cereals, and many other commodities.

It candidly does not entail the erudite propensities of auditing or accounting experts to realize that the combined costs of wholesale and retail distribution on these products, exclusive of transportation, ranges around 20 percent and that certainly is an exceedingly modest figure.

Present-day exigencies dictate a careful reexamination of all elements of cost. The keenness of competition forces us to draw on every resource at our command in striving for the goal of irreducible costs. Let us not be unmindful, however, that in appraising the cost of distribution it is the consumer who governs the character and type of services he or she demands, and that with the advent in recent years of all sorts of distributive media, the consumer does not have to be too much perturbed about anyone's ability to mulct him or her with exorbitant costs of distribution.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, whose love no manmade barriers can shut out, as this day we ascend the world's great altar stairs sloping through darkness up to Thee, we would stretch out lame hands and with our fallible requests come not with a philosophy of prayer, but in the practice of this greatest of all powers which, as with golden chains, ties our human race around the throne of the eternal. On this world day of petition we would join our aspiring desires with those of Thy children under all skies—

"As o'er each continent and island
The dawn leads on another day,
The voice of prayer is never silent,
Nor dies the strain of praise away."

With all dividing walls down, with no curtain separating us from those who call on Thee in all lands, we pray for the leaders of this sadly sundered world, that they may be guided by the spirit of the one God over all. We pray for the millions of God-fearing people who look up to Thee even as they are bound with the shackles of a temporary tyranny. We pray for those in the captive lands who strive and struggle patiently, who suffer silently, as their ruthless leaders endeavor to put out their altar fires.

We thank Thee for the inner shrine in human hearts where blaze the candles of faith which no iron fingers can blot out. And for our America, whate'er our name or sign, create in us clean hearts, O God, and renew right spirits within us. And on this day of prayer which encircles the globe, make our hearts the altars and Thy love the flame. We ask it in the name of the Elder Brother of all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 23, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission, on the part of the House, Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi, and Mr. COON, of Oregon.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER of New York, Mr. WALTER of Pennsylvania, and Mr. REED of Illinois were appointed members on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2581. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical-research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research;

H. R. 3952. An act to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4048. An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2581. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical-research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3952. An act to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4048. An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be given leave of the Senate until Tuesday, March 1, in order that he may attend the joint session of the Washington State Legislature which is to honor him on his 25th anniversary as a distinguished public servant.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate, for the purpose of concluding hearings on the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be a Justice of the Supreme Court. For the information of the Senate, and in order to enable members of the Committee to be present at the meeting promptly, I wish to say that the meeting will start immediately.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate operate under a 2-minute limitation with reference to statements made in connection therewith.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXAMINATION PRELIMINARY TO PROMOTION OF OFFICERS OF NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the withdrawals of certain public lands, for the calendar year 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the administration by the several States of their respective school systems

"Whereas recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States have tended to withdraw from the sovereign States the power to administer their respective school systems in a fashion never contemplated by the ratifiers of the 14th amendment; and

"Whereas this unconscionable usurpation of power, if not restricted, will ultimately result in the destruction of every vestige of State-supported and regulated public education: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Georgia respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. Anything in this Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding, the several States shall have exclusive authority to

regulate, administer, and operate their respective educational systems as they may deem necessary and proper, and neither the Congress, the President, nor anything in this Constitution shall in anywise interfere therewith or otherwise affect the same.

" 'SEC. 2. The Supreme Court, the several district courts and courts of appeal, and any and all other Federal judicial tribunals, quasi-judicial tribunals, and all administrative or executive agencies, shall have no jurisdiction to decide or consider, either originally, on appeals, or by other means of review, any matter drawing in question the administration by the several States of their respective educational systems'; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Georgia; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Governor of every State and the president of the State senate of every State and the speaker of the house of every State for the express purpose of encouraging these sovereign States to take similar action in their legislatures.

"MARVIN E. MEATE,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOS. BOONE,
"Clerk of the House.
"S. ERNEST VANDIVER,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretaary of the Senate.

'Approved this 29th day of January 1955.

"MARVIN GRIFFIN,
"Governor."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

"Legislative Resolution 10

"Re memorialization of Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to complete Glendo Dam in 1957

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, is presently constructing Glendo Dam on the North Platte River in the State of Wyoming for the purpose, among others, of furnishing supplemental storage water for irrigated lands in eastern Wyoming and western Nebraska; and

"Whereas a contract for construction of said Glendo Dam has been awarded, which contract provides for completion of the dam in early 1958; and

"Whereas the contractor has indicated a willingness, without any increase in the cost of the work, to prosecute the work as rapidly as available funds will permit, and to complete the dam 1 year earlier than scheduled if sufficient funds are provided; and

"Whereas the earliest possible completion of Glendo Dam is of the utmost importance in order to relieve a critical water shortage in the North Platte Valley of eastern Wyoming and western Nebraska, which shortage endangers the general economy of the area and threatens the security of hundreds of farm families; and

"Whereas the accelerated completion would not only make storage water available 1 year earlier without any increase in cost to the Government but would actually result in benefits to the Government, including increased revenues from sale of electric energy and lower costs of supervising the work: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 67th session assembled:

"1. That the 84th Congress of the United States be memorialized to provide appropriations for Glendo Dam in such amounts as may be necessary to support a construction program designed to complete said Glendo Dam in 1957 instead of 1958 as presently planned.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"C. J. WARNER,
"President of the Legislature."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress against passing legislation reducing tariff rates on textile imports from foreign countries

"Whereas the textile industries in Massachusetts are being affected economically by legislation favorable to textile imports from foreign countries; and

"Whereas the continuance of the textile industry in the Commonwealth is essential to its economic development; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth urges the Congress of the United States not to pass any legislation granting a decrease of tariff rates on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the national laws provide that each State containing a national forest is entitled to receive as a payment in lieu of taxes on such forest lands an amount equal to 25 percent of the proceeds from timber sales, such payments to be used for the support of schools and roads in national forest areas; and

"Whereas by special act of Congress, applicable only to Alaska and no other Territory or State of the United States, the proceeds from timber sales in the Tongass National Forest have been impounded in the United States Treasury and are not available for regular distribution to Alaska; and

"Whereas the amount of money so impounded on October 1, 1954, totaled $1,428,662.96 of which the Territory was properly entitled to the sum of $357,165.74; and

"Whereas the amounts received from such timber sales are increasing due to the development of the forests of Alaska, and the annual amount to which Alaska is rightfully entitled on the same basis as all other Territories and States would be of benefit to the programs for schools and roads in Alaska; and

"Whereas the amounts impounded have been set aside, and should be kept available, for the settlement and proper determination of the entitlement of natives of Alaska to such lands in the Tongass National Forest.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 22d session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress appropriate an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount of Tongass timber receipts now impounded; and that, hereafter, the Congress annually appropriate an amount equal to 25 percent of the Tongass timber receipts impounded in each preceding year.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 2, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 10, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"To the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate of the United States Congress, the Speaker of the House of the United States Congress, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the Chairman of the House Committee on Commerce, and to the Delegate in Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas a committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay has prepared for the President of the United States a Federal-State-local highway program that would cost a total of $101 billion over the next 20 to 30 years; and

"Whereas the road program as presented by the Clay committee calls for a Federal expenditure of $24 billion in improving highways throughout the United States; and

"Whereas the road needs of the Territory of Alaska are nowhere mentioned in the report or included in its recommendations for large Federal expenditures on highway improvements; and

"Whereas no area under the American flag stands in greater need of improved and extended highways than does the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas General Clay is reported to have advised the Governor of Alaska that while his directive from the President on preparation of his report excluded consideration of road needs of areas outside the 48 States and the District of Columbia he suggested that Alaska's problem be brought to the attention of the committees of the Congress which will deal with the recommendations in the Clay committee report; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has been excluded from participation under the Federal Highway Act, with the result that there is a 35-year accumulation of road needs for which Federal financial assistance is appropriate; and

"Whereas the construction and improvement of trunk roads in Alaska is of benefit to the Nation from the standpoint of national defense and economic development: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, That the national administration and Congress include Alaska in any special Federal-State-local highway program which may

be evolved as a result of the recommendations of the Clay committee.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 4, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate, February 14, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Natural Gas Act

"Whereas recent interpretation of the Federal Natural Gas Act by the Supreme Court of the United States, and the recent interpretation of that Supreme Court decision by the Federal Power Commission, threaten the traditional and historical right of the State of New Mexico to regulate and control the production and gathering of oil and gas in the best interest of the people of the State of New Mexico and the Nation; and

"Whereas despite 14 years of interpretation to the contrary, the recent Supreme Court interpretation of the Natural Gas Act and the orders of the Federal Power Commission based on that interpretation, would now apply control of price and market for gas to independent producers; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico, through the commissioner of public lands, the commissioner of public lands being the trustee of State lands under the Federal Enabling Act, is the largest royalty owner of oil and gas in the State; and

"Whereas royalties, rentals, and bonuses from oil and gas on State land are the major support of public schools and State institutions; and

"Whereas the regulation of the independent production of gas, and the inevitable resultant regulation of the production of oil, by the Federal Power Commission contemplates control of the price received for these resources at the wellhead, thus affecting the right and the duty of the New Mexico Commissioner of Public Lands to receive the full benefit of its State lands for the schools and institutions of the State, such royalties, rentals, and bonuses commensurate with a fair price established by arm's length negotiations; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico, through its oil conservation commission, has pioneered in laws and regulations to prevent waste of oil and gas and has spent many years establishing a method of control beneficial to the State and the Nation, and fair to those engaged in the oil and gas exploration and production business; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico does not recognize the independent producer of natural gas as a public utility; and

"Whereas this legislature and the responsible officials of the State of New Mexico recognize:

"That the tried and proven method of arm's length negotiations has been beneficial to the development and establishment of the reserves of both oil and gas;

"That the industry under these circumstances has met rapidly the expanding demand for gas and currently supplies almost one-fourth of the Nation's mineral energy;

"That the field price of gas on a heat content basis is far lower in cost than any other fuel;

"That the natural gas producers' field price currently amounts to less than 10 percent of the residential consumers' gas bill;

"That since 1945, the cost of living has risen almost 50 percent yet the cost of gas to the household consumer has risen only 12 percent;

"That the State of New Mexico and the Nation's fuel problem can better be served by a continuation of the long-standing interpretation of the Natural Gas Act wherein independent producers were excluded from Federal Power Commission control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to amend the Natural Gas Act to exclude the independent producers of natural gas from the control of the Federal Power Commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress, and to such other officials as the Governor of the State of New Mexico shall deem advisable.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.

"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"DONALD D. HALLEM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

By Mr. KERR:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 505

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact necessary legislation giving aid to certain farmers of the State of Oklahoma

"Whereas the control of crop production or restriction placed upon the use of farm lands for certain purposes by the United States Government has created depressed financial conditions among thousands of people who have resided upon and personally operated farm lands in the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas by reason of the conditions set forth in the first paragraph hereof, hundreds and thousands of farmers, who owned and personally operated not to exceed 160 acres of land, have been compelled to move to the cities and towns throughout the State and seek employment in industries in order that they may support and maintain themselves and their families and that such conditions have been brought about by no fault of the people of the State of Oklahoma; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oklahoma are entitled to immediate legislation, having for its purpose the relief of the needy and destitute farmers of the State of Oklahoma who now own and personally operate or who formerly owned and personally operated not to exceed 160 acres of land in the State of Oklahoma for agricultural purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate of the State of Oklahoma concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby requested to enact necessary laws which will provide for the immediate relief of farmers throughout the State of Oklahoma, who own, reside upon and personally operate or who may hereafter own, reside upon and personally operate not to exceed 160 acres of land for agricultural purposes, by removing all restrictions, conditions and limitations governing the number of acres of land which each of such farmers may operate and the kind or amount of agricultural products which they may produce; that in so doing, the cities and towns of the State of Oklahoma will be greatly relieved of congested population for which there is insufficient housing; that the standard of living of such farmers will be greatly improved and industries, other than farming, may then absorb the vast number of unemployed; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of February 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate the 8th day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate."

"House Concurrent Resolution 508

"Concurrent resolution relating to cotton acreage control; memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass suitable legislation increasing present cotton acreage allotments and establishing a long-range cotton acreage program

"To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas the exports of cotton from the United States have increased from approximately 3,500,000 bales in 1953, to approximately 5,000,000 bales in the year 1954; and

"Whereas domestic consumption of this commodity has also greatly increased during the past year, and as a result thereof there has been an unexpected diminishing of the supply of carryover cotton; and

"Whereas this situation, in the absence of proper cotton-acreage allotments, may lead to unrestricted planting and possible acute overproduction in the year 1956.

"Therefore, your memorialist, the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, prays:

"1. That the President and Congress of the United States consider legislation which will permit increased cotton acreages for the year 1955, and develop a stabilized long-range cotton-acreage program which will eliminate the uncertainties attendant to fluctuations in acreage allotments.

"2. That a copy hereof be sent to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress and to the Honorable President of the United States.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 1st day of February 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate the 3d day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 503

"Concurrent resolution relating to the importing of crude oil from foreign countries memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to curb the imports of crude oil from foreign countries

"To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"That crude oil and petroleum products are among Oklahoma's greatest natural resources; that the State of Oklahoma has taken every precaution to properly conserve its crude oil reserves by limiting production to conform with local demands.

"That competition from foreign imports have a tendency to nullify the efforts of the State of Oklahoma and of other States to properly conserve their oil reserves and that such imports should, therefore, be controlled

in proportion to domestic production and demand.

"That when drastic curtailment in oil production was imposed within the United States during the year of 1954 to the extent that the economy of the State of Oklahoma was on the verge of economic chaos, imports of foreign oil to the United States were being increased: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein):

"1. That the President and Congress of the United States enact legislation curtailing and controlling the imports of foreign crude oil and petroleum products to the United States, in such a manner that the present rate of imports be reduced 50 percent and in the future that such imports be permitted only in direct ratio to domestic demand and production of such products within the boundaries of the United States.

"2. That copies hereof be transmitted to the Honorable President of the United States and to the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 18th day of January 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate the 10th day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF RICHMOND, KY.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I present for reference to the Senate Finance Committee, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Richmond, Ky., in support of an adequate tariff as a protection to a local industry, namely, the Richmond, Ky., plant of the Westinghouse Electric Corp.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution A–62

Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Richmond, Ky., in support of an adequate tariff as a protection to a local industry

Whereas the local Westinghouse miniature light bulb plant, with an annual payroll in excess of $1 million, constitutes a major element n the economy of Richmond and Madison County; and

Whereas the continued operation of said plant, as well as other like plants, is dependent on the companys' ability to retain their markets for such products in competition with such products imported from foreign countries where very low standards of wages and living prevail; and

Whereas legislation is pending in the Congress of the United States to reduce from 20 percent to 15 percent the import tax or tariff on such products, which reduction, if it becomes effective, will compel all domestic manufacturers of such products to abandon all but their most centrally located and efficient plants, thereby adding to the existing burden of unemployment and hardship, in Richmond and elsewhere; and

Whereas notwithstanding the alleged need to strengthen our former foes, Germany and Japan, as units in our farflung first line of national defense, we cannot but believe an enlightened self interest should persuade the Congress that the broader the base of our prosperity, and the more widespread and diversified our employment and manufacturing plants, the more able we shall be to sustain our overseas lines of defense: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Richmond, Ky., That we urge our Senators from Kentucky and our Representative from this district to wage a fight in the Congress to retain the present 20 percent protective tariff on miniature light bulbs imported from Japan and Germany, and that they resist in every proper way every effort to reduce such tariff to 15 percent, it being a matter of record that many items manufactured in Japan are inferior in quality and are sold here below their low cost of production in order to acquire United States dollars; and that the loss of the local Westinghouse plant would deal a crippling blow to our community, but that such loss is in prospect unless protection can be given by our Government against the flood of inferior goods being imported from abroad.

Resolved further, That triplicate original copies of this resolution be mailed to Senator CLEMENTS, Senator BARKLEY, and Representative WATTS, for their consideration and action, and that a copy hereof be transmitted to the local Westinghouse plant.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Richmond, Ky., in regular semimonthly meeting assembled, on the 14th day of February 1955.

JOHN P. REICHSPFARR,
Mayor.

Attest:

W. V. JACKSON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, relating to incentive payments to wool growers, and so forth. I wish to state that I concur in the resolutions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT ANNUAL MEETING BY MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 10, 1955

Be it resolved, That the Government be requested to permit assignment of incentive payments so that wool growers of the Middle West will have use of a part of this money when their wool is shorn rather than waiting until the late summer or fall of 1956.

Be it resolved, That we, the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, favor an investigation by our Congress of the big spread in prices between the dairy producer and the consumer.

Whereas we, the dairy producers, get only 6¾ cents per quart for milk, and consumers may pay up to 24 cents per quart, we feel that the processor is taking out too large a share of profit. Great strides in improving the efficiency of producing milk on the farm have been made in the past few years. However, we feel distributors and processors have not taken full advantage of improved distribution and marketing procedures, and as it now stands the producers and consumer are suffering as a result of inefficiency between the farm and consumer.

Whereas we are of the opinion that if this processing phase of the dairy industry is carefully and completely investigated it will definitely assist the dairy farmer.

(A copy of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators from Minnesota, to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and news releases be made for the press.)

MINNESOTA LIVESTOCK BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION,
VERLON WELCH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SUGAR ACREAGE QUOTA—RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL (MINN.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution relating to the sugar acreage quota, adopted by the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce. I fully concur in the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENT AND REENACTMENT

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, now in force, expires December 31, 1956, and its protective provisions apply, therefore, to sugar refined from beets grown in 1955 and sold in 1956, but to no subsequent crop; and

Whereas sugar refined from beets planted in the fall of 1955 and in 1956 for marketing in 1957, consequently, would have no protection from the unbridled competition of world-glutted sugar markets; and

Whereas reenactment of the present law with revision of its protective quota provisions, as well as those designed to produce a parity price for sugar produced in the United States, is therefore, imperative in the 84th Congress; and

Whereas during a period of either worldwide armed conflict or political upheaval in sugar-exporting nations, this country would face a perilous situation in meeting its sugar requirements, with barely 27 percent supplied from within the continental boundaries of this country; and

Whereas the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce has heretofore recognized the essentiality of the sugar beet crop in rotation programs in the Red River Valley and believes the American farmers have the right to supply the sugar requirements of this country to the extent of their ability; and

Whereas present severe quota limitations in the present act restrict beet acreage on established Minnesota farms and make it impossible to secure additional acreage needed for existing plants to process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce hereby urges the 84th Congress to enact legislation which will—

A. Reenact the major provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act as amended on a permanent basis.

B. Provide yearly sales quotas for sugar derived from beets or cane grown in continental United States on an escalator basis, increasing yearly as consumptive requirements increase.

C. Provide for the relief of the immediate problems of disposing of above-quota sugar produced in 1953 and 1954 in continental beet and cane areas by granting them sugar sales quotas in 1957 based on the percentage of the American market which they enjoyed at the time of passage of the 1948 act; be it further

Resolved, That chambers of commerce in States concerned with sugar beet production be urged to give their full support to the proposed reenactment and amendatory legislation.

Submitted by the agricultural committee January 19, 1955.

Approved by the executive committee February 1, 1955.

FRED E. SPERLING,
General Secretary.

CONDITIONS IN TEXTILE INDUSTRY—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received from Minnesota locals of the Textile Workers Union of America a number

of communications which refer to a resolution adopted at the 16th convention of the CIO, which was held at Los Angeles, Calif., last December. The resolution relates to the textile industry, and sets forth certain recommendations with respect to alleviating depressed conditions in that industry.

I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one of the communications which is signed by the president and by the secretary of the Twin City joint board, Textile Workers Union of America, and the resolution adopted last December by the CIO.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWIN CITY JOINT BOARD,
TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
Minneapolis, Minn, February 16, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed herewith, is a copy of a resolution which was passed at the national CIO convention at Los Angeles, Calif., December 6 to 10, 1954.

This resolution puts forth the depressing plight which grips the textile industry in the United States and is causing great hardship to all people who are depending on this industry for a living.

The members of Twin City joint board, TWUA, most earnestly ask you to do all in your power to have the proper agencies of our Government carry out the suggestions to investigate this situation, and as a result we feel a remedy will be worked out which will bring relief to the textile industry and cause reemployment of thousands of workers who are now unnecessarily unemployed.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR GUSTAFSON,
President, Twin City Joint Board.
ANNA VANUSEK,
Secretary, Twin City Joint Board.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY PROBLEMS

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT 16TH CONVENTION OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., DECEMBER 6–10, 1954

The textile industry preceded the rest of the American economy in the descent to mass unemployment and suffering. Today some 300,000 textile workers are idle, more than 50,000 as a result of permanent mill closings during the last 2 years. Several hundred thousand are working part time. Employment is less than in 1932. Thousands have exhausted unemployment-compensation benefits and have been forced onto local relief rolls. The depression in the industry has caused widespread hardship in textile communities throughout the country.

The plight of the industry is due to the failure of managements to fulfill their responsibilities to their customers and workers. Fabric and apparel design has not kept pace with the changing living habits of American consumers. Instead of fashioning materials to whet the appetites of the new suburbanites, the bills have continued to produce fabrics designed for more formal urban living. There is a dearth of fabric and apparel designs suitable for this era of the long, casual weekend, backyard sports, TV-viewing and the home workshop. Expenditures on advertising and sales promotion have been woefully inadequate. Research is needed on the potentialities of textiles for new industrial applications as well as for expansion of old uses.

Consumer per capita expenditures on apparel have not increased in proportion to the rise in total consumer spending because the textile industry has not moved to maintain its position in the consumer market. Employers have resigned themselves to shrinking the industry's capacity without consideration for their public responsibilities. Some have carried their irresponsibility to the point of capitalizing on tax loopholes and local government subsidies to reap financial gain by closing their plants. The welfare of the workers and the community has been ignored in the ruthless drive of a few men to profit from the low-tax rate applicable to gains from the sale of capital asets. Others have exploited the industry-hungry towns which used their tax-exempt authority to float municipal bonds to pay for new plants and equipment.

Many companies were forced out of business because of their failure to reinvest the excessive profit earned during previous boom periods. Others were unable to compete in a buyers' market because they lacked enterprising management. Their inability to keep pace with new methods, style changes and merchandising developments made their demise inevitable.

In contrast, there are many companies whose efficiency and superior merchandising have continued to yield profitable financial returns. Corporations with strong financial backing have grown through the acquisition of additional plants. These mergers and acquisitions have resulted in an unprecedented concentration of control in the industry. Some 50 textile giants control half of the industry's basic capacity.

Rapid improvements in textile technology have added to the workers' problems by reducing the amount of labor required per unit of production. Management has taken advantage of these developments to extend work assignments inordinately and has refused to share the gains from increasing productivity. Man-hour productivity has risen at the annual rate of 4.5 percent since 1946 with a total cumulative rise of 36 percent. Combined with a declining total production to an annual rate of 12.7 billion yards from a rate of 14.76 billion yards at the end of 1950, these developments have permanently eliminated thousands of textile jobs.

Imports of textiles, including woolens and worsteds, cordage and twine, fine cottons, silk scarves, and others, have increased markedly and have accentuated the problems of the industry. In the woolen and worsted branch the impact of imports has been most severe because of the shrinking American market and the concentration of foreign exporters of lightweight fabrics for this country.

The Federal Government has abdicated its responsibilities in the textile field. The defense manpower policy which authorized allocation of some Government orders to areas of high unemployment has been scuttled. The protection promised by the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act to employers with decent wage scales in bidding for Government contracts has been wiped but by the Fulbright amendment which authorizes court action to prevent minimum-wage regulations from being put into effect. Increases in the minimum wage for work on public contracts, from 87 cents to $1 in cotton-rayon and from $1.05 to $1.20 in woolen and worsted, have been blocked by such litigation. The Government has refused to implement a provision of the tariff agreement which authorizes higher rates to protect the woolen and worsted industry from growing imports. On the other hand the Government maintains a duty on raw wool which adds to the cost of wool products without protecting the wool farmer.

It also supports an artificially high price for cotton which results in the accumulation of a huge cotton surplus and prevents the consumer from enjoying the benefits of lower cotton costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. We call upon the Federal Government to take affirmative action to stem the tide of depression in the textile industry:

(a) An agency should be set up by Congress to represent the textile industry, labor, and the public for the purpose of enforcing a basic 35-hour workweek in the industry at 40 hours' pay. The agency should be empowered in periods of distress to limit machine operations to two shifts per day.

(b) A program of stockpiling needed military fabrics should be created now so that production orders can be released immediately.

(c) American textiles should be used in the same fashion as surplus food and coal for the relief of needy nations overseas. In similar fashion, textiles should be distributed to needy Americans as surplus food is now distributed.

(d) Contracts should be negotiated with mills in distressed manpower areas to reemploy the unemployed.

(e) A systematic investigation should be undertaken of ways to broaden the use of wool fibers as well as cotton. The Department of Agriculture should provide leadership in establishing a wool-fabric library to stimulate new design and aggressive merchandising.

(f) Industrial expansion programs must be revised to locate new plants in areas where surplus manpower is available.

2. We support the proposal of the House Ways and Means Committee to disallow, for tax purposes, the deduction of rent from taxable income by industrial companies which lease plants built from the proceeds of municipal bond issues. This action would be a suitable first step in eliminating State and local tax exemptions and other subsidies to private enterprise.

3. All profits and capital gains resulting from the liquidation of mills should be taxed at a special rate of 25 percent and the proceeds used to finance local development programs, to aid workers to adjust themselves and to set up public works and the development of local resources and facilities.

4. We call upon the Senate Committee on Labor and Education to look into the use of capital-gains taxes, local subsidies, and corporate mergers as stimuli to the liquidation of business enterprises.

5. The Federal Government should provide a research organization for studying methods of broadening the markets for textile fabrics.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF CONCESSIONS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the House of Representatives of the 34th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, protesting the proposed sale of concession facilities in the Yellowstone National Park to the State of Wyoming.

In view of the seriousness and unsoundness of the proposed transfer, I have forwarded the resolution of the Montana House of Representatives to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, requesting that the interests of Montana be given every consideration before a decision is reached.

To my knowledge this is the first attempt at delegating Federal responsibility in our national parks to the individual States. It has been a long-standing policy for concessions and facilities on Federal property in our national parks to be operated for the pleasure,

convenience, comfort, and accommodation of the multitude of tourists and visitors from all parts of the Nation and the world. If States should be allowed to purchase concessions in our national parks, and control the same through agencies and commissions, it would bring in the element of politics and political gain. The end result would be a lack of uniform policy throughout our national park system. Our national parks are set aside for the benefit and pleasure of all, not for the benefit of one political subdivision.

The United States has a system of national parks of which it can justly be proud. The execution of the proposed transfer of these concessions in the Yellowstone National Park to the State of Wyoming would be detrimental to the interests of the public, the Nation, and the State of Montana.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1202. A bill for the relief of Prem Lall (Peter) Sarup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER (for himself, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BENDER):

S. 1203. A bill to authorize construction of certain flood-control improvements on Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 1204. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1205. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Batenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 1206. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1207. A bill to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1208. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit liability from being imposed upon a licensee because of defamatory statements made in a broadcast by a political candidate unless such licensee participates in such broadcast with intent to defame; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a maximum manufacturers' excise tax on the leases of certain truck trailers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1210. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1211. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served as contract surgeons or contract dental surgeons during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1213. A bill to provide the same basis for awarding pensions to widows and children of veterans of World War II as is now provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I, to provide pensions for widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II who died in service not in line of duty, to increase the income limitation for widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II, and to redefine the terms "widow of World War I" and "widow of World War II"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1214. A bill for the relief of Mary Ellen Krueger and Alvin Konrad Krueger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1215. A bill relating to the claims of the Mid-Columbia River Indians against the United States arising out of the construction of the Dalles Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1216. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 72 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1217. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the sale of water from Clark Hill Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FLOOD CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS ON LAKE ERIE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER and Mr. BENDER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize construction of certain flood-control improvements on Lake Erie.

Mr. President, this work has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers and is needed imperatively. It is considered meritorious and deserving of construction.

The communities concerned have been devastated over the years by floods caused by the high lake level and strong northeasterly winds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1203) to authorize construction of certain flood-control improvements on Lake Erie, introduced by Mr. POTTER (for himself, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED WORK-HOURS ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to revise and codify the group of statutes known collectively as the 8-hour laws. The bill is sponsored also by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I ask unanimous consent that other Senators desiring to sponsor this bill be permitted to add their names during the course of the day.

This bill follows up the reference by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address to legislation in this field and is a part of the current legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The present 8-hour laws, which govern hours of work and overtime pay of laborers employed on public work by the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors, are a hodgepodge of conflicts, confusion, and inequities. This bill, if enacted, would do three salutary things.

First, the bill would eliminate the confusion and inequities of the present laws and would make clear the liability of contractors to pay laborers time and one-half for all overtime work.

Second, although Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employees, for work connected with interstate commerce, and for work on Federal supply contracts, some Federal contractors not covered by the above statutes are working laborers a 7-day, 56-hour week without paying overtime. This bill would assure time and one-half pay for overtime worked in excess of a 40-hour week.

Third, at present the contract work covered by the 8-hour laws is work contracted out directly by the Government. This may have been adequate in 1892 when the first of the existing laws was enacted, but presently many non-Federal agencies do the actual contracting for work that is financed in whole or in part from Federal funds or guaranties. Therefore, this bill would extend coverage, with exceptions, to any contract for "work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or loans insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof." Such laws as the antikickback statutes already have similar application.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that we may have early hearings and action on

this bill. Codification and modernization of the 8-hour laws are long overdue. I can see no partisan implications or any other stumbling blocks which would preclude expeditious consideration of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a short explanatory statement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1204) to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Work Hours Act of 1955."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Contract Work Hours Standards Act."

SEC. 102. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages of every laborer and mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in his performance of work on any contract of the character specified in section 103 shall be computed on the basis of a standard workday of 8 hours and a standard workweek of 40 hours, and work in excess of such standard workday or workweek shall be permitted subject to the provisions of this section. For each workweek in which any such laborer or mechanic is so employed, such wages shall include compensation, at a rate not less than 1½ times the basic rate of pay, for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours in any calendar day or in excess of 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The following provisions shall be a condition of every contract of the character specified in section 103 and of any obligation of the United States, any Territory, or the District of Columbia in connection therewith:

(1) No contractor or subcontractor contracting for any part of the contract work which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics shall require or permit any laborer or mechanic, in any workweek in which he is employed on such work, to work in excess of 8 hours in any calendar day or in excess of 40 hours in such workweek except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(2) In the event of violation of the provisions of paragraph (1), the contractor and any subcontractor responsible therefor shall be liable to each affected employee for his unpaid wages and shall, in addition, be liable to the United States (or, in the case of work done under contract for the District of Columbia or a Territory, to such District or to such Territory) for liquidated damages as provided herein. Such liquidated damages shall be computed, with respect to each individual employed as a laborer or mechanic in violation of this act, in the sum of $5 for each calendar day on which such individual was required or permitted to work in excess of 8 hours or in excess of the standard workweek of 40 hours without payment of the overtime wages required by this act. The governmental agency for which the contract work is done or by which financial assistance for the work is provided may withhold or cause to be withheld, subject to the provisions of section 104, from any moneys payable on account of work performed by a contractor or subcontractor, such sums as may administratively be determined to be necessary to satisfy any liabilities of such contractor or subcontractor for unpaid wages and liquidated damages as herein provided.

SEC. 103. (a) The provisions of this act shall apply, except as otherwise provided, to any contract which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics upon a public work of the United States, or any Territory, or of the District of Columbia, and to any other contract which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics if such contract is one (1) to which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, any Territory, or the District of Columbia is a party, or (2) which is made for or on behalf of the United States, any agency or instrumentality thereof, any Territory, or the District of Columbia, or (3) which is a contract for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or loans insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof. Except as otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of this act shall apply to all laborers and mechanics, including watchmen and guards, employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of any part of the work contemplated by any such contract, and for purposes of this act laborers and mechanics shall include workmen, other than seamen, performing services in connection with dredging or rock excavation in any river or harbor of the United States or of any Territory or of the District of Columbia.

(b) This act shall not apply to contracts for transportation by land, air, or water, or for the transmission of intelligence, or for the purchase of supplies or materials or articles ordinarily available in the open market. This act shall not apply with respect to any work required to be done in accordance with the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (49 Stat. 2036, 40 U. S. C. sec. 35–45).

(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply with respect to any laborer or mechanic in any workweek in which his services in performance of work under a contract or contracts subject to this act are performed entirely in a work place within a foreign country or within United States territory other than the following: A State of the United States; the District of Columbia; Alaska; Hawaii; Puerto Rico; the Virgin Islands; and outer Continental Shelf lands described in Public Law 212, 83d Congress, 67 Stat. 462.

Sec. 104. (a) Any officer or person designated as inspector of the work to be performed under any contract of the character specified in section 103, or to aid in the enforcement or fulfillment thereof shall, upon observation or investigation, forthwith report to the proper officer of the United States, of any Territory or possession, or of the District of Columbia, all violations of the provisions of this act occurring in the performance of such work, together with the name of each laborer or mechanic who was required or permitted to work in violation of such provisions and the day or days of such violation. The amount of unpaid wages and liquidated damages owing under the provisions of this act shall be administratively determined and the officer or person whose duty it is to approve the payment of moneys by the United States, the Territory, or the District of Columbia in connection with the performance of the contract work shall direct the amount of such liquidated damages to be withheld for the use and benefit of the United States, said Territory, or said District, and shall direct the amount of such unpaid wages to be withheld for the use and benefit of the laborers and mechanics who were not compensated as required under the provisions of this act. The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to pay directly to such laborers and mechanics, from the sums withheld on account of underpayments of wages, the respective amounts administratively determined to be due, if the funds withheld are adequate, and if not, an equitable proportion of such amounts.

(b) Any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved by the withholding of a sum as liquidated damages as provided in this act shall have the right within 6 months thereafter to appeal to the head of the agency of the United States or of the Territory for which the contract work is done or by which financial assistance for the work is provided, or to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the case of liquidated damages withheld for the use and benefit of said District. Such agency head or Commissioners, as the case may be, shall have authority to review the administrative determination of liquidated damages and if it is found that the sum determined is incorrect or that the contractor or subcontractor violated the provisions of this act inadvertently notwithstanding the exercise of due care on his part and that of his agents, recommendation may be made to the Secretary of Labor that an appropriate adjustment in liquidated damages be made, or that the contractor or subcontractor be relieved of liability for such liquidated damages. The Secretary of Labor shall review all pertinent facts in the matter and may conduct such investigations as he deems necessary, so as to affirm or reject the recommendation. The decision of the Secretary of Labor shall be final. In all such cases in which a contractor or subcontractor may be aggrieved by a final order for the withholding of liquidated damages as hereinbefore provided, such contractor or subcontractor may, within 6 months after such final order, file a claim in the Court of Claims.

(c) Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3175, 64 Stat. 1267) shall be applicable with respect to the provisions of this title, and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 54 Stat. 1236; 63 Stat. 108; 40 U. S. C., sec. 276c), shall be applicable with respect to those contractors and subcontractors referred to therein who are engaged in the performance of contracts subject to the provisions of this act.

Sec. 105. The Secretary of Labor may provide such reasonable limitations and may make such rules and regulations allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions to and from any or all provisions of this title as he may find necessary and proper in the public interest to prevent injustice or undue hardship or to avoid serious impairment of the conduct of Government business.

SEC. 106. Any contractor or subcontractor whose duty it shall be to employ, direct, or control any laborer or mechanic employed in the performance of any work contemplated by any contract to which this title applies, who shall intentionally violate any provision of this title, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and for each and every such offense shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not to exceed $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court having jurisdiction thereof.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The proviso of section 23 of the act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 509, 522), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: *Provided*, That the regular hours of labor are hereby established at not more than 8 per day or 40 per week, but work in excess of such hours shall be permitted

when administratively determined to be in the public interest: *Provided further*, That overtime work in excess of 8 hours per day or in excess of 40 hours per week shall be compensated for at not less than time and one-half the basic rate of compensation, except that employees subject to this section who are regularly required to remain at or within the confines of their post of duty in excess of 8 hours per day in a standby or on-call status shall be paid overtime rates only for hours of duty, exclusive of eating and sleeping time, in excess of 40 per week."

SEC. 202. (a) Section 1499 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"1499. Liquidated damages withheld from contractors under Contract Work Hours Standards Act.

"The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim for liquidated damages withheld from a contractor or subcontractor under section 104 of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act."

(b) The Court of Claims shall continue to have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim for a penalty withheld from a contractor or subcontractor under section 324 of title 40, United States Code, in connection with any contract subject to said section entered into prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 203. The following statutes are hereby repealed: Sections 1 and 2 of the act of August 1, 1892 (27 Stat. 340), as amended by the act of March 3, 1913 (37 Stat. 726); the act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. 137), as amended by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 939); that portion of the Naval Service Appropriation Act, 1918 (act of March 4, 1917, 39 Stat. 1192) which is codified as section 326 of title 40 of the United States Code (1952 ed.); and section 303 of the Second Supplemental Defense Appropriations Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 884, 40 U. S. C., sec. 325a); *Provided*, That the foregoing statutes shall remain in full force and effect with respect to contracts subject thereto entered into prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 204. This act shall take effect 60 days after its enactment.

The explanatory statement, presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF 8-HOUR LAWS

This bill meets the great need in the field of labor standards legislation for a single general hours act to revise and replace the group of complicated and overlapping statutes, dating back to 1892, which are known as the 8-hour laws. The President, in his state of the Union address on January 6, stated that the administration would propose legislation regarding these laws, which relate to hours of work and overtime pay on Federal public work. The proposals embodied in this bill are a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that their enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

The bill would improve the present 8-hour laws in three major respects: (1) By replacing the uncoordinated and confusing series of laws enacted at different times with a single statute simplifying and clarifying the present provisions; (2) by modernizing its hours standards through inclusion of a provision for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and one-half pay for overtime work; and (3) by making the laws' standards applicable not only to direct Government contracts but also contracts for work financed in whole or in part with the aid of Federal funds or guaranties.

SIMPLIFYING AND CLARIFYING THE EXISTING LAW

The present 8-hour laws, which govern hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on public work by the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors, were enacted at different times between 1892 and 1940. The 1892 statute replaced a statute dating back to the Civil War period. Certain provisions of these laws make it a crime for Government officials or Government contractors and their subcontractors to employ laborers or mechanics more than 8 hours a day. Others, which apply only to contractors and subcontractors, provide a separate and additional contract penalty of $5 for each day's violation with respect to each worker permitted to work more than 8 hours. Many workers are covered by both provisions but there are others who are subject to the criminal statute only and still others to the statute providing the $5 penalty. This bill would consolidate the existing laws into a single statute with simplified provisions which apply in the same way to all contractors and subcontractors performing work coming within its terms.

The bill would also eliminate the confusion and inequities which result from a number of conflicting and ambiguous exception provisions contained in the present laws. Some of the exceptions taking particular work out of the laws' coverage are cancelled out by exceptions to the exceptions which put it back in again. And although the language of these laws prohibiting more than 8 hours' work in a calendar day has not been changed, there is still another independent statute that has the effect of relieving most contractors and subcontractors from this prohibition if they pay time and one-half overtime compensation for all work over 8 hours a day. The courts and the Comptroller General are in disagreement as to whether the present language of this law also gives the employees who work overtime the right to collect the time and one-half compensation if the employer fails to pay it. This bill would set hours standards for work at straight-time pay and make clear the liability of the contractor to pay his laborers and mechanics time and one-half for all overtime work.

FORTY-HOUR WEEK PROVISION

In addition to a need for revising the language for the 8-hour laws to eliminate complicated and overlapping provisions, the present overtime provisions need amendment. Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employment, for work connected with interstate commerce under the wage and hour law, and for work on Federal supply contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act. Many responsible contractors who perform Government contract work covered by the 8-hour laws have adopted this 40-hour standard. However, there are other contractors performing Federal work with laborers and mechanics working 56 hours a week without receiving overtime compensation. The bill would modernize the hours standards of the 8-hour laws by adding a provision to assure time and one-half pay for overtime worked in excess of a 40-hour week.

CHANGES IN COVERAGE

The third needed improvement in the 8-hour laws is an extension of their scope to include work financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. The contract work covered by these laws is work contracted out directly by the Government. When these laws were developed, this coverage made the hours standards applicable to substantially all the work for which Federal funds were expended. This situation no longer exists. Many non-Federal agencies now do the actual contracting for work that is financed in whole or in part under Federal programs with the aid of Federal funds or guarantees. The coverage of a revised hours law should extend to this federally aided work, which Congress has already made subject to other Federal labor standards under laws such as the antikickback statutes and the many laws providing for payment of predetermined wages on federally financed construction. The bill provides that its hours standards will apply on all contracts for such work.

Since the labor standards provided in the bill would be applicable only to contractors and subcontractors, its enactment would terminate the application of the 1892 statute to employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, as was proposed in S. 1926, 83d Congress, 1st session, a bill approved by the Bureau of the Budget. For this reason a necessary amendment to existing legislation relating to Federal employees is included in section 201 of the bill, which follows the language used in this earlier bill.

COORDINATION OF ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

Inasmuch as the proposed legislation would take the place of labor standards laws with respect to which the Secretary of Labor is given coordinating authority under Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, a provision continuing this authority is included in the bill, as is also a provision affirming the applicability in accordance with its terms of section 2 of the Copeland Act, as amended, giving the Secretary of Labor certain authority to issue regulations for contractors and subcontractors on work of the character covered by the bill.

PROPOSED IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP ACT OF 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce for appropriate reference an omnibus immigration and naturalization bill to replace the Immigration and Nationality Act, or so-called McCarran-Walter Act. The bill has for its title "The Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955," and a similar bill is being introduced simultaneously in the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release, issued in connection with the introduction of the bill, together with a comprehensive explanation and summary, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the press release, explanatory statement, and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1206) to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The press release, explanatory statement, and summary presented by Mr. LEHMAN are as follows:

PRESS RELEASE

Thirteen Members of the Senate and 8 Members of the House today simultaneously introduced a comprehensive immigration and citizenship bill completely revising and replacing the McCarran-Walter Act.

In an accompanying statement the sponsors, headed by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN in the Senate and Representative EMANUEL CELLER in the House, called on the administration and on the leadership of both Houses, to redeem the campaign pledges and reiterated commitments of both major parties by facilitating prompt consideration of proposals to overhaul and replace the existing "discriminatory, oppressive, and ruthless immigration and citizenship laws now on our statute books."

The sponsors called for early and intensive hearings on their new bill and on other proposals to revise and amend the McCarran-Walter Act, which was enacted in 1952.

"In the present state of world affairs," the joint statement issued from the office of Senator LEHMAN said, "we dare no longer tolerate on our statute books the present shameful law which is losing us friends abroad daily, holding us up to contempt in the eyes of free mankind, and working havoc among our own people.

"It is intolerable that we should continue to maintain our own Iron Curtain, against visitors and alien immigrants alike, while criticizing the Iron Curtain abroad. And the daily examples of senseless cruelty and injustice against aliens already resident here, or recently arrived here, makes our advocacy of justice abroad seem like hollow sham and pretense.

"All decent-minded Americans, if they knew the facts about present law, would join in demanding that Congress promptly remove the many booby traps for citizens, for resident and immigrant aliens, and for visitors, now secreted in the McCarran-Walter Act. The law is a mess which must be cleaned up without delay."

The new Lehman-Celler proposal which, with some technical improvements, is basically the same as the Lehman-Cellar bill introduced in the 83d Congress, would achieve the following:

1. Eliminate the national origins quota system with its built-in discriminations based on place of birth;

2. Eliminate statutory discriminations and distinctions between native-born and naturalized American citizens;

3. Eliminate present insubstantial grounds for revocation and denial of citizenship;

4. Eliminate fractious and arbitrary grounds for denial of admission to the United States;

5. Make a clear distinction in requirements for entry between (a) aliens seeking permanent residence here, and (b) alien visitors coming here for scholarly or scientific purposes, for pleasure, or for business;

6. Eliminate special immigration barriers against orientals and Negroes;

7. Establish an annual immigration ceiling of approximately 250,000 per year, but permit immigration up to that limit;

8. Require all ordinary immigration from the Western Hemisphere to be included within the annual quota limits;

9. Establish a unified quota system, based on national need, individual aptitude, and the requirements of our foreign policy;

10. Establish statutory review and appeals procedures in all cases of deportation and exclusion, and for denials of visas.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

We are today introducing an omnibus immigration and citizenship bill to overhaul, revise and replace the discriminatory, oppressive, and inhospitable immigration and citizenship laws now on our statute books.

Our bill is a recodification of the McCarran-Walter Act, preserving the technical advances it made over preexisting law, but modifying and humanizing the spirit and letter both of preexisting law and of the McCarran-Walter Act in conformity with the repeated pledges and commitments which have been made by both major parties and by the President of the United States in official communications and messages to the Congress.

Our bill conforms to the recommendations of scores of religious and nonsectarian organizations of all shades and complexions interested in immigration and citizenship, and dedicated to the free exchange of ideas and persons, within the limits of reasonable security safeguards and orderly immigration procedures.

Our bill carries out the recommendations of the nonpartisan Presidential Commission on Immigration and Citizenship, which made its report in January 1953.

We call on President Eisenhower, and on the leadership of both parties in both Houses, to help insure prompt, early and intensive hearings on our bill and on other pending proposals to amend the McCarran-Walter Act.

In the present state of world affairs we dare no longer tolerate on our statute books the present shameful law which is losing us friends abroad daily, holding us up to contempt in the eyes of free mankind, and working havoc among our own people.

It is intolerable that we should continue to maintain our own Iron Curtain—against visitors and alien immigrants alike—while criticizing the Iron Curtain abroad. And the daily examples of senseless cruelty and injustice against aliens already resident here, or recently arrived here, makes our advocacy of justice abroad seem like hollow sham and pretense.

Our bill provides full and comprehensive security against the admission of subversive and undesirable aliens into the United States. Indeed, our bill tightens existing loopholes which now permit millions—yes, millions—of unscreened aliens to flood across our northern and southern land borders, and prevents orderly apprehension and prevention of such illegal immigration, with its dangerous components of subversive, diseased, and criminal elements.

Our bill would remove the intolerable barriers which now keep renowned scientists, scholars, and men of letters from coming to our shores as visitors; and also businessmen and tourists. Our bill would remove this particular stigma of shame from our statute books.

Our bill would eliminate racism and national discrimination from our immigration laws.

Our bill would eradicate the status of second-class American citizenship which now is fastened on millions of naturalized Americans.

American citizenship, which was once inalienable, both for the native-born and for those who acquire citizenship by naturalization, has become, in the McCarran-Walter Act, a temporary license—subject to revocation on a score of grounds—many of them unsubstantial and even capricious.

Our bill would limit immigration, but would not stifle it. Our bill would permit immigration to be used, as it should be, as one of the tools and expressions of our foreign policy—meeting our national need at home, and the particular need of aliens abroad.

Our bill would help restore America to the role it has traditionally occupied—as the hope of the oppressed and the persecuted everywhere, an asylum for the brave, the venturesome and the freedom-seeking abroad—within the limits of our conservative capacity for assimilation.

Our bill recognizes that a limited amount of immigration, carried out in an orderly way, with due regard for selection, resettlement, and integration, is of benefit to America, not a danger to America.

All decent-minded Americans, if they knew the facts about present law, would join in demanding that Congress promptly remove the many booby traps for citizens, for resident and immigrant aliens, and for visitors, now secreted in the McCarran-Walter Act. The law is a mess which must be cleaned up without delay.

DETAILED SUMMARY

A. NEW ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY; APPEALS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

(Titles I and III, secs. 103 through 111, 304)

Our present immigration and naturalization laws are administered by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice, and by the consular service in the Department of State. Obviously, the administration of the immigration laws is remote from the major concerns of the Attorney General and of the Secretary of State. In fact, the Secretary of State has but nominal control over the immigration functions of the consular service.

This two-headed system is, in itself, the end product of a long series of transfers, consolidations, and separations which have accomplished little except to confirm the relative immunity of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and of the consular service to cabinet-level direction. Both services have tended to become imbued, through the years, with an anti-alien spirit. The predominant attitude is one of suspicion of the alien rather than of service to the immigrant.

For this, and other reasons to be cited, the proposed act terminates the major responsibility of the Department of Justice and the Attorney General and of the Secretary of State for immigration and naturalization, and vests this responsibility in a single new and independent agency, called the Immigration and Naturalization Commission (sec. 103).

Another outstanding defect of present law is the absence of adequate statutory appeals and review procedure. Under the McCarran-Walter Act, the alien overseas seeking admission to the United States has no assurance of uniform justice * * * no right of appeal from the decision of a consular officer. The alien who has landed in the United States has only limited rights of appeal and review and these rights are far from being either adequate or uniform.

In addition to eliminating the duplication between the Department of State and the Justice Department, the proposed act provides an orderly system of fair procedure and adequate review, by an independent quasi-judicial tribunal, of all administrative actions and decisions (secs. 107–111).

The desirability of the consolidation of all immigration and allied functions in one agency was recognized by the Hoover Commission. That body recommended outright transfer of the visa-issuing function from the State Department to the Justice Department.

Upon close study, however, it becomes clear that neither the State Department nor the Justice Department is equipped to discharge the full responsibility for this complex and highly sensitive operation. The business of the State Department is foreign affairs. That of Justice is legal counseling and the conduct of criminal and civil litigation. The best solution is the establishment of a separate independent agency concerned solely with immigration and naturalization.

The new Commission set up in the proposed act is a bipartisan body of three members appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate (sec. 103). Tenure is at the pleasure of the President. Provision is made for an administrator and a

general counsel, both to be appointed by the Commission (sec. 104).

Under the McCarran Act a person seeking admission to the United States, whether as an immigrant or a visitor, applies to a State Department official, namely, a consul, for a visa. The consul's decision as to admissibility is final and unreviewable. At the port of entry, an official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice independently redetermines the alien's admissibility. This duplication is expensive to the Government and needlessly burdensome to the applicant. It precludes, moreover, uniform and reasonably predictable application of the law.

Under the proposed act, the functions of the Commission would include: the admission of aliens into the United States; the prevention of illegal entry; the deportation of aliens; the adjustment of status of aliens; the investigation of citizenship applicants prior to the presentation of the applications to the naturalization courts; and the institution of appropriate proceedings in various citizenship matters including denaturalization for fraud (sec. 105). Authority over the issuance of visas to diplomats and to U. N. officials would be retained in the State Department.

The proposed act empowers the Commission to establish its own field offices in foreign countries, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to take over the job of issuing visas to immigrants, visitors, and others desiring to go to the United States. But the Commission is authorized to delegate the visa-issuing authority to consular officers in areas where visa-issuing is not a full-time function. In such cases, the consular officer would work under the direction of the Immigration Commission, insofar as his immigration duties were concerned.

Under present law, administrative review in deportation and exclusion cases is not assured by statute; it exists at the pleasure of the Attorney General in the form of a Board of Immigration Appeals set up by executive order of the Attorney General. Nor is the Attorney General bound by the decisions of his Board. Under the proposed act, adjudicative functions within the Commission framework would be performed by hearing officers and finally by a Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals (sec. 108). The Board's independence is assured by a statutory grant of jurisdiction and by provision for fixed terms for Board members who would be appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and who would be removable only for cause (sec. 107). This Board is empowered to hear appeals and to review the decisions of Commission officers, including decisions on the denial of visa applications.

The membership of the Board is set at nine. The Board may act through panels of three or more members. (The present Board has a backlog of over 12,000 cases.) The Board is empowered to sit, in panels, in any part of the country or abroad.

As is generally true of other independent agencies, the Commission, under the proposed act, would be governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (sec. 109). This assures a separation of prosecuting and adjudicative functions, and fair and open hearings. At the same time, the proposed act is sensitive to the needs of national security. Thus, in the case of the exclusion of an alien, evidence need not be revealed which the Attorney General certifies would seriously impair the security of the United States or a source of confidential information (sec. 304).

The provisions of the proposed act with respect to hearings are designed to afford fair treatment under clear and uniform procedures. The present law is subject to the objection that it contains complex provisions for different types of hearings in various situations affecting aliens. The proposed act provides uniform hearings on adequate notice. The proposed act requires that an alien be informed of his right to be represented by counsel. Hearings under the proposed act would be open and public, unless it is determined by the examiner or the Board that national security requires a closed hearing (sec. 108).

The proposed act would require that all decisions be based upon a record, be in writing, and state the reasons therefor.

Under the McCarran Act the alien may suffer lengthy confinement during any proceedings questioning his right to enter or remain in this country. The proposed act guarantees the privilege of reasonable bail. It would permit the denial of bail in cases involving the national health or security, or in the cases of aliens ordered deported but who have not left the country.

The Commission would have the power to impose reasonable conditions upon an alien released from custody, designed to assure his availability and to protect the public interest (sec. 111).

Board decisions, except in the case of visa denials, would be subject to limited review at the court of appeals level (sec. 110). This would be a significant change; the decisions of the present Board are, in legal effect, no more than recommendations to the Attorney General. The only recourse from a decision of the Attorney General is the writ of habeas corpus which is available only in a limited number of cases.

The proposed act gives the Commission authority to prescribe by rules and regulations many of the administrative details for the enforcement of the various provisions relating to immigration, exclusion, deportation, and naturalization. The Commission is given investigatory powers, and is required to report at least annually to the President and to Congress.

B. THE UNIFIED QUOTA SYSTEM—A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE NATIONAL ORIGINS SYSTEM

(Titles I and II, secs. 102 (a) (32), 102 (a) (19) (A), 201–204)

The proposed act abolishes the long-criticized and discredited national origins quota system of selecting immigrants.

This system has been described by religious leaders as an affront to the conscience of the American people. As pointed out in the report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, "the test it applied was not the individual worth of the immigrant, but rather the presumed superiority of people from certain areas of the world. Place of birth, not individual capacity or cultural background, was the test."

The national origins quota system has failed. It contemplated that 81.6 percent of quota immigration would come from northern and western Europe, and that 16 percent would come from southern and eastern Europe. Actually only 55.8 percent has come from northern and western Europe and 42.4 percent from southern and eastern Europe. One reason for this is that the countries of northern and western Europe have not wanted and have not used the immigration quotas assigned to them. Since the time the national origins quota system went into effect, only 44 percent of the total quotas available have been used, and 56 percent have remained unused, despite the existence in some countries of long waiting lists of applicants, some of whom have been waiting for 10 or 15 years for a quota number.

The total number of quota visas available under existing law is approximately 154,200 annually, derived from a formula of one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1920 population (excluding Negroes and Indians).

The proposed act, in establishing the new unified quota system (title II), uses the same basic percentage formula as in present law, except that the percentage of one-sixth of 1 percent is applied to the last decennial census (1950) and includes all our inhabitants. Calculation on this basis results in a total immigration quota of approximately 251,100 annually. This means an annual increase of approximately 97,000 in the total quota.

The number 251,000 based on one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1950 population, was not haphazardly arrived at. It represents the consensus of the most outstanding experts in regard to the number of immigrants who can be easily absorbed into our population and into the labor force. The American Federation of Labor and the CIO have supported this estimate. And it is, of course, based on the same percentage now written into the McCarran act, except that the one-sixth percent is applied to our present population instead of to our population in 1920. The use of the 1920 population figure has no basis in logic or reason.

The McCarran act took a few halting steps toward the abolition of racial barriers in our immigration laws, but at the same time erected new barriers. The McCarran act created the so-called Asiatic-Pacific triangle, openly discriminating against so-called orientals. The McCarran act established small maximum quotas for colonial areas, such as Jamaica, thus discriminating against Negroes.

The proposed act makes no radical departures from the traditional pattern of immigration flow to the United States, but sets up a completely nondiscriminatory framework, flexible enough to meet the changing needs of American policy requirements.

The unified quota system is, in fact, chiefly characterized by its flexibility. It is built around the seven following principles:

(a) The establishment of a series of preference groups whose detailed allocation to areas, nations, and classes of individuals, although made by the Commission, and subject to the approval of the President, is guided by a definition, written into the law, of four objectives sought to be served by immigration:

1. To provide for the reuniting of families, and the admission into the United States of close relatives of United States citizens and of alien residents of the United States.

2. To provide for the admission of persons of outstanding technical and professional skills whose services are urgently needed in the United States.

3. To provide for the admission of aliens whose coming will serve American foreign policy requirements of the United States by helping to solve economic and other problems of friendly nations.

4. To provide for granting haven and asylum in the United States for victims of racial, religious, and political persecution.

(b) The reservation of a portion of the total quota for new and self-initiated immigration, for persons without special ties to the United States, on a first-come-first-served basis for those otherwise qualified.

(c) The assurance of a minimum quota to all nations and areas.

(d) The assurance that no one nation will get a preponderant share of the total quota.

(e) The abolition of barriers to immigration based on race or national origin.

(f) The use of the concept of citizenship and residence as a fundamental qualification, rather than national origin in cases where it is found necessary to allocate visas by nations.

(g) The selection of individuals on the basis of personal qualification and need rather than national origin.

Based on these 7 principles the unified quota system provides for the division of the total quota into 5 components. Four of these are preference groups; one is a nonpreference group, the so-called newcomer group.

The four preference groups, and the percentage range of the portion of the total of the quota allocated to each are:

1. Family unification: Not less than 25 percent nor more than 35 percent.
2. Occupational: Not less than 5 percent nor more than 10 percent.
3. Asylum: Not less than 15 percent nor more than 25 percent.
4. National interest: Not less than 20 percent nor more than 25 percent.

The newcomer group is allocated a minimum percentage of 20 percent of the total, plus such additional amounts as are not allocated to the four preference groups.

This is the total limit provided for quota immigration—the ceiling—adjustable every 10 years on the basis of the decennial census.

All quota allocations are required to come within this total limit. But the present deceptive system whereby a large proportion of the total available quota remains unused is abolished. As long as there are would-be immigrants who qualify and desire to come, the quota remains available. Unused quota visas are made available for use in the succeeding year.

For years some of the apologists for the national origins quota system have defended it—even while conceding its national and racial bias—with the argument that no better plan or system had been worked out and was available.

The unified quota system, as formulated in the proposed act, is such a plan. It sweeps away racial and national discrimination, substituting a scheme which assures a regulated and controlled flow of immigration from those areas of the world which logically look to the United States as a haven, and which are capable of contributing useful citizenship material to this country. The proposed act grants the Commission the necessary leeway to adjust immigration to actual needs; but statutory guides are laid down designed to insure a fair and equitable distribution of immigration, and a varied flow.

A major feature of the proposed act is its consolidation, within the quota, of all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This has been done in order to put all foreign countries on the same basis consistent with the best interests and needs of the United States. Thus the proposed act does not give nonquota status, as present law does, to aliens born in the Western Hemisphere, with the right to immigrate to the United States without limitation as to number.

Under the proposed law, all immigrants, except those in special classes defined as nonquota, will be required to qualify for 1 of the 5 groups, already described, into which the total annual quota is divided.

The first and largest of the five groups, the family unification preference group, includes the blood relatives of citizens of the United States, and the spouses and blood relatives of resident aliens—in both cases through the third degree of consanguinity as computed under civil law (sec. 202 (a)).

The occupational preference group (sec. 202 (b)) includes persons whose admission is especially advantageous to the United States because of their education, technical training and skill and ability to contribute to the national security, health, and welfare.

The asylum preference group (sec. 202 (c)) includes persons oppressed or persecuted because of their race, color, creed, national origin, or opposition to totalitarianism. This preference group will provide a special priority for 2,500 war, occupation or refugee orphans (as defined in sec. 102 (a) (32); also see the special section of this summary, p. 14, dealing with children and orphans).

The national interest preference group (sec. 202 (d)) is designed specifically to advance the foreign-policy interests of the United States by strengthening those areas of the free world whose acute political and economic problems may be alleviated by some emigration. This preference group will also include a priority for orphans.

Finally, the newcomer group (sec. 202 (e)) will consist of aliens who do not qualify for admission under any of the preference groups, but who desire to immigrate to the United States, and who possess all the other qualifications which are required of quota immigrants. The basis of the admission of qualified aliens in the newcomer group is first-come-first-served (sec. 204).

Annual allocations of the total quota among the five groups are to be made by the Commission, subject to the approval of the President. Any unused quota visas are to be reallocated from year to year among other groups (sec. 203).

Although priority in the issuance of visas within the newcomer group is to be determined in the order of application, it is provided that one-half of 1 percent of the number of visas assigned annually to the newcomer group shall be assigned to each nation having a population of 200,000 or more. This provision assures each nation with a population of 200,000 or more of an annual newcomer quota of no less than 250 visas (sec. 204 (c)).

It is further provided that no more than 10 percent of the newcomer group shall be assigned to any one nation. Inasmuch as the minimum in the newcomer group (20 percent of the total) would be about 50,000 annually, the maximum for any nation under such an arrangement would be 5,000. This figure could increase somewhat in proportion to the additions to the newcomer group authorized by the Commission and approved by the President.

A nation, as used in this connection, is defined to mean a colony, a possession or a dependency, all of which are given similar status. But the Commission is given the power to group individual nations into a single quota area (sec. 204 (c)). (See chart.)

Another major feature of the proposed act, to be considered in connection with the unified quota system, is the provision dealing with nonquota immigration. The McCarran Act adopted the main features of pre-McCarran law, except for a new grant of nonquota status to husbands as well as wives of United States citizens, while at the same time withdrawing nonquota status from college and university professors. Under the terms of the proposed act, professors coming to the United States to teach at acknowledged colleges, universities, etc., are restored to their traditional nonquota status.

The unified quota system based on one-sixth of 1 percent of the 1950 United States Census (150 million) provides for the annual issuance of 250,000 immigration visas to be allocated as follows:

Family unification preference, 25 to 35 percent—62,000 to 87,000 visas	Occupation preference, 5 to 10 percent—12,000 to 25,000 visas	Asylum preference, 15 to 25 percent—37,000 to 62,000 visas	National interest preference, 20 to 25 percent—50,000 to 62,000 visas	Newcomer group, 20 percent—50,000 visas
1. Children [1] 2. Parents [1] 3. Grandparents 4. Brothers and sisters 5. Uncles and aunts 6. Other close relatives —of citizens and resident aliens.	Persons especially selected because of their— 1. Special skills. 2. Technical knowledge. 3. Education. 4. Potential contribution to national security. The Commission to consult with Secretaries of State, Defense, Commerce, and Labor in making allocations.	1. Persons threatened with persecution or oppression. 2. Refugees from persecution or oppression. 3. May include up to 2,500 visas for orphans.	1. Visas to be allocated to areas of the world to alleviate acute political and economic problems. 2. May include "surplus population" and persons displaced by war or its aftermath. 3. Allocated after consultation with Secretaries of State and other Government agencies. 4. May include up to 2,500 visas for orphans.	1. To be allocated on first-come, first-served basis throughout the world. 2. Designed to take care of general immigration. 3. Every nation of the world over 200,000 population assured one half of 1 percent of visas in this group. 4. No nation can be issued more than 10 percent of visas in this group. 5. Nations geographically or culturally related may be grouped as one "nation."

[1] Children of citizens, and parents of resident citizens would be nonquota immigrants.

Unused quota visas occurring at the end of each year may be allocated to the various groups for the following year under rules and regulations of the Commission.
All immigrants under the unified quota system would be required to meet the health, education, economic, security, and other standards of the basic immigration laws.

In addition—and this is a vital feature—a nonquota status is given to parents as well as to children and spouses of American citizens (sec. 102 (a) (19) (A)).

At the same time that nonquota status is given to parents of American citizens, the proposed act deprives aliens born in the Western Hemisphere of their nonquota status, as already described.

The effect of these changes is to confine the nonquota status to very special classes of immigrants—children, spouses, and parents of citizens, professors, ministers, and 1 or 2 other technical categories—and to place all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere, under the quota system.

Under present and preexisting law it is theoretically possible for all the 130 million natives of Latin America to apply for immigration to the United States without numerical restriction. The fact that immigration from Western Hemisphere nations has been kept within manageable limits in the past has been due largely to arbitrary refusal by consular officials to grant more than a limited number of visas in each country. Such a procedure is obviously unjustified in law and discriminatory in practice. The nonquota status for natives of the Western Hemisphere has thus been largely mythical rather than actual. Under the terms of the proposed act, Western Hemisphere nations would fare better than under the present nonquota status but would at the same time be placed on the same footing with all other nations, subject to the total numerical limitations and to all the other qualifications of quota immigration.

The abolition of the national origins quota system and of national quotas per se results in the wiping out of existing mortgages on the quotas of many small countries—mortgages left over from the operations of the Displaced Persons Act. Under that act, displaced persons who were admitted to this country were charged against the future quotas of the countries in which the aliens happened to be born. The practical result was to cut in half the future quotas of these countries. In the case of Latvia, for instance,

one-half of its quota is used up until the year 2274; in the case of Estonia, until 2146; in the case of Poland, until 2000; in the case of Yugoslavia, until 2014; in the case of Turkey, until 1964. With the termination of the national origins quota system all these mortgages are brought to an end and immigration would begin, after the enactment of the proposed act, with a fresh start.

The proposed act would, in general, enable the United States to make its contribution toward a solution of European population and refugee problems, without the necessity of repeated emergency measures. The proposed act is designed to establish a permanent immigration policy based on world conditions which show no likelihood of alleviation for a long time to come.

The enactment of the proposed act will bring renewed hope to hopeless, persecuted, and distressed people in many lands. Enlightened immigration policies adopted by the United States will provide leadership for other countries which can absorb immigration. Millions of victims of war and of the aftermath of war may thus find opportunity for rehabilitation, to the benefit of the entire free world.

C. SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR CHILDREN, ADOPTED CHILDREN, AND ORPHANS

(Titles I, II, and III, secs. 102 (a) (32), 202 (c), (d), and 303 (c))

The proposed act gives special attention to children—natural-born, adopted, and orphans. The proposed act facilitates the admission into the United States of alien children of American citizens and of resident aliens, treating adopted children on the same footing as natural-born children.

In recent years there have been many appeals by both private and public agencies, and by thousands of individual citizens, for special legislation to permit alien orphans to be admitted to the United States for adoption.

There has also been a demand for legislation permitting orphans who are adopted abroad by our citizens, especially by our GI's, to be brought back to this country without securing in almost every case, as is now required, the enactment of a private bill.

And finally there has been increased agitation for "doing something" about the many illegitimate children, born abroad to GI fathers—children whose mothers cannot care for them, and who could be made available for adoption by childless couples in the United States.

All these demands have been met in the proposed act by a series of special provisions dealing with adopted children and with orphans.

The proposed act provides, in the first place, that children adopted abroad by American citizens shall be considered as nonquota immigrants, the same as natural-born children, and be admitted freely without being charged to any quota.

The proposed act then makes special provision for the annual entry of up to 5,000 war, refugee, or occupation orphans (as defined in sec. 102 (a) (32)). This is accomplished by providing a priority within the asylum preference group (sec. 202 (c)) and within the national interest preference group (sec. 202 (d)), for 2,500 orphans each, annually.

Thus permanent statutory authority is provided to allow the admission of 5,000 orphans annually—if that many are demanded for adoption and qualify. This should do much to eliminate the flourishing "black market" in babies, and at the same time help solve a critical social problem in many countries of Western Europe.

"War, occupation, or refugee orphans" are defined (sec. 102 (a) (32)) as children under 10 years of age who have been orphaned by the death or disappearance of both parents, or who have been abandoned or deserted by, or separated and lost from both parents. The definition also includes a child who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of the other parent where there is reasonable ground to believe that such other parent was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States. If the remaining parent is unable to care for the child and agrees to release the child for immigration and adoption, the child can be admitted into the United States for adoption.

All these orphans must be coming either to be adopted by American citizens or alien residents, on the basis of assurances given by such citizens or residents, or be coming under the sponsorship of a public or private agency approved by the Commission, with assurances that adoption or guardianship proceedings will be initiated for such orphans.

The provisions of the proposed act and the rules and regulations to be adopted by the Commission would adequately protect not only the American families who might wish to adopt these orphans, but would also protect the orphans' health and safety.

The McCarran-Walter Act makes no provision for an infant child whose birth occurs at a time when it is inconvenient or impossible for the parents to obtain the proper documents necessary for the child's admittance into the United States. Sometimes the children are born en route to the United States, or are born prematurely during a vacation trip to Canada or Mexico. The proposed act (sec. 303 (c)) would prevent the exclusion of any child under 1 year of age accompanied by his parents, one or both of whom are citizens of the United States. This protection would also extend to a child under 1 year of age who has been born to alien parents after their visa or reentry permit has been issued. These safeguards are designed to prevent arbitrary barring of infant children from admission into the United States with their parents.

D. SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR VICTIMS OF PERSECUTION; THE GRANTING OF ASYLUM

(Titles I, II, and III, secs. 102 (a) (18) (B) (vi), 202, 302 (a) (4))

One of the new features of the proposed act is a series of special provisions designed to translate into legislative effect the traditional United States policy of providing asylum for victims of political, racial, and religious persecution.

This undertaking is reflected, first, in the basic quota provisions (sec. 202), in which one of the preference groups is reserved for persecutees as defined (in sec. 202): "persons whose coming will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, national origin, color, religion, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship."

An additional innovation of the proposed act is an arrangement whereby the Secretary of State is given authority to certify for temporary admission into this country "executive, legislative, or judicial officials or leaders of national opinion of any foreign state who seek political asylum in the United States." [Sec. 102 (a) (18) (B) (vi).] This provision requires the Secretary of State to certify that the admission of such persons is "in the interest of the United States." Under these terms, officials of foreign governments who escape, for instance, from behind the Iron Curtain or are forced to flee from a Latin American country because of an armed uprising, may be granted, on the certification of the Secretary of State, temporary haven in the United States as nonimmigrant visitors. Thus, the United States will be able to provide political asylum as Switzerland does.

In regard to this special class of refugees, there is no fixed requirement that they must satisfy all the standards established for other immigrants or even nonimmigrants. All such requirements may be waived at the discretion of the Secretary of State if the Secretary of State finds that the entry of these individuals is in the interest of the United States.

A further provision dealing with asylum from persecution (sec. 302 (a) (4)) authorizes the Commission to grant to a person fleeing for his life from political, religious, or racial persecution special permission to enter the United States, even though he may not have a visa. Such a fugitive must be otherwise eligible, in all respects, to receive a visa, and must have been unable to obtain the visa because he fled in imminent danger of his life from political, racial, or religious persecution.

E. NONIMMIGRANTS

(Titles I and III, secs. 102 (a) (18), 305)

With respect to various classes of nonimmigrants, such as visitors, diplomats, students, and treaty merchants (sec. 102 (a) (18)), it has always been necessary to vest power to waive what might otherwise be grounds for exclusion. Under the proposed act that power is vested in the Commission (sec. 305) in regard to all aliens except those in diplomatic categories (102 (a) (18) (A), (B), and (C)) who receive their visas at the direction of the Secretary of State. Waivers may be granted on such terms and conditions as the Commission deems appropriate to protect the national health and security, and all waivers of more than 30 days' duration must be reported annually to Congress.

The McCarran-Walter Act has been administered as though there were no logical basis for differentiation between an immigrant for permanent residence and a visitor seeking to enter the United States for business or for pleasure; or to lecture, to take part in a scientific seminar or conference, or a gathering of scholars or artists or for consultation with other specialists in the sciences or the arts.

Scientific research in a variety of fields, for instance, has suffered significantly in the United States, because of the inability of foreign scientists and scholars to enter after being invited here to attend such meetings and conferences. Many international conferences on science and technology which might otherwise be held in this country are now being scheduled elsewhere, to our great loss in scientific knowledge, business, and prestige.

Admission for permanent residence is properly denied to actual or potential subversives, but the privilege of even a temporary visit to the United States is now also being denied in the cases of persons whose political thinking appears to deviate in any marked way from orthodox political concepts. Were such a criterion to be applied on a reciprocal basis by other countries, no American citizen devoted to the principles of free speech, free press, and free worship would be admissible even as a tourist to totalitarian countries or to any countries with basic political concepts different from our own.

The purpose of the waiver provision in the proposed act is to restore reason and flexibility in the case of the nonimmigrant, subject only to measures necessary for the protection of the national health and security.

F. ENTRY, EXCLUSION AND DEPORTATION OF ALIENS: PROVISIONS TO PROMOTE THE SECURITY AND WELFARE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Titles I, III, and IV, secs. 102 (a) (15), 102 (a) (28), 301, 302, 323, 333–336, 341 et. seq., 361 et seq., 367, 413, 414, and 422)

One of the major goals of the proposed act is to eliminate discriminatory and unnecessarily harsh provisions contained in the McCarran-Walter Act relating to exclusion and deportation; to guard against abuse of administrative discretion; and to provide adequate safeguards against the admission or

retention in the United States of subversives or other undesirable aliens. This objective is sought to be achieved in various sections of title III.

It is recognized that the American people rightly desire that our immigration laws contain all provisions necessary to insure us against infiltration by subversive elements. Self-defense and common sense require that every possible and reasonable precaution be taken to prevent the admission of individuals whose purpose is to subvert or overthrow the Government of the United States and our democratic way of life. The same strictures are pertinent in regard to the admission of criminal elements or other undesirables. In the proposed act every practical protection has been provided for our national security. Comprehensive and workable standards are established so that genuine subversives and anti-democratic elements are barred from admission. Provision is made for the deportation of those who, despite all precautions, obtain entry to this country.

In fact, the antisubversive provisions of the proposed act are designed to be more effective than those in the McCarran Act.

The McCarran Act erects such a confused and contradictory network of antisubversive provisions that it catches many anti-Communists in its web while allowing true subversives, both Fascist and Communist, to slip through.

Thus, while the McCarran Act erects a Maginot line of defense against all individuals guilty of dangerous thoughts or associations, who seek to come to the United States through the conventional channels of immigration, the McCarran Act establishes virtually no safeguards against the surreptitious entry of spies and saboteurs across the Mexican and Canadian borders. Nor does the McCarran Act contain any barriers against the admission of Nazis.

The proposed act (sec. 301) sets forth 15 categories of aliens defined as ineligible to receive visas. A valid visa is, of course, a prerequisite for admission. Exceptions from the rigid standards of eligibility and the right to waive some of the grounds of ineligibility are duly provided for, where an admission would not be contrary to the best interests of the United States. Generally speaking, aliens who are mentally defective, who have contagious diseases, who are criminals or subversive, or who are otherwise undesirable for the reasons enumerated in section 301 are ineligible to obtain visas.

Among the classes of aliens most clearly ineligible for admission are those who have advocated or taught subversive doctrine, or who have been members of or affiliated with any organization which advocates or teaches subversive doctrine. Aliens ineligible under these provisions may be admitted if their activities or affiliations were terminated at least 5 years prior to the application for a visa, and their entry would not be contrary to the best interests of the United States (Sec. 301 (i) (2)).

The term "subversive doctrine" is defined in Sec. 102 (a) (28) (A) to (F) inclusive, and under the three subsequent subsections (G) to (I) inclusive. In accordance with these provisions, certain organizations are defined as subversive per se. These are: The Communist Party of the United States or of the Soviet Union; or any other Communist Party in any other country, affiliated with either the Communist Party of the United States or of the Soviet Union; the National Socialist Party of Germany or any of its paramilitary affiliates; and any successor parties to the above-named which advocate or teach subversive doctrine.

The definition of "subversive doctrine" is so written as to bar aliens who advocate: (a) opposition to all organized government or forms of law; (b) the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, violence or other unconstitutional means; (c) the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States (which is itself defined in sec. 102 (a) (29)); (d) the duty, necessity or propriety of the assassination of public officials; (e) the unlawful destruction of property, or the extermination or persecution of persons because of race, religion or ancestry.

Membership in or affiliation with an organization which advocates or teaches subversive doctrine (sec. 102 (a) (15)) means voluntary membership or affiliation when over the age of 16 with knowledge that the organization advocates or teaches subversive doctrine. "Voluntary" membership or affiliation does not include joining a "subversive" organization when required to do so by law, without personal belief in the subversive doctrine taught or advocated, or solely for the purpose of obtaining employment, education, food or other essentials of life.

The classes of undesirable applicants for admission also include those who seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in commercialized vice, who are paupers, professional beggars, vagrants, or who are likely to become public charges; and also aliens who have been convicted of violating laws relating to traffic in narcotic drugs (sec. 301 (c), (d), (e) and (k)).

Except where a charge of crime is made for political purposes, aliens who have been duly charged with committing a crime involving moral turpitude are ineligible for visas (sec. 301 (l)), as are those who desert from the armed forces or remain abroad in order to avoid military service (sec. 414).

Aliens who have assisted any other alien to enter the United States illegally are themselves barred, as are, of course, all aliens who have attempted to enter by willful and material fraud (sec. 301 (o) and (p)).

The proposed act makes improvements in the present system of keeping a check on undesirable aliens. All investigative agencies are directed to keep the Commission advised of relevant information they may gather regarding any alien who may apply for admission, or who may enter the United States, so that all such information will eventually be concentrated in one place, where it can be acted upon promptly and effectively, thus avoiding duplication, waste, and delay (sec. 116).

The proposed act is generally more uniform than the McCarran Act in its application of similar standards to all aliens. Substantially the same provisions relating to eligibility for visas are to be found in the sections relating to deportation and to naturalization (secs. 341, 413, 422).

As pointed out elsewhere, the proposed act, by creating a single agency to administer the immigration laws, minimizes the chances of cruel and unnecessary loss and injury to would-be immigrants, who, under the McCarran Act, may be granted a visa abroad by the consular service and denied admission at the port of entry by the Immigration Service (sec. 302).

Under the proposed act, visa-granting officers of the Commission are bound to exercise great care before issuing a visa (sec. 322), and the alien whose eligibility for admission is established is then assured that, except for one or more of several contingencies provided for in the proposed act (sec. 302 (b)), his trip to the United States will not be in vain, and he will be admitted.

The idea of making a visa a virtually certain guaranty of admission into the United States is also applied to reentry permits. Under existing law, a resident alien, duly admitted and about to leave the country for a temporary visit abroad, may apply for and receive a reentry permit. But the permit is of no practical validity. When the alien returns to an American port, he is treated as if he had never before been admitted, and he may, and frequently is, denied admission on any one of a wide variety of grounds. This is the notorious new-entry doctrine which the proposed act would abolish. Under the proposed act an alien having his home in the United States and desiring to go temporarily abroad may be denied a reentry permit on security or other grounds (sec. 323). But if he is granted a reentry permit, he is guaranteed a return to the United States, except under certain few and clearly defined circumstances (sec. 302).

The proposed act would nullify the effect of a visa or reentry permit in those cases where it was procured by willful and material fraud; or where new evidence, discovered after the issuance of a visa, would, if it had been known, have made the alien ineligible for a visa; or where he fails to meet other specified conditions contained in the proposed act (sec. 302 (b)).

As a general rule an alien previously admitted to the United States but who has gone abroad for a temporary stay is to be excluded only if, while he was abroad, he was convinced of a crime involving moral turpitude; or if he seeks to reenter to engage in criminal activities; or if, while abroad, he has advocated or taught subversive doctrine, or joined with or become associated with a subversive organization; or if he has for gain assisted any other alien to enter the United States in violation of law (sec. 303).

In these respects, the provisions of the proposed act in regard to reentry permits are similar to those governing visas: Aliens who are undesirable for security or for other reasons set forth in the proposed act are not admitted or allowed to enter the United States, even if they have a visa or reentry permit (sec. 302 (b)).

On the other hand, the possibilities for arbitrary, capricious, and otherwise unfair treatment of aliens is greatly minimized. Procedures are created for hearings and for appeals from adverse rulings, and all proper precautions are taken to provide safeguards against discrimination and other injustices, and to assure humane and impartial consideration to all who come to the United States to visit or to stay.

The proposed act requires the examination and inspection of all arriving aliens, other than those who are not excludable, and the prompt deportation of those who are not entitled to enter (secs. 333–336).

Nine classes of aliens who are or may become deportable are defined in the proposed act (sec. 341). These include aliens who are (1) found to have obtained admission through fraud; or (2) enter the United States without inspection; or (3) violate a condition of admission; or (4) become public charges within 5 years after entry for reasons not shown to have arisen after entry; or (5) are sentenced and confined in prison for a term of at least 1 year upon conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed within 5 years after entry; or (6) within 10 years after entry, are sentenced more than once for such offenses; or (7) are convicted at any time after entry of any crime involving commercialized vice; or (8) are convicted at any time after entry of violating laws relating to narcotic drugs; or (9) within 5 years prior to the issuance of a warrant of arrest in deportation proceedings, advocated or taught or were members of or affiliated with organizations which advocated or taught subversive doctrine.

It is provided that conviction, as used in this connection, shall not apply to crime committed by aliens under 16 years of age, or those which have been pardoned, or to convictions where the court recommends that deportation is not warranted. In addition, the Commission is given authority to waive deportation for a single crime where serious hardship would occur and where continued residence in the United States would not be undesirable (sec. 301 (b)).

No alien who has been admitted for permanent residence before his 14th birthday may thereafter be deported, nor an alien who

has lived as a permanent resident of the United States for 20 years or more (except as a fugitive from justice) (secs. 341, 342).

The proposed act contains detailed provisions for the arrest and detention of aliens believed to be deportable (secs. 343 et seq.). Ordinarily, the Commission is given a period of 6 months within which to effect the alien's departure. Aliens ordered to be deported are given an opportunity for judicial review, but meanwhile remain subject to supervision by the Commission.

Aliens who are to be deported may select the country to which they wish to go, if the country in question will receive them, unless prejudicial to the interests of the United States. If a deportable alien is unable to or fails to arrange to be received in the country of his choice, his deportation is then to be arranged by the Commission (sec. 344).

Appropriate provision is made to defray the expenses of deportation. Deportable aliens who can prove good moral character for the preceding 5 years are permitted to leave at their own expense without the stigma of deportation (sec. 345).

All aliens who remain in the United States for more than 30 days are required to be fingerprinted and registered, and to notify the Attorney General of any change of address (secs. 361 et seq.). But failure to carry a registration card or to notify the Attorney General of a change of address, while a misdemeanor if it is a willful failure, is not made, ipso facto, a ground for deportation, as such a failure is under the McCarran Act.

The proposed act contemplates that all information with respect to registration of aliens will be kept in a central place, and the Attorney General is given full authority to administer and enforce the registration provisions (sec. 367).

Scattered through the proposed act are provisions imposing maximum penalties, some giving the Commission authority to assess and collect fines, and other provisions defining offenses punishable by the courts. In addition, chapter 8 of title III contains general penalty provisions, in which a number of offenses are defined and appropriate penalties provided. This chapter also provides for the detention and prompt deportation of alien stowaways.

In general, the proposed act is much more definite than the McCarran Act in its treatment of aliens who apply for visas, who are admitted or excluded, and those who, if admitted, thereafter become deportable and are ordered to be deported. Full recognition is given to the gravity of the issues involved in the decisions to grant, revoke, or deny visas, or to exclude or deport.

The proposed provisions under which children admitted prior to the age of 14 and aliens who have resided in the United States for more than 20 years are made immune to deportation reflect tested principles long recognized in our general body of laws covering criminal offenses and civil liabilities.

The deplorable tendency in recent immigration legislation to remove limitations of time within which the Government is required to act in order to deport an alien is reversed in the proposed act. Under the McCarran Act an alien living in the United States who joined the Communist Party at any time in the distant past—perhaps 20 or 30 years ago—is subject to deportation even though he may have left the party soon after poining, and may have subsequently become a strong anti-Communist.

Under the McCarran Act the Government is required to deport such an individual, thus causing great distress and hardship on members of his family. At the same time, the McCarran Act admits aliens who, 5 years or more previous to their admissions to the United States, may have been active members of the Communist Party.

It should be emphasized that the present provision for deportation of resident aliens who have, in the past, belonged to subversive organizations is retroactive and penalizes persons whose acts were not proscribed at the time the actions were taken. The proposed act eliminates this inconsistent retroactivity.

Banishment or exile is a severe penalty, the relic of another day and age. In many cases it is a much greater punishment than any provided by the criminal laws, and should not be imposed under conditions where no criminal prosecution could be brought. That goal has not quite been reached in the proposed act but the new proposals are a marked improvement, at the same time containing adequate provisions to guard the security, the health and the welfare of the United States.

G. ALIEN CREWMEN

(Title III, secs. 352, 354–357)

The provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act (secs. 251–257) which deal with the admission and exclusion of alien crewmen have been widely criticized as unworkable and unfair. The press of the major maritime countries of the world has been filled with reports of the abuse and unfairness involved in the procedures for handling alien crewmen who wish to land temporarily in the United States during the stay of their vessel, or while awaiting assignment to another vessel.

Under the terms of the McCarran-Walter Act, alien crewmen are for the first time required to fulfill the same requirements as immigrants coming to live permanently in the United States. Arriving at the port of entry, they are cross-examined concerning every detail of their past lives and political beliefs and affiliations. This questioning is neither appropriate nor necessary for crewmen who are coming here for only a few days.

Under the proposed act an alien crewman can be prevented from landing in the United States on any ground that would make him ineligible to receive a visa (sec. 352). However, unlike the McCarran Act, the proposed act gives the Commission the power to waive any provision barring the temporary landing of an alien crewman if it determines that the health and safety of the United States would not be thereby endangered.

The McCarran Act makes no provision for informing the excluded crewman of the reasons for denial of a permit to land, and it provides him with no administrative appeal from the decision of minor immigration officials.

The proposed act would not extend to alien crewmen the broad hearing and appeals procedures provided for aliens coming here as permanent immigrants, but the proposed act would provide for expeditious hearings under special rules and regulations, in cases where landing permits for alien crewmen are denied or revoked (sec. 352 (b)).

The proposed act retains all the necessary safeguards to prevent the landing of diseased alien crewmen, and to prevent alien crewmen from illegally remaining in this country by jumping ship, or by being discharged or paid off in the United States without permission of the Commission (secs. 354–357).

The McCarran Act sets an absolute time limit of 29 days for temporary landing permits. This restriction has worked considerable hardship on alien crewmen who have become subject to arrest as a result of sailing delays, or failure to obtain assignment on another ship. The proposed act would leave to the determination of the Commission the time limitation on a valid permit. All waiver cases for stays exceeding 30 days are required to be reported to Congress.

H. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS

(Title III, sec. 346)

Reasonable and flexible provisions for the adjustment of the status of an alien from that of a nonimmigrant to an immigrant or vice versa without the time-consuming and expensive necessity of leaving and reentering the country have long been needed in our immigration laws. Prior to the McCarran-Walter Act this was possible only through the suspension of a warrant of deportation, a suspension which could be secured only in the case of an alien who had resided here for 7 years or who had lived here for 5 years and could prove to the Attorney General (a) good moral character; and (b) that his deportation would result in serious economic detriment to a citizen or to a legally resident alien spouse, parent, or minor child.

The McCarran-Walter Act (sec. 247) established direct procedures for adjustment of status, permitting a resident alien to adjust his status from that of immigrant to nonimmigrant, and appearing to make it possible (sec. 245) for a nonimmigrant to adjust his status to that of an immigrant. The latter provision, however, seems to be more of a trap for the unwary than a grant of grace. The adjustment may be granted only in the discretion of the Attorney General when, both at the time of the application and at the time of the Attorney General's approval of that application, an immigrant visa is immediately available. The McCarran-Walter Act defines a visa as being immediately available only if the quota is not filled at the time the application for adjustment of status is filed. The McCarran Act provides, moveover, that the very act of filing an application for adjustment of status automatically ends the nonimmigrant status of the applicant. Thus, an alien who files such an application may become immediately subject to deportation if, all unknown to the alien, an immigration visa is not immediately available.

This is a clear illustration of the undue harshness of the McCarran Act, under whose terms broad discretion is granted to the Attorney General to exclude aliens from admission to the United States, or to deport them, but whose discretion to suspend deportation or to permit change of status is severely limited.

With respect to suspension of a warrant of deportation, the McCarran Act (sec. 244 (a)) drastically cuts down the rights existing under prior law. Under the McCarran Act the procedure is restricted to applications filed not more than 5 years after December 24, 1952, by aliens who last entered the United States more than 2 years prior to June 20, 1952. It requires a 7-year residence in the United States, and the Attorney General must be convinced that the alien's deportation would "result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien, or to his spouse, parent, or minor child who is a citizen or legally resident alien."

The proposed act (sec. 346) simplifies and combines the two procedures and makes it possible for any legally resident alien, as a matter of right, upon application and appropriate showing to the Commission, to adjust his status. If the adjustment sought is to the status of an immigrant, the alien need merely show that (1) if he were applying abroad, he would be eligible for admission, and (2) a visa is reasonably available in the group for which the alien is eligible. In a case where those facts cannot be shown, the alien may nonetheless obtain the adjustment if he proves good moral character for the preceding 5 years, and that he has resided in the United States for 7 years, or that his departure from the United States would cause "serious hardship to himself or to a citizen or a previously admitted alien who is his spouse or child."

I. CITIZENSHIP AND NATURALIZATION

(Title IV)

The corresponding title of the McCarran-Walter Act was presented to the American people as an advance, because it abolished racial barriers to naturalization. But at the

same time the McCarran Act riveted into law a rigid second-class status for naturalized citizens of the United States and, under this title as elsewhere, vested tremendous power in the unreviewable discretion of the Attorney General. The proposed act grants to naturalized citizens full equality with natural-born citizens, except in cases where naturalization was procured by actual fraud. The proposed act makes other changes to simplify and clarify the law and to bring naturalization and denaturalization procedures back into line with traditional American standards of justice.

J. WHO IS A CITIZEN?

(Secs. 401, 402, and 408)

Citizenship is acquired either at birth or by naturalization. The proposed act (sec. 401) slightly broadens the category of citizens of the United States at birth, abolishing the undemocratic distinction between citizen and national (now applicable to persons born in American Samoa and Swains Island), and (sec. 408) extending citizenship to persons born in Puerto Rico before 1899 (sec. 402).

K. REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR NATURALIZATION

(Secs. 413, 421–423, 431–434, 447)

Except in certain special cases, noted below, a 5-year residence in the United States is required for naturalization. The proposed act returns to pre-McCarran law by abolishing the McCarran Act's conclusive presumption (sec. 316 (b)), that absence from the United States for a period of 6 months or more breaks the continuity of residence for naturalization purposes. An alien absent for less than 1 year will, under the proposed act (sec. 422), be able to show that he had reasonable cause for not having sooner returned to the United States. Absences longer than a year without breaking the continuity of residence are permitted by the McCarran Act only in the case of a person absent in connection with the performance of religious duties (sec. 317). Under the proposed act (sec. 423) this exemption is extended to alien employees of specified types of United States organizations who may be sent abroad in connection with their jobs.

In view of the obvious desirability of having all members of a family group acquire United States citizenship as soon as reasonably possible, our law has always reduced the residence requirement in the case of the spouse of an American citizen and has permitted the naturalization of minor children through the naturalization of their parents. The proposed act reduces the required residence of a spouse of a United States citizen from 3 years to 1 year (sec. 431) and increases the maximum age for derivative naturalization from 15 to 17 (secs. 432, 433). Also the proposed act extends this privilege to legally adopted children (sec. 434). Abuse of these provisions, as through short-lived marriages entered into for the purpose of acquiring citizenship, is guarded against by the provision for revocation of any naturalization procured by fraud (sec. 447).

Subversive activity will bar naturalization. But instead of the vague and general language of the McCarran Act (sec. 313), the proposed act gives a clear and definite test—precisely the same as that applied in an exclusion or deportation case—namely, no alien may be naturalized if at any time within 5 years of filing his petition for naturalization, or at any time prior to naturalization, he has either advocated or taught subversive doctrine or been a member of or affiliated with a subversive organization (sec. 413).

The proposed act retains the literacy requirement for naturalization, but restores it to the form in which it was prior to the McCarran Act, requiring that the petitioner be able to read. No writing requirement is provided (sec. 421).

In accordance with the modern trend in all fields of law, the proposed act permits naturalization on an affirmation rather than an oath in the case of a person whose religion forbids the taking of an oath (sec. 444).

No basic change is proposed in the procedure for obtaining naturalization. The proposed act does, however, restore the law to what it was prior to the McCarran Act in two important respects:

First, it eliminates the mandatory requirement of the so-called neighborhood check of the petitioner, leaving to the discretion of the Commission the scope of the investigation in any particular case.

Second, it deletes the provision of the McCarran Act (sec. 335 (d))—completely foreign to American concepts of proper administrative procedure—which permits the naturalization examiner, a subordinate employee of the Attorney General, to be represented in court by separate counsel, in cases in which the Attorney General has overruled the examiner.

Under the proposed act the court would have before it the complete record of the Commission's action on the naturalization petition, including, as a part of the record, the examiner's decision.

L. SPECIAL NATURALIZATION PROCEDURES FOR GI'S; EXPEDITED NATURALIZATION FOR WARTIME SERVICE IN KOREA

(Secs. 436–438)

The privilege of accelerated acquisition of United States citizenship through wartime service in the Armed Forces of the United States is granted, as in present law, to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Ninety days of such wartime service is required. In the case of Korea, the service must be during the period June 25, 1950, through July 1, 1955 (sec. 437 (b)).

Service in the Armed Forces during peacetime or other than in the Korean conflict is required to amount to 3 years in order to qualify the alien for citizenship (sec. 437 (a)). Arrangements for naturalization in the field and standards for determination of honorable service are also included (sec. 438) in the proposed act. A much simpler procedure is provided than under present law.

The proposed act reverts to the law as it was prior to the McCarran Act in restoring a simplified procedure for the naturalization of persons who lost their United States citizenship by serving in the armies of the allies of the United States during World War II (sec. 436).

M. LOSS OF CITIZENSHIP AND REVOCATION OF NATURALIZATION

(Secs. 447, 451, and 452)

Loss of United States citizenship, whether acquired by birth or by naturalization, is a drastic penalty. The McCarran Act (sec. 349) contains a long list of acts which automatically cause loss of citizenship. If citizenship was acquired by naturalization. those acts may include mere residence abroad for as little as 3 years (sec. 352). Moreover, the effect of these provisions in every case is to place upon the person whose citizenship is thus forfeited the burden of proving that he did not, in fact, commit the act on the basis of which our Government now strips him of citizenship.

Under the proposed act, two basic changes are made:

First, the list of acts which automatically would cause loss of citizenship is limited to (1) renunciation of United States citizenship, (2) obtaining naturalization in a foreign nation, (3) desertion in time of war, (4) leaving the country to avoid military service, (5) conviction for treason, or (6) an attempt to overthrow our Government by force of arms (sec. 451).

The McCarran Act (sec. 349) specifies additional grounds, e. g., taking an oath of allegiance to a foreign state, serving in its armed forces, accepting or serving in an office under a foreign government if foreign nationality is thereby acquired, and voting in a foreign political election. Under the proposed act only the taking of an oath of allegiance, or service in the armed forces of a foreign state after having acquired its nationality, in each case without compulsion, will result in a loss of citizenship. In such a case, as in a proceeding for revocation of naturalization, loss of citizenship would result only from a decree of a United States court in a proceeding brought by the Commission for forfeiture of citizenship, in which the Commission would have to sustain the burden of proof, e. g., to show that by swearing allegiance to a foreign state the defendant acted without compulsion (sec. 452).

All distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens are abolished by the proposed act so that mere residence abroad, even in the country of birth or former citizenship, will not, as it does under the McCarran Act (sec. 352), forfeit United States citizenship.

With respect to revocation of naturalization, the proposed act would restore the law to what it was prior to the McCarran Act. The basic ground for revocation of naturalization has always been fraud in its procurement. However, the McCarran Act (sec. 340) contains a broad definition of fraud which may include an unintentional concealment of a material fact, even where the petitioner for naturalization did not think it was material or had forgotten it. The McCarran Act also has provisions under which such things as refusal to testify before a congressional committee (sec. 340 (a)), residence in the country of birth (sec. 340 (d)), or joining a subversive or front organization (sec. 340 (c)), after naturalization, may give rise to a conclusive presumption that the naturalization was procured by fraud. These provisions are of doubtful constitutionality as they stand in the McCarran Act. However, the proposed act (sec. 447), eliminates them as un-American. It leaves naturalization revocable only for an act found by the courts to constitute fraud in its procurement. Action for revocation of naturalization must be brought within 10 years after citizenship was granted, an extension of the statute-of-limitations concept to the field of naturalization.

N. NO PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP

(Sec. 455)

Both under the McCarran Act and under prior law, a person denied a right or privilege of citizenship on the ground that he is not a citizen must seek confirmation of his status by suit for a declaratory judgment in the United States courts. However, under the McCarran Act, despite the fact that the Government may assert citizenship to be lost while the individual is abroad, the suit to confirm the citizenship status may be brought only if the plaintiff is within the United States (sec. 360 (a)).

Under the proposed act (sec. 455), the action could be instituted while the plaintiff is outside the United States and the court may, if it finds that the suit was instituted in good faith, order the issuance of a certificate of identity to the plaintiff, permitting him to come to the United States while the suit is pending. If he loses the case, the plaintiff is made immediately deportable.

O. JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

(Title V, sec. 501)

The McCarran-Walter Act established a joint congressional committee which was given broad—far too broad—powers in connection with the administration of our immigration and naturalization laws. The basic idea of a Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is a useful one. But

the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act setting up this committee are violently inconsistent with sound Government practices.

Under the McCarran-Walter Act power is given to the joint committee to participate in the administration of the act. Subordinate administrators are required to report directly to the joint committee, a gross violation of the concepts of sound government and of the doctrine of the separation of powers as between the legislative and executive branches of Government.

Moreover, under the terms of the McCarran-Walter Act, membership on the joint committee is reserved to members of the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate. This reflects the basic philosophy inherent in the McCarran-Walter Act that immigration policy is solely and entirely a matter of police powers, of investigation, apprehension, prosecution, and punishment, and is of only legal concern.

The proposed act is based on quite another philosophy, namely, that immigration and naturalization policy has much wider ramifications, involving foreign policy, economic policy, and the public welfare generally.

Consequently, in the proposed act (sec. 501), the joint congressional committee is first of all confined in its jurisdiction and functions to matters of legislation and legislative inquiry; secondly, the committee is broadened to include representation of the Foreign Relations and the Labor and Public Welfare Committees, as well as of the Judiciary Committee. The joint committee is, of course, retained as a bipartisan committee. The distribution of membership in each House is as follows: 3 from the Judiciary Committee, 2 from the Foreign Relations Committee, and 2 from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Such a joint committee, with broad representation and clearly defined legislative functions, can usefully operate to keep a vigilant eye on the administration of our immigration laws and the effect of those laws and policies upon our relations abroad, upon our economy at home, and upon the welfare of the country as a whole.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, according to the text of the Employment Act of 1946, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is supposed to file its report on the 1st of March. The committee voted unanimously yesterday morning to request that it be given until March 15 to file its report. I ask unanimous consent that this additional time be granted to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON (S. DOC. NO. 12)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 140, which was passed by the 83d Congress, 2d session, established a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton. Section 6 of Public Law 601 requires the Commission to make a report to Congress on or before March 1, 1955. As chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, I submit a preliminary report, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and also that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the report will also be printed as a Senate document.

The preliminary report, presented by Mr. MUNDT, is as follows:

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON, WHICH OCCURS IN 1957

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1955.*

To the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Senate Joint Resolution 140, to establish a Commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, passed by the 83d Congress, 2d session, was approved by the President on August 20, 1954 (Public Law 601, ch. 770).

Pursuant to the law:

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, on August 21, 1954, appointed the following Representatives as members of the Commission:

Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., of New York.
Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa.
Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey.
Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York.

The President of the Senate on November 17, 1954, appointed the following Senators to be members of the Commission:

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia.
Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri.
Hon. IRVING M. IVES, of New York.
Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota.

The President of the United States on January 11, 1955, the 198th anniversary of Hamilton's birth, appointed the following persons as members of the Commission:

Milton G. Baker, of Pennsylvania.
Edward R. Burke, of Maryland.
Mrs. Marie Coffin, of the District of Columbia.
George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury.
Laurens M. Hamilton, of Virginia.
John A. Krout, of New York.
Clark Haynes Minor, of New York.
Mrs. Margaret W. Patterson, of New York.

On February 1, 1955, at the call of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission met in the Secretary's office for the purpose of organization. Senator KARL E. MUNDT was elected Chairman, and Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., was elected Vice Chairman, pursuant to the terms of the law. Mr. W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, was named Secretary of the Commission, and Mr. Robert A. Dillon, of the Treasury Department, was named Assistant Secretary.

The Commission established an Executive Committee of 5 members, consisting of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and 3 to be appointed by the Chairman. The Secretary was made an ex officio member of the Executive Committee. The Chairman named Mr. Burke, Mr. Hamilton, and Representative ROONEY to serve with himself and the Vice Chairman on the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee of the Commission met in Senator MUNDT's office on February 7, 1955. The executive offices of the Commission were established at 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., through the courtesy of the American Good Government Society, and research space has been assigned by the Library of Congress in its Manuscripts Division.

J. Harvie Williams, of the District of Columbia, was appointed Director of the Commission, and Dr. Frank Monaghan, also of the District of Columbia, was appointed Historian of the Commission, to prepare a report for the Commission on plans and a program for signalizing the bicentennial of Alexander Hamilton in 1957, in accordance with section 2 of Public Law 601, which requires the Commission to give due consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to it.

Meanwhile, the term of Representative Thomas E. Martin having expired with the 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House appointed Representative CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, as a member of the Commission.

Section 6 of Public Law 601 requires the Commission to make a report to Congress on or before March 1, 1955, in order that further enabling legislation may be enacted. In view of the extremely limited time since the Commission was organized it is not prepared at this time to make definitive recommendations with respect to the programs of the Commission which might require such legislation. However, such a report will be made at the earliest possible date, perhaps by May 1, 1955.

During the 10 months between Senator MUNDT's introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 140 and the organization of the Commission, informal work was done in behalf of its ultimate objectives. Indicative of the intense interest in Alexander Hamilton and his contributions to the building of the Republic is the fact that several national organizations had established special committees to cooperate with the proposed Commission, when appointed.

Within 10 days of their appointments the Director and the Historian met in Washington with special committees of the Manuscript Society and the American Association for State and Local History. Both of these committees, representing more than 1,800 private collectors, museums, local libraries, and historical societies, have already submitted varied and excellent proposals which are now under consideration by the Commission, together with others from within and without the Commission.

Our heartening experience with these two prominent organizations leads us to expect equal cooperation from other national groups in strategic positions to further the ultimate program of the Commission.

Among the suggestions made to the Commission from every informed source is the publication of an adequate and comprehensive edition of Hamilton's papers. Previous editions of Hamilton's works, inadequate as they were, have long since been out of print, and are generally unavailable. The unpublished Hamilton materials now available, together with a reediting of previously published manuscripts will provide the solid foundation for what the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary called the finest monument that could be erected to Hamilton. This and all other proposals which have been or may be made will receive careful consideration by the Commission.

The Commission plans to submit a comprehensive report with recommendations on or about May 1, 1955.

Respectfully submitted.

KARL E. MUNDT,
Chairman, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT TO ENTER INTO TRADE AGREEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit proposed amendments, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into

trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask that they be printed, and appropriately referred.

I have prepared a statement completely explaining my views on this problem which I desire to submit as part of my remarks.

In explanation of the proposed amendments, I wish to make just a short description.

The amendments are designed to bring the tariff-making procedure of the United States back into equilibrium again. This they do by the following:

First. Continuing to provide for utilizing the administrative facilities and services of the executive branch of the Federal Government for the negotiation of trade agreements under standards and within limits of congressional delegations.

Second. Revitalizing the United States Tariff Commission by establishing criteria as a basis for its escape clause recommendations which also must be definite and specific and which are so designed as to insure that congressional policy is carried out.

Third. Reserving to the Congress the final decision on escape clause recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Briefly, the amendatory substitute I am introducing for H. R. 1 provides for:

First. The extension of the trade agreement program. In this respect, it recognizes that the actual negotiation with regard to the thousands of items covered by trade agreement and tariff legislation is best handled by the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Second. It increases to seven the number of Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission, and provides for 7-year terms. Since the Commission is an expert body, it is essential that continuity of policy and decision be provided for in the Commission's organizational structure. This is best assured by having an odd number of Commissioners, with long tenure, and with one member leaving the Commission each year.

Third. It returns to the Congress substantive control over trade and tariff legislation, by requiring the Tariff Commission to keep the Congress informed as to the effect, before their conclusion, of proposed reciprocal trade agreements; in the case of findings of the Tariff Commission on escape-clause actions, it reserves to either House of Congress the power by a majority vote of its members to override such findings, which otherwise, in the absence of such a vote, would become final.

Fourth. It sets up a procedure—very similar to the method used in the Reorganization Act—by which the recommendations of the Tariff Commission are to be handled. The language providing for special rules for handling legislation in the absence of action by the Congress is necessary, in order to meet constitutional requirements.

Mr. President, I submit the amendments, in the nature of a substitute, for appropriate reference. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments and the statement explaining them be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955."

"SEC. 2. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), is hereby extended from June 12, 1955, until the close of June 30, 1957.

"SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) (1) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

"'(A) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof: *Provided*, That no provision in any such agreement shall be given effect in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States: *Provided further*, That the enactment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the Executive Agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

"'(B) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or exercise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder.

"'(2) No proclamation pursuant to paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall be made—

"'(A) Increasing by more than 50 percent any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945.

"'(B) Transfering any article between the dutiable and free lists.

"'(C) In order to carry out a foreign trade agreement entered into by the President before June 12, 1955,

decreasing by more than 50 percent any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945.

"'(D) In order to carry out a foreign-trade agreement entered into by the President on or after June 12, 1955, decreasing (except as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection) any rate of duty below the lowest of the following rates:

"'(i) The rate 10 percent below the rate existing on July 1, 1955.

"'(ii) In the case of any article which the President determines, at the time the foreign-trade agreement is entered into, is normally not imported into the United States or is normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities, the rate 50 percent below the rate existing on January 1, 1945. This clause shall not apply with respect to any article unless it is identified in the list required by section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1360 (a)), for possible consideration as an article which is normally not imported into the United States or is normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities.

"'(iii) In the case of any article subject to an ad valorem rate of duty above 50 percent (or a combination of ad valorem rates aggregating more than 50 percent), the rate of 50 percent ad valorem (or a combination of ad valorem rates aggregating 50 percent). In the case of any article subject to a specific rate of duty (or a combination of rates including a specific rate) the ad valorem equivalent of which has been determined by the President to have been above 50 percent during a period determined by the President to be a representative period, the rate 50 percent ad valorem or the rate (or a combination of rates), however stated, the ad valorem equivalent of which the President determines would have been 50 percent during such period. The standards of valuation contained in section 402 of this act (as in effect during the representative period) shall be utilized by the President, to the maximum extent he finds such utilization practicable, in making the determinations under the preceding sentence.

"'(3) (A) Subject to the provisions of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph, the provisions of any proclamation made under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection, and the provisions of any proclamation of suspension under paragraph (5) of this subsection, shall be in effect from and after such time as is specified in the proclamation.

"'(B) In the case of any decrease in duty to which paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection applies—

"'(i) if the total amount of the decrease under the foreign-trade agreement does not exceed 10 percent of the rate existing on July 1, 1955, the amount of decrease becoming initially effective at one time shall not exceed 5 percent of the rate existing on July 1, 1955;

"'(ii) except as provided in clause (i), not more than one-half of the total amount of the decrease under the foreign-trade agreement shall become initially effective at one time; and

"'(iii) no part of the decrease after the first part shall become initially effective until the immediately previous part shall have been in effect for a period or periods aggregating not less than 1 year.

"'(C) No part of any decrease in duty to which the alternative specified in paragraph (2) (D) (i) of this subsection applies shall become initially effective after the expiration of the 2-year period which begins on July 1, 1955. If any part of such decrease has become effective, then for purposes of this subparagraph any time thereafter during which such part of the decrease is not in effect by reason of legislation of the United States or action thereunder shall be excluded in determining when the 2-year period expires.

"'(D) If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of the amount of duty imposed with respect to an article, he may exceed any limitation specified in paragraph (2) (D) or paragraph (4) of this subsection or subparagraph (B) of this paragraph by not more than whichever of the following is lesser:

"'(i) The difference between the limitation and the next lower whole number, or

"' One-half of 1 percent ad valorem.

In the case of a specific rate (or of a combination of rates which includes a specific

rate), the one-half of 1 percent specified in clause (ii) of the preceding sentence shall be determined in the same manner as the ad valorem equivalent of rates not stated wholly in ad valorem terms is determined for the purposes of paragraph (2) (D) (iii) of this subsection.

"'(4) Notwithstanding the foregoing limitations on the amount of decreases in duty that may be proclaimed in order to carry out foreign-trade agreements—

"'(A) in order to carry out a foreign-trade agreement entered into on or after June 12, 1955, to which the Government of Japan is a party, and with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published on November 16, 1954 (19 F. R. 7379), the proclamation may, if the President determines that the decrease is necessary in order to provide expanding export markets for products of Japan (including such markets in third countries), decrease by not to exceed 50 percent any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945; and

"'(B) if such agreement is entered into before July 1, 1955, such reduced rate may be further decreased by an amount not to exceed 10 percent thereof.

"'(5) In exercising his authority under this section, the President shall avoid, to the maximum extent he deems practicable and consistent with the purpose of this section, the subdivision of classification categories.

"'(6) Subject to the provisions of section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1362), duties and other import restrictions proclaimed pursuant to this section shall apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries, whether imported directly or indirectly: *Provided*, That the President shall, as soon as practicable, suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts (including the operations of international cartels) or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purpose of this section.

"'(7) The President may at any time terminate, in whole or in part, any proclamation made pursuant to this section.'

"(b) The last sentence of section 350 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351 (b)), is hereby amended to read as follows: 'No rate of duty on products of Cuba shall be decreased—

"'(1) In order to carry out a foreign trade agreement entered into by the President before June 12, 1955, by more than 50 percent of the rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945, with respect to products of Cuba.

"'(2) In order to carry out a foreign trade agreement entered into by the President on or after June 12, 1955, below the applicable alternative specified in subsection (a) (2) (D) or (4) (subject to the provisions of subsection (a) (3) (B), (C), and (D)), each such alternative to be read for the purposes of this paragraph as relating to the rate of duty applicable to products of Cuba. With respect to products of Cuba, the limitation of subsection a) (2) (D) (iii) may be exceeded to such extent as may be required to maintain an absolute margin of preference to which such products are entitled.'

"(c) Subsection (c) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351 (c)), is hereby amended by inserting '(1)' after '(c)', by striking out '(1)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(A)', by striking out '(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(B)', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(2) For purposes of this section—

"'(A) Except as provided in subsection (d), the terms "existing on January 1, 1945" and "existing on July 1, 1955" refer to rates of duty (however established, and even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress or otherwise) existing on the date specified, except rates in effect by reason of action taken pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1362).

"'(B) The term "existing" without the specification of any date, when used with respect to any matter relating to the conclusion of, or proclamation to carry out, a foreign trade agreement, means existing on the day on which that trade agreement is entered into.'

"(d) Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351 , is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) The President shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the operation of the trade-agreements program, including information regarding new negotiations, modifications made in duties and import restrictions of the United States, reciprocal concessions obtained, modifications of existing trade agreements in order to effectuate more fully the purposes of the trade-agreements legislation (including the incorporation therein of escape clauses), and other information relating to that program and to the agreements entered into thereunder.'

"SEC. 4. Subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1363 (b)), is hereby amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1360 (a)), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'At the time the Commission makes any report under this subsection to the President, it shall transmit a copy of such report to the Senate and a copy of such report to the House of Representatives. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session at the time of such transmission, the copy shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.'

"(b) Section 6 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1363), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) No reduction in any rate of duty, or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession hereafter proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect when importation or prospective importation, either actual or relative, of increased quantities of any product upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement, resulting, in whole or in part, from the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, causes or threatens serious import injury to the domestic industry producing either like or directly competitive products.'

"(c) Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 7. (a) Upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either House of Congress, upon resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party, the United States Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation and make a report thereon not later than 9 months after the application is made to determine whether importation or prospective importation, either actual or relative, of increased quantities of any product upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement, resulting in whole or in part, from the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, causes or threatens serious import injury to the domestic industry producing either like or directly competitive products.

"'(b) In the course of any such investigation, whenever it finds evidence of serious import injury or threat of serious import injury or whenever so directed by resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings giving reasonable public notice thereof and shall afford reasonable opportunity for interested parties to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"'(c) Should the Tariff Commission find, as a result of its investigation and hearings, that importation or prospective importation, either actual or relative, of increased quantities of any product upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement, resulting, in whole or in part, from the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, causes or threatens serious import injury to the domestic industry producing either like or directly competitive products, it shall find and declare the extent to which and the time for which—

"'(1) permanent withdrawal of the concession;

"'(2) modification of the concession;

"'(3) suspension of the concession in whole or in part;

"'(4) limitation of the quantity of the product which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption; or

"'(5) any combination of any of the foregoing;

is necessary in order to prevent or remedy such injury or threat thereof. Such finding and declaration shall be embodied in a plan for the taking effect of the action so found and declared to be necessary in order to prevent or remedy such injury or threat thereof, which plan (bearing an identifying number) shall be transmitted by the Tariff Commission to the Congress. The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

"'(d) Without excluding other factors of import injury, the Commission shall consider any of the following factors as constituting import injury with respect to a domestic article when caused or threatened to be caused, in whole or in part, by the importation of competitive imported articles:

"'(1) Unemployment, layoffs, or curtailment of workweek;

"'(2) Reduction in actual or relative wages, including reduction of "fringe benefits" enjoyed in lieu of wages;

"'(3) Decline in prices or sales;

"'(4) Rising inventory;

"'(5) Decline in profits of, or operation at a loss by, the manufacturer, producer, grower, or wholesaler;

"'(6) In the case of an agricultural product, a return to the grower or producer below the established parity price for such product;

"'(7) Decline in flow of investment into plant expansion, new equipment, or other improvements;

"'(8) Decline in proportionate share of the domestic market enjoyed by the domestic article;

"'(9) Increase in the importation of like or directly competitive imported articles accompanied by unused, but available and suitable, capacity to produce, manufacture, or grow domestic articles;

"'(10) Inability to meet promotion, advertising, and customer services provided for a like or directly competitive imported article, to the extent that such inability is due to the lower landed costs of the imported article or to payments from foreign sources not included in the landed cost of the imported article; and

"'(11) In the case of any natural-resource industry or of any industry determined to be essential to the national security by the

National Security Council, a productive capacity of the domestic industry which is less than the peacetime requirements of the domestic market for the article produced or manufactured by the domestic industry, plus a reasonable reserve over and above peacetime requirements for emergency use.

"'(e) Evidence of import injury may show that such injury exists, or is threatened to exist, with respect to domestic articles produced or sold by an entire industry, or produced or sold by any substantial or otherwise readily determinable segment thereof. Where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one such industry, or more than one such segment of a single industry, the Commission shall distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining import injury; and in examining the factors set forth in subsection (d), the domestic industry shall be held to include only those operations that relate directly to the production of the products under investigation.

"'(f) (1) Except as may be otherwise provided under paragraph (3) of this subsection, the provisions of any plan transmitted under subsection (c) of this section shall take effect on the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by either of the two Houses, by the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of that House, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the plan.

"'(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"'(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"'(B) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

"'(3) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"'(g) When, as the result of its investigations and hearings under this section, it is the judgment of the Tariff Commission that it is not necessary to take any action with respect to a product, it shall make and transmit to the Congress a report stating its findings and conclusions.

"'(h) As used in this section the term "import injury" means the existence or threat of existence of any materially adverse effect upon industry, agriculture, or labor, or segment thereof, engaged in the production or sale of any domestic article, caused in whole or in part by the importation of any like or directly competitive article.'

"SEC. 6. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 330 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1330), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Membership: The United States Tariff Commission (referred to in this title as the "Commission") shall be composed of seven Commissioners appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person shall be eligible for appointment as a Commissioner unless he is a citizen of the United States, and, in the judgment of the President, is possessed of qualifications requisite for developing expert knowledge of tariff problems and efficiency in administering the laws administered by the Commission. Not more than four of the Commissioners shall be members of the same political party.

"'(b) Terms of office: The term of office of a Commissioner shall expire 7 years from the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed; except that any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.'

"(b) Notwithstanding section 330 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) existing terms of office shall expire at the time provided therefor by such section 330 as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this act;

"(2) the first term of office of the additional Commissioner provided for by subsection (a) of this section shall expire at the close of June 16, 1962; and

"(3) the term of office of the Commissioner appointed to succeed the Commissioner whose term of office expires June 16, 1955, shall expire at the close of June 16, 1961.

"(c) Subsection (d) of such section 330 is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 7. (a) The following provisions of this section are enacted by the Congress:

"(1) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in subsection (b)); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"(b) For purposes of this section, the term "resolution" means only a resolution of either of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the ——— does not favor the plan relating to tariff concessions numbered —— transmitted to the Congress by the Tariff Commission on ———, 19—.", the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving House and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a resolution which specifies more than one plan.

"(c) A resolution with respect to a plan relating to tariff concessions shall be referred to the Committee on Finance of the Senate or to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives by the President of the Senate or by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"(d) (1) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a plan relating to tariff concessions has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction, it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(2) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(3) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same plan.

"(e) (1) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a plan relating to tariff concessions, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(2) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(f) (1) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a plan relating to tariff concessions, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(2) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a plan relating to tariff concessions shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 8. (a) The amendment made by section 5 (a) of this act shall apply with respect to reports made under section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 after the date on which this act, is enacted.

"(b) The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) of section 5 of this act shall take effect on the day on which this act is enacted and shall apply with respect to any investigation with respect to which, before such date, the President has neither (1) taken action under section 7 (c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, nor (2) submitted a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate in accordance with such section 7 (c).

"(c) Section 7 of this act shall take effect on the day on which this act is enacted."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to extent the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to establish an improved escape clause procedure, and for other purposes."

The statement presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

Several decades ago when changes were needed in our tariff laws the Congress, under its constitutional authority "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises," almost did the job unassisted by the executive branch of the Government. In those days, the House Ways and Means Committee generally assembled in Washington several months in advance of the convening of the Congress. It divided itself into subcommittees which held hearings and prepared the applicable provisions of the bill on different portions of the tariff problem. Once the full committee had acted upon the bill, which sometimes was discussed in the majority party caucus, it went directly to the House of Representatives where it was likely to be the most important matter before the House that session.

The measure, formally having passed the House, was then transmitted to the Senate, where, in all probability the Finance Committee had been conducting hearings simultaneously with the House Ways and Means

Committee. The Senate in those days generally introduced such extensive changes that for all intent and purpose it amounted to a new measure. Invariably, therefore, detailed commodity tariff legislation was written in conference, where compromise generally produced a measure that would pass both Houses.

As the economy grew and developed, it likewise produced a vast number of complex problems of interest with multifarious ramifications involving thousands of economic interest groups. Thus our complex society, as we are only too well aware, has been productive of an ever-increasing volume of legislative concern for the Congress. Limitations of time and the complexity of certain aspects of this legislative concern have necessarily forced the Congress to delegate some of its responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government. Tariffmaking, the subject matter of which involves schedules covering thousands upon thousands of products, was one such activity which, over a period of time, has progressively passed by delegation to the executive.

Exclusive tariffmaking by the Congress was plainly no longer tolerable by the time of the First World War, and, in 1916, the Congress created the United States Tariff Commission to assist the Congress. At that time the Commission's activities were limited to the continuous investigation of all economic matters which had a bearing upon tariff policy, and the reporting of its findings to the President and the Congress; it had no independent authority to make changes in the tariff laws or in their administration.

The Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930, however, give the United States Tariff Commission the authorization to investigate cost of production differences between domestic and foreign products and required it to recommend to the President, on the basis of its findings, specific increases or decreases in the appropriate tariff rates. The President, in turn, was given authority to readjust tariff rates either up or down within a range of 50 percent. The effect of these two acts was to provide the United States for the first time with a flexible tariff policy which enabled cost differentials between domestic and foreign production to be adjusted without awaiting the necessarily slow and very uncertain results of congressional attention and detailed legislation.

With the passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act in 1934, the Congress began the gradual disintegration of its control, except in theory, over the tariff-making procedure. The United States Tariff Commission in effect has been reduced to a Presidental staff agency in the purest sense of the word "staff" for its administrative history indicates that it serves mainly as an informative and advisory agency, an agency whose recommendations are seldom followed. By 1945, trade agreements were in operation between the United States and 28 countries. The result of these agreements by 1945 was that the general tariff level had been reduced almost to that prevailing under the so-called Underwood "low-tariff" act of 1913. More recent extensions as you are aware have given the President added authority to reduce tariff rates still further.

Simultaneously with vigorous activity on the part of the executive in developing the trade-agreements program there arose a growing volume of protest from certain segments of American industry. The complaints have charged that such negotiated agreements contained tariff and other concessions which resulted not only in American producers losing domestic markets but also in the demise of American industries. And as the years have gone by this conflict has grown and magnified, producing in its wake voluminous but conflicting opinions and literature on the subject of trade agreements.

As I indicated in my remarks to the Senate on January 26, 1954, I am in general agreement with that portion of President Eisenhower's statement in his special message on foreign economic policy to the effect that all nations should mutually undertake the lowering of unjustified barriers to trade "on a mutual basis so that the benefits can be shared by all." But, as I said on that occasion, the "all" must include those domestic industries which are operating in the face of ruinous and disadvantageous competitive conditions with foreign imports. I firmly believe that an American trade policy must embody those features that will work toward the enlargement of international trade but in a manner consistent with maintaining a sound domestic economy.

Our experience to date, however, seems to indicate that certain revisions in the trade-agreements program are necessary if these two objectives are to be realized. It is evident, I believe, that the Congress return to itself a larger share of the direct responsibility for tariff-making policy in those areas of intense conflict which has been generated by the trade-agreements program. The pendulum of tariff-making authority has simply swung too far toward the expediency of administrative negotiation and execution by the executive branch. It has swung so far in fact that it would cause a reasonably prudent person to conclude, I am sure, that the Congress de facto has completely abdicated its constitutional authority in this field.

An analysis of escape-clause applications and their administrative disposal will make this quite clear. The escape clause, as you undoubtedly know, was not an original part of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Rather, it was the product of extensive liberality in granting tariff and other concessions by the executive branch under the trade-agreements program and the result of increasing protest by American industries adversely affected by excessive imports. The function of the escape clause is, of course, to compromise the conflict which arises between the need and desirability of freer international trade and the need for protecting defense and certain other industries fundamental to the economies of certain sections of the United States, the customs and traditions of our people, and for maintaining safeguards which protect wages, industry, and agriculture.

The early trade agreements negotiated under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 contained no general means of providing realistic relief if a particular concession proved unexpectedly injurious to a domestic industry. Although escape clauses had been contained in bilateral trade agreements since 1941 and in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade since 1947, it remained for the Congress, because of the difficulty of foreseeing the contingencies that might arise, to make the inclusion of an escape clause in new trade agreements a statutory requirement. This was accomplished in 1951 by the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

The facts, however, indicate that the executive branch of the Federal Government and the United States Tariff Commission have not in general interpreted and administered the escape-clause provisions as the Congress so intended. First, let us examine the role of the Commission in this matter. In making recommendations to the President on applications for relief, it is interesting to note that of 56 applications, which were filed during the period 1948–54, the Commission recommended relief in only 12 instances, all but 2 of which involved only products of minor importance.

These 12 favorable recommendations were made with respect to—

1. Women's fur, felt hats, and hat bodies (unanimous, September 25, 1950).
2. Hatters' fur (unanimous, November 9, 1951).
3. Garlic (4 to 2, June 6, 1952).
4. Watches, movements, and parts (first investigation, 4 to 2, June 14, 1952).
5. Dried figs (unanimous, July 24, 1952).
6. Tobacco pipes and bowls (unanimous, December 22, 1952).
7. Screen-printed silk scarves (unanimous, April 13, 1953).
8. Scissors and shears (4 to 2, March 12, 1954).
9. Groundfish fillets (second investigation, 3 to 2, May 7, 1954).
10. Watches, movements, and parts (second investigation, 4 to 2, May 21, 1954).
11. Lead and zinc (unanimous, May 21, 1954).
12. Alsike clover seed (unanimous, May 21, 1954).

Rather an unimpressive list, is it not? But why only 12 favorable applications? In part, because the Congress has failed to establish definite criteria for the Commission to follow in arriving at decisions. But primarily it is because the Commission in considering the effect of increased imports on production, profits, and employment has consistently held that an industry is deemed to include, for purposes of escape-clause relief, all the operations of the constituent firm making the application, rather than only those operations that are directly related to the production of the product identified in the escape-clause application.

This interpretation has directly served to nullify the intent of the Congress to give needed tariff relief. Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, the author of the escape clause contained in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, made this very clear in a speech delivered to the House of Representatives on May 26, 1954. This speech, which was entitled "Tariff Commission Interpretation of Domestic Industry Nullifies Escape Clause in Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951," is worthy of the attention of every Member of the Senate, and I ask, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. (See exhibit I.)

Now, let us examine for a moment the role the President has played in acting upon favorable recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission. How close has the President followed what we must presume to be the expert recommendations of the Tariff Commission? Of the 12 favorable Commission recommendations I named a few moments ago, you will observe the following:

1. Seven were unanimous decisions and included—
   (a) Women's fur felt hats and hat bodies.
   (b) Hatter's fur.
   (c) Dried figs.
   (d) Tobacco pipes and bowls.
   (e) Screen-printed silk scarves.
   (f) Lead and zinc.
   (g) Alsike clover seed.
2. Four were 4-to-2 decisions and included—
   (a) Garlic.
   (b) Watches, movements, and parts (first investigation).
   (c) Watches, movements, and parts (second investigation).
   (d) Scissors and shears.
3. One was a 3 to 2 decision and was made with respect to Groundfish fillets.

In only five instances did the President follow the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission. These five favorable actions by the President involved the following:

1. Four products which the Commission unanimously believed needed relief. They included—
   (a) Women's fur felt hats and hat bodies.
   (b) Hatter's fur.
   (c) Dried figs.
   (d) Alsike clover seed.

2. The other product—watches, movements, and parts (second investigation)—involved a favorable recommendation decided by a 4 to 2 vote of the Commission.

In these other cases the President refused to grant relief even though by unanimous vote the Tariff Commission had recommended such action. These included—

(1) Tobacco pipes and bowls.
(2) Screen printed silk scarves.
(3) Lead and zinc.

Likewise, he refused relief with respect to three 4 to 2 decisions and one 3 to 2 recommendation, which respectively involved—

(1) Garlic.
(2) Watches, movements, and parts (first investigation).
(3) Scissors and shears.
(4) Groundfish fillets (second investigation).

In these cases, despite the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, an expert body, the President held to the contrary that serious injury to the domestic industry had not been established to his satisfaction.

It is absolutely useless for the Congress of the United States to create an expert body that is largely investigational in nature and designed to lead to expert recommendation for administrative action in areas where it has delegated to the executive branch extensive authority, as it has done with respect to trade and tariff matters. I believe, Mr. President, that where such delegations have consistently been abused and congressional intent evaded and nullified, the Congress should take necessary steps to correct the situation.

A typical case in which the devastating effect of delegating too much authority to Executive discretion is readily apparent, concerning the escape clause in trade agreements, is well illustrated by the Screen Printed Silk Scarves case, an instance in which the President refused to act favorably on a unanimous recommendation of the Commission. The original application for investigation was filed on April 14, 1952; the hearing date was set for February 24, 1953—nearly 10 months later. The Tariff Commission rendered its decision on April 13, 1953, and recommended to the President that tariff rates be increased to 65 cents. Three months later on June 10, 1953, the President asked the Commission to restudy the case. Fourteen months later on August 6, 1954, the Commission sent to the President a second unanimous recommendation for relief. Yet on December 23, 1954, the President, in spite of two unanimous recommendations for relief, held in denying the industry relief that he could find no basis of injury.

There is no doubt in my mind why the President of the United States could not find a "basis of injury." The reason he couldn't is because by the time he rendered his final denial there was no screen printed silk scarf industry in the United States. The delay of 2 years and 4 months from the date of the original application to that upon which the Tariff Commission made its second favorable recommendation saw 11 of the 13 domestic producers of screen painted silk scarves go out of business. The other two domestic producers "went to the wall" in the 5½ months between the date of the Commission's second recommendation and the President's denial of relief in which he contended that he could find no basis of injury.

These are sobering facts indeed. It is quite evident, I submit, that the pendulum of responsibility for escape clause actions must swing toward greater control by the Congress. This is a portion of its constitutional authority which it must recall from the executive branch. But I want to make it just as clear, for reasons I discussed at the beginning of my remarks, that we cannot, with respect to the general responsibility for negotiating trade and tariff matters, return to the cumbersome and slow procedure which saw the Congress try to write detailed tariff legislation.

EXHIBIT I

TARIFF COMMISSION INTERPRETATION OF "DOMESTIC INDUSTRY" NULLIFIES ESCAPE CLAUSE IN TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

(Speech of Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, May 26, 1954)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once more I feel compelled to call the attention of my colleagues to the grave situation of many of our Nation's domestic industries that are threatened by increasing and unrestricted imports of foreign goods.

Our reciprocal trade policy, in effect since 1934, has never had a test of operating under peacetime conditions. Emergencies like the depression of the thirties, World War II, and later the Korean situation, have tended to lessen the ill affects of our trade policy on many of our industries. We all know that war and the preparation for war is not a normal American situation. We also know how these periods of mobilization for defense affect our economy for the period of emergency.

We are now face to face with realities. We know that under peacetime conditions, that such slogan as "More trade and less aid" can mean only the economic devastation of large areas in our country, while our domestic industries cannot compete with unrestricted imports manufactured under lower standards of wages and living conditions than we have in our American industries.

The Congress created the United States Tariff Commission in order to rid itself of the details of our trade policies. Since delegating its authority to the Tariff Commission, it has found it necessary to write into the Trade Agreements Act, the well-known peril-point and escape-clause provision.

In my opinion, the Tariff Commission is violating the spirit and letter of the escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act.

The Commission is asking companies seeking relief for a specified product under sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Act to furnish information about their production and profits on other products and all phases of their business operations, including those not related to the product for which relief is sought.

The Commission is using the information about other products and the overall activities of the concerns to decide whether the production of a given product has been injured by imports and whether the petition for relief should be granted or denied.

This attitude on the part of the Commission, or perhaps I should say, some members of the Commission, can nullify for all practical purposes the escape-clause provision. The majority of the companies making a product adversely affected by competitive imports also make other products, and have other business activities than those for the product for which relief is sought. If the definition of a domestic industry is to be expanded to cover all the activities of concerns making a particular product, the escape clause, for all intents and purposes, goes out the proverbial window. For example, if the production of pins is being injured by imports, relief is denied because the companies are making a profit on plumbing hardware.

The whole matter is brought into focus in a case—No. 28—involving the straight-pin industry. There is a similar case involving the safety-pin industry but, for the sake of simplicity, I will discuss only the straight-pin application.

The straight-pin manufacturers—eight firms—filed on September 23, 1953, an application for an investigation under sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951 with respect to straight pins.

However, the application did not furnish information about the business of the companies involved other than that relating to straight pins. Under part 207 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, the information as to products made and business activities other than those affecting the commodity for which relief is sought is asked for by the Commission.

The applicants did not file information concerning their production and profits on products other than straight pins, contending such information was not relevant or material to the ordered investigation of the straight-pin industry. They said the straight-pin industry would furnish the extraneous data only if it were required by subpena.

The Commission decided to institute the investigation—No. 28—but the absence of information on other products such as plumbing hardware was noted by the Commission Secretary, Donn N. Bent. He commented:

"Such information is considered by the Commission to be pertinent to investigations under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, and will be called for in the course of the investigation with respect to straight pins."

On March 25, 1954, the Tariff Commission held a public hearing in its investigation No. 28 of the straight-pin industry. At the opening of the session, Commissioner McGill referred to the fact that the industry had not furnished all the information it requires under its rules of procedure. He said that he and Commissioners Ryder and Edminster felt that the straight-pin industry had wilfully refused to volunteer the data and that, consequently, he and the Commissioners "joining in this statement will be unable to formulate findings on the merits of this investigation." Although the Commission was given complete and detailed information with respect to production, sales, employment, and profits in straight pins, these three Commissioners say they cannot formulate findings without considering plumbing hardware, window chains, and many other unrelated products.

Commissioner McGill added:

"Inasmuch as it is obvious that the applicants did not intend to furnish the desired information voluntarily, we are of the opinion that the investigation should be terminated forthwith and that the Commission should immediately issue a report thereon, without formal findings, explaining the reasons for the termination of the investigation."

What this amounts to is that 3 Commissioners of the 6 on the Tariff Commission have decided against the straight-pin industry before hearing the case. They announced their decision before even hearing the arguments of applicants. I think this is a very high-handed and arbitrary procedure. Particularly do I think so since I think the law and every fact in the case justified the refusal of the straight-pin industry to supply information other than that relating to the product in question.

As I see it, the Commission has no business considering data other than that relating to straight pins. As one of the attorneys in the case put it:

"By no stretch of the imagination could it be contended that the inquiry should extend into the manufacture of plumbing hardware with respect to these points, simply because the manufacturer of pins also happens to make plumbing hardware in some other division of its corporate organization, and it is no more logical to extend the inquiry into the sales and profits of the applicants arising from their production of other products."

It is obvious I think that data on the overall activities of the concerns making

straight pins is desired for one object and one object only—for its bearing on the decision in the straight pin case and in order to reject an otherwise meritorious case on the relevant and material straight pin facts. Otherwise, why, does the Commission ask for it?

The bicycle case, decided in 1952 by the Commission, clearly shows that the Commission considered the overall status of the domestic concerns making bicycles and their production of unrelated products in finding that bicycles and bicycle parts were not being imported into this country in sufficient quantity as to cause or threaten to cause serious injury to the domestic industry. For example, in its statement of considerations bearing on findings and conclusion, the Commission said:

"Most of the domestic bicycle producers manufacture various products in addition to bicycles and the importance of bicycle manufacture in their total operations varies widely. * * * Products manufactured by bicycle manufacturers in addition to bicycles and bicycle parts include other children's wheel goods, power lawn mowers, exhaust fans, and various defense products. * * *

"The reported profits on total operations, expressed as a percentage of total sales, followed the same trend as profits on sales of bicycles and parts but averaged somewhat higher."

Here the higher profits made on products other than bicycles was used as an important factor in denying relief to bicycles. To contend that such a construction of the words "domestic industry" was in the intent of Congress is utterly absurd. It would make the escape clause meaningless to most products suffering from imports.

The split within the Commission over requiring the concerns seeking relief from imports on one product to file material on all their business operations on other products is most sharply shown in the dissent by Commissioner Brossard in the wood screw case. Here the Commission decided that the imports of wood screws were not sufficient to warrant relief for the domestic industry. Commissioner Brossard said:

"Were this phrase, 'domestic industry,' to be interpreted as including the profits of all other products such as rivets, hand tools, and builders' hardware, that might be produced by the same concerns that produce wood screws, as long as the companies, though losing money on wood screws of iron or steel, were making such other products at a profit and the company was making an overall profit, or could find some other alternative products to produce, other than wood screws, that would show an overall profit, few claims of injury would be allowed as a result of escape-clause investigations. Under such an interpretation, a great part of domestic production, article by article, might be forced to a stop by the destructive competition of imports and, if the manufacturing companies turned to importing and made good profits at it, they would be adjudged to be uninjured as a 'domestic industry.' Such an interpretation of this 'domestic industry' phrase in the escape-clause law would practically nullify the escape-clause provision in trade agreements as a possible remedy of serious injury, and in effect would almost, if not entirely, void the escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act."

The specific issue comes down to the definition of the phrase, "domestic industry," in sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, as amended. The legislative history of the Trade Agreements Act and other tariff legislation clearly shows that the manufacturers of straight pins constitute a domestic industry.

I have carefully studied the arguments of the attorneys for the straight pin applicants concerning the congressional intent and I agree with them fully. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask to have them printed in the RECORD at this point:

"CONGRESSIONAL INTENT OF INJURY TO THE DOMESTIC INDUSTRY PRODUCING LIKE OR DIRECTLY COMPETITIVE PRODUCTS (STRAIGHT PINS) AS USED IN THE ESCAPE CLAUSE (SECS. 6 AND 7) OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951

"(Extracts from Tariff Commission hearing record (March 25, 1954), in investigation No. 28 of the domestic straight pin industry)

"(Statements of: Alexander M. Heron, attorney for applicants; Congressman Cleveland Bailey, author of the escape clause; John Breckinridge, attorney for applicants; Commissioner George McGill, opening statement of hearing on behalf of himself and Commissioners Ryder and Edminster.)

"(The opening statement of Commissioner McGill on behalf of himself and Commissioners Ryder and Edminster appears at the end of these extracts from the record.)

"Statement of Alexander M. Heron, of the firm of Pope, Ballard & Loos, Washington, D. C., counsel to the applicant

"Mr. HERON. The investigation here revolves about the effect of increase in imports of straight or common pins in causing or threatening to cause a serious injury to the domestic industry of producing straight pins. The applicants manufacture 100 percent of the straight pins produced in the United States. In the questionnaire which was sent to the applicants, information was requested with respect to annual sales by the applicant of all other products. Detailed information was requested with respect to the sales and profits of applicants in connection with the manufacture of lines of products other than straight pins. All of the applicants in this proceeding manufacture products other than straight pins, with one exception. Witnesses who will testify in the hearing shortly will explain in detail what those other products are. It is the position of the applicants here that the domestic industry of producing straight pins consists of the labor, the management, and the capital devoted to the production of those pins. The evidence in the hearing will disclose that the manufacture of straight pins involves the use of labor and machinery which is not interchangeable with any other product manufactured by the applicants.

"In other words, the machinery and equipment which is used for this purpose is not subject to being used for any other purpose by the applicants. Labor which is employed in the manufacture of straight pins can't be used interchangeably by the applicants in the manufacture of other products by them.

"Now the correspondence which has occurred previously with the Commission secretary states at an earlier stage the applicants' position. On January 15 of 1953 the applicants, through their counsel, wrote to the Commission as follows:

" 'We have your letter of December 31, 1952, concerning the above-named application'—and those were the applications which were later withdrawn—'and we regret very much that the Commission has decided to ignore the application on the ground that it "fails substantially to furnish information called for" and is "not properly filed" under the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

" 'After a careful review of sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (under which this investigation was requested) and after a careful review of the Commission's rules, the applicants are confident that their application, as filed, did include all of the information properly required by the Commission's rules. More specifically, the applicants strongly feel that their application was "properly filed" within the meaning of procedural section 7 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the pertinent part of which commands that: "* * * upon application of any interested party, the United States Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation and make a report thereon * * *."

" 'The applicants feel that their application was "properly filed" within the meaning of this mandate of Congress and that the action of the Commission in deciding to ignore the application "as not property filed" was improper and not authorized by the statute.

" 'Even though section 7 was designed and intended by Congress to set up the Commission's procedure under escape-clause investigations and even though the applicants are convinced that the Commission's rules cannot modify this congressional mandate that the Commission shall promptly make an investigation, they wish to state that in tLeir considered opinion their application was properly filed even within the would-be terms and provisions of the Commission's rules.

" 'The application did submit all of the information required by such rules. Subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 207.3 attempt to indicate the type of information which shall or must be included in an application and a review of the application will show that all such information was included therein. Your letter does not question this fact.

" 'You cite subparagraph (e) of section 207.3 of the rules as indicating the type of information called for but which was not included in the application and you enclose a table indicating the desired additional information. A review of this subparagraph (e) will show that it only states that the additional information indicated therein and the information indicated on the table enclosed with your letter should also be furnished with an application, to the extent that it is readily available to the applicant.

" 'Thus, it is apparent that even the Commission's rules do not require that this information must be submitted with the application. Some of such additional information was included in the application and the balance of it was not and is not readily available to the applicants. Also such information could not possibly be put together in comparable and understandable form by the individual applicants prior to February 2 as required by the Commission's action. The application clearly indicated that such additional information was not readily available to the applicants but that it would be made available to Commission representatives by each individual applicant during the course of the investigation.

" 'Furthermore, the applicants do not consider the information requested with respect to their production of other commodities as proper to be submitted to or even considered by the Commission within the terms or intent of sections 6 and 7. The applicants have not requested an investigation concerning any of the products they produce other than safety pins. Consequently, they do not consider it appropriate to submit to the Commission information concerning their operations with respect to such other commodities (which differ from applicant to applicant). They consider themselves as representative of 100 percent of the domestic industry producing safety pins which are like and directly competitive with imported safety pins within the meaning of sections 6 and 7. As to their production of other products, which varies from company to company, they do not consider themselves as constituting a domestic industry within the meaning of said statute. Consequently, each individual applicant does not consider any information with respect to their production of other products as being material or relevant to the issue involved in the requested investigation. They also feel that it

would be improper for the Tariff Commission even to consider any such information. They feel that the sole question involved in a section 7 investigation would be the effect of imported safety pins upon the American producers, capital, and laborers employed in the production of safety pins, without regard to other income they might have or other products they might produce.

" 'In view of these basic differences in interpretation of sections 6 and 7 and concerning the propriety of the Commission's rules to such extent as they may differ from the statute, the application is hereby withdarwn in accordance with rule 201.8 (d).

" 'In view of section 201.10 of the Commission's rules concerning public notices and since the Commission does not consider this application as properly filed, it is assumed that the Commission has made no public notice of the receipt of this application and that its contents have not been discussed with any parties outside of the Commission. Since there is to be no investigation, the applicants are extremely anxious that the information contained in the application be kept strictly confidential. Consequently, it is hereby requested that all copies of the application be returned until such time as the applicants may decide to reapply for an investigation.

" 'Within a few days, the undersigned will drop by your office to pick up the application. Very truly yours, John Breckinridge, attorney for DeLong Hook & Eye Co.'

"Commissioner TALBOT. What is the date of that letter?

"Mr. HERON. That letter, sir, is January 15, 1953.

"Now, a subsequent letter which followed the institution of the present investigation is dated October 31, 1953, addressed to the Commission Secretary:

" 'DEAR MR. BENT: We thank you for your letters of September 25 and October 30, 1953, advising that the Commission has, under sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, instituted Investigation No. 28 with respect to the straight (common) pin industry and Investigation No. 29 with respect to the safety pin industry. We acknowledge also the copies of the public notices of these investigations issued by the Commission.

" 'The applicants are gratified that the Commission has instituted these two investigations. We are instructed to inform the Commission that the applicants will submit to the Commission or make available to its reperesentatives any requested information in their possession, concerning imports or their domestic employment, production, costs, sales, and profits with respect to straight pins or safety pins, the two commodities with which the announced investigations deal. All books and records of each applicant dealing directly with these two commodities (or indirectly to such extent as necessary for allocation of overhead costs or similar items) will be made available for inspection to any authorized representative of the Commission.

" 'Your letters of September 25 and October 30 comment upon the area and character of evidence to be called for and considered in connection with each investigation.

" 'As indicated in our letter of January 15, 1953, it is our view that to such extent as the information indicated as desirable in paragraphs (2), (3), and (5) of section 207.3 (e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and procedure, and referred to in your letters, relates to the production or sales of commodities other than straight pins or safety pins, or to other sources of income, it is not material or relevant to the investigation of the straight pin industry or the investigation of the safety pin industry within the meaning of sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. The applicants have not requested nor has the Commission ordered an investigation of the effect of imports upon applicants' production or sales of commodities other than straight pins or safety pins. Applicants do not presently claim that their profits from production of other commodities or that their income from other sources are being adversely threatened by imports.

" 'It is our position that an applicant's production of other commodities or its income from other sources does not constitute a part of the domestic industry producing straight pins or a part of the domestic industry producing safety pins. Also, it is our position that applicants producing straight pins only are not a part of the domestic industry producing safety pins and that the applicants producing safety pins only are not a part of the domestic industry producing straight pins. The two are separate and distinct industries and must stand on their own merits or demerits.

" 'In past instances, as indicated by your letter, members of the Commission have taken a view different from that to which we subscribe, but this action on the part of the Commission has not been unanimous. We wish to earnestly urge upon the Commission a further consideration of all of the factors involved in this question. For this reason, we shall not voluntarily supply information beyond the boundaries indicated herein. We hope that upon consideration the Commission will uphold our view. However, if the Commission concludes that a subpena on subpenas are to be issued to compel the production of this data, we shall promptly comply with such order.

" 'We wish to again emphasize the fact that all of the applicants, in each case, desire to cooperate fully with the Commission and its staff in supplying any and all requested information from their records dealing directly with their production and sales of straight pins or safety pins, as the case may be.

" 'In order to facilitate their full cooperation, the applicants would like to suggest an informal conference at the Commission at the earliest convenient time. It is felt that such an informal conference would facilitate a determination of the type of information with respect to safety pins and straight pins desired by the Commission and would enable the applicants to make their own preparations for supplying such information as fully and promptly as possible. At such a conference the applicants would also like to discuss the possibility of a change in the hearing dates the Commission has announced.

" 'Very truly yours,

" 'JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.'

"We feel that a statement of our position on this point should be made at this time. Now the question for determination is what Congress in paragraphs 6 and 7, which constitute the escape clause and the formula for its operation, intended. That intent must be drawn from the statute itself, read against the background of legislative history.

"Section 6, which constitutes the substantive portion of the escape clause, provides that no reduction shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product is imported in such quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like products.

"Section 7 sets up the procedure for administering the provisions of the preceding section. It provides for the institution of investigations and their conduct. It sets up the criteria for the Commission's guidance.

"It sets up the criteria which in their entirety revolve about specific articles being imported and the production and the sale of specific articles in the United States.

"The Commission is told that it shall take into consideration a downward trend in the domestic industry concerned, of production, employment, prices, profits, and wages. No serious contention could be made that the production to which the act refers is any production other than that of the article involved. Likewise, the employment is the employment of personnel engaged in the manufacture of the article involved.

"The prices are the prices of the article under consideration, and wages are the wages of the employees who make the article. The Commission is told to take into consideration a decline in sales; an increase in imports, either actual or relative; a higher or growing inventory or a decline in proportion of the domestic market supplied by the domestic producers.

"By no stretch of the imagination could it be contended that the inquiry should extend into the manufacture of plumbing hardware with respect to these points, simply because the manufacturer of pins also happens to make plumbing hardware in some other division of its corporate organization, and it is no more logical to extend the inquiry into the sales and profits of the applicants arising from their production of other products.

"Such inquiry is no more relevant to the determination of the effect of the importation of straight pins upon domestic producers of safety pins than would be an inquiry into the employment of the husbands and wives, the spouses or members of the families of the employees engaged in the operation of the machinery which produces the safety pins.

"Aside from the minor purposes of raising revenue, tariff acts have represented primarily that degree of protection which Congress concluded should be afforded to the American production of each article or product which was named in the tariff and for which a duty was provided. The terms "domestic industry" and "domestic producers" have been used by Congress in the enactment of tariff legislation for years past. No purpose would be served by quoting dictionary definitions or referring to clarifications made by various administrative branches of the Government in which similar terms are used for different purposes or for their own convenience. These terms have a wide meaning or a narrow meaning. The question here is what did Congress intend when it used these terms in tariff legislation.

"In 1921 the Emergency Tariff Act was passed. House Report No. 1 of the 67th Congress, 1st session, on this bill, which is H. R. 2435, declared the purpose of the bill to impose temporary duties on certain agricultural products to meet emergencies and to prevent dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States. Tariffs were placed on specified agricultural products.

"Title I of the bill stated that it was 'to protect certain farm products.' It was the purpose of the bill and the intention of Congress to protect the American production of the specified articles named in the legislation.

"The benefit to be derived from that protection inured to the farmer, farm labor, and the investment of the farmer, all of which were involved in the production of those specific articles.

"Title II of that same act, the Antidumping Act of 1921, discloses the same purpose, and an intention to protect an industry which is being or which is likely to be injured or is being prevented from being established by the importation of a class or kind of foreign merchandise at a price below market value in the country of origin.

"The Tariff Act of 1922 and its legislative history again reaffirmed that the term industry or industries were used with reference to specifically named articles and specifically named products. The opening portion of that act recites that it is an act to 'regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States.'

"This was followed by a long list of specific articles and commodities which were to be subjected to a specified tariff. Obviously it was the production of the specified articles that Congress determined to encourage. This intention is demonstrated by a statement in the report of the Ways and Means Committee, bottom of page 3 of Report No. 248 of the 67th Congress, 1st session, on H. R. 7456, where it was said with respect to certain exceptions: 'where the committee thought that particular products which represented infant industries or the materials essential to national preparedness have been given slightly increased rates.'

"And then again, the same report at page 18 states:

" 'A wide range of industries is covered by this schedule and a general statement would apply to them all.'

"The schedule to which the reference is made is a long list of individual commodities subjected to specified tariffs. And then the report continues:

" 'In the case of a number of articles, Japanese competition has become important since the beginning of the war.'

"And it is obvious that the competition was with particular products and articles.

"This same committee report goes on to say:

" 'Both straw and fur hats fall within this schedule, and constitute two very important industries.'

"And there is demonstrated the fact that the industry is identified by its product and the producers of one type of hat are a different industry from the producers of another type of hat.

"The intention of Congress to protect American labor producing a product is found in Senate Report No. 595 on the same bill, that is, H. R. 7456. The Senate committee stated:

" 'In the preparation of this measure your committee has endeavored to recommend rates that will afford protection to American industries and permit them to pay wages sufficient to enable our workmen to maintain an American standard of living.'

"On page 11 of that report which covers schedule 3 of metals and manufacturers of metals, the committee said:

" 'A general policy of adjusting rates on raw materials to protect the domestic mining interests without inflicting undue hardship upon the consuming interests was followed throughout the metals schedule.'

"And there you will observe that the mining interests were not considered one industry but that each mining product was considered a separate industry.

"In 1930 a new tariff act was passed, the purpose of which was 'An act to provide revenue, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor.'

"And the industries to be protected by these were the industries engaged in the production of specified products. The Ways and Means Committee Report No. 77 of the 71st Congress, 1st session, on H. R. 2667, stated:

" 'For the great majority of the articles for which it'—that is, the Tariff Act of 1922—'provided protection, it is still efficient and sufficient.'

"It was through the protection of American production of named articles that industry was to be encouraged.

"In discussing 'reasons for the readjustment,' the committee states:

" 'New products have been added to the list, improved machinery has been adopted both here and abroad, foreign competition has attacked production in new ways and new lines of products are being manufactured, destined primarily for the American market.'

"The concern of Congress over new products and improved machinery attacking domestic production clearly indicates that the product industry and the product named were considered as synonymous. The report continues:

" 'The protective policy does not exclude and it is not intended to exclude foreign products from our markets, but does propose that such products should not come into this country to the detriment of American producers and wage earners.'

"And the producers are management and capital, and the wage earners are the labor engaged in the production of that specified article to which Congress gave its attention and to which it gave a specified tariff.

"In discussing agriculture and industry on page 4 of the report, the committee states:

" 'Industries generally in the United States are in a sound and prosperous condition but there are a number of instances where the foreign competition is being sharply felt. There is a slackening in these (industries), loss of employment, and a number of instances were presented at the hearings showing that enterprises had been abandoned or were in serious straits.'

"That the committee was thinking of each agricultural product as constituting an industry is demonstrated on page 5, where it was said:

" 'Under the Underwood Act of 1913 agricultural products generally were put under three lists. The restoration of these products to a dutiable status where they properly belong by the Tariff Act of 1922 has been of immense advantage to the agricultural industries.'

"Then again on page 9:

" 'This bill is therefore presented as containing the readjustments necessary to give all our industries, all our laborers, and all our people a fair and equal opportunity in our great market and prosperity.'

"In explaining schedule 3, which covered metal and manufacturers of metal, including straight pins, at pages 43 and 44, under the heading 'Electrical Machinery and Apparatus' it was said:

" 'The products of this important group of industries are now dutiable under two paragraphs.'

"And later under the heading 'Surgical and Dental Instruments' the committee said:

" 'These are among the outstanding American industries suffering from foreign competition.'

"In discussing hardware and tools, the committee referred to the whole group of industries producing hardware and tools.

"In 1934 the Trade Agreements Act was passed. The President was authorized to reduce tariffs. The authority thus given constituted an implement of policy, the use of which necessarily had direct repercussions on domestic producers and domestic industry.

"Recognition of this was at once apparent, as is shown by the escape-clause provisions administratively inserted in the trade agreements. That those provisions were insufficient and ineffectual is demonstrated by the peril-point provision in 1948.

"That the purpose of that enactment was solely for the protection of domestic producers is emphasized by the bitter minority report of the Committee on Ways and Means submitted to the 80th Congress, 2d session, report 2009. The report of the Committee on Finance, which was report 1558 in connection with the same bill, noted that there were complaints from widening sources that domestic producers who required protection against injurious competition from imports were not receiving adequate consideration in trade-agreement negotiations. The report emphasizes that the committee was concerned with the injury to domestic producers resulting from the trade-agreements program. The committee's report as to the necessity for the peril-point legislation turns largely about the injuries caused or threatened to domestic labor, capital, and management producing a like or similar article to that imported under the concession of the trade agreement.

"That act required the Commission before the commencement of negotiations for a foreign trade agreement to make an investigation and report to the President with respect to the limit to which a tariff change might be made without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, and to report further if increases in duties were required to avoid serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles.

"Note that in this legislation the term 'domestic producers' is used interchangeably with 'domestic industry.' Note also that the negotiation of the trade agreements is conducted on an article-by-article and a product-by-product basis.

"In 1951 there was enacted the Trade Agreements Extension Act under which this proceeding is now pending. This legislation when originally introduced and amended in the House provided relief not only when the imported article increased in such quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry, but also provided the same relief when even a segment of such industry was endangered.

"The debates in the House on this act as thus amended emphasized specifically the oil industry, of which a group of independent producers was apparently bearing a heavy burden. Emphasis was also directed toward potato growers in Maine, it appearing that imported potatoes were giving that segment of the potato industry more difficulty than elsewhere.

"In the bill as finally enacted, the reference to a segment of industry was omitted, but the serious consideration given to extending the benefits of the escape clause to groups either territorial or identified by the production of only a part of the product in America emphasizes the intention of Congress that the benefits of this legislation were intended for specific groups, and more particularly for the precise groups to whom the injury occurred as the result of reductions in tariff rates on specific articles.

"This intention is made more emphatic by the debate in the Senate. The report of the debate of May 21, 1951, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 4, page 5494, carries the assurance given by Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Finance Committee, to Senator NEELY, and it reads in this fashion:

" 'Mr. NEELY. Will the distinguished Senator from Georgia please turn to section 7, page 2, of the committee report, and from his profound knowledge of the entire complicated subject of reciprocal trade agreements favor us with his opinion of the following: If a pottery or glass factory in West Virginia should be shut down because of irresistable foreign competition, would it be possible under the pending bill if it became a law for the employees as well as the employer to have the Tariff Commission make the investigation required by that circumstance of the case?

" 'Mr. GEORGE. Yes, entirely so, because it is expressly provided in this amendment that the application may be made by any interested party. Then the whole procedure under the escape clause comes into effect.'

"In the same debate a comparison of the cost of the production of sewing machines in this country as against the cost of such machines in Japan was made, and that is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 4, pages 5501–5502. It was pointed out that the difference in the selling price of the two machines in this country arose solely from the differential in wage rates paid to the employees. The Japanese worker received 90 cents a day, the American worker received $15.50 a day.

"Those debates did not consider the wages of laborer producing plumbing hardware or any other product which the sewing-machine industry might produce. There are some

other sources of interpretation which give some assistance here.

"An examination of the records of the hearings held in connection with the 1930 Tariff Act will disclose the testimony on behalf of the straight pin industry went no further than the manufacture and the sale of that product. The committee didn't consider any other facts in connection with the pin industry. This is the basis upon which our position is predicated here.

"An examination of the testimony offered in those hearings on behalf of other products will disclose that they likewise were limited in a similar manner. From this it can be concluded that the committee considered only the production of specific commodities, the labor, management, and capital involved in the production of those specific commodities. Those are the elements of production Congress intended to protect by the specific tariff.

"Now, the Antidumping Act of 1921 provided that whenever the Secretary of the Treasury found that industry in the United States was being or was likely to be injured, or was being prevented from being established by reason of the importation into this country of foreign merchandise dumped here, he was required to make a finding of dumping. An examination of those findings beginning in 1922 will indicate the construction put upon the term 'an industry' in its administration. The decisions run in this way:

"Treasury Decision 5233, an industry manufacturing glass frostings is being prevented from being established. Treasury Decision 50035, industry manufacturing ribbon fly catchers. Treasury Decision 50034, the industry manufacturing wool knitted berets. Decision 46826, industry manufacturing woven wiring fencing and netting. Decision 46618, the industry of manufacturing rubber-soled fabric-topped footwear. And Decision 46617, the industry of manufacturing incandescent electric light bulbs and lamps. And so they run, each in a very narrow field.

"Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 dealt with unfair methods of competition, unfair acts in importation of articles into the United States, with the effects or tendency to destroy or substantially injure an industry efficiently and economically operated or to prevent the establishment of such an industry. Under that provision a number of proceedings have taken place before the Commission. What has been regarded as an industry is demonstrated by a number of decisions here. The industry of manufacturing slide fasteners was determined to be such an industry. That is section 337, report No. 86, second series of Tariff Commission, 1934.

"The industry of making and selling drive springs was determined to be an industry, section 337, report No. 87 of the second series, Tariff Commission, 1934.

"The industry of making cigar lighters was determined to be an industry, and the report in that case showed that the complainant manufactured numerous other articles including clocks, toiletware, deskware, automobile goods, electrical goods, and general novelties. It is in section 337, report No. 72, of the second series.

"The industry of making collable metal rules and holders was determined to be such an industry in the United States, section 337, report No. 106, second series, United States Tariff Commission.

"In the Collable Metal Rules case the transcript shows testimony to the effect that the complainant was the largest maker of hand tools in the United States. The report does not indicate that any attention was given to the relation between complainant's manufacture of collable rules and the obviously extensive volume of its own business.

"The decision gives no indication that the production of other tools had any consideration as a factor in reaching the decision that the petitioner in that case was entitled to relief.

"In a section 337 proceeding in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, that court sustained the conclusion reached by the Commission in which the complainant manufacturer appeared to be the only member of the domestic industry whose production and cost data was examined. That is the Northern Pigment Co. case in 71 Federal (2d) 447.

"The meaning of the term "industry" as used by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in that case is that of a product industry.

"Now, in investigation No. 22, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 there was involved the importation of handblown glassware. This Commission agreed unanimously that machine-made ware was not like or directly competitive with the imported ware under consideration, and as a consequence the machine-made glassware was not the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles.

"And with respect to the profits, it was pointed out in 1 of the 2 recommendations to the President that if the profits derived from kindred industries, in that case the glass-container industry, were to be combined with the profits from the production of the article under consideration, the escape-clause provision would be nullified for all practical purposes.

"It was pointed out that the producers of chemicals would probably never have the advantage of the escape clause if profits of producers of all chemicals were to be considered on the application of the producer of one chemical.

"Now if the Commission pleases, that covers the underlying basis of the position which we have taken here.

"Secretary BENT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that Congressman BAILEY is present and wishes to make a statement.

"Chairman BROSSARD. We will be glad to have your statement, Mr. BAILEY, if you desire to make it now.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, we asked Congressman BAILEY to appear for a specific reason, and if the Commission please, I would like to have the Congressman sworn.

"Commissioner MCGILL. That is not required.

"Chairman BROSSARD. We don't require Congressmen to be sworn unless he is your witness and you insist on it, why we wouldn't insist on it.

"Commissioner MCGILL. As far as any statement he makes, he is under oath the same as we are.

"Chairman BROSSARD. I think we can take his statement as being the equivalent of being under oath, since he is a Congressman of the United States.

"Statement of the Honorable Cleveland M. Bailey, Representative from the Third District of West Virginia

"Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the Commission that I have no formal statement. I was supposed to answer some questions, clarifying questions, and I am ready to be cross-examined.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Congressman BAILEY, have you heard the discussion of the escape clause that has taken place here this morning?

"Mr. BAILEY. A portion of it.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Are you familiar with the escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951?

"Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. How did you become familiar with those provisions?

"Mr. BAILEY. I happen to be a Member of the 82d Congress in the 1st session. I am the author of the present escape clause as contained in sections 6 and 7 of Public Law 50.

"Might I add there, Mr. Breckinridge, that the escape clause came in the form of a substitute motion for an escape-clause plan submitted by Congressman CURTIS of Nebraska. It was accepted by Mr. CURTIS as a substitute for his proposed amendment and adopted by the Congress.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Was Congressman CURTIS' amendment ever voted on?

"Mr. BAILEY. It was not.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. And he personally accepted your amendment?

"Mr. BAILEY. The RECORD will so disclose.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Did you draft the escape provision that was eventually adopted and passed by the House?

"Mr. BAILEY. I did.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Did you use in that draft the words 'injury to domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products'?

"Mr. BAILEY. I did.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. What did you have in mind in your use of 'domestic industry'?

"Mr. BAILEY. Let me answer that question by saying that my district is one that produces a large amount of pottery products, glassware, clothespins. I had in mind in my reference to domestic industry there the jobs of the men employed in the plants, the welfare of the management, including adequate profits, because everyone realizes that the only way you can have continual employment is to have profits for management.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Were you concerned about that because those industries were actually experiencing difficulty with imports?

"Mr. BAILEY. I was, and may I add, Mr. Breckinridge, that we are still experiencing those injuries. I visited my home State, Saturday last, and due to the operations of your Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, in major part, we have 106,200 people on relief in 26 counties in the State of West Virginia.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. What was one particular product that was being imported and that you were concerned about?

"Mr. BAILEY. Well, I mentioned those three. I was also concerned in the independent oil industry, and that is why I included in my draft of the escape clause segments of an industry, because I was thinking of the welfare of the independent oil producers of my State as distinguished between them and the oil cartel which was importing excessive amounts of residual fuel oil and crude oil into the United States.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. By the oil industry, what do you refer to there? Do you mean the corporate organizations engaged in the oil industry or the capital engaged specifically in producing oil?

"Mr. BAILEY. Well, I was thinking of protecting the people who are employed in the independent oil industry and the profits of the independent oil industry. I think it is a well-known fact that three of the major American oil companies, together with the Dutch Shell, are engaged in extensive developments, possibly as much as a million barrels of crude oil a day like Maracaibo in Venezuela.

"I wanted to make sure that my independent oil industry had an opportunity to survive in the face of those floods of imports.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Congressman, in the case of spring clothespins, which I understand are produced in your State, were you concerned about that?

"Mr. BAILEY. I was very much so. We have the largest clothespin producing plant in the world in my district.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. In your concern about that industry, were you concerned about the corporate entities who were producing spring clothespins, or were you concerned about the labor specifically employed in producing spring clothespins?

"Mr. BAILEY. I was concerned primarily with the jobs of about 400 employees employed in that plant, and the fact that the company had to make a profit in order to keep those people employed.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Were you concerned about their income from Government bonds or from other sources or from other production than spring clothespins?

"Mr. BAILEY. I have no knowledge that they had such investments, and I was not concerned in that angle of it whatever. I had in mind protecting the wage levels and the standard of living of the people employed in that plant and continuing work.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. What in your opinion was the understanding of the House of the words 'domestic industry' when they debated and adopted the escape clause containing those words?

"Mr. BAILEY. I think if you will peruse my debate on the floor there, you will understand what the primary object was. It was to protect domestic industries, producers of individual articles who were being harassed, injured, harmed by importation, excessive imports of light products coming from abroad.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. May I put this question to you? If General Motors should buy out the spring clothespin plant, in your opinion would they be part of the industry producing spring clothespins?

"Mr. BAILEY. I should not so consider.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Mr. Breckinridge, do you desire to make an opening statement as counsellor or do you want to be sworn?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I would like to make partially a statement as counsel and partially as a witness, sir, and I would prefer to be sworn.

"Chairman BROSSARD. You had better be sworn.

"Testimony of John Breckinridge, representing the straight pin industry (having been duly sworn by Secretary Bent)

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to make it entirely clear on the record that the position of the applicants has consistently been one not of lack of cooperation nor a desire not to give the Commission anything that is necessary to the investigation and a proper decision in the investigation, but they have, as I think they are entitled to, their opinion of what the law means, what they are entitled to under the law, and what was meant by the domestic industry producing straight pins.

"We made it clear from the very beginning that if the investigation had to consider and be affected by the production, sale, and profits of other products, we would prefer or just as leave the investigation not be made.

"We recognized all along the right of the Commission to overrule us, to make an adverse report on the investigation without a hearing, and we assumed that that would be done if the Commission, by formal vote, ruled that we were not supplying relevant and pertinent information under the law.

"We still take the same position. If it is necessary to supply the figures on the production of plumbing fixtures, we would just as leave not have the investigation made. We feel that we are entitled to that position.

"Commissioner RYDER. I thought you put your statement in the record of your position on this subject. Why do you have to repeat it here now?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Commissioner Ryder——

"Commissioner RYDER. We heard it ad nauseum.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I am not repeating just what was said yesterday; I intend to supplement it briefly, and since the statement on behalf of three Commissioners has been read in the record here, I think we are entitled to state our position and have it clearly understood.

"Commissioner RYDER. Well, we gave you permission to put in the record your full statement on the other, applicable to this case.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I am not going to repeat what is in the statement already in the record.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Proceed, Mr. Breckinridge.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Breckinridge, I do not mean to interrupt the course of your statement——

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. It is all right, Senator.

"Commissioner MCGILL (continuing). But I think there is one matter that may not have been clearly stated in the questions that were propounded to you a few moments ago with reference to overall production, and that is that my reference was intended to be the overall production, etc., in the plants where straight pins are produced. I want to make it clear that is what I had in mind, and, I take it, you also, unless you state to the contrary, you had it in mind also.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. We had that in mind; yes, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Yes.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. On that point we feel that where Oakville may have 2 separate plants and Risdon may have 2 separate plants, another company, Star Pin Co., may have a comparable thing, but only separated by a wall, makes no real difference as to what is material and what is not material.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Well, I had in mind some company might manufacture in some place railroad engines, and I am not trying to get at anything like that and, therefore, I meant to confine my questions to the plants in which straight pins are produced; that that is the information we are asking for, the information from those plants.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I think after the investigation is completed the Commission will find that in the plants involved are produced some items that are just as irrelevant and immaterial as railroad engines.

"Back before the escape clause was enacted in 1951, the Commission had operated purely under an Executive order which did not state any criteria for escape-clause investigations. Those investigations were conducted under an administrative escape clause which was written in administratively by the State Department primarily into trade agreements.

"The escape clause provided for relief only—the principal provisions—only in case of unforeseen developments and in case of unforeseen injury; and it provided no criteria, no rules, for the conduct of investigations, and no procedural provisions.

"Under those investigations, the Commission wrote some indication of the criteria they considered and, for the most part, dismissed all applications for an investigation without even a hearing and without stating a reason for not conducting the investigation.

"Under those, I am sure, that the Commission considered these broad range of products that a producer of a product being injured or which they claim was being injured, they also produced. I am sure they considered also broad economic factors, the effect on world trade, international trade, generally.

"Commissioner EDMINSTER. May I interrupt you there? Since no report was issued, no statement of reasons was issued, how did you become sure of what we considered?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I have a statement——

"Commissioner EDMINSTER. What is your source of information on that?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE (continuing). A statement by Commissioner Ryder, who was at that time Chairman of the Commission, before the House Ways and Means Committee in 1948, testifying on H. R. 6556 which, at that time was considering a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

"I will not quote it, but the statement of the, at that time, Chairman, Commissioner Ryder, did indicate that these broad other things were considered and were pertinent to their investigation.

"Comparable statements were submitted at later times to the committees of Congress considering that or a subsequent extension of the trade-agreements law.

"In 1951 the matter was again considered, the Trade Agreements Act was again extended, and at that time was when the escape clause was written under the act under which this proceeding is being conducted.

"In the minority report of the committee recommending a bill to extend the trade-agreements law without an escape clause and extension as was, it had this to say—now, this is a minority report, and was a minority report by 10 to 5:

" 'The authority of the President to enter trade agreements was delegated to him by the Congress in the 1934 amendment of the Tariff Act of 1930. The 1934 amendment did not itself, however, provide any avenue of escape from serious injury, but almost all trade agreements now contain a so-called escape clause designed to prevent serious injury or the threat of it to domestic producers and their workers. The language of the escape clause is as follows.'

"I will not read the escape clause, but the significant thing is it contains criteria, particularly unforeseen, but not in the present law.

"Then the committee minority go on:

" 'As a result of the patent looseness of and ambiguity of the language of the escape clause, and as a result of the lack of any standards established by the Congress for the President's guidance in determining when relief should be granted, only one industry has ever been afforded relief by the President under this clause, and this took nearly a year to accomplish. The facts established during the public hearing on H. R. 1612 brought clearly into focus that the failure of the Congress to lay down any broad principles to guide the President has resulted in the complete ineffectiveness of the escape clause and that this failure is the basis of the well-founded complaints against the present procedure'—well-founded complaints against the present procedure which the Ways and Means Committee considered.

" 'Because of the complete ineffectiveness of the escape clause, domestic producers, even when they have been injured, feel it futile to apply to the Tariff Commission for relief, and even when relief is requested the ambiguity of the language in the escape clause is such that most applicants have been dismissed without even a formal investigation. A summary is given in appendix B listing all applications which have been made under the escape clause and showing the disposition of these cases.'

"Now, that report—that opinion—of the former administration and criteria of escape clause became the majority opinion of the House and the majority opinion of the Congress.

"Mr. Congressman BAILEY, who drafted the original version of the escape clause that was finally enacted, and sponsored it on the floor of the House, was here and testified as to what his intent was and what he thought the intent of the House was, what they understood the law to mean after the debate in which he participated.

"Commissioner MCGILL. You think that is a legal manner of determining what was the intent of Congress in the enactment of the bil?

"Mr. BRECKENRIDGE. I think that that is a part of the legislative history going to make up and to determine what the intent of Congress was. I do not say or contend that it should be necessarily controlling. I think that has to be taken along with other indications of the intent, such as the reports, the debates, the conference report, and final passage.

"Commissioner McGILL. Do courts, in your judgment, take into consideration the testimony of a Member given after the measure had been passed?

"Mr. BRECKENRIDGE. I do not think the courts would give much weight to it; were it available, I think they would consider it for such weight as they saw fit to put on it. Certainly, it does not carry as much weight as the debates and the reports do. We think the debates and reports all substantiate what Congressman BAILEY testified to.

"The language involved here is 'injury to the domestic industry producing a like or directly competitive domestic product.'

"That language was contained in the House version, as passed, was not changed by the Senate version, and was finally adopted in the same form by the conference report and by both Houses of Congress, and signed by the President.

"We think that very clearly, in view of the background, the information that the Congress had as to how the Commission had administered the escape clause in the past, makes it very clear that they intended that there be a change, and because they did not like the criteria being used, did not like the procedure being followed, they specifically wrote a procedure section, section 7.

"They not only said the concession shall not continue if it causes injury; they said, 'You shall investigate and follow these criteria.'

"We think that what the Commission has done in the past has been completely overruled by the Congress, and they have laid down new criteria for procedure and for findings of fact.

"In interpreting these words, 'domestic industry,' I think we have to go, in addition to what Mr. Heron has said on the subject which, I think, is very convincing as to what Congress has always understood the word 'industry' to mean in tariff legislation of various kinds, in 2 pieces of legislation where they have used it in this same context, that is, injury to domestic industry, or preventing domestic industry from being established, and those 2 pieces of law being the Antidumping Act of 1921, and the unfair-trade-practices section of the Tariff Act of 1930, which is section 337—decisions under those 2 laws by the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of dumping, by the Tariff Commission in the case of unfair-trade practices, have all indicated that industry and injury to industry meant injury to the production, the labor, capital, and management devoted to the production of the product being dumped or the product which was being unfairly imported; and the Commission, in the decisions, has consistently referred to injury to the industry of manufacturing flycatchers, the industry of manufacturing rules, and in those cases the companies producing those rules produced many other things.

"They did not consider the corporate activity of the companies producing those to be the industry, and when Congress spoke of injury to industry, it is not reasonable to think they were thinking in terms of corporate entities.

"The Congress thinks in terms of people, labor primarily, votes, if you please. They do not think in terms of corporate entities, and if a corporate entity is producing straight pins, regardless of other products they might be producing, they are thinking of the labor in straight pins, and they wanted to keep the labor of the straight-pin machine and not in Michigan producing automobiles.

"I think it is unfortunate that three members of the Commission have made up their minds and announced their decision before they heard our argument on the case. We fully recognize and fully respect the right of the Commission to overrule us, the same as we do any court; but we normally expect our day in court before they overrule us.

"If the Commission will permit, I would like to make an opening statement on the facts of the labor, management, and capital in producing straight pins.

"I first would like to introduce as an exhibit, a copy of the application filed by the applicants on September 22, 1953. In that application we have brought the statistical figures up to date through the year 1953.

"At the time of filing they only contained figures through the first 6 months of 1953.

"Mrs. COMPTON. Exhibit 2.

"(The document referred to was marked 'exhibit 2 (Breckinridge).')

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Next I would like to introduce an exhibit, a consolidated industry report to the Tariff Commission, which contains consolidation on the overall industry basis of precisely the information which was submitted to the Commission by each individual applicant on a questionnaire submitted to the Commission; and I have changed none of the figures. I have only consolidated them in one report giving an industry picture. They were consolidated from a copy of the reports which were sent to the Commission directly by each individual applicant.

"I think it would be well to note that the information contained in the questionnaire submitted by each applicant contained in exactly the same form, with exactly the same instructions, with exactly the same headings and subheading numbers and titles as was requested by the Commission's questionnaire.

"We revised the questionnaire only in respect to omitting information on the production, sales, and profits of products other than straight pins, and we included considerable information in addition to what the Commission asked for. Each applicant submitted all of the information that was requested by the Commission with respect to straight pins.

"This exhibit is being submitted in confidence, and I have a copy here for each Commissioner.

"Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, may we inquire why these consolidated figures of eight companies should be received in confidence?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, we consider the figures as confidential because they reveal information of value to our competitors, and the makeup and nature of the industry is such that with this overall industry report it would not take much ingenuity to figure out substantially what the operations of each individual company were.

"Now there is certain information in the report—the report, as a whole, is confidential, but there is certain information that is taken from public records in it, which I have extracted and now propose to give to counsel for the importers. That information is item 2 on annual sales in pounds and in dollar value.

"It includes another item that we added on production capacity on existing machines and facilities, item 4 on exports, item 4–X on imports, item 4–Y on apparent acquisitions by the domestic market.

"Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the information that has been given us graciously, but I repeat my question. There are 8 companies involved here, and this is a consolidation of 8 companies' statistics. This cannot reveal the operation of any individual companies.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this point that the applicants are extremely anxious that this information be treated as highly confidential, and at this point I might suggest that a little later on the applicants would like to have an informal conference with the staff of the Commission indicating the type of things that they would prefer not to have published in the report.

"Of course, we are not trying to dictate to the Commission, but the type of information that has been included in some reports of the Commission, in this case would be very damaging. We, of course, recognize the Commission's right to do as it pleases.

"Commissioner McGILL. Have any of the applicants seen this report?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. They have all seen it, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. All have seen it?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. Then they know what is in it, do they not?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. So that any of this confidential information that might be revealed from one to the other has already been seen?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. We are concerned about revealing the information to our foreign competitors and to others outside the industry, who the applicants do not wish to reveal the information to.

"Commissioner McGILL. So far as each applicant is concerned, he has had his opportunity of figuring out his competitor's data?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. As best he can, but I am sure—I do not wish the importers and the foreign manufacturers to have the same opportunity.

"Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the implication of superior analytical ability to figure out these confidential matters, but we do not think the compliment is warranted. I do not believe that the rule has ever been taken to such an extent to mean that eight companies' figures, which are all common knowledge among the companies, nevertheless should be confidential Government statistics.

"Commissioner McGILL. May I ask Mr. Breckinridge——

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. This is a confidential industry statistic not Government statistic.

"Commissioner McGILL. Let me ask you a question, Mr. Breckinridge, in connection with this.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. Are the figures of individual companies shown here or is it the total of all eight companies that are shown?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. It is the total of all eight companies.

"Commissioner McGILL. So that no 1 of the 8 is disclosed, not 1 of the 8 is disclosed? It is just the totals, and the best you could do would be to——

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. The nature of the business is such, and the knowledge outside the industry of the operations of the different companies is such, that it would not take anybody long to figure out almost exactly what the individual company operations are. Now, if the Commission will not accept it in confidence, we will be glad to withdraw it.

"Commissioner McGILL. I do not care myself. I do not think it is confidential, though.

"Chairman BROSSARD. I would accept it in confidence at this time. We have not had a chance yet to examine it in detail because it was submitted this morning, and I would like to say that if the Commission should decide that it is not material that ought to be submitted in confidence, why, then we will subsequently make it known to these people and that they can withdraw it if they want to or leave it in and make it public, one or the other; but right at this moment I would not want to make a ruling on it one way or another. I think that is the feeling of my colleagues.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. The Commission would advise us before they published any information, would they not?

"Chairman BROSSARD. Oh, yes.

"Commissioner EDMINSTER. You would have an opportunity to withdraw it if you preferred not to submit it, if we were not going to treat it as confidential.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. All we would want is an opportunity to confer about it, and the Commission could do as it pleases.

"Chairman BROSSARD. This is the rule of the Commission on this matter of confidential information. It is 3 (c) under 201.6:

"'Information submitted to the Commission in confidence should be submitted on separate pages clearly marked "Confidential." The Commission may refuse to accept in confidence any particular information which it determines is not entitled to confidential treatment.'

"It was upon that basis that the Commission does not rule positively upon the subject at this time because we would like to examine the document carefully to see whether or not it is the kind of information that might reveal operation of individual concerns.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. That is satisfactory, sir.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Before it is published in any way, we will give you people an opportunity to withdraw it or leave it in as an exhibit in confidence.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to avoid lengthy questioning later in the hearing, I would like to explain minor deviations that will be found in the statistics included in the application and in the statistics included in the consolidated report which has just been submitted as exhibit No. 3.

"Mrs. COMPTON. No. 3.

"(The document referred to was marked 'Exhibit 3, "Confidential" (Breckinridge).')

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Here again in the application, the statistics were gathered by the Pin, Clip, and Fastener Association, straight pin division, and reported on a somewhat different basis than was requested by the Commission.

"These figures on sales do not include exports, whereas the figures on the Commission's questionnaire do include exports.

"Also another reason for minor differences which we do not think are consequential concerning the industry picture, in the case of retail items, such as papers, straight pins stuck on a paper, it was necessary for the secretary of the association to determine from the applicants a factor, and convert those pin papers to a pound basis.

"Now, in the case of the Tariff Commission questionnaire, each company converted where he did not have accurate pound figures, he converted his retail items, pin papers, to a pound basis based on his own records, and would be more accurate than what is in the application.

"But other than that, errors of that sort, I do not believe the figures are substantially different unless, possibly, I made a mistake in addition somewhere which, of course, the Commission will find.

"Now, in analyzing and considering the facts in the straight pin industry, I think underlying every consideration should be its profit picture, in the past and today.

"Now, that appears on page 15 of the questionnaire, and at the bottom line "percent of net profit to net sales," which is item 30, it shows that the industry, both before the war, during the 1935–39 period and since the war, has been operating just on the verge of the break-even point, sometimes a little below, sometimes a little above.

"The average profit during the 1935–39 period was a loss of .4 percent.

Chairman BROSSARD. Is that net profit before income taxes?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. No, that is net profit after State and Federal income taxes; and we have used that figure because that is what you pay dividends on, that is what you get a return on your investment on.

"Now, in the immediate postwar period, 1946 and 1947, the companies, as did all companies, made some money; but, surprisingly little, compared to the profits of other firms, comparable firms in the same period.

"During the 1946–49 period, the profit, average profit, was less than 8 percent of net sales, and then in 1950 was when the imports hit, and from 1950 through 1952, the average profit dropped to only 3.2 percent.

"In 1952 it hit the low of a loss of 1.3 percent of net sales. In 1953 we had some recovery to the surprising figure of two-tenths of 1 percent profit.

"Now, the significance of that is that the industry is just on the verge, just operating, at the break-even point.

"Before the war they were struggling to get out of the depression under difficult circumstances, and they were saved by the war, beginning in 1939 and 1940.

"Since the war, immediately thereafter, they had considerable volume because of the pent-up demand, and the fact that trade channels had been exhausted, but it started a steady decline, and when the imports hit, it has removed any possibility of the industry pulling itself up by its own bootstraps.

"The present percent of imports to annual sales is not any startling figure, as one hears of imports these days, but the nature of the industry makes a small percentage much more damaging in this case than two-thirds of sales, as it would be in wool or some other commodities where the production capacity is less than demand.

"In this case production capacity is considerably in excess of American demand. Prewar 1935–39 imports averaged 2.4 percent of domestic sales in the domestic—correction, averages 2.4 percent of domestic market acquisitions or apparent consumption.

"In 1946–49, they averaged four-tenths of 1 percent, and then the avallanche by comparison started. It went up to 3.2 percent in 1950, 10.7 percent in 1951, 6.5 percent in 1952, 8 percent in 1953. But those imports have had to be absorbed on a declining market, on a static demand, and a considerably declining per capita consumption.

"The average domestic sales in 1935–39 were 3,763,433 pounds. Even during the peak period of the immediate postwar 1946–49, it averaged less than prewar. It averaged 3,121,236 pounds.

"In 1950–52 average, it averaged 3,267,182, still below prewar.

"In 1952, when the full force of the imports was felt or, perhaps, I should stop and explain that—in 1950 and 1951 there was considerable importing as a result of scare buying, stocking, afraid we were going to get into total war, and those imports were not all consumed, and they very seriously, in our opinion—and I think the facts will substantiate it, very seriously—affected sales in 1952, and is still affecting sales.

"In 1952 sales dropped to 2,389,341 pounds. In 1953 there was a slight recovery to 2,917,188 pounds, both substantially below the prewar sales, substantially below the preconcession sales for postwar, if you want to consider that period as representative.

"Now, in addition to the sales, I think the next most important factor is production capacity. I have asked for and obtained from each applicant the following figures: Their actual production in 1953, the additional number of pounds they could have produced in 1953 with existing machinery, and within normal work schedules, and 5 days a week, and their production capacity.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Is that one shift?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. It is one shift in most cases, Mr. Chairman. In the case of one company they normally run a two-shift schedule of production, I understand. Within my knowledge there is only one company where it is more than one shift.

"I also asked for the additional capacity, additional amount, number of pounds that each company could have produced with additional shifts on the same machines and with the same facilities. Those figures, production in 1953, were 3,181,128 pounds.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Is that in addition to what they did produce?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. No, that is what they actually produced in 1953.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Yes; all right.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. This is on the first page of the consolidated report, incidentally.

"The next figure was the additional amount they could have produced within a normal work schedule, which was 997,356 pounds, making a total production capacity, with normal work schedule and existing facilities, of 4,178,484. That is more than the domestic market has ever consumed since 1935, and it appears we have declining overall consumption as well as declining per capita consumption.

"The greatest amount that was ever required by the market was in 1936 with 4,148,504 pounds.

"In addition to that, if we should ever have an emergency and need it, which is unlikely, the companies could produce a still additional amount of 5,070,724 pounds if they used additional shifts, with existing machinery and facilities.

"In view of the testimony that will be submitted later to the effect that a pin is a pin, and you cannot tell a foreign pin from a domestic pin, under those circumstances, it is difficult to conceive of how 1 pound, even 1 pound or, let us say 100 pounds—which would sound a little more reasonable, 100 pounds—can come in here without displacing the consumption of the American-produced pin; it just cannot be done.

"How seriously have we been hurt to date? During 1951 and 1952, the domestic manufacturers lost about 550,000 pounds of sales to imports.

"To these companies, operating at a break-even schedule, that is serious injury and the threat of future imports is much greater because with the volume they got in 1950 and 1951, they were able to get their foot in the door to establish a distribution system, to establish stocks from which they could make delivery, and that is what is causing the very serious threat to the industry in the future.

"In the past, the main thing that protected the industry was not the tariff primarily, but the fact that the importers could not deliver.

"This industry operates on a delivery basis from inventory. Until they built up a stock and improved their distribution system, the users were hesitant to buy from them for fear next month they could not get delivery. Now, that reliability of supply preference is disappearing, and disappearing rapidly.

"In the application we estimated that 90 percent of the imports were of steel pins, and that they were imported in bulk form for industrial use rather than household use. We do not know the actual figures—they are not available to us—but we still think that figure is about right, although there are indications in the market that imports of brass pins, and imports of retail packaged pins are increasing, and probably will increase further, particularly because of the distribution system they built up which enables them to contact better retail stores and retail outlets.

"The bulk is sold to large industrial users where you can make one big sale, big volume, and not have much investment in inventory, and so forth.

"But as they build their distribution system they will move more and more into the brass pins and hospitals, and so forth, and into household use and, incidentally, as well as the imports, a large percentage of the domestic production is also sold in bulk packages to industrial users.

"It is not quite as big as the percentage of the imports, but it runs somewhere between 70 and 80 percent, 70 to 80 percent in bulk form; and in table 3 of the application, which is exhibit No. 2, I believe, this shows the distribution and sales on a gross basis rather than a dollar value basis shown in the Tariff Commission questionnaire; it

shows that of brass straight pins 76 percent of the domestic production is sold in bulk to industrial users; and of steel, 91 percent, almost 92 percent, of the domestic sales are in bulk form to industrial users.

"Now, those figures are for 1953, and they are pretty close to that for other recent years. For all sales put together, the bulk is 84.66 percent bulk for industrial use.

"Now we believe that the imports consist chiefly of No. 16, No. 17, and No. 20 straight pins in bulk form; those are the size numbers, sizes Nos. 16, 17, and 20.

"In 1953, the domestic sales of those particular sizes constituted 41.9 percent of their total sales. That is one figure I was not supposed to reveal; it was a slip.

"Commissioner McGILL. Don't let us know about that because we might tell it to somebody.

"Mr. BRECKENRIDGE. I am sure, Commissioner, that Germany will know of it tomorrow, but we all make slips once in a while. I do not know whether they will fire me or not. But anyhow, it illustrates that the great bulk of the imports are affecting the backbone of the American pin industry. The straight-pin industry is built around sizes Nos. 16, 17, and 20.

"I have referred to the trend of sales and how they went down, beginning with 1950, when the imports increased in such tremendous volume—and when I say tremendous volume, I am referring to as compared with imports at any other time—and in 1950, when everything was supposed to be prosperous, we had the Korean war scare-buying and everybody says we had quotas and could not sell enough, our inventory was 518,077 pounds of pins. That is shown on page 3 of 7 of the questionnaire, which is item 5, and the Commission will note that while the Korean war was still going on, our sales declined from 3 million to 2 million in round figures, and in inventory, as the Commission will see, went up very, very substantially.

"It would not indicate that we were short of pins or short of material to produce them with. The situation has been such that this industry could pretty much control, in spite of the allocations, how much steel or brass it put into pins, as distinguished from other products.

"The employment in the industry has not gone down alarmingly. The number of people, the number of hours, is not alarming as yet, but the downward tendency is apparent, and with the importers now having a foothold in the market, it will probably go down very rapidly if we do not obtain relief.

"Now, a drop of 10 or 15 percent in the volume of this industry at this time could put most of the producers out of business unless they saw a recovery in the immediate future, and I believe the testimony of the individual applicants will substantiate that.

"Mr. Chairman, that completes my opening statement.

"Commissioner SCHREIBER. Mr. Breckinridge, you do not mean that, if, for instance, Oakville was to drop out of the straight-pin business that they are making, that they would have to close up, do you?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I did not say that, Commissioner, I hope.

"Commissioner SCHREIBER. Well, you said they would have to go out of business.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I intended to say they would go out of the straight-pin business.

"These companies produce straight pins to make money, and if they do not make money they are not going to continue to produce them. They do not carry them as a loss leader in their line, and the straight-pin production has got to stand on its own feet, and if it does not make money they are going to take their money out and put it some place else.

"Commissioner SCHREIBER. Wait a minute, this is straight pins.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Did I say safety pins?

"Commissioner SCHREIBER. That is what you said.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Thank you, Commissioner; I hope the reporter will correct that. I am troubled with the same trouble the chairman is. I might ever say spring clothes pins.

"Commissioner TALBOT. Yesterday, Mr. Breckinridge, I asked you the form of relief that you recommended. I had in mind an increase in tariff or a quota, and you said you would take it up before the end of the hearing, which, apparently, you forgot to do.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I did not.

"Commissioner TALBOT. Somebody forgot it, anyway, and we did not get it, so I assume you will put it in your brief. I do not find anything in here as to the form of relief you are asking.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I believe it is in there, Mr. Commissioner, Commissioner Talbot. I did not completely forget it before. We were rushed for time, and I thought we would put it in the brief.

"We have requested in the straight-pin case—I will do it now so I will not forget it—we have requested—an import quota of 100,000 pounds of straight pins.

"We feel that is necessary to establish some stability in the market, and we feel it is the type of relief that can prevent injury and do the least amount of damage to the dollar resources of the countries which export pins to the United States.

"Commissioner TALBOT. The chairman points out to me that it is page 4 and page 5.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. The reason for that is with a quota limitation of 100,000 pounds that quantity can come in, which is more than has ever come in before 1950, that quantity can come in with the benefit of the concession, with the reduced duty, and give an additional dollar return to the foreign countries involved; and it might bring about a situation where prices in this country can increase, at least to a reasonable level, to where the domestic manufacturers can earn a fair return on the investment involved.

"However, I think the Commission can be satisfied that a limitation would not cause any extremely high prices in the domestic market because you have eight producers, and the history will show that this has been a highly competitive business among our own domestic producers. We never had extravagant or exorbitant prices in the past, in the 1930's when imports were inconsequential. I would not say inconsequential, but they were very, very small.

"Now, if the Commission concludes that a quota—if the Commission finds injury and concludes that a quota—is not the right kind of relief to recommend, we urge that the duty be increased to 52½ percent. That is the maximum which it could be adjusted under the escape clause; that is the 50-percent increase above the rate in effect on January 1, 1945, which was 35 percent.

"Now, the law authorizes, in making concessions, that the rate be fixed anywhere between 50 percent above, 50 percent below, the rate in effect January 1, 1945.

"I was pleased to note for the first time that a finding of the Commission had recommended an adjustment of the rate under the escape clause to above the original rate, I believe it was in the handblown glassware case.

"While the industry feels that a quota is the better form of relief and would be even more acceptable to the importers and the foreign producers, we hope that if a quota is not granted, that a rate of 52½ percent will be recommended. A mere reversion to the 35 percent would not prevent injury to this industry.

"The third alternative is if the Commission decided merely to withdraw the concession entirely, if the Commission decided to recommend that, that is, we would prefer to have the concession entirely withdrawn and let the rate revert to the statutory rate of 35 percent rather than adjusting the concession to 35 percent.

"If the concession is entirely withdrawn, it would then make the industry eligible for relief under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, so they could apply for an increase up to as much as 52½ percent on the basis of the difference between the foreign and domestic costs of production.

"If the Commission does not feel it can recommend a rate higher than 35 percent, we hope they will open the door so we can present our case under the cost-of-production provision of the Tariff Act of 1930.

"Thank you for bringing that up, Commissioner Talbot.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Commissioner McGill has a statement he would like to make.

"Mr. McGILL. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to inquire if all the applicant manufacturers of straight pins are present?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. They are all present but one, sir, which is Noesting, whose president had a heart attack recently but he has a representative here to speak for him.

"Mr. McGILL. So that there is a representative of the applicant-manufacturers present?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement for the record, in which I am joined by Commissioners Ryder and Edminister.

"We want the record to show that the applicants in this case have willfully refused to supply the Commission with information which the Commission agreed was pertinent to the instant investigation and which the Commission requested them to supply. The Commission has been very patient with the applicants, notwithstanding repeated assertions by their attorney that they would refuse to supply voluntarily information of the kind in question. With the exception of the investigation relating to safety pins, hearings in which have just been concluded, the Commission has never experienced a situation of this kind, and it is difficult to understand this refusal to supply pertinent information by the very people who have invoked the Commission's jurisdiction in seeking relief for their industry. The type of information in question has been regularly called for in escape-clause investigations, but we have never experienced a deliberate and intentional refusal to cooperate such as has been exhibited by the behavior of these applicants.

"In a situation of this kind, any suggestion that the Commission should resort to its compulsive powers in order to secure the desired information from the applicants is patently absurd. A different situation might obtain in this respect if domestic producers generally were cooperating and only a small but important segment of the industry was withholding information. We are not here confronted with such a situation, however, as applicant-producers comprising over 90 percent of the production of the domestic industry are adamant in their refusal to supply the information.

"The right of the Commission to call for information of the kind involved was originally challenged by the attorney who is appearing today in behalf of the applicants in connection with an application filed with the Commission on December 17, 1952, for an escape-clause investigation relating to safety pins. The Commission, after reviewing the application, decided that information called for by the pertinent rules of the Commission governing applications but not supplied with the applications should be fur-

nished, and requested the applicants to supply the information in a letter to the attorney dated December 31, 1952. A copy of this letter will be inserted in the record at this point.

"I understand the Secretary has these letters and will supply them to the stenographic reporter.

"(The letter dated December 31, 1952, above referred to, is as follows:)

"DECEMBER 31, 1952.

"POPE, BALLARD & LOOS,
"Munsey Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIRS: Reference is made to an application which you submitted to the Tariff Commission on December 17, 1952, in behalf of the DeLong Hook and Eye Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; the Oakville company division of the Scovill Manufacturing Co., Oakville, Conn.; William Prym, Inc., Dayville, Conn.; and the Risdon Manufacturing Co., Naugatuck, Conn., for an investigation under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 with respect to safety pins.

"The Commission, after considering the application, found that it fails substantially to furnish information called for by the provisions of part 207 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, and ordered that the applicants be given until the close of business February 1, 1953, to complete the application by furnishing the necessary additional information. Until the additional information is furnished, the Commission will treat the application as not properly filed.

"The essential deficiency in the application lies in the failure to supply certain information called for by section 207.3 (e) of the rules, particularly paragraphs (1) (ii), (2), (3), and (5). It is noted that the 4 appplicant companies are stated to be the producers of 90 percent or more of the safety pins produced in the United States, and that all of them combine their safety-pin production with other lines of manufacture. Accordingly, there would appear to be no reason why each of these companies could not supply the information called for in the provisions of the rules referred to.

"Also noted is the statement in the application that much of the pertinent information called for in the rules, such as prices and profits, is a closely guarded secret of the various members of the industry and would have to be obtained by the Commission in confidence. In this connection, your attention is called to sections 207.3 (e) and 207.4 of the Commission's rules, which provide for the submission of confidential information in connection with the application. As is clearly evident from these rules, the confidential nature of information called for does not justify failure to furnish such information with the application.

"In order to assist the applicant companies in supplying the necessary information we have prepared a form, copies of which are attached, which they may wish to use. Any information called for on the form which the applicants consider confidential may, if desired, be submitted in confidence by each of the applicants separately. It should be noted that section 207.4 of the rules provides that information submitted in confidence should be submitted on separate pages clearly marked 'Confidential.'

Sincerely yours,

"DONN N. BENT,
"Secretary.

"Commissioner MCGILL. The attorney for the applicants replied to the Commission under date of January 15, 1953, flatly refusing to comply and challenging even the Commission's right to make rules governing applications for investigations. His reply will be inserted in the record at this point.

"(The letter dated January 15, 1953, above referred to, is as follows:)

"POPE BALLARD & LOOS,
"Washington, D. C., January 15, 1953.

"Re withdrawal of application for investigation under section 7 with respect to safety pins.

"Mr. DONN N. BENT,
"Secretary, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. BENT: We have your letter of December 31, 1952, concerning the above-named application and we regret very much that the Commission has decided to ignore the application on the ground that it 'fails substantially to furnish information called for' and is 'not properly filed' under the Commission's rules of practice and procedure.

"After a careful review of sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (under which this investigation was requested) and after a careful review of the Commission's rules, the applicants are confident that their application, as filed, did include all of the information properly required by the Commission's rules. More specifically, the applicants strongly feel that their application was properly filed within the meaning of procedural section 7 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the pertinent part of which commands that 'upon application of any interested party, the United States Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation and make a report thereon.'

"The applicants feel that their application was properly filed within the meaning of this mandate of Congress and that the action of the Commission in deciding to ignore the application 'as not properly filed' was improper and not authorized by the statute.

"Even though section 7 was designed and intended by Congress to set up the Commission's procedure under escape-clause investigations and even though the applicants are convinced that the Commission's rules cannot modify this congressional mandate that the Commission 'shall promptly make an investigation,' they wish to state that in their considered opinion their application was 'properly filed' even within the would-be terms and provisions of the Commission's rules.

"The application did submit all of the information required by such rules. Subparagraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 207.3 attempt to indicate the type of information which shall or must be included in an application and a review of the application will show that all such information was included therein. Your letter does not question this fact.

"You cite subparagraph (e) of section 207.3 of the rules as indicating the type of information called for but which was not included in the application and you enclose a table indicating the desired additional information. A review of this subparagraph (e) will show that it only states that the additional information indicated therein and the information indicated on the table enclosed with your letter 'should also be furnished with an application, to the extent that it is readily available to the applicant.'

"Thus, it is apparent that even the Commission's rules do not require that this information must be submitted with the application. Some of such additional information was included in the application and the balance of it was not and is not readily available to the applicants. Also such information could not possibly be put together in comparable and understandable form by the individual applicants prior to February 2 as required by the Commission's action. The application clearly indicated that such additional information was not readily available to the applicants but that it would be made available to Commission representatives by each individual applicant during the course of the investigation.

"Furthermore, the applicants do not consider the information requested with respect to their production of other commodities as proper to be submitted to or even considered by the Commission within the terms or intent of sections 6 and 7. The applicants have not requested an investigation concerning any of the products they produce other than safety pins. Consequently, they do not consider it appropriate to submit to the Commission information concerning their operations with respect to such other commodities (which differ from applicant to applicant). They consider themselves as representative of the overwhelming majority (90 percent) of the 'domestic industry' producing safety pins which are like and directly competitive with imported safety pins within the meaning of sections 6 and 7. As to their production of other products, which varies from company to company, they do not consider themselves as constituting a 'domestic industry' within the meaning of said statute. Consequently, each individual applicant does not consider any information with respect to their production of other products as being material or relevant to the issue involved in the requested investigation. They also feel that it would be improper for the Tariff Commission even to consider any such information. They feel that the sole question involved in section 7 investigation would be the effect of imported safety pins upon the American producers, capital, and laborers employed in the production of safety pins, without regard to other income they might have or other products they might produce.

"In view of these basic differences in interpretation of sections 6 and 7 and concerning the propriety of the Commission's rules to such extent as they may differ from the statute, the application is hereby withdrawn in accordance with rule 201.8 (d).

"In view of section 201.10 of the Commission's rules concerning public notices and since the Commission does not consider this application as "properly filed," it is assumed that the Commission has made no public notice of the receipt of this application and that its contents have not been discussed with any parties outside of the Commission. Since there is to be no investigation, the applicants are extremely anxious that the information contained in the application be kept strictly confidential. Consequently, it is hereby requested that all copies of the application be returned until such time as the applicants may decide to reapply for an investigation.

"Within a few days the undersigned will drop by your office to pick up the application.

"Very truly yours,

"JOHN BRECKINRIDGE,
"Attorney for DeLong Hook & Eye Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Oakville Division of the Scovill Manufacturing Co., Oakville, Conn.; William Prym, Inc., Dayville, Conn.; Risdon Manufacturing Co., Naugatuck, Conn.

"Commissioner MCGILL. It will be noted that the Commission did not reject the application, but merely called for the desired information which should have been furnished with the application. It will be further noted that the attorney for the applicants withdrew the application voluntarily.

"The application in the intsant investigation relating to straight pins was filed on September 23, 1953, by the same attorney who represented the applicants in the safety pin case referred to above. This application reflected a deliberate omission of the kind of information which was omitted from the former application relating to safety pins. However, for the reasons stated in the Commission's letter dated September 25, 1953, to

the attorney for the applicants, the Commission instituted the investigation. A copy of the Commission's letter of September 25 will be inserted in the record at this point.

"(The letter dated September 25, 1953, above referred to, is as follows:)

"SEPTEMBER 25, 1953.

"POPE, BALLARD & LOOS,
"Munsey Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"(Attention Mr. John Breckinridge.)

"DEAR SIRS: The receipt is acknowledged of an application filed September 23, 1953, in behalf of the American straight-pin industry for an investigation under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 with respect to straight (common) pins.

"The Commission has noted the statement in the application that 'Such additional information as is indicated as desirable by rule 207.3 (e) has also been included if it was readily available to the applicants in a form that it could be submitted on an industry basis in understandable form.' It appears, however, that none of the information indicated in paragraphs (2) and (3), and much of the information indicated in paragraph (5) of section 207.3 (e) of the rules has been furnished with the application. While it is difficult for the Commission to believe that most of this information is not readily available to the applicants, it has decided to institute the investigation. A copy of the public notice of the investigation is attached.

"In view of the position which you took in the safety-pin case the Commission wishes it to be clearly understood that the institution of the instant investigation is not to be considered as reflecting any doubt on the part of the Commission as to its authority to call for and to consider information of the kind indicated in section 207.3 (e) of the rules, including paragraphs (27), (3), and (5) of that section. Such information is considered by the Commission to be pertinent to investigations under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, and will be called for in the course of the investigation with respect to straight pins.

"Sincerely yours,

"DONN N. BENT,
"Secretary.

"Commissioner MCGILL. On September 28, 1953, presumably after the receipt of the Commission's aforementioned letter of September 25, the attorney for the applicants in this investigation relating to straight pins filed an application for an investigation relating to safety pins which, except for bringing certain data down to date, was practically identical with the previous application relating to safety pins filed December 17, 1952. The Commission, nevertheless, instituted an investigation, but advised the attorney for the applicant, in a letter dated October 30, 1953, that it would call for information of the kind omitted from the application during the course of the investigation. A copy of this letter will be inserted in the record at this point.

"(The letter, dated October 30, 1953, above referred to, is as follows:)

"OCTOBER 30, 1953.

"POPE, BALLARD & LOOS,
"Munsey Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"(Attention Mr. John Breckinridge.)

"DEAR SIRS: The receipt is acknowledge of an application filed September 28, 1953, for an investigation under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, with respect to safety pins.

"It is noted that, except for bringing certain tables relating to production, sales, and imports down to date through the first 6 months of 1953, the application is identical with that filed in behalf of the same applicants on December 17, 1952, and which was withdrawn January 15, 1953, as a result of the Commission's request in its letter of December 31, 1952, for information which it considered should be furnished with the application.

"In view of the fact that the applicants chose to withdraw their previous application rather than supplement the application with the information requested in our letter of December 31, 1952, thus unnecessarily delaying the investigation for almost a year, the Commission has concluded that, to avoid a possible repetition of such action, it will institute the investigation requested in the instant application. A copy of the Commission's notice of investigation is enclosed.

"The Commission wishes it to be clearly understood that the institution of the instant investigation is not to be considered as reflecting any doubt on the part of the Commission as to its authority to call for and to consider information of the kind indicated in section 207.3 (e) of the Rules of Practice and Procedure, including paragraphs (2), (3), and (5) of that section. Such information is considered by the Commission to be pertinent to investigations under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, and will be called for in the course of the investigation with respect to safety pins.

"Sincerely yours,

"DONN N. BENT,
"Secretary.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Under date of October 31, 1953, the attorney for the applicants in the investigations relating to both straight pins and safety pins addressed a letter to the Commission in which he again indicated that the applicants in both cases would refuse to furnish the Commission with the information in question, except under compulsion. A copy of this letter will be inserted in the record at this point.

"(The letter dated October 31, 1953, above referred to, is as follows:)

"POPE, BALLARD & LOOS,
"Washington, D. C., October 31, 1953.

"Re investigation No. 28 (straight pin industry) and investigation No. 29 (safety pin industry).

"Mr. DONN N. BENT,
"Secretary, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. BENT: We thank you for your letters of September 25 and October 30, 1953, advising that the Commission has, under sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, instituted investigation No. 28 with respect to the straight (common) pin industry and investigation No. 29 with respect to the safety-pin industry. We acknowledge also the copies of the public notices of these investigations issued by the Commission.

"The applicants are gratified that the Commission has instituted these two investigations. We are instructed to inform the Commission that the applicants will submit to the Commission or make available to its representatives any requested information in their possession concerning imports or their domestic employment, production, costs, sales, and profits with respect to straight pins or safety pins, the two commodities with which the announced investigations deal. All books and records of each applicant dealing directly with these two commodities (or indirectly to such extent as necessary for allocation of overhead costs or similar items) will be made available for inspection to any authorized representative of the Commission.

"Your letters of September 25 and October 30 comment upon the area and character of evidence to be called for and considered in connection with each investigation.

"As indicated in your letter of January 15, 1953, it is our view that to such extent as the information indicated as desirable in paragraphs (2), (3), and (5) of section 207.3 (e) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, and referred to in your letters, relates to the production or sales of commodities other than straight pins or safety pins, or to other sources of income, it is not material or relevant to the investigation of the straight-pin industry or the investigation of the safety-pin industry within the meaning of sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. The applicants have not requested nor has the Commission ordered an investigation of the effect of imports upon applicant's production or sales of commodities other than straight pins or safety pins. Applicants do not presently claim that their profits from production of other commodities or that their income from other sources are being adversely threatened by imports.

"It is our position that an applicant's production of other commodities or its income from other sources does not constitute a part of the 'domestic industry producing' straight pins or a part of the 'domestic industry producing' safety pins. Also, it is our position that applicants producing straight pins only are not a part of the 'domestic industry producing' safety pins and that the applicants producing safety pins only are not a part of the 'domestic industry producing' straight pins. The two are separate and distinct industries and must stand on their own merits or demerits.

"In past instances, as indicated by your letter, members of the Commission have taken a view different from that to which we subscribe but this action on the part of the Commission has not been unanimous. We wish to earnestly urge upon the Commission a further consideration of all of the factors involved in this question. For this reason, we shall not voluntarily supply information beyond the boundaries indicated herein. We hope that upon consideration the Commission will uphold our view. However, if the Commission concludes that a subpena or subpenas are to be issued to compel the production of this data, we shall promptly comply with such order.

"We wish to again emphasize the fact that all of the applicants, in each case, desire to cooperate fully with the Commission and its staff in supplying any and all requested information from their records dealing directly with their production and sales of straight pins or safety pins, as the case may be.

"In order to facilitate their full cooperation, the applicants would like to suggest an informal conference at the Commission at the earliest convenient time. It is felt that such an informal conference would facilitate a determination of the type of information with respect to safety pins and straight pins desired by the Commission and would enable the applicants to make their own preparations for supplying such information as fully and promptly as possible. At such a conference the applicants would also like to discuss the possibility of a change in the hearing dates the Commission has announced.

"Very truly yours,

"JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

"Commissioner MCGILL. The Commission responded to this letter under date of November 17, 1953, a copy of which response will be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

"(The letter above referred to is as follows:)

"NOVEMBER 17, 1953.

"POPE BALLARD & LOOS,
"Munsey Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"(Attention Mr. John Breckinridge.)

"DEAR SIRS: Reference is made to your letter of October 31, 1953, with regard to investigations No. 28 and No. 29 under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, covering straight pins and safety pins, respectively. Reference is also made to your letter of November 3, 1953, re-

questing postponement of the hearings in these investigations.

"The Commission has noted your statement that the applicants in the above-mentioned investigations will not voluntarily furnish information regarding their operations other than will respect to straight pins or safety pins ,and your request that the Commission give further consideration to the position taken by the applicants. In its letter to you dated September 25 with respect to investigation No. 28, and in its letter to you dated October 30 with respect to investigation No. 29, the Commission clearly stated its position in this matter and therefore does not consider further comment in this connection to be necessary.

"The investigations will proceed in the usual manner, and information which the Commission considers pertinent to the investigations, including information relating to the operations of the domestic industries producing safety pins and straight pins with respect to other commodities produced by such industries, will be called for in due course. If any of such information is not furnished voluntarily, the Commission will either exercise its right to require the production of any such information by subpena or to take such action, other than compulsive measures, as it may determine to be appropriate.

"With respect to your suggestion for an informal conference at the Commission for the purpose of facilitating a determination of the type of information desired by the Commission and to enable the applicants to make preparations for supplying such information as fully and promptly as possible, the Commission has authorized the undersigned to arrange a conference between the applicants and appropriate members of the Commission's staff for such time as may be mutually convenient. However, it should be understood that such a conference will not include a consideration of any question regarding limitations on the extent of the operations of the industries concerned which is to be the subject of inquiry by the Commission in these investigations.

"Your request for postponement of the hearings in the investigations in question has been granted by the Commission. The hearing in investigation No. 29 has been postponed to March 23, 1954, and the hearing in investigation No. 28 has been postponed to March 24, 1954.

"Sincerely yours,

"DON N. BENT,
"Secretary.

"Commissioner MCGILL. In accordance with its usual practice, the Commission in the course of the investigations formulated questionnaires which were mailed to the producers of straight and safety pins on January 8, 1954, calling for information which the Commission considered pertinent to the investigations. These questionnaires were duly approved by the Bureau of the Budget. A copy of the Commission's questionnaire will be included in the record as Commission Exhibit No. 1.

"(The document was marked 'Commission Exhibit No. 1.')

"Commissioner MCGILL. None of the applicants returned the Commission's questionnaires; instead, they each sent to the Commission their own statements of information, which statements supplied some of the information called for in the Commission's questionnaires. However, none of the statements contained information of the kind in question and which the attorney for the applicants had previously repeatedly asserted would not be supplied to the Commission voluntarily.

"The Commissioners joining in this statement consider that the applicants have wilfully refused to cooperate with the Commission; that the applicants are attempting to dictate to the Commission the extent and scope of its investigations; and are insisting on substituting their judgment for that of the Commission as to what information is pertinent to the investigations. The information which the applicants have been requested to furnish and which they have wilfully refused to furnish is necessary to the Commissioners joining in this statement in order for them to arrive at a proper decision in the case, and the Commission itself has agreed that the information is pertinent to these investigations. In the absence of such information being furnished by the applicants concerned, the Commissioners joining in this statement will be unable to formulate findings on the merits in this investigation.

"Inasmuch as it is obvious that the applicants do not intend to furnish the desired information voluntarily, we are of the opinion that this investigation should be terminated forthwith and that the Commission should immediately issue a report thereon, without formal findings, explaining the reasons for the termination of the investigation.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, that completes the statement that I desire to make, but I desire to inquire of the counsel for the applicants, inasmuch as it took considerable time in the safety-pin investigation to cover the point, if the applicants, and each of them—and they are entitled, either one of them, any or all of them, to answer for themselves if they so desire, if they continue and at this time decline to supply the information requested in the questionnaires of the Commission as has been mentioned?

"Mr. BERCKINRIDGE. Senator McGill, in accordance with your desire, I have discussed the matter with all of the applicants and each have indicated that they would stand on the position they have taken in the past, as explained in my letters to the Commission and as explained by Mr. Heron, and that they will supply the information to the Commission if it is subpenaed.

"Commissioner MCGILL. If not subpenaed, do they decline to supply the information?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. They will not supply the information voluntarily, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. They understand, and you understand, just what portions of the questionnaire to which reference has been made?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir. The portion they decline to submit voluntarily is that portion dealing with their production, sales, and profits on products other than straight pins.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Mr. Breckinridge, at the hearing on safety pins, I enumerated the various places in the Commission's questionnaire, referred to them by page, and the items contained on each page. You have that all in mind?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. And you decline to supply it without its being subpenaed?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir; and, as I interpreted those portions of the questionnaire which the Senator mentioned, it was those dealing with the production, employment, sales, and profits of products other than straight pins.

"Now, Senator, Mr. Heron, my associate and partner in my firm, is going to make a brief statement at this point concerning our position. I would suggest that it might be appropriate to permit him to appear at this time.

"Commissioner MCGILL. They have indicated what they intend to do, and I am not intending to go through some proceeding here for no particular purpose.

"The questions, Mr.——

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, could I at that point—I think what we wanted to do, what Mr. Heron wanted to do, was to ask that his statement of our position on the issue be included in the record as though it were given here in full, although he will not make the statement in full.

"Commissioner MCGILL. I have no objection to that, except I would like to have what I am about to ask precede that in the record.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Yes.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Mr. Breckinridge, do you have the Commission's questionnaire there?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir; I have it right before me.

"Commissioner MCGILL. I would like to call your attention, on the first page, the items on that page shown down a little more than the middle of the page and headed by the letters D and E. Do you have those in mind?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. I take it you have.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. And on the next page, the items at the top, near the top of the page headed C and D?

"That would be page 2.

"Mr. BREKINRIDGE. Yes, sir; all other products and total.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Then, at the bottom of the page under title 'Average Number of Persons Employed,' all of the items contained therein?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. No, sir. We have supplied (2) (a) on safety pins, (2) (c) on straight pins, (3) (b) on safety pins, (3) (c) on straight pins.

"Commissioner MCGILL. You have not supplied item (1) under that heading?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. No, sir; that is all.

"Commissioner MCGILL. In either case?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. No, sir; because those refer to total employees on other products.

"Commissioner MCGILL. You have not supplied those items which I have last mentioned?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. No, sir; the applicants have not supplied that.

"Commissioner MCGILL. On the following page, which would be page 3.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. It is page 4 of 7, I believe, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. It would be 4, page 4, instead of 3, under the first heading of 'Item,' you find that, that part under the heading of 'A'?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir; all products.

"Commissioner MCGILL. You have that in mind.

"Under the next group headed under the title 'Item,' in that place you have in mind that headed by 'A'?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes; that is other products again.

"Commissioner MCGILL. I know it shows for what it is, but I am asking if you have that in mind.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Then, the next page there is nothing on it; but the following page, which I think would be page 6—would it be page 6?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Page 5 of 7, I believe.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Well, you have this place in mind?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner MCGILL. Under operating statements? That is, 15, at the top of the page, you have in mind the matter mentioned under the heading A?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Is that the one referring to operating statements on the overall business of each firm?

"Commissioner MCGILL. It reads: 'Submit with this questionnaire audited profit-and-loss statements and balance sheets for your company as a whole for your accounting years 1939 and 1948 to 1953 inclusive.'

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir. The applicants have not furnished that.

"Commissioner MCGILL. You have that in mind?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. Then, under the title 'Item,' you have all of the matters involved in the subdivision headed by figure '1.'

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir, that is the one covering all products.

"Commissioner McGILL. You have that in mind?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. You have all of them in mind when you say that you decline to supply the information except on subpena?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. My statement was that the applicants will not submit it and supply it voluntarily, sir.

"Commissioner McGILL. Unless they are subpenaed, as I understood you?

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Yes, sir; that is correct.

"Commissioner McGILL. Yes, sir.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I would like at this time, just to be sure that all the applicants are here——

"Chairman BROSSARD. Just a moment. Mr. Martin wanted to raise a question on something about it, I think.

"Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, since, as I understand it, Mr. Heron has agreed not to read his statement but to put it in the record, I wonder if it would not be satisfactory to make it an exhibit rather than to extend the transcript. Monday's statement ran 28 pages in the transcript. Wouldn't it be just as effective——

"Commissioner McGILL. May we take that up just as soon as—I thought Mr. Breckinridge wanted to take up something about the questions we asked him.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I would say that it is not satisfactory.

"I wanted to say to you, Senator McGill, if all of the applicants are here, and if any of them disagree with what I just said to the Commission, they should have this opportunity, and the record should show that they were all present, and by not saying anything they agreed with what I have stated.

"Commissioner McGILL. That is the way I assumed, and I invited any or all of them to answer individually if they saw fit.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Are there any of the representatives of the industry here who desire to make a statement contrary to the representations of counsel?

"(No response.)

"Chairman BROSSARD. It is agreed.

"Commissioner McGILL. I did not mean to interrupt Mr. Martin if he had something to say, but I thought Mr. Breckinridge wanted to finish that.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Just one statement. This matter, as I said when we began the hearing on safety pins, is a matter which the Commission had before it in a Commission meeting, and the Commission decided to proceed with the hearing to get all the information it could at this hearing, so we will proceed with the hearing.

"Commissioner McGILL. I think we will do the same as we did in the safety-pin investigation, and I will state that the vote was 3 to 3.

"Chairman BROSSARD. Thank you.

"Commissioner TALBOT. It was 3 to 2 in the safety pin.

"Commissioner McGILL. Not at the Commission meeting, it was not.

"Chairman BROSSARD. It was 3 to 3 in the Commission meeting, and so stated.

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have my partner, Mr. Heron, respond to the question put by Mr. Martin, counsel for the importers.

"Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, if the alternative to my suggestion is reading the statement, I withdraw the suggestion.

"Chairman BROSSARD. I think it would be advisable, since everybody heard the statement, if the statement is inserted in the record, if that is agreeable to everybody. Is there any objection to that? It will be inserted in the record, and you will not need to make it.

"Mr. HERON. Thank you, sir.

"(The statement of Mr. Heron appears at the beginning of these extracts from the hearing.)"

Mr. Speaker, as the author of the escape clause as it is now contained in section 6 and section 7 of Public Law 50, I have some idea of what the Congress intended when this major change was made in our trade policy.

As a witness some weeks ago before the Tariff Commission on hearing No. 28, dealing with straight pins, I stated what I considered the intent of the Congress.

John Breckinridge, attorney with the firm of Pope, Ballard & Loos, questioned me, as follows:

"Mr. BRECKINBRIDGE. What in your opinion was the understanding of the House of the words, 'domestic industry', when they debated and adopted the escape clause containing those words?

"Mr. BAILEY. I think if you will peruse my debate on the House floor, you will understand what the primary object was. It was to protect domestic industries, producers of individual articles who were being harassed, injured, harmed by importations, excessive imports of like products coming from abroad."

Mr. Breckinridge reviewed the entire history of the escape clause and other tariff legislation using the words "domestic industry." It seems indisputable that the clause was written primarily to protect individual products which are injured by imports. Otherwise, section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act is made impotent for its intended purpose. If an interpretation is put upon it that the overall situation of the companies, asking relief—including unrelated products—can be taken into account, the result is absurdity. Plainly, then, only information concerning the straight pin industry should be considered by the Tariff Commission in deciding whether that industry is entitled to relief under sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Act.

I do not see how the Commission can, upon mature and sober consideration, conclude otherwise. To me the action of these three Commissioners reflects a lack of sympathy with the congressional mandate of the escape clause and an unwillingness to carry out the clear intent of Congress to protect the American production of those specific products which were being threatened with injury from imports of a like or competitive product.

I hope that those Commissioners who so injudiciously prejudged the case and announced their decision at the opening of the public hearing, before hearing the facts or arguments of the applicants, will give this important matter further thought and reconsider their position. At least, I hope, in their report on the case, they will give a complete and clear statement of their interpretation of the words "domestic industry." The Commission has never defined these words and the Congress should understand their interpretation. These words constitute the very heart of the escape clause.

Today the Congress finds itself at the crossroads in our trade policies. Should the Congress fail to enact legislation contained in H. R. 9159, which drastically altered the present administrative features of our tariff law, then I would suggest to the Congress that we immediately enact and clarify the language and the intent of Congress when it amended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by adding the escape clause intended to protect America's labor, capital, and management devoted to the production of individual products on which the tariff has been provided by the Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], does not the Federal Trade Commission cite any law on which they base the decision to which he referred?

Mr. BAILEY. I will reply to the gentleman from Kansas in this way. They say that they are unable to interpret the intent of the Congress in passing the escape clause; that they have set up certain rules and regulations and printed them, which were controlling, and that they were not complying with the rules and regulations of the Tariff Commission. Those rules and regulations were not established by the Congress but by the Tariff Commission. I say that their action is arbitrary.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by Senator BENDER at Youngstown, Ohio, on February 24, 1955, dealing with America's business future.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address entitled "Let's Put America First," delivered by Senator JENNER before the Dallas Public Affairs Club and the Committee of One Hundred, at Dallas, Tex., on February 14, 1955.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Statements by him and by the Secretary of the Interior on the question of the public power issue and the so-called partnership program of the national administration.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Address delivered by the Secretary of the Treasury on February 16, 1955, at Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration.

THE 14 FUNDAMENTAL FACTS OF THE NUCLEAR AGE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in the October 1954 issue of the Review of Politics, which is published by the University of Notre Dame, Indiana, there was published an article under the heading of "Courage or Perdition?—The 14 Fundamental Facts of the Nuclear Age," written by Ferreus.

Mr. President, from time to time articles which have great significance and great interest appear in various publications. I wish to ask at this time unanimous consent that the article to which I have just alluded may be printed in the body of the RECORD. It deals with vital matters affecting the defense of our country.

I would particularly call the article to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the ranking members of those three committees. I think they will find the article challenging, and in due time and at an early date I believe they will want to explore some of the very basic questions raised, which vitally affect the security of the country.

Fundamentally, the article takes up the possibilities of an effective system of inspection relative to atomic energy. That question, of course, is of vital concern to this Government and to the American people, in view of the fact that the Soviet Union to date has rejected all proposals for effectively checking on atomic weapon development.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURAGE OR PERDITION?—THE 14 FUNDAMENTAL FACTS OF THE NUCLEAR AGE

(By Ferreus)

However distasteful it may be, nuclear weapons of the fission and fusion types have come to stay. Henceforth, they will be as much a part of human existence as rain and snow, morality and crime, the telephone and the airplane, pacifism and aggressiveness, freedom and tyranny, stupidity and wisdom. It is unlikely that this new invention can be undone except through the destruction of civilization itself. On the contrary, nucleonics sooner or later will provide the foundation of industrial civilization all over the globe. Given the anticipated increase in consumption or our energy resources, it appears that nuclear fuels, on a large scale, will have to be made available to industry within the life span of the present generation. Otherwise economic decline (and hence political catastrophe) must come about as the result of the gradual depletion of oil and coal deposits, the concurrent price rise of mineral fuels, the lack of a mineral energy basis in many countries, the rapidly rising demand for industrial goods, and the uninterrupted increase of population.

On a less cosmic scale, the continued progress of many individual industries is dependent, at least partially, upon the early utilization of nuclear techniques and materials. For example, the future of surface and possibly air transportation, of irrigation agriculture, and perhaps of the chemical and metallurgical industries, is interrelated with nuclear advances. Both energy needs and technological changes make it inevitable that large nuclear industries, including producers of fissile materials and atomic particles, will arise in presently industrialized countries. It is no less inevitable that such industries will grow in under-developed areas, because nuclear technology offers an unprecedented chance of cutting the time requirements for industrialization. Nucleonics are fast becoming a global necessity. Naturally, in a world where there are numerous installations using nuclear techniques, and where there are also many basic nuclear producers, there must be available manifold abilities to build nuclear weapons. The inevitability of the nucleonic age and the emergency of nuclear industrial potentials is the first fundamental fact which we must grasp firmly.

True, the mere existence of nuclear industries or even of atomic weapons does not by itself pose a security threat. This threat arises only when such weapons are in the hands of the politically immoral and uninhibited, and more particularly, in the hands of governments or political (and criminal) groups willing to employ such weapons for the blackmail or destruction of their opponents. It may be argued that, given governmental encouragement to the present tendency of society to decentralize, and given some efforts to reduce the vulnerability of factories and cities, the relative effectiveness of nuclear weapons could be reduced. It also may be argued that the employment of nuclear weapons could reduce war to a single battle of a few days' duration and that, while casualties in this battle would be very heavy, total casualties would be smaller than those resulting from a hypothetical protracted war fought without nuclear weapons. In comparison with wars of previous centuries, a nuclear war indeed need not be more destructive of human lives than, let us say, the Thirty Years' War (which, admittedly, would be scant solace). However, these arguments may be countered with equally, and perhaps more, cogent objections. In the end, the disputants should agree easily that wars in general, and nuclear wars in particular, are most unpleasant occurrences which all of us must make strong efforts to avoid. Hence the question arises: granting the inevitable existence of nuclear capabilities are there feasible methods for avoiding a nuclear holocaust?

A nuclear monopoly in the hands of an aggressive dictator certainly would have spelled doom for much of mankind. If, by the end of the Second World War, Stalin had possessed such a monopoly in the form of a significant weapons stockpile, he would have been able to establish a Soviet world dominion; in all likelihood, he would have proceeded to do so. Or we may ask ourselves what might have happened if the Nazis had come into possession of an operational stockpile of atomic weapons prior to the Normandy invasion? Had not the United States achieved the first atomic stockpile in history, human society would have suffered the worst catastrophe in its history. Let us be grateful that this disaster was spared us.

If an aggressor were to use nuclear weapons in the future, he would do so in the expectancy of retaliation in kind. We probably are entitled to make some rationalistic assumption with respect to human nature, including the psychology of aggressors. If we assume then, that aggressors aim at the fruits of war but dare shoulder only the minimum of sacrifice, we should expect that in the face of a deadly retaliatory threat, aggressors might abstain from the employment of nuclear weapons. Yet this expectation cannot be firm because the aggressor may be able to neutralize, by military or political means, the capability or willingness of his opponents to retaliate; and secondly, because he may be a madman (in the clinical sense), and hence not be rationally mindful of the consequences of his acts—in fact, depopulation and the creation of ruin and chaos may be his primary objectives. Hence the concept that atomic attack is preventable through the threat of retaliation, while probably valid in general, cannot be relied upon in all and any circumstances.

There is a school of thought which denies that security against atomic destruction can be obtained at all through retaliatory threat. The fear is that retaliation would compound the evil. In different variants and mixtures, it is proposed that the supervised destruction of existing stockpiles and the establishment of an international control apparatus be undertaken in order to prevent the future production of nuclear weapons. Perpetual international control is the heart of this concept; its purpose is to make nuclear war impossible through nuclear disarmament. There have been numerous schemes setting forth infallible and effective control arrangements. Many supplementary and occasionally ingenious ideas have been proposed to provide for the closing of the loopholes which, invariably, appeared after a particular scheme had been analyzed closely.

The drawing of utopias has been the favorite pastime of our nuclear Morus, Campenellas, and Bellamies. It is amazing that such cerebrations have arrested the attention of political scientists and even of practicing statesmen (if we assume their attention was genuine). No less startling is the fact that discussions about such schemes usually ignore the practical difficulties which would arise even in the unlikely event of an international agreement undertaken in truly good faith.

Let us look at three of these practical difficulties.

1. Effective atomic control probably would entail the direct watching of no less than 100,000 industrial firms and factories the world over; hence at least 300,000 technically qualified inspectors would have to be assigned to the control of existing facilities. In reality, this world-wide requirement would be considerably larger and in addition to supervising industrial enterprises it would be necessary to control many other economic activities, such as mining, trading, laboratory research, etc. I doubt that there are in the world enough technically—and linguistically—qualified persons to undertake such a task. (In the United States only 7,400 persons received master of arts and doctor of philosophy degrees in engineering and physical sciences during 1952.)

No elaborate statistics are necessary to show that commitment of such a corps of inspectors would swallow a large percentage of the world's scientists and technicians. While on control assignments, these men would be taken away from their primary professions. One can but picture the effect on future scientific progress. Yet if volunteers were not forthcoming in adequate numbers, personnel would have to be drafted. and this not just for a short emergency. The loyalty and the reliability of drafted inspectors probably would not rate very high. Since, actually, the world's entire technical economy must be supervised, literally every qualified citizen would have to become a part-time policeman. Even in this improbable case a modern state would possess enough resources and wits to outwit the honest inspectors, bribe the dishonest ones, blind the attention of the disaffected, and enlist the willing or forced cooperation of the ideologists and political careerists.

2. To avoid secret preparations in out-of-the-way places and uninhabited areas, approximately 30 million square miles would have to be supervised, with at least half of this area requiring frequent and close looks. This type of massive supervision can be done only through aerial reconnaissance. Assuming a range of aircraft of 1,000 miles and a photographic coverage per sortie of a 2-mile strip, 15,000 aircraft sorties would be necessary for a single supervision or if a weekly check is desired, as it must, about 780,000 sorties per year. This estimate neglects additional sorties necessitated by bad weather and the need to survey sea areas, and it does not take into account the responsibility of following up suspected violations with detailed checks and precision photography obtainable only through large numbers of low-level flights (and conceivably through airborne landings). With maintenance, repair, and loss, approximately 8,450 aircraft and about 2 million men as well as very substantial photographic facilities would be required to do just the basic job. With all that investment and flying, it still would be possible—easily possible—to fool the air patrol: many infractions would be feasible in tunnels, underground installations, and even in innocent-looking city houses. Needless to say, such a global air patrol would deprive all states of their military security in nonnuclear weapons. Hence the patrol can be instituted only after states no longer are required to have military and industrial secrets. If so, would the air patrol not be superfluous?

Future technology, however, may modify the above requirements for control flights. With better aircraft, enlarged airbase systems, and broader photographic coverage, the job may be done with fewer sorties. Substantial increases in commercial flying gradually may restrict the area which needs to be controlled. Still, the cost of the inspectors corps and the air patrol may be estimated at approximately $18 to $20 billion yearly as compared to the current budget of the United Nations of less than $50 million.

Unquestionably, the United States would have to pay the lion's share of this budget. More significant perhaps, only the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom would be able to make available adequate air facilities and personnel for the purpose. The air patrol would be an almost exclusive responsibility of the super powers. Let us be content with the remark that such a state of affairs would present very great political hazards.

3. Nuclear weapons already are in existence. Before an agreement conceivably can be negotiated, there will be large weapons stockpiles in many countries. How on earth can it be assured that all these weapons would be destroyed and the sizeable numbers of "insurance weapons" would not be hidden? Yet if no reliable and practical method can be designed against this mortal danger of concealment, then the time for the establishment of dependable controls did pass years ago. While it may be a useful propaganda device to talk about control schemes (which I rather doubt since the spreading of illusions usually backfires), nuclear international control never again can be a safe security measure. International control would be possible only as a sham and, if adopted, would constitute an extreme and unacceptable security hazard. This is the second fundamental fact which we must understand.

For that matter, the point is entirely academic. So long as the Soviet government retains its present structure and political intent, and wants to remain safely in power as a dictatorship, it cannot, and will not, accept an international control agreement. This is so because it cannot allow thousands of foreign inspectors to investigate Russian industry and possibly ferret out major Soviet secrets. International control, moreover, would mean the end of the iron curtain and hence signify the end of this most essential prop of Soviet political survival.

Our concern must center on the threat of an atomic war within the next ten to twenty years. It is unlikely (though, naturally, not impossible) that during this period the Soviet government will have changed enough to make it any more amenable to mutual supervision. Hence even the best conceived control scheme will not help us with our problem of avoiding nuclear warfare in the immediate future. It may be granted, however, that should the Soviet government change substantially within this crucial period, a new look at the problem could become useful. For the time being, discussions of safe nuclear disarmament schemes are, at best, useless or naive and, at worst, hypocritical or subversive. Soviet talk about control is designed to disarm the United States, and enhance the nuclear posture of world communism. This is the third fact which we must always keep in mind.

It also has been proposed to forego involved control schemes. Instead, a simple international agreement should be concluded, for example, in the form of a mutual promise never to use nuclear weapons. Proposals of this type are based on the assumption that it is, objectively, to the best interests of all to avoid nuclear war. Hence such a promise—it is alleged—would be undertaken in good faith by all states, at the risk of atomic perdition. To assume good faith in vital security matters is in flagrant contradiction to overwhelming historical evidence; as of the date of this writing, it cannot be shown plausibly that the advent of the new technology has invalidated the significance of historical precedent. To postulate that it would be against the interests of a potential aggressor not to use nuclear weapons, especially if other nations would have lived up to their word and would be unprepared for nuclear warfare, is hazardous to the point of advocating political suicide. The lack of proper nuclear capabilities in peaceful states would provide the aggressor with unparalleled opportunities for attack and with an historically unprecedented chance of all-inclusive victory. The atomic bomb is an attractive weapon for the bolshevik. It places him within arms' length of fulfilling what was before an unattainable pipedream: The destruction of the United States and the accomplishment of world revolution, regardless of Russia's survival or demise. The nuclear bomb inevitably will become the aggressor's weapon par exellence. While the historical Alexanders, Napoleons, and Hitlers were pitiable illusionists, the atomically armed future aggressor may be the greatest military realist of all times, and hence end up as the first true world conqueror in history. This possibility is the fourth fact of the nuclear era.

Agreements of any kind, and surely those dealing with key security matters, presuppose mutual trust. International agreements are, or should be, similar to those found in private life—they must not be entered into unless they are based on a calculable minimum of confidence. No sane businessman ever deals with a person whose credit rating is bad and who has a record of defaulting on his debts. If a promissory international nuclear agreement were concluded in the present situation, it would produce the strongest sense of insecurity and fear. For this reason alone, it probably would become inoperable and conceivably lead to war.

No nation in its right mind would risk its security through destroying its atomic stockpile in reliance upon a mere diplomatic agreement. With large nuclear industries in existence, such a paper agreement could be broken easily and rapidly. Let us not forget that governments change and that few governments consider themselves bound by the promises of their predecessors. To have any security at all therefore, nations would have to retain readily usable nuclear weapons in their arsenals. There is no other insurance against breach of promise. But, then, we would be back at the point where we started, namely, at the existence of nuclear armaments. Naturally, it would be possible to conclude agreements limiting the number of nuclear weapons in the possession of each nation. Yet such agreements cannot be enforced in such a manner that violations would be made impossible; and presumably it would prove difficult to include in such agreements limitations on the number of defensive nuclear weapons.

No doubt, governments could pledge themselves not to use their nuclear weapons aggressively or offensively, and yet reserve the right to produce and maintain such weapons. It is conceivable that such an agreement would be kept. All that is necessary to make the agreement stick is to produce a military situation in which the employment of nuclear weapons would be equally harmful to both sides, and in any event, extremely harmful to the first user. If there were such a situation—which cannot be defined properly or predicted, and which hardly would be of a stable and lasting nature—the agreement would be superfluous: the belligerents anyway would act according to their best interests. By contrast, if there were a military situation in which it would be advantageous for one belligerent to initiate the employment of nuclear weapons, even at the price of retaliation, then in all likelihood the agreement would be disregarded. The chances are that, within the next 10 to 20 years, this latter rather than the former situation will prevail.

I will refrain from judging whether, at present, it would be advantageous for the United States to commit itself to the nonuse of nuclear weapons. The fact is that the United States Government has not made such a commitment (as little as it ever committed itself to forego the use of toxic gases). The effective abolition of nuclear weapons undoubtedly would reduce the dangers of a surprise attack against North America and also protect American cities. But this advantage would have to be paid for dearly and cannot be obtained without heavy risk.

The proscription of nuclear weapons would be meaningful only if the Armed Forces in their entirety were reorganized to wage nonnuclear war. In order to protect its security in the absence of nuclear weapons, the United States would have to acquire an entirely different military establishment. Any surface strategy replacing present air strategy would suffer from fatal geographical handicaps or, to phrase it differently, to compensate for Russia's advantages in a surface war, an extraordinary military effort of the United States would be necessary. For example, to balance Soviet ground strength, in such a manner that further Russian advances in Eurasia would not be invited, American land forces would have to be tripled and supporting air and naval forces be enlarged substantially; possibly the Strategic Air Command (nonnuclear) also would have to be doubled or tripled. The adoption of a nonnuclear air strategy would require even greater efforts. The maintenance of so considerably larger forces must demand a military budget on the order of $100 billion or more, and could not be done without compulsory military service, perhaps of 2 to 3 years' duration. Despite such an exertion, the security of key areas in Europe and Asia could not be guaranteed.

I do not know whether the United States can afford such a military outlay. I do know that long-lasting armaments of such a size would transform American society, and I doubt seriously that the United States soon would be inclined to arm on a $100 billion scale during peacetime. If this doubt were justified, then the abandonment of nuclear weapons could spell only the defeat, and ultimately the Communist domination, of the United States. And yet, despite our nuclear forbearance, we could not be sure that the United States would be spared atomic attacks. Certainly, in the closing phases of war in which the U. S. S. R. achieved air mastery, the Soviets would not refrain from using atomic weapons against American targets if the American Nation otherwise would fail to surrender; or the Soviets might use those bombs to further their objective of liquidating hostile classes. For that matter, a parallel argument can be made for the Soviet nation: Without nuclear weapons, the Soviets never can hope to defeat the United States. Hence, they will accept proscribing atomic weapons only after they have abandoned first their objective of world revolution.

Nuclear weapons are the key of modern military power, and hence the irreplaceable key to American security. This is the fifth fundamental fact of the nuclear problem. We are all free to deplore the situation but we are unable to change it unless we are willing to concede victory to the Communists and to surrender without resistance as, indeed, has been proposed.

Such counsels of despair—if made in good faith—result from an improper analysis of the problem. Many of those who have been participating in the nuclear argument find it difficult to understand that, within the present world situation, the avoidance of nuclear catastrophe is a military and political task. The nuclear problem is not susceptible to solutions by legal agreement, nor by any other trick aiming at the evanescence of nuclear weapons. This is the sixth fact with which we must come to grips. It is true there is no guaranty, even if suitable military and political techniqucs were used skillfully, that there will be no nuclear devastation. Nor is there any guaranty that these techniques, in fact, will be used with dexterity and imagination. Since, however, there is no practical alternative solution, we

must concentrate on the techniques which are available. If those who lose their time in chasing utopian butterflies could but devote some of their brainpower to the real problems before us, we might make some progress after all.

The military task, briefly, consists in maintaining armaments in such quantities and of such quality that the opponent of the United States will find it impossible to solve his military problem through the employment of nuclear weapons. More particularly, he must be prevented from knocking out the American retaliatory forces through surprise blows and delivering a substantial portion of his atomic stockpile on American targets. He also must be prevented from posing, as he does now, a unilateral nuclear threat to European and Asiatic countries. Once the various free nations have acquired quantities of nuclear explosives, the military problem becomes essentially a matter of delivery vehicles and defense systems, viz., of overall technological superiority, as well as of constant readiness and a gradual reduction of the vulnerability of cities and people.

This military problem is of major dimensions and it will continue to grow. I need add only that the American people and the peoples of other free nations have not yet understood fully the scope of their military responsibilities. I do not believe that in order to solve its military security problems, the United States will have to be turned into an "armed camp" (a cliché which many abuse to argue against proper preparedness), but the United States no longer can afford to have military budgets which fall far short of satisfying minimum requirements. Present American and allied armaments and technological programs have many gaps which any military expert can identify without difficulty. Insufficient forces in being and inadequate quantities of modern weapons, as well as poor command, alliance and decision-making structures which are not responsive to the requirements of rapid modern war, constitute an invitation to nuclear death, especially so since in a modern war the first battle may decide the outcome of the entire conflict. This is the seventh fact which we never should allow to be forgotten.

And we may immediately add the eighth fact that future wars hardly will be fought with weapons ordered and produced after the start of hostilities. Military and industrial mobilization after D-day is a concept which is not applicable to nuclear air war. Hence, war potentials have lost much of their significance, while forces in being and weapons stockpiles have become of crucial importance. This means that one of the main military assets of the United States, i. e., industrial superiority, no longer possesses its traditional significance. Current American military policies do not yet respond to this fundamental strategical change.

Politically, several different tasks have to be performed. There must be an effort to make all free nations understand that the dangers of atomic war cannot be obviated by paper promises, but only by painful security actions. There is further the task of inducing the free nations, including the United States, to acquire the ready military strengths they need. Third, there is the problem of convincing our allies and ourselves that we must sacrifice for our security and possibly accept economic hardship, in order to procure those weapon systems which are needed in a modern war rather than those which were needed half a generation ago. Phony security is the excessive hazard in the present phase of the nuclear age. This ninth fact of the period often has been willfully and perilously overlooked.

Such persuasions probably will not be feasible if they be done by words and dollars alone. Much more is needed. Let us mention the need, in many European countries, for a new concept of economy to bring about the transformation of old societies from paralytic structures, or at best slowly going concerns, into fast growing, open societies, in which discouragement and disaffection will give way to positive attitudes. It is at this point that nuclear technology, in its industrial applications, should be able to do wonders, not only because it will provide energy to areas where there are at present inadequate resources, but also because the establishment of new major industries must produce an economic upswing. The buildup of the nuclear and electrical industries could bring about a socioeconomic mutation which would result in a vast improvement of living standards and an easing, relatively speaking, of the armaments burden. An economic rebirth on a new technological basis would demonstrate that the disintegration of the old society has been halted and that progress again has become possible. Our 10th fundamental fact is that the industrial application of nuclear energy offers an excellent chance for the social strengthening of the free world. Lest the impression arise that no basic reforms are required in the United States, be it pointed out that there is an urgent need in this country to stimulate technological inventiveness and imagination and to bring about a more rapid exploitation of new inventions. To satisfy this need, undoubtedly, additional research funds may be required, but more important still would be the streamlining of overly long and constructed bureaucratic channels. American technological and industrial time lags are too long. This is the 11th fact to which we must pay attention.

The political task, of course, should include efforts to persuade Soviet leadership that it is unwise for them to pursue their goal of world domination after, and in spite of, the onset of the necleonic age: Unwise because nuclear technology has all but destroyed the last vestige of the Marxian argument that due to the scarcity of resources, the abolition of private ownership is the prerequisite for material well-being of all members of society; and unwise, further, because the continued pursuit of the revolutionary goal, in disregard of the dangers of nuclear war and of the unpopularity of the Soviet Government at home, may spell the doom of the Communist regime, regardless of what would happen to the free world.

Western statesmen should not tire in explaining and emphasizing those two points. If, ultimately, the Soviet Government were to accept those two propositions, a new era would have begun and unless a new aggressor were to arise, the danger of nuclear ruin ipso facto would have ended. Unfortunately, it is most probable that the Soviet Government, at least in its present composition, will not accept the truth of those propositions and, partly for reasons of intellectual blindness, partly because of its inability to abandon its ideology which it needs to legitimize its rule, and partly because of the inertia of its power machine, will continue its relentless and hazardous drive toward world domination. Hence, the threat of atomic devastation is posed anew.

In the absence of adequate powers of persuasion, the threat of nuclear aggression against the free world can be eliminated only if the Soviet Government is changed or replaced. An alternate, though less conclusive solution, would involve a substantial retraction of the Soviet power orbit. Shall we consider the need to weaken, modify, or replace the Soviet Government to be the 12th basic fact of the nuclear age?

An effective liberation policy appears as one of the few alternatives to continued life in the shadow of nuclear death, with its expensive and growing demands for constant military readiness. It is true that a policy of liberation in and by itself poses the threat of atomic conflict, the important difference being, however, that an initiative policy by the free world would make it impossible for the aggressor to rig the game entirely in his favor and to create situations which would be most favorable to his plans of attack. If the would-be aggressor were kept off balance and forced to busy himself with his own defenses rather than with offensive plans, the threat of atomic devastation might be diminished.

In the nuclear age, political and military initiative is an indispensible prerequisite of security, while loss of initiative poses insoluble problems. The term "initiative" is not used here as a circumlocution for preventive war. Hundreds of initiatives are possible without resort to military conflict. As an example of a successful American initiative, we may recall the decision to acquire the hydrogen bomb before the Soviet Union. However, the time may come when a dispassionate survey of the security problems of the free world would indicate that these problems cannot be solved except through the deliberate resort to force. We should hope that such a moment never will come. But we must remember that in order to secure our safety without an offensive strategy, our military posture would have to be strengthened considerably and that, conversely, if no such strengthening occurs, the fateful decision may become inevitable. It is easy to pronounce cliché opinions about this grave problem and to take pleasure in pointing out that preventive war is logical nonsense: War cannot be fought to prevent war. True; but war can, and occasionally must be fought to prevent disaster and perdition. Only one thing is worse than nuclear war: Defeat in such a war. And this is the 13th fact to which I wish to call attention.

Article I, section 10, paragraph 3 of the Constitution of the United States anticipated the need of initiative and offensive security actions in case of "imminent danger as will not admit of delay;" if such dangers occur, the States may "engage in war * * * without the consent of Congress." So long as the United States clings to the concept that under no possible circumstance will it initiate war, not even while the opponent is preparing to strike, so long the initiative will remain in Soviet hands. In the seven generations of its existence, the United States has waged quite a number of wars and in every one of them—this possibly includes World War II—the United States faced up to the ineluctable decision and initiated hostilities on its own volition. There is absolutely no factual basis for the contention that democracy abhors war. The very nature of democracy demands that it accept its responsibilities and that, while it should not seek war lightly and do everything to avoid conflict, it must fight if and when there is no other choice but the destruction of the democratic system. Has it not become apparent now that the world would be a better place—and that many millions of innocent human beings still would be alive—if Hitler had been stopped between 1933 and 1936? The concept for peace à outrance has proved to be unmanageable, excessively costly and utterly destructive.

No doubt, in the nuclear era, a war decision is of far graver import than a similar decision before 1945. Personally, I never would favor a war decision unless there is a clear, urgent, and immediate need to anticipate and forestall attack with no other solution being available, and unless there is no other way to avoid a clearly inevitable war at a later date and under significantly more unfavorable circumstances.

However, looking back at my own reactions of 20 years ago, I remember arguing, too, that war should be waged against Hitler only under conditions of extreme necessity. But was that policy so wise? Was it not based on the invalid assumption that the Nazi regime was unstable? Did this policy not provide Hitler with many trumps and allow him to outarm his opponents? Maybe the ideals of pacifism are so lofty that the price which we had to pay—and which in the end possibly will have

included a future world war III—was not too high. But again, was it such a good idea to refuse paying the relatively small price required to hold China during 1947 and 1949, seize North Korea in 1950, and liquidate Communist China after it actually had attacked United States forces? Far from embracing preventive war, the United States adopted a strategy of not fighting back and of deliberately averting its own victory. What did this new departure in militant peacefulness save for us in Southeast Asia? What will it have saved for us after Communist China and Russia will have developed modern industries and combined their military resources? Clearly, do we not have a policy of avoiding the smaller and easier wars to make the big and costly wars ever more inevitable? In any event, in proclaiming good intentions of peacefulness with respect to future wars we are forced to look hard at the 14th fact of the atomic age which, perhaps, is the most ominous of all: That in an atomic conflict the force which plans to strike second never may be in a position to strike at all.

In the discharge of its security duties toward itself, its allies, and toward the free world, the United States must seize the political initiative. Yet, this initiative cannot be seized so long as the opponent knows that the United States does not mean it seriously and will shrink away from the ultimate consequence. The United States also may have to seize the military initiative, but nothing effective can be done in either field so long as the opponent is allowed to count upon his double ability to determine the timing of the war and to strike the first blow. No sustained and successful American initiative is possible while the by far most important decision is left in Soviet hands.

Without vigorous initiative, there can be no liberation, nor can the Soviets be dissuaded from their clearly avowed aggressive intentions. Yet, unless this Soviet objective of world domination is eliminated, there is no real chance of avoiding war; and, naturally, unless the basic military initiatives are in free world hands, there will be no protection against devastation, loss of life and defeat, nor preservation of free institutions and democracy. We may get away with a policy of the least effort, but only if our opponent is thoroughly frightened by what we can do to him after we received his first blows. It is in the nature of atomic war that he has no overwhelming reason to be excessively frightened.

To sum it all up: We have a policy of avoiding war, but we have achieved only this—the danger of war is becoming ever more unmanageable. To keep the military situation under control and to preserve our democratic institutions, we shall have to make a stand at some time. On the basis of the record of the years 1933 to 1954, we can say confidently that the sooner and the firmer the United States will make this stand, the easier the task will be and the greater the chance of forestalling atomic warfare.

The world is full of unprecedented dangers. We may argue about the means by which the dangers could be overcome, if such means were utilized. But we should realize that, in all probability, the dangers will persist. It is easy to predict the doom of our civilization and quite unrewarding to propose concrete—and costly and unpopular—military and political measures aiming to insure the survival of that civilization. I cannot help feeling, however, that this civilization is a spiritual force and, therefore, not susceptible to physical destruction. In any event, it cannot survive if the people who live under its blessings display a deplorable weakness of conviction and lack the ethos of courage. Nor can this civilization survive if its intellectual elites, fearful of risk, effort, and self-assertion, advise collective political suicide. This is a statement which can be supported with historical evidence and which I intend to be an objective proposition. I realize that the advocacy of suicide is not always intentional and that praiseworthy desires often are the midwives of deadly proposals.

I would like to add, and say it clearly, that I have nothing but contempt for those who are willing to surrender to communism in order to avoid nuclear war and thus to assure the physical survival and the enslavement of the maximum number. If such a spirit were typical of the free society, our civilization would be dead now. I do not believe that doom is near, let alone that it has come. But I am worried that the voices of cowardice are heard far more often than the voices of determination. I, too, want my family and my friends to survive and I do want to live to the end of my natural days. Everyone has the instinctive animal fear of death. But it hardly pays to survive for the blessings of a slave existence and it will be intolerable to purchase survival through the betrayal of value and conscience. Policies cannot be based just on the instinct of self-preservation. Do intellectuals and politicians have a lesser moral obligation than the simple private of whom they expect that he sacrifice himself when ordered into battle? Our entire society has been pushed into mortal conflict. In some way, most of us are now manning a battle station. Must we not be true to our duties?

The issue of the present world conflict is whether communism will be victorious or be destroyed. The hydrogen bomb has not changed this issue, not by one iota. If the desire for freedom were a variable dependent on the expected rate of casualties, we should not even attempt to fight. If, however, national and individual freedom is our highest political value, then we should do our best to keep casualties to a minimum—even in the country of our opponent—but we should not be deterred by the cost of the conflict; the cost of defeat and of loss of principle would be still higher.

We are living today twice as long as the generations who conquered freedom for us and established the foundations of good government. Our task is to preserve and improve freedom for ourselves and for our descendants, and to bring freedom to those who still are enslaved. The way to solve a serious problem is not to distort or ignore it, but to handle it; to take all precautions which prudence imposes, to accept the irreducible risks, to bear the required responsibilities and to follow the dictates of one's conscience. To cringe before the enemy, to bewail fate even before it is known, to become paralyzed from fear and pessimism, and to abandon oneself to the visions of apocalyptic horror is despicable. It is moral self-destruction to which atomic devastation would add little but physical confirmation and merited punishment.

THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday, February 24, marked the 37th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. In joining my fellow Americans of Estonian descent in commemoration of this noteworthy event, I fervently hope that the reestablishment of a free Estonia is near. The forcible annexation of Estonia and her Baltic neighbors is a tragic reminder of the totalitarian imperialism of the Soviets. Although freedom in Estonia has fallen victim to the treacherous Communist tyranny, the gallant Estonian people remain firm in resisting their oppressors. Let us, on this anniversary, reaffirm our determination never to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic nations, and express our fervent hope and prayer for their speedy liberation.

IMPORT DUTIES ON JAPANESE CRABMEAT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at the present time in Geneva, Switzerland, the United States is taking part in tariff concession negotiations with the Japanese.

Among the items subject to tariff concessions in favor of the Japanese is crabmeat. The announcement last fall that our country would consider tariff reductions on imported Japanese crabmeat was met with grave concern by members of this young American industry. The crabmeat industry finds even present import duties on Japanese crabmeat inadequate to assure fair competition with the crabmeat industry of Japan on the American market.

The Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries as bounded by my State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia to the south, constitutes the largest crabmeat producing area in our Nation, although substantial segments of this industry are also found along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and the Gulf of Mexico. If provided with reasonable protection from unfair competition of foreign nations where, as an example, workmen receive but a fraction of what they are paid in America, this young American industry will grow and continue to furnish employment opportunities for thousands of our countrymen and make it possible for all Americans to enjoy this fine seafood at fair and reasonable prices.

There are many factors which ably demonstrate why tariff concessions on Japanese crabmeat should not be made. The President, under existing statutes, has the final discretion in determining whether such concessions shall be granted.

In order that these factors may be appropriately illuminated, I have been joined by a number of my colleagues in the Senate and also by a number of Members of the House of Representatives in presenting a petition to President Eisenhower, setting forth the basic reasons why present import duties on Japanese crabmeat should not be reduced at this time. In keeping with this goal, I ask unanimous consent that this petition, together with the names of the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives who joined me in signing the petition be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the list of signers, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
February 9, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, acting on information we have received from the American Crab Packers Association which was presented in detail at hearings of the United States Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information last December, and

without being influenced by our views on the tariff policy of the administration as set forth in H. R. 1, do hereby petition you to instruct the proper authorities not to reduce the present tariffs on imported crabmeat from Japan or other countries at the forthcoming conference of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to be held at Geneva, Switzerland. Our reasons in making this request are as follows:

1. The present tariffs of 15 percent ad valorem on fresh and frozen crabmeat and 22½ percent ad valorem on canned crabmeat, have apparently not obstructed or restricted the importations of such supplies as Japan, the principal producer, has had available for export to this country, since imports of crabmeat from Japan have increased from 480,000 pounds in 1948 to 3,800,000 pounds in 1953, a gain of 700 percent. In 1953 we imported 95 percent of the crabmeat that Japan exported.

2. Japanese crabmeat is now underselling the domestic in the United States market. The prices of the imported item are in keeping with the prices of other items of its class such as lobster and shrimp.

3. No sales effort or advertising is being used to promote the sales of imported crabmeat. If this were done it is quite evident that the market would absorb a much larger volume at present price levels. But big supplies suddenly dumped into the market would sell only at sacrifice prices.

4. It has been pointed out that, by the Potsdam Treaty, Russia took over 80 percent of Japan's crabbing grounds at the end of the last war. Our Government excluded Russian crab imports in 1951 because it was produced by slave labor. But Russia has tried repeatedly to enter the United States market with crabmeat via England and other free countries.

5. Japan, to increase her crab production to an extent that would materially help her economically, must secure the supply she lost to Russia. Fishing concessions to Japan, involving a return of these crabbing grounds, is the ace which Russia holds in the trade negotiations that are now being proposed between these two countries. For such agreements reached, Japan will likely pay heavily and Russia will benefit.

6. It was reported in a reliable London publication early last December and not contradicted since by the British Government, that five crab and salmon fleets supplied by the British Government, flying the British flag and under the protection of their Navy but manned by Japanese workers will fish the Siberian coastal waters in 1955. These reports as well as possible Russian and Japanese commercial agreements being discussed, lead one to suspect that the great crabbing grounds now in Russian hands will eventually be fished by Japan. In such a deal, the Russians are bound to be benefited while the American industry will suffer irreparable damage if the tariffs are lowered.

7. The American crab industry is not small. It employs 34,000 persons in 1,500 plants located in coastal towns of 17 States and Alaska. We do not think it should be considered expendable, certainly not under such circumstances.

8. The American crab industry is not mechanized. In fact it is more of a handicraft industry than is that of Japan because the crabs picked by Americans are so much smaller than those picked by Japanese. The American labor wage is more per hour than the Japanese pay for a day's work of unlimited hours. The Japanese pay 65 cents for picking a sufficient amount of meat to fill a case consisting of 48 tins, 6½ ounces each. For the same work, the American industry pays as high as $3.02. It is evident that the American industry cannot survive if the present tariffs are lowered.

9. The effect of imports of cheaply produced foreign fishery products has long been of concern to the Commitee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and to various Members of the Senate. During the 81st Congress the House approved a resolution expressing concern over the matter and calling it to the attention of the State Department.

10. We understand the objectives of the overall tariff policy of the administration but we feel justified in calling to your personal attention such cases as this one, where a lowering of the tariff apparently will not help Japan materially but may benefit Russia and surely will do great damage and cause unemployment needlessly in an industry that is important to our State and our Nation.

We, therefore, petition you not to lower the tariff but to give the matter more time to adjust itself, in the manner it seems to be doing now, without undue hardship to either country.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. BUTLER, United States Senator, Maryland; HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator, Virginia; FREDERICK G. PAYNE, United States Senator, Maine; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, United States Senator, Washington; STROM THURMOND, United States Senator, South Carolina; W. KERR SCOTT, United States Senator, North Carolina; J. GLENN BEALL, United States Senator, Maryland; OLIN D. JOHNSTON, United States Senator, South Carolina; SAM J. ERVIN, JR., United States Senator, North Carolina; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator, Louisiana; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, United States Senator, Maine; RUSSELL B. LONG, United States Senator, Louisiana; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Representative, Washington; RUSSELL V. MACK, Representative, Washington; JACK WESTLAND, Representative, Washington; WALT HORAN, Representative, Washington; HUBERT B. SCUDDER, Representative, California; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Representative, California; JAMES B. UTT, Representative, California; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Representative, California; CRAIG HOSMER, Representative, California; JOE HOLT, Representative, California; CARL HINSHAW, Representative, California; JOHN PHILLIPS, Representative, California; BOB WILSON, Representative, California; JOHN F. SHELLEY, Representative, California; GEORGE P. MILLER, Representative, California; JOHN E. MOSS, Jr., Representative, California; LEROY JOHNSON, Representative, California; GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Representative, California; B. F. SISK, Representative, California; JOHN F. BALDWIN, Representative, California; E. W. HIESTAND, Representative, California; JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Representative, California; CHET HOLIFIELD, Representative, California; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Representative, California; CHARLES S. GUBSER, Representative, California; CLYDE DOYLE, Representative, California; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, Representative, California; JAMES ROOSEVELT, Representative, California; PAT HILLINGS, Representative, California; CLAIR ENGLE, Representative, California; CECIL R. KING, Representative, California; WALTER NORBLAD, Representative, Oregon; SAM COON, Representative, Oregon; W. J. BRYAN DORN, Representative, South Carolina; JAMES A. HALEY, Representative, Florida; EDWARD J. ROBESON, Jr., Representative, Virginia; HENDERSON LANHAM, Representative, Georgia; HERBERT C. BONNER, Representative, North Carolina; WILLIAM M. COLMER, Representative, Mississippi; JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Representative, South Carolina; CHARLES E. BENNETT, Representative, Florida; JOHN J. RILEY, Representative, South Carolina; GRAHAM A. BARDEN, Representative, North Carolina; L. MENDEL RIVERS, Representative, South Carolina; PRINCE H. PRESTON, Representative, Georgia; HOWARD W. SMITH, Representative, Virginia; THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Representative, Mississippi; E. E. WILLIS, Representative, Louisiana; BOB SIKES, Representative, Florida; ARTHUR WINSTEAD, Representative, Mississippi; ALBERT RAINS, Representative, Alabama; T. A. THOMPSON, Representative, Louisiana; JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Representative, Louisiana; HALE BOGGS, Representative, Louisiana; JAMES H. MORRISON, Representative, Louisiana; F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Representative, Louisiana; GEORGE S. LONG, Representative, Louisiana; D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Representative, Florida; PHIL M. LANDRUM, Representative, Georgia; L. H. FOUNTAIN, Representative, North Carolina; GEORGE H. FALLON, Representative, Maryland; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Representative, Maryland; EDWARD T. MILLER, Representative, Maryland; J. P. S. DEVEREAUX, Representative, Maryland; SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Representative, Maryland; DEWITT S. HYDE, Representative, Maryland, RICHARD E. LANGFORD, Representative, Maryland; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Representative, Louisiana.

THE CONDITION OF FARM WORKERS IN 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, to be associated with the remarks I shall now make, a report to the board of directors of National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., by Fay Bennett, executive secretary.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONDITION OF FARM WORKERS IN 1954

(Report to the board of directors of National Sharecroppers Fund, by Fay Bennett, executive secretary)

Significant beginnings were made in 1954 in the recognition by the Federal Government of a responsibility toward the farm worker, both resident and migrant.

LEGISLATION—NATIONAL

The most encouraging development was the inclusion for the first time of a large percentage of farm workers under the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act. All farm workers earning as much as $100 a year from a single employer are now included. This covers virtually all resident farm wageworkers and a large number of the migrants as well.

Farm workers still lack the protection given industrial workers through minimum wage and maximum hour legislation, unemployment insurance, and Federal guaranties of their right to organize and bargain collectively.

Migrant workers achieved specific legislative recognition with the appropriation for the establishment of the Interdepartmental Committee on Migratory Labor (within the Bureau of Labor Standards of the Department of Labor) to co-ordinate the various Federal departmental activities in this field. Unfortunately, the President's meagre budgetary request for this important work was halved to $50,000. It is hoped that this new Federal committee, despite its small budget, will make an effective start toward stimulating and strengthening the activities of the several agencies now dealing with some aspect of the domestic migrant problem. Such

a start will point up the need for larger appropriations.

Still unprovided for is a needed Federal commission on imported migrant workers. Some aspects of this problem will be dealt with in the discussion of Mexican workers.

LEGISLATION—STATE

A few scattered States were notable for active governmental concern with—and some remedial legislation for—the migrant problem. Some highlights:

New York: The prior-established joint legislative committee on migrant labor made intensive studies of living conditions in migrant camps, goaded by newspaper revelations of horrible conditions and spurred by pressure from private organizations. Legislative authorization resulted in the adoption at year's end, January 1955, of a new code of health and sanitary regulations. High standards of safety against fire, water pollution, food and milk spoilage, and bathing and toilet contamination are required. A minimum floor space in sleeping quarters of 30 square feet for each person over 2 years old is provided for. If adequate inspection renders these rules effective in the coming year, a distinct advance will have been made in this most pressing aspect of the migrant labor problem.

Pennsylvania: For the first time, State funds were appropriated for the establishment of a day-care center for migrant children. Augmented by Federal and private funds, it is a notable example of practical cooperation between State agencies and citizen groups. The Pennsylvania Citizens Committee on Migratory Labor deserves prime credit for this achievement. National sharecroppers fund is gratified that its financial aid has helped make this work possible and looks forward to continuing cooperation in the citizens committee's program for better health, housing, working conditions, and minimum wages.

New Jersey: The 9-year old joint governmental-public migrant labor board continues to direct and stimulate the State's program administered through the migrant-labor division (now the bureau of migrant labor) of the department of labor. A significant development was the operation of the recent law including farm-labor contractors (crew leaders primarily) under private employment agency regulation. The chief effect of this regulation has been to encourage payment of the worker directly and thus reduce his financial dependence on the crew leader. New Jersey has continued its experiment with a summer school for migrant children. It is hoped that out of this experience there will soon evolve a more comprehensive program which will include all, rather than a hundred or so, migrant children and that this program will be adapted by other States to their needs—perhaps with Federal aid.

In sharp contrast to these few forward steps on the State level is the more nearly typical situation existing in Maryland. Here not only has there been no official governmental recognition of the problem, despite the presence of over 10,000 migrant farm workers during the course of the year, but residency requirements ranging up to 1 year exclude most migrants from public welfare, hospitalization, and medical care. No provision is made for periodic inspection of farm labor camps and no special provisions are made for schooling. Like most States, Maryland fails to provide for workmen's compensation for injured farm workers. Only Ohio, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico provide for compulsory coverage of farm workers on the same basis as other workers.

PUERTO RICAN WORKERS ON THE MAINLAND

Puerto Rican workers coming to the mainland were the only group of domestic farm workers to receive Federal protection in wages, housing, and working conditions. In 1954, 10,800 of them came under work agreements prepared by the Puerto Rican department of labor and cleared for placement by the United States Employment Service. Early drought and late hurricanes had reduced this work force by 4,200 under 1953.

It is estimated that at least 10,000 more Puerto Rican farm workers came to the mainland without formal contracts and that in recent years 5,000 to 6,000 of them have become part of the year-round migratory stream. Despite some serious drawbacks to the Puerto Rican program, such as denial of union representation or of worker participation in the determination of the prevailing wage, it has demonstrated the feasibility of direct remedial action by the Government in the field of domestic farm labor.

MEXICAN WORKERS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Southwest farm operators' claimed dependency upon Mexican workers which has encouraged over 1 million illegal entries a year continued unabated during the first half of the year. By that time a large part of the crops of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas had been planted and cultivated by illegal (wetback) Mexican labor, often at pay as low as 25 cents an hour. The domestic labor force had been driven out to swell the size, and depress the conditions, of migrant labor in other parts of the country.

By June public opinion forced Attorney General Brownell to take action. With an augmented border patrol, the Justice Department cracked down on wetbacks. In a 4-month period, 300,000 Mexican illegals were arrested and deported, or frightened back across the border.

The operators' outcry against this loss of cheap labor was met by a quick stepup of the legal Mexican contract labor system. A preliminary screening station was established at Monterey, 150 miles south of the border. From there, the certified bracero (farm worker) went to border recruiting centers where, after physical examination, chest X-ray, and fingerprinting, he was hired by corporation farmers or farmer associations for work in Government-certified labor shortage areas. Under the work contract, Mexicans received guaranties of 50 cents an hour minimum wage, at least 3 weeks work out of 4, workmen's compensation, adequate food and housing at reasonable prices. No such guaranties were available to any domestic worker except the Puerto Rican.

Three hundred nine thousand and thirty-three Mexican nationals were legally imported under contract in 1954, a 54 percent increase over 1953's 201,380 total.

The growing magnitude of this problem cannot be solved by an annual "crisis" deportation drive against the illegals nor by legalized Mexicans working at 50 cents an hour. This minimum becomes the maximum and creates the domestic shortage that is the excuse for the importation. National Sharecroppers Fund favors last year's Senate Judiciary Committee proposals for more stringent penalties on those who participate in the traffic in illegal entry. NSF believes that the alleged domestic labor shortage in the area is artificially created by pay rates too low for decent living. NSF favors legal importation, only if the contracts are enforced [1] and the minimum raised to a wage where a domestic worker can support his family without putting his wife and children to toil in the fields. Finally, NSF believes that the domestic farm worker is entitled to the same Federal protection that the imported worker enjoys, and which has long been taken for granted by the city worker.

[1] On November 1, 1954, the U. S. Department of Labor and the Texas Employment Service had less than a dozen compliance officers to enforce the Mexican workers contract. At that time, there were 16,570 employers hiring 96,532 Mexicans in the State.

THE SOUTH

While the sharecropper system is on the decline with increased mechanization and diversification throwing the 'cropper into the day labor and migrant stream, it continues to be the prime producer of the crop in many areas. National Sharecroppers Fund, concerned with the problems of all farm labor, has always done what it can to help the efforts of this group to help itself. NSF is particularly happy to report that at least one group of sharecroppers in Alabama, barely eking out subsistence, is seeking to meet this problem of mechanization by banding together for the joint purchase of a tractor and other equipment. NSF hopes to help in this and other such projects which might well be one solution to the problem of keeping the landless from becoming the homeless.

Closely akin to the sharecroppers are the farm workers who, while primarily needed for day labor at peak seasons, live on the plantations in planter-owned shacks and trade on credit in planter-owned stores. Typical of this group are the sugarcane and rice workers of Louisiana.

In the fall of 1953, 2,000 sugarcane workers, organized by the National Agricultural Workers Union—AFL, went on strike (after exhausting all other means) to better their miserable living and working conditions. (Average yearly family earnings: $700–$1,200.) Despite the help of National Sharecroppers Fund and other organizations, the strike was broken through antilabor injunctions, a type of court interference that long has been a thing of the past in industry. The injunctions were appealed and, after almost a year, the Louisiana Supreme Court ruled that the injunctions were valid because the strike during the harvest season jeopardized a vital segment of the economy of the State. Chief Justice Fournet said in his decision: "The guaranties of freedom of speech, even if picketing and speech are held to be identical, cannot be maintained in the face of such irreparable injury to property." If this doctrine is permitted to stand, the workers in a major industry of any State may be enjoined from striking at a crucial production period. The union attorneys are preparing an appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

The rice workers of the same area have appealed to the National Agricultural Workers Union for help in organizing. These Cajun-speaking workers, about equally divided between Negro and white, earn 35 cents to 40 cents an hour during the season. They work 10 to 12 hours a day, irrigating the canals essential to rice production. Louisiana is the second largest rice-producing area in the world. There should be significant developments soon in this effort of the workers to gain a decent measure of return for their work.

SMALL FARMER COOPERATION

The small farmer, squeezed between the large operators and the distributors of the farm product, has long tried to better his bargaining position through marketing cooperatives in many areas. Only recently, however, has he begun to recognize that his interests are more nearly those of the worker than of the corporation farmer.

The attempt of 3,000 small Louisiana strawberry growers to market their product in 1952 and 1953 through the Fruit and Vegetable Producers Union, AFL was thwarted by the institution of a Sherman Anti-Trust Act prosecution against them. It is ironical that these farmers, whose average yearly earnings from strawberries were less than $400, were convicted of being a strawberry trust and their union leader was given the maximum sentence under the law—$5,000 fine and a 1 year (suspended) prison sentence. A recent report from the Attorney General indicates that rarely is such a sen-

tence imposed in cases involving corporations.

Partly out of this bitter experience, the National Agricultural Workers Union has established a Department of Cooperative Unions. This department will accept into affiliation cooperative marketing associations of small farmers set up in compliance with Federal and State law. Thus the ability and strength of union organization and cooperative marketing will be pooled to raise the living standards of the small farmer.

First result of this program was the organization of 300 small dairy farmers in northeastern Pennsylvania. Other dairy groups have been formed in Maryland, Minnesota, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In the offing is the reorganization of the Louisiana Fruit and Vegetable Producers Union.

EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN

A major emphasis of national sharecroppers fund in the last year has been education of migrant children. NSF has joined with 6 other organizations in launching a demonstration project in Florida and Virginia. It will attempt to alleviate the educational disruption of the child who when school opens in the fall finds himself on the eastern shore of Virginia where his parents harvest the late crop, returns to Florida to enter class late in November, and starts north again in April. Such a schedule results in little education and early drop-outs. The project has established, in cooperation with the local boards of education, a supervisor of migrant education, who will work with the local schools and travel with the migrants. She will see that the children get to school and that they have their proper records. She will work with the teachers to coordinate the curricula and see that the migrant child gets the special help he needs to integrate him with his nonmigrating classmate.

To continue this work, NSF has helped organize the migrant children's fund, whose main aim is to develop and promote educational opportunities for migrant children who, studies show, become retarded through constant migration though their native abilities measure up to those children not constantly on the move.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON AGRICULTURAL LIFE AND LABOR

Now in its fifth year of operation, this national council serves its large number of affiliated organizations with up-to-the-minute news of the Washington scene affecting farm labor and the small family farmer. National sharecroppers fund is an active participant in the council's program and supplies financial support as well.

Over the years, national sharecroppers fund, conscientious news reporters, and concerned groups of citizens have been gradually educating the American public concerning the plight of the sharecropper, tenant farmer, and migrant farm worker. As this report shows, advances are being made in some areas. It is to be hoped that the fund's supporters will renew and expand their generous support of our work in 1955.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call the particular attention of the Senate to the section dealing with the importation of Mexican farm workers. Although under the work contracts they receive guaranties of 50 cents an hour minimum wage, we continue to receive reports to the effect that wages as low as 25 cents an hour are being paid both to contract workers and to illegal wetbacks.

I also call particular attention to the portion of the report dealing with the State of Louisiana. The report points out that employers in Louisiana claim the right to prevent labor from organizing in farm industry. The report shows that a judge issued injunctions against a strike by farm workers in the harvest fields in that State.

The injunction was upheld a year later by the Lousiana Supreme Court on the ground that the workers did not have the right to strike during the harvesting season. That case is being appealed to the United States Supreme Court. If it should ever become universal law in this country, it would amount to breaking the back of the economic strength of organized labor.

It is a rather novel ruling that labor should have the right to strike only when it would not do any injury to the employer. That would destroy the economic strength derived from the right to strike in American industrial relations. It is a very disturbing decision. Of course, it is a long step backward to government by injunction in the United States in the field of industrial relations.

I particularly urge my colleagues to read this report, because it is clear evidence that we still have a long way to go before economic justice is done to the people in the low wage brackets, particularly agricultural workers, who, in many sections of the country, are looked upon as human beings who do not even have the right to organize.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

THE SHAWNEE AND JOPPA POWERPLANTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last Friday reference was made on the floor of the Senate to what was called the "Ebasco fiasco." Unfortunately, I was unable to be present at that time, or I would have replied to the statement.

In my own State of Arizona a large oil refinery is to be built by Ebasco. Having perfect confidence in the ability of the people of my State to select companies which can do the work and which are honorable, I wish to make a brief statement in reply to the remarks last Friday.

For a while, Mr. President, we heard a great deal about how TVA had outstripped private industry in building the Shawnee powerplant, which is comparable to the Joppa plant built by Electric Energy, Inc., but we have not heard so much about that recently. I wonder if the court case in East St. Louis had anything to do with causing less discussion of the comparison. The chances are that most of us are not informed about this court case. Before the trial, public power enthusiasts made a great deal of to-do about the Ebasco fiasco and their statements received wide publicity. But outside the St. Louis area one really had to search to find information about the indictment, trial, conviction, and sentencing of two big labor racketeers for their nefarious operations on the Joppa plant which was being constructed by Ebasco.

It never did make sense to me that an organization with some 70 or 80 leading utility companies as clients, a company that had designed and built more powerplants than any other single organization in the world, would make a flop on a plant so important as the one at Joppa, unless something happened that was entirely beyond their control. Any reasonable man would know that Ebasco realized it was in competition with TVA and that if TVA outdid it on the job, they would advertise the fact to the world.

I know a little about Ebasco. I know they have built some of the finest, cheapest, and most economical plants in the world. They have done most of the engineering, and some of the construction, for the Public Service Company of Arizona, a large utility serving my State. I know the management of Public Service sufficiently well to be confident that it would not tolerate inefficiency or incompetency 5 minutes, so I know those who get its work, and continue to get it, must be good.

But getting back to the East St. Louis trial: Irving R. Dale and James Bateman, large southern Illinois labor leaders, were found guilty of attempting to extort $1,030,000 from Ebasco, which was building the Joppa plant. They did extort $7,500 from Maxon Construction Co., which had subcontracted a part of the work.

When these racketeers failed to get the money out of Ebasco, the company was plagued with a series of strikes. Another peculiar thing about the whole transaction is that the strikes were not against the company for unfair labor practices or anything like that, but were jurisdictional strikes. There were more than 40 strikes and 23 partial shutdowns. Twenty percent of the working time was lost because of these strikes. But the strikes were not the worst part of this deal. Those familiar with construction know that when an operation is plagued with one strike right after another, even during the time men are working there is a slowing down. The slowdown is worse than the strike. When men are giving a third or a half a day's work for a day's pay the cost is heavy. At least when they are out on strike the employer has only the overhead going on and he does not have to pay the men who are not producing.

This whole thing has a smell to me, and I am not sure the whole story has yet been told by any manner of means. Its a strange coincidence that many of the strongest supporters of Government power are backed by labor and are willing to give labor anything it wants. And, by the same token, most of the segments of organized labor have been strong proponents of TVA and other Government power developments. Could it be that labor, too, realized the competition between private industry and TVA and undertook to see that TVA won the contest?

If I was boosting TVA I would be very quiet on this subject.

I have here a press release dated January 1, 1955, from the Department of Justice. I desire to read one paragraph from this release:

The flagrant example of the type of situation involved can be found in the Evan Dale case in the southern district of Illinois. Dale gained complete domination of the rank

and file of his union. He then used this control, plus terrorism, to intimidate contractors and sabotage construction work for his own personal gain. Actions of Dale and his associates have been estimated to have cost the Government more than $51 million during construction of the Joppa, Ill., powerplant for the Atomic Energy Commission. He and another labor leader, James Bateman, convicted of attempting and conspiring to extort more than $1,030,000 from the original contractors for the plant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed a press release issued by the Department of Justice on January 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney III said today that major progress was made against labor racketeering during 1954 by the Department of Justice with the cooperation of responsible union officials.

Reporting to Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., on the 1954 activities of the Department's Criminal Division, which Mr. Olney heads, the Assistant Attorney General said:

"Creation in 1954 of an Organized Crime and Racketeering Section was an important development in the work of fighting crime. The section serves as a national filter for all information pertaining to organized criminal activity. By coordinating work of the other sections of the Division where criminal activity cuts across several fields, it is proving a sharp weapon against racketeering in all forms.

"A particular result is that approximately 50 investigations of extortion or bribery now are being initiated every month under the Labor Management Relations Act and the Anti-Racketeering Statute (the Hobbs Act). In 1953, there were 19 labor racketeering indictments involving 44 defendants under these 2 laws. In 1954 there were 37 indictments involving 65 defendants. There were 28 convictions in 1954; none in 1953.

"A flagrant example of the type of situation involved can be found in the Evan Dale case in the southern district of Illinois. Dale gained complete domination of the rank and file of his union. He then used this control, plus terrorism, to intimidate contractors and sabotage construction work for his own personal gain. Actions of Dale and his associates have been estimated to have cost the Government more than $51 million during construction of the Joppa, Ill., powerplant for the Atomic Energy Commission. He and another labor leader, James Bateman, convicted of attempting and conspiring to extort more than $1,030,000 from the original contractors for the plant."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed a series of newspaper articles dealing with the situation I have been discussing.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 30, 1954]

BUILDERS' AGENT TELLS OF $7,500 IN PAYOFFS MADE TO UNIONIST DALE—WITNESS IN RACKETS TRIAL SAYS HE GAVE CASH TO DEFENDANT FOR PROMISES TO HALT JOPPA LABOR TIEUPS

Payoffs totaling $7,500 were made to Evan R. Dale, southern Illinois boss of the AFL Laborer's Union, in exchange for assurances that work stoppages plaguing a subcontractor on the Joppa (Ill.) atomic facility would cease, a witness testified today in United States District Court at East St. Louis.

Thomas J. Scott, resident construction engineer for the Maxon Construction Co., of Dayton, Ohio, said he made the payments in 4 installments in 1952, delivering the cash to Dale personally in sealed envelopes. The first payment was made March 17, he said, and the final one was made September 17.

Scott, a large, gray-haired man, bowed his head as he testified. He spoke in a low voice, haltingly, and flushed as he described the payoffs.

DALE LISTENS INTENTLY

Dale, seated near the front of the defendants' counsel table, leaned forward and listened intently to the testimony. He is on trial with James Bateman, another southern Illinois labor leader, on charges of violating the Federal Antiracketeering Act.

Dale alone is charged in 1 count of a 3-count indictment with extorting the $7,500 from the Maxon firm. He and Bateman together are alleged to have attempted to extort $1,030,000 from Ebasco Services, Inc., of New York, general contractor on the $197 million Joppa job.

Scott testified he and other officers of the Maxon Co. became alarmed in July 1951 at the number of work stoppages which had occurred on their job of constructing a water intake structure, a discharge well, and a loading dock for the Ebasco firm. Work had started in May, he said, and laborers were walking off the job at least once a week.

SOUGHT INTERVIEW WITH DALE

As a result of this concern, he testified, he sought an interview with Dale, who controlled a labor pool of 30,000 men for work on the Joppa Job and also for large atomic energy construction projects at Paducah, Ky., and Shawnee, Ky. He met with Dale at a hotel bar in Cairo, Ill., he recalled.

"Dale told me he wasn't expecting me, but had expected one of the big boys," Scott said. "At this meeting he asked me how much our job was and I said it was $863,000."

The witness said he saw Dale again several days later. At the second meeting, he said, Dale told him the customary price for labor peace in southern Illinois was a flat 1 percent of the contract "in cash."

Scott testified he agreed to pay Dale after holding several conferences with other officers of his company. Labor troubles ceased for the Maxon company, he added, although no payments were made immediately.

Early in 1952, he said Dale summoned him to the labor chief's office at Carbondale, Ill.

DALE SAID HE NEEDED MONEY

"Dale told me it was being rumored around that Maxon Construction Co. had already paid off", the witness said. "He said his associates had begun to believe this and were concluding that, he (Dale) was holding out. Dale said he needed the money right now."

The figure of $7,500 was agreed upon at this conference, Scott said.

Asked by Assistant United States Attorney Edward G. Maag if he actually paid any money to Dale, the witness said:

"I did. I paid him a total of $7,500. I made four payments. The first time was about March 17, 1952, in the men's room of the Embassy Club at Cairo, Ill. I gave Dale the money in a brown manila envelope. He counted it and put it in his pocket. It was $2,000 in cash."

Scott testified the next two payments also were $2,000 each and were made at Dale's Carbondale office April 23 and June 3. The final payment, he said, was for $1,500 and was turned over to Dale at the Carbondale office September 17, in each case the money was carried in a brown manila envelope, he said.

The witness said he obtained the payoff money from John E. Burke, vice president and treasurer of the Maxon company, and that Burke knew for what purpose it was to be used.

TELLS OF ANOTHER CONVERSATION

A conversation he had with Edward M. Marselli, assistant general plant superintendent for Electric Energy, Inc., for whom the Joppa plant was built, was also related by Scott.

"I was talking to him on July 24, 1951", Scott testified, "and I told him about Dale's statement that the customary price for labor peace in southern Illinois was 1 percent of the contract.

"Marselli gave a long, low whistle. He said, 'One percent of $100 million amounts to $1 million.' "

Scott testified Marselli was referring to the estimated overall cost of the Joppa contract which at that time was $130 million.

In his opening statement to a jury of six men and six women, Maag outlined details of the alleged Maxon shakedown as given in Scott's testimony.

He said Dale told Scott and other representatives of companies working on the Joppa project that he (Dale) was the boss in southern Illinois and must be paid for labor peace.

DEMANDS ON EBASCO COMPANY

In support of the other two counts, Maag said the Government would prove that Dale made similar demands of Ebasco Co. and that work stoppages and jurisdictional disputes among unions continued for more than 18 months after the general contractor refused to pay off.

He said that Bateman, a business representative of a Murphysboro (Ill.) local of the AFL pipefitters' union, took part in several conferences where demands were made. Dale, who lives at Carbondale, is the most powerful southern Illinois figure in the AFL construction laborers' union.

For the defense Fletcher Lewis of Murphysboro, attorney for Bateman, said his client had "done everything humanly possible" to stop jurisdictional disputes at Joppa. Bateman's union was involved in only 3 of 43 work stoppages, he said, and Bateman was named chairman of a conference of business agents to mediate and prevent jurisdictional trouble.

General denials of the Government's charges were made in behalf of Dale.

A last minute motion to dismiss the indictment on which Dale and Bateman are being tried was filed this morning by defense attorney John J. Hoban of East St. Louis, but it was overruled by United States District Judge Fred L. Wham.

The motion contended that Dale had been deprived of his constitutional rights when he was called before a Federal grand jury in St. Louis, in June 1953, and asked to give testimony about labor trouble at Joppa.

OTHERS AIDING MAAG

Working with Maag in presentation of the Government's case were United States Attorney Clifford Raemer and Tom E. DeWolfe and Ben Brooks, assistant attorneys general assigned from the trial division of the Department of Justice.

The jury was selected yesterday after an all-day session. Two alternates, a man and a woman, also were chosen.

Dale is represented by Hoban and Bateman by Lewis and John M. Karns of East St. Louis.

Judge Wham questioned prospective jurors exhaustively, asking if they had any union affiliations, if close relatives belonged to unions, if they were employers of union labor and if they were prejudiced against organized labor.

He dismissed 5 men who expressed a bias against labor and said they thought this would influence their verdict. The defense challenged 11 and the Government 5.

The jury was placed in custody of the United States marshal for the duration of the trial.

MEMBERS OF JURY

Members of the jury are Dwight B. Bailor, coal miner, Valier; Oliver Breidicker, vice president, First National Bank, East St. Louis; Michael Brennan, office manager, Ames Construction Co., East St. Louis; Mrs. Virginia Cover, Tunnel Hill; Daniel Gover, insurance agent, Mattoon; Mrs. Carmen Hutchcraft, Fairfield; Edwin Kleeman, farmer, Nashville, Mrs. June Klein, Pinckneyville; Bert Knoll, farmer, Danville; Mrs. Mildred Meyer, Walsh; Mrs. Mildred Molique, East St. Louis, and Mrs. Martha Mueller, Carlyle.

Alternates are Gilbert Potts, store manager, Altamont and Mrs. Virginia Richard, Pinckneyville.

The second count alleges an attempt to extort the money from representatives of the general contractor, Ebasco Services, Inc., of New York, recognized as one of the largest constructors of utility powerplants in the world.

The first count of the indictment charges Dale and Bateman with conspiring to obstruct and delay interstate commerce by demanding payment of the $1,030,000 in exchange for industrial peace at the Joppa plant.

The Joppa plant, built to supply power for the atomic energy gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Ky., was constructed for Electric Energy, Inc., an organization of five private utilities. It was plagued with work stoppages, which began the same month the first alleged shakedown attempt was made.

Cost of construction increased $58 million over the original estimate. Staff employees of the Atomic Energy Commission have testified the added costs were due largely to strikes and labor trouble. Four generators are now in operation.

The labor strife, mostly jurisdictional disputes between unions, continued for 18 months. Finally, in the summer of 1953, Electric Energy, Inc., took the contract away from Ebasco and turned it over to another firm.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 1, 1954]

WITNESS TELLS OF DECISION NOT TO PAY OFF DALE—COMBINE AGENT TESTIFIES ON MEETING REFUSING $1,030,000 SOUGHT BY UNIONIST

Testimony about a St. Louis conference in which high level utility and construction company officials decided against making a $1,030,000 payoff to Evan R. Dale, southern Illinois boss of the AFL Laborers' Union, was given in United States district court today at Dale's trial on labor-racketeering charges.

The witness, Turner White, Jr., vice president and general manager of Electric Energy, Inc., a combine of 5 private utilities organized to build and operate an atomic-energy facility at Joppa, Ill., said 3 company representatives attending the meeting reported demands made on them by Dale to permit peaceful completion of the project.

White was permitted to testify about the meeting only because Defense Attorney John J. Hoban had insisted on asking him questions relating to whether he had ever received any direct threats from Dale.

PROSECUTOR OBJECTS

Since Assistant United States Attorney Edward G. Maag had interrogated White only about contracts, the Government prosecutor objected to Hoban's line of questioning.

United States District Judge Fred L. Wham at first sustained the objection, but when Hoban announced he would call White as a defense witness the judge permitted him to continue.

Hoban then drew from White a statement that Dale had made no direct threats.

This gave Maag an opportunity to ask if any indirect threats were made.

"All I know is what was reported to me by Mr. Marselli (Edward M. Marselli, assistant plant superintendent for Electric Energy, Inc.)," the witness replied. "He reported on his conversations with Dale in which he was told to see another man who told him it would take 1 percent of the contract to stop our troubles."

White said Marselli's report was made at the high level conference in St. Louis, held in the late summer of 1951. Among those attending the meeting, he said, were J. Wesley McAfee, president of Union Electric Co., of Missouri, and also of Electric Energy, Inc.; Ralph E. Moody, a vice president of Electric Energy, and a number of Ebasco officials, including Kemp W. Reese, Fred Gardner, Clinton J. Sammond, and Arthur J. Mohan.

OTHERS REPORTING DEMANDS

Asked if anyone at the meeting besides Marselli reported demands made on them, White said that Garner and Reese had so reported. He did not elaborate.

Sammond, industrial relations consultant for Ebasco Services, Inc., a New York firm of contractors and consultants, testified earlier about a conference with labor leaders at Cairo, Ill., in which Dale boasted of his power and said the Joppa job would never be completed unless Ebasco learned to do business his way.

This testimony was corroborated, in its main parts, by Fred J. Daugherty, president of Daugherty Co., Inc., of Youngstown, Ohio, piping contractors, and Delphin Johnson, Portsmouth, Ohio, who was in charge of materials for the Daugherty firm. They said they attended the meeting.

Facts alleged in the indictment occurred while Ebasco Services was the prime contractor on the Joppa powerplant. The estimated cost of the project skyrocketed $58 million to a present estimate of $197 million, the rise being attributed largely to labor trouble. Ebasco Services was unable to complete the contract and was replaced by another firm.

Dale, who lives at Carbondale, is on trial with James Bateman, business representative of a Murphysboro local of the AFL pipefitters' union. They are charged with interferring with interstate commerce by attempting to extort $1,030,000 from Ebasco Services, Inc., and Dale alone is charged with receiving a $7,500 payoff from a subcontractor at Joppa.

DESCRIBES MEETING WITH DALE

Sammond, a forthright witness with a sharp, New England manner of speaking, gave the jury of 6 men and 6 women a vivid description of his meeting with Dale and Bateman at the Embassy Club in Cairo, August 20, 1951.

At no time during the 5-hour conference did Dale directly broach the subject of a shakedown, the witness said, but kept advising Sammond to "learn how to do business with labor in southern Illinois."

Pressed for further details of what he meant, Sammond testified, Dale told him to look up Thomas J. Scott, resident construction engineer for the Maxon Construction Co., a subcontractor at Joppa, and find out what Dale meant.

TESTIMONY ON PAYOFFS

Scott, the first Government witness, has testified that he made payments totaling $7,500 to Dale after the labor boss told him his company could enjoy good relations with labor by payoffs amounting to 1 percent of its contract.

Dale was in a boastful mood as the Cairo conference opened, Sammond testified. He talked about his hunting lodge in Alexander County and of a $1,500 shotgun he owned. He said, Sammond related, that he had once been a chauffeur for a Chicago man, known as the "asphalt king," who was killed by gangsters.

Sammond quoted Dale as saying: "I am a Chicago boy. When I left Chicago I threw away my shovel for a blackjack and I have been using it effectively ever since. I came to southern Illinois 15 years ago to carve out an empire. I have carved out an empire. I have 38,000 laborers and 28 business agents under me."

(Dale, as president of the Southern Illinois District Council of the AFL Hod Carriers and Building Laborers' Union, has control of a pool of 38,000 laborers. He also has been a prominent figure in Illinois Republican politics since 1940.)

TELLS OF INDICTMENT

Dale told those attending the meeting, Sammond went on, that the last time he had had trouble with a contractor six men had been killed or injured. Dale was quoted as saying he had been indicted for murder.

(In 1948 Dale and 3 others were indicted at Cairo for conspiracy to assault 2 Alexander County labor leaders involved in a jurisdictional dispute. The case was eventually dismissed.)

Hoban objected to Sammond's testimony at this point, but Judge Wham ruled it admissible because it tended to support Government charges that Dale had attempted to induce a feeling of fear on the part of the contractor.

Sammond then continued, testifying that Dale suddenly accused him of having gone to Lawrence Callanan, ex-convict boss of the AFL Steamfitters' Union in St. Louis, to make a deal. This was the first time he had ever heard of Callanan, Sammond said. Callanan was convicted earlier this year of racketeering and is under a 12-year sentence.

Bateman took little part in the discussion, Sammond testified, but several times urged Dale to send his men back to work on a jurisdictional strike which had the project tied up at that time. The dispute was between Dale's laborers and Bateman's pipefitters over unloading of pipe.

NO HURRY TO SETTLE STRIKE

"Dale told Bateman he was in no hurry to settle the strike," Sammond testified. "He said he would just as soon keep the men out another week."

Then, Sammond said, Dale changed the subject.

"He asked me what Ebasco's contract was worth. First, I said $86 million, then changed the figure to $93,500,000. Dale made his own estimate. He said it was about $103,500,000.

"I asked him what we could do to settle the labor difficulties. He advised me to learn how to do business in southern Illinois. Then he elaborated. He suggested that I consult the Springfield (Ill.) office of the Associated General Contractors or see Tom Scott of the Maxon Co."

Sammond, who operates as a national troubleshooter for Ebasco, one of the largest builders of powerplants in the world, said Dale boasted that Bateman once had been one of his assistants, and that he could be assured of Bateman's cooperation. Dale was quoted as saying he had all the other southern Illinois labor leaders in his pocket.

WARNS OF STOPPAGES

"Dale asked me," Sammond testified, " 'Do you have authority to commit Ebasco?' I told him I would have to consult my superiors. He replied, 'Unless you learn to do business in the manner customary in southern Illinois, you won't complete the job.' He bragged about 87 work stoppages which had occurred on a building job at Grand Tower, Ill."

(Dale is under indictment in St. Louis on a charge of conspiring to extort money from a contractor working on a levee job at Grand Tower.)

The laborer's boss boasted of political candidates he had elected and others he had

defeated, Sammond testified. During the conference, Sammond said, Dale sent the Embassy Club manager out to summon the sheriff of Alexander County. The sheriff came to the club, he added, and Dale directed the law officer to "take a seat over in the corner."

Sammond testified he never made a deal with Dale, but later visited Scott, the Maxon Co. engineer, as the labor boss had suggested. Scott told him, he testified, that Dale had set a price of 1 percent of the contract for insuring labor peace. This would have amounted to $1,030,000 if the contract estimate made by Dale were used.

Marselli, who had made the "shakedown report" to the St. Louis high-level conference, testified that Dale directed him "to see Tom Scott" when he asked Dale what could be done about settling the labor trouble.

MEETING IN TRAILER

Marselli said he visited Scott in Scott's trailer office on the bank of the Ohio River. Scott told him, he said, that Dale had agreed to insure labor peace for 1 percent of the cost of the job.

"I was amazed," Marselli testified, "and I told Scott, 'Why 1 percent of $100 million is $1 million.'

"He nodded. He said, 'You're good at figures.' "

Marselli said he asked Scott what guarantee his company would have that there would be no further labor trouble after a payoff.

The witness quoted Scott as saying: "You make it in monthly payments. If you have labor trouble, you discontinue payments."

Sott testified earlier in the day that he had made four payoffs, totaling $7,500, to Dale in four installments in 1952, beginning March 17 and ending September 17.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of December 1, 1954]

BUILDER SAYS HE PAID $7,500 TO EVAN DALE

A contracting firm official testified yesterday that he paid $7,500 to Evan R. Dale in hopes that the southern Illinois labor and political leader would bring labor peace to the job of constructing the Electric Energy power plant in Joppa, Ill.

Thomas J. Scott, Jr., a former superintendent on the job for the Maxon Construction Co., of Dayton, Ohio, was the Government's first witness at the labor-racketeering trial of Dale and his codefendant, James Batemen, Murphysboro, Ill., labor leader.

A jury of 6 men and 6 women is hearing the case, which is expected to take about 3 weeks, in the court of United States District Judge Fred L. Wham, at East St. Louis.

TELLS OF MEETING

Scott testified that his firm had a subcontract from Electric Energy, Inc., to erect loading and barge docks and water intake structures on the Ohio River for the plant, which was being built to supply Atomic Energy Commission power needs for its project at Paducah, Ky.

The superintendent told the court that he had met Dale in mid-July 1951 in a room in Hotel Cairo at Cairo, Ill., after seeking him to see if we couldn't arrive at some solution to all the labor difficulties we were having on our contract at Joppa.

Dale told him, he related, that it was not Scott but someone from the big boy he was expecting. Dale, of Carbondale, Ill., president of the Southern Illinois District Council of the A. F. of L. Hodcarriers, Building, and Common Laborers Union, then asked him, Scott continued, how much the Maxson contract was worth. Scott set the value at about $863,000 and Dale suggested Scott see him in a day or so.

ACCUSED OF HOLDOUT

At a second meeting soon afterward, Scott testified Dale set the price to insure labor peace at 1 percent of the contract price, $8,630 in cash. Scott said he would inform his superiors about this, but testified he told them that Dale expected nothing from them at the time.

Assistant United States attorney then asked Scott if he had talked with Dale in the latter's office in Carbondale in late 1951 or early 1952. Scott said he had and testified Dale told him then that it was being said that Maxson had been paying and that Dale's associates were saying he had been holding out on them.

Scott said he informed Dale that the job was then worth $750,000 and agreed to pay Dale $7,500 (1 percent).

Scott testified he gave Dale $2,000 in cash in a manila envelope at the Embassy Hotel in Cairo about March 17, 1952. He said Dale opened the envelope, counted the money and put it into his pocket. The balance of the money was paid Dale, Scott said, in two payments of $2,000 each and one of $1,500, all in Dale's office in Carbondale, and the last being handed over about September 17, 1952.

In earlier testimony Scott said that on about July 24, 1951, he had been told by Edward Marselli, plant superintendent for Electric Energy, that he had been referred to Scott by Dale for information about work stoppages and labor in southern Illinois.

"I told Mr. Marselli," Scott testified, "my opinion of the price of labor peace on his job was 1 percent of the contract's price in cash." Scott said Marselli, who was sitting with him on the bank of the Ohio at Joppa, whistled and figured aloud that 1 percent of $100 million was $1 million.

Scott testified under cross-examination by John J. Hoban, counsel for Dale, that Dale at no time made any demands or threats. He said he got the impression that Dale wanted the money from "observation of what actually happened" but not from any "large happening you can put your finger on."

He said in response to Hoban's questions that he did not recall how many work stoppages there were in the first 2 weeks on the job and that of those there were, Dale's union was involved in some but not all.

MADE NO DEMAND

Scott further testified that the payoff meetings were unwitnessed and that "I think I suggested $7,500, and that was agreeable to him (Dale). He did not make a demand at any time."

The witness said Dale had told him in substance that "the (Maxon) contract was rather small," adding he gained the impression that Dale would be interested in knowing that he was "the labor boss and the man to deal with."

The $7,500 extortion indictment count is against Dale alone. Two other counts accuse both Dale and Bateman of attempting to extort $1,030,000 from Ebasco Services, Inc., of New York City, Electric Energy's general contractor at Joppa, and threatening labor trouble if the demands were not met. Maag said he would prove that Ebasco's refusal to pay was followed by labor trouble for more than 18 months.

Bateman is business representative of Local 160 of the AFL Pipefitters Union at Murphysboro.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 2, 1954]

FIRM HEAD TELLS OF $2,961 PAYOFF TO UNIONIST DALE—TESTIFIES DEFENDANT TOLD HIM CUSTOMARY RATE WAS 1 PERCENT FOR CONTRACTORS

Edgar M. Stephens, a Cairo (Ill.) contractor, testified today that Evan R. Dale, A. F. of L. laborers' boss, told him it was customary for contractors hiring construction workers in southern Illinois to pay off at the rate of 1 percent of their contracts.

In permitting the testimony of Stephens, who told of a $2,916 payoff he made to Dale, United States District Judge Fred L. Wham ruled that it would be admissible only in order to enlighten the jury of 6 men and 6 women what had been meant in previous testimony by the phrase "doing business in the customary manner." The phrase was attributed by a number of witnesses to Dale.

Dale and James Bateman, both southern Illinois labor leaders, are on trial on charges of violating the Federal antiracketeering act. They are charged specifically with interfering with interstate commerce by attempting to extort $1,030,000 from Ebasco Services, Inc., prime contractor on construction of the Joppa (Ill.) power plant. Dale alone is charged with extorting $7,500 from a subcontractor at Joppa.

UNITED STATES RESTS ITS CASE

Ben Brooks, special assistant attorney general assisting in prosecuting of the trial in United States district court at East St. Louis, announced this afternoon that the Government was resting its case.

At defense attorney John J. Hoban's request a Government witness, Clinton J. Sammond, industrial relations consultant for Ebasco, was recalled to the stand for additional cross-examination. Upon completion of this questioning the attorneys in the case retired to the chambers of Judge Wham for a conference.

Stephens, president of Edgar Stephens & Sons, general contractors, said Dale approached him for a payoff in June 1951 after his company had begun work on construction of a spur line from the Chicago & Eastern Illinois line to the Joppa plant.

"Dale advised me he felt he had been instrumental in securing the contract for our company," Stephens said. "He said he felt he was entitled to some consideration. I asked him what he meant and he said it was customary to pay off 1 percent."

Nothing further was said about the matter, the witness said, until October 10, 1952, when he met Dale in Cairo, Ill.

"Dale told me, 'We need some money'," Stephens said. "I said, 'On what basis do you need it?' He said, 'On the basis of your contract for the spur line as per our previous discussion'."

SAYS DALE REFUSED CHECK

Stephens said he subsequently paid off. Dale refused to accept a check, he said, and Stephens gave him cash. The witness identified a check made out to cash, vouchers and invoices which, he said, represented the transaction.

Another witness, George Orick, associate editor of Architectural Forum and former writer for the magazine, Engineering News-Record, testified about interviewing Dale in October 1953.

He testified he asked Dale about reports the labor boss had attempted to shake down Ebasco. Dale replied, he said, that "if Ebasco wants to get the impression I am looking for money it is all right with me."

Later in the conservation, Orick related, Dale remarked he had been fishing and would be interested in knowing what he had caught.

On cross examination Orick acknowledged he had written in his story for Engineering News-Record that he could find no evidence to support reports that shakedowns were behind labor trouble at Joppa.

Today's first witness was Ewart Mitschke, chief of operations for the Atomic Energy Commission's gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Ky. He was called by the Government to testify about the interstate nature of the Joppa plant's operation.

He said the Joppa plant was constructed to supply power to the atomic energy installation at Paducah and that the first electricity was transmitted across the Ohio River from Joppa October 7, 1952.

Other witnesses identified documents which were introduced in evidence to show that turbines, generators, and other mate-

rial used at Joppa was shipped in interstate commerce.

John M. Graney, project manager for Ebasco Services told of a conference in the fall of 1952 at which efforts were made to end a work stoppage by pipefitters. He said Bateman, business agent of a Murphysboro local of the pipefitters' union, told him the stoppage would end if he would contribute to the union's welfare fund. Graney said he declined to contribute.

Details of a St. Louis conference in which high-level officers of Ebasco Services and Electric Energy, Inc., operator of the Joppa plant, allegedly reached a decision not to pay Dale the $1,030,000, was given in testimony by Turner White, Jr., vice president and general manager of Electric Energy, and Arthur J. Mohan, resident labor-relations consultant for Ebasco.

The meeting, held in offices of the Union Electric Co., of Missouri, 315 North 12th Street, was called August 28, 1951, the witnesses said, 8 days after Dale had boasted at a meeting with company men in Cairo, Ill., that the Joppa job would never be completed unless the contractor learned to do business his way.

Several Government witnesses have testified that Dale made no direct threats or demands for money at the Cairo meeting, but they insisted he created a distinct impression, by innuendo and restatement of generalities, that labor peace could be secured only by a payoff.

Three other Government witnesses testified about another conference, held by officers of the Maxon company, in which it was decided to pay off at the 1-percent rate. The payoff was made to Dale, they said, in four installments between March and September 1952. The conference was held in the summer of 1951.

John E. Burke, Dayton, Ohio, treasurer and vice president of Maxon, was asked by Maag why the company decided to pay off.

"We felt we had made a commitment to Dale in exchange for labor peace," he testified. "We thought he had an obligation, and the payments were made to fulfill our commitment. We made them in hope of having labor peace on the job."

Another Maxon company officer, Vice President Thomas L. Ohl, testified Scott had been sent to Dale to see what could be done about straightening out their labor difficulties. The company, which was building a loading dock and other facilities, was having more labor disputes at Joppa than at any other job it had ever undertaken, he said.

Asked why he had joined in the decision to pay off, Ohl said: "Because construction costs were becoming excessive and we were suffering considerable loss. We were concerned about the welfare of our supervisory employees. It was too much of a burden for them to endure the circumstances there. We had to pay for relief."

Roosevelt Patrick, chairman of Electric Energy's labor-relations committee and a former operating engineers' business agent, testified about trouble between contractors and the pipefitters' union over installation of panel meters in 1951.

The union objected because part of the piping for the meters was prefabricated before arrival at the plant, the witness said. He told of a conference he had with defendant Bateman about the matter.

Bateman, the witness testified, suggested several methods of settling the dispute. One was for Electric Energy to make a $1,500 donation to the pipefitters' social fund, Patrick said. At this point, he related, the international organizer threw up his hands, said: "Deal me out," and left.

Dale, as president of the Southern Illinois District Council of the AFL Hod Carriers & Building Laborers' Union, controls a pool of more than 30,000 workmen who have been employed at Joppa and Paducah, and also at a TVA power plant under construction at Shawnee, Ky. He has been an important figure in Illinois Republican politics. He lives at Carbondale.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of December 3, 1954]

CONTRACTOR TESTIFIES ON $2,900 PAYOFF TO DALE

A contractor testified yesterday that he paid $2,900 to Evan R. Dale after the southern Illinois boss of a pool of 38,000 AFL laborers told him he felt he "was entitled to some consideration."

Later in the day Assistant United States Attorney Edward G. Maag announced the Government was resting its case.

Edgar M. (Cap) Stephens of Cairo, Ill., testified that in mid-1951 his firm received a contract to build the spur from the main line of the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad to the Electric Energy, Inc., plant at Joppa, Ill.

Dale advised him in June 1951, he said, "that he was instrumental in getting the spur line for us and was entitled to some consideration."

The contractor said he asked Dale to explain and was told "it was customary to pay off at the rate of 1 percent."

INSISTED ON CASH

Stephens said Dale told him in Dale's Cairo office on October 10, 1952, " 'We need some money.' I asked him on what basis. He said on our contract for the spur line."

The witness said Dale rejected a $2,916 check made out to Dale, insisting on cash. Stephens said he cashed the next check in his checkbook and gave Dale the money in Dale's office the same day.

Stephens testified the sum was 1 percent of the labor payroll through September 1952.

Stephens' testimony was objected to vigorously by counsel for Dale and his codefendant, business representative James Bateman of Local 160 of the AFL Pipefitters at Murphysboro, Ill.

OBJECTION OVERRULED

Judge Fred L. Wham, told the jury, in Federal court at East St. Louis, that the testimony could be received against Dale only. He said that it would enable the jury to better understand what was meant by the words "customary practices," used in connection with an August 1951 meeting at which Dale is testified to have said that the EEI project would never be completed unless Ebasco followed the "customary practices" of doing business in southern Illinois.

The judge overruled a late objection on the "customary practices" ground but explained that Dale was not on trial for the alleged payoff by Stephens.

Dale and Bateman are charged with attempting to extort $1,030,000 from a subcontractor on the Joppa job, the Mason Construction Co.

Stephens testified under cross-examination that Dale never demanded money or made threats of any kind.

Another witness, John M. Graney, an Ebasco official, said he talked with Bateman in the former's office at Joppa in November 1952, about a dispute over installation of piping that was prefabricated despite an agreement that pipe of this size was to be fabricated on the site.

Graney said Bateman suggested "giving something to the union's welfare fund," which made contributions to charity, but the money was not paid and the job was done.

Doubt that Gov. William G. Stratton will be called as a witness was expressed by Dale's counsel, John J. Hoban, after the court adjourned until this morning. Hoban said the Governor had been subpenaed relative to incidents that occurred in 1951 and 1952 but not brought out in the Government case.

Hoban estimated it would take 3 days to present the defense case if motions for acquittal are denied.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 7, 1954]

DALE, BATEMAN CONVICTED OF ATTEMPT TO EXTORT $1,030,000 FROM BUILDERS—JOPPA PROJECT LABORERS' BOSS IS FOUND GUILTY ON THIRD COUNT—JURY DELIBERATES 5½ HOURS—DECEMBER 17 SET FOR ARGUING MOTIONS FOR NEW TRIAL, DECEMBER 21 FOR SENTENCING

Evan R. Dale and James Bateman, southern Illinois labor leaders, were found guilty today on two counts of attempting to extort $1,030,000 from a contractor building the strike-plagued Joppa (Ill.) atomic-energy facility, by a jury in United States District Court at East St. Louis.

Dale, president of the Southern Illinois District Council of the AFL Hod Carriers and Common Laborers' Union, was found guilty on a third count of extorting $7,500 from a subcontractor at Joppa.

They were the 13th and 14th labor bosses to be convicted in Illinois and Eastern Missouri Federal courts as the result of grand-jury action which followed an intensive investigation of labor racketeering by the Post-Dispatch in the summer of 1951. All but two of this number have been found guilty of violating the Federal Anti-Racketeering Act.

JURY OUT 5½ HOURS

The jury of 6 men and 6 women deliberated for 5½ hours last night before reaching the verdict. They sealed their findings in an envelope upon retiring at 1 a. m. today and the envelope was opened in court in the presence of the jurors at 9: 30 a. m.

At the request of defense attorneys the jury was polled by United States District Judge Fred L. Wham, who then set December 17 as a date for arguing motions for a new trial and December 21 for sentencing.

Defendant Bateman, business agent of a Murphysboro (Ill.) local of the AFL Pipefitters' Union, was red-eyed and nervous when he entered the courtroom this morning. He drummed on a table as the verdict was read.

The bulky, stolid Dale, who has headed Republican labor groups in Illinois for the past 14 years, appeared unconcerned before the verdict. He flushed and leaned forward as it was read.

CONSOLED BY FRIENDS

As soon as Judge Wham adjourned court about 25 friends and relatives, many of them members of Dale's union, gathered around Dale and began consoling him.

He told a reporter: "I feel now as I felt on the witness stand, not guilty. I simply tried to tell the truth as I knew it."

Both defendants were permitted to continue at liberty on bond.

The full impact of the verdict seemed to hit Dale as he walked through the second-floor corridor toward an elevator. His body appeared to sag. He headed for his home at Carbondale, Ill.

The 63-year-old Bateman, who has been a labor officer for about 15 years, was severely shaken. Tears streaming from his eyes, the bushy-haired, bespectacled man walked from the courtroom accompanied by a son and daughter.

Jurors told a Post-Dispatch reporter they had agreed on a verdict in the case of Dale shortly after beginning deliberations last night. Agreement on Bateman's guilt required more deliberation, they said.

Dale and Bateman were charged jointly in 1 count of the indictment with interfering with interstate commerce by demanding the $1,030,000 payoff from Ebasco Services, Inc., prime contractor at the $197 million Joppa generating plant. A second count jointly charged them with entering into a conspiracy to make the demand.

FIRM LOST JOB

Ebasco Services, one of the largest builders of power plants in the world, was forced to surrender the Joppa contract after more than 40 work stoppages, many caused by jurisdictional disputes, had occured in 29 months. The firm was replaced by the Bechtel Corporation of San Francisco.

In a third count, Dale alone was charged with demanding and receiving the $7,500 payoff from the Maxon Construction Company, of Dayton, Ohio, in 1951 and 1952. The company was building a loading dock and other facilities at Joppa.

The maximum penalty on each count of the indictment is 20 years in prison and a fine of $10,000.

The case went to the jury shortly after 6 o'clock last night following a day given to final arguments and reading of instructions by Judge Wham.

Each side took 2 hours for argument. The final speaker was Assistant United States Attorney Edward G. Maag who delivered his address in short, staccato sentences, alternating between cold analysis and outbursts of indignation.

He pointed out that of all the persons attending a meeting August 20, 1951, at the Embassy Club in Cairo, Ill., where Dale was alleged to have made a demand for a $1,030,000 payoff, only Dale took the witness stand to deny that he boasted of his power and invited the payoff.

He called off the names of 4 representatives of Ebasco and Electric Energy, Inc., for which the Joppa plant was built, who had attended the meeting and testified for the Government about what went on there.

"Are they all lying?" he asked. "Is only Dale telling the truth? He says they are all lying. Are they all committing perjury except Dale? It is the duty of the Government to strike fair blows. How can we get that many people to commit perjury? It is unthinkable."

RECALLS ALLEGED BOAST

He recalled that witnesses had quoted Dale at the meeting as boasting that he was "a Chicago boy," had worked for gangsters, and had been indicted for murder as the result of killings on another big construction project.

"Why would anyone recite the horrible, nightmarish things that man said at that meeting?" Maag asked. "Does Ebasco have to be hit by a truck to know they have been threatened?"

The young prosecutor's voice rose as he walked about the courtroom, at times confronting the jury and then standing within arm's length of the man about whom he was talking.

"Dale had demanded 1 percent of the contract for labor peace," he thundered. The opposite of labor peace is labor war. What is labor war? It's everything we have charged in this indictment.

"This is not a trial of union labor. Dale is a union leader who betrayed his trust. Betrayal of trust is horrible."

Maag referred to Dale's position as head of a pool of 38,000 laborers whom he channeled to jobs at the Joppa power plant, the TVA power plant at Shawnee, Ky., and the Atomic Energy Commission's atomic gaseous diffusion installation at Paducah, Ky.

"He used those 38,000 men to line his pockets," Maag charged. "He had their interest at heart only insofar as he could use them. Can you imagine all that power in that man's hand?"

WOMAN JUROR CRYING

He pointed an accusing finger at Dale, who drew back. The jurors were leaning forward in their seats, listening intently. A woman juror in the front row was crying quietly.

"There is a shame and a stain in southern Illinois," the prosecutor said. "There is a sign up at Joppa. It reads: 'The price of peace is 1 percent.' "

Stepping again toward the jury, he lowered his voice and said: "It's high time you serve notice that blackmail is not going to work. Are you going to condone this man's conduct? It's all wrong and it's time you cleaned it up."

Dale, 38 years old, was born at Latham, Ill., and has been a member of the common laborers' union since he was 18 years old. He quit school to marry when he was 16 years old and has 2 daughters, a son and 4 grandchildren.

He became head of the Southern Illinois District Council about 1938. This office placed him in charge of furnishing laborers for construction of the huge Crab Orchard Lake ordnance plant in 1942 and 1943. The plant produced "blockbuster" bombs for the Army Air Force.

The council has jurisdiction over laborers' locals in 38 southern Illinois and 4 western Kentucky counties.

When the Atomic Energy Commission announced plans to contruct its gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah and the generating plants at Shawnee, Ky., and Joppa, the laborers organized an area council, placing Dale in charge of 38,000 laborers.

He served as national consultant of the Republican National Committee's labor division in 1952 and has held other Republican positions.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 8, 1954]

STRIKE-PLAGUED JOPPA PLANT EXPECTED TO BE IN FULL PRODUCTION EARLY IN 1955—COST IS $58 MILLION ABOVE ORIGINAL ESTIMATES—TWO LABOR BOSSES CONVICTED

(By Carl R. Baldwin)

The Joppa (Ill.) steam-generating plant, one of the country's most vital atomic energy installations, is expected to go into full production early next year after a stormy 4-year history marked by almost constant strife between management and labor and frequent skirmishes of union against union.

Two powerful labor leaders charged with the responsibility of supplying workmen for the construction, Evan R. Dale and James Bateman, were convicted yesterday of racketeering and a third, William B. Sanders, has been expelled for life from his international union.

Ebasco Services, Inc., one of the largest builders of powerplants in the world, was forced to surrender its contract to build the installation because it was unable to overcome Joppa's many headaches.

Meanwhile, costs rose a staggering $58 million above original estimates until the plant now will cost the Atomic Energy Commission an estimated $197 million. Management blames this primarily on labor and some labor leaders have placed the blame on inept management.

ONE MILLION THIRTY THOUSAND DOLLAR EXTORTION ATTEMPT

Whatever the reasons for the enormous cost of Joppa, which already is supplying electric power to the huge atomic energy plant at Paducah, Ky., two of the key figures in the Joppa labor disputes now stand convicted of interfering with interstate commerce by attempting to extort $1,030,000 from Ebasco Services.

Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell, after learning of the verdict returned by a jury in United States District Court at East St. Louis yesterday, said it was "the largest shakedown attempted since more than $1 million was extorted from the movie industry by the Browne-Bioff syndicate nearly two decades ago."

Brownell said the conviction should serve notice "that labor racketeers will not be tolerated and that we intend to prosecute such crimes wherever found." He added he believed responsible labor leaders felt the same way the administration does about "those who use violence, threats, and personal intimidation" to enforce shakedown demands.

The Joppa plant, born by act of Congress in November 1950, was hailed as a boon to southern Illinois labor in the beginning. The Biblically named town which had been a thriving river port at the turn of the century and had one of the deepest channels in the Ohio River, was expected to once again become a busy metropolis.

STAIN ON SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

None of these things came to pass. The workers who came to Joppa came in trailers or commuted great distances from other Illinois and Kentucky towns. And the Joppa plant itself became what Assistant United States Attorney Edward G. Maag, young prosecutor of Dale and Bateman, "a stain and a shame on southern Illinois."

Dale, the central figure in the Joppa case, first came on the scene in January 1951 when he was placed in charge of a Joppa-Paducah-Shawnee labor pool of 38,000 workmen by Joseph V. Moreschi, international president of the hod carriers and laborers.

Dale had cut a wide swath through southern Illinois as a labor boss and political leader. He expressed his personality wearing wide-brimmed hats and fancy hunting clothes. He bought expensive shotguns, entertained at a hunting lodge in Alexander County, and was seen often in nightclubs.

In 1940 he became a member of the Republican Party. He explained recently to a Post-Dispatch reporter that he did so because he felt that party was on its way back to power at the time and he wanted to be on the ground floor when the political complexion of the country changed.

That he has changed his mind about the Republicans, whose administration has directed the investigation which led to his conviction, was evident from a tirade he made against his adopted party.

"I thought there would be a place for me in helping the party build up its strength," he said, bitterly. "But I find the Republicans are out to cut labor's throat."

LEADER IN COMMUNITY LIFE

The self-made labor boss, who had quit school at the age of 16 to marry, took a leading part in community life at Carbondale, Ill., and headed downstate Republican groups. He was a highly controversial figure. Some persons held him in great esteem as a bulwark of the community, others thought his record as a labor boss left much to be desired.

Prosecutor Maag made an unusual comparison of Dale and Alexander the Great in his final argument to the jury at East St. Louis.

Maag pointed out that in July 1952 Dale had created one of the major work stoppages at Joppa by ordering 350 carloads of laborers off the job simply to back him up in a show of strength across the river at the Paducah plant.

Laborers there were questioning Dale's leadership. The 350 automobiles, loaded with laborers, paraded around the Joppa plant for 2 days, it was reported, until Dale regained command of the situation. Then they went back to work at Joppa.

"Alexander the Great conquered nations with fewer men," Maag told the jury.

FORTY WORK STOPPAGES

The work stoppage was one of more than 40 that occurred at Joppa in 1951, 1952 and 1953. The job became so hopelessly bogged down that Ebasco Services, a segment of the old Electric Bond and Share Co., powerful New York utility, finally surrendered the contract in July 1953.

While continuing to deny any wrongdoing at Joppa, Dale acknowledged to the Post-Dispatch that some complaints of featherbedding and slowdowns by unionists were justified.

"These are the sins of the cost-plus contracts of World War II," he declared. "The abuses became widespread because contractors, always anxious to pad their costs, encouraged them. Now that my boys have got accustomed to these things it's hard to make them change their ways."

POWER FOR PADUCAH PLANT

The Atomic Energy Commission ordered the Joppa and Shawnee plants built to supply 1,000,000 kilowatts of power to the Paducah installation, which produces fissionable uranium-235 from natural uranium by a gaseous diffusion process. In 1950 this was said to be the biggest around-the-clock load of energy in the world for a single plant.

Later, as the United States stepped up the pace in the race with Russia in stockpiling atomic material, the load planned for Paducah was almost doubled. One-fourth of the additional load was assigned to Electric Energy, Inc., utility combine operating the Joppa plant, and the other three-fourths was ordered from the TVA-operated Shawnee plant.

The importance of completing the Paducah plant and also additions to the atomic energy facility at Oak Ridge, Tenn., was pointed out by Gordon H. Dean when he was chairman of the AEC in July 1952.

Outlining plans for a rapid acceleration of construction, he said: "The purpose of this expansion program is to gain precious time by achieving minimum stockpile objectives established by the Department of Defense, and to achieve them about 4½ years earlier than we would achieve them if we went at our present rate."

During the years of strife the reasons given for the many jurisdictional disputes and other labor troubles were vague and varied. Pipefitters and laborers would walk out and set up picket lines in disputes over unloading pipes, controversies that Joppa management thought had been settled on previous jobs. Some walkouts were never explained.

BATEMAN IN MANY DISPUTES

Bateman, business agent of a Murphysboro, Ill., AFL pipefitters union, was in the middle of many skirmishes with management and other unions. He was elected head of a council of business agents to rule on jurisdictional disputes in November 1951, but the work stoppages continued.

Next to Dale the most important figure in the labor troubles affecting the atomic installations was Sanders, business agent of the Paducah local of the AFL ironworkers union. He waged warfare with Dale in a struggle described by on-the-spot observers as a clash of strong personalities.

Like Dale, Sanders had his loyal following who paraded about Joppa and Paducah to indicate they were solidly in back of him. About 1,000 carloads of ironworkers and friends, many wearing Kentucky string ties in imitation of their leader, formed a motorcade at Joppa in October 1953 to show their defiance of his enemies.

Sanders, a talkative Kentuckian, remained in the saddle as long as Ebasco Services was handling the construction at Joppa. But when he ignored an order by J. H. Lyons, president of the International Iron Workers' Union, to end a strike by the iron workers after the Bechtel Corp., of San Francisco, took over in September 1953, the international expelled him.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 21, 1954]

DALE GETS 15 YEARS, FINED $10,000 IN RACKET CASE; BATEMAN IS FINED $2,000—ILLINOIS LABOR BOSS A MENACE TO UNION CAUSE, JUDGE WHAM SAYS—CODEFENDANT PLACED ON PROBATION FOR 5 YEARS—CHARGES INVOLVED SHAKEDOWN ATTEMPTS AT JOPPA PROJECT

Evan R. Dale, powerful southern Illinois labor boss and formerly a Republican political leader, was sentenced to 15 years in prison and fined $10,000 today on charges of labor racketeering by United States District Judge Fred L. Wham at East St. Louis.

Judge Wham, in pronouncing sentence, described the stout, stolid Dale as "a menace to the union-labor movement, to the State, and to the men you represented."

He ordered Dale taken into custody, declaring he was doing this so that the labor boss would disassociate himself from all power immediately. A request that Dale be admitted to bond pending appeal was denied.

BATEMAN FINED

Dale's codefendant in the case, James Bateman, business agent of a Murphysboro, Ill., pipefitters' union, was fined $2,000. He received no prison sentence but was placed on probation for a period of 5 years.

Bateman was ordered to disassociate himself from any leadership in his union or any other union for the probation period. He was given 60 days in which to pay the fine.

Dale's sentence was imposed on each of three counts, charging him with interfering with interstate commerce by attempting to extort $1,030,000 from a contractor on a Joppa, Ill., atomic energy power facility and by extorting $7,500 from a subcontractor on the same job. The sentences will be served concurrently.

Bateman, who wept after hearing sentence imposed, was charged only in two counts with participating in the attempted $1,030,000 shakedown of the Joppa general contractor, Ebasco Services, Inc., of New York City.

Maximum penalty on each count is 20 years' imprisonment and a $10,000 fine.

The small courtroom on the second floor of the East St. Louis Federal Building, was packed with spectators as Judge Wham prepared to sentence Dale and Bateman. About half were women and most appeared to be friends of the defendants.

ATTENTION TO BATEMAN

The tall, ramrod-straight judge, looking stern and thoughtful, directed his attention to the 63-year-old Bateman first.

Bateman was the less important of the two defendants from the standpoint of public interest, he observed, and the evidence presented against him had been slight. A presentence investigation showed he had a good reputation in his home town, the judge said.

"He stayed on the fringe of the light cast by Dale's bold operations," said Judge Wham. "His connection with the whole picture are dim."

Then the judge pronounced sentence on Bateman. The graying defendant wept at first as he returned to his seat in the courtroom, but later accepted congratulations from friends in the hallway outside, appearing elated that he had escaped a more serious penalty.

As Assistant United States Attorney Edward G. Maag began stating the Government's position in the case of Dale, Judge Wham leaned back in his chair and meditatively held a hand to his face.

EIGHT INDICTMENTS CITED

Maag referred to eight indictments charging racketeering and income-tax evasion which have been returned against Dale.

"The very number of indictments screams at this man that he is a menace to the men he represents and the people of his district," he said. "The Government feels that a substantial sentence should be imposed in his case, and that bail should be denied him pending appeal."

The bulky, 38-year-old Dale, shifting his weight from foot to foot, looked subdued as Maag and Defense Attorney John J. Hoban discussed his case. He kept his eyes on the floor most of the time, occasionally lifting them toward the bench.

Hoban announced the defense would appeal and requested bond. He contended that, even if the facts alleged in the case were true, they did not constitute a violation of the Federal Antiracketeering Act, the statute under which the charge was brought.

JUDGE LOOKS ANGRY

Judge Wham looked angry as he began pronouncing sentence on Dale.

"Dale has been disloyal to the men he represented," the judge said, speaking slowly. "He has been responsible for an increase in costs of public and private works in southern Illinois amounting to millions of dollars.

"He has a faculty for installing fear of physical violence in people. He has never failed to profit in full from use of his abilities along this line."

Then, looking directly at the reddening defendant, he said:

"I think you are a menace to the union-labor movement, to property and to the contractors of southern Illinois, and have been for a long time. You deserve a severe sentence."

Dale was obviously shocked as Judge Wham read off the sentence of 15 years and the fine of $10,000. His face showed little emotion, but he was perspiring and kept wiping a hand across his face.

The court took a recess and Dale was led by a deputy sheriff across the hall from the courtroom to a small holdover cell. Friends crowded into an anteroom and some spoke consoling words.

Dale issued a statement to the press, handing to reporters the statement typed on a piece of paper attached to his business card.

It said: "December 21, 1954.—I now believe labor's interests and labor's trust can never be served by the Republican Party."

HAD BEEN GOP LEADER

The statement amounted to Dale's official declaration of severance of ties with the party. He had been a member since 1940. In the last 14 years he has been a down-State Illinois political leader, heading Republican labor groups and working with the Republican National Committee in formulating the party's labor policies.

Hoban announced he would ask the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Chicago to direct that Dale be admitted to bail pending a decision on an appeal of the case.

Dale, who lives at Carbondale, Ill., and has offices there and at Cairo, Ill., later was taken by deputy marshals to city jail in St. Louis, where he will await transfer to a Federal prison or will bide his time until the appeal is decided.

CONVICTED DECEMBER 7

Dale and Bateman were convicted December 7 by a jury of 6 men and 6 women following a trial which lasted 7 days.

They were the 13th and 14th labor bosses to be found giulty of Federal charges in Missouri and Illinois as the result of grand-jury action which followed an intensive investigation of labor racketeering by the Post-Dispatch in the summer of 1951.

The trial opened with the Government presenting a key witness, Thomas J. Scott, resident construction engineer for the Maxon Construction Co., of Dayton, Ohio. The company had an $800,000 contract to build dock facilities at Joppa.

Both Scott and Edgar M. (Cap) Stephens, a Cairo, Ill., contractor, set the stage for testimony about the big conspiracy—the allegation that Dale and Bateman attempted to extort the $1,030,000 from Ebasco Services—by testifying about payoffs of $7,500 and $2,916 they made to Dale.

The witnesses said Dale told them the customary way of doing business with labor in southern Illinois was by paying off at the rate of 1 percent of the contract.

CONFERENCE IN CAIRO

The Government then presented witnesses who testified about a conference at the Embassy Club in Cairo, attended by Dale, Bateman and representatives of Ebasco Services

and Electric Energy, Inc., a utility combine for whom the Joppa plant was constructed.

They said that Dale made it known, through implied threats and innuendo, that the only way Ebasco could finish building the $197 million Joppa plant was to pay off. The $1,030,000 figure was presented as being 1 percent of the estimated contract at that time. Costs soared after that and additional facilities were constructed.

Officials of the two big companies said they decided against meeting the shakedown demand. A series of work stoppages, most of them caused by jurisdictional disputes among unions, had already begun when the meeting with Dale took place August 20, 1951.

The work stoppages continued until more than 40 had occurred. In July 1953 Electric Energy, Inc., took the construction contract away from Ebasco Services and turned it over to the Bechtel Corp. of San Francisco.

Dale wielded the greatest power of any labor leader in charge of providing workmen for the Joppa plant. In January 1951 he was placed in charge of a pool of 38,000 common laborers and had the responsibility of channeling them into work constructing not only Joppa, but two associated plants, the atomic-energy gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Ky., and the TVA power plant at Shawnee, Ky.

He had made his weight felt in downstate labor and political circles since 1938 when he became president of the laborers' Southern Illinois District Council. This gave him jurisdiction over 19 Illinois and 4 Kentucky counties.

Bateman was one of Dale's close associates at Joppa. In November 1951 he was elected head of a business agents' council set up to rule on jurisdictional disputes. The council's actions had little effect on halting the work stoppages however.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, United States Army, for appointment as Comptroller of the Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Lt. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commander in chief, United States Army, Europe, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States; and

Rear Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Trevor Gardner, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Boyd Leedom, of South Dakota, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, vice Albert Cummins Beeson, term expired.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably a group of 15,684 nominations, consisting of 692 routine nominations in the Army and Air Force in the grades of Major and below, and 14,992 routine nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps in the grades of captain and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the executive calendar of this large group, it is requested that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

CONVENTIONS WITH JAPAN AND BELGIUM RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME, ESTATES, INHERITANCES, GIFTS, AND SUCCESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, proceed to the consideration of Executive D, Executive E, and Executive G, 83d Congress, 2d session. The first two are conventions with Japan and Executive G is a convention with Belgium. They are all similar, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the three treaties considered and discussed together, inasmuch as they all deal with the general subject of double taxation, and so forth. However, in conformity with our prior understanding in the Senate, I believe, so far as the actual ratification of the treaties is concerned, there should be a separate yea-and-nay vote on each convention. With that understanding, I have no objection to their being considered and discussed at the same time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. My unanimous-consent request was only that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the following conventions:

CONVENTION WITH JAPAN RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME

Executive D, 83 Congress, 2d session, convention with Japan relating to taxes on income, signed at Washington on April 16, 1954, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

Mr. Walter Bedell Smith, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The Government of Japan:

Mr. Sadao Iguchi, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Japan to the United States of America,

who, having communicated to one another their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in the present Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal income taxes, including surtaxes.

(b) In the case of Japan: The income tax and the corporation tax.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other tax on income or profits which has a character substantially similar to those referred to in paragraph (1) of this Article and which may be imposed by either contracting State after the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in the present Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Japan", when used in a geographical sense, means all the territory in which the laws relating to the taxes referred to in paragraph (1) (b) of article I are enforced.

(c) The term "permanent establishment" means an office, factory, workshop, branch, warehouse or other fixed place of business, but does not include the casual and temporary use of merely storage facilities. It also includes an agency if the agent has and habitually exercises a general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts on behalf of an enterprise or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders on its behalf. An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other contracting State merely because it carried on business dealings in such other State through a bona fide commission agent, broker, custodian or other independent agent acting in the ordinary courses of his business as such. The fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States maintains in the other contracting State a fixed place of business exclusively for the purchase for such enterprise of goods or merchandise shall not of itself constitute such fixed place of business a permanent establishment of such enterprise. The fact that a corporation of one of the contracting States has a subsidiary corporation which is a corporation of the other contracting

State or which is engaged in trade or business in the other contracting State shall not of itself constitute that subsidiary corporation a permanent establishment of its parent corporation.

(d) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, United States enterprise or Japanese enterprise.

(e) The term "United States enterprise" means an industrial or commercial enterprise or undertaking carried on in the United States by a resident (including an individual, a fiduciary and partnership) of the United States or by a United States corporation or other entity; and the term "United States corporation or other entity" means a corporation or other entity created or organized under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States.

(f) The term "Japanese enterprise" means an industrial or commercial enterprise or undertaking carried on in Japan by an individual resident in Japan or by a Japanese corporation or other entity; and the term "Japanese corporation or other entity" means a corporation or other association having juridical personality, or a partnership or other association without juridical personality, created or organized under the laws of Japan.

(g) The term "tax" means those taxes referred to in paragraph (1) (a) or (b) of Article I, as the context requires.

(h) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and, in the case of Japan, the Minister of Finance or his authorized representative.

(i) The term "industrial or commercial profits" includes manufacturing, mercantile, agricultural, fishing, mining, financial and insurance profits, but does not include income in the form of dividends, interest, rents or royalties, or remuneration for personal services.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by either contracting State any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under the laws of such State relating to the tax.

ARTICLE III

(1) An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be subject to the tax of the other contracting State in respect of its industrial or commercial profits unless it has a permanent establishment situated in such other State. If it has such permanent establishment such other State may impose its tax upon the entire income of such enterprise from sources within such other State.

(2) In determining the tax of one of the contracting States no account shall be taken of the mere purchase of merchandise therein by an enterprise of the other contracting State.

(3) Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States has a permanent establishment situated in the other contracting State, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing on an independent basis with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment.

(4) In determining the industrial or commercial profits of a permanent establishment there shall be allowed as deductions all expenses wherever incurred, reasonably allocable to such permanent establishment, including executive and general administrative expenses so allocable.

(5) The competent authorities of both contracting States may, consistent with other provisions of the present Convention, arrange details for the apportionment of industrial or commercial profits.

ARTICLE IV

Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management or the financial structure of an enterprise of the other contracting State, makes with or imposes on the latter enterprise, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which would normally have been allocable to one of the enterprises, but by reason of such conditions have not been so allocated, may be included in the profits of such enterprise and taxed accordingly.

ARTICLE V

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Article III and Article IV of the present Convention, income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered

(a) in such State, or

(b) in a third country which exempts (A) such enterprise, and (B) an enterprise of the other contracting State, from its tax on earnings derived from the operation of ships or aircraft, as the case may be, registered in the respective States,

shall be exempt from the tax of such other contracting State.

(2) The present Convention shall not be construed to affect the arrangement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan providing for relief from double taxation on shipping profits effected by the exchange of notes at Washington dated March 31, 1926 and June 8, 1926.

ARTICLE VI

The rate of tax imposed by one of the contracting States on interest on bonds, securities, notes, debentures or any other form of indebtedness (including mortgages or bonds secured by real property) received from sources within such State by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State not having a permanent establishment in the former State shall not exceed 15 percent.

ARTICLE VII

The rate of tax imposed by one of the contracting States on royalties and other amounts received as consideration for the right to use copyrights, artistic and scientific works, patents, designs, secret processes and formulae, trade-marks and other like property (including in such royalties and other amounts, rentals and like payments in respect of motion-picture films or for the use of industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment) from sources within such State by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State not having a permanent establishment in the former State shall not exceed 15 percent.

ARTICLE VIII

A resident or corporation or other entity of one of the contracting States deriving

(a) income from real property (including gains derived from the sale or exchange of such property, but not including interest from mortgages or bonds secured by real property), or

(b) royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries or other natural resources

situated within the other contracting State may elect, for any taxable year, to be subject to the tax of such other State on a net basis as if such resident or corporation or other entity had a permanent establishment in such other State during such taxable year.

ARTICLE IX

An individual resident of one of the contracting States shall be exempt from the tax of the other contracting State upon compensation for labor or personal services (including the practice of liberal professions) performed in such other State in any taxable year if such resident is temporarily present in such other State:

(a) for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 180 days during such taxable year and his compensation is received for such labor or personal services performed as an officer or employee of a resident or corporation or other entity of the former State, or

(b) for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 90 days during such taxable year and his compensation received for such labor or personal services does not exceed 3,000 United States dollars, or the equivalent sum in yen as computed at the official basic rate of exchange in effect at the time such compensation is paid.

ARTICLE X

(1) (a) Salaries, wages and similar compensation paid by the United States to an individual who is a citizen of the United States (other than an individual who has been admitted to Japan for permanent residence therein) shall be exempt from tax by Japan.

(b) Salaries, wages and similar compensation paid by Japan to an individual who is a national of Japan (other than an individual who has been admitted to the United States for permanent residence therein) shall be exempt from tax by the United States.

(2) The provisions of this article shall not apply to salaries, wages, or similar compensation paid in respect of services rendered in connection with any trade or business carried on by either of the contracting States for purposes of profit.

ARTICLE XI

A resident of one of the contracting States, who, in accordance with agreements between the Governments of the contracting States or between educational establishments in the contracting States for the exchange of professors and teachers, or at the invitation of the Government of the other contracting State or of an educational establishment in such other State, temporarily visits such other State for the purpose of teaching for a period not exceeding two years at a university, college, school or other educational institution in such other State, shall be exempt from the tax of such other State on his remuneration for such teaching for such period.

ARTICLE XII

(1) A resident of one of the contracting States who is temporarily present in the other contracting State solely as a student at a recognized university, college or school in such other State, shall be exempt from the tax of such other State with respect to remittances from abroad (including payments, if any, by his employer abroad).

(2) A resident of one of the contracting States who is a recipient of a grant, allowance or award from a religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational organization of such State and who is temporarily present in the other contracting State, shall be exempt from the tax of such other State on such grant, allowance or award remitted from abroad (other than compensation for personal services).

(3) A resident of one of the contracting States who is an employee of, or under contract with, an enterprise of such State or an organization referred to in paragraph (2) of this Article, and who is temporarily present in the other contracting State for a period not exceeding one year solely to acquire technical, professional or business experience from a person other than such enterprise or organization, shall be exempt from the tax of such other State on compensation from abroad paid by such enterprise or organization for his services rendered during such period, if the amount of compensation paid by such enterprise or organization for his services during such period, when computed

on the annual basis, does not exceed 6,000 United States dollars, or the equivalent sum in yen as computed at the official basic rate of exchange in effect at the time such compensation is paid.

ARTICLE XIII

For the purpose of the present Convention:

(a) Dividends paid by a corporation of one of the contracting States shall be treated as income from sources within such State.

(b) Interest paid by one of the contracting States including local Government thereof or by an enterprise of one of the contracting States not having a permanent establishment in the other contracting State shall be treated as income from sources within the former State.

(c) Gains, profits and income derived from the purchase and sale of personal property shall be treated as derived from the country in which such property is sold.

(d) Gains, profits and income derived from the sale by a taxpayer in one of the contracting States of goods manufactured in the other contracting State in whole or in part by such taxpayer shall be treated as derived in part from the country in which manufactured and in part from the country in which sold, and to the extent such gains, profits and income are not allocable under other provisions of the present Convention they shall be allocated between both contracting States in accordance with such taxpayer's relative sales and property in the respective countries.

(e) Income from real property (including gains derived from the sale or exchange of such property, but not including interest from mortgages or bonds secured by real property) and royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries, or other natural resources shall be treated as income derived from the country in which such real property, mines, quarries or other natural resources are situated.

(f) Compensation for labor or personal services (including the practice of liberal professions) shall be treated as income from sources within the country where are rendered the services for which such compensation is paid.

(g) Royalties for using, or for the right to use, in one of the contracting States, patents, copyrights, designs, trademarks and like property shall be treated as income from sources within such State.

ARTICLE XIV

It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

(a) The United States, in determining the tax of its citizens, residents or corporations or other entities may, regardless of any other provision of the present Convention, include in the basis upon which such tax is imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States as if the present Convention had not come into effect. The United States shall, however, subject to the provisions of section 131 of the Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the first day of January 1954, deduct from its tax the amount of the tax of Japan. In determining the credit under the said section 131 of the Internal Revenue Code, any interest received from an enterprise of the United States with a permanent establishment in Japan shall be treated as income from sources within Japan to the extent so treated under the laws of Japan, if the debt with respect to which such interest is paid is made in connection with the business of such permanent establishment of such enterprise.

(b) Japan, in determining the tax of its residents or corporations or other entities may, regardless of any other provision of the present Convention, include in the basis upon which such tax is imposed all items of income taxable under the tax laws of Japan as if the present Convention had not come into effect. Japan shall, however, deduct from its tax so calculated the amount of the tax of the United States upon income from sources within the United States and included for the taxes of both contracting States, but in an amount not exceeding that proportion of the tax of Japan which such income bears to the entire income subject to the tax of Japan.

(c) In determining the taxes of the contracting States of a recipient, who is a citizen, resident or corporation or other entity of the United States, of a dividend from a Japanese corporation, in so far as the tax of Japan imposed on income or profits of a corporation out of which a dividend is paid is deemed under the tax laws of Japan to have been imposed on a recipient of such dividend:

(i) The United States shall deem that such recipient has paid with respect to such dividend the tax of Japan in an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount of such dividend, and deduct, under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article, from its tax the amount of the tax of Japan so deemed to have been paid provided the recipient includes in gross income the amount of tax thus deemed to have been paid, and

(ii) Japan shall impose with respect to such dividend received by such recipient (except as such recipient is a resident of or has a permanent establishment in Japan) no tax other than the tax imposed on income or profits of the corporation out of which such dividend is paid.

ARTICLE XV

(1) Organizations organized under the laws of Japan and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes shall, to the extent and subject to conditions provided in the United States Internal Revenue Code, be exempt from the tax of the United States.

(2) Organizations organized under the laws of the United States and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes shall, to the extent and subject to conditions provided in the tax laws of Japan, be exempt from the tax of Japan.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) There shall be allowed, for the purposes of the tax of the United States, in the case of a resident of Japan who is a nonresident of the United States (other than an officer or employee of the Government of Japan), in addition to the exemption provided in section 214 of the United States Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the first day of January 1954, a credit against net income, subject to the conditions prescribed in section 25 of the Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the said date, for the spouse of the taxpayer and for each child of the the taxpayer who are present in the United States and residing with him in the United States at any time during the taxable year, but such additional credit shall not exceed that proportion thereof which the taxpayer's gross income from sources within the United States for the taxpayer's taxable year bears to his entire income from all sources for the fiscal or calendar year in which ends such taxable year.

(2) For the purposes of the tax of Japan, there shall be allowed in the case of a citizen of the United States who is a resident of Japan the same exemptions for a dependent of dependents as those granted to a national of Japan who is a resident of Japan.

ARTICLE XVII

(1) The competent authorities of both contracting States shall exchange such information available under the respective tax laws of both contracting States as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or for the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the tax. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those, including a court, concerned with the assessment and collection of the tax or the determination of appeals in relation thereto. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade, business, industrial or professional secret or any trade process.

(2) Each of the contracting States may collect the tax imposed by the other contracting State (as though such tax were the tax of the former State) as will ensure that the exemptions, reduced rates of tax or any other benefit granted under the present Convention by such other State shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE XVIII

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the tax authorities of either contracting State has resulted, or will result, in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, he shall be entitled to present the facts to the competent authorities of the contracting State of which he is a national or a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, to those of the contracting State under the laws of which it is created or organized. Should the taxpayer's claim be deemed worthy of consideration, the competent authorities of such State to which the facts are so presented shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authorities of the other contracting State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XIX

(1) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance now or hereafter accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in determining the tax of such State.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement; it being understood, however, that this provision shall not be construed to preclude the contracting States from settling by negotiation any dispute arising under the present Convention.

(4) The competent authorities of both contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of the present Convention and may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE XX

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Tokyo as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall enter into force on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable to income or profits derived during the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January of the calendar year in which such exchange takes place.

(3) Either of the contracting States may terminate the present Convention at any time after a period of five years shall have expired from the date on which the present Convention enters into force, by giving to the other contracting State notice of termination, provided that such notice is given on or before the 30th day of June and, in such event, the present Convention shall cease to be effective for the taxable years be-

ginning on or after the first day of January of the calendar year next following that in which such notice is given.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Japanese languages, each text having equal authenticity, this sixteenth day of April, 1954.

For the United States of America:

WALTER BEDELL SMITH.

For Japan:

S. IGUCHI.

EMBASSY OF JAPAN,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1954.

The Honorable WALTER BEDELL SMITH,
Acting Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In proceeding today to the signature of the Convention between Japan and the United States of America for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income, I have the honor to enclose herewith, for the purpose of future reference, a memorandum confirming an understanding in regard to the interpretation of certain provisions of that Convention. I shall appreciate receiving from you an acknowledgment and confirmation of this statement of the understanding.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

S. IGUCHI.

(Enclosure: Memorandum.)

MEMORANDUM

It is understood that in the application of Article XIV and Articles XI and XII of the Convention between Japan and the United States of America for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income

(1) the provisions of Article XIV shall not be construed to deny the exemptions from the Japanese tax or the United States tax, as the case may be, granted by Article X (1), Article XI and Article XII;

(2) neither of the contracting States shall be precluded from taxing its own nationals or citizens with respect to income coming within Article XI or Article XII.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1954.

His Excellency SADAO IGUCHI,
Ambassador of Japan.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note dated today and to confirm the understanding, as set forth in the memorandum enclosed with that note, in regard to an interpretation of certain provisions of the Convention Between the United States of America and Japan for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income, signed today.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

WALTER BEDELL SMITH,
Acting Secretary of State.

CONVENTION WITH JAPAN RELATING TO TAXES ON ESTATES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Executive E, 83d Congress, 2d session, Convention with Japan relating to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES, INHERITANCES AND GIFTS

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Japan, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

Mr. Walter Bedell Smith, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The Government of Japan:

Mr. Sadao Iguchi, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Japan to the United States of America,

who, having communicated to one another their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in the present Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal estate and gift taxes.

(b) In the case of Japan: The inheritance tax (including the gift tax).

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other tax on estates, inheritances or gifts which has a character substantially similar to those referred to in paragraph (1) of this Article and which may be imposed by either contracting State after the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in the present Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Japan", when used in a geographical sense, means all the territory in which the laws relating to the tax referred to in paragraph (1) (b) of Article I are enforced.

(c) The term "tax" means those taxes referred to in paragraph (1) (a) or (b) of Article I, as the context requires.

(d) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and, in the case of Japan, the Minister of Finance or his authorized representative.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by either contracting State any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under the laws of such State relating to the tax.

(3) For the purposes of the present Convention, each contracting State may determine in accordance with its laws whether a decedent at the time of his death or a beneficiary of a decedent's estate at the time of such decedent's death, or a donor at the time of the gift or a beneficiary of a gift at the time of the gift, was domiciled therein or a national thereof.

ARTICLE III

(1) If a decedent at the time of his death or a donor at the time of the gift was a national of or domiciled in the United States, or if a beneficiary of a decedent's estate at the time of such decedent's death or a beneficiary of a gift at the time of the gift was domiciled in Japan, the situs at the time of the transfer of any of the following property or property rights shall, for the purpose of the imposition of the tax and for the purpose of the credit authorized by Article V, be determined exclusively in accordance with the following rules:

(a) Immovable property or rights therein (not including any property for which specific provision is otherwise made in this Article) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the land involved is located.

(b) Tangible movable property (including currency and any other form of money recognized as legal tender in the place of issue and excepting such property for which specific provision is otherwise made in this Article) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such property is physically located, or, if in transitu, at the place of destination.

(c) Debts (including bonds, promissory notes, bills of exchange, bank deposits and insurance, except bonds or other negotiable instruments in bearer form and such debts for which specific provision is otherwise made in this Article) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the debtor resides.

(d) Shares or stock in a corporation shall be deemed to be situated at the place under the laws of which such corporation was created or organized.

(e) Ships and aircraft shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are registered.

(f) Goodwill as a trade, business or professional asset shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the trade, business or profession to which it pertains is carried on.

(g) Patents, trade-marks, utility models and designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are registered (or used in case they are not registered).

(h) Copyrights, franchises, rights to artistic and scientific works and rights or licenses to use any copyrighted material, artistic and scientific works, patents, trade-marks, utility models or designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are exercisable.

(i) Mining or quarrying rights or mining leases shall be deemed to be situated at the place of such mining or quarrying.

(j) Fishing rights shall be deemed to be situated in the country in whose government's jurisdiction such rights are exercisable.

(k) Any property for which provision is not hereinbefore made shall be deemed to be situated in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax solely by reason of the situs of property within such State, but if neither of the contracting States imposes the tax solely by reason of the situs of property therein, then any such property shall be deemed to be situated in accordance with the laws of each contracting State.

(2) The application of the provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall be limited to the particular property, and any portion thereof, which without such provisions would be subjected to the taxes of both contracting States or would be so subjected except for a specific exemption.

ARTICLE IV

Where one of the contracting States imposes the tax solely by reason of the situs of property within such State, in the case of a decedent who at the time of his death, or of a donor who at the time of the gift, was a national of or domiciled in the United States, or in the case of a beneficiary of a decedent's estate who at the time of such decedent's death, or a beneficiary of a gift who at the time of the gift, was domiciled in Japan, the contracting State so imposing the tax:

(a) shall allow a specific exemption which would be applicable under its laws if the decedent, donor, or beneficiary, as the case may be, had been a national of or domiciled in such State, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which (A) the value of the property, situated according to Article III in such State and subjected to the taxes of both contracting States or which would be so subjected except for a specific exemption, bears to (B) the value of the total property which would be subjected to the tax of such State if such decedent, donor, or beneficiary had been a national of or domiciled in such State; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph and for the purpose of any other proportional allowance

otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article III outside such State in determining the amount of the tax.

ARTICLE V

(1) Where either contracting State imposes the tax by reason of the nationality thereof or the domicile therein of a decedent or a donor or a beneficiary of a decedent's estate or of a gift, such State shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the tax imposed by the other contracting State with respect to property situated at the time of the transfer in such other State and included for the taxes of both States (but the amount of the credit shall not exceed that portion of the tax imposed by the crediting State which is attributable to such property). The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (2) of this Article.

(2) Where each contracting State imposes the tax by reason of the nationality thereof or the domicile therein of a decedent or a donor or a beneficiary, with respect to any property situated at the time of the transfer outside both contracting States (or deemed by each contracting State to be situated in its territory, or deemed by one contracting State to be situated in either contracting State and deemed by the other contracting State to be situated outside both contracting States or deemed by each contracting State to be situated in the other contracting State), each contracting State shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for a part of the tax imposed by the other contracting State attributable to such property. The total of the credits authorized by this paragraph shall be equal to the amount of the tax imposed with respect to such property by the contracting State imposing the smaller amount of the tax with respect to such property, and shall be divided between both contracting States in proportion to the amount of the tax imposed by each contracting State with respect to such property.

(3) The credit authorized by this Article, if applicable, shall be in lieu of any credit for the same tax authorized by the laws of the crediting State, the credit applicable for the particular tax being either credit authorized by this Article or credit authorized by such laws, whichever is the greater. For the purposes of this Article, the amount of the tax of each contracting State attributable to any designated property shall be ascertained after taking into account any applicable diminution or credit against its tax with respect to such property (other than any credit under paragraph (1) or (2) of this Article), provided, however, in case another credit for the tax of any other foreign State is allowable with respect to the same property pursuant to any other Convention between the crediting State under the present Convention and such other foreign State, or pursuant to the laws of the crediting State, the total of such credits shall not exceed the amount of tax of the crediting State attributable to such property computed before allowance of such credits.

(4) Credit against the tax of one of the contracting States for the tax of the other contracting State shall be allowed under this Article only where both such taxes have been simultaneously imposed at the time of a decedent's death or at the time of a gift.

(5) No credit resulting from the application of this Article shall be allowed after more than five years from the due date of the tax against which credit would otherwise be allowed, unless claim therefor was filed within such five-year period. Any refund resulting from the application of this Article shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded, unless otherwise specifically authorized by the crediting State.

(6) Credit against the tax of one of the contracting States shall not be finally allowed for the tax of the other contracting State until the latter tax (reduced by credit authorized under this Article, if any) has been paid.

ARTICLE VI

(1) The competent authorities of both contracting States shall exchange such information available under the respective tax laws of both contracting States as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or for the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the tax. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those, including a court, concerned with the assessment and collection of the tax or the determination of appeals in relation thereto. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade, business, industrial or professional secret or any trade process.

(2) Each of the contracting States may collect the tax imposed by the other contracting State (as though such tax were the tax of the former State) as will ensure that the credit or any other benefit granted under the present Convention by such other State shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE VII

Where a representative of the estate of a decedent or a beneficiary of such estate or a donor or a beneficiary of a gift shows proof that the action of the tax authorities of either contracting State has resulted, or will result, in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, such representative, donor or beneficiary shall be entitled to present the facts to the competent authorities of the contracting State of which the decedent was a national at the time of his death or of which the donor or beneficiary is a national, or if the decedent was not a national of either of the contracting States at the time of his death or if the donor or the beneficiary is not a national of either of the contracting States, to the competent authorities of the contracting State in which the decedent was domiciled or resident at the time of his death or in which the donor or beneficiary is domiciled or resident. Should the claim be deeemed worthy of consideration, the competent authorities of such State to which the facts are so presented shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authorities of the other contracting State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) The provisons of the present Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed so as to increase the tax imposed by either contracting State.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement; it being understood, however, that this provision shall not be construed to preclude the contracting States from settling by negotiation any dispute arising under the present Convention.

(4) The competent authorities of both contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of the present Convention and may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE IX

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Tokyo as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall enter into force on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after the date of such exchange and to gifts made on or after that date.

(3) Either of the contracting States may terminate the present Convention at any time after a period of five years shall have expired from the date on which the Convention enters into force, by giving to the other contracting State notice of termination, provided that such notice is given on or before the 30th day of June and, in such event, the present Convention shall cease to be effective for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January of the calendar year next following that in which such notice is given.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Japanese languages, each text having equal authenticity, this sixteenth day of April, 1954.

For the United States of America:

WALTER BEDELL SMITH.

For Japan:

S. IGUCHI.

CONVENTION WITH BELGIUM RELATING TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND SUCCESSIONS

Executive G, 83d Congress, 2d session, convention with Belgium relating to taxes on estates and successions, signed at Washington on May 27, 1954, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND BELGIUM FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND SUCCESSIONS

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and successions, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The Government of Belgium:

Baron Silvercruys, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Belgium at Washington,

who, have communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are the following:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: the Federal estate tax, and

(b) In the case of Belgium: the succession duty and the duty on transfer by death.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other death duties of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Belgium" means the Kingdom of Belgium, excluding the Colony of the Belgian Congo and the territories under Belgian mandate.

(c) The term "tax" means the Federal estate tax imposed by the United States, or the succession duty or the duty on transfer by death imposed by Belgium, as the context requires.

(d) The term "competent authority" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, and in the case of Belgium, the Directeur General de l'Enregistrement et des Domains or his duly authorized representative.

(2) For the purposes of the present Convention, the question whether a decedent was at the time of his death a national of or domiciled in the United States or an inhabitant of Belgium, shall be determined in accordance with the law in force in such State.

(3) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States, any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under its own law.

ARTICLE III

In the case of the death of a person who at the time of his death was a national of or domiciled in the United States or an inhabitant of Belgium, the situs of any of the following property or property rights shall, for the purposes of the imposition of the tax, and for the purposes of the credit authorized by Article V, be determined exclusively in accordance with the following rules:

(a) Real property shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the land involved is located. The question whether any property or right in property constitutes real property shall be determined in accordance with the law of the place where the land involved is located.

(b) Tangible personal property (other than such property for which specific provision is hereinafter made) and bank or currency notes and other forms of currency recognized as legal tender in the place of issue shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such property or currency is physically located at the time of death, or, if in transitu, at the place of destination.

(c) Debts (including indemnities, insurance and bonds but not including negotiable promissory notes, checks and bills of exchange for which provision is hereinafter made) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the debtor resides, or, if the debtor is a corporation, at the place in or under the laws of which such corporation was created or organized.

(b) Bills of exchange and checks shall be deemed to be situated at the place of the drawee's residence, and negotiable promissory notes at the place of residence of the maker.

(e) Shares or stock in a corporation (including shares or stock held by a nominee where the beneficial ownership is evidenced by scrip certificates or otherwise) shall be deemed to be situated at the place in or under the laws of which such corporation was created or organized.

(f) Ships and aircraft and shares thereof shall be deemed to be situated at the place of registration or documentation of the ship or aircraft.

(g) Goodwill as a trade, business or professional asset shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the trade, business or profession to which it pertains is carried on.

(h) Patents, trade-marks and designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are registered or, if not registered, where used.

(i) Copyrights, franchises, rights to artistic and scientific works and rights or licenses to use any copyrighted material, artistic and scientific works, patents, trade-marks or designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the rights arising therefrom are exercisable.

(j) Rights or causes of action ex delicto surviving for the benefit of an estate of a decedent shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such rights or causes of action arose.

(k) All property other than hereinbefore mentioned shall be deemed to be situated in the State in which the deceased person was domiciled at the time of his death.

ARTICLE IV

(1) If the United States imposes tax in the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was not a national of or domiciled therein but was an inhabitant of Belgium, the United States:

(a) shall allow a specific exemption, which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the property subjected to its tax bears to the value of the property which would have been subjected to its tax if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this paaragraph and for the purpose of any other proportionate allowance otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article III outside the United States in determining the amount or rate of tax.

(2) If Belgium imposes a tax in the case of a decedent who at the time of his death was not an inhabitant thereof but was a national of or domiciled in the United States, Belgium:

(a) shall allow a specific exemption which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been an inhabitant of Belgium, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the property subjected to its tax bears to the value of the property which would have been subjected to its tax if the decedent had been an inhabitant of Belgium; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph and for the purpose of any other proportionate allowance otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article III outside Belgium in determining the amount or rate of tax.

ARTICLE V

(1) If the United States determines that the decedent was a national of or domiciled in the United States at the time of his death, and Belgium determines that the decedent was an inhabitant of Belgium at the time of his death, each contracting State shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the tax imposed by the other contracting State with respect to property situated in such other contracting State and included for tax purposes by both States, but the amount of the credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed by the former State which is attributable to such property. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (2) of this Article.

(2) If each contracting State imposes tax on any property situated outside both contracting States (or deemed situated in both contracting States), each contracting State shall allow against so much of its tax (computed without application of this Article) as is attributable to such property, a credit which bears the same proportion to the amount of its tax so attributable or to the amount of the other contracting State's tax attributable to the same property, whichever is the less, as the former amount bears to the sum of both amounts.

(3) The credit authorized by this Article, if applicable, shall be in lieu of any credit for the same tax authorized by statute of the crediting State, the credit applicable for the particular tax being either the credit authorized by this Article or the credit authorized by such statute, whichever benefit is the greater. For the purposes of this Article, the amount of the tax in each contracting State attributable to any particular property shall be ascertained after taking into account any applicable diminution or credit against its tax with respect to such property, other than the credit to be allowed under this Article, provided, however, in case credits are allowable with respect to the same property pursuant to any other Convention in force between the crediting State under this Convention and any other State or pursuant to a statute of the crediting State, the total of such credits shall not exceed the amount of tax of such crediting State attributable to such property computed before allowance of such credits.

(4) No credit or refund of any amount of tax resulting from the application of this Article shall be made after six years from the date of the decedent's death unless claim therefor was filed within such period. Any refund of tax resulting from the application of this Article shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded.

(5) Credit against tax imposed by one of the contracting States shall not be finally allowed for tax imposed by the other contracting State until the latter tax (reduced by credit allowable under this Article, if any) has been paid.

ARTICLE VI

(1) The competent authorities of the contracting States shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting States) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or for the effective administration of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention.

(2) Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than the tax authorities of the contracting States. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade secret or trade process.

ARTICLE VII

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the tax administrations of the contracting States has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of this Convention, he shall be entitled (within a period of two years from the date of the notification of the tax which has been last asserted or proposed, or of the payment of the tax if such payment has been made prior to notification) to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen, or, if he is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, with the State of which he is a domiciliary, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other juridical person, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authorities of the two contracting States shall come to an agreement with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed so as to increase the taxes imposed by the contracting States.

(2) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of this Convention or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

(3) The competent authority of each contracting State may communicate directly with the competent authority of the other contracting State for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE IX

(1) Either of the contracting States may, at the time of exchange of instruments of ratification or thereafter while the present Convention continues in force, by a written notification of extension given to the other contracting State through diplomatic channels, declare its desire that the operation of the present Convention, either in whole or as to such provisions thereof as may be deemed to have special application, shall extend to any of its colonies or overseas territories which imposes taxes substantially similar in character to those which are the subject of the present Convention.

(2) In the event that a notification is given by one of the contracting States in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article, the present Convention, or such provisions thereof as may be specified in the notification, shall apply to any territory named in such notification with respect to the estates or successions of persons dying on or after the first day of January following the date of a written communication through diplomatic channels addressed to such contracting State by the other contracting State, after such action by the latter State as may be necessary in accordance with its own procedures, stating that such notification is accepted in respect to such territory. In the absence of such acceptance, none of the provisions of the present Convention shall apply to such territory.

(3) At any time after the expiration of one year from the effective date of an extension made by virtue of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Article, either of the contracting States may, by a written notice of termination given to the other contracting State through diplomatic channels, terminate the application of the present Convention to any territory to which the Convention, or any of its provisions, has been extended. In that case, the present Convention, or the provisions thereof specified in the notice of termination, shall cease to be applicable to any of the territories named in such notice of termination with respect to the estates or successions of persons dying on or after the first day of January following the expiration of a period of six months after the date of such notice; provided, however, that this shall not affect the continued application of the Convention, or any of the provisions thereof, to the United States, to Belgium, or to any territory (not named in the notice of termination) to which the Convention, or such provision thereof, applies.

(4) For the application of the present Convention to any territory to which it is extended by the United States or by Belgium, references to "the United States" or to "Belgium" or to one or the other contracting State, as the case may be, shall be construed to refer to such territory.

(5) For the purposes of the present Convention, the Belgian Congo shall be considered to be a Belgian territory to which the provisions of this Article shall apply.

ARTICLE X

(1) This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Brussels as soon as possible.

(2) This Convention shall come into force on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be effective only as to the estates or successions of persons dying on or after such date.

(3) This Convention shall remain in force for a period of five years beginning with such date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the five-year period or at any time thereafter, provided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this twenty-seventh day of May, 1954.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

For the Government of Belgium:

[SEAL] SILVERCRUYS.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate has before it Executive Report No. 3 dealing with three separate tax conventions, including an income tax convention with Japan—Executive D, 83d Congress, 2d session; an estate and gift tax convention with Japan—Executive E, 83d Congress, 2d session; and an estate tax convention with Belgium—Executive G, 83d Congress, 2d session. The two conventions with Japan were reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the last session of Congress. These conventions were again reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations on February 9, 1955, along with the convention with Belgium which was considered by the Committee for the first time in this session.

ESTATE TAX CONVENTION WITH BELGIUM

The convention with Belgium relating to taxes on estates and successions is generally similar to other death duty conventions which the Senate has previously approved, for example, conventions with the United Kingdom, Canada, France, Australia, and others.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAX CONVENTION WITH JAPAN

Similarly, the provisions of the convention with Japan relating to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts closely parallel provisions of other death duty conventions now in effect. The unusual feature of this convention is that it is the first treaty to combine provisions applicable to both estate and gift taxes in the same convention. There are now in effect between the United States and Australia both a gift tax convention and an estate tax convention. The pending convention with Japan, however, is the first dual estate and gift tax convention.

INCOME TAX CONVENTION WITH JAPAN

In the case of the income tax convention with Japan, there are several noteworthy features which should be called to the attention of the Senate. It was for the purpose of permitting a fuller discussion of these features that the Senate did not take action upon either of the Japanese tax treaties in the closing days of the last session of the Congress.

Attention should be called first to the principal provisions in the Japanese income tax convention which are particularly favorable to the United States. For example, there is provided a reciprocal exemption of shipping and aircraft operating profits. This provision which was contained in article V of the convention operates primarily in favor of the United States since the Japanese at the present time have no airlines in operation between Japan and the United States. Thus, the exemption of United States aircraft profits derived from operations in Japan is especially favorable to this country. The United States also has the greater preponderance of shipping operations between Japan and the United States so that exemption of the profits derived from shipping benefits the United States more than Japan at the present time.

In article VII of the convention there is provided a reciprocal limitation on the tax on outgoing royalties. The tax on such royalties may not exceed 15 percent. This provision results in a reduction of the Japanese withholding tax on film rentals from the present tax of 20 percent to the 15-percent maximum tax under this convention. At the present time most film rentals flow from Japan to the United States rather than in the tends to be particularly advantageous to reverse direction, so that this provision the United States.

In article X of the convention there is provided an exemption from Japanese tax of compensation paid by the United States Government to a citizen of the United States who is resident in Japan, unless the United States citizen has been admitted to Japan for permanent residence. This exemption is of particular importance to a number of United States citizens who are employed as technical experts in Japan by the United States but whose employment is not of such a nature as to bring it within the diplomatic immunity from tax. The exemption is a reciprocal one but it operates predominately in favor of the United States at the present time.

In article XIII of the convention there are provided certain rules for determining the source of income. These source rules are derived from the United States internal-revenue laws and regulations. Thus, it is significant that the rules for determining sources of income are those with which the United States taxpayers are generally familiar rather than Japanese concepts.

In article XIV of the convention there is a very important provision dealing with the credit for Japanese corporate dividends paid to United States citizens, corporations, or residents. This provision is not a reciprocal exemption. Thus, the United States withholding tax of 30 percent on dividends from United States corporations going abroad to Japanese citizens remains unaffected by the provision.

Under the convention, Japan agrees not to impose any witholding tax on dividends paid to a United States stockholder—unless the recipient is a resident of Japan or has a permanent establishment in Japan. At the present time Japan imposes a 20 percent withholding tax on outgoing dividends. This tax, however, is reduced to 10 percent if the investment tends to further the Japanese economy. Under the provisions of the convention described previously, Japan agrees to impose no withholding tax on outgoing dividends paid to United States recipients.

The convention also provides that with respect to United States recipients of dividends from Japanese corporations, the United States will grant a credit against its tax of 25 percent of the

amount of the dividend but only on the grossing-up principle, to borrow an English term. This provision is generally similar to provisions contained in tax treaties now in effect between the United States and Ireland and between the United States and the United Kingdom.

To illustrate the grossing-up principle, assume that a United States shareholder receives $100 of dividends from a Japanese corporation. If it is assumed that the United States shareholder is taxed on his income at an effective rate of 50 percent, he would compute his United States tax and the allowable credit for the dividend in the following manner: He would include the dividend of $100 in gross income; he would also then include in gross income 25 percent of the amount of the dividend, or $25. Thus, he would include in gross income a total of $125 with respect to the dividend, or more than the actual amount of the dividend. He must include this extra amount in order to get the benefit of the tax credit provided for in the treaty. The tax on this $125, at the effective rate of 50 percent, is $62.50. Against this tax the United States stockholder would receive a credit of 25 percent of $100, or $25. Thus, the United States tax attributable to the $100 Japanese dividend would be $37.50.

This grossing-up principle has the effect of decreasing the advantage of the tax credit as the taxpayer goes into a higher bracket of tax liability. Thus, assume that the United States recipient of the $100 Japanese dividend is in a higher bracket so that he might be taxed, for example, at an effective rate of 85 percent. In this case, he would again have gross income of $125, but his United States tax attributable to the Japanese dividend would be $106.25. Against this tax he would receive a credit of $25, so that he would pay a total United States tax with respect to a Japanese dividend of $81.25. Thus, out of the $100 Japanese dividend he would have left, after paying United States taxes, only $18.75.

This latter example may be compared with a United States citizen who receives a dividend from a domestic corporation. With respect to a $100 dividend from a domestic corporation—leaving out of consideration the dividend exclusion—there would be imposed at an effective tax rate of 85 percent a tax of $85. Against this tax the individual would receive a tax credit of 4 percent of the amount of the dividend, or $4. Thus, the tax attributable to the United States dividend at the 85 percent effective rate would be $81. The individual would thus have $19 remaining on his $100 United States dividend as compared with $18.75 if the dividend had been received from a Japanese corporation.

As indicated earlier, this grossing up principle is similar to that employed in other tax conventions with respect to dividends received by United States recipients from corporations which are entities of the other contracting country.

On balance, Mr. President, it seems very clear that the treaty or tax convention with Japan is more favorable, or at least equally favorable, to the United States than it is to the Japanese citizen who is similarly affected.

The whole purpose of the first treaty with Japan, which I described briefly, and of the Belgium treaty, is really to avoid double taxation in the case of estate and death taxes.

I believe it is agreed that these conventions may be considered together, but a separate vote is desired on each one of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending conventions will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to the point of the consideration of the resolutions of ratification.

CONVENTION WITH JAPAN RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME

The clerk will first read the resolution of ratification of Executive D, the convention with Japan relating to taxes on income.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive D, 83d Congress, 2d session, a convention between the United States of America and Japan for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington April 16, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend his 25th anniversary celebration in the State of Washington.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BENDER and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BENDER and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted: Yeas 72, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Frear	Morse
Barkley	Fulbright	Mundt
Barrett	George	Murray
Beall	Goldwater	Neely
Bennett	Gore	Neuberger
Bush	Hayden	Pastore
Butler	Hennings	Payne
Byrd	Hill	Potter
Carlson	Holland	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Ives	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Cotton	Kerr	Smathers
Curtis	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Ellender	McClellan	Welker
Ervin	Millikin	Williams
Flanders	Monroney	Young

NOT VOTING—24

Allott	Hickenlooper	Malone
Anderson	Hruska	Martin, Iowa
Bender	Humphrey	McCarthy
Bible	Johnson, Tex.	McNamara
Bricker	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Kennedy	Robertson
Capehart	Langer	Smith, Maine
Green	Magnuson	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

CONVENTION WITH JAPAN RELATING TO TAXES ON ESTATES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I urge all Senators to remain in the Chamber, for we have two additional treaties to consider. They have already been gone into and explained by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If Senators will remain in the Chamber, we shall be able to complete the ratification of the treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification of Executive E will now be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive E, 83d Congress, 2d session, a convention between the United States of America and Japan for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts, signed at Washington on April 16, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend his 25th anniversary celebration in the State of Washington.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BENDER and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BENDER and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted: Yeas 71, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—71

Aiken	George	Morse
Barkley	Goldwater	Mundt
Barrett	Gore	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bush	Hill	Pastore
Butler	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Hruska	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Cotton	Kefauver	Smathers
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Kuchel	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Ervin	McClellan	Williams
Frear	Millikin	Young
Fulbright	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—25

Allott	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Hickenlooper	McNamara
Bender	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bible	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Bricker	Kennedy	Russell
Bridges	Langer	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Magnuson	Wiley
Chavez	Malone	
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

CONVENTION WITH BELGIUM RELATING TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND SUCCESSIONS

The resolution of ratification of Executive G will now be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution of ratification, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive G, 83d Congress, 2d session, a convention between the United States of America and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and successions, signed at Washington on May 27, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the atomic energy tests in Nevada.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend his 25th anniversary celebration in the State of Washington.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BENDER and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators

from Ohio [Mr. BENDER and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted: Yeas 74, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—74

Aiken	Frear	Monroney
Barkley	Fulbright	Morse
Barrett	George	Mundt
Beall	Goldwater	Murray
Bennett	Gore	Neely
Bridges	Hayden	Neuberger
Bush	Hennings	Pastore
Butler	Hill	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Carlson	Hruska	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Ives	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Schoeppel
Chavez	Jenner	Scott
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cotton	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kerr	Sparkman
Daniel	Kilgore	Stennis
Dirksen	Knowland	Symington
Douglas	Kuchel	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McClellan	Young
Flanders	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—22

Allott	Humphrey	McNamara
Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Bender	Kennedy	Robertson
Bible	Langer	Russell
Bricker	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Malone	Wiley
Green	Martin, Iowa	
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the ratification of the three conventions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I now ask that the nominations on the Executive Calendar be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert J. Hayes to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis S. Rothschild to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Allin H. Pierce to be judge, for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ross Rizley, to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Coggeshall, to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

OREGON LEGISLATURE MEMORIAL ON JOHN DAY DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a few brief remarks to make on a memorial adopted by the House of the Oregon Legislature dealing with the John Day Dam.

House Joint Memorial No. 2 of the Oregon Legislature has been placed before the Senate and referred to the appropriate committee.

It requires comment. House Joint Memorial No. 2 relates to the John Day multi-purpose project on the Columbia River which was authorized by the Congress in years past as a wholly Federal project as part of the main control plan for the Columbia River Basin.

The memorial correctly relates the magnificent and urgently required power, navigation, and flood-control benefits of the John Day Dam as a Federal project. It goes on to urge Congress to "appropriate immediately the funds necessary to enable the Corps of Engineers to complete the preliminary investigations and planning for the John Day Project."

That is fine as far as it goes. It should state in addition that the President's recommendation of $500,000 for this purpose is totally inadequate. Apparently the Republican majority in the State Legislature that adopted this memorial, to the applause of the private utilities, thought it best not to mention this fact.

On January 16, Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, NEUBERGER and I issued a statement expressing the hope that the President would recommend adequate planning funds for John Day Dam. Our hopes went unanswered by the President, who recommended one-third that amount in his budget.

Last year, starting in January, I urged that John Day be a new start—so desperately needed in the Pacific Northwest to provide navigation aid and cheap power and what is equally scarce in our area, jobs.

In March 1953, I urged the Senate Appropriations Committee to provide the funds in the amount of $750,000. That is the amount the Corps of Engineers can use and needs to do a full year's work to ready John Day for construction, a long and laborious process.

The committee recommended $500,000 and the Senate agreed, but the amount was eliminated in conference. I protested and was joined by Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON. We sought to have the bill recommitted. The then chairman of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, the present minority leader, vigorously opposed us and pointed out that he did not think it wise to proceed to start a project of such dimensions and cost.

We persisted. When the first supplemental appropriations bill was before the Senate, we urged the appropriation of $1.5 million, because after the first elimination of the funds for John Day, the Army Corps of Engineers advised us that if it received funds before August, the planning job could be done in 15 months instead of more than 2 years. Had the Republican 83d Congress acted, John Day could have been under construction this year.

The committee recommended $750,000. The Senate agreed. Once again, every penny for John Day was cut out in conference.

The Democratic Senators from the Pacific Northwest are determined to fight this year for $1.5 million for the accelerated program.

Our area, and the Nation, needs that new start in 1956.

It is my hope that the Oregon Legislature follows up its memorial with a suitable one urging an appropriation of $1.5 million. Let them also urge the President to revise his request so that the job can be done, be done right and be done quickly. Why was that not done in the first place?

The memorial has another subsection asking that the Federal Government "indicate its intention to build the John Day project promptly and solely with Federal funds by making the necessary appropriation to start construction immediately upon completing the preliminary planning or, in the alternative, enact without delay such enabling legislation as is required to permit local agencies to advance funds, under appropriate arrangements with the United States, so that construction of such project by the Federal Government can be initiated immediately."

I fear the Republican draftsman of the resolution was ill-advised about congressional procedure, or totally unaware of how long the planning phase will take. For projects of this sort, Congress limits appropriations to the fiscal year ahead. I fear that the Republican legislators in Oregon were not looking for an assurance that the Federal Government will go forward with the project, but instead were looking for an excuse for advocating so-called partnership.

Let me briefly describe what that "partnership" entails. In doing so I quote the views I presented upon behalf of a majority of the Democrats on the Public Works Committee last year:

This is the partnership prize.

The John Day Dam, an authorized project, is almost exclusively a power dam located on the main stem of the Columbia River.

It will have an installed capacity of 1,100,000 kilowatts (as compared with 39,000 at Cougar and 81,000 at Green Peter-White Bridge). With the addition of upstream storage installed capacity can be increased to 1,500,000 kilowatts.

In the form proposed the project would cost about $400 million exclusive of interest costs during construction. The Army engineers advise that this project is essentially like the McNary Dam project, for which a tentative cost allocation charges power with over 90 percent of the total cost. So that under the plan for the dam proposed in the partnership bill, power would be chargeable with some 90 percent of the cost which will range from $360 million to $400 million without interest charges during construction. Under Federal construction, operation and marketing of power, the Federal investment for power would be returned in full in a 50-year period.

However, this is what the sponsor of the bill (S. 3510) proposes (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 5, p. 7042):

"The estimated total cost of the John Day Dam is $320 million. The local interests propose to contribute $164 million or more than half of the cost of the dam to the Federal Government. We are, therefore, dealing with much larger sums of money—hundreds of millions of dollars—than we were in the other cases.

"With the bill providing that the local interests contribute $164 million and that the Federal Government assume the responsibility to pay the remainder of the cost of the dam, one of the first questions that occurs is how this division of financial responsibility was arrived at. The answer is this: We started with the proposition that a partnership in the ordinary sense of the word meant approximately equal contributions by the partners. It was next determined that the probable limit of financing by the local interests was in the neighborhood of $165 million."

In the remarks the sponsor of the bill put into the RECORD he neglected to break down the benefit which will accrue to the respective partners. The benefit which will accrue is that the private utilities which are to receive the power will get the proceeds from the power, and the taxpayers of the United States will get the fish ladders, and will have to pay the flood-control capital cost, but will not receive dividends from the dam. Of course the Secretary of the Interior does not like to have me say in the State of Oregon that he is sponsoring a giveaway project; but he is sponsoring the giving away of millions upon millions of dollars to the private utilities of my State at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation. The private-utility interests do not own the Columbia River. It belongs to 164 million American people; and as a Senator from the State of Oregon I intend to stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleague in this body to see to it that the taxpayers of the Nation are protected from the giveaway program of the Secretary of the Interior to the private utilities of my State. It is because of the position he takes on John Day and other dams in our section of the country that I always refer to him in my State as the Secretary of the Department of Private Utilities, and not as the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the remainder of the comments on the John Day Dam issue which I made in the Senate last year, and to which I have previously referred.

There being no objection, the remainder of the comments was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An additional feature of this proposal is that the Government will build the project with its own funds—thereby conferring upon the participating utilities the benefit of the low interest rates available to the United States.

The partner or partners would receive an amount of power equal to the total generation of John Day delivered, over Government transmission lines, at load centers. This could involve Federal expenditure for construction of additional transmission facilities, but the partner would pay only for the cost of transmission, not the cost of constructing transmission facilities.

The power partners would receive electricity in proportion to their contribution to the $164 million invested. Among the potential participants, Portland General Electric Co., which initially proposed the plan, undoubtedly would make the major investment and thereby receive the lion's share of the power output.

Interestingly, the method for cost allocation contained in the Cougar and Green Peter bills are not included in S. 3510. That task is left solely to the Army engineers and Federal Power Commission. Yet, the Engineers and the Secretary of Interior recommended the cost allocation formula of the bills for the 2 small projects for use in connection with regular Federal multipurpose projects. In the case of McNary, power has been charged with 97½ percent of the cost of the project.

Apparently, the partnership advocates are not content to have Portland General Electric Co. bear the cost of power generation upon the basis that has resulted in weighting Federal power from McNary with so large a portion of the project cost.

Another aspect of the John Day partnership bill is the express provision for using the Federal transmission system for the distribution of power to Portland General Electric at load center. Partnership advocates have not been so generous in supporting funds for transmission lines to deliver power to PUD's and rural electric co-ops.

But, the main significance of this provision in the bill is the comparison it presents with the Cougar bill, which contains no such provision. However, in the John Day bill the use of Federal transmission lines do not imply the pooling and integration of power. Rather it represents an exchange of power so that Portland General Electric and its junior partners will get an amount of power equal to the amount generated at this mammoth project.

The John Day partnership would result in higher power costs for the profit of a private utility. The people's river and the people's funds, the people's borrowing power—would be used to hand over power under a 50-year contract and the power revenues would be used to repay the people's investment after a markup for the private utility's profit.

Public preference, the chief target of the private utilities of the country, would be nonexistent for a million to a million and a half kilowatts of capacity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senate that the 21-to-7 vote in the State senate and the 34-to-26 vote in the State house of representatives was almost a straight party-line vote. Only two Republican members of the house, Representatives Gust Anderson and McKenzie, to their credit, joined the Democrats in opposition.

It is unfortunate that the Republican leadership in Oregon has made opposition to public power development a partisan issue. It does not represent the rank-and-file Republicans of my State. The people of Oregon, Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, know that inexpensive public power means the difference between economic progress and economic stagnation. The Oregon Republican machine has made itself the party of stagnation.

John Day, like high Hells Canyon Dam, must be built if Oregon is to prosper and make its contribution to the economy and defense of the country.

Do the Republicans in the Oregon State Legislature care to put themselves on record on the Federal Hells Canyon Dam?

Such action is awaited with interest.

The Republican leadership of Oregon, by this resolution, has made itself a soundtruck, with no parade. The people of the State I, in part, represent are not behind the private utility soundtruck which is being driven through the State by the Republican machine of Oregon.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to invite attention to a very fine article written by my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], published in the current issue of the Reporter magazine, entitled "Partnership Versus the Public Interest."

I desire to be associated with the observations of the junior Senator from Oregon appearing in this fine article. But before I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks, I wish to read a quotation or two from the article. The junior Senator from Oregon is one of the most able and brilliant writers in the field of American journalism today, and in this article he has, with his usual clarity, boiled down the essential features of this great power issue in the State of Oregon.

Speaking of the Secretary of the Interior, my colleague says in this article:

When he spoke out for partnership in Oregon last year under the aegis of the Republican National Committee, Secretary of the Interior McKay cited the need for safeguarding the country's exchequer. He did not mention that power receipts are pouring into that exchequer from many of the same Federal projects partnership would displace.

The key partnership bill drafted to date calls for development of the John Day power site on the Columbia River, where the mightiest of America's hydroelectric streams forms the boundary between Oregon and

Washington. This measure, introduced near the close of the 83d Congress with the approval of both the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior, calls for a dam to cost approximately $320 million. The Government would contribute $156 million of this sum, and the remaining $164 million would come from what the President refers to as "non-Federal interests," meaning in this particular instance the Portland General Electric Co. Mr. McKay had originally announced that the State Grange and farmers' rural electric cooperatives might join with the power company as "non-Federal interests," but these organizations later denounced the proposed partnership in strong terms. The co-ops said that it could mean the doom of public power in the Northwest.

Under the partnership bill, the Government gets as its share of the projects the fish ladders, the navigation locks, and the flood-control gates along the spillway. These are facilities that the President regards as involving "a national interest," a description he evidently does not apply to water power. Kilowatts being thus less important than chutes for salmon or locks for sternwheelers, the "non-Federal interests" receive as their portion of the dam the energy produced in the powerhouse for a period of at least 50 years.

Up to this point partnership may seem a sound venture for the Government. The great dam gets built and the Treasury has to put up only about 49 percent of the funds, as compared with the 100 percent required of the Federal Government in the era of New Deal spending, when Bonneville and Grand Coulee rose above bedrock in the Columbia River.

MR. M'KAY, MEET MR. M'KAY

During a nationwide TV program Secretary McKay, a former Governor of Oregon and Chevrolet dealer, blurted out: "I don't think it's right to subsidize power out in my country—for instance, in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho."

If the Secretary is correct in his contention that the Government is losing money on the kilowatts generated in the Northwest, then altruistic utility companies are merely sparing the Government a fiscal headache in offering to take over the powerhouses. What could be finer for the public? Partnership becomes a generous gesture on the part of Electric Bond & Share and its brethren.

But the truth seems to be that Mr. McKay, like so many other administrators in the Capital, has failed to read material to which his own name is signed. In appraising the bank balance of the Bonneville Power Administration, the 1953 annual report of the Secretary of the Interior noted that "The repayment is substantially in excess of scheduled requirements."

Behind this formal language lurks one of the most profitable financial records of any Federal agency in the land. A total of $128,549,822 has been invested, for example, in construction costs, operating expenses, and interest in the majestic dam at Bonneville, where the Columbia River surges through the Cascade Mountains. Up to June 30, 1954, $48,825,958 has been put back into the Treasury, through the sale of Bonneville current, and Bonneville Dam has been in full operation only since 1943. How many other undertakings, public or private, are more than 35 percent paid for after so brief a period? Even allowing for the decreased value of the dollar, the return would seem to look pretty good.

My colleague goes on to say in this very keen article:

Under the John Day partnership bill, the Government will be paid back by the utility corporation only the funds invested by the powerplant section of the dam, plus the cost of transmission and maintenance. Yet the all-Federal system of operation now in effect at Bonneville and Grand Coulee will probably return to the Treasury many times the total value of both projects.

In fact, the Bonneville Power Administration, which markets at wholesale the energy from all Government dams on the Columbia and its swift tributaries, has collected $340,565,589 in gross income out of hydroelectric-power receipts. Approximately half of this, $170,409,914, has gone to repay the original investment in hydroelectric facilities. The other half has been applied on interest and operating expenses.

Although some of the present advocates of partnership once prophesied that the Federal dams in the Northwest would never find a market for their juice, the demand for kilowatts extends from tidewater to the Canadian boundary. Of the $221,462,229 spent on the generating features of vast Grand Coulee Dam, the largest edifice ever reared by mankind, $51,031,697 already has been repaid to the Treasury. Yet Grand Coulee has not been in full operation even as long as Bonneville. Its complete quota of turbines dates only from 1951.

By any test, these dams have been enormously profitable for the Government. To begin with, they probably would have had to be built anyway to serve other purposes. Grand Coulee is wresting from the high desert 15,000-irrigated homesteads, many of them settled by ex-GI's. Peach orchards and alfalfa fields have driven back the tumbleweed and sagebrush. And Bonneville's locks and lake have increased navigation on the upper Columbia River from 85,715 tons of cargo in 1933 to 1,343,575 tons in 1953. This water competition, in turn, has held down rail and truck freight prices.

The income from power at the dams has been a bonus. Irrigation and navigation were the first reasons for the projects. Yet it is probable that this income may pay for Bonneville and Grand Coulee many times over before steel girders and concrete bastions yield at last to the erosion of wind, weather, and the surging river.

I digress from my reading of the article by my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] to make a comment about the phony tax issue which is constantly being raised by Republican spokesmen in my State, the argument that the private utilities pay taxes. If we had continued to be subjected to the high-power rates charged by the private utilities in our State, private enterprise, to the extent of millions upon millions of dollars of investment in new business never would have come into the State. Private enterprises with a volume of business of millions upon millions of dollars came into Oregon, because of the availability of cheap power, which was produced by the great multipurpose dams. Those private businesses have returned to the United States Treasury many, many times the increase in tax dollars the Treasury would ever have received from private utilities had they been allowed to build high-power cost, low-head dams.

When I discuss next week, as I expect to do at the time of the introduction of the Hells Canyon Dam bill, the issue of taxation, I shall present to the Senate a breakdown of the contributions by way of tax payments which private industry has made to the Treasury, payments which never would have been made otherwise, because those private industries never would have come into our State except for the building of such dams as Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

A great dam like Hells Canyon Dam will bring to the Pacific Northwest millions upon millions of dollars' worth of new industry, which never will come in if the Secretary of the Interior shall be permitted to get by with his sellout to the Idaho Power Co., in conjunction with the Idaho Power Co.'s plan to build low-head dams on the Snake River, instead of the great multiple-purpose dam so badly needed in Hells Canyon. The site at Hells Canyon is the greatest remaining multiple-purpose dam site on this continent; yet it is proposed by this administration to scuttle it, so far as the welfare of future generations of American boys and girls is concerned, and to make the same mistake which the private utilities sought to perpetuate in the early days of the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The private electric utilities wanted to scuttle the Grand Coulee project and build a low-head dam at Kettle Falls. But President Roosevelt was warned of their scheme by the great Republican leader from my State, Charles McNary; by George Norris, of Nebraska; by Bone and Dill, of Washington; by La Follette, of Wisconsin; Johnson, of California; and other liberals. They pointed out to Roosevelt what the private utilities were up to in seeking permission to build a low-head dam at Kettle Falls, knowing full well that if they got by with it, Grand Coulee Dam never could have been built.

But those Senators had a friendly President to work with, one who understood the Republican source of a conservation program in this country, a Republican source that went back to Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. That program, carried on by a great liberal of liberals, George Norris, who made his historic fights on this issue, aided and assisted by Charles McNary, Bob La Follette, Hiram Johnson, and others, preserved for our generation of American boys and girls their heritage in the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest.

At this time, we who are making this fight in the Senate do not have a friendly President on this issue, because our President has gone along with the private utilities' program under the label of "partnership." It is the kind of partnership under which, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] points out in his great article, the people get the fish ladders and the locks, while the private utilities get the generating forces of the dams and the power profits which come from those generating forces.

That is why I said on an earlier occasion that I do not think much of a partnership in which one of the partners picks the pockets of the other partner. The Eisenhower partnership program, sponsored by his Secretary of the Interior, is a partnership program in which the private utilities, as one of the partners, will proceed immediately to pick the pockets of the American taxpayer; and the private utilities have the audacity to say that they ought to be allowed to do so because, on the basis of their taking, they pay taxes.

The American people need to be told that the great power sites belong to them and that the water belongs to them.

The Government ought to build multiple-purpose dams on these sites and have them owned by the people of the Nation, not by a private-utility, monopolistic combine. That is what Senator NEUBERGER points out so clearly in his fine article.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTNERSHIP VERSUS THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

"Partnership" has become one of the most honored words in the lexicon of the Eisenhower administration. It peppers the President's recent budget message wherever natural resources are discussed. Indeed, neither the President nor Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay can refer to the vast river systems of America without dwelling reverentially on the term "partnership."

The people are told that under partnership they are to enjoy an infinitely more wholesome management of the country's water, timber, and public lands than under Federal operation in the past.

"This budget," declared the President of his financial plans for the fiscal year 1953, "proposes the start of several new construction projects under such partnership arrangements. Thus, we are continuing to develop our natural resources at less cost to the Federal Government."

Yet, although the President and his aides talked frequently and fondly of partnership in general, rarely do administration leaders spell out precisely what they actually mean by partnership. For this, we must turn not to speeches and budget messages but to the proposed legislation through which partnership would be put into effect. Upon studying one of these bills one discovers quite a contrasting prospect to the idyllic descriptions given by the President.

In the cold, terse lines of a printed Senate bill partnership becomes simply a disposal of resources. The American people would be committed not only to parting with some of the most valuable hydroelectric-power sites in the world but also to appropriating public funds so that these sites can be exploited for private interests. Far from developing natural resources at the less cost to the Federal Government boasted of by the President, partnership over the years will deny to the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars that might otherwise go toward reducing the national debt, which so worries many of the President's followers.

This is perhaps the most startling aspect of partnership. In the name of fiscal responsibility, the public would be deprived of the income-producing features of Federal projects that have been paying for themselves at a much more rapid rate than even their most enthusiastic sponsors ever dared to predict. When he spoke out for partnership in Oregon last year under the aegis of the Republican National Committee, Secretary of the Interior McKay cited the need for safeguarding the country's exchequer. He did not mention that power receipts are pouring into that exchequer from many of the same Federal projects partnership would displace.

The key partnership bill drafted to date calls for development of the John Day power site on the Columbia River, where the mightiest of America's hydroelectric streams forms the boundary between Oregon and Washington. This measure, introduced near the close of the 83d Congress with the approval of both the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior, calls for a dam to cost approximately $320 million. The Government would contribute $156 million of this sum, and the remaining $164 million would come from what the President refers to as "non-Federal interests," meaning in this particular instance the Portland General Electric Co. Mr. McKay had originally announced that the State Grange and farmers' rural electric cooperatives might join with the power company as "non-Federal interests," but these organizations later denounced the proposed partnership in strong terms. The co-ops said that it could mean the doom of public power in the Northwest.

Under the partnership bill, the Government gets as its share of the project the fish ladders, the navigation locks, and the flood-control gates along the spillway. These are facilities that the President regards as involving "a national interest," a description he evidently does not apply to water power. Kilowatts being thus less important than chutes for salmon or locks for stern-wheelers, the "non-Federal interests" receive as their portion of the dam the energy produced in the powerhouse for a period of at least 50 years.

Up to this point partnership may seem a sound venture for the Government. The great dam gets built and the Treasury has to put up only about 49 percent of the funds, as compared with the 100 percent required of the Federal Government in the era of New Deal spending, when Bonneville and Grand Coulee rose above bedrock in the Columbia River.

MR. M'KAY, MEET MR. M'KAY

During a nationwide TV program Secretary McKay, a former governor of Oregon and Chevrolet dealer, blurted out: "I don't think it's right to subsidize power out in my country—for instance, in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho."

If the Secretary is correct in his contention that the Government is losing money on the kilowatts generated in the Northwest, then altruistic utility companies are merely sparing the Government a fiscal headache in offering to take over the powerhouses. What could be finer for the public? Partnership becomes a generous gesture on the part of Electric Bond & Share and its brethren.

But the truth seems to be that Mr. McKay, like so many other administrators in the Capital, has failed to read material to which his own name is signed. In appraising the bank balance of the Bonneville Power Administration, the 1953 annual report of the Secretary of the Interior noted that the repayment is substantially in excess of scheduled requirements.

Behind this formal language lurks one of the most profitable financial records of any Federal agency in the land. A total of $128,549,822 has been invested, for example, in construction costs, operating expenses, and interest in the majestic dam at Bonneville, where the Columbia River surges through the Cascade Mountains. Up to June 30, 1954, $48,825,958 had been put back into the Treasury, through the sale of Bonneville current—and Bonneville Dam has been in full operation only since 1943. How many other undertakings, public or private, are more than 35-percent paid for after so brief a period? Even allowing for the decreased value of the dollar, the return would seem to look pretty good.

Under the John Day partnership bill, the Government will be paid back by the utility corporation only the funds invested in the powerplant section of the dam, plus the cost of transmission and maintenance. Yet the all-Federal system of operation now in effect at Bonneville and Grand Coulee will probably return to the Treasury many times the total value of both projects.

In fact, the Bonneville Power Administration, which markets at wholesale the energy from all Government dams on the Columbia and its swift tributaries, has collected $340,565,589 in gross income out of hydroelectric-power receipts. Approximately half of this, $170,409,916, has gone to repay the original investment in hydroelectric facilities. The other half has been applied on interest and operating expenses.

Although some of the present advocates of partnership once prophesied that the Federal dams in the Northwest would never find a market for their "juice," the demand for kilowatts extends from tidewater to the Canadian boundary. Of the $221,462,229 spent on the generating features of vast Grand Coulee Dam, the largest edifice ever reared by mankind, $51,031,697 already has been repaid to the Treasury. Yet Grand Coulee has not been in full operation even as long as Bonneville. Its complete quota of turbines dates only from 1954.

By any test, these dams have been enormously profitable for the Government. To begin with, they probably would have had to be built anyway, to serve other purposes. Grand Coulee is wresting from the high desert 15,000 irrigated homesteads, many of them settled by ex-GI's. Peach orchards and alfalfa fields have driven back the tumbleweed and sagebrush. And Bonneville's locks and lake have increased navigation on the upper Columbia River from 85,715 tons of cargo in 1933 to 1,343,575 tons in 1953. This water competition, in turn, has held down rail and truck freight rates.

The income from power at the dams has been a bonus. Irrigation and navigation were the first reasons for the projects. Yet it is probable that this income may pay for Bonneville and Grand Coulee many times over before steel girders and concrete bastions yield at last to the erosion of wind, weather, and the surging river.

THE SILENT PARTNER

The partnership proposed by the Eisenhower administration would end this favorable arrangement. By putting up only about half the cost of a dam, a private utility combine would be able to monopolize the revenues. At the same time, the Government would continue to be saddled with the apparatus that returns no cash dividends—locks and fish ladders.

The most appropriate comparison would be that of two men forming a partnership to build a department store. Each man chips in approximately half the cost. When the store is completed, one partner gets the revolving doors and escalators and fire escapes; the other partner gets the sales counters. That is essentially the division proposed by the administration between the Government and "non-Federal interests" at dam sites along the Columbia River.

Although the opponents of partnership are occasionally denounced as Socialists and radicals, it is significant that the national administration itself favors some Federal dams. The President has urged Congress to authorize the prodigious upper Colorado project at an ultimate cost of $1 billion. Curiously enough, this is not proposed as a partnership. One might ask why partnership is good for dam sites on the Columbia but undesirable for dam sites dotting the Colorado and its silty feeder streams.

The answer is simple. The Columbia is the greatest power waterway in North America. More than 40 percent of this Nation's latent hydroelecricity lies within its swift, cold reaches. Power has been produced more cheaply along the Columbia than anywhere else in the United States. The Bonneville Administration's wholesale rate of two mills a kilowatt-hour has resulted in the moving of nearly half our national aluminum production to this region, although not a single ounce of aluminum was smelted in the Pacific Northwest before 1940. Utility companies that could get the Government to underwrite their tapping of the immense power potential of the Columbia would be waist-high in clover.

The upper Colorado project is something else again. In this realm of light rainfall, many of the rivers are shallow and unreliable

in flow. Furthermore, conservation groups are militantly opposed to the Echo Park Dam, which would flood out the famous Dinosaur National Monument. Power in the upper Colorado is high-cost power contrasted with that on the Columbia. Transmission distances are measured by horizons rather than miles. Industrial locations are few and far between. No utility corporation covets these sites. Accordingly, partnership proposals have not come close enough to the upper Colorado project even to communicate with it by smoke signals.

This is one of the strangest phases of partnership. Evidently it represents no fervent ideological goal of the administration, to be fought for through thick and thin. It is simply a question of dollars and cents—for the power companies. Where the power site is a choice one, the administration advocates partnership with the utilities. Where the kilowatts are likely to be hard to peddle at feasible rates, the Government will go ahead with a socialistic Federal dam. This is an odd course for an administration dedicated to fiscal solvency. The sites that are potentially profitable will be developed in partnership with private corporations, while the marginal sites are to be given a spigot tapping the United States Treasury.

"LOCAL" INTERESTS

The President often uses the word "local" when he discusses partnership. In his opinion, "non-Federal interests" are generally local. Sometimes, in fact, they are—for example, at the few sites where the partner can be a municipal light plant. But "local" hardly describes the Idaho Power Company, to which the administration would give the great Hell's Canyon hydroelectric site, a dark and spectacular gorge more than a mile deep.

Nearly all the largest holders of common stock in the Idaho Power Company are banks and insurance companies, with headquarters thousands of miles from Hell's Canyon. Only about 7 percent of the common stock is owned in the intermountain West, where the Snake River has trenched America's deepest abyss. Sixty-six percent of the stock is held on the distant Atlantic Coast. On top of all this, the Idaho Power Company holds its annual meetings in Augusta, Maine, which is about as remote as one can be from Hell's Canyon without crossing an international border.

President Eisenhower occasionally likes to trace the lineage of his regime back to Theodore Roosevelt. Mention of the Rough Rider by President Magloire of Haiti brought noisy approval from a recent joint session of Congress. Yet one can only wonder what the first Roosevelt would have thought of partnership. Gifford Pinchot, who was Roosevelt's campfire friend and chief forester, has told how the two of them relied upon subterfuge to save hydroelectric sites in the West from "the Power Trust." They designated as forest ranger station locations the places along roaring mountain rivers where the utilities planned to stake out claims.

"Power sites were passing into corporate hands in ways both legal and illegal," Pinchot wrote in his autobiography, Breaking New Ground. "Some of these ranger stations we located deliberately on water-power sites, in order to ensure some form of Government control * * *. A certain number of ranger stations were applied for which were needed less for rangers than to give the Government a temporary hold on some power site and prevent the power octopus from sucking it in."

The difference between these tactics and the partnership program of the present administration need not be elaborated upon. Roosevelt and Pinchot stretched the law to keep power sites in the West out of private hands. Mr. Eisenhower and Secretary McKay seek authorization to use Federal funds to develop western water-power sites for the benefit of private utilities.

THE EARTH BELONGS OF RIGHT

Tumbling plumes of water are not the only public property now being subjected to the dubious blessings of partnership. Through its Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the administration has endorsed two proposals that would make big timber operators and a handful of favored livestock owners the partners of the American people in managing our national forests. A timber-exchange bill would require that lumbermen whose acreage was taken by the Government for any purpose could demand choice Government forest land in return.

Lyle F. Watts, formerly Chief of the United States Forest Service, contends that the bill has been so drawn as to apply only to the largest lumber operators. "It's a big man's bill," he adds.

Furthermore, the bill places lumber on a higher legal plane than any other possession of the human race. Ever since George Washington's era, the Government has had an obligation to pay only in money whenever it commandeered property—whether the property consisted of a farm, church, factory, or school. Under the terms of the timber-exchange bill, money would not be sufficient. Lumbermen would be entitled to redemption in kind, a privilege never vouchsafed to the farmer whose home is acquired for a highway or a military cantonment. In addition, the lumbermen might pick national forest lands that furnish recreation for thousands of skiers or campers.

Another bill would increase the equity of livestock operators in the 44 percent of national forests which comprise grazing lands. Under this particular variety of partnership, the authority of rangers to police mountain meadows belonging to the public would be modified. By making a few minor improvements in the range, stockmen might be able to sell grazing permits when they sold their ranches, although these permits are for land supposedly belonging to the Government. A permit to graze only a hundred head of cattle on national forest lands could add at least $25,000 to the value of a ranch. Even today the 61 million acres of western national forest lands used for grazing are monopolized by a mere 3.5 percent of western stockgrowers.

Outdoor organizations have warned that the bill would give 18,000 stockmen a higher claim on the national forests than 30 million vacationers and sightseers. "Under such a program," warns the Denver Post, "our national forests would be put in hock to one particular group of forest users." Yet this bill passed the Senate with administration backing last year by a vote of 44 to 41, and was blocked in the House only by the eleventh-hour rush that occurs when congressional valises and Presidential fishing rods are packed.

"Partnership" is a reassuring word to most Americans. It implies mutuality of interest, a sharing of losses and gains. But the curious partnership suggested by the national administration in the development of the most valuable natural resources still belonging to the American people calls for all the losses to be on one side and all the gains on the other. The appeal of partnership has depended to date upon ignorance of the true facts.

"The earth," said Gifford Pinchot, who founded our Federal forest reserves, "belongs of right to all its people, and not to a minority, insignificant in numbers but tremendous in wealth and power. The public good must come first."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say that the Democratic Senators of the Pacific Northwest intend to continue this year to fight as valiantly as they can to awaken the people of the United States to the need for the building of John Day Dam as a Federal project. I say to the people of the State of Oregon that if it is not to be built as a Federal project, then, remember, it will be because we were stopped by a Republican administration. The time has come to put the Republican members of the State legislature, which adopted the memorial to which I referred early in my remarks, right on the political spot, and to ask them to stand up and be counted: First, are you for the John Day Dam as a Federal project, and are you doing everything you can to get the Republican administration to see the importance to the economic welfare not only of the Pacific Northwest, but of the country as a whole, from the building of John Day Dam as a Federal project?

Second, are you for Hells Canyon Dam as a Federal project? And are you, as Republican members of the legislature, doing everything you should be doing to get a Republican administration to walk out of the agreement which it has entered into with the private utilities, because that agreement is against the public interest? Do you intend to repudiate it and serve notice on the Nation that the Republican administration will have no more of a partnership arrangement whereby the private utility partner proceeds to pick the pockets of the American taxpayer?

Let me make it clear that so far as I am concerned, this fight has just started. I am satisfied that once the American people, in all sections of the country, not only in the Pacific Northwest, but also in Massachusetts, New York, Florida, the Middle West, and the South, come to understand that we who are fighting for the building of John Day and Hells Canyon Dams as Federal projects are fighting to protect the interests of this generation and also future generations in the natural resources of the country, they will react with approval to our position, and they will show their approval in 1956.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 36, joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution be passed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] desired to make a statement on the joint resolution. I note the Senator from Virginia is now present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I simply wish to make clear my objections to the joint resolution. I shall vote against the pending joint resolution for numerous reasons. In my judgment, any one of these reasons would be sufficient to justify winding up all the Federal housing programs.

One of the reasons is the fact that a relatively limited examination of a small minority of accounts in only one of the many housing programs has developed scandals beyond compare in the history of our Government.

Another reason is the fact that the legislation under which these programs are promoted is loose beyond repair. This has resulted in lax administration. And the combination has attracted racketeers who have infiltrated the housing industry to exploit buyers, tenants, and the reputations of honest builders and lending institutions.

The whole housing program is now suffering with a scandal cancer which bears marked similarity to the one that infested the RFC in its notorious latter days.

In short, like the RFC, the housing programs were originated as depression measures; war emergencies caused an otherwise unjustified survival of these programs; and in postwar inflation they have outlived their usefulness and become a lucrative haven for unscrupulous exploiters of public credit and Federal Government largesse.

During the 21 years since 1933, in guaranteed, insured, and direct loans, direct appropriations, appropriations for payments in lieu of taxes, appropriations for the purchase of capital stock, and so on, the Federal Government has used public credit and funds to subsidize domestic housing to a gross total of more than $60 billion.

I use the term "subsidize" advisedly. I know it will be argued that real property stands back of the housing loans, which may be foreclosed. I know also that fortunately a minimum number of foreclosures has been necessary to date, because of war conditions and inflated markets. But I know also that if and when the real estate bubble deflates ever so slightly, there will be a wild clamor for the public, through Federal housing programs, to absorb the losses.

A tremendous amount of this public credit has been used for private gain at the expense of buyers, tenants, and the Government. The notorious 608 program of FHA is one example, if an example is needed.

This public credit has been made available in the form of contingent debt, and the Federal money has been made available by direct drafts on the Treasury outside of budgetary control and appropriation procedure, as well as through direct appropriations, and just about every other conceivable financing device.

The housing subsidies which have been provided in the form of direct appropriations represent a high degree of total financial loss to the Government.

The loss in insured, guaranteed, and direct loans is impossible of estimate for several reasons.

Most of them are long-term loans, of duration ranging up to 40 years.

In the case of insured loans, most of the relatively rare cases of foreclosure to date have been followed by disposing of the property again under other publicly insured loans.

Gross reserves from earnings for all the housing programs, exclusive of Federal Home Loan banks and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, total less than $300 million against approximately $35 billion in direct, guaranteed, and insured loans outstanding.

Most of the authority to lend directly, purchase mortgages, and insure loans contemplates revolving funds so as to provide continuing use of the authority.

A summary, in gross figures, of public credit and Federal funds which have been used since 1933 is set forth in a table which I shall ask to have printed following my remarks.

The figures in the table are gross, and they do not reflect such repayments as have been made. Its purpose is simply to show the tremendous extent to which public credit and Federal funds have been used to subsidize domestic civilian housing.

The $60 billion total is more than all the agricultural subsidies in this period; it is more than all the transportation subsidies, including postal deficits; and is more than all the foreign aid expenditures. It ought to be enough.

I ask to have printed the table to which I have referred, showing the compilation of gross figures to demonstrate the magnitude of the Federal housing program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of public credit and money (gross) which have been made available under Federal housing programs—1933 to June 30, 1954

[In thousands]

Program	Authority to make loans, grants, purchase mortgages, and insure loans		Authority to expend from public-debt receipts			Appropriations		Administrative expenses [1]	Reserves from earnings	Payments to U. S. Treasury (interest, dividends, and capital)
	Total current authority	Cumulated gross total authority used	Total current authority	Gross amount borrowed	Owed to Treasury	Total	Unexpended balance			
Housing and Home Finance Agency:										
Authority to make loans, grants and purchase mortgages:										
Office of the Administrator:										
Housing loans for educational institutions	[2] $300,000	$49,624	$300,000	$51,500	$51,500			$953		[3] $792
Slum clearance and urban redevelopment:										
Loans	[2] 1,000,000	49,806	1,000,000	38,000	38,000			6,891		[3] 983
Capital grants	500,000	19,401				$28,000	$8,599			
Federal National Mortgage Association [4]	3,650,000	2,365,000	[5] 3,650,000	3,716,463	2,233,210			13,848	$35,683	[3] [6] 188,814
Home Loan Bank Board:										
Federal home-loan banks	(7)	(7)	1,000,000						39,362	[6] [8] 150,917
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporations	(8)		750,000					7,287	147,620	[6] [8] 69,226
Home Owners Loan Corporation		3,498,903		3,279,669				272,792		[3] 200,000
Public Housing Administration:										
Administrative expenses						37,941	321	78,278		
Annual contributions	336,000	160,715				169,422	14,640		4,130	[3] 89,912
Loan authorization	[2] 1,500,000	3,882,137	1,500,000	4,445,256	215,000					
Total, authority to make loans, grants, and purchase mortgages	7,286,000	10,025,586	8,200,000	11,530,889	2,537,710	235,362	23,559	380,048	226,795	700,649

[1] Includes expenditures from appropriated and agency funds.
[2] Lending authority is limited by corporate resources, including authority to expend from public-debt receipts shown in col. 3. Generally, lending authority is approximately equal to authority to expend from public-debt receipts.
[3] Interest.
[4] Figures are cumulative since transfer to Housing and Home Finance Agency. Records of business in this program while it was under RFC were not readily available.
[5] Federal National Mortgage Association could borrow from the Treasury any amount sufficient to finance its portfolio of mortgages.
[6] Dividends.
[7] Figures for Federal home-loan banks are excluded because they are now privately owned. The total amount of loans that may be outstanding at any one time is limited to 12 times the amount of their capital which on June 30, 1954, was $420,532,700. Gross loans made through June 30, 1954, was $5,599,302,297.
[8] Capital.
[9] There is no monetary limitation on the lending authority of this Corporation which is authorized to make loans to insured institutions to prevent default.

Summary of public credit and money (gross) which have been made available under Federal housing programs—1933 to June 30, 1954—Con.

[In thousands]

Program	Authority to make loans, grants, purchase mortgages, and insure loans		Authority to expend from public-debt receipts			Appropriations		Administrative expenses	Reserves from earnings	Payments to U. S. Treasury (interest, dividends, and capital)
	Total current authority	Cumulated gross total authority used	Total current authority	Gross amount borrowed	Owed to Treasury	Total	Unexpended balance			
Housing and Home Finance Agency—Continued										
Authority to insure loans:										
Federal Housing Administration:										
Title I:										
Insurance program, sec. 2 (home improvement)	$1,750,000	$7,056,271				38,244		$31,142	$29,387	
Housing insurance program, sec. 8		104,521				8,333		1,826	449	[8] $8,333
Title II:										
Mutual mortgage insurance program, sec. 203, 1- to 4-family		17,452,328				41,994		221,112	64,198	[3] [8] 59,054
Housing insurance program, sec. 207–210, rental		357,123				4,170		13,739	676	[3] [8] 5,557
Housing insurance program, sec. 213, cooperative		365,205								
Title VI:										
War housing insurance program:										
Sec. 603, 1- to 4-family		3,645,260								
Sec. 608, multiple rental	[10] 20,342,863	3,439,771				5,000		70,196	106,498	[3] [8] 6,390
Sec. 609		5,030								
Sec. 610		24,462								
Sec. 611		12,546								
Title VII: Housing investment insurance program, sec. 701						1,000		39	−77	[3] [8] 1,108
Title VIII:										
Military housing, sec. 803		596,228				5,000		4,137	9,196	
Title IX:										
Defense housing:										
Sec. 903		428,753						4,091	739	[3] [8] 5,441
Sec. 908		58,698								
Total, authority to insure loans	22,092,863	34,446,197				103,741		346,282	211,067	85,883
Other:										
Office of the Administrator:										
Lanham public works						[13] 65,807		400		[3] 197
Defense community facilities and services:										
Loans		3,233				20,625	$6,130	250		[3] [8] 43
Grants		11,012								
Advanced planning of non-Federal public works:										
1st advanced planning						65,000		2,083		[8] 19,820
2d advanced planning						28,607	5,018	1,856		[3] [8] 6,529
Alaska housing program		17,753				19,000		403		
Loans for prefabricated housing	[11]	52,444	[11]	$36,170	$12,801	[11]		754		[3] [12] 1,446
Public Housing Administration:										
Public war housing						[13] 1,654,978	8,673	89,007	25,000	[8] 408,363
Subsistence homesteads and Greentowns						[13] 62,454		1,850		[8] 20,499
Veterans' reused housing program						[13] 442,625	171	14,639		[8] 36,472
Homes conversion program						[13] 90,109		10,910		[8] 29,278
Total, other		84,442		36,170	12,801	2,449,206	19,991	122,153	25,000	522,647
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	29,378,863	44,556,225	$8,200,000	11,567,059	2,550,510	2,788,309	43,550	848,483	462,863	1,309,179
Veterans' Administration:										
Guaranteed loans	[14]	12,439,634				613,211		90,772		[3] 39,081
Direct loans	411,093	343,860	366,719	366,719	363,741				8,335	[3] 8,126
Total, Veterans' Administration	411,093	12,783,494	366,179	366,719	363,741	613,211		90,772	8,335	47,207
Department of Agriculture:										
Farmers' Home Administration:										
Farm ownership loans:										
Direct loans	[15] 19,550	418,732	[15] 19,550	444,446	[16]	30,000		[16]		[16]
Insured loans	[17] 100,000	75,319						[16]		
Title V, Housing Act of 1949:										
Farm housing loans	[15] 15,950	97,305	[15] 15,950	97,174	[16]	1,350		[16]		[16]
Farm housing grants		364				1,050		[16]		
Contributions		86								
Total, Department of Agriculture	135,500	591,805	35,500	541,620		32,400				
Grand total	29,925,455	[18] 57,931,524	8,602,219	12,475,398	2,914,252	3,433,921	43,550	939,254	471,198	1,356,386

[3] Interest.
[8] Capital.
[10] May be increased by $500 million upon approval of the President.
[11] Authority to make loans and to borrow from public-debt receipts has expired. This program is now in liquidation. Notes were canceled by the Treasury in the amount of $3,383,339 before June 30, 1954.
[12] Interest paid by Housing and Home Finance Agency on notes since 1950. Does not include interest paid to Treasury while program was under RFC.
[13] Represents allocations or reallocations to Public Housing Administration and its predecessor agencies on the basis of the best information available.
[14] Authority is unlimited, except by maximum to which individual loans may be guaranteed.
[15] This is the amount authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1954. Authority is granted annually.
[16] Not available.
[17] Annual limitation.
[18] This is a cumulative gross total of loans and grants made, mortgages purchased, and loans insured. It does not reflect repayments.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make the RECORD clear that I shall vote in the negative on the passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) was passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000, except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased by not to exceed $500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,500,000,000."

PEACETIME APPLICATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in his closing remarks at the Bangkok Conference this morning, Secretary of State Dulles urged the members attending the Conference to participate with the United States in the peacetime applica-

tions of atomic energy. Such cooperation was made possible by the general authorization for agreements for cooperation incorporated in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

I think it is especially meaningful that, at this conference devoted to the broad problems of southeast Asia, the Secretary placed emphasis on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I can think of no more appropriate time or place for him to have made his statement. The closing sentence of Secretary Dulles' speech this morning was:

> My Government is resolved that we shall do all in our power to assure that these benefits are increased and are widely available to our friends.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to endorse the position taken by Secretary Dulles in Bangkok. I shall do everything within my power to insure that the agreements for cooperation which are negotiated by the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission and which are duly submitted for review to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are handled promptly and receive every encouragement.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the full text of that portion of the statement by Secretary Dulles in Bangkok this morning which deals with peacetime atomic cooperation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY MADE BY SECRETARY OF STATE DURING ECONOMIC DISCUSSION ON FRIDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 25, 1955, AT THE BANGKOK CONFERENCE

In considering measures which will strengthen the economic shelf of our Nation and speed their development, we look to the opportunities of the future as well as the problems of the present. New hope of a future of human well-being is stirred by the possible peaceful uses of atomic energy. The vision of atoms as the servant of mankind rather than its destroyer, which President Eisenhower eloquently presented to the U. N. General Assembly on December 8, 1953, has caught the imagination of men everywhere. The unanimous endorsement by the Ninth General Assembly of steps taken to implement the President's "Atoms for Peace" proposal testified to the continuing validity of this vision.

Four of the nations represented here are engaged in the present negotiations to establish an international atomic energy agency, and we look forward to the participation in due course of all of us.

Discussion in the United Nations and official notice from the United States Embassies in this conference have, no doubt, given information as to the assistance program which the United States has undertaken now in the period while the agency is being established. I wish to take this opportunity to express directly the sincere hope of my Government that each of you will take full advantage of these various programs. I note with gratification that, in the first reactor training course to be conducted at our Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne National Laboratory, 10 students will attend from nations represented here. Two students each from Australia, France, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand, have been selected for this course which commences in March. I hope that you will send other students to the second course next fall.

I am pleased also that applications from Australia and Thailand have been received for the special course in radioisotopes technique to be given in May 1955. The most sympathetic consideration is being given to these applications, and to the request for technical libraries received from Australia and France. We will be happy to receive other requests for libraries and for participation in the various training programs.

My Government believes that these preparatory programs raise the realistic approach to mastering of the basic technique of utilization of the atom. Through mastery and extension of these techniques we work toward the vast potential contribution of the atom to our healthier prosperity. The bold 10-year program of construction of nuclear power stations, recently announced by the United Kingdom is a heartening affirmation that the promise of atomic energy is not a matter of the distant future. The vigorous basic program on which you are now all embarking is evidence that you will be prepared to share in these benefits. The cooperation which my Government is prepared to offer under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is not limited to training. As you are aware, 100 kilograms of fissionable material have been set aside for use in construction of research reactors in other countries. Our Department of State and Atomic Energy Commission are ready to discuss with interested countries the negotiation of agreements for cooperation under which some of this nuclear fuel could be made available. I am confident also that, beyond the programs of assistance which have been formulated and announced, there are other ways in which we can be of help. If you will present your proposals and inquiries regarding possible cooperation and assistance, they will receive careful and sympathetic study.

Already the application of atomic energy in science, medicine, agriculture, and industry is of substantial value. My Government is resolved that we shall do all in our power to assure that these benefits are increased and are widely available to our friends.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, last fall a special subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy visited many of the countries represented at the Bangkok Conference. The report of that subcommittee was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18 by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who was the acting chairman on the trip. The effectiveness and appropriateness of the trip was particularly emphasized in the newspapers of the country on the day the report was released.

The subcommittee found that in most countries which they visited the new climate for international cooperation in atomic energy, which has developed here in the United States, was inadequately understood. This was true in India, which had long been interested in getting United States assistance in obtaining a supply of heavy water for a large research reactor to be built by their Atomic Energy Commission. The subcommittee urged the Indian Government to renew its request for our assistance on this matter, and on the very day the report of the subcommittee was issued the Atomic Energy Commission announced that it had approved the renewed Indian request.

In these days of talk about H-bombs, radiation fallout, and all the accompanying horrors which could result from a new world conflict, it is all too easy to lose sight of the fact that we must get on with constructive steps so that this will be a better world in which to live. Appropriate as it may be to talk about defending free nations against communism, it is not enough. We must do everything in our power to demonstrate to our friends in the free countries around the world that staying free from communism is worth while. Secretary Dulles has made this very clear at Bangkok, for during the past week he has not only given to the Southeast Asian nations assurances that the United States stands ready to assist them in defending themselves against communistic aggression, but—equally important—he has now given them the strong assurances of the United States that this most advanced tool available to mankind will be used in every way possible to raise the standards of living, to improve health, and to make their countries better places for their people.

I think it is also important to call attention to the fact that we are not proposing an atomic Marshall Plan for Southeast Asia or any other part of the world. What Secretary Dulles called to the attention of his colleagues in Bangkok was that we stand ready to assist them in whatever way they may desire. We are not seeking to impose our way of living upon them. This is the very point the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] expressed so effectively on the Senate floor, last Friday. We can be friends and we can have friends, provided we recognize the freedom these people must have to choose the kind of world in which they wish to live. And we must stand ready to assist them in obtaining what they want in the field of atomic energy.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend Secretary Dulles for ending the Bangkok Conference on this note. It was an act of true statesmanship, and deserves the bipartisan support which I am sure it is receiving and will continue to receive in the Congress of the United States.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, pp. 2160–2161.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement concerning the report.

The conferees met for approximately 2 hours on yesterday, to try to work out the differences between the House and the Senate versions of this proposed legislation. In the effort to agree upon a report which could be submitted to the two Houses the point of give or take was reached. The report has already been agreed to by the House of Representatives, and is now before the Senate.

In regard to the salaries of the members of the judiciary—the judges—there was no substantial difference between the House and the Senate figures. I do not think there is any particular argument on that score.

The House version of the bill provided for an effective date, insofar as the judiciary is concerned, of January 1, 1955—that is to say, retroactive to that date. As for the congressional salaries, the House version provided for a date retroactive to the beginning of this term, namely, to January 5, 1955. On that point the conferees on the part of the Senate insisted upon the Senate version; and the House receded and agreed to substantially the position taken by the Senate, namely, that the new rate would become effective on the first day of the first month after the bill became a law. The language agreed upon was that it would become effective on the 1st of March, which is substantially in accordance with the position taken by the Senate.

The House version contained a section 4, which authorized an increase in the salaries of members of the professional staff of committees. It also authorized an increase in the salaries of clerical employees of the various legislative committees, and proposed amending the law by raising the ceiling on such salaries to $14,800, instead of the present ceiling of $11,646. In the conference, the House conferees insisted very strongly upon that provision with reference to legislative employees. Such a provision was not contained in the Senate version of the bill.

In the statement by the managers on the part of the House, the following appears:

COMPENSATION OF LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

The House version of the bill contained a provision to raise the maximum basic compensation of professional and clerical staff members of the standing committees to $10,000 and further provided that the ceiling of $11,646 as it related to legislative employees be adjusted so that the ceiling existing under the classified pay act should be substituted therefor. The House receded from its insistence on this provision, which was not contained in the Senate version of the bill, but it was the opinion of the conferees on the part of both Houses that some adjustment should be made relating to pay increases to legislative personnel. It was the further sense of the conferees that the respective committees of each House explore the salaries of all legislative personnel for the purpose of an upward adjustment in relation to their pay as it is believed that this matter is essentially one which should be the subject of a pay act applying to all legislative personnel.

Mr. President, let me point out that this matter is before another committee, which is considering it. Furthermore, there was not very much testimony about it; in fact, the Senate had absolutely none on it. So our position was that this item should not be approved and agreed to by the Senate. After a lengthy argument the House conferees receded and the Senate position was sustained.

The House bill also contained a provision for increasing the amount which United States district attorneys and their assistants might be paid. Under present language in appropriation bills the ceiling is $15,000. The minimum for a United States district attorney is $12,000. The ceiling for assistant United States district attorneys is $12,000, and the minimum is $6,000.

There was substantial testimony before the Judiciary Committee on the question of district attorneys. Mr. Brownell testified, as did Mr. Rogers, the Deputy Attorney General, who appeared on behalf of Mr. Brownell. There was also a statement by Mr. Segal, Chairman of the Joint Commission, in which he said that while the Commission had no authority to report officially on the question of salaries for United States district attorneys, the members of the Commission felt that they should be given an increase. It was testified that there was a great deal of difficulty in obtaining and keeping competent men as United States attorneys, particularly in the larger cities. It was said that the importance and volume of Federal legislation had greatly increased, requiring excellent lawyers to handle the important cases, in which at times there are involved corporations which have a great many highly paid lawyers. It was testified that in order to obtain the services of the kind of attorneys necessary properly to represent the best interests of our Government in connection with Federal legislation, the salaries of such attorneys should be increased.

The Senate Judiciary Committee discussed this subject at some length. Our opinion at the time the bill was passed was that, in the interest of proper administration of justice, district attorneys and their assistants should be given an increase; but inasmuch as that subject was not covered in the Segal Commission report, we did not include it in the bill.

The press of the Nation has generally been in favor of increasing the compensation of United States district attorneys. I have before me an editorial from Washington Star of this afternoon, in which the conclusions reached by the conferees are highly commended. The editorial states that it is believed that, in the give and take of the conference, a good job had been done. Particular pleasure is expressed over the fact that something had been done with respect to United States district attorneys.

On this item the Senate conferees receded and accepted the House provision. Under the new language the salary range for district attorneys will be $12,000 to $20,000. That does not mean that they will be paid $20,000, but the Attorney General is given discretion to decide as to the worth of a man, what salary is required to keep him, and the importance of the work in a particular judicial district. The Attorney General will be enabled to fix salaries for United States district attorneys between the two figures named.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana in a moment.

Under the present rule of the Attorney General district attorneys may not engage in outside law practice, as they formerly did. The conferees considered writing into law the prohibition which now exists by virtue of an order of the executive department. However, feeling that such a provision would be subject to a point of order, the conferees omitted it. It is our feeling that the order referred to should be continued. The conferees expressed themselves as being willing to support a bill to write into permanent law the prohibition against engaging in other law practice, which prohibition is currently imposed upon United States district attorneys.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the present range of salaries for Federal district attorneys?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The present range of salaries is from $12,000 to $15,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the conferees propose to increase the maximum by $5,000?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The conferees proposed to increase the maximum so as to provide for a range from $12,000 to $20,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. What caused the Senate conferees to change their minds? As I remember, when the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] submitted an amendment to the Senate bill to include district attorneys, the Senator from Tennessee took the position that inasmuch as we were dealing with salaries of the judiciary and of Members of Congress, it was not felt that the salaries of district attorneys should be covered by the bill, but should be excluded from it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What caused the conferees to change their minds?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The position I took in the debate was the position of the Senate conferees in the conference. I will say frankly that that is the way I feel now, and I think all the other Senate conferees feel that this is a subject which should be handled in separate legislation. However, the House conferees receded on the matter of legislative increases, and on raising the ceiling for certain legislative employees. This was a conference of give and take.

We felt that authorization of an increase in the salaries of district attorneys had a close connection with problems affecting the judiciary, in the administration of justice. We felt that the salaries of district attorneys were closely related to judicial salaries. We had to recede in order to bring a bill out of conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the congressional salary level fixed in the House version was $22,500, plus an expense account. The Senator stated that the conference was a matter of give and take, and that in order to reach an agreement, the Senate conferees receded with respect to the provision for district attorneys, but with respect to the salaries of Members of Congress, the House conferees receded.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. I stated that with respect to legislative employees, the House conferees receded. I refer to section 4 of the House version of the bill. The Senator will recall that the bill proposed to increase the salaries of professional staff members, and also of clerical employees of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did not that provision relate only to the staffs of committees, that is the heads of committee staffs?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would have increased the salaries, not only of the heads of committee staffs, but of all professional staff members.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the House version of the bill pertained to committee staffs only, and not to the staffs of the Members of Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That may be correct, although I believe that employees in a Senator's office whose salaries are held down by virtue of the classification ceiling of $11,646 would be benefited by raising the ceiling.

Mr. ELLENDER. With respect to the salaries of Senators and Members of the House, they were the same in both bills, except that in the House version there was a $2,500 expense account.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The conferees agreed to split that in half, did they not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; that was not the agreement. Let me say that in the conference we spent most of our time arguing in favor of the Senate position relating to salaries of Members of Congress. The House conferees were adamant in insisting that there should be an increase of $2,500 over that provided by the Senate bill. It seemed that we would not be able to reach any agreement. The salary increase under the House version of the bill would have been retroactive to the beginning of the term of Congress; that is, January 5.

Finally, in the give and take of the conference, the House conferees agreed with us as to the effective date. They gave up the idea of the $2,500 increase. However, there was a great deal of discussion in the conference meeting, as there has been a great deal of discussion in the Senate, as to expenses which Members of Congress must meet, over and above the allowance which is made for legitimate and necesary office expenses. I refer to such items as overage in stamps, long-distance telephone calls, telegraph expense; subscriptions to newspapers to which Members of Congress must subscribe, although perhaps not necessary; subscriptions to the Congressional Quarterly and other congressional aids; duplicating machinery which is used in informing constituents or issuing newsletters; and perhaps amounts paid out of the pockets of Members for research or for occasional employees. In the compromise which was reached the House conferees agreed to accept the Senate version in regard to the effective date, and in lieu of the $2,500, there was provided $1,250 a year, though not by way of salary.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is an additional cost, however, is it not, which is equal to 50 percent of $2,500, the amount provided in the House bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I read from the conference report at the bottom of page 2:

(b) For the purpose of assisting in defraying expenses incurred in the operation of their respective offices, each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be entitled to reimbursement for such expenses for each fiscal year at the rate of $1,250 per annum, which shall accrue quarterly and be paid in quarterly installments upon itemized vouchers certified by such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

The provision further states that this amount of money shall not be considered as salary for purposes of retirement.

In answer to the Senator's question, I do not believe it would amount to an additional $1,250, because many Senators and Representatives—and I believe this is particularly true with reference to Representatives, because they do not represent an entire State—would not have official and legitimate expenses growing out of the conduct of their offices over and above what they are already allowed.

I submit to the Senator from Louisiana it seems to me there is justification for some allowance for this kind of expense. Without it, it is impossible for Senators to operate their offices without paying for them out of their own pockets. Only yesterday, for example, my secretary brought me approximately 20 checks to sign for subscriptions to newspapers over the State. I believe all of us subscribe to newspapers, and all of us take many other aids. As private citizens, we would subscribe to the hometown papers, and perhaps one or two other newspapers. I believe every Member subscribes to 50 or 60 newspapers. This extra allowance can be used only for expenses for which itemized statements are submitted showing that the expenses have been incurred in connection with the necessary operation of the office of a Senator or Representative.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Tennessee subscribes to as many as 50 or 60 newspapers from his State?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe I take about 100.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know of any other Senators who do that?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know what other Senators do. I do know what I am doing.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been in the Senate for 18 years, and I have not taken so much as one newspaper subscription, as I recall. We have newspapers available to us in the reading room commonly known as the Marble Room. I use those newspapers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I take quite a number of county newspapers and weekly newspapers, which are not available to us in the Senate. Of course, the subscription cost in each case is only two or three dollars a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot agree that subscriptions to newspapers would be a legitimate expense to operate one's office. Suppose a Senator desired to use any part of the $1,250 for the purpose of increasing the salary of a clerk in his office. Could he do it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should not think so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, the amount is to be used merely to pay actual expenses along the line the Senator has indicated. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is, for newspapers, for example, if he desires to subscribe to them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe that if a Senator engages a person to do some special work for him or to do some research, or if he employs an extra secretary for a day or two, he would be justified in paying such a person out of the allowance.

Mr. ELLENDER. But not a regularly employed clerk; is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. A regularly employed clerk would have to be compensated out of other appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us what the difference is in cost as between the bill passed by the Senate and the one now before the Senate for consideration in the form of the conference report?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The maximum amount which would be added to the Senate bill, if every Representative and every Senator should have maximum expenses which amount to $1,250 in each case—which I do not believe would be true—would be about $700,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means that if each Senator used the full amount provided in the bill now under consideration it will cost about $700,000 more a year than the bill as passed by the Senate a few days ago?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be $1,250 times 531.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the number of trips home permitted the Members of Congress? As I recall, the House provided for one trip, and the Senate provided for five trips.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent did the House conferees object to the five trips? Did the Senator from Tennessee have much trouble in getting the House conferees to adopt the Senate version of the bill in that respect?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the debate on the floor I believe even the opponents

of the bill agreed that the actual expense of returning to one's State or district a limited number of times, if one had to take such trips, should be compensated for. There was no criticism of that provision from any source, even from Senators who had opposed salary increases.

Mr. ELLENDER. In respect to those extra trips, provided for in the bill, I understand they must be clearly for official business. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. All the legislative background shows that the payments are to be made on a mileage basis, and it is contemplated that the Committee on Rules of each House will adopt rules which will follow the official allowance with respect to mileage expenses in force for other Government departments. I believe the amount at the present time is 6 cents a mile.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee. It is my hope that the conference report will be rejected. I object to these fringe benefits. In fact I am against the bill. One of the arguments advanced for more pay is the tremendous expenses a Senator is put to and yet we provide, somehow, for most of these extra expenses. As I stated in debate I would have been willing to vote for a reasonable increase in salary in keeping with the increased cost of living. Mr. President, I wish to again thank my friend from Tennessee for answering my questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The $1,250 amount disturbs me a little. I am not quite reconciled to it. Is it not correct to say that the expenses for which that amount is designed are deductible on the income tax return?

Mr. KEFAUVER. They are at the present time; that is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the present time?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With the rather substantial salary increase carried by this bill, which would put most, if not all, Members of Congress in a higher income tax bracket, the payment of the expense charges would not be a very great burden.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator that I, too, am not happy about the $1,250 item.

We did not want it. We tried to get the House conferees to strike it out. I do not know what else we could do. We had to reach an adjustment between the bill the House passed and the bill the Senate passed. I think it is a fair compromise. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so well stated, there are aids in connection with the necessary things which Senators and Representatives must do, but we all know the expenses exceed the allowance we receive. I have had to pay something additional for telephone calls and telegrams. Undoubtedly the Senator from Arkansas has had to do likewise, for example, in the matter of addressograph or duplicating machines. I am not happy about it, but it is a compromise.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's position as a conferee. I am glad to hear him say he is not happy about it. Not having been a conferee, I am in position to object to it, and I think I shall have to vote against the conference report. I think it is not justified on the facts.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am terribly disappointed in the conference report which has been submitted to the Senate. In the Reorganization Act, when the congressional salaries were raised from $10,000 to $15,000, we at that time tried to make it a clear, clean-cut matter of pay and not a series of special allowances and special things attached as extra emoluments of office. I was glad when we made the $2,500 expense allowance taxable as salary.

The Senate voted to increase congressional salaries to $22,500, a 50-percent increase over what we had been receiving. Then we sent the bill to conference. I am deeply disappointed to find now another "gimmick" tied to it.

I am becoming tired of hearing talk about getting free haircuts. I am glad to pay for my own haircuts. With the tip included, the cost is the same as it is outside. If our job is of value in service rendered to the country I think we are entitled to some increase in salary. I feel the motion of the Senator from Louisiana for a lesser amount should have been agreed to. But, certainly, we should not go over $22,500. We are in the undesirable position of being the only ones under the law who can fix our salaries. It works both ways. It works to retard, to delay, and to keep the Members of the Congress usually behind the rising costs of living and inflation. But it also places upon us the responsibility of seeing to it that what we vote for ourselves can be fully justified.

As I read this device, if I can charge the cost of my local newspapers, my Christmas cards, or flowers sent to bereaved persons in my State, and other expenses which are so broadly and carelessly defined in the language, the public will consider it to be an additional $1,250. Of course, Members may be supposed to account for it, but would the Rules Committee of the Senate or the Accounts Committee of the House measure and pass those items? I do not see it provided for in the language of the bill. The salary voted by the Senate only day before yesterday includes money to be spent for expenses in an amount far exceeding the $1,250 provided as an expense allowance in the bill. Much of the salaries accruing to the office of Senator and Representative go for things that would be normal expenses in an attorney's office or in private business. I think this extra amount is uncalled for in this bill. Congress has it in its power to put into its operational expenses whatever deficiency might need to be met.

In the matter of stamps, we receive an adequate allowance for airmail stamps. I understand the franking privilege is still available to the Members of the House and Senate. If we want to send Christmas cards by the thousand, or if we wish to put stamps on our news letters or other things, we have no right to charge campaign expenditures to the Treasury.

I rather think we are adequately recompensed in our allowances. I had the privilege of checking my telegram account and found I had used less than half of the amount allowed over the years, and slightly over half of the telephone expense allowed. I was surprised in checking my stationery account to find that there was a $1,000 balance remaining. Possibly I am a very poor Senator and possibly I do not keep in sufficiently close contact with my constituents, but I feel that in trying to operate Government business there are economies that should not call for a wastage of telephone calls or telegrams or an overemphasis on supplies and stationery.

I feel that because we are in a position which no one wishes to occupy, of being forced under the law to fix our own salaries, we must always lean over backward to be sure that what we do is within the range of propriety.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am hopeful that the Members of the Senate will send the report back to the conference with the demand that the $1,250 additional expense be stricken from the bill, and that we may have a straightforward, fully taxable $22,500 salary which, to my way of thinking, is perfectly adequate, if not more than adequate to cover our salaries and the necessary business expenses which always have been considered part and parcel of the salary paid to us as Members of the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to make a brief comment, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. President, I appreciate fully the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. We made pretty much the same argument for a long time in the conference. Perhaps it is unfortunate that there were not present other Senators who might have made a more forceful argument. But in a conference report we cannot have our way about everything. There were approximately 6 or 7 points of disagreement. We got our way on almost everything. The report represents the best compromise we knew how to make. We felt that if we got salaries out of adjustment, we would have to change many other parts of the bill. So far as the question of additional expenses is concerned, if a Senator or a Representative does not have them, he will not charge them. We did the best we could in the conference. I hope we can have an early consideration one way or the other. If the Senate does not like the report, it can send it back to conference.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me make it clear— —

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, may I yield the floor?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Senator yield time to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not have control of the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee has yielded the floor. The junior Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to make it clear to the Senate that this proposal is not on all fours with the way the expense allowance was originally provided. I share no disappointment such as that voiced by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma. Years ago I was on the joint committee with him when the Legislative Reorganization Act was drafted.

The $2,500 expense allowance was the result of a floor amendment in the House of Representatives. My friend from Oklahoma knows that quite well. He is familiar with the history of that allowance. The amount of the expense allowance was fixed at $2,500, to be accredited on a monthly basis to every Member. It appears on the Senator's fiscal sheet in the disbursing office every month. That is the way it always has appeared. It required no voucher; it required no itemization whatsoever; it was an automatic accretion. I have no doubt that actually it was an addition to the salary check, because the Internal Revenue Service at that time simply required that a Member scrawl on his income-tax blank a statement to the effect that the $2,500 was fully expended, and no other questions were asked.

The provision was amended by a resolution or an amendment, which was offered on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Delaware, by inserting the words "No accounting shall be made except for income-tax purposes."

Let us consider what the new language does. I was not too happy about it, but I think we have it nailed down. I trust that no senatorial arrogance will ever come into my mind which will make me feel that I am superior to any one of the 435 Members of Congress at the other end of the Capitol.

When all is said and done, proposed legislation before conferences and in conference reports is a matter of compromise. The House receded on the retroactive feature. The House receded on the disparities in judicial salaries. The House receded on quite a number of items. Finally, this item became the bone of contention, and it was worked out.

First, we said that the $1,250, which is only half the amount allowed in the House bill, should be for the operation of the respective Members' offices. If any Member has a flexible viewpoint and wishes to buy wedding flowers, funeral wreaths, or Christmas cards, that will be for the individual Member to determine. But the language is clear that the amount provided is for the operation of the respective offices of the Members. I do not intend to go around monitoring any senatorial conscience as to whether a Senator is buying Santa Claus cards, when the language of the bill is "the operation of their respective offices."

If I were a member of the staff of the disbursing office, and an item for Christmas cards came in, I would disallow it. I think I would be in a position to do so.

So the committee of conference required, first, that the funds be limited to the operation of a Member's office.

Next we provided the language: "shall be entitled to reimbursement."

There is nothing automatic about this. It is not accredited to any Senator. At the end of a quarter, after he has spent the money for an office operation, he must submit an itemized voucher before he can be repaid. If he does not submit a voucher, he will receive no money.

Under present law, the amount is automatically placed upon a Member's pay sheet. But under the proposed language there is nothing automatic about it. If a Member does not spend the money, he cannot be repaid a dollar.

In the report we tried to recite that money spent for robot paper, robot machines, telephone calls, and telegraph services would be proper office expenses.

My friend from Oklahoma says that he has money left over. I make long-distance telephone calls very frequently. I have an idea that in most months it costs me $75 out of my own salary, because when emergency situations, hurry-up situations arise, I do not send letters; I call up the persons in the State of Illinois. I think they like that kind of service, and I like to give it to them. So I consider that to be a legitimate office expense.

If I want to go to the trouble to file a voucher at the end of a 3-months' period and say that I have spent so much for long-distance calls, and I have paid for them, I think I am entitled to reimbursement of the money I have spent. If I have paid the money out of my own pocket, I do not think I should have to pay an income tax on it after I have expended it in the service of the people.

The language reads: "It shall accrue quarterly." I think we have nailed down the language pretty well. I do not care particularly what appears in the press about it. This is entirely defensible language. We have put it in better shape than it was before.

A question arose about clerk hire. If a Member hires extra personnel in his office for a couple of weeks to attend to an avalanche of mail, that is a legitimate office expense, and a ceiling of $1,250 a year is provided for it. This is a ceiling, and there is nothing automatic about having the amount repaid. If a Member does not wish to go to the trouble of filing a voucher with the Disbursing Office, he will not get back any of the $1,250. His pay sheet at the end of the month, showing how much has been allocated for salary and how much has been deducted for income tax withholding purposes, will not disclose an amount for office expense. Either a Member must spend the money and then submit a voucher for reimbursement, or else he will receive none of the money.

I have regard for the 435 Members of the other body. This is one item on which they were quite adamant. There was a little feeling of dissidence, which was a carryover from last year. When we went to conference on the pay bill, on the provision involving retirement, the Members of the House wished to put themselves in the same position as that occupied by every employee of the United States Government on the civil service rolls. Every employee, whether he is in grade 1 or grade 18, is entitled to compute his earnings for the five highest years for purposes of his retirement. An effort was made in conference to include such a provision. There were 11 conferees from the House at that time. It was the Senate conferees who put their foot down on the proposal. Nothing was done, but it should have been done. The House has been smarting a little about it. They have been very much interested in it.

I remind Senators that there was not a single dissenting vote at 15 minutes after 12 today when the House agreed to the conference report. I suggest, therefore, in view of the fact that this is defensible language, and since Senators cannot get the money unless they spend it, and it must be for the legitimate operation of their offices, that they should be pretty careful about recommitting the report to conference and making it necessary to go back to the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Illinois serves on the Committee on Appropriations. He certainly knows that in connection with appropriation bills the practice is that both Houses, or either House separately and individually, can write whatever limit it wishes to write into an item for office expenses and an allowance for the necessary needs of Members to operate their offices.

If the Senate in its wisdom should choose not to participate in the $1,250 allowance, the Members of the House would not be proscribed from taking action on an appropriation bill for the legislative branch, and fixing whatever additional allowance it might wish to provide for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, photoengravings, broadcast-scripts, airmail stamps, and all the other perquisites, including all the weekly and daily newspapers published in their respective districts, if they wished to do so. That is within their power.

But the point I desire to make is that this is a pay bill. There is nothing in it about the amount of stationery which Federal judges may have. There is nothing in the bill about the operational expenses of the offices of other Federal officials. This is a pay bill. I feel certain, considering the diligence and care which the distinguished Senator from Illinois exercised in connection with the pay features of the Legislative Reorganization Act, that he is fully conscious of the fact that the best light in which Congress can stand is to keep the bill as a pay bill, and to announce to the whole country and the whole world exactly what we are receiving.

If reimbursement for other items is considered to be necessary, let it be handled in a bill in which it properly belongs, but not in a pay bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I make two answers to the Senator from Oklahoma. The easiest answer I can make to him is that he would not have to file a single voucher, and could leave the $1,250 in the Treasury. That is infinitely easier than going before a subcommittee of either of the appropriation committees. This is a matter for every Senator to determine. If the Senator wants to be flexible about it, it is all right with me. I know what I think office expense means, and when I file a voucher for office expense, it will be office expense for an activity in the public interest.

The other answer I make to the Senator is that I do not know whether he has had the experience of going before a subcommittee of the Committees on Appropriations, either in the House or in the Senate. I served on the Appropriations Committee in the House for 12 years. I know what a tough nut it was to crack to get a dollar out of the Appropriations Committee, and I know how the committee constantly sat down upon every effort of Members to get the wherewithal to operate properly their public offices. Then, of course, there is the usual timidity that always is evidenced.

I say this not disparagingly, but, Mr. President, our pleas are frequently disregarded. I went before the subcommittee on legislative appropriations on a number of occasions. I protested the fact that rugs in a great many Senatorial offices were not fit to be there, because those offices are public offices, and I was heartily ashamed of the kind of rug I got when I moved into suite 204. I continued my efforts until 50 rugs were purchased, and, thank goodness, I received one of them for my office. I want to be proud of my office when my constituents visit it, as a great many of them do.

I appeared before the Appropriations Committee requesting additional personnel. It was like pulling teeth to get clerical help—and I happened to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator who was chairman of the committee at that time does not happen to be present on the floor at the moment, but I fairly begged for a couple of clerks. I had to compromise. I wanted three. I was told, "We will give you one."

Why are we so niggardly about our own affairs, I should like to know? Do we not want to do a good job, Mr. President? Can my colleagues not explain their need to their constituents? If I thought for one moment that enough of my constituents had some doubt about my integrity in public office and the expenditure of this fund, I would quit the Senate. It is just that simple.

When are we going to get over our timidity? When are we going to vote for ourselves the instrumentalities which are necessary in order that we may serve the public? The selfishness lies on the side of not asking for the tools and instruments with which to do the job. Running a senatorial office has become almost an industry. I do not know how the volume of the mail and the telephone calls of the Senator from Oklahoma run, but I am up to my ears in such communications all the time, and we must have the equipment with which to carry on the functions of our offices.

I think the members of the conference committee have done a good job. Provision has been made whereby payments for expenses will no longer be automatic. A Senator will receive reimbursement if he asks for it and is willing to sign his name to a voucher and certify that he has expended the amount in the operation of his office. We have written that provision into the bill. What more shall we do?

I hope the Senate will not reject the conference report. I think it would be an act of timidity on the part of the Senate. I would rather stand up for it than make that kind of confession.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall oppose the conference report. I should like to review briefly the history of the tax-exempt features. Several years ago Congress extended to the President of the United States an increase in his salary making it $150,000, with $100,000 of that salary taxable and $50,000 tax-exempt. At the same time $10,000 of the salary of the Vice President was made tax-exempt and nonaccountable, $2,500 of the salaries of Members of Congress was likewise put in the tax-exempt category. I opposed these tax-exempt features.

Later, I was the author of an amendment, which was overwhelmingly adopted by the Senate and the House, repealing all three of those tax-exempt features. Now if we accept this provision we will be in the position of having left repealed the tax exemption for the President and for the Vice President, but of partially restoring the tax-exempt features for ourselves, and ourselves alone.

This is not a question of whether or not a Senator has enough money to operate his office. I recognize that some of the Senators from the larger States are handicapped and will help correct that condition at the appropriate time.

This is simply a question of whether we shall or shall not give to Members of Congress a special tax exemption that is not extended to other taxpayers.

I have said many times on the floor that I would support the necessary authorization to reimburse Senators from larger States for their legitimate office expenses. We who come from smaller States are not confronted with that same problem. However, the proper way to provide for the necessary funds to operate the offices of Senators from the larger States is by making direct appropriations, as the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out. Let it be kept in the class of expenses alone and not by payments to the Members of Congress as salary.

I think the bill should be strictly a salary bill. I voted against it at the beginning, but that is beside the point, Mr. President. Congress passed the bill, but now the conference report is worse than the bill.

If the conference report is rejected, as I think it should be, I shall immediately make a motion that a new conference committee be appointed with instructions to insist upon the elimination from the conference report of the language in subsection (b) of section 4 amending section 601 of the Reorganization Act of 1946. The rest of the conference report would not be affected by the motion.

I think it is very important that we impress upon the American people the fact that Members of Congress are enjoying no more privileges in the payment of taxes than anyone else. It is very important for their morale that every public official be required to pay taxes in the same manner as every other citizen is required to. There is no justification for having special tax exemption provided for Members of Congress, and I hope the conference report is defeated and new instructions given to the conferees.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware if a Senator does not actually expend any money for office expenses and does not file a voucher for reimbursement, how much tax exempt income will the Senator get under the $1,250 provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A Senator would not get any, but under the existing law a Senator is allowed up to $3,000 in expenses. Under the present law there is one expense account. Why should Members of Congress now have two expense accounts?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The $3,000 the Senator talks about is nothing in the world but a limitation on Senators and Representatives.

The limitation does not apply to anybody else in the United States. A business man who incurs expenditures during the course of earning his income, including traveling expenses away from home, is entitled to deduct them as ordinary expenses in computing his income tax. The provision mentioned by the Senator from Delaware merely puts Members of Congress on the same plane as other citizens in the United States, except that it puts on Members of Congress a limitation of $3,000, to which other citizens are not subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is partially correct. There is a limitation spelled out for Members of Congress which is not spelled out for all other taxpayers. On the other hand, that provision for an exemption up to $3,000 is authority for the Internal Revenue Bureau to allow Members of Congress allowances up to $3,000, whereas all other taxpayers have no such ceiling. They can go up to X amount as agreed upon by the Treasury Department. Many times taxpayers are disallowed claims way below $3,000. It works both ways. The provision has advantages and disadvantages.

However, that still has nothing to do with the question now before us. The

question before us here today is, Shall we or shall we not give ourselves another $1,250 top exemption?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Florida desire me to yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to have the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I conclude by saying that I hope the conference report is defeated because it seeks to reestablish for Members of Congress a special privilege which we have taken away from the President and the Vice President. I think we should stand on our action as a matter of principle.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that expenses beyond those which would be covered within the extra $1,250 will be paid out of the $22,500 which the Senate and the House have provided under the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They will be paid either out of the $22,500 or out of other expense accounts which we are allowed. We are allowed expenses for telegraph, telephone, stationery, and so forth. Those items can be paid for either out of the various expense accounts, our salaries, or out of the $3,000 itemized expense account. This $1,250 account is merely a nontaxable addition to our salary.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me also say that the $1,250 provided by this measure will not be subject to examination by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, for a determination in any way, shape, or form, as to whether it is taxable or nontaxable. It is declared nontaxable, as a necessary office expense, by the language of this proviso. So it is, in effect, a nontaxable amount which is being allowed in this measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is my understanding.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me further point out that the only right of supervision or the only right to audit or check or define what this particular category of general office expenses might be, would accrue either to the individual Senator or Representative, according to his conscience; or, perhaps, if we were to pass supplemental legislation, such expense items could finally be audited by the Senate Disbursing Office or the House Disbursing Office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. Furthermore, the first time the Disbursing Officer made an adverse ruling which we did not like, we could put another disbursing officer in his place.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, if this allowance is to be made, it should be made subject to approval by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, just as in the case of any other item of this sort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

As I have already said, the Members of Congress from the larger States have a bona fide claim for more office allowance, and I would support legislation to take care of their situation. For instance, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who represents the large State of Pennsylvania, which adjoins my State, is allowed approximately 30 or 40 percent more for office expenses than I am allowed; but in the one city of Philadelphia alone there are many times the total number of people in Delaware. However, the proposal before us here today does not correct this inequity.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. How could such expenditures be taken care of under the proposed arrangement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only to the extent that a Member of Congress could charge against the $1,250 some of his office expenses which otherwise he would not be able to handle in some such manner. Technically, it might be said that none of the $1,250 would accrue to a Member of Congress; but that amount could be used to reduce his expenses, which otherwise he would have to pay out of his salary of $22,500.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. So far as I personally am concerned, I can take care of the expenses of my office without having the proposed additional allowance, and probably I would never certify—except in the case of the development of a most unusual situation—that such unusual expenses had been required, so that I would request such a reimbursement.

But after hearing the stories told by various Senators and Representatives who are in a far different category, I reached the conclusion that this allowance is justified. Many Representatives and Senators today have to pay out of their own pockets a considerable portion of the expenses of their offices. It was largely because of that situation that this fund was allowed.

In the conference, after listening to the pleas and explanations of the conferees on the part of the House, we arrived at this report, and we can justify it. There can be no legitimate criticism of Members of Congress who have to spend, as legitimate expenses of their offices, this amount of money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I think the Senator from Utah will agree with me that this $1,250 allowance will not begin to take care of the differential which should be recognized as between the expenses of a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, California, New York, or any other large State and the expenses of a Member of Congress representing one of the smaller States, such as those the Senator from Utah and I represent. The $1,250 will not answer that problem. Certainly it does not answer the problems of the Members of Congress who represent the larger States.

My personal opinion is that the conference report should be rejected, and we should keep our salaries on the basis of being 100 percent taxable so that all Members of Congress would be under the same provisions which apply to all other taxpayers, and the same as the ones which the Congress has imposed upon the President and the Vice President. Only a short time ago, Congress voted to end such an arrangement, insofar as it would apply to the President and Vice President of the United States. We deprived them of that tax exemption, and apparently we did so on the basis that such an arrangement was not justified. Certainly we cannot properly do otherwise for ourselves.

Mr. WATKINS. But we put a stop to allowing the President and Vice President to be in a position of not having to certify to such expenses, by way of vouchers. In our case there would have to be vouchers. I assume that no Member of Congress would attempt to juggle the figures in regard to his legitimate office expenses, in order to obtain an allowance to which he was not entitled.

Of course the conferees on the part of the House insisted that $2,500 is not sufficient to take care of the situation. In the report we agreed to a compromise of $1,250.

Under the circumstances, I think the conferees were justified in doing what they did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the problem with which the conference committee was confronted, but at the same time we in the Senate have to vote either to accept the report or to reject it. As I have previously said, I think it is well for the Members of Congress to keep their salaries 100 percent accountable and taxable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree completely with the statement which has just been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to the effect that he does not believe the Senate should approve the conference report. I take the same position. I think the Senate should disapprove the report, and should do so on the sole ground the Senator from Delaware has mentioned.

I do not believe it would be a long or a difficult task for the conferees to bring in a new report, if they were given instructions to bring in a report eliminating this particular provision with respect to the expense account of $1,250.

I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the Senator from Delaware, to the effect that the Senate has been on much stronger ground since the law was changed several years ago, when we changed the earlier provisions of section 601 (b) of the statute, under which the whole amount of $2,500 a year was then not subject to any accounting, and not subject to the payment of income taxes, so that, in effect, we added the $2,500 to the $12,500 salary we received, and made the additional amount just as subject to income tax as was the $12,500.

If we begin to attach to this salary bill provisions which will raise in the public mind questions about the propriety of what we are doing for ourselves, I think we shall be making a very great mistake.

I call attention to the fact that, whether we want it to be so or not, we are in the very difficult position of having to legislate in our own behalf. In that respect, our situation is not an easy one; but the Congress is the only place, under our law, where the very acute problem of inadequate salaries for Members of Congress can be dealt with. However, when we are doing for our-

selves what we think is necessary and right and defensible, I do not want to have us include in this measure something which will point the finger of suspicion at every Member of Congress and will renew the wholly unsatisfactory position or situation which existed prior to the time when we made the amendment of some years ago.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the conferees have done many things which are good, in the conference report; and I wish to say that I think the provision regarding section 601 (b), which they suggest in the report, is an improvement over what was in the House version of the bill, because the House version was silent as to section 601 (b), and would have left that provision exactly as it was before.

But, Mr. President, even though the conferees have made progress in this particular, as well as in other matters, I think that in this one matter the conference report is so far inadequate and so far from doing what we wish to do in this matter, that the report should be rejected, and that the conferees should be directed to hold a further conference.

In order that the RECORD may clearly show that the conferees have accomplished something—and then I shall return to the argument in criticism of the one thing which I believe the conferees have not done properly—I wish the RECORD to show at this point the earlier provisions which have been written into law in regard to this particular matter of expense accounting.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, section 601 (b) of the original Legislative Reorganization Act; and in that connection I point out that the critical words in it, relative to the $2,500 allowance, which was made by that original provision, are these: for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 601.

* * * * *

(b) Effective on the day on which the 80th Congress convenes there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties (for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made), such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

In other words, that was a tax-free allowance which got every Member of Congress in trouble, so long as it was on the books, in trying to explain why it was there, and why, in legislating for ourselves, we had placed a provision in the law which differentiated between Members of Congress and other citizens of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for clarification?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Reorganization Act provided for a straight $15,000 salary, with no tax deductibility other than the normally deductible items as shown by an itemization. The Senate passed the bill with a figure of $15,000. It went to the House. The bill contained the figure of $15,000. However, a floor amendment was inserted, over the objection of those of us who helped to pass the Reorganization Act, and for many years embarrassment resulted to Members of Congress. That provision was not in the original Reorganization Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully understand that the bill reported by the joint committee was not in the form which I have placed in the RECORD. However, when I refer to the original Reorganization Act, I refer to the act as passed, as it became law, and as it was published. I hold in my hand one of the original publications of the Reorganization Act of 1946, from which I have quoted for the RECORD.

By subsequent amendments, section 601 (b) was amended to read as set forth in a compilation printed in 1953, which I hold in my hand. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the changed or amended provision 601 (b), as passed by the Congress, and as it become effective at that time.

There being no objection, the subsection was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(b) Effective on the day on which the 80th Congress convenes there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no accounting, other than for income-tax purposes shall be made; such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

Mr. HOLLAND. The critical words which appear in that particular subsection, differentiating it from the one which was in the original measure as passed, are these: "For which no accounting, other than for income tax purposes, shall be made."

In other words, it was made very clear by the amendment that the $2,500 was subject to income tax, and was just as subject to income tax as was the $12,500, which, to all intents and purposes, meant that from that time forth the salary was $15,000, subject to all the provisions of the income tax law.

The House bill on this subject was silent as to section 601 (b), as it came over from the House, simply providing that only a part of section 601 (a) should be amended, leaving even the rest of section 601 (a) unchanged, and leaving in the law all of section 601 (b) as amended, as I have already placed it in the RECORD.

In order that the RECORD may show just what the provision of the House bill was, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks section 4 (a) of House bill 3828, appearing in lines 10 to 17, inclusive, on page 4 of the House print of the bill.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) The matter preceding the semicolon in section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

Mr. HOLLAND. The effect of the House bill, therefore, was to leave unchanged and unaffected the amended provisions of subsection 601 (b), as Congress had changed them some years ago.

As the matter comes back to us by conference report, the conference bill does include a provision with respect to section 601 (b), which had been completely stricken from the bill by the Senate. The provision in the conference bill which we are now discussing is found at the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3 of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks that part of section 4 of the conference bill which relates to the amendment of section 601 (b).

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(b) For the purpose of assisting in defraying expenses incurred in the operation of their respective offices, each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be entitled to reimbursement for such expenses for each fiscal year at the rate of $1,250 per annum, which shall accrue quarterly and be paid in quarterly installments upon itemized vouchers certified by such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. Amounts paid under this subsection subsequent to March 1, 1955, shall not be deemed to be salary, pay, or compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is quite clear that in the administration of the act that provision is left pretty much to the discretion of each individual Senator.

Like the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has already ably spoken on this question, I certainly do not expect to impugn the motives of any Senator. However, I invite attention to the fact that the arguments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], operate as red flags, advising citizens that in the administration of the act things may be done which may be subject to question, and abuses may occur.

For example, in his argument on two or three occasions the distinguished Senator from Illinois said that he did not propose to check the vouchers which were submitted by other Senators, and that if they wanted to be flexible in their approach—and that was the word he used—that was their business and not his.

The point I am making is that that gives notice to the whole country not only that there is the possibility of misconduct under this particular provision, but that in the debate on the conference report the situation was called to the attention of the Senate by one of its ablest Senators, then advocating the approval of the conference report. He stated that just such nonuniformity,

just such flexibility, might exist in the administration of the act.

If we should approve the conference report after that kind of argument, I say that we would do so knowing that it had been represented to us that this particular amendment would not be uniform in its operation, and would be subject to mishandling and to suspicion of abuse.

The point I am making is that under this provision of the conference bill every Senator and every Representative would place himself in the position in which they were before we adopted the amendments of several years ago, under which there is suspicion that we are not treating ourselves uniformly, and not treating ourselves in the way we treat all other taxpayers of the country.

I do not think we want to be in that position. I think we want to lean backward to see that the bill, which affects us so vitally, is not subject to any such interpretation, is not subject to a situation in which we may all be suspected of not having done exactly the right thing in connection with this little item of $1,250 a year for each of us.

If this situation is to be corrected, it can be corrected best by returning the bill to conference. So far as I am concerned, if the conferees wish to place in the law an additional amount by way of salary, that is one thing. Let the question be discussed on its merits. But if they leave in the bill a provision which one distinguished Senator says is subject to flexibility in the method of approach by his brethren, and which another Senator says might be used to defray the cost of stamps on Christmas cards, and things of that kind, I do not propose to vote for a conference report which is so represented by the friends of the measure on the floor of the Senate.

While I am first to recognize that the conferees have done many worth while things, I feel that the Senate, in the preservation of its own good name, and in order to prevent Senators and Representatives from being subjected to suspicion, as we were once before, should return this measure to conference with instructions to eliminate this particular provision.

One further point and I shall conclude. If this provision were allowed to stand, it would not be at all uniform in its treatment of Senators. It differs from other parts of this measure which give uniform treatment—for example, on the question of additional travel pay for a Senator who lives in California, as compared with one who lives in Maryland. Additional travel pay will be authorized on a just basis so that one Senator would be permitted to return to his home State as many times as any other Senator would be, regardless of the distances involved.

But in this amendment it is proposed to fix an arbitrary limit of $1,250. The item of expense we hear most frequently cited is that of telephone calls. It is proposed, therefore, to provide that $1,250 of such expense may be repaid. I see sitting together the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I invite their attention to the fact that $1,250 would not cover nearly so many telephone messages and not nearly so much time on the telephone in their cases as it would in the case of the Senator from Virginia, or the Senator from Florida, or the Senator from Delaware, or any other Senators who do not come from such great distances. In that regard the provision does not give fair treatment as between States and as between Senators and as between Representatives.

Furthermore, it differs in that regard from other provisions of law which govern us. As every Senator knows, he is entitled to use the telephone in exact equality with other Senators on a per-minute basis or on a per-number-of minimum-conversations basis. Everyone knows that it costs more to talk on the telephone to someone in California than it does to talk to someone in Florida. On the other hand, if every Senator, regardless of which State he represents, is entitled to use that method of immediate communication with constituents for the same number of minutes or for the same number of calls, that is equal treatment.

Under the present amendment nothing like equal treatment is even suggested. To the contrary, the provision is just as unequal and discriminatory as it is possible to be with reference to Senators who have the honor of representing distant States, and with respect to House Members who happen to have the honor to represent districts, which are far removed from the Capital of the United States.

I do not believe this measure should stand, and I hope the Senate will reject it, not with any feeling of hostile criticism—because there are included in the conference report many good provisions, which I hope will be retained—but with instructions, as suggested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to eliminate section 601 (b), which the Senate did eliminate in its version of the bill. I hope the conference report will be rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret that my first utterance in the Senate since my return to it should revolve around a salary bill for Members of Congress. I recall the Congressional Reorganization Act passed in 1946, and the increase it provided in the compensation of Members, together with a $2,500 expense allowance, which was made nontaxable.

That provision was included in the bill because it sought to put Members of Congress on a basis of some equality with businessmen and professional men, who are allowed to deduct their actual expenses from taxable income.

We all know what happened. Criticism was uttered against it, on the ground that Members of Congress were being treated in a different manner from other citizens, which was not the truth. Finally I believe the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered the amendment, which Congress adopted, eliminating the nontaxability of the $2,500.

That provision is included in the present bill, but only to the extent of one-half of the amount, namely, $1,250. If the $2,500 exemption from taxation in the former bill was objectionable, certainly on the same principle the $1,250 exemption is objectionable, and should not be included in the bill. If it is included, it will be subject constantly not only to criticism, but inspection. Although a Senator will not be required to swear to his expenses, he will be compelled to itemize them. I object to it myself. If the Senate and the House wish to fix the salary at $24,000 a year, they ought to fix it at that amount, without any contingencies, and without any additions, under some false pretense that it is not salary but an expense.

I would rather vote for a straight $24,000 salary, with all of it being salary, to be expended by the Member as necessities might require, than to vote for $22,500, and for $1,250 additional under the guise that it is for expenses which must be itemized by the Senator or the Member of the House before it may be paid to him.

There is another provision to which I object. Probably I should have objected to it when the bill was before the Senate. I refer to the provision which proposes to compensate Members for 5 round trips from Washington to their respective homes. Such trips are also to be itemized and certified to the disbursing officer of the Senate before payment may be made for them.

I realize that a great many persons throughout the country believe that every Senator and every Representative gets all of his expenses paid every time he goes home. Of course, it is not the truth. A Representative or a Senator is allowed 1 round trip at the rate of 20 cents a mile from his home to Washington and when he returns home again during a session of Congress. He is compensated for the expense of 1 round trip.

I object to the feature of the bill making allowance for 5 round trips. As I have said, probably I should have raised my voice against it when the bill was before the Senate a few days ago, but I did not do so.

All of us have observed the multiplicity of duties imposed upon us in our offices and in connection with the departments of Government and the States which we represent. As a consequence, we find it necessary from time to time to absent ourselves from the Chamber. All of us have observed that absenteeism in the Senate has been developing and growing over a period of years. During my 2 years' retirement, out of circulation here, I have seen no improvement in the attendance on the floor of the Senate. It is deplored by everyone. Nobody does anything about it. Nobody can do anything about it. It is a matter of individual and personal conduct whether a Senator will work in his office or on the floor of the Senate or in a committee, or be downtown in one of the departments at the request of a constituent.

We all know that we are busy at something in the performance of our official duties. Yet, without any reflection on anyone, I have the fear that giving us five more trips from the seat of Government to our respective homes will offer the temptation to return to our homes on occasions when we might avoid

it, or when it might not be necessary. It might well constitute a temptation for more absenteeism in the Senate, which I believe would be deplorabe.

I have wondered for years how our friends and constituents feel when they come to the Senate and look down from the galleries and see a half dozen Senators on the floor, transacting the business of the Senate under the assumption that a quorum is present unless a Senator makes the point that a quorum is not present. When our constituents look down on a practically empty Chamber and go away with no explanation of the reason for the small attendance on the floor, I wonder what their impression of this great body may be. I have often been chagrined and sometimes humiliated because of the meager attendance on the floor of the Senate when important business was under consideration.

Therefore, I am not willing to vote for the conference report. I object to that provision in the bill. Perhaps it cannot be eliminated. I believe it was in the bill when it passed the Senate, although probably not in the House bill. I do not now recall. It will still be in conference if we send the bill back to the conference committee.

But I even more object to the $1,250 provision which I fear will bring about such a condition as that which we remedied a few years ago. We may again be called upon to apply a remedy if we insert the provision in the bill at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote to reject the conference report in the hope that the conferees may eliminate the $1,250 provision and the provision for 5 additional round trips in the course of a year.

I regret to take this position, Mr. President, because I realize the need for some increase in the compensation of Members of the Congress, but it seems to me that we should provide for the increase by a fixed sum and omit these petty and extraneous things under the guise of which it may be said we are trying to increase our compensation.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote to reject the conference report.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to make a number of observations simply because some of the things which have been said on the floor would indicate that the conference committee has recommended to the Senate and the House the adoption of a tax-free item of $1,250.

There is in the conference report no provision for a tax-exempt item of any kind. The $1,250 is like the item which is now in the Legislative Act which provides an allowance of not to exceed $600 a year for the expenses of a Senator's home office. Under that provision I spent $76.06 during the past 6 months to maintain my home office, out of my own pocket, and was reimbursed to that extent. But I did not get a penny of tax-exempt income.

I think the conference committee has done a good job in dealing with this subject and ironing out differences between the Senate and the House. I am, nevertheless, going to vote to reject the conference report because of the $1,250 item, on the theory that Congress, like Caesar's wife, should avoid anything which might create any suspicion.

The distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] pointed out a while ago that the public could not understand this $1,250 provision. In view of the fact that some Members of the Senate do not understand it, I can readily believe that the public cannot understand it. For that reason, and believing that we should not pass a bill which would give rise to any suspicion that the Members of Congress are getting any advantage over other taxpayers, I shall vote to reject the conference report.

While I was a private citizen at the time of the passage of the bills which gave the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Members of the Congress some special tax exemptions above those of other citizens of the country as a whole, I was very much opposed to such bills and I never expect to vote for a measure which in any form would give a Member of the Senate or of the House any special exemption from Federal income taxes. I think that every Senator and every Representative should pay taxes on the same basis as do the other people of the country.

I do not construe this conference report as containing any provision for a tax exemption allowance of any kind for Senators and Representatives; but I shall vote against the conference report because I agree fully with the statement of the Senator from Florida that some of the people of the country will not understand it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I supported the Senator from Delaware in the amendment which he offered and which was agreed to a number of years ago. I was a co-sponsor of that amendment. But I hope the Senator realizes the position of the conferees on the part of the Senate. We presented the arguments just made by the Senator; we made a strong plea, and we thought we were justified in accepting the conference report. I hope the Senator will realize the position in which the conferees found themselves. We tried to present the case.

Mr. ERVIN. I fully appreciate the position of the conferees. A compromise is not a one-way street. I realize that some concessions must be made to the Members of the House.

I wish to point out that if there is any allegation that the conference report is any sort of a tax-free proposition, that is unsound. But since some Members of the Senate do not understand it, I am sure that the people of the country will not understand it, and I shall vote to reject the report.

Mr. WATKINS. I take it that the Senator believes that our position must not only be right, but it must seem right.

Mr. ERVIN. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I fully recognize the problem faced by the conferees, and I think, that in a great many respects, the bill as now presented to us is in better shape than it was; but as a matter of public policy I certainly question very much the addition of section (b). Therefore, I hope the Senate will reject the conference report. When that is done, as I trust it will be done, I hope the Senate will approve the instructions to be offered by the Senator from Delaware to the conferees to insist upon the elimination of section (b).

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have no desire to discuss the matter further at any great length; but I should like to make it amply clear that the Senate conferees were confronted with such a situation that, if an agreement was to be reached, they had to make some compromise with the Members of the House.

With reference to the expense item a compromise was offered by one of the House conferees to which we agreed, with the understanding that it be related solely to necessary expenses in the conduct of a Member's office, that the expenses be itemized, and that the itemization be submitted and be paid by way of reimbursement only after he certifies the expenses as being necessary in the operations of his office.

In my view, this is pinned down to the office of the Senator or the Representative. It does not include the taking of constituents to lunch. I do not consider as legitimate office expenses some of the items which have been spoken of, such as Christmas cards, and what not. On the basis of a Member's necessary expense in running his office, I do not think he will certify anything which is not a necessary expense.

I desire all Members of the Senate to understand that there was no effort on the part of any conferee of the Senate or of the House to include any provision in the nature of an item of compensation on a tax-exempt basis. That is not the purpose of this provision. The purpose of the provision is to reimburse for actual outlays which a Member has necessarily made.

It appeared that the only way in which the bill could be reported from conference was to make some adjustment. The House had acceded to our position on three very important items in the bill. They refused to agree fully with us on our provision in connection with this section. We did our best to sustain the action of the Senate, but we felt we were under an obligation to try, at least, to bring some bill out of conference.

There was a discussion in the committee of conference about the fact that Members of the Senate, and I believe Members of the House also, are entitled to an allowance of $600 for office rent in their respective States. I do not believe any Member has ever charged $600 unless he paid it for office rent. For my own part, I am fortunate to have an office in the Federal Building. I have never received any of the $600 which has been authorized for Senators and Representatives to maintain offices in their respective States.

Neither do I know of any Member who has purposely stayed out of a Federal building, if he could have obtained space

in one and has rented an office on the outside.

It seems to me that this is somewhat the same kind of situation. I realize that public policy is involved. We thought we had the language pinned down so that it would be amply clear that it was not salary, not a gimmick, not a method of trying to get compensation, and then of covering it up. It was simply a straightforward provision for reimbursement of necessary expenditures for one's office.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said that a Senator might charge something which might be in the nature of a fringe benefit, and then charge other items off on his income tax. The interpretation of the Internal Revenue Service is that what a Senator can charge off in the way of extra expenses is identical to the language in the bill, namely, necessary office expenses directly arising from the running of his office. So I cannot see any validity in the point raised by the Senator from Delaware.

The matter is now before the Senate. I hope we can vote it up or down at an early time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I correct in my understanding that before a motion is made to instruct the conferees, a motion should first be made to authorize the Chair to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, and to ask for a second conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the Senate ask for a second conference and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now move that the conferees on the part of the Senate be instructed to insist upon the elimination from the conference report of the language contained in subsection (b) of section 4, amending section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I join in the request of the Senator from California.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inauguration of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend his 25th anniversary celebration in the State of Washington.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BENDER and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the inaugural ceremonies of the President of Cuba.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Ervin	Mundt
Anderson	Flanders	Murray
Barkley	Frear	Neuberger
Barrett	Fulbright	Pastore
Beall	George	Payne
Bennett	Goldwater	Potter
Bible	Hayden	Purtell
Bush	Hennings	Russell
Butler	Hill	Saltonstall
Byrd	Holland	Scott
Carlson	Jackson	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Kuchel	Stennis
Clements	Long	Symington
Cotton	Mansfield	Thurmond
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Daniel	McCarthy	Welker
Douglas	McClellan	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Young
Ellender	Monroney	

NAYS—7

Bridges	Ives	Lehman
Dirksen	Kefauver	
Eastland	Kilgore	

NOT VOTING—27

Allott	Humphrey	McNamara
Bender	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Capehart	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Duff	Kerr	Robertson
Gore	Langer	Schoeppel
Green	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	Malone	Thye
Hruska	Martin, Iowa	Wiley

So Mr. WILLIAMS' motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the Senate the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

ORDER FOR DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I am about to move an adjournment to Monday. Before doing so I wish to inform the Senate that the only possible business which I am aware at this time will come before the Senate on Monday will be the second conference report on H. R. 3828, which I hope may be brought back by that time.

I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until noon, on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert Tripp Ross, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of titlet IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Congress):

To be colonel

Perry, Russell V., O15383.

To be captains

Ancker, Jack P., O37217.
Bush, Hugh W., Jr., O60626.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be captains

Connolly, John R., MC, O2103459.
Cowgill, Herbert F., MC.
Kilpatrick, William C., Jr., MC, O1717778.
Mincks, James R., MC, O2097881.

To be first lieutenants

Blough, Leland S., MC, O4003873.
Gardenier, Edward D., DC, O2267251.
Horton, Virginia A., ANC, N780235.
Hunsuck, Ervin E., DC, O2270447.
Johnson, Elizabeth F., ANC, N798022.
Louro, Jose M., MC, O2041851.
Mitchell, Bradford W., JAGC, O2237214.
Parker, James W., MSC, O717952.
Pogrebniak, Alexander, MC, O2268932.
Young, William H., Jr., MSC, O2263182.

To be second lieutenant

Randolph, George B., Jr., MSC, O1920422.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Abrams, Fredrick R., O2273772.
Barrett, O'Neill, Jr., O971387.
Bergin, James J., O2273743.
Boehrer, Philip M., O4030393.
Canby, John P., O4024337.
Carey, Philip O., O2268941.
Herman, Robert H., O2268938
Price, Frank W., O4002903.
Price, Ira B., O4002576.
Grass, Adrian L., O2273750.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenants

Broady, William, O2028412.
Sherberg, Auden L., O1924859.

To be second lieutenants

Berry, Fred C., Jr.
Craver, Roger H., O4021064.
Early, Charles D., Jr.
Foley, William R., O4006426.
Simcox, George N., O4026470.
Treadway, Thomas J.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Lawson, Lowell F.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Kaczenski, John A.
Krengel, Thomas F.
Lokie, Andrew P., O4032758.
McFather, Bennie S., O4033500.
Murphy, Charles K., O4029919.
Pede, August R.
Perry, Archie, O4025001.
Price, Raymond S., O4024963.
Saxon, George E.
Street, Clover B.
Soupene, James C., Jr., O4029449.
Vandeventer, William R.
Weiskirch, Thomas N., Jr., O1940922.
Williams, Thomas W., O4029469.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the United States Coast Guard:

Charles E. Haley
Zoltan Papp
Claude M. Hutchins

The following persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the United States Coast Guard:

Edward R. Harris
Francis A. Massey
Parker R. Johnson
Philip H. Fry
Thadeus Penry
Albert J. Bates
Michael Kabaczy
John H. Brown
Manuel L. Bent
Walter P. Stipcich
Clarence B. Anderson
Robert H. Burn
Leroy H. Harmon
Joseph J. Dobrow, Jr.
Alfred M. Livingston
John P. Ryan
Roland R. Davis
Oliver F. Rossin
James W. Lockhart
Russell M. Young
Kenneth E. Payson
Cyril D. Kring
Gene D. Vecchione
Harry V. Hardy
Andrew Kirkpatrick
Oliver T. Henry, Jr.
William Keokosky
Louis S. Schweitzer
John R. Howarth
Howell O. Wall
Elmer J. Nolan
Frank Jakelsky
Anthony F. Glaza, Jr.
Meredith D. Hazzard
Frank J. Recely
Elmer C. Knudson
Walter V. Corteg
Gordon B. Sworthout
William F. Winslow
John Senik
Joseph L. St. Pierre
Robert S. Phillips
"A" "Z" Shows
Carroll Tingle
Luke B. Midgett
Paul A. Woodard
Moses McNure
Woodrow F. Clookie
Malcolm Versaw
William R. Gaither
Fletcher R. Peele
Leon A. Anderson
George B. Schack
Albert DeCosta
Leonest L. Tillett
Gilbert Coughlan
Henry A. Cook
John Chartuck
William E. White, Jr.
Edward E. Lewis
Louis M. Piermattei
Andrew Hauswirth
Ellis M. Moore
Harvey J. Hardy
Frank D. Coffey
James A. Somers
Roy L. Singleton
Alexander M. Grant
Kenneth G. Fields.
Gustave A. Kuhnert
John W. Short
Earlie W. Shelton
Ernest R. Stacy
Roy Huffstetler
John Ventre
Nevette A. Gardebled
Neal Griffin
Charles R. Ellington, Jr.
Charles E. Christman
Leonard W. Arnold
Henry L. Cotton
Kenneth E. Diem
Raymond L. Barnett
Bernard A. Koebbe
Irving T. Bloxom
Suell R. Grimm
James W. Freeman
Homer E. McCullough
Foister E. Blair
Norris D. Hickman
Charles U. Stastka
Thomas J. Bennett
Norman R. Hundwin
Andrew J. Donaldson
Walter R. Terry
John T. Mears, Jr.
Victor J. Shurkus
Harold D. Gallery
Robert N. Piland, Jr.
Clemens F. Knox
John J. Pinton
Harry L. Partridge
Thomas A. Smith
Martin J. Connolly
John E. Giles
Lloyd L. Franklin
Ralph L. Tarr
Henry O. Aeschliman
William S. Gray, Jr.
George A. J. Michaud
Allen S. Marsdale
John Szakara
Earl W. Skinner
Hobart E. Sadler
Robert S. Gaddy
Van H. White, Jr.
William D. Oliver

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25, 1955:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission, for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1958.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Louis S. Rothschild, of Missouri, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Allin H. Pierce, of Illinois, to be judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1948.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term expiring December 31, 1960.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Thomas Coggeshall, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, to be effective date of acceptance:

To be assistant surgeons

John W. Glotfelty
John D. Tovey
John F. Ice
Inez L. Ice

To be assistant dental surgeon

George J. Yocum

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. R. Paul Schearrer, minister, Takoma Park Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the Father of us all and the only sure hope of all mankind, we bow before Thee in humility and reverence. We would voice our common gratitude for the freedoms and blessings of life which we enjoy. Deliver us from pride of position and possessions. May we never forget the obligation that rests upon the strong.

On this World Day of Prayer, when millions upon millions of Thy children of every continent and color are praying for peace on earth, we would add our sincere supplications that this world may be spared from the horrors of another war. Free us from the bondage of suspicion and hate. Increase our faith in Thy power to save us from self-destruction. Give us the vision of a better day of brotherhood and the united will to work for its coming. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 79)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Chief Justice of the United States and to the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out '$25,500' and substituting therefor '$35,500', and by striking out '$25,000' and substituting therefor '$35,000'.

"(b) Section 44 (d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out '$15,000' and substituting therefor '$22,500', and by striking out '$15,500' and substituting therefor '$23,000'.

"(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out '$15,000' and substituting therefor '$22,500'.

"(g) The first paragraph of section 4 of the Act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, relating to the District Court for the District of Alaska, is amended by striking out '$15,000' and substituting therefor '$22,500'.

"(h) Section 7443 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Salary: Each judge shall receive salary at the rate of $22,500 per annum, to be paid in monthly installments.'

"(i) (1) Article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(2) Such article is further amended by adding at the end of subdivision (a) (1) thereof the following: 'Each judge shall, upon his certificate, be paid by the Secretary of Defense all necessary traveling expenses, and also his reasonable maintenance expenses actually incurred, not exceeding $15 per day, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station. The official station of such judges for such purpose shall be the District of Columbia.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 508. Salaries

"'The Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title within the following limitations:

"'United States attorneys—not less than $12,000 or more than $20,000; and

"'Assistant United States attorneys and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title—not more than $15,000.'

"(b) The salaries of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys for the districts of Alaska, Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands are subject to the provisions of section 508 of title 28, United States Code.

"SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum.'

"(b) Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) For the purpose of assisting in defraying expenses incurred in the operation of their respective offices, each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be entitled to reimbursement for such expenses for each fiscal year at the rate of $1,250 per annum, which shall accrue quarterly and be paid in quarterly installments upon itemized vouchers certified by such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. Amounts paid under this subsection subsequent to March 1, 1955 shall not be deemed to be salary, pay, or compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.'

"(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out '$30,000' and substituting therefor '$35,000'.

"SEC. 5. In addition to any amounts heretofore authorized by law for travel, the Vice President, each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, shall be allowed, under regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, respectively, out of the contingent fund of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, the expenses incurred in making not to exceed five round trips per year, beginning at noon of January 3 of a calendar year and ending at noon on January 3 of the succeeding calendar year, between Washington, District of Columbia, and the State, congressional district, Territory, or possession which he represents in Congress or, in the case of the Vice President, the State of his legal residence.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on March 1, 1955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following table sets forth the difference between the House and Senate versions and the conference report as to the matter of salaries:

Position	House	Senate	Conference
Chief Justice	$35,500	$35,000	$35,500
Associate Justice	35,000	34,500	35,000
Court of appeals	25,000	25,500	25,500
District court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Chief judge, District of Columbia	23,000	23,000	23,000
Court of Claims	25,000	25,500	25,500
Customs and Patent Appeals	25,000	25,500	25,500
Customs Court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Alaska District Court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Tax Court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Military Appeals	25,000	25,500	25,500
United States attorneys	12,000 to 20,000	[1]	12,000 to 20,000
Assistant and special attorneys	6,000 to 15,000	[1]	Up to 15,000
Deputy Attorney General	21,000	[1]	21,000
Solicitor General	20,500	[1]	20,500
Assistant Attorney General	20,000	[1]	20,000
Vice President	35,000	35,000	35,000
Speaker	35,000	35,000	35,000
Members	22,500	22,500	22,500

[1] No provision.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

The House version of the bill made no provision for any additional travel allowance for Members of Congress. The Senate version provided for an additional five round trips per year, commencing on January 3 of one year and ending on January 3 of the following year, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules of the Senate as it relates to Senators, and by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives as it relates to the Members of that body. The House accepted the language of that provision in

the Senate bill with a minor modification in order to clarify the point that the Vice President would be included in the provision on travel allowance as provided by section 43a, title 2, United States Code. That provision would place the Vice President on a par with the Speaker of the House in this particular situation.

The Senate version provided that the judges of the Court of Military Appeals would receive up to $15 per day for travel and maintenance expenses incurred while traveling on official duty. The House version contained no such provision. Since the justices and judges of the other United States courts now receive such an allowance, the House accepted the Senate version.

COMPENSATION OF LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

The House version of the bill contained a provision to raise the maximum basic compensation of professional and clerical staff members of the standing committees to $10,000 and further provided that the ceiling of $11,646 as it related to legislative employees be adjusted so that the ceiling existing under the classified pay act should be substituted therefor. The House receded from its insistence on this provision, which was not contained in the Senate version of the bill, but it was the opinion of the conferees on the part of both Houses that some adjustment should be made relating to pay increases to legislative personnel. It was the further sense of the conferees that the respective committees of each House explore the salaries of all legislative personnel for the purpose of an upward adjustment in relation to their pay as it is believed that this matter is essentially one which should be the subject of a pay act applying to all legislative personnel.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR OFFICE EXPENSES

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Senate version provided for repeal of the existing $2,500 expense allowance to Members of Congress. No similar provision was contained in the House bill. The conferees agreed that while the present expense allowance to Members of Congress should be eliminated, there nevertheless is a need for reimbursement for certain office expenses incurred by Members for such things as additional stamps, phone calls, telegrams, robo plates, stationery for robo machines, and like expenses incidental to the proper maintenance and operation of their office. Accordingly, the conferees agreed to language which provided the sum of $1,250 annually by which Members of Congress would be reimbursed for certain expenses actually incurred over and above those for which they were already compensated in the operation and maintenance of their office. The conferees agreed that the sum of $1,250 annually should be paid in quarterly installments upon itemized vouchers submitted by them and that it was a reasonable amount to be included in order to assist in defraying the expenses of their office.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The Senate version provided that the effective date of the act would be the first day of the month following the date of enactment. The House bill provided that the effective date would be January 1, 1955, for those provisions relating to the executive and judicial branches of the Government and the date of commencement of the 84th Congress for the provisions relating to the legislative branch of the Government. The conference report provided that the effective date of the act shall be March 1, 1955.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be opposed and intend to vote against H. R. 3828, as it comes to the House of Representatives in the form of the conference report. This measure would still provide for an increase of $7,500, or 50 percent, in the salaries of the Members of Congress. I continue to feel that it is inappropriate for a new Member of Congress to vote for a pay increase of this magnitude.

AMENDMENT OF McCARRAN-WALTER ACT

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an omnibus immigration and citizenship bill along with Senators LEHMAN and HUMPHREY and my colleague, Congressman CELLER, to completely overhaul, revise, and replace the discriminatory immigration and citizenship laws now on our statute books. This recodification of the McCarran-Walter Act is long overdue. The McCarran-Walter Act in its present form has been the law of the land far too long. If it had been the law of our country in our early days, America could never have grown to its present greatness and indeed would never have been the America that it is.

There is nothing in this bill which impairs the security of our country. It merely eliminates the shame of racism and national discrimination from the body of our law. It eradicates the stigma of second-class citizenship now imposed on millions of naturalized Americans. All right-thinking citizens of our country, if they knew the facts, I am sure would join in demanding that Congress pass this measure without delay.

WINDFALLS IN CONNECTION WITH SECTION 608 HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, some months ago there was a great fuss raised in the press over the so-called windfalls in connection with section 608 housing projects. At that time, along with many others, I urged that the investigations be extended into the section 213 cooperatives. I said then, and I repeat, that a thorough and full investigation of the cooperative housing program would make the so-called 608 windfalls look like penny-ante stuff. Unfortunately, while the committee handling the matter at that time made a very fine analysis of the problem, no worthwhile remedial legislation has resulted from the same.

Whether or not these investigations continue, and are extended, it is now perfectly obvious that the 213 cooperators are in serious financial difficulty because of circumstances over which they had absolutely no control. It is perfectly obvious that they are entitled to some measure of relief so that the inflated maintenance costs of the 213's can be kept at a minimum. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to these citizens to correct some of these inequities if it is possible.

I am today introducing a bill which would in essence reduce the FHA mortgage premiums from one-half of 1 percent per annum to one-fourth of 1 percent per annum.

I am told that this measure, if enacted, would reduce maintenance costs per unit per year of 213's by as much as $10,000.

I submit that while this would only be a feeble step in the right direction, it would pave the way for restoring the confidence of our people in the agencies of our Government.

I most emphatically urge my colleagues to join with me in this measure. I truly believe that in passing this bill we would not only correct a basic inequity, but would also be discharging our obligation and our responsibilities to our people.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, March 1, the House Small Business Committee may sit during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REVENUE ACT OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4259, with Mr. PRIEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in

order except those offered by the Committee on Ways and Means and one amendment to strike out all after line 17, page 4 of the bill.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments to be offered to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York have an amendment?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Strike out all after line 17, page 4, of the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is the most important issue that has arisen on the floor of the House during my service here.

Last night I took the floor to point out the character of the issue before this House. Under our form of Government, the Committee on Ways and Means and every other committee of the House is a small legislative body within the greatest legislative body of any country in the world. I think we are all proud of that fact. We cannot afford by sharp practice or by surprise to lower the prestige of this great legislative body in the eyes of the world.

If this body has not the conscience, if it does not believe in fair play, if it develops a precedent for hitting below the belt, people are going to know it, and they cannot have any more confidence in us than our record shows that we have in ourselves.

I have always been very much interested in President Tucker, of Dartmouth College. In a notable sermon he asked the question:

Have we a national conscience which can bear the strain that is coming upon it?

He said:

I believe that you wish to build up a conscience firm and strong enough to meet the needs of the Nation, because you must know that with your answer is bound up the destiny of the Nation we love.

I think we all ought to take that to heart. We face the most unscrupulous enemy in the Soviet Union. They are looking for every little thing they can find to point out that we are a dishonest nation, that we cannot stick to the truth, that we would resort, for instance in this instance, in one part of this great body to taking undue advantage of the other.

I know the chairman of this committee, and I am fond of him. I am just as sure as that I am alive that he does not countenance this sort of practice. He has pride in being chairman. Not very many men have been chairman.

Coming from the great State of New York, the largest taxpaying State in the Union, I had the opportunity to serve as chairman for only 2 years. I felt proud of that. I know that he does. We want to maintain the prestige of this great committee within this great legislative body by following the highest standards. I do not want to see this attempt made a precedent to be flashed all over the world and especially to our enemies who fill the air every day with their propaganda about how unfaithful we are to true principles and honesty and so forth.

This amendment that has been attached to this bill does not belong here. I still cannot believe that they wanted to cheat us out of the opportunity of appearing in connection with this or knowing anything about this situation.

I shall not characterize this by any violent words. I just feel hurt and distressed that anything like this should happen in this Congress. I want this body to stand before the world as an example of what is good, straight, honest legislating. I want to protect the prestige and the honor of every committee of this House.

If we do this today, it is going to be done in other committees, and sooner or later it is going to have a corrupting influence. Let us live up to our conscience and strike this out. We know it will not work. We know that great institutions such as the life insurance companies are today worrying; they do not know what to tell their clients. They do not want to see the insurance whittled down. That is what it is going to do. You are going to have inflation. You are going to pretend to give these people something and then take it away through inflation.

So I trust that when the vote comes here men on both sides of the House will stand by the conscience and sense of fair play of this great Congress and wipe out this amendment, for which there is absolutely no defense.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of the pending amendment is to strike out of this bill the $20 tax-credit provision for a taxpayer and each of his exemptions.

Last year when the deficit in the Treasury was about double what it is now tax relief of about double the amount proposed here was advocated and urged by the administration. The bill then passed provided for far greater tax relief for business and the high-income taxpayers than the small amount here proposed for the low-income taxpayers.

We have heard a good deal of talk about inflation. I am just wondering whether anybody can seriously believe that $800 million difference next year is going to start a spiral of inflation in this country when last year twice that amount was added to the deficit in the Treasury and we heard nothing about the question of inflation.

The bill passed last year was estimated then to lose a billion and a half dollars of revenue, about double the amount suggested by this Democratic provision in this bill, and there is no doubt in the world that the loss of revenue will be vastly in excess of that amount.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] made a very effective statement here yesterday in which he pointed out that one provision in that bill passed last year, with respect to the accounting methods, will probably lose $5 billions, and there is no telling how far it will go.

The question presented here today is one of simple justice for the low-income taxpayers of this country. Let me point out for the consideration of my good friend from Texas [Mr. DIES] who spoke here yesterday, and many others who have spoken, that this is the first administration in my knowledge in peacetime that has not even recommended or suggested a balanced budget for this Government of ours. I was here during the administration of Mr. Hoover. Mr. Hoover recommended taxes to provide for a balanced budget. Of course, we know that during Mr. Roosevelt's administration he had the great depression and the most expensive war in all of human history to finance. But Mr. Truman in 1951 recommended taxes of about $10 billion to balance the budget and the Congress only gave him about half of that amount. In 1952, Mr. Truman again recommended taxes to balance the budget. This administration has not even recommended or requested any revenue to balance the Federal budget. There is no indication that they expect to balance the budget as far as asking for additional revenue is concerned. Now we have this situation presented here—that last year the administration could urge and secure the passage of legislation increasing the deficit by at least $1,500,000,000 or about double the amount that is even suggested here today, and we heard nothing about inflation at that time or that the Government was headed toward bankruptcy.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman certainly heard my speech last year in which I denounced the tax revision bill for the same reason that I am opposed to the inclusion of this deduction.

Mr. COOPER. I compliment the gentleman. He was right then, but I am afraid he is not as right today.

Mr. Chairman, this provision which is sought to be stricken out by this amendment simply provides for a limited degree of relief, most of which, or at least 66 percent of which will go to the low-income taxpayers of this country. It is relief that is justified. The amendment should be voted down and the bill passed, as reported by your committee.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it would have been entirely justifiable for the Democrat majority to bring before us legislation providing this type of tax reduction in a separate bill. An honest determination as to whether it was wise at this time to vote to further unbalance the budget for the coming fiscal year and the year after could then have been made.

However, this attempt by parliamentary trickery to make such a reduction veto proof deserves the condemnation of all good Americans who believe in the constitutional provision that legislation should only become law after passage by both Houses and consideration by the President as to whether the proposal is in accord with the Nation's welfare.

I feel sure that the people of our country, intelligent as they are, will see

through and condemn this shoddy maneuver. For this reason alone, even those who believe that such a cut is advisable should vote to delete this amendment, and then do their best to have the proposal reported by the Ways and Means Committee as a separate bill, which can be done by the Democrat majority any time they wish.

As far as the merits of the proposal are concerned, the Eisenhower administration through valiant efforts has succeeded in substantial reduction of Government spending.

Though I have been disappointed that we have not succeeded in balancing the budget, we are coming closer every year to doing so. The trend has been in the direction of sound fiscal management. We have again achieved an honest dollar. The fear of that inflation which is the result of unbalanced budgets has faded away. The record purchase of Government bonds by individuals shows their renewal of confidence that the purchasing power of their money would not be lost if they made such an investment, as it was over the 15 Democrat years before 1953.

This portion of the bill which we are attempting to delete would reverse this trend; would again indicate that we are taking the path of irresponsibility and further inflation.

There is one good thing about this proposal and that is that it will remind the country that Democrats cannot be trusted for sound finances and that if through some unfortunate circumstance they should resume control of the Government in 1957, our people can only look forward then to a further rise in the cost of living.

As far as the method of cutting taxes provided by this proposal is concerned, I believe that when we next are able to cut taxes we should not do so by removing 5 million people from their obligations to pay any direct tax in support of their Government, but that we should reduce the burden on the lower-income group by splitting the lower bracket, so that the tax on the first thousand of taxable income is at a lower rate than the tax on the second thousand. Such a provision as the result of my efforts was included in the 1947 tax-reduction bill when it passed the House, but owing to the opposition of the Truman administration was struck out by the Senate.

I do not believe, however, that the American people, much as they long for tax reduction, wish one now at the expense of sound fiscal policy.

It so happens that a week ago I sent out a questionnaire which reached each residence in my congressional district. I took an at-random sampling of the first thousand answers to the following question, "Do you favor an additional tax reduction now even though it would further unbalance the budget and increase the country's debt?" From that at-random sampling I found that 758 opposed a tax cut now and only 242 favored it under present conditions. My district is not a district which is a purely Republican district. I have not won by over 55 percent of the votes since 1946. My election this year was by about 53 percent.

I do not think that the American people are as dumb as you Democrats think they are.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the last 2 days we have heard a lot of adjectives here on the floor of the House. A moment ago the gentleman from New Jersey used the expressions "not to be trusted," "shoddy," and so on.

Prior to that the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee was highly critical of the procedure adopted by the committee. He led us to believe that nothing similar had ever happened in the history of the great Ways and Means Committee.

The truth of the matter is that this procedure was not one bit unusual. I recall the committee sessions on H. R. 1, introduced by the gentleman from New York in the beginning of the 83d Congress. After about an hour's discussion in the committee in executive session the distinguished ranking minority member at that time, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] asked that delay be had until such time as the Treasury Department could be heard from, until such time as the position of the administration could be made known, until such time as hearings might be held on the proposed legislation. I made a motion, if I recall correctly, that we hear the Secretary of the Treasury—who is the present Secretary of the Treasury—Mr. Humphrey. That motion was voted down by a straight party vote, 15 to 10. My recollection is that this vote came on a motion to table, made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

This time the majority of the Ways and Means Committee under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee called the Secretary of the Treasury and obtained his expressions on this legislation. Two years ago the Republican majority on the committee would not even hear their own Secretary of the Treasury. So I believe it to be a bit in bad taste to talk about our precedure as being shoddy, or star chamber proceedings, or secret meetings, when everyone knows that this proposal has been studied time and time again.

It did not take the Treasury Department any great length of time to comment on this proposal, because the measure had been before the Congress previously.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. No. I am sorry. Get your own time.

Let us do a little talking about this shoddy business. Last year we had up the excise extension bill, a bill similar to the one we have before us at the moment. What happened? Despite the opposition of the administration, $1 billion in revenues were lost in that bill. In this bill, in the next fiscal year, only 800 million will be lost, or $200 million less. Was that bill inflationary?

Did you hear anything about its being inflationary?

Did you hear what it might do to the budget when at that time the budget was more out of balance than it is right now? You did not. As a matter of fact, I recall the executive sessions of the committee—and they were executive, just as ours were; I remember trying to get from the members of the committee on the majority side the position of the Republican Treasury Department on those recommendations, and I could not get it.

Talk about irresponsibility. Talk about shoddiness. Talk about inflation. Well, now, it is just a strange situation that we could pass measures last year without even getting the views of the Treasury Department, unbalancing the budget by $2 billion to $3 billion and that was statesmanship, yet we are irresponsible. How political can you get?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means talk about balanced budgets. He says that the Democratic Presidents have always asked for a balanced budget, they have always asked for increased revenues to meet expenditures. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I wonder where the gentleman from Tennessee was at the time he was the No. 2 man on the Democratic side of the Ways and Means Committee. Certainly the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee never reported bills which would furnish the revenue to accomplish that purpose and the Democratic Congresses never provided such revenue.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the present administration believes in action, not in a lot of unfulfilled promises. We are actually arriving at a balanced budget. That is what irritates the Democratic side of this House and that is why they want to reduce our revenues by the amendment they have inserted in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there were some words of real wisdom uttered on this floor on March 24, 1948, during debate on the revenue act of that year. That was a tax-reduction bill. It was said then by the gentleman we all respect as our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]:

> I said a while ago from this place that one of the greatest statements that was ever made by anybody was: "Just a minute."
>
> Why all this haste about tax reduction? We will have another month, another 2 months, another 3 months. We do not know how much money this Congress is going to spend.

If that advice was sound then, how much sounder it is today. Let me remind the Members that at that time the President had just a few months before, in January, sent up his budget message in which he said that the budget balance for that year would be over $7 billion. Today we know a deficit of $2.4 billion is in prospect. At that time 2 or 3 appropriation bills had passed through the House. Today we have not acted on a single appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that these Democrat speeches are fooling any of our low-income people. I have more respect for their intelligence. They are not going to be fooled by the twisted use of statistics and figures, and they are not going to be fooled by half-truths.

Let us look at the history of the Democratic Party, so far as taxes are concerned, and where relief has been given. You cannot find where they have ever given much relief to anyone because in their 20 years of control of this Government taxes were increased nine times, and only once did they provide for tax relief. That was the tax bill of 1945.

Let us see how they distributed the relief that they gave on this lone occasion when they offered a tax-relief bill. Fifty-three percent of the reduction went to corporations. The balance of 47 percent went to individuals. That is their complete record of providing tax relief. Here is the breakdown:

TABLE A.—*Changes and revenue effect of the Revenue Act of 1945*

Changes	Revenue effect in 1947 (1st full year of operation)	Percent of total reduction
	Millions	
(1) Corporation taxes:		
Excess profits tax, repealed	−$4,847	
Normal and surtax—Surtax reduced:		
Income not over $25,000, 4 percentage points		
Income between $25,000 and $50,000, from 4 percentage points to 2 percentage points	+2,058	
Income over $50,000, 2 percentage points		
Capital stock and declared value excess profits tax, repealed	−351	
Total corporation taxes	−3,140	53.0
(2) Individual income taxes:		
Normal tax provided same exemptions, for normal tax as for surtax and reduced remaining liability 5 percent	*Millions* −$847	
Surtax reduced 3 percentage points and remaining liability 5 percent	−1,798	
Total individual income taxes	−2,645	44.6
Total income and excess profits taxes and the capital stock tax	−5,785	
(3) Excise taxes: Use tax on autos and boats, repealed	−140	2.4
Total reduction	−5,925	100.0

Prepared by Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Now look at the history of the Republican Party and let us take last year. But do not be dishonest and take only one bill, one little piece, one-fifth of the whole Republican tax program of last year, as the Democratic speakers want us to do. Take the whole program. First there was the $3 billion individual income-tax reduction that was permitted to go into effect on January 1 of last year. There was the $2 billion reduction in the excess-profits tax that was permitted to go into effect on January 1. There was the $1 billion reduction in excise taxes approved the early part of the year and which benefited the individual taxpayer. Then, Mr. Chairman, came the general tax-revision bill.

Let us look at this one bill that the Democrats want to concentrate on. This was a tax reform that cost about $1.2 billion, $827 million of that went to individuals and only $536 million went to corporations. Here is a breakdown of the relief granted under that law:

TABLE B.—*The revenue effects of H. R. 8300 for the fiscal year 1955*

[Millions of dollars]

	Estimated revenue loss or gain (+)
Individuals:	
Head of family:	
Full split income for 2 years after death of spouse and ½ split income for taxpayers who support parents regardless of their place of abode	11
Dividends received:	
Exclusion:	
$50 in 1954 and subsequent years	46
Tax credit:	
4 percent of taxable dividends received after July 31, 1954	158
Total, dividends received	204
Taxation of annuities on life expectancy	10
Deduction for dependents regardless of earnings	75
Dependent deduction for members of taxpayer's household who meet the support test	10
Retirement income credit	141
Deduction of interest charge on installment contracts	10
Medical expense deduction:	
Increase in maximum limitation	10
Reduction in exclusion from 5 to 3 percent	115
Limitations on drugs and medicines to excess of 1 percent of adjusted gross income	+45
Total, medical expense deduction	80
Child care deduction	130
Exemption for distributable trusts (increased from $100 to $300)	3
Premium payment test on life insurance	25
Increase charitable contribution limitation from 20 to 30 percent	25
Deduction for soil and water conservation expenditures	10
Depreciation	73
Partnerships and proprietorships taxed as corporations	20
Effect on individuals	827
Corporations:	
Natural resources: [1]	
Depletion	[2] 34
Total, natural resources	34
Foreign income:	
Removal of overall limitation on foreign tax credit	2
Total, foreign income	2

[1] A small part of this estimate applies to individuals but cannot be clearly segregated.

[2] Excludes estimate for uranium, thorium, and vanadium. Data confidential.

TABLE B.—*The revenue effects of H. R. 8300 for the fiscal year 1955*—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	Estimated revenue loss or gain (+)
Corporations—Continued	
Depreciation:	
Allow declining balance at 200 percent of straight line	300
Restrict declining balance to assets with useful life of 3 or more years	+9
Total, depreciation	291
Net operating loss:	
Extend carryback to 2 years	90
Adjustments for dividends received and depletion	30
Total, net operating loss	120
Removal of 2-percent surtax on consolidated return of regulated public utilities	35
Tax on earnings improperly accumulated	10
Continuation of 26-percent capital-gains rate to Apr. 1, 1955	+9
Accounting provisions	47
Declarations and payment of estimated tax	([3])
Alcohol, distilled spirits strip stamps	6
Effect on corporations, exclusive of rate extension	536
Extension of 52-percent corporate rate	+1,200
Grand total	163

[3] No revenue effect in fiscal year 1955.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

I think the record is pretty clear, Mr. Chairman, as to who actually has done something for the little fellow and who has been fairer in the distribution of tax relief. I do not think anybody is going to be fooled. The people of this country are honest and they want honest facts.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the 1954 tax bill carried tax reductions aggregating $7.4 billion annually. The so-called little people, those under $5,000 in the tax brackets, received 23 percent. The big ones and the corporations received 77 percent of that reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in a balanced budget. I have always voted that way and expect to continue to vote that way. That is the way I voted last year. We could have very easily balanced the budget last year. There was no reason why we should not, but we did not. It poses this question as to whether or not the deficit was premeditated for the purpose of having an excuse to vote against a bill like this that would help the small-income taxpayers.

I doubt that there is an effort made to completely balance the budget. I do not think that effort is being made by the experts in charge of fiscal policy and debt management of our Government. They do not want the budget balanced. They want to use it for an excuse. They are not trying to reduce the national debt. They are making it bigger.

What are all these commissions doing like the ones for schools and roads?

Trying to create more debt paper, high interest, tax-exempt paper, for bankers and investment bankers to put their money in, some of it manufactured money on the Nation's credit, just for that purpose, to buy United States bonds with. If they wanted to balance the budget, why did they issue bonds drawing 3¼ percent when they did not even need the money and when they could have gotten that money for much less than 3¼ percent? Why did they deliberately increase the cost of carrying our national debt if they wanted to balance the budget? Why did they put out 3-percent bonds and exchange them for 2⅞-percent bonds and deliberately increase the interest rate and deliberately increase the cost of servicing our national debt if they wanted to balance the budget? It is all done for an excuse against a policy like this that helps the little people.

TRICKLE-DOWN THEORY

Now, if I believed in the trickle-down theory, I would vote for this amendment, because it is the first time since I have been in Congress that there has been a definite, positive vote on the trickle-down theory. A vote for this amendment is a vote for the trickle-down theory. A vote against this amendment is a vote against the trickle-down theory. Now, personally I am not for the trickle-down theory. It has brought our country to the brink of ruin before, and it will bring our country to devastation and destruction again if we follow it. It is a policy of not paying any debts, creating more debts, high interest rates, greater costs for carrying the national debt and favor big business, big banks, and the big rich. That is not in the direction of a balanced budget. That is the trickle-down theory, to let the big people have it in the hope that it will trickle down, percolate down to the masses. But it did not do so in the past and it will not do so again. It is like trying to fatten the entire herd of cattle by merely feeding the bull.

In the bill last year there was $2 billions savings on excess-profits taxes. Where did that money go? Into the profits of the corporations. That is where it went.

Did they reduce prices? Not 1 penny did they reduce prices. They said they would but they did not. Therefore they are collecting from the consumers of this country in higher prices money that they use for expansion, capital for expansion, relieving them of the necessity of borrowing money.

That is the reason why people who have savings are unable to invest them now and are running into the stock market and bidding up existing securities; just because of this trickle-down theory, putting the money in at the top. That is the cause of it. It will not help our country. It will harm our country.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, out in Nevada last week, the first of a series of new nuclear fission explosions took place, but the continuation of experiments in this line had been indefinitely postponed due to atmospheric conditions. However, in Washington on Saturday morning, believing that the political winds were blowing in the right direction, there came a bombshell dropped by the House Democratic leadership, unannounced, unprecedented, determining that an exemption to all taxpayers should be decreed, in spite of all budgetary considerations and in spite of the fact that no appropriation for any Government Department had been brought to the floor for consideration, thus far in the 84th Congress.

And, our Committee on Ways and Means was summoned into extraordinary executive session on Monday morning to hear the one and only witness, Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, who was recalled from a Chicago meeting, to testify on the proposal—not as originally requested by the administration to extend the excise taxes as is, without variation as contained in H. R. 4201—but to be confronted with this mushroomed political appendage.

Some of my committee colleagues have termed the gesture fiscally irresponsible, and I cannot disagree. This contemplated action will definitely affect existing administrative policies tending toward a sound and stabilized dollar. The new suggestion, I believe, rudely and abruptly intercepts this sound fiscal approach with this untimely and premature political lure.

At this particular time—uncertain and conjectural as are the requirements of defense and all governmental functions—our friends on our right have the audacity to promise tax relief 10 months hence. They propose to put it on the statute books now at a time when we prayfully hope an unequalled holocaust in world's history may not explode in the Formosa Straits where the tension is at its bursting point.

I intend to support our President in helping to balance the budget and bring about a sound tax policy. I want to help him to increase fiscal stability and decrease deficit financing. I support the motion to strike by Mr. REED.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to read a telegram that I just received from the American Farm Bureau Federation. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 24, 1955.*
Hon. LEO E. ALLEN,
House Office Building:

Based on AFBF resolutions adopted by voting delegates of member State farm bureaus and in view of present fiscal situation, we are opposed to any reduction in personal income tax at this time.

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on January 28, 1948, when H. R. 4790, a tax-reduction bill, was up in the 80th Congress, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] said:

The excuse generally offered by those who would keep taxes on wage earners at the present high level is that an income-tax reduction would contribute to an inflationary spiral. * * * It is these huge spending programs which are inflationary * * * and not an income-tax reduction.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in connection with H. R. 1 of the 80th Congress, said:

What are we now facing? We face a situation under which I think we must all recognize that the value of the dollar can be maintained only by the maintenance of a strong, functioning, productive economy. Certainly tax relief is now necessary if such a functioning economy is to be maintained in this country.

It seems to me that that same argument would apply to the low-income tax groups. I have some quotations here, along the same line, made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] in which he said as follows:

We are releasing the $3.8 billion which can be properly called an increase in the pay of the people who earned that income, or you can put it another way and say that much of it is going to be released as venture capital, it is going into industry, it is going to create more payrolls and payrolls will create more revenue to the Government and the income from more property will be available to be taxed. That is the reasons we are going to get more revenue from tax reduction.

Speaking frankly, I would say if I were new in the Congress and had not been here at the time taxes were cut in the twenties, and the same arguments had been put out against reducing taxes and the same forces had been at work as are at work here trying to frighten the people and frighten the Congress, I might have felt some hesitation. But after the experience of the twenties, I feel no hesitation in cutting taxes now. * * * What we do here means everything in maintaining the liberty of the citizens under a free-enterprise system. We have to keep in mind what these high taxes can mean to the Government because it has been said, and truly said, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 26, 1947, vol. 93, pt. 2, 80th Cong., 1st sess., p. 2656, debate on H. R. 1.)

Following the war (World War I) we were faced with a tremendous debt. * * * People had the highest taxes they had ever had in the history of the country at that time. I heard the same arguments then when it was proposed to reduce taxes. * * * In spite of the lugubrious howls that went up * * * we received more revenue as a result of the reduction in the tax. Then, we started to pay on the national debt. We reduced taxes again and more revenue came in and we did that four straight times. Each year for 10 straight years we reduced the national debt by $1 billion (p. 702).

It seems apparent to me that greater production is the key to the solution of our present inflationary problem. This greater production can be supplied by increasing the productivity of labor, by stimulating the incentive to break the bottlenecks which are stopping the flowing of industrial products. * * * The present wartime tax rates are not designed to provide these necessary incentives to produce. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 28, 1948, vol. 94, pt. 1, 80th Cong., 2d sess., p. 703, debate on H. R. 4790.)

Also I have here a copy of the New York Times of Tuesday, February 22, 1955. This is what it says:

Dupont earnings rose 48.4 percent in 1954.
Douglas Aircraft profits rocket 94 percent in 1954.

We have no renegotiation act in effect at the present time. None has been recommended by the Eisenhower administration. Their profits increased in 1 year from $18,586,000 to $36,156,000.

Also:

Eastman's profit rises 39 percent in year.

And yet when it comes to a $20 tax credit which benefits the lower-income tax groups it is inflationary, it is dangerous, it is politics, it should not be done.

Now let us examine what the Republican majority on the Ways and Means Committee had to say in their committee reports in the 80th Congress about tax reduction.

House Report No. 180 on H. R. 1, 80th Congress, 1st session:

The severity of existing taxes makes them a real threat to the initiative and new investment essential to a high level of employment.

Your committee believes that the bill is economically desirable both because it stimulates investment and managerial incentives and increases consumer purchasing power. The stimulus to venture capital and managerial initiative provided by the bill can best be seen by examining the proposed reduction. * * *

Individuals in these income classes [under $5,000] control about 80 percent of consumer purchasing power of the Nation.

The added spendable income in the hands of the consumer, and incentives for business expansion which this bill provides not only are important from a long-run point of view but also as counteractives if the recession, so frequently forecast by businessmen and Government officials, should occur. * * * If such a recession should take place, it is important that the tax reductions be made now, since a considerable period must elapse before these tax-reduction measures achieve their full economic effects.

House Report No. 1274 on H. R. 4790, 80th Congress, 2d session:

H. R. 4790 provides tax reduction, relief, and equalization. It reduces * * * the individual income tax. These rates were a product of wartime conditions, and constitute a serious obstacle to the increase in production needed to relieve current inflationary pressures. The reduction of these rates also is essential to the long-run improvement in the American standard of living.

* * * * *

By lowering tax rates * * * your committee's bill will increase the incentives of labor and management to produce and will increase investors' willingness to assume business risks.

The foregoing are Republican words that were totally inconsistent with Republican action in the 80th Congress.

Any time anyone takes this floor and speaks for the average person of America, he is accused of being a demagog, playing politics, or being a Socialist or something else.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] in his remarks said:

The present administration believes in action and not unfulfilled promises.

I am sure the gentleman must think we have a forgetful memory. Do I remember hearing something about the great crusade? Where is that now?

Do I remember hearing some promise made about the liberation of enslaved peoples? Where is that? Not only broken but forgotten.

Do I remember hearing something about the promise of massive and instant retaliation? Where is that promise? Not only broken but forgotten.

Do I remember hearing something about unleashing Chiang Kai-shek? Where is that promise? He has been releashed, not released—releashed, his hands tied, the promise not only broken but forgotten.

Do I remember hearing something about cooperative peace? Not only broken but forgotten.

Do I remember hearing something about the promise of peaceful coexistence? I was never for it but the present administration had plenty to say about it.

Do I remember hearing something about the promise of the new military look? Where is it? Not only broken but forgotten.

Do I remember hearing something about the promise of a balanced budget? That promise was definitely made. No matter how much some of my Republican friends—you note I say "some of my Republican friends"—might talk to the contrary, they cannot forget the fact that those promises were made.

Yet my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has the audacity to take the floor and make the statement that the present administration "believes in action and not unfulfilled promises." The record is one of broken promises.

Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of H. R. 8300 in the 83d Congress, the Democratic Members of the House made many unsuccessful efforts to obtain satisfactory revenue loss estimates. The Department of the Treasury seemed very reluctant to make such data available.

I have had such data prepared and I submit it for the RECORD at this time so that the Members of the House can be informed about what Republican tax relief did for the small income taxpayers.

I recognize the fact that these figures may not be 100 percent accurate but they are substantially correct and should be available to the House membership pending the release of Treasury data.

REVENUE LOSS UNDER INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The following factual analysis is designed primarily to show who benefits—and by how much—from the compromise tax bill approved by the conference committee—based primarily on recommendations of the Eisenhower administration.

In considering this analysis, two facts should be kept in mind: (1) only 20 percent of all taxpayers have incomes of over $5,000 a year; (2) most of the 80 percent of taxpayers with incomes of under $5,000 got little or no relief from the individual income tax reductions of last January 1, when coupled with the social security tax increase. (A family of 4 earning less than $3,500 actually suffered a tax increase on January 1.)

Summary table

	Total annual tax relief (in millions)				
	Fiscal year 1955			Full effect	
	Percent of all taxpayers	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount
Corporations	------	39.0	[1] $530	73.0	[2] $2,439
Taxpayers over $5,000	20	38.0	516	18.0	601
Total, corporations plus taxpayers over $5,000	------	77.0	1,046	91.0	3,040
Taxpayers under $5,000	80	23.0	311	9.0	311
Grand total	------	100.0	1,357	[3] 100.0	3,351

[1] Does not include the temporary continuation of present corporation tax rates.

[2] Includes maximum annual revenue loss of $2.2 billion (reached in 1960) from new depreciation method (assuming that present rates of taxation and capital investment remain the same) according to estimates of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

[3] Does not include $6 million revenue loss from alcohol "strip stamps."

Attached is detailed list of the items in this bill on which this summary is based.

NOTE.—A table showing the benefits to corporation shareholders under the compromise "dividend tax credit" provision is attached.

I. Who gets how much tax relief from the Republican tax bill

A. PROVISIONS WHICH WILL BENEFIT THE 80 PERCENT OF TAXPAYERS WITH INCOMES OF LESS THAN $5,000 (AS WELL AS THOSE WITH HIGHER INCOMES)

Provision	Comment	Total annual tax relief (in millions)	
		Fiscal year 1955	Full effect
Exemption for foster children		$10	$10
Taxation of annuities		10	10
Tax credit on $1,200 of retirement income		141	141
Child care deduction	This will allow a deduction of only a week for a working mother, regardless of how many children she has.[1]	130	130
Deduction of interest charges on installment buying	This benefits only those who itemize their deductions instead of taking standard 10-percent deduction. Only 19 percent of the under $5,000 group itemize.[1]	10	10
Soil and water conservation expenditures		10	10
Total relief for primary benefit of under $5,000 group		311	311
Percent of total gross tax relief in this bill [2]		23	9

[1] When a similar provision was included in the House bill in 1948, there was an estimated loss of $100 million. (See H. Rept. 2087, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

[2] This is a percentage of all the tax reductions made in this bill, all of which are permanent. This does not include the extension of the present corporation tax rate, which is simply a 1-year proposition, and which will net $1,200 million in fiscal year 1955.

I. Who gets how much tax relief from the Republican tax bill—Continued

B. PROVISIONS WHICH WILL PRIMARILY BENEFIT THE 20 PERCENT OF TAXPAYERS WITH INCOMES OVER $5,000

Provision	Comment	Total annual tax relief (in millions)	
		Fiscal year 1955	Full effect
Dividend tax credit	92 percent of all families own no corporation stock; those with incomes under $5,000 receive only 11 percent of all dividend income; 4 percent of all taxpayers get 76 percent of all dividend income; 9/10 of 1 percent of all taxpayers get 55 percent of all dividend income.[1]	$204	$362
Full split-income benefits for "head of household" [2]	A head of household with 1 dependent earning less than $3,555 gets no benefits whatever from this provision, and earning $5,000 gets only $13 benefit.	11	11
Exemption for dependents under 19 or students, regardless of their earnings.	This will primarily benefit families who are able to send their children to college.	75	75
Medical expense deductions	This benefits only those who itemize their deductions instead of taking standard 10-percent deduction. Only 19 percent of the under $5,000 group itemize.	80	80
Personal exemptions for trusts raised from $100 to $300	Very few, if any, taxpayers with incomes under $5,000 put their property in "trusts."	3	3
Premium test on life insurance in estate taxation	Estate taxes only apply to people leaving estates of over $60,000	25	[1] 25
Increase in charitable contribution limit from 20 percent to 30 percent.	Very few taxpayers, if any, with incomes under $5,000 can afford to give 20 percent (much less 30 percent) of their incomes to charity.	25	25
Depreciation under the new "declining balance" method	This will primarily benefit partnerships and unincorporated businesses, although such people as farmers will be eligible for its benefits.	73	(4)
Taxing partnerships and proprietorships as corporations		20	[5] 20
Total relief for the primary benefit of the over $5,000 group		516	601
Percent of total gross tax relief in this bill		38	18

C. PROVISIONS WHICH WILL BENEFIT CORPORATIONS

Depreciation (under the new "declining balance" method)		$291	[6] $2,200
Natural resources (percentage depletion)		34	34
Net operating loss		120	120
Other		85	85
Total relief for the primary benefit of corporations		530	2,439
Percent of total gross tax relief in this bill		39	73

[1] When a similar provision was included in the House bill in 1948, there was an estimated loss of $100 million. (See H. Rept. 2087, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

[2] This provision can only be applied to the 2 years following the death of the father or mother where there are children in the family.

[4] The maximum revenue loss from the new depreciation provision for both corporations and "individuals" ($2.2 billion in 1960) is shown under corporations. No estimate is available as to how much of this $2.2 billion benefit goes to "individuals."

[5] This is probably a conservative figure, since businesses unable to make the necessary reorganization during fiscal year 1955 will be able to do so in subsequent years and thus benefit by this provision.

[6] Estimated by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to be the maximum revenue loss, reached in 1960 (assuming that present rates of taxation and of capital investment (replacement) remain the same). IMPORTANT NOTE.—Total loss from this provision estimated at $19 billion. (See p. B3 of the Minority Report of Committee on Ways and Means, H. Rept. 1337, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Amount of tax savings to corporation shareholders under the compromise dividend tax credit provision

Income	Married couple, 2 dependents		Tax saving	Percent increase in take-home pay
	Tax on earned income	Tax on unearned income		
$3,000	$60	$40	$20	0.7
$5,000	420	328	92	2.0
$10,000	1,372	1,099	273	3.2
$25,000	5,318	4,497	821	4.2
$50,000	15,976	14,246	1,730	5.1
$100,000	44,724	41,188	3,536	6.4
$500,000	356,956	339,009	17,947	12.5
$1,000,000	766,456	730,509	36,147	15.4

NOTE.—This gives investment income an enormous advantage over earned income, contrary to most tax philosophies and systems.

WHO GETS THE DIVIDEND INCOME?

Eighty and three-tenths percent of all taxpayers (those with incomes under $5,000) get only 10.9 percent of all dividend income.

Three and seven-tenths percent of all taxpayers (those with incomes over $10,000) get 76 percent of all dividend income.

Eight-tenths of 1 percent of all taxpayers (those with incomes over $25,000) get 55 percent of all dividends.

(Source: Statistics of Income, 1950.)

WHAT PORTION OF LOW- AND HIGH-INCOME GROUPS REPORT DIVIDEND INCOME?

Only 4.5 percent of taxpayers with incomes under $5,000 reported any dividend income at all.

Only 16.6 percent of taxpayers with incomes between $5,000 and $10,000 reported any dividend income at all.

Forty-nine and four-tenths percent of taxpayers with incomes of $10,000 to 25,000 reported dividend income.

Seventy-three and seven-tenths percent of taxpayers with incomes over $25,000 reported dividend income.

(Source: Statistics of Income, 1950.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot let pass without answer the repeated untrue charges that the last Congress did not give any tax relief for the little fellow, the low-income groups, the poor man and his family, and so on.

Why not look at the facts? Look at what we actually did.

Almost two-thirds of the tax relief, about $4.7 billion, went to individuals.

First, everybody got a 10-percent reduction. Rich or poor, every taxpayer got a 10-percent reduction of his income tax. That amounted to $3 billion savings.

Second, every person who purchases any commodity on which there is an excise tax, benefits from the reduction of such taxes by a half, in most cases. When any person buys some cosmetics, or a handbag or other luggage, or a refrigerator or other household appliance, or a movie ticket, or a bus ticket, or pays a telephone bill, that person whether a big shot or a so-called little fellow, pays only about half as much excise tax as formerly.

Those two measures gave relief to every taxpayer, and the same to the poor as to the rich.

Then we selected for special relief those who need tax relief most. Who are the people who need relief most? First, the aged. We allowed those who have pensions or retirement allowances, who have built up provision for their old age in the traditional American way and in accordance with the philosophy of self-reliance, to deduct from taxable income the first $1,200 of their retirement allowance.

Second, the ill. Those are the families that need help most. We allowed them to deduct all medical expenses above 3 percent of their income instead of 5 percent as was the case previously.

Third, those with big families and youngsters who can work and earn. Formerly, if a boy or girl went out and earned $600.01, the family lost that dependent as a $600 exemption. It was penalized because of the youth's following the normal American tradition of industry and initiative, working to make the most of himself and to help his family. We Republicans believe in the American system and want to support it, not punish those who use it and work to preserve and strengthen it. We gave tax relief to families so the grown boys and girls are encouraged to earn as much as they can without the parents being penalized by losing them as exemptions.

A fourth group was the working mothers and widows who have to pay somebody to take care of their children while they work. Why should not that expense, within limitations, be a legitimate deductible business expense? Why should they not be encouraged to do all they can to support their families rather than go on relief?

The people who need tax relief most are not those with regular jobs paying $1.25, $1.50 or $1.75 an hour, but the elderly, the ill, families with teenage youngsters, and widows and mothers who work to support their families. The Republican 83d Congress gave them relief.

That is the answer to the baseless charge that we are not concerned about "little people." Look at the record. We gave most tax relief to the people who need it most. It did not, perhaps, have

as much vote appeal as $20 to every taxpayer whether he needs it or not; but it was done because our first concern, next to the fiscal solvency of the Government, is for those citizens who are in greatest need.

Now consider the other third of the tax relief, some 2½ billions. It went to corporations—and it has been said repeatedly that this showed our first concern is for big business and not for little people. But take a good look at what we did for or to corporations. First, we kept at 52 percent instead of 47 percent, the tax rate on all corporations. We plugged more than 50 loopholes that smart corporation lawyers were able to take advantage of to get out of taxes. That action of ours was hardly partial to corporations.

The tax relief that we gave to corporations was in such items as enlarged depreciation allowances to encourage them to expand and thus make jobs.

It was not to help the corporations as such. It was to help the unemployed, that some of you last year were shouting about almost every day. The end of fighting in Korea ended millions of war jobs. Where were those discharged persons to get work? You wanted us to appropriate endless billions of more money and still more money for Government handouts. You said there was already such a terrible, terrible depression that we had to help the unemployed by direct relief right then and there.

We believe jobs in private industry are better than relief. So we gave tax reductions to corporations to expand employment. And it worked. It did encourage the corporations to expand their operations and provide jobs. As a result the predicted depression did not develop.

Mr. Chairman, there is no such thing as a job without first of all somebody putting up some money to buy a plant and buy some equipment and buy some raw materials and pay wages to workers. If private industry and corporations are not given incentive to do that with their own money, who else can provide the jobs? Only the Government through tax money. Is that what you want?

The tax relief that we provided for corporations was not as a favor to the corporations; it was as a favor to the workers—again, the so-called "little fellow."

How did it work? Well, by the end of last year our economy had already provided 62 million jobs—with peace. The highest under the previous administration was only 64 million jobs, even with a war.

Thus the record will show that we gave most tax relief for those individuals who needed it most. And the relief we gave to the corporations was primarily to help the workers by making peacetime jobs for the unemployed. I am exceedingly proud of that record. Let us be done with these baseless charges and misrepresentations.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill and opposing the Reed amendment because I believe the committee proposal will be clearly beneficial to the average American and to the economy of our whole Nation.

It may sound like an oversimplification to say that when we benefit the average American, we benefit America, but it is nevertheless true.

By permitting a tax reduction of $20 for each dependent beginning next January 1, this proposal will provide a measure of tax relief for those who need it most—for the moderate income families upon whom the weight of the Federal tax burden has begun to fall with increasing heaviness.

These are the people who pay the bulk of the excise taxes, and it seems only right that they should be relieved of part of the burden of income taxation.

A single person trying to support himself on only $25 a week is getting hardly enough on which to live. Yet, under the present law, the income tax takes a $116 annual bite out of his meager earnings. He must manage somehow on his bare subsistence to contribute the equivalent of almost 5 weeks' work to the Government. This person is entitled to the $20 in tax relief which he would receive through this measure.

A married man with a wife and child trying to establish a home on $300 a month must today hand over 1 month's paycheck for income taxes. To lighten this family's tax burden by $60 seems only just.

This bill is designed to spread its benefits among our citizens who need them most in their efforts to cope with the high cost of living.

It is designed also to strengthen the entire national economy. Allowing the average American family of 4 to keep an extra $80 of its income to spend on family needs next year should have a dynamic effect on lagging retail sales.

It would not be realistic to say that we are today in a serious depression. But neither would it be realistic to close our eyes to the danger signals which have become so clearly evident during the past 18 months.

Our gross national product declined $12 billion last year from the year before in spite a 3 million growth in population. The total number of unemployed doubled during 1954.

In a free, healthy capitalistic economy, private employment in sound business is surely preferable to public-works employment. Yet we cannot increase private employment except as we increase the production of American business.

Obviously, production can enjoy no continuing increase except as consumption increases.

And what better way could we find to influence greater consumption of goods on the part of the American public than by permitting the average American to retain more purchasing power?

Spending power is the oil that lubricates the machinery of prosperity.

This bill would unleash approximately $2 billion of dynamic buying power among people who will keep it circulating in the bloodstream of our commercial life, mostly among people required by necessity to spend all of their available resources upon consumer goods, enhancing their modest standard of living and facilitating the free flow of commerce.

The measure has been criticized on the grounds that it will exempt numbers of people of any income-tax burden. Let us see just who it will exempt.

It will exempt the fellow who is earning only $700 a year, just $58 a month, out of which he is now expected to eke out income-tax payments.

It will exempt the married couple trying to struggle along on $119 monthly, out of which they must presently save up $40 for income taxes.

These people will still contribute appreciably to our Government through their payment of excise and other consumer taxes. To relieve such hard-pressed citizens of this additional burden cannot be dangerous.

Since there has been so much talk of fiscal irresponsibility on the floor of this House by the critics of this tax-relief proposal for the average American, I think it is necessary that several facts be pointed out:

First. Tax receipts for fiscal 1956, even with this moderate tax cut, will still be more than a billion dollars greater than we are receiving in fiscal 1955.

Second. Most of the very people who are today objecting most strenuously to this $2-billion tax reduction were beating the drums a year ago for the $7.4-billion tax cut they succeeded in putting into effect. Only two Republicans in the House voted against a $5-billion tax cut in 1948, and a vast majority supported the still larger one last year.

Third. If it was sound fiscal policy last year, when the President had already forecast a larger deficit than he has this year, to approve twice as costly a cut for the principal benefit of higher income taxpayers, then it cannot be fiscal irresponsibility this year, in face of a smaller deficit, to provide less than half as big a cut for the benefit of moderate income taxpayers.

Fourth. The President himself said only last month in his budget message to Congress that he expected further tax reduction to be "justified next year, to spread the relief fairly among all taxpayers." This bill, scheduled to take effect next year, should make a reality out of the hope he expressed.

Fifth. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who now objects so vociferously to this measure, has said on so many occasions, tax-reduction bills do not necessarily result in decreased revenues. Speaking to this House on April 13 of 1953, he said a personal income-tax reduction of 11 percent "will not hurt the Treasury one iota, or prevent us from having a balanced budget."

On January 29, 1948, he told of cutting taxes in the 1920's and said:

> We received more revenue as a result of the reduction in the tax. We reduced taxes again and more revenue came in, and we did that four times.

Sixth. In all honesty, however, I think we must assume that this reduction will diminish Treasury income by the expected $2 billion. This gives us a full year to scale down appropriations accordingly.

There are many who believe that foreign-aid payments may be safely reduced as result of the 3-year extension of

reciprocal trade and the lowering of tariffs on goods from friendly nations.

As a member of the Public Works Committee, I am convinced that some substantial economies can be made in trimming down the administration's ambitious $27 billion highway plan which would cost an additional $11.5 billion in interest over the next 30 years.

These and other savings could easily balance off the $2 billion tax reduction proposed for the average American.

Seventh. By planning a full year ahead, we shall have ample time to review what we have done if in the light of any new emergency it should prove unworkable.

In face of these facts, I think it ill-behooves many of the opponents of this measure to wrap the cloak of self-righteous sanctimony about themselves with their shrill cries of demagogery and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let us face the issue squarely: Last year tax relief was provided to help mainly the larger income taxpayer and dividend earner. Whether it was then justified I cannot say, for I was not a Member of that Congress.

The two questions we now face are these:

First. Do we wish to equalize that tax relief by distributing similar benefits among the great mass of average Americans of moderate income and thus counteract the trends of decreased buying, slackening production, and rising unemployment?

Second. Are we prepared to make an honest effort to hold Federal expenditures down to the essential levels in order that this may be accomplished next year without adding further to the deficit?

Personally, I think both questions can be answered affirmatively. And for these reasons I shall support this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Christian Science Monitor, Thursday edition, suggests this particular debate be conducted in terms of political economy. The gentleman from Louisiana has made, I think, a very important point with reference to all of the statements assailing and impugning the motives of Democrats or anyone who supports this particular measure.

I would like to discuss some of the economic questions which I think are important on this debate. The Republicans have charged that this action will be inflationary. I suggest that they compare economic conditions today with the economic conditions which existed in January 1953 when, under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], they attempted to advance the effective date of the 10-percent reduction in income taxes scheduled for January 1954. At that time there was definite indication of inflation. The Federal debt was increasing—the cost of living was rising. Despite the evidence of inflation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] proposed that we advance the date at which these tax reductions should go into effect. An important tax cut was made in the last Congress despite the fact that the administration anticipated making a request for authority to increase the public debt by 15 billion.

Let us take a look at the effect of the tax reduction of last year. There is no question but what it was intended to help industry, to stimulate investment. Republicans made an economic argument for their action. Let us look at the record of what has happened since that bill was adopted.

Investment in new plant and equipment declined by 2 billion in 1954. Gross national products declined by approximately $8 billion. Unemployment was nearly twice as high in 1954 as in 1953.

The Secretary of the Treasury has stated his opinion that there is an unsound inflationary factor working in the stock market. I suggest that the explanation of that unsoundness, since corporate earnings have declined and since there is little prospect of inflation, is the tax and fiscal policy which has been pursued by Congress and the administration. Tax action which will restore the balance between consumer demand and the potential of our economy to supply that demand is necessary. The administration has expressed great concern about the lack of balance in the Federal budget. In the short hearings which we held on this bill—and this is material which I am sure would have been brought out in public hearings—the specific question was asked of the Secretary of the Treasury as to whether he would prefer to have the Congress, if it persisted in making this tax cut, at the same time take action to provide for increased revenue through such measures as repealing the present dividend exemption provision of the law or simply to make this cut. The Secretary said that he would rather have a greater deficit than to have funds replaced through repeal of the dividend exemption.

I suggest that that was the time to speak up about inflation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all pro forma amendments close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes for the gentleman from Massachusetts, and 5 minutes on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GAVIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, there is little new that can be said upon this proposal. It has been thoroughly debated yesterday and today. Frankly, I believe that everybody's mind is made up, and few votes could be changed by talk at this time. However, I do wish to express a few thoughts.

This tax proposal has been thoroughly debated and clearly understood throughout the country. I hold in my hand a sheaf of editorial comment from newspapers. May I say that invariably, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the newspapers of this country are opposed to tax reduction at this time. They believe it is poor timing and not in the best interests of the country.

No one would say that all the newspapers can be wrong. I believe they are correct in their appraisal of the bill and the injury passage at this time threatens to do to our economy.

There has been some talk relative to the position of the President of the United States. I shall read two statements which I believe make crystal clear his position on this bill and upon tax reduction in general. This statement was made in his state of the Union address on January 6 of this year:

> Last year we had a large tax cut and, for the first time in 75 years a basic revision of tax laws. It is now clear that defense and other essential Government costs must remain at a level precluding further tax reductions this year. Although excise and corporation income taxes must, therefore, be continued at their present rates, further tax cuts will be possible when justified by lower expenditures and by revenue increases arising from the Nation's economic growth. I am hopeful that such reductions can be made next year.

On the 17th of January in his budget message he made this statement:

> We must always make adequate provision for our security and other essential services, and further tax reductions can only be made as savings in governmental expenditures or increased revenues resulting from growth in our economy are in sight.
>
> However, further tax reduction remains a firm goal of this administration, and our policy is directed to achieving both the savings in expenditures and the economic growth that will make such reductions possible.

These statements are the official views of the President.

It is clear from these statements that further tax reduction must be based on further improvement of the fiscal situation. The budget reported that there would be a $2,400,000,000 deficit this year. Obviously working for a balanced budget this deficit would not permit the attempted reduction, without presenting a serious threat.

Personally I believe the best way to put this country in a position where tax reductions will be possible will be for the Congress to economize and bring the budget into balance. If the people of the country knew we were determined to do that, there would be such confidence and stimulation of industry that increased revenues plus our savings would bring about a balanced budget and make a tax cut possible. This would be a welcome signal for everybody—the businessman and the worker alike. It would stimulate the good times we all want.

Whether a man receives tax relief to the extent of $20, $30, or $50, whatever the amount may be set does him no good if he does not have a job. It could be a positive ill if our action would put the budget out of balance, and cause an inflation of prices. It would not take much of an increased cost of living to erase the meager tax relief and it would press heavily upon the lower group, who are not paying any taxes at all.

No; I think we have got to be sensible. There is no real reason to be stampeded

into action today. You have a Democratic Congress, you have a Democratic Ways and Means Committee. You can institute legislation at any time. Let us wait until the appropriation bills are out of the way; then we can see more clearly what the fiscal situation is. Then as sensible legislators, fully conscious of our obligations not only to our party but to the country we can act more wisely. In these days when war and peace hang in the balance we must proceed cautiously.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should hesitate about going ahead with tax reduction regardless of what the economic situation might be at home or what we may face abroad. As long as we have this Soviet threat we have got to keep our forces armed to the teeth in order that we can protect ourselves. That is going to cost money; a lot of money, and I cannot believe any sizable group in our country is opposed to making some contribution to the support of our country.

The average American citizen is proud of his country and is appreciative of what the country means to him. He wants to help pay for the cost of defense.

So my friends, let us cut down the cost of Government; let us through our savings demonstrate we can balance the budget and permit of savings that will make possible tax reduction. Then we can have the reductions we all seek without jeopardizing our country with rising debts, unbalanced budgets and dreaded inflation. When the trade bill was before the House there was considerable inquiry from the Democratic side as to how the President stands. Perhaps some of you are still interested, particularly those who in the last election promised to stand by Eisenhower and this enhanced their prospects of victory. The President is absolutely opposed to tax reduction at this time. He considers it injurious and a blow to his efforts to hold a prosperity based on peace. I hope the Reed amendment will be adopted and tax reduction be deferred.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request that all debate on the pending amendment and all pro forma amendments thereto close in not to exceed 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the merits of this provision in the bill or into the merits of the amendment to strike it from the bill because it has been thoroughly discussed by Members on both sides of the aisle who are more capable of discussing the technicalities of the tax bill than I am.

During all of my service in this House—and I do not intend to lecture anyone—I said one sharp thing to a Member of Congress that I allowed to stay in the RECORD and I have been ashamed of that ever since.

Now, argument is one thing and accusations are another. I have heard from those on my left, some of them pretty prominent in the Republican Party, statements here that grieved me very much. We are considering a great question where arguments should be put forth to try to influence the votes of the Members of this Chamber on both sides of the aisle. I heard the word "blackjacking"; I heard the phrase "shoddy deal" used; I heard the word "irresponsible"; and I heard the words "buying votes."

I would be very much ashamed to serve in any body, especially this one, where we have people indulging in shoddy deals. I would not accuse any Member of this House or anyone who ever served in this House of being engaged in a shoddy deal or in blackjacking.

Irresponsibility? Who here does not feel responsibility, not only to his constituents, his State, his country, and the world in the position in which we stand—in the position in which we find all of the democracies of the world today—threatened more than they have ever been since Vally Forge, or, in my opinion, since civilization came to this earth.

I am going to vote against this amendment to strike the so-called $20 provision out of the bill, and I am in no shoddy deal. I am not trying to blackjack anybody and I am not trying to buy any votes, and you who have made those statements will live to regret it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, almost am I so highly elated, so deeply grieved, by the just finished masterly oration of our Speaker, whom we all honor and respect, that I have difficulty in speaking. Elated because I was privileged as a Member of this House to listen to his wisdom and his oratory; grieved because he seemed to feel that he and some of his Democratic colleagues had been accused of blackjacking the President; of supporting or opposing legislation because of political motives; of entering into "shoddy deals."

The Speaker vehemently asserted—at least, as I recall his talk—that he was not blackjacking anyone; that he had not entered into any "shoddy deal" in connection with this or any other legislation.

As a pinch-hitter the Speaker never fails to deliver.

Now, while there may, during the debate of yesterday, or even today, have been some intimation or even charges that the position of some Members of the House was influenced by political considerations, certainly I have not made any such charge. We all know that political considerations never influence the casting of our votes.

While it has not been my privilege to serve in this House for any forty-odd years, as has the Speaker, I have been here long enough to have heard pleas similar to the one the Speaker just made, made from the well of the House on more than one occasion. And, may I add, for a similar purpose.

Efforts such as he just made but call to mind, when, years long gone by, as an attorney I listened to opposing attorneys—who desired to distract attention from the real issue—charge me with misstating the facts, beclouding the issue, or making unfair charges against their client or against their methods.

In short, when there was no real merit to the defense which they were able to devise, they sometimes claimed that they had been unjustly accused of wrongful conduct.

The Speaker, familiar with House debate, should not be, and I am sure is not, too deeply grieved by any unfounded charges which have been made.

Under our system of government and under our practice, everyone has the right to his own opinion. He also has the right, if opportunity offers, to express that opinion.

For myself, permit me to add that, while I frequently cannot accept the judgment of even the majority of the Members of the House, never have I thought, much less charged, that any Member entertained improper motives which influenced either his judgment or the casting of his vote.

It is doubtful if anyone would even suggest that members of the Democratic Party, by the position they have taken on this exemption, are seeking to buy votes.

Permit me to remind my Republican colleagues that our worthy opponents, who—our great President just reminded us—are not our enemies, are far shrewder politically than are we.

If their attitude on this bill as written was motivated by a desire to buy votes, instead of bringing in a little, petty $20 exemption for members of a certain group who, under the present law, are required to pay an income tax, they would have come in with a legislative proposal to give every voter, whether his income required him to file an income-tax return or whether it did not, either a straight $20 exemption or, if he was not required to file an income tax return, a $20 payment for himself, each and all of his dependents, all of his offspring.

That is what the leaders of any group influenced solely by vote-getting ideas would, or at least might, have done, if their purpose was to buy votes.

No, I doubt if any Member of this House would seriously charge our Democratic friends and opponents with an attempt to buy votes.

Permit a repetition. If their sole purpose was to buy votes, they would come along—and they have the votes—with a proposition far more attractive—and this is really an attractive one—far broader than the present bill.

More than once it has been my privilege to see the Speaker—again let me emphasize the point—whom we all honor and respect, come down into the well of the House, use his great ability; unconsciously throw into the scale the prestige that his high office gives him, and make his plea for support of a specific legislative proposal.

Never, of course, never has he gone on the floor of the House—certainly he did

not today—with the idea of buying votes; of "blackjacking" anyone; of carrying out any "shoddy deal." Of course not.

Certainly, the Speaker had no intention; assuredly he made no effort, to intimidate anyone.

Nor, in my opinion, did he at any time even intimate that any political advantage would accrue to the Democratic Party because of its present opposition to the administration's position on this bill. Perish the thought that today—February 25, 1955—our Democratic friends are looking forward to the political campaign of 1956. How absurd that thought would be. Have they not many times announced their support of "Ike."

The Speaker just gave his colleagues on the Democratic side the benefit of his wisdom. Beyond question, because of his long experience in the House, his familiarity with legislation, past and present; his opinion has weight equal—yes, superior—to that of a mere party leader who on occasion can crack a disciplinary whip over the average Member.

I place no credence whatsoever in the recent newspaper report that, at a breakfast attended by some of the younger Members on the Democratic side, the Speaker made the statement, in substance, that, if a Member wanted to get on, he should go along. That, in my judgment, was just some newspaper story.

My reaction, as our honorable and honored Speaker gave us the benefit of his views, was that, because of his wide knowledge of legislation generally and of the present financial situation in which we find ourselves, he was just advising us as to how each of us should cast his vote.

In his remarks, there was no cracking of the party whip; there was not the slightest hint of intimidation. He seemed to feel greatly and unjustly hurt, grieved, and abused because some thoughtless individual—perhaps some Member of the House— during the debate on this measure had so far forgotten himself as to suggest that political considerations either had influenced or might influence, a Member in casting his vote.

There was no hint of the purchasing of votes in our Speaker's remarks. No. No. He was just enlightening the Members of the House, and especially those on the Democratic side, as to the manner in which they could best discharge their duty to the people of thir districts; to the Nation as a whole.

Permit me to say just one thing about this bill. By and large, those who are supporting this provision which would exempt a certain group of taxpayers are the same individuals who consistently for the last 10 years, if they have been here that long, or for 20 years if they have been here that long have gone along and voted for appropriation after appropriation which created the situation in which we now find ourselves and yet those same individuals who have voted for those billions upon billions of appropriations now want to deny to the present administration the opportunity to get the money to meet our obligations.

A logical conclusion which can be drawn from the position taken by the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is that, even though his party has consistently over the years advocated and voted for policies which required the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars, now, as the payment of some of our debts falls due, we should legislate in such a manner as to deny to this administration the opportunity of honorably meeting our obligations.

The gentleman's party continuously claims credit for all the benefits which have flowed from the expenditures for which they voted—expenditures which have resulted in an ever increasing national debt; with every year a higher interest payment; with every year a heavier burden on the taxpayer's shoulders. But, today, they would cut down on the revenue which is absolutely necessary if we are to meet the debt which they voluntarily and enthusiastically imposed upon us.

The very able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and the very able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] said, in effect, "Well, this is comparatively only a few million." And they are right about that, but both seem to have forgotten that old kindergarten jingle, "Little drops of water, little grains of sand," and so forth.

This is another step to increase the national debt, to further unbalance the budget, to add to the tax burden of future generations.

Yes, I am old fashioned. You can call me conservative. You can call me reactionary or whatever else you desire. I am Pensylvania Dutch, and as far as I am concerned I am going along and paying my debts as I make them. I have always hoped that I would live to see the day when the nation would at least try to follow that same policy.

At my age, I shall not, for my own personal financial advantage, pass along either to my grandchildren, my great grandchildren, and so on down the line indefiinitely, a burden which the present generation should pay.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this motion should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, recognizing the importance of the issue presently before the forum I wish to speak briefly my personal feelings in the matter.

I am 100 percent in accord with the recommendation for a $20 tax-relief credit against personal incomes for each exemption.

As regards fiscal irresponsibility, which is the tribute paid to this provision in certain circles, I should like to ask the following questions:

Is it fiscal irresponsibility to grant a tax indulgence that includes the 70 percent of our citizenry who were overlooked last year? I think not.

And is it fiscal irresponsibility to inject the purchasing power of the economy with the wherewithal for decreasing bulging inventories on our merchant's shelves? Again I would answer in the negative.

And, lastly, is it fiscal irresponsibility to legislate the wishes of the President who, in his budget message to the Congress, promised the American people:

> I shall recommend a reduction in taxes to spread the relief fairly among all taxpayers.

Does this administration mean what it says to the little fellow? Or are these empty promises—"a dream devoutedly to be wished"?

This provision, I feel certain, will take it out of the dream stage and restore it to the realm of reality where it will do the taxpayer and the economy of this country a great deal of good.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, some serious and unfair charges have been levelled against the Democrats in Congress in the last few days over this tax bill. The President is said to have described our actions as reaching the height of fiscal irresponsibility. The Secretary of the Treasury accuses us of playing politics. Democrats playing politics? Shame on them. Do not the Democrats know that only the Republicans are supposed to be politically minded?

Editorials in some of the great metropolitan newspapers have followed the same line as the President. Perhaps that is because most of these newspapers supported Mr. Eisenhower, the presidential candidate, and now support the "favor-big-business" philosophy of the Eisenhower administration.

The charges against us can be divided generally into two categories: First, that we are playing politics; and second, that we are being fiscally irresponsible.

Now let us see. As for politics, well, it no doubt is good politics to cut taxes, particularly for the man with a small income. That is precisely what we propose to do here. I would be the last to argue that this is bad politics. But let me say this—the coupon clippers got a windfall last year with the blessings of the President of the United States. Now we are going to take care of the little fellow; and if we were of a mind to give political advice to the Republicans, we might suggest they missed a good bet last year when they insisted on giving a tax break to the rich while paying little attention to the bulk of the taxpayers.

But that is not the point I want to make at this time. The point is that the President himself has said he hopes to propose further tax reductions to Congress next year. This plan put forwar l by the Democrats gives substance to the President's hope—it will provide a tax cut as of January 1, 1956, and the biggest chunk of it will go to persons whose incomes are under $5,000 a year. Did you know that 80 percent of all the taxpayers have incomes of less than $5,000 a year?

The truth of the matter is that the big Republican tax bill last year, which you fellows have bragged about so much, gave almost no consideration to small taxpayers. You left that for us. The historic Democratic position on taxes—and all other issues, for that matter—is to take care of the little fellow, the people who are the backbone of our country and who make up the vast majority of our citizens.

Now as to the contention that this $20 tax-credit idea was picked out of the air as a political gimmick—the fact of the matter is that this same idea was advanced in another body last year and was defeated by a very narrow margin. This is no new proposal. It is a renewal of one which many Members argued should have been made a part of the 1954 law. Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means proposed an increase in personal exemptions a year ago. The issue was before us then when a Republican-controlled Congress was making the largest tax cuts in history. The Republican Party had its chance then to write a tax bill for the average man. Your failure then is the reason why we are here now.

Yes; I would say there is politics involved here, good politics, in the best Democratic tradition. I hope the Democrats will never forsake this kind of politics, for I believe it to be in the best interests of the vast majority of our people.

Now as to the charge that we are being fiscally irresponsible. I would like to say, in the first place, that as far as we on the Democratic side are aware last year was the first time any administration, Republican or Democratic, ever recommended a tax-reduction program when the budget was out of balance. But the Eisenhower administration, under the guise of tax revision, got congressional approval of a tax-reduction program that lost the Treasury an estimated $1,400,000,000 in fiscal 1955 revenue. What the loss will be in 1956 and succeeding fiscal years no one knows. But we know that it will be considerable. For example, I have been informed that the new depreciation formula for business will cost the Government an estimated $20 billion in revenue in the next 15 years. That would be an average of about $1,300,000,000 a year.

It also must be kept in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the present administration sponsored its bill in a Republican-controlled Congress in a year when the estimated Federal deficit was greater than it is now. Let me give you the figures on that: the deficit for fiscal 1956 is estimated at $2,400,000,000. If this bill becomes law, the deficit will be increased by an estimated $815 million, making the total estimated deficit $3,200,000,000. This would be $1,300,000,000 less than the $4½ billion deficit for fiscal 1955, the year in which the administration saw fit to push its tax reduction program through the Congress.

We heard no outcries last year from the President or the Secretary of Treasury about financial irresponsibility. But now that the Democrats have proposed a tax reduction plan for the small taxpayer, giving him a break he failed to get from the Republicans, we hear all sorts of anguished cries. Is it that the Republicans favor tax relief only for those in the high income brackets? Or is it that they are just unhappy that the Democrats have stolen their thunder?

After all, the President has already served notice that he hopes to see taxes reduced in the election year of 1956. We are willing to go further than to express a pious hope. We propose here to make that hope a reality.

Mr. Chairman, this tax reduction plan is justified, if for no other reason, than on the basis of equality of treatment. If the corporations and the coupon clippers were entitled to the windfall they got from the Republicans last year, then the little man is entitled to the $20 reduction for himself and each of his dependents provided in this bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for whom I have great respect, make the statement a few moments ago that Mr. Truman requested a tax increase in 1948 to wipe out the deficit of $10 billion and that the Congress gave him a tax increase which reduced the deficit by only $5 billion.

He further said that the Eisenhower administration had not asked for an increase in taxes to wipe out the budget deficit.

He did not say that the Eisenhower administration has reduced the deficit by reducing and curtailing expenditures which is much better and sounder Government financing than by increasing taxes, which places the burden upon the people rather than reducing expenditures and cutting out surplus and unnecessary spending.

The gentleman from Tennessee contradicts his own logic and reason when he talks about increasing taxes to reduce the budget deficit and at the same time brings in this bill, H. R. 4259, and urges its approval, which if passed, would increase the deficit by $1 billion, increase the public debt, and depreciate the purchasing value of the dollar.

I do not think the people of the Nation are going to be fooled by such an unsound and fallacious argument and appeal to pass H. R. 4259.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, today's debate has been centered on the amendment to provide every taxpayer with a $20 tax credit commencing in 1956. I will support the measure.

The bill does not provide tax relief in the form that I would prefer it. I would rather support a bill to increase exemptions for dependents each year until the exemption allowance for the support and care of dependents would be commensurate with the costs involved.

A bill to increase exemptions would be founded on stronger principles. The present dependency exemption of $600 is a pure bit of fiction. It bears little relationship to the cost of supporting a dependent which is at least 100 percent below what it ought to be. A dependency exemption should be what it purports to be—an effort to allow a taxpayer a fair tax credit for the cost to him of a dependent's support. An exemption based upon any other consideration is unrealistic. To tell the average taxpayer today that a $600 allowance per dependent is a fair exemption is completely unreal. The purpose of the exemption is to place the taxpayer with dependents in a more competitive living position with the taxpayer lacking dependents. The wealth of the land is the people. Today's dependents are tomorrow's creators of goods, services, and enterprises.

The family is the keystone of our system of government and social life. It is only in the interests of justice that purchasing power finds its way to the family and that family units be accorded proper recognition in our tax system.

Over and beyond a proper exemption, a taxpayer should be granted a full exemption for the costs of providing hospital and medical care provided his dependents. A family should not be permitted to fall into despair because one of its members is afflicted with a dreaded and costly disease. Should we permit the high costs of illness and medical care to force one man's family to hopeless indebtedness or depressingly low standard of living? The least that can be done is to provide the taxpaying head of such an unfortunate family with fair medical and health deductions at tax time.

A taxpayer should, in addition, be allowed a full deduction for the tuition and special education costs of his dependents. It is not intended that this deduction should include board and lodging away from home—they are included in the basic exemption—but such a deduction should include laboratory and special tuition fees. In our modern educational system, these charges are steadily rising. The average parent manages to get along satisfactorily enough until his dependents commence higher education—at which point the family budget is completely undermined by the costs of education. Education for the members of his family may provide a taxpayer with some personal satisfactions—but the educational investment which he makes in a member of his family is made for all America. The benefits of education for dependents are harvested in their higher wage and income level. Everyone is benefited by the increased productivity and usefulness of an educated citizen. The taxpayer who brings about these fruitful conditions by the educational advantages which he provides for his dependents is at least entitled to a deduction for the tuition costs of the education which he has provided his dependents.

A family-tax program must, therefore, provide adequate incentives to privilege family life. Responsible family heads who assume their proper obligation of providing the necessities of life for their dependents by way of support, medical care, and education, are rendering a social service to their families which the community would have to assume if the family heads were not available for this task. It is only reasonable, therefore, that the present unbalance in tax contribution be adjusted in favor of the family taxpayer.

Exemptions must be raised to become increasingly more commensurate with

the cost of supporting dependents; full deductions must be allowed for the rising costs of medical, and hospitalization care and full deductions must be allowed for the reasonable costs of education. It is only in this way that we can effectively say as a nation that we believe in the family and family life as the most vital part of our democracy.

The $20 tax credit for each taxpayer is only a step in the right direction.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I am unequivocally in favor of this bill and will support it.

This legislation, in addition to extending for another year the existing corporate tax and certain excise-tax rates, also provides a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

The primary beneficiary of this general tax deduction is the little fellow, the low income-wage earner who needs tax relief.

As I see it, there is nothing political or irresponsible in voting for this remedial legislation. This additional tax deduction will give the American taxpayer more pocket money to spend. It will give him relief from the financial straits he finds himself in by reason of the high cost of living.

Last year, I urged the Congress to give the American taxpayer, more particularly the low-income group, some sorely needed tax relief. However, we were not much help to him.

To say that the 10-percent tax reduction, which went into effect January 1, 1954, gave the little fellow tax relief, is not correct. Because on the same date, the social-security tax increased from 1½ percent to 2 percent. The effect of this rise in our social-security tax meant a reduction in the pay checks of millions of workers in the low-income bracket even after the 10 percent income-tax relief.

To say further that the little fellow received tax relief in our excise-tax reduction bill passed last session also is incorrect. The only way he would gain the benefit of that so-called tax relief was to spend money. If he could afford to buy his wife a new fur coat or a diamond ring, or take her on a trip, then he would receive that tax benefit. But how many of these little fellows could afford to buy a fur coat, or jewelry, or even take a trip? I am sure a very insignificant number.

To say that the taxpayer received additional tax benefits by providing added dividend exemptions is also incorrect, because 90 percent of the people in my district did not benefit by this legislation.

I do not propose to be an economist or a tax expert, but our tax analysts have often said tax cuts are always followed by increased spending which, in turn, increases revenue. While it is true that this $20-tax reduction will cut Government revenue, it is also true that it will increase consumer spending. Business will be stimulated to produce more, and to employ more people. Experience shows that Canada, Australia, and other countries that have cut taxes have discovered that their Government receipts have risen.

It is about time we became realistic in our approach to the American taxpayer and in his desire to get out of the tight squeeze in which he now finds himself.

This is a just and equitable bill and deserves full support.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, after reducing budget expenses in the first year of the Eisenhower administration by about $14 billion, we continued the high excess-profit tax on big corporations, to bring in over a billion dollars a year, and we continued the general tax on corporations at 52 percent, from 1953 to 1954, to bring in more billions, and continued the excise tax for another year.

We drastically began cutting expenses and continued to build up the Federal Treasury, in the hope that we could give a tax reduction to the people for the entire calendar year of 1954.

In the transition from a hot war to a temporary peace, which greatly reduced our expenditures for war, a slight depression started in 1953, and there were dire predictions that we were headed into a dangerous depression.

The President and the Congress wisely decided that we would give the people a tax reduction for the entire calendar year of 1954, in order to keep our people employed and in an effort to stop the recession and get started on the road upward in the expansion of business, keeping our people employed as fully as possible.

We did give the people the biggest tax reduction in history—$7.4 billion. We felt that if we would allow them to keep for themselves $7.4 billion that they would spend the greater part of it in buying things that would stop the downward unemployment trend, keep more people employed, and avert a depression.

This we did, and this was responsible in beating the depression that threatened, and we started the country forward to expansion and greater prosperity. We did all of this, and reduced the deficit to the low mark of a little over $3 billion. In that same session, we continued to reduce governmental expenses, and at the same time, because of the threat of war, we continued to build up the defense of our country to where it is stronger today, in peacetime, than ever before.

After rendering this great service to 150 million people we find that in computing the budget expenses that we will have to meet for the latter part of this year and the first half of next year, that we will still not be able to completely wipe out the deficit, and it is predicted the deficit will be a little over $2 billion at the close of the coming fiscal year, ending June 30, 1956.

DIVISIONS OF BENEFITS

We gave the small income-tax payers two-thirds, or 66⅔ percent, of the $7.4 billion tax reduction.

We gave about one-third of that reduction to small business in order to encourage it to expand, and a very small part of that reduction to big business.

It has been our hope and our purpose, if we can hold down Government expenses sufficiently, to again give the people a small tax reduction beginning on January 1, 1956. We cannot be sure that such a tax reduction will be given, because we cannot be sure that war conditions will be such that we may have to spend more money than now anticipated, if we are still in great threat of war from Russia.

A GREAT RECORD

There never has been so much relief given to the ordinary and small-tax payer, and to all taxpayers before in the history of this Nation as the Eisenhower Administration has given them in 2 short years.

If the Congress, even though it has a slight Democrat majority, will cooperate with the President and this present administration, we can continue our present prosperity and by such continuance, the people will have the greatest assurance not only for jobs for our 60 million wage earners, but for the earliest tax reduction in the future.

POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Now, in the face of this record of accomplishment for all of our people, we are today faced with the Democrat leadership having introduced the bill we have before us for consideration, which is a threat to the financial solvency of our Government, which, if passed, will start inflation again, that will take billions of dollars away from all of our people and start down the purchasing power of the dollar that had been stabilized. With all of our accomplishments in the interest of the people, we have stopped the high cost of living, and for the past number of months it has been going down. As it has slowly gone down, the purchasing power of the dollar has raised a like amount.

Speaker RAYBURN and the majority leader brought this tax bill to the floor of this House, which promises to give every income taxpayer a reduction of $20 for himself and each of his dependents, without any hearings being held at all before the Ways and Means Committee. When you compare this with the months of hearings held on the tax bill last year before the Ways and Means Committee, you can understand what a dangerous political expediency move is being made by the Democrat leaders.

They are asking this Congress to pass this legislation before we know how much it is going to take to run this Government for the coming year. Nothing like this has ever happened in the history of this Congress, or this Government up to the present time.

Conditions may arise between now and next January that will force this Congress to increase the expenses and to increase the deficit that is now already in sight. If this bill is passed, it will increase the deficit immediately by $2,400,000,000. This, added to the deficit of over $2 billion that it appears we will have, could well run the deficit to $5 billion of money that we do not have in the United States Treasury. This will start the spiral of inflation again, and could cost the people that this bill is supposed to help, and the taxpayers generally, twice as many billions of dollars through inflation alone.

FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

This is why President Eisenhower said, in substance, that such a movement demonstrates fiscal irresponsibility on the part of those who are trying to put this legislation through.

It is apparent that those who have cooked up this dangerous proposal have their eye on only one thing—that is political advantage they hope it will bring to them in the campaign in 1956. They say they want to help the little fellow, who we gave a benefit in the last tax bill of a 66⅔-percent reduction.

They do not tell the wage earners and all of the people that if this legislation is passed, it will increase the cost of living through inflation, and hurt the little fellow and everyone. They do not tell the wage earners that this will bring about a condition that will make less jobs for the little fellow.

The little taxpayers, that they are talking about, are more interested in the well-paying jobs that they now have, yes, they are more interested in keeping and holding these jobs than they are in receiving a $20 tax exemption that amounts to about 37 and one-half cents a week.

WHY DO IT NOW

The administration in power has demonstrated that it will reduce taxes just as often as the financial strength of the Nation will permit. We reduced taxes when we were in power in the 80th Republican Congress, and we have done it again in the second year of the Eisenhower Republican administration.

The Democrat leaders who were in power nearly 20 years preceding, constantly raised taxes, and never reduced them, yet they have suddenly become tax conscious, looking to the election in 1956.

They propose to put this tax bill through now rather than to wait until next January to see whether or not a tax reduction can be justified in the interest of all of the people.

The President and we in this Congress are just as strongly committed and interested in giving the people a tax reduction in the next session of Congress if, in fact, we are justified in doing so. They want to impress the small-tax payers and particularly the wage earners that they are so much interested in a tax reduction bill for 1956 that they want to pass it now, nearly a year ahead and let it become operative in 1956.

In other words, President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress have managed this country so well that we have beat off a depression, business is expanding, prosperity is here in 1955, and, we hope, will be greater in 1956; and, of course, it is our intention to reduce taxes, if we can, when we learn what our financial situation is next January.

The Democrat leadership wants to make political propaganda out of jumping the gun and writing the tax bill now, without holding any hearings, which would go into effect next January 1, regardless of what conditions then exist, and regardless of whether or not such a tax bill would touch off a spiral of inflation that might help to wreck this country financially.

If this is not the height of financial irresponsibility, if this does not prove that this whole proposal is based on the cheapest sort of political advantage, then I do not know how it could be proven to the American people.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT

They talk about supporting the President. The President has declared that his entire fiscal policy is based largely upon the policies written into the tax bill in the last session of Congress. He has well pointed out the danger of this legislation. Now, when the chips are down, after all their talk in the last campaign that it was safe for the people to elect a Democrat Congress, that they would support the President, they are now in the first big test—voting for legislation that will wreck the President's and the administration's efforts to keep this country sound financially; keep all of our people employed; keep the Armed Forces of this country sufficiently strong to deter any other nation starting a war with us.

I hope that the Members of this Congress on both sides of the House will put the interest of their country first, and that they will not be swerved from that position because of any political benefit that they think might come to them by passing such a dangerous bill as the one that is before us.

Our first line of defense, our freedom ultimately, and the well-being of all of our people is dependent upon the financial solvency of this Government. We must not endanger it by approving this unreasonable and unjustifiable legislation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter this morning from Mr. George K. Kloor—a veteran of World War I—2414 Alma Street of Alexandria, La., in my district, and asked that I place this in the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN:

I am sending this note to advise you
That taxes have taken away
The things I find most essential—
My reindeer, my workshop, my sleigh;
Now I make my rounds on a donkey,
He's old and crippled and slow;
So you will know if you don't see me Christmas,
I'm out on my ass in the snow.

SANTA CLAUS.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed gratified that 9 of the 10 Members from the Virginia delegation will today stand and be counted against fiscal irresponsibility. Eight Members of this delegation, as you know, are affiliated with the Democratic Party. By their opposition to their party's leadership they are convincingly demonstrating that they refuse to play politics at the expense of the Nation's financial stability.

This is statesmanship of the highest order and the great Commonwealth of Virginia has just reason for pride. I am certain that the people who populate the Old Dominion will applaud this forthright and courageous action.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal we are considering this afternoon is patently political. It seems to me to be a deliberate attempt to purchase votes at $20 per vote. It is an irresponsible proposal that completely disregards the fiscal state of these United States. We have in the Executive Mansion today a man who is dedicated to balancing the national budget, ending inflation and providing stability for the consumer's dollar. These achievements will benefit all Americans in all income groups. The $20 sop to the voter will, if enacted by the Congress, prevent the attainment of these objectives. It will cost in lost revenue nearly $3 billion. Thus the country will be shoved $3 billion more on the deficit side of the ledger.

But there is another major objection. This reckless proposal would remove nearly 5 million people from the tax rolls. They would be relieved of paying any income tax at all. I am not one to believe that Americans in any income level are willing to shirk their responsibility of citizenship by escaping income taxes. Good Americans, regardless of how much they earn, want a part according to their ability to pay in helping their country to become strong economically and militarily in these times of grave peril. To conclude otherwise is to brand them as selfish individuals who place their own self-interest above the interest of their country. No. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe they are that selfish. I do not believe that they can be bought by a political maneuver which saves each of them only about 37 cents a week.

There is another aspect to this reckless income-tax reduction proposal. It is an aspect that the leaders on the opposite side of the aisle have kept completely quiet about. They harp on what they loosely call Republican favoritism to so-called big business. The last tax reduction—that is, the revision of the Internal Revenue Code last year—they say, was a rich man's tax measure. Of course, that is pure poppycock parroted around for political purposes.

But let us see what they are doing for big business in this measures before us today. If they are successful, they will undoubtedly kill the extension of the corporate tax at its present rate. This will come about because they know that President Eisenhower will be forced to veto their political tax scheme to prevent the loss of $3 billion. This means that the higher corporate tax rate will go too. Now, Mr. Speaker, every big business corporation in the country wants a lower corporate tax. So if the Democratic Party leaders pass this measure, knowing full well that the President will affix a veto, they will be giving big business a tremendous tax cut and it will not be the little $20 tax sop dangled before the eyes of those in the lower income brackets. It will be a big-business bonanza. And yet we hear those of the Democratic leadership speak in tearful language about the plight of the low-wage earner and about Republican tax cuts favoring big business. Whom do they think they are kidding?

Mr. Chairman, the American people are no fools, and I think they will bitterly resent the suggestion contained in this bill that they are being favored by the party which proclaims itself the champion of the little man. They know that they are being offered a pig in a

poke and they know that pig has big letters on it that spell "political." When you try to deceive them you only succeed in deceiving yourself. Make no mistake about it.

Again, let me say that the position of the Virginia delegation is a position that justifies the confidence its constituents have placed in it. My only regret is that the vote of the members of this delegation is not 10 instead of 9 against this reduction.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates and, in addition, to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

In the first place, it should be noted that it was the hope of many in this Congress that economic conditions this year, as well as budgetary requirements of the Government, would make it possible for us to dispense with and discontinue many onerous excise taxes essentially wartime or emergency in character, and thus extend a substantial modicum of long-overdue relief to many basic industries and businesses and to the American people as a whole.

It is distressing, but nevertheless a very accurate observation, that emergency taxes levied in the first instance to meet greatly augmented needs of war, defense, or related objects, tend to perpetuate themselves. During the past few years we have had striking illustrations of taxes of this type which were enacted on what was believed to be and intended to be a temporary emergency basis, being extended into periods of the national life which, while not normal by any means, are not emergent.

This has unfortunately been the case with heavy corporation and excise taxes, the first of which diverts seed capital from constructive business channels to the Government, and the second of which continues costly and vexatious levies, not only upon business, but upon practically every class of the people. It is particularly unfortunate that these levies bear down most unfavorably and ofttimes oppressively upon those business groups and individuals less capable of sustaining them. A stern impact, for example, is visited upon small-business men, who because of the existing tax structure, are in all too many cases unable to plow back into their going concerns, legitimate profits and surpluses that are so essential to their growth, continued health, and prosperity. In a similar way, workers, householders, and individuals in every segment of American life have inflicted upon them continuing, inequitable, and most oppressive excise tax exactions.

It has been my sincere and studied belief that many of these taxes have not only been ill-advised but dangerous. They have constricted initiative. They have impeded enterprise. They have reduced revenues. They have diminished the incentives which lie at the very bottom of our great economic system and which indeed are vital to its success, well-being and vigor. Once that we lose by taxation, or in any other way, that dynamic quality of incentive which prompts men and women to utilize their talents and exert their best energies for the establishment and advancement of their own business, we shall have lost one of the most precious attributes of our American way of life, because it is upon the free, independent activity, the zeal to get ahead, the legitimate ambitions and aspirations of our fellow citizens that this Nation must depend to sustain and develop our economic institutions and to furnish the driving force, which alone can produce, that dynamic forward surge so necessary to the health of our econmic system, the prosperity, employment and happiness of our people.

I regret that the administration has not selected the other choices available by which many of these excise taxes could be relieved or even completely elminated. They are unwholesome, unhealthy and restrictive in their effect upon the industrial and business activity of the Nation as well as upon the standards of living of millions of Americans.

I recognize, however, that in this dangerous world our Government is burdened with huge necessary expenses of recurrent and apparently indefinite nature which probably will make it very difficult for us to achieve that most desirable goal of immediately balancing the budget. Taxes may be disagreeable and even obnoxious, but for the common good and for the defense of the Nation, we will have to endure them, however unpalatable and disagreeable.

On the other hand, our current critical situation in the world and the continued vast expenditures we are facing make it all the more important that we should impose all taxes upon a rationalized, workable plan, and secondly, upon the basis of ability to pay and equitable treatment of every class and group in the American body politic. I am not convinced that either of these desirable aims have been served by recent tax policy or by this bill. I propose to support it.

This $20 credit section of the bill moves toward a laudable objective in that it endeavors to lighten certain burdens on lower income groups which were overlooked and unconsidered in last year's tax bills. Members of the House will recall what happened when those measures were pending here. Substantial relief was given to recipients of dividends and other income, and I have no complaint about that because I am anxious as anyone to preserve our marvelous system of private capital investment. But I felt that if this relief was being given to a class which perhaps needed it less, that some coordinate relief should have been extended to the lower income groups that needed it more. As we all know, for a variety of reasons, this was not done.

Now this House is given a limited opportunity provided by this measure to some extent at least to equalize this palpably discriminatory situation. I am not at all satisfied that the measure is as well thought out as it should be, or that it fits into the tax machinery as efficiently as it should. Notwithstanding this, it provides some measure of overdue relief for those in the lower levels of the American economic scale which by every rule of reason, logic, and equity should have been extended in last year's tax bill. I should like to have seen a more efficient integration of proposals for the relief of this group and other groups—an appropriate integration, so to speak, of tax relief that could be well extended to many citizens who are entitled to receive it. But we are facing the issue and while the choice is limited, I believe, that on the whole the measure seeks to promote the equitable balancing of some of these taxes in favor of those who need and should have the consideration of this Congress.

Let me stress as others have done during the debate that the bill is not applicable to this year's taxes but will go into effect in 1956. In the interim, if the status of the budget and world conditions, our revenue position and other factors are favorable, it may be possible next year for the Congress to consider and adopt broader measures which will entail a larger measure of relief to all our taxpayers. I sincerely hope that this will be the case and that at an early date the Government and the Congress will be in a position to lift a great many of the existing heavy tax burdens from business and all of our people and thus strengthen the economic and social fabric of America.

It is unfortunate that political considerations should creep into the debate. Tax measures are an area where definite principles of taxation, of justice, of equity, and of social science should dominate our consideration. Tax measures should never be predicated upon political factors alone, but I suppose it would be unrealistic for any of us to expect that in a great democracy like ours we should ever be able to achieve that degree of perfected detachment that would permit us to settle these great questions in a legislative body without the intervention of political questions. And perhaps that fact is not only a great tribute we can pay to democratic institutions, but also a satisfying assurance that our peerless democracy is functioning.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, being impressed by the great importance to the people of my district of Florida of this proposed cut in taxes, I took the question directly to them. My St. Petersburg district office, through volunteer workers, polled, by telephone, several hundred constituents throughout the four counties I represent. I have here the result of that telephone poll which has been reported to me, and it is as follows:

Seventy-seven and sixty-three one-hundredths percent contacted in four counties were against this tax reduction.

Fifteen and six one-hundredths percent were in favor of the reduction.

Seven and thirty-one one-hundredths percent expressed no interest and no opinion.

Of those favoring defeat of the tax cut at least 60 to 70 percent expressed the opinion: "The proposal is pure politics."

I am happy to ask the extension of these remarks and their inclusion in the RECORD, as well as the three editorials pertinent to this problem and opposing the tax cuts as presented on a basis of

poor economy. I include the following editorials:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Independent of February 22, 1955]

TAX CUTS ARE FINE BUT—

Everyone likes the idea of less taxes.

Particularly the politicians when a Presidential election year is approaching.

It is not surprising then that Democratic Members of the House of Representatives have proposed a tax reduction bill that would give a dab of extra cash to almost everyone.

The Democratic proposal calls for a tax credit of $20 for each taxpayer and his dependents. Thus, a man, his wife and one child would pay $60 less in income taxes beginning next January if the Democratic proposal is pushed through Congress.

In many instances this would relieve families from paying any income taxes, which would be a happy state of affairs for them. This would include those in the lowest income brackets. It wouldn't, however, be a terrific bonanza for the average person who now pays several hundred dollars in annual income taxes.

But the Democrats are going on the theory that every little bit helps, and are banking on the idea that millions of appreciative taxpayers will return the favor with votes, come next November.

We, of course, do not object to paying a smaller income tax bill. Contrariwise, we love the idea.

But it strikes us that if those who are plumping for tax reductions were equally zealous in their attempts to reduce Government spending, all concerned would be better off.

For a reduction in income taxes now without an accompanying reduction in Government spending simply means that this generation is living on the earnings of future generations. In other words, what the Government would lose in revenues as a result of the tax cut would be added to the public debt which future generations must pay. That is, of course, unless the Federal debt is repudiated eventually, all wealth and savings wiped out, and we start from scratch again.

The tax reduction proposed by the Democrats would cost the Government approximately $1,500,000,000 a year in lost revenues. That means that instead of going into the red at the rate of about $3 billion a year as we are now, we'd hit a level of about $4,500,000,000.

Obviously we are in a ridiculous situation. We are enjoying an era of the highest prosperity we have ever known. Although we are in a touch-and-go situation in the so-called "cold war," we're still at peace. Yet in spite of our high prosperity and the fact that we are not in the emergency of a shooting war, we just don't seem to be able to match Federal expenditures with Federal income—to say nothing of paying anything on the gargantuan public debt we accumulated during World War II and the subsequent Korean fiasco.

Instead of bringing our books into balance and attempting some token payment toward that old debt, we talk about reducing taxes without cutting expenditures, thus mortgaging the futures of generations to come.

How long would your own family endure economically if you attempted to operate your finances on the same principle? How long would your creditors let you go if you consistently spent beyond your income and never attempted to make even a token payment against your debts, and, instead, simply borrowed more money to stay off your more pressing creditors?

You'd soon be in bankruptcy, wouldn't you? And your credit rating would be nil.

Yet this is exactly what we are attempting to do on a national scale. We are kidding ourselves that we can delay the day of reckoning forever.

We talk about cutting income taxes. The politicians think it's a fine idea. It will make everyone happy and win votes.

But does anyone suggest that it would be wise to cut expenditures first, balance the budget and begin payment on the national debt?

Perish the thought. Don't even whisper such an idea. Or you'll be labeled a "reactionary," an "isolationist," and a "tool of Wall Street."

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times of February 24, 1955]

TAX CUT SHARP POLITICS, BUT POOR ECONOMICS

The ability of Congressmen to talk of giving themselves a $10,000-a-year raise and, at the same time, consider cutting taxes $20 a person is a prime example of the doubletalk in Government finances that has plunged this Nation so deeply into debt.

It has been estimated that this proposed reduction would amount to more than $2 billion a year. Where, then, would the funds come from to raise congressional salaries and provide for the many Federal spending programs? The only answer is more borrowing and a deeper Federal debt.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey is leading the opposition to the tax cut with a protest that Democratic sponsors of the measure are abandoning "responsible financial management of the Federal Government" and he has accused them of "playing fast and loose with the welfare of 160 million Americans."

The Secretary's attitude is understandable. The $2-billion-plus cut literally pulls the rug out from under planning for sensible management on Federal finances. The tax cut is being rushed through 10 months before it would become effective, complains the Secretary, and when no one knows what conditions may be at that future time. In short, the Nation could become entangled in a military operation in the Far East and be hamstrung because of inadequate appropriations to finance such a venture.

Another ugly fact from the Secretary's viewpoint is, that it is tacked on to an Administration proposal for extension of the corporation tax rate and certain excise taxes which otherwise would be reduced. Should the President veto the income-tax cut, he would automatically kill the bill extending present corporation and excise taxes. If all of these tax cuts go through, the Treasury Department will, indeed, be faced with a heavy deficit and a limit will be imposed on Administrative planning.

There is still hope that, if the House is determined to pass this measure, it will be defeated in the Senate where Senator BYRD of Virginia, has already announced his opposition.

It is not at all unusual to see politicians acting like politicians, but the public must realize that this tax cut's Democratic proposers are not unmindful that it could give them a popular issue for the election next year.

There are few persons who would not enjoy a $20 income-tax reduction. There are also few who would not appreciate the almost 67 percent salary hike Congressmen seem determined to vote themselves, but responsible citizens realize that Government economics goes much deeper than wishful thinking.

This Nation has pressing obligations, both at home and abroad. Its earning capacity is at an all-time high. Surely, it is the wisest course to hold taxes at the present level and attempt to reduce unnecessary spending in an effort to bring the Federal budget into balance.

Any other course is dangerous experimenting in deficit financing. It is impossible to increase spending and reduce income further without inviting financial chaos.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of February 22, 1955]

TWENTY-DOLLAR TAX CUT?

House Democrats are watching the 1956 Presidential election so closely they cannot see the list in the Federal budget.

The Democrats want to reduce personal income taxes by $20 for each taxpayer and each dependent beginning next year.

If approved, it would cost the Federal Government an estimated $1.5 billion in revenue—at a time when the budget already shows a deficit and defense expenditures might have to be increased.

The reason for the move is clear. President Eisenhower, in his economic report of last month, held out hope for a general tax cut in 1956. Democrats want to show that they, and not the Republicans, can reduce taxes for voters.

But it is unfortunate, partisan politics. It should be recognized as such and rejected by realistic Members of Congress.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, who has the wisdom or ability to truly characterize the sincerity of insincerity of any Member of this House? Who knows the spirit or pressure that motivates the decision of any other Member in his voting?

This much we all know and it is indisputable with facts.

A proposal is now being made to reduce by a fraction the personal income tax. We are asked to support an amendment offered to this House without benefit of any hearings within committee and on an overnight impulse of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee. Why such haste for a provision to become effective in 1956?

In the years of my own legislative experience it has always been my understanding that the needs of government must first be screened so that a balanced budget can be achieved, if possible.

Mr. Speaker, not an appropriation bill has been reported to this House. We have no full view of the fiscal picture for the approaching year. It is most irresponsible to vote the proposed tax reduction without any facts to guide us.

The Democratic majority has pending within its controlled committees spending proposals that would further unbalance the budget and cause much greater deficits. The present administration has made heroic efforts to achieve a stabilized economy, a balanced budget and to encourage the even flow of business in a peacetime economy. The splendid record of the 83d Congress fully discloses the excellent program enacted into law. A sound dollar has been achieved.

Are we to throw all these gains out the window and for what appears to be a partisan political purposes vote encouragement to further inflation and a loss of purchasing power to the American people?

Can any measure be termed other than an outright political bid to purchase votes, when it is based on no study, no hearings, no recognition of fiscal obligations and pointedly not for this year, but for 1956?

Who now can determine what conditions our country will face in 1956? We may have an even greater measure of prosperity or we may be in the midst of a worldwide holocaust.

As a Representative keenly feeling his responsibility to the people I cannot support the $20 reduction amendment. A measure of this kind should not be determined in a bid for partisan political advantage. It should be decided on the merits—based on the appropriations required to run our Government and a full review of our fiscal position.

The New York Herald Tribune on its editorial page said today:

THE TEST ON TAXES

If ever there was a plain case of playing politics, it is the Democrats' effort to put through a $20 tax reduction for each person. The House votes today on this mischievous measure. Every Congressman is challenged to stand fast for good sense and for principle.

Let it be admitted that the Democratic leaders in the Congress have acted with enlightenment on such issues as trade and foreign policy. This gives them no license to go hog-wild on domestic matters. Taxes are the raw materials of political emotions, and the opposition evidently feels that here it has an opportunity to strike blows against the administration.

It is an old-fashioned partisan maneuver which would look pretty shoddy at any time and is deplorable in today's circumstances.

What would this cut mean? It would mean a loss in revenues of something over $2 billion a year, and it would remove an estimated 5 million persons from the tax roles. It would do these things when the people are summoned to steady efforts and to a common awareness in carrying forward the burdens of defense and leadership in the cold war.

President Eisenhower has scarcely ever appeared more deeply moved and more persuasive than when he appealed at Wednesday's press conference for a defeat of this measure. He would not be driven into the position of saying that no tax cuts are justified until the budget is balanced, or saying that a balanced budget is not now within sight. But he insisted with vigor that reductions must be made with system, with an eye upon the dangers of inflation, and with constant concern for the national welfare.

The President made his case before the newspapermen, and it was carried by TV across the Nation. It must be supposed that this is one of those instances where the people have more sense than the politicians who seek to flatter and seduce them.

They will not be taken in by so flagrant a trick. All who stand with the President when the vote is taken today will be doing not only the thing that conscience dictates but what in the long run must win for them the only kind of popularity that is worth having.

Mr. Chairman, in the best interests of all the American people the ill-advised $20 reduction amendment should be defeated.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4259 presents some very vital challenges. On one hand is the sincere and honest desire of everyone for a proper reduction in taxes. On the other hand, however, is the very compelling need to have a strong, proper, responsible fiscal policy for our Federal Government.

During the 83d Congress I supported the reduction in taxes recommended by the House Committee on Ways and Means. I feel that the action taken then can be very well justified on the record made by the 83d Congress and the administration in the increased efficiency in the executive branch of the Government and the consequent reduction of the expenditures of our Federal Government. Also, all economic indexes were very favorable for continued prosperity and the fears expressed for a recession as the result of our transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy following the close of the Korean war did not materialize. The action which was approved was amply justified and there was every reasonable expectancy of a balanced budget.

Conditions, however, have changed. Situations in the Far East have changed and at the request of the President for authority to use the Armed Forces in the Formosa area was approved by an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress. The continuing need for large defense expenditures of about two-thirds of the total requested budget shows conclusively that any substantial reductions in the budget must come from these defense expenditures. The House Committee on Appropriations is now holding hearings daily in an effort to determine how and where expenditures can be reduced. This committee has not yet brought in any budget recommendations and until this is done and acted upon by Congress, there will be no certain knowledge as to what the expenditures will be for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955.

If we continue to spend more than we can receive in taxes and, therefore, have another deficit, we must borrow money to meet this deficit. Who will eventually be called upon to pay this deficit? This will fall upon the grandchildren of the present generation and our grandchildren's grandchildren.

I am just as eager as any Member of Congress can be to reduce taxes and to reduce them especially for the lower-income groups. This, however, is not now the time to vote decreases. Congress should wait and see what the conditions are later, both as to worldwide conditions and economic conditions in our own Nation. Therefore, I feel compelled to vote for the Reed amendment to strike from this bill the provisions for a $20 reduction in the taxes of individuals. I feel also that the matter can be properly considered either later this year or next year and that the decision at that time must be based on conditions prevailing at that time and likely to prevail in the future.

The Dayton Daily News has long been recognized as one of the very important forces in the expression and molding of public opinion in the 3d District of Ohio. This great newspaper is owned by the Honorable James M. Cox, a three-term Governor of the State of Ohio. Mr. Cox not only served with great distinction as a three-time Democrat Governor of Ohio, and a former Member of Congress from the 3d District of Ohio, but he was also the Democrat candidate for the President of the United States in 1920 while Franklin Delano Roosevelt was his running mate for the Vice Presidency. The Dayton Daily News on February 23, 1955, carried an editorial on the subject discussed herein and under the unanimous agreement obtained in the House, I make it a part of my comments:

LOW-LEVEL POLITICS

The action of House Democrats in rushing toward passage of a $20 decrease in personal income taxes represents politics on its basest level. It is an attempt to purchase votes for dollars.

The fact that Republicans have promised the electorate similar bribery next year is no justification for Democratic irresponsibility now. Neither are similar Republican transgressions in the past.

Fortunately, there is reason to believe that the Democratic majority in the Senate will face up to its obligation for orderly Government and toss the tax cuts into the ash can. If so, those guilty of the current exhibition in the House will have accomplished nothing except to expose their irresponsibility.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this measure providing a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption because, in my conscientious judgment, its objective not only is designed to advance the national economy as a whole, but indeed, it is directly in line with the sentiments expounded by the President himself in his recent budget message, when he stated:

I hope that tax reductions will be so justified next year. If so, I shall recommend a reduction in taxes to spread the relief fairly among all taxpayers in a way which will be the most effective to relieve individual tax burdens and to increase incentive for effort and investment.

The $20 tax credit will extend to the taxpayers the President mentions the relief which he said he hoped and planned to give them. At the same time, this relief will expand private spending and tend to offset the depression in our economy of contracting Government expenditures.

It is my very deep belief that this tax credit for individual income taxpayers in general, and very particularly for our low-income taxpayers, is urgently needed now to sustain an expanding economy. I supported the tax legislation enacted in the last Congress mainly because it contained the first major revision in over 50 years for improving our antiquated tax system. However, I felt then, as now, the specific provisions of that legislation did not extend fair and just tax consideration to those working people and their families within our lowest income brackets. This present measure before us contains provision for the correction of that past deficiency because it benefits all taxpayers and is distributed to every taxpayer evenly on a dollar basis with respect to each personal exemption.

As I said here when the last tax bill was being discussed, it is axiomatic that to have expanding production, we must have increasing consumption. It is a matter of statistical proof that the individuals in our lower income brackets, from $5,000 down, and this group of individuals embraces the great majority of our taxpayers, are the ones who must spend practically every cent of their income in order to live. It is, therefore, only elemental logic to realize that savings and credits among these individuals are almost immediately thrown into the country's purchasing power, which, in

turn, naturally increases the demand for consumer goods resulting in the greater production for the continuing employment we all patriotically desire to achieve.

I submit, therefore, that this manner and method of providing some needed tax relief for our overburdened American citizens will inevitably have a sustaining effect upon the national economy. On that fundamental ground, I earnestly hope you will all give this measure your sympathetic consideration and, in doing so, may I say again, you will be acting in accord with the Chief Executive's own admonition to the Congress to legislate for the good of all Americans.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, the hue and cry of the Eisenhower administration condemning the $20 tax credit as proposed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and their accusation of fiscal irresponsibility reflects the President's capitulation to big business and the high-income taxpayers. He opposes the Democratic proposal because he does not want "to lead the country into greater deficit spending." Does he forget that it was the Republican tax cut in 1954 of $7.4 billion that caused the present deficit, as evidenced by his own words:

The budget would have been balanced for the current fiscal year if there had been no tax cuts. (Eisenhower's budget message, 1955.)

Last year the President forecast a deficit of two and nine-tenths billions for the fiscal year 1955, and in spite of this deficit, approved tax cuts of seven and four-tenths billions. Tax cuts that benefited, for the most part, the large corporations and high-income taxpayers. This year the President forecast a deficit of two and four-tenths billions for fiscal 1956, yet protests the Democratic proposal of a $20 tax credit to the small-income taxpayer, which would amount to two billions, only half of which would be reflected in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, inasmuch as the proposed tax credit would be effective January 1, 1956. In other words, it was all right for the Republicans to give most of the seven and four-tenths billions to the wealthy in 1956 resulting in a deficit, but the present Democratic proposal to give a $2-billion tax cut in 1956 to the taxpayer earning $5,000 a year or less is all wrong.

President Eisenhower stated in his January 1955 budget message:

I hope that tax reduction will be justified next year.

The present proposal is only carrying out the President's promise. Republicans say that the present tax cut will render our economy an irreparable harm. If the 1954 reduction was designed to stimulate the economy of our Nation, why should not the Democratic proposal do the same, keeping in mind the administration's promised cut in 1956. The administration during the campaign of 1954 and now is constantly reminding us that we have changed from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy. It would seem proper under these conditions to continually expect the costs of Government to decline and that tax benefits might be passed on to the people. If this was not an act of irresponsibility in 1954, why would it be considered so in 1956.

It would seem that the only sound argument now being presented against the tax cut for the little man is opposition for the sake of opposition. Democratic concern for the welfare and well-being of all the people is traditional and a matter of long record, and I think this, more than anything else, is causing the irritation to the President and his party.

Mr. Eisenhower has, by his own choosing, entered into the arena as a political candidate for election in 1956. He further, by his own actions in recent weeks, assumed the active leadership of the Republican Party by word and deed. In the elections of 1954, the American people voted the Democrats into control of the Congress. They, therefore, now share a dual responsibility with the President to decide what is best for the country on all constitutional levels. Appropriating money and establishing tax rates are the sole responsibility of the Congress. In accepting that responsibility, the Democrats do so in full knowledge that they are the only hope of the little men to obtain a tax break just as the Republicans know they must represent the wealthy taxpayer if they are to fulfill their traditional responsibility as exemplified by the past history of their party.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I have given a great deal of consideration to important rollcall votes which are expected this afternoon.

President Eisenhower submitted a budget to this Congress for fiscal year 1956 which is out of balance in the amount of $2.4 billion. I personally will support further reductions in this budget. In the last two sessions of Congress, I have voted for expenditure reductions in an amount which would have placed our Federal budget for fiscal years 1955 and 1956 in balance. I regret that the position which I have taken to reduce expenditures has not been shared by a majority of the Members of this great legislative body.

The time has come when we must face up to the reality that a majority of the Members of the present Congress will vote for still larger appropriations than were recommended by President Eisenhower in his budget for fiscal year 1956. This simply means that our Federal budget deficit for fiscal year 1956 will be even larger than that anticipated by the President. This situation places a responsible legislator in a very difficult position when the roll is called on the matter of paying the bills, which I believe should be paid through Federal revenue and not by still further increases in the national debt.

This afternoon I shall vote to recommit H. R. 4259 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to strike out sections 4 and 5. Sections 4 and 5 of this bill provide for the $20 tax giveaway and represents complete fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the majority party. If this motion does not prevail, it is my sincere hope that a majority of the Members will vote to defeat this legislation and work for the passage of H. R. 4200 or H. R. 4201. These two bills provide for the extension for 1 year of the excise taxes and corporation tax rates, which otherwise would be reduced automatically on April 1, 1955. These two extensions have been recommended by the President as necessary to the fiscal stability of our Nation. There seems to be no disagreement that the excise taxes and corporate income taxes should be extended for another year. There is no reason for granting any tax reductions this year. Sections 4 and 5 of H. R. 4259 have been hastily drawn, and no hearings have been held on these two sections of the bill we have under consideration today. The public has had absolutely no opportunity to express its views on the problem and no other method of tax reduction was even discussed in the House Ways and Means Committee. If H. R. 4259 is enacted into law, we will not be helping the individual taxpayer. These sections are deliberately designed to destroy confidence in our economy and to force this Congress to increase still more the national debt limitation.

Fiscal responsibility must be maintained in America. The threat of fiscal irresponsibility is as great or greater than the threat of war. If this Congress approves fiscal irresponsibility in the United States, we will be granting international communism a great victory.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of reduction in taxes especially for people in the lower-income bracket. The method you are using today is not the way to go about it. The original bill, H. R. 4259, provides for continuation of present tax rates on corporations and the extension of present excise-tax rates. This must be done within the next few weeks so the Government will not lose by reason of taxes on corporations and excise taxes on automobiles, liquor, and tobacco. Almost all Members agree these taxes should be extended.

This $20 amendment proposal is a different matter. It comes in at the last minute without hearings or discussion by the committee in charge. It does not even take effect until 1956. In fact it will not show up on the tax return until 1957. It is said to involve $2 billion a year. It seems to me if proponents of the bill are sincere, and I think they are, they should submit the proposal under a separate measure so the House can discuss it. Under the rule you have before us, no amendments are permitted. We do not even have a report on the bill. If the bill should be passed right away, then it ought to take effect immediately. We should not fool the taxpayers by telling them we are giving them a $20 reduction in their taxes and then write in the bill that they cannot have it for another year. We cannot even amend that part of the bill because of the gag rule you have approved.

I am in favor of reducing taxes for individuals at the earliest possible date. I think the fair and equitable thing to do is to increase exemptions for individuals and their dependents. That is the fair way to do it.

Incidentally, we should be reminded that the majority party while in power over a period of 20 years has not here-

tofore advocated tax reductions for the little fellow. The record shows that when the majority party took over, individual exemptions were $2,500. These exemptions were cut from $2,500 clear down to $500 or $600 and no relief was given until the Republican Party was in power in the 80th Congress. Some relief was given at that time.

There has been some discussion that if Members of Congress are increasing their own salaries, then this legislation should be approved. Of course, I did not support legislation to increase Members' salaries. I did not think it was the thing to do especially at this time. I suggest that the thing for the Ways and Means Committee to do is to consider legislation to increase exemptions for individual taxpayers and let it be considered on its merits, but do not bring legislation in in the form of a rider and make people think you are giving them a $20 handout that will not, if approved, take effect until 1956. Let me repeat, I am in favor of giving relief to the lower-income taxpayers, but let us do it in a straightforward manner and not handle it in this way.

HOPKINS' FORMULA, 1955 MODEL

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, it appears that even confirmed New Dealers, and Fair Dealers now regard the notorious Harry Hopkins' philosophy of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect as out-of-date.

Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that they have discovered that this formula has its own law of diminishing political returns—at least the tax and tax portion of the formula.

There is no evident decrease in the eagerness to spend and spend or in the zeal to elect and elect. But the maneuver of the House Democratic leadership—designed to secure a $20 per person Federal tax reduction—indicates a belated Democratic recognition that the tax and tax portion of the Hopkins' formula is no longer popular.

The word "belated" is used advisedly, since Democratic tax policies increased average overall Federal taxes from 4 to 24 percent in 20 years, without ever catching up with Democratic spending policies.

Of course every effort is being made by the Democratic leadership, in connection with the latest maneuver, to picture themselves as advocates of tax relief for the little fellow and the Republicans as advocates of tax relief for the big fellow and the coupon clippers. This is demagogery which deliberately ignores the fact that the only tax relief which the Nation has had in the past 22 years came during the Republican 80th Congress and under the Eisenhower-Republican 83d Congress. It ignores the fact that this tax relief included increases in personal exemptions voted by the Republican 80th Congress, and across-the-board tax relief voted by the Republican 83d Congress. And it ignores the fact that the proposed $20 per person tax cut would reduce the aggregate tax yield from continuation of the corporation normal tax and excise taxes—proposed in the administration bill—from $2,830,000,000 to $737 million.

In other words, without any proposals for reduced expenditures—and, indeed, with numerous proposals from both the administration and the Democrats for increased expenditures—the net effect of the Democratic proposal would be an increase in the deficit for the next full fiscal year of more than $2 billion. President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey were entirely correct in denouncing the proposal as fiscal irresponsibility—especially in view of the further inflationary effect of such a policy.

I personally favor tax reductions—including reductions which would directly benefit the low-income bracket of Federal taxpayers. But I do not believe such tax reductions are sound or valid—or beneficial to anyone, including the low-income bracket—unless they are based on further sharp reductions in Federal spending and curtailment or outright rejection of new Federal spending schemes.

The Democratic maneuver is all the more objectionable because it was made even in advance of any major appropriations for the fiscal year 1955–56.

Actually this maneuver out-Hopkins Hopkins in terms of political cynicism, economic unsoundness and fiscal irresponsibility. It amounts to the dangerous proposal to recognize the growing public revolt against the tax and tax portion of the Hopkins formula and to substitute the even more delusive proposal to borrow and borrow, spend and spend, elect and elect.

That, in brief, is why I shall vote against the $20 per person tax cut at this time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I support the motion of the gentleman from New York to strike from H. R. 4259 sections 4 and 5 which provide the $20 credit for each personal exemption.

This is the most arrant piece of political shenanigans that I have witnessed since I have been in the House. In the first place, it is a tax-reduction measure tacked onto a bill designed to give our Treasury much needed revenue. If it were subject to a point of order it would be thrown out as not germane.

The provisions which the motion seeks to strike out were hastily added to the bill with no hearings whatever. Although they would cost the Treasury only about a billion dollars in fiscal 1956, they would cost it two and one-third billion annually thereafter. There is no contention even on the part of the sponsors of this legislation that it embodies fiscal prudence. It is a perfectly barefaced handout in the hope of winning support in the 1956 election. We already have an income tax sharply graduated against higher incomes and this new provision rejects the whole structure of our present law and substitutes a new one. It is an attempt to embarrass President Eisenhower, who should in my opinion veto any such legislation if it passes.

I believe that the people of this country are amply intelligent enough to see through this contemptible piece of chicanery. Certainly they will realize that it disposes forever of the idea that the majority in the Congress intends to support the President, as they boast of doing in the reciprocal trade legislation.

This measure, if it were to become law, would take 5 million taxpayers off the tax rolls. With the Federal budget still far out of balance and the country in danger as never before, I can see no reason why 5 million people should be exempted from the necessity of paying any income taxes. The insincerity of this $20 exemption is further evidenced by the fact that it is not to take effect until next January when the fiscal position of the country cannot possibly be seen so far ahead.

If a measure of this kind were sincerely believed to be salutary and justified it would have been offered to take effect at once.

I hope that the Reed amendment will be adopted and sections 4 and 5 of the bill stricken.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to attempt to set the record straight because I am of the opinion that my esteemed friend from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] left what I consider the wrong impression. He stated and I quote:

> All this country was ever able to attain under the Democrats was 64 million employed and war.

To me that seemed to indicate that the gentleman from Minnesota was trying to leave the impression that the Democratic Party was a war party.

I wonder if the gentleman thinks we should not have engaged in World War I. The Kaiser had set out to conquer the world, and in the interest of freedom, he had to be stopped. We had no choice but to enter that conflict. I do not believe that the gentleman believes that we could or would have stayed out of World War I had the Republicans been in power. Democratic and Republican boys fought and died side by side to win that war. Men and women of both political faiths worked on our farms and in our defense plants to make victory possible.

Likewise with World War II, when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and sank our fleet, should we have declared war or waited for Japan to take Seattle, San Francisco, Oakland, and Los Angeles? Again we had no choice. Republicans and Democrats alike voted to declare war and again our sons fought side by side to win the conflict.

When the Communists began their aggression in Korea, President Truman's action was approved over the length and breadth of this country, not only by Democrats, but by Republicans as well. In fact, the approval of the action taken in the Korea situation received almost unanimous approval. So history causes the inference of the gentleman from Minnesota to fall flat of its own weight.

All we are seeking to do here today is to give a little tax relief to the average American citizen and we are seeking to give it directly to those citizens who need it the most. That is good old Democratic philosophy as old as Thomas Jefferson, himself.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, when the tax revision legislation was before the House of Representatives in March of

1954, I publicly said that I had grave doubts about the wisdom and prudence of a tax cut of any kind at that time. But, I added, that since the Administration had decided it could afford a tax cut, it was my conviction that this relief should be given to wage earners, to salary earners, and to persons who earn their living through professional fees and commissions.

Instead the administration gave the cut to dividend earners and to corporations.

The $20 tax cut proposed today will give relief to this neglected element of our population, and in this way will make more equitable the tax cutting program which was started by the Eisenhower administration in 1954.

It is important to remember that this particular measure will cost much less than the relief extended to dividend earners and to corporations.

And besides, the money saved by the people who are to get this relief is more likely to find its way quickly into the economic lifestream of this country than the money, in the form of tax relief given to dividend earners and corporations.

This is a fair thing to do. I shall vote for it.

THE AUTOMOBILE IS NOT A LUXURY

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it is most discouraging to me as the Representative from an important industrial area of our country to have to address this House on every occasion of consideration of the excise provisions of our tax bill to plead the case for the automobile industry. This discouragement stems from the futility with which my efforts to ellicit effective response from my colleagues has been met. Be that as it may, I shall not let pass an opportunity to remind the members of this body of the rank injustice that is being perpetrated upon a very large segment of the American people. This is multiple taxation at its very worst.

I need not belabor you, gentlemen, with a long list of statistical information to impress you with the merits of our great automobile industry—their record is indelibly imprinted on the scroll of our Nation's achievements for all the world to read. A mighty tribute to the industry of our great people. In its own right, the automobile industry represents the largest single corporative enterprise in the world and the progenitor of several others. Another distinction unparalleled anywhere else in the world. The welfare of this industry is directly reflected in our variated channels of commerce and industry. To handicap it is to manacle a large segment of our economy. This, I feel certain, is not the intention of this legislative body.

Directing your attention to the legislative reasoning which is responsible for bringing the automobile within the purview of this law it will be found that it is included in a long list of so-called luxury items. This is a bare myth not worthy of lengthy discussion or argumentation. The common utility of the automobile is an established fact and no form of legislative hocus-pocus will change it into a luxury. And what are we doing to the working public that so heavily depends upon auto transportation? I will tell you what we are doing: We are demonstrating to the American taxpayer that once we reach into his pocket and find the "pickins" easy that we will not let go. Let us put an end to such unfair taxation, let us accept the plain facts of the case judiciously and return to the American public a tax bill that reflects his will rather than the expediency of our policymakers.

I know this is a closed rule and that my speaking here will not alter the inequities of this bill as regards the automobile, but I feel it my duty to remind my colleagues of the antiquity of some of our legislative reasoning.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers on the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. REED of New York and Mr. COOPER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 192, noes 197.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRIEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, pursuant to House resolution 153, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker, definitely.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies, definitely.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 4259, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the bill forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike out all after line 17, page 4, of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 210, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—205

Abbitt	Fjare	Minshall
Adair	Ford	Morano
Alger	Frelinghuysen	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Gamble	Nelson
Allen, Ill.	Gary	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	Gavin	O'Hara, Minn.
	Gentry	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	George	Osmers
	Gross	Ostertag
Arends	Gubser	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Pelly
Ayres	Hale	Phillips
Baker	Halleck	Poff
Baldwin	Hand	Prouty
Bass, N. H.	Harden	Ray
Bates	Hardy	Reece, Tenn.
Baumhart	Harrison, Nebr.	Reed, Ill.
Beamer	Harrison, Va.	Reed, N. Y.
Becker	Harvey	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Fla.	Heselton	Riehlman
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Robeson, Va.
Bentley	Hiestand	Robsion, Ky.
Berry	Hill	Sadlak
Betts	Hillings	St. George
Bolton Frances P.	Hoeven	Saylor
	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Bosch	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Bow	Holmes	Schwengel
Bray	Holt	Scott
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Scudder
Brownson	Horan	Seely-Brown
Broyhill	Hosmer	Sheehan
Budge	Hyde	Short
Burdick	Jackson	Siler
Bush	James	Simpson, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Canfield	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Carrigg	Johansen	Smith, Miss.
Cederberg	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Chase	Jonas	Springer
Chatham	Jones, N. C.	Taber
Chenoweth	Judd	Talle
Chiperfield	Kean	Taylor
Church	Kearney	Teague, Calif.
Clevenger	Kearns	Thompson, Mich.
Cole	Keating	
Colmer	Kilburn	Thomson, Wyo.
Coon	King, Pa.	Tollefson
Corbett	Knox	Tuck
Coudert	Krueger	Utt
Cramer	Laird	Van Pelt
Cretella	Latham	Van Zandt
Crumpacker	LeCompte	Velde
Cunningham	Lipscomb	Vorys
Curtis, Mass.	Lovre	Vursell
Curtis, Mo.	McConnell	Wainright
Dague	McCulloch	Weaver
Davis, Wis	McDonough	Westland
Dawson, Utah	McIntire	Wharton
Derounian	McVey	Widnall
Devereux	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Dies	Mailliard	Williams, N. Y.
Dixon	Marshall	Wilson, Calif.
Dolliver	Martin	Wilson, Ind.
Dondero	Meader	Withrow
Dorn, N. Y.	Merrow	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Miller, Md.	Wolverton
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	Younger
Fisher	Miller, N. Y.	

NAYS—210

Abernethy	Boyle	Davis, Tenn.
Addonizio	Brooks, La.	Dawson, Ill.
Albert	Brooks, Tex.	Deane
Alexander	Brown, Ga.	Delaney
Andrews	Buchanan	Dempsey
Anfuso	Burleson	Denton
Ashley	Burnside	Diggs
Ashmore	Byrd	Dingell
Aspinall	Byrne, Pa.	Dodd
Bailey	Cannon	Dollinger
Barden	Carlyle	Donohue
Barrett	Carnahan	Donovan
Bass, Tenn.	Celler	Dorn, S. C.
Bell	Chelf	Dowdy
Blatnik	Christopher	Doyle
Boggs	Chudoff	Durham
Boland	Clark	Edmondson
Bolling	Cooley	Elliott
Bonner	Cooper	Evins
Bowler	Davidson	Fallon
Boykin	Davis, Ga.	Fascell

Feighan	Knutson	Rabaut
Fernandez	Landrum	Radwan
Fine	Lane	Rains
Fino	Lanham	Reuss
Flood	Lankford	Rhodes, Pa.
Flynt	Lesinski	Riley
Fogarty	Long	Rivers
Forand	McCarthy	Roberts
Forrester	McCormack	Rodino
Fountain	McDowell	Rogers, Colo.
Frazier	McMillan	Rogers, Fla.
Friedel	Macdonald	Rogers, Mass.
Fulton	Machrowicz	Rogers, Tex.
Garmatz	Mack, Ill.	Rooney
Gordon	Madden	Roosevelt
Granahan	Magnuson	Rutherford
Grant	Mahon	Selden
Gray	Matthews	Sheppard
Green, Oreg.	Metcalf	Shuford
Green, Pa.	Miller, Calif.	Sieminski
Gregory	Mills	Sikes
Griffiths	Mollohan	Sisk
Hagen	Morgan	Staggers
Haley	Morrison	Steed
Harris	Moss	Sullivan
Hays, Ark.	Moulder	Teague, Tex.
Hays, Ohio	Multer	Thomas
Hayworth	Murray, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Hébert	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson, N. J.
Herlong	Natcher	Thompson, Tex.
Holifield	Norrell	Thornberry
Holtzman	O'Brien, Ill.	Trimble
Huddleston	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tumulty
Hull	O'Hara, Ill.	Udall
Ikard	O'Neill	Vanik
Jarman	Passman	Vinson
Jennings	Patman	Walter
Johnson, Wis.	Perkins	Watts
Jones, Ala.	Pfost	Whitten
Jones, Mo.	Philbin	Wickersham
Karsten	Pilcher	Wier
Kelley, Pa.	Pillion	Williams, Miss.
Kelly, N. Y.	Poage	Williams, N. J.
Keogh	Polk	Willis
Kilday	Powell	Winstead
Kilgore	Preston	Wright
King, Calif.	Price	Yates
Klein	Priest	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Quigley	Zelenko

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gathings

NOT VOTING—18

Avery	Hinshaw	Scrivner
Blitch	Kee	Shelley
Bolton, Oliver P.	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Buckley	McGregor	Spence
Eberharter	Mason	Young
Engle	Norblad	
	Richards	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Engel with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. McGregor.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Norblad.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Young.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. EBERHARTER, who is in the hospital. If he were present he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COOPER, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. REED of New York demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 175, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—242

Abbitt	Fogarty	Natcher
Abernethy	Forand	Norrell
Addonizio	Forrester	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Fountain	O'Brien, N. Y.
Alexander	Frazier	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews	Friedel	O'Konski
Anfuso	Fulton	O'Neill
Ashley	Garmatz	Passman
Ashmore	Gary	Patman
Aspinall	Gathings	Perkins
Bailey	Gordon	Pfost
Baker	Granahan	Philbin
Barden	Grant	Pilcher
Barrett	Gray	Pillion
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.	Poage
Bell	Green, Pa.	Polk
Bennett, Mich.	Gregory	Powell
Blatnik	Griffiths	Preston
Blitch	Gross	Price
Boggs	Hagen	Priest
Boland	Haley	Quigley
Bolling	Hardy	Rabaut
Bonner	Harris	Radwan
Bowler	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Reuss
Boyle	Hays, Ohio	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bray	Hayworth	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Hébert	Riley
Brooks, Tex.	Herlong	Rivers
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Roberts
Buchanan	Holtzman	Robeson, Va.
Burleson	Huddleston	Rodino
Burnside	Hull	Rogers, Colo.
Byrd	Ikard	Rogers, Fla.
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Carlyle	Johnson, Wis.	Rooney
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Rutherford
Chatham	Jones, N. C.	Saylor
Chelf	Karsten	Schwengel
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.	Selden
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Clark	Keogh	Sheppard
Colmer	Kilday	Shuford
Cooley	Kilgore	Sieminski
Cooper	King, Calif.	Sikes
Corbett	Klein	Simpson, Ill.
Cunningham	Kluczynski	Sisk
Davidson	Knox	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Staggers
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Steed
Deane	Lanham	Sullivan
Delaney	Lankford	Teague, Tex.
Dempsey	LeCompte	Thomas
Denton	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Dies	Long	Thompson, N. J.
Diggs	McCarthy	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	McCormack	Thornberry
Dodd	McDowell	Trimble
Dollinger	McMillan	Tuck
Dolliver	Macdonald	Tumulty
Donohue	Machrowicz	Udall
Donovan	Mack, Ill.	Vanik
Dorn, S. C.	Madden	Van Zandt
Dowdy	Magnuson	Vinson
Doyle	Mahon	Walter
Durham	Marshall	Watts
Edmondson	Matthews	Whitten
Elliott	Metcalf	Wickersham
Evins	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Fallon	Mills	Williams, Miss.
Fascell	Mollohan	Williams, N. J.
Feighan	Morgan	Willis
Fernandez	Morrison	Winstead
Fine	Moss	Wright
Fino	Moulder	Yates
Fisher	Multer	Zablocki
Flood	Murray, Ill.	Zelenko
Flynt	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—175

Adair	Belcher	Carrigg
Alger	Bennett, Fla.	Cederberg
Allen, Calif.	Bentley	Chase
Allen, Ill.	Berry	Chenoweth
Andersen, H. Carl	Betts	Chiperfield
Andresen, August H.	Bolton, Frances P.	Church
Arends	Bosch	Clevenger
Auchincloss	Bow	Cole
Ayres	Brown, Ohio	Coon
Baldwin	Brownson	Coudert
Bass, N. H.	Broyhill	Cramer
Bates	Budge	Cretella
Baumhart	Burdick	Crumpacker
Beamer	Bush	Curtis, Mass.
Becker	Byrnes, Wis.	Curtis, Mo.
	Canfield	Dague
		Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Derounian	Jonas	Rees, Kans.
Devereux	Judd	Riehlman
Dixon	Kean	Robsion, Ky.
Dondero	Kearney	Sadlak
Dorn, N. Y.	Kearns	St. George
Ellsworth	Keating	Schenck
Fenton	Kilburn	Scherer
Fjare	King, Pa.	Scott
Ford	Krueger	Scudder
Frelinghuysen	Laird	Seely-Brown
Gamble	Latham	Short
Gavin	Lipscomb	Siler
Gentry	Lovre	Simpson, Pa.
George	McConnell	Smith, Kans.
Gubser	McCulloch	Springer
Gwinn	McDonough	Taber
Hale	McIntire	Talle
Halleck	McVey	Taylor
Hand	Mack, Wash.	Teague, Calif.
Harden	Mailliard	Thompson, Mich.
Harrison, Nebr.	Martin	Thomson, Wyo.
Harvey	Meader	Tollefson
Henderson	Merrow	Utt
Heselton	Miller, Md.	Van Pelt
Hiestand	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
Hill	Miller, N. Y.	Vorys
Hillings	Minshall	Vursell
Hoeven	Morano	Wainwright
Hoffman, Ill.	Mumma	Weaver
Hoffman, Mich.	Nelson	Westland
Holmes	Nicholson	Wharton
Holt	O'Hara, Minn.	Widnall
Hope	Osmers	Wigglesworth
Horan	Ostertag	Williams, N. Y.
Hosmer	Patterson	Wilson, Calif.
Hyde	Pelly	Wilson, Ind.
Jackson	Phillips	Withrow
James	Poff	Wolcott
Jenkins	Prouty	Wolverton
Jensen	Ray	Younger
Johansen	Reece, Tenn.	
	Reed, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—17

Avery	Hinshaw	Richards
Bolton, Oliver P.	Kee	Scrivner
Buckley	Kirwan	Shelley
Eberharter	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Engle	Mason	Spence
	Norblad	Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Mason against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Young.
Mr. Engel with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Spence with Mr. McGregor.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Norblad.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say what will happen in connection with the conference report on the pay raise bill in the other body.

Aside from that the program for next week follows:

On Monday there will be no business.

On Tuesday there is a primary in Baltimore and there will be no business.

For Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, if the Rules Committee reports out

rules on the bill H. R. 1573, which undertakes to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and House Joint Resolution 202 relating to an increase in FHA mortgage insurance on housing, those bills will be brought up.

Any conference reports that may be available next week will be brought up. The only one I know of is the one that is in the other branch at the present time.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the gentleman been advised by anyone from the Appropriations Committee as to when we may expect an appropriation bill to come before the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not definitely.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there any in the near offing?

Mr. McCORMACK. I say this with reservations so that I might inquire for specific information: There is a likelihood of an appropriation bill coming in week after next, but I do not want to make that as a definite statement or as a commitment.

Mr. MARTIN. I hope we may have an appropriation bill soon. Two months have now elapsed and not a single appropriation bill has reached the floor. If we are going to have a recess we will have to get some of them moving.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no observation to make in reply to the gentleman's remarks.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE CHARLES LABAN ABERNETHY

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce the death of a former Member of this House, the Honorable Charles Laban Abernethy. Mr. Abernethy died at his home, February 23, 1955, after a long illness. He was elected to the 68th Congress from the Third North Carolina Congressional District and was re-elected to the five succeeding Congresses. He was a native North Carolinian, the son of a very outstanding Methodist minister. He studied law at the University of North Carolina and began his practice in Beaufort, N. C. He served as district solicitor of the fifth judicial district for a period of 12 years; moved to New Bern, N. C., in 1913 and continued his law practice until he was elected to Congress in 1922.

Mr. Abernethy was a tireless worker, and rendered valuable service to the people of the Third North Carolina District and to the State. During the period of his service, he was instrumental in obtaining an appropriation for the erection of a handsome Federal building for his hometown of New Bern. He served for several years as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the House and worked tirelessly for the improvement of North Carolina waterways and the fishing industry, both of which are so important to the residents of eastern North Carolina. He was one of the first advocates of an inland waterway for North Carolina.

The former Congressman was very active in veterans' affairs, and during his service in Congress, he not only strongly supported and worked for the passage of legislation for the benefit of the veterans, but he also handled successfully hundreds of individual veterans' claims through his office.

During the 69th Congress, Representative Abernethy introduced and obtained passage of a bill establishing a national military park at the battlefield of Moore's Creek, which is located in Pender County, N. C., and where one of the most significant battles of the Revolutionary War took place. Many thousands of people will mourn his passing.

Mr. Abernethy was a past master of the Franklin Masonic Lodge at Beaufort, N. C., and was a member of the New Bern, N. C., Sudan Shrine Temple. He organized the Deems Bible Class at New Bern's Centenary Methodist Church, and was its teacher for a number of years. While in Congress, he commuted frequently from Washington to New Bern to conduct this class. He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Minnie May Abernethy, one son, Charles L. Abernethy, Jr., two sisters, Mrs. Frances Hardenburg and Mrs. Dora Blount, and two brothers, Ivan B. Abernethy and Benjamin Abernethy. Funeral services will be held today at Centenary Methodist Church, New Bern, N. C.

Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to recount the many valuable contributions that he made to that district in the way of service, and his activities for securing consideration for the people of that district that they were entitled to. He was an active church worker. He was active in the Democratic Party. He was respected by the official family of North Carolina, and I am quite sure there are many Members of this body who will join with me in mourning his passing. Many of you knew him, and many of you will recall the very fine contribution that he made.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep regret of the death of our late friend. I remember him well. I served with him for several years. He was a very hard-working Member of the House and one who served his district with ability and with devotion. He was an outstanding son of North Carolina and a great American. I am glad to join with my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, in these expressions of regard on his passing and to extend to his loved ones my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I learned of the death of former Congressman Abernethy. Many years ago his father, who was a Methodist minister, and an able one, moved to our city and educated his sons in the University of North Carolina. Still today in that city lives the widow of one of his brothers who was one of the most famous and most beloved physicians that the vicinity of North Carolina ever had the privilege of knowing. I have known the Abernethy family for some 45 years or more. They were very conscientious. They were people who were patriotic. They were devout people. He also has two sisters living here today in Washington. I extend to them and to the widow of Mr. Abernethy, who still lives in Chapel Hill, my deepest sympathies.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, living in the same town with Mr. Abernethy, having practiced at the same bar with him prior to his coming to Congress, I, of course, knew him well and knew his family well. I extend to his family and friends my very sincere sympathy and my expressions of regret on his passing. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have the privilege of extending their remarks, if they so desire, at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the State of North Carolina has lost a fine citizen; his friends have suffered a great loss. God bless his family.

AUTHORITY TO ACT DURING ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 8, section 1106 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, Mr. REED of Illinois.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FRIEDEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. PRIEST and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and include letters and articles.

Mr. BURDICK and include additional material.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and include a speech.

Mr. FORD and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

467. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

468. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 4420. A bill to modify the basis for award of gratuitous national service life insurance to a dependent parent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4421. A bill to extend to certain persons an additional period in which to obtain national service life insurance under section 620 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4422. A bill to authorize the grant of insurance under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 on permanent, as well as 5-year level premium term, plans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4423. A bill to provide continued national service life insurance for certain veterans totally disabled in active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4424. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to obstruction of justice) so as to make certain provisions of that chapter apply to the District Court for the District of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4425. A bill providing for a preliminary flood-control and bank-stabilization examination and survey in the Matanuska Valley, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4426. A bill to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 4427. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4428. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4429. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4430. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4431. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 4432. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4433. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 4434. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 4435. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4436. A bill relating to the sale of water from the Clark Hill Reservoir to the city of McCormick, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4437. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4438. A bill to provide that the decennial census of agriculture shall include Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4439. A bill to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of veterans of World War I of the U. S. A. in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4440. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to include dependents in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 4441. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4442. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4443. A bill to reduce the premium rates for FHA insurance on cooperative housing to one-fourth of 1 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4445. A bill to liberalize the marriage requirements for compensation and pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4446. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State or Territorial operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4447. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit of the West San Joaquin division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4448. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 4449. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point terminal and ammunition loading pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4450. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death from injury or disease incurred while engaged in active-duty or inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 4451. A bill to repeal section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to amend section 84 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing that each member of the Armed Forces sent overseas shall be notified of the fact that, because of certain international agreements, he may be subject to the criminal jurisdiction of a foreign country without the safeguards provided by the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 158. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and study monopolistic mergers in the textile industry; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the urgent necessity to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pura Chaviano Martinez de Walter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Miss Zmirah Mittelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Christa Harkrader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Oscar H. Mash, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Jacob Fraim Zubli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko Kaneshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Piberger Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Theocharous Grammatikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Attilio Gabrielle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4462. A bill for the relief of John Maurice Lamont; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4463. A bill for the relief of Rosa Alaton Eskenazi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn H. Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4465. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Lois O. Jennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 4467. A bill for the relief of Elsie Kathleen Bucknell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 4468. A bill for the relief of Margarethe Bock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4469. A bill for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Prentice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

122. By the SPEAKER: Petition of secretary-treasurer, Texas Association of Accident and Health Underwriters, Austin, Tex., expressing opposition to the Federal reinsurance bills now before the Congress, known as H. R. 3458 and S. 886; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

123. Also, petition of the chairman, Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., expressing support of the principles of the Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

124. Also, petition of the chairman, Lithuanian Community of Stamford, Stamford, Conn., expressing gratitude to the United States for its support to the cause of independence of Lithuania, and her neighbors, Latvia and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

125. Also, petition of the chairman, Lithuanian Americans of Westfield, Westfield, Mass., expressing gratitude to the United States for the support given Lithuania by refusing to recognize the unjust enslavement of the Republic of Lithuania, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tax Relief Under H. R. 4300

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk to the effect that the Republican tax program of last year did practically nothing for lower bracket taxpayers, specifically those with incomes below $5,000. Let us put the record straight once and for all.

In the first place these statements have referred only to the big tax-revision bill. This ignores the fact that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was only one part of the entire tax program and, from a revenue standpoint a relatively small part. The entire tax reduction provided last year amounted to $7.4 billion, of which the revision bill only accounted for $1.4 billion.

The biggest single portion of the program was the across-the-board individual income-tax reduction which went into effect a year ago last January. That reduction amounted to $3 billion. There are some who say that that reduction was provided for in a law enacted by a Democratic Congress. Of course, we all know that the actual reduction could never have been permitted to take effect unless tremendous expenditure reductions had not been achieved by the Republican Party. The $3 billion reduction was achieved by a tax cut in the rate of about 10 percent in the lower and middle income brackets and ranging down to a little over 1 percent in the upper brackets. About 31 percent of the tax relief in that bill went to individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than $5,000. It should be pointed out that this was approximately the same percentage by which these individuals had previously had their taxes increased. In other words, we went down almost exactly the way we had come up.

Moreover, it should be recognized that this group with adjusted gross incomes of under $5,000 to whom 31 percent of the tax relief went, actually bear about 29 percent of the total income tax burden. Therefore the percentage reduction in the below-$5,000 area represented an equitable distribution of the tax relief based upon the existing distribution of the income tax burden.

In addition, the majority ignored the fact that we also provided $1 billion excise tax reduction on a wide variety of items including telephone calls, railroad tickets, ladies' handbags, toilet articles, and so forth. Practically this entire reduction benefited individuals, particularly the Nation's consumers. Moreover, I would like to point out that that particular tax reduction helped a class of people which the present Democratic $20 proposal ignores completely. The class which I am talking about is made up of those who pay no income taxes today because of low incomes, such as those living on social security benefits and other small pensions. Excise tax cuts are the only way to lessen the tax burden on these people.

Insofar as the tax revision bill is concerned, about $800 million or more than half of its total reduction went to individuals. It is not possible to make any accurate estimate of which classes of taxpayers received the most dollar benefit from this reduction. To say that those below $5,000 received little or no benefit is to completely distort the facts. Take one single provision, for example, the retirement income credit involves a revenue loss of about $140 million, approximately one-fifth of the entire individual tax reduction contained in the bill. This provision was so drawn that its benefits are concentrated almost entirely in the low income area. More liberal treatment of dependents, representing another $80 million in tax benefits was also of material help to low income taxpayers. It is my belief that individuals with adjusted gross incomes of $5,000 or less received approximately the same percentage of tax benefits as their present share of the tax burden bears to the total income tax.

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago there was much propaganda afloat in this country advocating a world government of which the United States is to be merely one of the states, surrendering its national sovereignty to the overall organization. That idea was apparently rejected by the people of the United States, and for a time the propaganda died out. Since January of this year, however, it has been revived and is now going full bast.

This is the most important issue before the American people today. The question is: Shall the United States give up its national sovereignty and become only a member of a world government?

Some of the people in high places startle us with their statements. Owen J. Roberts, former member of the Supreme Court of the United States is quoted as saying: "National sovereignty is a silly shibboleth." Justice Roberts is president of the Atlantic Union Committee. How he could hold up his right hand and swear to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and then head a committee seeking to build a world government which would eliminate our own sovereignty is hard to understand.

Here is the text of the resolution introduced in the Senate on February 9 of this year:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a Federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

Here again is the knockout blow against the Constitution:

This called meeting for next year * * * is to explore the possibility of relinquishing our sovereignty.

How can we support the Constitution and defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic, if we are to contemplate relinquishing our sovereignty? The author of this resolution in the Senate just got through swearing to defend our Constitution, and in the next breadth he proposes the possibility of surrendering it. This last resolution does not propose to surrender our sovereignty, but proposes the possibility of doing so. It is a new coat of sugar—but the same doughnut.

It is a curious fact that Rhodes scholars are quite generally in line with the philosophy of world government, not all, however. I wondered why and looked into the matter. Here is the announced purpose of this school. From the American Oxonian, the official publication of the Association for American Rhodes Scholars, January 1945, we read:

This is not an educational endowment as ordinarily understood. Its purpose is not to give anyone an education he could not otherwise afford; not to promote learning; but to encourage in the rising generation * * * a particular outlook on problems of the world: To give them in fact a political bias.

And a booklet issued by the Chicago Tribune in 1951 says:

Rhodes scholarships were established for the primary purpose of instilling political bias in the minds of young Americans in favor of world federation, involving the surrender of American sovereignty.

I would be unalterably opposed to the appointment of John Marshall Harlan as a member of the Supreme Court, because he is a Rhodes scholar and if indoctrinated with the philosophy above quoted, I would not be sure he would support and defend the Constitution of the United States if it conflicted with the Charter of the United Nations. Some members of the Supreme Court have taken this position already, and I refer to the steel-seizure case under the Truman administration. We already have on the Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who is a vice president of the United World Federalists. In a recent test case before that body it is reported that the vote was a tie, 4 to 4, on the question of which is the supreme law of the land—the United States Constitution or the United Nations Charter.

Judge Harlan, if appointed, might turn against the doctrine of his own school, but the chances are that he would not. We cannot afford to take chances on a matter as important as this.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware, I am sure, of the fact that we are now in the midst of an annual observance of Brotherhood Week. America has a great number of observances during the year commemorating occasions, personages, and ideals—all of which have a special significance in their link to certain basic principles inherent in our democratic form of government and our concepts concerning man and his human rights. In these many observances, I think it well that we be reminded that Brotherhood Week, in the essential meaning of the observance and without regard to point of time in which the celebration was established, is the basic premise from which all of these observances stem. Brotherhood Week embodies the very roots of our religious faith and the very roots of the faith upon which our Nation was founded.

Whatever our religious creed, we who are Christians hold the common faith that the one Father made of one blood all the races of the world; that fundamentally all men are brothers. Whatever our political party affiliations, we who are American philosophically—in truth—hold the common faith that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Brotherhood Week is not then an observance pointing up the human rights of any particular people; rather it is an observance meant to keep in the fore of all men's mind that our basic religious and democratic tenets are the protection to your human rights, to my human rights, and to the human rights of all the peoples of the world who hold our common faith.

Human rights was the underlying issue behind extension of the universal military program, which involves the sons of all races, colors, creeds; human rights was the issue behind the Formosa resolution, involving protection of rights of our Nation and of brother nations. The right to life and the pursuit of happiness, through promotion of general welfare—as set forth in the opening of our Constitution—is the issue behind our concern in the economic well-being of our Federal workers and our Nation's workers in general.

"Your faith shall be known by your works"—if as an individual, regardless of race, creed, or national origin, we truly believe that we hold inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; if as an individual, we truly believe that through one God in whom we live and move and have our being, we, having a spark of His divine nature, have dignity and stature before all men, it must follow that all men have such equal rights and stature and to uphold and promote our individual human rights, we must uphold and promote the human rights of all men.

Brotherhood week is not a time to be viewed with lightness. It is a time for rededication to democratic principles and, above all, a time of rededication to the principles of our Christian faith. I call it to your attention, urging its practice, not for a week, but for each day of daily life, knowing that in its principles is the hope and salvation of this world in which we live.

Willis W. Bradley: Naval Officer and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the splendid eulogies on our late colleague, the Honorable Willis W. Bradley, of California, so far published portray not only a rich personality but also a

career notable for its record of constructive achievements. Of his many important contributions none are of more lasting value than those for the Panama Canal while he was a Member of Congress, 1947–49. These merit special emphasis.

At the time he was elected to the 80th Congress Captain Bradley had just completed a long and distinguished career as a line officer of the Navy with early specialization in ordnance engineering. In later years, he had important administrative assignments, served as Governor of Guam, held responsible positions afloat, and navigated in many parts of the world. This background of experience combined to qualify him eminently for leadership in the 80th Congress, in which he was assigned to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. On that assignment he quickly became a recognized authority on interoceanic canal problems, for which he had been prepared by a lifetime of naval experience and years of study of the Isthmian problem.

When the question of the sea-level project for the Panama Canal was presented to the Congress in 1947, his definite views, vigorously expressed, served to prevent hasty action. Thus, the committees of the Congress were able to delve more deeply into that controversial proposal and its far-reaching implications.

On that committee one of his ablest colleagues was the late Representative Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, who was then the senior minority member of the committee and its former chairman. He and Captain Bradley recognized each other's great abilities and formed an effective team, particularly as to canal matters.

When leaving the Congress in 1949, Captain Bradley passed on to Judge Bland and others the results of his canal studies. Thus, the 81st Congress, under the guidance of Judge Bland, who then resumed his chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was able to carry on its work on the Panama Canal without discontinuity. As the member of that committee designated by Judge Bland to be chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the operations of the Panama Canal, I was one of the principal recipients of Captain Bradley's teachings. We had many consultations.

The highlight of these was a presentation on the subject of the Panama Canal in the Navy Department, arranged at the suggestion of Captain Bradley by the Secretary of the Navy. By means of canal operational exhibits and terrain models, Captain Bradley explained the problems of ship transit and what is required for their solution. A distinguished engineer with Panama Canal experience, who was also present, described the principal engineering questions, which are fundamental in its consideration.

The lessons derived from those particular discussions were of immeasurable value to the subcommittee. They helped to clarify much of the fog of confusion that has featured so much canal debates, and helped to start the investigation along a path that overcame obstacles.

Captain Bradley made two notable addresses on the Isthmian question. The first, delivered on April 19, 1948, before the Cosmos Club, of Washington, is entitled "What of the Panama Canal?" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, page A2449. The second, made on February 24, 1949, before the Engineers Club of Washington, is entitled "The Whys of the Panama Canal," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, page A1303.

These two addresses are among the finest pronouncements on the canal question in the records of the Congress. As such, they are must reading for all who wish to go deeply into the canal subject, and are especially commended for study by the committees of the Congress.

Benefits to Little Taxpayers by Republican Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, by eliminating wasteful, duplicating spending, the Republican 83d Congress, with the backing of the Republican administration, has made possible the largest tax reduction in the history of the world. Since we took over as majority party in Congress in 1953, the tax savings to the American farmers, consumers, and businessmen have been at the rate of $7.4 billion per year.

Today, however, I would like to talk not about the great accomplishment of the Republicans in the field of tax reduction, but about what we have done in the field of tax revision.

The bill which I introduced and which the President signed on August 16, 1954, is the most monumental legislative undertaking ever attempted in any legislature anywhere in the world.

This 900-page Republican law cuts away the overlapping, unfair, and useless provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which had grown up piecemeal under successive Democratic Congresses. It corrects countless inequities which had been permitted to work against some of the most deserving groups of our taxpayers, such as farmers, retired old people, widows, widowers, working mothers, and those burdened with high medical expenses. And it closes innumerable loopholes in the old tax laws under which unscrupulous taxpayers were able to avoid their fair share of tax burden.

Work on this bill started in 1951 when, in anticipation of a Republican victory in 1952, I instructed my staff to prepare a questionnaire to be sent out to representative farmers, consumers, workers, and businessmen, asking them for their suggestions as to how our tax laws could be improved. The response was astounding. Over 15,000 taxpayer suggestions for improvements in the Internal Revenue Code were received. In addition, groups of leading tax experts throughout the country were organized to study specific problem areas in our Federal tax structure.

The Committee on Ways and Means conducted public hearings on 40 different topics of major importance in connection with general tax revision. In the course of these hearings the committee heard testimony from over 500 witnesses. The committee and its staff then gave intensive consideration and study to the vast material which it had thus obtained. President Eisenhower and the staff in the Treasury Department endorsed this great task. In fact, the President has referred to it as the cornerstone of his legislative program. It has been estimated that over 500,000 man-hours have been spent on the bill.

Of course, I cannot summarize, today, the over 3,000 independent tax-law changes which the bill makes in our tax laws. I would like to give you just a few examples of the kind of thing that it does.

First, it permits a parent to take a $600 deduction for a child whom he supports, if the child is under 19, or is attending school, or is receiving on-the-farm training, or is going to college, regardless of the child's earnings. Number of taxpayers benefited, 1,300,000. Saving to these taxpayers, $85 million.

Second, it permits farmers to deduct up to 25 percent of farm income for soil and water conservation. Number of farmers benefited, 500,000. Saving to these farmers, $10 million. In addition, farmers are benefited by provisions which permit more rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery equipment and construction and which remove the tax on the sale of diseased cattle.

Third, retired persons 65 or over will be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200, with tax saving up to $240 per person. In addition, of course, to their personal exemptions. Over one and one-half million of our retired schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants and other senior citizens will be benefited by this provision. Tax saving to them, $141 million.

Fourth, under the bill medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under prior law. Thus under the new tax bill a family with $3,000 of gross income, and medical expenses of $150, will be able to deduct $60. The same family would not be able to deduct anything under the old law. In addition, the bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted for medical expenses. Eight and one-half million taxpayers will be saved $80 million by this provision.

Fifth, the bill gives working widows, widowers, and mothers a tax deduction of up to $600 for child care expense. Two and one-tenth million taxpayers in the low-income group will save $130 million as a result of this provision.

Sixth, the bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of the employee.

Seventh, the bill gives some relief from the double taxation of dividend income. It does this by excluding from the taxpayer's income the first $50 in dividends. A 4-percent credit on the amount of dividend income over $50 is allowed. This is an election year and the Democrats have seized on this provision in an attempt to claim that it is designed to benefit the rich. They neglect to point out that among Americans who own stock are 2,130,000 housewives; 20,000 sailors, soldiers, and marines; 210,000 semiskilled workers, 320,000 farmers, 410,000 factory workers, 590,000 clerical workers, 250,000 small shopkeepers, and 200,000 salesmen.

Of the 4,750,000 families who own stock in public corporations those with income of $5,000 a year or less own about one-third of the stock. These include 200,000 families with incomes of $2,000 or less.

The Democrats neglect to point out that even under the new tax bill the total income tax on the single man who has wages of $3,000 per year would be $300. If the same man had made this amount of money in a corporation and had received it in dividends instead of wages the total income tax paid thereon would have been $1,568.

The Democrats also neglect to point out that almost all civilized countries provide relief from the double taxation of dividends far greater than that in the new law. Canada, for example, provides a 20-percent tax credit for dividend income—five times the credit in the new bill. Incidentally, one of the results of this Canadian tax credit is that new capital has been flowing into Canada at a tremendous rate, creating jobs in that country which otherwise might have been made available in the United States.

In addition to these benefits, the new law will save taxpayers $25 million in increased allowable deductions for charitable contributions; $10 million in deductions for interest on credit purchases and $10 million in more equitable taxation of pensions and annuities.

In addition to removing countless inequities in the taxation of individuals, the new Republican tax bill removes tax shackles which have impeded the growth of our economy. Thus, the bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment through the depreciation allowance. For example, in the first year of life of the new equipment the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed. This provision represents savings to taxpayers of $375 million, of which seventy-five million represents savings to individuals, such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

Of course, in the long run there will be no net loss of revenue to the Government from this provision since by accelerating the depreciation deductions these deductions are simply shifted from later to earlier years. However, the provision will mean thousands of jobs and better products at less cost.

Other aids to business found in the new tax law are as follows: Tax accounting rules are brought into harmony with business accounting.

The law will ease for small business the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings which are retained for legitimate business purposes in the corporation.

The law will give to small-business men favorable tax treatment in the deduction of expenditures for research and experiments designed to create new products and new jobs.

I have listed only a very few of the important changes in our tax laws made by the bill. All in all, the new law contains $827 million of tax relief for individuals and $536 million of tax relief for business. However, since the new law also extended the present 52-percent corporate income tax for 1 additional year, it will bring in an additional $1.2 billion from corporations. This increased tax on corporations practically pays for all the tax relief granted so that the net cost of the bill to the revenue will be only $163 million.

I hope I have said enough to show that the new Republican Internal Revenue Code will create more jobs, will help farmers and workers, as well as business, will promote the technological development needed for defense, and will provide more goods and services for all our people.

It is a blueprint for a better and more prosperous America.

The Late Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Pete Jarman, an illustrious Member of this body from 1937 until 1949, and my esteemed friend and valued colleague, died on February 17 at the age of 62.

Pete Jarman represented the Sixth District of Alabama with courage, charm, and political know-how. He has been called a Congressman's Congressman. We can point with pride to his confident support of our foreign policy and the ability he had to draw others to him.

He was born in Greensboro, Ala. After graduating from the University of Alabama he tutored under his father in the probate office of Sumpter County. When World War I came he attended the first officers' candidate school at Fort McPherson, Ga., and went overseas as a first lieutenant. He returned February 2, 1919, having been wounded in France.

In 1931 Mr. Jarman became secretary of state for Alabama. Four years later he was named assistant State controller. Elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1937, he served until 1949.

President Truman named Pete Jarman as Ambassador to Australia in 1949. He left that post in 1953 and retired.

His interest and membership in worthwhile organizations reads like a cross section of American life. He was commander of the Department of Alabama, American Legion, in 1927–28. In 1947 he was elected president of the Jefferson Island Club, which drew its membership from members of the Democratic Party, and dedicated itself to the political principles of Thomas Jefferson.

Pete Jarman regarded his constituents as "the finest, the best, the kindest people of the world." He was one of them. He shared with distinction the responsibilities of our House Foreign Affairs Committee. His duties he regarded as a sacred trust.

I believe the finest tribute I can accord our deceased colleague is to repeat his own words, given in this Chamber during his years of service:

> Congress is composed of men of common interests with the plain people as well as the mighty. * * * I have served all the counties of my district with regard for the advice and counsel of the citizens of them all, never having been controlled by any group. You also know I never will be * * * To serve my country, my district, my State, my Nation to the best of my ability has ever been my keen desire.

I rejoice that I was privileged to serve with Pete Jarman and welcome this opportunity to express my great admiration for him. I am certain you join with me in acknowledging a deep sense of personal loss in his passing.

The family life of our late friend and Mrs. Jarman was beautiful, an inspiration for all to follow. They were always together, always sweethearts.

I extend to Mrs. Jarman my deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Let's Put America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent address delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] before the Dallas Public Affairs Club and the Committee of One Hundred, at Dallas, Tex., on February 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S PUT AMERICA FIRST

(Address by Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana)

It is always a pleasure for me to leave Washington and travel to one of our great States, to meet with the people there and to discuss our national problems. I believe fervently the strength of our Nation resides not in the Capital but in the vast expanse of our country. Empires are represented by, as they are governed by, their capital cities. Free countries are not divided into a capital city and the provinces which are ruled by it.

It is a special pleasure for me to come to Texas, because in my State of Indiana we still believe the United States is a Union of sovereigns, and our State is in every respect the sovereign equal of the Federal Government. There is no deference in Indiana to

the glamour and show which are now so evident in Washington. We believe that we, the people, govern the country, and Washington is the front office, part of the administrative headquarters. I am sure that doctrine will sound right and proper in the State of Texas.

It is a favorite argument of the collectivists that foreign policy is something remote and abstract, which can be understood only by experts who have spent years in the precincts of the State Department or on the staffs of certain daily newspapers. Congressmen, who have not had the benefit of long indoctrination in the mysteries, and you, who do not even breathe the air of Washington, are supposed to sit patiently and wait until the great minds have handed down what you may know.

Americans never accepted such nonsense. Our greatest diplomatic achievements were the work of laymen, who had spent most of their years in private life. In the last few years we have been bewildered and bemused by foreign relations experts in Washington offices, but the moment has come when the American people need to decide what kind of foreign policy they wish to stand for, and then tell our Government to follow it.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S COMMITMENT TO THE FREE NATIONS

President Eisenhower's message on defense of the nationalist stronghold on Formosa will certainly be a landmark in American foreign affairs, but what kind of a landmark it will be is not yet certain.

First let us look at the documents themselves—the message of the President, and the resolution of Congress supporting the President's position.

In the words of the message and the resolution, the United States reaffirms its close ties with its loyal ally, the Nationalist Government of China, and makes a commitment to defend the Nationalist stronghold with American military power if the Communists carry out their threat to attack it.

This statement does not solve all the problems of our foreign policy in the western Pacific. There is no good reason why it should be. We have had 20 years of mismanagement of our activities in Asia. It is not reasonable to ask that any single statement clear away all the confusion.

The message is significant because it deals with the most important question. We have announced that we shall tolerate no new retreat in Asia. The Red Chinese will not be permitted to breach the frontiers of the still free world. We will make it clear that we shall meet Communist military action with military action, the only argument the Communists understand. We will not start the shooting, but if the Communists choose to start a war, we will finish it.

A foreign policy carefully worked out in many conferences, publicly stated on the authority of the Chief Executive, and supported by Congress and both parties, should be firm as a rock.

But I say to you, what you know well, that the foreign policy established in the Formosa papers is not firm at all. The fact that it is clearly stated in a Presidential message, and formally approved by the legislative branch, may mean nothing. It is wholly possible that we shall follow the opposite policy of appeasement of the Communists, surrender of our advantage, and a sellout of our loyal allies in Asia.

Why am I so certain that the wishes of the American President, the American Congress, and the American people, may be flouted?

TWO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY CENTERS

The reason is, briefly, that we have two lines of authority in foreign policymaking. One is the line of responsibility laid down in our Constitution and followed by all those who believe in our Constitution. The other is a network whose members deliberately disregard our Constitution, our President, and our Congress, and act as a law unto themselves.

The sad fact is that no public document, no formal commitment, no legal mandate, can determine American foreign policy today. Our fluctuating foreign policy is a tug of war between these two forces. It is an unsettled question which group will be triumphant in the struggle to shape our Nation's destiny.

We have seen again and again in the last two decades, that the foreign policy put forward in our public statements, is not the foreign policy carried out by our Government.

This is not because the American Government has suddenly become untrustworthy. That would be a most inaccurate statement of what has happened.

The reason is that the American Government is a two-headed monster. It is led by two different organizing centers. The never-settled question of which center is to determine our foreign policies has kept us in constant turmoil, and made us look futile and ineffectual before the world.

This conflict between two heads of our Government will not end until one or the other is wholly defeated, uprooted, and destroyed.

For years now our Government has been pulled in two opposite directions in making its decisions.

ONE CENTER IS PRO-SOVIET

The hearings of the so-called Tydings committee disclosed clear evidence, in spite of the whitewash, that a powerful and ruthless group were guiding our decisions to the advantage of the Soviet Union. This was not news. Committees of Congress had been making the same charge for years.

The Russell committee, which investigated the dismissal of General MacArthur, and investigations by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, showed that a secret faction in our Government had worked out its own foreign policy, to suit its own ends, and had by infinite skill, patience, and ruthlessness, put it into effect, regardless of the legally established foreign policy set by Congress and by our President.

Throughout all of 1951 and 1952 the Congress, especially the Senate, was engaged in a great debate to turn the light on this secret foreign policy and destroy its influence.

You know the achievements of this secret group.

After the defeat of Japan in World War II, our official foreign policy was to defend and strengthen the Nationalist Government of China. But the secret faction in our Government was determined we should support the Chinese Reds. In the name of the United States Government, they insisted on a united front government in China, with the Communist rebels retaining their own armed forces. Our representative gave the Reds a long cease-fire by which they could rest and re-equip their armies, and he set up an embargo on American bullets for the guns of the defenders.

Since 1950 we have had two policies for the Nationalist Government on Formosa. Our official policy was to support the legal Government and help rearm the Nationalist forces. Congress voted the money again and again as proper for our own defense. But the hidden faction in our Government intended that we should "disengage ourselves"—as the polite phrase goes—from the Nationalists. Their real policy for Formosa paralleled the famous advice of Owen Lattimore—to let Korea fall, but not let it look as if we pushed her. In December 1949—5 years ago—our State Department even issued instructions to its personnel abroad to show no regrets when the Government on Formosa fell—according to plan.

During the war in Korea we were ostensibly fighting to defeat the Red Chinese attackers. Our military leaders, our people, and I believe most of the members of the administration were loyal to that objective. But the invisible group had a different policy. They were determined to prevent military victory over the Reds. They intended to return by force the Chinese prisoners of war who did not wish to go back to Communist China, as they returned the hopeless refugees in Europe after 1945. They intended to leave North Korea a wasteland, occupied by Red troops who could infiltrate South Korea at will and descend at a moment's notice on free Korea with armies rested and reequipped.

The secret group won every objective except the return of the pitiful prisoners of war, who were saved by the insistence of Congress and the unremitting determination of our military leaders.

The same double purpose can be found in our German policy, in Austria, in Italy, in Greece, and in the tragic surrender of all Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union.

The public policy of the United States, which has in almost all instances denounced conquest and supported the independent peaceful nations, has faded away. The secret policy of the faction so friendly to the Soviet Union has in almost every instance been triumphant.

Our public policy of resisting communism has succeeded only in Turkey, and to a limited extent in Greece. But Secretary of Defense Forrestal, who was determined to block the Communist advance, and who won over President Truman, was driven to an early grave. His hard policy of armed resistance to communism was replaced by the soft policy of economic aid to Europe.

From 1945 to 1952 the power of the Soviet Union spread east and west, until it covered one-third of the world and put millions of people in bondage. The conflict between freedom and slavery was not lost in Asia or in Europe. It was lost in Washington, because the little group in our policy-making which favored the Soviet Union was stronger than the people who believed in a pro-American policy.

ITS PROGRAM IS DEFEAT OF THE FORMOSA POLICY

I say to you that the Eisenhower policy, for defense of the perimeter of the free world where it is threatened in the Formosa Straits, will be undermined, eroded, covered up, twisted, and made over into a policy favoring Red China, unless we learn our lesson, and deal with the realities of politics today.

Already erosion is apparent. We constantly hear it dinned in our ears that it is all right for us to defend Formosa, but very wrong to defend Quemoy and Matsu. That is as if the UN should say to the United States, "You will reduce tension with the Soviet Union if you give up Alaska, which is nearer the Soviet border than it is to the United States. The Soviet Union says Alaska belongs to it. It does not matter if you need Alaska for radar information, weather information, and early warning of threatened attack. You must give up Alaska to the Soviet rulers so their tension will be lowered."

Another form of erosion is hidden in the warnings that Formosa really belongs to Japan, and so it is all right for the United States to intervene, but Quemoy and the Tachens belong to China, and therefore, if we defend the coastal islands, we are threatening Red China. That argument omits the minor fact that we are not threatening the Reds. They are threatening us. They cannot get the coastal islands except by conquest. They have already tried and failed. It is they who talk of new conquests, not we.

A third form of erosion is the attempt to get a cease-fire in the United Nations. A cease-fire would tell the Nationalists they could never win back their own country. That would be like telling George Washington he could have a cease-fire if he would

remain in Valley Forge, but make no effort to reconquer New York, or Philadelphia, or Yorktown.

A cease-fire would free the Red armies for a new attack on Indochina.

A cease-fire would give further recognition to the Red Chinese. It would tell the desperate people on the mainland they had no hope. It would tell the people of Poland, the Balkans, and East Germany, that the United States had no interest in their fate.

Other pitfalls are the proposals to establish two Chinas, and sooner or later to put free China under a U. N. trusteeship. We know where that will lead. After Red China is safely installed in U. N. as a peace-loving nation, it will bring up the demand that Formosa be surrendered to it, and cite the Cairo declaration as proof we have already agreed to the proposal.

Perhaps the most serious threat of all is the recent report that our Government intends to ask other members of the U. N. to help us patrol the Formosa Strait. That would end all pretense of either a pro-American or an anti-Communist policy. It would mean another victory like Korea.

THE UNITED NATIONS MAKES NO COMMITMENTS TO FREEDOM

Whatever you make of U. N. in general, it should be possible to get agreement among all good Americans on a few facts. The Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations. So are her satellites. She has a permanent seat on the Security Council, with the veto power.

The U. N. has no commitments to support freedom. For every obligation to the free nations it has corresponding obligations to the Communist nations. Its staff includes a proportion of open Communists, but it also has a substantial number of secret Communists. The U. N. recently awarded large damages to some American fifth amendment Communists on its staff, who were dismissed only because of hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The U. N. is in the middle, seesawing between the free world and the Communist world.

The most favorable policy to us which the U. N. can adopt is neutralism. It is nearer to downright coexistence.

This is the minimum of undisputed fact about U. N. on which all Americans can agree. The U. N. is an agent of both Communist, anti-Communist and neutral nations. It has no justification for favoring the side of the free. It has never pretended to do so. Nowhere in the vast outpouring of documents that flows from the U. N. is there any commitment to freedom. The U. N. works for peace, for welfare, for one world. It does not pretend to work for liberty.

PRO-COMMUNISTS CANNOT BE STOPPED BY PAPERS

Why do I say that these proposals to soften up the Formosa resolution—so dangerous to the interests of the United States, so shameful a breach of our moral obligations—will probably prevail, in spite of the solemn commitment by the President and the Congress to a true American line of action?

The reason is this. A group of gangsters cannot be stopped by a written contract. A power group in government cannot be stopped by a state paper. A revolutionary junta, whose purpose is to take over the sovereignty, cannot be stopped by a resolution of congress. The only answer to a ruthless political-action group, determined to destroy the honor of America, is a political-action group determined to support American political ideals and defend the men in Government who are loyal to them.

We have talked loosely and superficially about this rival-power system. But talk is no longer good enough.

We have called the product the Acheson foreign policy. This dual control of foreign policy was operating in our Government as early as 1940 under Harry Hopkins. It operated under Dean Acheson, but it has operated just as effectively since he left. We have no reason whatever to think this group lost its hold because Mr. Acheson resigned. Everything we know indicates the contrary.

Who then are the people we are discussing? Where do they operate? On what foundation does their power rest?

THEY DO NOT OPERATE UNDER CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINTS

Part of our confusion comes from the fact that this group does not operate along constitutional lines at all. Our legal foreign relations staff works in the State Department, under the direction of the President, and within the policy framework laid down by Congress. But the extralegal foreign-policy-making conspiracy operates all over the lot. Like a cancer growing wild, it ignores all the restraints inherent in a healthy, well-balanced organism. This collectivist machine operates, in part, in the State Department, in part, in the White House Secretariat, in the super-Cabinet agencies of national defense, in the Foreign Operations Administration, in the CIA. But a substantial part of it operates outside Government. It may be found in the press, in the parties, in the colleges, in labor unions, in business, in the United Nations. The important point is that all the parts of this political machine are coordinated. They operate, as one, from some control tower we cannot see.

We have tried to blame our Presidents, the State Department, the party in power, for our failures in foreign policy. I am convinced we shall never recognize the octopus we have to fight until we realize it is not part of the legally established Government at all. It is a revolutionary junta, operating within our Government, and through our Government, but not for our Government, our Constitution, or our Nation.

What keeps this cabal in power, under Democratic and under Republican administrations? Why has it been impossible for three Presidents and many Congresses to demolish it? That is a long story but it can be summarized in three p's: pressure groups, propaganda, and pelf—that is, big spending.

You are going to ask me whether this group is entirely Communist directed. I doubt if our problem is that simple. This group has, we know, included Communist Party members and Communist agents, and may still include them. It includes Socialists, collectivist one-worlders, ambitious individuals greedy for power, willing in time of trouble to advance themselves at the expense of their country. It includes trimmers and collaborators who believe they can make deals with the unscrupulous, who think they can get votes or power or contracts or publicity, from the Communists, and then cast aside their temptors. It includes the innocent and the simple-minded, who love big words that have no meaning.

I do not know what proportion of these people are Communists, but I know for certain that everything they do is of benefit to Moscow, because it is directed by Moscow. The Soviet leaders are the most skillful people in the world today in the new political arts of propaganda, brainwashing, camouflage, and what I have called revolution by assembly line. We can save ourselves a great deal of time and thought if we realize one fact. As conditions are today, the Communist world revolution will control and use all the bits and pieces of collectivism, one-worldism, centralism, internationalism and all their variations. None of them will be helpful to us.

How are we going to redress the balance, and give strength to the vast majority of true Americans, so they can manage their own Government?

We must give up our reliance on legalism.

The pro-Communist, internationalist, collectivist foreign policy, with its favoritism for everything which helps the Soviet Union, has triumphed again and again because of the energy, intelligence, and determination of a self-directed elite. We fight this advancing army with statements, promises, papers and laws. We will never win until we oppose the collectivist political faction with resolute political action by men determined to put America first.

The pro-American group within our Government today is more numerous, abler, stronger, more devoted, than the collectivist group. It is supported by the vast bulk of the voters of both parties. Its weakness is that it is trying to win a debate under the rules of American political life. It should be fighting for victory over opponents who know no rules.

PRO-AMERICANS ARE UNDER ATTACK

We must know first the names of leaders of the pro-American group. You can find out who lead the American branch of our two-headed Government by the enemies they have made. The left-wing press and the collectivist collaborators are always ready to attack Secretary of Defense Wilson. They center much of their fire on Admiral Radford.

Khrushchev, speaking in Red China last fall, violently denounced Admiral Radford, and bracketed him with the Communist-hated Senators KNOWLAND and MCCARTHY. Isn't it significant that left-wing American columnists today follow exactly the line spoken by Khrushchev 4 or 5 months ago?

You remember this bloc did not exactly like MacArthur. They denounce the Senators who support the free nations of Asia. They criticize President Eisenhower if he dares cooperate with Republicans they have not recommended.

The collectivist press has not yet started to attack Herbert Hoover, Jr., who is now our Under Secretary of State, but it is a rule of theirs never to call attention to good people on our side until they have to. Assistant Secretary of State Robertson has escaped their attack for the same reason.

Today, pro-American officials have not one moment's security. They are constantly under attack, mostly by moves they cannot see. If you need a blueprint of how the collectivists keep dangerous anti-Communists under constant pressure, I suggest you analyze the series of moves which they employed to destroy Senator MCCARTHY, from the day in Wheeling, W. Va., when he tore down the curtain of censorship hiding the Communists in our State Department.

I tell you just such a subtle, complex, perfectly timed, secret campaign is already under way against the men who dared advise the President to resist the Chinese Reds. The strategy is worked out, and broken into steps. It will arise, spontaneously, from all directions. It will be echoed in all quarters of the world. The line is already apparent in the inspired British press and that of the Continent.

From a well-informed left-wing magazine I learn the shape of coming events. Once the U. N. is well in the picture the plan is to "build up enough pressure to make imperative the gentle liquidation of Chiang Kai-shek, and the establishment of true self-government for the Formosans under U. N. trusteeship." But, my friends, the Nationalists are not Formosans. Self-government will give the island to its prewar inhabitants. Can you see the Nationalist armies, driven from Formosan soil by a demand for neutrality, wandering like a ghost army about the world, as helpless as General Anders valiant Polish fighting men? Next we are told "binding multilateral agreements for the reduction of armaments are imperative." These agreements will bind us but not the

Communists. Finally we are told, "then the gamble that the President has taken will start paying off. The greater his success, the more likely he is to acquire the freedom of action he needs to (and I urge you to note) shed his most troublesome aides."

ONLY POLITICAL ACTION WILL SAVE US

The bloc which intends to destroy the true Americans in our Government is in action. Is there a bloc to defend the true Americans and drive out the secret enemies of our country? I am not urging you to help our friends in Asia. I am urging you to prevent the humiliating defeat of our country and everything it stands for.

You ask who are the leaders of the collectivist bloc. Who is taking Acheson's place today?

I can guess but I have no legal proof. Remember, the physician cannot have proof that his diagnosis is correct. He can get that only from the autopsy.

But I want to point out one significant fact. We are never going to have legal proof, about the most dangerous enemies of our country. We will not be able to use what proof we have, when the culprit is close to the top. Attorney General Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover told us how FBI reports on Harry White, for example, were sent to President Truman, and his Cabinet officers again and again. We know President Truman and his top Cabinet members opposed promoting Harry White to the International Monetary Fund, in view of his record. But he was promoted.

Who could tell the President of the United States he must promote a known Communist collaborator? I have been told who was the person responsible but I have, so far, no proof. Shall we sit and do nothing, when we have political proof that some of our officials are selling out our country, merely because we have no affidavits of what was said in their secret conferences?

One thing we know. The Communists and their collaborators push their best men close to the top, because that is the safest place to be. No one could remove Dr. John from his job in Germany though more than one person knew he was disloyal. We may get the little traitors by assembling legal proof. We will never get the big ones, except by political counterattack.

The pro-Communist attack on our political institutions is political action. We must use political action to remove from public life every man or woman who is beholden to the Communists, or committed to a philosophy alien to our Constitution. We cannot wait until we see a party card.

POLITICAL ACTION WILL BRING ABOUT AN AMERICAN POLICY

We must also know American policy. It is all very well to know Communist policy, but it is more important to know American policy.

We must have a clear American foreign policy and a clear American military policy before we enter any conference with other nations in the United Nations or outside.

There is no harm in conferring with foreign governments, inside or outside of U. N. so long as we put America first.

Nationalist China has perhaps half a million men eager to fight for their independence.

Korea has courageous soldiers ready to fight on their own soil. Indochina can provide others, with American training. Altogether free Asia can furnish millions of troops eager to guard their sectors of the frontier of freedom.

Can we guarantee that no one in our State Department or FOA will hamstring the funds Congress has voted to arm them? Can we guarantee that agencies of our Government will not conspire to undermine Chiang Kai-shek or Syngman Rhee or Vietnam? If the great brains, who have abandoned newspaper work for pontificating, sow planned confusion or attack our pro-American leaders, are we ready to meet them with better newspapers, better writers, better radio and television programs, or, if necessary, by mimeograph machines in every block?

The Chinese Communists have started four wars in the last 10 years, with no penalty. The Red Chinese know they can never put down the Chinese on the mainland, while the Chinese on Formosa have an army. They will never be satisfied with less than total destruction of that army. They must destroy the armies of Korea and of Indochina. They count on the aid of their supporters in our councils.

Support of the armies of free Asia is American policy, as destruction of these armies is Communist policy.

The Communist regimes are weak and their people rebellious. The only strength they possess is the faction within the American Government which puts the Soviet Union first.

We must deal first with our own dual Government. If we will organize political action, to support the pro-Americans in our Government and in public life, the world conflict will soon be over. We can win true peace for all the world if we will gird ourselves to defeat the enemy within.

Accounting Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the course of its extensive overhaul of our tax system during the last Congress, one of the most widespread complaints received by the Committee on Ways and Means was that artificial divergences had developed between the computation of income for tax purposes and the computation of income for business purposes as determined under generally accepted accounting provisions. These differences were confined almost entirely to questions of when certain types of income and expenses should be taken into account in arriving at net income.

As a result, the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954 sought to bring the income tax provisions of the law into harmony with generally accepted accounting provisions and, as stated in the report of our committee, "to assure that all items of income and deductions are taken into account once, but only once, in the computation of taxable income." Sections 452 and 462 of the new code were designed to meet these objectives.

Under the prior law, payments received in advance for the use of property in future years or for services to be rendered in future years were includible in the income of the recipient in the year they were received. This was true regardless of the taxpayer's method of accounting. However, well established accounting procedures provide that, in the case of taxpayers on an accrual accounting system, payments for rentals, club dues, warehouse fees, and the like should be included in income in the year in which income is earned and in the year in which the related expenses are incurred. Obviously, this is not necessarily in the year of receipt.

As a consequence, section 452, in general, permits accrual basis taxpayers to defer the reporting of advance payments as income until the year, or years, in which, under the taxpayer's regular method of accounting, the income is earned.

With respect to deductions for expenses and losses incurred by a taxpayer, prior law provided that these deductions could be taken only when all events had occurred which fixed the fact and the amount of the taxpayer's liability. This rule, in many cases, was at variance with generally accepted accounting principles which require all determinable liabilities relating to reported income to be taken into account.

As a result, section 462 of the new code conformed the tax treatment of expenses more closely to general business treatment by permitting an accrual basis taxpayer to deduct reasonable additions to reserves for estimated expenses.

These two provisions, sections 452 and 462, were strongly advocated by the accounting profession of the United States. Each section was approved by the unanimous vote of both the Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

It has developed recently that there is a sharp difference of opinion between taxpayers and the Government as to the scope of these sections. The tentative regulations issued by the Treasury on January 22 in order to carry out the provisions of the law have come under strong attack as being too restrictive. For example, the tentative regulations would not permit a deduction for additions to reserves for estimated repair and maintenance expenses. Taxpayers have already served notice that they intend to litigate this restriction. Should they be successful in the courts, the revenue loss under the law would be far in excess of anything contemplated by the Congress.

In addition, the tentative regulations also require that the reserves which these sections permit for tax purposes must be shown on the regular books of the company which are used for statements of financial condition to stockholders. This requirement is also under attack although it would seem to be in line with the objective of the law to bring tax accounting into harmony with business accounting.

Therefore, it seems clear that many groups will seek an opportunity under these sections to receive tax benefits substantially in excess of anything anticipated by the Congress. If the present provisions remain in effect, extended litigation appears inevitable. As a result, I believe that the two sections in question should be repealed in order to prevent this type of uncertainty and to avoid possible taxpayer abuse. The Secretary of the Treasury has recommended this action. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4726, to carry out this objective.

There is absolutely no question in my mind but that the objective which Con-

gress sought to achieve by these provisions was and still remains highly desirable. Tax accounting should not depart in an artificial manner from generally accepted principles of business accounting. Therefore, it is my earnest hope that this matter will receive further study with a view to solving the transitional problems which have occurred. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that effective and practical legislation along these lines can and should be developed.

Commission for the Study of the Civil Defense Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter I have written to the President in which I respectfully urge that prompt action be taken to establish a commission for a study of the civil-defense problems which have been brought about by the advent of nuclear weapons. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Much has been said in the press this week concerning the possible establishment of a commission for a prompt study of the civil-defense problems brought about by the advent of nuclear weapons. In the light of the recent information released by various Federal agencies regarding the lethal affect of these nuclear weapons, I respectfully urge that immediate steps be taken to bring such a commission into reality.

Nearly 2 years ago, on July 22, 1953, I expressed my views on the civil-defense problem in a letter addresed to Mr. Sherley Ewing, director of the Maryland State Civil Defense Agency, a copy of which is enclosed. This letter, in which I expressed my belief that we have an obligation to make available to our citizens all information (within security limits) which will alert them to the peril created by these nuclear weapons, appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1953. At that time I urged that more effective civilian defense precautions be prepared and tested.

I do not believe that Members of Congress have been kept as well informed as security would permit concerning the horror flowing from the use of nuclear weapons, and certainly the average citizen has been kept even less informed.

As a result of the series of explosions now taking place in Nevada, I have been receiving quite a bit of mail from my constituents in which many of them express, for the first time, their great interest and alarm.

I believe that recent disclosures of information with regard to the hazards from fallout and other affects of nuclear explosions should be encouraged, and even expanded, within the limits of national security. I also believe that the Federal Government ought to make realistic appropriations for use at the Federal level and for grants to State and local governments on a matching basis, in order to bring our civil-defense preparations and activities to a level where, if and when needed, the citizenry will be protected.

I heartily endorse your recommendation to appoint a commission to study the problems of civilian defense. I again urge that this action be taken immediately.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

The Soybean Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the soybean industry, and specifically the growers of soybeans in the Midsouth, are threatened by a proposal of the Department of Agriculture to reclassify certain varieties of beans.

This matter is rather complicated in its ramifications, and for the benefit of the Congress I would like to call to the attention of the Members several letters written on this proposal.

On February 14 the Department called a meeting of soybean growers in Memphis, Tenn. Herewith is a letter which I wrote to Mr. J. E. Barr, Chief of the Inspection Branch of the Agricultural Marketing Service Grain Division:

FEBRUARY 10, 1955.

Mr. J. E. BARR,
Chief, Inspection Branch,
Grain Division,
Agricultural Marketing Service.

DEAR MR. BARR: I am writing you in reference to the series of meetings you are conducting throughout the country concerning a proposal to define or classify soybeans with green seed covers, which in cross section are yellow, as green soybeans.

The growers in the section of Arkansas which I represent have been growing Ogden Lee, and Dortchsoy beans, all of which have a yellow meat but a green cast on their coats.

Such a reclassification, I am informed, would cause such beans to be labeled "mixed" and, as such, would sell for less. In addition, I am advised, they would receive a lower loan rate, and growers and producers would have greater expense of handling.

From information here in Washington, it would appear that there is some belief that within a few years these varieties will be replaced by others which have been given some trial in other sections. If this is true, I would be interested in knowing if sufficient trial has been given to assure that these new varieties will replace the beans now being grown in this section. This would, in a short time, eliminate the need for a reclassification.

Such action would prevent added economic difficulty to these growers and would solve the problem within a short time. For this reason, I am writing to suggest that any action to reclassify be deferred until it can be determined that these new varieties will be of commercial value to our growers and they can begin to switch over to these new varieties.

I will appreciate your placing this in the record of the meeting to be held in Memphis on February 14.

Yours very sincerely,

E. C. GATHINGS.

At the Memphis meeting, Mr. W. H. "Bill" Wyatt, of Blytheville, Ark., made a very fine statement relative to this reclassification, and for the information of the Congress, I wish to include Mr. Wyatt's full statement:

TESTIMONY AT MEMPHIS HEARING, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ON CHANGES IN OFFICIAL STANDARDS FOR SOYBEANS, FEBRUARY 14, 1955

I am W. H. "Bill" Wyatt, of Mississippi County, Ark. As a member of the board of directors, I'm representing the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation at this hearing.

Let's consider first the proposal to "define or reclassify soybeans with green seed coats, which in cross section are yellow, as green soybeans, instead of yellow soybeans as at present."

On the face of it, that seems to be all right since green soybeans and yellow soybeans now carry the same CCC loan value and both may be traded on the board. But on a closer analysis we find this to be entirely false as far as our Ogden soybean is concerned.

We called in C. A. Silas, of Woodson Tenant Laboratories, and asked for a description of the Ogden bean. This is what he said: "Ogdens are now classed as yellow beans. The proposed change would force them into the 'mixed bean' classification, because Ogdens are neither green nor yellow by seed coat analysis alone."

Keith Bilbrey, county agent, added, "The green pigment is variable and unstable depending on the age of bean and length of exposure to sun rays before harvest. So, because some of the Ogdens bleach out to yellow, they could no more be classed as green than as yellow. The dangerous consequence is that nearly all the highest producing soybeans in the South would automatically be classed as 'mixed beans.'"

This is supported by the definition on page 69 of the Official Grain Standard section (g) "Mixed Soybeans—Mixed soybeans shall be any mixture of soybeans which does not meet the requirements for classes, yellow soybeans, green soybeans, brown soybeans, or black soybeans. Bicolored soybeans shall be classified as mixed soybeans."

What does this mean pricewise to the producer?

The 1954 CCC Grain Price Support Bulletin Supplement 2, Soybeans, said: "The support rates for soybeans of the classes, black soybeans, brown soybeans, and mixed soybeans shall be 25 cents per bushel less than the support rates for the classes, green soybeans and yellow soybeans."

Mixed beans may not be tendered on the board, could not be hedged, and could not be delivered.

The American and world markets have accepted the Ogden bean for 10 years, with no complaint that we have ever heard of before. Why the suggested change now? It would be a calamity to the South. A tremendously unfair and discriminatory act.

Southern production in 1951

	Acres	Bushels per acre	Total
Arkansas	607,000	20	12,140,000
Alabama	88,000	18	704,000
Georgia	21,000	10.5	211,500
Kentucky	130,000	19	2,470,000
Louisiana	38,000	17.5	665,000
Mississippi	425,000	13	5,525,000
North Carolina	309,000	16.5	5,098,500
South Carolina	83,000	12.5	1,037,500
Tennessee	183,000	17.5	3,202,500
Virginia	166,000	18	3,004,000
Missouri [1]	420,000	20	8,400,000
1951 total	2,470,000		42,458,000

[1] Assuming ⅓ of Missouri's production in the Ogden area.

(1951 figures were used because they are nearest to, but under anticipated production in 1955).

Surely it is fair to guess that 80 percent of all southern beans are Ogdens. Mississippi County Arkansas' percentage will run 90 percent Ogdens.

Eighty percent of the 1951 production would be 33,966,400 bushels.

If you force Ogdens into a "mixed-bean" class, then by 1954 loan standards, you would be saying to the world, "The South's 33,966,400 bushels of Ogden soybeans are worth $3,491,600 less than the same number of yellow soybeans." And there would not be a word of truth in it.

And, by reclassification, the American market might start discrimination in price also, and for no reason, except promoted by Government classification.

We believe any foreign buyer can get strictly yellow soybeans from Northern areas for their limited needs without hurting them and without totally wrecking our economy.

Then there is extra danger: We fear the idea would "snowball" and others would start demanding strictly yellow beans.

We are against the proposed change in classification of Ogden soybeans from the cross-section analysis to color of skin coats. If the United States Department of Agriculture can show us just cause why they should be changed, then time must be allowed to develop a comparable yielding yellow bean for the South. In other words, we want no change now.

Likely lowering of support price for 1955 crop from 80 percent down to 70 percent may be tragic enough: $2.22 down to $2.04 if the market follows.

A conservative estimate of 4 or 5 million bushels crop in Mississippi County, Ark., alone in 1955, at 20 cents per bushel less would be nearly a million dollars to that county alone.

The United States survey shows 99 percent of Arkansas farmers sell less than $25,000 gross annually. All our farmers grow soybeans with cotton controls on. This thing would affect all of us.

This proposed change would only concern the South as the Ogden bean is not grown in cooler climate and since the crushers find the oil content of the Ogden as high or even a little higher in some instances and since the cross-section of the Ogden is as yellow as the purely yellow-coated beans, the 58,000 members of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation respectfully request that no change be made in the classification of the Ogden soybeans.

Concerning the proposed revision which would decrease the maximum limits of foreign material by 1 percent in each grade, we, as producers, after much consideration, cannot see that this will benefit us in any way.

Last year nearly all buyers bought the No. 1 grade, which as it now stands limits foreign material to 2 percent. If these buyers plan to return to a No. 2 grade for basis of purchase under the proposed change, they are still allowing the 2 percent foreign matter. What is to be gained?

Grading at its best, as far as foreign materials are concerned, is far from accurate. No two graders can probe the same load and come up with the same foreign matter percentage.

Going a little further into this, I checked the grades on two carloads shipped January 27, 1955, by Farmers Soybeans Corp., of Blytheville, Ark. Here are results of three different peoples grading.

	Woodson-Tenant Laboratories	Memphis Merchants Exchange	U.S.D.A. Federal appeal
T. W	56	56.0	56.0
F. M	4.0	2.5	2.7
Splits	18.0	19.0	20.0
Damage	3.9	2.9	4.0
Moisture	14.1	14.3	14.3
T. W	56	56.0	55.5
F. M	2.8	2.0	2.0
Splits	19.0	21.0	22.0
Damage	4.2	3.0	4.0
Moisture	14.0	13.9	13.9

You will note the difference in the grades especially, even in the last two when the car was in Memphis and did not move. Because of this inability to accurately determine the exact amount of foreign materials in a load of beans (and the difference is much greater on a farm truckload because the beans have not been blended) it is dangerous and injurious to producers for this grade schedule to be too strict.

Until a better means of grading is found or until the country elevators and local buyers will use their cleaners and weigh the foreign material, or until a premium is paid for better grades as in purchase of cottonseed, we would hesitate to approve any tightening of the United States soybean standards.

We do not want to be shortsighted and lose our export market.

We are interested in improving and delivering a quality product as are other interested groups such as the American Soybean Association. If a 5/64 round-hole bottom screen is put into use in order to remove the chipped beans from the foreign material count, we will support the proposed revision which would decrease the maximum limits of foreign materials by 1 percent in each grade.

As to the other proposed changes, they are minor as far as the farmer is concerned compared to the aforementioned proposals, but most of the argument of foreign matter will relate.

In addition to Mr. Wyatt's remarks, two other excellent statements should be presented to further emphasize the seriousness of this proposal. Mr. G. A. Hale, of the Hale Seed Farm of Burdette, Ark., has pointed out a very definite objection to this proposal, and his letter addressed to the Director of the Grain Division follows:

HALE SEED FARMS,
Burdette, Ark., February 15, 1955.

DIRECTOR, GRAIN DIVISION, AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After attending the very efficiently and fairly conducted hearing in Memphis yesterday, I wish to submit to you my comments on one of the proposed changes in the present classification of soybeans by your Division: namely, the classification of soybeans with green seed coats but yellow in cross section as green soybeans.

As a breeder, tester, and producer of soybean varieties for the Cotton Belt since 1942, I am of the opinion from the remarks made by your representative and others at this hearing that they do not fully appreciate the reasons why southern soybean growers are opposed to classifying the Ogden variety and its selections and possibly the new Lee variety, when grown under some conditions, as green soybeans.

Commercial, State, and Federal soybean breeders in the South have been cognizant of the desirability and the possibility of breeding a completely yellow, full-season soybean variety to replace the Ogden variety and its selections, which we realize have several undesirable characteristics. To date no breeder has succeeded in producing a widely adapted all-yellow variety with the maturity date and high yield of the Ogden-type soybean. All of the adapted, available yellow varieties, with the possible exception of the Lee variety—which has some green coloring when grown under some conditions—and which is not adapted to the northern part of the Cotton Belt, yield from 10 to 40 percent less than the Ogden and its selections according to tests made by our State experiment stations in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

It is the opinion of all the growers and buyers of soybeans that I have contacted in this section that, if the proposed change in the classification of the Ogden-type soybean is made, this change would likely result in southern growers getting lower prices for the bulk of their soybean crop. Our only recourse to this condition would be to switch to the growing of less productive all-yellow varieties. This change would be impossible until we have time to increase the present inadequate seed supply of these varieties to the volume required to plant most of our acreage.

As a soybean grower, I appreciate the clear and enlightening presentation of the reasons why the Department of Agriculture has proposed the change in the classification of the Ogden-type soybean. It is doubtful if all of your problems would be solved by changing your method of grading so that our Ogden-type soybean would be classed as a green soybean because of the fact that the green coloring in the Ogden seedcoat will fade and the coat will be yellow under some conditions. The seed analyst of the Arkansas State Plant Board, Little Rock, Ark., which is the official seed-certification agency of Arkansas, has difficulty in determining whether or not even our registered-grade Ogden-type soybeans are pure as to variety because of the unstable color of the seedcoats.

Until soybean producers can develop and growers can increase an all-yellow soybean variety that is as good as the Ogden and its selections to replace it and until an accurate method of classifying soybeans with green seedcoats but yellow cotyledons such as the Ogden and its selections, which are very unstable in color, is devised, I am opposed to a change in the present classification because I do not think a change at this time would be to the best interest of any segment of the southern soybean industry.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to present my views.

Respectfully submitted.

G. A. HALE.

With this should also be included the letter written by Mr. Paul C. Hughes, of Blytheville, president of the Mid-South Soybean & Grain Shippers Association. Mr. Hughes points out the economic circumstances connected with this proposed change:

MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN & GRAIN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
February 17, 1955.

TO DIRECTOR, GRAIN DIVISION, AMA, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.:

VIEWS OF THE MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN & GRAIN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION OF THE PROPOSED REVISIONS OF THE SOYBEAN STANDARDS

1. On the proposed revision that would reduce the maximum limits of foreign material 1 percent in each numerical grade. As country shippers we are in the middle on this question as we only buy on the grade that we have to sell but as the growers as presented by the American Soybean Asso-

ciation and the processors thought their present buying practices went 2 percent foreign material in No. 2 soybeans, we see no reason why the change cannot be made. We do, however, urge that a study be made to see if some simple method can be found to separate true foreign material from the small broken pieces of soybeans that fall through an 8/64 round hole screen. Maybe the use of a smaller hole size such as a 5/64 would let enough of the small weed seed through and leave enough broken pieces on the screen to reduce the buildup of foreign material we now have in soybeans through handling. If such a method can be found we urge its use.

2. On the reduction of moisture we see no reason why the moisture in No. 1 soybeans cannot be reduced to 12 percent. However, we feel that no change need be made in the moisture of No. 2 soybeans as we have found that even in our humid climate 14 percent moisture soybeans can be stored.

3. We can see no reason why the change in splits should not go through if you in the Department feel that it would improve the soybean grading system.

4. On the proposed special limits on heat damage in each numerical grade, we are against such limits as they would work a hardship on all shippers. Today inspectors are having enough trouble determining total damage or just how much total damage a sample contains. However, if the Department feels that such limits should be put into effect, then heat damage should be more clearly defined. We suggest that it means soybeans that have turned entirely black or brown from heat. The present methods of saying that a small brown spot in the middle of an otherwise sound soybean is heat damage leaves too much room for human error and judgment for such narrow limits of heat damage as have been proposed by the Department.

5. On the proposed reclassification of soybeans with green seed coats that are in cross section yellow from the yellow class to the green class. We cannot say too strongly that we are opposed to this change. We have many reasons for being against the change. Here are just a few of them: 80 percent or more of the Midsouth soybean production would be affected by this change. No evidence was present at Memphis to disprove our conclusion that if the proposed change went through that 90 percent of our Ogden-type soybeans would grade as mixed. This was the case before the change in 1949. If they were classed as mixed in 1948 and before what new method has been developed to tell class by the variety predominate color and how could variety purity be proven? In other words how could an inspector tell the difference between a bleached Ogden and a pale S–100 to say that the sample was a mixture of green and yellow varieties or just a sample of Ogden-type soybean and therefore are classed green and just happen to have 10 percent or more that just happen to be faded yellow?

We recognized the Department's desire and the need to make a grade and class such that it will tell the buyer if he wants that certain quality or not. We agree that under the present standards for soybeans it is not always possible for the buyer to get just what he wants by buying a certain grade and class but as one of the speakers at Memphis pointed out No. 2 hard wheat does not always describe just what type of No. 2 hard wheat that a buyer wants. Therefore, a buyer will say that he wants Kansas or Texas No. 2 Hard Wheat and not Illinois No. 2 Hard Wheat. Today most buyers that need a yellow-coated soybean for their special products have found that they can get what they want by saying that they want a No. 2 yellow soybean from Illinois points or maybe Ohio. We feel that since the buyer can get yellow-coated soybeans by saying what he wants that it is not right to penalize the Midsouth that has no high yielding soybean that isn't mixed with green and yellow coats. We realize that you cannot sell a person for long something that he does not want so if it was not possible for a buyer to get yellow-coated soybeans without changing the standards we would not be opposed but as he can get yellow-coated soybeans leave the standards alone.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL C. HUGHES,
President.

Mr. Speaker, from this brief outline of the facts it should be readily seen that this proposed change will work a great hardship on the South.

However, Mr. Speaker, in discussions with Mr. Barr and with Mr. Clyde M. Jackson, of the Grain Division, I have been unable to find a basis for this proposal.

I trust that the Department will abandon the reclassification plan. If it is put into effect the Southern soybean grower will be forced to sell his commodity at an appreciable smaller return.

The order should not be put into effect as it would work a severe economic hardship on a large section of the country.

America's Business Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at Youngstown, Ohio, last night by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] dealing with the subject of America's business future.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to be here with you this evening after the most strenuous 2 weeks I have put in since the campaign. In the last 10 days I have been talking to men and women all over the State of Ohio and in Pennsylvania. People sometimes ask me why I accept so many invitations and why I work so hard at my job. I can tell you the truth—I enjoy it. The more I see the people the more I enjoy it.

There is a great alertness in our country today. People are better informed on public affairs than they have ever been. They are often skeptical, but they are ready to listen to reason, and I think they have a real understanding of our country's basic problems.

Talking to you business and professional people, I know that I reflect the thinking of the overwhelming majority of the American people in what I am going to say. We have changed our country's outlook tremendously in the last few years. When all of us were a little younger our country's position was vastly different from what it is today. A generation ago we were a creditor nation, to be sure, but we had not yet realized all the implications of the position. Today, we have discovered what the British learned in the 19th century. The country which provides the world's financial foundations automatically assumes the responsibility of preserving these foundations.

This is, I think, the most important corollary of our new role in the world. Whether we like it or not, and many of us do not like it, a position of world leadership has been thrust upon us. I know that many of us would like nothing better than an opportunity to live our lives in peace and contentment. We have virtually all of the things we need upon this great North American Continent to provide for the needs of our country. If we were to stay at home, minding our own business, we would not require some of the raw materials which must be obtained from foreign sources for military forces.

If we could turn back the hands of time to the 19th century many of us would be far happier with our lot.

This is all a bygone dream. The world will not let us enjoy the luxuries of isolation. This last week a brigadier general of the Army told a group, over which I presided in Cleveland, that our entire system of military air defense is on a 24-hour 20-minute alert basis. Every military station in the country is prepared to go into action on 20 minutes' notice. This is a frightening prospect. But it illustrates the tension of the times in which we live. Today the expanding frontiers of science have compressed the world into a globe which is, figuratively, no bigger than a baseball. You can almost put your hands around it. Our means of communication can span the oceans in a matter of seconds. No one knows the exact speed of our potential guided missiles. Some of my scientific friends tell me that there is probably no theoretical limit which we can establish. Planes can already span our own country in a matter of 4 hours. If we can do these things, intelligence dictates the sobering knowledge that our possible enemies may do the same.

I say these things, not because I am fearful of the future, but because I believe sincerely that we sometimes think and react as if we could forget these facts of life. Often men and women who are confronted with the knowledge of something too frightening to contemplate, push it so far into the background that they lose all power of action. The Eisenhower administration has not made this mistake. Our President is a remarkable man. He has learned from long and bitter experience how to face a disturbing situation and how to live with it. When he relaxes it is only because he knows that he must do so in order to face the reality which he can never really escape.

There are people in our country who make a serious mistake of political judgment. Some of them have been writing me letters, declaring that they see no difference between the foreign policy of President Eisenhower and the foreign policy of President Truman. Nothing could be more erroneous. Truman and Acheson believed in waiting for the blow to strike. They did not anticipate. They did not plan. As a result, when the enemy did strike, in 1950, we were shockingly unprepared. Despite the fact that we had spent billions of dollars for defense purposes, our defenses in the Far East were grossly unprepared. Today that has been changed entirely. We are prepared for any emergency. We are not cocky. We have no chip on our shoulder. But, we are on the alert. More than this, our Secretary of State, acting under the President's direction, has taken the lead in organizing the free countries of Asia and the Pacific to meet any threat. For the first time in the history of the world, we are parties to an agreement in the Pacific. I want to call your attention to one of the specific terms of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. This provision declares that any of the countries involved may call for help from their allies to resist not only external agression, but also internal subversion. This is a most important development. In the past the Communist

technique has been simple. They have infiltrated governments. They have used native Communists to stir up discontent and when they were challenged, they invariably said, "This is an internal problem, and it is none of your business." This is not going to happen again—thanks to the foresight of our President and his administration.

There is another vital distinction between the policies of President Eisenhower and his predecessors. Mr. Truman told American military leaders that they could go so far and no farther. He told our fliers that if they are attacked they could pursue their attackers up to point X. And then turn back. He told one of the greatest living military experts that he could not attack—he could only defend. President Eisenhower has reversed this entirely. If any one fires at an American plane, on an American ship, or on an American soldier, we are going to fire back. The prestige and dignity of the American people will no longer be ignored and trampled into the dust without retaliation. I think our people are sick and tired of playing the Communist game. We know that if we give them an inch they will take a yard. If we give them a yard—they will take a mile.

These are by no means the only differences that I can see in the administration's program. Right here at home, our President is doing his utmost to cut wasteful, meaningless spending of the taxpayers money. We are reducing bloated Federal payrolls. We are trying to establish intelligent order inside the bureaucracy that has grown up over the years. This is not easy. It involves human beings and no public official enjoys the prospect of dismissing any employee. We can't help remembering that each one of them has a family—and a vote. But nothing that I have seen in public life comes closer to sheer downright political opium smoking than the latest stunt of the Democrats in Washington. For months they have been shouting to the high heavens about the reduction of military personnel by the Eisenhower administration. They have been crying for more public housing. They have been asking for Federal funds for everything they can think of. Now they want to cut Federal taxes by $20 for every taxpayer and every dependent.

This is the best political mousetrap since Ralph Waldo Emerson's. No one in public life ever wants to raise taxes and cut spending. Everyone likes to cut taxes and increase spending, but unless somebody repeals the law of gravity and finds a way to keep going up higher and higher without ever coming down, it can't be done. I do not believe the American people will buy this kind of political goldbrick.

Just what is my conclusion from all of these observations? I am—you might not think it from what I have been saying—but I am an optimist. If I were not, I could not be a Republican. I was an active Republican when some of my colleagues were in hiding. But I have faith in America and its future. Our country shares that faith. Every 24 hours in the last year our population, throughout the country, has increased by 11,000 people. Every 30 days we have added to our population a city the size of Syracuse. This physical fact alone is going to create tremendous needs—more housing, more schools, more clothing, more automobiles, more savings, and more opportunities. More and more people reaching the age of retirement will be enjoying their years of rest. There will be more money to spend, more time to travel, and better health to enjoy it. The same technical skills which threaten the extermination of the world today can be used tomorrow to assure our country of an almost incredible future. The atomic science that can throw hydrogen radiation to vast parts of the world can also fuel our factories, light our cities, and power every vehicle in the world. What we need is time—time to consolidate our knowledge—time to help mankind work out its destiny.

I am a man of faith. I do not believe that we are born into existence simply for our self-destruction. I believe that we have the intelligence and the judgment to prevent such a catastrophe. Certainly, here in America, we have the will to do so. With your help and with the help of the American people, I am sure that we will solve our problems, and that we will work together to create a world which will live and not die.

Public Power and the So-Called Partnership Program of the National Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, early in February I was asked by the North American Newspaper Alliance to present my support of public power and my opposition to the so-called partnership program of the national administration. At the same time, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay was invited to state an opposite viewpoint on these vital issues.

I ask, Mr. President, that both of these statements, in fairness to Mr. McKay and myself, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR NEUBERGER DEFENDS PUBLIC POWER, STAND THAT GAVE HIM UPSET OREGON VICTORY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The junior Senator from Oregon, a Democrat, won an upset victory over Senator Guy Cordon, the incumbent Republican, in the traditionally Republican, Northwestern State. That victory, last November, gave the Democrats control of the Senate. The big issue in the Oregon campaign was public power. In this exclusive article, Senator NEUBERGER explains his position on this issue.)

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—The ending of the public-power program can only mean economic stagnation in many key regions of the United States. The TVA and Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have brought electricity to American farms, strengthened industrial payrolls and during the war helped to make possible the production of atomic energy and 50,000 planes a year.

Why did the Eisenhower administration, through Secretary of the Interior McKay, abolish so beneficial a program for what it calls "partnership?"

Under partnership, the Government will put up half the cost of dams and private utilities generally the other half. When the dam is built, the Government gets the fish ladders and locks and floodgates, which yield no revenue. The utility acquires the kilowatts from the powerhouse for a period of at least 50 years.

What is the purpose of this? Under the Federal program, power receipts have been pouring into the Treasury. The Government has invested $128,549,822 in construction costs and operating expenses for Bonneville Dam. Yet, after only 11 years of full operation, this project has put $48,825,958 in power revenues into public coffers. In fact, the whole Bonneville Power Administration, which markets energy from all Federal dams in the Northwest, has collected gross income of $370,565,589 through the sale of kilowatts.

Why end this program for a vague partnership which could benefit only the private utilities and raise the cost of power needed for western industrial development? It is significant, I think, that the administration proposes partnership for the magnificent hydroelectric sites along the Columbia River, but at the same time recommends fully Federal dams for the far less valuable sites in the upper Colorado Basin where electric-power output is less profitable. In other words, the power companies get the cream, Uncle Sam the dregs.

I have compared the partnership proposed by the administration to the building of a department store by two men. Each partner puts up half the money. After the store is erected, one man receives as his share the drinking fountains, revolving doors, fire escapes, and escalators. The other partner gets the sales counters. That describes the partnership scheme under which the Government would get fish ladders while the utility corporations take over the powerplants.

Actually, partnership has proved to be the label for an empty package. In the 2 years that the administration has been pushing the idea partnership has failed to get a single Northwest power project under way. The only tangible accomplishment has been a 2-year moratorium on Federal construction of the Big Priest Rapids project while a local public utility explores the feasibility of construction. Meanwhile, the specter of a severe power shortage in the area—with inestimable economic repercussions—moves closer to reality.

As long ago as 1908 two great progressive Republicans—Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot—fought an historic battle to keep magnificent waterpower sites on mountain rivers away from what they then called the Power Trust. Contrast this with the desire of Secretary of the Interior McKay to give the great Hells Canyon site on the Snake River to the Idaho Power Co., a corporation which holds its annual meetings in Augusta, Maine, nearly 3,000 miles from Idaho.

The Idaho Power Co. would not develop the full power potential of Hells Canyon. Its rates are high, far higher than the Government charges through the Bonneville Administration. Long before this controversy began, the Corps of Army Engineers recommended in their famous 308 report the construction of a multipurpose Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Why reject this master plan for development of the Snake River?

The plan for full development of the Columbia River Basin, pioneered through the years by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, is an engineering masterpiece. The plan calls for operation of dams throughout the basin in a unified system for maximum power production, flood control, irrigation, navigation, and protection of wildlife. This integrated operation increases efficiency and total use of the region's water resources. As a result, benefits from the whole river system—as a unit—become greater than the sum of its parts.

From the standpoint of conservation, Hells Canyon is of major importance. If it is abandoned to partial development by a private company, as sought by the administration, the multipurpose possibilities of the entire river system will be greatly reduced. Specifically, this will mean the loss of 3 million acre-feet of storage for flood waters, loss of about 500,000 kilowatts of electricity, loss of assistance to irrigation from power revenues, less navigation, and fewer recreation benefits. The shortsightedness of the administration in breaking up the river pro-

gram can be measured in countless millions of dollars.

I was born and raised in a region, the Pacific Northwest, where there is no coal, no oil, no natural gas. Our sole industrial fuel is falling water, water which flows to the sea for "as long as the sun shall set in the sky and grass shall grow on the hills," to use a colorful Indian phrase. In the first decade that the Government tapped the swift reaches of the Columbia River, where lurks almost half of the Nation's potential hydroelectricity, industrial payrolls in Oregon and Washington soared 329 percent. Think of the private enterprise, the tax revenues, the self-supporting families made possible by that great gain in factory employment.

By any conceivable test, public power has been a success. It has brought comforts to farmers, jobs to workers, profits for businessmen. Equally important, it is paying for itself. Grand Coulee Dam has had its full quota of turbines in action only since 1951, and yet $51,031,697 has been paid into the Treasury toward retiring an eventual power debt of $221,462,229. Under partnership a large portion of this income, instead of going to the Federal Government, would be preempted by the private power companies.

ROOM FOR BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POWER IN UNITED STATES, SAYS SECRETARY MCKAY—AIM: MORE POWER FOR PEOPLE'S USE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Secretary of the Interior McKay, at the suggestion of North American Newspaper Alliance, gives here a blueprint of the Eisenhower administration's policy on development of United States power resources.)

(By Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—The partnership power program of the Eisenhower administration is not a question of public power versus private power, but whether there is to be Federal power, and Federal power only.

The idea of partnership is very simple. It is based on the concept of all the things that made this country what it is today—the greatest in the world. It is based on the pride that people take in initiative, in doing things for themselves.

In the 1952 campaign, President Eisenhower said at Seattle:

"We need resource development, and we need it on a river-basin basis. We need resource development, not to the limit of the whim of any administration in power, but to the limit of the capacity of the region to benefit. And to do that we need partnership to the limit of everyone's ability."

There is the blueprint of the Eisenhower administration's power policy. First, we want to give local enterprise—either public or private—a chance to develop its power resources.

But when the time comes when these agencies are either unable or unwilling to do so, then the Federal Government should step in and develop the power for the benefit of the people of the region.

Public power is here and it is here to stay. There are some who insist there is no place in this Nation for it. I do not agree. There is room for both public and private power and the job is to see that both are developed in a working arrangement which has but one goal—more power for use of the people.

There is one fundamental difference between those who support the partnership power policy and those who oppose it.

We who support it do so to move toward a goal of more actual kilowatts, not conversation kilowatts. More electrical power, not political power.

Here is what we mean by partnership.

We want local agencies, either public or private, to develop as much energy as they can. In some instances flood control, navigation, recreation, fish and wildlife, and irrigation come into the picture. In these instances we want to become partners in the project.

Three big partnership programs were approved in the 83d Congress. All were supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. In two instances Democrats introduced the bills for the projects.

So partnership is not partisan. I repeat, the disagreement is between those who want Federal power and Federal power only.

Here is how the partnership policy works.

Take, for instance, the big Priest Rapids Dam in the State of Washington, which will produce more than 1 million kilowatts. Here a public utility district, owned and controlled by the people in the area, wants to build the dam and have the Government build the navigation and flood-control features.

Congress approved the project and members of both parties joined. There are drillers now at work in that stretch of the Columbia River making test borings. It is a step toward the main goal—more power, not more conversation.

Take, now, the Cougar Dam in my home State. For years the Army engineers had approval of a flood-control dam on a fork of the McKenzie River. Then up came the city of Eugene, operating the oldest municipal power system in the State, and asked to become a partner in the project.

The city of Eugene wants to build the powerplant and pay for it and have the power available for the people in its area through the Northwest power pool.

A short distance away from Eugene is the Green Peter Dam site. Here the Government again has a flood-control project in which it plans to build a dam. A private power company offers to build the powerhouse and take the power through the Northwest power pool.

Senator KERR introduced and Congress approved a bill to permit a State-Federal partnership in the development of the Big Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma. That had been hanging fire for some time until the partnership idea led to its development.

Senators HILL and SPARKMAN, of Alabama, well known as public-power advocates, supported a proposal to deauthorize Federal development of the Coosa River in their State and permit the Alabama Power Co. to join in a partnership to get this project started.

So, you see that Democrats and Republicans alike in the Congress have joined in getting projects started. Power is needed all over the country and this is just a faster way to get it.

Just last month in my home State the partnership policy came up in the State house of representatives. It was in the form of a memorial to Congress supporting the Cougar Dam and Green Peter proposals. The vote was 44 to 16 for the memorial.

Mrs. Richard L. Neuberger led the fight against the partnership. There are 25 Democrats in the Oregon house but 11 of them supported the partnership. Three of the 11 were recently elected from the Hells Canyon area. So, you see partnership meets with approval.

On the main stem of the Columbia between the Dalles Dam and the McNary Dam is the proposed John Day Dam. Here a group of private power companies want to join with public agencies to build the powerhouse and then take the power. They will simply be paying for their future power supplies in advance.

Now, the argument that here the Government surrenders its revenue-producing feature is fallacious. The Federal Government has always borne the cost of flood control and navigation. So the Government will not assume any more costs than it would if it built the dam alone.

In Oregon the house of representatives asked Congress to approve the project, either as a partnership or an all-out Federal project. The Federal Government is not withdrawing from the power field.

The President's budget includes $20 million to enable the Federal Government to participate in 1956 in partnership developments. The President has also recommended legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin developments. These projects are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private. Both are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado and the Fryingpan-Arkansas projects. They are vitally needed to conserve the water supply in the Intermountain States.

These projects are beyond the ability of the local enterprise, either public or private, because they covered large areas in several States and require amounts of money beyond the capacity of anyone to raise except the Government. They meet the administration's standards and are being supported.

But to say that all power development must be Federal—all dams, all river development—is to ask the impossible from the money standpoint. To federalize completely all electric power and have control from Washington of all water supplies and the land which depends on these supplies is such a program of bureaucratic control of America or of any region to which the people will never subscribe.

Accomplishments of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration in encouraging initiative and enterprise have not made headlines because they do not involve controversy and crises. But these unspectacular achievements of the past 2 years have been very important to every American. The quiet, undramatic progressive developments the Eisenhower administration is helping in America—without making sensational news—are important for the present and future of our people.

This point was made very clearly by Treasury Secretary Humphrey in an address at Philadelphia last Wednesday, February 16. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD, so that all Senators may have a chance to read this accounting of the fiscal management of the first 2 Eisenhower years.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY TREASURY SECRETARY HUMPHREY, FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE 1954 WILLIAM PENN AWARD OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY 16, 1955, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I am deeply honored to receive the 1954 William Penn Award of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia. It is a great privilege for me to receive this honor

as a member of President Eisenhower's administration.

I am going to talk to you tonight not as Secretary of the Treasury, not as a Cabinet officer, or even as a businessman who is now a bureaucrat. I will talk rather as a friend and fellow citizen and a taxpayer who shares with you the responsibility of good government, of keeping America the land of opportunity—the land where the economy of today must build for the economy of tomorrow by its wisdom, its soundness, and its farsightedness. We must build a world with more and better opportunities for our children and our children's children and not a world that will take opportunity away from them.

The problems and accomplishments I speak of tonight are the problems of every citizen, and the accomplishments are the work of all who, by their own efforts, have helped to build soundness and opportunity by hard work and honest endeavor.

I am going to talk to you tonight not of headlines, controversy, and crises, but of the quiet, undramatic, progressive developments that are going on all around us in America. There have been no headlines to tell you that more than 60 million Americans are working at jobs of their own choosing—jobs that they are free to leave or change if and whenever they so desire. There are no headlines to tell you that about 55 percent of the 47 million families in America own their own homes, that Americans have savings of $80 billion in life-insurance policies; almost $50 billion in United States savings bonds; and $25 billion in retirement pension funds. There are no headlines to remind you that stringent wartime Government controls no longer hamper or restrict the individual or the businessman. And there are no headlines to herald the stirring return of confidence of Americans in their Government, in each other, and in our ability and strength to do whatever may be required of us in any emergency.

I am even more encouraged to talk about these simple principles that have made our country great when I read over the list of names of those who have been previous recipients of the William Penn Award, showing that the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce over the years has been honoring men who stand for the same principles of free, competitive enterprise and initiative which we now believe are basic to our American way of life—the way of life which has yet to be surpassed anywhere in this world of ours.

It has been a dedicated goal of the Eisenhower administration to keep alive and vigorous the priceless principles of free, competitive enterprise and initiative. But we must do more than keep them alive and vigorous. We must keep them growing and always developing the new things and the better ways of doing things which have made this Nation great.

What has been done in encouraging initiative and enterprise has not been sensational or dramatic. But it has been important to every American in his daily life. It is important to the standard of living of every American worker and his loved ones. And it is vitally important to the defense of all Americans against any possible enemy attack, for the power and strength of American industrial capacity is the very foundation of our security.

It is often true that "good news" is "no news" to attract public attention in the daily news outlets of press, radio, and TV. Yet the quiet, undramatic, progressive developments that are going on in America—without making sensational news—are important for the present and future of our people.

I have no quarrel with what makes news. I make these observations only as a reason for talking a little tonight about some of the constructive things that have been done during the past 2 years—important things which are worth mentioning because they do not draw the attention that controversy and violence do.

What are some of these unspectacular things that this administration has been helping to accomplish during the past 2 years?

The undramatic but steady and healthy progress which has been going on in this country has increased the confidence of all Americans in the possibilities of our future. This increasing confidence is the most important stimulant to the development of the strength of our Nation's economy, with the careful and quiet assistance of an administration which knows that Government can do relatively little except to help to properly set a stage upon which free vigorous Americans can perform.

Our Nation has made the transition from a wartime high to a lower level of Government spending without a major economic upset. This transition was helped substantially by heavy tax cuts and other moves stimulating confidence.

While there is still high tension in many places, there is no armed warfare between major powers at any point on the globe as of this moment. There is peace, uneasy as it is, as far as American fighting men are concerned. War in Korea has halted. War in Indochina has ceased.

The present improved relationships in many places throughout the world have been achieved by ceaseless and dedicated pursuit of solutions for the vexing and serious widespread international problems. It is a treacherous path. Bold risks must sometimes be taken, but success to date is high proof of the competence and wisdom of the policies which have been adopted in wrestling with this problem of preserving the peace and making it more secure.

Inflation has been stopped. In the past 2 years the value of the dollar has changed only one-fifth of 1 cent. This compares with a drop in the value of the dollar from 100 cents in 1939 to only 52 cents in January 1953. All departments and many people in Government have been working hard for, and insisting upon getting, our Federal spending under control. Deficits, which lead to more borrowing and so to inflation, have been cut substantially.

The Federal Reserve System has acted promptly, courageously, and wisely to adopt monetary and credit policies which have met the needs of the economy while walking the fine line between deflation and inflation. And the Treasury has done its bit in halting inflation, and avoiding deflation, by doing its borrowing so as to be as careful as possible concerning its effect upon the constructive course of the economy.

This is well illustrated by the issue and highly successful placement only a few days ago of nearly $2 billion in 40-year 3-percent bonds. They are the longest bonds that have been sold by the Government since an issue to help pay for the Panama Canal in 1911.

There is nothing academic about the importance of keeping inflation locked out. The value of earnings and savings can be protected in no other way. Just realize that 55 out of every 100 families in America now earn more than $4,000 a year as compared with only 10 out of 100 earning $4,000 a year early in the century in terms of today's prices. And recall the millions of owners of their homes, accounts in savings banks, savings bonds, insurance policies, and pensions, of which I spoke just a moment ago. Because this Nation has quietly become a nation of haves rather than have-nots, inflation must stay checked to protect the earnings and savings of millions of Americans.

We had a cash balance between money collected from the public and money paid out by the Government last year. Although we will not have a cash balance this year, we are estimating a small surplus in the fiscal year ahead. The total debt has continued to grow because of the large deficit we inherited in our first year in office and the subsequent deficits, even though they have been much smaller. But the inflationary effect of deficit financing has been almost wholly eliminated now that most of the increase in debt is being financed by securities issued to Government trust funds rather than borrowing from the public.

In fiscal 1956, spending will be almost $12 billion less than in 1953. We have not yet balanced the budget. We could have done so in 1954, but a big tax cut was more stimulating to a growing economy and we believed that it was better for the people to have more of their own money left with them to spend, as they thought best, rather than to have the Government spending it for them. We have cut the deficit from more than $9 billion in fiscal 1953 to what we estimate will be less than $2½ billion in 1956. We are still a year and a half away from the end of that period, and we have every hope of cutting this deficit even further if some development elsewhere in the world does not upset our plans.

There is nothing in the Formosa situation or elsewhere in the world which up to this moment has altered our budget program for reduced expenditures in the year to come. And reduced expenditures we make do not mean reduced defenses.

As the President has said, the United States is in a stronger position to defend itself against aggression than it was 2 years ago. The Defense Department has developed a better balanced, more mobile and flexible and effective defense establishment at lower cost to the taxpayers.

Progress has been made in reducing waste and extravagance. Obsolete equipment and supplies are being eliminated. There is much left to be done, but that does not alter the fact that much has already been accomplished. We have a far better balanced program. We are making progress in real unification in the armed services, so that competition between them is less likely to duplicate efforts and expenditures that squander both tax money and our national resources. Greater unity adds strength to our defense position.

We can and we must spend whatever is needed for our security; that is our first concern. But we know that real security does not result simply from spending huge amounts of money. The worth of our defense must be measured not by its costs but by its wisdom.

The President's decisions on our defense forces are recognition of the fact that in this age of almost unbelievable developments in science and production techniques, we cannot have a static defense committed to old-fashioned strategy and weapons. Real security for our Nation over an extended period must also rest upon a sound and growing economy.

As cuts in future expenditures all through the Government's operations come clearly into sight, and if at the same time our expanding economy promises greater income with lesser rates of tax, we will look forward to further reductions in our tax structure, distributed as fairly as possible among all taxpayers.

The expectation of further tax reduction and the maintenance of sound fiscal policies are firm foundation stones creating greater confidence in our future prosperity.

These, then, have been fine, worthwhile accomplishments for the good of the Nation, its economy, and its future. They have been accomplished without fanfare or sensational controversy. In the Cabinet and in the agency heads in this administration, there exists a wonderful team spirit which has resulted in real accomplishment with few headline battles.

The role which the Government can play in the economic affairs of the Nation should be limited. Government manipulation is the antithesis of a free America, and encroachment by Government in restricting the freedom of its citizens should be limited to doing, as Lincoln said, "for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

The future of free America lies in the initiative, the resourcefulness, the tenacity, daring, and courage of 160 million Americans, each free to choose how best he can promote his own interest and the interest and future of his loved ones in whatever way he can best devise only so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others. It is the cumulative power of this great effort which has made America great in the past and which I am convinced will drive us ahead in the future at an accelerated pace in excess of anything we have ever known before.

You and I as citizens must participate in this great drive toward a better America. As such a citizen, I am pleased and proud to accept this fine award from the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, and to receive it in recognition of the contributions which President Eisenhower's administration has made to the advancement of the economy of this Nation.

Address by Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, Before the Republican State Convention, Detroit, Mich., February 19, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, before the Republican State Convention held at Detroit, Michigan., on Saturday, February 19, 1955:

It's always a pleasure for me to get away from Washington for a few hours, to meet and talk with fellow Republicans. It's an opportunity to keep a true perspective on American's problems and America's dreams.

We had a lot of both 2 years ago when the members of the Republican administration moved to Washington. Thank goodness, I can report that many of the worst problems have been conquered and that many of America's dreams are closer to reality. Our Nation has gone a long way under the inspiring leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower. He has proven to political friend and foe alike that he is truly a great man, a great President.

Michigan has a wonderful squad working on President Eisenhower's team. You have given our President men of outstanding ability and integrity. Charley Wilson is doing a great job at Defense, and so is Governor Brucker. Joe Dodge put a lot of good old Michigan commonsense into the budget. Art Summerfield is putting the Post Office on a realistic, businesslike base. Senator PORTER has displayed the foresight so vital to sound legislation and decent legislative conduct.

Every one of them—and a lot of other Michigan peole—are devoting long, long hours of unselfish work for the administration and for the Nation. I know you are as proud of them as those of us who are privileged to work with them.

I'm just as proud of the fine performance of Fred Kaess here in Detroit and Wendell Miles in western Michigan. They are two of the best of the Justice Department's group of outstanding United States Attorneys.

Your personal interest in government and world affairs is heightened, too, as work progresses on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Here is a project which was just a fond dream since George Washington first envisioned it. And the seaway, as you know, has been advocated by every President since McKinley. Yet, when Dwight Eisenhower presented the facts and the needs fully—and then went to bat for it—a Republican Congress passed the legislation to make that dream a reality. The seaway will bring deep-draft oceangoing vessels to the Lakes, letting your industry compete equitably for foreign trade. It will mean new factories, new jobs, and new prosperity for Michigan and for the entire Nation. History shows that any major advance in transportation benefits the entire Nation's economy—not just that of the immediate area served.

And let's talk realistically about prosperity for just a moment.

It was a big issue up here last fall. You still were making the transition from a wartime boom, based on blood and bullets, to a peacetime economy, based on the needs of our growing population and our rising standard of living. Also, campaign time was change-over time in the auto industry and a lot of people were temporarily out of work.

There was a lot of political talk of gloom and doom in the past 2 years. Yet, today, no one challenges the fact that your Republican administration has guided the Nation successfully from a wartime to a peacetime economy without the great depression so many predicted. No one challenges the fact that your Republican administration has helped bring our Nation instead its two most prosperous years in history in terms of wages, in terms of jobs, and in terms of earnings. We're well on our way right now to a third fine year.

This all was done without mirrors and without controls on the economy—on the prices a businessman could ask or the wages a worker could seek. Even more important, both can now plan realistically on the buying power of the dollar they will earn later this month, or next summer, or next winter, because inflation has been halted. The retired couple no longer find 10 or 20 dollars being taken out of each hard won hundred dollars every year by unchecked inflation. Neither do the parents trying to save money to give their children an education, nor the young couple saving for a decent home of their own, nor the farmer saving for new machinery or new stock.

All this is to the benefit of all Americans. So is the sense of security and faith that came from the end of that inflation, the end of the fighting in Korea, the end of loose security in Government, the end of corruption in Washington. It is such matters of the common good I wish to discuss primarily today because President Eisenhower's entire aim is to be a President for all Americans.

We all recall proudly that Republican Abraham Lincoln declared repeatedly he was for that "which will give the greatest good to the greatest number." Republican Dwight Eisenhower said in his recent state of the Union message, "Let the general good be our yardstick on every great issue."

The philosophy of Lincoln has returned to Washington.

President Eisenhower summed it up well for us when he said:

"This administration is committed to a program of progressive moderation."

He said that program must be "liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals, constructively dynamic and optimistic in its appraisal of the future."

Progressive moderation is nothing new to the Nation or to the Republican Party. In a speech generally credited with uniting factions within the party just 2 years after its founding, Lincoln asked his fellow Republicans to "appeal to the moderation" of the people. He declared that "we will grow strong by calmness and moderation."

I think you will agree that all forward-looking Americans can support a program of progressive moderation, especially when we consider what President Eisenhower said in applying it to the individuals and what the administration seeks to do for those individuals. It was this, and I quote:

"We seek increase in their opportunity to enjoy good health, good schools, good homes; we seek a lessening in their fear of personal disaster and in the impact of hardships beyond their control. In this endeavor, we reject Federal domination over State and community, for we seek to strengthen—not weaken—the historic self-reliance of our people."

What does all this mean in specific terms? Well, I think we should first review quickly the first 2 years of the Republican administration and the steps to carry out this program of making this a better Nation for all to live in and to enjoy.

Most necessary, of course, in pursuit of this goal is a strong, growing economy. By keeping it vigorous and free, we create more and more opportunities and an ever-widening share in prosperity for our people.

What has your administration already done to help? Several things. For instance, I've discussed how controls were removed from wages, prices, and materials. Then, through reducing Federal spending, an unprecedented tax cut was possible, and Americans as individuals were the beneficiaries. The tax cuts also encouraged increased spending, which in turn brought about greater production and more job opportunities. Couple these moves with the flexible monetary and debt management policies of the administration and this is the result: a halt to inflation and stabilization of the value of the dollar.

Meantime, the administration created an atmosphere conducive to good labor-management relations. An unprecedented low of work stoppages due to strikes was reached. Man-days of idleness due to strikes in 1954 were the fewest in any year since the end of World War II. This resulted from the administration's belief that Government has no place at the bargaining table—that labor and management can settle their problems over that table without the Government sitting with either side.

And there's another helping hand which is being extended to the unionman, as part of a drive against the evil elements of organized crime. Extortion and bribery by labor racketeers had become a flourishing and lucrative business. This not only impeded commerce and industry. More important, it reflected unfairly on the millions of honest workingmen who were caught up as pawns of these labor racketeers.

A special section on Organized Crime and Racketeering was created in the Department of Justice last year. With the cooperation and assistance of the FBI, this section has been vigorously investigating labor racketeering. At present, it is initiating about 50 investigations every month. The effort is paying off.

During 1954, 65 of these racketeers were indicted in 37 cases and there were 28 convictions. So far this year, there have been nine more convictions or pleas of guilty.

Contrast that, if you will, with a complete absence of any convictions under the anti-racketeering laws in 1951, 1952, and 1953.

Among those convicted was a racketeer who sought to extort more than $1 million from contractors for a powerplant for the Atomic Energy Commission. His actions cost the Government millions of dollars because of delays in construction. An Illinois man was sentenced to 4 years for extortion in a 700-mile pipeline project needed to serve the Chicago and Indiana area. A man tabbed the Duke of Indiana for the power he wielded for his own selfish gains pleaded guilty to attempting extortion in connection with road construction. And a longshoreman's leader in New York was convicted recently for taking gratuities from a trucking concern with which he supposedly was dealing on behalf of his union. Ample warning has been served that the Government will not stand idly by while the unionman and the businessman are being victimized by the ruthless and greedy use of power by labor racketeers.

That is a matter of the common good. So are the tax reductions which have totaled more than $7 billion a year. More than half goes directly to the individual taxpayer, the consumer. And indirectly they benefit from the rest. It now looks, barring unusual developments, that a further tax cut will be possible next year.

Let's look at what was done in the social security field. Carrying out the 1952 pledge, Republicans improved many of the ills of the program. They added 10 million Americans to the eligibility rolls. They increased benefits for more than 6 million now entitled to and drawing benefits. On the unemployment compensation side of the picture, the President recommended to the States increased weekly benefits, while coverage was extended to an additional 4 million persons, including Federal employees who previously were not entitled to protection.

Here in Michigan a major industry is production of automotive vehicles. You will benefit from the record Federal-aid highway program allotting $875 million a year to the States. And while making it easier for our people generally who use the roads, it also will increase the market for vehicles. Hence your State will have both direct and indirect benefits.

One of the most important things in life is health. Over the years hospital facilities particularly have failed to keep up with the demand. We now have a 3-year hospital construction program embracing grants totaling $182 million.

What about homes? Well, the administration and Congress worked out a housing program permitting longer mortgages, thereby stimulating home ownership. It also speeded up slum clearance and encouraged remodeling, modernization, and repair of homes.

What about the future? President Eisenhower said that the wise course for Government in 1955 is to direct its program principally toward fostering long-term economic growth rather than toward imparting an immediate upward thrust to economic activity.

What did he suggest to Congress? Simply stated, he suggested a program which you and I naturally support and which, I know, all people of Michigan want. Here are the major recommendations:

1. Extension of personal security against the hazards of unemployment.

2. Strengthened minimum wage legislation.

3. Protection of savings in credit unions.

4. Increased Presidential discretionary authority to vary the terms of insured mortgage loans in the interest of economic stability.

5. Authorization of a great 10-year program to modernize the interstate highway system—this on top of what already has been done.

6. Meeting the nationwide need for school construction.

7. Creation of a coordinator of public-works planning and a revolving fund for advances to States and municipalities for public-works planning.

All of these proposals, plus the others now pending or to be sent to Congress, will create a favorable atmosphere for economic activity. They will encourage private initiative. The Federal Government would be in a position to help State and local governments in providing needed public facilities. They would provide greater opportunities for the less fortunate of our population and help all to cope with the hazards of unemployment, illness, old age.

In the field of health, the Nation is failing to exert proper efforts to reduce the impact of disease. This administration, under leadership of President Eisenhower, is urging steps which will alleviate the situation.

Establishment of a Federal health reinsurance service to encourage private health-insurance organizations in offering broadened benefits to those insured and to provide coverage to more people has been recommended.

I noted enthusiastically as I entered this hall the youthfulness of all of you. The youngest of you, I know, are beginning to understand, as oldsters do already, the economic strain on a family that comes in time of illness or injury.

Now, any one of us could become what the medical profession is now calling the medically indigent. They are referring to that time when any one of us could be faced with medical bills which we just could not afford to pay. Group hospitalization programs and the prepaid surgical plans available in some communities have done some good in meeting this problem. This is true also in the case of aid toward medical, therapeutic, hospital and similar bills by such organizations as the Tuberculosis Association, the Infantile Paralysis Fund, Heart Fund, and others. But more is needed.

The reinsurance proposal of the President would furnish a system for broad sharing among health-insurance organizations of the risks of experimentation. It would be the incentive for improvement in existing insurance plans, and encourage better protection, particularly against expensive illnesses. And it would mean extension of these private voluntary health-insurance plans to millions of additional people. It contemplates a reasonable capital fund, using it as necessary to reinsure programs which would meet the needs which I have outlined.

We also hope Congress will authorize separate Federal matching of State and local expenditures for the medical care needed by public-assistance recipients. As proposed by the President, it would provide better care for the aged, the permanently and totally disabled, the blind, and children deprived of parental care.

Also recommended to Congress is a program to further stimulate construction of more health facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, and technical establishments. As proposed by the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized by Congress to insure, for a small premium, mortgage loans made by private lending institutions for the construction of such facilities. This program, I am sure, would go a long way to help the many communities which today lack some, if not all, of these things needed for the protection of the health of our people.

Another part of the health program is designed to end the shortage of nurses. Recommended are a 5-year program of grants to State agencies for training practical nurses; and an expansion of Public Health Service operations to establish traineeships for graduate nurses in specialties such as administration, teaching, and research. In addition, Mr. Eisenhower has proposed revision of the present public health grant programs to include authority for training in all public health specialties, including mental health.

These are well-formulated plans. These, plus other elements of the health program proposed by your administration, represent a real attack against problems standing in the way of a stronger and healthier United States.

One other program the President has proposed means something to all of us. It is the proposal for Federal cooperation with the States to give our children as quickly as possible the classrooms they must have. As you know, there is a deficit of 300,000 classrooms, and with mounting enrollments at least 50,000 new classrooms must be completed each year just to care for this new crop of youngsters. What is happening is that the present construction rate is barely keeping up to the mounting enrollment, so the deficit of 300,000 classrooms is being cut only slightly.

Viewing this as an emergency and for purposes of meeting it on that basis only pending results of nationwide conferences, the administration has proposed to widen accepted channels of financing, without interfering with the responsibilities of State and local school systems.

Congress has been asked to authorize the Federal Government to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at reasonable interest rates. This would be possible if Congress authorizes appropriation of $750 million for use in the next 3 years. It is also proposed that the Federal Government be authorized to participate with the States in establishing and maintaining for State school-building agencies an initial reserve fund. Thus, we would help those communities which are unable to build schools because of restrictive debt limits and which now depend on State agencies. With such a program, $6 billion worth of building would be possible in the next 3 years.

Other elements of the proposed program would provide for grants to school districts with proved need, and lack of local income; and grants to States for administrative costs of State programs.

These are some of the things now planned to make this a better America, by protecting our most precious asset—our people.

What we do this year and next will continue to merit the support of the great majority of our citizens.

They already have seen a Republican Party devoted to serving needs of all people.

It will continue to serve the people well.

Under the inspiring and courageous leadership of President Eisenhower, we cannot fail.

Neuromuscular Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, Federal legislation is not the solution to all the problems uncovered by the comprehensive health inquiry made by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during 1953 and 1954. As in the past, most of the responsibility must be assumed by private individuals and in-

stitutions. As chairman of the committee, I call attention to a particular need in the field of research that was developed partly by the recent hearings. In order to avoid any partisan approach to this critical human situation, the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the committee during the 1953–54 hearings, joins me in inviting comment and constructive suggestions. Our joint comment follows:

In the health inquiry directed by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during 1953 and 1954, it was found that about 20 million persons are affected by neurological and sensory disorders for most of which medical science has discovered neither causes nor means of specific treatment, and that the deaths from these diseases are exceeded only by the number of persons dying from cancer and heart disease.

It was even more startling to learn that public and Federal Government expenditures from 1951 to 1952 for research and treatment for each victim of a neurological or sensory disorder averaged only 3 cents, while $29 was spent for each victim of cancer and $1.75 for each victim of heart disease.

Because the spending of this 3-cent-per-victim money is shared by the Government and by many individual national organizations concerned with multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, the crippled, epilepsy, and neurology, it is apparent that very little can be allotted to fundamental research, without which progress toward finding causes and cures will proceed at a snail's pace.

This need for basic research is of special concern to the families of victims of certain neuromuscular disorders that baffle medical science and that have not been the specific concern of a national organization supported by public funds. This neglected group includes amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (the disease which ended Lou Gehrig's life when he seemed at the peak of physical health), progressive muscular atrophy, and peroneal muscular atrophy. In 1950, 1,006 Americans died from these diseases, compared to 1904 for poliomyelitis. One tragic aspect of the situation is that a man who contracts the disease from which Gehrig died cannot expect to live more than 3 years. Doctors are helpless; they do not even like to talk about this visitation of death to about 667 Americans each year.

Basic research in nerve fibers and muscle tissues offers the means of determining the causes of neuro-muscular disease and developing methods for treatment and prevention. Such research has been initiated in a small way by public and private groups. The National Institutes of Health, for instance, is carrying on a study of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in Guam in an effort to find a clue as to why there are from 50 to 100 times as many deaths there per 1,000 of population as in the United States. Scientists such as Nobel Prize Winner A. Szent-Györgi, of the Institute for Muscle Research, are concentrating on basic research. The Neuro-Muscular Research Foundation has just been formed to promote basic research which will be directed toward amyotrophic lateral sclerosis and other neglected diseases as well as the neuro-muscular disorders which have received greater public attention. We commend an intensification of such activities and greater coordination of public and private efforts in this field.

On the probable cost of such a research program, we quote Dr. Cornelius Traeger, speaking for the National Committee on Research in Neurological Disorders at the House inquiry: "If we could get, not 3 cents per patient, but $2 a patient, I think that we could do a job that the Atomic Energy Commission did, or what preceded the Atomic Energy Commission did, in nuclear fission, and in about the same time."

J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman during 1952–54.

Address of Hon. Leroy Johnson, of California, Delivered to the New York Chapter, Atlantic Union Committee, February 18, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a group of us in both branches of the Congress have introduced concurrent resolutions asking the President to invite the other democracies who sponsored and signed the North Atlantic Treaty to meet in a convention to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form a Federal Union for our mutual protection. Last Saturday night I had the honor of making a speech on this proposal to the New York Chapter of the North Atlantic Union Committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including that speech, which follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I warmly appreciate the courtesy of your kind reception. Especially I am grateful for the high honor paid me by your invitation to address your chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

I rather imagine that any ideas I bring you on the North Atlantic Federal Union proposal will be neither novel nor startling. But what is lacking in originality I hope will be made up at least in part by my genuine, abiding interest and also by my true sincerity in respect to this challenging, vital proposition so important to every civilized person on earth.

Last week was a possible turning point in the long history of this movement.

In the United States Congress a group of Senators and a group of Representatives, including myself, introduced highly important resolutions. They contain this key provision:

"The President is requested to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from such other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union."

I am profoundly convinced that the formation of a Federal union with free nations of Europe for defense purposes would open vast possibilities for advancing and stabilizing the world peace for which all of us hope so prayerfully today. If the proposition is sound, repetition of its supporting arguments may be useful, even though I suspect that most of you are more conversant with them than am I.

This fundamental approach to mankind's most critical problem—that of building a solid foundation for unity and peace in this divided world—first came into my consciousness through a lecture delivered by Clarence Streit in the 1930's in Stockton, Calif. I was deeply stirred by the concept. Today its appeal to me is as fresh and as powerful as it was two decades ago.

Little did I think as I listened to Clarence Streit that I would soon be witness to a global conflict far more destructive than the gigantic struggle in which I participated in 1917 and 1918. Nor had I the faintest premonition that I would become a member of the House of Representatives, or that for seven Congresses I would serve on a Congressional committee charged with drafting laws pertaining to the security of our Nation. In both the Senate and House of Representatives these laws are handled by the Committee on Armed Services. Senator KEFAUVER and I are members of these committees.

For the past several days, the House committee has had before it the top military experts of America. They have described with candor and in detail the dangerous situation confronting our country. They have set forth the steps we must take for our protection in this nuclear age. I shall quote a few of their statements made in public hearings. From them you may gain a clear appreciation of the deadly menace confronting us and of the character and scope of our defense needs.

Let us hear first from Adm. Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He says:

"In my opinion a personnel strength of 2,850,000 men is the size of forces we must maintain for as long as the Communist threat hangs over our head. This may be 10 years or it may be 50."

Next, let's listen to the Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson. He says:

"The security of the United States and the security of our allies are in reality one and the same. This concept of collective security is reflected in our military arrangements around the world.

"In the development of our military programs now and in the future we must reckon with the Communist capabilities as well as with their possible intentions. Because their military power has continued to grow and now includes the ability to produce and deliver nuclear weapons, the United States for the first time in its history has reason to be deeply concerned over the serious effects which a sudden attack could conceivably inflict upon us.

"As a Nation we reject the concept of preventive war. However, a sudden nuclear attack aimed at our population, industrial and military centers, could be a threat to our survival as a Nation. Therefore, our primary objective must be to maintain the capability, first to deter an enemy from such an attack; and second, to blunt any such attack if it comes. Both purposes require a combination of effective retaliatory power and a continental defense system of steadily increasing effectiveness.

"The forces envisaged in the long-range program of the Department of Defense constitutes by far the largest Military Establishment that this country has ever undertaken to maintain for an indefinite period of time.

"The maintenance of these forces and their qualitative improvement will require expenditures over an indefinite period of years of many billions of dollars."

Since the A-bombs were dropped in Japan, a decade ago, there has been a rapidly rising crescendo of frightfulness in the construction and development of weapons.

From a low-flying plane, about a year after atomic bombs had fallen on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, I looked at the ruins of these two cities. The sight of the carnage wrought

by those two small bombs actually made me ill for several days. It was an incredibly ghastly, horrible, shocking sight. I kept saying to myself, "Has humanity gone stark, raving mad; is man so stupid, so inherently evil, so savage and untamed, that in the end he will destroy himself?"

And yet, today we face a situation far more staggering in its implications.

Today, we know, though we can scarcely comprehend the awesome fact, that the hydrogen bomb can wreak 1,000 times the damage inflicted upon Japan. Other weapons are still more hideous. Noted scientists have written that a few properly placed cobalt bombs could exterminate most of the human race. Weapons of such boundless destructive power may soon be in the hands of our own and hostile military forces.

In the face of such momentous developments, it is indeed understandable that during the past 10 years apprehension that these new weapons might be used against us has steadily heightened among our people. There is, in truth, no escaping this grim fact: We live in an age in which cruelly ambitious, unprincipled, atheistic men could destroy the civilized word—not only its people but also its institutions, its public and private works, its most hallowed traditions, its very will to survive. This dread capability rests both with the Communists and the free world.

As I look back over these 10 years, I can see that more and more, year by year, our country and its allies are relying on the power to destroy an enemy in an effort to find protection against sudden attack. We are, perforce, chained to a military treadmill; feverishly we labor, lavishly we expend our resources, in our effort to increase the deadly power of our military force. Our antagonists are ensnared in the same fantastic spiral; day and night they are striving to surpass us in building stronger, ever stronger, weapons of destruction.

And yet, here is the pathetic paradox:

Every person, in America and abroad, with whom I have seriously discussed this problem, longs ardently for peace. On every continent in the past decade I have talked of this terrible dilemma with public officials, businessmen, teachers, the poor and the rich. All give voice to the same deep yearning: "We want peace," they say with almost pathetic earnestness. "We do not want war."

Yet, the pages of history are filled with the message that a race in arms ultimately explodes into war.

The Secretary of Defense says we may have to fight for our survival; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says our tense situation may last from 10 to 50 years. The Secretary of Defense further advises us that our costly weapons rapidly become obsolete due to technological advances. Thus we are in an economic vise; we are also in a military position which will remain eternally precarious.

I must, of course, make this clear; I have strongly supported all of our efforts to strengthen our Armed Forces. I have voted to draft our young men. I have voted to have American youth trained so they may be skillful warriors, able and ready to defend not only their country but also themselves on the field of battle. I have supported our Nation's efforts to buttress our friends throughout the world. These steps and others I, as a Congressman, feel we must take to protect our country and to neutralize the terrible, imminent threat to our survival.

All of these things we reluctantly do for one reason alone: Ungodly men are at large in this world, implacably bent upon communization and enslavement of all humanity. At any time they may strike with atomic or hydrogen bombs, hoping to destroy our industrial system or, in one massive blow, wound us so mortally that domination of our country would surely follow. Our ready military power, our national resolution, our patient firmness, the certainty of our devastating counterblow will, we pray, deter them from war.

But, in all candor, it is somewhat less than inspiring to contemplate nerve-racking tension and deadly threat year after year, for decades to come, even though war may never be our lot.

I repeat that we cannot minimize the imperative necessity for a strong military posture. Our strength is our insurance against annihilation in today's world. But it is comparable to a fire-insurance policy: Comforting, of course, to have, but no guaranty that there will be no fire. We must stay alert to the danger of our situation; we must keep the threat in the forefront of our minds as we look hopefully and enthusiastically upon the promise held out to mankind by a North Atlantic Union Federation.

With these caveats behind us, let us now explore our route toward peace which provides an alternative to military force. It requires no coercion, no intimidation, no exploitation. In my deepest belief, this peaceful method of building strength against communism and aggression holds the key to the present world dilemma; it contains the seed from which can grow enduring world peace.

With my colleagues in the Congress, I am eager to explore the possibility of Americans joining with other peoples who have representative government, combining their ingenuity, their skill in government, their belief in a peaceful society, their boundless resource and strength, that ultimately, by the sheer majesty of their aggregate power, we shall neutralize and finally eliminate the threat that looms today over much of the world.

The federation we visualize would make common rules and establish legal machinery to compel the obedience of all member nations thereto. Those failing to comply could be brought to do so through judicial decree, backed by the combined force of the federated nations.

The obvious parallel is right at hand. We Americans have grown up with it.

In our country we have 48 States, each sovereign, yet each joined permanently in common cause for the common good. Controversies among our States are settled in the Supreme Court of the United States whose decrees are binding upon and respected by the losing parties.

Forgive me for particularizing in a somewhat personal way, but this example may help make the point clear.

Right now a controversy is awaiting resolution between my State of California and the State of Arizona. The issue involves interpretation of a contract governing the allocation of certain waters of the Colorado River. The differences between the States have been bitter, acrimonious, and explosive, for water is critically needed in both States. It is easy to envision that two sovereign nations would resort to war to settle such a dispute; matters of far less importance and complexity have turned nations to the sword in the past. But here, in our Federal system, we avoid the ultimate test of power, reposing the issue, for the common good, in a disinterested, objective branch of the Government.

Many persons anxiously search for parallels to this process in the processes of the United Nations. Some persuade themselves that this great body has the power to enforce its own decisions and those of its related agencies. But this is wishful thinking; it is dangerous thinking which could lead us to tragic ends.

The United Nations, true enough, can issue decrees; it can enunciate principles; it can find a nation guilty of subversion or aggression; it can recommend remedies for injustices committed by one member nation upon another. But it lacks the power to compel its members to obey its suggestions; it founders upon the rock of enforcement of its will.

This fatal weakness finally shattered the League of Nations; it tore the heart out of the Kellogg-Briand Pact which bound nine nations not to wage war on one another until every peaceful remedy had been exhausted. The insufficiency of both efforts is still painfully clear in our memory. We shall never forget that Japan struck us at Pearl Harbor at the very time their Foreign Minister was talking with our Secretary of State.

So it is that nations, in contrast to our States, in striving to adjust their differences, still tend to resort to that ancient and brutal institution—military force, which, applied today, amounts to mass murder and, conceivably, the obliteration of both sides.

In such a contest, victory is the goal. And what is its reward? The flower of our manhood decimated by slaughter; multitudes disabled for life; cities pulverized; a system of society sundered at its roots. Many among us today have seen three wars come and go, each more brutal than the one before. And yet, our experience is clear: military victory does not bring permanent peace.

I am convinced that man's inhumanity to man, that the endless, futile cruelty and bloodshed of modern warfare, can be avoided through a federal union of free nations. The federal system has proved both its efficiency and its stability in our own country and in the Swiss Republic. I remind you that in the latter nation four languages are in use; nevertheless, regardless of divergent, even antagonistic, national strains, the Swiss experience with federalism has been outstandingly successful.

I most earnestly hope, therefore, that our Nation will take the first halting step forward in the direction of which I speak. Let us move now toward creating the climate and the opportunity to build an alternative to Armageddon. Let us move toward joining with our friends throughout the world in exploration of a federal union which would bind the parties for mutual protection—and, if that should prove successful, moving toward an integration of a larger scope.

Now, of course, we have the jeremiads, the gloommongers, the it-can't-be-done type of people. In all ages, as in our own time, such people point with fear and trembling, obsessed with the problems, never inspired by the oportunities. These are the barnacles on the ship of mankind.

You know their doleful strain. It adds up, essentially, simply to, "It just can't be done."

Our own past shouts the denial to those who fearfully hold back.

Boldly oure forefathers resolved a chaotic situation which resulted from the inability of the Articles of Confederation to bind the Colonies closely together.

After the Colonies had fought and won the Revolutionary War, they shattered into independent, even antagonistic, sovereign units. Economies of the several States disintegrated; traffic was impaired; the common defense was undermined; navigation and trade was fettered and harrassed to the point almost of extinction. Something had to be done. The common good dictated subordination of the primitive fetish, sovereignty which held the Colonies almost at swords' points.

The Articles of Confederation became the first rallying point—the first attempt at common government. This failed utterly to unite the Colonies into a strong cohesive nation, with an effective central government. For a time, unity seemed impossible. You know what then occurred.

On February 21, 1787, the Continental Congress decided to hold a convention in May of that year at Philadelphia. Its purpose was sharp and clear: to revise the Articles of Confederation. Delegates were chosen. Through the bitter debate that ensued only the majestic personality of the beloved

George Washington and the benign influence of wise, philosophic Benjamin Franklin saved the deliberations from ruin. And then, as you know, ultimately, rather than amending the Articles of Confederation, they wrote a new Constitution and laid an enduring foundation for a new nation.

And in this Constitution, precisely for the reasons which plague us today in this trembling world, they turned to a Federal system. They built a national government with the vitality and power to carry forward the common good; they retained, nevertheless, State and local responsibilities, reserving to the States and to the people all powers not specifically granted to the National Government.

And in the preamble, they used language which is the key to much of the problem of which we speak today: "We the people of the United States," is the way they began this immortal document. Not "We the States"—but "We the people" do ordain and establish the Constitution for the United States of America.

Thus government was brought through the governmental maze to the citizen; thus sovereignty was brought home to the individual; thus government was made of the people, for the people, and by the people. And therein is a powerful lesson for those of us who today aspire to a better order of things in this world. There, my friends, is the key to world peace.

And so you see that I am indeed a devotee of this concept—because, mainly, I so deeply revere our own system and the strength and the glory it has brought to our people. I cannot conceive of any supportable reason why a similar effort would, in our own time, fail to bring just as many rich dividends to ourselves and to our children.

Across the seas are nations in mortal fear of the Soviet Union. They live in daily dread that their life, their property, their liberty, and all that they love in life may be destroyed by the Communist advance. They know all too well of the agony and, even, the despair of their neighbors today behind the Iron Curtain. I cannot but believe that they would slowly, perhaps, but surely, inevitably, seize upon a federation such as I have discussed with all the ardor of a drowning man reaching for a helping hand.

I happen to believe that a juncture of the free nations of the North Atlantic, with still others who might wish to join, would be so potent an aggregation that the Soviet threat of aggression would dissipate and frustrate and consume itself futilely, finally dying out altogether. Freedom is a mighty force. I mention only that 95 percent of inventions in the world in the last 2 centuries have been made by persons living in nations with representative government and protected personal freedoms. Freedom is the seedbed of initiative and ingenuity.

The nations of which I speak also have a genius for government based upon the will of the people. In most of them, substantially the rights accorded an American citizen are accorded to their citizens. They have, moreover, the industrial skill, the industrial plant, the agricultural knowledge, and the richest resources, added to ours, of this world. Such an amalgam would soon have a massive impact upon the ambitions of the Soviet Union. That nation would, in my judgment, recognize swiftly that only defeat would be the outgrowth of their contined assault on the free world. And this above all else is true: dictators cannot stand defeat. I am convinced that the rock upon which international communism will surely founder is federation of all or part of the states in the North Atlantic area.

Just as our own country has developed under the Federal system of Government, so would this group of nations, these millions of people, develop in strength, in capacity, in genius, in a unified democratic forum. They would be assured of victory in this divided world; they would be assured of a better world.

My friends, how deeply I wish that we were blessed by having 10,000 Owen J. Roberts to speak to a hundred thousand groups of our people. His penetrating mind, his profound experience and knowledge in judicial and governmental affairs, his wise insight into the perils of our time, would bring light into the darkest places of opposition to federation. Would that we also could stimulate the sale of Union Now, bringing its vital, gripping message to millions more of our people, so that this cause could reach out and truly grasp the minds and hearts and the imagination of His Majesty, Mr. Average American. Surely this is one light that we must ever strive to keep from under a bushel.

There are so many more things I wish I could mention. I remember with pride our gift of freedom to the Philippines in 1946. For 48 years we governed these wonderful people. But instead of resorting to tyranny and oppression, we spent a good part of those years helping these people prepare themselves for self-government and independence. Truly this is one of the brightest stars in our firmament. In many ways, I believe that my vote for Philippine independence was one of the most significant votes I have cast in my 13 years in the Congress. Two years ago, for example, I found on a trip into the Asian region that almost all nations along the Indian Ocean were aspiring to achieve the same recognition, the same self-respecting position in the family of nations, that our Nation had accorded to the Philippines.

Such is the power and the glory and the opportunity of America. Such is the promise our people, our faith, our system, holds out to the suffering and the oppressed who people much of the globe.

And such is the America which, I hope and pray, will boldly rise to today's challenge and lead God's people from the wilderness of militarism and terror into the shining light of hope and opportunity and dependable, just peace. Federation, my friends—what better article could America hope to merchandise among mankind today. It is an imperishable, proud part of our own experience. Let us help others reap its rewards.

And, in the process, we shall help ourselves and assure our children and their children a decent chance to lead fruitful, happy lives.

Thank you very much for your courteous attention.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1955

Rev. Louis J. Kaczorowski, pastor, Polish American Catholic Church, Chicopee, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we pray that our minds and hearts may be blessed with the knowledge, the wisdom, and the understanding to know Thy holy will and the courage to follow it.

We pray that the Members of the Senate of the United States may always incorporate in their deliberations and enactments the moral and spiritual principles that are basic to our American way of life, and which must be preserved if our civilization is to survive and if our Nation is to continue to be worthy of Thy benediction.

Help each one of us personally to grow in devotion to Thee and to Thy holy law and in the sincere practice of true brotherhood toward our fellow man so that love of Thee and of neighbor may be truly the supreme motive and purpose of everything we say and do.

These blessings we ask in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 25, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. GORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet this afternoon, during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of memorials and petitions, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask

unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RETIREMENT OF GOVERNMENT CAPITAL IN CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN DOCTORS FOR ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the procurement of doctors of medicine and doctors of dentistry for the Armed Forces by providing scholarships for education in medical and dental professions, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASED ANNUITIES FOR RETIRED MEMBERS OF CERTAIN TEACHING STAFFS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the annuities of certain retired members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON MEDICAL SERVICES BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on Medical Services, together with a report of its task force, on the same subject, dated February 1955 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorial of the House of Representative of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, urging that the Congress reject the proposal of the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to dismantle the Soil Conservation Service and turn its functions over to the States

"Whereas the Federal Soil Conservation Service, working with soil conservation districts, has been outstandingly successful in serving the soil conservation districts of America; and

"Whereas the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended that this program be relegated to the various States with a progressively decreasing grant-in-aid status; and

"Whereas the present corps of SCS technicians would be gradually shifted to the status of State employees; and

"Whereas the idea is financially impracticable because a number of the States, including Montana, have, in the past, been unable to make sufficient appropriations to meet their obligations on other similar grant-in-aid programs such as Federal highways and other worthwhile projects; and

"Whereas a good program must be based and dependent on well-trained and educated personnel who can be assured of the security and permanence that only the civil-service status could provide; and

"Whereas a high standard of achievement is unlikely of achievement in all 48 States under separate programs; and

"Whereas under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, this undesirable shift in Soil Conservation Scrvice responsibility will automatically go into effect after its approval by the Federal Commission unless rejected by the Congress within 60 days; and

"Whereas the benefits of a nationally administered program of soil conservation accrue to all the people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, now in session, hereby most urgently request the Congress of the United States to reject the aforesaid reorganization plan, and retain the Soil Conservation as a Federal service in substantially its present form, with responsibility for carrying forward the programs developed by the locally administered soil conservation districts; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana be hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

"LEO C. GRABILL,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"*To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and Territorial Delegate to Congress:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas in Alaska the performing of $100 worth of assessment work on unpatented mining claims accomplishes very little beneficial work because of the high wage and equipment rates; and

"Whereas the remoteness of most claims from roads and the high cost of Alaskan air transportation cause many claimholders to spend a disproportionate amount of money in travel to and from the claims in order to perform the assessment work; and

"Whereas construction of mine-access roads would be of greater benefit to mines and mineral claims than the assessment work now being performed; and

"Whereas a system similar to that proposed below is employed satisfactorily in some of the Canadian Provinces,

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully urges that Federal legislation be passed to allow claimholders to deposit $100 in cash per claim in lieu of assessment work with the recorder of the proper precinct, executing an affidavit therefor, and the money to be forwarded to a fund administered by the Territorial highway engineer for the sole use of building mine-access roads.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 8, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house February 18, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"JOHN N. MCLAUGHLIN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial by the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide adequate sources of farm credit to agricultural enterprises in New Mexico, particularly those stricken by the drought and other disasters

"Whereas drought and disaster have created in many areas in New Mexico a critical financial condition for farmers and businessmen; and

"Whereas sound and adequate credit facilities are urgently needed to preserve the economy of many sections of the State and to prevent needless suffering on the part of those family enterprises hardest hit by drought and other disaster: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact new legislation and broaden existing legislation that will authorize or provide for the following:

"1. Extension of the authority and time limit for making emergency loans beyond the present 2-year period which expires in July 1955;

"2. Orderly liquidation of the above emergency loans over periods up to 10 years;

"3. A relatively low interest rate on such emergency loans;

"4. A loan program set up through the Farmers' Home Administration to enable farmers and ranchers to consolidate all of their financial obligations, excluding real-estate mortgages, but including provision for interest on real-estate loans and for taxes;

"5. A provision allowing the borrower, where necessary, to make reasonable land payments from sale of farm products;

"6. Additional farm mortgage credit comparable to the former Land Bank Commissioner loans in such disaster and drought areas;

"7. Streamlining of Farmers' Home Administration loan procedures, including removal of regulations requiring personal financial responsibility of Farmers' Home Administration personnel except where fraud or gross negligence is clearly indicated;

"8. Broadening and extension of the feed and livestock use provisions of the emer-

gency feed relief program so that this program will be better adapted and more workable in each area, to include a provision that necessary precautions be taken to see that the feed is used for the purpose for which it was intended; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 4

"Memorial memorializing the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States to pass Senate Bill No. 500 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project

"Whereas there is a pressing need for the most beneficial use of natural resources in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the citizens of New Mexico are especially interested in, and dependent upon the natural resources represented by life-giving waters of our rivers and streams; and

"Whereas Senate bill 500, now before the Congress of the United States, would, in the considered opinion of the people of New Mexico, and the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico, authorize an extremely vital project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be urged to give their earnest consideration to, and pass Senate bill 500, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct; operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to both Houses of Congress, to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to Senators CLINTON P. ANDERSON and DENNIS CHAVEZ.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 8th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting 2 million acres of land in trust to this State for the purpose of providing public school buildings

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the United States Government and the agencies thereof own over 40 percent of the total land in the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas such land is not subject to taxation by the State and results in a hardship to the people of this State in raising sufficient revenue for the support of public schools; and

"Whereas a grant of 2 million acres in trust to the State for public school buildings would greatly alleviate such hardship; and

"Whereas such a trust would be of permanent and enduring benefit and would provide a more stable support for the public schools than appropriations by Congress for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation granting 2 million acres of land in this State in trust to the State for public school buildings and providing that only the income from such trust may be expanded for such school buildings; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Memorial 6

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to prohibit the issuance of Federal liquor licenses in counties of States having exercised local option prohibiting sale of intoxicants within its boundaries

"Whereas certain counties in New Mexico have elected by the local option process to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in their boundaries; and

"Whereas certain individuals obtain Federal liquor licenses and distribute liquor in violation of the local laws, a condition has developed which tends to contribute to juvenile delinquency. Lack of adequate police supervision in remote rural areas encourages youths to purchase alcoholic beverages from federally licensed persons and in violation of the New Mexico law; and

"Whereas the problem of law enforcement in counties of large area and small population is materially increased it is felt the denial of Federal liquor licenses in local option dry counties will reduce violation of local laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully urged to enact legislation prohibiting the issuance of Federal liquor licenses in counties of the State of New Mexico which have by local option process elected to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages; and be it further

"Resolved, That the enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 6

"Senate resolution to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from the State of North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressman from the State of North Dakota; requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway 2 to the national interstate highway system

"Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that 'there shall be designated in the Continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico'; and

"Whereas the act further provided that 'the routes of the National System of Interstate Highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States,' and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

"Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the National System of Interstate Highways, dated the 2d day of August 1947, which adopted a National System of Interstate Highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States; and

"Whereas the national system of Interstate highways selected, modified, and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

"Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

"Whereas United States Highway 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the State of North Dakota as well as the several other boundary States; and

"Whereas said United States Highway 2 plays an ever-increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

"Whereas the said United States Highway 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's highways 9 from New York to Montreal and highway 17 from Montreal to Sault

Ste. Marie, which are of importance in Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air-defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

"Whereas under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of the United States Highway 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the bureau, this could call for a two-lane highway with a 100-foot right of way; and

"Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in seven States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

"Whereas while this is a petition from the State of North Dakota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway 2 because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

"Whereas this request that the designation of the United States Highway 2 be placed on the National System of Interstate Highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of North Dakota and in the other States served by the United States Highway 2: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the State of North Dakota, That the senate does hereby, most earnestly and respectfully, request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the National System of Interstate Highways; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Honorable Norman Brunsdale, Governor of the State of North Dakota, and by the Honorable Ben Meier, secretary of state of North Dakota, to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from North Dakota; and to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LERCO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, at Washington, D. C., relating to the military status of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, at Washington, D. C., relating to support for the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent, at Kenosha, Wis., relating to the liberation of Lithuania and other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, at Washington, D. C., relating to the termination of Federal supervision over Indian tribes and Indian health services; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of James E. Tangney-Sanborn, of the State of Illinois, relating to his claim for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Richard Bladel Mossman, of Bettendorf, Iowa, relating to his claim for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the taxation of oil production is the primary source of revenue to the State of Texas. It accounts for approximately 68 percent of all the business and property taxes collected in the State. Yet, Mr. President, our production of oil today has been reduced to 15 days a month. We now produce only one-half the time. This situation is partially due to excessive oil imports.

The President's Committee on Energy and Fuel Supplies last week reported that these excessive imports could injure the economy and security of our country.

On page 3 of the mimeographed report, the President's committee said:

> The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oil will exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oil bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuel situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which insures the supplies and reserves necessary to the national defense.

In other words, Mr. President, the President's committee says there should be no significant increase in the amount of oil imported this year and in future years over and above what was imported in 1954.

Figures have come to my attention today indicating that for a 4-week period ending February 11 crude-oil imports into the United States averaged 170,800 barrels a day, 27.4 percent higher than for the same 4-week period in 1954. There has been no increase in market demand. The increase at this time is terrible and clearly illustrates that self-controlled voluntary restriction has had its test and failed.

It would appear that the limit set out in the President's committee's report has already been reached. The report goes on to say:

> The committee recommends that if industrial statesmanship and voluntary reduction do not care for the situation, and in the future if imports of crude and residual fuel oils exceeding significantly the respective proportion that such oils bore to the domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

It appears that appropriate action is now in order, that voluntary reductions have not been forthcoming, and therefore some type of legislation should be enacted by the Congress to protect our domestic oil industry not only for the sake of the industry itself, but for the sake of the national defense and security.

Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Texas on this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 23

Whereas there have been tremendous and growing increases in the importation of foreign oil, against which no restriction now exists in the laws of the Nation; and

Whereas the production of petroleum in the State of Texas has been unrealistically curtailed, to an injurious extent, as a result of the growing encroachment of foreign oil on the markets normally supplied by oil producers of Texas; and

Whereas taxation on oil production is a primary source of revenue to the State government of Texas, accounting for approximately 68 percent of all business and property taxes; and

Whereas taxation on the petroleum industry is depended upon to pay more than 45 percent of the cost of public education and 45 percent of the cost of higher education in the State of Texas; and

Whereas the aforementioned curtailment of oil production in Texas not only has a harmful impact on our general economy, but is seriously undermining our State tax structure to the extent that harmful losses are inflicted on State budgetary requirements for schools, colleges, highways, and other essential public projects; and

Whereas expanding oil production is not only essential to our State economy but is vital in generating full development of oil and gas resources to provide for future defense needs of our Nation and to stimulate business and commercial enterprises throughout our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress is hereby requested to give immediate attention to proposals now pending and to others which may be introduced for the limitation of imported oil as will cause no further injury to the oil-producing industry of the State of Texas and the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives in Congress elected by the people of Texas.

JIM LINDSEY,
Speaker of the House.
BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESTORATION OF PACKAGE FREIGHT SERVICE ON GREAT LAKES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature memorializing the President and Congress to support meas-

ures to restore package freight service on the Great Lakes.

This is a matter of real importance to the economy of the entire Great Lakes area. I have, in all the years I have been in the Senate, worked for the development of our transportation facilities on this great inland waterway system. Restoration of package freight and passenger shipping on the Great Lakes, to supplement bulk cargo shipping, which is now amply served, is extremely important from every point of view. It has a vital bearing on the economic future of the Great Lakes region.

In 1950, together with a group of colleagues from the Great Lakes States, I introduced proposed legislation to aid in the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes.

Public Law 856, 81st Congress, embodying this legislation, made available to purchasers for use on the Great Lakes surplus war-built vessels, at prices and with allowances similar to those which were allowed to purchasers of vessels for use on the oceans under the Ship Sales Act of 1946.

Although a very limited time was allowed between the enactment of this law, September 28, 1950, until December 31, 1950, for the signing of contracts, two companies made applications.

Six C–4's were sold, 3 to the Wisconsin-Michigan Steamship Co., and 3 to the Nicholson Universal Steamship Co. Five of these ships have been converted and are in use on the Great Lakes, and one is in process of conversion as a passenger vessel and car ferry. It was intended that the ships should add to the package-carrier fleet, but the Korean war emergency necessitated the original use of several of them for iron-ore carriers.

Before World War II, there were 24 ships on the Great Lakes engaged in package-freight trade, and 19 vessels carrying passengers.

These facilities were practically eliminated or became obsolete because of wartime demands for concentration on iron-ore shipping.

Today demand for package freight and passenger service is greater than ever, but the rebuilding of the necessary shipping facilities to take care of package freight has not kept pace, due to the high capital outlays and the need for emphasizing bulk shipping in the national interest.

Freight can be carried on the Great Lakes at substantially lower cost than by other transportation.

Restoration and development of adequate shipping facilities would actually supplement rail and truck transportation in the area served and would give us a better-balanced and more adequate transportation system.

With the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the deepening of the upper Great Lakes channels, and the improvement of important harbors like the one at Duluth and Superior, I believe it is vital that steps be taken to assure an adequate fleet of freight carriers operating on the Great Lakes.

I have asked the Maritime Administration, through its planning division, to give consideration to this need, particularly with reference to how the Federal Government can assist.

Private enterprise, through such organizations as the Great Lakes Carriers Association, is completing studies on the requirements.

I believe that we in Congress should likewise fully support this effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution of the Minnesota State Legislature, which sets forth the importance of this entire matter, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Congress of the United States to support measures to restore package freight service on the Great Lakes

Whereas the Congress of the United States under Public Law 856 enacted by the 81st Congress, provided that certain surplus vessels could be reconverted for use as package freighters on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the vessels which were so reconverted were not used for the purpose intended because of the outbreak of the Korean war, but were assigned to the carrying of iron ore; and

Whereas prior to World War II package freight was a major Minnesota industry. In excess of 700,000 tons of freight were shipped to and from the Port of Duluth during the last year that package freighters operated on the Great Lakes. Included in said shipments from the State of Minnesota were approximately 64,000 tons of butter; 6,000 tons of buttermilk; 12,000 tons of cheese; 28,000 tons of cream; 6,000 tons of eggs; 45,000 tons of dressed poultry; 170,000 tons of flour; 107,000 tons of mill products; in excess of 18,000 tons of wool; 19,000 tons of lumber; 3,000 tons of paper products, and in excess of 40,000 tons of manufactured metal products; and

Whereas this trade benefited every segment of the Minnesota economy including the great agriculture and manufacturing industries; and

Whereas the discontinuance of this trade not only has adversely affected our agriculture and manufacturing industries, but has caused substantial unemployment in the maritime industries at the head of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes not only will substantially contribute to the well-being and growth of Minnesota industry, provide a market for products grown and manufactured in Minnesota, both at home and abroad, but will also help reduce unemployment and more importantly will provide a stepping stone to the maximum use of the facilities of the Port of Duluth for international trade when the St. Lawrence Seaway has been completed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effect the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, and to each member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, the 1st day of February, 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the Senate, the 11th day of February, 1955.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved February 18, 1955.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

INCLUSION OF UNITED STATES HIGHWAY NO. 2 IN NATIONAL SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, with reference to United States Highway No. 2, which traverses the northern part of North Dakota.

This highway has considerable strategic military significance in serving as a connecting link for several air-defense installations soon to be constructed along the northern border of this Nation. The resolution requests that United States Highway No. 2 be designated and placed in the national system of interstate highways, without prejudice to existing interstate highways in North Dakota and the other States served by United States Highway No. 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

House Resolution 9

Resolution to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from the State of North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from the State of North Dakota; requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway No. 2 to the National Interstate Highway System

Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that "There shall be designated in the Continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national

defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico"; and

Whereas the act further provided that "The routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States, and the adjoining States," and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated the second day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States; and

Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the State of North Dakota as well as the several other boundary States; and

Whereas said United States Highway No. 2 plays an ever increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

Whereas the said United States Highway No. 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's Highway No. 9 from New York to Montreal and Highway No. 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air-defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

Whereas under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of the United States Highway No. 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the bureau, this could call for a two-lane highway with a 100-foot right of way; and

Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in 7 States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

Whereas while this is a petition from the State of North Dakota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway No. 2 because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

Whereas this request that the designation of the United States Highway No. 2 to be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of North Dakota and in the other States served by the United States Highway No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, That the house of representatives of the State of North Dakota does hereby, most earnestly and respectfully, request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway No. 2, and through the proper Federal agencies, take immediate action to United States Highway No. 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Honorable Norman Brunsdale, Governor of the State of North Dakota; and by the Honorable Ben Meier, secretary of state of North Dakota; to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from North Dakota.

K. A. TIKH,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—RESOLUTION OF LEAGUE OF KANSAS MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the governing body of the League of Kansas Municipalities, at Topeka, Kans., favoring an amendment of the Natural Gas Act, relating to the return to the States the function of regulation for conservation of natural gas.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE LEAGUE OF KANSAS MUNICIPALITIES MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently ruled that sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers made in the field in which the gas is produced are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission under the terms of the Natural Gas Act when the gas is ultimately transported to and sold in other States; and

Whereas the League of Kansas Municipalities has, from its inception in 1910, concerned itself with the problems of its member cities in supplying themselves with an adequate supply of natural gas at reasonable rates and it has carried on studies, conducted research, issued brochures, news releases, reports, and recommendations to its member cities, and to all municipalities of Kansas, concerning the availability, regulation, and cost of natural gas to the ultimate consumer; and

Whereas the ultimate consumer has a tremendous investment in gas-consuming devices for the utilization of this fuel, the protection of which is a prime responsibility of municipal governing bodies; and

Whereas the production of natural gas is a highly competitive business and its conservation is of vital concern to the various States wherein it is found; and

Whereas the State of Kansas has for 20 years regulated the production of natural gas to the end that wasteful practices be prohibited, that this great natural resource be conserved by the discouragement of early abandonment and the drilling of marginal wells, and by encouraging the orderly production of natural gas to insure maximum recovery thereof; and

Whereas the regulation by the Federal Government of the price of gas sold by independent producers and gatherers is contrary to the public interest, including the interests of consumers in the municipalities who are members of this league in the following particulars: (1) Such regulation will result in curtailing the development of new sources of supply of gas because it will lessen the incentive of independent producers to explore for and produce natural gas, will interfere with and impede State conservation measures and thereby result in waste of gas and will ultimately increase the cost of gas to the consumer and increase the rates of depreciation and obsolescence of his gas-consuming devices; (2) Federal regulation is unnecessary in that field prices represent only a small portion of the cost of gas to consumers and in any event such prices are competitive with other fuel prices; (3) Federal regulation cannot be justified except on a socialistic basis which could lead to the regulation of the price of all commodities, including oil, coal, and other products of nature, and which would further centralize regulatory authority in the Federal Government and thereby usurp the powers and functions of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the governing body of the League of Kansas Municipalities, assembled at Topeka, Kans., That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to restore to the several States their historic function of regulation for conservation of natural gas, and remove from the field of Federal regulation sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers made in the field, even though such gas is ultimately sold in interstate commerce; be it further

Resolved, That the executive director of the League of Kansas Municipalities be instructed to furnish a copy of this resolution to each Member of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

J. GLEN DAVIS,
President.

Attest:

JOHN G. STUTZ,
Executive Director.

CONTINUANCE OF NORTHWEST AIRLINES SERVICE—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, previously, when speaking on the floor of the Senate, I have commented on the tremendous significance to the economy of the State of Wisconsin and all other States along the northern tier of our Nation, as well as to our country as a whole, of continued service by Northwest Airlines.

I present a resolution forwarded to me by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., reemphasizing this point. I ask unanimous consent

that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be referred to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that the President of the United States has recently entered an order which in effect terminates the near great circle route of Northwest Airlines from Milwaukee to Anchorage, Alaska, via the twin cities and Edmonston, Canada, as well as the direct one carrier service of the Northwest Airlines to Hawaii via Seattle. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be respectfully requested to reconsider such decisions for the following reasons, to-wit:

Milwaukee County in the construction of General Mitchell Field has invested almost $16 million in this terminal facility.

Northwest Airlines was one of the first carriers to render air service between this community and the rest of the United States, Canada, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The growth of Northwest Airlines together with Milwaukee's commerce during recent years have extended on a parallel basis, with the result that today Milwaukee is on the main route to New York to the Orient and has developed a growing volume of trade with Asiatic countries, due greatly to these facilities.

Milwaukee's annual $6 billion volume of manufacturing and other trade would be most seriosuly affected by the termination of the present direct routes from this city to our important domestic trade Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. Direct air transportation to these markets plays an important part in the economic prosperity of our community.

The Milwaukee area affected by the Presidents decision ranks eighth in the industrial production of the Nation.

In view of all of the foregoing and consistent with the petitions of our Representatives in Congress now before the President, Milwaukee County by these presents respectfully prays that the President's decision be not merely modified but rescinded and the future situation of Northwest Airlines be returned to its former status; and be it further

Resolved, That the above resolution be spread upon the minutes of this regular meeting of the board of supervisors duly held at Milwaukee the 8th day of February 1955, and that a copy thereof be forthwith communicated to the President of the United States of America, and to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and Congressmen ZABLOCKI and REUSS.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 70), which was placed on the calendar as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1218. A bill for the relief of Luigi Cardone and his two minor children, Vita Cardone and Diomedio Cardone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1219. A bill to grant minerals, including coal, oil, and gas, in certain lands in the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Montana, to individual Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1220. A bill for the relief of Josephine Ray; and

S. 1221. A bill for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1222. A bill for the relief of Fotini Kiliarhi Stavrides;

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Miltiades Skordos;

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Andrew Saliaris;

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Tom Marinatos;

S. 1226. A bill for the relief of Soterios Christopoulos;

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of John Stamoulas;

S. 1228. A bill for the relief of Nick Paschalis;

S. 1229. A bill for the relief of George Tziotes;

S. 1230. A bill for the relief of George Vratsanos;

S. 1231. A bill for the relief of Konstantine Mastoras;

S. 1232. A bill for the relief of Constantine Piteris;

S. 1233. A bill for the relief of Aristides Kendros;

S. 1234. A bill for the relief of Christ Torvas; and

S. 1235. A bill for the relief of Angelo Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1236. A bill for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Prentice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1237. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish townsites within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1238. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Baruch Mintz, Tchia Mintz, Shulamit Mintz, and Shalom Boaz Mintz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1239. A bill to amend section 42 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to increase the compensation of members of county committees from $5 per day to $10 per day; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1240. A bill for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1241. A bill for the relief of Ernst Windmeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1242. A bill for the relief of Purita Rodriquez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte;

S. 1243. A bill for the relief of Kyu Lee;

S. 1244. A bill for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein; and

S. 1245. A bill for the relief of Agnes V. Walsh, the estate of Margaret T. Denehy, and David Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1246. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to prohibit the deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1247. A bill to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1248. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to require that the rates and charges of natural-gas companies be determined on the basis of the actual legitimate cost of the companies' property, less depreciation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1249. A bill for the relief of Nouritza Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1250. A bill to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution designating the Saturday before Palm Sunday in each year as Crippled Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED REVENUE ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, in order that it may be printed for the information of Senators, and particularly the Committee on Finance. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak briefly on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, to H. R. 4259, the tax bill, I have submitted an amendment proposing to revive and extend the Renegotiation Act for 2 years.

The Renegotiation Act had its origin in an amendment which I offered to the Sixth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act of 1942. Later it became a separate title in the Revenue Act of 1943. It was revised and extended as the Renegotiation Act of 1951 after we got into the Korean war. As such, it expired December 31, 1954.

During World War II, by the renegotiation process, more than $11 billion were recovered for the taxpayers and the Treasury. Secretary Bob Patterson used to say its value was even greater in pricing subsequent contracts. Thus far, in the Korean war extension, renegotiation has recovered over $233 million and may double that. This is in addition to the refinements that have been made in pricing and the operation of an excess-profits tax.

When I proposed renegotiation by statute in the spring of 1942, we did not have an excess-profits tax. We were seeing contractors make huge profits on contracts begun with "letters of intent" and through the use of Government loans, tools, and plants to expedite production. We needed something to prevent profiteering and at the same time something that would not delay production.

We did not have the charges of war profiteering after World War II as we did following World War I. Renegotiation met the need. Renegotiation provides for an audit of actual costs and pricing on that basis. Thus, it avoids the inherent unfairness of the ordinary percentage tax on corporation income or profits when one manufacturer is working with his own capital and tools, and another is using facilities provided by the Government.

Furthermore, it meets the need when speed is the order of the day. When a new model or a changeover is demanded, there may be no time and possibly no basis on which to price the new item. Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts do not fit the bill, because while they may deny profit in cost boosting, they do not reward for keeping costs down.

In the present buildup of defense equipment, and particularly in the great changeover from propeller to jet planes, Mr. President, taxpayers and the Treasury need the protection of renegotiation.

Technically, renegotiation is a revenue matter. Under the Constitution, revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate can amend tax bills. That is why, with the tax bill now through the House, I am offering this amendment to revive and extend renegotiation as a part of the tax bill now before the Senate Committee on Finance.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at the 50th anniversary banquet of the Knights of Columbus, at Kenosha, Wis., on February 27, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Letter written by him to William R. Mathews, editor of the Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson, Ariz., in regard to the differences between the Salt River Valley Water Users Association and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GILBERT H. JERTBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 8, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Gilbert H. Jertberg, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice Campbell E. Beaumont, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TEXTILE TARIFFS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, millions of Americans are turning their eyes to Geneva, Switzerland, this week as negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade get underway. The course that conference takes in broadening the flow of international trade will profoundly affect not only the economic strength of the free world generally but also that of the United States.

I am one of those who favor greater commerce among the proud nations which stand firm against the rising tide of Communist expansion. Greater trade, I believe, will act as a strong bulwark against further Communist expansion.

But it is no secret that action hastily taken, or ill-conceived, can do profound damage to the cause we seek to promote. The free nations of the world greatly fear economic instability in the United States. It has been said many times that when the United States sneezes, the rest of the world catches pneumonia. It is our duty to our friends, as well as to ourselves, to see that, economically speaking, we do not sneeze.

To do this we must maintain employment and vitality in our basic industries. Reductions in tariffs which would disrupt any of our important industries should be temporarily postponed in the interest of American and, indeed, world economic stability.

Ms. President, I desire today to call the attention of the Senate to one such industry, an industry which, as I am sure all in this Chamber know, is temporarily suffering economic illness. That is the textile industry, 90 percent of whose products are subject to tariff reductions at the GATT meeting.

It is now proposed, as Senators know, that tariff reductions be made on goods imported from Japan, which is our most serious competitor, and one of the world's greatest textile exporters. The reductions made in favor of Japan would then be extended to other countries on a most-favored-nation basis. This adds up to serious trouble for the industry countrywide, and in particular for New England.

More Japanese imports would seriously affect certain contracting textile markets. The question is not one of Japanese firms gaining a larger share of a market in which American firms are also growing. Few persons would quarrel with that.

But the fact is that important segments of the American textile industry are faced with steady drops in domestic textile consumption, as well as in exports. Since 1950, per capital consumption of wool in the United States has fallen 40.9 percent and of cottons 18.3 percent.

The market today cannot even absorb the full production of our own industry's present capacity. Yet some people would increase Japanese imports even more, in spite of the fact that the flow has increased steadily since the end of World War II. From 1953 to 1954, alone, imports of Japanese cotton fabrics increased about 100 percent; and this came about under the present tariff levels. New Englanders, already hard hit by migration of their industry and stiff competition from new fabrics and technological changes, are disturbed, and rightfully so, to think of the awful consequences of imminent tariff reductions.

But New England alone will not suffer. Since 1951, 268,000 textile jobs have been lost all over the country. A total of 107,000 were lost in New England alone up to 1954, or 38 percent of such jobs which existed in 1951. In the South, the decline in all types of textile jobs was 41,000, or 7 percent of the 1951 figure. An editorial in the February 8, 1955, edition of the Atlanta Journal expressed the concern the South feels over further tariff reductions.

While textiles were suffering, what was happening to the rest of our economy? During the same period our gross national product increased 12 percent, and total industrial production increased 10 percent.

The figures on textiles alone are bad enough. But the damage done is compounded by the effect a textile slump has on related industries, such as utilities, transportation, textile-machinery firms, and so on. The ills of the textile industry, with its more than 1 million workers, are contagious, spreading insidiously, and infecting many millions more of our Nation's workers.

Even assuming for the moment that there are such things as expendable industries, the textile industry certainly is not one of them. The textile industry provides 7 percent of all industrial employment and about 17 percent of all the nondurable goods employment. It provides 5 percent of all industry's payroll and 15 percent of the nondurable goods payroll.

In many New England towns a majority of the people earn their bread working in textile mills. Can these people be told that they are expendable? Dr. William E. Miernyk, of Northeastern University has studied unemployed textile workers, in the most careful analysis

yet made of this problem. He found that most textile workers were older persons who had devoted their life to the industry. Dr. Miernyk found that the great majority of those who lost their jobs were unemployed, or had left the labor market, as they were simply unable to find work. Whole communities have been depressed because of this lack of mobility in the textile labor force. The result is that 5 of the 8 major substantial labor surplus areas in the United States today are textile areas, according to the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the percentage of textile workers to total manufacturing employment in many of the major New England cities.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Textile employment [1] as a percent of manufacturing employment

	Percent
Massachusetts:	
Adams	81.5
North Adams	23.2
Fall River	40.8
Holyoke	14.2
Lowell	37.1
New Bedford	25.9
Connecticut:	
Baltic	40.2
Stonington	26.8
Maine:	
Lewiston	42.9
Biddeford-Saco	38.3
Sanford	50.0
New Hampshire: Manchester	34.0
Rhode Island:	
Albion and Lonsdale	86.4
Anthony	99.0
Ashton	83.6
Warren	38.0
Warwick	31.5

[1] Predominantly cotton and synthetic textiles.

Mr. PAYNE. Japanese industry has been modernized and is gaining ground. Japan's costs of production are so low that fair competition with her products is out of the question. The average American costs per yard of various kinds of fabrics exceed the Japanese costs by from 52 percent to 70.1 percent.

There are many reasons for this. I hasten to point out that the reason is not monopoly in the domestic industry. The industry has many small manufacturers engaged in sharp price competition. New production techniques are constantly being introduced. Efficiency and productivity are rising. When the present dislocations in the industry are straightened out, I believe that our textiles may be able to compete with the products of any country. But time is needed to smooth out the wrinkles in our ever-changing textile industry.

The most significant reason for our high-cost situation is wages, which is the most important element in the production of textiles, accounting for over 40 percent of unit cost. The American textile worker receives an average of about $1.36 an hour. Even this is below most industrial wages in our country. But the Japanese worker gets only approximately 14 cents an hour. I will point out later how this difference counts heavily in favor of the Japanese.

The staff papers of the Randall Commission said this on page 432:

> To the extent that low-paid labor in a country like Japan can operate the new machines as effectively as they can be operated in high-wage countries—the low-wage country can make serious inroads in various lines in the high-wage country. In the mid-30's, shortly before the outbreak of the Second World War, Japan was invading various segments of the American textile industry. Similarly her electric-light bulbs, her shoes, and a number of other products were undercutting similar American-produced goods in the United States market.

Remember, this is the Randall Commission staff speaking. This can happen again. Considering New England's economic problems, the result could well be disastrous, especially when we realize that other New England industry, including the shoes and light bulbs mentioned above, might be also injured by lower tariffs.

Some would pass over the low-wage argument lightly, saying that American productivity is greater and makes up for the difference. American productivity is greater—but it does not make up for the difference very often. Japanese productivity is increasing at a fantastic rate, with output per man-hour rising from a base of 100 in April 1950 to 224.5 in June 1954, according to the Mitsubishi Research Institute in Tokyo.

Unless properly tested, however, the low-wage argument does not stand up. The staff papers of the Randall Commission on page 433 provides a way of testing the validity of the argument. The report says:

> The test of such unfairness of competition is whether the labor involved is receiving wages, per unit of output, that are substantially lower than wages received in the country as a whole.

How does this test of unfairness, suggested by many distinguished economists, apply to Japan? The Department of Labor tells me that the average hourly wage in all manufacturing and mining industries in Japan is 24 cents. Remember, it is only 14 cents an hour in textiles. This is, I think it will be agreed, a substantial difference and meets the test of unfair competition set up by the Randall Commission staff.

One wonders what might happen to imports under a substantial tariff reduction. Fortunately we have a clue to this, again from the Randall Commission's staff papers.

The staff tried to determine the probable effects on imports under a temporary tariff suspension. In terms of percentage increases, the staff said the most significant changes would probably be in textiles. It has been estimated, on the basis of figures for 1951, that the increases would be from 37 to 74 percent. The staff also listed areas of potential injury where "domestic producers would be forced to give away in substantial measure to increased imports."

The report said that these areas, ones in which there existed a very inelastic demand or a contracting market, "warrant a legitimate fear of increased imports." What are some of the products which would be affected? The report lists nearly a dozen textile products.

I know that total tariff suspension is not contemplated. But I think it fair to say that these predicted results would apply also in case of a tariff reduction, even though not to quite so serious a degree.

But the textile industry, being hit from all sides, can stand no more troubles. It is even being hurt under the existing tariff rates. I ask that the people of New England and of the textile industry generally throughout the country be given a chance to live, to work out their problems, to become strong again. Then the industry can stand on its own two feet. It has been estimated by the industry itself that our domestic textile industry will disappear in 15 years, 8 years in New England, if it continues to lose jobs at the rate it has in the past 3 years.

A healthy national textile industry is vital in peace and war. Textiles was the first great industry to grow in this country. I do not ask for exclusion of imports, but only for the maintenance of existing rates and for an opportunity for this industry to work out its problems before it is destroyed by an increasing flood of foreign imports.

Although the dollar shortage shows signs of disappearing, I know that problems remain, particularly in the case of Japan. It is the responsibility of this country to help solve that problem. But we will not solve it by sacrificing American industry. That will only make the situation worse. The free world will win short-term gains for long-term losses. When an important industry or an entire section of the country can show serious injury through foreign competition, that industry should be saved, not sacrificed.

VIOLATION OF FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO STORAGE OF GRAIN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, under date of February 25, 1955, I addressed a letter to the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Attorney General, which letter was also signed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. The letter dealt with the disposition of certain criminal charges involving violations of Federal laws relating to the storage of grain.

Under date of February 27, 1955, the Attorney General replied to our letter, enclosing a report from Warren Olney III, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence, which I think would be most informative to Members of Congress, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 25, 1955.*

The Honorable HERBERT BROWNELL,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: We have noted in the newspapers during the past few days an account of dismissal by the Federal court in Texas of certain criminal charges involving the Bunge Corp. and certain of

its officers who were charged with violation of Federal laws relating to the storage of grain.

Knowing of your personal interest in the prosecution of this and similar cases which grew out of an investigation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture in 1953, we would be very much interested in having from you a complete report on the dismissal of the Bunge case and the status of other similar cases in order that the public record may be complete and accurate.

As chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings leading up to the disclosure of the original information on which the Department of Justice based a number of its prosecutions and also speaking in behalf of Senator AIKEN and Senator YOUNG, who had participated in the hearings, it will be very much appreciated if we could have your answer at as early a date as possible.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senator.
MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D .C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THYE: In response to the letter from you, Senator AIKEN and Senator YOUNG of February 25, 1955, relative to the Bunge case, I am pleased to transmit to you the enclosed report from Warren Olney III, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

INQUIRY OF SENATOR EDWARD J. THYE CONCERNING THE DISPOSITION OF THE CRIMINAL CHARGES INVOLVING THE EUNGE CORP. AND CONCERNING THE STATUS OF CTHER SIMILAR GRAIN CASES

This memorandum is prepared in response to the request addressed to you by Senator EDWARD J. THYE and cosigned by Senators AIKEN and YOUNG under date of February 25, 1955, for a complete report on the dismissal of the Bunge case and the status of other similar cases involving the importation or exportation of offgrade, frost-damaged Canadian wheat imported into the United States from 1950 to 1952, and which has been the subject to investigation by and interest to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator's letter requests an answer at the earliest possible date.

As a matter of fact, the Bunge case was not dismissed. The Bunge Corp. was charged as a defendant, entered a plea of guilty, and has been sentenced. The dismissals related not to the corporation but to individual defendants, some of whom were corporate officers and one of whom was not. The reasons for the action taken by the Department of Justice in the Bunge case are readily stated, but a complete report on the status of the other grain cases which the Senator has requested will necessarily be time consuming in its preparation.

In order to comply with Senator THYE's request for a prompt answer, I am setting forth herewith the explanation of the disposition of the Bunge case and will supply the requested status report on the other cases at a later date, as soon as the necessary information can be compiled.

Of course you are aware that the civil aspects of the Bunge litigation are pending in the civil division. It is expected that the Government will recover every dollar which it may have paid to the Bunge Corp. in illegal subsidies, as well as the full amounts of the substantial civil penalties incurred. Five hundred and fifteen thousand has already been deposited by the Bunge Corp. to guarantee the payment to the Government of all amounts owed. Of course, the final settlement of the civil aspects of this matter has necessarily awaited the termination of the criminal proceeding. The plea of guilty by the corporation would appear to establish the Government's right to civil recovery, although the amount remains undetermined.

The indictment in the Bunge case was returned in the southern district of Texas, Galveston division, on June 10, 1954, against the Bunge Corp., Robert F. Straub, president of Bunge Corp.; Andre Hirschler, vice president and director of the Bunge Corp.; Simon Kern, vice president of Bunge Corp.; Walton F. Mulloy, assistant vice president of Bunge Corp.; and E. H. Thornton, Sr., general manager of the Galveston wharves. The indictment contained one count charging a conspiracy: (1) To defraud the United States by obstructing it in the administration of its programs under the International Wheat Agreement; (2) to falsify, conceal, and cover up by trick, scheme, and device, material facts concerning the origin of wheat shipped by the Bunge Corp. pursuant to the International Wheat Agreement; and (3) to make false and fraudulent claims against the United States in connection with the collection of export subsidies.

The counts of this indictment included all criminal offenses which, in the opinion of the Criminal Division, could be charged in Texas against the defendants named. Of course, the mere importation of the Canadian wheat was not a crime. Neither is its mere use an offense. The indictment in this case is based upon the theory that the defendants conspired to load Canadian wheat which was ineligible for subsidies under the International Wheat Agreement (IWA) program on vessels destined for countries which were participants in the IWA and to claim subsidies from the Government for the wheat shipments based upon false statements and claims as to its eligibility. The indictment alleged that to accomplish the objectives of this conspiracy the defendants did the following things:

1. That the defendants mixed the Canadian wheat with wheat of domestic origin at the Galveston Wharves;

2. That the defendants caused such mixture to be exported to purchasers in countries participating in the IWA concealing from the Commodity Credit Corporation that the shipments were, in part, wheat of Canadian origin; and

3. That the defendants altered the records of the Galveston wharves to conceal from the Commodity Credit Corporation the fact that Canadian wheat had been shipped to participant IWA countries.

Of course proof of specific intent is an essential element of the criminal case against each of the defendants. Proof of the alteration of the wharf records and knowledge of such alteration on the part of each individual defendant was most important to the establishment of the case against each.

Subsequent to the return of the indictment in the Southern District of Texas, a grand jury was convened in the southern district of New York to ascertain whether there had been substantive violations by the corporation and its officials in filing false claims for subsidies. The matter was presented in the southern district of New York since the claims for subsidies were filed in that district. A number of the witnesses who had testified before the grand jury in the southern district of Texas were called before the New York grand jury. Some of the witnesses upon whom the Government relied heavily gave testimony which differed from that given before the Texas grand jury. Pending the study and resolution of these conflicts the Government did not request any indictment from the New York grand jury.

On January 25, 1955, Mr. C. K. Richards, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, who had secured the Texas indictment, wrote the Criminal Division that the subsequent investigation had been completed and had developed evidence and testimony which made it extremely doubtful that the Government could secure a conviction in the Texas case. The same evidence and testimony also made it impossible to proceed further with the proposed indictments in New York. The development which caused this drastic reevaluation of the case was the production of what are claimed to be original worksheets prepared at the time of the grain shipments and upon which the subsequent records purported to be based.

At the time the Texas indictment was returned in June 1954, it was believed that the Government could prove the shipment of specific amounts of damaged Canadian wheat on certain IWA ships by means of records in the possession of the Stone Forwarding Co., which was the forwarding agent for Bunge Corp.

These records were extracts from documents known as "Form 206" which had been originally prepared by the Galveston wharves, the originals of which, however, were missing. These extracts, found in the records of the Stone Forwarding Co., purported to show the actual shipment of Canadian wheat on IWA ships. In addition, the Government expected to rely upon the testimony of a witness named James E. Parrish, an employee of the Galveston wharves. The Government expected Parrish would testify that he had been directed by the defendant Thornton to destroy the original copies of the form 206 showing the shipment of Canadian wheat and substitute records which would not show any Canadian wheat charged to IWA ships. It was expected that this witness would testify further that he had actually made the necessary substitution of records and destroyed the conflicting original forms.

Subsequently certain documents were discovered among papers supplied by the defense to Mr. Richards at the time of the Texas grand jury hearing which at the New York hearing were identified by Parrish as his original workpapers which he had used in filling out the form 206 covering the grain shipments in question. These work papers failed to show that any Canadian grain was shipped on IWA ships and that the cargoes of the IWA ships for which subsidies were claimed were ineligible cargoes. Since Parrish was the key witness in establishing the Government's contention that there had been a conspiracy to falsify the records, the Government found itself in the position of being unable to establish the necessary falsification of records and conspiracy excepting by the testimony of a witness whose own contemporary documents contradicted his oral assertions. Of course, every effort was made to determine the authenticity of the work papers, but no conclusive evidence has been produced to impeach or contradict Parrish's identification of them as genuine. Under these conditions it has been manifest to every lawyer who has reviewed the case that the Government could not hope to establish the falsification of the records and the conspiracy to a moral certainty and beyond a reasonable doubt by Parrish's testimony. It is equally clear that the same evidence would prevent successful prosecution of any of the defendants on substantive counts of filing false statements to secure subsidies.

Difficulties with other witnesses also attended the case. In his letter of January

25, 1955, Mr. Richards pointed out that a number of other less important but necessary witnesses were open to impeachment because of conflicts in their statements. Another, who had been examined by a psychiatrist at Mr. Richards' request, was certified as unfit to testify. No less than six of the essential witnesses were subject to impeachment on one ground or another seriously affecting the creditability of their testimony.

From the beginning a serious weakness in the case against the individual defendants has been the absence of motive upon their part. There is no evidence to indicate that any of the individual defendants could have profited personally from the crime charged. None of them even owned a share of Bunge stock.

On February 12, 1955, the defendants were arraigned on the above-mentioned indictment before Judge Ben C. Connally, of the Southern District of Texas. At that time the defendant Bunge Corporation, through its counsel, entered a plea of guilty and the five individual defendants entered pleas of not guilty. Thereupon Mr. C. K. Richards, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, who has been in immediate charge of this litigation from the beginning, moved to dismiss the five individual defendants, stating his reasons in open court. The motion was granted. Thereafter, the court assessed a fine of $5,000, notwithstanding Mr. Richards' recommendation of the maximum fine of $10,000.

The decision to accept the plea of guilty from the corporation and to dismiss the indictment as to the individual defendants was made by me personally in accordance with my responsibilities as the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division. This decision was in accordance with the recommendations of Mr. C. K. Richards, who, as I have said, has been in immediate charge of the litigation. United States Attorney Malcolm R. Wilkey, for the Southern District of Texas, who has actively participated in the case, concurred in this recommendation. After a most exhaustive reevaluation of the case, the attorneys of the General Crimes Section of the Criminal Division also recommended acceptance of a guilty plea from the corporation and dismissal of the individual defendants. These recommendations were unanimous. They were approved by Mr. Alan A. Lindsay, the executive assistant of the Criminal Division.

The foregoing explains my approval on February 4, 1955, of the recommendation that a plea of guilty from the corporation be accepted and that the indictment as against the individual defendants be dismissed. In my opinion this course was in the best interest of the Government. Nothing could be gained by an expensive and lengthy trial on the unsatisfactory state of the evidence. Much has been gained by the plea from the corporation which could not have been secured except by dismissing as to the individual defendants. The plea has resolved the issue of the guilt of the corporation without the expense of a trial, and has subjected the corporation to a $5,000 fine, but most important of all constitutes an admission on the part of the corporation in one of the most difficult issues in the civil proceeding.

I wish to make it clear that no other considerations entered into the decision reached by the Department of Justice in the disposition of this case. After I had reviewed the foregoing recommendations, I advised you of my conclusion and received your approval. This is the extent of my discussion of the disposition of this case with you. No one outside of the Department of Justice has importuned me in any manner in connection with the disposition of this case or with any other of the grain cases.

Senator THYE's letter alludes to the testimony concerning these transactions taken by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but the testimony given before the committee by the defendants in this case cannot be used against them in any criminal proceedings because of the provisions of section 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code as it existed at the time of the committee hearings. Such testimony can, however, be used by the Government in the civil proceeding.

PRICE INFLATION, DEFICITS, AND TAX REDUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if we consider the national product as goods placed in the national warehouse and the nationally produced income as tickets that can be exchanged for what is in the warehouse, the number of tickets required for the exchange of a unit of production will increase when the number of tickets is arbitrarily increased without increasing the number of units in the warehouse. Although a bit oversimplified that, in essence, is the meaning of price inflation.

With the exception of Spain, the whole world now has to a greater or less degree price inflation. In this country it now takes 1½ tickets to buy what one ticket would buy 15 years ago. By means of deficit financing as a result of which currency and bank check money increase faster than the goods put in the national warehouse we have set the stage for what would be a very costly inflationary program. The amount of currency in circulation and of bank check money is at an alltime high. Last year it increased by $4 billion, the rate of increase in the second half of the year being twice that of the first half. A rapid increase in the money supply necessarily makes a draft on Federal Reserve credit. Its notes in circulation, amounting to $26 billion, now account for 85 percent of the circulating currency. When the Government engages in deficit financing and sells a $1,000 bond to a national bank it can call on the Federal Reserve System for a $1,000 of new currency. That method of issuing currency has been practiced over a period of years with the result, as indicated, that now only 15 percent of the currency in circulation was directly issued by the Government.

The surplus of currency and bank check money is now being superimposed upon a very high level of industrial production. For the current year it is now running at an annual rate close to $368 billion, just short of the previous peak of $375 billion reached in the second quarter of 1953. The proportion of our national production going into consumption, including new houses, over the past 2 years has risen from 66 percent to 70 percent. For instance, new starts in housing are at an alltime high, and 60 percent are being financed under the FHA program. The production of automobiles is at an alltime high. Prices on the New York Stock Exchange recently reached an alltime high and are still close to that level.

The budget submitted to the Congress by the President last January contemplates a deficit of $2.4 billion, which will mean the creation of still more money. There are no organized plans to reduce that level of spending but many to increase it—for the military, for highways, for school houses and school lunches, for increased pay of civil-service employees above the budget estimate, and so forth.

If through the increase of money over the supply of goods in the national warehouse just 1 percentage point is added to the cost of those goods it means a tax on the American people of more than $2½ billion if consumer purchases total $257 billion. There are now in this country families, aggregating about 50 million people, who are not now subject to any Federal income tax. They would be hurt by price inflation but not helped by a tax reduction. Millions of others who would be hurt by price inflation would get but a fraction of the proposed tax cut of $20. But the House has sent to the Senate a tax bill under which the revenue of the Government would be reduced about $2 billion on an annual basis and approximately $1 billion would be added to the budget deficit for fiscal 1956. The Constitution authorizes the Government to issue money, but it also places upon it the responsibility of fixing its value. In 1934 we fixed the value of gold which was then the backing for our currency at $35 an ounce, and then the United States went off the gold standard. Since that time Congress has done nothing to fix the value of money except in two instances to provide for a balanced budget.

Within the next 4 weeks Congress will be called upon to make a vital decision with respect to fixing the value of the national currency. If it votes to cut taxes in the face of a large deficit, which may conceivably be measurably increased by new spending proposals, the Congress will be voting to cheapen the value of money and indirectly to tax every consumer in the Nation on what he buys. That indirect tax will fall with the greatest severity upon 50 million people who can least afford it, namely, the families comprising 50 million who are now earning less than a taxable income; and for those who get the full $20 tax cut carried in the bill sent to the Senate by the House a 1 percent increase in the cost of living will amount to far more than the tax cut. But if we deliberately vote to reduce the value of our money, we have no assurance that the inflationary spiral so touched off will end at only a 1 percent increase in the cost of living. The masses of the American people may not be alerted to what is involved before we vote in the Senate on this issue, but, Mr. President, make no mistake about their not knowing the effect of the resulting inflation if we bring it about. No man can call himself a statesman who does not have the ability to anticipate the natural and probable consequences of his voluntary act. We know there can be no major cut in spending so long as the present cold war continues, because 85 percent of current expenditures are either for the defense establishment or the fixed charges growing out of previous wars. The natural and probable consequence, therefore, of cutting revenue when expenditures cannot be cut will be a vote for inflation, and I cannot believe that any Member

of the Senate would knowingly and willingly cast such a vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Does not the Senator from Virginia believe that the chief cause of inflation is deficit financing, or the creating of debt?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is one cause. It results in a surplus of money being placed in circulation. It is the easiest way to create a surplus of money over goods.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not correct to say that the people of our country who are injured most by inflation are those in the small-income brackets, or those who have a fixed income, such as from wages or investments?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is indubitably true. They cannot protect themselves from the effect of inflation. They spend all they make for consumer goods. When the price goes up, they must pay the higher price or do without some necessities of life. Some people believe they know how to hedge on inflation, and they do temporarily hedge against it. If the inflation comes to an early end, they may realize a very substantial profit. However, I believe all economists are agreed that if the inflation lasts long enough and the subsequent reaction is deep enough, it is impossible to hedge against inflation, and the inflation hurts everyone.

As I pointed out in my remarks, we already have an unprecedented amount of currency in circulation. The present $18 billion of reserves of the Federal Reserve System is supporting $120 billion of deposits and bank check money.

If there is a deficit of $4 billion, $5 billion, or $6 billion, a large portion of it will be paid by the commercial banks. As I have already pointed out, when a commercial bank buys a thousand-dollar bond, it can issue a new thousand-dollar note. That is where the new money will come from.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator. His statement is very clear.

FAIR PLAY FOR WESTERN STATES

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, last month I introduced S. 680. The objective of that bill is to transfer to the public-land States the oil and gas and other leasing act minerals in the public domain for the benefit of their public schools and for other State purposes. It seems to me that any intelligent discussion of this proposal necessarily requires than an examination be made of the broad aspects of our historic public-land policy.

OUR FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS OF GOVERNMENT

No nation on earth had such a noble and inspiring origin, Mr. President, as had your country and mine. Our great Nation was founded on the principle of freedom for the individual. Our forefathers were firm believers in the sacredness of personality and the seriousness of human life. They were determined that the dignity of man should be the cornerstone of our Republic. When our Founding Fathers drafted the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, their political philosophy was based on strong and abiding convictions. One of their basic tenets was that under the natural law man is endowed with certain inalienable rights among which is the right to own property. They were determined that this principle should be a paramount precept in the law of our land. Thus was laid the groundwork for private ownership of property and the development of a free competitive private enterprise system.

PUBLIC LANDS IN EARLY TIMES

History records that from the beginning our public lands played a significant role in forging together a Union of great States and contributed immeasurably to their growth and development. The vast unsettled area of public lands proved to be the powerful magnet that attracted millions of emigrants from Europe to our shores in one of the greatest mass movements of people to be found in the annals of history. These emigrants were exiles from their homelands because of political, religious, and economic oppression and knew full well that under the old feudal system of land tenure only royalty were free to own land. They came to America in search of freedom. The free lands in the rich valleys of America provided the golden opportunity for those enterprising and intrepid souls who sailed thousands of miles across a treacherous ocean to establish their homes and to rear their families on the virgin soil of the new world. By their indomitable will and unconquerable spirit they succeeded far beyond their fondest dreams. They were eternally thankful that the feudal system was foreign to the American way of life. Speaking on the floor of the United States Senate about 1830, Senator Thomas Hart Benton, the illustrious exponent of settlement of the public domain, summed up the case of private ownership in these words:

> Tenantry is unfavorable to freedom. It lays the foundation for separate orders in society, annihilates the love of country, and weakens the spirit of independence. The farming tenant has, in fact, no country, no hearth, no domestic altar, no household god. The freeholder, on the contrary, is the natural supporter of a free government; and it should be the policy of republics to multiply their freeholders, as it is the policy of monarchies to multiply tenants. We are a Republic, and we wish to continue so: then multiply the class of freeholders; pass the public lands cheaply and easily into the hands of the people; sell, for a reasonable price, to those who are able to pay; and give, without price, to those who are not.

THE ORIGINAL COLONIES RETAINED THEIR PUBLIC LANDS

The Original Colonies retained all their lands; the Federal Government never laid claim to ownership of a single acre within their borders. By the Constitution the Federal Government was granted full and complete title and jurisdiction to the District of Columbia which was not to exceed 10 miles square and, also, such lands in the States as may be necessary for post offices, forts, arsenals, and other needful buildings. There were many obstacles to overcome before a union could be achieved. There were sharp political and economic differences among the people of the Thirteen Colonies. Because of this discord it was debatable whether a union could be formed, let alone whether it would endure if organized.

PUBLIC LANDS WERE SOURCE OF BITTER ARGUMENT BEFORE UNION WAS PERFECTED

The chief bone of contention was the so-called backlands. They were in an area that was later known as the Northwest Territory and constituted the wide expanse of unsettled lands beyond the western boundaries of the Colonies. They were commonly called crown lands because they were originally the subject of grants to some of the Colonies from the British Crown. The title to that vast empire of about a quarter of a billion acres was tenuous and weak. It was likely that, because of the indefiniteness of the claims and the overlapping boundaries, these lands would be a continual source of argument and dispute. Only seven of the Colonies laid claim to that vast area. The other Colonies were fearful that, unless these claims were surrendered, the Union would consist of 7 strong and powerful States along with 6 weak and impoverished neighbors. So long as the western lands were claimed by the seven Colonies, they were a potential threat to a federal union. It was inevitable that a satisfactory solution must first be found to the western land question before a union could be formed. The fight was between the landed and the landless.

STATES WITHOUT LAND GRANTS IN OHIO COUNTRY MADE STATES WITH CLAIMS CEDE THEM TO THE UNION

Maryland led the battle for the landless States. Its assembly instructed its delegates to submit the following resolution to the Continental Congress in 1778:

> We are convinced policy and justice require that a country unsettled at the commencement of this war, claimed by the British Crown, and ceded to it by the Treaty of Paris, if wrested from the common enemy by the blood and treasure of the 13 States, should be considered as a common property, subject to be parceled out by Congress into free, convenient, and independent governments, in such manner and at such times as the wisdom of that Assembly shall hereafter direct.

The Congress of the Confederation passed a resolution in September 1780 urging the States to cede their claims to the Union in order to bring about harmony and better feeling among the Colonies, and in October 1780 the Continental Congress agreed to the following resolution:

> The unappropriated lands that may be ceded or relinquished to the United States * * * shall be disposed of for the common benefit of the United States, and be settled and formed into distinct republican States, which shall become members of the Federal Union, and have the same rights of sovereignty, freedom and independence as the other States.

This resolution proved to be the basis for the Ordinance of 1787, which was enacted the same year the Constitution was signed, but before its adoption. Our public-land policy was now in its formative stages. That it had a powerful effect on the formation of our great Union is plain and evident. Instead of colonies, territories, or dependencies, it was proposed and fully intended that new States be created and that new stars be added to the flag. The assurances inherent in these resolutions provided the inducement that brought approximately 267 million acres into the Federal domain, which prompted Morison and Commager, in their Growth of the American Republic, volume I, page 145, to remark:

This common possession of millions of acres of land was the most tangible evidence of nationality and unity that existed during these troubled years, and gave a certain substance to the idea of national sovereignty.

ORDINANCE OF 1787 LAID THE PATTERN FOR EQUAL RIGHTS FOR NEW STATES

After the cessions were made, the Congress enacted the famous Ordinance of 1787, which provided for the erection of the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota in the Northwest Territory in the following language:

To provide also for the establishment of States, and permanent government therein, and for their admission to a share in the Federal councils, on an equal footing with the original States, at as early periods as may be consistent with the general interest.

There were two impelling reasons which made possible the enactment of this ordinance. In the first place, unless the great unsettled empire to the west was surrendered it was possible, if not probable, that there would have been no Union at all. In the second place, the new Union was wholly without means to pay the large Revolutionary War debt. It had no power to tax. The only source of income for the proposed United States was from the sale of the public domain. Undoubtedly, the States claiming these lands were impelled to cede them to the United States largely so that the war debt could be liquidated without the necessity of prorating and assessing it among the original States. The Congress was very liberal in selling and disposing of the lands in the Northwest Territory, and before long sufficient funds from land sales were on hand to pay off the entire Revolutionary War debt. The so-called Public Land States of that day thereupon immediately insisted that the Congress divest itself of title to these lands at the earliest possible moment.

In 1832 the Public Lands Committee of the United States Senate made a complete survey of the whole land question, and reported to the Senate in part as follows:

Our pledge would not be redeemed by merely dividing the surface into States and giving them names. The public debt being now paid, the public lands are entirely released from the pledge they were under to that object, and are free to receive a new and liberal destination for the relief of the States in which they lie. The speedy extinction of the Federal title within their limits is necessary to the independence of the new States, to their equality with elder States, to the development of their resources, to the subjection of their soil to taxation, cultivation, and settlement, and to the proper enjoyment of their jurisdiction and sovereignty.

EQUAL TREATMENT INTENDED

There can be no question that during the formative years of the country, it was clearly intended to treat the new States on the same basis as the original States. The strong language that the new States should be "distinct republican States and have the same rights of sovereignty as the other States" makes that intention crystal clear, although there was no strict injunction requiring the Congress to admit States upon an equal footing. The Supreme Court time and again has referred to equality of States as an accepted truism of our constitutional law.

KENTUCKY ADMITTED AND OBTAINS ITS PUBLIC LANDS THROUGH ACTION OF VIRGINIA

Virginia consented to the creation of Kentucky out of its territory. Since Virginia did not cede the public lands in the territory to the Federal Government, Kentucky retained all of its public domain. In its admission act it was declared that Kentucky should be "a new and entire member of the United States of America."

TENNESSEE ALSO GETS ITS PUBLIC DOMAIN

In 1796 the Congress established the State of Tennessee from the western lands North Carolina had ceded to the Federal Government 6 years earlier. The Tennessee Enabling Act contained no reservation of the public domain. Title to the public lands in Tennessee was a matter of bitter dispute between the United States and Tennessee, and eventually that State secured full rights to its public lands. The act whereby Tennessee came into the Union contained this language: "On an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever." When Georgia executed its deed of cession, Alabama was admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and later the Supreme Court found occasion to examine that State's rights in the public lands within its borders rather thoroughly.

STATES CONTEND THAT OWNERSHIP OF SOIL IS ATTRIBUTE OF SOVEREIGNTY

The Congress was extremely liberal in its policy affecting the disposal of the public domain in the Northwest Territory, and at an early date practically all the lands within the borders of the States carved out of that area were either privately owned or granted to the States themselves. No doubt the leaders in the executive arm of the Government and in the Congress during the early years proceeded on the theory that ownership of the soil was an essential attribute of sovereignty and that the people of the new States and the States themselves should ultimately own and control all the soil within their confines.

THE DESTINY OF OUR COUNTRY LINKED WITH PUBLIC LANDS

It is significant that the only provision in the Articles of Confederation for increasing the number of States specifically sets forth that "Canada acceding to the confederation and joining in the measures of the United States shall be admitted into the Union." It seems that nations, like individuals, find that their lives and their destinies are often affected in a marked degree by circumstances over which they have little or no control. By no stretch of the imagination can one conclude now that the founders of our country contemplated or designed a nation extending from one ocean to another and from Canada to Mexico. If the Thirteen Colonies had not contracted such a huge debt in carrying on the Revolutionary War, it is not at all certain that the States in the Northwest Territory would have been admitted into the Union. During the period the Constitution was under consideration, there had been ceded to the United States all the western country, from the Canadian line to Florida, and from the head of the Mississippi almost to its mouth, except that portion which now constitutes the State of Kentucky. Those were the days when the policy of expansion and nation building were in the process of formation.

Our Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution provisions governing admission of States and the power to dispose of public lands, as well as the rights of citizens of each of the States. The appropriate sections of article 4 are as follows:

SEC. 2. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

SEC. 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

SEC. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.

COURT SAYS "NEW STATES HAVE EQUAL SOVEREIGNTY WITH OLDER STATES"

The construction placed by the courts on section 3, providing that "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union," is discussed and disposed of in this language on pages 518 and 519 of the Constitution of the United States, as amended to December 1, 1924—annotated:

This clause refers to and includes new States to be formed out of territory yet to be acquired, as well as that already ceded to the United States. New States when admitted have equal sovereignty with the older ones, and are entitled to all the rights of jurisdiction and eminent domain which the original States possessed, whether such equality be stipulated for in the act of admission or not * * * when, also, a State enters into the Union, it solemnly pledges to the other States to support the Constitution as it is, in all its provisions, until altered in the manner which the Constitution itself

provides, and she cannot, by a compact with the United States, enlarge or diminish her constitutional rights or liabilities.

Attention is invited to the proviso at the end of section 3 affecting public lands: "And nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

FORTUITOUS CIRCUMSTANCES MADE OUR COUNTRY BIG AND POWERFUL

Not by design on our part but rather as a result of a combination of fortuitous circumstances were we able to conclude the Louisiana Purchase which doubled the territory of our country. We wanted to purchase the mouth of the Misssissippi for security reasons and Jefferson sent his envoys to Paris to negotiate with France. Napoleon was in dire financial distress and, consequently, with a magnificent gesture threw the great heartland of America into the laps of our envoys. When France refused to sell only New Orleans, Livingston and Monroe decided to pay Napoleon $27 million for the whole province. Bemis, in his A Diplomatic History of the United States, writing about the Louisiana Purchase on page 137, states:

It gave to the Nation one of the earth's richest storehouses of foodstuffs, fuel, and power. It impounded within American boundaries the great valley of the Mississippi which some still say will be the terrestrial foundation of English-speaking culture of future centuries. Be that as it may or may not be, Louisiana became the vestibule of American expansion to Florida, Texas, New Mexico, California, and Oregon.

THE STORY OF OUR EXPANSION

The building of the great continental United States that we know today was in the making. Following the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, the public domain was expanded through the purchase of Florida from Spain in 1819, the annexation of Texas in 1845, the acquisition by treaty of Oregon Territory in 1846, the Mexican cession of 1848, the Texas Purchase from that State in 1850, and the Gadsden Purchase from Mexico in 1853. That is the story of the building of the United States of America.

BY COVENANTS IN TREATIES WITH FRANCE AND MEXICO, WESTERN STATES ASSURED EQUAL RIGHTS

The treaty with France concluding the Louisiana Purchase and that with Mexico authorizing the Mexican cession made it abundantly clear that States would be carved out of the ceded areas and that they would be placed on an equal footing with all other States. The treaty with France provided:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of the citizens of the United States.

The treaty with Mexico contained the following provision:

Article IX: Mexicans * * * in the territories * * * shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States, and be admitted at the proper time * * * to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States, according to the principles of the Constitution.

OVER CENTURY AGO FEDERAL OWNERSHIP DEBATED IN SENATE

In construing these covenants the courts have uniformly held that these lands were transferred to the United States as trustee and subject to the condition that the lands shall be formed into States on an equal footing with the original States. The question of Federal ownership, even as trustee, of such a large portion of the new States was the subject of heated debate shortly after the Louisiana Purchase. In 1829, Senator Hendricks, of Indiana, argued rather vehemently on the floor of the Senate in this fashion:

This Union is in theory formed of sovereign, equal people, and independent States. In the older members of this Confederacy, the Federal Government sets up no claim to the waste and unappropriated lands. A statesman or historian making himself acquainted with our system would pronounce it in theory beautiful. With nothing would he be more pleased than with the republican equality of the States. But what would be his surprise when told that in 7 of these States the soil itself belongs to the Government of the Union, while in 17 States the soil belonged to the States themselves. Would he not instantly inquire why are the States of this Confederacy equal in theory when they are not so in fact? Why are they not equal in reality as they are in name?

In a Senate speech in January 1825 Daniel Webster stated:

The great object of the Government in respect of these lands is not so much the money derived from their sale as it is the getting them settled. What I mean to say is I do not think we ought to hug that domain as a great treasure which is to enrich the exchequer.

Senator Hayne argued on the Senate floor in January 1830 in these words:

In short, our whole policy in relation to the public lands may perhaps be summed up in the declaration with which I set out, that they ought not to be kept and retained forever as a great treasure, but that they would be administered chiefly with a view to the creation within reasonable periods, of great and flourishing communities, to be formed into free and independent States; to be invested in due season with the control of all the lands within their respective limits.

I do not contend by any manner or means that the public land States can safely rely on a strict legal right to obtain recourse under the law with respect to the public lands within their borders. This is an equity case that appeals to the conscience of the court, which in this case is the Congress. Let us first determine the exact nature of the title of the United States to the public domain. Under the Constitution the Federal Government was empowered to own outright lands within the States only for the purposes outlined in paragraph 17 of section 8, article 1 of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the States in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OWNS PUBLIC LANDS AS TRUSTEE ONLY

The public lands acquired by treaties and cessions are held by the United States in a limited ownership as trustee. This has been the accepted and recognized rule of law by court decisions, time and time again. By its very nature a trust does not run forever. The Supreme Court of the United States went into this question quite thoroughly in the case of *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagen et al.* (3 Howard), with Justice McKinley delivering the opinion of the Court.

Page 221: We think a proper examination of this subject will show, that the United States never held any municipal sovereignty, jurisdiction, or right of soil in and to the territory, of which Alabama or any of the new States were formed; except for temporary purposes, and to execute the trusts created by the acts of the Virginia and Georgia legislatures, and the deeds of cession executed by them to the United States, and the trust created by the treaty with the French Republic, of April 30, 1803, ceding Louisiana. * * *

Page 222: Taking the legislative acts of the United States, and the States of Virginia and Georgia, and their deeds of cession to the United States, and giving to each, separately, and to all jointly, a fair interpretation, we must come to the conclusion that it was the intention of the parties to invest the United States with the eminent domain of the country ceded, both national and municipal, for the purposes of temporary government, and to hold it in trust for the performance of the stipulations and conditions expressed in the deeds of cession and the legislative acts connected with them. To a correct understanding of the rights, powers, and duties of the parties to these contracts, it is necessary to enter into a more minute examination of the rights of eminent domain, and the right to the public lands. When the United States accepted the cession of the territory, they took upon themselves the trust to hold the municipal eminent domain for the new States, and to invest them with it, to the same extent, in all respects, that it was held by the States ceding the territories. * * *

Page 223: The right which belongs to the society, or to the sovereign, of disposing, in case of necessity, and for the public safety, of all the wealth contained in the State, is called the eminent domain. It is evident that this right is, in certain cases, necessary to him who governs, and is, consequently, a part of the empire, or sovereign power. * * *

Page 224: The right of Alabama and every other new State to exercise all the powers of government, which belong to and may be exercised by the original States of the Union, must be admitted, and remain unquestioned, except so far as they are, temporarily, deprived of control over the public lands. * * *

Whenever the United States shall have fully executed these trusts, the municipal sovereignty of the new States will be complete, throughout their respective borders, and they, and the original States, will be upon an equal footing in all respects whatever.

SUPREME COURT DISCUSSES PUBLIC LANDS

Chief Justice Taney in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Scott against Sanford discussed related questions on public lands in the course of the decision, and I shall cite here a few excerpts:

Page 446: There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own

pleasure; nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way, except by the admission of new States. * * * No power is given to acquire a territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

Page 447: The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given. * * * It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with the other States, must rest upon the same discretion. * * *

The principle upon which our governments rest, and upon which alone they continue to exist, is the union of States, sovereign and independent within their own limits in their internal and domestic concerns.

The Court discussed in that decision the lands ceded by the Louisiana Purchase as affected by the third article of the Louisiana Treaty, which reads as follows:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities, of citizens of the United States; and, in the meantime, they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess.

The words of the Court were:

Page 448: At the time when the territory in question was obtained by cession from France, it contained no population fit to be associated together and admitted as a State; and it therefore was absolutely necessary to hold possession of it, as a Territory belonging to the United States, until it was settled and inhabited by a civilized community capable of self-government, and in a condition to be admitted on equal terms with the other States as a member of the Union. But, as we have before said, it was acquired by the General Government, as the representative and trustee of the people of the United States, and it must therefore be held in that character for their common and equal benefit; for it was the people of the several States, acting through their agent and representative, the Federal Government, who in fact acquired the territory in question and the Government holds it for their common use until it shall be associated with the other States as a member of the Union.

But the power of Congress over the person or property of a citizen can never be a mere discretionary power under our Constitution and form of government. The powers of the Government and the rights and privileges of the citizen are regulated and plainly defined by the Constitution itself.

JUSTICE CATRON HOLDS CITIZENS' RIGHTS TO PUBLIC DOMAIN ARE BASED ON PARAMOUNT RIGHT OF THEIR STATE UNDER CONSTITUTION

Justice Catron in a separate, concurring opinion refers to the constitutional provision referred to earlier by pointing out that the guaranty that the citizens of the new States shall be entitled to all the privileges of the citizens of the several States means that the citizens of the new States shall have equal rights in the public domain, as the citizens of the older States did in their own State. In those days they referred to the public lands as territories. It is important to note that the citizens came into their rights through their States in this language:

Page 527: The Constitution having provided that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States," the right to enjoy the Territory as equals was reserved to the States, and to the citizens of the States, respectively. The cited clause is not that citizens of the United States shall have equal privileges in the Territories, but the citizen of each State shall come there in right of his State, and enjoy the common property. He secures his equality through the equality of his State, by virtue of that great fundamental condition of the Union—the equality of the States.

The theory of Justice Catron's decision is that the States had reserved the ultimate power over their own soil. On the other hand, the United States had temporary authority over the public domain in the States for the purpose of disposal under the Constitution and international treaties.

It is plain that one of the moving considerations in each of the treaties and cessions is the provision whereby our country agreed that States would be created out of the area granted and admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States. The lands were transferred to the United States to be held until the lands could be surrendered to the States and the citizens thereof. The United States was given title to the lands coupled with a trust. That point will bear repeating. True, we cannot enforce the trust, but certainly we can appeal to Congress to live up to the terms of the trust. Black's Law Dictionary, at page 1759, defines a trust as follows:

An obligation arising out of a confidence reposed in the trustee or representative, who has the legal title to property conveyed to him, that he will faithfully apply the property according to the confidence reposed, or, in other words, according to the wishes of the grantor of the trust.

From the above discussion these points should be kept clearly in mind:

WE RECAPITULATE

First, the original States retained for themselves the full and complete ownership and control over all the lands within their borders.

Second, under our historic policy new States were to be admitted on a free and equal basis with the original States.

Third, some of the States such as Tennessee and Kentucky, as well as other States, were permitted to retain all the public domain within their confines when they were admitted to the Union.

Fourth, the public domain within the area known as the Northwest Territory was carved into States and the lands were transferred to the States for school or improvement purposes or patented to individuals, and, as a consequence, these States were placed on an equal footing with the original States at an early date.

Fifth, Texas retained all its public lands at the time of its admission to the Union, since Congress was unwilling to assume the existing indebtedness in the State.

Sixth, the Federal Government obtained the title to much of our frontiers mainly by treaties and cessions, all of which stipulated that the area would be carved into States and admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and that such agreement constitutes a trust.

Seventh, the United States did not become the absolute and unqualified owner of the land but holds it as trustee for the people and for the States that were carved out of the ceded area.

THE PUBLIC LANDS EAST OF THE ROCKIES—SETTLEMENT ENCOURAGED

As was said earlier, nearly a century of effort was exerted to get settlers on the lands, first in the Mississippi and then in the Missouri Valley. An eminent writer has described that era as follows:

In the latter half of the 19th century the spirit of the public land laws in the United States was settlement and development. With a public domain of 1⅓ billion acres, acquired in the preceding half century—the wilderness called for pioneers of every type, and large premiums were held out to capital enterprise and individual initiative. Development was desired whatever the cost in lands that were intrinsically of little value without settlement. The same century that saw the creation of this national domain—an empire in itself—also witnessed the distribution of more than one-half of its acreage. Western prairies have become the world's granary.

The Homestead Act of 1862 provided the vehicle whereby hundreds of thousands of veterans of the Civil War and other citizens were able to acquire rich farmlands and do their part in building a nation of freedom-loving homeowners.

It is true that the public-lands question was a subject of intense and bitter controversy during every period of our history, yet on the whole it can be said that the great area from the Rocky Mountain States east to the Atlantic, and between Canada and the gulf, was treated generously insofar as homesteading was concerned and, also, with respect to grants to the States for schools and other purposes. At an early date the States in that section of the country found that they were substantially on a par with the older States of the Union.

WYOMING CREATED OUT OF FOUR CESSIONS—WYOMING ENABLING ACT AND CONSTITUTION

Wyoming has the distinction of having been forged out of the public domain acquired through the Louisiana, Texas, and Mexican Purchases and under the Oregon Treaty. While it is true that the people of our State disclaimed title to the public lands within their borders, this was done on the basis of court decisions that it did not change or alter in any respect the constitutional right of the State as a free and equal State of the Union. It is interesting to note the language in the act admitting Wyoming into the Union:

Whereas the people of the Territory of Wyoming did, on the 30th day of September 1889, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution, which constitution was ratified and adopted by the people of said territory at the election held therefor on the first Tuesday in November 1889, which constitution is republican in form and is in conformity with the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas said convention and the people of the said Territory have asked the admission of said Territory into the Union of States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Wyoming is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, and is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and that the constitution which the people of Wyoming have formed for themselves be, and the same is hereby, accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

It is interesting, also, to note the section in the constitution of Wyoming reaffirming that provision of the Constitution of the United States giving to Congress the power to dispose of our public lands without prejudice to the right of the State of Wyoming in these words which will bear repeating.

Article IV, section 3, Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Please note the language in article 21, section 26, of the constitution of Wyoming referring to the fact that at some future date the title of the United States to the public domain of Wyoming will be extinguished:

The people inhabiting this State do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated public lands lying within the boundaries thereof * * *, and that until the title thereto shall have been extinguished by the United States, the same shall be and remain subject to the disposition of the United States.

ENABLING ACTS DO NOT ALTER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF STATES

Nearly every authority on the subject agrees that under the compacts with the States whereby the States waive or cede their rights to the public lands and agree that they will not interfere with the primary disposal of the soil by the Congress, the States were justified on relying on the belief that the United States would observe the terms of the trust. The Supreme Court has held that these compacts in the enabling acts of the States cannot and do not alter their constitutional rights. In the Supreme Court case of *Coyle* v. *Oklahoma* (221 U. S. 567), the question arose whether by the terms of the enabling act a State might be denied the right to exercise powers that belong to the original States. The Court declared that Congress has—

The power * * * to admit new States into this Union. This Union was and is a Union of States, equal in power, dignity, and authority, each competent to exert that residuum of sovereignty not delegated to the United States by the Constitution itself. To maintain otherwise would be to say that the Union, through the power of Congress to admit new States, might come to be a Union of States unequal in power, as including States whose powers were restricted only by the Constitution, with others whose powers had been further restricted by an act of Congress accepted as a condition of admission.

TRUST MUST BE COMPLIED WITH BEFORE WYOMING IS EQUAL STATE OF THE UNION

Who can deny that until the trust is finally executed the new States are by no manner or means equal States of our great country sitting in its councils on the same footing with the older States. It was never contemplated that any of the States should be only half-States. The trust cannot go on forever. It was never so intended. In truth and in fact Wyoming is much less than a half-State today. The time has come for Wyoming to be put on a par with the other States. It is high time that all the Western States came into that full sovereignty and equality with other States to which they are entitled as a matter of equity and right.

The great weakness of the Homestead Act was its utter unadaptability to the western country. The idea of a small farm in the semiarid regions was wholly untenable. While the arid and semiarid lands of the West presented new problems, and undoubtedly accounted for the abrupt reversal in the historic land policy of the Nation, no one anticipated that this complete change in concept would eventually make the Federal Government the perpetual landlord over most of the area in the Western States. However, the current policy of withdrawal, classification, reservation, and development by the Federal Government, under its supervision of the public lands of the West, has had precisely this effect. The Congress attempted to improve the situation in this regard by enacting the Stockraising Homestead Act of 1916 whereby a settler was entitled to the surface of 640 acres of land with the Government retaining the minerals.

PERMANENT RESERVATION UNREASONABLE, UNFAIR, AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Little did our forefathers think that an expanding bureaucracy would sink its tenacles into the public lands of the West and attempt to hold these lands forever under its control and dominion. To reserve permanently and keep from development and under Federal control one-half of a State is both unreasonable and unfair. It violates the conditions imposed in the treaties under which the lands were acquired. Someone might say if that is true why not go into court and enforce the treaty. In the first place, there is not any court to take jurisdiction. In the second place, only France can complain about the failure of the United States to comply with the terms of the Louisiana Treaty, or even to object to a breech thereof, and under the circumstances there is only one way for the Western States to obtain relief and that is to appeal to the Congress for fair and equitable treatment.

By the same token only Mexico can object to a breach of the Mexican Treaty. In *Botiller* v. *Dominguez* (130 U. S. 238, Apr. 1, 1889) the supreme court said:

Two propositions under this statute are presented by counsel in support of the decision of the Supreme Court of California. The first of these is that the statute itself (9 St. 631 * * *) is invalid, as being in conflict with the provisions of the Treaty with Mexico * * * and also in conflict with the rights of property under the Constitution and laws of the United States * * *

With regard to the first of these propositions it may be said that, so far as the act of Congress is in conflict with the Treaty of Mexico, that is a matter in which the court is bound to follow the statutory enactments of its own Government. If the treaty was violated by this general statute, * * * it was a matter of international concern, which the two states must determine by treaty, or by such other means as enables one state to enforce upon another the obligations of a treaty. This court, in a class of cases like the present, has no power to set itself up as the instrumentality for enforcing the provisions of a treaty with a foreign nation which the Government of the United States, as a sovereign power chooses to disregard.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS IN 1929

A quarter of a century ago, a presidential committee made an extensive and comprehensive study of the western land problem. The committee, which consisted of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in office at that time, as well as James A. Garfield, a former Secretary of the Interior, and 19 other eminently qualified men, studied the question of the disposition of the remaining public lands, and on January 16, 1931, made their unanimous report to the President of the United States. Among other things the committee reported that—

All portions of the unreserved and unappropriated public domain should be placed under responsible administration or regulation for the conservation and beneficial use of its resources * * * that the remaining areas, which are valuable chiefly for the production of forage, and which can be effectively conserved and administered by the States containing them, should be granted to the States which will accept them.

TAYLOR ACT STATES PUBLIC DOMAIN WITHDRAWN UNTIL CONGRESS FINALLY DISPOSES OF SAME—THE CONGRESS INTENDS IT BE DONE SOMETIME

When, about 20 years ago, the Taylor Act was passed, withdrawing 142 million acres of public lands from homesteading, the Congress attempted to allay the fears of those who thought this was a permanent withdrawal. The Congress indicated clearly that sometime or other it would have to make final disposition of the public lands in the very first sentence of the act:

In order to promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion—

That the progress and growth of the Western States is stymied by our current land policies is so evident that it does not require proof. As sovereign States they should be permitted to develop and obtain complete sovereignty over their own soil. Wyoming, with its 62,403,480 acres, is one of the largest States in the Union. It exceeds in size the whole of England, Scotland, and Wales combined. The United States owns the oil and other minerals under 44 million of Wyoming's 62 million acres. It owns both the minerals and the surface of 32,055,721 acres of our lands which constitutes over 51 percent of Wyoming's vast area. In truth, more than 70 percent of our State is actually Wyoming territory; and, judged by the standards of its older sister States, Wyoming is but a trifle over a quarter State. We have within our borders an area of land larger than the entire State of New York which is not Wyoming at all. The American land system was based on the English system, and the minerals went with the surface ownership. The period of great withdrawals is generally recognized as between 1906 and 1924.

MINERALS BELONG TO STATES

The Minerals Leasing Act of 1920 seems to indicate that the Congress intends to retain and own and hold in perpetuity the leasing act minerals enumerated in that act. It seems only right and proper that those minerals and the income therefrom should belong to the States whose soil produces those minerals. No authority can be cited in the Articles of Confederation or in the Constitution of the United States or in any decision by the judiciary to the effect that the United States would be justified in holding these great property rights as against the State in which they are found. It seems ridiculous to say that these minerals belong to all the people of the United States. As a matter of fact, Congress has already largely decreed otherwise.

TWO HUNDRED AND SIX MILLION ALREADY PAID INTO UNITED STATES TREASURY FROM WYOMING PUBLIC LANDS

The income from those minerals is divided 37½ percent to the State where the mineral is produced, 10 percent to the Treasury of the United States, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund for the benefit of the Western States—by no means to all of the States. There are some who contend that the income from the public lands in Wyoming, mainly through oil royalties, is not a large amount. Let me disabuse them by stating that to date the total income is over $200 million. To be precise, it is exactly $206,926,955.80. The following table shows the income by years paid into the Treasury of the United States by minerals produced on the public lands of Wyoming:

Fiscal year:	*Receipts*
1921–23	$13,813,560.49
1924	12,270,500.75
1925	6,953,501.44
1926	6,883,125.55
1927	5,097,775.42
1928	2,940,091.00
1921–28	536,796.79
1929	2,835,871.32
1930	3,274,459.06
1931	2,184,422.88
1932	1,435,109.81
1933	1,224,017.37
1934	1,134,711.74
1935	1,391,220.92
1936	1,307,803.54
1937	1,503,743.29
1938	1,679,357.71
1939	1,715,298.60
1940	1,742,103.97
1941	2,081,507.37
1942	2,674,919.39
1943	2,325,403.05
1944	4,474,385.24
1945	3,841,038.57
1946	3,347,531.00
1947	4,967,522.00
1948	9,030,395.00
1949	10,827,412.00
1950	8,801,428.00
1951	12,977,921.36
1952	14,584,912.58
1953	15,269,591.25
1954	19,474,507.34
July 1, 1954, to date	12,983,004.00
Income from sale of public lands to date	9,342,026.00
Total	206,926,955.80

It seems to me that those most concerned with the inequity inherent in this situation are the children of our State, now of tender years. After all, many of them will live to see much of our minerals extracted from the soil of our State, and they will not like it when they learn that Wyoming has not benefitted from these blessings in the degree to which it is justly entitled. Assuming that the annual income from royalties under the Leasing Act continues to equal last year's income, I am sure that Senators will be as astounded as I was to learn that by the time children born this year reach their 41st birthday the total income from royalties on Leasing Act minerals produced from the public lands of our State will exceed $1 billion. To be exact the figure at that time will be $1,002,135,992.13.

OVER 108 MILLION FROM WYOMING PUBLIC LANDS PAID INTO RECLAMATION FUND

From the total of revenue received to date from the public lands of Wyoming, the sum of $108,636,653.00 has been paid into the reclamation fund. The following table shows the total credits from each of the public land States as of last year. The income from oil and gas royalties to the reclamation fund accounts largely for the total amount. As will be noted from this tabulation, Wyoming contributes from its soil nearly one-third of the entire amount.

Accretions to reclamation fund from public lands States through fiscal year 1954—Receipts from sale of public lands and from Mineral Leasing Act

State:	*Amount*
Arizona	$3,255,829.20
California	65,656,345.59
Colorado	31,576,333.72
Idaho	8,286,964.61
Montana	24,527,035.49
Nevada	2,606,666.65
New Mexico	33,440,053.37
North Dakota	12,890,259.61
Oregon	13,924,715.05
South Dakota	8,123,612.28
Utah	12,278,839.85
Washington	8,395,112.60
Wyoming	[1] 108,636,653.00
Total	333,638,421.02

[1] Includes income accruing to the Reclamation Fund from oil royalties in Wyoming from July 1, 1954 to date, in the amount of $7,475,811.00. Source: U. S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. President, the records show that the Federal Government has received from the public lands of Wyoming, as of this date, the sum of $206 million. Of that amount, $108 million has been paid into the Reclamation Fund.

Ours is a poor State. There is no reason under the sun why the wealth of our State, contained in our soil, should be divided with the wealthier States of the Union. That is the foundation and the basis upon which I am asking at this time that the minerals under the soil of Wyoming be surrendered to the State for the benefit of the people of the State.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION HAS SPENT $155 MILLION IN WYOMING—REPAID IN FULL

One of the first projects that was constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation was the Shoshone project at Cody, Wyo. It was built 55 years ago. In the meantime several other projects have been built in our State. Some projects are built for the benefit of adjoining States. Several of the projects are combined irrigation and power projects and will pay out with interest on the power features in the allotted time. The Bureau of Reclamation advises that it has spent, to date, in the State of Wyoming, a total of $155,195,997, broken down as follows:

Eden	$3,970,283
Kendrick	29,289,241
Riverton	21,332,634
Missouri River Basin:	
Boysen unit	33,389,774
Kortes unit	13,735,254
Glendo unit	876,818
Hanover-Bluff	230,320
Keyhole unit	4,697,285
Transmission division	8,507,954
Other units	2,204,830
Minidoka	2,170,665
Palisades	189,556
Shoshone	21,717,099
North Platte	12,884,284
Total	155,195,997

The repayments from the settlers on the projects are as follows:

Riverton	$554,451
Shoshone	2,412,146
North Platte	3,704,668
Total	6,671,265

The net income from power projects to date is $7,795,036, which is itemized in this fashion:

Kendrick	$3,846,228
Riverton	437,930
Shoshone	3,197,162
North Platte	413,716
Total	7,795,036

To recapitulate, the Bureau of Reclamation has spent for all projects in our State a total of $155,195,997. As against this expenditure, must be credited:

(a) Payment from settlers	$6,671,265
(b) Income from power (excluding interest)	7,795,036
(c) Receipts from oil and gas royalties on Wyoming public lands and paid to reclamation fund	108,636,653
(d) Amount paid into Treasury of the United States representing 10 percent of entire receipts from oil and gas royalties	19,758,493
Total	142,861,447
Balance necessary to completely reimburse Bureau of Reclamation for all expenditures in Wyoming to date	$12,334,550

The difference between total payments to the Federal Government from public lands and the cost of reclamation projects is $12,334,550.

Mr. President, from the above it is clear that sometime this year the Federal Government will be completely reimbursed for all reclamation expenditures made in my State by payments from the settlers on the projects, by net income from power projects, and by income from minerals produced on the public lands of Wyoming. It can safely be said that unless the law shall be changed Wyoming will pay for its projects several times over, and thereafter the money will be used to pay for large projects in other and wealthier States.

WYOMING PEOPLE UNHAPPY

Mr. President, the people of my State are kindly and generous, but I must confess that they are not at all happy at the

prospect that several hundred million dollars accruing to the Federal Government from the income on mineral production on Wyoming public lands will be used to build big irrigation projects in other States. When the reclamation law was put on the books a half century ago, and later when the Mineral Leasing Act was passed, Congress dedicated a great part of the income from the public lands to the reclamation fund on the theory that this money represented income from the depletion of exhaustible resources in the public-land States and that it was only fair and proper that it should be put right back in the Western States in the form of a continuing resource such as reclamation projects. No thought was given to the possibility that the time would come when one State would contribute so much to the reclamation fund from its own soil, only to see it used elsewhere to develop projects in other States that are endowed with far greater resources of one character or another. Our State has more coal than has all of Europe. Someday ways will be found to extract chemicals from the great storehouse and, at the same time, to produce power sufficient to maintain an enormous industrial community. Wyoming is rich in countless mineral resources, but I ask, Why should not our State be the beneficiary of these blessings? The present policy of extracting the wealth from our soil and using it for improvements in other States can only result in the eventual impoverishment of Wyoming and the enrichment of our sister States. One can realize that this is a critical situation since such a large proportion of the wealth of our State consists of these rich irreplaceable resources. It seems strange that even today, when we are in the midst of the production of so much of this mineral wealth, we are experiencing such great difficulty in maintaining schools for the education of our children.

MY BILL WILL CORRECT THE INJUSTICE

Mr. President, in an effort to do simple justice to the people of my State and to correct the situation that I have outlined here today, I introduced in the Senate last month S. 680, and my colleague, Representative KEITH THOMSON, has introduced a companion bill, H. R. 2678, in the House of Representatives. Under my bill the Federal Government will retain the title to the surface of the public lands in Wyoming and in the Western States, but the minerals and mineral rights and royalties are transferred to the States for the benefit of our public schools, State university, public roads, and for such other purposes as the legislature may direct. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the text of my bill, S. 680.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 680) is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act all minerals (including oil and gas) and mineral rights subject to disposition under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 437), are hereby granted to the several States within the territorial boundaries of which the lands wherein such minerals and mineral rights exist are situated. Such grant shall include the rights of ingress, egress, and regress with respect to such lands by such States or their lessees or permittees for the purpose of exploring for, mining, or otherwise recovering such minerals. In the event that there is outstanding, on the date on which any grant made by this act takes effect, any lease or permit with respect to any minerals or mineral rights included in such grant, the State receiving such grant shall succeed on such date to the position of the United States as lessor or permitter under such lease or permit.

SEC. 2. (a) The grant made by the provisions of the first section of this act shall be conditional in the case of each State upon such State—

(1) granting 1 percent of the oil and gas and other hydrocarbons produced and saved from deposits received under the provisions of this act, and such proportion of the other minerals produced from such deposits as may be determined to be just and proper by such State, to the owner of record of the land wherein such oil, gas, hydrocarbons, or other minerals exist, except where such owner is the United States or any agency thereof; and

(2) providing for the use by such State or the subdivisions thereof of the income from the remainder of such oil, gas, hydrocarbons, and other minerals and any other income resulting from the grants made by the provisions of the first section of this act for the construction and maintenance of public roads or the support of public schools or other public institutions, as the legislature of the State may direct.

Upon the determination by the Secretary of the Interior that a State has made proper provision for the satisfying of the conditions provided in this section, he shall cause to be delivered to the proper officials of such State an instrument evidencing the grant made under the provisions of this act together with such maps, records, books, and documents as may be necessary for the enjoyment, control, use, administration, and disposition of such minerals and mineral rights. Such grant shall be effective with respect to such State upon the receipt of such instrument by such officials.

(b) Upon such grant taking effect as provided in subsection (a) all Federal laws and regulations relating to the disposition of the minerals and mineral rights granted shall cease to be applicable to such minerals and mineral rights.

ONE PERCENT TO THE LANDOWNERS—JUSTICE TO SETTLERS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the bill provides that 1 percent of the royalties from oil and gas production shall be paid to the owners of the surface in cases where the Government reserved and owns the minerals. There are any number of cases where the owner of the surface finds that the production of oil on his land has practically destroyed his opportunity to use the surface. In most cases the owners of these lands find that their right to use the lands is jeopardized by almost continuous investigations by geologists and geophysical crews to the point where it is difficult to graze their livestock on their own lands. They pay taxes on the lands but they have only a limited ownership.

Those sturdy settlers who took up stockraising homesteads in our State found that they were practically the first citizens of the country who did not get a full fee simple title to the land when they proved up. They got a patent, but their Government kept the minerals. This reservation was contrary to the English system, which we adopted in colonial days. It was contrary to the policy and practice of this country in the first 125 years of its history. It was wrong in the first place and I maintain an injustice was done when the minerals were reserved from the settlers.

The injustice of this arrangement is apparent to others. Let me cite three examples. The State of Texas has adopted the policy, I am told, of giving the owner of public lands purchased from that State one-half of the oil and gas royalty when production is encountered on these lands, notwithstanding the fact that the State has reserved all of the minerals. Some Provinces in Canada, if not all, have adopted a similar policy. A large corporation, owning millions of acres of land, has the policy of reserving the minerals when selling its lands, but when oil and gas is discovered on the lands sold, it transfers 2½ percent of the oil and gas produced to the owner of the surface. I submit, Mr. President, our Government should be as fair as those institutions I have cited and should give the owner of the surface 1 percent of the oil and gas produced on his own land.

Someone might conclude that Wyoming is the only Western State that might benefit from the proposed legislation. Such is not the case. The bill applies with equal force to all the public land States of the West. While the income from Wyoming's public domain is much greater than that of any other State, the amounts accruing to the United States from the public domain of each of the other Western States runs into high figures.

THE PUBLIC DOMAIN HAS DONE MUCH FOR THIS COUNTRY

As I said in the beginning, our public domain has exerted a tremendous influence of the destiny of our country.

First. Our public domain was opened to veterans of the Revolutionary War and every other war in which our country was involved, down to and including World War I.

Second. Our public domain served as a bond to hold our Union together when its fate hung in the balance before the Constitution was adopted.

Third. Our public domain was the source of public revenue for our new Republic which was wholly without means to pay the Revolutionary War debt and to carry on its functions. Sale of these lands provided the money to liquidate the debt.

Fourth. Our public domain made possible the building and expansion of our country through the Louisiana Purchase and other cessions.

Fifth. Our public domain provided the incentive for one of the greatest mass movements of people in recorded history. Those hardy immigrants from Europe came here seeking free soil, free homes, free institutions, and more important, freedom for the individual. They did their full part in the building of our country.

Sixth. Our public domain was the source of generous grants making possible the construction of canals, levees,

wagon roads, river improvements, and highways in the first half century of our history.

Seventh. Our public domain exerted a powerful influence on transportation. These lands made possible rail lines in every section of the country and the great transcontinental railroads that united the Union with the Pacific.

Eighth. The colonies were liberal with land grants for public schools. The famous Ordinance of 1787 contained this injunction:

> Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

WESTERN STATES MUST HAVE RELIEF IF THEY ARE TO BE MORE THAN HALF STATES

The conclusion is clear that Wyoming and the other Western States cannot possibly attain the equality with the older States to which they are entitled unless they can enjoy the benefits of the resources of their own soil. The title to the public lands rests in the Federal Government to be sure, but it is not a full and unrestricted ownership. It is impressed with a trust. The Government holds title as trustee and like a guardian it should be held to a strict accountability for the administration of the trust. The Congress is charged by the Constitution with the duty to carry out the terms of the trust. The trust was created by the international agreements with France and Mexico. The claims of the new States have been asserted repeatedly down through our history. The Congress has acknowledged the claims of the new States at least partially by numerous acts granting public lands to the States.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR ACTION

The time has come when the Western States should demand equal treatment under the Constitution. Either the Mountain States are equal partners in a great union of sovereign States, or they are mere dependencies. Are we forever to remain "less-than-half" States? Were we admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States? Until the trust is fully executed our Western States are by no means on an equal footing with the original States or with the States in which the trust has been fully executed. By transferring the minerals to the public land States we will go a long way toward placing our Western States on an equal footing with the other States. It would give to the people of each of the Western States the chance to develop their States, and to rear and educate their children in a fashion comparable to that of the people of the older and richer States.

FAIR PLAY DEMANDS ENACTMENT OF MY BILL

Our State is small in population. Our lands are largely valuable for grazing purposes only. The people of my State have great difficulty in supporting our schools and our State university. The people of Wyoming are as anxious as the people of other States to give their children the benefit of a good education. The one great asset which gives Wyoming the golden opportunity to assume its rightful place in the society of States is the tremendous mineral resources of our soil. It is very difficult for the people of Wyoming to understand why the great storehouse of new wealth being extracted daily from our soil should be used for the benefit of irrigation projects in our sister States. When our minerals have been entirely depleted, what will we have to replace them? When the Wyoming youngsters of today become the leaders of tomorrow and learn that a cool billion dollars has been taken from the public lands of Wyoming, surely they will look back at this generation and ask: "Where were you when all this was going on? What did you do?"

THE CONCLUSION IS IRRESISTIBLE

In the treaties of purchase this country entered into a solemn covenant guaranteeing that the States carved out of the ceded area should be admitted to the Union in due course on a free and equal basis with the original States. No reasonable man can contend that our States have attained an equal status with the older States when the Federal Government remains the landlord over more than half our soil. For the Federal Government to withhold permanently from a sovereign State such a tremendous proportion of the wealth stored in its soil constitutes an outrageous invasion of the rights of that State. No reasonable man will deny that the western public-land States cannot possibly attain the same rank as the older States if they are deprived permanently of most of the resources of their own soil. It is high time for the Congress to finally "dispose" of the lands which it holds under the trust created by treaty with France. The trust was not created to go on forever.

It seems to me it is abundantly clear that the United States obtained title to all public lands by reason of the treaty with France and the treaty with Mexico. The covenants in the treaties constitute a trust and provide that the lands shall be held only temporarily by the United States Government, to be surrendered to the States or to the citizens of the States at the first opportunity.

I believe a century and a half is long enough to wait for a trustee to account for, to execute, and to terminate the trust. There is only one way left to execute the trust, and that is by transferring the property to the States. That alone is the only honorable course of action. Anything less would be a breach of faith. On the basis of simple justice and fair play I bespeak favorable consideration of my bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had further disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, and Mr. REED of Illinois were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

AMERICAN MARKETS BASIS OF AMERICAN ECONOMY—CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS UNDER GATT—AMERICAN WORKINGMEN AND SMALL INVESTORS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a case is being filed today in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to test the constitutionality of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the executive agreements under GATT, which is officially known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

THE YEAR OF DECISION

This is the year of decision. The suit will break through the sound barrier laid down by the State Department in cooperation with foreign nations with low-cost production, low wages, low taxes, and other trade advantages.

CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY AMERICAN WORKINGMEN AND SMALL INVESTORS

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act could be called a conspiracy to destroy the workingmen and the small investors of the Nation; and to destroy our ability to defend ourselves by making the United States dependent upon foreign nations, across the major oceans, for the critical materials without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace.

The time is long past when we should have had such a clear-cut court test as the suit being instituted today will afford.

LICENSE TO DESTROY THE WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Under the Trade Agreements Act, Congress gave the President and the State Department a license to commit daylight robbery on any labor group or industry in the United States.

WHOLESALE DESTRUCTION

GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—is wholesale murder in the dark, committed by the State Department, without even the pretext of a congressional license. If the President and the State Department need a hunting license to liquidate American labor, American investors, and American industry and business, then their operations under GATT are plainly illegal, because no such license has been granted by or even sought from Congress.

CONSTITUTION IS TO DEFEND UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES, NOT DESTROY THEM

I contend the Constitution gives Congress no authority to license a President or the State Department to destroy American industries, investors, and labor.

This is being done under the Trade Agreements Act by importing cut-rate foreign competition to take over American jobs and markets.

Proof that this is being done is shown by the fact that the State Department time after time has come before us with proposals that industries they are scuttling and jobs they are destroying be compensated for by appropriations from the Congress.

Having remade the industrial map of America they want us to cover up their

mistakes with subsidies from the taxpayers.

The Constitution, in my opinion, gives a President and the State Department no authority to kill off American industry and labor either through the Trade Agreements Act or on their own volition, as they are doing under GATT.

CASE FILED TODAY OFFERS MAGNA CARTA TO AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE

This case being filed today to test the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act and the powers of the President under GATT may well be the Magna Carta of free enterprise in America.

It can be the most important case for the American people, for America's economy and America's security since the Blue Eagle and steel seizure cases denied to the executive branch powers beyond the Constitution.

Constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act and executive agreements entered into through GATT is a matter of economic life or death to thousands of enterprises throughout the United States which today are being ruined by cut-rate imports.

Likewise, it is a matter of life or death to our distressed areas, which have increased from 37 to 144 in the past 2 years.

Until there shall be a decision in this case, it is my prediction that there will be a shocking increase in the number of such areas and in their economic distress, in unemployment in scores of industries, and in the numbers of business and commercial failures, already far too high.

PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES HAVE RIGHT TO KNOW IF THEY FACE ECONOMIC DEATH SENTENCE

Under the Trade Agreements Act the President sits as judge and executioner over industry and employment. He wields absolute veto power even over decisions in which the Tariff Commission has declared an American industry a victim of serious injury by tariff cuts the President and State Department have themselves inflicted.

Maybe that is constitutional, but I do not think so. If it is constitutional, then let us have the bad news from the courts, and ultimately from the Supreme Court. The people, who are sovereign in this land of ours, have a right to know the score and whether or not they face an economic death sentence.

Mr. President, if the constitutional responsibility of the legislative branch to fix duties or tariffs and to regulate foreign commerce or foreign trade can be transferred legally by a simple act of Congress, then some Congress some time could get mad enough to pass a bill to transfer to the Congress the power now vested in the President of the United States, repass the bill over the President's veto, and let the President sit on his cushion without anything to do.

Let me tell you, Mr. President, that it takes intestinal fortitude for an industry to file a suit against the Government, because such an industry knows it will get no contracts or favors from that time on.

INDUSTRY SUBJECT FOR 22 YEARS TO DICTATION BY WASHINGTON

In the past 22 years everything has been transferred to Washington, so that industry can live or die only in accordance with the decisions of Washington bureau heads.

PEOPLE ENTITLED TO KNOW

Mr. President, whatever the Court's decision in the pending case, the people are entitled to have it, and soon. They have never had it either on the controversial Trade Agreements Act or on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; that organization meets in Geneva. The idea of the organization is to divide the markets of the United States with the markets of the world. That is the goal toward which it works.

If the President's power under these two destructive devices is constitutional, then let the Court, and the Court alone, tell the people.

STATE DEPARTMENT REPRESENTS INTERESTS OF NO STATE, COUNTY, OR PRECINCT

If it is contended that GATT and the Trade Agreement Act are constitutional, then the people will have to be told that the President, whoever he may be, wields the commerce power, not the elected representatives of the people.

There was obviously a reason for the Constitution of the United States prescribing that the Congress should fix duties or tariffs and regulate foreign commerce and trade, because every precinct in the United States is represented in the Senate and the House of Representatives. What precincts are represented in the State Department, as it is now constituted, or as it has been constituted for 22 years? None, Mr. President; the people have no say in the present procedure.

If the Supreme Court should hold GATT and the Trade Agreements Act constitutional then the court must tell the people that the President wields the taxing power, the tariff power, and the treatymaking power without any check or balance by the Congress.

It will have to say that the President wields supreme power over jobs, investments, industries, and business, and over the Nation's economy, national defense, and national security; and that he wields the power to destroy these jobs, investments, and economy for the benefit of foreign interests through trade treaties turning over American markets to low-wage, low-tax foreign competitors.

FOREFATHERS WROTE CONSTITUTION FOR AMERICANS, NOT FOREIGNERS

The Supreme Court will have to say that these powers may be exercised by the President with the advice and consent of the State Department and its free trade lobbyists; not with the advice and consent of Congress, as required by the Constitution.

I do not think the Supreme Court is going to say that.

The patriots and statesmen who wrote the Constitution wrote it for Americans, not foreigners.

They wrote it to preserve the independence of Americans from despotism, both foreign and domestic.

The Founding Fathers of our Government conceived and declared a separation of powers into legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government, and assigned to each its constitutional duties and responsibilities.

DELEGATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS TO PRESIDENT PROHIBITED

Under the Constitution they permitted no branch of Government to delegate its powers, as Congress has attempted to do under the Trade Agreements Act.

The New Deal Congress of 1934 sought to amend and repeal the Constitution of the United States when it passed the Trade Agreements Act.

It sought to transfer its duties and responsibilities under the Constitution to the President, who in turn shifted them to the State Department.

The State Department has used these powers, wrongfully delegated in my opinion, to remake the industrial map of America, destroy certain industries, and transfer the jobs of men and women working in these industries to foreign labor on foreign soil.

AVERAGE THE STANDARDS OF LIVING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not true that if the policy of free trade were to be carried to its logical conclusion, the inevitable result would be to bring the scale of living of the people of the United States down to the scale in effect in the foreign countries which compete with us, rather than to raise the standard of living in the foreign countries to the American standard of living?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that common horsesense would lead to that conclusion. There are 2½ billion people in the world. The population of our country is approximately 160 million, and we have the highest standard of living in the world. Averaging our standard of living with that of other countries through the division of our markets with the other nations would result in what? It would be the same as taking the glass of water which I hold in my hand and undertaking to average the height of the water in this water glass with the height of the water in the city reservoir by pouring the glass of water into the reservoir. The effect on the height of the water in the reservoir would be infinitesimal, but my glass would be empty.

STATE DEPARTMENT LACKS KNOWLEDGE OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY OR ITS PROBLEMS

So I say, in direct answer to my distinguished friend from Wyoming, we have the situation of having tariffs—or duties as the Constitution calls them—regulated by the State Department, which has no knowledge of industry, and cares to acquire none. It is done to provide some fancied advantage to Europe, Asia, or Africa. One of the reasons is, as the State Department says, trading for friendship. If such friendships have been made, they are not evident. When the tariff—or when the duty, as the Constitution calls it—is

lowered 2 percent or 10 percent, investments in the United States must be written down, and wages must come down, in order to compete with foreign countries. It is either that or go out of business.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question, if I may.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARRETT. In the opinion of the Senator, is any industry in this country, save and except possibly the automobile industry, which is practically a monopoly so far as world production is concerned, able to compete with foreign production, when plants in foreign lands are of a standard comparable to ours and when the wages paid in the foreign countries are in some cases only one-third of the wages paid in this country, and, in the case of Japan, one-tenth?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, again I say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming that common horsesense, of which there is a great scarcity in Washington, and of which there has been a great scarcity for 22 years, can lead to only one conclusion, and that is that we cannot compete without a lower American standard of living. I do not agree that the automobile industry is immune from such competition. Mr. Ford, who is a leading freetrader, has 26 assembly and manufacturing plants located in other countries, and even now he is importing to New York from abroad a Ford car which is to sell for $1,300.

FOREIGN COMPETITION AFFECTS LABOR IN AMERICAN AUTO INDUSTRY

I say that laborers in the automobile manufacturing industry in this country can be driven out of their jobs. All that is necessary to have effective competition is to have in a foreign country the same kind of machinery which we have in this country, and the same know-how. They do have the same know-how in foreign countries, because top mechanics and other skilled personnel are sent from this country to supervise low-cost labor in foreign countries. All that is needed is the labor, the know-how, and the machinery, and automobiles can be manufactured abroad just as cheaply as in the United States—even more cheaply. No one is going to say that a Scotchman, an Englishman, or a Japanese cannot do as much work as can an American. Japanese work for 11 to 19 cents an hour, and they can do more work than an American can, because a Japanese will work longer hours. It would be impossible to compete with that kind of labor.

UNITED STATES HAS EXPORTED MACHINERY AND KNOW-HOW TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES THROUGHOUT WORLD

I should like to say to the senior Senator from Wyoming that the senior Senator from Nevada has been in every nation in the world except Russia and Iron Curtain countries. He has seen plants in operation in those countries. He has been in the engineering business 30 years. He knows something about industrial engineering. I hear much loose talk to the effect that with our know-how and with our machinery we can outproduce any other nation. Our machinery and our know-how are available to every nation on earth. The last plant sent to a foreigin country is the best plant in existence, no matter in which country it may be used, because it is the latest one manufactured.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS PAYING FOR BUILDUP OF FOREIGN COMPETITION

As a matter of fact, the American taxpayers pay for it all. Who are sent to such countries if, for example, engineers, of which I happen to be one, are needed there? The very best engineers in the particular business specified are sent to those countries, as are the best technicians and machinists. It takes about 5 or 10 percent of supervisory labor to oversee low-cost labor, and that can be done in any foreign country. Since labor and taxes in foreign countries are lower than those prevailing in this country, the manufactured product can be sold for less than a similar product manufactured in this country.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not a fact that since World War II this country has expended a large sum of money, running into many billions of dollars, for the purpose of rehabilitating industrial plants all over Europe, including England, and elsewhere in the world, and that now we find ourselves learning that those plants are just as up to date as are any plants in this country? Accordingly, with the low wage scales which prevail elsewhere throughout the world, we find ourselves in such a position that it is not possible for us to compete with foreign production. As a consequence, thousands upon thousands of our skilled mechanics are out of work at the present time. Is that not a fact?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming that economically this country is treading water. We are producing and sending to Europe much obsolete so-called war equipment which is put in warehouses there. It will never come out of the warehouses, unless the Russians take it out, because they will control Europe within a week after the war starts.

BILLIONS SENT TO EUROPE TO FINANCE EUROPE'S PAYMENT FOR GOODS SHE GETS FROM US

But we are afraid to cut down that kind of production, for fear of further unemployment. Then each year, we send from $5 billion to $10 billion across the pond, to enable foreign countries to purchase our goods. We are only treading water, Mr. President.

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming just what I said on the floor of the Senate 8 years ago, when I was trying to explain this matter, at the time when the Marshall plan was before the Congress. The advocates of that plan said at that time that the only thing necessary was to enable foreign countries to build more plants and to increase their productive capacity, and then everyone would raise their standard of living.

I was then a freshman in the Senate, but I was frank to state that I could not understand any justification for that proposal. It appalled me to see such a development. When I spoke at that time before the Senate, I tried to say that there is never any trouble in getting funds with which to build a plant anywhere on earth, if there is a market for the product. Private funds can be obtained at any time for that purpose, and Government funds are not needed. The only reason why private funds cannot be obtained now is that there is no market for the commodities produced by such plants. If the productive capacity of foreign nations is increased beyond their consumptive ability, it will be necessary for them to sell their production elsewhere, which means either to the people of the United States or to the people of the countries behind the Iron Curtain and to Russia. That is why several years ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 96 trade treaties with Russia. They show that everyone of the Western European nations is trading with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, and is sending them everything they need in order to prepare to fight us; and those materials include ball bearings, tool steel, trucks, and similar items. Of course, under that arrangement, such countries overbuild, in respect to their own markets; and now they say to us, "We will increase our shipments to your enemies, if you do not buy from us."

FOREIGN NATIONS BLACKMAIL AMERICA TO TAKE THEIR SURPLUS OFF THEIR HANDS

At the time I said we would finally be subject to blackmail, and that is what it is. Little Mrs. Luce, one of the best looking ambassadors we have, when appearing before one of our committees, which had under consideration the so-called reciprocal trade law and its extension, testified in favor of free trade, which is what the so-called reciprocal trade really is.

Of course, Mr. President, the words "reciprocal trade" do not occur in the act; that term was invented by the London bankers, in an attempt to sell free trade to the United States. At the time when Mrs. Luce testified before the congressional committee, she said, "Mr. Chairman, the Italians will not understand if you do not extend this act, and thus permit them to sell in the United States the goods produced in Italy at plants established there with funds coming from the United States taxpayers."

Mr. President, that is almost precisely what I said 8 years before that. So what she said then was no news; it was just 8 years late. Naturally, selling the goods here would destroy our own producers.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, from the remarks of the Senator from Nevada, I take it he believes that the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was a good piece of legislation from the standpoint of the London bankers.

UNCLE SAM VICTIM IN INTERNATIONAL POKER GAME

Mr. MALONE. Thirty or thirty-five nations are willing to participate in a poker game, but there will be no game unless the sucker they have in mind agrees to play. The sucker is the United States. In this case, the 30 or 35 nations are the ones who are willing to sit in the

game, provided the sucker with the money will sit in, too. The name of the game is, in this case, GATT—the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs—sitting at Geneva, Switzerland, a country which never was the friend of anyone when the chips were down. So there those nations are sitting in the big poker game.

GATT LIKENED TO GAMING AT CHEYENNE OR RENO

If we do not enter the game there will be no game. In this case, if we do not go into the game there will be no game, because today we have the only market in the world where even 10 cents' worth of chewing gum can be sold for money unless we have previously given that nation the money to buy the goods.

HOW BRITAIN DUMPED LEAD AND ZINC ON UNITED STATES THAT AMERICAN TAXPAYERS HAD ALREADY PAID FOR

For instance, we provided Britain with funds with which to purchase a stockpile of lead and zinc, and Britain bought it. But in 1953, Britain began releasing it in the United States—and at what price? At 6 cents under the market price for zinc. At 16 cents a pound, miners could be paid $15 or $18 a day, and the mine operator could just about come out even, or perhaps make a little money, in order to keep going. But at 10 cents a pound, the result was to turn 98 percent of the ore into country rock; and, Mr. President, the only difference between country rock and ore is the ability to mine it at a profit. So those mines shut down. Today 90 percent of the zinc and lead miners in the United States are walking the streets, unemployed.

At this time I shall not discuss the matter further; but I could very well do so, because what I am saying applies equally to many other industries and many other areas of the United States.

ACT USED TO REMAKE INDUSTRIAL MAP OF AMERICA

Since 1934 successive administrations have used the Trade Agreements Act and GATT to remake the industrial map of America and bring ruin to scores of fine American communities and thousands of American manufacturing, mining, and business enterprises.

Mills, mines, and factories have been closed and industries crippled throughout the United States, through the administration of this act, and their work orders have been transferred to foreign mills, mines, and factories.

Tens of thousand of jobs in the United States have been destroyed to make jobs for low-wage foreign labor.

Investments have been wiped out or diminished.

In that connection, Mr. President, let me refer to the Studebaker Automobile Co. Not long ago, as we remember, the great Studebaker organization headed by Mr. Paul Hoffman requested its workers in Indiana to accept a reduction of wages, and then almost immediately it was reported it planned to build a Studebaker plant in Japan, where skilled labor can be obtained at rates of 15 to 19 cents an hour.

We must bear in mind that in Japan skilled labor may be obtained for as little as 19 cents an hour, whereas in the United States the rate is anywhere from $2 to $2.25 an hour. Common horsesense is something that is becoming scarcer and scarcer in the city of Washington, D. C., Mr. President, I am sorry to say, but we should know better than to enter such a contract. A factory which is built today in Japan can be built exactly like one in the United States; in fact, it will be better, because it will have been the last one. The only counterbalancing item as between 19-cents-an-hour labor in Japan and $2 or $2.25 labor in the United States is low-cost water transportation, which is so cheap that almost anyone can figure the transportation cost.

FREE TRADE POLICY MAKES UNITED STATES DEPENDENT ON DISTANT FOREIGN LANDS FOR CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Mr. President, American interests and American security have been subordinated to foreign interests and foreign prosperity. For many critical materials without which we could not fight a war, and without which we cannot live in peace, we have been made dependent upon foreign countries, separated from us by major oceans. In peacetime, we are under blackmail. In wartime we could be defeated; and in the meantime the workingmen and small investors in the United States would be utterly destroyed.

For the purpose of this discussion, Mr. President, a small investor is one who is not large enough to be able to commence operations in a foreign country, and there take advantage of the very cheap labor, and send their production to the United States, to be sold on United States markets, under the free-trade monstrosity, the extension of which we are about to vote on, for the bill is now before the Senate Finance Committee.

COMPLAINT READ IN SUIT CHALLENGING CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TRADE ACT AND GATT

A suit for declaratory judgment was filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by the Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc., of Morgantown, W. Va., plaintiff, versus George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C., defendant. I read the complaint:

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

1. Plaintiff is a West Virginia corporation with principal offices in the State of West Virginia, at the city of Morgantown. Defendant is the executive officer of the Federal Government charged by law with the assessment of duties on imported merchandise in accordance with the appropriate acts of Congress and the Constitution of the United States. The amount in controversy exceeds, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum of $3,000. This court has jurisdiction of this matter by reason of the Declaratory Judgment Act (22 U. S. C. A. 2201).

2. Plaintiff is a domestic manufacturer of handblown and pressed table, stem and ornamental glassware and tumblers. Its factory was started at the close of the last century. In 1949 it had over 300 employees and shipped a million and a quarter dollars' worth of glassware annually. Today it has only 150 employees, and its shipments have fallen to approximately $750,000 per year. During the same period the industry average hourly wage has increased 43 percent, to an industry hourly average of $1.72 per hour, while European and Japanese glassworkers' wages are anywhere from one-eighth to one-third of wages paid to United States workers.

3. Between 1945 and 1950 handmade glassware was not being imported in any substantial volume. Beginning in 1950 imports increased very rapidly, and as a result plaintiff suffered the injury set forth hereinabove.

4. Plaintiff alleges that the injury it has suffered is directly caused by and is the direct result of the unlawful assessment of duties by defendant on imported handblown and pressed glassware. The proper rate of duty on handblown ware is 60 percent ad valorem and the proper rate on pressed ware is 50 percent ad valorem, as established by paragraphs 218 (f) and (g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C. A. 1001).

5. Defendant is charged under 19 United States Code Annotated, section 1502, with the duty of assessing tariff duties in accordance with applicable law. At present defendant is assessing duties on handblown and pressed glassware on the basis of certain concessions in the rates made by the President in the purported exercise of authority delegated to him by the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 943, 57 Stat. 125, 59 Stat. 410, 63 Stat. 698), the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 72), and the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 472, 68 Stat. 360).

6. Plaintiff alleges that defendant in assessing duties based on said concessions has acted and is acting ultra vires his power and authority, and that said reduced rates are null and void and of no effect, and deprive plaintiff of a valuable property right without just compensation and without due process of law, since the statutes under which the President assumed to reduce the rates of duty established in the Tariff Act of 1930 are unlawful and in violation of article 1, sections 1, 7, and 8 and article 2, section 2 of the Federal Constitution in that they attempt to delegate to the President the legislative duty of Congress to regulate foreign commerce, to delegate to the President the supreme taxing power of Congress, and to delegate to the President the treatymaking powers of Congress, all of which powers are beyond the constitutional authority of the President to exercise and beyond the constitutional power of Congress to delegate.

7. Plaintiff further alleges that defendant is assessing the said duties on the basis of the reduced rates on handblown and pressed glassware contained in a certain multilateral agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Geneva Agreement), 1947, placed in effect provisionally as of January 1, 1948, by proclamation of the President dated December 16, 1947, and that said rates are null and void and of no effect in that they are less than the duties duly established by act of Congress for such items in paragraphs 218 (f) and (g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C. A. 1001). Said reduced rates deprive plaintiff of his statutory protection against destructive foreign competition, and have resulted in irreparable injury to his business as set forth hereinabove, and thus deprive plaintiff of a valuable property right without just compensation and without due process of law. Said General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, popularly known as GATT, including all reduced tariff rates, and limitations on the power of Congress to impose excises and quotas or impose tariffs on an item on the free list or raise reduced rates contained therein, is illegal, unlawful, and of no effect, as it is, in entirety, violative of the supreme taxing authority of Congress, the treatymaking powers of Congress, and the foreign-commerce regulating authority of Congress. Plaintiff further alleges it is an unconstitutional and unlawful attempt by the President to exercise power and authority not delegated to him in the Federal Constitution for the purpose of limiting certain powers delegated exclusively to Congress and transferring said

powers to an international administrative agency neither recognized by the Congress nor approved by the people's elected representatives. Plaintiff further alleges the provisions of GATT were specifically rejected in 1950 by Congress when it disapproved the International Trade Organization (Habana Agreement), 1947. Plaintiff further avers and states that as a result all efforts by defendant to give effect to the handmade glassware rates contained in GATT are unlawful and unconstitutional.

Wherefore, plaintiff demands that the Court adjudge:

1. That the actions of defendant complained of hereinabove are unlawful and in violation of the Tariff Act of 1930, and

2. That said acts of defendant as hereinabove alleged are beyond his statutory and/or constitutional authority and power.

ROY ST. LEWIS,
CARL L. SHIPLEY,
Washington, D. C.
ROBERT T. DONLEY,
Morgantown, W. Va.,
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

PRESIDENT'S LETTER ASKING FOR TRADE ACT EXTENSION RECALLED

Mr. President, we had the spectacle of the President of the United States writing a letter to the minority leader of the House, JOE MARTIN, saying, in effect, "Give me the right to destroy your industries and I will not do it."

The reason private investors go into various businesses is that there is a certain principle established by law, which provides that a bill affecting, or reducing tariff duties must be introduced in the House of Representatives, considered by congressional committees, favorably reported after full hearings, and then considered by the Senate and the House after full debate.

What is the principle established by law? I shall read from the Tariff Act of 1930, Public Law 361, 71st Congress, 2d session, to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, approved by the President of the United States on June 17, 1930. I shall read from section 336, under the title "Equalization of Costs of Production."

Except for the unconsitutional monstrosity called reciprocal trade, the purpose of which is to sell free trade to the American people, this is the law. The suit to which I have referred alleges that this is a law, because the delegation of legislative power by the legislative branch is unlawful and unconstitutional.

TARIFF ACT OF 1930 AGAIN THE LAW WHEN RECIPROCAL TRADE DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL

If the Trade Agreements Act is declared unconstitutional, section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 becomes the law and the principle upon which duties and tariffs will be fixed for the protection of American industry.

Section 336, in effect, provides that American workingmen and American investors shall have equal access to their own markets. That is all it says. The senior Senator from Nevada does not believe that is too much to ask. It provides that they shall have a fair and competitive chance in their own market, with fair and reasonable competition. That is what it says.

SECTION 336 OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 QUOTED

Section 336 reads:

EQUALIZATION OF COSTS OF PRODUCTION

(a) Change of classification or duties. In order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this act intended, the Commission (1) upon request of the President, or (2) upon resolution of either or both Houses of Congress, or (3) upon its own motion, or (4) when in the judgment of the Commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, upon application of any interested party, shall investigate the differences in the cost of production of any domesitc article and of any like or similar foreign article.

Mr. President, that lays down the principle upon which the act is based and which was sought to be repealed by the unconstitutional monstrosity called, by the London bankers, reciprocal trade.

I read further from section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930:

In the course of the investigation the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

TARIFF ACT OF 1930 CAVE FAIR HEARINGS TO PRODUCERS; GATT SESSIONS AT GENEVA SECRET

Mr. President, does that sound like secret meetings of the State Department at Geneva? Not very much. That is the kind of meetings that are held in Geneva.

I read further:

The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions under this section.

It does not give authorization to change the principle. All the Commission can do is to lay down rules and regulations under which it will hold its hearings to determine what the difference is in the cost of production between this country and the chief competitive nation. That is what the law provides.

FLEXIBLE TARIFF OF 1930 TOOK FOREIGN PRODUCTION COSTS INTO ACCOUNT

I read further:

The Commission shall report to the President the results of the investigation and its findings with respect to such differences in costs of production. If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences.

That is what that section provides. It does not give anyone the discretion to trade one industry for another, or to determine a rearrangement of the industrial map of the United States of America. It lays down the principle under which the Commission is to operate, and the Commission is authorized to make rules and regulations governing its procedure in arriving at a determination on that basis and on that principle. That is what it says.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act embraced a principle as different from that in the 1930 act as night is from day.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1934 PUTS EUROPE-ASIA FIRST

The State Department in every negotiation under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, has, in my opinion, put Europe first, Asia first, and every other foreign area first at the bounteous trade table which we supply, leaving to American free enterprise, American workingmen, and small investors, only second helpings, scraps, and leftovers.

It has made the United States dependent at this moment on distant and remote offshore areas for many of the critical and strategic materials without which we cannot fight a war or build for peace. This is, of course, as the Harry Dexter Whites, the Hisses, and their Red collaborators planned it.

HARRY DEXTER WHITE MEMORANDUM ASKING $10 BILLION LOAN TO RUSSIA RECALLED

Harry Dexter White, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, sent a memorandum to the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, in which he stated we were about to run out of many of the critical materials, including petroleum, manganese, tungsten, and 7 or 8 other principal materials which we need in order to prepare for war or to fight a war, and that, therefore, we would have to save our domestic materials and lend $10 billion to whom? To whom did Harry Dexter White recommend we lend the $10 billion with which to furnish these materials to us? He recommended that we lend $10 billion to Russia for that purpose.

Mr. Morgenthau took the memorandum and prepared a letter to the President of the United States, which contained exactly the same verbiage. It stated that we were about to run out of these materials, and therefore would have to get our materials from some other nation. From where, Mr. President? From Russia, of course. We must lend Russia $10 billion.

Then what happened? The President of the United States announced one day that he was not in favor of the buy-American clause, and that the policy of the United States of America was to save its critical materials and to import such materials from foreign countries. That is what he said. That officially continued the principle of a have-not nation.

WHITES AND HISSES PROPOSED APPROACHES TO DESTROY THE NATION

Of course, 99.9 percent of our people have no means of determining whether we have these materials or whether they would be available in the Western Hemisphere in time of war.

It was the Hisses and the Whites who proposed the two approaches for the destruction of our Nation.

The first was the political approach, beginning with the recognition of Russia in 1933, without any safeguards whatever. The other was the economic approach by means of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The intention of both was to make our Nation dependent upon

foreign nations for the critical and strategic materials without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace. Thus, we would be made the subject of blackmail in peacetime and of destruction in time of war, to say nothing of the utter destruction of the workingmen of the Nation and the small investors who are the ones who are unable to build plants in foreign countries. In those countries, of course, it is possible to obtain cheap labor, which is paid from 40 cents to $1.50 or $3 a day, with our taxpayers buying the machinery for such plants in many cases.

The State Department has sacrificed American markets to foreign manipulators, American wealth to foreign competition, and American jobs to foreign labor working for a sweatshop, peon, or coolie wage.

Yet in the 21 years since the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was approved by an ambitious President, no suffering American workingman or business enterprise, until today, has had the courage to go into court and challenge, formally, the constitutionality of this foreign-sponsored legislation to transfer their jobs to foreign soil and destroy their investments.

UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF ACT CHALLENGED ON SPECIFIC GROUNDS

The plaintiff in the case filed today is attacking the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act and GATT on the following grounds:

First. That the act has deprived him of a valuable property right without just compensation and without due process of law.

Second. That administrative actions under the act are in violation of article I, sections 1, 7, and 8, and article II, section 2, of the Federal Constitution, and that the act itself is void.

Third. That the act unlawfully attempts to delegate to the President the legislative duty of Congress to regulate commerce.

Fourth. That it attempts to delegate also to the President the supreme taxing power of Congress.

Fifth. That it attempts to delegate to the President the treatymaking powers of Congress without the requirement of Senate ratification by a two-thirds vote of Members present.

The contention of plaintiff, in brief, is that the act is unconstitutional.

DETERMINATION OF VITAL ISSUE NOW BEFORE COURTS

Under article III, section 1, the judicial power of the United States is vested in the Federal courts, and the question is now before the court for a judicial determination.

At long last an American enterprise, fighting desperately for survival and for the employed who have helped establish the business, has had the fortitude and courage to lodge its challenge in the courts, relying on the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, for the protection of its corporate life, its industrial liberty, and its property.

It is for the court, now, to give its answer.

That answer can liberate American industry from the ever-present menace of being wiped out by foreign competition which has been given special privilege by the State Department to invade our markets.

Mr. President, constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act is now a matter for judges to determine.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS ABDICATED WHEN ACT ADOPTED

I do know that when Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the extension acts which have followed, Congress abdicated to the State Department its constitutional responsibility to lay and collect duties, regulate the foreign commerce, and raise revenues from foreign commerce.

I know also that administration of the act has inflicted irreparable damage on American manufacturing and processing industries, mining, extraction and craft industries, on working men and women, and on investors in these industries and has crippled the national defense.

Technically, of course, the delegation of power—constitutional or unconstitutional as it may be—is to the President.

STATE DEPARTMENT GIVEN LIFE OR DEATH POWER OVER EVERY AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Three successive Presidents, to all purposes and effects, have given this authority to the State Department.

The State Department sifts the power down to second echelon and subordinate employees elected by nobody, responsible to no congressional district, community, precinct, or voter, untrained in domestic industry or business.

These subordinates wield tremendous power—the power of life and death over jobs, industries, and whole communities and areas—and they are answerable at the polls to nobody.

They are jealous of this tremendous power.

We are told, time after time, that we must not nudge even a fraction of this power. We must not touch it.

We must not put even so much as a little finger in the gaping loophole in the escape clause, which was intended to give a wee little relief, a little protection, to an industry which is being destroyed by ruinous foreign competition these State Department authorities have encouraged and invited.

In the other branch of Congress a few days ago there was a proposal to close that loophole, to return to the Tariff Commission, an agency of Congress, authority to restore previous tariffs upon a finding that an industry was being crippled or destroyed by import floods from low-wage, low-tax foreign countries, countries to which we have given $50 billion since the war.

NO ESCAPE UNDER PRESENT ESCAPE CLAUSE

In other words, proponents of this proposal wanted to put escape back in the escape clause.

One could hear screams of protest at this proposal all the way from Foggy Bottom.

Unfettered discretion in such mattters on the part of the administration was demanded, and unfettered discretion was granted to the President.

Mr. President, the escape clause was written into the act several years ago to delude the public into believing that an industry could escape from State Department deals flooding the country with foreign imports.

The injured industry could apply to the Tariff Commission, an agency of Congress, for escape from the deadly concessions granted foreign competitors by the State Department.

The Tariff Commission was supposed to weigh carefully these applications, and determine injury or threat of injury, and it has done so.

THE JOKER IN THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

But there was a joker in the so-called escape clause which removed the escape.

Decisions of the Tariff Commission that an industry had been or was being injured gave no iota of relief to the injured industry.

Instead they were referred to the President.

The President, with no self-acquired knowledge of the situation, could reject the Tariff Commission's findings or approve them, his was the sole and arbitrary authority to use his own unfettered discretion in rendering an administrative decision.

Fifty-nine applications have been presented to the Tariff Commission for relief under the escape-clause section. Some are still pending.

In 15 of these cases the Tariff Commission found injury or threat of injury to the domestic industry. It referred its findings to the President.

The President has taken action to grant relief in only 5 of the 15 of these cases. He has given no relief in 10 of them.

The escape clause thus turned out to be only a blind alley for 2 out of 3 of the injured industries and there was no escape even if the State Department had loaned them a seeing-eye dog, which of course it did not.

HOW STATE DEPARTMENT BLOCKS RELIEF TO STRICKEN INDUSTRIES

The State Department gives things away only to foreign countries, or to Americans investing in foreign countries.

The Tariff Commission recommended, for example, relief for the lead and zinc industry, which is being destroyed by imports from foreign countries, its production being cut in half in the past 2 years.

The findings were referred to the President. I am informed that the departments were consulted, and that all but one of the departments consulted concurred in the Tariff Commission findings.

One did not.

It is my understanding that the one that did not was the State Department.

The lead and zinc industry of the United States was turned down and relief was not granted.

GLASS INDUSTRY DENIED PROTECTION AGAINST COMMUNIST COMPETITORS

Another industry that sought relief through an escape-clause proceeding was the hand-blown glassware industry, threatened by destruction by imports of glassware, including glassware from Communist Czechoslovakia and Communist Hungary.

At a future date I expect to list the quantities of hand-blown glassware be-

ing imported into the United States from these Communist countries.

The Tariff Commission divided 3 to 3 in recommending relief for the domestic glassware industry. Its findings went to the President. The glassware industry was turned down.

No relief was given to the American glass industry, and Communist-made and manufactured glass continues to come into the United States, putting American workers out of jobs and creating distressed areas and communities, dependent in part on glass manufacturers for their economy.

ONLY ESCAPE NOW LEFT TO INDUSTRY IS THROUGH THE COURTS

The only escape for the glass industry from this foreign, including Communist competition, is in the courts, and it is to the courts that one of the historic components of this industry has now applied.

The Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc., of Morgantown, W. Va., today, I am informed, is filing a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, demanding a declaratory judgment that the duties now being assessed on imports of hand-blown and pressed glassware are unlawful and unconstitutional.

Under the Tariff Act of 1930, the duty on hand-blown ware was 60 percent ad valorem, and that on pressed ware, 50 percent.

The State Department, and the State Department alone, acting for the President under the Trade Agreements Act, cut the duty on blown glassware from 60 to 12½ and 22½ percent, and on pressed glassware from 50 to 25 percent.

COMMUNIST GLASSMAKERS REAP BENEFITS OF TRADE DEALS WHILE UNITED STATES GLASSMAKERS HURT

Mr. President, Communist Hungary's glassmakers, and Communist Czechoslovakia's glassmakers reap the blessings of the State Department while American glassmakers suffer.

The plaintiff in the case being brought before the Federal courts today began its industry more than half a century ago.

In 1949, I am informed, it had more than 300 employees and shipped and sold a million and a quarter dollars worth of glassware annually.

Today the number of employees have been cut to less than half, and sales have fallen half a million dollars.

In other words, this American enterprise has lost, percentagewise, about what Communist and other glass factories in foreign countries have gained in tariff concessions from the State Department.

ONLY UNITED STATES LIVES UP TO TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. President, these are not real trade agreements; they are agreements to lower tariffs. No foreign country as yet has lived up to its agreement, simply because 10 seconds after the ink has dried on such an agreement the foreign country can establish, and almost always does establish, a new price for its currency or for its particular product; or else it establishes exchange permits or import permits, which entirely nullify the entire arrangement. The foreign country makes no attempt to live up to its agreement. It does not even pretend that it is living up to it.

The United States is the only country which lives up to its agreements. The situation is exactly as I described it a while ago. We are the only country which has markets to divide; and when we are not "in the pot," there is no game. When we are in the game, we furnish the only money and the only markets in the game.

How can we try to promote trade with another manufacturing or processing area, such as Europe? Anything Europe imports from the United States is that much less that Europe produces. Anything the United States imports from Europe is that much less that we produce.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS PAYING FOR NEW FOREIGN COMPETITION

In many instances, taxpayers of the United States are paying for the establishment of the competing industries in foreign countries; and our machinery, our superintendents, and our foremen are going into the foreign plants and are directing the low-wage labor there. I have visited many of the production plants in foreign countries. Of the foremen and superintendents from 5 to 10 percent are Americans who are directing the low-cost labor, which is very efficient though working for low wages. As I said before, common horsesense in Washington in the last two decades has dwindled to a startlingly low ebb.

GLASS INDUSTRY BLAMES CUT-RATE DUTIES FOR ITS DISTRESS

The State Department, to all effects, has turned over the jobs of American glass craftsmen to low-paid foreign glassworkers.

The plaintiff in the case filed today charges that the injury it has suffered is caused directly by the unlawful assessment of cut-rate duties on imported handblown and pressed glassware under the Trade Agreements Act.

It alleges that the present duties are based on illegal concessions made under this act, and that in assessing these cut-rate duties the Government is acting without authority and outside of the Constitution.

The Government in other words, says the plaintiff, is depriving him of his constitutional and property rights.

OTHER INDUSTRIES THROUGHOUT NATION SIMILARLY AFFECTED

Mr. President, I submit that there are hundreds, if not thousands, of industries throughout the United States which today are being deprived of their rights under the Constitution by reason of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and its extensions.

I submit that these industries, deprived of all protection, and deprived of property and income by a capricious State Department, have a grievance which should properly be adjudicated in the courts.

I submit that the craftsmen and other workers who have been thrown out of work by the free-trade machinations of the State Department have a grievance. The Constitution of the United States is their Constitution. Its preamble reads:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

That is what the preamble of the Constitution says. It does not say that the legislative branch, Congress, can transfer its constitutional responsibilities to the executive department, to be discharged by Executive action and order. The Constitution prescribes how it may be amended; but in this instance that process has never been attempted.

The Trade Agreements Act has done none of the things expressed in the preamble to the Constitution.

The Trade Agreements Act has created injustices to a large segment of our industry and economy.

It has disrupted domestic tranquillity.

It has damaged our defense capabilities.

It has injured the general welfare.

It has deprived countless working men and women of the blessings of liberty.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT, GATT PUTS CHAINS ON ECONOMY AND WORKINGMAN

The Trade Agreements Act and GATT have put foreign chains on our economy, on industry and labor, with the idea of dragging them down to the status of our lowest-wage foreign competitor. I hear mouthings to the effect that we are going to raise the standard of living throughout the world by dividing the wealth of the United States, and the markets upon which that wealth is based. It is proposed to divide the holdings and the wealth of 160 million people with 2½ billion people. Where is our common horsesense?

COURTS COULD STRIKE CHAINS FROM AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRY BY DECLARING TRADE ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Success in the litigation instituted today by the Morgantown Glassware Guild would free it and all American industry from these foreign chains clamped on them by the State Department. It would rid the Nation of State Department control over our foreign commerce and domestic welfare. And, above all, it would restore America to the Constitution.

Mr. President, the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 has never previously been tested in the United States Supreme Court. There must be a Supreme Court determination if the free-enterprise system in America is to survive.

CONSTITUTION WRITTEN FOR ALL TO UNDERSTAND

Mr. President, I can read the Constitution of the United States. That is one document, together with the Bill of Rights, as to which Congress did not give some joker in a Government bureau the right to prepare a set of rules and regulations under which it was to be administered.

The Constitution was written in language which any citizen of the United States can understand, and was written that way so that the citizens of pioneer America and their descendants could and would understand it and live by it.

Many of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787, including

Gen. George Washington, who presided, were not lawyers, but they knew what they were doing, and why they were doing what they did. They had suffered by having someone in an executive capacity push them about for years on end, and they were tired of it. So they wanted to live by a constitution and a bill of rights.

CONSTITUTION CONFERRED ALL LEGISLATIVE POWERS ON CONGRESS; NONE ON EXECUTIVE

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution states:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 8 of the same article provides that the Congress shall have power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises—meaning tariffs or import fees—and to "regulate commerce"—trade—"with foreign nations."

Section 8 further says that the Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers which had been enumerated.

Section 8 does not provide that an appointive administrative officer in an executive department shall, in order perhaps to buy the loyalty of another nation, have the authority to give it an industry out of the wealth of the United States of America. To show that the State Department had in mind doing just that, I wish to point out that several times the State Department has suggested that when by such action a domestic industry is destroyed and unemployment is created in the United States, the Congress of the United States should appropriate money to compensate investors and provide unemployment insurance for the unemployed, and also pay transportation to enable workers to migrate to other areas where they might take other jobs. If there could be a concept lower than that, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada cannot possibly imagine what it would be.

I know of no clearer language than what I have quoted from the Constitution that could have been used to show that our constitutional fathers meant it when they said that all legislative powers to lay and collect duties and to regulate foreign commerce were vested in the Congress.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH NOW LAYS TARIFFS, OR DUTIES, IN DEROGATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Constitution did not give to the executive branch, or to the State Department, the power, or any power, to lay duties, or tariffs, but that is precisely what they have been doing ever since the Trade Agreements Act was approved on June 12, 1934.

It did not give to the executive branch or to the State Department power, any power, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, but the Department has been doing that, too, since the Trade Agreements Act was enacted.

It has been doing those things under the assumed authority of the Trade Agreements Act and outside of that assumed authority, as I shall presently show.

It has taken over legislative functions which the Constitution prescribes to the Congress and to the Congress alone.

ATTEMPTS BY CONGRESS TO DELEGATE LEGISLATIVE POWERS HELD UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The Constitution places these powers in Congress, and nowhere does it say that Congress may delegate to the executive branch of the Government these powers.

The Supreme Court has stated that the Congress may not delegate legislative powers to the executive branch.

It has declared acts void and unconstitutional in which the Congress did attempt to delegate its legislative powers.

It has declared unconstitutional acts in which the Congress attempted to delegate its powers to regulate commerce.

It has declared unconstitutional acts in which the Congress sought to delegate its taxing power to the executive branch, and duties and imposts are nothing more than taxes on imported products.

It has declared unconstitutional acts in which the Congress sought to, and did, enact legislation in violation of the due-process clause of the fifth amendment, under which no person in America may be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT DEPRIVING CITIZENS OF PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS

The Trade Agreements Act is being used by the State Department today, and for years past has been used by the State Department, to deprive countless Americans of the use and benefit of their property, and, to a considerable extent, of their liberties, without due process of law.

Today thousands of textile workers, petroleum workers, machine-tool workers, and miners, millworkers, railroad and factory workers, loggers, fishermen, yes, and farmers, are in distress by reason of trade agreements entered into by the State Department with foreign slave-wage nations under the assumed authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

The State Department remade the industrial map of America in its own image.

The genesis of the Trade Agreements Act was very simple. In 1933 an administration took office which sought to exercise all power over the Nation's economy, and in particular to control production, money, commerce, and trade, especially trade.

A docile Congress, the 73d, accepted every White House dictate, and ground out acts wholesale under administration orders.

CONGRESS THAT PASSED TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT HOLDS ALLTIME RECORD FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ENACTMENTS

Ten acts passed by this Congress subsequently were declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States—10 of them. No other Congress has ever achieved such an ignominious record.

Among them were the National Industrial Recovery Act, under which the executive branch sought to enact its own laws for the government of trade, industry, and transportation, and to do so through a delegation of legislative power by the Congress.

These laws, for that is what they were, were called codes, just as laws which the State Department presumes to make today governing foreign commerce are called trade agreements.

Chief Justice Hughes, who wrote the opinion, in the case of the Schechter Corp. against the United States, declaring the act unconstitutional, said in part:

Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President to exercise an unfettered discretion to make whatever laws he thinks may be needed or advisable for the rehabilitation and expansion of trade and industry.

Please note the words "unfettered discretion." The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 grants to the President unfettered discretion to fix what tariffs he chooses on what products he chooses, and with what countries he chooses.

PRESIDENT HAS "UNFETTERED DISCRETION" TO SENTENCE INDUSTRIES TO DEATH UNDER TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act—and H. R. 1, if enacted—give the President unfettered discretion to choose any industry, sentence it to death and extinction, and to determine how rapidly and how quickly it shall be liquidated as a burnt offering to the greed of foreign low-wage imports and trade.

In the Schechter case, Chief Justice Hughes said:

The act provides for creation by the President of administrative agencies to assist him, but the action or reports of such agencies, or of his other assistants—their recommendations and findings in relation to the making of codes—have no sanction beyond the will of the President, who may accept, modify, or reject them as he pleases.

Substitute the term "trade agreements" for "codes," and the State Department for the agencies President Roosevelt set up to administer the National Industrial Recovery Act, and I submit that the same declaration of the Chief Justice applies equally to the Trade Agreements Act of today.

Chief Justice Hughes continued as follows:

Such recommendations or findings in no way limit the authority which section 3 (of the National Industrial Recovery Act) undertakes to vest in the President with no other conditions than those there specified. And this authority relates to a host of different trades and industries, thus extending the President's discretion to all the varieties of laws which he may deem to be beneficial in dealing with the vast array of commercial and industrial activities throughout the country.

Such a sweeping delegation of legislative power finds no support in the decisions upon which the Government especially relies.

Chief Justice Hughes held that the National Industrial Recovery Act was an attempted delegation, to the Chief Executive, of legislative power, and therefore invalid.

DELEGATION RUNNING RIOT

Justice Cardoza, in a concurring opinion, called it "delegation running riot."

Provisions in the National Industrial Recovery Act had previously been held unconstitutional in the case of Panama Refining Co. against Ryan, as an attempted delegation of legislative power to the Chief Executive. I shall quote only

briefly from the syllabus of the opinion, rendered by Chief Justice Hughes:

Assuming (not deciding) that Congress itself might have the power sought to be delegated to the President by section 9 (c) of the National Industrial Recovery Act—viz, the power to inderdict the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of petroleum and petroleum products produced or withdrawn from storage in excess of the amounts permitted by State authority—the attempted delegation is plainly void because the power sought to be delegated is legislative power, yet nowhere in the statute has Congress declared or indicated any policy or standard to guide or limit the President when acting under such delegation.

ABDICATION BY CONGRESS OF ITS POWERS FORBIDDEN IN CONSTITUTION

And again:

The principle forbidding Congress to abdicate, or to transfer to others, the essential legislative functions with which it is vested by article I, section 1, and article I, section 8, paragraph 18 of the Constitution, has been recognized by the Court in every case in which the question has been raised.

Or, as Chief Justice Hughes put it in his opinion:

The Constitution provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives" (art. I, sec. 1). And the Congress is empowered "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" its general powers. (Art. I, sec. 8, par. 18.) The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate, or to transfer to others, the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested.

Mr. President, let me repeat that part of the decision:

The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate, or to transfer, the essential legislative functions.

The essential legislative functions are enumerated in the Constitution.

Mr. President, for 21 years Congress has abdicated its powers to regulate commerce. Among those powers are the functions—and they are vested functions, as Chief Justice Hughes declared—of laying duties on imports and regulating the foreign commerce.

Congress has abdicated them to the sacrifice and betrayal of scores and hundreds of patriotic American enterprises and tens and hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic American citizens, now out of work, with no hope or prospect of employment, and subsisting on a dole of surplus food commodities which have accumulated under the administration's misguided foreign-trade policies.

I say that the New Deal and the Fair Deal administrations put American industry on the auction block and sacrificed segments of its own selection to the avarice of foreign interests.

It did this through an illegal and unconstitutional grant by the Congress of the United States, in my opinion, and I hope and believe that the Supreme Court of the United States will soon so hold.

Lawyers and laymen may have opinions, but only the Supreme Court of the United States can be the ultimate and final judge.

Whether the Supreme Court ultimately holds that the Trade Agreements Act is constitutional or unconstitutional—and I think the latter will be the result—the act is morally and materially wrong and contravenes the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

COMMITTEE MINORITY HELD ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UN-AMERICAN IN 1934

The Republican minority of the House Ways and Means Committee, when the law was enacted, declared in a minority report signed by 10 of the 25 members of the committee, that it was not only unconstitutional, but that it was un-American.

I fully subscribe to that conclusion. It is un-American to sacrifice American industries to the interests of foreign competitors and to discriminate between the areas and regions of this Nation in economic development.

It is un-American to place the prosperity of foreign industrialists and foreign workers above the welfare and economy of American workers in American industries.

It is un-American to subsidize foreign investors and foreign interests with American tax dollars to the detriment of American interests—and there are many American interests and industries which today are being destroyed.

It is un-American to turn over our rich American market to foreigners when Americans walk the streets searching for jobs that we have given, willy-nilly, to foreign sweatshops, foreign coolie, and foreign peon labor.

Thousands of American workers are "on the bricks today" because they have been bumped by a 13-cents-an-hour Japanese textile worker, a 30-cents-an-hour Italian pottery maker, or a 53-cents-an-hour-and-less British mechanic.

IT IS UN-AMERICAN TO GIVE COMMUNISTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES JOB PREFERENCE OVER AMERICANS

Other Americans are destitute because their jobs have been given away by our State Department to Communist pig farmers and pork processors in Communist Poland, to Communist glass workers and Communist glass factories in Communist Czechoslovakia, and to Communist farmers and industrialists in Communist Hungary.

It is both un-American and unconstitutional, if we believe in the Constitution as it was written. I do.

As I stated before, the administration of 1933 and 1934 sought to usurp the legislative power and to exercise autocratic and dictatorial control over all commerce and trade.

It sent to Congress the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and it was enacted. The Supreme Court knocked it out as invalid under the taxing power conferred exclusively on Congress in article I, section 8.

The Adjustment Act amendments of 1935 similarly were declared unconstitutional, and eight other power-seeking enactments of that era.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT KIN TO NEW DEAL LAWS DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 came out of the kettle of poison brewed by that dictatorial-seeking administration, poison intended to paralyze the legislative branch and subject it to the whims of an arbitrary Chief Executive.

Seizure of domestic trade, commerce, and transportation was one goal: control of agriculture and the farmers another.

A New Deal Congress swallowed the poison bait, but the Supreme Court saved it from its folly. In doing so it preserved the Constitution of the United States and saved the rights of free American citizens, American producers, American industries, and American workers and investors under this, our Constitution.

The power-seeking administration also sought authority and control over all foreign trade and commerce, in defiance of the Constitution, article I, section 8.

Such controls, of course, affect the domestic economy and welfare, as the executive branch of that time well knew.

Congress swallowed that bait, too, away back in 1934, and it has renewed the dose at intervals ever since, paralyzing its constitutional authority and responsibility.

BAIT SUGAR-COATED WITH PROMISES NOT TO USE POWER TO INJURE INDUSTRIES AND CITIZENS

Each time the bait has been held out to the Congress it has been accompanied by bland assurances from the Executive. In effect, the assurances are these:

Give us authority to destroy any industry, business, or labor force we wish, and we will not use it. While we want the power to hurt, we are really nice people and will not hurt anybody.

That has been repeated in substance by every President who has asked extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

The grim facts are that industries have already been and are now being destroyed, that workers and investors are now, and have been, destroyed.

The powers of life or death each Chief Executive has sought under an extension of the Trade Agreements Act has resulted in the economic death of American enterprises and business in hundreds of American communities.

Mr. President, we are treading water with our economy, by throwing everything we have into national defense, manufacturing obsolete defense equipment, and sending the equipment to Europe, there to be put into warehouses, from which it will never be taken, unless it is taken by the Russians. In addition, we send billions of dollars to Europe to enable them to buy our goods. It is like a groceryman who, finding business a little slack, borrows money from a bank and throws the money around a neighborhood, in the hope that some of it will come back to him in trade. If a storekeeper were to go to a banker and ask him for a loan for the purpose of throwing the money around the neighborhood in the hope that some of it might come back to his store, we know what the banker would do. He would engage that person in conservation while he stepped on the little button on the floor. Soon the policeman on duty near the bank would take the person by the arm. The policeman would know the man was crazy, although he would not know whether he was dangerous.

As I have previously stated, common horsesense has become the scarcest commodity in Washington.

STATE DEPARTMENT BACKS FOREIGN COMPETITORS

Mr. President, the State Department has pitted communities and workers against foreign communities and foreign sweatshop workers in a bitter struggle for survival with the foreign concerns, many of which are financed by American capital.

In the economic slugging match the State Department loads the gloves of our foreign competitors with gold, coaches them from the sidelines, and makes all decisions in their favor. Any American who calls foul is sneered down with the admonition that the fight is under trade-agreement rules passed by the Congress.

It is difficult to win a fight fixed in advance against you.

American industry is striving desperately to survive in a fight fixed against it, with the State Department acting as the fixer.

The State Department is in the corner of the foreign competitor. The State Department rigs the rules.

The State Department not only rigs the rules giving the foreign competitor the knockout advantage but it acts as judge and referee.

State Department decisions invariably favor the foreign interest the State Department has championed, or in which the Foreign Operations Administration, which works with it, has invested American gold extracted from our taxpayers.

FIFTY-FIVE THOUSAND CONCESSIONS TO FOREIGN INTERESTS; NONE TO UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES

Some 55,000 concessions have been made, I am informed, to freeze or lower duties or tariffs under the Trade Agreements Act and GATT, all to the advantage of foreign low-wage industry workers and interests.

When has the State Department ever sought a concession to benefit an American industry, interest, or for that matter, an American investor or American workingman?

Mr. President, every nation in the world except the United States of America works for its own interests and strives to build up its own economy. Through the illegal, unconstitutional Trade Agreements Act we are working toward the destruction of our workingmen and small investors, and we are becoming dependent on foreign labor as against our own skilled workers.

As I stated previously, the Supreme Court has never yet handed down a decision on the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which differs drastically from all previous trade and tariffs acts which have been tested in the courts.

Supreme Court decisions in companion New Deal legislation declaring such legislation unconstitutional were all handed down subsequent to passage of the Trade Agreements Act.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS TERMED TRADE ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN 1934

When the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, 10 members of that committee called it unconstitutional.

They gave their reasons in a very comprehensive report.

Other members of the committee took the position that the constitutionality had been determined in previous but different acts.

This the 10-member minority disputed.

Committee members disagreed then and disagree today.

There was disagreement on the question in the House debate on H. R. 1.

There always will be disagreement until the Supreme Court decides the question once and for all, basing its decision on clear and express terms of the Constitution.

This the Supreme Court has not done.

It has not done so because no case has reached the Supreme Court on which the Court felt impelled to render a decision on the constitutionality of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, or of any of the extension acts.

WAYS AND MEANS MINORITY IN 1934 RAISED 24 OBJECTIONS TO ACT

The report of the House Ways and Means Committee on the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is almost unavailable today. It contained both the majority views and the minority views, the latter signed by 10 members.

I should like to quote some of the 24 objections to the bill, those bearing on its constitutionality.

Objection 1: It (the trade-agreements bill) delegates to the President discretionary legislative power on tariffmaking—not simply an administrative power to apply a definite formula laid down in advance by Congress, such as is given under present flexible tariff provisions—and thereby provides for an unconstitutional delegation of the supreme taxing power of Congress.

Objection 2: It has no counterpart in past legislation, Republican or Democratic, since in each previous reciprocity measure Congress has either fixed in advance the concessions or retaliations the President might use as a basis for negotiation, or it has reserved the right to both the House and Senate to approve or reject any treaty or agreement entered into by him.

Objection 3: Any previous legislation giving the President authority to put a prescribed legislative policy of Congress into effect upon the finding by him that a certain state of facts existed is no precedent for giving him the power under similar conditions to put into effect rates of duty which he himself prescribes.

Objection 4: If the expansion of our foreign trade seems desirable, it should be accomplished by existing constitutional means.

ACT ABANDONED PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Some of the other 24 objections may be pertinent at this point.

Objection six states:

It (the act) contemplates the abandonment of the principle of protection for domestic industry, agriculture, and labor by allowing existing duties to be modified without reference to the difference in cost of production of domestic and foreign articles.

And here is an objection that bears out what I have said many times on the floor of the United States Senate:

It places in the hands of the President and those to whom he may delegate his authority the absolute power of life and death over every domestic industry dependent upon tariff protection.

Here is another objection:

The bill gives no indication as to what domestic industries may be put upon the auction block in the negotiation of foreign-trade agreements, nor were any of the accredited representatives of the administration appearing before the committee willing to give such an indication except in the most general and meaningless terms.

H. R. 1 TODAY AVOIDS NAMING WHAT INDUSTRIES TO BE KILLED

Mr. President, that criticism is as applicable today as it was in 1934.

H. R. 1, which the Senate Finance Committee will presently consider, gives no indication as to what domestic industries are to be put upon the foreign auction block in the future, nor did the administration witnesses appearing at the hearings on H. R. 1 give any such indication, even in the most general and meaningless terms.

Nor was one mark of sympathy or pity expressed by these administration witnesses for any of the scores of American industries which already have been put up for sacrifice on foreign auction blocks at Annecy, France; Torquay, England; and Geneva, Switzerland, where the State Department prefers to hold these auctions selling American industry, workingmen, and interests down the river.

I expect, at a later date, to discuss H. R. 1 in considerable detail, particularly with reference to its potential effects on investments and employment in American industry, but today I am primarily concerned about the constitutionality of the present act, which is the act of 1934 as extended.

The minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1934 was devoted principally to a discussion of the constitutional aspects.

It first stated, as I have indicated, its objections, 24 in number, and then expanded on them at some length in a more general statement.

I shall quote several portions.

REPORT DETAILED "LEGAL ASPECTS"; TERMED ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The first portion is headed "The legal aspects" and I quote from it as follows:

The Constitution of the United States provides in section I of article I that all legislative powers therein granted shall be vested in the Congress. Section 8 of the same article provides, among other things, that Congress shall have the power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" and to "regulate commerce with foreign nations." Article II lodges the executive power of the Government in the President, and the judicial power in the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court has many times held that under this division of powers, it is a breach of the Constitution for Congress to delegate its legislative powers to the Executive, or to invest itself with either executive or judicial power. This bill gives the President broad discretionary power in fixing tariff duties, and the minority submit that it is unconstitutional * * *.

Those sponsoring the bill attempt to argue that it is not a delegation of legislative power, but rather one of administrative power, against which there is of course no constitutional inhibition. They point to the fact that by the terms of the bill the President may not increase or decrease an existing duty by more than 50 percent, but this limitation only goes to prove the contention of the minority that it is the President who fixes

tariff duties under the bill and not Congress. They also attempt to show that the bill lays down a rule of conduct to guide the President in fixing duties, but the minority submit that he is guided by his own discretion.

ACT OF 1934 FIRST TO GIVE PRESIDENT FREE HAND IN TARIFFMAKING

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to review the tariff acts prior to the act of 1934, which proponents contended serve as a precedent for the 1934 act.

Suffice to say that not one of them gave the President a free hand in tariffmaking as did the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and its subsequent extensions, and as H. R. 1 proposes.

No previous legislation ever authorized the President under general powers to conclude foreign-trade treaties without also requiring that such treaties before becoming operative should be ratified by Congress.

To sum up, the minority views of this committee, signed by 10 of its members, termed the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 unconstitutional.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION HELD NECESSARY TO MAKE ACT LEGAL

It said that:

If the administration wants to set up a cabinet form of government, with power in the executive to legislate by presidential decree, then it should first submit the proposition to the people through a proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, in its tariff negotiations today and in those of recent years, we have had a cabinet form of government, the executive branch legislating by decree just as does the head of any kingdom, monarchy, or dictatorship.

At this point I should like to quote what George Washington said in his Farewell Address relative to changing the Constitution of the United States:

If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Mr. President, the State Department, as I previously stated, has entered into trade treaties outside the presumed delegation of any Trade Agreements Act, and, furthermore, the executive branch contends it has that power.

In the recent so-called potato case—United States against Guy W. Capps, Inc., involving an executive trade agreement with Canada—it was actually contended that the executive powers transcended any legislation by Congress.

POTATO CASE REVIVES QUESTION OF "INHERENT POWERS" OF PRESIDENT

The executive agreement, in fact, had been made outside of any authorization by the Congress.

On this point Chief Judge John J. Parker of the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals said:

It is argued, however, that the validity of the executive agreement was not dependent upon the act of Congress but was made pursuant to the inherent powers of the President under the Constitution.

The answer is that while the President has certain inherent powers under the Constitution, such as the power pertaining to his position as Commander in Chief of Army and Navy and the power necessary to see that the laws are faithfully executed, the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is not among the powers incident to the Presidential office, but is expressly vested by the Constitution in the Congress.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON EXECUTIVE POWERS CITED

Judge Parker also cited the Supreme Court decision in the steel seizure case of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. against Sawyer, in which the Court stated:

In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States * * *." After granting many powers to the Congress, article I goes on to provide that Congress may "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution of the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Further in his decision, Judge Parker said:

Imports from a foreign country are foreign commerce subject to regulation, so far as this country is concerned, by Congress alone.

The Government carried this case to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court avoided completely the constitutional question involved and decided the case against the Government on other grounds.

I submit that in the clear-cut test of constitutionality filed today by the Morgantown Glassware Guild, if it reaches the Supreme Court, such an avoidance can hardly happen. I see no room in this case for either avoidance or evasion.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that even a 10-percent reduction in the duty may result in the almost complete annihilation of an industry, because such a reduction relates to the particular difference in the cost of production, considering the wage standard of living, the taxes, and the cost of doing business in the United States and in the chief competitive nation. So the only way in which the industry could remain in business, under a 10-percent reduction, would be to write off the investment and lower wages to meet the competition, otherwise it would have to go out of business. But in the case filed today plaintiff industry has been hurt by a reduction of duties on foreign goods competing against it, not 10 percent but 50 percent and even greater.

PRESIDENT HAS UNFETTERED DISCRETION IN TARIFF MATTERS UNDER PRESENT ACT

Today the President has unfettered discretion to modify duties, change them, prescribe them, the only limitation being that they may not be varied more than 50 percent. However, he is on the second 50-percent reduction, making a total reduction on many items of 75 percent.

The effect is that the President may cut off the legs of an industry, or the arms, or a leg and an arm, but cannot amputate more than half an industry at one stroke of the executioner's ax, or a maximum in some cases of three-fourths of an industry's protection.

The President has unfettered discretion under the so-called escape clause, which is to be continued unchanged under H. R. 1, and there is no escape from the President's authority at all.

The escape clause, of course, is to wet the public down for an additional 1, 2, or 3 years, whatever the extension is to be; it was never intended to be for the relief of industry.

The Tariff Commission may make an exhaustive review of the industry being decapitated by foreign imports, it can present findings of fact of injury or crippling damage caused by these imports, and it can make recommendations for relief based on these facts and findings only to have the President, in his unfettered discretion, throw the findings and recommendations into the wastebasket and rule in favor of the foreign competitor, as has been done in 10 of the 15 cases in which relief was found by the Tariff Commission to be justified and needed.

CAN ESCAPE CLAUSE BE VALID WHILE PRESIDENT HOLDS VETO POWER?

The escape clause itself, in my opinion, is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority so long as it gives absolute veto power to the President, as it does.

It presumes to delegate a power to the Tariff Commission, and at the same time delegates a power to the President to negate the power given to the Tariff Commission, both powers affecting the same tariff principle or tariff relief.

The delegation of power to the Tariff Commission is a nullity so long as the President can arbitrarily set this delegation aside.

As a learned judge has said in a similar case, likewise involving tariffs:

If the Commission finds the predetermined will of Congress, a presidential veto, or refusal to proclaim it, must then negative the congressional will.

In such cases the President expresses a contrary will of his own. The Commission's finding and the Presidential veto cannot both be the predetermined will of Congress. It cannot be two things at once.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the present escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act serves to emphasize the exercise of "unfettered discretion" by the President.

NO CHECK ON PRESIDENT'S POWER UNDER PRESENT ACT

No power, other than his own, determines the tariffs placed on imports today. There is no check, no balance of this power, no control or legislative regulation. It is sheer autocratic Executive power such as, in my opinion, the Constitution expressly prohibits, and it has been used as such.

In the minority views on the trade agreements bill itself, signed by 10 members of the Ways and Means Committee in 1934, they asked:

Should we place in the hands of one man the absolute power of life and death over every domestic producer dependent upon tariff protection, and allow him to destroy one industry in an attempt to find a foreign market for the surplus products—

That is the crux of the matter, Mr. President.

POWER TO DESTROY TOO GREAT TO PUT IN ONE MAN'S HAND

The power to destroy is too great a power to place in the hands of any one man as it now is in one man's hands, no matter how humanitarian, conscientious, and patriotic that man may be. It is too great a power to place in one man's hands even if it were constitutional, which it is not. Furthermore, it was not so intended by the Constitution.

There were other questions asked in that report. The objectors asked:

What are the implications of this authority?

In the first place—

They continued—

the negotiations of reciprocal trade agreements will be carried on in secret, as are all international negotiations.

Mr. President, no more truthful statement was ever uttered. All of them have been carried on in secret, and still are.

The State Department takes great pride in the fact that the negotiations are secret.

Secondly—

The report resumed—

the President will not do the negotiating himself, but will delegate his authority to subordinates.

How true.

REPORT CORRECTLY PREDICTED SUBORDINATES WOULD WIELD TARIFF POWERS

These subordinates may find that some foreign country is willing to take more of our typewriters or lard if we will reduce our duties on some industrial or agricultural product. They may consider that the domestic industry producing this particular product is uneconomic or inefficient—

How often we hear that from our present-day subordinates and free traders—

and that therefore it—

The particular industry—

should not be encouraged by further tariff protection.

Thereupon—

The report continued—

without notice to the domestic industry affected, or without opportunity for it to be heard, the agents of the President will concede the reduction in duty asked for by the foreign country and recommend to the President that the agreement be entered into by him and the necessary reduction in duty proclaimed. The President, in good faith, and in what he deems to be the public interest, may accept the recommendation of his subordinates and make the reduction in duty called for by the agreement.

As one result, the report pointed out—

Some branch of American agriculture or industry will be put out of business by the admission of the foreign product at a lower rate of duty.

We had a shining example of that in the case of an agricultural product, butter, which, as a result of lower duties, is imported from European nations, and sold in our domestic market, while American-produced butter is bought by the Government and stored. Then every so often we hear a prominent official in the administration threatening to give the American-produced butter to Russia or to sell it to American housewives at about half the price the Government paid for it. The only way American butter makers are kept from being put out of business is by having the rest of the taxpayers buy their butter and put it in storage.

REPORT CALLED PROCEDURE "UN-AMERICAN"

As I have pointed out, by the admission of a foreign product at a lower rate of duty the unfortunate victim, the American producer, will have been condemned to economic death, without appeal from the executioner's verdict.

This procedure—

The original 10 objectors, several of whom still are Members of the Congress, stated—

is decidedly un-American, and in conflict with the fundamental principle that neither a man's business, nor his property, nor his livelihood, should be taken from him except by due process of law.

Mr. President, hundreds if not thousands, of businessmen and industrialists throughout the Nation are today finding their enterprises, their property, and their livelihood taken away from them without any semblance of due process under constitutional procedure.

They are being deprived of their business, their property, and their livelihood by trade agreements entered into with foreign countries by subordinates of the President exercising what I considered arbitrary, unconscionable, and unconstitutional powers.

SUBORDINATES HOLDING LIFE OR DEATH POWERS OVER INDUSTRY ARE NOT ELECTED

Not one of these subordinates has been elected by the people to represent them in any capacity.

Not one of them is a representative of a single precinct, town, county, city, or State in any elective capacity.

Yet they assume life and death powers over, not only industries and jobs, but also over geographic areas and localities.

Mr. President, we have read statements from the State Department that Congress should appropriate money to enable idle workers to move from one area to another to seek other jobs, when their unemployment has been caused by trade agreements, and that investors should be compensated for their loss of investment.

Mr. Lincoln had something to say about that when in 1860 the Republican platform proposed to adjust import tariffs "so as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country," Mr. Lincoln said:

If this Nation is ever destroyed, it will be not from without but from within.

He did not say that there would be both an economic and political approach to destroy the Nation, but he very clearly had a premonition to that effect.

At another time, we were engaged in building railroads across the country. At the end of the Civil War there were no transcontinental railroads. So after Congress had decided that there should be transcontinental railroads, the problem arose as to whether we should build foundries in this country to manufacture steel rails or whether we should buy them from England, which country already knew how to make steel rails. Abraham Lincoln used that great brain of his for a while and then said something in keeping with the commonsense for which he was noted. He said:

If we purchase a ton of steel rails from England for $20, then we have the rails and England has the money; but if we buy a ton of steel rails from an American for $25, then America has both the rails and the money.

It sounds a little bit like the Buy American clause Mr. President, with a 25 percent advantage.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Nevada aware of the fact that the quotation which he has ascribed to Lincoln is in all probabality a purely fictitious quotation which was attributed to Lincoln by advocates of the protective tariff, but which cannot be found in any speech or statement of the great Emancipator? I urge the Senator from Nevada to consult the various biographies of Lincoln, including an article published in the Journal of the American Economic Association written by Mr. Taussig 38 years ago, as well as the authorized anthologies of Lincoln writers. I love Lincoln too much to have the Senator from Nevada desecrate his memory by quoting an alleged statement by Lincoln which he never made.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would simply say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that for 22 years all the New Dealers, including the Senator from Illinois, have tried to desecrate the memory of every great man we have had by belittling almost every commonsense statement he ever made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the question is simply whether Lincoln said this or did not say it. There is no evidence that he ever said it. The Senator from Nevada, apparently in good faith, is attributing to Lincoln a statement he never uttered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have given the distinguished Senator from Illinois all the time it is necessary for him to have to further desecrate the memory of Lincoln. The facts are that Lincoln ran on a platform in 1860—a Republican platform—pledging protection to labor and industry—so as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country—and was elected. Abraham Lincoln always stood for the workingman and for free enterprise, and there is ample record. I think evidence can be found to the effect that George Washington did not

cut down the cherry tree; furthermore, I think ample evidence can be found to the effect that many things were said by both of those great men, and all of them make good commonsense.

Again, Mr. President, I say that for 22 years, less common horsesense has been exercised in Washington, D. C. than in any other place I have ever been. This is the only country on earth where some men are not for their own country. Instead, they are in favor of dividing our wealth with all the other nations; and in all the debates in which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has engaged, all his remarks have been along that line.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the sake of the record——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada declines to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois when he has any questions to ask, but I decline to yield for a speech by him.

DISTRESS AREAS INCREASE FROM 37 TO 144 IN 2 YEARS

Eleven months ago, Mr. President, I read into the RECORD the list of distressed areas in the United States, as the list was constituted at that time. There were 80 of these areas then. There are now 144, or were at the time of the January 1955, check made by the Department of Labor, the report of which was received only several weeks ago. If the distinguished Senator from Illinois will listen, I think he will find that some of them are in Illinois.

This is 107 more distressed areas than there were in January 1953; 93 more than there were in January 1954; and 64 more than at the time of my report last March.

In that report I broke down the distressed areas into the dominant industries which have been injured by imports of foreign goods. I demonstrated that a preponderant majority of these distressed areas were in distress because cheap foreign imports from countries subsidized by billions in American tax dollars had invaded and captured much of the American market.

Today, I shall not attempt to break down the record, industry by industry, or occupation by occupation. Each distinguished Member of this body knows what areas in his State are suffering a depression, what industries in these areas have been cut down or destroyed, and approximately the number of industrious citizens who have been thrown out of work; and each Senator knows, or should know, what effect imports of foreign goods have had on these distressed areas and depressed industries.

SUPERDISTRESSED AREAS NOW ADDED TO DISTRESSED AREA LIST

Mr. President, since my address of March 31, 1954, the Labor Department has seen fit to break down the distressed areas into two classes, Group IV–A and group IV–B, the distinction being that in group IV–B unemployment—or labor surplus, as the Labor Department prefers to call it—exceed 12 percent of the labor force, while in group IV–A only 6 to 12 percent of the workers are out of jobs.

We thus have in the United States distressed areas and superdistressed areas—144 of them at present; and they do not receive one dime of Mr. Harold Stassen's foreign aid. They are distressed despite prosperity in certain parts of the country, and despite reasonably stable conditions in other parts of the country. If Senators will look closely for the reason why these areas should be distressed and others not, I think they will find this is the reason.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Nevada say that the great increase in the number of distressed areas in the last 2 years is proof of Republican prosperity?

DEMOCRATS FOR FREE TRADE; REPUBLICANS FOR PROTECTING WORKINGMAN AND MARKETS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would say that I am not defending our mistakes, any more than I defend the mistakes of the Democratic administrations for 20 years.

For 70 years—and the Senator from Nevada documented the evidence—the Democratic Party has been in favor of free trade. Every one of the national conventions of the Democratic Party has adopted a resolution to that effect. Every one of the Republican conventions for 70 years has been in favor of duties to make up the differential between the wage-standard of living and the taxes and the cost of doing business, as between the United States and the highest competitive nation, in the case of each product. That is for the purpose of protecting the workingman and industries of the United States of America.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we repeat the same mistake, there is no excuse for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, Mr. President, I take it that the answer of the Senator from Nevada is that the 2 years of Republican prosperity have largely been fictitious, and that the result has been a great increase in the number of distressed areas.

WAR-BUILT PROSPERITY IN PAST 20 YEARS FICTITIOUS

Mr. MALONE. Not only that, Mr. President; but I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that for 20 years the so-called prosperity has been fictitious. In other words, in that period there have been two world wars, plus the WPA and the PWA, and now preparations for war, and the sending of billions of dollars to Europe to enable the countries of Europe to buy American goods. This is much the same as in the case of a little grocery store which could not do enough business—the grocer might go to the bank and might borrow money with which to purchase groceries from his own store. That is the kind of prosperity we have, and we are treading on water, and that is dangerous.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I treading on water, or is the Republican administration treading on water?

Mr. MALONE. The present Republican administration has thus far carried out the Democratic platform that has been in existence for 70 years. The only reason the Democrats have never been hurt particularly before is that they never have been in office long enough in peacetime to put their theory into play. But they did during World War I; and immediately afterward, they had to call a special session of the Congress in an attempt to pull the country out of the depression. During the past 20 years they were in war, or preparing for war 12 years, and maintaining a fictitious prosperity by keeping the Nation on a war economy. Democrats have never brought prosperity in peacetime.

Mr. President, when a Democratic principle, such as free trade, is wrong, it does not make it right for a Republican administration to follow it. However, we have not yet followed the Democratic free-trade principle permanently. We have been extending it. In 1953, we extended the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year. In 1954 we extended it for another year. This Senate has not yet extended it. Today, as I have pointed out, there has been filed in the Federal district court a suit to determine the constitutionality of the act; and I have an idea that before a good many people are much older, they will be listening to that suit.

TRADE ACT BORN AS AN EMERGENCY ACT

In 1934, the Trade Agreements Act was passed for 3 years, as an emergency measure. Every few years thereafter it was extended. In 1951, some of us were able to cut the extension to 2 years. In 1953, we were able to cut the extension to 1 year. We were able to do the same in 1954.

This year we are confronted with a request for an extension for 3 years, together with a 15 percent further reduction in tariffs. Such a measure has not yet been passed by Congress.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to say that in this country we have had an awful lot of advice from various persons—from the President, down—who have been telling us what Congress is going to do and what the policy of the United States will be. In many speeches, various Senators and Representatives have been saying what the national policy will be; and similar statements have been made by top administrative officials.

PRESENT TRADE ACT EXTENSION BILL WILL SPELL DESTRUCTION OF SMALL INVESTORS

Mr. President, I should like to predict what the policy of the Nation is going to be. It is going to be what Congress passes, after full debate, and what the President signs. That is what it is going to be. Congress has not yet passed the proposal for a 3-year extension of the act. Furthermore, last year, Congress did not extend the act for 3 years; neither did Congress agree to make the presently proposed 15 percent reduction in tariffs, all of which would have completely destroyed the small investors in the United States. These small investors are the ones who do not have sufficient credit or funds to enable them to build their plants on foreign soil and there use the low-wage labor of foreign countries, to compete with American

labor by sending into the United States markets the products thus developed in foreign countries.

I shall be glad to yield any time any Senator wishes to ask a question.

BLIGHT DUE TO IMPORTS STEADILY GROWING

Mr. President, the areas of distress and superdistress in the Nation today are those which have been and are being cut down by foreign-import competition. The areas not yet suffering distress are those where the effects of import competition have not yet reached a crippling extent. However, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act all areas are under a continued threat of reduction or extinction, because the State Department fixes the tariff rates or duties, and fixes them ever downward.

EXPIRATION OF TRADE ACT ON JUNE 12 WOULD RESTORE PRINCIPLE OF FAIR COMPETITION

When one executive officer, with unlimited authority, has the power of life or death over the investment of an American investor or the job of an American workingman, then private investments are not available, as they would be under a basic principle established by Congress, as the Constitution contemplated. This would end with expiration of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which is now scheduled to die at midnight of June 12. Then we would revert to the 1930 Tariff Act. Under the 1930 tariff law the question of the duty would be determined by the Tariff Commission, an agency of Congress. Then the Tariff Commission would be bound by the principle prescribed in the 1930 law of determining the difference between the cost of production of an article in this Nation and the cost of producing a like article in the chief competitive country. The Commission would then recommend that difference as the tariff.

As the wage standard of living rose in other countries, tariffs could come down in this country, and would come down under the principle established by law in the 1930 Tariff Act. A change in that principle requires action by Congress. The Tariff Commission is working in accordance with a principle as the Interstate Commerce Commission is working in the regulation of freight rates according to a certain principle. At one time every railroad had a different rate for every important shipper. That system did not work very well, so Congress enacted a law creating the Interstate Commerce Commission and establishing a principle by which it should work in regulating freight rates.

What was that principle? That principle was based upon a reasonable return on the investment. Congress did not say that the President of the United States, through an administrative officer, could fix any freight rates he wished to fix. It created the Interstate Commerce Commission, an agent of Congress. The Tariff Commission is an agent of Congress. Congress laid down the principle under which the Interstate Commerce Commission was to operate in fixing freight rates on the basis of a reasonable return on the investment.

The Tariff Commission was created as an agent of Congress, and the principle was laid down that the difference in cost of production of an article as between this country and the chief competitive nation was to govern the tariff.

POWER OVER TARIFFS IN ANY ONE MAN'S HANDS IS WRONG

To give anyone, whether he be the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or any other individual, the power of life and death over an industry or over a man's job, is unthinkable. Even if it were constitutional, it would be clearly beyond anything that has ever been done in the United States. It would mean a return to the old English system of taxation without representation, which resulted in the Boston Tea Party.

Mr. President, the list of areas blighted by import competition is constantly growing, and growing rapidly. From 37 to 144 in 2 short years is a tragic increase, a growth that can be fatal to our entire national economy. It is creeping economic paralysis brought about by an unconstitutional grant of authority.

NEW ENGLAND SUFFERING FROM IMPORT COMPETITION

Let us look to the distressed areas in region I first, which embraces New England.

There I find under group IV–A distressed areas the following:

Bristol, Conn.; Biddeford, Maine; Fall River, Mass.; Fitchburg, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; Milford, Mass.; New Bedford, Mass.; North Adams, Mass.; Providence, R. I.; and Springfield, Vt.; 10 in all.

But under group IV–B, the superdistressed list, I find three more: Lawrence, Mass.; Southbridge-Webster, Mass.; and Burlington, Vt.

To recapitulate, there are 8 in Massachusetts, 2 in Vermont, and 1 each in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Maine.

Ask the industrialists and businessmen in these cities, ask the jobless textile worker or costume jewelry craftsman, ask the unemployed in any productive occupation in these cities and communities what has blighted their areas. You will find one answer: Imports—imports of cheap, foreign, sweatshop goods from countries that are being subsidized in billions of American tax dollars.

NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY DISTRESSED AREAS LISTED

Let us move on now to region II, New York, New Jersey, and Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rico areas, all three of them, have been in distress for several years; their distress is chronic.

But in addition to Puerto Rico, we find 5 distressed New York State areas, and 3 superdistressed New York State areas. The former are Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Buffalo, Hudson, Oswego-Fulton, and Utica-Rome, 9 cities within 5 areas, and in the latter classification Auburn, Amsterdam, and Gloversville, where 12 percent or more of the labor force is jobless.

Eventually I expect to discuss in some detail the causes of their distress, as reported from other sources, and the effects of imports on their economy. Paterson, N. J., and Atlantic City are the two other class 4 areas in this region.

MID-ATLANTIC STATES HURT BY IMPORT FLOOD

I now come to region III, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia, which the import blight has struck with the greatest vengeance of any region in the United States.

Forty-three distressed areas are in this mid-Atlantic region, and 25 of them are superdistressed.

Pennsylvania has 12 class IV–B areas where 12 percent or more of the labor force is unemployed: Altoona, Butler, Clearfield-Du Bois, Indiana, Johnstown, Kittanning-Ford City, Lock Haven, Pottsville, Scranton, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville, and Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.

The Keystone State also has 8 class IV–A distressed areas with 6 to 12 percent of the labor force out of jobs, Berwick-Bloomsburg, Erie, Newcastle, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, and Williamsport.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SEEK PENNSYLVANIA AREA VIEWS ON FREE TRADE

Are they enthusiastic and inspired by the State Department's free-trade program? Ask them. Do they want the Trade Agreements Act extended to give foreign producers further opportunity with further tariff cuts, to flood the American market with foreign goods, cutting down American payrolls and closing American plants, mills, mines, and factories? Ask them. Or perhaps the President should ask them. After all, he is a prospective Pennsylvanian.

West Virginia has 9 superdistressd areas and 4 that are merely distressed. The former are Beckley, Bluefield, Charleston, Fairmont, Logan, Morgantown, Point Pleasant, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, and Welch.

The latter are Clarksburg, Huntington, Parkersburg, and Wheeling.

That is a total of 13. How do they feel about extending further free-trade advantage to foreign producers of residual oil, or glassware, or pottery, or electrical equipment, or other products that are pouring in on the cutrate tariff wave and swamping their traditional American markets?

SOUTH ALSO HURT BY IMPORTS

North Carolina has five distressed areas, Asheville, Durham, Kinston, Waynesville, and Winston-Salem. Maryland, one: Cumberland. Virginia, four: Radford-Pulaski, in class IV–A, and Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Covington-Clifton Forge, and Richlands-Bluefield in the superdistressed class IV–B.

Mr. President, region IV embraces Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee, which hold great industrial promise for the future if their manufacturing industries are permitted to thrive. Under free-trade theories this should be the most prosperous region in the United States, and yet I regret to find that there are 15 distressed areas in this region: Alexander City, Anniston, Decatur, Florence-Sheffield, Gadsen, Jasper, and Talladega, Ala.; Cedartown-Rockmart and Cordele, Ga.; Walterboro, S. C.; and Chattanooga, Knoxville, Newport, Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol and La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell, Tenn.

Three of these areas are superdistressed: Jasper, Ala., and La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell and Newport, Tenn.

MIDWEST AREAS SUFFER FROM MARKET LOSS

Region V—Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio, have 29 distressed areas, 10 of them in the superdistressed category.

The 10 are Corbin, Hazard, Henderson, Madisonville, Middlesboro-Harlan, Morehead-Grayson, Paintsville-Prestonburg, and Pikeville, Ky.; Iron Mountain, Mich.; and Cambridge, Ohio.

They are in the group where 12 percent or more of their working citizens are unemployed.

The areas where unemployment ranges only from 6 to 12 percent are Frankford and Owensboro, Ky.; Adrian, Battle Creek, Bay City, Benton Harbor, Ionia-Belding-Greenville, Jackson, Monroe, Muskegon, Owosso, and Port Huron, Mich.; and Canton, Findlay-Tiffin-Fostoria, Mansfield, Newark, Sandusky-Fremont, Springfield, and Toledo, Ohio.

LOSS OF MARKETS TO FOREIGN COMPETITORS FATAL TO PROSPERITY

All are fine American cities and communities. All have enjoyed maximum employment and prosperity in the past. All of them once had the advantage of the world's greatest market, the United States of America, for their products, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and equal access to their own American markets.

What has caused those markets to shrink, and in many instances to dry up?

Money?

We have more money in circulation now than ever before.

Depression?

We have no general depression. We have spot depressions, as these 144 distressed areas could testify, but elsewhere we have a relative degree of prosperity.

Then what has happened to the market for the products of these areas?

I can tell the Senate.

The domestic market in large measure has been captured by our foreign competitors with their slave-wage, government-subsidized foreign goods, which in the main have been financed through American aid and American tax dollars.

Any one commodity made by foreign labor and imported into the United States means one less of that commodity to be made by American labor in an American factory in an American city or community.

FOREIGN COMPETITORS SUBSIDIZED BY 50 BILLION OF OUR MONEY SINCE WAR

American labor, American industry, and American communities are quite willing to compete against foreign labor, foreign industry, and foreign commodities on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, but there is no assurance of such fair and reasonable competition since the State Department took over under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

We have poured $50 billion since the war into foreign countries to build up foreign competitive industries manufacturing the same commodities that we do.

This is known as foreign aid.

Having built foreign industries to overcapacity, with production so immense that the European countries cannot absorb their own production but have a surplus, we have undertaken to absorb whatever surplus they may have in our own markets.

We have encouraged them to sell their products, the same products we make ourselves, in the American market, and we have done and are doing this by lowering tariffs so that they can outbid us for the American dollar in our own market.

First, we financed overproduction in Europe's industries, built up in Europe an industrial surplus and a commodity surplus, and now we are trying to take that surplus off Europe's hands by dumping it on the American market. The same is true in Japan.

The American market simply will not sustain America's full production and Europe's excess production both at the same time, and never has.

Something had to give, and it is American industry, American working men and women, and American communities that have had to give.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY DEPRIVED OF EQUAL ACCESS TO OWN MARKETS

American industry has had to give because, in the absence of fair and reasonable competitive tariffs or duties based on the difference in wages, taxes, and other production factors, the American workingmen and the American industry has been deprived of equal access and equality of opportunity in their own markets.

The Midwest, like the East, is losing the American market to low-wage competitive foreign products financed by our own tax dollars. We build our own competition with our own money.

A tariff is a tax on imports.

The tax on imports has been reduced for the benefit of low-wage foreigners from 50 to 75 percent, and two-thirds of our imports pay no tax at all.

No such tax cut has been given to Americans by the Federal Government, or by State, county, or city governments, and none could be.

But foreigners shipping their goods to America to compete with American industry and labor, have had a whopping tax cut under the Trade Agreements Act, or pay no tax at all, and legislation is pending in the Congress now to give foreign competition further cuts in tariff taxes ranging from 15 to 50 percent.

We are threatening to go even further. A bill now before Congress—recommended by the President—would give a foreign investor a 14-percent advantage in income tax over a domestic producer. That means a 14-percent advantage if an American investor will invest his money on foreign soil instead of in America.

I contend it is morally wrong to extend privileges to foreign citizens and industries which not only are denied to American citizens and industries, but which American citizens and industries have had to finance and subsidize.

I contend it is likewise unconstitutional under present procedure.

But let me proceed to the record of our distressed areas.

DISTRESSED SIGNALS ALSO UP IN WEST

We have discussed the record east of the Mississippi, and now we cross that mighty river to the west.

In region VII, which includes Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas, we find 7 distressed areas: Burlington, Ottumwa, Iowa; Joplin, St. Joseph, St. Louis, and Springfield, Mo. and Pittsburg, Kans., the latter with more than 12 percent unemployment.

In region VIII, are Fort Smith, Ark., McAlister and Muskogee, Okla., and Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.

In region IX we find only Albuquerque, N. Mex., and in region XI, we have Portland, Oreg., and Tacoma, Wash.

To date these distressed areas west of the Mississippi have been relatively free from the import flood of subsidized low-wage goods from foreign countries, although Tacoma, Wash., I am told, has had to face strong Canadian competition resulting from lowered tariff rates on Canadian products, and high Canadian tariffs or import bars on American products.

FATE OF MANY CITIES AND COMMUNITIES HANGS ON COURT TEST

It would seem to the senior Senator from Nevada, Mr. President, that many of these distressed areas scattered over the United States, these blighted towns and cities in the midst of plenty, and their leaders in government, industry, and labor, should be concerned, if they are not already, in the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act.

We are now engaged in attempting to favor some distressed areas in Government contracts, thus creating more distressed areas by moving defense industries from one area to another.

It is the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which has opened the gates to unfair competition by low-wage, low-taxed, foreign goods undercutting American products in our own markets.

It is this act which puts foreign prosperity above America's economy and welfare, foreign jobs ahead of American jobs, foreign investors, businessmen, and brokers above American investors, businessmen, and brokers.

It is also putting foreign industrial communities and areas ahead of American industrial communities and areas.

STATE DEPARTMENT OPERATES GIANT "DISCOUNT HOUSE" FOR FOREIGN TRADERS

Under the Trade Agreements Act the State Department operates a giant international discount house with all the discounts going to the foreigners.

Foreign products were shipped to the United States and brought in with discounts ranging up to 75 percent.

Under H. R. 1 the State Department wants to increase the discount from 15 to 50 percent further.

American business, labor, and industry cannot stand these discounts to foreign competitors. American cities and communities cannot stand these discounts. And in my opinion, Mr. President, these discounts to foreigners are illegal and unconstitutional.

NO AUTHORITY FOR PREFERENTIAL DISCOUNTS TO FOREIGNERS IN CONSTITUTION

Congress, in the first place, has no authority, under the Constitution, to delegate to the State Department powers to grant these preferential discounts to foreigners.

Congress has no authority under the Constitution to transfer its taxing and tariff powers to the executive branch.

Congress has no authority under the Constitution to transfer to the executive branch its commerce powers. Every commodity that comes into the United States is commerce.

Government as a whole has no authority whatsoever, under the Constitution, to deprive any American citizen of his property without due process of law.

Congress did attempt to transfer its taxing power when it enacted the Trade Agreements Act.

Congress did attempt to transfer its commerce powers through the Trade Agreements Act.

And the Government has been and is depriving American citizens of their property and livelihood without due process of law, using the Trade Agreements Act as its weapon.

Mr. President, I should like to bring up one further point before I complete my remarks on this occasion.

The Tariff Act of 1930 is still the act under which we are operating, and the Trade Agreements Act consists merely of an amendment, although a disastrous amendment in my opinion.

H. R. 1, now before the Senate Committee on Finance, is a bill, as it states by its own language, "to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930."

The Tariff Act of 1930, as we know, provided for a flexible tariff.

CORDELL HULL'S POSITION ON FLEXIBLE TARIFFS CITED

What did Mr. Cordell Hull, then a member of the Ways and Means Committee, but later to serve as Secretary of State, say about these flexible provisions then? He called them "subversive of the plain functions of Congress." Senators will find his remarks in his minority report on the tariff bill of 1930.

Mr. Hull, then Representative Hull, referred to the bill on another occasion as constituting an "unjustifiable arrogance of power and authority to the President."

And on May 9, 1932, Mr. Hull said in a speech that these provisions virtually vested in the President "supreme taxing power of the Nation, contrary to the plainest and most fundamental provisions of the Constitution."

I repeat: "Contrary to the plainest and most fundamental provisions of the Constitution."

Yet we later find Mr. Cordell Hull approving and administering these same powers vested in the President which, as he stated, are "contrary to the plainest and most fundamental provisions of the Constitution."

VOTE RECORD BY STATES IN HOUSE ON H. R. 1 CITED

Mr. President, only recently the House passed a 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act after considerable debate and a floor fight, to say nothing of the battle which took place in the Ways and Means Committee.

As Senators know, a majority in the House can invoke cloture at any time. That is different from the situation prevailing in the Senate. They won cloture by one vote. Later on, a motion to recommit the bill was lost by a vote of 206 to 199, a difference of 7 votes.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a record of that vote, by States, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the vote, by States, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 1—VOTE ON REED RECOMMITTAL MOTION

RECAPITULATION

Total vote: 199 for, 206 against.

How Democrats voted: For, 80, against, 140.

How Republicans voted: For, 199; against, 66.

Paired votes: For, 3 Democrats, 6 Republicans; against, 6 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

THE VOTE BY STATES

Alabama—9 votes

For, 2: George W. Andrews, Democrat; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Democrat.

Against, 7: Frank W. Boykin, Democrat; George M. Grant, Democrat; George Huddleston, Democrat; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Democrat; Albert Rains, Democrat; Kenneth A. Roberts, Democrat; Carl Elliott, Democrat.

Arizona—2 votes

For, 1: John J. Rhodes, Republican.

Against, 1: Stewart L. Udall, Democrat.

Arkansas—6 votes

For, none.

Against, 6: E. C. Gathings, Democrat; Wilbur D. Mills, Democrat; James W. Trimble, Democrat; Oren Harris, Democrat; Brooks Hays, Democrat; W. F. Norrell, Democrat.

California—30 votes

For, 12: Clair Engle, Democrat; John J. Allen, Jr., Republican; Edgar W. Hiestand, Republican; Craig Hosmer, Republican; Glenard Lipscomb, Republican; Gordon L. McDonough, Republican; John Phillips, Republican; Hubert B. Scudder, Republican; James B. Utt, Republican; Robert C. Wilson, Republican; Charles S. Gubser, Republican.

Against, 18: Clyde Doyle, Democrat; Harlan Hagen, Democrat; Chet Holifield, Democrat; Cecil King, Democrat; George P. Miller, Democrat; John E. Moss, Jr., Democrat; James Roosevelt, Democrat; Harry R. Sheppard, Democrat; B. F. Sisk, Democrat; John F. Baldwin, Republican; Patrick J. Hillings, Republican; Carl Hinshaw, Republican; Joe Holt, Republican; William S. Mailliard, Republican; Charles M. Teague, Republican; J. Arthur Younger, Republican.

Absent but paired for: Leroy Johnson, Republican.

Absent but paired against: John F. Shelley, Democrat; Donald L. Jackson, Republican.

Colorado—4 votes

For, 4: Wayne N. Aspinall, Democrat; Byron G. Rogers, Democrat; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Republican; William S. Hill, Republican.

Against, none.

Connecticut—6 votes

For, 5: Horace Seely-Brown, Democrat; Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat; Albert W. Cretella, Republican; James T. Patterson, Republican; Antoni N. Sadlak, Republican.

Against, 1: Albert P. Morano, Republican.

Delaware—1 vote

For, none.

Against, 1: Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Democrat.

Florida—8 votes

For, 2: James A. Haley, Democrat; Robert L. F. Sikes, Democrat.

Against, 6: Paul G. Rogers, Democrat; Charles E. Bennett, Democrat; Dante B. Fascell, Democrat; A. S. (Syd) Herlong, Jr., Democrat; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Democrat; William C. Cramer, Republican.

Georgia—10 votes

For, 8: Iris Faircloth Blitch, Democrat; Paul Brown, Democrat; James C. Davis, Democrat; E. L. (Tic) Forrester, Democrat; John J. Flynt, Jr., Democrat; Phil M. Landrum, Democrat; Henderson Lanham, Democrat; J. L. Pilcher, Democrat.

Against, 2: Prince H. Preston, Democrat; Carl Vinson, Democrat.

Idaho—2 votes

For, 2: Gracie Pfost, Democrat; Hamer H. Budge, Republican.

Against: None.

Illinois—25 votes

For, 6: Kenneth J. Gray, Democrat; Richard W. Hoffman, Republican; Noah M. Mason, Republican; William E. McVey, Republican; Chauncey W. Reed, Republican; Charles W. Vursell, Republican.

Against, 19: Barrett O'Hara, Democrat; James C. Murray, Democrat; Thomas J. O'Brien, Democrat; James B. Bowler, Democrat; Thomas S. Gordon, Democrat; Sidney R. Yates, Democrat; Charles A. Boyle, Democrat; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Democrat; Melvin Price, Democrat; Timothy P. Sheehan, Republican; Marguerite Stitt Church, Republican; Leo E. Allen, Republican; Leslie C. Arends, Republican; Harold H. Velde, Republican; Robert B. Chiperfield, Republican; Sid Simpson, Republican; William L. Springer, Republican.

Absent but paired against: William L. Dawson, Democrat; John C. Kluczynski, Democrat.

Indiana—11 votes

For, 4: E. Ross Adair, Republican; John V. Beamer, Republican; William G. Bray, Republican; Ralph Harvey, Republican.

Against, 7: Winfield K. Denton, Democrat; Ray J. Madden, Democrat; Charles B. Brownson, Republican; Shepard J. Crumpacker, Jr., Republican; Charles A. Halleck, Republican; Cecil M. Harden, Republican; Earl Wilson, Republican.

Iowa—8 votes

For, 3: James I. Dolliver, Republican; H. R. Gross, Republican; Ben F. Jensen, Republican.

Against, 4: Paul Cunningham, Republican; Charles B. Hoeven, Republican; Karl M. LeCompte, Republican; Fred Schwengel, Republican.

Absent or not voting, 1: Henry O. Talle, Republican.

Kansas—6 votes

For, 3: Edward H. Rees, Republican; Errett P. Scrivner, Republican; Wint Smith, Republican.

Against, 2: William H. Avery, Republican; Clifford R. Hope, Republican.

Absent or not voting, 1: Myron V. George, Republican.

Kentucky—8 votes

For, 1: Carl D. Perkins, Democrat.

Against, 6: Noble J. Gregory, Democrat; William H. Natcher, Democrat; Frank Chelf, Democrat; John C. Watts, Democrat; John M. Robsion, Jr., Republican.

Absent or not voting, 1: Eugene Siler, Republican.

Absent but paired against: Brent Spence, Democrat.

Louisiana—8 votes

For, 2: T. A. Thompson, Democrat; Edwin E. Willis, Democrat.

Against, 6: Hale Boggs, Democrat; Overton Brooks, Democrat; George S. Long, Democrat; Otto E. Passman, Democrat.

Absent but paired against: F. Edward Hébert, Democrat; James H. Morrison, Democrat.

Maine—3 votes

For, 3: Robert Hale, Republican; Clifford G. McIntire, Republican; Charles P. Nelson, Republican.

Against, none.

Maryland—7 votes

For, 2: James P. S. Devereaux, Republican; DeWitt S. Hyde, Republican.

Against, 5: George H. Fallon, Democrat; Samuel N. Friedel, Democrat; Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat; Richard E. Lankford, Democrat; Edward T. Miller, Republican.

Massachusetts—14 votes

For, 10: Edward P. Boland, Democrat; Philip J. Philbin, Democrat; Harold D. Donohue, Democrat; Thomas J. Lanes, Democrat; Torbert H. Macdonald, Democrat; William H. Bates, Republican; Edith Nourse Rogers, Republican; Donald W. Nicholson, Republican; Laurence Curtis, Republican; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Republican.

Against, 4: John W. McCormack, Democrat; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Democrat; Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Republican; John W. Heselton, Republican.

Michigan—18 votes

For, 8: John B. Bennett, Republican; Elford A. Cederberg, Republican; George A. Dondero, Republican; Victor A. Knox, Republican; August E. Johansen, Republican; George Meader, Republican; Ruth Thompson, Republican.

Against, 9: John D. Dingell, Democrat; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Democrat; Don Hayworth, Democrat; Louis C. Rabaut, Democrat; John Lesinski, Jr., Democrat; Martha W. Griffiths, Democrat; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Republican.

Absent but paired, for: Clare E. Hoffman, Republican.

Absent or not voting, 1: Jesse P. Wolcott, Republican.

Absent but paired against: Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Democrat; Alvin M. Bentley, Republican.

Minnesota—9 votes

For, 3: August H. Andresen, Republican; H. Carl Andersen, Republican; Joseph P. O'Hara, Republican.

Against, 6: Roy W. Wier, Democrat; Eugene J. McCarthy, Democrat; Fred Marshall, Democrat; John A. Blatnik, Democrat; Coya Knutson, Democrat.

Absent but paired against: Walter H. Judd, Republican.

Mississippi—6 votes

For, 2: William M. Colmer, Democrat; John Bell Williams, Democrat.

Against, 4: Thomas G. Abernethy, Democrat; Jamie L. Whitten, Democrat; Frank E. Smith, Democrat; Arthur Winstead, Democrat.

Missouri—11 votes

For, 3: A. S. J. Carnahan, Democrat; Thomas B. Curtis, Republican.

Against, 8: Frank M. Karsten, Democrat; Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat; George H. Christopher, Democrat; Richard Bolling, Democrat; W. R. Hull, Jr., Democrat; Clarence Cannon, Democrat; Paul C. Jones, Democrat; Morgan M. Moulder, Democrat.

Absent but paired for: Dewey Short, Republican.

Montana—2 votes

For, 2: Lee Metcalf, Democrat; Orvin B. Fjare, Republican.

Against: None.

Nebraska—4 votes

For: None.

Against, 4: Phil Weaver, Republican; Jackson B. Chase, Republican; Robert D. Harrison, Republican; A. L. Miller, Republican.

Nevada—1 vote

Absent or not voting, 1: Clifton Young, Republican.

New Hampshire—2 votes

For, 1: Chester E. Merrow, Republican.

Against, 1: Perkins Bass, Republican.

New Jersey—14 votes

For, 8: Alfred D. Sieminski, Democrat; T. James Tumulty, Democrat; Charles A. Wolverton, Republican; T. Millet Hand, Republican; James C. Auchincloss, Republican; William B. Widnall, Republican, Gordon Canfield, Republican; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., Republican.

Against, 6: Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Democrat; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat; Hugh J. Addonizio, Democrat; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., Republican; Robert W. Kean, Republican.

New Mexico—2 votes

For, 1: Antonio M. Fernandez, Democrat.

Against: None.

Absent but paired for: John J. Dempsey, Democrat.

New York—43 votes

For, 15: Leo W. O'Brien, Democrat; Frank J. Becker, Republican; Henry J. Latham, Republican; Albert H. Bosch, Republican; John H. Ray, Republican; Paul A. Fino, Republican; Ralph W. Gwinn, Republican; Dean P. Taylor, Republican; Bernard W. Kearney, Republican; William R. Williams, Republican; R. Walter Riehlman, Republican; John Taber, Republican; William E. Miller, Republican; Daniel A. Reed, Republican.

Against, 27: Lester Holtzman, Democrat; James J. Delaney, Democrat; Victor L. Anfuso, Democrat; Eugene J. Keogh, Democrat; Edna F. Kelly, Democrat; Emanuel Celler, Democrat; Abraham J. Multer, Democrat; John J. Rooney, Democrat; Adams Clayton Powell, Jr., Democrat; James G. Donovan, Democrat; Arthur G. Klein, Democrat; Irwin D. Davidson, Democrat; Herbert Zelenko, Democrat; Sidney A. Fine, Democrat; Isidore Dollinger, Democrat; Charles A. Buckley, Democrat; Stuyvesant Wainwright, Republican, Steven B. Derounian, Republican; Francis E. Dorn, Republican; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., Republican; Ralph A. Gamble, Republican; Katharine St. George, Republican; J. Ernest Wharton, Republican; Clarence E. Kilburn, Republican; Kenneth B. Keating, Republican; Harold C. Ostertag, Republican; John R. Pillion, Republican.

Absent but paired for: W. Sterling Cole, Republican.

Absent or not voting, 1: Edmund P. Radwan, Republican.

North Carolina—12 votes

For, 7: Graham A. Barden, Democrat; Carl T. Durham, Democrat; F. Ertel Carlyle, Democrat; Hugh Q. Alexander, Democrat; Woodrow W. Jones, Democrat; George A. Shuford, Democrat; Charles Raper Jonas, Republican.

Against, 5: Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat; L. H. Fountain, Democrat; Harold D. Cooley, Democrat; Thurmond Chatham, Democrat; Charles B. Deane, Democrat.

North Dakota—2 votes

For, 1: Usher L. Burdick, Republican.

Against, 1: Otto Krueger, Republican.

Ohio—23 votes

For, 12: Wayne L. Hays, Democrat; Gordon H. Scherer, Republican; Paul F. Schenck, Republican; William M. McCulloch, Republican; Clarence J. Brown, Republican; Jackson E. Betts, Republican; Thomas A. Jenkins, Republican; A. D. Baumhart, Jr., Republican; John E. Henderson, Republican; Frank T. Bow, Republican.

Against, 9: James G. Polk, Democrat; Thomas L. Ashley, Democrat; Michael J. Kirwan, Democrat; Michael A. Feighan, Democrat; Charles A. Vanik, Democrat; Frances P. Bolton, Republican; John M. Vorys, Republican; William H. Ayres, Republican; William E. Minshall, Republican.

Absent but paired for: William E. Hess, Republican; Oliver P. Bolton, Republican.

Absent or not voting, 2: J. Harry McGregor, Republican; Cliff Clevenger, Republican.

Oklahoma—6 votes

For, 5: Ed Edmondson, Democrat; John Jarman, Democrat; Victor Wickersham, Democrat; Page Belcher, Republican.

Against, 1: Carl Albert, Democrat.

Absent but paired for: Tom Steed, Democrat.

Oregon—4 votes

For, 2: Sam Coon, Republican; Harris Ellsworth, Republican.

Against, 2: Walter Norblad, Republican; Edith Green, Republican.

Pennsylvania—30 votes

For, 22: William A. Barrett, Democrat, William T. Granahan, Democrat; James A. Byrne, Democrat; Earl Chudoff, Democrat; William J. Green, Jr., Democrat; Daniel J. Flood, Democrat; Francis E. Walter, Democrat; James M. Quigley, Democrat; Augustine B. Kelley, Democrat; Thomas E. Morgan, Democrat; Benjamin F. James, Republican; Joseph L. Carrigg, Republican; Ivor D. Fenton, Republican; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Republican; Walter M. Mumma, Republican; Alvin R. Bush, Republican; Richard M. Simpson, Republican; James E. Van Zandt, Republican; John P. Saylor, Republican; Leon H. Gavin, Republican; Carroll D. Kearns, Republican; Robert J. Corbett, Republican.

Against, 7: Frank M. Clark, Democrat; Vera Buchanan, Democrat; George M. Rhodes, Democrat; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Republican; Karl C. King, Republican; Paul B. Dague, Republican; James G. Fulton, Republican.

Absent or not voting, 1: Herman P. Eberharter, Democrat.

Rhode Island—2 votes

For, 2: Aime J. Forand, Democrat; John E. Fogarty, Democrat.

Against: None.

South Carolina—6 votes

For, 5: L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat; W. J. Bryan Dorn, Democrat; Robert T. Ashmore, Democrat; James P. Richards, Democrat.

Against, 1: John L. McMillan, Democrat.

Absent but paired for: John J. Riley, Democrat.

South Dakota—2 votes

For, 1: E. Y. Berry, Republican.

Against, 1: Harold O. Lovre, Republican.

Tennessee—9 votes

For, 2: B. Carroll Reece, Republican; Howard H. Baker, Republican.

Against, 6: James B. Frazier, Jr., Democrat; Joe L. Evins, Democrat; J. Percy Priest, Democrat; Ross Bass, Democrat; Tom Murray, Democrat; Jere Cooper, Democrat.

Absent or not voting, 1: Clarence Davis, Democrat.

Texas—22 votes

For, 11: Brady Gentry, Democrat; Olin E. Teague, Democrat; John Dowdy, Democrat; Jim Wright, Democrat; John J. Bell, Democrat; J. T. Rutherford, Democrat; Walter Rogers, Democrat; Paul J. Kilday, Democrat; O. C. Fisher, Democrat; Martin Dies, Democrat; Bruce Alger, Republican.

Against, 10: Wright Patman, Democrat; Jack B. Brooks, Democrat; Albert Thomas, Democrat; Clark W. Thompson, Democrat; Homer Thornberry, Democrat; W. R. Poage, Democrat; Frank Ikard, Democrat; Joe M. Kilgore, Democrat; Omar Burleson, Democrat; George Mahon, Democrat.

Not voting, 1: Sam Rayburn, Democrat.

Utah—2 votes

For, 2: Henry Aldous Dixon Republican; William A. Dawson, Republican.

Against: None.

Vermont—1 vote

For, 1: Winston L. Prouty, Republican.

Against: None.

Virginia—10 votes

For, 5: Edward J. Robeson, Jr., Democrat; Watkins M. Abbitt, Democrat; William M.

Tuck, Democrat; W. Pat Jennings, Democrat; Richard H. Poff, Republican,

Against, 5: Porter Hardy, Jr., Democrat; J. Vaughan Gary, Democrat; Burr P. Harrison, Democrat; Howard W. Smith, Democrat; Joel T. Broyhill, Republican.

Washington—7 votes

For, 3: Russell V. Mack, Republican; Walt Horan, Republican; Thor C. Tollefson, Republican.

Against, 4: Thomas M. Pelly, Republican; Jack Westland, Republican, Hal Holmes, Republican; Don Magnuson, Democrat.

West Virginia—6 votes

For, 6: Robert H. Mollohan, Democrat; Harley O. Staggers, Democrat; Cleveland M. Bailey, Democrat; M. G. Burnside, Democrat; Elizabeth Kee, Democrat; Robert C. Byrd, Democrat.

Against: None.

Wisconsin—10 votes

For, 6: Glenn R. Davis, Republican; Gardner R. Withrow, Republican; William K. Van Pelt, Republican; Melvin R. Laird, Republican; John W. Byrnes, Republican; Alvin E. O'Konski, Republican.

Against, 3: Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat; Henry S. Reuss, Democrat; Lester R. Johnson, Democrat.

Absent or not voting, 1: Lawrence H. Smith, Republican.

Wyoming—1 vote

For, 1: E. Keith Thomson, Republican.

Against: None.

HISTORY OF ACT REVIEWED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, to set forth in a clear manner the situation as it exists at this time, I would say that the act was passed as an emergency measure. At the end of each 3-year period it was extended, without material change, until 1951, when we were able to cut the extension to 2 years, in 1953 to 1 year, and in 1954 to 1 year. It is now before the Congress for another extension. If the act is not extended, then 1 minute after midnight on June 12 the regulation of foreign commerce and the fixing of duties, tariffs, and import fees will revert to the Tariff Commisssion, which is an agency of the Congress.

Whenever there is a trade agreement in existence, it remains in full force and effect until or unless the President shall serve notice on the particular country with which the tariff agreement has been made that it will be canceled, and then, within 6 months, the question of determining the duties will revert to the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission will then operate just as it has always operated in fixing duties and imposts, now called tariffs; and there will come into play particularly section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act, which was passed as Public Law No. 361, to provide revenue, regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes. That act was approved by the President of the United States on June 17, 1930.

REFUSAL TO EXTEND 1934 ACT WOULD GIVE PRODUCERS THEIR "DAY IN COURT"

Section 336 provides, in effect, that upon the request of the President, either House of Congress upon its own motion, or upon the application of any producer, can review the tariff rates prescribed in the act of 1930. They are flexible duties or tariffs, Mr. President. The law of 1930 provides that determination shall be made of the difference between the cost of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country; and the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute, including any necessary change in classification as is found by investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences.

In other words, under a flexible tariff system, there would be a reversion to fair and reasonable competition. Equal access to the American markets would be given to foreign nations; but also equal access to their own markets would be given to American workingmen, investors, and producers.

So if the Trade Agreements Act shall not be extended beyond June 12, then, as I have already said, the regulation of tariffs will revert to the Tariff Commission, under the conditions outlined.

COURT DECISION TRADE ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL WOULD STOP BARTERING AWAY ECONOMY AT GENEVA

If, as a result of the suit filed today in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the act shall be declared unconstitutional, as I truly believe it will be, then none of the trade agreements will have any force or effect; they will be illegal.

I call attention specifically to the fact that all the meanderings at Geneva, in the State Department, and in the United Nations to create additional organizations to divide the markets of the United States with the nations of the world, so as to bring about one economic world, will fall of their own weight if the present Trade Agreements Act shall be declared unconstitutional or shall not be extended.

"RECIPROCAL" LABEL ON TRADE ACT FALSE

From the beginning, the excuse given in seeking this act and the illegal transfer of legislative power to the Executive, the President, who in turn has transferred it to the State Department, has been that we must buy friendship; we must buy allies.

Mr. President, since the act was first named a reciprocal trade act by London bankers, our State Department has continually mouthed the phrase "reciprocal trade." But I call attention to the fact that that phrase does not occur in the act. No such phrase or word occurs in the act. The act is not reciprocal, never was intended to be, and does not work out that way.

"DOLLAR SHORTAGE" HOAX EXPOSED

This is similar to the expression "dollar shortage," which was created at the same source in London. There is one way in which an individual can have a dollar shortage, and that is to spend each year more than he makes. That causes a dollar shortage for him. But there are two ways in which a nation can have a dollar shortage. The first is, if it spends each year more than it receives; the other is if it fixes the price of its currency above the market price of the world. Then it will have a dollar shortage which no one will make good except a silly Congress. Yet while we question these phrases, these catch words, that sell us a bill of goods, we still go forth preaching the gospel that there is a dollar shortage and we must have so-called reciprocal trade.

Then along came the slogan, "Trade, not aid." That phrase came out of the same feed basket. Mr. Butler, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, coined the phrase "Trade, not aid." The senior Senator from Nevada pinned it on him a week or two after he had coined it in 1952. Mr. Butler is proud of it. He now comes to the United States and brags that "Trade, not aid" is his phrase.

Mr. President, I say let us return to the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, which Washington, Franklin, and Lincoln knew and honored.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF UNITED STATES COURTS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE'S speech,

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. For what purpose?

Mr. KEFAUVER. For the purpose of calling up a conference report, with the understanding that the proceedings in connection therewith will be printed following the remarks of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee the length of time that will be required?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think it should take long. It would be necessary to develop a quorum.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Nevada will conclude his remarks within a reasonable time. It is now only 10 minutes of 2. I should much prefer having the Senator from Tennessee delay the action he proposes until I have finished. The matter he wishes to take up is very important, and the proceedings may cause a debate which will last some time. I respectfully ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if he will delay his request until I have finished.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Can the Senator from Nevada estimate the length of time he intends to continue speaking?

Mr. MALONE. About 20 or 25 minutes, I should think.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator from Nevada finds that he will require more than that amount of time, will he permit me to interrupt him, to bring up the conference report?

Mr. MALONE. I shall discuss the matter with the Senator again.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this discussion follow my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE'S speech,

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am asking the Senator from Nevada to yield, but not for a question, with the understanding that, in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, so that the Senate may take up the conference report on the so-called salary bill, with the understanding that there will be a quorum call, solely for the purpose of alerting the membership that some such matter is about to come up on the floor; that the quorum call will be called off very shortly; and that then a brief explanation may be made by two members of the conferees on the part of the Senate who have taken a leading part in the conference?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield for that purpose to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the acting majority leader, with the understanding, however, that if there is any extended debate, it will be called off, and I may resume my speech.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I request such consent on that basis with the further understanding that debate dealing with the salary bill, shall appear at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings for today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of what is contained in the conference report.

Senators may recall that last Friday the conference report was rejected by the Senate, and by an overwhelming vote, the Senate adopted a motion to instruct the Senate conferees to insist upon their disagreement with respect to the so-called office expense allowance item which was contained in section 4B. That was the provision under which, upon itemized certification, reimbursement would be made for necessary office expense incurred by a Member of Congress.

The conferees met again today, and followed the wish of the Senate by striking out the allowance for necessary office expense.

The House conferees insisted that if that item were to be stricken out, and no expense allowance were to be provided, and no salary increase were to be authorized, over and above $22,500, they would not go along with section 5 of the conference report agreed upon and submitted last Friday.

Section 5 provides for the actual expenses of five additional trips each year by Members of Congress returning to their States or districts.

There seemed to be no alternative except to agree with the House on this item, inasmuch as we were not in a position to make any adjustment with respect to the other section, so the conference committee has unanimously agreed to strike out the necessary office expense allowance; to insert the repealer of section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which is the one which contains the $2,500 allowance; and to strike out section 5, which is the section providing for trips home.

We are sorry that this is necessary. Not very much question had been raised with respect to the proposition that, in connection with necessary trips home, the actual expenses—not 20 cents a mile, but the actual expense of transportation—should be paid. However, the House conferees refused to go along with that proposal, in view of our refusal to go along with the other sections.

So as the matter now stands, the conference report provides for a plain salary increase, up to the amount of $22,500, and nothing else so far as Members of Congress are concerned.

No changes were made in the conference report with respect to members of the judiciary. No changes were made so far as district attorneys or other items are concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not quite catch the significance of what the Senator said about striking out a repealer. What is the repealer that is to be stricken out?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. I said that the repealer was restored to the bill. I refer to the section of the Senate bill which repealed section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, section 601 (b) being the section providing for the $2,500 expense allowance. The original Senate bill repealed that section. It was rewritten in the first conference. Now the repealer is placed back in the bill, so that the $2,500 item is repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] for relinquishing enough time to consider this conference report.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE's speech,

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for one or two unanimous-consent requests? I assure the Senator that I am not rising to provoke any lengthy discussion, but only to submit one or two unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. MALONE. I am always glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. He may have all the time he desires. I understand his method of doing business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada may yield to me without losing his right to the floor, and that any request I make may appear following the speech now being delivered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized, during the adjournment following today's session, to sign the enrolled bill, H. R. 3828, the conference report on which was agreed to in the Senate today, and is now pending before the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized, during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, to file such reports as the committee may wish to file.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank my friend from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] for yielding to me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS SKILL AND "PUBLIC BE DAMNED" PROGRAM OF THE NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to pay a brief tribute to the great public-relations skill—and public-be-damned program—of the natural gas industry.

The latest proof of this is the gold mine they have just persuaded a special Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy to give them.

According to a White House release of February 26, this Cabinet Committee is

recommending the exemption from Federal regulation of the interstate gas sales by nontransporting producers. A free hand to charge all that the traffic will bear would, of course, be the result of any such legislation.

This bonanza for the oil and gas industry, which it is estimated would cost the gas consumers of America at least a cool $200 to $400 million a year in exorbitant prices, is the first and presumably the most important of the Cabinet Committee's recommendations.

The artistry of the gas industry's work is seen most clearly in the phrasing of the recommendation, which piously asserts it is for "the protection of the national defense and consumer interests." The Cabinet Committee was thus persuaded to revert to the lordly theme—once discredited as enunciated by one of its members, the Secretary of Defense—that "what's good for the gas industry is good for the country." No matter what it does to the 60 million users of gas.

Let it not be said that this triumph was won without careful planning. According to releases issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization in September and October 1954, a task force of 4 persons was set up to advise the Cabinet Committee; and 7 consultants were appointed, to advise the task force on technical matters.

GAS AND OIL INDUSTRY WELL REPRESENTED ON TASK FORCE

The task force member who was made responsible for their oil and gas studies, according to the report, was a banker who happened also to be a former president of an oil company and of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, as well as a leader of the American Petroleum Institute. Another task force member was from the coal industry, which has for many years urged higher gas prices. The other two task force members had no known experience in rate-regulatory matters or consumer protections.

The seven technical consultants were all from the oil and gas industry. This was batting 1,000 percent, which would rate top honors in any league, and liaison with the official propaganda drive of the industry was made easier by having as 1 of the 7 consultants the assistant to the chairman of the board of the oil company whose president is heading that drive for exemption from reasonable regulation.

PUBLIC AND CONSUMER INTERESTS INADEQUATELY CONSULTED

Not only were the personnel of the task force and its consultants chosen in a way to give a heavy balance to the gas industry interests but the procedures seemed also set to exclude any adequate representation of consumer or public considerations. Despite my own efforts after the election last November to point out to the earnest and genial Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, the skillful maneuver that was taking place under his scholarly nose, I have seen no evidence that the public or consumer interest experts I recommended were consulted by even so much as an invitation to submit their views.

Mr. President, so that the background of this Cabinet committee's work may be seen in perspective and the success of the gas industry's drive on the Cabinet may be fully appreciated, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence with the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming concerning the makeup of that task force:

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SEANTOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS AND HON. ARTHUR H. FLEMING

NOVEMBER 30, 1954.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Now that the distractions of the recent election campaign are past, I should like to raise with you a basic question about the recently appointed task force of the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

My question is this: Has any effort been made in establishing this task force and selecting the consultants for it, to give the representatives of the public interest a preponderant voice and representatives of the consumer interest a voice at least equal in numbers and experience to that of the producing and transporting groups?

Frequent reports in the financial press and in trade journals make it clear that there will be a determined drive in the new Congress for legislation to exempt the nontransporting producers of gas from all regulation by the Federal Power Commission. This drive, if successful, can mean a difference of tens, and in the long run hundreds, of millions of dollars to consumers of gas.

Without arguing the merits of that question here, I am nevertheless disturbed to note that 2 of the 4 members of the task force mentioned above and all 7 of its consultants have had close relations with oil, gas, and coal companies whose trade associations have been among the most vigorous advocates of this exemption legislation. One of the task force members, I am informed, is a former leader of the American Petroleum Institute and former president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. These are all quite legitimate interests, but I do not know why the advice to the Cabinet should not come from a more balanced group.

If the two task force members who apparently have no connection with the industry have any experience in dealing with the regulatory problems or with the complex requirements for protecting consumers against exorbitant rates, it is not evident in the publicity I have seen about them.

If a balanced recommendation is desired from this task force, it is difficult to understand why representatives of distributors, consumers, or regulatory bodies were not included, at least among the consultants. Persons like James F. Oates, of the People's Gas, Light & Coke Co., of Chicago; Thomas C. Buchanan, of Beaver, Pa., former Chairman of the Federal Power Commission; Charles S. Rhyne, of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers; Martin T. Bennett, engineer, of Washington, D. C., formerly with Wisconsin and New York regulatory agencies, and many others could have contributed a different and an experienced point of view.

I note that a generalized invitation to submit views has gone out to the industry and to State regulatory bodies—by way of press release, I assume. Would it not be desirable, in view of the industry-weighted nature of the personnel, for you to persuade this task force to make a special effort to secure presentations from public and consumer representatives such as I have mentioned? Can the Cabinet or the Congress give much weight to the task force's findings unless this is done?

I hope to learn that you have anticipated this inquiry and on the basis of your own sensitive regard for the public interest have already taken steps along the lines I have suggested.

I know that in the interest of our security we must, as a Nation, have these great resources available in abundance. But I am also convinced that we can do this without yielding to the gathering industry pressure to let them charge all that the traffic will bear.

With kindest regards,
Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, December 13, 1954.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I very much appreciate your thoughtful letter of November 30 in which you discussed the membership of the task force of the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

As you know, this group is composed of the following: James F. Brownlee, a general partner of J. H. Whitney & Co., who has served as chairman; J. Ed Warren, a vice president of the National City Bank, who was responsible for the oil and gas studies; Charles J. Potter, president of the Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co., in charge of the coal aspects of the task force studies; and retired Federal Judge Robert N. Wilkin. Neither Mr. Brownlee nor Judge Wilkin has any connection with industries concerned in these studies. In my opinion, both of these gentlemen represent the interest of the general public. Messrs. Warren and Potter were selected because of their special familiarity with the problems of the oil and gas and coal industries, respectively. On many issues the positions of these industries are widely divergent in character. It cannot be said, therefore, that the "industry members" represented a single bloc. As a practical matter, therefore, the representatives of the public interest did have a preponderent voice in the deliberations of the task force.

You call attention to the number of consultants from the oil, coal and gas industries. While these men were chosen from the ranks of oil, gas and coal companies, their services on the task force were strictly technical in nature. They had no part in the development of policy recommendations.

In order to achieve the widest possible dissemination of our request that industry and state regulatory bodies submit views to the task force, a suitable announcement was made via the public press. The alternative to such a course of action would involve the process of selecting those groups whose views should be sought. Within the time allotted it was not possible to do this, and if there were time, we would have no assurance that all specific interests were contacted.

Because the response to the initial newspaper story was not completely satisfactory, on November 2, I sent a wire to the Governors of a number of States, the mayors of several cities, and the chairman of several public-service organizations. In this wire I specifically solicited the views of those groups from whom response had not previously been received.

I consider it important to keep in mind the fact that the task force to which you refer makes its report to the members of the Cabinet Committee. The Cabinet members themselves, as public servants, have the ultimate responsibility for evaluating the material submitted to them and reaching

their own decision as to the report which will be made to the President.

If there is any further information with which I can provide you, I hope you will not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

The Honorable ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
General Accounting Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: Thank you for your response to my letter of November 30 concerning the unbalanced composition of the task force of the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy and its consultant group. I found your letter on my return from a brief holiday, and I want to comment quite frankly on it.

Unfortunately the facts reported in your reply give little or no assurance that consumer interests will be adequately represented or protected in the work of this task force.

There is no evidence that the investment banking and judicial experience of the members you cite as public representatives has especially equipped them as consumer defenders on a complex regulatory issue, no matter how highly we may regard their general ability and character.

And while you refer to the divergent views of the coal industry and the oil and gas industry on many issues, they have long seen eye to eye on the precise legislative issues I mentioned—the question of exempting from reasonable regulation the sales in interstate commerce of nontransporting gas producers. It would be a miracle, therefore, if the 2 industry members on the task force, with their 7 consultants all drawn from the oil and gas industry, did not present what you term a "single bloc" on this 1 vital question.

That the industry regards this question as important must be clear to you from the series of reports culminating in the Wall Street Journal story this past Wednesday announcing a $1½ million propaganda drive to sell the exemption bill to the country. I note in passing that the chairman of the industry committee running this drive is the president of an oil company which has supplied the task force with one of its seven consultants. I am enclosing a copy of that newspaper story for your information on this issue.

I realize that the work of the Cabinet Committee's task force is probably nearing completion so that my earlier suggestions of ways to assure greater consumer representation cannot be utilized. I can only hope that the governors and mayors whom you invited to send their views included consumer-minded leaders familiar with the complexities and the propaganda currents in this controversy.

Because of the lack of balance in the composition of your task force, however, and in view of the mounting industry drive to be allowed to charge all that the traffic will bear, I frankly believe there is an urgent need for those in leading administrative posts to make sure that the task force's report does not become the instrument for advancing the gas producers' interests in higher prices at the expense of the country's consumers.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1955.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I appreciated very much receiving your letter of January 14. I know that we are dealing with a very difficult and complex issue and I can assure you that we will endeavor to arrive at a result that will prove beneficial to the entire country.

I am indeed grateful to you for the interest that you have taken in this matter.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

TIMING OF CABINET COMMITTEE'S REPORT ALSO AIDS GAS INDUSTRY LEGISLATIVE DRIVE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the timing of the release of the Cabinet committee's report, as well as its contents, shows the effectiveness of the gas industry's work. Governors, State legislatures, economic groups, and others were being enlisted in the campaign to free the interstate sellers of gas from restriction to reasonable profits and fair prices. The Oil and Gas Journal for February 14, 1955, disclosed that the legislative drive was to be kicked off with the Cabinet committee's report. But this journal added a warning:

The snail's pace of the Cabinet resources committee threatens the chances of legislation this year to free independent natural-gas producers from Federal Power Commission control.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD fuller extracts from the report in the Oil and Gas Journal for February 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAS BILL IN CONGRESS—TEXAN'S PROPOSAL IS FIRST TO VOID FPC CONTROL OF GAS

WASHINGTON.—The first bill to cancel the Supreme Court ruling in the Phillips case has been introduced in Congress.

The bill, written by Representative WALTER ROGERS, of Texas, would exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal Power Commission control. A large number of similar bills is expected to be offered by Congressmen from the producing States.

The oil and gas industry will support any bill freeing producers from regulation. But it will put its effort behind a bill which Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, is expected to sponsor. PRIEST plans to write his bill when the report of the Cabinet Energy Resources Committee is made public.

Industry bill: The industry-backed bill is expected to call for the exemption of all gas production, pipeline-owned as well as independent (see Watching Washington).

The big question is whether Congress will pass a bill voiding FPC control over the price of gas produced by pipeline companies. But industry men who are working on the bill think that is a matter for Congress to decide. The bill they propose would put all production on an equal footing.

The timetable for the legislation is still uncertain. It is hoped the Cabinet Committee report will be made public soon. But there has been no indication that agreement has been reached on its recommendations.

Once his bill is ready, PRIEST plans to hold prompt hearings. His committee hasn't yet written a schedule for the bills it will consider and it will be able to make a quick start on the gas measure if it is introduced this month.

Quick action on the House side is necessary if the bill is to become law this year. The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee won't take the matter up until a bill is sent over from the House. If the bill takes too long getting there it may run into a logjam that would be hard to deal with.

WATCHING WASHINGTON—DELAY THREATENS GAS BILL

The snail's pace of the Cabinet resources committee threatens the chances of legislation this year to free independent natural-gas producers from Federal Power Commission control.

Strategy of the gas industry group is to present its bill in Congress after the committee makes its recommendations. The committee is expected to favor exemption of independent producers. This would be a big boost for the measure.

But if the committee's report doesn't reach Congress in the near future, it will be difficult to hold lengthy hearings and get action on the bill by midsummer, before Congress adjourns.

It will require time to get the bill through. Long hearings are in prospect on both sides of the Capitol. Chairman J. PERCY PRIEST of the House Commerce Committee plans to get into hearings quickly once he has a bill to work on. How fast the corresponding Senate committee will handle it is less certain.

A point on which the bill may stand or fall is that of exempting the production of the pipeline companies as well as the independent producers. If the companies are included, the consuming areas will fight the measure even more bitterly. If they are not included, the pipelines aren't likely to give much support.

More to the point, the exemption of pipeline companies would meet with opposition from Congressmen who otherwise might vote for the bill. The 1950 bill, vetoed by Truman, started out with an overall exemption but it was found necessary to drop the pipelines to get support. Even then the bill passed by only a few votes in each House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So on February 26, as if to oblige, the White House released the report. And now, I presume, we shall begin to see the culmination of the drive with stepped-up legislative action, more newspaper ads, high-powered TV programs, resolutions from innocent groups who have not had a chance to see how they will suffer in higher gas rates, and all the other paraphernalia of a skillful effort to create an apparent public opinion in favor of another gigantic giveaway.

GAS INDUSTRY'S STACKED DECK IS SHOWING

So, Mr. President, while I congratulate the gas industry on their success in the Cabinet Committee, I must observe that their stacked deck is showing. And I am hopeful that the Members of Congress who see through all this artful window dressing will still determine our national policy on the basis of what is needed for the benefit of the people of the country, and not merely what will deliver a new and larger bonanza—at great expense to consumers—to an oil and gas industry which I think is already doing rather well.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, background information which I have prepared dealing with the proposed amendment of the Natural Gas Act, which answers some of the questions raised and some of the arguments advanced in support of the amendment.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT, 1955

1. Who is proposing amending the Natural Gas Act?

The so-called independent producers of natural gas are continuing their efforts to escape reasonable regulation of the prices charged for the natural gas they sell in interstate commerce for ultimate public consumption. Ever since the Natural Gas Act was passed in 1938, these producers have avoided regulation through litigation, legislative efforts and, in some instances, through appointments to the Federal Power Commission. The produoers have had bills to remove themselves from Federal regulation in every Congress starting with the 80th. They would have succeeded in the 81st Congress had not President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill. Following the decision of the Supreme Court on June 7, 1954, in the Phillips Petroleum case, the FPC was no longer able to sidestep enforcement of the law. Producers then selling gas in interstate commerce were compelled to file their rates with the Commission. Because they have been finally brought to book, producers are redoubling their efforts to thwart regulation by amendment of the Natural Gas Act in this Congress.

2. How would such amendment affect the consumers of natural gas?

The price of gas in the gas fields where it enters the interstate carrier affects the price of gas sold at the other end of the line to the distributing utility and to the ultimate consumer since the cost of such gas to the pipeline company must be covered by the rates paid the distributor and the distributor must recover his cost by rates paid by the consumers who ultimately burn the gas in their homes, commercial establishments, and factories.

3. Who furnishes the gas supply to the interstate pipeline companies?

In the year 1953, pipeline companies purchased from their affiliates and produced from their own reserves about 21.5 percent of their total gas requirements. They purchased the balance of approximately 78.5 percent from the so-called independent producers who would be exempt from Federal rate regulation if the proposed legislation is enacted.

4. Who are the independent producers?

In number, there are about 4,100 producers, selling gas to pipeline companies; however, 7 producers supply one-third of the total and 100 producers more than 85 percent of the total. In other words, a few large producers, mostly major oil companies, make most of the sales of gas to pipeline companies.

5. Do the 4,100 producers compete with each other in the sale of gas to pipeline companies?

According to sworn testimony before the Federal Power Commission by a number of pipeline executives, all of the competition in the gas fields is between buyers seeking a supply of gas. Nearly 70 percent of the 4,000 producers are very small producers having wells only in the Appalachian area and they provide in the aggregate less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the total gas sold to interstate pipeline companies. The opportunity of pipeline companies to purchase additional gas to meet increasing consumer demand or to replace the gas used is limited to fields in close proximity to existing pipelines unless large volumes of reserves can be secured. This is so because of the great cost of constructing or relocating pipeline systems. Thus, the claim that 5,000 producers are competing with each other to sell gas to pipeline companies is purely theoretical and without practical substance. It is equivalent to saying that the grocers in Richmond, Va., are in competition with the grocers in Kalamazoo, Mich., or Dallas, Tex.

6. Are not the consumers protected against price increases by the long-term, arm's-length contracts between pipeline companies and independent producers?

A large share of the contracts betweeen pineline companies and producers contain various kinds of escalation clauses which provide ways of increasing the price. Many of the contracts also contain what are known as renegotiation and "favored nation" clauses. Because of the pressure upon the pipeline companies to secure additional gas supply to meet market demands, pipeline companies are compelled to renegotiate upwards the prices called for in existing contracts in order to obtain additional gas supplies under new contracts. Favored-nation clauses compel the companies to pay existing suppliers the highest price paid to other suppliers and in many cases the highest price paid in a field or area by third parties.

7. Has the Commission previously regulated the prices charged by these producers?

No; as pointed out earlier, the producers have been able to thwart regulation by the Commission. In 1948 the Commission commenced a rate proceeding against Phillips Petroleum Co. and it was not until June 7, 1954, or nearly 6 years later, that its jurisdiction over Phillips was determined by the Supreme Court. During this period of no regulation, the price of gas has been rising in the field. In the last 3 years it has practically doubled and in some instances tripled and quadrupled.

8. Have the increases in field price been reflected in increases in rates of pipeline companies and in rates to consumers?

Yes; the Federal Power Commission has been swamped with applications by pipeline companies in the last 4 years for increases in their rates which have aggregated more than $400 million. Most of the requested increases have been brought about by increases in the field cost of gas. Some companies have filed for as many as 4 successive increases in their rates within a period of 3 years. Consumers' rates have also been increased in many States of the Union. The average increase in the United States in the retail cost per therm of natural gas over the 3-year period 1951–53 has been 20 percent. In some States it has been lower than this and in some States higher.

9. Is it a fact that only about 10 percent of the average gas bill goes to the producer?

No; it is misleading to claim that the producer receives only 10 percent of the average gas bill. In 1953 the average price paid to producers by pipeline companies was 9.1 cents per thousand cubic feet. The average revenue received for natural gas sold to consumers by utilities in that year was 4.2 cents per therm which approximates 42 cents per thousand cubic feet. Thus, on the average, the producer received approximately 22 percent of the total amount paid by the consumer. It is also misleading to claim that the price the consumer paid for gas has risen only one-eleventh as much as the general cost of living during the past 16 years. It was because of the existence prior to 1938 of high natural-gas rates that the Congress enacted the Natural Gas Act. The Federal Power Commission drastically reduced pipeline-company rates during the years 1942–47 which reductions were reflected in lower retail rates in many areas of the country.

During the period 1948–53 the retail price of gas as reflected in the Consumers' Price Index has increased about 11 percent. Many gas-rate increases have been granted in 1954 by the State regulatory commissions and are not, of course, reflected in the above percentage. Other increases are pending.

10. Is Federal regulation necessary to keep gas rates at reasonable levels?

Unless the price of gas entering the interstate line is regulated all that subsequent regulation can accomplish is to pass on the increased field cost of gas in higher pipeline and retail gas rates. Increases in the field cost of gas must be recognized by the FPC and the State regulatory commissions and they are compelled by law to shift the burden of these increases to the consumer.

11. Why should the price of gas be regulated when coal, oil, grain, and most other commodities are not regulated?

The purpose of regulation is to limit profits of monopolies to reasonable levels. Because the supply of natural gas is mostly owned by a relatively few corporations and because only one practical transportation medium is available, namely, pipelines, Congress determined in 1938 that the natural-gas business was affected with a public interest and should be regulated by the Federal Government. The change which has taken place since that time in the field cost of gas has emphasized the necessity for regulation in order to protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural-gas companies.

12. Will Federal regulation conflict with State conservation regulation?

The Natural Gas Act prohibits regulation by the Commission of the physical activities of production and gathering. In the 16 years the Commission has regulated pipeline companies which own producing properties it has never regulated the production and gathering activities of such companies. In the Commission's Order 174–B prescribing rules and regulations for the so-called independent producers, the Commission specifically provided that its rules were not intended as interfering or intended to interfere with valid conservation orders of a State agency relating to the production or gathering of natural gas. There is no valid reason to contend that a conflict would result.

13. Will Federal regulation reduce the supply of natural gas?

The threat to the gas supply of consumers has been and is being used as a club over the heads of distributors, pipeline companies and others who refuse to support legislation exempting the big oil companies from regulation of their gas sales in interstate commerce. The hearings and debates in the 80th and 81st Congress on bills to amend the Natural Gas Act are filled with similar threats to the effect that if legislation was not enacted, gas supply would be curtailed or shut off. Despite these threats the great expansion program of the gas industry continued.

Under Federal regulation, producers would be assured the recovery of their costs including costs of exploration and of drilling dry holes plus a reasonable profit. There is no reason to believe that producers will deny themselves a reasonable profit on the capital invested just for the purpose of going on a sit-down strike any more than any other utility would refuse to furnish service to the public unless it were permitted to charge all the traffic would bear. Under the standards of the Natural Gas Act, the amount of profit allowed must be sufficient to permit the attraction of capital to the enterprise on reasonable terms. Thus, it is the Commission's duty to allow such margins of profit as will make the gas producing business attractive to investors.

14. Is it necessary to subject the little well owners to the burden of regulation in order to protect the public from unreasonable rates?

No, for the reason these little producers control such a small proportion of the gas reserves that they cannot dominate the price situation. These small producers could very well be exempted from Federal regulation. A distinction should be made between them and the hundred or so large producers who sell 85 percent or more of the natural gas in interstate markets.

COMMISSION SHOULD USE ACTUAL LEGITIMATE COSTS AND NOT THE SO-CALLED FAIR FIELD PRICE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am introducing today, and am now sending to the desk, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act and to require that the rates and charges of natural-gas companies be

determined on the basis of the actual legitimate costs of the companies' property, less depreciation.

I may say, Mr. President, that this has been the standard used in the past, in happier days, by the Federal Power Commission. Under it, prices were kept at more reasonable levels, while profits were more than fair. The pipeline industry prospered and grew at an amazing rate. The present Federal Power Commission wanted to escape from this reasonable valuation procedure, however, and it is apparently trying to change the method of valuation generally from actual legitimate costs to what it terms fair field value, or the going rate in the field.

In the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline case last year the Commission has already applied the fair field price formula to gas produced by the pipeline itself at a much lesser cost. There is no valid excuse for writing these phantom costs into the rates that gas consumers must ultimately pay.

The bill which I am introducing would reverse the principle laid down by the Commission in the Panhandle case and would prevent them from applying the field price formula to other producers also.

In the absence of regulation, the going rate charged by the producers to the pipeline companies is largely what the traffic will bear. Since natural gas is in great demand, there is no adequate competition between the natural-gas producers to keep the prices fair. This means, in effect, that the producers of natural gas can charge their own prices, and those prices to the pipeline transporters can be raised, and the higher costs passed, all the way down the line, in the form of higher retail prices of gas to the users and consumers. In the same manner, the phantom costs—based on field price levels—of pipeline producers are also being passed down the line to natural-gas consumers.

We have just seen an instance of this in my own city of Chicago, where gas rates have been increased by $3.7 million a year. It was the admitted testimony that this increase had been made necessary by the fact that increases had occurred in the field and in the price of gas as it entered the main pipelines.

So, Mr. President, we should return to the method of actual legitimate costs, and not turn to the method of so-called fair field value, which is nothing but the going price, which is not a regulated but a monopoly price. The bill I am introducing would require the return to that cost method of rate regulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1248) to amend the Natural Gas Act to require that the rates and charges of natural-gas companies be determined on the basis of the actual legitimate cost of the companies' property, less depreciation, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON DISPOSAL PLAN OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I wish to give general notice that the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on Tuesday, March 8, will begin hearings on the disposal plan submitted to the Congress on January 24, 1955, by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. It will be recalled that under the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Congress created this Commission and empowered it to accept proposals from prospective purchasers of the 27 synthetic rubber manufacturing facilities owned by the Federal Government. That act further empowered the Commission to negotiate and recommend to the Congress sale of those plants in cases where acceptable terms of sale could be worked out in accordance with the terms of the act. The Commission was given certain guides in carrying out these duties. It was to bear in mind, among other items, the need for obtaining full fair value for the plants, the need for setting up a free, competitive industry, the needs of national security, and the interests of small business.

The Commission, on January 24, recommended to the Congress that 24 of the 27 plants be sold.

Under the act, the Congress has 60 days of continuous session following January 24 within which either House may disapprove the sale of any one or more or all of the plants. The continuous session is broken only by adjournment sine die or adjournment of either House for more than 3 days to a day certain. The statute provides that either House may adopt a disapproving resolution affecting the sale of any one or more or all of the plants, but unless it does so within the 60-day period, the sales as recommended by the Commission will be carried out. If either House of Congress disapproves the sale of any plant, the prospective purchasers of the remaining plants have an opportunity to withdraw from purchasing the plant. If the result of action by the Congress and the purchasers is to leave less capacity than 500,000 long tons of general-purpose synthetic rubber or 43,000 long tons of butyl rubber available for sale under the Commission's plan, then none of the plants may be sold, but they will continue to be operated for the account of the Government.

If any part of the Commission's disposal plan is carried out, plants not sold must, under the terms of the act, be placed in standby for a 3-year period. Under certain conditions, any alcohol butadiene plant can be leased within that 3-year period.

The Banking and Currency Committee has received a bill—S. 691—to allow reopening of sale negotiations on a synthetic-rubber plant at Baytown, Tex. That bill, introduced by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for himself and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is now pending before that committee's Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization. Hearings on it are in order.

Moreover, several committee members have received specific objections to the sale of certain of the plants recommended for sale by the Commission. For that reason, it is thought desirable for the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization to hold an open hearing on those objections plus any other substantial objections brought to its attention before the date of the hearing.

As chairman of the subcommittee I wish to give public notice that the subcommittee will begin hearings on Tuesday, March 8, at 10 a. m.

Prior to that time the subcommittee staff will collect and evaluate complaints concerning the disposal of specific plants. Testimony will then be taken from those whose complaints appear to be of such substantial nature as to warrant consideration by the subcommittee. Upon request, testimony in opposition to the complaints will also be received. Those not heard will be given an opportunity to include material in the record of the hearing.

At the same hearing the subcommittee will take testimony on Senate bill 691.

This is to give public notice that anyone objecting to S. 691 for any reason is expected to bring his objection to the attention of the subcommittee in writing prior to the date of the hearing.

Similarly anyone having a substantial complaint concerning the proposed sale of any of the 24 plants included in the Commission's report is likewise expected to submit his objections in writing to the subcommittee in time for its consideration prior to the scheduling of witnesses for the hearing.

The 60-day deadline prescribed by the act makes it imperative that any hearings held on these matters be conducted promptly and concluded in time to allow any action necessary to be taken by the Senate before the expiration of the 60-day period.

I hope that this announcement may receive widespread publicity so that the plans of the subcommittee may be known. This will result in the holding of adequate and fair hearings within the time limits set by the act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Delaware may have stated the exact date; but if so, I did not note it. When will the 60 days expire?

Mr. FREAR. On March 25.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In order to stop a sale is it required that both Houses veto it, or can it be stopped by a veto by only one House?

Mr. FREAR. Either House may thus veto it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But if the Senate is to veto it, the Senate must do so before March 25; is that correct?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and, any such proposal supposedly would come from the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Unless either the Senate or the House were to be out of session for a period of more than 3 days.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, that is not likely to occur before March 25.

Mr. FREAR. No; it is not likely.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the veto deadline is getting pretty close upon us; is it not?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I thank the Senator from Alabama for calling attention to these facts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think this point should be emphasized, because there is little time in which to act.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. By the way, this involves a multimillion dollar bill.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and 24 plants.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And also one of the largest undertakings of the Government during the war, and one which has generally continued in operation since that time. I may add that it has been a profitable operation.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; it has been profitable and productive at a time when synthetic rubber was most needed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

EXCHANGE OF NOTES WITH THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT REGARDING THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an exchange of notes between the United States Ambassador to Canada, R. Douglas Stuart, and the Canadian External Minister, Lester Pearson, on the subject of future construction of the United States-Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway. This exchange supplements a previous exchange of August 17, 1954, and constitutes an important landmark in the history of this great project, which I am pleased to have helped achieve as author of the Wiley Seaway law—Public Law 358, 83d Congress.

I may say that I have been in closest touch with our American officials relative to this important exchange. I ask unanimous consent that it be reproduced at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES EMBASSY,
Ottawa, Canada, February 21, 1955.

The Honorable L. B. PEARSON,
Secretary of State for External Affairs, Ottawa.

DEAT MR. PEARSON: I refer to conversations which were held recently between yourself, Mr. Howe, and Ambassador Heeney and, on our side, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Anderson, and myself, on our respective plans for St. Lawrence Seaway construction.

In the light of these conversations, and of the exchange of notes of August 1954, we understand that the Canadian Government under present conditions will not construct navigation facilities which by-pass the power dams in the Cornwall-Barnhart Island areas. It is further understood that while the Canadian Government intends to acquire land now in that vicinity to provide such facilities at some future date, such construction will not be initiated until after discussions between the two governments.

The United States Government has, as you know, a statutory obligation under Public Law 358, 83d Congress, to construct facilities for 27-foot navigation in the vicinity of Point Rockway, N. Y., opposite Iroquois, Ontario. However, since the Canadian Government has awarded a contract for construction of facilities for 27-foot navigation at Iroquois, we will seek congressional action at an appropriate time to be relieved of this statutory obligation for such construction and, thereafter, will not initiate such construction until after discussions between the two governments.

Under these arrangements the Canadian canal and lock at Iroquois will be the exclusive means for navigation to bypass the power project control dam at that point. Similarly, the Long Sault Canal, with two locks near Massena, N. Y., to be constructed by the United States, will be the exclusive means for navigation to bypass the dams in the Cornwall-Branhart Island area.

These arrangements eliminate uneconomical duplication of navigation facilities for 27-foot or lesser draft on opposite sides of the St. Lawrence River to bypass the power and control dams in the International Rapids section, and retain the development on a joint basis of this common undertaking of our two countries, consistent with the principles of St. Lawrence Seaway legislation of both countries.

I would appreciate your confirming that this letter represents the views expressed in our meetings.

Respectfully yours,

R. DOUGLAS STUART.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, CANADA,
Ottawa, February 22, 1955.

His Excellency R. DOUGLAS STUART,
Ambassador of the United States of America, Ottawa, Ontario.

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR: In reply to your letter of February 21, 1955, on our respective plans for the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, I wish to confirm that your letter represents the views expressed in our meetings.

Yours sincerely,

L. B. PEARSON.

DEEPENING THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most important issues facing the current session of the Congress is action on proposed legislation to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels. This is the subject of a bill (S. 171) which I have personally introduced, in addition to numerous other measures having the same objective.

The people of Wisconsin, who have long been in the forefront of the efforts for the seaway itself, are once more extremely anxious to see the fulfillment of this phase of the 27-foot, 2,400-mile artery into the heart of the North American Continent. Without these channels, we will not have a true deep waterway west of Lake Erie.

I send to the desk four expressions on this important matter from my State: The first is from the Governor's Committee for the St. Lawrence Seaway Project, whose chairman is the Honorable Harry Brockel. The second is from the Milwaukee Common Council; the third is from the Superior Common Council; and the fourth is from the Algoma Harbor Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that each of these be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and that they be preceded by a list of the distinguished members of the Governors' committee—men and women representing all phases of Wisconsin life.

There being no objection, the list and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT, STATE OF WISCONSIN, HEADQUARTERS, ROOM 710, CITY HALL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Officers: Honorary chairman, Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr.; chairman, Harry C. Brockel; vice chairman, Curtis Hatch; secretary, Robert W. Hansen.

Committee: Organizations—Gordon W. Roseleip, commander, American Legion; George Haberman, president, Federation of Labor; Robert W. Hansen, Fraternal Order of Eagles; Curtis Hatch, president, Farm Eureal Federation; K. W. Hones, president, Farmers Union; John F. Leason, past commander, Amvets; Bertell MacDonald, past commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Frank E. Betz, commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Lyman McKee, President, Madison Milk Producers Association; H. O. Melby, Rural Electrification Association; Wm. O. Perdue, Pure Milk Products Cooperative; Mrs. Carl Romanik, Business and Professional Women's Club; Wm B. Seffern, Master Grange; Howard E. Norris, president, junior chamber of commerce; Charles M. Schultz, president, CIO; Milo K. Swanton, secretary, Council of Agriculture; Leonard Zubrensky, chairman, AVC Council. Industry—Robert Friend, president, Nordberg Manufacturing Co.; Joseph Heil, president, the Heil Co.; Henry R. Knudsen, Knudsen Bros. Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.; William D. Vogel, president, P&V-Atlas Industrial Center. Citizens—Harry C. Brockel, Milwaukee; C. E. Broughton, Sheboygan; C. D. Brower, Jr., Sturgeon Bay; Mrs. J. W. Keck, Watertown; Ray J. Laubenstein, Green Bay; Irwin Maier, Milwaukee; Frank H. Ranney, Milwaukee; Julius Sherfinski, Ashland; Neil Smith, Superior.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 12, 1955.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This committee, as you know, was appointed by Governor Kohler in 1952 to develop wide public support for the St. Lawrence Seaway project and to encourage seaway support by affiliated organizations in other States.

With the successful passage of the Wiley Seaway bill in May 1954. Governor Kohler has requested that the committee continue its service, with the particular assignment of working for the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels, and supporting the efforts of our congressional representatives for this important legislation.

Meeting in Governor Kohler's office on February 2, the committee directed that an expression of commendation be conveyed to you and the other members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation for leadership and loyal support of St. Lawrence Seaway legislation through many vicissitudes. The committee also went on record as declaring its full support of legislation for the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels, and the committee resources will be made available to the fullest extent to support measures taken by the Members of the House and Senate from Wisconsin in support of this important objective. We are fully conscious that without the deepening of the Great

Lakes connecting channels to the official seaway draft, the upper Great Lakes and the State of Wisconsin will be severely handicapped in realizing the full benefits of the seaway project.

Please call upon the committee for any assistance it may be able to render in your commendable efforts toward this very important goal.

Yours sincerely,

H. C. BROCKEL,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION REGARDING FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND APPROPRIATIONS TO DEEPEN CONNECTING CHANNELS OF THE GREAT LAKES

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Canada are now engaged in the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, which, when completed in 1959, will open the Port of Milwaukee and other cities of the Great Lake to deep-draft ocean navigation, with great benefits to the economy of the entire midcontinent area and to national defense; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway project will provide 27-foot navigation only to Lake Erie, and the connecting channels of the Great Lakes in the Detroit River, St. Clair River, Straits of Mackinac, and St. Marys River will require deepening in order to bring the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project and deep-draft navigation to the ports of Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior; and

Whereas, entirely aside from the requirements of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, the deepening of Great Lakes shipping channels is timely and necessary to utilize to full capacity the many large vessels which have entered service on the Great Lakes recently, representing an investment of hundreds of millions of dollars, and which are now unable to operate at full capacity due to channel depth limitations; and

Whereas the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels will add to the efficiency of lake and ocean shipping and will confer great economic benefits on the commerce of the Great Lakes and of the entire Middle West, and is consistent with the trend toward deep-draft shipping and the substantial deepening of seaboard harbors at many localities; and

Whereas congressional legislation for this purpose should be given high priority so that the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels may be completed in time to coincide with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., That this body hereby declares its vigorous support for legislation to authorize the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels and the appropriation of funds for that purpose by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin be requested to exert their best efforts to secure the passage of such authorizing and appropriating legislation by the 84th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of harbor commissioners and other interested city officials and departments be authorized by this common council to take all steps necessary to further the progress of connecting channels deepening legislation, and to collaborate with all other ports, associations, and interests working toward this end; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to the President of the United States; to the Senators and Members in Congress from the State of Wisconsin; to the Public Works Committee, House of Representatives; to the Commerce Committee, United States Senate; and to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SUPERIOR, WIS., AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY CLERK TO FORWARD THIS RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES URGING THE ENDORSEMENT OF A PROPOSED BILL FOR THE DEEPENING AND IMPROVING OF THE CONNECTING CHANNELS OF THE GREAT LAKES

Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army have filed their report on the cost of the proposed deepening and improving of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the United States Congress will, very shortly, consider the necessary appropriation for such deepening and improving of said connecting channels; and

Whereas the Great Lakes Harbor Association has, through its legal counsel, filed a brief with the United States engineers endorsing the connecting channels project; and

Whereas it is extremely necessary that this project commence at the earliest possible time in order that large ships entering the Great Lakes will be able to move west of Toledo at full draft upon completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Superior, in regularly assembled meeting, That this council go on record as endorsing and strongly urging the adoption of the report submitted by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he hereby is instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Wisconsin representatives in Congress and to the Great Lakes Harbor Association.

Passed and adopted this 18th day of January 1955.

Approved this 19th day of January 1955.

SCOTT G. WILLIAMSON,
President of the Council.

Attest:

R. E. MCKEAGUE, *City Clerk.*

ALGOMA, WIS.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: This letter is being written on behalf of the several civic organizations of the city of Algoma which has a small harbor on Lake Michigan. The subject legislation has been studied and discussed with the members of the various organizations, and we strongly urge the endorsing of the connecting channels project as outlined in the brief filed by Mr. Herbert Naujoks, of the Great Lakes Harbor Association, with the United States engineers. Copies of this endorsement have been sent to all Members of Congress.

Acting as chairman of the Algoma harbor committee of the city of Algoma and received definite expressions urging the adoption of this legislation. The list is as follows:

Mr. Richard DeGuelle, mayor of the city of Algoma.

Algoma City Council, eight members.

Algoma Chamber of Commerce, 115 members.

Algoma Boating Club, 50 members.

Algoma Lions Club, 36 members.

Mr. Verne Bushman, traffic manager of United States Plywood Corp.

We all urge your support of this legislation.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

GORDON R. MERCER,
Chairman, City of Algoma
Harbor Committee.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP CONTEST BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FOOD CHAINS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a most interesting letter from Mr. John A. Logan, president of the National Association of Food Chains. Mr. Logan describes a most commendable effort on the part of his national association in connection with good citizen awards throughout the 48 States. Good citizenship at the grass roots is indeed the pillar of this constitutional republic.

I send to the desk the text of Mr. Logan's letter describing the contest, and a list of the Wisconsin winners. I desire to congratulate each of these persons in the Badger State. I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FOOD CHAINS,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1955.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: You will, we believe, be interested in the attached list of supermarket and food store managers in your State who are being presented Good Citizen Awards by the National Association of Food Chains.

It has been said that, "Everyone talks about good citizenship, but very few do anything about it." The members of the National Association of Food Chains are now making what is, so far as is known, the first such effort on the part of an entire industry. To encourage good citizenship, the association, on behalf of its members, has taken the following steps:

It approached Teachers College of Columbia University, which has been studying the subject of citizenship and made a grant to the college to develop a simple questionnaire which would make it possible to rate the citizenship qualities of an individual.

More than 50 food-chain companies asked over 10,000 of their managers to fill out these questionnaires. These have now been rated and some 1,600 managers who scored highest on the test are being awarded certificates of good citizenship.

It is the hope of the members of this association that the interest aroused by this program will stimulate similar action by other industries and in the thousands of communities which these 10,000 men help to serve.

The questionnaires include such subjects as work on community problems and projects, voting and encouraging others to vote, knowledge of local problems and issues, and participation in welfare, church, and public service programs.

The National Association of Food Chains' membership includes most of the country's leading food chains employing hundreds of thousands of people in food distribution centers, offices, and 15,000 supermarkets and food stores throughout the Nation.

Cordially yours,

JOHN A. LOGAN.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FOOD CHAINS 1955 GOOD CITIZEN AWARD WINNERS—WISCONSIN

George F. Anderson, Red Owl Stores, Inc., Franklin; Oconto Falls.

Norman Austvold, National Tea Co., 621 West Miner Avenue; Ladysmith.

Clarence A. Anderson, National Tea Co., 301 Ruder Street; Wausau.

Lawrence Belongie, Red Owl Stores, Inc., 827 Carney Boulevard; Marinette.

Douglas M. Eland, Red Owl Stores, Inc., 1014 Gross Avenue; Green Bay.

Anton M. Flegel, Red Owl Stores, Inc., Luxemburg.

Arless M. French, Red Owl Stores, Inc., the Pines; Rhinelander.

William J. Hossman, National Tea Co., 119 South Seventh Street; Delavan.

Robert Johnson, National Tea Co., 1517 East Van Beck Avenue; Milwaukee.

Harold Lindell, Red Owl Stores, Inc., 1107 Wilson Avenue; Green Bay.

Royce Locke, Red Owl Stores, Inc., Denmark.

Ronald Leverence, National Tea Co., 2455 North 68th Street, Wauwatosa.

Thomas M. Morrissey, National Tea Co., 3609 South Third Street; Milwaukee.

Fred A. Mallach, National Tea Co., 302 Ninth Street; Watertown.

William Moffit, National Tea Co., Rural Route 2; Menomonie.

Edward Micka, the Kroger Co., 604 Washington Street; Darlington.

Bernhardt Naumann, National Tea Co., 1606 South Seventh Street; Milwaukee.

Robert Nickoli, the Kroger Co., 128 East Johnson Street, Fond du Lac.

Paul T. Robbins, National Tea Co., 505 LaBelle Avenue; Oconomowoc.

David D. Schurhammer, National Tea Co., 2802 South 23d Street; La Crosse.

James J. Smith, National Tea Co., 2407 West Finn Place; Milwaukee.

John A. Stock, National Tea Co., 2317 White Street; Marinette.

Bernard Therriault, Red Owl Stores, Inc., Main Street; Oconto Falls.

Emanuel Tate, Red Owl Stores, Inc., 114 South Union Street; Shawano.

Mel Tozier, Red Owl Stores, Inc., 1113 Marquette Avenue; Green Bay.

Leonard Ullsperger, National Tea Co., 219 East Park Avenue, Menomonee Falls.

Earl D. White, National Tea Co., 6324 Ogden Avenue; Superior.

Lowell Zimmer, the Kroger Co., 1149 Forest Street; Beloit.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Charles Noah Shepardson, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, vice Paul Emmert Miller, deceased.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report, favorably, for the calendar, the nomination of Theophil Carl Kammholz, of Illinois, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may be authorized to file any views he may see fit to submit on the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be received, and placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the authority requested for the Senator from Illinois is granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Trevor Gardner, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—BOYD LEEDOM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Boyd Leedom, of South Dakota, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1959.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am sure this nomination will be confirmed. I rise to speak, not because of any fear that it will not be confirmed, but because I wish the RECORD to show that in my opinion this nomination is an outstanding one of a very worthy man, and also because I desire to give expression to a few personal thoughts in connection therewith.

Mr. President, Boyd Leedom, of South Dakota, is presently the presiding judge of the South Dakota Supreme Court. The father of Judge Leedom was Chester Leedom, popularly known for many years in South Dakota as "Chet" Leedom. "Chet" was executive secretary to a former Member of this body, the Honorable William Henry McMaster, when Senator McMaster became a Member of the Senate. Subsequently, Mr. Leedom was appointed United States marshal for the State of South Dakota.

A number of years ago—far more than I care now to recount—"Chet" Leedom was one of half a dozen men who first encouraged me to become a candidate for nomination to a seat in the House of Representatives. He liked to encourage young men to take an active interest in politics. He often told me of the accomplishments of his son, Boyd, then a student at the State university. "Chet" had a flair for making friends and for public service that has been carried on in the career of his son, Boyd Leedom.

But it would hardly be fair to credit the father of Boyd Leedom with all the capacity for public service which the son embodies for Judge Leedom had a mother who was widely respected for her advocacy of high ideals in public service. She was very active in the Women's Christian Temperance Union. She had a deep religious faith which has found expression in the ideals exemplified in the life of Judge Leedom.

Judge Leedom himself has been an outstanding layman of the Methodist church in South Dakota. He is a man of very broad sympathies. In his home town of Rapid City, S. Dak., he is a member of the board of directors of a Protestant hospital. At Pierre, the State capital, when he became a member of the supreme court, he became a member of the board of trustees for a Catholic hospital.

I only wish that Judge Leedom's parents could be here today, for they would rightfully take pride in the appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate of their son to this important post on the National Labor Relations Board.

As a lawyer, Judge Leedom practiced law in Rapid City for more than 20 years.

A few days ago when the announcement was made by the President of the nomination of Judge Leedom, a resolution commending the appointment was unanimously adopted by the bar of Pennington County.

As a member of the Supreme Court of South Dakota, Judge Leedom has been widely known for his fairness and legal ability and the understanding with which he has met the responsibilities of that office.

It was characteristic of the modesty of the man that, the other day, when he appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in connection with that committee's consideration of his nomination, he should refer to his 2½ years in the Navy as "uneventful." That drew commendation from the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

When the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], queried Mr. Leedom with respect to his service in the field of labor relations, he modestly said that he supposed he had had little experience which would be regarded as directly in the field of labor-management relations. However, he had served as "the neutral member" of some mediation boards appointed under the National Railway Labor Relations Act. The questioning by the Senator from Alabama developed the fact that Judge Leedom had served in some 40 cases as the neutral member of the board, cases in which the members representing labor and management had been unable to come to an agreement. The Senator from Alabama asked, "What happens when they do not agree?"

Judge Leedom explained that then the neutral member of the board makes the decision.

The Senator from Alabama asked, "What if the respective sides do not wish to accept the award?"

Judge Leedom said they could go to court and obtain an injunction or affirmative action. However, it developed that in none of the 40 cases in which he had served, so far as he knew, had either side resorted to the courts to carry out the findings.

Mr. President, many men would hesitate to leave the relative security and comparative quiet of a State supreme court for the uncertainties and turmoil of a board in the field of labor-management relations. But when the invitation came to Judge Leedom, he looked upon it as a challenge to wider service. So as he said to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] at the hearing Friday, he will resign from the bench if confirmed, and come here shortly to enter upon his new duties.

I feel that in this appointment the United States will be well served. It is generally recognized that membership on the National Labor Relations Board entails difficult responsibilities. Judge Leedom has been an honest and upright judge. I feel confident that he will become a worthy and respected member of the National Labor Relations Board, and I am pleased to note that his nomination comes to the Senate recommended by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Boyd Leedom to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board?

The nomination was confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe to be commander in chief, United States Army, in Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams to be Comptroller of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, AIR FORCE, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS FAVORABLY REPORTED BUT NOT PRINTED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, sundry routine nominations in Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps have been favorably reported, but not printed on the Executive Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AID TO OPERATORS OF FAMILY-SIZE FARMS—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 1199

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on February 23, I introduced a bill, for myself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I refer to Senate bill 1199. I take great pleasure in asking unanimous consent that in the permanent RECORD, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] be added as a joint sponsor of that bill, and that in any subsequent printing of the bill his name be added thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say in that connection that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has a very fine background with respect to agricultural matters. The bill which I introduced is an agricultural bill. It seeks to obtain effective action along the line of assistance to the operators of family-sized farms. For many years after graduation from college, the Senator from South Carolina was actively engaged in agricultural pursuits. I am therefore very happy to have him join in sponsoring this measure.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 2, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1955:

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. James Dunne O'Connell, O14905, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be generals

Gen. John Edwin Hull, O7377, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolté, O6908, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Trevor Gardner, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics for a term of 4 years.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Boyd Leedom, of South Dakota, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1959.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS

Lt. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe, O12263, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be commander in chief, United States Army, Europe, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425, United States Army, to be Comptroller of the Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Francis J. Aiken, Jr., and 246 other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 15, 1955, and may be found in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Francis J. Aiken, Jr., which appears on page 1555, and ending with the name of Peter H. Thames, which appears on page 1556.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Robert Crawford and 442 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 1, 1955, and may be found in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert Crawford, which is shown on page 1066, and ending with the name of Jessie J. Heney, which is shown on page 1067.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Galen B. Allen and 665 other officers, for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 4, 1955, and may be found in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Galen B. Allen, which is shown on page 1200, and ending with the name of Don J. Slee, which appears on page 1202.

The nominations of William H. Sublette and 6,406 other officers, for appointment in the Navy, and the nominations of Charles W. Abbott and 7,910 other officers, for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 11, 1955, and may be found in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William H. Sublette, which is shown on page 1474, and ending with the name of Murray G. Dowler, which appears on page 1503.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Michael Igoe, St. Louis Catholic Church, Groveton, Va., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the Living God, one and coequal with the Father and the Holy Ghost, very God and very man, Thou didst promise that whatsoever we ask the Father in Thy name it will be given to us. With humble and humbled hearts, contritely mindful of our sins and weaknesses, in the name of Christ Jesus our Lord, we ask our Father in heaven graciously and mercifully to hear this our prayer:

Help us to realize and ever more perfectly in our civic life our calling to be sons of God. The inspiration and the ultimate stability of our democracy is the fact of the inviolable dignity and rights, with corresponding duties of adopted sons of God. Before every human law, there is Thy divine law, under which we are accountable to Thee.

Thou didst so create us that perforce we must live together in civil society for our common temporal good.

Thankful for Thy bounties to us, we humbly beg for the light and strength to express our gratitude in true wisdom in our local and national actions.

Send forth Thy spirit to enlighten and strengthen our civic duties toward each other.

Father in heaven, accept this pleading in the name of Thy divine Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, and through His merits mercifully and graciously hear our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 25, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3828) entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE IN JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment, and agree to the further conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DIES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I wish to make a very brief observation. I understand the difference is over the $1,250 expense allowance. May I suggest to our conferees that that $1,250 be eliminated, and the five railroad trips which the members of the other body want also be eliminated. The salary ought to be put at $25,000. and we ought to pay our taxes on $25,000 like every other citizen.

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if he can possibly clarify for me the situation with respect to this particular conference. As I read the accounts in the papers Saturday and yesterday, there seems to be the general impression that this $1,250 item is tax exempt. I would like a clarifying statement, because certainly I do not think any one of us should be put in a special category or classification different from any other taxpaying citizen of the United States. I was always under the impression that that item was not tax exempt.

Mr. CELLER. It is an expense allowance. It is tax exempt in this sense. For example, you are allowed $600 for your expenses back home for the operation of your office. You may be supplied a voucher, one of those pink vouchers and you get $600 a year out of the contingent fund of the House. That is like an expense account which any businessman or professional man incurs. He takes it out of his business funds. It is essential for his business operation to spend such sums. So it is with Congressmen. They spend $600 a year to defray expenses of running their congressional office or doing their work back home. Of course there is no tax on it. The $1,250 allowance was a limitation, a maximum allowance for legitimate expenses. If you spent, let us say, $200 for extra telephone calls or $300 for extra telegrams or $200 for mimeograph work, you could specify those items of expense by voucher and submit the voucher to the Clerk of the House and the funds would be paid out of the contingent fund of the House up to $1,250. There was no tax on it.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to the chairman of the conferees on this side of the aisle, I think that item ought to be eliminated so that we will not be classified as tax escapees one way or the other or granting ourselves any special privileges. It leads to misunderstandings.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly, that will be given consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from New York would answer a question or two. I notice in the papers that one of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court is scheduled to embark in June on a trip throughout Russia. This same Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, about this time a year ago, spent a week or 10 days tramping along the old C. & O. Canal to prove something or other. I do not know just what. Does the gentleman still think that the increase to the Supreme Court Justices of the United States should be continued in this bill under the circumstances of that Court adjourning in June until October each year?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think that we should judge whether there should be an increase by what that particular judge or any other judge has done or has failed to do.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman that in my opinion, these increases to the Federal judiciary and the Supreme Court are out of all reason under the circumstances. I want the RECORD to show I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for our pay raise. While it was more than I really wanted to go, I did so with the sincere belief that the conferees of both Chambers would agree on a reasonable salary. The House version did not contain a tax-exempt expense account. Our bill laid it on the line and was all subject to full income tax payment, the same as all other taxpayers in America.

On last Friday, February 25, at noon, when the House met, I was detained in my office by a long-distance call from a constituent. When I had finished, I practically ran from my office to this floor in order to object to the conferees' report, and attempt to have the House strike from it the section that contained this free-loader expense account, on the grounds that the new pay raise itself obviated the necessity for any such piggyback ride. Much to my chagrin, I arrived here on the floor about a minute after the conferees' report had been approved.

There is a desperate need for a judicial and congressional salary increase, because Congress has had only 1 pay raise in 30 years. What is more, the $7,500 raise is cut actually to about $3,750, due to our present 50-cent dollar. Take the additional income tax out of this raise—counting five exemptions—and the net increase take-home pay is roughly $2,750. The present $22,500 contained in the conferees' report makes any additional office expense at this time ill-advised, unwarranted, and indefensible. In my opinion, if we do not void this section promptly, the taxpayers might justifiably think that this is a lightfingered, backhanded raid on the Treasury.

All any Member wants is a fair and reasonable salary without any fancy fixings.

Having supported the original measure in the hope of an equitable, fair compromise, I urge the House conferees to accept the instructions of the Senate conferees. Let us cut out this tax-free expense account of $1,250 and settle the issue now.

As bad as we need a salary increase, we simply cannot sacrifice the dignity of our office or cheapen ourselves in order to get it.

One year ago tomorrow, March 1, the House was badly shot up by would-be assassins. While that might well be an occupational hazard we assume upon election to Congress it could also be an additional argument for a salary in keeping with our station in life. However, let us not ever expect, ask, or accept any tax-free "doodads" no matter how difficult the course. If the conferees do not toss this expense account out, I urge you all to join with me and vote against the whole business. In my opinion, we will command far more respect from the country if we do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, WALTER, and REED of Illinois.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 159, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] and I have introduced identical bills, H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, which provide for a comprehensive, universal, adequate, pay-as-you-go retirement program. These bills are similar to the bipartisan legislation cosponsored in the 83d Congress by our former colleagues Mr. Angell, of Oregon, and Mr. Secrest, of Ohio.

These bills, in summary, provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal social-security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; they give protection to widows with children; and further provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Last year extensive and complete testimony in behalf of these measures was presented before the House Committee on Ways and Means, including a comprehensive statement signed by about 100 Members of the House from both sides of the aisle, strongly urging the Ways and Means Committee to favorably report this legislation to the House for final debate and vote. I call to the attention of my colleagues this testimony found on pages 525 and 572 in the printed hearings:

Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, on H. R. 7199, Social Security Act Amendments of 1954.

The testimony, therefore, is complete and already available to the Ways and Means Committee and to all Members of the House. The only new evidence to be presented is the fact that the tragic plight of millions of our old folks is even more critical than ever before, and it shall continue to worsen. I urgently appeal that the Ways and Means Committee favorably report this legislation to the House, so that this Congress may work its will upon this vitally needed legislation for the welfare of the aged of America.

PROTECTION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. ROBERTS. The Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it will be a year ago tomorrow that the House was attacked by four Puerto Ricans. This gunplay wounded five of the Members, and but for a miracle might have resulted in many deaths. The scars of this murderous demonstration will be borne by some until the ends of our lives. There are still many grim reminders of that infamous day, and I am sure that those of us who sat like clay pigeons do not care to be again reminded of its horrors.

Following this unfortunate incident have been other events which I regret to call to your attention. Some of you will remember the youth who used a flash camera in the gallery. The explosion of the flashbulb again brought to your memories the day of the serious attack. Just a few weeks ago a lady, with harmless intent, entered the Chamber unescorted and without permission, strolled down the aisle and walked up to our beloved Speaker. Let us be thankful that she was not bent on a mission of malice and hate.

These happenings gravely illustrate the absence of the protection or security needed by this body during its work. This House of Representatives has been called the greatest deliberative body on the face of the earth by one of Britain's most illustrious statesmen, yet it enjoys less protection than many of our public parks and national buildings.

Following the attack by the Puerto Rican nationalists the air was literally full of suggestions for a more rigid security. Some said that a glass wall—bullet proof—should be erected to separate the galleries from the floor. A bill was introduced to accomplish this project. Others thought that a metallic detection device should be placed at points of entry to the floor and galleries. Some called for the marines, the FBI, and various other police measures. It is not my purpose to advocate any measure that will cause us to take on the appearance of an armed camp, nor to deny our constituents the full opportunity to hear the debates and speeches in the House. I believe that any such measure would not be in the public interest and would not receive the support of the country nor of this House.

It is my opinion that the people of the country rightfully expect that we have some degree of protection while we are engaged in their business. The country was shocked to learn of the utter lack of security which prevailed. I have received countless letters urging that protection be provided. A great section of the press, radio, and television interests have urged that some measure be introduced for this purpose. Certainly they cannot feel that we are acting in the best interests of our people unless we provide ourselves with adequate security. Actually such protection will cost little more and probably no more than we are now spending. It just calls for some system that will require reasonable standards. Mental and physical examinations which are no higher than those of almost any city or town police system will provide the maximum amount of security.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the House did not pass a bill that we hoped would afford proper protection?

Mr. ROBERTS. That is correct. I am coming to that in just a moment. Last year the House Speaker stated that it was the desire of the leadership on both sides to enact legislation creating a Capitol Police force. The bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], and with the endorsement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], had the unanimous support of the House. It was introduced in July, after full and complete hearings, and was a good enough bill to attract complete and full bipartisan support. After passing the House, it was sent over to the other body and did not clear in time. I do not criticize the other body but I feel that the measure should reach them in time to have due consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman who is addressing the House will carry for the rest of his life the effects of a bullet

received when that dastardly attack occurred, I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for an additional minute, without considering it to be a precedent.

The SPEAKER. Since there is no legislative business today, without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for myself it does not mean that I will be disturbed if the measure fails. I have no personal wish in the matter because I am of the opinion that lightning does not strike in the same place twice. I believe that no Member has a better right to press for this legislation than the five of us who were victims. All of them are in accord with the principles of this legislation and join me in its sponsorship. They feel, as I do, that every Member deserves a fighting chance while engaged here in public business. Many of the issues discussed here generate friction and can easily inflame persons who might be mentally unbalanced or who have allowed themselves to become involved in some deadly plot or conspiracy. You never know what may be in that person's mind who is in the gallery. Members from large metropolitan districts cannot possibly know every voter or person who might come down here and under such a guise, obtain entry and a position from which he could do a great deal of harm. It is only commonsense that we do what other reasonable people do to provide protection. America is not only the leader of this hemisphere. Washington is not only the center of Government for this country. In the minds of the people of the free world, Washington is the center of the world. What we do here will determine the course, not only of our people, but of more than half of the people of the world.

The bill which I shall introduce is practically the same bill which was passed last year. I have no pride of authorship, there are a few changes which I think will make the bill more acceptable. These changes I shall explain when the bill is before the House for further consideration.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Armed Services may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today the Hoover Commission makes public its report on medical services. Without going into detail, I am putting a list of my dissenting views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under unanimous consent, but I would like to make one point at this time for the benefit of the Congress: The whole purport of this report will be to close up Public Health Service hospitals which are now in existence, to close out military hospitals and veterans hospitals in the name of economy. I want to make a public protest at this time because of the danger of radioactive fallout which would occur if we have an enemy attack on this country. This danger would be so great and the facts that have recently been released warn us against closing up any hospital facility. If such an attack should occur we will not only need the hospitals that are now in existence but also probably a great many more.

THE HONORABLE RUTH THOMPSON

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the signal honor recently paid to one of our Members, the Honorable RUTH THOMPSON, Member of Congress from the Ninth District of Michigan.

At a founders day award banquet on February 12, 1955, in celebration of its centennial year, Michigan State College added to its own distinction by presenting a centennial award to the Honorable RUTH THOMPSON, in recognition of distinguished services which have contributed to the benefit of mankind. The citation which accompanied this award paid due tribute to Judge THOMPSON as follows:

> Legislator, jurist, friend of youth. For the wisdom and the sense of justice which you have brought to our courts; for the leadership which you have provided the people in Michigan in our State legislature; and for the skill and sincerity with which you have represented us in the Congress of the United States, Michigan State College is honored to present to you this centennial award.

Those of us in the Congress who have long been aware of the valued experience, honorable services, and rare intellectual achievement and high integrity of Judge THOMPSON wish to express to her on this occasion our congratulations on this honor duly paid her by leaders of her own State.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Small Business Committee may have permission to meet on Wednesday, March 2, while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF NATURAL GAS COMPANIES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed the second flanking movement in the two-pronged drive by the Eisenhower administration to sterilize the Natural Gas Act by removing natural gas companies from rate regulation. If there were any doubt that the big oil and gas corporations were the special darlings of this administration, that doubt was dissipated last Saturday when the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy issued its report. Inasmuch as the 8-man committee consisted of 7 members of the President's cabinet and the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization as chairman, it is difficult to conceive that this report does not reflect the Eisenhower policy.

The report continues the administration's long record of flouting the interests of the consumers. If its recommendations are adopted, consumers will pay hundreds of millions of extra dollars into the treasuries of the big oil and gas companies in the country.

The report follows closely upon the first enveloping movement on the consumers' pocketbook which occurred last spring with the decision by the Federal Power Comission in the Panhandle Eastern pipeline case. This decision had the effect of relieving the pipeline companies owning their own reserves from the effect of rate regulation contemplated by the Natural Gas Act. The purpose of the act is to shield consumers from exorbitant charges by companies furnishing natural gas in interstate commerce and it requires the public utility concept of rate regulation, that is, a rate base predicated on actual costs. Until last spring, the Federal Power Commission had always used this method of valuation, even in the face of Panhandle's militant contention that the current field value of its gas reserves should be considered as the base for fixing its rates. In each instance where the Commission rejected the company's contention and insisted upon regulation based on actual cost, its decision was sustained by the courts. Then on April 15, 1954, for some reason the Commission changed its mind and adopted the company's argument. It apparently preferred the dissenting opinions of the late Justice Jackson to the majority opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of the decision on the consumer was enormous. In my own city of Chicago, as one isolated example, 1,450,000 gas users will pay an additional $5,216,000 for their gas as a result of this decision. And its impact has not yet been fully felt inasmuch as the decision is still on appeal of the courts.

If other pipeline companies are given the same consideration as Panhandle

Eastern, and there is no clear reason why they should not—if rate regulation is tied to current market price of gas reserves rather than original cost, the pipeline companies will have been taken out of effective rate regulation.

Now the report by the President's committee marks the second part of the attack on the Natural Gas Act. Essentially, the report advocates enactment of the old Kerr bill to relieve the so-called independent producers from regulation. This recommendation is in direct contrast to the action taken by the previous Democratic administration, for it will be remembered that President Truman refused to bow to the pressures exerted by the oil and gas interests and vetoed the Kerr bill.

The particular form of the committee's recommendation leads me to believe that the committee was guilty either of gross ignorance or willful deception. This is what it said:

> In the interest of a sound fuel policy and the protection of the national defense and consumer interests by assuring such a continued exploration for and development of adequate reserves as to provide an adequate supply of natural gas, we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

Certainly the committee knew or should have known that the production and gathering process is now exempt from regulation. Why, then, should it attempt to tie that process in with the movement of gas in interstate commerce unless it sought to confuse the issue?

As the Supreme Court has pointed out time and again, the important point is when the gas begins its interstate journey to the gas stoves of the consumers. This may or may not be when it enters an interstate pipeline. In the Interstate Natural Gas Co. case, the court held that it began before it entered the pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the passage of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, the Supreme Court of the United States has held in the case of *Public Service Commission* v. *Attelboro* (273 U. S. 83), that the States could not regulate the transportation of natural gas and electricity in interstate commerce and the sale of natural gas and electricity in interstate commerce for resale. Thus, natural gas companies engaged in interstate commerce were regulated neither by State nor Federal authorities. This void in interstate regulations became known as the Attelboro Gap. It was to fill this vacuum that the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was passed, to fill the regulatory gap beginning at the city gate and extending back to the source of the gas. If the recommendation of the committee be adopted, that gap in regulation will again come into being, to the detriment of the consumer.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

WHY TVA IS RIGHT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my regular address for today, I would like to begin by inserting in the RECORD certain statements that were made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the then candidate for President of the United States, in his remarks on the Tennessee Valley Authority in the State of Tennessee. In an address at Memphis, Tenn., October 25, 1952, Mr. Eisenhower said:

> In this region, you are deeply interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and in the part it has played in the improvement of the agriculture and commerce in this area. TVA has served rural areas well and has created many new industries in this section. It has helped conserve natural resources, control floods, and promote national defense.

He then said this:

> Certainly there would be no disposition on my part to impair the effective working out of TVA. It is a great experiment in resource development and flood control for this particular area.
>
> We should not, however, look upon the TVA as a rigid pattern for such development in other regions. In the Missouri valley, for example, many officials and other thoughtful citizens are considering the possibility of a legal arrangement which would make State and Federal agencies true partners in developing the resources of that great region. We should give all such suggestions serious consideration. This is the system I favor in general for new project.

After Mr. Eisenhower left Memphis, he went over to Knoxville, Tenn., the same day and made this statement:

> Now, today after I left Memphis someone handed me a newspaper ad that came out of your State. I don't know who this misguided man is; I never saw him and I am sure he never saw me. But here is a thing where he tells what I think about the Tennessee Valley Authority and his picture of me is enjoying the dynamiting of some big dam. Now, fortunately, before I knew what was this man's idea of what was in my heart and mind, I had expressed myself very emphatically on the point over at Memphis. With your permission, I shall read what I said over there.

And he requoted the same statements that were made in Memphis that I read to you previously. Then he went further and made this remark:

> Now, is it a crime, ladies and gentleman, to want the local people who are affected by these great things to be satisfied with the way they are worked out, the way they are organized, the way they are administered, the purpose to which they are put?

I would like to remind the Members of this House that as I continue my address, I am one of the local citizens of that area he mentions, and also a representative, and represent a majority of the thinking of some 350,000 people in that area to which Mr. Eisenhower referred.

The issue upon which I rise today to address this House is one upon which I would not hesitate to stake my political future. In it is involved the most critical phases of the history of our country going back to the War Between the States. Upon this issue rests the prosperity, as I see it, of the seven States in the Tennessee Valley, and indirectly a good part of the prosperity of the rest of the country. With this issue is involved perhaps the greatest single economic achievement in the annals of man anywhere. The issue to which I am thus dedicating myself in this appearance before the House is the Tennessee Valley Authority. It has influenced the populations of seven States in every detail of their living. It has influenced, substantially, government everywhere in this country and it is no secret that it has influenced government throughout the world. The question which we have to resolve is simply: Why is it right? Why is TVA right?

The reason I rise to speak on a matter with which all of us are to some degree familiar is not so much because I am myself a product of the TVA country—rather I feel, as I must, a profound sense of responsibility as one of the representatives of the people in that area in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States. And I rise to speak on its behalf because I recognize that TVA is under attack. The very nature of this attack is so subtle, so implied, so indirect, but so devastating, that at the risk of appearing bold, in the light of my freshman role before this body, I hasten to a defense which must not be further delayed. As I speak, under the President's budget 75 percent of TVA appropriations have been cut. And if the President's decision holds it will mean the dismissal of one-fourth of the employees on the TVA work rolls or a kind of minor man-made depression. And above all, I am eager that my colleagues here shall know the depth of my concern and that henceforth there will never be even the faintest doubt as to my position on the issue. The nature of the attack is mostly indirect and subtle because TVA has so successfully demonstrated its worth that an open and frontal attack is frustrating to the attackers and without validity. Even Dixon, of the famous team of Dixon and Yates, under direct questioning has been obliged to applaud TVA.

But the attack is powerful. It must be said to be spearheaded by this very administration now in office. It is the type of attack which argues that it has no intention to attack. It strikes out at TVA by deliberately undercutting its program and seeking to bring hostile

private power influences into its territory. Then, while appeasing TVA devotees with faint praise, it moves out generally to point to TVA as the Nation's outstanding example of creeping socialism, or socialism on the gallop, or, at any rate, accusing its sponsors of having introduced into the heart of America some baleful isms from abroad. Our fight is confused because we are not fighting really an open enemy openly. What we are fighting is a more deadly enemy disguised under the half-concealed pretense of being a friend. Under this guise, this half-friend plants a bomb called Dixon-Yates under the vigorous TVA structure with the intent of blowing it up.

The most important function which the believers in TVA have to perform in the present hour is to keep clear the channels of information on this mighty and magnificent and superbly American project.

That is why I rise to speak.

The waters of propaganda must never be muddied by false arguments. I am compelled to see myself in the role of a voice in this House that shall nail down the lie the moment it raises its head. What we have to ask and answer in the face of these unwarranted attacks is the question: Is TVA socialism? What we have to ask and answer is the question: Is TVA some kind of an eleemosynary institution supported by the taxpayer, some kind of charitable trust, subsidized by the people? What we have to ask and to answer is the question: Is the TVA the product of some alien ideology aimed to destroy free enterprise?

What we must produce before the people of America is the proof of the fruit of this project. The proof must exist one way or the other as strong as the sunlight.

The proof does exist and can be evaluated.

The proof is not a matter of opinion—it is proof.

It is evidence, the best kind of evidence. We have results that you can feel, and count, and see, and photograph, and submit to adding and calculating machines. The evidence exists in the lives of people. The evidence exists in the produce of their fields and their farms and their factories. The evidence can be computed in terms as cold and objective as a balance sheet—before TVA and after. The argument about socialism is answerable to the point of utter devastation. And so—as I hope I shall show—are all the other attacks which would be made to distort into a thing of evil the outstanding achievement of the American people in the field of economic progress.

But to give this picture body and background, bear with me while I go back into the history of the uses that have been made of American wealth before TVA. Go back with me while I talk of economic aid to Europe and other nations after World War I, World War II, and Korea. And then, if I may, permit me to review the analogous situation in the American South after the War Between the States. What aid was it that we gave the Southern States when they were reduced to waste and ruin, to economic collapse and disintegration? From the, I hope, objective panorama I shall thus briefly draw up for you, I ask you to focus your attention on TVA. I ask you to see, in the light of the facts and the figures I shall give you, how ideally the quality of this project, in its every phase, fitted the desperate needs of the situation. I ask you to see it as the symbolic and concrete expression of the American tradition, as defined in so many words, under the welfare clause in the Constitution of the United States. I ask you to recognize its bursting stimulus to free enterprise—as if some Niagara of prosperity had been let loose. And I ask you to recognize its vastly effective importance to the defense of America, and its marvelous outlet for the vitality and the ruggedness of the American people. The TVA did all of that.

And it did more. It assuaged the bitterness of an economically war-destroyed section of the United States of America. It did more to heal the continuing wounds between the North and the South than any other single event in the history of our country—including the unifying effects of the two World Wars and Korea. It is unthinkable to me, Mr. Speaker, that this 84th Congress of the United States will even begin to permit the undermining, the delimitation, the gradualistic starvation by underappropriation, of a project that has done and is doing so much to bind up the Nation's wounds—both the wounds of war and the wounds of depression. And that is so rich in promise for the future. What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is the greatest demonstrable answer in the history of all time to mass poverty. To call this socialistic is to blaspheme against the Constitution of the United States and to give credit to a philosophy that is abhorrent to the people of my part of the country.

In speaking to the proposition: Why is TVA right? Of course I know that TVA is economic aid. To say that economic aid is wrong is to say that every river and harbor bill is wrong and river and harbor bills are as old as our country. We did not think that economic aid to Europe was wrong after World War I. And there you have, for the first time, economic aid—not to us, to other peoples—in figures that read like language out of interstellar space. World War I cost the Treasury of the United States $66,592,966,000. Of this sum we gave for the economic aid of Europe and nations elsewhere $17,151,479,717.22. World War II cost the Treasury of the United States $499,678,266,000. Of this incredible figure which it is impossible for my mind to encompass, we gave for the economic aid of Europe and the Far East—including, mind you, Japan, and other nations, a total of $46,847,000,000 for the period from July 1945 to June 1954. I ask: Is it right to give to the rest of the world—including our former enemies—more than 17 billions of dollars during one war, and almost 47 billions during another, and is it wrong to give 7 States in our own country a TVA which, in total cost according to the latest estimate, comes to only $1,629,688,540? This is broadly one-seventeenth of the treasure we gave foreign countries after World War I, and broadly one forty-sixth of what we gave in economic aid to foreign countries after World War II.

I am not now debating the right or the wrong of foreign aid. I am only asking what kind of logic is it that ladles out with such unexampled largess these billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money to the nations abroad, friends, former enemies and potential enemies alike, and then raises the cry of socialism when we give a minor fraction of such vast amounts to our own people? Why is the heart of the TVA critic who makes this argument always so warm for the far countries beyond the seas? And so cold for the soil under his feet? I recognize the motivations to strengthen the free world. But where must the sinews of the free world be strengthened first and most of all if not right here in Tennessee, in Mississippi, in Arkansas, in South Carolina, in North Carolina, in Alabama, in Kentucky, in Virginia—and, as a matter of fact, everywhere in the United States?

I need no one to spell out for me the significance of the war in Korea for our own freedoms and the freedoms of mankind. But I ask that we see the whole picture in perspective. As a result of that action in Korea we gave away $26,269,000,000 from July 1, 1950, through July 1954. Of this about 85 percent was economic aid because of this war for all the allies. Korea through this same period, 1950–54, received of this sum some $941 million. What I am doing is merely setting these ponderous sums of money out of the Treasury of the United States for foreign aid, against the sums—piddling by comparison—spent by us for ourselves precisely for the same purpose—economic aid—under TVA. The arithmetic resulting from this contrast, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, is material for a cartoon. It would show Uncle Sam penuriously handing out small coins from a tight change pocket to his own people, and scooping out mighty handfuls of big denomination bills for the, I am sure, needy and deserving citizens of other parts of the world out of a bushel basket. I am not pleading that we ignore the rest of the free world or that we deny them our aid. I ask that we do not neglect our own and I ask that we put the global picture financially—with ourselves in it—in some kind of arithmetical perspective.

What we are doing with our prodigious wealth overseas is rebuilding a war-torn world and keeping it inside the circle of free nations. How I wish I could have stood on this very floor 90 years ago and pleaded for precisely this policy when the American Southland was one deathridden ruin after the War Between the States. The Southern economy was in collapse, and had been even before surrender in the field. The total wealth of the Southern Confederacy including real property, came to something less than $3 billion. And this was all ashes after the war. In the end the total debt of the South was $2,345,000,000 in Confederate currency, representing $572 million gold value. This sum, one historian tells us, represented a financial

sacrifice by the southern people over twice as great as the northern per capita expenditure for the war. The Shenandoah Valley was a devastated field of weeds. Southern cities were like ghost towns on doomsday. Plantations were charred embers. There had been dizzy inflation, there was hunger and misery, and the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse were riding high.

We can all see the futility of setting the pattern of the middle of the 20th century against the pattern of the middle of the 19th, even though principles remain unchanged. I make this note, however, that the ready and easy idealism which persuades us to shovel out our wealth in buckets today all over the earth was as dead as a tombstone when the searing winds howled through the trees of our own southern desolation 90 years ago. We waited through the decades—many of our States through poverty and near-poverty—until the TVA decade of the 1930's before that great neglect was overcome and before that great wrong was righted. Under the burden of the terrible losses of the War Between the States the South found recovery a grinding and ill-rewarding task, for they were obliged to start from scratch creating an entirely new economy. Considering their ruin and their resources, their success, as we know, was phenomenal. But none of us can deny that it was at long last TVA that really brought the sunlight of prosperity into the valley, benefiting directly more than one-seventh of the States of this Union and doing it with immediate returns and eventual profit to the Treasury of the United States.

Before TVA what did we have? Three percent of the region's farms were electrified in 1933. Today—since TVA—it is 90 percent. Before TVA what was the income per capita in the valley? It was only 40 percent of the average for the Nation. By 1945 it jumped to 58 percent of the national average. In 12 years the valley raised itself up by its economic bootstraps by 18 percentage points, or by almost 50 percent. The people in the valley have raised their per capita income since TVA began more than 500 percent for the same period during which the increase for the Nation has been 345 percent. Before TVA we had all that can be compressed in the word "depression." Since TVA there has been a net increase of 1,600—I repeat—1,600 manufacturing and processing plants in the region.

These items of growth and development I am giving you are but haphazard notes I have selected at random out of a vast mass of statistical material which cannot be refuted and which—only lately—has begun to confound the critics of TVA. At least those more honorable critics who like to know what they are talking about. You can strike an opinion with another opinion but bookkeeping is an exact science. Now, just how much moned did TVA cost the United States Treasury? And where did the money go? The total cost for TVA's fixed assets, minus depreciation, according to the TVA annual budget report of 1954, was $1,629,688,540. Suppose we break this figure down. Well, we find that $330,601,282 went for power features of multiple-purpose dams, and $49,422,313 for single-use dams, the two giving us hydroelectric power. We spent $318,237,703 for the generation of steam power, and $270,103,883 for transmission lines and other electric plants. Thus the total cost for hydrogenation, steam generation, and transmission comes to $968,365,181.

Today TVA hydro and steam plants are producing about 30 billion kilowatt-hours a year. TVA power is used by more than a million and a quarter consumers. This is four times as many as had electricity in the same area in 1933. I may add that residential consumers pay only about half as much per kilowatt-hour as those in the Nation as a whole but they use nearly twice as much power.

Now, going on with the cost of TVA to the National Treasury, we find that $140,577,055 was spent for navigation, and $169,360,354 for flood control. We find that chemical plant costs $22,648,952 and general plant $12,239,864. Construction in progress comes to $316,497,134 and this includes small amounts allocated to investigations for future projects. All this gives us the grand total for TVA's fixed assets of $1,629,688,540. There have been TVA expenditures from appropriations for research on natural resources, mainly fertilizer and munitions. In 1954 this expenditure was $2,171,129; in 1955 it is estimated at $2,143,000 and $2,181,000 is projected for 1956.

In addition—to these figures on research—TVA carried on chemical and engineering research during fiscal 1954 for classified defense projects. For these TVA was reimbursed $5,023,354.

Now we have to answer the question I asked earlier: Is TVA some kind of Federal eleemosynary institution, some vast alms house, a charity foundation cleaving to the Nation's Treasury to provide doles; a crackpot experiment in socialism, a waste of the taxpayer's money, a fly-by-night dream culled from the pages of Karl Marx? Suppose we go back to the bookkeeping. And then suppose we put ourselves in the hard-headed, show-me-the-figures frame of mind of a conservative banker evaluating the situation, not sociologically, not economically, not from the standpoint of the national defense even, but from the practical, profit-yielding point of view, so much for so much. We find that the TVA investment has already paid back into the United States Treasury total payments from power proceeds amounting to $101,132,000. Of this $50 million went to the general fund and $27,500,000 to reduce the bonded indebtedness of TVA. Payments to the Treasury from other proceeds came to $22,039,000. There were reinvested net earnings owned by the Federal Government which come to $153 million. And we find that the annual return on power investment in the total TVA period between 1933 and 1954 was 4 percent.

The net effect of TVA on expenditures of the United States Government may be simply told. In 1954 the figure was $238,048,295. For 1955 the estimated figure is $214,411,679. For 1956 the estimated figure is $1,979,000. The sharp change from the 1954 and 1955 figures to the 1956 figure is accounted for principally by a $200 million reduction in expenditures for construction, and further by a $40 milllion increase in power revenues.

These figures are, of course, complex, but what they prove to any banker, to any hardheaded man of business, to any chamber of commerce, is that TVA is a business proposition pure and simple, that it is paying off handsomely, and that it is as far removed from socialism as George Washington is from Nikolai Lenin. What my figures have shown is that there is a direct, across-the-counter return from TVA's power investment. One fourth of TVA's investment in power facilities has come from the people of the Tennessee Valley through the bills they pay for service. There is the indirect return from the nonrevenue producing facilities devoted to navigation, flood control, and kindred activities. Gordon R. Clapp, the former Chairman of the Board of the TVA, offered what I now believe is an understatement but which sums up what I have been saying. Clapp said: Historians will judge TVA "as one of the best investments this country has made since the Louisiana Purchase."

Who can deny that?

Therefore if the opponents of TVA—especially in the private power monopolies—must attack this program let them attack it on several grounds. Let them say that it is not the right yardstick to use in evaluating private power projects. There is an answer for that one too. But let them say it. Let them say that private power could have done it, too. Let them say that private power could have done it better. If they could, I wonder why they did not. Let them say this and let them say that. But, please, let us not have any more of this living off the argument that TVA is socialism. That is an abuse of the truth, a twist of the tortuous tricks of dishonest propaganda which has been forever nailed in its coffin. For once some people really get to believe the fake argument that TVA is socialism, they may be pardoned for demanding more of it and in far more radical form. TVA, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, is—from my angle of vision—the very antithesis of socialism. It is a form of innoculation against it. What TVA really constitutes is the best answer yet to socialism by a free government. It is the antidote to socialism and the demonstrated answer to pastoral poverty on one side and the failure or timidity or procrastination of private power monopoly on the other. In fact, should I have the boldness to make another speech on this subject—which I doubt—I think I would have far less difficulty proving that private-power monopoly is socialism than private power is now having proving that TVA is socialism.

TVA is the constitutional answer to the plague of socialism. It gives the people the tools with which to do their own work. It derives its constitutional justification from the very words of the constitution itself—"promote the general welfare." The TVA is the greatest engineering and structural phenomenon

in the history of civilized society—ours or any other in all time. It must be presented to the people of the United States and to the world for what it is: To date the ultimate economic triumph of democracy. Socialism would have inundated it with the paraphernalia of total government. But here democracy provided the mechanism so that the people at the grass roots were put in the position of being able to help themselves instead of being patronized. The question was: Is there the need? The next question was: Can private interests provide it, and will they? The answer was simple. The need was not only apparent; it was urgent. The answer was again simple: Private interests were either unable or unwilling, or indifferent to the involvements of the public interest. It had to be done and the Government had to do it.

The Government did.

Yet today—let us face it—we find ourselves in a fight for TVA's survival. I will not quarrel with the President of the United States, but I shall certainly oppose him on any curtailment of TVA. It is my humble right as a citizen of the United States to fight for my principles. But it is much more my duty as a representative from the Tennessee Valley to oppose him in what seems to me a ruthless and incredibly unwise campaign to drain the lifeblood out of the greatest prosperity giving project man has been able to achieve since he taught himself the mathematics of construction and design.

The Dixon-Yates contract is an invasion of TVA. It is an invasion with certain connotations of favoritism and privilege that excite shock, suspicion, and indignation. My language in describing this deal is correctly inhibited by my respect for the integrity of the President. But for that, the bare facts, now in the public domain, reveal the unabashed use of the Presidential power for private advantage to Dixon-Yates for which I can find no parallel outside the area of great Federal scandals. This is a great wrong to the basic principles of democratic government as I understand them. Dixon-Yates got their way without competitive bidding; nor was opportunity or invitation to alternative proposals offered to other possible competitors for such a contract. Yet we know that other private firms were interested.

Opposition existed within the AEC and the TVA. It had been planned to build a powerplant at Paducah, Ky. But solely for Dixon-Yates' benefit the decision was changed to fit their advantage, and what Dixon-Yates asked for they got: The decision to have the plant built in Arkansas, on the other side of the Mississippi River from Memphis, where they would be in an ideal position for impinging on the TVA power market. I would be just as firm in fighting a deal so unfair were it directed at private power and were public power the aggressor. Building this plant on the wrong side of the Mississippi means $15 million greater cost, according to the estimate of engineers. The contract—for so much of it as has been made public—practically guarantees Dixon-Yates 9 percent on the investment, and Dixon-Yates gets $40 million from the United States even if none of this power is ever used. As Senator ALBERT GORE has pointed out, this may not be probable, but he says—and I agree with him—that it certainly indicates who it is that is being favored in this contract. The TVA, itself, has estimated that it could provide the needed power at a saving of from $90 million to $140 million to the American people, and the office of the President has stated that TVA could furnish this power for $90 million less than Dixon-Yates. Yet the President has put himself solidly and stubbornly behind Dixon-Yates to the great chagrin of the people in the Tennessee Valley. Many of us cannot believe that the President means in this way to pervert the powers of his great office.

Finally, what is it that we ask?

We do not ask for the geographical enlargement of the TVA and I know of no one else who does. What we ask is that the truth about TVA—the rightness of it inside the American economy—get the recognition it deserves. We ask that those who seek to diminish it be stopped. That means an end of the Dixon-Yates contract. I pledge myself here to fight as hard as I can, and as long as the need remains and I am in this House, against any effort to make TVA the stepchild of Government and the whipping boy of special interests. I will not stand by to see it cut down or to have its territory and its markets uneconomically and unfairly invaded. My future in politics is staked on continuing the noble and the practical purposes for which TVA was created; nor will I be inhibited in this effort, no matter how powerful and how highly placed the enemies of this project may be. TVA gave the valley of the Tennessee prosperity; it gave the United States the muscles of defense when she needed them desperately in World War II. Those of us who know her story—as the whole world knows it—will give everything we have in us to keep TVA strong and fruitful for the people of the valley, for the entire country, and for the peace of the world.

THE BOSTON ROPEWALK—HISTORICAL LANDMARK AND MODERN DEFENSE INSTALLATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, between 1824 and 1828 the Navy conducted numerous experiments and studies at navy yards and aboard vessels of the United States Navy in order to determine the relative value of Russian hemp and manufactured cordage as compared to American-grown water-rotted hemp. On March 2, 1827, the House of Representatives passed a resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to report its findings from the cordage studies completed or in progress. In a letter dated December 20, 1827, the Secretary of the Navy went into details on the experiments conducted by the Navy between 1824 and 1827 and commented:

> Cordage of American water-rotted hemp would always be preferred over Russian hemp. * * *
>
> It is proper to observe that there is no establishment connected with the Navy in which hemp is manufactured, and, therefore, it is purchased in its raw state by the Department. It will, however, be the interest and policy of the Government to make such establishment whenever it is believed that economy will be promoted by it.

Subsequent to this, on May 12, 1828, the House of Representatives:

> *Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy be instructed to prepare and report to this House at the commencement of the next session of Congress plans and estimates for connecting with two or more of the naval yards of the United States, as many establishments for purchasing, water-rotting and processing for manufacture, American hemp and flax; as well as for manufacturing the same into cordage and canvas for the use of the Navy, also for purchasing and manufacturing cotton for the purpose of aforesaid.

The Board of Navy Commissioners considered this resolution, and in a letter dated October 31, 1828, presented the Secretary of the Navy with its conclusions. The Board discounted the establishment of water-rotting facilities for preparing hemp and flax fiber as disadvantageous to the improvement of the navy yards on the basis that water-rotting hemp and flax created an unhealthy condition. However, the Board expressed the opinion that facilities for the manufacture of cordage "ought to be connected with one or more of our navy yards; and additional experience has proved that it would be wise and economical to erect them without delay." A single establishment was recommended as sufficient to supply all the wants of the Navy. The Board estimated the cost of a brick building 900 feet by 35 feet at $15,024.16, plus an additional $18,000 for machinery and hemp house.

Apparently, no action was taken on the recommendations at that time. The matter came up again in the annual report for 1831, wherein the Secretary of the Navy indicated the establishment of two ropewalks as desirable improvements with estimated cost of $140,000. In this report he stated that—

> All observation and experience in the Navy show that in nothing does it suffer more at this time than from bad cordage. The impositions in the quality of the hemp, in the manufacture, and in the tar, are numerous, are difficult of detection, productive of injurious delays when detected and when not detected, exceedingly hazardous to the safety of both crews and vessels. Indeed, the reasons seem more powerful in favor of making our own cordage, than of building our own vessels, or manufacturing our own blocks and anchors.

A circular dated September 26, 1831, from the Board of Navy Commissioners to the Commandant, Boston Navy Yard, indicated that the Navy had decided to locate one ropewalk at Charlestown—Boston—and the other at Norfolk.

Still no action was forthcoming and the Secretary of the Navy's report to the President dated November 30, 1833, requested $50,000 with which to construct a ropewalk at Charlestown Navy Yard. The appropriations for the Navy for 1834 provided the requested funds. Subsequent appropriations enabled the Navy to complete the ropewalk in 1837. For its time, it was a model manufacturing plant. Steam engine power was used

instead of the hand twisting operations usually practiced in the commercial ropewalks of that period. Spinning machinery, said to be the first of its kind used in this country, was installed to obviate the hand spinning methods then prevalent. Apparently, no effort was spared to make the ropewalk the finest establishment of its kind in the Nation.

The ropewalk has been in continuous operation since its establishment. It has provided valuable service, not only in the production of rope, but also in the research, development, and test fields. It has studied foreign and domestic sources of fiber supplies, characteristics of fibers and other raw materials, cordage manufacture and technology, and specifications. In effect, the ropewalk has been actively involved in practically all phases of the Navy's cordage work.

Recent research and development work has been centered on the development of improved cordage products because of new and critical needs of the services; on developing the best possible substitutes for hard fiber, which must be imported making it subject to the hazards of ocean shipping in time of emergency; and on developing suitable chemical treatments for the prevention of rot.

Of particular importance to the Navy has been the ropewalk's participation in tests to determine suitable preventative treatment methods to counteract deterioration of hemp products in storage and in actual use. Other research and development projects include the development of a suitable cordage structure for nylon yarns, evaluation of synthetic fibers, and nylon rope standardization.

Over the years, the ropewalk has acquired facilities suitable to the accomplishment of its various tasks. At present it represents an investment of nearly $700,000 in buildings and more than $387,000 in machinery and equipment.

The ropewalk has usually employed, since the 1930's, between 70 and 80 employees. These men have produced in the neighborhood of 5 million pounds of rope each year in peacetime years since the 1930's. Most of this rope has consisted of hard-fiber products such as manila and sisal cordage. During World War II, production rose to a high of 22,300,235 pounds in 1942. In 1953 the ropewalk furnished about 38 percent of the Navy's rope requirements.

Mr. Speaker, there has been under consideration for some time an unfortunate proposal to close the ropewalk. I have vigorously opposed any such proposal, basing my opposition on the arguments which I shall develop herein. And I might add that they are compelling arguments.

However, early this month I received the following letter from Secretary Thomas of the Navy:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 9, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: I am writing to apprise you of the Navy's decision to terminate the operations at the ropewalk of the Boston Naval Shipyard.

A careful study of the operations of the ropewalk and the commercial availability of its products has been conducted. This study has revealed that there are ways of having the rope produced by private industry. It is the Navy's policy to foster free competitive enterprise and to avoid Navy production of items which private business firms can furnish except where essential to fulfill military requirements. In line with this policy I have therefore decided that the ropewalk must be closed.

I have reached this decision with very great regret. As you know, the ropewalk has rendered valuable service to the Navy over a long period of years. The many fine and highly competent people employed there have been developing and producing excellent rope to meet the Navy's requirements since the unit was first established in 1834. The loss by the Navy of their services and special skills will be a very real sacrifice.

It is estimated that approximately 6 months will be required to finish work in process at the ropewalk, conduct a final inventory, and discontinue this operation. Facilities and equipment will be preserved in a standby status for possible reactivation in the event of a future national emergency. I assure you that officials of the Boston Naval Shipyard will cooperate closely with State and local authorities in an effort to locate new employment for those personnel whose services are terminated.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

I immediately transmitted this information to various persons who had a definite interest in such a move, including leaders of the labor unions concerned, and the Boston Chamber of Commerce. Here is the heart of my message to them:

I have sad news for you. I have received definite word that the ropewalk at the Boston Navy Yard is going to be closed and the announcement will be made very shortly. This is done on the highest level, by the President himself, and with the Hoover Commission pressuring for it. I want to give you the information I have so you will know and let others know who are interested. The authority is on the level of the President himself and the Hoover Commission. I have vigorously protested against it. I have personally talked with Secretary Thomas of the Navy, protesting against any such action, but unfortunately it is going to happen. If they had left it on the legislative level, I know I could block it. I blocked it in the last Congress, which was Republican controlled, and I know I could block it in this Congress, which is Democratic controlled, but it is going to be action by the executive branch.

The Boston Daily Globe responded quickly with an editorial directed toward preserving the time-honored installation known as the ropewalk:

[From the Boston Daily Globe of February 11, 1955]

EMBATTLED ROPEWALK

Few New Englanders will applaud the decision of Assistant Naval Secretary Charles S. Thomas closing down the famous ropewalk at the Naval Shipyard in Charlestown. A year ago an attempt to end this important adjunct to the fleet drew widespread protests. They would seem to be in order once more.

This ropewalk is the only one the Navy possesses. In addition to being an old institution, it produces cordage for the fleet at about 25 percent less cost than would be the case were its product purchased elsewhere. Also, it employs 100 skilled men. The decision entails needless expense as well as adding to the problem of unemployment in this area.

The ropewalk dates from the days of the whalers when the Navy used far more cordage than now; yet our sea fighters still need large quantities of "walked rope." Neither economy nor social realities support the decision. It should be rescinded.

There are many arguments favorable to the continued operation of the ropewalk at Boston. They include the following:

First. This is the only ropewalk the Navy has, and it supplies most of the Navy cables used by the Navy.

Second. Employees at the ropewalk are among the most skilled ropemakers in the United States—specialists in their field—and they are particularly skilled in making the cables on which our fighting ships depend for their safety. It would be a questionable policy to discharge this important group of workers today, when tomorrow they may be vitally needed to defend our country.

Third. If this team of skilled workers is allowed to be dispersed, it is unlikely that its members will ever be brought together again.

Fourth. It has always been the policy of the Federal Government to maintain vitally needed defense organizations. Certainly the ropewalk answers all the requirements of an organization which is vitally needed.

Fifth. The heavy rope made here is used primarily to anchor ships or to tow disabled craft. It becomes an item of safety on which the lives of many men and our valuable ships must depend in times of emergency.

The ropewalk enjoys an outstanding record of ropemaking for the Navy. The skill of 117 years of experience has gone into these cables and hawsers. The Navy knows what it can do with this rope, down to the last pound of strength.

Sixth. The Federal Government has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in the special equipment and machinery in the ropewalk. It would be extremely uneconomical for the Government to waste this heavy capital investment, for which there is no market. A recent report from the ropewalk indicated that various additions and improvements had been made including various new machinery, new lighting, fireproofing, and additional fire escapes, new materials handling equipment and methods, and the adoption of new performance methods and techniques, and of quality control testing methods.

Seventh. One of the important activities at the ropewalk has been that of research and development work in connection with cordage. One recent accomplishment was the development of a mildew-resistant rope. Other research is being directed toward the use of nylon, finding a suitable substitute for wool grease which became short in supply, and determining the rate of deterioration of rope, among other studies. The answers to all of these problems are of great aid to the Navy and other elements of the Armed Forces; they are no less valuable to the members of the cordage industry. There can be no assurance that all of these important research efforts will be continued in the future if the ropewalk facility is closed.

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce had previously taken a definite stand on the question of closing the ropewalk. This was the chamber's statement—letter dated May 26, 1953, from Paul T. Rothwell, president, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce:

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce is deeply concerned over the threatened closing of the ropewalk at the Boston Naval Shipyard. After an examination of what appears to be the facts we feel that the discontinuance of this operation, and the relegation of the walk's production to private industry, would be uneconomical. The chamber is, of course, in full support of the Government's economy program but it would appear that the proposed closing would be a step away from, rather than in the direction of, the program's goal.

We further feel that the workers now employed at the walk, because of the highly specialized skills in which they have been trained, would be difficult to place in other employment near their present earning capacity which could well mean an added burden to the Massachusetts unemployment compensation fund.

A third consideration is the special service which the ropewalk now renders to the Navy. The research arm of the ropewalk, which because of its close link with and understanding of Navy operations, must conceivably perform a service that would be difficult for private industry to replace.

Those who oppose the operation of the Boston Ropewalk have advanced certain arguments to support their position. I believe that some of these arguments should be examined carefully. First, the claim that closing the ropewalk will result in a saving to the Federal Treasury. There is appended hereto a table comparing the ropewalk and commercial prices for rope for various years between 1931 and 1952. For each year there is shown a net savings to the Federal Government, with the amounts saved ranging from $36,000 in 1931 to the peak of nearly $1,200,000 in 1941. It is admitted that these amounts are not great, but what is more significant, they represent net savings over what this rope would cost in the open market. Mr. Anthony Tieso, past department commander, Disabled American Veterans, stated that the cost of rope produced at the ropewalk was 25 percent lower than that produced commercially.

Another claim is that the industry can supply both the peacetime and wartime cordage needs of the military services. However, there has been cited the instance in 1939 when the Army mobilization requirements led to an acute demand for small size tent rope, at which time the Army was forced to turn to the ropewalk to help meet this demand. Rope remained in short supply throughout World War II, with the main cause cited as being a lack of full utilization of capacity rather than a shortage of fiber supply. When a national emergency develops such as war, the normal requirements of the Armed Forces multiply many times overnight. This applies to cordage demands no less than to munitions and all other materiels of war. The ropewalk is sensitive to such changes in requirements and can gear its operations quickly to meet sharp increases in military needs.

With respect to the maintenance of quality requirements, the records of the ropewalk installation indicate that during the period 1951–52, out of 152 samples of rope submitted for test, 35 samples had one or more deficiencies. Moreover, the files include a number of instances where direct assistance was given to outside concerns to help them meet the specification requirements.

Finally, the industry claims that it is fully prepared to carry on research and development work in connection with cordage. A spokesman for the naval facility at Boston has criticized certain research and development efforts of private concerns on grounds that they are not industrywide. Such work is costly, and he pointed out that only the larger companies are in a position to undertake it. He observed that where the development of improvements in cordage is concerned, the information which a particular company develops is not divulged to competitors. This practice was contrasted to that of the ropewalk, the policy of which is to make the results of its studies available to all.

Certainly, these points I have just discussed emphasize quite clearly that the ropewalk at Boston Navy Yard is important to the Navy, and to the industry as well. The philosophy behind the operation of this installation has been well said in this statement:

Ropes and cordage are fully as vital in naval operations now as they were when the wooden sailing ship Navy plied the seas. The trim fighting ship of the modern Navy does not form as obvious a background as the masts with their rigging and billowing sails. Yet we who make and use ropes in the Navy know that each vessel, for its daily work requires hundreds of pounds of ropes for berthing, mooring, hoisting, towing; for nets, ladders, life rafts, life lines, floats, etc., building up a demand running into millions of pounds annually. Further, because each operation involves personal safety and the protection of property running into huge sums of money, not only must the rope be available for the operation, but must be of highest quality to insure against disastrous failure. The latter was a basic factor in establishing the ropewalk.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing constitutes an impressive array of arguments favoring the continued operation of the ropewalk at Boston Navy Yard. Moreover, in the light of these discussions I can find little or no merit in the arguments opposing the facility. Therefore one must inevitably conclude that to keep the ropewalk going full force will be to the best interests of all concerned, including in large measure the defense of the United States.

APPENDIX

Cost of rope production, years 1931–52

Year	Ropewalk rope production (million pounds)	Price per pound		Savings
		Ropewalk	Commercial	
1931	1.86	$0.1406	[1] $0.16	$36,084
1933	2.25	.1002	[1] .13	67,050
1935	3.29	.0957	[1] .13	112,847
1937	4.27	.1312	[1] .17	165,676
1939	5.52	.1041	[1] .16	308,568
1940	11.70	.1058	[1] .17	751,140

[1] Utilization of Cotton and Other Materials in Cordage and Twine, U. S. Department of Agriculture publication, 1940.

Cost of rope production, years 1931–52—Con.

Year	Ropewalk rope production (million pounds)	Price per pound		Savings
		Ropewalk	Commercial	
1941	20.88	.1125	[2] .17	1,194,336
1942	22.30	.1413	[2] .17	640,010
1943	18.45	.1532	[2] .17	309,960
1944	15.37	.1620	[2] .17	122,960
1945	14.05	.1624	[2] .17	106,780
1946	4.40	.2362	[3] .25	60,720
1947	3.71	.2464	[3] .37	458,556
1948	4.34	.2842	[3] .42	589,372
1949	3.77	.2919	[3] .405	426,387
1950	2.63	[4] .320	[5] .387	176,210
1951	5.30	[4] .356	[5] .448	487,600
1952	5.14	[4] .299	[5] .352	272,420

[2] World War II Average Price for Manila—Government Contracts.

[3] Boston ropewalk commercial survey.

[4] Adjusted to reflect prevailing commercial market prices for raw fiber, which constitutes more than 80 percent of the rope cost. During 1950–52, ropewalk fiber was procured from the national stockpile of strategic material at an average estimated price with subsequent adjustment for fiscal purposes. Stockpile withdrawals began in May 1950 in accordance with administration policy of rotating the fiber after 3 years of storage to allay the effect of deterioration.

[5] Boston ropewalk commercial market survey, cororborated by actual Government procurements from commercial contracts.

Source: Testimony of David Himmelfarb, in charge of operations, Ropewalk, Boston Shipyard, before the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, 1953.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAY and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 1, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

469. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the secret semiannual statistical stockpile report, covering the period from July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

470. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal farm credit system; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

471. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the procurement of doctors of medicine and doctors of dentistry for the Armed Forces by providing grants and scholarships for education

in the medical and dental professions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

472. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on medical services, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

474. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the Task Force Report on Federal Medical Services, prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

475. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 34th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

476. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, transmitting a report by the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, to signalize the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 601, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, pertaining to Administration of Cargo Preference Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. H. R. 3828. A bill to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 81). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4470. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4471. A bill Pay-as-you-go Federal Social Security for all. To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal social-security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4472. A bill Pay-as-you-go Federal Social Security for all. To provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal social-security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 4473. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4474. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police Force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 4475. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemical additives in food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4476. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemicals in cosmetics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4477. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4478. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4479. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 4480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the refund of manufacturers' excise taxes paid on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 4481. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4482. A bill to protect trade-mark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public against injuries and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trademark, brand, or name in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4483. A bill to prohibit the disposal of certain surplus real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4484. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation with the Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, Nebraska, in the construction of the mid-State project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4485. A bill to prohibit the disposal of certain surplus real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4486. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 4487. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4488. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4489. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age from 65 to 60, to provide for the payment of old-age insurance benefits to certain disabled individuals under the age of 60, and to remove the limitation on the amount of outside earnings which an individual may receive while entitled to benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4490. A bill to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service during an enlistment or employment entered into on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption for the taxpayer if he or his spouse is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4492. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution relating to the discontinuance of United States post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring about the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER: House Concurrent Resolution 8 of the Indiana General Assembly memorializing Congress to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world, Wabash, Ind.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the metal-mining industry the same depletion allowance as that given the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the oil-shale industry the same depletion allowance as that given the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that sufficient funds be made available to develop topographic maps for the entire State of Montana as soon as possible; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging the rejection of the proposal of the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to dismantle the Soil Conservation Service and turn its functions over to the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide adequate sources of farm credit to agricultural enterprises in New Mexico, particularly those stricken by the drought and other disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass S. 500, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Colorado River storage project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting 2 million acres of land in trust to this State for the purpose of providing public-school buildings; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prohibit the issuance of Federal liquor licenses in counties of States having exercised local option prohibiting sale of intoxicants within its boundaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that immediate attention be given proposals now pending and to others which may be introduced for the limitation of imported oil as will cause no further injury to the oil-producing industry of the State of Texas and the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that Federal legislation be passed to allow claimholders to deposit $100 in cash per claim in lieu of assessment work with the recorder of the proper precinct, executing an affidavit therefor, and the money to be forwarded to a fund administered by the Territorial highway engineer for the sole use of building mine-access roads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing the desire of the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico that the provisions of title III of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act be extended to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 4493. A bill for the relief of Jose Saavedra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aherasturi (Cigorraga); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4495. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Vlassopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Hannah Cox Fransone (nee Garbutt) and her minor child, Heleene Garbutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4497. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Irrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4498. A bill for the relief of Francesco Prano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4499. A bill for the relief of Chai Wook Ho and Sook Yung Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4500. A bill for the relief of Tien S. Chan and Chan Li Wai-Sheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Maud Claer Wahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Victor Javier Granados-Gal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Fouad George Baroody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle F. Brocki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4505. A bill for the relief of George K. Jue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 4506. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Hartmann H. Pauly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4509. A bill for the relief of Margaretha Rath Rahneberg and Erich Rahneberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

126. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions unanimously accepted at a mass meeting in Kenosha, Wis., on February 20, 1955, of Lithuanians commemorating the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

127. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary-treasurer, Hale County Farm Bureau, Plainview, Tex., relative to two resolutions adopted by the Hale County Farm Bureau on February 14, 1955. Resolution 1: To direct the Commodity Credit Corporation, within each marketing year, to dispose of all stocks or surplus commodities in Government warehouses for which there is no need or use in the United States—stocks on farm commodities which have become a burden to the taxpayers in the United States; and Resolution 2: To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to use either the old parity price or the new parity price, whichever is higher, for all agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

128. Also, petition of the president, the American Progress Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif., requesting the review and reappraisal of the legislation empowering the President to negotiate international agreements for the pooling of atomic resources for production or use under international control, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

129. Also, petition of the president, Kenosha Chapter American Lithuanian Council, Kenosha, Wis., expressing their deepest gratitude to the United States for its support constantly extended to the cause of the independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. Also, petition of the president, Paterson United Lithuanians, Paterson, N. J., expressing gratitude to the United States for the ever-increasing support of the cause of Lithuanian independence, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

131. Also, petition of the president, the 442d Veterans Club, Honolulu, T. H., unanimously endorsing favorable action on the bill H. R. 588, now pending in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Coast-Hawaii Airlines Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, membership on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee brings those of us fortunate to serve with that body in intimate contact with civil aviation and its multiple problems. I have been particularly interested, in the past few weeks, in what has taken place regarding the so-called West Coast-Hawaii case as determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board with the concurrence of the President.

There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding as to what President Eisenhower did and did not do in the West Coast-Hawaii case. Since the record is clear, the misunderstanding must be created by those having a motive to do this.

The certificates for the Seattle/Portland-Honolulu route were first issued in 1948. Then, as now, there was a contest between Northwest Airlines and Pan American Airways as to which should be certificated.

The CAB decided, by a 2-to-1 vote, to give Northwest a temporary 5-year certificate. Northwest had argued that it could develop traffic to Hawaii from the Central and Eastern States which it serves on its transcontinental route. Pan American had argued that the route was important to it for through transpacific traffic. Pan American had argued also that it could operate more economically than Northwest because it already had installations at both ends of the route required for other operations for which it was permanently certificated, whereas Northwest had these at Seattle only.

Pan American sought reconsideration of the decision, claiming that the Board had been misled into various errors. President Truman directed that Pan American should be given a temporary 5-year certificate in addition to Northwest because "the national security and the public welfare require the establishment of the most direct and expeditious service between the Northwest and points on the existing services of Pan American Airways, Inc., in the South Pacific, Philippines, Japan, and other points in the Orient served by that company."

When the certificates expired in 1953, both companies applied to have them renewed. There was again general agreement that only 1 of the 2 should be selected.

The Board's staff investigated the claims of the two carriers. They decided Pan American had the better case. They found that Pan American had demonstrated by experience the truth of the assertions, made 5 years before, that it could operate the route more economically than Northwest. They found this would continue to be true in the future. They found that, on the evidence available at the time of the hearing, neither carrier had developed much through traffic. Since it appeared that the route would require subsidy whichever carrier was chosen, the choice should go to the one that would require less.

The CAB's examiner, who heard the evidence, agreed with the CAB's staff. He recommended also that Pan American be selected. He agreed with the staff's analysis of the relative costs. He also relied heavily on President Truman's determination that broad national interest considerations required an operation by Pan American. If one carrier was to go, as everyone including Northwest then agreed, it must therefore be Northwest.

The five-man Board reversed its staff and its examiner and selected Northwest over Pan American. Just why, its opinion does not make very clear. It admitted—at page 13—that—

> Upon consideration of the route structure of Pan American and Northwest, there can be little doubt that Pan American enjoys certain cost advantages which should enable it to operate the route at less total cost, and therefore, for less mail-pay subsidy, than Northwest.

It referred—at page 15—to a last-minute offer by Northwest to operate the route without subsidy but said that this proposal was not made at any earlier stage of the proceeding and was neither presented in detail nor subjected to critical scrutiny and that therefore the Board's decision was not predicated on this offer. Concerning the examiner's point as to President Truman's determination that broad national interest considerations required operation by Pan American, it specifically noted that these matters are properly within the province of the President—page 10.

On February 1, 1955, President Eisenhower advised the Board of his disapproval of this decision. He stated that he believed the choice of Pan American "will contribute most to the sound development of our air-transportation system in the Pacific." Quite obviously the President was acting on the same broad national-interest considerations that had led President Truman to determine in 1948 that Pan American should initially be certificated and to which the five-man Board had itself referred as being within the President's province. Since the hearing the amount of through traffic carried by Pan American over this route to points beyond Hawaii has tremendously increased. The loss of this through traffic to foreign-flag carriers, which would have resulted from the elimination of Pan American in favor of Northwest, was undoubtedly a factor in the President's decision. In any event, the President was simply going back to what the CAB's own staff and examiner had recommended, on a basis which the five-man Board had recognized to be within his province. His selection of Pan American was no more a promonopoly decision than was the Board's selection of Northwest.

While Northwest's friends would have seen absolutely nothing wrong in a decision establishing a Northwest monopoly of this route and throwing off Pan American, which had become the carrier preferred by a large majority of the traveling public, they were horrified at the elimination of Northwest in favor of Pan American. All the stops were turned loose. The President was informed by the Board that although the opinion written as recently as November 26, 1954, stated—page 11—that all parties and the examiner agreed that "the operation would require substantial Government support in the form of subsidy mail pay for the foreseeable future," it now appeared that all of the Pacific operations would shortly go off subsidy. The President therefore altered his decision and directed that both carriers should be allowed to operate over the route so that both might have "an equal opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to develop adequate traffic to operate without subsidy or prove definitely that the route cannot economically support two carriers."

Both actions taken by the President were sound in the light of the facts before him at the time. If the route would require continued subsidy, as the Board's opinion had said it would, the route should be operated by only one carrier and that the carrier which had demonstrated that it could operate at lower cost and for which the route was a link in a through international operation rather than a stub end—page 15. If circumstances had changed so that the route can be operated without subsidy, the Board should have advised the President and not allowed him to be misled by the contrary view stated in its opinion. For if no subsidy is needed, then by all means both these carriers, which had developed a substantial business on the route in competition with each other, should be allowed to compete on fair and equal terms in the future.

Hoover Commission Report on Medical Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the Hoover Commission report on medical services which was released to the press yesterday and which will shortly come before Congress. The report contains many sweeping and, I think, dangerous innovations. Today I wish to call attention only to recommendation No. 15 and a part of recommendation No. 17.

No. 15 is "that the provision of hospital and clinical services to American merchant seamen by the Federal Government be ended."

No. 17 provides that, except for certain institutions not pertinent to my comments, "the Public Health Service should close all of its general hospitals."

Since 1798 the Federal Government has provided some medical and hospital service to American-flag seamen, under authorities enacted, and with funds appropriated, by Congress. There are now, I believe, 12 general hospitals owned by the Government in which such cases are handled. One is known as the Public Health Service Hospital on Staten Island, in the district I represent.

The Public Health Service Hospital on Staten Island is one of the largest general hospitals operated by Public Health Service. It has 800 beds and has been running 80 to 85 percent filled. Something like two-thirds of its patients are American seamen. If service to those seamen were to be ended, as the report recommends, the hospital would of course have to close entirely. Beyond that, recommendation No. 17 expressly urges that it be closed.

Closing of that hospital would be calamitous in many ways for the community and would be a serious step backward for the Government. Such a move would work against the Government's policy of developing and maintaining a strong privately owned and operated merchant marine to be available for Government use in time of emergency, as well as for Government and private business at other times. And with present uncertainties as to whether or not, and if so when, a national emergency will develop, it seems unthinkable that the Government would consider

closing an 800-bed hospital now fully staffed and equipped, in the part of the country in which that hospital stands.

I have the highest regard for the Hoover Commission and its work thus far, but not for this report. While I have spoken today only of the Public Health Service general hospitals in relation to merchant seamen, there are a number of other recommendations which seem open to serious question. It is fortunate that recommendations 15 and 17, as well as some of the others, cannot be made effective without first repealing or amending existing statutes. That fact insures time and opportunity for adequate study and consideration of the revolutionary changes proposed.

The Continuing Problem of Communist-Front Groups in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night it was my pleasure to address the Knights of Columbus in Kenosha, Wis. I referred to numerous problems, notable among which is the antisubversive issue. I send to the desk the text of the address I delivered at that time. I append to it a most interesting article written by the nationwide syndicated columnist, Mr. Victor Riesel, and carried in the February 18 issue of the New York Daily Mirror and other newspapers coast to coast. It refers to the continuing problem in our Nation of Communist-front groups which solicit the names of the unwary and the gullible, and misuse the names of others.

I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and article were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGES WE FACE AT HOME AND ABROAD

(Address by Senator WILEY before Kenosha Knights of Columbus 50th anniversary banquet, in Kenosha, Wis., Sunday night, February 27, 1955)

I consider it a real honor to have been invited to join you on this occasion of your 50th anniversary.

I value this opportunity to rejoice with you on this half-century landmark, as well as the opportunity to learn your views, and to share with you my convictions concerning the challenges we face, as individuals and as a Nation.

THE K. OF C.'S GREAT RECORD

I am honored by your invitation for other reasons. Although I am not one of the million loyal members of your distinguished organization, I admire and respect you for the things for which you stand.

No one could read an issue of Columbia without sensing at once your deep convictions on matters of national concern, your keen sense of civic responsibility, your abiding faith that right makes might, your grim determination that America shall remain free, that her enemies abroad shall not prevail, and that communism at home must not be tolerated.

I salute you for your record—for the constructive deeds of Father McGivney down to the present day—of charitable concern for needy widows and children.

I salute you for your firm stand against juvenile delinquency and against harmful literature.

I salute your loyalty to country, to you who have sent a higher percentage of your sons to defend our country than virtually any other group in America.

Yours is indeed an organization of which America rightfully can be proud, and to which all of us owe a great deal.

LEGISLATION AGAINST COMMUNISM

Since the Knights of Columbus are dedicated to the service of God and country, it is only natural that I submit to you some observations particularly on the foremost menace both to God and to country. I refer, of course, to the menace of international communism.

If time permitted, I would be happy to set forth for you now some of the things which I, for one, have tried to do down through the years in opposing the atheistic, international Communist menace—for example, some of the bills which I have introduced.

I should like to point out now, however, that for one thing, in the present Congress, I have introduced legislation to stiffen the penalties against seditious conspiracy either advocating to overthrow the United States Government by force or violence or conspiring to do so.

I SUPPORT ANTI-RED INVESTIGATIONS

I have given my support to the various vital investigating committees which are hard at work on this problem.

From time to time, as you know, there have been arbitrary proposals to force all of these congressional investigating groups into one.

I, for one, oppose such an effort. I believe that an important service can be performed by having the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, each fulfill their respective responsibilities in this important field.

This can and should, of course, be done without duplication of effort, with maximum of coordination, so that there is no waste in either manpower or resources.

I have seen, however, occasions when the individual interests and background of some committee chairman or members of one of the committees have made each of these groups, in turn, especially qualified to work on some particular phase of the complex Communist problem.

On the other hand, if all these investigations were centralized into 1 source, there might be a committee chairman of that 1 group whose interest might be so specialized that he might pass over some of the important aspects of the Communist problem.

SMACK DOWN ON RED FINANCES

I want to state that one phase which has hardly been studied is the matter of cracking the Communist conspiracy in the one place that it will hurt most; namely, the pocketbook. Vast sums of money have been collected by the Communist conspiracy in our country, most of it through Communist fronts. Large, inordinate sums have come from some wealthy people. Other large, in the aggregate, sums have come through smaller donations by considerable numbers of dupes.

There are indisputable evidences that the Communists have been guilty of financial trickery, in keeping the books, both on their own party organization and on their Communist fronts, as in the instance of the misnamed National Committee for Justice in the Rosenberg case, in so-called defense of the atom traitors.

However, ex-Communists have testified how, time and again, large sums of money have been transferred secretly from group to group, including to and from Red-dominated unions, by all sorts of bookkeeping juggling.

In addition to these sums from American origins, there are the considerable top-secret sums made available by the Soviet Union and its intelligence networks.

So I, for one, believe that the Internal Revenue Bureau should crack down on Communist finances. The Internal Revenue Bureau should assign a sufficient number of skilled agents to make sure that income taxes, social-security taxes, and all other taxes are actually being paid by the Red groups just as law-abiding, patriotic Americans must pay such taxes.

I believe that a careful study of Communist-front books would provide many leads for tracing down numerous secret phases of the Communist conspiracy. And so, I have corresponded with T. Coleman Andrews, the able Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for this purpose. I intend to follow up, because I cannot say as yet that he has given me the sort of complete assurances of an all-out effort such as I seek.

I do not believe that the Internal Revenue Bureau can sit back and wait for evidence to show up. The Communists are too sly to permit obviously phoney bookkeeping to be readily noted.

Unless you assign crack squads of agents to this task and for a long enough period of time—agents not only trained in detecting financial trickery, but agents who really know something about the Communist conspiracy, who can recognize the names of individuals and groups, then the full story of the Red financial network will not come out.

THE DISGRACEFUL MATUSOW EPISODE

Now, I want to say just a word about one particular anti-Red phase which has recently been giving serious concern to all of us who have fought against the Communist menace. I refer, of course, to the disgraceful situation involving the self-admitted liar, Harvey Matusow.

I do not purport to have any final observations as to the overall meaning of the current activity of this contemptible individual.

It seems quite clear, however, that he is trying deliberately and maliciously to cast a cloud over as many as possible former Communists who have confessed.

The fact of the matter is that, as John Edgar Hoover has often stated, the genuine defector from Communism is one of the greatest assets which we have in the fight against the Red menace. How else can we ever find out the secrets of the Communist conspiracy?

We really only have two means: (1) by placing patriotic agents inside that conspiracy, and (2) by encouraging defection by those who have had their stomach full of communism and who want to return to the American fold.

A great many former Reds have confessed their sins. They have confessed—in full and in truth—to the FBI. They have cooperated with the FBI. The Bureau has checked, double checked, and triple checked their stories in order to make sure that the ex-Communists were not lying or exaggerating or casting a cloud over any possible innocent individual.

This process of cross-checking must be intensified, particularly now, in view of the disgraceful Matusow episide.

Matusow's current allegations must be analyzed with greatest care and skepticism. Perjury charges must be carefully weighed. The Communists are capable of such trickery that we should not be surprised at al-

most any tactic they, or Matusow, may adopt. We must not permit them or their accomplices to prevent genuine defactors from deserting the party and telling all to the FBI. We must maintain our confidence in the Bureau.

SUPPORTING J. EDGAR HOOVER

And on this latter point, recently I noted that an educator from one of the New England universities conducted a vicious personal attack upon Mr. Hoover.

I do not have the full absurd text of what he said, but I can say this: There are few individuals who have been more intensely and effectively devoted to trapping the guilty and protecting the innocent (whether it is in connection with communism or general crime) than has John Edgar Hoover.

For more than three decades, he has been a faithful public servant. This untarnished, uninterrupted service in highest public office—under both Democratic and Republican administrations—proves the universal esteem with which he is rightly held.

I wonder if that educator stopped to think that one of the highest priority aims of the Communist Party in the United States has always been to smear and destroy John Edgar Hoover.

I am not accusing the educator personally of anything. I am simply pointing out the facts.

A man has a right to speak his opinions and to have those opinions weighed on their merits. But no man should shoot off his mouth before checking the facts, particularly on so important a subject as this, and involving so faithful a public servant as Mr. Hoover. And no man should open his mouth before he figures out whether he is unwittingly serving ends which are contrary to the best interests of our beloved country.

COMBATING RED MENACE ABROAD

Now, just as we must be adequate to meet the Communist menace at home, we must be adequate to meet it head on abroad.

Fortunately, the United States has taken a strong stand against aggression in the western Pacific Ocean. And by our very firm policy in relation to protecting Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas, we have lessened the danger of war.

Our strength increases the possibilities of peace; weakness before communism, appeasement of communism, increase the danger of war.

The very fact that the Peiping radio is full of continued angry threats and vicious denunciations is proof of the fact that the Communists know that we are not bluffing.

We are determined to keep the Formosa bastion as a vital link in our chain of security in the western Pacific. The northern tip of Formosa is but 500 miles from Japan. The southern tip is but 100 miles from the Philippines. We must defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and such related islands as the Joint Chiefs of Staff determine are necessary in order to make sure that our Pacific security chain is not broken.

It has been estimated that if we were to lose Formosa we might have to retreat in effect far back across the Pacific. That would bring Soviet bombers still closer in range to American shores.

MODERN MILITARY PREPAREDNESS ESSENTIAL

As we view this Communist problem, we know that here at home we must be prepared against any military emergency.

The Knights of Columbus have contributed so many men to the uniform of our country that I need hardly remind you of the admonition of the Father of Our Country, whose birthday we celebrated last Tuesday: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace."

I know that none of you are fooled by so-called apostles of peace—false apostles, who preach unilateral disarmament—apostles who often are inspired by those who would destroy us. Nor, for that matter, are we fooled by those who seek to hide behind our Constitution, especially when their own sinister purpose is its ultimate destruction.

I am not one who believes that storm clouds on the horizon will cause us to panic. Nor am I one of those few who fear that Americans are not equal to the task.

You and your organization are but a symbol of the answer that America can and will provide. You, who stand for the dynamic principles of your organization; you, who have stood by your country before; you, who have demonstrated your loyalty to country and your determination to keep her free; you can provide the answer yourselves.

One of these answers is, of course, modern-type, military preparation. Just as the Boy Scout says, "Let us be prepared," so must we be alert to the dangers which threaten us—be prepared for any eventuality—be equal to any occasion.

We must guard the far-flung ramparts of the free world. We must take every step necessary to maintain our own military preparedness.

Our giant industries must be maintained in a position for instant mobilization. Our people must be psychologically prepared for any emergency.

This is particularly important in the new jet-atomic age when time and space have been dwarfed by intercontinental guided missiles.

Enemy bases may exist only 3,300 miles from Milwaukee. Projectiles may someday soon be launched at a velocity of 10,000 miles per hour.

Yes, the need for up-to-the-minute military preparation is evident.

I need not remind you of the obligation of every American boy who may be called upon to defend his country. He is entitled to receive the type of modern military training (especially under field conditions) from his Government which will enable him to defend himself adequately and perform his duty with honor.

At the same time, we know that any system of universal military preparation must be scrutinized most carefully. The dangers of militarism that have enslaved other nations must be avoided. A tragic pattern of human bondage must never leave its scar across this beloved land of ours. Preparations for war, which are necessary to preserve the peace, must always be accompanied by adequate safeguards of our democratic principles.

PREVENTING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Of course, interwoven with the problems of youth, is that of juvenile delinquency. The stand of your organization against this dreaded social malady among our youth is well known. It deserves the merit it has won.

In Congress, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and as a former member of the Senate Crime Committee, I have sponsored the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act. I am deeply convinced that the moral standards of our youth are more than an indication of the level of our civilization. They are a direct indicator of the world of tomorrow.

For each of you know that the thoughts in the minds of our young people today will be the actions of our leaders of tomorrow. And, by safeguarding the moral climate of our youth, we are preserving for them the heritage they deserve.

The work your organization has done in this field is outstanding. I can think of no single contribution to the American way of life more beneficial. I congratulate you and urge you never to cease your vigilance.

Yet, there is a caution we must observe. As serious as this problem is, we must not lose our perspective. We must not forget that last year, some 18 million boys between the ages of 10 and 17 were not picked up by the police for any crime whatsoever. This vital statistic somehow escapes attention in our eagerness to solve the problems of juvenile delinquency.

By all odds, the great majority of our youth—over 95 percent—are law-abiding youngsters, living and learning and eager to take our place in the building of tomorrow. Our confidence in our youth must not be shaken by the bad example of a few.

DELINQUENCY AND THE MASS MEDIA

There is one particular phase of this juvenile delinquency problem which I want to mention.

It is the matter of the strong influences through public media of communications—on our Nation's youngsters. I refer to the printed word, the spoken word, and the visual scene: namely, books, magazines, motion pictures, radio, and television.

I am not one of those who believes that there is any one single cause of the present wave of juvenile delinquency.

You cannot, for example, trace it alone or even principally, to programs full of violence on radio or television. I would oppose any overstatement to that effect by our Senate subcommittee, or by any other source, were such overstatement submitted. Obviously, juvenile delinquency is a complex problem. It arises from a great many causes: from broken, divorced, or separated homes, and neglected children; from slum conditions, where the children don't have facilities for wholesome play, recreation, and growth; from lack of constructive influence by the schools; from physical and mental handicaps that are untended by society; from inadequate spiritual education and a preoccupation with material acquisitions; from inadequate police forces and improper rehabilitation by courts or by juvenile homes, and from other sources.

Fortunately, here in our own State, we have set a comparatively good example of combatting the problem, both of adult and of youthful crime. Fortunately, our Badger facilities are among the finest in the Nation. And, yet, we know they can be improved.

We know, too, that by and large American books, magazines, radio, and television are sound. But there is a small minority among books and magazines which are definitely of salacious, indeed, pornographic content. These must absolutely be cleaned from the Nation's newsstands and from the mails. That is why time and time again, I have taken up this problem with the Postmaster General. That is why I will continue to support legislation in accordance with sound judicial process—to eliminate such pornographic literature.

Then, with relation to radio and television, I have urged a greater concentration on wholesome programs. This problem can be met, in part, by American parents insisting upon wholesome radio and TV fare for their children. Voluntary patronage or nonpatronage of sponsors' products is just about the most powerful lever for assuring good programs and curbing unwholesome ones. Government censorship as such is not the answer, except in programs clearly beyond the border of good taste.

I have stated publicly, too, that this country could use a topnotch regular radio-TV program, or programs, dedicated to the problem of combating juvenile delinquency, as such. The story of youthful waywardness can be and should be told without sensationalism, without exaggeration, without phony melodramatics, without still more suggested violence. It can be told simply, yes, even entertainingly.

It can be shown that juvenile delinquency is not something totally offbeat that happens to the abnormal child or the abnormal situation; it can happen in or out of the so-called normal home, with parents of fine background who are not vigilant to protect average youngsters.

What I want are down-to-earth, realistic radio-TV programs that tell the story of the average American home, the many wholesome influences in it that prevent delinquency, and yes, the all too common conditions in it, like parental neglect, which contribute to juvenile delinquency.

CONCLUSION

Now, my friends, this has been a gratifying experience for me. It has been a real pleasure to visit with you about a few of the problems which confront us daily in Washington. The pleasure of meeting with a group of dedicated and concerned citizens is always a stimulating and challenging experience.

I have passed along to you a few of the ideas and problems that have occupied my attention in recent days. In turn, I trust that you will give me the benefit of your advice and counsel—that you will not hesitate to tell me your problems, your views, and your considered opinions on issues affecting Wisconsin and our Nation.

Your problems are my problems. Thank you and God bless you.

SCIENTIST EASY PREY FOR PROPAGANDIST OUTSIDE LAB

(By Victor Riesel)

Explanation, please.

Prize-winning nuclear scientist Dr. Harold C. Urey has just written that the greatest danger to this country is a powerful revolutionary country, namely the U. S. S. R.

Yet, in the same message, soon to be made public, this atomic expert defends convicted spies and the perjurer, Alger Hiss, who helped make the Soviet Union the greatest danger to this country.

The atomic spies slipped to Russian intelligence the blueprint for the atomic trigger, the sky platform, and the famed proximity fuse. Alger Hiss delivered the inner secrets of our diplomacy.

Yet, Professor Urey, writing in the forthcoming Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, asks: "What is it that Alger Hiss * * * did that profoundly or even moderately put the United States in a less favorable position? How much damage have all the arrested and convicted agents actually done to the political and military position of the United States?"

Would it be too emotional to suggest that the answers come from the mothers of GI's dead in Korea?

In the same message from Dr. Urey, we see that he says that the "way we handled the Rosenberg (atomic spy—VR) trial" makes him "feel less secure for myself and my family."

We respect Dr. Urey's right to express himself so freely in words which would be howled down in the market place were they not written by one whose profession is viewed with awe by so many of us. But we do not respect his judgment in reflecting on men who are as skilled in their field as he is in his; namely, the jurists of the United States Supreme Court who upheld the convictions of Hiss and the spies.

We do not respect his taking the platform offered last week by a subsidiary of a pro-Communist agency devoted to a fight for the release of an Alcatraz prisoner by the name of Morton Sobell, a man who stole secrets from our Nation for the benefit of what Dr. Urey himself describes as our greatest menace.

But most important is the unscientific approach to all this by scientist Harold Urey. He agreed to accept a testimonial dinner on February 12 from something called the Chicago Sobell Committee, 20 West Jackson Boulevard, Room 1301, Chicago, Ill. Phone: Webster 9–5992.

Why did not Dr. Urey use his research skill to learn that this committee is a subsidiary of the National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell.

These committees were set up to smear the United States. They use the same techniques, down even to the same exploitation of spies' innocent children.

Did not Professor Urey know that some of those who signed the imitation parchment paper scroll given him by the subsidiary of the National Rosenberg-Sobell Committee (headquarters, 1050 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; phone, LO 4–9585) are now bitter over being deceived into sponsoring what turned out to be a rally for a convicted spy and not merely a testimonial dinner?

We have spoken to one who signed such a scroll thinking he was adding his name merely to a list of persons honoring scientist Urey. This signer is the great fighter for human rights, A. Philip Randolph, head of the AFL's Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Randolph is greatly disturbed over the emphasis on the spies at the dinner to Urey. He points out that he received an innocuous letter asking him to join in hailing Urey as a scholar.

"I signed a tribute to Dr. Urey as a distinguished scientist and scholar. I signed in good faith," Randolph told us.

"If any group then attempts to use my name and the name of my union for ulterior purposes—and especially pro-Communist purposes—they are doing something reprehensible. My union and I have been in the forefront of the fight against Communists."

Surely now Dr. Urey will use his great talents as a scientist to investigate and expose all this.

Or will he?

The Salt River Valley Water Users Association and the Tennessee Valley Authority

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, several weeks ago there appeared in the Arizona Daily Star an editorial concerning remarks I had made about the TVA and the Dixon-Yates contract. In the editorial there was a discussion of the workings of the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, in my home State. That was not factual in every aspect, particularly when the editorial tried to compare the association with TVA. Because the editorial was published in the RECORD, and has subsequently appeared in newspapers, I now ask unanimous consent that an answer which I wrote to the editor of the Star, Mr. William R. Mathews, also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1955.

Mr. WILLIAM R. MATHEWS,
The Arizona Daily Star,
Tucson, Ariz.

DEAR BILL: Once before it was necessary for me to answer an editorial of yours that touched upon some basic thinking of mine. That was the occasion when you asked me, "What kind of a Republican are you?" and, if you will recall, that answer required far more words than I like to burden anyone with, particularly a busy editor.

Now you have questioned my stand on TVA because I say it is socialistic, and you evidently do not agree with me, and, in the saying, you try to compare TVA with the Salt River projects, and I find it necessary to resort to a lengthy explanation, which I feel will explain to you why I do not like this approach that has been used under false colors in the State of Tennessee.

I do not consider the Salt River Valley Water Users Association in any way comparable to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I quoted Mr. Norman Thomas as an authority on TVA being socialistic. If he thought for one minute that the Salt River Valley Water Users Association was socialistic, I am sure he would have eulogized it as such years ago. I accept him as an expert on this subject.

I heartily endorse Federal assistance in the development of our streams for irrigation, flood prevention, navigation, and other beneficial uses, including the production of hydroelectric power. Had it not been for Federal assistance, the Salt River project would not have been developed to its present status or, let me say, developed to that status as expediently. I still believe a project as sound as it is would have been completely developed by local interests in time. Federal assistance was necessary to the development of many other fine reclamation projects in the West and it will be required in the future for many other fine developments such as the central Arizona project.

Congress, in its wisdom, decided to encourage reclamation development in the West, and in particular that of Government lands. It not only authorized loans for this purpose but offered further assistance, or subsidy, if you please, by making the loan interest free for a certain number of years. I am proud to say that a Republican administration, under the dynamic leadership of that great President, Theodore Roosevelt, made this possible by passing the Reclamation Act of 1902. I am happy to say that succeeding Democratic and Republican administrations have recognized the wisdom of the act and have not only continued it but have improved it. This is to the credit of both parties. The present administration has recommended the most ambitious of all reclamation programs, including the upper Colorado River development, which I was happy to cosponsor.

I feel confident that it will support our central Arizona project as soon as the court settles the question of water rights between our State and California.

In addition to irrigation this administration has initiated a farsighted policy—the partnership approach—for furthering flood prevention, navigation, and other benefits including hydroelectric power that come from the development of our river basins. This program I heartily endorse. It will result in more extensive development than could be accomplished by the Federal Government trying to go it alone.

The purpose of the above statement is to let you know how I stand on development of our water resources. I have no quarrel with Tennessee over the fact that the Tennessee River Basin has been developed. In fact, I am very happy that Tennessee or any other area can benefit from development of its water resources. However, I would not want what has happened in that State to happen to my State. Under the guise of flood control and navigation, the river has actually been developed for production of hydroelectric power. Their greatest irreplaceable resource—land—the best land in the State, has been inundated and lost to production forever. Better flood control could have been provided without losing this land. But if that is the way Tennessee wants it, I certainly offer no objections.

My criticism of TVA is that it has not done exactly what the Salt River Valley Water Users Association has done. The water users got some help from the Government to build a storage dam, some canals and to install a powerplant at the dam. The cost of this work was beyond the ability of the

water users at the time. The Salt River Valley Water Users Association is a true cooperative of farmers. The electric power it produced was primarily intended to operate its facilities and provide electric service for its members. It sold excess power and used the money to reduce water costs to its members. When it needed additional power it financed the additional dams and steam plants through the private investment money market and pledged the land of its members as security. It did not run to Uncle Sam for another handout. When its facilities were completed, it took over the operation and management and has run them on a businesslike basis. It has paid interest—sometimes high interest up to 6 percent—on its borrowed capital. It has assessed its members sufficient money to meet all of its costs including repayment of the money advanced by the Federal Government ahead of schedule. It got no gifts from the Government for flood control and other benefits provided by its facilities as did TVA. No, it is paying back all the Federal and private money and has never defaulted on a single obligation.

The Salt River Valley Water Users Association-Government arrangement is a true partnership that has worked out to the everlasting good of the State. The Government loaned a helping hand when it was necessary, but the people have retained their own independence and initiative and are beholden unto no Federal bureau or bureaucrat.

It is true that Salt River Valley Water Users Association pays no taxes, but you will remember that the Internal Revenue Department contended from 1936 on that it did owe Federal income tax on the profits it made from the sale of electric power. It was only after it organized the power operations into a separate and distinct public power district and made a cash settlement with the Revenue Department that it was relieved of further Federal income tax liabilities.

Public power districts, municipalities, etc., are tax exempt on the theory that they are subdivisions of the State and operate on a nonprofit basis. A true cooperative is tax exempt on the theory that at least 85 percent of its service, and therefore its income, is derived from its own members. The original concept of tax exemption for States and their political subdivisions was based on services normally performed by Government or segments thereof for the people, such as schools, roads, public buildings, etc. I am sure it was not originally thought of or contemplated to carry over these tax exempt privileges to the operation of proprietary businesses, otherwise through Government tax-exempt competition all such businesses will some day of necessity come under Government ownership. It must also be remembered that at the time these tax-exemption laws were set up, taxes, and in particular Federal income taxes, were not much of a business problem.

In the operation of a tax-exempt proprietary business it is not the state or segment thereof that gets out of paying the tax; it is the individual, the business or industry using the service that gets out of the taxes. Why should an industry located in a public power area escape paying taxes on the electricity it uses and an industry located in a private utility area, maybe right across the street, pay as much as 24 percent on its power bill for tax purposes? I am not suggesting the Salt River Project Power District pay taxes on its power operations so long as similar operations are exempt over the United States. And I am not suggesting that true farm cooperatives pay taxes on their power operations so long as they serve their members on a nonprofit basis, but when either starts serving business establishments and industries, I see no reason why such businesses or industries should be exempt from taxes on power that other businesses have to pay.

We have discussed the Salt River Valley Water Users Association; now let us see wherein TVA differs. Let me tell you that I have made quite a study of TVA since the Dixon-Yates controversy came up and now realize for the first time what it is all about. Let me also tell you that the propaganda this country has been fed on TVA at public expense, could hardly have been excelled under a dictatorship and a controlled press.

TVA was originally sold as a flood control and navigation development with hydroelectric power incidental thereto. It had not been underway long before a public power clique decided to take over. The first step was to kick out Dr. Arthur Morgan, the Board's first Chairman, and put Dave Lilienthal in. After that the main emphasis was put on power development. I will not dwell on flood control and navigation except to say that instead of providing flood control to protect valley lands, TVA has permanently flooded with lakes more land than the Army engineers estimated would be flooded by the undeveloped river once in 500 years. The interest on the money invested in navigation facilities and the cost of operating and maintaining them alone costs almost as much as the all-rail rate on the same volume of freight. Besides that, the big percentage of water traffic results from TVA's own use.

Instead of providing reasonable flood protection, saving as much valuable land as was possible and improving navigation within economic limits and producing all of the hydroelectric power that could be economically developed from the primary undertakings, and turning this power over to the people to be distributed through existing facilities, either private or public, the TVA operators planned a Federal power monopoly. They schemed with a public power advocate, Harold Ickes, to use Public Works Administration funds for loans and grants to compete with the private electric companies and in this way forced them to sell their properties to the Government. The cities of Tennessee, under the persuasion and guidance of TVA, bought the electric distribution systems within their city limits. The cities operate the municipal electric systems and purchase their power from TVA at wholesale. These cities are now under captive contracts with TVA. They cannot build their own generating plants and produce their own power if they want to. TVA tells them what they shall charge for power and what to do with the money they take in. The local people not only have no voice in running TVA but are not allowed a free hand to run their own distribution systems. The situation is even worse than described above. TVA runs Tennessee. It has such a grip on the State, including its politics, that no candidate for political office, regardless of party, has a chance of election if he does not follow the TVA line. A farmer loses his free fertilizer and can no longer be a TVA cooperator if he supports a candidate that TVA objects to. This political and economic power is in the hands of a three-man Board of Directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The people of Tennessee have no say in the selection.

TVA claims it has averaged earnings of 4 percent on the power investment over the years. Yet it pays no interest on the money it gets from the Federal Treasury but the people, through taxes, have to pay an average of 2.6-percent interest on this long-term financing. We taxpayers have had to pay out in interest alone over $240 million on money advanced to TVA for expenditures other than those connected with flood control and navigation. TVA has returned to the Treasury through fiscal 1954 only $87 million, about one-third of the interest the rest of us have had to advance on this venture. It is not the Authority or the State of Tennessee that is getting out of paying this interest, it is the power consumers, individuals, businesses, and industries, many of them competing with other sections of the country.

TVA pays no Federal taxes and only token payments in lieu of State and local taxes. Once again, it is not the Authority or the State of Tennessee that dodges these taxes but the individuals, businesses, and industries consuming the power. If these TVA customers were paying their fair share of taxes it would mean just that much less the rest of us would have to pay. As it is we lose both ways. We are being taxed to support TVA and the TVA consumers get out of taxes the rest of us pay on power we buy.

TVA conducts special forestry and soil-conservation programs. Arizona and the other 26 States depend on the Department of Agriculture for such programs. Why should one State be singled out for a special program through some separate Government authority?

TVA operates a fertilizer program but the great development programs in this country, aside from atomic energy, have been through the initiative of private industry, not Government. Why do we have to turn to some Government authority for this work in one section of the country?

Salt River Valley Water Users Association by good business management, running its own affairs, paying its own way, financing its own expansion after an initial start, in other words through initiative of its own members, has contributed greatly to the growth and prosperity of Arizona. What has TVA, an all-powerful Federal authority done for Tennessee? After the expenditure of over $4 billion of Federal funds on TVA and atomic energy installations in Tennessee, that State has shown less advancement in those things indicative of prosperity than its neighboring States. I gave the Senate statistics supporting this statement last year and they have not been disputed. It is not because the State lacks the natural advantages of its neighbors. It is my opinion that the people have become so dependent on a Federal authority they have lost their own initiative.

TVA already has cost the people of Arizona $3,595,000 and the annual subsidy to TVA from Arizona is $175,000. If the Dixon-Yates contract does not go through and TVA is allowed to build another steam plant, it will cost Arizona at least another $235,000. I do not object and am sure the good people of Arizona have no objection to lending a helping hand to any section of the country, but we certainly have a right to expect those receiving help to put their operations on a sound businesslike basis as Salt River Valley Water Users Association has done and not be the continuing drain on us that TVA has been for over 20 years.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

Dissent and Separate Views of Commissioner Chet Holifield on Commission Report on Medical Services

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission released as of today—February 28—their recommendations regarding medical services furnished by the Federal Government to veterans, military personnel, and others.

I present herewith a copy of my dissenting and separate views to the majority recommendation and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

DISSENT AND SEPARATE VIEWS OF COMMISSIONER CHET HOLIFIELD ON COMMISSION REPORT ON MEDICAL SERVICES

The burden of the complaint in the Commission report is that (1) too many persons are receiving medical (particularly hospital) care at Federal expense; (2) they are receiving more care than is necessary; and (3) the Federal Government is maintaining more facilities than are needed to take care of the present patient load.

The Commission therefore proposes that no more general hospitals be built by the Veterans' Administration, that some VA hospitals be closed, and that hospital care for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities be limited in several ways. An effort is made, also, to reduce disability allowances to veterans.

Furthermore it is proposed that the general hospitals of the Public Health Service be closed and that merchant seamen no longer be given medical care by the Federal Government. Other beneficiaries and their dependents now receiving care at such hospitals (commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, and employees of the Coast Guard and Coast and Geodetic Survey) would be shifted to military hospitals for treatment pending the development of voluntary health insurance plans for all Federal Government employees.

Hospital and clinical facilities of the military services would be reduced by making one service in a given geographic area responsible for taking care of all military patients, whether Army, Navy, or Air Force. Dependents of military personnel would have access to military medical facilities only until such time as voluntary contributory plans for health insurance are developed by the Federal Government.

My objections to certain parts of the report are summarized as follows:

1. Hospital and other medical facilities of the Federal Government should not be curtailed in the face of impending civilian defense needs and greater Federal responsibilities in meeting them, which have yet to be clearly defined. Recent disclosures of the potential danger of radioactive fallout to millions of people are reason enough to make us pause and proceed with care.

2. Until the health insurance programs proposed by the Commission for Government employees generally and for dependents of military and certain other Government personnel are fully developed, and their adequacy demonstrated, I am opposed to any reduction whatever in the Federal medical services presently available to such persons.

3. It is not in keeping with congressional intent to take a narrow and restrictive view of hospital care for veterans. Although the veteran population will decrease, medical needs will increase as it grows older. On the basis of present and authorized hospital facilities, the Veterans' Administration should be able to plan and provide a stable program of medical care to veterans without severe restrictions on eligibility.

4. The proposal to make veterans who receive medical care for non-service-connected disabilities liable for future payment is wholly unrealistic. It poses awkward and difficult problems of assessing costs and enforcing collection in future years. It would create inequities as between those who received care in the past and those who receive it in the present or future.

5. Medical care for merchant seamen in hospitals of the Public Health Service in an historic function of the Service dating back to its inception more than 150 years ago. Whatever the arguments for discontinuing such medical care, certainly the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that suitable alternatives are developed within the maritime industry before terminating present arrangements. Huge subsidies paid to ship owners and operators by the Government should provide sufficient leverage to cause the industry to initiate and develop a program of medical care for merchant seamen.

I would add as a general comment that the repeated mention in the report of alleged waste in expenditures for Government medical facilities and services should not make us lose sight of the tragic waste of human life resulting from inadequate medical care.

The Government is said to be furnishing some type of medical service to 30 million people. Among the millons of taxpayers who do not receive such assistance, or receive it only in minor degree, are many families unable to meet the present high costs of medical care.

When the Government faces up to this problem and takes the initiative in devising an adequate medical insurance system for the whole population, perhaps it will be relieved in substantial part of the heavy demands for direct medical services and resultant large expenditure cited in this report.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Edward G. Latch, Metropolitan Memorial Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, who art the rock and fortress of Thy people, draw near unto us as we in the quiet of this moment draw near unto Thee. Thou art the strength of our souls, the light of our minds, the joy of our hearts, and in Thy life do we find our lives.

Give us this day, O God, a real sense of Thy presence and a sure faith that Thou art with us. As we formulate our plans, make our decisions, cast our votes, relate ourselves to one another, may we ever be mindful of Thy spirit and have the courage to do Thy will. So may we, the leaders of the people of this great land, have the will to work together for the common good of our country. Grant us wisdom, grant us courage that we fail not man nor Thee. We pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes."

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports on several bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the chair appoints as members of the board of directors of Gallaudet College the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; Mr. PHILLIPS, of California.

JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of the United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would again like to record my opposition to H. R. 3828, providing for an increase in congressional salaries. As it now comes before the House of Representatives for the third time, it still provides for an increase of $7,500, or 50 percent in salary. This, in my opinion, is too much. I intend again to vote against this measure.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the House will accept the report of the conferees on the judicial and congressional salary matter. It is well that the $1,250 tax-free expense item has finally been eliminated. The membership of this body is not entitled to any special privileges or considerations when it comes to income-tax payments. I have never been in full accord with the present system of congressional pay and the increments that go with it. It would be far better that a definite, final figure be set and that particular items relative to office expenses be eliminated. When this matter was before the House on last Wednesday I voted for the Burdick amendment. When this amendment, establishing the salary at $17,500 was defeated, I voted for the bill recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary carrying the figure of $25,000. There is no doubt in my mind that there is a need for an increase in salaries of members of the judiciary and the Congress. President Eisenhower recommended it in his state of the Union message, and his recommendation was based on the report of the special committee of distinguished Americans from all walks of life appointed to study the matter. That committee

recommended congressional pay of $27,500; House action cut this to $25,000, and today the compromise is to $22,500, with the entire amount subject to income taxes. As an unmarried man I can get along on the present schedule of $15,000. However, I am convinced that the great majority of this House who have to maintain two homes have not been able to make ends meet. The test here is objective. So, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the conferees' compromise.

HIDDEN SALARIES IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the salaries of the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks. These salaries are fixed by each Federal Reserve bank with the approval of the Board of Governors under the law passed by Congress. The money that is used to pay these salaries comes from the taxpayers just like the money that is used to pay salaries of Members of Congress and all other Government officials:

President, Federal Reserve Bank, New York	$60,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Chicago	40,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, San Francisco	35,000
Presidents, Federal Reserve Banks: Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, and Kansas City, $30,000 each	210,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Minneapolis	28,000
President, Federal Reserve Bank, Dallas	25,000
Total	398,000

The Federal Reserve banks raise their money in a very unusual and painless way, although it is paid by the taxpayers. For instance, the manager of the Open Market Committee, who is employed by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, has unlimited power and authority within the general rules laid down by the Open Market Committee to exchange new currency printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing here in Washington, known as Federal Reserve notes, for United States Government bonds which provide an interest charge. The point is the Federal Reserve System trades non-interest-bearing government obligations in the form of printed currency or paper money for United States Government bonds and keeps the bonds in their vaults and requires the Government to pay interest each year when the interest is due on the bonds. In this way, the Federal Reserve banks are collecting over a half billion dollars a year interest from the United States Government on bonds that the banks have bought by exchanging Federal Reserve notes for them.

The Members of Congress could have arranged to collect their salaries in a way that would be just as hidden and just as painless. It could be done by allowing each Member of Congress to exchange a million dollars worth of new money for a million dollars worth of Government long-term bonds that provide for 2¼ percent interest payable annually. In that way, each Member would collect, as long as he was a Member of Congress, $22,500 each year as interest on a million dollars in bonds. Then the taxpayers would be paying the bill in the same way and manner that the taxpayers pay the salaries of the Presidents of the Federal Reserve banks and other officials. Many of the other Federal Reserve officials also receive huge salaries in the same way.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY

It is necessary that a Member consider the matter of pay from the standpoint of the country in the future rather than from the standpoint of his own present individual situation. What is best for a democracy? Obviously, congressional pay around $25,000 a year is not out of line with salaries received in business, industry, or even in the Government itself. One thing is sure; we should not pay Government officials too much, and we should certainly not pay them too little. The people's representative should not be in such a weak position that he would have any excuse—not that all of them would—to yield to the pressures of special-interest groups.

The cost is insignificant in comparison to its importance. The total raise for the legislative branch in the bill that passed the House involves 1½ cents additional cost per person per year.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to passage of this bill at this time. I regret the action of the Democratic leadership of the House in bringing up such a bill now. Congress is the board of directors for managing the country's affairs, and I believe Members of Congress are entitled to a fair increase in salaries in line with their heavier responsibilities, greatly increased workload, and the increased costs which they face along with all other people in the Nation. Congress has had no increase since 1946, while other governmental employees have had two cost-of-living raises during that period and deserve a third. It is only reasonable that Congress be given a raise also.

However, the first responsibility of a board of directors is to the organization's employees, in this case the workers in the Federal service. We tried to enact a pay increase for them in the last Congress, and I voted for it twice. Unfortunately, some who pretended to be the special friends of Federal employees were more interested in playing politics with the issue. They blocked passage of the only kind of bill that could become law with the promise that they could get a better bill. The result was no bill at all.

Our first task is to correct that situation. I do not believe that Members of Congress should raise their own salaries until they have first taken care of employees in the lower-paid brackets.

Furthermore, how are Members who vote for the conference report now to resist the demands of all sorts of groups during the remainder of the session for all sorts of subsidies, increased grants, or appropriations? Full independence in using my best judgment on each issue as it comes along is more important to me than the salary increase.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 81)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Chief Justice of the United States and to the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out '$25,500' and substituting therefor '$35,500', and by striking out '$25,000' and substituting therefor '$35,000'.

"(b) Section 44 (d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out '$15,000' and substituting therefor '$22,500', and by striking out '$15,500' and substituting therefor '$23,000'.

"(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out '$15,000' and substituting therefor '$22,500'.

"(g) The first paragraph of section 4 of the Act approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended, relating to the District Court for the District of Alaska, is amended by striking out '$15,000' and substituting therefor '$22,500'.

"(h) Section 7443 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) SALARY.—Each judge shall receive salary at the rate of $22,500 per annum, to be paid in monthly installments.'

"(i) (1) Article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and substituting therefor '$25,500'.

"(2) Such article is further amended by adding at the end of subdivision (a) (1) thereof the following: 'Each judge shall, upon his certificate, be paid by the Secretary of Defense all necessary traveling expenses, and also his reasonable maintenance expenses actually incurred, not exceeding $15 per day, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station. The official station of such judges for such purpose shall be the District of Columbia.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 508. Salaries

"'The Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title within the following limitations:

"'United States attorneys—not less than $12,000 or more than $20,000; and

"'Assistant United States attorneys and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title—not more than $15,000.'

"(b) The salaries of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys for the districts of Alaska, Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands are subject to the provisions of section 508 of title 28, United States Code.

"SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum.'

"(b) Section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (relative to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

"(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out '$30,000' and substituting therefor '$35,000'.

"SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on March 1, 1955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On February 25, 1955, the House adopted the conference report on the bill H. R. 3828, House Report No. 79, 84th Congress, 1st session. On that same day, however, the Senate rejected the conference report and asked for a second conference. The Senate further instructed its conferees to insist upon the elimination from the conference report of the language contained in subsection (b) of section 4 of the conference report.

The following table sets forth the difference between the House and Senate versions and the conference report as to the matter of salaries:

Position	House	Senate	Conference
Chief Justice	$35,500	$35,000	$35,500
Associate Justice	35,000	34,500	35,000
Court of appeals	25,000	25,500	25,500
District court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Chief judge, District of Columbia	23,000	23,000	23,000
Court of Claims	25,000	25,500	25,500
Customs and Patent Appeals	25,000	25,500	25,500
Customs Court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Alaska District Court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Tax Court	22,500	22,500	22,500
Military Appeals	25,000	25,500	25,500
United States attorneys	$12,000 to 20,000	(1)	$12,000 to 20,000
Assistant and special attorneys	6,000 to 15,000	(1)	Up to 15,000
Deputy Attorney General	21,000	(1)	21,000
Solicitor General	20,500	(1)	20,500
Assistant Attorney General	20,000	(1)	20,000
Vice President	35,000	35,000	35,000
Speaker	35,000	35,000	35,000
Members	22,500	22,500	22,500

[1] No provision.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICIALS AND UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Senate version of the bill made no provision for an increase in the salaries of various officials of the Department of Justice, United States attorneys, and assistant and special attorneys. The House version provided for increases in the salaries of such officials. In conference the Senate agreed to accept substantially the House version relating to salaries as set forth in the above table. A minor change was made, however, in that the minimum paid to assistant United States attorneys and special attorneys was eliminated by the conferees.

COMPENSATION OF LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

The House version of the bill contained a provision to raise the maximum basic compensation of professional and clerical staff members of the standing committees to $10,000, and further provided that the ceiling of $11,646, as it related to legislative employees, be adjusted so that the ceiling existing under the Classified Pay Act should be substituted therefor. The House receded from its insistence on this provision, which was not contained in the Senate version of the bill, but it was the opinion of the conferees on the part of both Houses that some adjustment should be made relating to pay increases to legislative personnel. It was the further sense of the conferees that the respective committees of each House explore the salaries of all legislative personnel for the purpose of an upward adjustment in relation to their pay as it is believed that this matter is essentially one which should be the subject of a pay act applying to all legislative personnel.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

The Senate version provided that the judges of the Court of Military Appeals would receive up to $15 per day for travel and maintenance expenses incurred while traveling on official duty. The House version contained no such provision. Since the justices and judges of the other United States courts now receive such an allowance, the House accepted the Senate version.

The House version of the bill made no provision for any additional travel allowance for Members of Congress. The Senate version provided for additional five round trips per year, commencing on January 3 of one year and ending on January 3 of the following year, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules of the Senate as it relates to Senators, and by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives as it relates to Members of that body. The travel would be authorized between the District of Columbia and the State, congressional district, Territory, or possession which the Member represents. The Senate receded from this provision of its bill and accepted the House version, thus eliminating the travel allowance.

In conference Report No. 79 the provision for this travel allowance was retained with a minor modification of a clarifying nature.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR OFFICE EXPENSES

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Senate version provided for repeal of the existing $2,500 expense allowance to Members of Congress. No similar provision was contained in the House bill, thus retaining the existing $2,500 taxable expense allowance. The House receded from its version and accepted the Senate version, thus eliminating the provision of section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended. In Conference Report No. 79 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, provision was made to reduce the amount of the taxable expense allowance to $1,250. However, that conference report was rejected by the Senate.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The Senate version provided that the effective date of the act would be the first day of the month following the date of enactment. The House bill provided that the effective date would be January 1, 1955, for those provisions relating to the executive and judicial branches of the Government and the date of commencement of the 84th Congress for the provisions relating to the legislative branch of the Government. The conference report provided that the effective date of the act shall be March 1, 1955.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE

The amendment of the title merely reflects the recommended amendment to the original text of H. R. 3828.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] if there is any agreement about a rollcall not being had today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further pro-

ceedings in this matter be dispensed with until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 113, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—223

Adair	Gavin	Multer
Albert	Gray	Murray, Ill.
Alger	Gregory	Nicholson
Allen, Calif.	Griffiths	Norblad
Arends	Gubser	Norrell
Aspinall	Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Hale	O'Brien, N. Y.
Avery	Haley	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
Bailey	Hand	O'Neill
Baker	Hardy	Ostertag
Barden	Harris	Patman
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Pelly
Bates	Harvey	Phillips
Becker	Hays, Ark.	Pilcher
Belcher	Hébert	Pillion
Bennett, Mich.	Herlong	Poage
Bentley	Heselton	Price
Betts	Hess	Priest
Blatnik	Hiestand	Prouty
Boggs	Hillings	Quigley
Boland	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Bolling	Holifield	Reed, Ill.
Bonner	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Bowler	Holt	Beuss
Boyle	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brooks, Tex.	Hosmer	Riehlman
Brownson	Hull	Robeson, Va.
Broyhill	Hyde	Rogers, Colo.
Buchanan	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Burnside	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Rooney
Cannon	Jennings	Roosevelt
Carlyle	Jensen	Rutherford
Carrigg	Jones, Mo.	St. George
Celler	Karsten	Scherer
Chatham	Kean	Schwengel
Chelf	Kearney	Scott
Chiperfield	Kearns	Scudder
Cole	Kilburn	Sheehan
Cooley	Kilday	Sheppard
Corbett	Kilgore	Short
Cramer	King, Calif.	Sieminski
Cretella	King, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Crumpacker	Kirwan	Sisk
Cunningham	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mass.	Knox	Spence
Dague	Krueger	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Sullivan
Davis, Wis.	Lanham	Teague, Calif.
Deane	Lankford	Teague, Tex.
Dempsey	Lesinski	Thomas
Denton	Lipscomb	Thompson, La.
Derounian	Long	Thompson, N. J.
Devereux	Lovre	Thompson, Tex.
Dies	McCarthy	Thomson, Wyo.
Dodd	McCormack	Thornberry
Doyle	McDonough	Tollefson
Durham	McIntire	Trimble
Edmondson	McMillan	Tumulty
Ellsworth	Machrowicz	Vinson
Engle	Madden	Walter
Evins	Magnuson	Westland
Fallon	Mailliard	Wharton
Fascell	Martin	Wickersham
Fenton	Matthews	Widnall
Fernandez	Meader	Williams, N. Y.
Fjare	Merrow	Wilson, Calif.
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Flynt	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Fogarty	Mills	Wright
Forand	Minshall	Yates
Ford	Mollohan	Zablocki
Fountain	Moss	
Frelinghuysen	Moulder	

NAYS—113

Abbitt	Andrews	Brown, Ga.
Abernethy	Ashmore	Brown, Ohio
Alexander	Baldwin	Burdick
Allen, Ill.	Beamer	Burleson
Andersen, H. Carl	Bennett, Fla.	Bush
	Berry	Byrd
Andresen, August H.	Blitch	Cederberg
	Bray	Chase
Chenoweth	Johansen	Rogers, Fla.
Church	Johnson, Wis.	Saylor
Colmer	Jonas	Schenck
Coon	Jones, Ala.	Scrivner
Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Seely-Brown
Coudert	Judd	Selden
Davis, Ga.	Keating	Shuford
Dawson, Utah	Laird	Siler
Dixon	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Dolliver	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Springer
Dorn, S. C.	Mahon	Staggers
Dowdy	Marshall	Taber
Elliott	Mason	Thompson, Mich.
Fisher	Miller, Md.	
Forrester	Mumma	Udall
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Gentry	Natcher	Vorys
George	O'Konski	Vursell
Grant	Perkins	Watts
Green, Oreg.	Pfost	Weaver
Gross	Poff	Whitten
Harden	Polk	Wier
Harrison, Va.	Rains	Wigglesworth
Hayworth	Ray	Williams, Miss.
Henderson	Rees, Kans.	Willis
Hill	Rhodes, Pa.	Wilson, Ind.
Hoeven	Richards	Winstead
Hoffman, Mich.	Riley	Wolverton
Hope	Roberts	Younger
Huddleston	Robsion, Ky.	

NOT VOTING—98

Addonizio	Eberharter	Metcalf
Anfuso	Feighan	Miller, N. Y.
Ashley	Fine	Morano
Barrett	Fino	Morgan
Bass, Tenn.	Friedel	Morrison
Baumhart	Fulton	Nelson
Bell	Gamble	Osmers
Bolton Frances P.	Garmatz	Passman
	Gary	Patterson
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gathings	Philbin
	Gordon	Powell
Bosch	Granahan	Preston
Bow	Green, Pa.	Radwan
Boykin	Gwinn	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks, La.	Hays, Ohio	Rivers
Buckley	Hoffman, Ill.	Rodino
Budge	Holtzman	Sadlak
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Shelley
Canfield	Jenkins	Sikes
Carnahan	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Christopher	Kee	Smith, Wis.
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Talle
Clark	Kelly, N. Y.	Taylor
Clevenger	Keogh	Tuck
Curtis, Mo.	Klein	Utt
Davidson	Knutson	Vanik
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Van Pelt
Delaney	Latham	Velde
Diggs	McConnell	Wainright
Dingell	McCulloch	Williams, N. J.
Dollinger	McDowell	Young
Donohue	McGregor	Zelenko
Donovan	McVey	
Dorn, N. Y.	Macdonald	

So the conference reported was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Christopher against.

Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Eberharter with Mrs. F. P. Bolton.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Canfield.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Williams of New Jersey with Mr. O. P. Bolton.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. MacDonald with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Green with Mr. Young.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Budge.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bosch.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. McVey.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Dorn of New York.

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Morano.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Fine with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Talle.

Mr. Donovan with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Utt.

Mr. ASHMORE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LET US LOOK AT THE RECORD

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, from 1933 to 1953 the New Deal Democrats, under F. D. R. and Truman, were in the saddle. During those 20 years our Federal taxes were upped and upped and upped—from $2 billion in 1933 to $65 billion in 1953, an increase of 3,250 percent in 20 years.

The Republicans gained control of Congress in 1946. During their control they not only cut taxes, but they also balanced the budget, and had a cash balance of $8.4 billion on hand at the end of the 2-year period.

In 1953 the Republicans again gained control, this time of both the White House and the Congress. During 1953 and 1954 Federal expenditures were cut $10 billion and Federal taxes were cut $7.4 billion—the greatest tax cut ever made in 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, that is the record. Taxes being upped and upped during the 20 years of control by the New Deal Democrats, and taxes being reduced both times the Republicans took over control of the Government.

Now, the New Deal Democrats have forced through the House a $20 per person tax cut. That amounts to a loss of $2.3 billion to the Treasury, but it also means an additional $2.3 billion available for the taxpayers to spend upon themselves. That appears to be an excellent proposal on the surface. However, for every $20 the taxpayer does not have to pay next year, the Government will have to borrow $20 and charge it against the children of the present taxpayers, plus the interest upon the same. So all we really do is to place a heavier tax load upon our children in order to lighten our own tax load.

Every tax increase means less take-home pay for the American workingman. It means an automatic reduction in his pay. By the same token every tax cut means more take-home pay for the

American workingman. It means an automatic pay raise for him. Which party therefore has the better record from the standpoint of the workingman, the New Deal Democratic Party or the Republican Party? In 1956 which political party—judged by the record—can with good grace go before the voters and ask for their support on the basis of the record?

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ASSAULT ON THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to relive the experiences of a year ago for the benefit of my colleagues of the House here today or to call their attention to it particularly. I think I said all I care to say on that subject when I returned to the floor last April 27.

But I am taking this occasion to address the House for the purpose of calling attention to a gentleman who was seated in the gallery by the name of Frank B. Wise who, although he had just gotten up from a sick bed at the time of the shooting, distinguished himself by his actions on that occasion.

I include as a part of my remarks the following letter:

LAW OFFICES OF E. K. GUBIN,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1955.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.,

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: In looking over some old material today, I noticed the observation that March 1 will be a year since the unfortunate assault was made on you and other Members of Congress in the House Chamber.

As a person who is interested in little people, I am wondering what, if anything, was done to pay tribute to the courage of a little man who was present in the gallery that day and who performed a tremendously heroic act.

I refer to a man whose name, I believe, is Frank B. Wise. If I recall a newspaper statement correctly, Mr. Wise had just gotten up from a sick bed but despite the state of his health, unarmed and alone, successfully stopped part of the gunfire and subdued one or more of the assailants.

I don't know Mr. Wise, and remember only generally what the newspapers reported, but if my memory serves me correctly, he is a little man who possibly may have been overlooked in the hurry and bustle of our present turbulent world.

It occurred to me that possibly you or some of the other members of the House might be interested in checking the facts of Mr. Wise's heroic act and possibly saying something about it on the floor of the House on the anniversary of the day when the trouble occurred. Maybe a resolution of the House, thanking Mr. Wise might be in order, or you may know of some other way to officially recognize his heorism.

The world is full of little people who often rise to the occasion and perform great heroic acts. I think one way or another, these acts as they occur should be recognized in some way, even though the little man who performs the act in most instances neither expects nor desires any recognition.

Sincerely yours,

E. K. GUBIN.

Mr. Speaker, that is about all there is to it. Those of us who were here a year ago today will never forget, and I am sure the American people will never forget that occasion last March 1.

I trust that the House will take prompt action on the bill I and my other colleagues have introduced with regard to the security of the House.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON ENERGY, SUPPLIES, AND RESOURCES POLICY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the report of the President's Committee on Energy, Supplies, and Resources Policy has been filed. As we expected, as far as the coal industry is concerned, it is an utterly confusing and disappointing document. With reference particularly to anthracite coal, the President's committee report is a classic example of the mountain laboring and bringing forth a mouse. It has decided, believe it or not, that something should be done about the coal industry. Now, that is what is desired, and I do not think this House needs much information from another commission in that regard. We in the coal industry take exception to the report determining that residual oil imports should be frozen. Unalterably are we opposed to that and persist and insist upon the quota theory with reference to the importation of residual fuel oil. As far as the coal industry is concerned, there are some good things in the President's committee report, but with reference to residual oil under no circumstances can we accept the recommendation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BOYLE asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday, April 27, for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following any special orders heretofore entered.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would repeal the provisions of the tax act of 1954, giving tax preference to individuals receiving corporation dividends.

The measure would repeal section 34, relating to credit against income taxes for dividends received by individuals, and section 116, relating to partial exclusion from gross income of dividends received by individuals, of the Internal Revenue Code passed by the Republican Congress last year. Other technical provisions of the code would be correspondingly amended.

Section 34 permits individuals to deduct from income taxes an amount equal to 4 percent of dividends received from domestic corporations. Section 116 permits individual taxpayers to exclude from their gross income the first $50 of dividend income received each year.

The effect of this proposal would be to place taxpayers reporting dividend income on an equal basis with persons receiving income from wages, salaries, and noncorporate business enterprises. I want to point out that if the $20 per person income-tax credit passed by the House is enacted, taxpayers receiving dividend income will share equally in the benefit.

I had hoped to propose this measure as an amendment when the bill extending excise taxes and allowing the $20 per person tax credit was before the House last Friday. The Treasury has estimated that repeal of the dividend-preference provisions of the 1954 act will bring in more than $200 million in additional revenue. This is a sizable share of the tax revenue it is claimed may be lost by reason of our effort to reduce the tax burden of the great group of our citizens in the lower income brackets who are least able to pay taxes. As you know, it was not possible to propose it then because of the rule under which the bill was considered.

I can conceive of no reason why we should continue this inequitable and unjust tax preference forced through by the administration last year. I see no logic in taxing the family man who works for a living at a higher rate than another citizen who receives an equal income from stock investments. I cannot reconcile this discrimination nor can I understand how an administration crying for responsibility in taxation can justify this deliberate lowering of tax revenues by more than $200 million a year.

The only argument I have heard advanced for this tax preference is that it encourages investment in stocks and may thus provide additional working capital to industry. Judging by performance of the stock market in recent years, I cannot agree that industry needs this stimulus.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, there is presently being held before the Small Business Committee of this House consideration of the extension of the Small

Business Administration Act which expires June 30, 1955. I submitted before that committee a statement indicating that I wholeheartedly favor the extension of this act.

The continuation and extension of SBA is of tremendous importance to the future industrial development and growth in Florida.

My statement to that committee dated February 28, 1955, reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1955.

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 2,
HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE,
House Office Building.

In re hearings of the Small Business Administration established under the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163, 83d Cong.)

GENTLEMEN: I submit the following statement and ask that you include same as a matter of the hearings being conducted by you.

I would appear before you and speak in interest of extending the activities of the Small Business Administration established under the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163, 83d Cong.), by which law said Administration terminates its activities as of June 30, 1955.

I respectfully submit that the Small Business Administration has performed an outstanding service to the businessmen of this Nation, particularly in that category designated by them as small business, by provision of loan facilities, business administrative aids, and counseling services of great value both to the individual and to the economy of our Nation.

The upsurge and prosperity during the serious readjustment period of the small-business man throughout the country is due in large respect to the continued and diligent efforts of this Administration. In the State of Florida the Small Business Administration has been successful in many instances and certainly of great value in assisting this most important segment of our business economy. I would particularly emphasize its early and more recently accelerated activity in the field of consultation, Government procurement, and operational assistance as well as direct financial assistance in the State of Florida. These particular activities have been beneficial to what is one of the outstanding States in the Union as regards population growth and development of business activity under the continued efforts of the communities throughout the State. Continued advice and expanded SBA facilities are of great importance to my State.

I would call the attention of this committee to an exemplary type of service being rendered by the Small Business Administration in the First District of Florida, which it is my privilege to serve. The city of Tarpon Springs is unique in the respect that it is one of the very few and certainly the largest sponge fishing center along the United States coast. A recent economic crisis was reached in Tarpon Springs when marine disease affected the sponges in this area. This disease having been overcome, the Small Business Administration, with great cooperation from the State director, Mr. Willard Silva, in coordination with the regional office at Atlanta and as a matter of direct concern of the Administrator, Mr. Wendell Barnes, is providing great assistance and considerable advice in the reestablishment of the sponge marketing, processing methods, and Government procurement programs for this business. In this example funds were not needed and the outstanding services of the Small Business Administration beyond the lending phase are well demonstrated.

Many similar examples will continue to develop and exist under the current planned industrial growth evident in the State of Florida. There has recently been organized under Governor LeRoy Collins a State council for industry and commerce. The State legislature has proposed and appointed a legislative committee to study the industrial development of the State. Pinellas County is an example that is common throughout Florida in the operation of a Pinellas light-industry council. The several county and city chambers of commerce throughout Florida all have established industrial committees of their group, the Tampa Chamber of Commerce, in what is one of Florida's great industrial cities showing outstanding development and great aggressiveness in seeking new business. I feel that here again the call will not only necessarily be for financing of new business, but also for the continuation of the present able facilities of the Small Business Administration in counseling, engineering research, and actively coordinated procurement programs with Government agencies and other service features of the Administration that are now being broadened into greater use.

It is my request to you that this program be continued for I can envision a greater demand and need for the facilities of the Small Business Administration. It is my hope that in this extension, adequate personnel be authorized and provided the Small Business Administration. Efficient use of personnel is demonstrated in that only some 300 individuals are concerned solely with the loan portions of the program. This, I feel, should be extended. It is my further suggestion and recommendation to you that budgetary items of the Small Business Administration be carefully considered and that sufficient provision be made in this regard that certain limitations under which they operate at the present time will be eliminated.

Your consideration of these remarks is appreciated and it is my sincere hope that this committee shall, upon consideration of this and other material and information presented, continue the services of this outstanding organization.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress,
First District, Florida.

(Copies to Mr. Wendell Barnes, Mr. Willard Silva, Mr. Casper Ruf.)

MISUSE OF UNION FUNDS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, beyond question, some union officials are misusing the funds collected from union members in the way of initiation fees, dues, and special assessments for political purposes and, because of the power which such individuals have or assume to have, many a candidate for public office yields to their unreasonable demands.

The teamsters union, of which Dave Beck is the head, with lieutenants like Hoffa, of Detroit, and Ring, of Kansas City, and which has millions at its disposal, certainly can put candidates on the spot. Just why we in Congress and those in State legislatures do not enact legislation which prohibits the collection and expenditure of what might be termed "blood money," coerced out of workers for political purposes, is difficult to understand.

We certainly know the facts. Is it because of fear of retaliation at the polls that we do not bring labor unions and officers of unions under the Hatch Act? Several times it has been my privilege to mention the fact that Jimmy Hoffa at Detroit—he is the one whose wife, with the wife of his sidekick, Brennan, made some $45,000 profit in 4 years when they took over a trucking business formerly operated by unionmen—testified that the executive board of his union had authorized him to spend union funds for political purposes and that some of those funds had been spent in behalf of the election of a judge.

UNION BOSSES NOT ALL POWERFUL

Let me give you the result of an election held last November in Dave Beck's home baliwick. Our colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], who was opposed by Beck, received 86,594 votes. The Democratic candidate, Mr. Mitchell, backed by Beck, received but 77,408 votes. At the same time, the Democratic sheriff, who did not receive Beck's support, received 137,599 votes, while the Republican candidate, Callahan, who had Beck's help, received but 126,053 votes. If my figures are incorrect, perhaps some Representative from Washington will correct me.

Of interest might be the enclosed article from Alice Staples, printed in a recent issue of the Seattle Times, and which I read:

UNITED STATES SEEKS RECORDS OF TEAMSTERS LOCAL IN BREWSTER TAX CASE

(By Alice Staples)

The United States attorney's office today took steps to compel Local 174, Teamsters Union, AFL, to produce all its records in connection with an examination of income-tax returns filed by Frank W. Brewster and his former wife, Dorothy. Brewster is an international vice president of the union and former secretary of local No. 174.

The Government said in its complaint that the union made large disbursements to Brewster in the form of expense allowances, but they were not listed in his income-tax returns. The complaint also said Brewster had borrowed thousands of dollars from the local.

A show-cause order was signed by United States District Judge William J. Lindberg on motion of William A. Helsell, assistant United States attorney.

The Teamster local and Nugent LaPoma, also known as George Cavano, were ordered to appear before District Judge John C. Bowen at 10 o'clock, February 28. Cavano now is secretary-treasurer of the local.

Officials of the local will be expected to show why they should not be ordered to comply with a summons served upon them January 3 by the Secretary of the Treasury.

CHARGES OUTLINED

A complaint brought by Helsell and Charles P. Moriarty, United States attorney, stated the Government has reason to believe that additional taxes are owed by Brewster and his former wife for 1943 to 1953.

The complaint states Brewster filed separate returns for himself between 1943 and 1947 and that joint returns for him and Mrs. Brewster were filed for 1948 to 1953, inclusive. Mrs. Brewster obtained a divorce in December 1953.

Brewster's income-tax returns do not list any items of expense or travel allowance from the local nor do they list any deductions for

travel or business expense, the complaint states.

The returns do not list deductions for interest on loans obtained by Brewster except for a $7.50 item in 1952, and the returns do not reflect any items of income resulting from cancellation of loans made to Brewster, the complaint said.

LOANS UNSECURED

The United States attorney said that from such information as the Government was able to obtain from the local, the balance due on loans to Brewster from local No. 174 on June 30, 1950, was $35,500. The loans were unsecured, the complaint stated.

An examination of union books, in connection with another taxpayer, revealed that a loan of $8,000 was made jointly to Brewster and the other taxpayer by the local in April 1943. The Government has been unable to find any evidence that the loan was repaid, the complaint said.

A financial statement for 1952, which was furnished to members of local No. 174, accompanies the complaint. That statement did not list any unsecured loans to Brewster.

During 1952, local No. 174 incurred car and transportation expenses totaling $46,403.22 and expenses for officers and delegates totaling $6,272.56, the complaint said.

OTHER SOURCES QUOTED

"From confidential sources, the plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that large disbursements were made to Frank Brewster in 1952 and other years by local No. 174 in the form of expense allowances," the complaint states.

The complaint said that, from information which the local has been willing to disclose, disbursements to Brewster by check for expenses in December 1952 totaled $1,748.65 and that $1,500 was paid by check to Dorothy Brewster in November 1952 by the local for an automobile.

The items were not reported in the tax returns, the Government said.

Claude J. Watson, a special agent for the Internal Revenue Service, was assigned in January 1954 to investigate Brewster's tax returns.

A request was made last July to examine the union records. Another request was made December 10, when the agent communicated with Samuel B. Bassett, attorney for the union. Watson failed to get permission to check the records.

A summons was issued requiring the local to produce the records January 18.

The complaint states that Bassett, LaPoma, Laurita Thayer Apagoff, bookkeeper; Vern E. Milton, recording secretary, and Floyd H. Anderson, also known as Russell Anderson, vice president, appeared January 18.

RECORDS INCOMPLETE

They had with them "what purported to be copies of certain records," the Government stated, but produced no general ledgers, journals, or other necessary documents, the complaint stated.

Bassett refused, after an examination of the documents, to produce other records, the complaint said.

Among the records sought are cash books, journals, memoranda, general ledgers, canceled checks, check stubs, bank statments, deposit slips, audit reports, and notes receivable.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 160, Rept. No. 82), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 202, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO REPEAL SECTION 348 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 161, Rept. No. 83) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

STRENGTHENING OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to read into the RECORD an appeal of Newell M. Hargett, postmaster at Maysville, Ky., now before the United States Civil Service Commission, which I feel should be read by all the Members of this body. I feel confident that this entire body is interested in strengthening our civil-service laws:

NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER, MAYSVILLE, KY., APPELLANT, *v.* MOTION FOR ORAL HEARING, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, APPELLEE

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.:

Comes appellant, Newell M. Hargett, postmaster at Maysville, Ky., who prays that you grant him an oral hearing wherein he may present witnesses to sustain his case since he was denied by your regional director at Cincinnati, Ohio., his reasonable and necessary request to set such hearing over until November 8, 1954, in order to prepare his case and he was forced into a hearing by the regional director at Cincinnati, at Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 22, 1954, to the prejudice and detriment of this appellant.

Respectfully submitted.

D. BERNARD COUGHLIN,
M. HARGETT,
PHILIP HARGETT,
Attorneys for Appellant, Maysville, Ky.

NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER, MAYSVILLE, KY., APPELLANT, *v.* ADDENDA TO APPELLANT'S BRIEF FILED HEREIN, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, APPELLEE

UNITES STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.:

Among the charges preferred by appellee against the appellant to establish a charge of inefficiency was an allegation regarding the manner in which the star-route carriers records were kept. We wish to call your attention to the change Postal Bulletin No. 19801, December 16, 1954, third column, first page, which is as follows: "The procedure and form of records to be kept (for star-route carriers) may be determined by the postmasters involved."

Another charge of appellee against the appellant was that the assistant postmaster kept the cashbook. Inspector Ferrell in the hearing of October 22, 1954, at Cincinnati, Ohio, contended that the appellant was not permitted, unless a superintendent of mails was on duty, to have the assistant postmaster keep the cashbook under Post Office Manual, chapter I, article 14 (c) which says that a postmaster at post office such as the Maysville office at which a superintendent of mails was authorized could have the assistant postmaster keep the cashbook. But nowhere in the hearing was evidence produced tending to show what the Post Office Department's interpretation of such regulation was. To let an inspector say what the Department meant by the language of the manual and base appellant's ouster on such inspector's statements is highly prejudicial to the appellant. However the same manual in chapter II, article 86, states that at post offices having a superintendent of mails that all case examinations shall be given by the superintendent. The use of the words "authorized" in chapter I, article 14 (c) and "having" in chapter II, article 86 in the manual was not unintentional as the language was aptly chosen by the appellee and expresses the Department's intention clearly to sustain the appellant's contention that he was correct in permitting the assistant postmaster to keep the cashbook since a superintendent of mails was authorized at the Maysville post office.

Therefore, we respectfully submit the appellant is not inefficient and appellee's attempted removal should be set aside and appellant retained as postmaster at Maysville, Ky.

Respectfully submitted.

D. BERNARD COUGHLIN,
M. HARGETT,
PHILIP HARGETT,
Attorneys for Appellant, Maysville, Ky.

BRIEF IN BEHALF OF NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER AT MAYSVILLE, KY., ON HIS APPEAL UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED—NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER AT MAYSVILLE, KY., APPELLANT, *v.* BRIEF FOR APPELLANT, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, APPELLEE

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.:

Appellant, Newell M. Hargett, appeals the unfavorable decision of the United States Civil Service Commission, sixth region, Cincinnati, Ohio, sustaining the Post Office Department's removal of appellant.

The Post Office Department charged the appellant, in a letter dated June 13, 1954, with two items:

(1) Inefficiency.

(2) Failure to devote 8 hours per day to his duties as postmaster.

Considering first item (1), "inefficiency." All of the charges of the Post Office Department are minor, some are duplications, and none are sufficient to establish that the appellant was inefficient and some are open to several interpretations of the postal regulations upon which reasonable minds would differ. The appellant has been acting under an established interpretation of the regulations which had been accepted by the Post Office Department when other inspections were made at the Maysville Post Office in previous years, and while appellant was postmaster. That should estop the appellee from changing them without warning the appellant. None of the charges against appellant deal with dishonesty, moral turpitude, or the proper and efficient functioning of the Maysville Post Office.

Appellant has answered these charges and rebutted them with conclusive evidence.

The charges adduced by appellee to prove appellant's inefficiency are frivolous, as follows:

Bank deposits made at noon instead of latest time of day, all stamp stock not protected, form of endorsement of checks should be different, payroll savings bonds sold in May were issued on June 1, inventory of main stamp accounts not made, inventory not maintained on current basis, customs duties should be entered in another manner, no alphabetical or numerical file of metermail permit holders, post-office box receipts are not numbered, clerks in finance section do not have fixed credits for stamps instead of purchasing stamps for each transaction, excess accrued from sale of envelopes in odd lots by window clerks not accurately determined, c. o. d. should have been filed with applications rather than separately, postal-savings depositor cards restored to file after transaction rather than at close of the day, form 3539 handed to mailer by assistant postmaster but should be done by clerk in mailing section, no inventory of keys made, no pouch list kept, no annual inspections of city routes, rural carriers did not turn in money order receipt books daily, time cards in collection boxes missing, special delivery mail not backstamped, rural route sorting boxes do not show box numbers, star-route carriers are required to ring time cards, postmaster absent on some days, little attempt to arrange work and leave schedules, clerks not required to qualify on city distribution, time cards do not show name of substitute, no corrections made in Postal Manual in last 12 months, revolvers should be placed in the safe at night.

On behalf of the appellant we submit that these flimsy charges of the Post Office Department were rebutted and disproved by the appellant's evidence in the record.

Another purported charge advanced by the appellee to prove the alleged inefficiency of the postmaster was that the postmaster permitted the assistant postmaster to keep the cash book. The answer is that the Post Office Manual, chapter I, article 14 (c) permits this to be done in post offices where the receipts are less than $400,000 and a superintendent of the mails is authorized. That is the Maysville Post Office situation. Several years ago the record shows that a superintendent of the mails was authorized for the post office at Maysville. That the assistant postmaster had been keeping the cash book was known by the Post Office Department as it had made several annual inspections previous to June 1954 and approved the method. In those previous inspections the postmaster was given a rating of 90 percent plus on the average. Now the appellee, Post Office Department, at the June 1954 inspection wants to shift the former interpretation and method of operations without warning to the appellant to chapter I, article 14 (d) which applies to post offices at which no superintendent of the mails is authorized and use this as a basis to support the charge of inefficiency against the postmaster.

If the Post Office Department had notified the postmaster prior to June 1954, that the approval given that procedure under chapter I, article 14 (c) in the Maysville Post Office which resulted in 90-percent ratings formerly at the Maysville Post Office and while appellant was postmaster was no longer to be effective, it should have notified the appellant to change the procedure for keeping the cash book from subsection (c) to subsection (d) and if he subsequently failed to conform thereafter would have been the time to consider action. But nothing should have been done without previous warning. In fact, such conduct in equity estops the Department from basing inefficiency on such ground.

Another effort to establish the inefficiency of the appellant postmaster was that he failed to supervise the building properly as custodian. These charges consist of silly duplications and impossibilities.

A sample of the charges as follows: Post-office windows and interior dusty, surplus articles in basement, postmaster's office used for United States Army Reserve meetings, lookout galleries not cleaned on Monday before inspection, toilet bowls cracked and dirty, fire hose not tested by air, wornout flag in attic of post office, and parking by employees on the spacious lot around the post office.

The postmaster produced evidence to rebut them. The regional director's opinion dismissed the charge as to dirt around the post office. The Postmaster General had given approval for United States Army Reserve meetings to be held at the post office. The use by the United States Army Reserve was an economy measure to save the Government from renting other quarters in Maysville when it had available space there. The junk items were those accumulated during the improvements being made at the Maysville Post Office in May and June 1954, when the inspection was made and were sold as junk immediately on conclusion of the work in 1954. As to the cracked toilet bowls the postmaster had made requisition to appellee on various occasions for replacements and was refused.

Turning now to item No. (2), "Failure to devote 8 hours per day to postmaster duties," we find the following evidence:

Three or four Maysville Post Office employees claimed to have kept a record of the hours the postmaster was at the post office on 3 days in December 1952, and other days in May 1953, March and April 1954. The appellant's proof established that such a record could not have been kept by them because the affiant's leaves of absence, hours of duty, and arrangement of the post-office building were such that they could not have seen or been present to testify to what they did say and the result was impossible. Appellant proved this by use of time cards filed in the record. On the contrary the postmaster stated he was on duty on those days and stated positively that he was on duty at other times and had complied with the Post Office Manual, chapter 1, article 21, pertaining to his hours of duty.

Further the appellant was charged with only being on duty 5 hours per day for 2 years prior to May 1, 1954. This charge was dismissed by the regional director because of lack of specificity. However, regardless of any other reason for its dismissal the evidence in the file is so overwhelming that the postmaster was on duty always that such a charge against appellant has been proved untrue.

The appellant, a veteran of World War II and a permanent preference eligible under section 14, Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, contended before the regional director and now contends here that this proceeding against him should be dismissed because (1) such action will not promote the efficiency of the service; (2) the reasons charged are general and not specific and not in detail as required by the law; (3) the action is capricious, arbitrary, and unreasonable; (4) that the true basis and reason for the attempted removal of appellant is political and an effort to replace him, a qualified permanent preference eligible veteran, by a political appointee with no civil-service status or rights; (5) appellant was prejudiced as his request for time to prepare until November 8, 1954, for the Cincinnati hearing was denied him and he was forced into an earlier hearing at which he could not produce all his evidence and asks for an oral hearing before you.

The appellant also challenges the erroneous regional decision and opinion because—

1. It states that the evidence shows neglect of appellant in the disposition of worn out articles at the post office. However, such worn out articles were being accumulated during the construction at the Maysville, Ky., post office during May and June 1954, for disposition in one lump after the remodeling was completed. Such articles were sold as a whole for junk in July 1954, and they weighed less than 500 pounds. The civil service regional opinion so charges appellant although admitting that improvements resulting in the junk accumulation were in progress at the post office in Maysville, Ky., when the June 1954 inspection was made.

2. Because it penalized appellant on account of the occasional automobile parking of postal employees while on duty on a large lot around the post office building which did not interfere in the postal operation in and out of the building. The public was never permitted to park on the Government property.

3. Because it attempts to justify the Post Office Department's efforts to establish the postmaster's inefficiency by charging that the lookout areas, which are dark, unlighted shaft and closet spaces in the post office building used by inspectors to observe actions of postal employees, were dusty. This is erroneous because the decision finds that dust inside and outside of the building was due to construction operations within and without the building and the same was true with reference to the lookout areas. They were constantly cleaned from time to time and there should be no exceptions as to the accumulation of dust there different from the other parts of the building.

4. Because it required the postmaster to test the fire hose by some sort of air pressure equipment which the Post Office Department had never furnished to the postmaster and which equipment the Maysville City Fire Department did not possess. The evidence shows that the hose was taken out from time to time and inspected and that there was no leakage whatsoever.

5. Because it states that the main stamp stock was kept by the assistant postmaster as the postal regulations required that.

6. Because it fails to consider the evidence establishing that keys to the building are all catalogued and accounted for and none are lost.

7. Because it joins the superintendent of the mails issue with the main stamp obligation and there was no connection whatsoever between handling the main stamp stock and keeping the postal accounts.

(8) Because it holds that the appellant postmaster was to keep the main stamp stock where a superintendent of the mails was authorized, as this is contrary to Postal Manual, chapter I, article 14 (c).

(9) Because it holds that the assistant postmaster supervised the postal personnel on the mail room floor. The assistant postmaster has nothing to do with supervision. The truth is, as the postmaster testified, that

he supervised the whole office and was acquainted with all the duties of all the employees at all times and their performance of same. He has never admitted his lack of knowledge with reference to the duties of the post office or any of its employees. The organization was never questioned by the inspectors and was fully described to them and also for the inspectors on previous inspections as the proof shows without denial.

(10) Because it stated that a member of the district manager's staff visited the Maysville Post Office regarding the superintendent of the mails and personnel inspection. The postmaster had recommended a superintendent of the mails and said visit was made for that particular appointment. The appellant proved the need and nomination had been discussed by appellant with the district manager long before the official's visit with reference to said appointment. The visit was merely to determine the employee to be appointed to such position. Appellant objects to such statement by the regional opinion as it is unfair, unjust, and places the position of the postmaster in an erroneous light.

(11) Because it is unfair in permitting the Post Office Department to put an interpretation on its regulations prejudicial to the postmaster as it does when it classifies the appellant under Post Office Manual, chapter I, article 14 (d), rather than under subparagraph (c) under which he had been inspected in the years previously. The Post Office Department in equity is estopped to change an interpretation any time it desires and charge an employee with inefficiency after permitting it at other inspections in previous years and since other inspectors knew of the practice and said nothing about it. If such a course of conduct by the Post Office Department is condoned then the postmaster and all other employees so situated are in the middle with no knowledge as to where they may stand and such action of the appellee Department is arbitrary, unfair, and unreasonable. It cannot be justified and is used only as a device for the removal of employees. To permit it to happen absolutely destroys the intent of Congress as expressed in the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Nothing could be more arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable than the Post Office Department's act and no civil-service employee would ever be successful or safe under the Veterans' Preference Act.

Attached hereto is a copy of a letter from the Post Office Department plainly and specifically authorizing a superintendent of the mails at Maysville, Ky., post office. Postal Manual, chapter I, article 14 (c), says: "He shall have direct supervision of the preparation of accounts, assist with the handling of the postal account, personally analyze and sign all accounts and requests for allowances; direct proper methods of auditing to insure individual responsibility; personally check the main stamp stock once each quarter and see that all fixed credits are checked once each quarter." It is the appellant's contention that the Post Office Department is estopped to discharge him from the position of postmaster without first being told by the Post Office Department that in the future he would have to act under subsection (d) since the Department had permitted the postmaster to act under subsection (c) for years and other inspections were made during that time without objections by the Post Office Department inspectors at such prior inspections.

(12) Because it states that there was no evidence to establish clearly the abuse of discretion by the inspectors since such assertion is contrary to the evidence. The appellant postmaster from the time he was appointed in 1949 and up until the inspection of June 1954, had annual average inspection rating of over 90 percent while the removing inspection gave him a rating of 60.5 percent in June 1954. This is certainly an abuse of discretion and it is arbitrary, unreasonable, and capricious.

(13) Because it is based on untrustworthy evidence when it says the employees collaborated in keeping records on the time of the postmaster in June 1954, as Clerk Arvid Tucker said he verified the time that three clerks allegedly kept on the postmaster and it was correct but in his later affidavit in the record dated September 22, 1954, made to Stanley F. Heald, the civil-service representative investigating this case, stated that he knew of "no plan to remove" the postmaster. Why did four employees, Clerk Tucker being one of the four, purport to keep time if they did not have an intent to remove or otherwise harm the postmaster? What could further establish the "plot" than the statement in the regional opinion that apparently the joint affidavit of alleged hours was a device used by the four clerks in question for the reason that none of the several employees could testify on his own knowledge to the times involved? In that affidavit they purport to give hours, day, and date and testify jointly about matters on which they could have no knowledge. What is that but an effort to remove the postmaster? The old adage "False in one thing, false in all things" certainly applies to the time affidavits and they should be discarded in honesty.

(14) Because it alludes to the statement of the hostile employees that the postmaster devoted more time since the June 1954 inspection, which is a mere opinion to justify their statement as the record does not disclose any charge on the part of Inspectors Ferrell and Henry that they did not find the appellant devoting the required time to his duties.

However, the post office inspector on the stand under oath at the hearing at Cincinnati, Ohio, stated that it (the June 1954 inspection) was a regular and special inspection based on complaints made to them from the employees at the Maysville post office, page 14 the transcript of the record, hearing of October 22, 1954. Clerk Royse is constantly reporting to the inspectors by long distance telephone. The inspector investigating the removal proceedings was the same one causing the removal proceedings against Democrats at other post offices as he admitted at the October 22, 1954, hearing. (See pp. 14 and 15 of the record.)

The plan of removal of the inspectors and the 3 or 4 Maysville post-office employees is glaringly evident from the lowering of the rating of the post office from the previous annual inspections of the prior years from 1949, since the postmaster had been in office, which was approximately 90 percent to 60.5 percent, based on the June 1954 inspection. Another factor to consider in unraveling the plot was the unusual and secretive manner in which that June 1954 inspection was conducted by Inspectors Ferrell and Henry. It was held at night in secret, behind closed doors, from which the appellant postmaster was excluded and given no opportunity to see or hear any of the proceedings, and the appellant was told by Inspector Ferrell that he would never be informed of what had been told the inspectors in such meetings during said June 1954 inspection.

The whole removal proceedings are the result of political plot. In the election campaign of 1952 the postmaster's job was promised to two or more individuals by the Republican powers that be. The morning after the November 1952 election one of the ardent Republican Party supporters met Attorney D. Barnard Coughlin, a writer of this brief, and stated appellant postmaster Hargett would be removed and civil service and veterans' rights did not matter. Clerk Sudduth Royse, one of the affiants to the purported time affidavit concerning the appellant's hours in December 1952, May 1953, March and April 1954, stated shortly after the 1952 election that a Republican should be postmaster at Maysville, Ky. To further establish this political plot Attorney Coughlin attached herewith affidavits of former Congressman Joe B. Bates and himself. This plot has been conceived, assisted, and carried on by the connivance of the four clerks in the Maysville post office. Postal Inspector Ferrell, John Dieterich, chairman of the Kentucky Republican State central committee; John Sherman Cooper, United States Senator from the State of Kentucky; William B. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Maysville Public Ledger, a Republican newspaper, in order to remove the present appellant postmaster and appoint said William B. Mathews as such postmaster. Inspector Ferrell was ordered to the Maysville post office to make the June 1954 inspection with the express understanding that he would find some purported charges to remove the appellant postmaster to pave the way for appointing the political promises. Further proof of its political nature comes from a quotation from the front page of the Kentucky edition of the Cincinnati Enquirer of Monday morning, October 25, 1954, which is in pertinent part, as follows: "Patronage difficulties over the Maysville postmastership is the only factor we noted that might swing the county stronger for Mr. BARKLEY than indicated." It is our honest opinion that if it was not for such political plot that no effort would have ever been made to remove the efficient, capable and honest, and publicly supported appellant postmaster at Maysville, Ky. Our reasoning is based on the unsolicited public affidavits filed in this record establishing that the appellant postmaster is a man of the highest repute who has managed the post office in a most efficient manner since his appointment in June 1945. The local public indignation of the appellant's mistreatment in this matter was evidenced in the fulfillment of the Enquirer's prophecy of October 25, 1954, at the November 1954 election, since Mason County swung from a substantial majority in favor of Senator Cooper in 1952 to a substantial majority against him in 1954.

There is not the slightest indication of dishonesty or moral turpitude or inefficiency evidence to sustain charges against the appellant in any way regarding his actions or dealings with his employees, the Government or the patrons of the office. It is true that he has required the employees to render service to the public and the Government commensurate with their salaries. At the same time he has endeavored successfully to make the post office stay within its budget and refused to let the employees take possession of the post office and call in needless extra help at the Government's expense whenever they saw fit. At times the postmaster has been able to return to the Government unused a part of his annual budget. This method of operation is very distasteful to these few disgruntled employees handed down to the appellant at the Maysville post office. It is for that reason they are determined to get the postmaster out and started on the plot after the November 1952 election. The record as you note does not purport to state any time was kept on the postmaster prior to December 1952.

The United States circuit court of appeals in the case of *Laden* v. *Crosson et al.* (108 Fed. Supp. 240 (East. Dist. Pa.) held in order to separate a veteran preference civil-service employee that it is necessary to show that he is incompetent. The appellant was not incompetent because if he were he could not have operated within his budget, increased the post-office receipts and had the good will of the patrons of the office if it was otherwise. It might be added that the June 1954 inspection Inspectors Ferrell and Henry were unable to get any unsatisfactory evidence from the

post-office patrons although such endeavor was then made by them. A copy of an unsolicited letter from Henry T. Davidson, a patron of the Maysville post office is attached.

We submit to you gentlemen that the evidence does not show that the removal of the appellant postmaster is for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service, nor that the appellant is incompetent, and the reasons charged against him are not specific and in detail, and the whole action is a political plot. Consequently the appellant should not be removed, the charges should be dismissed as groundless from the evidence, the postoffice should have been rated 90 percent at the June 1954 inspection, the action of removal is unjust, arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, political and highly prejudicial and appellant should be reinstated by you.

We request a favorable hearing and adjudication of reinstatement of appellant by you. This will save this appellant veteran the expense of having to appeal his removal to the courts to save his rights, have them fairly protected and adjudicated and to retain his position as postmaster at Maysville, Ky., as it is a valuable property right which he has earned in the service of his country as a veteran of World War II.

Somewhere we read that the Honorable Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, stated to the 1954 postmasters' convention that in all the removals of postmasters to date none had been for political reasons, so with that statement we are confident of a favorable decision in this instance because the evidence warrants it.

Copies of this brief, letter, and affidavits attached are being furnished to every member of the Post Office Department and Civil Service Committees of both Houses of Congress and the various veterans organizations including the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars so that they may be fully advised.

Respectfully submitted.

M. HARGETT,
PHILIP HARGETT,
D. BERNARD COUGHLIN,
Attorneys for Appellant, Newell M. Hargett, Postmaster, Maysville, Ky.

MARCH 10, 1952.

Mr. NEWELL M. HARGETT,
Postmaster, Maysville, Ky.

DEAR MR. HARGETT: Reference is made to the recent survey which was conducted at your office.

From the data disclosed it appears that an additional supervisory position is warranted. The position of superintendent of mails at a salary of $5,005 per annum, exclusive of any longevity pay to which the employee appointed to the position may be entitled, is hereby authorized. A form 1559 covering the duties to be performed by the superintendent of mails should be submitted, and similar action should be taken if the duties of the assistant postmaster will be changed as a result of the authorization of the superintendent of mails position.

Please submit your recommendation on form 1533 for filling this position. No change in designation or in salary should be made until a copy of form 1533 has been received showing the effective date, which will be determined by the department. This action increases your supervisory complement to two, including the assistant postmaster, but does not change your clerical complement, which will remain at eight, including the assistant postmaster.

Attention is invited to the provisions of III–102, M. I., relative to a probationary period for employees promoted to supervisory positions who have not had prior supervisory experience.

When the clerical schedules are rearranged and the superintendent of mails position is filled, it is estimated that 757 hours of clerical auxiliary assistance, exclusive of absenteeism, item 2 to 6 on form 024, will be sufficient to maintain adequate service during normal quarters. Future estimates should be submitted on that basis.

The suggestions and recommendations outlined in the inspector's letter to you, dated November 6, 1951, pertaining to the clerical service, are approved. It is noted you concurred in the findings.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH J. LAWLER,
Assistant Postmaster General.

STATE OF KENTUCKY,
County of Mason, ss:

I, D. Bernard Coughlin, state that in December 1953 a letter came to William B. Mathews, Maysville, Ky., from Senator John S. Cooper or John Dieterich, the Republican National Chairman, of Ashland, Ky., making statements relative to and offering him the office of postmaster at Maysville, Ky.; further that in June 1954, 2 post-office inspectors arrived in Maysville, Ky., and conducted an investigation altogether different from any inspection ever held before; that during said investigation this affiant watched these post-office inspectors when they had 3 individual clerks, namely, Royse, Housh, and Perkins, in the postmaster's office behind closed doors after hours for several hours on the night of June 9; and that these 3 clerks had been in a conspiracy to remove the Maysville postmaster, Newell M. Hargett, prior to that time; that the postmaster to my knowledge received an anonymous phone call telling him that those 3 clerks had had private meetings outside the post office in Maysville plotting his removal; Clerk Royse early in 1953 said that there should be a Republican postmaster at Maysville, Ky.; Clerk Royse has been promoting himself for superintendent of the mails at the Maysville post office; subsequent to that time and about June 16, 1954, this affiant talked with Republican State Chairman John Dieterich, being a few days after said inspectors had made their unusual inspection at the Maysville post office; said Dieterich stated to me in said conversation that he was committed to give the postmastership at Maysville, Ky., to said William B. Mathews; said Mr. Dieterich further stated with reference to the post-office inspectors who inspected the Maysville post office and the Post Office Department that "they could get you if they wanted to"; this affiant further states that in the same conversation he had with said John Dieterich in June 1954 that Dieterich said that he was obligated politically to Mathews for all that he had done for him in the past in a political way; Post Office Inspector Ferrell, who was one of the inspectors who made the Maysville inspection in June 1954, is friendly with said Dieterich; a few days after said conversation with said Dieterich the said post-office inspectors sent their letter of charges to Postmaster Hargett at Maysville, Ky.; this affiant also talked with Joe B. Bates, an attorney at law at Greenup, Ky., who told him said Republican Chairman Dieterich said to him that he did not know what they were going to have to do about the postmaster job at the Maysville post office as William B. Mathews was forever after him to do something about the post office so that he could take the job of postmaster there, and the written statement of Joe B. Bates is attached hereto; affiant further states that on or about August 23, 1954, he phoned Congressman BRENT SPENCE to speak with Mr. Norman Abrams, who wrote Postmaster Hargett's letter of dismissal, in Postmaster Hargett's behalf, and in the same conversation I told him that I would be in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, August 26, 1954, en route to Boston, Mass.; without my knowledge Mr. SPENCE kindly made arrangements for me to accompany him to Mr. Abrams' office; on arrival there I was impressed by the political air, and the Post Office Department officials talked about the removal of Postmaster Hargett, and any of my thoughts that the matter could be or was nonpolitical were immediately dispelled by the conversation of the postal official of the Department who conferred with us; such postal official at the same time tried to tell us Senator Cooper had nothing to do with the removal but later on that same day I visited Senator Cooper's office in Washington and I was informed that a delegation had accompanied Congressman SPENCE to Mr. Abrams' office to intercede for the retention of Postmaster Hargett at Maysville; Congressman SPENCE did not give that information to Senator Cooper or Senator Cooper's office, as the Congressman and I went to lunch, and he immediately left by plane for Kentucky; affiant says that he did not call Senator Cooper's office about Congressman SPENCE and my visit to the Post Office Department; so only the postal officials interested in Postmaster Hargett's political removal had informed Senator Cooper of our visit in spite of the Post Office Department official's protestation that morning that the removal was nonpolitical; affiant states that in the civil-service hearing of October, 22, 1954, at Cincinnati, Ohio, the record shows that I asked Inspector Ferrell if he was not the inspector of the numerous post offices in this vicinity where removals of Democrat postmasters had been instituted since the change of administration, and he admitted he was the inspector in all but one office.

And further the affiant sayeth not.

D. BERNARD COUGHLIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me by D. Bernard Coughlin, this December 29, 1954.

[SEAL] PHILIP HARGETT,
Notary Public, Mason County, Ky.

My commission expires April 4, 1958.

JOE B. BATES,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Greenup, Ky.

DEAR BERNARD: I talked to John Dieterich some time ago about the postmaster in Maysville, and he told me that he didn't know what they were going to do; that Bill Mathews was after them to do something about it.

Your friend,

JOE B. BATES.

Subscribed and sworn to before me.

[SEAL] D. BERNARD COUGHLIN,
Notary Public,
State of Kentucky at Large.

My commission expires September 2, 1955.

HENRY T. DAVIDSON,
FARMS, FARM PRODUCTS,
Maysville, Ky.

POSTMASTER,
Maysville, Ky.:

My definition of the word "efficiency" is: The Maysville post office. Congratulations to you and your aides for a job well done.

Sincerely,

H. T. DAVIDSON.

CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1955 publication of Texas Credit Union, the following article appeared:

CREDIT UNIONS CONTINUE GROWTH IN 1954

Continuing its record of steady growth, the credit union movement forged solidly ahead in 1954, the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) reported today (January 14, 1955).

In all, 2,175 new credit unions were organized during the year—an average of 181 each month. The number of credit unions in the Western Hemisphere now stands at 19,880, with membership well over the 9 million mark. This compares with the 1953

year-end figure of 18,091 credit unions with some 8 million members.

"Credit unions are continuing—and will continue—to grow because they fill a genuine need. While providing a way for the average wage earner to solve his credit problems at low cost, these self-help thrift associations encourage him to build his savings—to plan for his future security," Thomas W. Doig, CUNA managing director declared.

Following is the complete CUNA report for 1954:

Credit unions in the Western Hemisphere

[Number of credit unions actual; other figures conservative estimates]

	A year ago (Dec. 31, 1953)	Now (Dec. 31, 1954)
Number of credit unions	18,091	19,880
Number of members	8,240,000	9,200,000
Amount of outstanding loans	$1,631,000,000	$1,792,000,000
Amount of paid-in-shares	$2,100,000,000	$2,275,000,000
Amount of reserves	$132,000,000	$145,000,000
Total assets	$2,429,000,000	$2,689,000,000

Another article appeared as follows:

I Am Your Credit Union

I was born of human desperation, reared in the household of need and dwell amidst the little people of our time.

I have experienced war, famine, misery, and greed; daily I endure indifference and human selfishness.

I am clear of vision, firm of purpose and strong of heart and hand. Despite those who would misuse and neglect me, I press ever onward to serve and to save those who need me.

I am democratic in organization and cooperative in action; obedient to the majority voice of you, my members, in all I do. I am, therefore exactly what you make of me—poor, weak and inefficient if you are disinterested; but strong, virile and helpful if you properly use me.

I am anxious to help with your family budgets, your personal financial problems and your credit needs—all on a neighborly basis.

I am dedicated to serve all men without distinction of race, color, or creed. I neither favor the rich or refined, nor frown on the poor or bereaved.

I am pledged to teach thrift, encourage thrift, and render thrift financial service to you, my people. Millions approve of my purpose.

I encourage you to build and use your own financial resources so as to better help yourself and your neighbors over the rugged places on the highway of life.

I rejoice to see you saved from the hand-to-mouth basis of daily existence, from those ever present who would keep you debtor de facto, and from the vicious spendthrift habits of your own making.

I am trustworthy. I have a remarkable record; financially, I have helped birth your babies, rear your children, build and furnish your homes, transport your families, hospitalize your ill and bury your dead. I am an ever-present helper in the hour of your greatest financial need.

I am a part of the great international credit union movement serving mankind. I am a part of all who need me. To serve is my task.

I am your credit union.

Arthur Pursell, *Managing Director, Tennessee Credit Union League.*

One of the most interesting talks on the subject of credit unions was made recently at Beaumont, Tex. It is as follows:

Bain Addresses Beaumont Exchange Club

(Editor's Note.—Often opportunities come up to tell our story, to get the facts about credit unions to those who are relatively unfamiliar with credit union operations. We should never hesitate; if we can't do it ourselves, there is generally a speaker available. Case in point is Beaumont credit union leader W. C. Bain's talk before the Beaumont Exchange Club.)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Beaumont Exchange Club, and guests, I appreciate very much the opportunity to meet with you and discuss with you one of my favorite subjects. Your program chairman has asked me to come down here to talk to you about the credit union movement in the United States and told me that I could have 10 or 12 minutes to tell you about a subject about which many books have already been written. You will pardon these notes and I will do the best I can in the allotted time.

A credit union is a cooperative association organized to promote thrift among its members and to accumulate a fund from these savings from which to make needed loans to members for useful purposes at reasonable interest rates.

The principal objectives, therefore, are to promote thrift, to provide a source of credit, and to eliminate usury.

At the outset you must keep in mind the credit union motto, "Not for profit, not for charity, but for service," and realize the spirit of helping one another is the compelling motive behind all credit union activity. In the credit union we help a member by teaching and encouraging him to help himself. We preach the saving habit—the habit of saving something each month, no matter how small—to provide for that time when the money will be needed and to pool these small amounts with the savings of others to provide a fund from which another member might be given credit assistance now.

I believe—and this thought might not be concurred in by other credit union people—that the practice of usury forced credit unions into existence—and, of course, usury results from two circumstances—the acute need for money by an individual and the complete breakdown of normal credit facilities.

Now, usury has been a problem since time immemorial and its control is as vital to our national and community economic well-being as the control of smallpox is to our community health or the control of the hoof-and-mouth disease is to our stock raisers.

The need for the control of usury was recognized by our lawmakers long ago and at the time the credit-union movement started in this country a good many States had laws which would not permit a licensed moneylender to charge interest in excess of 42 percent. I am informed that the average rate permitted under the law at the present time is about 30 percent.

Of course, such regulations have driven the usurious moneylenders underground, but not very far, and the credit unions have been forced into existence. The maximum interest rate charged by many credit unions is 1 percent per month on the unpaid balance. This costs the borrower $6.50 per year per hundred. There are no other charges. Many loans are made at lower rates, some as low as one-half of this rate. In this fair city, I am told that some of our reputable financial institutions will loan a man $150 if he will sign a note for $165 and repay same at the rate of $15 per month. Now, you figure out what interest rate that is.

The occasions that call for the use of money when no cash is available seem limitless. Hospital bills, insurance, home improvements, educational expenses, legal entanglements, vacation expenses, to say nothing of the purchase of consumer goods such as automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, TV sets, air conditioners, etc. Had one member having an unusual need for money. He called it unnecessary expense. He put it this way. He stepped up to me and said that he needed $100. As usual, I asked him what the purpose of the loan was. He then told me that it was to enable him to meet some unnecessary expense. Further questioning revealed that some of his wife's people had moved in on him for a week or 10 days. We agreed with his reasoning and he got the loan. All of this need for credit is largely satisfied where credit-union service is available.

In our credit-union experience we have discovered that the average person is honest. We have found out that the average person will pay his note; that is, so long as his earnings are of sufficient size to provide the other things he wants and there is something left over with which to pay the note. In this connection I am reminded of the story of the woman on the bus who suddenly realized that she had not paid her fare and told the lady sitting beside her about it. Her companion told her to just sit tight, the driver hadn't noticed it. But the lady's conscience began to bother her and she stepped up the aisle to pay her fare and returned with her face beaming and said to her companion, "See, it pays to be honest. I gave him a quarter and he gave me change for 50 cents."

The banks of this country gradually became conscious of the proven honesty of the average worker and have added personal-loan departments to their other services, thereby extending a lending service at reasonable rates to millions of men and women far beyond the expanding fields of credit-union membership. I know that this is true because the last time I made a loan from my bank I had no trouble at all getting the money I desired just so long as I was able to put up $3 worth of collateral for each dollar I borrowed.

But I should give you some facts about the credit-union movement instead of so much theory and philosophy.

There are both State and Federal credit unions. Most States have credit-union laws. Massachusetts had a credit-union law in 1909. Texas passed a law providing for the establishment of credit unions in 1913. The Federal act was passed in 1934.

Membership in a credit union is limited to persons having a common bond of occupation, association, or residence.

In the first group you find industrial workers, school teachers, State, county, and Federal employees and the like.

The second group is comprised of members of fraternal organizations, labor unions, church groups, etc., while the third group is composed of small community groups, housing projects, etc.

The membership fee in a credit union is 25 cents.

In the control and management of a credit union each member has a vote regardless of the amount of his shares.

The board of directors, supervisory committee, and credit committee are elected by the members.

Policies are set by each board of directors as long as they are within the act and the bylaws.

Now listen to this: All officers, directors, and committeemen serve without compensation with the exception of the treasurer, whose compensation is set by the members.

Act required that 20 percent of net earnings be set aside for reserve for bad loans. In this connection, the national average of losses is less than two-tenths of 1 percent of all loans made.

I read somewhere that losses sustained by credit union due to failure of banks in which the credit-union money was on deposit exceed the losses due to bad loans to members.

Dividends to shareholders—not to exceed 6 percent—may be paid from the remaining net profit.

No talk such as this would be complete without some statistics:

There are about 14,585 credit unions in the United States; 839 are located in Texas.

There are about 7,323,900 credit-union members in the United States; 310,000 are members of Texas credit unions.

Total assets of credit unions in the United States amount to $2,080,717,000. Texas credit unions have assets of $115 million.

The largest credit union in the United States is the Detroit Teachers. It has assets totaling $14 million.

I do not have any information as to the largest credit union in Texas, but the Gulf Employees Credit Union in Port Arthur, Tex., has more than 4,500 members and assets of more than $2 million. Other large credit unions in Texas are the Dallas teachers, Humble Employees of Houston, and Hughes Tool Co. in Houston. Our own credit union probably ranks fifth or sixth in size in Texas.

I have some brief statistics covering our own credit union:

We organized our credit union in August 1935.

Mr. W. E. Smith has been president since its organization, quite a record for loyalty and faithfulness.

We have 11 directors representing various groups in the plant.

We have a supervisory committee composed of 3, a credit committee composed of 3, and an educational committee composed of 3.

Regular monthly meetings of directors and committeemen are held.

We have a full-time office manager and 2 full-time girls, 1 extra girl on yard paydays.

We have 3,535 members who own shares amounting to $1,481,000.

We have 2,007 loans outstanding amounting to $970,000.

Our total assets amount to $1,580,000.

But, so much for that. I have a copy of our June 30 report with me and would be glad to try to answer any questions concerning our credit union you might like to ask.

Let me wind this up by saying that I have noticed that your membership certificate recites that: The spirit of exchange is the giving of self for the privilege of serving others; of parting with selfishness and receiving in return the satisfaction of discharging your duty to your fellow men, to your community, and to your Nation. Your covenant concludes with this line: "To serve in unity with those seeking better conditions, better understandings, and greater opportunities for all."

If these statements truly and sincerely reflect your feelings as individuals, then I can say without reservation that you—members of the Beaumont Exchange Club—are well qualified for credit union membership and leadership.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BURDICK (at the request of Mr. BENTLEY) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARTLETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include an address.

Mr. GAVIN and to include a statement before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3828. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States Attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 2, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

477. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by Haystack Equalizing Reservoir, and excepting a limited acreage of lands presently holding water rights and being irrigated, that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

478. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

479. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the text of a resolution of the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly extending its thanks to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States for the greetings contained in the joint resolution made at the second session of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

480. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 195, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

481. A letter from the Chairman, the Commission of Fine Arts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, relating to the establishment of a Commission of Fine Arts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on House Administration.

482. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

483. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Robert K. Koonce which, when executed by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, will authorize Mr. Koonce to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within White Sands National Monument, N. Mex., during a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

484. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

486. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting new and additional evidence in the case of Ramon Gonzales-Garcia, case No. A-8974193, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

487. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled 'An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department,'" approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

488. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

489. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the payment of money orders"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 160. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 202, joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 4510. A bill to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service during an enlistment or employment entered into on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4511. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4512. A bill to alleviate and adjust the heirship problem involved in Indian trust or restricted allotments, promote the economic use of Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4513. A bill to prohibit wiretapping except by a court-authorized Federal officer engaged in the investigation of crimes against the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4514. A bill to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 4515. A bill to increase the depletion rate on thenardite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4516. A bill to extend to grazing lessees the right of compensation for losses sustained by reason of the use of the public domain or other property for war or national defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4517. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits may become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 4518. A bill to create a Federal highway corporation for financing the construction of the national system of interstate highways; to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4519. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 4520. A bill to increase the depletion rate on thenardite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4521. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4522. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4523. A bill to amend section 7 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide that benefits may be paid under such act concurrently with retired pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 4524. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of a breakwater for the protection of the Cleveland, Lakewood, Rocky River, and Bay Village, Ohio, shore of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4525. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4526. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4527. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4528. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 4529. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 with respect to determination of sugar quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 4530. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which give tax preference to individuals who receive dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4531. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 4532. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act and the District of Columbia Use Tax Act so as to limit the sales and use tax on vendors to the amount of reimbursement authorized to be collected by them if they can establish such amount by accurate records; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4533. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4534. A bill to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 4535. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a report on the prayer room established in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Res. 162. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of national civilian air policy and its enforcement; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK: Memorial of the Minnesota State Legislature to support measures to restore package freight service on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THORNBERRY: Memorial of the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, State of Texas, resolving that the Congress is requested to give immediate attention to proposals now pending and to others which may be introduced for the limitation of imported oil as will cause no further injury to the oil-producing industry of the State of Texas and the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Concurrent resolution expressing the consensus of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma concerning Indian affairs; requesting the Federal Government to continue its obligations and responsibilities to the Indian people; requesting that the Congress of the United States enact no termination bills transferring responsibilities to State governments without the express approval of Indian tribal councils affected; to the Committee n Inte.ior and Insular Affairs.

Also, house concurrent resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, the Senate concurring therein, relating to the importing of crude oil from foreign countries, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to curb the imports of crude oil from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the administration by the several States of their respective school systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world, Wabash, Ind.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of John J. Cowin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4537. A bill for the relief of Sung-Un Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4538. A bill for the relief of Young-Sook Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4539. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toy Shee Moy (Choy Sen Yuet); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4540. A bill for the relief of Daniel Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4541. A bill for the relief of Rafael Aguilar-Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Ng Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4543. A bill for the relief of Isak Hertig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4544. A bill for the relief of Andrew Carrigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4545. A bill for the relief of George V. Tawes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4546. A bill for the relief of Celso Telle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4547. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Saida Barsam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4548. A bill for the relief of Michele Pica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4549. A bill for the relief of John J. Eraund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VORYS:

H. R. 4550. A bill to authorize Harvey Walker to accept and wear the Commander's Cross of the German Order of Merit from President Heuss of the German Federal Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 4551. A bill for the relief of Maria Guglielmina Reselli Younker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Are States Rights Disappearing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in a republic like ours, composed of member States, the trend is to enlarge the powers of the National Government and limit the power of the States; and this has been true since our Federal Government began.

The ninth amendment of the Federal Constitution declares:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The tenth amendment provides that:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

There is no question, therefore, that Federal authority over the police powers of the States was not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, yet we have seen measures passed by Congress that invade the powers of the States. For example, no one will deny that a State has the right to fix hours of labor and to prohibit child labor and other matters pertaining thereto, but the courts have held that labor in connection with the manufacture of goods designed for shipment in interstate commerce is national in character, and that therefore the Federal Government has authority to pass laws which, in an extreme case, may annul a State law. So in criminal cases, such as the driving of a stolen automobile from one State to another, the Federal law controls. Almost any set of facts can be considered of national interest and concern; and when it is, the Federal Government assumes command. The tendency is, and has been for 100 years, to read into a set of facts a national interest.

The more business the National Government gets into in a State, the more the Federal courts ignore State laws. When the Government participates in appropriations for roads and the support of schools, when strings are tied to the appropriations, it is very easy to find a national interest, and hence Congress legislates where the State should and where it has a perfect right to do so.

Wars wreak great havoc with the Constitution. When a soldier is drafted or voluntarily enters the Armed Forces his civil rights end, and if sent to a foreign country the laws of his own country and the Constitution do not protect him in criminal cases. Congress saw fit to pass an act making all soldiers of occupied countries subject to the laws of that country. After a war stops, the whole economy of the country has suffered to such an extent that the Federal Government, to stop depressions and aid those in distress, gets busy with appropriations for relief. It then directs the manner of relief, the agents of relief, and jurisdiction over violations of law with respect to it.

If this course continues, the States will have a very small voice in the affairs of their own Government. That is not what the framers of the Constitution intended, but that is the way it has been interpreted.

Public health programs sound good on paper, but where the Federal Government supports them in a State, the Government will, directly or indirectly, control it. In this case it is easy enough to find a national interest, because the Federal Government wants sound soldiers, and I will not be surprised to see the health programs carried out in each State with minute details of administration prescribed by the Federal Government. The Government Health Department at Washington will make rules and regulations, regardless of what the States desire.

On the illegal manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor the Federal Government made great headway in subjugating the States to Federal law and has steadily encroached on their powers since that time.

I personally know of one glaring incident which illustrates well this Government interference in State matters. A merchant in a small town, whose reputation for honesty was not questioned, sold 100 pounds of sugar to an oldtime customer whom he had known for years, who wanted it to put up his fruit. Everything was open and aboveboard, and the sugar was delivered and the fruit saved.

Shortly after the sale revenue officers appeared at this merchant's store and said that the sale was illegal. The storekeeper consulted me about it and I said I would look it up. I did so, and found no law anywhere that would make the sale of sugar for canning purposes illegal. I so advised him. He was later arrested and hauled into a Federal court in Baltimore, tried by a jury and under the charge given the jury by a Federal judge was promptly convicted and sent to prison for 3 months. No one was permitted to see him, and although suffering from diabetes he was given no relief and died soon after his term was served.

What the court relied upon was a regulation issued by the Treasury Department saying that a sale of 100 pounds of sugar or more must be reported to that Department, and providing a penalty. I do not think one Member of Congress knew that there was any such regulation, having the force of law. From a strictly legal standpoint the regulation had been authorized by Congress. That is, Congress gave the Treasury Department the power to make such rules and regulations as it saw fit.

In this case the merchant did not know a thing about the regulation, but the court said they are printed every night in a book known as the Federal Register, and that publication there is notice to everyone. I since learned that the regulations are made during the day, hundreds of them, and published that night. Some of them come in late in the day, just in time to reach the printer. At 6 o'clock in the evening there was no law against selling sugar, but at 7:30 there was.

A successful lawyer in the Federal courts does not need any lawbooks. All he has to have is the Federal Register, and if printed at 12 o'clock at night, he must get a copy and sit up the rest of the night to find out what new law has been passed by some bureaucrat. Here you see the State laws of the State of Maryland set aside and ignored, and a Federal regulation taking its place. This is an extreme case, but a true one, as I know every fact in it from beginning to end.

Surely we ought to stop and listen, or all the power reserved by the Constitution to the people will be lost, and we will have in this country an arrogant Federal Government controlling our every action; and those rights which were guaranteed to the States in the Constitution will disappear forever here in this great heralded democracy.

I do not believe that the public generally recognizes this tendency toward an autocratic Federal Government. Wars, and depressions following wars, with all the distress that comes in their train, has made Government assistance necessary, but as soon as possible Government assistance ought to be discontinued or the Federal Government will usurp all authority down to the smallest township.

For their own good people should not encourage Government hand-outs while able to do for themselves. We did that to the Indians, and now, after a hundred years of dependence on the Federal Government, with very few exceptions, they cannot take care of themselves. We adopted the opposite course of action with the Negroes. With them it was "dig in for yourselves," and as a result the Negroes of today have made most praiseworthy progress. They have shown that they can make their way as well as any other class of citizens.

I hope the American people will not be lulled to sleep by a paternal Federal Government and thereby lose their own initiative, their desire to progress, and see their State governments mere agents of the Federal Government. This Government was never organized to insure success to any individual. All it was intended to do was to give him an equal opportunity, and how successful he becomes is up to the citizen himself. Special privilege can be controlled by law, but the success of a citizen must be determined by himself. Too much paternalism will lead to the destruction of individual liberty.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the United States Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me before the House Committee on Appropriations March 1, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, and members of your distinguished Committee on Appropriations, I appreciate this opportunity to appear in support of the appropriations for the United States Forest Service. I feel confident that your committee will give the forestry items in the budget the thorough and careful consideration needed to assure their future well-being.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Forest Service. While February 1, 1905, is considered the birthday of the Forest Service, it really marks the beginning of the great conservation movement in forests, soils, water, and wildlife as we know it today in America, a movement that has captured the imagination, attention, and concern of millions of our people. Today more citizens are interested in what Congress is doing to protect and develop our forest resource than at any time in the history of America.

Congress has always played a big part in the development, use, and protection of the forestry resources of our Nation, not only through legislation but also with appropriations. We have often been generous with the first item and then failed to carry through in an adequate manner our responsibility under the second. Mr. Chairman, over the years Congress has passed numerous bills which will do reasonably well the forestry job at hand—both on our national forests and on State and private woodlands. Often, however, we have failed to appropriate the money needed to adequately carry on the work we have created, or we have been asked to make cuts in the working funds of the great forestry enterprises that have meant so much to our Nation. Under my remarks on page A995 of the daily RECORD for February 17, 1955, there is mentioned the gratifying progress we have made in forestry in the United States in the past half century. The members of this and other Congresses can claim some of the credit for these accomplishments.

Mr. Chairman, today your committee is in an enviable and rather unique position, for in this 50th anniversary year of forestry you have a great deal to say as to just how the second half century of forestry in America will go forward. I, therefore, need not remind my distinguished colleagues on this committee that our responsibilities are great. Also, that throughout the Nation many eyes are upon us, conservation-minded eyes, so to speak.

There is an item on page 363 of the printed budget that deserves serious consideration. I refer to the proposed cut of $1,083,690 in the appropriation for cooperation with the States in forest-fire protection. This reduction in an essential program with the States came as a surprise to me because I know that Congress does not intend to go backward in this vital cooperative work. The 81st Congress passed Public Law 392, which amended the Clarke-McNary Act, to provide an annual authorization of $20 million for cooperation with the States in forest-fire protection. The appropriation for fiscal year 1955 is $9,449,500, some $10 million under what should be the annual appropriation if the full intent of the law were carried out. And now for fiscal year 1956 you have been asked to cut the current appropriation some $1 million.

The appropriation for cooperation with the States in fire control is one of the most important in the budget. Through it 43 States and Hawaii are assisted in the protection from fire of forests which produce primary forest products worth over $3 billion and which affect many payrolls and great investments in wood-using industries. This appropriation is the basis for protecting recreational values in State and private lands now estimated to exceed $4 billion. The sport of hunting and fishing so dependent on good forests now brings about $9 billion into the economy of this country. I need not dwell upon the need for protecting water resources and the reduction of loss from floods. All these are tied into this appropriation. Therefore, rather than a reduction at this time, an increase which would at least start to bring the Federal share of this appropriation somewhere toward the goal set by Congress would be in order and certainly would have the support of many organizations and conservationists throughout the Nation.

In fiscal year 1954, the total expenditures on this program were $39 million of which the Federal share ($9,449,500) as about 24 percent. This indicates that we are still a long way from doing the job particularly in light of a detailed study made jointly by the States and the Forest Service in 1949 which showed a need for an expenditure of over $48 million to provide basic protection to the forests and watersheds on State and private lands in the Nation. I might point out here that this estimate was based on 1949 prices. Also it provided only a normal or average level of protection and it didn't include any refinements or superior protection facilities by the State government cooperating in the program.

If I appear to be unduly concerned about this item in the budget, it is because we still have about 53 million acres of State and private forest land in this Nation without any kind of organized fire protection. This unprotected acreage is burning at an annual rate of more than 13 percent of the area. In comparison, the burn on the 374 million acres under protection is less than 1 percent of the area. In other words, 7 million acres of the 53 million unprotected acres burn each year while only 2½ million acres of the 374 million acres under protection burn. This indicates that the States are doing a fine job on the areas under this program. It also indicates that the big job ahead is to get these remaining 53 million acres under protection as soon as possible. The members of this distinguished committee know that we cannot do this by a reduction in the amount of Federal participation in the program. We have been 44 years making the above progress—our efforts cannot be relaxed now.

The proposed reduction if not restored would mean that each cooperating State can expect about 12 percent less Federal Clarke-McNary fire funds in fiscal year 1956. The argument that a few States might make up this reduction overlooks the fact that we still have a big job if we are to maintain the present level of protection and at the same time bring in these millions of acres of unprotected land. Also many people forget that cost of living has gone up and that the Federal appropriation now buys less than it did even a year ago.

The woods are full of people. In the forests of my State of Pennsylvania we find millions of people now coming to the woods for recreation. "Smokey Bear" is doing a great job in preventing fires, but in spite of his fine work and the work of everyone else concerned the average number of forest fires on State and private forest lands in 1953 was greater than the average number of fires during the previous 5 years. Simply, this means that there are more people using the forest. If the cooperative funds are reduced at this time the chances are slim that the reduction will be made up by additional State or private funds. In Pennsylvania we are spending $895,000 each year on this cooperative program; $188,500 or 21 percent is Federal Clarke-McNary money from this appropriation. The $20,000 more or less that Pennsylvania will lose if the proposed reduction is allowed could not be taken lightly because it would probably mean doing without several tractors or fire plows or other needed equipment. More seriously, it could mean loss of manpower. Pennsylvania has been in this program since 1920. Forest-fire protection has progressed under the cooperation of the Federal Government, and I urge the committee to give serious consideration to restoring the $1,083,690 to this fund for cooperation with the 43 States and Hawaii in forest-fire prevention. At the same time, I believe it would be good conservation business to give very serious thought to increasing the overall appropriation by several million dollars. Such an increase would amount to what commonly might be called a cost of living increase to provide for the increased costs the States must now pay for fire equipment, labor, tools, radios, and other facilities for fighting fires. No Member of Congress has ever been criticized for supporting a conservation program as vital to the national welfare as this one.

There is another item on page 363 of the printed budget under State and private forestry cooperation in which I am vitally interested. I refer to the item "Cooperation in Forest Management and Processing." Each year I have discussed this Federal-State cooperative program with the Appropriation Committee. It is a privilege now to discuss it with you.

Since 1940 the Federal Government through the Forest Service has been cooperating with some 38 States in giving technical forest management assistance to the private owners of small woodland properties. As you perhaps know, over three-fourths of all the privately owned productive forest land in the Nation is in the hands of some 4¼ million small owners and farmers. Many of the forest problems of the Nation as far as proper cutting and regeneration of the timber crop occurs on these small properties. The problem is so important and caused so much concern that Congress in 1950 passed the Cooperative Forest Management Act which authorized to be appropriated annually the sum of $2,500,000 for cooperation with the States in advising and assisting the small woodland owners to do a better job of forest management on their properties. The act also included provisions for advising small mill operators to do a better job of sawing logs into lumber and other forest products. There are 50,000 of these small sawmill operators.

The budget this year provides $632,429 for carrying on this work in 38 States. The States are spending an additional $1,228,000. The work has just begun in that about 5 percent of the Nation's small owners have been assisted and better management has been started on 21 million acres or 8 percent of the small woodland acreage in the Nation. There has been over 5⅔ billion board feet of timber products harvested from the improved small forests with a return of over $100 million to their owners. Basically, however, the assistance of the farm foresters has been to improve the forest-management practices and to get better crops of timber on these small properties.

There are now about 275 farm foresters being employed by the States under the cooperative forest-management program. Some 8 or 10 States are marking time waiting to get into the program when Federal match-

ing funds are available. These are States where the Federal leadership and advice in the development of the woodland management program, training the farm foresters, and review of the work is important. This is a program which has the support of the State officials wherever it is in operation; it is one which is of great importance to the Nation if our small woodland properties are to be brought into full productivity.

My own State of Pennsylvania has been temporarily out of this program for several years due to pressing requirements of surveys on State forest properties. However, it is my hope that Pennsylvania will be among the 7 or 8 other States that are coming into this program if a small Federal increase in this appropriation is forthcoming. Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitancy in urging your committee to consider granting the full amount of the authorization in the Cooperative Forest Management Act. And if such action is impossible at this time, I hope you will consider at least an increase of $100,000 so that more States can employ farm foresters. I know that there would be no criticism from the States or from conservationists throughout the Nation if this program were strengthened and brought up to operating needs of the cooperating States. Any increase, however, which the committee would make in this appropriation would enable the program to go ahead and bring better management on many thousands of additional small woodland properties.

Another item under "State and private forestry cooperation," page 363 of the budget, is cooperation with some 43 States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the production and distribution of forest trees for planting unproductive land in this Nation. This cooperation is under section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act. Each year a small annual appropriation of some $450,000 ($447,061 to be exact) is allowed for cooperation with the States in this worthy project. The States themselves in 1954 contributed $1,600,000.

In 1954 almost one-half million acres were planted to forest trees under this program. This sounds like a tremendous accomplishment. It is small, however, when we consider that there are around 60 million acres of private and non-Federal public forest lands in need of planting to restore productivity for future timber needs.

Mr. Chairman, while the budget allows the same amount for this program as the appropriation act included last year, I believe it would be good business to consider bringing this cooperative tree-planting program up to the full measure of activity which Congress provided for in the Clarke-McNary Act. I firmly believe this committee would receive the commendation of conservation groups all over America, State foresters, and private landowners if the full authorization of $2½ million in the Clarke-McNary Act were appropriated so that a realistic and dynamic tree-planting program could be started now and not 20 to 30 years from now when the situation is serious. I visited several foreign countries last fall and saw firsthand the terrible results of allowing denuded, unproductive land to wash away and erode into the rivers and streams. It's too late in many of these countries to do anything about it even though from time to time we have poured millions of American dollars into tree-planting programs far removed from our shores. I think it's about time we do something about this Nation's unproductive land. We can't make much progress by spending millions on conservation projects abroad and only a few thousand here at home.

White pine blister-rust control is another cooperative activity in which the Federal Government has been working with the States as far back as 1916. Federal funds for blister-rust control were reduced from $2,986,354 in fiscal year 1954 to $2,570,000 in fiscal year 1955. This represents a reduction of $416,354. Of the 1955 appropriation, $165,000 was earmarked for assisting States and private-property owners with control on their lands, a 50-percent reduction over 1954. The 1956 budget carries the same amounts as were appropriated for 1955—only $165,000 for assistant State and private owners with control.

The sharp reduction in the cooperative item in the 1955 appropriation was predicated on the belief that the States and property owners can and should assume a greater share of responsibility for this and other similar cooperative programs. However, funds provided by the States and local agencies for conducting blister-rust control of their lands totaled $732,192 for fiscal year 1954 and dropped to $650,315 for fiscal year 1955. There were reductions in 8 States in 1955 over 1954 totaling $97,880. There were increases in 9 States totaling $16,003. This represents a net reduction of $81,877 in cooperative funds in 1955 over 1954. The State of Pennsylvania was 1 of the 9 States increasing its contribution, from $25,720 in 1954 to $25,960 in 1955, an increase of $240.

The record thus indicates that the States and the local agencies did not absorb the slack occasioned by the reduction in Federal assistance. On the contrary, the overall net action was a reduction in both Federal and local funds for blister-rust control on State and private lands with its consequent curtailment in control work. Treatment on non-Federal white pine areas decreased from 981,165 acres to 687,690 acres, a reduction of 30 percent. For Federal areas the decrease was from 179,033 acres to 165,425 acres, or 8 percent. Here is another area of Federal-State cooperation which should be carefully scrutinized by your committee. The Federal appropriation for cooperation with the States in control work on State and private lands was reduced to $165,000 in the fiscal year 1955 appropriation act. I respectfully recommend that this item be restored to the full amount that was appropriated in the fiscal year 1954 appropriation act, namely $330,000. I urge this action because we are losing ground in the fight to control white pine blister rust. The blame for this backward step can be laid right at the door of the Federal Government.

In my appearance before this distinguished committee, I always consider it a privilege to speak in behalf of protection and management of national forests. Here I refer to the items on page 359 of the Budget. The small increases provided for timber resource management, the sanitation and care of public camp grounds and forest-fire protection on the national forests are a step in the right direction and should receive every consideration. In fact, the $200,000 item recommended on page 359 should be increased to at least $1 million.

While the national forests of the East do not have the tremendous volumes of timber sales of those of the West, the sales they do make are very important to communities and the wood-using industries on which these communities depend. The volume of saleable material is increasing rapidly on these growing forests and more thinnings should be made for the good of the trees. However, there are too many situations where the timber needs cutting, communities need the work, and industries need the wood, but the Forest Service does not have adequate funds to put the timber on the market.

It has been estimated that the national forests of the North, South, and East could increase their timber sales by almost 150 million feet a year if the necessary funds were available.

The $800,000 increase requested in the budget for timber management will provide more sales and more jobs in many communities where unemployment has become a real problem. It is only good business to help people who want to work to help themselves. And it is particularly good business to do this by providing more timber sales since for every dollar spent on timber sales, at least $10 is returned to the Treasury.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the item on page 361 of the budget, Forest Roads and Trails, for which an increase of $1,500,000 is requested to provide the total amount authorized for appropriation in 1956. As I understand this item, it is to complete the access roads needed to make Government timber available in inaccessible areas in the West.

Most of the road money appropriated for national forest roads and trails since before World War II has been spent for timber access roads. The Forest Service needs this timber access road money. There are millions of board-feet of Government timber that should be harvested before disease and forest pests destroy its value.

But other roads are also needed on the national forests. Visitors to the national forests have increased by leaps and bounds since World War II. Last year more than 40 million people came into the forests to camp and visit. Since the CCC camps were demobilized at the beginning of the war, national forest recreation roads and trails have been virtually neglected. During World War II forest road money was spent almost entirely on timber roads. There wasn't enough left to even maintain recreation roads. That was as it should be, but now we should be rebuilding the roads that went to pieces from lack of maintenance and building many more to accommodate the thousands of additional campers, picnickers, hunters, and fishermen.

According to Forest Service records, there are approximately 119,000 miles of existing roads on the national forests. Twenty-five percent of these are recreation roads, but only a third of them are in good condition. Twenty thousand miles of recreation roads need improving and the Forest Service estimates that another 12,000 miles of new recreation roads are needed so people can reach camping sites and hunting and fishing that is now inaccessible to families in moderate circumstances. Recreation trails on the national forests likewise deteriorated while timber access road needs were consuming forest road and trail appropriations. The Forest Service says that there are enough trails, but 20,000 miles of the mountain trails need a lot of work before they are safe for vacationists.

From the Forest Service, I learned that about $15 million was spent from appropriated forest road funds for improving and building timber access roads in 1954. But only 5 percent of that amount was spent for improving or building recreation roads and trails. The Forest Service should have at least $3 or $4 million a year, just for recreation roads for several years.

On the Allegheny National Forest, in my State of Pennsylvania, we have a lot of national forest timber but since it is accessible after a fashion, we have no claim on the forest road funds earmarked for opening access roads to new timber stands. But there are thousands of people who want the timber roads and other roads on the Allegheny forest made suitable for automobiles as well as for travel by logging trucks. Those people want the Forest Service to continue building timber access roads where needed for getting out national forest timber in the West before it is destroyed by beetles and fire, but they also want a few good roads in the West and here in the East for other national forest users. Now, I might point out to the committee that 16,500 people live inside the forest; 64,000 additional people live immediately adjacent to the forest; 139,000 live in the

four counties within which the forest is located; 5,125,000 live within the forest's immediate zone of influence; 47,099,000 people (Americans, Canadians not considered) live within 300 air miles—an average day's motor travel—from the approximate center of the forest. This is approximately 31 percent of all the people in the Nation. Within this area the population pressure is 222 individuals per square mile as compared to a national average of 50, and an average of 17 in the 11 Western States.

Recreation roads must receive more attention and more money or we shall have a few million national forest campers, picknickers, hunters, and fishermen on our necks. The national forests have always been open to public use and always should be. We can't discourage people from going to our national forests for recreation and to get away from their daily grind. The only other alternative is to provide funds whereby roads can be built for recreation needs. Here is one area of use which I urge this committee to give serious consideration.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, I appreciate your earnest and sincere interest in these appropriations for our forestry activities in our Nation. The amount of time you have granted for my remarks is generous indeed and reiterates your interest. This is a matter which should vitally concern every Member of Congress. We have been dragging our feet in keeping up our end of the load on these Federal-State cooperative programs of fire control, small woodland management assistance, and tree planting. Your committee, Mr. Chairman, will be doing the Nation a great service by beginning this next 50 years of forestry in America with adequate funds for Federal participation with the States in this work.

At the same time I urge continued vigilance that sufficient funds are appropriated to properly manage and harvest the resources of our great national forests.

Science Talent Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL C. KING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the highest award in the 14th annual science talent search was awarded last night to a boy of my district, Frederick P. Greenleaf, 17-year-old senior of the Allentown High School. This young physicist-mathematician-chemist was awarded the $2,800 Westinghouse grand science scholarship after 5 days of intensive competition with 40 finalists picked from several thousand contestants throughout the country.

The people of Allentown and my whole district are very proud of this high honor paid to one of our boys, and we congratulate him, his parents and his school instructors who have guided him in his education.

In this talent contest young Greenleaf expressed his scientific knowledge with a project which demonstrated a process of practical use in separating almost any complex mixture of metals by distillation. I could not fully comprehend his explanation of the process, but it was apparent that Fred is an expert builder of "stills." Accordingly, I have offered his services as consultant to my congressional colleagues from the hills of West Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky.

The more important use of Fred's process will be in diverse fields, ranging from refining operations to atomic energy production. He believes the distillation method of separating mixtures of metals will be quick, economical, and efficient.

Science has interested Fred Greenleaf since he was 6 years old, when he received a chemistry set as a gift. Later he won top honors in the Annual Lehigh Valley Science Fair and competed in the 1954 National Science Fair.

The Science Talent Institute and Westinghouse are to be congratulated for their work in stimulating young talent in the field of technology which will be so important in the future development of our country.

The Cattle Program on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Indian Bureau evidently does not understand the agricultural program among Indians. At the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota the Department advised the Indians to go into the livestock business. Through that venture, the Department thought, the Indians would become self-supporting. This was a good plan, but apparently the experts on agriculture in that Department did not think the plan through.

No one can go into the cattle business for 1 year or 2 years and get very far. This is a long-term enterprise. There have been some losses on the reservation from this livestock venture, but nowhere near the loss which the Department is now forcing on these Indians. Since 30 percent of the cattle loans are in default, the Bureau has decided to advance no more money—and remember, it is Indian money and not taxpayers' money—and are recommending that the cattle loans in arrears be closed out. In other words, the cattle on hand are to be sold and the proceeds credited on the loans.

Just as soon as this is done those loans will be an almost total loss. If the cattle are sold through forced sale, the Indian will have nothing from which he can get money to pay. What should be done is to tide these loans over, put into the venture more money, and bring the herds up to a good standard of production. In many cases the Indians have bred their original stock up to better beef animals, and that cannot be done in a year or 2 years. It takes time, and these herds should not be sold but financed. These good cattle should not be sacrificed to make small payments on the indebtedness. What would you think of a man who started a turkey venture, bought birds for production, set the eggs, and then sold the turkey hen before the eggs hatched? This would be the same as what the Department is now doing in the cattle business on the Fort Berthold Reservation.

Senator LANGER'S committee held hearings at the reservation in October 1954, and pages 116 to 163 of Senate Report, Senate Resolution 89, sets out the whole situation in the cattle business on that reservation. In my opinion the cattle loans must be refinanced in order to do two things:

First. To stop further losses.

Second. To bring the cattle program to final success.

It cannot be done in a short time, but it can be done with proper financing over a long period of time. I am in the cattle business myself, and it took me several years in breeding better stock and getting a herd built up to a proper size to make my efforts worth while and to finally reach a point of success. I reached that point, but I didn't do it in 1 year or even 2.

The Indian Bureau evidently knows but little about cattle raising.

Alaska Road Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, January 27, 1955 marked the 50th birthday of the Alaska Road Commission. It was on that date in 1905 that the Congress created the Board of Road Commissioners for Alaska to work under the direction of the War Department. This Board, appointed by Secretary of War William H. Taft, was charged with the responsibility for location, construction, and maintenance of wagon roads and trails in Alaska. Prior to that time Capt. W. R. Abercrombie had located and constructed a military trail from Valdez to Eagle in 1901, over which mail was carried twice a month with packhorses in summer and dog teams in winter. In 1904 the Seattle Office of the Army Engineers completed a survey for a wagon road between the same points, Valdez at that time being the northern terminus of the Seattle-Valdez military cable, and Eagle the principal port of entry into Alaska from Canada and the Klondike gold fields.

The first road board consisted of Maj. Wilds P. Richardson, 9th Infantry, 1st Lt. George B. Pillsbury, Corps of Engineers, and 1st Lt. Samuel C. Orchard, 3rd Infantry, and was directed to hold its first meeting in Skagway on May 15, 1905. Major Richardson, being the senior officer, became the first president of what has since been known as the Alaska Road Commission. The first year's appropriation was $28,000, made available by the Congress from the Alaska fund derived from trade taxes collected out-

side of incorporated towns, and from liquor licenses.

Some of the earliest projects included a road from Haines up the Chilkat River to the large Indian villages of the Chilkat Valley, road from Fairbanks to the newly discovered gold camp on Pedro Creek, a tributary of Gold Stream, and short roads at Nome where gold had been discovered at and near the beaches. During this first year of the new Board, the overland route from Valdez to Fairbanks was also scouted out, utilizing the first section of the Valdez-Eagle trail between the coast and Gulkana. Based on these first-year studies of the Board, a direct appropriation of $150,000 was made by the Congress for work in 1906, which permitted start of construction of what is now known as the Richardson Highway, joining Valdez with Fairbanks, and which for years was the only overland route into the heart of Alaska.

The major effort until the late 1920's was directed toward improvement of the Richardson Highway and construction of mining roads in the vicinity of Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Nome. Then followed, in rapid succession, the construction of the Steese Highway from Fairbanks to Circle, the Elliott Highway from Fairbanks to Livengood, the Gulkana-Nabesna Road, and the road from Anchorage to Palmer to serve the colonization project established in 1935 to farm the Matanuska Valley.

The Glenn Highway, designed to connect Anchorage with the Richardson Highway, was started in the spring of 1941 and punched through during World War II. It was the following year that construction was initiated on the Alcan Highway—now officially the Alaska Highway—through Canada and Alaska to connect with the Richardson Highway at Delta Junction, as well as the Tok Cutoff to connect the Gulkana-Nabesna Road at Slana with the Alaska Highway at Tok Junction. Following World War II, construction was initiated in 1946 on the Sterling Highway on the Kenai Peninsula and also on the Taylor Highway, linking the Alaska Highway with Eagle on the Yukon River.

In 1948, at the request of the Armed Forces charged with the defense of Alaska, an extensive program of improving and asphalt surfacing of the main highway system was authorized by the Congress and which included the construction of the important link to join Seward with Anchorage. This program, having an estimated cost of $108,450,000, is now approximately 84 percent complete, with 812 miles of black top surfacing in place to serve the needs of the military as well as to aid in the development of the Territory.

The present system of highways in Alaska consists of a total of 4,100 miles, of which 3,791 miles are under the jurisdiction of the Alaska Road Commission and the remaining 309 miles, located in Chugach and Tongass National Forests, under control of the Bureau of Public Roads, the road-building agency for the United States Forest Service in Alaska. The major interconnected system joining the cities of Seward, Anchorage, Valdez, Fairbanks, and the villages of Kenai, Homer, Circle, Livengood, and Chitina with each other and the Alaska Highway, totals 1,372 miles. The important Copper River Highway, now under construction, will eventually link Cordova with this primary system.

The Alaska Road Commission continued under the jurisdiction of the War Department until June 1932, when civilian personnel and operations were transferred to the Department of the Interior with Mr. Ike P. Taylor as chief engineer.

Active heads of the Alaska Road Commission, in order, included:

Maj. Wilds P. Richardson, later general, 1905–17.

Maj. William H. Waugh, 1917–20.

Maj. John C. Gotwals, 1920.

Col. James G. Steese, later general, 1920–27.

Maj. Malcolm Elliott, 1927–32.

Mr. Ike P. Taylor, now retired, 1932–48.

Col. John R. Noyes, now brigadier general, and adjutant general of the Alaska National Guard was loaned to the Alaska Road Commission for 3 years by the United States Army to head up the extensive paving program requested by the military, 1948–51.

A. F. Ghiglione, incumbent Commissioner of Roads for Alaska.

Recent years, starting with the extensive improvement and paving program, have witnessed an increase in construction by contract on those roads which are readily accessible and adaptable to that type of construction. The Alaska Road Commission still continues to open up virgin and isolated areas of Alaska with crews and equipment under the direct supervision of the Commission, following a policy of stage construction whereby length is the initial and primary purpose of a highway in a pioneer country followed by refinements as needed and warranted by economic development. A current project of this nature is the Denali Highway connecting the Richardson Highway with a system of roads in Mt. McKinley National Park. The newest approved project is a road between Fairbanks and Nenana which will be started in the summer of 1955.

Working in cooperation with the Alaska Road Commission, a Federal organization deriving most of its funds from Congress, is the territorial highway organization consisting of the territorial highway engineer and a territorial board of road commissioners with one member from each judicial division. The territorial organization calls upon the Alaska Road Commission to perform a major part of work financed by territorial funds, thereby preventing costly duplication of effort. Mr. Irving Reed is the present Territorial highway engineer.

This oldest roadbuilding agency of the Federal Government numbers among its personnel many employees who have served the agency for 25 years or more, over half the period of its active life. Appropriate golden anniversary commemorative functions are planned during this 50th year of service to the Territory.

St. David's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there are few honors that please me so much in the course of a year than that of rising in the Congress of the United States on March 1—St. David's Day—to pay tribute to a proud, rugged, and productive strain in the American people whose ancestors were Welsh. St. David's Day is a folk holiday that is rich in ancient lore and steeped in religious faith. It has its inner appeal to all people who love strong character and the will to independence. It deserves recognition nationally. It has earned a place for itself on the calendar of significant events worthy of observance in this House because of the contribution Americans of Welsh descent have made to America's strength through the generations. And this holiday—St. David's Day—is a fitting moment for that recognition because it has a distinctive folk origin in the best sense of the word.

It expresses the vigor, the loyalty to tradition, and the love of life that is inherent in these remarkable people. In my judgment there is not an American of Welsh extraction who does not pause on this day to pay homage to what may well be termed the "patron saint" of Wales. In fact not only Americans of Welsh extraction but millions of other Americans join with their Welsh fellow-citizens to do hcnor to St. David. I sincerely hope we are witnessing the beginning of a celebration that, as the years go on, will become a day of national rejoicing for all Americans of whatever racial strain everywhere, a day upon which we can all join together to wish the people of Wales the best of health and the best of luck.

St. David's Day deserves a note of tribute from us all because it symbolizes the spirit of independence which is so characteristic of America's own beginnings and rules our way of life so much today. The intrepid quality of these people and their undying devotion to independence remained steadfast through the centuries, and it is this which is emphatically remembered as the Welsh all over the world join in keeping green the basic qualities of their unique culture. When Wales resisted the rule of the Norman kings in the 12th century—500 years after the death of St. David—it was their ancient saint's spirit that fired their cause. They evoked his memory in demanding an archbishop of their own, untrammelled by the domineering interference of Canterbury.

There is a fascinating mythology that has evolved through the centuries about the life of this unquestionably extraordinary historic personage. He is mentioned first in a 10th century manuscript of the Annales Cambriae. This reports his death in 601. He had been a bishop

and presided over the synods in Wales in the sixth century. In 1120 Pope Callistus II canonized David, and since then he has served as a kind of deeply devout and immensely moving rallying torch for Welshmen everywhere. And the language of Wales, it should be remembered, is a Celtic tongue, Celtic at one time having been spoken from the Alps in the north, to Gaul, Iberia, northern Italy, and as far east as points in Asia Minor.

The reason this story moves me so much is because my fellow Americans in the district in Pennsylvania that elected me to this seat have impressed me with the tough and loyal qualities, the steadfastness, the hard-toiling life of usefulness and patriotism that so marks Americans of Welsh extraction. In many ways this holiday expresses the jocund strength of the Welsh. And it is this strength which has fused itself into the life of our country and contributed to its greatness. For St. David's Day brings out the vitality and the eternal youth of the Welsh on a note of triumph and in a burst of song. Wherever groups of Welshmen gather they will sing together Hen Wlad Fy Nhadau or The Land of My Fathers. And they will talk, with an eloquence that is traditional, of the glories of old Wales. Whether the American whose forebears came from Wales is a leader in industry, in business, in the church, in the professions, in politics; or whether he is one of the doughty anthracite coal miners of Pennsylvania, we are bound to find in him the best of the stuff that makes a good American.

I believe that these people are so loyal to America, so indissolubly assimilated into the life and meaning of this country, because they are basically loyal, and, cleaving forever to the ancient folklore of their own racial beginnings, we know they will always—as they have demonstrated—remain loyal to the United States of America.

It is a pleasant duty and a reverent one to speak in honor of St. David's Day.

Career Planning in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Mr. Millard Cass, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, at the College of William and Mary:

ADDRESS BY MILLARD CASS, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR, AT THE COLLEGE AND CAREER DAY PROGRAM, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., FEBRUARY 24, 1955

CAREER PLANNING IN A CHANGING WORLD

That the world is changing is a truism too obvious to require proof. Even in the lifetimes of those now in college, we have developed guided missiles, jet propulsion, atomic energy, television, electronic computers, radar, tubeless tires, antibiotics, numerous alloys and plastics, and countless other products.

Back in 1937 the only commercial transportation from here to Europe was by boat. This required 4 days on the *Normandie*, which was then the world's fastest ship. Today, planes regularly fly the Atlantic in approximately 12 hours.

It was 1930 before we had a telescope that was able to locate the planet Pluto, which comes within 2¾ billion miles of the earth. Now the 200-inch telescope at Mount Palomar Observatory captures from stars light which has been on its way to the earth for 2 billion years and has traveled at the rate of 6 trillion miles a year all that time. The distance of such stars from the earth runs into literally astronomical figures.

Change and progress are not, of course, new to the American scene. The difference between the technological advances of this generation and those which preceded us is basically in the rate, degree, and intensity of the progress.

You men and women now in college may, therefore, wonder in planning about the future. You may ask whether skills acquired today will be obsolete before they are perfected through experience. You may even feel that career planning in this changing world is futile. I do not blame you for being puzzled, but there is no need to be apprehensive.

Each generation of Americans has thrilled to the promise of new inventions. Some workers in each generation have viewed with fear, however, the effect which new industrial developments would have on their own opportunities for employment. Such fears—then and now—cannot be discounted. Industrial progress has ofttimes involved displacement of some workers. Always, however, it has required the employment of others in the new processes. Many basic inventions which at the time appeared to reduce job opportunities in fact opened vast new fields of employment. This was true of the invention of the steam engine by Oliver Evans in 1795, the steam locomotive of John Stevens in 1825, the Duryea Brothers' automobile of 1896, and the Wright Brothers' airplane in 1903.

It is up to us to be aware of the economic problems which arise from industrial progress and to render help whenever possible to those who are displaced by technological advances. It is up to those planning their careers to plan with a view to meeting the changing demands of a changing world.

The number of jobs available to our people has constantly increased through the years. Labor-saving devices have reduced our work but not our work opportunities. They have made it possible to reduce the workweek and lengthen vacations, thereby increasing our leisure time, improving our health, and expanding our cultural and educational activities. The marvelous inventiveness of the American people has thus helped rather than hindered our forward progress. Our ever-rising standard of living is based upon the industrial development of our Nation and the skill, ingenuity, and industry of our people.

There are some who have seen in the development of atomic energy cause for great fear. Like any other powerful force, atomic energy can be used to create or to destroy, to promote progress or to devour things we hold dear. Fire, gunpowder, dynamite, and electricity all share with atomic energy the power to make life more pleasant and fruitful or to destroy persons and property.

There is no more need for our generation to be paralyzed by the fear of a mushroom cloud than there was for prehistoric man to quake at the sight of fire, for the people of the Middle Ages to recoil at the threat of gunpowder, or for our own grandfathers to be petrified by the development of electric power or shaken by the explosion of dynamite.

Fire, gunpowder, dynamite, and electricity have all brought more blessings than sorrow to mankind. I am confident that this great new development of our generation will also, in the years ahead, become a benefactor of man and a servant of the human race. Already we have started to reap rich dividends from atomic research in the fields of medicine and agriculture, and have taken the first steps toward commercial production of electrical energy by atomic power.

I am convinced that we shall meet successfully the dilemma which nuclear fission has posed. We shall be able, through the peaceful uses of atomic energy, to bequeath to our children a better world than that we received from our parents.

As President Eisenhower said in his magnificent address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, we are determined "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

Underlying all other economic and social change in the United States is the rapid growth of our population. Nearly 4 million children were born each year between 1948 and 1953. Last year, the number exceeded 4 million for the first time in our history. As a result, demographic experts predict that our population will increase to between 200 and 220 million by 1975. This increase in population will stimulate the economy by creating growing markets.

Men and women now in college will be about in the middle of their working lives in 1975. At that time, the labor force of the United States will be over 88 million, according to the Bureau of the Census—20 million more than now. We will need one-third more jobs for a work force of that size.

Of course, not every industry or every occupation will increase employment by one-third. For a second significant trend in our economy is the shift in manpower requirements as between certain industries. This shift has brought about a substantial realinement in recent years in the employment opportunities in the various sectors of our economy. Some industries, such as agriculture and mining, have been declining in employment for some years. Other industries, such as railroads and textiles, have been remaining relatively stable. The Department of Labor's occupational outlook studies suggest that some of the other basic industries, such as steel, electric power, and automobiles, may expect only moderate increases in employment over the next two decades.

Greater than one-third expansions will therefore have to take place in other segments of the economy—for example, such rapidly growing industries as chemicals and electronics manufacturing, health services, and educational services. We may need a half-million more teachers in the next 10 years to take care of a 50-percent increase in school enrollments.

The industrial trend in the years ahead, then, is definitely toward an increasing proportion of employment in services and a decreasing proportion in the goods-producing industries.

A third underlying trend in our economy is increasing productivity. Changing technology increases productivity and affects employment opportunities, as well as the whole social and economic framework of the changing world.

Output per man-hour in the economy as a whole has grown by about 2 percent compounded annually over the long run, and some studies indicate even more rapid growth in recent years. The heavy expenditures on factory construction and new equipment over the last 8 or 10 years have had a

substantial effect on increased productivity. So has the increase in the number and percentage of our workers who are skilled.

The dramatic impact of technological advances upon our entire way of life can be illustrated with the important effects of a few products developed in the last 20 years, such as nylon, plastics, frozen foods, television, and antibiotics, which have already become taken for granted as a part of our daily lives, and atomic energy.

On the horizon we can see the beginnings of a few new developments which may have the same far-reaching effects in the next 20 years, such as solar energy, the gas-turbine engine, automation, and electronic computers.

We must assume that in the future technological development will proceed at an accelerated pace because the number of scientists and engineers in the United States is growing rapidly. In the 1930's, when the basic research was done which later gave rise to nylon, television, atomic energy, and antibiotics, there were less than one-quarter of a million engineers in the United States. There are now over half a million. The number of scientists has grown equally rapidly. Taking engineers and scientists together, we now have between three-quarters of a million and one million people engaged in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge in the natural sciences and converting this new knowledge into practical use in industry, medicine, military applications, and our daily lives. There is every reason to think, therefore, that the fruits of their labor, which we will reap 20 years from now, will be even more impressive than the gains over the past two decades.

A fourth major underlying trend, and one that results directly from increasing productivity, is a vast and very widespread increase in consumer purchasing power. It is safe to predict that the American people will continue a steady gain in purchasing power out of an increasingly productive economy as long as there is no all-out war. This means, of course, a higher standard of living in terms of housing, leisure, vacations, labor-saving devices, education, and health services.

A fifth aspect of our changing world is the growing importance of international events to us in the United States. Our position of leadership in the free world provides us with a challenge and a responsibility. Today's college students will have to strive toward a greater understanding of the people of other countries so that, as thinking citizens of the United States, they can help our country exercise its leadership effectively.

What are the implications of all of these developments for you who are attending college today?

In the first place, the rapid changes of the past and the prospect of even greater ones in the future suggest that no individual can count upon making a career in one occupation or working for one employer his whole life. He must strive to maintain flexibility. Our studies of occupational mobility have shown that in every field there is a great degree of mobility into and out of the occupation, from one employer or industry to another, and from one part of the country to another.

To a person in college, getting a broad educational background is extremely helpful. It makes possible greater flexibility in the years ahead and increased mobility. Many of you are now struggling with subjects which seem at first glance to be quite remote from your chosen field of endeavor. You may wonder why a foreign language is important or what you are going to do with the mathematics or English which you are required to study. I think when you graduate and start to work, you will find that practically every subject you studied in your college career is of real use to you.

In order to progress in the world, to earn a good living and to find satisfaction from his work, a person must be qualified to accept the many and varied employment opportunities which come his way in the course of a lifetime. Now is the time when you must acquire the basic tools and the fundamental knowledge necessary to adapt yourselves to changing jobs in this changing world.

Even in professions like law and medicine, changes are constantly taking place and a broad background of education and training is essential in order to keep up with new developments. For example, commercial air transportation has opened to lawyers the new and specialized field of aviation law. The same is true of atomic energy, which has brought in its wake legal problems far different from those we have faced before. This is also the case in medicine, where new drugs and new methods of treatment require constant changes in techniques. New medical problems have been posed by radiation and, on the other hand, we hope to find new cures for old ailments through atomic research.

In addition to the need to be informed of international affairs so as to discharge your responsibilities as citizens, you should be interested in them in connection with your career planning. The number of jobs in all phases of international work has increased tremendously in the past 15 years and will continue to grow. These positions are in a number of Government agencies engaged in international affairs and technical assistance programs. They are also available in industrial firms having export business or overseas operations, as well as tourist and travel businesses.

The increased opportunities in the international field may confront many of you now in college with attractive job opportunities for which you can qualify if you have, for example, taken seriously your study of foreign languages. Thus, a subject which now seems to have no practical value may pay great dividends in the years ahead.

Many economists, statisticians, chemists, and physicists have found in later years that it is as important to be able to write a good letter as it is to know the technical tools of one's specialty. The English compositions which may seem like drudgery in college may, in fact, lay the groundwork for a good impression upon some business associate in later life. Too many of us forget that a large majority of the people with whom we deal may judge us by the letters they receive from us or the articles we write.

Just 2 months ago, the national manpower council at Columbia University released its study of a Policy for Skilled Manpower. This report points out that the nuclear age will not eliminate the need for skilled workers. Quite to the contrary. The more highly complex and automatic the machinery of production and daily living becomes, the more skilled technicians are required to produce, operate, and service this machinery.

The skilled worker will have to have a broad base of training and experience to meet the changing and increasingly complex problems he will face. As the research staff of the national manpower council found: "Automatic machines will require highly skilled maintenance and repair men. Atomic generators will require maintenance men who are more skilled than at present. Many of today's electricians will have to learn electronics if they are to retain their skilled status. Pipefitters may have to learn hydraulics. A skilled worker who formerly measured with calipers and now uses a micrometer will soon have to learn to work to tolerances measured with light waves." This is just as true in the professional and scientific field.

The college graduate of tomorrow will find, as so many of us have already found, that learning is a continuing process. The truth of the matter is that the college degree you will earn does not certify that you have learned anything of great moment in the business world. A college degree just certifies that you are ready to begin learning how to use to practical advantage the theoretical training you have already acquired. This truth does not confront only the college graduate. I have heard skilled craftsmen, who served an apprenticeship and worked as journeymen in their trades, state that they were only then beginning to acquire the well-rounded skill that permitted them to be justly proud of their ability.

All of us, whether we are in the skilled trades, in a professional field, or in the world of business or finance, continue to learn throughout our working lives by study and by experience. We must keep up with the changing developments, new tools, novel problems, and modern techniques in our vocations.

These facts emphasize the importance of a broad educational background which can provide a foundation for future learning and facilitate the acquisition of knowledge throughout one's working life. This changing picture has prompted Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to give a new direction and increased impetus to the training activities of the United States Department of Labor.

As Secretary Mitchell has said: "For the training of our workers we use many sources—schools and colleges, vocational education, apprenticeship, the Armed Forces, and the on-the-job training courses of industry. We must reexamine all of these with a view to determining whether the methods they employ and the skills they teach are keeping pace with the temper of our times and the requirements of our economy. We must constantly reevaluate our training programs to determine whether we are training enough of the people we need in the skills we require."

Security is one of a number of factors worth considering in choosing a vocation. It is not the only or even the main factor, however. Yet, in the past 20 or 30 years there has been a growing emphasis on job security. People are deeply interested in protection against depressions. Security in this sense of permanence is not always consistent with opportunity. Relatively secure jobs, such as those in public utilities, retail establishments, or in the local, State, or Federal Governments, do not always offer the greatest opportunity to advance, the greatest earnings, or the greatest job satisfaction.

The United States is dedicated to the maintenance of a high level of employment and business activity. We believe that we have learned a few things about how to forestall serious depressions, and that we have developed mechanisms and programs to cushion our economy against economic declines, and to stimulate business when an incipient downward trend is spotted. We have come so far along the road of economic stability that all of us can appropriately face the future with confidence. The strength of our economy was fully demonstrated in the economic downturn of 1949–50 and in the decline through the first half of 1954.

I certainly would not advise any persons planning their careers today to choose their path upon the basis of economic fears or a depression psychology. Those whose main interest in choosing a career is security may find that they are paying a very high premium for insurance against something that is not very likely to happen.

You here at William and Mary are to be commended for holding a Career Day. This occasion provides an opportunity for you to give attention to job openings that might presently be available, and also to give thought to the broader aspects of career planning. I hope that today's program has been of both immediate and long-range

assistance to all of you. But to get real returns from this program, you must follow-up; you must continue to think about and plan your careers, and to use the counseling facilities of your college.

In closing, I should note that by your presence here at this fine college you have already shown that you have a real interest in career planning. Merely by attending college, you are taking effective steps to prepare yourselves to meet the challenge of the world of tomorrow. Through your studies, extracurricular activities and social contacts, you are equipping yourselves to face the problems of this troubled world.

In you, and millions like you, studying in colleges, secondary schools, vocational schools and through apprenticeship and on-the-job training of industry, is the hope of our Nation.

The Wall Street Journal Shoots From the Hip and Misses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there are two ways of doing things—the right way and the wrong way. No more striking example of these two ways of doing things has come to my attention for a long time than the handling of the same set of facts by the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1955, and the Wall Street Journal of the same date. Both papers were reporting on the hearings held by the subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee on legislation cosponsored by 12 of my colleagues and myself to create a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center.

One of the witnesses who appeared and testified in support of these bills was Robert W. Dowling, president of the City Investment Co., of New York, and president, also, of the congressionally chartered American National Theatre and Academy. The same day Mr. Dowling appeared before the subcommittee he repeated an offer he had made a few years ago to President Harry S. Truman to raise through private subscription from businessmen, foundations, and wealthy individuals whatever sums were necessary to build the kind of cultural center envisioned in these 14 bills. The New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post and Times Herald, and the Washington Evening Star handled this story the right way. The Wall Street Journal handled the story the wrong way. I include the following material for the information of my colleagues who will undoubtedly have this legislation before them shortly for decision:

[From New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1955]

PLAN FOR FINE ARTS CENTER IN WASHINGTON IS REVEALED

WASHINGTON, February 23.—A group of New York art patrons stands ready to underwrite the entire cost of a national fine-arts center in Washington. Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., Democrat, New York, said today such a center, long proposed, would cost from $15 to $20 million.

Representative POWELL made his statement while testifying before a House District of Columbia subcommittee studying a bill to establish a commission which would plan such a center and a civic auditorium.

"I can state positively," Representative POWELL said, "that a group associated with the arts for many years and spearheaded by one of the biggest investment corporations will completely finance the project without one cent of expense to the United States."

The group would want from Congress only Federal land to build on, Representative POWELL continued, and indicated the probable site would be near the Smithsonian Institution on the wide Mall which leads from the Capitol to the Washington Monument.

DOWLING HEADS GROUP

Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman of the subcommittee later said the head of the group, Representative POWELL, was talking about, is Robert W. Dowling, president of the City Investment Co. in New York, who also is board chairman of the American National Theater Academy, a private group promoting the American theater.

Representative MORRISON said Mr. Dowling had told him there was an excellent possibility that funds could be raised by private subscription to build a cultural center here second to none in the world.

NOT YET ORGANIZED

In New York last night, Mr. Dowling described the phrase "excellent possibility" attributed to him by Representative MORRISON as describing the situation accurately. He said the matter has been discussed by a number of groups, but that no organization has been formed nor any steps started toward raising the funds for the project.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 24, 1955]

CULTURE BY DECREE

Like many other people in this country, we're all for culture. But like many others, we're not for all-out culture. We think people ought to be free to take it or leave it.

So we don't like the idea of the Government getting into the business of building theaters and cultural centers as proposed recently to a congressional committee. Some officials of the American National Theatre and Academy suggested that Congress pass a bill which would set up a District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, which in turn would plan construction of a civic auditorium including an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center in the Nation's Capital.

The ANTA says that the center is necessary because of the State Department's cultural exchange program; France, for instance, has placed at United States disposal five Government national theaters there for painting exhibits and for performances of the Philadelphia Orchestra and Oklahoma. We think that's fine; it will doubtless do us more good for Europeans to see some American folklore and hear music by Americans than some of our other efforts to make friends there have been able to accomplish.

The trouble is, ANTA says, that while everything's up to date in Paris, France, the same isn't true of Kansas City or New York or Washington. There just aren't five Government theaters where visiting troupes or art collections from abroad can be housed to reciprocate in the exchange of culture. There isn't even one.

Well, we think that state of affairs is sound. For one thing, we doubt if there is such a lack of private space as ANTA says; a couple of years ago the Austrian exhibit packed the crowds into the art gallery the Mellons built in Washington. For another, you can't get culture by decree any more than the Treasury can get taxes by osmosis. For still another, why should taxpayers in San Antonio or Seattle or Sarasota be forced to contribute to a National Theater in Washington or New York which they may never have the chance to see? It would make as much sense to pass a law saying that every collector of old masters must scatter some surrealism about the walls.

There's even a better reason in our view why this proposal should be voted down. Art has languished and the theater has been prostituted everywhere exactly to the extent of Government interference and control.

Though he didn't mean it that way, what we mean was put very well by President Derwent of ANTA when he told the House District of Columbia Committee:

"Only in America do we lag behind in the establishment of a National Theater. We need to counteract efforts of Russia—the Russians use their arts in propaganda."

Exactly.

FEBRUARY 26, 1955.

Mr. WILLIAM H. GRIMES,
Editor, the Wall Street Journal,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GRIMES: I am very interested in the editorial "Culture by Decree" which appeared in your publication on Thursday, February 24, particularly because it was inaccurate in several respects.

As you know, I am 1 of the 13 House Members who introduced bills creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center. All of these bills provide that the proposed commission shall "endeavor particularly to formulate a method of financing the project on a self-liquidating basis."

The Nation's Capital is particularly disadvantaged and underprivileged in cultural matters in comparison with other world capital cities and many cities in our own country, we are told by competent observers who cannot be accused of making political hay or of trying for partisan advantage. In his message on the state of the Union last month the President declared that—

"In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities."

An appropriation of only $25,000 is called for in these bills which are sponsored by members of both parties on a strictly bipartisan basis. If your Washington representative had attended the hearings, or if you had taken the trouble to read the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, page 9, to check the facts, you would see that Robert W. Dowling, president of the American National Theater and Academy and the City Investment Co., who testified in support of these bills, repeated an offer he had made to President Truman to raise through private subscription from businessmen, foundations, and wealthy individuals whatever sums were necessary to build the cultural center envisioned in these bills. I would hope, also, that every American, when Mr. Dowling begins his fund-raising campaign, will be given the opportunity to contribute any amount he wishes toward building a great cultural center in Washington which will make the Federal city the Paris of America. Money is raised for the Metropolitan Opera Co. and the Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra of New York on a national basis and the advancement of the cultural status of

our National Capital is a challenge to the loyalty and patriotic love of country which is present in each and every one of us.

As you know, the Congress insists on depriving Washingtonians of the vote and in serving as the city council of Washington—a role it has jealously maintained since the 1870's. The citizens of Washington pay nearly $170 million, more than is paid by a good many States, in Federal taxes each year. Yet they are deprived of all voice or representation in local or National Government, and the District's Commissioners are appointed by the President. Washington can't build a sewer, collect garbage, or put a dog in the pound without the consent of Congress. Washingtonians would like to abolish segregation in their Fire Department and there is much discussion of this at the present time with Congress insisting that segregation be maintained. Forty percent of Washington's real estate is reserved for Federal purposes which effectively removes it from the tax rolls. The Government started out with a 50–50 division of costs of running the Federal City but has reduced its contribution over the years until now it is about 15 percent. No other American city is treated like this by private business located within the city's limits. Our forefathers threw the tea in Boston Harbor and went to war when King George III insisted on taxation without representation.

I have been told that the Federal contribution to the civic center at Columbus Circle in New York City was about $6,500,000. American tax dollars have been used to rebuild opera and music buildings in Europe. Why can't similar funds be spent at home on cultural programs in San Antonio, Seattle, Sarasota, the cities you mention, as well as Cleveland, Trenton, New York, Washington, and other cities and towns across our land? Surely, more money should be spent in each State and in each community on the advancement of the various activities which make our civilization endure and flourish, for, as you may know, all of our cultural programs are finding it increasingly difficult to continue in the face of constantly rising costs.

In my statement on behalf of my bill, H. R. 4215, I said in part: In view of the many roadblocks which have defeated all efforts of earlier Congresses to enact legislation similar to the bills which you are considering here today, it is my considered opinion that it is very important to make a thorough and detailed study of American subsidy, direct or indirect, of foreign art programs and cultural centers. This information should be available through the Department of State and the Foreign Operations Administration. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will request this information and include it in the hearing record of your subcommittee. I believe that this information is essential to a general, public understanding of the issues involved in this legislation and to the advancement of these excellent bills in the Congress.

Copies of my bills, H. R. 4215, H. R. 4307, and H. R. 2210 (H. R. 4215 being considered), together with my statement before the subcommittee, are enclosed for the information of your readers and yourself. I hope you will do me the courtesy of carrying this material in order to correct the picture you presented. Dare we hope that once you have established your branch office in Washington the accuracy of your reporting will improve?

Cordially,

FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Member of Congress.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL,
New York, N. Y., February 28, 1955.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you very much for taking the trouble to write us such a long letter about our editorial, Culture by Decree, and explaining to us your own views on the matter.

I note that you are interested in having the funds for this national theater raised by popular subscription or otherwise financed by private means. The Wall Street Journal would certainly not oppose a national theater financed on this basis and if our editorial gave any such impression, I am very sorry. What we questioned—and what we continue to question—would be the idea of having such a theater paid for out of Federal funds. Our view may be wrong, of course, but it is our opinion that a government ought not to take money from all the taxpayers and use it to subsidize individual cultural affairs.

You mention some cases where it has been done and can only note that we were opposed to it in those cases also. Specifically, we wrote an editorial opposing the use of Federal funds for the proposed civic center in New York City.

I hope this position does not make you think I am opposed to cultural activities. I personally contribute to both the Metropolitan Opera Guild and the Philharmonic Society and believe that this is the way for Americans to pay for their cultural activities.

You say you hope that the accuracy of our reporting will improve. I do not see from reading over the editorial again where our reporting was in error, although, of course, our opinions might be, but I am sure you will do us the courtesy of not denying us the right to a different opinion.

Sincerely yours,

VERMONT ROYSTER,
Senior Associate Editor.

Statehood and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there never has come to my attention a more eloquent, convincing, and logical expression why the grant of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would aid our foreign policy than that which was made on February 22 by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, when S. 49, the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, was under consideration by the Territories Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Senator O'MAHONEY's remarks were made when Under Secretary of the Air Force James H. Douglas was before the committee; they were so appropriate and so right that I take pleasure in presenting the statement here:

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us, Mr. Secretary, two recommendations from the Cabinet level. One of these is the letter of the Secretary of Defense, C. E. Wilson, from which I will read this sentence, which, of course, has been repeated several times during the hearing:

"With respect to title II of the bill"—being the Alaskan portion—"however, the Defense Department believes that it would be in the interest of the national security that Alaska remain a Federal Territory at the present time."

Now, those last three words are qualifying words "for the present." They may have little significance, or they may have much. I do not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will be very glad to ask the Secretary if he thought it practical and appropriate to interpret those words.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think it would be very well if you would do so. It would be helpful.

Now, the other report which I have here is the letter of the Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton, dated February 4, 1955, to the chairman of this committee. In the second paragraph of his letter he says, speaking of the two Territories which are affected here:

"It is this Department's view that such action would serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international relations."

Senator JACKSON. Senator O'MAHONEY, that seems to corroborate the statement made by the then General Eisenhower in Denver after the Korean war, the very point that President Eisenhower previously made.

Senator O'MAHONEY. When I was chairman of this committee some years ago, and we held hearings on the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, and the committee endorsed them, I took them to the floor with the deep conviction that what Secretary Morton said was right, namely, that it is an efficient method of defense of the United States and of the freedom for human beings for which it stands, to prove to the Asiatic world that we believe in letting people govern themselves.

We are represented in this cold war as being imperialists who want to step into the shoes of the vanishing empires of Great Britain and France and Holland in Asia.

I have been convinced from the very outset that the most effective thing that we could do in the Pacific area would be to prove to the Asiatics that we do believe in self-government by granting statehood both to Hawaii and to Alaska. And when we say Alaska, I say it because I know that the Aleutian Islands are just directly north of Hawaii, and Bering Strait, only 40 miles across, separates Alaska from Siberia.

I am mindful of the testimony that was given on behalf of the governors of the 11 western States by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, now Chief Justice of the United States. I want to make a part of the record here his statement:

"I am also appearing as a westerner who happens at the moment to be chairman of a governors' conference of 11 western States, which organization has gone on record several times during the past few years in favor of statehood for Alaska. We in the West believe that the development of any part of the West is of great benefit to the entire West and we consider Alaska as an integral part of the West. We have had the association of its governor in the council of the governors' conference committee 5 or 6 years and we have come to believe that this is the time for Alaska to be given statehood. We believe that we have a particular interest in the defense of Alaska and we believe that if Alaska is given statehood, is given an opportunity to develop its resources and its civilization, that it will be a greater factor in the defense of our Nation than it could otherwise be. We believe in the last analysis the defense of Alaska will come from the civilization that we develop there rather than just from the airplanes we send there or the fortifications that we develop.

"We are of the opinion that Alaska will not develop to the full extent of its potentialities unless it does achieve statehood."

I cannot think of a more eloquent expression of the point of view which this committee has shared in the past. But the testimony that is now presented here on behalf of the Department of Defense is vague and cloudy and uncertain.

The issue before us is whether or not our foreign policy, of which Secretary Morton speaks in his letter, is to be supported by an attitude of the extension of freedom to our own integrated Territories or whether it is going to be hampered by a policy which would seem to indicate that instead of advocating the right of self-government in the Territories, we are being asked by the Department of Defense to insist that the territorial status be maintained in Alaska, but you do not say that as to Hawaii. Alaska is closer to the area of war than is Hawaii. If it is a matter of defense, if there is a present danger, if there are any conditions that this committee does not know of which are governing the Secretary of Defense in what he says, by all means let the Secretary come here and in executive session tell us what they are.

* * * * *

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I make another statement here?

Mr. Secretary, what bothers me about this matter is this: during this period while Congress has been declining to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska, the situation in Asia has been deteriorating. At this moment the Secretary of State is at Bangkok seeking to convince southeast Asia, where Thailand now is apparently about to be attacked by the Communists, that its interests lie in joining with the other states of southeast Asia in defense against communism, and the chief obstacle to the progress of the Secretary of State in Bangkok is the fact that we have been represented as only colonials of a different kind.

I cannot understand why it is not clear to the Department of Defense, unless there is something that you cannot tell us, why it is not clear to you that by granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii we will be telling all of Asia that we are not colonials.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou unseen source of beauty, goodness, and truth: Though the people imagine a vain thing, Thou still art God, sitting above the floods of human turmoil; Thy mercy endureth through all human denials and betrayals. Make us alive and alert, we pray Thee, to the spiritual values which underlie all the struggle of these epic days. Open our eyes to the futility of changing maps without changing men. To this end may selfishness and all uncleanness be purged from our own hearts and our will be lost in Thine. In spite of suspicions, animosities, disillusionments, and disappointments which plague the councils of men, gird our hearts to seek peace and pursue it, that the sadly sundered family of mankind at last may be bound by golden cords of understanding fellowship around the feet of the one God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 28, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 8, section 1106 (a), United States Code, the Speaker appointed as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. CELLER of New York, Mr. WALTER of Pennsylvania, Mr. FEIGHAN of Ohio, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. REED of Illinois.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Speaker had appointed as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; and Mr. PHILLIPS, of California.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 28, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on March 1, 1955, he signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 3828) to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 28, 1955,

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, reported it favorably, with amendments, on March 1, 1955, and submitted a report (No. 36) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today and the remainder of this week and the Subcommittee on Internal Security was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today.

BURNET R. MAYBANK, LATE SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended, in order that memorial addresses may be delivered on the life, character, and public service of the late Senator from South Carolina, Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on September 1, 1954, while the Senate was in recess, a distinguished colleague and a dear personal friend of mine passed from the scene of his many and arduous labors. When death called, BURNET R. MAYBANK was at his summer home in the mountains of North Carolina, resting temporarily from his heavy responsibilities.

Senator MAYBANK was born in Charleston, S. C., on March 7, 1899, of an illustrious family of South Carolinians. Five of his forebears held the high office of Governor of our State. Graduating early from Porter Military Academy, at 18 years of age he entered the naval service of our country, during World War I. Later, he graduated from the College of Charleston, the first municipal college in the United States and the oldest institution of higher education in South Carolina.

Early in life, entering private business as a cotton broker and exporter, he likewise began his public-service career as a

young man, first as an alderman, and then as mayor of his native city. He was elected Governor in 1938, and United States Senator in 1941. In the latter office, by successive reelections, he served until his untimely death.

Only a short time before his passing, Senator MAYBANK was renominated without opposition to succeed himself—a rather unique and singular happening in the political vicissitudes of South Carolina. This fact illustrates the high respect and esteem in which his fellow citizens there held him, and denotes, as well, a token of grateful appreciation of the able and faithful service he so capably rendered his State and his Nation.

It is my good fortune to have been his friend since 1938, when he succeeded me as the Governor of South Carolina. He was my able senior colleague in this body.

When I arrived here, he welcomed me with an intimacy of friendship, fellowship, and helpfulness that I shall cherish as long as I live. Through our years of common service, there was never a difference of a substantial nature between us. The infrequent occasions of our contrary voting arose by reason of differing viewpoints; yet, we always maintained the mutual respect and esteem due one colleague from another. I recall with gratitude that on one occasion, when a measure of great concern to me was about to be voted upon, and when he was then resting at his summer home, he sent this cheering message: "I will come back if my colleague wants or needs me." In our conferences, meetings, and discussions, there was always the kind consideration that any man hopes to receive from his associate. I relate these qualities of his personality in order to give utterance to my deep feeling of loss, as it now becomes my sad duty to pay my humble tribute to a friend and brother, an advocate in a common cause—for our Nation's and State's best interest.

Had Senator MAYBANK lived, he would have returned to the chairmanship of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the high position he held as a member of the all-important Appropriations Committee. In both of these offices of great trust and confidence, he displayed qualities of leadership and ability that mark him as a statesman of the first order. Devoted as he always was to the Nation's prime interests, he reflected with great honor the confidence placed in him by the citizens of South Carolina.

Millions of our fellow countrymen in South Carolina and throughout the country are indebted to him for his unceasing labors toward solution of the Nation's housing problems.

The men of our armed services, and the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of our servicemen are in debt to him for his unceasing interest in their welfare, because of his service as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

There seemed to be no end to his indefatigable industry and his unlimited capacity for work. Toll, however, was being taken by his ceaseless activities in ways hidden from the public, and which, no doubt, accounted in a large measure for his sudden death at a time when most of us felt he was at the meridian of his powers and capacities.

The name and fame of every man survive for a little time or, perchance, for a little longer time—then disappear. It is strikingly true, however, that what a man is or does remains eternal.

Carlyle framed it in this manner:

> Genuine Work alone, what thou workest faithfully, that is eternal, as the Almighty Founder and World Builder himself. Stand thou by that; and let time and the rest of it go prating.

Numberless thousands, recognizing in him the true qualities of leadership and friendship, are sorrowed by his passing. The country has lost a statesman it can now ill afford to lose. The State of South Carolina has lost a senior Senator of whom she will always have reason to be proud. I have lost a true friend, a fine companion, and a dear colleague, the like of whom rarely exists among men of differing opportunities.

Senator MAYBANK was a devoted husband, a kind and generous father whom his family loved and respected. These ties and his family obligations were foremost in his consideration, and he was always attentive to their interests and their needs. Because of his early demise, a beloved member and strong supporter is absent from the family hearth.

Those near and dear to him have our heartfelt sympathy and the knowledge that we sincerely appreciate his real worth both as a man and as a public servant.

In the busy pursuit of our everyday lives, it is quite appropriate to set aside a sacred hour to pause in serious reflection and to pay deserved tribute to the memory of our departed colleague. So we gather today to do honor to him who but yesterday walked and labored beside us.

The thought of death and a day dedicated to memorial observances must bring to each of us the stark realization of life's uncertainty, the immutable certainty of death, and the utter vanity of many of our human pursuits. The issues of life with Senator MAYBANK have been framed. In all the controversies involving mortal beings he has finally answered the ultimate summons from the Supreme Judge of us all. How vain and useless would be our present proceedings were they not to awaken in us a more serious and conscious knowledge that we soon will follow in his train.

Our sadness today is lightened by a happy reflection of the great accomplishments attributed to him—accomplishments of trust and confidences kept, deeds of unselfish public service, and consecrated devotion to the noble ideals of manhood and statesmanship.

The great American poet, Longfellow, prescribed a mission in life for us all—a mission to which the life of this great statesman directs us:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time:
> Footprints, that perhaps another,
> Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
> A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
> Seeing, shall take heart again.
>
> Let us then be up and doing
> With a heart for any fate,
> Still achieving, still pursuing,
> Learn to labor and to wait.

BURNET R. MAYBANK did leave well-defined footprints on the sands of time, footprints that we may well follow.

Mr. President, in these troubled times when the world is ajar with seemingly impossible differences among men and nations, our country suffers an irreparable loss in the passing of such a man as the late senior Senator from South Carolina.

We miss him. South Carolina misses him. And we join our thoughts and voices in saying of our departed friend, "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. President, the opportunity was presented to the late Senator MAYBANK to come to this body when his illustrious predecessor was elevated to the Supreme Court of the United States. Former United States Senator James F. Byrnes served many years in this body with distinction and honor and in other high offices with great distinction and ability. The practice has usually been, as in the case of Senator MAYBANK and myself, to leave the Governor's office and receive the compliments of a favorable constituency by being sent to this body.

Not so with Senator Byrnes. After leaving the Senate and the Supreme Court of the United States, and other high offices, he returned to South Carolina for further service in the high office of governor.

Because of a long and continuous friendship existing between Governor Byrnes and our deceased colleague, I was pleased to ask former Senator Byrnes to send me his tribute, which I now request be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement of Governor Byrnes was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JAMES F. BYRNES—BURNET R. MAYBANK

The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has invited me, as a former Senator from this State, to prepare for inclusion in the RECORD some remarks about the late Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK.

I would not abuse the privilege generously accorded me by writing at length the story of BURNET MAYBANK's interesting and inspiring life. I am sure that detailed story will be recorded by members of the congressional delegation who were associated with him in recent years.

As I think of Senator MAYBANK, my mind goes back to my association with him in his younger days. He made rapid progress in his cotton business, but he was interested in public affairs and particularly in the progress of the city of Charleston, where he was born.

With his fine mind, his indomitable energy, and inspiring enthusiasm, he so impressed people of Charleston in all walks of life that they drafted him to be a candidate for mayor. He was elected.

By the time he assumed office the great depression was on. While revenues were rapidly decreasing and loans could not be negotiated, Charleston, like other municipalities, was faced with the problem of continuing public services to which the people had become accustomed.

Mayor MAYBANK demonstrated unusual resourcefulness and had marked success in solving the financial problems of his city.

He gave to the city a sound and progressive administration.

When he became a candidate for governor, his successful administration as mayor of Charleston, his outstanding service on the board of bank control, and his contribution to other agencies having jurisdiction over statewide activities, caused the people of the State to conclude that he would make a good governor.

At that time there still remained some political prejudice in the Piedmont section of South Carolina against any citizen of Charleston who was a candidate for a State office. BURNET MAYBANK overcame that prejudice and was elected governor.

As governor he made such a fine record that when I resigned from the United States Senate to become an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, he was elected to the Senate, where he served until his death.

Senator MAYBANK had reason to be proud of his continued election to the Senate because in some of these contests he was opposed by men of ability, who had previously demonstrated unusual political strength.

He was successful, not only because he possessed ability, but because he inspired his friends to fight for him and for the causes he espoused.

He believed with Emerson that, "To have a friend, one must be a friend." He liked people. He wanted people to like him. I am satisfied that nothing gave him greater happiness than the fact that in 1954 when he announced his candidacy for reelection, he had no opponent in the Democratic primary.

A man in public office can show appreciation of the support of his friends in no way better than by faithfully and efficiently discharging the duties of his office. BURNET MAYBANK did that. He made good in every public office he held, but he was particularly efficient in his service in the United States Senate as a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee. As a Senator he rendered outstanding service to his country and his State. South Carolinians are proud of the record of Senator MAYBANK.

Through the years, whenever I was a candidate for public office, BURNET MAYBANK supported me. I always supported him. I enjoyed his friendship and his confidence. I cherish the memory of that friendship. I cherish it because BURNET MAYBANK was a good man. Whenever a man can say that of another man, he can pay no higher tribute. Additional adjectives are unnecessary.

Senator MAYBANK was at home among people in all walks of life. He could enjoy their virtues without indulging in their weaknesses. He was always a gentleman. He was honest and truthful, and always considerate of the feelings and the views of others.

He was clean. In all my years of intimate association with him, I never heard him tell a story that could not be repeated in the presence of his family.

He was an impulsive man. Like all of us, he made mistakes. Unlike many of us, he had the courage and willingness to admit his mistakes.

He loved his family. His will is indicative of that love. Some of its bequests are indicative, too, of his pride of family. He made specific gifts of personal property to his children, giving the "Aiken silver" to one daughter, and the "Madison chair" to another. He valued these things more than most people, and he wanted his children to value their heritage.

By his sudden death the State and the Nation lost a devoted public servant. Certainly, I lost a valued personal friend.

The highway of life is a wonderful road. In our youth we joyfully dance through the years, free of cares and responsibilities. Determinedly we march through the years of maturity, manfully overcoming the obstacles that beset our paths. Bravely we walk along the ever-narrowing path of old age until with faltering steps we finally reach our resting place. Along this highway we meet many people. Some of them we take to our hearts and share their joys and sorrows. To part with them is painful and they are sorely missed.

I miss BURNET MAYBANK. I shall miss him always.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on November 2, 1954, I received from a dear friend of mine and a resident of my home city of Spartanburg, S. C., Mr. Walter S. Montgomery, resolutions which were adopted by the board of directors of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

Mr. Montgomery is chairman of a special committee appointed to prepare resolutions of condolence over the passing of Senator MAYBANK. These resolutions extoll the virtues and character of our departed friend.

In deference at that time to the expressed wishes of members of the family of the deceased, I have retained these resolutions for presentation on this memorial occasion. I now ask that they be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURNET RHETT MAYBANK: AN AMERICAN STATESMAN

When BURNET RHETT MAYBANK died on September 1, 1954, the Nation lost one of its outstanding statesmen. Senator MAYBANK was a man of deep loyalty and devotion to friends and country. He had a keen awareness of the worth of the individual and an understanding of the need to provide a sound structure of government within which the individual might develop to the limit of his capabilities.

Born in Charleston, S. C., March 7, 1899, Senator MAYBANK was the descendant of five former governors of his native State. He was first elected an alderman of the city of Charleston, and later its mayor. At the age of 38 he followed in the footsteps of his forebears to become Governor of the State. He was elected to succeed James F. Byrnes as Senator from South Carolina in 1941, and served in that position until the date of his death. During his tenure in the Senate, one of his most important assignments was chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, from which position he distinguished himself for the clarity of his reasoning and the soundness of his judgment.

While Senator MAYBANK's death brought sorrow to countless thousands who had known him and who had labored with him, it brought particular sadness to those connected with the American cotton trade and industry. Having worked as a cotton broker, Senator MAYBANK understood the problems of the cotton industry and was quick to champion the cause of cotton whenever consistent with the best interest of the Nation. With the death of Senator MAYBANK, there passed from the American scene a brilliant statesman, an outstanding citizen, and a beloved friend.

In recognition of the value of the life of this great American, the board of directors of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., assembled in regular meeting at Charlotte, N. C., on September 22, 1954, directed that the president of the institute appoint a special committee composed of those members of the board residing in South Carolina; that this special committee transmit to Mrs. Burnet Rhett Maybank and family these expressions of sympathy of the members of this organization and of the members of its board of directors; and that a copy of these expressions be sent to the senior Senator from South Carolina with the request that they be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.: Walter S. Montgomery, Chairman, Special Committee; James A. Chapman; R. G. Emery; F. E. Grier; C. B. Hayes; Ellison S. McKissick; J. C. Self, Jr.; Wm. A. L. Sibley; Elliott Springs; Earle R. Stall; Fred W. Symmes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Democratic national committeeman from South Carolina, Mr. Edgar A. Brown, of Barnwell, S. C., who was a friend of our late colleague for many years, upon learning of the latter's death, paid a fine tribute to the late Senator MAYBANK.

I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH OF STATE SENATOR EDGAR A. BROWN, OF BARNWELL, S. C., REFERRING TO THE UNTIMELY DEATH OF SENATOR BURNET R. MAYBANK

On September 1, 1954, God, in His infinite wisdom, saw fit to take from our midst our beloved Democratic Senator, BURNET R. MAYBANK, a person who was not only loved by the people of our State, but was loved, admired, and respected by the entire Nation.

He not only carried the torch for his native State, but he carried it for the South. He carried this torch in one hand and the Democratic banner in the other hand. No matter how tired and weary he may have become at times, this Democratic banner was never allowed to be lowered. He always held it high above his head, and was proud that he was a son of a Democratic State and represented Democratic people who had put him in a position of prestige and power to carry on in his way the work he loved with all of his heart.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, BURNET R. MAYBANK, as I have already remarked, was a devoted and zealous friend of our public-housing program. This interest of his originated long before his service in this body began.

The National Association of Housing and Development Officials knowing most intimately of the valiant services rendered his country by the late Senator, very appropriately adopted a resolution expressing their sorrow over his passing. I ask that this resolution be now incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in 1937, upon the passage of the United States Housing Act, it was freely predicted that the program would never be accepted in the South; and

Whereas BURNET R. MAYBANK, as mayor of the city of Charlston, S. C., proved this prediction wrong by securing for his city one of the first allocations made for low-rent public housing, sponsoring a program based on the housing needs of the people of his community that currently is regarded as one of the more successful in the country, especially for minority families; and

Whereas as Governor of South Carolina, BURNET R. MAYBANK carried out the principal planks in his platform by calling for

local, State, and Federal aids of various kinds for families of low income—public housing, public power, and rural electrification—indicating his tremendous interest in and dedication to the welfare of the little people; and

Whereas on his election to the Senate just prior to World War II, Senator MAYBANK was assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency and immediately became active in the whole field of housing and slum clearance, playing a major part in securing rent control, effective war-housing legislation, and other programs aimed at maintaining economic stability and increasing war production; and

Whereas on assuming the chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee he introduced the Housing Act of 1949 and piloted it through the committee, the Senate, and the Congress by securing unprecedented bipartisan support for it; and

Whereas he was the first to recognize the need for a total approach to housing, particularly the necessity for homes for families of middle income, authoring the middle-income bill of 1950 and courageously battling for it on the Senate floor, where it was defeated by a close vote, thus dramatizing for the country the problem for which we are presently seeking a satisfactory solution; and

Whereas when the slums of America are wiped out and the objectives of the Housing Act of 1949 are realized, history will show that BURNET R. MAYBANK was one of its chief architects and will prove his philosophy that true equality for all people can be achieved only when all families have the opportunity to secure decent homes in good neighborhoods and are permitted to enjoy the fruits of a sound and prosperous economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials pays this grateful and affectionate tribute to the memory of a lovable human being who used his many talents, his great wealth, and his illustrious heritage in the interests of the less privileged among us.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK was a great friend of the schools of America and he was instrumental in rendering many services to the schools in Beaufort, S. C.

An article to this effect was prepared by Mr. O. K. McDaniel, administrator of the school-construction program at Beaufort, in the Beaufort Gazette, a fine newspaper in my State.

I desire to have that expression of their regard incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beaufort (S. C.) Gazette of September 9, 1954]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BURNET R. MAYBANK

(By O. K. McDaniel)

In the sudden and untimely passing of the late Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK I feel that I have lost a friend, the community of Beaufort an ever-ready helper, the State of South Carolina an able representative and the South, and the Nation, a real statesman.

During the last 12 years it has been my duty and privilege to contact Senator MAYBANK on a few personal matters and more often on matters connected with the maintenance and operation of Beaufort schools. On every occasion he has shown exceptional courtesy and displayed a genuine interest and desire to help. He was always frank to give us both sides of the issue at stake and plainly pointed out the difficulties involved. At the same time he assured us that he would do all in his power to help.

Only recently it was my privilege to be in his office in Washington, D. C., concerning legislation before the Senate affecting the schools of Beaufort. It was during the closing days of Congress and he was exceedingly busy on the floor of the Senate. His able assistant, Mr. Smith, and his secretary, Mr. Jones, listened to my story and assured me that they would convey my problem to the Senator. Early the next morning the Senator called me from his office and talked to me over the phone in my room at the hotel. He had a complete understanding of my problem and assured me that he would do all he could. However, he informed me that we in the South might expect some rough sailing from the present administration, as he had already encountered such in other legislation he was sponsoring. Two days later the desired legislation passed the Senate and the following week it passed the House. The last accounts we have of it is that it is on the President's desk awaiting his signature.

All of us are familiar with the problem of ever-mounting school enrollment and increasing attendance as the result of the influx of pupils in war-impacted areas, such as Beaufort. Our representatives in Congress, both in the House and the Senate, became aware of this problem and took the position that there was a Federal responsibility involved and that assistance from the Federal Government should be given. As a result of their efforts, along with others of like mind, this responsibility was accepted, first, through the Lanham Act, later through the Landis Act, and finally through Public Law No. 874, which gives assistance in maintenance and operation, and Public Law No. 815, which renders aid for schoolhouse construction. Senators MAYBANK and JOHNSTON, and Representative RIVERS worked shoulder to shoulder in convincing Congress that such need was just. After the acts were enacted into law it took a lot of pushing each year to get sufficient appropriation to take care of the entitlements. Our Representatives, including Senator MAYBANK, saw to it that Beaufort received its share. With the reactivation of and enlargement of Beaufort Naval Air Station it became evident to many of us that more assistance and more buildings would be needed. During the closing days of the 83d Congress these laws were extended and they now await the President's signature.

It is an interesting story concerning the actual benefits Beaufort County School District No. 1 has received from such legislation and the untiring work of our representatives in Congress. In 1941–42 Beaufort school district received $3,867 for assistance in maintenance and operation. Since that time the district has received $447,979 for that purpose, and $857,414 for schoolhouse construction. It may well be said that the excellent school buildings at Port Royal, Dale-Lobeco, Robert Smalls, and the additions to the Beaufort High School stand as a memorial to the faithful and untiring work of Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK and others who had a part in making them a reality. Only recently we received announcement that an additional $27,000 has been awarded Beaufort school district for additional classrooms at St. Helena consolidated schools.

Senator MAYBANK was the product of the best culture and refinement of the Old South and Charleston in particular. Yet he never lost the common touch and never forgot in his public career that he was the servant of the most humble. The high esteem in which he was held by the people of his native State was such that he never asked for a public office that it was not given him. A final testimony of the implicit trust in his ability and sincerity was shown in the last primary when he was renominated for a 6-year term in the United States Senate without opposition. The poet, Kipling, might well have spoken of Senator MAYBANK with these words when he said:

"If you can walk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with Kings—nor lose the common touch,
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son!"

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, from the time he was 27 years old, BURNET RHETT MAYBANK devoted his life to public service.

Most Senators knew him here in the United States Senate as a colleague from 1941 till last year when his untimely death came on September 1—a man admired, respected, and loved by his associates and by vast numbers of people who knew him only through his reputation.

Prior to coming to the Senate as successor to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, who was appointed to the Supreme Court, BURNET MAYBANK had served as Governor of South Carolina from 1938 through 1941. For the 8 years from 1931 through 1938, he served the city of Charleston as a distinguished mayor. Before being elected mayor, he was an alderman in Charleston from 1927 through 1930. Also, during this long period of outstanding public service, he was from 1934 through 1938 chairman of the South Carolina Public Service Authority which created the huge Santee-Cooper power project, now serving lower South Carolina. President Roosevelt appointed him to the Public Works Administration.

My distinguished predecessor was, by profession, a cotton exporter. You who were his colleagues know of his continuing interest in, and vast store of knowledge on, the subject of cotton. He was an expert in this field.

You knew, too, of the great legislative ability which he demonstrated throughout his career in Washington. He served exceedingly well as he went about the task of representing the people of his State and the people of the United States in this great deliberative body.

He performed in an unusual manner the duties of a Senator, whether on the floor, where he seldom spoke at length, or in the committees of which he was a member. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Senator MAYBANK established himself deep in the favor of Members on both sides of the aisle who recognized the superb qualities inherent in this South Carolinian.

Not only in the Senate, but also as a leader in the Democratic Party, BURNET MAYBANK was held in high esteem by his fellow Members. From 1930 on he was a member of all city, county, State, and National Democratic conventions for which he was eligible.

We recognize him as having been the epitome of the people of his native city,

Charleston. He graduated from Porter Military Academy in Charleston and from the College of Charleston. His college career was interrupted by service in the Navy during the First World War. But he finished at the top of his college class as its honor graduate.

BURNET MAYBANK'S political record was phenomenal. He never lost a political contest in which he was a candidate. After having served on the Charleston City Council and one term as mayor, he was virtually drafted by public demand for mayor for another term, and he was unopposed. Although he knew little of the technical aspects of sociology, he was at all times conscious and mindful of the desires and needs of his people.

He was the first Governor elected from Charleston in 75 years after the War Between the States. The second time he ran for a full Senate term in 1948 he won nomination in the first primary by a handsome majority over four opponents. Six years later, last year, he was accorded the unusual honor of being nominated to another 6-year term without opposition.

I first knew BURNET MAYBANK while he was mayor of Charleston. In 1932 when both of us attended the National Democratic Convention, I came to know him more intimately and to like him. Later I was closely associated with him in the creation of the South Carolina Public Service Authority. During the years 1947 through 1950, while he was in the Senate and I was Governor of South Carolina, we worked together on many projects. He was sincerely and deeply interested in the public good.

He has been described as a man who had an inherent feeling of obligation for public service. BURNET MAYBANK came of ancestry which was used to high office and leadership. Five of his forebears had been Governor of South Carolina.

A most intimate friend of Senator MAYBANK told me recently that "he had the most forgiving disposition of any man I ever knew. He never held opposition against anyone and, therefore, he gained friends and votes with each succeeding election, even among his former opponents."

This friend declared that the Senator had a deep feeling of attachment for the land and for the people who worked it, in spite of the fact that he, himself, was city-bred. He loved the restful seclusion of his mountain retreat and went there as often as his duties in Washington and Charleston permitted.

BURNET MAYBANK liked the sun and the surf of the beaches of his native State. An excellent shot, he was a hunter of turkey and ducks in the low country of South Carolina. This love of the out-of-doors gave him the appearance of robust health until very near the end of his life.

Despite the honors and demands of public life, and the attractions associated with such a career, the outstanding characteristic of BURNET MAYBANK was his utter devotion to his family. As a husband and a father he fulfilled the highest meaning in the definitions of those relationships. He was fond of children and he enjoyed the days during which his two daughters and his son were growing up. I am told that he enjoyed playing little jokes on his children and they in turn on him, knowing his excellent sense of humor.

Senator MAYBANK was a member of the Episcopal Church and served as a vestryman at historic old St. Michael's Church in Charleston. At the time of his death he was senior warden at St. John's-in-the-Wilderness, at Flat Rock, N. C., where his summer home was located.

A South Carolina newspaper editor has well expressed the thought which aptly sums up the feeling of the people who knew him best. This is what he said in an editorial the day after Senator MAYBANK died:

The sincere sadness felt by the people of South Carolina over the death of Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK is a mirror of the distinguishing trait of the man they grieve.

For Senator MAYBANK was above all a sincere man. He had other fine qualities, to be sure, but shining above them all was his innate freedom of hypocrisy, his nature to appear to be no better or worse than he was.

In conclusion, I offer, with my colleagues, consolation to our deceased friend's family with the thought that BURNET MAYBANK'S sacrifices for his State and Nation were not in vain. Long will his record stand for lesser statesmen to emulate. But much more significant, long will he be remembered for what he was himself—for his ability, his generosity, his friendliness, and his impulsive eagerness to do good for others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Senator MAYBANK," which was published in the Greenville (S. C.) News of September 2, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MAYBANK

The sincere sadness felt by the people of South Carolina over the death of Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK is a mirror of the distinguishing trait of the man they grieve.

For Senator MAYBANK was above all things a sincere man. He had other fine qualities, to be sure, but shining above them was his innate freedom of hypocrisy, his nature to appear to be no better or worse than he was.

His effectiveness both as governor and Senator gathered strength because of being fed copiously from his fountain of sincerity. One did not search for a motive in his words, deeds, or votes. Even though one did not agree with him on occasions, still there was the feeling that he acted only with a sincere desire to do the right thing.

The people of South Carolina liked the man. His neighbors elected him mayor of Charleston. When he offered to become Governor of the State he was a new kind of candidate, but thousands who had not known him before were attracted to his genuine sincerity. No citizen of Charleston had been elected governor since the Civil War, but MAYBANK overcame this artificial handicap and proved one of the State's best chief executives.

In the Senate MAYBANK was not spectacular, because that was not his nature. He was not a blowhard in the cave of winds. But he was attentive to business, both that which pertained to national affairs and those of South Carolina. He had boundless enthusiasm and energy which he applied wholeheartedly to whatever business was to be done. He had the confidence and respect of his colleagues, without which a Senator had just as well not be there.

Result was that with each passing year MAYBANK grew in stature in the Senate and came to be known as one of the outstanding Members of that body. He was a specialist on the problems before the Banking and Currency Committee, which he headed during the last Democratic administration and later was ranking member. He was serious and he was good humored and it was natural that he should have persuasion with those who also served.

At the same time the Senator never neglected the problems and opportunities peculiar to his own State. He never forgot the people who elected him. He was not a pork-barrel Senator, but he insisted and usually got the share to which his State was entitled. The Donaldson Air Force Base, for example, was forever under his watchful eye for nurture. The personal problems and difficulties of his constituents were taken to heart. His telephone bill for talking to them took a sizable portion of his pay check.

It is ironical that a man who so appealed to voters as to receive another term without opposition should be stricken before the new term begins. Whereas only 2 months ago there was rejoicing that he had been so well rewarded for good service, today there is a void against the sky. In bowing to the wisdom of the Lord in taking him in what should have been his prime, one still may grieve that there was work he wanted to do and could not do.

South Carolinians will always remember the smiling face of the young man from Charleston who came to them a few years ago seeking the governor's and later the Senator's offices. They will not forget the impression he made as one offering to render unselfish public service and not to satisfy personal political ambition. He measured to their appraisal and expectations.

It was in the early years of his political life that MAYBANK delivered a one-sentence speech at a banquet in South Carolina. He arose and said, "BURNET MAYBANK will never let you down." And he never did.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a newspaper article published in the Greenville (S. C.) News of September 2, 1954. It was written by Mr. Frank van der Linden, manager of a Washington news bureau.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, September 1.—A unique and powerful personality passed from the national scene today when Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina, died suddenly of a heart attack at his summer home at Flat Rock, N. C.

No other Senator was ever quite like the husky human dynamo who thought, spoke, and acted with lightning speed, as he did the work of three men every day.

Beloved for his kindness and good humor, MAYBANK mingled the courtesy and charm of the old Charleston aristocracy with the nervous energy of a business executive.

He talked in telegrams—brief snatches of sentences that jumped from one subject to another as his brilliant mind flashed. He spoke in a staccato dialect of soft Charleston accents fired with the speed, and the gestures, of a Frenchman. He once said he developed his machine-gun delivery as a cotton broker, doing business by telephone.

MAYBANK drove himself, and his office staff, at a terrific pace. He shuttled back and forth from his office in the Senate Office Building, to the Senate floor, the hearing rooms of the Appropriations and the Banking and Currency Committees, and his pri-

vate hideaway in the Capitol, where he kept two telephones buzzing most of the time.

MAYBANK was a national statesman, not a provincial politician. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, he fathered the 1949 Housing Act which encouraged the construction of homes by the millions, and included public housing and slum clearance projects.

MAYBANK also wrote the Defense Production Act, which set up the economic controls essential to the Korean conflict. He was cochairman of the joint Senate-House watchdog committee which kept tab on the Federal agencies administering that act.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, the South Carolina Democrat helped to draft money bills providing hundreds of billions of dollars for Government expenses in war and peace. He was formerly chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee. He fought for cuts in foreign aid bills and favored high price supports for basic farm commodities.

MAYBANK also sat on the steering committee that assigns Democratic Senators to committees.

MAYBANK remained a "regular" Democrat in the 1952 election, although Governor James F. Byrnes and many other friends urged him to back Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who nearly carried South Carolina on an independent presidential ticket.

MAYBANK made one concession: He resigned from the Democratic National Committee in protest against his party's civil rights plank. But he campaigned for Democratic senatorial candidates in several States.

In his 13 years on Capitol Hill, MAYBANK rose to a powerful place among the southern leaders of the Senate. He ranked with such men as Georgia's Senators WALTER F. GEORGE and RICHARD RUSSELL, Virginia's HARRY BYRD, and Texas' LYNDON JOHNSON in influence and prestige. He always stood up for the rights of the South.

MAYBANK used his power for the benefit of his constituents, including the textile mills, the cotton and tobacco farmers, and the other economic interests of his State. Many an item, buried deep in the technical language of a complicated bill, turned out to be a "Maybank amendment" protecting some of his people.

While he spoke rarely on the Senate floor, MAYBANK was a master of person-to-person conversation in the cloakrooms and around the committee tables and over the telephone. He got things done through his driving force but without a lot of waste motion.

Having a genial disposition, and loving a good joke, MAYBANK had a host of friends among his fellow Senators and the Capitol employees, regardless of party. He was unbeatable as a candidate for office.

Mayor of Charleston at 32, he became Governor at 40 and a Senator at 42. He was elected in November 1941 after Senator Byrnes resigned to become a Supreme Court Justice. MAYBANK had a hard race in 1942 but defeated four other candidates by a clear majority in 1948 and won renomination this year without opposition.

MAYBANK'S sudden death, at 55, shocked Washington. None of his associates had known that he had a heart ailment, although he had occasionally visited the naval hospital at nearby Bethesda, Md., for treatment of other illnesses and for checkups. A blood vessel burst in his throat in the winter of 1950, and he had a siege of pneumonia after the day-and-night grind of the Democratic convention of 1952. But he snapped back, each time, and had appeared in excellent health.

"He worried about his health," said his longtime administrative assistant, Col. Dresden A. Smith, of Walhalla. "He was afraid of having a long and painful illness. He wanted to go quickly—just as he did."

Smith, who had served with MAYBANK for 20 years, was probably the first person in Washington to be notified of the Senator's death. Smith recalled that, on his own 73d birthday last August 13, MAYBANK had honored him with a party.

"I remember joking with him and saying, 'When you are 73 I am going to have a party for you.'

"He was always doing little kindnesses for people," Smith said. "The only complaint I ever had against him was that he worked too hard."

"He died in his prime, still champion," said Norman Stevenson, of Charleston, member of the Banking Committee staff.

"That is the way he wanted to go, and at the place he wanted, too," said Lee Parsons, of Andrews, minority clerk of the committee. "He loved that summerhouse, for it was his father's house, and you know what a family man he was."

MAYBANK'S associates said the Senator had planned to retire after his next 6-year term, for which he was the unopposed Democratic candidate in the November 2 election. They said he had once expressed the hope that his son, Burnet Maybank, Jr., of Greenville, might succeed him in the Senate.

The Senator's death was a double shock for Miss Mary Anthony, of his office staff. She was formerly an aid to Congressman Joseph R. Bryson, of Greenville, who died in March 1953.

South Carolina has thus lost two members of its congressional delegation in the 83d Congress. MAYBANK is the eighth Senator to die in this Congress and the fifth in 1954. Senators Taft, of Ohio, Tobey, of New Hampshire, and Smith, of North Carolina, died in 1953; Senators Butler and Griswold, of Nebraska, Hoey, of North Carolina, Hunt, of Wyoming, and Maybank died this year.

Among the other South Carolina Senators who died in office were Ben Tillman, 1918; Alva M. Lumpkin, who was appointed after Byrnes' resignation and served only 10 days, from July 22 until his death August 1, 1941; and Ellison D. (Cotton Ed) Smith, who died in 1944.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, will head the official Senate delegation to MAYBANK'S funeral at St. Michael's Episcopal Church, in Charleston, Friday at 11 a. m., eastern standard time. Burial will be in Magnolia Cemetery, Charleston.

Bobby Baker, of Pickens, the assistant secretary for the Senate minority, is in charge of arranging for Democratic Senators to attend the funeral. Baker, who came to Washington in 1942 as a page for MAYBANK, said about 30 Senators of both parties will go to the rites. The list will be published tomorrow.

Flags over the Capitol flew at half staff today in honor of MAYBANK.

Everyone attending the McCarthy censure hearings stood for a moment of silence at the request of the investigating chairman, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah.

"It is with regret and deep sorrow that we received the news of the death of Senator MAYBANK," WATKINS said. "He was greatly beloved in the Senate."

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, of North Carolina, another committee member, said: "I considered Senator MAYBANK one of the most capable Members of the Senate. He was a gallant gentleman. His death is a great loss to North Carolina as well as to his own State. He had rendered fine service to the textile industry of our States, being an authority in that field."

Senator JOHNSTON, attending a convention of Government workers at Cleveland, Ohio, also sent a message of regret.

JOHNSTON praised his colleague as "a true gentleman and statesman whom I had learned to know, respect, and admire so well."

Former Gov. STROM THURMOND, of Aiken, in Washington for the American Legion convention, said: "Our State has suffered a tremendous loss in the death of Senator MAYBANK. He was a fine citizen and a great United States Senator who rendered outstanding service to South Carolina."

THURMOND, who ran against JOHNSTON in 1950, refused to comment on reports that he is a likely aspirant for MAYBANK'S seat.

Martin Rosefield, of Sumter, past department commander of the American Legion, said: "Senator MAYBANK was a good Legionnaire and a friend of all veterans. We regret his passing very deeply."

South Carolina House Members, scattered by the congressional recess, telephoned their tributes to Washington.

From Lancaster, S. C., Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, of the Fifth District, said: "It is a tragic loss to South Carolina and to the Nation that BURNET MAYBANK has been taken in the fullness of his service and influence. I feel a deep sense of personal loss, as I valued his friendship. His place will be hard to fill."

Second District Congressman JOHN J. RILEY, of Sumter, vacationing at Edisto Beach, said: "I was shocked to learn of the passing of Senator MAYBANK. South Carolino has lost one of her outstanding and influential public servants. I have lost a very dear friend whose counsel and cooperation have been of untold benefit to me in my public service."

Sixth District Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of Florence, said: "Senator MAYBANK'S death is a great shock to me. He was one of my closest friends, and he will always be missed by me. South Carolina and the Nation have suffered a great loss. With his long service, he had built up seniority, and he was a great man in the Senate."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is difficult to realize that our good friend, BURNET R. MAYBANK, is no longer with us.

Senator MAYBANK was one of the most forceful personalities in a body of forceful men. His skill and his determination made him a power to reckon with—whatever the occasion and whatever the issue.

Although my service in the Senate has been comparatively brief, yet I count myself among his friends and as one of the many whom he helped with his advice and counsel. I learned early that it was the part of wisdom to begin any step by consultation with BURNET MAYBANK.

He was never too busy to help any Senator, no matter how junior. Although he presided over one of the most important committees of this body, he was always willing to cooperate, and likewise to see the other man's point of view.

In return, his colleagues bestowed upon him an affectionate regard which is possessed by few. He was respected; he was admired; he was loved to an extent that made him a Senate institution.

As a legislative craftsman, he had few equals. His personality was stamped on some of the most important legislation of our times, vital economic legislation that affects the daily lives of our citizens.

I was deeply shocked by the sad news of his passing. To all of us came the realization that something very strong and very fine had passed from our lives.

But to the Senate, to his native South Carolina, and to his family, BURNET R. MAYBANK will always remain a living legend—a force from which all of us can draw strength as we face the problems yet to come.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that all the Members of the Senate heard of the passing of our late good friend and colleague, BURNET MAYBANK, of South Carolina. He had served his State and country well, not only, as has been already pointed out, as mayor of his native city, but as Governor of the great State of South Carolina, and as a Senator of the United States.

BURNET MAYBANK was a good party man. He took a keen interest in the party to which he belonged, and he served in the various echelons of that organization from the precincts on the city level up to the national committee. Yet, while a devoted partisan, he was not a bitter partisan. Before he was a Democrat he was an American; and the aisle which divides our two parties in the Senate of the United States did not divide BURNET MAYBANK from those of us who sit on this side of the aisle.

It was not my privilege to know him before I came to the Senate 10 years ago, but I have been privileged, as were some other Members of this body, to serve with him during almost a decade. I can say that I know of no Member of this body who showed greater courtesy and consideration to his colleagues than did BURNET MAYBANK.

I was privileged to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations. He was an interested and active member of that committee. Of course, as a Senator from the State of South Carolina, he was deeply interested in the great economic, social, and political problems which affected his native State. As a Member of the Senate from the great South, which has shown such tremendous development over the years, of course, he was interested in that area of our country whose development meant so much to him and which means so much to the people of all the 48 States. But, over and above that, in a true sense of the word, he was a Senator of the United States. Regardless of locality, whenever a given area had a problem Senator MAYBANK took a keen interest in trying to find a fair and equitable solution.

It was the sad privilege of a number of us representing the Senate of the United States to go to Charleston, S. C., to attend his funeral services. We could all recognize the deep affection in which BURNET MAYBANK was held by the people of South Carolina and of his native city of Charleston.

He will be greatly missed as long as any of us who serve in the Senate of the United States shall survive. He left his imprint upon this Chamber and upon the Members who served with him. To his family and to his colleagues we extend our deepest sympathy.

All of us on this side of the aisle will miss him as deeply and as sincerely as will any of his colleagues who sit on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, shocked indeed were we when the news of BURNET MAYBANK's death was flashed across the country. We knew that he had not been well and, in fact, sick and hospitalized at times during the past 2 years. But we little dreamed that the end was at hand. He was always so vital, so alert, so active, and so persistently on the job.

BURNET MAYBANK and I had been close friends almost since the day he first came to Washington to take his place in the Senate. During his service of 13 years our homes were in the same neighborhood. We were neighbors and our families were close. During all the hard and strenuous days of World War II we shared the ride back and forth to the Senate Office Building each morning and each evening.

BURNET MAYBANK was a gallant soul. He literally gave his life to the service of his people. He was city councilman and mayor of historic old Charleston, his native city. Then he was the devoted and distinguished Governor of his State, the first Charlestonian to be elected Governor since the War Between the States. His record as Governor was so outstanding in its accomplishments for South Carolina that the people promoted him to the Senate.

It was my privilege to sit by his side as a member of the old Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I saw at firsthand his devotion to our country and its free institutions, and his deep concern for the rights, the happiness, and the welfare of the people.

BURNET MAYBANK's life is the story of exceptional ability, of rare knowledge of human nature, of generosity, of courage, of tireless effort, of dedication and of faith—and above all of loyalty. Loyalty to his family and his friends. He needed no assurances. He made no demands. He gave the utmost of his friendship. He stood steadfast and true, as fixed and constant as the North Star.

Loyalty to his State, its great traditions and proud history. His forebears had written much of that history, and no word or deed of his should profane it. Rather did he bring to it new honor and luster.

Loyalty to the people of his State. He could walk with kings, but he never lost the common touch. And his was ever the grateful heart, thankful to God and to the people who honored and favored him. His was the heart attuned with compassion, sympathy, and understanding for all people. He was the leader in the many battles for decent and better homes for people of every color, creed, and class. He fought that all men might have a fairer and a better opportunity, and that those who inhabited the land might enjoy its fruits, their rightful heritage.

Loyalty to his country. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee during the Korean war, with all the vexatious, exacting, and overwhelming problems, from price control to military defense, he gave his all. He was the soldier and the patriot, and the heavy and excruciating burdens took the toll that brought his untimely end. He gave his life in the cause of our country while the sun of his life was still high in the western sky.

No man in this body was more beloved of his colleagues than was BURNET MAYBANK. We loved him living. We love him now. There was no braver, manlier man.

As we pay our hearts' tribute to him, we remember his wonderful wife, his fine son, who has already started a career worthy of his father, and his two lovely daughters. We shall treasure all our days the privilege of the golden friendship and of the example of the life and character of BURNET MAYBANK, the friend, the patriot, the statesman, the great American.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, since last Thursday I have attended the funerals of three close friends in Indiana. I returned to the Senate Chamber today in order to be present at this memorial service.

When I learned of Senator MAYBANK's death, I traveled from Los Angeles to Charleston, S. C., so that I might attend his funeral.

I wish I had the ability to express adequately my feelings about Senator MAYBANK. There is an old saying that in order really to know a person one must talk with those who worked with him each and every day, not merely with those who associated with him only socially, who met him only at clubs, or at church. By talking with those who worked with him daily, one would really learn the true character of the man.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Joint Committee on Defense Production, I had the good fortune, privilege, and pleasure of working very closely with Senator MAYBANK for almost 11 years. He was the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Banking and Currency when I was chairman, and I was the ranking Republican during the past few years when he was chairman of the committee.

I have been associated with many persons in business and in politics, but I do not believe I have ever been associated with any one who was more highly regarded than was Senator MAYBANK. The reason was that Senator MAYBANK was perfectly frank, honest, and outspoken and he never hesitated to make clear where he stood, so that there could be no doubt about his position. He had the faculty of promoting teamwork and cooperation. Although he and I did not always agree, we worked together and were able to accomplish much as a result of our teamwork. Senator MAYBANK had great respect for every member of the committee over which he presided. It always was his purpose to do what was right, and he always tried to do what was right.

Senator MAYBANK was a man of ability and wisdom. He was an outstanding statesman. As we say in Indiana—and I think this is one of the highest tributes I can pay him—he was smart. He understood people and their problems. He worked hard and was enthusiastic about everything he did. He was a good businessman. During his life he accomplished much as an administrator, as governor of his great State, as mayor of his home city, and as a United States Senator.

BURNET MAYBANK had deep love for and pride in the members of his family. He was sincerely interested in their welfare, as he was in the welfare of every person in his great State of South Carolina, and in the welfare of the United States. He loved not only his home, but also his State and the American system of government.

It was a great experience for me to work with Senator MAYBANK as closely as I did, because in that way I really learned to know him; and, as I have said, one must work with a man in order to know him. Too often we are inclined to jump to conclusions concerning friends or acquaintances when we really do not know them. But when one can work with a man such as Senator MAYBANK for almost 11 years and be in almost daily contact with him, one acquires a deep love for the man.

As the years passed, my respect for Senator MAYBANK deepened, as did my regard for his ability and sincerity of purpose. I think this is the greatest compliment one can pay to another.

Senator MAYBANK was a loyal American. His death is a deep loss to me and to the Senate as a whole. We all know what a great loss has been sustained by his family, his home city of Charleston, and his beloved State of South Carolina. We in this body have lost a true friend.

Mr. President, we need more Burnie Maybanks in this world.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I count my association with our late distinguished colleague, BURNET MAYBANK, as one of the great privileges that have come to me as a Member of this body.

His untimely passing leaves me with a profound feeling of personal loss.

Senator MAYBANK was respected and honored on both sides of the aisle as a statesman who was guided in every thought and deed by the highest principles of patriotic Americanism. He served with distinction as a member of the Armed Forces in World War I. He served as Governor of his native State and as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission. He served the Senate as an active and forceful chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

South Carolina and the Nation have suffered a severe loss in the death of Senator MAYBANK, and I join in extending my deepest sympathy to those near and dear to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on August 19 of last year, the day before the Congress adjourned, I left Washington on an official visit abroad. It never dawned on me that death would claim two of my friends and neighbors in the Senate before my return. I well remember that on the afternoon before I departed, I stood at my desk in the Senate and suggested to my two neighboring colleagues, Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada, who sat to my right, and Senator BURNET MAYBANK, of South Carolina, who sat to my immediate left, that they "take care of things for me" in my absence. Both wished me "bon voyage," and suggested that I be careful on the long voyage by airplane I was about to undertake.

I was in Libya, having breakfast at Wheelus Air Force Base when I learned of the passing of BURNET MAYBANK. My first sensation was of great shock; my second was the knowledge of deep loss and of consummate sorrow.

BURNET MAYBANK came to the Senate in 1941 to fill the unexpired term of James Byrnes. I came to know him well; I served with him on the Committee on Appropriations; I worked with him on many legislative problems, particularly those relating to housing. In that field he evidenced keen interest and a most sympathetic understanding of the problem.

He was a good friend and an able Senator. His arduous work on the Committee on Banking and Currency, his tedious work on the Senate Appropriations Committee, the wealth of constructive legislation which bears his name, all attest to the fact that BURNET MAYBANK served his State and his Nation with distinction.

Mr. President, BURNET MAYBANK came from a distinguished family. Some of the prominent characters portrayed in the famous novel Gone With the Wind could be traced to his ancestry. He began his career in public life in 1927 as a member of the City Council of Charleston, S. C., his home town. Eleven years later, he was elected Governor of his State. In 3 more years he had been elected to the United States Senate. At the time of his death he had been renominated without opposition for another full term. BURNET MAYBANK had never, in his full and illustrious career, known political defeat. Death came in the bloom of that career, and I know that all of us here today who have known him, and who have worked with him, feel deeply his loss. We who have the same philosophy of government have suffered a grievous blow, for the wise counsel he has provided, and the sage leadership he has offered, will be difficult to replace.

I wish to add my voice to the other voices which have been raised today in eulogy to BURNET MAYBANK—a devoted husband, a loving father, a fine man, an able Senator, but above all, a true gentleman, whose sense of honor and fair play offer all of us in this Chamber a standard which we could do well to follow.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it is with a sense of deep sadness and heavy heart that I join with my colleagues, and his countless friends everywhere, in paying tribute to our late colleague and beloved friend, BURNET RHETT MAYBANK.

The great State of South Carolina has contributed many men of outstanding character, ability, and leadership to serve in positions of honor and trust in the National Government. None acquitted themselves more ably, or served with a greater sense of dignity and devotion to duty, than did Senator MAYBANK.

BURNET MAYBANK was rooted deep in the soil of South Carolina. His life was in keeping with her finest traditions. As a cotton exporter, he was an able man of business, and accumulated his fair share of worldly goods, but his great contribution to his fellow man is found in the simple phrase—a public servant. From 1927 he was continuously in public office, as alderman of the city of Charleston; mayor of Charleston from 1931 to 1938; Governor of South Carolina from 1939 to 1941; and finally, United States Senator, elected in 1941 to finish the unexpired term of the Honorable James F. Byrnes.

My intimate association with Senator MAYBANK started in 1943, when I returned to the Senate for my first elective term. To know him was to love him, and as the years passed and we fought many battles together, our devotion to each other became deep and abiding. To me, his passing has left a void that cannot be replaced.

Through the perilous years of war, it was the steady hand and clear head of Senator MAYBANK that framed the multiple and intricate legislation which was necessary to mobilize our civilian economy for the maximum degree of war effort. No more monumental task was ever accomplished than that performed by his Banking and Currency Committee, both during World War II and the Korean incident. For years he also served on the Armed Services Committee, thus encompassing both military and civilian effort. His arduous work and patriotic sacrifices during those periods of danger and strife must have been a strong contributory factor in his early demise.

His contributions to the economy of this Nation in the field of slum clearance, apartment construction, Federal aid for home building, and like legislation, have erected for him a lasting monument, and for his efforts the people of this Nation will be forever in his debt.

The great agricultural population of the Nation knew that in Senator MAYBANK they had a tried and true friend. He was always in the frontline in the fights for the farmers' welfare.

Mr. President, I could eulogize Senator MAYBANK at great length. But his life, as he lived it, is its own eulogy. Mere words cannot express the degree of his sterling worth and high-minded character. To me his loss is deep and personal. But his State, the South, and the Nation, as well as we who knew him so well, have been the gainers for his having lived. About him it can truly be said: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to pay a brief tribute to a colleague whom I truly miss. BURNETT MAYBANK was my friend. We first met in 1920, at a wedding of a mutual friend in Flat Rock, N. C., where he spent his summers. We had a nice time together at that function. Then our ways parted until we were Governors of our respective States, and again we met at the Governors' Conferences over a period of years, and became fast friends.

When I came to the Senate in 1945, BURNET helped in every way he could to acquaint me with the procedure and the ways of operation of the Senate. During the past 10 years he and I served together on the Armed Services Committee and on the Appropriations Committee. In the latter we were respectively chairman and ranking minority

member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices for the past 4 years, and as such we worked out a mutual understanding of the various problems before that subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. We thought alike on many of the matters before the committee.

Always he was cooperative. Always he was helpful; and while we naturally disagreed at times on political philosophy and, as Senators from our respective States, necessarily differed on some questions that came before us, we never suffered a break in our personal relations, no matter how keen the political arguments became.

Like every other Member of the Senate, I trusted him. I liked him. He was always friendly. Many times we discussed our various children and their problems. During the last years of his life, he had a stepdaughter who married the son of a friend of mine in Massachusetts, so that brought him to our State.

The citizens of South Carolina may well take pardonable pride in choosing as their Governor, and then as their Senator, a man of BURNET MAYBANK'S standing. The people of the city of Charleston, the city which he called home, can truly consider him one of the first of its many fine citizens. His personality, his character, his unimpeachable integrity, and his loyalty to his colleagues, will be remembered in the United States Senate for many years to come. His public life was one of energy and service to the people of his State and to the people of the Nation. We shall always remember him as a friend, and we shall always respect him for his principles, for his high standing as a public servant, and, above all, for his love of country, in the full sense of that phrase.

At this hour, when we are thinking of him, of what he made of his life and of his public career, and of his love of his family and his friends, we can with full hearts extend our sympathy to his widow, his children, and his friends.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I sincerely share, subscribe to, and associate myself with the very reverent and profound sentiments which have been and will be expressed by others here today, in eulogy and in memory of our distinguished, honored, and lamented colleague, BURNET MAYBANK.

At this hour, Mr. President, we pause from our pressing and arduous duties of state to pay well-earned and deserved tribute to one of our great Americans; one with whom it was our pleasure and privilege to labor and to associate in this body for a number of years; one who became known to us and esteemed by us for his real worth and magnificent qualities, which we so well recognized and so fondly cherished.

I have referred to the strenuous duties incumbent upon those who serve in this body because I am constrained to attribute his untimely passing to his unswerving devotion to duty and his indefatigable labors in performing the duties that rested upon him as a Member of the United States Senate.

He was dedicated to America; to the ideals and traditions of freedom, justice, and liberty; and to the preserving of the way of life we have established and maintained—a way of life unexcelled and unequaled in the annals of world history.

Mr. President, although I knew of him as governor of his State and as a United States Senator, I had never met him personally and it was not my pleasure and privilege to know him until I came to the Senate, some 12 years ago. It was then that our friendship began; and during the passing years, those ties were constantly strengthened, as my admiration and respect for him were increasingly enhanced as our associations became more constant and confiding, and as we labored together toward the same general goals and objectives in the legislative branch of the Government.

I first served with him for a brief time on the Banking and Currency Committee, and later for a number of years, until his death, I served with him on the Appropriations Committee. In his every act, in his every decision, there was reflected a consciousness of his sense of obligation and responsibility to the public trust which had been reposed in him.

He possessed deep and firm convictions. Once he had reached a decision on an issue involving a basic and fundamental principle, he was unswerving in the course he pursued. He was possessed of both the vision and the courage of a true statesman, and he applied these qualities unreservedly throughout his entire career of public service.

He had another notable capacity, that of developing strong and lasting reciprocal friendships. One could not know Senator MAYBANK without sensing the warmth and depth of his appreciation of his fellow man and his keen sense of fairness and justice toward all.

These, Mr. President, and many other sterling qualities commanded the admiration, respect, and esteem of us all.

Mr. President, my life has been greatly enriched by having known and having had the pleasure and privilege of being associated with and laboring with BURNET MAYBANK. The great loss the Nation has sustained in his passing is felt keenly by every Member of this body.

Mr. President, beyond the fields of labor, it was my opportunity and privilege to have had many social contacts with BURNET MAYBANK and his family. His family and mine have enjoyed many happy associations together and a warm friendship which has endeared them to us. Today we say to them that they have our deepest, heartfelt sympathy and prayers that they may be comforted and sustained.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who today have paid and others who will pay tribute to a fine citizen and public servant, the late Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina.

Mr. President, many years ago I read Sir Thomas Gray's Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard, wherein he said:

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of pow'r,
And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
Awaits alike th' inevitable hour.
The paths of glory lead but to the grave.

I am sure those who now are paying tribute to our late colleague do not believe that is the fate of Senator MAYBANK. His path did not lead only to the grave. I prefer to believe in the faith expressed by him, and so well known to the American people, especially to those of us of the South: "He is just going away."

I knew BURNET MAYBANK intimately and well for many, many years. I worked with him on committees. I traveled with him in many parts of the world. Whether in official work or in the everyday affairs of life, he was always an outstanding example of an American at his best, and at all times he was a perfect gentleman.

As a family man, as a father, as a husband, he was ever loving.

Today we can repeat the words of the bard of Avon, who, speaking of the dead king, said:

After life's fitful fever, he sleeps well.

Mr. President, I am positive and confident that every person who knew BURNET MAYBANK is today offering a prayer for him. May the Lord take care—as we know He will—of BURNET MAYBANK'S noble and fine family.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, it was my rare privilege to meet and to know Senator MAYBANK but not until after I came to the United States Senate, for I did not have the opportunity of knowing him when he was chief executive of his great State. He served in the Senate during some interesting, and certainly some challenging years, as well as fruitful years, when many issues were contested. They were rewarding years for BURNET MAYBANK because he gave generously of himself and of his wisdom to meet the problems which arose.

I had the privilege of serving with him on the Banking and Currency Committee. It was there that association with him endeared him to me. There I came to know him as a man of ability, integrity, and fairness, a man of understanding, and of great tolerance toward all the views there expressed.

He has departed from this chamber and from the presence of all of us; but he has left indelibly imprinted on our memories the recollection of his sterling character, his unswerving loyalty and his devotion to principle, and to his country. We shall always cherish our association with him and the privilege we have had of serving here with him.

BURNET MAYBANK came from the Deep South. He was a great southerner, but yet he had a profound understanding not only of the problems of the South, but of the problems of the North, and of the burning issues of the day. He understood the positions which many of us took.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a man whom I learned to admire greatly in the short time I served with him. He has left his imprint here. His influence was directed toward a greater America. Those of us who served in the Senate with him are better because we were privileged to know BURNET MAYBANK. Our sympathy to his family and to his close associates will always be warm and vital.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I wish I could speak with the eloquence of my distinguished colleagues about BURNET MAYBANK who was my close personal friend and whom I truly loved.

The circumstances which brought me the news of his tragic death were sorrowful, indeed. At that time I was living in the high mountains of Idaho. Newspapers were late. I rose early one morning to go out and get my newspaper. Then, for the first time, I read that Senator BURNET MAYBANK would be buried in Charleston, S. C., upon that very day.

I confess that my heart was heavy. My family had not yet risen. I am proud to say that I went back to my room and penned in longhand a letter to his wonderful widow and her children, expressing my deep sorrow at the loss of this great American.

It is difficult to understand why such a great American, such a great statesman, regardless of political affiliation, should be stricken down in the full flower of his service of his country.

BURNET MAYBANK played the game squarely and above board. He never stooped to low partisan politics. His vote was dedicated to that which was best for his country. No one needs to tell the American people the rich heritage which he left to this great Republic because of his devoted and patriotic public service. I admired him not only as a close personal friend, but because he was a fine Christian gentleman. He was among the foremost of the lay leaders of the church he served so well. He was a great Governor of the State of South Carolina. Prior to that he served his country with distinction as a soldier in World War I.

South Carolina and the Nation have lost a magnificent public servant. The vacant chair which he left in the United States Senate will always remain a challenge to those who follow in his footsteps.

As I say farewell to this great man, whom I know God has taken into His loving hands, I am confident He is watching over us every day. He asked us first, last, and always to be Americans, regardless of political affiliations.

In my opinion—and this conviction I shall hold as long as I shall live—Senator MAYBANK is not dead. He is just away.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the death of BURNET R. MAYBANK, late a Senator from South Carolina, removed from the Senate one of the most colorful and lovable personages who have been Senators during the period of my acquaintance with Members of the Senate. I met Senator MAYBANK in July 1941, when we were serving as Governors of our respective States, during our attendance at the National Governors' Conference in Boston, Mass., where we were the guests of the then Governor of Massachusetts, now the distinguished senior Senator from that Commonwealth, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Mrs. Holland and I were delighted to know Governor and Mrs. Maybank, who had with them one of their lovely daughters, Roberta. The friendship between our two families has grown ever warmer since that date, 14 years ago. Senator MAYBANK and I quickly discovered that we were members of the same college fraternity, in which both of us continued to take an active interest, which made for an added strong bond between us.

Senator MAYBANK was already serving as senior Senator from his State, with quite important assignments, when I came to the Senate, and he found frequent occasions to assist me in various friendly ways, especially during my early months and years in the Senate. I shall always gratefully remember that consideration. He had a contagious sense of humor, which frequently evidenced itself at otherwise serious moments in such a way as to lighten the burden of all Senators and preserve and enhance the kindly personal relations among all of us, which were to him a matter of course, and to which he obviously attached very great importance. I do not know any Senator who had more friends in the Senate, or whose friends found warmer pleasure in the opportunity to do things for him and for causes which were dear to him.

I am completely satisfied that his interest in the housing problems of citizens of modest income played a very great part in the passage of important legislation in that field, which was handled by the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which he served for many years so effectively, either as its chairman or as ranking minority member.

He had served with distinction as mayor of Charleston during a large part of the depression, and I remember that he found great satisfaction in the knowledge that he had been able, during those difficult days, to secure the construction of badly needed public housing for some of his humbler fellow citizens. He was proud that much of this housing had been secured through local financing rather than by Federal assistance.

One of his fields of greatest service was the cotton industry, including in his active interest, as he did, the problems of the growers and all other groups in that great industry. It is my recollection that he told me that his people had been exporters of cotton from Charleston for over three generations, and his family have been cotton planters for at least that long.

I believe he was the first and only citizen of Charleston to be elected Governor of his State since the War Between the States. I know that he was recognized by his fellow citizens as the very personification of the spirit and traditions of historic Charleston, which has played such an important part in the shaping of the growth and life of our Nation throughout all the years of our history.

He was particularly active and effective in attending to his important duties as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, on which he rendered outstanding service to our entire Nation.

We had the pleasure of visiting him and his family at their beautiful and well-loved summer home at Flat Rock, N. C., which was established by his grandfather in his search for restored health and strength at the end of the War Between the States.

Senator MAYBANK was deeply imbued with the traditions of his family, his city, his State, and his beloved Southland, but, in addition and above all, he was a truly great and loyal American who served his country well and played a large part in helping to build national unity and national strength.

It was an inspiration to know BURNET MAYBANK and to come within the influence of his hospitable, good-humored, friendly, and always lovable personality. The vast concourse of his fellow citizens who attended the funeral obsequies at historic Charleston last September—people of high and low estate whose deep personal affection for BURNET MAYBANK showed clearly in their grief-stricken faces—spoke eloquently of the tender place which he held in their hearts—and those of us who could be present came away with the fullest possible impression that his loss was a tragic personal blow to his neighbors who knew him best.

His passing was a great loss to his State and to his Nation. I miss him greatly, both personally and officially. Mrs. Holland and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Maybank and the children, who, in their great sorrow, have every right to be exceedingly proud of the splendid heritage which he left to them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to each of us during our lives come times when we must perform certain duties which are most painful to us. One such occasion faces me today when the Senate is paying its respects to the memory of my very good friend and colleague, the late BURNET RHETT MAYBANK.

I first met BURNET MAYBANK when he served as mayor of his home city, Charleston. My close personal friendship with him began in 1941, when he first came to the Senate. It ripened rapidly after he was appointed to the Committee on Appropriations, on December 15, 1941. During the years of close working association with him, my respect and affection for him grew until I came to regard him as a real friend in every sense of the word.

One of Senator MAYBANK's outstanding characteristics was his profound sense of duty to the Nation and to the great State of South Carolina, which he in part so ably represented. Despite the increased responsibilities which came to him, he was ever willing to devote himself and his time to the duties which he shouldered so effectively. He gave himself unstintingly to the role of chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, yet he worked just as hard and just as effectively on the Senate Appropriations Committee. In 1949 and 1950, he was chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee, and in 1951 and 1952 he carried on the arduous tasks of the chairmanship of the Independent Offices Subcommittee. It was then that I first saw the type of work he did and the kind of leadership he rendered.

In so many ways, BURNET MAYBANK typified the essential qualities of a gentleman in high places. That is unusual in any man. At all times, even in the very heat of debate—and he was a good

debater and he liked debate—he was always courteous and willing to listen to both sides of the question. He never compromised with his conscience, but he was always willing to cooperate if possible. He was a determined and courageous fighter, but he never took unfair advantage of an opponent.

He worked hard, but his own accomplishments and his unfailing sense of good humor invariably lightened the tasks of his colleagues. Above all, to my mind, it was his inborn sincerity and decency which instilled in all of us a deep sense of respect.

BURNET MAYBANK's untimely death has removed from our ranks a stalwart who will be hard to replace. However, his record and the principles he stood for will remain always to guide us throughout the future. We miss him, and in this hour our thoughts are with his loved ones, to whom we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the late Senator BURNET MAYBANK was one of the first Members of the United States Senate I met when I came here 10 years ago this month.

He was an easy person to meet. Like all great men, he was an easy person to talk to. He was kindly and likable. He was a very able Senator, and few, if any, Members of the Senate today have their names attached to more important legislation than the late Senator BURNET MAYBANK.

He was one of the best friends agriculture ever had. Senator MAYBANK believed in the cause of the farmers and never missed an opportunity to try to help them.

Senator MAYBANK made a great many friends, largely because of his kindly and sincere manner. He was an honest man and an honorable Senator. The United States Senate has lost a very able Member, and all of us a most cherished friend.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I first met the late lamented BURNET RHETT MAYBANK in Savannah, Ga., when we were both very young men. I cannot recall the exact year. It must have been about the year 1926, because I remember he told me then that he was a candidate for a place on the aldermanic board of his home city, historic Charleston, S. C. The year, the month or the day do not come to mind now, but I remember the occasion very well.

It is rarely that a person meets a man for the first time and then has a feeling that he has known him always. I have met only 2 or 3 people, as I recall, about whom I had such a feeling. I felt that BURNET MAYBANK and I understood each other completely the first time we met, when we were very young men. We were from neighboring States. I, therefore, had brief contacts with him from time to time as he pursued his career in South Carolina and I pursued mine in the State of Georgia.

I remember well when a large number of Members of the Congress and the Vice President of the United States visited the city of Charleston on the occasion of what I believe was called an azalea festival when BURNET MAYBANK was mayor of the city of Charleston. He was always a gracious man, and he was a most gracious host at that time. The Members of the Congress who were in the group presented him with a piece of silver as a token of their appreciation of the wonderful hospitality which was extended to us. It was my high privilege then, Mr. President, to be asked to make the brief presentation speech when a silver platter was given to the mayor of the city of Charleston. I do not recall what I said, but I do remember that I predicted then that the low country of South Carolina would again provide the State with a Governor, and that he would be BURNET MAYBANK. I also expressed the hope that I would meet with him in the Senate, and voiced the belief that I would serve with him if I were able to remain in the Senate long enough.

For several years we served together in this body, and the friendship which was already fast became as intimate and close as any friendship that can exist between men. It was one of the finest frinedships I have ever known. I came to love him as Jonathan loved David, and I know from countless acts rather than from words that he was my devoted friend. I could never find words to express my feelings regarding our companionship and relationship in this body.

BURNET MAYBANK was a remarkable man, Mr. President. He came of an old and aristocratic family. He was a gentleman to the manner born. But over and beyond that, BURNET MAYBANK was a gentleman by instinct. It was not necessary for him to point to his heritage, because within himself he had every instinct of gentility and of a real man. He was both an aristocrat and a democrat. I refer not only to his party affiliations, but to his relations with the people among whom he lived and whom he served in this body. I have never known a man who more completely held and kept the common touch than did BURNET MAYBANK.

He had a fine aptitude and a natural capacity for public service. From a local leader he became a State leader. At the time of his untimely passing, when the hand of death was laid upon him, he was recognized as a great national leader. In every position in which he ever served in a public capacity, as alderman, as mayor, as governor of the great State of South Carolina, and as a Senator of the United States, he demonstrated a prodigious capacity for work.

I have served in legislative bodies, Mr. President, for 33 years, for 10 years as a member of my State Assembly, and for 23 years in this body. I have served with hundreds of men in legislative work, but I have never known a more conscientious man or one who was more consecrated to the public service than was BURNET MAYBANK. He had every attribute of real greatness. He had all the hallmarks we look for when we undertake to define and to describe a real man.

He was tolerant. He could differ with others widely and vigorously, not only in the Senate, but in his local political relations within his State, but he did so without bitterness. I never heard him make bitter statements about any of those who ever opposed him in a political campaign or on the floor of the Senate in debate.

He was a courageous man. He had the personal courage of a man who reacts to personal dangers. He had the kind of courage that permitted him to stand by the side of a friend when all others had left, and he had the kind of courage of conviction in political matters which, for lack of a better definition, we call intellectual honesty.

In all his relations with his family and in his personal relations with his friends he was as gentle as a woman, but in defending the things in which he believed he was as brave as a Numidian lion. He had real character. He was loyal to his friends, to his State, to his Nation, and to the Senate as a great legislative body. He understood the Senate of the United States. He had genuine character. There is no higher tribute to be paid any man, in my opinion, Mr. President, than to say he was incapable of little thoughts or petty acts.

He was greatly beloved on both sides of the aisle. I believe every Member of the Senate of the United States with whom he served over a period of almost 14 years had a real affection for him.

Mr. President, I sorrow with the people of South Carolina. They have lost one who stands high in the galaxy of great statesmen whom, from its infancy, they have given this country and who have contributed so notably to its upbuilding and progress. I grieve with his personal friends and with the members of his family. I grieve with them in the passing of one whom I deeply loved. It is difficult to realize that I cannot look down to his seat and see him there. I hear at times the echo of the voice which we all knew so well. I can only say I shall miss him and that the Senate of the United States will never be the same to me without the presence of BURNET MAYBANK.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, when the sad tidings came that Senator MAYBANK had answered the last summons, North Carolina sorrowed with her sister State, South Carolina, in the irreparable loss suffered by her and the Nation. It was altogether natural that this should be so. I do not believe there are any two States in the Union which feel more close to each other than do North Carolina and South Carolina. There are many historic ties between these two sister States. They have stood together in times which tried men's souls. The people of the two States are bound together by personal ties as numerous as the sands of the sea. Moreover, BURNET MAYBANK was, in a sense, an adopted son of North Carolina, because he loved to spend his vacations in his summer home in the beautiful mountains of Henderson County, in my State.

While I did not have an opportunity to know BURNET MAYBANK well until I came to the Senate last June, I had followed his career in the service of his State and the Nation throughout the years with increasing admiration. I was deeply impressed, during the time I sat in the Senate with him, by three qualities which he displayed in a striking manner: The intellectual integrity which he brought to bear upon the problems

which confronted him as a Senator; the great devotion which he manifested to the causes in which he believed; and the unsurpassed friendliness with which he treated those who had the privilege of coming into contact with him.

Since BURNET MAYBANK has taken his departure from this historic Chamber, we who were permitted to enjoy the good fortune of sitting beside him can appreciate, with increased poignancy, the words of the ancient Persian poet:

For some we loved—the loveliest and the best,
That from his vintage rolling time hath prest,
Have drunk their cup a round or two before,
And one by one crept silently to rest.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve with BURNET MAYBANK during the entire period of his service in the United States Senate.

I was in the first year of my first term when Senator MAYBANK, then a young man of 42, was first elected to the Senate to fill the unexpired term of James F. Byrnes. When Senator MAYBANK entered upon his senatorial duties, he had already made a distinguished record of public service as mayor of his native Charleston and as Governor of South Carolina, and he brought to the Senate an ability, a capacity for work, and a devotion to principle which never faltered.

I first met Senator MAYBANK before he came to the Senate, while he was serving as Governor, when I attended the funeral of Judge Alva Moore Lumpkin, whom Governor Maybank had appointed to fill the unexpired term of Senator Byrnes, but who died shortly after he took his place in the Senate.

During the 1940's, before the reorganization of the committee structure of the Congress, I served with Senator MAYBANK on the old Senate Committee on Mines and Mining and on the Committee on Military Affairs, and there I came to know him intimately. Later we served together for a time on the Committee on Armed Services, and from 1949 until his death we served together on the Committee on Appropriations.

Senator MAYBANK was a public servant in the tradition of Jefferson. He shared Jefferson's belief in the wisdom of the people, and like Jefferson he reposed particular confidence in the wisdom of the American farmer. Jefferson's remark that "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people, whose breasts he has made his peculiar deposit for substantial virtue," was echoed by Senator MAYBANK on the floor of the Senate 2 weeks before his death, when he said in debate on the farm bill:

The farmer does more thinking than the city folks, who are continually going to the moving-picture theaters or somewhere else. The farmer stays home and thinks, until election day.

It was my privilege also to sit beside Senator MAYBANK in the Chamber for a great many years. While on occasions we may have disagreed, he was always absolutely honest with me, as I tried to be honest with him. For that reason, I had sincere respect and regard for him. BURNET MAYBANK was more like a brother to me than he was a Senator. His passing leaves a void in my life in the Senate. For that reason, it can be understood how deeply I feel about his death.

Senator MAYBANK himself had in full measure the wisdom and the virtue which he saw in agrarian democracy. The Senate of the United States is smaller without BURNET MAYBANK. The State of South Carolina has suffered a severe loss by his death.

We who associated with Senator MAYBANK shall treasure, as will his family, our feeling of trust and confidence in him.

While BURNET MAYBANK might have felt differently than I did on various questions, he always understood my feelings, and was always completely honest. That is a virtue which, in my humble opinion, makes of a man a true representative of his people as well as a sincere Member of this body.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is strange how sometimes casual, isolated episodes weave themselves into a fabric of thought or human conduct. Last night after retiring I turned on a bedside radio, as is my custom, and found myself listening to the Bing Crosby program. Instead of the usual musical selections, the program consisted of a discussion of 2 new biographies, 1 of Sir Walter Scott, and 1 of Alexander Dumas. Very interesting commentaries were given with respect to both men.

My thoughts returned to 2 visits to Scotland which I have made in recent years, to 2 drives from Edinburgh to Abbotsford, which was the home of Sir Walter Scott, and to 2 trips from his home to Melrose Abbey, where his remains now lie. I was told that over that road for years it was Sir Walter Scott's habit to drive a span of horses, and that when he reached a certain hillside or highland upon the road he always stopped to look at a very beautiful scene which to him never grew stale.

The same horses which had drawn him for years over that highway drew his hearse from Abbotsford to Melrose Abbey; and when they reached the identical spot on that Scotland highway, the horses stopped as if to give Sir Walter another chance to have a final view of the scene which he loved.

Today our legislative carriage pauses. The team that draws us on the journey which will finally terminate at some Melrose Abbey stops as if to give BURNET MAYBANK another chance to view the scene in which he worked and which he loved.

It is difficult to speak of the friendship that existed between Senator MAYBANK and me. We served for many years on the Committee on Banking and Currency. Because of the illness of Senator Wagner, who was chairman, it fell to my lot to be acting chairman of the committee for many years during Senator MAYBANK's service upon the committee. During that time and that service, and partly, perhaps, because he had married an outstanding Kentuckian who was socially and politically connected with the history of my State, we formed a very close and abiding personal friendship, and I contracted for him at that time a profound admiration, not only for his ability and for his industry but for his deep understanding.

Later he became the chairman of the committee, and was chairman of it for a good many years while I presided over this distinguished body. I often said then what I repeat today—that he was one of the ablest and most efficient chairmen of any committee who ever served in the United States Senate.

He had all the qualities which have been so eloquently described in the Senate today. He could walk with kings and never lose the common touch. He could walk with men in the common walks of life and never lose his appreciation of the value and the contribution of those who occupied a lower stratum of human society.

It seems really a pity that men of such charm, personality, ability, devotion, and affection should die at any time, but particularly that they should die in the prime of life.

So I utter these few words in honor of a great Senator, a great South Carolinian, but even beyond and above that, a great American, which term has become sort of hackneyed, but which, in the case of BURNET MAYBANK, fulfills all the implications that such a description may have in application to a human being.

As I have come back to the Senate, I miss many of my former colleagues, but none more greatly and more grievously than two whom I shall mention, Clyde Hoey, of North Carolina, on whose behalf I understand memorial services have already been held, and BURNET MAYBANK, of South Carolina. As long as I shall live I shall cherish the memory of those two great American statesmen and two warm, fine friends, and I hope that today, like Sir Walter Scott, on the way from Abbottsford to Melrose Abbey, as the spirit of BURNET MAYBANK looks down from the battlements of heaven, he may catch a hallowed view of the scene where he worked and which he loved.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, through the relentless passage of time, we in this Chamber have witnessed the departure of a number of distinguished and able colleagues. It may be truly said that most, if not all, of these men have been taken from us at a time when their ability and capable guidance of national and international affairs could ill-afford to be lost. Most assuredly was this true of our late associate from South Carolina.

I had the privilege of counting Senator MAYBANK as one of my close personal friends. We served together on the Committee on Banking and Currency for 6 years, during 4 of which he held the position of chairman. I am sure that no one who was a member of that committee or who appeared before it during the chairmanship of Senator MAYBANK would fail to acknowledge the complete fairness and impartiality with which he administered the functions of the committee. It was always an interesting, stimulating, and pleasant experience to observe Senator MAYBANK in the role of presiding officer at committee sessions.

His colorful personality is remembered with affection by all who knew him.

In addition to our association in the Senate, I have had the opportunity of visiting Senator MAYBANK's great State of South Carolina on several occasions in company with him on committee assignments. It was notably obvious that the people of Charleston, and, for that matter, of all parts of the State, were genuinely and sincerely fond of the man who had served them with such boundless enthusiasm and energy as mayor of his home town, as Governor and as a leading Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, while I should like to say many things at this time, I do not believe that words can compensate for the loss which this body has sustained as a result of Senator MAYBANK's death.

I should merely like to add that the recollection of our work together over a period of 6 years will ever be remembered by me as one of the most rewarding experiences of my life.

To the Senator's family and to the young men from South Carolina whom he brought here for his personal staff and for his committees, I again extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was my privilege first to meet Senator BURNET MAYBANK when I came into Government service some 10 years ago. At that time I knew very little about the operations of the Government. Senator MAYBANK, a Member of this great body was the one to whom I reported with respect to the operations of the Surplus Property Board. Almost immediately I came to know him as a truly outstanding and patriotic American. In the following years of our friendship he never once said anything that was little; he never once committed a small act.

I had the honor over the years to get to know him better, and also his gracious and lovely lady. I visited in South Carolina with him, and he did me the honor to visit me in Missouri.

The more I saw BURNET MAYBANK, the more I listened to him, the more I understood him, the more I felt in my own mind and heart how great this legislative body must be to produce men of his caliber, and how honored it must be to have him as a Member.

He has left us now. To me the Senate will never be the same without his blessed character and personality. I loved him and respected him.

To his wonderful wife, and to his fine children, I express my deepest sympathy, and I also express the same sympathy to his great State.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

Whether at Naishapur or Babylon,
Whether the cup with sweet or bitter run,
The wine of life keeps oozing drop by drop,
The leaves of life keep falling one by one.

Another cherished leaf has fallen from the Senate's ceaselessly changing tree of life. Once more the senatorial silver cord has been loosed, the golden bowl broken, and the pitcher broken at the fountain and the mourners go about the streets. In the Senate we weep for the beloved departed BURNET MAYBANK as Rachel wept in Rama for her children and would not be comforted because they were not.

Senator MAYBANK was a masterful debater, an outstanding statesman, and a distinguished public official who knew no dictator but his conscience, no guide but his judgment, and no purpose but to serve his State, his country, and his God. While he was on the pinnacle of political and official fame, in the prime of mature manhood, while every breeze was bringing him promises of a long continuation of his boundless service and brilliant success, he was abruptly summoned from a home of comfort, culture, and love to that mysterious realm from whose bourn no traveler ever returns. Without a protest, a murmur, or a moan, he passed from the restless land of the living into the silent land of the dead.

He was a veteran of the First World War. He was successively an alderman of Charleston, and the mayor, chairman of South Carolina's Public Service Authority, and Governor of South Carolina. He received important appointments from both President Roosevelt and President Truman. In 1941 he was elected United States Senator to complete an unexpired term, and was reelected to the Senate in 1942 and again in 1948.

Political history attests, and the people of South Carolina, by recorded vote, repeatedly proclaimed that BURNET MAYBANK was a preeminent patriot of spotless character and stainless reputation, and that he was a worthy successor of such famous South Carolinians as John C. Calhoun, Wade Hampton, and Robert Y. Hayne.

He symbolized the fortitude, glamor, and glory of the Old South. He typified the progress, goodness, and greatness of the South that is new.

In the Senate none knew "Burnie" but to love him, none named him but to praise. It seems but yesterday that he was with us, endowed with joyous life and peace and sweet content. It seems but an hour ago that our hearts were thrilled with the eloquence of his words and the logic of his argumentation. But now we call his name in vain. From his lips an answer never more will come. And in the hush that pervades the sanctuary of our dead, we realize that this beloved, faithful friend has sailed that surging, sad, and solemn sea which separates the narrow shores of time from the boundless kingdom of eternity. He has passed the limits of earthly vision. His shadowy form cannot be seen through the illusions of love, the telescopes of science, or the tears of grief.

On occasions such as this we are haunted by the demon of skepticism and despair, and we ask anew the world-old question propounded by the man of Uz, "If a man die, shall he live again?" But unlike the afflicted patriarch, we seek no refuge either in silence or submission. We simply turn from this perplexing question of the Old Testament to find it answered in the New by Him who came 15 centuries after Job, and said: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."

Thanks to the hallowed hope that springs eternal in the Christian breast, we believe that the separation from our beloved one is but for a night, and that joy cometh in the morning. A divinity within whispers with still small voice in the listening ear of love: "The grave is not the end of all."

While our hearts are filled with grief and our eyes are dimmed with tears, thoughts of the last bitter hour come like a blight over our spirits; but even now, when earthly help and sympathy seem vain, we look beyond the cloud that hangs above us like a pall, and there, through faith, we see the star of hope still shining on. In the lustrous light of that constant star, we read the assuring promise of the Saviour of the world: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." In this promise we put our trust. While dogmas perish and creeds crumble, while agnosticism decays and atheism dies, we shall continue to lean upon the everlasting arm, believing that the twilight here is but the dawn of a grander day upon some other shore; believing that the feeble flame that flickers here for a little while will at last leap into a bright and shining light when the spirit of man has winged its flight back to Him that gave it birth. God pity the man who doubts the existence of another life in another land—

Who hopeless lays his dead away,
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play;
Who hath not learned in hours of faith
The truth, to flesh and sense unknown,
That life is ever Lord of Death,
And love can never lose its own.

Fortunately for us, an unbeliever such as this, if such there be, is not with those who mourn with us today.

No one knows, nor would it be well to know, what takes place between the great Creator and His created in the last sad moment of life on earth. But we do know beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the dying thief, while suffering on the cross, received absolution from his sins and was promised a triumphant entrance into Paradise with the Saviour of the world.

It is our fervent hope and belief that the same unfailing mercy, the same loving kindness and the same boundless charity that gave to the malefactor a heritage in that house not made with hands, have been extended to Senator MAYBANK, and that he has been joyously admitted into the kingdom of Heaven. Let us—

No farther seek his merits to disclose,
Or draw his frailties from their dread abode,
(There they alike in trembling hope repose)
The bosom of his Father, and his God.

From this memorial exercise, the living should learn anew a lesson that is as old as sacred history. The lesson is this: "It is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting; for that is the end of all men; and the living will lay it to his heart."

While we are busily engaged in weaving our names into the tapestry of private fortune and public fame, and while we are eagerly endeavoring to lay up for ourselves treasures upon earth, let us also make timely preparation

for the coming of that inevitable hour in which every man must surrender his own soul. May we not be unmindful of the fact that death, "with icy hand that never tires and sickle keen that never turns its edge," comes nearer and nearer to everyone with every fleeting breath; that it comes indifferently "as a thief in the dead of night or as a royal guest at the blaze of noon." Let us bear this well in mind, not that our days may be consumed with impotent grief or our lives shrouded with dispiriting gloom, but rather that we may be up and doing while opportunity's sun still shines, for the night cometh soon when no man can work. Henceforth let us labor in the Master's vineyard, with renewed energy and increasing zeal. With abiding faith that everything in this vast universe was designed by an Unerring Architect for some ultimate good, and that all who seriously strive shall eventually wear perfection's starry crown, let us emulate the illustrious "BURNIE" MAYBANK'S shining example by going forth with hope in our hearts and courage in our breasts to fight the good fight, to finish our course and unqualifiedly keep the faith. And

When Earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and, faith, we shall need it—lie down for an aeon or two
Till the Master of All Good Painters shall set us to work anew!

And those that were good shall be happy; they shall sit in a golden chair;
They shall splash at a ten-league canvas with brushes of comets' hair;
They shall find real saints to draw from—Magdalene, Peter, and Paul;
They shall work for an age at a sitting and never be tired at all!

And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the doing, and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the Thing as he sees It for the God of Things as They Are!

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas did not know BURNIE MAYBANK either as long or as intimately as did other Senators who have spoken today in tribute to his memory. However, in the short period of 2 years as his colleague I found him to be a distinguished statesman, a Christian gentleman, and a true friend.

In 1953 Senator MAYBANK was one of the first Members of this body to welcome me as a freshman Senator. He made it a point to be present during my maiden speech, and in this and in many other ways he indicated his friendly interest in this new Member of the Senate.

On St. Patrick's Day in 1953 Senator MAYBANK invited me to speak at the annual banquet of the Hibernian Society in his home city of Charleston. It was there, in his home city, that I saw at firsthand the love of this man not only for the Irish, but for all his fellow men. It was there, as his guest, that I observed at firsthand the deep love of this distinguished statesman for his wonderful family, his beloved city, and his native State.

Above all, Mr. President, it was there, in Charleston, that I saw at first hand the love and esteem which the people of South Carolina held for BURNIE MAYBANK. Only they and his family loved and respected him more than did we, his colleagues in the Senate.

The privilege of knowing BURNIE MAYBANK is one of the rich rewards which have come to me as a Member of the United States Senate. I join my colleagues in this tribute, and in heartfelt sympathy for his family and for the people of South Carolina.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last summer the Senate lost one of its most useful, most respected, and most beloved Members, Senator BURNET MAYBANK, of South Carolina. I am very proud of the privilege of joining in this heartfelt tribute to a great Senator and a great American.

I was honored by Senator MAYBANK'S friendship for more than 15 years. I met him first in Albany in 1939, when he and his family attended the governors' conference, held that year in New York State. His children were about the age of some of my children, so we had the pleasure and privilege of seeing a great deal of the family during their stay in Albany.

When I came to Washington 6 years ago he was one of the first to greet me and to offer his assistance. His encouragement and help were invaluable. I shall always be deeply grateful to him.

I can vouch for the fact that he was one of the hardest-working men in the Senate. Throughout the time of my service here my offices were across the hall from his. I saw him in operation. I know the long hours he worked. I can testify to the fact that night after night the lights in his office shone until well toward morning.

I had the privilege of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee with him for several years. I came to respect deeply his expert knowledge and interest in housing, and in the many other activities of that very important committee.

I shall not talk about his accomplishments in politics in his own State or in the Senate. I would rather say a few words about my estimate of BURNET MAYBANK as a person. There is no question that he was a man of rigid and unbending integrity and character, and of complete sincerity. We always knew where BURNET MAYBANK stood on any important issue. He never hesitated for a moment to express himself frankly and forcefully upon issues that affected his State or the Nation, and to fight for the principles to which he was devoted. He was completely frank and honest in his estimate of people. He was either for you or against you; and yet I do not believe that he ever deliberately sought to hurt or punish anyone in the world. He was always punctilious, fair, and courteous in his relationships, just, and without rancor.

He was an impulsive man, and a very friendly man. My estimate of him was that he was also a very shy and sensitive man. He gave his respect and his affection to many people, but only when he thought they were worthy of his trust. Above all things, no man I have ever known was motivated by a fiercer devotion to his State and to his Nation than was BURNET MAYBANK.

He is greatly missed in the Senate, and we shall remember him for the rest of our lives. I have the deepest sympathy for his devoted family, to whom he meant so much. We in the Senate have lost a real friend—friend for whom we had deep affection—and the Senate as a whole has lost one of its most valuable and most beloved Members. The country has lost a devoted and loyal public servant.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in paying tribute to the memory of our late colleague, Senator BURNET RHETT MAYBANK, of South Carolina, each one of us understands the inadequacy of words in praising the life of a great and good man. The divine secret of life and death will be forever wordless.

When I became a Member of the Senate and made the acquaintance of Senator MAYBANK, from the very outset of our association I found him to be considerate, kind, and fair in all his dealings with his fellow Senators. Always he was fair and highly professional in his relationship with Senators with whom he found himself in disagreement on an issue. He made a memorable record in the United States Senate for his State and for all America.

Especially am I grateful to Senator MAYBANK for his understanding and cooperative attitude in dealing with the problems of the Pacific Northwest. His interest in the maximum development of our national resources was not confined to his native South Carolina, but reached out to all other areas of the Nation. He once said, "No government ever went broke developing for the people their own resources."

Senator MAYBANK was a devout believer in human values, as well as in property values. At the outset of his political career he resisted the lure to join the swelling stream of able young southerners seeking fortune in other sections of the country. In 1937 he refused a Presidential appointment to the Federal Power Commission. He preferred the uncertainty of a gubernatorial race. All his life he placed a high premium on human needs. There is no doubt in my mind that his untimely death on September 1, 1954, was hastened by his untiring devotion to his Nation's needs.

To his wonderful family I extend my sincere sympathy. I pray they may find some comfort in the fact that his public record will remain a living memorial.

The State of South Carolina, the United States Senate, and all America have lost a dedicated servant.

Thanks be to God that such men have been
Although they are no more.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the moving eulogies being paid to the memory and the public service of our beloved friend, Senator BURNET MAYBANK, are but a continuing testimonial to the private feelings of fellowship and friendship and affection that each of us has felt throughout the years for this wonderful man.

I wish the family of Senator MAYBANK to know that what has been said on the

floor of the Senate during the past few hours is but a continuation of the kind and sincere expressions of individual Members of the Senate throughout the years.

Senator MAYBANK made a distinguished record of public service which was noteworthy for devotion to his country and to the people whom he so brilliantly and ably represented.

It is always fitting and proper to note that in the life of Senator MAYBANK there was a kind of awareness of the vital needs of the people, not only of his own State, but of the Nation as a whole.

We have heard references to Senator MAYBANK'S devoted patriotism; but his patriotism went far beyond what is generally described as patriotic devotion. His was the patriotism of good works.

No citizen of this Nation should be unmindful of the splendid work and achievements of Senator MAYBANK in the field of housing—not only housing for those who were more fortunate, but a shelter and home for those who were less fortunate. This beloved friend of ours was interested in "the least of these." He worked in their behalf. Senator MAYBANK was a friend of the farmer—the small farmer, the family farmer. He was the friend of the kind of agriculture in this country that builds for a strong society, both morally and economically. His record of achievement in the Senate in behalf of agriculture is second to none.

Nor can I forget Senator MAYBANK as one who was always willing to lend his energies and talents—and great they were—in the field of social welfare. He was interested in the infirmities which always plague mankind, and to the dedication of the resources of our country toward lifting those burdens.

I like to remember Senator MAYBANK by the affectionate term by which so many of us knew him—Burnie. I shall always remember the spontaneity of his activities and of his bodily motions in the Chamber. It will never seem quite the same not to have him rise, with hand uplifted, and address the Chair.

Senator MAYBANK was a friend to many of us who came here without many friends in the Senate. He was one of the first to extend the warm and generous hand of fellowship to a new Member. I like to think of him as a great giver. The greatest gift he gave to anyone was the privilege of his friendship.

Whether it was in the Chamber or in the cloakroom, or whether it was in the dining room or in the every-day activities of life, this man, Senator MAYBANK, was always the same. There was no assuming on his part, and there was no false pretense. He was a true blue, good man day in and day out.

I believe it is for those reasons, among many others, that he was held in the highest esteem by persons of all political persuasions throughout our great Nation.

Finally, I should like to comment upon the unusual qualities of human understanding that BURNIE MAYBANK possessed. He understood people. He understood their limitations and their great qualities. He had a way of being most tolerant and understanding of both their assets and liabilities. It was because of these wonderful attributes, one might say, that he was the kind of Senator that has made America a truly great and progressive country. He really felt the impulses of the people of the Nation, and he was able, in his own, inimitable fashion, to translate those impulses into legislative action.

That is a great achievement. Many people are brilliant, many have intellectual qualities, but only a few possess both brilliance and intellectualism, plus the human qualities which bring forth the positive and glorious achievements of program and of policy to which Congress is supposed to be dedicated.

I wish to join with my colleagues today in expressions of sympathy and condolence to the lovely family of our departed good friend. America is a better country because of "BURNIE" MAYBANK. The memory of his spirit and of his many fine achievements will abide with the Senate. There is an immortality of the soul and spirit, in which all of us believe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the spontaneous tributes which have been paid to Senator MAYBANK by so many Members of this body constitute a real indication of the deep affection in which he was held by everyone. I can imagine, however, that after 2½ hours of such tributes, the services may become somewhat painful to the members of the family of the Senator whom we loved so well, and, while I had hoped to pay verbal tribute to Senator MAYBANK, I shall content myself with asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

BURNET R. MAYBANK was one of the most lovable and warmhearted men whom it has ever been my privilege to know. When I first came to the Senate and was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee of which he was chairman, I must confess that I was at first slightly repelled by what seemed to be the sternness of his face and the surface formalism of his manner. As we worked together, however, I soon found that all this was largely a mask and that underneath it all, BURNIE MAYBANK had a deep and passionate concern for the underdog and wanted to help him in every way which he regarded as proper.

This came out clearly in the 1949 struggle to pass a slum-clearance and public-housing bill. Senator MAYBANK fought like a tiger to get this bill passed. He turned on his great personal charm, he buttonholed Senators, and he lobbied. We could never have passed the bill without him. While the struggle was at its height, I asked him what had caused him to take such a deep concern in the terrible problem of the slums. He told me about the Charleston slums and of epidemic diseases which had started there and of how a member of his own family who had gone into the slums to nurse the sick had caught the deadly disease and had died. "I determined then and there," he said, "to do my best to help wipe out the slums, and as Mayor of Charleston, I put through the first public-housing project in the country." BURNIE'S eyes glistened with moisture as he spoke. I lost my heart to him right then and there and we became fast friends.

Although one of the Charleston aristocracy—and what could possibly be more exclusive than that—BURNET MAYBANK was extraordinarily sensitive to the hardships which hard-pressed men and women of all races had to suffer and his great heart was always urging him on to help them.

There were certain other traits of his which we all cherish. Mathew Arnold once defined a gentleman as "one who never consciously inflicts pain." This was true of Burnie. He was always gentle in public speech, if explosive in manner, and he was always careful not to reflect on the character or motives of those with whom he differed. He set us all a good example in this, as in so many other respects.

One of Burnie's most endearing, if often puzzling characteristics, was his rapid and frequently unintelligible speech when he was stirred up on a matter of great importance. Northerners find the Charleston accent difficult enough to understand at best, but to this Burnie joined his training as a cotton broker where speech and action has to be rapid. The result was that his sentences would pour out in a perfect Niagara of speech. I, at least, could barely understand a word, but I could guess how much he cared about the topic by the tones of his voice and by the frequency with which he would raise and wave his forefinger. It was therefore always very endearing, exciting, and stimulating to hear him speak.

But underneath all his manner, at times formal and at other times lovably boyish, was a keen and cool mind. He knew what forces were at work on any given issue and he could appraise the relative strength of every position, both logically and politically. He knew how to get people to help him and the causes in which he was interested, for it was difficult to deny him anything, and he was a master political strategist and tactician.

But most of all he was our beloved friend, warmhearted, generous, and kind. We loved him and we grieve for his loss. We extend our sympathy to his wife, his son, his daughters, and his family whom he loved. It is hard to lose him in the full strength and vigor of his career, but it was inspiring to have had him as a noble and highly useful citizen and friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to identify myself with those who have paid such glowing tributes to my dear friend, Senator MAYBANK. I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate for 10 years, and during nearly all that time Burnie was one of my dearest friends. I wish to express on this occasion the deep affection I had for him as a man and the respect in which I held him as a statesman. As I look back over my contacts with him—and they were not so many as were those of some of my colleagues, because I did not have the privilege of serving on any committee with him—one or two thoughts stand out. One is that BURNIE MAYBANK expressed his love for his fellow men. There was not a Senator who did not feel the personal affection of BURNIE MAYBANK. As members of opposite political parties, we frequently were on different sides in debate, but no political differences ever lessened Burnie's love of his fellow men. We can never forget him. It is because he had that affection for others that we are hearing these wonderful tributes to the man whom everyone loved. He was a symbol of something which those coming from his State can understand. He represented the high civilization of America as expressed in the Deep South.

In the city of Charleston, where I have visited many times, I feel there is something which BURNIE MAYBANK symbolized to the *n*th degree. He represented and symbolized the area from which he came. He was a great credit to his State and to the Nation.

I merely wish to add that Mrs. Smith, who is devoted to his family, joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife and his children at this time, but we rejoice with them in the career of this great and outstanding American who lived what he represented.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, coming from North Carolina, I wish to speak of a name which has been in the memories of the people of the Carolinas for several generations. Having been in public life for some 30-odd years and having served as the head of a farm organization dealing with many people in South Carolina, I can say that the name and the achievements of the man whom we honor today have always been held in the very highest esteem. When, for several years, I worked with the Federal land bank, with headquarters at Columbia, I learned the truth of the statement made here a few moments ago, that in order really to know a man one should talk with those who have worked with him in various capacities. The name of MAYBANK has always been honored and regarded in the very highest degree.

While commissioner of agriculture of my State for 11 years I had occasion to work with another segment in South Carolina, and all my associates in that undertaking had profound respect for Senator MAYBANK.

We in North Carolina felt that we had an unusual distinction, in that we seemed to have 3 Senators from our State. Senator MAYBANK'S second home was in North Carolina. It was also the second home of his father. He had his second home in the Land of the Sky, amid beautiful surroundings. In the Land of the Sky we knew Senator MAYBANK as our third Senator.

On September 1 I attended the apple festival in the city of Hendersonville. It was a gala occasion. People came from all over the country to attend and take part in the exercises. There were many personal friends of BURNIE MAYBANK present. I happened to be in the audience when the news came that our distinguished third Senator had passed away. There was a complete hush throughout the audience. No one, for a moment, could say a word except "Is it so?" As we learned the truth and were shocked at what had happened, we knew that a tenant of the Almighty, "a workman who needeth not to be ashamed," had passed on.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the time I entered the Senate, I have had the great privilege and pleasure of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee under the leadership of our great colleague and great friend Senator MAYBANK. From January, 1947, for 2 years, the Republicans were in the majority, and, consequently, that committee had a Republican chairman. Senator Wagner, who was the ranking Democratic member, was kept away continuously because of illness. So it fell to Senator MAYBANK to serve in the capacity of ranking Democratic member. When the new Congress was organized, Senator MAYBANK became chairman of the committee, and I served under his chairmanship thereafter, with the exception of the 83d Congress, when again he served as the ranking minority member.

BURNIE MAYBANK, as chairman, appointed me to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That subcommittee perhaps had the heaviest load of any subcommittee of the full committee. It was in the days of rent control. The subcommittee were preparing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, which became law. We rewrote the law the following year. I can bear testimony to the finest cooperation and help from BURNIE MAYBANK, as chairman of the committee, that could possibly be extended, not only in the subcommittee, but also in the full committee and on the floor of the Senate. There were many controversial questions. The passage of the bill entailed a hard fight.

Something has been said about Burnie's characteristics on the floor of the Senate. I recall that many times during a hard fight on the floor, he would instantly pick up the ball, so to speak, and run with it. I remember his coming to members of the committee many times and saying, "We have this fight won. Let's vote."

I do not recall his ever guessing wrong. He knew. More often than not it was because the Members of the Senate had absolute confidence in him and in his leadership.

BURNIE MAYBANK was an outstanding Senator and a devoted friend. I was out of the country when he died. I remember that when I received the first report of his death, I simply could not believe it; it did not seem possible that a man in the prime of his life, so active, and so intensely interested in the very things which contribute to life, should be taken away. Great was my sadness when I realized the truth.

Senator MAYBANK was a devoted servant of the people of South Carolina and, indeed, of the people of the Nation as a whole. I mourn his passing, and I am proud to join with my colleagues in paying this brief word of tribute to the memory of so good a man.

I join with my colleagues also in extending my sympathy and condolences to the beloved members of Senator MAYBANK'S family.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] remained in the Chamber until a few minutes ago, when it was necessary for him to leave in order to keep a previous engagement. He had planned to make some remarks on this occasion.

He has asked me to obtain unanimous consent to have his remarks printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks prepared by Senator ROBERTSON were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

When I first learned of the death of Senator MAYBANK, I gave a brief statement to the press in which I characterized him as "one of the best beloved Members of the Senate—a statesman, a patriot, a lovely southern gentleman."

That statement was based on the close association which we had over a period of nearly 8 years during which the late Senator from South Carolina and I served together on both the Appropriations and the Banking and Currency Committees and had daily contacts. I also had the privilege of visiting him in his native State and saw for myself the regard in which he was held by the friends and neighbors whom he served.

The rule of "noblesse oblige" seldom has been better exemplified than in the career of BURNET RHETT MAYBANK. He was the descendant of a distinguished Member of this body—R. Barnwell Rhett—and of five Governors of South Carolina. He grew up in the atmosphere of Charleston where an aristocratic background meant not the right of personal privilege but a solemn obligation to reflect credit upon honored names and to preserve those principles of constitutional government for which his ancestors had stood.

Accepting the obligation of public service, our late colleague became an alderman in Charleston at the age of 28 and went on to be mayor of that city and then Governor of South Carolina at the age of 38. After 3 years in that office, he accepted appointment to the United States Senate and was twice thereafter elected to this body in which he served until the date of his untimely death.

The expert knowledge and sound judgment which made BURNET MAYBANK successful in the cotton business were not left behind when he started handling public rather than private funds. He is remembered as mayor of Charleston particularly because when he took office the city was in a bad financial condition and when he left office it was out of debt.

When he was elected to the higher offices which he later held he was sometimes spoken of as a friend of the businessman, because of his recognized knowledge of business affairs but it is significant that in his actions and decisions he made it clear that he represented all the people and not any limited group. Thus the Washington Post and Times Herald, in an editorial comment on his death, said the secret of his success was his ability to reconcile antagonistic forces in politics; that he was essentially a moderate and used his influence to harmonize conflicting interests.

His quality as a harmonizer was strikingly demonstrated by the fact that he never was defeated in any bid for public office and throughout his political career opposition to him steadily diminished to the point that he was without opposition in either major party for reelection to the Senate last year. This was the first time since popular election of Senators began in 1913 that South Carolina chose one of its representatives to sit in this body without making him meet the test of opposition.

Editorial writers, since his death, have commented on his integrity, his independence, and his personal charm. The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, which recognized him as the Member of the Senate who knew the most about cotton, publicly characterized his as a man of deep loyalty and devotion to friends and country, and one who had a keen awareness of the worth of the individual and an understanding of the need to provide a sound structure of government within which the individual might develop to the limit of his capabilities.

I personally concur in all of these statements and can only reiterate what I said at the time of his death—I feel as though I have lost a brother and share the grief over his passing which was so universal in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] also had hoped to be present on this occasion, and had prepared a statement about the late Senator MAYBANK. The Senator from Arkansas unfortunately has been delayed in his return to Washington, and has asked me to present his remarks for the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent therefore, that the statement prepared by the junior Senator from Arkansas be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement prepared by Mr. FULBRIGHT was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

The late Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK preceded me to the Senate by about 3 years. I had of course known of his political career in his native city of Charleston and in his State of South Carolina, dating back to 1927. This was a career, incidentally, which had never been marked by defeat.

I had not been in this body very long before I came to recognize in Senator MAYBANK the qualities which so endeared him to his State and which later brought him national recognition as one of the outstanding statesmen of his time. He and I became close friends and we were intimately associated while he served as chairman or ranking minority member, of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I was privileged to sit at his side through many, many hours of committee deliberations. As time passed I came more and more to admire him as a man and as a Senator.

While he was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, he was for several years a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. It would be difficult to imagine two more strenuous committee assignments than these. However, Senator MAYBANK carried this burden in good humor and without complaint. Throughout my many years of association with him I never knew him to shirk his duties or responsibilities. On the contrary he always met them cheerfully and sincerely welcomed them as opportunities for public service.

I relied on Senator MAYBANK to a great degree in the Banking and Currency Committee, always with the knowledge that his counsel would be given freely and openly and that his only motive would be his concept of the public welfare. I also relied upon him in many other problems which were common to our States, with the same degree of certainty that his counsel would be forthright and wise.

His death was a grievous shock to me. When I had seen him last he appeared to me to be in the prime of life, as full of vitality, good humor, and friendliness as any man could be. His political career had only recently been crowned by renomination without opposition in the Democratic primary of his State.

Senator MAYBANK'S death was a personal loss to me. I feel that my own life and my experience in the Senate were immeasurably enriched by reason of my association with him. His death also deprived the State of South Carolina, the South, and the Nation of one of its wisest and most unselfish leaders.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it has been an inspiration and a comfort to be present in the Senate to hear the beautiful tributes which have been paid to our late friend, and which, from my personal knowledge of the man, I know have been uttered with great sincerity and truthfulness.

I do not know of any Member who is missed more on the floor of the Senate than is our late colleague, BURNET MAYBANK. He is missed on the floor of the Chamber, in the committee rooms, at the luncheon table, at social functions, and in the cloakroom. We miss him for his fine qualities, which have already been so clearly enumerated today.

I remember that soon after I came to the Senate, someone pointed him out to me and said, "Senator MAYBANK can get a bill passed here perhaps easier than anyone else."

That statement impressed me, and I asked why.

I was told, "Even though Senator MAYBANK sometimes talks so fast that all that he says cannot be understood, we have such absolute confidence and faith in his high integrity, that we accept, on our personal faith in him, bills which he sponsors."

That was quite a complimentary statement. But observations in the Senate over several years taught me that it was exactly correct.

I was impressed by what the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] said with reference to a telegram Senator MAYBANK once sent to him: "If you want me or need me, I will come." That describes the man. It was not a question of need alone. If a friend simply wanted Senator MAYBANK to be here, that was enough. If one simply wanted Senator MAYBANK to respond, his response, was spontaneous; there was no argument or fuss about it. He was ready.

"If you want me or need me, I will come." I can think of no better tribute to Senator MAYBANK than those words, because they describe his ever ready friendly helpfulness.

He had all the instincts of a gentleman. He was one of the most delightful traveling companions I have ever known.

I wish to mention also that Senator MAYBANK was a man of outstanding ability. He always knew what was going on, and usually he was one step ahead of many of us in his thinking and in his solution of a problem.

To those to whom he gave his name, I wish to say that none have ever had a finer heritage, none have ever had more to live up to, than they do. May God guide them and sustain them in their efforts to do so. Such true greatness deserves worthy successors.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when our deceased brother was Governor of his State, it was my good fortune to visit him. I remember meeting him, as it were, under the pillars, and I recall what someone said about him: "There is a real southern gentleman."

I did not realize then that it would be only a year or two before he would be a Member of the Senate, but when he came, it was like meeting an old friend. Yet I had met him only that one time before he came to the Senate.

I concur in the many beautiful things which have been said about his life. He was a real southern gentleman. He possessed the virtue of honesty. He was friendly. He was straightforward. He was kindly. He was generous.

It was Edison, I believe, who said that genius is 99 percent work. Our deceased brother was a genius because he was a hard worker, and he loved the American way of life. He was not living in his yesteryears. He was aware of the changing world, and he knew of its challenges.

As one of his colleagues has said, Senator MAYBANK was a friend of the lowly. He was one who loved his fellowmen.

To me, Senator MAYBANK had a virtue which is lacking in many of us. He was cooperative and always ready to help.

We all feel a deep sympathy for those who seem to have lost him, but I say to them: You have not lost him. You cannot lose something real. He simply has gone ahead in the journey.

I feel certain that if Senator MAYBANK could speak now, he would say, "Carry on. I am all right. I am doing my job as I have always done it. Life was but a kindergarten. I learned there how to work and how to carry on."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator MAYBANK. I can say without qualification he was one of the finest men I have been privileged to serve with while in Congress.

When the news of Burnet's death reached me, I was in Indochina. I can say truthfully that the Americans in that part of the world, 10,000 miles away, were very much saddened by the passing of this great Senator and statesman from South Carolina.

His death in September of last year has left a vacant spot on Capitol Hill, which will be extremely difficult to fill.

Although my association with Senator MAYBANK in the Senate was of less than 2 years' duration, I knew him as an extremely capable, conscientious, and friendly man. He had a remarkable record of service to the Democratic Party, to his State, and to his Nation.

It is interesting to note that since his attaining office in 1927 he never once suffered a defeat.

He made outstanding records as mayor of Charleston, Governor of South Carolina, and chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

I know that the death of our friend, the late Senator BURNET MAYBANK, has deprived our Nation of a great Senator and a true gentleman. We shall miss him greatly. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be associated with the late BURNET MAYBANK as a colleague in the Senate and as a next-door neighbor.

BURNET MAYBANK brought to the Senate a wealth of talent and experience, gained as mayor of Charleston and as Governor of South Carolina. Upon his arrival in the United States Senate in 1941 he quickly made for himself an enviable reputation as a legislator through his great ability and his unflagging devotion to the interests of his State and Nation. I had the honor of serving under his chairmanship on the Committee on Banking and Currency shortly

after my admission to this body. I came to know of those many qualities which made BURNET MAYBANK so respected as an authority on monetary policy, housing, and related matters.

His vigorous leadership, his sound, clear thinking, and his devotion to duty as he saw it were always abundantly in evidence. His conduct on the floor of this body was exemplary. Never was there an occasion when his words were offensive or abusive of any of his colleagues. Time and again we saw him save the day to make possible the passage of legislation vital to the welfare of this Nation. He displayed that indispensable legislative requisite of the ability to find the honorable middle course upon which men of differing views could join for constructive achievement.

Millions of our people today enjoy better housing as a result of his farsighted efforts in the field of housing legislation during the years following World War 2. His other legislative accomplishments are too many to enumerate and discuss at this time. We knew him as a man of the highest integrity and honor, a man who gave sympathetic consideration to the problems of others, a man of deep convictions, and at all times a man of truth and loyalty.

BURNET MAYBANK was a kindly man. As his neighbor here in Washington, I have many vivid memories arising from his gentle qualities. I was often touched by his kindness and affection for my two small daughters. They thought of him as a true friend.

It was the combination of his many fine qualities that endeared BURNET MAYBANK to his colleagues in the Senate and to his many friends. I have often said and heard it said by others, that no Member of this body was more completely loved my all Members than BURNET MAYBANK. His State and the Nation at large suffered a grievous loss in his passing. It was a genuine honor to have been his friend.

I wish to extend my sympathy to his widow and his family.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, BURNET MAYBANK was a man devotion for whom came easily to all of us.

He was a fine public servant throughout a long career as United States Senator, and as a legislator and governor of his beloved State of South Carolina.

I think he would like to have us remember him in the words of the motto of his State—"Ready in Soul and Resource."

I never knew a man who was more ready always to start with diligence from where he stood to achieve his objective.

He was a man with the imagination of hope, not regret; a man with will and force and personality.

With an overriding capability to conceive goodness, he was a master of commonsense as a measure of that which was possible. His common sense was a composition of experience and vision. He used it for the practical interpretation of the facts and whims of human nature before him.

He was a fine mixture of faith and work, but he would make no compromise between doctrine and fantasy.

There was nothing about him or his personality that was sham or imitation. Everything he did was characterized by a deep respect for his fellowman, which, to him, meant preserving as much liberty as possible for those whose lives we share.

I shall always remember Senator MAYBANK as a man of personal merit and rare individual charm. And to me his association and company were always a source of warm pleasure.

He and I, Mr. President, were intimate and devoted friends. He had many other friends in this chamber. I treasured his friendship. I admired and loved him as a man.

He was a man of contagious cordiality, innocent mirth, and high resolution.

I mourn the loss of BURNET MAYBANK, and trust that the heritage of his spirit may remain with us undiminished.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today as a large number of Senators have spoken of our late beloved colleague, BURNET MAYBANK, of South Carolina, I have been thinking of the pleasure of association that we have all had in serving here with him.

Certainly his great achievements for agriculture, for social progress, for financial stability of our institutions have marked his official career with great distinction. The pride that his State has in his fine record is a distinction to them in recognizing his ability and to elevating him to high office so many times. For he served all the people of his State, his Nation, and the world with distinction and ability.

But I wish to address my remarks to the friendly personality and the ever-present desire to help a fellow Member that our friend "Burnie" always had. He was a busy man, with a tremendous workload thrust upon him by the Senate, but he always had time for a friendly word or a friendly hand for a fellow Member.

Indeed his friendliness was not limited to Senators, for he was a favorite with the staffs of our committees, and of our offices, with the elevator operators, doormen, and others who serve us in this task.

I first discovered this helpful friendliness of Senator MAYBANK when I served in the House. No matter how difficult the legislative matter was in the conference committees between the House and the Senate—Burnie always managed to give every man his hearing, to respect his ideas and his suggestions and to work out in the best possible spirit of compromise a bill to achieve the ends sought by the legislation.

I have seen him preside over deadlocked conference committees until 2 or 3 a. m., always maintaining his friendly attitude and spirit. It helped to solve many tough legislative problems because the conferences were being run by a man whom all knew was a real friend.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his lovely family, to his devoted friends in the State of South Carolina, and yes, to ourselves, for we will miss this able, friendly, and diligent public servant. His work has well served his Nation and his memory will always be fresh in the minds of those who were privileged to serve with him and to know him.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, some of our colleagues who will not be present this afternoon have requested that statements they have prepared be placed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that statements prepared by the following Senators be printed in the RECORD at this point: The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

The glory of this beautiful sunshiny day is made even brighter as we think about our departed friend and colleague, BURNET MAYBANK. I held him high in my esteem and if it were possible, even higher in my respect. He was my friend for nearly a dozen years. He first won my admiration as a great Governor of his native State of South Carolina. His life was an inspiring example as a devoted husband and father. He won undying fame by his constant and effective service to all classes of citizens in his successful efforts for better housing. The present and future generations of American farmers will remember him and be grateful for what he did for them.

We in the Senate and people everywhere will be encouraged to always make the defenses of our country strong and true as we remember the heroic work that he did for a greater Air Force and a stronger military power. We have all lost a cherished friend. South Carolina has lost one of her most distinguished sons. America has lost one of her noblest patriots and statesmen.

But in the higher sense BURNET MAYBANK will live on in the memories of those who knew him and in the hearts of friends who loved him.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

BURNIE MAYBANK was my friend—one of the closest and truest friends I have ever had.

In a legislative fight it was comforting to have him on my side. He fought hard. He fought clean—but he fought effectively. He was always considerate—he was a gentleman.

As a companion Senator MAYBANK had no peer. Though we served States from opposite sides of the Nation, Burnie and I were closer than brothers.

His departure is a great personal loss to all who knew him. Yet he lives on in our affections and our memory.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of a beloved and kindly colleague; of a fine Senator and a great American—to the memory of BURNET MAYBANK, in whose warm friendship I was honored to share.

BURNET MAYBANK devoted his life to the service of his city, his State, and his Nation. He rendered that service with a constancy, an ardor, and a selflessness seldom matched in these or any other halls. And in so doing he displayed at all times a keen intelligence, a delightful quickness of wit and, above all, a warm and human understanding of his fellows and their problems.

Senator MAYBANK served the people of his State well. He was wholehearted in his devotion to their interests and adamant in defending those things they held to be right. Yet BURNET MAYBANK accorded to every other Member of the Senate those same rights to hold and fight for contrary opinions as he demanded for himself. And when regional or sectional differences of opinion or approach to a problem could be compromised without sacrificing principle, it was BURNET MAYBANK who, time after time, worked out those agreements which, during his service in the Senate, made possible those great legislative achievements which have meant so much to all our people in every part of our country.

In BURNET MAYBANK's passing, the Nation lost a devoted servant, the Senate lost one of its stalwarts, and I lost a warm and kindly friend. To his family, I would extend my most sincere condolences and the hope that their sorrow may be in part assuaged by the knowledge that in his too-short span of life BURNET MAYBANK accomplished far more that was good than is often vouchsafed those granted 4-score years and more.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

Together with so many of his colleagues here in the Senate who knew and loved BURNET MAYBANK, I would like to join with a few words of tribute, conscious as I am of their inadequacy, to a good friend and a distinguished American.

BURNET MAYBANK's life was a record of outstanding public service—to his community, his State, and his country. After service in World War I, he went on to serve as alderman of the city of Charleston, mayor of Charleston, chairman of the South Carolina Public Service Authority, and then as Governor of South Carolina and Senator from his State from 1941 until his untimely death.

A man of indomitable spirit and abundant energy, he devoted himself tirelessly to his duties in the Senate and ably represented all the people of his State. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, his broad understanding of the issues coupled with a remarkable ability to get to the heart of a situation were responsible for much of the constructive legislation enacted in the field of housing, banking, and postwar economic stabilization. And, yet, as his responsibilities in the Senate became heavier and the demands on his time more pressing, he was never too busy for a kind word of friendship and encouragement to his colleagues. Our lives are all richer for having known BURNET MAYBANK. He was truly a great soul.

All of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with BURNET MAYBANK had the highest respect for his integrity, his ability, and his remarkable character, and the deepest affection for those qualities of heart and mind which endeared him to all. We will continue to miss his inspiration and his leadership here in the Senate. And to Mrs. Maybank, his family, and to the State and its people who honor and loved him, I want to add my few and humble words, impossible as it is to express my sense of loss in the passing of our friend. We shall never see his like again.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

It is my privilege to be given this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to our late beloved colleague, BURNET MAYBANK.

BURNET MAYBANK devoted a lifetime to the service of his people and his country. From the day back in 1927 when he was elected to the office of alderman of the city of Charleston, until that fateful day in September 1954 when he was taken away from us, Senator MAYBANK served the people well.

BURNET MAYBANK is no longer with us, and his absence will be greatly felt. But his devotion to duty will always remain as an inspiration to his successor and those of us left behind to carry on the many tasks remaining to be done.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

There are men in this world—and, unfortunately, they are few—who combine to a high degree the seemingly contradictory qualities of force and gentleness.

In their ranks could be found our late colleague—my good friend—BURNET R. MAYBANK.

We all knew Senator MAYBANK as a man of firm determination and unshakeable purpose. We knew him as one with an uncanny eye for the weakness of an opposing position and with the skill and ability to exploit that weakness to the fullest advantage.

But we also knew him as a man of reason; a man of moderation; a man with a deep affection for his fellow mortals. Coupled with that affection was a keen understanding of the problems which others face and a willingness to share the burdens of finding a solution.

His heart quite properly belonged to his beloved South Carolina. But because he loved his native soil so deeply he understood with equal depth the feelings of those who were born and reared in other sections—no matter how distant.

In BURNET MAYBANK I always found the counsel of wisdom and the courage of conviction. He never shirked a duty or an obligation, and his devotion to his Nation was of the highest order.

His passing was a sad blow to his Nation, to his friends, and to his family. But all of us can draw consolation from the thought that we were once associated with this very strong but very gentle man.

He was a gentleman in the true sense of the word. And the name BURNET R. MAYBANK will always live in the annals of American statesmanship.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I ask unanimous consent that he may have printed in the RECORD the statement he has prepared on the passing of the late Senator MAYBANK.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON HONORING SENATOR BURNET R. MAYBANK

Mr. President, it is not possible for me to add to the outstanding tributes that have been paid today to BURNET MAYBANK. I can only confirm and corroborate these deserving statements. I shall always remember him for his deep and devoted interest to the problems of not just the State of South Carolina but the the Nation as a whole. He was sincerely interested in assisting other Senators with their many problems. He never hesitated to devote his talent, his energy, and his wisdom to the many social and economic problems of the Nation. He had a broad vision, a broad understanding of our country and the world as it is today. His wise counsel, his devoted service, will be sorely missed in this Chamber. I wish to join with my colleagues in extending to his family my deepest sympathy.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT OUT OF RESPECT TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE SENATOR MAYBANK

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it do so out of respect to the memory of and in reverence for the late Senator MAYBANK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will now be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate operate under a 2-minute limitation on statements made in connection therewith.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT RELATING TO TWO-PRICE SYSTEMS OF PRICE SUPPORT AND MARKETING APPLICABLE TO RICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with respect to the various two-price systems of price support and marketing which could be made applicable to rice (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed by the Department of Justice, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

STATISTICAL STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report entitled "Statistical Stockpile Report to the Congress," for the period July 1 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTION OF GOLD COAST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a joint resolution adopted by the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly, thanking the Congress of the United States for the message of greeting contained in the joint resolution adopted at the 2d session of the 83d Congress (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS BY CERTAIN CIVILIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND TIMBER-ACCESS ROADS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and

timber-access roads (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, WHITE SANDS NATIONAL MONUMENT, N. MEX.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a proposed concession permit within White Sands National Monument, N. Mex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX, AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be benefited by Haystack Equalizing Reservoir, north unit, Deschutes project, Oregon (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, ARIZONA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit, in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

OVERSEAS NAVIGATION CORPORATION *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, and pursuant to Senate Resolution 193, 82d Congress, 1st session, a copy of that court's opinion rendered on March 1, 1955, in the case of *Overseas Navigation Corporation* v. *The United States*, together with an opinion in the case of *Gay Street Corporation of Baltimore* v. *The United States*, decided January 11, 1955 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Ramon Gonzalez-Garcia from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on July 15, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAYMENT OF MONEY ORDERS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the payment of money orders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PURCHASE OF BONDS TO COVER CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO ESTABLISH COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

A letter from the Chairman, the Commission of Fine Arts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of May 17, 1910, relating to the establishment of a Commission of Fine Arts, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States on March 2, 1899, set aside certain lands in the State of Washington as Mount Rainier National Park (30 Stat. 993) and the legislature of Washington on March 16, 1901, ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over this area (ch. 92, Laws of 1901); and

"Whereas, the Congress declared in the statute creating the first national park (17 Stat. 32) that the area be 'designated and set apart as a public park and pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people,' which purpose was again confirmed in similar language in the act creating Mount Rainier National Park; and

"Whereas Mount Rainier National Park has become the prime and major attraction in the State of Washington for visitors from all States of the Union because of its unique natural and scenic features and its year-round potential for recreation; and

"Whereas facilities necessary for adequate use of the recreational potential of the park are sorely inadequate and those existing have deteriorated and are in an obsolete state, thus severely restricting the use of the park; and

"Whereas the National Park Service has for years pursued policies which make it difficult for private enterprise to operate tourist facilities in the park and which discourage it from investing in improved or expanded facilities; and

"Whereas a number of surveys undertaken over the years have proposed that certain improvements be undertaken in Mount Rainier National Park which proposals were refused by the National Park Service; and

"Whereas the Governor of the State of Washington and the Mount Rainier National Park Development Study Committee recommended in 1953 a program under which modern tourist and recreational facilities would be built and operated by private enterprise without drawing on Federal appropriations, which program is being actively supported by a large number of leading civic organizations and the National Park Service has declined these plans; and

"Whereas an essential part of such development plans are facilities to transport visitors to higher altitudes and the act of Congress which created Mount Rainier National Park granted the right to any railway or tramway company to construct and operate a railway or tramway line which provision was amended by act of Congress of January 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1044), which empowered the Secretary of the Interior to authorize the establishment and operation in the park of a tramway or cable line or lines for the accommodation or convenience of visitors and others; and

"Whereas the Governor of the State of Washington requested on October 16, 1953, that the Secretary of the Interior grant such authorization, which request was joined in by the Mount Rainier National Park Development Study Committee and a large number of clubs, associations, and organizations in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior by letter of December 17, 1954, notified the Governor of the State of Washington that no further consideration would be given to permitting the establishment of a tramway or cable line for the transportation of visitors nor to some of the other requests that would permit the establishment and operation of tourist and recreational facilities for visitors; and

"Whereas by such action the original purpose of the park as designated by Congress is being frustrated, and the use of the recreational potential of the park is being denied to hundreds of thousands of residents of Washington and other States and serious damage is being inflicted upon the tourist industry which is one of the largest industries in the State of Washington: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That your memorialists respectfully petition the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and take such appropriate measures that will assure the citizens of the United States and of the State of Washington the adequate use of Mount Rainier National Park through permission to establish and operate such facilities as are required for the use of visitors, both summer and winter, and create such conditions that will make it possible for private operators to finance and maintain them at no public expense; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Committees on Interior Affairs of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation.

"Passed the House February 8, 1955.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate February 19, 1955.

"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate."

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled,

respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the construction of McNary Dam on the Columbia River has created a large lake composed of the backwaters from the dam; and

"Whereas the lake created by McNary Dam has inundated the town of Wallula, which was an historic site in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas it would be appropriate to perpetuate the memory of the historic town of Wallula by naming the lake which now covers its site after the town now destroyed by its waters: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States of America, and the Congress of the United States of America, to name the body of water created by the backwaters of McNary Dam, Lake Wallula.

"Passed the house February 3, 1955.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Passed the Senate February 10, 1955.

"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"*President of the Senate.*"

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood

"Whereas the matter of the admission to statehood of Alaska and Hawaii has been under consideration for a long time; and

"Whereas both Alaska and Hawaii by the democratic processes prevailing therein and the actions of their people have shown that they are entitled to become States of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to admit both Alaska and Hawaii to statehood; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, to JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, urging that the Congress of the United States make sufficient funds available to develop topographic maps for the entire State of Montana as soon as possible

"Whereas the State of Montana is very inadequately covered by the United States topographical maps; and

"Whereas at the present rate of progress it will take many years to complete the State; and

"Whereas topographic maps are used by many industries, such as, mining, lumbering, and the development of oil-bearing areas; and

"Whereas topographic maps are very essential in the development of radio and television stations, and especially since television is a new enterprise just coming into the State; and

"Whereas topographic maps are invaluable in development of land and water resources; and

"Whereas topographic maps are essential in locating rights-of-way for telephone, telegraph, rural-electrification lines, highways, railways, and pipelines; and

"Whereas topographic maps are essential in planning the operation and management of both State and national agricultural, grazing and forest lands; and

"Whereas the Interdepartment Advisory Council on Natural Resources has made a study of the uses to be made of topographic maps in Montana and has set up an orderly program for developing the mapping areas of the State according to priorities: Be it therefore

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Montana*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and reqeusted to make sufficient funds available to develop topographic maps for the entire State as soon as possible; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress, RICHARD NIXON and SAM RAYBURN, to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committees and Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of the National Congress, and to the Regional Director of the United States Department of the Interior—Geological Survey; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana be hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial to the Congress of the United States, to JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"GEO. M. GOSMON,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 17, 1955."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the oil shale industry the same depletion allowance as that given the oil and gas industry

"Whereas it is becoming apparent that the United States must eventually turn more and more to synthetic sources to supplement its petroleum resources, and for this reason the promotion and development of new domestic sources of fuel oils, including the mining and production of oil shale, is essential; and

"Whereas the depletion allowance now allowed on the mining of oil shale is 5 percent as compared with a 27½ percent depletion allowance given the oil and gas industry; and

"Whereas the oil shale industry, in the exploration and promotion of oil shale deposits and in the mining of oil shale, should be given the same economical assistance as is given the oil and gas industry, in order to expand the oil shale industry and create a competitive market between the two industries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Act so as to provide that the depletion allowance allowed on the mining of oil shale be raised from 5 percent to 27½ percent of the value of the oil produced from oil shale mined; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"STEPHEN R. MCNICHOLS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"LEE MATTIES,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the metal mining industry the same depletion allowance as that given the oil and gas industry

"Whereas it is the consensus of the members of this general assembly that the metal mining industry be given the same economical assistance in the form of depletion allowances as is given the oil and gas industry: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado, (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Act so as to provide that the depletion allowance allowed the metal mining industry the same as that allowed the oil and gas industry; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"STEPHEN R. MCNICHOLS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"LEE MATTIES,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution to express the desire of the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico that the provisions of title III of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act be extended to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

"Whereas it is the desire and purpose of the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to enact for Puerto Rico a law providing a system of unemployment insurance for workers in Puerto Rico; and

"Whereas economic insecurity due to unemployment is a serious menace to the health, security, and welfare of the people of Puerto Rico. Unemployment is, therefore, a subject of general interest and concern which requires appropriate action by the legislative assembly to prevent its spread and to lighten its burden which falls relentlessly upon the unemployed worker and his family. The achievement of social security requires protection against this great hazard of our economic life. This objective can be obtained by the establishment of employment agencies which will render gratuitous services to the public; by devising appropriate methods to reduce to a minimum the volume of unemployment and by the systematic accumulation of funds during periods of employment from which benefits may be paid during periods of unemploy-

ment, thus maintaining the purchasing power of the workers, and limiting the serious social consequences of unemployment; and

"Whereas it is desirable in the interest of the Commonwealth that unemployment insurance in Puerto Rico be coordinated with the unemployment insurance system in the States of the United States and with the standards adopted by existing legislation of the United States, and this would be made possible by the extension of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to Puerto Rico. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico:

"First. The Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico hereby expresses its desire and consent that the provisions of title III of the Social Security Act as well as the provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act be extended to Puerto Rico, and specifically that section 3306 (j) of the latter act, which appears in chapter 23, subtitle C of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code of the United States (26 U. S. C. A. 1607 (j)), be amended so that the definition of 'state' therein shall be amended by inserting the words 'Commonwealth of Puerto Rico' after the word 'Hawaii.'

"Second. The Legislative Assembly of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico likewise expresses its desire and consent that the effective date of said amendment to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act be the first of January of the year 1956.

"Third. That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico so that the governor will certify the contents thereof to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, and the Secretary of Labor of the United States."

A letter from the secretary of state of the State of Washington, informing the Senate that legislation relating to abandoned iceboxes is now pending before the house and senate of that State (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Friday Morning Club, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Ontario-Upland Real Estate Board, Ontario, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for the establishment of a San Bernardino Federal Housing Administration office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A telegram from the Seattle branch of Marine Cooks and Stewards, A. F. of L., signed by James O. Willoughby, port agent, congratulating Senator MAGNUSON for his 25 years of public service; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memoralizing Congress against passing legislation reducing tariff rates on textile imports from foreign countries

"Whereas the textile industries in Massachusetts are being affected economically by legislation favorable to textile imports from foreign countries; and

"Whereas the continuance of the textile industry in the Commonwealth is essential to its economic development: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the house of representatives of the Commonwealth urges the Congress of the United States not to pass any legislation granting a decrease of tariff rates on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Whereas the attention of a world plagued with the imperialistic designs of Godless communism is focused with foreboding on the next move of the Chinese Communists; and

"Whereas this move could take form in large-scale military aggression aimed at subjugation of Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, and related territory; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has asked the Congress for a grant of authority to employ United States Armed Forces as he sees fit in frustrating a possible Chinese Communist attempt to seize Formosa, the Pescadores Islands, and related territory; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States with but 6 dissenting votes has given its approval to the subject request, known as the Formosa Resolution; and

"Whereas the greatest import of the 'Formosa Resolution' stems from its inherent influence as a deterrent to Chinese Communist aggression; and

"Whereas this influence will be felt in direct proportion to the degree of unanimity with which the 'Formosa Resolution' is upheld by the citizens of the United States of America and their elected officials, as well as the peoples of all free nations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring, That this 48th legislative assembly, in regular session assembled, hereby give its unequivocal backing to the action taken by the President and the Congress in their advocacy of the 'Formosa Resolution'; be it further

"Resolved, That all interested citizens of Oregon and all civil, fraternal, management, labor, veterans' and other organizations in this State hereby be urged likewise to apprise the President and the Congress of their concurrence in the 'Formosa Resolution' to the end that as many Americans as possible be united in expressing opposition to Chinese Communist designs on the territory in the western Pacific area in question; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon hereby be directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Oregon delegation to the Congress of the United States of America and to the appropriate representatives of press and radio who can assist in giving the viewpoint set forth in this resolution the widest possible dissemination.

"Adopted by senate, February 3, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate.
"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.

"Adopted by house, February 9, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House."

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Members from Oregon of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled; and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior for the United States of America:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas several years ago certain airlines were granted temporary authority by the Civil Aeronautics Board to establish and operate through air freight and passenger transportation service between Portland, Oreg., on the one hand, and Alaskan cities upon the other, pending a general investigation known as the States-Alaska Case, covering the issuance of permanent certificates authorizing such operations; and

"Whereas by reason of this through air transportation service, inaugurated and maintained by these airlines during the past several years, a vital pattern of trade and commerce has been developed as between the industries and businesses of the State of Oregon and the Territory of Alaska, and as a result Oregon industries and businesses are enjoying a rapidly increasing air cargo commerce with industries and businesses in Alaskan cities, while through passenger service is encouraging and building a close tie of friendly business relationship, and thus this service has proved to be an absolute necessity in the public interest; and

"Whereas during 1954 the Civil Aeronautics Board, in the course of their general investigation, caused public hearings to be held respecting the question of adequate air transportation service in the public interest between the United States and the Territory of Alaska, and at these hearings the business interests of the city of Portland and the State of Oregon, supported by the Public Utilities Commissioner of Oregon, intervened in support of a permanently maintained through air transportation service, both air cargo and passenger, between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities, while Seattle business interests, supported by the Washington Public Service Commission, took a position favoring a monopoly of Alaskan air commerce by Seattle commercial interests in that they advocated that presently existing through air transportation operation between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities should be done away with as uneconomical, and that all temporary airline certificates be rescinded, and that Seattle, Wash., should be permanently designated as the sole and exclusive terminal of all air commerce between the Territory of Alaska and the United States of America; and

"Whereas thereafter an initial decision was proposed by the Chief Hearing Examiner to the Civil Aeronautics Board recommending the granting of the request and contentions of Seattle business and commercial interests by the creation of a virtual monopoly of air trade and commerce in favor of Seattle, and limiting all through air transportation service between the Territory of Alaska and the United States to the one single air terminal located in and near Seattle, Wash., and rescinding all temporary certificates held by airlines now serving Portland, Oreg., maintaining through air transportation service between Portland and Alaskan cities, thereby slamming shut the door of trade and commerce between Alaska and the State of Oregon and strangling all competition which is the very essence and life of American commerce, all to the great detriment and loss of not only the businesses,

industries and the people generally of Oregon, but also to the detriment and loss of citizens of the Territory of Alaska and their new and growing industries; and

"Whereas presently existing air trade and commerce between the United States and the Territory of Alaska was found by the Civil Aeronautics Board investigation, through its Chief Hearing Examiner and staff, to be an absolute necessity in the public interest, as shown by the following quoted excerpt from the examiner's report:

" 'No territory under the American flag is so dependent upon air transportation as the vast land area of Alaska. The last frontier of the United States contains a vast wealth of natural resources and is so located as to play a vital role in the defense plans of the Nation. Unlike other parts of the United States, there are no alternative modes of transportation in Alaska—the river boats and the dog team have, to a large part, been displaced by the airplane.

" 'Inadequate, unreliable, and high cost shipping from the States to Alaska has played a large part in the development of the Territory as an area of high costs with a consequent deterring effect upon its growth. In addition to the high transportation charges incurred in the transportation of cargo to Alaska, the uncertainties inherent in the system in the past have resulted in the necessity for maintaining unusually high inventories. The problem of spoilage in perishable products has been another problem resulting from the transportation lack. * * * Neither the sea route nor the highway route can offer a reasonably comparable service from standpoint of time, and both of these routings are of limited use during the winter months'; and

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that the membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board has finally adopted the detrimental recommendations of the Chief Hearing Examiner, basing their conclusions upon the concept that economy of operations demands a cessation of through air transportation service between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities, even though a strangling monopoly is created and established thereby in favor of Seattle businesses and industries, and despite the apparent fact that the public interest of Oregon will suffer great and irreparable damage while the Territory of Alaska becomes competitively shackled respecting its air trade and commerce with the United States; and

"Whereas if the aforesaid decision becomes the final decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board, all air transportation operations between Portland Oreg., and Alaskan cities will be subject to the additional costs of terminal operations at Seattle, Wash., made necessary by the combination of local flights to Seattle with through flights from thence on to Alaskan cities, which will warrant necessary additional overhead costs of separate organization, separate billing and handling expense on air cargo, and under well recognized court decisions covering rates and charges for transportation, increased rate charges for these additional terminal services are justified, and it is obvious that any proposed shuttle service between Seattle and Portland, and thence by through service to Alaska, on all movements of air cargo, as well as passenger, would entail added rates and charges which will have the effect of doing away entirely with any competitive aspects of air transportation, trade and commerce as between Portland and Seattle in relation to the markets and cities of the Territory of Alaska: Be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior be hereby memorialized to bring this most vital transportation and economic situation to the attention of the honorable membership of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, through established procedures, in behalf of the public interest of the people of the State of Oregon, to insure the protection of the public interest in Oregon, as well as the Territory of Alaska, and avert the grave economic consequences which will inevitably follow if an air trade and commerce monopoly is created in flavor of the business and commercial interests of Seattle to the exclusion of the commercial and trade interests of the city of Portland, Oreg., by the establishment of through air transportation service as between Seattle, Wash., only, and Alaskan cities, while denying the same through air transportation service between Portland, Oreg., and Alaskan cities, in direct violation of the competitive principles of trade and commerce which is the very essence of the American system and way of life; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, is hereby directed to present official copies of this memorial and resolution, through proper channels, to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior for their consideration and action relative to any decision which might throttle air trade and commerce as between Oregon and the Territory of Alaska, and create a virtual monopoly in behalf of Seattle, Wash., detrimental to the public interest of both the State of Oregon and the Territory of Alaska.

"Adopted by house February 1, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Adopted by senate February 11, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of the Senate."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"House resolution memorializing the electors of the Hall of Fame at New York University to consider the name of Gen. Thomas J. 'Stonewall' Jackson for inscription in the Hall of Fame

"Whereas the President of the United States in an address to the United Daughters of the Confederacy in Washington, D. C., on November 10, 1953, referred to Robert E. Lee and Thomas J. 'Stonewall' Jackson as holding before us a veneration for ideals, a conviction that to rise high in your profession you do not have to surrender principle; and

"Whereas the President in the same address further said: 'If you had no other reason for existence except to hold before Americans the memory, the accomplishments, the characters, and the qualities of these two men, I still think your Association would be well worthwhile'; and

"Whereas one of these distinguished Generals referred to by the President, Robert E. Lee, is now honored in the Colonade of the Hall of Fame; and

"Whereas 'Stonewall' Jackson has been referred to as the 'Perfect Lieutenant' and the right hand of Lee; and

"Whereas distinguished heads of State, soldiers, statesmen, authors, poets, and scholars have for many years paid high tribute to General Jackson; and

"Whereas the fame of 'Stonewall' Jackson is known throughout the civilized world, and has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American; and

"Whereas the Jacksonian principles of military tactics and discipline have been and are now studied by military leaders of all nations; it seems fitting that his name should be forever enshrined in the Hall of Fame: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, That the electors of the Hall of Fame are urged to consider the name of Thomas J. 'Stonewall' Jackson for inscription in the Hall of Fame and if at all possible be so placed that it will be near the colonnade of Robert E. Lee; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each Member of the South Carolina congressional delegation and to the director of the Hall of Fame at 17 East 80th Street, New York City, for dissemination to each member of the Electors College."

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Congress of the United States to support measures to restore package freight service on the Great Lakes

"Whereas the Congress of the United States under Public Law 856 enacted by the 81st Congress, provided that certain surplus vessels could be reconverted for use as package freighters on the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the vessels which were so reconverted were not used for the purpose intended because of the outbreak of the Korean war, but were assigned to the carrying of iron ore; and

"Whereas prior to World War II package freight was a major Minnesota industry. In excess of 700,000 tons of freight were shipped to and from the port of Duluth during the last year that package freighters operated on the Great Lakes. Included in said shipments from the State of Minnesota were approximately 64,000 tons of butter; 6,000 tons of buttermilk; 12,000 tons of cheese; 28,000 tons of cream; 6,000 tons of eggs; 45,000 tons of dressed poultry; 170,000 tons of flour; 107,000 tons of mill products; in excess of 18,000 tons of wool; 19,000 tons of lumber; 3,000 tons of paper products; and in excess of 40,000 tons of manufactured metal products; and

"Whereas this trade benefited every segment of the Minnesota economy including the great agriculture and manufacturing industries; and

"Whereas the discontinuance of this trade not only has adversely affected our agriculture and manufacturing industries, but has caused substantial unemployment in the maritime industries at the head of the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes not only will substantially contribute to the wellbeing and growth of Minnesota industry, provide a market for products grown and manufactured in Minnesota, both at home and abroad, but will also help reduce unemployment and more importantly will provide a stepping stone to the maximum use of the facilities of the part of Duluth for international trade when the St. Lawrence seaway has been completed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effect the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, the 1st day of February 1955.

"ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, the 11th day of February 1955.

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved February 18, 1955.

"ORVILLE J. FRUMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 941. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; (Report No. 37);

S. 942. A bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."; (Report No. 38); and

S. 1051. A bill to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; (Report No. 39).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 752. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Asssitance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; with an amendment (Report No. 40).

INCREASED EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing further expenditures and temporary employment of additional assistants by the Committee on Banking and Currency to study public and private housing, and I submit a report (No. 42) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, and that the resolution and report be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, for action by that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received, and printed, and the resolution and report will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE. (S. REPT. NO. 41)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a favorable report on Senate bill 1, to increase the rate of basic compensation for officers and employees in the Post Office Department, with an amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the views of the minority be filed in connection therewith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and fifty-three postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Julius C. Holmes of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran, vice Loy W. Henderson;

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, vice James L. Morrill, resigned;

Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange;

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange; and

Robert H. S. Eakens, of Texas, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, vice Raymond Sayre, deceased.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1251. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of any benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1252. A bill to provide price support for class II durum wheat of the 1955 crop at 125 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JENNER (by request):

S. 1253. A bill for the relief of Peter Skole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1254. A bill creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision; and

S. 1255. A bill for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1256. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges;

S. 1257. A bill for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn, and others;

S. 1258. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952;

S. 1259. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

S. 1260. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 1261. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point terminal and ammunition loading pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1262. A bill to transfer ownership to Allegany County, Md., of a bridge loaned to such county by the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1263. A bill for the relief of the city of Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1264. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1265. A bill for the relief of Francisco-Manuel Gonzalez Abad and Jose Maria Gonzalez Abad;

S. 1266. A bill for the relief of Helene Margareta Jobst; and

S. 1267. A bill for the relief of Lionginas Kublickas, Juozas Grismanauskas, and Edmondas Paulauskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. BIBLE):

S. 1268. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Minerals Advisory Council; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1269. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1270. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Alfred Fisher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1271. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; and

S. 1272. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1273. A bill to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1274. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422), to provide for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of special policemen, and for other purposes;

S. 1275. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions;

S. 1276. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907; and

S. 1277. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1278. A bill to further define self-employed individuals for purposes of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; and

S. 1279. A bill to provide that services performed by agricultural employees who are not employed by the same employer for more than 60 days in a calendar year shall not be considered to be employment for the purposes of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1280. A bill to provide for the uniform classification of certain persons who are subject to the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1281. A bill to exempt from tax billiard and pool tables maintained by religious organizations if no charge is made for their use; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1282. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until July 1, 1959, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1283. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1284. A bill for the relief of James P. Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1285. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1286. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal farm credit system; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1287. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1288. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. BIBLE and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items or provisions in appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills which have been submitted by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Department of the Army, and the Department of the Navy.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these bills the letters forwarded on these proposals, by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Department of the Army, and the Department of the Navy, recommending the enactment of such legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1256. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1256 is as follows:)

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On behalf of the judicial conference of the United States, I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft of a bill providing for additional circuit judgeships and district judgeships which have heretofore been recommended by the judicial conference but not authorized by the Congress. I hope that the bill may be introduced in the Senate and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration. Evidence concerning the business of each of the courts involved and the need of the additional judgeships is ready to be adduced when a hearing is held. The need is urgent and I therefore trust that a hearing may be set as soon as practicable.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

S. 1257. A bill for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn, and others.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1257 is as follows:)

DECEMBER 23, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "For the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn, and others" and 4 enclosures explaining in detail the overpayments for which legislative relief is requested for certain disbursing officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955. The Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The objective of the proposed bill is to clear the accounts of the named disbursing officers of the amounts listed in the draft of bill, which amounts represent errors that occurred in making payments to certain individuals during the period July 1, 1948, through June 30, 1952, and resulted in disallowances by the Comptroller General of the United States. The enclosures include descriptions of the erroneous payments made, a résumé of the circumstances under which they occurred, and statements regarding the collection actions taken with regard thereto.

The absence of negligence on the part of disbursing officers, the impossibility of securing voluntary refunds from the payees, or the impracticability of enforcing collection against the recipients of erroneous payments does not operate to relieve the disbursing officers of the technical responsibility with which they are charged under the statutes and under their bonds. Further, the accounts of these disbursing officers cannot be cleared under any provision of law currently in effect or now under consideration in the Congress. For the protection of the Government, that is, in order to bring suits against the surety companies because of shortages in the disbursing officers' accounts within the 5-year limitation required by the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 646; 6 U. S. C. 5), the Comptroller General has caused suits to be filed against the sureties of the bonds of certain disbursing officers named in the proposed legislation, or the Comptroller General has referred to the Department of Justice, for institution of legal proceedings, deficiencies in the accounts of certain disbursing officers named in the proposed legislation. The legislative relief herein proposed is required to stay or prevent further judicial proceedings against the named disbursing officers in those cases where collections have not been effected from the payees. This legislative relief in no way affects the right of the Government to continue collection action against the payees.

The proposed legislation, if enacted, will authorize the relief of each disbursing officer of the accountability and responsibility and will allow credit in the official disbursing accounts in the amount shown or in such lesser amount as may be necessary to adjust his account up to the maximum stated. This language is considered necessary since collection actions are being continued and the exact amount of relief which ultimately will be required for each disbursing officer cannot now be determined. The amount set forth in the proposed bill opposite the name of each disbursing officer is the maximum amount for which such disbursing officer is believed to be presently indebted to the United States by reference to current records.

Where the circumstances surrounding disbursements indicate that reasonable care and attention have been given to the performance of the disbursing duty, and where every effort has been made to recoup to the United States the amounts of erroneous payments, the relief of disbursing officers of technical accountability is considered distinctly in the interest of the United States, when viewed from the standpoint of justice to a group of public servants.

Attention is also invited to the fact that the number of disallowances which are represented by the amounts listed in the bill and the total amount represented thereby are negligible when measured against total payments made by such disbursing officers of hundreds of millions of dollars to a great number of payees.

The proposed legislation further provides for the refund to any disbursing officer named, or his heirs, if deceased, if any amount of the overpayments described herein is refunded by the disbursing officer or his heirs to clear his account, or if any amount due the disbursing officer or his heirs is set off against any of the overpayments made by the disbursing officer. Such amounts are to be paid from the account to which credited, if such account is available for disbursement, or if not, to be paid from the appropriation set aside for the

payment of certified claims. It also provides that the relief granted shall be considered and construed as precluding recovery from the disbursing officer of any interest charges arising from any item included in the overpayment so cleared or relieved.

The proposed relief legislation contains cases not within the purview of (1) the act of December 13, 1944 (58 Stat. 800), relating to relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of the physical loss of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge; (2) the act of December 23, 1944 (58 Stat. 921), losses due to exchange transactions; (3) the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States, within 2 years, to relieve disbursing officers and certifying officers, and special disbursing agents of the War and Navy Departments of accountability or responsibility for losses of public funds, and of responsibility for erroneous and illegal payments occurring between September 8, 1939, and July 1, 1946; (4) the proposed amendment to the act of July 26, 1947, supra, to extend coverage for payments made from September 8, 1939, to July 1, 1948, as originally authorized by that act for a more limited period, now incorporated in the act of March 17, 1954 (Public Law 310, 83d Cong.); (5) legislation for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams and others incorporated in the act of August 31, 1954 (Private Law 957); and (6) the act of June 3, 1954 (Private Law 391, 83d Cong.), for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning and others.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Legislation identical with the attached draft of bill was submitted by the Department of Defense to the 83d Congress on June 14, 1954, and introduced in the form of H. R. 9597. No further congressional action was taken on that bill.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of the proposed legislation will not entail an expenditure from Federal funds, except as to any amounts that might be refunded to any disbursing officer or his heirs under section 2 thereof, but will validate approximately $157,159.64 in the accounts of disbursing officers concerned for disallowances by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1258. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1258 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 5, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft "To permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit the naturalization of those Filipinos who by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy were eligible for naturalization under the Nationality Act of 1940, but who because they have not been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence are not now eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 324 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1149) enabled a member of the Armed Forces, including a native-born Filipino, who was not a citizen of the United States and who had served honorably at any time in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period or periods aggregating 3 years, to be naturalized expeditiously without having met certain normal requirements such as lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence.

The Nationality Act of 1940 was repealed by the Immigration and Nationality Act, which Act became effective December 24, 1952. Section 323 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that persons in the Armed Forces of the United States who have served honorably for a period of 3 years may be naturalized without having been physically present in the United States for any specified period and without meeting certain other normal residence requirements. This section, however, differs from section 324 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in that it requires that the application must have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in order to qualify for naturalization under its provisions.

The majority of the Filipinos in the naval service were enlisted in the Philippine Islands and have never been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Of those who were eligible for naturalization prior to December 24, 1952, the effective date of the Immigration and Nationality Act, some were prevented from filing petitions for naturalization before that date because of service outside of the United States, and others did file their petitions but the petitions were received too late to be processed before December 24, 1952. Because of the small annual immigration quota of 438 allotted the Philippine Islands by Presidential Proclamation No. 2980, it is now virtually impossible for these Filipinos to qualify for naturalization.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would waive the requirement of lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence in the case of those Filipinos who, by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952, are otherwise eligible for naturalization under section 328 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, if petition for naturalization is filed within 3 years after the effective date of the legislation. Many of these Filipinos are serving in areas where there is no naturalization court before which they may appear. A period of 3 years during which they may file petitions for naturalization is necessary in order to permit them to make the required appearance through normal rotation of duty. It is estimated that approximately 2,800 Filipinos would become eligible for naturalization by the enactment of this proposed legislation. Past experience, however, has shown that not all Filipinos in the naval service desire to become United States citizens, some preferring instead to return to their homeland upon final discharge from the Navy or transfer to Fleet Reserve. This figure, therefore, represents the maximum number who would become eligible for naturalization by the enactment of this proposed legislation.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Navy on June 21, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. It was introduced as H. R. 9755 and S. 3739. No further action was taken by the Congress with respect to the proposal.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The Immigration and Naturalization Service has advised that the enactment of this proposed legislation would involve additional cost to the Government of possibly $30,000.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

S. 1259. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1259 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it is in accord with the program of the President. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would amend section 2 of the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257; 50 U. S. C. App. 611, Note), as amended (Public Law 426, 82d Cong., and Public Laws 97 and 443, 83d Cong.), so as to continue the effectiveness of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, or until June 30, 1957, whichever is earlier. Public Law 443 of the 83d Congress last extended that authority until June 30, 1955. This 2-year extension of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, was urged by the President in his state of the Union message (p. 6, H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong.).

Under the provisions of the existing law the President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the national-defense effort to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of the law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the national defense, subject however, to the additional provisions which are set forth in title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Also by the authority of that title, the Deparment of Defense is empowered to amend contracts without consideration. This includes the extension of the time of performance of contracts and the waiver of liquidated damage and performance bonds by the United States.

The Department of Defense is currently authorized to make advance payments on advertised contracts. Without the authority granted by title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the Department of Defense could make advance payments only on negotiated contracts.

The exercise of title II authority permits the defense agencies to make the necessary adjustments to assure the continued availability of essential productive capacity. Without this authority, it will be impossible to use the special procurement techniques necessary and proper in situations of military or production urgency, which other permanent laws are not designed to afford. It is believed that the extension of title II

of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended, is vitally necessary in order to supplement other contract authority and to insure an uninterrupted performance of contracts to facilitate the national defense.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this legislation would cause no apparent increase in budgetary requirements insofar as the Department of Defense is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

S. 1260. A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1260 is as follows:)

DECEMBER 23, 1954.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land."

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955. The Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over lands otherwise under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States so as to enable the State to provide for the control of roads, streets, highways, or other rights of way thereon. This authority is needed primarily to avoid problems that arise out of the policing by military personnel of highways that are situated within a military reservation but used extensively by the civilian public as well as by military personnel. It would provide for the retention, at the same time, of appropriate military control over the area.

This proposal would provide for the creation in a State of jurisdiction over land without any relinquishment by the Federal Government of its jurisdiction of title to the land. Any grant or retrocession of jurisdiction pursuant to its terms would take effect only upon the acceptance thereof by the State concerned. The authority to make the grant or retrocession of such jurisdiction would be vested in the heads of departments, independent establishments or agencies of the Federal Government, including the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, in much the same manner as such officers are now authorized by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to accept or secure from a State consent to or cessation of exclusive or partial jurisdiction.

The act of May 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 187) provides for the retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Devens. The act of April 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 60) provides for the retrocession to the State of North Carolina of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Bragg. The act of May 27, 1953 (Public Law 38, 83d Cong.) provides for the retrocession to the Commonwealth of Virginia of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Belvoir. Public Law 41, 83d Congress, provides for the retrocession to the State of Oklahoma of jurisdiction over a highway transversing Fort Sill.

Problems involving the policing of a highway transversing a military reservation have arisen at a number of military installations. This proposal would provide a means for alleviating the particular problems that have arisen at such installations as well as similar problems that may arise in the future at these and at other installations without the necessity of special legislation by the Congress in each case.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

A similar legislative proposal was included in the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1954 and was submitted to the 83d Congress in January 1954 and introduced as H. R. 7111. That proposal passed the House of Representatives on May 17, 1954, with a minor technical amendment (House Rpt. No. 1558, dated May 5, 1954). The inclosed proposal is identical with H. R. 7111 as it passed the House of Representatives.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

NATIONAL MINERALS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of a National Minerals Advisory Council. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Nevada be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1268) to authorize the establishment of a National Minerals Advisory Council, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. BIBLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. CLEMENTS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

I have today introduced a bill to establish a National Minerals Advisory Council in the Department of the Interior. The bill provides that members of the council are to be persons familiar with mining and the minerals industries. It does not place a limitation on the number of members who shall compose the council but it does provide that the council shall meet not less than four times each year and may meet more frequently at the call of the Secretary of the Interior. The chairman of the council would be designated by the Secretary.

The council's major function would be to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary concerning activities and duties of the Secretary relating to mining and the minerals industries, including matters of policy. Council members would be compensated on a per-diem basis for the time actually engaged in advisory or consultative purposes in conjunction with council activities.

A National Minerals Advisory Council is not a new idea. Such a council was originally organized without benefit of authorizing legislation in 1947 and dissolved in 1952 at the insistence of the Department of Justice because of antitrust objections.

Hearings on a bill to establish a National Minerals Advisory Council were held before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in May 1954. At that time, representatives of the Department of the Interior expressed a need for the enactment of such legislation. However, at that time the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice had been unable to reach a satisfactory agreement with respect to establishment of such a council without impinging upon the antitrust laws.

It is felt that proper statutory authority from the Congress for such a council could meet those objections.

In its report to President Eisenhower on November 30, 1954, the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy, made a strong recommendation along these lines. I quote from recommendation No. 11, under the heading "Development of Domestic Mineral Resources," contained in the Committee report:

"It is recommended that the Secretary of the Interior develop ways and means of establishing and maintaining through some workable body the contacts between the mining industry and Government necessary to give force and effect to policies recommended herein."

In my judgment, in effect the practical implementation of the entire Committee report hinges on a workable body similar to the council proposed herewith. This Committee is composed of the Secretary of the Interior as Chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The original establishment of the National Minerals Advisory Council came about after persistent criticism of the lack of concern for the mining industry and the failure to heed the advice of its leaders on the governmental level. Initially, the Council membership came from industry alone, but it was later expanded to include technical experts, fabricators, and large consumers of metals. Public members were later added.

After the Defense Production Act of 1950 was approved, the Department of Justice set down certain criteria to guide all department advisory committees. Such were set down in a letter of October 19, 1950, which, as printed on page 27, House Report 1217, 82d Congress, follows:

"MY DEAR ———: In several instances various Government departments have requested the views of the Department of Justice with respect to whether participation by members of an industry in the activities of industry advisory committees would be considered a violation of the antitrust laws. In view of the recent increase in the number of such requests, it is felt that a statement of the Department's position in this regard might be helpful.

"As a general matter we are of the view that the decision as to the necessity for the formation of industry committees to advise a Government department, and the responsibility for their formation, rests with the specific department. However, in organizing such committees, there are certain requirements which should be met in order to minimize the possibility of violation of the antitrust laws. Briefly stated these requirements are:

"1. There must be statutory authority for the employment of such committees, or there must be an administrative finding that it is necessary to utilize such committees to perform certain statutory duties.

"2. The agenda for such committees and their meetings must be initiated and formulated by the Government.

"3. The meetings to be held must be at the call of and under the chairmanship of full-time Government officials.

"4. Full and complete minutes of each meeting must be kept.

"5. The functions of such committees must be purely advisory and any determinations of action to be taken must be made solely by Government representatives.

"So long as the activities of industry advisory committees are carried on within these limitations, we would not view the activities as constituting an independent violation of the antitrust laws. We wish to emphasize, however, and it should be made clear to participants in such activities, that the De-

partment of Justice retains complete freedom to institute proceedings, either civil or criminal, or both, in the event that any particular plan or course of action is used to accomplish unlawful private ends. Further, this Department retains full freedom to institute civil actions to enjoin continuance of any acts or practices found not to be in the public interest and persisted in after notice to desist.

"Yours sincerely,

"PEYTON FORD,
"Deputy Attorney General."

If the above are the objections of the Department of Justice, I believe such can be met by proper language.

With respect to the bill presented herewith, I gave recognition to laws establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the advisory committee to advise the General Services Administration, the advisory council to advise the Secretary of the Interior respecting the coal-mining industry, and the advisory board selected by the President to advise in connection with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Therefore, it appears to me precedent exists for such a council as proposed.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN RETIRED ARMY OFFICERS TO CIVILIAN POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Justice, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills authorizing the appointment of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, to civilian positions in the Department of Justice. I believe this proposed legislation will be helpful to the public interest in making available the splendid capacities of these two distinguished officers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILEY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1271. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; and

S. 1272. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a memorandum describing the reasons for this bill, in terms of making more effective the original act, in clearing up its ambiguities, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1273) to amend sections 1, 3, and 4 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The excerpts presented by Mr. WILEY are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM MEMORANDUM ON FOREIGN AGENT AMENDMENTS

In administering the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 the Department of Justice has become aware of a number of deficiencies which, if eliminated, would materially strengthen the act. * * *

Section 1 of the act contains a definition of terms. In defining "foreign principal" the section provides that the term shall include "a domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, subsidized directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal demand. * * *" By reason of this limited definition agents of a domestic organization, which is financed, controlled, supervised or directed by a foreign government or foreign political party, are not required to register unless it can be established that such domestic organization is "subsidized" by a foreign principal. The proposal will bring such agents within the purview of the registration requirements of the act, irrespective of whether their organization is "subsidized," if a foreign government or a foreign political party supervises, directs, controls, or finances a domestic organization to such a degree as to exercise substantial control over its policies and activities.

Section 3 of the act sets forth the exemptions from the registration requirements. Among others, the section exempts "any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, * * *." This exemption has been found to be ambiguous, and it is therefore proposed that it be amended so as to define more exactly the nature of the activities, engaged in or to be engaged in by an agent of a foreign principal which will entitle him to exemption. The amendment will clarify the subsection and aid in the making of administrative rulings.

Another amendment which would improve the act is addressed to the filing and labeling requirements (sections 4 (a) and 4 (b). These require the filing and labeling of political propaganda transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce "(i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons." The quoted matter constitutes a test which is most difficult to administer, and is really unwarranted. Its deletion would increase the effectiveness of the act.

Finally, it is suggested that a new subsection (e) be added to section 4 to give legislative sanction to what is presently a rule promulgated by the attorney general. The rule, designed to plug a possible loophole in the disclosure provisions of the act, subjects an agent of a foreign principal physically outside of the United States to the registration, filing, and labeling provisions of the act in the event such agent disseminates political propaganda within the United States through the mails or any other instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce. This rule is now being utilized by the Post Office Department as its legal basis for declaring nonmailable propaganda mailed by an agent of a foreign principal outside the United States to persons within the United States, and as the basis upon which the Bureau of Customs is resting its authority for the seizure of propaganda material arriving in the United States by freight or express from agents of foreign principals located outside the United States and destined to persons not registered with this Department within the United States. Consequently, it is considered desirable that this rule be given legislative approval.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT PERTAINING TO FARMERS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that services performed by agricultural employees who are not employed by the same employer for more than 60 days in a calendar year will not be considered to be employment for purposes of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

When the Congress approved last summer the amendment to the Social Security Act broadening the coverage of farm workers I made a statement on the floor strongly opposing broadening the coverage of farmers. I pointed out that the bill carried the germ to destroy the small farm unit in many areas of this country, and that the tax would add greatly to the burden which the small farmer was already carrying. Judging by a number of reports that I have received, there are a number of problems that are coming to the surface in connection with this program and particularly in regard to the tremendous burden of recordkeeping.

It seems to me that an employee not employed by the same employer for more than 60 days in a calendar year should be exempt, and I certainly urge the appropriate committee of Congress to give this important question immediate consideration.

It will be recalled that the bill as finally approved provides for coverage of any farm worker who earns as much as $100 a year from any one employer.

The $100 a year criterion is bringing into the picture a large number of persons who are not really a part of the farm-labor force, such as a farm boy working for a neighbor on Saturdays, a high-school boy working a few weeks during a summer vaction, local people who turn out for a couple of weeks to help harvest a cotton crop or a strawberry crop, and numerous other situations where the work is extremely temporary in nature. It does not seem to me that any purpose is accomplished by the inclusion of this very casual type of employment, and that this goes beyond the intention that the Congress had in mind in enacting the legislation.

A second major problem is that associated with the so-called day-haul labor. For example, during the cotton season, or during a vegetable or fruit harvest season, a farmer may need to employ about 20 workers for a period of 4 or 6 weeks. He may send his own trucker, or some trucker with whom he has an arrangement, into a local city each morning to haul out workers wishing to work that day. The daily turnover of such workers is very heavy, quite normally 50 percent or more, and occasionally 100

percent. Thus, during a 2-month period a farmer may actually employ five or six hundred workers, even though the number of workers on his farm at any one time is not over 20.

These workers are usually paid once a day, or in some cases many times a day as they deliver harvested products to the central collecting point.

Of the five or six hundred workers this farmer may employ during a harvest season, not a single worker, or perhaps 1 or 2 workers, may work for the farmer a sufficient number of days to earn a hundred dollars. But the farmer has no way of knowing which workers are likely to come back to his farm and earn $100 or more.

Therefore, if the farmer is to be sure that he complies with the law he must keep a record of how much money is paid to each of these five or six hundred workers. This involves a record-keeping operation extremely difficult to work into the established pattern of harvesting operations in many areas. As a result of all this record keeping, the employer may not actually pay any social-security tax at all because no individual worker earns as much as $100, or in other instances the amount of the social-security tax will be a few dollars. We have here a situation in which the cost to the employer of collecting the tax will be many times greater than the amount of the tax itself. It is, I think, an impossible situation and one which the Congress should study to determine if there may not be a means of avoiding this burden without jeopardizing the major purposes of the 1954 amendments to the social-security law.

In order to provide a basis for consideration of the problem, this bill which I am introducing provides for what might be called a qualification period; that is, a period of employment that is not covered by social-security tax liability. Those who qualify by working the requisite number of days will then be considered to be covered by social security for the remainder of the period worked. It is my belief that this proposal will eliminate the great bulk of record keeping required by the present legislation without appreciably affecting the purposes of the 1954 amendment.

Another problem has arisen in this connection, that is, the status of sharecroppers. It was my understanding of the amendments we approved last summer that a sharecropper was to be considered as self-employed. I understand, however, that interpretations are being made that a sharecropper under certain circumstances is to be classified as an employer, and that the landowner is therefore responsible for withholding a paying tax in such instances. I think this goes beyond the intent of the Congress, but since the law is apparently not explicit in this connection, I am introducing a bill to clarify the intent of the law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1279) to provide that services performed by agricultural employees who are not employed by the same employer for more than 60 days in a calendar year shall not be considered to be "employment" for the purposes of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to extend the GI bill of rights so that its educational benefits will be made available to all of our young men and women who enter the service through the Selective Service System or through voluntary enlistment. The proposal would accomplish that objective by extending until July 1, 1959, the basic service period for establishing educational benefit eligibility.

All of us in the Congress and the people of the Nation appreciate that we are in an emergency. It is highly unlikely that we can foresee any period in the near future when we shall need less military manpower. Our manpower needs, in fact, may continue to grow as we meet constant international crises and growing tensions. It will be necessary that our military forces be large and that the morale of those forces be high. It is to me unfair and unjustifiable to say that young men and women who entered the Armed Forces in January of this year somehow are more deserving of benefits from their Nation than the men and women who enter the Armed Forces in March of this year or January of next year. These men and women will be serving together in the same units and with the same responsibilities. They should receive the same benefits.

My proposal relates at this time to the extension of the GI educational benefits law because I consider the educational program the least controversial of the benefits we call the GI bill of rights. The educational program is of value not only to the individuals who are able to continue their education by virtue of it, but is also vitally important to our Nation. A well-educated citizenry is the foundation stone of a strong democracy. I, therefore, look upon my proposal not only as providing a reward for service to deserving men and women who join the armed services, but also as being of value to the national security of the United States.

In order to achieve this objective, I am presenting my proposal to the Senate in two forms. First is a separate bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and second is this same proposal in the form of an amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act. It is my hope that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will favorably report my bill. It is my intention to propose an amendment when H. R. 3005 reaches the floor if it seems at that time to be the most effective way for the Senate to pass upon the proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1282) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend until July 1, 1959, the basic service period for establishing eligibility for educational benefits, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INCREASE OF CERTAIN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service disability system.

Until 1946, our Foreign Service personnel served under the basic act of 1924. In 1946 the act was amended in a form which effectuated a reorganization of the Foreign Service, so as to provide a better Foreign Service, with increased pay for those in that Service.

Normally, when Congress increases the pay of those who are engaged in any particular governmental service, provision is made for an automatic increase in the retirement pay of those who have previously retired from that service. But a ruling by the Comptroller General held that this particular act did not provide for such an automatic increase.

In 1952, Congress passed an act providing for a 7-percent increase in retirement pay. However, the increase which was provided for the active personnel in the Foreign Service approximated an average of about 33⅓ percent. The result has been that the few persons who had retired before that time have received an increase of only about 7 percent, whereas those who have continued to serve received an increase which probably averages about 33⅓ percent.

The bill I am introducing attempts to adjust that discrimination and to make it possible for the few persons—there are probably not more than 200—to receive greater benefits. These persons constituted the real backbone of our Foreign Service in the years prior to World War II.

I think the measure is entitled to the most careful consideration of the Senate and of Congress as a whole, and I hope that favorable action will be taken on it without too much delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD. It is very brief, and I think it would be helpful in providing information to all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on For-

eign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annuity of an annuitant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system pursuant to the act of May 24, 1924 (45 Stat. 140), as amended, or the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), shall be increased the first day of the second month following enactment of this act in accordance with the following rules:

If the annuitant was formerly a participant in the system, the annuity to which he is entitled shall be increased—

(a) by 25 percent if his retirement took place before July 1, 1945;

(b) by 22.5 percent if his retirement took place on or after July 1, 1945, but before July 1, 1946;

(c) by 17.5 percent if his retirement took place on or after July 1, 1946, but before July 1, 1947;

(d) by 11.25 percent if his retirement took place on or after July 1, 1947, but before July 1, 1948; and

(e) by 5 percent if his retirement took place on or after July 1, 1948, but before July 1, 1949.

SEC. 2. (a) The increase in the annuity of an annuitant who was formerly a participant in the system shall be computed on the annuity he was entitled to receive immediately prior to the effective date of Public Law 348, 82d Congress; (b) in the case of an officer who elected a reduced annuity at time of retirement and who availed himself of the restoration clause in section 821 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, such officer's annuity shall be recomputed, in the event of his wife's prior death at any time after the effective date of Public Law 348, on the basis of the full annuity to which he would have been entitled had his wife died prior to July 1, 1948.

SEC. 3. If the annuitant receives an annuity as the survivor of a former participant in the system, the increase in the annuity shall be based on the amount by which the annuity of the former participant would be increased, pursuant to sections 1 and 2 of this act, if he were still living. The increase in the annuity of such an annuitant shall bear the same ratio to the increase that would be received by the former participant as their respective annuities, computed as of a date immediately prior to the effective date of Public Law 348, 82d Congress, bear to each other.

SEC. 4. If a wife of a Foreign Service officer who retired prior to July 1, 1949, becomes an annuitant subsequent to the effective date of this act, as a result of the election made by the officer at time of retirement, such widow shall be entitled to the same increase as though she was an annuitant on the effective date of this act.

SEC. 5. In no case shall an annuity increased under this act exceed the maximum annuity payable under section 821 (a) or (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 6. No annuity currently payable to any annuitant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system shall be reduced as a result of the provisions of this act.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO DISAPPROVAL OF INDIVIDUAL ITEMS IN APPROPRIATON BILLS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of individual items in appropriation bills. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement by me explaining the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items or provisions in appropriation bills, introduced by Mr. BYRD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

The question of authorizing the President to veto single items in appropriation bills has been considered for nearly a hundred years. I have advocated it as a means of reducing nonessential Federal expenditures since I came to the Senate 22 years ago. I am today introducing proposed legislation which I believe to be a new approach to its accomplishment.

The new joint resolution would amend the Constitution to allow Congress to confer the authority on the President by statute. Heretofore, most proposals have been in the form of amendments writing specific item veto authority directly into the Constitution.

Principal objections to writing the authority directly into the Constitution have included:

1. The contention that too much time would be required to repeal a constitutional amendment in the event of a President who would abuse the authority, or exploit it for political purposes.

2. The contention that too much time would be required to amend the Constitution to perfect the provision on the basis of experience.

3. The requirement for brevity in the Constitution precludes necessary definitions of such terms as "items" and "provisions."

The approach contemplated in the amendment would meet all of these objections, and at the same time conform with the views of many legal authorities that a constitutional provision is required to confer item veto authority on the President.

The resolution would amend the Constitution to provide that "Congress may by law authorize the President to disapprove any item or provision, as defined by the Congress" in any appropriation bill it passes, in the same manner, and subject to the same authority of Congress to override a presidential veto of the whole bill.

Under this arrangement Congress could define items and provisions in such manner as it chooses with respect to limitations on appropriations, legislative riders, etc.

Action on repeal or amendment of a statute is much simpler and faster than amending the Constitution. In fact, the statute could be written so its effect could be suspended for specified periods by resolution which would not be subject to veto.

The wisdom of the item veto is demonstrated by the fact that a great majority of the States have conferred the authority upon their governors, and the record of its use in the States is impressive in terms of savings in nonessential appropriations.

The Federal budget has been in the red 23 out of 26 years. The Federal debt is at its peacetime peak of $280 billion. Contingent debt of the Federal Government is approximately $250 billion. Under present conditions a balanced budget is not within sight.

Under these circumstances, it would seem that every device for responsible and constructive economy should be used. I believe this is such a device, and that it is properly safeguarded in the form I have suggested.

The joint resolution reads as follows:

"Resolved (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The Congress may by law authorize the President to disapprove any item or provision, as defined by the Congress, in any appropriation bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and shall have been presented to him for his approval, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under section 7 of article I of this Constitution, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him. Whenever the President pursuant to any such authorization disapproves more than 1 item or provision in any appropriation bill, the vote of the House of Representatives and the Senate upon reconsideration shall be taken separately on each such item or provision.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.' "

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

TRADE AGREEMENTS AND EXTENSION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to House bill 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. At the proper time the amendment will be proposed on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment just submitted by me for myself and 16 distinguished Republican and Democratic Senators representing every geographical area of the country, is to place a reasonable limit upon the foreign oil which is flooding the United States at the rate of a million two hundred fifty thousand barrels every day.

Let it be thoroughly understood that it is not the purpose of the amendment to destroy or impair the principle of reciprocal trade with the other nations of the world. On the contrary, it is my belief that the amendment, if adopted, would strengthen the sound reciprocal trade principle by protecting it from abuse by those who are more concerned about profits than they are about the general welfare.

The basic principles upon which the nation was founded have survived for almost 200 years because, from time to time, they have been subjected to such restraints and limitations as were dictated by changing times and conditions and the instincts of national self-preservation.

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that the sponsors of this amendment will urge the Senate to make it a part of the law of the land.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 38, the resolution (S. Res. 70) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Public Works, be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "The Expanding Great Lakes Frontier," delivered by him before the Antigo (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce on February 26, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BEN F. CAMERON, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, pursuant to notice published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1955, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Ben F. Cameron, of Mississippi, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Edwin R. Holmes, retired, that a hearing has been scheduled on this nomination for 3 p. m. Friday, March 4, 1955, in the committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, at which time all persons interested in this nomination may make any representations which are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE W. PERKINS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON COUNCIL OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. GEORGE. The Senate received today the nomination of George W. Perkins, of New York, to be the United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, vice John C. Hughes, resigned. I give notice that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the Committee rule.

THE CLAY ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials and articles with respect to the program known as the Clay road program.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of January 26, 1955]

THE NEW ROAD PROGRAM

The President is scheduled to send to Congress Thursday his recommendations for a 10-year, 101-billion, Federal-State road building program. It contains one big flaw.

Something will have to be done in the next 10 years if the Nation's roads are to remain adequate to handle the expected volume of vehicular traffic. The President's plan is intended to bring about the needed improvements. But the financing will mean a large increase in the national debt.

The proposed bookkeeping setup is such as to avoid the appearance of debt increase. Actually it will be cellophane camouflage. Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy watchdog of Capitol Hill, has been at pains to point this out.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program submitted on January 11, the 10-year plan concentrates on modernizing the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways. The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some 5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates.

The $20-billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean "operating the Government on two sets of books. One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the (public) debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11,500 million, or 55 cents on the dollar.

No matter what oratory may ensue on the proposed plan, the essential point is this: If the Government is responsible for a debt, it makes no difference how that responsibility is recorded. Laudable as the intent of the plan may be, the country's debt ceiling is dangerously high now.

[From the Martinsville (Va.) Bulletin of January 17, 1955]

SENATOR SCOTT MIGHT GIVE SENATOR BYRD IDEA ABOUT HOW TO GET ROADS

Last week Gov. Robert F. Kennon, of Louisiana, went to Washington and told a highway conference that he felt taxpayers would shell out money for road construction less grudgingly than for any other purpose.

He said he felt this was so because the taxpayer is convinced he is really getting something for his money when roads are built with what he pays for taxes.

The Louisiana Governor was speaking in support of the Federal highway plan submitted to President Eisenhower by a special committee appointed to investigate the matter.

On Saturday of this past week, United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, took the Federal plan apart, declaring that it was wrong financially and would destroy the Federal budget. He appears to be very definitely against the same plan, at least in its financial aspects, that appears to be warmly supported by Governor Kennon and others.

We confess we know little about the Federal highway plan. All we profess to know is that we need highways and plenty of them. We need them in Virginia and we need them badly. About the rest of the Nation, we can hardly say.

To Senator BYRD we say only that we need the highways in Virginia and hope someone can come up with a plan that will meet his sympathetic support. If the Federal Government cannot undertake the program, perhaps the State of Virginia could handle its own needs with the same recognition of need, that has made North Carolina highways an envy of those Virginians who enjoy them. Perhaps our Senator would enjoy calling on Senator KERR SCOTT, of North Carolina, to find out how better and adequate roads can be acquired as needs demand.

[From the Lake Worth (Fla.) Leader of January 21, 1955]

BYRD HITS ROAD PLAN

"Thoroughly unsound" was Senator HARRY F. BYRD's verdict on the multi-billion-dollar highway program formally proposed to President Eisenhower last week by his advisory committee for a national highway plan.

The contemplated procedures, he added, would violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law. With a good deal of restraint he avoided the obvious word, "sham."

First among the Virginian's targets was the proposal to set up a Federal corporation to sell $20 billion in Government-guaranteed bonds at 3 percent interest. The bonds would be retired from revenues from the 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax, and 5 billion more would be raised by taxing filling stations and motels along roads.

This bond issue would cost taxpayers more than $11.5 billion in interest, which would mean every dollar borrowed would eventually cost $1.55. But to make matters worse, in Senator BYRD's opinion, it is proposed that the bonds not be included in the regular Government debt figure. This would mean keeping two sets of books and pave the way for endless outlays for other building programs under the same formula of financial legerdemain. Furthermore, it is predicted, the bonds will probably not be paid off at maturity, in keeping with the current idea on debt retirement.

Having had long experience with road-building in his own State, Senator BYRD proposes an alternate plan.

First, he suggests that the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it. Secondly, the present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road system which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, should be continued on a longstanding basis. This amounts to $535 million. Further, the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued, and finally, a one-half cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax be imposed. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating-oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly would be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

Under this plan, it is declared, States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

By comparison, the Byrd program stands out as a forthright approach to a major problem without an effort at financial trickery and misrepresentation of the kind that has been offered to Mr. Eisenhower. And as such it is recommended reading for Gen. Lucius D. Clay, head of the Presidential Advisory Committee, whose voice carries so much weight at the White House. Its importance is already conceded by the Democratic Congress.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman of January 17, 1955]

MR. BYRD TALKS SENSE

One Democratic Member of the United States Senate who demands attention when money matters are discussed is Senator BYRD of Virginia. And the Senator has been heard from in one of the occasional times he speaks up on Federal expenditure.

Senator BYRD has criticized, as "thoroughly unsound," the Eisenhower administration's plan for a multi-billion dollar highway program financed in part by revenue outside the Federal budget. There are few who will dispute Mr. BYRD's reasoning. Once the Government starts an extensive use of outside financing to attain the desires of any administration it is plain that the budget is meaningless. Furthermore, the entire obligation of a Federal administration to have concern for the expenditure of public funds will have been discarded.

This particular Eisenhower plan, which has some likeness to the New Deal schemes that were generated to create prosperity, should not be necessary if the Nation's economy is as sound as the President has contended. Only in times of national disaster, when the economy is at a low ebb, should the Federal Government attempt extraneous expenditure of any kind, and then only through a period of readjustment. The Federal Government's function is to govern, and nothing more. There is no emergency now, and none in sight.

Under the Eisenhower highway program, the Federal Government would expend $25 billion over and above normal highway expenditures for an interstate network. A Federal highway corporation would raise $20 billion of this amount by floating bonds, and the debt would not be classed as part of the Federal budget. The bonds would be retired from revenues from the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax. The remaining $5 billion would be raised by fees charged to filling stations, motels, and other businesses along the highways.

Senator BYRD has a better suggestion: Return to the States 1½ cents of the Federal gasoline tax and let them build their own highways, meanwhile forgetting the $20 billion of Federal bonds.

As always, the gentleman from Virginia knows what he is talking about.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin of January 21, 1955]

SENATOR BYRD'S HIGHWAY PLAN

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, is in accord with the views of the special committee named by President Eisenhower which has recommended a 10-year plan of highway construction that will involve the expenditures of over $100 billion. "No one recognizes more fully than I," declares the Senator, "the need of road improvement to meet the constantly increasing impact of modern-day traffic." On the other hand he doesn't like the method that has been suggested for financing the plan. He cannot understand how the proposed arrangement can be carried out without actually increasing the indebtedness of the Nation.

Being in favor of such construction, but believing that some other way of meeting the situation would be preferable, he has done what is always asked under such circumstances, produced a plan which he figures will meet the requirements and at the same time will not create a greater national debt and at the same time save billions in interest for other road construction.

Under his substitute plan Senator BYRD recommends:

1. That the 2-cent gas tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the longstanding match basis. This amounts to $535 million.

3. That the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

4. A one-half-cent gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating-oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

This represents a look at the highway-building program which is deserving of consideration as further study is given to the question by Congress. It doesn't represent opposition to the proposed system of improved roads throughout the country. Rather is it agreed by the Senator that such construction is needed. What he is concerned about is keeping away from piling up Federal indebtedness and he cannot see how the bonding plan escapes being regarded as an increased debt.

The Byrd plan leaves much of the gas-tax revenue now going to the Federal Government to the States, with the half a cent still going to the Government for meeting the road work on which the Federal and State Governments join. The saving in interest is a substantial one.

The administration's idea of seeing that the country is provided with a better system of highways has received a good reception. That Congress will do something about it is to be expected. That other suggestions regarding financing will be offered is probable but out of the medley of ideas an efficient and economical plan should result.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier of January 24, 1955]

HIGHWAY PROGRAM ARGUMENTS

It now looks as if President Eisenhower's proposed 10-year road-building program—to be offered to Congress in a special message on Thursday—may become one of the most controversial items on the 1955 agenda.

While it is not argued that the roads shouldn't be built, there is a definite cleavage on Capitol Hill on the financing methods proposed by the Clay Commission.

The program as now constituted would cost $101 billion. Of this, State and local governments would supply $70 billion, $6 billion would come from regular Federal tax moneys, $5 billion would come from fees from gas stations, motels and other business enterprises operating along the new highways. The remaining $20 billion would be borrowed via 30-year, 3 percent bonds to be offered—outside the Federal debt limit by a Federal corporation created for that purpose. Presumably these bonds would be retired on schedule by toll revenues.

Senator BYRD and some others already have challenged the soundness of the principle of creating this kind of extra-budgetary Government debt. It is argued that once such a precedent has been set, statutory ceilings on the Federal debt will become meaningless.

There will be counter-proposals. One will be that the Federal tax on gasoline be cut from 2 cents a gallon to ½ cent so the States can increase their own gas taxes 1½ cents a gallon and do the highway-building themselves according to the Clay Commission blueprint.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) News of January 20, 1955]

GOLD BRICK HIGHWAYS

Senator BYRD has a plan for financing the $100 billion, 10-year highway program proposed by the President's Advisory Committee.

Instead of the gold-brick scheme devised by the committee, which would hike the Federal debt without acknowledging it, the Senator suggests:

Repeal the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax so the States may reimpose it and pay for their own highway construction. Use a Federal tax on lubricating oil and a new half-cent tax on gasoline to finance the present Federal aid program for roads.

This, the Senator estimates, would save loading the cost of the program on future generations—with an additional price tag of $11,500,000,000 for interest on the debt.

In the Senator's own State of Virginia, a first-class highway system has been built and maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis—which makes it cheaper and doesn't indulge in the sleazy trick of passing on to the children our own obligations. What's wrong with Virginia's way?

[From the Texarkana (Ark.) Gazette of January 19, 1955]

SENATOR BYRD AND THE HIGHWAY PROJECT

In the Sunday morning dispatches, Senator BYRD of Virginia was quoted as blasting the Presidential Commission's proposal for

a multi-billion-dollar highway program as thoroughly unsound and one which he believes would completely destroy the budget as a Federal debt limitation.

People who advocate a balanced budget, a halt to inflation, and a sound economy, who also have some knowledge of finance, will thoroughly agree with him.

The proposed authority to the suggested highway commission to raise $20 billion by floating bonds would clearly be an evasion of the present Federal debt limitation. The proposed allocation of the present revenue from the 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax to retire these bonds would be a diversion from the present revenues of the Government and would further unbalance the budget.

However, President Eisenhower has apparently lost much if not all of his interest in any attempt to balance the budget, probably having come to the conclusion that the public is not particularly interested in recovering from the 20-year financial debauch and is in favor of trying to taper off rather than sober up.

This is evidenced by the highway proposal, the proposal to increase payments to the defense forces and Government employees, the increase in social benefits of one kind and another with no suggestion of any increase in taxes to take care of the increased expenses, which can only lead to further deficits. The present deficit is figured at around $4 billion.

Are we going back to the old New Deal proposal to spend and spend and tax and tax with the idea that we can spend ourselves into prosperity?

Apparently we are.

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Star of January 18, 1955]

HIGHWAY PLAN UNSOUND

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, was right last week when he attacked the Clay Commission plans for a vast interstate network of Federal highways as financially unsound.

The plans, expected to be incorporated in a forthcoming message from the President, envisage a $25 billion highway program, $20 billion of it financed by 3-percent revenue bonds repayable from Federal gasoline taxes, and $5 billion of it by fees on service stations, motels, and other business establishments along the highways.

Senator BYRD's point, in attacking the proposal, is that it would destroy the Federal budget and debt limit, by allowing a $25 billion indebtedness to be incurred by the Government, completely separate from our current bookkeeping system. "You cannot evade debts by definition," he pointed out, adding that in 30 years the money would cost taxpayers 55 cents on the dollar, and the chance of it being repaid in that time were slim, since we have retired not a dollar of Federal debt in a quarter of a century.

In condemning the plan, which would certainly entail waste on a grand scale, Senator BYRD wisely suggested that we continue the present system, in effect, of Federal and State cooperation on highway building.

This, he points out, would permit States to retain what control they now have over highways, would save $11.5 billion in interest for future highway building, and would allow a flexible and continuing construction program designed to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

[From the Florence (Ala.) Times of January 20, 1955]

MR. BYRD HITS SHAM ROAD PLAN

"Thoroughly unsound," was Senator HARRY F. BYRD's verdict on the multibillion-dollar highway program formally proposed to President Eisenhower last week by his advisory committee for a national highway plan.

The contemplated procedures, he added, would, "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law." With a good deal of restraint he avoided the obvious word, "sham."

First among the Virginian's targets was the proposal to set up a Federal corporation to sell $20 billion in Government-guaranteed bonds at 3 percent interest. The bonds would be retired from revenues from the 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax, and $5 billion more would be raised by taxing filling stations and motels along roads.

This bond issue would cost taxpayers more than $11.5 billion in interest, which would mean every dollar borrowed would eventually cost $1.55. But to make matters worse in Senator BYRD's opinion, it is proposed that the bonds not be included in the regular Government debt figure. This would mean keeping two sets of books and pave the way for endless outlays for other building programs under the same formula of financial legerdemain. Furthermore, it is predicted, the bonds will probably not be paid off at maturity, in keeping with the current idea on debt retirement.

Having had long experience with road building in his own State, Senator BYRD proposes an alternate plan.

First, he suggests that the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it. Secondly, the present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, should be continued on a long standing basis. This amounts to $535 million. Further, the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued, and finally a one-half-cent-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax be imposed. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating-oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly would be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

"Under this plan," it is declared, "States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

By comparison, the Byrd program stands out as a forthright approach to a major problem without an effort at financial trickery and misrepresentation of the kind that has been offered to Mr. Eisenhower. And as such it is recommended reading for Gen. Lucius D. Clay, head of the presidential advisory committee, whose voice carries so much weight at the White House. Its importance is already conceded by the Democratic Congress.—The Nashville Tennessean.

[From the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle of January 17, 1955]

A HIGHWAY PROGRAM THAT ISN'T UNANIMOUS YET

President Eisenhower's proposed 10-year road-building program, which carries a price tag of $101 billion, sparkles with appeal for if there is anything that the people of this country want it is more, better, and safer highways—particularly when the Federal Government bears part of the cost.

This program, developed by a Presidential Highway Commission, would include a network of toll roads desired by the Federal Government for strategic defense purposes. The Federal Government would pay $25 billion of the cost and the States and local governments the remainder. As an inducement for the State and local governments to participate, they would be allowed to use the tolls to liquidate their expenses and, in addition, the Federal Government would give them other money to help build primary and secondary highways.

To finance the cost of the Federal Government, the Commission proposes establishment of a Federal Highway Corporation, which would float $20 billion worth of bonds to be repaid by the Federal tax of 2 cents a gallon on gasoline. The FHC would get the other $5 billion from fees on filling stations, motels, etc., along the highways. None of this new $25 billion debt would be classed as part of the present Federal debt.

But, appealing as this plan may seem to be on paper, it is drawing opposition from quarters that advance sound arguments for opposition. First, the National Education Association is against it. Second, the American Automobile Association. Third, Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

The AAA objects to the provisions for toll roads on the grounds that the Commission would permit the Federal Government to pay cash to the States for toll highways already built—or built later—if they became part of the interstate highway system.

The NEA objects because of a fear that State governments would be tempted to divert school funds to highway construction.

Senator BYRD complains that the program is unsound, and would wreck the Government's already questionable control over the Federal debt. Establishment of the FHC, he says, would give the Government 2 sets of books—"1 set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

"If," he says, "they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything." He points out that the FHC would not own the roads or have any assets, unlike the RFC which had loans and the CCC which has crops as assets.

Under the proposed interest rate on the FHC loan, says BYRD, the Government would have to pay $1.55 for every $1 borrowed and he doubts if the bonds would be paid off at maturity because, "We have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years."

With the AAA, the NEA, Senator BYRD, and others who will find objections protesting the President's road-building program it is, as they say in the Senate, certain to bring on some debate.

[From the Lewiston (Ohio) Tribune of January 20, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAY FINANCING PROBLEMS

President Eisenhower's proposed national highway program seems headed for critical examination in Congress, chiefly because of the odd financing plan recommended for it.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat, Virginia) raised some valid doubts about the plan when he objected that the program, as presently proposed, would "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law."

BYRD has a habit of objecting almost automatically to proposals which he thinks threaten States' rights or a balanced budget. This time, however, he seems to have found a cause to which he can recruit objectors from outside his normal circle.

BYRD declared in an announcement Saturday, the text of which was received here yesterday, that he would discuss Mr. Eisenhower's highway recommendations in the Senate after they are submitted to Congress next Thursday. Meanwhile he takes a dim view of the financing plan proposed by the National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, the Clay commission. BYRD declares:

"The committee's recommendations fall generally into two parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional $25 billion for the so-called interstate highway system. Federal expenditures on

the two programs in 10 years would total $31 billion.

"The committee estimates the $25 billion would construct 40,000 road-miles designated by the Federal Government as interstate highway. This would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. The average would be about 800 miles per State. For this the committee recommends borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

"If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the committee can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule, the last maturing in 1987, the interest would cost more than $11.5 billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55."

However, BYRD contends it is most unlikely, in view of the Federal debt's history, that the bonds would be paid off on schedule and predicts that the program will be expanded in mileage, scope, and amount even before the 40,000 miles are constructed.

"The committee recommended to the President," said BYRD, "that the program be financed throught a Federal corporation, which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses for 30 years if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

"Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays. * * *

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books—one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income, we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs."

Perhaps BYRD's condemnations of the fiscal methods suggested are unduly harsh, and we were not greatly impressed by the States' rights financing methods BYRD proposed instead. But it does seem odd that a "businessman's government" has proposed such an apparently unbusinesslike method of financing a very worthy project.

If the Federal Government cannot countenance, for example, a separate Columbia Basin account to help finance the expansion of self-liquidating Federal dam projects in the Northwest, how can it justify going outside regular budget channels to finance a national project which cannot directly repay its costs to the taxpayers?

Surely there must be some way, considering the importance of a national highway program, to depend more upon direct taxing to finance it and less upon cost-doubling bonds, annoying tolls, and other trick methods of raising the necessary funds.

Mr. Eisenhower's national highway program is an excellent idea, particularly if it can be kept reasonably free of pork-barrel politics and develop a truly national highway system. But the methods thus far suggested for financing it undoubtedly will get some deservedly critical attention in Congress.—B. J.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of January 25, 1955]

HIGHWAY PLAN NEEDS STUDY

To everyone who piles up mileage in an automobile President Eisenhower's proposal to spend $100 billion in 10 years to modernize the Nation's highways, looks good. But, it's not all gold that glistens. United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, great watchdog of Uncle Sam's purse, has spoken sharply against the multibillion-dollar proposal.

Senator BYRD, whose reputation as a wallet watcher has maintained the Finance Committee chairmanship for him whether the majority is Democratic or Republican, declares the idea of financing a vast program by a bonding scheme outside of the Budget violates finance principles and opens the door to all manner of similar operations without budgetary controls. Says he: "This ambitious highway program would cost some $11.5 billion in interest. That figures that for each dollar's worth of highway constructed, gasoline taxpayers would contribute $1.55."

Mr. BYRD offers as a substitute that the Federal Government withdraw from the gasoline-tax field. He would cut the Federal levy, now 2 cents a gallon, to one-half cent and let the States raise their existing gas taxes for road purposes. We like that decentralization idea.

Senator BYRD, indeed, makes a strong argument when he declares that road revenue can be more easily distributed over future years if the States retain control over most of the fuel-tax moneys. Under the President's plan, we can see distinct possibilities of constructing multilane highways beyond actual present and anticipated needs in some areas and paying 55 percent too much for them through interest charges. Remember, after construction, comes maintenance costs. Ouch!

As far as strategic interstate routes are concerned, it appears to us the Federal Government with its tax on lubricating oil and a half-cent tax on gasoline, could press forward with programs to continue developing those highways. Certainly the job could be done on a pay-as-you-go basis. Of course, this is not as fast.

President Eisenhower's plan is the result of a study made by a committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. That committee's plan, adopted by Mr. Eisenhower, is based on existing rates of highway-user tax. We frankly wonder how much of that revenue from State and fuel taxes would remain for other roads after State participation in Ike's plan for the three key routes in Illinois. Continuation of existing highway programs, which we also need in our great State, might call for a boost in gasoline taxes for the small-car owner whose burdens are heavy enough already. The gasoline tax in Illinois now is murder—a nickel a gallon.

An estimate by the Clay committee that taxes on interstate highway filling stations and motels could raise $5 billion toward those roads look too much like counting chickens before they hatch. States certainly would want a hand in such a source of revenue, be it large, medium, or small. Bet your life on that.

Senator BYRD has performed a valuable public service in pointing out the pitfalls of the $101 billion (to be exact) interstate highway program. It would appear from this roost the Clay committee's grand plan deserves close examination and, if approved in principle, some revision lest it lead the Nation into a financial trap.

The Clay committee also is to be commended for working out a great scheme anent our highways. Our roads are lagging behind the onrush of more and faster automobiles. Too, highways form an important factor in our pattern for defense. Just the same, we feel sure, General Clay would be the first to concede that his plan is not bulletproof. Let the Congress weigh this program carefully. It's a terriffic deal.

H. F. W.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Star of January 18, 1955]

BYRD CHALLENGES ROAD PLAN

We do not doubt that the $101 billion in road construction contemplated in President Eisenhower's plan is all needed, but Members of Congress had better sit up and pay attention to Senator BYRD's objections.

The Senator foresees that the plan entails borrowing by the Government beyond the legal debt limit. He foresees that every Federal dollar spent in this way will cost the taxpayer $1.55, since the interest charge (at 3 percent) on the proposed $20 billion bond issue would be $11½ billion. And Senator BYRD foresees that if this method of borrowing and spending outside the normal budgetary controls is approved by Congress, "It may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc." Senator BYRD said the President's proposal for Federal funds for building schools was of this character.

One big objection to this type of financing is that the accounting system of the Government would not truly reflect its fiscal operations.

It is our opinion that Senator BYRD's point will have to be refuted logically before the President's highway plan can be approved, and we are inclined to believe that the Senator is right.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of January 20, 1955]

IS NATIONAL ROAD PLAN PANACEA?

Much has been made of the Eisenhower administration's proposed national highway program as a positive hedge against the threat of a depression cycle.

Much has been said about the necessity for Federal domination on such a road program, and any critics who suggested it might well be another step in the ultimate complete domination of the citizen by his Government were dismissed contemptuously.

But the other day Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, brought his powers to bear on the matter and came up with a few thoughts with which the administration will have to deal.

Under the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, the administration proposal falls generally into two classifications:

1. Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year.

2. Expenditures during the next 10 years of an additional $25 million for the so-called interstate highway system.

Now let's see what Senator BYRD has to say, first, about the Committee's recommendations for financing the $25-billion expansion:

If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they should be paid off on schedule, the last maturing in 1987, the interest on the bonds would cost more than $11.5 billion.

That, Senator BYRD points out, would mean every dollar borrowed would cost the taxpayer $1.55. Furthermore, he adds:

"Based on all recent Federal experience, I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar

of the Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period."

Furthermore, the Senator predicts that even before the contemplated 40,000 miles of road are constructed under the program it will be expanded in mileage, scope, and amount—getting the taxpayer ever more certainly on the hook.

But, more importantly, Senator BYRD takes issue with the whole theory of the program being carried out by the Federal Government and dares suggest such a program is more properly the province of the sovereign States.

As a substitute for the Committee's recommendations, he proposes:

1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. That present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, which for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. (This aid now amounts to $535 million.)

3. That the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

4. That a one-half-cent-a-gallon Federal tax be imposed, which, together with revenue from the lubricating-oil tax, will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

We agree with Senator BYRD when he says his plan would permit the States to retain as much control over their roads as in the past, save $11.5 billion in interest to be applied to additional road construction, and evenly distribute road revenue over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

And certainly no Hoosier will disagree with the Virginian when he declares:

"Nothing is truer than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant, it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the State. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of Federal bureaucracy compel the States to do things they desired not to do because of grants made by the Federal Government."

Hoosiers, too, have felt the "iron hand of the Federal Government" in the past and are feeling it currently in the Civil Service Commission's allegations on violations of the Hatch Act. And we don't like it.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Times of January 18, 1955]

MR. BYRD WARMS UP

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has come out with a preliminary appraisal of the $101 billion highway program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission.

The respected Virginian has made it clear that he is choosing his words with restraint, pending Ike's formal announcement on where he stands.

While merely warming up, so to speak, Mr. BYRD has this to say:

"Legerdemain * * * thoroughly unsound * * * a procedure that would violate financial principles, defy budgetary control and evade the Federal debt."

That is pretty good for a starter. In full voice, Mr. BYRD may peel the paint right off the White House.

We admire both his splendid early season form and his views on this matter.

The President's commission says among other things that if a Federal corporation is set up, and if that corporation sells $20 billion worth of 30-year bonds, then for some reason or other we can just forget about adding the total to our national debt.

Nonsense, says Mr. BYRD. The so-called corporation plans to pay 3 percent interest to the bond buyers. Over 30 years, that'll mean the buyers must be paid back their $20 billion plus $11.5 billion in interest. And who'll be in hock for all those billions? The taxpayers, of course. If that isn't adding to the national debt, what is?

Good luck, Senator BYRD. From any angle, the whole set-up looks about as sound as a chain letter.

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item of January 23, 1955]

UNSOUND FEDERAL FINANCING

Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, has shown his customary sound judgment in analyzing the proposal for a national highway program costing $101 billion.

The Senator finds that during the 10 years which this project would cover the Federal Government would spend $31 billion on the highways.

One part of this program includes the annual spending of $623 million a year in regular Federal aid to highways.

The second part would be the expenditure of $25 billion to build 40,000 miles of national highway.

Five billion of this latter fund would come from fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating along the highways. The other twenty billion would have to be borrowed at not less than 3 percent interest.

Senator BYRD says that the interest on the twenty billion, the principal of which is to be retired in 30 years, would amount to $11½ billion dollars. This means that for every dollar borrowed taxpayers would have to pay back $1.55.

BYRD does not believe the bonds issued as evidence of indebtedness would be paid off in 30 years. He says that not a single dollar of Federal debt has been paid off in the past 25 years, and the national debt is going higher.

It also is a matter of concern to note that one of the proposals is that the Federal Government set up a corporation, which without either assets or income, would borrow the $20 billion from the public. The United States Treasury would guarantee the bonds, but the actual debt for which the Government would be pledged to meet if required, would not be included in the national debt.

This, actually, is dishonest bookkeeping and deceptive juggling of national obligations in order to avoid boosting the current staggering national debt of $275 billion.

This procedure would be a violation of sound fiscal policy as well as of moral principle.

Senator BYRD again has drawn a clear picture of what would be a grave mistake in Federal financing.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat and Times of January 30, 1955]

IKE'S ROAD PROGRAM MEETS OPPOSITION

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious opposition in Congress.

Foremost critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, and chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who has assailed it strongly in his self-appointed role as watchdog of the Treasury.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee, the 10-year plan concentrates on modernizing 40,000 miles of interstate highways. The Federal Government would continue regular aid to States for 10 years at $600 million a year while State and local governments would spend an aggregate of $70 billions over the same period.

In addition, the Federal Government would spend $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion would come from licensing filling stations, motels, and so forth, along the rights-of-way, while $20 billion would be raised through 30-year bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

Senator BYRD proposes instead that the 2-cent Federal gas tax be cut to one-half cent and the States be allowed to raise their taxes to absorb the difference. He thinks the States would do a better and more efficient road-building job.

Opposition from so strong and determined a Senator makes it certain the road program will not have smooth sailing.

[From the Muscatine (Iowa) Journal of January 21, 1955]

SENATOR BYRD ON ROADS

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is recognized as among the able Members of the United States Senate and likewise as one who looks with concern at the mounting national debt.

He has commented and criticized recommendations which were made in the Clay Commission relative to a national highway program, in which included: (A) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year; and (B) expenditures during the next 10 years of an additional $25 billion for the so-called interstate highway program.

It is to the latter phase of the proposal that Senator BYRD voices objections. The committee recommended borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of $5 billion from concessions operating along the highways. The committee report indicated that revenue from gasoline taxes and lubricating oil would liquidate the debt, which would be assumed by a Government corporation, carrying a Treasury guaranty, but with the obligation not included in the Government's debt.

Such a procedure, he charges, violates financing principles, defies budgetary control, and evades Federal law.

If the Federal Government can borrow money for roads in this fashion, BYRD contends, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays for other purposes.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income, we add to our debt," he insists. "You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot avoid debt by classification. The obligations of the Federal Government and its citizens will still remain."

BYRD sees another grave objection to the program as outlined of importance equal to his other objections.

This is in the phase which provides Federal grants to States.

Since 1934, he notes, Federal grants to States have expanded enormously in cost and in functions. Every Federal grant, he continues, elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States. Nothing is truer than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant, it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the State. "Time and again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy compel the States to do things that they did not desire to do, because of grants made by the Federal Government," he asserted.

The Virginian, noting that he realizes the need of road improvements, proposes another way to get them.

He suggests that the Federal Government repeal its 2-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline, permitting States to reimpose it; that present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban roads be continued on the long-standing basis; that the Federal tax on lubricating oil be continued; and that there be a one-half-cent-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax, on the basis of estimated increasing use, he says, will be sufficient to compensate

the United States Treasury for the Federal highway aid.

BYRD says his suggestions will result in more road development than can be accomplished under the committee's plan; will avoid increasing the national debt and will serve to preserve the soundness of the Federal budgetary system.

It's difficult to believe that the Virginia Senator is talking through his hat, for a considerable part of his career in public life has been devoted to the problems of road construction in Virginia.

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal of January 19, 1955]

THE HIGHWAY PLAN

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, the Senate watchdog on finance, has spoken out sharply against the multi-billion-dollar highway construction program recently presented by Gen. Lucius Clay's presidential advisory committee.

The Senator, whose reputation as a dollar-watcher, has kept his Finance Committee chairmanship for him whether the majority is Republican or Democratic, says the idea of financing a vast program by a bonding scheme outside of the budget violates finance principles and opens the door to all manner of similar operations outside of budgetary controls.

Perhaps even more pertinent to Iowans who rejected a Democratic gubernatorial candidate and his proposed bonding program for highway modernization, is Mr. BYRD'S observation that the ambitious interstate highway program would cost some $11.5 billion in interest, meaning that for each dollar's worth of highway, gasoline taxpayers would contribute $1.55.

Mr. BYRD offers as a substitute for the Clay committee plan a proposition similar to that backed by numerous States in the past; namely, that the Federal Government withdraw from the gasoline-tax field. The Virginia Senator would cut the Federal levy, now 2 cents a gallon, to one-half cent and let the States raise their existing gas taxes for road purposes.

Senator BYRD makes a most significant point in his opinion that road revenue can be more evenly distributed over future years to keep roads modernized if the States retain control over most of the fuel-tax revenues. Under the Clay committee plan we can see distinct possibilities of building multi-lane highways beyond actual present and anticipated needs in some areas and paying 55 percent too much for them through interest charges. And after the construction phase would come the costs of maintenance.

As far as the strategic interstate routes are concerned, it appears to us that the Federal Government with its tax on lubricating oil and a half-cent tax on gasoline could press forward with programs to continue developing those highways. The job could certainly be done on a pay-as-you-go basis, though admittedly not as fast as a massive bond issue would permit.

Iowa has had some experience with highway bonding. We well recall the early thirties, when gasoline revenues were not meeting payments on the $100 million bond issue. The bonds had to be refinanced along with drastic action to increase gasoline revenues.

The Clay committee plan is based upon existing rates of highway user taxes. We frankly wonder how much of that revenue from State fuel taxes would remain for other roads after State participation in the committee's plan for the three key routes in Iowa. Continuation of existing highway programs, which Iowans need too, might require a boost in gasoline taxes for the small-car owner whose burdens are heavy enough already.

An estimate by the committee that taxes on interstate highway filling stations and motels could raise $5 billion toward those roads looked too much like counting the chickens before they hatch. And States would certainly want a hand in such a revenue source.

Senator BYRD has performed a valuable public service in pointing out the pitfalls of the $101 billion interstate highway program. We think that the Clay committee's grand plan deserves some very close examination and, if approved in principle, some revision lest it lead the Nation into a financial trap.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of January 21, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The President's National Advisory Committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay has made recommendations as to what the road program of the United States should be for the next 10 years. President Eisenhower will submit a special message on this on January 27.

The Advisory Committee recommends continuation of regular Federal aid for highways at the rate of $623 million a year. This is a very wise suggestion because there is always the danger that in undertaking an extensive long-range program this might be used as an excuse for cutting down on the present road construction.

In addition, the Clay committee recommends that in the next 10 years an additional $25 billion be spent on constructing 40,000 miles of road designated by the Federal Government as interstate highway. This would entail an expenditure of approximately $31 billion in 10 years.

That practical businessman, HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, in a statement analyzing the Clay proposal, insists upon figuring the interest and adding it to the cost. He says this program will cost $42.5 billion and that "it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity." He says that in 25 years "in effect we have not paid off a single dollar of the Federal debt."

He also says with considerable truth that the type of revenue-bond financing which is proposed violates Federal financing principles, defies budgetary control, and evades the Federal debt law. There is justification for this viewpoint, and Senator BYRD has called attention to many obligations of the Federal Government over and beyond those calculated in the Federal debt.

On the other hand, these roads just must be built. Unless they are, the population of the country is going to be decimated on the highways and traffic will be bottlenecked all over the country.

Senator BYRD offers an alternate plan which would not work as a substitute. Irreconcilable States righter as he remains, he suggests that the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed and the source of revenue turned over to the States. No real national interstate system of roads would ever be built this way. There would be toll-road States, detour States, and a crazy quilt of patchwork roadbuilding without the through highways of the type the Nation needs. It is to be doubted, too, if the States would face the necessity for meeting these national needs.

A great deal depends, too, on the designation of the interstate highways and the division of the funds to be spent. For that reason, it is a good thing that the Public Works Committees of both Houses of Congress will go into details of this immense plan.

Meanwhile, there must be a new look at the whole problem of the big Federal debt because no longer can it be claimed that it is a New Deal device to throw the country into socialism. The realities of the debt situation must be faced and so must the roadbuilding needs.

[From the Biddeford (Maine) Journal of January 19, 1955]

HIDING SOME ROAD COSTS

When you are making a study of financial problems in relation to government it is usually safe to depend for one angle of the study on the opinion of United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia. He has something to say on the proposed national highway program recommended by the National Advisory Committee to the President.

Those who favor bond issues to build roads would do well to weigh the words of the Virginia Senator. He touches on programs financed by borrowing outside the debt, and expenditures outside the record, as far as budgetary control is recorded; also on activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control. Senator BYRD says: "Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs. When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit."

Federal grants have increased 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost since 1921. Committee recommendations fall generally in two parts, Senator BYRD points out. One part is continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional $25 billion for the so-called interstate highway system. Federal expenditures on the 2 programs in 10 years would total $31 billion. The $25 billion would construct 40,000 road miles of such interstate highways. The average would be about 800 miles per State. If the bonds can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule—the last maturing in 1967, the interest would cost more than $11.5 billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55, Senator BYRD figures.

The Virginia Senator says that, "Based on all recent Federal experience, I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period. Actually, the committee recommends that the Federal Government assume virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system. (Abolishing the 60–40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program.)"

Federal agencies will determine the location of the interstate road system, will fix the number and location of access roads, which may be considerable distances apart, will fix the fees for the activities, such as filling stations, motels, restaurants, etc., that are located along the rights-of-way, and will control construction standards and other details, the Senator points out in an article outlining his program to be introduced on the Senate floor.

Maine can appreciate the above warning by the Virginia Senator, as we already have such a powerful and dictatorial authority operating within the State.

Senator BYRD is going to do more than talk. He will offer a plan as a substitute for the Committee's recommendations. His proposals will include:

1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, this to permit the States to reimpose it.

2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many

years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. This amounts to $535 million.

3. That the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

4. A one-half cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from this tax, plus the Federal lubricating-oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

Under this plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions. Under the committee plan principal and interest payments on the $20 billion bond issue would dry up gasoline-tax revenue for 20 years, to 1987, with the exception of about $600 million which is committed to matching funds of States for their primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Maine would de well to study the program of Senator BYRD before committing the great-grandchildren of present residents to paying for roads which will be outmoded, worn out, and probably abandoned years before that generation of citizens first see the light of day.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Evening Globe of January 17, 1955]

SENATOR BYRD'S DOUBTS

President Eisenhower's $101 billion public roads program faces close inspection in Congress. That is the meaning of the attack delivered against the plan by conservative Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia. Senator BYRD, expressing the instinctive distrust of huge Federal projects implicit in an old-fashioned States rights southerner, thinks it would be wiser to have the Federal Government hand over gas taxation rights to the States to do their own road building.

Undoubtedly, the President's program is the largest public works proposal ever put forward by our Government in peacetime. Beside it, the projects sponsored by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt seem modest. On the other hand, the case for inducing Federal and State collaboration to obtain a well-balanced transcontinental road system is strong indeed.

Senator BYRD'S criticism may not block Ike's program. It does insure that Congress shall give careful scrutiny to the scheme before rendering a verdict.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald of January 14, 1955]

HOW TO MAKE DEBTS DEBTLESS

There are still a few Puritans left in the world of finance. These are the men who know life is hard and earnest, and it does no good to sugar-coat the facts. In Government HARRY BYRD is one of them. Sometimes we wonder if maybe we—well, here's the story:

The Federal Government is considering a $101-billion highway program in the next 10 years, of which the Federal share will be $25 billion. The traditional, the puritanical, method of raising the $25 billion would be to borrow it quite frankly and openly and put it on the books as that much more of a national debt.

But that isn't the present plan. The present plan is to set up an authority, which would issue the necessary bonds. This would make the debt a debt of the authority and not of the Federal Treasury, even though the bonds would be guaranteed by the gasoline tax and other governmental revenue.

In this way the Government could get the $25 billion without any increase in the national debt. The debtless debt system.

But that isn't the only modern un-Puritan device.

There is a plan now under scrutiny here and elsewhere for schools and other public buildings to be constructed by private enterprise, which would then lease the buildings back to the municipal or State government. When Government payments on the lease had sufficiently reimbursed the constructor, ownership would go to the Government.

Offhand, it would appear that the Government would pay, year by year, just as much on the lease as it would pay on borrowings for its own construction. The only difference would seem to be that in one case it would be called a debt (in the good old puritanical sense), and in the other it would not be called a debt.

Of course that isn't the whole story. It appears to be possible for private enterprise to build things a lot cheaper than some cities. Besides, securities issued by private enterprise yield income taxable under the Federal income tax, while municipal bonds give a happy refuge to persons in the high brackets. There may be something in the plan we don't fully appreciate.

Maybe we are being a stuffy old Puritan in wanting a debt to be acknowledged as a debt. Maybe we ought to go lie down on McKinley's grave and watch the world progress. But will someone tell us first how this debtless debt practice can be extended to family finances?

A PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DISARMAMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I rise to submit a resolution outlining a plan for economic disarmament. The resolution is a practical one, in that it presents a businesslike method for attaining disarmament.

In order to save the time of the Senators, and in respect of the memory of our beloved late colleague, the Honorable BURNET MAYBANK, I submit the resolution without making supplementary remarks; and I ask unanimous consent that it be retained in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate until Monday next, March 7, in order that Senators who may wish to do so may join in sponsoring it. At a later date I plan to speak on this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks, together with an article by John R. Cavley, of the Kansas City Star; an article by Mr. R. K. Shackford, of the Washington Daily News; and, finally, an editorial, "The Gauge of Red Intent," also published in the Washington Daily News.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 71) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas low living standards are one of the primary causes for war and improved living standards promote peace; and

Whereas such improved living standards can be attained only if world resources, both human and material, are devoted in increasing amounts to peaceful purposes; and

Whereas a major power has recently announced an increase in its armaments budget and has proclaimed as policy the expansion of arms production and war-supporting industry at the sacrifice of civilian production: Be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to present to the United Nations this proposal to explore the possibilities of limiting the proportion of every nation's resources devoted to military purposes, both direct and indirect, so as to increase steadily the proportion devoted to improving the living levels of the people.

That any such limitation provide adequate means of inspection and control and be made part of any comprehensive regulation, limitation, and balanced reduction of all armed forces and armaments.

That the exploration of the possibilities of this method of disarmament be pursued to gain recognition for the principle that the way any government divides its resources can be taken as a measure of its peaceful or aggressive intent; also for the principle that high living standards constitute an automatic built-in deterrent against aggression and that any nation which deliberately and persistently holds down the living levels of its people to build military power is a threat to world security; also for the principle that the conversion time that must elapse before resources can be shifted from peaceful to war purposes can be used as a basis for preventing possible aggression before it takes place.

That to implement these principles consideration be given to the following:

An adequate number of key resources be selected and standards be drawn up for determining what ratio of each of these resources should be set as a maximum ceiling limiting the proportion of each of these resources which may be utilized for military purposes.

Along with each such ceiling adequate measures of inspection and control be enforced to prevent the diversion or conversion for military purposes of resources committed for peaceful uses, also that any such acts of diversion or conversion be considered automatic evidence of aggressive intent.

The ceilings limiting the possible military uses should be set to attain a major increase in living levels, to provide adequate warning before any of these resources can be converted to war production and to contribute to other arms and armament controls.

These ceilings be subject to periodic revision by agreement among the participating nations with the view of providing balanced security and progressively to increase the proportion of all resources to be committed to peaceful uses, provided that it be recognized a "freeze" of existing resources allocations cannot be taken as a starting stage because it would freeze a pattern of continuing aggression for some nations, while keeping others relatively defenseless.

Ceilings upon the military uses of these key resources be established to the end that no nation's economic expansion be curbed.

In setting such ceilings, allowance be made for the special economic needs of individual nations, particularly those with underdeveloped economies.

That the President be further requested to direct the appropriate Government agencies to complete studies now underway, or to undertake any new studies that might be needed to carry through the objectives of this resolution.

The articles and editorial presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star of March 1, 1955]

BOLD PEACE PLAN—SENATOR SYMINGTON OFFERS NEW CONCEPT FOR DISARMAMENT AND GLOBAL SECURITY—TO WORK THROUGH U. N.—RESOURCES OF EACH NATION WOULD BE PRORATED FOR CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PRODUCTION

(By John R. Cauley)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, today proposed an economic disarmament plan which he

said is aimed at "achieving security through high-living standards for all the peoples of the world, including the Russians and Chinese."

The Missouri Senator said he would introduce in the Senate tomorrow a resolution requesting that the President present to the United Nations a proposal to explore the possibilities of limiting the proportion of any nation's resources which can be devoted to military purposes. That would increase steadily the proportion of every nation's resources devoted to improving living levels, he said.

BASIS FOR ACTION

His proposal, SYMINGTON explained, would require a foolproof system of inspection and controls but, even if the Russians do not agree, he said, the plan still would provide a basis for action on behalf of peace.

"Under this plan," SYMINGTON said, "certain key resources would be selected. A system of ceilings would then be imposed, limiting the proportion of each of these resources that could be devoted to military purposes.

"As an example, it could be stipulated that no less than a certain percent of the steel output of a particular country should be allocated to its civilian economy. This clearly would limit the steel available for military purposes.

"These ceilings would not curb any nation's economic expansion."

SUBJECT TO REVISIONS

"Because of different economic needs, all nations would not be allotted the same ceilings. The ratios would be subject to periodic revisions by agreement."

SYMINGTON pointed out his proposal is advanced as an integral part of any enforceable proposal to achieve a balanced reduction of all arms and armaments.

Under SYMINGTON'S plan, once a nation has committed its resources to peaceful use, a significant length of time must elapse before they can be converted to war use.

A TIME LOCK

"This lapse of time—conversion time—is of crucial importance," SYMINGTON said, "because if aggression is to be prevented, the time act is during the period when the manufacture of weapons first begins. That is when resources are being shifted from peaceful to warlike uses.

"The resolution being introduced stresses the importance of a full study of how this factor of conversion time can be utilized to prevent aggression. In principle, this conversion time can be transformed into a virtual time lock, which would have to be broken open before any nation's resources could be shifted to warlike purposes.

"In the very process of being broken open, that time lock could serve automatically to warn the world of approaching aggression."

The Senator said that his resolution was not "put forward with any thought that such a disarmament program could serve as a substitute for our capacity for instant retaliation with nuclear weapons in case of an all-out attack."

MUST NOT LAG

"We must retain that capacity," he said. "And we should never lag either in the development of nuclear weapons, or in the means of delivering them. This is specially true with respect to the development and production of the so-called 'ultimate' weapon, the intercontinental ballistic missile with hydrogen warhead."

The plan embodied in his resolution, SYMINGTON explained, would enable the free peoples to bring to bear the full pressure of world opinion upon the Communist leaders to improve the living standards of their people.

"Since the same resources cannot be used simultaneously for both peaceful and warlike purposes," SYMINGTON said, "a rapid increase in the standard of living in Communist countries would tend to curb their potential aggressive power."

APPLY TO ALL

"The Soviet rulers have justified the hardships imposed on the Russian people as being necessary for defense. This plan of disarmament would be applicable to all nations. It would offer the Soviet leaders a means of preventing any possible invasion of Russia. At the same time the way would be opened for a swift and dramatic increase in the Russian standard of living.

"Rejection of this plan could only mean that the sacrifices now being exacted from the Russian people are made necessary by the aggressive intentions and commitments of the rulers of Russia."

[From the Washington Daily News of March 1, 1955]

(By R. H. Shackford)

President Eisenhower was urged today to explore the possibilities of challenging Russia to a butter over guns economic disarmament plan—a plan for raising living standards the world over.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, former member of the National Security Resources Board, announced his support of the plan and released the text of a resolution he will introduce in the Senate tomorrow.

"Low living standards * * * high armaments. I believe it is time the free nations launched an all-out moral offensive to break the chain linking these two," Senator SYMINGTON said.

Seventy-five percent of Russia's production goes into heavy, war-potential industries. Seventy-five percent of America's production goes into personal consumption for a high standard of living.

WORK THROUGH U. N.

Under the SYMINGTON resolution the Senate would ask the President to present the butter over guns plan to the United Nations. The U. N. would try to work out a formula for limiting the proportion of every nation's resources that could be devoted to military purposes.

The original butter over guns plan was suggested by Samuel Lubell, an associate of Bernard Baruch. It was published last week by the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers. The plan would not stand alone but be part of an integral plan to obtain reduction of all arms.

"This (butter over guns) disarmament plan," Senator SYMINGTON said, "is designed to combat any type of aggression.

"The plan embodied in this resolution would enable the free peoples to bring to bear the full pressure of world opinion on the Communist leaders to improve the living standards of their people.

"Since the same resources cannot be used simultaneously for both peaceful and warlike purposes, a rapid increase in the standard of living in Communist countries would tend to curb their potential aggressive power."

The plan would call for a "fool-proof system" of inspection and control, as in all disarmament plans.

"Rejection of this plan," Senator SYMINGTON said, "could only mean that the sacrifices now being exacted from the Russian people are made necessary by the aggressive intentions and commitments of the rulers in the Kremlin."

AUTOS CITED

Senator SYMINGTON pointed out that the United States built 5,500,000 autos last year whereas the Soviets built only 45,000—less than 1 percent of United States auto production although Soviet steel production is growing fast.

The butter over guns disarmament plan, according to Senator SYMINGTON, is based on these principles.

"The way a government divides the resources at its command is a revealing measure of its peaceful or aggressive intent.

"High living standards constitute an automatic, built-in deterrent against possible aggression.

"After a nation has committed its resources to peaceful uses, a significant length of time must elapse before they can be converted to war."

If the Soviets rejected such a plan, Senator SYMINGTON said, it would reveal for all the world Russia's aggressive intentions.

Russia can block a butter over guns plan and probably will. But she cannot prevent the free world from observing how the Soviet regime is allocating more and more resources to military purposes and dragging the Russian people down to the armed misery of a totalitarian fortress.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 1, 1955]

THE GAGE OF RED INTENT

We can have no hope that any disarmament talk, whatever its form, ever will lead to actual disarmament so long as the rulers of Russia continue to pour the bulk of their nation's resources into war goods.

Unfortunately, Russian peace propaganda has been too much trusted, too little suspected, in too many parts of the world.

But the real test of the Kremlin's intentions can be measured by the treatment of Russia's civilian population. How much for human necessities and comforts? How much for war?

That is the purpose of the butter-and-guns disarmament proposal, which Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, now recommends to the United Nations. Senator SYMINGTON proposes a Senate resolution calling on President Eisenhower to urge the U. N. to explore and consider this proposal.

The idea is simple: Whatever nation depresses the living standards of its people to build military power is an aggressor nation, and therefore a menace to the peace of the world.

"High living standards," said Senator SYMINGTON, "constitute a built-in deterrent against possible aggression."

To prove the peaceful aims of which they prate, all the Russian rulers need do is convert a major portion of their resources to civilian purposes, in line with similar action by other industrial nations. No nation, and especially Russia, can maintain high living standards and at the same time go all out in preparing for war.

That's the test. It is a test any people can understand. It is a test from which the Kremlin bosses cannot hide. So long as they deprive their people of necessities and comforts in the interest of military power, so long must the free nations of the world judge them as aggressors.

The Russian rulers may block the butter-over-guns proposal, or any other disarmament plan. But they cannot prevent the rest of the world from seeing how they divide their resources between the civilian economy and their war program.

To this end, the butter-over-guns proposal merits the widest debate and attention in the Senate and in the United Nations—that it may be put squarely to the Communist bosses. Their answer inescapably will be the measure of their intentions.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, a little earlier in the afternoon, during my temporary absence from the Chamber, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] submitted a resolution which I believe has been referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations. I think the resolution is deserving of an early hearing, to explore the point of view expressed relative to a means of carrying on our diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, in an attempt to arrive at a formula whereby the world can be directed to more peaceful pursuits.

In asking that my remarks appear in the RECORD immediately following those of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the following:

An article entitled "Butter Over Guns—A Peace Plan for the Free World," written by Samuel Lubell, and published in the Washington News of Thursday, February 24, 1955. I understand the article was also published in other Scripps-Howard newspapers on the same day.

An editorial entitled "Butter Over Guns," also published in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, February 24, 1955.

An editorial entitled "The Big Lie," published in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, February 26, 1955.

An article entitled "Ivan Has Less To Eat Now Than Under the Czar. Figures Prove Reds' Big Lie," written by R. H. Shackford, a distinguished foreign correspondent and staff writer, and published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 25, 1955.

An editorial entitled "Russia's Behind and Our Ahead," published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 25, 1955.

An article entitled "Agriculture Is Russia's Achilles Heel. After 37 Years the Soviets Still Can't Feed Their Own," written by R. H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard staff writer, and published in the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 28, 1955.

An editorial entitled "The Gauge of Red Intent," published in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, March 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1955]

BUTTER OVER GUNS—A PEACE PLAN FOR THE FREE WORLD

(By Samuel Lubell)

The peaceful nations of the world can seize the initiative—now—in the long struggle for peace by striking at all that is most vulnerable in the Soviet system.

That opportunity was put there by the Kremlin itself in the bitter struggle which brought the recent downfall of Premier Georgi Malenkov. In the course of that upheaval the soft underbelly of Soviet communism was flung over and exposed. Unwittingly, Russia's own ruler pointed where to strike the blow that could change the whole course of the cold war.

They showed the world the way to mobilize every measure short of war to halt aggression before it takes place.

How can that be done?

By taking these steps:

The United States should sponsor before the United Nations a bold new plan of economic and military disarmament which would: Limit the proportion of any nation's resources that could be devoted to "guns"—that is, to war industries and all other direct and indirect military expenditures—as against "butter," meaning what goes to lifting levels of the people.

The debate touched off by this proposal should be used as a dramatic moral offensive to make clear to the world why high living standards are a built-in reassurance of peace, and any industrial nation which deliberately depresses the living of its people to build military power is a threat to peace.

If the Soviets accept the proposal, a basis for lasting peace might move into sight. Trade could flow freely, since products would be exchanged with Russia for mutual advantage.

But if the Soviets refuse to reverse their present guns-over-butter policy, the free nations should agree to treat her as a potential aggressor.

In support of that, every measure short of war should be invoked until the Soviets do reduce defense expenditures appreciably, and better the living conditions of the Russian people.

Among those short-of-war measures would be the full force of world opinion, the strengthening of other nations' defenses; also the breaking off of all economic relations—aid, credit or trade—which might strengthen a potential aggressor.

The basic idea of emphasizing living standards as a war deterrent was touched on by President Eisenhower in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington in 1953. But there was no followthrough. Now there is opportunity to act.

This entire program stems from the nature of modern warfare. As Hitler taught only too well, wars do not start when one country crosses another's frontier.

War begins when a would-be aggressor shifts his resources from peaceful to warlike processes, when tractor assembly lines are replaced by tank assemblies, when building materials are diverted from constructing homes to rearing munitions plants.

In short, war starts when a would-be aggressor makes the ominous choice of putting guns over butter.

Malenkov's ouster stripped away the last illusion that the Soviet Union has become anything more than a perpetual war economy.

Although our own defense budget has been cut for 3 successive years, Soviet arming has been raised at least to what it was when Russia was supplying Red China with equipment to fight in Korea.

The Soviet proposal announced a week ago to freeze defense budgets at present levels still would leave Russia mobilized for aggression, while preventing peaceful nations from strengthening their own defenses.

It seems to have been brought forward largely to delude the Russian people into thinking that the new sacrifices being imposed on them are made necessary by some threat from the West rather than by the Kremlin's aggressive commitments.

In ousting Malenkov the dominant faction in the Kremlin cracked down on efforts to increase civilian production so as to expand Russia's arms and war industry. In essence this was the same decision Hitler made when he boastfully chose "guns over butter."

The challenge is clear.

If war is to be prevented, Hitler taught, the time to act is when the bombs are being made rather when they are falling.

The "butter over guns" disarmament proposal would furnish the basis for such action. By setting ceilings on the use of certain key resources, "butter over guns" disarmament would lock up enough of every country's production in peaceful purposes so no nation could mobilize its economy for a blitzkrieg without giving the world at least 3 years' warning.

No country's economic expansion would be curbed, since the proportion of resources allocated to guns, not the quantities, would be limited. The butter-guns ceilings also would vary with the special needs of individual countries—underdeveloped nations would not have the same ceilings as highly industrialized ones—and they could be reviewed periodically, say, every 5 years.

The net effect would be like drawing a new internal frontier inside each nation's economy—the butter-guns line—which, if crossed, would be an open confession that a government had passed from peaceful to aggressive intention.

If the men in the Kremlin really want peace, they should welcome such disarmament and cooperate to set up the system of inspection and control that would be required to enforce it.

If they do not, the peaceful nations still can draw this frontier against aggression by declaring they will use Russia's division of her resources as a yardstick for judging Soviet intentions.

Going further, the free nations could bring forward their own "butter over guns" standard of how Russia's resources should be divided to insure a minimum level of decent living for the Russian people.

Soviet propagandists, of course, would try to make the world believe that Russian living standards were rising. But the outside world would have little difficulty in judging the truth of the matter.

If Russia's resources actually were directed from war to peace, it would become readily apparent in the new homes that would be built, the new factories for consumer goods, the general abundance of things to buy.

In debating this butter over guns disarmament proposal we could call on the world to judge which of the two economic systems, ours or Russia's, makes for peace.

Last year, for example, the United States produced 5.5 million autos, 7.3 million television sets, and 9 million washing machines, refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners.

The steel used to manufacture these articles obviously could not be used for war.

In Russia, with roughly half of our steel supply, only 45,000 passenger autos were produced in 1954, only 365,000 TV sets, and hardly 600,000 washing machines, refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners. Most of the rest of Russia's steel went into expanding her military potential.

Shortly after he became premier, Malenkov revealed that more than two-thirds of Russia's industrial resources were being directed into heavy industry, and scarcely one-third to consumer goods.

Every possible means should be utilized to make known to the Russian people that satisfying their yearning for better living is our peace aim.

Within the Kremlin may be some men who will understand how other Soviet leaders are destroying any basis for peace by denying their own people a decent living.

Moscow has always sought to justify the harsh exactions inflicted on the Russian people as being necessary to strengthen Russia against outside attack. The butter over guns proposal would challenge this propaganda. The ceilings would be applicable to all major powers, including a revived Germany.

The peace offensive proposed here is not intended to settle every cold-war issue. It does not cover such problems as subversion, which could be considered another form of aggression. Nor would it take the place of efforts to control atomic and other weapons.

Essentially, it seeks to give new life to the possibility of curbing military aggression with measures short of war by gaining worldwide recognition for a simple principle:

That the intentions of even the most secretive dictators can be judged by how they divide the resources they command between

war preparation and bettering living standards.

It may be argued that other countries will not go along with so forthright a program. Even if we knew that to be true, simply to proclaim this principle before the United Nations would be a considerable victory for the cause of peace.

WHAT ABOUT ENFORCEMENT?

(By Samuel Lubell)

Enforcing butter over guns disarmament would be no more—nor less—difficult than policing other systems of arms control.

The plan aims at padlocking enough of every nation's resources in peaceful production so no country can mobilize its economy for military aggression without warning the rest of the world. A variety of inspection controls could be employed to achieve that objective.

Every phase of economic activity need not be policed. We know enough of the interrelated processes of mobilizing for war to be able to select a relatively small number of economic choke points—which would show readily how a nation is dividing its resources between war and peaceful uses. In Russia, because nearly all her industries rely on railroad transportation, inspection would be easier.

Obviously it would be easier to make sure that tractor plants were not producing tanks than to check on the number of troops or weapons a country might be permitted.

In any case, these industrial and economic controls could be reinforced by and meshed with the usual controls on weapons and armed forces.

The big question mark, of course, is whether the Soviets would agree to the tamper-proof system of inspection and control which all disarmament plans require. This requirement cannot be compromised.

Where butter over guns differs from other disarmament plans is that if it breaks down, the violation comes early enough in the mobilization process to give every other nation time to rearm.

Also by drawing a guns-butter frontier inside every nation's economy it provides the free world with a moral basis for employing measures short of war to halt aggression while it is being prepared.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1955]

BUTTER OVER GUNS

We're under no illusion that the Russians will accept the butter over guns disarmament proposal of Samuel Lubell, suggested on page 1.

They probably won't even want to discuss it.

They would much rather talk about capitalist warmongering and capitalist imperialism, and try to get us to waste our time talking about their own phony disarmament and peace proposals. Such as that latest phony, a freeze on armaments as of January 1, 1955, which would leave nations on Russia's east and west, Japan and Germany, totally disarmed, with Soviet bayonets bristling on their frontiers.

But we have our own good reasons to discuss butter versus guns. It is a subject of universal appeal to humanity in all lands, including especially the people in Russia and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Those people have had precious little butter—or anything else they want and need. But they are overequipped with guns, tanks, bombs, jet planes.

Russia is 1 of the 2 mighty military powers on earth. Yet the average Russian worker has but one pair of shoes and it takes 2 months of his wages to buy another pair. He has only the clothes on his back. His family lives in one room. And his living condition cannot be made better as long as Russia's productive capacity is geared to producing tools of war, at the sacrifice of civilian goods.

Russia has more steel capacity than either Germany or England, and about half as much as the United States. But is that steel used to produce autos, refrigerators, television sets, bicycles, etc., as in Germany and England and the United States?

Certainly not.

But Russia has more jet planes than any other nation. More tanks. More artillery. The Commies claim they have more A-bombs than the United States has, and if we didn't know they were such liars, we might agree.

But this much we know: Russian arms fueled the Red aggression in Korea. Russian-made guided missiles and artillery and jet planes are lined up along China's coast facing Formosa, threatening the peace of the world.

If Russia's hard-pressed economy were diverted from producing arms and made busy providing a few necessities for the Russian people—another suit of clothes for each man, another dress for each Russian woman, another loaf of bread and roast of meat on the dinner table, a spare pair of shoes, a whole house or apartment for a family—there wouldn't be enough productive capacity left for Russia to rear a formidable fortress and keep other countries fearfully armed.

Even if Russia agreed to a foolproof inspection of atom-bomb production—which she won't—we still would need to draw a line on how much of her productive capacity were dedicated to civilian needs.

Hitler couldn't have started a war if several years earlier he hadn't started denying his people in order to build his war machine. Yet Hitler never denied his people as the Russian people are denied now.

Our hope for peace for our time lies in somehow forcing the Russian rulers to provide more generously for the Russian people—to lock up in higher living standards the Soviet productive capacity.

The boys in the Kremlin would rather talk about something else. But let's talk about that. It's a way to get the Russian people, and all peoples, on our side.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 26, 1955]

THE BIG LIE

It would be fantastic, of course, to have any real expectation that the Russians ever would agree to any workable disarmament program.

But that doesn't mean the "butter over guns" idea shouldn't be proposed and debated.

The chief purpose of the proposal is to get over in a dramatic way to the peoples of the world, including as far as possible the Russian people, the difference to them individually between the economy enjoyed by the United States and the economy suffered by the people of Russia.

For home consumption the Communists harp on the big lie—that the people of the United States are living in misery because the Government has devoted our resources almost exclusively to war production.

The opposite is true, of course. While about 75 percent of our production goes to consumer enjoyment, only about one-quarter of Russian production is grudgingly liberated for consumer goods.

But the Russian people, who never have had a decent standard of living, are fed on promises—promises which never materialize. Still there always is hope. What else have they to live on?

And they are fed on the big lie that conditions in America even are worse than they know them to be in Russia, despite the propaganda.

The nub of the "butter over guns" program is that all industrial nations agree to limit the proportion of their productive capacity devoted to a war potential. The Russians won't agree, as we have said.

But we think they should be given the opportunity to reject it. For in the rejection is another telling revelation of their aggressive intentions. And in the process, another means of showing the peoples of friendly and neutral nations—and to some degree the peoples behind the Iron Curtain—the evidence of our own peaceful intentions.

The evidence is conclusive. It lies in the overwhelming percentage of our resources which are devoted to the well-being and pleasures of the individual American citizen—as against the headlong war production in Russia.

The difference will be understandable to anyone once the facts are made clear. The "butter over guns" proposal is an effective and vivid way of achieving this. It is a peace offensive with a stomach appeal.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 25, 1955]

IVAN HAS LESS TO EAT NOW THAN UNDER THE CZAR—FIGURES PROVE REDS' BIG LIE

(By R. H. Shackford)

If the United States challenged Russia to give the Russian people more basic needs, it might expose one of the biggest "big lies" intensively propagandized by the Kremlin.

That big lie goes like this:

The United States economy is on a war basis; the Soviet economy is a peaceful one.

The American standard of living is deteriorating and impoverishment of American workers is growing; the Soviet standard is improving rapidly and the Soviet worker is happy as a lark.

THE LUBELL IDEA

The butter over guns peace proposal of Samuel Lubell, published in the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, strikes at the heart of this problem. The United States would sponsor a United Nations plan for economic disarmament. All nations would be asked to agree to limit the proportion of their resources devoted to guns—heavy industry—to allow more for butter—consumers' goods.

Today three-fourths of what Russia produces never gets to the consumer; it goes into heavy industry (what the Communists call means of production) to turn out more heavy industry and armaments.

By contrast, nearly three-fourths of America's production is for personal consumption; food, clothing, houses, autos, TV sets, refrigerators, and so forth.

Since World War II per capita personal consumption in the United States has risen more than 40 percent. Russia is barely above prewar level and in most of her satellites personal consumption has been reduced below prewar levels.

This is the comparative production picture of Russia and the United States:

STEEL

Russia has surpassed both Britain and Germany, but has only about two-fifths of American production. The Soviets are about where we were during World War I. Despite the advantage of western know-how, Soviet steel capacity is increasing at the same rate we were 40 years ago. Almost all Soviet steel production goes back into heavy industries or armaments.

AUTOMOBILES

United States: With steel production of about 111 million tons a year, we produce more than 6 million cars annually plus another 1 million trucks and buses. In 1915–16, when American steel production was about the same as Russia's today, the United States made 895,930 passenger cars and 74,000 trucks.

Russia: With steel production of 41,700,000 tons, only 28,000 cars were made in 1950;

only 42,000 are due this year. If the ratio between steel and auto production was the same as in the United States, the Soviets would be building more than 1 million autos a year.

HOUSING

United States: Between 1946 and 1952 6 million privately owned one-family separate dwellings were built in urban areas. Average size was 4 to 5 rooms. In addition, millions more multi-dwelling units and rural houses were built.

Russia: In the same 7 years only a little more than 1 billion square feet of urban housing was built. That's equivalent to about 10 million 10- by 12-foot rooms. Fewer than 4 million rural dwellings—many floorless huts—were built.

FOOD

Russians always have lived on a bread diet. Yet the Soviets can't produce enough grain for the people, let alone to raise livestock. That didn't deter the regime from selling 366,000 bushels of wheat last week to Iran. America is plagued with the reverse problem—huge grain surpluses.

United States: More than 23 million pounds of meat are produced annually—145 pounds a person.

Russia: Meat is almost unknown to average Russians. Stalin's grandiose target for 1955—now admitted a flop—called for only 5,600,000 pounds of meat or 25 pounds a person. Actual production is less than half that.

CLOTHING

United States: More than 500 million pairs of leather shoes annually or 3 pairs for each person; nearly 2 billion pairs of hosiery or a dozen pairs a person; more than 10 billion yards of cotton goods.

Russia: Only about 1 pair of shoes a year for each of its 210 million people; 777 million pairs of hosiery; less than 6 billion yards of cotton goods.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 25, 1955]

RUSSIA'S BEHIND AND OUR AHEAD

A story that went the rounds here in wartime, when Russia was an ally, related that a Soviet general called at the Pentagon to complain loudly that the United States was behind on promised deliveries of munitions to Russia.

An American general listened to the tirade just so long and then started reeling off a number of promises the Russians had made on which they, too, had failed to deliver.

"But," said the indignant Russian general, "I am not here to discuss the Russian behind. I am here to talk about the United States' behind."

The story gives point to why it is all to the advantage of the United States and the free world to explore and debate the butter-over-guns disarmament idea—the proposal that each industrial nation's aggressive intentions be measured by how it divides its productive capacity between the hardware of war and soft goods for civilian uses.

It is in producing things the people want that is Russia's biggest "behind," and contrariwise the United States' largest "ahead." Indeed, all countries of the Western World are far ahead of Russia in permitting people to work for their own comforts.

After 37 years of Communist rule, the Russian people are worse off than under the Czars. They have fewer cattle, and thus less beef on the table and fewer hides from which to make shoes. Russia has a vast and potentially productive Wheat Belt, but there isn't enough bread to eat, because farmers over there do not have the incentive, as ours do, to make 2 grains grow where 1 grew before. And because too much of Russia's chemical capacity is devoted to making explosives rather than fertilizers, and Russia's rapidly expanding steel production goes into tanks rather than tractors.

We have here the material for a big debate: Does capitalism or communism promote war? In all capitalist free-economy countries, where goods are produced to meet the demands of consumers, living standards have risen. In Russia, living levels are being deliberately depressed to build a more awesome war machine.

The people of England, who suffered so cruelly from Hitler's air armada and who have known so much of austerity, will understand the menace of an unfriendly country staying perpetually on a war economy. The French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Danes, the Norwegians, whose lands were invaded, know the probable consequences.

None of those countries fears the United States, because they know that most of our productive capacity is devoted to making automobiles, refrigerators, television sets, and surpluses of food and fiber which threaten nobody.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 25, 1955]

AGRICULTURE IS RUSSIA'S ACHILLES HEEL—AFTER 37 YEARS THE SOVIETS STILL CAN'T FEED THEIR OWN

(By R. H. Shackford)

Of all the failures of communism, Soviet agriculture is the most dramatic and, for the Russian people, the most tragic.

It has been for 37 years of Communist rule because the peasant won't be communized, the farms were stripped of workers for heavy industry, and only a tiny amount of machinery was allowed for farm modernization.

Just before Stalin's death, Malenkov announced: "The grain problem * * * has been solved—solved definitely and finally."

A year later, just before Malenkov's ouster, Khrushchev said:

"The present level of grain production does not meet the growing requirements of the national economy * * * why was it believed that we had sufficient grain?"

The failure is not an accident. The reason is the deliberate planning of the Kremlin and its fanatical drive for more industry with military potential.

Here are some highlights from Khrushchev's report which disclose how desperately Russia needs more emphasis on peaceful rather than warlike production:

Grain: "It is completely inadmissible that as a result of a protracted harvesting period (up to 45 days some places), one-quarter of the harvest on collective and state farms is being lost."

Hogs: In one area, Khrushchev reported, "the number of pigs increased between 1940 and 1953 from 68,000 to 129,000, or nearly double. But the output of pork declined from 1,900 tons in 1940 to 1,500 tons in 1953.

"Twenty-two per cent of all pigs are being delivered in bad condition, weighing only 30 kilograms (66 pounds) each." (American pigs delivered for slaughter weigh several hundred pounds each.)

Dairy cows: "In Kostrama Oblast the number of cows increased by 20 per cent in comparison with 1949, but the production of milk decreased by 10 percent."

Beef cattle: "From October 1953 till October 1954, the losses of cattle in live weight amounted to 42,000 tons. This is due to fact that cattle delivered to many procurement bases do not receive either food or water for prolonged periods. The ministry of meat and dairy industry attempt to justify themselves with the peculiar theory that cattle can live without food for a prolonged period, and, having water, do not lose weight."

Tractors: Sovietized farms received only 137,000 much-needed tractors in 1954. In the United States more than 300,000 are sold for farms each year. The ratio of tractors to farm acreage in Russia is one-tenth that in the United States.

Khrushchev complained many tractors produced were obsolete, used expensive kerosene and damaged crops.

"For six years work has been in progress on the designing of a new tractor with a diesel engine," he said. "About 3,500,000 rubles were spent for this purpose, and the tractor hasn't been designed yet."

[From the Washington Daily News of March 1, 1955]

THE GAGE OF RED INTENT

We can have no hope that any disarmament talk, whatever its form, ever will lead to actual disarmament so long as the rulers of Russia continue to pour the bulk of their nation's resources into war goods.

Unfortunately, Russian peace propaganda has been too much trusted, too little suspected, in too many parts of the world.

But the real test of the Kremlin's intentions can be measured by the treatment of Russia's civilian population. How much for human necessities and comforts? How much for war?

That is the purpose of the "butter-and-guns" disarmament proposal, which Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, now recommends to the United Nations. Senator SYMINGTON proposes a Senate resolution calling on President Eisenhower to urge the U. N. to explore and consider this proposal.

The idea is simple: Whatever nation depresses the living standards of its people to build military power is an aggressor nation, and therefore a menace to the peace of the world.

"High living standards," said Senator SYMINGTON, "constitute a built-in deterrent against possible aggression."

To prove the peaceful aims of which they prate, all the Russian rulers need do is convert a major portion of their resources to civilian purposes, in line with similar action by other industrial nations. No nation, and especially Russia, can maintain high living standards and at the same time go all-out in preparing for war.

That's the test. It is a test any people can understand. It is a test from which the Kremlin bosses cannot hide. So long as they deprive their people of necessities and comforts in the interest of military power, so long must the free nations of the world judge them as aggressors.

The Russian rulers may block the butter-over-guns proposal, or any other disarmament plan. But they cannot prevent the rest of the world from seeing how they divide their resources between the civilian economy and their war program.

To this end, the butter-over-guns proposal merits the widest debate and attention in the Senate, and in the United Nations—that it may be put squarely to the Communist bosses. Their answer inescapably will be the measure of their intentions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe these articles and editorials are worthy of the attention of the Senate. They are along the general lines, as I understand, of the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will consider them and that the agencies of the executive branch which are interested in foreign affairs may also have the opportunity to discuss with the committee the merits or demerits of the proposal, in case there should be some weaknesses in the plan, so that the committee might be fully advised.

IMPORTANCE OF AN EXPANDED UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL-ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested in the work of the United Nations technical assistance specialists throughout the world who, along with our own point 4 experts, have literally been performing miracles in contributing to the economic health of underdeveloped nations, for a very modest appropriation on our respective parts.

I have before me a letter which was sent to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, along with various members of that committee, including myself. It comes from Mr. Oscar A. Benson, president of the National Lutheran Council. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. It underlines the importance of an expanded U. N. technical-assistance program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., February 24, 1955.

The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Pursuant of the expressed desire of the National Lutheran Council at its 1955 annual meeting held recently in Atlantic City, N. J., let me share with you the following statement concerning the continuing participation of the United States in the United Nations' expanded technical assistance program:

Among more than a billion people in our world today, substandard food and clothing supplies represent the normal condition. In vast areas, disease and illiteracy run rampant. Millions of our fellow men strive for a better future but need help to help themselves.

The National Lutheran Council, representing eight Lutheran church bodies whose aggregate United States of America membership totals 4.5 million souls, has been gratified to see the United States and the United Nations develop programs of technical assistance to countries in the economically underdeveloped areas of the world. We have been pleased that our country has had a leading role in the development of the technical assistance program of the United Nations.

We now note with keen disappointment that the United States has not contributed to the support of the United Nations expanded technical assistance program for 1955. We believe the United States should make clear its deep interest in an effective United Nations program.

The National Lutheran Council urges the Congress to strengthen the multilateral program of the United Nations by appropriating the full amount requested by the President for the United Nations expanded technical assistance program.

We urge that future appropriations for this important work be made in advance of the period of intended use so that the United Nations may develop a program of increased stability and vigor. We want to do our full share in supporting this program which helps the people of economically underdeveloped areas toward a fuller realization of their desires for a better economic, social, and cultural future.

Respectfully yours,

OSCAR A. BENSON,
President.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO HIS HOLINESS, POPE PIUS XII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, March 2, 1955, marks the 79th birthday of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

It is my pleasure and privilege to convey now to this great spiritual leader my warmest personal greeting and, I am sure, that of my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives.

It is my hope and prayer, and I am sure that of men of good will everywhere, representing all the religious faiths of mankind, that this great leader will enjoy many more full, healthy years in the service of mankind.

His long and unfortunate illness, from which he has not completely recovered, has caused deep concern, not only to the 450 million devout members of his church, but to all men who have appreciated his noble and tireless efforts in the cause of world peace, freedom, and spiritual dedication.

His particular efforts in sustaining the hope and faith of the millions of valiant souls of his own and other churches trapped behind the Iron Curtain, have been a particular contribution.

His historic appeals for wisdom and judgment on the part of leaders of all nations to avoid the holocaust of a third world war, have struck a respondent chord in hearts everywhere.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, is a great man, but a humble man. He is a frail man, but a mighty man. His is the supreme voice of his church, but his is a voice which speaks universal concepts that men and women of all faiths can understand and appreciate.

He is a great heir of a rich tradition of centuries, but he is keenly sensitive to the special needs of modern times.

As former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and now as its ranking Republican member, I am pleased to express this personal word of deep and sincere tribute.

His Holiness is no stranger, to these, our own American shores.

The many Americans who had the opportunity to feel his magnetic presence in the course of his extensive air travel throughout the United States almost 2 decades ago, remember him with deepest admiration. The people of Germany, where he served a tour of duty of 12 years, remember him with affection, as do the people of many other lands.

Eugenio Maria Giuseppe Giovanni Pacelli was born on March 2, 1876. He was ordained a priest in the Basilica of Saint Mary Major on April 2, 1899. A monsignor in 1904, and soon an envoy on many missions abroad, he became, on February 7, 1930, Papal Secretary of State, under Pius the XI.

During these long years of preparation, his notable record had marked him for the destined role which was to be his upon his selection by the sacred College of Cardinals for the position of vicar of Jesus Christ, successor of St. Peter.

His services as supreme pontiff has occurred during an era of grimmest significance to mankind. The onrush of the merciless international Communist conspiracy, with its vicious persecution of countless millions; the unveiling of the most destructive weapons in the history of mankind—to cite but two phases of the problems of our time—have made of his years in the Holy See some of the most significant in all the long history of the Catholic Church and of all mankind.

A great many anecdotes—inspiring, humorous, and full of human interest—could be told of this great but humble man. But the one I should like to recall now concerns his comments on the subject of a sneering remark by Red dictator Joseph Stalin. The archatheist and materialist, Stalin, had snidely asked at one of the international conferences, "How many divisions does the Pope have?"

When asked what he thought about Stalin's inquiry, His Holiness once said: "You may tell my son Joseph he will meet my divisions in the hereafter."

Perhaps that single sentence in reply to the ruthless enemy sums up most vividly the humility, the compassion, the understanding, the faith of this great spiritual leader. Perhaps, it best epitomizes the struggle of Christ versus anti-Christ. It depicts the caliber of leadership of this servant of the Lord, unawed by all the massive 175 Red army divisions or by the Red atomic bombs or H-bombs, unawed by the vast power of the Communist Party in Italy itself, or throughout the world. It conveys the well-merited, complete confidence and reliance in Him who is the only source of real power, and who is the Father—omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent—of all men, of Communist and Christian alike.

So, now, to His Holiness—both from men, such as myself, and women not of his faith, as well, of course, as from the faithful of his church; from the hearts of humanity everywhere—go these prayerful good wishes and congratulations. May divine providence grant him many, many more years of service to mankind.

USE OF BAGASSE NEWSPRINT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a weekly newspaper, the Franklin Banner-Tribune, published in Franklin, St. Mary Parish, La., the heart of the Louisiana sugarcane belt. This issue—that of February 24, 1955—is printed on bagasse newsprint. The heading at the top of the front page is as follows: "Twenty-five Louisiana Papers Using Bagasse Newsprint."

On page 2 appears an editorial entitled "The Sugar Belt Makes History Today." The editorial sets forth a most interesting account of the trials and tribulations which were experienced by those who worked on the project and brought it to a successful conclusion. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUGAR BELT MAKES HISTORY TODAY

Thursday, February 24, 1955, will go down in history as one of the most momentous

days in the economic revolution that is taking place in the Sugar Belt of Louisiana.

All over the 18-parish area in which sugarcane is grown, and even in some sections of Louisiana that do not cultivate and harvest the tall, sweet grass, smalltown weekly and daily newspapers are going to press today with a special type of newsprint.

The cooperating publications are publishing their regular editions on paper that has been made from Louisiana sugarcane bagasse by the Valentine Pulp and Paper Co., of Lockport, La.

This significant announcement means that at long last a byproduct of the principal crop grown in southern Louisiana is being put to use for the manufacture of one of the most important commodities consumed in a free country. Over one-half of the 700,000 tons of bone dry bagasse that has been produced in the State has largely gone to waste. Now it is going into newsprint and other paper products to help to satisfy the needs of a dynamic, growing population.

There are many far-reaching aspects to this official announcement. For one thing it means that now the sugar cane farmer will be growing a crop that will be used in its entirety. It marks the beginning of an era when year-around employment will be realized in the cane patch supplanting the uncertainty of the seasonal "cane grinding." The Valentine properties at Lockport substantiate this statement. The new paper mill adjoins the sugar factory, cane fields and research department of the company. There are jobs to be had in the sugar mill and the fields and in the laboratory and now there are 180 more men and women employed in the paper mill.

This has resulted in a boom in the Lockport community and throughout the parish of LaFourche. A big new housing development is now going into Lockport and the new payrolls will mean new families and new homes and a higher standard of living and a bigger and better town.

What the smokestacks of Valentine have done for that area will be accomplished throughout the sugarcane-growing part of the State just as sure as night follows day. St. Mary and her sister parishes are bound to benefit from this program.

This is a rich and diversified agricultural area but cane is king in the land. The farmer can grow sugar cane better than he can grow any other kind of crop. He has proven this for over a century now, overcoming every conceivable type of obstacle from disease to world politics. He has developed new varieties of sugar cane and by sound farm practices he has been able to realize a higher yield per acre with each passing year. Now he will be growing cane for sugar, sirup, molasses, feed—and paper.

If there has ever been any doubt in the mind of the cane planter about the value of research the Valentine mill should erase it forever. This new development was due to hours and months and years of patient, painstaking work and experimentation in the laboratory of the Valite Corp., an affiliate research company of Valentine's. The work began back in the 1930's and was accelerated after the Korean war. In 1952 newsprint was made from 100 percent bagasse by the company on an experimental basis at the Herty Laboratory in Savannah, Ga.

After economic feasibility was established, Valentine interests banded together with Brown and Root, one of the world's greatest construction firms, to form the Valentine Pulp & Paper Co. A mill capable of producing 50 tons of paper products daily was built at Lockport. The success of this mill is attested to by the fact that hardly had it been completed but what the company announced that it was being expanded into a $4,500,000 facility capable of manufacturing 80 tons of paper a day, including newsprint.

Small town newspapers in Louisiana and all over the Nation have been confronted with a problem that parallels the problem of the cane farmer in magnitude. Newsprint has been a scarce and expensive commodity. Most of it had to be imported. Financially unable to build their own mills or even enter into long range contracts, the small newspapers have had to fight for newsprint in the open market on a catch-as-catch-can basis. During wartime the situation had been particularly acute and the black market operators thrived.

The newsprint market has improved considerably, but the future for the small town newspaper had been in doubt. Now, with the mill at Lockport able to supplement established sources, the nonmetropolitan press can face the future with confidence. Newsprint is the basic commodity on which the free press is printed and if it is cut off, the real victims will be the American people because, without the newspaper for the dissemination of news and advertising, freedom would die on the vine.

Member newspapers of the Louisiana Press Association look on the mill at Lockport as "their mill" because for almost 4 years now the LPA has been working hand-in-hand with the Valentine company on this project. The ultimate benefit to the economy of the State of Louisiana is beyond the imagination.

There is one last conclusion that can be drawn from this development. The Farm Bureau of Louisiana, the American Sugar Cane League, Louisiana Congressmen and other agencies have fought a hard but discouraging fight for an increase in the mainland quota of sugar cane. If there had been any hesitation on the part of the Congress or the national administration to justify this increase, that question should now be resolved in favor of the increase. There are about 120 small town newspapers in Louisiana and over 8,000 in America. They won't all use bagasse newsprint, but this new source may one day mean the difference between success or failure to many of them.

This story is being told in Louisiana today, but in a few days it will be known all over America and in most foreign countries. Great industries are built over a long period of time. The south Louisiana paper manufacturing industry will be built around bagasse. The only way to insure its full growth is with an ever-increasing supply of sugarcane now and in the years that lie ahead. The only safe and sure way to obtain the product needed by the American farmer and the American publisher is to have it grown on the same ground that gave birth to the Red, White, and Blue.

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY BEFORE THE NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, Treasury Secretary Humphrey, in Chicago, on February 19, made an unusual speech in which he asked himself questions, and then gave the answers, on many of the troublesome problems of the present day. The questions asked are of the bothersome kind that many Members of the Congress are asked these days. The answers are forthright and clear, from a man in a position to have a substantial amount of information on what the situation is. So that all Members may have available to them the answers to these questions, I ask that Secretary Humphrey's speech in full be inserted in the body of the RECORD. It deserves careful reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY TREASURY SECRETARY HUMPHREY AT 48TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 19, 1955

Mr. Willkie (Mr. E. E. Willkie, president of the National Canners Association) and gentlemen, I am delighted to have the opportunity to meet with the National Canners Association this morning.

I am greatly impressed with something I have just heard about your association. I am told that your financial statement for the past year shows that you have operated with a budget that is balanced. To one who has the ambition to do likewise but is beset with all of the problems of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, that is something I note with great envy.

I am also glad to have this opportunity to see so many of my good friends of days that were more carefree and to have this chance to explain to such a fine group of leading businessmen as are here this morning some of the simple principles so vital to the successful operation of our economy which the Eisenhower administration is trying to perpetuate and strengthen.

We live in an age of change, devoted to the use of new techniques. Now, as I am not an orator but at heart, and by experience, just a businessman like yourselves, to whom deeds mean more than words, I am going to choose a new technique in speaking to you this morning. It is the technique of the presently popular radio-TV quiz show. By using questions which I am constantly being asked by Government officials, newsmen, Members of Congress, and people like yourselves, I will try to inform you by my answers of our problems, our accomplishments, and our hopes.

Gentlemen, the stage is set. The clock is marking off the seconds. The klieg lights are on. The moderator is in his place. We are on the air and are ready for the first question.

Question: "Mr. Secretary, please tell us—has the administration abandoned its program of trying to balance the budget?"

The answer to that is absolutely "No." We are working, and with a reasonable amount of success, toward a balanced budget. The record shows that progress has been good, even though we have not reached the goal. The Government's deficits have been cut substantially since we came into office. The deficit in fiscal 1953 was almost $9½ billion. We could do very little about this in 5 short months as actual spending plans were committed beyond recall. However, the Eisenhower administration did cut the deficit in the next fiscal year, fiscal 1954, down to $3.1 billion, or two-thirds of the way toward a balanced budget. It is true that the deficit in the present fiscal year (fiscal 1955) looks like $4.5 billion, but the new budget for fiscal 1956 again cuts the deficit to $2.4 billion. Both the present deficit and the deficit for the next fiscal year may be less than now estimated if revenue holds up and if we are able to cut spending further, as we are continuously trying to do.

Question: "Why haven't we cut Government spending faster?"

The Government can only reduce its expenses by putting people out of work, either directly or indirectly. This sounds harsh, but the fact is that the Government spends most of its money for only two things: (1) the employment of people working directly for the Government, or (2) the purchase of goods which are made by people who will be out of work if the orders for the goods are canceled. Under these circumstances, it would not be prudent to cut Government spending too fast, even if it were possible to do so. Of course, the most important reason

is that in these perilous times our first obligation to the Nation is to adequately provide for our security. But there is another very important consideration that must be prominently kept in mind.

We must constantly have in mind in making these reductions the necessity of creating new employment to absorb those who will thus be out of work. There must be a great transition—moving people from working for the Government, either directly or indirectly, into jobs working for the production of goods for the general public. We have gone through 2 years of this transition with reasonable success. We are striving continually to do better and to make the transition with less loss of time for those directly involved. We cannot switch from years of deficit spending to a balanced budget in too short a time.

Question: "Why has this administration cut so much from the defense budget?"

Sixty-five percent of our latest budget goes for major national-security programs. This amounts to about $40.5 billion a year. Of the remaining $21.9 billion, $14.8 billion or 24 percent of the total budget goes for payment of interest on the debt and other charges fixed by law. That leaves only $7.1 billion, or 11 percent, of the total budget for other so-called civilian agencies of Government. So, it simply follows that if any large cuts in spending are to be made, they must largely come—but carefully and wisely made—from the heavy total for defense.

Now, when we talk about cutting expense, let's always remember that does not mean cutting our effective defense. Let's recall how much stronger we are today than we were when Korea began in June of 1950. At the outbreak of Korea, our Armed Forces had less than 1½ million men, equipped almost wholly with material of World War II manufacture. We now have 3,100,000 men in service, and our present target for 1956 is an armed strength of 2,860,000 men, or almost double the number of June 1950. By the end of fiscal 1956 we will have an Air Force of 131 wings and 975,000 men as compared with 48 wings and only 411,000 men when the Korean fighting began. The Navy and marines will be second to none (with 857,000 men). And the Army will be 80 percent above June 1950 in manpower (1,027,000 as compared with less than 593,000), but of even greater importance is the fact that because of advances in the science of warfare, each Army division will have 80 percent more firepower than a division of World War II.

To support these forces, we will spend an estimated $34 billion—almost three times what we were spending when Korea broke out. So the total in both personnel and money going into our defense forces today is comparatively substantially increased.

Question: "Have we cut too much from our security?"

No. The reductions that we have made in spending for defense have not reduced our armed strength. As the President has said, we are increasing it; this Nation is in a stronger position to defend itself today than it was 2 years ago. We have a more flexible and better balanced Defense Establishment tailored to meet the requirements of future warfare and at lower cost to the taxpayers. Nothing that has happened in Formosa or elsewhere in the world up to this very day has changed our budget plans for lower spending in the year to come. I say this while emphasizing one basic fact: We can and will spend whatever we need to spend for our security. But this administration is operating in the firm knowledge that real security comes not from merely spending billions of dollars but rather from spending them wisely.

What we are doing is shifting some of the emphasis from men to machines, from the old concept of slugging it out with masses of men to being ready to beat the enemy with mobility, technological know-how and the most modern superiority of weapons and equipment.

Question: "Can't we cut spending and balance the budget by just eliminating all foreign aid?"

That is a program which is often suggested but is neither simple nor wise to carry out if you just stop and think about it. Certainly it is better to put military equipment in the hands of our friends overseas so that they can help to defend themselves if the need comes, rather than to also send American boys to handle those weapons, with all the potential loss in lives and national wealth, as well as the human anxiety that is involved. Total expenditures for mutual security, including both military assistance and economic support, are estimated at $4.7 billion for fiscal 1956, including the provisions for a program in Asia. This compares with mutual security spending of $4.3 billion in the present fiscal year.

The total cost included in this program for economic assistance alone is $1,025,000,000 in fiscal 1956 as compared with $1,075,000,000 in the present fiscal year. The total estimated expenditures in 1956, not including obligations for the future, for all Asian economic assistance will be about $585 million as compared with about $500 million to be spent for economic aid in Asia in the present fiscal year. So, while the estimated over the actual spending for economic aid increases slightly in Asia, the overall foreign economic aid program is still decreasing. This is directly in line with this administration's conclusion that we can best serve the cause of the free world by helping its members to help themselves through selective development programs in which private investment can play the major role.

While significant accomplishments have been realized through foreign aid which are in the mutual interest of the United States and other free countries, history has sadly proved that large grant programs not only burden the American taxpayer but do not always produce either stronger or more friendly allies. The entire program is under intensive, continuing review to be sure that in the future both military and economic assistance may be properly balanced as operating parts of our foreign relations and defense programs.

Question: "In view of the big reductions in expenditures that have been made could the budget have been balanced?"

Yes. If we had not accompanied the heavy cuts we made in spending with substantial tax cuts, we would have balanced the budget. But we had to consider the proper balance in our sensitive economy. We knew that heavy cuts in Government spending meant putting people out of work. We believed that we should cut taxes sharply and so give more people added money to spend for themselves to help create jobs for those who previously got their paychecks directly from the Government or from Government purchases. We cut taxes in calendar year 1954 by a total of $7.4 billion—the largest single dollar tax cut in history. We did this to help make possible the easier and quicker transition in jobs from high Government spending to lower Government spending. The fact that the economic downturn was so quickly checked and that we are now proceeding upward on a broad front is proof that the policy of cutting taxes as we cut spending is a sound policy. The fact that consumer spending in the past year was the highest that it has ever been is also good evidence of how the tax cuts helped to make the successful economic transition.

Question: "Will there be further tax cuts?"

Not this year, if the administration's recommendations are accepted by the Congress. The President has proposed that the corporate rate of 52 percent, as well as excise taxes which would go down on April 1, be continued for 1 full year. We are asking this because we think the current status of the economy will take it and because further tax reduction would lead to too heavy deficit financing and a possible revival of dangerous inflationary pressures.

This does not mean that taxes must not be cut further. They are still too high for the long run and must come down. As the President has said, we certainly hope that we can be planning additional tax reductions a year from now.

Question: "If you are going to cut taxes further next year, how can you ever balance the budget?"

That is a question we are often asked—and it is an important one. As I have said, we have not abandoned the goal of balancing the budget, and neither have we stopped cutting taxes. We can and will do both. We will keep trying to cut government spending further. At the same time our expanding economy can provide greater tax income even at lower tax rates because it is on a broader base. As this country continues to grow, there is no reason why we can't have both a balanced budget and lower tax rates provided only that world conditions continue to improve.

Let's notice here the difference between the administrative and the cash budgets. As long as the Government is not taking out of the economy more than it spends, the Government is not increasing the money supply and thus being inflationary. So when we have a balance in the cash budget (which includes the receipts of the trust funds such as social security) we have eliminated that particular inflationary pressure. We did have a cash balance between money collected from the public and money paid out by the Government last year, although we will not quite have a cash balance this year. We estimate a small cash surplus in fiscal 1956. So that the inflationary effect of deficit financing will have been almost eliminated during the entire period this administration has been in financial control.

Question: "Why do you have to raise the debt limit if you are really cutting spending as you claim?"

When we came into office, there was $8 billion between the amount of the then-existing debt and the $275 billion debt ceiling. Now, in the very first year, the previous budget which we inherited turned out with a deficit of $9½ billion. Actually there was little we could then do beyond carrying out the spending that had already been planned and paying the bills that were presented. We had no leeway under the debt limit as we entered our first full fiscal year, 1954, so we asked the Congress for an increase, as a matter of prudence as we looked ahead. As things came out in fiscal 1954, we cut the prior administration's $11 billion estimated deficit (after an overestimate of revenue is figured in) to $3 billion—a cut of $8 billion. But even then we still had this $3 billion deficit that had to be put on top of the $9 billion deficit that we inherited from the preceding year. These two things, plus the wide seasonal variations in collection of corporate income taxes, made some elasticity in the debt limit absolutely essential. Congress recognized this and last year authorized a $6 billion temporary increase in the limit on the condition that the debt would go back to the $275 billion limit at the end of this fiscal year.

This year we estimate a $4.5 billion deficit, which we hope we may cut a little, as I have said. And in fiscal 1956 we are estimating a smaller deficit of $2½ billion or less. But regardless of the size of the deficit and the reductions we are making, each deficit pushes up our debt still further, and so involves the problem of what to do about the debt limit. It will be with us acutely again this June.

Question: "Is borrowing outside the debt limit necessarily improper?"

No, not necessarily. If the Government borrows outside of the regular debt for something which must be paid back from general funds, it is and would be improper. But if the Government is acquiring or operating earning assets, it is perfectly proper that they should be independently financed.

For example, if a toll road is built and the tolls to be collected are sufficient to meet the debt service, both principal and interest, required to amortize the debt that is created to pay for the road, it is a perfectly clear case of a proper independent financing of an earning asset. Now, the toll to be collected can be based on weight or axle charge, on a mileage basis, or on any other suitable measure of use, including the consumption of oil and gasoline.

If the collections made under such a measure of use are dedicated in good faith to meet the debt obligations that are incurred, it is a perfectly proper way to independently finance debt required to pay for roads. Moreover, the entire economy is benefited: First, by the construction of the road and its employment of men and materials; second, by the use of the road and its benefits to transportation; and, third, by the liquidation of the cost of the road through a user tax measured by gas and oil, rather than by placing an additional burden on the back of the general income-tax payer.

Question: "Is the Government improving its debt structure?"

Yes. The enormous debt is too heavy in short-term maturities. These can be inflationary as well as the source of trouble and possibly real danger to our whole economy under certain circumstances with so many short maturities. We are making progress slowly in lengthening the average maturities, and we must move slowly so as not to upset our sensitive economy. The 40-year 3-percent bonds just issued have been a real step forward. The issue was a great success. It has lengthened the average maturity of our whole marketable debt from 4 years and 2 months to 4 years and 9 months. It is the longest Government bond issued since 1911 when some 50-year bonds were issued to help finance the Panama Canal. This issue, like all our financing operations, had to be rightly timed for market conditions which were appropriate to be sure that we did not interfere with other financing requirements and so affect the economic situation in an unfavorable way.

Question: "Will there be more long-term issues?"

Yes. It is our firm goal to continue to lengthen the maturities of the debt as rapidly as appropriate conditions permit. The issue last week was the second long-term issue we have put out. The first was the 3¼-percent 30-year bond in the spring of 1953. We will have more when and as the conditions make it appropriate. We want to have varied types of issues so that all types of investors will have appropriate Government securities in which to put their funds. This will spread the debt as widely as possible among the largest number of investors so as to both finance the debt and promote sound economic growth.

Question: "Have we permanently stopped inflation?"

That depends upon the courageous and tenacious will of the great majority of the American people to do so. The lure of inflation is something that is never permanently killed. It beckons like a siren to enticing, evil ways. Unless continuously watchful resistance is always exerted, the weak may fall for its false promises of ease to riches and be led down the primrose path to their ruin. It means the destruction of savings, which make investment possible, which in turn makes jobs. When we jeopardize the making of ever more and better jobs in America, we are ruining the very foundation of this Republic.

Our record of the past 2 years has been good. The value of the dollar has changed less than one-fifth of 1 cent between January 1953 and today. This compares with a loss of 48 cents in the value of the dollar from 1939 to the time when this administration took office. Inflation will stay checked only if we continue to actively resist the things which bring inflation about. Government must continue to cut down deficit financing and to handle its debt in a proper way.

The Federal Reserve System must continue to use wisely its money and credit responsibilities so that the economy of the Nation can operate with the minimum of regulation. Savings must be protected. Investment must be encouraged by a great and ever-growing group of both large and small investors, and more and better jobs will thus be created to produce more goods for better living for more and more Americans.

Question: "Isn't a little inflation a good thing?"

No, it is not, and such thinking is very dangerous. I know there are millions of Americans who are earning more dollars today than they did 20 years ago. That's good. In many cases there is a real improvement in that they have better homes, automobiles, and so forth. But the fact that this increase in dollar income has been accompanied by less value of the dollar must be considered. In addition, the large numbers of persons on fixed incomes and persons who have put aside savings for retirement and old age have been cruelly hurt by inflation taking away 48 cents of each dollar they saved 15 years ago.

Fortunately, inflation has now been stopped. As economists of the American Federation of Labor put it recently, according to press reports: "Unionized labor fared better in 1954 on the wage front than in any other postwar year. Higher hourly wages and stable living costs had given most workers their greatest postwar gain in purchasing power. This was true even though the average pay rise of 5 to 9 cents per hour was modest in comparison with increases in previous years. Last year the wage earner got the full benefit of a fatter pay envelope. In other years inflation gobbled up much of his gain."

There is nothing academic about this point because America today is a Nation of earners and of haves rather than have-nots. Most Americans today are saving several dollars a week out of their pay and putting it in insurance policies, retirement funds, and so forth. The recurrence of inflation would rob millions of people of their savings.

Question: "What is the prospect for more jobs in this country?"

The prospect for jobs is very closely related to what I have just been talking about. Probably the most important thing in promoting a high level of employment and business activity is confidence—people's confidence in our Government, confidence in each other, and confidence in the future.

If the great bulk of the American people are reasonably confident of the future they will expand their activities, invoke new initiative and try new ways of doing things. As they continue to find their confidence justified, they will not only save money but will invest their savings. This will provide the funds to produce the tools and power for the new plants, new equipment and new and better ways of making more things. This will lead to greater production, greater earnings of more people to pay for more consumption of more things and so in turn make more and better jobs as the years go by. A man can earn more only if he can produce more. As we produce more we will all have more. If we maintain confidence in the stability of our system, there will be more and cheaper goods produced through more and better jobs and with more and better earnings for both the workers and the investors.

Question: "What is the economic outlook today?"

The economic downturn of last year is behind us. In general, the economy is now moving upward on a broad front. There are some lines and areas which are still depressed. Unsolved problems still remain on which we are diligently working. Unemployment in January was 3,300,000, an increase of 500,000 over the previous month and an increase of 200,000 over January a year ago. But as concrete evidence of the economy's upward movement, employment in January was 60,200,000, or 400,000 higher than in January a year ago. The economy never moves in a smooth straight line, up or down, but as long as our broad movement is upward we are moving in the right direction. If Government, business, labor, farmers, and all our citizens remain both confident and reasonable in their demands upon the whole economy, we should be able to maintain this upward trend, and supply the rightful demands of an ever-growing population.

REVENUE ACT OF 1955—FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of certain members of the Committee on Finance, that they be authorized to prepare and file miniority views on House bill 4259, the Revenue Act of 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to clarify 1 or 2 points.

First of all, there has been printed, and is now available to Members of the Senate, the report of the Committee on Finance on House bill 4259. I have asked the Secretary of the Senate to see that each Member on this side of the aisle receives a copy this afternoon, so that it may be studied over the weekend. I assume it will be available also to Members on the other side of the aisle.

I have made some inquiries, and I understand that the printed hearings before the Finance Committee will be available on Friday. It seems to me that the Senator should give some indication to the Senate as to when the minority views will be filed. This is a subject of great importance. I had hoped that the bill might be taken up this week, and at least the debate started, but I understand from the leadership on the other side that they do not care to have the bill taken up this week.

In connection with a tax bill which may affect some $2 billion-plus in revenue, it seems to me that we should have some assurances from the Senator that the minority views will be filed at least by Friday, so that they will be available to the Senate by Monday of next week.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, there are six members of the committee who, I believe, will participate in the minority views. Certainly there is no disposition on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma to delay consideration of the bill by a day, an hour, or a minute. Neither can I determine with any degree of accuracy when we shall be able to send the minority views to the printer.

Therefore, in view of the fact that when the chairman of the committee asked permission to file the report of the committee on the bill during the recess, he did not ask permission that the minority views also might be filed, we had no choice other than to come to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that we be permitted to file the minority views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear. I think the Senator is entitled to file the minority views. Certainly the minority Members, or those having minority views, should have the right to file them. Merely because of a parliamentary situation which requires the obtaining of unanimous consent, I would not object to the Senator's filing the minority views, because I think the views of the minority should be before the Senate at the time the bill is taken up for consideration.

My only point is that it seems to me the Senator should give some indication as to the time within which he expects to file the minority views—let us say, until midnight on Friday next—in order that there may be ample opportunity to file them and make them available to the Senate next week. I am not trying to foreclose the filing of the minority views, or making them available to the Senate.

Mr. KERR. I cannot make the views available until they are prepared. I cannot speak for other Members who, I am advised, wish to participate in this report. I will say to the Senator that I shall undertake to see that the minority views are filed within a week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should have to object to that. If the Senator wishes to make a request that the minority members have until midnight on Friday to file the minority views, I shall have no objection to such a request.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As I understand the request of the Senator from Oklahoma, it covers only such time as is needed by the six Members to file their views.

Mr. KERR. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. And only the time that is needed.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The observation of the acting majority leader is that the minority should have an opportunity to file their views. As I understand, they do not have access to all of the committee staff which would be available to those who filed the majority report, if they desired to use it. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. We would have access to the committee staff after they had served the purposes of the majority. Knowing that, we made arrangements to obtain outside help, in order that we might expedite the preparation of our report.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I hope that neither the leadership on the other side of the aisle nor the chairman of the committee will insist that a deadline be set for the filing of the minority views. I think we can place confidence in the Senator from Oklahoma, who is one of the ranking Members on the Democratic side, and who supports the minority position. I think we may have confidence that he will not delay the filing of the minority views one day, one hour, or 1 minute beyond the time necessary to place those views before the Senate.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is entirely correct. The distinguished Senator from California knows that the majority leader is one of the Senators with whom I expect to confer. The Senator from California knows he is not in Washington. He knows that the Senator from Oklahoma at this time cannot state the exact hour or day or minute when he can complete that contact and discussion and bring the minority views to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The acting majority leader has made reference to the staff of the committee. The report of the committee will require very little work, because it will merely transmit to the Senate the continuation of the excise taxes and the 5 percent additional corporation tax, which expire on March 31. Therefore, as chairman of the committee, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I believe he can get the staff today, if he chooses to do so, in order to prepare his minority views. I wish to make it clear also that had the chairman of the Committee on Finance known that the Senator from Oklahoma desired to file minority views, he would have included that request.

Mr. KERR. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Was not that request made at the meeting yesterday; namely, that certain members of the committee be permitted to file minority views?

Mr. BYRD. I do not recall it.

Mr. KERR. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I was present until toward the end of the meeting. When I left the meeting, the motion was pending. I discussed the matter with one of my colleagues, and asked him to be good enough to make arrangements for the filing of minority views. He said he would do so. He told me that he had done so.

Mr. BYRD. I know the subject was discussed, but I do not recall that any motion was made.

Mr. KERR. I will say to the distinguished chairman that no motion is necessary. Any Member may merely ask for the privilege, and that privilege is automatically granted.

Mr. BYRD. I inquire of the Chair whether the report of the committee has been filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The report has been filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. The committee had unanimous consent that the report may be filed during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report was filed yesterday afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. As chairman of the committee I have no objection to the filing of minority views. I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma, however, in the interest of speed, that he can use the staff of the committee, which is a very excellent staff.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy, but I will say to him that it will be our purpose to use the staff just as soon as we have gathered the material for a draft of the minority views. However, the Senator from Virginia knows that six Senators are interested in this matter. He is as familiar with the situation generally as is the Senator from Oklahoma, and he knows that the Senator from Oklahoma cannot state the hour or the minute when he can finish his discussion with his colleagues.

Mr. BYRD. It is not necessary to name the hour or the minute. It seems to me that there ought to be some limitation, because the tax bill is in a very peculiar situation. The excise taxes expire March 31, and, if they should expire, it would mean a loss to the Treasury of $1 billion. The 5 percent tax on corporations will also expire on March 31, and unless they are continued, the Treasury will be faced with a loss of $2 billion.

There will be quite a controversy with respect to the amendment to the bill which was adopted by the House and which provides for a $20 reduction in income tax for every taxpayer and for every one of his dependents.

Time is a very important factor in the situation. If the bill should go to conference, it may well remain in conference quite a while.

Therefore, I believe there ought to be a reasonable assurance from the Senator from Oklahoma with respect to the date on which he will file the minority views. He has the services of the entire staff of the Committee on Finance in preparing his minority views.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am asking only for the time that is required. I told the distinguished Senator from California that it could be done within a week. I did not ask that we should be permitted to wait a week to file it, but only such time as is required, not to exceed 1 week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have to object to such a request. I believe revenue is of the utmost importance to the Nation and to the Treasury. Certain taxes will expire at the end of March. We are now approaching the middle of March. Obviously, the bill will be highly controversial. Undoubtedly, there will be considerable discussion on one or more amendments to the bill.

I have no desire to prevent the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma from filing minority views. The report of the committee was filed yesterday under unanimous consent that the committee

could file its report during the adjournment of the Senate. I would not object to a request that the Senator from Oklahoma be permitted to file the minority views up to midnight of Friday or up to noon of Monday. However, I feel, in the interest of orderly procedure of the Senate, the Senate is entitled to some assurance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I renew my request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object to the request in that form.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent to file, as soon as we are able to prepare them, minority views of certain members of the Committee on Finance on H. R. 4259, the Revenue Act of 1955.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views of the Committee on Finance may be filed up to noon of Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like very much to have the Senator from Oklahoma express the views of the minority of the committee with reference to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California. I should not like to object to it. If the Senator from Oklahoma feels that the request gives him ample time in which to file the minority views, I would not wish to object to it. However, I should like to have him express himself on the request.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not know if that will give him ample time. I must say that I have examined and made some research of the records of the Senate with respect to requests for unanimous consent to file minority views. So far as I have been able to learn, never in the history of the Senate has such a request been objected to.

I am sure the distinguished minority leader feels very heavy upon his shoulders the burden of his leadership. It may be that he feels that he and those who agree with him will need from Monday noon—which according to my calendar will be March 7—3 weeks and 3 days in which to secure action by the Senate of the United States on this proposed legislation. I acknowledge that it could not be passed in that time if passage depended alone on the merits of the bill.

However, there is not the slightest disposition on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma, or anyone associated with him in the request, to delay either the filing of the minority views or the consideration of the bill beyond the time necessary for us to be in position to submit our views to this body in accordance with the orderly processes of the Senate, which are and have been, so far as I know, from the day the Senate was organized, in line with the request I have made.

If the minority leader cares to assume unto himself the prerogative to sit in judgment upon the intended purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma and five other honorable Members of the Senate, to the extent that he is unwilling, if unanimous consent is granted for the filing of the minority views, to accept the assurance that they will be filed as soon as they reasonably can be, then I would want him to stand on his record of objecting. I would then object to his request for unanimous consent for limited debate, which might be more than needed but which also might be less than needed, in which six Members of the Senate would have the opportunity, in accordance with custom as old as the Senate, and without any exception on the record, to file their views as a minority of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma, as I understand, has agreed to file the minority views by noon on Wednesday. The Senator from California wishes them to be filed by next Monday. I make the unanimous-consent request that they be filed by noon next Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am of the opinion that the report can be filed at or prior to that time. I feel that the chairman of the committee has made his request in a spirit of fairness and in recognition of the fact that there is no intent on my part nor on the part of any of the other members who constitute a minority of the committee in any way to delay the filing of the minority views. While I should like the Senate to have the advantage of the unanimous-consent request as it was originally made, in view of the action of the minority leader in objecting to the request made by me, and the spirit of fairness and of good will evidenced by the chairman of the committee, I make no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If the Senator from Oklahoma is making no objection, I suppose it is a little late for me to make the suggestion which I was going to make, but I make it, anyway.

It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the committee, would not object to the Senator from Oklahoma having until next Wednesday to submit the minority views, and so stated.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Kentucky is eminently correct, and I had that in mind as a part of the background from my knowledge of the fairness and good will of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that at the time the Senator from Oklahoma had his discussion with the chairman of the committee he assured the chairman that he was not going to take any more time than was absolutely necessary to prepare the minority views and get them before the Senate?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not think we should quibble about 24 hours. The Chairman of the Finance Committee wishes to get the proposed legislation before the Senate and has absolute confidence in the Senator from Oklahoma.

It seems to me that if one side wants the minority views filed on Wednesday and the other side wants them filed on Monday, it would be well to suggest the time as noon on Tuesday.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in view of my knowledge of the attitude of fairness and good will of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I will make no objection to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Hoover Commission released earlier this week its recommendations relative to Federal health services. I have taken particular interest in their recommendations regarding medical care of veterans. The Commission proposes the closing of 19 Veterans' Administration hospitals because of "uneconomic and inefficient operation." I have my reservations about the curtailment of free hospital care to veterans, but my immediate concern is the Commission's recommendations to the Veterans' Administration to close all "surplus" hospitals immediately. One of these 19 veteran's hospitals is located in Miles City, Mont.

This is the second attempt by the Hoover Commission to close this Veterans' Administration hospital at Miles City. At this time, I wish to register strong protest against this proposed action.

There are 2 veterans' hospitals in the State of Montana, 1 at Helena and the 1 at Miles City, at opposite ends of the State. These 2 hospitals serve 148,000 square miles in Montana alone, not considering the large areas served in adjoining States. Under present conditions great distances are involved in reaching these hospitals. If the hospital at Miles City is closed it will place much greater burdens on those who are in need of the services offered at veterans' hospitals. Many will have to travel hundreds of additional miles to receive adequate medical attention.

The hospital at Miles City serves veterans in Montana and in addition, those from large sections of North and South Dakota and Wyoming. There is one veterans' hospital in Sheridan, Wyo., but this hospital is limited to mental patients. This is the closest one to the Miles City Hospital.

The Hoover Commission has made great strides in many areas but these latest recommendations are a great disappointment. If there is one category of citizens which we should not treat solely on a dollar-and-cents basis, it is the veteran, those who have given of their time, health, and lives in the service of the United States. In addition, the report fails to make note of the fact that the existing number of VA hospital

beds is short of the total authorized by Congress.

In view of the seriousness of these recommendations I again wish to make known my opposition to the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Miles City, an important link in the network of services provided for our veterans.

SHIPMENT OF FOODSTUFFS TO RUSSIA AND OTHER COMMUNIST-DOMINATED COUNTRIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, recently numerous reports have appeared in the press to the effect that serious consideration is being given by the administration to a proposal that we give to Russia and other Communist-dominated countries wheat, butter, and other surplus agriculture products.

According to the press this proposal has been considered seriously enough to have the question submitted to the Attorney General for an opinion as to whether or not the necessary authority exists under the present law. It is reported that the Attorney General has ruled that it would require new legislation authorizing the sale of our surplus agricultural commodities to Soviet Russia, but that no additional legislation would be required to give it to them.

I am very much concerned that such a proposal would even be seriously considered, especially when we realize that Russia is today not only recognized as a major threat to our national security, but also recognized as having encouraged the illegal retention of American citizens as prisoners in Red China.

The fact that the economic system of Russia is today breaking down to such an extent that under the Communist program they are unable to supply the citizens of their country with the necessities of life, is the only hope we have that through inner strife the present regime in Russia can be overthrown.

The Communist clique which has been governing Soviet Russia is well aware of the restlessness of her people. There is not enough food. There is not enough clothing. There is no security for anyone.

To ship American food into Russia today to alleviate the unsettlement as the result of short food rations would not only relieve the present Soviet regime of their embarrassment but also release more Russian workers for military service or for service in the production of military goods. The Soviet people would never even know that the extra rations came from America.

Certainly from a humanitarian standpoint we would like to help the distressed of any nation; however, as long as the would-be recipient nation insists upon violating all rules of international law and ignoring the rights of the free citizens of other countries such aid cannot be justified.

The Russian people should be given to understand in clear language that as long as their country maintains her present warlike attitude and as long as a single American citizen is illegally imprisoned in Soviet dominated territories no economic aid can be expected.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD an article on this subject which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEAT TO SOVIET?—PROS AND CONS CLASH

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Should the American wheat surplus be used to help meet Moscow's wheat deficit?

That question has more angles than a tetrahexahedron.

The issue arose with the shift in Soviet Premiers last month and the Kremlin's admission of a breakdown in its farm program.

This question has just about everything. It involves humanitarianism, psychological warfare, congressional legislation, the national stockpile, interdepartmental differences, international trade. It is studded with personalities: President Eisenhower, Nikita S. Khrushchev, Nelson Rockefeller, the Shah of Iran, Ezra Taft Benson, poor Georgi M. Malenkov, Konrad Adenauer. It involved the USIA, the CCC, FOA, the National Grange, Public Law 480, definition of what is and what isn't a friendly nation.

RUSSIAN SALAD

What you get when you mix up all these issues, factors, personalities—if you will pardon the expression—is a salade Russe. For every question answered two new unanswered ones pop up. For every argument pro, a con shows up on the other side of the ledger. In fact some of the issues involved provide both pro and con arguments. And so, without further ado and introduction, let us plunge into the confusions that this very simple question causes.

A gift of American wheat to the Soviet people obviously would relieve a certain amount of human suffering. Or would it? Moscow admits it is low on wheat and other grains. But why then is it selling 10,000 tons of wheat to Iran? Why is Warsaw, its satellite, trading agricultural products with West Germany?

Is there any assurance that the U. S. S. R. wouldn't step up its wheat sales abroad to keep pace with the free wheat it received from the United States? Or what would prevent it from even selling American wheat gifts abroad, if it so desired? United States wheat, after all, might not help the poor Soviet peasant. It might rather be used by Moscow to improve the Soviet trade position.

Or take the mechanics of the question. Should this wheat be "given" to the Soviet Union, or "sold or traded"? Why should not the United States turn a fast ruble out of the deal? Wouldn't it be smart to try to get some Soviet manganese, or cobalt, or even sables in return for these shiploads of wheat? Uncle Sam doesn't need to be Uncle Shylock, but neither does he need to play Santa Claus to the Soviet Union. You can build up a good case for selling or trading, rather than giving, surplus wheat to Moscow.

But at this point you run into Public Law 480. This law allows that the Commodity Credit Corporation can sell some $700 million worth of farm surpluses to nations "other than the U. S. S. R." It lets the Foreign Operations Administration give away $300 million worth of farm surpluses to "friendly people without regard to their governments." Thus, unless the law is amended, the United States cannot sell wheat to the Soviet Union. It has to give it to Moscow. It can be charitable, but it cannot be businesslike.

WEB OF CONFUSION

This Soviet wheat shortage has both the Soviet and United States Government tangled in a web of confusion and contradiction. Mr. Malenkov gets the down elevator in the U. S. S. R. because of the failure of the government's farm policy—which was really the fault of his successor to authority, Mr. Khrushchev, but who was able to pin it on poor Georgi.

Here in Washington, President Eisenhower looks at the subject with suspicion. New psychological warfare boss, Mr. Rockefeller finds himself playing Laocoon trapped in the coils of this great debate. Commerce is pitted against Agriculture; State Department finds itself at odds with FOA. The United States Information Agency through the Voice of America, sheds crocodile tears over the critical shortage of foodstuffs in Russia. Mr. Benson pleads for the part of the good Samaritan. Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., says it's for free or Congress will have to pass a law.

With all this wrestling, debate, arguments, and dispute the chances are against any sale, barter, or free gift of United States wheat to the Soviet Union. It is a political axiom: When in doubt, do nothing. And there's no doubt the administration is in doubt on this question.

NOMINATION OF GEN. JULIUS C. HOLMES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the nomination of Brig. Gen. Julius C. Holmes as the Ambassador to Iran.

I wish to go on record in opposition to the confirmation of General Holmes for this important position, and at the same time officially to file a request with the majority and the minority leaders that advance notice be given to the Senate prior to taking up the nomination for consideration. At that time I will state my reasons for objecting to the confirmation of the nomination.

SHORTER PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS COULD INCREASE DOMINANCE OF MONEY IN ELECTIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a matter which has received very little attention publicly, but which I think is of considerable concern.

I must confess to some alarm over the fact that both major political parties have substantially shortened the 1956 Presidential campaign through planning their national conventions for later dates than usual.

The Democratic convention is scheduled for Chicago either July 23 or August 13, depending upon State election laws. The Republican convention is scheduled for August 20.

It is evident that these dates narrow the time of campaigning. It also will tend to reduce the length of the campaigns in the various States, because the identity and character of the Presidential nominees invariably influence all campaigning in a Presidential year.

At first blush, Mr. President, this might seem a desirable objective. Yet I confess to the fear that it will make big money more dominant than ever in our political life. A short campaign will not reduce the sums available for politics;

it merely will mean that these sums can be concentrated more decisively and effectively.

Television is astronomically expensive. A national hookup may cost $75,000. In the city of New York, at the last mayoralty election, a leading candidate withdrew because he confessed that soaring TV costs made a $1,000,000 exchequer necessary to be elected chief executive of that one city.

The presidential nominee with the smaller purse will need more time in which to make felt his personality and his program. Some of the most decisive campaigning in America is carried on by word of mouth—at community suppers, at church socials, at trade-union meetings, at farm potlucks, around the hot stove, or over the corral fence. This is why the candidate with the slim wallet occasionally can defeat the man with the big campaign treasure chest. But such word-of-mouth campaigning, Mr. President, takes time—a lot of time. It can't be flashed onto millions of TV screens virtually overnight, at vast expense.

I am disturbed over the total impact of television upon our national life Through TV, it is possible to introduce theatrical techniques into politics. When we give additional dominance to such a medium, through shortening the period of time for candidates to reach the people, I am alarmed. I wonder if a "blitzkrieg" on TV will not shape the public mind, before a less favorably financed nominee can get his message to the people by slower and less costly means.

The campaign train, making the whistle stops, is traditional in our life. But a short campaign may not allow time for a candidate to go by train, at only nominal expense, to hundreds of comparatively small communities. He will have to be on TV nightly, spreading his image across the Nation into every parlor and living room. And what if one candidate lacks the funds to buy all this TV time?

Some day, Mr. President, shorter political campaigns may well be possible and desirable, but I believe they will be premature until we have solved the urgent problem of making television—and perhaps other media—equally available to candidates irrespective of their financial backing.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, prior to moving that the Senate adjourn until Friday next, I should like to announce for the RECORD that no legislative business is expected to be taken up on Friday.

Under the order previously entered, I move that as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, the Senate stand in adjournment until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator MAYBANK, the Senate adjourned until Friday, March 4, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2, 1955:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

George W. Perkins, of New York, to be the United States permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, vice John C. Hughes, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Thomas H. Trent, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida, vice Leo H. Brooker, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are again turning unto Thee with confidence and hope, for Thy thoughts and purposes concerning us are always those of kindness, of love, and of peace.

Grant that during this Lenten season we may take some time to yield ourselves to the discipline of silence and self-examination and listen more attentively and eagerly to what Thou art saying unto us about our character and conduct, our tasks and responsibilities.

Help us to cultivate those capacities and powers of insight and understanding which will enable us to see our problems and difficulties in their right perspective.

Enlarge and enrich our minds and hearts with faith and trust and may we surrender our wills and desires in glad obedience to the infallible guidance of Thy divine spirit.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NEBRASKA'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Nebraska's birthday. Eighty-eight years ago, on March 1, 1867, President Andrew Johnson signed a proclamation making the State of Nebraska one of the United States, the 37th State in the Union. It is interesting to note that the Nebraska statehood bill is one of the few statehood bills vetoed by a President.

On March 21, 1864, the Congress passed a law defining the boundaries of the Nebraska Territory and setting up the machinery for creating the State of Nebraska, which was subsequently approved by the President on April 19, 1864. The people of the proposed State called a constitutional convention, adopted a constitution and a formal government and transmitted these items to the Congress.

The Statehood Act was passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, but was vetoed by the President because he felt that a provision in the act might be construed as infringing upon the right of the new State to regulate the voting and other fundamental rights of its citizens. The Congress then reconsidered the act, and overrode his veto and Nebraska was admitted on the condition that the embryonic State assure the Congress and the President that there should be no denial of the elective franchise and all other fundamental rights of persons within the State by reason of race or color. The Territorial legislature was called into session and on the 20th of February 1867, enacted its assurance accordingly. President Andrew Johnson then, on the 1st of March 1867, issued his proclamation declaring Nebraska a State. Thus, in the strife-torn years immediately following the Civil War, we find the formal beginning of the State of Nebraska.

There are many factors that have contributed to the greatness of our State, but the two most important are its land and its people. From 1867 until 1950 our population has grown from 50,000 to 1,325,510; and our land has been developed from the native unbroken prairies, even then rich with life-giving grasses, to the highly cultivated irrigated farm grounds that lie in the valleys of the many Nebraska rivers.

The exploration and settlement of Nebraska is one of the striking chapters in the history of American expansion, one without parallel. It is a story written in adventure, in toil, in tragedy, and reward. Acheological expeditions have uncovered considerable evidence of the presence of prehistoric man in the State, indicating that man existed in this area from ten to twenty thousand years ago. The deep soil deposits have preserved some of the finest prehistoric animal and reptile specimens yet found on the North American Continent.

At the time of the coming of the first white men, the Nebraska territory was inhabited by the Indian tribes, who moved across the Great Plains as the food supply shifted from place to place. The first white men to visit this region were 30 Spaniards under the leadership of Francisco Vasquez Coronado, who came into the territory on a foray from the Rio Grande in 1541. French fur traders began to venture up the Missouri River about 1700, and in 1739 the Mallet brothers, with a party of eight Frenchmen, named the Platte River and traveled nearly the entire length of the State on a journey from the Missouri River to Santa Fe.

During these years, ownership of this little-explored and richly abundant territory was a source of struggle between France, England, and Spain. The reports of the early French explorers, glowing with praises of this wonderful new empire, awakened the imagination of the French as to the possibilities of this "most marvelous region upon the face of the earth." France moved upon the Nebraska region from two directions—from the North, following the founding of Quebec in 1609, and from the

South with the founding of Biloxi on the Gulf of Mexico in 1700. By the year 1720, Spain and France had become rivals for possession of this vast region west of the Mississippi River; the Spanish had settlements in the Rio Grande Valley and in Texas; the French in the Mississippi Valley. At the close of the Seven Years' War, France ceded all her claims east of the Mississippi River to England, and all claims west to Spain. Nebraska was thus a part of the Spanish province of Louisiana from 1763 until 1801, when Napoleon bought it back from Spain. Even before the new provisional governor could arrive to take up control of his domain, war broke out between France and England. In financial desperation, Napoleon changed his plan and sold the entire province to the new American Republic for $15,500,000; and at an imposing ceremony in the Great Square on the river front in New Orleans on November 30, 1803, the Nebraska region became American territory with Thomas Jefferson as her President.

Almost before the ink was dry on the purchase agreement, an American expedition started to explore the area of the Louisiana Purchase. Lewis and Clark were the commanders of this initial exploratory adventure, and in the 2 years of their expedition, 1804–06, skirted the Nebraska territorial boundaries. Five years later, the Hunt party of Astorians touched Nebraska on their way to Oregon, and in 1813 seven of the party crossed the mountains and followed the North Platte to its junction with the South Platte, and thence along the Platte to the Missouri River. Manuel Lisa, who built a permanent fort in 1812 about 10 miles north of the present Omaha post office, was probably the first white settler and the first to engage in farming in Nebraska. In September 1819 Major Long established Fort Atkinson upon the site of the present village of Fort Calhoun in Washington County, and the 1,000 people who came to live there built the first school library, brickyard, sawmill, and grist mill in the State.

The missionary period followed the establishment of a permanent fort in Nebraska. While the missionary work among the Indians of the State did not generally convert the tribes to Christianity, still the story of missionary work among the Indians filled the space of 40 years in the history of Nebraska with a heroic record and with more valuable information upon the elements of life in this territory at this time than is derived from any other single source.

With the settlement and beginning of development of Nebraska, the pioneers again looked to the westward toward the lands that lay beyond the Continental Divide. Nebraska was the avenue for the crossing. The rich grasslands provided the food to sustain the animals, and the abundant water supply and wild game provided the means of survival for these hardy adventurers. To Nebraska belongs the honor of first pointing out to the American Nation a natural, practicable roadway across the mountains, binding the western shores of this great country to the rest of the Nation.

Several trails were developed. Of all the old overland trails crossing Nebraska, each with its story written deep into the lives of the men and women in the record of the westward march of the American people, the Oregon Trail was the first and the most famous. The Trail began its career in 1832, and by 1840 had become a well-traveled road, a great traveling city flowing 2,000 miles from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

The migration of the Mormons from Florence, now a suburb of Omaha, in the spring of 1847, brought into existence the great Mormon Trail, which traversed Nebraska and merged at Fort Laramie with the established Oregon Trail.

An increased interest in quicker, more adequate transportation naturally followed after the establishment of these wagon routes to the West. The Nation was divided by the extreme pressure of commercial interests of the North and the South, each pushing to construct the first Pacific railroad. Farsighted leaders of both areas grasped the strategic position of the Nebraska Territory as the natural route for the railroad to the west coast, and voices in many quarters became loud in a demand for the organization and recognition of the Nebraska Territory. In his annual report, dated November 30, 1844, Secretary of War William Wilkins recommended the formation of a territorial government, but it was not until May 30, 1854, after several bills had been introduced and nearly all the controversial issues of the day were debated, that President Franklin Pierce signed the Kansas-Nebraska bill into law.

In only a few years the movement for statehood was started, and on April 19, 1864, the Nebraska enabling act was passed and approved. Nebraska's statehood, as had been her Territorial establishment, was to be delayed and greatly influenced by the stark national issues facing the Congress and the people during those times. Local factions were divided over the slave-free question, and controversy developed over the problems of governmental expense which would be created if Nebraska was to become an independent State, so it was not until 1866 that a constitution and a form of State government were framed. The statehood bill finally passed after long and bitter debate, over Presidential veto, when the Nebraska Legislature adopted laws repudiating slavery in the new State.

Settlement and growth of this new Territory had been slow during the Civil War period and years before, although the foundation for growth had been laid by the Congress when it enacted the free-homestead law in 1862. On the date this law became effective, January 1, 1863, Daniel Freeman took out the first homestead in the United States, on Cub Creek, in Gage County, Nebraska. Since that time, over 1 million homesteaders over the United States have received more than 120 million acres of land from our Government, and more than 100,000 homesteaded and lived in Nebraska. These settlers came from New England and New York, Michigan and Illinois, and from the war-torn States of the South. More and more settlers came from many countries across the seas. The Irish settled in Holt County in 1874 and Greeley County in 1877. Germans settled Madison, Stanton, and Thayer Counties between 1867–70. Swedes settled in Polk and Saunders Counties about 1870 and Phelps and Burt Counties about 1880. Bohemians founded communities in Knox, Colfax, Saunders, and Saline Counties about 1870. A group of Hollanders settled in the southern part of Lancaster County about 1875 and extended their settlements into Clay and Hamilton Counties. Danish, Swedish, Bohemian, and Polish communities were founded in Howard and Valley Counties. French settlements were made in Richardson, Nemaha, Antelope, and other counties. The seeds of greatness of Nebraska's people were brought in from a score of different States and from a dozen different foreign countries; but, once these seeds took root in Nebraska soil, the product which grew from them became Nebraska's most valuable asset—courageous, hard-working and sincere American citizens.

The several homestead laws, the free homestead law of 1863, the Timber Culture Act, and the Kinkaid law, have been instrumental in opening the lands of Nebraska to the agricultural development and cultivation now so prevalent in our great State, and the railroad brought great progress by transporting settlers into the State and farm commodities from Nebraska to the other States of the Union.

Over the many years, one of the significant achievements in the State's history has been the development of irrigation in the North Platte Valley. Local individual initiative and the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 helped these farmers turn much of the dry land into a true Garden of Eden, the Quivera for which Coronado searched when he and his small band of explorers first entered this territory. Scottsbluff, one of the most important and fast-growing cities in Nebraska, owes much of its expansion to the development of irrigation from the North Platte River and its feeder streams. The sandhills area grazes most of the State's 5 million beef cattle, and we look with pride on the industry that provides much of the world's beef supply and foundation stock for cattle herds in all quarters of the agricultural world.

Nebraskans are justly proud of the progressive, efficient, and economical record of their State government. The State constitution, adopted in 1920, contains a provision prohibiting the State to contract any indebtedness in excess of $100,000. The State has no income tax and no sales tax, and in 1934 the people adopted an initiative proposal to create the unicameral legislature, a novel experiment in the field of lawmaking bodies.

Many Nebraskans have brought credit to the State and the Nation with their contributions to literature, art, and music; and to the military and political science of the world. Writers such as Willa Cather, Bess Streeter Aldrich, Mignon Eberhart, Louise Pound, Hartley Burr Alexander, Keene Abbott, and Mari Sandoz; poets such as the beloved John

G. Neihardt, poet laureate; musical composers such as Thurlow Lieurance and Howard Hanson; great military leaders such as John J. Pershing; artists such as J. Laurie Wallace, Elizabeth Dolan, Kady Faulkner, Robert Gilder, Dwight Kirsch, and Dale Nichols; and political giants of their time such as William Jennings Bryan, J. Sterling Morton, Charles G. Dawes, and George W. Norris, have helped bring fame and recognition to the State, and have left their works as a heritage to the people of our time. Our State Capitol, the creation of Bertram Goodhue, stands as one of the outstanding architectural achievements of the age, a fitting monument to the men and women whose courage and vision built a prairie land.

No tribute to the great State of Nebraska would be complete without pause to pay homage to the 47,801 sons who served, and the 1,000 who died, in World War I; and the 128,000 men and women who served, and the 3,655 who died, in World War II.

One of the most able portrayals of Nebraska is contained in a description of the great seal of Nebraska, adopted by the legislature in 1867:

> The eastern part of the circle to be represented by a steamboat ascending the Missouri River; the mechanic arts to be represented by a smith with hammer and anvil; in the foreground, agriculture to be represented by a settler's cabin, sheaves of wheat, and stalks of growing corn; in the background a train of cars heading toward the Rocky Mountains, and on the extreme west, the Rocky Mountains to be plainly in view; around the top of this circle, to be in capital letters, the motto, "Equality before the law," and the circle to be surrounded by the words, "Great seal of the State of Nebraska."

"Equality before the law," "Honesty before men," "Reverence before God"—these are the precepts that have made Nebraska great during her 88 years as a State; these are the precepts that will keep Nebraska great as long as our free Nation endures.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on Armed Services may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 160) providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 202, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 202, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. At this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 160, which will make in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 202, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the joint resolution itself.

The testimony before the Committee on Rules indicated that the presently authorized FHA insurance authorization will be used up within the next month, and House Joint Resolution 202 proposes to increase the existing insurance authorization by $1.5 billion. Passage of House Joint Resolution 202 would permit the FHA residential mortgage insurance programs to continue until Congress, later on in the session, decides upon the insurance authorization which will be required by FHA during fiscal year 1956.

According to the provisions of the Housing Act of 1954, the general insurance authorization under section 217 of the National Housing Act was amended to provide that the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all FHA mortgages which may be insured and outstanding at any one time, with the exception of home repair loans, cannot exceed the sum of (a) the outstanding principal balances as of July 1, 1954, of all insured mortgages, (b) the principal amount of all outstanding commitments to insure as of July 1, 1954, and (c) $1,500,000,000, except that with the approval of the President such amount may be increased by not to exceed $500 million.

On July 1 of 1954, the outstanding principal balances of mortgages insured by the FHA stood at $16.5 billion, while commitments to insure mortgages were outstanding in the amount of $2.3 billion. Upon passage of the Housing Act of 1954, the FHA mortgage insurance authorization stood at $20.3 billion, and became $20.8 billion—the extra $500 million authorized by the President—on December 28, 1954. If House Joint Resolution 202 becomes law, the authorization will be $22.3 billion.

Under the FHA program the dollar amount of mortgage insuring authority is set up on a revolving basis and as mortgages are paid down or off, or commitments expire a corresponding amount of mortgage-insuring authority again becomes available to the FHA. At the present time amortization payments and insured mortgage terminations are running at about $100 million a month, while the pickup in insuring authorization from expiration of commitments approximates $125 to $150 million a month. Thus during an ordinary year from $2.7 billion to $3 billion of insuring authority becomes available for use again due to this revolving fund. This amount, of course, becomes available within the maximum insuring limitation.

It is estimated that if the $1.5 billion additional authorization is granted that this increase, together with the estimated $393 million available at the end of January 1955, would provide a total authorization of $1,893 million, or about $630 million over estimated net requirements to June 30, 1955. Thus a comfortable margin of safety is provided in case unforeseen activity in insuring takes place.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will adopt House Resolution 160, which will make in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 202.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has explained the purposes of this rule making in order House Joint Resolution 202, to amend the National Housing Act. There has been no controversy over this measure. I understand that the action of both the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Rules was unanimous.

I have no requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 161 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute

rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and I yield myself such time as I may require at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 161 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

House Resolution 161 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, it was brought out during the hearing before the Committee on Rules that the present section of 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by section 311 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1954 prohibits the making of agricultural conservation program payments to any farmer who knowingly harvests any basic commodity in excess of his acreage allotment.

The testimony before the Committee on Rules indicated that this provision has not worked well and has placed some undue hardships on some farmers who really were not meant to be affected by this provision.

One example that was given was that ordinarily conservation payments are made to the farmers as soon as they start carrying out the provisions of the conservation program. According to the strict interpretation of this section of the present bill, however, a farmer must wait until he can certify that he has not harvested a crop in excess of his allotment before he can receive his payments and in some areas crops are being harvested at the year's end. Thus it would mean that conservation payments would be carried over until the next year.

According to the report on H. R. 1573, section 348, of the AAA Act, as amended, which H. R. 1573 would repeal, is in direct conflict with the spirit of several provisions of the acreage allotment and marketing quota laws, and with at least 2 other provisions of the 1954 act itself.

The Committee on Agriculture in their report indicated that they feel that the marketing quota penalties and the loss of price supports in the case of acreage allotments have been sufficient deterrents to overproduction of commodities which are granted price supports in return for a measure of production control by farmers.

The Committee on Agriculture indicated that they feel that conservation programs are designed for the long-range benefit of the Nation and that the conservation program should not be tied to the price-support program.

Mr. Speaker, the rule which the Committee on Rules has granted is an open one; amendments will be in order and I hope that the membership of the House will adopt the resolution which will allow for the consideration of H. R. 1573.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was deeply shocked to see a press release which purported to issue jointly from the offices of several Senators and Members of this body.

I was, and still am, shocked because the statements made in the release were inaccurate.

I regret that those who permitted the use of their names on this erroneous release did not check the facts before making it public.

It is not true that the Immigration and Naturalization Act in any way tends to, and I quote, "maintain our own iron curtain, against visitors and alien immigrants alike, while criticizing the Iron Curtain abroad."

It is not true that, under present law, there are "daily examples of senseless cruelty against aliens already resident here, or recently arrived here." Such statements are untrue, made either ignorantly or deliberately, but they are untrue and demonstrably so.

During the year 1954, the total admission of aliens to the United States was over 770,000—immigrants, temporary workers, and visitors. This is no iron curtain.

According to the Solicitor General of the United States, Simon Soboloff, a week ago, there were 2, I repeat 2, persons under arrest in the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. They were both stowaways.

The Immigration and Naturalization Act, characterized by its enemies as a "shameful" law, has not had the stifling effect they would imply.

An actual increase of immigration is reported in 1954, the second year the act was in operation. A total of 208,000 immigrant aliens were admitted, an increase of 22 percent over the preceding year. Nonimmigrant admissions reached an all-time high of 566,613 during the past year, according to the statistics of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The act attempts to deal in an orderly way with the admission of aliens, placing restrictions in the way of those whose admission would be contrary to the interests of the United States. It provides for the deportation of those who abuse our hospitality, or by subversive or criminal act endanger our country and its citizens. The critics of the act lose sight of the fact that admission to the United States is a privilege and not a right, that national and not international interest must be our first concern in this field.

The intolerable barriers which are said to keep renowned scientists, scholars, and men of letters from coming to our shores as visitors, cannot be found in the language of this statute. Aliens whose entry would be prejudicial to the public interest or would endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States are barred, it is true, but if these renowned scientists, scholars, and men of letters fall within this subversive classification, their admission could not seriously be advocated by any persons having the interests of the United States at heart. Did we not hear from Professor Pontecorvo in the Soviet press just the other day how many atomic secrets he has betrayed to our mortal enemy? And was he not a visitor to the United States just a few months before he deserted to the enemy camp? I am rather proud of the fact that all those visits Dr. Pontecorvo paid to the secret United States laboratories were made before the enactment of the "iniquitous" McCarran-Walter Act and that he could not have paid such a visit since its enactment.

The national origins quota system, which is basically the target of the opposition to the act, has been in effect since 1929. It provides a mathematical formula for determining quota allocations, based on the 1920 census figures, with a view to the maintenance of homogeneity in this melting pot of nations. It was not designed to relieve population pressures in all the countries of the world. It is a businesslike formula which insures, at least, the minimum quota to every country or quota area. It is quite unlike the "commission-distribution" proposal advocated in some of the loosely prepared bills which would permit almost the entire quota to be allocated to asylum preference and national interest groups. Suffice it to say, these bills propose that the commissioners who would allocate these quotas would be political appointees.

As I have said before, I much prefer that visas be allocated under a formula devised by mathematicians rather than under one contrived by politicians.

The joint explanatory statement appearing in the RECORD of February 25, 1955, submitted by the sponsors of the alleged revision bill in the Senate refers to the flexibility of its proposed quota system. This proposal certainly has flexibility, if nothing else. In fact, it permits the politically appointed commissioners to exercise flexibility to the extent that, of the 250,000 quota numbers to be made available under the bill, only 250 numbers would be guaranteed to any one nation or quota area, leaving approximately 200,000 quota numbers to be dispensed by the commissioners at will, as political expediency may direct. True, the statement stipulates that not less than 25 percent of the quota shall be available for family preference, not less than 5 percent for occupational preferences, not less than 20 percent for surplus-population groups, and a minimum of 15 percent for refugees, but there is no restriction which would prevent the commissioners from allotting the total number of 200,000 visas to just one nation or quota area.

One item in the statement calls attention to the liberal provision in the new bill that a naturalized United States citizen may return with equanimity to the country of his birth or of his former nationality and may permanently reside there throughout the rest of his lifetime without loss of United States citizenship.

Coupled with the exemption in our income-tax laws benefiting citizens who remain abroad for a period in excess of 18 months, we might question the advisability of permitting permanent retention of United States citizenship for persons so residing. It certainly does not substantiate the charge that the present law is "discriminatory, oppressive, and ruthless."

But the whole issue turns upon the question of the quota. According to the joint release, the intention seems not to abolish quotas but to reallocate them so as to put the whole Western Hemisphere under a quota, and thus to destroy our good relations with our closest neighbors.

It is a truly devilish scheme to turn our Canadian and Latin-American friends away from us and to give aid and comfort to future Moscow agents like Arbenz, of Guatemala.

The timing is good. It is as good as the best Kremlin tradition. Latin America is now—after Asia—the No. 1 target of international communism.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has explained, House Resolution 161 makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 1573 under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate.

H. R. 1573 simply corrects an inequity that has been found in the Agricultural Adjustment Act as it was amended last year. The situation creates a controversy in agriculture, and this amendment is a corrective one only.

The measure was, of course, as expected, reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. The rule was also reported unanimously by the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, certainly each of us cannot become a millionaire nor establish and maintain a mammoth industrial plant.

Nor can management, without the wholehearted cooperation of employees, create, build, and maintain an efficient, profitable industrial plant.

Nevertheless, the door of opportunity is still open here in America to those of us who are willing to wholeheartedly work toward a desired end. Each of us can, if health permits, at least do something more than worthwhile to establish his own independence and security.

As an outstanding example of what can be done, not only by the individual possessing exceptional ability and a driving ambition but by those of us who have just an average amount of intelligence in an industrial age, is illustrated by the story of Whirlpool, its workers, its president, and management.

From the February 1955 issue of Inside Michigan comes the story demonstrating the truth of the above statement. That story reads as follows:

WHIRLPOOL'S OTHER BALANCE SHEET—A BIG-SCALE EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY RELATIONS IS PAYING OFF FOR WHIRLPOOL CORPORATION AT ST. JOE

(By Edward C. Fielder)

Some few months ago Mr. Elisha Gray II, president of the Whirlpool Corp., makers of home laundry appliances, addressed the Rotary Club, of Los Angeles, on a somewhat unique topic. He was holding forth about the changed concept of industrial management in general, including the effect of "big government" and "big labor." He said that for the past 20 years these two had occupied the center of the industrial stage while the businessman had figuratively been pushed into the wings. This was a good, solid, informative speech and the members nodded appreciatively over their cigars. But Mr. Gray went on to say something that gained national attention:

"I beg of you—let us heed the lessons and the meaning of the past two decades. Let us acknowledge that in addition to the ordinary assets which we list on our balance sheet such as cash, accounts receivable, inventory, etc., we truly have other unlisted assets which contribute greatly to our business success. And just as today's corporate balance sheet fails to list these assets, so does it ignore the matching liabilities or responsibilities."

What other assets? Many of his listeners knew that Mr. Gray headed the Whirlpool Corp., with principal offices and plant at St. Joseph, Mich.; many knew that Whirlpool is the largest manufacturer of home washers in the industry, almost as large as its two leading competitors combined; a few know that Elisha Gray II was the bearer of a famous American industrial name, being the grandson of the inventor of the pay-station telephone and a founder of what is now Westinghouse Electric. That's about all the Rotarians knew about Mr. Gray or his company. But it was enough to qualify him to speak with authority.

He went on to set up virtually another set of books in his speech. He listed as assets: (a) "a well-balanced community," physically, socially, and educationally; (b) "our people—our greatest asset;" the 3,500 men and women who work for Whirlpool in St. Joseph and Benton Harbor, and the total of 6,000 or more who work for the company in all its plants, and (c) the community spirit of all the people, employees, and others, toward the company.

Balanced against these assets were liabilities which he called responsibilities. First among these was consideration, if it could not be freely given, then the asset called "people" was worthless. Second was competent management, in which the people could retain confidence. If they didn't have confidence in the company management, and trust it to decide wisely on matters affecting company operations, said Gray, no amount of dollar profit on the books would have any lasting meaning. The company would disintegrate, in time. And the third responsibility was a sense of belonging to the community; integrating the company into it in a spirit of good citizenship and nothing else. That meant gifts, he said, for charitable and community causes, "because there are few rich people nowadays to finance such things." And it meant an everlasting effort to see that the company's people were successful, personally, according to their definition of the term—happy, solvent, prosperous.

"Up to now," he concluded, "in evaluating the performance of a company, we have used only a financial accounting. I suggest that we encourage a public accounting by all businesses on the additional values of a company's citizenship—its success in the handling of the human factors which, in the last analysis, are its very bone and sinew."

In a spirit of curiosity, which might be called openminded skepticism, I conducted a small investigation at the Whirlpool plant, to see what was happening. I was shown through the various departments, often cutting loose from my guide to finger some newly fabricated parts or examine a big multistage press. I wanted to see how Whirlpool washers were built, and the kind of material and workmanship that went into them. I had a chance to talk to a few people. Later I was given cordial access to all the statistics on the business, its history, and figures on earnings, dividends, Federal income and excise taxes, and so on. It's exciting reading.

For example, Whirlpool's phenomenal volume—production and sales. The company is not a major advertiser; it has about 80 regional distributors and 12,000 retail outlets. The company makes and sells upward of 6,000 units a day. It has achieved, through elaborate and costly production tooling (including 20 miles of overhead conveyors) so efficient a utilization of manpower that it is challenging the automotive industry. Whirlpool's Benton Harbor-St. Joe plants are running about 1.75 completed units per man-day.

Whirlpool has a very good record of labor peace in St. Joe, although its contract is with one of the most volatile of all unions, the UE. It pays hourly wages in excess of the industrywide average in the electrical appliance industry and among other St. Joseph industries, and Whirlpool pays not far from $100 a week across the board. To challenge the worker to the utmost, the production engineers give him more and more elaborate machines to operate. Thus the production cost per item remains the same, or drops slightly from year to year.

With fair wages, secure employment with minimum seasonal layoffs, and a delightful community to live in, Whirlpool employees tend to become quite happy with their lot and develop a genuine satisfaction for their jobs. The president, Mr. Gray, is an MIT-trained engineer who learned merchandising after graduation. He was an executive for Sears-Roebuck and learned personnel work with Sears at Chicago. Later he was vice president of the Cutler Shoe Company, manufacturers. As general manager, he built up that business even in the depression period, 1933–1938. He came to the predecessor of the Whirlpool Corp., then known as the Nineteen Hundred Corporation, in 1938 as assistant to the president. Later he became executive vice-president, and in 1949 was elected to the presidency upon the retirement of the co-founder and long-time president, Louis C. Upton.

The trade name "Whirlpool" was adopted by the corporation in 1950 to replace the cumbersome and confusing brand name "1900 Cataract." Gray's skill as a merchandiser has been largely instrumental in building a big sales volume rapidly, and keeping it climbing. He is a keen business analyst, well aware of the limitations on too-rapid growth, but able to exploit the present demand for automatic washers, dryers and ironers to its utmost.

With Gray as president and active head of the business, Whirlpool operation shows facets of genius. He uses truck trailers by the dozens as warehouse space for purchased parts, because of rapid consumption and savings in handling costs. Conveyors running around the high upper spaces of the plant, 30 feet in the air, serve as mobile parts supply reservoirs, with "cushion" supplies ready to flow down into the assembly lines in case of a breakdown somewhere.

The company's capitalization is low, and the sales high. Working capital turns over nine times a year. Until 1954 a reasonably

good rate of earnings before taxes was virtually confiscated by the application of the so-called excess-profits tax to growing companies. With earnings before taxes of nearly $12 million in 1953, net earnings after taxes were only $4,203,036. But with the excess-profits tax no longer applicable, net earnings for 1954 are expected to be nearly double the 1953 figure.

Gray has repeatedly made it plain that in spite of skyrocketing production and sales volume since World War II the company's net income remains proportionately low. There isn't very much left to accumulate capital reserves for new construction, badly needed at the present time. Every dollar in the business has to do the work of 2 or 3. To help stretch available dollars, the company's story is told to machinists, press operators, office clerks, everybody who will listen. They are told in effect "You've got a stake in this company too. We've all got a big job to do. It gets tougher every year. So you should know what management is doing, and what our problems are. Maybe you can help us with suggestions."

Throughout the various Michigan plants of the company there is a noticeable response to this spirit. You can see it in St. Joe, in the washer plant. You can hear it when a worker voluntarily points out to a plant visitor why the one-piece single-weld cabinet is better and stronger than the competitors'; why the three-point rubber suspension is better and longer lasting than any other washer's. You can feel it in the surprising thickness of the sheet-steel fabricated parts and the sturdy iron castings. "Look," says the worker. "Feel that casting. Weigh it in your hand. They don't scrimp on stuff like that. It's the best. Costs more, but with this volume it's possible to put the value into the machine, and take a smaller unit profit."

The Kenmore line, sold by 692 retail Sears-Roebuck stores as well as 550 catalog offices and the general catalog, is made here in this plant and is a part of the spectacular production volume. Whirlpool and its predecessor company have supplied all of Sears' electric washers since 1916. At that time the late Louis C. Upton negotiated a contract with Sears for 25 machines; sort of an experimental contract to see if Sears had a market for what was then a dubious item. Not many housewives believed in it. In 1922 the company delivered only $25,000 worth of machines to Sears. But 3 years later, in 1925, Sears sold $125,000 worth. Except for that first experimental 1916 contract for 25 machines, Sears has purchased hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of home-laundry items from Whirlpool in the last 39 years—without a contract of any kind.

Sears-Roebuck does not single out Kenmore washers and dryers for any special advertising. Housewives buy both Whirlpool and Kenmore machines mainly because they hear about them from other wives who own them; word-of-mouth advertising. If ever an electrical appliance was sold strictly on its competitive merits, without ballyhoo, the Whirlpool products are. And because of its vast public acceptance, they are now the leading brand names in the whole field. The added fact that no exclusive contract exists between Sears and Whirlpool shows that Sears thoroughly believes that Kenmore machines are the best that can be built. Since World War II it has been selling both brands, as fast as Whirlpool can build them, and usually the market howling for more.

In the eyes of Elisha Gray, whom his associates call Bud, there are two major human advantages in this position of leadership. First comes his human balance sheet, wherein he conscientiously asks himself and his management team whether he is doing his utmost to preserve his invaluable pool of trained, able workers. "Our greatest asset," he calls them. "Pride in being part of a company, loyalty to a company, devotion to the job—these things can be earned, depending upon what management does." He says that responsibility cannot be delegated to the public-relations department or to some vice president in charge of good citizenship. It is something that all management has to live with—"they have to feel it in their bones." And the determination to merit the respect and trust of these highly skilled employees is a continuing, day-by-day effort.

The highest wage in the industry and steady employment are only two of the means used at Whirlpool to gain this objective. There is a long list of regular and special benefits for employees, including a good retirement program, a year-end bonus, vacation pay, veterans' benefits, medical services, recreational facilities, various shared insurance coverages, and even a big Christmas turkey to every employee with the company's compliments.

"These are some of the direct and indirect benefits that we enjoy from the existence and healthy growth of Whirlpool Corp., and the effect that these benefits have in gaining and holding mutual respect and support. If these things are not good, then it is only a matter of time," says the company's statement to employees, "before our tangible assets, such as machinery, buildings, supplies, and the like, will be so much junk."

Working conditions are constantly improved, but Gray says there is still a long way to go. Parking facilities are being expanded periodically, ventilation improved, better lighting installed, and large sums spent to ease the workload in certain operations.

Secondly, Gray feels that the Whirlpool Corp. should work unceasingly to maintain its present excellent relations with the community of St. Joe-Benton Harbor. "If charity begins at home," he says, "we feel at home * * * in the last 10 years we've contributed $596,836 to local charities," to about 150 separate causes per year. In addition, the company pays nearly a third of all the local taxes collected. The Whirlpool comment on this is typical: "It's money well spent. It has helped develop the community's schools, streets, and system of fire and police protection." There was no gasp of pain at the size of the local tax bill, which is now about a quarter of a million dollars per year.

Whirlpool buys locally in every possible case, last year spending over $14 million in local purchases from 125 firms. All kinds of supplies and services that can be produced in St. Joe-Benton Harbor are contracted for. The Whirlpool payroll in the community for 1954 came to approximately $20 million, which upon analysis turned out to be about a third of the community's industrial income. That $34 million in cash means a greatly expanded community economy, felt in every line—better schools, more doctors and dentists, bigger and better supermarkets, and general community prosperity.

This is a story of paramount importance to Michigan. This is the tale of a single organization, started in St. Joseph in 1911 with a borrowed $5,000, which grew gradually and not at all rapidly for most of its 44 years, from an original 6 employees to more than 3,500. It is the chronicle of a long struggle and repeated failure in its early years, when the company tried its hand at everything from air rifles to Boy Scout mess kits. Its first electric washer prototype was a failure because it used cast-iron gears, which quickly stripped their teeth. The lesson of quality was learned right then. Cut-steel gears, much more expensive, restored the machine's dependability.

It is of importance to Michigan because in this world center of high-speed mass production this company proves that its people and its community are indeed its greatest assets—by treating them with the consideration their importance demands. Employees, as well, find in the Whirlpool story an ever-present example of what enlightened labor relations can be and should be—cooperation with a management program toward the common goal of building a better product at less cost as the only way to earn higher wages, security of employment, and greater opportunities for advancement.

"Anyway," says a company spokesman, "we think that the money spent on these projects by Whirlpool is a sound investment in ourselves, our future employees and in our neighbors."

Call it parternalism if you like. The company doesn't have to do many of these things. President Bud Gray calls it "square-dealing," and that's something the Whirlpool people understand. The point is—it pays off.

Because of the "human balance sheet," the financial balance sheet is the biggest of its kind in the world. Michigan can well be proud of such an achievement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

RETIREMENT EXPERT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 163) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective March 1, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $4,100 per annum for the employment of a retirement expert in the House Disbursing Office who shall be designated by the Clerk of the House subject to the approval of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve inself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 202) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 202, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a resolution that increases the authority for insurance by the FHA by the sum of $1,500,000,000.

This is not an appropriation; it is an authorization to this agency of the Government to insure home mortgages.

This organization has been in operation since 1934. It was organized in depression times when we needed to stimulate home building, and it has been an instrument used for that purpose ever since.

The unused balance of authorized insurance on the 1st of January this year I believe was about $390 million. This sum will be exhausted very shortly, and the $1,500,000,000 is to carry on the activities of this agency until June 30 of this year. But before that time the whole housing program will have to be gone into and there will have to be an extension, before June 30. Of course, up to this point the FHA has sustained no losses. They charge one-half of 1 percent for insurance and they have a reserve now, I believe, of about $400 million.

If in times of depression an undue burden might be placed upon the Government to meet the defaults, it could be taken care of without great strain upon our economy. When a mortgage is in default it will be paid by debentures which do not mature for 20 years. This would tide over a possible cycle and would probably save the Government from any serious loss. I think a man does not have to be an optimist to think there might not be some losses from these great activities. The outstanding insurance, I believe, is limited to $20,800,000,000 with reserve funds growing all the time.

As an evidence of my optimism in this respect I cite to you the Home Owners Loan Corporation. You will remember that the Home Owners Loan Corporation was organized when we were in the depths of a depression, when mortgages were being foreclosed all over the land and people were being dispossessed of their homes. That device was set up in order that the Government might take over these mortgages, might reduce the interest rates and might give the mortgagors further time to pay. That was done and millions of homes of American citizens were saved by that method. It never cost the Government a cent because in the final liquidation of the affairs of the Home Owners Loan Corporation the Government sustained a profit.

I think we can make the same argument in favor of this agency. At the time it was stated that these methods were visionary. They were not visionary, they were the result of vision. As the prophet of old said, "Where there is no vision people perish."

I think you can vote with absolute assurance for this increased authorization in reference to insurance to continue to accomplish the purpose which it has accomplished throughout the years. I believe firmly that if you would take away this support from the mortgage market and the building industry there would be a great decrease in building during coming years. I do not believe we have reached the saturation point in good homes in America. We can stand a great deal more building of decent homes for our people, which is not only an investment in the health and comfort of our people but it is an investment in the assurance of good citizenship and stable government.

I hope that this joint resolution will be passed and I ask for its support.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think it is self-evident by this time that the Congress did a very splendid job last year in the enactment of the Housing Act of 1954. The only criticism that is heard is that we might have done a better job than we intended to do because there are some people who are thinking now in terms of saturation of the home-building market and wondering if we perhaps are not producing more homes than the economy will absorb. It might be well for us to have in mind that we have not reached that point yet.

The projection made by the economists and our own economic committee in the Congress presents a very interesting, if not amazing, condition. We project the economy for 10 years in the future, and we find that we may expect a national economy dollar-wise valued at about $535 billion in 10 years' time as opposed to the present national product of about $365 billion.

That is predicated upon the expectation that within the next 10 years we will have a population here in the United States of about 191 million people. So, carrying the projection one step further, if it was considered probable that the national economy could absorb 1 million new homes, new units, a year for the next 10 years as of last year, with these new facts before us, we may raise our sights somewhat and can be reasonably assured that we need for replacement of old homes and the construction of new units at least 1.2 million units for the next 10 years.

The Housing Act of 1954 made such a program possible, and in practice during the last few months we are assured now, with the aids which we have given the act, the aids which we are giving it under this bill, that we can safely produce 1.2 million homes not only this next year, but if we continue these practices, for the next 10 years. We do not need to be in any danger; we do not need to sense any danger that we will reach the saturation point in the production of safe, sanitary, very desirable homes under the program for the next 10 years. For that reason, this bill should be enacted, because without its enactment there will be a probability that the authorization for home owners' financing through the Federal Housing Administration will be inadequate to cover this next year.

Now, we have coming up further amendments to the Housing Act of 1954 which we must pass upon before June 30 of this year. At that time we will take a long-range look at the housing situation and determine what we might expect should be the maximum of authority.

I want to stress that this is only an authorization for mortgage financing and involves no appropriation. The Federal Housing Administration is on a sound basis, as the chairman has indicated. Perhaps not adequate reserves have been built up against all losses, but reserves are being constantly built up against losses, which indicates, of course, that the FHA is not only on a sound basis but it is making a profit. The profit that goes into reserve against losses, I believe, is about $400 million, which is a sizable sum. Although the total authorization for home-mortgage assistance is a large amount, in the billions of dollars, in order to get the true picture of the possible contingent liability on the part of the Federal Government, we must deduct from this total authorization all of the assets included in all of the mortgaged properties covered into the FHA insurance program, all of the homes which have been financed through FHA. In addition to that, we may take into consideration, of course, this increase in reserves. So the probabilities of any losses under the FHA-insured program are infinitesimal.

At this juncture, I should like to pay what I intend to be a very high compliment to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a former colleague of ours, Albert Cole. The FHA is one of the constituent parts of the organization which he heads. This organization, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, during his tenure of office, has functioned efficiently with no losses and with a high regard for the true American idea that private enterprise can and should be able to do the job which the Government, in some quarters, is expected to do. I want to commend to this House for its consideration the very splendid work which has been done by Mr. Cole and his staff. Wherever there have been deficiencies Mr. Cole has stepped in quickly to correct them, and all of them are in the process of being corrected.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes possible the uninterrupted continuance of this very delightful program under which the American people can be assured of decent, safe, adequate, and sanitary homes; and it should be adopted unanimously.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 202, the pending measure would increase the insurance authorization available to FHA by $1.5 billion. This increase together with an estimated $393 million available at the end of January would provide an aggregate authorization of $1,893,000,000 or about $630 million over estimated requirements to June 30 of this year. Such excess would provide a reserve margin in insurance authorization against a possible greater volume of FHA activity than anticipated. If it is not needed it will, of course, not be used.

Mr. Chairman, several of my colleagues are critical of what they regard as the exceedingly slow pace of the new FHA programs, inaugurated last year as part of the Housing Act of 1954. They are, I realize, understandably disappointed with the failure of the FHA to issue any commitments under either section 200—rehabilitation and neighborhood conservation housing insurance—or section 221—relocation housing

insurance—in the 6 months which have elapsed since their enactment into law. But may I remind these gentlemen that in the establishment of any new housing program there are often many complexities and problems initially unforeseen even by its most unenthusiastic advocates. So while sympathizing with the irritations and disappointments felt by them on this matter, I do believe that, at least for the present, a somewhat more patient attitude upon the part of my colleagues is warranted.

My friends, let us not lose our perspective on this subject. Let us never forget that the overall record of FHA down through the years has been such that we can all point to with pride. A revolution has taken place in the housing field during the last 20 years, and the FHA has played a major role in that revolution.

Prior to 1933, most prospective buyers had to make a downpayment of at least 25 percent of the appraised value of the property. A first mortgage would probably be limited to a half or two-thirds of the appraised value. On this mortgage the borrower would pay anywhere from 6 to 8 percent interest. The loan would have a maturity of 3, 4, or 5 years. If a second mortgage was necessary, as it usually was for families of moderate incomes, the purchaser could obtain one by paying a discount to the lender and perhaps a commission to a broker in addition. Discount and commission may have amounted to 15 or 20 percent of the loan. Interest on the second mortgage would be 8 percent or more. The borrower was periodically at the mercy of arbitrary and unpredictable forces in the money market. When money was easy to get, renewal every 1 to 5 years was no problem. But if his mortgage expired at a time when money was hard to get, it might be impossible for the homeowner to secure a renewal, and foreclosure would ensue. This was the situation in the early thirties. Foreclosures totaled 150,000 in 1930, nearly 200,000 in 1931, and 250,000 in 1932.

Such was the inevitable result of the free money market policy pursued during the 1920's. The mortgage interest rates I have cited were, of course, but typical of the general level of interest in every segment of the economy at that time. During the 1920's the interest rates paid by the Government on the Federal debt were extremely high, with dramatic peaks reached in 1920—before the 1921 depression—and in 1928—before the 1929 depression. The computed rate of interest on the Federal debt averaged 4 percent for the decade. Rates on private borrowing were also very high. Rates on short-term loans to business were well over 6 percent during much of the time. Yields on high-grade corporate bonds maintained a level well above 4 percent. Farm mortgage interest rates fluctuated between 6 percent and 6.5 percent. It is a widely held opinion among economists that these high interest rates were a major contributory factor causing the economic debacle of the early 1930's.

Mr. Chairman, it may be that I have been guilty of a slight digression, but I do feel strongly that, not only for the sake of the housing industry but for that of the entire economy as well, it is vital that our present monetary managers avoid a repetition of anything approaching the tight credit policies of the twenties. If they do not, I fear, despite FHA and the many other economic safeguards we have developed over the last 2 decades, that we may yet experience a a painful economic readjustment.

Today, due to FHA and the liberal credit policies developed during the 1930's, the home buyer can make a downpayment of as little as 5 percent. If he is a veteran he may not need to make any downpayment at all.

His interest on an FHA-insured loan is 4½ percent plus one-half percent to cover the cost of insurance. The loan may run for as long as 30 years. On a VA-guaranteed loan no insurance premium is charged and the interest is 4½ percent net. Prior to the hard money policy of 1953, as you know, our veterans only had to pay 4 percent on their home loans. It is my most sincere hope that this Congress will, by developing a workable secondary mortgage market, make it possible to return the GI rate to its historic level of 4 percent.

The FHA loan is an amortized loan, on which payments of interest, principal, taxes, and insurance are made monthly during the life of the loan. Making arrangements for financing the home has become a one-time transaction. Monthly payments are geared to the borrower's prospective income.

In the twenties a family could acquire a home only after many years of saving to meet the high initial costs. After a downpayment was finally made, interest costs on payments were high. Hopes of owning a home usually were deferred to middle or later life. There always was the risk of sudden foreclosure and liquidation.

Today a family can get a home early in life. The initial cost is relatively low. Monthly payments are reasonable and there is protection against sudden foreclosure caused by economic fluctuations.

The home has become a reality to most American families when they need it most—to bring up the family, not simply to retire to when the children have grown up.

Let me remind you that the changes brought about by FHA are the product of bipartisan endeavor. Men on both sides of the aisle in this body long ago came to the conclusion that home building is far too important to made a political football. There is no other industry that is so dynamic—no other industry that can do as much to sustain the prosperity of this Nation. There is no other industry which touches so greatly the lives of so many millions of families, no other industry whose full production is so necessary to raise our American standard of living.

I fear too many of our people desire to depress the present housing boom by tightening credit and raising interest rates.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise just for the purpose of issuing a word of warning on this whole program which I voiced in the Committee on Rules yesterday.

We have indirect obligations of the Government on this program now of something like $20 billions. We have been constantly increasing them. I am not speaking in opposition to the bill, I am just throwing out a little red flag on the thing of whether we are going to overdo it.

If you drive around Washington and the suburban areas today you will find that in the last few months there have appeared a great many signs of properties for sale and for rent. You will find in the daily newspaper pages of advertising of property either for rent or for sale.

I am just wondering if we are giving enough attention to the question of whether this market is becoming saturated, because when it becomes oversaturated the financial burden of taking care of these loans is going to fall on the taxpayers of the United States.

I would hope that our Committee on Banking and Currency, which has given so much and such fine attention to this subject, would go into that question a little more deeply and see if we have not about reached the point where we are building more houses under Government financing than the public demand calls for.

In that connection, I saw last night a little card that is put out by the Riggs National Bank here in Washington, a weekly financial summary, in which it makes the statement that housing starts continue at the rate of over 1,400,000 a year, but the number of households increase is less than 600,000 per year, in contrast to the 1,500,000 increase in households in the late 1940's. In other words, the demand for houses in the last 5 years has decreased from 1,500,000 a year to 600,000 a year. That is a warning we should heed.

I think that is a pretty serious thing for us to be thinking about. I do hope that the committee, before asking for any further increases in authorization, will give some very serious study and consideration to the question, namely, of whether we have not about reached the saturation point in the building of homes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I feel this is very essential, urgent, and necessary legislation at this time, in spite of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia concerning the situation in this immediate area. Out in California, where we are taking in around 500 new residents per day, we have had a tremendous building program going on for a number of years, and the saturation point has not been reached by any means. Without the extension of this authorization the building of homes for thousands upon thousands of people not only in California but other parts of the United States would be hampered.

Further, I think I can say without much fear of contradiction that the

building of homes is a means of supplying labor to thousands of skilled mechanics. It is the means of keeping in circulation much of the manufactured products that go into the homes.

Although it may appear that a saturation point has been reached in certain places, in many other parts of the country the saturation point has not by any means been reached as yet. There is another feature of the FHA, which I think we should realize, which would prevent saturation, and that is the caution with which these loans or guaranties of loans are granted. The FHA does not promiscuously allow loans to be made in the various communities. It makes surveys. It determines whether those homes are needed. It finds out whether it is economically sound to allow those loans. For these reasons, I think it is very timely that we pass this legislation. I do not know of any reason why any Member of the House should vote against it. We should supply facilities for the processing of the loans. In the Los Angeles area, the processing of loans is about 6 months behind, because the demands for loans on new homes is so great. That is the sort of problem we are facing in the West, and I think in other parts of the country. For these reasons, I believe the bill should be passed.

To give you a picture of the population increase in the Los Angeles area in the last 10 years, if the entire population of Pittsburgh and Baltimore—1,755,000—were transported westward and settled within the Los Angeles metropolitan area, you would have a fair estimate of our population increase between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1955.

The impact of this migration, averaging nearly 500 new residents a day for 10 years, makes even seasoned statisticians sit up and take notice.

While the city's population climbed from 1,725,000 in 1945 to its present estimated 2,150,000, a 24.6-percent increase, Los Angeles County became the most populous county in the country, second in the world. The county jumped from 3,345,000 residents 10 years ago to 4,950,000 today, and has not stopped yet.

With a 50-percent rate of increase for the metropolitan area chalked up during the past decade, a population larger than that of Albany, capital of New York, has been added to this area each year. Certainly the problems inherent in this number of increased residents stagger the imagination and resources of any community.

Only 5 United States cities—New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles—exceed the present 1,041,140 population of the San Gabriel Valley, which now accounts for more than a fifth of the county's population, according to figures compiled by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

San Fernando Valley, starting with about 200,000 residents in 1945, now has more than 600,000 inhabitants, more than the population of Minneapolis or Buffalo.

Los Angeles, city, county, and metropolitan area, has met the challenge of fantastic growth with a creativity and resourcefulness characteristic of the Southland.

To take care of the housing requirement of the tremendous increase in population, houses built on subdivisions formed in 8 southern California counties since 1946 to late in 1954, about four-fifths—conservatively estimated—or about 371,200 were built in the Los Angeles metropolitan area—enough homes to supply housing for 371,000 families or around 1,300,000 men, women, and children. And, of course, in that same time thousands more dwellings were built on previously formed subdivisions and on scattered lots.

Strongly indicated is that the recently enacted National Housing Act signed by President Eisenhower will stimulate home-building and home-improvements projects. That new widening of the way to homeownership is one of the phases of the strong building and realty activities and general progress here during the past 2 years that give impetus to continuance of very favorable trends in this new year and thereafter.

In the 556,380 building permits, totaling $2,990,314,100, issued in Los Angeles—city—in the span from January 1, 1945, to the final third of 1954, there were 139,578, amounting to $1,143,066,978, for single-family dwellings; 6,456 permits, $73,990,583, for double dwellings, and 7,606 permits, $333,091,567 for apartment buildings.

The urgent need to pass this bill, House Joint Resolution 202, was indicated by Mr. Norman P. Mason, Federal Housing Administration Commissioner, when he made the following statement during the hearings of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I quote:

> At the end of December the estimated unused authorization was $603 million. Preliminary estimates show $393 million unused authorization on January 31. The net use of authorization has averaged $260 million monthly for the period since September. Continued net use at this rate would exhaust the present authorization about mid-March. This will be the beginning of the spring peak in individuals' planning for home construction or home purchase and also at a time when servicemen are increasing their use of the new insurance program adopted for their assistance in 1954 and as the new program for urban renewal in our cities is just getting underway.
>
> Taking into account the seasonal increase in applications for mortgage insurance during the spring months and also some increase in expirations of commitments, it is expected that monthly use of authorization will average about the same amount through June, or a total of slightly over $1,250,000,000 authorization to be needed through that date.
>
> House Joint Resolution 202 would have the effect of raising the available mortgage insurance authorization by $1,500,000,000. Combined with the $393 million authorization unused at the end of January, this would provide $630 million above estimated requirements and provides only a reasonable reserve for a possible greater volume of applications than anticipated. It should perhaps be noted that the FHA program of mortgage insurance is a voluntary one in which the volume of activity is entirely dependent on the desires of builders, lenders, and home buyers.

I urge every Member of the House to support and vote for House Joint Resolution 202.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when I came to the Congress, following the election of President Truman, we were experiencing in the district from which I come, and generally throughout Chicago, a severe housing shortage. Conditions were tragical. I was grateful to the leadership for my assignment to the Banking and Currency Committee. It was in the committee vested with jurisdiction in the field of housing that I thought I could best serve, humbly but hopefully, the men and women who had given me the confidence of their ballots.

This thought was strengthened by the not inconsiderable experience, well known to the people of Chicago, that had been mine two decades ago when another feverish construction boom at a time of inflated costs was followed by a bust engulfing both equity owners and the many investors in real-estate bonds whose savings had financed skyscrapers, luxurious hotels, and palatial apartment buildings in almost every nook and corner of the city.

Those skyscrapers, hotels, and apartment buildings still glorify the skyline of beautiful Chicago. All went through the wringer of reorganization. The original equity owners and bondholders were washed away with the suds, and those who enjoyed the handsome windfalls later to come were those who gained control through the purchase of securities from starving and impoverished bondholders at a few cents on the dollar.

I did not want that to happen again. I had seen $10 billion of the savings of good people in my home city of Chicago go down the drain for the simple reason that no one told these good people that improved real estate, constructed in a period of unusual prosperity and high costs, and with the expectation of a continuing ability of tenants to supply money necessary for maintenance and mortgage commitments, inevitably must suffer the impact of a return to normalcy.

The tendency in a period of large salaries and generous wages is to build above the ability of ordinary people either to own or to rent in normal times.

HOUSING ACTS OF 1950 AND 1954

In 1950 I was happy when the housing bill that came from the Banking and Currency Committee was enacted into law. I saw great promise for the future in the research provision. Here, thought I, was something constructive—a laboratory study with constant and persistent experimentations in new forms of dwellings, in types of structure, in materials, in financing—until from it all had come a feasible and practical blueprint for decent housing within the financial reach of all our people. Nothing came of it. The great promise held forth by the research provision in the housing bill of 1950 rests amid the junk.

The housing bill of 1954 admittedly was a measure to stave off the recession or at least to prevent the recession from growing into a depression. No one pre-

tended that it would relieve in any measure the housing shortage among the large segment of our population with limited means. But it would build homes, into which people could move with small downpayments and mortgage commitments running many years. It would do that because the Government, not the builders or the mortgage houses, was guaranteeing against the future.

I voted for amendments that I thought would broaden the range of benefits to include some at least in the low or modest income brackets. The amendments defeated, I voted for the bill.

DEFEAT OF MULTER AMENDMENT

I shall vote for House Joint Resolution 202 despite the defeat in committee of the Multer amendment reducing the amount of the increased authorization. At present time, we do have FHA, and under its guaranty homes are being built when without FHA there would be no home construction, a great industry would collapse, unemployment would grow and our economy certainly would suffer; better houses beyond reach of many families than no new houses at all.

The amendment that was offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York to reduce the increase in FHA mortgage insurance authorization I thought had great merit. The purpose of the amendment, I thought, should have appeal to my colleagues on the ground of prudence. It was not intended, nor would it retard the present building activity, which happily is approaching an all-time high. We must be realistic. A collapse in the construction boom well might be the forerunner of a depression. We cannot permit that to descend upon us. And without FHA there would be no construction, or very little, and the collapse would be inevitable. Therefore, the enactment of House Joint Resolution 202 becomes imperative.

ENCOURAGEMENT TO PROCRASTINATION

But I thought it is equally imperative, if we are to begin to get our housing program on a sounder basis, profiting from our experiences, that the increased authorization should not exceed the requirements of the present and the foreseeable future. Otherwise we encourage practices which we could not condone and which ultimately might bring the entire housing program into popular disfavor. Furthermore, an authorization beyond the requirements of present plans would be an incentive to procrastination in the enactment of a housing act of 1955 in which imperfections in the present act could be corrected and which could have the benefit of our past experiences in the field.

Briefly, here are the facts and the figures: As of January 31, 1955, there was an estimated $393 million in unused authorization. House Joint Resolution 202 increases the authorization by one and a half billion dollars, which added to the $393 million would make the total available to FHA $1,893,000,000. As the average monthly use of the authorization is $260 million, this would carry FHA to the end of August or into September. This is longer than is necessary since the responsibility is no longer that of the 83d Congress but now belongs to the 84th Congress.

Without delay work should be started and assiduously pursued in the housing bill of 1955 to the end that in the early summer it should have gone from the consideration of the Congress to the action of the President. Certainly if we are to adjourn by August, as seems to be the expectation, the Housing Act of 1955 should be on the statute books in early summer. If we hold back our action on legislation in the housing field to the last frantic, frenzied, and confused days and weeks of the session we are sure to come up with a dud.

By reducing the increase in FHA authorization by $250 million we would supply all the authority needed to carry the present wave of construction, even accelerated much beyond expectation, up to and into August. The adoption of the amendment would have served the double purpose of keeping FHA adequately and abundantly equipped to carry on its work and of encouraging the early enactment of a better housing act in 1955. I say a better act because it is not too unreasonable to expect that always we progress, in legislation as in other matters, through trials and failures.

I shall vote for House Joint Resolution 202 even though I think the adoption of the Multer amendment would have strengthened FHA and its purpose.

HOUSING SHORTAGE CONTINUES

The housing shortage, especially as it slaps with tragedy our urban families of modest means, remains with us, unaffected by the $32 billion of Federal credit responsible for the greatest home-construction activity in our history. In my own district and in Chicago generally the tragedy has become more grim since the end of rent control. Despite the efforts of the responsible real-estate interests to keep rent increases within reason, the letters that pour into my office show how cruelly the housing shortage in the area of residence by families of modest incomes is being taken advantage of by speculators who purchase properties at inflated prices, raise the rent, and try to pay off the purchase price within a few years.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the 84th Congress will approach the housing problem in a new manner. I came here with a dream that we might make possible decent housing within the reach of all people. This is the third Congress of which I have been a Member. I still hold to the dream; I think sometime, and while I am here, it will be realized.

I cheerfully give credit to FHA, but when I contemplate the billions of dollars of credit of the United States we have extended to build homes it makes me sad to realize that not one home has been built within the reach of 50 or 60 percent of our population.

These are the facts that stand out: First, since World War II we have built more new homes than in any comparable period in our history; second, this has been made possible not by private industry working with investment capital, but by the furnishing by the Federal Government of full guaranty against loss; third, the security to builders, who immediately receive cash payments from mortgage proceeds, and to the mortgage houses, who are guaranteed by the Government against loss, has confined the operations of private industry almost exclusively to the furnishing of homes to those in the upper- and middle-income groups; and, fourth, with the exception of some public housing in earlier years, now practically at a standstill, nothing has been done to meet the housing needs of those in the low-income brackets.

As regards urban families in the low- and middle-income groups the situation has been getting worse rather than better. I am not blaming private industry. It is natural that when there is available a market with certain profits and no risks private industry will not explore the possibilities of other markets. When the more attractive markets have been worked out, American private industry will, as it has always done, find a way of profitably meeting the need that does exist.

CHALLENGE TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The need now is for homes within the financial reach by purchase or by rent by the 50 or 60 percent of our urban populations that have received little or no benefit from the FHA program, however advantageously that program has worked in other income areas. I have too much confidence in American business to believe that it cannot develop this housing field where there is the greatest unfilled demand. The blueprint for a future America, supplied by the active participation of private industry with decent housing for all American families, should be suggested in the Housing Act of 1955.

There cannot be a safe America until we have reached our goal of decent housing for every family within our fold. Safety from disease, safety from crime, safety from social disorders are only a few of the safeties we assure for ourselves with good housing.

SITUATION IN CHICAGO

Let me speak briefly on the situation in Chicago. That is the territory with which I am most familiar. Practically all of the FHA-mortgage-guaranteed construction is in the suburban areas. Homes are priced in some instances possibly as low as $12,000, most run $15,000 and up. Downpayments are small, mortgage terms are long.

Families who have resided in the city are forced to go into the suburbs because of the shortage of suitable homes in the old neighborhoods. With the sudden growth of suburban communities has come an excessive demand on school, water, and other facilities. There also has been created a traffic problem. In many instances the suburban residents use their own automobiles for transportation to and from their places of business and of employment in Chicago. The resultant congestion in traffic in the rush hours adds to a situation already difficult to handle.

Meanwhile with the exodus to the suburbs the residential districts of the city itself are becoming more and more

dilapidated. Even in some of the districts where rehabilitation plans have been approved by official action and by popular sentiment the properties to be demolished are to be replaced with residences in the $25,000 and up class. Where will the families in low and middle income areas go?

PUBLIC HOUSING FOR AGED

What is needed if our cities are to be saved and utilized for the greatest use by all the people who work in those cities is a new approach. I will not take the time to pursue this thought other than as it applies to a bill for public housing for our senior citizens. Eleven other members of the Banking and Currency Committee have joined me in the introduction of this measure.

Under the FHA program it is impossible for a senior citizen to qualify for a mortgage. Security required is the productivity of the mortgagee not only at the time of entering into the mortgage but during the entire period of the mortgage commitment. Value of the real estate security is of secondary consideration.

My distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], who is a cosponsor of the bill for housing for our senior citizens brought out at a recent hearing of our committee that the present average of FHA mortgagees is 32 years whereas only a few years ago it was 37 years. This would indicate that it is getting more and more difficult for a man even in the prime of life to get FHA insurance. For the man or woman passed the prime the door is shut, nailed up and padlocked.

Here then is a segment of our population deserving of our best effort that is entirely overlooked in our housing program. If we should increase the FHA authorization under the present setup a hundredfold our senior citizens still would be shivering in the cold.

CONTENTMENT HAS BEEN EARNED

Policemen in Chicago are forced to retire at 62, schoolteachers at 65, industrial workers generally at 65. Usually they retire on modest pensions or allowances. They have before them many rich years of contentment if given the opportunity.

Housing in congenial neighborhoods and associations is requisite to the enjoyment of that contentment earned by their long and honorable service in the working periods of their lives. They have earned something more than being given shelter in the homes of their children, welcome and beloved, it is true, but nevertheless guests in the homes and strangers in the activities of younger generations, that of their children and that of their grandchildren.

The bill which has been introduced by 12 members of the Banking and Currency Committee would provide for public housing especially constructed for the aged, located in the neighborhoods where their children reside and dear to them because of old associations. The public housing for our senior citizens would have none of the stigma of charity since the cost of maintenance would be borne entirely by the rental payments of the tenants. Such rents, however, would be geared to the limited means provided by modest retirement pensions. I trust that the bill cosponsored by 12 members of the Banking and Currency Committee will receive the thoughtful and sympathetic attention of Members on both sides of the aisle.

NEW APPROACH REQUIRED

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted only to sketch the outlines of the new approach I think we should take to the housing problem of the Nation. We have put some $32 billion of the Nation's credit behind FHA, and we are happy with the results that have been accomplished in the higher income area. The benefits of the program have extended into the modest income areas as well, and for that we rejoice.

Let us now explore the possibilities of bringing housing into the income areas that have been overlooked. A decent roof over the head of every American family must remain our objective until that end is reached.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "$1,500,000,000, except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased by not to exceed $500,000,000" and inserting "$3,500,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER], having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 202) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 160, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 42.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000, except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased by not to exceed $500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,500,000,000."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. J. Res. 202) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1573, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The section reads as follows:

SEC. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Section (b) reads as follows:

(b) Persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall file with the application a statement of facts showing eligibility under this section.

Section 348 was written into the law during the last session of the Congress. It was sponsored by the senior Senator from Florida. The bill now before you was introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] on January 6, and the purpose of H. R. 1573 is to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

To the end that you might know the views of the Secretary of Agriculture and the officials of the Department of Agriculture, I need only read only one line from the hearings. Mr. McConnell, Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture, had this to say:

All I can say is that the Department favors the repeal of section 348.

I would like to say that it was never intended or contemplated, even remote-

ly, that the agricultural-conservation program should be tied in with the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota law. The effect of this amendment, which is now section 348, was to deprive a farmer of his ACP payments if he knowingly exceeded his acreage allotments on any one of the crops then under control. I do not believe anyone would suggest that there was any element of control contemplated in the original ACP program. It was a program to induce the farmers to build up their soil resources and to enrich the fertility of the soil and to engage in good farming practices. I believe that every dollar that has been invested in the ACP program is a good investment in the future security of our Nation.

Actually, in my section of the country, through the ACP program, we have just about revolutionized agriculture. We have changed the whole landscape and the countryside, and we have enriched the Nation, I believe, far beyond the investment that we have made in this program.

I know that in some high places in farm circles there are people who would like to destroy the ACP program. There are others in other high places who would like to destroy the entire farm program which has served so well the needs of our people both in times of peace and in times of war. There are those who are going on the platforms of this country in an effort to bring the farm program into disrepute, and they talk about the tremendous and gigantic costs to the Federal taxpayers of the farm program which is now and for the past two decades has been in operation. The truth is the program has been successful.

I do not think any intelligent person, familiar with the operations of the program, can truthfully say that the program has been financially burdensome. If we are to continue the program we want it to be as free from controls as practicable.

We have heard a lot of these orators screaming their heads off about controls and regimentation and we are told that we have been making the farmers of America goosestep to tunes that are played here in Washington. Those who talk loudest about freedom for the farm are now actually advocating economic shackles for the farmers of America.

I want to call attention to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, after very careful thought and consideration, decided to issue an order which would force the farmers into a program of multiple compliance or cross compliance, meaning that a farmer would have to comply with every program for every commodity or he would lose all of the benefits of all of the programs for every commodity. But after issuing that administrative order, even Secretary Benson himself concluded that the order was not feasible and should be repealed and, by proper order he did repeal the order requiring multiple compliance.

This section 348 is absolutely incompatible with the ACP program. It is no part of the marketing quota and acreage allotment program and yet in the last hours of the last session, when it appeared that we would not have a farm bill at all, the House conferees were forced into the position of having to embrace this section 348, when there was not a man on our committee in favor of it.

This bill has as its author the former distinguished chairman of our committee, Congressman HOPE, of Kansas, who is recognized by this Congress and by this country as one of the brilliant farm leaders of America. I daresay that he knows more about agriculture at home and abroad than perhaps any other Member in either House of the Congress. I know that there is no greater champion of the farmer than CLIFFORD HOPE.

I need call attention only to one other thing and that is that this resolution that is now before the committee was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. It is recommended by the Department of Agriculture. I hope it will be adopted without opposition.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a little time to go into the history of the legislation which would be repealed by the bill before us at this time. In the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 there was a provision which said in effect that a cotton producer would not be eligible to receive agricultural conservation payments unless he stayed within his cotton-acreage allotment. That provision, as I say, was included in the Agricultural Act of 1938 and remained in that form in the agriculture legislation until the last session, when the Agricultural Act of 1954 was enacted. When that legislation was before another legislative body which I am not permitted to mention by name, an amendment was adopted on the floor which applied that provision to all basic commodities. Examination of the RECORD discloses that this matter was not debated or discussed on the floor in the other body, except that the author made a very, very brief explanation.

In the committee on conference on that bill all of the House conferees opposed the provision but they were unable to eliminate it from the legislation and it remained a part of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The effect of that legislation if we retain it will be to prevent any farmer from participating in the agricultural conservation program if he is in any respect whatever out of compliance with acreage allotments under the farm program. Since all of the six basic commodities are now under acreage allotments, it means that all producers of the basic agricultural commodities will not be able to participate in the agricultural conservation program if they are out of compliance even if it is by one-tenth of an acre or less.

This matter has been considered by the Department of Agriculture and, as the distinguished chairman of our committee has stated, the Department was represented by Mr. McConnell, the Assistant Secretary, at the hearing which was held on this legislation. He endorsed the legislation and gave the Department's reasons for opposing it.

I would like at this time to read a part of the statement of Mr. McConnell which he made at the hearings on this measure before the Committee on Agriculture. I quote now from the hearings:

> If there is anybody in the United States who is concerned with surpluses, it is certainly the Department and the portion of the Department with which I am concerned. It is my considered judgment, after studying this matter, that all the power that can be brought to bear on the objective of holding down overproduction is in the acreage allotments, backed up by marketing quotas, and anything else you do, like this measure, does not add to that. In other words, you do a lot of work, go to a lot of expense, create a lot of hardships which have no relation to the overproduction. That is my one point. We feel that it will not change that pattern materially.

This provision we are attempting to repeal today will particularly affect corn and wheat producers. It will not have any material affect on cotton and peanut and tobacco producers because those commodities are under marketing quotas whenever acreage allotments are in effect, and that almost automatically, prevents any farmers from being out of compliance. But it will have a very great effect upon the producers of wheat and corn if they are not in compliance.

There is a particular situation affecting wheat that I wish to mention, and that is that under the Agricultural Adjustment Act all producers may produce and sell without penalty up to 15 acres of wheat. That does not mean that they are in compliance if their acreage allotments are less than 15 acres. If their allotments are less than 15 acres and they plant 15 acres, then they are out of compliance, and under the legislation we are trying to repeal today those farmers would be out of the ACP program.

There are more of those situations, perhaps, than most people imagine. In the States east of the Missouri River, and in some other areas also, there are a great many farmers who are not in compliance with wheat acreage allotments but who have been led to believe that they were in compliance with the program, if they planted 15 acres or less. Acting in good faith, they planted 15 acres or less, and then found that they are not in compliance and cannot participate in the ACP program. Most of them feel that they have been misled and that their Government is acting in bad faith with them. That is one situation which very substantially enters into this picture. Of course, in the case of corn where we do not have marketing quotas, there will undoubtedly be farmers who will not comply with acreage allotments and they will be thrown out of the agricultural conservation program.

My thought has always been that the agricultural conservation program was a program which should stand on its own feet. It should not be used to compel compliance with the programs for price support. Likewise, I think the price support program is one which should stand on its own feet. We have methods of forcing compliance with the price support program, and as Mr. MCCONNELL

said in his statement before the committee, we do not need this additional method. We have been able to get along without it for almost 20 years and I see no reason for going into it now.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. LOVRE. I simply want to commend the gentleman for sponsoring this legislation. With reference to corn farmers, I do want to call the attention of the House to the fact that last year, in 1954, in South Dakota, 40 percent of our farmers complied with corn allotments. That means that is the same law is in effect in 1955, and we have no greater compliance than we had last year, 60 percent of our farmers would be denied the benefits of the soil conservation program.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota who is the author of a similar bill, and who has been very active in his support of this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like the RECORD to show also that Messrs. BERRY, CHRISTOPHER, POLK, WILSON, JONES, LAIRD, and ALBERT are authors of similar bills, and that Messrs. AVERY, MOULDER, ABBITT, GEORGE, JOHNSON, QUIGLEY, DEANE, and Mrs. KNUTSON also introduced bills having the same purpose in mind as the bill reported by our committee.

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I thank the gentleman. What he says indicates the great interest in this matter. I cannot recall any time in recent years where so many bills on one subject were introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Can the gentleman tell us the official position of the farm organizations on this legislation, especially the Farm Bureau?

Mr. HOPE. No farm organizations appeared at the hearing on this bill. I have no direct information myself as to the position of any of the farm organizations. I have been told since coming on the floor today that some Members have received wires from the Farm Bureau opposing the legislation. That is all I know about it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that I impose upon the time of the committee in debate having to do with agricultural matters, but I think certainly it is in keeping with what the gentleman from Kansas was just saying and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the committee, if I point out that while it is true the basic industry of my district is the production of anthracite coal, I have about 3,000 farm families in my district. Further, to point up what the gentleman from Kansas was indicating with particular reference to the small wheat acreage matters, that problem is especially mine with reference to the matter now before us.

Certainly there is little doubt, from what they have presented to me, that this amendment to the original act was certainly wrong in principle.

I have before me, on page 2 of the report, this language, and this typifies the case that I have. For instance, these small wheat farmers in my district, mostly under 15 acres, were not at any time permitted to vote on this wheat acreage allocation program. They had nothing to do with the voting on allotments. They were subject entirely to the action of their bigger brothers throughout the country.

This wheat-marketing-quota law provides, for example, that any farmer, whether he has a wheat allotment or not, may plant and market up to 15 acres of wheat without becoming subject to the marketing-quota provisions. It was the clear intent of this provision of law to permit farmers in areas where wheat is not a major commercial crop, and certainly wheat in my district is not a major commercial crop, but there is a great deal of small wheat acreage, to plant a small acreage as a nurse crop or a cover crop or for use on the farm.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the committee is unanimously reporting this legislation and this amendment to the law, and return to the real purpose and intent to help the small farmers and not in any way destroy what we are trying to do.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get into the RECORD the official position, as my office has it, of the farm organizations on this matter, including the Grange, the Farmers Union, and the Farm Bureau Federation. The Grange and the Farmers Union, according to what we hear, were both enthusiastically for this particular piece of legislation. The Farm Bureau official to whom we were referred, did not seem to know about it when first called, but after studying the report, stated that the Farm Bureau was against the legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the 1955 report of the American Farm Bureau Federation, on page 6, I find this language:

> That Government should, with a minimum of control and aid, stimulate individual initiative.

That is exactly the ACP program. It has no control over the farmer. It does not contemplate that the program will in any way control his operation. It is only calculated to stimulate individual initiative.

I am not surprised at the Farm Bureau Federation. Unfortunately, in recent years we have met with opposition from the American Farm Bureau Federation on every bill we have brought from the Committee on Agriculture. This section that we are trying to repeal is an effort to regiment the farmer, and yet the Farm Bureau Federation comes out in favor of retaining section 348.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I wonder if there is anyone here who can state why the Farm Bureau Federation is opposing this measure. Did they give any reasons?

Mr. COOLEY. No. I would like to say that we held open hearings. A public announcement was made that the hearings were going to be held. The Farm Bureau did not ask to be heard. They have representatives in the city of Washington, and apparently they were indifferent about the matter until the bill reached the floor of this House for consideration. I hope no Member of the House will be influenced by any expression of opinion by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 1573. I associate myself with the views expressed by my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and by the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

I think it has already been well stated that section 348 has never had any rightful place in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The present language of section 348 prohibits the making of agricultural-conservation program payments to any farmer who knowingly harvests any basic commodity in excess of his acreage allotment. In the first place, the ACP program is a separate and distinct program from that of the acreage-allotment program.

Prior to 1954, section 348 had applied only to cotton and had declared ineligible for ACP payments any cotton farmer who knowingly overplanted his allotment. There are no acreage allotments on cotton except when marketing quotas are in effect. In addition, the quota provisions themselves are an effective deterrent to overplanting. Consequently, as the committee report indicates, the provision was largely unnoticed and seldom used. During the closing hours of the 83d Congress a conference committee of the House and Senate reluctantly accepted section 348 in order to assure the passage of the 1954 act. This was the first time the principle set forth in section 348 had been made applicable to all basic commodities. It became new law and all kinds of difficulties and conflicts resulted, many of which have already been related during the course of this debate.

It is obvious that a strict interpretation of the provisions of section 348 would seriously retard the agricultural-conservation program which for any particular year is usually planned almost a year in advance and is authorized by Congress on that basis. As has been stated, the practices which will be approved for payment are normally determined prior to the beginning of the calendar year and soon after the beginning of the year farmers are invited

to sign up for the program and begin to carry out the practices. Normally, our farmers are eligible for payments as soon as they have carried out these practices or as soon as the materials have been purchased, and ordinarily all payments have been made by the end of the fiscal year on June 30.

If a farmer must wait until he can certify that he has not harvested a particular crop in excess of his allotment, payment frequently cannot be made until the following year because in some areas some crops are still being harvested at the year's end. Another situation indicated the ridiculousness of section 348. It is the wheat-marketing-quota law which provides, for example, that any farmer—whether he has a wheat allotment or not—may plant and market up to 15 acres of wheat without becoming subject to the marketing-quota provisions. Clearly it is the intent of the wheat-marketing provision of law to permit farmers in areas where wheat is not a major commercial crop to plant a small acreage as a nurse crop or cover crop, or for feed on the farm, without penalty. In spite of this fact, section 348, as amended, would penalize these farmers without allowing them any benefit from the agricultural-conservation program unless they complied with acreage allotments.

In addition, section 304 of the 1954 act repealed the authority for marketing quotas on corn, permitting the growing of corn in excess of acreage allotments with no penalty other than the loss of eligibility for price support. Section 348, nevertheless, would impose a new penalty—loss of ACP payments.

Section 348, as amended, would be repealed by this bill. Its provisions, as I have indicated, are in direct conflict with the spirit of several provisions of the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota laws, and as pointed out in the committee report, with at least two other provisions of the 1954 act itself. It is most unfortunate that section 348 was ever included in the 1938 act, as amended. It would add additional and unnecessary administrative difficulties and procedures. It in no way adds anything to the restrictions already set forth in the program. Programs which are designed to stabilize the price and the supply of basic agricultural commodities necessarily are and should always be kept entirely separate from those programs, such as the ACP program, which are designed for the preservation and improvement of our soil and water resources for the long-range benefit of the Nation as a whole.

The ACP program has been a good program. It has given our farmers added incentive to conserve our soil and to make it more productive. While the program has helped them individually, it has also played a significant part in keeping our Nation economically strong. Let us strike section 348 from the Agricultural Adjustment Act and carry on with a program which has meant so much to our people and to the security of our Nation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to burden the committee. I was the author of a bill similar to the one we are considering. The particular point I would like to make here today is that my colleage the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], who, as most Members know, has been quite active in the farm program, was also the author of one of the bills and appeared before our committee at the hearings. He is ill and unable to be here today. I am sure that if he were here he would speak on this in his usually convincing manner and show you the desirability of approving this bill. The change, of course, as has been pointed out, has been endorsed by the Department of Agriculture. Also as Mr. McConnell told us, there is no connection between price supports and ACP. I think we are all agreed on that; and that is the purpose of this bill today, to get rid of the amendment which did tie the two together.

I hope this bill will pass.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record in support of this bill.

I think it could be said that anybody who opposes the repeal of this section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is opposed to the soil-conservation program, because I do not think there is any particular law at this time that is doing more to wreck the soil-conservation program throughout the United States than the section we are trying to repeal.

I also introduced a bill, H. R. 3438, to correct the inequitable section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 pertaining to cross compliance for agricultural conservation payments.

The present law has worked to the disadvantage of farmers in my district, and I suspect that the same thing is true of farmers in many other sections of the country. Most of the dairy farmers in the ninth district of Wisconsin raise corn for feed on their own farms. They do not raise corn for commercial sale.

Thus, the present cross compliance law does not help in the promotion of soil-conservation practices because farmers cannot qualify for ASC payments. On the basis of numerous letters from farmers in my district—and also on the strength of personal conversation with scores of farmers—I know that this situation is true.

In January of this year I received a letter from a county agent in my district which summarizes the difficulties of dairy farmers in operating under the cross compliance provisions of the Agricultural Act.

I wish to quote two short paragraphs from this county agent's letter as follows:

> There is one matter I would like to bring to your attention. Under the present ASC regulations, a farmer must comply with his corn allotment to get ASC payments. This works a hardship on dairy farmers since a considerable amount of their corn acreage is for silage corn.
>
> Since the corn allotment is designed to cut down the amount of corn on the market, and since the acreage of silage corn will not affect corn on the market, wouldn't it be possible to eliminate silage corn from the corn-acreage allotment?

It was this situation that prompted me to introduce my bill, H. R. 3438. Since H. R. 1573 accomplishes the same purpose, I support the committee's report and urge my colleagues to vote for its adoption.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the committee's attention to the following telegram I received from the New Jersey Farm Bureau opposing this legislation. This telegram sets forth the reason for the Farm Bureau's opposition to the bill.

I join with them in their opposition to this bill. The telegram is as follows:

> TRENTON, N. J., *March 1, 1955.*
>
> JAMES TUMULTY,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> New Jersey Farm Bureau opposes H. R. 1573 which would make agricultural conservation program payments to farmers who exceed allotments. This principle contrary to a sound farm program.
>
> W. P. WATSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the proposed legislation, H. R. 1573 as reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture. Along with several Members of this House, I introduced a similar measure, H. R. 4059, which would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

This measure is particularly vital to the farmers in my section of the country. I have heard from many of them, both in writing and by word of mouth, and the consensus of their opinion is that section 311 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which amended section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is too rigid. As is known by this House, section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, provides that any person who knowingly harvests any basic agricultural commodity, namely cotton, tobacco, corn, wheat, rice, and peanuts, in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity shall not be eligible for any payment under the agricultural conservation program.

I am delighted to see that the House Committee on Agriculture has reported out a bill, H. R. 1573, which abolishes this rigid and unfair restriction.

In changing the basis of allotment to harvested acres, section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, did not eliminate the difficulties it was designed to eliminate but instead it multiplied the conflicts and problems of administration. If a farmer has to wait until he can certify that he has not harvested a crop in excess of his allotment, he frequently cannot receive

his payment until the following year, and it is very difficult in farming as in business to have one's payments held up for several months or a year.

Section 348, as amended, which would be repealed by this bill, is in direct conflict with the spirit of several provisions of the acreage allotment and marketing-quota laws, and with at least two other provisions of the 1954 act itself.

Therefore, due to the conflicts which section 311 of the 1954 act has caused in amending section 348 of the 1938 act and due to the rigid regulatory authority left in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture in enforcing the provisions of section 311, I am altogether in accord with the repeal of this restrictive legislation. In supporting the committee bill, H. R. 1573, I agree with the findings of the committee that the marketing quota penalties and the loss of price supports in the case of acreage allotments have proved sufficient deterrents to overproduction of those commodities which are accorded price support in return for this measure of production control by the farmer.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize my strong support for the provisions of H. R. 1573, which would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Sometime ago I introduced a bill identical in purpose to H. R. 1573.

Section 348 under existing law is to take effect this year and will deprive farmers of agricultural-conservation program payments if they knowingly exceed acreage allotments for any of the crops under control by the ASC.

For example: In my own State of South Dakota, during 1954, 60 percent of the farmers in the commercial-corn area overplanted their allotment. These same farmers, if they continue their present operation in 1955, will lose their AC payments under the provisions of section 348.

Many South Dakota farmers have contacted me about this matter, and I share their belief that the agricultural-conservation program should not be tied in with the acreage-allotment law. No one would suggest that the original ACP program was inaugurated in order to exercise an unfair control over the farmers of this Nation. It was to the contrary a program aimed at inducing farmers to enrich the fertility of the soil by building up soil resources through engaging in good farming practices.

I do not have to outline for you the significant accomplishments of the ACP program, as we are all familiar with the great value of soil-conservation practices. It is enough to say that the AC program has given our farmers increased incentives to practice soil-conservation methods, and the program has thereby played an important role in maintaining our Nation's economic strength.

It is grossly unfair to deny our American farmers partial reimbursement for cost of their conservation programs because they have not complied with acreage allotments.

The agricultural conservation program should not be used to compel compliance with the programs for price support. If a farmer does not choose to comply with acreage allotments and thereby lose his right to participate in the price-support program, it is not necessary to impose an additional penalty in the form of depriving the farm operator of soil conservation payments.

I know there are many Members of the House who agree with my contention that the provisions of section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 would prove to be very detrimental to the American farmer and thereby of great harm to the entire Nation.

I hope that the Congress will recognize the great benefit to be derived from repealing section 348 and making it possible for the farmers of this country to receive Federal cost-sharing payments under the agricultural conservation program even though the operator plants in excess of acreage allotments.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation is not a matter of great significance, and I do not oppose this matter strenuously because it will not materially change the overall program. I believe, however, we should understand what we are doing.

First, I would say that the Department of Agriculture approves this in a passive way, because they recognize that the old provision is hardly worth the trouble it makes for them in administration.

The more significant thing in my estimation is the reasoning of the Farm Bureau in opposing this bill. They recognize this as just relaxing the rules, relaxing the restrictions which are inevitably necessary to make any Government price-support program work.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Would it be more equitable to say that what they want to do is to increase the restrictions? That is the position of the Farm Bureau. We have never had these restrictions before; but their position, as I understand, is that they want to impose additional restrictions, and the position of the Department is that they are satisfied with the restrictions we have now.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I do not propose to speak for the Farm Bureau, but it is my opinion that they recognize that any workable price-support program must have rather rigid restrictions on production.

Even the leaders of our committee who favor high supports admit the necessity of regulations which will keep supply in line with demand. Yet, they take every opportunity to weaken the regulations.

After all these years of rigid price supports no reasonable adjustment has been accomplished and the surpluses pile higher and higher.

The legislation as it now stands does tie together two separate programs, the price-support program and the soil-conservation program, both of which are pure subsidies of production. They are responsible for the tremendous surpluses we are now carrying and we are not carrying those surpluses at any small cost. The cost is tremendous.

Last year's amendment was put in simply to say that if a farmer is going to benefit by receiving these subsidies he ought to comply fully with the farm program and cooperate to every extent, even if the programs be separated into separate pieces of legislation. Both are a part of the same old subsidy of production that has gotten us into this mess and because it creates a few hardships and causes the Department administrative troubles, we are now relaxing this restrictive measure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We have only had it in operation during the past year. After having it for 1 year, Mr. McConnell of the Department of Agriculture, I am sure with the consent and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, the Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman is a member, advocates the repeal of it. Why should we insist on keeping something in the law which the Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, does not want?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I said at the outset that I was not strenuously opposing this bill. I was only trying to explain why the Department is willing to go along with it. I tried to point out the simple implications in what we are doing.

We are doing away with one of the restrictive provisions and insofar as that is accomplished we will make farmers a little freer to go ahead and produce. We speak very solicitously about the soil-conservation program. I am not attempting to argue that at this point, except let me say that the soil-conservation program that you all want to preserve is at least 80 percent subsidy, 80 percent of the $250 million we put into that program every year is a subsidy of production.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated here that this particular section has been in operation for 1 year. I think it should be made clear that this particular section has not gone fully into operation as yet, but it will go into operation with this year's ACP program unless immediate action is taken here in the House and in the Senate. It is necessary to get rapid action on this legislation.

I have talked with the Wisconsin State ACP committee in reference to the so-called Holland amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1954. The members of our State committee have stated to me that it will be almost impossible to administer the program in our State if section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is retained. For that reason I joined with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], in cosponsoring this legislation providing for the repeal of section 348. The repeal of this section is supported by the Secretary of Agriculture and the

Department of Agriculture as well as by your House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation is to separate two distinct programs which were united in the 1954 Agricultural Act. The two programs involved are the price-support and soil-conservation programs. There is absolutely no correlation between the two programs—one is designed to support prices and the other to encourage good soil and water conservation practices.

Last year, the conferees on the agriculture bill adopted what is known as the Holland amendment, which is nothing else than a penalty provision for the enforcement of the price-support program. The purpose of the amendment was to deny any farmer payment for good soil-conservation practices when he failed to comply with his acreage allotments under the price-support program. This method of jeopardizing one program, which admittedly is universally accepted as sound, to enforce another program, which is more or less controversial, certainly is unfair and unjust in every way and should be repealed. That is the purpose of this legislation.

In my State alone, in 1954 only 40 percent of our farmers complied with their corn-acreage allotments. If this legislation, which we today seek to repeal, had been in effect in 1954, it would have meant that 60 percent of our farmers would have been denied the right to participate in the soil-conservation program.

We all know of the great need for sound soil and water conservation practices in this country. With an ever-increasing population, in the not too distant future, we are going to find that the productive capacity of our farmers is definitely limited because of a shortage of tillable land. We must keep what we have and recover what we can.

By denying farmers partial reimbursement for the costs of their conservation programs, we are hindering a most vital program. I have never been able to see why this provision was in the law, and the first bill I introduced during this session of the Congress was to repeal this section. I hope that this will be done with no undue delay.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the Department had to say about the effect of this section, and I am quoting from Mr. McConnell's testimony where he says that:

> We have observed the effects of it long enough to believe that it has no particular effect in controlling what it was aimed to control, to keep people within their allotments, and we think there are other means which are already in effect. The marketing quotas do that very effectively.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this an administration measure?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, it is sponsored by the former distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. HOPE?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. HOPE, and it is approved by Mr. Benson and his colleagues in the Department of Agriculture, and the repeal of it, I might say, is both an administration measure and a nonadministration measure, which has bipartisan support.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is one of the measures where the Democratic Party is supporting the President?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, that may be. You can take it that way if you want to, but section 348 was written into the law in the last Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It takes care of cotton and peanuts?

Mr. COOLEY. Popcorn and crackerjacks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I rise is this: There has been some controversy about the Farm Bureau opposing this measure. I would like to state that on two different occasions we held public hearings on this bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] held hearings, and there were no opponents to the bill. He felt that he should circulate the information and give 4 or 5 days for someone to come in and oppose the bill if they felt like that. Five days later we had another hearing, and I feel quite sure that the Farm Bureau is well enough organized that they had information that some 15 bills were introduced in this matter, they knew that public hearings were being held, and I am surprised to find that organization, ordinarily efficient as a legislative sounding board for farm people, would come in on the day this bill is to be voted on the floor of the House and oppose it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 1573. My colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and I introduced identical bills to repeal the so-called Holland amendment.

I think the substantiating evidence has been pretty well presented here this afternoon, and there are just two basic points I would like to make. There has been considerable talk about the small wheat farmer with 15 acres of wheat being unduly penalized by section 348. In my part of Kansas we are mostly small farmers. I am one of them myself. I am not speculating on what the farmers are thinking, because I am one. I have found that it is the small farmer that is being penalized by section 348. Now, because of the price-support program, your large farmer will naturally stay in compliance; he practically has to, because he is going to freely market his merchandise and commodities. Your small farmer, operating 160 acres or less or a half section, primarily is trying to raise feed for his livestock on his farm and does not offer commodities on the market directly for sale, and he is the man that is being penalized by section 348, the Holland amendment. Therefore I think he should receive some consideration in this repeal this afternoon.

Just one more thing. We have been conscious of soil conservation development for about 30 years. This thinking began to generate back in the twenties. It was in the thirties before it got going, and now in the fifties it is just about approaching the point where it is somewhere near satisfactory to those of us interested in it. Now comes section 348, which, in my opinion, will probably retard soil conservation work by at least 5 years. I urge everyone to support H. R. 1573.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, in my opinion, is in the best interest of the small farmers throughout this entire Nation.

In the district I represent, we have many small farmers who grow from 1 to 15 acres of wheat, not for the market, but for home consumption. I do not believe it was ever the intent of Congress that these people who are operating small farms should ever become penalized because of providing the necessary feed for their poultry or livestock. A vote against this bill would be un-American and a violation of trust which is vested in the Congress. It is very unfortunate that Senator HOLLAND'S amendment prevailed in the Senate a year ago, bringing about this problem of confronting small farmers. Therefore, I heartily endorse the provisions of the bill for the repeal of section 348 whereby the small farmer who has the initiative to provide for himself and his poultry and livestock will not become penalized as he would today should this amendment not be adopted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby repealed, effective with respect to 1955 and subsequent crops.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER] having assumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, pursuant to House Resolution 161, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING INEQUITIES IN SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress made certain changes in the Social Security Act in accordance with the recommendation of the President of the United States. These changes were modest in their application and coverage.

The basic reasoning behind the social-security program is to see that the people of this country enjoy the benefits from the money which they have contributed into the fund. I am firmly convinced that there is need for further revision of the program in three respects. It is for this reason that I am today reintroducing my bill which will, if adopted, remove what I would consider inequities in this program.

First. It will give more benefits to the needy, those whom we consider at all times. It raises the basic benefit to $75 for beneficiaries and raises the widow and children benefits proportionately.

Second. It will reduce the benefit age from 65 years to 60 years. I believe that a more equitable distribution under the social-security program will take place if the benefit age is reduced to 60 years. It has become increasingly evident that it is almost impossible for anyone over 45 years to obtain employment. Having contributed to the fund they should have the opportunity to enjoy the benefits at 60 years of age.

Third. This bill will also remove the restrictions on outside income and earnings of the beneficiaries as long as they have met all other requirements and are otherwise found qualified to receive social-security benefits under the program. I am firmly convinced that the present restriction on outside earnings, before the age of 72 years, works a hardship on most of those who are recipients of these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that these recommendations will receive favorable consideration and action by the Committee on Ways and Means.

SECTION 462, REVENUE ACT OF 1954

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat alarmed last week when the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO], as recorded on page 2061 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carrying the proceedings of the House of February 24, made the statement that the taxpaying business people of the country were getting a terrific windfall in the matter of tax deductions by reason of the accrual method by which they kept their books.

I was so worried about this matter, because I had never heard of any such provision in the last tax bill in connection with the taxes a corporation had to pay, that I had our accountant check up on this subject. We have been in business 35 years and he has been very successful in his relations with the Internal Revenue Bureau, and rightly so. He said we have been keeping our books on an accrual basis for the last 35 years.

It is true that this deduction, or whatever you may call it, does tend to level out the hills and the valleys in your financial statement. People selling items that require service, such as air conditioners, set up an account against every one of such articles they sell, but sooner or later within the year there is a day of reckoning.

Let me read this letter in which our accountant explains this situation:

PENNSYLVANIA SUPPLY CO.,
Harrisburg, Pa., February 28, 1955

Congressman WALTER M. MUMMA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MUMMA: The following is some dope I got together on the changes that were made by the 1954 Revenue Act that Mr. ZELENKO talked about:

1. Section 462 permits a taxpayer to provide reserves for estimated expenses and to deduct reasonable additions to such reserves in the year in which the expenses are estimated. Estimated expenses of this kind were not permitted prior to the 1954 Revenue Act.

2. Examples of expenses which ordinarily meet the requirements are cash discounts, product warranties, sales returns and allowances, freight allowances, quantity discounts, and vacation pay; an example of this is:

A taxpayer sells air conditioners which he guarantees for 1 year. Taxpayers' experience indicates that the average cost per unit of fulfilling the guaranty is $24. For each unit sold $24 is credited to a reserve account. As the expenses are actually incurred, the reserve shall be charged with the amount of these expenses. In no event will a double deduction be permitted. At the close of each taxable year the reserve shall be adjusted to reflect charges in the actual cost experience of the taxpayer.

3. From Mr. ZELENKO's statements one might be led to believe that a taxpayer could set up reserves for expenses without limitations to evade income tax and that the Government would never collect tax that it would otherwise collect, to the extent of 5 billions (it would be interesting to know how this amount was estimated).

The above reasoning is not true for the following reasons: (a) Only reserves can be set up for expenses which in the opinion of the Commissioner can be estimated with reasonable accuracy; (b) the general purpose of section 462 is to bring tax accounting more closely into harmony with generally accepted accounting principles. It is not intended to permit taxpayers to deduct estimated expenses in any taxable year unless such treatment would be proper for such year under the taxpayer's method of accounting.

The estimated expense must be attributable to the income of the taxable year and part or all of which would be required to be taken into account for a subsequent taxable year. Expenses attributable to income of future years are not expenses for which an addition to a reserve under section 462 is allowable.

Whether a reserve for estimated expenses is reasonable shall be determined in each particular case in the light of the pertinent facts known at the close of the taxable year. In case actual expenses prove to be more or less than those estimated for prior years, the amount of the excess or inadequacy shall be reflected in the determination of a reasonable amount for the current taxable year.

In any case in which a reserve for estimated expenses as of the close of any taxable year is determined to be excessive, such excess shall be taken into account in computing the taxable income for the taxable year for which such determination is made.

I hope this gives you some information that you wanted; and if not, please let me know and we will try again.

Yours truly,

AMOS EBERT.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday, March 9, 1955, for 60 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

VIEWS EXPRESSED IN WEEKLY LETTERS, JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith certain paragraphs that were contained in my weekly letters during the past 60 days. They are as follows:

[From 1,115th weekly letter of January 6, 1955]

C-BOMBS

The first A-bomb was a crude weapon in comparison with later scientific developments, yet it leveled a large industrial city. The H-bomb disintegrated a whole island in the Pacific Ocean. The cobalt bomb, or C-bomb, has been discovered and our scientists have the know-how for its manufacture. It will be the greatest of them all. Two hundred cobalt bombs will be sufficient to make a ball of fire out of the entire earth. It is the weapon of ultimate destruction and presents a great challenge.

WORKWEEK

Were it not for the 40-hour week, we would likely have 12 million unemployed people today. Many people now living can remember the 6-day workweek when it was standard in American industry with 12 hours a day. Technological developments are constantly improving our productivity. Consideration is now being given to a 36-hour workweek to be effective within the next decade, with frequent 3-day weekends a uniform practice.

BOOM AND BUST

The boom-and-bust theory is outmoded. Depressions are either manmade or man-permitted; they can be avoided. A panic every few years, which would permit the fortunate and the privileged to acquire the property and possessions of the less fortunate and poor, should not be tolerated in the future. If well-known policies and practices are pursued by officials working in the public interest, all the people of our country will be

privileged to enjoy reasonable prosperity with accompanying conveniences, comforts, and many of the luxuries of life.

WHY PAY TAXES?

Advertisements are appearing in financial journals with the heading "Why Pay Taxes?" The incomes from all bonds issued by States, cities, and other political subdivisions are not taxable for Federal income or other purposes. A fortunate person with a few million dollars can invest his savings in these tax-exempt securities and make no reports of any kind whatsoever and pay no taxes. There are persistent demands for projects that will cause the issuance of tax-exempt bonds.

In the $25 billion highway program, it is proposed that half the bonds be sold by the States and cities. They would be tax exempt. Would it not be better for the Federal Government to issue all the bonds, which will be taxable, and require the States and cities to reimburse the Federal Government to the extent of 50 percent?

[From 1,116th weekly letter of January 13, 1955]

FARMER'S CONCERN

There is developing growing bipartisan concern about the farm situation among Members of the House. Of immediate concern is the continuing drop in farm incomes. Since 1951, farm income has dropped from $16 billion to a little over $11 billion in 1954. It is expected to decline some more in 1955. Efforts will be made to wipe the Republican farm law off the books and restore the nonsliding 90 percent of parity price supports. Representative COOLEY, of North Carolina, the incoming chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, believes such an effort will get bipartisan support among House Members, and a rigid 90-percent support law will be passed. However, the outlook for approval in the Senate is doubtful at this juncture. Any worsening of the farm picture could change the Senate outlook quickly.

DISTURBING TREND

President Eisenhower has made a fine prediction that we should have a gross national product of $500 billion a year in 10 years. This is a commendable declaration on his part; however, since he came into office, the gross national product has gone down over $14 million on an annual basis. This is disturbing. In order for our country to remain prosperous and afford an adequate opportunity for full employment, our gross national product should go up 3 or 4 percent a year. The trend the last 2 years has definitely been downward.

[From 1,117th weekly letter of January 20, 1955]

SMALL BUSINESS VERSUS MONOPOLY

There are disturbing signs indicating that monopoly and concentration of economic power are increasing. The expansion of monopoly power is at the expense of independent small business. Between 1950 and 1954, the annual rate of mergers has quadrupled. This rate of increase in mergers is as great as the concentration movement that took place between 1924 and 1928 before the great depression.

The growing power of monopoly has made it extremely difficult for small business to prosper and survive, even under conditions of high-level business activity. Thus in 1954, a year which the administration has called one of the most prosperous peacetime years on record, small-business failures were 35 percent larger than they were in 1952.

Federal Trade Commission reports explain also why there has been such a sharp increase in mergers. According to their quarterly financial statistics for all United States manufacturing corporations, the profitability of the small firms has dropped markedly the last 2 years while that of the giants has increased. The after-tax-rate of profit for the smallest-size manufacturing firms fell 60 percent from the first half of 1952 to the first half of 1954. In the same period, the firms with the largest assets increased their profit rate by 6 percent. Under the Democrats in 1952, the profit rate of the small firms was almost on a parity with their large competitors.

PROGRAM NEEDED TO ENCOURAGE FAMILY FARMING

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address expressed concern over the plight of the low-income farm family. About 1 in every 4 farm operators receives under $1,000 cash income a year. A farm family cannot enjoy an American standard of living at such depressed income levels. I am in favor of a system of income payments limited to family-size farm operations to boost the level of farm family income and promote family-size farming. Such a system could be based on parity supports ranging, for instance, from 100 percent of parity on the first $7,500 of gross farm production up to 70 percent of parity on the last increment of $2,500 of production but not exceeding $15,000 in total production. This would remove some of the criticism against the present price supports whereby the big payments go to the largest farms.

WILL THERE BE A BANKERS' TOLLGATE ON THE NEW HIGHWAY PROGRAM?

The President's message proposing to increase highway spending by $50 billion in the next 10 years will be sent to Congress on January 27. The financing features will undoubtedly reflect the recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission. Of the Commission's 5 members, New York bank representation dominated, with 3 of the members, including the Chairman, having such connections. Gen. Lucius Clay, Commission Chairman, is a director of the Marine Midland Trust Co., of New York. Stephen Bechtel, a member of the Commission, is a director of the J. P. Morgan bank. The third representative of the New York banks on the Commission was S. Sloan Colt, head of the Bankers Trust Co., of New York. This latter bank is regarded as a part of the Morgan group. A fractional one-tenth of 1 percent difference in interest charges on the proposed program could mean millions in profits to the bankers and millions in extra costs to the public. The President's proposals for financing the expanded highway construction should be carefully scrutinized to make sure that the New York banks will not be standing like tollgate keepers on the new highways.

FEDERAL RESERVE AND TREASURY RESPONSIBLE FOR STOCK INFLATION

Our economy has been exposed to a new element of instability as a result of the accelerated inflation of stock prices. The Federal Reserve and the Treasury are to blame. The Federal Reserve cut margin requirements 33 percent in early 1953 to expand margin trading. Brokers' loans went up $300 million in 3 months when legitimate business was starved for credit. In early 1954 I predicted that the tax cut on dividends and accelerated depreciation would increase upper-bracket and business saving. Because of the lack of consumer purchasing power, I warned this would not go into new plant and equipment investment but would be used for speculative purposes, such as bidding up the prices of existing securities. When this became apparent and stock prices began to accelerate in October 1954, why didn't the Federal Reserve move in and stop this inflation? I shall find out whether the fact that the elections were held in the midst of the spiral was responsible for the failure to take early preventive action. I shall also ask whether the fact that speculators, who took their profit in 1955, can wait until April 1956 to pay their capital-gains tax influenced the Board's decision.

PROMISE VERSUS PERFORMANCE

No matter how many Madison Avenue hucksters the White House hires to write its messages, these facts cannot be erased from the record:

1. Nonfarm jobs averaged 1.3 million lower in 1954 than in 1953.

2. Small business failures rose sharply the third year in a row. They totaled 11,220 in 1954, up 35 percent over 1952.

3. Dividend payments are approaching a rate of $10 billion a year, up a billion since 1952. Farm income is approaching a rate of $10 billion a year, down $4 billion since 1952.

[From 1,118th weekly letter of January 27, 1955]

NEW YORK BANK HELPED BY FEDERAL RESERVE MONETARY POLICY

The Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, a leading supporter of the Federal Reserve's hard-money policy in 1953, has warmly praised the Board of Governors for its timely and flexible policies. This bank has just had the happy experience of increasing its 1954 net profits by 23 percent, while its loans to business declined and its gross earnings from bank operations also fell. The Guaranty Trust Co. made over $7 million from the sale of United States Government securities in 1954. No wonder the bank praised the Federal Reserve, for the Reserve's flexible policies made it possible for the Guaranty Trust to buy Government securities cheap in 1953 and sell them at a higher price in 1954.

Profits from the sale of securities were the chief reasons why major New York banks hung up new profits records in 1954, a year of declines in business borrowing and slightly lower average interest rates.

The executor of the new flexible monetary policy is William McChesney Martin, for a number of years the head of the New York Stock Exchange. The architect of the new policy is the Under Secretary of the Treasury, former economic policy adviser to the American Bankers Association and former executive board chairman of the National City Bank of New York, W. Randolph Burgess.

These two Government officials, along with the Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, formerly a director of the National City Bank of Cleveland, are holding their feet on the necks of the farmer, the small business man and the laborer to protect the country from inflation. But the bankers in Wall Street, who are applauding this trio, know whose interests are being protected.

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-ONE-BILLION-DOLLAR HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The President's highway program is going to be carefully scrutinized. Apart from the fact that extreme care should be taken to guard against any unfavorable financing features that the New York bank representatives may have recommended, other considerations are involved. For example, it is set policy as of now that Federal matching-funds are not available for toll-financed State roads. However, the American Automobile Association believes that the new highway program being recommended by the President will practically force the State to build toll roads. The AAA is against toll roads. I am against toll roads. The average toll paid is equivalent to an additional 15 cents a gallon tax on gasoline.

[From 1,119th weekly letter of February 3, 1955]

AGE DISCRIMINATION OVER 30

James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, has warned that half of our population might be jobless in the next 20 years as a result of prejudice against hiring older workers.

According to persons who have studied the trends in employment practices, present trends are against hiring men past 45, and some even refuse to take men over 40. Women past 35, or even younger, are finding hiring practices that rule them out on the grounds of age.

The practice is said to grow out of the employers' desire to keep down their pension liability, which is increased when older workers are taken on.

On the other hand, the ban against hiring workers over 35 or 40 will mean that in a short time a few workers will be supporting a growing load of jobless citizens, either through taxes or by direct contributions.

This problem will have to be solved by means of education, changes in employment policies, and also by making the private pension and welfare program more flexible than they are now.

CREDIT UNIONS FACE ATTACK FROM BIG BANKS

With the growing popularity of low interest cooperative credit unions, many of the big bankers have determined to put a stop to this kind of competition. The big eastern bankers have powerful voices in the Eisenhower administration. It is, therefore, no surprise to see that the President has—unwittingly, perhaps—thrown his full weight on the side of the big banks and against the little people who run their own credit unions. Using the excuse that he wants to protect workers' savings, the President in his economic report proposes a series of measures that will effectively put the credit unions under the control of elements favorable to the big banking interests. The objective of the President's recommendations is to stop the "rapid spread of credit unions, cooperative agencies which provide a means whereby employees of the same firm or members of the same fraternal or similar association can invest their savings in an institution under their own management and from which they can, when the occasion arises, borrow money for personal needs."

[From 1,120th weekly letter of February 10, 1955]

ADULT DELINQUENCY

Alcoholism is 100 times more prevalent than polio, according to Dr. Caradine R. Hooten, executive secretary of the Methodist Board of Temperance. There is a lot of talk about delinquency—most of it concerning juvenile delinquency. From the information available, it appears that the question of adult delinquency should also receive consideration.

Back when Dr. Hooten and I were young boys, we were deskmates for a year at the Hughes Springs Public School. Now he occupies an office adjacent to the United States Capitol Grounds in the magnificent Methodist Buildings in a suite formerly occupied by the famous Bishop Cannon, of Virginia. Our offices are within a stone's throw. Dr. Hooten has become nationally and internationally known and recognized.

EASY CREDIT VERSUS LOWER TAXES

Concern has been voiced about the no-down payment, 30-years-to-pay building boom. People who voice misgivings about the recent increase in mortgage and installment debt feel that the administration could have done the consumer a better service by reducing his taxes last year instead of making it easier for him to get into debt. There is no question, however, but that the need for housing is great, especially among young veterans. Liberalizing terms has opened the way for mass production and mass merchandising of housing, which should result in a bigger and better quality house for the middle and lower income families.

ROSY PICTURE CLOUDED BY DARK SPOTS

Looking at the stock market and the overall picture of jobs and sales, there is plenty of prosperity around us. Furthermore, if we pursue the right economic policies, there is no reason why we can't have an expanding economy with decent jobs and rising living standards for all. But the danger is that we are going to try to sweep some of the unpleasant facts under the rug and sort of hope they will stay out of sight. This is what the President has apparently done in his economic report. The fact that this is a postwar low for the income shares of farmers and small-business proprietors is given a line in some obscure section of the report. The plight of the depressed belt of high-level unemployment running down the Appalachian Range from Maine down through Alabama is treated only scantily. Here we have depressed coal mining and textile towns, not to count the depressed farm equipment area of the Quad Cities in the Midwest and also excluding the serious unemployment in Oregon. Yet, very little is offered in the way of relief for these people in the President's economic report. Pools of unemployment do not remain isolated. Unless they are mopped up, they seep out and cover the neighbor's floor.

ANOTHER REVERSAL ON MONETARY POLICY

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey has taken off on the second leg of his campaign to restore the high interest rates of the 1920's. Issuance of the recent 40-year, 3-percent bond finds the Treasury another step closer to its goal of restoring a 4-percent rate on United States Government bonds. This was the rate under the Republicans back in the early 1920's. The last long-term bond approaching this maturity was the 50-year, Panama Canal Zone, 3-percent bond issued 44 years ago. In other words, Secretary Humphrey is paying 3 percent for 40-year money today when savings are much more plentiful, compared with the 3 percent that was paid for 50-year money nearly a century ago when savings were scarcer.

A panel of monetary and fiscal experts appearing before the Joint Economic Committee did not feel there was any inflationary danger, nor was there any urgent need for putting out such a long-term bond at this time.

An official of one of the big Government bond houses has called the "flexible" monetary policies a financial roller coaster.

NATIONAL DEBT

For 20 years, the Republicans claimed that the Democrats were spendthrifts who were driving the country down the road to national bankruptcy. Republican campaign pledges have always contained promises to reduce the national debt and balance the budget. I have looked at the President's 1956 budget, and this is what it shows. From fiscal 1953 to fiscal 1956, total budget deficits come to $19.4 billion. The President has asked to have the statutory debt ceiling raised permanently.

[From 1,121st weekly letter of February 17, 1955]

OUTLOOK

Despite much rosy optimism in year-end forecasts, it is becoming evident that our economy is vulnerable to a setback in a number of places. I am not a prophet of gloom and doom, but I do believe that action is a better safeguard against serious trouble than just preaching confidence. We should be watching the auto- and home-building picture very closely.

THE MONEY MANAGERS ARE PUNISHING INNOCENT PEOPLE

Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report by a panel of monetary economists brought out several interesting facts. First was the disavowal of the Treasury-Federal Reserve myth that they do not determine the interest rates and prices of Government securities. Second, it was stated that in the last 2 years basic economic forces had little to do with the determination of all interest rates. They were determined by the Federal Reserve and Treasury officials. Finally, one witness, Professor Wood of the University of Missouri, said that the Eisenhower monetary policy was punishing innocent people with unemployment for the misdeeds of the monopolies. He predicted that the people will sooner or later demand that the money managers stop this inequitable and inhumane practice.

LESSONS FROM EXPERIENCE AND GUIDES TO THE FUTURE

Under this heading, the President's Economic Report notes that "monetary policy can be a powerful instrument of economic recovery, so long as the confidence of consumers and businessmen in the future remains high." I agree that confidence in the future is the key ingredient for the success of any economic policy. That is why I have opposed as vigorously as I know how the so-called flexible monetary policy and flexible price-support policy. The flexible monetary policy is upsetting to businessmen, to consumers, to home builders and home buyers, and to holders of Government bonds. Under such a policy, it is impossible to build confidence in the future. There is no assurance that the marketable bonds you buy today at 100 will not drop to 96 or lower within a few months. Interest rates fluctuate, upsetting business calculations. Mortgage money tends to dry up at the least sign that credit may be tightened. Planning is difficult under these circumstances. The same is true under the flexible price-support program. I say give a farmer a fair price that he can depend on, and he will go out and produce and earn a living for himself and his family. In that way, we will build confidence for the future. Par support of Government bond prices will assure an ample credit supply at low interests rates at all times, thereby eliminating uncertainty and building confidence for the future. Firm support of farm prices, at least 90 percent of parity, will build the farmer's confidence in his future.

HOUSING FOR THE AGED

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, is sponsoring a bill setting up a Federal program of low-rent public-housing units for the aged. It is pointed out that our national housing program has, so far, failed to make provision for this deserving group. Retired people represent a large part of the market for consumer goods. They are very important in our economy. A grateful Government must adequately provide for them. The States of New York and Massachusetts have set up modest State programs.

PLIGHT OF SMALL BUSINESS AND FARMERS

The administration is taking a callous approach to the real squeeze that exists for millions of our low-income farm families and for the millions of independent businessmen. Their income shares have reached a postwar low. In large part, their position reflects the abandonment by the Eisenhower administration of the full-employment philosophy in favor of protecting the integrity of the lenders' dollar. When the economy stops growing as fast as it should, the weaker groups soon become victims of the strong. This is what has been happening in this country the last 2 years.

[From 1,122d weekly letter of February 24, 1955]

UNFAIR TAXATION

A terrific campaign is being carried on concerning the matter of Federal income taxes on cooperatives and corporations. I doubt that any country on earth has ever had or ever will have a system of taxation that metes out exact justice in every instance. We certainly do not want injustices or inequalities, but oftentimes in adjusting one, we create a dozen more.

COOPERATIVES

It is the desire of Congress to make taxes just as equal and uniform as it is possible to make them and is now considering these questions. There are four principal ways of doing business: (1) as an individual—although he operates under a trade name, he pays taxes as an individual and does not pay Federal income taxes under the trade name; (2) a partnership—earnings of the partnership are divided; the partnership pays no Federal income tax, as such, but the partners pay on what they receive; (3) cooperatives, as such, pay every other kind of tax from the lowest to the highest level, but do not pay a Federal income tax; the members occupy the position of a partnership and pay on the profits that they receive; (4) a corporation—it pays all taxes like a cooperative and a Federal income tax, since it occupies the position under our Constitution as a person and is entitled to all the rights and privileges of a person; when the earnings are distributed by the corporation, the shareholders pay on what they receive in the way of profits.

The Government makes no effort to compel a person or group of persons to operate a certain way; they are privileged to operate either way they choose. They can select the form of business that they desire to the extent of changing from a corporation to a cooperative or to a partnership, if they believe it will help them taxwise. For instance, the largest brokerage house in the United States, Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, is a partnership. In the year 1954, their published report disclosed a $20 million net profit. This partnership will not pay taxes on the net profit, but the 107 partners will pay Federal income taxes on the part they receive. The Railway Express Co. is a cooperative. It is owned by 80 railroads. The Associated Press, the greatest of the national news-gathering agencies, is a cooperative. Mutual investment funds aggregating over $8 billion dealing in stocks and bonds occupy a cooperative status for income tax purposes. Some corporations have changed their status to that of cooperative, believing they will have some tax advantage that way. There is nothing to prevent this being done and it is strictly a matter up to the individuals concerned. Other corporations, after considering the matter, have declined to convert into cooperatives because, after evaluating the matter, they have decided that the advantages of a corporation far outweigh the tax advantges of a cooperative and there are too many disadvantages in a cooperative, which they do not have as a corporation.

The fight in Congress in recent years has been double taxation. Many people seriously contend that it is double taxation to tax a corporation and also tax the shareholders. Congress has made a substantial step in the direction of relieving this burden by exempting the first $100 received by a taxpayer in dividends from the corporations.

There is one particular tax evasion that is devastating to independent and small businesses throughout the Nation. A national chain can permit one of its units to sell goods at a loss until the small business is destroyed. It does not mean too much to the national chain because, at the end of the year, it secures a deduction on the loss for Federal income tax purposes; the national chain indirectly receives a premium or bonus from the Government for destroying a small-business man. It is going on every day throughout the Nation. Efforts to stop it have been persistent over the years, but sufficient attention has not been gained in the Congress to assure success.

[From 1,123d weekly letter of March 3, 1955]

INTEREST RATES GOING UP

Interest rates are rising. The long-term, 2½ percent Victory bonds fell below 96.5 in the week ending February 26. These bonds were at par after the debacle of the spring of 1953. In 1953, these long-terms dropped below 94 in early April. As the Federal Reserve refused to support them, they continued to fall. Even after small-scale purchasing was started by the Federal Reserve, they fell; and finally on June 1, 1953, they touched 89. The Federal Reserve is again refusing to protect these bonds, although it could be done without any cost to the Government or to the Federal Reserve banks. Knowledge that the 12 powerful men, who run the Open Market Committee, will not intervene will enable the speculators to drive the price of these bonds down as far as they want. They will buy them back cheap and wait for a new rise to sell.

SCHOOL BILL FRAMED BY INVESTMENT BANKERS?

Hearings are being held on the President's school-financing proposal. The opposition to this bill is widespread. The intricate and complicated financing provisions and the establishment of a so-called "reasonable interest rate" yardstick at the high rate of 3⅛ percent on tax-exempt bonds has called the attention of many to what I have said for a long time, namely, that the money, credit, and debt-management programs of the administration have been conceived and executed by and for the banking and investment groups. On this point, I was happy to note that Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, a member of the Senate Labor Committee considering the bill, said that the testimony indicated the administration bill appeared to have been "primarily drafted by investment bankers" and that its result would be to run the neediest school districts "more heavily into debt."

Indications are that we may be returning to my idea that 2.5 percent is the maximum rate the Government should pay for its bonds. Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, the Republican Senator from New Jersey and a former chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, has suggested a lower rate at which the Federal Government could buy school-construction bonds. He said a good rate might be 2.5 percent rather than the 3⅛ percent now included in the proposal. If school districts can sell their bonds to the Federal Government at 2.5 percent, there would be no good reason why the Federal Government should pay more when it offers to sell its own bonds. There are $40-billion of tax-exempt bonds outstanding now. Federal bonds that are taxable should be issued instead of school district or State bonds that are exempt from income taxes.

VETERANS, JOBS, AND HOUSING

We have been told that about 300,000 members of the armed services may be entering the civilian labor force this year. In addition to the normal additions to the labor force, this means we will have to have a million new jobs. If we don't, unemployment will increase. The economy has to expand faster than it has been to provide these veterans with the jobs they should have if they want them and are willing to work. Therefore, I think the administration should begin to seriously plan for a more rapid expansion than we are now getting. More consumer purchasing power is needed. It will mean more income for the businessman and better prices for the farmer. This will lead to a demand for still more goods and more investment. Investment means jobs. In this way, boosting consumer purchasing power will provide jobs for our returning veterans.

Our veterans need housing too. Yet there is a widespread propaganda campaign that the GI home loan terms are too liberal. As a result, there are signs of tightening up of mortgage money already. This may be used as an excuse for raising interest rates again and perhaps to increase down payments. These actions will make it more expensive for a veteran to obtain decent shelter and reduce the level of home building. I believe that this country can expand and absorb much more housing than is now being provided. The present terms are making it possible, for the first time, for many of our young married couples to afford a home instead of renting. We should encourage, not discourage, home ownership for our veterans.

WHAT CHANCE DOES SMALL BUSINESS HAVE?

One witness before the Joint Economic Committee, T. K. Quinn, former vice president of General Electric Corp., told us, "There are today 68 private billionaire corporations in the country. As few as 200 industrial giants own outright the most important half of American industry."

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a committee of the other body for a long, long time has been conducting hearings upon the subject of juvenile delinquency endeavoring to ascertain the courses thereof and a possible remedy.

In this noon's Washington Daily News, page 52, there is an item which may be of interest to those who are interested in that very important subject. It states that—

Prince Georges police today put a thick file in a drawer and marked it "closed." A 9-month investigation of a teenage "gang-war" battle which sent one youth to the hospital and left 4 razor scars on another.

The news story continues as follows:

Nine youths known to be present at the "rumble" testified yesterday in Hyattsville police court.

IDENTITY UNKNOWN

None of them, including the 2 who were injured, could identify the ones who clambered into one teenager's car, beat him to insensibility, and left another bleeding from cuts on both arms.

After the hearing, Deputy State's Attorney Ernest N. Cory recommended that assault with intent to kill charges against two 17-year-old District boys be dropped.

"This was done more as somebody's idea of sport rather than with any malice," he said.

Why should a prosecuting officer make that kind of comment when a group of high-school students and other youth are interested? What was he trying to do?

Having already stated that the beating and the carving was done more as somebody's idea of sport rather than with any malice, this prosecuting officer added the following:

When I was a kid there was a gang here known as the swamp rats and another as the hilltoppers. I was a swamp rat. We used to have fights with the hilltoppers all the time.

Doubtless millions of our citizens have heard the story of George Washington and the cherry tree. The statement attributed to him, true or false, "Father, I cannot tell a lie," beyond question has influenced many to be truthful.

The youths of today as well as we older folks get plenty of propaganda, the trend of which is not helpful toward a better life. Many young people and some older ones, reading or hearing

statements made by public officials, especially those charged with the enforcement of the law, are sometimes unduly influenced to follow a course or join in activities which do not tend toward good citizenship.

Fighting between rival gangs certainly does not contribute toward good citizenship and why a public prosecuting officer should publicly, at least by inference if not directly, condone that kind of vicious, illegal action—think of the razor—is an attitude which I cannot understand. Can you?

I cannot believe that Mr. Cory, if he has children, would suggest that his boys or girls join a gang and follow in their father's footsteps by engaging in gang fighting. Surely, Mr. Cory would temper his remarks by suggesting that the boys and girls leave their razors at home while engaging in that sport.

NATURAL GAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would make it clear that the independent producers and gatherers of natural gas and the sales thereof to interstate pipeline companies shall not be subject to the control and jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

On the other hand, it assures protection for the consumer by providing that when an increase in any rate or charge of a natural-gas company is based upon any new or renegotiated contract for the purchase of natural gas the Commission will be required to consider and thus determine if the price for such natural gas is the reasonable market price in the field where it is produced.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this bill has a dual purpose: First, to relieve the burden and the onus of independent producers and gatherers of natural gas and their sales in the field where they are highly competitive of control and regulation of the Federal Government; and, second, to protect the consumers from unreasonable rates and charges. It would prohibit any "gigging" of the consumer.

The provision of this proposed bill is in line with and carries out the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, established by the President last year, as announced in its report made public last Saturday, February 26.

The Committee, generally known as the President's Fuel Policy Committee, said that—

> The Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

The President's Committee further recommends that the consumer should be protected by the Federal Power Commission when applications for an increase in rates and charges are made by an interstate natural-gas company based on any new or renegotiated contract for the purchase price of natural gas.

In other words, the President's Fuel Policy Committee would make it clear that the interstate transmission of natural gas by the interstate transmission lines, and the subsequent sale of such gas for resale, is a public utility function and should be under the regulations of the Federal Power Commission.

These and other recommendations made by the Policy Committee are consistent with the principles and policies which have made this the greatest country in the history of mankind.

I have prepared this bill to carry out these recommendations.

It would extricate the concern, confusion, and consternation which now exist.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the culmination of a long-drawn out fight that resulted in the decision of the United States Supreme Court in June of last year, in the Phillips Petroleum Co. case.

In that case, the Supreme Court completely nullified and reversed the policy, which had been consistently adhered to for 15 years and regarded during all of that time as the law of the land, by holding that the Federal Power Commission had unqualified jurisdiction over the production and gathering of natural gas and the sales thereof by an independent producer to an interstate pipeline company.

The majority opinion of the Court stated that—

> We believe that the legislative history indicates a congressional intent to give the Commission jurisdiction over the rates of all wholesales of natural gas in interstate commerce, whether by a pipeline company or not and whether occurring before, during, or after transmission by an interstate pipeline company.

This rather strange interpretation of the plain language of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, makes it imperative that Congress clarify this problem by positive legislation.

Under this interpretation, the Supreme Court of the United States has by one stroke made every gas producer in the United States, more than 4,000 of them, a public utility, whether it is a big or little producer, an integrated company, or an individual independent wildcatter.

If this policy by such an interpretation of the Court is allowed to stand, it will destroy future exploration and discoveries of natural gas and thereby ultimately deprive the consumers of an adequate supply of this important fuel.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this proposed bill to amend the Natural Gas Act recognizes that the production and gathering of natural gas and the sale thereof, in or near the field where it is produced, is a local and highly competitive risk-taking enterprise, and should not be subject to Federal price-fixing utility regulations.

It would make it clear and definite that the more than 4,000 independent producers and gatherers of natural gas are not utilities and, consequently, should not be treated as such.

It provides assurances for protection of the consumer by establishing an equitable criteria for a determination as to the reasonable market price of natural gas in a field should an interstate natural-gas company on such basis ask for increased rates.

Furthermore, it would provide equity and justice of a natural-gas company who produces a part or all of its gas or purchases from an affiliate by permitting a reasonable market price therefor in the field where produced.

Finally, it would establish additional criteria with reference to an application for a certificate of a natural-gas company in further protection of the consumer. A certificate should be granted only in the event the price to be paid for the natural gas is not greater than the reasonable market price in that area.

Under these proposals and safeguards, our fundamental objective for a sound program to stabilize and obtain the greatest possible results by this industry could be accomplished in efforts to serve the American public.

They would offer the greatest possible encouragement and hope for the future. It would strengthen our national security, provide for our national defense, and give assurance of an adequate supply of natural gas in a time of rapidly growing demands. At the same time it would guarantee the consumer continued low prices which have been maintained through free, competitive practices in the face of constantly increased cost of other commodities.

This is not necessarily a Republican proposal. It is not necessarily a Democratic proposal. It is the American way under long-established American tradition.

I am deeply impressed and, indeed, highly pleased over this joint effort to bring about this important and imperative amendatory legislation.

I am hopeful and fully expect that hearings will be held on this proposed legislation by our committee in the very near future.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much the statement the gentleman has made. As chairman of the committee, I can assure the gentleman that while no date has been set for holding hearings, the committee will hold hearings within a reasonable time.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Regardless of whatever Congress eventually decides to do, I am sure the gentleman shares my opinion that following the opinion by the Supreme Court last year the Congress must take some action in this field.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I think it is highly imperative.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I have listened to the gentleman's very able presentation. I received the impression that this was not only a consumer bill but a nonpartisan bill. Am I right?

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct. I hope the gentleman will join us in getting it reported out of the committee and approved by the House.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I wish to join the gentleman in his feeling about this legislation that it affords State control instead of being forced to go to the Federal Government.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It was my understanding that you made the statement that the consumer, under this legislation, would be protected. Just how will that be brought about?

Mr. HARRIS. By providing authority for the Federal Power Commission, as the regulatory agency of the Federal Government. If and when an interstate natural gas company makes application for increased rates and charges on the basis of additional or higher cost of the natural gas in the field, the Commission shall determine whether or not it is a reasonable price in the field where it is produced. If it is unreasonable, then the application for the increased cost would not be allowed by the Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then ultimately the Federal Government will have indirect control of the price.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that is true. If prices are out of line they would have, should the company ask for an increase. Otherwise they would not have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What criteria are used in determining what is an independent producer of natural gas?

Mr. HARRIS. An independent producer is one who is engaged only in the production and gathering of natural gas and sells at arm's length or competitively to the transmission lines for resale.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. Is it not true that under this measure you are eliminating dual control by Federal and State governments?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. As the President's committee, when it reported last Saturday, stated, the interstate transmission field in this industry would be controlled by the Federal Government, the distributing end of it by the States, as we provided by enabling legislation in the last Congress, and the production and gathering and sale by independent producers by States where it is produced, gathered, and sold.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the gentleman's statement to be that the Federal Power Commission first ruled that they did not have jurisdiction of this matter?

Mr. HARRIS. Throughout the history of the act the Federal Power Commission has consistently adhered to the policy that they did not, under the act, have jurisdiction over this phase of the industry.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the Supreme Court ruled that they did have?

Mr. HARRIS. The Supreme Court did rule that, as I just explained, in the decision of June 7 last year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Prior to the time the Supreme Court rendered that decision, have you any facts and figures to indicate how the consumer was protected during that period?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. There are many facts and figures which we will develop during the course of the hearings.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to point out that in my State an interstate gas supply line was supplying gas to the city and county of Denver, and a company there, and they made application to our public utilities commission for an increased rate, based upon the theory that they had to pay the interstate line a much larger price for the gas.

Mr. HARRIS. But was it based on the increased cost or purchase price of gas in the field? That is the point.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The question is, That the interstate system apparently was free to charge anything they wanted to.

Mr. HARRIS. No, no; they never have been. The Federal Power Commission has that authority and has had it since the act of 1938, and is strengthened in that authority by this piece of legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then what did the Phillips decision do in this case?

Mr. HARRIS. It made a utility out of more than 4,000 independent producers of natural gas in this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But before then did not the Federal Power Commission have complete control of it?

Mr. HARRIS. No; and never did attempt to take control of them.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then what would keep any interstate gas company from charging anything they wanted to under the present law?

Mr. HARRIS. The Federal Power Commission has control over rates and charges of the Natural Gas Co. to the distribution company for sale.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman means the Federal Power Commission has charge of it prior to the Supreme Court decision?

Mr. HARRIS. And they still have charge of it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And if they still have charge of it why the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. To clear up or extricate the jurisdiction given by the Supreme Court to the Federal Power Commission over the producing and gathering and sale of natural gas to the interstate transmission companies. Those prices are arrived at competitively in the usual enterprise system.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In other words, you do not want the Federal Power Commission which now regulates interstate gas transportation to regulate the producers?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right. Independent producers that sell at arms length.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. You do not want them to have any regulation of any producing field.

Mr. HARRIS. They never have had, and the country has developed pretty fast under this procedure.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes to make an announcement on an additional subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

A COMMON SYSTEM OF AIR NAVIGATION, TRAFFIC CONTROL, AND LANDING AIDS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an announcement and call to the attention of the House a serious problem which I believe to be of great importance.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House has for many years fostered the development in this country of a common system of air navigation, traffic control, and landing aids. Your committee has regarded this objective as in the national interest, because it eliminates duplication of facilities as well as duplication of expenditures, and promotes efficiency in the movement throughout the country of military and civil air traffic.

Facts have come to our attention recently which indicate that there may be developing a conflict between civil and military navigation systems. The present system, which was expected to accommodate the needs of both civil and military operations, is known as VOR/DME. This is a static-free, short-range, navigation system. This very high frequency omnirange and distance measuring equipment gives both bearing and distance to the pilot. It appears that during several years past the military agencies have been developing the TACAN system which, for military purposes, holds certain advantages over the present one, and which incorporates, for defense reasons, certain important military features. This system supplies information similar to that supplied by VOR/DME. It is understood that the newly developed TACAN system and the present VOR/DME cannot coexist if both are fully implemented.

Thus, the issue presents itself as to the course of action which should be followed in maintaining air navigation facilities in the future, which are common to both civil and military users. The satisfactory development of such a short-range system of navigation is essential to the defense of the country, as well as to the economic growth of civil aviation, both commercial and private. In addition to the problem of technical compatibility, there is also a very important consideration of economy. The support of two major systems of navigation in the United States would impose a heavy and unnecessary burden on the public.

In view of your committee's constant interest in the maintenance of a common system of air navigation facilities, it is essential that we learn all of the facts concerning this developing conflict, for the purpose of informing the House on

this important subject and recommending a policy to be followed for the future. Therefore, our committee will immediately start the necessary inquiries, under its standing authority to investigate the problems of civil aviation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the committee is going to start hearings on this proposal to scrap Omnirange, is that right?

Mr. HARRIS. As I have just advised, apparently there is a conflict developing between these two systems. It is the intention of the committee to make inquiry into this conflict.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and say that I hope the committee will go into this thing thoroughly.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. The committee intends to do so.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wonder how this system will tie in with the foreign systems that are now being used commercially? For instance, I have in mind a plane taking off from LaGuardia or Idlewild and going to Italy. Is there any conflict there?

Mr. HARRIS. Apparently not, but we are going to inquire into it. I think I can say that some of these types of operations are going into foreign countries.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the foreign countries have the equipment to use under the system that the gentleman is recommending?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not now recommending any system. We will look into it and find out.

Mr. GROSS. If they get it we will give it to them probably.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I think the gentleman from Arkansas has answered the question that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] asked about the situation, which is about all I have in mind.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I would like to commend the gentleman for calling this matter to the attention of the House. I am satisfied that it will be impossible to operate a dual system of air navigation in our country. I think they have taken initial steps to inaugurate such a program and I believe it is highly important that our committee investigate this matter and make a detailed study of these two proposals.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the gentleman, a member of the committee. I am highly delighted, and I am sure every Member of this House will be pleased, that he is a member of the committee which will go into this very important matter. He is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on this subject.

Mr. PRIEST. I think it might be well to point out to the House at this point in the RECORD that some of this is classified information. It will have to be dealt with as classified on an operational level, but otherwise it is not classified.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. As a matter of fact, most of it is classified, and for that reason I may have appeared to be somewhat evasive in answering my friend from Iowa and my friend from Connecticut a moment ago. But we do intend to go thoroughly into all phases of it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GORDON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ABBITT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCVEY).

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KNOX and to include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. PATMAN to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the day's proceedings and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include an article.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BERRY in two instances, and to include in one a tabulation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 3, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVES COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications, were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

490. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the study of various two-price systems of price support and marketing which could be made applicable to rice, pursuant to section 315, Public Law 690, 83d Congress; (H. Doc. No. 100); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

491. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Harris"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

492. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees, were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 84. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 249. A bill relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters; with amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4552. A bill to authorize the construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex., and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4553. A bill to prohibit the disposal of certain surplus real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4554. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4555. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that survivors of certain deceased employees who had 30 years' service or more at the time of their deaths shall be entitled to survivor's benefits under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 4556. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefits payable thereunder, to lower from 65 to 60 the age at which such benefits become payable, and to provide that deductions on account of outside earnings shall not be made in the case of beneficiaries 60 years of age or older; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4557. A bill to amend the postal service laws relating to publication of attachments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4553. A bill to amend section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4559. A bill to amend section 1784 of title 28, United States Code, relating to publication of notice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4560. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4561. A bill to amend section 28 of the Bankruptcy Act of 1938 relating to designation of newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4562. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a) to provide for payment of not in excess of $75 to cover the cost of acquisition of a burial site for certain deceased veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4563. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may fix special compensation rates for certain seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4564. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general, medical, and surgical hospital of 500 beds at Russellville, Ala.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4565. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4566. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4567. A bill to prohibit sales from vending machines of postage stamps accompanied by matter bearing or containing advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 4568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4569. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 4570. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 4571. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to make certain emergency loans and to provide an improved emergency credit source for farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4572. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 so as to provide greater flexibility in making rural-electrification loans, by eliminating the requirement that half of the funds for such loans be allotted among the States, and removing the limit on the amount of unallotted funds which may be loaned in any State or in the Territories; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 4573. A bill authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4574. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4575. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 4576. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4577. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 4578. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the age requirement from age 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4579. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to repeal the duty on crude silica; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4580. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which widows' benefits become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4581. A bill to amend section 4091 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to imposition of tax upon lubricating oils) and to amend section 6416 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to overpayments of tax); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4582. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to deductions from gross income of amounts contributed to employees trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4583. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4584. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 4585. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4586. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army under certain circumstances to offer land in reservoir areas for sale to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items or provisions in appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution designating the third week in October of each year as National Farmers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to establish a national policy for the production and utilization of food and fiber, so as to make full economic use of the productive capacity of United States farms to improve domestic nutrition and clothing standards and buttress the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Committee on Government Operations on the organization and administration of the military research and development programs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. Res. 164. Resolution relative to the proper nomenclature of hurricanes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Res. 165. Resolution to express the felicitations of the House on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Hoboken, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Memorial of the State of Arkansas urging that action be taken by the Veterans' Administration to provide more beds and facilities for treatment of ex-servicemen who are in need of psychiatric care at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Roots, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Massachusetts House of Representatives to take action to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to house joint resolution 48, relating to expressing confidence in the foreign policy of the President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to name the body of water created by the backwaters of McNary Dam "Lake Wallula"; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pereira Moco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Antonio Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 4589. A bill for the relief of Janos (John) Kapka; wife, Edith; and children, Edith Rosemary, Georgette, Janos, Jr., Alice, Steven, and Mary Valery; and mother-in-law, Antonia Majer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 4590. A bill for the relief of Agosto Giampoali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4591. A bill for the relief of Marion A. Comegys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 4592. A bill for the relief of Katherine Wiedner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Loretta Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4594. A bill for the relief of Kathryn T. Lilly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4595. A bill for the relief of Slobodan Galeb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4596. A bill for the relief of Suye Uchida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 4597. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Goddard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 4598. A bill for the relief of Oldrich Prochazka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4599. A bill for the relief of Raymond Jean-Henri Rombeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4600. A bill for the relief of Antonio Hernandez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4601. A bill for the relief of Max Horkheimer and Rose Christine Horkheimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Edward Neal Fisher; Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4603. A bill for the relief of Edith C. Eldred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4604. A bill relating to the issuance of certain patents in fee to lands within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4605. A bill for the relief of Andrew Christopher Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4606. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iris Millicent Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4607. A bill for the relief of Joyce Delores Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4608. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 4609. A bill for the relief of Winsome Valarie Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4610. A bill for the relief of Victorena Ambrozene Plunkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4611. A bill for the relief of Bernard M. Silbert and others doing business as Almond Acres housing project; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 4612. A bill for the relief of Vladimir and Svatava Hoschl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

132. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Bottle Run Grange, No. 1301, Williamsport, Pa., in opposition to the universal military training bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

133. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, American Lithuanian Council, Gary, Ind., requesting the United States to use its influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

134. Also, petition of Francisco Cepero, Santurce, P. R., relative to Civil No. 95-4, *Francisco Cepero, petitioner,* v. *United States District Court for Southern District of New York;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Expanding Great Lakes Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on last Saturday, February 26, it was my pleasure to address the Antigo, Wis., Chamber of Commerce on the subject of the expanding Great Lakes frontier.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPANDING GREAT LAKES FRONTIER

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

It is a privilege to address this fine chamber of commerce regarding the expanding economic frontier of America.

I want to talk to you about the future prosperity which you of Antigo and which all of us in Wisconsin will enjoy in the years and decades to come.

What we are going to do is not, however, "put on rose-colored glasses" and assume that the future will be all bright and easy. Rather we are going to take a realistic look at the great challenge—the great opportunity which lies before us.

SEAWAY A GREAT BOOST

It is my belief that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, now scheduled to begin operations in the 1959 shipping season, will prove to be one of the most tremendous economic boosts in United States history.

It is my belief that it will be a great spur to midwestern industry and agriculture; that it will pump economic health into communities in States all along the Lakes and adjacent to those States.

POPULATION WILL SOAR IN LAKE AREA

Right now, in the Great Lakes area, 58 million people live in the 8 States having immediate access to the Lakes.

An additional 13 million people live in the 9 States which are generally regarded as tributaries, in an economic sense, to the Lakes.

We 71 million Americans will be the ones most immediately affected by the waterway.

But meanwhile America's population is zooming upward. Last year 4 million babies were born.

By the normal laws of population increase, our country as a whole is scheduled to jump from 163 million people today to around 285 million people 20 years from now—in 1975.

It is my belief that because of the seaway populations along the Lakes will increase even faster than the normal proportion of increase in other States provided—I repeat, provided—we take the necessary action to assure our progress.

NEW SEAWAY WILL BENEFIT US

Fortunately, such progress already is shaping up.

The lake area is going to benefit from seaway construction payrolls immediately, construction on harbors, construction on deepening of channels (such as are provided under the Wiley channel bill, S. 171).

Then, the lake area is going to attract many new industries, requiring direct access to the deepwater ports of the world.

It is going to attract increased tourist trade.

It is going to benefit from increased integration between America's economy and the economy of our Canadian good neighbor (which is also booming).

All this is scheduled to result, and yet I believe that it is only the beginning of the bright horizons before us.

OVERALL UNITED STATES OUTLOOK BRIGHT

If in the next decade the seaway were to come about all by itself, then the promise which the future holds would not be so completely bright.

But the fact of the matter is that the seaway is but a part of the overall expanding economic horizons affecting our country as a whole.

Right now, whole new American industries are developing.

I cite but two industries: The atomic energy industry, which will probably revolutionize electric power, medicine, and many other fields; and the industry known as automation; that is, the so-called automatic factories in which electronic machines perform operations which might otherwise be performed manually.

Now, it is a fact that all of these new industries will raise problems in turn.

They will require shifting of labor from one type of job and industry to other types, and there may be temporary labor surpluses.

But, so long as new industries are being created as fast as old industries feel the impact of sometimes adverse developments, then we can be sure there will be overall prosperity ahead for Wisconsin and America.

Now, I ask you, my friends in the Antigo area: How well are you and I planning to have this community benefit from the changing economic patterns of America—patterns involving, for example, atomic energy and automatic factories?

Can you contribute here in this area—directly or indirectly—to some of the subcontracting work involved in, say, these two enormous industries?

The fact of the matter is that each community must plan its place in the coming dynamic era.

You in this audience tonight are realists. You know that we cannot here in this area try to duplicate, even in part, the factories, the facilities, the resources, the transportation of some enormous metropolis. Even if that were possible, you wouldn't want it.

What you can and should do, however, is make Antigo's unique, specialized, tailored contribution to the coming era.

That means mobilizing the best minds in this community, the best civic organizers, and doers.

It means tapping your finest engineering, business, labor, and professional abilities so as to make Antigo's fullest contribution.

GETTING IN ON GROUND FLOOR

Most of the technical developments which I am describing are not going to happen overnight. They are going to take years and years. But the time to get in on the ground floor is now.

Recently, I have been in correspondence with an outstanding organization know as Atomic Industrial Forum, which consists of leading Wisconsin and other businesses which are planning for their atomic future.

This is the type of self-help, forward-looking organization which will help accelerate America's economic development. It is the type which is needed as we advance boldly and in a free-enterprise fashion to America's new economic frontiers.

So, too, I am hoping that in our State of Wisconsin we can, on a statewide basis, plan to attract the most modern type of industries to our State. We want industries with tremendous growth potential, industries which will need the type of skilled workers with which we in Wisconsin are blessed, industries which will need the stable, wholesome communities which we in Wisconsin have to offer.

That is why I have been in correspondence with the Governor's office, with the University of Wisconsin, and with other leading Wisconsin enterprises—private and public.

SO-CALLED NORMAL INDUSTRIES REQUIRE ATTENTION

But we don't need miracle fields, like atomic energy or automation, to assure our prosperity.

Even and indeed, especially, in so-called normal ordinary types of enterprise—manufacturing, wholesale, distribution, agriculture, we can and should plan to benefit from the St. Lawrence seaway.

WORKING OUT PROBLEMS WITH CANADA

But I want to repeat my word of caution regarding not becoming overoptimistic or going overboard, and assuming that prosperity will automatically be ours. And let me mention now that we still have to work out some seaway matters with our Canadian friends.

I want to say very frankly that there have been some differences with regard to duplicating seaway facilities between ourselves and our friends across the border. I have hope and confidence that these differences are properly going to be worked out satisfactorily. After all, there is no finer set of neighborly relations in the world than prevails between ourselves and our Canadian friends.

America tarried too long on approving the seaway. We were long overdue in coming in on the dual-nation, dual-purpose navigation and power project.

But now that we are going in, I hope that we and Canada will proceed on a basis of complete cooperation. I hope we will definitely avoid duplicating facilities and will put our respective dollars where they can be of best possible use for the good of both nations.

MIDWEST MUST PROTECT ITSELF

And just as I want America to speak up frankly in relation to her needs and those of Canada, so I want the Midwest to speak up frankly in relation to her needs.

Frankly, the Midwest has often been woefully negligent in protecting itself in the economic race.

Time after time, the Midwest has been treated like an orphan child when Uncle Sam has built new projects and poured in new Federal funds.

Time after time, the Midwest delegations in Congress have failed to work together as a team, while, by way of contrast, New England delegations or gulf coast or Northwest delegations have far exceeded us.

I don't mean to say that I want the Midwest to come "hat-in-hand" to Uncle Sam for handouts. We of the Midwest don't believe in handouts. We don't believe in looking to Washington for things which we should do and will do for ourselves.

But neither should we fail our obligations to make sure that we receive our fair share of Federal cooperation on projects in which there is a very definite national interest.

The Great Lakes connecting channels represent one such project. But there are many others which will directly benefit us.

Now, just how will the seaway affect Wisconsin?

It is my belief that Wisconsin particularly stands most immediately to gain from the seaway. Our State has probably planned more intensively for the seaway than most other States. We have been in the forefront of the battle for the seaway, and it is we who should be in the forefront of benefiting from it.

CHANNELS MUST BE DEEPENED

Our first priority must, of course, be to secure action on the legislation to which I have already referred. It is the legislation which not only I have introduced, but which numerous other Senators and Representatives have introduced—namely, to deepen the connecting channels to 27 feet. Otherwise we will not have a 27-foot deep waterway west of Lake Erie.

We can we quite sure that these channels are going to be deepened. That does not mean, however, that we should take them for granted. Actually, some of my colleagues from the South, for example, were more interested in getting Federal funds to supplement the hundreds of millions that they have poured into the gulf coast than they are interested in approving the relatively modest $109 millions which will be necessary for the Great Lakes connecting channels.

Now, as channel work is getting under way, it is our estimate that seaway traffic will reach 52 million tons by 1965.

This tonnage will be of great aid to all of Wisconsin, to its industries, and its farmers who will be able to ship their products inexpensively across the waters.

But, I reiterate, my friends, that each community, including Antigo, should not assume that benefits will flow automatically to us, should not assume that prosperity is going to drop into our laps.

In the first place, there is stiff competition for new business all along the lake area.

QUESTIONS ON ANTIGO'S FACILITIES

In the second place, even if there were not this competition, each community cannot prosper unless it analyzes and improves its own particular facilities and resources—soundly and carefully.

And so, we should ask ourselves, as I'm sure you of this Chamber have been asking yourselves:

What is our available industry and our available labor supply?

What are the trends affecting current Antigo business?

What can we do to hold what we have and improve what we have?

What land do we have available for expanded industries?

What housing is available for increased labor supply?

How modern is the machinery in our plants?

What is our access—today and tomorrow—to other means of transportation: railroad, road, and air?

These are but a few of the important questions which must be considered before Antigo or any other community can fully benefit from the waterway.

There is every reason for faith and confidence in the future. Wisconsin stands at the threshold of a new era. I am sure that with the leadership displayed at this meeting and meetings throughout our State, we can go forward to fully benefit from this great frontier.

CONCLUSION

I have tried during this address to comment on some of the highlights of the coming era. I have tried to paint a picture which I believe is realistic and sound, and not one based upon superoptimism or rose-colored glasses, especially in relation to so-called new miracle industries.

I believe, in summary, that the seaway is what you and I choose to make it. It is not going to drop prosperity into our laps. But it is going to make prosperity available to us if we have the brains and the initiative to realize it, as I believe we will.

Very shortly, there will be published in Washington a new St. Lawrence Seaway Manual which has been prepared at my direction. It will help answer some of the many questions which I know are in your minds about the seaway. I hope that you will write to my office for a copy of it. And I hope that on my return to Washington you will always feel free to contact me. Give me the benefit of your judgment, your constructive criticism, your advice. I will be happy to hear from you always.

Thanks again for your attention and good luck to you all.

Drought-Relief Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD criticisms of the handling of the drought-relief program by the Department of Agriculture. Most of these criticisms have been made by those who do not have a clear understanding of the problem or the steps taken to alleviate the hardships caused by drought throughout the country. Congress has passed several acts to help meet the distressing situation caused by drought and it has been the earnest desire of those charged with the administration of the programs to so administer them within the law as to give the greatest relief possible.

I am placing at the close of my remarks a table showing the number of cases and the funds expended through the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1955, and in the case of loans, feed, and hay programs and wind-erosion control, July 1, 1954, through February 4, 1955.

The charge has been made that the emergency credit made available to farmers in drought-stricken areas has been entirely inadequate. However, since emergency loans were first authorized in

1949 pursuant to Public Law 38, 81st Congress, a total of 157,940 loans amounting to $212,274,468 have been made to enable farmers in designated areas to continue their normal operations. Since the inception of the special livestock-loan programs, which was authorized in 1953, a total of 5,649 loans amounting to $49,702,328 have been made to livestock operators. Most of these loans, as well as a majority of the emergency loans, have been made as a result of the drought conditions which have existed throughout much of the country. The following table reflects the activity under these programs by years for the country as a whole:

	Emergency loans		Special livestock loans	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
United States:				
1949	362	$974,948	------	----------
1950	25,360	29,833,887	------	----------
1951	13,274	19,198,873	------	----------
1952	21,226	31,488,774	------	----------
1953	35,442	43,225,068	------	----------
1954	42,449	57,984,342	3,985	$37,282,206
1955 through Feb. 4	19,827	29,568,576	1,664	12,420,122
Total	157,940	212,274,468	5,649	49,702,328

These loans have been made to farmers and stockmen who have been unable to obtain elsewhere the credit required for them to continue their normal operations and the volume of loans made is an indication that the emergency credit programs of the Department have been used fully in meeting the needs of farmers who have suffered from the drought and similar conditions.

Uniform regulations have been issued with respect to all of the emergency lending programs of the Department and these regulations apply in all of the States. The Farmers Home Administration emergency lending authorities are used in meeting the needs of small farmers as well as the needs of large operators who qualify for assistance. The refinancing of existing debts under our emergency lending authorities is prohibited. To do otherwise would not be consistent with the acts under which the various loans were authorized. Likewise Farmers Home Administration emergency lending authorities are not used to compensate applicants for the actual losses which they have suffered as a result of the drought or similar conditions. Emergency and special livestock loans were authorized for the purpose of enabling qualified applicants to continue their normal operations. Consequently, the amount advanced to each applicant is limited to what is necessary for that purpose. The amount actually advanced may or may not be in excess of the actual losses suffered by the applicant, depending upon the particular circumstances involved.

The act under which special livestock loans were authorized states specifically that such loans will be made only to those applicants "who have a good record of operations but are unable temporarily to get the credit they need from recognized lenders and have a reasonable chance of working out of their difficulties with supplementary financing." A similar restriction applies to all of the other types of emergency loans and it would not be consistent to approve a loan for any applicant in a position to obtain his credit elsewhere or to any applicant who did not have a reasonable prospect for success with the assistance of the loan. It is not intended for these loans to compete with credit extended by banks and other private lenders but rather to supplement the credit available from those sources. When loans are made other creditors are urged to cooperate in keeping the farmer or stockman in business so that he will have an opportunity to recover from his losses and in a relatively short period return to his usual source of credit. Therefore, there is no justification or authority for making loans to applicants who are able to obtain their credit elsewhere or to applicants who do not have a reasonable prospect for success.

When loans include funds for the production of cash crops, the amounts advanced for that purpose generally are scheduled for repayment out of the income to be derived from the crops produced. Loans are scheduled for repayment in this manner as it is the generally accepted principle that creditors advancing funds for production purposes are entitled to the first claim upon the income produced. In situations in which an applicant's prospective income will be abnormally low because of the drought or other conditions or when his expenses will be abnormally high for similar reasons, provision is made for the scheduling of amounts advanced for annual recurring expenses over a period longer than 12 months.

In general, there have been two chief criticisms of the agricultural conservation program.

First. Fair prices of conservation materials were discontinued.

Second. Green manure, small grains, and so forth, were limited to land shifted from production of crops because of acreage allotments.

The determination and posting of the maximum fair price at which ACP would purchase materials—in this case seed—for conservation work was required under law until enactment of Public Law 690, 83d Congress. It then became permissive and could be used whenever and wherever it was apparent that a maximum was needed to prevent unjustifiable increases in prices of conservation materials or services. Instructions were sent to States by the Acting Secretary, September 3, 1954, canceling existing fair prices and giving instructions for their re-establishment where needed. Conditions for establishing were:

First. Supply through local sources inadequate to meet anticipated demand.

Second. Inadequate supply will result in commercial prices that are excessive in relation to such demand.

In drought areas there was a special practice (F-3). This practice permitted use of cost-sharing for cover crops without regard to the shifting of acreage from other crops. The rate of cost-sharing for this practice was determined by the State and county committees as that rate necessary to obtain adequate performance under prevailing conditions without regard to the 50 percent of cost provision.

In order to further alleviate the drought situation where 1954 funds were not adequate, authority was given to open the 1955 program in the late summer and fall of 1954 with the use of funds allocated for the 1955 program.

On January 27 and 28 a conference was held here in Washington, attended by one representative from each of the drought States. In most cases, prior to January 27, representatives of the Federal agencies had conferred at the State level in order to enable their conferee to reflect the thinking of all agencies.

Several times during the conference here the statement was made to the effect that the emergency drought measures carried out in 1954 under the agricultural conservation program were most helpful and no doubt more productive of lasting good than any of the other emergency measures.

The statement has been made that the present emergency feed program is inadequate in that farmers, particularly the small farmers, cannot obtain sufficient relief.

The present emergency feed program was designed to utilize the regular channels of trade to the maximum extent practicable. Aside from the general policy that private channels of trade should be used insofar as practicable, there were other compelling reasons for utilizing the type of program. It was clearly the intent of Congress that feed grains should be placed in the farmers' hands as rapidly as possible. This type of program was designed to take advantage of the feed grains in dealers hands and elsewhere in the pipeline so that farmers could obtain feed without any delay.

It is probable that at least a month's time was saved on the average as compared to delivering feed direct to farmers from CCC stocks. It was also realized that to furnish feed grains to farmers in designated areas gratis would tend to greatly disturb the national price structures by offering incentives to obtain feed in large enough quantities to permit resale at a profit. It was felt that the subsidy rate when coupled with the provisions for credit and the provisions of the hay program would make it possible for farmers, both large and small, to retain their basic herds.

It has been suggested that the Department should furnish CCC stocks of feed grains or seed direct to farmers for the purpose of planting pastures. This type of program was also considered but the same delays could be expected in placing the feed grains and seed stocks in farmers hands as outlined above. Furthermore, to furnish these direct to farmers would be putting the Government in direct competition with the long-established channels of trade.

Large supplies of hairy vetch have been held by CCC and a stock of 26 million pounds remains in inventory. These seeds have been and are, at the present time, offered for sale at $12.65 per hundred pounds. CCC sold several million pounds of hairy vetch in fall of 1954 at

the above price, which is the market price in wholesale carlots.

The crimson clover seed held by CCC was mostly acquired from the 1953 crop in February and March of 1954. This seed was sold by CCC at prices that returned to CCC its total cost in the seed and this action kept the price of the seed to the consuming farmer much lower than would have been the case had CCC not owned the seed.

The alfalfa seed owned by CCC amounted to 37 million in January 1954. This seed had been offered at $37.50 and $43, which is more than CCC costs for nearly a year with few sales. It was reduced $35 and $40, which is the support price at which it was acquired. These prices are market prices for carlots in producing areas as is evidenced by the fact that CCC has at present 7,700,000 pounds and sales are not active.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree with me that Congress has wisely provided ways to alleviate a serious drought situation that has extended all the way from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean. It is my belief and I think will be concurred in by most Members of Congress, that the hardships of drought have been very grave and that they continue to be a threat to a great many communities throughout the Nation. It may be that additional legislation will be required. However up to the present I think you and Members of Congress from these States will agree that the drought relief program as authorized by Congress and administered by the Department of Agriculture has been of untold help in relieving a most distressing situation.

United States Department of Agriculture drought program (fiscal year 1955) [1]*—Loans, feed, and hay programs, and wind erosion control (July 1, 1954, through Feb. 4, 1955)*

	Loans						Feed and hay assistance						Allocations to States for emergency wind erosion control measures under the 1954 agricultural conservation program [4]
	Production disaster		Economic disaster		Special livestock		Emergency feed program [2]				Commitments for advances to States under hay distribution agreements [3]	Number of counties	
							Purchase orders issued to farmers	Hundredweight of feed	Dealers certificates issued				
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount			Number	Amount			
States designated under Public Law 875:													
Alabama	581	$562,510	23	$38,425	15	$44,085	21,356	1,398,699	3,958	$972,330	$500,000	58	
Arkansas	244	293,985	1,119	1,442,430	118	103,365	134,541	4,099,431	10,233	2,770,369	500,000	69	
Colorado	209	395,350	28	66,080	168	1,566,285	10,848	1,210,256	1,875	654,125	500,000	24	$2,900,000
Georgia	753	1,532,580			10	34,815	15,533	1,509,654	3,086	929,504	500,000	124	
Kansas	66	64,265	380	614,015	76	814,265	26,338	2,204,072	4,030	1,442,187	500,000	43	4,100,000
Louisiana	197	192,835	299	292,910	2	750	13,217	504,089	1,324	262,444	500,000	28	
Mississippi	517	586,050	687	821,335			31,812	1,540,317	3,787	862,678	500,000	58	
Missouri	477	518,490	1,023	944,295	263	382,950	121,713	3,889,597	9,400	2,643,444	500,000	82	
Nevada	3	6,525			9	252,735	587	151,874	145	95,570	500,000	14	
New Mexico	72	122,405	118	289,370	175	1,669,655	4,885	795,101	914	497,360	500,000	19	1,600,000
North Carolina	702	573,490	1,129	1,456,251	1	1,600	10,177	354,359	883	195,385	500,000	39	
Oklahoma	110	103,610	707	881,351	146	1,062,585	186,990	6,677,364	16,196	4,166,641	500,000	77	550,000
South Carolina	2,184	1,906,780	1	160	1	3,000	13,421	723,766	2,033	505,307	500,000	46	
Tennessee	105	67,030	253	161,760	10	8,800	42,210	2,334,166	4,725	1,461,497	500,000	90	
Texas	2,445	4,476,222	4,759	9,506,546	492	4,082,471	176,824	9,080,242	19,463	5,665,833	1,000,000	127	4,000,000
Utah					16	406,526	781	135,323	110	75,280		9	
Virginia	12	29,700	38	30,595	5	40,400	2,700	166,799	167	44,667	500,000	33	
Wyoming	23	32,355	1	2,500	23	371,640	7,054	1,350,239	1,589	732,743	500,000	19	
Other States	387	987,266	175	569,105	134	1,574,195							
Total	9,087	12,451,448	10,740	17,117,128	1,664	12,420,122	820,987	38,125,348	83,918	23,977,364	9,000,000	959	13,150,000

[1] This report covers the States in which counties are currently designated as drought disaster areas for emergency feed and hay assistance. A separate report is available, as of June 30, 1954, covering activities under the drought program in the fiscal year 1954.

[2] This reflects activity under the 1954 feed program. In addition, there were obligations of $79,500 for Colorado and $491,500 for New Mexico incurred in the fiscal year 1955 under the 1953 feed program which was terminated in these 2 States as of July 15, 1954. The cost of the subsidies under the 1954 program is being borne by Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to sec. 301 of Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.); the administrative costs are being borne under Public Law 175 funds.

[3] Charged to the balance of $15,257,747 of the $50 million appropriated to carry out sec. 2 (d) of Public Law 38, as amended by Public Law 115, 83d Cong.

[4] Represents allocations made from the $15 million provided by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954. An allocation of $180,000 from these funds was also made to Nebraska.

The Alabama Coosa River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress legislation was authorized to permit the building of five hydroelectric dams on the Coosa-Alabama Rivers system, and it has long been evident that a 9-foot channel should be constructed from Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. This improvement is in great demand and should be done at the time the dams are being constructed, by providing for locks on the dams and by dredging these rivers while the hydroelectric dams are being constructed. This would result in great savings to the Federal Government. In order for this work to proceed in an orderly, economical, and efficient way, a new survey of the river should be made by the Corps of Engineers, and I am especially grateful that a public meeting has been called under the sponsorship of Mayor W. A. Gayle, of the city of Montgomery, the chamber of commerce of the capital city, and the Coosa River Improvement Association.

On Saturday, March 5, 1955, public officials, businessmen, industrial leaders, and others of the cities and towns which will be affected by this improvement will meet in the city of Montgomery for the purpose of organizing a movement to begin work on this important development. An outstanding engineer, Lieutenant General Pick, United States Army (retired), will address the group at its luncheon meeting.

I have prepared a statement on this important development which gives the background and history of the improvements that have been made, and of the efforts that have been put forth in the past to bring about the realization of this highly important development. The statement is as follows:

THE ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER BASIN

THE RIVER

The Alabama-Coosa River is one of the principal rivers of the Southeast extending from the Blue Ridge Mountains of northwest Georgia and southeast Tennessee southwesterly across the Piedmont Plateau to the lowlands of the gulf coastal plain in Alabama and draining an area of 22,800 square miles.

The river basin has all the natural and climatic resources essential for economic progress. It has a moderate climate with an abundant but well distributed rainfall. It has fertile soil. It has many of the basic raw materials within its soil, so essential for future industrial progress. The human resource—an adequate supply of labor—is also available for industrial progress.

The potential hydroelectric development of the river basin is great. At the present time, there is an installed capacity of 564,000 kilowatts of hydropower in the 6 plants owned by the Alabama Power Co. together with the Allatoona plant built by the Corps of Engineers. This past session of Congress (83d) Public Law 436 was enacted which will permit the Alabama Power Co. to construct an additional 5 dams on the Coosa River and which is expected will add 360,000 kilowatts to the Alabama Power Co.'s capacity; these dams are to be constructed within 10 years from the date of the commencement of construction of the first dam.

At the present there are frequent floods in the river basin and though they are not severe, they cannot help but retard the economic growth of the basin. About 526,000 of the acres are subject to overflow which

could be avoided by the construction of certain flood projects in connection with the development of the dredging of the river and the construction of the proposed dams and hydroelectric plants.

HISTORY

The development of the Coosa River has been the subject of study by the Corps of Engineers for the past 80 years. The Corps of Engineers of the Army first began investigating and reporting on the practicability of improving the Coosa River for navigation in 1870. The Corps of Engineers made a study of the Alabama River in 1875. The first improvement was a series of locks and dams in the Coosa River to enable shallow-draft navigation to reach Rome, Ga. The first really significant step toward overall basin development in the Alabama-Coosa River system was the 308 report made in 1934. This report recommended a system of locks and dams on the Alabama River and on the Coosa River above the existing power dams, and locks in the power dams. It also recommended a 9-foot deep channel for navigation upstream to Rome, Ga., 650 miles above Mobile, and additional power.

The feasibility of several dams for power on the tributaries was also investigated. A system of levees was built at Rome to control floods, and another flood-control project has been built at Prattville, Ala. Great progress was made when the Allatoona Dam and Reservoir was built on the Etowah River, 48 miles above Rome.

In 1941 the Corps of Engineers submitted a report recommending the adoption of a comprehensive program of development of the basin's water resources in accordance with plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers with such modifications thereon from time to time as seemed advisable. This was adopted by Congress and approved by the President in 1945 and is the present authorization for the Corps of Engineers' program.

The 83d Congress enacted Public Law 436 to permit the Alabama Power Co. to construct five dams along the river.

OUTLINE OF LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The Corps of Engineers 308 report was made in 1934. It presented a long-range plan for development of the river. (H. Doc. No. 66, 74th Cong.)

House Document No. 414, 77th Congress recommended a comprehensive project including a deeper channel for navigation.

Hearings held on Alabama-Coosa River in the 77th Congress before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. (November 5 and 6, 1941.)

Hearings held in 78th Congress:

1. Before House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, October 19-20, 1943.

2. Before Senate Committee on Commerce, April and May 1944. (Held on H. R. 3961.)

The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945: It authorized appropriations for the implementation of the plans as set forth in House Document No. 414, 77th Congress.

Public Law 436, 83d Congress authorized the Alabama Power Co. to build a series of dams on the river.

THE FUTURE OF ALABAMA LIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER

One of the firmest cornerstones of Alabama's future lies in the development of the great resources of the Alabama-Coosa River Basin. This promising future can be attained only by the eventual development of the Alabama and Coosa Rivers and the long hoped for and dreamed of 9-foot deep-water channel from Rome, Ga., to Mobile.

The fulfillment of the dreams Alabamians have had for this magnificent river basin for these many years would provide a significant contribution to the defense bulwark of our Nation—allowing for the fast, safe, yet inexpensive movement of vital defense elements such as petroleum, chemicals, pulp, ore, and building materials; it would provide economic advantages to the industries already in the area through lowering their operating costs; and it would attract new commerce and industries to develop the abundant natural resources within the river basin.

The present shallow depths of the Alabama River generally limit commerce to small movements of gravel, sand, logs, and pulpwood. The Alabama and Coosa Rivers must be channeled because of the advantages which will accrue to Alabama and its people, the Nation, and its citizens.

RESOURCES OF THE RIVER BASIN

Industry

Textiles: Cotton processing is important; silk and rayon knitting are prominent. There are approximately 130 textile mills employing about 43,000 workers.

Steel and iron: There are steel and iron mills in the river basin towns of Gadsden, Anniston, and Rome which use coal and iron ore mined in the surrounding area. This industry employs about 10,000 men in 33 plants.

The vast Cahaba coalfield of St. Clair, Bibb, and Tuscaloosa Counties which produce great amounts of coal would be made available if the coal had the advantage of reduced transportation rates afforded by river transportation. The same situation would be true of the great Warrior coalfield lying in the counties of Walker, Blount, Cullman, Winston, Marion, Fayette, and Tuscaloosa.

The steel mills would use Venezuelan iron ore and ore from other foreign countries coming into Alabama through the port of Mobile, thereby giving the counties served by the Alabama-Coosa, an equal and fair chance with the counties served by the Tombigbee and Warrior system which is now being made navigable.

Paper: Paper manufacture consumes vast quantities of water, involves a difficult waste problem, and requires low-cost, dependable, bulk transportation to and from the mill. The waters of the Coosa River plus the nearby supply of pulp has aided in the success of the Coosa River Newsprint Co.

Chemical: In the river basin there are approximately 64 establishments engaged in the manufacture of chemical products, including fertilizer plants, the Childersburg powder works, and cottonseed-oil mills.

General: There are about 70 concerns of the glass, clay, and stone group of industry which are engaged in the manufacture of cut stone, marble, building brick, and tile.

Agriculture

The abundant rainfall and fertile soil make farming desirable in this area. About 40 percent of the population is engaged in agricultural pursuits. Cotton, corn, peanuts, potatoes, velvet beans, and cattle raising are the most important.

Mineral resources

The Alabama-Coosa River Basin acreage contains many valuable minerals; bauxite, Selma chalk (for cement), clays, coal, arsenic ores, fluxing materials, fuller's earth, gold, lead graphite, granite, marble, slate, mica, ochre, lime, manganese ore, iron ore (both brown and gray), gravel, sand, silica sand, and asbestos.

At the present time because of the high transportation costs, only clay, coal, marble, lime, iron, gravel, and sand are being produced. Decreased water transportation costs would undoubtedly make it more profitable to mine bauxite, cement, coal, iron ore, fluxing materials, fuller's earth, graphite, and manganese.

Human resources

There is an adequate labor supply in the river basin—much of it due to the influx of war workers, many of whom stayed on. The number of workers has also increased due to the movement of new industries into the area.

It is interesting to note that populations demonstrate a tendency to follow water. In northern New York State where water transportation on the New York State barge-canal system parallels the railroad, the population is 5½ times greater than the population in southern New York which has only railway service. Almost three-fourths of the 100 largest American cities are either sea, Great Lakes, or river ports with rail connections. Take the case of Houston, Tex., 50 miles from deep water in the Gulf of Mexico. In 1910 Houston's population was 78,000. Today it is 600,000. The city is next to the largest port in the Nation, second only to New York, and this is due to the dredged ship channel from the gulf to Houston.

THE ADVANTAGES OF WATER TRANSPORTATION

In recent years, freight business on the Nation's waterways has been increasing between 10 to 15 percent a year; in 1953 the waterways, excluding Great Lakes, transported 6 percent of the total ton-mileage. Traffic on the inland waterways has nearly tripled since 1946. Over the past 20 years, ton-miles have increased on the inland waterways at the average rate of 3.25 billion a year. On the Mississippi, traffic rose from 36 million tons in 1942 to 80 million tons in 1953.

The greatest advantage water freight has over other methods of transportation is cost. The average cost of railroad equipment to move 15,000 tons of freight would be $3,220,551. The average cost of equipment to move 15,000 tons of freight on the inland waterways would be $930,000. In the 22-year period ending June 30, 1948, the transportation savings on the 15 largest and most active waterways, as computed by the Army engineers, totaled over 2.5 billion dollars.

As another example, take the shipment of a ton of wheat from Minneapolis to Knoxville. By rail it costs $17.69 but by water costs only $5.55.

This is why new industries moving south every day would prefer to settle along the banks of a river where it can take advantage of the low costs of water transportation rates. In the first 3 months of 1954, 85 waterside development projects—all costing over $100,000 and some well into the millions—were announced. Within the last 2 years over $3 billion in new plant investments has been made along the banks of the Ohio River and its tributaries.

In 1952 the midcontinent of the United States surpassed the industrial East as a producing area—and why? Because industries have been leaving the East and settling along the inland waterways. It should be remembered that the railroads serving the river-port cities have also benefited by thousands of additional car loadings from industry and by greatly increased movement of in- and out-bound consumer goods and passengers.

ALABAMA'S FUTURE LIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER

Full development of the Alabama-Coosa River would bring the river-basin area adequate hydroelectric power for industrial purposes; employment for its people; cheap water-rate transportation; freedom from floods; and would provide wonderful recreational areas for its people to enjoy. The river and its basin possess all the natural resources of people, water, and minerals, and all it needs is the direction of man in order that this area can make a significant contribution to the national defense and general economic progress of the State of Alabama and the entire Nation. Every dollar spent will bring more than its own value in return. It is estimated that the river and harbor and flood-control program accomplished to date by the Corps of Engineers has returned to the Nation more than $2 in value for every dollar expended.

I would like to urge that the State of Alabama and the Federal Government jointly pursue the full development of the Alabama-Coosa River, including a 9-foot channel from Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. Such an undertaking would be beneficial not only to the immediate people and industries within the river basin but to Georgia, Alabama, and to the Nation.

I would like to encourage the State of Alabama and the Federal Government to undertake this project at the same time that the Alabama Power Co. is building five dams along the river in order that the work might be coincided and accomplished with the least amount of cost. Perhaps the State could assume the responsibility for building the docks in the various ports under the already established State Waterways Commission. The cities could also participate in the construction of such docks and warehouses. The counties and State jointly could contribute to the building of access roads to service the ports. The Federal Government would dredge the river and build the channel, and work on the flood-control installations.

Alabama should no longer ignore the bounty of this magnificent river system. Alabama must act now.

Girl Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD a statement about the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. I know that all Members of the Congress are familiar with the fine work that is being accomplished by the Girl Scout organization. However, I feel it is appropriate that we give special recognition to this worthwhile group and take note of some very interesting facts about the Girl Scouts.

During the week of March 6 to 12 the Nation will observe Girl Scout Week. As the organization of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America begin their 43d year, there are 2,350,000 girls and adults registered as members of the organization. In my own State of South Dakota there are well over 6,000 Girl Scouters.

South Dakota is known as the Land of Infinite Variety, because we are blessed with a variety of terrain and activities that are ideal for outdoor enthusiasts. Anne L. New, director of public information for national headquarters of the Girl Scouts, informs me that the State and National parks in South Dakota will no doubt be visited by many Girl Scouts during the coming camping season. I know that all of the other States will also experience considerable activity by the Girl Scouts as they develop resourcefulness through camping and outdoor living.

I like the Girl Scout theme for 1955, which is "Believe, Belong, Build."

Girl Scouts believe by knowing their country's history and traditions, by constantly renewing their promise to God and their country, by adhering to the Girl Scout laws, which emphasize the spiritual foundations underlying our society.

Girl Scouts belong by entering into scouting's free association of girls and adults, by learning through actual experience to accept people on the basis of their essential worth, by enjoying the personal satisfactions of belonging to a group with worthy objectives and a constructive program of learning by doing.

Girl Scouts build as each girl in scouting develops her own best capacities under the guidance of trained and devoted adults, as she explores her community and its resources and contributes to community welfare in line with her growing experience and ability, as she learns the duties and responsibilities of citizenship and strives to achieve the Girl Scout goal of becoming a happy, resourceful individual who is willing to share her abilities as a citizen in her home, her community, her country, and the world.

Some 10 million women have enjoyed Girl Scout experiences and certainly the training they have received through the organization has helped them to be better citizens. The Girl Scout organization is helping to build a strong America, and it is fitting that this Congress give the Girl Scouts recognition and support.

Hoover Commission Latest Report a Blow to Many Existing Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the new Hoover Commission report to the Congress on personnel and civil service, in effect, is a repeat of the job and the recommendations made some 4 years ago by the original Hoover Commission.

Certainly the position taken in this new report is a repeat performance so far as the basic rights of veterans are concerned, inasmuch as the recommendations propose a further whittling away of the vital veterans' preference rights under existing law.

Foremost among the recommendations again put before the Congress, is the abandonment of the rule of three, the means by which initial selection for jobs in the Federal service has traditionally been made. The substitute offered would be a rule of five, which plainly means there will be no veterans' preference of any consequence—a system of select any and pass over others. A further recommendation is made for the elimination of the numerical rating and the present register system—the substitute offered being some loose device called the category system.

The Hoover Commission would also limit veterans' special appeal rights and otherwise whittle away at the statutes.

The recommendations in this regard should again be defeated. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD, along with my remarks, an editorial entitled "Hoover Commission Latest Report a Blow to Many Existing Veterans' Laws," which appears in the current issue of the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, a publication of the veterans of the United States.

The article is as follows:

HOOVER COMMISSION LATEST REPORT BLOW AT MANY EXISTING VETERAN LAWS—CALLS FOR REDUCTION IN COMPENSATION FOR SOME SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES—WOULD DENY HOSPITALIZATION TO NONSERVICE GROUP AND ASKS FOR PROMISSORY NOTES FOR CARE IN CERTAIN CASES—HOSPITAL PROGRAM CUT

The Hoover Commission last Sunday night released its special study on the vastness of Federal health and medical services, and recommended radical surgery of such services.

The Commission's economy knife was directed chiefly against medical services of the Veterans' Administration, but other medical programs such as those of the Armed Forces, Public Health Service, and other Federal arms also would be overhauled and curtailed.

The report, which deviated considerably on some major points from the recommendations of the Commission's medical task force which spearheaded the study, recommended:

That VA hospitalization and other medical services be confined only to service-connected ailments, and to those veterans with nonservice-associated ills who are truly indigent—and are proved to be so needy they can't go elsewhere.

That even needy veterans with non-service-associated illnesses be required to sign some non-interest-bearing promissory note, obligating them to pay for their hospitalization or other medical care at a future date should their financial state improve.

That the whole VA system of disability pension ratings for service-connected infirmities be made more realistic to the effect of such disabilities on earning capacity. (The Commission cited, as example, that present VA practice allows 30 percent disability, with pension of a minimum of $50 a month, for amputation of a great toe in service-connected cases.)

That there be more cross-servicing between the military hospitals to better fill some hospitals and eliminate others now only partially filled. Thus, sailors would be admitted to Army hospitals; soldiers might go to Air Force hospitals and, in general, admissions would be made for convenience rather than according to the kind of uniform the patient wears.

That merchant seamen patients be no longer eligible for care at public expense. These seamen are now cared for at 12 Public Health Service hospitals at a cost estimated by the Commission's medical task force at about $12 million a year.

That all plans to build any more VA general hospitals, excepting those actually under construction or contracted for construction, be withdrawn. This would forever kill the hopes of those fighting for a new VA hospital for the Washington area.

To effect many of its major recommendations, the Commission urged creation of a Federal Health Advisory Council to coordinate Government medical policies and oversee systematic cross servicings among the 66 administrative units now having medical functions.

The Commission also asked the Government to develop a voluntary, contributory system of medical and hospital insurance

for its civilian employees, rather than provide the medical services and hospitalizations in Government institutions.

The report complained that Federal agencies have assumed more and more responsibilities for complete or partial health and hospital care until they now service some 30 million Americans. The cost of such servicings, the report noted, now exceeds $4 billion, including $2,030,000,000 for disability allowances under "a cumbersome system which breeds inefficiency and huge waste."

Unless something is done, these costs and coverages will increase, it was stated in the Commission's report.

The medical report is the latest of a series the Commission is making on Government reorganization. An earlier medical task force for the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government made similar findings, in March 1949, on "enormous and expanding Federal medical activities, devoid of any central plan."

The report similarly complained that in addition to the wastage, the Federal medical services also drain off physicians and dentists from private practice. In 1954, the newest medical task force estimated, more than 6 percent of the active medical personnel in this country was employed by the Government.

The Commission's report is scheduled to be presented to Congress this week and since it touches on so many controversial points it is certain to meet many objections from legislators.

One, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, a nonveteran, who also is a member of the Commission, filed the sole Commission dissent, which accompanied release of the report and recommendations.

Congressman HOLIFIELD called the report recommendations "wholly unrealistic," and said he was opposed to curtailment of any hospital and medical facilities "in the face of impending civilian defense needs."

The Commission's report differed radically from that of its own task force in the recommendations for medical care of veterans with non-service-connected ailments. In effect, the Commission recommended a form of "means test" of financial ability to pay. These veterans, in non-service-connected illnesses, who could pay for part or all of VA hospitalization costs, would have to do so. Others would have to sign obligations for future payments, if they could afford this repayment in the future.

The task force, however, had recommended a form of GI bill of health rights which would offer veterans free care for even non-service-connected ills occurring within 3 years after separation from the service. After that, except for service-associated ailments, veterans would be on their own.

As now practiced, the Commission said, veterans with non-service-connected disabilities can get VA care only if beds in VA hospitals are available, and only if they sign a statement of inability to pay for such care. However, the Commission pointed out, the Veterans' Administration is prohibited by law from challenging such can't-pay statements.

On the task force's 3-year limit on VA hospitalization rights, the Commission said it believes that "the sentiment of American people is that a sick and really indigent veteran should be provided care in a Veterans' Administration hospital." But it recommended that the can't-pay statement should be verified by VA investigators, and that VA be authorized to collect wherever such statements are not substantiated.

"It is difficult to believe," the Commission said in its report, "that all of the approximately 369,000 such veterans given care last year were actually unable to pay for at least part of their hospital and in-patient medical care."

Eisenhower's So-Called Power Partnership Reverses Half a Century of Public Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the principle of low-cost public power with preference to municipalities and other public agencies has been stated at least 13 times in acts of Congress dating from 1906. In other words, for almost 50 years the Federal Government has consistently followed a policy of selling publicly produced power at the lowest possible rates, giving preference to municipalities and public agencies. Furthermore, that has been the policy of the executive agencies in the generation and sale of electric energy during all of that time, including the present administration up to and including the issuance of the power statement made by the Department of the Interior with the approval of the President in August of 1953.

The adoption of the so-called power partnership program therefore is a reversal of almost half a century of power policy in the Federal Government. It is a complete reversal of the low-cost power principle and a complete abandonment of the preference to municipalities and other public agencies. If this new policy is adopted and put into effect, there will be no more low-cost public power, and public agencies will no longer be able to secure such power on a preference basis, or at all.

The reversal of this historic policy in the Federal Government will have the effect of turning over for the exclusive benefit and profit of the private power monopoly the major yet-to-be-developed hydroelectric resources of the Nation. The huge investments of the Federal taxpayers in these great projects will be in a large measure handed over for the profitable use of the private utilities.

It gives the private utilities the benefit of the Government's low interest rate on the storage features of these projects used for power—no doubt the power companies would be glad to have the Federal Government build the storage features on all their projects on the same basis.

This would enrich the treasuries of the private utilities but it will leave the general public without the benefit of a low-cost power supply. The private power monopolies, operating with what amounts to a guaranteed profit on their investment, will be able to charge the power consumers whatever price they choose to fix or can wangle from the various State agencies established for the purpose of regulating power rates. In my opinion, this is exactly the opposite direction to which the American people want to go.

CVP PROJECT CITED

An example of how this policy will operate can be readily seen by asking what would have happened if such a power-partnership principle had been applied in the construction of the Central Valley project. Under those circumstances, the private power company would have built the powerhouses at Shasta and Keswick, paid the Federal Government a price for storing the water in Shasta Dam, and then distributed and sold the power at its established commercial rate throughout its service area in California. There would have been no low-cost Government public power for the farmers in the irrigation districts in California, or for the Federal installations and the municipalities using that power at the present time. There would have been no low-cost public power in the market with which to compare the rates of the private utility, thus forcing a more favorable contract as has been done for the city of Redding. There would be no power to operate the pumps at the delta to lift the water of the Central Valley project to the San Joaquin Valley, unless the Federal Government turned around and bought some of its own power back from the private utility for that purpose, presumably at a much higher rate than is presently being charged the farmers of the San Joaquin Valley for the use of power. The revenues from power which presently are used to subsidize the irrigation development in the San Joaquin Valley would be nonexistent. In short, the Central Valley project would never have been built and today would not be serving the needs and growth of the State of California.

Even a more dramatic example is the possible application of this principle on the power development on the Columbia River. Great industrial development has followed the low-cost available power in the Northwest; however, had private power companies taken over the development of these powerhouses, the cash receipts they paid to the Federal Government for storing the water would be returned to the United States Treasury and the power would have been sold on the market at the going commercial rate. The great aluminum plants that contributed so much during the Second World War would not have grown up around that kind of a power market.

PUBLIC POWER AN ASSET

There is little real distinction between the taxpayers and the power consumers of an area. Everybody who turns on a light pays taxes in one form or another, and everybody who turns on a light pays a light bill. Low-cost public power produced in this area is a rebate on taxes to every consumer who turns on a light. If that public power is turned over to a private utility, the light consumer pays the commercial rate and the private power company puts the profit in its pocket. Low-cost power is an asset in every area in which it is produced and distributed. History has shown that the volume of use of electricity and industrial growth rises in proportion to the reduction in power rates. That has been true not only in the Northwest, but in the TVA area. Turning the powerhouses on the proposed Trinity River project over to the P. O. & E. Co. is an

assessment against every man who uses an electric light or electric power in his business in this whole area.

While belaboring the partnership idea at home, and calling on the local people to build their own projects, no such philosophy is being advocated or put in effect overseas. We are committed to spend nearly $2 billion—1.7 billion—for irrigation and power developments in foreign lands. This compares with roughly two and one-half billion—$2.4—spent in over a half century in this country. Not one penny of this foreign expenditure will be repaid, principal or interest, while here at home repayment is becoming the main test for new projects. Why has our Government agreed to give away nearly as much for irrigation and power development in 6 years of the Marshall plan as we spent in 50 years of reclamation here at home? Obviously because it is a good thing for the economies of those countries we are trying to help. I am in favor of doing a little something for America too as we go along—and without a lot of argument about partnership, and how soon the project is going to pay back to the last penny.

PROGRAM INCONSISTENT

But the inconsistency in this administration's clampdown on irrigation and power development does not end there. The projects under construction in Europe today with your money are all for power—nothing for irrigation—a million one hundred and fifty-five thousand kilowatts—1,155,000 kilowatts. If anyone suggests that the Federal Government here build a steam plant, a howl goes up to high heaven. But in Europe most of the power being built is steam power—900,000 kilowatts of it, only 255,000 in hydroelectric power. We have had knockdown and dragout fights over the Federal Government building transmission lines, but in our foreign aid program we build not only the transmission lines but the distribution systems as well.

Is this "creeping socialism" here at home, and something good and beneficial in foreign countries? The answer is no—it is good for those countries, and it would be good for us. But here we have a well-heeled power lobby that picks the pockets of the power consumers in order to poison their minds with false propaganda.

De Valera Approves Joint Talks Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks concerning the proposal of Mr. Costello, Premier of Ireland, to engage in mutual discussion of problems between the Republic and the officials of the six-county government in Ireland. In the February 18 issue of the Irish Times appears an article giving the reaction of Mr. Eamon De Valera, former Premier of Ireland, to the proposal suggested by Mr. Costello.

The complete harmony of viewpoint of these two opposing leaders of the Irish Republic is indicative of the universal opinion held by the Irish people concerning the demand for the unification of their island country. Mr. De Valera shows a complete accord with Mr. Costello regarding the desirability of mutual talks concerning the various problems, which must, of necessity, arise between the two areas of the country. He also pointed out the impossibility of any agreements being reached on the matter of mutual defense between Great Britain and Ireland, so long as partition continued.

During the course of his address before an audience in Manchester, England, Mr. De Valera concisely set forth the difficulties underlying any consideration of the question of mutual defense between Great Britain and Ireland. He also very forcefully pointed out that the principle by which those in the six counties demanded separation from the rest of Ireland, applies equally to the majority in Tyrone, Fermanagh, Derry city, South Down, and South Armagh, where that majority desired to be separated from the six counties and reunited with the Republic. If the principle is valid in justifying the cutting off of the six counties from the rest of Ireland, then certainly that same principle is equally valid in cutting off these additional areas from the six counties and returning them to the Republic of Ireland from which they were forcibly removed.

The resolution which I have presented to this House, House Resolution 32, would aid in bringing about the mutual discussions and amicable settlement of the border problem in Ireland. The urging for such a solution, which favorable consideration of my resolution would provide, could well prove a determining factor in achieving an end to partition in Ireland.

The article reporting Mr. De Valera's reaction to Mr. Costello's proposal, as well as the article reporting on Mr. De Valera's speech in Manchester are being made a part of my remarks, because I feel that both articles are of genuine interest to the Members of the House. They are as follows:

NORTH-SOUTH TALKS PROPOSAL ENDORSED BY MR. DE VALERA

Mr. Eamon de Valera, T. D., said in London on Wednesday that a meeting between the Governments in Dublin and Belfast was an obvious step, which should be taken. But on the question of defense talks, he said that the Irish people could be relied on to take the necessary measures. There was no possibility of discussing this subject while the country remained divided.

Mr. de Valera said this is an interview with a representative of the Yorkshire Post. He was commenting on an interview with Mr. Costello published in that newspaper, and in the Irish Times yesterday, which quoted the Taoiseach's readiness to meet Lord Brookeborough, and on a leading article in the Yorkshire Post.

The report of the interview quotes Mr. de Valera: "I am particularly glad to see a paper like the Yorkshire Post showing an interest in this question, which is of fundamental importance," and goes on: He added that the attitude of Britain and of its publicists when the question of the partition of Ireland arose and was discussed, was: "Oh, it's a matter for the Irish themselves. If only the Irish would agree among themselves."

"You seem to want to have it both ways," Mr. de Valera commented. "When there's a possibility of Irish agreement you say, 'We must have something to do with it.' If that's your attitude you must share the responsibility for the continuance of partition. Those of us who have been dealing with this matter over the past years feel that this shows a little of the old imperial approach. It is the wrong way.

"The way to get good relations between the two countries is to admit that the question of Irish policy is a matter for Ireland. There should be agreement on matters of common concern between the representatives of Ireland, on the one hand, and the representatives of Britain, on the other. That's the way to get a lasting result. When approached in that way you have the goodwill of both peoples with you."

"If there are aspects of the defense of the two countries that are of common concern, then the Irish people through their own parliament and in their own interests can be relied on to take the measures considered necessary," he said. "There is no possibility even of discussing this while our country remains divided.

"Mr. Costello has indicated the willingness of his Government to be represented at such a meeting," he said. "The question now is, what is Lord Brookeborough's attitude?"

(Mr. de Valera was in London to attend the funeral yesterday of Mr. John Dulanty, the former Ambassador to Britain.)

REPUBLIC'S ATTITUDE

Mr. Eamon de Valera, T. D., addressing the Manchester branch of the Anti-Partition League in Manchester last night, said he was glad that important papers such as the Yorkshire Post, had shown themselves interested in the question of partition and about what steps might be taken about the reunification of the country. He recalled that Mr. Costello had expressed his willingness to meet the representatives of the six-county government. What one wanted to know now was what would be Lord Brookeborough's attitude.

As far as the people of the 26 counties were concerned, their first objective must be to secure unity with the rest of the country. Until this objective was achieved, they could not regard national independence as having been attained.

The question at the moment was to secure independence, rather than confederation or how to preserve it. If independence was secured, then the people of all Ireland would have the same anxiety to preserve the nation's independence as other nations, and would naturally be ready to consider what steps they might take, in cooperation with other countries, to make their independence secure. An All-Ireland Parliament, completely free, would be able to consider what steps it might take with Britain and other countries toward mutual defense. Defense policies could not usefully be discussed under existing circumstances. That was also the position largely during the last war. If there was to be any reconsideration of Ireland's attitude in a possible future war it could only be done by a united Ireland.

Mr. de Valera told his listeners that the Yorkshire Post had stated that certain British interests were paramount, and that the claim of Britain to use Irish ports, etc., would have to be maintained. "Britain cannot have it both ways," he asserted. "If

this attitude is taken up, Britain must accept her share of the responsibility for the continuation of partition, and cannot wash her hands of it. The claim put up by the Yorkshire Post cannot be admitted. It savors of the old imperialism which we experienced in the past."

Referring to the attitude of those in the six counties who wanted to remain separated from the rest of their fellow countrymen, Mr. de Valera said that the principle on which they demanded separation would equally apply to the majority of the people, of say, Tyrone, Fermanagh, Derry city, South Down and South Armagh, who desired to be separated from the Belfast Parliament and to be attached to the 26 counties. At present the majority in those areas were being held against their will, and coerced to remain under a jurisdiction to which they would not willingly submit.

Prepare To Begin Work on Beardstown's New Seawall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Journal, of Springfield, Ill., under date of February 27, carried an article dated at Beardstown, Ill., February 26, to this effect, and I quote:

Prepare To Begin Work on Beardstown's New Seawall.

Beardstown, Mr. Speaker, is in Cass County, Ill., and in the 20th Illinois District. Representing that area, it was my privilege to introduce a bill for the original authorization for this work which is just starting as outlined in the Illinois State Journal.

Many years ago at the expense of the city of Beardstown and the State of Illinois, a so-called seawall was constructed. It is my understanding that at that time, the engineers stated this wall was constructed 28 feet and would be high enough to hold back any flood water of the Illinois River that might come in the future. This did not prove to be correct. In 1943, when the Illinois River was at flood stage this same seawall had to be sandbagged to a height of over 32 feet. Even then, their situation was so precarious that older people and children were evacuated from the city.

Last year, the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee included funds to start this project which is just now beginning to take shape. The budget this year has additional funds recommended to be allotted for further construction. The total cost of this project, Mr. Speaker, is estimated at $3 million. This is to protect a city of over 6,000 people, factories, flour mills, railroad shops, churches, schools, and homes. It is justified in every way.

I simply wish to take a few moments before the Congress to personally thank the United States Army engineers in Washington, in Peoria, and in the Chicago office for their help and cooperation. I wish to thank the Civil Functions Subcommittee for their fine cooperation as well as the full Appropriations Committee. I wish to thank the entire membership of the House for agreeing to the authorization and the first appropriation.

I am doing this, Mr. Speaker, knowing full well that the citizens of Beardstown agree with my statements here today in thanking the House in their behalf for what they have done.

PREPARE TO BEGIN WORK ON BEARDSTOWN'S NEW SEAWALL

BEARDSTOWN, February 26.—Work of driving the sheet piling, which is a preliminary to the beginning of construction of the new seawall here, will start Monday. Several men started unloading the several large loads of piling Wednesday and 10 men will be on hand Monday.

The Peoria Barge Terminal Co. has the subcontract for putting down the piling. The Myers Construction Co., which has established offices at Main and Jackson Streets, has the contract for building the $3 million wall.

Report of Presidential Committee Regarding Supplies and Reserves of Coal, Oil, and Natural Gas for Defense and Peacetime Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, early in July 1954 a group of Congressmen representing the soft-coal fields in eastern United States visited the White House and conferred with President Eisenhower regarding depressed conditions in the industry that were having adverse effects on the railroads and related industries.

After our conference with President Eisenhower the Chief Executive appointed an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Arthur Flemming, was designated as chairman with the heads of the following agencies serving as members; Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, the Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

The White House directive respecting the committee's assignment included the following specific statements:

At the direction of the President the committee will undertake a study to evaluate all factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources fuels in the United States, with the aim of strengthening the national defense, providing orderly industrial growth, and assuring supplies for our expanding national economy and for any future emergency.

The committee will review factors affecting the requirements and supplies of the major sources of energy including: coal (anthracite, bituminous and lignite, as well as coke, coke tars, and synthetic liquid fuels), petroleum, and natural gas.

The committee has been aided greatly by an able and representative task force appointed pursuant to the President's instructions. The committee's recommendations are set forth as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE REPORT ON ENERGY SUPPLIES AND RESOURCES POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

The importance of energy to a strong and growing economy is clear. As conditions of supplies and reserves of coal, oil, and natural gas change and as both defense and peacetime requirements come more clearly into focus, the bearing of Government policies upon energy needs reexamination.

What degree and kind of public regulation is appropriate to the present situation and future outlook? What trade policies for energy supplies will most effectively express the overlapping national needs for adequate protectable supplies in case of war and for encouragement of economic growth of this country and friendly countries elsewhere in the world? What steps may be taken to improve the economic position of the coal industry, now seriously depressed, without penalizing competing industries, as a means of enhancing the ability of that industry to contribute to the national defense? More particularly, should specific changes be made in tax, freight rate, research, Government purchasing, or other policies in the energy field?

These and other policy questions press for careful review and decision.

On July 30, 1954, the President established an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization was designated as chairman and the heads of the following agencies served as members: Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, the Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

The White House directive respecting the committee's assignment included the following specific statements:

"At the direction of the President, the committee will undertake a study to evaluate all factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources fuels in the United States, with the aim of strengthening the national defense, providing orderly industrial growth, and assuring supplies for our expanding national economy and for any future emergency.

"The committee will review factors affecting the requirements and supplies of the major sources of energy including: coal (anthracite, bituminous, and lignite, as well as coke, coke tars, and synthetic liquid fuels); petroleum and natural gas."

The committee has been aided greatly by an able and representative task force appointed pursuant to the President's instructions. The committee's recommendations are set forth below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Natural gas regulation

We believe the problem of natural gas regulation should be approached from the viewpoint of assuring adequate supplies and the discovery and development of additional reserves to support such supplies, in the interests of national defense, an expanding domestic economy, and reasonable prices to consumers.

To secure these objectives, it is essential to give due consideration to (1) the operations known as the production of natural gas, (2) the transportation of gas in interstate transmission lines, and (3) the distribution of gas in municipalities. Individual companies may engage in more than one of these activities. Each operation of such companies should be treated by like criteria according to its appropriate industry function.

In the production of natural gas it is important that sound conservation practices be continued. This area of conservation management is under the jurisdiction of State conservation commissioners. In the interest of a sound fuels policy and

the protection of the national defense and consumer interests by assuring such a continued exploration for and development of adequate reserves as to provide an adequate supply of natural gas, we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

The interstate transmission of natural gas by the interstate transmission lines and the subsequent sale of such gas for resale is a public utility function and should be under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission. In considering the certification of new lines and applications for increased rates based on new or renegotiated purchase contracts, the Commission should consider, in order to provide protection for the consumer, not only the assurance of supply but also whether the contract prices of the natural gas which the applicant has contracted to buy are competitively arrived at and represent the reasonable market field price, giving due consideration, in the interest of competition, to the reasonableness and appropriateness of contract provisions as they relate to existing or future market field prices.

The several States or their political subdivisions should continue to provide the public utility regulation of distributing companies in accordance with usual utility practices.

Thus the complete cycle of natural gas production, transmission and utilization will be appropriately regulated: the production and conservation of natural gas by the State conservation commissions; the interstate transmission of natural gas by the Federal Power Commission; and the distribution by the local public utility commissions.

2. Sales below cost by interstate pipeline companies

The basic principles regarding the regulation of natural gas and the use of alternative energy resources should be as far as possible that of free choice by the consumer and free and fair competition among suppliers. This, it is confidently thought, will provide most effectively for the assurance and flexibility of energy supply, both for economic growth and strong security readiness. But sales either for resale or direct consumption below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges which drive out competing fuels constitute unfair competition and are inimical to a sound fuels economy.

The committee recommends, therefore, that appropriate action be taken that will prohibit sales by interstate pipelines either for resale or for direct consumption, which drive out competing fuels because the charges are below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges.

3. Eminent domain for natural-gas storage

The power of eminent domain for the acquisition of surface and mineral rights for the development of underground storage reservoirs should be granted subject to appropriate safeguards to protect the public safety, including the mining industry.

4. Crude oil imports and residual fuel oil imports

An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in friendly countries which help to supply the United States market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary. In this complex picture both domestic production and imports have important parts to play; neither should be sacrificed to the other.

Since World War II importation of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States has increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the United States market for fuels.

The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.

The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

The committee recommends further that the desirable proportionate relationships between imports and domestic production be reviewed from time to time in the light of industrial expansion and changing economic and national defense requirements.

In arriving at these conclusions and recommendations, the committee has taken into consideration the importance to the economies of friendly countries of their oil exports to the United States as well as the importance to the United States of the accessibility of foreign oil supplies both in peace and war.

5. Petroleum refining capacity

The Departments of Defense and the Interior should have studies made by their staffs and expert advisers as to the adequacy of present and prospective refinery capacity, both as to amount and dispersal, as well as other factors, to determine the need for any measures to maintain refinery capacity necessary for defense purposes, particularly the capacity operated by small, independent refineries.

6. Tax incentives

(a) Present tax provisions on coal, oil, and gas production have been an important factor in encouraging development of energy sources at a pace about in keeping with demand. Further analysis and study by the appropriate branches of the Government should from time to time be made to review the amount and method of making such allowances to maintain proper relationships with continuing changes in other features of the tax law. Any changes which may be proposed in the future must be analyzed in terms of their probable effect on development of domestic resources needed for economic progress and national defense as well as the fiscal and tax policies of the Government.

(b) Retroactive tax legislation and special relief provisions should be avoided.

(c) Accelerated amortization should be used only to insure the maintenance of a sound mobilization base for energy supplies.

7. Research and development program for coal

We recognize that coal is a great national asset and endorse a cooperative study to determine what research and development could be undertaken. The coal industry and both Federal and State Governments should participate in this study and its cost.

8. Unemployment and business distress in the coal industry

We recognize that serious unemployment and business distress exist in the coal industry and recommend that the Interdepartmental Committee on the Soft Coal Industry be continued for the purpose of developing for Cabinet consideration specific action programs to alleviate these conditions.

9. Coal freight rates

In order to maintain coal's vitality as an instrument of national defense by improving currently its ability to compete with other fuels, the railroads, by voluntary action, and, in the absence thereof, the Interstate Commerce Commission, by compulsory order, should adjust freight rates to the extent necessary to remove the excessive and disproportionate contribution that coal rates are making to meet the cost of other unprofitable services of the railroad industry. Train load rates should be established to reflect the lower costs of such service.

10. Coal exports

(a) The Government should urge foreign governments to reduce unreasonable discriminatory restrictions against imports of United States coal.

(b) The Government, when making foreign loans, should use its best efforts to obtain provisions to prevent discrimination against United States coal. Discrimination would be judged to exist when United States coal imports are disallowed despite its availability at costs no higher than foreign coal.

(c) The Government should expedite efforts to establish credits through the Export-Import Bank to foreign banking institutions in countries where there is reasonable prospect of repayment so that American coal exporters can offer more competitive payment terms to foreign customers.

(d) Where United States coal can be supplied competitively with other available coal, the Government should use its best efforts to enlarge the participation of United States coal in the foreign aid program.

(e) The Government should compensate for higher shipping costs when incurred as a result of the requirement that 50 percent of all shipments be in United States ships at fair and reasonable United States market rates.

11. Mobilization requirements for coke

The Committee believes that present and prospective rates of shutdown and dismantling of slot-type coke ovens will leave inadequate coking capacity to support full mobilization production of steel and other essential wartime industry.

On the basis of national security, coke requirements can only be met if the Office of Defense Mobilization is directed to prepare plans to make the necessary arrangements and tests to expand coke production rapidly in the case of an emergency.

12. Government fuel purchasing policy

In working out a more consistent and equitable coal purchase policy, the following steps should be taken:

(a) The Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act should pursue his present policy of making determinations of wage standards applicable in the coal-producing areas and should establish these standards at the earliest practicable date.

(b) The Government agencies should, to the extent practicable, purchase not less than 75 percent of their estimated annual coal requirements on a contract basis.

(c) All Government agencies purchasing coal should, prior to and after the award of the contract, verify the quality of the coal offered and supplied to the agencies.

(d) All Government contracts for the purchase of coal should contain appropriate escalator clauses which protect the buyer and the seller.

(e) In instances where it is not possible for a Government agency to take all the coal for which it has contracted, the deficit should be apportioned equitably among all participating contract suppliers without penalty to the Government.

(f) Coal suppliers should be required to submit, along with their bids, proof of their ability to produce the requirements at the times specified.

(g) All coal suppliers to the Government, regardless of size, should comply with the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

(h) All transactions with the Government relating to coal purchases and supply should be public information.

(i) The domestic fuel purchasing policies set forth above should be applied to purchases of coal by companies acting as agents for the Federal Government, as well as to purchases made direct by Government agencies.

Prior to the purchase of any fuel by a Federal Government agency having a large annual use of fuel, that agency should request advice from the Office of Defense Mobilization as to how this purchase can contribute to the maintenance of a strong mobilization base within the domestic fuels industry. The Office of Defense Mobilization should be directed by Executive order to develop a mechanism for accomplishing this objective.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 the House passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to which I was opposed and voted against because of the domestic market being faced with cheap foreign articles that are imported into this country in direct competition with our industries. Our industries are suffering from the lack of markets, and this ultimately produces unemployment.

My position is well fortified through a news article from the Escanaba Daily Press, a daily newspaper published in my congressional district. The article sets forth conditions that exist in a small industry of the 11th District of Michigan.

Under permission granted, I include the article entitled "Cheap Foreign Plywood Is Threat to United States Industry," and that it become a part of the RECORD so my colleagues may be informed as to how cheap foreign products are threatening small industries in the United States of America:

CHEAP FOREIGN PLYWOOD IS THREAT TO UNITED STATES INDUSTRY

The American hardwood plywood industry, taking an alarmed look at the rising tide of unfair import competition, is asking that tariff concessions be modified and quotas imposed on imports of hardwood plywood.

The story of the import plywood problem and its effect upon the industry in Escanaba, Gladstone, and throughout the Nation was told recently in Escanaba by R. D. Behm, Chicago, director of the trade-promotion program for the Hardwood Plywood Institute. Behm talked to the Escanaba Rotary Club, where he was introduced by Russell Lee, Birds Eye Veneer Co. official.

Behm reported that the domestic industry is being seriously injured by tariff reductions that have resulted in a sharp rise in imports.

LOST 300 JOBS

"The imported plywoods are being sold in America at unfair prices much below those required by domestic producers to remain in business," Behm noted. He said the Hardwood Plywood Institute cited these facts in an application for an investigation by the United States Tariff Commission.

The application to the Tariff Commission to modify tariff concessions on cheaply produced foreign plywood and impose quotas on imports will be heard in Washington on March 22.

Birds Eye Veneer Co. and Northwestern Plywood and Veneer will be among members of the Hardwood Plywood Association represented at the hearing. These 2 local industries, together with related woods and sawmill operations, have lost an estimated 300 jobs to the community because of the cheap foreign imports.

The mounting volume of imports, according to the application, has decreased domestic producers' share of the American market, depressed domestic prices, and caused substantial unemployment and wage losses among American plywood workers.

IMPORTS CLIMBING

Tariff concessions were made in 1936, 1949, and 1950, the application pointed out. The last revision provided for reductions of up to 50 percent from the rates prevailing in 1949.

Detailing the results of the lowered duties, the application asserted that—

Imports rose from 63,362,000 square feet in 1950 to 220,424,000 square feet in 1953, an increase of 348 percent. They have continued to climb in 1954, amounting to 133,750,000 square feet in the first half of the year, compared with 98,831,000 square feet in the corresponding period of 1953. This represented a gain of 35.3 percent. Third quarter totals recently released show imported plywood amounting to 124 million square feet against domestic production of 177 million square feet.

Japan, which accounts for 57.4 percent of the imports, boosted its shipments to this country by 506 percent last year, as compared with 1952. Finland, the second-largest exporter, registered a gain of 583 percent.

FLOODING THE MARKET

Shipments of domestic producers, on the other hand, dropped from 451,663,000 square feet in the first 6 months of 1953 to 337,043,000 square feet in the first half of this year.

In 1951 the ratio of domestic hardwood plywood on the domestic market was 12 square feet to each square foot of imported plywood. By the first half of this year the ratio had shrunk to 2.5 square feet to one. Currently, the rate is closer to 1.4 square feet to one.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the price index for hardwood plywood declined from 108.4 in 1953 to 101.9 for January and February 1954. The price index for all commodities, however rose from 110.1 in 1953 to 110.8 for January of this year.

HUGE WAGE LOSS

A survey of 43 domestic plywood plants, among the industry's total of 142, revealed that employment was 19.3 percent lower in the first quarter of 1954 than in the similar period of 1953. The reduction in hours worked amounted to 26.8 percent.

Estimated wage losses to American workers as a result of this curtailed output was $2 million Extension of the same rate of reduction to the entire industry would indicate a total wage loss of $5 million to $6 million for that period.

The Institute's membership accounts for about 60 percent of the total domestic production of market hardwood plywood, according to the application.

While Canada is among the larger plywood exporting countries, the application said, production costs of Canadian manufacturers do not permit them to sell at prices comparable to the unfair prices charged by Japanese and Finnish producers.

Stop the Smuggling of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II there has been a sharp increase in the crime rate throughout the country, due in large measure to the social upheavals during and after the war, the lack of discipline, and the breakup of many family units. Most deplorable is the growth of juvenile delinquency, particularly the large number of youthful drug addicts.

In recent years narcotic addiction among teen-agers has reached alarming proportions in many of our major cities. These young addicts are often driven to commit serious crimes in order to obtain the necessary funds to purchase drugs. Unfortunately, the American public is not sufficiently aware of the problem and the menace it constitutes to our youth. Our laws are too lax in meting out punishment to those who peddle drugs among teen-agers, and the hand of our Federal Government must be strengthened if we desire to gain control of the situation.

Above all, it is absolutely necessary that we locate the origin and roots of the narcotics trade and expose the evil men who bring this poison into our country for illicit purposes and force it into the hands of inexperienced and thrill-seeking youth. Most narcotics are imported from the Far East, the Middle East, and Africa. They are smuggled into this country by ship and plane as well as across our borders, and then distributed to the dope traffic to continue its deadly work, whose only harvest consists of broken and agonized lives.

If we can succeed in plugging up this evil trade and corrosion of human lives, we will have solved much of the problem. About 2 or 3 years ago, Harry M. Durning, the collector of customs for the port of New York, stated that only 1 of every 5 ships entering the port of New York can be searched for smuggled narcotics because of the lack of sufficient personnel in the customs service. I do not know to what extent this situation has been remedied since then, but the problem is still very much with us.

Congress must take effective action to suppress this vile trade by giving the Bureau of Customs the means and the men with which to operate in the proper enforcement of our antismuggling laws.

For this reason, I have introduced today a bill in Congress which provides for

the establishment of a United States customs port patrol and a United States customs border patrol in the Treasury Department's Bureau of Customs in order to increase the effectiveness of this agency in dealing with the smuggling of narcotics into this country. These are to be law-enforcement bodies with adequate personnel and equipment for use in patrol work in our harbors, airports, along the coasts and borders. Officers of these patrol services shall be empowered to enforce the antismuggling laws of the United States, to make searches of all vessels, as well as seizures and arrests in accordance with our laws.

Mr. Speaker, the customs patrol officer is our best and most effective obstacle to the constant flow of illegal narcotics from our docks, airports, and borders. He is the only law-enforcement officer regularly assigned on a 24-hour basis to apprehend and arrest the dope smugglers. By increasing the ranks of these men and giving them the necessary authority to pursue their antismuggling assignments, we shall be able to root out this evil.

Parents, teachers, welfare agencies, civic organizations, church groups, and most of all, our young people themselves, whose health, morale, and careers are at stake, will heartily endorse this action by Congress. I urge all of my colleagues to support my bill and I call for its speedy enactment. Remember that each day's delay means the additional sacrifice of young American lives.

Ernest Hemingway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1954, a coveted honor was awarded to a distinguished native of Oak Park, Ill., when Mr. Ernest Hemingway received the Nobel prize for literature. Another tribute, which I am sure was warmly appreciated by Mr. Hemingway, was occasioned by the announcement of this award.

This tribute came from a group of outstanding Pan-American scholars and educators, assembled at the bicentennial conference of Columbia University on Responsible Freedom in the Americas, and was the result of the only resolution approved by the conference. Six former presidents of Latin American Republics were participants in the conference, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, of Colombia; Dr. Eduardo Santos, of Colombia; Dr. Galo Plaza, of Ecuador; Dr. Ricardo Alfaro, of Panama; Dr. Otilio Ulate, of Costa Rica; and Dr. Carlos Davila, of Chile, who is now secretary general of the Organization of American States.

The conference approved a resolution submitted by Dr. Jorge Manach, of Cuba, which called for a commendatory message to be sent to Mr. Hemingway, and the following message was sent in behalf of the conference:

By awarding Ernest Hemingway the literature prize for 1954, the Nobel Prize Committee has rendered a well-deserved tribute to a great novelist whose works have reflected with virile energy a passion for liberty and justice, a love of the heroic in man, and a generous concern for human suffering. Assembled on the occasion of the bicentennial conference of Columbia University on Responsible Freedom in the Americas, writers and teachers of both Americas send their congratulations to the great author of The Old Man and the Sea. In their behalf this message is sent.

American Good Government Society Honors Hon. Howard W. Smith, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend, on Tuesday evening, February 22, 1955, the third annual George Washington awards dinner of the American Good Government Society.

The American Good Government Society was formed in 1942 for the purpose of fostering good government in America and to reinspire a wide and deeper appreciation of the American political system, through a clearer understanding of it.

This organization is endeavoring to bring to our citizens the realization of the importance of maintaining our Government as it was founded and set up under the Constitution. It is rendering a real and important service to the country.

In 1952 the society established the George Washington awards that it presents to outstanding citizens who have rendered distinguished service beyond the call of duty to good government in America.

It has presented two awards for each of the past 3 years. In 1953 the society honored Senator HARRY F. BYRD and the late Senator Robert A. Taft. In 1954 the recipients were the Honorable Herbert Hoover and Gov. Allan Shivers, of Texas. This year, the society honored the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, Member of the House of Representatives from Virginia, and Gen. Robert E. Wood.

I am most pleased that the outstanding services that Representative SMITH has rendered our Nation are being recognized by the presentation of this award.

"Judge" SMITH, as he is affectionately called by his colleagues and many friends, is one of the outstanding statesmen of America today. He stands for and represents the highest ideals in public life. He is one of the most beloved as well as one of the most influential Members of the House of Representatives. He is admired for his keen intellect, his ability to grasp a situation quickly and for his determination to do what he thinks is right and best for his country regardless of the political consequences. All of us love and admire him for the statesmanship he has exhibited down through the years and join with the society in its description of his virtues set out in the award which is as follows:

HOWARD WORTH SMITH, statesman, lawyer, farmer and banker, has served the public weal for more than 30 years—as judge and as Representative in Congress, becoming chairman of the Committee on Rules in the 84th Congress.

Among his notable achievements are the Smith Act of 1940, which declared the law under which Communist leaders have been convicted, and the constructive investigation of the National Labor Relations Board which led to the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

Law is the eternal sense of justice of the community. Law is because law was, unwritten, unfolding and growing as man moves slowly toward civilization. Spurious edicts, pretending to be law but not law at all, are struck down when the law is restored.

In any early restoration of law the wisdom of Judge SMITH will be a vital influence. We can rejoice in numbering this Virginia gentleman among the Nation's most illustrious sons.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I herewith include the address delivered by the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH on the night of February 22, 1955, when the American Good Government Society bestowed upon him its George Washington good government award:

The basic ground rules of good government upon which our Republic was founded was the principle that matters of controversy between the States and relations with foreign governments should be delegated to the Federal Government, while the solution of all domestic and local problems should be reserved to the respective States.

It was the guiding principle of the framers of our Constitution.

It was the very heart of the contract between the Thirteen Original Colonies as expressed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It was implicit throughout every word, every sentence, and every paragraph.

It was summed up so that "he who runs might read," in the brief words of the 10th amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

When that amendment was adopted, as the last and final clause in the Bill of Rights, the American people meant it. The great bulk of the American people, regardless of party affiliation, mean it just as earnestly today.

The difference is that the framers of the Constitution were painfully aware of their recent wrongs that required remedy. As the country grew and prospered, the people became neglectful and indifferent to the basic principles of government that brought about that growth and prosperity.

A spirit of slothful indifference replaced alert determination. Today we have reached a point of centralized government that has swallowed up the reserve States rights. We have transferred the administration of justice away from home into the strange and faraway hands of the Federal Courts.

The legislative department has usurped the power to deal with a multitude of local problems reserved by the Constitution to the States and in doing so has delegated to the executive department the power to fill in the details of administration by regulations having the force and effect of law. While the Chief Executive confronted with a huge and overwhelming mass of administrative detail

has, in turn, delegated the power to make regulations to sundry minor executives not elected by or responsible to the people.

Each such departure from constitutional standards has directly or indirectly deprived the citizen of some constitutional liberty until today the individual American citizen is gradually being placed under compulsion and his daily life and activities controlled by the judgment of the Federal courts, the acts of Congress, and the edicts of the executive department to an extent never remotely conceived by the authors of the Constitution.

Today we have what might be called government by delegation of authority.

Local communities have delegated to State legislatures local problems that could best be solved at home, in return for a mess of financial pottage from the State legislatures.

The State governments have delegated to the Congress problems that could be best solved at home by the States, in return for handouts from the Federal Treasury of their own money. Congress, in turn, catching the spirit of the times, has passed out the appropriations from money derived from taxes imposed upon the citizens of the States and exported to Washington to be, in turn, doled back to the States after deduction of an appropriate but substantial toll. Along with the appropriations and as a condition, go laws curtailing the freedom of the citizen, and then the whole impossible mess is turned over to the Executive to administer, abdicating to him the legislative power to make regulations having the effect of law, a violation of which subjects the citizen to criminal penalties in the Federal courts. But the end of delegation is not yet. The President delegates the authority given him by Congress to the heads of departments and agencies. They, in turn, delegate it to the heads of bureaus; and to whom the bureaus delegate the actual writing of these regulations or laws, only God knows.

Congress finally found it necessary to provide for a daily publication known as the Federal Register, in which the executive departments are required to publish each day all new regulations which now control the lives and activities of our citizens.

I mention this for the information of the unwary citizen, who may prefer what freedom he still enjoys to a Federal jail house, with the advice that he peruse the Federal Register along with his daily paper.

On top of this whole mess of delegation, administration and confusion sits the judicial department, the ultimate and final arbiter of our constitutional rights.

So when the Supreme Court speaks the final word we all, including the present speaker, relieve our blood pressure by exercising our remaining constitutional prerogative of abusing the Court.

What is the remedy?

There is only one.

Congress reflects the will of the people. The will of the people is transmitted to Congress by those who make the loudest noise, and the most convincing threats of political reprisal.

Until and unless the great mass and majority of our thinking people awaken to their responsibility and assert their demands for sound and constitutional government and a return to the constitutional limits upon the functions of the Federal Government, we shall continue the present policy until sometime, some sad day, we find that we have gone too far to retrace our steps.

In a democracy a people get the kind of government they deserve.

If they think little, they deserve little. If they do little about it, they get little results.

If the present trend of government away from the sovereignty and the reserved rights of the States is wrong, as I believe it is tragically wrong, it will continue wrong as long as a slothful and indifferent people remain impervious to, and neglectful of, the danger signals flying all about them.

Block Ike Plan Is Brainchild of Economic Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, Mcrch 2, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there are people in this country who sincerely believe that the free enterprise economic system is no good and should be replaced either piecemeal or entirely by some form of state socialism.

Why, when all evidence points to the fact that our present system of free enterprise is the greatest system ever devised by the mind of man for his own betterment, these people persist in their beliefs is a mystery to me. They need but look at the result of state socialism wherever it has been tried to see physical evidence of its inadequacies.

An interesting article in the current issue of the U. S. News & World Report detailing the deterioration of Britain's defenses observes that the quantity and quality of that Nation's armaments went into immediate decline during her postwar flirtation with socialism. Under the socialistic scheme of things neither peacetime nor wartime items flowed into Britain's economy as they did under the free-enterprise system.

Nevertheless the economic planners in this country are determined in their efforts "to halt and reverse the Eisenhower administration's counteroffensive on behalf of private enterprise and less Government dictation" as is set forth in the following column by Ray Tucker:

HALT IKE PLAN WELL DESIGNED

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—The most unpublicized conflict at Washington today concerns the attempt of the so-called economic planners of New Deal stamp to halt and reverse the Eisenhower administration's counteroffensive on behalf of private enterprise and less Government dictation.

Opponents of Ike's milder measures have two main objectives: They do not expect to enact their more advanced and radical proposals at this session, awaiting possible return to power in 1956 or 1960. They plan to expand or to kill off his offerings.

They do not want them to be given even a temporary trial lest the success of the measures check their movement for Government intervention and operation in almost every field of human activity.

"ECONOMIC POULTICES"

They argue, for instance, that Eisenhower proposals on Federal aid to health, education, and highways are mere economic poultices. The most spectacular example of the conflict in philosophy is illustrated by the quarrel over Washington's contribution to improvement of national health.

Ike wants the work to be done by private insurance companies with minimum financial assistance from the Government. The "planners," who resemble the British Fabians that led Britain step by step into a Labor-Socialist regime, demand compulsory health insurance. They would finance their bedside scheme along the lines of social security—namely, by direct payments from everybody's pay check.

If Ike's plan is adopted and gives promise of success in its initial stages, their alternative will lose its appeal. There is nothing so difficult to defeat as demonstrated success in politics.

Similar strategy has been applied to the farm problem. Ike believes that flexible price supports will maintain farm income, lower retail prices, dispose of surpluses. The planners still insist on the Brannan plan, with Uncle Sam paying the difference between the market price and the higher Government-financed support figures.

PRIVATE EXPANSION PLAN

Likewise with power. As in the Dixon-Yates contract, the White House seeks to limit the Government's investments and operations in this field, as well as in atomic developments. President Eisenhower advocates private expansion to a maximum degree under a partnership of local, private, and Federal interests.

His enemies demand continued Government production of power, although Uncle Sam and local political units now generate about 20 percent of the Nation's electricity.

The planners want Washington aid in obtaining contracts for a guaranteed annual wage. They demand higher minimum-wage levels, to be policed and enforced by NLRB and the Labor Department. They insist upon greater control of credit by Treasury and the Federal Reserve System.

They urge a vast public-works building blueprint after the pattern of Roosevelt-Ickes-Hopkins programs in the depression. They shout for far larger foreign-aid funds, with the United States economic reforms aboard.

AIM TO DEFEAT IKE'S COMPROMISES

Although recognizing that fulfillment of their dreams and ambitions under Republican rule is impossible, the liberals' main aim is to keep alive agitation for their schemes. When they recapture the White House and Congress, they hope to transform them into reality. Meanwhile, they must defeat Ike's milder compromises.

Ironically, they may get help from GOP conservatives on Capitol Hill, who think that Ike is too radical. They refuse to recognize his program as a holding action.

Let Us Fight Against Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for all of us concerned with the health of the Nation, there is a problem of vital urgency—and that is to control the disastrous effects of the crippling disease, multiple sclerosis.

In thousands of households there are young mothers and young fathers stricken with disabling multiple sclerosis. This means that there are mothers who cannot take care of their homes—guide their children—play with their children. That there are fathers who must cease being breadwinners; who are unable to assume their role as the head of the family unit. This also means that there are young men and women throughout the land—some in college, who are forced to give up their education; some just starting on careers they are unable to pursue; because they have been afflicted

with MS, which is the popular abbreviation for multiple sclerosis.

Multiple sclerosis is indeed a matter of pressing import to the Nation for, at this time, the cause and cure of this insidious disease are unknown. It attacks mostly young adults in the prime of youth—those between the ages of 20 and 40—the very best, the most productive years, of any person's life, and it strikes at the very heart of the basic foundations of our society—the home and the family.

Let me try to explain for a moment, for those of you who may not understand the nature of this mysterious illness, just what this is all about. I have tried to find out for myself and I will speak in terms which I have understood, as a layman, from my discussions with doctors who have specialized in this field.

Multiple sclerosis is a disease of the central nervous system. It gets its name from the fact that multiple, or "many," sclerosis, or "scars," form in certain areas of the brain and spinal cord. This results in what may be likened to a short circuit, nerve impulses which usually pass through the central nervous system are blocked by scar tissue which has formed on nerve covering. Then we have the usual symptoms of the disease which may be: paralysis in hands, arms, and legs; blurred or double vision; staggering gait; garbled speech; loss of personal functions. A victim of MS may have one or all of these distressing symptoms. The ordinary dignities with which most of us are privileged—such as washing ourselves, dressing ourselves, taking a walk around the block, reading or watching television—all these private necessities, pleasures, and privileges are often denied sufferers of multiple sclerosis. Some victims are ambulatory; some are on crutches or in wheelchairs; most severe cases are bedridden. There are about one quarter of a million victims of MS in the country.

Because MS is usually progressive, and thus far incurable, it presents a problem of care and financial stress which always goes with chronic long-term illness.

I am glad to say that all is not black in this picture. Something is being done across the Nation to help the victims of multiple sclerosis. In 1946, with the founding of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, an intensive program of research and patient-care service for MS sufferers was begun. Today the society is a vast organization with some 65 chapters throughout the United States, all supported by public funds. The society is a clearing houses in MS for all up-to-date scientific and self-help information for patients and physicians.

Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, this year, as in the previous year, is honorary chairman of the campaign to raise funds for this very important and worthy organization. In this respect, Mrs. Eisenhower is a real helpmate to her husband, for our own Mr. President has been a stanch ally in helping Congress to appropriate funds for continued and expanded aid in the fight against chronic neurological, crippling illness. President Eisenhower has made magnificent strides throughout the country in the field of rehabilitation of the disabled. The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has worked with nonprofit health organizations, such as the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, in spurring the public's support and industry's support in the help to our disabled.

There is much reason for hope in the multiple-sclerosis problem. Leading scientists in universities and laboratories throughout the land and beyond its borders are engaged in intensive research—about 45 projects in all—to find the answers to the cause and cure of multiple sclerosis. Clinics for the rehabilitation of multiple-sclerosis victims are in operation, teaching independence and self-reliance to the severely handicapped. All this heartening work is being done under the guidance and support of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, which in turn is dependent upon public funds and governmental appropriations in order to sustain and expand its promising work.

Each year the Government appropriates funds to the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. This vast Institute, which is conducted by our foremost research scientists, is at present investigating the causes and treatment of multiple sclerosis. It is one more example of hope in dealing with this problem.

I urge all of my fellow Congressmen to give serious thought to the ways in which each of us, in our own way, may help in the fight against crippling multiple sclerosis. Perhaps we may serve on special committees, perhaps we may be able to fight for bigger and better appropriations in the war against crippling neurological diseases. To be sure, it is, as they say, "all for the good of the country."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all goodness, we thank Thee for this beautiful day bringing unto us many opportunities to do good and to serve Thee and our fellow men.

May it be a day when we shall be richly blessed with new experiences of Thy presence and power, for we are conscious of our helplessness and insufficiency.

Grant that, in our programs of legislation, we may not only have a clear vision of what is valuable and useful but above all of that which is vital and essential.

Help us daily to grow and gain in vital and victorious living, and may we be inspired and sustained by that faith which will enable us to meet every moral issue without compromise or evasion.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry. I am doing this because I am convinced that a majority of dentists, not only in my own district or the State of Ohio, but throughout the country, wish to have the opportunity of benefiting from this insurance program, the same as other self-employed individuals. This conclusion was reached after numerous conferences with and voluminous correspondence from the dentists in my State, including signed petitions from the members of local societies. It does not seem fair to me to exclude the members of this profession from participating in the program if it is their wish to participate in it. The House of Representatives voted to include them in the Social Security Act amendments last year but the other body deleted this group from the bill because, I am told, of representations made by the American Dental Association, which the dentists in my district and State say do not reflect the true wishes of the majority of the profession. Their contention is based on the results of polls taken throughout the country where the individual dentists were given an opportunity to voice their sentiments and in most of the States the polls showed that the dentists want to be included in this insurance program. I hope the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives will grant these dentists the privilege of expressing themselves again and that they will take appropriate action to report this bill to the floor of the House for consideration. I am convinced the Members of the House will approve it again so that it may receive proper and favorable consideration in the other body.

EXPEL RUSSIA FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has an obligation to challenge the right of Soviet Russia to membership in that organization. All of the 60 nations who are members of the United Nations are definitely bound to

refrain from the exercise of force in their international relations.

Yet the guilt of Russia in those relationships is beyond all reasonable doubt. Armed aggression in Korea was instigated by the Soviet. Red China could not have forced its belligerent attitude without the military support of their Soviet counterpart.

Mr. Speaker, in February of 1951 the United Nations, by formal resolution, declared Red China as an aggressor, and if that action had any meaning at all, Russia was bound by it. But the masters in the Kremlin chose to ignore it and continue their support to the declared aggressor.

The United Nations, Mr. Speaker, is still in a state of war with the Communist Chinese and the Communist government of North Korea. How much longer are we to consider Red Russia as a bona fide member of the United Nations, pledged to a program of peace? This is a fiction and it is time to call a halt.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 89, which requests the President of the United States to take action through the United States delegation to bring about the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the United Nations.

The basis for that action is article 6 of the United Nations Charter, which provides:

A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Soviet Russia cannot veto this proposed action by the Security Council. Under article 27, "A party to a dispute shall abstain from voting."

Mr. David Lawrence, in the U. S. News & World Report for February 25, put his finger on the nub of this situation in support of action to expel Russia. He states:

The charter declares that membership in the United Nations shall be open to peace-loving states willing to accept the obligations of membership. The Soviet Union, however, has disregarded its obligations to the U. N.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I shall insert a copy of my resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 89—and I urge its prompt adoption as the sense of this Congress:

House Concurrent Resolution 89

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its profound sense of indignation at the repeated acts of aggression committed by the Soviet Union in violation of the United Nations Charter, at the flagrant disregard shown by the Soviet Union for the principles contained in such charter, and at the persistent attempts of the Soviet Union to frustrate the actions duly taken by the United Nations pursuant to such charter; and the President is accordingly requested to take such steps, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, as may be necessary to bring about the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the United Nations in accordance with article 6 of such charter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object—and of course I am not going to object—would the gentleman tell the House what legislative program he has in mind for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I should be very happy to. Monday would be the Consent Calendar day, but there are only 8 bills on the calendar. I had in mind to confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and then ask unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar be called when the next Private Calendar will be called, so we could have them both in one day. That date would be March 15. I intend to ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There are some resolutions being heard by the Committee on Rules, resolutions of inquiry and investigation. If they are reported out, they will be in order. There is also the resolution on the change of rules in relation to committee procedure. If that is reported out by the Committee on Rules, that will be brought up.

For Thursday, I have reasonable expectation there will be reported out from the Committee on Armed Services, and a rule obtained, on H. R. 2607, which will be brought up on that date. That is a bill providing certain pay and allowances as incentives to the members of the Armed Services. I have been informed by the chairman of the subcommittee that the subcommittee will probably act on it tomorrow and report it to the full committee; and I have been informed by the chairman of the full committee that that committee will meet on Tuesday and act on it. If that is so, they will ask for a rule on Wednesday and it will be in order for next Thursday.

Aside from that I have no further announcement at this time to the Members of the House. I do not expect any other legislation, but I do not want to be bound by a definite commitment.

I might say for the benefit of the Members of the House, so they may govern themselves accordingly in connection with the Easter recess, that the recess this year will be from Monday, April 4, to Wednesday, April 13. As a matter of fact, and in effect, it will be from the close of business on April 1 until we meet on April 13.

I have been informed that we might reasonably expect an appropriation bill on April 13.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman will yield, which bill is that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have to confess my inability to answer that question. Perhaps the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] could answer that question?

Mr. FORD. I will say to the gentleman that I think it will be the Treasury-Post Office bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that is coming in on March 14.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GARY. The Treasury-Post Office bill will come in the week after next. That bill has been marked up and should be presented to the full committee next week and would be ready the following week for presentation; I do not know just what date.

Mr. MARTIN. I understood that the hearings were available and I was wondering why they were waiting a month.

Mr. McCORMACK. The information I have, which I am glad to give to the House at this time, is that the Treasury-Post Office bill will be in the week of March 14. It is expected that the Second Supplemental Appropriation bill will be in on March 18. The bill covering the Labor Department and the other agencies that come before that particular subcommittee will come up the week of March 21 and the Interior appropriation bill on March 24. There may be a little change here and there, but that is the information I have received the other day from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

From the information I have received, on April 13, when we meet again, they will probably be in position to bring in an appropriation bill. As to the question asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I cannot tell now what that bill will be, but I will find out. Of course, if a bill is brought in, they will have to get permission to file it earlier, and I assume that will be done.

That is the best information I can give the Members of the House, particularly with reference to the Easter recess this year.

Mr. MARTIN. Returning to the program for next week, I presume if there is any change in the schedule we will all have adequate notice of the change?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I am informed there might be a conference report or something come in.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman may be optimistic.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senate does sometimes act quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; sometimes the Senate conferees do give in to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman referred to April 13. As I understand, that is a Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will there be a vote on that day, or Thursday or Friday of that week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because I did have in mind discussing it with

the Speaker and the gentleman from Massachusetts. Assuming there were any rollcall votes on that day, it would be agreeable to me for the vote to go over to the next day.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman means on the 13th?

Mr. McCORMACK. If on the 13th of April there are any rollcall votes, it would be perfectly agreeable to me that we put them over to the next day.

Mr. MARTIN. Speaking for myself, I would agree to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The next day would be Thursday, the 14th. I was just wondering whether the vote could go over to the next week. The reason I ask is that I noticed that day before yesterday we had a sort of lull here because there was a primary in Baltimore. Now, we have an election in Michigan in April.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman confer with us after this discussion is over and we will see what can be done, rather than have this colloquy on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF DICKENSON COUNTY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, today, March 3, marks the 75th anniversary of Dickenson County, the youngest in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The county, one of those in the Ninth Congressional District in the great southwest Virginia, will begin today a 6-month diamond jubilee celebration that will touch every phase of community life. The schools of the county will have commemorative programs to start the celebration and it will be concluded next fall with a gigantic old-fashioned gathering and picnic in the beautiful Breaks of Cumberland where a new park will be dedicated.

I believe the Congress should take note today of Dickenson County's 75th birthday. I know of no other group of people who take a greater interest in their local, State, and National Government and in their elected representatives than those living in Dickenson County.

I want to mention, briefly, Dickenson County's history. On March 3, 1880, Dickenson became Virginia's 100th and last county. It was carved from the territories of three other ninth district counties—Wise, Russell, and Buchanan—and was the result of a petition signed by a majority of the area's citizens who wanted another county established.

These petitioners asserted that the territory to be included in the new county was fast becoming heavily populated and that the residents were finding it inconvenient to travel all the way to the other seats of country government to transact their legal and private business. The signers of the petition also wanted to participate more actively in their local government and this desire was being restricted by distance.

I might say here, with considerable pride, that this desire to take an active part in Government has carried down to the present time; in the last congressional election Dickenson County broke its own record as to the number of voters qualified to cast ballots for their Representative and Senator.

The Virginia House of Delegates received the bill for the creation of the new county and designating its name as "Dickenson" on January 12, 1880. The first county seat was to be Ervinton, a town now known as Nora.

The bill was approved by the house on February 12, 1880, but when it reached the Virginia Senate an argument arose over the proposed name. A motion was made to change the name from Dickenson, which was that of a prominent Russell County family, to Stonewall and the county seat to Jackson in honor of Stonewall Jackson. However, the bill finally passed the general assembly with the names as originally proposed, and Gov. W. M. Holliday signed it into law on March 3, 1880.

The county seat was later moved to Clintwood where it is located today.

Dickenson lies almost wholly in the Sandy Basin, a bowl-like depression in the Appalachian Mountain range. Being very mountainous, it was not sought out by the early settlers and remained a hunters' paradise long after the surrounding counties were settled. The first settler was "Fightin' Dick" Colley, who built his three-walled log cabin at Sand Lick about 1810. After him came the Rasnicks, Countses, Fullers, and Deels to that vicinity. Ambrose Harmon settled about 1830 at Nora and he was followed by the Ervins, Blairs, Yateses, Dyers, and Smiths. John Mullins settled at Clintwood about 1830 and was followed by the Flemings, Vanovers, Chases, and Stanleys.

The early industries were hunting and farming. Later lumbering became important and at present the mining of vast deposits of coal is the chief industry. Valuable deposits of natural gas have been tapped recently in the county.

The Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway penetrated the county in 1915 and provided the transportation necessary to the shipping of the coal produced.

Dickenson today has over 23,000 citizens who are all concerned with the future growth and prosperity of their county. Steady progress is being made in the road and school system of the county; three modern high school buildings are nearing completion at the population centers. These have cost around $2 million and will serve large areas of the county. These new structures will be dedicated as part of this diamond jubilee celebration.

I want to point out that Dickenson County has great natural scenery. Vast panoramas of mountains, hills, and rushing streams can be viewed from the crests of Cumberland Mountain, Sandy Ridge, Big Ridge, and other high points. The most significant natural scenery, which surpasses anything east of the Mississippi, is in the breaks of the Cumberlands where the Russell Fork River has churned a 1,000-foot deep channel through the rocky base of Cumberland Mountain. This area will be dedicated as a State park next fall when Dickenson County ends its diamond jubilee celebration.

The jubilee celebration will include programs in the schools, churches, and community centers. There will be parades and historical pageants and an illustrated county history will be published. Entitled "Meet Virginia's Baby," this publication will be unique in that it is the first known publication of a county history in the United States.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members to an important event in the history of one of my counties, Dickenson, which I am proud to represent in the Congress. The observance today of its 75th anniversary and the opening of a long celebration means much to my constituents in this county. I would like to invite each Member to join me and my constituents in celebrating Dickenson County's birthday and to ask that they attend any or all of the events connected with this observance. In closing, I wish to make this final remark: should any of you visit us during this jubilee celebration, you will be received most cordially and treated to the heartfelt hospitality of Dickenson County.

CORRECTION OF HEARINGS

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on pages 488 and 489 of the Treasury-Post Office Department hearings for 1956, under the topic "Abandonment of Site Tax Privilege," the Gulf Oil Co. is erroneously referred to. The hearings should have read, "The Tidewater Oil Co."

I make this statement in order that the public may be informed of this error.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

HAWAIIAN AND ALASKAN STATEHOOD

Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States (Rept. No. 88), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

SUPERCARRIERS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call your attention to the fact that hearings will start next week on H. R. 4393. This bill will authorize the construction of a fifth supercarrier.

I have the highest regard for the members of the Armed Forces Committee and I am confident that before they take final action on this bill they will request an opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the weapons system evaluation group. It is my understanding that the Joint Chiefs have never been called upon for a direct recommendation or approval of this particular part of our defense program. The time has come in America when we must eliminate any unnecessary expenditures concerning national defense or any other spending program by any branch of the Federal Government.

It was my pleasure to work for the passage of the Unification Act of 1947. It was our understanding at that time that the Unification Act would eliminate waste and duplication in the various branches of our national defense. I have been greatly alarmed by recurring reports that supercarriers are being built, and will continue to be built, for the purpose of strategic air bombardment. If this is the real idea behind the supercarriers then their construction is designed for duplication of the role of our Strategic Air Force.

With our immense national debt and burdensome taxation, our people cannot afford the luxury of two strategic Air Forces within our National Defense Department. I do not believe anyone will argue that it is not many times more expensive to launch a strategic air attack from carriers into the heart of Russia if, indeed, it can be done at all. For what other purpose could giant supercarriers be built, other than to duplicate the role of the Air Force? No potential enemy country is constructing aircraft carriers or in any way challenging our supremacy of the seas except by landbased aircraft and submarines. No one would argue that supercarriers are necessary to eliminate a submarine menace.

Mr. Speaker, for what other reason, may I ask, are they being constructed other than as a rival and duplicating force to the strategic air arms?

I believe the supercarrier to be squarely in competition with the Strategic Air Command. There is, of course, no divine law which dictates that strategic air operations are and should be forever the exclusive responsibility of the Strategic Air Command.

To me it is entirely conceivable that the carrier might have a proper role in the conduct of strategic air operations. If it is so, we should recognize that fact and assign them that responsibility. On the other hand, if it is not so, we should limit its responsibility to control of the seas. If it is not so, we should not waste any more of our resources on a weapons' system which is less effective than others which are available.

If the supercarriers were actually in service today they would be incapable of any material contribution to a strategic air campaign. Yet the very first one will not join the fleet until next year. And the last one will not be finished until the 1960's. By that time, with the development of ultrasonic long-range aircraft and a whole new family of guided missiles designed for all kinds of targets, the supercarrier will be as obsolete as the prehistoric mastodon. Thus these behemoths will be obsolete even before we finish appropriating the money for their construction.

But we do not have to look into the crystal ball of the future to judge their ineffectiveness. I understand, for example, that a carrier strike today on a few targets on the periphery of the Soviet Union would cost 8 to 10 times as much as the same mission performed by land-based bombers. Would it not be more appropriate for our strategic aircraft to drop off the necessary bombs as they fly over the enemy's submarine pens rather than build a weapons system for one limited look? If these submarine pens threaten our control of the seas, they must be destroyed. But is there any divine reason why they must be destroyed by planes flown from supercarriers when our Strategic Air Command can do the job more effectively and more economically.

The most important strategic targets, of course, would be completely out of the range of the supercarriers regardless of the expense. It is a simple fact that because of their inherent characteristics, carrier aircraft cannot compete on favorable terms with long-range, landbased planes such as the B–47 and B–52 which can be refueled in the air.

Even more important is the fact that the excessive vulnerability of the supercarrier would make it impossible to do the limited job even at 8 or 10 times the cost. The Navy's concern about the supercarrier's vulnerability was unexpectedly brought to light recently in a statement by an Assistant Secretary of the Navy that they would like to withdraw their carriers from the restricted waters of the Mediterranean. This makes sense in view of the carrier's extreme vulnerability in such narrow waters. Such a withdrawal, of course, drastically reduces the number of targets the carriers can attack.

Apologists for the supercarrier tacitly acknowledge the vulnerability of the supercarrier but attempt to divert attention from these disadvantages by pointing to the supercarrier's mobility. The fact that the supercarrier will be able to travel at 40 knots is truly its strongest point. A speed of 40 knots, however, is insignificant in comparison with the 400-knot speed of the enemy's long-range reconnaissance and bomber aircraft. With modern heavy airborne radar the enemy will be faced with the proverbial sport of shooting fish in a rain barrel.

Despite the serious drawbacks of the excessive vulnerability and limited effectiveness of the supercarrier, it would not make so much difference if they were not prohibitively expensive.

It is not always recognized just how much this supercarrier program will cost us. The Navy has announced that they plan to build a total of 10 supercarriers. The cost for these supercarriers alone will run to more than $2 billion. Any aircraft carrier, of course, is too valuable a piece of equipment to be left without protection. It is this high degree of vulnerability which makes the supercarrier program so very expensive. We might reasonably expect that the combat ships, such as cruisers, destroyers, and submarines necessary to protect these carriers would represent an additional investment of $2 billion. The supply ships needed in direct support would mean an additional investment of more than $1 billion.

Thus, in terms of ships alone, the cost runs to more than $5 billion. This does not include the cost of intermediate logistics units nor shore bases. Nor does it include the aircraft for the carriers. Nor does it include the yearly costs of maintenance—repairs, petroleum, supplies, and costs of personnel. Yearly salaries of personnel alone would be considerable when you consider that a typical 4-carrier task group with its supply ships would consist of almost 50,000 men.

These astronomical sums seem- almost unbelievable. I confess they floored me. However, when you stop to realize that Congress never votes on the whole program, but merely approves the program piecemeal on a year-to-year basis, you can more readily realize how these vast sums can be spent before you realize it.

The point is simply this: I feel that we should take a long look at the whole supercarrier program before we go on to spend any more of the taxpayers' money.

I would like to remind the Members of Congress, and especially the members of the Armed Services Committee, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have never approved the supercarrier program. What justification then do we have for appropriating billions of dollars for a weapons system which has never been evaluated by our top military organization?

Neither the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Weapons System Evaluation Group, or any other interservice group has ever conducted a comparative cost study of the carriers as compared with other competing weapons. To me this is inconceivable. It was to make such comparisons possible that the Unification Act was passed.

Before we spend another cent for the supercarriers I think this House should insist that an interservice group undertake an honest, impartial, comparative cost and effectiveness evaluation. Only after we have been given such an evaluation can we be in a position to make the correct decisions on these vital questions of our Nation's security.

CANCER RESEARCH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 4583, a companion bill to S. 312 sponsored by Senator M. M. NEELY, who has long advocated cancer research and has devoted many years to this humanitarian work. This bill authorizes and requests the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and

utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer.

Yellow fever, diptheria, typhoid, smallpox, and other dire afflictions have been conquered by medical science. Yet, in spite of all that physicians, surgeons, chemists, biologists have done, cancer is still unconquered and unconquerable. It is the most defiant foe of the human race. Surgery, radium, and X-ray are the only means of combating this frightful destroyer, yet every passing year adds to the demonstration that cancer cannot be eradicated by those, or any other means, now known.

On the average of every 48 seconds some man, woman, or child dies of cancer in our country. It is more destructive to life, health, and happiness than all the wars that have ever been waged. It is more irresistible than the mightiest armies that have ever marched to battle and has invaded every country in the world.

There is hardly a family in the United States—nay, a Member of this House—who in the realm of his own friendship or in his own immediate family has not felt the swift and silent hand of cancer strike with unrelenting force.

That is why we must make an all-out effort to control this destructive force in human tissue, to solve the mysteries and end the tortures and the terrible mortality rate of the country's dreaded killer. We must not think only in terms of dollars, but in terms of human lives and the great loss we suffer of the hearts and minds of those we cannot ever replace.

What wonders we could develop for the advancement of humanity, if the same skill, money, and effort which is spent on the cold war were diverted in a race of armament against this dreaded disease.

The American Cancer Society and many devoted medical experts are doing a magnificent job in aiding and alleviating the suffering and prevention of cancer, but the effort of this group is all too meager. We must most definitely encourage scientific research and end the nightmarish terror and emotional breakdown suffered by the victims of cancer. We must give suffering humanity a fair opportunity to benefit from the skilled brains of our country.

Now is the time for us to take immediate steps to help the hundreds of thousands of our American men, women, and childen, including members of our Armed Forces and veterans lying in hospitals who are helplessly afflicted by this disease. We must bring about a timely and called-for study by appropriate experts to aid these victims. They look to us in the Congress who have the opportunity to speak for them to do what we can to help them in their helpless condition.

In this great Nation of ours, with its vast resources and tremendous capacity for wealth, I cannot help but wonder if we cannot bring ourselves to provide more funds for research. Through research can be found the answer to the diseases which today have disappeared and which are now academic matters and are contained in the medical volumes. In the same light, by research will we be successful in finding the answer to the problems of cancer, heart diseases, and the other dreaded diseases.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that the wonderful day is not too far in the future, when the energy and skill of science, through research, may bring about the improvement of human health and the advancement of civilization throughout our great Nation and the world.

We have no guarantee that any amount of expenditure will result in the discovery or invention of a cure or preventive of cancer but we must keep trying for some new means as revolutionary as the atomic bomb itself to destroy this all-devouring foe, or it will ultimately rob this planet of human life.

AUTHORIZING SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES HAVING A SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill which I introduced this date authorizing the Small Business Administration to make loans to any municipality having a substantial labor surplus, as certified by the Secretary of Labor according to the standards established under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 or any similar rule, regulation, order, or policy.

The purpose of these loans is to assist local communities to promote the establishment and location of new industries and businesses in such communities.

It is also provided that loans may be made with certain restrictions for the purpose of assisting the community in promoting the expansion and modernization of those industries and businesses already located in the community. The restrictions require that no financial assistance be extended unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

All loans require security to assure repayment and shall have a maturity date not in excess of 25 years. No municipality may expend for any one project an amount which exceeds $100,000 or one-half of the total cost of such project whichever is smaller. It is also provided that the total amount of the outstanding loans at any one time shall not exceed an aggregate of $100 million.

Mr. Speaker, since the postwar years of the Second World War, with the exception of the Korean war period, the United States Department of Labor has found it necessary to classify areas having a marked labor surplus into what is known as class IV–A and class IV–B. Class IV–A areas are those having a substantial labor surplus; while class IV–B areas have a very substantial labor surplus.

By way of explanation class IV–A areas are those that have a substantial labor surplus to the extent that from 6 percent to 12 percent of their employables are unemployed, while class IV–B areas have a very substantial labor surplus with 12 percent or more of their employables unemployed. For example, in my home city of Altoona, Pa., we have in excess of 18 percent of our employables unemployed, while in some other cities in the class IV–B category the percentage of unemployed employables is in excess of 22 percent.

As many of you know, there has been a determined effort on the part of communities throughout the Nation that have substantial labor surplus to try to correct the situation by intensive and extensive programs to attract new industries or assist present manufacturing firms to expand and modernize their facilities as a source of providing employment. This community effort has spread to the State and National level as the departments of commerce of the various States, in cooperation with the United States Department of Commerce, have made every possible effort to assist local community groups in their programs to attract new industries.

The various community organizations have sponsored live-wire programs enlisting the active support of business and labor organizations in their drive to make known the advantages a community can offer to a prospective industry.

In addition, funds have been collected through the efforts of these community groups to finance the expenses incurred in aiding a new industry or in moving a plant that is interested in locating in the community.

In my congressional district, which comprises Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties in central Pennsylvania, almost every community has a well-organized program in its efforts to attract new industries.

These programs are sponsored by the various trade organizations, such as the chamber of commerce in Altoona, Tyrone, Philipsburg, Clearfield, Curwensville, DuBois, Coalport, Houtzdale, and Beccaria.

From an overall standpoint, there has been organized in Clearfield County an industrial development corporation known as the Clearfield County Moshannon Valley Industrial Development Corp. This nonprofit corporation is designed to coordinate the efforts of all the community groups and has as its common objective the revitalization of the economy of the Clearfield County and Moshannon area by the development and use of available resources.

In trying to solve the unemployment problem in my hometown of Altoona, where over 18 percent of the employables are unemployed, we have had excellent cooperation from every segment of the economic life of the city and surrounding areas. Wage earners, professional people, businessmen, and labor and civic groups, as well as industrial leaders, have worked shoulder to shoulder in trying to find a solution to the problem of unemployment. It is a hard, difficult task with keen competition from hundreds of other areas which are in the same boat.

Whether an area has a textile or some other industry that is at low ebb or like in central Pennsylvania where our coal industry is in the throes of a depression, the same old problem of unemployment is the end result.

When you consider that every 2 months the United States Department of Labor is required to classify 149 major labor-market areas in the Nation and the majority of them are in the substantial or very substantial labor-surplus category, it is evident that the Federal Government, through the Small Business Administration, can lend a real helping hand by extending loans to municipalities who can qualify under the provisions of my bill. After World War II, when efforts were made to return our economy to a peacetime basis, unemployment began to rear its ugly head as contracts for war materiel were curtailed and our industrial plants reduced production because of lack of orders.

Then came the Korean war and war contracts were again awarded with the result that the increased production temporarily suspended judgment day, which came upon us when the shooting ended and the truce talks became a reality.

Now we are back on the same old trail toward an economy based on peace and not on war. It is a difficult transition after so many years of stepped-up production of the materials of war. None of us want to see our national economy permanently dependent on war and its senseless slaughter of human lives. Therefore, to cushion the shock that comes from an all-out effort to turn swords into plowshares, we have as a Nation a solemn duty to make certain that every American wage earner is given an opportunity to earn a living without being dependent upon the ravages of war for his daily bread.

I think that my bill to provide financial aid to the communities in the all-out struggle against unemployment is a bill that deserves the support of every right-thinking American because any legislative measure that will promote employment opportunities and replace sorrow with hope in the hearts of American wage earners is deserving of support.

Therefore, since we are sent here to Washington to represent the best interests of the people of our respective congressional districts, I hope that all of you will take the time to study the potential results that are bound to accrue from my bill and in doing so will join me in a wholehearted effort to have it enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point the language of my bill:

H. R. 4628

A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to authorize loans to be made by the Small Business Administration to municipalities having a substantial labor surplus

Be it enacted, etc., That, section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (15 U. S. C., sec. 636) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (d); by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (e) and inserting in lieu thereof: "; and"; and by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(f) to make loans to any municipality having a substantial surplus of labor (as certified by the Secretary of Labor according to the standards established under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 (18 F. R. 6995), or any similar rule, regulation, order, or policy), to enable such municipality to promote the establishment and location of new industries and businesses in such municipality, and to enable such municipality to promote the expansion and modernization of those industries and businesses already located in such municipality; except that such loans shall be subject to the following restrictions:

"(1) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to (f) above unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and all loans made under (f) above shall be so secured as reasonably to assure repayment;

"(2) no loan shall be made which shall have a maturity date in excess of 25 years;

"(3) no municipality may expend for any one project an amount which exceeds $100,000 or one-half the total cost of such project, whichever is smaller."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 204 of such act is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "275,000,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof: "375,000,000";

(2) by striking out "207 (a), (b), (c), and (d) in the fourth sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof: "207 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (f)"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after the seventh sentence thereof the following: "Not to exceed an aggregate of $100,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 207 (f) of this title."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 221 of such act (relating to the termination date of the Small Business Administration is amended by striking out "June 30, 1955," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED MARCH 15

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday, March 14 be dispensed with and that the Consent Calendar be called on March 15 when the call of the Private Calendar takes place.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today—March 3—is an anniversary of great significance to this body and to the Nation. It was on this day 100 years ago that President Franklin Pierce signed the bill establishing St. Elizabeths Hospital. I need not dwell on the gravity of the problem with which this great institution is concerned; as we all know, mental illness in its various forms claims more victims in this country today than any other single disease.

This is an anniversary of special interest, of course, to those of us who have the good fortune to represent the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, because it was from Massachusetts that the inspiration came which led to the establishment of St. Elizabeths and many other mental hospitals in this country and Canada and some, even, in far-off Japan.

A century ago, there were few institutions devoted exclusively to the care of the mentally ill, and it is probably safe to say that those that did exist at that time were inadequately staffed and equipped. For the most part, the mentally afflicted in those days were kept locked up in jails and almshouses, or, as was usually the case with the more seriously ill, boarded off in barns and other outbuildings. A great many of them, indeed, lived out their days in chains.

How long it might have taken the country to become aroused to these terrible conditions had it not been for the inspired work of the onetime Boston schoolteacher, Dorothea Lynde Dix, no one can say. Interestingly enough, it was by mere chance—or perhaps it would be more accurate to say by good fortune—that Dorothea Dix herself became interested in the plight of the mentally ill.

One day in 1841 Miss Dix was asked if she could recommend someone to teach Sunday school to the inmates of the East Cambridge jail. They were a difficult group to handle, she was told. Although she had only recently been forced to give up schoolteaching because of ill health, or so she thought, she decided to take on the task herself. St. Elizabeths Hospital and many other mental hospitals as we know when today owe their existence to that decision.

Until she got inside the jail Miss Dix was unaware that it was also used to house the insane people of the community. The biography, Dorothea Dix: Forgotten Samaritan, by Helen E. Marshall, describes the incident in the following words:

> It was a raw March day and the wind whipped sharply around the corners and rattled the windowpanes; the mentally ill huddled closer together in their cold, damp quarters; their teeth chattering at times, and they drew their thin garments tightly about them. They looked appealingly at the sad-faced woman in the dark cashmere, and she was moved to compassion.

Miss Dix was 39 years old at this time. From then on until her death in 1887 at the age of 85 she worked continuously, one is prompted to say almost furiously, to improve the lot of the mentally ill. Until the last few years of her life, her own strength finally exhausted, she was almost never still. Back and forth she went, into one State after another, to Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, visiting the mentally ill in their hovels, marshalling her facts, then pleading, cajoling, demanding action—and getting it. Her

memorial to the Legislature of Massachusetts, the first of many such presentations to legislative bodies, is one of the great documents in the annals of mental illness.

Today, just across the Anacostia River to the south, in the District of Columbia, stands one of the great monuments to the work of this remarkable woman, St. Elizabeths Hospital. From the beginning, St. Elizabeths has been a leader in its field. It was the first hospital in the Western Hemisphere to use the malaria treatment for paresis, probably the first American hospital to use the psychoanalytic technique in the treatment of schizophrenia. It was St. Elizabeths that introduced military psychiatry to this country. It has trained thousands of psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric nurses and social workers, chaplains, occupational therapists, and others engaged in the care and treatment of the mentally ill.

In all of its 100 years, St. Elizabeths has had but five superintendents, and one of the early superintendents died prematurely after he had held the position only a short time. This is a remarkable tribute, it seems to me, to the devotion of the professional people who helped to found this great institution and who have maintained its great traditions through the past century. The present superintendent, Dr. Winfred Overholser, is well known to many Members of the House. The great advances at St. Elizabeths in the present century are a tribute to his work and that of his immediate predecessor, Dr. William A. White, who served as Superintendent of St. Elizabeths from 1903 until his death in 1937.

The mental hospitals that have been built throughout the land since Dorothea Dix went to teach Sunday school to the inmates of the East Cambridge jail over a century ago are, above all, manifestations of the humanity of the American people. At the same time they stand as constant reminders that we have really traveled only a short distance along the road toward the ultimate solution of the problem of mental illness.

Improved care of the mentally ill, both as a result of better facilities and scientific advances, has removed much of the pain and squalor so commonly associated with diseases of the mind in times past. The fact that today the term "mental illness" has so largely supplanted the term "insanity" is, in itself, an indication of the progress that we have made in our attitudes and understanding of the problem. But the anguish, the economic loss that are concomitants of mental illness remain and are immeasurable.

I am sure that my colleagues in the House and the American people generally join me in wishing the people of St. Elizabeths Godspeed as they enter upon another century of their endeavor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include a broadcast.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 7, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

493. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report showing the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 201 (c), of Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

495. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

496. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

497. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

498. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

499. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove a discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 100. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2535. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; with amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 780. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; without amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4613. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the United States Customs Port Patrol and the United States Customs Border Patrol in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 4614. A bill to provide that Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., shall be a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4615. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4616. A bill to provide that certain caps shall be dutiable under paragraph 1504 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4617. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 4618. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 4619. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 4620. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the age at which individuals may become entitled to benefits thereunder from 65 to 55 in the case of widows and from 65 to 60 in the case of other women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4621. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 4622. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 4623. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4624. A bill to establish a family court in and for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4625. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 4626. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to certain individuals who are over the age of 18 but who are incapable of self-support by reason of physical or mental disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4627. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4628. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to authorize loans to be made by the Small Business Administration to municipalities having a substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4629. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4630. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution to control the number of licenses issued in the District of Columbia for the operation of motor vehicles for hire (taxicabs); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution relating to sales of Commodity Credit Corporation feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution designating the 26th day of May of each year, beginning with the year 1955, as National Country Music Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution extending the congratulations of Congress with respect to the celebration of the Jewish tercentenary in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 166. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate and study the administration of the Buy American Act; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 167. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate and study the problems of the aging and aged; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Memorial of the State of Arkansas Senate, senate concurrent resolution No. 12 urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate money under the Arkansas River multiple purpose plan and the President of the United States to approve such appropriation for the beginning of construction of dams within the State of Arkansas on the said river as set out in the comprehensive plan and recommended by the United States engineers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and take such appropriate measures that will assure the citizens of the United States and of the State of Washington the adequate use of Mount Rainier National Park through permission to establish and operate such facilities as are required for the use of visitors both summer and winter, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Verbie G. McCrory, Joseph Franklin McCrory, Mildred Childers, and Kenneth W. Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 4633. A bill for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4635. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 4636. A bill for the relief of Alicia Shapard (Mrs. J. I. Shapard); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4637. A bill for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4638. A bill for the relief of Fillipo Mastroianni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4639. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 4640. A bill for the relief of James M. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4641. A bill for the relief of Elias Kulukundis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 4642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 4643. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

135. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of the Laurel Hill Grange No. 1161, Ulster, Pa., in opposition to universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, March 7, marks the 105th anniversary of the birth of the founder and liberator of the Czech Republic. I am extending my remarks to pay tribute to this great man.

America has always had a warm place in her heart for Thomas Masaryk. Many thousands of Americans either came themselves or are descendants of men and women who came to us from the land of Thomas Masaryk, Czechoslovakia.

Furthermore, Thomas Masaryk had spent some time in the United States, where he had worked toward the final achievement of his goal, the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic. Here in Washington, he was a close friend of our great wartime President, Woodrow Wilson. And like Wilson, he was a scholar, a statesman, and a great leader of democracy.

Most of all, however, it was in America that Thomas Masaryk saw embodied many of the ideals of democracy which inspired his drive toward the achievement of national independence for Czechoslovakia. It was, therefore, partly upon the same principles which motivate American democracy that Masaryk constructed the Czechoslovak Republic.

On the anniversary of the birthday of Thomas Masaryk, it is fitting that all Americans pause to pay tribute to the memory of this great Czech patriot. In our tributes let us not forget the homeland of Masaryk, a nation which now lies downtrodden beneath the yoke

of the Communist aggressor. The Communists destroyed the Republic of Thomas Masaryk, but they can never destroy the ideals for which he dedicated his life. It is our prayer, as it once was Thomas Masaryk's, that Czechoslovakia will once again be free and independent.

The Leading Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast:

CBS RADIO PRESENTS THE LEADING QUESTION, FEBRUARY 27, 1955

Participants: Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee, and Hon. William F. Tompkins, Assistant Attorney General in charge of Internal Security Division.

They will give their answers to the lead-question: "How effective are former Communists as witnesses?"

Moderator: Dwight Cooke.

Producer: Nancy Hanschman.

Mr. COOKE. How effective are former Communists as witnesses?

Well, gentleman, recent events have raised this whole question of how effective former Communists are as witnesses, and for that matter, how useful they are and how desirable they are.

Of course, I suppose the item of news which has spurred interest in this overall subject has been the recent testimony of one Harvey Matusow, who has now, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, testified that he has been a perpetual and habitual liar, and I believe he was involved in testifying against some 180 persons by name.

Other witnesses also have changed their minds, or decided what they said was not so.

Does this mean, Congressman WALTER, that most former Communists should not be depended on as witnesses?

Mr. WALTER. Of course it does not. To my mind it indicates that the anti-anti-Communist drive is succeeding.

Mr. COOKE. Wait a minute, a double negative is takable, but the pro-Communist drive then——

Mr. WALTER. That's it exactly. It's technically called the anti-anti-Communist drive, Mr. Cooke, but I certainly feel that the American people are quite fortunate in having people who are willing to make the sacrifices that they do make, in order to learn about the machinations of this conspiracy, willing to come forward and assist the agencies of Government in exposing this international conspiracy.

Mr. COOKE. Well now, Congressman WALTER, are we not talking simultaneously about two different groups of people involved here now? First, the former Communist, like Harvey Matusow; and, second, the Americans who never were Communists, but who infiltrated into the Communist movement so that they would help the United States against it.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. COOKE. Do you also have praise for the first group, the former Communists themselves?

Mr. WALTER. I find it very difficult to bring myself around to praising anybody who, at any time, was a member of an organization that had as its purpose the overthrow of this Republic. However, they have apparently seen the light and are willing to atone for the dreadful mistakes that they made.

Mr. COOKE. So far we have only heard from the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. Tompkins, how about the executive branch?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Mr. Cooke, I'd like to say this: first of all you must remember that former Communists have given very valuable testimony concerning the revolutionary principles of the Communist Party; and you should also bear in mind that their testimony has been subjected, in each instance, to extended and intensive cross-examination by highly competent counsel.

Some of their cross-examination has lasted for several weeks. Now, the testimony of these witnesses, furthermore, has been weighed by numerous American juries, and it has been found credible.

Now, so far, of the 85 defendants that we have tried for conspiring to violate the Smith Act, and in one membership case which recently terminated here in Chicago, 82 have been convicted.

Now, I can't give you a more convincing yardstick of these witnesses.

Mr. COOKE. These witnesses being carefully tested before you present them all, as part of the case?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Very definitely so. In a preparation for a case, a host of reports have to be digested, a lot of material has to be correlated, the witnesses have to be interviewed, and you must remember that in many of these cases the witnesses are going back many years, searching their recollection.

Now, some of them may have notes from the time that they were members of this Communist conspiracy, but others are searching back maybe 10 or 12 years.

Mr. COOKE. And yet, gentlemen, I can hear some of your listeners say, "I have been reading about a character called Harvey Matusow. He says he was a liar when he testified to the things which helped cause court decisions and jury decisions to be made in one way or another. What kind of a witness was he then, or what kind of a witness was he now?"

Mr. WALTER. Well, maybe I could answer that best, Mr. Tompkins, because I heard Matusow testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities, and it seems to me that before I mentioned his testimony, it might be well for me to point out what that committee does in order to attempt to establish the credibility and honesty of the witness before he is called.

In the first place, and, General, may I say that we call on the Department of Justice for information? Is that revealing any secrets?

Well, we obtain a report from the FBI, and its judgment as to whether or not a witness is responsible and trustworthy, reliable, and honest.

Then we turn to the other agencies of Government concerned with people of this sort, and direct the same inquiry to them. Then the witness is interrogated in executive session by an investigator or counsel for the committee.

Then a report is made to the committee, as to whether or not in the judgment of the person who was charged with the responsibility of making this preliminary inquiry, this person is trustworthy.

The committee then acts, usually on the recommendation of the investigator or the attorney.

Now, that's exactly what happened with Matusow. We were of the opinion that the man was trustworthy and reliable. His story to the committee was absolutely straightforward. I saw nothing in it to indicate that it was colored, and having had the experience of trying literally hundreds of cases in the courts, and knowing something about witnesses, I felt positive that this man was telling the truth.

And, let me tell you, Mr. Cooke, I am convinced that he did tell the truth when he testified before our committee.

Subsequently, we heard stories about his recanting, we called Mr. Matusow a second time, took his original testimony and asked him questions on the original testimony, and he reaffirmed everything that he had said originally.

Now, and that is why I am thoroughly convinced that the fellow is now an emissary of the anti-anti-Communist movement, because when he said that he didn't tell the truth before our committee, then I say it was then that he lied.

Mr. COOKE. So in other words you believe now that Matusow is lying in order to help the Communist Party by impugning witnesses who've testified against people they claimed were Communists.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Cooke, not only to aid the Communist Party, but in order to try to prevent justice from being done in the cases of those conspirators who were convicted and are faced with the serving of terms in the penitentiary.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Mr. Cooke, and Congressman WALTER, I'd like to point out one very fundamental fact: People say why do you have to use these witnesses, and I'd like to quote a very famous jurist, American jurist, Judge Learned Hand, speaking for the court of appeals in the famous Dennis case, wherein the judge said:

"Courts have countenanced the use of informers from time immemorial in cases of conspiracy or in other cases when the crime consists of preparing for another crime. It is usually necessary to rely upon informers or accomplices because the criminals will almost certainly proceed covertly."

Now, the Communists and some of the Soviet apologists and some of the left-wingers have attempted to connote something evil in the term "informer."

In other words, they have tried to cast a shadow over every one of these witnesses who will come forward and testify for the Government.

Now, a second thing that I think you should be mindful of, in the country today, there is an article that appeared in the January 30 issue of the Denver Post, and it was a very blunt announcement that the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, and I think all of us know what kind of an organization that is, and that it was expelled from the CIO——

Mr. WALTER. May I interrupt, Mr. Tompkins, for the benefit of those people who don't know what it is, let me say categorically that it is a Communist-dominated union.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Thank you, Congressman.

The International Union, at any rate, announced publicly that they were going to start a drive to discredit Government witnesses who were appearing against Maurice Travis, the union secretary-treasurer, who is awaiting trial in Denver's Federal District Court.

They have made no bones about it, that they are going to use every means to discredit the Government witnesses.

Mr. COOKE. In your statement——

Mr. WALTER. Well now, may I interrupt at that point?

Mr. COOKE. Go ahead.

Mr. WALTER. And isn't it a fact that this same union has purchased 6,000 copies of Matusow's book, which is now on the presses?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Congressman, if you will accept that amendment, it's gone up. I think it's closer to 10,000 right today.

Mr. WALTER. Well, of course it will go up, as is necessary to maintain this man.

Mr. COOKE. Well now, a minute ago Mr. Tompkins used a phrase I would like to have him expand a little bit.

You have been stressing how you believe people like Matusow are an attempt to impugn witnesses which help you convict Communists.

You used the phrase, Mr. Tompkins, "Communists," and I don't remember it specifically, it doesn't matter, and left-wingers, something to that effect.

Would you like to expand that last part of that phrase a bit, because——

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, the only way I can expand it is this: We expect to see the Daily Worker come out and denounce these witnesses, but we are very, very much mystified at some apparently respectable writers who have been carrying on a consistent campaign to discredit; and I might say some of these writers had an advance copy of Mr. Matusow's book.

Mr. COOKE. Are you thinking of a certain columnist specifically who said he'd read it, and every page had been signed by Mr. Matusow?

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's correct.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I might inform you gentlemen that I have a copy of the book here, with me, and I brought it over just because I thought that at some time or other in this discussion with the distinguished Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States somebody might raise the question about the loyalty of this man at any time.

And I think that right at the very beginning he makes it very apparent that he has always been a Communist, in addition to his testimony before the Senate the other day, when he questioned whether or not there was any international conspiracy; but here is what he says in his book:

"My second act of political agitation was a violent one. I threw a rock through the window of the Young Communist League headquarters in my neighborhood. I knew nothing about communism, and cared less, because communism was bad and I feared and hated it.

"I lost my fear while in Europe when I met my first Communists face to face, two members of my infantry company were party members and, to my great surprise, I liked them.

"On occasion I went to Paris and there I met a number of French Communists. I found I respected them. They had all been active in the underground movement, fighting on the same side, in the same war, and for the same cause that brought me to Europe."

Now, gentlemen, I submit that as exhibit A of my charge that this man has always been a Communist, because if that isn't the Communist Party line, then I don't know what the Communist Party line is.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, I think the Congressman and I have very, very strong suspicions that Mr. Matusow had no such book in mind until he fell afoul of the Communists. I think that one of the publishers of his book pleaded the fifth amendment when questioned before a Senate committee last year in Boston.

Mr. COOKE. Not about this book, though?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Not about this book, no; the book was not in being then, I don't believe.

I think it's also interesting to note, in connection with Mr. Matusow's testimony now, in which he repudiates his testimony concerned with Clinton Jencks, an official of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union. It's interesting to note that Mr. Matusow now has retracted his testimony, and I'd like to cite this as an example of whether his present retraction is in good faith.

When a Senate committee had a hearing, I believe it was out in Salt Lake, Mr. Matusow testified that Mr. Jencks, I believe, was a member of the party.

When Mr. Jencks was confronted by Matusow, put under oath and asked whether he was a member of the party, he pleaded the fifth amendment.

Now, I don't think it takes much reasoning to come to the conclusion as to why he pleaded the fifth amendment, and as to whether or not Mr. Matusow was then telling the truth.

Mr. WALTER. Now, General, right at that point, may I ask you this: A number of people have minimized the importance of pleading the fifth amendment. Of course, I recognize the fact that there are some people who have firm convictions about testifying; but don't you—hasn't it been your experience in checking over the people who have used the fifth amendment, that they are Communists and have a Communist background, and are using the fifth amendment instead of admitting that they are Communists?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Oh, I think that's absolutely correct, Congressman WALTER.

Mr. WALTER. Well, it's very interesting to me, in examining Matusow's testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to a youth organization. He named a number of people, and I say to you quite frankly that we have subpenaed these people, not for the purpose of corroborating Matusow's testimony but for the purpose of establishing by other means the fact that these youth organizations against which he testified are, in fact, Communist organizations.

And it would be interesting to me to see how many of the people we've subpenaed will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. TOMPKINS. I think you will have quite a large group of them, Congressman.

Mr. WALTER. I am sure we will.

Mr. COOKE. There is one point I wanted to clear up, Congressman WALTER:

Are you suggesting that anyone who pleads the fifth amendment, namely, that says "I will not answer the question, because it would in some way criminally involve me," is, therefore, necessarily assumed to be a Communist?

Mr. WALTER. No, sir; nothing further from the truth. However, it's important, insofar as the Committee on Un-American Activities is concerned, to bear this in mind: That the people who have advanced the fifth amendment, have pleaded the fifth amendment, to use the vernacular, are people that we know are Communists.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, let me clear up one point, Mr. Cooke, in view of the question you just asked Congressman WALTER: Just remember this, you cannot plead the fifth amendment unless you have a reasonable apprehension that a truthful answer will incriminate you or expose you to a criminal charge.

Mr. COOKE. You can't plead it on matters of, so to speak, faith and conviction, that you don't believe that a committee has any right to ask you the question, and therefore you are not going——

Mr. TOMPKINS. I don't think you have any legal ground, so to plead it.

Mr. WALTER. That's right.

Mr. TOMPKINS. And these people are well advised by counsel, they have them outside grand-jury rooms, and next to them at hearings, and next to them at trials.

Mr. COOKE. So that a counsel says, "You can't—look here no matter what your conviction is here, you cannot plead the fifth amendment unless you have something to hide."

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's correct.

Mr. COOKE. Now, let me say——

Mr. WALTER. Wait a minute; I want to interrupt you at that point.

Mr. COOKE. We have two lawyers, and here we go.

Mr. WALTER. No, it isn't "here we go"; but you are overlooking this, Mr. Tompkins: Some of the members of the legal profession—I don't call them lawyers—you know there is a distinction between a member of the bar and being a lawyer——

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's right.

Mr. WALTER (continuing). But some of these members of the profession that you and I are members of, and are proud of, are the kind of characters who would attempt to prevent congressional inquiries from taking their full course, and would impede their work by advising their clients to hide behind the fifth amendment for no reason at all except that they, the lawyers, were desirous of preventing the truth from being known.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Congressman, you are absolutely right. I intended to bring out that point, sir. It's been my experience, in many cases, that you can pick any name out of the air; I've picked famous ballplayers, prizefighters, and people sitting next to me in grand-jury rooms, and the Communists have taken the fifth amendment.

Now, in other words, let me make this clear, and the Congressman, I think, has already made it clear—they don't plead the fifth amendment in good faith.

Mr. COOKE. All right; thank you——

Mr. WALTER. Well, I think the most dramatic instance of that comes from my own community, where a man came down here to testify—came to Washington to testify before a Senate committee—and he was approached in the Senate by a member of the bar who has appeared in a great many of these cases, who offered him his services. This man said he didn't have a lawyer, didn't want a lawyer, because he was going to testify, and this member of the Washington bar advised the man to plead the fifth amendment, which he did; he went back home to Easton, Pa., and lost his job as a steelworker.

Mr. COOKE. Mentioning Pennsylvania brings up another case, Mr. WALTER.

So far, the only witness we've mentioned by name here has been Harvey Matusow. There was a woman who testified in a hearing before the FCC, I believe, she testified first linking the owner of this television station with Communist activities, and then later retestified and said all that was false.

Where does she fall into the general picture here?

Mr. WALTER. Well, Im afraid that the FCC has gotten around to the point where a general investigation of its activities is indicated. I couldn't imagine anybody calling the kind of a witness this woman apparently is, and giving credence to her testimony.

Mr. TOMPKINS. You want to—you brought in the name of another witness now, Mr. Cooke, and I want to bring in the name of still another one that I know the Congressman is familiar with.

Mr. COOKE. I didn't name her, but I referred to her.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, I will mention one right now that some of those who seek to undermine the Government's program have attacked—Paul Crouch. They attacked Paul Crouch for his testimony in the Philadelphia Smith Act case which was concluded here last summer. They claimed it was at variance with the testimony that he gave in the Harry Bridges case on the west coast, when he was asked did he know 98 different names, in rapid succession.

Now, let me say this: The Government could have corroborated Mr. Crouch's testimony in Philadelphia with another witness, but for reasons of security we can't, you know, always use all witnesses at a given time, for reasons of security that witness was not used; but I want to make this very clear, that Mr. Crouch's testimony in Philadelphia could be corroborated.

Mr. WALTER. Why was it necessary? One of those witnesses up there, one of the de-

fendants up there, admitted that he was a Communist, but he said it wasn't a crime.

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's exactly right——

Mr. WALTER. Now, they are going to try to impeach Crouch's testimony because he testified against a man who admitted he was guilty.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, of course, as you know, Congressman, the Communists and their supporters want to confuse and mislead the American people.

Mr. COOKE. There's one area you gentlemen, I know, are interested in, we haven't had a chance to focus on.

Mr. WALTER mentioned it for a minute, and that's the area of witnesses who have gone into the Communist Party for you, or gone into other organizations to infiltrate and then report back. There are people who have accused them of being tattlers, spies, un-American, all kinds of things.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, that term "tattlers" reminds me of my own hometown newspaper where the editor describes a great patriotic American's testimony as tattling.

I want to tell you that it takes a great deal of courage to do what these people have done, to go into the Communist Party, lead the kind of lives that they lead when they are in it, only in order to make a contribution to the preservation of our institutions; and I think that they are deserving of a great deal of credit.

They are really the unsung heroes of this cold war.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, that's exactly right. I want to reiterate what the Congressman has said about these citizens who—he and I, I know, feel very strongly—are patriotic citizens. For example, one of these informants had to discontinue attending his church functions because of the antagonism shown toward what were believed to be his Communist activities. The children of his neighbors were not permitted to play with his boys and girls because their father was considered a Communist.

Now, when they come and testify, editorials—they have gotten editorial support and help in everything. Now, why is it that certain people now see fit to call them "stool pigeons"?

I disagree.

Mr. COOKE. All right, gentlemen; thank you for being with me today and giving us the benefit of your knowledge and your experience in this very tricky subject of former Communists as witnesses for the Government of the United States.

Price Increases in Shotgun Shells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district whose inhabitants burn up more powder than those of almost any other district in the Nation. In recent months, I have received many protests from hunters and trap shooters at the sweeping price increases imposed by the manufacturers of shotgun shells in the last 10 years. In the case of 12 gauge trap loads alone, the increase in this period has been 147.6 percent. I am further informed that price changes are generally announced by all manufacturers on the same, or practically the same, date. Typical of the many protests I have received is the following letter of February 25, 1955, from Mr. J. W. Whitehill, president of the Milwaukee Gun Club:

DEAR MR. REUSS: I am writing to you this morning in the interest of the many shooters from Wisconsin who participate in shooting trap and skeet at the Milwaukee Gun Club, Lake Park, Milwaukee, Wis.

The greatest number of shooters are from the Milwaukee area; however, at times shooters from all over the State shoot on our grounds. A considerable number of teams from the large industrial plants also shoot with us and we all are very much disturbed over the raising of the price of shotgun shells during the past year.

Earlier in the year of 1954, these prices were raised and at this time both the shooters and the manufacturers felt that by the elimination of some of the variety of shells being loaded we could agree upon simplifying our requirements by adopting a lighter load in a few specific types. It was our feeling that this would in some degree assist the manufacturers in stabilizing the price. Shortly after this, however, the manufacturers again raised the price 6 percent.

These continuing raises in price are most discouraging to the average citizen who derives pleasure and recreation in shooting of shotguns and in a very sincere effort to help ourselves we are experimenting at this time in the reloading of shells already shot and in this way we are reducing the cost to the shooters who are turning to this reloaded shell in desperation. The Milwaukee Journal has already written a story about this situation and we are finding more and more clubs around the country very much interested in doing something to cut down shooting costs, even importing foreign shells which can be delivered here for 10 percent less than the cost of American shells. We believe this is a most unfortunate situation, Mr. Reuss, and something should be done to stop it.

Shortly after these complaints came to my attention, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to obtain for me the price history of shotgun shells in the last 10 years. On February 11, 1955, the Legislative Reference Service wrote the Shotgun Shells Manufacturers Trade Association, the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute at 250 East 43d Street, New York, requesting a list of price changes in shotgun shells for the postwar period. When no reply was received, the Legislative Reference Service sent a followup telegram on February 25, 1955, saying, "Information urgently needed for Member of Congress."

Finally, a letter dated March 1, 1955, has been received by the Legislative Reference Service from the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter requesting a list or table showing price changes in sporting ammunition.

We regret that we are unable to comply with your request, but the Institute does not collect or publish information of any kind in regard to prices and has no such list or table. It is a definite policy of the Institute not to engage in any activity in respect to prices. Thus, the Institute has nothing whatsoever to do with prices charged by any of its member companies. Each member company determines its own pricing policy on whatever basis it sees fit and does not report its prices to the Institute. Therefore, we do not have and are not able to furnish any information as regards price changes for sporting ammunition over any period.

The activities of the Institute are concentrated in the fields of research, promotion, safety, and conservation. With the thought that they might be of some interest in connection with your survey of the industry, we are enclosing copies of various Institute publications, which will give you an idea of the important types of activity engaged in by the Institute.

RICHARD F. WEBSTER,
Secretary.

I have communicated to an official of one of the sportsmen's clubs in my district the position of the Sporting Arms and Ammunitions Institute that "We do not have and are not able to furnish any information as regards price changes over any period," and asked him for his comment. His comment was "applesauce."

I have today directed to Mr. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the following letter:

MARCH 3, 1955.

Mr. EDWARD F. HOWREY,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to bring to your attention a situation existing in the shotgun shell industry which is working great hardship on the millions of Americans who enjoy the sport of hunting and of trap and skeet shooting.

For some time, I have been receiving complaints from both within and without my district complaining of the steady price increases in shotgun shells and noting that these price increases have quite generally come at precisely the same time and in precisely the same amount. The following appears to be the price history of the larger shotgun shell manufacturers for 12-gauge trap load shotgun shells during the past 10 years:

Year:	*Price per thousand shells*
1942–46	$32.41
March 1946	37.21
July 1946	40.00
January 1947	48.00
March 1947	50.90
July 1947	53.45
January 1948	53.52
April 1948	58.82
July 1948	64.50
November 1948	67.70
May 1949	64.50
January 1950	65.10
August 1950	71.10
December 1950	78.60
January 1953	75.60
December 1954	80.25

Although trap loads are only some 20 percent of the total shotgun shells sold, the same percentage raises have been made over the years for all varieties of field loads.

You will note that the increase in price is 147.6 percent in under 10 years. I am further informed that these increases by the various manufacturers have been practically simultaneous.

You are, of course, familiar with the numerous cases establishing that horizontal price-fixing practiced in concert by manufacturers is violative of the Federal antitrust laws:

Federal Trade Commission v. *Pacific Paper Association* ((1927) 273 U. S. 52, 62); *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Company* ((1940) 310 U. S. 150); *American Tobacco Company* v. *United States* ((1944) 147 F. 2d 93); *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures* ((1946) 66 F. Supp. 323, 337).

On the question whether concerted action can be inferred from a long-standing uniformity of prices charged for a given product by the various manufacturers, coupled with almost simultaneous announcements periodically of identical price increases, the

Federal court in the *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures* case had the following to say:

"Such uniformity of action spells a deliberately unlawful system, the existence of which is not dispelled by the testimony of interested witnesses that one distributor does not know what another distributor is doing; and there can, in our opinion, be no reasonable inference that the defendants are not all planning to fix minimum prices" (*United States* v. *Paramount Pictures*, op. cit., p. 337).

On the facts, it seems to me that a thorough investigation of whether the Sherman and Clayton Acts have been or are being violated is in order. In this connection, the question of mergers in the shotgun-shell industry, and of possible relationships between domestic producers and foreign manufacturers of shotgun shells in restraint of trade should also be investigated.

I shall appreciate being informed of such public action as the Federal Trade Commission undertakes.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

Indefinite Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the House a very disturbing situation which has arisen in my district in connection with the new civil-service appointment system, referred to, I believe, as the career conditional appointment system, which went into effect in January.

On the surface the technical features of this program point to a definite improvement of the system. However, as is so often the case, when put into practical operation many grave inequities immediately become apparent. I am referring in particular to the unfortunate position in which over 1,000 employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard have been placed through no fault of their own. Many of these employees, having a record of from 3 to 8 years' continuous employment in the yard and with excellent performance records, now find themselves with an indefinite classification, and as such will fall victim to the first reduction in force that comes along, simply because at the time of employment the civil-service register had either been exhausted or was not established. Conversely many other employees with much less length of service and perhaps a lower efficiency rating have been classified as career conditional or in some cases given career status, with all the benefits and protection attendant to these categories.

I have received scores of letters protesting the arbitrary enactment of this new system. Many of the authors of these protests are known to me personally as fine craftsmen and would represent a serious loss to the defense effort should they fall victim to this ill-conceived order. I am asking the Civil Service Commission to review this program to the end that these glaring inequities be corrected.

As further proof of the disturbed condition of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, I offer by way of explanation an editorial entitled "Indefinite Status," which appeared on Friday, February 25, 1955, in the Salute, a weekly publication of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard:

INDEFINITE STATUS DISCUSSED

The retention of PSNS employees junior in length of service to shopmates who recently received reduction-in-force notices has given rise to questions about the regulations that authorize this apparent inequity.

In January the Civil Service Commission directed the Navy to replace the indefinite system of appointment with the career system. Under the new regulations indefinite employees who had been hired from the civil-service register were automatically converted to a career or career-conditional status. Other indefinites who may have been hired for similar work but were hired instead by recruiting (off the street), remained in an indefinite status and with lower retention rights. Because indefinite employees are in the lowest retention status they are usually the first to be affected by a reduction in force.

Prior to the adoption of new regulations the Civil Service Commission made no distinction between persons hired off the register and those hired by recruiting. During the Korean buildup registers were exhausted and many employees were hired off the street.

When notice of the new regulations was received the shipyard took every step possible to convert indefinite employees to career or career-conditional status. The conversion procedure requires that the indefinite employee who did not receive appointment from the register must now file and be within reach for appointment before he can be changed to retention group II.

The shipyard is doing little hiring at present and as current registers have many outside applicants it is not expected that conversion of all indefinite employees will be accomplished in the near future.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom, o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent still lead us on. We do not ask to see life's distant scenes; one step enough for us. We grope forward with uncertain step in a tense time, dark and filled with fears; as men in mad fury, oblivious to the precious prizes of a thousand years, would fain lead the race back to the law of the jungle as they crucify good will. In all the tumult and the shouting and the confusions of these days help us to trust the faithful stars above us and the glow on the far horizon where the gates of dawn await the day of global brotherhood.

Grant us honesty in dealing with our own besetting sins, humility in confessing them, and determination in overcoming them. At this high altar in the temple of public service maintain in us the fidelity of those to whom much has been given, and from whom much will be required. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 2, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, to make its provisions applicable for an additional period of 2 years. I make this recommendation because I believe the welfare of the country requires it.

In spite of major improvements which we have achieved in our contracting and price redetermination operations, there nevertheless remains an area in which only renegotiation can be effective to assure that the United States gets what it needs for defense at fair prices. In addition, I believe that the entire period of defense expansion and rebuilding which the United States has undertaken since the beginning of the Korean hostilities should be considered as a whole insofar as renegotiation treatment is concerned.

Continuation of the renegotiation authority is necessary for several reasons. Because of the complex nature of modern military equipment, the lack of experience in producing it and the frequent necessity for alterations during the life of a contract, it is impossible for the Government to determine, when the procurement contract is made, what constitutes a fair price and for the supplier

to forecast accurately his costs. Moreover, because of limited sources of supply in many cases, there are situations in which the Government is unable to obtain the price benefits that accrue from normal competition.

Furthermore, in the interest of broadening and strengthening the mobilization base, we have encouraged the extensive use of subcontracting. Because the United States has no direct contractual relations with the subcontractors, the only protection against unreasonable prices by them is through the process of renegotiation.

All these factors become particularly important when it is recognized that expenditures by the Government during the next 2 calendar years will include paying the bills for the completion of the expansion of the Air Force to 137 wings. The next 2 years also will see an introduction into the Air Force program of the latest type of supersonic aircraft. New types of equipment also are being ordered for the Army, and Navy, and Marine Corps.

As a nation, we recognize that so long as defense expenditures represent more than half of the national budget, we must do everything in our power to see to it that the maximum return is received for each dollar spent. On the other hand we must also be careful not to interefere unwisely in the traditional commercial relationship between the Government and its suppliers. In extending the Renegotiation Act last year, the Congress instituted new statutory exemptions. These have lessened the burden imposed on industry by renegotiation and, more important, have concentrated renegotiation in the areas where it is most needed.

I strongly urge that the Congress take action as promptly as possible so that both Government and business will know that this important adjunct to speedy and effective defense contracting will remain available, at least until December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1955.*

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have just heard with profound interest the President's message which urges the extension of the Renegotiation Act for a 2-year period.

On February 9, 1955, I introduced a bill to accomplish that very purpose, to extend the Renegotiation Act until December 31, 1956. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. I have discussed this subject with the chairman of that committee. I certainly hope favorable action will be expedited.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 4, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States, the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

CORRECTION — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 38

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask to have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1955, corrected on page 1134, so as to include the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 38, consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during the next 2 weeks while the Senate is in session, to conduct hearings in respect to the stock exchanges of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. HORACE KING, MEMBER OF THE PARLIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have as my guest today Dr. Horace King, a member of the British Parliament from the Southampton district, and a member of the British Labor Party. Under the rules of the Senate, as a member of a national legislative body, Dr. King is entitled to the privileges of the floor. I am very happy to have him present, and I am sure the Members of the Senate will be delighted to meet Dr. King individually. [Applause, Senators rising.]

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. RICHARD WOOD, A MEMBER OF THE PARLIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, it is a distinct honor to be permitted to introduce to the Members of the Senate a very distinguished visitor from England. He is distinguished in his own right and as being the son of a very distinguished gentleman, Lord Halifax, who, during a visit to some 40 States of the Union, called on disabled veterans in various hospitals and did much to bring them hope and cheer. Thus we had, in effect, two ambassadors from England, instead of only one. It is a great pleasure and honor to introduce the Honorable Richard Wood, a member of the Parliament of Great Britain. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are delighted to welcome to the Senate this distinguished visitor from the British Parliament.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished President pro tempore and also those of the Senator from Oklahoma in welcoming to the Senate Chamber this distinguished member of the British Parliament, the second one present today. I think it is quite fitting and appropriate that we have present a representative of the British Conservative Party, who has just been introduced, since earlier I had the pleasure of introducing a member of the British Labor Party, both of whom are distinguished representatives of their constituencies and of their country. I hope that as the years go by more representatives of both of those great parties may be able to visit this country and that perhaps more of our people may visit England, so that in the years ahead there may be brought about an even better understanding and closer relationship between the two great nations.

PRINTING OF MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR MAYBANK

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, during the memorial services held for Senator Maybank, our late departed colleague, numerous eulogies were handed to me by Members of the Senate, and unanimous consent was obtained to place them in the RECORD. It was my intention at that time to make a request, at the instance of other Members of the Senate, including the President pro tempore, to the effect that other Members who could not be present on the floor that afternoon would have several days in which to submit for the RECORD remarks or statements on the life, character, and public services of the late Senator Maybank.

I now ask unanimous consent that such remarks or statements may be submitted and that they may be printed in the permanent RECORD as of Wednesday last, following the other eulogies delivered on that day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote an agricultural development program under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and Army General Staff on December 31, 1954 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Borrowing Authority, for the quarter ended September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove a discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF NARCOTICS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO SURPLUS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Department of the Air Force covering the disposal of Air Force excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF MONEYS RECEIVED AND EXPENDED UNDER OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, the amounts of all moneys received and expended in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of August 7, 1953, for the period August 7, 1953, to July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION OF MORTGAGES AND DEEDS OF TRUST ON CERTAIN INDIAN OR RESTRICTED LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TERRITORY OF ALASKA TO INCUR INDEBTEDNESS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO AUTHORITY OVER CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Acts of 1934, as amended, submitted by the Federal Communications Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THEODORE J. HARRIS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Theodore J. Harris (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FURNISHING SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSAL OF FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY AT OBSOLESCENT CANALIZED WATERWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Selective Service System, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"To the President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; Director of Defense Mobilization; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of the Interior; the Governor of Alaska; the Delegate to Congress from Alaska; the Bureau of Public Roads; and the Alaska Road Commission, Juneau, Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the connection by road of Unalakleet and Kaltag, Alaska, is important to the defense of Alaska and the development of river commerce on the Yukon River; and

"Whereas such road would approach the Kateel River area in which approximately 500,000 acres of land are under oil leases; and

"Whereas the distance from St. Michael to Kaltag, the usual shipping route, by river is approximately 500 miles; and

"Whereas the distance from Unalakleet to Kaltag by proposed road is approximately only 90 miles; and

"Whereas navigation from Kaltag up the Yukon River as far Galena is open at least 30 days before navigation of the same river is open from St. Michael to Kaltag; and

"Whereas the proposed site for said road is a natural roadbed conducive to easy construction; and

"Whereas the construction of said proposed road would make it possible to get supplies into Galena by a much shorter route than that now followed in shipping down river from Nenana.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, Director of Defense Mobilization, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Interior, the

Governor of Alaska, the Delegate to Congress from Alaska, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Alaska Road Commission, Juneau, Alaska, to appropriate sufficient funds to construct this proposed road between Unalakleet and Kaltag, Alaska, in the construction year of 1956.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 15, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 21, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES; TO THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS MCKAY, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR; AND TO THE HONORABLE FELIX WORMSER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas domestic deposits of many vital metals and minerals are not nearing exhaustion; and

"Whereas heavy taxation has depressed the mining industry to the point where the chance of making a fair return on a new mining investment has all but disappeared:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully urges that to encourage and promote active search for, and exploitation of, domestic mineral resources, the Congress of the United States legislate into effect a tax incentive program, applicable to all States, Territories and possessions, embodying the following principles:

"1. Exemption from income tax liability of a newly launched mining enterprise for a period of 3 years after the property has begun commercial operations;

"2. Removal of the existing limitations on deductibility of exploration expenditures;

"3. Deductions for percentage depletion should not be denied a taxpayer either in a year of loss or the year against which the loss is applicable;

"4. Depletion should be allowed to stockholders owning stock in a corporation that derives 75 percent or more of its profits directly from the operation of mines; and

"5. A mining taxpayer should be allowed to write off up to 25 percent of his depreciable capital annually.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 4, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 21, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Petitions of Joseph M. Lynch, and sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Women's Federation of San Diego County, Calif., favoring the enactment of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Redlands (California) Real Estate Board, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish the San Bernardino FHA office for the processing of loan applications; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Western States Conference of the International Union of Operating Engineers, A. F. of L., relating to the use of Federal gasoline taxes for the reconstruction of the national interstate system of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR SPRING WHEAT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota relating to the unwarranted, unfair discrimination in acreage allotments for spring wheat.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture to take appropriate steps to correct unwarranted and unfair discrimination in respect to acreage allotements for hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota

Whereas there has never been and there is not now a surplus or oversupply of hard spring wheat; and

Whereas the allotement of hard spring wheat acreage throughout the State of North Dakota is so low in many instances that many farmers cannot operate their farms successfully and produce sufficient agricultural products and livestock to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families; and

Whereas there is unquestionably an unfair discrimination against the small hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota as compared with soft wheat farmers in other States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary and appropriate steps to establish a minimum of 100 acres for each hard spring wheat grower in the State of North Dakota, as well as in such other States as may be producing hard spring wheat and which are now faced with the hardship resulting from such unfair discrimination; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in Congress.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement of not to exceed 1 minute in support of the resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of North Dakota, and presented by my senior colleague [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the junior Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. YOUNG. The resolution very properly calls attention to the fact that the United States today does not have a surplus of high quality hard spring wheat. The spring wheat farmers of America have constantly strived to produce the very best-quality wheat. They have refrained from the temptation to produce low-quality wheats which are a much higher producer. To a large extent many of our low yields, and sometimes our crop failures because of rust, are due to the fact that our farmers have planted only top-quality wheat. This is not true of many other wheat-producing areas of the United States.

We do not believe our farmers should be penalized, as they are now, because they have continued to produce top quality but lower producing wheats.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 6

"Resolution to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from the State of North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from the State of North Dakota; requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway No. 2 to the National Interstate highway system

"Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that 'There shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico;' and

"Whereas the act further provided that 'The routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States,' and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

"Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated the second day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States, and

"Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified, and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

"Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

"Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the State of North Dakota, as well as the several other boundary States; and

"Whereas said United States Highway No. 2 plays an ever increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

"Whereas the said United States Highway No. 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's Highway No. 9 from New York to Montreal and Highway No. 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

"Whereas, under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of the United States Highway No. 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the Bureau, this could call for a two-lane highway with a 100-foot right-of-way, and

"Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in seven States from the City of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash., and

"Whereas, while this is a petition from the State of North Dakota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway No. 2, because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

"Whereas this request that the designation of the United States Highway No. 2 be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of North Dakota, and in the other States served by the United States Highway No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, that the senate does hereby, most earnestly and respectfully, request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway No. 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway No. 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Honorable Norman Brunsdale, Governor of the State of North Dakota, and by the Honorable Ben Meier, secretary of state of North Dakota, to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from North Dakota; and to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood

"Whereas the matter of the admission to statehood of Alaska and Hawaii has been under consideration for a long time; and

"Whereas both Alaska and Hawaii by the democratic processes prevailing therein and the actions of their people, have shown that they are entitled to become states of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to admit both Alaska and Hawaii to statehood; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial by the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide adequate sources of farm credit to agricultural enterprises in New Mexico, particularly those stricken by the drought and other disasters

"Whereas drought and disaster have created in many areas in New Mexico a critical financial condition for farmers and businessmen; and

"Whereas sound and adequate credit facilities are urgently needed to preserve the economy of many sections of the State and to prevent needless suffering on the part of those family enterprises hardest hit by drought and other disaster: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact new legislation and broaden existing legislation that will authorize or provide for the following:

"1. Extension of the authority and time limit for making emergency loans beyond the present 2-year period which expires in July 1955;

"2. Orderly liquidation of the above emergency loans over periods up to 10 years;

"3. A relatively low interest rate on such emergency loans;

"4. A loan program set up through the Farmers' Home Administration to enable farmers and ranchers to consolidate all of their financial obligations, excluding real estate mortgages, but including provision for interest on real estate loans and for taxes;

"5. A provision allowing the borrower, where necessary, to make reasonable land payments from sale of farm products;

"6. Additional farm-mortgage credit comparable to the former Land Bank Commissioner loans in such disaster and drought areas;

"7. Streamlining of Farmers' Home Administration loan procedures, including removal of regulations requiring personal financial responsibility of Farmers' Home Administration personnel except where fraud or gross negligence is clearly indicated;

"8. Broadening and extension of the feed and livestock use provisions of the emergency feed-relief program so that this program will be better adapted and more workable in each area, to include a provision that necessary precautions be taken to see that the feed is used for the purpose for which it was intended; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Representatives and Senators of the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States to support and undertake legislation limiting the importation of foreign petroleum

"Whereas to the best information available to the legislature of this State the following considerations pertaining to the petroleum industry should be held paramount in any public policy concerning the industry:

"Item I. There exists no reasonable and economic means of stockpiling petroleum for the national defense; therefore, large proven and developed reserves must be maintained through the investment of vast amounts of labor and capital and through the continuous application and development of new methods of discovery and recovery of petroleum reserves.

"Item II. The United States Department of Interior has urged that the petroleum industry maintain a production capacity far above the Nation's average daily production.

"Item III. In the interest of conservation of petroleum as a basic natural resource it is essential that the depletion of any pool or area be done in a methodical and orderly manner to conserve the resource and to attract new capital.

"Item IV. Most of the Nation's petroleum producing States have joined in creating and maintaining a voluntary and effective means of regulating production to serve the ends of national security and the conservation of this highly essential resource by providing a venturesome but, for the aggregate

of investors, a sound investment opportunity, and by providing for the Nation a rapidly growing quantity of proven reserves and highly productive capacity; and

"Whereas national policy now permits the importation of foreign crude petroleum or refined products at a rate which jeopardizes the continued development of domestic sources and production facilities and so endangers the Nation's defense as well as the economic welfare of New Mexico and her sister petroleum producing States; and

"Whereas New Mexico and her sister oil-producing States are contributing to and becoming essential parts of a great industrial complex founded largely upon petroleum as an economic and easily transported source of energy; and

"Whereas the continued growth and well-being of these States and the Nation depend upon the continuing development of petroleum resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, urged to act at the earliest opportunity to restrict the present excessive rates of imports of oil to a level which will prevent injury to the national security and the general economy and welfare of the Nation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be transmitted to Members of this State's delegation in Congress.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution to the United States Treasury Department regarding the sale of foreign and imported potash in the United States at less than fair market value

"Whereas the United States Treasury Department has reportedly ascertained that potash is being imported from foreign sources and sold in the United States at less than fair market value; and

"Whereas such action appears to be in violation of the Federal antidumping laws; and

"Whereas such action tends to damage the American potash industry, and particularly the potash industry of the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas the potash industry is of vital concern to the economy of the State of New Mexico and its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the United States Treasury Department be urged to take necessary action to investigate and enforce compliance with the letter and spirit of the antidumping laws of the Federal Government insofar as such laws pertain to potash and the potash industry; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and to each Member of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Mexico, and the United States Tariff Commission.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting 2 million acres of land in trust to this State for the purpose of providing public school buildings

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the United States Government and the agencies thereof own over 40 percent of the total land in the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas such land is not subject to taxation by the State and results in a hardship to the people of this State in raising sufficient revenue for the support of public schools; and

"Whereas a grant of 2 million acres in trust to the State for public school buildings would greatly alleviate such hardship; and

"Whereas such a trust would be of permanent and enduring benefit and would provide a more stable support for the public schools than appropriations by Congress for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation granting 2 million acres of land in this State in trust to the State for public school buildings and providing that only the income from such trust may be expended for such school buildings; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 4

"Memorial memorializing the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill No. 500 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project

"Whereas there is a pressing need for the most beneficial use of natural resources in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the citizens of New Mexico are especially interested in, and dependent upon the natural resources represented by life-giving waters of our rivers and streams; and

"Whereas Senate bill No. 500, now before the Congress of the United States, would, in the considered opinion of the people of New Mexico, and the 22d legislature of the State of New Mexico authorize an extremely vital project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be urged to give their earnest consideration to, and pass Senate bill No. 500, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to both Houses of Congress, to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to Senators CLINTON P. ANDERSON and DENNIS CHAVEZ.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 8th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Memorial 6

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to prohibit the issuance of Federal liquor licenses in counties of States having exercised local option prohibiting sale of intoxicants within its boundaries

"Whereas certain counties in New Mexico have elected by the local option process to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in their boundaries; and

"Whereas certain individuals obtain Federal liquor licenses and distribute liquor in violation of the local laws, a condition has developed which tends to contribute to juvenile delinquency. Lack of adequate police supervision in remote rural areas encourages youths to purchase alcoholic beverages from federally licensed persons and in violation of the New Mexico law; and

"Whereas the problem of law enforcement in counties of large area and small population is materially increased it is felt the denial of Federal liquor licenses in local option dry counties will reduce violation of local laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully urged to enact legislation prohibiting the issuance of Federal liquor licenses in counties of the State of New Mexico which have by local option process elected to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages; and be it further

"Resolved, That the enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

LETTER AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF INDIANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from William C. Brummett, principal clerk of the Indiana State House of Representatives and the enclosed copy of the House Concurrent Resolution 9, of the Indiana Legislature, relating to the investigation of corrupt operations of the Federal Housing Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter and resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, February 24, 1955.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The House Concurrent Resolution 9 commending the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate and you for your efforts in investigating the corrupt operations of the Federal Housing Administration is enclosed.

We are indeed proud to know that our own Senator is doing such fine work in the Senate.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM C. BRUMMETT,
Clerk.

House Concurrent Resolution 9

Concurrent resolution commending the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate and Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART for their efforts in investigating the corrupt operations of the Federal Housing Administration

Whereas shocking proof of wholesale misuse of the people's money under the loose or corrupt operation of the Federal Housing Administration has been revealed by the coast-to-coast investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate; and

Whereas these revelations are resulting in the correction of the laws and regulations which permitted this multi-million-dollar abuse to grow into a scandalous racket: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring):

SECTION 1. The members of the 89th General Assembly of the State of Indiana do hereby extend congratulations to the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate for what it has done, and they especially commend the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART for his tireless and thorough work as the chairman of that committee and for his fearless exposure of the Federal Housing Administration mess.

RESOLUTION OF GUAM LEGISLATURE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Maria C. Duenas, Executive Secretary of the Third Guam Legislature, Territory of Guam, together with Resolution No. 25, adopted by the Guam Legislature, relating to the special housing finance fund for Guam.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD GUAM LEGISLATURE,
TERRITORY OF GUAM,
Agana, Guam, February 14, 1955.

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
House of Senate,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As directed, I am enclosing a certified copy of Resolution No. 25, relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana, for his cooperation and his conscientious consideration and representations leading to the provision of a $15 million special housing finance fund for Guam, duly and regularly adopted by the Guam Legislature on January 19, 1955.

Very truly yours,
MARIA C. DUENAS,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution 25

Resolution relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana, for his cooperation and his conscientious consideration and representations leading to the provision of a $15 million special housing finance fund for Guam

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana and members of the staff of the distinguished Senator did cooperate fully and were instrumental in assisting the people of Guam to obtain a special assistance $15 million housing fund for the rehabilitation of this Territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Third Guam Legislature does hereby express on behalf of the people of Guam their deep and sincere appreciation to the Honorable Senator HOMER CAPEHART from Indiana for his sympathetic understanding of the housing problems of Guam and his constructive and effective aid in helping to partially solve the same through special assistance financing; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary be and she hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana, and to the Governor of Guam.

F. B. LEON GUERRERO,
Speaker.
A. S. N. DUENAS,
Legislative Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS, INC., CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the delegates of the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, at their meeting in Chicago, Ill., on October 2, 1954, relating to the treatymaking power, and tax-exempt foundations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION ON THE NEW BRICKER AMENDMENT

"Whereas the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, in regular session assembled in the past, have adopted resolutions favoring passage of Senator BRICKER'S amendment which would limit future treaty commitments to such areas as (1) those which would not abridge individual freedom, and (2) those which would not be unconstitutional if passed as domestic law; and

"Whereas a new Congress (the 84th) will convene on January 5, 1955, and many Members of it will not be cognizant of the association's previous actions; and

"Whereas Senator BRICKER has declared his intentions of introducing his new amendment (S. J. Res. 181 of the 83d Cong.) on the 1st day of the 84th Congress, January 5, 1955: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, in regular session assembled this 2d day of October 1954, do hereby reaffirm our support of Senator BRICKER'S Senate Joint Resolution 181 (83d Cong.), or equivalent legislation to be introduced; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to (1) the President of the United States, (2) all Members of Congress, and (3) all State and county medical societies."

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION ON TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

"Whereas the Reece subcommittee of the 83d Congress to investigate the activities of tax-exempt foundations is a temporary committee; and

"Whereas the Reece subcommittee was unable to complete its work and ceased to exist with the end of the session of the 83d Congress; and

"Whereas its preliminary investigations have revealed the urgent necessity of further investigation of the activities of the tax-exempt foundations: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons commend the Reece subcommittee for its work and petition the House of Representatives of the United States Congress to extend the life of this subcommittee with power and resources to complete its probe of the tax-exempt foundations."

TRANSFER OF NARCOTICS BUREAU—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I have long been deeply interested in doing everything possible to combat and destroy the dreadful narcotics menace in our Nation.

I have cosponsored legislation to battle against this grim problem and will continue to do so until dope addiction is slashed to the irreducible minimum in our land.

But we must always exercise sound judgment in evaluating actions which are proposed to meet this problem, particularly because narcotics are an indispensable arm of medical science wholly aside from the fact that narcotics are unfortunately misused in illicit channels.

I was interested recently to receive from Dr. J. O'Neil Closs, executive vice president of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, a message rightly conveying the judgment of that association in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Narcotics Bureau from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice.

The narcotics laws of our country are inextricably related to the administration of selected tax laws. The logical place of the Narcotics Bureau remains within the Treasury Department. Merely shuffling a Bureau which has been doing an outstanding job—shuffling it from one department to another is no answer to the narcotics challenge, as such. What is needed is better understanding of legitimate and illegitimate uses of narcotics, allocation of more agents for the Narcotics Bureau, more effective enforcement at State and local levels, tighter penalties and firmer rehabilitation of addicts.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be

referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., February 18, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of directors of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association has given thoughtful consideration to the proposal for transfer of narcotic control from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice, as provided by Senate Joint Resolution 19. Because such transfer appears to be against the public interest at this time, our board has passed the following resolution opposing it, and it urges that Senate Joint Resolution 19 be not adopted:

"Whereas governmental supervision of narcotic problems involves not only questions of criminal enforcement but also national and international social problems of addiction, and regulation of the affected drug and pharmaceutical industries; and

"Whereas the sound and effective execution of governmental narcotic control will be disturbed and impaired detrimentally to the public and to industry by its transfer to a different agency not presently organized to deal with the narcotic problem as a whole: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association opposes the transfer of narcotic control from the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice."

Sincerely,

J. O'NEILL CLOSS,
Executive Vice President.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CARPET INDUSTRY—MEMORIAL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a fortnight ago I received from the chamber of commerce of Amsterdam, N. Y., a petition signed by over 16,000 citizens of Amsterdam protesting against any further cuts in tariff as applied to carpets and rugs.

Mr. President, there is a tragic condition of unemployment in Amsterdam. It is a truly distressed area. One of the largest carpet manufacturers in America has closed its plants in Amsterdam and is moving elsewhere. There are, however, other carpet mills in Amsterdam. It is one of the great carpet-manufacturing centers of this country. The workers in the carpet mills, their families, and all the citizens of Amsterdam are deeply concerned over the impact of possible tariff reductions on their industries. I am concerned, likewise, although I have always been in favor of the greatest possible expansion of trade consistent with our national interest.

Without committing myself on proposed legislation that will come before us on this subject, I think that these petitions are of sufficient importance—representing the viewpoint of a large number of people in my State—that note of them should be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that one of these petitions be printed in the RECORD at this point. I shall transmit the remaining petitions to the Senate Finance Committee, which is considering this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned workers and residents of the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., and immediate vicinity, who are preponderantly dependent on our local manufacturers of machine-made rugs and carpets (Mohawk Carpet Mills, Inc., and Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., Inc.), do hereby respectfully petition United States Senators HERBERT H. LEHMAN and IRVING M. IVES, and Representative in Congress from the 32d Congressional District BERNARD W. KEARNEY, to exert every effort to prevent any Federal legislation which would further reduce tariff rates on machine-made rugs and carpets.

Foreign, cheap-wage machine-made carpets are coming into the United States at the rate of 2,800,000 square yards a year.

For every yard of carpet imported, 1 hour's work is lost to an American workman.

Foreign imports meant loss in 1954 of 2,800,000 man-hours of work, or an average of almost 3 weeks' work for each of the 30,000 United States carpet workers. Lost wages of American workers curtailed purchasing power which affects all segments of the community.

Since 1946 annual rate of growth of imports of machine-made carpets and rugs has averaged 26 percent per year.

Average wage for industrial workers in Belgium, 48 cents an hour; in Britain, 47 cents; in France, 46 cents; and in Japan, 19 cents.

It is against such wage levels that many American industries—including carpets—are being forced to compete.

The carpet industry firmly believes in, and makes a considerable contribution to, world trade. The industry is a vital part of our economy and contributes to world trade through $100 million a year in imports of raw materials, which is a very large proportion for a $400 million a year industry. All wools used in carpets are imported.

The city of Amsterdam, N. Y., is now classified as a critical labor area. The reduction of tariff rates on machine-made rugs and carpets will further increase unemployment, and such reduction will in all probability destroy our only industry in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y.

We petition that, in any trade-agreements act that may be passed, such legislation contain a provision excluding machine-made carpets and rugs from further tariff reduction.

(Signatures omitted).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 804. A bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 45).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 802. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 46).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 829. A bill to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games, and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 44).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 72. A bill to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national-forest lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 43).

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72) which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 and authorized by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period from April 1, 1955, ending January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $160,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE AN ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report, favorably, the nomination of Chester R. Davis, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Charles C. Finucane, who has been appointed Under Secretary of the Army. I ask that the nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Executive R, 83d Congress, 1st session, the International Telecommunication Convention, with annexes, and the final protocol to the Convention, signed at Buenos Aires on December 22, 1952, reported it favorably, with two understandings, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 5) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1289. A bill to establish a family court in and for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1290. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Government buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S.1291. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Gerasimos Christoforatos (otherwise known as Ioannis Gerasimu Christoforatos or John Christoforatos or Jon Christoforatos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 1292. A bill to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1293. A bill relative to the payment of salaries to recess appointees;

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of James William Turner;

S. 1295. A bill for the relief of Vera Ivanovich; and

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of Maria Anna Coone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 1297. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to regulate the transportation and shipment of fireworks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1298. A bill for the relief of Pericles G. Callimanopoulos and his family; and

S. 1299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esteni Rodriguez Estopinan de Witlicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1300. A bill to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1301. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1302. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S. 1303. A bill to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

S. 1304. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes.

S. 1305. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed; and

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; and

S. 1308. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to authorize more effective use of the special fund provided for in section 44; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1309. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 1310. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 1311. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 1312. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Santina Reichardt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1313. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $10,000 to $20,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1314. A bill for the relief of Reuben Nichols and Andrew Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1315. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1316. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1317. A bill for the relief of Yao Chung Hsuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 1318. A bill to authorize construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex. and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 1319. A bill to make available unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated for the agricultural-conservation program for wind-erosion control measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1320. A bill for the relief of Peter N. Vandoras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1321. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1322. A bill for the relief of Maria Ioannou Karvelis and her three minor daughters, Martha Karvelis, Boeleta Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1323. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S.1324. A bill for the relief of Salvatore di Morello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

READJUSTMENT OF THE POSTAL CLASSIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL MATERIALS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to readjust the postal classification of certain educational and cultural materials. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1292) to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CARLSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 204 (d) and (e) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C., sec. 292a (d) and (e)), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (d) The following materials when in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight may be sent at the postage rate of 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof, and this rate shall continue until otherwise provided by the Congress: (1) Books permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements

of books; (2) 16-millimeter films and 16-millimeter film catalogs except when sent to commercial theaters; (3) printed music whether in bound form or in sheet form; (4) printed objective test materials and accessories thereto used by or in behalf of educational institutions in the testing of ability, aptitude, achievement, interests, and other mental and personal qualities with or without answers, test scores, or identifying information recorded thereon in writing or by mark; (5) manuscripts for books, periodical articles, and music.

"SEC. 204. (e) (1) The following materials when in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight when loaned or exchanged between (A) schools, colleges, universities, or public libraries and (B) religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, or between such organizations and their members or readers or borrowers, shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, and this rate shall continue until otherwise provided by the Congress; (a) Books consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books; (b) printed music whether in bound form or in sheet form; (c) bound volumes of academic theses in typewritten or other duplicated form and bound volumes of periodicals; and (d) other library materials in printed, duplicated, or photographic form or in the form of unpublished manuscripts.

"(2) The rate provided in paragraph (1) for books may apply to 16-millimeter films, filmstrips, projected transparencies and slides, microfilms, sound recordings, and catalogs of such materials when sent in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight to or from (A) schools, colleges, universities, or public libraries, and (B) religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual."

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that every reasonable encouragement should be given as a matter of Government policy to the export through private commercial and eleemosynary channels of American publications and literary, artistic, and scholarly works and therefore the United States Government should take advantage of the optional provision of the Universal Postal Convention of 1952 to reduce by 50 percent the regular printed matter rate in the international mails for newspapers, periodicals, books, pamphlets, music, and maps as other leading countries of the world have done.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

This bill is designed to correct the principal anomalies and inequalities in the classifications governing postal rates applicable to educational and cultural materials. It has long been national policy to encourage the dissemination of such materials through the postal system; but in the many years since the matter of mail classifications has been considered as such, a number of relatively small but important types of material have been overlooked.

This is a particularly appropriate time to make these adjustments. Our educational institutions and libraries are struggling with the problems of maintaining educational and cultural standards for a vastly expanded school and college population. The continued growth of our intellectual, cultural, and artistic life is important not only for its own intrinsic value here at home but as a factor in international relations during this era of competition for the minds and spirits of men throughout the world.

I. SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

Section 1. Domestic rates: The first provision of this section adds to the materials eligible for the general rate on books and educational films the following additional items: (1) scholarly bibliography; (2) sheet music; (3) educational tests; and (4) authors' manuscripts. The second provision of this section removes the geographical limit on the library rate on books and educational films and makes the following additional items eligible for this rate: (1) scholarly bibliography; (2) sheet music; (3) bound academic theses and bound periodicals; and (4) other library materials including manuscripts.

Section 2. International rates: This section is an expression of congressional opinion that the United States should encourage the international exchange of American educational, cultural, and artistic materials by adopting the optional reduction in international postal rates for books, newspapers, periodicals, music, and maps authorized by the Universal Postal Convention, as many other leading countries of the world have done.

II. DETAILS OF THE BILL

Application of general book rate to additional materials

There has existed since 1938 a separate rate for books which is not zoned for distance. This rate is patterned on the nationwide rate for reading matter in newspapers and magazines (second-class mail) which dates from 1879. The objective in both cases has been to facilitate the dissemination of educational and cultural materials and not to penalize the citizens, the libraries and the educational institutions more remote from publishing centers with higher rates merely because of the accident of geography. In 1953 the book rate was also extended to educational films by Public Law 141, 83d Congress.

This general rate for books and educational films now stands at 8 cents for the first pound and 4 cents for each succeeding pound, and this bill suggests no change in this rate, which is still twice as high as the 1.95 cents per pound rate now applicable to the reading matter in general second-class publications. The bill merely permits this rate to apply to the following four additional small categories of educational and cultural materials:

Scholarly bibliography: By scholarly bibliography is meant lists of books and articles, frequently annotated, in a particular field sponsored or published by a professional society or other disinterested group for the guidance of scholars, students, librarians, professional practitioners and others interested in the field. At present such works are not admitted to the book rate if the name of the publisher and the price are listed, the Post Office Department having ruled that this makes the bibliography an advertising catalog. Thus works such as Winchell's Guide to Reference Books of the American Library Association, which is a critical guide for librarians on the encyclopedias and reference works of most use for particular purposes, is ruled to be a catalog and therefore not eligible for the book rate. These bibliographic guides are essential tools of the librarian, scholar, educator, and researcher, and are fully as deserving of favorable treatment as the periodicals and books to which they refer. Catalogs of individual publishers are not covered.

Sheet music: Printed music in sheet form is now severely penalized as compared with music in bound form in the domestic mails, and music in any form in the international mails. Printed music in bound form, such as songbooks and hymnals, qualifies for the book rate within the United States and is not zoned for distance; but the same music in sheet form is classed as parcel post if over 8 ounces, with considerably higher rates and rates increasing with distance. In the international mails, on the other hand, music qualifies for the favorable printed matter rate along with books, magazines, newspapers, and maps. By far the greatest volume of sheet music—some 84 percent—which is sold in the United States today is standard music, that is, religious, classical, or semiclassical. Only 16 percent of all music sold at retail consists of current popular songs. The bulk of this standard music is sold to public and private schools and colleges, to churches, and to private teachers of music: 88 percent of the music sold by dealers and 94 percent of the music sold directly to the ultimate consumer by publishers goes to these classes of consumers. The customary practice in the trade is that the consumer pays the postage. Almost half of the music sold by dealers is forwarded by mail to their customers and practically all of the music sold directly to the consumers goes through the postal system. The bill provides that sheet music shall qualify for the general book rate as bound music now does.

Educational tests: With the progress of education have come certain valuable new educational materials that have taken an important place alongside books: namely, films, pupil workbooks, and objective tests. The place of films and workbooks in the postal rate structure has been recognized by the Congress: these instructional materials may now be shipped to educational institutions under the same postal classification as books. This bill accords printed tests used by or in behalf of educational institutions the same treatment.

Use of tests is now one of the indispensable procedures in the improvement of teaching and guidance and in the discovery of talent. A significant aspect of a student's education today is measurement and appraisal of his status, development, and aptitudes by means of such tests. This procedure is to be encouraged, for tests contribute to the school's understanding of the student and his own understanding of himself, and thus to educational and vocational guidance to enable him to make the full use of his potentialities.

The bill provides that these test materials that are employed by or in behalf of educational institutions to determine abilities, aptitudes, achievement, interests, and other mental or personal qualities of their pupils be classified for shipment at the general book rate. This includes both (1) new test booklets and answer sheets and (2) those that have been marked by pupils.

1. The shipment of new or unmarked test material from the publisher or distributor to educational institutions: If the major premise is accepted that postal rates should apply equally to all forms of educational communication, then it seems clear that tests should be accorded the book rate. Tests and their associated materials (e. g. answer sheets, scoring keys, directions) seem to have been inadvertently excluded from the current book classification in part because of the arbitrary definition that a book must contain 24 pages. Transportation costs are borne by the educational institutions and this now imposes a special hardship under zoned parcel post rates for schools remote from the publishing centers for these materials.

2. The shipment to and from central scoring and research agencies for test materials with pupils' answers, scores, or identifying information recorded thereon: Many schools and colleges have come to rely heavily on cooperative educational testing programs that may be statewide, regional, or national in scope. The scoring or marking of the tests and the statistical analysis of test scores is frequently done by a central agency, usually on a nonprofit basis, with the results reported to the participating schools. Thus, the teachers and guidance personnel in the schools are relieved of the heavy clerical burden of marking tests, and the work is done faster and more accurately than it could be done at the school.

According to an interpretation of the present postal statutes by the Solicitor of the Post Office Department, test booklets or answer sheets on which pupils have indicated the answers they believe to be correct are technically classified as letters and must be transported by first-class mail. Shipment by parcel post or by means of private transportation agencies, such as Railway Express, would thus be in violation of the law because of the Federal Government's monopoly on first-class mail.

The operation of the present postal law seriously retards the development of cooperative testing programs involving central scoring and statistical service. Hence, it has a restrictive effect upon the obtaining and use of objective data in the improvement of the instruction and guidance of individual boys and girls. Funds available for testing are small in numerous schools and, under present financial conditions, it seems unlikely that they can be increased. The cost of transportation of marked test material to a test service center may now, in many situations, actually be greater than the service costs. Many schools must either refrain from participation in testing programs or require their teachers to use time in scoring tests that ought to be devoted to more important professional activities. This kind of use of teacher time for clerical purposes is particularly unfortunate at present when the teacher shortage is very acute.

High postage costs deter schools from obtaining for their pupils the full benefits of objective measurement, and especially is this true in districts that have low financial resources. It is the schools themselves that must pay the transportation costs; and the schools particularly in need of objective test data oftentimes are the ones least able to pay those costs. The provision of the bill to permit the shipment of test materials at the book postal rate will benefit children and youth at all educational levels throughout the United States.

Authors' manuscripts: Authors' manuscripts for books, periodical articles and music are now required to be sent by first-class mail unless they accompany corrected printers' proof sheets, in which case they may be sent as third- or fourth-class. This is a burden on authors and composers, who pay postage charges both ways in submitting manuscripts to publishers, and especially on authors of books and long serious works of music. Book manuscripts frequently weigh from 4 to 10 pounds and an average figure would be about 6 pounds, or $2.88 in first class postage. Thus the submission of a manuscript of 6 pounds to 10 publishers before acceptance would cost $54.72. Express is often somewhat cheaper but even express involves high minimum charges. In the 19th century our domestic postal rates gave more consideration to authorship—manuscripts were then not classified as first-class mail. Nor at the present time is the burden of letter rates imposed in the international mails governed by the Universal Postal Convention, under which manuscripts may be sent at the favorable commercial paper rate. An American author can now submit a book manuscript to a British publisher in London for about one-third the postage charges required to send the same manuscript to a publisher in the United States. It is one of the anomalies in our domestic postal classifications that the original form of literature and music and the original creator are penalized as compared with the more favorable rates granted on the manuscript in proof form or in final printed form, or even in its original form in the international mails.

Application of the library-book rate to additional materials

The special library rate dating from 1928 is 4 cents for the first pound and 1 cent for each succeeding pound on books exchanged in interlibrary loans, or in loans by libraries to their readers, within the first three postal zones or within the limits of any one State. In 1953 the Congress extended this rate to educational films and other audio-visual materials in Public Law 141, 83d Congress.

This bill extends the library rate to several additional small categories of library materials and removes the geographical limitations and the present requirement of securing permits. No change is proposed in the level of the rate itself.

Scholarly bibliography and sheet music: The bill adds scholarly bibliography and sheet music to the materials eligible for the library-book rate, consistent with their coverage by the general book rate in the preceding section.

Academic theses and bound volumes of periodicals: Institutions of higher learning at one time frequently required that academic theses submitted for higher degrees be published in printed form, but with the growth in higher education this requirement became impractical and most such theses are now typewritten, but in bound form. There is a considerable volume of interlibrary loans of academic theses as a service to researchers, to scholars, and to students preparing other theses. Despite the fact that this traffic is almost entirely between libraries and especially college and university libraries, these theses are not eligible for the library book rate, and are required to carry first-class postage because they are in typewritten form. This is a considerable burden on scholars and students who must reimburse the libraries for the postage required in securing the loan of these materials. It is entirely consistent with the philosophy of the library book rate, and would be a considerable benefit to higher education and scholarship, to include theses in the general rate applicable to library materials.

Bound volumes of periodicals, when exchanged between libraries or between libraries and their borrowers, are not eligible for the library book rate although these materials serve exactly the same purpose as library service on books. Library loan of bound periodicals now takes place in relatively small volume because of the development of photostating arrangements and microfilming but the application of the library book rate would contribute substantially to library service and to scholarly research.

Other library materials: In addition to books, theses, and periodicals, modern libraries make available to their readers a considerable variety of a number of other materials. One of the most important of these, educational films and other audiovisual materials, was assimilated to the library book rate in 1953. Miscellaneous other library materials should be added in order to carry out the broad purposes of this special rate for library interchange.

Removal of geographical limits and permit requirement: When the library-book rate was established in 1928, library service by mail was confined largely to readers in the local area or to interlibrary loans between institutions in the same general locality. In the years since that time regional library services for scholarly and research materials have been established; and a nationwide network now exists for the interchange of materials needed for research. It seems appropriate, therefore, to recognize these changed conditions. There seems no reason why the library rate should be subject to a narrow geographical limitation now that the general book rate has been on a nationwide basis for some 18 years. Much the same considerations apply to the requirement of permits. No permit is necessary under the terms of Public Law 141, which extended the library-book rate to audiovisual materials in 1953. The permit system hardly seems necessary for administrative purposes since the institutions eligible for this rate are clearly identifiable by their names on the addresses or return addresses.

Educational and cultural materials in the international mails

The Universal Postal Convention, which was last revised at Brussels in 1952, permits national postal authorities to reduce the rates charged for books, magazines, newspapers, music, and maps to 50 percent of the required rates for other printed matter in order to encourage the international exchange of educational and cultural materials. This optional provision has now been adopted in its entirety by the following countries: Austria, Western Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela, plus several other countries which restrict the 50-percent reduction to books alone or to other more limited classes of materials. The United States has not yet taken similar action and the result has been to place American materials of this type at an economic disadvantage in competing with the publications of other countries. For example, a book weighing 2 pounds may be sent from London or Frankfort to Pakistan, Japan, or the Philippines for about 10 cents in postage, whereas to send a book of the same weight from New York requires 25 cents in postage, or 2½ times as much. American-published materials, although much in demand, are already under a severe handicap of foreign-exchange restrictions limiting dollar imports in many countries as compared with similar materials from soft-currency countries; and this differential on transportation charges, which are paid by the purchaser, further adds to the competitive disadvantage of American materials. In view of the governmental efforts being made through the United States overseas information program and the technical-assistance program to encourage the use of American educational, cultural, technical, and scientific materials abroad in the national interest, it would be sound public policy to eliminate the existing differential in postal rates which handicaps distribution through private commercial and eleemosynary channels. The cost to the United States in reduced postal revenue would be small as compared with the cost of achieving similar results by direct governmental expenditures.

III. ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE BILL

The following is a partial list of organizations endorsing and supporting the bill or one or more of its several provisions: American Academy of Teachers of Singing; American Educational Research Association; American Guild of Organists; American Library Association; American String Teachers Association; American Textbook Publishers Institute; Association of College and Reference Libraries; Association of Research Libraries; Authors' League; Church and Sunday School Music Publishers Association; College Entrance Examination Board; Committee on Diagnostic Reading Tests; Committee on Reading Development, American Book Publishers Council; Educational Records Bureau; League of Composers; Music Educators National Conference; Music Library Association; Music Publishers Asso-

ciation; Music Teachers National Association; National Association of Educational Broadcasters; National Association of Teachers of Singing; National Audio-Visual Association, Postal Committee; National Catholic Music Educators Association; National Council on Measurements Used in Education; National Federation of Music Clubs; National Guild of Piano Teachers; Sigma Alpha Iota; State Testing Leaders Conference; the American Accordionists Association.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: I am glad to join in the sponsorship of the bill—S. 1292—dealing with postal classifications on certain educational and cultural materials, especially as they affect our educational institutions and public libraries. As a result of a special study of the educational use of the mails which was made last year for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a number of situations have come to light which should be adjusted. Congress has always recognized the vital importance of the postal system as an instrument of education in the broadest sense; and the bill will serve to bring certain details of postal classification into line with established congressional policy.

DESIGNATION OF WATERWAY AT GREENWICH, CONN., AS A NONNAVIGABLE STREAM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn., a nonnavigable stream.

This proposed legislation is needed because the layout of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway crosses over a portion of the marshland and a portion of the dredged basin, both of which are within the officially established limits of Greenwich Harbor. I have introduced the bill at the request of the Connecticut State Highway Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1300) to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills which have been submitted by the Department of the Treasury, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Air Force, and by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these bills the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Department of the Treasury, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Air Force, and by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, recommending the enactment of such legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1302. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1302 is as follows:)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 10, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to give the Secretary of the Treasury the same authority to settle claims of Coast Guard military and civilian personnel as is now held by the Secretaries of the Military Departments with respect to similar claims in their departments.

Section 490 of title 14 was based on the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), which had been applicable to the Coast Guard prior to the enactment of title 14 into positive law. Subsequent to the enactment of title 14, the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 was amended by act of Congress approved July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 321).

By adding a new subsection to section 490, the proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims made by survivors of personnel whether or not the incident giving rise to the claim occurred simultaneously with or subsequent to the death of such personnel. This authority is now held by the Secretaries of the Military Departments under the act of July 3, 1952. Moreover, the proposed legislation would change the time allowed for filing claims from 1 year to 2 years, which is the time limit now applicable to the other services. Finally, the proposal would suspend for 1 year all time limitations on filing of such claims to allow for the consideration of new claims arising under section 490, as amended, and for the reconsideration of claims previously disapproved as not having been filed within the legal time. This provision is similar to that included in the similar amendatory legislation of the armed services.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY PROPOSED BILL

Changes in existing law made by the proposed bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matters in italics):

"SECTION 490 OF TITLE 14 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

"(a) The Secretary, and such other officer as he designates for such purposes and under regulations prescribed by him, may consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay any claim against the United States, including claims not heretofore satisfied arising on or after December 7, 1939, of military personnel and civilian employees of the Coast Guard, when such claim is substantiated, and the property determined to be reasonable, useful, necessary, or proper under the attendant circumstances, in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, or to replace such personal property in kind, if the damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and shall not have occurred at quarters occupied by the claimant within the continental United States, excluding Alaska, which are not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the Government.

"*(b) In the event of the death of any person among the military personnel or civilian employees enumerated in subsection (a), the Secretary is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle and pay any claim, otherwise cognizable under this section, presented by the survivor of such person for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of the personal property of such person, regardless of whether such damage, loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment occurred concurrently with or subsequent to such death. For the purposes of this section, the term 'survivor' means surviving spouse, child or children, parent or parents, or brothers or sisters or both, of the decedent, and claims by survivors shall be settled and paid in that order of precedence.*

"[b] (*c*) No claim shall be settled under this section unless presented in writing within [one year] *two years* after the accident or incident out of which such claim arises shall have occurred; if such accident or incident occurs in time of war [.] *or in time of armed conflict in which the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged,* or if war *or such armed conflict* intervenes within [one year] *two years* after its occurrence, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within [one year] *two years* after [termination of the war.] *such good cause ceases to exist, but not later than two years after peace is established or such armed conflict terminates. The dates of commencement and termination of an armed conflict for the purpose of this subsection shall be as established by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by determination of the President.*

"[c] (*d*) Any such settlement made by the Secretary, or his designee, under the authority of this section and such regulations as he may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

"[d] (*e*) Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this section are authorized. Coast Guard appropriations shall be available for the settlement of claims by the Secretary or his designee under the provisions of this section."

S. 1303. A bill to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1303 is as follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, February 14, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing draft of a bill together with a memorandum of explanation, which would authorize the Attorney General to designate additional officers and employees of our Federal penal

and correctional institutions, as the need may be, who would have authority to administer oaths and take acknowledgments of officers, employees, and inmates without charge. If you feel that this proposed amendment has merit, I would appreciate it very much if you would sponsor it in the Senate.

I have sent another draft of the bill and the explanatory memorandum to Congressman CELLER for introduction in the House, if he feels that the proposed amendment has merit.

While this proposed bill has not been made a part of the formal departmental-legislative program, I am sure that the Department will be glad to support it.

Yours very truly,

JAMES V. BENNETT,
Director.

S. 1304. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1304 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Under the provisions of section 208b of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.) as interpreted by the Comptroller General of the United States (pp. 242–244, vol. 28, Decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States), Navy nurses are permitted to count civilian service as nurses with the United States Public Health Service as creditable service for the computation of longevity pay. However, there is no provision in the above-cited law which permits Army and Air Force nurses to count such service as that noted above as creditable service for the computation of longevity pay. This inequity was corrected in 1949 upon the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.). It is deemed a matter of equity to provide legislation which would validate payments of longevity pay made to Army and Air Force nurses on the basis of civilian service as nurses with the United States Public Health Service from the effective date of enactment of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to the day prior to the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. This proposal would allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for such payments and would authorize repayment of any amounts which have been collected by the United States in settlement of claims arising from such payments.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Army on June 24, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislation program for 1954. It was introduced as H. R. 9740 and S. 3806. H. R. 9740 was reported to the House on July 20, 1954, Report No. 2300, and passed the House on August 3, 1954.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Any additional cost resulting from the enactment of this proposal would be small and will be absorbed in existing appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1305. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1305 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943, as amended (31 U. S. C. 223b) authorizes the settlement of claims based on loss of or damage to property or personal injury or death resulting from noncombat activities of the Armed Forces. Ordinarily, there is a 1-year statute of limitations on these claims. However, if the accident or incident on which the claim is based occurs during or within 1 year before a war, the claim may, for good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after peace is established. Section 2 (c) of Public Law 450 of the 82d Congress amended the basic statute to provide that claims arising after June 23, 1950, and before the termination of the emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, may be presented within 1 year after the termination of that national emergency or April 1, 1953, whichever is earlier. By Public Law 12, 83d Congress, the termination date was changed from April 1, 1953, to July 1, 1953, and, by Public Law 96, was changed to August 1, 1953.

This proposal would amend the basic law to provide a 2-year statute of limitations for filing claims thereunder instead of the 1 year now provided. This change would be consistent with a similar change made in the Military Personnel Claims Act by Public Law 439, 82d Congress, approved July 3, 1952, and is considered advisable in the interest of creating uniformity with respect to the statute of limitations in these claims laws.

The basic law allows an extension of the statute of limitations only if there is a war. The conflict in Korea did not constitute a war within the technical sense used in the statute. This statute is used to settle claims such as those which occur to property during maneuvers or on training grounds which may be closed to the owner until after the time for presentation of the claim has expired. It also allows settlement of claims for losses that result from parcels sent through the mails. The addressee of the parcel may suffer a loss which he does not know about until the statute of limitations has run. Even though an armed conflict prevents claims of this nature from being presented within the period ordinarily applicable, no extension of the statute of limitations is authorized under existing law. This proposed legislation would also eliminate this inequity by extending the statute of limitations upon the occurrence of armed conflict.

Another inequity under the act of July 3, 1943, arises because, in the case of personal injury or death, the amount is limited to "reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses, actually incurred, * * *." No recovery is permitted for the loss of earnings, diminished earning capacity, permanent injury, pain and suffering, and death benefits. This proposal would allow settlement under the act of claims based on those reasons; however, the amount of payment would continue to be limited to $1,000. The amendment would apply to claims accruing after the date of its enactment. The proposed amendment would eliminate many costly lawsuits, reduce the number of private relief bills, and expedite the settlement of claims.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Two proposals containing amendments to the act of July 3, 1943, were submitted to the Congress as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. One was introduced as H. R. 2977 and the other was introduced as H. R. 5108. Subsequently, H. R. 5108 was incorporated into H. R. 2977 and was passed by the House of Representatives. No further action was taken on that proposal. This proposal is identical with H. R. 2977, as it passed the House, except for a change in the title of the bill.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the enactment of this proposal would result in an increase in cost to the Army of $35,000 and to the Air Force of $100,000 for fiscal year 1956; however, no worthwhile estimate of the increase in cost to the Navy or the Marine Corps is possible.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1306 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt. This proposed legislation is submitted by the Department of the Army in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide for the payment of a claim by Mr. DeWitt, which cannot be settled administratively by the Department of the Army, but which has been determined by the Department to be meritorious and worthy of payment.

During World War I, Mr. DeWitt was county auditor of Limestone County, Tex. He was approached at Groesbeck, Tex., by one Maj. Chester H. Machin, representing the United States Army, and asked to sponsor the raising of a company of recruits for war service. Mr. DeWitt patriotically agreed after discussing the matter with Judge J. E. Bradley and Judge C. S. Bradley, both of Groesbeck, who, in turn, agreed to advance him any funds necessary. Under the terms of the informal agreement made with Major Machin, Mr. DeWitt was to bear all expenses, including transportation from the place of recruitment to Groesbeck, meals and shelter for the recruits, until a minimum of 150 men had been accepted by the Army. At that time the group was to be sent to San

Antonio, Tex., for training, and, upon acceptance of the group into the service of the United States, Mr. DeWitt was to be reimbursed for the expenses borne by him during the period of recruitment. After 156 men were so recruited, there was a delay of some 30 days before an Army representative arrived in Groesbeck, where the recruits had been collected, to inspect and accept them.

It was after a 5-month period of recruitment that these men were finally accepted into the Army and sent to San Antonio for training, where Mr. DeWitt entered the officers' training camp. During such period Mr. DeWitt had borne their expenses in accordance with his agreement with Major Machin. To secure funds for this purpose, he personally borrowed substantial sums of money from Judge J. E. Bradley and Judge C. S. Bradley. Although a number of unrecorded expenses appear to have been incurred, those known at the present time consist of the following:

Rent of building used as headquarters and sleeping quarters for 5 months at $75 monthly	$375
Hire of labor for laundry for 5 months at $30 monthly	150
Installation and use of telephone for 5 months (estimated)	125
Transportation of recruits from various towns (place of enlistment) to Groesbeck (estimated)	150
Meals for soldiers from time of enlistment until departure for San Antonio	3,300
Total	4,100

Until his release from the service early in 1919 Mr. DeWitt repaid the Judges Bradley at the rate of $100 per month out of his salary as a first lieutenant. Following his release, he returned to his position as county auditor and continued the $100 monthly payments. Some time later he accepted a position with the Internal Revenue Bureau at Dallas, Tex., and before leaving Groesbeck liquidated his indebtedness to the Bradleys by selling his automobile, his equity in a house at Groesbeck, and his equity in a farm.

Following his release from the service, Mr. DeWitt requested that he be furnished the proper forms for filing his expense account and had several conferences with respect to the matter. It appears that the military authorities could not determine whether the claim should be filed with the Texas National Guard or with the United States Army, and as a result no claim was actually filed at the time, and no reimbursement was made to Mr. DeWitt. However, it appears that Mr. DeWitt's dealings at the time were, in fact, entirely with the United States Army. These men were supplied with equipment by the Army, the enlistment blanks used were furnished by the Army and two Army enlisted men assisted Mr. DeWitt in his recruiting drive. It also appears that Major Machin made speeches in the area to assist in the recruiting. The entire benefit of the money expended by Mr. DeWitt and for which he requests reimbursement in the amount of $4,100 (or $26.28 per man) was received by the United States Army.

The Department of the Army first became aware of this matter through a letter dated June 25, 1953, from Mr. DeWitt to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, United States Senate, inquiring as to the possibility of recovery. A formal claim was filed in September 16, 1953. The claim cannot be considered under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372), as amended (31 U. S. C. 223b), because it is not based on a tortious act or omission of military personnel or civilian employees of the Department of the Army and because the cause of action arose more than 1 year prior to submission of the claim. Similarly, it may not be considered under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (60 Stat. 843), as codified and amended (28 U. S. C. 921–934), because it is not based on negligence and because it was submitted more than 2 years after the cause of action arose. There is no other statute available to the Department under which a claim of this nature may be processed administratively. However, Mr. DeWitt clearly made expenditures totaling at least the amount of $4,100 for the raising of troops. His motives in doing so were patriotic, and the beneficiary of his acts was the United States Army. Under the circumstances it would be entirely inequitable to deny him reimbursement of the amount so expended.

The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be $4,100.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

It will be recalled that in both his state of the Union address and his budget message President Eisenhower referred to improving the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. These bills follow up the President's recommendations and are a part of the current legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, in addition to being the workmen's compensation law which applies to longshoremen and employees of Government contractors at defense bases or on public works outside of the United States, is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia.

The first of these bills, Mr. President, would modernize the benefit provisions of the existing law by increasing in both injury and death cases the maximum weekly compensation limit from $35 to $50 a week and by increasing the minimum weekly compensation limit from $12 to $15 a week. Also, the period of disability required before the waiting time become compensable would be reduced from 49 to 28 days.

The second bill would improve the existing act by extending the uses of the special fund set up under section 44. This fund is derived from nondependency payment requirements and from fines and penalties. In recent years the fund has been receiving over three times as much money as has been disbursed. Among the new uses for which this money would be available are the extension of rehabilitation services and the relief of employees who have no recourse because of the insolvency of the employer.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that there may be early and favorable action on these bills by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The Federal Government which constantly, and properly, urges the State to improve their workmen's compensation acts should certainly see that its own statutes on the subject keep pace with general economic and social advances.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of each bill and short explanatory statements thereof, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills, together with the explanations, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the explanations thereof, as follows:

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (44 Stat. 1424; 33 U. S. C. 907 et seq.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6 (a) No compensation shall be allowed for the first 7 days of the disability, except the benefits provided for in section 7: *Provided, however,* That in case the injury results in disability of more than 28 days the compensation shall be allowed from the date of disability.

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $50 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $15 per week; *Provided, however,* That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $15 per week he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

SEC. 2. Section 9 (e) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $75 nor less than $22.50, but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be applicable only to injuries and death occurring on or after the effective date of its enactment. The amendments to section 6 and section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act shall not affect the payment of any benefits heretofore adjudicated under the act of December 2, 1942, as amended (56 Stat. 1028; 42 U. S. C. 1701, et seq.) prior to the enactment of this act.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 1307

This legislation is intended to modernize the benefit provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which have remained unchanged since 1948. This would be accomplished by increasing in both injury and death cases, the maximum weekly compensation limit from $35 to $50 a week and by increasing the minimum

weekly compensaion limit from $12 to $15 a week. Also the period of disability required before the waiting time becomes compensable would be reduced from 49 to 28 days.

This proposal is intended to carry out the objective of the President expressed in his recent budget message to liberalize the benefits of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The proposal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in accord with the program of the President.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which is administered by the Department of Labor, is a workmen's compensation law which applies to longshoremen and other maritime employees who are not within the jurisdiction of the States and to employees of Government contractors at defense bases or on public works outside of the United States. This act is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia. Further, the compensation rate under the act is the measure of compensation paid by the Federal Government under the so-called War Hazards Act for injuries arising out of war hazards to Government contractors' employees working on defense bases and on contracts outside of the United States. The total coverage of the law is estimated to be between 500,000 and 600,000 employees.

THE PRESENT BENEFIT LIMITATIONS AND AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE BILL

The act specifies that benefits shall be based on 66⅔ percent of the employee's average weekly wage. This specified ratio of compensable wage loss, however, at present is subject to a maximum dollar limit of $35 a week. When extended on an annual basis, this weekly sum aggregates only $1,820. This benefit limit, therefore, prevents the percentage from operating in the case of wage earners whose wages exceed the dollar maximum. As the level of wages rises, the compensation which is received sinks far below the two-thirds of the employee's wage intended by the law.

Congress set the weekly compensation limits of this law in 1948 in relation to the prevailing wage rate in the industry and the prevailing cost of living at that time. Since the limit was set in 1948 on the basis of a $52.50 weekly wage average wages earned by longshoremen for a 40-hour week have advanced substantially and, in some areas, are approximately $90. On the basis of current earnings, therefore, the weekly maximum compensation of $35 equals only about 40 percent of the wage loss.

It is of utmost importance that these compensation standards within Federal authority be revised in the light of changes in the economic factors which guided their establishment. The bill takes cognizance of the increases in average earnings in the employment affected and in the cost of living which have occurred since the present compensation limits were established. While a compensation limit of $50 a week will not authorize adequate restitution in the case of injuries or death of employees with high earnings, the increased limit will cover a proportion of wage loss which is more nearly commensurate with the intended compensation ratio of 66⅔ percent of the average weekly wage for injury and death benefits which the act specifies than the present outmoded limits. The proposed increase in the minimum compensation under the act from $12 to $15 a week is proportionate to the increase in the maximum limitation.

CHANGE IN WAITING PERIOD

At the present time no compensation is allowed under the act for the first 7 days of disability unless disability continues for more than 49 days. This restriction means that in the large majority of injuries sustained by employees covered by the act the employee must suffer more than a week's complete wage loss. The provision of the bill allowing payment of compensation retroactively after 28 days of disability is more in accord with the modern legislative pattern of workmen's compensation laws than the longer periods now required by the act.

RETROACTIVITY BAR

This bill also provides that the increase in benefits which would be authorized prospectively for longshoremen will not be applied retroactively to cases already adjudicated under the so-called War Hazards Act of December 2, 1942.

S. 1303. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to authorize more effective use of the special fund provided for in section 44.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (g) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (44 Stat. 1424; 33 U. S. C. 901, et seq.) is amended by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25."

SEC. 2. Section 18 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "18" at the beginning of the section and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In cases where judgment cannot be satisfied by reason of the employer's insolvency or other circumstances precluding payment, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion and to the extent he shall determine advisable after consideration of current commitments payable from the special fund established in section 44, make payment from such fund upon any award made under this act, and, in addition, provide any necessary medical, surgical, and other treatment required by section 7 of the act in any case of disability where there has been a default in furnishing medical treatment by reason of the insolvency of the employer. Such an employer shall be liable for payment into such fund of the amounts paid therefrom by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection; and for the purpose of enforcing this liability, the Secretary of Labor for the benefit of the fund shall be subrogated to all the rights of the person receiving such payment or benefits, including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this act, as against the employer and may by a proceeding in the name of the Secretary of Labor under section 18 or under subsection (c) of section 21 of this act, or both, seek to recover the amount of the default or so much thereof as in the judgment of the Secretary is possible, or the Secretary may settle and compromise any such claim."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 39 (c) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended by striking out "education" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "rehabilitation."

(b) Section 39 (c) of such act is further amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following two sentences:

"Where necessary rehabilitation services are not available otherwise, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, use the fund provided for in section 44 in such amounts as may be necessary to procure such services, including necessary prosthetic appliances or other apparatus. This fund shall also be available in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriations for the Department of Labor for the costs of administering this subsection."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 44 (a) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended by striking out "of this act" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "of subsection (b) of section 18, and of subsection (c) of section 39 of this act."

(b) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 44 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"The proceeds of this fund shall be available for payments under subsections (f) and (g) of section 8, under subsection (b) of section 18 and under subsection (c) of section 39: *Provided,* That payments authorized by subsection (f) shall have priority over other payments authorized from the fund."

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 1308

This legislation is intended to make the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, administered by the Department of Labor, more effective by extending the uses of the special fund established under section 44 of the act.

The bill authorizes the special fund to be put to additional constructive uses in areas where expenditures will produce particularly beneficial results.

This is one of the measures within the objective stated by the President in his state of the Union and budget messages to improve the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The proposal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in accord with the program of the President.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applies to longshoremen and other maritime employees who are not within the jurisdiction of the States and to employees of Government contractors at defense bases or on public works outside of the United States. This act is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia. Further, the compensation rate under the act is the measure of compensation paid by the Federal Government under the War Hazards Act for injuries to Government contractors' employees working on defense bases and on contracts outside of the United States. The total coverage of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as extended, is estimated to be between 500,000 and 600,000 employees.

THE SPECIAL FUND

This special fund is not established by appropriations from the Congress but is derived from amounts paid by employers in the stevedoring industry covered by the act, and from fines and penalties collected.

In cases of fatal injury where there are no survivors eligible for benefits under the act, the employer of a deceased employee is required to pay $1,000 into a special fund in the Treasury. These nondependency-payment requirements, which are usual in compensation systems, tend to equalize the liability of all employers under a particular system. Under the existing law, the sums so paid in, together with fines and penalties collected for infractions of the act, are authorized to be spent for specified purposes.

Receipts into the fund under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the past few years have averaged approximately $35,000 a year and disbursements have averaged only $10,000. The principal of the fund, therefore, increases constantly and on June 30, 1954, totaled $734,522.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED USES OF SPECIAL FUND

When an injury compensable under the act occurs to an employee who had a previous injury, and the combined result of the two injuries is to create permanent total dis-

ability, payment from the special fund is authorized with respect to the total disability, after the employer has completed the payments for which he is liable in connection with the second injury. The present law requires that 50 percent of the amount paid by each employer into the fund shall be made available for payments in connection with second injuries. The bill establishes a priority for payments from the entire fund for this purpose but it does not freeze any portion of the fund for one use.

Payment from the special fund is also authorized up to $10 a week for the maintenance of employees undergoing vocational rehabilitation. The maximum allowance now authorized for payment from the fund for this purpose would be increased under the proposal from $10 a week to $25 a week. The present maximum is too meager to be a worthwhile supplement to the economic resources of employees undergoing training to refit them for gainful employment.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to use the fund, in addition, for the limited purpose of furnishing prosthetic appliances or other apparatus to refit an injured employee for employment. The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Labor to use the special fund to procure rehabilitation services in those cases where necessary services are not otherwise available through existing facilities. The expanded Federal-State rehabilitation program authorized by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954 may be expected to reduce to a minimum the number of rehabilitation cases requiring services supplementary to those offered by the program. It is important, however, to take care of the unusual cases where by reason of extraordinary circumstances, rehabilitation would otherwise be foreclosed.

Despite the safeguards of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the securing of compensation protection by employers for employees, a few cases occur in which the insolvency of the employer or his estate precludes the collection of compensation awarded under the act. The bill authorizes the payment of awards in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor in such cases from the special fund to provide relief to employees who otherwise would have no recourse to payments from their employers.

Further, the Secretary of Labor would be permitted to use the special fund, in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriations, for administrative expenses involved in aiding employees to obtain rehabilitation and encouraging their use of available facilities.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, to provide that the various Federal agencies shall be charged with their share of the cost of workmen's compensation.

I am particularly gratified to have the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as a cosponsor of this bill.

President Eisenhower said, in his budget message:

> At present all workmen's compensation payments to Federal employees are provided from a single appropriation. To encourage better safety practices, I shall recommend legislation to shift the financing of some of these benefit payments to the employing Federal agency.

This bill is designed to carry out that part of the President's budget message, and is a part of the current legislative program of the Department of Labor.

I desire, Mr. President, to pay full tribute to my colleague and cosponsor, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for his long record of interest, imagination, and activity in the field of promoting industrial and office safety, especially as it affects the workers of our Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the bill we are now introducing is essentially the same as one title of a broader Federal Government safety bill introduced in the last Congress by the Senator from Massachusetts.

As President Eisenhower noted, presently the cost of injuries to Federal Government workers, or death benefits, is met by a single direct appropriation. This bill would intensify the effort of employing agencies to reduce their accident rate, by assessing premium charges against each of the agencies based on manual rates as modified by the accident experience of that agency. The cost of these premium charges will be met from the appropriations of the individual agencies.

Mr. President, when an agency comes before the Appropriations Committees of Congress for its annual appropriation, the premium rate assessed against it will immediately be evident. If, by reason of a high accident rate, an agency is charged a high premium rate, it is obvious that there will be an additional and powerful incentive to reduce accidents. I hope that the Congress will provide this incentive by enacting this legislation expeditiously.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill and a short explanatory statement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1309) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the explanation, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 759) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies for the furnishing of medical and other services of the kind provided for by this section, and for reimbursement to the agency furnishing the services of the approximate cost thereof as shall be agreed upon. The cost of furnishing such services shall be reimbursed or paid from the Employees' Compensation Fund."

SEC. 2. Section 24 of such act as amended (5 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 774) is further amended by inserting before the first sentence thereof the designation "(a)" and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(b) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device, a material fact in relation to the injury or death of a person compensable under the provisions of this act or any extension or application thereof, or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry, in relation to such an injury or death, or induces or compels any person to forego the filing of any claim for compensation or other benefits provided under this act or any extension or application thereof, or retains any notice, report, claim, or paper which is required to be filed under this act or any extension or application thereof, or regulations promulgated thereunder, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

SEC. 3. Section 35 of such act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 785) is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35 (a) There is established in the Treasury a separate fund to be known as the Employees' Compensation Fund which shall consist of the unexpended balances of moneys heretofore appropriated for the purposes thereof, together with such sums as the Congress may from time to time appropriate therefor or transfer thereto, and amounts otherwise accruing thereto under this section. Such fund, including all additions that may be made to it by appropriation or otherwise, shall be available without time limit for the payment of the compensation, medical benefits, sums advanced as costs for enforcement of liability in third-party cases as required or as undertaken by the Secretary pursuant to section 26 of this act, and such other benefits and payments as are provided for by this act or any extension or application thereof, except as may otherwise be provided by this or other acts.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (e) of this section, each executive department and each agency or instrumentality of the United States, or other establishment, having employees who are or may be entitled to compensation under this act or any extension or application thereof (hereinafter called "agency") shall contribute to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund by the payment of premium charges based upon manual rates computed in a manner consistent with commercial insurance practice on the basis of experience under this act as applied to payrolls. The Secretary of Labor from time to time shall determine and promulgate such rates which shall be fair, reasonable, and adequate. As to all risks involving similar kinds and degrees of hazards the basic rates charged shall be the same: *Provided, however*, That in determining premium charges such rates may be adjusted to reflect an agency's loss experience by merit or experience rating. Premium charges may be made on the basis of employment in a particular officer, bureau, or other constituent unit of an agency for which annual or other appropriations are made for personal services, or in such other manner as the Secretary of Labor may determine will best assist in the evaluation of trends with respect to safety at the various operational levels. Premium charges shall be determined prospectively on an annual basis, and readjustment of such charges may be made at any time on account of errors, changes in classifications of employments or extent of payroll exposure, or because of other similar factors which distort proper premium charges: *Provided*, That there shall be no retroactive readjustment of the manual rates.

"(c) The respective premium charges shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor together with a charge for administrative expenses, and billed by him annually, quarterly or such other times as may be requested by the head of each agency concerned. The head of the agency concerned shall cause the said charges to be paid promptly from the respective appropriations and funds of the agency and its constituent units, such payments to be placed to the credit of the employees' compensation fund, to remain available thereafter for the payment of benefit costs and other payments heretofore or hereafter authorized by statute.

"(d) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to expend from such fund, for the necessary administrative expenses of his Department and within such limitations as may be set in appropriation acts annually. Premium charges and charges for administration of claims shall be subject to such readjustment and correction as may be found necessary, including repayment from the employees' compensation fund to the appropriation against which such charge was made. Should the Secretary of Labor determine at any time that there has developed in such fund a surplus of premiums over losses, which in his judgment is larger than is necessary adequately to safeguard the solvency of the fund, the Secretary shall cause such excess to be transferred into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

"(e) Each agency required by this act to contribute through the payment of premium charges to such fund shall, at such time, and in such manner and form as may be determined by the Secretary of Labor, furnish the Secretary with payroll reports. Each agency shall upon request make its payroll records available to the Department of Labor for inspection and audit for premium-making purposes.

"(f) The provisions of this section in respect of the fixing and charging of premiums shall not apply to any agency, other than an executive department, with respect to any fiscal year if on June 30 of the second preceding fiscal year it had less than 5,000 employees in its employ or in the cases of members of any Reserve components of the military forces of the United States (including Reserve and auxiliary of the Coast Guard) while serving as such members or persons engaged in emergency relief employment, or to persons to whom the benefits under this act or any extension or application thereof are payable from sources other than the Employees' Compensation Fund. Loss experience under this act arising from war-risk hazard (as defined by the Secretary of Labor) shall be excluded from the experience which is used under subsection (b) for ratemaking and premium rates shall not include any loading for war-risk hazard as so defined.

"(g) Payments to the Employees' Compensation Fund under this section shall be made from the respective appropriations and funds which are used for payment of the salaries, wages, or other compensation of the covered employees of the several agencies."

SEC. 4. All provisions of law, other than those included in this act, which require contribution or payment by any agency to the Employees' Compensation Fund are hereby superseded as to any agency required to comply with the provisions of section 35 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as amended by this act: *Provided*, That this provision shall not be construed as in any way affecting the liability of an agency for contributions in respect to compensation and other benefits for injury (or death from injury) where the injury occurred prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of this act shall take effect January 1, 1956, and the first period for which charges shall be made as provided in section 3 of this act shall commence on January 1, 1956.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 1309

These provisions are intended to reduce the personal accident toll in Federal service by amending the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to charge the various Federal employing agencies with their workmen's compensation costs.

This particular legislation is intended to carry out the objective of the President expressed in his recent budget message to encourage better safety practices in Federal employment by shifting the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. These provisions have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in accord with the program of the President.

It is of utmost importance that the Federal Government should intensify its effort to reduce the accident rate among its employees. If the various departments and agencies are made more aware of the incidence of accidents in employments within their responsibility more effective safety measures should be adopted and the number of accidents in the employments reduced.

PREMIUM FIXING

Premium costs will be fixed and charged to the various agencies in accordance with accident experience under the Compensation Act. The assessment of premium charges upon each agency based on manual rates, as modified by the accident experience of that agency, is designed to make the agencies aware of their injury records and the success of their efforts in accident prevention. Further, when appropriations are sought by the individual agencies to defray premium costs, the premium rate will furnish a concise indication to the Congress of their accident records.

The shifting of accident costs to the employing agencies is a good business practice, consistent with business methods followed in underwriting workmen's compensation. This financing should also result in better safety practices for the Nation's largest employer.

CONTINUING AUTHORITY FOR INTERAGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE

The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies for the furnishing of medical and related services required under the act and for the reimbursement to the cooperating agencies of the approximate cost of the services rendered. At the present time it is necessary for the annual appropriation acts to carry this authorization.

SANCTIONS FOR MAINTAINING FALSE RECORDS OF SAFETY

A section would be added imposing sanctions for concealing material facts relating to injury or death. This section is intended to discourage any tendency by any agency official to establish a false record of safety.

The following is a section-by-section analysis of the "charge-back" provisions:

"SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 1309

"SECTION 1. REIMBURSEMENT TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR MEDICAL SERVICE

"This section would add to an existing section of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (sec. 9) a new subsection which would authorize the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies for the furnishing of medical and other services required under the act and for the reimbursement to the cooperating agency of the approximate cost of the services rendered.

"A provision of this kind has for years been carried in appropriation acts for the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor. It more appropriately belongs in the act itself.

"SECTION 2. SANCTIONS FOR CAUSING INACCURATE ACCIDENT RECORDS AND HAMPERING THE FILING OF CLAIMS

"This section would amend section 24 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by inserting a new subsection, the purpose of which is to impose sanctions for concealing material facts in relation to injury or death; or for making false statements or representations; or for making or using false writings or entries in relation to injury situations; or for inducing or compelling a person to forego the filing of a claim or for retaining a claim or other paper required to be filed under the act.

"In the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, it has been alleged over the years that some individuals have discouraged employees and dependents from filing claims in bona fide injury and death situations, merely to make a showing of an apparently good—though fictitious—safety record. This proposed section is intended to discourage any such actions and to impose sanctions where the forbidden acts are done.

"SECTION 3. PREMIUM CHARGING METHOD

"This is the principal section setting up the premium charging method.

"Compensation funds

"Subsection (a) embodies largely the basic content of the present section 35 of the Compensation Act; namely, it provides for the establishment of the employees' compensation fund. The additions to the old statutory language are those necessary to integrate the section with the new charging system. Included in subsection (a) is a provision with respect to advancement of costs for enforcement of third party liability, a provision that has appeared in the annual appropriation acts of the Bureau for many years, but which more appropriately belongs in this section.

"Payment of premium charges

"Subsection (b) contains the requirement that agencies contribute to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund by the payment of premium charges. It is intended that the premium charges will be determined in the same manner as premium charges are determined in the United States under other workmen's compensation laws; that is, the loss experience will be tabulated and premium rates will be established from this experience and published in manual form with appropriate rates for the various classifications of employments. The several classifications will reflect the relative hazards of the employments covered. The manual rates for the various classifications will then be applied to the appropriate payrolls in the generally accepted manner, and the resulting premium will represent the charge against the agency as its annual contribution to the upkeep of the employees' compensation fund.

"The basic manual rates will apply to all agencies alike. However, in determining the premium charges, adjustments will be made to reflect a particular agency's loss experience. Premiums will thus reflect an agency's merit or experience rating. This means, for example, that if an agency is able to hold down its losses, a favorable premium adjustment will be made reflecting that ability. An agency's premium will thus be a barometer to gage the extent to which it operates safely.

"The bill contemplates that the premium charges will be made at operational levels within departments and large agencies, particularly at levels at which appropriations are made for personal services by the Congress. In this connection the bill provides that the Secretary of Labor may approve any

other manner of making the premium charges if the manner selected will best assist in the evaluation of safety trends at the various operational levels. Provision has been included for correcting errors in premium charges, for example, where there is a fluctuation of employment or extent of payroll exposure or other similar factors not known at the time the premium charge was made.

"Administrative expenses

"Subsection (c) authorizes adding to the pure premium charge a charge for administrative expenses. The premium charge and the loading for administrative expenses would be billed on a periodic basis and would be paid from appropriated or other funds of the agency.

"Disbursement for administrative expenses

"Subsection (d) would authorize the expenditure from the employees' compensation fund by the Secretary of Labor of amounts necessary for administration, within such limitations as Congress may set in appropriation acts annually. Included in this subsection is a provision the effect of which is to authorize the transfer to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury any accumulation in the employees' compensation fund of a surplus of premiums over losses.

"Payroll inspection

"Subsection (e) is designed to give the Secretary of Labor authority to make the usual inspection of payroll records necessary for the audit of payrolls for premium-making purposes. This is the usual kind of authority and function which insurance companies exercise in checking an employer's records to verify the accuracy of the premium charge.

"Exceptions from premium payments

"Subsection (f) contains such exclusions of agencies and types of employments from premium charging as are deemed appropriate. The first of these is the exclusion of the smaller agencies, that is, those having less than 5,000 employees. The next exclusion is of members of the Reserve components of the military forces. The basis for compensation eligibility for such members differs from that applicable to the ordinary civilian employees. To include military loss experience would distort the rate basis for civilian employments. Other reasons exist for eliminating this class of covered individuals from the premium-charging plan.

"In addition, relief employments, if any, would be excluded. Where benefits under the act are paid to persons from sources other than the employees' compensation fund, no premium charge would be made with respect to the employments of such persons. In order that the premiums may reflect true occupational injury hazards and no other, a provision has been added to exclude from the basic experience used for rating-making purposes those losses which can be identified as due to war risks. (During World War II, the insurance purchased by the Government for Government contractors' employees was written without a factor for war-risk hazard so as not to distort the proper premiums.)

"Agency personnel

"Subsection (g) is an authorizing subsection under which the several agencies would be permitted to use their appropriations and funds for salaries, wages, or other compensation, for the purpose of making payments for the charges billed to them by the Secretary.

"SECTION 4. SUBSTITUTION FOR PRESENT METHODS OF FUND REIMBURSEMENT

"This section is designed to provide for the substitution of the premium-charging method for the other methods by which at present the employees' compensation fund may be reimbursed. There are at present four statutory provisions requiring agencies to contribute to the employees' compensation fund on the basis of annual billings. (These four statutes provide for the inclusion in the billing of a fair portion of the cost of administration.) The statutes are: Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (sec. 1306 (e)); Small Business Act of 1953 (sec. 206 (b)); Virgin Islands Corporation Act (sec. 7 (c)); and the act incorporating the Panama Railroad (sec. 252, Canal Zone Code).

"SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

"This section would make section 4 of the act effective January 1, 1956. On that date the first period for which charges are to be made would commence. The other provisions of the act would go into effect upon enactment so that work could get under way to establish the manual rates and the necessary procedures well in advance of the effective date for charging purposes."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am certainly glad to have this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in sponsoring this bill, which is designed to improve the performance of the Federal Government and its workers in the field of accident prevention and general safety.

To date, the Government's performance in this field is shockingly bad. Every year preventable accidents to Government employees are causing untold human suffering. In compensation payments, medical care, and loss of work, they are costing American taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

According to Labor Department records, 486,062 civilian Federal employees were injured in the 6-year period from 1947 to 1952. Fatal accidents took the lives of 1,547 Federal workers. Man-days lost totaled 17,725,358. Direct and indirect accident costs to the Federal Government during the 6-year period amounted to more than $563 million for occupational accidents alone.

Production time lost as the direct result of disabling injuries was the equivalent of the loss of 77,066 workers. In man-hours, the cost to the taxpayer totaled more than $217 million, at an average hourly rate of $1.54.

In March of last year, I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment in the Department of Labor of a Federal Safety Division, and for other purposes. Several valid objections were registered to this bill, relative to the establishment at this time of such a Federal Safety Division; but other provisions of the bill, now contained and amplified in the bill being introduced today by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, have the complete approval of the Secretary of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget. They represent a very sound and promising implementation of existing safety programs within the Federal Government, and should, we feel, have the complete support of the Congress.

As the Senator from New Jersey has said, President Eisenhower in his budget message has recommended passage of this measure, in order that improved safety practices throughout the Federal Government may be encouraged.

Mr. President, this bill is a product of discussions and study with the Department of Labor, the Bureau of the Budget, the Social Security Administration, and the National Safety Council, in company with representatives of Government employees' unions. I hope very much that hearings on the bill will be scheduled soon, for I believe it represents another forward step toward a real improvement in the safety record of the Federal Government, a record which is very much less effective than that of private industry. Only as thoughtful steps such as this are taken can we achieve the objective we seek; namely, that of reducing and, whenever possible, preventing accidents, injuries, and fatalities among our Federal workers.

INCREASED INSURANCE PROTECTION OF DEPOSITORS IN FEDERALLY INSURED BANKS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $10,000 to $20,000.

In my State there are many counties which have only 1, 2, or 3 banks; and it is a matter of much inconvenience to depositors who desire to have their deposit guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to be limited to the inadequate amount of $10,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1313) to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $10,000 to $20,000, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is a bill designed to reintroduce the spirit of humanitarian compassion and democracy into our immigration laws. It is my hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will look upon this effort kindly and will report the bill to the Senate floor favorably.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was not a controversial issue in the recent election campaign. Candidates of both majority political parties made clear their understanding that our present laws were in some respects discriminatory and undesirable. The President of the United States has declared that to be his position. Our effort with this bill is to correct some of those discriminatory and undesirable portions.

Our bill does not constitute a complete revision of the present Immigration and Nationality Act. It does not go so far as I would like it to go. However, it is a fair beginning on which reasonable men of both parties can agree at this

time. It would ameliorate some of the harsh provisions of existing law, making the law more flexible and adaptable to change in world conditions. It would aid us in carrying out our foreign-policy objectives and thus help us to combat communism. It will also go far toward relieving the continuous pressure for emergency immigration legislation.

We introduce the bill in the spirit of modest progress and progressive change. We introduce it in the hope that it can represent a consensus of nonpartisan opinion designed to help democratize our immigration and nationality laws.

More specifically, the bill accomplishes the following:

First. Section 1 restores to professors eligibility for nonquota status—which they enjoyed prior to the McCarran Act—if a university requests their services. This proposed change is based on a feeling of confidence that our universities will select only well-qualified persons for employment on their teaching staffs. It, therefore, abolishes the unnecessary red tape and delay involved in requiring universities to obtain clearance orders from the local employment service and then proving to the Immigration Service that the professor whose immigration is being sponsored is needed urgently in the United States. My amendment in no way changes the security requirements of our laws as they concern all who wish to enter the United States.

Second. Section 2 would grant to certain adopted children the immigration status enjoyed by natural children. This change would have 2 important effects: (a) it would make it unnecessary for adopted children of American citizens, in many instances of servicemen, to wait their turn on the quota or, as happens so often, to require that Congress pass a special bill on their behalf; (b) it would make adopted children of aliens eligible for the same quota status or quota preference as that enjoyed by natural children, thus avoiding the heartbreaking situations in which adopted children force their family to delay their trip to the United States or have to be left behind.

As section 2 applies only to children adopted prior to their reaching the age of 14 years, and as it specifically excepts children adopted solely for the purpose of obtaining immigration preference for them, the danger of abuse is avoided.

Third. Section 3 repeals the provision of the present law under which some quotas, generally those which are needed most urgently, are mortgaged for decades, in some cases even for centuries.

Fourth. Section 4 ends one of the racially discriminatory features of the present law. It abolishes the racial ancestry blood test for persons "attributable by as much as one-half of their ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle." Henceforth, all visa applicants would be classified only according to their place of birth.

Fifth. While section 4 still retains the national-origins principle, sections 5 and 6 would go far toward ameliorating its harsh effects. They do that without raising the existing overall quota ceiling of about 154,000. They simply provide that if, in any given year, no takers are found for any portion of these 154,000 numbers, that portion is not declared forfeited, as under present law, but is made available during the following year, without regard to national origins to (a) persons of special skills, (b) close relatives of citizens or alien residents, (c) persecutees, and (d) other groups of persons whose emigration to the United States would further our foreign policy.

Another change effected by this section concerns the problem of family unification. Under present law, a person qualifying under the national-need preference may enter this country with his wife and minor children, all of whom are covered by the preference. A person qualifying for preference as the brother of an American citizen, however, must leave his wife and children behind and can get a preference for them only after he has arrived in this country. Under the change provided for by this section, the preference right shall apply not only to the person directly affected, but also to his spouse and minor children so as to enable families to enter this country as single units.

Sixth. It has often been said that a man who tries to import a sack of beans into the United States and finds that it has been excluded, has the right of appeal, but a man who wants to bring his mother over, and finds that she has been denied a visa, has no such right. Section 7 of my bill is designed to change that situation. It is designed to modify the anomaly of the present Immigration Act under which authority for the acts of the Immigration Service—which acts in many instances through the Board of Immigration Appeals—is concentrated in the hands of the Attorney General, while authority for the acts of the Consular Service is diffused among the numerous consuls, each of whom is the final arbiter in the visa application cases before him. Section 7 concentrates responsibility in a visa review board appointed by the Secretary of State, to which the sponsors of prospective immigrants may be allowed to appeal. This board would assure that visa regulations are enforced uniformly throughout the world and would also safeguard against irresponsible and capricious acts by individual consular officers.

Seventh. The concept of justice tempered with mercy is a part of our administration of law. It is deeply imbedded in our religious traditions. It was in conformity with that concept that Congress long ago gave the Attorney General discretionary authority to suspend deportation in deserving cases. That authority was severely curtailed by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the Senate majority report on which states harshly and cruelly:

> Hardship or even unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child is not sufficient to justify suspension of deportation.

Under section 8 of this bill the standards for suspension of deportation contained in the law in effect prior to the adoption of the MrCarran Act are restored. As suspension of deportation will only be granted in the discretion of the Attorney General and only with the concurrence of Congress, I am certain that there is no danger of this humanitarian provision being abused.

Eighth. Sections 9 and 10 are purely procedural.

Our proposal is a reasonable one. It provides a meeting ground on which those of us who oppose the 1952 act can unite with those who support it with certain reservations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1315) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FUNDS FOR WIND EROSION CONTROL MEASURES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make available unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated for the agricultural conservation program for wind erosion control measures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak briefly with reference to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to speak more than 2 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. My remarks will take slightly more than 2 minutes and less than 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 1319) to make available unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated for the agricultural conservation program for wind erosion control measures, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, many of my colleagues will remember that last session the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was joined by 15 other Senators, in presenting to the Congress a resolution asking that special funds be set aside for the use in areas suffering from excessive wind erosion.

This money was appropriated in the amount of $15 million under the heading "Department of Agriculture, Agri-

cultural Conservation Program" in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1954.

At the time the authority for the use of these funds expired on December 31, 1954, there remained approximately $7,147,000 in the fund. It is that amount which we ask the Congress to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to have available.

The facts of the situation are that in many of the areas where an emergency existed last year, there has been no moisture in quantities which will assure as favorable a situation as in 1954. At that time, much of the land did have some submoisture which is not present today. We hope that we will have rain or snow and that none of this money may be needed, but we must be prepared to cope with the situation when the spring winds commence.

Unfortunately, the conditions that make possible these wind erosion disasters are largely beyond human control. Lack of normal rainfall and severe winds in the spring months comprise the raw material of soil erosion.

The area chiefly affected has been suffering drought or near drought conditions for the past 4 years. The situation has become progressively worse. In eastern Colorado, precipitation, rainfall, and snow are from 30 to 60 percent of normal for the past 6 months. Similar conditions exist, at least to some extent, in southwestern Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and northern Texas, with some areas in Wyoming in the danger zone. Unfortunately, Colorado seems to be in the worst condition.

Much wind damage has occurred durin December and January. In the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas more than 4 million acres have been damaged, of which number all but a million acres are in Colorado. Numerous letters and telegrams inform me that land is now blowing and eroding in southeastern Colorado. As of February 1, Department of Agriculture figures show that in these same States more than 20 million acres are classified as in a condition to blow. This includes cropland and rangeland, as well as other land.

Needless to say, we hope that we shall not need to use this money, but my colleagues and I are asking that this program be reinstituted so that in the event of calamity, rapid rescue operations can begin.

Another example of the seriousness of the situation for the farmers in Great Plains States can be best exemplified by these figures for Colorado. The receipts from the sale of farm products in Colorado have been reduced $163 million during the past 2-year period. This is $163 million less that the farmer has to spend, not only in Colorado, but to buy the products of industry all over the country. A great portion of this loss of income can be attributed to the drought. Multiply this by like figures in other States of the Great Plains, and the impact upon our farm economy is plain to see.

Official reports reaching me indicate that farmers have had to borrow over $7 million in my State from the Farm Home Administration alone. They have reduced their foundation herds of livestock chiefly for the lack of feed and pasture. In Colorado since the drought and duststorm of 1954, the farmers have reduced their foundation herds as follows: Beef cattle, down 70,000 head; stock sheep, down 58,000 head; dairy cattle, down 4,000 head.

I urge the Members of the Congress to go on record quickly and to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to put into effect the assistance so necessary to protect the farmlands of the West.

In many areas this is already an emergency. It must not become a catastrophe.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who spoke on the need for sufficient funds to be made available immediately in areas where there is danger of soil erosion because of wind.

It seems to me that the important factor in connection with the bill is to have the funds made available quickly to the Secretary of Agriculture, for use at the earliest opportunity, because the funds will be most effective when they are used promptly.

CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants to accredited medical schools to be used for expanding, remodeling, or constructing facilities needed for the training of doctors.

The bill was worked out in a series of conferences with the committee on financing of the Association of American Medical Colleges and has been unanimously endorsed by the executive council of the association. The bill conforms to the principles approved by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association.

All the approved medical schools in the Nation today number but 74. Many are housed in buildings half a century or more old. To establish one new medical school can cost as much as $25 million. The costs involved in reconstructing and modernizing old facilities are likewise great. Almost without exception, our medical schools are today confronted with serious financial problems. Through the fine efforts of private groups, the National Fund for Medical Education has raised some $7 million since 1949. Yet even if the fund succeeded in attaining its goal of $10 million a year for the support of medical education, such an amount would be no more than our medical schools must have to meet necessary costs of operation and maintenance.

The medical schools on which we rely to provide the Nation with an adequate supply of properly trained doctors must have assistance for the construction of new facilities and for the expansion and rehabilitation of existing facilities.

The bill which we have today introduced authorizes $250 million over a 5-year period, to be used for construction grants. The bill contains specific guaranties against any Federal interference with or control over the schools. Such guaranties are essential to preserve our free system of American medicine, the best in the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1323) to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I wish to make a few brief remarks.

The bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of educational and research facilities for our medical schools, in which I have joined as a cosponsor, involves a recognition by Congress not only of an important public need but also of assistance by the Government in a program of the highest potential value to the future well-being of the people of this country.

Our medical schools, despite generous private gifts and endowments and the contributions of various States, have not been able to meet their most urgent requirements for buidlings and facilities.

Without such facilities we cannot hope to have an adequate number of properly qualified and trained physicians, teachers, and research scientists.

The proposed legislation would make $50 million available in each of the next 5 years for grants for construction to accredited medical schools.

In most cases the grant would represent 50 percent of the cost of construction, although larger shares would be provided where enrollment increases warrant it or in the case of new schools.

No grant or grants to any medical school for the total 5-year program would exceed $3 million for construction, exclusive of grants up to $25,000 for preparing initial plans.

While the main emphasis in the bill is placed on construction, it is provided that up to 20 percent may be allocated to permanent endowment for maintenance.

During the past 2 years when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, I made a special study of the needs of our medical schools for expansion of their educational and research facilities.

I visited the University of Minnesota during the course of this survey and found that despite the establishment of the Mayo Memorial and greatly expanded medical and research facilities there was need for surgical research laboratories, a clinical cancer research building, additions to the Heart Hospital, for a faculty and student medical library, and for a residence hall for graduate medical students engaged in research.

These needs are typical of many of our medical schools.

Last fall, Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of the medical sciences at the University of Minnesota, wrote me as follows:

> If we are to provide more and better trained personnel in medicine, dentistry, nursing, medical technology, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and other health service fields, one of the fundamental and basic needs is for improved and expanded facilities.
>
> The same basic necessity applies to the expansion of medical research activities.

Emphasis on the need for added facilities in our medical schools was also emphasized in a letter which I received from Dr. Owen V. Wangensteen, chief of the department of surgery at the medical school of the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Wangensteen wrote me as follows:

> Ideas and men are, of course, of the greatest importance in any research venture.
>
> Nevertheless these men must have a place to work.
>
> A year ago Surgeon General Scheele's office had indications of requests for help running into millions of dollars for medical schools throughout the country.
>
> In many areas, that need is urgent.
>
> I have the definite feeling that one to two million dollars could be employed usefully and immediately in a large number of medical schools throughout the country to give helpful impetus to medical research work now in progress in the area of cancer and heart disease alone.

Mr. President, I reported my observations last year in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated July 16, 1954, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 16, 1954.*

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: This is in reference to your communication of July 1 wherein you made further mention of our conversation concerning the applications that have been received by myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations and that some of the college and university officials had recommended that the Federal Government appropriate funds to assist them in developing the research activities of these educational institutions to the maximum. At my earliest opportunity I visited the University of Minnesota as I had received a communication from Dr. Owen H. Wangansteen, of the University of Minnesota, setting forth their research activities and also their great need of assistance as it is impossible to obtain sufficient funds to continue expanding not only the necessary space but the laboratory equipment.

It is at the University of Minnesota that a young surgeon, Dr. C. Walton Lillehei, is making it possible to open the heart in man for more than a half-hour to repair congenital defects within the heart. He is making it possible to enlarge the scope of surgery of the heart considerably. This is a monumental contribution—perhaps the most importan surgical contribution in this area of work in our generation. Dr. Lillehei had the idea of how to do it; he worked it out in the experimental laboratory. He then applied it to patients. I would say that the nature of this contribution could not be estimated in money—yes, not even in millions or billions. It is that important.

I was privileged last Saturday, July 10, to witness such a surgical performance on a dog, where the second dog was used as the host for the purpose of purifying the blood while the arteries were separated from the other dog's heart that was under surgery. It was unbelievable, and yet research has accomplished it. Only through this intensified research activity at this University of Minnesota has this been accomplished. Think of the thousands into the hundreds of thousands of blue babies and others afflicted with a defective heart who can be saved and be permitted to lead a normal life.

A university or college that has developed in this manner in the field of research cannot possibly find the means to finance itself. It is for that reason that I definitely believe that the Federal Government should make a very careful study of this question. I am taking the matter up with Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have already discussed it with her assistant, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, in the hopes that this appropriations need can be brought to the attention of the Budget Bureau in order that this Bureau may give consideration to such an appropriation and that we in Congress may have the benefit of a recommendation from the Budget Bureau as we reconvene in the 84th Congress.

I believe that it would be better if we handle the funds for such research facility construction in much the same manner as we now appropriate and make available funds for cancer, heart, mental health, and the other health research assistances. By handling the funds in such a manner, the specific worthy projects that were proven and approved by the national health authorities would be granted the funds to continue in their research.

Now again referring to the activities at the University of Minnesota, where I made this specific investigation and study of what their needs are, both Dr. Wangensteen, one of the noted surgeons of this Nation, and Dr. Harold S. Diehl, the Dean of the Medical School of the University of Minnesota, discussed every phase of their needs and what their future plans are. It would be my surmise that the University of Minnesota at the present moment could well use somewhere in the area of $3 million and even possibly $4 million immediately and directly to satisfy present existing urgent needs for laboratory space to give momentum to research which is now in progress.

I am certain were we to visit other educational institutions that have proven their ability and scientific leadership in this field of medical and surgical research that we would find a need much similar to what exists at the University of Minnesota.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the basic problem that needs to be considered, aside from the obvious benefits to the people of this country of enlarged medical education and research facilities, is the number of doctors that are needed for an expanding population.

Since 1910, the population has increased 75 percent yet the annual number of medical-school graduates has increased only 54.5 percent.

An accepted ratio is 1 active doctor for every 750 people.

Our net rise in population in 1954 demanded a net increase of 3,333 new doctors, yet our actual increase of new doctors was only 2,816.

Beginning with an estimated shortage of 20,000 doctors in this country, it is apparent that if this trend is not changed the ratio of doctors serving our people will be reduced still further.

In fact, the report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, made 3 years ago, stated that by 1960 the United States will need 30,000 additional physicians over and above the predicted supply for that year for reasonably comprehensive medical care to the whole civilian population, for the pressing needs of public-health services, industrial medicine, mental and tuberculosis staffs, faculties of medical schools and schools of public health, and to meet all the requirements of the Armed Forces.

The principal barrier to increasing the number of physicians is actually the limited capacity of our medical schools.

The Journal of the American Medical Association of September 11, 1954, states:

> Medical schools indicate that large sums are still needed for construction of new buildings, remodeling and modernization of existing facilities, and the purchase and installment of new permanent equipment.

It is to help in meeting these basic needs, which loom so large in any consideration of the health and well-being of our people, that the proposed legislation to authorize Federal grants for construction of educational and research facilities for our medical schools is directed.

I believe this is a most constructive bill, and I am confident it will have serious and favorable consideration by Congress.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me in connection with the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement, presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

For 160 years, the United States has been hampered by an obstacle in the path of democratic selection of the Chief Executives. The system has persisted in spite of oft-repeated efforts to substitute more rational and democratic methods. Now, in a time when democracy is enduring its severest trial before the peoples of the world, the United States must perform the duties which it has assumed, and lead the free nations of the world in demonstrating that democracy is the best way.

The fundamental principle on which any democracy is founded is that the people governed shall have a voice, a controlling voice in their government. This means that they shall elect their public servants by popular vote, so that the servants are responsible to the people in the most direct way possible. It is also inherent in any democracy that all citizens shall have an equal voice in choosing their public servants. It is inconsistent with our principles that the votes of some of our citizens are worth twice, 5 times, or 10 times as much as others, merely due to their geographic distribution. It is even more inconsistent that in every presidential election, millions of votes are not counted at all. These inconsistencies are difficult to justify in the eyes of the world. The United States should meet the challenge, and reform its outmoded election system in order that it may better reflect the will of the people.

The electoral college system has many defects. Not only is it possible for a man to be elected President of the United States even though more Americans may have voted for his opponent, but this has happened three times in the short history of our country. In 1824, Andrew Jackson polled 50,000 votes more than his nearest rival, John Quincy Adams, but lacked a majority due to the votes received by two other candidates. The election was thrown to the House of Representatives under the provisions of the Constitution. There, through pressure and influence, Adams was chosen to be President.

Again in 1876, Samuel J. Tilden received almost 265,000 votes more than Rutherford B. Hayes. Hayes won the election, however, through a vote in the electoral commission set up to decide the contest.

In 1888, Grover Cleveland received 375,000 votes more than Benjamin Harrison but lost to Harrison through the peculiar distribution of votes in the electoral college.

These three men, Adams, Hayes, and Harrison, were all defeated in the popular election, but nevertheless became President. More voters preferred another candidate in each instance, but due to our election arrangement, the also-ran became the Chief Executive. How can we justly say we believe in majority rule unless we correct the situation which allows this possibility?

There are three factors which contribute to the possibility of a President being chosen without receiving more votes than any other candidate. The first of these factors is that all the electoral votes of a State are cast for the candidate that polls the greatest number of votes in the State. Thus, it makes no difference in the result of an election whether a candidate wins a State by a narrow margin or by a sweeping majority. The votes cast for the losing candidates in a State might just as well not have been cast at all. It is as if all the voters who did not vote for the winning candidate had been disfranchised. They might just as well have stayed at home. This may well be the cause of much apathy at election time in this country, particularly in the States which consisently vote one ticket year after year. There are an estimated 37 million people in the United States qualified to vote who do not choose to exercise this fundamental prerogative.

There are further statistics to show the unfortunate effects of the "all-or-nothing" rule, not as spectacular as electing the wrong President, but important nonetheless because they show that the electoral vote does not reflect the will of the people. In 1884, Cleveland received 563,084 popular votes in the State of New York and all of its electoral votes. In the same election, Blaine received 562,001 popular votes, only 1,083 fewer than Cleveland, but got none of the State's electoral votes. The electoral vote cast by the State seemed to indicate that New York was 100 percent behind Cleveland when in actuality, the margin between his support and Blaine's amounted to less than a tenth of a percent of the total vote cast.

In 1932, Herbert Hoover had 15,800,000 popular votes and of these, 13,600,000 brought no electoral votes due to their distribution among the States. Of Mr. Hoover's nearly 16 million votes, only 2 million were reflected in the electoral vote. In 1924, John W. Davis polled 6 million votes which were worthless to him for they brought no electoral votes, while 2 million other popular votes brought him 136 electoral votes. These 2 million votes were infinitely more valuable to Davis than the votes of 6 million other people who happened to be living in the wrong States to make their votes effective.

The second factor which contributes to the possibility of an also-ran becoming President of the United States is the fact that under the present electoral college system, each State is given a bonus of two electoral votes over the votes it has due to its population. There are 96 of these bonus votes distributed among the 48 States, and they give an unfair advantage to the voters who reside in the smaller States.

In 1950, the census showed the United States population to be 150,697,361. Thirty-eight States contained 70,453,399 people; the remaining 10 States contained 80,243,962 or 9,790,563 more than the 38 smaller States. But the 10 States have 20 automatic electoral votes while the 38 have 76 automatic votes. The 10 large States have over 6 million more people but 56 fewer electoral votes. The voters in the large States are penalized in that their votes don't count as much as those from the smaller States due to the two-vote bonus.

The third factor that contributes to the possibility that a President may be elected without having polled the most votes is the fact that a State casts the same number of electoral votes regardless of the number of people who turn out to vote. In the extreme case, a thousand people in New York could cast 47 electoral votes so long as no one else in the State bothered to vote. We don't have to go to the extreme case, however, to find extraordinary situations which actually existed. In the 1952 election, 1 electoral vote in Mississippi represented less than 36,000 popular votes due to the small election-day turnout, while in Minnesota 1 electoral vote represented more than 125,000 popular votes. The voter in Minnesota had less than one-third the importance in the final result as the voter in Mississippi. I am sure we all revere and respect the Mississippi voter, but there are few among us, I think, who will maintain that his judgment concerning who should be President is more than three times as astute as that of the Minnesota or Massachusetts voter.

The following table represents other instances of unequal representation which have actually occurred:

In 1912 Wilson received 1 elector per 14,500 votes; Taft received 1 elector per 435,000 votes.

In 1928 Hoover received 1 elector per 48,180 votes; Smith received 1 elector per 172,602 votes.

In 1932 Hoover received 1 elector per 267,149 votes; Roosevelt received 1 elector per 48,351 votes.

In 1948 Truman received 1 elector per 78,123 votes; Dewey received 1 elector per 113,990 votes.

In 1952 Stevenson received 1 elector per 306,646 votes; Eisenhower received 1 elector per 76,764 votes.

The best way to eliminate the possibility that a man will be elected President in spite of the will of the people is to conduct a general popular election for the position. This does away with all the factors which might contribute to the election of a man who has lost the general election. Under the constitutional amendment which I am introducing today, every voter casts one vote, a whole vote, which is just as good and just as important as the vote cast by any other voter in the country. This is the democratic way. This is what we are trying to convince the people of the world to do. This is, in reality, what is implied in the spirit of our Government. This is the final step in the constitutional evolution which began with the declaration that all men are created equal, and continued with the assertion that no man or woman may be denied the right to vote for arbitrary reasons. Now we must make the suffrage an equal suffrage, and repudiate arbitrary and discriminatory geographical bases for denying or reducing the importance of the votes of some of our citizens.

The electoral college also permits the majority will within a State to be ignored. The best an individual member of the electoral college can do is perform a function which could more efficiently be performed without him. The worst he can do is to refuse to vote as instructed by the voters of his State and substitute his own will for theirs. In 1948, electors of four States repudiated the Democratic candidate and cast ballots for the States rights candidate. One elector out of eleven from a fifth State, Tennessee, did the same in spite of an overwhelming victory of the Democratic candidate over the States rights candidate in that State. The electors are not legally bound to follow the dictates of their State's electorate, and are free to exercise their discretion as they see fit.

In 1796 three electors disregarded the mandate of the general election, with the result that John Adams rather than Thomas Jefferson was elected.

A whole State's citizenry may be disfranchised by the action of a handful of men. The sooner this possibility is removed from our election procedures, the better for the American people.

From the voters' point of view, the electoral college only adds to the confusion of election day. The voter wants to vote for the President and Vice President, not for a list of electors whose names he doesn't recognize. Yet in 10 States, only the names of the electors appear on the ballot. In 16 other States, the ballot includes both the names of the candidates and of the electors.

Another reason for abolishing the electoral college is the possible confusion which would result if an elector is unable to carry out the function for which he was chosen. Suppose he dies, or fails to cast his vote on the proper

day and in the proper way. Or suppose the presidential candidate to whom he is pledged becomes ineligible and the elector is freed from his pledge. All of these circumstances have occurred in our history and all of them could have been avoided if the electoral college had been abolished.

Direct popular election of the President and Vice President are not new concepts in our political philosophy. The father of the Constitution, James Madison, strongly favored direct popular election. The man whose counsel and philosophy guided the creation of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin, also supported this form of election. Andrew Jackson, one of the great Presidents of our history who was more closely in touch with the will of the people than most emphasized in his first message to Congress the need for direct popular election as a method of democratizing the election process. At best, the electoral college system is the result of a crude compromise, a matter of necessity in order to unite the States at the time of the constitutional convention. At worst, it is a device originally created to remove from the hands of the people the selection of the country's Chief Executive. Do we still believe that we must compromise on an issue so basic in a democracy? Do we still believe that the people are not to be trusted in choosing their President?

The answer to both of these questions is clear and it is "No." We have shown countless times that we recognize that the country is strong when the voice of the people is heard. We have removed restrictions on the suffrage three times by constitutional amendment, in amendments 14, 15, and 19. In reality, these amendments did not extend the suffrage; they merely recognized contradictions of democracy in our country and removed the contradictions.

We must now continue in the pattern set by our enlightened predecessors, in the tradition of democracy. We must support a direct election of the President and Vice President, recognizing that the present system is defective in guaranteeing the democratic equality of all voters, and that this anachronism must be eliminated.

The process of election as it exists today, promotes an unusual and unfortunate emphasis in presidential campaigning. In the first place, most candidates concentrate on winning majorities in a few large States, realizing that even if these majorities are very slight, they will carry with them all the electoral votes in the States. These large States contribute a disproportionate number of votes in the electoral college and for this reason the campaigns are disproportionately directed toward these States. The voters in the smaller States are neglected and must choose between the candidates on insufficient evidence. Proof of this campaign emphasis exists in the fact that 17 out of 27 major party candidates for the Presidency since 1900 came from Ohio or New York. In the past 50 years, we have had 3 Presidents from New York and 3 from Ohio. In the past 70 years, only twice has a President been elected without winning a majority in the State of New York.

I don't mean to detract from the caliber of the Presidents and candidates produced by New York and Ohio, and several of the other large States. However, I would venture to say that there have been other possible candidates from smaller States who weren't given the consideration that might have been due them because of their geographic position. On the other hand, citizens of the smaller States who are not the beneficiaries of vigorous campaigning are often apathetic about voting. We have a nonvoting population of 37 million, an extraordinarily large percentage for a free Republic.

Another factor in the peculiar emphases of our campaigns is the unusual importance of minority groups in large doubtful States. Often, Presidential candidates must give these groups far more consideration than is healthy in a democracy where the majority is supposed to rule. That minorities can exert an important influence is clearly shown in the election of 1948, when the Progressive Party polled enough votes to swing two important States to the Republican candidate. I use this example because it is one of the few cases where the effect of the vote of a political minority group can be accurately shown. It is more difficult to study the voting patterns of other minority groups because under the secret ballot these votes cannot be separated in the final election returns. However, there is no doubt that certain minority groups receive special treatment in Presidential campaigns, and we can be sure that this is not without good reason.

A direct Presidential election is needed, then, for many reasons, but all of the reasons are derived from the principle that all votes cast should have equal importance in deciding who is to be President. This principle is basic in our democracy as well as in any other democracy. It means not only that all the votes case will have the same mathematical importance, but that all votes will be the end product of virtually the same opportunity of choice, as far as possible.

It is our duty to the world as well as to our citizens to perfect our form of democracy until it is beyond the criticism of principle without execution. We must be the example to the free world not only in our words and ideas, but in our actions and our conduct. We must mean what we say when we dedicate ourselves to a government in which its strength, integrity, and sovereignty are those of its people, as expressed in free, untrammeled elections.

ANNUAL CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], my colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution providing for annual consolidated appropriation bills. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in connection with the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15), submitted by Mr. BYRD (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the 84th Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of —— (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such con-

tract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and and conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure as of the beginning of the fiscal year, other than the obligated balances of expired appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (B);

"(E) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from revolving and management funds, other than expenditures referred to in clauses (C) and (D);

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on revolving and management funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in a preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Forty-six Members of the Senate today joined in the introduction of a bill to establish procedures by which Congress could regain control of annual obligations for Federal expenditure.

This approach to the recapture of fiscal control would be accomplished by provisions in the bill under which Congress annually would fix limitations on obligations for expenditure by Federal agencies from balances they have built up in appropriations previously enacted for them as well as obligations against new authorizations in current appropriation bills.

The importance of expenditures from balances in old appropriations, over which Congress has been exercising virtually no control, is emphasized by the following facts to be found in the Federal Budget Document of January 17:

1. The President estimated expenditures in the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, at $62.4 billion.

2. The President estimated that, of the $62.4 billion total expenditures, only $37.9 billion will be from the $58.6 billion he requested in new appropriations and other authorizations to be enacted this year.

3. The President estimated that $24.5 billion of the total expenditures will be from the $82 billion in balances of old appropriations and other authorizations, enacted in previous years, which are to be carried over into the new year.

Under present practices, Congress ordinarily acts only on new appropriations requested, without exercising control over expenditures from balances in old appropriations which are to be carried over.

To attempt to balance the budget by action only on that part of new appropriations for expenditure in the coming year would require excessively heavy reductions on half of the expenditure budget, while that part to be spent from old appropriations would be largely exempt even from review for reduction.

Sponsors of this bill do not claim it is the complete solution to the tail-wagging-the-dog situation created by uncontrolled expenditure from tremendous carryover balances, but, among other reforms in fiscal legislative procedure, it is largely directed at this problem.

Provisions of the bill may be divided generally into three parts:

1. They would provide that Congress consider all appropriations in one package, instead of a dozen scattered, unrelated bills as at present, so Members and the public can see the whole picture as the spending side of the budget is enacted.

(The so-called single appropriation bill of 1950 merely collected all of the regular appropriations between two covers of the bill, and that was as far as its similarity to this proposal went.)

2. They would provide that Congress shall write into the appropriation bill, against all items involved, limitations on annual obligations for expenditure from all appropriations—those previously enacted as well as those currently under consideration.

(The importance of provisions in this category may be seen from the fact that as of next June 30 the build-up of unexpended balances in old appropriations and authorizations will exceed $80 billion. While a large part of this total will be called "obligated," the validity of some of the so-called obligations should be subject to scrutiny in review.)

(It should be noted also that it is annual expenditure—not annual appropriations—against annual revenue which result in annual deficits or surpluses; and that it is annual deficits which pile up public debt.)

3. They would provide also that committee reports on appropriation bills shall show annual expenditure estimates which could be compared with revenue estimates, and that revised revenue estimates shall be requested from the Treasury from time to time during the consideration of the bill, so that the budget may be kept in balance during the process of appropriation bill enactment.

The language of this bill is practically identical with that of Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 of the past session of Congress, frequently referred to as the "single appropriation bill."

This bill originally was drafted in 1947 when it first became evident that, even under peacetime conditions, Congress was losing annual control over Federal expenditures.

The bill is designed to recapture a measure of that control, through its obligation limitation features, and at the same time provision would be made for necessary long-term contracts such as those required for heavy and intricate military equipment.

The language of the bill has been carefully worked over by fiscal experts and drafting technicians, and it has been approved four times by the Senate Rules Committee, twice with a Republican majority, and twice with a Democratic majority. It has been passed twice by the Senate as a whole.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Address entitled "Education: Democracy's Indispensable Weapon," delivered by him before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, at St. Louis, Mo., on February 28, 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him before the Rotary Club of Memphis, Tenn., on Tuesday, March 1, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at Stephens College, Missouri, on February 22, 1955.

By Mr. CURTIS:

Statement prepared by him entitled "The Republican Valley Conservation Association."

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address entitled "Peace Through Power," delivered by the Assistant Secretary of Defense Fred A. Seaton at Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., February 9, 1955.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Statement in commemoration of centenary of St. Mary's College, near South Bend, Ind.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 3, 9, 10, 27, 30, AND 31, PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO THE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 16, 1955, beginning at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 3, Senate Joint Resolution 9, Senate Joint Resolution 10, Senate Joint Resolution 27, Senate Joint Resolution 30, and Senate Joint Resolution 31, resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to the election of President and Vice President. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in this legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8, TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION TO AUTHORIZE GOVERNORS TO FILL TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE CONGRESS CAUSED BY A DISASTER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 15, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 8, a resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]; and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the nomination of William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Tenth Session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Notice is hereby given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

The Senate also received today the nomination of Kingsley Davis, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1957. Notice is also given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR AWARDS OF FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I know that the Congress read with pleasure on Saturday, February 20, the news from historic Valley Forge, Pa., of the 1954 Freedom's Awards, made by the Freedom's Foundation.

This distinguished foundation has given tremendous new impetus to patriotic observance and rededication throughout our country.

I have prepared a statement on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Under its charter, Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge exists for the following purpose:

"To create and build an understanding of the spirit and philosophy of the Constitution and Bill of Rights and of our indivisible bundle of political and economic freedoms inherent in them.

"To inspire love of freedom and to support the spiritual unity born of the belief that man is a dignified human being, created in the image of his Maker, and by that fact possessor of certain inalienable rights."

NOTABLE OFFICERS, TRUSTEES, AND DIRECTORS

The distinguished officers, trustees, and board of directors of the foundation indicate the high caliber of this great organization. I should like now to list these outstanding individuals:

FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE

Honorary Officers

Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman; Hon. Herbert Hoover, honorary president.

Officers and Trustees

Kenneth D. Wells, president and trustee; Don Belding, chairman of directors and trustee; Charles E. White, trustee; Fred Maytag II, trustee; William C. McCord, treasurer and trustee.

Board of Directors

Kenneth W. Akers, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. Raymond B. Allen, Los Angeles, Calif.; George D. Bailey, Detroit, Mich.; Mrs. Olive Ann Beech, Wichita, Kans.; Don Belding, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Lewis H. Brown, New York; Erwin D. Canhan, Boston, Mass.; Colby M. Chester, New York; Paul Foster Clark, Boston, Mass.; William Robertson Coe, New York; James Cope, Detroit, Mich.; James W. Cothran, Bishopville, S. C.; Nathan L. Dauby, Cleveland, Ohio; Edward M. Dealey, Dallas, Tex.; George S. Dinwiddie, New Orleans, La.; Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, State College, Pa.; Dr. Fred D. Fagg, Los Angeles, Calif.; Adrien Falk, San Francisco, Calif.; Hon. James A. Farley, New York; Walter D. Fuller, Philadelphia, Pa.

Fred G. Gurley, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. John Robbis Hart, Valley Forge; Maj. Gen. Harlan N. Hartness, Ophelia, Va.; Hon. Charles R. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak.; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C. S. C., Notre Dame, Ind.; Conrad N. Hilton, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Mrs. Clifford F. Hood, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Edward F. Hutton, New York; Dr. Raymond E. Jackson, Buffalo, N. Y.; Dr. Albert C. Jacobs, Hartford, Conn.; Dr. Robert L. Johnson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Clarence A. Manion, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Maytag II, Newton, Iowa; Dr. Kevin McCann, Defiance, Ohio; William C. McCord, Detroit, Mich.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Middleton, New York; Thomas E. Millsop, Weirton, W. Va.; Clint W. Murchison, Dallas, Tex.; John P. Murphy, Cleveland, Ohio; Graham Patterson, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. James B. Patton, Columbus, Ohio; Mrs. J. Howard Pew, Ardmore, Pa.; Henning W. Prentis, Jr., Lancaster, Pa.; Sid. W. Richardson, Fort Worth, Tex.; Jackie Robinson, New York; Miss Ginger Rogers, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Hon. George Rossman, Salem, Oreg.; Dr. Guy M. Rush, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. Norman Salit, New York; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York; Herbert E. Smith, New York; Faustin J. Solon, Toledo, Ohio; Dr. Harold E. Stassen, Washington; Arthur W. Steudel, Cleveland, Ohio; Reese H. Taylor, Los Angeles, Calif.; Hon. William Glenn Terrell, Tallahassee, Fla.; Mrs. Robert A. Vogeler, Bedford Hills, N. Y.; Kenneth D. Wells, Valley Forge; Hon. Carl V. Weygandt, Columbus, Ohio; Charles M. White, Cleveland, Ohio.

SOME OF THE TOP AWARDS

The awards themselves were numerous.

Their very comprehensiveness indicates how clearly the foundation's guiding hands have understood that the challenge to America must be met in every field of endeavor, in every media of communication, in every phase of American society—religion, education, business, labor, civic activity, and many others.

While I cannot, of course, attempt to list all of the awards, I should like to mention just a few highlights of them without in any way detracting from all the other groups and individuals who were honored by other prizes.

SPLENDID AWARDS JURY

I may say that these annual awards are a highlight each year of patriotic American's admiration of noble contributions to the cause of service of country.

I have been pleased to be in contact down through the years with Mr. W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, vice president in charge of the national awards program and former director of the Americanism division of the American Legion.

I am happy to note that the 1954 national and school awards jury represented as usual a cross-section of outstanding American organizations and individuals. Among them, I am glad to say was a notable jurist of my own State, member of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, the Honorable Roland J. Steinle.

The list of the awards jury now follows:

THE DISTINGUISHED 1954 NATIONAL AND SCHOOL AWARDS JURY OF FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE

Chairman: Dr. George D. Humphrey, president, the University of Wyoming.

Coordinator: Hon. Charles R. Hayes, retired presiding judge, Supreme Court of South Dakota.

Col. Walter C. Bowman, national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. Thomas J. Cuite, national commander, Catholic War Veterans of the U. S. A.

Col. William B. Freeland, member, National Council, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Inc.

Hon. Frederick G. Hamley, Chief Justice elect, Supreme Court of Washington.

Hon. W. W. Harvey, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Kansas.

Hon. W. Marion Hendry, past national commander, Coast Guard League.

Mrs. Mae Holmes, national commander, Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary.

Mrs. Thomas F. Holz, national president, Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U. S.

Hon. Ernest A. Inglis, Chief Justice, Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors.

Mrs. Pauline M. Kelly, national commander, Navy Mothers' Clubs of America.

Miss Bertha M. Luckey, president, Quota Club International.

Mr. Tag Manning, first vice president, 20–30 International.

Hon. James Morris, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of North Dakota.

Mr. Nicholas C. Mueller, international vice president, Optimist International.

Hon. M. T. Phelps, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Arizona.

Mr. Jay A. Pound, national president, American War Dads, Inc.

Dr. Dorothea F. Radusch, international president, Zonta International.

Dr. Carl J. Rees, vice commander, the American Legion.

Mr. George K. Shamgochian, national commandant, Marine Corps League.

Hon. Roland J. Steinle, Justice, Supreme Court of Wisconsin.

Mrs. Sara E. Stone, national president, National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the U. S.

Mrs. Louise Tegeler, national vice councilor, Daughters of America.

Mr. Lloyd Thurston, commander, United Spanish War Veterans.

Hon. Walter L. Tooze, Acting Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Oregon.

Hon. Frank L. Wilkinson, general president, the General Society, Sons of the Revolution.

Mr. R. Clarence Williams, president-elect, Civitan International.

Here then are a few of the fine awards:

A special award went to Rev. Billy Graham for his famed evangelistic efforts, and to St. John's University, whose faculty group has written the volume Concept of Freedom.

Top general awards went to the All-American Conference to Combat Communism (composed of America's leading fraternal, veterans, womens, patriotic, civic, religious, and other groups) for the AAC's Know Your America Week program; to the Hawaiian Residents' Association, Inc., for its three-fold program of combating communism, promoting racial harmony, and demonstrating and maintaining the American way of life; and to Kiwanis International for its Minutemen for Americanism program.

Top magazine article award went to Henry Lee, of Stamford, Conn., and of the New York Daily News, for his memorable article in Collier's magazine entitled "Our Lives, Our Fortune, and Our Sacred Honor." The article depicted the ultimate fate of the patriots who risked everything in their signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Top award in 16-millimeter motion pictures went to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for its splendid film, It's Everybody's Business.

Top television award went to America's electric light and power companies for one of the programs in their highly esteemed CBS series, You Are There. This program, Resolve of Patrick Henry, reenacted the scene on March 23, 1775, when the indomitable Patrick Henry led the gallant sons of Virginia in taking their stand on behalf of separation from the crown.

WISCONSIN WINNERS

We, of Wisconsin, are pleased to note the numerous winners from our own State, and I should like now to include the text of an article which appeared in the February 20 Milwaukee Journal listing the seven Wisconsin award recipients:

"FREEDOM AWARDS TO SEVEN IN STATE

"Mrs. Florence V. Beadle of 3057 N. Sherman Blvd., was one of seven Wisconsin residents who won 1954 Freedom awards, the Freedoms Foundation announced Saturday at Valley Forge, Pa. Eight Wisconsin companies, schools, and corporations also were honored.

"Mrs. Beadle won an honor certificate award for her work as editor of the Geuder, Paeschke & Frey Co. publication, As We See It. Her company also won an honor certificate.

"Other Wisconsin award winners:

"George B. Thacher, Madison, honor award certificate for work as editor of Wisconsin Power & Light Co. publication. The company also won an honor certificate.

"Rita Middleton, Germantown, second place award for untitled essay, $50 and George Washington medal; Kaukauna High School, honor award certificate; Wisconsin department, American Legion, George Washington medal award for community programs; Rodney Jonathan Crook, Mineral Point, second place in general category, $50 and George Washington medal; Laboratory School, Platteville State College, George Washington medal.

"Elaine M. Kitto, Racine, honor certificate award for work as editor of Belle City Malleable Iron Co. publication. The company also won an honor certificate.

"William Johnson, Racine, honor certificate award for work as editor of J. I. Case Co. publication. The company won the same award.

"The Reverend Edwin Jaster, Racine, George Washington honor medal for 16-millimeter motion picture, An Adventure in Freedom, and Waupaca city schools, George Washington medal.

"The foundation also announced a series of awards, totaling $20,000, for college journalism students. There will be 100 awards of $100 each and 20 fellowship awards of $500 each. Students aiming at a career in journalism will be invited to submit two papers for judging by the Freedoms Foundation. The first will be a monograph on the American way of life, the second an editorial on some facet of the American way of life."

CONCLUSION

To all the individuals who were honored by awards, as well as to those whose efforts were considered but did not receive a prize, I want to convey best wishes for their patriotic resolve.

And I want to renew my greetings to all the participants in the work of Freedom's Foundation.

They are carrying on today the noble traditions which were first established by George Washington and his valiant soldiers of the Continental Army in the dark days of 1777–78, when the very life of America hung in the balance.

Today, once more, the same type of dedication is necessary in the face of a challenge even greater to our own country and to the world—the challenge of aggressive, atheistic, international communism.

Just as the enemies of America would like to assault us from abroad and to try to divide us at home by their alien propaganda in every segment of society, so the protectors of America, the sustainers of America, the guardians of America, must protect us to the limit of their ability in every sphere. They must encourage eternal vigilance, must generate right thinking and right action, promote the brotherhood of man and faith in the Fatherhood of God.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF JOURNALISM SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday in Madison, Wis., there occurred a memorable dinner marking the 50th anniversary of journalism teaching at the University of Wisconsin. The dinner climaxed a 2-day golden anniversary program, which included seminars on news reporting, circulation, and advertising. The program honored what is generally regarded as the oldest continuously operated school of journalism in American higher education.

There were many scoffers and skeptics when the late Dr. Willard Grosvenor Bleyer opened the first journalism class in the fall of 1905. Many outstanding leaders in journalism of that day scoffed at the idea that journalism could be taught in school; they insisted it had to be taught in a city room, or on the police beat, or only in other actual practice.

But in the half century which has followed, the teaching of journalism has become an indispensable segment of the American fourth estate, and of higher education as well.

The 50th anniversary dinner at Madison heard a significant address on the subject of Secrecy in Government delivered by the noted newspaper columnist, an alumnus of the university's school of journalism, Mr. Marquis Childs. Mr. Childs, a 1923 graduate, was 1 of 6 alumni who received citations for distinguished achievement. The citations were presented by the university president, E. B. Fred.

Others who received the awards were: Irwin Maier, publisher of the Milwaukee Journal; Lloyd Lehrbas, Assistant to the Secretary of the Army; Kenneth W. Payne, executive editor of the Reader's Digest; Louis P. Lochner, author and former foreign correspondent; and Walter Seiler, president of Cramer-Krasselt Co., Milwaukee advertising agency.

I desire to convey to the faculty and students of the school of journalism my warmest wishes and, in particular, to the editors and staff of the Daily Cardinal, my special greetings for their actual demonstration, famed throughout the Nation, of modern university journalism.

May the next 50 years be as rich with achievement as the past 50 have been for this great school, and may the American fourth estate continue to prosper as one of the great sentinels of American freedom and a vital check and balance in the American process.

THE FORMOSA SITUATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, like most of the people of our country and many of our friends abroad, I continue to be deeply concerned with regard to the Formosa situation. I have made my views and my fears clear in several speeches in the Senate when the Formosa resolution and the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek were before us. For the reasons set forth in my remarks, I voted against both the resolution and the treaty.

The situation is so explosive and dangerous that it should, and must, continue to engage the attention and study of all our people. Unfortunately, however, our people have so little knowledge of what our policy actually is that they are thoroughly confused and greatly disturbed. Last Tuesday night I listened to a telecast on the Edward R. Murrow See It Now program. It was an interview with Chiang Kai-shek, by our colleague the senior Senator from Maine. General Chiang Kai-shek made it completely clear that the aim of this country and that of Chiang Kai-shek were in wide divergence. Our announced policy is to defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. Chiang's intention, which he again announced is to seize and return to the mainland of China. I do not believe that these conflicting aims can be reconciled without our courting serious danger, and possibly disaster.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article, written by the distinguished columnist and author, Joseph Alsop, entitled "The Fix We're In," and an editorial, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 26, entitled "What's Clear About It?" The article and the editorial are thoughtful and highly important analyses of the dangerous situation which we are confronted. I commend them to the careful reading and study of the Members of the Senate and of the people of the country generally.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 25, 1955]

THE FIX WE'RE IN

(By Joseph Alsop)

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—It is high time for people at home to face the full seriousness of the fix we are in out here in Asia. The leaders of world communism are now conducting an elaborate nerve war on the Formosa issue. It may be the prelude to a decisive showdown. Or it may only be intended to put the courage of the members of the Western Alliance to an acid test.

Either way, the danger to the United States is incalculably great. For the Eisenhower administration's foreign and defense policies have painted the United States into an almost inescapable corner in Asia.

For 2 years, Washington has paid no attention to the prejudices that hagride the Formosa issue in Britain and Western Europe. Only last week, Secretary Dulles' important speech received the usual acknowledgments—jubilation from Senator KNOWLAND and doleful cries from London.

Even now, no serious effort is being made to form a united front in Asia with our allies. Thus the Communist nerve war has an excellent chance of isolating America on the issue of this controversial island.

This would not be so disturbing, if the Eisenhower administration had ever bothered to match its bold talk with an equally bold defense policy. From Korea onward, there has been a good case for going it alone to halt Communist aggression in Asia. But going it alone costs a lot of money for defense; and our defense policy has been made in the Treasury Department.

The result of simultaneous efforts to please Senator KNOWLAND and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey is the fix we are in. The key to that fix, well known to the world Communist leaders but concealed from our own people, is the present status of the American Strategic Air Command.

Our main weapon and almost our only offensive weapon squarely depends upon its trans-Atlantic bases. The Strategic Air Command's trans-Atlantic bases are controlled, not by us, but by our allies. If our allies part from us over Formosa, the bases will be denied to SAC. And if the bases are denied, SAC will still be able to fight, but SAC will be unable to strike the immediate, decisive blow that it is SAC's vital job to strike.

In fact you can express the practical effects of the successful isolation of America in a crude equation. It equals denial of the trans-Atlantic bases which equals the destruction of about half of General LeMay's airplanes before the shooting even starts.

Consider the shock, if the news came over the radio that half the great SAC force had just been destroyed by saboteurs. Imagine how the country would then feel about a final show-down with Red China and the Soviet Union. And despite the loud denials that will be heard from the Defense Department, remember that this will approximate the real situation if the Communists win their nerve war.

These are the points that must be borne in mind, in weighing the present crisis. It is certainly conceivable that the Communist leaders seriously want a final show-down on Formosa, if they can just contrive to isolate America and thus to bend and blunt our main weapon.

Molotov's grim speech seemed to say as much. German rearmament provides a possible motive. And if the masters of the Kremlin really prefer fighting America to seeing Germany rearmed, the ideal place to start the war is here in Asia, where there is such a gaping hole in the Western Alliance.

It is much more likely that the Communist leaders mean to carry their nerve war only as far as the nerve-shattering brink of final catastrophe. Even so, as matters stand now, they will still have a good chance of isolating America. And how will President Eisenhower choose, when he is not quite sure the enemy is really bluffing, and he has to make the choice between backing down on Formosa or risking a big war with his main weapon half broken in his hand?

There would be no need to ask such questions if we had pursued a different defense policy. But the only course now open is to take out disunity insurance. Let the American Government, then, make a little speech to the British Government:

"We will not abandon Formosa, because Formosa is strategically vital and such a surrender would bring the loss of all of Asia in its train. But if you can get a cease-fire down the middle of the Formosa Strait in exchange for Quemoy and the Matsus, we will back you all the way. You have carte blanche to make a trade. On the other hand, if you cannot make a trade, we think it means the enemy intends to fight anyway. Then we see no reason to give away the offshore islands. And we hope you will back us."

This would outrage Senator KNOWLAND, not to mention the same newspapers and magazines which have professed to see perfection in the defense policy that has put us in our present fix. But it would also get us out of the fix. For such a gesture would give Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden just the help they need in their rather courageous efforts to cope with British public opinion. It would almost certainly prevent the isolation which is now the great danger. And in the end, even those who dislike the cease-fire idea would probably be happy. For there is no reason to suppose that the terms which would restore Western unity would be accepted by the Communists.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1955]

WHAT'S CLEAR ABOUT IT?

The frequency with which the Chinese Communists are warning sundry diplomats in Peking that they intend to invade Formosa has all the earmarks of a war of nerves. If the threat is a bluff, it is a rather foolish one; for either the Communists will have to produce or they will have to acknowledge that it is a bluff and thereby lose face. Most observers seem to feel that the Communists do not want a conflict in advance of the Afro-Asian conference in April. It is, of course, more than possible that what they have in mind is a subversive coup on Formosa stimulated by propaganda and intimidation—a problem that was not contemplated in the Formosa defense pact.

Admiral Radford says flatly in an interview in U. S. News & World Report that the Chinese "do not have the military capability" to carry out a successful invasion of Formosa at this time. This judgment would be more convincing if it were not accompanied, in the same interview, by a lot of misleading gloss about the relationship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to other aspects of national policy—particularly the proposed intervention at Dien Bien Phu last spring. Let us hope that Admiral Radford's estimate of the Chinese capabilities is right. Even if the Chinese do not mean what they say about Formosa, however, this does not rule out an attack on the Quemoys and Matsus that could lead to larger war.

In the event of an attack on Formosa, the United States probably could count on at least the moral support, and perhaps some physical support, from the western allies. Prime Minister Churchill intimated as much the other day at the same time that he made clear Britain's disagreement with the American position respecting the Quemoys and Matsus. These islands are the immediate problem. What will the United States do in the event of a Communist attack on these coastal outposts?

The Quemoys and Matsus have none of the collective guarantees of the SEATO pact, which the conferees at Bangkok seem to have made some solid progress in defining. The islands are, in fact, only obliquely related to the defense of Formosa, and they are poor places to fight. Unhappily, the administration has maneuvered itself into a position in which, it seems to us, it will have to defend the Quemoys and Matsus. The alternative now would be to weaken whatever determination there is in the free world to prevent a forcible Communist takeover of Formosa, and to deal an extremely serious blow to American prestige.

This predicament stems directly from the attempt of the administration to carry

water on both shoulders—to buy off Senator KNOWLAND and guarantee Chiang Kai-shek's morale at the same time it was trying to effectuate a basic change of policy. Evidently administration spokesmen have been telling different stories to different audiences about the coastal islands; and Chairman RICHARDS, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is justified in questioning the ambiguity. Far from being a precise statement of American intentions, the much-touted clarification of policy has turned out to be exactly the opposite. Congress and the American public, as well as the Communists, have been left in the dark.

Hindsight, however, will not extricate us. The best course now seems to be to rely on the British and our other friends to clarify matters by emphasizing to Peking that the United States will fight if the coastal islands are attacked, even though it might relinquish the islands in a peaceful settlement. This is a highly risky situation in which the burden on the President is immense. The country has no choice now but to rely on his good sense and restraint. As Marquis Childs observes, it is a decision between war and peace, delegated to him by Congress, such as few Presidents have ever faced.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of discussing trade and tariff matters with Hon. Joseph E. Talbot, Vice Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission. Our discussion was filmed for broadcast this week by Connecticut stations WKNB, New Britain; WGTH, Hartford; WNHC, New Haven; WICC, Bridgeport; and WATR, Waterbury.

Mr. Talbot formerly practiced law in Naugatuck, Conn., and for three terms represented Connecticut's Fifth District in the House of Representatives. Our Fifth District in Connecticut is a highly industrialized area, and one of many in our State in which industries have grown up behind tariff protection.

In the belief that Mr. Talbot's views on H. R. 1, and his explanation of the procedure involved in tariff negotiations will be of interest to Members of the Senate and to the public generally, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of our discussion be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF A DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY BY UNITED STATES SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH AND THE HONORABLE JOSEPH E. TALBOT

Senator BUSH. Hello everybody, I'm glad to be able to bring my friends in Connecticut another report from Washington, today, as we did 2 weeks ago. And I'd like you to consider with me President Eisenhower's foreign economic policy, and more specifically his recommendations for authority to negotiate moderate reductions in tariffs.

Our guest in our previous report from Washington on this subject was Clarence Randall, who pointed out the importance of the President's program in contributing to America's strength in the cold war against international communism in which we, with other free nations, are engaged.

In our discussion with Mr. Randall, who served as Chairman of the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, we also emphasized that moderate tariff cuts can be made safely if the principles of gradualness, selectivity, and reciprocity are followed. They can have a stimulating effect on our whole economy, and create new opportunities for jobs.

Those principles have been insisted upon by President Eisenhower, who additionally has strongly recommended that we keep the so-called peril point and escape clause provisions of the present Trade Agreements Act.

With us today we are very fortunate to have an expert on those matters in the person of Joseph E. Talbot, Vice Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission. Of course, Joe Talbot is well known to the people of Connecticut. He is a former treasurer of our State, and for three terms he represented Connecticut's Fifth District in the Congress of the United States. Joe, it's good to have you with us today.

Mr. TALBOT. Thank you, Senator. I am delighted to visit again with our friends in Connecticut and to join you in an explanation of the technical details concerning our present and future trade agreements.

Senator BUSH. Joe, in my experience with tariff matters, which is not as extensive as yours, I've found that there's lot more heat than light generated by those who take the extremes on both sides of this issue. The freetraders represent one extreme; the highest protectionists the other.

The President's program has been under attack from both sides. It's my conviction, from the study of this problem over a period of the past 2 years, in particular, that his program will open up opportunities for increased trade among the free nations, have a stimulating effect upon our domestic economy and avoid serious injury to any of our industries, if it's properly administered. It will increase Connecticut's prosperity, and create new opportunities for jobs in this State and elsewhere. Based on your experience, do you agree with that point of view?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes, I do, Senator. The tariff-reduction provisions of the so-called Cooper bill, H. R. 1, are quite mild, and the record of Mr. Eisenhower's—President Eisenhower's—first 2 years in the White House indicates that when he uses them he uses them with restraint, especially as the Cooper bill does not seek in any way to modify the present peril point or the escape clause—which are the chief checks on cutting present tariff rates too deeply.

Senator BUSH. Joe, in the wide range of products produced by American industry, there are those on which tariffs can be safely reduced and others which are more vulnerable, and may need the protection they now have. Then, still others, indeed, may be in need of more protection. We see that from time to time. That's why the principle of selectivity has been insisted upon by the President. Let's discuss, for a minute or two, how we go about selecting the products on which tariffs may be negotiated.

Mr. TALBOT. Well, after the United States and let's say country X decide to negotiate a trade agreement, the first step in the selection of products for modification of import duties is a survey made by the Tariff Commission of past United States imports from that country. Meanwhile country X usually makes a list of products on which it desires modification of United States import duties. The data thus prepared by the Tariff Commission and the request list of country X are then studied by a committee of representatives of various Government agencies, including the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Treasury, Defense, Labor, and Interior, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Foreign Operations Administration.

Senator BUSH. That's Governor Stassen's group, isn't it?

Mr. TALBOT. That's right, Senator. This Country Committee, so-called, also considers all the factors known to it which are pertinent to the future composition and magnitude of the trade between the two countries. It is the general policy not to consider granting a concession on a particular product to a given country unless that country has been or is likely to be the principal, or a major supplier. In addition, the Country Committee carefully considers the competition between imports and domestic goods. On the basis of all these facts, the committee prepares a tentative list of articles on which the United States should consider granting concessions to country X.

Senator BUSH. The reason for all that procedure, Joe, I suppose, is to be certain we enter negotiations with our eyes open. Is that right?

Mr. TALBOT. That's correct, Senator. We want to make certain we have all the essential facts. But that's not the whole process we go through. The list is next sent for review by the Trade Agreements Committee, another interdepartmental committee, whose members represent the same Government departments as the Country Committee, I spoke about before. After careful study of all the facts, the Trade Agreements Committee transmits to the President a list of products for consideration in the negotiations. If the President accepts the Trade Agreements Committee's recommendations, as he usually does, the public is advised of this list and is entitled to supply at a public hearing information that may be useful in the conduct of the negotiations.

Senator BUSH. The Tariff Commission comes into the picture then by making peril-point findings. Does this come next?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes, Senator, after public hearings, the Tariff Commission makes its peril-point findings and sends them to the President. This places a floor below which the President and the Trade Agreements Committee cannot go; and if the President should go below that floor, he must justify his position to Congress. The inclusion of an item in the published list of products does not necessarily mean that a concession will actually be made on that. The information supplied by the manufacturers, and parties interested, may convince the Trade Agreements Committee that a concession should not be granted. Moreover, before the negotiations are completed, the Trade Agreements Committee must conclude that the United States will itself obtain concessions equivalent to those which it is prepared to grant, or to give away.

Senator BUSH. That's reciprocity.

Mr. TALBOT. That's right. In order to obtain a balanced agreement, the Trade Agreements Committee may conclude that certain concessions it was prepared to approve in the first instance should not be made by the United States.

Senator BUSH. That's why they are called reciprocal trade agreements, I presume, and why the President emphasizes reciprocity—which, of course, is as it should be. Now, Joe, we've been talking about the peril point, but I don't think we've defined just what it is, so how about telling us just what the law says about the peril point.

Mr. TALBOT. In plain language, the peril-point provision makes it the duty of the Tariff Commission to determine the lowest rate necessary to protect the domestic industry from serious injury from imports. This rate, which is called the peril-point rate, would ordinarily be expected to be a lower rate than the now existing rate in view of the nature of trade-agreement negotiations. However, if the Commission should find that

a higher rate than the existing rate is necessary to protect the domestic industry, it must name that higher rate as its peril-point rate, and the President is required to either negotiate at the increased rate in the trade agreement or explain to the Congress why he did not do so.

Senator BUSH. Some of our friends in Connecticut, Joe, have been advocating repeal or modification of the peril point. I haven't been able to agree with that. I think that the President's insistence on retention of this safeguard is wise. It offers the only sound method by which we can determine the facts before we enter tariff negotiations. Its the only way we can know the safe limits beyond which we should not go in cutting tariffs. Don't you think so?

Mr. TALBOT. Senator BUSH, even if the present method of establishing peril points and the safeguard of the escape clause were completely eliminated and abolished, some new method would have to be devised immediately to put on the brakes. We cannot sail the ship recklessly, without rudder or anchor. But more important than that, and I say this to those who are asking their Senators and Representatives to vote for abolition of the present peril-point and escape-clause provisions—I say to them, once you begin amending H. R. 1 with this, that, and the other thing, you're bound to end up with a great conglomeration of amendments that will result in the Randall Commission's report and the President's recommendations becoming almost meaningless. The escape clause is the only remedy left to the domestic industry for its protection after the trade agreement has been entered into and it also is a further safety valve in the event that the Tariff Commission may have been in error in the first place in finding a proper peril point.

Senator BUSH. Yes, Joe; I think we should certainly keep the escape clause, too. Now I see that our time is up so I want to thank you again for being with us and to my friends in Connecticut, see you in 2 weeks at the same place, same time. Goodby.

BIPARTISAN CONSULTATIONS ON FOREIGN-POLICY MATTERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a compilation of the meetings and appearances of the Secretary of State with bipartisan congressional groups for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, to date, together with a list of bipartisan consultations on foreign-policy matters with congressional leaders and committees.

There being no objection, the compilations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE WITH BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL GROUPS, 1953, 1954, AND 1955

1953—39 MEETINGS

January 22, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
January 29, 1953: Congressional leadership.
February 10, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 13, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
February 17, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
February 18, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
February 24, 1953: Senate Banking and Currency.
February 26, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
February 26, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 18, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 18, 1953: House Appropriations.
March 24, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee.
March 25, 1953: Congressional leadership.
April 6, 1953: Senate Judiciary.
April 7, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
April 17, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
April 17, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 28, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
April 29, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 30, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
May 2, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
May 4, 1953: House Ways and Means.
May 6, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
May 6, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 9, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations.
June 2, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
June 3, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 8, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
June 12, 1953: Senate Agriculture.
June 15, 1953: House Agriculture.
June 19, 1953: Congressional leadership.
June 29, 1953: Senate leaders.
June 30, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations (Far East Subcommittee).
July 7, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
July 7, 1953: House Appropriations.
July 9, 1953: Congressional leadership.
July 9, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
July 25, 1953: House and Senate Far East Subcommittee.
October 14, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations.

1954—42 MEETINGS

January 5, 1954: Congressional leadership.
January 7, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 13, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 18, 1954: Senate U. N. Subcommittee.
January 19, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
February 22, 1954: Congressional leadership.
February 23, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
February 24, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 19, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 23, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
April 3, 1954: Congressional leadership.
April 5, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
April 6, 1954: Senate Minerals Subcommittee.
April 20, 1954: Congressional leadership.
May 5, 1954: Congressional leadership.
May 11, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
May 12, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 17, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
May 21, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
May 21, 1954: House Judiciary leaders.
May 24, 1954: House leadership.
May 25, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 3, 1954: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.
June 4, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 17, 1954: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
June 23, 1954: Congressional leadership.
June 24, 1954: House Appropriations Subcommittee.
June 28, 1954: Congressional leadership.
July 2, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 2, 1954: Senate Judiciary.
July 12, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 16, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 17, 1954: House Appropriations.
July 19, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
July 21, 1954: House Appropriations.
July 21, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
July 22, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
July 22, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 27, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
August 20, 1954: Congressional leadership.
November 10, 1954: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
November 11, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.

1955—7 MEETINGS

January 13, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 17, 1955: House Ways and Means Committee.
January 20, 1955: Congressional leadership.
January 24, 1955: House Foreign Affairs.
January 24, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 7, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 8, 1955: House Appropriations.

1953	39
1954	42
1955 (to date)	7
Total (to date)	88

Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult on current foreign policy matters

Date	Subject	Members	Department
1953			
Apr. 17	Forthcoming Paris meeting of NATO Ministers.	Senators H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Taft, Langer, Ferguson, Knowland, George, Green, Gillette, Mansfield; Representatives Chiperfield, Vorys, Bolton, Judd, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Adair, Bentley, Battle, Brooks Hays, Roosevelt, Kelly.	The Secretary.
May 9 (at Department of State).	Communist proposal on prisoners of war not desiring repatriation.	Senators H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Knowland, George, Sparkman; Representatives Chiperfield, Richards.	Do.
May 22 (at Department of State).	Far East	Senators Wiley, H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Ferguson, Knowland, George, Sparkman; Representatives Chiperfield, Vorys, Judd, Richards, Lanham.	The Under Secretary.
June 19 (at Department of State).	Korea	Senators Knowland, L. B. Johnson, H. A. Smith, George, Sparkman; Speaker Martin; Representatives Chiperfield, Vorys, Judd, Richards, Lanham.	The Secretary.
June 30 (at Department of State).	Korea	Senators Wiley, H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Knowland, Sparkman; Representatives Chiperfield, Vorys, Judd, Lanham.	The Secretary.
July 9 (at Department of State).	Proposed Foreign Ministers meeting	Senators Knowland, Millikin, Saltonstall, L. B. Johnson, Wiley, Bridges, George, Russell; Speaker Martin; Representatives Halleck, McCormack, Chiperfield.	Do.
July 25 (at Department of State).	Korean armistice and relations with the Republic of Korea.	Senators Wiley, H. A. Smith, Knowland, Sparkman; Representatives Chiperfield, Vorys, Judd, Richards, Lanham.	Do.
Oct. 14 (at Department of State).	London trip and special problems	Senators Wiley, Ferguson, Green, Sparkman; Representatives Vorys, Judd, Burleson, Zablocki.	Do.

Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult on current foreign policy matters—Continued

Date	Subject	Members	Department
1954			
Jan. 22 (at Department of State).	Iranian oil situation	Vice President Nixon, Senators Knowland, L. B. Johnson, Wiley, Saltonstall, George; Speaker Martin; Representatives Priest, Halleck, Short, Rayburn.	The Under Secretary.
Feb. 8 (at Department of State).	Hoover Commission recommendations on Foreign Service.	Senators Wiley, Ferguson, George, Mansfield; Representatives Vorys, Bentley, Richards, Chatham.	Do.
Feb. 22 (at Department of State).	Berlin Conference	Senators Knowland, Saltonstall, Ferguson, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Wiley, George, Russell; Speaker Martin; Representatives Arends, Rayburn, McCormack, Chiperfield, Richards.	The Secretary.
Apr. 3 (at Department of State).	International security problems and Indochina.	Senators Knowland, Millikin, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Russell; Speaker Martin; Representatives McCormack, Priest.	The Secretary, also Deputy Secretary of Defense Kyes, Secretary Anderson, and Admiral Radford.
Apr. 20 (at Department of State).	Recent discussions in Europe and plans for Geneva Conference.	Senators Knowland, Ferguson, Millikin, Saltonstall, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Wiley, Bridges, Hickenlooper, Green, Russell, Fulbright; Representatives Arends, Chiperfield, Brooks Hays, Fisher.	The Secretary.
Apr. 26 (at Department of State).	Indochina	Senators H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Langer, Fulbright, Gillette, Mansfield; Representatives Chiperfield, L. H. Smith, Fulton, Carnahan, Zablocki.	The Acting Secretary.
May 5 (at Department of State).	Report on Geneva Conference	Senators Knowland, Ferguson, Millikin, Saltonstall, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Wiley, Bridges, H. A. Smith, George, Russell, Green; Speaker Martin; Representatives Halleck, Arends, Rayburn, McCormack, Chiperfield, Short, Vorys, Judd, Gordon, Vinson, Lanham.	The Secretary.
July 20	Germany	Senators Knowland, Ferguson; Representatives Martin, Halleck	Do.
1955			
Jan. 20	Far eastern situation	Senators George, Wiley, Byrd, Saltonstall, Clements, Knowland; Representatives Richards, Chiperfield, Arends, McCormack, Martin, and Vinson.	The Secretary, Under Secretary, Mr. Robertson, Admiral Radford, Mr. Morton.

Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or subcommittees of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters

Date	Subject	Committee	Department
1953			
Feb. 10	Recent European trip with Mr. Stassen	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary; Mr. Stassen.
13	Far eastern policy	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	The Secretary.
18	Situation in the Far East	Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
26	German debt settlement agreements	Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs	Legal Adviser Phleger; Mr. Riddleberger.
Mar. 13	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Assistant Secretary Cabot.
25	Korea	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	The Secretary.
Apr. 2	Proposed German cultural convention and revival of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights of 1923 with Germany.	Subcommittee, European Affairs	Mr. Riddleberger.
7	Soviet proposals	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	The Secretary.
10	Palestine refugees	Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
13	Problems before United Nations; Korea; selection new Secretary General; security United States employees.	Subcommittee, United Nations Affairs	Assistant Secretary Hickerson.
24	Reactivation of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights of 1923 with Germany.	Subcommittee, European Affairs	Mr. Riddleberger.
29	Paris NATO meeting	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary.
May 2	Far eastern situation	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	Do.
26	Permanent representative on North Atlantic Council	Subcommittee, State Department Organization	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
27	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Assistant Secretary Cabot.
June 3	Trip to Middle East and South Asia	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary.
4	European Coal and Steel Community	Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs	Mr. Moore with Mr. Monnet.
5	do	Foreign Relations Committee	Miss Camp with Mr. Monnet.
8	Korea	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	The Secretary.
9	Spanish base agreement	Subcommittee, European Affairs	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
July 7	Korea	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	The Secretary.
16	Situation in Korea	Foreign Relations Committee	Assistant Secretary Robertson.
23	Problems before the U. N.	do	Ambassador Lodge.
28	International Tin Conference	Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
1954			
Jan. 7	World developments	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary.
Feb. 3	Situation in Guatemala	do	Mr. Fisher.
16	Indochina	do	The Under Secretary.
18	Military assistance to Pakistan	Subcommittee, Near East and African Affairs	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
19	Panama development program	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Mr. Muccio.
24	Indochina	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary.
Mar. 26	The Saar	Subcommittee, European Affairs	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
Apr. 12	Proposed convention of protection of cultural objects during armed conflict.	Subcommittee, United Nations Affairs	Mrs. Flexner, Miss Roach.
28	Situation in Germany	Foreign Relations Committee	Ambassador Conant.
May 7	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
12	Geneva conference	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary.
17	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
21	do	do	Do.
25	Far East situation	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary.
June 11	Situation in the Near East	Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
11	Guatemala situation	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
17	Indochina	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	The Secretary.
22	German contractual relations	Subcommittee, European Affairs	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
25	Guatemala situation	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
July 16	Geneva conference	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary.
28	Panama Treaty	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
Nov. 10	Manila pact	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs	The Secretary, Mr. Robertson, Mr. MacArthur.
1955			
Jan. 13	Report on world developments	Foreign Relations Committee	The Secretary, Mr. Morton.
19	Review of situation in France	do	Ambassador Dillon, Mr. Fisher (WE).
Feb. 17	Germany	do	Ambassador Conant.

Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the House Foreign Affairs Committee or subcommittee of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters

Date	Subject	Committee	Department
1953			
Jan. 22	World situation	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
Feb. 17	Recent European trip with Mr. Stassen	do	The Secretary, Mr. Stassen.
25	Current developments in Europe	Subcommittee, Europe	Deputy Assistant Secretary Bonbright.
Mar. 2	Analysis of political trends, including Guatemala and Argentina.	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Deputy Assistant Secretary Mann.
5	Political and economic situation in Near East	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Mr. Gardiner.
10	Situation in Iran, Egypt, and Israel	do	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
11	Berlin refugee problem	Subcommittee, Europe	Mr. Riddleberger.
12	Economic situation in various parts of world	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Assistant Secretary Linder.
18	The United Nations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Assistant Secretary Hickerson.
19	International security situation	do	The Under Secretary.
25	European organization	Foreign Affairs Committee	Mr. Stassen, Assistant Secretary Merchant.
25	United States position at rubber study meeting, Copenhagen, May 10.	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Mr. Armstrong.
27	United States participation in international organizations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Assistant Secretary Hickerson.
Apr. 24	Situation in Indochina	Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific	Mr. Bonsal.
28	NATO Paris meeting	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
May 7	Situation in Spain	Subcommittee, Europe	Ambassador Dunn.
20	International Organizations; Palestine refugees	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Mr. Ingram.
22	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Assistant Secretary Cabot.
26	Permanent representative on North Atlantic Council	Subcommittee, State Department Organization and Personnel.	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
June 2	Trip to Middle East and South Asia	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
4	Spanish Base Agreement	Subcommittee, Europe	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
July 2	Situation in Panama	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Ambassador Wiley.
8	Korea and the United Nations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Ambassador Lodge.
16	Situation in Korea	Foreign Affairs Committee	Assistant Secretary Robertson.
16	Foreign economic policy	Subcommittees, Foreign Economic Policy and Inter-American Affairs.	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
28	International Tin Conference	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
30	Riots in East Germany and United States food shipments.	Subcommittee, Europe	Mr. Lewis.
1954			
Jan. 19	The GATT meeting; questions on East-West Trade	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
19	Review of world developments	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
26	Situation in Guatemala	do	Ambassador Peurifoy.
27	Lima Conference	do	Mr. Stassen, Mr. Nolting.
28	Proposed arrangements for settlement of war damage claims under the Italian Peace Treaty.	Subcommittee, Europe	Deputy Assistant Secretary Elbrick.
Feb. 2	Security of American employees of the United Nations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Ambassador Lodge.
5	Problems of the Near East area	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
16	Economic defense program	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Deputy Assistant Kalijarvi.
17	Situation in Japan	Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific	Ambassador Allison.
18	Indochina	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Under Secretary.
19	Panama development program	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Mr. Muccio.
Mar. 23	Caracas Conference	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
24	Conditions in Near East	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Mr. Gardiner.
25	European Defense Community and the Saar	Subcommittee, Europe	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
Apr. 1	Congressman Smith's trip to the Near East	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Mr. Gardiner.
9	Caracas Conference	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
May 11	Geneva Conference	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
19	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
June 9	Guatemala situation	do	Do.
July 20	Rio Economic Conference	Subcommittees, Inter-American Affairs and Foreign Economic Policy.	Assistant Secretaries Holland and Waugh.
21	Geneva Conference	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
1955			
Feb. 1	Indochina	do	Gen. J. Lawton Collins.
18	Germany	Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe	Ambassador Conant.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 (A) OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, there are now pending before the Committee on the judiciary bills to amend section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act having exactly opposite purposes. These bills are S. 780, introduced by me, and S. 11, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and other Senators.

Throughout the past 5 years interested Government agencies, and the White House, have frequently, and with consistency, expressed themselves on these bills. I sent to each member of the Judiciary Committee a memorandum of the actions by Government agencies during the past 5 years on this subject. This documented history seems so persuasive to me that I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks so that it may be available to the entire Senate.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE KEFAUVER (S. 11) AND CAPEHART (S. 780) BILLS (84TH CONG.)

Senator KEFAUVER (and 29 other Senators) introduced S. 11 on January 6, 1955, to amend section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act to provide that the defense of good faith meeting of the equally low price of a competitor should not apply whenever its effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. Senator KEFAUVER's statement acompanying the bill was a repetition of a previous statement that the Federal Trade Commission found it necessary to challenge almost in its entirety. On January 27, 1955, Senator CAPEHART introduced S. 780 to make the good faith meeting of an equally low price of a competitor a full defense to a charge of price discrimination. Senator CAPEHART accompanied introduction of his bill with a letter from the White House saying that that bill was in accord with President Eisenhower's program. These bills are for opposite purposes.

History of proposals: Beginning in the Truman administration, and continuing in the Eisenhower administration, the Kefauver proposal has been opposed, and the Capehart proposal approved by the Department of Justice, Department of Commerce, and the President's Council of Economic Advisors. In the Truman administration the Federal Trade Commission at one time supported the Kefauver proposal and at another time supported the Capehart proposal. The present Commission has supported the Capehart proposal.

In the Truman administration the White House advised that a bill similar to the Capehart proposal (S. 1008, 81st Cong.) was in accord with the President's program. President Truman later vetoed that bill; but for the reason that confusion might follow from its legislative history, which included adoption of an amendment following the Kefauver proposal, that was later modified in conference.

The Kefauver bill would enact into law a construction of the present act which the Federal Trade Commission, without the support of the Department of Justice, had argued in the Standard Oil case and which was expressly rejected by the Supreme Court

in that case (340 U. S. 231; 1951). Senator KEFAUVER, in spite of objections from the Department of Justice, has attempted to write this concept into bills dealing with this subject that have been before the Congress in the past 5 years.

Since the purpose of the Kefauver bill is to overrule the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil case, it is necessary to consider both the pertinent provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act and to understand what the Supreme Court held in that case.

The statute: Section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act makes unlawful discrimination in price "where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy or prevent competition with any person who either grants, or knowingly receives, the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them."

Section 2 (b) provides that a seller may rebut a charged violation of section 2 (a) "by showing that his lower price * * * was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor."

In the absence of a price discrimination having the adverse effect on competition provided for in section 2 (a) there is no occasion for the defense in section 2 (b) ever to be invoked. However, as shown below, the Kefauver bill would make that defense not available whenever there was present the very competitive effect required to bring the pricing practice within the condemnation of the act in the first place. This is the equivalent of eliminating the meeting of competition defense from the act entirely because it is made inapplicable to every case in which it might ever be invoked.

Section 2 (a) applies to price discriminations that may lessen competition, tend to create a monopoly, or injure competition with any person, etc. The Kefauver bill would make the section 2 (b) defense inapplicable only where there may be a substantial lessening of competition, or a tendency toward monopoly. It might appear on the surface that the defense would still be available whenever its effect might only be to injure competition with any person, etc. However, the courts have not distinguished between substantially to lessen competition and to injure competition with any person, etc. Both the courts and the Commission have treated those phrases as having the same meaning. Therefore, the proposed bill would make the defense of good faith meeting of an equally low price of a competitor meaningless; and the bill has been so construed by all responsible officials of the Government concerned with the act.

The Standard Oil case: Despite the plain language of section 2 (b), in the Standard Oil case the Federal Trade Commission ruled that the defense of good faith meeting of a lower price of a competitor did not apply if the Commission found an injury to competition among resellers.

That case involved gasoline marketing in the Detroit area where there were 130 licensed jobbers—gasoline buyers taking delivery in tank car quantities, who had their own bulk storage plants, and had truck distribution facilities for deliveries to retail stations. Standard had had 7 of those jobber customers but had lost 3 to competitors. The case involved the legality of Standard's trying not to lose those accounts by giving its remaining 4 customers the tank car price at which all other jobbers were buying from other suppliers. That price was 1½ cents a gallon below the price to retail service station customers. The Commission charged that it was unlawful for Standard to get a higher price from its retailer customers who purchased in small quantities delivered by truck to their retail stations.

Standard admittedly could not have retained those 4 customers unless it sold to them at the jobber tank car price. It was recognized that the statute could not be applied to other competing suppliers who sold only at one price level to jobbers and offered those customers the same jobber price. Since Standard also sold to retailers in the same area and because one or more of those jobbers resold at cut prices, the Commission contended that Standard had no right to retain its jobber customers.

The Commission's trial examiner made the finding that, "the lower prices allowed these four customers were in fact granted to meet equally low prices of competitors."

In reviewing the Commission's ruling, the court of appeals found that, "it may be assumed to be conclusive" that Standard "made its low price" to the four jobber customers "in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor."

The Commission's own findings are that: "It may well be that respondent was convinced that if it ceased granting tank car prices to (the four jobber customers) it would lose those accounts. It had substantial reason for believing this to be the case."

The Supreme Court stated the Commission's position, and its effect upon the statutory defense, as follows: "The proviso in section 2 (b), as interpreted by the Commission, would not be available when there was or might be an injury to competition at a resale level. So interpreted the proviso would have such little if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless."

The Supreme Court rejected the Commission's view that the statutory defense was not available whenever there might be an injury to competition. The Court said:

"It must have been obvious to Congress that any price reduction to any dealer may always affect competition at that dealer's level as well as at the dealer's resale level whether or not the reduction to the dealer is discriminatory."

Of the pricing rigidity that would be required if a seller had only the alternatives of reducing his prices to all of his customers, or to none of them, the Court said:

"There is nothing to show a congressional purpose, in such a situation, to compel the seller to choose only between ruinously cutting its prices to all its customers to match the price offered to one, or refusing to meet the competition and then ruinously raising its prices to its remaining customers to cover increased unit costs. There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers."

That decision was by a divided Court, 5 to 3. However, the Justices were unanimous in their view that the construction urged by the Commission, and now embodied in the Kefauver bill, would weaken competition. The premise of the dissenting Justices, however, was that Congress had intended so to do.

The minority opinion stated:

"Nondiscriminatory pricing tends to weaken competition in that a seller, while otherwise maintaining his prices, cannot meet his antagonist's price to get a single order or customer. But Congress obviously concluded that the greater advantage would accrue by fostering equal access to supplies by competing merchants or other purchasers in the course of business."

The majority of the Court refused to believe that the Congress had intended to thus restrict the right to compete, saying:

"It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor."

The majority opinion also quoted (in a footnote) from a TNEC monograph written in 1941 by members of the Federal Trade Commission staff. That monograph said of this provision:

"The amended act now safeguards the right of a seller to discriminate in price in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, but he has the burden of proof on that question. This right is guaranteed by statute and could not be curtailed by any mandate or order of the Commission. * * * The right of self defense against competitive price attacks is as vital in a competitive economy as the right of self defense against personal attack."

The ultimate conclusion of the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, apparently the primary basis of its decision, was that:

"The heart of our national economic policy long has been faith in the value of competition. In the Sherman and Clayton Acts, as well as in the Robinson-Patman Act, 'Congress was dealing with competition, which it sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent.' "

Concerning the statement by Senator KEFAUVER on his bill: In a letter to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee dated June 16, 1953, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission said that the Commission felt "compelled to comment for the record" in order "to avoid any misunderstanding, and to avoid any misconstruction," which might result from Senator KEFAUVER's statements about the similar bill he introduced in 1953. The Commission referred to glaring errors in a statement released by Senator KEFAUVER which appears in large part in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1953, volume 99, part 2, pages 2045–2046.

Senator KEFAUVER's statement says that the good faith defense, "permits any price discrimination, regardless of its effect upon small business or competition as long as it is made in good faith." The Commission's comment is: "The defense is in fact available only to meet an equally low price that a competitor offers to a customer. It does not permit any other price discriminations."

Senator KEFAUVER's statement says, "the burden is upon enforcement agencies to prove the discrimination was not in good faith—which is almost impossible as a practicable matter." The Commission's comment is: "The burden is in fact upon the seller to show his good faith. The Court so held in the Standard Oil case. It is for the Commission to decide whether the seller has proved that he acted in good faith. The Commission does not have to prove the seller's bad faith."

The statement says that, "the Court held that good faith is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act." The Commission's comment is: "The Court in fact concluded that a seller is permitted to meet 'in good faith a lawful and equally low price of its competitor'."

The statement says:

"The big supplier can drive these smaller competitors out of business by reducing his price in one market at a time, making up any losses through higher prices charged elsewhere."

The Commission's comment is:

"This is in fact not possible under the defense in question for it would not be meeting the equally low price of a competitor. More important, such conduct has frequently been held unlawful under the Sherman Act and we think it inconceivable that conduct which violates the Sherman Act could be said to be in good faith. Certainly this Commission would never find such conduct in good faith. That type of predatory price cutting, which had been held unlawful by this Commission before the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, is certainly an attempt to monopolize and is thus specifically excepted from the Capehart bill."

The statement says:

"As the law now stands, there is no limit on discriminations, as long as they are made in good faith. Once this simple test is met the big firm is given carte blanche to drive his smaller competitors out of business and to create monopolies."

The Commission's comment is:

"We do not believe that such is the existing law. As noted above, the defense applies only to meeting an equally low price which a competitor is already offering to the customers. The seller must affirmatively prove his good faith and this is not a simple matter (as is inferred in the statement quoted above). Creating—or even attempting to create—monopolies is never good faith, nor is the carte blanche destruction of others. The Commission does not consider good faith as a meaningless requirement. It means that the seller must convince the Commission that he acted for proper competitive purposes, and not in a predatory manner."

The statement further says that under that bill:

"The good-faith defense would still be a complete defense in all cases except where the effect of the discrimination fell short of probable injury to competition."

The Commission's comment is:

"As we have shown above, the exception would include virtually every possible case. Under the decisions in the Morton Salt and Standard Oil cases, it is unlikely that any price difference to meet the equally low price of a competitor would fall short of probable injury to competition."

Nevertheless, on January 6, 1955, Senator KEFAUVER again repeated the same statements previously challenged by the Federal Trade Commission in introducing the pending bill. Except for a paragraph on the legislative history of his proposal, Senator KEFAUVER's statement in introducing S. 11 is verbatim the officially challenged statement he made in 1953.

Perhaps the most glaring extent to which Senator KEFAUVER has been misadvised is with respect to the burden of proof. The statute makes clear, as does the Supreme Court opinion, that the burden of showing good faith is upon the seller who seeks to avail himself of the defense. This is repeatedly emphasized by the Court. The existing statutory language is "that nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the case made against him by showing that his lower price * * * was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor."

Referring to two prior cases in which the defense was denied to a seller, the Court said in the Standard Oil case: "The decision in each case was based upon the sufficiency of the seller's evidence to establish its defense." The Court also quoted from an earlier case in which it said that "petitioner [seller] failed to sustain the burden of showing that the price discriminations were granted for the purpose of meeting competition" (emphasis added by the Court).

The Court quoted from an earlier case the conclusion that:

"We agree with the Commission that the statute at least requires the seller, who has knowingly discriminated in price, to show the existence of facts which would lead a reasonable and prudent person to believe that the granting of a lower price would in fact meet the equally low price of a competitor. Nor was the Commission wrong in holding that respondents failed to meet this burden."

Finally the Supreme Court said in the Standard Oil case that:

"In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, reduce their own resale prices to their customers."

After identifying the bill's cosponsors, the opening paragraphs of Senator KEFAUVER's statement introducing his pending bill are:

"I am today offering a bill to plug a glaring loophole in the Robinson-Patman amendment. * * * The loophole is the so-called good-faith defense which permits any price discrimination, regardless of its effect upon small business or competition as long as it is made in good faith. * * * The loophole stemmed from the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Standard Oil of Indiana* case (340 U. S. 231)."

Certainly the statute does not permit "any price discrimination, regardless of its effect, * * * as long as it is made in good faith." As the Supreme Court said in the Standard Oil case, "the defense in subsection (b), now before us, is limited to a price reduction made to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor." The Court quoted from an earlier case that the proviso required the seller to show "that the granting of a lower price would, in fact, meet the equally low price of a competitor." And the Court said that section 2 (b) permits a seller "to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers."

The Court's opinion makes clear that the proviso does not apply to any discrimination made in good faith, but that it applies only to a price reduction by a seller to meet a lower price which his competitor is offering to the customer. Section 2 (b) does not permit a seller to reduce his price to meet an unlawful price of a competitor, to grant a price which he does not have reason to believe is in fact offered to the customer by his competitor, or to meet a price which bona fide competition does not require him to meet.

Official Government views: Since the Truman administration, the Department of Justice has opposed the principle of the Kefauver bill. The same is true of the Department of Commerce and the President's Council of Economic Advisers. President Truman in 1949 supported the principle of a bill by Senator O'MAHONEY directly contrary to the Kefauver proposal, although in 1950 he vetoed that bill on the ground that amendments adopted in the Congress might cause confusion and therefore not succeed in clarifying the law. The Federal Trade Commission, during the preceding administration, shifted back and forth; but at the present time the Federal Trade Commission is firmly on record in opposition to the Kefauver bill.

In 1949 the Department of Justice spokesman, opposing the Kefauver proposal, told the House Judiciary Committee:

"First we would recommend deletion of the parenthetical phrases in sections 2 and 3, the so-called Kefauver amendment. * * * While we recognize the competitive problem which arises when one purchaser obtains advantages denied to other purchasers, we do not believe the solution to this problem lies in denying to sellers the opportunity to make sales in good faith competition with other sellers."

The Supreme Court's opinion shows that opposition of the Department of Justice to the Kefauver amendment was a factor considered by the Court in reaching its decision.

In a letter dated November 27, 1953, to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee the Department of Justice again opposed the Kefauver proposal, giving the same reasons for its conclusion that it "does not favor the enactment of this (Kefauver) bill."

The June 16, 1953, letter of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee analyzed and opposed the Kefauver bill. That letter expresses the views of the majority of the Commission as:

"The Kefauver bill would have the effect of overturning the Supreme Court decision in the *Standard Oil* case (340 U. S. 231). A majority of the Commission believes that it should not be enacted into law. * * *

"Our free enterprise system requires competition in all areas. In fact, our whole theory of trade regulation is based upon the existence of competition in every market. If such regulation is to remain effective, a seller must be permitted, when acting fairly and in good faith, to meet the equally low price of a competitor. We think the Supreme Court reaffirmed this fundamental principal in the case of *Standard Oil* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231), but if a legislative restatement seems necessary or desirable we believe the Capehart bill will accomplish this. The view recently, but no longer, urged by a majority of the Commission, and which is the basis for the Kefauver bill, is that meeting the equally low price of a competitor should not be a defense whenever it injures competition. As a practical matter this completely nullifies the defense, and it would then never be available to any seller, for the Supreme Court has already held that every substantial difference in price may injure competition."

The Secretary of Commerce wrote the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on October 9, 1953, opposing the Kefauver bill. He said that—

"S. 1357 adopts the minority opinion of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case. In our opinion, S. 1357 would invalidate the defense of meeting in good faith a lower competitive price whenever the effect 'may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.' This would, in our opinion, destroy the availability of this defense for all practical purposes and in effect prevent real competition."

Conclusions: It may be urged, as noted earlier, that the Kefauver bill would only prohibit good faith meeting of an equally low price of a competitor when its effect might be substantially to lessen competition; and it would not prohibit doing so when the effect might only be to injure competition with any person, etc.

But as interpreted by the courts and by the Commission, "substantially to lessen competition" and "to injure competition with any person" are one and the same.

In one Commission case the order goes so far as to find that:

"These arguments [that prices were made for the purpose of meeting competition] show that respondent's discriminatory prices were made to retain the business of certain customers or to secure the business of others and that they were largely successful in doing so. To the extent that business is held by or diverted to respondent from its competitors by its discriminatory prices and unfair practices, competition has been adversely affected within the meaning of the law." (FTC Docket 4920; reversed on other grounds by the court of appeals, seventh circuit.)

The Kefauver bill is generally referred to as the equal-opportunity bill. Its avowed purpose is to give every buyer an equal opportunity to buy at the same price. The difficulty with this concept, as noted by the Supreme Court, is that it eliminates price competition and materially weakens our competitive system.

Dr. John D. Clark, a member of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisors, testifying in favor of an earlier proposal contrary to the Kefauver bill, told a congressional committee that:

"All competitive effort is burdensome and harmful to those who cannot keep pace, but if we said it must stop short before it hurts anyone we would completely abandon the policy of competition."

On May 25, 1954, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget wrote Senator CAPEHART transmitting a draft bill slightly revising his prior bill to reaffirm the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil case. That letter advises that it was, "agreed upon by you, us, and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division and the representatives of the Secretary of Commerce, and the Council of Economic Advisors." That letter concludes, "I am authorized to inform you that enactment of the draft bill [to reaffirm the Standard Oil decision] would be in accordance with the program of the President" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, pages 8561–8562). This bill is now pending as S. 780 (84th Cong.).

The Supreme Court, in rejecting the Commission's prior construction of existing law and the proposal of the Kefauver bill, said:

"We need not now reconcile, in its entirety, the economic theory which underlies the Robinson-Patman Act with that of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor."

This is what the Kefauver bill is designed to do.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT WAGES OF CITY LETTER CARRIERS WITH INCREASES PROVIDED IN H. R. 1592 AND H. R. 2987

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of February 21, 1955, by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, relating to the proposed pay increase for postal employees, and also a table enclosed with the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington D. C., February 21, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the enclosed chart should be helpful in comparing present postal wages for city letter carriers with the increases provided for in H. R. 1592 and in H. R. 2987.

The chart was prepared primarily to present a comparison of city letter carrier wages only, all of whom are assigned to salary level 4 in H. R. 2987. However, an exactly identical comparison is applicable to another large group of postal employees.

According to the figures furnished your committee by the Post Office Department (Salary Plan, Schedules and Statistical comparisons, 1955, p. 2), a total of 300,371 carriers and clerks now in the salary range $3,270 to $4,070 under Public Law 134, as amended, are all assigned to salary level 4 under H. R. 2987. These 300,371 represent by far the great bulk of employees in the field postal service—exclusive of rural carriers and postmasters at fourth-class offices, these 300,371 employees represent 72.8 percent of those occupying key positions under H. R. 2987.

Many among this large group are long-time career employees now in longevity grades A, B, or C, acquired after 13, 18, and 25 years' service. The column on the extreme right side of the chart indicates that among city letter carriers alone, 55.3 percent of the regular force are in the longevity grades. Under the terms of H. R. 2987, these veteran employees would receive from 4.81 to 5.04 percent in salary increases.

Trusting this chart will be helpful in your consideration of the salary bills before you, and with every personal good wish, I am

Sincerely,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

National Association of Letter Carriers—Effect of pending postal pay legislation on letter carrier salaries

Present		Proposed by H. R. 1592—S. 1				Proposed by H. R. 2987—S. 773 (salary level 4)							Number regular carriers [9] [10]
								Increase on enactment		Increase or decrease on adjustment [7]	Total adjustment		
Grades [1]	Salaries	Grades [2]	Salaries	Dollars, increase [3]	Percent, increase [4]	Grades [5]	Salaries	Dollars [6]	Percent		Dollars	Percent [8]	
1	$3,270	1	$3,700	$430	13.15	1	$3,590	$163.50	5	+$156.50	$320	9.78	192
2	3,370	2	3,800	430	12.76			168.50	5	+51.50	220	6.53	718
3	3,470	3	3,900	430	12.39	2	3,705	173.50	5	+61.50	235	6.77	1,350
4	3,570	4	4,000	430	12.04	3	3,820	178.50	5	+71.50	250	7.00	2,216
5	3,670	5	4,100	430	11.72	4	3,935	183.50	5	+81.50	265	7.22	3,755
6	3,770	6	4,200	430	11.41	5	4,050	188.50	5	+91.50	280	7.43	12,044
7	3,870	7	4,300	430	11.11	6	4,165	193.50	5	+101.50	295	7.62	9,515
8	3,970	8	4,400	430	10.83	7	4,280	198.50	5	+111.50	310	7.81	4,425
9	4,070	9	4,500	430	10.57			203.50	5	+6.50	210	5.16	5,818
A	4,170	A	4,600	430	10.31	A	4,380	208.50	5	+1.50	210	5.04	16,328
B	4,270	B	4,700	430	10.07	B	4,480	(213.50)	5	−3.50	210	4.92	11,769
C	4,370	C	4,800	430	9.84	C	4,580	(218.50)	5	−8.50	210	4.81	21,538

[1] Present law, Public Law 134, June 6, 1945, as amended, provides for 9 automatic grades and 3 longevity grades acquired after 13, 18, and 25 years' service, A. B. C.
[2] H. R. 1592 and S. 1 proposes no change in existing grades under Public Law 134.
[3] H. R. 1592 and S. 1 provides for a 10-percent increase, with $400 minimum, then rounded off to nearest $100 multiple.
[4] Overall average increase in H. R. 1592 and S. 1 is 11.35 percent.
[5] H. R. 2987 and S. 773 proposes to eliminate present grades 1 and 9, thus establishing 7 new automatic grades; present longevity grades A, B, and C remain.
[6] H. R. 2987 and S. 773 proposes these dollar increases on enactment of the bill.
[7] Adjustments to be made 6 months after passage of bill.
[8] Overall average increase in H. R. 2987 and S. 773 is 6.67 percent.
[9] Total regular positions shown, 89,668. There are additional 32,081 part-time (substitute) letter carriers for whom no in-grade breakdown is available.
[10] Source: Basic Pay Data, U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 1954.

USE OF SECRET ACCUSERS IN GOVERNMENT SECURITY CASES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Murrey Marder and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 4, 1955, bearing on the use of secret accusers in Government security cases.

It is significant that the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States, Simon E. Sobeloff, has not joined in the appeal of the Government's case to the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I think that the right of an accused person to face his accusers is one of the things which, throughout history, has distinguished liberty-loving lands from tyrannies like Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

The star chamber is more appropriately associated with the Nazi swastika and the Soviet hammer and sickle, than it is with the free-flying American eagle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PLEADS FOR SECRET ACCUSERS—BROWNELL URGES SUPREME COURT TO UPHOLD POLICY IN SECURITY CASES

(By Murrey Marder)

The Eisenhower administration told the Supreme Court yesterday that to grant accused persons the right to confront secret accusers in loyalty-security cases might endanger the national security.

In a new test case, the Government said that the same procedure employed under the Truman administration must be maintained to preserve the identity of confidential informants.

This position was vigorously set forth in a 120-page brief signed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and three Assistant Attorneys General.

They urged the High Court to uphold the 1953 dismissal of Dr. John P. Peters as a consultant to the United States Public Health Service, on grounds that there was "reasonable doubt" of his loyalty.

The case arose under the Truman loyalty program. But the confrontation-of-accusers issue is also basic to the Eisenhower Federal employees security program, and the industrial security and other present programs. Three years ago, in the Dorothy Bailey case, the Supreme Court split 4 to 4 on this point, upholding the Government.

There had been considerable speculation about the position the Government would take in the present brief. Its filing was delayed several weeks, with reports of a split in official opinion.

Significantly, the name of Solicitor General Simon E. Sobeloff, the Government's chief spokesman before the Supreme Court, does not appear on the brief, and he will not participate in the arguments.

When asked for comment, Sobeloff issued a carefully worded statement which was most meaningful in what it failed to state. He said:

"The Attorney General and I are in complete understanding about the matter.

There is no requirement that the Solicitor General shall sign a brief filed in the Supreme Court, particularly when the Attorney General signs. There are precedents for this."

He added, "If you wish further comment, you might see the Attorney General." A spokesman for Brownell said he felt no further statement was necessary.

The "understanding" clearly did not mean "agreement" on the case. Sobeloff, who has spoken frequently on constitutional rights, has in the past expressed concern about the concept of "averting national dangers by surrendering some of our liberties to save the rest."

In the Supreme Court the case is expected to be argued by Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger, Chief of the Civil Division, who signed the brief along with Assistant Attorneys General William F. Tompkins, head of the Internal Security Division, and J. Lee Rankin.

Dr. Peters, who is senior professor of medicine at Yale University, had occupied a Government consultant job that was nonsensitive from a security standpoint.

He was twice cleared of loyalty charges, including the charge that he was a Communist. But in May 1953, just before the present program went into effect, he was notified that the Loyalty Review Board had adjudged him a loyalty risk.

ANONYMITY DEFENDED

In his case—as in the Bailey case and most cases under these programs—he was not given the names of his accusers or permitted to cross-examine them.

The Justice Department said in its brief: "A large area of vital Government intelligence depends on undercover agents, paid informers, and casual informers who must be guaranteed anonymity.

"Thus, evidence which would be rejected under established legal doctrine in a criminal proceeding could well be the compelling reason for dismissal of an employee on loyalty grounds. An agency head or a loyalty board which would not give weight to information satisfactorily evaluated would be derelict in their respective duties."

"In addition to information from confidential informants," the brief continued, "a large percentage of the material included in the reports under the loyalty and security program is derived from the use of extremely delicate and confidential techniques."

DEPARTMENT'S ARGUMENT

This means, the Department said, that such information, often developed as by-products of major espionage and sabotage investigations, is frequently included in reports on employee cases.

Therefore, said the brief, "professional" and "casual" sources of information "might well dry up, to the detriment of the basic security of the country, if petitioner's contention as to his overriding rights of confrontation and cross-examination were to be honored."

The Department said that "Never in our history has a Government employee been granted a judicial trial or a quasi-judicial administrative hearing upon his dismissal from office."

"Insofar as petitioner has been injured by the stigma to his reputation," it said, "we see no basis for holding that stigma is a thing apart, which gives rise to constitutional rights not applicable to other dismissals from Government service."

"The difference in harm resulting from a dismissal on loyalty grounds and a dismissal for offenses of serious moral turpitude is a difference in degree, not in kind.

"It might be equally difficult for one dismissed because of the acceptance of bribes, theft, sex offenses, or even incompetence, to obtain suitable employment elsewhere."

The Department said that "it is well settled that due process is not a technical conception with a fixed content unrelated to time, place, and circumstances."

POLICY HELD REASONABLE

The Government's program has been "reasonable," said the brief, and must be looked at in respect to the possible espionage and fifth column activities which the techniques of the Communists threaten.

Unlike a criminal trial, the Department said, the Government in dealing with the Federal service "is not required to wit for proof; it may properly insist that Government employees be above suspicion."

Dr. Peters, in his brief filed by the Washington firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, contended:

"The issue is solely the use of star-chamber methods to impose on nonsensitive employees the stigma of a dishonorable discharge and disqualification from Government service."

In the 3 years since the Bailey case, Dr. Peters' attorneys said, the consequences of this procedure have become clear.

PROCESS CALLED LOTTERY

"A trial without due process," they said, "is at best a lottery on which no man should be asked to stake his career and reputation. But this particular lottery is not even a fair gambling device."

The CIO, which has filed a friend of the court brief, said in it that, "What began as a Federal employees loyalty program has * * * found its way into all types of employment throughout the land" with repercussions on millions of citizens, which it asked the court to weigh in reaching its decision."

Other briefs have been filed in the case by the American Civil Liberties Union and the Engineers and Scientists of America. No date has yet been set for oral arguments.

SENATOR WALTER F. GEORGE, OF GEORGIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am somewhat embarrassed in what I am about to say, but I think now is as good a time as any to say it. I wish to take a few moments today to pay tribute to one of the truly great men of our time, a man we all have the honor to be associated with, and to call our colleague. I refer to the President pro tempore, WALTER F. GEORGE, senior Senator from Georgia.

Senator GEORGE is at the height of a brilliant career of service to his Nation and State. Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a Senator for 32 years, he holds an almost unique position in this great legislative body. He is a symbol of everything fine in the traditions of the United States Senate.

WALTER GEORGE is a man to whom we all, Democrats and Republicans alike, look for advice and counsel in times of crisis. When he speaks, we listen. It is rare, indeed, to have a man of such great qualities in our midst, the undisputed dean among his Democratic colleagues, and a true bipartisan in matters of foreign policy and national security.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine tribute paid to a great man, taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 27, 1955, entitled "GEORGE, of Georgia."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE, OF GEORGIA, FOREIGN RELATIONS CHAIRMAN, A SENATOR FOR 32 YEARS—THE MAN ROOSEVELT WANTED TO PURGE NOW AT PINNACLE OF HIS CAREER—AT AGE 77 HE IS AN INSTITUTION IN WASHINGTON—GOT CONGRATULATIONS, THANKS FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER FOR BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

(By Edward F. Woods)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—When courtly WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE, of Georgia, moves down the center aisle of the United States Senate Chamber he leaves the impression that he owns the place, or at least is about to bid on it.

If GEORGE exudes something of a proprietary interest in the meeting place of the world's greatest legislative body, he may be pardoned. For 32 years and 3 months as of Washington's birthday the Chamber has periodically trembled at the impact of his powerful voice.

In that time he has become the undisputed dean of his Democratic colleagues. He is credited with being the only man in the Senate who can switch votes by making a speech. He has collided openly with two Presidents within his own party and today is openly a favorite of a Republican Chief Executive.

Now, in the twilight of his career, the 77-year-old Georgian has reached the pinnacle. He no longer is regarded as just another Senator. He has become an institution, taking his place in history along with the late Senators William E. Borah and Hiram Johnson. In a sense he has become the custodian of Senate traditions and the Senate's way of doing things.

As the Democratic chairman of a Democratic-controlled Foreign Relations Committee he is the Nation's most important instrument for effectuating the foreign policy of President Eisenhower. In this, he has inherited the role of the late Arthur H. Vandenberg, the Republican Senator from Michigan, who was an effective collaborator in the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policy.

GEORGE now is above legislative pulling and hauling. He is not what is known here as a cloakroom trader. Lobbyists shrink in horror at the thought of buttonholing him. While he is not a member of the Democratic policy committee, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, the majority leader, confers with him for 20 minutes to a half hour each noon hour as the Senate convenes, clearing with him such decisions as the policy committee may have reached on pending business.

His influence is such that it is hard to conceive of a coalition of which he was a member being beaten on any issue, though it did happen once. That was last year when Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, a warm admirer of GEORGE, led a floor fight against the George amendments to limit the power of the President to make executive agreements with foreign governments.

To the amazement of his colleagues, Senator HENNINGS engaged in toe-to-toe debate with the distinguished Georgian and the amendment was beaten by the margin of one vote.

Senator GEORGE'S hold on his colleagues stems from two major sources: His age and tenure—and his voice and imperiously paternal bearing.

He makes a speech only when he has something very important to say, a rare quality in the Senate. On these occasions he could spellbind a rooster. He generally opens on a conversational tone, his pleasant southern accent washing soothingly over his listeners.

Then without warning, his voice hardens into a thundering rumble, one fist goes high

over his head, soon followed by the second and then down they both come as scorn and passionate indignation are commingled in a harsh finale intended to cast into outer darkness the issue or the person which is his target.

Senator GEORGE actually began to achieve the status of an institution in the last Congress, which was Republican-controlled, fashioning an astounding unity among the diverse Democratic elements on two major issues.

In one instance, Senator GEORGE did not approve of the way an Eisenhower appointee to the National Labor Relations Board, Albert C. Beeson, had failed to fully and frankly inform the Senate Labor Committee of a private pension arrangement he had with his former employer. GEORGE let it be known that he would vote against Senate confirmation of Beeson. On the rollcall only two Democrats failed to fall in line with him.

Later he likewise made known that he was in favor of recommitting to committee, or killing off, the administration-sponsored revisions in the Taft-Hartley law. On this rollcall every Democrat joined him. It was the first time in history of their party that the Democrats, who usually claw each other on labor union issues, voted unanimously on such a question.

His crowning achievement, however, came last January 28 when, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he guided the administration's resolution on defense of Formosa to a whopping 85-to-2 victory in the Senate. Nary a Democrat strayed on the rollcall and GEORGE achieved a noteworthy milestone in the conduct of bipartisanship in the cold war.

Senator GEORGE used forceful language in support of that resolution, declaring:

"I hope that no Democrat will be heard to say that because the President of the United States came to Congress he is thereby subject to criticism.

"He chose a courageous course, a course which would be taken only by a prudent man who knows the pitfalls along the course and who knows the horrors of war.

"No person can guarantee the results of any important public act. We cannot. But there is no man who is worth his salt * * * who is not willing to exercise his best judgment, his honest judgment in response to the President."

It is no secret that many Democrats found the calling for the defense of Formosa and its current tenant, Chiang Kai-shek, grossly unpalatable. And while the resolution undoubtedly would have passed anyway, the opinion here is that GEORGE alone was responsible for the overwhelming assent. GEORGE's vigorous support of the resolution was viewed by some as justifying claims during the 1954 campaign that a Democratic congressional victory would help rather than hinder Mr. Eisenhower in foreign policy matters.

President Eisenhower was so elated over the vote that he sent GEORGE a note describing his leadership on the Formosa resolution as superb and offering his congratulations and grateful thanks. The following day, Secretary of State Dulles personally conducted GEORGE from his suite at the Mayflower Hotel to the White House to take part in the signing ceremonies. It was GEORGE's 77th birthday.

There are some here who say privately that Eisenhower and Dulles are simply using GEORGE to push projects which are not compounded on a true bipartisan basis. He rejects such contentions, asserting that the Eisenhower-Dulles approach to bipartisanship on foreign policy is genuine and complete. He attributes to the White House no disposition to confront the Democratic leadership with decisions already made.

Senator GEORGE's influence is by no means confined to passage or defeat of legislation. In this city where foot-in-mouth disease is rampant, 44-year-old Majority Leader JOHNSON frankly exults that some of the dean's aloofness and reserve has rubbed off on him, thus restraining him from popping off to the press as does the minority leader, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California.

With more than 32 years tenure behind him, Senator GEORGE is the fourth most durable man in Senate history. Ranking him in this respect were South Carolina's Ellison D. Smith and Iowa's William B. Allison, each of whom served 35 years and 5 months, and Wyoming's Francis E. Warren, who was a Senator for 37 years and 5 days.

Some of the Senator's critics regard him as an arch conservative. He calls himself a liberal, but a liberal within the Constitution.

GEORGE was born January 29, 1878, at Preston, Ga., the son of a tenant farmer. His childhood was one of hard work and privation. He acquired a one-room-schoolhouse elementary education and eventually went through Mercer University and into a successful law practice.

He became a judge and rose from the lower courts to the State supreme court. A studious and scholarly man, he devoted long hours to the history of the Constitution and its interpretation, strengthening his concept of the rights of the States and localities against potentially oppressive powers of a central government.

In 1922, firebranding Senator Tom Watson, of Georgia, died and GEORGE got the nod from Georgia business and utility interests to run for the vacant seat. His views have undergone some startling changes since then.

In a scorching 1922 campaign, GEORGE roundly denounced the League of Nations and all such foreign entanglements. He criticized the soldier bonus and proposed liberalization of immigration laws. The Volstead Act, he preached, should have stiffer penalties for illicit dealing in spirits.

Four years later, however, in the next primary campaign, his enemies attacked him for having voted for the World Court and, in 1928, after receiving 52½ national convention votes for the Democratic presidential nomination, he was supporting that implacable foe of prohibition, Al Smith, for President, and was denouncing the Volstead Act as a Federal invasion of a domain where it has no business to be—the regulation of a private citizen's habits and wishes.

In 1932, GEORGE opposed the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt for President, a misdeed which Roosevelt never forgot. However, after Roosevelt's election, GEORGE voted for NRA, AAA, TVA, SEC, and social security. He bridled against regulation of utility holding companies, the New Deal housing bill, and Roosevelt's plan to enlarge or as some put it, to pack, the Supreme Court. He energetically, but without success, fought the 1936 tax bill which included a levy on the undistributed profits of corporations.

His opposition to so much New Deal legislation earned him the hostility of the White House and President Roosevelt marked him for a political purge.

The President journeyed to Gainesville, Ga., in 1938 and with GEORGE seated behind him on the speaker's platform he informed the Peach State's citizens that he wanted GEORGE defeated in the upcoming primary. When the President finished, George got up, shook his hand, expressed his regrets over the President's position, and added:

"Mr. President, I accept the challenge."

He fought the President up and down his State in the best southern political tradition. He denounced outside interference, carpetbaggers, and another march to the sea. When he concluded his speeches a brass band rendered Dixie, and tears flowed.

In the voting, GEORGE won, thus becoming the hero of the anti-New Dealers. He polled 141,922 votes to 102,264 for Eugene Talmadge and 78,223 for Roosevelt's hapless candidate, Lawrence Camp.

In 1949, GEORGE found himself at loggerheads with another Democratic President; Harry S. Truman, over the President's plan to raise taxes to cover spending contemplated in the Fair Deal program and still keep the budget balanced. GEORGE thought the budget could be balanced by slashing Truman's spending plans and leaving taxes at their current levels.

GEORGE concedes that during the war years he was reputed, undeservedly, to have been unduly tender with corporations and wealthy people in tax matters as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

But a year ago he rose in wrath against the whittling away of tax exemptions for lower bracket income taxpayers, and he horrified his more conservative followers with a proposal that exemptions for dependents be increased immediately from $600 to $800 and eventually to $1,000. This bombshell failed to detonate.

When he is not fulfilling his function as pivot man in legislative and policy matters, GEORGE confines himself to his Mayflower Hotel rooms where he and his wife, whom he calls Miss Lucy, watch television and read. His habits are simple and he regards even White House receptions as above and beyond the call of duty.

In view of GEORGE's advanced age, it is no secret that several Georgia politicians are wondering when he will step down and give somebody else a chance, because no one will have the chance unless he gives it to him.

Asked if he might quit in 1956 and support Herman Talmadge as his successor, GEORGE replied:

"I do not know if I can support anybody at that time. I am somewhat in the position of an old friend of mine in Savannah who said that when he died he wished to be carried back to Savannah to be buried because every 2 years they would resurrect him at election time so he could vote. I do not know who would be my redeemer in such circumstances, and, therefore, I do not know whom I would vote for."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] paying tribute to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is now occupying the chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to say that the junior Senator from Missouri is most gratified that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch had the wisdom to pay deserved tribute, as it did in the article presented by the junior Senator from Montana, to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and President pro tempore of the Senate, WALTER F. GEORGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may be permitted to do so, he desires to thank both the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from Missouri for their generous references to him.

MEETING IN WASHINGTON OF NATIONAL BOARD MEMBERS OF FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to take about a minute to call attention to a meeting which took

place in Washington during the past 3 or 4 days of a very dedicated group of women who are the national board members of an organization known as the Federation of Republican Women. They operate through 4,000 units or chapters and represent 500,000 women in the Republican Party.

While, of course, they are affiliated with a political institution, the Republican Party, they, nevertheless, serve an extremely useful purpose in that they direct the attention of people everywhere to issues that constitute challenges at home and abroad. So I think I should commend the service they render to our country and their fellow citizens.

They held a very constructive conference and seminar in the Nation's Capital, which included, among other things, addresses by Members of the Senate, visits to agencies of Government, and also a visit with the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43, Senate bill 752.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment.

SENATOR MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on Friday last my distinguished senior colleague, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, was given a testimonial dinner at our State capital, Olympia, Wash. The dinner was in honor of Senator MAGNUSON'S 25 years of devoted public service, and was arranged by distinguished members of the State legislature. It was attended by outstanding leaders from all over the State. On this occasion he received congratulatory messages from national leaders in business, labor, and civic affairs.

Mr. President, it has been my distinct honor to be closely associated with Senator MAGNUSON during 15 of his 25 years of brilliant public service. He first entered public life in 1930, when he was appointed special prosecuting attorney for King County, Wash. Two years later he was elected to the State legislature, where he quickly became one of the leaders of that body. In 1934 he was elected prosecuting attorney of his home county. In 1936 he became the second Democrat ever to have been elected to the Congress from what is now the First Congressional District. He served continuously in the House of Representatives until he was elected to the Senate in 1944. He was reelected in 1950, and is now 13th in seniority in the United States Senate.

At the present time, Senator MAGNUSON is serving as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This is the first major chairmanship a Senator from the State of Washington has held since 1931, at which time Senator Wesley Jones terminated his service as chairman of the old Senate Commerce Committee.

Senator MAGNUSON is the senior member of the delegation from our State, and members of both parties in the State of Washington owe a debt of gratitude to him for his leadership, inspiration, and constant help.

Mr. President, I know of no one who has been more cooperative in working for the interests of our State and the Nation than has WARREN MAGNUSON. His long years of public service constitute one of the most valuable assets the people of the State of Washington have. As the junior Senator from Washington, I am honored indeed on this occasion to join with the people of our State in extending to him every good wish.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to join with my colleagues in this well-deserved salute to our good friend and able public servant from Washington, the senior Senator from that State, WARREN MAGNUSON.

It is not without reason that he is celebrating his silver anniversary in public life. Such celebrations do not just happen. In our democracy the voice of the people is heard, and when they find wanting a public servant whom they have elected they retire him from public service long before he has completed 25 years of service.

The people of Washington have not found WARREN MAGNUSON wanting. He is an outstanding western legislator. He loves the West and fights for the West, as he fights for the Nation. Instinctively he is on the side of the people. His service to the Nation during the past 25 years covers the most tumultuous period in our history. Through depression, war, and cold war, WARREN MAGNUSON has measured up in every way to the public trust.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say how happy I am to have heard these fine tributes to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], both the tribute by his colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and that couched in the eloquent words of our acting Democratic leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

For a number of years it has been my pleasure and my privilege to serve with the senior Senator from Washington in the Senate, and previously I served with him in the House of Representatives. I know how able, how devoted, and how brilliant he is. I know the fine leadership he displays in working, laboring, and fighting for the advancement of the programs designed to promote the welfare and the happiness of all the people.

I congratulate the State of Washington on having two such brilliant and outstanding Senators as Senator MAGNUSON and Senator JACKSON.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleague and longtime friend the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], as well as with the acting majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the compliments they are bestowing this day on the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

I, too, have had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives with him, and I wish to say that, in my opinion, he is one of the great men the Northwest has produced, and that those of us who come from that area in particular look to him for leadership, advice, and counsel.

I am happy that he has completed 25 years of public service in the public good; and I only hope that the next 25 years will see a continuation of the outstanding activities of this man, who has represented so well his State and the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Let the present occupant of the Chair state that for many years he has served on the Judiciary Committee with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who has been an outstanding member of that committee.

From the Chair's observation, the Chair does not believe that any other Member of Congress has succeeded in having passed more legislation of benefit to his people and the people of the Nation than has the senior Senator from Washington. Senator MAGNUSON is a distinguished Member of this body who has made great accomplishments for his State, for the great western region, and for the Nation; and the Chair hopes for him many more years of successful public service.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Washington very much.

Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly and associate myself with the tribute being paid to the senior Senator from the State of Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON.

Mr. President, no other two States have problems which are more closely related and are more in common than do the States of Oregon and Washington, which share the great Columbia River, the principal resource of the Pacific Northwest.

Whenever there has been a question of whether the resources of that area should be developed in the public interest or for special interests, the senior Senator from Washington, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, has always been found fighting for the public interest. For example, within the next 2 weeks there will be introduced proposed legislation, bearing the names of many Members of this body, providing for the public, Federal multipurpose development of Hells Canyon, the greatest hydroelectric-power site left on the North American Continent. Everyone knows, so it is almost unnecessary to state, that in the forefront of that battle will be found the senior Senator from Washington. Long before I came to this body, I was writing about such developments in the Pacific Northwest; I believe I wrote the first magazine article about Grand Coulee Dam, in Harper's magazine. Even then, I found WARREN MAGNUSON, as a member of his State legislature, taking wise leadership in the fight for the proper development of the resources of the Pacific Northwest.

I wish to say that my senior colleague from the State of Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has asked me to express for him, as well as on behalf of myself, our gratitude to the State of Washington, our neighboring State across the Columbia River, for sending to the Senate so able a senior Senator as WARREN G. MAGNUSON, who has taken such keen and outstanding an interest in the problems of both States.

I appreciate very much indeed, Mr. President, the courtesy of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in yielding to me at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is worthy of consideration by his colleagues in the Senate that the State of Washington has recognized in a formal way the outstanding service, noble character, and fine talents of its distinguished senior Senator [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Such recognition certainly has the approval of all his colleagues.

Having served with WARREN MAGNUSON in both Houses of Congress for 17 years, I feel that I know the man, and know the statesman.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has just referred to his consistent fight for the development of the resources of the Northwest in the public interest. I can testify to the correctness of the statements of the junior Senator from Oregon; but I should like to broaden the scope of the description of the service of the senior Senator from Washington. I have seen him fight for the development of the resources of the entire country, for the benefit of all the people. In 17 years I have never known of WARREN MAGNUSON, either as a Representative in Congress or as a Senator, taking either a niggardly or a niggling attitude. He possesses the ability to recognize the national interest. It is his philosophy that a program which is good for the New England section of the United States is likewise good for his section of America, and, indeed, for all America. He has viewed the problems confronting him and his colleagues during the vexatious years of his service in that light, and has brought to both Houses of Congress and to the leadership of his State the kind of vision, courage, and warm human compassion that we seldom see.

The senior Senator from Washington is a proper subject of honor, and it is well that his service should be accorded proper honor. As he goes on through the years in the fullness of his manhood, serving still further and with greater ability and increased strength, we shall see him become more renowned. The able assistance, fine enthusiasm, and outstanding ability of his brilliant junior colleague will add not only to his stature, but the stature and renown of the State of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my colleague from Tennessee in saying a few words about the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON.

I became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1939, and came to know the then Representative MAGNUSON. We have been very close personal friends since those days, both in the House of Representatives, and later in the United States Senate.

Senator MAGNUSON knows how to get along with his colleagues in both Houses of Congress, and he always maintains a very friendly attitude toward members of the executive department of the Government.

One thing which should be pointed out is that the two Senators from Washington constitute a wonderful team, working not only for the welfare of the Nation, but for the development of the great Pacific Northwest. They have always worked together. They have supported each other as Representatives from the State of Washington, and they have stood together as Senators for the advancement of that great area.

No section of the United States has made more remarkable progress agriculturally than has the Pacific Northwest. Land is being reclaimed, irrigated, and developed. Large areas, which not many years ago were arid, have come into cultivation. Rivers are being harnessed. Mineral resources are being utilized. New industries have been brought to the Pacific Northwest.

I think one of the main reasons why this great development has taken place has been the excellent leadership which the senior Senator from Washington has given in all efforts looking toward a greater Northwest. In these efforts, he has been joined by his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

As my junior colleague [Mr. GORE] has said, the senior Senator from Washington not only thinks about the Pacific Northwest but appreciates the importance of developing all the resources of the entire Nation. In our fight for the Tennessee Valley Authority, we have had no better friends than the Senators from Washington and their associates from the State of Oregon.

I have served on several committees with the senior Senator from Washington. He knows how to get things done. He presents his facts in a quiet but forceful way. Many times in committees and on the floor of the Senate, as well as the House of Representatives, I have seen him present an amendment which might have seemed minor, but which would prove to be very important in promoting the development and progress of a great section, and his point would usually prevail.

It should also be pointed out that he has always been a great friend of Alaska. I think the Alcan Highway and the development of many of the resources of Alaska, bringing this great Territory closer to our country, have been the result of his foresight, his devotion, and his energy.

I feel that the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, with its wide jurisdiction over the transportation and communication systems of our country, is very fortunate in having as its chairman this young man of great ability, energy, and experience, with the know-how which he has acquired over the years. In my opinion, he will be one of the great chairmen of all time of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Not only have the people of the Pacific Northwest been fortunate in having the two present Senators from Washington representing them in legislative bodies in the Nation's Capital during all these years, but I think they have made a notable contribution to the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, it is always a great satisfaction to realize that a State which has been ably served for a quarter of a century officially recognizes the distinguished and outstanding service of one of its public servants. It is even more gratifying to note that the distinguished servant so honored is in the legislative branch of the Government, because in that field it is sometimes harder to leave a lasting impact than it is in the other two branches of Government, the judiciary and the executive.

We who serve with Senator MAGNUSON, the senior Senator from Washington, are gratified to know that the people of his home community, of his home State, in

the great Northwest, recognize and appreciate his greatness as much as do those of us who have served with him in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

It has been my privilege to serve with Senator MAGNUSON for 17 years. I know the great impact he made in his efforts to give America a first-rate merchant marine, in order to provide the ships that were necessary for us to win victory in World War II. I know what he has done for the development of the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest.

I also know of the great faith and understanding he has in the leadership that has come to him officially in the present Congress through the chairmanship of one of the most important committees of the United States Senate. I refer to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has widespread jurisdiction over many important resources and developments, including communications and transportation.

Senator MAGNUSON is well qualified to perform those tasks. He has been well qualified to perform all the other great services he has rendered in Congress, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and of other committees. His work has been outstanding. Therefore, I am glad to join with my colleagues in expressing appreciation of the wonderful recognition, deservedly due him, accorded him by the people of his home State on the 25th anniversary of his legislative service.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know Senator MAGNUSON for many years. Ever since I became a junior Member of the Senate, he has gone out of his way to show kindness to me and to give me the benefit of wise counsel, for which I have always been very grateful.

I am glad to note that the people and the legislature of his home State are according him the honor which is justly his due.

Although Senator MAGNUSON is perhaps known primarily in the Northwest as one who is interested in such outstanding projects as public power and the development of American maritime interests, I first knew him when he was interested equally as much in airpower.

Few people realize that most of the bombers which have helped to build up our airpower in recent years were designed and most of them built in Seattle, Wash. The greatest bomber of its day, the B–17, followed by the B–29, which was built toward the end of World War II, then the B–50, and now the new intercontinental jet bomber, the B–52, were all either designed or built in the State of Washington.

I believe that Senator MAGNUSON has shown as much understanding of airpower as has any other Member of the Senate.

When I was connected with the Air Force, his advice and assistance were of great help to all in that branch of the service.

For these and many other reasons, it is with a great deal of pleasure and respect that I join my colleagues in extending congratulations to our dear friend and colleague, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to associate myself with the Senators who have spoken words of congratulation and of commendation to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington upon the completion by him of a quarter of a century of public service.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with Senator MAGNUSON and to have been associated with him on the floor of the Senate since he first became a Member of the Senate. I know of his earnest and unfaltering interest in the development and conservation of the natural resources of the United States. I worked with him on legislation which affects the agricultural interests of the Nation. I know that no one would refer to his public service without mentioning his contribution to the maritime industry and the development of electric power.

It is unusual for one to have served 25 years and still to be a comparatively young man. It is even more unusual for one of Senator MAGNUSON'S age to have attained the seniority he has attained in the Senate. I believe he is 13th in seniority in the Senate. His long service has brought to him increasing responsibilities in the form of the chairmanship of one of the most important committees of the Senate, as well as by way of membership on other committees. All of us understand what seniority means in this body.

I congratulate Senator MAGNUSON, and I commend those in his home State who have honored him on this eventful anniversary. I congratulate the great State of Washington and the great Northwest and these United States upon the assurance that they will have the benefit of Senator MAGNUSON'S service, predicated, as it is, upon broad experience in the Senate, for many years to come.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a high privilege and a great pleasure for me to join in paying tribute to Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington. The State of Washington is very fortunate in being represented in the Senate of the United States by two such distinguished and aggressive men as Senator MAGNUSON and Senator JACKSON.

In the tributes which have been paid, enumeration has been made of the legislative enactments to which Senator MAGNUSON has made notable contributions during his 25 years of public service.

I wish to say a word concerning his activities on behalf of the farmers of the State of Washington. I do not know of anyone in the Senate who has been more cognizant of the problems of the farmers, particularly those of the great Northwest, than has Senator MAGNUSON, ably assisted by his colleague, Senator JACKSON. I wish particularly to refer to the work he has done in the field of the fruit industry in the Pacific Northwest—legislation of benefit to the fruit industry he has introduced and has had passed. He has insisted invariably that in connection with our foreign trade program we should not follow a course of action which would amount in effect to uprooting thousands of acres of orchards. That is what would happen if the profits were taken out of that enterprise; and it would have happened except for the very effective work done by Senator MAGNUSON and his colleague and other Senators, one of whom I see on the floor, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], all of whom have worked together on the problems which have confronted the fruit industry of the Nation. Senator MAGNUSON has a great record of true friendship for the farmers of his State and of the country, but always on the merits of the issue, not on the basis of seeking to get something to which the farmers are not actually entitled.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has mentioned the fact that the senior Senator from Washington has made notable contributions in the field of aviation. I have worked with him, as the junior Senator from Washington knows, in connection with aviation problems pertaining to Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands. His fine record on that issue speaks for itself, as does his record in regard to Air Force defense. He and his colleague [Mr. JACKSON] represent a great State of the Pacific Northwest, the State of Washington, as the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I represent the State of Oregon. We are aware of the threat posed by the tongue of Siberia which is sticking out at us across the very narrow martime area near Nome, Alaska. We know who would be hit first if the Russian air might should ever leave Siberia or Big Diamede, and start toward the United States. When we read the RECORD we become cognizant that the senior Senator from Washington recognizes the importance of strong defenses in that area as well as of strong defenses in the entire Pacific Northwest. The people of our section of the Nation are greatly indebted to the senior Senator from Washington for the work he has done in the field of air defense.

As was mentioned by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Washington has made very valuable contributions with reference to maritime problems. For a long time thousands of workers in the State of Washington have owed a great debt to the senior Senator from Washington so far as their livelihood is concerned. It is my opinion that the shipyards there would not have been developed to the importance which they now have had not the senior Senator from Washington worked so hard in their behalf and in behalf of the workers employed by them.

In the field of power development and irrigation and the maximum development of the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest, he has no peer in the Senate of the United States. It is a great pleasure to me to work shoulder to shoulder with him, as we shall be working together on the floor of the Senate next week on a matter involving a great

natural resource development for the improvement of our section of the country, because the senior Senator from Washington recognizes, as do the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and other Senators, that the economic value of our section of the United States depends upon the development of the maximum potential of its great rivers, such as the Columbia and the Snake.

The senior Senator from Washington has become a symbol, a personification, of the maximum of development of the potentialities of the vast resources of the great Northwest. The people of the State of Washington owe him a very great debt, because his statesmanship has brought benefits to the State of Washington, not in the millions of dollars, Mr. President, but actually in the billions of dollars, when we begin to evaluate his public service over a quarter of a century.

Therefore, Mr. President, because of his record and because it is thrilling to pay tribute to the living, and always sad to pay tribute to the dead, I particularly enjoy this opportunity to pay tribute to a great living statesman, the senior Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I deem it a great honor to have this opportunity to participate in the tributes which are being paid to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I have known him for a great many years. My association with him commenced many years before I came to the Senate of the United States. I visit his State frequently, and when he visits Montana I wish to say that no Senator of the United States is more sincerely welcome in Montana than is the distinguished senior Senator from Washington. We have worked together over the years on problems concerned with the development of the natural resources of the great West. The notable progress which has been made in the Columbia Basin in recent years can be attributed largely to the splendid work of the able senior Senator from Washington and his colleague.

I recall my association with former Senator Bone, of Washington. We traveled through the State of Montana and the State of Washington on many occasions and in the Congress we worked together on power and reclamation projects. In like manner I have been associated with the present senior Senator from Washington and no one has worked more diligently, more effectively, and more efficiently for the program providing for the development of the Columbia Basin, which has brought about such tremendous growth and progress in that section of the country, than has the senior Senator from Washington.

I remember, Mr. President, when I first used to visit Seattle, 50 years ago. The situation was then entirely different from what it is now. There is now a huge power development there which has brought industry into that area in such large volume that it has become one of the great industrial sections of the United States. It is one of the marvels of American industrial growth.

Mr. President, the work of the senior Senator from Washington in the Senate has had the commendation of every Senator who knows of his able work and effective contributions in connection with the great power, reclamation, and irrigation programs which we have had under consideration here in the Senate over the years.

I deem it a great honor to be able to say these few words in support of my good friend the senior Senator from Washington; and while I am on my feet I wish to extend to his colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], my sincere felicitations on the splendid work he is doing.

I am proud to be associated with both of those great Senators, Mr. President. They are making vital contributions, not only to the development of their own State, but to the development of the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the complimentary statements which have been made concerning the senior Senator from Washington on the anniversary of the start of his public service. He was one of the most active Members of this body when I first came to the Senate. He attracted my attention because of his fine energy, his efforts, his persistence, and insistence on everything pertaining to the development of his particular area and of the country as a whole. Later, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I traveled through portions of that great area including several stops in his wonderful home State, and saw some of the fine results which have been achieved and various projects in which he had had a part.

My impression is that he has been one of the most active Members of the Senate. After all, Mr. President, results are the real test of a Senator; results are what count.

I used jokingly to say to him that I believed he carried around a pocketful of amendments. Regardless of what bill might be under consideration, he could pull an amendment out of his pocket that would change a bill somewhat more to his thinking and his ideas. That is my way of saying that he is active and diligent. There have been a great number of Magnuson amendments, and many of them have prevailed.

I am very glad to join with other Senators who are paying these deserved tributes. I consider the senior Senator from Washington to be a very valuable Member of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I have been delighted to hear so many of my Democratic colleagues pay tribute to the distinguised senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Senator MAGNUSON is not a Democrat at all; he is a Theodore Roosevelt-Bob La Follette-George Norris Republican, and has been such all his life.

Senator MAGNUSON was born at Moorhead, Minn., less than half a mile across the Red River from Fargo, N. Dak., and about 24 miles from where I was born. I have known him for most of his life.

Senator MAGNUSON was a student at the University of North Dakota, where he attended the agricultural college. He played quarterback on the football team of the Agricultural College of the University of North Dakota.

Most important of all, when he was practically an orphan, by whom was he educated? By the Republican national committeeman from North Dakota, Mr. William Stern. Mr. Stern was not only chairman of the Republican National Committee, but also for many years was Republican national committeeman from North Dakota, and for a long time Senator MAGNUSON was his protege.

Mr. Stern was responsible not only for Senator MAGNUSON's academic education but also trained him along political lines. The views which Senator MAGNUSON holds about public power, rural electrification, conservation, and similar programs, he received from William Stern, the former head of the Republican Party in North Dakota.

Senator MAGNUSON has done a magnificent job in connection with Alaska. Some time ago he was a member of a subcommittee investigating Federal penitentiaries, and was himself in charge of the investigation of penitentiaries in Alaska and Hawaii. That is a subcommittee which never receives any headlines. A Senator who is a member of that subcommittee will sometimes get up at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, go to a penitentiary, and learn at first hand what kind of food the prisoners or inmates are receiving. He investigates the living conditions; he determines whether there has been any discrimination among inmates in connection with their civil liberties. He investigates also the conditions of solitary confinement to which inmates may be subjected.

Senator MAGNUSON did excellent work in the investigation of prisons in Alaska, particularly the prison at Anchorage, a wooden building in which the lives of the inmates were endangered during their entire terms of confinement. The structure was a disgrace to the United States. Senator MAGNUSON succeeded in having the present fireproof building erected.

Senator MAGNUSON performed magnificent work in the development of Northwest Airlines, which started at Minneapolis and St. Paul and continued across the Pacific Ocean to Alaska and Hawaii. I was delighted to learn a few days ago, after the President had issued an order practically barring Northwest Airlines from flying to Hawaii, that through the diligent efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who was assisted by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, the Executive order was revoked. That great airline is now continuing to fly passengers to Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator MAGNUSON, who was a poor boy when he was reared in North Dakota and Minnesota, did every kind of work imaginable on a farm. He shucked corn and bundled wheat. He was an expert operator of a threshing machine. He hauled grain to the elevator. He plowed and harrowed and did every kind of farm work imaginable. Therefore, as a Senator he is intimately acquainted with the problems of farmers, which is perhaps one important reason why he has been so earnestly engaged in trying to solve their problems.

I am delighted that his colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington, has called to our attention the fact that the people of the State of Washington honored Senator MAGNUSON a few days ago by tendering him a dinner commemorating 25 years of distinguished public service. I know that if the people of North Dakota and also, I believe, the people of western Minnesota, had realized that such a dinner was to be given for Senator MAGNUSON, they would have flooded the banquet with telegrams expressing their appreciation for the many things which the senior Senator from Washington has done for the rank and file of the people of those two States.

PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 8

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to state the program for next Tuesday, as it is the intention of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate adjourn until that day. On Tuesday, in addition to the call of the Executive Calendar, it is the intention to take up Calendar No. 40, Senate bill 941; Calendar No. 41, Senate bill 942; and Calendar No. 42, Senate bill 1051.

The bills referred to by Mr. CLEMENTS are, respectively, as follows:

S. 941, to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 942, to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold; and

S. 1051, to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire when House bill 4259, the Revenue Act of 1955, is to be taken up?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in a position at this time to tell the Senator a specific date. However, it is certainly the intention of the acting majority leader to move that bill along as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator say that it might be taken up sometime next week?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not wish to be placed in that position at present, because there are some other measures on the calendar which likewise have certain priority. However, I can assure the Senator that the revenue bill will not be unduly delayed. It is the intention and the hope of the acting majority leader that action can be taken on that measure, which is of such vital importance to so many, at the earliest date consistent with the wishes of those on both sides of the aisle with respect to it, and also another bill on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the unfinished business is S. 752, a bill to repeal the buy-back provision of Public Law 480, which was passed last year. The measure is noncontroversial. It largely affects—in fact, it solely affects—the United States cotton industry.

Under Public Law 480, a cotton shipper, when he sold cotton, was obligated to repurchase from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation the same number of bales of cotton, of the same grade, and of the same staple.

The bill under consideration repeals the buy-back provision for the reason that that provision cannot work in the case of cotton.

The world price of cotton and the American price of cotton are about the same. American cotton shippers have found that when they have to buy back from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation an amount of cotton equal to that which they have sold, frequently the prices of the Commodity Credit Corporation cotton are 2 or 3 cents a pound above the selling price. That prevents the sale of the cotton.

Then, too, it has been found that frequently the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation do not contain the same grade and staple of cotton as that which has been exported; therefore, the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot make the sale.

The bill has been endorsed by the Department of Agriculture. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture James A. McConnell testified in favor of it before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill has been endorsed also by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cotton Council, the National Grange, and the Cotton Textile Institute. In fact, all the farm organizations and all other organizations concerned have endorsed the bill.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings, and not a single witness appeared in opposition to the measure. The bill is noncontroversial, and I urge its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 2, line 11, after the word "amended.", to insert:

The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897), shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded by the President hereunder, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with regulations issued by the President pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, (1) shall make available for sale hereunder to domestic exporters, surplus agricultural commodities heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price-support operations, and (2) shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities, whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In supplying such commodities to exporters under this subsection the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be subject to the sales price restrictions in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897), shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the passage of S. 752, the report on the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 40) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with an amendment.

This bill which would repeal the buy-back provision of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress, was favorably considered by a subcommittee. The subcommittee's report is attached hereto and fully explains the bill and the amendment:

"REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON S. 752

"Your Subcommittee on Agricultural Exports, to whom was referred the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, having considered the same report thereon with the unanimous recommendation that it pass with an amendment.

"The report of the Department of Agriculture recommending enactment of this bill as amended by the subcommittee amendment is set out at the end of this report. Representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Cotton Council as well as representatives of the Department of Agriculture testified in support of the bill at the hearings held by your subcommittee, and it has

also been endorsed by the American Cotton Shippers Association, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, and the National Grain Trade Council. No witnesses testified in opposition to the bill.

"This bill would remove the requirement that exporters of privately owned stocks under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) acquire an equivalent quantity of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. At present such acquisition is required by section 102 (a) of that act whenever the Corporation is in a position to supply the commodity.

"The necessity of locating and purchasing replacements from stocks owned or under loan to the Corporation (which in the case of cotton, for most qualities, is currently priced above the market) hampers trade by delaying sales, increasing prices, and adding unnecessary administrative detail. Since generally under the price-support program surplus stocks flow to the Corporation, there does not appear to be any advantage to the Government in requiring replacement from Corporation stocks. Rather such requirement may cause the Government additional expense by increasing the Corporation's volume of loans, acquisitions, and sales. For example an exporter of privately owned cotton under Public Law 480 must now replace that cotton with cotton owned or under loan to the Corporation. Under these circumstances it may be expected that the cotton coming out of CCC owned or loan stocks will be replaced by new cotton going under loan so that the net result of the present requirement is the addition of unnecessary redtape. On February 1 the market price for Middling 15/16-inch cotton at Memphis was 34 cents per pound, while the price for CCC-owned cotton was 36.21 cents and CCC-loan cotton of the same quality was somewhere between 34 and 37 cents, depending on the amount the producer gets for his equity. While under the law, CCC could sell its cotton to replace that exported under title I of Public Law 480 at any price it might see fit, it has set such price at the price prescribed by Congress for sales for domestic use in order to encourage use of loan stocks rather than owned stocks and thereby reduce the quantity of loan cotton required to be taken over August 1, 1955. The exporter must take this difference in market price and replacement costs into account in determining the export price of the cotton to be delivered against the sale, and if it results in a higher export price for the cotton, transactions under Public Law 480 will be made that much harder to negotiate.

"The amendment recommended by your subcommittee would add at the end of the bill the following new sentence:

" 'The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897) shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks.'

"This would require the set-aside under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 to be reduced by the quantity of private stocks exported under title I of Public Law 480. This is in keeping with the original purposes of the Agricultural Act of 1954, section 103 (a) (2) of which provides for reduction of set-aside through disposition of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks under title I of Public Law 480. While many witnesses who testified at the hearings on the Agricultural Act of 1954 pointed out how useful the set-aside might be to meet emergency needs, the principal purpose of the set-aside was to insulate the existing surplus from the market so as to permit the new price-support program to function properly. Disposition of the set-aside as rapidly as possible by means designed to avoid interference with the price-support program was always intended and provided for by the act. As is pointed out in the report of the Department of Agriculture title I sales constitute the only means of appreciably reducing the quantities of wheat and cotton in the set-aside; and it is therefore desirable that all title I sales, whether from public or private stocks, be applied to such reduction.

"The Department's report on the bill is set out below.

"JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*
"SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.
"W. KERR SCOTT.
"MILTON R. YOUNG.
"ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL.

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
"Washington, D. C., February 17, 1955.

"Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
"Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of January 27, 1955, for a report on S. 752, a bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

"Subject to revision in accordance with the recommendation set out below, the Department would favor enactment of S. 752.

"Section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 currently provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available for sale, under the act, surplus agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price-support operations, and shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of such commodities from its owned stocks, from loan stocks, or, if the Corporation is not in a position to supply the commodity out of its owned stocks, from privately owned stocks. That section also provides that to facilitate the use of private trade channels the Corporation, even though it is in a position to supply the commodity, may finance the sale and exportation of privately owned stocks under arrangements whereby the private exporter acquires the same commodity of comparable value or quantity from CCC stocks.

"The bill, S. 752, would amend section 102 (a) to provide that the CCC shall make its stocks of surplus agricultural commodities available for sale under the act and shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities, whether from private stocks or from stocks of the CCC. As amended by S. 752, section 102 (a) would enable United States exporters making sales under the program to ship private stocks without making corresponding purchases from CCC stocks.

"The operation of this amendment would affect cotton primarily at this time. Because the world price and the domestic market price of cotton are approximately the same, exporters can sell private stocks for export at competitive prices. Where this price relationship exists, and especially where these two prices approximate the support price as in the case of cotton, the overall advantages, including the net effect in reducing CCC holdings, will be equally as great whether surpluses are financed for export directly from private stocks or taken or replaced from CCC owned or loan stocks. The amendment would be helpful in eliminating the redtape involved in the replacement procedure and the operation of the program would be facilitated both from the administrative standpoint and from the standpoint of efficient operation of the program through private trade channels.

"It must be noted, however, that title I sales constitute a major means of reducing the commodity set-aside, and are the only means of appreciably reducing the quantities of wheat and cotton in the set-aside. If S. 752 were enacted in its present form, title I sales from private stocks would not result in reduction of the set-aside. It is, therefore, recommended that the bill be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

" 'The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897) shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks.'

"Enactment of S. 752 would require no additional administrative or program funds.

"The Bureau of the Budget advises this Department as follows:

" 'It is understood that amendment of section 102 (a) of Public Law 480 is necessary to remove from the language of this section an unforeseen impediment to the export of cotton under title I of the act. On this basis, you are advised that there would be no objection to enactment of S. 752 amended as recommended by the Department.'

"Sincerely yours,

"TRUE D. MORSE,
"Under Secretary."

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

* * * * *

"SEC. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded by the President hereunder, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with regulations issued by the President pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, (1) shall make available for sale hereunder [at such points in the United States as the President may direct] *to domestic exporters,* surplus agricultural commodities heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price support operations, and (2) shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities [from stocks owned by the Corporation or pledged or mortgaged as security for price support loans or from stocks privately owned if the Corporation is not in a position to supply the commodity from its owned stocks: *Provided,* That to facilitate the use of private trade channels the Corporation, even though it is in a position to supply the commodity, may finance the sale and exportation of privately owned stocks if the Corporation's stocks are reduced through arrangements whereby the private exporter acquires the same commodity of comparable value or quantity from the Commodity Credit Corporation], *whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation.* In supplying *such* commodities to [private] exporters under [such arrangements] *this subsection the* Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be subject to the sales price [restriction] *restrictions* in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. *The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897) shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks."*

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF HEARINGS ON HOUSE BILL 4259

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand the acting majority leader

is about to move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next. Before that is done, I should like to call to the attention of Members of the Senate the fact that the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on House bill 4259, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, have been printed and are now available to all Senators. I have requested that the secretary for the minority make available to each Member on this side of the aisle a copy of the hearings. I hope that majority Members on the other side of the aisle will also have the hearings made available to them and that each will receive a copy, in order that the hearings may be studied over the weekend. Sometimes a point is raised that there has not been a sufficient time to read the hearings. The hearings are now available, and I hope that fact will expedite consideration of the tax bill next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 8, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1955:

UNITED NATIONS

William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Kingsley Davis, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1957.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1956, vice Louis S. Rothschild.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

John Stephens Wood, of Georgia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term of 3 years expiring March 4, 1958, vice Watson B. Miller, term expired.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Louie W. Strum, deceased.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Fourth Object of Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered on Tuesday of this week at the Memphis Rotary Club. As Senators know, I have been concerned by the manner in which our policy has been proceeding in the Far East. I am glad that the President clarified it publicly to some extent this week when, at his press conference, he assured all that this Nation will not help Chiang invade the mainland. I am glad also that the Secretary of State this week did not give Chiang assurances of help in support of the offshore islands. How I feel about this situation is expressed in my address to the Rotary Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor that you have invited me to participate in your golden anniversary of Rotary. I have been rereading the object of Rotary. I want to talk with you briefly today about the fourth object. As all of you know, it is: "The advancement of international understanding, goodwill, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service."

There is no greater need in the world today than just such organizations truly dedicated to just such an object. I am told that there are now 8,431 Rotary clubs, composed of 396,000 Rotarians in 89 different countries. Your Rotary foundation is contributing much toward international understanding by sending students all over the world for a year's study.

The activities of such an international group as yours, really working at the job of effectively carrying out the fourth object can contribute magnificently toward international understanding.

I feel that we Americans today face three major problems. Broadly stated they are these:

1. To preserve the peace.
2. To preserve our constitutional liberties and our free way of life, and
3. To preserve our economic health and prosperity.

All three of these blend together and are really aspects of the same problem—the problem of preserving a free society.

It is the first of these—the problems involved in preserving the peace—which I wish to discuss with you today and which fit in so well with your fourth object.

Anyone would be less than frank to say that we are not today in a very delicate situation in our international relations. Our world is balanced precariously between peace and war.

We want peace—but what has caused me so much concern is the fear that we are forever on the verge of stumbling into war, with the very best of intentions to be sure but with disastrous consequences nevertheless.

I think it is time that we raise our sights. We owe it to ourselves and to posterity to do so. We have been losing the forests in the trees. We haven't been able to see India for Matsu—we haven't been able to see Japan for Quemoy.

If a major war is to be avoided we cannot blink at the fact that the position of the United States in Asia generally is deteriorating steadily and that the Communists are gaining strength through improved tactics. If this trend continues the bulk of free Asia may follow China behind the Iron Curtain within the matter of a decade or so. Long before then, moreover, we may have lost whatever ability we now have to influence events.

An Asian policy broad enough, bold enough, and flexible enough to reverse this dangerous drift must have the support not only of a preponderant majority of the people here at home, but also of our free allies in Europe. Like it or not, there is a situation in the world in which the only alternative to coexistence may be no existence, which could be the result of an atomic or hydrogen war. And coexistence is a two-way street—there has to be give and take on both sides.

I don't think we have been proceeding in a very sophisticated way. For instance, we have just entered into a mutual defense treaty with Chiang Kai-shek. I was one of a minority who voted against it. In this treaty we mutually agree that if anyone attacks Formosa we will help Chiang and if anyone attacks the United States he in turn will help us.

What's mutual about that? I have no objection to defending Formosa. I think that the United States has both a moral and a legal obligation to do so. Formosa and the Pescadores were liberated from Japan largely by our arms during World War II. Pending their final disposition we are in what amounts to a sort of trustee position. Chiang is there by our forbearance.

We are, therefore, under obligations to defend Formosa, but let's not kid the world or ourselves by keeping up the fiction that Chiang is a great, dynamic force in Asia, and that he will be rushing over to defend the United States should anyone attack us in mutual exchange for our defense of Formosa.

I thought my colleague, from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, put it very well when he said:

Of course, I have no sympathy whatsoever with the Red Chinese claim to Formosa, but I believe that until final disposition of the islands is determined, neither Chiang nor the Reds have sovereign rights to them. In this respect the Formosa treaty falls short of meeting the definition of a treaty, because treaties are agreements between sovereign nations. Chiang's government is not a sovereign nation, but a government in exile.

Furthermore, Formosa, doesn't include Matsu and Quemoy. These offshore islands are within 5 miles of the China coast. To say that their defense is necessary to the defense of Formosa is about like saying that the defense of Staten Island, in front of the harbor of New York, is necessary to the defense of Bermuda. They may be important to the morale of Chiang Kai-shek but one cannot really expect the Chinese Communists to lie down and play dead with his forces that close to their harbors.

I doubt if the administration intends to defend these islands. We are told that they must keep this unclear in order to confuse the Chinese Communists. The trouble is that it confuses us here at home, too, and it certainly confuses our allies. Thus during this past week we have seen Mr. Eden at the SEATO conference trying to clarify the situation as far as these islands are concerned and Mr. Dulles keeping it unclear.

I had hoped that the administration had given up its go-it-alone policy. However, when we had the Formosa resolution before Congress, it was obvious that it took the

British, our strongest ally, by surprise. Evidently there had been no consultation.

Unless the administration has a very firm rein on Chiang this is very dangerous business. His goal is to return to the mainland. I would rather see him there than Mao, but to be realistic I must say that he can't get there unless we put him there and that brings into play the Sino-Soviet defense treaty, which really is mutual. And I'm not willing to pay that price, particularly when I believe that if the Chinese people ever successfully throw over the Communist regime they will not be looking to Chiang for leadership, but will be looking to some new force.

One disturbing thing is that immediately after ratification of the Formosa treaty, Chiang announced that this meant the United States would defend Quemoy and Matsu even before Dulles indicated we would. At the very least, I prefer to have our policy announced by our own State Department, rather than by the Generalissimo.

A Far Eastern policy tied to Chiang is almost certainly doomed to fail, and by the time the failure is recognized it may be too late to disengage ourselves without grave loss of prestige.

The key to the security of Asia lies instead in the development of dynamic centers of indigenous stability and power which will lend their own growing strength to that of their neighbors—with the military and economic power of America and the Western Alliance discreetly in the background.

The two major potential sources of such stability are Japan and India. The history of our generation in Asia may be written around what happens in these two nations, with one-fifth of the world's population.

If they remain free, there is every reason to believe that the bulk of Asia will remain free. If they go under, the Communists are likely to take over from Tokyo to Cairo. We must continue to defend and support the smaller nations now favorable to us, but we should not assume that they constitute a decisive, effective anti-Communist force.

We must remember also that the real bulwark of our strength in the world is the Western Alliance. For the past 2 years while the administration has fought the so-called war party within the Republican Party the Western Alliance has taken a back seat. The doctrine of massive retaliation enunciated for domestic political purposes along with the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek frightened our allies. They would stand exposed to massive annihilation.

Now the administration is again showing awareness of the Atlantic concept, but here, too, we have got to drop outworn theories and plan big things. My own strong conviction is that NATO must be more than just a military alliance. It must have political and economic ties as well in order to operate effectively. We will be effective neither in Europe nor in Asia as long as the free world itself is divided on its approach, for the Communist world is not.

Problems of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I was pleased to deliver on Washington's Birthday at Stephen's College in Columbia, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY at Stephen's College, Columbia, Mo., February 22, 1955)

I am grateful to you for asking me to speak on the problems of American foreign policy instead of on the answers. It is a great deal easier to recognize the problems than it is to find the solutions to them, and I will frankly confess at the outset that I do not know the answers to many of the problems I am going to discuss with you.

Still, it is helpful if one knows the problem to which one is looking for an answer. Indeed, a precise definition of the problem may point to an answer. And in this field defining the problem is not so easy an exercise as some people apparently think. There is a great temptation to oversimplify, and oversimplified problems lead to oversimplified solutions.

Let us begin, however, by attempting to define our objective. What is it that we are really trying to achieve through our foreign policy?

The answer to this question, I think, is fairly simple. We want a world in which the American people can live securely, peacefully, prosperously, and happily. That is what is at the bottom of our foreign policy—so far to the bottom that sometimes we lose sight of it and talk about the means by which we try to achieve it as if they were ends in themselves.

Some of us may have strong cultural and sentimental ties with Western Europe, but the preservation of democracy in Western Europe is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for these reasons, but because the communization of Western Europe would immeasurably reduce the chances for the American people to live as they want to live.

Some of us may have strong emotional feelings about the righteousness of the cause of Chiang Kai-shek and the iniquity of Chou En-lai, but the defense of Formosa is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for this reason, but because the occupation of Formosa by an unfriendly power would make the defense of the United States more difficult.

Some of us may feel called upon in a spirit of Christian charity to feed the hungry and clothe the naked of Asia, but the success of the Indian 5-year plan is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for this reason primarily, however appealing it may be, but because a prosperous India can contribute to the peace and well-being of the American people while an impoverished India represents a positive threat to that peace and well-being.

Keeping our eye on the end and not on the means will help us to limit our activities and commitments somewhat, but even so our objective is a pretty big one and our national resources are limited.

Despite our great wealth and power, we are not strong enough to arrange the world precisely as we would like it. Neither are we strong enough or secure enough to ignore the rest of the world.

This seeming paradox sets the upper and lower limits of our foreign policy. Regardless of our likes or dislikes, there are many things which we cannot do, and at the other end of the scale there are some things which we must do.

Although we still occasionally hear voices urging upon us the doctrine of isolationism, I think the suicidal implications of that doctrine have by this time been pretty well established.

It is rather a curious thing, however, that some of the people who have been emotionally inclined toward isolationism have now swung to the other extreme. Whereas formerly they wanted to have nothing at all to do with the rest of the world, they are now clamoring for all kinds of impossible intercessions. I am sure you are familiar with the type. They have what we might call ultimatum mentality. They demand that we tell the Soviet Union and Communist China to behave themselves or else. What is even worse, they demand that we have the effrontery to tell one of our sovereign allies to do as we say "or else." Apparently they are not at all concerned that the "else" in one case might be hydrogen warfare and in the other case the loss of a valued ally.

One extreme is as bad as the other. The ostrich, which hides its head in the sand, is not particularly more stupid than the rhinoceros, which charges at every noise it hears.

Both of these extremes fail to take adequately into account four major international facts of this mid-20th-century world. These facts are:

1. The existence of aggressive communism with sufficient resources and power to constitute serious threat to all free societies.

2. The development of technology at an ever-increasing tempo.

3. The dynamic urge for political independence and economic development which characterizes most of the non-Communist world.

4. A shrunken world due to man's ingenuity.

Any one of these facts, taken alone, would present a challenge to American foreign policy. But they are interrelated, and the problems presented by each become more acute and more difficult because of the existence of the others.

NATURE OF COMMUNIST THREAT

Let us consider some of the implications of these facts, and let us begin with the nature of the threat posed by aggressive communism.

This threat is only in part military. It is also in part economic and political. It has been most immediate, however, in its military aspects, and this is the form in which it is easiest to meet.

Compared to our other problems, it is a relatively simple matter to draw a line around the Western Hemisphere or around Western Europe and to generate, in concert with our allies, enough military strength to create doubts in the minds of the potential aggressor as to his ability successfully to breach that line.

In his first annual message to Congress in 1790, George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate today, said: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Well-meaning people have sometimes criticized our policy as being too heavily militaristic; but when you are confronted with overwhelming military power, you necessarily have to devote first attention to building some sort of a defense structure. While doing this we have by no means neglected the political and economic aspects of the Soviet threat, but I think the time has now come when we must give these aspects even greater attention.

IMPLICATIONS OF HYDROGEN WEAPONS

One reason for this is found in the second major international fact which I mentioned earlier—the ever-increasing tempo of technological development. This is one of the factors which seems to me to make allout war a remote possibility, if, indeed, it is any longer possible at all. In the cobalt-coated hydrogen bomb, technology has given us something which, if it is not the absolute weapon, is at least so close to it as to raise grave questions as to whether its use would be self-defeating. Both the United States and the Soviet Union may very well at this moment have the mutual power of total

destruction. This includes, of course, self-destruction.

In dealing with nuclear weapons, you very quickly reach a point beyond which superiority becomes meaningless. If each side has the power to inflict a mortal blow upon the other, then it doesn't matter if one side has twice as much power as the other.

I once heard this point made in terms of less awesome weapons. For example: If I am pointing a .38-caliber pistol at you, and you are pointing a B–B gun at me, I have a very great superiority. But if we each increase our strength, so that I am pointing a .45-caliber pistol at you and you are pointing a .38-caliber pistol at me, then, although I would still have a superiority of sorts, it wouldn't really do me very much good in and of itself.

GROWTH OF TECHNOLOGY

As the military applications of technology make allout war more nearly impossible, and as the defensive strength of the free world increases in other respects, aggressive communism tends to shift its tactics from overt military action to other means. These other means cannot be met by military measures. They require a good deal of imaginative, constructive thinking on our part.

The United States has risen—one might almost say it has been thrust—to its present extraordinary position of wealth and prestige with only 6 percent of the world's land area and only 7 percent of the world's population. Other countries have more natural resources. Other countries have more people. But none has approached the United States in either total or per capita production.

There is an old saying that "It's what you do with what you have that counts." Americans have done the most with what they had. The atmosphere of political and economic freedom which has always prevailed in the United States has had a great deal to do with it, but there is more to it than that.

One of the great advantages which the United States has in world competition—perhaps at this moment in history the greatest single advantage—is our superior technology. This superiority is so marked that we are apt to take it for granted. But it is not inherent. There is nothing peculiarly American about genius. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that genius occurs with no more frequency per million Americans than per million non-Americans. The difference lies in the fact that the American system of education and of social organization makes possible a greater development of the talents which are inherent in all people.

Recent studies, however, indicate that the Soviet Union is bending every effort to close the technological gap between itself and the United States. More scientists, engineers, and technicians are being trained in the Soviet Union than in the United States. And the evidence is that they are being well trained. This to me is an alarming fact, and one that we had better do something about.

It seems to me, for example, extremely wasteful of talented manpower to draft bright young scientists into the Armed Forces. These people can make a greater contribution to the security of the United States by working in laboratories than by carrying a gun.

We would also be well-advised to take steps to train more high school and college teachers in mathematics and the physical sciences. Our position in the world dictates such a course, quite apart from considerations of domestic policy and aid to education generally.

I would not want it inferred from this, however, that our schools should emphasize science and technology to the exclusion, or even to the neglect, of the humanities and other fields of learning. As short as we are of technicians, it could still be argued that our technological progress has outstripped our social progress. One need only look at the impressive fact that although scientists have discovered how to blow us up, statesmen haven't discovered how to keep them from it.

It is important, therefore, that we maintain, or if possible widen, the technological and economic gap between ourselves and the Soviet Union. At the same time, it is equally important that we narrow that gap between ourselves and the underdeveloped countries of the free world.

The economic disparity between the United States and these countries is great—and it is growing at an increasing rate. This trend is not in our national interest.

I have frequently said that the world today is one big neighborhood. Now, no matter how well off you may be yourselves, you cannot have a really good neighborhood if most of the families in it are on the verge of starvation. And the United States cannot continue rich and growing richer in this world neighborhood today so long as a majority of the human race, in the words of Fairfield Osborn, is "living in a crisis whose monotone is interrupted only by catastrophe."

People in this condition make poor customers. They also make poor suppliers—and more and more of the materials our industry uses come from abroad.

Thus, it is our national interest to encourage the economic development of underdeveloped countries on economic grounds alone. Given the existence of the Soviet threat, it is also in our national interest on political and military grounds. From the military point of view, highly developed countries are better able to defend themselves, and to join in measures of collective defense against overt aggression. From the political point of view, they are better able to defend themselves against subversion.

The matter takes on particular urgency at this moment in history because of the third of the major international facts which I mentioned at the beginning; the drive for political independence and economic development in these underdeveloped countries. These twin urges pose different problems for American foreign policy.

DRIVE FOR POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE

The United States itself was born in a revolution against colonialism, and it has traditionally been anticolonial. Most Americans can easily understand the desire of other people to govern themselves.

Our history confirms that we sympathize with that desire. We set a target date for the independence of the Philippines and stuck by it. We allowed the people of Puerto Rico to work out their own destiny, and they freely chose to become a self-governing commonwealth in association with the United States. We have turned down many opportunities to acquire overseas colonies and possessions.

We have used our good offices, through the United Nations and in direct contacts, to hasten the withdrawal of colonial powers from other territories, many of which are now sovereign states. At the same time, however, we have found some of our principal allies in the world struggle against aggressive communism among the colonial powers of Europe. Because of our close relations with these powers, we have been tarred throughout much of Africa and Asia with a kind of colonial guilt by association.

For understandable, but also, I fear, ill-founded, reasons, we have too frequently sought to steer a middle course, torn between military logic which dictated that we support our European allies on the one hand, and on the other hand our historic sympathies which dictated that we support the colonial peoples. After much travail of spirit, we have usually alined ourselves in the end with the colonial peoples.

Speaking now with the benefit of hindsight over the last 10 years, I think we should have been much less equivocal about our position in these matters. I do not say that in any spirit of criticism of those who have been in charge of our policies, because I am not prepared to say that I would have done it differently myself—given the circumstances which existed at the time. I am not one of those who believes in using hindsight to take an unfair advantage of someone in public office. Hindsight is useful only to the extent that it helps us to avoid mistakes in the future. But if we had it to do over, I would advocate a much stronger policy in favor of freedom and independence for the colonial areas of the world. It is not yet too late to adopt such a policy, and I believe we are moving in that direction. Actually, of course, more people have achieved political independence in the last decade than at any other comparable period of history.

DRIVE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The record of economic development does not, unfortunately, show as much progress. A start—and on the whole, an encouraging start—has been made, but the difficulties are so complex that we do not as yet thoroughly understand the problem. Here, especially, we must guard against the tendency toward oversimplification against which I warned at the outset. There is a proneness in some quarters, and not least in some of the underdeveloped countries themselves, to think that massive doses of capital investment, administered by the United States, will bring about the desired results. The problem is not that simple, nor is the cure that expensive.

This is another field in which what the United States can do is limited, not only by our own resources but also by the attitudes of the people with whom we are dealing. After all, it is their countries we are talking about, and they can do as they please with them. We should—and we do—stand ready to help insofar as we properly can, but the initiative and most of the effort must come from the people who are being helped.

Economic development is an exceedingly intricate process, consisting of many things, but one of its most important aspects is psychological. Economic development—or economic stagnation to look at the other side of the coin—is in part a state of mind. It is the result of a combination of circumstances which can rarely, if ever, be induced from without. The urge for economic development must be self-generated.

At this point, it is important to distinguish between the urge for economic development and the simple desire for automobiles, air conditioners, and steel plants. Economic development is closely related to cultural attitudes and social organization. Before a country can economically have automobile factories, it must have enough people with enough money to buy the automobiles, and it must have highways for the automobiles to run on. It must have an agricultural production efficient enough to feed the persons who will have to give up farming themselves in order to work in the automobile factories. If it wants greater agricultural production, is it willing to change its system of land tenure which, in at least some underdeveloped countries, breeds inefficiency? If it wants greater industrial production, is it willing to step on the toes of the privileged few who have a vested interest in monopoly and restrictions on output—a privileged few who are usually in positions of great political power? Finally, if it wants eventually to have a complex corporate economy, is it willing to revise its social ideas about the position of women, without whom the American economy could not operate a single day?

These are all questions which can be answered only by the country itself. What its

answers are will indicate whether it really has the urge to develop or whether it merely wants the material results of economic development without the social and cultural reorganization which such development implies.

Economic development is only in part the result of capital investment. It is also an aggregate of technical skills—the knowledge and capacity to make efficient use of capital and capital goods. This is the field in which, in my judgment the United States can make the most worthwhile contribution to the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

In this context, then, it seems to me that the proper course for the United States to follow is to adopt, on a long-term basis, a policy of furnishing technical assistance to countries which are genuinely interested in making efficient use of it. You can get more results in work of this kind from a billion dollars spent over 10 years than from a billion dollars spent in 1 year. Indeed, if we tried to spend that much in 1 year in the areas I am talking about, it would be largely wasted. Among other things, it would cause a severe inflation and leave the country which was supposedly being helped worse off than before.

I would not rule out entirely funds for capital investment. But such activities should be limited to specific situations in which a clear and compelling case can be made.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that results are required quickly. Throughout Asia, Communist propaganda is telling people that communism offers a short-cut to economic development. The short-cut, of course, is slave labor but sometimes a people may not realize the implications of this until it is too late.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

We may now, thanks again to technology, have found a way to speed up the process within the framework of a free society. As atomic energy provided the weapons which may have made war impossible, so atomic energy may also have provided the materials which will make peace durable. Potentially the most hopeful development of the atomic age is the movement through the United Nations to establish an international pool of atomic energy materials for peaceful uses. Growing out of the President's great speech before the U. N. General Assembly in December 1953, this movement has made slow but nonetheless real progress and there are grounds for encouragement that more progress may be made in the next several months.

This promises, indeed, to be one of the great imaginative triumphs of American diplomacy. The Soviet reaction indicates that the Kremlin is fully aware of the danger which is posed to its own schemes. The first reaction of the Soviet delegate to the U. N. was automatic—he criticized the President's speech. Within 48 hours, his bosses in Moscow had taken a new reading on world opinion and instructed him to make noises of cooperation. In the intervening period, the Soviet Union has tried to block the project without giving the appearance of doing so—and without being wholly successful on either count. All in all, the last 14 months must have been a very trying time for the Communists. They have used it, however, to push feverishly ahead on their own research into the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

It is just as important that we stay ahead of the Soviets in regard to the peaceful use of atomic energy as it is that we stay ahead of them in regard to the military applications. It is perhaps not too much to say that the uncommitted world of Asia will go to the side that first develops a feasible means of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes on a large scale. For that reason, we can welcome the recent decision to supply heavy water to India.

It may very well be that the benefits of atomic energy can be made available in underdeveloped countries before they become practicable in countries such as the United States. In a country with a shortage of electric power and with fuel resources which are either insignificant or underdeveloped, for example, it would be economical to generate electricity from atomic energy at higher costs than in a country with abundant and well-developed supplies of other fuels.

We can only guess at what large quantities of atomic-generated electric power would mean in the underdeveloped countries of the world. Irrigation projects would become feasible to bring vast new areas of land into cultivation with all that that would mean in terms of an increased food supply, a better diet for the people, and improved distribution of land ownership. Multitudinous new light industries could be established.

There are undoubtedly other uses which we cannot now foresee. The potentialities are so vast that any sort of analogy with known experience is dangerous. But one comparison which suggests itself and which may be indicative, if not precise, is that the atomic powerplant may very well do for Asia what the steam engine did for Europe—and that, of course, is to remake totally the economy and society of the area.

We must not allow ourselves to become so preoccupied with day-to-day crises that we lose sight of these underlying, long-range problems that I have been talking about. But at the same time, of course, we have to deal effectively with today—or else tomorrow may never come. So let us now examine briefly 2 or 3 of our more pressing immediate crises. There are, unfortunately, a large number from which we can choose, but let us take two on opposite sides of the world—one in the Far East and one in Europe.

SITUATION IN FAR EAST

Paradoxically, it seems to me that both the chances of war and the chances of peace have increased in the Far East in the last month. This results primarily from the fact that both military and diplomatic activity in the area of Formosa have been stepped up, and the situation, which had been in something of a stalemate, has become more fluid. It is now off dead center, but we do not yet know which way it will move. This is another instance in which the power and influence of the United States are limited, and we must frankly admit that the decision is to a large degree up to the Communists. If they want war, there will be war. If they want to avoid war, they can do so very easily.

So far as the United States is concerned, our basic position is quite simple. Our national interests do not permit us to tolerate the occupation of Formosa by an unfriendly power. The island is an integral part of the chain which runs north and south in the Western Pacific from the Aleutians through Japan, the Ryukyus, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. World War II provided a vivid demonstration of what even some of these islands in unfriendly hands can mean to the United States. Formosa provides a potential enemy a means to outflank the Philippines, as well as our bases on Okinawa in the Ryukyus. The Philippines and Ryukyus, in turn, provide stepping stones to other islands and so on, until we reach Hawaii and the west coast.

Since the end of World War II, Formosa has been in friendly hands—namely, the Republic of China headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. But its status in international law is not entirely clear. Prior to the 1890's, Formosa was occupied by the Chinese, and it was ceded by China to Japan some 60 years ago. In the Cairo Declaration of World War II, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang agreed that it should be returned to China. In the Japanese Peace Treaty, Japan renounced all claims to the island, but no affirmative disposition of it was made. It should be noted that the Soviet Union was a party neither to the Cairo Declaration nor to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Since 1950 there have in effect been two Chinas—one on the mainland, which is Communist, and one on Formosa and a few other islands, which is not Communist. The United States, the United Nations, and most of the nations of the world have recognized the non-Communist regime on Formosa as the legitimate Republic of China.

As long as these two Chinas spar with each other across the Straits of Formosa there exists an area of international tension which is in constant danger of erupting into full-scale war. The situation has become increasingly acute since last September as the Communists have stepped up their attacks on the Nationalist-held islands and as they have filled the air with loud declarations of their firm resolve to capture Formosa.

Two other new elements have also been added. First, the United States has made it as clear as possible—we hope beyond the possibility of misinterpretation even in Peiping—that we will use American Armed Forces to protect Formosa and the Pescadores. We have already used our Armed Forces to protect the withdrawal of Chinese Nationalists from the Tachen Islands in a redeployment which will not only strengthen the overall Nationalist position but will also remove a potential trouble spot.

Second, the United Nations Security Council has taken cognizance of the situation, and efforts are under way to arrive at a cease-fire which will introduce at least some measure of stability into the situation. I do not know what the outcome of those efforts will be. So far as the U. N. itself is concerned, the prospects do not at this moment look particularly favorable. But at least the question has been opened up, and it is a matter of active concern to the world's statesmen, not only in Washington but also in London and New Delhi, and we may hope in Moscow and Peiping.

The United States should support these efforts to achieve a cease-fire, insisting only that our vital interests be protected. We can protect those interests without becoming involved in a war on the mainland of China. The prevention of such a war should be one of the primary objectives of our policy.

SITUATION IN EUROPE

Let us look now at Europe, where the stakes are, in some ways, even higher than they are in the Far East.

Western Europe contains the world's greatest aggregation of industrial capacity and technical skills outside the United States. With Western Europe a part of the free world, our preponderance of economic strength over the Soviet bloc is overwhelming. With Western Europe behind the Iron Curtain, our economic strength and that of the Soviet bloc would more nearly approach parity.

Through the Marshall plan, we strengthened Europe economically so that it could resist subversion and at the same time support a military effort of its own. Through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the military defenses of Europe have been further built up.

But one more tremendously important step remains to be taken, and that is to make the skills, the energies, and the resources of the people of Western Germany available for the common defense of Western Europe. We thought a way had been found to do that through the European Defense Community, but national jealousies were still too great, and the memories of three German occupations of France were still too vivid.

Now, through wise statesmanship, an alternative has been worked out to admit the Federal Republic of Germany to NATO, to restore German sovereignty, and to provide for the rearmament of Germany.

The London and Paris agreements which make provision for these steps have been approved by the French National Assembly, but we still wait for action by the French Council. We wait, also, for action by the German Bundestag.

Meanwhile, we see a political deterioration in both France and Germany. In France, one government crisis follows another. In Germany, delay brings with it increasing opposition to the agreements.

Actually, what is involved is more than simply adding German strength to our system of collective security in Western Europe. What is really involved is the integration of Europe—a dream of a thousand years that is now so close and yet apparently still so far from realization.

If we fail this time, we may not again soon have another chance. Yet here we have another instance of a situation beyond the control of the United States. We can only watch and wait and pray—and remind our friends in Europe that this is a time for responsibility, for rising—as Lincoln said—with the occasion, and for putting aside petty jealousies in the interests of the whole community.

UNITED NATIONS

No discussion of the problems of American foreign policy would be complete without considerable emphasis on the United Nations. It is perhaps not a very great exaggeration to say that no organization has ever accomplished so much in the face of so many difficulties. By any standard, the list of what the U. N. has done is impressive. It becomes positively astonishing when one remembers that the U. N. was founded on the principle of Big Five unanimity in the Security Council and that that unanimity hardly survived the San Francisco Conference.

To mention only a few of the U. N.'s accomplishments, it got Russian troops out of Azerbaijan, it ended the Israeli-Arab fighting, it preserved the integrity of South Korea, and through its technical assistance program it has made a modest but hopeful beginning toward improving standards of life in underdeveloped countries.

But it has done more than this. It has provided an international forum where nations can talk out their problems and differences, where the whole world can see the obstructionist tactics of the Soviet Union and the constructive efforts of the free nations. It has provided an excellent means of clarifying the issues in the cold war.

That the United Nations has accomplished as much as it has despite the abuse of the Soviet veto is a clear indication of the powerful, underlying desire of the nations and the people of the earth for an international organization to keep the peace.

The United Nations deserves our full support. I do not have very much patience with people who criticize the U. N. because it falls somewhere short of perfection. No human institution will ever be perfect; nor will one ever be improved by carping complaints.

CONCLUSION

Now, in conclusion, let us try to sum up by formulating some principles which can serve as guideposts for the United States to follow in making and carrying out its foreign policy.

First, we must measure up to the position of leadership which we occupy in the world, but we must at the same time remember our own limitations.

Second, the foremost of these limitations is that we cannot live alone. We must have allies. The only real security lies in collective security.

Third, although the Soviet veto in the U. N. has made it necessary for us to develop a series of regional security alliances, we must remember that the best instrumentality for developing a real system of collective security is the United Nations.

Fourth, although we must not neglect the military aspects of our security, we must pay increasing attention to the political and economic aspects.

Fifth, we must continue technical and other assistance to promote the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

Sixth, we must continue and strengthen our overseas information programs, not merely to counteract Soviet lies about us, but more importantly to present an affirmative story of freedom.

Seventh, and possibly most important of all, we must keep faith with ourselves and our allies. Let the Communists entangle themselves in devious Machiavellian plots. In foreign relations, as in personal relations, honesty and frankness are the best policies.

With our minds so much on the Far East, I cannot help but recall the teaching of Confucius (and this the Chinese Communists would do well to recall) that there are three essentials to a state—a revenue, an army, and good faith. Of these three, he said, "the greatest is good faith. Without a revenue and without an army, a state may still exist, but it cannot exist without good faith."

Education: Democracy's Indispensable Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, at St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, February 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: DEMOCRACY'S INDISPENSABLE WEAPON

(Address of Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama, before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, St. Louis, Mo., February 28, 1955)

The public school, conceived in a frontier settlement more than three centuries ago, is one of the great rocks on which our Nation has been built. In the early days of this Republic, learning, reason, and faith in the people's capacity to govern themselves inspired that adventurous spirit which dared trust the future of an infant nation to the judgment of the many instead of the dictates of the few. The lives and fortunes of individual Americans, the nature of our institutions, the quality of our industry, commerce, and agriculture, the conservation and use of our natural resources, the nature of our law—the destiny of the Nation itself—depend on decisions rendered by all the people. The public school was created to inform the popular wisdom.

The magnitude of the responsibility resting on public education was forcefully described by Jefferson when he declared: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

The frontiers of our forefathers have faded from the American scene. Today we live among busy lanes of commerce, mighty industries, complex networks of communications, productive farms, great hydroelectric plants, and, now, the harnessing of nuclear power.

These are achievements of generations of American men and women educated in our system of free public schools—achievements wrought by a nation grounded in belief in the supreme worth of the individual man, his dignity, his freedom, his capacity to meet the challenge of each new age.

These are the values and traditions that have led people all over the earth to turn longing eyes toward America, to knock on her door for admittance. These are the values and traditions that have made people in the free nations turn to America for leadership in this time of crisis. These are the values and traditions upon which the greatness of America rests. These are the values and traditions that our schools must preserve and perpetuate.

Our schools, as has been so eloquently stated by your splendid president, Mr. Larson, "are the backbone of our national defense, the bulwark of our free enterprise system, and the foundation of a trained and loyal American citizenship."

Yet, anyone who studies our public schools today, as it has been my opportunity and responsibility to do as a citizen and a Member of your Congress, knows that American education is in serious trouble.

The millions of children attending school on a part-time basis, in makeshift quarters, in overcrowded classrooms, evidence the plight of education in America today. Census figures on the increased millions of children already born who will be crowding through our schoolhouse doors in the years immediately ahead pose an even more desperate situation.

Quantitatively and qualitatively we are possessed of an education deficit that threatens the very capacity of the American people—scientifically, politically, and intellectually—to cope with the most complex and most dangerous problems in the history of freemen.

Educationally speaking, we are still breathing the quiet air of the peaceful years before the wars and revolutions of the first half of the 20th century wrought a world filled with malice and fear.

As we analyze what has taken place in the world, we know that the fall of the Western democracies from their preeminence was due not as much to the designs of evil men as that those nations lacked the clarity of purpose and resolution of mind and heart to deal successfully with the world disorders which made possible the rise to power of the totalitarian warlords.

The world disorder has forced us to adopt a radically higher and different defense concept, employing the most terrible and costly weapons that man can devise, yet we have been willing to limp along on an educational system that is wholly inadequate for turning out sufficient numbers of highly trained citizens and for meeting the multiplied demands for moral discipline and wisdom of great affairs.

The hour demands a radically higher and different concept of education.

Our supreme and ultimate aim is to build a world in which all men may live together in peace. But, if we are to build the peace, we must first be able to survive.

We know that our ability to survive in this era of warlords of aggression rests upon our ability to marshal superior brainpower against the brawn of overwhelming numbers. And our edge is slipping away as our educational system falls further and further behind in the quality and quantity of its product while Russia is pushing her educational effort to unprecedented heights.

One field in which this is clearly apparent is that of the training of engineers and scientists.

Our defense authorities tell us that Russian schools this year will graduate some 54,000 engineers, as compared with only 19,000 to be graduated in the entire United States. This is a ratio of 3 to 1. The ratio is as bad or worse with respect to physicists and scientists of every kind. But this is not the worst of the story of how Russia is outstripping us. Russian facilities will turn out approximately a quarter of a million technicians in nonengineering categories this year, while Americans with comparable training will number but 10,000. This is a ratio of 25 to 1.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, of the National Research Council, and Dr. John R. Dunning, atomic expert and dean of Columbia University School of Engineering, have warned that if present trends continue—that is to say, if our education systems fails to effect a sharp increase in the annual output of engineers and other scientific graduates, the Russians will catch up with us in the next 5 years and after that they will pass us in the race.

The same warning has been echoed by Prof. Joel Hildebrand, president of the American Chemical Society. "In producing scientists," Professor Hildebrand declared, "we need to run very much faster if we intend to win the race for survival."

Today we are reaping the harvest of years of neglect of our educational system—of waste of the talent of our youth. Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration, Columbia University, told our committee at our hearings on school-construction legislation that "more than half the children who enter at the first grade fail to finish high school." He added that "even more important in terms of its effects upon our preparedness is the fact that only one-half of our top talent, those who get high marks in high school, who pass intelligence tests, who it is generally agreed could do college work and do it well, actually do so." "We are," Dr. Norton declared, "wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial professional, technical, or vocational training."

We must bring to a halt the 50-percent dropout rate in our elementary and secondary schools. We must make certain that more and more of the top talent among our high-school graduates is fully capitalized through college and university training.

We know that if we are to do these things—if we are to build our professional manpower resources—we must begin in our elementary and secondary schools for it is here that our young people must be trained and prepared to pursue college and university training.

Emphasizing the urgent need for training more scientists, the National Science Foundation in its annual report just submitted to the President and the Congress declared that the fostering of scientific training involves first the matter of incentives.

"The primary and indispensable incentive," the National Science Foundation report declared, "is a deep, personal, and indefatigable interest in scientific discovery. To find ways to promote that interest is," the report concluded, "of first importance and leads directly to the quality of the teaching in the secondary schools."

We must sharply increase our supply of well-trained teachers. To do so, we must lift the level of teachers' salaries from its present rank among the lowest of all employed groups in America to its rightful place.

Indeed, the hour demands a bill of rights for the teacher; a bill of rights guaranteeing a salary which will enable the teacher to enjoy a good standard of living, to permit recreation and travel, continued study and educational growth, and provide security in old age.

The bill of rights must go further. It must recognize the essential worth and dignity of the teacher and assure full opportunity to take part in the life of the community—outside the classroom. The teacher must be free of the petty restraints and interferences with his personal life that are so often imposed in many communities. The teacher must be protected from the unprincipled demagogic attacks that fetter the mind, breed suspicion and fear, and threaten the very destruction of free public education.

Teaching has long been called a profession. We must make it a profession, in fact—appreciated and honored in the community, adequately paid and acclaimed for devoted public service.

The total accumulated needs of our educational system are so great that we cannot, with any reasonable hope of success, attack them all at one and the same time on any major scale.

Today the States and local communities and the across-the-board needs of education are straitjacketed by our $12 billion classroom deficit and the 6-year certainty of continued recordbreaking school enrollments. Our best hope of relieving the deficit and of enabling the States and local communities to turn more of their efforts and resources to raising teacher salaries and to meeting the other needs of education lies in the Federal Government putting its shoulder to the wheel and providing substantial Federal aid for school construction.

As soon as the returns of the elections last November were known and it became evident that I would be chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I pledged to our parents, teachers, and school officials that the very first bill that I would introduce in the new Congress and the very first bill that I would take up in the committee would be for Federal aid for school construction.

On the very first legislative day of the Senate, I, along with 29 of my Senate colleagues, introduced Senate bill 5, providing $1 billion in Federal aid for school construction over a 2-year period.

On the same day the President referred to the school crisis in his state of the Union message and announced he would have more to say in a special message on February 15. This was encouraging but the idea of waiting another 5 or 6 weeks to see what the President might say would—it seemed to me—involve a breaking of faith with our parents, teachers, and school officials to whom I had pledged full speed ahead. So we moved forthwith with hearings and consideration of Senate bill 5 and similar bills that were ready for action.

As we know, the President early this month sent to Congress his education message and the administration bill. Our committee moved promptly to hold hearings and consider the bill.

The administration bill provoked a storm of protests from educators and school officials. Spokesmen for leading educational organizations, experts on school financing problems, State school laws, and State constitutional provisions came before our committee at the hearings and literally took the administration bill apart.

One witness called it Federal aid for investment bankers. Others said they are prohibited by their State constitutions and State laws from complying with the loan provisions of the bill. Still others said their school districts could not afford to go further into debt or pay interest or amortize Federal loans or pay rent on school buildings without seriously reducing the already inadequate funds for salaries to teachers.

Stating that the bill provides "much too little aid and much too much control," Dr. William Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, declared that the NEA refuses to "embrace untested and hastily formulated proposals which do not conform to the existing pattern of State and local school administration."

Dr. Carr declared further that the bill while hedged about with unnecessary restrictions and controls, provides only token assistance.

He showed that while Secretary Hobby and Commissioner of Education Brownell have spoken of the administration's bill as a proposal to set in motion a $7 billion school program, analysis of the bill reveals that actually the only Federal expenditure for construction provided is $67 million a year for 3 years—less than 1 percent a year of the huge $7 billion figure Secretary Hobby and Commissioner Brownell have been talking about.

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, told the committee that he had "never seen a bill that had more Federal control. Under the bill," Dr. Fuller declared, "there would be General Accounting Office people, tax attorneys, estimators of building values, and a horde of Federal officials in local school districts. The bill," Dr. Fuller declared, "is written with the tone of a mortgage banker who is lending money to a pauper and is going to tie him down just as solidly as he can to make sure he gets back every cent plus a good rate of interest. As this bill is written," Dr. Fuller declared, "the Federal Government will eventually make a profit at the expense of the school districts of the county most in need. The Chief State School Officers," Dr. Fuller declared, "would not favor the bill because it would set up separate State agencies and because it would be too expensive and because it would be an example of Federal discrimination against schools in contrast with generous Federal grants to highways, hospitals, and other physical facilities in the States. It would," he continued, "make education an orphan, deny it broad sources of income that every other service has and throw the schools back on real estate taxes as a permanent policy."

Our committee heard either in person or by telegrams and other communications from 40 out of the 48 State superintendents of education. Not one favored the bill.

Dr. Carr and other educators cited as the proper kind of approach to school construction legislation the bills developed and sponsored by the late Senators Elbert Thomas, of Utah, and Robert Taft, of Ohio, and myself. The bills embodied these fundamental principles:

1. Direct grants to all the States;
2. Allocation of funds on an objective formula;
3. Administration of the funds by the established State and local agencies.

We have twice passed in the Senate by overwhelming vote, bills containing these principles. These are the principles of Senate bill 5.

Every day of delay deepens the crisis in our schools.

The testimony before our committee made clear that with the passage of Senate bill 5 at least 42 States, under authority of State statutes already on the books, can begin at once to put Federal funds to work along with State and local funds to build schoolhouses for our children.

I am urging that Senate bill 5, strengthened and fortified in every possible way be quickly brought to the Senate floor that we may pass it now. With your splendid help, we shall win the battle.

Please let me take this opportunity of telling you how helpful the support of your association has been in the fight for our Oil for Education amendment, which will dedicate to education the income from the oil wealth of the Outer Continental Shelf. With your help we won adoption of the amendment in the Senate in the last Congress. We have reintroduced the amendment and are carrying on the fight for final victory.

From these oil resources $150 million has already come into the Treasury and the Department of the Interior has predicted that the revenues will ultimately exceed $6 billion.

The $150 million that has already been derived and the revenues that will follow should be put to work to help meet the financial crisis in our schools and colleges.

Here is nontax revenue for relieving the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools, for providing more and better schools and better trained teachers, and for scholarships, fellowships, and training and research grants. With your continued help, my friends, these revenues will become education's endowment for the future.

As we provide for the education of our children, we nourish the wisdom of America at its roots, we strengthen the well-springs of our democracy, we build the strength and security of our country and build for the peace of the world.

Centenary of St. Mary's College, Near South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, Mareh 4, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in commemoration of the centenary observance this year of St. Mary's College, near South Bend, Ind.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTENARY OBSERVANCE OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, NEAR SOUTH BEND, IND.

St. Mary's College for women, the first Catholic women's college in the United States empowered to grant degrees and the first to confer bachelors' degrees continuously, celebrates the centenary of its establishment at its present site just north of South Bend, Ind., during 1955.

The college began as an academy for girls in Bertrand, Mich., in 1844 and held its first commencement 4 years later. Four young French Sisters of the Holy Cross, members of the order established 2 years previously, came to the Indiana frontier in 1843 to assist the priests and brothers who had founded the University of Notre Dame only a year before.

The Sisters began their work in America by assuming housekeeping duties for the new mission school of Notre Dame, but soon established their own girls school at Bertrand, 6 miles north of Notre Dame, and the school was chartered by the State of Michigan in 1851.

As the decade of the 1850's opened, the Sisters came to realize that Chicago was fast replacing Bertrand as the area's population and trading center.

Early in 1855, the Sisters of the Holy Cross moved their young school to its present location north of South Bend, Ind., and west of the University of Notre Dame. The State of Indiana promptly granted an academic charter to the school (February 28) "for the education of young ladies in the various branches of arts and sciences * * * and to confer such degrees upon scholars as are usual." In April 1855 the cornerstone was laid for the first building.

The convent and novitiate later (1868) became the motherhouse of the United States Sisters of the Holy Cross.

Under Mother M. Angela, first directress of studies, who guided the school until 1870, St. Mary's developed a curriculum acclaimed by both Catholic and non-Catholic educators.

While emphasizing the study of the liberal arts—still the foundation of a St. Mary's education—the college curriculum continued to add specialized courses.

The most memorable event for the young science department at St. Mary's came in 1899 when the first long distance wireless transmission in the United States was received at the college.

Prof. Jerome Green, of the University of Notre Dame, unaware of Marconi's achievements in Europe a few months before, amazed a group of newsmen by successfully sending a message from the Notre Dame campus to St. Mary's, more than a mile away, on April 19, 1899.

The physical growth of the campus has kept pace with the academic development of St. Mary's. Magnificent LeMans Hall, a tasteful combination of administrative offices, resident rooms, and classrooms, was built in 1926 at a cost of $1,250,000 and a home economics practice home was erected in 1939.

The college marked the centenary of the founding of the Sisters of the Holy Cross with the building of a 90,000-volume library in 1941. A new 30-room science hall will be dedicated on April 23, 1955, as one of the major events of the year's centenary program and a modern fine arts building and auditorium will be begun on February 26, 1955, as a centenary project.

Sister M. Madeleva, CSC, current president of St. Mary's, succeeded to the presidency of the college in 1934. A world-renowned poet and educator, Sister Madelava has had a strong influence on the intellectual and physical growth of St. Mary's.

Under her guidance, St. Mary's in 1944 established the Nation's first graduate school of sacred theology for laywomen and sisters. This pioneering graduate school, under papal approbation, offers the master's degree and doctorate in religion and a number of summer schools of theology have been opened throughout the country as a result of Sister Madeleva's inspiration.

St. Mary's College, in its centenary year, now ranks as the largest resident Catholic women's college in America.

St. Mary's offers courses leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of music, and bachelor of science.

The Republican Valley Conservation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me, entitled "The Republican Valley Conservation Association."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN VALLEY CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

(Statement by Senator CURTIS)

I should like to take a few minutes today to call the attention of this body to a very important development which is taking place out in Nebraska. I refer to the reorganization of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, which has made great strides during the past 15 years, and has built a reputation for effective promotion of flood control and irrigation in the upper Republican River watershed.

Many Senators will recall the disastrous flood of 1935, when 112 persons were drowned and tens of millions of dollars of property loss sustained in southwestern Nebraska. It is interesting to note that the numerous flood-control conferences which were called through the years, to deal with the perennial flood threat, found Gov. Arthur Weaver, of Nebraska, among the most active advocates of a complete program of flood control from the headwaters down. Congressman PHIL WEAVER, who succeeded me in that great First District of Nebraska, is the son of the illustrious Governor, and has taken up the campaign where his father left off, determined to complete the job that is so nicely under way. The whole decade of the thirties witnessed repeated droughts and floods. Frequently, as in 1935, heavy floods would be suffered in the spring, then the crops would be lost that fall as a result of drought. Clearly, the only possible method of stabilizing agriculture in that area lay in a program involving the storage of floodwaters in the spring, which could subsequently be spread upon the land in the summer months in the form of supplemental irrigation. For instance, during the year just passed (1954), this territory received less than 10 inches of moisture. To meet this challenge, many of the State's outstanding citizens have come forward and put their shoulders to the wheel.

Nebraska has furnished many outstanding workers in the field of reclamation. C. Petrus Peterson, of Lincoln, is currently serving as president of the National Reclamation Association and one of the greatest authorities nationally on irrigation from ground water sources is Dr. E. C. Condra of the State University, Lincoln. Also, the lower Republican River has had its share of illustrious leaders who have unselfishly devoted their efforts to the furtherance of such a program. Any such list would have to include Oswin Keifer, of Superior, the late Paul Spence, of Red Cloud; Ben Harrington, Leon Sprague, and Halpert Thomas. Also, northwestern Nebraska, and the Platte River territory generally, have brought forward their own group of men who have helped mightily to make our State a better place in which to live.

But no group has ever launched a program of action with as many strikes against them as did the Republican Valley Conservation Association. The organization was formed in McCook in 1940 under the vigorous presidency of Harry D. Strunk, who himself served as director for many years, representing Nebraska on the board of the National Reclamation Association. The Republican Valley group was told by the United States Corps of Engineers that no flood protection was possible in the upper Republican, inasmuch as the valley possessed no satisfactory sites for dams and reservoirs. This would have stopped men of lesser courage. I am rather proud that, responding to a request of that body, I personally urged a review of the reports on the upper Republican by the Engineers Corps. Also, the association sent representatives out into the field, and recorded detailed statements of landowners, setting forth the actual property losses which they had sustained in 1935 and subsequent floods. These sworn statements helped the Engineers Corps reappraise the potential flood damages, and increase its estimate of benefits which could flow from the construction of flood-control reservoirs. And, fortunately, a review of the upper Republican enabled the corps, and the Bureau of Reclamation, to come up with a list of about a dozen reservoir sites. Here, then, was the

basis for a sustained drive by which the people of that area could appeal to the Congress to reclaim their lands and usher in an era of irrigation farming.

Many other headaches confronted this little group of citizens. They immediately discovered that, because of State and Federal statutes, it would be necessary to negotiate an interstate compact between Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado, legally apportioning, for consumptive purposes, the flow of the Republican River and its tributaries. And such a compact had to be ratified by the Congress. With the everlasting help and guidance from the late Senator Hugh Butler, together with all other members of the Nebraska congressional delegation, these initial legislative hurdles were cleared.

Then World War II broke loose. It was apparent that the United States would be fighting for its very life, and all critical materials were to be diverted to defense purposes. So it was that a good many of the members, and some of the officers of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, took the view that it would actually be unpatriotic for the organization to carry on its activities during the war period. It was proposed that they suspend their efforts until the war was over, but level heads prevailed and the group decided to carry on for, after all, a stepup in the production of food supplies comprised one of the methods by which such areas could make their maximum contribution to the Nation's welfare during that emergency period.

It was well that they continued active, because they were able to bring about Federal appropriations sufficient to complete investigations by technical agencies of the Federal Government. Thus it was that they were ready to have included in the Flood-Control Act of 1944 authorization of 10 or 12 upstream projects. Since Congress passed that measure, Enders, Medicine, Bonny, and Culbertson Dams and Reservoirs have been constructed, one by one, together with several diversion dams. This is a tremendous beginning toward a basinwide program, which will ultimately enrich that area immeasurably. Senator Butler used to say that completing the flood-control and irrigation program in the upper Republican Basin would mean more, economically, than striking oil in southwestern Nebraska.

But as the years went by, some of the original band of loyal sponsors of the program, including Dr. M. Campbell, of McCook, treasurer, and P. N. Foster, director, from Imperial, passed away. The organization encountered considerable difficulty in meeting its moderate financial requirements. Some of the leaders have been obliged to invest substantial amounts of their own money in order to keep a vigorous program running. McCook, the headquarters of the organization, has always contributed a good deal more than its proportionate share among the 32 member towns. But with the firm backing of the McCook Chamber of Commerce, under the presidency of Joe Rothmeier, a special committee has now been named, including Ralph G. Stevens, John Van Auken, Elwood C. Ackerman, and Ben Hormel.

Also, a few of the forward-looking business firms in Lincoln, Omaha, Kansas City, and Denver have made modest contributions through the years. Unquestionably, it is to their enlightened self-interest that they do so. After all, more than $100 million of Federal funds alone have been expended to date in the upper Republican, and $50 million to $75 million remain to be spent before the job is finished. This will treble the farm production in that area. Supplemental irrigation brings in sugar beets, potatoes, increased corn crops, and multiplies materially all phases of livestock production. Growth of these crops also brings, in its wake, the processing plants needed to handle such products. Further, completion of the job will step up the population and the buying power materially, and it will provide permanent protection against recurring floods. All of these things are important within the market area of Omaha, Denver, and Lincoln. By the way, irrigation is universally conceded to be the biggest single factor which has caused population in the 17 States to increase nearly 2½ times as fast as population in the 31 Eastern States during the last 50 years. Without irrigation, western Nebraska would undoubtedly have lost population heavily in the decade of the thirties and subsequently.

One of the principal reasons that I wished to speak today was to urge that the Congress give sympathetic consideration of the proposal for appropriations for investigations by the Engineers Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, not only in Nebraska but elsewhere in the Nation. It seems to me that we should have a reservoir of projects built up, from those which are found practical and feasible, so that construction can be inaugurated at the earliest possible date. You are all undoubtedly aware of the fact that President Eisenhower himself has said, "I am recommending increased funds for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation to insure a proper basis for project authorization." We must have investigational moneys from which detailed investigations can be undertaken on the Red Willow, the Pioneer, either Wray or Parks, and along those three Kansas tributaries, the Beaver, Sappa, and Prairie Dog, which enter the Republican below Oxford. It has already been 11 years since these projects were authorized by the Congress, but no detailed investigations have yet been undertaken.

I want to emphasize today that I am especially ambitious for this program because of the great record which the Republican Valley Conservation Association has made in its efforts to develop southwestern Nebraska, northwestern Kansas, and southeastern Colorado. Not only has Harry Strunk continued to serve as president in the intervening 15 years, giving unselfishly of his time and energies, but he has been surrounded by other good citizens who, likewise, have made a great contribution.

Mr. Strunk has stepped aside now, and become chairman of the board of directors of his organization, welcoming to the presidency H. E. Robinson, who just retired as director of the Kansas River District, Bureau of Reclamation. It was he who built these projects that today stand as a monument to them, and to the farsighted Members of this Congress who have appropriated the necessary funds. And it is Harold Sutton, one of McCook's real leaders, who today serves as treasurer of the organization. And there is another man who has served the group extremely well through the years. He is M. O. Ryan, who served as executive secretary of the organization from 1940 until World War II struck, in 1942. Since 1943, while being otherwise employed in Washington, his extensive knowledge of the entire area and of the complex problems involved has made his judgment invaluable to the Federal agencies and to the Nebraska congressional delegation as they sought to push this program forward.

There are some who maintain that Federal appropriations for development of western areas must be reduced. Let me point out that W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, states that for the fiscal year of 1954, all appropriations for reclamation construction through the 17 Western States comprised only one-fourth of 1 percent of the national budget. Geographically that is more than one-third of the land area of this country. Of course, President Eisenhower has already asked Congress for a somewhat larger allocation of funds for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. In addition to funds to step up navigation facilities on the Missouri River, which runs through eastern Nebraska, and for the construction of agricultural levees at numerous points, an appropriation is asked for a multiple-purpose power project at Gavins Point, Nebr. And then, in the field of reclamation, the President is asking more than $10 million in appropriations for the Bostwick, the Frenchman-Cambridge, and the Sargent projects in Nebraska.

Appropriations alone do not meet the total needs, however. Refinements in our Federal statutes must be made from time to time. Already, during the 84th Congress, I have joined hands with 11 other Senators from the Great Plains, including my colleague Senator HRUSKA, in introducing S. 787, which paves the way for the negotiation of a compact to achieve maximum conservation and development of water resources throughout the Missouri Basin. Also, I have joined with seven other Republican Senators from west of the 100th meridian, in introducing S. 863, which strengthens the control of the individual Western States over navigable and unnavigable waters within their boundaries. Such a bill appears necessary in order to clarify the nebulous area between State and Federal jurisdiction over reclamation and flood-control activities.

Also, my esteemed colleague, Congressman A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, who is the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has reintroduced a bill which he proposed in the last session, which is now numbered H. R. 1824, clarifying national policy in regard to the development of certain water resources. These are among the measures which Congress will need to enact if we are to meet our full responsibility in paving the way for maximum development of arid lands throughout the West.

A watershed like the Republican is honeycombed with many small creeks and streams. In between the major tributaries, upon which larger projects can be built by the Engineers Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, lie innumerable smaller streams, each of which provides a flood threat. The Soil Conservation Service, an integral part of the United States Department of Agriculture, is geared to treat these areas with small retardation dams. My mind goes back to 1950, when Senator Kenneth Wherry, an active member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, personally inspired the first appropriation of $500,000 for the Soil Conservation Service to undertake surveys to ascertain those watersheds where feasible projects existed. Our late Congressman Karl Stefan, who was simultaneously serving on the House Appropriations Committee, put his shoulder to the wheel, and both bodies of Congress approved that appropriation. From the resulting survey, the first of a number of pilot projects are ready for construction in 1955. The McCook Gazette of January 26 gave a map, in complete detail, of Dry Creek watershed project, the first in that area to be constructed under the Hope-Aiken Watershed Protection Act, which was passed by the 83d Congress. These projects do take time, but once constructed, they last a lifetime.

Commissioner Dexheimer offers concrete evidence of the national value which reclamation projects offer to our United States economy. He reports that Federal-tax revenues from reclamation areas, since 1916, have exceeded $3 billion. This sum alone exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all Bureau-constructed projects in the past 50 years, or since the Reclamation Bureau was established. Not only do landowners on reclamation projects enjoy enhanced revenues, as a result of irrigation, but the adjoining urban areas share substantially in the increased revenue. As an example, in 1953 reclamation project farmers had an income of $550 million, whereas the nonfarming urban areas, which had these projects

in their immediate vicinity, enjoyed total income of approximately $786 million.

We have reason to rejoice this year over the fact that hundreds of additional acres of fertile land in the Missouri basin will be brought under supplemental irrigation for the first time. Completion of the last 50 miles of irrigation canals on the Frenchman-Cambridge project, east of Cambridge, and the 13-mile Franklin Canal on the Bostwick project, jointly account for very substantial acreage in southwestern Nebraska which will be irrigated this year for the first time.

To my way of thinking, these groups like the Republican Valley Conservation Association are the only device by which 32 member communities, or whole sections of a State, can pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. I think that the modest support required from chambers of commerce, city councils, and county commissioners, to maintain such organizations, comprise one of the best possible investments in the future welfare of any State.

As I stand here today, I am concerned about the fact that the Department of Agriculture reports more than 26 million acres of farm land in the whole dust bowl area are in condition to blow this spring. In many areas the Great Plains are experiencing the worst drought since the decade of the thirties. Without adequate snow cover, and frequent spring rains, the Dust Bowl could be revived before root fiber from the 1955 crop affords protection against wind erosion. This perennial threat will be with us constantly until we have brought the benefits of supplemental irrigation to the maximum acreage possible, and stepped up the volume of cover crops and legumes which effectively anchor the soil.

Let me confide something to this great body, the United States Senate. The very last day he was alive, our beloved Hugh Butler spent the afternoon in his office conferring with top level officials, seeking ways and means to step up the tempo of this program in the upper Republican watershed in Nebraska. I was there, as were Secretary McKay and other officials of the Department of the Interior. That night he was stricken, and died 24 hours later. To Mr. Strunk and Mr. Robinson, and the directors from the individual cities and towns that comprise the association, I send greetings, confident that they will continue to enjoy the support of all city, county, and State officials. Their efforts will forever remove the threat of repeated floods, and will temper the droughts, and thus stabilize the economy as nothing else in that whole area can do.

I trust that this important program may go forward to completion.

Peace Through Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "Peace Through Power," delivered by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Fred A. Seaton, at Kansas State College at Manhattan on February 9.

On this occasion Secretary Seaton was awarded by Kansas State College at Manhattan the honorary doctor of laws degree.

Manhattan is the home town of the Secretary and he is a graduate of Kansas State College.

Secretary Seaton is a successful businessman and newspaper publisher who has had an outstanding career in public life. At the present time he publishes newspapers in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota. Through these mediums he wields great influence for the building of our Nation and the strengthening of our democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH POWER

You are all familiar with the general aspects of our present world situation. You know the story of the spread of Communist influence and power from a numerically insignificant Russian political party prior to the October 1917 revolution to its present dominion, over 800 million people arranged over one-fourth the land area of the world.

In response to the common threat to their security, more than 40 of the nations of the world, including our own have allied themselves in several regional defense agreements.

The two blocs—the Communists and the free world alliance—now face each other across a narrowing world, and compete for the support of those nations which have not as yet committed themselves to the struggle.

The seat of military power of the Communist bloc is the Soviet Union. In terms of ground strength, this amounts to a standing army of 175 divisions, to which must be added the 70 divisions of the European satellites. Communist China, furthermore, has more than 2 million men under arms. The amount of manpower the two principals could eventually mobilize is suggested by the fact that during the latter part of World War II, the Soviet Union had on its western front an active strength of over 400 divisions, and, further, on conservative estimates, that the Chinese military manpower pool amounts to over 20 million men. In contrast, at the peak of its military strength in 1945, the United States had 95 divisions (89 Army and 6 Marines) under arms.

On the sea, the Soviet Union commands virtually all the effective strength of the Communist bloc. Its submarine fleet consists of at least 375 vessels, 75 of which are long-range fleet types. It possesses 125 modern destroyers, and 24 cruisers, 15 of which are known to be modern, combatworthy types. So far as we know, the Russians possess no aircraft carriers but we cannot dismiss the possibility that some may be under construction. Since World War II, the Soviet Union has built more combatant ships—destroyers, cruisers, and submarines—than all of the free world put together.

In the matter of air strength, we estimate the Soviet Union to have an inventory of over 1,000 TU–4 bombardment aircraft, which are copies of our own B–29's. If we credit the Soviet air commands with the capability of in-flight refueling, which seems reasonable, it means that a substantial number of our vital cities and installations come within their range. And, of course, on a one-way mission, they could reach almost any target in the United States, if confronted with no opposition. We know also that the Soviet has an undisclosed but growing number of medium and long-range jet bombers, and that they are producing a better fighter than the MIG 15, which was used in Korea. Their total number of aircraft of all kinds exceeds 20,000, most of them tactical types—fighters, interceptors, and light bombers.

As you know, this brief recital of military means at its disposal in no way describes the true dimension and nature of the threat which comes from the Soviet sphere. Policy decisions in the Kremlin have resulted in a world situation which has influenced us to allocate since June 1950, a staggering portion of our national substance and effort valued at $220 billion to the economically unproductive purposes of defense. Today, 60 percent of your Federal taxes go for the equipping and maintenance of a 3-million-man armed force.

The Communists know as well as we that the physical basis of all our military power is our economy, and that if this economy can be undermined and sabotaged, the effect may well be as disastrous to us as a major military defeat. We must not permit this to occur.

Moreover, we must also contend with the insidious threat of subversion, sabotage, and espionage within our own country and the countries of our allies, which can sap the strength and vigor of the most enlightened democracy. Externally, there is the continuous pressure of political and psychological warfare, of deceit and bluff and blackmail. All these are also part of the total threat, physical and moral, which militant communism poses to freemen.

Obviously this threat, total as it is in scope, cannot be successfully countered by military means alone. But the provision of adequate military strength, particularly for the years immediately ahead, is an indispensable prerequisite to every other action which we must undertake. We must maintain military forces in being sufficient to deter aggression, either limited or unlimited, or in the event we are attacked, to preserve the minimum territorial and military security essential to successful mobilization and subsequent prosecution of the war. Moreover, we must be organized for smooth and rapid mobilization of our material and human resources.

This military capability to handle ourselves under any and all possible situations is the essential shield upon which we must rely to provide the protective sanction to the political, economic, and psychological pressures we must continue to exert against the Communist regimes.

To this end we have developed over the past 4 years a very potent military force. It is in fact, the most powerful we have ever maintained in time of peace. We have a Navy second to none, with its own steadily growing atomic striking potential. Our large and growing Air Force now consists of 119 wings which will increase steadily toward an ultimate goal of a minimum of 137 wings by 1957. We have a mobile amphibious striking force of 3 Marine divisions and 3 Marine air wings. With the cessation of fighting in Korea, our Army has gradually been reoriented toward a June 1956 strength objective of approximately 1,027,000 men. This represents a decrease of about one-third from the average strength during the Korean operations, but it remains well over 80 percent above the pre-Korean level.

And here I would like to talk briefly about this matter of ground strength, if I may. One of the foundation stones of our military policy is that our strength shall be integrated with that of our allies in such a way that the maximum power potential is made available to the community of allies. Throughout all these alliances there runs the understanding, written or otherwise, that each partner will contribute to the common cause those elements of strength which it is best able to supply, and to the limit that it is able to supply them.

In this great global system of alliances in which we participate, our Nation is peculiarly well suited to supply two vital elements—sea power and the striking capability of long-range land based air power. Our contribution in these particular categories is by all odds the preponderant one. We also have made a substantial contribution in ground strength, but in the very nature of things we cannot hope to supply more

than a small part of the total number of troops required. The basic accounting unit of a land army is the man. Which suggests that within the special situation obtaining in each strategic area, the contribution in ground strength must bear a general relationship to the population of each interested nation. So we greatly understate the total ground strength available for our common defense effort if we do not count the very substantial contributions of our allies.

To our own 19 divisions should be added at least a hundred more which the free world could count on in any major war undertaken by the Soviet bloc. NATO presently has available to it an active ground strength equivalent of 48 divisions. The Republic of Korea has approximately 19 battle-tested divisions within a total force of 400,000 men. Japan has initiated the formation of its national security police force, and the Philippines have reestablished internal order and are rapidly building up their strength. The 12 West German divisions are to come. We feel, militarily, well able to take care of ourselves in the event of actual physical attack, provided we conduct our operations along lines which permit us to oppose our own factors of strength against the Soviet factors of weakness.

And this, I think, is the key to the success of our whole defense effort. There are certain areas in which we are greatly superior to the Soviet—our powerful and versatile economy, the depth and breadth of our technology, the enormous fire power and mobility assured by our intensive development of atomic weapons and our control of the seas. Most important of all, there is the universal appeal of the great system of values we have moved to defend, as contrasted to the total disregard for human life and liberty which necessarily underlies the Communist philosophy.

It is of great significance to me that in 1952 United States produced half again as much coal as the Soviet, 2½ times as much steel, 4 times as much electric power, 7 times as much oil, and 20 times as many automobiles and trucks. While free American agriculture was bringing in record crops, the Soviet staggered lamely along at about its level of 25 years ago. I am sure you would be interested as I was, in knowing that the USSR, still largely an agricultural nation, consumes more grain than it harvests, that its cattle population is 10 million below what it was in 1928, that its pork production has dropped by 5 million tons since 1940; that by its own admission the supply of meat, potatoes, and vegetables is unsatisfactory.

Our allies, on the other hand, have set remarkable records of food production. England now produces a surprising 56 percent of her food needs whereas she formerly imported about 80 percent. France and Turkey are now producing surpluses of wheat. Wherever free enterprise operates free men always win the battle of production.

I derive a keen sense of satisfaction in the marvelous technology which both supports and depends upon our economic system—the same technology which daily enriches our lives in its thousands of peacetime applications, but which when the chips were down could bring forth such vital weapons of war as radar, the VT fuze, and the atomic bomb.

But, most of all, I sense the great latent strength of a society whose goals represent the highest hopes and greatest expectations of men throughout the world—values which men the world over have repeatedly shown themselves ready to lay down their lives to obtain and defend—a sense of dignity for the individual, the right to worship, to speak, and to think as freemen, to have the love of family and friends, to enjoy the love of the land, and of one's ancestral home, the right to participate freely in a government of their own choosing, and to stand as equals before the eyes of the law. These deep and abiding aspirations we hold in common with all people, and in no way can the barren, atheistic philosophy of communism claim them as basic or even a fundamental part of its ideology.

In contrast, the Soviet has nothing to rely upon except force—force of the most brutal and callous sort. Many of you have read of our President's account of his deep shock when, as General Eisenhower, he learned from a high-ranking Soviet officer the Russian Army technique of clearing minefields. "When we come to a minefield," the Soviet officer told him, "our infantry attacks exactly as if it were not there. The losses we get from personnel mines we consider only equal to the losses we would have gotten from machine guns and artillery if the Germans had chosen to defend that particular area with strong bodies of troops instead of with minefields." This may be logical from a coldly analytical military viewpoint, but it is hardly logical in light of the fact that any regime, even a dictatorship, depends for its existence over the long term upon a certain minimum degree of acceptance by the people over which it exercises its authority. To me it shows weakness, not strength.

Nevertheless, there are certain areas in which we must concede the advantage to the Soviet bloc. Their numbers far exceed the combined strength of ourselves and our allies in sheer military manpower. Moreover, a differential population increase is presently weighing the manpower balance further in their favor, so that it may be expected to become more and more unfavorable to us as time goes by, unless we can associate ourselves with additional allies. In World Wars I and II, our side had a very substantial numerical superiority, and this advantage had its influence in shaping our strategy and tactics in those two great conflicts. But the reverse will be true of any conflict which may be fought out on the present alinement of world power and this tremendously important fact demands our close and continued study.

The only logical remedy for a situation in which we cannot match the enemy man for man lies in the development of capabilities which nullify this enemy advantage. Fortunately, the controlling element in military operations is not mere manpower, but effective firepower, delivered at the time and place of decision. And in the development of such firepower, and the means of its effective delivery, our technology and our massive economy give us a long lead over our nearest competitors. Our arsenal of atomic weapons ranges from giants in the megaton range, which is to say the equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT, down to small tactical weapons which can be fired from guns for relatively limited effect. We have them in increased supply. The Army, Navy, and Air Force all are busily engaged in perfecting the tactics and techniques of employing these tremendous new additions to our military capability.

In the battlefield employment of atomic weapons the effectiveness of our Army has been enormously increased by the 280-millimeter atomic gun, the Honest John rocket, and the Corporal guided missile. All these powerful innovations are now available to our ground forces in Europe, and the recent North Atlantic Council meeting in Paris gave its approval to the proposal that atomic weapons be fully integrated into the basic strategic concept for the defense of Western Europe. It is our deep and earnest belief that the devastating curtain of fire which we shall be able to call down upon the enemy hordes will enable us to keep any would-be invader out of Western Europe and thus deny him his prize.

Measured in our capability to project destruction in the form of rockets, missiles, and bombs, our firepower in the air increases daily. The last B–29 has been retired from active service, and our long-range bombers now are mainly the jet B–47's and the combination jet and propeller-driven B–36's. The B–52's, a superb long-range jet bomber, is being received in increasing numbers and will eventually replace the B–36.

A point frequently overlooked is the fact that the capability of delivering massive firepower is not confined to the Strategic Air Command alone. Our Tactical Air Command also has a tremendous atomic capability. All the fighters and light bombers of the TAC will be able to carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending on what the target requires. All of its wings are modern, and all of its fighters are jets, in the high subsonic speed ranges. Our new fighter interceptor aircraft now in production, beginning with the F–100, will have supersonic speeds. Moreover, our great mobile airfields, the Navy aircraft carriers, have comparatively unrestricted access to the seven-tenths of the earth's surface which is covered by water, and can bring their seaborne atomic striking forces to bear upon targets deep in the interior of the enemy's homeland.

We review this vast power which is ours with mixed feelings.

We can derive great satisfaction and confidence from the enormous increase which it represents over the power which was available to us even a scant 10 years ago. Yet we are sobered by the contemplation of where our weapons technology may lead us in the decade which lies ahead. Moreover, our problem is complicated by the fact that we neither can nor will prepare for initiating war as a conscious act of national policy. Adhering to our moral code, as a nation we can only prepare for the eventuality that war may be forced upon us under unknown conditions at an uncertain future date. Thus, the element of chance in the preparatory phase of war is inherently larger in the case of democracies than it is with dictatorships, for we cannot with certainty predict when war will occur, if at all. We cannot predict, except within the general limits, the method of attack, or the exact direction from which it may come. Nor can we now foresee very far into the future the political arrangements which may result from the use of military pressures exerted by an aggressor prior to the outbreak of hostilities. These things we cannot know. We can know only that in this lawless world we must be prepared to fight at any time, with weapons that are better than those which will be used against us.

As a result, in the area of weapons procurement, we dare not put all, or even most of our eggs, in one basket. We dare not load our Armed Forces down with weapons which may, at best, have begun to be or become obsolescent even before the last lot has been delivered. The best that we can possibly hope for is to keep our weapons stocks at a level which will enable us to fight effectively with what we have, meanwhile pushing out the older versions with newer, more efficient models as they become available from an economy that has never been known to stand still.

There are those who constantly agitate for more of everything now—more planes, more guns, more of this and more of that. Sincere as they may be, they fail to take into account either the economic or the military problems involved. To over-burden our economy is to risk losing the struggle against communism without firing a shot. To overload the services with obsolete equipment is to risk defeat in battle. True war readiness consists in being able not only to fight today's war with today's weapons, but of being ready to fight tomorrow's war with tomorrow's weapons. This requires a sensible balance in weapons programing. And that, we now believe we have achieved.

This, I think, is the thing which we must keep always in mind in all our defense considerations. For our national security is

not tied to a date on a calendar, or to a certain specified number of divisions, ships, planes, or men. It is not to be identified with any one type of weapon or any one strategic approach. Rather, it depends upon our continuing and increasing ability to meet successfully a variety of challenges—military, political, and economic—while maintaining the essential soundness and health of our economy and our political system. And this we must be prepared to do perhaps for 50 years to come.

There is nothing transitory about the threat to our Nation and our way of life, and there is nothing cheap or easy or simple about the things which we must do to protect and preserve them. These difficult and costly measures which we must undertake in our defense will demand the very best that is in us, the people of America. Among these responsibilities will be your own part in the great common effort we all must make to maintain our military readiness, our political solidarity, and our industrial and technological superiority over that of any possible enemy.

If we can do these things, we have an excellent chance for peace, and an accommodation between the free world and the Communist bloc which will effectively serve our interests.

From a plateau of great strength we can negotiate for the easing of tensions and the reduction of trouble areas dangerous to world stability. For many years, it may be a peace, not of good will, but of power, in which our national strength will be the validating factor. But it will be a peace in which free men can live and breathe, and pursue those ends which tend to lessen the misery and increase the sum of human happiness in the world. It can, at the least, be a peace which will stop the flow of the Red tide which has engulfed so much of the world, and the opening of a more hopeful prospect for democracy than the one it has faced these past 20 years.

This is the peace which we must have, and can have, provided we remain patient, united, and strong.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the sovereign ruler of the universe, Thy wise and beneficent laws are the inspiration and foundation of every just and righteous human law.

Grant that the laws, which are made and adopted here in this Chamber by the legislative branch of our Government, may always be in accord with the plan and pattern of Thy divine law.

May we daily be inspired with a lofty sense of respect and reverence for the sacred office of the Chief Executive of these United States.

We beseech Thee that our President, our Speaker, and all who are engaged in the high vocation of statecraft may be richly endowed with special gifts of wisdom and understanding and leadership.

May the citizens of our beloved country be great in loyalty and obedience to law, in righteousness and in peace and may our national strength and resources be used for the good of mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 3, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 752. An act to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–8.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–9.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered and to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statements and extraneous matter.

Mrs. PFOST asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE HONORABLE MARY T. NORTON

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 80th birthday of that distinguished lady, Mary T. Norton, who represented the 13th District of New Jersey for so many years so gloriously and so well. As a resident of the city of Jersey City and one who lived in her district so many years, I felt it would be a great honor and privilege to remind you of her great work, which you all know, her wonderful achievements in the field of labor.

All of us in Jersey City remember her affectionately and I thought the House would be very much pleased to know that she is celebrating her 80th birthday today, that she is in excellent health, and that she thinks many times of the great friendships she made here, and of her friends in this body.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY]. I sent Mary Norton a letter of congratulation on her birthday anniversary today. I am very happy that the gentleman from New Jersey made the remarks he did.

Those who served with Mary Norton remember her not only as a sweet lady, but also as a great American, one of the outstanding Members of this body. She served with devotion and courage the people of her district, of her State, and of our country, and I join with her many friends in congratulating Mrs. Norton on her birthday anniversary. I hope that God will continue to shower upon her for many years to come an abundance of His choicest blessings.

Mr. TUMULTY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom Mrs. Norton had great affection, as well as for the Speaker of this House. I may say that my first knowledge of this House came from Mrs. Norton and from her praise of the work done by you, Mr. Majority Leader, and the Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN], as well as by the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Mary Theresa Norton was born and brought up and lives today in the congressional district she represented. She is a widow, having lost her husband, Robert Francis Norton, a businessman of Jersey City, several years ago.

Mrs. Norton attended parochial and public high school in Jersey City and business college in New York. Previous to her marriage, she was a secretary and businesswoman, and believes that this experience has been of great help to her during her public career. She became interested in welfare work in 1912 upon the death of her only child, a son. She was one of the founders of the Queen's Daughters Day Nursery, a volunteer nonsectarian day nursery, furnishing care during World War I to thousands of children of working mothers. She was president of the nursery for more than 12 years, resigning a few years following her election to Congress. Through her knowledge of welfare work and its de-

mands on citizenship she became interested in politics.

She was appointed to represent Hudson County on the Democratic State Committee in 1920, and was elected vice chairman of the State committee the following year. She served continuously until 1932 when she was elected chairman. In 1923 she was the first woman of the Democratic Party to be elected freeholder in Hudson County and in the State. In 1924, 1928, 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948 she was elected delegate at large to the national Democratic conventions. She was cochairman of the platform committee in 1944 and chairman of the credentials committee in 1948.

In 1924 she was elected to the House of Representatives, reelected each succeding Congress, including the 81st. She is the first Democratic woman ever to be elected to Congress and the first woman ever to head a legislative committee of the House of Representatives of the United States. She was chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia from 1930 to 1937, and chairman of the House Committee on Labor from 1937 to the opening of the 80th Congress, when all chairmanships went to Republicans, since they held the majority of seats in the House. The House was organized by the Democrats again in the 81st Congress and Mrs. Norton became chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

Mrs. Norton's best known work was her sponsorship of the wage and hour law, legislation in which she herself got the greatest satisfaction. She worked ardently for passage of the law to benefit thousands of American workers, although it was necessary to file a petition, requiring the signatures of 218 Members of the House of Representatives to permit it to be brought to the floor for action. Brought to the floor, it was recommitted to the Committee on Labor, and Mrs. Norton again had to sponsor a second petition to allow it to be presented for consideration on the floor. She has consistently done all that she could to maintain gains made by labor during the Democratic administrations. She sponsored and actively worked for legislation to establish the Fair Employment Practice Committee as a permanent agency.

Because of her broad knowledge and experience in labor problems in 1945, she was appointed by the President to attend the International Labor Conference at Paris as an advisor and alternate delegate.

Mrs. Norton has always stood for constructive, liberal, and good government. She was a strong advocate of adequate defense of our country even before the war. She has always been very much interested in the problems of veterans, and is keenly and vitally interested in the problems of our present day veterans. The first large and constructive measure which she sponsored in Congress was the building of a veterans' hospital in New Jersey, which institution has been enlarged many times.

As a woman, she is greatly interested in child welfare programs. During the war she was sponsor of an amendment to the Lanham Act, which provided funds for the care of children whose mothers were engaged in war work.

Mrs. Norton was dean of the New Jersey delegation. At times, when New Jersey had no Democratic representative in the Senate, Mrs. Norton handled matters not only for her own constituents, but for citizens of New Jersey as a whole who had no Democratic representation in Congress. She was concerned not only with general legislation, but hundreds of letters cross her desk dealing with individual cases, all of which required immediate attention. She is well known in the various Government agencies for the personal work that she did in behalf of individual constituents.

In 1930, Representative Norton received the first degree of doctor of laws ever conferred by St. Elizabeth's College, the oldest woman's college in New Jersey, in recognition of service in welfare and Government. In 1937, she received the degree of doctor of laws from Rider College, Trenton, N. J. The Women's National Press Club awarded her a citation for the most important contribution to Government in 1946. In 1947, she was awarded the Theta Phi Alpha medal—National Catholic University Women—as the outstanding Catholic woman of the year. An award for outstanding service was presented by the International Relations Club, St. Elizabeth's College, to Mrs. Norton in 1949. On June 4, 1950, she was awarded the degree of doctor of laws by St. Bonaventure's College, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who care to do so may extend their remarks at this point on the birthday anniversary of Mrs. Mary Norton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today former Congresswoman Mary T. Norton is 80 years old. Each of us joins in wishing her a happy birthday.

A COMMON CIVIL-MILITARY SYSTEM OF AIR NAVIGATION AND TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief announcement for the benefit of Members interested in the current controversy over the development of a common civil-military system of air navigation and traffic control.

The Transportation and Communications Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House will hold hearings in executive session at 10 o'clock next Thursday morning to make a thorough investigation of the facts in this dispute.

As stated by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], chairman of the subcommittee, last Wednesday, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House has fostered the development of a common system of air navigation. The common system grew out of recommendations made by a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the 80th Congress, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] was chairman. That subcommittee, in House Report No. 885, 30th Congress, urged the establishment of a single system which will safely and economically serve the requirements of both commerce and the national defense simultaneously.

Subsequently, the Air Navigation Development Board, representing civil and military agencies, was formed, and it developed a common system known as VOR/DME. This system now is almost completed.

As a result of developments during the Korean hostilities, the military pushed ahead with the development of a tactical navigational system now known as TACAN.

TACAN and DME/VOR are not compatible. If we are to have a common civil-military system, it must be one or the other.

Recently, ANDB voted to complete the development of TACAN and clear the way for its adoption as the common system. This action has brought numerous protests.

We must have a common system. That is essential for national defense and also for the orderly growth of civil aviation. In addition, there is the very important consideration of economy. It would cost the country a lot of money to support two systems.

For those reasons, your committee proposes to make a complete investigation of this problem in an effort to resolve this conflict. We cannot permit this conflict to develop to the point where it threatens the very concept of a common system.

The committee questioned the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics about this on February 11 in open session but because details of the TACAN system are classified, it was decided to postpone the investigation until an executive session could be held. On next Thursday morning, the subcommittee will hear Dr. Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, and others familiar with the facts in the case. Also, to appear are representatives of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, the Department of Commerce, the Coast Guard, the Air Navigation Development Board, the Air Transport Association, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, and the National Business Aircraft Association.

PRESIDENTS' DAY

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that at my request our distinguished chaplain gave a prayer this morning for Presidents' Day, I think it appropriate that I call your attention to the fact that it originated in the great 23d District of California, which I have the honor to represent this my ninth year in the House; through the efforts of a very distinguished American, Mr. Hal Fischer, in the important city of Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif.

I call your attention to the fact that on March 4, in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at pages A1404 and A1405 in my extension of remarks, I gave a brief history of the origins and processes of Presidents' Day as furnished me by Mr. Hal Fischer, the director of the Committee for Presidents' Day.

I think the prayer by our distinguished Chaplain, Reverend Braskamp, this morning was certainly most beautiful, appropriate, and pertinent. I wish to thank our distinguished chaplain for the beautiful prayer he gave this noon at the convening of this great legislative body.

Here is the proclamation which, according to Mr. Fischer, was used by some 41 governors of 41 States for Presidents' Day, 1954:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the office of the President of the United States of America is the highest and most important that a citizen may attain, and it is the living and working symbol of the American flag and our Constitution; and

Whereas free peoples everywhere today face their greatest trials for the survival of their democratic way of life, which makes it incumbent upon citizens of this Nation to accept their just responsibilities in preserving the general welfare of this land; and

Whereas religion is our most vital asset, as it was with our Founding Fathers, and it is essential to remember and reaffirm our faith in God and our system of delegated authority under him:

Now, therefore, as governor of the State of ————, I do hereby proclaim March 4 as Presidents' Day in and for this State, and urge that prayers be said in all churches and places of worship for the President of the United States of America, and urge that the opportunity be given our schoolchildren to acquire a better understanding of the American way of life by studying the lives of our Presidents and their wives and presenting special programs appropriate to the observance in the schools of this State on this date.

And, in 100,000 schools in our Nation last year particular emphasis was given to the study of the Constitution and the office of the President of the United States.

MILK DISPENSER MACHINES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, at 11:30 this morning, members of the House Agriculture Committee, representatives of dairy districts, and the leadership officially christened the two milk dispenser machines which have been installed in the Republican and Democrat cloakrooms.

I made arrangements to install these machines through the cooperation of the National Milk Producers Federation so that the Members of this House could actually see a milk dispenser in operation. These milk-vending machines have been installed during the past year throughout the United States. At installations of the Defense Department where they have been installed, they have become the most popular type of vending machine in operation.

Milk and its products have been and continue to be the best food bargain in America today. The difficulties which the dairy industry has faced during the past 2 years have grown from underconsumption of milk and milk products. Here in our Nation's Capital, we can show the way to better health and longer life through the greater consumption of dairy products.

These milk-vending machines being installed in the Capitol symbolize the effective efforts which are being made by organizations such as the National Milk Producers Federation and the American Dairy Association to increase the consumption of dairy products. Since I have been a Member of Congress, I have worked for and have promoted the increased consumption of dairy products by the armed services and the Veterans' Administration. In my original testimony before the Agriculture Committee last year, I suggested the increased use of milk in our Nation's school-lunch program. Currently I am sponsoring legislation to further increase the use of milk and dairy products in schools throughout the United States. I particularly call attention to my bill H. R. 675 which provides for the continuation of the school-milk program for the next 2 years.

At the present time all 48 States have signed up under the school milk program and the latest figures available show an increase of 55 percent in the consumption of milk in our schools as compared with last year. This volume is increasing rapidly as more and more schools get started on the program. Under the new program, schools in Wisconsin and other States are being reimbursed for a large portion of the cost of the additional milk which they serve to schoolchildren. Our State was the first to go under this program and it is interesting to note that the milk consumption in Wisconsin schools has increased by 114 percent—more than double the amount of milk which was consumed by Wisconsin schools last year.

A survey which was recently released by the American Dairy Association shows that the per capita consumption of butter has increased over 5 percent during the past year. This survey showed that during the 9-month period of April to December 1954, butter purchases by householders was up 12 percent. The per capita consumption of fluid milk and cheese also showed a marked increase and the total consumption of milk and cheese is up even more because of our growing population.

I invite my colleagues to help me raise these consumption figures even further by promoting the sale and use of dairy products in each of their individual districts. I thank the National Milk Producers Federation for their cooperation and it is my hope that each of you will enjoy the fresh, cold milk which is available as of today in the cloakrooms of both the Democrats and Republicans.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE 105TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF CZECHOSLOVAKIAN PATRIOT, T. G. MASARYK

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today is the 105th anniversary of the birth of the great Czechoslovakian patriot, T. G. Masaryk, and it is an event celebrated by all Americans of Czechoslovakian origin, and by the Czechoslovak people all over the world.

Thomas Masaryk was a true patriot. He was a man who dedicated his life to the realization of freedom, democracy, and independence for his native Czechoslovakia. And Masaryk lived to see his fondest dreams fulfilled.

However, shortly after his passing in 1937, the republic to which he had contributed so much, fell victim to Nazi tyranny. After enduring the hardships of Nazi rule during the war years, Czechoslovakia regained its freedom briefly, only to lose it again to the advancing tide of Red communism which has engulfed that nation.

The Communists have attempted to destroy the ideals of freedom and democracy in the hearts of the Czechoslovakian people, but in this they have not succeeded. The words of Thomas Masaryk still inspire his people, and give them renewed courage to withstand Communist tyranny.

Thomas Masaryk is an inspiration not only to the people of Czechoslovakia, but to all the free world. His words and deeds bring a message of the blessings of democracy and independence, and inspire unceasing struggle to achieve the ideals of liberty for which he stood throughout the world.

REGULATION OF NETS IN ALASKA WATERS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters. A similar House bill (H. R. 249) has been reported by the Committee

on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and is now on the House Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina kindly explain the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. The necessity for the bill arises from a recent court decision in Alaska which classified gill nets as fixed fishing appliances, the location of which is specified by law.

For the past 25 years the Fish and Wildlife Service has treated gill nets as a type of fishing gear subject to its regulation and has made regulations governing their use based upon the particular conservation needs of each area. In the absence of this bill, gill nets as well as salmon traps would be governed by the law covering the latter. Not only would this require a prompt and drastic revision of the rules of the Service but it would work hardship on various groups of fishermen without any compensating advantage.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I should like to inquire whether this bill is the one that was referred to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. BONNER. This bill was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which committee has jurisdiction over fishing matters in Alaskan waters.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We had a bill before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last year regarding the same problem, which was quite controversial, as I recall it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to inform the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] that this bill had no relationship to the one to which he referred. This is a separate matter entirely.

Mr. MARTIN. This bill was not necessary until the court decision, is that correct?

Mr. BONNER. That is what brought it about. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] that there was no opposition to the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman that when the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dealt with a similar subject, there was considerable opposition.

Mr. BONNER. I can only tell the gentleman what took place in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when we set it for hearing, and it had been set some time for hearings.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be in the position of holding up an important bill, but I was wondering if it would be possible to let this matter go over until tomorrow so that I may have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will yield further to me, I should like to say that this bill has been agreed to by the Department of the Interior, by the Alaska salmon industry and by the fishermen in the areas concerned. It has no relationship whatsoever to the proposed legislation which was formerly in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman understands that the bill that was before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did have some opposition?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is true, but I assure the gentleman that this is an entirely different subject and that there is general unanimity as to the desirability, the purposes, and even the necessity of the bill now before the House.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I will say further to the gentleman that the reports on the bill were all favorable.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reqeust of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 3 of the act entitled "And act for the protection and regulation of the fisheries of Alaska," approved June 26, 1906, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 233), is hereby amended to read as follows: "It shall be unlawful to lay or set any seine or net of any kind within 100 yards of any other seine, net, or other fishing appliance which is being or which has been laid or set in any of the waters of Alaska, or to drive or to construct any trap or any other fixed fishing appliance, except a set gill net, stake gill net, or anchored gill net, within 600 yards laterally or within 100 yards endwise of any other trap or fixed fishing appliance."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. BONNER, a similar House bill (H. R. 249) was laid on the table.

THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK: A GREAT MAN AND A GREAT WORLD CITIZEN (1850–1937)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, who was the founding father and the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, probably worked longer and harder than anyone else for its creation. No one was more patriotic, more persevering, and more devoted to the Czechoslovak cause than this scholar and philosopher. Consequently, it is not difficult to understand why the celebration of his birthday had become a national event in the Czechoslovak Republic before the advent of the Communist regime.

This great man was endowed with many talents, and he would have been a shining success in a number of professions. His learning, his mellowed wisdom, and above all his forthrightness and forceful character served him supremely well in his chosen task, that of recreating the idea of Czechoslovak independence among his countrymen. It served him equally well when he was presenting the Czechoslovak cause to the governments of other countries. Through sheer force of character he enlisted the support of the Allied governments for the Czechoslovak cause. Our Government, always sympathetic to the struggling underdog, gladly followed suit. In 1918 when Czechoslovak independence was proclaimed and Czechoslovakia was recognized as a democratic republic, it was not only a victory for the deserving and brave Czechoslovaks, but it was also a personal achievement of that great and gifted man, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

Unfortunately, today, because of the treachery of the Communists, this Republic is far from what he had hoped it would be, and his compatriots are now suffering a tragic fate. We in the free world honor his memory on this day and devoutly hope that soon the Republic which was his own creation and for whose well-being he devoted his life, will arise once more and regain that freedom which it enjoyed under Masaryk's leadership.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the founder-architect of the post-World War I Czechoslovak Republic and its President for more than 15 years, is rightly regarded as one of the great men of Europe. He was a man of many talents; he was distinguished as a teacher, as a journalist-editor, as a philosopher-statesman, and as a national leader. This son of a humble coachman, through hard work and sheer force of character, became the leading figure in a movement for reviving the idea of national independence among his coutrymen. He probably did more than any other one man in securing that independence.

Profoundly grateful for his almost superhuman efforts in the cause of their freedom, he is regarded as the father of his country. He was elected to the Presidency of the Republic, and was reelected until 1935. At the ripe age of 85 he retired from office. Two more years of peace and tranquility brought him to rest on September 14, 1937, not long before his dearest work, the Czechoslovak Republic, was visited with destruction.

Thomas Masaryk doubtless would have been eminently distinguished in any land or in any age. His wide learning made him temperate and wise. He was a kind man and believed in the goodness of humanity. He was a stanch advocate of freedom for all, and was an undaunted champion of political democracy.

Today when we see many of the things for which this great man stood in danger of destruction, when we see them being sneered at and attacked by the leaders of the so-called people's democracies, we are dismayed but not discouraged. For we know that the principles of freedom and humaneness which Masaryk represents can never be destroyed even by the most ruthless tyrant. Today we pay tribute to his memory and pray that our generation will emulate Masaryk's strength and courage. If we do, we will certainly be victorious over those who seek to enslave mankind.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on this 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk it might be well for us to restate the views of this great statesman of Czechoslovakia on the subject of religious toleration; for he was above all else a disciple of religious freedom.

Thomas Masaryk firmly believed that in a truly democratic republic "freedom of conscience and toleration must not merely be codified but realized in every domain of public life."

Truly this is an ideal to which all mankind can well aspire. But it is perhaps the greatest tragedy and at the same time the greatest paradox that the nation which gave the world Thomas Masaryk is today part of that world which denies the democratic concept of religious toleration and freedom of conscience. Czechoslovakia, like all States within the Communist orbit of power, has been undergoing a sustained attack upon its institutions of religion. Armed with total power, the Communists have denied religious freedom; they have decreed freedom for only the Communist creed. They have, in fact, even set out to destroy religion completely and in its stead infuse the philosophy of materialism and atheism into the structure of the Czechoslovak nation.

In Czechoslovakia today religion is under attack. Like all other nations in the Communist world, the light of religious belief in Czechoslovakia, as a consequence of sustained Communist persecution, might well slowly fade away. It is well, therefore, that on this anniversary commemorating the birth of Thomas Masaryk that we hold high the ideal of freedom of conscience and religious toleration which this great statesman advocated in the hope that its light may give some hope to the world's oppressed and perhaps do something to drive back the shadows of intolerance and religious persecution that have been enveloping the world.

EXTENSION OF THE RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 101)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, to make its provisions applicable for an additional period of 2 years. I make this recommendation because I believe the welfare of the country requires it.

In spite of major improvements which we have achieved in our contracting and price redetermination operations, there nevertheless remains an area in which only renegotiation can be effective to assure that the United States gets what it needs for defense at fair prices. In addition, I believe that the entire period of defense expansion and rebuilding which the United States has undertaken since the beginning of the Korean hostilities should be considered as a whole insofar as renegotiation treatment is concerned.

Continuation of the renegotiation authority is necessary for several reasons. Because of the complex nature of modern military equipment, the lack of experience in producing it and the frequent necessity for alterations during the life of a contract, it is impossible for the Government to determine, when the procurement contract is made, what constitutes a fair price and for the supplier to forecast accurately his costs. Moreover, because of limited sources of supply in many cases, there are situations in which the Government is unable to obtain the price benefits that accrue from normal competition.

Furthermore, in the interest of broadening and strengthening the mobilization base, we have encouraged the extensive use of subcontracting. Because the United States has no direct contractual relations with the subcontractors, the only protection against unreasonable prices by them is through the process of renegotiation.

All these factors become particularly important when it is recognized that expenditures by the Government during the next 2 calendar years will include paying the bills for the completion of the expansion of the Air Force to 137 wings. The next 2 years also will see an introduction into the Air Force program of the latest type of supersonic aircraft. New types of equipment also are being ordered for the Army and Navy and Marine Corps.

As a Nation, we recognize that so long as defense expenditures represent more than half of the national budget, we must do everything in our power to see to it that the maximum return is received for each dollar spent. On the other hand we must also be careful not to interfere unwisely in the traditional commercial relationship between the Government and its suppliers. In extending the Renegotiation Act last year, the Congress instituted new statutory exemptions. These have lessened the burden imposed on industry by renegotiation and, more important, have concentrated renegotiation in the areas where it is most needed.

I strongly urge that the Congress take action as promptly as possible so that both Government and business will know that this important adjunct to speedy and effective defense contracting will remain available, at least until December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 4, 1955.*

STRENGTH OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been asked to approve an unanticipated cut in the strength of the Army. It is a cut which, from testimony before committees of Congress in recent weeks, was decided on last December after Army budget figures already had been prepared calling for a larger number of troops. The original estimate of troop strength for which budget figures had been prepared was more in line with the recommendation of the Army Chief of Staff Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, and the recommendations of the key Army planners who have first-hand knowledge of the Army's worldwide responsibilities. The new figures on Army strength now before us do not have the approval of those men. In order for these figures to be submitted to Congress an entire new set of budget figures had to be hurriedly assembled. As a matter of fact, this adjustment of Army budget figures is still in process, attesting to the unusual manner in which the presently projected Army strength was arrived at. With this in mind, I feel that the Congress should take a long and careful look at the situation which now confronts this Nation defensively, and I urge that we be very certain of our ground before we place our blessings on the current estimate. There is no similar reduction of Communist army strengths anywhere in the world. There is ample evidence that Communist armies have been materially improved in recent years in firepower, mobility, equipment, and supply.

I am continually impressed with the scope and complexity of Army missions, with the number and importance of the tasks which the Army is expected to carry out, at the same time Army strength is being reduced. Particularly am I concerned when I contemplate the possibility of war and the nature of the prodigious job the Army will be called on to do in war.

Regardless of how popular the notion is that we can win a quick, cheap war without the extensive use of soldiers, whether they be allied or our own, and that we can win it in a few days, let us not be wholly committed to that notion, lest we learn too late that we were wrong. History has demonstrated clearly enough that there is no easy, impersonal way to win a war without getting your hands dirty. The inescapable truth is that war is a dirty business and we are not likely to win it without fighting the enemy's fighters, without enduring all the sweat and pain and hardships that war entails.

The premise of various new and untried military policies, in accordance with the perennial search for a machine

that will do our fighting for us, appears to be that nuclear weapons delivered by airplanes will be decisive, if we are forced to go to war. This assumption may or may not be true. But it is dangerous for a great nation such as ours to stake its security upon the accuracy of that one premise, yet untested by history, even if the premise were supported by all the military experts, which indeed this particular premise is not, by any means.

No matter how much we seize the diplomatic initiative, it will still be beyond our power to prevent the development of situations such as Indochina, Korea, and possibly Formosa—which is the crux of the matter today—if we have tailored our strength to a single concept and have relied on that single concept, even for total war. I cannot help believing with all my conviction that our best life insurance is versatile military strength, in which a highly mobile and hard-hitting United States Army is firmly in the foreground. This Army must be able to reinforce our overseas garrisons promptly, whenever and wherever they may be threatened, in local wars or total conflict. I do not mean to deprecate the roles of the other services, which are vitally essential. In fact, I believe that certain Air Force programs, for example, should be expanded, particularly in the air transport field, where our military experts say we need to accrue some of the strategic mobility necessary for the movement of hard-hitting combat Army forces in coping with Communist aggressions.

No matter how much we would like to substitute machines for men, there is so far no evidence that we can afford to do so. As far as can be foreseen at this time, the numbers of ground fighters required in future wars will not be less than in recent wars, despite the presence of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of nations. In fact, there is a real possibility that nuclear weapons will never be used in a future war. Although nuclear weapons have been available since 1945, everyone knows that they were not used in Korea, and that it took large numbers of the fighting ground troops of the United States Army and United States allies, powerfully supported by air and naval forces, to stop the Communist armies.

But especially if nuclear weapons are used in a future war, there is good reason to foresee requirements for more, not fewer, troops. In the first place, the great normal characteristic of the atomic battlefield will be dispersion, sporadically interrupted by rapid concentration after atomic blows to exploit the power of the nuclear weapon and then followed again by rapid dispersion. Dispersion does not mean that an army can do the same job with fewer men. While, as a simple illustration, ground forces are dispersed laterally to avoid presenting massed linear targets, there will be urgent requirements for dispersion in greater and greater depth, to prevent enemy infiltration between the dispersed forward units and to prevent atomic breaches in the defensive areas.

Units will probably be smaller and more mobile than formerly, but many more units will be required. When you disperse units over wider areas, you increase the problem of control and communications. More and better communications equipment will be required, which, in turn, means more and better trained communications personnel.

Replacements will be needed in higher ratios and greater numbers than heretofore, for the destruction possible by nuclear weapons may destroy large numbers of men, including whole units, at one time. The same increased effects will be felt in the enormous and vital logistical complex backing up the fighting field armies. For the evacuation and treatment of greater numbers of casualties, more medical personnel will be needed. All logistical operations will require greater dispersion. Great ports, for example, will be more vulnerable than heretofore; to avoid these vulnerable bottlenecks, we may have to use many small ports and beaches, which is a system expensive, not economical, in the use of manpower.

These are only a few of the considerations which provide the basis for considering that the Army, as I have said, may well need more rather than fewer men.

On purely pragmatic grounds, it would be an error of great magnitude to become overcommitted to untried strategies which leave the enemy's combat forces relatively unhampered. I do not know of any example in history of a great nation at war losing its will to resist until its armed forces have been decisively defeated. It is sometimes said that Japan's surrender in 1945 was brought about by strategic bombing on Japan's home islands, or even that the two atomic bombs alone brought about Japan's capitulation. This argument ignores the destruction of Japanese armies in New Guinea, in Burma, in the Philippines, and other areas; it ignores the strangling of Japan's naval forces and economic lifelines, primarily accomplished by United States naval power; it ignores the destruction of Japanese airpower, largely by United States carrier-based airpower; it ignores the fact that Japan put out surrender feelers before the atomic bombs were dropped—before, in fact, any strategic bombing attacks were made in force on the home islands; and, among still other factors, it ignores the fact that overwhelming land, sea, and air forces were poised outside the door, ready to apply the final invasion blows.

The missions and responsibilities assigned to the Army today are many, varied, and comprehensive. Mostly, they are missions which cannot be performed by any other organization or force, but must be performed by formidable organized land forces of adequate size and strength.

Among the missions and responsibilities assigned to our United States military forces, the Army has primary responsibility for all operations on land. In support of national objectives, the Army must defend the territorial integrity of the United States, establish and support strategic bases in vital overseas areas, and be prepared to assume an early offensive against the sources of Soviet power. These are tremendously complex responsibilities whose full requirements are difficult to grasp. At the risk of repetition, the following list of general responsibilities officially assigned to the Army may give a somewhat more detailed understanding of what the Army must be prepared at all times to do:

First. To organize, train, and equip Army forces for the conduct of prompt and sustained combat operations on land. Specifically, this means to defeat enemy land forces, and to seize, occupy, and defend land areas.

Second. To organize, train, and equip Army antiaircraft artillery units.

Third. To provide Army forces, properly organized and equipped, for joint amphibious and airborne operations.

Fourth. To develop, in coordination with the other services, tactics, technique, and equipment of interest to the Army for amphibious operations.

Fifth. To provide an organization capable of furnishing adequate, timely, and reliable intelligence for the Army.

Sixth. To provide Army forces as required for the defense of the United States against air attack.

Seventh. To provide forces for occupation of territories abroad, to include initial establishment of military government.

Eighth. To develop, in coordination with the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, the doctrines, and equipment employed by Army and Marine forces in airborne operations.

Ninth. To formulate doctrines and procedures for the organization, equipping, training, and employment of forces operating on land, at division level and above, including division, corps, Army, and general reserve troops.

Tenth. To provide support for the administration and operation of the Panama Canal; river and harbor projects in the United States, its Terirtories, and possessions; and certain other civil activities prescribed by law.

The Army, along with the other services, carries out its responsibilities in support of United States policies, interests, and commitments. In order to understand how far-reaching these worldwide interests are, the following roster lists the numerous countries with which the United States has commitments which may involve United States military action of one kind or another:

First. Through NATO: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and United Kingdom.

Second. Through the RIO pact: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala — pending — Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Third. Through the ANZUS and Manila pacts: Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, Cambodia, Laos, and Free Vietnam. Okinawa in this area has equal strategic importance.

Fourth. Through occupation: Germany and Austria.

Fifth. Through military assistance agreements: Spain, Yugoslavia, Iraq, and Iran.

Sixth. Through various bilateral mutual defense treaties: Canada, Japan, Formosa, Philippines, and the Republic of Korea.

Seventh. In addition, the United States is the principal bulwark of the United Nations, with its many member nations and numerous responsibilities.

In addition to these general missions, the Army must provide definite forces to accomplish certain specific missions:

The Army must provide certain forces which the United States has promised to NATO. The Army must garrison the outposts protecting the Western Hemisphere, such as those in Hawaii, Panama, the Caribbean, Alaska, Greenland, and Iceland. The Army must provide forces for defense of the continental United States. Mindful of the harsh fate of our forces left without reinforcement for months on Bataan, we want no more Bataans. Nor do we want any more Koreas, where a handful of troops, rushed onto the beaches, fought desperately to keep a toehold, hoping for early and strong reinforcements. Therefore, the Army must maintain combat-ready forces as part of our strategic reserve located in or near the United States ready to be deployed quickly to trouble spots, before disaster overtakes our side. There is no magic known by which trained forces can be created overnight. To create the additional powerful, trained forces required in emergencies, the Army must maintain in readiness a nucleus of training units, a nucleus of training installations, a nucleus of mobilization requirements of all kinds and a nucleus of the logistic structure to support the expansion that will be inevitable should war come.

In support of United States interests, and particularly in support of the specific responsibilities assigned, the Army is stretching its resources to accomplish its combat-ready mission, its training mission, its continental defense mission, its mobilization-base mission, and all its other missions in the United States, as well as maintain half its strength overseas in support of its overseas missions. In addition to Army attachés, there are Army personnel in more than 40 foreign nations, ranging in scope from small groups to the great field armies, the Eighth United States Army in the Far East and the Seventh United States Army in Europe. The presence of sizable United States Army forces stationed in key overseas areas on the ground, where the peoples of the countries concerned can see them every day, has been a strengthening factor in the determination of our allies to resist aggression, and the Army's presence has made a major contribution to such stability as exists in those areas of the world today. It is significant, I think, that there has been no Communist aggression against countries in which United States Army forces have been stationed.

The United States needs its entire arsenal of versatile, powerful forces sufficient to meet the many possible situations that may have to be faced in the cold war as well as in general war. The Army's role is indispensable. The Army must, in the interest of United States security, be maintained at strength adequate to carry out the missions which the Army is expected to perform. It is a proud, successful, forward-looking Army which deserves the best of support from the Nation which it defends.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my able friend from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have listened to what the gentleman has to say and it is very interesting. But, we have had some hearings in the Committee on Armed Services of the House where it was pointed out that the decrease in the armed strength was O. K.'d by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, of course, the Chief of the Army is Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, himself, and he did tentatively say that he felt he ought to have more men than were allotted to him. But, I understand the final decision was based on this theory: That they balanced the capabilities of the groups, and that is not entirely measured by numbers. You made the point a while ago, it is true, that the Army has a great many commitments that it cannot shuffle aside, like the Army engineers, for instance, and others. But I received the distinct impression from the testimony before our committee that the total force we hoped to maintain, which includes deduction from the Army, is adequate to take care of any situation that might arise. But I do want to compliment the gentleman on raising this problem with other Members of Congress who have not heard the testimony given before committees.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman's interest certainly is understandable and commendable because of his long service on the great Committee on Armed Services. I can tell you that I made careful inquiry into this matter during the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on the defense budget for fiscal 1956. At that time I made very thorough inquiries of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Army and of the Army Chief of Staff, General Ridgway. It was clearly brought out that this is not a cut which has the approval of the Army Chief of Staff or of the Army's planners who must do the job which has been assigned to the Army. It was difficult to tie down responsibility for the cut in Army strength to any one particular person. Treasury Secretary Humphrey is credited by some as insisting that cuts be made somewhere in the military organization in order to present a stronger budget picture. The President himself is credited with accepting responsibility as Commander in Chief. The Secretary of Defense has assumed primary responsibility. But that does not mean that the Army's leaders who must do the job assigned to the Army, approve of it. I believe the testimony in our hearings bears that out in detail and I believe further that budget considerations were given more weight than they previously have carried where national defense is concerned.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman is performing a great service by alerting the House of Representatives to what is taking place with regard to our national defense on the Army level. I think the point is well made when the gentleman emphasized the fact that we are not seeing a corresponding decrease in Army strength on the part of the Communists or their satellites. As a matter of fact, is it not correct to say that the proposed cut in the Army strength of the United States is more drastic than any cut being sought by any other major power in its Army strength at the present time?

Mr. SIKES. In my belief, that is true. Further, it is a cut which is not balanced by a proportionate buildup in our allied forces. There is a dangerous gap in Army strength where Communist forces have a definite advantage.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a subject which is of utmost importance to Members of this Congress is the development of the natural resources of our country. One of the basic plans for comprehensive resource development lies in the program of construction of multiple purpose water resources projects. This is especially important in the Pacific Northwest where the Federal Government and local, non-Federal interests have constructed billions of dollars worth of dams and water control reservoirs. A vital part of these projects is the development of electric power.

The need for electric power is nowhere more urgent than in my own Pacific Northwest. Unless new power projects are started within the next 2 years, the Northwest will face a serious power shortage by 1960. In fact, in the winter of 1952–53 we experienced brownouts and temporary shutdowns of industries. At present the creation of new industries is awaiting power from projects now being completed.

The people of my State and of the entire Pacific Northwest, however, realize that the responsibility for constructing new power projects does not rest solely on the Federal Government. They have wholeheartedly accepted the principle that local agencies should aid in the construction of multiple-purpose projects.

This principle was long ago outlined by President Eisenhower. In Seattle during the election campaign of 1952 the President sketched in a few words what is now the policy of the administration:

> We need resource development, and we need it on a river basin basis. We need resource development not to the limit of the whim of any administration in power, but to the limit of the capacity of the region to

benefit. And to do that, we need partnership to the limit of everyone's ability.

This principle strikes me as being a sound, efficient method to develop our natural resources. This is particularly apparent when such projects are small in nature and located within the service area of a locally owned utility. It seems entirely reasonable to me that such utilities should be allowed to relieve the Government of the power-generating and distribution costs of the project on a partnership basis.

I have today introduced a bill which represents an ideal partnership arrangement of this sort.

In the Willamette Basin in Oregon there have been authorized by Congress, two important multiple purpose water-resources projects. Both projects are primarily flood-control structures.

During the second session of the last Congress, however, both were authorized for the installation of power-generating facilities.

These projects are located in the heart of the territory served by two of Oregon's most successful electric utilities. One of these is publicly owned and the other is privately owned. These utilities are the Eugene Water and Electric Board, an arm of the city of Eugene, Oreg., and the Pacific Power & Light Co., a privately owned company whose service area includes a large section of the Willamette Valley.

The municipally owned utility was organized in 1911. It serves the parent city and a portion of the surrounding area. The total population in the area served is approximately 80,000. The board which administers the utility operation has made an outstanding record in the United States of efficiency, economy, and vision in the construction and operation of its electric system. In the 1954 report of the Federal Power Commission, the city of Eugene was cited as having the lowest residential electric rates of any city in the United States of over 2,500 population. The city owns and operates hydroelectric and steam generating facilities which supply the bulk of the community's power needs. This city's system is in need of the power which will be generated at the Cougar Dam. The city already has transmission lines which run close to the Cougar Dam site. It is logical, therefore, that the city of Eugene should be allowed to pay for and use the power facilities at the Cougar Dam.

The Pacific Power & Light Co. has been in business since 1910 and today serves 261,000 customers in a large area. It supplies electric service to all the principal communities affected by the flood-control problem on the Santiam River. In view of the fact that this company is at present the only electric utility serving the area and since it too has transmission lines in the vicinity, it is the logical utility to become the local participant in the construction of Green Peter project. The power that will be produced at the Green Peter Dam will not only benefit the region but also will materially strengthen the local power supply of a section of the State which has experienced tremendous growth in the wood products industries during recent years.

Both of these utilities have done a complete and thorough job in engineering and planning for the future power needs of their customers. It has become imperative that these utilities develop additional electric-generating facilities due to the rapid increase in the population of their service areas and the continuing industrial development of the Pacific Northwest.

When the present administration announced its policy of encouraging local participation in multiple-purpose projects, both the city of Eugene and the Pacific Power & Light Co. made separate engineering studies of the projects I have mentioned.

The bill I have introduced today permits the Federal Government through the Corps of Army Engineers to make contracts with local utilities, either publicly or privately owned, for participation in the Cougar and Green Peter projects. The local interests would pay for and operate the power facilities, including the reregulating dams. The participating utilities would also share such proportionate costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of the two flood-control dams and reservoirs as may be charged to power development in accordance with the separable cost remaining benefits method of cost allocation, as set out in the report made by the Federal Interagency Basin Subcommittee on Benefits and Costs, dated May 1950. The participating utilities will, of course, be licensed by the Federal Power Commission and will be subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act as well as to the provisions of the bill I have introduced. The power generated at both dams will be sent into the Northwest power pool and thereby become a part of the power resource of the whole region.

Although the additional power which will be obtained from these two flood-control dams is badly needed in the area, the flood-control benefits to be obtained from the dams are of far greater importance to the communities. The people there realize that the passage of the bill I have introduced will hasten the time when the urgently needed flood-control benefits can be realized by reducing the amount of Federal appropriations required.

Both of these projects are fundamentally flood-control structures. They were originally authorized by Congress for that purpose. These two dams are the only major units in the Willamette Basin flood-control system which are not either completed or under construction. Flood-control damage which these projects will eliminate annually amounts to more than $2 million.

Under the terms of the partnership proposal which this bill authorizes, the non-Federal agencies would pay the total cost of the power features and would also contribute a portion of the cost of the flood-control structure. In the case of Cougar this means a payment of the city of Eugene of $11 million toward a total cost of $37 million. In the Green Peter-White Bridge project, the company would pay about $29 million toward a total cost of $58 million.

The two projects would have a total capacity of 135,000 kilowatts and would annually produce 436 million kilowatt-hours of energy. The power from these projects will integrate perfectly with all other power developments in the Pacific Northwest. Lines of both the city of Eugene and the Pacific Power & Light Co. are tied in with the Northwest power pool and their system operations are geared to the benefit of the entire region.

These projects are vitally needed by my State. The partnership proposal, with local agencies contributing $40 million of the total cost, will lead to their early completion.

This proposal represents a forward step in the thinking of the people of my State. In this bill we have a public agency and a private power company joined in a common endeavor to provide power for their customers and, at the same time, to hasten the development of two critically needed flood-control projects.

This proposal has received the overwhelming endorsement of both houses of the Oregon Legislature. A memorial seeking partnership construction of the projects was overwhelmingly approved within recent days and has been presented to the Congress.

During the second session of the 83d Congress a bill authorizing the participation of the city of Eugene in the Cougar project was unanimously approved by this House and was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works. Due to the last minute press of business in the Senate, it did not receive final action.

These specific projects received unqualified support from President Eisenhower in his January 17 budget message. I now quote from page M65 of that message:

> My recommendations are intended to encourage States and local public and private groups to take the initiative in developing our valuable water resources with Federal cooperation where national interests are involved. This budget includes $20 million under proposed legislation to enable the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to participate, in 1956, in partnership water developments. Five million dollars of this amount is proposed for three multiple-purpose projects with power facilities in the Pacific Northwest. It is expected that local interests will install and operate the power facilities of the Cougar and Green Peter-White Bridge projects in Oregon and that the Corps of Engineers will build the flood control and other facilities in which there is a national interest.

This plan is a straightforward proposal which will give the State urgently needed power and flood control. It is a partial answer to the critical power problem which faces the Pacific Northwest. Under the partnership, everything is accomplished that could be accomplished by all-Federal development, and at a cost saving to the Federal Treasury of $40 million.

We have before us an opportunity to do exactly what the President of the United States has suggested as a sound basis for public improvement, where the Government undertakes to supply the

money for that portion of the improvement which is of national interest, and local interests are prepared to put up every dollar of the cost where they and they alone can use the resulting benefit. I am hopeful that this legislation will receive early and favorable consideration at the hands of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD on this subject:

H. R. 4662

A bill to reduce the cost to the United States for the development of flood control, navigation, and irrigation in the Willamette River Basin, Oreg., by providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of power facilities and appurtenances at the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork of the McKenzie River, Oreg., and the construction, operation, and maintenance of power facilities and appurtenances at the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir and construction, operation, and maintenance of the White Bridge Dam and Reregulating Reservoir (including power-generating facilities and appurtenances) on the Middle Santiam River, Oreg., to be done with funds advanced by licensees; said facilities, to the extent of local participation therein to be subject to the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act

Be it enacted, etc., That the comprehensive plan for the improvement of the Willamette River Basin, Oreg., as authorized by act of Congress, approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, including the act of Congress approved September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1265), is hereby modified to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the power-generating facilities and appurtenances at the Cougar Dam on the South Fork of the McKenzie River, Oreg., and for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the power-generating facilities and appurtenances of the Green Peter Dam together with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the White Bridge Dam and Reregulating Reservoir (including power-generating facilities and appurtenances) on the Middle Santiam River, Oreg., under licenses issued in accordance with the terms of the Federal Power Act and with this act.

SEC. 2. The power-generating facilities and appurtenances including White Bridge Dam and Reregulationg Reservoir (as described in sec. 1, hereof) of the respective projects may be constructed by the respective licensees hereunder, or, in the alternative, such facilities may be constructed by the Corps of Engineers as agents for the respective licensees with funds advanced therefor by such licensees. Construction pursuant to this section shall be in accord with the provisions of licenses to be issued by the Federal Power Commission in accordance with the Federal Power Act and this act. The respective licensees shall operate and maintain the power-generating facilities and appurtenances including White Bridge Dam and Reregulating Reservoir at their own cost and expense subject to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. The Cougar Dam and Reservoir and the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir shall remain the property of the United States and shall, except as specified in section 2 above, be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers. The respective licensees shall pay to the United States, through the Department of the Army, such proportionate shares of the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir, and the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir as may be appropriately allocated to power development by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army in collaboration with the Federal Power Commission, in conformity with the separable-cost-remaining-benefits method of cost allocation as recommended by the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Subcommittee on Benefits and Costs in its report dated May 1950 or by such other method as may be mutually agreed upon by the licensees and the Secretary of the Army and approved by the Federal Power Commission.

SEC. 4. The Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to enter into agreements with the respective licensees for the operation of the dams and reservoirs insofar as such operation affects the production of power so as to secure the maximum multiple benefits from the operation of the dams and reservoirs as set out in the comprehensive plan of improvement for the Willamette River Basin, Oregon, referred to in section 1 hereof, and for the advancement of funds by the respective licensees, in accordance with the provisions of this act, and for other matters incident to the construction, operation, and maintenance of said projects. Such agreements shall be for such periods as may be consistent with the terms of the licenses issued by the Federal Power Commission, and any renewals or extensions thereof, and may be amended from time to time by mutual agreement.

SEC. 5. (a) If no application for a license to construct the power facilities at the Cougar Dam and Reservoir is filed with the Federal Power Commission within 2 years from the date of approval of this act, or if such application for a license is denied, or if construction is not commenced and carried out within such reasonable period of time as may be fixed by the Federal Power Commission, the entire Cougar Dam and Reservoir, including power facilities, shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Department of the Army, as provided in the act of Congress approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, including the act of Congress approved September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1265), as though this act were not enacted.

(b) If no application for a license to construct the power facilities at Green Peter Dam and Reservoir and to construct the White Bridge dam and reregulating reservoir is filed with the Federal Power Commission within 2 years from the date of the approval of this act, or if such application for a license is denied, or if construction is not commenced and carried out within such reasonable period of time as may be fixed by the Federal Power Commission, the entire Green Peter Dam and Reservoir and the White Bridge dam and reregulating reservoir, including power facilities at both sites, shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Department of the Army, as provided in the act of Congress approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress, including the act of Congress approved September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1265), as though this act were not enacted.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include copy of a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked and have been given permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter. I expect to speak today on the Hoover Commission and encouraging the family-sized farm and concerning a bill that has been introduced and also to include some correspondence in opposition to the proposal to sell the synthetic rubber plants. Some action must be taken pretty soon or they will be sold. I also expect to speak on credit unions.

Mr. Speaker, during the last week there has been a lot of publicity that has not been helpful to Members of Congress. This publicity leaves the impression that Members of Congress have permitted some great scandals to grow up and that the Members of Congress are not making any effort to correct these scandals. The information comes from the Hoover Commission.

One bit of information came out last Friday, published in the Washington Daily News, which stated in effect that the Government is wasting $4 billion a year on red tape documents and correspondence. It was stated that this is costing the people $100 a year per family to cover the cost of this unnecessary and wasteful paper work. I think that is very bad publicity for the Congress. I cannot believe it is true. I am ready to be convinced if there is any evidence to convince me because I certainly do not want $4 billion spent in wasteful correspondence. I do not want even $1 spent in wasteful correspondence. So I shall await with interest any proof that may be submitted.

On Saturday, March 5, 1955 the picture of a very intelligent looking, and I may say charming looking, lady was shown in the Washington Daily News. Under the picture it was stated that she has been appointed by the Hoover Commission to study ways and means of shortening and cutting down the 4 million letters that are being mailed daily by the United States Government at a cost of $1 a letter. It is rather startling to me to think we are mailing 4 million letters a day at a cost of $1 a letter. That runs into a lot of letters and a lot of money very soon, about $20 million a week, which in the course of 12 months would add up to considerably over $1 billion. Even that large estimate does not jibe with another Hoover Commission estimate of $4 billion a year.

The thought occurs to me, Why should not congressional committees look into this? Why should we be told by an outside group, that is not elected by the people, about these things when it has not been presented to a congressional committee? Why should an outside group appoint someone to find out something for Congress? And then, in the district I am privileged to represent, last week more than one weekly newspaper mentions an item which must have been sent out to weekly newspapers generally, or it would not have appeared in more

than one of the papers, but the item says that when "750,000 people are employed to do a job that Herbert Hoover says could be handled by 10,000, it is high time some sort of a change should go into effect." Well, I never heard of 750,000 people being employed to do a job that 10,000 could do. I never heard that here in Washington, D. C., or in the United States Congress. But, that is rather sensational and borders on emotional propaganda.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman said that he did not understand why the Hoover Commission should be called upon to do that. Now, perhaps there are two answers. One is—and I recall this very distinctly—when the Hoover Commission was created the argument was that the Congress could not do it, and another reason, perhaps, was that when we did suggest something to the executive departments, they did not follow along. But, unless I am mistaken, did not the gentleman vote for that approximately $2 million to create the Hoover Commission and have it carry on its activities?

Mr. PATMAN. I did the first time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. And the gentleman correctly stated there that the argument was made that the Executive was lax in making these changes, but I think he is incorrect in saying that the Executive would not make the changes when called to his attention, because the very resolution itself calls for the Executive to make the changes that they recommend, where it can be done under reorganization, so certainly we would not be placed in the inconsistent position of voting for a resolution to cause changes to be made, because the Executive would not make them, and yet call upon that same Executive to make the changes that are recommended. That part does not seem to be very consistent to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. First I want to thank the gentleman, and I appreciate very deeply that concession of yours that I may be 50 percent right. That is a little above the average, perhaps. And, again, as part of your criticism, it cannot be due to the fact that these suggestions were made by a commission headed by Mr. Hoover, could it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; that would not necessarily enter into it. Look at the facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. There have been so many, many things charged up to the Hoover administration.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. Well, Mr. Hoover said himself that he was honored by having the Hoover depression named for him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And he did recall, too, that the Democratic Congress had rejected practically everything of any value in his recommmendations.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, he did not correctly state that. I do not agree with the gentleman there. The Democratic Congress tried to help save the country, and he even refused to cooperate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And you just came along and closed the banks, did you not?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Hoover caused it. But, they were, in effect, closed when Mr. Hoover went out, because his policies had been very damaging to our country, and his policies were devastating to our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, and if that was true, you recall that Mr. Roosevelt said that that was not Mr. Hoover's baby. He would not even wet nurse it a little bit.

Mr. PATMAN. I would rather discuss that some other time with the gentleman, if he would like to do that. It would be a pleasure to do it, because there is another side to what the gentleman has brought up, I assure you.

Referring again to the Hoover Commission—yes, I voted for it. That was in 1947, the beginning of the 80th Congress, when President Truman was persuaded that if he would just bring ex-President Hoover back into the Government—Mr. Hoover had been President, he had served under Woodrow Wilson, who had started Mr. Hoover out pretty well, he had been Secretary of Commerce, had held all these poistions, and was in a good position to know something about the executive branch of the Government—it would serve a good purpose. Mr. Truman agreed to the creation of the Commission, with Mr. Hoover to be Chairman of the Commission, and for an outstanding Democrat to be vice chairman. They wanted it to be bipartisan; 7 Democrats and 7 Republicans. He thought that would be a fine thing. Congress voted for it unanimously. I voted for it. It sounded like a reasonable thing. During the first Hoover Commission, with their first reorganization plan, it was strictly bipartisan; there is no question about that. The Democrats had as much power as the Republicans. But in 1953 another Hoover Commission was set up and strange as it may seem, the word "bipartisan" was taken out of the resolution creating it. I discovered just recently that we do not have a Hoover bipartisan commission any more. It is a partisan commission. There are more Republicans on it than Democrats and they do not represent themselves to be a bipartisan commission.

If this was going to be a bipartisan matter under Mr. Truman, we should have had some outstanding Democrat as vice chairman—somebody like Mr. Acheson who was selected. Then when the Republicans came in, if they wanted to continue its work as bipartisan, they should have had an outstanding Democrat as chairman with Mr. Hoover as vice chairman. That is the way bipartisanship should work, as I see it. But instead of having the Commission with Mr. Hoover as vice chairman and an outstanding Democrat as chairman under the Republican administration, they struck out the word "bipartisan," indicating thereby that it was going to be a partisan commission. They made Mr. Hoover chairman and had no vice chairman at all.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is a great believer in carrying out the strict letter of the law. The resolution providing for a second Hoover Commission said that the Commission "shall" select a chairman and a vice chairman. The language was mandatory. Ordinarily people carry out the plain letter of the law. Oftentimes they will debate whether the spirit of the law is so and so or such and such, but they never debate on the question of the strict letter of the law. But the Hoover Commission did debate on the strict letter of the law and elected Mr. Hoover chairman but refused—I will not say refused, but they have never had an opportunity to vote on a vice chairman. They do not have any vice chairman. They never have had any although the law says that they shall select a chairman and a vice chairman.

The gentleman agrees that they should not have done that, does he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They should have done what?

Mr. PATMAN. They should have had a vice chairman and carried out the law, should they not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman is yielding to me, I think they should.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; I know the gentleman agrees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit me to finish my answer to his question?

Mr. PATMAN. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will not the gentleman acknowledge that the way things are going now it is pretty difficult to find anyone to serve as a Democrat or a Republican? There are so many New Deal Republicans and there are so many conservative Democrats that it is rather difficult to find a person to fill the bill. Moreover, does not the gentleman think that the way it is going along now it is all right?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What about that report that came in by this task force?

Mr. PATMAN. I was just referring to this sensational, emotional propaganda that is being sent out by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman; that is all wrong. They should not have anything emotional in it.

Mr. PATMAN. To continue, President Eisenhower selected some mighty good men in his Cabinet. I do not take any issue with him on his selections. He selected one of the ablest business men in the United States of America when he selected Mr. Wilson, the head of General Motors, as Secretary of Defense. I have Mr. Wilson's statement right here.

Mr. Wilson got out a pamphlet, You and Your USA—Your Representative in Government—It Is Your Town Council, Your State Government in Washington—Your Government Depends on You—Study the Issues and Study the Candidates, Then Vote.

That is a wonderful pamphlet, and I want to commend Mr. Wilson for getting it out. It is 11 pages long. This

pamphlet is intended for servicemen, who vote, of course. In this pamphlet, it says here on page 6:

Most pressure groups are watching out for the interests of some group of people. However, there are two phases we should know about. First, we should not permit a pressure group to force through a proposal which will benefit one group at the expense of all the rest of us. Second, pressure groups sometimes use unethical means to achieve their objectives. In trying to win public support they often arouse emotions and avoid the appeal to good judgment. Any organization which attempts to influence people by taking advantage of their prejudices is employed un-American methods of persuasion. The American way is through an appeal to the intelligence.

What confused me is that when Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, who got out this very excellent pamphlet, and he correctly described un-American activities, I am just afraid he is going to call the Hoover Commission an un-American group for putting out this emotional, highly prejudicial material, and I do not want him to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who published that pamphlet?

Mr. PATMAN. It is published at Government expense. The Secretary of Defense put it out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not quite understand how this Hoover Commission can be so partisan when it or a commission created at the President's request came out the other day with a report on the public housing bill that the President had sent down. The gentleman noticed that, did he not?

Mr. PATMAN. Now, listen. I know the gentleman is one of the cleverest lawyers in this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Answer that question, please.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but I want to make this statement first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has the floor. He can do anything he pleases.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is one of the cleverest Members of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I protest. The gentleman is assailing me.

Mr. PATMAN. When a humble Member of Congress like myself gets up to talk about something that I know a little something about——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object. The gentleman is just saying that because I am helping to furnish him an audience.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has a habit of changing the subject to something that I do not know anything about from what I do know something about. So I am not going to yield to get clear off the subject. I will yield on this subject for anything the gentleman wants to ask.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was charging the Hoover Commission with being partisan in its activities. I asked the gentleman if he did not realize that just the other day the task force or a commission created at the President's request brought out a report which has since, I understand, been suppressed, condemning the Eisenhower school bill, Federal aid to education. That does not look as though it was very partisan.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course the gentleman might pick out things here and there, because those task forces are composed of nearly as many members as we have members of the House and Senate. We have farmed out to them a lot of our legislative work. They even have subpena power. They go out and have hearings. They have a conflict of interests, too. They have a right under the law to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We authorize them to do that.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. I say they have a right under the law to have fellows sitting up there as Members of Congress who have a personal interest. The conflict-of-interest statute does not provide anything against that in view of the exemption. They call them up and ask questions, then they get out the record. They probably might fix the record so that it would make it look pretty good the way they want it to go.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do I understand correctly that the gentleman from Michigan said the task force made a recommendation that was suppressed?

Mr. PATMAN. I heard him say that, but I do not know anything about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Either suppressed or the publication limited. I have not been able to get one yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think there is anything partisan about that. It is strange to say the least.

Mr. PATMAN. The point I am getting at next is this.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has been complaining about this Hoover Commission and apparently its desire to advance the interest of the Eisenhower administration. Is not the State of Texas partly to blame or to be congratulated for Mr. Eisenhower's election? Did not your State cast its vote for Mr. Eisenhower?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; under a misconception.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think they will do it any more.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But you will admit you made one mistake.

Mr. PATMAN. We sure did, we sure did, that is a majority did, and a lot of your people made that mistake too. I did not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; we do not think it is a mistake on our part.

Mr. PATMAN. As to this second part of this Hoover Commission, it is not right for the Members of Congress to farm out their duties anyway. Let us go back to fundamentals. The legislative branch of the Government, I think, is the greatest of the three branches of Government because it has all of its power directly from the people. You know under our system, everyone of the 435 Members of the House is elected every 2 years. No person who sits in the House of Representatives comes here unless it is as the result of a free election by direct vote of the people. No Member of this legislative body is an appointed Member. No Member has ever been appointed or ever will be appointed. They are all elected. If they are here as Representatives of the people, they are elected by the people, and that is a fine thing. Thus, the people have control and they can change the trend in the Government every 2 years, if there is the desire to change the trend in Government. Furthermore, the Founding Fathers made it possible under the constitution for this body, the House of Representatives, which is so close to the people, to have certain powers over the purse strings which the other body does not have. The reason is obvious. The people want the House of Representatives which is the body closest to them to have charge of the purse strings. Therefore, certain bills cannot be introduced except in the House of Representatives. Certain bills cannot be introduced in the other body at all. The Founding Fathers were wise in having that provision so that this body which is so close to the people would enable the people to control their Congress and the Government by controlling the purse strings. They control the purse strings of the Nation by controlling the House of Representatives. It was a wise thing to do.

We should not farm out these legislative duties. Here we have people under the Hoover Commission, with almost as many Members of the Congress representing special private interests and selfishly interested going out and holding hearings just like Members of the Congress with almost as many people as there are Members in the Congress, getting out reports and getting up legislative bills for us, and naturally they have a lot of steam behind them by the time they get to the Halls of Congress. Should that be allowed at all? Should not Congress do this work? The other day Congress properly provided extra pay for the Members of Congress. It should have been done a long time ago. We are getting a man-sized salary for the work we do. The Members of Congress are honest and sincere people. I do not believe that the people could improve on the Members we have here, and I am not now talking from the point of view of partisan politics, but I make that statement because I feel that the people in the long run always make a wise choice in selecting people to come to the Congress in both the House and the other body to represent them. That salary increase was not voted for, at least by myself, in the hope that the people could improve their representation from any district in the United States. That was not the object at all. It was just to pay people a salary comparable to what other people get in similar or like work in business and industry. It was a well

deserved and a long deserved raise. But now since we have that raise, I think we ought to increase it a little bit and have an administrative assistant who could help us. Last year, we saw a tax bill go rushing through the Congress. The bill was 900 pages long. It might have had 900 loopholes in it. I do not know. We have had testimony that there are a lot of loopholes in it since that time.

If we had had 435 administrative assistants looking over that bill, pulling it apart when it reached the floor of the House, we would have had some intelligent discussion of that bill and would have knocked out some of these loopholes; but the Members have not been equipped to do that. They should be equipped to do that. They should be equipped to do a good job. We should not have these Hoover Commissions. We should not have these commissions appointed by the President looking into veterans' benefits. Why does he not refer it to the people who are elected by the people? Why pick out the head of some big life insurance company or the head of Standard Oil and ask them to look into veterans' benefits? Why not turn it over to the people in the United States Congress who are responsible to the people? If they make a mistake the people will penalize them for it. We should not have these commissions. We should stop them, and the Congress should do the work itself.

ENCOURAGE THE FAMILY-SIZE FARM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago I called the attention of the Congress to the disastrous rate at which we are destroying our family farms. I pointed out how we are building up the huge, absentee-owned and operated factories in the field, and displacing nearly 75,000 small farm families each year.

We have just concluded the joint committee hearing on the President's Economic Report, and soon will have a report of our own ready for the Congress. I hope every Member will read it.

Surveying the American scene today, what do we find?

Giant banks are merging in the great cities, concentrating the financial power to hitherto undreamed of extent.

Industrial concerns are being merged faster than ever before, as small business struggles unequally to maintain itself in an economy that is more and more passing into fewer and fewer hands. It used to be that when we spoke of a billionaire corporation we were talking in theoretical possibilities; today we speak of such corporation in terms of actual fact. There are 68 billionaire corporations today, and they control over one-half of American business, according to testimony before our joint committee.

And finally, we see more and more small, independent farmers, 75,000 a year, forced from their land, their holdings swallowed up in big corporate farms, and themselves forced to go to the cities, there to hunt for jobs. This matter is of urgent concern to all of us, and that includes organized labor, which is increasingly pressured for jobs by the augmentation of the working force. It is not improbable that another 30,000 or 40,000 tradesmen, servicemen, and small merchants leave the small rural towns each year to go to the cities. The departure of the farm population strikes a continuing and deadly blow at the small town and the small merchant.

According to the latest figures I have been able to obtain, farm population has decreased more than 8 million since 1930, while our overall population has increased by some 41 million.

CONSIDERABLE INTEREST MANIFESTED

I confess that when I first spoke of this alarming situation a year ago, I feared that I might not even be heard, but the public reaction to what I said then has been overwhelming. Labor groups, churches, farm organizations, the Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Council of Churches of Christ in America are concerning themselves most seriously with the condition—the blight, if you please—that has stricken our farm economy.

We cannot go on destroying our independent family farmers and hope to remain a strong Nation. History teaches us that. Every upheaval and political dissolution in recorded history has proceeded from the amalgamation of land and natural resources in a few hands, and the denial of those blessings to their rightful owners, the people. We can no more escape this fact than we can escape the law of gravitation. The Communists built the Russian revolution of 1917 on the campaign to take the land away from the nobility and give it to the peasants; the Chinese most recently have built their own revolution, and their subversive campaigns throughout southeast Asia, on the same program of propaganda. In Italy, Germany, Japan, and now in southeast Asia, we have taken the lead in effecting a redistribution of the land to give the people farms upon which to work and earn or grow a living.

But at home, despite the disastrous rate at which the family farm is being wiped out, we have chosen pretty much to ignore the whole problem.

I should like to remind the Members of what Thomas Jefferson, who saw very clearly the value of a family farm population, wrote to John Jay in 1785:

> Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous, and they are tied to their country, and wedded to its liberty and interests, by the most lasting bonds.

The English historian, Arnold Toynbee, has this to say of the dissolution of Greece and Rome, which began on the farms:

> The next stage of technical advance was an increase in the scale of operations through the organization of mass production based on slave labor. Here the technical advance was offset by a grave social lapse, for the new plantation slavery was a far more serious social evil than the old domestic slavery. It was worse both morally and statistically. It was impersonal and inhuman, and it was on a grand scale. The social consequence was the depopulation of the countryside and the creation of a parasitic urban proletariat in the cities and more particularly in Rome itself. * * * Thus this social cancer eventually extinguished itself by causing the death of the society upon which it had fastened.

History furnishes us with no example by which we may console or lull ourselves in the thought that political upheaval and time of trouble does not inevitably follow the dissolution of a family farm society.

LIMIT GOVERNMENT BENEFITS

That was why I proposed more than a year ago that we act to devise a program of support for the family farm, and that we limit the Government benefits which might be derived by the big, absentee-owned factory farms. That is why I proposed that we limit the Government payments to the family farm level of gross annual product, and that we allow all farmers to participate in the benefits up to that level of $7,000 gross product, and thereafter cut off any benefit payments. I renew that proposal today. I said then, and I repeat it, that after the farmer has received benefit payments up to the family-farm level of gross annual product, $7,000, he should receive no benefits above that level of product; and if he should produce $25,000, or $50,000, or a million dollars' worth of cotton, corn, wheat, or any other product, he should not be allowed to draw Government benefits for that amount. He should sell on the free market without the benefit of Government assistance any amount of product above $7,000.

Thus I would provide full parity price support up to that level of production. Thus we would give full support to the 80 percent of farmers who sell $7,000 or less of product each year, and we would immediately cut off the operators of enormous farms who are producing for the Government market in enormous quantities and swamping us with surpluses.

We have been and are still paying enormous and undeserved Government subsidies to these factory farmers, encouraging them to produce more and paying them more Government money with which they can expand at the expense of the general taxpayer. Since I first spoke, I have found that great numbers of citizens are becoming aware of this situation and will support a program designed to limit benefits to the family-sized farm. I have literally hundreds of letters testifying to this fact.

SPARKMAN-PATMAN BILL

I am advised that the President soon will submit his farm recommendations to Congress. It is my earnest hope that the program will include positive measures to provide family-farm supports without allowing at the same time an undue enrichment of mass-production farmers; and second, that the program will provide measures for assisting with credits, technical assistance, and other means the more than 1 million farmers who produce and sell less than $1,000 of product each year. I hope the measures will be along the lines of the credit assistance bills introduced recently by Senator SPARKMAN and myself. By limiting the benefit payments to the average family-farm income level, to sustain that income; by giving assistance to our underprivileged farmers; and by cutting out unjust enrichment of the huge farmers, we can have a realistic and sound farm program.

Some of our economists and others tell us that we simply have to have consolidations and elimination of the small farmer in the name of efficiency. I take it they mean technical efficiency. I am waiting for them to speak up in the name of social efficiency, which means keeping a healthy economy, providing the greatest good for the greatest number of persons, including farmers. We know for a surety that the age of automation is upon us; we cannot possibly foresee the vast developments of automation that will come within the next 10 years; nor the possible effects on employment. But we can foretell without any difficulty that whatever the effects of automation may be, they will be compounded by the steady displacement of some 150,000 small farmers, artisans, and merchants each year, and their addition to the surplus-labor pool. It will simply create more unemployment pressure, more relief loads, more unemployment compensation payments.

How much better it would be then—for the farmer, for labor in the city, for small business, and even for big business, too—to have a workable family-farm program that would enable the family farmer to stay where he wants to be and where he belongs—on his own farm—and a program that would enable those in the city who might wish to return to the farm to do so with a reasonable surety of being able to make a living.

I believe that, if we enacted the program I have proposed, this objective would be achieved.

Lower prices—without hurting the family farmer in the least, who comprises over 80 percent of all our farm families—would enable us to regain in part our foreign markets. Lower prices would amount to an automatic wage increase for all of our wage and salary earners.

The factory farmer would be given a direct and compelling incentive to cease production for Government market and to break up and sell or rent his vast holdings to those families who now need and want land but cannot have it under our present system.

I have been asked what the family farm - production payments program would cost, based upon providing full parity for gross annual product up to $7,000 per year. The question is a fair one, and the only answer is that it is impossible to tell with any finality. I have made rough calculations which show that it might be as low as three-fourths billion dollars per year, and as high as $3 billion. A great part of the cost of the program could be borne by funds derived from the liquidation of our present surpluses down to reasonable stockpile levels. We need a stockpile as insurance against wars, droughts, floods, and other emergencies. But a part of the cost could be taken up by liquidation of our present surpluses to those reasonable levels.

In our capitalistic system which we all approve velocity of money helps the country as much as volume of money. Every dollar placed in the hands of a person who spends it causes $1 more to enter the blood stream of business and commerce. It will travel and travel fast from hand to hand and from business to business. If it only reaches 20 people in a year who pay the equivalent of 5 percent on it in income taxes to the Federal Government the dollar will be entirely repaid to the Federal Treasury.

Interestingly enough, Secretary Benson has submitted a report on the use of production payments in the dairy industry. It is printed as House Document No. 57, 84th Congress, 1st session, and is dated January 5. On page 9 of that report, it shows—and the Secretary's staff prepared the study—that the substitution of production payments instead of loan-purchase storage would greatly increase consumption of milk products, bring down food prices without depleting the farmer's income, and that the total overall cost increase to the Government by production payments would be $350 million at 75 percent of parity, and $1,225,000,000 at 90 percent of parity. I have had some other calculations prepared on the basis of the Department of Agriculture report.

These figures show that consumers would buy 3.2 billion pounds more of milk and milk products. The payments program would cost them $350 million more as taxpayers, but their milk products would cost them $100 million less as consumers. The studies show that as consumers the public would benefit, while as taxpayers the public would pay slightly more to sustain the programs. This, too, is without any limitation of benefits to family-sized producers such as I have proposed. Such a program would have the advantage of reducing food costs generally, but of particular importance to the low income, large-sized worker families which form the mass consuming base of the country; while the added cost, $1,225,000,000 at the most without any limitations of production payments, would be borne by the groups which pay income taxes in accordance with their earnings.

Such a program should be undertaken for a trial run, and then improved upon as our experience directed.

I am glad that the Department of Agriculture is coming around to see some merit in such a program, and in fact, it has adopted just this program—again without limitations—in respect to wool production.

This program of payments plus limitations was first proposed more than a year ago by one of the finest Americans I have ever known, Mr. E. G. Shinner, of Chicago, a retired successful businessman. I believe that we will have to come to such a program; if we do not do so willingly and with foresight, we will be forced to do so by the stern logic of social efficiency, and the necessity to maintain a strong farm economy.

Some economists, as I said, disagree with the suggested program on the ground that it would subsidize or underwrite inefficiency. I do not agree with this. The factory farms, employing seasonal hired labor, would not make such a mark of efficiency if they were required to pay minimum wages, unemployment compensation, and other benefits commonly required of factory-type production.

Recently Mr. Shinner sent out letters explaining his program to many members of the National Grange. You will note that in his original letter he suggested the possibility of a graduated-support system. I make that point because this is an effort to reach an equitable and workable program that supports the family farm, sustains our economy, and proposes to withdraw the benefits from those only who do not need them.

Mr. Speaker, I place Mr. Shinner's original letter in my remarks at this point:

THE SHINNER FOUNDATION,
Chicago, Ill., December 17, 1954.

Nearly everyone agrees that some form of farm-price support is necessary to insure our whole economy against the effects of an agricultural depression, and that neither the present flexible supports nor high rigid supports are the final answer.

Your organization, the National Grange, has advocated a two-price system for wheat which would permit it to drop to the market price but provide that the farmer get a payment on that portion of his wheat used for domestic food; payments to the farmers to be made from money collected from the processors who use the wheat for domestic food products.

Your organization, likewise, is a valiant defender of the family-type pattern of agriculture.

I would like to have your reaction to a proposal that uses the adjustment-payment principle in your wheat plan to accomplish a little different end—family income support instead of a particular commodity price support. The suggestion is:

That new farm legislation be enacted which would provide for direct payments to farmers, in the place of a general price support, for the entire crop; that support be limited to the family-size farm on a graduated basis substantially along the following lines: 100 percent of parity on the first $7,500 of gross production, 90 percent of parity on the next $2,500 of gross production, 80 percent of parity on the next $2,500 of gross production, 70 percent of parity on the next $2,500 of gross production; thereby bringing the total amount of farm products on which a farmer could earn a payment up to a maximum of $15,000; any production beyond this amount to be sold in the open market without benefit of Government support.

Payments would be the difference between the support level and the open-market price. Any payment which a given farmer may have earned during a calendar year would be paid to him in accordance with a report filed with his annual income-tax return. It is suggested that the Government maintain the ever-normal-granary idea, both to moderate commodity price fluctuations and to provide a reserve against floods, droughts, wars, or other emergencies.

Very sincerely yours,

E. G. SHINNER,
Chairman, the Shinner Foundation.

P. S.—The writer spent many years of his life on a farm and is seeking to advance this idea purely on his belief that it is in the interest of the general welfare.

E. G. S.

A great many of these letters were sent to the National Grange headquarters here in Washington for comment, as the members were plainly impressed by the equity of the Shinner program. So many letters were sent in that on January 26, 1955, the Grange economist, Dr. Lloyd C. Halvorson, replied directly to Mr. Shinner. Mr. Speaker, I place Dr.

Halvorson's reply in my remarks at this point:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1955.

Mr. E. G. SHINNER,
Chairman, the Shinner Foundation,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SHINNER: We have received a number of letters from you. Many letters were forwarded to us by our members. We also acknowledge receipt of the two enclosures.

If we want to maximize the utility of farm products already produced, or if we want to maximize the potential utility-producing capacity of our agricultural resources, we should allow the free market to reign. (This is generally true, but possibly not in all cases). The problem is, of course, that if we so rely on the free market, farm income is unsatisfactory. Now we can raise farm income either by interfering with the free market so as to increase the gross and net income of farmers, or we can leave the free market alone and raise farm income by direct subsidies.

As you may know, for farm products with an inelastic[1] demand it is possible to raise the gross and net income by curtailing the supply. In some cases production is not curtailed and instead the surplus is in effect bought by the Government. Here the taxpayer's money is used to buy the surplus, and in such cases, we believe, the Government has a responsibility to see that the surplus is not wasted but it is used to some advantage. When the production of a commodity has not been curtailed and the surplus is at hand, the attainment of a certain producer's income might not cost the taxpayers any more through the direct payment route than through the nonrecourse loan or purchase agreement route. However, if the demand for the product was very inelastic, the direct payment route would cost taxpayers considerably more than the nonrecourse or purchase agreement route. However, the total cost of the direct payment route to the American people (taxes plus consumer expenditures for the commodity) would be no greater and the people would be ahead by having the product to consume rather than to pay storage on.

Aside from economics, many people consider it a political evil for farmers to be dependent upon the Treasury, that is upon politicians for part of their income, and for consumers to have food at low free-market prices, below a price which would reflect an American standard of living to farmers.

There is and always will be some stigma upon those citizens of our country who receive a direct subsidy from our Government. Direct subsidies will always be looked upon as a dole or handout. Farmers are a self-reliant group and want to earn their income in the market place. If the free market does not give them a return for their labor and investment comparable to that received in industry and commerce, they want to see adjustments made in the market place. Farmers feel that the main reason for their low income is that the small size of farms and the large number of them puts them at a disadvantage in the market place, and that this situation needs some remedy.

A direct payment program for all farm commodities, or just the major ones including livestock and livestock products, would have cost the Treasury several billion dollars a year during the 1930's. Of course, the total cost to the American people of raising farm income this much above the free market level would be the same by either the price or subsidy method, but in the one case most of it comes from taxpayers, and in the other through the price system. The incidence of the cost of raising farm income is much different in the two cases and some feel it is morally wrong to put the cost upon our taxpayers rather than upon the consumers. Raising farm income through the direct payment route, because it increases taxes, may have more of a stultifying effect on our national economy than doing it through the price system.

The school of thought which favors the direct payment route points out that to raise farm income through the price route involves a curtailment of production or the withdrawal of supplies from the market. This reduces the supply of food and fiber available for consumption, and this is contrary to a rising standard of living. It is, they say, a philosophy of scarcity. Also, this school of thought points out that if we try to raise farm income through the price or market route, we regiment farmers in their production and we get Government into business, and, even worse, we destroy the resource allocating function of price. However, even the compensatory payment method, unless done in a particular way, would also be guilty on this charge.

If Congress implemented your farm program with its schedule of support prices (100 percent of parity on first $7,500 gross production down to 70 percent of parity for $15,000 gross), it would likely get production more out of balance with consumer demand than anything I can imagine. The support level has to be related somehow to the commodity's doing in the market place or else there has to be production control. For example, under your schedule, the farmers could all shift to producing cabbage, if that parity price were especially attractive. Your schedule of supports from 100 percent of parity for small farms down to 70 percent for large farms would continue in existence, even if we raised enough cabbage to make a stone wall all around our country 20 feet high and 10 feet wide.

Apparently you would abolish the tobacco program and let anyone grow tobacco. Any small farmer (under $7,500 gross) would get 100 percent of parity. What would you do with all the tobacco that would be produced?

We recognize that the policy of using restriction of production (beyond simple adjustment or balance within agriculture itself) as a means of raising net farm income is of debatable soundness, because of the often repeated indictment that it is a philosophy of scarcity. Our two-price plan on wheat would not require production control after the present accumulated surpluses were disposed of, but the amount of wheat that would be supported at or near parity would be directly related to the quantity sold for cereal food uses, rather than according to size of farms as you propose.

I could go into the direct-payment plans proposed by farm economists, starting about 1945 to show how they are more realistic than your proposal, but I cannot take the time.

Some people doubt that a direct-payment system would be administratively feasible. They feel that farmers should, in collusion with local buyers, show larger sales, the basis of subsidy, than they really had. Also, it would not make sense to pay a direct subsidy of a few dollars to millions of farmers if the purchase of a few hundred carloads of the product at a certain time would have obviated the need of this gigantic administrative task.

The direct-payment method would mean cheap food for those who are employed, and even those with good jobs. Some argue that these people should pay farmers a price in the market place reflecting a fair rate of return for labor and investment and that the surplus should be disposed of to people who are unemployed, are handicapped, or are unable to afford an adequate diet for some reason or other. In other words, these people feel the stamp plan is superior to the direct-subsidy plan.

For storable commodities it may be wise for the Government to carry some reserve, but for perishables this is rather impractical or unwise.

The Grange program does not favor the direct-payment method as a general method of supporting farm income for the reasons advanced against it above, but we do recognize that in some cases it may be the best method of supporting the income of some commodity producers, especially in the perishable field. Even then we believe it should be used as a last resort if other methods are unsatisfactory.

You favor reducing payments for farms with a gross income over $7,500. About 800,000 farmers do have gross sales in excess of $7,500. We know that many of these are efficient family-sized farms. I do not think we should discriminate against efficiency nor put a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture. Some businessmen have Cadillacs and vacation in Florida. We should allow capable people to prosper in agriculture just as people in other fields than agriculture are allowed to prosper.

We do believe it is sounder for America to have her food and fiber supply produced by people who largely own or rent the land they operate rather than by people who are only employees with indefinite tenure. Our agricultural communities would be lacking much if they were not made up of independent owners with enough security of tenure to have community pride and to take an active part in civic affairs. We probably get a more equal distribution of income with a family-type agriculture than we would with a corporate-type agriculture seeking cheap labor.

Another point of view is that society does not really sanction the subsidization of the income of people who are really well-to-do. A taxpayer of small means really wonders why he should pay taxes so that someone with a $200,000 wheat or cotton crop can have even more income. Especially this is true when some big farmers say they can produce for less than the support price. Of course, on this premise we really get to the question of why do we subsidize the income of family-sized farms and not the income of city people no better off or even worse off than family farmers.

To a large degree we can defend the farm program on the basis that it provides (1) needed reserves, (2) eliminates extreme and harmful price fluctuations, (3) promotes technological progress, (4) gives agriculture better merchandising methods, and, more nearly, equal bargaining power (we do not look upon the large Government acquirements of surpluses in recent years under the loan program as normal), and (5) promotes soil conservation. If these devices raise farm income, even for the better farmer, maybe it is fully justified.

As for the low-income farmer, we believe there are better ways to help him than give him a subsidy for being poor. We must try to get them into situations where they can make more productive use of their efforts, in particular combine their brains and brawn with more land and capital. We need more education and credit to aid them to reach desirable income levels based on their own productivity. What we need is equal opportunity—not a handicap race.

We believe in more equal distribution of income, not by taking from the productive and giving to the poor by subsidy, but rather by making our economic machine reflect fairness in income distribution for equal effort and by raising the productivity of those who lack knowledge or capital, or lack opportunity for their labor to be used productively.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpt entitled "The 1953–54 Recession, the Paradox

[1] "Inelastic demand" means that even though a larger quantity is sold, the price drop is so great that less income is received for the larger volume.

of Efficiency," you seem to think that efficiency caused the recession. You seem to be practically against increased efficiency. We can hardly agree with this thinking. We agree that as our society becomes more productive and further above the level of necessities, we can well give thought to sacrificing efficiency for some other values. For example, we may want to preserve and promote the family-sized farms, even if they should not be as efficient as large corporate farms. Similarly, we might feel that small-business people are the bulwark of democracy and the kingpin of community welfare and improvement. As such, we might want to preserve them, even if big business and chains are so efficient as to drive them out. However, we need considerable sociologic research before we decide that some forms of business organization are so good that we should sacrifice efficiency to preserve them. Big business is showing more and more recognition of the necessity of the company itself and their top executives contributing to the welfare of the community and its development educationally, esthetically, and culturally.

We are in full accord with the objective of preserving a fair basis of competition between small and big business. It is vicious and unsound to allow a big business to put out of existence a small and more efficient business if it does so by lowering its prices only in the territory of this small, efficient business. It is also unsound to allow big business to grow bigger simply because of its greater bargaining power in buying from manufacturers, but if this benefits consumers, we must allow it to continue, and small business must find some way to also buy from manufacturers at favorable prices. Many small businesses have formed buying cooperatives in order to get the same advantages of large-scale purchases from manufacturers that big chains already have. There are certain economies in large-scale purchasing that we need to preserve.

We believe that by preserving an equality of opportunity, and by preserving the right of cooperative marketing and purchasing, without unfair taxes or other burdens, that family-sized farms will meet the competition of corporation farms very well. Family-sized farms are getting larger and should even grow larger because with mechanization a family can farm more land than ever before. To try to preserve a larger number of people on farms than is needed with present technology is to divide the national farm income among more people than necessary with the result that the per capita income in agriculture would be much too low. If we tried to force consumers to pay more for food than the free market would charge, we would probably have to go in for curtailed agricultural production or for direct payments from the Treasury. All this, in order to keep more people on farms than necessary at satisfactory incomes, hardly makes sense. The fewer people any nation has in food and fiber production, the more people it has for producing television, cars, etc.

You apparently believe that we can produce more than we can consume and that our productivity will be our undoing. It is true that we can produce too much of some things, but it is obvious that most American families could spend at least $10,000 to $20,000 a year with little difficulty. Because the average annual family income in this country is around $4,000, it is clear we are not anywhere near overproduction, nor are we too efficient. It is true that if we increased our output per man 100 percent and if we produced just twice as much of everything as we now have, we would be in an overproduction mess, but if we tailored our production to what people with a $8,000 or $10,000 income would buy, we would all be living probably on a level closer to what you, Mr. Shinner, are now enjoying.

In your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpt you say: "Much has been said and much lip-service has been paid to the subject of small and independent business and its value to the Nation, with all of which I am in full accord. However, as long as we cling to the theory that what we need is an ever and ever greater productivity per man-hour, more efficiency, with constantly lower prices to the consumers—to create a bigger and cheaper pie so that all may share in it—we are in reality paying lipservice to small business and fighting it at the same time. Once we get a general recognition of the fallacy of this theory, we shall then be in a position to really contribute something to the welfare of independent business—the real mortar that holds the economic bricks together."

We disagree with this statement in two respects. First of all, we are not fighting small business if we let the free market decide who is most capable of producing efficiently. Many small businesses are more efficient than big business, and it is wrong to say that we are fighting anyone who cannot keep up with the pace of competitors. Secondly, we see no right in protecting inefficiency or handicapping the efficient and thereby increase the cost of goods to consumers. We in agriculture have promoted efficiency in farming in spite of the surplus problem, because it is obvious that not only farmers, but consumers also would be much worse off if we had not encouraged research and education to increase productivity.

I could comment on many other statements made by you, but I have indicated our fundamental concerns. It seems to me, offhand at least, that you are willing to enhance small business for the sake of small business, even if it stops progress and retards living standards for millions of American families.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD C. HALVORSON,
Economist.

Subsequently, Mr. Shinner replied to Dr. Halvorson, and I place Mr. Shinner's letter at this point in my remarks:

FEBRUARY 7, 1955.

Mr. LLOYD C. HALVORSON,
Economist, National Grange,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HALVORSON: I wish to acknowledge receipt of and thank you for your letter of January 26, wherein you comment upon my proposed solution to the farm problem.

I am highly pleased to note that you favor legislation designed to protect the family sized farm, that you favor a free and open market on farm products, and that you are opposed to paying subsidies or making outright purchases of unlimited quantities of products produced by corporate or factory-in-the-field type of agriculture.

While your letter raises many theoretical arguments which I shall answer presently, I think the crux of it lies in these sentences, regardless of the other arguments (excerpts quoted from pp. 1 and 3 of your letter):

"If we want to maximize the utility of farm products already produced, or if we want to maximize the potential utility-producing capacity of our agricultural resources, we should allow the free market to reign.

* * * * *

"When the production of a commodity has not been curtailed and the surplus is at hand, the attainment of a certain producer's income might not cost the taxpayers any more through the direct-payment route than through the nonrecourse-loan or purchase-agreement route.

* * * * *

"We do believe it is sounder for America to have her food and fiber supply produced by people who largely own or rent the land they operate than by people who are only employees with indefinite tenure. Our agricultural communities would be lacking much if they were not made up of independent owners with enough security of tenure to have community pride and to take an active part in civic affairs. We probably get a more equal distribution of income with a family-type agriculture than we would with a corporate-type agriculture seeking cheap labor."

I cannot forebear pointing out to you that these are the identical things at which my program is aimed. My program, I believe, is more certain than any other program yet proposed or tried, to accomplish exactly the results which, according to your letter, you and I are both seeking.

It is encouraging to know that you endorse and approve of the objectives which I have proposed, in spite of arguments thereafter given as to why these objectives are theoretically unattainable. Since our aims apparently are identical, I deem it proper to comment upon the objections which you have raised:

1. It is your contention (p. 3) that my program would be too difficult to administer. First of all, let me remind you that the most worthwhile objectives in life are often beset with difficulties and we must not let minor or even major difficulties deter us; as a matter of fact, I have discussed the situation with many capable students of the subject and they agree that my proposal would be less complex than the present law. It is one of the first laws of nature that remedial action of every name and nature is virtually always both difficult and unpleasant, and frequently opposed for that reason alone. That applies to our personal physical well-being, economic, political, and sociological problems; hence, we cannot and should not cast a possible solution aside because of the mere fact that it looks difficult. Certainly, it would be no more complicated than a system of (a) acreage allotments, (b) marketing quotas, (c) cross-compliance regulations, (d) loan and/or purchase, (e) storage.

Speaking quite humbly, I do not see how administration of my program could be made more complicated or difficult than the present law.

2. You raise the question of honesty in connection with reporting the amount of products that a given farmer might sell and on which he might be entitled to compensatory payments, or a subsidy if you will (p. 3). I do not recognize this as a problem. Certainly there is no more opportunity or incitement to commit fraud than there is in filing the ordinary income-tax report, and the matter of checking the amount of a given product produced by a farmer would be vastly more simple than checking the average businessman's overall income. Or for that matter, a farmer's abiding by the cross-compliance rules.

3. You express a fear that my program would result in a glut of certain products. You state: "For example, under your schedule, the farmers could all shift to producing cabbage, if that parity price were especially attractive. Your schedule of supports from 100 percent of parity for small farms down to 70 percent for large farms would continue in existence, even if we raised enough cabbage to make a stone wall all around our country 20 feet high and 10 feet wide" (p. 2). I find it hard to believe you are serious in this argument of reductio ad absurdum.

Let me remind you that, first of all, cabbage is not a basic crop, is not in Government storage, has not and presumably will not receive price support. Furthermore, any law which we enact cannot be regarded as a final solution nevermore to be amended. In case of uncontrollable gluts of any commodity the parity price would, of necessity, have to be readjusted. You, of course, are well aware of what happened in connection with support for the potato market and you are likewise familiar with the fact that the glut was not the result of the potatoes raised

by the family-sized farmer. On the contrary, the glut resulted from vast operations set up by financiers from the money centers of the country, on factory farms.

4. You are fearful of the cost of my proposed program and state: "A direct-payment program for all commodities, or just the major ones, including livestock and livestock products, would have cost the Treasury several billion dollars a year during the 1930's" (p. 2).

In this respect, let me remind you that the great depression of the thirties really started on the farm and, had farm products been given a reasonable amount of support, the depression, which it has been estimated cost the Nation some $600 billion, could have been largely avoided or at least greatly alleviated. Even several billions of expense, say $10 billion annually, would have been a rare bargain had it resulted in relieving the depression even to a minor degree. If we act in time, in emergencies, the costs are always lower than if we let the emergency grow to major proportions before acting. To make a homely analogy: it is cheaper to inoculate an entire community against polio or smallpox than wait until the disease is epidemic before acting. Furthermore, it seems to me that your argument conflicts with your statement, quoted on page 1 of this reply, that "the attainment of a certain producer's income might not cost the taxpayers any more through the direct payment route than through the nonrecourse loan or purchase agreement route." I find these two statements somewhat conflicting.

5. You recommend a stamp plan as a means of disposing of our unmanageable surpluses. Presumably, you would be willing to make such a program permanent (p. 3).

I submit, Mr. Halvorson, that such a plan is un-American in concept and I cannot help but feel that both you and I are unwilling to create and maintain a permanent class of poverty-stricken citizens which the stamp plan would surely create.

You state: "There is and always will be some stigma upon those citizens of our country who receive a direct subsidy from our Government." What is the stamp plan but that? I should also like to point out, in this respect, that under my plan farmers would get nothing unless they produce. Under your stamp plan, persons would receive a subsidy for remaining in idleness. Moreover, the stamp plan, on every marketing day, would stigmatize an entire section of our population; it would become a publicly displayed badge of pauperism. Also, I am more impressed with your statement on page 1 of your letter, "if we want to maximize the utility (use) of farm products already produced * * * we should allow the free market to reign."

My concept of our free enterprise system is that as goods and services move in trade and commerce, and this most certainly applies to all farm products, that it should be accomplished via the cash register. The Government's buying and giving away of products even in small quantities should be avoided. Our energies should be directed, rather, toward improving the economic climate in which our underprivileged people now exist.

They don't want Government stamps; they want a decent, livable income and the chance to buy in the marketplace.

6. On the subject of free markets, the United States as a leading exponent of the capitalistic system should, above all things, attempt to demonstrate by example what it advocates—yes, fights for in theory. Our European cousins look upon us aghast as we talk free enterprise, free markets, and in turn legislate these concepts right out of existence. For our own good, we ought to be consistent in these things.

7. You state on page 2: "I do not think we should discriminate against efficiency nor put a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture."

I fail to see where supporting the family-sized farm in any sense discriminates against efficiency. I regard it, instead, as exactly comparable to the minimum wage law. Limiting support to family-size farms on the basis of sales) would in nowise prevent the ambitious and efficient farmer from producing an income of $100,000 a year or even more. It would simply place him in a position where he must do it in the open market (the American way) and not at the expense of the taxpayer. I see nothing wrong with that. As a matter of fact, the family-farm support program should encourage efficiency, and expand opportunity.

As you state, there are some 800,000 farmers who have gross sales in excess of $7,500 and, accordingly, there must be, roughly, 4½ million farmers with annual incomes of less than this amount. (Actually, 45½ percent of farms in 1950 had annual gross incomes of less than $5,000.) My theory of sound Government policy is that laws should be enacted which will result in the greatest good to the greatest number, without abrogating the rights of the minority; hence, our concern is for the 4½ million, rather than for the 800,000. It is not necessary to make an extended argument that the 800,000 with large holdings and great volumes of production are well able to take care of themselves.

8. You speak of the ease with which farmers might spend an annual income of $10,000 or $20,000, or 2½ to 5 times the average income for the Nation (p. 5). I know of no one, least of all myself, who has proposed a limitation on income. I am and always have been in favor of good wages, good salaries, and a high income level as necessary to a healthy economy. But surely you cannot be serious in presuming that such an increase in income would be possible without a corresponding rise in the price structure throughout the economy; in other words, pure inflation. It is a fundamental principle of our capitalistic society that income for the average citizen is derived from the sale of his services, or the product of his labor.

Mechanics presently employed in the building trades in Chicago are earning $25 per day for 8 hours' labor. Increase their pay either 2½ or 5 times and it would not be difficult to calculate what that would do to the price of homes. What we are seeking to do is to stabilize our economy, rather than indulge in wild inflation. I feel that I can safely assume that you are not serious when you suggest the possibility of an average income of $10,000 or $20,000 per person for the entire Nation. If you are serious, how are you going to achieve it without inflation of the most serious and flagrant type?

9. You suggest that the low-income farmers need access to better and more liberal credit (p. 4) and again, I find myself in disagreement with you. I disagree because I think this ignores the real heart of the matter. My 15 years as a banker have taught me that the basis of all credit is the ability to repay. Extending credit to underprivileged farmers would simply increase their burdens. What they do need is an improved economic condition—an opportunity to market whatever products they are able to produce at a fair market price; and once they are able to demonstrate a given earning power, credit will flow to them as a matter of course. The problem is not one of increasing debts; but increasing the ability to repay debts.

You point to the title of my article, "The 1953–54 Recession: The Paradox of Efficiency," which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and you comment that I seem to think that efficiency caused the recession.

Mr. Halvorson, I mean just that. I believe it is very easily susceptible to proof, and I would point to the condition in your industry. Efficiency has removed some 12 million people from the farms in the last generation and you and I are both aware of the fact that through purely improved technological conditions (efficiency) the present farm population can supply the food and fiber for a population approximately double that which we have today. Through purely efficiency measures, if we should see fit to apply them, we can dispense with another 2 million families, or roughly 10 million people now living on farms. The traditional academic economist will contend that these displaced persons should find employment in the urban centers in industry, and in case they do not find such employment, that becomes a sociological problem, rather than an economic one.

It is my observation that sociological, economic, and political problems are so interrelated that they are impossible of separation. The traditional economist will further point out that industry has been able to absorb this vast array of people who were technologically displaced from the farms but the economist fails to analyze and state how this came about.

During the past 60 years, which is all well within my memory, the only real prosperity with full employment has resulted either from war or a war economy, bitter as that fact may be. During the depth of the depression, we had some 15 million people unemployed and it took a world war to give our economy sufficient momentum to restore our citizenry to a decent standard of living and a reasonably prosperous condition. The great sustaining factor in our present economy is the $40 billion presently being spent each year by the Government for national defense. No one wants war, but we cannot blink the fact that it has stimulated our economy. Reduce our defense expenditures by one-half and I believe you will agree with me that our economy would almost overnight go into a disastrous tailspin.

Again, on the subject of efficiency against waste: I cannot forebear pointing out that few, if any, thinking people will deny that we are presently living in a war prosperity and have been for the past 15 years; neither will they deny that war is a total waste—a waste, which it so happens, we have been well able, economically speaking, to afford.

I repeat, we prosper by waste (Webster defines waste as a useless or unnecessary expense). We Americans are the greatest wastrels on earth. And therein lies the secret of our high standard of living. Compare, if you will, our prodigal use of food, clothing, autos, liquor, cigarettes, cosmetics, sporting goods, money spent for travel, etc., to say nothing of the huge amount of war munitions (tanks, planes, etc.) which lie rusting out in the open fields; yes, compare these with other nations of the earth and you have the answer to our national well-being. It should now become our goal to help the 4½ million low-income farm families to improve their economic position so they, too, can afford to indulge themselves in a reasonable amount of "waste," rather than that we go about shedding crocodile tears for the 800,000 top-bracket group of which you speak. Supplying our underprivileged urban population with food stamps and advising our so-called submarginal farmers to throw in the sponge—get off the land—is in my humble judgment, the epitome of unsound economic reasoning.

On this subject of waste versus efficiency, I would conclude with the statement that every man has a right to his opinion but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts. And I believe that the facts point directly to one of the greatest problems with which we have ever been faced; namely, technological unemployment. Unemployment, from whatever cause it may result, is the basis of all depressions.

No one is suggesting that we subsidize inefficiency. Even your letter implies that many small family farmers are efficient and are capable of being more so (given the incentive). It so happens that, involved in this problem, we have a way of life for some 10 millions of American citizens. On page 4, you say: "What we need is equal opportunity—not a handicap race." I say, "Amen," and that is what I propose.

If we are seeking only efficiency and cheapness of production, why not then rub out the fences and consolidate the land into vast factory enterprises? Then General Motors, Ford, International Harvester, and like companies could take over operation and management of these vast farms. By supplying their own machinery and buying other necessities in great bulk at cheaper prices, they could greatly increase efficiency and lower costs. But I submit that more is involved than mere efficiency. On page 5, you seem to take the position that it is better to have fewer people in food and fiber production, and more people in the factories. With this also, I disagree.

Overproduction is not peculiar to farms alone. The capacity of our industry, with its present labor force, to produce vastly in excess of our consumption is too well known to require any debate. It does not require much imagination to see what would happen to the 2 million families if they were driven off the farm, into urban centers where according to the latest Government figures there are already 3.3 million unemployed.

I trust, Mr. Halvorson, that you will accept the above remarks in the spirit in which they are intended, and as I have accepted yours, as constructive criticism and as an effort to explore and resolve this, one of our most difficult national problems.

Yours very truly,

E. G. SHINNER,
Chairman, the Shinner Foundation,
Chicago, Ill.

I believe you will agree that this is a most interesting exchange of thoughts on one of the great and vital problems facing Congress. I hope that the Members will study this correspondence, for I know that they, like I, are seeking all possible light on this problem.

Personally, I regard the family farm program as exactly comparable to the minimum wage law and the benefits which unions provide for their members; it puts a floor underneath the farmer, and provides benefits only in accordance with the amount of his production up to a maximum gross product of $7,000 per year. In my opinion, this is workable and fair.

I cannot accept Dr. Halvorson's arguments. I recall that in the early 1930's economists argued against the social security law, old-age pensions, the railroad, bank, stock exchange, and utility holding company legislation. And some argued for these bills. We were told by some that we were on the way toward wrecking the economy, or that we were going Socialist. Actually, nothing like that happened. We gave our economy the firmest base it had had in 130 years of our national history; we built in economic stabilizers into our law that have been a major factor in preventing the 1949 and 1954 recessions from sliding into depressions.

We have provided stabilizers for business, wage-hour laws and union guaranties for labor, insurance for the banks, unemployment compensation for the jobless, pensions for the aged; we have yet to build a set of sound and workable economic stabilizers for the family farm.

I do not for a moment argue that our farm programs have not benefited the family farmers; they have. But the lion's share of the benefits have gone to the 484,000 factory farmers who produce more than half of our gross annual farm output, while a minor trickle has gone to the millions of farmers who produce $7,000 or less each year. The record of family farm displacement since 1935, and growth of the huge factory farms, proves that we have not done the job. I do not believe we are doing the job so long as we are permitting 75,000 family farmers to be "washed out" each year, and another 40,000 or 50,000 or more of small townspeople to be driven with them into the city labor forces.

Such a process, if carried to the only possible conclusion, means ruin. I believe it means ruin just as surely as night follows day, just as surely as an ever-increasing concentration of business into fewer and fewer gigantic corporations means ruin.

There is a point at which such concentration passes purely economic significance, and becomes socially and politically significant. I believe we have long since passed that point.

That is why I desperately hope that the President and his advisers will resolutely come to grips with this program and submit a realistic program, a program that provides for family farm supports along the line of the Shinner program, and that will not allow the rich, vast, factory farmers to enrich themselves further at Government and the taxpayers' expense.

In my own mind, I believe there is only one answer: That is to work out a realistic family farm support program with a limitation on the amount that any farmer may produce for the benefit payments. Only then will we really get at the "cancer" which Historian Toynbee described. I would further favor limiting the total payment any farmer might receive in any year to $2,000. I urge the Members to read the correspondence I have placed in the RECORD.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS TO BE SOLD UNLESS CONGRESS ACTS QUICKLY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the big rubber companies are going to get the synthetic rubber plants built by the Government at a price that will give them a 3-year payout on their investment. The price is not as important to the general welfare as the privileges and opportunities it will give the purchasers of these plants.

On June 25, 1953, the House had before it a rule providing for the consideration of a bill to permit these plants to be sold under certain terms and conditions, with Congress only given the veto power if exercised in certain ways, in which Congress is greatly handicapped, retarded and almost wholly prevented from effectively considering the matter. At that time, I made a speech in opposition to the rule, in which I stated:

POSSIBLY NEED THE FACILITIES AGAIN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and to the bill. The first reason why I am opposed to this rule and to the bill is because it is possible we will need these facilities again and we should not have them in hands where they will be out of our control. We have been embarrassed in the past by reason of the lack of production of rubber. We should not again place ourselves in a vulnerable position.

No. 2. The big rubber companies or a few of them—there are just a few—would like to have these facilities disposed of now in this tight-money, hard-money, policy. No one will be able to bid on these facilities except the big rubber companies. The committee has been rather generous in its bill in that it does not require a deposit of more than 10 percent on a bid, or more than $500,000 per bid. But, the little fellows cannot put up that kind of money.

LITTLE FELLOWS WILL SUFFER

Now, the people who will suffer under this proposal, when the big rubber companies buy these plants, are the little fellows, and under this proposal and under the present situation they cannot go any other place except to the large rubber companies. The small independent producer and fabricator of goods using rubber as a basic material will be dependent upon these large companies as a source of supply. Well, these large companies have similar fabricating facilities which they own, and naturally the large companies are not going to be very sympathetic and generous to the little fellows across the street from their own facilities in allocating rubber from their plants. This is a serious proposition. It will destroy the little rubber fabricators throughout the United States except those who will live by sufferance, because the big fellows will own them.

One word of warning I have for the Federal Reserve Board. They have caused half a dozen major and minor depressions in this country. They are very insecure. Another depression, and the Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve System are both gone. They are out, because people are tired of their going in and causing depressions at every opportunity they have. They have started now to plan a depression. They had better stop it, and they had better use some weapons and vehicles a little bit different from the ones that they are using to help a selfish few.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I notice on page 6, paragraph (e), with relation to the payment of the purchase price, that they can take a purchase-money mortgage in an amount not to exceed 75 percent of the purchase price, and that the rate of interest is 3 percent. We are paying 3¼ percent ourselves on the last long-term bond issue.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. MCCORMACK. They ought to pay at least 4 percent, it would seem to me.

Mr. PATMAN. That will be of help to the little big rubber companies. The little big rubber companies are the only ones that can bid on this. Look at the testimony. Look who testified for this. The big rubber companies. They want it done, of course. Get it out in the open, and they are going to buy. When they buy, they can punish every competitor they have in the business. They can withdraw the supplies from the competitors of their subsidiaries. They cannot do it now, but they will be able to do it when they buy. As the distinguished acting minority leader just pointed out, they will have

an interest rate of 3 percent. The Government bond going rate is 3¼ percent on a 30-year term right now. Of course, that is a small matter, but it just goes to show the opportunity that is given to them. I am not impugning anybody's motives in doing it—it just happens that way. But the big companies are the only ones that can buy these facilities. Now is not the time to sell them.

CREDIT UNIONS ARE THE ANSWER FOR UNMERCIFUL LOAN SHARKS AND RUTHLESS SHOTGUN LOAN OFFICES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the New York Times—January 17, 1955—tells how household workers, tradesmen, and Government employees in Pakistan are burdened by excessively high interest rates. A Hindu launderer pictured in the Times with his family is reported to have paid over $1,200 interest on $30.58 borrowed in 1941.

It was not too many years ago that Americans faced with emergencies of one sort or another, and in need of credit to finance payment found themselves in somewhat similar circumstances.

Even today there are many individuals who are not accommodated by their local banks. They turn to the small loan and finance companies where they pay large sums of interest on their borrowings.

However, unlike the Pakistani, these people can avoid excessive borrowing costs. This has been made possible by the organization of credit unions. I insert in the RECORD the remarkable story of the credit union which appeared in the September 1954 issues of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine.

I also insert the article from the New York Times of January 17, 1955, entitled "Poor of Pakistan Sorely Burdened."

[From Changing Times of September 1954]

YOU CAN START A CREDIT UNION—THE PROCEDURE IS SIMPLE AND YOU WILL GET PLENTY OF HELP—THEN YOU HAVE A GOOD PLACE TO PUT MONEY AND TO BORROW FROM

By starting a credit union, a group of people solve two common problems—where to borrow money at reasonable rates and where to save it at profitable rates.

If this idea appeals to you, and you do not already belong to a credit union, you may want to get one going. But first you will want to know more about what a credit union is, how it operates, and how much work is needed to set it up.

The simplest definition of a credit union is this: An organization of people—usually people employed together—who agree to save their money together and to make loans to each other at low rates of interest.

Members of a credit union deposit money, preferably on a regular basis, in any amount from 25 cents on up, for which they receive shares in the credit union. Usually a share is worth $5. The money they deposit becomes a fund, available to all members for borrowing. The maximum rate of interest on borrowed money is 1 percent a month on the unpaid balance. In some credit unions the rate is a bit lower.

Loans are made on the approval of an elected credit committee, and no security is required on loans under $300 to $500, depending upon the operating charter of the credit union. Amounts in excess of the unsecured limit may also be borrowed on a car or some other security. Loans are granted quickly with a minimum of red tape.

The credit union will, of course, show a profit from its lending operations if everything works out O. K. After expenses are paid and a small reserve for bad debts is set up, the remaining money is returned to the shareholder members as dividends. The amounts of dividends vary, but they average 3 percent a year.

How can a credit union lend money at lower rates and pay its members higher dividends than most comparable commercial organizations? Because the credit union is a nonprofit cooperative organized among a selected group of people—which means that it pays less in taxes, in salaries, in credit investigation and collection costs, and in general overhead.

NINE MILLION MEMBERS

Because the credit union is such a simple device and is so successful in meeting the financial needs of a large number of people, credit unions are springing up all over the United States and Canada at a rate that has surprised even their most enthusiastic supporters.

At this moment there are roughly 9 million credit union members in the United States and Canada. There are some 18,000 credit unions with assets of more than $2½ billion. It is estimated that credit unions were the source of roughly 11 percent of all consumer borrowing last year.

Some of the largest credit unions with assets of millions of dollars employ a large staff of paid clerical help. Others operate with no paid help whatsoever. (Officers always serve without pay, except the treasurer, who may get a salary.) Credit union operation is fairly standardized, and experts in bookkeeping and accounting, although desirable, are not necessary to the successful operation of a small association. As few as 50 people actually can have a credit union.

IT'S EASY TO GET GOING

You will be pleasantly surprised to learn how easy it is to form a credit union. You don't need a lot of money and a battery of lawyers or accountants, and it doesn't take much time. A credit union can be organized in a month with the work of only a few people, and you can get expert help in organizing one without any charge whatsoever.

But first ask yourself which group of people would be the most logical to organize. Would it be the people you work with, the members of your union, the members of your church, or the people who live in your neighborhood? Credit unions have been established under the sponsorship of all kinds of groups. One credit union limits its membership to descendants of certain families, and another was formed by members of a poker club.

Most credit unions, however, are established by groups of employees in factories, offices, banks, schools or government. About 80 percent of credit unions are based on occupational groups, some of them under trade union auspices and some under employer auspices.

If you are a member of a group that is likely to be interested in organizing a credit union, here is a step-by step outline showing how one can be set up.

1. Your first move is to get in touch with the Credit Union National Association, Filene House, Madison 1, Wis. Ask for literature describing credit unions and for the help of an organizer. His services are free. CUNA has a staff of 19 such men, and many State credit union leagues also employ organizers. If a regular organizer isn't available, someone from an existing credit union in your area will be asked to help you get started.

2. The organizer will go directly to the employer, the minister or the union president, depending upon the group to be organized, and explain the way a credit union works and how it can help its members. He will request and will usually get the cooperation of the sponsoring organization. In most cases, the company, church or union provides small office space for the credit union. Employers sometimes sanction payroll deductions for the purchase of credit union shares.

With cooperation assured, the organizer will then ask the sponsoring organization to call together a group of 15 or 20 people from all ranks of the organization. The purpose of this meeting is to sell the credit union idea and to get the charter application signed.

3. At this charter meeting, the organizer will again explain the aims and usefulness of the credit union and will answer questions. And in order to get things going, he will then ask whether the group is really ready to go ahead and file an application for a charter.

4. Seven or more members are required to sign the application, and each of them may be asked to contribute a small amount, usually about $5, toward the charter fee. Later on, these signers of the charter application will be given shares in the credit union to reimburse them for their initial contribution.

5. With your application for charter you will also have to file a set of bylaws for the operation of the credit union. Copies of a standard set of bylaws are available from the organizer or directly from CUNA.

6. At this same charter meeting you will select a committee to nominate a slate of officers for the credit union, including a president, a vice president, a treasurer, 3 members of the credit committee and a 3-man supervisory committee.

7. With the slate of officers ready, the next step is to call an organization meeting. All members of the union, church or neighborhood or fellow workers will be informed of the meeting and asked to attend. At this meeting officers will be elected, and a general summary of credit union aims and methods will be given to all prospective members.

Immediately after this meeting an open meeting of the newly elected board of directors and officers will be held to accomplish the following jobs:

Apply for a bond for the treasurer so that he may handle the funds; select a bank in which credit-union funds shall be deposited; set a limit, if any, on the amount of shares that any one member may hold; establish the rate of interest to be charged (not more than 1 percent on the unpaid balance); authorize the expenditure of enough money to buy supplies—a set of books, membership cards, etc. (usually it takes from $60 to $150, including the charter fee, to get a credit union going); set the time and place at which deposits may be made and loan applications received; approve all applications for membership; set the time and place of the monthly meetings of the board.

After these preliminaries, the credit union is ready to begin operation.

TAKES TIME TO GROW

Typically, only a small percentage of the potential membership will join the credit union at its earliest stages. Within the first year fewer than 10 percent of the group may sign up. But as a rule, credit-union membership doubles every year for the first 5 years, and assets do, too.

The number of participants in the credit union depends largely upon the kind of group you have and their experience with cooperative activities. In a plant where there are bowling and baseball leagues or in an office where there are frequent social affairs, a credit union will usually attract a large share of the potential members. Sometimes, however, the credit union itself is the magnet that draws people together.

During the first year of operation, credit union officers and committee members should be in close contact with the organizer

or with officers of a nearby credit union. Difficulties are bound to arise, and experienced help will be a blessing.

OBSTACLES YOU MAY ENCOUNTER

Sometimes, of course, organizing a credit union turns out to be difficult. Here are some of the stumbling blocks.

Lack of leadership: The organizer and others interested in forming a credit union should be careful to pick as leaders people who are respected and who have influence among the members of the group that will form the credit union. The election should not be a popularity contest. The office of treasurer is particularly important. He or she should be a person to whom other people can bring their troubles—and a person of excellent reputation.

General or specific opposition: Occasionally the sponsoring group for the credit union will oppose the organization on principle. And in some cases, opposition comes because the credit union may interfere with an existing and profitable loan-shark racket.

Most often it is simply a lack of understanding of how a credit union works that causes friction. A good organizer can overcome most of that opposition. As a matter of fact, there are far more credit-union supporters among company presidents and union leaders than there are critics.

Poor timing: A successful credit union cannot be organized unless there is some live, current need for it and some willingness—at the crucial time—on the part of a small group of people to do the organizing job.

If your efforts are successful, you will have created an organization that is truly a help to many people. As the credit union grows, you will notice that more and more of its members develop regular habits of thrift and that fewer and fewer of them become overburdened with heavy debts at high rates of interest—in short, that the members begin to learn how to manage their money wisely.

HOW A CREDIT UNION STACKS UP FOR BORROWING AND FOR SAVING

As you can see, it is a better-than-average place to get a loan and a good place to keep your money.

If you borrow $100 and repay it in 12 monthly installments you will pay this much interest or carrying charge:

Personal loan from a bank: $4 to 12; most loans range between $6 and $8.

Life insurance policy loan: $2 to $3 if repaid monthly.

Auto loans from banks or finance companies: $3 to $6 on new cars; $5 to $18 on used cars.

Carrying charges on installment purchases: No common rate; may cost from $3 up to $25 or more.

Small-loan company: $13 to $24.

Credit union: $6.50 most common; may be a bit lower.

If you have $100 in savings you will get this much in annual dividends or interest:

Bank savings account: $1.50 to $2.50.

Savings bonds: $3 if held 10 years; interest first year about 1 percent.

Savings and loan associations: $2 to $4.

Credit union: Usually $3.

[From the New York Times of January 17, 1955]

POOR OF PAKISTAN SORELY BURDENED—SOME VICTIMS COMMIT SUICIDE AND ALMOST ALL ARE FORCED TO PAY INTEREST FOR YEARS

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, January 11.—Organized moneylenders, the bane of Pakistan's poverty-stricken millions, are driving victims to suicide.

These giant Pathans, who hail from the rugged northwest frontier province and are recognized by their heavy, steeltipped walking sticks, black-turbaned heads, and mercurial tempers, work with brutal efficiency.

Here in the capital of a Moslem state where usury is forbidden by Islamic law, they prowl day and night, striking terror in the hearts of household servants, tradesmen, and Government employees from whom they collect interest at the rate of 25 percent a month on loans of 100 rupees ($30.58) to 500 rupees ($152.95) made 10 and 15 years ago.

The Pathan has never been known to insist on repayment of principal, and a borrower's offer to repay a loan is refused with a gesture of magnanimity that discourages a second try.

Attempts to escape or to enlist the support of the law are thwarted.

INFORMAL NEGOTIATIONS

Negotiations are most informal, yet most binding. They usually begin in the dimly lighted corner of a fly-ridden tea stall, the office of the ubiquitous Pathan. A potential client is conspicuous, his worried facial expression reflecting the delayed but unavoidable decision that there is no one else to whom he can turn.

Timidly he takes an adjoining table and smiles nervously across to the usurer. Sometimes, a borrower will tell you, he wanted to turn and run. The memory of a suicide who could find no other way out of the Pathan's debt, the thought of not being able to repay the loan if he lost his job—these almost deterred him. But the need for money to pay his child's doctor bill or to buy a peddler's cart or clothes for the clerical job he finally got, these outweighed his fears.

The gambit acknowledged, the Pathan invites the victim to join his table. In the unhurried custom of the East they chat with apparent amiability for a few minutes and then, in the din of native song from a radio, get down to business.

The client needs 300 rupees ($91.74). He signs a note for 600 rupees ($183.53), a cautious procedure insisted upon by the moneylender for his own protection should the case get to court. The borrower receives 225 rupees (68.80), the 75 rupees ($22.94) withheld representing interest payment for the first month.

LEGAL ACTION DISCOURAGED

The practice of recording the loan at double the amount gives the Pathan a possibility of assurance that if the client dares bring the matter to the claims court, the magistrate would recommend settlement by payment of half the principal. There are few instances of this; the borrower knows that resort to the law usually is followed by violence against him by goondas, hired thugs who beat him between the Pathan's temporarily unsuccessful collection visits.

One loan victim, Mohan, a Hindu dhobi (launderer), was freed by the usurers last week after an association that began in December 1941. In addition to holding a receipt for the original loan of 100 rupees ($30.58) that he borrowed 13 years ago, the jubilant dhobi showed a collection of 157 receipts that represented interest payments of 25 rupees ($7.64) a month since December 1941—a total of 3,925 rupees ($1,200.30) paid for the loan of 100 rupees.

Mohan, his wife and their 4 children occupy a squalid hut, rent-free, on the grounds of a wealthy landlord in exchange for washing and ironing the clothes of his master's family of eight.

Now that he is out of debt to the loan-shark, Mohan thinks of him as a friend.

Among the hundreds who share bitter memories of the vengeful Pathan is the family of a late victim "dealt to death" according to police reports, "and eyes removed."

Apparently unable to prosecute the Pathans for flouting the religious injunction against usury, legislators in at least one province are trying to enact a civil statute that would end the moneylenders' racket. In the meantime they flourish.

CARGO PREFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLIOTT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat disturbed, if not quite irked, at the efforts of some misinformed people to undermine the Cargo Preference Act which Congress approved last year. This is Public Law No. 664 of the 83d Congress, and has commonly been referred to as the 50–50 shipping legislation. It provides in effect that not less than 50 percent of Government-sponsored cargos shall be carried in American-flag ships, if such ships are available at reasonable rates. Whenever American-flag vessels are not available at reasonable rates, then foreign-flag vessels may be used.

Particularly am I disturbed at the efforts, direct or indirect, of foreign nationals to undermine that legislation. Such efforts come with ill grace from those nations to whom we have rendered considerable assistance during the past few years through our foreign-aid programs. For instance, since 1945, we have supplied Great Britain some $7 billion worth of relief. Other nations were the recipients of our largesse in varying huge amounts. Altogether, we have, since the end of World War II, dispensed about $48 billion abroad.

In 1954, Congress approved Public Law No. 480 which authorizes the gift of some $300 million of our surplus agricultural products to needy nations. It also provides for the sale of $700 million of surplus products to friendly foreign nations, with payment to be made in the soft currency of the purchasing nation. In oher words, foreign nations are enabled to obtain or buy surplus agricultural products which they otherwise could not. The United States would spend the soft currency in the nations which purchased the products. The Cargo Preference Act simply provides that 50 percent of such products shall be carried on American-flag ships.

It might be well to point out at this time how the United States is spending the soft currency it receives from surplus agricultural products. I have here a statement from the Secretary of Agriculture made to the House Committee on Agriculture on February 17. According to his statement out of $337 million worth of surplus agricultural products disposed of under Public Law 480 only 24.3 percent represents reimbursable funds for United States use.

The bulk of the soft currency spent in those countries will go for nonreimbursable United States use, and better than 50 percent of it is in the nature of foreign relief. I quote two items: The program for military equipment other than for the United States, $42 million, or 12.6 percent. Loans from multilateral trade and economic development, $128 million, or 38.1 percent. So in effect this program is in the nature of a relief program somewhere between the outright relief programs of the past and an enlargement of the trade-not-aid programs of the present.

Now, the rates on American-flag liner vessels are the same as those of foreign liner vessels. American tramp ships, which are not subsidized, charge a slightly higher rate than foreign tramp ships—less than 20 percent higher according to testimony presented to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. But the foreign nations do not pay that cost differential—it is absorbed by the United States. Some United States citizens object to the Government absorbing this cost differential because, first, they term it an indirect subsidy; or second, it adds to the cost of the surplus disposal program and is an undue expense. I shall refer to that aspect of the matter at a later point.

Foreign nations object to the 50–50 legislation, saying that it is discriminatory. They complain to the Department of Agriculture which handles the surplus products disposal program and to the State Department with whom they constantly deal. They intimate that they will buy no surplus products if the Cargo Preference Act must be complied with. In at least one instance, representatives of a foreign nation have approached a Member of Congress and stated that products of his State will be purchased if such can be shipped on their own flag vessels. The inference is that unless they can use their own vessels they will not purchase the surpluses. And therein perhaps lies the reason for their objection to our law. They want the transportation business for their own ships, but at the same time say it is discriminatory and wrong for us to want only 50 percent of the business for our vessels.

The General Council of British Shipping in January 1955, issued a statement in which it said several things:

British shipowners have protested to the British Government against the acceptance of what is known as the 50–50 rule.

Another statement:

The results * * * are bound to undermine the ability of British shipping to continue to make its present vital contribution to our national earnings of foreign currency.

Again:

Shipowners of all major maritime countries of Europe have entered protests against the 50–50 rule, and the Norwegian Government only recently declined to purchase American coal, even for payment in Norwegian currency.

The Organization for European Economic Cooperation, an organization of European nations, according to the British shipping periodical called the Siren and Shipping, reported that an understanding had been reached between member countries to the effect that they would not take American surplus products if the transportation of them was made subject to the 50–50 rule.

Other news items indicate the desire of foreign nations to undermine and scuttle our Cargo Preference Act. The most vocal are those with merchant marines of their own which they want to help and support. According to their point of view, apparently, it is all right for them to support their own shipping, but wrong for us to support ours. I am afraid they are making their point of view felt by some people in departments of our own Government, and I suspect that these people would also like to scuttle our 50–50 law. Recent hearings before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries convinced me that such was the case. The committee's report on the hearings directed some criticism at Government departments, and recommended, among other things, that the State Department should maintain the national policy of the United States as reflected in the Cargo Preference Act in our relations with foreign nations.

This act was designed to help bolster our faltering merchant marine by supplying some cargoes for our ships, subsidized or not. Ships cannot operate without cargoes. Our United States merchant marine is truly our fourth arm of defense and is just as important to our national security as our other arms of defense. Military spokesmen recognize the importance of our merchant ships and have not hesitated to say so on many occasions. We have been able to conduct wars on foreign soil only because we have had ships to transport our fighting forces and war materiel to distant lands. Our allies have never been able to supply ships for this purpose. In World War II, for instance, we supplied our allies with eight times as many ships as they supplied to us. We furnished them with about 5½ million tons of ships whereas they furnished us about 700,000 tons.

Congress has for many years recognized the worth and need of merchant ships, and has through various acts declared a policy of maintaining a merchant marine in the interests of national defense. This policy has necessitated the payment of subsidies. However, the history of that policy has proved not only its worth but also the insignificant cost of the subsidies when compared to other defense expenditures. For instance, the Navy has this year requested $1.3 billion for combat vessels. It has requested similarly huge sums in other years. One might properly inquire as to the effectiveness of combat vessels without supply lines; or, for that matter, of the effectiveness of any military machine without supply lines. When we fight elsewhere than on United States soil, those supply lines are merchant-type vessels.

Congress annually appropriates billions of dollars for strictly military purposes without much question or debate. About the only question which arises is that which asks, "Are we appropriating enough?" And yet when we are not fighting a war our whole military machine valued at countless billions of dollars is more or less on a standby basis. People, both in and out of Congress, accept such a situation as necessary even though the cost is terrific. But some of them cannot understand the necessity of maintaining on a similar standby basis at least a nucleus American merchant marine. They complain of the cost to the Government, even though that cost is insignificant in comparison with other military costs.

I can understand the attitude of our agriculture friends in this country with respect to our whole agriculture program, and also with respect to our surplus agriculture disposal projects. Under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, it was proposed to dispose of $1 billion surplus products abroad over a 3-year period. Seven hundred million dollars worth of products is to be sold for soft currency. These agriculture friends have been led to believe that it will cost our Government $25 million per year more—or $75 million over the 3-year period—to transport those products by American flagships. I hasten to assure them that such is not the case. The most that the use of American flag vessels could add to transportation costs over the 3-year period is $14 million, using the most liberal estimates. This figure would be reduced by the extent to which United States liner services were used. A witness for the Department of Agriculture so admitted in testimony before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It is a small sum, indeed, to help maintain our merchant fleet.

To offset this additional cost I need only call attention to the fact that by using United States flag vessels to carry only 50 percent of these surplus products cargoes, the Government will collect a greater amount back in taxes. These taxes would be lost to Uncle Sam if all the cargoes were carried in foreign flag vessels. I need not call attention, I am sure, to the additional benefits to our economy which would accrue through seamen's wages, ship supplies, and ship repairs for United States flag vessels.

As I indicated earlier, the thing that disturbs me most is the effort on the part of foreign nationals to scuttle our Cargo Preference Act. We have enough difficulty convincing our own people of the necessity of maintaining an American merchant marine without having our foreign friends add to our problems. I respect their desire to maintain their own fleets. Let them respect our desire to maintain ours. They needed our ships desperately on a couple of occasions. They might need them again.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman on the splendid address he has given the House with reference to our American merchant marine. It might do well for industry, the farmer, and other segments of our national economy to pay some attention to the necessity of our American merchant marine, for if the foreign nations who are now so opposed to this 50–50 program have their way and were to drive our fleet from the high seas, I do no know what would become of our export business. They would so arrange their sailings as not to be beneficial to the American exporter but would so operate their flagships entering our ports to best serve their commerce. It has come with poor grace, Mr. Speaker, from one of the great nations of the world, the recipient of untold benefits from this Government, the recipient of our generosity. They have received benefits from us, and we have responded to their call when

their national life was at stake. They are the ones, sir, today who are bringing the greatest pressure against this 50–50 program, and it is with poor grace, in my opinion, that they take the position they do and stoop to the practices they are so bold in. I have always been one of those who have supported our foreign-aid program and have been willing and anxious to help our allies, but I cannot understand what is happening; whether those who have received from us the great assistance, the great aid that we have given, have no recollection of what has taken place in the past and what may take place in the future. I hope the people of this Nation will listen to the words of wisdom that have been spoken here by the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and give aid and assistance to the perpetuation and the maintenance of the American merchant marine. The 50–50 maritime program is very similar to the crop-support program, so enjoyed by our farmers.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for that contribution. The gentleman is the chairman of our House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He has served on that committee for many years. No one in the House knows better than he the value and importance of the American merchant marine. No one in the House has contributed more to the welfare of the American merchant marine and thus to American national defense than our present chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] of his very fine statement. I think it has added a great deal to the understanding of the Members of this body of the importance of the merchant marine to our Nation. I do not know any one in the last year or so, since I have been in Congress, who has done more to preserve our merchant marine than my colleague from Washington. I am very proud to be associated with him in this interest.

I should like to ask the gentleman one question. That has to do with statements he made regarding the cost to the American taxpayer of using our American liners. Did the gentleman in his figures give credit to the fact that our experience has been that we recapture from the subsidized lines considerable in the way of profits during certain years?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. First, let me thank the gentleman for his kind comments. Coming from a gentleman who has had a great interest in the welfare of our American merchant marine, I appreciate that very much.

I did not say anything about recapture as far as our subsidized lines are concerned. I devoted most of my discussion to this program as it was applied to the American tramp ships. The tramp ships are those which do not operate on schedule. They are not subsidized. They are the only ones that charge more than the foreign-flag ships.

When we talk about liner service, we are talking about a regularly scheduled service. The rates on foreign-flag liner ships and American-flag liner ships are exactly the same. When we use our United States liner-flag vessels and they get additional business, that puts them in what we call a recapture or possible recapture bracket as far as the Government is concerned. They are subsidized lines. If they earn a profit in excess of 10 percent of their capital necessarily employed, then 50 percent of that profit comes back to Uncle Sam. There have been many years when their subsidy program did not cost Uncle Sam very much, if anything, because of the recapture provision. As a matter of fact, during the war years there were no subsidies, because there was so much business there was not any need for them. I am glad the gentleman brought that fact out, because it is important.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman mentioned that we recover a great deal in the way of income taxes, and the recapture of profits would be in addition, would they not?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is right; the recapture profits would be in addition to that. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last year carries a study of the returns to Uncle Sam by way of income tax from shipping lines which carried 50 percent of our relief cargoes. As I have already indicated, although over the period of 6 or 7 years it cost the Government, it is said, about $125 million more to use American-flag ships than foreign-flag ships, yet in the process Uncle Sam collected over $160 million. So again I say that we operated on that basis at a profit.

I have not said as much as could be said about the benefits to our economy by keeping our sailors employed, our shoreside operations going, keeping our ship-repair yards employed, all of which add to the welfare of our general economy.

Mr. PELLY. If the gentleman would yield further to me, am I correct in understanding from what the gentleman has said that if it were not for this 50–50 preference today, our merchant marine would be practically off the seas?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That would be true, as far as the tramp vessels are concerned. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, so far as these ships are concerned. If they were not permitted to participate in the carriage of shipments under this surplus agricultural-production program, practically all of our tramp ships today would have to be laid up, in my opinion.

Mr. PELLY. In the event, then, of an emergency, if we had trouble over in Formosa, we would be hardput to supply the needs of our armed services?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. We would not have the same number of ships available for immediate use. Those tramp ships undoubtedly would be put up in laidup status, and it would take some time to get them out. I think it is absolutely imperative, and all the military spokesmen feel the same way, that we have a nucleus number of ships ready for immediate use in the event of an emergency, and that we seek in every way to avoid the mistakes of World War I and World War II, when we were caught short of ships to such an extent that there are those in military circles who say we almost lost the war.

Mr. PELLY. May I ask the gentleman if it is not so that for military purposes it has been testified by the Bureau of Ships that we actually do not have enough ships at the present time in layup and in active service to take care of our military needs?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Spokesmen for the military feel that we are deficient a certain number of ships in addition to ships in our laidup fleet and in addition to the active American merchant marine. We are still deficient several hundred of certain types of vessels. We are at the same time concerned about the bloc of obsolete ships now in the laidup fleet, most of which are the old Liberty-type vessel built during World War II. They are at least 10 years old, or possibly older. They will be completely obsolescent within another 10 years. The military are concerned about that fact. What with the Russians having seven times as many submarines today as the Germans had at the outbreak of World War II, submarines of greater speed and greater range, the bulk of the ships in our laid-up fleet would fall easy prey to those submarines in the event of an emergency.

Mr. PELLY. I do think the gentleman has made a very timely and important statement, and I know that the Members of the House have been greatly interested.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

PROCUREMENT OF MILITARY DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to facilitate procurement of military doctors and dentists by providing scholarships and grants for medical and dental students. This bill was recommended by the Department of Defense in an executive communication over the signature of Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens dated February 23, 1955.

One of the most serious health problems in America today is the doctor shortage. We simply must recruit more doctors if we are to improve medical services for service personnel. As helpful as the proposed military pay increase would be, it is not the complete answer to service morale problems. It needs to be supplemented by improved medical and other fringe benefits. All plans for improved medical care in the services depend upon an adequate number of military doctors and dentists. This bill would help to break this bottleneck at a remarkably low cost of only $2,542,000 for its first fiscal year.

The bill would not only help service personnel. It would also help meet the medical needs of our civilian population. More doctors and dentists would be left at home to minister to civilian health needs, as fewer doctor draft calls would be necessary. Some of the scholarship recipients would eventually go into civilian practice, thus further helping to relieve the civilian doctor shortage.

In his executive communication, Secretary Stevens points out that there is a shortage of 2,300 regular medical officers in the 3 military departments, and that current methods of procuring career medical officers are inadequate to stop the growing deficit of career personnel of this type. He estimates that these scholarships will provide a maximum of 300 new doctors and 126 new dentists at the end of the second year of the operation of the plan.

One of the appealing features of this proposal to me, Mr. Speaker, is that it provides a military expenditure which is bound to be a sound investment for America's future, whether or not we eventually obtain the peace we are all so earnestly seeking. We hope the day will come when we can safely scrap our armaments. If that day comes, we would not lose the value of the doctors educated as the result of this bill's modest expenditures. We could look forward to many more years of our civilian populations benefitting from their training. Moreover, this is a military expenditure which is not subject to obsolescence. Today's munitions are rapidly out-dated, but today's new doctor can expect 40 or more years of significant service to our people, in peace or in the wars which we hope will never come.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to inform us how these scholarships may be obtained, and whether or not the scholarships will be paid by Federal money through the medical schools. In my own district, in Jersey City, we are for the first time starting a medical school combined with a private university. We are very anxious to get the scholarships and to get the school going. Could the gentleman explain whether or not your program envisages Federal help to the medical schools themselves?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. In order to conserve time, I will say that it will be allowed on a competitive basis. Very definitely it will help the medical schools because it will be on a scholarship basis for the individual and the scholarships will be apportioned out among the schools so there will be a chance for helping the various schools in that way.

Mr. TUMULTY. I thank the gentleman. I think his plan is most commendable.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PRIEST in connection with a bill he is introducing today that will form the basis for a review of our civil air policy.

Mr. DOYLE and to include appropriate material.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCVEY).

Mr. BALDWIN and to include a bulletin.

Mr. FJARE and to include a speech by Mr. Ancher Nelson, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $200.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. ZABLOCKI (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. CELLER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas.

Mr. BURDICK in three instances.

Mr. TUMULTY.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of illness in the family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 752. An act to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 1, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House on the following title:

H. R. 3828. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 8, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

500. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 102); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

501. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $10,000 for the John Marshall Bicentennial Celebration Commission (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

502. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $6,269,842, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

503. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

504. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to promote an agricultural development program under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

505. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

506. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

507. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

508. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

509. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of the General Accounting Office on the operation of the national school-lunch program by the Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act, 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

510. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the General Accounting Office report on the audit of the Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

511. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the annual report of the Department of the Air Force covering the disposal of Air Force excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV, 1949 (Public Law

152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Government Operations.

512. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a request for authority to dispose of records, transmitted by the Selective Service System, being of certain importance relative to selective service World War II records; to the Committee on House Administration.

513. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

514. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mrs. Elsie F. Campbell which, when executed by the regional director, Region No. 3, National Park Service, will authorize Mrs. Campbell to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within Timpanogos Cave National Monument, Utah, during a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

515. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report showing that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the following claim: *Felix McCauley, a member of the Kaw Tribe of Indians, on the relation of all members of the Kaw Tribe of Indians, plaintiff, v. The United States of America, defendant* (Docket Nos. 33, 34, and 35), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

516. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

517. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934, (18 U. S. C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

519. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report detailing the amounts of all moneys received and expended in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, pursuant to section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 470; U. S. C. sec. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

520. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

521. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

522. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

523. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged in floating plant operations"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2126. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4644. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 4645. A bill to facilitate the procurement of doctors of medicine and doctors of dentistry for the Armed Forces by providing grants and scholarships for education in the medical and dental professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4646. A bill to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 4647. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4648. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4649. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718d), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4650. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4651. A bill to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4652. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4653. A bill to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4654. A bill to provide that prices charged for barber services at certain Army and Air Force installations shall not be less than 80 percent of the prices charged for barber services in the nearby civilian trade area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 4655. A bill to authorize the expansion of post-office facilities at Williston, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLYLE:

H. R. 4656. A bill relating to the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4657. A bill to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit air carriers and foreign air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; to the Committee on Intestate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4658. A bill to amend section 602 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide an optional method of settlement of certain contracts of insurance which matured prior to September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4659. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 4660. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4661. A bill to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4662. A bill to reduce the cost to the United States for the development of flood control, navigation, and irrigation in the Willamette River Basin, Oreg., by providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of power facilities and appurtenances at the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork of the McKenzie River, Oreg., and the construction, operation, and maintenance of power facilities and appurtenances at the Green Peter Dam and Reservoir and construction, operation, and maintenance of the White Bridge Dam and Reregulating Reservoir (including power generating facilities and appurtenances) on the Middle Santiam River, Oreg., to be done with funds advanced by licensees; said facilities, to the extent of local participation therein to be subject to the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4663. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River Division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE (by request):

H. R. 4664. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4665. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that employees with at least 30 years of service may retire with full

annuities at 55 years of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 4666. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4667. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical and dental educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4668. A bill to amend section 4021 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 4669. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4670. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a taxpayer may deduct amounts paid to acquire, improve, or repair a home, to the extent that such amounts do not exceed 5 percent of his adjusted gross income for the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 4671. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relating to import duties on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 4672. A bill to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4673. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4674. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to provide for the payment of an additional amount to cover the cost of a burial lot in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4675. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4676. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4677. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 4678. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army under certain circumstances to offer land in reservoir areas for sale to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H. R. 4679. A bill to retrocede to the State of Michigan concurrent jurisdiction over that portion of former United States Highway No. 12 (Dickman Highway) traversing Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 4680. A bill affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4681. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4682. A bill to authorize the General Services Administrator to construct a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif., on land now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4683. A bill to amend section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1954, approved September 3, 1954 (ch. 1264, Public Law No. 780, 83d Cong.), to extend the time for work done by local interests on dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., from July 1, 1953, to November 7, 1953, and authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make reimbursement therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4684. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4685. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4686. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 so as to provide greater flexibility in making rural electrification loans, by eliminating the requirement that half of the funds for such loans be allotted among the States, and removing the limit on the amount of unallotted funds which may be loaned in any State or in the Territories; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4687. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of certain real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4688. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4689. A bill adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 4690. A bill for the relief of the city of Priest River, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 4691. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 4692. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 62 in lieu of at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4693. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that in the case of women the term "retirement age" shall mean age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4694. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4695. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a monetary allowance in lieu of providing a headstone or marker for the unmarked grave of a soldier or a member or former member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4696. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the cost of certain age searches, made by the Bureau of the Census to aid in determining the eligibility of applicants for old-age assistance under approved State plans, shall be paid from funds generally available for payments to States under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4697. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4698. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 4699. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4700. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4701. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4702. A bill to authorize modification of the flood-control project for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513–512–R, Richardson County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4703. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity, and relating to railway property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 4704. A bill to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4705. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens and limiting debts and expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Memorial of the State of Illinois, 69th General Assembly, senate resolution No. 19, resolving that industry be encouraged to take immediate steps to effectuate the dispersal of its facilities in the State of Illinois and urging that similar steps be initiated at the national level; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Concurrent resolution by the Senate of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the House of Representatives concurring therein, memorializing the Congress of the United States to act

promptly and favorably upon the Washita Basin (Okla.) project report; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting an increase in acreage allotments for Montana's premium high protein milling wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam located on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the introduction and early enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing sufficient appropriations be provided the Corps of Army Engineers for early construction of the Libby Dam located on the Kootenai River in Lincoln County in northwestern Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954 to add United States Highway No. 2 to the interstate system in accordance with the needs existing in 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give attention to the development of Lehman Caves National Monument and to take such action as is deemed necessary to bring this national monument to the standard of other national monuments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that sufficient funds be appropriated to construct a proposed road between Unalakleet and Kaltag, Alaska, in the construction year of 1956; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that to encourage and promote active search for, and exploitation of, domestic mineral resources, the Congress of the United States legislate into effect a tax-incentive program, applicable to all States, territories and possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4706. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Carl Adolf Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4707. A bill for the relief of Duncan McQuagge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4708. A bill for the relief of Roger Eugene Caillaud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4709. A bill for the relief of Margaret M. McCullin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4710. A bill for the relief of Ramon Gullon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 4711. A bill for the relief of Pedro Savala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H. R. 4712. A bill for the relief of Alina Kosmider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4713. A bill for the relief of Caterina Lueder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4714. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 4715. A bill to authorize Maj. Gen. Robert W. Grow, United States Army, retired, to accept the Homayun Decoration, 2d Class, and supporting documents conferred upon him by the Government of Iran; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4716. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ruth Long Crow Running Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4717. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain lands, to the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4718. A bill to authorize and direct the issuance of patent to Robert W. Retherford, of Anchorage, Alaska, to certain land in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

136. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., transmitting 16 resolutions adopted by the association at its biennial convention on November 29, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

137. Also, petition of the recording secretary, Nashville Industrial Union Council, Nashville, Tenn., requesting enactment of a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

138. Also, petition of the chief clerk, City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., requesting the Congress of the United States to increase the salaries paid to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

139. Also, petition of the general president, International Union of Operating Engineers, Washington, D. C., relative to the allocation of Federal automobile and related excise taxes exclusively for the use of highway planning and building and otherwise expanding the highway construction program; to the Committee on Public Works.

140. Also, petition of the president, the Estonian National Committee in the United States, New York, N. Y., requesting continued support of the cause of Estonia, which is aimed at the liberation of Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

141. Also, petition of the president, Lithuanian American Community of Omaha, Omaha, Nebr., expressing appreciation to the United States for its ever-increasing support of the cause of free Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Review of Civil Air Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill containing a number of amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. In its examination of this bill, along with other amendments of the act which may be proposed by others, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will conduct a review of the civil air policy of the United States.

Through the years this committee has been responsible for developing and presenting in legislative form the present civil air policy, both as it relates to purely domestic operations and as it affects the operations of our aircraft abroad and foreign aircraft to this country. This committee wrote and recommended to the House the legislation which became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the basic statute under which civil aviation operates today. The committee is proud of that statute. Under it, civil aviation has made the magnificent progress with which all of us are familiar—progress which permits us to say that we maintain, under the American flag, the finest air transport system in the world, both at home and abroad.

During the years since 1938 there have been few changes in the Civil Aeronautics Act. The problems of civil aviation have been adequately dealt with, notwithstanding the vast changes which have come about in those 17 years. However, the time has come when it is necessary to review that statute to determine whether some changes need to be made in order to make it a more effective instrument for the continued development and regulation of this great industry.

The bill which I have just introduced will serve as the basis on which this inquiry will be made. In it I have sought to present the major legislative issues which are under discussion at this time. However, if there are other issues which the Members of this body feel should be

reviewed as they affect civil aviation, I hope they will be promptly presented to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in order that they may be resolved.

My bill provides for the regulation of contract carriers by air. At the present time these carriers are not subject to economic regulation under the Civil Aeronautics Act. The bill would impose limited economic regulation upon them along the lines presently prescribed for c ntract motor carriers and contract water carriers. Since contract carriers compete with both scheduled and nonscheduled carriers by air for the best traffic available, the regulation of contract carriers is designed, among other things, to prevent discrimination in regulation. Your committee will expect to call upon its knowledge of civil aviation, as well as its experience in regulating other forms of transportation, in determining whether contract carrier regulation is necessary, and if so, the manner in which this regulation should be carried out.

My bill also includes provisions which more clearly define the relationship between the State and Federal Governments in the regulation of civil aviation, both safety and economic. Unfortunately, in the past few years there has been quite a bit of litigation in which it has been sought to draw the line under the existing law between the jurisdiction of State and Federal Governments in aviation regulation. Here again the committee will call upon its experience in dealing with other forms of transportation, as well as on its knowledge of the special characteristics of aviation, in working out this particular problem.

My bill also deals with the problem of the proper regulation of nonscheduled air carriers. Some years ago the Civil Aeronautics Board issued certain exemptions from regulation for the benefit of carriers conducting nonscheduled or, as we call them in the motor-carrier field, irregular route operations. Ever since that time the Board has expended great efforts in seeking to enforce its regulation which restricts these carriers to nonscheduled operations. While most of the carriers who are beneficiaries of the Board's exemption successfully conduct operations within the regulation, a few have sought to conduct elaborate scheduled operations between major cities in the country. The Board's efforts to enforce its regulation have resulted in violent controversy, some indications of it having appeared in statements on the floor of the House. Members have been concerned by reason of the charges made by some of the nonscheduled lines that a monopoly exists in air transportation, to the detriment of the sound development of air transportation. Similarly, members have been concerned by reason of the countercharges that the Civil Aeronautics Act is being subjected to wholesale violations. These fears, of which Members of this body have spoken, must be inquired into by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. The facts must be ascertained, and if legislative remedies are necessary, they must be recommended to the House by your committee. This will be done.

My bill provides for the extension to international operations of the Board's present powers to regulate cargo and passenger rates. At the present time the Board's powers to regulate international rates are very limited. A number of times the Board has recommended that its ratemaking powers be extended in the way provided for in my bill. This is a controversial subject. Your committee studied this same question very carefully prior to recommending legislation which became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. At that time the committee rejected the proposal for complete rate regulation in the international field, because it was fearful that this would cause retaliation and place the carriers in such an inflexible position that they would not be able to compete effectively with their foreign competitors. Times have changed greatly since that decision was made. The committee should explore the controversy and settle this question as to the scope of the Board's rate regulation.

In reviewing this proposed legislation I have touched upon only the major issues with which the bill deals. Many significant, though less important, changes appear in the bill and will be subjected to review. My reason for making this lengthy statement upon the introduction of this bill is to inform the Members of the House that this review of civil aviation policy is to be conducted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Thus the members will be afforded an opportunity to inform the committee of any problems affecting civil aviation which are giving them concern. Based upon its knowledge not only of civil aviation, but related fields of transportation, the committee will then consider these problems and make a report to the House, accompanied by such legislation as seems required to meet the problems presented.

Thomas Masaryk: The First Czechoslovak President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to pay tribute to an outstanding leader of our time.

Great nations have produced great men who have shaped the destiny of their peoples. America has men like Washington and Lincoln; Czechoslovakia has Thomas G. Masaryk. He was born on March 7, 1850, in Moravia, under humble conditions, and died as the first president of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Throughout his life Masaryk was a seeker and protector of the truth. He abhorred violence and terror in social life and politics. His intense feeling for democracy is evident from his statement: "The ideal of democracy is so high, so valuable, so dignified, that it is worth believing in, living for, fighting for." A champion of the oppressed, he constantly fought for the rights of minority groups.

Believing the Hapsburg monarchy to be incompatible with democratic self-government he worked for a free and independent Czechoslovakia. He continued the struggle after the outbreak of World War I, by traveling abroad to gain support for the Czechoslovak cause and with the aid of Edward Benês formed the Czechoslovak National Council, which was recognized, during the war, as the de facto government of Czechoslovakia. On November 14, 1918, when the Austro-Hungarian monarchy collapsed, he was elected president of the newly formed Czechoslovak Republic, and being on American soil at that time he visited President Wilson to express his gratitude for America's aid in the creation of the infant nation.

The Czechoslovak state which he founded was based on democratic freedom and recognized the rights and duties of the individual. Under Masaryk's firm leadership Czechoslovakia became one of the foremost democracies in Europe. He was reelected to the presidency in 1920, 1927 and 1934 and resigned, due to ill health, in 1935.

His spirit lives on in Czechoslovakia, despite the tragic experiences of the Czechoslovak people under the present Communist regime. This was appropriately expressed by President Benês at Masaryk's funeral in 1937 when he said:

> Though he passes on Masaryk is still with us. * * * President-Liberator, we will remain faithful to the heritage which you have laid in our hands.

Although this heritage has, at least for the present, been betrayed by the Communists, we know that the Czechoslovak people remain faithful to it in their hearts.

Thomas G. Masaryk: The Spirit of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, ought to remind us all of the great American heritage of democracy.

Thomas Masaryk was the embodiment of those same concepts that have made our Nation a great Nation. And it is not without significance that it was in America that Thomas Masaryk found much of the spiritual inspiration for creating the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. Thus,

Thomas Masaryk represents a link between America and his own native Czechoslovakia.

On this anniversary of the great Czech statesman let us, therefore rededicate ourselves to those higher ideals of democracy which are exemplified so well by the spirit of Thomas Masaryk. We are living in an epoch of trial; and the firmness of our convictions, the steadfastness in the righteousness of our cause, and the determination to preserve Western democracy—all are the elements which will insure ultimate victory.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk: Scholar and Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk it is fitting that we pay tribute to the man, to his life, and to his work.

At this critical juncture of civilization, the name of Thomas Masaryk has a special meaning; for next to Woodrow Wilson, perhaps no statesman of World War I had a greater appreciation of the importance of knowledge and education in relation to a democracy and to the continued growth of Western culture than Thomas Masaryk. Like Wilson, Masaryk was a scholar, statesman, and philosopher well grounded in the ideals of our Christian civilization. Christian democracy was to Thomas Masaryk the highest ideal to be achieved in the building of a state: A state inspired by, and based upon, the ideals of both Christianity and democracy.

A statesman convinced of the necessity for a sound educational system in a democracy, Thomas Masaryk infused into the newly constructed Czechoslovak Republic his own spirit of democracy and humanism. As a cure for political evils, Masaryk wrote:

> Democracy demands the political education of citizens and electors.

Education, he pointed out, was not to be solely erudition or one-sided and exclusive school education because they alone cannot bestow understanding, talent, or political sense. A nation needs a "strong and healthy brain," he said, and thus the objective of education in a democracy is "to teach the young to think."

Education did flourish in the Czechoslovakia of Thomas G. Masaryk, and it aided in molding the new Republic in the spirit of true democracy and humanism.

Since the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia in February 1948, the Communists have made a concerted effort to destroy the structure of the educational system of once free and independent Czechoslovakia. They have endeavored to build a structure based entirely upon the philosophy of communism. Knowing that education can mold the generations to come, the Communists have tried to mold the entire Czechoslovak system in the image of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and to produce a new type of man, the so-called Soviet man.

This communistic system of education, presently operating behind the Iron Curtain, is atheistic; it is materialistic; it is antidemocratic and antihumanistic.

Fundamentally, the Communist educational system is the very antithesis of everything Thomas Masaryk stood for.

Today Czechoslovakia is a participant in the universal struggle against totalitarian, atheistic communism. Unfortunately, Czechoslovakia is now within the Soviet orbit of power, and thus it is a nation in slavery.

On this 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, let us, therefore, call the attention of all the world to the dedication and to the principles of this great statesman. Let us also reassert and reemphasize our Christian and democratic principles, for it is in the strength and the vitality of these principles that the salvation of mankind may well rest in this global struggle with materialistic and totalitarian communism.

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, Dinosaur National Monument is an important part of our national-park system. It straddles the Utah-Colorado border up near Wyoming, and contains in it some of the most livable and beautiful river scenery in the entire Colorado system.

Right now, Dinosaur is under a serious threat. There is a multi-billion-dollar reclamation project before Congress to build a series of huge dams in the upper Colorado River system, so that Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico can make use of their half of the Colorado River's water. Conservationists would like to see a good Colorado River development plan. But they do not want to destroy our enviable, priceless reserves of parks and scenic wilderness unless there should be a compellnig national need for such destruction. There is not.

The proposed Echo Park Dam, which is part of the proposed upper Colorado River project, would destroy the best of Dinosaur. All over the country conservation organizations have vigorously protested this plan because national parks and monuments were set aside to be left unimpaired for the enjoyment and use of present and future generations. In the course of compiling their protests, they have discovered from the Bureau of Reclamation's own figures that alternate dam sites can do the job that needs to be done.

The conservationists oppose it for one reason: It violates both Dinosaur and the whole national-park idea. If a place is set aside for use as a dam site, the building of a dam will change it for all time. It is only fair, then, that if a place is set aside as a park or monument, it should be left as it is for just as long a time—forever unavailable for conflicting types of use.

I am a life member of the Sierra Club, which is an organization dedicated to the purpose of preserving our national parks and monuments. Last summer I spent 6 days in a rubber boat traveling 80 miles of the Yampa River Gorge through Dinosaur National Monument and past the proposed site of Echo Park Dam. The Yampa River Gorge is truly one of the most spectacular and unusual river canyons in the United States. It would be changed materially and adversely by the proposed Echo Park Dam. The destruction of the beauty of Dinosaur National Monument for the construction of such a dam would violate every principle upon which our great system of national parks and national monuments was built.

I am strongly opposed to the Echo Park Dam and therefore must be and am opposed to the upper Colorado River project, unless this project is modified to eliminate the Echo Park Dam and to use some alternate site which will not destroy Dinosaur National Monument.

The Sierra Club, in its bulletin for February 1955, has published the following analysis of the weaknesses of the upper Colorado River project as now proposed:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE COLORADO PROJECT?
A BRIEF STATEMENT OF DISPUTED QUESTIONS

CONCERNING PROPOSED ECHO PARK DAM

1. Advocates insist, even after demonstration that their figures were wrong, that this dam would save loss by evaporation that would supply water for "a city the size of Denver." This is incorrect. Alternate plans would result in less loss by evaporation.

2. Advocates imply that land nearby in Utah and Colorado would derive irrigation benefits. This is misleading. No water will be available for irrigation or domestic use from this dam.

3. Secretary McKay has stated that the dam would alter but not destroy the scenic beauty of Dinosaur National Monument. This is an error in judgment. The National Park Service was correct when it said the effect would be deplorable. The reservoir would periodically retreat nearly 40 miles, exposing 30,000 acres of silted landscape.

4. Some advocates claim that a reclamation withdrawal in the 1938 proclamation enlarging Dinosaur justifies constructing Echo Park Dam. It does not. This withdrawal is specific to Brown's Park, where a dam would flood a mile of canyon. The Dinosaur dams would flood 100 miles.

5. Advocates promise recreation for millions. Such choice is unnecessary and would be tragic. We need not flood an irreplaceable scenic sanctuary to provide reservoir recreation which can be had in abundance outside the national park system.

6. Advocates deny the damaging precedent, but precedent means "that which goes before"; and there now exist plans to build dams in nine national parks and monuments. The future will need more parks, not fewer.

CONCERNING THE ENTIRE DEVELOPMENT

1. The administration's local-State-Federal partnership plan for conserving small water-

sheds will alter the flow of the Colorado River. The effect on big-dam requirements is not yet known and needs to be considered.

2. The present storage project encompasses only part of a river basin and tends to duplicate rather than to complement existing costly development.

3. Premature authorization of so questionable a project would prejudice the emerging national water policy.

4. The project is likely to require major redesigning to accord with the pending Supreme Court interpretation of the 1922 Seven State Compact.

5. Financing, based on estimating procedures now proved unreliable, places undue faith on assumed hydroelectric-power revenues for repayment decades hence in an atomic-power age.

6. Excessive water is committed to more agricultural production—and at high altitudes—at the cost of upper basin industrial development and national decentralization.

7. Proponents have not given a frank estimate of the ultimate cost—probably to exceed $13 billion exclusive of interest subsidy.

A Common Intellectual Tradition Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is a weakness in our colleges and universities. It lies in the failure to keep intact as a unifying reference point for the students a common intellectual tradition, a sense of an intellectual community leading to a sense of the continuity of human experience. One used to find all this in the old prescribed courses of the humanities before a rampant, free-for-all, excessively individualist elective system ripped everything apart. But now we live with a situation where doctors only know how to make their meaning plain to other doctors; or engineers to other engineers; or lawyers to other lawyers, or businessmen to other businessmen, and so on. Each of these talks, and talks well within the range of a profession. But they do not talk up and down and across their professions. They do not talk up and down and across the whole range of human experience, stimulating and stimulated by that experience, to perfect the spirit of their age in the light of the spirit of all ages. They do not and they cannot do this, because they do not have in common a vocabulary they all understand—a vocabulary that was once drawn from the common fund of knowledge embraced by the humanities.

This point was well and brilliantly made in a recent speech at the National Conference on Higher Education by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas. I include this speech here. I do this in connection with a bill I am introducing today which I trust will help to correct a situation which is growing progressively worse.

The speech follows:

After the many taxing hours you've spent in discussion groups, I think I can best thank you for the invitation to speak here in this final hour, by speaking briefly. I shall try to do just that. In fact, the heart of what I have to say is expressed in but one story.

Some time ago, so this story goes, a warden at the Joliet penitentiary played host to a conference of criminologists, called to consider ways and means of reducing the crime rate. One speaker seemed to carry the day with his thesis that the way to do this was by requiring all young people to study mathematics intensively. For the discipline gained in this way, so the speaker claimed, would lead the young to think logically, and so make them virtuous when they came of age.

There was great applause when he reached the end and sat down. The warden alone seemed unimpressed. He asked an aide to fetch a certain prisoner, introduced him to the meeting, and then at once sent the prisoner back to his cell. "That man you just saw," the warden explained to the criminologists, "is the most brilliant mathematician in the whole prison. So brilliant, in fact, that it took bank examiners 10 years before they found that he was embezzling funds by juggling bank ledgers. That man was not deficient in mathematics. What he lacked was a sense of grammar and rhetoric. He simply didn't know the difference between the words 'mine' and 'yours'."

You will agree, I think, that the criminologist who saw in the science of mathematics the means to create a nation of moral men and good citizens, is not alone in his approach. He is joined by a chorus of voices, each with a special educational emphasis leading to the magic formula. To one person, it is training in physics, or medicine, or plant life. To another, it is training in business, or homemaking, or athletics. Let this or that be the cornerstone for higher education—so they say—and the arrangement of its own force will meet every danger, solve every problem, remove every evil, and gain every good.

As for myself, I am inclined to favor the warden's theory of education, if I may call it that. I am inclined to favor it, subject to three qualifications.

First, no system of higher education, however arranged, can bear the whole load of cultivating what lies in the human spirit. For that spirit, as the ancients taught us long ago, is a mixed thing. It is formed and ruled not alone by reason. It is also formed, and it is all too often ruled, by the will and by the passions. And if there are those who may deny this ancient fact, the rule of Adolph Hitler in Germany, and Mussolini in Italy, and the careers of a variety of imitators in the United States—each in a land preeminent for its literacy and enlightenment—are case studies of how reason can be set on its head by willful men who know how to play on passions, and so make the worse cause appear to be the better one.

The second qualification follows from the first. It is that if the education of the individual is viewed in its entirety, then disciplined hearts must dwell in the same body as disciplined minds. And in this light, not the schools alone can carry the burden of the work that needs to be done. Nor can they be charged—as they now often are—with full responsibility for any defective products. Our homes, our churches, our political institutions, our economic enterprises—all our media of communication—are, and must be considered, a part of what educates the individual. None can absolve itself from the end result. All are jointly responsible for what it is like.

The third qualification is addressed to those who would have the schools and colleges emphasize this or that specialized science and art. Let me say here that I have the utmost respect for the specialist. It is plain, for example, that we urgently need scientists and technicians who can lend their expertness to the defense of America and the free world. So, too, as a further example, do we need men, skilled in the art of economic management, who can perfect the way we organize production and distribution. This work is of supreme importance; for though it is true enough that man does not live by bread alone, at least he lives by bread. And we need places specifically set aside for the purpose of cultivating the science and art of making bread, and defending it.

Yet divorced from all else, this specialization in art and science—and here I come to my point—is not an education for a democracy. There is nothing to distinguish it from an educational system in a totalitarian state. Men like Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin may have boasted of a Nazi, or a Fascist, or a Communist science and technology. Yet these bits of knowledge are not political or moral by nature. The same textbooks dealing with them can be used by students in both democracies and tyrannies. For the subjects themselves are equally useful to freemen and slaves alike; and indeed, in ancient times, they were cultivated chiefly by slaves.

I repeat that this specialization does not form an education for a democracy. It does not create an atmosphere in which the mind can be opened to every intimate impulse and voice, meshed with other minds of a like sort. Specialization, by definition, focuses on only a small part of the human battleline. It orients no one toward a view and a place in the battleline as a whole. It orients no one toward the whole intellectual life and tradition of a country. It orients no one toward an understanding of man as he appears in a particular moment of current history, and in the history of the ages.

And it is precisely at this point—as I shall try to make plain in a moment—that the comment of the warden at Joliet seems to apply on all fours. Here, let me digress to say that from what I have seen of our colleges and universities, their key weakness is not that they breed Communists. It is arrant nonsense to say that they do. Not one of our enlisted men who went over to the Communist side during the Korean war and refused repatriation, cited as his reason any Marxist indoctrination while in college. Many of them never went to more than the primary grades, and in fact, were illiterate. As for the officers who were court-martialed for aiding the enemy, not one of these pointed an accusing finger at some university professor under whom they had studied at West Point or elsewhere.

Yet there is weakness in our colleges and universities. And now, in this hour of grace, we ought to turn our thoughts inward, and seek where this weakness lies. In my view, at least, it lies in our failure to teach grammar and rhetoric—to teach the difference between "mine" and "yours." In the largest sense for which this difference in words is but a symbol, it lies in our failure to keep intact as a unifying reference point for the undergraduate body, a common intellectual tradition, a sense of an intellectual community leading to a sense of the continuity of human experience.

One used to find all this in the old prescribed courses of the humanities before a rampant, free-for-all, excessively individualist elective system ripped everything apart. But now we live with a situation where doctors only know how to make their meaning plain to other doctors; or engineers to other engineers; or lawyers to other lawyers; or businessmen to other businessmen, and so on. Each of these talks, and talks well within the range of a profession. But they do not talk up and down across their professions. They do not talk up and down

and across the whole range of human experience, stimulating and stimulated by that experience, to perfect the spirit of their age in the light of the spirit of all ages. They do not and they cannot do this, because they do not have in common a vocabulary they all understand—a vocabulary that was once drawn from the common fund of knowledge embraced by the humanities.

All of this lends an air of paradox to our commitment to democracy. On the one hand, we assert our devotion to a system of government that is based on free and intelligible communication between citizen and citizen, and between the leaders and the led. On the other hand, we weaken the effectiveness of that system by a prevailing educational process that tends to narrow down communication by limiting it to an "Information Please" program and a Readers Digest, or by rendering meaning altogether meaningless. This paradox, let me add, is made to order for exploitation by the demagogs. For I noticed that when our higher institutions of learning came under attack from that quarter, all too many of them were bewildered by what they were called on to defend. They seemed at times to flounder in an inner darkness of their own making, equal in density to the darkness the demagogs meant to impose on them from without. The best that many of them could do was to raise the rallying cry of academic freedom. Yet academic freedom, while of supreme importance in the educational process, is not the end aim of the process. It is but a means to an end. And under conditions where so many of our institutions of higher learning lacked any coherent, general, and organized body of knowledge they meant to impart to their students, they were at a loss how to define the end they meant to preserve through academic freedom.

In saying this, I am not implying that our colleges and universities ought now to sit down in a solemn convention and agree on a body of doctrine which they will then impose as a new orthodoxy on their student bodies. In common with all of you, I see in any such proposal the death of all education; of an education, at least, whose aim ought to be the infusion of the spirit of learning among students, and whose method ought to be not indoctrination, but the constant exercise of the mind in meaningful arguments. In common with all of you, also, I see in any such proposal for orthodoxy, something of the ludicrous outlook of a university trustee who strongly objected to the text of a university president's commencement address. And when the president said to the trustee, "Well, don't you want your students to hear the truth?" the trustee answered, "Of course. But can't you print the truth on the back of the convocation program, and hand it to the graduates as they file out of the chapel?"

The tradition of the humanities, for whose restoration I am pleading as the heart of any educational system that can best serve democracy, is not a tradition of orthodoxy. It is a tradition of continuous disagreement between parties in a great dialogue extending back over the ages. All that these parties agreed upon was the topics they felt were worth talking about. And beyond this, the sense of unity that is present in their great dialogue was hinged to the fact that when they disagreed, they knew what they were disagreeing about. Today, by contrast, we are inclined to rush ahead pellmell with our solutions, without first asking what the question is we want to solve. Today, also, it happens all too often that people disagree violently without recognizing that they are talking about different things in the first place.

In the long retrospect, I think it is fair to say that the strength of our political institutions, is a strength drawn originally from men who shared the common heritage of education in the humanities. Indeed, in this respect, there probably was no institution of higher learning in history equal to the community of men who formed the Constitutional Convention. All were preeminent in practical affairs. Yet they were also men who knew how to speculate, who brought a broad range of human experience to bear first on their thoughts and then on their practical work. This is not to say that they agreed with each other. They disagreed sharply. But when they did, they shared a common vocabulary which made the eventual agreement possible. So, also, in later years, a Thomas Jefferson and an Alexander Hamilton, whose thoughts form the basic fabric of our national life, disagreed sharply. Yet they were children of the same tradition. And because they were, each in the act of disagreeing, brilliantly served the Nation so that we can now turn to Jefferson for guidance under one set of circumstances, and to Hamilton under a different set. And in this way, we profit from both.

I am saying here that tradition does not mean uniformity. It means diversity within an embracing unity. And it is to this end, I feel, that we must reconceive and reorganize the life that is lived in our schools of higher learning. We must make of those schools the home for a new spirit of learning. We must make them, as Woodrow Wilson pleaded in 1909, "a community of scholars and pupils—a free community but a very real one, in which democracy makes its reasonable triumphs of accommodation, its vital process of unity. I am not suggesting," Wilson continued, "that young men be dragooned into becoming scholars or tempted to become pedants, or have any artificial compulsion whatever put upon them, but only that they be introduced into the high society of university ideals, be exposed to the hazards of stimulating friendships, be introduced into the easy comradeship of the republic of letters. By this means the classroom itself might some day come to seem a part of life."

A final remark. I have no illusion that even if all this is done, all will be well with us in a present and future hour. For we face the fact that what we are educating, is, after all, the son of old Adam. And like his ancestor who rebelled against a teaching from the highest possible quarter, so can the son of old Adam rebel against what he is taught, and reach for forbidden fruit. Yet this much, at least, can be hoped for: That a familiarity with what the many generations of man have talked about and experienced in their career on earth, can, by pointing up the consequences, reduce the danger of such a rebellion, though it may not eliminate it altogether. Indeed, without this heroic hope that education can inch humanity forward toward the vision of human perfectibility, life itself would have no purpose.

In all that touches existence, free men everywhere look to America for leadership. When we wobble, they feel unsteady. When we creak, they groan. When we slip, they fall. But when we act with the clarity of a great purpose, they feel braced and uplifted. Our schools of higher learning must view themselves as the heart within the heart of what it is that can enable America to give free men the leadership they want. Yet America cannot exercise that leadership if, within the borders of our own land, we are in danger of losing the ability to talk to one another. It is to the restoration of that lost art, in all its admitted difficulties, that I hope our schools of higher learning will bend their chief energies.

"Just the Facts, Ma'am"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there is hardly among us anyone who has not at one time or another heard over the radio or the television, the expression which has become almost a household phrase, "Just the facts, ma'am."

Of course you recognize the phrase as that of Sergeant Joe Friday in the radio-television series "Dragnet."

Facts have always been a fetish with me.

For long years I dealt with the facts as a newspaper reporter. In those days I always attempted to portray the facts in the pieces which I wrote, as reliably and accurately as I knew them.

But facts, like statistics, are a rather tricky medium in the hands of individuals.

It has been said that statistics can prove anything.

I have always made the assertion that the same set of facts in the hands of an adroit and able reporter can be used for any purpose.

Give any reporter a set of facts and he can write a piece in any one of three ways: up, down, and in the middle. Facts can be slanted with adjectives and phrases to convey an idea or a conclusion which the reporter desires instead of what the cold facts actually are.

Give me a page 1 story and you can have 50 editorials on the editorial page of a newspaper and I will direct your conclusions.

An individual approaches an editorial page in one of three different attitudes.

If he is in agreement with the policy of the newspaper which he reads he approaches the editorial with a kindly and sympathetic feeling.

If he disagrees with the policy of the newspaper then he approaches the editorial with an antagonistic attitude and in a resentful mood.

If he has no feelings on the policy of the newspaper then he approaches the editorial with an open, but certainly argumentative frame of mind.

With the news story it is entirely different.

The average American newspaper reader accepts a news story at its face value as he does the remarks of the radio commentator, who in turn has gotten his information from the newspaper story.

Without suspicion the clever and adroit reporter can make his reader believe anything he wants him to believe. He can mold him like clay in the hands of a sculptor. And the very first to indignantly deny that he is being led by the average news article is the very individual himself who was affected.

Now what does all this lead to?

Having worked the other side of the street and with cause, believing that I know most of the tricks of the trade,

it has annoyed me considerably to read some of the so-called objective and unbiased news articles which have appeared in the Nation's press on the recent congressional and judicial salary boosts.

Objectivity—or the lack of it—in news reporting has always intrigued me and I am sure it would intrigue all of you if you ever stopped long enough to analyze some of these objective reports.

Seldom has there been such clever misrepresentation of the facts as during the consideration of the congressional and judiciary pay raise bills. In fairness to the press it must be stated that they were given very able assistance by some of our own Members.

I had hoped that these misrepresentations would cease with the final action on the measure. It was indeed a forlorn hope.

The most annoying thing about the whole business is that these misleading articles do deal in factual statements and in the facts but they are presented in such a manner and fashion that a completely erroneous conclusion is drawn from such articles.

I have a case in point.

Under the Associated Press credit line an article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Friday March 4 under the heading "Congressmen To Get Big Pension Hike."

Now that is true. Under the recent pay boost Members of Congress will get a big pension hike. But there is still more truth to such a statement—that part of the truth and the facts which have not been printed and which are necessary to complete the picture.

Any individual reading the article would immediately come to the conclusion that Members of Congress boosted their retirement pay by $5,625 to $16,875.

The article did not say that in order to receive such a retirement payment a Member would have to serve 30 years beginning March 1, 1955, through March 1, 1985, that he would have to pay a total of $40,500 from his paycheck and that he would have to have reached the age of 62 years.

In order to demonstrate what I have been talking about I have used this article and headline as an example of how a certain set of facts can be used to distort conclusions.

I am reproducing the article as it appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald under the Associated Press credit line. I then have taken the same story and written another story around the same set of facts but painting an entirely different and favorable picture. In order to be most accurate and to clearly and vividly demonstrate my point I have taken the exact words of the Associated Press story and incorporated them into my rewritten story and see what you have.

Here is the original story by the Associated Press:

CONGRESSMEN TO GET BIG PENSION HIKE

The $7,500 annual pay raise Congress voted its Members this year adds $5,625 a year to maximum congressional pension benefits.

The maximum payment goes only to those who complete 30 years or more of congressional service. To qualify for the new top pension of $16,875 a year, a Member would have to serve 30 years under the new pay scale.

Pension payments to Congressmen are based on average annual salary during a Member's tenure in office, with a limit of 75 percent of full pay.

President Eisenhower signed into law Wednesday a bill raising Congress Members' salaries from $15,000 to $22,500 a year as of March 1.

The top pension any Member could draw under the salary scale in effect when the present Congress convened was $11,250.

Pension payments are at the rate of 2½ percent of average pay multiplied by the number of years of service.

Contributions to the pension fund also will increase as a result of the pay raise, since Members pay 6 percent of their salary into the fund. Participation is voluntary.

Now here is the same story around which has been written all the facts in the case.

For the purpose of emphasis I have quoted those portions of the following story which appeared in the original Associated Press story. I have also written a new headline which is also as factual as the original headline but which carries a different suggestion and most certainly has a different flavor.

Here is the story which will never be printed except in these columns.

CONGRESSMEN MUST PAY HEAVY ADDITIONAL TAX

(Disassociated Press)

As a result of the recent $7,500 congressional pay raise, Members of Congress will be compelled to pay out of their checks an additional $3,300 annually, reducing the "take-home pay" of the new amount by approximately 40 percent.

Part of the deductions from the monthly paycheck of Members of Congress are compulsory, part of it voluntary.

The compulsory withholding sum for income-tax purposes will amount to $2,850 more annually assuming that the new pay raise, exclusive of other income, places a Member of Congress in the 38-percent bracket. In at least one instance the new pay raise will result in only $75 a year additional "take-home pay." The Member affected is already in the 90-percent bracket and voted against the pay raise.

The voluntary deduction, which qualifies a Member for participation in a retirement fund only after he has reached the age of 60, at a lesser rate, or the age of 62, at full rate, after he has served at least 5 years, will amount to $450 additional annually. Those Members of Congress who have elected to participate in the retirement fund are now paying annually $900 per year. The new pay raise will bring this contribution up to $1,350 annually, the highest it has ever been in congressional history.

"The annual pay raise Congress voted its Members this year adds $5,625 a year to maximum congressional benefits."

"The maximum payment goes only to those who complete 30 years or more of congressional service. To qualify for the new top pension of $16,875 a year, a Member would have to serve 30 years under the new pay scale." No present Member of the House could, therefore, qualify for the maximum figure unless he is reelected to the next Congress and serves 30 years after that. Because the pay raise did not become effective until March 1, 2 months short of a complete year for service in the 83d Congress, no Member of the House would be eligible until 1984 for the maximum.

"Pension payments to Congressmen are based on average annual salary during a Member's tenure in office with a limit of 75 percent of full pay."

Pension payments are also made to members of the judiciary who were given pay raise in excess of the amount given Members of Congress. Unlike Members of Congress who elect to participate in the retirement plan, judges do not contribute anything to their retirement payments which are automatic at retirement age regardless of years of service.

While the retirement amount for Members of Congress is based on the average salary during tenure of office the retirement pay of other Government workers coming under retirement plans is based on the 5 years' highest salary during Government service.

Members of the armed services, who also do not contribute to their retirement fund, receive an amount based on the pay of rank at their retirement regardless of age.

"President Eisenhower signed into law Wednesday a bill raising Congress Members salary from $15,000 to $22,500 a year as of March 1."

"The top pension any Member could draw under the salary scale in effect when the present Congress convened was $11,250." Only a relatively few Members of the present Congress could qualify for this amount, however, since it is based on 30 years' service at a salary of $15,000. For retirement purposes the $15,000 salary figure became applicable during the 82d Congress, thus only those elected to the last Congress and who serve for 30 years, to the year 1983, would have become eligible for this amount. "Pension payments are at the rate of 2½ percent of average pay multiplied by the number of years of service." Any Member to qualify for the maximum retirement pay under the recent pay rise must voluntarily contribute from his salary the sum of $40,500, serve 30 years, and reach the age of 62 years.

"Contributions to the pension fund also will increase as a result of the pay raise bill, since Members pay 6 percent of their salary into the fund. Participation is voluntary."

To further illustrate exactly how misleading the Associated Press story is, there are men serving in the present Congress for 30 years and over who never, never could or will qualify for the maximum retirement pay. These men, if they are in the retirement plan, will have their retirement computed on the basis of a salary ranging from $7,500 to $22,500 per year. A provision which would have enabled Members of Congress to enjoy the same privilege as all other Government civil service workers in the retirement plan by basing the retirement pay on the 5 highest consecutive years was knocked out of the proposed legislation.

To be specific take my own individual case. I could remain here 30 years and never receive either the new maximum of $16,875 or the most prior maximum of $11,250. When I first came to Congress the salary was $10,000, then it became $12,500 and then $15,000 for retirement purposes and now $22,500. I am in my 15th year. I will qualify when I become 62 years of age which is 8 years away. Then I would have had 22 years service and my retirement would be computed on the average ranging between $10,000 and $22,500. And incidentally I had to pay $3,000 cash in order to qualify for retirement when the system was opened to Members of Congress. There are many other cases similar to mine. I only cite it for example.

Anybody, however, reading this Associated Press article would come away with the conclusion that every Member of Congress just had to wait until he retired to collect this handsome sum of money.

Oh yes; "Just the facts, ma'am" are rather confusing when presented by some people who really do not want you to have all the facts about the facts.

What good will all this do?

None.

At least I have gotten it off my chest.

Supreme Court and U. N. Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, every day adds cumulative evidence to the proposition that we should get out of the United Nations at the earliest possible moment. This we can do by an act of Congress, as I have explained heretofore. We do not need any constitutional amendment to do it, although that would accomplish the purpose and further would make future so-called treaties like the Charter of the United Nations impossible.

The question came up squarely in the Steel Seizure case, where an attempt was made to declare the Charter of the United Nations superior to the provisions of the Constitution. Five Justices of the Supreme Court said "No," but the Chief Justice and three others said "Yes" or took no part. This decision saved the Constitution, and I thought it not likely that another attempt would be made to assault its authority. But it came up in the Iowa Supreme Court, where the decision declared unequivocally for the Constitution, and held that the Charter of the United Nations could not override the State laws of Iowa.

That decision was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, where 4 Justices declared for the Charter of the United Nations and 4 declared against it. One vacancy on the Court caused this 4-to-4 decision, and, there not being a majority of the Court ready to declare the charter superior to a law of Iowa, the Constitution was saved again.

This last case was a close call, for if it had gone the other way the Charter of the United Nations would have been declared superior to any law in any State.

You cannot, therefore, blame the Members of the Senate of the United States for being suspicious of the appointment of John Marshall Harlan, for, being a Rhodes scholar, and knowing the purpose of the Rhodes scholarships from their own definition, the chances are that this new Judge would be more apt to uphold the Charter of the United Nations as being superior to any State law. Senator EASTLAND, in opposing the confirmation of Mr. Harlan, has put his finger on the danger to the Constitution that could easily arise from the confirmation.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1850, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was born in southeastern Moravia. He later became the first President of Czechoslovakia. A Slovak by birth and the son of poor parents, he entered the University of Vienna in 1869. There he studied and later lectured on philosophy. In 1891 he was elected to Parliament as a member of the Young Czech—Liberal—Party. However, soon thereafter he resigned his seat and during the next 15 years wrote a series of books on the Czech question, the principles of nationality, and social philosophy. In 1900 he founded the small but influential Realist, or Popular, Party.

At the outbreak of the First World War he envisaged the breakup of Austria and the emergence of the Czechoslovak state. He fled to Italy and then to France, England, Russia, and the United States. In May 1917 Masaryk founded the Czech National Council, with its headquarters in Paris. He then went to Russia and created the Czech Legion out of Czech deserters from the Austrian Army. After the Bolshevik Revolution he secured the consent of the Soviet government for the exit of the legion through Siberia.

He came to the United States, and to a great extent through President Wilson's support for the Czech cause, the Republic of Czechoslovakia was recognized in 1918 by Italy, Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. The Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence was formally published at Washington, D. C., on October 18, 1918, and the Republic was formally proclaimed at Prague on October 28, 1918. Masaryk was elected the first President of the Republic. As President-Liberator, he wisely guided his country's affairs until 1935, when he resigned for reasons of health. Two years later Masaryk died, beloved by all his countrymen.

Masaryk ranks among the great as a philosopher and a statesman. Above all, he will take his place in history as a devoted Czechoslovak patriot who dedicated both himself and his country to the ideals of liberty and democracy. He was a friend and admirer of the United States and the principles for which it stands. He was an enemy of tyranny and a friend of freedom. As long as his memory and his teachings endure in the minds and hearts of the Czechoslovaks, the Communist regime which now oppresses them is doomed to fail. The Czechoslovaks can be sure that they have the sympathy and support of the American people in the trials through which they are passing.

Atomic Energy Progress Confronts Upper Colorado River Project With New Obstacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the age of nuclear power has arrived and electric power companies are now building at their own expense new plants which will supply electricity produced by atomic fission.

What does this mean to conscientious legislators who must evaluate proposals to invest large sums of money in new Federal hydroelectric projects?

Simply that they must look at them, not only in the light of all factors heretofore considered, but with this additional question in mind: In the foreseeable future will nuclear power be transformed into electric energy at cheaper rates than electric energy can be obtained from water power?

If the answer is "Yes," then our vast hydroelectric plants may become obsolete white elephants, giving way to more efficient nuclear-electric plants just as the horse and buggy gave way to the more efficient automobile. If this should happen, the Federal Treasury would never recover the millions it might pour into hydroelectric and related developments.

With millions, and possibly billions at stake, consideration of this possibility is absolutely essential if Congress is to act with responsibility in this day of swiftly moving scientific progress.

The proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River storage project is a specific instance.

Bills now before the Congress call for a spending authorization ranging from $1 billion to $1.8 billion on the upper Colorado River. They would construct numerous irrigation projects, the revenues from which could repay only 10 percent of their cost. Tied in the bills are expensive hydroelectric projects, the power revenues from which would be expected

to repay not only the cost of the power dams and installations, but also 90 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Planning figures show that it may take up to 100 years to pay for these projects out of the hydroelectric power cash register.

Thus, for financial success, nuclear-electric energy must not be produced more cheaply than hydroelectric energy for at least 100 years.

What are the prospects in this regard?

Simply, that not in 100 years, not in 50 years, but in a much shorter time nuclear-electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy.

Remember, just 15 years ago, in 1940 nuclear power was practically unheard of. By 1945, 5 short years later, the first A-bomb had exploded over Hiroshima. Research for peacetime use was so concentrated during the subsequent 10 years that today commercial nuclear-electric energy generating plants actually are being constructed.

The British Government announced a 10-year program for building 12 atomic power stations at an estimated cost of $840 million. The British say these plants will produce electricity at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with their present convention generating cost of 7.2 mills.

United States cost figures prepared by James A. Lane, of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, show the average figure in this country for producing electricity in conventional steam plants is 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills.

That is without considering that nuclear-electric plants can actually produce plutonium as a byproduct which can be sold for a high price, in the neighborhood of $100 a gram.

If this be done, there is little cost left for power generation to bear, and a reactor plant could put on the transmission line 1 or 2 mill current instead of 6.7 mill current. Even if the military demands become satisfied and the price of plutonium eases back to its fuel value of about $20 a gram, the sale of byproduct plutonium can be a substantial source of operating revenue.

That is why Representative CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, Vice Chairman of the Joint House-Senate Atomic Energy Committee, just a few days ago predicted that atomic experts will develop a reactor in the next 2 years that will produce power as cheaply as oil, coal, or water.

Within 5 years, he said, atomic powerplants should be commercially competitive with present lower cost sources of power, which, of course are the hydroelectric plants.

During a speech in Los Angeles on February 15, Floyd B. Odlum, financier and president of Atlas Corp., predicted that by 1975 all electricity in the United States will be generated by uranium-based powerplants. He, too, said that even at present atomic energy is practically competitive with other fuels for the generation of electric power.

Using a cubic-inch block of wood as a symbol representing a similar block of uranium 235, Odlum said that 20 such little blocks of U–235 would supply enough energy to provide New York City with all its electrical needs for a 24-hour period.

Of course, there are numerous technical difficulties yet to be overcome in the production of nuclear electricity. But the fact is they are being overcome and sometimes in the very process of building nuclear-electric facilities.

Consolidated Edison of New York, one of the Nation's leading power producers, boldly announced only a month ago that it will soon build a nuclear-electric generating plant to add to its system.

Thus the problem is facing us squarely, and we cannot dodge it in connection with the Upper Colorado proposal. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Congress must have their eyes open to these facts of modern day life. There must be a clear-cut determination as to whether or not nuclear-electric energy developments will turn this proposed multi-billion-dollar expenditure into a dead loss. We cannot inflict such an enormous new burden on the Nation's taxpayers for several generations to come.

Therefore, Congress must hold thorough hearings on this point. It must even delay consideration of the legislation for a year or two, if need be, so that it may be evaluated in the light of results of nuclear-electric energy research and development now under way.

So that the Congress may be further informed I am backing up this plea by citing additional information collected over the past few weeks.

On March 27, 1954, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said in a report that—

> Economically competitive atomic power will be a reality in the United States within the next 10 years.

On March 9, 1954, Henry D. Smyth, member of the Atomic Energy Commission, said in an address:

> It is evident that we can build powerplants which will convert the energy released in nuclear fission into electrical energy to be fed into transmission lines.

The electric companies public information program said in a 1953 report:

> Nuclear power looms on the horizon as an energy source which might well become competitive with coal, oil, gas, or falling water in the next few years. Within the past 2 years nuclear heat has converted water to steam, from which electricity was generated.

In a report to Congress in July 1954, the AEC stated it could be reasonably expected that nuclear fuel would be economical enough to compete with conventional fuels in the foreseeable future. Atomic material costs have been brought to a record low, and ore processing developments have resulted in major reductions in the cost of fissionable materials and paid for themselves many times.

Thorium, which can be converted by atomic reactions into a fissionable material, is 3 or 4 times as plentiful as uranium, the report said.

Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of engineering at Columbia University, said on June 3, 1954:

> The important conclusion from the data is that already, with only about 10 years of any appreciable searching for uranium, we have completely reversed our position held in the immediate postwar period when most so-called experts were saying we couldn't possibly have enough uranium to build an atomic power economy.
>
> In this short space of time, there has come general agreement that our uranium reserves constitute the major fuel reserves in the world for the future. A figure something like 25 times as much energy in uranium as in coal, oil, and gas is now usually quoted.
>
> There, again, this figure has to be viewed as a tentative figure. It wouldn't surprise some of us too much to find there were 100 times as much energy in the form of atomic fuels as future progress develops in atomic energy release methods, atomic fuel recovery methods, raw material prospecting, and so on down the line.
>
> The important lesson is that our future energy reserves are abundant in the atomic field.

On December 20, 1954, the Associated Press reported from Washington in the Salt Lake Tribune:

> Within 20 years about twice as much electric power will be furnished by the atom as is now generated by waterpower, according to a private study prepared for the use of investor groups.
>
> The growth will represent conservatively a private investment of about $6 billion in nuclear-powered electric plants, it was estimated, of which more than $1 billion will go into reactors alone.
>
> The survey was made by H. Dewayne Kreager, metal and power specialist associated with John R. Steelman. Steelman, a top assistant to former President Harry S. Truman, now is an industry consultant here. Kreager until mil-1953 was the executive officer of the Office of Defense Mobilization.
>
> Labeled "an economic timetable," the survey predicted that from 1975 to the end of the century, 80 percent of all new generating capacity installed in this country will be atom-powered.
>
> * * * * *
>
> "The first 10 years should be regarded as an experimental period," the study says. "Nineteen hundred and sixty-five is the estimated and somewhat arbitrary date at which power from nuclear reactors is expected to become economically competitive with existing thermal (coal- or oil-fueled) plants.
>
> "However, 1965 is an outside date; competitive electric power from nuclear energy may come as early as 1960."

A 5-year program of the AEC will embrace 5 different reactor projects costing a total of $241 million.

The projects are:

First. A full-scale nuclear powerplant to be built by Westinghouse Electric and Duquesne Light near Pittsburgh.

Second. A boiling-water reactor to be built by the Argonne National Laboratory. This reactor promises to cut power costs substantially.

Third. A sodium-graphite reactor to be built by North American Aviation, Inc. This reactor may produce more atomic fuel than it burns.

Fourth. A fast breeder reactor to be built by Argonne.

Fifth. A homogeneous reactor to be built at Oak Ridge.

In March 1954 a report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy stated:

> There is real confidence that atomic power can be produced at a cost competitive with fossil fuels such as coal and oil within the next decade by exploring these five approaches.

Lawrence R. Hafstad, Director of Reactor Development for the AEC, said, on July 21, 1954:

In uranium we have what promises to be both a compact and a cheap source of energy. * * * One pound of uranium, about a cubic inch, contains as much energy as * * * 1,500 tons of coal. That this energy promises to be cheap, we can see by calculating the cost of the 1,500 tons of coal. At $8 a ton, this would be in the neighborhood of $10,000, whereas the cost of 1 pound of uranium is more like $20.

A story in the New York Times, December 12, 1954, said:

Leaders of the Nation's $25 billion electric light and power industry have come to the conclusion that they must build nuclear reactors. This decision has been reached despite the greater efficiency of coal at present for generating steam for power.

In a private report being sent to the executives and engineers of the country's power companies, emphasis is placed on atomic fission as the future source of energy. * * *

Some of the finest atomic engineering minds in the country put the findings together after considerable research. The report is being issued by the electric power companies information program (PIP).

"The consensus of opinion is that within 10 years, or possibly sooner, private industry will cross the threshold of economic nuclear power," the study says.

Congress has appropriated more than $13 billion for atomic energy activities.

The Atomic Energy Commission already is the world's third largest business. Only Metropolitan Life Insurance and American Telephone & Telegraph have greater assets. Physical assets owned by the AEC are considerably larger than such assets of General Motors and Standard Oil of New Jersey. If the present expansion program continues, the AEC will soon be the world's largest single enterprise.

More than 150,000 persons were given employment under the AEC program in 1953.

Faced with a growing shortage of coal for power generation, Great Britain has turned to the development of commercial nuclear power reactors as before noted. "This is a historic day for Britain," declared Geoffry Lloyd, Minister of Fuel and Power, when he announced the plan to Parliament February 15. He spoke of tremendous prospects that offer possibility of a new industrial revolution.

Canada is completing a big reactor, after which private enterprise will be permitted to develop commercial nuclear power.

Norway and Sweden are engaged in extensive work to develop nuclear power for commercial use.

Brazil, Australia, and India are at work to develop nuclear power for commercial use.

The Edison Electrical Institute said in its 1953 report:

Commercial utilization of nuclear energy * * * could result in important conservation of the Nation's reserve of fossil fuels, a highly desirable long-range objective. Moreover, this potential sources of fuel may ultimately provide a means for reducing fuel costs at central stations.

On February 17, 1954, President Eisenhower said in a message to Congress:

In 1946, too, economic industrial power from atomic energy sources seemed very remote; today, it is clearly in sight * * * largely a matter of further research and development.

Foreign Aid Cost to the United States for 1953 Exceeded All Payments to Operate Our Government, Including Checks to Individuals, by $831,061,737

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the following tables will point out just how our Government expense account audits up, and shows how much money we spent and on what project spent, during 1953. We hear many complaints about the cost for old-age assistance, assistance to dependent children, the crippled and the blind, aid to veterans and hospitals for veterans, the agricultural conservation program, unemployment compensation, readjustment benefits to veterans.

Here is the actual accounting sheet:

Grants to States and local units

ACTIVITY AND TOTAL AMOUNT TO ALL STATES	
Agricultural experiment stations, grants	$12,285,308
Cooperative agricultural extension work	31,485,726
National school-lunch program, grants	81,665,047
National forest fund, shared revenues	17,608,984
Submarginal land program, payments for	448,049
State and private forestry cooperation	10,275,566
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	66,024,948
Commodities donated by CCC to schools	12,986
Federal airport program, CAA	26,990,836
Bureau of Public Roads, highway grants	515,444,540
Bureau of Public Roads, emergency grants	1,866,254
Support of State maritime schools	266,432
Lease of flood-control lands, Army	869,051
Federal aid, wildlife restoration	12,474,131
Distribution under Minerals Leasing Act	17,010,013
Distribution from receipts, Migratory Bird Act	485,694
Payments to States from grazing receipts	7,190,714
Unemployment compensation and service	197,779,364
American Printing House for the Blind	185,000
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	22,244,093
Colleges for agricultural and mechanical arts	5,030,000
Cooperative vocational education	25,420,754
School construction, and survey, grants	118,308,139
Maintenance and operation of schools, grants	65,994,669
Venereal disease control, grants	7,162,260
Tuberculosis control, grants	5,300,000
General health assistance, grants	13,536,970

Grants to States and local units—Continued

ACTIVITY AND TOTAL AMOUNT TO ALL STATES—continued	
Mental health activities, grants	$3,049,736
Cancer control, grants	2,894,666
Heart disease control, grants	1,348,104
Water pollution control, waste, studies	1,113,416
Hospital construction and survey	109,302,421
National Cancer Institute, grants	2,301,773
National Heart Institute, grants	1,685,740
Old-Age Assistance, regular grants	899,390,252
Aid to dependent children, grants	338,549,221
Aid to permanently disabled, grants	59,317,125
Aid to the blind, grants	32,668,872
Maternal and child health services, grants	13,299,919
Services for crippled children, grants	11,814,776
Child welfare services, grants	6,388,437
Housing aids of all kinds, grants	30,715,401
Disaster relief	4,629,128
Civil Defense Administration, grants	13,890,743
Federal Power Commission, payment to States	33,531
State and Territorial homes for veterans	3,722,190
Supervision, on-the-job training, veterans	1,890,574
Self-employment allowances for vets	242,156
Grants-in-aid	2,802,365,266
PAYMENTS DIRECT TO INDIVIDUALS	
Agricultural conservation program	$206,797,815
Administration Sugar Act, subsidies	61,210,169
Farm Housing Repair program, grants	56,310
Forest Highways, Bureau of Public Roads	22,334,373
State marine schools (4 States only)	273,298
National Guard and Air Guard	150,941,660
Unemployment compensation for veterans	25,907,392
Research grants, several fields, total	21,052,428
Traineeship awards, several fields, total	2,230,488
Teaching grants, etc	6,661,928
Fellowship awards, grants, total	1,784,673
Autos for disabled veterans	18,223,614
Readjustment benefits for veterans	734,073,888
Total payments to individuals	1,251,576,528
Plus grants-in-aid	2,802,365,266
Grand total (1953)	4,053,941,794

Compare that total of $4,053,941,795 to the total handed out to foreign countries during the same period of time. This total was $4,885,003,528.

The only place we can save money, and take off the backs of the people the onerous load of taxes, is to do it by cutting down this foreign aid. We cannot reduce our appropriations for national defense; we cannot do less than we have for the people of the United States—we should do more—but we can plug up this hole through which our billions are going in foreign aid.

The figures are taken from the News Bulletin No. 45, issued by Paul Peters.

As Things Look to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech by Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration, entitled "As Things Look to Me":

AS THINGS LOOK TO ME

(Address by Ancher Nelsen, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration)

Years ago in Minnesota we had a farm magazine called the Farm Stock and Home, and a former editor of that paper by the name of Harry Owens used to write a column entitled "As Things Look to Me." Harry would tell us each month just exactly what was on his mind, what he thought was right and what he thought was wrong. He gave his own opinion and appraisal of happenings of the day and these expressions represented his honest views. As a result, his readers eagerly followed his column month after month.

I am going to borrow that column heading to use as the title of my speech here today. I want to emulate also Harry's forthrightness in stating the facts as I see them as I give my annual report to the farm people who make up this rural electrification program.

This opportunity to speak to so many of you people who have the first-hand responsibility to your farm neighbors for the management of the rural electric system over the country is to me a real challenge. As co-op directors, you are carrying a responsibility which I used to have in my own co-op, and actually I feel more at home talking with you whom I consider fellow directors than in talking as REA administrator.

As directors and officials of the rural electric systems, you are the custodians of a great trust which your neighbors and friends have placed in you. You share in responsibilities which are common to all of us in this program. The fact that more than 9 out of 10 of our farms today are enjoying central station electric service does not mean that the trust has been discharged. No, not by any means. In some respects, your responsibilities are just starting.

We in REA have responsibilities too. Most of them are similar to yours, area coverage, financial soundness, adequate low cost power, self-reliance. These are among the things that concern you as well as REA.

Since coming to REA from my local co-op now nearly 2 years ago, I have tried to keep a clear picture in my mind as to what our job should be and with the help of the many dedicated people we have in REA, we have sought to shape a program of action aimed at getting those jobs done. What we have is a program that is working effectively on many fronts.

I want to make use of this opportunity here today to give you a report of that comprehensive action program and the progress we are making toward the major REA goals. If you will accept this report with an open mind, weighing fairly what has been done, I am convinced you will agree that REA has gone forward so that today rural electrification stands more firmly on solid ground than ever before.

Let us outline the major jobs that we have before us and then appraise what we have done about them.

First, there is area coverage.

REA was established in the first place to accomplish this job. The REA borrowers came into being to accomplish this job. It is a responsibility that is shifting more and more to you, the borrowers. REA continues to have the financing part of the job but, in the final analysis, whether or not area coverage is achieved depends upon what you do.

During the last year the percentage of farms electrified moved a little nearer the 95-percent mark. REA approved loans in calendar 1954 that will finance central-station electric service to a total of 116,000 consumers, a substantial increase over the year before.

Loans are the first step in area coverage and we have sought to speed up our handling of loan applications. We adopted a fast, hard-hitting type of organization, with competent people in the key jobs, and we cut redtape to the bone. This has speeded up our handling of loan applications, and we have been able to cut down the backlog of applications to just about half of what it was a couple of years ago. There will, of course, always be some backlog but the present situations means that there is a minimum of delay for borrowers in getting their loans approved.

Moving over into the telephone program, we have proceeded diligently to speed up operations there too, and we believe that new preloan engineering procedures now in effect will speed things up still more. In calendar 1954 we made more than $66 million in telephone loans, more than in any other calendar year since the program began. More than 100,000 rural homes now have received new or improved service through the program, and construction is proceeding at a good pace.

One of the big difficulties in the telephone program is to get enough qualified telephone engineers. We need them for our own staff and there is alsd a need for more private consulting engineers to work with borrowers.

Good progress in the telephone program requires a high degree of industrywide cooperation. Every borrower must have connecting arrangements of some sort—always for nationwide long-distance service and usually for local service into trading centers as well.

Our endeavor has been to cultivate an atmosphere of understanding and cooperation with the industry. In turn we have expected their cooperation. Gradually much of the distrust and misunderstanding is being overcome. We have repeatedly indicated that we are not interested in building an empire in the telephone field. We are only interested in making telephones available to the farmers. To the extent the industry is financially able and willing to do this, that is fine. Where the industry can't, REA will push ahead as hard as it can to find ways for doing the job.

From President Eisenhower on down the administration objective in both the electric and telephone programs is to meet the needs. The needs are being met and there is going to be money left over.

When this fiscal year has been completed, we will have made another reduction in the backlog of loan applications and there will be a total of $56 million of surplus loan funds that will not have been used. Remember that statement.

In one State as of now, it seems likely that the State allotment formula will handicap the making of loans, but keep this one thing in mind: more money is not the solution to that difficulty.

If we were going to circumvent the law by asking Congress to pour extra appropriations into the State allotment formula, it would take a truly fantastic additional loan authorization. The figure would be something like $250 to $350 million and we would end the year with a carryover of unused loan funds of about $300 million.

The sensible answer is to remove the State allotment formula from the law. That is exactly what we have asked the Congress to do.

In the early days of the REA program this formula served a useful purpose in making sure that the lines were built where the need was the greatest. Today, it is no longer needed with almost every State at or above the 90 percent level of connected farms. It is obvious that the greatest need for loan funds will be in those States where improvements are needed in systems already built and in those States that need new or extra sources of power.

Briefly, the need of funds in the various States can no longer be measured accurately on the basis of farms without electricity. On the contrary, the size of the REA program in the State will be the principal determining factor as to how much will be needed.

As to our new budget it recognizes greater loan requirements next fiscal year than this. The 1956 budget provides for $20 million more than the amount loaned in each of the last 3 years.

Incidentally, I want to thank all the borrowers which cooperated with us so extensively in our survey of loan needs. We obtained responses from more than 80 percent of the borrowers.

In addition to the funds being provided in new loan authorization, there is still nearly a half billion dollars of approved loans that has not yet been drawn by the borrowers, so it is hard to think that any borrower can be hurting for lack of construction funds. If there is, I would ask this fact be brought to our attention.

In this 20th year of the program, however, area coverage is primarily a responsibility of the systems serving the rural areas. Area coverage can never be completely realized unless they continue to forge ahead toward this objective.

How many of REA's borrowers actually have 100 percent area coverage in their proper service area? That is a question that you should ask yourselves. Here are some of the questions you ought to consider:

Have you determined the geographical area within which you should be responsible for seeing that electric power is available?

Have you recently surveyed this area? If not, shouldn't you do so to determine if there are people without service who rightfully look to you for service?

Have you developed plans which you are carrying out that will make electric service available on a sound and businesslike basis to all those people?

If not, what should you do about it? What do you think REA should do to help you?

We can see as we travel over the country that progress toward area coverage has been made. What's before us now is a challenge of seeing to it that you, with the help of REA, can finish the job so well begun.

The second major responsibility, as I see it, is to build financially sound systems. That is another responsibility shared by both REA and the borrowers. Certainly the Government's stake is great. The REA loans will soon total $3 billion, and the only way to get this repaid—as it is being repaid—is to have financially sound businesses.

Although the Government's stake is large, ours as rural people is even larger. We must build financially sound electric systems so that we can be sure of continuing to have the benefits of electricity in our homes and in our farming operations.

From REA's standpoint, our action program is geared to approach this matter of loan security from several angles.

First of all, I would like to say a good word about the work of the Management Advisory Committee which represents your association in the field of management. The group executive training meetings and management improvement activities that this

committee has helped push along constitute one of the most significant developments of the last year. If this work is continued and expanded as it should be, it will do more for the future safety of rural electrification than any other single thing that I can think of.

Conversely, if serious financial reverses or defaults should occur, it would give the program a real body blow. Just at this time, we face one of the most serious threats of this type that has ever confronted the program. We have one borrower that is in a hopeless financial condition, and a loss amounting to upward of a half million dollars is possible if it goes under. Even though this loan was made before I became Administrator, I certainly don't want to see the program get such a black eye and we are giving the situation our closest attention, working with every agency we know of that can help.

In the program as a whole, we are working with co-op directors and managers not only in identifying the difficulties that may lie in the future but in drawing upon the kind of practical and tested skill and experience that is needed if we are going to have financially sound systems in the future.

One point on which we have the opportunity to draw upon this experience resource is in connection with capital credits. A number of people from many areas have raised questions with us as to the capital credits plan and we have it under examination with the air of bringing about improvements as these can be developed.

We proudly point to the fact that of the approximately 1,000 borrowers, only 14 are delinquent in their loan repayments. However, a look at the principal and interest payments that will come due in the period ahead will illustrate that we cannot be complacent but must plan carefully for the future. In 1954, the amount due on loans was about $72 million. By 1958, it will amount to $116 million. In other words, this debt amortization load will increase 50 percent within a short period of 4 years.

How well prepared is your cooperative to meet your future obligations so that you can maintain a sound, enduring business?

One way to answer this is to calculate how you would stand if you faced your full amortization schedule today. We have made that calculation for all of the borrowers, and we have found that nearly a fourth of the borrowers would be in some financial trouble to a major or minor degree in that case. I am happy to report that as a result of our joint efforts with borrowers, about three-fourths of those systems with financial problems have achieved some improvement in their position during the past year.

Another interesting thing we have found is this: Of the total number which need to do something to improve their future outlook, about half are selling less electricity than was figured at the time the loan was made. If they were meeting these estimates, they would be out of the woods.

That is one of the reasons why we started last spring to strengthen the power use program and get some results in the form of load-building. This program is tremendously important to you as a director responsible for the successful operation of your power system and it is even more important to you as a farmer who has much to gain from the use of electric power.

The big thing that was done in this program was to organize the Inter-Industry Farm Electric Utilization Council, headed by Deputy Administrator Fred Strong. Today, through this council's efforts, borrowers in most States are working in cooperation with all segments of the electric industry and with the colleges and extension service. It is a game where everybody wins—the REA borrowers, the electric appliance people, the power companies, who serve part of the farms directly and sell you more than $50 million a year in wholesale power. And the one who will benefit the most from this power-use program is the farmer himself as he makes more profitable use of electric power on his farm and in his home.

My third point has to do with our goal of adequate low-cost power.

During 1954, we made major progress in improving the supply of electric power in rural areas. REA has been determined to work with borrowers in whatever direction promises better and cheaper service for the farmer, whether it be generation or buying wholesale or a little of both. We have made generation and transmission loans where these have been necessary and we have encouraged integration and interconnection where this approach has been to the borrowers' advantage. From the standpoint of the long-range view, we are keeping a careful eye on developments which may lead to lower cost power whether it involves conventional fuels or atomic energy.

As I have previously stated, I believe the REA authority to make G–T loans is important to the farmers. It is a fundamental part of the REA program and must be preserved. To keep it we must use it wisely. This is our aim and we are making G–T loans where they are the means to lower cost electricity for the farmer.

We approved G–T loans in 1954 in the amount of more than $40 million. This was nearly a quarter of all the loans approved by the Agency during the year, slightly higher than usual for the Agency through the years.

We were providing financing that will boost the generating capacity of the cooperatives by something over 100,000 kilowatts. At the same time, loans already approved were making possible the construction of a recordbreaking amount of generating capacity. During the calendar year 1954, REA borrowers in 10 States and Alaska put into service more than 200,000 kilowatts of generating capacity. This is more capacity than there was in service on all REA-financed generating plants on January 1, 1948. This new capacity sets a record for any one year of the program.

You don't get very far into this matter of power supply before you run up against the question: Do we get it alone or do we engage in an effective cooperative effort with all other segments of the electric industry?

It seems to me that the only sound approach to that question is to think about what is best for the farmer, because the program was set up to benefit him. Looked at from that viewpoint, the cases where it will pay to go it alone are mighty few and far between.

We have learned by experience that an isolated system of relatively small capacity means high-energy costs and requires standby capacity that adds to the expense. During the past year, an alarming number of distribution borrowers have come to us because they feel their rates are higher than their distribution systems can continue to stand. Some are paying their wholesale bills under protest and some have requested that we agree to their release from their contracts to buy power from their own G–T systems. Developments of this kind, unless solutions are worked out, might well be a threat to the future of the G–T co-op which in turn would be a blow to the whole program. It underscores the need to move forward soundly and carefully.

These are some of the reasons why we have recommended that consideration be given to interconnections where capacity can be merchandised into a power pool and peaking capacity purchased, resulting in a better power rate to the farmer and in turn protecting the distribution cooperatives. Interconnection and integration agreements were actually completed in three States during the past year, while in other instances studies are under way to see what the possibilities might be for savings. In one case, the co-op saved about $3 million in transmission lines, and in another a co-op saved close to a million dollars by exchanging with a power company and alternating the installation of new generating capacity.

Half the power input of your systems is being purchased from power companies at this time. Generally speaking, you are getting better rates than in earlier years. The average rate of power company purchases today is 8.2 mills as compared with 12.4 mills 15 years ago. The cost of power through G–T federations is higher, although it is improving gradually. I anticipate that further reductions in costs of power produced in REA-financed generating plants will be achieved through the marketing arrangements like the ones I have mentioned.

Another question for us to consider as Government officials and as electric co-op people is: What about the challenge of atomic energy?

Nobody can say for sure that atomic energy will lead to cheaper production of power than the fuels we are presently using. However, we have tried to gear our operations on the assumption that this will be the case because we want the farmer to benefit along with other consumers if it is.

For approximately a year, we have been working with the Atomic Energy Commission. We have asked for and received security clearance for five of our top people and through them we keep advised on the progress and research and development in that field and also are able to keep the Commission informed as to our needs.

The suggestion has been made that REA should employ physicists, metallurgists, and other specialized personnel for experimental work in the atomic field. However, we have been assured by AEC that people on its staff will give us the help we need at no additional cost to REA or to the taxpayers. This would appear to be the wise and effective course, and it is the course we intend to follow.

At the present time, we are contacting borrowers which are planning construction of generation plants. We are seeking to determine their interest in looking into the possibilities of nuclear power as a source for generating electricity. Where any of them is interested, we will help them get security clearance so that they can work with AEC and us in getting the up-to-date information they need to make their decision.

On the basis of information available to our people who are working with the Atomic Energy Commission, the prospects are not bright for obtaining power cost reductions in the near future through the use of atomic energy. As of now, nuclear power reactors are in a developmental state and their costs are therefore high. Commercially atomic energy is not yet competitive. Moreover, there are questions of service interruptions, site of plant locations and liability that have a bearing on the consideration of this matter.

At the same time, AEC's research is steadily going forward and we must keep up with it. In that way, we will keep informed and we will take advantage of every development that gives concrete assurance of a lower cost power source that will be dependable and feasible. We are determined that the REA co-ops will be able to move into the atomic age just as soon as it makes economic sense to do so.

In these days we are in the midst of a great debate on what our national power policies ought to be for the future. It is good that this debate is going on. But let us not permit emotionalism to decide the course for us. One of the questions before us is this: What is the proper role of the Government in the electric-power picture? We know that many have decidedly strong points of view on what the answer should be. I do not pre-

tend to be a judge on this but I am impressed by that large group of our citizens who do not see a solution in any extreme—rather in a moderate program that will harness both our natural resources and our private capital for the benefit of all our people.

What is the role of government?

Lincoln said—as we have frequently heard quoted—"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves."

That certainly spells out a job for government. But the rest of that Lincoln quotation is this, and I quote: "In all that the people can individually do so well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

And that spells out a job for you and me as private citizens. I am convinced we will be better off if we spend at least as much time and thought trying to figure out how we can do things for ourselves as we sometimes spend trying to figure out how we can get government to do things for us.

Thomas Jefferson's view on that subject was this: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

And that brings me to my fourth point—that of borrower self-reliance. The rural electrification program is free enterprise. We own and operate our system. We have borrowed money to build our lines. We intend to pay it back. We are proud of our accomplishments to date. Likewise, we need to remember that there are others who have invested their savings and facilities who also deserve tolerant consideration on our part. We should always be willing to give the same degree of attention, respect, and recognition to the problems that others face. Commonsense and mutual understanding are not always easy to achieve, and the test of leadership is to find answers through those means.

It is sometimes tempting and easy to be critical, but there are many constructive things to be talking about. In the words of the popular song, let's "count our blessings instead of sheep."

Counting our blessings, we find that Congress in its wisdom and generosity has made some $3 billion available as loans to you and me so that we might have electric and telephone service.

We find that human ingenuity has designed and built more efficient equipment so that in spite of commodity cost increases, you and I are able to buy electricity cheaper today than ever before.

We find that a farm today can enjoy a telephone, running water, freezer, television, and countless other home appliances, as well as milking machines, hay driers, and motor-driven devices by the score for farmstead chores.

Taking stock of these and the many other blessings we enjoy, let us not lose sight of the fact that these are times of international tension and peril. We must keep our program in its proper perspective, mindful always of the overall interests and problems of our country. As President Eisenhower has said, "Citizenship is not just a privilege, but also a responsibility."

Looking to the future, we, the directors, managers, and officials in this rural electrification program need always remember that the best insurance we can get for the program is to establish in other people confidence in us and in our integrity.

I know that every employee of REA joins with me in expressing the hope that our handling of your business with REA will merit your confidence because of our performance.

If all of us in the program are fair, tolerant, and sound—if we are willing to hear all the facts in regard to a question—we will be accepted with dignity and we need have no fear that any force can destroy the program.

Think back to your own community and recall the men well regarded and who have earned roles of leadership and influence. You will find their stature has grown from conduct guided by fairness, soundness, and reasonableness.

So as we look to the future of our program let us remember the principles that have proved to be of enduring quality. There is a quotation hanging on the wall in a Missouri co-op which goes like this:

"Four ways to test:

"1. Is it the truth?

"2. Is it fair to all concerned?

"3. Will it bring good will and friendship?

"4. Will it be beneficial to all concerned?"

Proceeding on such a basis, I am sure, will lead the way to a great future for rural electrification.

William Wallace Royster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, is the 83d birthday of William Wallace Royster, a former resident of Glenwood, Minn., and now of Vallejo, Calif.

Numerous railroad employees, especially those of the old days, value the contribution that Mr. Royster made to the idea of a pension plan for railroad employees. Many old-timers of the railroads have expressed deep and heartfelt gratitude for Mr. Royster's efforts.

His story, as told to me by Gottfrid Lindsten, is that after completing his run as a Soo Line engineer in Minnesota, Mr. Royster worked into the late night hours to develop a railroad pension plan that was one of the earliest of these plans.

The essentials of a pension plan were developed in 1928 by Mr. Royster, when various railroads offered gratuity pensions to such employees as the management considered worthy, which pensions could be terminated at will by the railroads. In these plans discrimination was possible, but Mr. Royster's plan sought to eliminate possible injustices of the gratuity plans, making it obligatory for the railroads to pay pensions to qualified employees. His plan, printed in pamphlet form, was filed with the Minnesota Historical Society in St. Paul and with the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

Many railroad employees supported Mr. Royster's plan; many joined his movement to effect such a plan. Their efforts, as well as those of many others, were successful when the Railroad Retirement Act was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is fitting, therefore, that William Wallace Royster be remembered publicly today as he is remembered by many of his friends and coworkers, the old-timers of the Nation's railroads.

Rubber Plant Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Armed Services Committee, Thursday, March 10, 1955, in opposition to proposed disposal of Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities, in pursuance of Public Law 205 of the 83d Congress:

There are some antitrust and small-business facets in the rubber producing facilities disposal program which I should like to comment upon.

When we passed Public Law 205 in the 83d Congress, the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry was stressed by section 3 (c) which reads as follows:

"SEC. 3 (c). From the time of its appointment and throughout the course of the performance of its duties, the Commission shall consult and advise with the Attorney General in order (1) to secure guidance as to the type of disposal program which would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry, and (2) to supply the Attorney General with such information as he may deem requisite to enable him to provide the advice contemplated by this section and sections 9 (a) (4) and 9 (f) of this act."

Section 17 of the act reads as follows:

"SEC. 17. The following criteria, together with such other criteria as the Commission deems necessary or desirable to best effectuate the purposes of this act, shall be used by the Commission in arriving at its recommendations for disposal:

"(3) That the recommended sales shall provide for the development within the United States of a free, competitive, synthetic rubber industry, and do not permit any person to possess unreasonable control over the manufacture of synthetic rubber or its component materials."

Most of these plants are scheduled for transfer to companies and entities which, to say the least, have a very bad antitrust record. That augurs little if any expectation for free and open competition in the synthetic-rubber industry. The prospective plant purchasers include rubber and oil companies whose records raise serious doubt that their operations will make for a competitive synthetic-rubber industry. Each of the big-four rubber companies, Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, United States Rubber, among the successful bidders, has lost 4 to 6 antitrust suits in this country and Canada since World War II. Several of the other rubber companies and chemical companies participating in the proposed purchase also have been branded as offenders in one or more antitrust suits in recent years. Significantly all but 1 of the oil companies involved in the purchase are even currently defendants in a Federal antitrust suit or a State of Texas antitrust suit or both, and several of the oil companies in addition have lost 1 or 2 other such suits in the past 20 years. In effect, the present disposal program would transfer almost the entire synthetic-rubber industry to corporations which in the past have taken active steps to limit competition, to fix prices, to establish quotas—all to the detriment of a free-enterprise system and to the detriment of small business and with a "consumer be damned" attitude.

One cannot easily swallow the Attorney General's opinion in approval of the disposal program that these companies will best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic-rubber industry.

Let me point out specifically some of the cases brought by our Government against these companies which indicate that they have actively combined and conspired to restrict competition and to fix prices in rubber products and petroleum products and chemicals, and in such minor items as storage batteries, brake lining and peach-pitting machinery. One of the parent companies of the lesser participants stands accused in a pending suit monopolizing air transportation.

Here are some of the cases:

1. In *United States* v. *Rubber Manufacturers Association et al.*, the Big Four, Firestone, Goodrich, Goodyear, and United States Rubber Co., plus Dayton, Seiberling, and others, were charged with combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade in tires and tubes, from 1935 to 1947. They pleaded nolo contendere, and were fined $5,000 each.

2. In *United States* v. *The Metropolitan Leather & Findings Association, Inc.*, in 1948, Goodyear and others were charged with price fixing in rubber heels and soles, and were fined.

3. In *United States* v. *United States Rubber Co. et. al.*, United States Rubber and Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd., were charged in 1948 with illegal cartel arrangements in latex; they took a consent decree in 1954.

4. In *United States* v. *Sears, Roebuck & Co. et. al.*, filed in 1952, Sears and Goodrich were held to be in violation of the Clayton Act by having a common director; he later resigned from the board of Sears.

5. In 2 1950 cases, 1 civil, 1 criminal, both known as *United States* v. *Association of American Battery Manufacturers*, Sears, Firestone, Goodrich, Goodyear, and others, were charged with price fixing and exercise of monopoly power to exclude competitors, among other things. They pleaded nolo contendere to one count in the criminal case, and took a consent decree in the civil case.

6. In *United States* v. *National City Lines, Inc., et al.*, also two cases filed in 1947, Firestone, Phillips, Standard Oil of California, and others, were charged with conspiracy, restraint, and monopolization of trade in the sale of buses, petroleum products, and tires and tubes. The charges went back to 1937. In the criminal case, the jury found them guilty on one count in 1949. The civil suit, involving injunctions against future violators, was still unsettled in 1954. Regulation of trade by law suit is sometimes a slow business.

7. Three Canadian antitrust cases are very enlightening. These are *Regina* v. *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. of Canada, Ltd. et al.* (mechanical goods); *Regina* v. *Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. of Canada, Ltd. et al.* (tires); and *Regina* v. *Dominion Rubber Co., Ltd. et al.* (rubber footwear).

In the first case, Goodyear, Goodrich, Dominion (the Canadian subsidiary of United States Rubber), Dunlop, and one other, pleaded guilty to conspiring to prevent or lessen competition from 1936 to 1952, and were fined $10,000 each. In the tire case, Firestone, Goodrich, Goodyear, Dominion, Dunlop and others, pleaded guilty to charges covering the period 1937 to 1952. They were fined $10,000, the then maximum fine, which the judge noted was wholly inadequate. The prosecutor estimated the companies had "illegally extracted" $1,300,000 a year for the 15 years they admitted operating the tire combine. The companies are reported to have replied that they were forced to band together for mutual protection during the depression. Banding together for mutual protection could be much more profitable in the United States, particularly if they own the GR–S plants which they now seek.

Dominion and Goodrich, and others, pleaded guilty in the footwear case, and were fined $10,000. The charges included identical product specifications and identical prices.

Canada has now removed the top limit on antitrust fines, permitting the court to assess such fines as the cases warrant. This should be a much greater deterrent than our $5,000 maximum fine.

In the *Regina* v. *Firestone* case, the Canadian High Court said as follows:

"Between the 1st day of January 1937, and the 31st day of October 1952, within the jurisdiction of this Honourable Court, they" (the defendants) "did unlawfully conspire, combine, agree or arrange together and with one another to unduly prevent or lessen competition in the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply in * * * the Province of Ontario, * * * and elsewhere in Canada* * * of * * * rubber tires (casings) and rubber tubes for passenger vehicles, trucks and buses, agricultural and road implements and tractors and related products including tire and tube accessories, automotive accessories and tire repair and retread materials, and did thereby commit an indictable offence contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code, section 498, subsection 1 (d)."

"Each of the accused corporations entered a plea of guilty and thereupon evidence was presented by the Crown to establish in a general way the nature and extent of the operations of these companies which resulted in this prosecution.

"In the view I entertain the maximum penalty of $10,000 provided by the code is wholly inadequate to meet the ends of justice, even as a punishment to the least of these offenders. This law has been in force for over 50 years and its provisions are, or should be, well known to the businessmen of this country. Their actions were cold-blooded, calculated, and deliberate violations of the law of the land and call for as severe a penalty as can be imposed within legal limits, both to mark the court's condemnation of the enormity of the offense from the standpoint of punishment, and for its deterrent effect upon other potential offenders. It is the sentence of this court that each of the accused shall pay a fine of $10,000 and that they be condemned to pay the costs incurred in and about the prosecution and conviction for the offenses of which they have been convicted, forthwith after taxation thereof."

In the case of *Regina* v. *Dominion Rubber Company, Ltd., et al.* the High Court of Ontario said:

"There were countless meetings and agreements among representatives of the accused and their co-conspirators at which an elaborate system of classifying their commodities was arranged, identifying them by common number. * * * A casual study of the analysis of common prices which resulted from these agreements, filed as exhibit A–3, will reveal how well they succeeded in maintaining an identical price level."

Now, let us take some of the cases against the oil companies who were successful bidders.

Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), which controls both Esso Standard Oil Co. and Humble, was charged in 1942 with conspiracy with I. G. Farbenindustrie in two cases involving synthetic rubber. They pleaded nolo contendere in one case and took a consent decree in the other.

Several oil companies involved in the bidding for the synthetic rubber plants were also involved in losing two cases filed in 1936. *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)*, a price-fixing case, was appealed to the Supreme Court under the name of *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. et al.*, and conviction was sustained as to Phillips, Continental, Shell Petroleum Corp., and Empire (the predecessor of Cities Service). Continental and Cities Service make up Petroleum Chemicals, Inc.

The other 1936 case, also called *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.*, concerned fixing jobber margins. In 1941 nolo pleas were entered by Cities Service, and an officer each of Empire, Shell, and Continental.

Among the 38 defendants pleading nolo contendere in *United States* v. *General Petroleum Corp. of California et al.*, a 1939 case charging illegal price raising and price maintenance, were Shell Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of California, and the Texas Co. Fines were $4,000 for Texas, $4,500 for the other two.

Still pending is a suit brought by the present Attorney General, *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) et al.* Standard, Gulf, the Texas Co., Standard of California, and one other, are charged with attempting to secure and exercise control over foreign production and supplies of petroleum and petroleum products, to regulate imports in order to maintain a level of domestic and world prices agreed upon by the defendants, and to divide world foreign producing and marketing territories.

The State of Texas has an antitrust suit in the State courts against 10 major oil companies, including Cities Service, Continental, Gulf, the Texas Co., Humble, Phillips, and Standard Oil Co. of Texas (a subsidiary of Standard of California). This case was brought by PRICE DANIEL, then attorney general of Texas, now a Member of the Senate.

United States v. *Food Machinery and Chemical Corp. et al.*, involving monopoly of peach-pitting machinery, was settled by a consent decree last August.

Several of the companies which make up American Synthetic Rubber Corp. appear among the antitrust case losers. American Cyanamid Co., the largest stockholder in American Synthetic and scheduled to be its exclusive selling agent, has been in three cases. *United States* v. *Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.*, filed in 1942, and ended by nolo pleas in 1946, charged price fixing at exorbitant levels in dyestuffs. Cyanamid and one of its officers were each fined. A subsidiary, American Cyanamid & Chemical Corp., was a party to some chemical antitrust cases filed in 1942, and settled in 1945, by nolo pleas. The cases all charged price fixing. Cyanamid & Chemical was fined $7,500. In *United States* v. *Standard Ultramarine and Color Co. et al.*, American Cyanamid took a consent decree in October 1954, on charges of fixing and maintaining prices and allocating sales of ultramarine blue and laundry blue.

Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a stockholder in American Synthetic, is a subsidiary of Anaconda Copper Mining Co. Two other Anaconda subsidiaries, Anaconda Sales Co. and Greene Cananea Copper Co., were named in *United States* v. *Climax Molybdenum Co., et al.*, in 1942, a price-fixing and competition-control case, which ended in a consent decree.

General Cable Co. and Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp. are stockholders in American Synthetic, and have been together before; they took a consent decree in 1948 in *United States* v. *General Cable Corp., et al.*, a cartel, price-fixing, and development-suppression case.

Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. is a part of American Synthetic, and has recently been acquired by W. R. Grace & Co.; Grace, Pan American World Airways, Inc., and Pan American-Grace Airways, Inc., are defendants in a Sherman Act case filed in 1954, charging combination restricting competition and monopolizing air transportation between the United States and Latin American countries.

Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., and Thermoid Co., both stockholders in American Synthetic, were also previously associated as nolo-pleaders in 1948 in *United States* v. *Brake Lining Manufacturers Ass'n, Inc.* They were fined $5,000 each on price-fixing charges.

Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co. is in American Synthetic; it is controlled by the British Dunlop, which was involved in the latex cartel case with United States Rubber.

It is only fair to add that some of the stockholders in American Synthetic Rubber Corp. have not been involved in antitrust suits.

The only plant, however, that would be sold to a company with no antitrust history is the Koppers Co. alcohol butadiene plant at Kobuta, Pa. Koppers Co., Inc., apparently didn't want the whole plant, but took it just to get the powerplant and utilities.

The list of antitrust cases is long, and perhaps boring. It could be extended by referring to Federal Trade Commission cease-and-desist orders covering such rubber items as golf balls, rubber soles and heels, canvas and rubber footwear, bicycle accessories, as well as tires and tubes.

The conclusion to be drawn is that competition in the future is no more likely than in the past. Banding together for mutual protection can be highly profitable in the case of synthetic rubber and its component raw materials.

The Attorney General, in his formal statement approving the pattern of disposal, completely ignored the antitrust history of the successful bidders. This is the more surprising, since he settled 3 and brought 2 of these suits in the past 2 years. With this record in his own files, it is extremely difficult to understand how he can make a positive finding that the proposed sales of the plants "will best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry."

Indeed, throughout his statement, the Attorney General stressed the lack of competing bids for the several plants. For 10 out of 11 GR–S plants (GR–S is Government rubber styrene, mainly used for rubber in tires) for both the butyl plants (rubber used for tubes) for 3 out of the 4 petroleum butadiene plants including the largest, and for the alcohol butadiene plant, only one bid was received. The Attorney General seems to consider this paucity of bids as conducive to future competition. To a Congressman such limited bidding might well suggest a lack of competition, that indeed, competition in the synthetic rubber industry is doomed from the start.

The cases that I have cited are mostly settled and thus legally dead. But for purposes of considering the disposal of these plants these cited cases are not dead, morally. Many of these successful bidders are self-confessed law violators or have been found guilty before a judicial tribunal. They thus come before this tribunal with unclean hands. They are malefactors and should be treated as such. This Congress should not reward them by turning over to them valuable plants, no matter how convenient it might be to the Government or to the members of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. These prospective purchasers have snapped their fingers at the laws we made. They have used inordinate power to ride roughshod over competitors. They even tried to cheat the Government by conspiring to present identical bids in their dealings with the Government. I refer to the case of United States against Cooper Corp., Civil Action No. 2–396, Southern District of New York, complaint filed February 20, 1939. The defendants in the case included the Dayton Rubber Manufacturing Co., the Dunlop Tire & Rubber Corp., the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., the B. F. Goodrich Co., the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the Seiberling Rubber Co., United States Rubber Products, Inc. This was a triple damage suit for conspiracy, brought by the Government, to fix the prices of tires on sales to the United States Government. The case was dismissed on technical grounds because the United States was not a "person" within the meaning of section 7 of the Sherman Act. The complaint, however, showed identical bids for tires submitted to the United States Government to three decimal points.

One would be naive, if not foolish, to believe that disposal of these plants to these companies would satisfy the sine qua non we laid down in section 3 (c) of the Disposal Act; namely, to secure a program that would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic-rubber industry.

Have these companies reformed? I see no signs of regeneration. They have habitually repeated their sins not only in the United States but in Canada. A leopard does not change its spots. Suppose you were a businessman and your supplier attempted to cheat you. You caught him redhanded. You'd be rather foolish to deal with him again. Frankly, you would boot him out. Well, these companies were guilty of wrongdoing against the United States. Shall the United States now reward them for their wrongdoing? The sales to any or all of these defendants in these antitrust suits should be canceled out. Otherwise we are guilty of double talk. We speak out of both sides of our mouths if we at one and the same time say we want free, open, competition and at the same time we say turn over these plants to antitrust violators.

Section 17, subsection (1) reads as follows:

"That the disposal program be designed best to afford small-business enterprises and users, other than the purchaser of a facility, the opportunity to obtain a fair share of the end products of the facilities sold and at fair prices."

Does anyone in his right senses say that these companies, if possessed of these plants, will help small-business enterprises? Their record proves to the contrary. Take a look at the list of the successful bidders, on pages 8 and 9 of the report to Congress by the Rubber-Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. With rare exceptions they are all huge companies. They are also huge users of synthetic rubber. They are going to supply themselves. They are not unselfishly going to cater to small-business enterprises; that is, small rubber fabricators. If rubber gets scarce they are going to husband unto themselves all the rubber they can produce. They are going to feather their own nests. All manner and kinds of subterfuges will be used to deprive the small fellows of a fair share of rubber. The little fabricators and manufacturers will die on the vine.

As far as I can see, there is no implementation of the declaration contained in section 17, subdivision (1). It is simply a pontifical declaration, with no sanctions for violation. There is no method of enforcement; it is simply a moral obligation. Antitrust violators do not usually abide by moral declarations. Take another look at the list of prospective purchasers. You will see that KYS Corp. is the only purchaser that really contains small operators. All the others are large or monolithic operators. None of these conditions make for fair dealing with small business and small fabricators of rubber.

For these reasons I think this committee should ponder long and well before granting any approval to the sale of these plants to antitrust-law violators. Conversely, as the law requires, such sales should be balked. In this respect I hope that this committee will negate the action of the Rubber-Producing Facilities Disposal Commisison.

House Resolution 151

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and all the Members of this great legislative body for approving and granting my request for unanimous consent to place the following in our daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Herewith is the text of Doyle House Resolution 151, which resolution was several days ago authorized by the House Rules Committee to come to the floor of the House, and I am informed that it will shortly do so.

I insert the text and the following editorials about it for the information of all concerned as it appears to me, for the present, that these editorials are informative and also indicative. I trust the insertion of the resolution text, together with these editorials will prove helpful.

House Resolution 151

Resolved, That rule XI (25) (a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read:

"25. (a) The Rules of the House are the rules of its committees so far as possible, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees. Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent therewith."

SEC. 2. Rule XI (25) is further amended by adding at the end thereof:

"(h) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which shall be not less than two.

"(i) The chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

"(j) A copy of the committee rules, if any, and paragraph 25 of rule XI of the House of Representatives shall be made available to the witness.

"(k) Witnesses may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

"(l) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

"(m) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—

"(1) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session;

"(2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and

"(3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

"(n) Except as provided in paragraph (m), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpena additional witnesses.

"(o) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

"(p) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

"(q) Upon payment of the cost thereof, a witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee."

[From the New York Times of March 9, 1955]

A CODE FOR INVESTIGATIONS

The excesses of some notorious congressional investigating committees have for years made it incumbent on both Houses of Congress to adopt general rules of procedure that would curb the worst of the abuses.

Congress is, in the last analysis, responsible for the conduct of its Members; and there is no doubt at all that the conduct of some of them, acting in their official capacity as investigators—or, more accurately, as inquisitors—has deeply reflected on the prestige and the dignity of the Congress and thereby done injury to our democratic institutions. This feeling took tangible form in a well-merited censure resolution against one Senator last fall. But the problem of establishing in each House a clearly defined minimum standard for congressional investigations remained.

Individual committees of both House and Senate have at various times adopted admirable codes for themselves, but what has been needed is a general expression representing the collective thought of each. The House Rules Committee has at last taken definite action in this regard. The resolution by Representative DOYLE, Democrat, of California, which it approved without dissent yesterday, represents no more than the predicted minimum; but if that minimum is adhered to some of the worst abuses that have tended to give congressional investigations a bad name may be eliminated. The reforms are generally intended to give committee witnesses a little more protection than they have sometimes had in the past. This is doing nothing more sensational than treating them in accordance with our constitutional tradition; but that, too, has not always been adhered to in the past.

Under the Doyle resolution each committee of the House would still have the right to draw up its own rules, but they would have to be not inconsistent with the guide set forth by the Rules Committee. Anyone familiar with congressional practice will realize at once that this code is not going to guarantee fairness to witnesses, because a committee chairman retains great power, and rules can always be ignored or broken. But what it can and probably will do will be to act as a valuable restraint on chairmen and their committees; it will make them think twice about abusing their powers; and it will stand as the conscience of the House, by which their conduct will be judged. This would be a useful innovation.

We hope the resolution is approved by the House and that one certainly no milder will also eventually be accepted by the Senate.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, of March 14, 1955]

AIMED AT INQUISITIONS

The House Rules Committee has made a good start toward curbing irresponsible investigating committees. The proposed code of fair procedure it has recommended to the House is by no means complete, and some of its provisions would be wide open to evasion. But at least it nails down a few simple rules that would be of value in keeping the more reckless investigators in line. Witnesses could stil be mistreated, but they would have better grounds for protest and the House itself would become responsible for enforcement of the rules of fair play.

The Rules Committee did not attempt to bring all House committees into conformity with a single set of regulations. Rather, it set up a few minimum requirements that all committees would have to incorporate in their own rules. Each committee would be free, for example, to fix the number of members required for taking testimony, except that this could not be fewer than two. Thus one-man hearings would be ended. The chairman would have to state the subject of the investigation and provide each witness with a copy of the rules. Witnesses could be accompanied by counsel, although the counsel would be limited to advising the witness as to his constitutional rights.

Several other devices would give at least qualified aid to witnesses under suspicion. Their testimony would be taken first in executive session; they could appear voluntarily as witnesses; they could ask the committee to summon witnesses in their behalf, although this would be solely within the discretion of the committee. Similarly witnesses could submit sworn statements for the record, but these would be included only at the discretion of the committee. No right of cross-examination would be granted; nor would the right of silence be recognized when the committee fished for information beyond the proper scope of its inquiry. Evidence taken behind closed doors would not be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee, but nothing is said about leaks.

With all its shortcomings, the proposed code is a valuable contribution to the cause of responsible investigation. We hope the House will adopt it, with improvements on the floor if possible, and that this example will stimulate the Senate into action in the same cause. No rules can change a witch hunter or a smear artist into a scrupulous factfinder, but rules help to make investigators more conscious of the public demand for fair play. Careful selection of investigating chairman, along with stiff rules at both ends of the Capitol, could help bring the disgrace of congressional inquisitions to a timely end.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of March 13, 1955]

BETTER BREAK FOR WITNESSES

The House Rules Committee has done a constructive day's work in reporting out the resolution submitted by Representative DOYLE, Democrat, of California.

This resolution proposes a variety of safeguards for the benefit of witnesses appearing before congressional committees. No set rules or regulations will prevent all abuse of witnesses, for this is a matter which is governed in considerable degree by the attitudes, the taste for fair or unfair play, of individual Congressmen. But Mr. DOYLE's proposals, if adopted, should curb the worst abuses, especially the one-man inquisitions of recent memory. It is to be hoped that the House will enact the proposals now before it, and that the Senate will take comparable action.

Mr. Speaker, the three foregoing editorials, which I have herein identified are but a few of a goodly number which have appeared in various places in the Nation, I am informed, in support of the objectives of House Resolution 151. I recite this information as it further indicates public interest in, and approval of same.

I desire to also state that the final text thereof is not the "brain child" of only myself. For, some of the distinguished members of this great legislative body who also worked strenuously and consistently with me to conclude a text which it was believed would be sound, reasonable and constructive, and yet not unnecessarily elaborate, or which would in any way interfere with the jurisdiction of each investigative committee, on its own behalf to write its own rules of procedure, were Messrs. WALTER of Pennsylvania, WILLIS of Louisiana, DAWSON of Illinois, and FORRESTER of Georgia. Also, we had the great benefit of counsel with, and material aid, by our distinguished Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler. As to the final drafting thereof, we were greatly assisted by Mr. Charles J. Zinn, of the House Judiciary Committee.

I think it should be emphasized that a careful reading of the text of the above resolution will make it clear that it only applies to an investigative hearing. In the resolution see section 2, rule 11, subdivision (h), (i), and (m). Also please note, as provided in section 25, as follows: "Committees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent therewith."

On behalf of myself and colleagues herein named, I desire to herein express appreciation to all the members of the House Rules Committee for their most courteous and full consideration of the subject matter of my resolution and of the other similar resolutions which were considered by said committee. I consider my attendance upon the Rules Committee when they were considering the several resolutions dealing with code of procedures and ethics for investigative committees as one of the most pleasant experiences and sources of information which I have experienced during these more than 8 years I have already been a member of this great legislative body.

Our Soldiers Convicted Under Foreign Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, we always thought the Constitution follows the flag, but that idea now is purely a myth. Congress passed an act making our soldiers subject to the laws of the country in which they are stationed.

Here is a case where a soldier assaulted a taxi driver in France and was given a 5-year sentence. In this country he would have probably been fined and perhaps given a few days jail sentence.

The following item appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 1, 1955:

The Supreme Court yesterday refused to review the case of Pfc. Richard T. Keefe, 26, formerly of 5310 Hamilton Street, Riverdale, who was sentenced to 5 years in jail in 1953 for assaulting a taxicab driver in Orleans, France. His wife, Gladys, contended that he was deprived of his rights in the French trial.

In view of the act passed by Congress, the Supreme Court could make no other decision.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, marks the anniversary of the birth of one of the great men of our times, Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first President of Czechoslovakia. Much has happened since the establishment of that country, and much that has happened has been tragic. But history has a way of redeeming its tragedies and of restoring to its great and noble figures the status that is their due.

I was invited recently by the publishers of a Czechoslovakian newspaper in the United States to express my sentiments about Dr. Masaryk; and I was glad to do so in a message as follows:

Mr. ANDREW J. VALUCHEK,
New Yorksky Dennik-New Yorske Listy, C. S. Publishing Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: I am deeply moved to be able to participate in the observance of the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, one of the noble spirits of our times, a great leader of his country, and a distinguished citizen of the world family.

No matter how intensive the efforts of those, to whom his democratic ideals are repugnant, to besmirch his reputation and to seek to eradicate the memory of his great achievements, the name of Masaryk will survive. His enemies may demolish the stone memorials commemorating his name. They can never reach the shrine in which he is steadily revered, the hearts of his countrymen and indeed of the people of all the world.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God over all, blessed for evermore: Amid the seething strife which mars the earth and still builds its walls of separation, when all mankind ought to be one, whate'er vexatious problems we face in this volcanic day, this white altar reared at the gates of the morning speaks to us ever of our final reliance on those supreme spiritual forces, faith and hope and love, which alone abide and on which our salvation in the end depends. Before the toil of a new day opens before us we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts; may they be acceptable in Thy sight.

Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day. May our loins be girt and our lamps burning, and ourselves as men who watch for their Lord's coming. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 4, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Executive Nominations of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. STENNIS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DEFINITION OF "SERVICE" OF MEMBER OF WOMEN'S AUXILIARY CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Army on Research and Development contracts, for the period July 1, 1954 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENTS OF ACT OF JUNE 3, 1916, RELATING TO FLIGHT INSTRUCTION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of June 3, 1916, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ended December 31, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

WAIVER OF COLLECTION OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE LOANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ENTITLED "BRAZILIAN TECHNICAL STUDIES"

A letter from the Acting Director, Foreign Operations Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a report entitled "Brazilian Technical Studies" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT AND SURVEY, NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the national school lunch program, and an investigative survey of the operations of the program, in the State of Indiana (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, TIMPANOGOS CAVE NATIONAL MONUMENT, UTAH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in the Timpanogos Cave National Monument, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

KAW TRIBE OF INDIANS *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the findings of fact and opinion, and conclusions of law and final award, in the case of Felix McCauley, a member of the Kaw Tribe of Indians, on the relation of all members of the *Kaw Tribe of Indians, Plaintiff,* v. *The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSON OF LAW RELATING TO PERJURY IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the wilful giving of contradictory statements under oath (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STANLEY RYDZON AND ALEXANDER F. ANDERSON

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of that organization, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation recognizing that the sale of natural gas by producers or gatherers in interstate commerce for resale are an integral part of the production and gathering of that resource and exempting such sales from any and all regulation by the Federal Government

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (both houses concurring therein):

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in 1938 passed the Natural Gas Act which gave the Federal Power Commission regulatory authority over the transportation and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce and provided that the provisions of this act shall not apply to the production and gathering of natural gas; and

"Whereas the Federal Power Commission ruled on many occasions between 1938 and 1951 that it had no jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers, and the United States Congress in 1950 again reiterated its intention that sales by producers or gatherers were exempt from Federal regulation under the Natural Gas Act; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 held that all sales of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act whether made before, during, or after production and gathering, such decision reversing a precedent of long standing; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of the Legislature of the State of Utah that the resultant subjection of theretofore unregulated activities of producers and gatherers to Federal regulation is not in the best interests of the people of the United States in that it will have a very detrimental effect on the future development and ultimate beneficial utilization of this very valuable natural resource, and will also result in an inevitable clash between the Federal regulating authorities and State regulation with respect to utilization of this resource, and will have the further effect of encouraging extension of crippling Federal controls to many other commodities in the American economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we do petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to propose and enact an amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 which will clearly and positively exempt from Federal regulation the activities of producers or gatherers of natural gas including sale by them of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, United States Senate, House of Representatives, and each congressional delegate from the State of Utah."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation curtailing and limiting the power and jurisdiction of inferior Federal courts to review criminal judgments of State courts

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the provisions of sections 2241 et seq. of the Revised Judicial Code, title 28, United States Code, purport to give to inferior Federal tribunals the right, by an application for habeas corpus, to review criminal judgments of State courts including jury verdicts, trial court rulings, and State supreme court decisions, and to issue orders staying the execution of such judgments by the duly constituted authorities of the States; and

"Whereas the exercise of such power serves to:

"(1) stultify prompt enforcement of capital sentences in the event of conviction;

"(2) produce disruption of State criminal proceedings;

"(3) disrupt the proper balance between the States and the Federal Government;

"(4) centralize and extend Federal power;

"(5) impair and debase the States' due powers and responsibilities in the detection and punishment of crime;

"(6) destroy the public faith in and respect for the judicial systems;

"(7) afford those guilty of heinous and reprehensible crimes the opportunity to delay, stultify, and avoid the enforcement of the sanctions imposed upon them by the legislatures of the various States; and

"Whereas the Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Senator from the State of Utah, has introduced in the 84th Congress, 1st session, S. 877, which will correct a duplicate jurisdiction given inferior Federal tribunals to review criminal judgments in the State courts including jury verdicts, trial-court rulings, and State supreme court decisions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to pass S. 877 curtailing and limiting the power and jurisdiction of inferior Federal tribunals to review criminal judgments of the courts of this and the other United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Utah be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Public Roads Administration; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable Orvin Fjare, Congressmen from Montana, requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway No. 2 to the national system of State highways

"Whereas the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which amended the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that there shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the act further provided that the routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

"Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated the 2d day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways selected by the joint action of the State highway department of each State and adjoining States, as provided by the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, for selection of the Federal-aid highway system, and which was reviewed by the Public Roads Administration to determine its compliance with the requirements and purposes of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, and the system as revised and modified by the Public Roads Administration was approved by the said Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, or the aforesaid date, by virtue of the authority vested in him by the said highway act of November 9, 1921, the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, effective July 1, 1939, in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; and

"Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified, and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

"Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

"Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the shortest through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada and Alaska in the State of Montana and other boundary States; and

"Whereas said United States Highway No. 2 plays an ever-increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous growth of oil, nuclear, mineral, and timber industries, and in the development of power generated by the Hungry Horse Dam and other power sites in the Pacific Northwest, and in the expand-

ing industrial development in the Western States and in Canada, notably the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

"Whereas the said United States Highway No. 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine and connected with Canada's highways, No. 9 from New York to Montreal, and No. 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air-defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, along the entire northern boundary of the United States; and

"Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length, and connects at points in 7 States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

"Whereas while this is a petition from the State of Montana, it contemplates the joining of similar petitions of the other six States involved; this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway No. 2, because such areas, at their present accelerated progress, resulting from a shift in population to the Western States and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

"Whereas this request that the designation of United States Highway No. 2 be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of Montana and in the other States served by United States Highway No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the 34th Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1955, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, do most earnestly and respectfully request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway No. 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway No. 2 designated as an integral part of the national system of defense highways and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Public Roads Administration; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable Orvin Fjare, Congressmen from Montana.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 27, 1955."

A resolution adopted by the Nashville (Tenn.) Industrial Union Council, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Okonite Co., of Passaic, N. J., signed by A. F. Metz, chairman of the board and chief executive officer, enclosing a copy of the "Recommendations of Electrical Manufacturers on Foreign Trade Policy" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

Fifteen resolutions adopted by the Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., relating to proposed legislation for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., relating to credit for $1,200 of retired income, for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial relating to timberland in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"For many years a controversy existed between the United States and the Aztec Land & Cattle Co. as to the ownership of 98,600 acres of timberland in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona.

"A court decision in 1952 resulted in the transfer of 98,600 acres of land in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona from Federal to private control and ownership.

"This acreage is a natural and integral part of the national forest in which it was formerly included and the best interests of the citizens of the State of Arizona and Nation require that it be returned to Federal ownership and control, as a part of the national forest in which it is located.

"At least 75 percent of this land is heavily forested and comprises probably the finest stand of virgin timber left on the Colorado plateau. Protection of this valuable timber and its proper sustained cutting can best be had by a return of ownership and management to the National Forest Service.

"This large acreage is valuable for timber, grazing and recreational purposes and is a natural resource that should not be jeopardized. It has immense value as a watershed.

"Without the protection and conservation practices of the Federal Forest Service this irreplaceable property will deteriorate to a point where the timber production and lumber business in Arizona will be extinct and the water cycle will be so affected as to drastically diminish the flow from the watershed.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress give its full support to the bill introduced by Senators CARL HAYDEN and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, to provide for the purchase of the acreage described above so that it may again be a part of the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest."

Mr. GOLDWATER presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL CEMETERY IN ARIZONA—JOINT RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona, praying for the establishment of a national cemetery in that State.

I ask unanimous consent that following the joint resolution there be printed in the RECORD Senate bill 1331, which I am introducing today, and which is designed to carry out the purpose of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 5

Joint memorial requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

There is no national cemetery in the State of Arizona.

Proportionately, there are more veterans in Arizona than in most of the States of the Union. This is due partly to the fact that for several generations there have been numerous military installations in the State, and partly because thousands of veterans have moved to Arizona to have the advantage of the dry, healthful climate.

A veteran on passing, who has expressed a desire to be buried in a national cemetery, has to be transported to a distant point in another State for burial. If he dies without financial means, he will be buried in facilities furnished by the county for indigent persons.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

That the Congress provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill (S. 1331) to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona, introduced by Mr. HAYDEN, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed (1) to establish one national cemetery at a location selected by him in the State of Arizona and (2) to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such land as may be required for the estalishment of such national cemetery.

SEC. 2. When requested to do so by the Secretary of the Army, the Administrator of the General Services is authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Army, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, any Government-owned land in the State of Arizona, which the Secretary of the Army has determined to be suitable for the purposes of this statute and which is otherwise surplus to Government needs. In addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to utilize when practicable, for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery, such Government-owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army which are located within the State of Arizona and which are no longer needed for military purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon selection by the Secretary of the Army of such land, as provided in sections 1 and 2 hereof, he is authorized to establish such national cemetery and to provide for the care and maintenance thereof.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled:

"Whereas His Excellency, Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel to the United States, will be the honored guest of the State of Washington on his first visit to the Northwest; and

"Whereas the friendship and understanding between America and Israel are cherished by the citizens of the State of Washington and have inspired and strengthened our mutual love of freedom and the republic; and

"Whereas the Ambassador of Israel, who is also his country's chief delegate to the United Nations, has been given worldwide recognition as an outstanding spokesman for the young Republic of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, that they hereby extend their cordial greetings to the Ambassador of Israel, His Excellency, Abba Eban, and respectfully request that he address a joint session of the senate and the house of representatives on Thursday, February 24, 1955; and be it hereby further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Washington congressional delegation, to the Secretary of the United Nations, to the Secretary of the Israel delegation to the United Nations, to the President of Israel, and to His Excellency, Abba Eban, the Ambassador of Israel to the United States.

"Adopted by the house February 1, 1955.
"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"Speaker of the House.
"Adopted by the senate February 2, 1955.
"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Honorable Chan Gurney, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition, as follows:

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that the Civil Aeronautics Board has voted to issue a decision in the States-Alaska Case, Docket No. 5756, et al, which would reduce the number of air carriers now operating between the Pacific Northwest and the Territory of Alaska from 4 to 2 carriers; and

"Whereas the continuance of adequate air transportation services to Alaska is of vital importance to the further economic development of the Territory, the State of Washington, and to the national defense interests of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the Board's decision would deprive every major city in Alaska of competitive air services, except the city of Anchorage; and would further deprive such important communities as Nome, Cordova, Kenai, Homer, Kodiak, and Bristol Bay of through services by any air carrier operating from the State of Washington and would thus require time-consuming and costly transshipment of all passenger, cargo, and mail traffic destined to these communities; and

"Whereas Alaska is almost wholly dependent upon air transportation facilities because of the recent discontinuance of passenger steamship services and because there is no railroad linking the Territory with the State of Washington, nor any satisfactory highway network; and

"Whereas Alaska is almost entirely dependent upon the State of Washington and other areas of the continental United States for its labor force and for virtually all of its foodstuffs, supplies, and materials, and is therefore peculiarly in need of adequate air transportation facilities especially tailored to its own needs; and

"Whereas the Territory is now on the threshold of significant business and industrial development which would be seriously impaired by any curtailment of air services as now contemplated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

"Whereas the Board's decision has resulted in an unprecedented storm of public protest throughout the entire Territory and the Pacific Northwest, resulting spontaneously in the sending of thousands of letters and telegrams to the Board and to the White House; and

"Whereas this public protest has been vigorously supported by the entire congressional delegation from the State of Washington, by virtually all of the other public and civic leaders in the Pacific Northwest, by newspapers, radio, and television commentators, and by most of the business concerns and labor unions in the State of Washington having trade interests with Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider the pending decision in the States-Alaska Case to insure that existing air transportation services to the Territory of Alaska are not curtailed, that competitive air services be maintained from the State of Washington to all of the principal gateway cities in Alaska, that through services by air from the State of Washington be preserved and expanded to as many Alaskan communities as possible, that the selection of the individual air carriers to perform such services be determined solely upon the basis of merit, and that paramount consideration be given to the vital need of Alaska for a system of air transportation services especially tailored to the peculiar requirements of the Territory and which will fully utilize the integrated operation of air carriers indigenous to Alaska, whose primary and exclusive interests are in serving the Pacific Northwest and the Territory; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Passed the house February 2, 1955.
"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"Speaker of the House.
"Passed the senate February 3, 1955.
"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate."

CONSTRUCTION OF LIBBY AND YELLOWTAIL DAMS, MONT.—JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate is interested in conservation of our Nation's natural resources. Without question, the most important of all our resources, next to our people, are our soil and water. Closely allied to these two fundamental natural resources are the use and the development of water power as a basis of industrial progress.

Therefore, I am certain every Member of this body will be interested in two joint resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana and approved February 26, 1955. One petitions for construction of Libby Dam, in northwestern Montana; and the other petitions for construction of Yellowtail Dam, in southeastern Montana. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these memorials appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield, United States Senators from Montana; and to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and Orvin B. Fjare, Representatives in Congress from Montana; the Appropriations Committee of the Uniter States Senate; the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives; and Joseph M. Dodge, Director of the Budget, requesting the introduction and early enactment into law the necessary and proper legislation authorizing sufficient appropriations be provided the Corps of Army Engineers for early construction of the Libby Dam located on the Kootenai River in Lincoln County in northwestern Montana

Whereas Libby Dam site is located in Lincoln County in northwestern Montana, and Lobby Dam will be constructed across the Kootenai River, at a point above and near to Libby, Mona.; and

Whereas preliminary geological investigation and work has been carefully completed and the findings compiled; and

Whereas the Libby Dam will be designed to provide power, flood control, and recreation benefits to Montana and the whole Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas existing industry and potential industrial development in timber, wood pulp and wood products, mining and its attendant products, will be greatly enhanced due to low-cost power at site of dam; and

Whereas the acre-feet of reservoir storage is estimated to be 6,483,000 acre-feet making a total accumulated acre-feet of 17,633,000 of regulated flow for the Columbia River for firm up-power for further industrial development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available for the early initiation of construction of Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Lincoln County in northwestern Montana; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be also submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the natinal Congress, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN; to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees; and

Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of the national Congress.

GEO. M. GOSMAN,
President of the Senate.
LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 26, 1955."

Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Senator Frank Barrett, of Wyoming; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Orvin Fjare, of Montana; the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate; the Appropriations Committee of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives; Wilbur A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation; Rowland R. Hughes, Director of the Budget; Glenn L. Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam, located on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana

Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon, 35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont.; and

Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Dam Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding riverbed, forming a natural damsite of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana, Wyoming, and the Nation with one of the greatest lake recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the backed-up waters of Yellowtail Dam will flood no presently used or usable land, which alone makes it one of the most desirable and economical of damsites available; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood-Control Act of 1944 as a part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has long since completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam and only awaits a congressional appropriation to commence work. Design specifications for the dam and powerplant are available for immediate use. Surveys have been completed of the irrigable areas and transmission lines. Plans are ready for construction of access roads, construction camp, and other essential base work necessary for actual construction to now be undertaken; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam is designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flood control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wild life, recreational development and other related beneficial uses of value to Montana, Wyoming, and the Nation generally; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of some 45,000 acres of new land by gravity flow along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and supplemental irrigation water will be provided for large areas now inadequately served. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low-cost power is a prerequisite toward bringing many acres of now unproductive land under the ditch. Construction of Yellowtail powerplant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable, but in many instances, little utilized river areas; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State boundary line; and

Whereas power-generating facilities to be constructed at the damsite will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. This power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be available for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system, constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use of old and new industries as well as residence—rural and urban—of the area; and

Whereas fish and wild life resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will most surely follow will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming, as well as the Nation generally; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete archetype structure, towering some 499 feet above the riverbed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

Whereas the construction of Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana and northern Wyoming and thereby be of great benefit to the entire States of Montana and Wyoming, as well as the entire Nation by firming up the economy and by supplying cheap power for industrial and home use, and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available for the construction of Yellowtail Dam now on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be also submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress, RICHARD NIXON and SAM RAYBURN, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committees and Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of the National Congress, to the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation and area director of the Indian Bureau, both located in Billings, Mont., and to the Governor of the State of Wyoming and the presiding officers of both houses of the Wyoming Legislature.

GEO. M. GOSMAN,
President of the Senate.
LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 26, 1955.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Montana, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. KERR:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to act promptly and favorably upon the Washita Basin (Okla.) project report

"Whereas the Washita River Basin in Oklahoma is one of the most fertile in our State and Nation; and

"Whereas the people of this great valley very frequently suffer heavy loss of life and property because of recurring disastrous floods; and

"Whereas following such disastrous floods there are long periods of protracted droughts, resulting in heavy loss of crops, excessive shortages of water for domestic, municipal, and industrial supplies, and greatly jeopardizing the health, welfare, and economy of the valley; and

"Whereas for many years the several agencies of the Federal Government have been making surveys and studies of the problems in the Washita Basin; and

"Whereas on July 25, 1953, the Secretary of the Interior did transmit the Washita River Subbasin, Red River Basin, Okla. and Tex., project report through the Bureau of the Budget to the Congress, identified as House Document 219, 83d Congress, 1st session, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

"Whereas aforementioned project report and plans provide adequately for the protection from destructive floods, storage for domestic, municipal, industrial, and irrigation water supplies; and

"Whereas on March 22 and 27, 1952, the Governor of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board did approve and urge the development of the Washita Basin as provided in aforementioned House Document 219: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully request the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Congress of the United States of America to consider at the earliest practical date and give their approval and to authorize for construction the Washita Basin (Okla.) projects.

"Adopted by the senate the 14th day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 22d day of February 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution relating to a permanent location for the Cowboy Hall of Fame; respectfully requesting the location committee, Cowboy Hall of Fame, to consider the many advantages of the Will Rogers Memorial site, Claremore, Okla., as a permanent location for said Cowboy Hall of Fame; extending an invitation for the establishment of the Cowboy Hall of Fame at said site; and directing that certified copies of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable C. A. Reynolds, chairman, Cowboy Hall of Fame; to each member of the location committee thereof; to the Honorable Will Rogers, Jr.; and to all other members of the Will Rogers Memorial Commission; and to the Honorable James Hammett, mayor of Claremore, Okla.

"Whereas a location committee of the Cowboy Hall of Fame is now giving consideration to a permanent site for the Cowboy Hall of Fame; and

"Whereas the Will Rogers Memorial, Claremore, Okla., was an inspiration for the establishment of a permanent Cowboy Hall of Fame; and

"Whereas the Will Rogers Memorial and the proposed Cowboy Hall of Fame are inextricably related in the folklore of the American cowboy; and

"Whereas the city of Claremore, Okla., a progressive city of native Americans and one of America's best known and most visited cities, is in the heart of "cowboy country" and is an ideal location for said Cowboy Hall of Fame, offering, among other advantages, the following:

"(1) Home of Will Rogers, native son, world citizen, and the greatest cowboy of all time;

"(2) Site of the Will Rogers Memorial, having an average of 1,200 visitors daily and ranking second only to visitation of Mount Vernon;

"(3) Municipally owned Will Rogers Library of approximately 11,500 volumes;

"(4) Oklahoma's largest roundup club, and ranking in size among the largest in the Southwest;

"(5) Location of the Davis gun collection; the largest individual collection of guns in the United States;

"(6) Home of the Oklahoma Military Academy;

"(7) Gilcrease Art Museum, in nearby Tulsa, which includes the world's finest collection of materials relating to the American Indian, as well as the finest collections of Frederic Remington and Charles Russell paintings and sculpture;

"(8) Excellent highway facilities directly serving the Will Rogers Memorial site include United States Highway No. 66, the Main Street of America, Oklahoma State Highway No. 20 connecting United States Highways Nos. 77, 169, and 69, and Oklahoma State Highway No. 33 connecting Claremore with United States Highway No. 169 and Oklahoma State Highway No. 33;

"(9) Nearby the city of Tulsa, Okla., has 5 airlines operating into and out of the municipal airport with 59 daily schedules; and

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma embraces a major portion of 'cowboy country, United States of America,' and has produced four world's champion all-around cowboys: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the people of the State of Oklahoma through the 25th legislature do hereby respectfully request the location committee of the Cowboy Hall of Fame to give serious consideration to the many advantages of the Will Rogers site, Claremore, Okla., as a permanent location for the Cowboy Hall of Fame, and do hereby extend a cordial invitation for the establishment of said Cowboy Hall of Fame in the State of Oklahoma.

"SEC. 2. That a duly certified copy of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable C. A. Reynolds, chairman, Cowboy Hall of Fame, 804 West 67th Street Terrace, Kansas City, Mo.; to each member of the location committee; to the Honorable Will Rogers, Jr., Beverly Hills, Calif.; to all other members of the Will Rogers Commission; and to the Honorable James Hammett, mayor, Claremore, Okla.

"Adopted by the senate the 22d day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 24th day of February 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

IMPORTANCE OF UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last Tuesday was Town Meeting Day in Vermont. The people of my home town of Putney adopted a resolution in regard to standing by the Constitution of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are several groups of people, both within and without the United States of America, which embrace various political ideologies, the effects of which are to enslave human beings; and

Whereas we, the people of Putney, being an informed, religious and patriotic people, do unequivocally reject all such political ideologies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the people of Putney, go on record as firmly believing in, and as upholding the Constitution of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as desiring to keep and retain, for ourselves and for our posterity, all of the liberties, freedoms, rights, and privileges now enjoyed by us, and guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as favoring a standard of liberties, freedoms, rights, and privileges, comparable to our own present standard, for all peoples everywhere as soon as may be; and be it further

Resolved, That the town clerk of Putney be hereby authorized and instructed to forward, as soon as possible, a copy of the foregoing resolution in its entirety to each of the two United States Senators from Vermont, namely Senator AIKEN and Senator FLANDERS; and to forward a like copy to the congressional Representative from Vermont, namely, Representative PROUTY; and that the above resolution, so forwarded, shall have clearly indicated thereon that it has been approved by the people of Putney, in town meeting assembled.

IMPROVEMENT OF RURAL ROADS—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the State Association of County Commissioners of Minnesota on February 3, 1955, relating to the improvement of rural highways. I believe this resolution is timely, and should be given attention by all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. CLOUD, MINN., FEBRUARY 3, 1955

Whereas the FAS program, as it now stands, is 50 percent participation by the Federal Government and 50 percent participation by the county; and

Whereas the FAS funds allotted to the county were meant for and intended to be used by said county for the improvement of rural highways or farm-to-market roads; and

Whereas it is becoming more difficult for an increasing number of counties to match the present FAS fund allotment;

Therefore we do hereby respectfully request the Commissioner of Highways, United States Senators and United States Congressmen to work together for effecting legislation changing the present Federal law for Minnesota to read 75 percent participation by the Federal Government and 25 percent participation by the county.

LEO B. GAMBRINO,
Secretary and Manager.

EXECUTION OF JEWISH CITIZENS BY EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District, on February 15, 1955, relating to the execution of Jewish citizens by the Egyptian Government.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GREENFIELD-MONTAGUE ZIONIST DISTRICT FEBRUARY 15, 1955

Whereas the Egyptian Government in its attempt to strengthen its unsettled internal position as well as to gain stature abroad, has so recently resorted to the hasty execution of some of its Jewish citizens after a shockingly unfair trial by Egypt's supreme military court; and

Whereas the 11th-hour pleas for clemency by the American, French, and other Governments fell upon deaf Egyptian ears; and

Whereas by their haste in carrying out these inhuman executions in spite of the intervention of the American Government, the Government of Premier Nasser has again demonstrated its contempt for American public opinion; and

Whereas by the continuation of abuses, calculated to harm the State of Israel ever since its establishment, in spite of repeated gestures of conciliation and goodwill by the Israeli Government: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District in meeting assembled this day goes on record as condemning the Egyptian Government in this their latest shedding of innocent Jewish blood; and be it further

Resolved, That the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District commends the Government of the United States for its effort in attempting to save the lives of the two Jews in Egypt; efforts which were so unsuccessful as to highlight the contempt of Egypt for American public opinion and democratic concepts.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 3952. An act to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with an amendment (Report No. 47).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1325. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 1326. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 1327. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Doreen Tsung-tao Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1329. A bill to require certain specifications to be included in star route and screen vehicle service contracts and in advertisements for bids on such contracts; and

S. 1330. A bill relating to the renewal and adjustment of star route and screen vehicle service contracts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1331. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1333. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks by Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of Harry Hume Ainsworth; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1335. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Huron Cemetery, Kansas City, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. 1336. A bill to provide for a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil;

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Schober Frugia; and

S. 1339. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty M. Boyersmith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 1340. A bill to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1341. A bill to require that the budget shall include each year a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1342. A bill for the relief of Sayoko Fujimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1343. A bill to require bills and resolutions authorizing appropriations reported by committees of Congress to be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost of the legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1344. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to dentists; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1345. A bill to readjust equitably the retirement benefits of certain individuals on the Emergency Officers' Retired List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1346. A bill for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Jose Arriaga-Marin; and

S. 1348. A bill for the relief of Anna Jerman Bonito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1349. A bill to establish an internal revenue district consisting solely of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni, his wife and child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1351. A bill to provide a means whereby domestic producers who are injured by increased imports resulting from trade-agreements concessions may obtain preferences in bidding for Government contracts; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; and

S. 1353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1354. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1355. A bill for the relief of William Luke Phalen; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1356. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1357. A bill for the relief of Ingeburg Edith Stallings (nee Nitzki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1358. A bill to authorize modification of the flood control project for Missouri River agricultural levee unit 513–512–R, Richardson County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1359. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to come into agreement with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives with respect to any sale, exchange, grant, or transfer, in excess of 1,500 acres, of land acquired by the United States under title III of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1360. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for refunds to farmers of the amounts of tax paid on gasoline used by them in farming operations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1361. A bill for the relief of Margaretta Zwack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1362. A bill for the relief of William Luke Phalen; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of George B. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1365. A bill to amend section 4091 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to imposition of tax upon lubricating oils), and to amend section 6416 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to overpayments of tax); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.;

S. 1367. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jacoe; and

S. 1368. A bill for the relief of Pedro P. Dagamac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1369. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1370. A bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1371. A bill to promote an agricultural development program under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1372. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. WELKER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1373. A bill to promote the economic use of Indian lands, alleviate and adjust the heirship problem involved in Indian trust or restricted allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1374. A bill to provide for the termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 1375. A bill for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung; and

S. 1376. A bill for the relief of Emil Arens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1377. A bill to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1378. A bill to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1379. A bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; and

S. 1380. A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1381. A bill to incorporate the Society of the 28th Division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of Homer E. Flynt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1383. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1384. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests, in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes, to the former owners of such land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REFUND OR CREDIT FOR TAX ON GASOLINE USED FOR CERTAIN FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a refund or credit on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment.

The Congress originally enacted the Federal gasoline tax in 1932 for purposes of general revenue. Despite this fact the concept has gradually evolved that the purpose of the tax is to finance highway construction.

This concept was crystallized by the enactment of the 1954 Federal Aid to Highway Act. The message from the President, the hearings in the Public Works Committees of both Houses, and the debate on the floor of both Houses, include numerous references to the effect that the amount appropriated for highways by the Federal Government should be equal to the amount estimated to be available from the Federal gasoline tax. The amount that was authorized by the 1954 act was in fact equal to the estimate of the revenue from the Federal gasoline tax.

The Congress has, therefore, for all practical purposes, established the principle that the Federal gasoline tax is to provide revenue to build highways. Even though the money collected from the gasoline tax is not formally earmarked for this purpose, the net effect is the same.

Since the Federal gasoline tax is considered as a use tax, that is, a tax for using the highways, then it is clearly inconsistent to collect the tax on gasoline used for nonhighway purposes.

The major form of nonhighway use of gasoline is on farms. Gasoline used on a farm is one of a number of farm production supplies—gasoline, farm machinery, insecticides, feed, fertilizer, and so on. There is no relationship whatsoever between these production supplies and the use of highways. It would be just as illogical to tax fertilizer and to use the tax for building highways as it would be to tax gasoline used on the farm for this purpose. I do not know of any other industry in which a production supply is taxed to build highways.

Looked at in another way, gasoline used on a farm is a source of power. If power used on the farm is to be taxed to build highways, it would be just as equitable to tax power used in other industries to build highways. We might, for example, tax coal, or electricity, or oil, or natural gas, or diesel fuel, and use the money thus acquired to build highways. But it would not be logical to tax these sources of power for this purpose. Nor is it equitable or logical to tax gasoline used on the farm to build highways.

The taxation of non-highway-used gasoline to build highways is, in my opinion, inequitable, illogical, and discriminatory.

Many of us who have served in various capacities in State government will remember that the same issue has been fought over in the State legislatures. In most States non-highway-used gasoline is exempt from the State gasoline tax. The only States in which the State tax is not refunded for non-highway-used gasoline are Vermont, Utah, and Wyoming. I understand that in two of these States, Utah and Wyoming, there is a considerable likelihood that nonhighway use of gasoline may be exempted from the State gasoline tax in the near future.

The reasons which have impelled 45 State legislatures to exempt nonhighway use of gasoline from the State gasoline tax, are the same as the reasons which should cause the Congress to exempt nonhighway use of gasoline from the Federal gasoline tax, that is, that it is plainly discriminatory to place on one class of citizens a tax for building highways that is not placed on other classes of citizens.

Farmers should pay their fair share of the cost of building highways, as measured by their use of the highways. They should pay both the State and Federal gasoline tax on gasoline used on the highways. But merely because gasoline happens to be the major source of power for farm production is no reason why farmers should pay the gasoline tax on gasoline that is not used on the highways.

It does not seem to me that the administration of this exemption represents any particular problem. There is no reason why the farmer, in applying for his refund of the State gasoline tax used for nonhighway purposes, should not, at the same time and on the same form, apply for a refund of the Federal tax paid for non-highway-used gasoline. The State agencies administering this program could merely act as fiscal agents for the Federal Government in this connection. I see no particular difficulty in the State and Federal tax administrators entering into arrangements whereby this could be accomplished without particular difficulty. And even if some difficulties were involved, this is no reason why the Congress should continue this inequitable tax treatment.

I expect some of my colleagues will want to ask, What is to prevent the farmer from including in his application for a refund a portion of his gasoline purchases used for highway purposes? The State governments have, over the years, developed techniques for auditing applications for refunds to prevent such abuse. Even if a few farmers do apply for more refund than they should have on the basis of nonhighway use, this is far more than offset by the fact that during many months of the year farmers do not buy enough gasoline to go to the trouble of applying for a refund on that portion of such gasoline used for nonhighway purposes. Thus, farmers as a group will continue to pay their fair share of the cost of building highways.

I am surprised at the fact that farmers have been fairly quiet over this inequitable situation in years past. I expect that the reason this is so is that most farmers have considered the Federal gasoline tax to be a temporary tax, and, since it would be terminated eventually, there was no purpose in becoming too concerned about the situation. But now that the Congress has extended the Federal gasoline tax year after year, increasing interest in correcting the inequity is developing. In the past few months I have received many letters from farmers on this situation. It appears to me that their case is fully justified and that the Congress has a responsibility to take action to eliminate this discrimination at the earliest feasible date.

Some of my colleagues may agree that nonhighway use of gasoline should be exempted from the Federal gasoline tax, but argue that this is not the time to reduce taxes. I would say to them that this is not a tax reduction, but, rather is a correction of an obvious inequity that the Congress should have corrected many years ago.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to provide for the exemption of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes from the Federal gasoline tax. Similar bills have been introduced in the House. I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee will give such bills their early consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, and that, in addition, a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation on this subject, and a letter from the Kansas Farm Bureau at Manhattan, Kans., be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1336) to provide for a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6416 (b) (2) (H) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special uses in which tax-payments considered overpayments) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting "; and"; and by adding after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph: "(I) In the case of gasoline taxable under section 4081, used or resold as fuel for the operation or propulsion of farm equipment."

SEC. 2. Effective date: The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall be effective with respect to gasoline used or resold on or after the first day of the first month beginning more than 10 days after the effective date of this act.

The letters, presented by Mr. CARLSON, are as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1955.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The American Farm Bureau Federation has long favored termination of the Federal gasoline tax, thus leaving this source of revenue available to the States.

Until such time as the Federal gasoline tax is terminated, we recommend an exemption from taxation for gasoline used for nonhighway purposes.

Although the Federal gasoline tax was originally adopted to provide general revenues, the concept has been gradually adopted that the purpose of the tax is to finance highway construction. Current discussions of the Clay committee report and other proposals for an expanded highway construction program, all involve the idea that gasoline tax revenues are the source of highway financing.

We submit that to continue to tax gasoline used for nonhighway purposes to build highways is inequitable. Gasoline used for nonhighway purposes is no more related to the use of highways than fuel oil or coal used for heating buildings.

The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully recommends that at an early date in the current Congress that hearings be held by the Senate Finance Committee on the proposal that nonhighway used gasoline be exempt from the Federal gasoline tax.

Very sincerely,

MATT TRIGGS,
Assistant Legislative Director.

KANSAS FARM BUREAU,
Manhattan, Kans., February 8, 1955.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Since the Federal gasoline tax at the 2-cent rate will expire April 1, 1955, legislation to provide for extension will undoubtedly be considered in the near future.

Kansas Farm Bureau was willing to go along with the Federal gasoline tax at the time it was originally adopted as a means of financing necessary war effort with the idea that it would be only a temporary measure used not only for road purposes but other activities as well. The thinking is that a gasoline tax should be left to the State legislatures as a method of financing road construction and maintenancee by the States and counties.

It now appears that Federal financing of roads with some of the funds raised by a gasoline tax is to be a permanent policy of our National Government. If this policy is to continue, and so long as it does continue, that part of our gasoline consumption which is used for nonhighway purposes should be exempt from a Federal tax.

To impose a special tax on nonhighway gasoline for building roads is as unrealistic as it would be to impose a special tax on any other material used in the production of any commodity including agriculture commodities. Some method of exempting nonhighway gasoline from this tax must be found. This might be done by exemption or by a refund system as now practiced by many States. Arrangements could be made with the States, whereby a refund of the Federal tax might be applied for and paid along with the State.

We know that none of our Kansas congressional delegation are on the House Ways and Means Committee where the extension of the gasoline tax will first be considered. But we also know that you may be in a position to exert some influence with the House committee. With your knowledge of the history of gasoline taxes in Kansas, you realize that Kansas farmers are very much opposed to taxing gasoline which is not used on roads, regardless of whether the tax is State or Federal. To do otherwise is to burden farmers with an added heavy production cost to further aggravate the cost-price squeeze. Kansas stands near the top in the use of gasoline for agriculture production.

Many Congressmen will not have the direct interest in this issue that you have. We must depend on our representation from agricultural areas to explain the discrimination effected through a special tax on nonhighway gasoline used for road purposes.

Sincerely yours,

W. I. BOONE,
President.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the distinguished author of the bill to permit me to join with him as a cosponsor of the bill. I think the proposed legislation which the Senator has introduced is most appropriate, and I should like to be associated with the bill as cosponsor.

Mr. CARLSON. I would be most pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Minnesota be a cosponsor.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO BUDGETARY AND FISCAL MATTERS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to the budgetary and fiscal matters of the Federal Government.

I am privileged to introduce them in the Senate as companion bills to measures introduced in the House of Representatives by the distinguished Member from the 24th District of California, the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB.

Briefly, one bill would require that each bill reported by a committee of the Congress which would authorize the appropriation of moneys from the Treasury must be accompanied by a printed report which shall include an estimate from the department, or other agency concerned, of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution.

The other bill would require the Bureau of the Budget to provide the Congress each year with a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that these two pieces of proposed legislation are vital to the proper function of the Congress. There has long been a critical need for the Congress to know to what extent the taxpayer has been committed to expenditures, annually, over long periods of time. This is particularly true in the case of great construction and development projects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

S. 1341. A bill to require that the budget shall include each year a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects.

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 1343. A bill to require bills and resolutions authorizing appropriations reported by committees of Congress to be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost of the legislation.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM TO DENTISTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Social Security Act so as to extend the benefits of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to our Nation's dentists.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, this proposal was voted favorably by the House of Representatives but failed to win approval from the Senate Finance Committee. Recently dental societies have conducted polls in many of the 48 States on this subject. Their members have favored the adoption of this retirement plan by ratios of up to 8 to 1.

The number of persons eligible for inclusion under social security has increased by more than 10 million during the past year. I am firmly of the opinion that our Nation's dentists are fully deserving of this opportunity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1344) to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to dentists, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED RECIPROCAL TRADE CASUALTIES ACT OF 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the Reciprocal Trade Casualties Act of 1955, designed to cushion the impact of an expanded world-trade policy which may be felt by some segments of the American economy. The bill was originally introduced by the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, Member from Wisconsin. It is a pleasure for me

to associate myself with Mr. REUSS and to publicly pay tribute to him for his imagination.

The House of Representatives has already passed a bill to renew and expand our reciprocal-trade-agreements program. It is my hope that the Senate will soon follow suit. Our Nation requires an expanded world trade and we know that the peace of the world depends upon increased commerce and industrial exchange. An ever larger amount of American industry is export oriented. The prosperity of these export industries and our American economy depends in the long run on the ability of the other nations to earn the dollars to buy our exports. We also appreciate that lower tariffs help the American consumer.

These comments are accurate and pertinent in the general. In the specific, unfortunately, a number of individuals, companies, and occasional communities suffer if imports to the United States increase. The legislative process in a democracy concerns itself with the specific, Mr. President, as well as with the general. We, therefore, have the responsibility to do what we can to prevent the individual specific injury as much as possible.

Earlier in the session it was a privilege for me to join with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in introducing a bill to provide some assistance to individuals, communities and industries jeopardized by lowering of trade barriers. The bill I introduce today is presented in the same spirit and with the same objective. It is designed specifically to provide import-endangered companies with certain advantages on Government procurement, and is in my judgment a supplement to the original Humphrey-Kennedy-Williams bill, S. 51.

The bill, in brief, provides that any domestic producer found by the Tariff Commission to be in danger by foreign imports may receive a certificate entitling it to a percentage advantage—up to 25 percent—in its bids for Government contracts. The idea is to provide an oxygen tent so that a company may keep busy and solvent while it finds new products which can sustain it in the long pull. The certificate would be good only for a limited period, while the company energetically sought to develop new products which could withstand competition. With the Government purchasing many billion dollars a year worth of materials, a percentage advantage of this type could be of real significance in tiding a hard-pressed producer over a transition period.

We have a responsibility to concern ourselves with these specific problems raised by expanded world trade, because every company that goes out of business and every industry that is seriously impaired and every individual who loses his job thereby, to that extent diminishes the strength of our Nation. We thereby lose savings, management, skill, and many economic and spiritual values associated with jobs, families and community living.

The principle of sharing burdens is a well-established one in the American society. The bill now at the desk would take the costs of a liberalized trade policy off the shoulders of a few isolated industries and spread that cost over the entire Nation as it should be. If we can accomplish this objective, we can move closer to our goal, a goal so ably characterized by the distinguished Member from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], as "trade without tears."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1351) to provide a means whereby domestic producers who are injured by increased imports resulting from trade agreement concessions may obtain preferences in bidding for Government contracts, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, legislation was approved by the Congress, at the request of ocean-shipping and other transportation interests, to adjust overtime pay rates for night, Sunday, and holiday inspections by employees of the Public Health Service at the various quarantine stations. The legislation did not receive Presidential approval and hence was not enacted into law.

In a statement explaining his refusal to approve the measure, President Eisenhower stated that "the claims of the shipowners for out-of-hours service have merit" and declared that "the problems which the bill seeks to solve are real and pressing." The Chief Executive further stated that he intended "to have these problems further explored," and promised a study of effective means to coordinate overtime pay for all inspectional services.

As the President so well made clear, the problems in the field of quarantine inspection are real and pressing, particularly with respect to ocean-cargo vessels and tankers. Because of weather and other conditions beyond their control, such vessels, and sometimes even the passenger liners, cannot reach port during the regularly prescribed daytime hours. Yet it may cost the owners as much as $5,000 if a vessel has to lay over until next day for quarantine inspections.

As is well known, operating costs for American vessels are extremely high in comparison to those of competing foreign ships. It is difficult enough to meet this low-cost foreign competition without running into additional quarantine-inspection costs every time a vessel fails to reach port before 6 p. m.

Inasmuch, also, as there has been no information forthcoming as to the results of the promised Presidential study, I consider the need so pressing that I have prepared a modified bill which merely seeks to place the Quarantine Inspection Service on an equality with similar inspection staffs of Customs and the Immigration Service with respect to overtime compensation.

All these employees are subject to 24-hour call and, as the President so justly stated, the Public Health group's claims for equal treatment with other inspectional groups have much merit.

Incidentally, the vessel owners for whom the overtime quarantine inspections will be made are quite willing to reimburse the Government for the full amount of overtime compensation paid, and this is provided for in the bill.

In view of the urgency of the matter, I sincerely hope that prompt consideration of the bill will be afforded in committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1370) to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO FURTHER DEFINE THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to further define the national transportation policy. This is the so-called antiracketeering amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. Its purpose is to establish as a matter of policy the intent of Congress that the transportation industry, insofar as it is subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, shall be kept free of terrorism, extortion, racketeering, or similar unlawful tactics.

This proposed legislation springs from recommendations contained in the third interim report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. Its principal sponsor was the late Senator Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming, who was a member of the Special Crime Committee.

Bills similar to the one which I am introducing today were introduced in the 82d and 83d Congresses; they were promptly reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and passed the Senate. For reasons unknown to me, however, the legislation on this subject never was reported from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in either the 82d or 83d Congress.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I intend to ask for speedy consideration of this antiracketeering legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1377) to further define the national transportation policy, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIDS TO CERTAIN MARITIME NAVIGATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury outlining the purpose and background of this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1378) to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 10, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States.

The proposed legislation would amend section 85 of title 14, United States Code, to place in the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating the duty to prescribe and enforce necessary and reasonable regulations, for the protection of maritime navigation, concerning lights and other signals required on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States. The amended section would contain penalty provisions.

A description of present diversity in authority is contained in the enclosure. It is believed desirable to concentrate in one agency the responsibility for prescribing and enforcing the requirements as to the lights and signals of these structures. The Coast Guard, which now has primary responsibility with respect to aids to maritime navigation generally, would appear to be the logical agency. Since the amended section is limited in its effect to the protection of maritime navigation, it would not in any way interfere with the existing authority of the Secretary of the Army to prescribe operating lights and signals for bridges.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM ACCOMPANYING A DRAFT BILL TO AMEND 14 U. S. C. 85

As background information for the proposed amendment to section 85 of title 14, an explanation of the present diversity of authority in connection with the lights and signals on various types of fixed structures is contained herein.

The act of August 7, 1882 (22 Stat. 309) and the act of March 23, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 85; 33 U. S. C. 494) required owners and operators of bridges approved for construction under those acts to maintain, at their own expense such lights and other signals as prescribed by the Coast Guard. The General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 847; 33 U. S. C. 525–533), does not contain such a provision. While the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may include compliance with Coast Guard requirements as a condition of maintenance and operation of a bridge under this later act, the Coast Guard does not now have specific statutory authority to control the navigational lights and signals on bridges approved for construction after August 2, 1946.

With respect to dams over navigable waters of the United States, the Federal Power Commission, under section 18 of the Federal Water Power Act, as amended (41 Stat. 1073; 16 U. S. C. 811), is authorized to require licensees to construct, maintain, and operate at their own expense such lights and signals as may be directed by the Secretary of the Army.

In connection with the lighting or marking of fixed structures other than bridges or dams, the authority for the Coast Guard to require certain lights and signals thereon is now derived from clauses in individual construction permits issued by the Department of the Army pursuant to authority contained in the act of August 18, 1894, as amended (28 Stat. 362; 33 U. S. C. 1).

Proposed legislation similar to the present bill was introduced in the 81st Congress and was passed by the House of Representatives, but action was not completed thereon by the Senate. At that time, the Corps of Engineers informally indicated that the Department of the Army would be in favor of such legislation.

AMENDMENT OF DEFINITION OF "AIRMAN" IN CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Secretary Weeks explaining the purpose of this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1379) to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 9, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed proposed bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, be introduced in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

As presently defined in section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 401 (6)), the term "airman" includes, among other aeronautical occupations, "any individual who is directly in charge of the inspection, maintenance, overhauling, or repair of aircraft" or their components. Section 610 (a) (2) of the act declares that it is illegal "for any person to serve * * * as an airman * * * without an airman certificate" issued by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of this Department. Thus all mechanics in charge of inspection, maintenance, overhauling, or repair of aircraft or their components in the United States must hold a certificate of competency issued by the Administrator. In consequence of this rigid provision of the act, some mechanics and repairmen are required to hold certificates although no substantial public interest requires it.

Aircraft manufacturers must employ certificated mechanics to repair their own products, although there is no such requirement with respect to the original production of the same article. Obviously a manufacturer who has demonstrated his ability to maintain the quality of his product under a Civil Aeronautics Administration production certificate is qualified to repair, restore, or rebuild the same product at his own factory.

Repair stations performing a great variety of special services to aircraft are also certificated by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The qualifications of the employees are checked upon the initial application for the certificate, and the maintenance of a qualified staff, and of high standards in work done, is requisite to its retention. Since employee qualifications are cumulatively passed upon in connection with this Government certification and inspection program, it is unnecessary duplication to require in addition a check upon, and a certification of, the qualifications of the individual supervisory employees.

It is our opinion, therefore, that aviation safety does not require the certification either of mechanics who work for a manufacturer on aircraft and aircraft components which he produces, or of employees of a certificated repair station. The enclosed proposed bill would amend section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to except persons so employed from the definition of "airman." This change would permit the elimination of regulation and control of these occupations where Government supervision serves no useful purpose. The Department of Commerce, therefore, recommends early and favorable consideration of this proposed legislation by the Congress.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SECURITY PROVISIONS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Secretary Weeks explaining the purpose of this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1380) to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 16, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed draft of a bill be introduced in the Senate at your convenience. The purpose of the proposal is: "To authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes."

Following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, legislation was enacted authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, upon the direction of the President, to exercise control of the flight of aircraft over certain areas for national security purposes. (64 Stat. 825; title XII, Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; 49 U. S. C. 701–705.) Thereafter, an Executive order was issued by the President (Executive Order No. 10197, December 21, 1950), directing the Secretary to put the program into effect. At present the only sanctions which may be applied for violations of the security regulations which have been issued by the Secretary under that authority are either (1) suspension or revocation of the offender's pilot certificate or operating authority, or (2) in the case of willful offenses, criminal penalties. In most cases, neither of these sanctions is appropriate.

To an airline or other commercial pilot, suspension or revocation means loss of earnings, and to the air transport industries, loss of essential man-hours of skilled services. Suspension of the operating certificate of a carrier, for example, means loss of essential transportation service to the Nation. These results are both inappropriate to the times and too severe for the usual offense.

Criminal penalties are even more drastic, and thus even less appropriate in most of the cases presented. In any event, criminal intent is usually lacking in these cases, which generally involve some unauthorized entry into an air defense identification zone through oversight or neglect.

The civil penalty which is the normal sanction applied for minor violations of other safety provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 would provide a moderate and expeditious remedy more appropriate to these technical violations. An amendment to the law is necessary to authorize the imposition of that sanction in such cases. The attached bill would provide that authority; it would amend section 901 (a) of the act so as to include within those infractions for which a civil penalty may be imposed, any violation of a "rule, regulation, or order issued under title XII" of the act.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the transmission of this letter and proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

INCORPORATION OF SOCIETY OF THE 28TH DIVISION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Society of the 28th Division. All three of the sponsors of this bill are veterans of that organization, and every State in the Union is represented in the 28th Division. Fourteen States are represented as the incorporators.

Units of the 28th Division trace their history back to the Revolution. It first fought as a division in World War I, and was the fourth division in the whole United States Army in number of casualties. It also fought in World War II, in Germany, and during the Korean conflict, was a part of our occupational troops in Germany.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1381) to incorporate the Society of the 28th Division, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. POTTER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF TIMBER DEVELOPMENT IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to improve timber development in national forests and to simplify the work of the Forest Service. This bill provides that 10 percent of all moneys received from the sale of timber and other forest products on the national forests during each fiscal year shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress. The bill further provides that these funds shall continue to be available until expended under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe within the national forests in the States from which such receipts are derived for improvement. In other words, the funds made available by this proposed bill would facilitate needed improvement of timber stand through pruning, thinning, burning, poisoning, girdling, controlling rodents, and other improved cultural methods.

Membership on the National Forest Reservation Commission has given me an opportunity to observe the fine progress which the Forestry Service is making and also some of the problems facing reforestation.

I have been very much impressed with the work being accomplished under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act which, in my opinion, is extremely important and highly beneficial. However, some of the most urgent needs for reforestation and timber-stand improvement work on the national forest are on areas where timber sales are not yet possible. The present program is not adequate to provide needed improvement for these areas. There is a substantial area of timberlands which were cut over when in private ownership and now included in national forest regions. These areas are badly in need of stand improvement and reforestation measures. An example of such a situation is found in my State of Mississippi where 110,000 acres are in need of planting and another 100,000 acres which have been planted but in critical need of weeding and thinning. I also understand other desired work would include cutting and girdling low valued trees in 56,000 acres of natural stands of longleaf pine-scrub oak type in Mississippi. There are similar needs for the same type of work in Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Florida, and South Carolina.

Officials of the Department of Agriculture estimate the cost of the high priority work for all national forests in the neighborhood of $115 million, which includes tree planting, timber-stand improvement, thinning, disease control—except white-pine blister rust—and rodent control work. This need when compared with present appropriations of less than $1 million—$810,000—for fiscal 1955 falls far short of meeting the critical need in developing reforestation and timber stand improvement work. The estimated $800,000 provided in the 1956 fiscal budget is not adequate to even restore the acreage of timber land annually destroyed nationwide by fire. Therefore, the backlog of work is increasing each year. The $115 million estimated for high priority work is far short of covering the cost of reforestation of the estimated 4 million acres within all national forests which need work so badly. Actually, these estimates would cover only the high priority work that should be accomplished on nonsale areas within a normal 10-year period.

Timber stand improvement measures and reforestation on several million acres where commercial cutting is not feasible cannot be accomplished under the provisions of the Knutson-Vandenberg Act. Neither can rodent control for the protection of established production and growing stock be protected under that act.

Mr. President, in my opinion the appropriation provided for in this bill amounting to about $7 million annually, based on the average of last 3-year sale of timber and other forest products on national forests, is not an expenditure, but can be considered a sound investment. I firmly believe that this is a pressing problem and I hope it will be given full consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1383) to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82), introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER — REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 542 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 542) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims;

and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

COMMISSION TO STUDY COPYRIGHT LAWS—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on March 2, 1955, I introduced the bill (S. 1254) creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision. I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 38, consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, and that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

It is my understanding that in previous years proposed legislation relating to this subject has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe that is also his understanding, that compacts relating to oil and gas generally are referred to his committee.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROTECTION OF VALUES OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under date of January 24 last the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced Senate bill 687, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to protect the timber and other surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes, and it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill really deals with mining, and should be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS FOR RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE IN CERTAIN CASES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] may appear as a joint cosponsor of Senate bill 627, to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance and benefits for others who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANALYSIS AND REEVALUATION OF HUMAN AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, since the introduction of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes, and pursuant to my previous request, the names of the following Senators have been added as additional cosponsors: Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. SYMINGTON.

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES — REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 45, the resolution (S. Res. 72) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee and Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PAYNE submitted amendments, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED REVENUE ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KERR:

Transcript of discussion on the "Capitol Cloakroom" radio program between Senator LONG and newspaper correspondents on March 5, 1955.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at the Second Century Convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Recent correspondence between himself and Hon. Edmund G. Brown, attorney general of California, with reference to efforts to combat crime.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Document prepared under his direction relating to the historical development of the conference committee.

PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the consumers of our Nation are following most anxiously the opening stages of the battle in the current 84th Congress which will determine whether or not the consuming public will be protected from being gouged by skyrocketing natural-gas rates.

It is my earnest hope that the very unsound legislation which has been introduced for the purpose of depriving consumers of protection will be rejected by the Senate and House of Representatives. This has been my position ever since the inception of this battle many years ago, and it remains my position.

I have, moreover, communicated to the President, respectfully urging that he reject the recent gas-exemption recommendations which were unfortunately made by the Committee on National Fuel Policy.

I present a letter which I wrote to the President, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing most respectfully to urge that you reject the recommendations of the Commission which had been appointed to study the Nation's fuel policies insofar as those recommendations relate to proposed exempting of natural gas from Federal control.

With all due respect to the distinguished members of that Commission, may I say frankly that in my judgment, were the recommendations of the Commission adopted, the net effects might be:

(a) To leave the consumers of the United States at the helpless mercy of a relatively small number of companies who have in the past shown themselves eager to skyrocket rates as high as the traffic would bear;

(b) somewhat to demoralize the people of the United States by weakening their respect of judicial process. Thus, decontrol would lead many people to feel that the judgment of the Supreme Court (which had fully confirmed the legality of such Federal control) has been arbitrarily tossed into the wastebasket because the majority decision did not please certain private interests and because those interests proceeded to raise a misleading hue and cry for decontrol.

May I say that I very definitely believe that in all fairness the investors in the vital natural-gas industry are entitled to a fair return on their investment and that they should be given sufficient incentive.

But unless they are subject to Federal control (which is, of course, always subject to court review), the respective consuming States like my own would be virtually helpless in trying to establish reasonable prices by the time the over-priced gas were to come into the respective State borders.

If we were to accept the absurd line of reasoning that the natural gas industry must be decontrolled in order for it to expand operations, then we would end up by scrapping Federal controls on railroads, on airplanes, on electric utilities, on the ground that Federal controls discourage those operations, too. I say that the public interest, through regulation, must remain superior to that of any purely private interest.

May I say, too, that the national defense with which you are naturally principally concerned, can best be served by reasonable Federal controls on natural gas.

Very shortly, Mr. President, I should like to submit to you the names of members of a highly qualified municipal delegation which would like to visit with you to explain the case for control of natural gas. I have been in close contact with Mr. Shanley toward such a meeting.

I know how heavy and time consuming are the countless burdens of your office and those of your staff, but I trust that you will find it possible to give this issue your considered personal judgment in consultation with staff experts.

With highest esteem of your great services, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

THE NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over a period of many months, I have pointed out to the Nation the seriousness of the problem of narcotics addiction among United States servicemen in the Far East.

Fortunately, this problem does not affect more than a very small proportion of our servicemen in that theater.

Nevertheless, as was pointed out during Foreign Relations Committee hearings which I conducted on the International Opium Protocol, Communist China has been flooding free Asia and the rest of the world with opium. And one of her main targets consists of American servicemen. Fortunately, I am glad to note that yesterday, the Senate Rules Committee approved Senate Resolution 67 offered by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for a review of this addiction problem by a Judiciary Subcommittee.

By way of depicting various phases of the problem in the Far East, I send to the desk now excerpts from a report as furnished by the headquarters of the United States Army Forces for the Far East, Office of the Provost Marshal General, to Dr. Frank B. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

I believe that this background information will be of interest to my colleagues. While it does not relate the overall grim statistics but confines itself to exploratory data, it will help flash a warning to our people. This narcotics problem is no accident, no mere coincidence. It is obvious that Red China is determined to continue her diabolic drive to subvert the world through dope.

The latest warning of that danger came from Narcotics Bureau Commissioner Harry Anslinger, at his recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

I believe that only the most vigorous and articulate reaction by the conscience of the free world can serve to deter Red China from her present infamous campaign.

In addition, the most effective detection and enforcement efforts will be necessary on the part of all the free nations.

Unfortunately, however, in the Far East, particularly, only the most insignificant fraction of what could be done and should be done against the dope problem is now being done. The evil of domestic corruption allies itself with the evil of international trafficking and the result is to further endanger the free nations of that area.

I ask unanimous consent that the background material from the Defense Department be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON FAR EAST NARCOTICS PROBLEM

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES
ARMY FORCES, FAR EAST,
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST MARSHAL,
APO 343, September 29, 1954.

INTRODUCTION

This briefing will cover the law enforcement and confinement program pertinent to the narcotics situation in Far East Command. The scope of the briefing encompasses several phases of police activity; jurisdiction, liaison arrangements with other agencies, apprehension methods employed, types of persons and drugs involved in illegal narcotics traffic, and procedures for handling narcotics offenders in military confinement facilities.

THE APPREHENSION PROGRAM

1. Jurisdiction

A. Service personnel and civilians accompanying United States forces. The Manual for Courts-martial, which governs all three services, provides jurisdiction over civilian personnel, and by one service over personnel of another service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. This is particularly applicable to service police personnel on duty. The post, base, or station commander is charged with discipline within the installation, and the operation of routine patrols in the vicinity of the installation. Most narcotics apprehensions, however, are made as the result of criminal investigation, or detective work. In Far East Command the Army is charged with "off-post" criminal investigation, except in specific areas where Air Force or Navy personnel predominate, such as at Tachikawa Air Base, or Yokosuka Naval Station. Under those situations agreements have been reached whereby the Air Force or Navy will conduct "off-post" investigations in those areas.

B. Japanese nationals. United States Armed Forces police do not have jurisdiction over Japanese nationals. The Japanese police are responsible for the police of Japanese citizens and foreigners living on the Japanese economy.

C. Korean nationals. United States Armed Forces police have limited jurisdiction over Korean nationals. Through agreements with the Korean Government, military police have authority to apprehend Korean nationals who commit offenses against United States property or persons. When apprehended the violators are delivered immediately to the Korean authorities for prosecution. The Korean national police have primary responsibility for apprehension of Korean law violators.

2. Liaison arrangements

A. Indigenous police. In consideration of the responsibilities of the Japanese and Korean Governments, the United States Armed Forces have not insisted upon authority to apprehend citizens of the two countries. Very satisfactory liaison arrangements have been effected that permit indigenous police to operate with United States Armed Forces police. In actuality the agreements have permitted a free exchange of police information on law violations, and if an apprehension is to be effected or a raid conducted, the police with unprejudiced jurisdiction are present to accomplish the task.

B. Narcotics Bureau of United States Treasury Department. The illegal narcotics traffic is such a problem in the United States that the Treasury Department maintains representatives in the Far East to help combat the traffic. Information on illegal narcotics or narcotics users is freely exchanged between United States Armed Forces police and the United States Treasury representative in Tokyo, Mr. Kent Lewis.

C. Indigenous governments. Continuous liaison with the Japanese Government is maintained for the Far East Command by Army forces, Far East Provost Marshal Liaison Division. The Chief of the Division acts as chairman of the Joint Committee for Suppression of Vice. The committee was organized in 1952 when the articles of agreement between the United States and Japan were signed. The commanding general of the Army forces was designated as responsible for police liaison with the Japanese Government for all three services. The committee provides for a mutual exchange of

information and coordination of effort, including legislation, toward suppression of illegal narcotics and other forms of vice in Japan.

The commanding general, Eighth United State Army, was delegated responsibility for liaison activities in Korea, and has effected a similar arrangement with the Republic of Korea Government aimed at the suppression of vice in Korea.

3. Apprehension methods employed

A. No unusual or sensational methods are employed in the apprehension program. Investigators are trained to observe, and to follow leads received from any source. Information on users or distributors and their source of supply is carefully investigated until the violators are apprehended or further investigation is useless.

B. Military investigators work very closely with the Korean and Japanese police. This is more important in the narcotics suppression program, perhaps than in any other phase of investigative activity because of the intermingling of civilian suppliers and servicemen users. In the metropolitan areas where the traffic is greater, special investigators are assigned exclusively to the narcotics program. Representatives of the Japanese police are assigned on a permanent basis to work with the United States investigators on the suppression of narcotics.

C. Army Forces, Far East, and Far East Air Forces each have an investigator group assigned to the headquarters which are available for immediate dispatch to assist local investigators in any part of the command. Special investigators are dispatched to a locality having an increase in narcotics incidents or suspected large-scale traffic in heoin or other drugs.

D. Science is also employed in the narcotics apprehension program. A lie detector is a standard piece of equipment in the larger criminal investigation detachments, and available to the smaller detachments. A complete criminal investigation laboratory is maintained in Tokyo for the benefit of any law enforcement agency that desires technical assistance in analysis of suspect articles or material. In addition to the Far East Criminal Investigation Laboratory, there is a medical laboratory in Tokyo, and another in Korea, which are available to investigators. All of the laboratories use the latest methods, such as paper chromotography, and are capable of detecting the most minute quantities of narcotics adhering to instruments, or present in specimens. The laboratories are invaluable in apprehending and convicting persons who use narcotics.

4. Statistical analysis of narcotics situation

A. The accumulation and analysis of statistical data is a vital part of police work. A successful narcotics suppression program must be based on knowledge of the type of person involved, the kind and source of the drugs used, and the attitude of the indigenous population in the locality.

B. The narcotics offender in the Far East.

(1) Usually he is a soldier. The Army has approximately 65 percent of the personnel in the command, but furnishes 80 percent of the convicted violators. The incidence of narcotics apprehensions among Army troops is twice as great as the incidence among Air Force and Navy personnel.

(2) Usually he is a Negro. Seventy-eight percent—3 out of every 4—are Negro. This is a very high proportion, and becomes even higher when command population ratios are compared. Only 13 percent of the command are Negroes, as against 78 percent of the offenders. The incidence among Negro troops is 20 times the incidence among white troops—14 per thousand compared to seven-tenths of 1 per thousand. This preponderance also exists among juvenile narcotics users in the United States. Negroes represent about 10 percent of the total juveniles but furnish 75 percent of the narcotics users.

(3) The violator is a reasonably well educated person. Seven percent have attended grade school, 87 percent have attended high school, and 6 percent have attended college.

(4) The majority are not new to the service, nor newly arrived in the Far East. In total service time, 29 percent have under 2 years, 34 percent have from 2 to 3 years, and 36 percent have over 3 years service. The amount of time in the Far East is very comparable to total service time. Thirty-five percent have been here less than 1 year, 42 percent have been here from 1 to 2 years, and 18 percent have been here more than 2 years.

(5) Many are chronic disciplinary problems. Twenty-one percent have been convicted by court-martial of other offenses once, 19 percent have been convicted twice, 20 percent have been convicted 3 or more times.

(6) The narotics problem is not confined to the Far East. There are an estimated [1] 50,000 adult, and 10,000 adolescent, addicts in the United States. It was reasonable to assume that some servicemen used narcotics before coming to the Far East. Research among convicted offenders revealed that many had. Nineteen percent used narcotics in civilian life before coming into the service, 5 percent first used narcotics after coming into the service, but while still stationed in the United States. Seventy-three percent first used narcotics after coming to the Far East; 40 percent in Japan, and 33 percent in Korea.

(7) Who induces the servicemen to use narcotics? Records show that 20 percent were introduced to drug use by prostitutes, 39 percent by service friends, 21 percent by civilian friends, and 20 percent by peddlers. Efforts directed against prostitution, and efforts to remove narcotics users from nonusers, reduces the possibility of others becoming users.

(8) It is a basic conclusion that among narcotics users there is a close affinity between the type of drug available and the user's choice of drug. Most of the world's supply of opium originates on the Asiatic mainland. The choice of drug in the Far East is an opium derivative. Heroin is the overwhelming choice—80 percent of the total. It is easy to conceal, the effect is quicker, and it can be taken in a number of ways. These factors are important to a person who uses or traffics in narcotics. Less than 1 percent of the illegal narcotics is raw opium. It is too difficult to conceal, and too difficult to use. Among narcotics users opium smoking is passé. Marihuana, synthetic opium derivatives, benzedrine, and other nervous system stimulants are used to some extent, but not to the same extent as heroin.

(9) The illegal narcotics traffic is not confined to service personnel. They do not smuggle or sell drugs. The smugglers and sellers are indigenous civilians, with whom the servicemen associate more or less freely and, over whom service police or courts have no jurisdiction. A soldier, sailor, or airman apprehended for a narcotics violation is almost certain to be tried by court martial, and if the evidence warrants, convicted. If convicted he will certainly be sentenced to confinement. The same attitude is taken by civil courts in the United States. Our national attitude toward illegal narcotics demands it. Such is not the case in Korea and Japan where the national attitude toward the traffic is more tolerant. Long association with the narcotics problem causes them to treat it more lightly than we do in the United States.

[1] Control of Narcotics Addiction, by George E. Connery, Washington, D. C.; published in J. A. M. A., vol. 147, No. 12, pp. 1162–1165, dated Nov. 17, 1951.

Japanese officials are becoming increasingly aware of the evils of narcotics and have passed many laws to control the traffic. Lesser officials, and the mass of the people, still regard the illegal traffic with no particular concern. Fifty percent of those apprehended are not brought to trial, 13 percent are given suspended sentences, 11 percent are given sentences of more than 1 year, 23 percent are given sentences of less than 1 year, 2 percent are fined more than 5,000 yen, and 1 percent are fined less than 5,000 yen. As a basis of comparison of the value of the fine, a housemaid will receive 6 to 10,000 yen monthly, and an average laborer will earn approximately 10,000 yen per month.

In Korea the situation is worse than it is in Japan. Of those narcotics cases referred to the prosecutor's office, 62 percent were dismissed without trial, 26 percent were tried by a summary court, and only 11 percent were tried by a court capable of sentencing to long prison terms. This chart does not show those cases summarily handled by the police and not referred to the prosecutor's office. There are only scattered statistics on police cases, but we know a very high percent of the cases are handled in the police station and never referred for trial. Narcotics offenders in Korea are never out of circulation for very long periods. There are many reasons for this. The government is bankrupt. Narcotics users are seldom productive workers and Korean prisons are expected to be self-supporting. Graft is commonplace. The general attitude of the Korean people toward narcotics is one of complete unconcern, despite laws forbidding the traffic.

CONFINEMENT PROCEDURES

1. A serviceman apprehended for a narcotics violation is tried by court-martial, and if found guilty, confined in a local stockade or guardhouse until the case is reviewed by the convening authority.

2. If in Japan, the prisoner is transferred directly to the United States Army Stockade in Tokyo when the sentence is approved. If in Korea, the prisoner is transferred immediately to the Pusan Military Post Stockade, and at the earliest opportunity transferred to the United States Army Stockade in Tokyo.

3. When the prisoner arrives at the United States Army Stockade in Tokyo he has actually entered the military penitentiary system. He is interviewed and completely classified as to background, type of offense, type of custody, and many other ways by the prison staff. The results of the interviews and classification determination will have a bearing on possible future rehabilitation and parole. The prisoner is held in Tokyo until shipped to the United States in a packet of other prisoners, either to serve his sentence, or earn parole.

4. The Narcotics Bureau of the United States Treasury Department is furnished the names of all prisoners convicted of narcotics offenses when they are shipped to the United States. This practice avoids the possibility of convicted narcotics offenders being released among the civilian population without the knowledge of the principal United States narcotics control agency.

5. At all stages of movement from local stockades to the United States, the prisoner is furnished necessary medical attention, carefully observed, and searched many times for narcotics or other contraband.

SUMMARY

We know we have a problem in the illegal use of narcotics by servicemen in the Far East. We do not think the problem is out of proportion, under the circumstances. The Orient is the traditional center of the illegal narcotics traffic. The attitude of the indigenous civilians is generally one of indifference and tolerance toward the use of drugs. It is not unusual for an otherwise honest worker to sell heroin in his spare

time to supplement his income. Opium and its derivatives are more available, and cheaper, here than in the United States. There is a wide variance in the price of narcotics. From day to day, and locality to locality, there are wide fluctuations. At the moment a 0.5-gram deck of heroin sells in southern Japan for 500 yen, $1.38. The same amount of heroin in New York City or Chicago would probably sell for more than $10, perhaps as much as $50.

Statistics on illegal users of narcotics in the United States show that 50 percent of the total are between 21 and 30 years old. Almost all service personnel in the Far East Command are in that age group.

Research among offending service personnel brought out the information that 24 percent were using narcotics in the United States. Many of those convicted of narcotics offenses in the Far East were previously convicted of other offenses, some of them 3 and 4 times. This group probably would have started to use narcotics had they never come to the Far East.

In view of these facts it is surprising that the ratio of users is as small as it is.

We are not attempting to pass over the problem. We are constantly working at it the same as we are at blackmarket, prostitution, pilferage, and other crimes. We maintain liaison with the Japanese and Korean officials, and keep pressure on them to work at the problem from the civilian angle. We spread the available men, money, and time as thick as we can on each of the problems. Unfortunately, it is never thick enough to eliminate any of the problems. We can devote enough effort to all of them to hold them in check.

We believe that the program of enforcement now in effect will keep the illegal use of narcotics by servicemen to a minimum.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday, March 7th, marked the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, a statement I have prepared in recognition of this noteworthy occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Today, on the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, his unwavering faith and devotion to freedom which brought to realization his dreams of a free Czechoslovakia, continue to sustain the gallant Czech people in their dark hour.

Thomas Masaryk was a man of far-reaching accomplishments. But above all was his compassionate dedication to democratic ideals, which embraced all peoples. In every sense this great patriot was a world leader and humanitarian.

The legacy of liberty which Masaryk left to his beloved land will never be obliterated by the Soviet despots. It is enshrined in the hearts of his people who bravely resist the ruthless Communist tyranny.

This anniversary of Masaryk's birth should provide renewed courage to the brave people of Czechoslovakia. Equally it should provide determination to free peoples everywhere that the march of Communist despotism must be stopped.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday, March 7, marked the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the late President of Czechoslovakia, who died some years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in commemoration of this anniversary be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

March 7 marks the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, that great world statesman and fighter for democracy, the late President of Czechoslovakia.

Thomas G. Masaryk was one of the world's great scholars and writers. His contributions to the writings of our times on the subject of democracy are of lasting significance.

His death, in 1937, at the age of 87, brought to an end one of the most fruitful lives of our time.

Today, the people of his beloved Czechoslovakia are living under the yoke of Communist enslavement. The memory of Thomas G. Masaryk, and the democratic ideals which he nurtured throughout his life bring continual hope to the people of Czechoslovakia. We have a special obligation to these people, who have kept the torch of freedom burning through the many long nights of foreign oppression and occupation. We must continually show, by our actions, that we are working toward eventual liberation of the people of Czechoslovakia. Such action by Americans should include the liberalization of our immigration and refugee laws to provide a haven in the United States for some of the refugees and escapees from Czechoslovakia. We must strengthen the Voice of America, so that the voices of freedom will continue to penetrate the Iron Curtain. In the Senate of the United States, we should press for the ratification of the Genocide Convention as a demonstration to the world of our conviction that the destruction of national, racial, or religious groups will be punished before the bar of international justice. Through these, and many other acts of faith in freedom, we in these United States will be preserving the fundamental principles for which Thomas G. Masaryk devoted his life.

SUBMARGINAL LANDS IN ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on February 9 last, I introduced S. 1023, which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise his authority under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to retire submarginal lands located in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States.

Two of the important problems which confront this country are drought and agricultural surpluses. My bill seeks to take some of the marginal agricultural lands out of cropland. This, in my opinion, would be a step in the right direction.

It would assure that there would be no tilling of land which, while it is not needed, may be seriously eroded during the first dry period and at the first windstorm.

If we have too much land under cultivation, which is a certainty because we are reducing both wheat and cotton total acreage planted, then the wisest course is to keep idle acres or diverted acres under the protection of grass or legume crops. There would then be created a reserve or a good earth deposit, just the same as a cash deposit would be created in the bank, awaiting some future need. This practice would definitely assist in bringing about an orderly reduction of crops which are now in surplus.

As will be recalled, title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, enacted in 1937, provided specific authority for a program of Federal purchase of submarginal lands which had been in operation under emergency relief legislation since 1934.

During the period 1934 to 1942, 10,086,000 acres were acquired under the program. The bulk of this acreage acquired, or 6,440,731 acres, was used for grazing in 1953.

No lands were acquired subsequent to 1942, in part because of changed conditions brought about by World War II, when increased production of food and fiber was essential.

I wish to call attention to a report by the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture to the Governors' Conference, April 26, 1954, in which the Administrator stated:

Two principal areas—one in southeastern Colorado and southwestern Kansas and the other in western Texas and eastern New Mexico—are in the most critical condition. Within these areas more than half of the cropland has been damaged. And it is from these areas that our worst dust storms have been coming. The severe damage in the two critical areas is due, in part, to the large acreage of grassland that has been plowed up and planted to wheat or cotton during the last 12 years.

Best estimates indicate that about 2 million acres of grassland have been converted to wheatland in the northern part of this region since 1942. Soil surveys indicate that at least 75 percent of this new wheatland is unsuited for cultivation. Most of it is in the western drier part of the region and has shallow or sandy soils. Such land will produce profitable crops only during wet years and will blow readily during drought years.

More than 1½ million acres of sandy land in the southern part of the region have been converted from grassland to cottonfields in the last 12 years. Nearly all of it is now blowing severely, and some of it has been blowing ever since it was first plowed. Newly formed sand dunes from 20 to 30 feet high may be found in many of the cottonfields of this area.

Out of the lands presently in cultivation, about seven or eight million acres have thin or sandy soils or lie in such low rainfall areas that they are unsuited for cultivation. These lands should never have been plowed. They should be diverted as quickly as possible to a permanent grass cover.

Supporting such legislative authorization as is proposed in my bill are many qualified individuals who appreciate the seriousness of the problem sought to be solved, and who are greatly concerned over the possibility of serious duststorms this year. They have specifically pointed out certain critical areas, such as western Texas, eastern New Mexico, western Oklahoma, western Kansas, eastern Colorado, southwestern Nebraska, and southeastern Wyoming.

The Soil Conservation Service has reviewed a recent survey of all lands in the United States, and officials estimate that approximately 20 million acres of cropland in 17 Western States covered by my bill are unsuitable for cultivation under

present methods of farming. This is approximately half such classified land existing in the United States.

In addition, there are approximately 25 million acres in these Western States which are now being farmed, but which would be classified on the borderline of lands suitable for farming and those not suitable. In other words, 25 million acres would be suitable for farming under best known methods, but normal weather conditions would have to prevail throughout the growing period.

No authority exists, and none would exist under the provisions of my bill, for sale of title III lands to private ownership, and exchanges could be made only if the Secretary of Agriculture found that they would not conflict with the purposes of the act.

The lands retired, therefore, would not be returned to improper utilization, but would be restricted principally to grazing.

Government ownership and leasing of these lands would further provide an example of proper utilization for surrounding landowners, and make it feasible for them to convert from cropping to livestock production with the aid of summer range leased from the Federal Government.

As I have already stated, wheat and cotton production are now being controlled through marketing quotas.

Surpluses in other commodities necessitate reductions in their production either through quotas, economic forces, or by some other means.

The bill which I have introduced provides for reductions, to the extent feasible for retirement of lands primarily unsuitable for production, which constitute a hazard to the communities in which they are situated.

There appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, February 27, 1955, an article by Mr. Aubrey Graves, which deals with this important question. The article is most timely, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY MILLION ACRES ARE READY TO BLOW

(By Aubrey Graves)

The specter of continuing and worsening drought hovers over many areas of the country, particularly the Southern Great Plains. After 4 (and in some cases 5) dry years, some sections face conditions that can become more acute than those of 1954.

Compounding the accumulated effect of prolonged drought come depressing reports of greatly below normal winter precipitation. In 11 western States as of February 1, the mountain snowpack and reservoir storage, for instance, were reported to be low—in some areas, dangerously so.

More than 4 million acres of land have been damaged by wind erosion this winter, according to late Soil Conservation Service advices. Most of this soil blowing occurred in December. The high-velocity wind months (March and April) are yet to come.

"We are praying that in the period immediately ahead we get more moisture than we get wind," Harvey Dahl, Agriculture Department drought-program official, said last week.

MORE DISASTER AREAS

Last spring's soil blowing was the most widespread and severe since 1938. In some localities moisture and crop conditions have deteriorated still further since then. In the 1954 emergency, 945 of the Nation's 3,000 counties were given Federal drought relief. Today about 1,050 counties are officially designated disaster areas.

In Colorado the mountain snow cover in some regions is down to 50 percent of normal. The upland soils are dry. In 47 Colorado reservoirs storage is only about one-fifth of normal. In New Mexico flow of the three streams feeding into the San Luis Valley is expected to be three-fourths of normal. In this area the reservoir storage is 50 percent below the 10-year average.

In greatest jeopardy this spring are southeastern Wyoming, the extreme southwestern corner of Nebraska, eastern Colorado, western Kansas, the extreme northeastern part of New Mexico, and the Panhandles of Oklahoma and Texas. More than 20 million acres, according to statements by Agriculture Department spokesmen, are ready to blow.

Soil Conservation Service Administrator D. A. Williams blames present difficulties largely on 2 things: (1) The continued plowing up of range lands unsuitable for cultivation, and (2) improper farming and grazing methods. "There are now," he says, "about seven or eight million acres in cultivation in this region that should never have been cultivated."

There were few dust storms back in the early days when the hoofs of Indian ponies and buffaloes were about the only things that agitated the prairie sod. Until the coming of the white man (about 1870), wild grasses held the topsoil in place. But with the white man came the plow.

Moist seasons favored the first crops the settlers planted. They plowed up ever more land. But in 1890 came a dry growing season. The drought persisted for 4 years. Crop disasters were general in the Great Plains in 1894. Many farmers moved away.

In 1896 came the rains and shortly afterward the farmers returned. Fortune in the form of weather favored them for most of the next 14 years.

By 1912 the pendulum had swung back. In that year 65,000 acres of cropland in one Kansas county alone blew away. In the following spring, 38 dust storms lowered visibility to less than 1 mile on the southwestern plains.

In 1933, though the soil was extremely dry, only 22 hard blows occurred; the winds that spring were unusually mild. Forty storms plagued the area in 1935. In 1936 there were 68; in 1937, 72.

During these years, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed to plant belts of trees to serve as windbreaks at points throughout the Great Plains where cultivated fields were most unprotected. Farmers were educated to the advantages of contour plowing and strip cropping in combating erosion.

THE QUICK PROFIT

The great demands for wheat and cotton created by World Wars I and II are blamed for man's misuse of much western soil. It was not just the "suitcase farmers" of those eras who were responsible. These were the fly-by-nights who came in, leased lands and put in crops. In years of good crops, they took a quick profit and departed, leaving the fields devoid of protective winter cover.

The landowners themselves were guilty of the same offense, to a lesser degree. When they saw the possibility of making more money by plowing than by leaving their holdings in grass, they plowed.

Only one State—Colorado—has a law which really forces a man to protect his farmland in time of drought. Landowners there are required to "chisel" their fields when the soil starts blowing. A narrow plow point turns up moist soil in small ridges to arrest the destructive action of the wind. The State itself performs this service, and levies the cost of it against the treated land, just as it levies taxes. A few other States have wind erosion laws but with far less teeth in them.

SCS Administrator Williams believes that one of the big jobs of his agency is to induce farmers and ranchers of the arid and semiarid areas to farm and ranch "according to the existing climate, not according to what they hope it will be."

Soil surveys of the region show a wide variety of land conditions, ranging from that suitable for permanent cultivation (if good soil and water conservation practices are used) to that suitable only for range. In between these extremes are areas of hazardous croplands.

A farmer may produce profitable crops on this land in wet years, but he usually has a crop failure in drought years. And when drought persists the soil starts to blow away.

"After the soil blowing starts it is too late to plant grass on the land," Williams points out. "Hence, it usually continues to blow until another wet spell comes. By that time much of it may have been so seriously damaged that it will no longer produce profitable crops even in the wet years."

Williams says that our present dilemma was caused in part by improper methods of cultivating and grazing.

"The improper farming or grazing," Williams adds, "is not always done by the man whose crops and land are damaged. Some fields with an excellent cover of productive stubble or straw are covered with drifting silt or sand from nearby unprotected fields. Some good grassland was smothered with dust from adjacent misused land.

"There were many conservation farmers who followed the best advice they could get, yet saw their crops ruined and their land damaged by their neighbors' careless practices."

The problem of wind erosion, he insists, must be attacked on a community basis.

Williams reports that farmers cooperating in soil conservation measures in the potential Dust Bowl areas are practicing stubble-mulch tillage (leaving winter crops or wheat stubble and high-cut cotton stalks) on about 5.5 million acres. They are plowing on the contour on another 6 million acres and have built about 150,000 miles of terraces. They have reseeded nearly 1 million acres to grass since 1938.

There are at least 7 million acres of land which should not be cultivated at all, Williams says, land with thin or sandy soil, or land in low-rainfall areas. "These should be diverted to grass as soon as possible," he says.

The persistent drought harassing the farmer makes the men in the city street wonder what has been happening to the weather in recent years. Has less rain and snow fallen on the country as a whole, and has the climate actually gotten hotter?

Dr. Harry Wexler, Chief of the Scientific Services Division of the United States Weather Bureau, has a quick answer to the latter question. The earth, he says, has become only 2.2 degrees hotter in the last 60 years. In Philadelphia the rise has been 4 degrees since 1870.

The weather scientists assure that, on the average, the 48 States as a whole receive just about as much precipitation one year as another. It is just that the pattern shifts.

In recent years the Pacific coast, the northern border of the country and New England have been getting more than their normal share of the precipitation. The Great Plains and the South—including Maryland and Virginia—have been shortchanged. Some reason is given to hope that the pattern will change back again, sooner or later.

Virginia in particular hopes it will be sooner, Arlington and Alexandria found it necessary to ration water last summer. Some Fairfax County areas were left dry by the private utilities companies for days at a time. Wells went dry that had never gone dry before.

Prolonged dry weather decimated crops throughout the northern part of the State. And many a Virginia Guernsey got her drinking water courtesy of the volunteer fire department, which hauled it to her in fire engines.

Virginia uses about 1,300 gallons of water per capita per day. The average citizen, of course, does not use that much. The manufacture of 1 ton of steel, for instance, requires 65,000 gallons of water. It takes 300,000 gallons to make a ton of rayon.

More than 27,000 gallons of water is needed to irrigate an acre of land to the depth of 1 inch, and there were more than 700 irrigation systems taking water from Virginia streams during last summer's drought.

Virginia has an annual rainfall of about 42 inches. About one-third of it flows away unbeneficially to the sea.

With population increasing the way it is, there is a growing conviction that Virginia will have to adopt some sort of legislation regulating the use of water, perhaps as the Western States do. A State legislature commission on water resources opened public hearings at Staunton Friday. It hopes to make water-use recommendations to the next general assembly.

"The State needs a water code which recognizes the rights of everybody," said Dr. H. N. Young, director of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Blacksburg and a member of the commission.

By "everybody," he meant the farmer through whose fields a stream runs, the farmer who lives near a stream and feels he has a right to some of it, and the city fellow miles away who depends on the stream for his drinking and bath water.

Mr. THYE. I also ask that the bill, Senate bill 1023, to retire submarginal lands from the production of surplus agricultural commodities, be printed in the RECORD at this point in order that all may see just what the bill proposes.

There being no objection, the Senate bill, 1023, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to exercise the authority granted to him by title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to retire from the production of agricultural commodities in surplus supply lands in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation.

RETURN TO THE FLOOR BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes, and perhaps an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to take this opportunity to thank personally all my colleagues who were so thoughtful and generous to me while I was away from the Senate. No matter how skillful the doctors, and no matter how kindly the treatment, a hospital bed is a pretty fretful place.

I have a very warm spot in my heart for those who cared for me while I was in the hospital. I hope to see them many times again in the future. They were very able and very understanding. There is no State in the Union, unless it be Texas, where the people are more considerate of a person than are people of Minnesota. However, I hope my visits to that great State in the future will be purely social.

There were some bright spots incident to my visit to the hospital. The brightest was the solicitude displayed by my colleagues. All of them were generous. I, therefore, cannot single out any one as outstanding. However, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the able Vice President for his interest in my welfare.

I also express my appreciation to my beloved friend, the able minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I believe the thing which caused me to feel better, and which did me more good than Senators may realize, was the fact that my Republican colleagues in the Senate, under BILL KNOWLAND'S leadership, sent me some beautiful flowers. The card which accompanied them read, "To a loyal Democrat, from his Republican colleagues in the Senate." I did not consider that a tribute to me, but I thought it was a tribute to the Republicans that they should feel and act in that way. I am very grateful for it.

I wish especially to thank the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] who took over my duties in my absence. I think he is one of the most outstanding men I have ever known. He is one of the great legislators of our time. I believe that every Member of the Senate counts EARLE CLEMENTS as a very close personal friend, and one who will always deal fairly and equitably with every man, regardless of party.

One of the most fortunate things that has happened since I came to the Senate was the selection of EARLE CLEMENTS by the Democratic conference as assistant Democratic leader. It brought to our leadership a mature mind and an able person. There have been few associations in my life that I have considered more rich and rewarding.

The State of Kentucky showed excellent judgment when it sent such a forceful and effective representative to the Senate as EARLE CLEMENTS. To me personally it has meant an enduring friendship.

Once more, I thank all my colleagues. I am glad to be back in the harness, even though my activity for the present must be on a somewhat reduced scale. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of all of us on this side of the aisle, I wish to say that we welcome back to his accustomed seat as majority leader of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Texas. We are delighted at his early recovery, even though it meant leaving such a delightful State as Minnesota, where he was temporarily incarcerated.

While the Senator from Texas was necessarily absent, he was ably represented by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. We continued the usual friendly and cooperative relationships which the Senator from Texas and I had previously enjoyed while holding these two positions of responsibility. I know that those of us on this side of the aisle are just as happy as are the Senator's own colleagues on the other side because of his return to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I arrived in the Chamber in time to hear most of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas. I am one of those who missed him. I wish to express my very great pleasure at having him back, and I wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

I desire to say a special word with respect to the very fine manner in which the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], has carried on. He has been faithful to his trust. He has vindicated the judgment of those who thrust upon him these responsibilities. He has been faithful to the Senator from Texas. He has enjoyed the most implicit confidence of those on his side of the aisle, as well as Senators on the Republican side of the aisle. He has proved himself fully capable in every way, and has discharged his responsibilities in the finest traditions of the Senate. I commend him for his work.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I could not sit here without expressing to my friend from Texas my very deep appreciation for the warm sentiments expressed by him, even though his estimate of me may be somewhat exaggerated.

I wish to join with other Senators who have expressed their happiness over his early return to the Senate. I am happy to see him here, not only as evidence of his own improvement in health, but also for other reasons. For example, with him here I have just one-tenth of the responsibility as compared to that which devolves upon me when he is absent.

I should also like to say that I appreciate very much the expressions which have come from the lips of the Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader. Certainly there have existed kind and friendly relationships between the two sides of the aisle, and between the acting majority leader and the minority leader. However, all we did was to follow the pattern which had been established by the majority leader and the minority leader in the 83d Congress, and that pattern has been followed in the 84th Congress even though the positions of the two Senators were reversed.

As the assistant to the majority leader, I look forward to a continuation of that fine relationship.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I do not want the occasion to go by without expressing my enthusiastic approval of the generous comments which have been made in welcoming back our distinguished majority leader and in bestowing appropriate praise on and paying adequate tribute to the great senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] for the magnificent way in which he carried on in the absence of the majority leader.

In that regard I wish to say that I have also been inspired by what appears to be a resurgence of the spirit of good

will and the evidence of mutual confidence and respect which has reappeared on both sides of the aisle upon the return of our distinguished majority leader. I believe a distinct contribution has thus been made to the opportunity for progressive action by this body and that all of us will have a better chance to expedite the public business in the light of the good will which seems to be apparent on this occasion today.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should not like this opportunity to pass without thanking my good friend from Oklahoma for his very kind remarks.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join in the joyous expressions made earlier today that the majority leader has returned to us, with every indication of a speedy recovery to robust health.

I wish to say to the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] that all of us are appreciative of the fine qualities of leadership he has exhibited in the absence of the majority leader. In fact, I shall speak this afternoon on a subject in connection with which I have received the wholehearted cooperation of the Senator from Kentucky; and I wish to have him know that I deeply appreciate his help, guidance, and leadership.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me further, I should like to make an announcement. When the Senate concludes its business today, it is my purpose to have it recess or adjourn until Thursday. On that day I propose to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the tax bill.

I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader and with the chairman of the Committee on Finance. We have agreed, so far as the leadership and the chairman of the Committee on Finance are concerned, that no votes will be taken on that measure before Monday next. We wish to have prompt action on that bill and to have its consideration expedited as much as possible. At the same time, we realize that it is an important piece of legislation and that many Members of the Senate will wish to express themselves on it. Therefore, I should like every Member of the Senate to know that while we shall begin the consideration of the tax bill on Thursday, with the hope that every Member who cares to discuss the bill will be in a position to do so on Thursday and Friday, there will be no votes on the bill before Monday.

There will be no session of the Senate on Saturday of this week. When the Senate completes its business on Friday, I shall move that it go over until Monday. We hope that on Monday the Senate will be able to continue the debate on the tax bill and proceed to vote on it as soon as possible and in no event, I hope, later than Tuesday of next week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that the program outlined by the majority leader is entirely acceptable to the minority. I join with him in the hope that the tax bill will be expedited as promptly as possible. In view of the fact that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow, but will go over until Thursday, I have already informed the majority leader that, so far as I am concerned, I would have no objection to having the unanimous-consent agreement extended so that the minority views of the committee may be filed by midnight tomorrow, with the understanding that the printing of the minority views will be expedited by the printer so that they will be available to Members of the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With the indulgence of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may file their minority views on the tax bill by midnight tomorrow.

I have had a chance only this morning to review some of the preliminary expressions in the minority views. The staff of the committee informs me that it is still working on certain figures which will not be available until late this evening. In view of the fact that the Senate will not proceed to the consideration of the tax bill until Thursday, and in view of the further fact that printed copies of the minority views will be available to the Senate before it proceeds to the consideration of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until midnight tomorrow night to file the minority views of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HON. WISHART ROBERTSON, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF CANADA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we are always delighted to have with us representatives of our wonderful, friendly, and progressive neighbor to the north. It is my high privilege and a great honor today to introduce to my colleagues in the Senate the President of the Canadian Senate, a distinguished statesman of Canada and of the world, the Honorable Wishart Robertson. [Applause, Senators rising.]

PARITY PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received dealing with parity price for farm products. The letter is from the Dickinson Farmers' Union, Local 781, Dickinson, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *February 21, 1955.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of Dickinson Farmers Union, Local 781, favor price support of 90 percent of parity or better.

As for the wheat acreage allotment, we think the big farmers can more afford to be cut than the small farmers. How can a small farmer meet all his expenses and yet exist if he cannot seed anything? We believe the wheat acreage should be determined by the amount of land the farmer cultivates, the less he has the less he should be cut down. At the rate we are going the small farmer will have to sell out and move to the city, which itself and the schools also are fast overcrowding. What is to become of our rural schools, and all the money invested in their improvements.

On wheat selling program, why not set a certain amount per acre of what the farmer produces. This would enable the farmers to have a sale of produce even though he should have a failure the following year.

Yours truly,

DICKINSON FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 781, DICKINSON, N. DAK.
JOHN J. WOLFE, *President.*
ANDREW DOLUHEH, *Secretary.*

PURCHASE OF REMAINING ASSETS OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION BY FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 40, Senate bill 941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 941) to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Federal land banks to purchase the assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. The Corporation has not made any new loans since July 1, 1947, and is now in process of liquidation. Its loans are now serviced by the Federal land banks on a fee basis, and the servicing charges are approaching the point where they will exceed the interest received. It is therefore to the Government's advantage to dispose of the Corporation's assets, which consist primarily of these loans. Since the borrowers are generally land bank customers it is to the advantage of the land banks to purchase the loans. The land banks, however, do not now have authority to purchase these loans in all cases and this proposed legislation is consequently necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 941) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Twentieth. Without regard to any limitations or restrictions of this act, to purchase all assets, except cash, accounts receivable, and reserved mineral interests, held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation as a result of loans made on or before July 1, 1947, in the farm credit district in which said bank is situated and to assume the

liabilities of said Corporation for future payment funds of borrowers and trust accounts applicable to said assets. The purchase price of notes and mortgages, purchase money mortgages, and real estate sales contracts shall be equal to the total of the unpaid balances on such items and accrued interest thereon at the date as of which purchase is made, less the total of the liabilities of the Corporation being assumed by the bank as herein provided. The purchase price of real estate, sheriffs' certificates, loans called for foreclosure, loans in suspense, judgments, and any other assets eligible for purchase under this paragraph but not specifically identified herein shall be equal to the fair market value of the assets as determined by agreement. The total consideration for the purchase shall be payable over a period of not more than 10 years from the date as of which purchase is made, and upon such terms as shall be agreed upon through negotiation with the Board of Directors of the Corporation."

A PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DISARMAMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Wednesday I introduced Senate Resolution 71 and requested that it be retained in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate in order that Senators who might desire to do so might join as cosponsors of the resolution. The following Senators, 44 in number, have indicated a desire to join as cosponsors of the resolution:

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GORE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THYE, and Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss an attack which was made on this resolution and me yesterday by the Moscow radio, in which the spokesman stated:

> I don't think there is any need to point out that not only the Soviet Union, but no Soviet country, big or little, would allow any country to dictate its home policy to it. The very thought is ridiculous, to say the least.

The Moscow statement asserts that the United States budget apportions 65 percent for military security, and then makes the extraordinary assertion that the Soviet apportions less than 20 percent for that purpose.

As I said in my statement a few days ago, in view of the fact that the Soviet Union is now producing around 40 million tons of steel, and but 45,000 automobiles, the industry which here consumes most of our steel, and America is now producing less than 100 million tons, but making some 5½ million automobiles, where is the Russian steel going?

In any case, could this question not be cleared up if the Communists allowed us the right of inspection and control, as we would be glad to allow them?

In the interest of world peace, this resolution only asks for that inspection and control which we would be entirely willing to accept ourselves.

Mr. President, in London the problems of disarmament are being discussed in secret session by representatives of the major nations.

Dispatches about the conference are not encouraging. So much is at stake, however, that hope must persist.

Low living standards are a primary cause of the unrest and tension that lead to war. Yet a tragically high proportion of the world's productive resources continues to be drawn into armaments.

Vast resources which could better the lot of every person are held back from that purpose because of the constant threat of further aggression.

Largely for these reasons I was impressed by the proposal for "butter over guns" disarmament put forward recently by Mr. Samuel Lubell, long-time associate of Mr. B. M. Baruch, with a broad knowledge in the field of economic mobilization. Mr. Baruch, probably our most experienced expert on economic mobilization, has long been for such a plan. Only today he reaffirmed his belief, stating, "While arming for defense we should also arm to defeat hunger."

Mr. President, I now reply in more detail to the attack from Moscow made yesterday against this resolution on this subject by a mouthpiece of the Soviet Government.

Moscow radio concedes that a government's peaceful or aggressive intentions can be determined by how it apportions its resources. "Naturally, there can be no argument on this point," the Soviet commentator said.

But then this spokesman failed to compare use of resources. Instead he took a comparison of military expenditures in the Government budget. To compare the United States and Soviet budgets is like equating pumpkins and apples, because under the Communist system the Russian Government budget is far over half their gross national product, whereas ours is less than a quarter of our gross national product.

Why did not the radio commentator take the axiom in this resolution—which he concedes is valid—and use it? Take, for example, such a key resource as steel. The Soviet produces about 40 million tons of steel a year. But every expert student of the Soviet economy agrees that if the Soviets fulfill their formerly promised meager goals for consumers' goods in 1955 by 100 percent, they could use no more than 2 to 2.5 million tons of steel for consumers' goods—or about 5 percent of their total production.

Where does the other 95 percent of Soviet steel go? The answer can only be into military-end items, war-essential transportation, and back into other heavy industries, and into the making of even more steel—the sinews of war.

One has only to look around the United States to see where the bulk of American steel production goes—into more than 5 million automobiles per year, into refrigerators and washing machines, and into school, hospital, and apartment buildings.

Let us start with the premise that the Soviets would like to deal in budget figures. Compare our military budget today, which is still steadily going down, with the wartime peak, and also compare similar figures for the Soviets.

To that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion at this point in the RECORD of a table comparing, roughly, the military budgets of the Soviet Union with those of the United States from 1933 through 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Military budgets

Year	U. S. S. R. (in billions of rubles)	United States (in millions of dollars)
1933	1.4	$784.0
1934	5.0	705.5
1935	8.2	924.3
1936	14.9	1,147.5
1937	17.5	1,184.8
1938	23.1	1,240.4
1939	39.2	1,368.0
1940	56.7	1,798.7
1941	80.0	6,252.0
1942	108.4	22,905.1
1943	125.0	63,413.9
1944	137.9	75,975.9
1945	128.2	80,537.3
1946	72.6	43,151.2
1947	67.0	14,769.3
1948	66.1	11,983.2
1949	79.1	13,987.6
1950	79.4	13,439.6
1951	96.4	20,857.0
1952	113.8	40,535.6
1953	110.2	47,455.5
1954	100.3	40,366.0
1955	[1] 112.1	[1] 34,375.0
1956	[2]	[1] 34,000.0

[1] Estimated.
[2] No information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Russia's wartime peak appropriation in 1944 was 137.9 billion rubles, compared with 112.1 rubles for this year. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five, therefore, is 80 percent of the 1944 peak. These are face-value rubles. Their value does not take into account the much increased purchasing value of the ruble by virtue of seven official postwar price cuts in Russia. Actually 112.1 billion rubles in the Soviet today represent more than 137.9 billion of the 1944 rubles.

If that be true, and to the best of my knowledge it is true, consider the ominous fact that today, as of right now, the Soviet Union is spending more wealth on preparation for war than it did at the peak of World War II.

The wartime peak military expenditures of the United States were around $80.5 billion. Our present military budget is $34.3 billion, 45 percent of our wartime peak.

I now proceed to a discussion of Senate Resolution 71. The proposal is one of how to achieve security through high living standards for all peoples of the world, including the Russian and Chinese peoples.

It opens new possibilities to act against aggression while that aggression is still in the making.

Low living standards. High armaments. It is time the free nations launch an all-out moral offensive to break the chain linking these two.

That is the purpose of this resolution. It requests that the President of the United States present to the United Nations the need to explore the possibilities of limiting the proportion of certain key resources of any nation which can

be devoted to military purposes, in order to increase steadily the amount of every nation's resources which could be devoted to improving the living levels of its people.

As is the case with all disarmament plans, to accomplish this would require a foolproof system of inspection and controls.

But even if the Soviets do not agree, this plan would still provide a basis for action on behalf of peace.

Here is how the plan would operate:

Certain key resources would be selected.

A system of ceilings would then be imposed.

These ceilings would limit the proportion of each of those resources which could be devoted to military purposes.

As example, it could be stipulated that no less than X percent of the steel output of a particular country should be allocated to its civilian economy.

Clearly that action would limit the steel available for military purposes.

As everyone knows, steel is the base of any modern industrial economy. But few realize the extent to which that is true.

As example, in 1950, 1,260 pounds of steel were produced in the United States for every person.

Second to steel in use is copper. But during the same period only 23 pounds of copper per person were produced—23 pounds as against 1,260 pounds.

It is fortunate that characteristics of the steel industry make steel unusually adaptable to inspection and control.

We are in, or are rapidly coming to, a nuclear strategic standoff, with both the free world and the nations behind the Iron Curtain capable of destroying one another.

Therefore if any war does come, which God forbid, it will probably be a limited war, a "war of discrimination"—one fought with modernized conventional weapons.

To be ready to fight such a war, a nation or group of nations must rely primarily on the production and fabrication of steel.

Even if the world at some future date must suffer the catastrophe of an all-out hydrogen war, after each faction had delivered its nuclear blitz, the one which won the subsequent more conventional struggle would rule the earth.

The ceilings proposed under this plan would not curb any nation's economic expansion.

Because of different economic needs, all nations would not be allotted the same ceilings. The ratios would be subject to periodic revision by agreement.

This proposed method of disarmament is not intended to stand alone. Rather it is advanced as an integral part of any enforceable proposal to achieve a balanced reduction of all arms and armaments.

Nor is the resolution put forward with any thought that such a disarmament program could serve, in any way, as a substitute for our capacity to wage conventional war, or for our capability for instant retaliation with nuclear weapons in case of all-out attack.

The United States must retain that capacity. We should never lag, either in the development of nuclear weapons, or in the means of delivering them.

This is especially true with respect to the development and production of the so-called "ultimate" weapon, the intercontinental ballistic missile with hydrogen warhead.

This "nuclear strategic standoff" may encourage further aggression short of all-out war comparable to those which occurred in Indochina and Korea. But as mentioned, this disarmament proposal is designed to combat aggression of any type.

The plan embodied in the resolution would enable the free peoples to bring to bear the full pressure of world opinion upon the Communist leaders to improve the living standards of their people.

Since the same resources cannot be used simultaneously for both peaceful and warlike purposes, a rapid increase in the standard of living in Communist countries would tend to curb their potential aggressive power.

The desire for a better tomorrow is the strongest single yearning of all people. What we are asking through this resolution is, Can that yearning be utilized in the cause of peace?

Always in the past the Soviet rulers have justified the hardships they are imposing on the Russian people as being necessary for the country's defense. But this plan of disarmament would be applicable to all nations. Actually it would offer the Soviet leaders a means of preventing any effective invasion of Russia. At the same time the way would be opened for a swift increase in the Russian standard of living.

Rejection of the plan could only mean that sacrifices now being exacted from the Russian people are being exacted in order someday to be able to carry out the carefully planned long-term aggressive intentions and commitments of the rulers in the Kremlin.

When the United Nations was formed, the countries which signed its charter pledged themselves to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and "to refrain in their international relations from the threat of use of force."

That pledge is not compatible with an economy perpetually mobilized for war. It is not compatible with an economy where living standards are systematically depressed; where harsh sacrifices are imposed on the people so as to concentrate on military strength.

The free nations should call on the Soviet regime to honor these pledges, not only in words but in reorganization of their economy so as to give a decent priority to civilian needs in relation to military preparation.

When Stalin died, Malenkov declared publicly that Russia's basic industrial capacity was large enough to permit "a steep rise in the production of civilian goods."

Actually, the increases he proposed were shockingly small. But even these goals had not been reached when Malenkov was forced to resign.

In this country last year we produced 5,500,000 automobiles.

At the same time the Russians manufactured 45,000.

Steel is the basis for automobile production; and the Soviet capacity for steel production is large and growing rapidly.

Nevertheless the production of cars in Russia last year was less than 1 percent of the number produced in this country.

An important question to everybody in the free world is, Where did the rest of Russia's steel go?

Any hope for our two systems continuing to exist side by side may well lie in the establishment of some recognizable limits to the degree of war preparation these countries behind the Iron Curtain can have.

The disarmament plan proposed in this resolution is based on the following three principles:

First. The way a government divides the resources at its command is a revealing measure of its peaceful or aggressive intent.

Second. High living standards in effect constitute an automatic built-in deterrent against possible aggression.

Third. After a nation has committed its resources to peaceful uses, a significant length of time must elapse before they can be converted to war.

This lapse of time—conversion time—is of crucial importance, because, if aggression is to be prevented, the time to act is during the period when the manufacture of weapons first begins; that is, when resources are being shifted from peaceful to warlike uses.

The resolution being introduced stresses the importance of a full study of how this factor of conversion time can be utilized to prevent aggression.

In principle this conversion time can be transformed into a virtual "timelock," a lock which would have to be broken open before any nation's resources could be shifted to a program for war.

In the very process of being broken open, that timelock could serve automatically to warn the world of approaching aggression.

Based on my experience with the National Security Resources Board, I believe the timelock principle is applicable to certain hard-line industries.

If the Soviet leaders refuse to cooperate in the establishment of a foolproof system of international inspection and control, they can block this disarmament proposal, as they can block any other disarmament proposal. But they cannot prevent the free world from observing how the Kremlin allocates its resources between its civilian economy and its armament program.

Nor can they prevent the free world from interpreting that choice as a tangible yardstick of Soviet intentions.

Recently the new Soviet rulers, Khruschev, Bulganin, and Zhukoff, announced they would increase their arms expenditures at the expense of their already low level civilian production.

That action was a warning, and our diplomatic, military, and economic policies cannot but recognize that warning.

It will not be easy to develop the mechanisms needed to implement the three principles referred to previously.

Nevertheless, we seek, as we should seek, a method of preventing aggression; a method for drawing an economic dividing line between plans for war and plans for peace, throughout the world.

Much of the continuing search for peace and freedom lies in lifting the living standards of all peoples toward those which have been attained in America, instead of having them dragged down to the armed misery of a totalitarian fortress.

Poverty breeds communism. There is a definite connection between the hunger of many peoples and the security of the United States.

Last week Winston Churchill gave the world the fullest implication yet of the new weapons. He "took mankind solemnly by the hand and walked to the edge of the cliff," and then to me he just about summed up the greatest incentive for successful world disarmament when he said:

> It does not matter so much to old people. They are going soon anyway. But I find it poignant to look at youth in all its activities and ardor, and most of all to watch little children playing their merry games, and wonder what would lie before them if God wearied of mankind.

In effect, these words sum up the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who is perhaps the best expert on this floor on the subject of airplanes, did not say how much steel is used in the manufacture of airplanes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is an interesting question. May I tell the able Senator from North Dakota that one of the great surprises I had was discovering that on a B–36 bomber there were more pounds of steel than there were pounds of aluminum.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield with pleasure to the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri in explaining the purpose of his resolution. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to join as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed with the statement I desire to make today, I wish to compliment the Senator from Missouri for the vision and the statesmanship represented by the resolution of which he is the primary author. I consider it an honor to join with him in that resolution, because I think he has presented once again to the Senate what is probably the most important issue of the century ahead, namely, whether or not the nations of the world will have the rationality to follow a course of action that will permit the preservation of mankind. If we pay any attention at all to the lessons of history, and if we contemplate what obviously is ahead of us, we cannot escape the conclusion that permanent peace on this earth never will be attained until men do two things: First, grasp the idea set forth by the Senator from Missouri this afternoon in connection with the need for true disarmament; and, second, recognize that we must settle international disputes by a system of international justice through law, which was so eloquently taught on the floor of the Senate for a long time by the great statesman from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg.

I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri I think that by a constant teaching of the lesson he has taught on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, there is bound to be an awakening not only of our own people, because even in America the lesson must be better understood, but also among our friends and our allies, and a conviction on the part of the world that wants to be won over to the side of freedom that our motivation is a sincere and sound one. We recognize that disarmament would be foolhardy unless it were mutual, and unless the Communist segment of the world were willing to agree to international control, and to check the warlike tendencies which undoubtedly dictate the foreign policy of both Red China and Red Russia today.

I desired to make this comment because I think when one discusses a subject such as that discussed by the Senator from Missouri, his remarks are bound to be misunderstood in some quarters, and in other quarters they are bound to be distorted. The Senator deserves the commendation which I have given to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks, and assure him there is no Member of this body from whom I would rather receive such comments. The Senator mentioned possible misunderstanding of this matter. I am sure there will be much of that.

I also again call to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon the fact that, based on the adjusted currency levels possible under a totalitarian system, as exists in the Soviet Union, the latter country is now spending more for defense than it did at the peak of World War II, whereas this country is spending a great deal less. I submit this as another excellent reason for continuing in our efforts to obtain international disarmament, under some foolproof inspection and control system, between the free world and its possible enemy.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the objective of the Senator from Missouri.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to proceed with the remarks I have prepared on the Hells Canyon Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

HIGH HELLS CANYON: THE INDISPENSABLE DAM

Mr. MORSE. The economic future of the 4 million people and the 392,451 square miles of the Pacific Northwest depends upon the building of Hells Canyon Dam. It is the indispensable multipurpose project for the comprehensive development of the great Columbia River Basin. Without it the United States will consign 13 percent of its land area and over 40 percent of its water resources to incomplete, haphazard underdevelopment.

It is a privilege to introduce this bill, S. 1333, to authorize the construction of Hells Canyon Dam, on behalf of myself and Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1333) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is requested that the bill lie on the table until March 11, in order to permit other cosponsors of the bill to add their names to it. I make that request because several of my colleagues have told me they wish to study the bill further and to review the speeches which will be made this afternoon in support of the bill, before making their final decision in connection with it.

There are other Senators, Mr. President, who are not cosponsors of the bill, because of a policy on their part of not cosponsoring any bill, but who assure me they will join in the support of the bill. In fact, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, as a matter of policy, does not join in the cosponsoring of bills, has assured me that he will make a statement in support of the bill, and will make perfectly clear his intention to vote for it. There are other Members of the Senate who do not as a practice cosponsor bills, but who have assured me that they will support the sponsors of S. 1333 in our endeavor to have the bill passed during this Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the bill will lie on the desk until March 11, 1955, for the purpose of adding additional cosponsors.

Mr. MORSE. The 30 Senators from 20 States join in support of this magnificent project not only because it is essential not only to the economic future of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, but they support it also because it is essential to the defense strength and economic expansion and stability of the Nation.

HELLS CANYON FOR A STRONGER AMERICA

The United States is today the mightiest nation in the world because of our magnificent natural resources and the genius of our free institutions combined.

We have built this great Nation with imagination and toil applied to the iron ranges fringing the Great Lakes, the coal deposits of Kentucky and Pennsylvania, the cotton-producing expanses of the South, the plains of grain of the Midwest, the oil of Texas, Oklahoma, and California; the timber of the Pacific Northwest; and the other natural wealth with which our country abounds. They are found in various parts of the Nation. They are regional resources, but national assets contribute to the strength and ease of all of our people.

The Pacific Northwest has a great resource which is as yet practically untapped—falling water. Aside from timber, which provides primarily seasonal employment, it has no other great natural resource. The Columbia River Basin, which makes our area a region, contains some 40 percent of the hydroelectric resources of the United States. Measured in terms of feasible projects, the Pacific Northwest holds some 60 percent of the hydroelectric potential of the country. Eighty-seven percent of the potential 30 million kilowatts of waterpower remain unharnessed. Their full development is the contribution which the Pacific Northwest can make to the Nation.

That contribution can be made in full measure if, and only if, the high Hells Canyon Dam is built by the Federal Government and is operated as an integral part of the Columbia River power system.

Nature and technology have so decreed it.

MULTIPURPOSE BENEFITS

The Hells Canyon Dam, which this bill would authorize, would rise 722 feet high from the floor of the deepest canyon in the United States. At this point on the Snake River, as it runs between Oregon and Idaho, nature has formed the greatest remaining damsite on the North American Continent. Through integrated operation with other power plants, the project would provide 1,124,000 kilowatts of firm power. As multipurpose benefits, it would provide badly needed flood control and improvement of navigation, and would create new recreational opportunities. And under a special and important provision in the bill, revenues from the sale of Hells Canyon power could be set aside to help farmers repay the cost of worthy irrigation projects in Oregon and Idaho, which they cannot finance unaided, and which are not now feasible under existing law. Except for a nonreimbursable allocation to flood control, navigation, and recreation, as authorized by Congress, the project is wholly self-sustaining.

FIFTY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE POINT THE WAY

The principles and conceptions embodied in this bill have been tested and proven again and again on river basin after river basin, in comprehensive plans for full development of our rivers. The foundation of these principles and conceptions was laid down in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt, when he transmitted to the Congress the first report of his Inland Waterways Commission, which read in part as follows:

> The report rests throughout on the fundamental conception that every waterway should be made to serve the people largely and in as many different ways as possible. * * * Every stream should be used to its utmost. * * * Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such. * * * The first condition of successful development of our waterways is a definite and progressive policy. The second is a concrete general plan prepared by the best experts available, covering every use to which our streams can be put.

Mr. President, because of that signal report in the administration of Teddy Roosevelt and because of his dedication to it and his implementation of it, he is very often referred to as one of the great conservation leaders in our history, one of the great developers of our natural resources, along with another great Republican, Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, followed, of course, by a whole series of bipartisan liberals in the Congress of the United States, such as the La Follettes; Hiram Johnson; Dill and Bone, of Washington; the great George Norris, of Nebraska; Charles McNary from my own State; and a host of others, all of whom recognized the importance of the basic premise for which I am arguing today, namely, that these rivers belong to all the people, and should be developed in their entirety and to the maximum economic potential of which they are capable.

Even as early as 1901, Roosevelt stated to the Congress that the major responsibility of moving forward with planning and programs to attain these objectives should be vested in the Federal Government.

> Great storage works are necessary to equalize the flow of streams and to save the floodwaters. Their construction has been conclusively shown to be an undertaking too vast for private effort.

And in its 1912 report, Theodore Roosevelt's Inland Waterways Commission was even more definite:

> In the nature of the case so comprehensive a policy could be administered only by the Federal Government, and consequently the eventual desirability of Federal control is easy to predict.

These words have served as the foundation stones of specific programs of land and water development which through the years have broadened to encompass in some fashion nearly all of our major drainage basins. It has grown as engineering knowledge, management techniques, and integrated planning for multiple uses of our basic natural resources have deepened and expanded. Their accomplishments are written enduringly in the great dams, in the march of the transmission lines, in the fertile irrigated acres, and the communities which in a relatively few short years have emerged like magic from the arid desert.

Our nearly 50 years of progress in harnessing our rivers have given this country Boulder, Shasta, Fort Peck, and many other multiple-purpose installations. This program has given us the miracle of the Tennessee Valley Authority which lifted a blighted area and people into a new and more abundant life.

In the Pacific Northwest it has given us Grand Coulee, Hungry Horse, Bonneville, and McNary Dams, with the Dalles and Chief Joseph under construction. But these massive embodiments of engineering skill and planning would be meaningless as the Great Pyramid if they had not brought with them the magic gifts of great blocks of low-cost power, flood control, aid to navigation—all keys to release and stimulate the productive forces of free, competitive enterprise over the widest possible area and contribute significantly to the upbuilding of the Nation's industrial and agricultural economy.

HELLS CANYON INDISPENSABLE TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

The Hells Canyon project is the key to full future development of the basin. It is a key upstream project in the main control plan of the Corps of Army Engineers, which in turn was the initial development phase of its so-called 308 report — House Document 531, United States Army Corps of Engineers, 1948.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to join the Senator from Oregon in his exposition and declaration in behalf of Hells Canyon Dam, and the great project which is possible there under proper governmental authority. The Senator's fight in behalf of the development of natural resources is notable and most praiseworthy, and he will have my unqualified support in his endeavors.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I consider it a great honor to have him associated with me as one of the cosponsors of this bill.

I think I am at liberty to speak for the many thousands of people in the Pacific Northwest, both in my State and in the State of Washington, represented on the floor at the present moment by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], when I express for them our gratitude that so many Senators from the Middle West, the South, and the East see the importance of this project to the economy of the Nation as a whole, and realizing its importance, are willing to associate themselves with us in the Pacific Northwest in seeking the development of this indispensable dam, so essential, we think, both to defense and to the maximum development of our economic resources.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Both the Senator from Oregon and the distinguished senior Senator from Washington have rendered yeoman service, not only to the people of the Northwest, but to the Nation as a whole, in their proposals for the improvement and development of our great river, land, and water resources. This project is within the spirit of what

they have already done. We will work together to see that it is accomplished.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for his kind words.

The Bureau of Reclamation, after exhaustive study, also considered Hells Canyon as vital to full use of the water resources of the Columbia Basin in its 1947 development plan—The Columbia, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1947. The joint comprehensive plan of these two agencies was ratified in 1949, and approved by the Secretaries of the Interior and the Army, as well as by the President. Hells Canyon Dam was assigned to the Bureau of Reclamation for construction, because of the relationship of its power revenues to future reclamation projects proposed by the Bureau.

Upstream storage of water is a vital factor in river basin development. Water must be stored when it is in more than ample supply to be released later when it is needed downstream to keep power dams running at full efficiency. Such storage is needed to prevent and minimize floods. Such storage is needed to keep stream levels stable for navigation.

Hells Canyon Dam would provide 4,400,000 acre-feet of storage. The Snake River has an annual runoff of 12 million acre-feet of water. The Idaho Power Co.'s three small dam plan would provide for less than one-fourth that amount of effective storage, and without integrated release for proper use downstream.

That storage capacity cannot be duplicated elsewhere in the Columbia River Basin so efficiently or at comparable cost and without interference with fish migration.

Without Hells Canyon Dam the water storage which is indispensable to full development of the Snake River and Columbia Basin would be lost.

THE NEED FOR KILOWATTS

By 1960–61, the Pacific Northwest will be plunged into a power shortage which will increase to such proportions as to threaten its economy. According to the Bonneville Power Administration this deficit will amount to 807,000 kilowatts of prime, or year-round power, by 1963–64.

Moreover this deficit does not include an additional 400,000 kilowatts of interruptible power used by industry which needs firming up. It does not make any provision for expansion of energy loads for new electro-process industries, such as aluminum, ferro alloys, and phosphate fertilizer, which over the next 10 years could absorb between 1 million and 3 million new kilowatts.

Assuming the possible, there is needed 807,000 kilowatts for normal load growths, 400,000 kilowatts to firm up interruptible industrial loads and 1,500,000 kilowatts for necessary industrial expansion of electro-process industries to keep apace of the needs of the Nation for their vital products and provide jobs for a continuously growing labor force.

This in the aggregate calls for a Federal investment in major power dams to provide about 2,700,000 kilowatts to the Columbia Basin. We have the comprehensive plan, the main control plan which is the immediate target. We have the need. The purpose of the bill is to go about satisfying the need.

HELLS CANYON FOR YEAR AROUND POWER

Hells Canyon Dam will add a large block of firm power, 1,124,000 kilowatts, to the Pacific Northwest power supply—firm power, power available every hour of the day, every day of the year. The energy will come from three sources: one, power produced at the site of the dam; two, power produced at downstream plants through the release of Hells Canyon storage during periods of low flow of downstream rivers; and three, integration of the operation of Hells Canyon plant with other Federal power plants in the Columbia River Basin.

At the site Hells Canyon will produce 688,000 kilowatts of prime power. The remaining 436,000 kilowatts would be made available at downstream plants and other plants in the Columbia River power system by use of Hells Canyon storage and through transmission integration of the network. The project will add this output to the system if all projects which are now existing, under construction, or currently authorized were to be placed in operation before Hells Canyon.

The primary reason Hells Canyon can add a greater amount of prime power to the output of the region than dams without storage or with negligible storage in the same stretch of the river, such as the Idaho Power Co. proposes, is that the heavy runoff of the spring would be impounded in the reservoir for release during low periods of the river to produce power which otherwise would not be available. This is true in the same manner that storage dams increase the amount of land that can be irrigated from a river—by storing excess water and releasing it when it is needed.

Hells Canyon powerplant is not intended to operate as an isolated unit, and any reference to it as such is misleading.

FULL PROTECTION TO WATER RIGHTS

Section 2 of the bill provides specifically that the operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall be subordinate to all valid, existing rights to the use of water for beneficial consumptive purposes, and to future rights to the use of water for those purposes.

Section 2 of this bill is an improvement over section 2 of my 1952 bill, not because it offers greater protection or provides for greater irrigation development in the future, but because new language makes it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for opponents of the project, already hard put to find fault, to declare that the irrigation structure of Idaho, present and future, is endangered.

Let us examine this important provision. The section states: "The operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall be only such as does not conflict with present and future rights to the use of water for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses, whether now or hereafter existing, valid under State law, of the upstream waters of the Snake River and its tributaries."

The bill provides that Idaho—the State that appears to be concerned most with this aspect of the matter—shall have a right to irrigate every imaginable acre of land upstream from Hells Canyon before the new dam shall have a right to touch a drop of water.

POWER RESERVED FOR OREGON AND IDAHO

Section 3 seeks to answer another spurious objection that power company spokesmen made to the first bill. They sought to instill in Idaho people's minds a feeling that Hells Canyon Dam was to be constructed solely for the purpose of rescuing the coastal States of Oregon and Washington from a serious power shortage.

Section 3 (a) provides "500,000 kilowatts of power attributable to the Hells Canyon project, or such portion thereof as is required from time to time to meet loads under contracts made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the Central and Upper Snake River Basin and to all other parts of Idaho lying outside the Central and Upper Snake River Basin."

This assures eastern Oregon and Idaho a major block of low-cost power.

ONE INTEGRATED PROJECT

Moving on now to section 4 of the bill it provides that the initial works of the Snake River project provided for in section 1 of the bill—the Hells Canyon Dam and the Scriver Creek plants in the Payette River Basin—plus any additional works that may be authorized and built later, including irrigation features of the Payette Unit of the Mountain Home Development, "shall be treated as one project." This is for the purpose, among others, of providing for the application of project revenues to the return of reimbursable costs in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws. Section 4 also stipulates that additional reclamation developments may be authorized as part of the Snake River project only by a specific act of Congress.

To permit Congress in deciding on future authorizations to evaluate the worth of proposed additions to the Snake River project, the Secretary of the Interior must submit recommendations with respect to such authorizations in a report and findings under section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), which report shall include findings as to the costs and benefits of the proposed developments and as to the effect of such authorization on the project's power-rate structure.

In the case of the irrigation features of the Payette Unit of the Mountain Home Development, such a report shall be made and transmitted to the Congress not later than during the term of the 85th Congress, which means 1957.

Aside from the tremendous business-stimulating effect that a new large block of power would have in Idaho and Oregon, the provision making available power revenues from this great dam and the smaller Scriver Creek plants to aid irrigation development is one of the most significant features of the bill. It would have an economic impact on the region that would be felt for decades, yes, for centuries to come.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the senior Senator from Oregon that I deeply appreciate his attitude with regard to legislation of this character, not only so far as Hells Canyon is concerned, but generally with respect to the development of the natural resources and rivers throughout the United States.

I had an opportunity to join in the introduction of the bill, but did not do so because I have consistently opposed and regretted the tendency toward multiplicity of authorship of bills. In the House of Representatives there is a rule which provides that only one Member may introduce a bill. Personally, I think such a rule ought to prevail in the Senate. I say quite frankly that I have deplored the tendency toward multiplicity of sponsorship of bills in the Senate, because I have always felt that it is a bad practice and ought not to be encouraged. Therefore, I have declined to join in the introduction of many bills which I favor and for which I shall vote on the floor of the Senate, merely because I think it is bad legislative practice.

Nevertheless, with regard to the bill dealing with Hells Canyon, which is a symbol, in a way, and typical of other situations, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I am fully in sympathy with his attitude, with his bill, and with similar legislation that may come before the Senate. All my life I have felt that the great rivers of this country belong to the people and are the property of all the people. I have always opposed turning them over to any private group for exploitation or control. If we ever allow these great arteries of commerce to be controlled privately, it will be a long time before we ever recapture control of them on behalf of the people.

Because of that feeling, I have supported and urged the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have supported the construction of dams and pools for irrigation, reclamation, power, and other uses, to which the great arteries of commerce, committed to Congress by the Constitution, should be put.

I desired to explain to the Senator from Oregon my reason for not joining him in the introduction of the bill. At the same time I wish to assure him that in my profound conception of the duty of Congress in dealing with our great natural resources, I am in sympathy with his proposal. While I have not read the details of the bill, and although I would not wish to commit myself to the details of it in advance, the Senator from Oregon can count on my support of the general idea he has in mind in introducing the bill.

I regret that because of my deep conviction about the procedure in the Senate I have not been able to join with him in the introduction of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should first like to respond to the Senator from Kentucky, by saying that there is no word which more appropriately describes my feelings, following the announced support of the bill by the Senator from Kentucky, than the word "thrilled."

I am greatly thrilled to know that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky stands behind us in the support of the bill. I wish to say to him that there will be great rejoicing in the Pacific Northwest over the announcement he has made on the floor of the Senate today. The people in my section of the country—and this is true likewise throughout the country—know the Senator from Kentucky to be one of the most beloved statesmen in our Nation today. I mean it most sincerely when I say that the history of the United States will record him as one of the great statesmen of our country. During his many years in the Congress of the United States he has made a record, he has fought to protect the people's heritage in their natural resources.

The announcement he has made comes as no surprise from the standpoint of the political philosophy he has expressed, but, I wish to assure him that it comes as a matter of great delight to those of us who intend to make the bill one of the major battles of our career in American public life. We recognize that only to the extent that we follow a course of action which retains to future generations of American boys and girls their rights to the Nation's natural resources will we be true to the future history of our country, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has been true to its history in his many long years of noble service to the people of this Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for that very generous compliment.

Mr. MORSE. It was more than deserved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was about to try to say the same thing, but probably not in such an eloquent way, to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I have spoken to him concerning the bill, and I know his long-standing conviction about the technical procedure of cosponsorship. Like the Senator from Oregon, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, with whom I have served for many years in this body, that I have never found him wanting when it came to the question of whether the people's heritage was going to be protected or exploited. He has always been on the side of the people.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, I now yield to another great Senator who is also a cosponsor of this bill, the great liberal Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said regarding the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The Senator from Kentucky helped me to fight for projects on the Great Plains of the Northwest, projects such as Fort Peck Dam, and, later, for the Garrison Dam, and for the development of the entire Missouri River Basin. He did a magnificent job for us. I know we can rely upon his experience not only upon the floor, in debate, but other ways to see to it, so far as he can, that ultimately the entire country which is so dear to the heart of the Senator from Kentucky, will be so developed as to equal what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has described as the miracle of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it will be a sad day for the American people if these great arteries of commerce, which, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, have repeatedly been declared subject to regulation by Congress, are taken away from the people and turned over to private control. I am in favor of private enterprise. I am interested in it, and I am for free enterprise. But when it comes to the great natural resources given to the people by God Almighty, it will be a sad day in the history of this country when they are turned over exclusively to the control of any private group. That is why I feel so profoundly upon the subject of retaining in the control of the people and the Government of the United States the development, improvement, and utilization of these great natural resources for the American people. That does not exclude their utilization for private industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky. With his great ability, and in his very concise way, he has summarized the whole political and economic philosophy of this bill and of similar bills which seek to develop through the Government the natural resources of the country for the people. I happen to believe it is one of the primary obligations of a representative government to do just that. Instead of its being in any way an impediment to free and private enterprise, it is one of the greatest stimulations of free and private enterprise. In my section of the country the great stimulation in private enterprise which has resulted from Grand Coulee and Bonneville never would have come about had not the Government of the United States built those great multiple-purpose dams, which are self-liquidating and are returning to the Treasury of the United States not only their original cost, but many times their cost, in the form of new tax dollars flowing into the Treasury of the United States from private enterprises, which never would have located in that area had it not been for the stimulation afforded by the cheap power obtainable from those dams.

The Senator from Kentucky has inspired me to digress long enough to make this observation in behalf of the farmers of the Pacific Northwest. When I think of the vast quantities of phosphate fertilizer which are in the ground and which have to be developed by cheap power, I must emphasize at this moment the importance of this dam to the development of commercial fertilizer for the farmers as far east, on the basis of present prices and cost of transportation, as Indiana. Even in Indiana

there will be great benefits accruing from the development of those commercial fertilizer beds by the cheap power which will result from the building of Hells Canyon Dam and other multiple-purpose dams, all of which are a part of the Army engineers' comprehensive 308 report. It never will be done by high-cost power developed by private utilities, if we permit them to scuttle the great dam sites still remaining, such as Hells Canyon Dam.

I shall join forces with private utilities any time at any point where there is a need for the building of a low-head dam by a private utility that is not aimed at scuttling a dam site that is part of the main control plan, but I shall continue to fight every attempt to scuttle the dam site at Hells Canyon. Roosevelt, Norris, LaFollette, McNary, and the Senator from Kentucky helped to stop the efforts of private utilities to exploit the great dam site which later became Grand Coulee. If those bipartisan liberals in the Congress, supported by the great liberal President in the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt, had not fought against the attempt to build a low-head dam at Kettle Falls and stopped that private utility maneuver, there never would have been the great Coulee Dam. That fight is part and parcel of the major point which the Senator from Kentucky has so eloquently brought out in this debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My attitude in regard to the development of our waterways indicates no opposition to private utilities. I am interested in their success. We all know that no private utility can develop a river valley. It cannot afford to undertake such a gigantic task. A private utility has stockholders who look to it for dividends. Therefore, a private utility will build a dam in order to create power for a local purpose, but in the very nature of things we cannot look to private utilities to develop a great system in any great river valley in the United States. It is, however, possible for the Government of the United States and for private utilities to work together in cooperation in developing these great valleys for the benefit of both the public and the utilities. That has happened in the Tennessee Valley in many instances.

My idea is that in the development of a river valley system, such as the Missouri Valley, the Columbia Valley, the Tennessee Valley, and many others, there can come about a general cooperation among private and public agencies which will inure to the benefit of all the people, including the stockholders of private utility companies and the citizens of the United States.

I express no opposition to private utilities. I am their friend. I think the development of our great natural resources, including the great rivers, will inure to the benefit of all the people. Such development may be worked out in such a way as to inure to the benefit of private utilities in a great cooperative scheme by which the entire resources of the United States may be utilized for the benefit of our economy.

Mr. MORSE. It is a matter of pride and is also a privilege for me to say that I share completely the views just expressed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. There is always the attempt to distort and to represent falsely those of us who are fighting for public river basin development. There is a continuing attempt to place us in the light of being opposed to private utilities.

In the Pacific Northwest there is in effect the great principle of the pooling of power whereby private utilities and public dams pool their power in a great power reservoir. I am in favor of that.

I completely share the view expressed by the Senator from Kentucky. I favor helping private utilities. I will help them on low-head dams. But our point of view is different when they seek to prevent the building of a great multiple-purpose dam, which should belong to all the people, and attempt to take the site for the building of low-head dams, thereby preventing the maximum development of power and other resources of the river.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difficulty, as I have experienced it in conversation and in correspondence, is that many of our friends favor the development of the rivers for navigation and flood control; but when it comes to the development of the rivers for the production of power, the same people are willing to have the United States take charge of the flood control and navigation but desire to produce the power for themselves. I hope I have not overstated the situation.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has used restraint and made a great understatement, but it is a very accurate one.

Mr. BARKLEY. When a great natural resource such as a river is developed for navigation, for flood control, for soil conservation, and the other purposes, I think the power developed by that enterprise conducted by the Government should still be the property of the people of the United States, and not of any private group.

Mr. MORSE. That is my thesis. There is no justification for asking the Government to give it away to a monopoly. The people are entitled to have the great project built and to have all the revenue derived from it go into the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of the people. Then, when the dam has been paid for, it is to be owned by the people, not by some private combine. That is a part of the great difference which has arisen over the development of Hells Canyon.

I shall not take the time to develop this point at length today, because I shall be discussing the subject from time to time for the remainder of the session. But the Senator from Kentucky has put his finger on the point when he speaks of the so-called partnership scheme, whereby the Government ends up with owning the fish ladders, the locks, and the other nonrevenue producing features of the project, while giving away great values to big business enterprises, so far as the power resources are concerned.

When a multiple purpose project is under consideration, it ought to be developed by the Government for all the people; and when the project is completely paid for, it should belong to all the people.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very much impressed with the remarks which have been made by one of the greatest experts in this body, certainly with respect to the question of public power versus private power, and more specifically with references to Hells Canyon Dam.

May I ask the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon if he is familiar with the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission in 1951 with respect to water conservation?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I am familiar with it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am correct, am I not, in my understanding that that commission, after its efforts of a year and a half, stated that very possibly within the next 25 years our greatest shortage would be fresh water?

Mr. MORSE. Entirely correct. We had better begin quickly to use all our scientific knowledge in seeing to it that we preserve and reserve for future generations the maximum possible reservoirs of fresh water in this country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Probably today the greatest remaining project for controlling water, which is important to cultivation of the soil, conservation of the soil, flood control, and for water storage, is the Hells Canyon Dam. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. It is the greatest remaining multiple purpose dam site in the country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] were saying, the Hells Canyon site should be developed as promptly as possible for all the people.

Mr. MORSE. The sooner the better. It should have been done yesterday.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand, the nub of the proposition is that if all the people, through their taxes, develop this great additional unit in the Nation's entire hydroelectric water conservation and resource facilities, the Government would have no right to give it away to any group of private citizens.

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the underlying theories of the bill. The complete wealth of the project should be returned to the people of the United States in the form of revenues which should be deposited in the Treasury.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Oregon make it clear that in his mind this is not a fight between the private utilities, on the one hand, and the advocates of public power on the other; but that it is

a contest between the advocates of public power and the private-power monopoly.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct. It involves a very serious problem of monopoly.

The Senator from North Dakota having raised the point, let me make it very clear that the sponsors of the bill are not proposing any Federal monopoly of power. The spokesmen for this administration are constantly trying to put us in the bad light of advocating a Federal monopoly of power. The contrary is the fact. All that the spokesmen for the administration have to do is to visit the area and study the power system in the Northwest, where power is being produced for private as well as public interests. Eighty-five percent of the power in the United States is produced by private utilities, not by the Government. We have no intention of materially cutting down that ratio.

To some extent, when a great project such as Hells Canyon is built, there will be an addition to the total supply of public power. But I have already pointed out in my speech that the population increase in the Pacific Northwest in the past 10 years has required a great increase in the quantity of power produced, so no great damage will be done to the power production potential of private utilities.

We are saying to the private utilities that in areas where the sites are adapted to the construction of multiple-purpose dams, the Government will develop them. We are not going to give them away in the form of low-head dams built by private utility combines.

Mr. LANGER. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator has said about the partnership idea as expressed by the President in his Oregon speech some months ago, a speech with which I thoroughly disagree. I am very happy to note that the Senator from Oregon, likewise, did not agree with the proposed partnership idea. It always seemed to me to be something like a great big lion in partnership with a little lamb. The partnership would not last long before the lamb would be gobbled up.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota. In a series of speeches I intend to deliver in the next few months, I intend to discuss every phase of the partnership program which, in my judgment, needs to be discussed, and to correct some false conceptions about it which have been spread by propagandists of this administration.

While the Senator from North Dakota is on his feet, I may say to him that he was fighting in the Senate long before I came here for the principles on which we have joined forces today. I thank him sincerely for his cosponsorship of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. If funds had been allotted to the Judiciary Committee by the Republican administration during the last session, witnesses, whose appearance had been arranged, would have been called, and the committee would have been enabled to make a thorough investigation, at the request of the Senator from Oregon, of the entire Hells Canyon project. Unfortunately, we had no money for that purpose. We did the best we could in our investigation of the Dixon-Yates contract and some of the other monopolistic enterprises; but we could not consider the Hells Canyon project, and that has always been a source of keen regret to me.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from North Dakota did a great job in the investigation which he undertook as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think the need for the continuation of that work still exists. It was the Senator's plan to conduct an investigation into the monopolistic tendencies and practices in the Pacific Northwest, including an investigation of the whole subject of what is happening to the Hells Canyon Dam program. I regret very much that there has been a lapse at least in the prosecution of that investigation, and I intend to urge on this side of the aisle that those in charge of the investigative authority of the Committee on the Judiciary continue to carry out the program so ably outlined by the Senator from North Dakota.

IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT

As I was saying, Mr. President, aside from the tremendous business-stimulating effect that a new large block of power would have in Idaho and Oregon, the provision making available power revenues from this great dam and the smaller Scriver Creek plants to aid irrigation development is one of the most significant features of the bill. It would have on the region an economic impact that would be felt for decades—yes, for centuries to come.

There are some 44 projects in eastern Oregon and Idaho not yet authorized, but which, based on preliminary examinations made by the Bureau of Reclamation appear to be desirable of development at some time in the future, in view of the favorable benefit-cost ratios. However, with minor exceptions, they can only be undertaken if the water users have assistance in the repayment of irrigation capital cost.

POWER REVENUE NEEDED FOR IRRIGATION

A special provision covering this desirable aspect of resource development in the Snake River Basin is necessary because the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 limits the use of power revenues to assist in repayment of irrigation costs to features of the project of which the power development is a part. Thus, it is necessary to state by legislation that additional works may be treated for payout purposes as part of the Snake River project, of which the principal division is the Hells Canyon Division.

The State of Idaho could gain enormously from the financial aid provision of the new bill. It has lying at the doorstep of the city of Boise the Mountain Home project. It is desirable to transform this vast area of sagebrush, some 192,000 acres, into a community of fertile, irrigated farms—in favor of creating another Boise Valley, so to speak. The cost of bringing water to the land, which involves the diversion of water from one river basin to another, is high. The small powerplants associated with the project would not produce adequate power revenues to aid farmers in complete repayment of the project. Under this legislation, Mountain Home project, when authorized, would be made feasible through use of Hells Canyon power revenues.

FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION

Two outstanding engineering organizations have agreed, in writing, that there are tremendous benefits to be attained through the use of the storage space behind Hells Canyon Dam for impounding some of the flood waters that imperil downstream lives and property. My colleagues will remember 50 lives were lost and $100 million in property damage suffered in 1948, when the Columbia went on a rampage. If a flood similar to that which occurred in 1894—greatest on record—should occur now, with a much greater development along the river banks, the total loss would exceed $350 million. Engineers think that some day such a flood, or even a bigger one, will occur, for 60 years in the history of a river or a country is very short.

A flood-control system, known as the main control plan, which would cope with the worst recorded flood, has been worked out, and Hells Canyon Dam is a key unit in this system.

Hells Canyon Dam, if available in 1948, when the last major flood occurred, would have decreased flood damages between $10 million and $12 million, the Corps of Engineers advises me.

HELLS CANYON FOR NAVIGATION

Navigation on the Columbia and Snake from Lewiston to the sea has increased, and will continue to do so as pools afforded by the Dalles, John Day, McNary, and the four lower Snake dams stimulate river transportation of crops and manufactured goods as well. With their economic feasibility dependent upon Hells Canyon storage releases to enhance their power output, the four Snake dams, as is Hells Canyon, are closely knit one with another to provide for a total transportation system of some 500 miles from the mouth of the Columbia to a point upstream from Lewiston. Hells Canyon releases will likewise aid deep draft navigation by contributing to channel maintenance and reducing need for dredging.

The great lake behind Hells Canyon which extends to the railhead upstream will make slackwater barge transportation possible into and out of the rich copper and silver-lead deposits of the Seven Devils mining district and hasten their development, prevented up to now by the rough, inaccessible terrain. Navigation, too, is a leading objective in the comprehensive plan.

HELLS CANYON FOR NEW INDUSTRY IN IDAHO

The location of Hells Canyon is uniquely fortuitous to the development of the phosphate fertilizer industry in eastern Idaho and neighboring States, where 60 percent of the Nation's reserves of phosphatic rock are found.

Hells Canyon is the only great power producer within economic transmission distance of these deposits, which are primarily low grade and require large quantities of low-cost power to be adequately utilized in processing economical, high analysis phosphate fertilizer.

CHEAP PHOSPHATE FERTILIZERS FOR THE MIDWEST AND WEST

Farmers in a belt of States from Wisconsin to California are paying too high

prices for too low analysis phosphatic fertilizer. They will be able to buy fertilizer from this region at prices which will afford them savings of many millions of dollars annually, in the form of lower freight rates and handling charges. There will be consequently greater use of fertilizer to replenish land which has been depleted by the growing of crops and enhanced productivity. The attendant benefits to the entire agricultural economy will be reflected in greater volume, lower costs of production, and more nutritious food for consumers.

HELLS CANYON FOR RECREATION

Recreation is another important aspect of the multipurpose structure. Suffice it to say with one of the world's highest dams to be situated in North America's deepest gorge, a tourist attraction will be created that will lure from a third to a half-million visitors annually, probably more. Tourist dollars are an important phase of our northwest economy, and we should not overlook the added drawing power to be provided by the opening up of a spectacularly rugged canyon and primitive area.

Aside from its tourist-attraction lure, the dam will create a reservoir that will be ideal for fishing, hunting, boating, swimming, and camping. One nationally known writer, who travels the country over, predicts Hells Canyon reservoir will become one of the greatest bass fishing lakes in the Nation. He wrote, "I believe that the building of Hells Canyon Dam would be the greatest possible good fortune that conceivably could befall the sportsmen of this area."

HELLS CANYON—KEYSTONE OF THE SNAKE AND LOWER COLUMBIA SYSTEM

As Hells Canyon goes, so goes the Snake and lower Columbia. The Hells Canyon Dam is the keystone of the system.

Let us examine the projects which would be more efficient and whose power would be augmented by the release of Hells Canyon water during periods of low water downstream.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks the table showing integration benefits which appears at page 377 of the 1952 House hearings on H. R. 5743.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nominal prime capability—kilowatts

Plant	With Hells Canyon	Without Hells Canyon	Added by Hells Canyon
Hells Canyon	688,000		688,000
Lower Granite [1]	170,000	116,000	54,000
Little Goose [1]	209,000	141,000	68,000
Lower Monumental [1]	194,000	132,000	52,000
Ice Harbor [1]	204,000	139,000	65,000
McNary [2]	617,000	569,000	48,000
John Day [1]	715,000	659,000	56,000
The Dalles [2]	687,000	637,000	50,000
Bonneville [2]	476,000	452,000	24,000
Other plants	3,894,000	3,885,000	9,000
Total	7,854,000	6,730,000	1,124,000

[1] Authorized.
[2] In operation.
[3] Under construction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the table shows the augmentation of power output at eight major downstream dams and a few other minor installations attributable to Hells Canyon. The eight are either in operation, under construction, or authorized.

Let us examine the authorized but unfinanced projects. As the table shows, Lower Granite (which is only authorized) has a potential of 170,000 kilowatts, 54,000 of which would result from integration with Hells Canyon—that is, approximately one-third of the total. We have the same situation in regard to Little Goose—68,000 kilowatts—again approximately one-third dependent upon Hells Canyon. Lower Monumental and Ice Harbor are in the same category. John Day is similar: of its full potential of 715,000 kilowatts, 56,000 would result from Hells Canyon.

The remaining dams, which are in place or under construction, would each have integration benefits smaller in kilowatts and percentage than any of the dams which are only authorized.

Last year a representative of the Army Corps of Engineers testified, for example, that Ice Harbor Dam would not be an economic project without storage of the amount and kind that would be provided by Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. President, I wish to digress long enough to issue a warning to the advocates of Ice Harbor Dam and the advocates of the other dams which have been authorized but have not yet been financed by way of appropriations made by the Congress. My warning to them is to "watch out." If they let the opponents of Hells Canyon Dam succeed in their attempts to scuttle it as a Federal project and prevent its construction, they will strike a devastating blow at the dams which have been authorized but have not yet been financed.

In connection with that warning, Mr. President, I wish to say that my fear is that so many of those dams, which, as I have just pointed out in my analysis, are dependent on Hells Canyon Dam, to the extent of one-third of their power capacity will be subject to the argument that they will no longer be economic without Hells Canyon Dam.

One of the reasons why the fight in favor of the construction of Hells Canyon Dam must be won now is in order to protect the future development of these authorized dams, for which Congress will sooner or later have to appropriate funds. We need to weigh that warning, Mr. President, in view of the testimony to which I have just referred; namely, that of the Army engineers, given last year, when they pointed out that without Hells Canyon Dam, Ice Harbor Dam would not be an economic project without storage of the amount and kind that would be provided by Hells Canyon Dam. Because of their similarity, the same would be true of Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite.

Without Hells Canyon, all of these projects may well be lost. With the loss of Hells Canyon's 688,000 kilowatts and storage, the probability is that the 1½ million kilowatts of the authorized but unfinanced dams will be gone. To that must be added the 131,000 kilowatts which Hells Canyon would add to Bonneville and the dams under construction. The results of not building Hells Canyon would come to a loss of 2,311,000 kilowatts a year.

NORTHWEST EXPANSION AND PUBLIC POWER

Is it mere coincidence that from 1939 to 1950 the kilowatt output in Oregon quadrupled and the total wages and salaries in manufacturing quintupled? The answer to that question, Mr. President, is that it was not a mere coincidence. Is it coincidence that the kilowatt output in the State of Washington increased 5 times over and that total wages in manufacturing went up to 4 times the 1939 figures? The answer to that question is that it was not a coincidence, Mr. President. Of course, in each case the tremendous increase in power was publicly generated power. During the period, public power in Oregon went from 216 million kilowatt-hours to about 4,000 million kilowatt-hours. Private output was increased all of 400 million kilowatt hours.

Is it mere coincidence that employees in manufacturing industries were 1½ times as numerous in 1950 as in 1939 in Washington and almost doubled in Oregon?

These are figures of growth which show that wages and employment are parallel to kilowatt output of inexpensive power—which has been public power. These are figures which tell in a very dynamic way, Mr. President, why the great labor organizations of the Pacific Northwest, most of the great farm organizations of the Pacific Northwest, and the leaders of small business in the Pacific Northwest see the importance of Hells Canyon Dam to the sale of farm products, the providing of jobs, the creation of new industry, and the great stimulation of the economic productivity of our section of the country.

HELLS CANYON—BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE

The Pacific Northwest and the Nation need the high Hells Canyon Dam as an integral part of the Columbia River Power System.

Hells Canyon power is indispensable.

Hells Canyon storage for downstream power increases is indispensable.

Hells Canyon's aid to navigation is indispensable.

Hells Canyon's contribution to flood control is indispensable.

Hells Canyon is needed to meet the low-cost power needs of industry, workers, and farmers.

Hells Canyon is needed to make new industry and new irrigation acres.

Hells Canyon is needed to provide employment and payrolls and taxes in the Pacific Northwest.

Let us move forward to build Hells Canyon Dam—the indispensable multipurpose project if we are to build for the future, not only in the Pacific Northwest, but throughout the Nation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the struggle over natural resources which has begun today with the introduction of the Hells Canyon bill will rank in history with the battle over the founding of the United States forest reserves

and the long fight by Senator George W. Norris for Muscle Shoals.

Hells Canyon is the greatest natural hydroelectric power site left on our continent, but even more than this is at stake.

Hells Canyon is the keystone in the arch of resources out in the great Pacific Northwest. If Hells Canyon is given to private monopoly for far less than full development, other resources will likewise pass from the hands of the people.

Five great principles are at issue in this bill:

First. Will the power resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries—the mightiest hydroelectric stream in North America—be tapped for the public or for a favored few?

Second. Will power sites in the Columbia Basin be used to full capacity or to merely a fragment of their possibilities?

Third. Will the 308 report of the Corps of Engineers, which is the master plan for Columbia Basin development, be followed, or will it be abandoned?

Fourth. Will Columbia Basin kilowatts be available to farmers, manufacturers, and homeowners at low cost or at high monopolistic rates?

Fifth. Will the generation of hydroelectric power be accompanied by such additional multipurpose benefits as flood control, irrigation, downstream power firming, and the protection of wildlife?

HELLS CANYON IS IN PUBLIC INTEREST

If the Hells Canyon bill which we have introduced today is passed by Congress and signed by the President these questions will be answered in the public interest.

If the bill fails of passage, Mr. President, these questions will be answered in sorrowful and adverse terms for the American people.

I should like to associate myself with my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in what he has said about Hells Canyon and its impact on our State, region, and Nation. I also should like to thank from the bottom of my heart the other distinguished Senators who have joined with him and myself in sponsorship of this bill, which means much not only to our State of Oregon, but also to the United States of America.

Mr. President, I first visited Hells Canyon in 1939. I have been there many times since. I have ridden its rapids on the mailboat *Idaho*. I have trudged its narrow trails and ridden horseback over Freezeout Saddle, the great pass on the Oregon rim of the chasm where Capt. Benjamin L. E. Bonneville and his fellow explorers escaped from the gorge nearly a century and a quarter ago. My wife Maurine and I have camped alone in the Seven Devils Range of Idaho, along the eastern wall of Hells Canyon, and peered down upon the foaming mountain river, which has trenched more than a mile into the earth.

STRUGGLE IS HISTORIC

Never did I think on those memorable occasions, Mr. President, that I would have the privilege and the challenge of standing in this distant arena of government, alined with my illustrious colleague [Mr. MORSE], in an historic effort to retain Hells Canyon for all the American people.

Hells Canyon passed into protected public possession when Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot set aside the forest reserves in 1908. The vast chasm is divided between the Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forests of Idaho and the Wallowa National Forest of Oregon. The hydroelectric power resources of Hells Canyon need not be given to the absentee-dominated Idaho Power Co. if this Congress will only stand by the principles of those progressive Republicans, Theodore Roosevelt and his Chief Forester, Gifford Pinchot. Indeed, Roosevelt and Pinchot deliberately located forest ranger stations along swift rivers at power sites to keep these sites out of the clutches of what Pinchot called "the power octopus." We are again confronted by a challenge similar to that which sent Roosevelt and Pinchot into action.

An administrative arm of Congress—the Federal Power Commission—now has before it a proposal by which a private power company could preempt that section of the Snake River wherein the high multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam would be built. Through narrow interpretation of the Federal Power Act, legal counsel for that body has recommended that licenses be granted to permit building three small private dams in the Hells Canyon area. Through tortured logic, this position was taken despite findings that the alternative high Hells Canyon Dam would provide superior total multiple-purpose benefits.

The Federal Power Act, it seems to me, is fairly clear as to how the Congress intended the Federal Power Commission to function in cases such as the present controversy. The act specifically declares that the Commission shall license that project best adapted to comprehensive development of a river basin. How can less-than-full development be the best policy, when an alternative will produce maximum use? It sounds inconceivable, but that is the unbalanced interpretation of the law which has been given by initial recommendation within the present Commission.

INTENT OF CONGRESS DISTORTED BY FPC

This is not the first time that the intent of Congress—established in the Federal Power Act—has been circumvented or distorted by administrative fiat. When such occasions arise and the national interest is endangered, it becomes necessary for Congress to clarify and redefine the meaning of previous acts. It is a legislative responsibility; not one to be shifted to other branches of government.

Congress has delegated certain of its power-licensing authority on navigable streams to the Commission, but without periodic reaffirmation of policy, the administrative arm tends to become rudderless, and increasingly subject to having scientific and technical knowledge twisted by political whims.

By authorizing Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam, the Congress will reestablish the guideposts for determining what constitutes full and comprehensive development of water resources. Then, there will be no question as to the primary test of comprehensiveness. It will be that project which contributes the most toward the economic and social development of an entire river basin. There will be no further reason for failure of the Commission to act in the best interests of resource conservation.

WATER POLICY IMPERATIVE

It is important that this national water policy be spelled out here and now. We live in an age when energy for industrial fuel is a dominant factor in social and economic growth. The Columbia River Basin contains about 42 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric energy. We have developed approximately one-sixth of the possible capacity. Here is a challenge to American ingenuity and farsightedness. Have we the wisdom to carry on the program which will realize the full possibilities of this resource? We must be equal to the challenge, because this Nation does not have a world monopoly on choice sites for development of low-cost energy.

If we fail to develop our waterpower to the fullest and at the lowest cost, industry will go where the cost of energy is cheaper and the supply more abundant. We have already seen this trend started in the Pacific Northwest, where aluminum companies have been forced to locate elsewhere because of the recent threat of power shortages. In our region—which has no other fuel for an energy base except falling water—the economic paralysis from piecemeal high-cost power would be roughly equivalent to a serious economic depression. We cannot allow the race for low-cost energy to be lost by default merely to satisfy the demands of special corporate interests.

The technique of multipurpose river development has been uniquely American. In recent years it has been one of our chief technological exports. The United States is spending millions of dollars to show governments in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere how to get the most out of river resources. Our funds and our know-how are being used for power development by governments around the globe. At home, however, such action is labeled by the present administration as "creeping socialism" and "subsidized power." Apparently the administration believes that what is good for our allies is not especially good for us.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DOUBLE STANDARD

We in the Columbia Basin States saw the effects of this teeter-totter logic when the President's budget was presented a few weeks ago. Again the administration failed to allocate a single dollar for start of a new multipurpose project on the main stem of the Columbia or its tributaries. At the same time there were ample funds for faraway places.

I favor the use of our aid to help underdeveloped areas raise their standards of living by better use of resources. But it seems singularly inconsistent for the administration to give its blessing to multipurpose river projects in foreign lands and the back of its hand to similar objectives on the Columbia, the

Snake, and the Tennessee Rivers. Surely, Baker, Oreg., deserves as much consideration as Bombay, India.

Continuation of the administration's double standard for river projects will put the Nation further behind in meeting its prospective power requirements while power expansion goes on around the world. We must regain our position in the world as the recognized disciples of full river-basin development. Our leadership in this field of conservation has been an example for the entire world, but it is suffering under the administration's policy of do-nothingism and phony "partnership."

PARALLEL: HELLS CANYON AND GRAND COULEE

Grand Coulee is the greatest power project ever erected. Its vast supply of energy has helped make possible 50,000 planes a year to safeguard our country. This energy stokes the Hanford atomic works, where atomic energy undergoes its final processing. Grand Coulee turns out more kilowatts than any other powerplant, exceeding even vast Kitimat in British Columbia, Dnieperstroy in the Soviet Union or Hoover Dam in the canyon of the Colorado.

Yet Grand Coulee could not have been built if the McKay philosophy had prevailed during the 1920's. The parallel between Grand Coulee on the Columbia and Hells Canyon on the Snake River is a striking one, in its similarities.

When the crusade for Grand Coulee Dam reached the same proportions as the current agitation for Hells Canyon, the Washington Water Power Co. proposed a relatively small structure at Kettle Falls, 117 miles upstream from the Grand Coulee site. It is obvious that the Kettle Falls edifice would have effectively prevented a high dam at Grand Coulee, because the reservoir back of Grand Coulee was to extend for 151 miles—all the way to the Canadian frontier.

Listen to these words from the recent new book on the history of Grand Coulee by George Sundborg—a book entitled "Hail Columbia!"—Macmillan Co.:

> In March of 1921, just after the appropriation had been secured to core-drill the Grand Coulee site, the Washington Water Power Co. began to exhibit interest in Kettle Falls for power development. If a water right could be obtained at Kettle Falls, any dam at Grand Coulee would have to be held to a height of 202 feet in order not to flood out the upstream site. Thus, Grand Coulee would have more than 100 feet of head lopped off, with consequent enormous reductions in its power-production capabilities.

Far-sighted men refused to swap the Grand Coulee Percheron for the Kettle Falls rabbit. They fought the pygmy dam at Kettle Falls. These were men in and out of Government—Jim O'Sullivan, of Spokane; Rufus Woods, of the Wenatchee Daily World; Senators Dill and Bone and Norris and McNary; J. D. Ross, of Seattle.

As a result, the Kettle Falls dog-in-the-manger dam was blocked. Eventually, Grand Coulee rose to fortress height above the Columbia and began to develop an ultimate 2,650,000 horsepower of electricity.

But we can see the parallel. If the Columbia River had been surrendered to the Washington Water Power Co., as today it is proposed we surrender the Snake River to the Idaho Power Co., Grand Coulee as a high dam would have been impossible to construct.

Imagine the loss to America in terms of hydroelectric power if this had occurred.

What we pass on to the future by our action on the Hells Canyon bill is more than a single dam site. Our decision on this measure may well shape the destiny of national conservation policy—a policy tried and proven for 50 years, until thrust into limbo 2 years ago under the influence of self-seeking interests. The issue at Hells Canyon is the very synthesis of the meaning of resource conservation. The question is this: Given the opportunity to put to beneficial use the greatest natural water-storage site in the continent, will Congress decide to reserve for all time the full multipurpose utility of Hells Canyon? Or, will it surrender to shortsighted expediency, telling this generation and those to come that they must accept less than total productivity from their river resources?

NO TURNING BACK FROM DECISION

This is a decision from which there is no turning back. Once established at Hells Canyon, the policy circumscribes our national attitude toward every rivulet that runs to the sea. Shall we impose a doctrine of inadequacy or shall we look to the future, endorsing a physical structure which symbolizes the meaning of full and comprehensive conservation of natural resources?

Mr. President, a dam is different from almost any other resource. It is possible to take part of the coal out of a mine at one time, and then go back later to get the rest of it. On a farm it is possible to plow the north 40 and leave the south 40 fallow. However, once a pygmy dam is built, it is impossible to go back later and erect a high dam, to get the remainder of the power.

Mr. President, future generations of American boys and girls—interested in the rich natural resources of this country—will know from their history books what we do on this Hells Canyon bill, and they will judge us by it. I hope they, in turn, can tell their own children that we have not only handed on to them a great Federal multipurpose dam, but a sound conservation policy. In so doing, we will tap for the people the full energy potential of the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River, where it surges along the border between Oregon and Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an article about the Hells Canyon bill written by the noted syndicated columnist, Doris Fleeson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE FIGHT FOR HELLS CANYON—MORSE AND 28 OTHER SENATORS TO OFFER BILL AUTHORIZING UNITED STATES TO BUILD MULTIPURPOSE DAM ON SNAKE RIVER

(By Doris Fleeson)

The power issue will move up to the partisan battlefront this week when Senator MORSE introduces for himself and 28 colleagues a bill to authorize Federal construction of a multipurpose hydroelectric power project on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon.

This is the famous Hells Canyon, the last really choice power site in the Northwest. The Idaho Power Co. wants it and has the administration's blessing. Interior Secretary McKay withdrew the Government's claim to the site, announced his personal support of Idaho Power's plans and the Federal Power Commission is expected to announce a decision in the company's favor.

The Morse bill is an attempt to remove the power of decision from the administration and reserve the site for the Federal Government. Like the Dixon-Yates effort to carve out a slice of TVA territory, it furnishes one of the rather rare clean-cut differences between the Eisenhower philosophy and the New Deal.

Signing the bill with Senator MORSE are his colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, and 25 liberal Democrats from the Northwest, Northeast, and the Middle South. They are joined by what is facetiously called the liberal wing of the Republican Party, Senators LANGER and YOUNG, of North Dakota.

The Democratic leadership will do its best to pass the measure or at least to give it such support that Democrats can attribute its defeat to virtually solid Republican opposition. There are sound political reasons for this strategy as well as much real conviction that Hells Canyon ought to be a Federal project.

Three Senate seats will be at stake in the area next year. Democrats think that Hells Canyon will help them reelect Senators MORSE and MAGNUSON. They think it will help them defeat Senator WELKER, of Idaho, the intimate friend of Senator MCCARTHY.

There are wheels within wheels in the politics of the situation. Hells Canyon, for better or for worse, can be draped around the necks of the Republican Governors—Patterson, of Oregon and Langlie, of Washington—who are expected to be the opposition to MORSE and MAGNUSON, respectively. Governor Patterson is a protege of Secretary McKay, who is also a former Oregon governor. FPC Chairman Kuykendall, who has been going along with the administration, was recommended for the post by Governor Langlie.

No candidate has yet appeared to make the fight against Senator WELKER but the national committee here has solid assurances from Idaho that at least it won't be the former Progressive candidate for Vice President, Glen Taylor. Mr. Taylor won a primary fight last year but was defeated by Senator DWORSHAK for a seat Democrats think they could have had with a different candidate.

The hard core of Mr. Taylor's Idaho support has been the labor unions. They are said to have told him now that he has had it and gets not one dime more from them. This clears the way for Democrats to find a candidate their conservatives may be willing to accept.

In the fight for the bill, its supporters will make much of the fact that 65 percent of the common stock of Idaho Power, which has all the senior voting rights, is held by residents of the New England and Middle Atlantic States. Of that amount, 30 percent is held by 30 owners, largely eastern insurance companies, but including Harvard University.

Democrats will argue that the businessmen who so largely surround the President are advising him, not the residents of the Northwest, on this issue and that it is absentee owners who are against the further development of the low-cost power in the West.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Without taking too much of the Senator's time, I wish to compliment him on his exceedingly able

speech in support of the great Hells Canyon Dam, which is of such importance to the Pacific Northwest. It is so typical of the Senator's writing. He has put in succinct form the essentials of that great project. The people of the Pacific Northwest are greatly indebted to him for his fine speech.

I should like to ask 2 or 3 questions of the Senator. Is it not true that the junior Senator from Oregon made this project one of the prominent issues of his 1954 campaign when he asked the people of Oregon to elect him to the Senate?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The senior Senator from Oregon, as usual, has stated the facts correctly. Along the line of what the senior Senator from Oregon has stated, I believe it is additionally significant, although in modern times the State which we represent has been traditionally represented by a political party other than the one with which we are associated, that I carried nearly every county along the Columbia and Snake Rivers, from Hells Canyon to the sea. It was in those counties that the Hells Canyon issue was most predominant.

It was in those counties that the issue was most clearly enunciated to the people. Those people were most aware of the issue and most alarmed and most concerned by it. They have lived with it, too. In those counties I ran far ahead of any other Democratic senatorial candidate in the history of our State in modern times, I have been told by Dave O'Hara, Oregon's experienced and capable elections bureau head.

I believe the senior Senator from Oregon has correctly stated that the issue of this great power site certainly was an important contributing factor in that decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that we may justifiably look upon the results of that election as a form of mandate on this particular issue so far as our State is concerned?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I agree completely with the senior Senator from Oregon. It is very significant that in the senior Senator's able presentation of the provisions of the bill, he emphasized the impact on our farm population, and discussed the question of cheap phosphate fertilizer as it is related to the development of electricity with low-cost power from Hells Canyon.

A short time after the election, there appeared in that outstanding national newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor, an article written by Mr. Malcolm Bauer, the correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor in Oregon. Mr. Bauer pointed to the very large rural vote which I had received, particularly in the areas contiguous to the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

From what Mr. Bauer has written and from the senior Senator's remarks on the floor of the Senate, we can draw no other conclusion except that the farmers in that important agricultural section of Oregon were influenced by the effect which the Hells Canyon Dam could have on our rural economy if it is constructed as a public, Federal project.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not correct to say that a few years ago, when the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, was a member of the Oregon Senate, the people of Oregon gave another clear mandate on this water development project at Hells Canyon when a referendum was held on a question that came before the Oregon Legislature involving an attempt on the part of the Idaho Power Co. to get peremptory rights over water in the Snake River?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The senior Senator from Oregon again recalls his facts correctly. I am very glad that he brought up this point. That occurred in the 1947 session of the Oregon Legislature. As I recall, it was the session before I became a member of the State senate.

It is significant that the late Gov. Earl Snell of Oregon vetoed a bill the Idaho Power Co. sought to have enacted, which would have facilitated the ability of that company to acquire the great Hells Canyon site for a piecemeal, pygmy development.

At that time the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, was a member of the State senate. As I remember, he was one of the very few State Senators who wisely voted to uphold Governor Snell's courageous veto.

It is significant that the people at the polls cast a margin of nearly 100,000 votes against that bill, despite the vast sums of money spent by the private-power companies to try to pass the bill.

I think it is also significant that the Secretary of the Interior, when he was a member of the State senate in our State, voted in that body to uphold Governor Snell's wise veto of the Hells Canyon giveaway; yet the same man, as Secretary of the Interior, is now out in front in favor of the giveaway parade—particularly as it applies to Hells Canyon.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is important to make this a matter of record, because I feel there have been two elections on the subject. There was one when the question was first before the people, and another one last fall when the Senator ran for his seat in this body.

I know my colleague's view on this issue and I completely agree with them, but while the Senator is on his feet I should like to have him spread on the RECORD a point which he did not cover in his speech today; namely, the argument of the opponents of Hells Canyon in reference to taxes; the argument that, of course, if the Government builds the dam, the taxes will not go into the Treasury, but if we permit the Idaho Power Co. to scuttle the dam by building three low-head dams, which will produce about 50 percent of the power potential, then more tax dollars will flow into the Treasury of the United States.

Will the Senator, for the sake of the RECORD, express his views on that highly fallacious argument?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the first place, that is the oldest cliché in connection with the whole question of public power. If we should take property taxes, income taxes, corporation taxes, and payroll taxes, which are paid by industrial development made possible through low-cost public power, the amount would be many times more than the relative pittance of taxes paid by private utility companies. I remember looking into the situation in Spokane County, in the State of Washington, and noting that the aluminum plants alone in that one county paid substantially more in local property taxes than did the private utilities in that particular county.

I also looked into the situation in Chelan County, in Washington, and found that one new aluminum company in Wenatchee paid almost twice as much in local property taxes in its first year of operation as did the important Great Northern Railroad.

If we forget the millions and millions of dollars paid in taxes by the vast new industrial and manufacturing development which comes from low-cost public power, then, indeed, will we be throwing away the birthright of the people of the Northwest.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator. I think we shall have to repeat and repeat our answer to this phony tax argument, because, as the Senator well knows, persons who seem to think that private utilities should be allowed to scuttle these public projects are overlooking the fact that many times the amount of taxes which might otherwise accrue will be paid by industries that will locate in the area as a result of the high dam, whereas such industries would never locate there and undertake to operate if they had to pay the high rates of the private utility companies.

I wonder if the Senator will tell us his views from the standpoint of the national defense.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it seems to me we must learn from history. When the Senator from Oregon asks that question, let us look at the analogy with Grand Coulee and the people who preceded us, such as Senator Bone, Senator Norris, and also Senator McNary, in whose illustrious line serves my colleague from Oregon.

When President Roosevelt suggested the production of 50,000 planes a year, he was met with laughter. But, largely as a result of the construction of Grand Coulee Dam, we have produced 50,000 planes a year. Before the construction of Grand Coulee Dam not 1 ounce of aluminum was smeltered west of the Mississippi River, but when that dam was completed, approximately 45 to 50 percent of our whole national production was concentrated in that northwestern territory. That was largely made possible by the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Low cost power provided by the TVA for Oak Ridge and low cost power at Grand Coulee in the Pacific Northwest made possible the production of the ultimate weapon which not only won World War II but which we know restrains the Soviet Union today from sending its divisions over the face of the world in aggressive warfare. If Grand Coulee had been bartered away, as Hells Canyon is proposed to be bartered away to private utilities, the result might have been very different.

In my State, Mr. President, Charles L. McNary was an esteemed figure. To

know where Charles L. McNary would stand on the question before us now, one has only to read his speeches. McNary was for low cost Federal power. The Senator recalls the President's speech in the 1954 political campaign at the dedication of the McNary Dam. That dam has a fine and honored name.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator has brought up that matter. The Senator has referred to the President's speech at the dedication of the McNary Dam. He will recall that the President sought to give the impression that those of us who are urging the construction of these projects are seeking a Federal monopoly of power, and in speeches evidently written for him by someone else he has referred to these projects as creeping socialism. What does my colleague have to say about whether we are advancing creeping socialism?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, the senior Senator from Oregon, when he brings up that question, knows that they are talking about two kinds of monopoly, Federal monopoly and private monopoly. I recall reading figures published in the New York Times in 1953 which indicated that 6 percent of electricity is produced by municipal plants, 13 percent of the electricity generated in the United States is generated by Federal dams, and 81 percent by private utility companies. I am not very good at arithmetic. It was always my poorest subject in school. But even I know that if there is any danger of monopoly, 81 percent is a greater danger than is 13 percent. I wonder what kind of arithmetic they are using in this administration. They say nothing about the 81 percent monopoly. They are worried over 13 percent. I hope they are not figuring out the budget with that kind of a multiplication table.

Mr. President, we hear talk about Hells Canyon Dam being creeping socialism. The Secretary of the Interior recently appeared before committees and advocated the construction of Federal dams on the upper Colorado River. How a Federal dam in Hells Canyon can be creeping socialism and a dam on the Colorado can be just good Republican free-enterprise statesmanship, I cannot understand.

Mr. MORSE. That will be debated.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That will be debated. The question of how there is creeping socialism through the construction of a dam at one place and not at another place will certainly be debated.

I have been in Hells Canyon; I have walked almost all the way through that wonderful gorge, and I did not notice anything about the atmosphere there which would make that dam "creeping socialism" and a dam at some other place just good statesmanship.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator shares my suspicion that it makes some difference whether a proposed project is in an area where the administration wants to give something away to a private utility. When that is the case, then the building of a dam by the Federal Government is considered to be creeping socialism. But when the area is one where it would not be profitable for private utilities to be involved in a natural-resource development, then one is battling for the public interest, and it is not considered to be creeping socialism.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator has a very valid point. I am not an engineer, and neither is my distinguished colleague; but I have always thought that the way in which a power site can be determined to be valuable is if the administration wants to give it away. Then it is valuable. If the administration wants to keep it for Federal development, perhaps it is not quite so good a site.

Compare Hells Canyon with Libby. Libby is fraught with international complications. Libby is up near the Canadian border. The building of Libby Dam would create a vast lake backing water into Canada.

Our good neighbors in British Columbia, naturally and quite properly, if part of their land is to be flooded, believe they should ask for substantial reparation and get benefits in return for allowing Uncle Sam to construct such a dam.

This administration talks about fiscal solvency. If it is going to develop a site which will be of benefit to the people, let it develop one involving no international obligations, a site which the Army engineers recommend, and not give it away to the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. MORSE. The Truman administration was proceeding with negotiations for the construction of Libby Dam. When the Eisenhower administration came into office they discontinued the negotiations. But when they decided it was not very good politics, they reopened the negotiations and are now stressing Libby Dam very much, apparently in an effort to meet the charge that they are not favoring any new starts in the Northwest. But the only start they are proposing is one they know will take a lot of international negotiations to get under way.

It is my hope that those negotiations will be successful so that a start can be made on Libby Dam. It may take quite a while, but I want the Senators from Montana to know that they can count on my vigorous support for that great project.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is correct. I think the site for Libby Dam is an excellent one and ought to be developed. I think that logically it should be developed. But I think also it is extremely significant that the one site which has need for international authority and treatymaking is one which has been recommended for Federal development, because the Government knows that negotiations will be required at Ottawa and Victoria.

But the Hells Canyon site, where the Government could be ready to go ahead, is a site which the administration wants to give away to the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. MORSE. One final question: What is my colleague's reaction to the very misleading argument of the spokesman for the Idaho Power Co., that there simply is not sufficient water in the Snake River to take care of the power, irrigation, and flood-control aspects of Hells Canyon Dam, and still leave enough water for the farmers and the other users of water in Idaho?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should simply say, to begin with, that it is always strange that there is said to be enough water for private dams, but not for Federal dams.

Secondly, I should hate to think that the great United States Corps of Engineers, which we allow to decide where airbases and atomic-energy plants are to be located in the United States, where the Alaska highway is to be located, and where airbases throughout the world are to be constructed for the protection of the American people, cannot be entrusted with the decision as to whether there is sufficient water in the Snake River. The Army engineers in their great Report No. 308, which is the master plan for the development of the entire Columbia River and its tributaries, have said that there is sufficient water in the Snake River for the construction of a high-level Federal dam at Hells Canyon.

I should be very much amazed if the people of the United States thought that the Army engineers were not competent to measure the water in the Snake River, but still had charge of the engineering studies relating to our international defense program.

I am not an engineer, and my colleague is not an engineer; but if there is not sufficient water in the Snake River for the building of a multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon, then the country is in a sad plight indeed, because then we should have to admit that the Army engineers were not capable of constructing our defense establishments throughout the world.

Mr. MORSE. Not only do I agree with the observation of the Senator, but I think an inexcusable, misleading, false argument is being used in opposition to the construction of Hells Canyon Dam. Both the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have set forth in detail the truth, if anyone will read it, that there is sufficient water in the Snake River to meet the purposes of the dam and also to supply water for the water users of Idaho.

I thank the Senator for participating in the discussion with me, and I congratulate him upon his very fine speech.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. I wish to say in conclusion, especially for the benefit of the senior Senator from Montana, that my position regarding Libby Dam, so that he understands it unmistakably, is that Libby Dam should be constructed by the United States Government as a Federal dam, just as all the other multipurpose sites in the Report No. 308 of the Army engineers should be constructed—namely, Hells Canyon, Libby, John Day, Ice Harbor, and other sites in the Columbia River system, a system which contains 42 percent of the latent potential hydroelectricity of our country.

Hydroelectricity is a renewable resource. With it, great quantities of power can be developed without using up such limited fuel supplies as coal, oil, and natural gas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has introduced, on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senators from Montana, and numerous other Senators, a bill to authorize construction of a multiple-purpose dam in Hells Canyon, on the Snake River, in the Pacific Northwest. Because this matter is so close and so important to the people of that area, I—along with other Senators—feel compelled to take some of the time of the Senate to present the case for authorization of the Hells Canyon project.

Mr. President, I have supported Federal development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River from the time it first was made an important element of the comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia Basin.

It is gratifying that so many of my colleagues from all sections of the Nation are joining those of us from the Northwest in sponsoring legislation to authorize this mighty and vitally needed project. I urge the Senate to act quickly and favorably on the bill we are introducing today.

The people of the Pacific Northwest—and, in particular, the people of the State of Washington—are keenly aware of the fundamental issue underlying the Hells Canyon case. They are aware that it involves a test between a long-established policy of maximum development of the rivers of the Nation and one which would provide, instead, for partial, wasteful, and restricted development.

This issue must be fought out again and again. The Columbia River spills itself like a prodigal giant from its headwaters to the Pacific. With its tributaries, it carries one of the richest prizes that can be sought—over 30 million kilowatts of electric energy.

To those of us who fight for the cause of full, comprehensive development, this is a challenge—a challenge to be met by putting this giant to work for the welfare of everyone.

To our adversaries, the falling waters of the Columbia River mean merely profits—even at the expense of wasting part of our resources. They see the river narrowly, and chiefly in terms of corporate self-interest.

To adopt the latter philosophy, as a policy to be underwritten by the Congress of the United States, would be to threaten both the present and the future economic growth of the Pacific Northwest—or of any other river basin where there is unharnessed power to be developed.

To the extent that the Nation fails to provide for energy in the highest volume and at the lowest cost and with the widest possible range of distribution—we fail to exercise the responsibilities which we owe to ourselves and to future generations. To the extent that we permit waste of a resource we undermine the very foundations of our society. This is true because every civilization in history has found that land and water—their use and conservation—determine its material welfare and even how long it will endure.

The greater part by far of activities in the development and use of energy resources is and must remain in the hands of private enterprise. But there are fields and situations that are far beyond the authority, the willingness, and the competence of private enterprise to assume alone. Fundamental conservation and development policies are impregnated with Federal responsibility. The Congress of the United States has recognized this fact and has established and carried forward fundamental policies and programs in this field since the beginning of the present century.

In the category of Federal responsibility is the planning, programming, construction, and operation of multiple purpose river development works designed and inaugurated to produce hydroelectric power and other benefits such as irrigation, flood control, and navigation. With such public projects has come the development of integrated operation of a series of dams by means of the regulation of stored water and a similarly integrated operation of power plants in order to provide the fullest use and greatest dissemination of energy over a backbone interconnecting transmission system.

Hells Canyon Dam is a proposal which fits in all respects into this conception of multiple-purpose development. It will be fully interconnected with the Federal Columbia River power system. Its 3,880,000 acre-feet of storage will be alternately held back and released. The 1,100,000 prime kilowatts of electric power it will produce, at site and downstream, will be fed into the backbone transmission system of the Bonneville Power Administration. Those kilowatts will become a part of the pool of energy available to meet the rapidly increasing load requirements of both the upstream and downstream areas of the Columbia drainage basin.

The proposal for private development at Hells Canyon violates these principles. The proposal, therefore, is contrary to the public interest.

Partial, uncoordinated and purely local development of a resource like that of Hells Canyon has no excuse for being, no matter by what agency it is proposed. For the Snake River pours its strength and promise through this massive, somber canyon for the use of the region and the Nation. To view the situation otherwise and to decide this question on the shifting sands of expediency and appeasement of powerful and vocal special interest groups is to betray the people whose resource this is and must always be.

Mr. President, a small, privately owned electric utility, the Idaho Power Co., incorporated in Maine, has fought bitterly to prevent maximum development at Hells Canyon. Its tactics have been those of delay and confusion during previous administrations. Since 1952 its tactics have included aggressive use of the present administration, all aimed at seizing the site for its own restricted use. To date it has not succeeded. It will not succeed.

I repeat, the issue is full and multipurpose development versus single-purpose underdevelopment.

Since 1916 this absentee-controlled corporation has held a small and unused powerplant at Oxbow, upstream from the Federal Hells Canyon site. From 1916 until 1947 it had its chance to do something about developing power there. It had 31 years to plan and perform, before the Federal Government completed its epochmaking river study of the Columbia and its tributaries. The company did nothing.

From 1947 to 1952, the Idaho Power Co. used this decayed plant at Oxbow as a lever to delay the Federal plans to harness Snake River at Hells Canyon. It was not until November 1950 that it applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct a small run-of-river dam at the site, of about one-tenth the power capacity of the Bureau of Reclamations proposed multiple-purpose storage project.

It was not until May 1953, after Secretary of the Interior McKay had withdrawn his Department's formal opposition to the construction of Oxbow Dam, that the Idaho Power Co. made application to the FPC for two additional installations. The three private plants collectively would produce less than two-thirds of high Hells Canyon output—and at a much higher cost—to be used primarily in the company's own service area.

Thus, we see a private company, controlled by eastern finance houses and insurance companies, which muffed its own opportunity of 31 long years to do something for the region when there was no competing plan at Hells Canyon. We see a private company which proposed a small dam to compete with the proposed Federal project to work a further delay of 5 years. It is 1955. Thirty-nine years of alternate inaction and obstruction are more than sufficient. The Idaho Power Co. has its own quota. Its time has run out—and the patience of the Northwest and the Nation with it.

The pattern of the fight for Hells Canyon is so similar to the great struggle for the Grand Coulee project that it bears out with startling truth what I stated earlier, namely, that comprehensive river development is an issue that must be fought over and over again.

At Grand Coulee too, a private power company proposed to build a low dam; a dam that would have obtained but a fraction of the benefits from the site. For years that company and its supporters delayed the project.

If these men of small vision—but of huge appetite for corporate profits—had had their way there would be no Grand Coulee, no Columbia Basin project. Had this private power company and its supporters had their way the kilowatts of Grand Coulee Dam could not have come to the aid of the Nation in World War II. Its kilowatts would not have been ready and waiting to produce 40 percent of our aluminum, and even the atom bomb itself.

The people won at Grand Coulee. No man in his right mind who lives in my State of Washington—be he Democrat or Republican—would now question the tremendous worth of this mighty project and what it has done for the economy of

the region and the Nation, in peace and in war.

The people are winning at Hells Canyon. This is my deep conviction. When the great dam stands astride the Snake River and the transmission lines are humming from McNary to eastern Idaho with the power created from its eight generators, the wisdom of the choice we shall have made will sink deep into the consciousness of everyone. But remember this—we can make this choice but once. There is no turning back once the die is cast.

Mr. President, the interest of the people of my State of Washington in Hells Canyon is based on two facts of life which hang over our heads like the sword of Damocles. They are most clearly illustrated by two major disasters which have struck us in the space of 7 short years, and can strike us again.

In 1948 the Columbia River produced a flood of proportions exceeded only once since river measurements have been taken. The swollen waters, almost without warning, burst through protecting embankments at the town of Vanport and inundated it in a wall of angry water. Fifty people were drowned. Damage to property exceeded $100 million.

Now let us turn to 1952. The spring runoff had gone down the river to the sea unchecked. During the fall and early winter of that year the lower Columbia experienced a tremendous drought. River flow dropped to a relative trickle. Power production fell. It was necessary to impose a power brownout over the entire area. The Bonneville Power Administration curtailed deliveries of interruptible power to the electroprocess industries and other customers. Firm power deliveries were cut 10 percent. Aluminum pot lines were shut down. Hundreds of workers were laid off. Privately owned electric utilities were forced to use old standby steam plants to provide high-cost energy to their customers. The loss to aluminum alone was over $5 million.

Here are two illustrations of economic damage to a region which comes from inadequate control of a river system. At one extreme—flood. At the other—drought. And as long as this situation exists, the Northwest must look nervously each spring to the melting snowpack in the headwaters—and hopefully each fall to the skies for rain.

Mr. President, there is not the slightest necessity for this shadow to hang ominously over my region. The Columbia carries to the Pacific Ocean a tremendous volume of water, exceeded in the United States only by the Mississippi River system.

The problem is to equalize the alternate cycles of high and low water—and, furthermore, to use every drop of that water, over and over, as it flows to the ocean. How can this be done?

It can be done by upstream storage reservoirs on the tributaries of the Columbia. These reservoirs will catch and hold the spring run-off and will release these impounded waters in the fall and early winter when precipitation is negligible. Thus the flow of the river system will be conserved, will be controlled, will be equalized through the year, and put to productive use.

That is why the upstream storage at Hells Canyon is so important. Its 3,880,000 acre-feet of impounding capacity will be a long step toward conservation and control. That storage will aid in reducing flood damage, by controlling Snake River from its source to the mouth of the Salmon. That same water will be released later in the year to turn the wheels of our run-of-river powerplants downstream, thereby firming up the power production. We must have that storage to aid in maintaining an equalized channel from the ocean to Lewiston, Idaho, and above. By so doing we will provide an added two-way avenue of transportation of goods and commodities of all descriptions through the inland empire.

Mr. President, Hells Canyon is one of the very important projects in the main control plan for the Columbia River system developed by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in 1948. Years and years of study preceded the formulation of that plan. As a whole it is engineeringly and economically sound.

I have said before that this comprehensive plan calls for 27 million acre-feet of upstream storage. Hells Canyon will provide 3.8 million of that amount. In addition it will produce at site and downstream 1,100,000 kilowatts of electric energy.

We are not asking the taxpayers of the United States for a handout. Projects like Hells Canyon have added to the strength of the Nation by adding strength to the economic foundations of a region. Projects like Hells Canyon are investments which are entirely self-liquidating and which provide low-cost money for low-cost power. Even with annual interest charges, Hells Canyon will pay for itself twice over during the 50-year amortization period. In the years beyond it will continue paying for itself so long as the structure stands. I should like to add at this point that in the case of the Bonneville Power Administration and in the case of Grand Coulee itself, not only have we paid back to the Federal Government every cent with 5 percent interest, but we are years ahead on our repayment schedule, and have a very healthy backlog of almost $97 million in the Treasury.

Mr. President, I said that the Hells Canyon project will strengthen the Nation by strengthening the economic foundations of the Pacific Northwest region. It will do this because the kilowatts it generates will provide the energy to turn the wheels of new industries—the energy to expand the operation of present industry. Completion of this project will mean new investment in the region—new jobs, new retail outlets, new purchasing power, greater sales of consumer goods shipped into the area from all over the Nation.

Kilowatts are just a name unless translated into jobs and investments. Experts contend that 75,000 kilowatts will provide the base for $50 million in industrial expansion. That investment will create jobs for 7,500 industrial workers.

Now what do 7,500 new jobs mean to an area?

Recently the Washington, D. C., Board of Trade provided an answer.

Seven thousand five hundred new jobs—and this figure would be multiplied 15 times in the case of Hells Canyon—mean 15,750 more people employed, 75 more retail outlets, 10,000 more households, and $37,500,000 more in retail sales per year. In the case of Hells Canyon we are not talking about 75,000 kilowatts—we are talking about more than 1 million kilowatts—or 14 or 15 times the figures I have just cited.

We are talking about 110,000 new jobs, 1,100 new retail outlets, 140,000 new households, and 525 million additional dollars in retail sales.

We are talking about low-cost energy from Hells Canyon to support $700 million of new investment. We are talking about a great new tax base for local, State, and Federal Governments—supplied by private enterprise—but made possible by low-cost kilowatts.

If anyone wishes to question the validity of these figures—let me give him some cold, hard, indisputable facts—taken from the story of the aluminum industry.

The aluminum industry in the Northwest was born and nurtured by low-cost kilowatts. In 1953 the 3 major producers employed 9,000 men, with an annual payroll of $40 million,, with a capital investment of $200 million.

The Washington, D. C., Board of Trade would say that these 9,000 new jobs created 90 more retail outlets, created employment for 18,900 more people, and boosted retail sales by $45 million.

Hells Canyon kilowatts are not just a name. They mean jobs, they mean investment, they mean a better and richer life for thousands of people, they mean opportunity to establish new private enterprise. They mean additional tax income to Federal, local, and State governments. They mean a stronger America.

Mr. President, the basic issue in the Hells Canyon fight is whether a public resource will be fully developed or whether a part of it will be wasted. The fight over Hells Canyon is a fight between those of us who believe that a great resource owned by the people should be developed fully for the benefit of the people. I fervently hope that the Congress of the United States will settle the issue in favor of the people by enacting the legislation we introduce today.

Mr. President, I know the Members of the Senate are always interested in how the people of a State feel on a subject of this kind. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted on January 27 by the House of Representatives of the Washington State Legislature.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is at the present time, before the Federal Power Commission, an application by the Idaho Power Co., a private utility, for permission to build three low-head dams on the Snake River; and

Whereas the Federal Government has heretofore proposed the building on the Snake

River at Hells Canyon of a multiple-purpose dam; and

Whereas the granting of the application of the Idaho Power Co. will kill off for the future the possibility of a multiple-purpose dam at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas the full potential of the Snake and Columbia River Basin for irrigation, reclamation, flood control and the production of electricity can be realized only by the building of a multiple-purpose dam at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas the economic conditions of the Pacific Northwest are dependent upon adequate power as well as adequate irrigation, reclamation and flood control; and

Whereas the proposed Hells Canyon Dam would provide for a better development of our natural resources and its construction would be in the best interests of the people of the State of Washington; and

Whereas with the exception of a few public officials, the majority of the people of the Northwest and this house of representatives are in favor of the building of Hells Canyon Dam: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in regular session assembled, That we oppose the granting of permission to the Idaho Power Co. to build the proposed low-head dams; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully petition the Federal Power Commission to deny the application of the Idaho Power Co.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the Federal Power Commission to be filed in the present proceedings of the application of the Idaho Power Co., and that copies be sent to all the members of the congressional delegation and the Governor of the State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In conclusion, I should like to say that I wholeheartedly concur in the comments made by both Senators from Oregon, as well as the other Northwest Senators, on this very vital Hells Canyon subject.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the debate which has occurred in observance of Hells Canyon Day. I do not rise at this time to engage in debate. That will be taken care of at some future time, I am sure, at a hearing to be conducted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. On the question of resource development I shall not take issue with my colleagues from the Northwest States who have discussed the subject today. Insofar as natural resource development is concerned, my record of 8 years in the House of Representatives and almost 8 years in the Senate will demonstrate that I have consistently advocated maximum river development in the Columbia Basin. However, my colleagues, particularly those from the State of Oregon, and the senior Senator from Washington, have indicated that they are approaching this problem primarily because they are dedicated to constituents not only of their own States, but throughout the entire country, in the effort to provide this maximum development in the Columbia River Basin.

They have assailed a private power utility. I have no desire at this time to defend that private power utility, because it has an application for a license to construct three low-head dams in the Snake River Canyon, which application is pending before the Federal Power Commission. But, Mr. President, I must rise to point out that I also have constituents in the State of Idaho, and I am sincerely concerned in safeguarding their interests and the interests of those who use our water resources in my State.

Only yesterday at Idaho Falls, in the eastern section of my State, more than 1,000 representatives of water districts throughout the Snake River Valley from the Oregon line to the Wyoming border held their annual water meeting, endeavoring to solve many of the problems which confront them and to plan for future development. I am advised that unanimously this group of 1,000 water leaders in the State of Idaho adopted a resolution vigorously opposing the building of the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Oh, Mr. President, it is significant that the Senators who have preceded me this afternoon have pointed out that it is in the interest of national defense and resource development and in the interest of the people not only of the Columbia River Basin but of the entire United States, that the high Hells Canyon Dam be built. They overlook one very vital and important fact, namely, that the States of Wyoming and Idaho furnish practically all the water which would be impounded in the Hells Canyon Dam if it were constructed. It is easy for my colleagues from Washington to plead for the building of that great dam. But, Mr. President, not a drop of water from the State of Washington will be impounded in Hells Canyon Dam.

I also understand, Mr. President, that the State of Oregon will furnish only approximately 7 percent of the water which would be impounded in the high dam at Hells Canyon. The State of Wyoming sends down considerable water into the great Snake River Basin in southern Idaho, to flow down through the Snake River Canyon to joint with the magnificent Columbia River.

Let me point out, Mr. President, when we talk about flood control, which has been referred to frequently during the debate today—and the implication is plain—that in 1948 when there was a loss of 50 lives in the Portland area and a property loss involving many millions of dollars, it was contended that the Snake River and the failure to build the dam in Hells Canyon were largely responsible for that tragic flood. What does the record show? Mr. President, the record shows that most of the floodwaters which had such devastating effect in the lower Columbia River Basin did not originate in the Snake River. They originated in the Salmon River and in the Clearwater River. Yes, five-sixths of the floodwaters which course down the Snake River originate in the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers. Yet we are told that a high dam must be built at Hells Canyon in order to avert in the future floods such as that which occurred in 1948.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield for a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy to hear the Senator from Idaho discuss some of the questions which have arisen in his mind with relation to Hells Canyon. I look forward to further debate on this subject, because the Senator from Idaho shares my great interest in the proper storage and development of the waters of the West.

I might say facetiously that he is beginning to feel the effects of the interests of other States in the water of Idaho. Without making any remark as to the State I am thinking of, I believe the Senator from Idaho might have a good idea.

I wish to ask the Senator from Idaho if private capital has ever offered to construct adequate dams on the Snake River for the purpose of water storage and the development of electricity?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I made reference previously to the fact that there is before the Federal Power Commission at present an application by the Idaho Power Co. for a license to build three low-head dams in the vicinity of Hells Canyon.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it true, as I have heard, that the three low-head dams could be constructed at a much less cost than a high dam?

Mr. DWORSHAK. According to newspaper accounts—and I must confess that I have not followed the hearing before the Federal Power Commission, because I consider it to involve a technical question by way of determining the adequacy of water with which to operate dams in the Hells Canyon area—I think it would cost only about one-third as much to build the low-head dams, which would depend largely upon the run of the river water, and would have less storage. I understand that 1 of the low-head dams would provide about 1 million acre-feet of storage, as contrasted with the much larger storage which would be provided by 1 high dam, such as that which is proposed in the bill introduced today.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If it be true that private funds can construct adequate dams in the Snake River, does the Senator from Idaho know of any reason why the United States should be deprived of the use of a half billion dollars, when private resources are ready to spend the money?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I answer the Senator from Arizona by saying that it would be the prerogative of Congress to determine whether such a gigantic investment of Federal funds as would be required for such a project would be justified at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What I am getting at is that evidently another argument is shaping up between the private power and the public power interests. We all recognize the possible need for a dam project in the Snake River. My question is directed to the point: Would it not be more economical for private funds to develop the project than it would be for public money?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I presume that it would be, very definitely, from the standpoint of using tax dollars. I feel certain that if the private utilities could successfully build dams which would provide power to meet the anticipated shortage in the years ahead in the Columbia River Basin, and to take care of floodwaters, it probably would be advisable to let them do so. But again, I must emphasize that

that is more or less a technical engineering question, because actually there has been no adequate proof to show whether there is ample water available with which to operate a high-head dam.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator's last remark interests me. Has there been no proof that adequate water exists in the Snake River for this purpose?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The record will show that about 3 years ago the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was then under the control of the Democratic Party, conducted extensive hearings. Representatives of the water districts, the private utilities, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army engineers testified for many weeks.

The proposal before the committee at that time to authorize a high Hells Canyon Dam was finally tabled unanimously, because all the members of the House committee concluded that there was not ample proof that water was available in the Snake River to justify the construction of such a huge project.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have already referred to the meeting which was held in eastern Idaho yesterday, which was attended by about 1,000 leaders of water development in my State. But on February 15, 1955, it was my good fortune to attend another meeting at the same city, which was sponsored by the Corps of Army Engineers. On that occasion there were present about 1,200 representatives of water districts and flood-control districts from every section of the State, predominantly, of course, from the southern part of Idaho, where there is so much reclamation.

FAVOR UPPER WATERSHED USE

At that time emphasis was placed on the upper watershed development. At this late hour I do not intend to discuss what transpired at that meeting. I simply wish to state that in the upper reaches of the Snake River, near the Wyoming line, the Palisades Dam is now being completed. This is a multiple-purpose dam which will not only take care of flood control in that area, but likewise will provide water for reclamation development and will generate about 113,000 kilowatts of power, with which to pump water onto farms, and to provide some revenue with which to subsidize the reclamation development.

I was largely responsible for the holding of that hearing by the Corps of Army Engineers, because I was successful, in the second session of the 83d Congress, in having funds made available to the Army engineers with which to conduct a survey in that area.

Heretofore the Bureau of Reclamation has been extremely active in that field, but it was thought that so far as flood control was concerned, the Corps of Army Engineers likewise should make engineering studies of that area.

Emphasis has been placed upon the need of building not only the Palisades Dam, but also other multiple-purpose dams in the upper watershed.

When this development is completed—and it should be completed within the next decade—the engineers have testified that there will be very little water running below Milner Dam, which is one of the downstream points in the Snake River in Idaho, so far as reclamation is concerned.

As I have already pointed out, practically all our reclamation development, involving about 2 million acres in the Snake River Valley, is furnished by water from that stream; and during the past 5 years an additional 250,000 acres have been reclaimed and irrigated, largely with the use of underground water.

I stress this fact because when water is diverted for consumptive use in the upper reaches, it is very obvious that less and less water will flow down the Snake River to serve the proposed high dam in Hells Canyon.

I also wish to stress the fact that in Idaho we have not only the great Snake River, which runs throughout the southern part of the State and serves the reclamation interests of agriculture, but that through the middle section, from east to west, we have the great Salmon River watershed. Farther north, there is the Clearwater River watershed.

It is very significant that in the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers not a single acre of land is irrigated. This means that the water in those two rivers flows down to join the Snake River and the Columbia River without any of that water being diverted.

I ask, Mr. President, why the champions of resource development in the Columbia River Basin do not support some of the proposals to build high dams downstream on the Snake, such as at Pleasant Valley, Mountain Sheep, Nez Perce—and utilize Salmon River water—or on the Clearwater River, the North Fork, the Middle Fork, and the South Fork of the Clearwater.

In those instances they would be backing a program of flood control without in any way jeopardizing the water rights of more than 2¼ million acres of rich farmland in southern Idaho.

I point out that it is my firm conviction that we have seen the initiation of what I believe is destined to become a controversial issue in the campaign of 1956. There is plenty of evidence that is true, because we know that Hells Canyon is more or less of a "political" dam. It is merely a symbol in the controversy between public and private power. If we want to build dams, why do we not build them where they will be most effective, instead of creating turmoil and dissension among those who have as a common objective the maximum use of our water and power resources?

Mr. President, in order to show that there is plenty of evidence that this more or less is a political issue, I should like to call attention to an article in today's Washington Star, by Doris Fleeson, that stalwart champion of New Dealism. Her article is headed, "Senate Fight For Hells Canyon."

I read the first paragraph of her article:

> The power issue will move up to the partisan battlefront this week when Senator MORSE introduces for himself and 28 colleagues a bill to authorize Federal construction of a multipurpose hydroelectric power project on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon.
>
> This is the famous Hell's Canyon, the last really choice power site in the Northwest.

Another paragraph of Doris Fleeson's article reads as follows:

> The Democratic leadership will do its best to pass the measure or at least to give it such support that Democrats can attribute its defeat to virtually solid Republican opposition. There are sound political reasons for this strategy.

Again, Mr. President, I ask the pertinent question whether those who have inaugurated this observance of Hells Canyon Day are primarily interested in building multipurpose dams which will actually serve multiple purposes in the great Columbia River Basin and whether we are going to permit this maximum resource development to become stymied and bogged down in the political debates which we will face during the next 18 months.

Mr. President, on Saturday, February 26, 1955, a very well-known Democrat, Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, made a speech at Boise, Idaho. I have in my hand a clipping from the Idaho Sunday Statesman, and I wish to read one paragraph from that article, reporting on the speech delivered by Chairman Butler:

> He classed the current controversy over whether a Federal high dam should be constructed at Hells Canyon as "the best illustration of the difference in vision between Roosevelt-Truman statesmanship and the masquerade pose of leadership that now parades in Washington, D. C."

The Democratic national chairman also referred to the fact that the Hells Canyon bill would be introduced soon in the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall not question the sincerity of the Democratic national chairman, but I wonder if he does not know that his own party for 20 years controlled the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, with the single exception of the 80th Congress, which was controlled by the Republicans. So I ask the great national leader of the Democratic Party if Hells Canyon means so much to the resource development of the Columbia River Basin and the Northwest, and if the Democrats have been trying for years to build that project, then why did they not build it during the many years when there was no obstruction on the part of the Republican Party?

Mr. President, the fact that they did not do so should prove the contention that I made a few minutes ago, to the effect that efforts are being made now to promote in this country what can be designated as purely a political dam, namely, Hells Canyon high dam.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I live about 2,000 miles from Hells Canyon, but I had the privilege of flying into the entrance of Hells Canyon, and I have a very real in-

terest in that dam. I should like to offer an explanation to my friend from Idaho as to the reason why the project at Hells Canyon was not included in previous budgets.

The fact is that under the leadership of the Democratic Party, we had been building dams on the lower river, which dams were constructed gradually upstream, and it is now time for Hells Canyon. Such projects are constructed first on the lower river, and are worked upward. If my colleague will consider the construction on the Columbia River before the Democratic Party came into power and then after the Democratic Party came into power, he will find the natural resource development of the Columbia River has been put through by the Democratic Party over the opposition of the Republican Party.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is not entirely true. However, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his observation. I know a few years ago, when he was taken on an airplane trip from Lewiston, Idaho, a snowstorm was encountered and vision was obscured, but he came back and made a speech telling about the glowing potentialities of Hells Canyon. Is that not correct,

Mr. DOUGLAS. In answer, I should like to say there was a snowstorm in Idaho, but the nose of the plane did get into the mouth of the canyon, and I saw one of the great wonders of America.

Mr. DWORSHAK. With that statement I agree. We are all proud of that wonder of America. It should be utilized not only for the people of that area, but for the whole State of Idaho and for the whole State of Oregon. It may be timely to point out that the Senator from Illinois a few years ago opposed the reclamation features involving the Mountain Home project which is incorporated in the bill, of which he is a cosponsor. Would the Senator deny that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly not. I think the Mountain Home part of the project is wasteful; that the cost of irrigation is excessive. If I had my way, I would have divorced the Mountain Home section from the Hells Canyon section.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that in this bill which he cosponsors there is a provision for the diversion of surplus revenue from the generation and sale of power from the high Hells Canyon to build the Mountain Home project?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is aware of that circumstance, but the fact that he serves as one of the many sponsors of this bill does not mean that his hands will be tied when that section of the bill reaches the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure that is true, because I have seen the Senator from Illinois in action on past occasions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to observe that there has been a sudden and very happy change in the philosophy of the Senator from Illinois regarding reclamation projects. I think it was a matter of 2 or 3 weeks ago that we discussed the matter in the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and the Senator from Illinois was bemoaning the fact that people of his State had to pay for reclamation projects. I hope his generous attitude will apply when other western reclamation projects are suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to say I serve as one sponsor of the bill because of my interest in Hells Canyon, not because of my approval of the Mountain Home project, and I reserve the right to move the elimination of the Mountain Home portion of the project when the bill reaches the floor.

I may say, in connection with this discussion, that the good State of Arizona has been getting more money from the Federal Treasury for reclamation projects than the public interest of the Nation requires. I hope I may have the opportunity of enforcing the principles of economy for which the Senator from Arizona stands, when bills dealing with projects in Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, and the $2 billion "boondoggle" for the upper Colorado are considered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator's penchant for correctness, and I should like to inform him that Arizona has paid back every cent of earlier project costs, and is now well ahead of its projected payments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The great catch is that no interest is paid.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The interest will be applied as it is in irrigation features.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is done is that the power section of the project carries the irrigation section.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator agree that is right?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I do not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a point of difference. I suggest the Senator may not be a sponsor of this bill very long.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues from Illinois and Arizona. If my colleague from Illinois is consistent in cosponsoring the bill, which provides for subsidizing of reclamation developments, when he has indicated he is against such reclamation development, then certainly there must be some amendments offered in order to clarify the bill in accord with the Senator's own thinking in that regard.

I am going to conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by making a final observation: I think that those of us in the State of Idaho, particularly the water users of the State, who, under both Federal and State law, have a prior right to use—primarily for consumptive purposes—the waters of the Snake River, should have an opportunity for a hearing. For some years there has been what might be called a misunderstanding, as between the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, and the various States, as to which projects should be built. I have tried to point out that Hells Canyon is a political symbol, because there are many other dams which probably offer even greater possibilities for maximum resource development than does the Hells Canyon dam.

So, Mr. President, while I regret that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is not present at this time, I realize he is more or less of a political engineer, when it comes to the building of reclamation projects, and that probably we shall have an opportunity at the hearings—which will be held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—to determine just what the facts are.

Mr. President, if there is enough water remaining in the Snake River, after we utilize fully all the water resources in the upper watershed in Idaho and in western Wyoming, we shall be very happy to see the water used downstream, for the specific benefit of the people of Oregon and Washington. But, again, I wish to emphasize that this water belongs largely to Idaho. While my colleagues may be dedicated to the service of their constituents and their respective States, I, likewise, have a solemn duty to safeguard and preserve the water rights and insure the maximum use of the Snake River resources for the people of my own State.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in joining with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the other cosponsors of Senate bill 1333, authorizing the great multipurpose Hells Canyon project, I feel that we are simply keeping faith with the people of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation.

We in this favored section of our country are possessed of abundant natural resources which, wisely conserved and developed, will mean a constantly improving standard of living, not merely for the people of the West, but for the entire Nation. During the past 50 years, in region after region, we have seen what coordinated development of land and water resources can mean in economic growth and prosperity. This is not an ideological matter, but is an intensely practical matter which touches and advances the welfare of our people every hour of their lives. This program we are sponsoring will profoundly influence the economic future and welfare of the West in all the years to come.

In the Pacific Northwest we have seen with our own eyes the benefits that come from maximum use of the falling waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, even though the program of comprehensive development is still in its infancy. True, in the past 2 years or more its progress has slowed up because the present administration has faltered in its pledges and promises to carry out its responsibilities.

Mr. President, in my own State of Montana we were compelled to enter into a long and bitter struggle to bring about the development of the Hungry Horse project. But no one today in Montana will question the wisdom of that development. It has stimulated population growth and industrial development on a wide scale thrcugh the low-cost power generated at the Hungry Horse Dam.

It has not only benefitted Montana, but it has had a pronounced effect upon the entire Columbia River System. The storage operation in Montana has provided a vast amount of additional output of electric power downstream, both

in Federal and private utility installations. Thus, in low-water periods on this river system, because of our storage facilities we have a constant supply of power.

Whereas Montana was regarded as a backward State 10 years ago, today it is recognized as one of the growing States of the Union. New industries have come into the State, and others will follow when the necessary low-cost power can be assured.

Furthermore, under this system the Hungry Horse project provides financial aid for future reclamation projects in Montana through its power revenues. We also see substantial benefits in flood control and conservation of natural resources.

A large phosphate fertilizer plant which located in the western part of Montana, and which processes the raw phosphate rock by means of electric furnace treatment, came into my State because of the cheap power available and because the legislation authorizing Hungry Horse also took cognizance of the needs of an underdeveloped area and allocated a substantial block of power to aid its economy. This is important. Projects of this type benefit the immediate region as well as the surrounding regions and the whole Nation.

And before Hungry Horse had begun to produce hydroelectric energy, contracts for nearly all its firm power had been let to public groups, new industries and privately owned electric utilities. This illustrates perfectly the wisdom of a resource development policy and program which conceives that creating large blocks of low-cost power ahead of demand creates a demand which quickly absorbs it. In the general interest, we must resume such a program, for if the economy of the Nation is not constantly sustained and stimulated to further growth by new energy it will not continue to expand.

The Employment Act of 1946 of which I had the honor to be the original sponsor, has written into our economic system a policy which calls upon the Federal Government to provide, through cooperation of all governmental units, a constantly expanding economy, thus to attain maximum employment and high purchasing power throughout our Nation. I have used the Hungry Horse example, close to home in Montana, to illustrate how this has been done and how necessary it is that the Federal Government resume a rapid and orderly creation of new economic strength in all other regions of our country by comprehensive development of certain key resources.

Here in the Northwest, between the States of Oregon and Idaho, the Snake River rushes with tremendous power through a massive canyon where walls of basalt rock have drawn together to provide a natural damsite which cries for development on a colossal scale. It is one of the last of the great natural damsites of this kind that is left in the land. If we in this body can see and understand what is required here to harness this great onrushing river and make it produce wealth on even a larger scale than Hungry Horse, we will exercise the wisdom and statesmanship our country demands and convert the wasted waters of Hells Canyon into one of the greatest economic assets of the Nation.

At Hells Canyon, just as at Hungry Horse, a huge storage reservoir will be created. It will be operated in coordination with other projects on the river to hold back water during flood stages to aid in protection against floods, and release it in dry months to firm-up the power production of the powerplants below and also contribute to maintenance of navigation.

Hells Canyon, just as at Hungry Horse, will pool its great contribution of low-cost power with the Federal Columbia River power system. Over the regional gridback transmission lines, this energy will surge forth to the load centers for the use of industry, municipalities, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned electric utilities. The underdeveloped upstream areas of Idaho and eastern Oregon will be allocated a large amount of power attributable to Hells Canyon, which power will be available the year around. What happened in western Montana and the lower Columbia will be repeated in the Hells Canyon area, for low-cost power is a magnet constantly attracting new private enterprise; and this predominantly agricultural, lumbering, and mining community will be diversified by new year-around payrolls and employment which it so sorely needs.

In the West there are still untold opportunities for reclamation as population inexorably presses against available food supply. The power revenues from Hells Canyon project, aiding farmers in paying off costs of new projects beyond their ability to meet financially, will be a most important factor in this development.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the relationship between Hungry Horse and expansion of phosphatic fertilizer development. Hells Canyon is even more important in this regard because of its unique geographic location as the only large power producer within economic transmission distance of the phosphate rock reserves of eastern Idaho and contiguous States. From the Midwest to the Pacific coast, the effects of low-cost power upon full development of these reserves, the Nation's largest, will be felt by the agricultural economy. There will not only be greater use of phosphate fertilizers on the land to restore the needed ingredients taken from it by growing crops, but tremendous savings of millions of dollars every year to farmers in 17 States who will be able to purchase high-analysis fertilizer at lower freight and handling costs.

The issue at Hells Canyon is both simple and significant to the entire American people. I have shown how Hungry Horse, an accomplished fact, and Hells Canyon, which will be an accomplished fact, are basically identical in concept and planned use in controlling and using a river through upstream storage. The one difference is geographical location.

Hells Canyon will mean to the region and the Nation what Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse, the TVA, and other great public works, of the people for the people, have meant. Every drop of water in our rivers must be used over and over again until it reaches the sea. The planning of the extent and full range of uses must be comprehensive. Only in this way can we meet our grave responsibilities to the people of these regions and to the Nation, for these rivers belong to the people.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate of the United States, which controls the future welfare of our country, realize the significance of this important measure, both in its narrower and broader aspects, for indeed our action on this bill will involve important and far-reaching repercussions upon our future. For the general welfare of the region and for America, this bill should pass.

REPEAL OF PUBLIC LAW 820 REGARDING REVOLVING FUND FOR THE PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is prepared to speak at this time. However, if agreeable to him, I now wish to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of several bills which I believe will not involve debate.

Mr. CAPEHART. That will be satisfactory, if the bills will not involve debate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me say that these bills, including Senate bill 941, which was passed earlier today, have been cleared with both the majority leader and the minority leader, and we know of no objection to the bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bills have been reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in line with the explanation just given, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 942, Calendar 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 942) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would repeal the act providing a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas. Japan was the only occupied area to make use of this provision; and no purchases have been made since January 1950. There is no likelihood of its use by any area remaining occupied, and the Department of the Army has consequently requested its repeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the

question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 942) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on June 30, 1955.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8A (4) OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in connection with the explanation given in regard to the Senate bills 941 and 942, I now request unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1051, Calendar No. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1051) to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would remove the limit of $10 on fees for registration of commission merchants and floor brokers under the Commodity Exchange Act. It was requested by the Department of Agriculture and is identical to S. 3207 which the Senate passed late last session but which was not passed by the House.

The $10 maximum registration fee was fixed in 1936 and is not now sufficient to cover the aggregate cost of registration activities under the act. In lieu of the $10 limit the bill would provide for reasonable fees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1051) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 12a (4)), is amended to read as follows:

"(4) to fix and establish from time to time reasonable fees and charges for registrations and renewals thereof and for copies of registration certificates; and."

AUTHORIZATION FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SECOND PAN-AMERICAN GAMES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in line with the explanation given regarding the bills just acted upon, I now request unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 829, Calendar No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 829) to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary concerned is authorized to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, the games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and, if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein, any other international amateur sports competition.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary concerned is authorized (1) to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, the games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games, and Olympic games, and (2) subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) herein, to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in other international amateur sports competition not specified in (1) above, if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 30 days prior to the commitment of personnel pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (2) hereof, furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed participation by personnel of the Armed Forces in international amateur sports competition.

On page 3, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(b) The", and insert, "(c) Subject to the limitations contained in section 3 of this act, the"; after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Treasury, as the case may be, may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this act.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in the activities covered by this act, not more than $800,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act, to be apportioned among the military departments as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(b) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Coast Guard in the activities covered by this act, not more than $100,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Appropriations available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Treasury, as the case may be, may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this act.

On page 4, line 9, after the word "naval", to strike out "activities.", and insert "activities".; and after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (a) no member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to the travel or transportation allowances authorized by section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which his expenses for travel or transportation are being paid by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions authorized by this act, and (b) no member of the uniformed services without dependents shall be entitled to receive the basic allowances for subsistence and quarters authorized by sections 301 and 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which such member is subsisted and quartered by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions as authorized by this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 1, 1947 (Public Law 159, 80th Cong.; 61 Stat. 243), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That as used in this act, the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Defense, and, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a part of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary concerned is authorized (1) to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the Second Pan-American Games, the Seventh Olympic Winter Games, the Games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American Games and Olympic Games, and (2) subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) herein, to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in other international amateur sports competition not specified in (1) above, if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 30 days prior to the commitment of personnel pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (2) hereof, furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed participation by personnel of the Armed Forces in international amateur sports competition.

"(c) Subject to the limitations contained in section 3 of this act, the Secretary concerned may spend such funds and acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide training of personnel of the Armed Forces for such games, to provide for their attendance at and participation in such games, and for training of animals of the Armed Forces for, and their attendance at and participation in, such games.

"SEC. 3. (a) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in the activities covered by this act, not more than $800,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act, to be apportioned among the military departments as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Coast Guard in the activities covered by this act, not more than $100,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act.

"(c) Appropriations available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Treasury, as the case may be, may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall authorize the payment of allowances at rates in excess of those fixed for participation in other military or naval activities.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (a) no member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to the travel or transportation allowances authorized by section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which his expenses for travel or transportation are being paid by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions authorized by this act, and (b) no member of the uniformed services without dependents shall be entitled to receive the basic allowances for subsistence and quarters authorized by sections 301 and 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which such member is subsisted and quartered by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions as authorized by this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Armed Services. A report has been filed in writing. The bill represents a very slight extension of the program of the pan-American games, in which we now participate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill is explained in full on pages 2 and 3 of the report under the title "Purpose of the Bill." I ask unanimous consent that the paragraphs on page 2 and the top of page 3, under the title "Purpose of the Bill" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill was introduced by the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. BENDER, for the purpose of authorizing participation by personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States in international amateur sports competitions.

The act of July 1, 1947 (Public Law 159, 80th Cong.; 61 Stat. 243) authorizes participation in Olympic games by the Armed Forces but does not authorize any expenditures therefor. The instant bill, in addition to affording the necessary expenditure authorization for the Olympic games, broadens the authority for military personnel of the United States to train for and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international sports competitions if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein.

Physical fitness activities are a regular and necessary part of the military training programs. The Department of Defense maintains that competitive athletic activities are conducive to, and are helpful in, keeping our military manpower mentally alert and physically strong. In view of our military interests in athletic activities and competitive sports, it appears that the Department of Defense should be authorized and encouraged to give active support to those international sports competitions in which the United States desires to be represented.

In the past the United States has achieved a position of prominence in international amateur sports competitions through the excellence and sportsmanship of its young men and women. Many of these young men and women are now performing service in the Armed Forces of this country. There is no sound reason why those persons who are now in military service and who are excellent athletes should be denied an opportunity to compete as representatives of this country in international sports competitions.

The committee is of the opinion that the authority granted in this bill would contribute to the demonstration of American standards of sportsmanship and fair play to the peoples of the world and that this action may enhance our efforts for world peace.

The expenditure of funds that would be authorized by this measure is for the purpose of preliminary training, equipping, and tryout costs that are generated within the Armed Forces. After a military athlete has been selected for a team representing the United States in international sports competitions he will be equipped, transported, and subsisted by the sponsoring agency (e. g., the United States Olympic Committee) in the same manner as are civilian members of the team.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 829) was passed.

THE FHA SCANDALS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as every Member of the Senate knows, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is one of the most able, most highly respected, and most experienced Members of the Senate.

Throughout the Nation, Americans of both political parties have long admired and respected his devotion to his public responsibilities, his keen judgment, his sense of fairness, and his unquestioned integrity.

The senior Senator from Virginia is truly one of the great Members of the Senate. In matters of substantial public consequence, he is above partisan politics; acting always according to the public interest as he sees it.

The Senator from Virginia was one of the first to become aware of the mess that is now known as the FHA scandals.

As one who spent most of last year wading through that mess of the FHA scandals, I feel qualified to say that the Senator from Virginia has performed a great public service in helping to expose past practices of the Federal Housing Administration.

The Senator from Virginia certainly did not overstate the extent of these scandals when he described them as, "even greater than the Teapot Dome scandal." I am confident it is a billion dollar fraud.

Because of Senator BYRD's high standing, both in the Senate and with the American people, I was very pleased to read the United Press dispatch of February 15, 1955, that, "Senator HARRY F. BYRD called today for a continued investigation by Democrats into the Federal Housing scandals."

That press dispatch further quotes Senator BYRD as saying, "there are still a lot of irregularities that have never been discovered." I feel certain that the Senator is correct. The only thing we do not know is the extent of those irregularities.

The dispatch continues that Senator BYRD said, "the inquiry should be continued by Democrats on the Senate Banking Committee."

I completely support Senator BYRD's position and hope the Democrats will take his wise advice.

I pledge the present committee majority my full cooperation in a continued search for those irregularities.

I know that Albert M. Cole, Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, is just as eager as Senator BYRD and I to uproot these scandals and will cooperate fully.

Senator BYRD has pointed out, according to that press dispatch, that FHA commitments are, "about $35 billion he estimated—and warned the Government will be 'left holding the bag' if the economy takes a downward turn." Of course, Senator BYRD is correct.

Yet, I should like to point out that while the statute of limitations has run against many of the criminal offenses committed by builders in the FHA program, I am counting on the Department of Justice to bring civil actions to recover any losses the Government may sustain.

There is no statute of limitations against a civil action by the Government for fraud.

The Senator from Virginia has had so much interest in these scandals that it is a source of deep personal regret to me that he was not a member of our Committee during the previous Congress. I know he could have been of great help to us.

In the previous Congress, the committee of which I was chairman heard 372 witnesses in public hearings and recorded 7,750 pages of testimony. We inquired into 543 projects and in 437 of those projects we found windfall profits exceeding $75 million.

Let me explain what we mean by "windfall profits." A windfall profit was the difference between the total cost—every conceivable cost—of a project and the amount of money received by the sponsor from his Government-guaranteed mortgage. In other words, if the Government agreed to guarantee a mortgage for $1 million, and the total of all conceivable costs was $800,000, there was a $200,000 windfall, because the sponsor received $200,000 more in cash from his Government-guaranteed mortgage than he actually spent in constructing the project. In those cases the Government-insured mortgages exceeded 100 percent of all costs of every kind by $75 million. In the great majority of those cases there were irregularities if not outright frauds.

Nevertheless I must completely agree with Senator BYRD when he says that our committee "barely scratched the surface" in our investigation. For example, we showed that Clyde L. Powell, for 20 years a top FHA official, received large sums of money which he did not report in his income-tax returns. In fact, he was the top official in connection with rental housing—what was known as section 608.

When we asked him what builders paid him how much money he took refuge behind the fifth amendment. But it is just as important to know who paid him money as it is to know how often he took money. Clyde Powell hid behind the fifth amendment on at least 3 or 4 occasions.

Our investigation has been criticized by a few as having been political and even as having been a witch hunt. Nothing could be further from the truth, as everyone who followed our inquiry knows.

I cannot understand anyone inferring that there was any politics involved in our FHA investigations.

It is now a matter of record in sworn testimony that it was common knowledge that approval of a big project required paying off Clyde L. Powell.

Let me give the Senate 1 or 2 examples of the almost unbelievable difficulty we have had in prying out the truth. It is a very difficult task to get at the truth and obtain the facts.

There is a lawyer in New York named Abraham Traub who represented builders in connection with FHA insured projects totaling very substantially more than $100 million. One of those projects was Farragut Gardens, in which the windfall profit was about $4 million. In other words, their total costs were $4 million less than the amount of actual cash which they received from the FHA Government-guaranteed mortgage.

We examined Traub's books with the help of accountants from the General Accounting Office and found a large number of checks drawn on his law firm's bank account to the order of cash.

The bank stamps showed that the checks had been cashed. But his records did not in any way disclose what happened to that cash. In the 5-year period when FHA was at its height checks drawn to cash on that Traub bank account, and for which currency was obtained at the bank, exceeded $1 million.

In other words, this attorney, who represented over $100 million in FHA mortgages in New York, had written checks to "Cash" for more than $1 million. The record showed that the checks had been cashed. Over a million dollars worth of checks had been written and cashed over a certain period of time.

We asked Traub repeatedly where that money went, to whom it was paid, and what it was paid for. The only answer he was ever able to give us was that it must "have gone to Schoenfeld."

Schoenfeld reads like a character out of a mystery novel. Traub claims that several years ago he borrowed a large sum of money from Schoenfeld in cash, and that these large sums of cash were payments to Schoenfeld in repayment of the loan.

When two such payments occurred in the same day, Traub said that Schoenfeld must have stopped in twice that day to ask for repayments.

Schoenfeld, as we might expect, is dead, and there is nothing in writing to show the existence of the loan or even to record payments on the loan.

At one point Traub said that the cash payments to Schoenfeld probably were not over $300,000. Yet that would still leave $700,000 not accounted for.

One interesting fact is a $125,000 payment to Traub from the owners of the Farragut Gardens project. It was not a lawyer's fee, and his books give no explanation of the payment.

Traub said it was a loan, but in 5 years he not only made no payments on the loan, but has not even paid interest on that alleged loan.

Could it be that that money was given to Traub for Traub to give to someone else, and that he did so?

The Traub story adds up to a million dollars in currency that cannot be accounted for.

There is no question about the fact that more than a million dollars cannot be accounted for by Traub. He had written more than $1 million worth of checks to "Cash." Those checks had actually been cashed. Yet, he could never tell us what he did with the cash, except to say that years ago he had borrowed in excess of a million dollars from a man named Schoenfeld, who is dead, and that Schoenfeld would come into his office from time to time and Traub would write a check for $10,000 or $15,000 and send one of his employees to the bank to cash the check. He said the employee would take the check to the bank and cash it and would bring the cash back to Traub, and Traub would give the money to Schoenfeld.

We pointed out to him that there were a number of occasions when 2 or 3 checks had been drawn to "Cash" on 1 day. Traub's answer was that he supposed Schoenfeld had come into the office in the morning to get $5,000 and then had come back in the afternoon to get $10,000. There is nothing on Traub's books to show such transactions. There is nothing on Traub's books to show that such a loan had ever been made to him by Schoenfeld. There is nothing on the books to show that he had paid out that money to Schoenfeld. There are no ledger sheets and no journal entries. Yet more than a million dollars' worth of canceled checks were before us, all of them made out to "Cash."

In the light of that background, let me say something about Traub's appearances before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Our staff interviewed him in New York on June 23, 1954. He was asked, "Have you ever had any business dealings with Powell?" Mr. Powell was the head of the rental division of FHA. Traub replied, "No."

When he was told that we had heard rumors that his group had had some dealings with Powell, Traub replied, "This rumor will turn out to be untrue."

On July 14, 1954, we heard Traub in executive session. He was sworn. I was present, and I swore him as a witness. He admitted frequent dealings with Powell; and then he was asked, "Have you, or has anyone else in your presence, ever paid or given anything of value, money, or otherwise, to Mr. Powell," He replied, "No."

He then testified that he had not, nor had anyone else in his presence, given anything of value to any FHA employee. Finally he was asked if his answer was unequivocal in both cases, and he replied, "Unequivocal, no, in both cases." That testimony appears at page 2807 of the executive session transcript.

I wish to review again the two occasions when this man Traub was asked if he had ever given anything of value to Mr. Powell, or whether he had ever seen anyone give anything of value to Mr. Powell. I do not mind telling the Senate that we were suspicious and we still are suspicious, and that we would like to know where the million dollars in checks made out to "cash" went. We always thought that a part of it went to Mr. Powell, and that perhaps a part of it went to other people as well.

We heard Traub at a public session for the first time on August 25, 1954. He testified then that he was certain that none of his cash payments went to Powell. Asked again if he was certain not only as to Farragut Gardens, but as to other projects, no cash went to Powell, he replied, "Positive."

When Traub testified that no money ever went to Powell, he was under oath. Mr. Traub then became indignant at the suggestion that he had paid Powell, and asked permission to make a statement.

I may say that we always found in these investigations that every guilty man was always indignant. We were always told by the guilty men that we were taking advantage of their personal liberty. In every instance the man who was guilty was the one who abused the chairman and abused the committee and yelled to high heaven that we were taking advantage of him and that we were taking advantage of his personal liberties. That is the kind of man who was always protesting that there ought to be some protection from these cruel Senators and these cruel chairmen who dared to question him. It was always that way. The innocent man was always very nice about it. However, the guilty fellow was always indignant. He always wanted to abuse the investigators.

As I said, Mr. Traub then became indignant at the suggestion he had paid Powell, and asked that he be permitted to make a statement. As chairman of the committee, I permitted him to make a statement.

He told the committee that he had been practicing law for 27 years and had represented some of the largest realtors in the country. He said he was considered one of the real-estate experts in the country.

Then he said, "I have never paid a bribe or conspired, not only FHA-wise, or in any other way with any official or anybody."

He took the position that we were abusing him. He said it was awful the way we were abusing him. He had been a lawyer for 27 years, he said, and he had never bribed anyone. He said he had never offered anyone any bribe. On several occasions, while under oath, he said he had never given any money or anything of value to anyone in FHA. That is the same man whose books showed that he had written checks for more than a million dollars, and he admitted the checks had been cashed, but could not remember to whom he had given the cash. I presume he still does not remember.

He was indignant, as I said. He said the "implications and insinuations" of the committee members and of the staff, to the effect that he had bribed someone, were "getting him down."

He added, "Now, I haven't, nor do I intend to, nor will I ever resort to bribery, collusion, or graft with anybody." That testimony appears at page 1253 of the printed hearings.

Throughout those hearings we showed him in his own books the hundreds of thousands of dollars in cash payments

charged under "expenses of clients"; but he would never tell us what client or what expenses those payments were for. He never did tell us, except to say that the money went to Schoenfeld, he supposed. We had a stack of checks before us which totaled over a million dollars, all of them made out to "Cash." He admitted they were cashed. The bank stated they had been cashed. We asked him to whom the money had been given. He could not remember anyone, except Schoenfeld. Schoenfeld is dead. Then we would pick out some checks at random and say to him, "To whom did you pay that $20,000?" He would answer, "I don't know, unless it was to Schoenfeld." Poor old Schoenfeld. He was dead. There is nothing on Traub's books to show that he had ever received a loan of money from Schoenfeld or had ever paid back so much as a dime to Schoenfeld.

Traub was examined again on August 26 and was asked to bring in some books. He objected, and finally Senator BUSH, who was then acting as chairman, said: "I shall have to rule that we will subpena those books, and we want them by 10 o'clock tomorrow morning." But the following morning Traub did not appear.

We then subpenaed Traub for an executive session in Washington on September 7, at which Senator BEALL presided. Traub's lawyer again raised technical objections to surrendering the books.

As a result we served a further subpena for those books returnable in New York on September 27, and I personally went to New York to preside at that hearing.

Most of the morning was spent by Traub's lawyer arguing against the production of the books. That is where we found a record of more than a million dollars in cash. I can well understand why they did not want to produce the books. But we ordered the production of the books.

That morning we also examined Traub's bookkeeper. She testified under oath that frequently Traub asked her to draw checks to cash in round sums like $5,000, $10,000, or $20,000; that sometimes he would tell her it was to pay an indebtedness without telling her to whom; and that sometimes he would not tell her what the payment was for.

In those cases where she was not told what the payment was for, she drew the check, delivered the cash to Traub, and charged the amount on the law firm books to "Office expense." That testimony appears at page 2935 of the printed hearings.

We examined Traub further at that New York hearing to inquire where the more than $1 million in cash that funneled through his hands went. But he would never identify any source to which any of that cash was paid, other than the dead man, Schoenfeld.

Finally, as we closed our hearings in Washington on October 8, 1954, we called Traub for the seventh time before our committee, and again we could not learn where so much as one penny of that $1 million in currency went.

The Department of Justice took over where we left off and subpenaed Traub before the grand jury. Being a lawyer, I assume he once took an oath to uphold the law. I think also as an officer of the court one could expect him to cooperate with the Government.

Yet after several appearances before the grand jury, he went to the United States district court in Washington last February 25 and asked for what amounted to an injunction against the Government taking him before the grand jury again.

I was amazed at a lawyer asking the court to prohibit the Department of Justice from taking him before the grand jury to answer the legitimate questions of the grand jury.

Of course Traub had, and still has, the constitutional right, which many of the witnesses before our committee, including Powell, took advantage of, to refuse to answer questions on the ground that the answers might incriminate them under the fifth amendment.

But without availing himself of the fifth amendment, Traub asked to be shielded from the grand jury because he said the special assistant to the Attorney General intended to seek an indictment against him.

The evidence brought out in open court was that Traub had told J. Bertram Wegman, one of his attorneys, that 99 percent of the builders in New York who had large FHA mortgages were forced to pay off to Powell.

The testimony was further that Traub had told Wegman he had been pressured by Powell into giving Powell a check for $11,684, which Powell turned over to Chicago gamblers in payment of a gambling debt.

Wegman's story was that Powell had in effect extorted this money from Traub. Traub did not want to be asked about that, or any other transaction, because he said the Department of Justice wanted to indict him.

The important fact to me is that Traub time and again told our committee under oath that he had never paid any money to Powell.

That is a matter of record, Mr. President. I do not know that it is necessary to place it in the RECORD, but I hold the testimony in my hand. I shall not place it in the RECORD, but it is available to anyone who wishes to see it.

Now Traub asks to be protected from appearing before the grand jury, on the ground that if he does so, the Department of Justice will seek an indictment against him in connection with the $11,684 that went from Traub to Powell, to the Chicago gamblers, in payment of a gambling debt. We tried to subpena one of the gamblers in Chicago to appear before the committee so that we might discuss the Powell matter with him, but we never succeeded in subpenaing him. I hope the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who will be chairman of what I hope will be a subcommittee which will continue this investigation, will bring the gentleman before the committee.

But here is a case in which Mr. Traub admits that he gave a check to Powell for $11,684.

Of course Traub does not want to be indicted. On no less than three occasions before the committee he stated that he had at no time given Powell any money or any checks. He now admits he gave him $11,684, and he does not want the Attorney General to question him about it. The $11,684 was a part of the $1 million. What we are trying to determine and what the Attorney General is trying to do is to find out to whom he gave the rest of the million dollars. Perhaps a large percentage of that amount went to Mr. Powell. We do not know, because he will not talk. Of course, Senators know that the first witness we called before our committee was Mr. Powell, because he was the head of the department at that time. We thought, when we called him, that he was going to give us some helpful information and would aid us. Instead, Mr. Powell, the very first minute he appeared, the very first minute the hearings opened, hid behind the fifth amendment. What did that mean? That was notice to everyone in the United States who had given Mr. Powell any money, including Mr. Traub, I presume, that he need not talk if he did not want to, because Powell was not going to talk. He was saying, in effect, "I am not going to tell the committee who it was that gave me the money"; and he did not tell. At no time did he tell the committee or admit that he had received any money from anyone. But, as Senators well know, the hearings show that we found any number of cases in which he did receive money.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following:

An article entitled "Witness Says Powell Paid Off Bookie by Forced Levy of $11,600 on Traub," written by Morrie Dunie, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, February 26, 1955;

An article entitled "Powell Forced Traub To Pay $11,864 Debt, Testimony Charges," published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, February 26, 1955; and

An article entitled "Jury Asks Traub Contempt Action," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, March 8, 1955. In other words, the grand jury has asked that Traub be cited for contempt.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1955]

FHA SCANDAL INCIDENT — WITNESS SAYS POWELL PAID OFF BOOKIE BY FORCED LEVY OF $11,600 ON TRAUB

(By Morrey Dunie)

A New York lawyer testified yesterday that former Assistant Federal Housing Commissioner Clyde A. Powell once forced Abraham Traub to pay an $11,600 bookie bill.

J. Bertram Wegman said Powell "stuck a gun in Traub's back" to get him to pay the debt. He said Powell actually did not use a gun, but that the action amounted to extortion. Wegman did not give any other details of the alleged incident.

The testimony came during a hearing by District Court Judge F. Dickinson Letts on a motion by Traub to enjoin a District grand

jury from questioning him in its probe of alleged misconduct in the Federal Housing Administration.

Traub, also a New York attorney, also asked that certain records he produced for the grand jury last fall be returned.

Traub was represented by Attorney Arthur Sheinberg.

During the bitter debate yesterday, Sheinberg declared that Max H. Goldschein was out to "get" Traub. Goldschein is the special Justice Department lawyer conducting the grand jury investigation.

Sheinberg called Wegman as a witness to prove this charge, and Wegman testified Goldschein told him that Traub might as well cooperate with the Government now "instead of after he has been indicted and convicted."

Goldschein took the witness stand and denied saying anything like this to Wegman. Robert Roschal, an assistant to Goldschein, then testified he was present at the conversations in New York and Washington between Wegman and Goldschein.

According to Roschal, Goldschein never said he was out to get Traub. He testified he heard Wegman tell Goldschein that all New York builders had to pay off Powell before they could get FHA insured mortgages.

Judge Letts said he would rule on Traub's motions Monday.

[From the Washington Star of February 26, 1955]

POWELL FORCED TRAUB TO PAY $11,864 DEBT, TESTIMONY CHARGES

Existence of an $11,864 check allegedly paid out by a New York attorney and businessman to cover a race bookie debt owed by Clyde Powell, was revealed yesterday in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

The check allegedly was made out by Abraham Traub of New York, a lawyer and head of a real estate firm, according to court testimony. Mr. Powell is former assistant commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

The financial transaction came to light during arguments on a motion by attorneys for Mr. Traub, who has been a witness before a Federal grand jury. The jury, since last October, has been investigating scandals in the FHA.

WANTS QUESTIONING CURBED

Counsel for Mr. Traub asked Judge F. Dickinson Letts to forbid further questioning of Mr. Traub by the grand jury. The request was based on the allegation that the jury is aiming to indict him and that the questioning infringed on his right against self-incrimination. Judge Letts said he would rule on the issue next Monday.

During the proceedings, an attorney for Mr. Traub, J. Bertram Wegman, testified that he was told of the check by Marx Goldschein, Justice Department attorney in charge of the FHA probe. Mr. Goldschein mentioned it in attempts to get Mr. Traub to cooperate with the grand jury and tell what he knows about Powell's dealings, Mr. Wegman declared.

During cross-examination by Mr. Goldschein, Mr. Wegman admitted saying that Powell "held a gun" at Mr. Traub's back in order to get the check. But the witness explained he did not mean "literally" that a gun was held.

SAYS PAYOFF NECESSARY

Earlier, Robert Roschal, special assistant to the Attorney General now assisting Mr. Goldschein, testified that Mr. Wegman had told him and Mr. Goldschein that all New York building projects had to pay off Powell before doing business with FHA.

The lawyers took turns on the witness stand and in cross-examining each other. At one point, Mr. Goldschein began to fire questions at himself. The function of questioner soon was taken over by Mr. Roschal.

At issue was a contention by Attorney Arthur Scheinberg, another of Mr. Traub's lawyers, that Mr. Goldschein had indicated he was out to indict and convict Mr. Traub.

This statement was corroborated by Mr. Wegman. But Mr. Goldschein vigorously denied the allegation and was supported in his denial by Mr. Roschal.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 8, 1955]

JURY ASKS TRAUB CONTEMPT ACTION

A district court grand jury yesterday asked that New York attorney Abraham Traub be found in contempt of court for contumaciously refusing to answer the jury's questions.

The gray-haired Traub, flanked by three lawyers, was in the courtroom when the jury asked Judge F. Dickinson Letts at 4:05 p. m. for the contempt action.

Judge Letts agreed to hear arguments in the matter at 10 a. m. Thursday.

For months, the grand jury has been digging into charges of misconduct in the Federal Housing Administration.

Last October, Judge Letts found Clyde L. Powell, ousted Assistant FHA Commissioner, in contempt for dodging the questions of the same grand jury. Powell got a year's jail sentence and currently is free awaiting appeal of the sentence.

In its presentment yesterday, the grand jury declared that Traub failed to produce all his records on fees he received from 1947 through 1953, and declined to say what he had done with records the jury claims still are missing.

Last November 5, Judge Letts first ordered Traub to produce the records.

On his last appearance, February 28, he was asked whether the sought-after records were in his office when the grand jury first subpenaed him. He replied: "They were in my office, yes," according to the grand jury.

The jury urged Judge Letts to use the court's punitive power against Traub "to preserve the authority and vindicate the dignity of the court."

Among other things, the jury wants to question Traub about allegations that he was high-pressured into writing an $11,864 check for a gambling debt owed by Powell.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not know, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] does not know, and the American people do not know, how much money Powell got and from whom he got it; nor do we know if any of the currency that flowed through Traub's hand went to FHA people and how much went to whom.

But I want to know. Many members of our committee want to know. The American people want to know. And I hope the grand jury will dig until they find out. If my desire to find out who paid whom, and how much, constitutes politics, then I can only say that I am certain the American people want that kind of politics.

Traub refused to tell us to whom he gave the money, but he personally handled the legal affairs of builders who had over a hundred million dollars. On 3 or 4 occasions, under oath, in direct answers to the question, "Did you give Mr. Powell any money or anything of value?" Traub said, "No," and then became very indignant because the committee had asked him such a question. He said he had been a lawyer for 27 years and that his record was unblemished.

Now he admits that he gave Mr. Powell at least one check for $11,684.

Another witness who gave us fantastic testimony was Arthur M. Chaite. Chaite formerly worked for FHA. He also is a lawyer. Telephone records which the committee had subpenaed showed many phone conversations between Chaite's home and Powell's home.

But under oath Chaite could not remember a single conversation he had ever had on the telephone with Clyde Powell.

Chaite worked for the Woodner interests, who received almost $50 million of FHA insured mortgages. Woodner paid him large fees for his work by checks made out to Chaite and deposited in his bank account.

In addition, however, we found among Woodner's records, checks payable to cash totaling about $50,000 which bore Chaite's endorsement.

The bank records showed the checks were cashed for currency. Chaite admitted his signature on the checks, but he testified that he could not remember whether he got the currency for any of those checks, and what, if anything, he did with the currency.

Fifty thousand dollars. Yet he could not remember what he did with it. He had to admit, of course, that his signature was on the back of the checks, because he could see it.

That is what we were confronted with from different witnesses throughout the hearings. They never seemed to be able to remember. They had cashed checks and obtained currency, but they had no record as to whom they paid the currency.

As I said a moment ago, the minute Mr. Powell appeared before our committee, he hid behind the fifth amendment, thereby signaling to everyone in the United States with whom he had had any dealings that they need not talk, if they did not wish to, because he was not going to talk.

Yet we found one bank account of Mr. Powell's, in the Riggs National Bank—and this information is contained in the record—in which he had deposited approximately $150,000 more than his salary during, I think, an 8-year period. But when we produced his income-tax returns, they showed only the exact amount of his salary; they did not show the additional $150,000. Yet he had deposited it. We do not know how many other bank accounts he had. At least, we were not able to find any others.

A former employee of Woodner's testified that on one occasion he identified Chaite at the bank to assist in cashing a check for thousands of dollars.

He testified that he saw the teller hand the currency to Chaite. Yet Chaite asked us to believe that he could not remember, not only what he did with all that currency, but whether he ever even received it.

The FHA must have been a very unusual place if one of its employees, upon leaving the Government's service, was so accustomed to dealing in large sums of currency that he could not even recall having received that amount of currency, much less what he did with it.

There are many other Traubs and Chaites, and I say that the American

people are entitled to know who received those large sums of currency that flowed through their hands.

As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said on the Senate floor on February 25:

A relatively limited examination of a small minority of accounts in only one of the many housing programs has developed scandals beyond compare in the history of our Government.

No truer words were over spoken, and I repeat, "scandals beyond compare in the history of our Government."

I ask the people of the United States whether they think it is politics for us to try to find out what happened to the currency that flowed through the hands of the Traubs and the Chaites?

We know that Clyde Powell in a few years deposited in his bank account about $150,000 in excess of his salary, and the $150,000 was not recorded on his income-tax returns. We also have reason to believe that he put large sums of cash in his safe-deposit box.

I ask if it is politics for us to try to find out who gave Powell that money, and why?

I have only one regret about my participation in the FHA investigation, and that is the pressures that were put upon me by so many persons.

In many cases we were vigorously urged that there were so many projects involving irregularities that we could readily skip this, that, or the other favorite builder.

I am proud to say on the floor of the Senate that we rejected all such pressures. We called them as we saw them; and we reported factually to the people and to the Senate what happened.

In St. Louis, Mo., the Department of Justice tried to proceed before the Grand Jury for an alleged crime involving the Warner-Kanter Co. A former official of FHA, since discharged, in effect pulled the rug out from under the Department of Justice by insisting that the Government was not defrauded.

I refer the Senate to the testimony of Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney, III, in charge of the Criminal Division, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 23, 1954 as to this project. His memorandum on the Warner-Kanter project appears at page 1622 of those hearings. We found substantial additional irregularities in the projects of those companies.

Yet we were subjected to real pressure either to eliminate or to materially soften the comments and factual statements about these companies in our report.

Last fall I asked the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to try to find out who covered up for Clyde Powell during the many years he occupied that top spot at FHA. I wanted to learn why the two FBI reports on Clyde Powell's criminal record never came to the attention of the FHA officials and how they managed to disappear. The records showed that the FBI sent to the FHA reports on Mr. Powell and his arrest record prior to his employment by the FHA in 1934. Those reports disappeared. No one could find them.

I wrote to Mr. Cole, the head of the FHA, and asked him to ascertain what had happened. I wanted to know how it was possible that a man having Powell's arrest record prior to his employment with the Government could have remained on his job after the arrest record had been called to the Government's attention, because when Powell signed his application for employment in 1934, one of the questions was: "Have you ever been arrested?"

Powell's answer was: "No."

In big type at the bottom of the application there is a statement to the effect that if the questions were answered wrongly the applicant, if appointed, would be subject to discharge.

I have received a reply from the administrator, which I think should interest the Senate. I will ask my colleagues to pay close attention while I read the letter. This is Mr. Cole's answer to my letter as to how it was possible for Mr. Powell to remain on the payroll of the Federal Government for so many years, how it was possible for him to be promoted, how it was possible for him to become the head of this big organization, handling hundreds of millions of dollars, when he had the record that was his prior to his coming with the Government in 1934, and when, on at least two occasions, the FBI had called FHA officials' attention to his record, and yet he remained with the FHA. I now read the letter from Mr. Cole:

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I regret the delay in replying to your letter of October 15, 1954. It was my desire, however, that the answers to the three inquiries propounded by you with regard to Clyde L. Powell be as complete as the files permitted. To that end I have caused an exhaustive review to be made of the many investigative reports and other material contained in the files of the Compliance Division of this Agency, as well as the records of the Federal Housing Administration. Certain additional inquiries have also been made by the Compliance Division to clarify the issues.

The facts disclosed are as follows:

1. Powell's original application was addressed to and processed by the headquarters office of the FHA in Washington, D. C., rather than by the field director, which was the normal procedure.

He was hired in St. Louis. Ordinarily the application would be processed there, but in this instance the application was sent to the Washington office, rather than being handled by the field director.

From correspondence between Powell and his St. Louis sponsors and FHA headquarters in Washington, it would appear that Powell may have been aided in obtaining his original appointment by Stewart McDonald, Special Assistant to the Administrator, who shared with Powell a number of mutual friends in St. Louis. Powell's arrests did not become known until he was fingerprinted by the FHA in 1941, since his appointment and employment were not within the civil-service system.

Powell went to work in 1934. According to this letter, his arrest record was not discovered until 1941, but that was before he was made the head of this big department.

2. Records of the Identification Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, show that Powell was fingerprinted by the FHA on August 14, 1941; that the prints were received by the FBI from the Civil Service Commission on October 18, 1941, and that a copy of the ID arrest record was furnished to the Civil Service Commission.

The ID files also reflect that Powell was again fingerprinted on August 4, 1947, by FHA and that the prints were received in the ID on January 10, 1948. The arrest record was then forwarded by the FBI to the Civil Service Commission on March 31, 1948.

No person could be located who recalled taking the prints, and no record could be found of the receipt of the arrest records in the Civil Service Commission. Further, no record of the forwarding of the arrest records by the Civil Service Commission to FHA and no record of their receipt by the FHA could be found.

Research has disclosed that beginning in 1950, pursuant to a Civil Service Commission procedure, arrest records were received in the office of the FHA Administrator and then forwarded to the Personnel Division. The possibility exists that this procedure may have been in effect in preceding years and, if so, that Powell may have been able to intercept his arrest records through connections in the Administrator's office.

I am still reading from the letter of Mr. Cole:

3. Even though Powell was secretive by nature and a lone wolf so far as friendships were concerned, his gambling proclivities were common knowledge among his office associates. Moreover, as early as 1950, and continuing thereafter, his dereliction in duty, as evidenced by unexplained absences from the office as well as his gambling pursuits, were known to his superiors who, nevertheless, vacillated between indecision and decisive action. Powell was interrogated by his superiors on March 17, 1952, regarding the Dunes Club incident in August 1950—

The Dunes Club, by the way, was a gambling establishment at Norfolk—

and denied any gambling losses beyond his pocket money, which was contrary to the facts, but no action was taken against him. His retention in office, therefore, can be attributed in major part to the failure of responsible officials to concern themselves with his background, his dealings with the public, and his unorthodox behavior in both public and private life. There is no evidence of any protection through political influence. None of Powell's former superiors is now with the Federal Housing Administration.

If there is any additional manner in which we may be of service to you or the committee, the resources of this Agency are, of course, at your disposal.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

That letter is not too helpful. It does show, of course, that somebody intercepted Powell's arrest record when it was delivered to the FHA by the Civil Service Commission and by the FBI. In other words, there is nothing in the FHA files to show the arrest record. Yet in the FBI's files and in the Civil Service Commission's files the records show the arrest record was forwarded to the FHA.

I realize that not all FHA projects were fraudulent. I want to say the great majority of them were not, but too many of them were. The large majority of the builders were honest, sincere, and conscientious, but I say to my colleagues too many of them were not. Too many of the FHA employees and officials and too many of the builders were not. I would be the last person ever to want to leave the inference that all projects were

fraudulent, but at the same time let us not leave the impression that there were only 2 or 3 fraudulent cases.

We now know of more than 400 cases in which the irregularities of FHA and builders resulted in mortgages in excess of 100 percent of all costs of every kind.

So far as the Senate is concerned, the important thing now, however, is not to discuss what has not been done by our committee, but to do promptly what needs to be done.

The present chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], submitted a resolution on February 11, 1955, asking for $100,000 to carry on this investigation. I congratulate him on doing that. The amount requested is certainly modest, and should promptly be granted.

If, however, an International News Service dispatch quoted him correctly, I must respectfully disagree with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. That dispatch says that the Senator from Alabama "pointed out that the probe handled by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART last year actually covered only 'several hundred' projects and said a full report might provide a better picture of the situation."

There were 7,000 projects.

We exposed 437 with windfall profits of $75 million, or an average of $170,000 for each project.

Even if there is not a single irregularity in the remaining 6,500 projects—which I doubt is the case—the FHA scandals still smell to high heaven.

Is it not enough that there were $75 million of windfall profits in cases involving at least irregularities and frequently fraud?

On the other hand, I am confident that the Senator from Virginia is completely correct when he says we have only scratched the surface and that there are still many irregularities to be discovered.

I am confident that if the committee will continue a vigorous investigation of these scandals they will find everything the Senator from Virginia has indicated exists—and even more.

I urge the Democrat majority to proceed promptly with a resumption of the search for these frauds.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without the necessity of a report by the Rules Committee, the Senate proceed to consider the resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], Senate Resolution 57, asking for $100,000 to carry on the FHA investigation.

It is my intention, if that unanimous consent is granted, to move the immediate adoption of the resolution so that the committee can promptly resume its investigation of the FHA scandals.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is now in the Committee on Rules and Administration, so the Chair is informed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 57, and that the resolution be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution must lie over for 1 day, under the rule. Therefore, unanimous consent would be required in connection with the request of the Senator from Indiana.

Is there objection?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before any such action is taken, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee which will conduct the hearing, has just informed me that the resolution will be reported from the committee tomorrow, and can be acted upon at that time. In view of the assurance from him, that the resolution will be acted upon and agreed to, and that the subcommittee will then immediately proceed with the hearing, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I so understand, Mr. President; but, reserving the right to object——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana that the order for the quorum call be rescinded?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana that the order for the quorum call be rescinded? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak now in regard to the other request. I rise to speak because of the situation and because I would not want silence on my part to be regarded as acquiescence in all the statements which have been made by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. Let me say that I was absent from the Chamber, attending a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I hope, Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration will move very promptly in this matter. I understand it has already reported the resolution, so it will be on the calendar. But I would not want the conditions laid down by the Senator from Indiana, in the course of his remarks, to be considered as binding on either the majority leader or the minority leader, because whatever action the Senate is to take is of course a matter for the Senate itself to decide; and the order in which the Senate will take up various matters is—and I speak as a former majority leader of this body—a question which should be left to the discretion of the leadership.

I hope the resolution will be taken up promptly, but there are certain other legislative matters which lie ahead of us. If the resolution is not controversial—and I have been informed that it is not a highly controversial matter, and can be acted on promptly, I should think there would be no difficulty in getting it before the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. May we have assurance from the majority leader and the minority leader that the resolution will be taken up in a reasonably short period of time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if I may be recognized for a moment, inasmuch as I simply happen to be sitting in the seat of the majority leader at the present time, let me say I have not consulted the majority leader regarding the position of the resolution on the calendar. I understand the resolution has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I certainly share the feeling expressed by the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I should like to say that our committee decided to request $100,000 for the purpose of carrying on the investigation, and to make a continuing study of the entire housing program. In my appearance before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I said we were requesting, as of that time, $100,000. I called attention to the fact that the committee, under the leadership of the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], had, as I recall, $175,000, and that most likely the $100,000 we were requesting would not be sufficient to enable us to complete the job, but that we were requesting that much in order to get started, and that we would operate on as economical a budget as we could.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me state that although we had $175,000, we spent only $125,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well. I said to the committee that most likely we would subsequently request additional funds.

It is my understanding that the committee voted, on yesterday, to report the resolution, along with several other measures, and that undoubtedly they will be reported to the Senate and be on the calendar as soon as reports on them can be prepared.

Beyond that, of course, the matter is one for the leadership to determine—in short, as to when the resolution will come up for consideration by the Senate.

We know that, as a practical matter, resolutions of such nature, once they have been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, are brought before the Senate at almost any opportune time, and are adopted very quickly.

So, speaking only for myself as an individual Senator, let me say that I feel confident the Senator from Indiana can rest assured that the resolution will get through. It was considered by both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the committees voted to report it in exactly the form in which it

was submitted originally. So I feel confident that the Senate will give its approval.

I assure the Senator from Indiana and the other Members of the Senate that we are going to do a good job in making the investigation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that I shall certainly be glad to discuss with the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] or, in his absence, with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], if he is then serving in the capacity of acting majority leader, the request of the 2 Senators, and to urge that at as early a date as possible the resolution be given consideration.

But I would not want the RECORD to indicate that the resolution would have priority over all other measures, because the leadership must have some discretion in that connection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of both the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], to the effect that the leadership will make every effort to bring up this resolution and the other resolutions, which also are important, and which came, on yesterday, from the Committee on Rules and Administration. Of course we shall be glad to do all we can to have them brought before the Senate for consideration at the earliest possible date.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that if one of the resolutions appears to be noncontroversial, and if it also appears to be one as to which the membership on each side of the aisle can be reasonably spoken for by the leadership, and if there is an opportunity to break into the consideration of some other legislative matter which may be before the Senate, in order to have the resolution considered and adopted, I am sure such an effort will be made.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is very important to have the work continued. We now have a staff, but there are no funds with which to pay the members of it.

However, with the assurances of the majority leader, the minority leader, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator who will be the chairman of the subcommittee which will make the investigation, I am satisfied to wait a few days.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further, so that I may make another observation to my friend, the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It might be well for the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee, who will be spending the money provided by the resolution, to place before the minority and majority leadership the views of other members of the committee, and expressions from Members on each side of the aisle, so as to see if the resolution cannot be disposed of in a very short time later this week.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Committee on Banking and Currency was unanimous in its support of the resolution. I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, representing the Committee on Banking and Currency. The able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] wrote a very strong letter urging quick action on the resolution and its approval. So I feel confident that it is a noncontroversial resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that this particular resolution has not yet been received from the Committee on Rules and Administration. It is not before the Senate.

THE PONTECORVO CASE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last week the press was full of stories about a statement by Dr. Bruno Pontecorvo, one of Britain's top atomic experts who had gone to Russia and was telling the folks back home how much better a place Russia is than our own United States.

I have observed in the press an open letter to Mr. Pontecorvo from Mr. A. N. Spanel, of New York. I happen to know that Mr. Spanel was born in poverty in Europe. He came to the United States and became one of our most successful businessmen. He is among those of our citizens who are most appreciative of the opportunities which the United States has to offer.

I believe he knows the difference between the happy land that Pontecorvo describes and the United States. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the open letter of Mr. Spanel printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO DR. BRUNO PONTECORVO

England, a free man's democracy, gave you refuge from Mussolini's fascism; and you were treated as a free man. Canada and the United States trusted you with their priceless atomic secrets.

The Kremlin now says, in your name, that the British police embarrassed you with their questionings. Hence, so their story goes, you "chose" Russia. Perhaps so. But if you are now a free man, you can easily prove it to a world that questions the very authorship of the propaganda statement attributed to you. Ask your Red guards whose asylum you "enjoy," to give you the free man's right to travel outside the Iron Curtain even as the freedom-loving British gave it to you.

For the right of free movement is as intrinsic to scientists as is the right to exchange what is new in pure science.

Unfortunately, in the police state you find yourself, you probably will not be permitted to read these few words from an American business man, but since ideas may pierce even prison walls, I ask you to consider the following: The Kremlin, in your name, accuses the capitalistic world of preparing to wage atomic war on Russia. Ten days ago it forced General Zhukov into playing the identical role of a second-class Goebbels, peddling the identical propaganda line. How cheap do scientists and generals come in Russia that they are thus degraded?

It's a sad role to be forced into, Dr. Pontecorvo, and sadder still when you know, as you do, that since 1946 the United States has had it in its power to rain atom bombs on Russia, yet never entertained doing so in face of almost endless provocation. You were part of the free world in 1946 and knew that Russia could not have retaliated (for she had no atom bombs then) nor long survived militarily.

It is testimony to the restraint of the western democracies that even in the recent Korean incident, the United States, England, and their allies refused to use the atom bombs that promised such enormous advantage, strategically and politically.

The current Kremlin wolf cry, Dr. Pontecorvo, is the habitual Soviet attempt to mask the catastrophes of Communist failure from within—this time the agricultural failure and its resulting food crisis—by whipping up the fear of invasion when none is in sight. Your name has now been linked to General Zhukov's in a gramophonic duet of fear mongering that must sound as hollow and scratchy to you as it does to Zhukov and to the whole free world.

Brainwashed or prison tethered, you are still a scientist for whom demonstrable facts, even of history, are inescapable. The more the pity.

Sincerely,

A. N. SPANEL,
Chairman, International Latex Corp.
PLAYTEX PARK, DOVER, DEL., U. S. A.

THE MATUSOW CASE

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the morning of March 1, I received at my office an airmail, letter-size, registered envelope with a return receipt requested. The postmarks indicated that it was mailed in Cincinnati, Ohio, on February 28. In the upper left-hand corner of the addressed side of the envelop, there appears the following: "The Cincinnati Enquirer, one of the world's greatest newspapers, office of the secretary."

This envelope did not contain a letter. Its sole content was a tear sheet of the editorial page of the Sunday, February 27, 1955, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer. An article on that editorial page under the byline of James Ratliff and entitled "The Matusow Case" was partially circled in red, indicating that it was the intention of the sender to call this particular article to my attention.

Mr. President, my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have already had that article made available to them, since on last Friday, March 4, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did me the unintentional kindness of having the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, for the sake of continuity and for the convenience of those who may read today's RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the extension of remarks of the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, as they appear on page A1437, of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1955, be again inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MATUSOW CASE

(Extension of remarks of Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, in the Senate of the United States, Friday March 4, 1955)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis by Mr. James Ratliff with respect to the Matusow case.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 27, 1955]

"THE MATUSOW CASE

"(By James Ratliff)

"One of the most remarkable exhibits of irresponsibility ever seen, even at Washington, D. C., was staged this week by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas Democrat, as chairman of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee.

"Nothing ever charged to Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, his predecessor, came near the spectacle put on by Mr. MCCLELLAN with Harvey Matusow. Mr. MCCLELLAN took a man who already had publicly confessed that he was a perpetual liar, and gave him a nationwide, congressionally immune Senate forum to promote the book in which he psychopathically describes his own lies. As if this weren't enough, Mr. MCCLELLAN put the mess on television.

"Senator MCCLELLAN knew that the publisher of this book could answer under oath whether or not he was a Communist. He knew that Matusow's press conferences were staged by Carl Marzani, notorious jailed Communist, and Nathan Witt, who refused to reply when asked if he was in Alger Hiss' Soviet espionage cell. Yet despite all this, Mr. MCCLELLAN questioned Matusow in front of cameras and newsmen on the ground that he wanted the truth from Matusow 'if the truth was in him.'

"For 1 week Matusow had been babbling, 'Read the lies in my book.' This was a book by a Communist, openly parroting the Communist lies. But instead of questioning Matusow behind closed doors, Mr. MCCLELLAN chose to give the Communists of America their outstanding propaganda coup of years.

"I met Matusow in October 1951. He was brought here by Martha Edmiston, one of the Federal Bureau of Investigation undercover agents who had helped so much 16 months before with the Enquirer's Communist exposé before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"Matusow was a swarthy but alert young man in a snappy Air Force sergeant's uniform. He kept twisting pipe cleaners into funny little animals while he talked. Maybe it was a warning. Martha, then a public relations official of Wright-Patterson Air Base, told us:

" 'This is the fellow who drove Wright Field brass into shudders when he listed the Communist Party and 46 Red fronts in his background. But he's a former Commie who wants to talk, Jim.'

"Matusow could type, so we put him at a typewriter to do his life story. It was an interesting tale of Red intrigue, 37 pages of it. But it still lies unused in Enquirer files, because only a little of it could be verified by us. One verification was a copy of the Daily Worker, the Commie paper, of January 29, 1951. In it Matusow was pictured as expelled from the Communist Party for misrepresentations. (How ironic can you get?)

"By coincidence, the Communists were helping to form the National Negro Labor Council, a Red front, over on Central Avenue. Matusow said he could identify some of the Communists, so he went over there with reporter Joseph Green, who had the news story.

"Matusow recognized some Communists all right. But they recognized him as a traitor to the party and threw him out. The Enquirer reported the incident, without using Matusow's name.

"In a few weeks Matusow was bounced out of the Air Force. He went to testify before the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. I told Sid Isaacs, commission counsel, that he might be able to use Matusow for a while as Commie spotter and research man. This is a calculated risk, but the best way to investigate a secret conspiracy is a man who has been in or can get into it.

"Mr. Isaacs told Matusow he would give him about $300 a month, but Matusow didn't actually last a full month. He started working on January 21, 1952, identifying Red literature, but had to go off for 10 days in February to testify in Washington, Sid told me.

"When Matusow got back from Washington he had forgotten the repeated warnings that he was just a Communist trying to undo the harm he had caused. He became a big-time agent. Without a by-your-leave, he went off to Yellow Springs, Ohio, site of Antioch College, and suddenly, to the horror of Isaacs, issued a press statement.

" 'Antioch has at least 400 potential Communists on its campus,' Matusow blurted. Even if true, Matusow didn't know this and he had no authority to open his mouth anyway. Isaacs, who had given him endless warnings, blew up. Matusow was due to testify before the Senate, so Sid paid him off at the end of February.

"We never saw Matusow again, but heard of him. He made occasional headlines, romping from one trial and hearing to another as a witness. Many columnists, including ourselves once, mentioned him briefly. But when he began identifying Owen Lattimore and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam as Reds we became worried. We looked up his forgotten story in the files.

" 'He didn't tell us he had met Lattimore or Oxnam,' I told the city editor Jack Cronin. 'He may be lying.' But we were unable to prove his possible lies any more than his story, and we didn't print it.

"Now Matusow admits he lied about Lattimore and Oxnam. He says he doesn't know when he ever told any truth. This leads to speculation the Communists may have published his expulsion to set a decoy who would discredit all Communist investigations.

"Credence to this theory is lent by the fact that Matusow, again a Communist, is linking every Communist exposer he can think of with his lies.

"But his tissue of lies is mainly hackneyed Communist Party line stuff. For example, I am supposed to have told him (his book says) 'not to overshadow the Ohio Commission, as they need the headlines for votes.'

"The Commies aren't even clever. This has been the Communist Daily Worker line for years. Imagine me giving a hoot whether the 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats on that commission from all over Ohio got votes for the Ohio legislature.

"Matusow quoted Sid Isaacs as telling him to 'break up unions in Dayton, Ohio.' The old mouldy Red line. Not only is Sid so liberal that the Republicans wouldn't give him a job in the State Department which asked for him but whenever he goes after Communists like those leading the United Electrical Workers, a decent American union benefits.

"I don't think Matusow was planted from the start, however. Too much of his original tale was corroborated by Government committees. The Commies wouldn't dare let him expose so much just for the later harm he could do. They probably blackmailed him back into line when it became obvious to them, too, that he was lying for headlines.

"But the harm is done. All over the country people who never say an unkind word about communism are saying it's all a tissue of lies. The fact that endless FBI files send the Commies to jail—not just a Matusow—doesn't bother them. They keep croaking it's all a witch hunt.

"As for Senator MCCLELLAN'S great book promotion that has aided the Communists? Well, it's your move now, Senator."

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, after reading the article by James Ratliff, whom I have never met, I must confess that I was surprised by its contents.

With reckless abandon of truth and facts, and in his unrestrained haste to criticize and condemn, the author of the article predicated his attack against me and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on a wholly false premise. It is hardly conceivable that any columnist or newspaper man in America did not know that it was the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that was then conducting the Matusow investigation, and that the distinguished and able senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, it will be noted that Mr. Ratliff concluded his article with this statement, "As for Senator MCCLELLAN'S great book promotion that has aided the Communists? Well—it's your move now, Senator." I immediately searched for but did not find the name of either the publisher or the editor of the paper on the editorial page on which this article was published. I did find, however, printed in the upper lefthand corner of that page the following:

Declaration of faith by the Cincinnati Enquirer, April 10, 1841: If we fail, that failure shall not arise from a want of strict adherence to principle or attention and fidelity to the trust we assume.

Partially because of that profound declaration, I made the charitable error of assuming that Mr. Ratliff was possibly an irresponsible columnist who did not necessarily represent the policies or reflect the views of this—"One of the world's greatest newspapers." I did not know at that time that he is the vice president of the Cincinnati Enquirer. I believed that the responsible authorities of this paper would, when the full significance and import of this erroneous article was called to their attention, publicly acknowledge the falseness of it and the malicious and vicious implications it conveys against every member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

I then learned that Mr. Roger Ferger is the publisher of the Cincinnati Enquirer. I reached him by telephone, and after a brief discussion of the article and its false premise and serious implications, he stated that the matter would have his prompt attention. Accordingly he directed his Washington representative, Mr. Glenn Thompson, to call on me. For that consideration and courtesy by Mr. Ferger, I wish to express my thanks.

Mr. President, I assume there is no way that this publication or Mr. Ratliff can completely undo all of the harm this article has done, but in all fairness I should like to relate for the record the

action they have taken in an attempt to at least partially right the wrong they have committed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which I received from Mr. Ratliff, dated March 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER,
March 3, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I owe you two apologies—one of which I shall give as much prominence and space as was given you in my column on February 27.

The mailing of the column without an enclosed letter was not intentionally discourteous but done in haste. I was trying to rush off copies in order to forestall more of Matusow's appearance, and with my secretary gone and a mail deadline to meet, rushed it off as received. I sent you the column because I would not dream of personally referring to you as I did without letting you know as soon as possible.

As to the confusion of your two committee assignments, I apologize for an inadvertent slip. Quite unfortunately it put upon you the entire onus when it was merely the committee of which you were one-ninth. This error will be corrected in my next column. You must admit that the subcommittees have complex ramifications, especially with the permanent investigating committee having so completely overlapped the Eastland Committee functions.

The best way to prove to you that personal malice does not enter into anything I write is the enclosed Times-Star clipping and its circumstance. I think I was the first person in the United States to whom Matusow told his original story. The story Matusow was telling then was, I believe, true. It was too detailed and incriminated too many names to be a Commie plant. Yet we here were dubious of Matusow's glib egotism and extreme forwardness. We never touched the story. Consequently, to be dragged into Matusow's lies is particularly galling.

You know of course what it means to expose communism. You have suffered the endless jibes and certainly the fevered tension of this uniquely uncomfortable crusade. Well, I have been at it 5 years, through congressional and State hearings, with more than my quota of insults. The Times-Star clipping shows graphically how disgruntled rivals seize on any opportunity to degrade anyone with a reputation as a Communist hunter.

I know from the celebrated TV hearings that you are a conscientious, loyal, and as disgusted with endless Red hippodroming and chicanery as I am. I believe it was your best judgment that Matusow be turned over simply to the Justice Department for quiet grand jury inquiry and prosecution. You say you urged that. I cannot understand what compelled you to change your mind and go along with this spectacle. As you went along, because the reason I inadvertently placed the action as your responsibility alone was that the Associated Press had constantly used you for a spokesman on the hearing. Senator EASTLAND is too new, I suppose.

There is no doubt that among many fair-minded persons Matusow's public appearance is discrediting him, but all too many Americans are attracted by sensation and headline. No matter how repugnant a thing is they flock around it in fascination simply because it wins attention. I therefore feel that this hearing has infinitely more possibility of spreading the confusion and distrust the Communists so dearly love to do than of discrediting its principal. Most Communists yearn to be martyrs. And a public forum enables them to perform beyond their wildest hopes. They should be restricted in Government hearings to only the most necessary questions when there is any chance of their putting on a show.

Matusow may be a psychopathic liar but he is no fool. And he is being advised by the same sinister anarchial minds which turned Judge Medina's courtroom into a travesty of decorum. The most successful public things the Communists have ever accomplished are their stunts in making one American mistrust another.

Had Matusow been nailed down for his openly admitted perjury before the publicity-barren facade of a grand jury his subsequent conviction would have amply labeled his book, without the sensation that inevitably will now attract the curious. He was no ordinary Red witness to be exploited. He already had admitted the crime of perjury.

You certainly know that the eastern press, along with thousands of amateur and professional civil-rights cliche howlers, look endlessly for material to discredit people like you and me, and important witnesses like Elizabeth Bentley. They care not how dubious the weapon. In my opinion, the Eastern press has been comparatively silent on this juicy morsel of what they normally label the travesty of Communist hearing procedure, simply because they are enjoying the trap into which the Red hunters have fallen.

I wish you had stuck to your initial resolve. But meanwhile I wish you the best possible luck in having this hearing turn out the way you hoped. I would rather be wrong on my whole thesis than give your enemies and mine the slightest crumb of satisfaction.

You have my sincere apology and best wishes.

Very truly yours,

JAMES RATLIFF.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not take time to read the letter, but I shall refer to some paragraphs of it.

That letter, Mr. President, while expressing an apology, makes a feeble attempt to justify some of the contents of the article, since the author was at the time laboring under provocations caused by articles published by a rival newspaper, the Cincinnatti Times-Star, about him and his connection with Harvey Matusow. But that provocation did not warrant, nor does it excuse, this libelous attack upon the Internal Security Subcommittee and its members.

It is further noted that he says in his letter, "I wish you had stuck to your initial resolve"—referring, Mr. President, to the fact that I had declined to call Matusow before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. He is bound to know that I kept that resolve. Mr. Matusow has not yet been called before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

However, Mr. President, as a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I did acquiesce in the desire of its Chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and other members of the subcommittee to hold the public hearings of that committee at which Mr. Matusow has testified. As we all know, the jurisdiction of the Internal Security Subcommittee in that field is much broader than that of the Government Operations Committee and its Investigating Subcommittee, and I felt that if Mr. Matusow was to be called before any committee in connection with the book False Witness and his confession of repeated perjuries, the Internal Security Subcommittee was the proper and logical one before whom he should be required to appear.

Prior to the time this article was published, I had stated to the press, and in the presence of the Cincinnati Enquirer's Washington correspondent, that since this investigation had been undertaken it was my hope that the testimony of Matusow and other witnesses in the investigation would reveal that the book False Witness was inspired by a desire on the part of its author and its publishers to serve the Communist cause; that it would be shown that the publishers of the book are either members of the Communist Party or that they are strong Communist sympathizers; and that the evidence would further reveal that its publication is being sponsored and financed by individual Communists and Communist organizations. Those views I believe are shared by every member of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

That Matusow, the author of the book False Witness, and his publishers, Cameron and Kahn, are primarily motivated by a purpose to aid the Communists, in my opinion, is being established by the hearings now in progress before the Internal Security Subcommittee.

The book, its author, its publishers, and the advance purchasers of it are now, I believe, being exposed for what they really are. They now stand discredited before the bar of enlightened public judgment.

It is hardly conceivable to me that any loyal and thinking American who recognizes and abhors the evil of communism will now be interested in purchasing the book False Witness. I would not purchase a copy of it, for by so doing I would feel that I was contributing to the Communist conspiracy in this country.

I believe, Mr. President, the most effective way to fight and destroy communism is to expose the vicious evil of it and the traitors to this country who espoused it.

As has been noted, Mr. President, the first paragraph of Mr. Ratliff's letter to me of March 3 reads as follows:

I owe you two apologies—one of which I shall give as much prominence and space as was given you in my column of February 27.

In some measure, he kept that promise in the Sunday, March 6, issue of his paper, under the title "A Correction."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article to which I have just referred, entitled "A Correction," which was published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 6, 1955, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CORRECTION

My column was in error last week in implying that Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas Democrat, was responsible for placing Harvey Matusow, turnabout Communist, on the stand at Washington. I apologize to Senator MCCLELLAN.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi Democrat, is chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee hearing Matusow, and Senator MCCLELLAN is merely one of the subcommittee's nine members. Senator MCCLELLAN is chairman of the permanent Investigating Subcommittee (formerly headed by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY) and he has informed the Enquirer that the committee he heads had declined to hear Matusow.

Answering our charge that the appearance of an admitted Communist liar on the stand only benefits the Communist Party, Senator MCCLELLAN disagreed. He said he went along with the other committee in hearing Matusow because he felt it was the best way to discredit Matusow and his book on false testimony.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to revert again to the profound declaration of faith of this newspaper to which I referred earlier in my remarks—"If we fail, that failure shall not arise from a want of strict adherence to the principle or attention and fidelity to the trust we assume."

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are indispensable essentials to human liberty. Those freedoms must be preserved. But freedom carries with it an obligation of honor, of reliability, and of responsibility. It does not license a newspaper or a columnist to bear false witness in what it publishes.

The article, The Matusow Case, by the strongest implications, falsely accused the members of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate of a "great book promotion that has aided the Communists." I have recorded here today all that Mr. Ratliff and the Cincinnati Enquirer have done to repudiate their false witness against Members of the United States Senate. Those who read this record may now judge how well they have discharged the strict adherence to principle and attention and fidelity to the trust they have assumed.

Mr. President, I may say I appreciate the extent to which the newspaper and the author of the article, who is vice president of that publication, have gone in trying to rectify this wrong.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for having indicated to me the general nature of the article. I may say I probably insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD fewer matters than does any other Member of the Senate.

How the article ever came to my desk, I am at a loss to understand. I am sure it was sent in the mail. As a result of the usual routine by which such matters are prepared, every once in a while I find myself submitting, for printing in the RECORD, a matter which is not too familiar to me.

I noticed that the article bore the general label of the Matusow case. If it had occurred to me for a moment that the article contained any reflection upon the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] or upon any other Member of this body, I would have been the last person to have inserted it in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I began my service in the legislative branch with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas, a long, long time ago. I have developed a deep and abiding affection for him. I know of no one who has brought to the public service greater fidelity to duty and greater patriotism than has he. So if there was any disparagement or any derogation by means of the article, I regert it exceedingly; and in so far as I am able to make amends, I shall certainly do so.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest hesitation whatever in apoligizing, both publicly and privately, if by any act of mine, either directly or indirectly, there has been any aspersion upon the reputation, integrity, or character of public service of any Member of this body.

I say to my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, that had I known about the article and had I examined it a little more carefully, it would not have been inserted by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois. I was surprised when I found the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But today, before I sought recognition by the Chair, I went to the Senator from Illinois, to tell him that I was compelled to refer to the article; and I showed him a copy of the remarks I would make, so that he might know of them.

I am glad to know that it was through inadvertence that the Senator from Illinois inserted the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I could not conceive that he would do so otherwise, because I know it is not the general rule of conduct of the Members of this body to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles which are malicious and vicious regarding other Members of the Senate.

I am very grateful, Mr. President, for the very kind expression which has been made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois.

I may say that I regret to have taken this much of the time of the Senate in order to make the RECORD today or to correct the implications of the RECORD as it stood as of this morning. But I felt that the fight against communism is so serious and is so important a part of the duty, responsibility, and obligation of every good American citizen, that I should make these remarks. Sometimes we may use bad judgment in our efforts in the Congress and on congressional committees. We may disagree as to the means by which to approach our goal and to maintain our opposition to communism, and in our efforts to stem the tide of influence of communism. But I may say it does not serve that cause, in which all of us should be united, if, merely because a person happens not to agree with a committee's decision to call a particular witness and to have him testify under oath, such person indulges in criticism to such an extent as to challenge the patriotism, loyalty, and motives of Members of Congress who conscientiously are trying to render the proper service to their country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further to me?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, having served for 2 years on the same committee with the Senator from Arkansas, in our pursuit of the sinister forces which would destroy the free concept of this country, I can testify, out of long experience and almost daily association in that committee, to the unremitting zeal of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas in his efforts to protect the institutions and the great concept of freedom, which is the wellspring of this country. I salute him now for the zeal and vigor he has brought to that task.

In that committee there have been differences of opinion and judgment, but, in the main, as between himself and me, they have always been considered, as they should be, objectively and in a spirit of almost complete amity.

So, out of that long experience, Mr. President, I can testify again to the great public service my friend, the senior Senator from Arkansas, has rendered in that field.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of considering nominations on the executive calendar, with the exception of Calendar No. 68, the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran. It is agreed that that nomination shall be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Capt. Amos A. Jordan, for appointment as professor of social science, United States Military Academy, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George W. Perkins, of New York, to be the United States permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, vice John C. Hughes, resigned.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

John Von Neumann, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the Secretary will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar, with

the exception of Calendar No. 68, the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Iran, which, without objection, will be passed over.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Noah Shepardson, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Theophil Carl Kammholz to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, among the most serious obstacles to good government in our time is the difficulty in recruiting for the public service experienced and capable citizens of demonstrated integrity. I regard it as our great good fortune when such a citizen, at considerable personal sacrifice, accepts appointment to a public office, where rewards are few and brickbats many.

Theophil C. Kammholz, prominent Chicago attorney, was nominated by the President for the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. He was approved for the post by a majority of my fellow members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is difficult to see, how on the basis of his character and career, the committee could have decided otherwise.

Mr. Kammholz, the son of a Lutheran minister, was born in Wisconsin and educated in the public schools of that State. In 1932 he was graduated from the law school at the University of Wisconsin, and engaged in the general practice of law until 1943. In that year he entered the public service as regional attorney for the Regional War Labor Board in Chicago, serving for a period of 8 months, whence he left to resume private practice. Since that date he has dealt primarily with the law of labor relations and is widely regarded as an expert in that field, an expertness particularly essential to the General Counsel of the NLRB. In 1954, Mr. Kammholz acted as an adviser to the United States Government delegation at the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva and filled that role with distinction.

Mr. Kammholz appeared before our committee and testified at length. The only witnesses who appeared against him were representatives of local printing trade unions in Chicago. They charged that some 12 years ago, Mr. Kammholz, while regional attorney for the War Labor Board, had been guilty of conduct which they alleged involved a conflict of interest. Mr. Kammholz entered a firm denial and our committee regarded the charge as not proved.

In his testimony, Mr. Kammholz enumerated 16 different labor unions with which he had dealt in the course of his career. Among these were such major organizations as the CIO Steelworkers, Auto Workers, and Electrical Workers, and the AFL Machinists and Building Service Employees Unions. None of these opposed Mr. Kammholz, nor did their parent federations, the AFL and the CIO. The only objection other than that of the local Chicago printing-trade unions was a written communication from the Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, independent. The Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers is one of those unions expelled by the CIO as Communist-dominated, and I regard its objection as a tribute to Mr. Kammholz.

My distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are the only members of our committee to sign the report recommending against the confirmation of Mr. Kammholz. As I have indicated, there is nothing either in his career, his character, or in the record to justify rejecting Mr. Kammholz. To the contrary, the Senators from Illinois and Michigan in their report specifically concede that he is a man of integrity, competence, and character—page 1. I quote further from their report:

> Theophil C. Kammholz has had an honorable record as a practicing attorney (p. 13).
>
> * * * * *
>
> With the exception of one incident in 1943 as to which there was contradictory testimony, there is no evidence that Mr. Kammholz acted other than as an honorable and able advocate for his clients' interests in all these years. Indeed, those who appeared before the committee to oppose his nomination freely conceded as much (p. 5).
>
> * * * * *
>
> The foregoing is a record of which any practicing attorney could well be proud (p. 5).

The sole basis for opposition to Mr. Kammholz is the assertion that one who, in the labor-relations field, has represented management exclusively, is incapable of attaining that objectivity and impartiality which the position of General counsel requires.

Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed by the increasing frequency with which nominees for public office are opposed solely by reason of their backgrounds. I fear this development. It contains the seeds from which might spread the view that American society is divided into classes whose interests are forever irreconcilable. This doctrine of class conflict is alien to our traditions and unjustified by the facts of our national life. I sincerely hope it never becomes a part of our existence. Mr. Kammholz has amply demonstrated his honesty, his integrity, his ability, and his unquestioned competence for the post of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. I move the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Theophil Carl Kammholz to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am reluctantly compelled to rise in opposition to confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Kammholz to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of views, signed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and myself, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWS OF SENATORS PAUL H. DOUGLAS AND PAT MCNAMARA IN OPPOSITION TO THE CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THEOPHIL C. KAMMHOLZ TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The undersigned, members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without reflecting on the character, competence, or integrity of the nominee, are convinced from the evidence in the hearings that Theophil C. Kammholz does not possess certain qualities which are uniquely required in the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Accordingly we believe and recommend that his nomination to that post should not be confirmed.

NATURE OF THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The powers and duties given to the General Counsel by law are far reaching. They can affect the welfare and relations of business enterprises and their millions of employees across the country. Certain of these powers are not reviewable, by courts or by the National Labor Relations Board, and cannot ultimately be delegated under the law to any other person or tribunal.

The statutory provision is as follows:

"There shall be a General Counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. The General Counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law" (sec. 3 (d), Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947).

It is thus clear that the General Counsel of the NLRB is not a "general counsel" in the usual meaning of that term in connection with other agencies and departments—a legal counsel advising the agency and acting under its control and direction.

The General Counsel of the NLRB is in fact administrator, housekeeper, prosecutor, and supreme judge of initial jurisdiction (or, one might say, Lord Chief Justice and Lord High Executioner), all wrapped up in one.

In the exercise of these functions, the law makes him independent of the Board. His supervisory and administrative powers over the Board's attorneys (with exceptions specified) and over the regional officers and employees are absolute. He has final authority over investigations, issuance of complaints and their prosecution.

It is in connection with the issuance of complaints, and most specifically in the refusal to issue them, that the extremity of the General Counsel's power is most clear. While the issuance of a complaint is ultimately reviewed by the NLRB itself and then possibly by the courts, the General Counsel's refusal to issue a complaint is not reviewable by anyone. This provision,

unique in administrative law, enables the General Counsel to close the door to the NLRB firmly and securely, and the parties thus shut out have no right of appeal. His decision is final.

That this power is not a mere theoretical one, but is one of great practical importance which goes to the heart of labor-management relations, is evident from the list of some recent decisions of the General Counsel refusing to issue complaints. As inserted in the hearings (pp. 10–11, hearings), they are as follows:

No. 1014. September 3, 1954. 34 LRRM 1601. Did employer violate act by hiring nonunion men ahead of pensioned union members? (No.)

No. 1013. September 3, 1954. 34 LRRM 1533. Did companies, members of trade associations, violate act by locking out employees of 3 companies because of strike against 1? (No.)

No. 1008. August 27, 1954. 34 LRRM 1512. Did unions violate the act by engaging in organizational picketing? (No.)

No. 977. July 16, 1954. 34 LRRM 1436. Did employer violate act by refusing to give union time study data? (No.)

No. 951. July 16, 1954. 34 LRRM 1208. Did employer violate act by refusing economic data to support its claim of inability to pay a wage increase? (No.)

No. 918. April 15, 1954. 33 LRRM 1527. Did a company violate the act by seeking a State court injunction? (No.)

No. 923. April 22, 1954. 33 LRRM 1527. Did a company violate the act by refusing to allow an employee to be represented by counsel in presenting a grievance to it? (No.)

No. 909. March 25, 1954. 33 LRRM 1461. Did a company violate the act by paying a Christmas bonus only to nonunion employees and refusing to bargain with the union about it? (No.)

No. 899A. March 10, 1954. 33 LRRM 1439. Did company violate the act by discharging a supervisor for union activities and then refusing to rehire him as a nonsupervisory employee for that reason? (No.)

No. 879. January 6, 1954. 33 LRRM 1218. Did company violate the act by discharging truckdrivers for failure to cross a fruit pickers' picket line? (No.)

No. 864. December 15, 1953. 33 LRRM 1137. Did employer violate the act by shutting down plant within 30 days after concluding a contract with a union? (No.)

No. 868. December 15, 1953. 33 LRRM 1137. Did union violate the act by securing discharge of union member who refused to pay increased union dues? (No.)

No. 851. November 30, 1953. 33 LRRM 1107. Did employer violate act by discharging two employees who attended an NLRB hearing without giving notice? (No.)

No. 856. November 30, 1953. 33 LRRM 1108. Did union violate the act by striking during the life of an agreement? (No.)

On basic matters of statutory interpretation, findings of fact and application of the law to the facts, therefore, the General Counsel of the NLRB has the power of life and death over charges by employers and unions. We do not think this provision of the law is wise or just. But it was enacted by the 80th Congress and is the law. We must deal with it as it is. And under it the General Counsel has sweeping and arbitrary powers.

NEED FOR IMPARTIALITY IN HIGHEST DEGREE

It is primarily because of this uniquely unreviewable, arbitrary power in the General Counsel, that impartiality, disinterestedness, objectivity, and lack of bias in the highest degree are required of any nominee to that post.

Customarily, great power in our Government is safeguarded by liberal checks and reviews. Here the only restraint possible on this independent NLRB General Counsel in his refusal to issue complaints is a self-restraint bred of his training and experience and the long-developed pattern of his conduct and thinking in a judicial capacity.

Indeed, in the case of judges, a higher court or associate justices on the same appeal level are always available to correct mistakes of judgment and to counterbalance the unfair effects of bias. Judges can likewise disqualify themselves when cases involving some past clients or adversaries come before them, and other judges are at hand to rule on them. With the General Counsel of the NLRB in his refusal to issue complaints, there are no such checks, no appeals, and no coordinate adjudicators. Consequently, impartiality and lack of bias to an even greater degree than that required of judges are obviously essential. Only then can the demands of justice be met. Only in such circumstances can the NLRB and its processes administered by the General Counsel merit the necessary public confidence.

A mere intention to be fair, honest as it may be, is not enough. The required impartiality and lack of bias are more than a conscious state of mind. They grow out of a background of balanced study and professional work, a general pattern of even-handed action and thought, a "bent" of a judicial and objective character—at least for this unique post they seem to us to rule out those who come directly with the deeply ingrained habits of advocacy over a long period of years for either employers or employees.

An especially heavy obligation is, therefore, imposed on the Executive of the Nation to present a nomination of one who clearly possesses these attributes. And a coordinate obligation rests upon us in the Senate to determine whether the nominee possesses the essential qualification for this powerful position. From a review of his background we are reluctantly compelled to conclude that he does not.

THE PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE NOMINEE

Theophil C. Kammholz has had an honorable record as a practicing attorney. The first 11 years were spent in general legal work in Wisconsin. This was interrupted by 8 months of service as regional counsel for the War Labor Board in Chicago in 1943.

The 11 years that followed were devoted to legal practice in Chicago with two different firms, both of excellent reputation. During all this period and with both firms, Mr. Kammholz spent most of his time in the labor-relations field. He represented management exclusively. He acted for employers in collective bargaining, in arbitrations, in grievances, in cases before the National Labor Relations Board, and in general consultations.

In the summer of 1954, Mr. Kammholz served as an adviser to the United States Government delegation to the International Labor Organization Conference in June, where he advocated that our United States delegation take a favorable position on a resolution for 2-week vacations with pay, despite employer opposition.

In his 11 years of employer representation, Mr. Kammholz acted in matters of public record for such large and well-known firms as:

Wieboldt Stores
R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.
Cudahy Packing Co.
Fairbanks, Morse & Co.
Inland Steel Co.
Peoples' Gas, Light & Coke Co.
Spiegel, Inc.
Tucker Corp.

And also for the following companies and employer associations:

Chicago Foundrymen's Association.
Cinch Manufacturing Corp.
International Register Co.
Paragon Die Casting Co.
Frederick Post Co.
Muncie Malleable Foundry Co.
American Rubber Products Corp.
Bastian-Morley Co.
Benton Harbor Malleable Industries.
Edward H. Anderson & Co.
Chrome-Rite Co.
Coleman Co.
Ditto Press, Inc.
Electric Storage Battery Co.
Great Lakes Plating Co.
Indiana Steel & Wire Co.
Kaplan's Department Store.
Molded Products Corp.
Marengo Foundry Co.
Masonite Corp.
The Perfect Circle Co.
Reliable Paste & Chemical Co.
Simpson Optical Co.
Warner Machine Products Corp.

Mr. Kammholz further reported that in his professional work he has appeared against the following unions:

United Steelworkers—CIO.
United Auto Workers—CIO.
International Union of Electrical Workers—CIO.
A. F. of L. Molders and Foundry Workers.
Building Service Employees: General Service Employees Union—A. F. of L.
Teamsters Union—A. F. of L.
United Electrical Workers—independent.
Farm Equipment Workers—independent.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers—independent.
International Association of Machinists—A. F. of L.: Die and Tool Makers Lodge.
International Printing Pressmen—A. F. of L.
Amalgamated Lithographers—CIO.
Basic Processors Union—A. F. of L.
Gas Workers Union—A. F. of L.
International Woodworkers—CIO.
Retail Clerks International Association—A. F. of L.

With the exception of one incident in 1943 as to which there was contradictory testimony, there is no evidence that Mr. Kammholz acted other than as an honorable and able advocate for his clients' interests in all these years. Indeed, those who appeared before the committee to oppose his nomination freely conceded as much.

NOMINEE'S LONG ADVOCACY OF EMPLOYER INTERESTS MEANS LACK OF ESSENTIAL IMPARTIALITY

The foregoing is a record of which any practicing attorney could well be proud.

But we do not believe such long-confirmed advocacy, all on one side of the employer-employee relations and disputes, fits this nominee to serve in the sensitive and uniquely powerful post of General Counsel to the NLRB. We are convinced that with this constant and exclusive experience on the employer side, he cannot have the lack of bias and prejudice, the openmindedness, the impartiality and the balanced view of the equities that are required for this post.

This is nothing against Mr. Kammholz as a person or his competence or integrity. But it represents a clear conviction that he is not the person for this particular position. This unwise provision of the law requires in the General Counsel a degree of objectivity and judicial temperament which this nominee cannot rightly be said to possess.

The duties of an advocate are the very antithesis of the duties of a judge. In bargaining and in advising employers who are resisting efforts of union to bargain, the advocate is necessarily a partisan. He is employed to discover and present the strongest points in support of his client's position. In justifying and protecting and advancing his client's interests, he necessarily seeks out and assails the weak points of his adversary.

In Mr. Kammholz's case, the objectors to this nomination have conceded that he "displayed in behalf of his clients the firmness, aggressiveness, ability, and reliability expected of a very able employer's attorney" (hearings, p. 18).

But such constant and long-continued advocacy for 11 years is bound to condition any man's habits of thought and action, to give him a bias or bent, however unconsciously, that is not consistent with the highest impartiality required in the General Counsel of the NLRB.

While we were glad to note his services to the United States delegation to the ILO, his apparently disinterested advice to this advisory group can hardly counterbalance 11 years of able and aggressive advocacy.

We are convinced that a hue and cry would have been raised if a previous administration—or the present one—had nominated for this post a person who came fresh from the ranks of labor or labor's legal advocates. We would ourselves have opposed it as lacking the requisite impartiality for this sensitive job.

We cannot believe that from State labor relations agencies, other offices of the Federal Government, the academic world or arbitration groups, someone with more impartial experience and training than Mr. Kammholz has had could not have been found. The previous incumbent as General Counsel had established an honorable and enviable record for such impartiality.

Service to management or labor is not a disqualification for public office generally. But long-continued advocacy for one side, without an intervening period of public service, is a disqualification for General Counsel of the NLRB, whose arbitrary and well-nigh dictatorial powers we have summarized before.

As we have said, it is not primarily a matter of character or intention, though both are, of course, essential. It is also a matter of impartial experience, judicial habits, proven lack of bias, a deep-seated bent for balancing the equities of both sides. To the degree required in the General Counsel of the NLRB by the law, we believe Mr. Kammholz does not possess these qualifications.

PRACTICAL OBSTACLES TO NOMINEE SERVING AS REQUIRED BY LAW

Were Mr. Kammholz' nomination to be confirmed, an impossible situation would arise, for it is almost a certainty that both of his two law firms and various ones of his former clients and union adversaries (whose membership must aggregate over 5 million) will continue to appear in contested matters before the National Labor Relations Board.

As brought out in the hearings, a trial judge in such a situation would disqualify himself and pass the matter on to another judge for trial. An appeals judge would disqualify himself and allow the other appeals judges to decide the case.

But the General Counsel of the NLRB has an exclusive and final authority with no one in a coordinate position to whom he can transfer the responsibility which the statute gives to him. We grant that in many cases the field staff and regional attorneys would handle the initial decisions in routine manner. But all of them serve under the General Counsel's supervision, and the final responsibility is his. And hotly disputed matters and those involving any close questions of law or fact would necessarily come to him for final decision.

When asked what he would do in such cases involving his former law firms or former clients or adversaries, Mr. Kammholz replied that he would delegate these matters to members of his staff to decide.

But the statute does not authorize and surely Congress did not intend to permit these arbitrary and unreviewable powers and responsibilities of the General Counsel to be simply delegated to persons selected by him.

It is as if a judge should say, "In all cases of my former firm or clients, I propose to let my law clerk decide the issues. But I shall sign the order." No one would dream of suggesting that this device would conform to the basic principles of just procedure. But in such a case at least there could be an appeal to a higher court.

If the General Counsel of the NLRB refuses to issue a complaint against a recent employer client, however, the decision is final. And no one is going to be impressed with the fairness of the procedure if the General Counsel himself makes that decision. And many are going to doubt both its fairness and its legality if he seeks to delegate to some subordinate a final authority granted only to him by law, under a Presidential nomination confirmed by the Senate.

In matters affecting, as these do, the life and death of unions, the success and failure of business enterprises, and the peace and profitability of complex industrial relations, we believe the Senate cannot condone the possible exercise by some unknown person of these extreme and arbitrary powers—or confirm a nominee whose very success in the private practice should disqualify him to act in many cases that will come before him.

DANGERS TO PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

This is the fifth major appointment this administration has made to the National Labor Relations Board, 4 board members and 1 General Counsel. Two of the four board nominees came fresh from responsible experience as representatives of employer interests and the other two had rather clearly revealed before their appointment that their orientation was proemployer.

If now in the delicate and powerful post of General Counsel—the most important job in the NLRB—another long-time advocate of employer interests is placed, we fear that public confidence in the impartiality of the board will be even further weakened.

Now we do not, of course, take the position that a person with management experience is thereby automatically disqualified from employment as a member of the National Labor Relations Board. Just as we do not take the position that a person with labor experience is necessarily disqualified by reason of such experience.

But we do view with alarm, and we think many people of this country have a right to view with alarm, a policy which in effect says that only employer-minded people are going to be appointed to jobs which by their very nature require judgments as between the merits of union and employer positions. This sort of appointment policy is on the way toward undermining the confidence of millions of people who work for a living in the impartiality of the present Board.

Already long-established lines of decision are being reversed by the new majority on the NLRB. It begins to look as if amendment of the law is being accomplished by administrative decisions of the Board, without so much as a by-your-leave to the Congress of the United States.

We fear the present nomination may cap the climax of this unhealthy development. We most earnestly declare that a policy which results in appointments coming only from employer ranks, or from people who have employer oriented interests, is wrong. This is an appointment which should never have been made and of which we cannot approve.

THE 1943 INCIDENT

Representatives of printing trade unions in Chicago reported an incident which occurred in October 1943, just 2½ days before Mr. Kammholz resigned from the regional staff of the War Labor Board, which also raised a serious question in their judgment as to his fitness for this position.

They reported that, as a Government representative, late on Friday, October 29, 1943, he had met them and received from them inquiries, complaints, and information of a fairly candid and confidential character concerning their bitter dispute with the R. R. Donnelley & Sons printing company. The following Monday, November 1, 1943, they then met Mr. Kammholz as co-counsel for the same Donnelley company in hearings that then began before the National Labor Relations Board.

They were confident that he must have known of his forthcoming association with the firm representing the Donnelley company at the time of his earlier meeting and discussion with them, and that his failure to disclose this future connection with their adversary was a breach of accepted principles against conflicts of interest. This raised a serious further question in their judgment as to his impartiality.

Mr. Kammholz in reply stated that he could not recall the incident of October 29, 1943, and that his duties with the War Labor Board did not include any action on wage matters of the Donnelley Co.

The testimony on this incident is in conflict. We believe the opposing witnesses and Mr. Kammholz all gave an honest account of their recollection. But in view of the conflict on this event of some 12 years ago, we do not rely upon this incident as one of our grounds of opposition to his confirmation.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, we believe the Senate should not consent to the nomination of Theophil C. Kammholz to the position of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.
PAT MCNAMARA.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I point out that my objection to this nomination was raised largely because of the unique and extraordinary powers which are given to the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board under the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

The General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board is not only made the legal officer of the Board, but he is also made the Administrator. He is in charge of the officers and employees in the regional offices. He has supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board, with certain exceptions. He is also the prosecutor.

Perhaps most important of all is the fact that this General Counsel has final authority, on behalf of the Board, with respect to investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect to the prosecution of such complaints before the Board. That means that if a union believes it has a grievance, requiring a hearing before the Board, the General Counsel may deny the union the right to prosecute its case, and the decision of the General Counsel is not reviewable by the Labor Relations Board or the courts. It is final, controlling, and complete.

These are extraordinary powers, which I think are unique in the whole history of American administrative law. In fact, they are a legal monstrosity and should never have been included in the act. Nevertheless, they are in the act; and the fact that such great powers are given to one official requires extra care in the nomination and confirmation of a suitable person for this post.

We do not attack the character of Mr. Kammholz. On the contrary we say that, so far as we can determine, he is an honorable man.

We do say, however, that this post calls for a man who has not been closely identified with one side or the other of labor controversies.

The record of the hearings, which is summarized in the report, shows that since Mr. Kammholz resigned from the War Labor Board in 1943, after a brief period of service as a regional officer of that Board, he has represented employers exclusively—some of the largest employers in the country—and they are listed. He has appeared against 16 or 18 of the largest unions in the country. His practice has not been of a general nature. It has been of a highly specialized nature. In that specialization he has represented exclusively one side of labor-management disputes.

In view of the fact that appointments of the present administration to the Board have been largely drawn from this same group of employer-oriented persons, I believe the administration should have shown more care in selecting a man for this sensitive and powerful office.

It would be almost inevitable that a man with the clients that Mr. Kammholz has had should carry with him some of that bias to his new post.

A judge can meet such a difficulty by dissociating himself from a case and disqualifying himself from a matter under consideration. He can do this because there are other judges who can fill his place, and the processes of law can go on.

Mr. Kammholz, however, cannot disqualify himself. The statute makes him the final authority. For him to say that he can get one of his subordinates to sit on cases on which he will not pass would be equivalent to having a judge say that if his former firm or clients should appear in court he will ask one of his legal clerks to decide the issues. That is not dissociating himself from a case or providing a satisfactory alternative.

I fear that if we confirm this nomination the Board, the parties before it, and the General Counsel himself are in for trouble. Therefore, without any criticism of Mr. Kammholz, himself, I say that in a matter of such importance as this the appointment should not have been made, and that the Senate should not confirm it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it occurs to me that character is, after all, the foundation of every good human attribute. Whether it be patience or restraint, or whether it be fairness or impartiality, all such questions rest upon the foundation of character. If we begin with character, I am confident that we can expect fair administration of an office by a man who possesses in high degress the quality we call character.

I have examined with a great deal of interest the minority views submitted by my colleague from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. The first part of those views deals with the wisdom or unwisdom of delegating such powers to the general counsel as he possesses under existing law. The second part of the minority views deals with the record. The third part deals, I would say, with a kind of psychological analysis of what Mr. Kammholz's mental processes, thoughts, habits, and potential actions might be under given circumstances. That is not meant invidiously, of course. However, as I examined the minority views I could almost contemplate Marc Antony standing at the bier of Julius Caesar. With great skill he constantly alluded to the fact that Brutus was an honorable man, while at the same time, speaking deftly and skilfully, he made it appear that Brutus was not the man he should be.

I have examined the minority views. Starting with character as the foundation for any public service, I read in the opening sentence that my colleague from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan state:

> Without reflecting on the character, competence, or integrity of the nominee—

At least it would appear that he is a competent man and that he is a man of character and a man of integrity—

> are convinced from the evidence in the hearings that Theophil C. Kammholz does not possess certain qualities which are uniquely required in the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

I notice on page 3 of the minority views that the Senators agree the nominee "has had an honorable record as a practicing attorney."

If he is a man of honor, he must be a man of character, no matter whether he was a specialist on one side of the fence or the other in the whole field of labor relations.

The Senators state also that the nominee was associated in legal practice in Chicago. They say that the nominee devoted 11 years to "legal practice in Chicago with two different firms, both of excellent reputation."

However, say the signatories of the minority views, from a review of his background they are reluctantly compelled to conclude that he does not have the required qualities. He was associated with two law firms of outstanding competence and good reputation, but, they say, he does not have the required qualities.

I notice on page 5 of the minority views the signatories state:

> With the exception of one incident in 1943 as to which there was contradictory testimony, there is no evidence that Mr. Kammholz acted other than as an honorable and able advocate for his clients' interests in all these years. Indeed, those who appeared before the committee to oppose his nomination freely conceded as much.

They say further:

> We are convinced that with this constant and exclusive experience on the employer side, he cannot have the lack of bias and prejudice, the open-mindedness, the impartiality and the balanced view of the equities that are required for the post.

Mr. President, if character means anything, it means impartiality. If character means anything, it means a capacity for one to rid himself of bias and to condition his mind under any circumstance to be fair and judicial.

The minority views also state:

> This is nothing against Mr. Kammholz as a person or his competence or integrity.

Mr. President, in other words, he is a competent man, say the signatories. They say he is a man of integrity. However, they say:

> But such constant and long-continued advocacy for 11 years is bound to condition any man's habits of thought and action, to give him a bias or bent, however unconsciously, that is not consistent with the highest impartiality required.

Mr. President, I recall all that was uttered in a rather unkind spirit at one time, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, about one from a Southern State who had been nominated for appointment to the Supreme Court. They expected him to be completely divested of an unbiased attribute of mind. They expected him to move in all directions at once. Yet he has turned out to be one of the most solid and substantial members of the Supreme Court in my long experience in Washington.

I think of a former Senator who came to this body from the great State of Michigan. He came here endowed with great wealth which he made for himself. Much of it, I understand, was invested in Government bonds which were then entirely tax free. There was a belief that he would be a reactionary conservative when he reached this body, but he turned out to be one of the great liberals of the United States Senate in his time.

I think, Mr. President, of a judge of a Federal circuit court in one of the Atlantic seaboard States, and I recall my own examination into his record when he was identified with certain "yellow-dog" contracts, as they were called. When he was appointed and the question of the confirmation of his nomination was before the Senate, the greatest of imprecations and maledictions were uttered against him. Yet, he has turned out to be an extremely liberal judge.

So, Mr. President, if Mr. Kammholz is an honorable man, if he is an able man, as my distinguished colleague, and as the Senator from Michigan say he is; if he is a man of character, if he is a reliable man, if he is an able man, as they say; if he is a competent man, as they say, what more is required in the public service to discharge his responsibility?

I note on page 5 of the minority views that our distinguished colleagues say:

> In Mr. Kammholz' case, the objectors to this nomination have conceded that he—"displayed in behalf of his clients the firmness, aggressiveness, ability, and reliability expected of a very able employer's attorney."

What finer qualities ought we to attract to the Federal service than firmness, aggressiveness, ability, and reliability?

But they say it is not a matter of character and intention, though both are, of course, essential. They say:

> It is also a matter of impartial experience, judicial habits, proven lack of bias, a deep-seated bent for balancing the equities of both sides.

That is interesting language, Mr. President. Let us give him a chance to see whether there is a deep-seated bent for balancing the equities. If he is a man of character, of competence, of ability, of aggressiveness, of reliability, of firmness, what further attributes are needed in order to make sure that he has that deep-seated bent if it is given a chance to manifest itself?

My esteemed colleagues also say in their views:

He served as an adviser to the United States Government delegation to the International Labor Organization Conference in June, where he advocated that our United States delegation take a favorable position on a resolution for 2-week vacations with pay, despite employer opposition.

What finer encomium could be given a man than that? He had one brief opportunity in public service, and there he acquitted himself with high credit to his country, to himself, and to his own sense of fairness. But, say those who signed the minority views:

His apparently disinterested advice to this advisory group can hardly counterbalance 11 years of able and aggressive advocacy.

The qualities are there and his character is there, and on the brief occasion when he could manifest them, he has done so. That brings to my mind, Mr. President, the quotation—

The noble Brutus has told you that Caesar was ambitious, and if so, it were a grievous fault.

But no fault has been pointed out. This has been a psychological analysis of what a man's mind might do. Let us give it a chance in the orbit of government, and see what it will do.

I notice that our esteemed colleagues say, also:

Service to management or labor is not a disqualification for public office generally.

Then they say:

Long continued advocacy for one side without an intervening period of public service is a disqualification for the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, there is pending in the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate the nomination of a very distinguished lawyer from New York to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. As I gather from the record—and I heard all the testimony as a member of the committee—he was one of the most skillful attorneys in the field of monopoly and antitrust actions. But he was on the other side from the Government. As a matter of fact, he came to Chicago and, with great brilliance as a lawyer and great competence as an advocate, argued the Du Pont case which was brought by the Government.

What other points are emphasized in behalf of this very brilliant lawyer from New York that would qualify him for a place on the highest judicial tribunal of the land? His competence is pointed out, Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the case of Judge Harlan, to which, I take it, my colleague refers, he had an interim period serving on the bench in New York, and although his service was not protracted, he had a period of decontamination from excessive advocacy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it may be argued that 1 period on the bench can decontaminate a man who has been at the bar for 30 years.

Mr. Kammholz has been at the bar for 11 years. He was on the War Labor Board in its regional capacity in Chicago for 6 months, and he was an attorney for the representative to the International Labor Organization. Frankly, I do not know how long it requires for a man to decontaminate himself under those circumstances, but I am willing, Mr. President, to gamble upon his fairness when every element and every component of character are present. And that has been freely conceded.

We are not concerned here today, Mr. President, with the wisdom or unwisdom of the powers enjoyed by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. That is a matter for the Congress to determine. We are passing only on the fitness and the capacity of a man to occupy a position in government quite aside from the powers which are involved.

So, as I appraise this record, Mr. President—and I sat with Mr. Kammholz throughout the entire hearing of the Committee on Education and Labor—even those who came to complain about some incident in Chicago were the first to concede his competence, his character, and his ability. I think, Mr. President, the Government of the United States and the public service will be enriched indeed with a clear-eyed, open-faced young man in a responsibility of this kind, and I earnestly hope that his nomination will be confirmed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a memorandum which I have prepared in connection with this nomination.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION REPORT

First. On page 2 it is stated:

"His (the General Counsel's) supervisory and administrative powers over the Board's attorneys (with exceptions specified) and over the regional officers and employees are absolute."

Comment: As a matter of fact the power to hire, fire, promote, demote and discipline such employees rests not with the General Counsel but with the Board. Heretofore the Board has delegated this authority to the General Counsel, a delegation which it can withdraw at any time. Moreover, even under the delegation, final approval for the designation of regional directors rests with the Board.

Second. On pages 2–3 the report refers to the unreviewable power of the General Counsel to refuse to issue complaints and asserts that this "arbitrary" power is a grave defect in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Comment: Under the Wagner Act this power to refuse to issue complaints rested with the Board, but just as under the present law it was a final power not reviewable by any other agency or court. Hence, the only difference between the 2 statutes in this respect is that final unreviewable authority rested with 3 persons under the Wagner Act and with 1 person under Taft-Hartley. The disappointed complainant, in either case, could get no review from a higher tribunal.

On the other hand, the setup under the Wagner Act permitted the Board to act both as prosecutor and judge, a procedure repugnant to every American concept of due process of law. Taft-Hartley by separating these two functions restored due process in this field of the law.

Third. On page 5, it is stated that Mr. Kammholz' background is bound "to give him a bias or bent, however unconsciously, that is not consistent with the highest impartiality required in the General Counsel of the NLRB."

Comment: The report fails to adduce a single specific example of bias or prejudice in Mr. Kammholz's career to support this generalization. As a matter of fact, the report admits (p. 5) that in his service with the ILO in 1954 he took a position advocated by labor and opposed by employers. Thus the only concrete evidence dealing with Mr. Kammholz's attitude in the entire record, affirmatively indicates that this background does not determine his attitudes when acting as a public servant.

Moreover, the courts have uniformly held that a charge of bias against any person acting in a judicial or quasi-judicial capacity can be sustained only by specific evidence of bias in concrete instances and not by a marshalling of background material from which a generalized inference of bias may be drawn on exclusively psychological or literary grounds.

If the theory asserted by the report were to prevail, a judge could be disqualified for bias to sit in any case involving an issue which, in the past, he has decided in a particular way.

4. On page 6 it is stated:

"But the General Counsel of the NLRB has an exclusive and final authority with no one in a coordinate position to whom he can transfer the responsibility which the statute gives to him."

Comment: His authority is final but the statute does not declare it to be exclusive. Thus, from the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act almost 8 years ago, only a tiny percentage of the complaints issued among the thousands of charges filed have been the result of the personal decision of the General Counsel. The overwhelming majority of charges have been disposed of by the regional directors, and in a small number of cases, by the General Counsel's top assistants in Washington. This was equally true under the Wagner Act, and neither statute provided for an administrative appeal to either the Board itself or the General Counsel, respectively. Where such appeals are granted, they are a matter of grace and not of right.

5. On pages 4–5 the report lists 16 unions with which Mr. Kammholz dealt at various times in his career. They include such major unions as the CIO Steel Workers, Auto Workers, Electrical Workers, The AFL Machinists, and Building Service Employees Union.

Comment: Among these 16 unions, the only protests to Mr. Kammholz's confirmation came from the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, independent, expelled from the CIO as Communist dominated, and local printing trade unions in Chicago. The latter, made the general charges of bias because of background on which the report itself is based and referred to an alleged conflict-of-interest incident in 1943 said to involve Mr. Kammholz. But the report itself, because of the conflicting testimony, does not rely on this incident in its opposition to confirmation. Thus, it is plain that the overwhelming majority of the unions with which Mr. Kammholz dealt, including the major unions, evinced no opposition to his appointment, and the objections of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers is to be regarded as an accolade rather than a condemnation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Theophil C. Kammholz to be General Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota, to be a member for the remainder of the term of 2 years from December 1, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the routine nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the routine nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Chester R. Davis, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran, be not considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. STENNIS. I move that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 10, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 8, 1955:

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Capt. Amos A. Jordan, Jr., O27895, for appointment as professor of social science, United States Military Academy, effective March 1, 1955, under provisions of Public Law 449, 79th Congress, and section 520 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Chester R. Davis, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Charles Noah Shepardson, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1954.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Theophil Carl Kammholz, of Illinois, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1957, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years, expiring January 27, 1958, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years, expiring January 27, 1958, and until her successor has been appointed and qualified.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board for the remainder of the term of 2 years from December 1, 1953.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert H. S. Eakens, of Texas.
Henry H. Ford, of Florida.
Merrill C. Gay, of Ohio.
Graham R. Hall, of Arkansas.
Mose L. Harvey, of Maryland.
Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia.
James R. Johnstone, of Virginia.
Clifford C. Matlock, of California.
Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska.
Philip H. Trezise, of Maryland.
J. Raymond Ylitalo, of Minnesota.

Randall S. Williams, Jr., of New York, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 3 to class 2.

Henry C. Ramsey, of California, a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John W. Auchincloss, of the District of Columbia.
John A. Chappelear, of the District of Columbia.
John F. Correll, of Ohio.
Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., of New York.
Donald B. Eddy, of Connecticut.
Robert Eisenberg, of Virginia.
John W. Ford, of Virginia.
Leo A. Gough, of Rhode Island.
Stanley I. Grand, of Missouri.
Herbert W. Griffin, of California.
Robert J. Halliday, of New Jersey.
Henry S. Hammond, of Pennsylvania.
William K. Hitchcock, of Virginia.
Russell B. Jordan, of Wyoming.
Abe Kramer, of California.
Stanley R. Lawson, of California.
Edgar L. McGinnis, Jr., of Virginia.
Louis C. Nolan, of Florida.
Richard C. O'Brien, of New Jersey.
Charles E. Rogers, of Connecticut.
Joseph M. Roland, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Tomlinson, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Rodger C. Abraham, of Maryland.
Edwin M. Adams, of Illinois.
Hugh M. Adamson, of Virginia.
John L. Barrett, of Texas.
George A. Berkley, of Pennsylvania.
Keirn C. Brown, of New York.
Robert W. Caldwell, of North Carolina.
Miss Margaret A. Fagan, of Iowa.
George S. Freimarck, of Maryland.
Justie E. Gist, of Iowa.
Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Warren G. Hall, of Washington.
Dwight B. Horner, of Virginia.
Thomas D. Huff, of Indiana.
J. Alfred LaFrenière, of Massachusetts.
John S. Meadows, of Massachusetts.
John G. Oliver, of California.
Harold W. Pfau, of New Jersey.
Harry M. Phelan, Jr., of Tennessee.
Ferdinand F. Pirhalla, of Pennsylvania.
Normand W. Redden, of New York.
Reed P. Robinson, of Utah.
Kenneth J. Ruch, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor W. Sandford, of Massachusetts.
Schubert E. Smith, of New York.
Richard L. Sneider, of New York.
Mrs. Lucille M. Snyder, of Missouri.
William B. Sowash, of Ohio.
Bertus H. Wabeke, of Massachusetts.
William H. Wade, of California.
Frederick S. York, of New Jersey.

Scott George, of Kentucky, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4 and to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4.

Robert M. Beaudry, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Chester G. Dunham, of Ohio, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 6 to class 5.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Karl D. Ackerman, of Oklahoma.
Joseph P. Bandoni, of California.
William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.
Hampton E. Brown, Jr., of Maryland.
Robert L. Burns, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Bushwaller, of Iowa.
Max R. Caldwell, of Texas.
Everett L. Damron, of Ohio.
John R. Diggins, Jr., of Maine.
George A. Ellsworth, of Georgia.
Miss Helen V. Garrett, of Oklahoma.
John W. Gordhamer, of California.
Miss Anna C. Gustavs, of California.
Arvid G. Holm, of Washington.
Thomas J. Hunt, of New York.
Anthony J. Jay, of Illinois.
John W. Jelich, of New York.
Edward P. Kardas, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary A. Kellogg, of Michigan.
Joseph A. Livornese, of Colorado.
Miss Charlotte M. McLaughlin, of Washington.
Jack C. Miklos, of Idaho.
William D. Morgan, of New York.
Robert L. Mott, of California.
Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
James B. Parker, of Texas.
Richard W. Petree, of Virginia.
John M. Powell, of Illinois.
Ralph C. Rehberg, of South Carolina.
W. Courtlandt Rhodes, of California.
Charley L. Rice, of Texas.
Emery Peter Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Virginia C. Stryker, of Washington.
Miss Margarite H. Tanck, of South Dakota.
Charles P. Torrey, of California.
Miss Irene Toth, of California.
Allen R. Turner, of Missouri.
James M. Turner, of Tennessee.
Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
Leland W. Warner, Jr., of Kansas.
Miss Alice D. Westbrook, of California.
Ralph H. Wheeler, Jr., of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
Robert T. Burke, of New York.
Robert J. Carle, of California.
Charles M. Gage, of Illinois.
Harold E. Grover, Jr., of Florida.
Stanley P. Harris, of New York.
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Johnsen, of California.
Henry G. Krausse, Jr., of Texas.
Franklin O. McCord, of Iowa.
Donald W. Mulligan, of Kentucky.
John Patrick Owens, of the District of Columbia.
James A. Parker, of Maryland.
Arthur H. Woodruff, of the District of Columbia.
James G. Sampas, of Massachusetts.
William R. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Edward J. Conlon, of Tennessee.
Charles F. Edmundson, of Illinois.
Tom A. Noonan, of Kentucky.
Lawrence E. Norrie, of California.
John P. Rhodes, of Ohio.

Thomas J. Needham, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Jack Liebof, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. (This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on November 8, 1954, and confirmed by the Senate on December 2, 1954.)

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Willis J. Marsh, Gordon.

ARIZONA

Henry L. Worischeck, Flagstaff.
Jerome B. Roberts, Parker.
Theodore Ralph Schmidt, Tolleson.

CALIFORNIA

Paul D. Hickcox, Agnew.
Vincent P. Murphy, Daly City.
Harry B. Woodbury, El Centro.
Mary J. Ramos, Farmington.
William E. Kester, Independence.
Harvey J. Kohler, Irvington.
Leland C. Barnard, Lynwood.
Norman Elwood Case, Orange.
Constance H. Post, Randsburg.
Phillip R. Freer, Rocklin.
Ralph A. McWaid, Twentynine Palms.

COLORADO

Richard D. Nelson, Lafayette.
Millard E. Ryan, Rocky Ford.

CONNECTICUT

Benjamin F. Wells, Shelton.

FLORIDA

James L. Ennis, Merritt Island.

GEORGIA

George W. Greene, Bluffton.
Marian L. DeLoach, Clyo.
Mathew H. Stevens, Jr., Danville.
Ora W. Adams, Dewey Rose.
Clara B. Kilpatrick, Midway.
Horace L. Fletcher, Mount Berry.
Shelby Deck, Rocky Face.
Paul P. Hunt, Silver Creek.
Leon C. Lewis, Twin City.

IDAHO

Richard P. Swanstrum, Ashton.
Taylor R. Bowlden, Cascade.

INDIANA

Gordon L. Schaefer, Andrews.
Maude Kendall, Cannelton.
Gilbert G. Gerster, Dillsboro.
Edmund G. Sollman, Haubstadt.

IOWA

Ray L. Haefner, Arthur.
Duane V. Clow, Gladbrook.
Evadne V. Fehrer, Lacona.
Alvin J. Goemaat, Leighton.
Mary E. Colwell, Livermore.
Thelma A. Godfredsen, Ringsted.
Louis F. Clay, Rudd.
William D. Parker, Stanhope.
Orlyn M. Enabnit, Swaledale.
Sigfred M. Johnson, Swea City.

KANSAS

John H. Leach, Arlington.
Melvin E. Decker, Bison.
Clarence W. Taylor, Chapman.
Melvin L. Butler, Fulton.
Irvin L. Magner, Galesburg.
Alfred H. Martens, Hepler.
Arthur H. Penner, Hillsboro.
Harry W. Arnold, La Roy.
Kenneth D. Bretz, Lucas.
Cleo L. Greenfield, Melvern.
Herman F. Kiesow, Osage City.

LOUISIANA

Carl D. Walker, Lena.
Milford L. Green, Natchitoches.
Malin A. Mary, Pleasant Hill.
Ione M. Estopinal, St. Bernard.

MARYLAND

Josephine P. Allison, Deale.
Ernest C. Zebuhr, Jr., Derwood.
Elizabeth H. Roberson, Dickerson.
Norman J. Schnepfe, Edgewood.
John Russell Carroll, Federalsburg.
Margaret R. Randall, Glen Echo.
Marion E. Slingluff, Mitchellville.
John D. Munnford, Vienna.

MASSACHUSETTS

Marshall E. Carroll, Chilmark.
Jerome A. Gallant, Jr., Green Harbor.
John S. Burnett, Housatonic.
William R. Richmond, Jr., North Wilbraham.
Donald M. Lincoln, Rutland.
Laurence J. Stange, South Deerfield.
Rosamond T. Marshall, Sterling.
Robert P. McMahon, Westfield.

MINNESOTA

George Ralph Laniel, Brooks.
Eugene C. Wensman, Chokio.
Donald J. Bode, Courtland.
Celia M. Mattinen, Esko.
Walfred R. Wicklund, Istanti.
Irven J. Kopischke, Janesville.
Edward C. Distel, Lakeland.
Melvin J. Moravec, Lonsdale.
Verlyn F. Cornelius, Medford.
Martha M. Freer, Oak Park.
Felix J. Eggen, Underwood.

MONTANA

Ruth Ish, Chester.
Olga Strand, Reserve.
Alma E. Fischer, Somers.

NEBRASKA

Harold D. Lessig, Gurley.
Edwin A. Misegadis, Lodgepole.
Eiet M. Wagner, Roseland.

NEVADA

Anna M. Houck, Weed Heights.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Thomas W. Golden, Hinsdale.

NEW MEXICO

Lucille G. Salazar, Dulce.
Charles Earnest Cooper, Melrose.

OKLAHOMA

Martha C. Roach, Chelsea.

OREGON

Flossie M. Coats, Boardman.
Thomas M. Biggar, Jr., Canyon City.
Leon M. Matheny, Jacksonville.
David I. Hoover, Mapleton.
E. Marjorie Ogan, Marcola.
Glen R. Sandford, North Plains.
Francis G. Petrie, Rogue River.
Nellie A. Bembry, Sisters.
Ray Kurz, Umatilla.
Doris H. Weaver, Valsetz.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edna M. Darragh, Amity.
Bertha E. Snyder, Dickerson Run.
Catharine B. Shultz, Dublin.
Kenneth H. Williamson, Edgemont.
Frank L. Bucko, Ford City.
William Jerome McMullin, Millheim.
Joshua J. Baker, Mineral Point.
Bian B. Walker, Jr., Mount Pocono.
Fred D. Starr, Muncy Valley.
Ralph H. Landes, Royersford.
Harold E. Walters, Sidman.
Demetrius Gula, Southwest.
David L. Dickson, West Monterey.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth Y. Curran, Brunson.
William W. Cone, Saluda.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence L. Shabino, Alexandria.
Eunice A. Sjerven, Bristol.
William L. Truex, Montrose.
Thomas V. Niederman, Morristown.
Matthew Voigt, Spencer.

UTAH

Donald F. Keele, Dugway.

VIRGINIA

Robert A. Wilkinson, Arrington.
Theodore Reese Hall, Callao.
Silverius C. Churn, Cape Charles.
Homer J. Amos, Chatham.

Walter E. Sealock, Falls Church.
Jerry W. Alford, Glasgow.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mary M. Leslie, Cowen.
Glen R. Dial, Harts.
Howard L. Carpenter, Hepzibah.
William D. Workman, Hillsboro.

WISCONSIN

Marvin W. Babbitt, Bloomer.
Raymond T. Huinker, Cato.
Lester V. Gilbertson, Coon Valley.
Arthur L. Ewen, Francis Creek.
DuWayne J. Bloch, Green Lake.
Robley H. Evans, Hawthorne.
Edward C. Hammer, Hillsboro.
Richard C. Cross, Larsen.
Dan H. Kimball, Marengo.
William A. Knoll, Mayville.
Arthur E. Bauer, Sussex.
Lloyd W. Bryant, Waterford.
Gordon A. Peterson, Waupaca.
Leo J. Verhasselt, Wrightstown.

WYOMING

Anthony M. Ries, Cheyenne.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Vernon F. Gallagher, president, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of heaven and of earth, boundless in wisdom and infinite in power, give us who were molded in Thy image and likeness the vision and strength to look beyond personal advantage to the goal of common welfare; to see the shadow of tomorrow's evil in today's apparent good; to fear the lack of principle more than the results of following it; to recognize, even in the welter of material considerations, the oft-forgotten fact that man does not live by bread alone.

Grant that, while the government is upon their shoulders, these dedicated agents of a free people may feel the power of Thy special blessing and merit a full measure of that reward which is destined for all who undertake to be their brother's keeper. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POTENTIAL RED AGENTS RELEASED IN FALSE COMMUNIST "LIBERATION" MOVE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I strenuously object to the admission to the United States, or to any Territory or mandate either totally or partially administered by the United States, of Dr. Malcolm Bersohn and Mrs. Adele Austin Rickett.

These two American nationals, both graduate students, were released by the Chinese Reds on February 27, after having served approximately 3½ years in prison as self-confessed spies.

Accounts of what they had to say, together with their pictures, have been splashed across the front pages of our American press. Their comments have been carried on American TV and radio. In my opinion, altogether too much sympathy has already been wasted upon them.

The woman's husband, Walter A. Rickett, remains to this day a prisoner of the Chinese Reds. It has not been made public, perhaps it is not even known, who happens to be Dr. Bersohn's particular hostage. A tremendous proportion of the stories about them insist that they have been brainwashed.

I do not argue the truth or falsity of the hostage or brainwash situation. I do argue that their usefulness as American citizens has come to an end.

During the Korean conflict, a few—a very few—American prisoners of war succumbed to the insistence of Red propaganda. Those who elected to return to their native land were subjected to courts-martial and are now either before the proper courts or have already been sentenced. I believe that these men were no better, no worse, than Mrs. Rickett and Dr. Bersohn. Three-and-a-half years ago we were engaged in a struggle with Red China that was a war in everything except the name. The two people recently released gave aid and comfort to the enemy at that time.

Should they be allowed to return to the United States, or to our possessions, there is no assurance that they would continue to act in any capacity save that of agents of the Red Chinese. Enough Red agents are now currently operating here, without our going to great lengths to import two additional agents.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that, since Dr. Bersohn and Mrs. Rickett are acknowledged enemies of our way of life, they be returned to live out their lives in Communist China.

I know of no more just, no more stringent, sentence than the one I have just proposed should be meted out to these two people.

By their deeds, by their words, they have forfeited their God-given right to live in America and to call themselves Americans.

THE LATE MR. JOHN T. JONES, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in behalf of a man who wrote his name not in water but in indelible ink upon the humanitarian record books of this Nation in behalf of the working men and women of America, Mr. John T. Jones, of the United Mine Workers of America, who passed away last week.

There is an old saying that "Man proposes but God disposes." It would be well for Congressmen to realize the truth of that saying. John T. Jones lived by those principles, because evidently the good Lord was on his side in life, in his work in behalf of the working men and women of America.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE JOHN S. WOOD

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Members of this body on both sides of the aisle are most happy and proud, as I am, that our good friend and former distinguished Member of the House, John S. Wood, was appointed by the President last Friday, March 4, for a 3-year term to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

John Wood served 12 years in the House and chairmanned the Un-American Activities Committee during the 81st and 82d Congresses. I learned to know John Wood quite intimately during our close association on the committee. His basic beliefs in freedom, the individual dignity of man, his sense of fair play, and his patriotism are, indeed, endearing traits.

John Wood is so ably fitted academically, too, to serve on the Subversive Activities Control Board. Before coming to Congress, he served the State of Georgia and her citizens as a superior court judge and as a prosecuting attorney. He has been practicing law for as long as I have lived and that dates back to 1910. No one will dispute that John Wood is known as one of the most formidable lawyers in the South, having handled better than 600 capital punishment cases without a defeat.

The American people will, I am sure, be grateful to the President for his choice of John Wood for this important appointment, and I do hope the Senate will be quick to give confirmation. There is no question in my mind that John Wood will do a splendid job for the American people as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

UNAUTHORIZED WIRETAPPING SHOULD BE A CRIMINAL OFFENSE

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the public must be protected from eavesdropping on telephone conversations. This is an invasion of a person's privacy, and frequently of his home, which cannot be tolerated.

Wiretapping is used for purposes of blackmail and other crimes. It may be used as a means of unfair business competition. In recent days it has become more prevalent, and further controls are needed.

Unauthorized wiretapping should be a criminal offense. Present laws do not adequately protect the public. The Federal communications law—title 47, United States Code, section 605—makes it illegal for a person improperly to divulge or publish a message, but a more direct prohibition of wiretapping is clearly needed.

I am today filing a bill to accomplish this purpose. It will add a new chapter to the Criminal Code providing that—

Whoever willfully or maliciously and without legal authority taps a telephone wire or makes other provision for listening in on said wire with the purpose of intercepting or listening in on any communication line used or useful in interstate communication shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

I hope that this proposed legislation will receive nonpartisan approval from Members of Congress.

AMENDING THE LAW RELATING TO PERJURY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am asking Chairman CELLER, of the House Committee on the Judiciary, for an early hearing on H. R. 799, which extends the law of perjury to cover the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath. I introduced this bill on the opening day of this Congress and am pleased to note that Attorney General Brownell has renewed his support of such a measure.

The problem to which this bill is addressed has plagued us for a long time, but it has been dramatized recently by turnabout witnesses like Matusow and Mrs. Natvig. Under the present perjury statute and court cases, a person who makes contradictory statements under oath cannot be prosecuted unless the indictment charges and the prosecution proves which one of the two statements is false. Moreover, under the rules of proof imposed by the courts, the falsity of one of the statements must be established by the testimony of two independent witnesses or by the testimony of one witness and corroborating circumstances. This is ridiculous in the case of people like Matusow, who openly contradict themselves under oath.

My bill is based upon the New York penal law which has worked well in my own State. It has the full endorsement and support of the American Bar Association which has offered one suggestion of obvious merit—that the language ought to be broadened to make certain that perjury committed outside of courts of law in proceedings such as congressional hearings will also be covered. I shall urge that change. It also contains a safeguard by being limited to a 3-year period so that the offense could not be extended retroactively beyond the usual period of limitations for similar offenses.

I hope the Judiciary Committee will act without delay on this important proposal, and that the House will give it favorable consideration.

HON. JOHN WOOD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the nomination of our former colleague here in the House, the Honorable John Wood, of Georgia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. In my opinion, this is one of the best appointments that could possibly have been made.

It was my great privilege on becoming a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to join that committee during the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Wood. He is not only a distinguished jurist in his own right but he is a man who is fair and honest. I am sure that his appointment will be confirmed speedily by the other body and that he will contribute greatly in sound judgment and intelligent work as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

TELEVISION CRITICISM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the American Building Association does not pay any more attention to the interests of the people they represent, and if the Ourisman Chevrolet Co. does not do a better job repairing Chevrolets, than does the TV fellow they hire to advertise their facilities, no one will get very good service out of either.

Last week I heard and saw their TV man Harkness on television and radio. Referring to the delay of the Committee on the Judiciary of the other body in confirming the nomination of Judge Harlan, in substance, he said that two-bit politicians doing a two-bit job had postponed the committee vote on that nomination.

I cannot make that statement here on the floor because it refers to Members of another body, but that man could, and he did, make that statement. Just who is he to characterize the members of a committee as two-bit politicians motivated by political expediency?

On that committee are 15 individuals, elected by more than 12,723,840 voters of 15 States. By just what authority does the gentleman who represents the American Building Association and the Ourisman Chevrolet Co. presume to characterize the members of that committee?

One of the questions which will come before the Supreme Court and which is of vital interest to all of our people, is whether, how far, or if at all, a portion of our sovereignty is to be surrendered to United Nations or some similar organization. Is there any sound reason why that committee should not take all time deemed necessary or advisable to consider the viewpoint of members who are to be appointed to the court of last resort?

Last night Mr. Harkness said another Member of the distinguished body at the north end of the Capitol should be appointed to the civil-defense organization because—as Mr. Harkness said, Members of that body left the floor when he rose to speak—he would be able to evacuate a hall quicker than anyone else.

Listen to him some night and see the smirk on his face when he finishes one of those nasty little jobs he is performing for those organizations every week.

If one desired to consult a building association or to have an automobile repair job done, would he not hesitate a little before patronizing an outfit which employed an advertising agent who assumed to speak so authoritatively, and with so little apparent knowledge of what he was talking about?

CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to which I would like to call the attention of the House. This bill is designed to clarify Public Law 763, chapter 1208, section 105, paragraph 7 of section 202 of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended.

The need for this remedial legislation was brought to my attention by the concerted protest of scores of my constituents employed at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, in Bremerton, Wash. It was pointed out by these employees that the interpretation placed on the present law would include certain trades, crafts, and positions of responsibility resulting thereto under the Classification Act. After a thorough investigation I arrived at the inescapable conclusion that these protests were well founded, and indeed the Navy Department itself was opposed to classifying these personnel into a so-

called white-collar category. The Navy Department takes the position, and I think rightly so, that this interpretation of the present law would inevitably result in a loss of efficiency and a lowering in morale with all the difficulties attendant thereto. As a result of the Navy's position in this matter the Civil Service Commission has held their decision in abeyance pending further investigation, and I am unofficially advised that the probable final decision will not adversely affect civilian naval employees at this time. However, in view of the fact that I am informed the Civil Service Commission has moved to implement this program with respect to these personnel several times in the past, it appears necessary that legislation be passed to settle for once and for all the status of these employees to the satisfaction of the Navy as well as the employees concerned.

In view of the fact that the results of my investigation disclosed an entirely different position on the part of the Army and the Air Force, this legislation is designed to exclude only Navy civilian personnel.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I again point out that the purpose of this amendment is to maintain the Navy's high level of morale and efficiency, nowhere more in evidence than at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, where the important work of repairing and maintaining one of the most vital arms of our Nation's defense, the Navy flattop, is carried out more efficiently than any place else in the world.

It is my further hope that the illustrious Members of the House will approve and support this most necessary amendment.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ARE CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS AND CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS PRESENTED IN READABLE FORM?—IMPROVING THE TYPOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a committee report is usually very dull and uninteresting. The tables and charts are pictured up in black and white without the aid of color. They are not presented in the most readable fashion and are usually uninteresting unless a person has a particular interest in what they contain. On the other hand, when the Department of Commerce, the Hoover Commission, and hundreds of other organizations that are supported entirely by Government funds present similar documents, they are presented in colors and in very attractive, readable form, including large type.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 26 years ago, when I first came to Congress, was printed on fairly good paper and in type that could easily be read. Since that time, the RECORD has been changed several times and each time in the direction of making it harder and more difficult to read, both in the method of printing and in the size of type. The type is very small now. A suggestion that Congress should furnish every person receiving the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a reader's magnifying glass in order to protect his eyes would not be unreasonable. On the other hand, publications that are gotten out by all other agencies of the Government with money provided by Congress present the readable material prepared by them in very interesting, readable form, both as to makeup and size of type, with the addition of color when needed.

It is heartening to me to know that the department of political science at Washington-Lee University, at Lexington, Va., is giving some attention to this matter. I am inserting herewith correspondence and statements that are self-explanatory. They are as follows:

LEXINGTON, VA.

Hon. W. PATMAN.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am interested in finding out your opinion concerning the format and type used in printing congressional reports. It would be very helpful to me if you could give me your answer to the following questions.

1. Do you think the format, type face, and size make congressional reports look hard to read?

2. Do you think the interest of the average person is discouraged by the format, type face, and size of congressional reports?

3. Do you think that improvements of the printing techniques of congressional reports would increase interest and understanding?

4. Do you think that congressional reports should be designed for the general public as well as congressional members?

5. Do you know of any movement to improve the printing techniques of congressional reports?

Sincerely yours,

E. BARCLAY SMITH,
Washington and Lee University.

FEBRUARY 24, 1955.

Mr. E. BARCLAY SMITH,
Washington and Lee University,
Care of Pi Kappa Alpha,
Lexington, Va.

DEAR MR. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter, with reference to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is my belief that the format of the RECORD could be improved upon considerably, which would make easier reading and increase reader interest, as well as understanding of the contents. I believe, too, that it should be given wider distribution, particularly to schools and colleges in the United States.

Unfortunately, I do not know of any organized effort being made to improve the RECORD, although I have complained to the Joint Committee on Printing from time to time.

On page A1156 of the February 23 issue of the daily RECORD, there appears an article by Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, setting out the value of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to schools and colleges. You will find it very interesting.

I want to thank you for your letter. I am glad that interest outside of the Congress is being shown in this matter.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY,
Lexington, Va., March 2, 1955.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: I think you will remember a recent letter from one of my students, Mr. Barclay Smith, asking your opinion of the typography of congressional reports. We are very appreciative for your interest.

We would like for you to have a copy of the enclosed petition. I am sure you will be attracted to it from an educational standpoint, for I know you are interested in seeing that young people are educated to take a greater interest in public affairs. I hope that on reading it over you will be able to support its specific aim of improving the typography of congressional reports.

I understand that as a result of our project a survey is being made by the Public Printer to determine what kind of changes might be made within a reasonable cost differential.

Aside from the intrinsic merits of this particular petition, I think you will appreciate the significance of this petition to all students of political science, and indeed to little people everywhere, as an example of democracy in action.

Very sincerely yours,

HARVEY WHEELER.

A PETITION FOR IMPROVING THE TYPOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

BACKGROUND

1. The congressional committee has undergone an especially rapid development during the past 30 years. Committee hearings and reports are increasingly designed to provide broad background information. As a result committee reports have become increasingly significant publishing events, far transcending the earlier notion of the committee report as a working tool for legislators in their daily tasks.

2. Not only the more widely publicized reports such as the Watkins report, but also such documents as the reports of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—especially the two recent ones entitled "United States Monetary Policy: Recent Thinking and Experience," and "Trends in Economic Growth"—are among the most important contributions to economics of the year. Should Senator DOUGLAS' projected background study of the stock market come to fruition, we may be sure that it will be one of the most significant documents of our day.

3. Such reports are major publishing events. They are directed to those outside the legislative branch as well as to working legislators. Documents of such importance should be designed to enlist interest rather than to repel interest.

4. The results of an inquiry directed to our Congressmen, a poll of the citizens of a small town, and the testimony of experts in the publishing field indicate that there

is a widespread feeling that the type size, face, and format of congressional reports repel interest rather than enlist interest. Given the importance of these documents, their significance outside Congress as well as inside, and the paramount need in a democracy to make every effort to provide for an informed citizenry, every effort should be made to determine whether improvements in readability may be made without significant increase in publishing costs.

5. The Public Printer has stated that "the general makeup and typography of congressional reports and hearings have been consistent since the First Congress. * * * Beginning in 1900, the present format was put into use, and is essentially the same today." During this time tremendous developments have been made in our knowledge of how to design a well printed page which is also economic. Each of the executive branches have redesigned their typographical practices with a view to informing the general reader as well as administrators who must use these documents in their daily work. It should be possible for congressional committees to designate certain of their reports as being likely to have widespread public appeal and therefore meriting better typographical treatment than the average report or printed hearing.

6. For all these reasons we are requesting your support of the following petition.

PETITION

1. It is our request that the Joint Committee on Printing conduct an investigation to determine (a) the potential demand for congressional reports from individuals outside Congress and (b) the opinion of experts outside the Government Printing Office on the possibilities of improving the type size, face, and format of congressional reports, with a view to establishing a more attractive and a more easily readable form for congressional reports deemed likely to appeal to a wide public audience.

The following documents are submitted in support of this petition:

1. Results of congressional questionnaire.
2. Poll of townspeople of Lexington, Va.
3. Statement by Mr. E. E. Morsberger.
4. Statement by Prof. C. Harold Lauck.
5. Excerpts from congressional replies.

Results of congressional questionnaire

[Total number: 501 [1]]

Questions asked	Yes	No	Indefinite
1. Do you think that the format, type size, and type face make congressional reports difficult to read?	21	16	13
2. Do you think that the interest of the average person is discouraged by the format and type?	22	20	10
3. Do you think that improvements in the printing and design would increase interest in congressional reports?	25	18	10
4. Do you think that congressional reports should be designed to be read by the citizen as well as the working Congressman?	31	11	11
5. Do you know of any attempts to improve congressional reports?	3	39	13

COMMENTS.—These answers show a remarkable proportion of the Congressmen who replied to our questionnaire think congressional reports hard to read and believe they should be redesigned to be made more readable.

[1] Due to the shift from fall to spring semesters it proved impossible to write all Representatives and Senators. Of the 100 Congressmen who responded to the questionnaire, 30 referred their questionnaires to Representative Burr P. Harrison, whose district includes Lexington, Va.

Poll of Lexington, Va., townspeople

[Total number in poll: 151; average age: 46; number of males: 76; number of females: 75; education: grade school, 10; high school, 54; college, 38; unreported, 49]

Questions asked	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	Undecided; no answer
1. Are you acquainted with congressional reports?	51	33	92	60	8
2. Have you ever read a congressional report?	46	30	101	70	4
3. Would you be interested in reading a report such as the Watkins report on Senator McCarthy? [1]	72	49	64	42	15
4. Do you know how to get a congressional report?	65	43	71	49	15
5. Do you think the appearance is appealing?	43	28	97	63	11
6. Would you use congressional reports if they were more attractive?	62	40	64	42	25
7. Do you think something should be done to make them more appealing?	48	31	51	33	52

[1] This was used as an example only because it was assumed to be the congressional report the largest number of people might have known about.

Comments: One of the most remarkable results of the poll is the indication from question No. 3 that something around 50 percent of our people might be interested in reading the most important or most publicized of the congressional reports; in this case the example used was the Watkins report. However, 63 percent thought them unattractive in appearance, and 40 percent believed they might be more interested in using them if they were more attractive.

Statement of E. E. Morsberger, assistant planning manager for Raymond Blattenberger, Public Printer, United States Government Printing Office:

"The general makeup and typography of congressional reports and hearings have been consistent since the First Congress. Until about 1848 reports were set in 10-point Scotch Roman, with page width of 4 inches. In addition, text was leaded: that is, with space of about one thirty-sixth of an inch between lines.

"From about 1848 to 1900, the page width was increased to 4⅜ inches, and the typeface was changed to text type of the period, but text was set solid. Beginning in 1900 the present format was put into use, and is essentially the same today. * * *

"Early printers designed the format for congressional printing, and it was accepted by the early Congresses. The typeface presently in use is regarded as most readable and practical."

Statement by Prof. C. Harold Lauck, director, journalism laboratory, Washington and Lee University: "The legibility of many congressional publications is notoriously bad. * * * I believe the Government Printing Office could help some if they give some study to the matter, and get away from some of the hide-bound traditions regulating the typefaces and sizes used. For the most part I would think it would be necessary to increase not only the type size but also to add extra space between lines. * * * I know Mr. Blattenberger, with his wide background as a printer, would be agreeable provided the economics could be worked out. Of course, the changes I have suggested would increase costs since they would involve an increased number of pages but these are necessary for better understanding by both people and Congressmen."

EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSIONAL REPLIES

Senate

"I have often wondered when somebody else would recognize the deficiencies."

"My answer to your first four questions is in the affirmative. On calling the Joint Committee on Printing, I find that a number of the Members of the Senate and House have communicated with them as a result of your letter and they are preparing a reply in response to your fifth question."

"It is my opinion that the insert material * * * is difficult to read. * * * It is my further belief * * * that the average person would not be encouraged by the format and type used in the subject reports. * * * I think changes in design might increase interest. * * * I am happy to advise you that, as a result of several letters of an almost identical nature to your own, the Public Printer of the United States has been requested to have the Division of Typography and Design make a thorough study."

House of Representatives

"There is no doubt that the present makeup and type styles used in publication of congressional documents gives a forbidding appearance to them. Much could probably be done to improve them without resorting to the techniques of the huckster. * * * Anything which would make a document more useful to a Member would also make it more useful to the interested citizen."

"My reply is in the affirmative. * * * I have talked with the members of the official reporters staff to House committees, and while they, too, apparently agree that there is room for improvement, I understand that nothing definite has been done lately. * * * I shall do all I can to improve the congressional reports in connection with the suggestions outlined in your letter."

"I definitely feel that the format, type size, type face, printing design, and similar qualities of congressional hearings and reports should be improved to the end that they become much more widely read. To my way of thinking, there is no more interesting reading material, in general, than that developed by the various committee hearings. Were this material more attractively printed and indexed I think it would be much more readily read. I feel that a great part of the strength of a democracy is due to citizen interest and participation. Anything we can do to increase this interest and participation should be done. To me, it follows we could easily increase participation by making printed matter connected with the legislative process more readable."

"Your questions * * * suggest some dissatisfaction. * * * I agree with you that an improvement well might be made."

"I think that congressional reports should be designed to be read by citizens as well as working Congressmen."

"I am inclined to think that the average person is discouraged by the makeup of the congressional reports."

"May I say * * * that I do believe that the format, type size, and type face make congressional reports difficult to read, and it would obviously follow that I, too, think the interest of the average person would be discouraged by all this. * * * I believe that some improvement would certainly make them more readable. * * * I do think that the average citizen should be encouraged to read many congressional reports, especially those of investigating committees."

"I think that improvement of the printing techniques of congressional reports would increase interest. * * * I do think someone should give the matter thought. You will hear from me further on this."

Submitted by:

JOHN HARVEY WHEELER,
Associate Professor of Political Science, Washington and Lee University.

SAVE HELLS CANYON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that in this year of 1955 the monopolistic policies of this administration could turn the hands of the clock back 76 years and plunge the people all over again into a bitter struggle to preserve our natural resources. Yet that is exactly what the giveaway, do-nothing, scuttling policies of this administration, under the fancy titles of "partnership programs," "private enterprise," and "local initiative" really mean.

This administration has tried to sell their partnership program for the disposal of our few remaining, priceless, natural water resources as though it were an original proposal being offered to the American people for the first time. But if you will go back to the year 1879, and examine the Federal legislation that authorized the giveaway of our water power resources to private exploitation and monopoly, and then examine those giveaway policies during the next 30 years, you will find they almost exactly duplicate the so-called partnership policies of this administration 76 years later.

Such giveaway programs were denounced and repudiated—we had hoped for all time to come—in the stinging veto messages of President Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican, in the famous Rainey River and James River vetoes of 1908 and 1909. But now we find we are right back where we started from.

Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing the bizarre spectacle of the United States marching backward instead of forward.

ALL IN SAME BOAT

Those of us who believe in preserving our natural resources for the benefit of the people, whether you call them TVA, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Boulder, or Hells Canyon, are in the same boat. We all sail along together, or we all sink together.

The private utility record is clear. They have already wrecked the Southwestern Power Administration. Through Dixon-Yates they are attempting to destroy TVA by driving a dagger into its heart. They are driving out of public office the finest servants in the Federal service. So what appears to be a local power problem in one part of the country is in reality a spoke in the common Federal power policy wheel.

Private utilities are solidly organized into a highly-financed, carefully-planned program which has for its objectives the destruction of any and all forms of public competition—local, State, Federal. To prove the truth of this statement we have only to examine the deceptive propaganda campaign against public power which the private utilities have so fully and completely financed out of the electric light bills that Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen pay.

The technique is quite simple. It is a variation of the technique exposed by the Federal Trade Commission many years ago—only the names have changed.

In order to discredit the public power programs generally, private utilities engaged research groups to discover public opinion in the field of power. These groups conducted question and answer surveys. They angled their questions so they were sure they would get the answer they wanted. For example, they thought the answer to such a question as "Do you like the TVA?" would come back with a resounding "No." To their amazement and chagrin, these public opinion polls showed that a majority of people did like TVA.

PRIVATE POWER STRATEGY

So the private-utility lobby changed its strategy. They asked people instead, "Do you like socialism?" Of course, the answer was a resounding "No" this time. The private utilities then began to scheme to hook up public opinion on socialism, which the people did not like, and to hook it up with TVA, which a majority of the people did like.

As a result, the scream against public power changed from "bolshevism," which it was a few years ago, to "creeping socialism," which it is now. So you have the same deceptive propaganda—only the label has changed.

The private-utility lobby also has its own blacklist. To get on it a public servant has only to oppose any part of their program. The type of campaigns that have been waged against me indicate this to be true. I have been an outspoken advocate of the Hells Canyon Dam for some time.

Yet in this past campaign, I found that for every private-utility vote I may have lost, I gained votes from dozens of other fearless citizens. There is one real—one very reassuring fact in this power fight. Give the people the facts, and they carry the ball for you.

I should like to pause here to pay tribute to the many fearless public servants who have continued to stand up and fight for the people down through the years. They have written a challenging record in the forward march of democracy. Every decade has its own smear label to scare these courageous Americans into silence. These labels have had little connection with the plain historic facts. Nevertheless, in varying degrees, they have been partially successful in frightening some people into inaction.

PILGRIMS ORIGINATED PUBLIC POWER

As all of you recall, the Pilgrims landed in this country in 1620. How long do you think it was before those Colonial governments were owning and operating their own waterpower projects? Just 18 years, to be exact. In other words, 18 brief years after the first settlers landed in this country, government ownership and operation of its waterpower sites was a reality. There was no mention then of socialism or of creeping socialism because these were essential things that the government had to do in order to survive.

This early government ownership arose nearly 150 years before our present Federal Government was established. The same traditions were continued after the United States came into being. There is nothing un-American or socialistic in our Government performing these essential tasks for its people. The only thing that is un-American is distorting the plain facts of history, and the necessity and reality of the Federal Government doing for the people certain things they cannot do as well for themselves.

The high dam at Hells Canyon is a shining example of something the Government can do for the people better than they can do for themselves. I have today introduced a bill to authorize construction of that high dam.

Hells Canyon is the last large remaining undeveloped dam site in America, and is deeper even than the Boulder Dam site in Nevada. Because it is embedded in solid rock, it is a dam builder's dream.

HIGH DAM WOULD VITALIZE IDAHO

The high dam would create an empire of productivity and transform the whole Northwest into a resource of immense value to the entire Nation. It would vitalize my own State of Idaho, now seriously lagging behind other northwest States in economic development.

For the people of Idaho and the Northwest, the high dam would mean—

First. Vast quantities of low-cost power.

Second. New industries and new jobs.

Third. Immensely increased tax revenues.

Fourth. A mighty expansion of irrigation, with water for thousands of now arid acres.

Fifth. Flood control.

Sixth. Regulation of navigation.

Seventh. A wonderful new playground for hunters, fishermen and all outdoor lovers.

To irrigation farmers whose very life depends upon water on their land, I give this assurance. Section 2 of this Hells Canyon bill provides iron-clad protection not only of all present water rights, but of all future water rights that may become valid under State law on the Snake River watershed. I would not support a bill that did not absolutely guarantee the priority of the use of water for irrigation and domestic consumption over the use of water for power production.

PLENTY OF WATER

People, however, need have no fear that there will not be enough water for both irrigation and power needs. Every hydrologist with long experience in the study of the Snake River reports there is plenty of water even during the dryest recorded years to irrigate at least 1 million new acres and still fill the reservoir of the great high Hells Canyon Dam for the production of power.

Nor do people need to worry about the cost of the project to the taxpayer. The money to build the dam would be in the nature of a loan. Profit from power sales would repay to the Government approximately 90 percent of the cost of the dam, plus interest. These power revenues would also help pay for the mighty expansion of irrigation in the Snake River Basin. Until such financing is provided for, all discussion of further large-scale irrigation developments in this area is nonsense. Costs would be too great.

Federal plans for the multiple-purpose development of the great Hells Canyon site have been in preparation for many years. The dam itself would be one of the highest in the world, and the reservoir would back up more than 90 miles into the mountain fastnesses. With a maximum capacity of approximately 4

million acre-feet, it would be one of the largest projects of its kind.

At the dam site it would be possible to produce over 600,000 kilowatts of prime power, while its great storage capacity will make possible the production of more than 400,000 additional kilowatts of power at down-stream plants. Reservoir storage water would be caught only after every drop of its use had been squeezed out for irrigation. In other words, my bill provides that during the growing season, Hells Canyon power production would be completely subservient to irrigation needs above.

IDAHO POWER PLANS

For many years before this administration came into power in 1952, all Federal agencies concerned with resource planning were unanimous in their opinion that the high Federal dam was the best possible development of the Hells Canyon stretch of the river. In contrast, however, the Idaho Power Co. plans have changed many times. Its first proposal was for a single-purpose, low power dam; then it contemplated a series of five such low dams. The latest plan, for which it filed an amended application for a license with the Federal Power Commission in 1953, is a three-dam project. Brownlee, the storage dam of the trio, would be less than one-half as high and would have only about one-fourth of the storage capacity of the high Hells Canyon Dam. This would give little assurance of a continuing supply of firm power to the great cities of the Northwest now plagued with cutbacks and periodic brownouts.

Ten days before the Idaho Power Co. filed its amended application in 1953, Douglas McKay, the new Secretary of the Interior, turned his back on the people and withdrew the Department as intervenor in the Idaho Power Co. license request. This reversed the bold stand of previous Interior Secretaries, who had intervened to safeguard for the benefit of all of the American people the priceless natural resource that is the Hells Canyon site.

To fill the public void and to protect the people's interest—numerous cooperatives and farm and labor organizations, with underlying memberships of more than 2 million people, organized the Hells Canyon Association. Additional support came from the Northwest Public Utility Districts, which represented approximately 75,000 consumers of electricity.

The Hells Canyon Association and the Public Utility Districts obtained permission from the Federal Power Commission to intervene and oppose the applications of the Idaho Power Co. Likewise, the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, speaking for a large majority of the members of the REA cooperatives, intervened, and filed a supporting brief.

Formal FPC hearings began on July 7, 1953, and with occasional recesses, continued for a little over a year. The first decision rendered—a staff counsel decision—favored the Idaho Power Co. The full Commission decision is expected sometime this year.

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE

The basic question at issue in the Hells Canyon controversy is, whether the long and carefully conceived Hells Canyon project is to come into being as an essential and integral part of a fully considered, comprehensive Federal plan to develop the entire Columbia River Basin, or whether three puny private dams in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River are to make that impossible.

History provides a duplicate analogy to the Hells Canyon controversy. Back in 1921, while Grand Coulee was still a dream, the Washington Water Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to build a small power project at Kettle Falls on the Columbia River in Washington State. The site was in the same reservoir area of what was later to be Grand Coulee. The Federal Power Commission appointed a board of engineers to study the Kettle Falls project.

Then, in 1922, the comprehensive plan for the development of the Columbia River Basin was outlined. Upon recommendation of the board of engineers, the FPC suspended all license applications for permits on the Columbia.

In 1925, the Washington Water Power Co. filed a new application to build a low-head project at Kettle Falls. In 1933, after the matter was aired in hearings, the application was rejected by the Federal Power Commission. Thus the FPC twice furnished protection for a comprehensive development of our natural resources, even though in the first instance, the Columbia River Basin plan was still nebulous and Grand Coulee had not yet even been recommended.

HELLS CANYON IS KEY DAM

Today, we know for a fact that the high Hells Canyon Dam is a key storage dam in the whole comprehensive Federal plan to develop the Columbia River Basin. We have known this for many years. Shall we sit by and see the plan thwarted and stunted, and at the same time allow the last great natural dam site in America to be squandered for the benefit of a monopoly rather than developed magnificently for the benefit of all the people? No, we must not sit idly by, we must save Hells Canyon for the people.

The term "partnership" brought into use by this administration is a complete deception.

In the first place, most private electric utilities are monopolies. As monopolies, they are subject to so-called local regulation.

It would take too long to go into the whole question of State regulation, and how these regulations have been rendered innocuous in a maze of legal opinions and decisions so that it takes years of litigation to secure any effective action for the people.

THE PUBLIC POWER YARDSTICK

It is sufficient to state that public power was introduced to set up a yardstick which could be used to get around the interminable delays and the general ineffectiveness of State and local regulation. It demonstrates an unbelievable lack of knowledge for this administration to say that since utilities are subject to local regulation, nothing more is needed.

It also begs the question. Most big water and power projects deal with interstate streams and interstate matters which are beyond the scope or power of local regulation, even if present local regulation was effective.

This is not to say there cannot be, and are not, genuine local partnerships of our Federal Government and our people. The best illustrations are TVA, Bonneville, and the REA cooperatives. In these three examples, the Federal Government assumes its proper role and helps local people help themselves. This makes it possible to secure for themselves essential public service at a price they can afford to pay.

What, for example, do Idaho families now pay for their REA electricity? The average rate in 1952 was 2½ cents a kilowatt hour retail. Compare this with private power company rates of 20 cents, 17 cents and 15 cents per kilowatt hour which were quite common in the United States not too long ago. North Idaho has profited greatly by having a public power yardstick in the neighboring States of Washington and Oregon.

PUBLIC POWER ON RATES

A recent Federal Power Commission map demonstrates how strikingly public power competition has reduced residential rates charged by privately owned utilities in the States closest to the TVA and Bonneville areas. Rates become higher the more remote the State from the public power area.

Thus the average residential bill for 250 kilowatt hours a month goes up step by step from $4.92 in Tennessee as you move northeast or northwest from the TVA area until it reaches a peak of well over $8 in the Dakotas. Similarly, the average moves up from $4.63 in Washington and $5.36 in Oregon step by step through Idaho, Wyoming and Montana to reach a high of well over $8 again in the Dakotas.

WHICH WAY AMERICA?

Today, the United States stands tottering on the threshold of its destiny. The conservation and wise use of all our natural resources, including our few remaining priceless water power sites such as Hells Canyon, may mean the difference between continuing as the arsenal of democracy, or going the way of historically forgotten nations that having succumbed to private aggrandizement, are no more.

On the one side the road points backward. For those who know history, the sign reads: "Private utility monopoly exploitation."

The other highway sign points ahead. It says: "Natural resources conservation for all the people."

Hells Canyon is a symbol of that American promise—our greatness for which every American is justly proud. It urges America to expand to her fullest self.

The question presented is: "Which way America?"

Lest we go the route of oblivion, our answer is: The Federal high Hells Canyon Dam must be built for the benefit of all the people of Idaho, for all the people

of the Pacific Northwest, for all the people of the Nation. This is not only conserving for the living but conserving for future generations yet unborn.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentlewoman from Idaho for the splendid statement of the issues on this Hells Canyon controversy. I want to assure the gentlewoman from Idaho that as the Representative of an adjoining district—an area that does not drain into a tributary of the Snake but has important tributaries of the Columbia River—I, too, have today cosponsored a Hells Canyon bill that is identical to the one which the gentlewoman from Idaho is chiefly responsible for. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Idaho for the fight she has carried on during the past months and years to bring this Hells Canyon legislation up to the point that we have today.

I want to ask one question. The other day I read a news report that Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, suggested that the order of the Federal Power Commission would be forthcoming around August of this year. Does that not mean that time is of the essence in the passage of this legislation; and if we are going to have any results from the bills introduced today, it must be accomplished during this session of the Congress?

Mrs. PFOST. Indeed it does. I, too, would say that time is of the essence and that we must consider this most important legislation as soon as possible.

I thank my colleague from Montana for his kind remarks, and I will say to the gentleman I well realize his State will not benefit from the Hells Canyon project to the extent that Idaho will. Nonetheless, he has again demonstrated today by introducing an identical bill to mine that he is a consistent and devoted fighter for the multipurpose development of our natural resources.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a letter which today I addressed to the editor of the Lewiston Tribune, Lewiston, Idaho.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, since we are in special orders it would not be proper for me to raise some misgivings which I have concerning this legislation until the previously granted special orders have been concluded. So far as my congressional district is concerned, there is an extremely vital feature of this legislation which should be developed at length, and it is my intention to request time to do so at the conclusion of today's special orders.

The primary consideration—and I might say that it is or may well become a matter of primary consideration throughout the Western States—is the effect which the building of this project may have on the appropriation and use of water upstream under State law. I was not advised that these bills were to be introduced today, but fortunately I have this morning written a letter to the editor of the Lewiston Tribune, at Lewiston, Idaho, which deals briefly with the possibility of what may happen to those water rights, and which is being inserted in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 7, 1955.

EDITOR, THE LEWISTON TRIBUNE,
Lewiston, Idaho.

DEAR SIR: On occasion in the past when you have editorially taken issue with statements made by me, you have courteously permitted me the opportunity of replying through your editorial column.

It seems to me that the occasion has again arisen in your issue of February 18 where you take issue with my recommendations for upstream storage, and state that if I would find an engineering engineer I would discover that for power, navigation, and flood control, downstream storage is preferable to upstream storage. In this connection I would like to quote from the report of B. E. Torpen, head engineer of the Corps of Army Engineers on the Columbia River Basin, written under date of August 1945 and supplementing the 308 Report of 1934. The title of the report is "Storage for Power, Columbia River Basin." Mr. Torpen is about as engineering an engineer as either of us is likely to discover. This is what he says at page 31 of his very comprehensive report on this very question, which comprises a total of 95 pages:

"When stored water is released at a powerplant, its direct effect is to increase the discharge at that site. If other power projects exist farther down the stream, they automatically receive the increased discharge induced by the released stored water from above them. In like manner, if several developed power projects exist downstream (as will be true when our rivers are fully developed) each in turn receives benefit from the released stored water above. Each time stored water is used through a downstream powerplant, it creates additional power, adds value. Obviously, then the farther upstream the stored water is situated, the greater is its potential value—directly in proportion to its elevation above sea level. Headwater storage sites at high elevations should, therefore, be investigated in great detail, even if more costly than larger valley sites farther down the stream because (a) they have greater potential value directly proportional to their elevation, and (b) because frequently headwater sites are in remote places where the damage created by flooding the reservoir areas will be a minimum.

"To locate storage on the headwaters of streams considered most likely to be fully developed along their courses—thereby making it possible to realize the potential value of storage at an early date—is desirable."

I am happy to note your statement, "And we have no objections whatever to any methods the folks in southern Idaho may find necessary and valuable for the fullest possible utilization in their area of the waters originating in their area." In southern Idaho, of course, the primary use of stored water has been for irrigation, and again, according to Mr. Torpen, each irrigation development helps the folks down the river. Mr. Torpen has this to say at page 10 of his report:

"Storage developed in the interest of power production will tend to provide benefits for other uses, such as flood control, recreation and health, navigation, and irrigation. Conversely, storage developed in the interest of any prime use, will, if properly coordinated, also tend to provide benefits to other uses, including power. When properly planned, conflict seldom arises between the use of storage for power and the use of storage for these various purposes; rather, they complement and benefit each other. This is true to the extent that the several purposes are almost invariably served more economically and effectively by joint, rather than separate, storage developments. Power storage, which with or without additional storage, skims off the peak floods and stores them for later release during periods of low flow, would obviously be beneficial to—

"(a) Flood control, because it removes the peak flood and joint storage brings economy.

"(b) Recreation and health, because it creates lakes in semiarid regions providing recreational facilities where most needed, and increases low water flow of streams. Power reservoirs are normally held near the full level during the summer recreation season.

"(c) Navigation, because it reduces flood peaks and increases low-water discharge.

"(d) Irrigation, because it conserves water otherwise wasted, raises the water level for irrigation diversion by gravity or pumping, and provides the power for such pumping. Irrigation and power further complement each other in that the irrigation power demand coincides with the period of surplus power capability of the Columbia River system, and the irrigation return flow reaches the river several months later, when most needed—during the winter when power demand is high and normal stream flow low."

So far as I know, no one in southern Idaho objects to the use by anyone for any purpose of the waters of the Snake River which cannot be used upstream. The objection is, rather, against any downstream commitment of any kind which may require the release of upstream waters to fulfill the commitment.

Much has been said about the fact that the authorizing legislation for the Federal Hells Canyon Dam adequately protects the water rights of the upstream users. It is my impression from your editorials on various occasions that you subscribe to this conclusion. It has been and still is my position, on the other hand, that there is no language which can be placed in a Hells Canyon bill or any other downstream commitment which will protect the water rights of the upstream users against the actions of a subsequent Congress. Present water rights have been obtained under the Idaho State constitution, its State statutes, and its State court decisions.

After the construction of Hells Canyon Dam or any other downstream commitment the Federal Congress could override the water rights obtained under State law and require the release of water from upstream to operate the Federal project. As authority for that statement I am attaching hereto a copy of a very exhaustive brief on this question prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This brief resulted from my asking the Library of Congress the very question which we are here discussing, and I believe it contains every applicable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Brought down to its very essence, the answer appears on pages 7 and 10 of the attached brief.

Page 7: "'If the language in H. R. 5743 or H. R. 4648 does not protect both present and future upstream diversion and use when a conflict arises between such upstream diversion and use and the operation of the Federal dam, is there other language which could be placed in the authorizing legislation which would protect both present and future upstream diversion and use?'

"We are unable to state that the language of these bills would not protect both present and future diversions. It would protect such diversions to the extent that other areas are now similarly protected by similar provisions. Such protection, as we have heretofore indicated, is not absolute and cannot be absolute because of the constitutional powers of Congress that are involved. In

view of past decisions of the Supreme Court, a constitutional amendment would be required to divest Congress of its power and vest complete control of these water resources of navigable rivers in the States. Under the circumstances we see no alternative to existing arrangements or improved variations of those arrangements. Control, if there is to be further development and use of the water resources, must come in many instances through 1 of 3 methods: (1) Federal legislation, (2) compact, or (3) adjudication by the Supreme Court. Federal legislation recognizing State laws, to the extent practicable, and authorizing State laws, may be the better solution. Adjudication, by a series of Supreme Court decisions, would, in effect, ultimately place that Court in the undesirable position of administering the water rights of the area."

Page 10: "This bring us to the main question underlying this whole problem, which, as we see it, can be stated bluntly as follows: In the event, after the authorization and construction of the Hells Canyon division, there is insufficient downstream flow for its operation, could the Congress, in the exercise of constitutional powers, require release of waters from above and thus curtail beneficial use, under applicable State and other laws, in those upper areas? See Hearings * * * on H. R. 5743 (82d Cong.) page 782. Based on applicable court decisions, the answer is in the affirmative."

It is my position that the conclusion immediately above quoted would be true no matter what language might be contained in the authorizing legislation for Hells Canyon Dam, and, so far as I know, the conclusion has not been questioned by any attorney who has had occasion to go into the matter.

Indeed, the Bureau of Reclamation goes even further than this when in its Manual of the Reclamation Service it says that the United States Government need not follow State laws governing the appropriation and use of water because the Federal Government is the owner of all unappropriated waters in the nonnavigable streams of the arid West. And, of course, the Bureau of Reclamation is the agency of the Federal Government around which the Hells Canyon controversy arose when its Commissioner was Michael Straus, who, incidentally, could hardly be called an engineering engineer since he was by profession a newspaperman.

It seems admitted by all that from a physical standpoint the only logical place to store water for irrigation is upstream, above the area to be irrigated, since even Mr. Straus in his engineering studies failed to devise a system of making water run uphill.

I am sure that as has been evidenced by your courteous actions in the past, it is your desire that your readers may have both sides of controversial questions. It is, therefore, my hope that you will have an opportunity to again develop editorially the above propositions, (1) the advisability and value of upstream storage for all purposes, and (2) protection of upstream water rights obtained under the laws of the State of Idaho.

Sincerely yours,

HAMER H. BUDGE,
Member of Congress.

I hope that the membership of the House will not conclude from the remarks previously made that the people of Idaho overwhelmingly favor this Federal project because such is most certainly not the case. In fact, the Idaho State Reclamation Association, the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, the Idaho State Grange, the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, Idaho's Governor during the past 4 years, and practically all, if not all, of the irrigation districts and canal companies in the State of Idaho have formally and consistently opposed this project, as they did its predecessor, the Columbia Valley Authority. And, of course, it is patently apparent from the remarks preceding mine that the project does not fit in with the program of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Although many, many reasons for such opposition in the area have been presented, I shall attempt to limit my remarks this afternoon to the one reason which I feel is uppermost in the minds of the people living on up the Snake River from the proposed location for this Federal dam. I am assuming that the various other reasons for opposition, as well as the opposition based on appropriation and use of water upstream, will all be fully developed at the time the appropriate committee holds hearings on the Hells Canyon bill.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand there will be no session of the House tomorrow. I had a special order reserved for tomorrow, and I ask unanimous consent that that reservation be put over until next Monday, March 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HELLS CANYON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion which I have long awaited. It is a privilege to introduce this bill to authorize the construction of Hells Canyon Dam. This bill is based on the fundamental concept that the power sites of the great Columbia and Snake Rivers are public resources—and it is dedicated to the principle that the water resources of the Northwest should be used for all the Northwest, and that, when full development of these resources can be obtained, anything less would be a crime against the public.

Many organizations in my State and other States of the Northwest are urging construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam because they have faith in their Government. The people of the Northwest are convinced that they and all Americans have an undeniable right to look to their Government for great multipurpose dams which will provide electric energy, flood control, and conservation.

In the Northwest there is 40 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric power.

I need not elaborate at this point on the importance of electric power. Certainly everyone here realizes how absolutely vital this source of energy is to our daily life—in our homes, our schools, our hospitals, our industries. Without an abundant, low-cost supply of electricity, our way of life would be incredibly impossible—for the people of the United States have a voracious appetite for electric power. Each year, consumption of electricity hits new peaks due to demands of our growing population and to the rapidly accelerating utilization of electric power in our homes, farms, and factories. The power demand curve soars upward year after year.

In recent years, and I stress the word recent, experts in Northwest power activities—Federal, private, and public—have been in reasonably close agreement concerning needs for additional power facilities required to meet power demands. It has been agreed by these experts that each year the Pacific Northwest must build new generating facilities having a capacity equal to a Bonneville Dam.

Even such a program, some have warned, would only provide sufficient power to satisfy the growing demands of domestic, rural, and commercial consumers. There is also the great need for power essential for the expanding industries of the Pacific Northwest. The tremendous and important task of constructing and operating a system of dams and power plants to meet such vast requirements is too big a job for non-Federal groups.

George Bernard Shaw once remarked: "The root of all evil is lack of money." His observation holds the key to the present power mess which has engulfed the Pacific Northwest and which threatent the stability of our regional and State economies. For the one question, "Where is the money coming from?" cuts across all the verbiage, the half-truths, the innuendoes, and places the Northwest power situation in realistic, factual perspective.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. As the gentlewoman is aware, the waters upstream on the Snake River are used for irrigation; can the gentlewoman advise us as to what happens to the water rights under State law in the event of the passage of the bill and the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam, as she advocates?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes; this bill guarantees the water rights to the State.

Mr. BUDGE. In what way?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would refer the gentleman to the bill, and I would be very happy to see that the gentleman gets a copy of it this afternoon. Those rights are guaranteed; all the water rights upstream for irrigation benefits are guaranteed.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I should like to point out to the gentlewoman at this point that I have from the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service a very comprehensive brief upon that particular question. The brief concludes in so many words that if the project is constructed and a subsequent Congress decides that it wants to require the release of waters upstream even under decreed water rights, that the Federal Government could require the release of those waters which are presently being used on the lands of the State of Idaho and of eastern Oregon for the purpose of irrigation.

I simply call that to the gentlewoman's attention.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I believe the gentleman on reading the bill will find that those rights are taken care of.

To go back to the Northwest power problem.

Let us look at the record of the Federal Government's past responsibilities in this matter. The Pacific Northwest did not fare too badly—for a while at least. Grand Coulee, Bonneville, McNary, the Dalles, Chief Joseph—and other Federal dams now in successful operation or under construction—are massive evidence of this record. It took a lot of work on the part of Bonneville Power Administration and the Department of the Interior. It took a willingness to fight for appropriations in the face of the undercover sabotage by the private utilities.

However, the present administration quickly washed its hands of this entire effort. It disclaimed any responsibility toward providing power supplies for this region. And the strategy is most alarming. The groundwork was laid very subtly in a campaign—first of innuendoes, later of strong argument—that the Congress would no longer provide funds for the development of power supplies in our region. Spurious reference was—and is—made that the people of the rest of the United States do not wish to invest in the future of the region—and as a consequence, in the future of the Nation.

I ask, can this be true?

One may search the record carefully. But it is only with considerable difficulty that one finds a reference here and there of opposition. Strangely enough, the few—and, I repeat—few, Congressmen of other States who spoke and acted against Northwest power appropriations are those whose records have always been of continuous opposition to Federal Power investments and have shown them to be strong supporters of private utilities. I maintain that the proposition that Federal funds cannot be obtained for Northwest multiple-purpose projects whose power features are reimbursable is sheer fiction planted by the private utilities.

The Federal Government is now being repaid—with interest—all the costs allocated to power. The multipurpose dams will be useful far beyond the 50-year period and therefore will continue to provide revenue for the Government which will in time repay the full cost of flood control and other features considered to be nonreimbursable.

Up to the time the present administration took over the power policy, progress in obtaining funds for the new dams and transmission lines had been fairly steady—even though not completely satisfactory. The appropriations did come through, except in time of war, including the Korean emergency—and whatever failures took place were due to the skillful undercover work of the private utility lobby. Lest anyone think this statement is a figment of political imagination, let me point out that early last year, Mr. Purcell Smith, the $60,000-a-year lobbyist for the private power utilities, boasted openly of the success of his work in cutting back appropriations for all Federal power development projects in the United States. He went so far as to report precisely which items of appropriation he had been able to sabotage.

The fact is—and it is a monumental fact—that for 20 years, except in time of grave national emergency, the Nation has maintained a program of orderly regionwide development of the Columbia Basin. The planning was regionwide in concept. The benefits were nationwide in their effect.

Our farms, homes, and factories were electrified. Our cities flourished and attracted new people by the hundreds of thousands. And all this was made possible by a Congress—a Democratic Congress—which recognized that money spent here was not a current expense, but rather, a capital investment. Not only did Congress recognize it as a capital investment in America's future, but as a self-liquidating investment which is already years ahead of the payout schedule and is busily creating new taxable wealth to help pay the general costs of Government.

Who says, "Congress has changed its mind"? Who says, "Congress now looks on a dam as an item of current budgetary expense which we can no longer afford"?

I have seen no declaration by Congress to that effect. None is in existence. Did either political party make such a declaration in any recent platform? My party certainly did not.

But what has happened in this short period of 2 years since the present administration took over the power policy? The electric clock has been turned back 20 years. And what do we have now? This is the simple answer—we have nothing, nothing but disastrous confusion. As farm and labor organizations in my State have said—if the Government should scuttle Hells Canyon and allow Idaho Power to build three private profit dams on sites which rightfully belong to the people of the United States, it will be one of the most colossal blunders ever committed by any administration.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield to me now?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Can the gentlewoman tell us what the cost per kilowatt would be to generate electricity at the Hells Canyon Dam, if it is constructed, and how many months during a calendar year the generating plant will operate during the low-water years upon which all these studies are based?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I think all the statistics show that there will be enough water so that the generators will be operating 12 months of the year. The water storage will be backed up for a distance of 93 miles. As far as the cost of it is concerned, our hope is to continue it on a postage-stamp rate. This means that we would continue to sell electricity at the wholesale rate of 2 mills per kilowatt. According to the experts in the Northwest, there is no indication that those rates will be raised in the immediate or the foreseeable future.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would permit me, I would like her to respond to the first part of my question as to what the cost per kilowatt would be to generate hydroelectric power at the Hells Canyon Dam; not what the rate would be throughout the system but what the cost to the Government would be to produce electricity at the Hells Canyon site.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sure the gentleman is well aware of the hearings held before the Federal Power Commission, and I would refer him to those reports.

Because of this nebulous "partnership" program, today, everyone is utterly confused—everyone except the private utilities. The industrialists, the farmers, the labor officials, the investors, the bankers, the insurance companies have not the remotest idea of where this situation will end. There is no prospect of stability in the administration's power policy. "Divide and conquer" is the unofficial word of the day. Pile confusion upon confusion—this makes the job of the private utilities much simpler. They can then continue in full control. The present situation is both tragic and ominous. The groundwork has been well planned. The real objective of the administration—paraphrasing that of the private utilities, is very simple. Notwithstanding pious protests to the contrary, it is the destruction of public power in the United States.

The administration program, in its simple private utility terms, is to destroy the yardstick principle so well-established by the Democratic administration and which resulted in power rates everywhere at the low cost levels. These low costs permitted wide and abundant use by everyone. The administration program is calculated to break down the principle of regional river and power development and to substitute piecemeal exploitation for the benefit of isolated private utility operations at a juicy, individual profit. The administration policy seems to be to abolish the idea of postage-stamp rates, which so far have made it impossible for individual utilities to charge locally all the traffic will bear. And the present administration seems intent on making impossible low cost power sales to industry and to permit the private utilities to skim the cream—as they did 20 years ago before Franklin Roosevelt put a stop to this practice.

A good start toward these objectives has been made—far better, I am sure than the most optimistic utility executive could have dreamed. Let us look at the record. Let us see the technique:

First, introduce rank confusion into the situation by throwing back power development to local enterprise, knowing full well its lack of financial capabilities. Second, destroy the one arm of government in the Pacific Northwest capable of appraising the situation and of planning for the future, by removing the Federal engineers who planned the system and could plan its orderly development for the widespread distribution of power to be generated from all portions of the Columbia River drainage system. Bonneville Power Administration has been

gutted of its most capable men. It is a hollow shell devoted now to unproductive accounting and bill collecting. Third, begin the fragmentation of the regional system by selling portions of the transmission system. Fourth, whittle away at the traditional preference and priority clause, long-accorded to publicly owned utilities, by means of weasel-worded contracts with private utilities. Fifth, make insecure the position of large power consumers such as the aluminum industry with the objective of curtailing their power demands. Sixth, start laying a foundation for increases in the power rates so as to make it profitable for the least efficient private utilities to operate.

I could continue the recitation of this factual record—a record which all of you have seen with your own eyes, but it would not provide the solution which must be obtained immediately.

The urgency of the overall situation is demonstrated by the agreed-upon fact that by 1960–61, the region's total power demands will be in excess of producing capacity, thus providing for black-outs and the most critical power shortage ever experienced by any region in the history of our Nation.

Inasmuch as "partnership," since it was first foisted upon us 2 years ago, has produced no tangible results except piously fraudulent talk, what are the alternatives? What do we do about this situation—this situation which threatens the immediate livelihood and welfare of so many?

First. We must return to the people the control and say-so on the development of our power resources. Let us make certain that the private utilities are placed where they belong—under effective control and regulation by means of the yardstick principle.

Second. Let us keep and use the assets of the Federal Government in the existing dams and transmission lines of the Pacific Northwest.

Third. Let us return to the tested and proved engineering programs providing for full river development on an orderly regionwide basis. The present dogfight over bits and pieces of our Northwest power resources is totally destructive and must be stopped.

Fourth. Let us see ahead, plan ahead, and be ahead of the needs of the coming generations—and that means, for one very important thing, the development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

A pattern for long-range development of the Columbia-Snake River system has been established. This pattern is a comprehensive pattern. It is based on years of study by engineers and cost nearly $5 million to prepare. It recognized the Pacific Northwest as one vast social, economic, and geographic unit and through the integration or tying together of river facilities it seeks to give maximum strength to the whole by the coordination of each part.

Each dam on the river system has been built with this pattern in mind. As a consequence, some are high storage dams with vast reservoirs behind them, while others are low, run-of-the-river structures, dependent for their performance on normal river flow plus the added feeding of storage waters from the high dams when normal flow is low. In this way a storage dam increases the capacity of several low dams and the power of each is fed back and forth over a vast network of transmission lines to increase the strength of the entire system. In this comprehensive plan no dam functions as an individual unit. Each is dependent on the others and each contributes far more because of this integration and interdependence than would be possible if it functioned as an isolated unit.

Every phase of the comprehensive river development program, through all the years of its projection, has emphasized the Hells Canyon site as the keystone to maximum development. The reason is obvious. Here, in this mighty chasm, exists a site for waterpower potential unrivaled throughout the Nation. In Hells Canyon the engineers visualized a dam 722 feet high, behind which the the Snake River waters will back up for 93 miles of the river basin. This huge reservoir of water offers a potential for the future which staggers the imagination. At the dam site Hells Canyon will produce 686,000 kilowatts of prime power—energy that can be delivered year after year, in wet or dry seasons—and the water it releases will again create kilowatts many times before it reaches the sea. It is a significant fact that downstream benefits from Hells Canyon are tremendous. On its way to the Pacific water from this mighty reservoir will make it possible for downstream plants to produce 436,000 kilowatts additional power.

The vast storage of water will help to minimize floods—in fact, even prevent them. You will remember there was $100 million in property damage when the Columbia River went on the rampage in 1948, and Hells Canyon will provide for irrigation development. Out of the arid desert it will provide fertile irrigated acres, and its cheap power will provide for the needed development of phosphate fertilizer, and not at all unimportant—Hells Canyon will provide a great recreation area.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Since the gentlewoman has referred to, what is I assume, my congressional district, and the irrigation of the arid lands therein, may I ask the gentlewoman to explain to the House just how the water will irrigate the desert upstream from the dam?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I said I would not yield at this point.

Again—to go back to the advantages to be derived from Hells Canyon Dam—except for a nonreimbursable allocation to flood control and navigation, the Hells Canyon project would be wholly self-sustaining. And this is extremely important to every taxpayer.

I maintain that Hells Canyon Dam can offer greater economic values than any alternate projects.

And I ask—where would our country be today, if we had not had the great public power developments at Grand Coulee and Bonneville—and in the Tennessee Valley, to provide the vast amounts of energy needed for aluminum production and for atomic development during the Second World War?

The President's own Materials Policy Commission had this to say:

Shortage of electricity and rising costs could impede economic growth, they could throttle the Nation's effort in event of war.

Yet, there is no need to propose in fear alone construction for such productive capacity. Rather, it is well for us to look toward strengthening and stabilizing for peace.

The soundness of our regional economies is basic to the welfare of our great Nation. And as we build for our future welfare, the full and proper development of our natural resources is fundamental. Therefore, let us build energetically and with vision and enthusiasm.

In the construction of Hells Canyon Dam lies the key to development of the Great Northwest region—for power, for irrigation, for flood control, for improved navigation, for new industrial expansion, for employment of our people—and for a better, richer way of life for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRD). The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes. I understand there is another special order to follow this, but I have conferred with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], whose special order it is, and he is agreeable to this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I desire to take this moment to congratulate the gentlewoman upon the high quality of her presentation. She certainly shows tremendous knowledge of a project that is important to her section and to the country.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I am happy to be present at this time to hear what the gentlewoman has said. Coming from a consumer district, I am very much interested in the subject. What she has said comes very close to our interests. We commend her for her very fine statement and agree with all that she has said.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mrs. PFOST. I, too, would like to join with my colleagues in saying that you have made an excellent presentation. I appreciate very much the fine support of my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DON MAGNUSON, yourself, Mrs. GREEN, and the gentleman from Montana, Mr. LEE METCALF. It is a privilege to join with you in sponsoring legislation so vital to the section of the country we represent.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I wish to join with my colleagues in commending the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] on the very fine presentation she has made.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. As a cosponsor of this Hells Canyon legislation, I assure the gentlewoman from Oregon I am very greatly concerned about any legislation which will impair the water rights of the farmers and the water-right holders of any State in the Northwest. I have examined this legislation, and I want to assure you that if such legislation were passed for the State of Montana I would be satisfied that the interests of the individual appropriators of water for irrigation purposes will be amply and adequately protected. I have not examined the brief which was referred to by the gentleman from Idaho. I am not as familiar with the laws regarding water rights in Idaho as I am with the water laws of the State of Montana. But I would like to call your attention to the fact that the question here is not whether or not the Federal Government is going to build the high dam at Hells Canyon, but the question is whether we are going to build one kind of dam or another, and whether we are going to build the three low-level dams or whether we are going to build a high dam. There is going to be a project. We are going to have electricity generated, and we are going to have some storage, and we are going to have a dam of one kind or another. To my mind, the question then comes up whether or not by such legislation as we have introduced today we are better protecting the water rights of the farmers who have appropriated it for agricultural purposes than their water rights would be protected in the proposal advanced by the Idaho Power Co. If the laws of Idaho are anything like the laws of Montana, this bill would take better care of farmers' upstream water rights than the protection afforded them by State laws if there were an appropriation by a power company or public utility such as the Idaho Power Co. The gentleman from Idaho has described a danger which is much more apt to arise under State laws and a private dam than under this bill.

The gentlewoman from Oregon has made a wonderful argument today for the kind of a program that we ought to have, not only in the Clearwater and on the Snake River, but in the State of Montana and on other tributaries of the Columbia. She has demonstrated here today that the appropriator's rights will be better protected. Not only will we have cheaper power, but we will get more benefits. We will get flood control and recreational benefits, and all these other things that come from a multiple-purpose dam which we will not get if we are going to build the other dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co. I call your attention to the fact that the Idaho Power Co. has already ordered generators for the Ox Bow Dam. They must be fairly optimistic of the decision of the Federal Power Commission. So the question that this Congress is going to decide between now and adjournment of the 1st session of the 84th Congress is whether or not we are going to build a dam under legislation that we have introduced today under rules and regulations that will protect the rights of the farmers and the prior appropriators, and whether we will build up recreational facilities, reclamation and flood control, or whether we are going to let a private power company build dams that will not protect those rights and give those benefits. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

HELLS CANYON—LAST CLEAR CHANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of history that I am introducing today, together with the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], a bill authorizing Federal construction, operation and maintenance of a high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River.

Construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon long has been recommended by Government engineers as an integral part of a comprehensive plan for the full development of the water resources of the mighty Columbia River and its tributaries. The high dam at Hells Canyon is a vital link in the chain of dams, high and low, which already have begun to harness the vast waterpower potential of the Columbia Basin and add so abundantly to the agricultural and economic good of the West and the entire United States.

Already, in the relatively few years since the completion of other dams called for in the comprehensive plan, tremendous changes have taken place in the Northwest. Aluminum, chemical, and atomic energy plants have been built, and whole new cities created, using the power provided by these dams. Great, barren areas have been planted with crops irrigated by the water which formerly was lost to the Pacific Ocean.

The comprehensive plan seeks to utilize and control all aspects of the endless flow of water from the mountains to the sea—low-cost power, navigation, irrigation, recreation, resource development and flood control. It is a multipurpose—not a single-purpose—plan. And Hells Canyon is the greatest remaining multipurpose dam site, not only on the Columbia River system, but within the whole of continental United States.

Today there is pending before the Federal Power Commission the application of the Idaho Power Co. for authority to construct a small dam—or possibly three—on this stretch of the Snake River. The application has the official blessing of the administration. If the application is approved and construction of a small dam started we shall have given away forever the multipurpose promise of a high Hells Canyon Dam.

A high dam at Hells Canyon will help provide control of the not infrequent and often disastrous floods on the lower Columbia; one or more small dams will not. A high dam will increase substantially the power produced at downstream dams through regulation of annual flow; one or more small dams will not. A high dam will make possible large irrigation projects; one or more small dams will not. A high dam will permit development of the vast deposits of low-grade phosphate ore in nearby areas; one or more small dams will not.

This is the last clear chance to save this great site for a multipurpose dam. There is every indication that by next year—unless Congress acts now—the picture will be clouded by a Federal Power Commission decision to give the site to the Idaho Power Co., which undoubtedly would throw the issue into the courts.

We in this country often enjoy the comforting belief that the resources which God has bestowed upon us are limitless. Under the pressures of the moment we often feel we can afford to waste much of our abundance. But if our population and our standard of living continue to increase at the present rate, the day is not far off when we shall need every bit of productive resources which we have.

The great issue at stake—the issue which will be decided by our action or inaction on this proposal—is conservation of our water resources. Acting wisely, we shall earn the praise—as failing to act we shall deserve the blame—of future generations.

We must not sacrifice the resource potential of a high Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I know the House is interested in hearing both sides of this question, so I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentlewoman from Oregon be extended an additional 5 minutes, and then I will ask her to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman wish additional time as requested by the gentleman from Idaho?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order and I have not been consulted. I am objecting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is entitled to recognition at this time.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, may I address an inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order, and I make a point of order against any further inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has been recognized under a special order for 15 minutes.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes immediately following the conclusion of any other special orders today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order, and I object. The gentleman can make his request later.

NEW HOUSING AUTHORITY BONDS AND PUBLIC HOUSING FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is to comment on an article by John S. Linen, vice president of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York, which originally appeared in the American Banker of December 16, 1954, and which now is being distributed in pamphlet form by the Chase National Bank to investors and financial institutions throughout the Nation.

As reflecting the new outlook on public housing in circles of conservative thought and in the sources of the wealth of the country, the article written by the vice president of one of the largest banks in the United States and widely circulated by that bank should prove of great interest to the Members of this body. It is possible that some Members have not seen this article by Mr. Linen. If so, I am confident they will appreciate my bringing it to their attention.

But first, Mr. Speaker, I feel moved to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST] and the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] on the addresses they made immediately preceding my remarks. They were outstanding in convincing content and eloquently forceful delivery. The gentlewoman from Oregon, whose reputation had preceded her arrival in the Halls of Congress, I understand was making her maiden speech in the well of the House. She understood so thoroughly her subject, and handled herself so masterfully in debate, more than justifying the reputation that had preceded her, that I would have wished to agree to a further extension of her time that the colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] might have been continued. My reason for objecting was solely that the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, has scheduled a public hearing on a most important measure and which I feel it my duty to attend. It was a matter of not having time available. I trust the gentleman from Idaho will understand my situation and that the time which by unanimous consent now has been granted him, following my remarks, will afford him ample opportunity to present his views in opposition to those so ably presented by Mrs. PFOST and Mrs. GREEN.

HOUSING FOR THE AGED

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago in addressing the House I stressed the demand for housing for our senior citizens, men and women of 65 and past who are living on limited means supplied by small retirement payments. In this connection I urged the prompt enactment of a measure I had introduced with 12 cosponsors, 11 of them members of the Banking and Currency Committee, to provide public housing especially constructed for these elder citizens and within their financial means. I am glad to know from Mr. Linen's scholarly article that such proposal impliedly would have the endorsement of the great bank of which he is vice president. Mr. Linen says:

If slums of objectionable character are to be cleared, and in the public interest as well as for humane reasons they should be, other homes must be found. In most cases the new public housing projects under the low-rent program have provided the only answer. A greatly improved environment for low-income families from the standpoint of health, public morals, and self-respect has been provided by this program. It should result in a more healthy, self-reliant, and responsible citizenry.

Changes in the structure of our population have occurred which present problems, particularly in our larger population centers. With many individuals being retired at the age of 65 and therefore having to exist on a substantially reduced income, it is interesting to note that the proportion of persons over 65 years of age comprised under 3 percent of the population in 1850, but was 8 percent of the population in 1950.

Thus, the purpose served by the low-rent housing program meets a variety of needs and deals with different segments of our population groups in constructive and useful ways.

Mr. Linen's article, in full, follows:

NEW HOUSING AUTHORITY BONDS

(By John S. Linen, vice president, the Chase National Bank, of the city of New York)

Unrealistic indeed would be the man, who, after examining with any understanding, the living conditions in the slum or poorer districts in most of our larger cities, would contend that housing facilities do not need substantial improvement.

There is involved far more than a desirable betterment for general social and welfare purposes. Public health which quite directly concerns our body politic, is clearly threatened by the absence of sanitary precautions; contagious diseases and avoidable illnesses are fostered by conditions prevailing in some of these areas.

Public safety is also endangered by the old and diplapidated buildings creating serious fire hazards as well as being a menace to proper moral and social standards and concepts.

To attempt to deal with these conditions, the original United States Housing Act was passed by Congress in 1937. It established a national policy of promoting the general welfare of the Nation by employing Federal funds and credit to assist the States and their political subdivisions in the elimination of unsafe and insanitary living conditions and to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income. The Housing Act of 1949 authorized a large expansion of the foregoing program. To carry out the provisions of the act, the Congress created the United States Housing Authority as a permanent corporate instrumentality of the Federal Government, the powers, functions, and duties of which are now administered by the Public Housing Administration, an agency of the Federal Government. This agency performs many important services in assisting local housing agencies in their project planning, financing, construction, ad operation.

Local housing agencies are public bodies organized by cities and other appropriate subdivisions under authority granted by the legislatures of 43 of our States and also by Congress for the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Such authorities or agencies are empowered and required to meet the many statutory provisions of the act in order to obtain from the Public Housing Administration the annual contributions and financial assistance provided for in the Housing Act, as amended.

FEDERAL OBLIGATION

Bonds issued by local agencies constitute obligations of such agencies. Most significant, perhaps, in considering the investment merits of new Housing Authority bonds is the obligation of the Federal Government to provide annually moneys sufficient in amount, together with funds of the local agencies available for such purpose, to pay principal and interest on all bonds issued by local housing authorities or agencies. This is in spite of the success or lack of success in the operation of the project against which new Housing Authority bonds are oustanding.

The amended legislation now completely eliminates the conditions to which payment of Federal contributions were subject under the provisions of the original Housing Act of 1937, which conditions applied on previously issued series A and B housing bonds. The commitment of the United States through its agency, the Public Housing Administration, is now unconditional.

The Federal Government's obligation to make the required funds available was confirmed in an opinion rendered by the Attorney General of the United States to the President dated May 15, 1953, which stated in part: "In summary, I am of the view that: * * * A contract to pay annual contributions entered into by the PHA (Public Housing Administration) in conformance with the provisions of the act (United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) is valid and binding upon the United States, and that the faith of the United States has been solemnly pledged to the payment of such contributions in the same terms its faith has been pledged to the payment of its interest-bearing obligations.

New Housing Authority bonds made their initial appearance in the investment market in July of 1951. Since that time, or in a period of a little over 3 years, approximately $1½ billion of new Housing Authority bonds have found their way into investment channels.

LACK OF UNDERSTANDING

The introduction of new Housing Authority bonds to investors has not been without disappointments and difficulties. Despite the fact that these bonds are in effect obligations of the United States, they have been plagued by a lack of public understanding and a broad investor prejudice. It would have been much simpler in the public mind if it could have been said that the obligations of the local Housing Authorities were "guaranteed" by the United States Government. This, however, would not have been an accurate statement, even though the effect were the same.

Because the Federal Government's commitment was through a Federal agency, (the PHA) even though direct, it required a sufficiently involved explanatory statement which discouraged ready acceptance by the public.

Investor prejudice if widely held can be a real market factor, whether or not such prejudice is well founded. Institutional and the larger individual investors who are interested in tax-exempt issues rather generally are strong advocates of the private-enterprise system. In the initial stages, before the need to remove and improve slum conditions was as well understood and accepted as it is today, many public-housing projects were considered unnecessary and in conflict with this concept.

PRICING

While all of the bonds issued by the various local housing agencies are identically secured, it has been found necessary by underwriting groups, in pricing the bonds for sale, to place selected issues in different price groups. Because bonds issued in some States and local housing agencies of the Territories and possessions above mentioned are exempt from State and local taxes as well as Federal in-

come taxes, where this local exemption is of special value, the bonds are priced to reflect this. Such advantage applies principally in the States where a high millage tax is levied on personal property or where a State income tax is present. A notable instance is the State of Pennsylvania. The status of bonds as a legal investment for trust accounts and savings banks in certain States is another factor which is given consideration.

In theory all of the remaining issues of new Housing Authority bonds should be offered at a price scale which shows no variance between issues. There are two factors which interfere with this procedure. One is investor prejudice which shows a preference for well known names, and issues offering sizable or round blocks in each maturity. The other is the fact that the bonds are purchased at public competitive sale. Because of competition all factors that affect the price at which the bonds can be reoffered must be carefully weighed by the bidders. This includes investor preferences and prejudices. If the investor will pay more, the bidder can bid more, and the result of these considerations is shown in the different offering scales applying to the respective issues. The placing of specific issues in various groups reflects the judgment of the underwriter regarding the preferences the ultimate investor will show in considering the purchase of such bonds. Time proves the underwriter right or wrong in such judgment.

For those understanding the pricing of these bonds the above discussion will appear to be unnecessarily elementary.

The comment is made because there are still many investors who believe that the price differences shown in the various price groups are due to some basic factors, not fully understood by them, which make such bonds in the higher priced groups better secured obligations and therefore a safer investment.

FINANCING PROCEDURE

There are three steps in financing the capital costs of low-rent housing projects. First, the Public Housing Administration makes direct loans in the preliminary stages to the local authorities. Second, the local authorities sell temporary notes at public sale when the amount required warrants going to the public market and the PHA is reimbursed accordingly. These temporary notes may be refunded with similar notes several times in certain instances before the third step occurs. Third, when the project is approaching completion long-term bonds are sold and the proceeds are applied to the payment of the notes and construction costs.

During the past fiscal year temporary notes in the hands of the public showed a net increase of $374 million and long-term bonds a net increase of $336 million or a total increase of $710 million. The total amounts outstanding as of June 30, 1954, were:

Temporary notes	$1,093,202,971
New Housing Authority bonds	1,335,750,613
Total	2,428,953,584

The placing of additional obligations in the amount of $710 million in the hands of private investors during the past year, resulted in paying off advances and loans made by the PHA to local authorities of approximately $410 million. This in turn reduced the advance by the United States Treasury to the PHA, thus making funds available for curtailment in the national debt.

The cost of temporary note financing is, of course, related to the money situation. Beyond this, however, there has been an improved and broader demand for such notes during the past year as evidenced by a decline in the interest rate from 1.965 percent on July 7, 1953, to 0.669 percent on June 15, 1954. The most recent sale on December 7, 1954, produced an overall average rate of 0.693 percent.

INTEREST TREND

This favorable rate on the notes makes it clearly advantageous to sell notes to the public rather than borrow from the PHA which must pay interest to the Treasury at the Federal going rate which averaged about 2¾ percent last year.

The sale of local Housing Authority bonds has also shown a favorable downward trend in interest cost during the past year. It should be noted that in the schedule below the issues sold in 1953 had the last maturities averaging 30 years as compared with 38.5 years or slightly longer, for the issues sold in 1954. Therefore, the reduction in the average interest rate is even greater than is shown when adjustment is made for the longer maturities.

Recent sales of new Housing Authority bonds

Sale date	Average longest maturity	Total sold	Average interest rate
	Years		*Percent*
Sept. 22, 1953	30.0	$125,210,000	2.833
Dec. 15, 1953	30.0	121,225,000	2.471
Mar. 2, 1954	38.5	119,000,000	2.338
June 22, 1954	38.9	119,210,000	2.273
Sept. 14, 1954	38.5	135,935,000	2.333

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The commitment of the PHA under the annual contributions contract, under which payments started in 1941, has been showing substantial increase during the past 3 years in view of the stepped-up construction program. Actual contributions over the past 14 years have totaled $160,716,647 which, however, was slightly less than half the maximum contributions for which the PHA was liable. The difference represents project earnings (rents less current operating expense).

The result of expenditures for public housing purposes was reported at Senator BYRD's request last summer. A total of 372,005 housing units under the low-rent housing program were constructed or are under construction. On July 1, 1954 there were 35,329 additional units authorized for completion on which construction has not yet started.

The maturity arrangement on the new Housing Authority bonds has from the beginning provided for level debt service. Thus, the total required for interest payments and principal retirement remains approximately the same each year. The annual cumulative total for debt service at the end of the 1953–54 fiscal year was something over $60 million for all of the 443 different issues of bonds sold to the public by the various local housing authorities up to that time. While this represents a substantial charge the actual amount of annual contributions paid was slightly under $45 million, the balance being provided from the net earnings of the projects. There were various other costs, such as interest on temporary notes and operating charges of the PHA agency and other miscellaneous expenditures.

INVESTOR INTEREST

It is, I believe, appropriate to observe that a consistent effort on the part of underwriters to better educate the public generally regarding these new Housing Authority bonds has brought about a much broader investment interest in those obligations. Because this broader demand for housing bonds has developed a far more active and dependable secondary market for the bonds, commercial banks, which require as a matter of policy a high degree of marketability in the major portion of their purchases for portfolio account, have been more disposed to acquire these bonds for their investment accounts.

Equally important in creating this broader interest and more active secondary market, has been the participation by some of the larger commercial banks as underwriters and dealers in these bonds. They have aided greatly in the educational program and their sponsorship of these bonds has carried much weight with a multitude of other banking institutions and with many other investors. In addition their own investment interest, increased substantially by their ability to underwrite and deal in such bonds, has contributed most helpfully in establishing a better market reception for new issues and a broader market generally.

The effect of the broader market has been of value not only in the sale of new Housing Authority bonds, but in the sale of temporary notes as well. As the notes are an integral part of the financing program of the housing projects, at least brief attention to them seems in order as we examine the overall program.

NEW YORK CITY NEEDS

In addition to the efforts of the Public Housing Administration, there are other public agencies that have also contributed to giving relief in this field. In New York City, for instance, the New York City Housing Authority has charge of constructing and managing projects financed through the local housing authority with Federal assistance (PHA) of which there are 19,682 apartments or units completed, New York State financed projects of which there are 23,297 completed, and New York City Housing Authority financed projects (guaranteed by New York City), with 22,644 apartments completed.

The need in New York City has been and still is serious for better housing conditions. A visit to some of these projects competently handled by the New York City Housing Authority is convincing evidence indeed of not only the better living conditions, but of the foresight in planning which is a part of such program. There are included in this plan modern sanitary conditions, outdoor recreation areas in many cases, child care and play facilities with the cooperation of the Hudson Guild, room for leisure-time activities with work benches, etc., in the basement for adults, cooperative laundry facilities, and in some cases medical care and examination centers.

SERVING VITAL NEED

The suspicion unquestionably still lingers in regard to some projects as to whether political considerations may not have been given as much weight as other factors when approval was given. Whether or not this suspicion is warranted, experience has demonstrated that the large majority of such projects are serving a vital need. Slum conditions in certain areas have been deplorable and disgraceful; they promote evil ways and delinquency. The effect of substantially improving the character of living and sanitary conditions will almost certainly reduce welfare, hospital, health, and fire departments and police costs. If slums of objectionable character are to be cleared, and in the public interest as well as for humane reasons they should be, other homes must be found. In most cases the new public housing projects under the low-rent program have provided the only answer. A greatly improved environment for low-income families from the standpoint of health, public morals, and self respect has been provided by this program. It should result in a more healthy, self reliant, and responsible citizenry.

GROUPS SERVED

Changes in the structure of our population have occurred which present problems, particularly in our larger population centers. With many individuals being retired at the age of 65 and therefore having to

exist on a substantially reduced income, it is interesting to note that the proportion of persons over 65 years of age comprised under 3 percent of the population in 1850, but was 8 percent of the population in 1950.

Thus, the purpose served by the low-rent housing program meets a variety of needs and deals with different segments of our population groups in constructive and useful ways. Veterans returned from service duty and beginning their civilian lives or returning to it with family responsibilities, are given preferential consideration. That they avail themselves of this privilege is illustrated by the fact that in many cases they represent over 75 percent of the occupants in these housing projects. A study has shown that approximately 16 percent of the projects under the management of the New York City Housing Authority, represents the very low-income group including families receiving welfare assistance. About 5 percent of the occupants are made up of the older residents including the pension and retirement group.

BENEFITS IMPRESSIVE

In the development of these housing projects not only has progress been made in the replacement and improvement of home facilities, but the results provide far more healthy environments which combine both sanitary and safety factors.

In addition to the physical advantages there is a corresponding benefit from the improved surroundings which should be favorably reflected in the character and lives of the children as well as the self-respect and, in some cases, rehabilitation of adults as well. We may all be happy and take satisfaction in these accomplishments.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the presentation of the Hells Canyon bills catches me somewhat unprepared. I had understood for some weeks that the bills were to be introduced, but of course I did not know the exact date.

For the further information of the House, I believe that we should know a little bit about just what the Hells Canyon project entails, particularly insofar as it affects the irrigated acreages upstream; that is, the irrigated acreages of Idaho and of eastern Oregon.

The Federal Government, and of course all private individuals who depend upon water that is stored in the irrigation dams, depend upon that water to irrigate their crops to grow the agricultural products which have made southern Idaho and eastern Oregon great agricultural producers. All of those people, including the Federal Government, due to its investment through the Bureau of Reclamation, are seriously concerned about what happens to the water rights in those areas.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] stated that perhaps the water laws in Idaho are different from those in Montana. I doubt that there is much difference, but even though there were, once this project is constructed and the Federal Government decides it needs water from upstream to operate this project, any subsequent Congress can require the release of those waters from these great irrigated acreages upstream in order to run this powerplant, and the laws of the State of Montana, or Idaho, or any other State of the Union would not be called into being at all.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is the gentleman familiar with the Reclamation Act passed by the Congress which provides that the Secretary of the Interior or anyone constructing dams pursuant to the Reclamation Act is required to comply with State law?

Mr. BUDGE. I am very familiar with section 8 of the Reclamation Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not that apply in the State of Idaho as well as the rest of the Nation?

Mr. BUDGE. It most certainly does.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I should like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. BUDGE. I wish to answer the gentleman's first question. This or the next or any other Congress can change section 8 of the Reclamation Act or any other Federal law.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUDGE. Not at this point; I want to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

This whole controversy arose during the regime of that great engineer, newspaperman by profession, Mr. Michael Straus, then Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Straus put out a manual in the name of the Reclamation Bureau and in that manual this is what the Bureau of Reclamation said about section 8 of the Reclamation Act:

> The section is purely directory; it is not mandatory, and the Federal Government owns all of the unappropriated waters in the West.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. BUDGE. I decline to yield, Mr. Speaker, and I would very much prefer if the gentleman would permit me to follow along on my brief statement. After all, the gentleman's side has had about an hour. I should be permitted 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I want to complete what Mr. Straus and the Bureau of Reclamation printed in their manual: That in spite of section 8 of the Reclamation Act the Federal Government is the owner of all unappropriated waters in the streams of the West, and that the Federal Government need not comply with the water laws of Colorado, Montana, Idaho, or any other Western State.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is the gentleman familiar with the Supreme Court decision in the case of Nebraska against Wyoming and Colorado under section 8 of the Reclamation Act and the contentions set forth in the pamphlet to which the gentleman referred were called to the attention of the Supreme Court and they very definitely and with certainty held that the Secretary of the Interior and any agency of the Federal Government operating under the Reclamation Act were bound by section 8 of the act. Is the gentleman familiar with that decision?

Mr. BUDGE. Let me answer the gentleman's questions one at a time. I have previously referred to an opinion prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The opinion in my belief contains every applicable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on this question including the case to which the gentleman has just referred. In their opinion which, I believe, comprises some 32 pages and which should contain every applicable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, this is what they say.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Quoting from what opinion?

Mr. BUDGE. This is an opinion addressed to me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, written by Mr. Frank B. Horne. I should be happy to furnish the gentleman with a copy. This is what is said on page 10:

> This brings us to the main question underlying this whole problem which, as we see it, can be stated bluntly as follows: In the event after the authorization and construction of the Hell's Canyon Division there is insufficient downstream flow for its operation could the Congress in the exercise of its constitutional powers require release of the waters from above and thus curtail beneficial use under applicable State and other laws in this upper area? Based on applicable court decisions the answer is in the affirmative.

I submit to the gentlemen, that coming from the arid Western States, as they do, they should pay a great deal of attention to the problem which we are discussing here this afternoon. Any time a commitment is made downstream from your irrigated acreage, you are placing your State in jeopardy of having the Federal Government through a succeeding Congress come in and say: We are going to override your water rights; we are going to require the delivery of water downstream in order to operate our powerplant.

I am not going to permit my congressional district to be placed in that position, if I can help it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The matter the gentleman quotes from came, as he says, from an opinion of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress?

Mr. BUDGE. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did they include in that the Supreme Court decision in the case of the State of Nebraska against the State of Wyoming in which the State of Colorado was interpleaded?

Mr. BUDGE. It is my impression that that decision is discussed in the opinion.

I do not want to guarantee that but the Library of Congress said it had included all applicable court decisions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For the benefit of the gentleman, I may state that as Attorney General of the State of Colorado I was involved in that lawsuit, representing the great State of Colorado. When the Department of the Interior through the Department of Justice made such a claim, it was filed as a part of the pleadings in that case. When it finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States they spelled out in no uncertain terms that the Reclamation Act, under section 8 that the gentleman refers to, requires the Secretary of the Interior or any other Government agency that files an appropriation to comply with the State law. They spelled that out in no uncertain terms and I would suggest to the gentleman, if there is any doubt in his mind that he read that decision.

I also would direct his attention to the fact that probably the State of Idaho like all the Western States has in its constitution that the first use of water shall be for domestic purposes, second irrigation, and third manufacturing, which is that of power. Under the interpretation as given throughout the entire West and substantiated by the Supreme Court decision in the Nebraska against Wyoming case, there is no question in my mind but what the building of this dam or any other dam does not deprive the State or the water users of their water rights contrary to their own State constitution and their own State laws.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, in order that I may answer the gentlemen fully, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Regardless of the legalistic arguments and the decisions of the Supreme Court would it not result, as a matter of fact, in about the following situation, if the Federal Government actually did deprive the downstream people of their rights: By the time they got through enforcing their rights in the courts, their farms would not only be dried up but they themselves would be bankrupt?

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman from California for that observation. I recall that his State just recently went through that experience exactly.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to proceed further in answer to the statements of the gentleman from Colorado. The Bureau of Reclamation in following section 8 of the Reclamation Act has, so far as I know, in the past in every instance complied with the State laws relative to the appropriation and use of water; but we should bear in mind that the Bureau of Reclamation also, to the best of my knowledge, in times past has never built an irrigation project below the area to be irrigated.

Just who dreamed up the idea that you could run the water uphill in this instance I do not know. The Bureau of Reclamation has always built its dams upstream where it impounds the water, changes the normal gravitating flow of the water, and diverts it to the areas to be irrigated. In this instance, the dam is being built some 200 miles below any potential irrigated areas. Now, that, of course, presents a different problem than any with which we have ever been confronted in the operation of the Reclamation Act.

As the gentleman from Colorado well knows, this Congress or any subsequent Congress can entirely delete section 8, should they so desire.

Now, I wish to quote again from this opinion from the Library of Congress, and I shall be happy to make a copy available to any Member of the Congress who is interested. This is what the opinion says on page 4 in the discussion on water rights. Incidentally, I am putting this section that I am reading from in the RECORD, and it will appear tomorrow.

> Such protection, as we have heretofore indicated, is not absolute and cannot be absolute because of the constitutional powers of Congress that are involved. In view of past decisions of the Supreme Court, a constitutional amendment would be required to divest the Congress of its power and vest complete control of these water resources of navigable rivers in the States.

In other words, until the people of the United States amend the Constitution of the United States there is absolutly no safeguard that you can put in these Hells Canyon bills which will protect the upstream users.

Now, that is the objection of the people of southern Idaho.

Now, let us follow the thinking of the gentleman from Colorado to a further conclusion. If it were true that the Federal Government could not build this project until it secured a permit from the State of Idaho, then would it not be logical to defer consideration of the project until such time as the State of Idaho has given the Federal Government that water right? Thus far, the State of Idaho certainly has not done so, and, so far as I know, is not about to do so. Why, then, should we be discussing this project when none of us know the answers to two very important questions. First: Is the water legally there, under the theory advanced by the gentleman from Colorado? Then, of course, the second question: Will it be there physically after the complete upstream development will have occurred, and which development the proponents of this bill maintain they are protecting?

I have heard the thought expressed around the country about this being solely a public versus private power fight. That is far from the whole story. We might all have our opinions on that, but the crux is whether you are going to place in jeopardy the present and the future water rights of a great agricultural area of this Nation, the major portion of which lies in my congressional district.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. There are going to be some dams built either by the Idaho Power Co. or by the Federal Government; is that not right?

Mr. BUDGE. I certainly assume that that is correct.

Mr. METCALF. If the private power companies build the dams, where is the protection for those people that you say are jeopardized by this legislation?

Mr. BUDGE. Well, now, I would take exception to the gentleman's statement that I am an apostle of the private power companies. I have no financial or any other interest in any power company.

Mr. METCALF. I will change that to "proponent."

Mr. BUDGE. I would not even agree to become a proponent. But now, this is the difference, if the gentleman will let me explain to him.

Mr. METCALF. I have been waiting patiently for this explanation.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman is going to get it. The water right which is given by the State of Idaho to the Idaho Power Co. to construct these dams has in it, as do all recent water rights obtained by the Idaho Power Co., the direct statement that any right therein granted shall forever be subservient to upstream appropriation and use under the laws of the State of Idaho.

Now, you cannot do that same thing with the Federal Government, because the Federal Government under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States will have a paramount right. Once this Congress says that this project is for navigation, flood control, or probably for the generation of hydroelectric power, which is its chief purpose—once you have done that in this Congress, you have conferred upon the Federal Government a paramount right to all the waters on that drainage.

Mr. METCALF. Unappropriated waters.

Mr. BUDGE. No, I do not agree that it is limited to the water which is unappropriated. That, however, is the difference so far as the upstream users are concerned between the private development and development by the Federal Government. We can protect ourselves in Idaho against the Idaho Power Co. We can protect ourselves against the citizens of our State or of any other State. But once you bring in the Federal Government, with its paramount rights, then the future development of my State and very possibly such present development as it has achieved is in serious jeopardy. I submit that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] had best be careful that the same thing does not happen in their States when the Federal Government comes along and wants to build a project far below your irrigated acreages.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman know how long the reclamation law has been on the statute books?

Mr. BUDGE. The Reclamation Act was passed in 1902.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. More than 50 years?

Mr. BUDGE. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. During that period of time, Congress has not seen fit to change the laws of the States of Idaho, Colorado, Montana, or Wyoming, has it?

Mr. BUDGE. I also know that during the last 52 years the Bureau of Reclamation has never attempted to build nor has it built a dam below the areas to be irrigated. That presents an entirely different situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUDGE. I want to answer the gentleman's question before he asks me another. As I say, this is the first instance in the 52-year history of the Bureau of Reclamation where they have drawn up plans to build a gigantic structure with a gigantic lake away down the river from the areas to be irrigated. That of itself poses a new question. I also know that if this project is built, that then at any time the Congress of the United States decides that it does not want to comply with State law as to the appropriation and use of water, it does not have to do so.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Can the gentleman point to any time when the Federal Government has, by court decision, been granted the right to invade State laws as applied to water rights?

Mr. BUDGE. I recall that in two successive sessions of the Congress we were forced to put a rider on an appropriation bill, and the House passed it overwhelmingly, to protect some irrigators down in California. I think perhaps some of the California Members might be able to answer the gentleman a little better on that; but I recall that happening in two successive Congresses.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What I was asking was whether there were any Supreme Court decisions which have said that the Federal Government has the right to override the State laws.

Mr. BUDGE. I will say to the gentleman that I shall deliver personally to him a copy of the Library of Congress brief. I have stated the conclusions which have been reached therein. I know that both of us have the fullest confidence in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and I shall state unqualifiedly to the gentleman that that was the conclusion reached in that opinion to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. On the point of interference of the Congress of the United States with the rights of States with respect to water, this Congress in passing the Boulder Canyon Project Act forced the State of California to limit its rightful use of waters in the Colorado River to 4.4 million acre-feet a year. At the present time, with respect to the situation as to the law and the courts, the Bureau of Reclamation is holding two interpretations of the Colorado compact with respect to the allocation of water rights among the seven Western States which is before the court itself for decision at the present moment. So naturally there can be no assurance that the Bureau of Reclamation might do anything but make its own interpretations of the law and persist therein to the very great detriment of those people who are standing behind and guarding the waters in their own ditch, as the gentleman from Idaho is so ably doing today.

Mr. BUDGE. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. Of course, the manual published by the Bureau of Reclamation under the dictatorship of Michael W. Straus specifically stated that the Federal Government was the owner of all unappropriated waters in the nonnavigable streams of the arid West, and note that that is "nonnavigable." They assumed that they were the owners of all the navigable streams. The Supreme Court of the United States has specifically held that the Snake River, on which this project is to be built, is a navigable stream, and that every drop of water that flows into it becomes a part of that same navigable stream. So the Bureau of Reclamation by its own publication says that the State water laws do not mean anything, that if the Federal Government wants to move in they can move in. That was the philosophy of Michael W. Straus during his administration of the Bureau of Reclamation and may be a recurring philosophy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sorry that the gentleman from California saw fit to bring this California self-limitation act into this discussion, but since he did I think it might be well to point out to the House that while California limited itself to the use of 4,400,000 acre-feet of water from the main stream of the Colorado River, they are now by their own admission using 5,316,000 acre-feet from the Colorado River, and we do not know where it is going to go from there. We are in the Supreme Court trying to keep them from taking the last drop of water from that stream.

Mr. BUDGE. I very much appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona because they point up to me another very significant problem which will arise if this dam is ever constructed, and that is that from a practical standpoint if the Government ever builds that gigantic dam and has this investment down there totaling nearly half a billion dollars, with the transmission lines necessary to get the power away from it, if the Federal Government ever puts that kind of an investment in that canyon I am satisfied that the two Members of this House allotted to the State of Idaho would have a very difficult time attempting to secure diversion of any additional water upstream. When that Federal investment to produce those kilowatts becomes a reality, I can well imagine that same Federal Government taking, to put it mildly, a dim view of further appropriation of water upstream.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUDGE. I want to make one further observation.

During the hearings on the Hells Canyon bill some 4 years ago, which were held before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, my recollection is there were some 21 members on that committee. Twelve members were of the present majority party and nine members of the present minority party, and after extensive hearings the committee unanimously refused to vote out the Hells Canyon project.

One strange thing happened in those hearings. The Bureau of Reclamation insisted that provisions had been made for all possible upstream development, but in their power studies down at the site of this dam, the Bonneville Power Administration in computing the amount of water which would be there to turn the turbines to generate the kilowatts to sell to pay for the project allowed for the diversion of only enough water to irrigate 192,000 acres upstream. That, strangely enough, is the exact acreage of the Mountain Home project which the Bureau of Reclamation wants to irrigate, and which I would like to see irrigated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been trying to inject myself into this—I hope the gentleman will assure me that he will yield to me for a couple of questions before he has completed his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. In making that computation of the amount of new acreage, the Bonneville Power Administration did not even take into consideration the Bureau of Reclamation projects which they presently have under construction on that river, nor did they anywhere near sufficiently provide for the private development which has occurred. Since the studies upon which this bill is based were completed, not 192,000 acres over a 50-year period as was set forth in the Bureau plan, but approximately 225,000 acres of new land have already been put in—not in 50 years but in the period between 1948 and 1954, and not a drop of

water has yet gone on the Mountain Home project.

I know that this water-rights question is a serious one to every Member of the Congress from the West. It has not in the past been sufficiently pointed up, and it is my sincere hope that the colloquy and the frank discussion which we have had here this afternoon will point up the issues which are involved and indicate to us the proper course which we should pursue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of congratulating the gentleman from Idaho on the very fine presentation that he has made of this problem. It shows that he has studied it and knows whereof he speaks. He has asked for aid from the Legislative Reference Service which is certainly commendable, and he has pointed up the real issues involved in this problem.

Some of the remarks made about this administration with regard to its policy on public and private power are very wide of the mark. Repeatedly the President and this administration have made it abundantly clear that they will do nothing to interfere with either private or public power. They have said that on the one hand they are not going to drive private-power companies out of business, and on the other hand that they are going to foster all proper public power developments. They have made it clear that they are not going to turn over the power development of this great country entirely to private interests nor are they going to say that it shall always be done with Federal funds. There is a proper sphere for each. The position of this administration on the appropriate role of public and private power, working in cooperation is a very clear position which should commend itself to the people of this country, and I believe it does so commend itself to them.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. The point I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Idaho is that before the dire consequences which he predicted would happen to the people who have upstream irrigation facilities in his district, before any of those things could happen, section 8 of the Reclamation Act would have to be repealed. That is a section which has been in effect for 50 years. The Flood Control Act would have to be repealed and specific protective sections of the legislation which was introduced today would also have to be repealed. There is not a Member of this Congress who would not come to the aid of the gentleman from Idaho or the gentleman from Colorado, and I hope the aid of the gentleman from Montana, in the event there was an attempt to take our upstream water rights and repeal those very beneficial and important sections of the Federal statute and the sections that we have suggested be written into the legislation, which we have introduced today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. STAGGERS) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING in four instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. HALE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 10, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of June 3, 1916, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

525. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

526. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4720. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1831. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4046. A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2121. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3761. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 151. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for a code of fair procedure for committees; without amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of David Del Guidice; without amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille; with amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 996. A bill for the relief of Robert Francis Symons; with amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1003. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley;

without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of Golda I. Stegner; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; without amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Sullivan Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1171. A bill for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1189. A bill for the relief of William H. Barney; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Ewing Choat; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1404. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1409. A bill for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of J. B. Phipps; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Herman E. Mosley; with amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1426. A bill for the relief of George S. Ridner; with amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; with amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Constantine Nitsas; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse; with amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward; with amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton; without amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Irving I. Erdheim; with amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1921. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1941. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mateo Oritz Vazquez, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1943. A bill for the relief of John G. Zeros; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Virginia Hell; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Leila Park; with amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1989. A bill for the relief of George D. Hopper; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; with amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alice Rose Spittler; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2486. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Roy M. Butcher; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice; with amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2907. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2936. A bill for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Paul Nelson; with amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3045. A bill for the relief of George L. F. Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3054. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3178. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Gunther H. Hahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3638. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3957. A bill for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett; with amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4191. A bill conferring jurisdiction

upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4288. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington and Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Guerdon Plumley; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 4719. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4720. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 4721. A bill to create a distinguished decoration to be known as the Washington Order of Merit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4722. A bill to amend the Public Building Act of 1949 so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4723. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Secretary of Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 4724. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4725. A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4726. A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4727. A bill to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4728. A bill making unauthorized wiretapping a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 4729. A bill to designate the lake created by the Fall River Reservoir, in the State of Kansas, as Lake Meyer; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 4730. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4731. A bill relating to the tax treatment to be afforded under section 117 (j) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in certain cases involving the sale, exchange, or conversion of land with unharvested crops thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4732. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4733. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4734. A bill to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period of November 7, 1953; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4735. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 4736. A bill to enlarge and extend the special school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request):

H. R. 4737. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for retirement of certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions excepted from the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4738. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4739. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4740. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4741. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4742. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the exclusion of crafts, trades, and labor positions therefrom; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4743. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4744. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 4745. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4746. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 4747. A bill to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4748. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 4749. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 4750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education for the education of any dependent of such individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4751. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4752. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 4753. A bill to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4754. A bill to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 4755. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4756. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4757. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to provide tax equity through the taxation of cooperative corporations and to provide tax credits for recipients of dividends from genuine cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to create a select committee to determine the extent to which

individuals and business enterprises in the United States have lost earnings as a result of the reciprocal-trade program; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to timberland in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests in Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the appropriation of sufficient Federal funds to be set aside as an emergency fund for Indian relief and welfare of all kinds to be used during the period of adjustment when the United States Government shall withdraw from the field of providing medical, hospital, and other welfare and security needs of the ward Indians of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the land-acquisition program in the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 4758. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Genser Tritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 4759. A bill for the relief of Clarence Maxwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Lonnie E. Spangler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 4761. A bill for the relief of Miss Sayoko Fujimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aberasturi Cigorraga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4763. A bill for the relief of Elzie C. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4764. A bill for the relief of Arthur Ronald Tower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 4765. A bill for the relief of William Patrick Flood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4766. A bill for the relief of James C. H. Paulson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4767. A bill for the relief of Henry G. Mathusek; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4768. A bill for the relief of Gino Filippelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 4769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara (Pearson) Boycott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 4770. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Kallimanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4771. A bill for the relief of David Ajuelo, Mrs. Roza Ajuelo, Victoria Ajuelo, and Lizet Ajuelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Atara Couse Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4773. A bill for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shriro, and Samuel Stackman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 4774. A bill for the relief of Francis Gerbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 4775. A bill for the relief of Charles Lang, otherwise known as Lum Sing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

142. Mr. HAYS of Arkansas presented a petition of Carl Olsson and other employees of the Corps of Engineers, Little Rock, Ark., urging approval of an increase in the general schedule of salary rate of at least 10 percent for Federal employees which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thomas G. Masaryk—World Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1850, Thomas G. Masaryk was born.

The world was busy that year. Jenny Lind, the Swedish Nightingale, was giving her first American concert. California was admitted as a State. Senator Henry Clay was striving to bring together the rapidly dividing interests of the North and the South.

But, to the world, nothing that happened in 1850 was more important than the birth of this one child.

Thomas Masaryk might have gone down in history as a great organizer. It was through his dedicated efforts that the diverse peoples of Czechoslovakia were welded into one.

Thomas Masaryk might have had his name graven among the great as a scholar. The brilliance of his pen produced books which will, long after his death, be praised as outstanding contributions to the science of politics.

Thomas Masaryk might have been forever known as a prophet. It was he who said, "A Communist is only a Czarist with his uniform on wrong side out."

But, to me, Thomas Masaryk was more than an organizer, more than a scholar; even more than a prophet.

He was a patriot who lived with his people; for his people. He was a lover of liberty who extended the hand of enduring friendship to all men who loved freedom, irrespective of their breed or their birth.

Thomas G. Masaryk was—and is—a hero of the world.

Tuition Expenses Should Be Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide an income tax deduction for amounts paid as tuition or fees to public and private institutions of higher education for the education of any dependent of such individuals.

This is a matter of tax justice which should be carried through by this Congress at the earliest practicable time. The average taxpayer can generally provide for his family until he faces the high and ever-increasing costs of higher education for his dependents, over and above the normal expenses of support. While higher education and training for dependents may be a matter of personal pride for the taxpayer—it is also a matter of investment in human life which pays fruitful dividends to the whole economy.

Higher education and training makes for a more useful citizen—in every respect. Not only is the educated or trained dependent more productive—but through such increased productivity he earns more income and pays more income taxes. Therefore, the entire national economy is benefited by the development of its most important resource—its young people. Taxpayers who contribute and help in this important way are certainly entitled to a tax deduction for the costs of education and training for their dependents. We should give the taxpayer credit for his contribution to the national wealth. When a taxpayer educates his dependent, he does so for the benefit of the entire American economy.

Family life is the very bulwark of our democracy—a fact which should be recognized in our tax structure. The family as our most cherished institution must not be allowed to suffer through present tax inequities.

We must recognize that the wealth of the Nation is more in its people than in its atoms. We must help the family develop the latent I. Q.'s buried under N. S. F.—not sufficient funds.

A New Look at Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the press has recently told of this year's A-bomb tests at the Nevada proving grounds of the Atomic Energy Commission. I was privileged to witness one of the previous tests. It is an awesome and unforgetable experience. I dread the day that we are faced with atomic warfare. Though we will be prepared due to the work of the AEC and the Department of Defense, nevertheless it is a terrible thing to contemplate. Worse still is radioactive fallout which according to the AEC report of February 15 had added a new dimension to atomic warfare.

What is radioactive fallout—and how is it brought about? Here is what happens: When an H-bomb goes off, the explosive force is so great and the fireball so huge—sometimes 4 miles in diameter—that great quantities of pulverized material are scooped up in the tremendous blast. They become impregnated with deadly radioactivity. This dust then is carried downwind from the explosion and is deposited over a cigar-shaped area which in last year's Pacific test extended 220 miles and was 40 miles wide.

As my constituents know, Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated that the radioactive fallout of bombs such as were used in the Pacific tests last year will extend over an area as large as New Jersey—more than 7,000 square miles. If no preventive measures are taken or if the people do not know what to do to protect themselves, casualties would be inflicted upon more than 90 percent of the population and some 45 percent of these casualties would probably be fatal. The situation is not hopeless because there is much that we can do. If we take cover either in a building or in a shelter, preferably covered by 3 feet of earth, we have a good chance of surviving. Radioactive substance also can be washed off. The difficult task is to determine where the radioactivity is because it is invisible and odorless. To meet this problem the Federal Government and our States and cities will have to provide monitoring instruments—Geiger counters—to civil-defense workers, fire and police stations, and probably to high-school science instructors. On the encouraging side, New Jersey has been in the forefront of the States that have had a good civil-defense organization. Gov. Robert B. Meyner has been briefed by the top people in the Government including the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the FCDA Administrator on the importance of the civil-defense program. Newark has budgeted $157,409 for civil defense, including approximately $84,000 which is matched by Federal funds for the purchase of equipment for warning systems and for stockpiling emergency supplies. By July 1 of this year over $130 million worth of medical supplies and other equipment will be stockpiled for civil defense use. Some of these medical supplies and other equipment is available for use in case of attack in the FCDA warehouse at Somerville, N. J.

In concluding these remarks I call your attention to the following words of Gov. Val Peterson, FCDA Administrator, before the Kefauver Subcommittee on Civil Defense during its present hearings:

> As I see it, the need for civil defense will continue until one of these two conditions prevails: until we are satisfied that man has been able to develop a permanent, secure peace; or until our Military Establishment is able to guarantee that no enemy can make an attack on this country. I am afraid that neither of these two conditions will be fulfilled for many, many years to come. Consequently, as long as there are weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them—in other words, as long as we need a military defense—we will need a civil defense.
>
> Lest there be any misunderstanding, I should like to make it clear that the military efforts to build strength to deter attack, or if it comes to defend our homeland, are most important contributions to civil defense. The successful military defense of a city is the best type of civil defense—and I am convinced that our military leaders are doing everything humanly possible to build the required strength. But since we are assured that no defense can be perfect that enough bombers may be expected to penetrate our defenses to pose staggering problems of destruction, we in turn must spare no effort to build a strong civil defense.

The 105th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to a great and worthy man, whose very life exemplified the highest ideals and traditions, I call attention to the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the father of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is only fitting that we here in America should note this anniversary because the Communist masters of Masaryk's homeland have banned any celebration, as did the Nazis before them. And why? Simply because they know that as long as the name of Masaryk lives in Czechoslovakia their rule is insecure. The spirit of Masaryk is the spirit of belief in the individual, of tolerance, of respect for truth and hatred of insincerity, and of belief in one's Creator. No dictatorship in the world can permit these truths to flourish and itself long endure.

Even in his personal life Masaryk can serve as an inspiration. He was born to a low station in life, but raised himself to a position of eminence by hard work and perseverance. Yet he never hesitated to jeopardize that hard-won standing by embracing causes that he believed to be right, regardless of popular or official opposition. He was undismayed in defeat, and magnanimous in victory.

A true friend of the United States, he created a Czechoslovakia that was an embodiment of the democratic ideal. We regret profoundly that this anniversary cannot be honored in his own land. The world needs more men like Thomas G. Masaryk.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of legislation to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to $1.25 per hour, I include in my remarks certain information prepared for me by a reliable source.

The information follows:

Number and classes of employees covered under Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949 and number and classes not covered or are exempted

	Covered and not exempted	Not covered or are exempted	Total
Manufacturing	15,448,000	683,000	16,131,000
Mining	747,000	21,000	768,000
Construction	614,000	1,951,000	2,565,000
Wholesaling	1,693,000	846,000	2,539,000
Retailing	230,000	6,698,000	6,928,000
Finance, insurance, real estate	1,048,000	744,000	1,792,000
Transportation, communication, and utilities	3,441,000	515,000	3,956,000
Miscellaneous	741,000	3,447,000	4,188,000
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	14,000	3,052,000	3,066,000
Domestic service		2,021,000	2,021,000
Total	23,976,000	19,978,000	43,954,000

Source: Department of Labor.

The Fair Labor Standards Act applies, with certain sizable exceptions, to all employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce, without regard to size of firm or whether the employee works in factory, office, or at home.

Coverage under the wage-hour provisions deals with the worker individually, rather than with the employing establishment; if the individual's work is in interstate commerce and his job is not exempt, he is covered regardless of the basic nature of the business. Many firms employ both covered and noncovered workers on the same premises.

Exemptions in the act exclude about half of the workers in interstate commerce who would otherwise be eligible. White-collar jobs—executive, administrative, professional, and outside selling jobs—are specifically excluded. Employees in retail or service establishments where more than 50 percent of the annual dollar volume of sales is made within the State are exempted. Also exempt are certain cannery workers and food processors,

workers in logging if the total number of employees does not exceed 12, certain agricultural workers and handlers of agricultural products within the area of production, certain employees of the fishing and maritime industries, workers on small county newspapers, and switchboard operators at exchanges with fewer than 750 stations.

The law permits payment of subminimum rates to learners, apprentices, messengers, and handicapped persons in protected employment. It sets no monetary rates for these categories but authorizes the Wage-Hour Administrator to approve pay scales lower than 75 cents an hour through certification of a limited number of subminimum workers to the extent necessary in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment.

HOW IS ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT SUPERVISED?

Enforcement is in charge of an administrator who has a staff of employees in Washington. The continental United States is divided into 10 regions, each under the supervision of a regional director. The territories embraced by the regional offices are as follows:

Boston: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

New York: New Jersey and New York.

Philadelphia: Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

Birmingham: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

Cleveland: Michigan and Ohio.

Chicago: Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Kansas City: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Dallas: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

San Francisco: Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

Nashville: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In North Carolina enforcement is under the supervision of the State Labor Department under a cooperative agreement. The same arrangement is true with respect to approximately one-half of the counties in Minnesota.

In addition to the continental regional offices there are Territorial offices in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Field offices under the jurisdiction of the regional offices are located in almost every State.

The actual number of investigators throughout the States and Territories at present fluctuates between 480 and 500. The investigators have authority under the statute to enter places of business, examine books and records and to interview employers and employees to determine whether the statute is being violated.

The remedies available where violations are found are:

1. Suits for injunctions to prevent future violations.
2. Criminal prosecution.
3. Suits by the Secretary of Labor to recover unpaid wages when such suits are requested by employees.
4. Suits by employees themselves to recover double the amount of unpaid wages.

Number of employees and number of violations for each of the last 8 fiscal years

Fiscal year	Employees	Violations
1947	1,509	20,570
1948	1,131	15,799
1949	1,110	18,180
1950	1,253	13,446
1951	1,821	18,908
1952	1,618	24,321
1953	1,375	22,186
1954	1,046	20,694

Source: Department of Labor.

Capitol Cloakroom Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] appeared on the CBS radio program Capitol Cloakroom on March 6, discussing various issues before the Congress and the Nation at this time. Inasmuch as the Senator's statements shed considerable light upon several of these issues, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program Capitol Cloakroom be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL CLOAKROOM

Guest: The Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, Democratic Senator from Louisiana.

CBS correspondents: Griffing Bancroft, Wells Church, Paul Niven.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, will this Congress reduce income taxes?

Mr. CHURCH. Can tariffs be lowered any more without hurting American industry?

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, will the South go Democratic in 1956?

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, welcome to Capitol Cloakroom. A lawyer, and youngest man in the United States Senate, you have been here now for 5 years, where you are a member of the Senate Finance Committee which this week has been busy with taxes and tariffs.

Let's start with the first: Will this Congress reduce personal income taxes?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, it is impossible to give you an answer for that. All I can tell you is that we will make a very strong effort to do it on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Right now I suspect we are a few votes shy of what we need in the United States Senate to put through the kind of amendment that the House adopted. I hope that we can gain more votes there, as the fight develops. I believe we have a good case to make for income-tax relief for the average individual. And, of course, I am going to support the kind of relief that the House voted for that the average man would have $20 tax relief, $20 more for his wife and $20 more for each child. For example, a family of 5 would have tax relief of $100 on their income tax.

Mr. BANCROFT. I know, Senator LONG, you were one of those who supported that in the Finance Committee, and were outvoted. Do you think there is a possibility that you can get it through the Senate when it comes up on the floor?

Senator LONG. I do not believe in giving up a fight before you have tried. I believe that we have a good case to make.

This type of tax relief would help to relieve unemployment. At the present time we have 3,350,000 people unemployed, and, incidentally, the press has not noticed particularly that unemployment increased 500,000 from December until January of this year. Those figures are too high in terms of unemployment, and I believe we are losing a tremendous amount of wealth in terms of national production by failure to give some tax relief in the ways of increasing purchasing power among the great masses of our people.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I would like to ask this:

In view of the fact that there are stories and reports going along that you supporters of this $20 tax cut are engaged in stalling the bill—we do not know for sure, it is apparently not coming up on the floor of the Senate until late next week at the earliest; when will that bill come up on the floor, and is there any deliberate stalling on the part of you supporters of it?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, there is no deliberate stalling as far as those of us supporting the tax cut are concerned. But we do want some time to get together the facts and figures upon which we buttress our case.

Now, I have been just today consulting with other minority members on that committee. I say minority, we are part of the majority, we are a majority of the Democratic majority, but the two Democrats voting with the Republicans give them a majority on that committee because Republicans vote solidly against this tax cut. We want that bill to come up. We want to make our fight just as we did last year to see to it that the average individual gets some tax relief because we believe it is in the overall interest of this Nation.

I would like to point this out in connection with this tax relief. We supported last year efforts to reduce taxes in the low-income bracket, and we were defeated by the Republican majority at that time both in the House and in the United States Senate. Now there was some income tax relief. However, it did not reflect itself where it was needed the most, because the increase in social security tax was even greater than the reduction in personal income tax as far as anybody making $3,500 or less was concerned. That meant that more than 50 percent of the people of this Nation really had no tax relief at all because the increase in social security more than offset what the reduction was in their personal income tax.

Mr. CHURCH. But, Senator, what about the Republican charge, as I understand it, that this tax cut will be just enough to cause sufficient inflation to more than wipe it out in some instances, the value of the dollar?

Senator LONG. Mr. Church, a man ought to be ashamed to make argument if he knows what the real facts are.

Last year against a previous budget deficit of $9 billion and a budget deficit of last year that turned out to be $4.5 billion, the administration was willing to go along with $7 billion of tax relief.

Now, for this coming year, we are told that the budget deficit would be only half as much, about $2.5 billion. So, without as much budget deficit, we are now told that it would be inflation to give just $2 billion of tax relief, or one-third as much.

Mr. CHURCH. But the Republicans say that is predicated on the Congress cutting expenditures in this next year.

Senator LONG. The point was that we had a deficit last year twice as big as we will have for this coming year and in spite of that $7 billion of tax relief did not produce any inflation at all.

The $7 billion, however, for the most part, went to the corporations and those who were better fixed financially. Now we want to give about one-third that much tax relief to the people, and there is no reason to think that would be any more inflationary than it was when the $7 billion was given to those who are better fixed economically.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, I presume you have been getting some mail on those proposals. Do your constituents seem interested in this $20? Do they regard it as a political maneuver or are they just bored by it?

Senator LONG. Mr. Niven, the press has made great effort to convince the people that the Democrats are just playing politics by trying to give the average individual $20 tax relief, per person. However, the average person feels that both Democrats and

Republicans play politics, and I believe that if you want to be fair and you ask the man on the street—I do not mean the businessman, I mean the average little fellow who is working for a living by the sweat of his brow—he will probably tell you it was Republican politics when the Republicans gave tax relief to the corporations, and perhaps Democratic politics, when the Democrats tried to give tax relief to the average man.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, you mentioned having gotten licked last year, and last year you had, I think we will all concede, a pretty big asset on tax matters over here in the Senate on your side, in the person of Senator GEORGE, and Senator GEORGE is against you this year. Do you still think with that opposition that you are going to get this bill through the Senate?

Senator LONG. Fortunately, after the people got through hearing the argument about the taxes last year, they elected more Democrats and, therefore, our hand is somewhat strengthened in that regard.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator GEORGE—to come back to him for a moment—while he said he opposed this, has talked about the possibility of a compromise if the House stands firm in its insistence on the $20 cut. Do you look for some possible compromise to come out of this thing, assuming you may get licked on the floor of the Senate?

Senator LONG. It is certainly my hope that the House conferees will stand their ground to the very last. If they will, I believe that there should be some sort of compromise.

For my part, I am ready to agree with the President, or anyone else, that there is no reason why we should reduce the corporation tax at this time. The corporations got relief last year on their dividends from taxation, and they got all sorts of handouts that are too complicated and too lengthy to explain here. But, if you read that 875-page bill, it was almost like an Easter egg hunt for golden nuggets, as far as a corporation executive was concerned.

Now, looking into this next year, it is only fair to say that their corporation stock is now at an all-time high. It has never been that high, even in 1929. Particularly, large corporations are concerned. They are not entitled at this time to expect any further tax relief, and we should extend that corporation tax for a while longer.

The Democrats will go along with the Republicans on that part of it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator Long, suppose it comes to a question of choosing one or the other, and I have in mind there is the possibility of the President vetoing a bill which might combine the two of them. Would you then go along for an extension of the corporation and the excise taxes alone, as he has asked?

Senator LONG. I suppose if we are successful in getting a bill to the President that would reduce taxes for the average individual, that we would stand our ground if the President vetoed the bill. I do not think he would veto it. I do not think he could afford to do it, for many reasons: politically, morally, and many others.

Mr. NIVEN. But you surely could not get two-thirds of the votes to override the veto, could you?

Senator LONG. No; we could not get two-thirds of the votes to override the veto; that would be correct.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I know in your Finance Committee you are involved in another problem now, this week, and this was the question that Mr. Church has asked you about the tariff bill:

What do you think is going to happen to that over here in the Senate?

Senator LONG. I believe we will report out substantially the bill that was sent to us by the House of Representatives. I suspect that there will be some amendments adopted in the Senate committee. I cannot predict just what those amendments will be, but I see that there are quite a few Senators who are receptive to one suggestion or another on that committee, and I would expect that there would be a few amendments drafted over in the Senate committee, in addition to those that were adopted in the House.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think those amendments would take the form of broadening the so-called escape clause, to make it easier for certain industries to get out of tax reductions or tariff reductions?

Senator LONG. I would not be surprised to see an amendment offered that would gain substantial support, along the line of saying that the President could not reverse the judgment of the Tariff Commission if the Tariff Commission recommended protection for domestic industry.

As you know, the President has reversed the Tariff Commission more often than he has upheld the Tariff Commission, when the Tariff Commission has recommended that the escape clause be invoked to protect some domestic industry.

I see substantial support for that, and I just cannot predict what the result will be when that amendment comes to a vote.

Mr. CHURCH. If I follow you correctly, Senator LONG, it sounds to me as though there might be an equally close shave in the Senate as in the House.

Senator LONG. It might very well be that way. As a matter of fact, on the floor of the House of Representatives the rule was that Members could not offer amendments. They could only offer one proposal to recommit the bill to consider one particular amendment.

Now in the United States Senate no one would ever agree to such a thing. As you know, we have this rule of unlimited debate. As long as someone wants to continue to fight, he has the right to stand there and be heard.

We have some Senators, I won't call any names right here, but I have some in mind, who very well might stand and talk at great length about that bill and offer an untold number of amendments. Some of those amendments may be adopted.

Mr. CHURCH. Is there chance for enough amendments to ruin the bill, that is, ruin it in the eyes of the President in what appears to be a Democratic majority in favor of the bill?

Senator LONG. I think that as far as the administration is concerned, they will have a good chance to regain whatever ground they lost in the Senate in conference because the conferees, for the most part, are either Republicans who have pretty well stayed with the President on most issues, or Democrats who believe in expanding trade, if you look at the senior Democrats and senior Republicans on the Finance Committee, so it is possible that the President may gain coming back from conference what he might lose on the Senate floor if a substantial number of amendments were agreed to there.

It is sort of like the man being chased by the bear. He jumps for a limb on a tree. A friend said, "Did you catch the limb?" He said, "I missed it on the way up, but I caught it on the way down."

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, once you start accepting amendments, surely the meat would be knocked out of it completely in a very short time, would it not?

Senator LONG. I do not believe that the committee will recommend accepting any amendments. I think the committee, for the most part, will stay together in trying to beat off amendments that are offered on the floor. Usually the Finance Committee has done that in the past. As a matter of fact, the Senate Finance Committee has a rather good record under Democratic leadership of defeating amendments. I recall on more than one occasion when Senator GEORGE was the chairman of the Finance Committee in which he was successful in getting the committee to stick together and beat off as many as 200 amendments without a single one being adopted. I would not be surprised to see that sort of thing work out again if the committee sticks together.

Mr. NIVEN. Will the committee stick together even in the case of amendments designed to help industries in their home States?

Senator LONG. There will be more difficulty in that case.

Mr. CHURCH. There were some 75 Members of the House, as I recall it, who had industries in their own State which caused them to go against the bill. How about your own State, Do you have anything down there that would make you worry about this bill?

Senator LONG. I have some individuals in my State who are interested in amendments to the bill. I do not expect to support many such amendments because I believe that most of those industries are getting along reasonably well and, after all, although this bill gives the President the authority to reduce tariff 5 percent each year or to reduce tariff on items where there is only a negligible amount being imported at the present time by as much as 50 percent, that is not mandatory upon the President. It is only anticipated that he would reduce the tariffs in the cases where he finds that American industries would not be too adversely affected.

Many of the industries that complain the most bitterly about this matter really cannot show that they are badly hurt or that they would be badly hurt by expanding foreign trade and permitting a few more imports to come into this Nation.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I would like to ask this if it has any bearing on the support of you southerners for this tariff-reduction bill, and that is the matter of the textile industry. As you know, the New England textile Senators are mostly lining up in opposition to this on the ground that it will definitely hurt their textile industry. But I have heard some of you southerners say that a little reduction in tariff might encourage even more movement of the textile industry from New England down South and, therefore, might help your industry. Is there anything to that?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, looking at the whole picture, we cannot expect everything to be in our favor in this foreign trade picture. You cannot expect to get everything from others without giving something in return.

Now in good years we can sell as much as 50 percent of our cotton to other countries, and they consume that cotton within those countries and I suppose they process most of it there.

We do have some textile imports coming back into this country, but the last figure that I saw on it indicated that we are actually shipping out more manufactured textile products than we are importing. So, what are we complaining about? I cannot see that there is any great reason to feel that the textile industry is being very badly injured.

Now, there has been some reduction in employment in textile industries but, for the most part, that has been because of the improvement in their machinery and increased productivity of their working people.

I think I receive about as much mail from textile workers in my State as almost any other one thing. But I believe that if we are efficient, as you suggest, and we continue to improve our ways of doing business, that we should be able to meet a slightly stiffened competition from abroad, and we should try to expand our textile market just as others try to expand their export to us.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, is anyone in your party contemplating plans for Federal

aid to communities which might face severe distress because of foreign competition, conceivably, for instance, a one-industry town which was going to be injured by foreign competition to take a loan from the Government in order to retool its factories, switch to another field?

Senator LONG. I do not know of any such proposal as that that is being advanced with much support at the present time, Mr. Niven. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any proposal of that sort pending at the moment. There might be.

I have, myself, thought that we should try to work out some way to compensate some of those who are genuinely injured as a result of tariff reductions. I particularly have that in mind when the President reverses the recommendation of the Tariff Commission for relief. Nevertheless, it is so difficult to work out a practicable plan to protect all those who are injured or to help those who are injured in so many different connections. For example, you might help the man who owns the plant, but then the laborers lose their jobs, how are you going to compensate them? The best thing you can do for them is to help them find a job somewhere else. The result is that no one really has anything worked out, that I know of, to help those who might be injured as a result of increased foreign competition.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, there are some other points in the President's overall program, as I understand it, to increase world trade. One of them is stepping up the so-called point 4 program, and another to grant some sort of tax relief for American business investments overseas. Are you in favor of those things in addition to the tariff relief?

Senator LONG. For the most part, Congress is getting rather weary of these foreign giveaway programs. I believe the tendency will be to reduce them, rather than give more in the future.

This economic aid has been going on for so long now that a lot of people would like to get out of the business. Congress, for the most part, will vote to reduce those things.

Insofar as the tax reductions for those doing business overseas are concerned, I would prefer to be selective and try to determine where we want to encourage additional investments or who we want to help and perhaps write into trade agreements if those people have a general increase in their living standards, that we would be willing to reduce our own tariff to help them to continue to sell on the American market. I have that in mind, especially in Central American countries, where many people are only making about 5 cents an hour for their labor. I think that just tends to encourage communism and things of that sort. However, I do not know whether you can attract much support for that sort of proposal.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, you supported the Stevenson ticket in 1952, but the South was anything but solid. Is it going to go Democratic again in 1956?

Senator LONG. Yes; I believe the prospects are very good for the South going solidly Democratic the next time. I would not be surprised to see every Southern State go Democratic. I said that some time ago, and I see nothing in what has happened during the past 2 years to change my mind about it. I would be inclined to think that you will see the South go together. We have been able to resolve many of these party fights during the last 2 years. We have had very good leadership; we have not fought nearly as bitterly. We have divided on some issues, but it has not been nearly as pronounced or bitter as it has been in years gone by. For that reason, I think the South will be inclined to go back solidly for the Democratic ticket next time.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, is this prediction of the South going Democratic based on the assumption that President Eisenhower will be the candidate for the Republicans in 1956?

Senator LONG. Yes; that is based on that assumption. As a matter of fact, I have seen various polls that have been made in my own State that would indicate that there is far stronger sentiment today for the Democrats than there was at the last election, even assuming that Eisenhower would be the candidate.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, of course, your State of Louisiana went against Eisenhower in 1952.

Senator LONG. We carried it, with difficulty. We carried it by about 40,000 votes, which is not a safe majority when you are polling about 750,000.

Mr. BANCROFT. In other words, you think President Eisenhower is less popular in the South now than he was in 1952?

Senator LONG. That is correct. It is not so much a matter of Eisenhower being less popular; it is a matter of the Democrats as a party, being more popular.

We had many burdens to carry at that time. It was difficult to explain a lot of things that were complicated. A lot of people tried to blame the Democrats for the various burdens that we had to carry during the Korean war, and things of that sort. I think that the next go-around, not having been in power for 4 years, we will be in better shape than we were, having been in power for 20 years.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, you said a moment ago that your party has avoided a fight in the last couple of years. Perhaps you made a distinction as to other parties. But, do you have reason to believe that the Northern liberals are going to let the race issue and the civil-rights issue lie dormant between now and the election?

Senator LONG. I do not know precisely what moves may be made by our Northern liberal friends, but I believe, on the whole, that they have been willing to join with us on those things that Democrats can unitedly support. And as long as we continue that trend, I believe there is every reason to believe the South should be more happy with the Democratic Party and more anxious to support it.

Mr. NIVEN. Then you do not expect a strong civil rights plan in the 1956 platform in your party?

Senator LONG. I expect a civil rights platform similar to the one we had last time. I do think the Southern Democrats will be somewhat helped in keeping their States in the Democratic column, however, because of the fact it is now clear that the Republican Party is not for the Southern position on civil rights. They are just as much opposed to our position, perhaps, as the Northern Democrats. But that always took a lot of explaining down South and kept some of us very much on the defensive when we were urging some of the people to vote Democratic before.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, this prediction of yours about the South was based on the assumption that President Eisenhower would be the Republican candidate. I would like to ask you if we could take the other assumption that Adlai Stevenson will be the Democratic candidate?

Senator LONG. It is possible that Adlai Stevenson would be, and he would be a good candidate. But at this time I would not be at all prepared to concede Adlai Stevenson would be the Democratic candidate. I think he would run a very good race and stand a very good chance of winning if he were the candidate. However, I think there are other possibilities who might run just as strongly and perhaps a stronger race.

Mr. CHURCH. Could you name some of them?

Senator LONG. I would rather not do it. I have some in mind, but I do not want to suggest any of them. I would rather let them put themselves forth rather than me to advance their candidacies.

Mr. CHURCH. You do agree that the President will run again?

Senator LONG. I do not agree he will run again. I do not know. I cannot speak for him.

Mr. CHURCH. That is what I understood you to say a moment ago.

Senator LONG. Well, I believe if he runs the South will go solidly Democratic, and I believe the Democrats will have a——

Mr. NIVEN. Is there likely to be a southerner in the race for the Democratic nomination?

Senator LONG. I would certainly hope so, being a southerner myself. I am rather proud of our representation from the South. I would certainly hope that we would have some good southerners offer themselves.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think Senator RUSSELL would run again?

Senator LONG. He said he would not. He is a man of his word, and if he said it, he means it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Let me ask you this about yourself: Your term is coming up in 1956. Are you a candidate for the United States Senate next year?

Senator LONG. Well, there is quite a bit of local politics in Louisiana at the present time. I have indicated that I might be a candidate for governor. I have not at all decided that. I think we had better let first things be decided first, and I cannot tell you whether or not I will run for Governor of Louisiana at the present time. Therefore, I could not tell you whether I would be a candidate for the Senate as yet.

Mr. BANCROFT. Could you say that you would be a candidate for one or the other?

Senator LONG. I would rather not answer that question quite that way. I would prefer to decide a little bit later on what my position will be, as far as offering myself for office is concerned.

Mr. NIVEN. Would you exclude retirement from your plan?

Senator LONG. I do not necessarily exclude it, but I would rather leave that to the public to decide.

Mr. CHURCH. You do enjoy being in the United States Senate?

Senator LONG. I have enjoyed it very much, Mr. Church.

Mr. BANCROFT. Coming back to some of the problems in the United States Senate, we have mentioned some of your problems on the Finance Committee. You are also a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which has this problem of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

What is going to happen to that in this session of Congress?

Senator LONG. I wish I could predict. I was one of those who supported the President's position that Hawaii should become a State because it had been ready for some time, and Alaska was not ready for statehood. Last year the Democrats were successful in adding an amendment that would put the Alaskan statehood bill in with the Hawaiian statehood bill. You had to vote for both of them or none. Therefore, I voted for statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

It looks as though there is not much chance for separating those bills, and so I suppose we will pass such a bill through the Senate again, if we get a chance to consider it.

Mr. CHURCH. Both of them?

Senator LONG. There are some machinations about this legislative mill. For exam-

ple, there is the Rules Committee over there on the House side. If there are any differences of opinion between the leaders on the House side, sometimes they won't let the House vote on it. That is what happened to the statehood bill last time. It might be the fate this time.

Mr. NIVEN. Why are most southerners opposed to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska?

Senator LONG. They can make many arguments, and I would prefer to believe that they are 100 percent sincere in saying that they believe that we shouldn't broaden the representation of this Nation, and that we would be a stronger Nation if we limited ourselves to the continental United States and did not take in outlying areas.

Personally, I believe that we would be a greater country if we did take those areas in.

Mr. NIVEN. Other motives are sometimes ascribed to them, aren't they?

Senator LONG. Oh, yes; there are some that say southerners feel it would be two more votes for FEPC or two more votes to make southerners quit talking when you try to reduce States rights.

I do not think that necessarily would be the case. I am inclined to think that the new States would be even more jealous of their States' rights than existing States.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I know one matter you have taken considerable interest around here in is the matter of civil defense. What do you think Congress ought to do about civil defense?

Senator LONG. About 10 times what we have done. A tremendous number of lives could be saved if we would make some plans to alert the people to the kind of measures that could be taken to save their lives in the event of an atomic attack. Just to give you an example, if you had an atom bomb, let's take a hydrogen bomb, the huge kind that could explode on one of our cities, while that might kill everyone within 5 or 6 miles of the explosion, most people beyond that point would live if they had just a good, deep basement to go into and stay there until the radioactivity of the so-called fallout, the dust that is created by these explosions, had settled and dissipated itself into the atmosphere. But most people would not know that unless you do a better job of educating them. The result is most of them would leave their homes to try to get away, and many of them would be killed as a result of the radioactivity.

Then, too, when those type bombs explode, these clouds of radioactive dust might go as much as three or four hundred miles, dropping the cinders all along the way. A person could be safe from that if he had himself a small cellar, or if he had prepared a little bomb shelter with as much as two feet of dirt over the top of it to protect himself against the radioactivity that would be involved there.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think the Federal Government should put up some money to help him do that construction?

Senator LONG. The first thing we ought to do is to tell him what sort of shelter he ought to build. Then I believe it would be good to pass some sort of legislation to make a housing loan to a person, just as you have a title I, FHA, where a person can borrow money to put venetian blinds or a thing of that sort in his home. Perhaps we ought to make them a longer term loan to install a properly specified bomb shelter in their own homes that might save their lives in the event of an atomic disaster. I believe you might save as many as 40 million lives that way if you had the proper type protection from just the radioactivity.

Mr. BANCROFT. I am afraid that is all the time we have. Thank you very much, Senator LONG.

Senator LONG. You are very welcome.

Why the Navy Needs the "Forrestal" Type Aircraft Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas when appearing before the House Armed Services Committee March 7, made the following statement concerning the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program.

While his statement covers the shipbuilding program in general, his reasons as to why the Navy needs additional *Forrestal* type aircraft carriers should be of interest to all persons concerned in that type of a national defense designed to meet any type of aggression that may concern our national security. Secretary Thomas' statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES S. THOMAS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, REGARDING H. R. 4393

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Admiral Duncan, Admiral Leggett, and I are here today to outline the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program and to give your committee reasons and justifications for it.

At the outset, I wish to note, as indicated in section 2 of H. R. 4393, that the proposed legislation does not grant increased shipbuilding or ship conversion authority to the Navy beyond that already authorized by law. This bill would simply indicate the approval of the committee and the Congress for this specific program. In this bill, the committee would give us a bill of particulars.

On the occasion of my recent appearance before your committee, I stated that President Eisenhower had indicated that the fundamental policy of the Department of Defense (which Admiral Carney, General Shepherd, and I fully and unequivocally support) is to prepare a military program which is adequate, balanced, and long ranged. A program which will prevent war if possible, which will meet a variety of military contingencies and, at the same time, a program which our national economy can support indefinitely.

The naval part of this 1956 program, I feel, meets these demanding requirements, and provides for a strong and balanced Navy and Marine Corps that will have the highest degree of combat readiness and flexibility for discharging our peacetime missions and worldwide commitments, and for carrying out our important tasks if war should occur.

In any size or type of war which can now be foreseen, the need of a strong and adequate United States Navy is more essential than it has ever been before. We must have command of the seas so that we can consolidate our strengths with those of our friends and allies. We must always be able to cross the seas to supply our industrial machine—still the free world's arsenal—with the many critical raw materials we need. We must have a Navy for transporting our armies overseas and for keeping them supplied. We must control the oceans in order to operate and supply our worldwide network of bases. And most important, we must be able to exploit the seas to keep the conflict away from our shores, and to carry the fight into the enemy's own territory.

One of the major and vital parts of that naval program is the procurement and conversion of combat ships. In these days of rapid progress in fields such as atomic propulsion, guided missiles, metallurgy, plastics, and shipbuilding techniques, ordering a combat ship demands much foresight on the part of the planners to insure that the vessels which they design are superior and advanced in the technical, naval, and engineering fields. To provide this superiority, our planners must not only anticipate the period of the ship's construction, as much as 3 or 4 years, but must also calculate the adaptability and potential of each type vessel during its life span of about 20 years.

Moreover, the naval needs of a quarter century in advance must also be foreseen with as much vision and wisdom as we can command. For this difficult task, the best—perhaps the only—parameters are experience, logic, and ingenuity. Careful weighing of the many diverse factors of national strategy, probable naval requirements, technical advancements, budgetary limitations, relationship to other military programs must be taken into account in arriving at a decision.

I assure you that all such factors have been most thoroughly and carefully reviewed by Admiral Carney, Admiral Duncan, and myself, and others in authority, in the presentation of this shipbuilding and conversion program for your consideration. I consider it a vital, sound, and well conceived one. This program also carries the President's approval.

The shipbuilding program for fiscal 1956 can be summarized by reference to four types of ships—the carrier, the cruiser, the destroyer, and the submarine. I will take each one of these in turn.

The Navy is requesting a fifth aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* type; we are also requesting authority to improve six of our older carriers by conversion.

This carrier program is essential for several reasons. First of all, new carriers are needed as replacements for World War II carriers which are now 13 and 14 years old. A ship has a life of about 20 years, so beginning in 1960 until 1965, we will be reaching the economical limit of their service. This carrier-construction program is a plan to gradually replace our older ships over an extended period.

Secondly, the fleets are now beginning to receive several types of new and larger jet aircraft whose full performance and potential can only be achieved from these modern carrier bases. The new *Forrestals* will have the stronger and larger landing areas, including the angled deck, increased hangar-deck heights, improved steam catapults and faster elevators, stronger arresting gear, and many other new features such as better fire-fighting and damage-control ability. The new families of jet aircraft, such as the A3D, a very advanced attack aircraft weighing 70,000 pounds, the A4D, an equally advanced but light attack aircraft, and several excellent fighter aircraft, such as the F4D and the F9F9, go hand in glove with our newest model carriers which have been specifically designed to operate and accommodate such modern, high performance planes. We are reaching the point, so to speak, where the suit of clothes we bought some 12–15 years ago is getting to be a tight fit for the growing young man of jet naval aviation.

But the most important reason is that our aircraft carriers—which are the key units of our naval task forces—are absolutely essential to the successful execution of our naval missions, and to the security of the country, either in cold war, fringe war, or nuclear war.

In this present period of prolonged tension, the value of having a potent offensive navy, built around our carrier forces, was recently seen in the Tachens operation. In the troubled waters around Formosa—far removed from our normal naval bases, in an

area where our fixed air bases are also limited, and 7,000 miles from our homeland—the importance of having our mobile carrier forces move into the threatened area to reinforce our national policy and to prevent trouble was, I am sure, readily apparent to all. I am confident that the continued presence of our naval task forces in the Formosa area is an effective brake and a great deterrent to the outbreak of general war, giving us time to work diligently for a real peace in the Far East.

The importance of carrier forces during a fringe or local war is best illustrated by the recent Korean war. I will not dwell on this, for I am sure the gentlemen of this committee are very familiar with the 3 years of unremitting and invaluable work which our naval task forces accomplished there. The Navy and Marine Corps flew approximately 183,000 sorties in Korea, totaling 412,000 flying hours from carrier decks.

As for having carriers during an all-out nuclear war, their value and capabilities are even greater. As a matter of fact, I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would make our carrier forces even more indispensable than they have ever been before.

In a nuclear war, the first task of any air force will be to destroy the opponent's air power at its sources. It is logical to assume that our retaliation system—our planes, our weapon sites, and our bases—would receive the enemy's initial onslaught.

Therefore the integrity and security of our airbase system, from whence our reprisal originates, assume the very highest priority in our defense planning. Ideally our base system should be a combination of both fixed air bases, continental and overseas, and moving air bases. The fixed air bases of the Air Force are designed, and properly so, to carry out the primary mission of strategic air warfare. The moving air bases of the Navy, which are the modern aircraft carriers, serve to carry out the Navy's vital tasks and to complement the fixed bases in order to make our reprisal system varied, versatile, and invulnerable.

Our moving carrier bases make it impossible for any enemy to completely destroy or neutralize our reprisal system in a sneak attack because he can never be sure of their locations. A balanced system of our primary fixed bases, complemented by our moving carrier bases, makes an aggressor uncertain that a blitz attack would succeed. No matter how powerful or pervasive his attack upon it, there will still be a sufficient punch left to devastate him. A partially successful enemy blitz of our retaliation system is tantamount to his suicide.

I am sometimes asked, usually by members of the press, 3 questions about the *Forrestal* carriers concerning their (1) vulnerability, their (2) state of development, and their (3) ultimate use which I think are fair ones, which are pertinent to this shipbuilding program, and which may be in the minds of some of the members of this committee.

Are not the *Forrestals* so vulnerable, I am asked, as to make it infeasible to build them? My answer is "no," because they are extremely difficult to destroy, even with an atomic bomb. Yes, a *Forrestal* can be hit. Any target can be hit under the right conditions. But it is patently obvious that a target moving at speeds up to 40 miles per hour, which can change its location 500 miles in a day, is a harder one to find, to hit, and to destroy than one which cannot move. Finding a carrier task force in the great wastes of an ocean is not an easy task even in these days of electronic magic. Even when it is found, attacking it would be very hazardous. Enemy planes would have to penetrate concentric circles of electronic warning curtains, overcome formidable jet fighter protection, and survive a guided missile and antiaircraft barrage before reaching their release point.

Moreover, the fast moving task force would be operating under dispersal conditions so that even a mass destruction weapon could neutralize but a small part of the force. Individual ships of the fleet might be neutralized, but it is highly unlikely that the task force could be kept from doing its job. Furthermore, the presence of our carriers in proximity to an aggressor's land will force him to divert his own offensive strength to defend against their power (which might otherwise be used against our homeland or fixed bases) and will also dilute his defenses; for he must anticipate attack from every direction from the seas which surround him.

The next question raised regarding the *Forrestals* concerns their state of development. Shouldn't a moratorium be called while these new ships are tested and evaluated? This question presumes that the carrier is an untested vessel, a new type which should be evaluated. My reply is that the aircraft carrier weapons system is a fully tested, repeatedly evaluated, and an oft-proven weapons system, that the new *Forrestals* are simply a logical and progressive step in the Navy's art of building aircraft carriers. We firmly know what they are capable of doing, and we must have them if we are to keep our fleets modern and capable of handling advanced aircraft essential to the fulfillment of the Navy's mission.

And finally, the question is asked, How does the Navy plan to use these ships which will be able to carry large attack and fighter planes capable of transporting nuclear weapons to targets more than 1,000 miles from their flight deck? The answer to that is that the Navy has many legitimate naval targets for which we need such a weapons system—such targets as submarine pens, shipping concentrations, shipbuilding activities, airfield bases, and other targets which jeopardize our command of the seas. Moreover, in the NATO theater, the Navy has been given certain collateral tasks to further prosecute the air battle and assigned certain specific tasks to support the land battle. In no sense does the Navy compete or infringe upon the field of strategic air warfare which is properly the primary responsibility of the United States Air Force.

In summary, then, a fifth *Forrestal* will add to our potent carrier weapons system which is the very foundation of our naval striking power. Without this carrier weapons system, it would be impossible to carry out the Navy's last mission to control the seas. The best military and civilian talent in the Department of Defense, and the President, have approved the building of a carrier this fiscal year as a proper requirement, and I strongly urge your appoval.

Turning briefly now to the other types of ships, we are requesting the conversion of one light cruiser and one destroyer to equip them with guided missile capabilities in order to make effective our guided missile progress. We are also requesting one nonatomic submarine with a guided missile capability. As you know, two guided missile cruisers—the *Boston* and *Canberra*—are virtually complete and will be joining the fleets this year. All of these ships, which are fundamentally prototypes, are indicative of the Navy of tomorrow. In the guided missile field, the Navy is just now crossing the threshold into a field which promises to revolutionize navies as much as did the discovery of gunpowder.

We are also requesting 13 destroyer types—7 destroyers and 6 "frigates." The frigate is a destroyer type, somewhat larger, with better sea-keeping qualities, and with heavier antisubmarine and antiaircraft defenses. These 13 destroyer types being requested are replacements for the hardworking, versatile, and indispensable workhorses of our Navy.

And finally, the submarines. As you know, the modern submarine is a very potent offensive weapon as well as an effective defensive weapon. We foresee that as a guided missile platform, the nuclear submarine with its almost unlimited range, can appear over the horizon or emerge from the depths of the ocean, and send missiles of great destruction great distances with deadly accuracy. Eight submarines are included in the program, 3 nuclear powered ones, 4 conventional ones, and the one I mentioned earlier which will have a guided missile capability. We have been encouraged by the excellent progress of the atomic-powered *Nautilus*, and we are progressing as rapidly as is practicable in this very promising field. However, we do not feel justified in waiting for final completion of this development to request these submarine replacements. The requested four conventional submarines, we feel, with their improved power plants, armament and hull structures, will not become obsolescent during their normal life span.

In summary, I believe the naval program for fiscal 1956 is sound. Throughout our country's history, naval power has always been an indispensable factor in carrying out United States policy in peacetime and in achieving victory in wartime. It is no less important and vital today. In the nuclear era now upon us, I am convinced that the talents of a Navy are even more necessary than ever before.

Anniversary of the Independence of Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1918, Estonia proudly proclaimed her independence. For two centuries Estonia had suffered under Russian domination, beginning with the period when Peter I conquered the territory in 1710. Independence came only after many uprisings and bloody reprisals, of which the most notable was the revolution of 1905. In November of 1918 Estonia declared herself a democratic republic and repulsed an invading Red army. But in 1940 the Soviets seized the country.

It is important for us to remember that the spirit of freedom that lived in the hearts of Estonians in the past is no less alive today. We in the United States should keep faith with the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Ours is a nation forged out of the strength and convictions of people from many countries. Ours is a nation that has the capacity to aid in the rehabilitation of displaced persons. We should not be blinded by our fortunate position so that we cannot appreciate the hardships of others less fortunate. Nor should we forget that a concrete basis of hope is sustained by a generous policy of immigration and by a continued and more revealing congressional investigation of the Soviet crimes against the Baltic peoples. It is desirable that we correct any shortcomings in this respect.

One closing thought that I wish to call to the attention of the House is this: We in the United States are fundamentally one people. We are one people in the

support of the Constitution of the United States. We believe in the freedom and dignity of man. We have faith in the ability of man to learn and grow and to overcome the obstacles in the path of his development. It seems to me that there might be more time spent toward establishing a more certain and a more effective long-run policy of carrying the message of the American people to the world, and this applies to those locked behind the Iron Curtain.

California Fights Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some recent correspondence I have had with the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, attorney general of California, whose continuous efforts to combat crime, especially as it exists in California, are highly commendable. His proposed legislation, as detailed in the following correspondence, if adopted, will provide, I believe, thorough and effective weapons against organized crime, and should make the State of California one of the progressive leaders in our war against crime.

Without hesitation, I would commend to law-enforcement agencies in other States all of Attorney General Brown's proposed legislation, particularly that portion which recommends the coordination of State crime activities with local law-enforcement agencies, crime commissions, State and Federal officials, and agencies, as well as the proposed mutual exchange of information concerning activities of reported criminals, racketeers, and their associates.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
San Francisco, February 21, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Your recent letter addressed to H. G. Robinson has been called to my attention.

I appreciate receiving your comments on the legislation which has been proposed to amend the California Penal Code to provide for surveys of local enforcement and for the establishment and operation of intelligence files.

After the lengthy and detailed studies which have been made of the matter by the United States Senate Crime Committee, the American Bar Association committee on organized crime and the California Crime Study Commission on Organized Crime and the unanimity of the recommendations made by these groups it is appropriate that those recommendations be implemented by appropriate legislation at State level. California, as you have found in investigations by the Senate Crime Committee, has been in the forefront in the matter of crime control and, as attorney general of this State, being charged with maintaining uniform law enforcement, it is requisite that everything be done to keep enforcement in this State at the highest attainable standard.

In further explanation it can be stated that during the past 3 years the work of our Bureau of Criminal Statistics has been strengthened and expanded. The results of this work have been published in two reports, Crime in California 1952 and Crime in California 1953, copies of which are being forwarded under separate cover. Further improvement in our statistical reporting has been programed during the coming year.

A good system of statistical reporting can measure and define the nature and scope of the crime problem but as worth while and necessary as this function is, it requires a further step to explore the factors giving rise to the statistics tabulated. Manpower, equipment, and training deficiencies resulting from unrealistic and budget conscious city administrators all have a material bearing on the general crime picture despite the common practice on the part of the public to relate crime trends to spiritual, moral, or economic factors. Until further survey functions make it possible to probe the underlying factors, there is no realistic way of completely interpreting or evaluating even the most accurate statistics on crime.

Your interest in this legislation and your valued comments are appreciated. Considering your leadership in the field of crime prevention and your continuing interest in this vitally important field, you will perhaps agree that the following acrostic suggests a more objective spelling out of the crime picture:

C-ongressional
R-ecommendations
I-mplemented by State legislation to
M-odernize and strengthen
E-nforcement efforts.

Sincerely yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Attorney General.

FEBRUARY 15, 1955.

Mr. H. G. ROBINSON, Esq.,
Deputy Director, Division of Criminal Law Enforcement, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR ROBBIE: I have read with great interest your letter of February 9, 1955, containing the proposed legislation to be introduced by Attorney General Brown, which I feel should make effective, the recommendations approved by the United States Senate Crime Committee, the American Bar Association Committee on Organized Crime, and the suggestions contained in the attorney general's two proposed amendments to the California Penal Code, appeal to me, particularly those that recommend the coordination of your State crime activities with local law enforcement agencies, crime commissions, State and Federal officials and agencies, as well as the proposed mutual exchange of information concerning activities of reported criminals, racketeers and their associates.

Your proposed legislation, if adopted without any crippling amendments, should very materially strengthen your law-enforcement machinery, and I am hopeful that other States may emulate the splendid steps that California is taking to combat crime.

With kindest personal regards to Attorney General Brown, yourself, and all other friends in California, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate.

The Historical Development of the Conference Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, conference committees of the two branches of Congress have often been referred to as the "Third House" of Congress. This designation arises from the fact that when the House and Senate have worked their will on a legislative proposal, particularly of a controversial nature, conference committees have often reshaped such legislation and thereby developed a very substantial influence on the whole course of legislation.

It has often occurred to me that the historical development of the conference committee and its powers would be of special interest to all Members of the House and Senate, and accordingly some time ago I requested the Library of Congress to make a documented study of this matter. This deserves consideration not only in government but by students of political science throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD because I am confident it will be useful to students of political science, useful in science courses, and useful to Members of Congress and others.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THIRD HOUSE OF CONGRESS

Now that the Federal Government has come to have an intimate impact upon the life and work of all of us, it is important for us to understand how the laws are made which influence our daily lives. Books have been written to describe the process of lawmaking. All I can do here is to hit the high spots of the legislative process as I have observed it work in Congress.

STAGES IN LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

From the introduction of a bill in the Senate or House of Representatives to its proclamation as the law of the land, there are 28 stages in the process of lawmaking. These steps are described in detail by Congressman CLARENCE CANNON in his authoritative manual of parliamentary procedure. The process begins when a Member drops a bill in a basket or "hopper" on the Clerk's desk on the floor of the House. Senate bills may be jointly sponsored by several Senators, but House bills may not be introduced jointly.

After its introduction, the bill is referred by the Parliamentarian to the committee which has jurisdiction over its major subject matter. There are 15 standing committees in the Senate and 19 in the House, set up along roughly parallel lines. The jurisdiction of these committees is defined in the rules to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. The clerk of the committee receiving the bill enters it on his committee calendar which is a schedule or docket showing the number of the bill, by whom presented, date of reference, title, subcommittee to which referred, and any action thereon.

The first major stage in the legislative process is the committee stage. Some committees have regular meeting days; others

meet only at the call of the chairman. When the committee meets, the calendar is called by the clerk and a particular bill taken up for consideration. If the bill is important, it may be referred to a subcommittee, appointed by the chairman, for study. Where a matter is deemed to be of sufficient importance, and the committee or subcommittee desires information on the subject, hearings are held and witnesses are called, or may ask to be heard, to give testimony. A day is fixed for the hearings and interested persons are notified. The hearings may last for 1 day or several weeks, depending upon the importance of the bill under consideration. After the hearings, the committee meets in executive session and votes either to report the bill favorably to the Senate (or House) or to lay the bill on the table. This is commonly known as pigeonholing a bill. If the bill is reported favorably, with or without amendment, the committee staff prepare a report explaining the bill which is then referred to the Senate (or House) Calendar. The House has 5 different calendars, whereas the Senate has but 1.

Subject to various limitations, the committees of Congress have come to play a dominant role in lawmaking. Each composed of a few members, each acting independently of the others, they now determine the agenda of both Houses, which have surrendered to their standing committees the power to determine what matters shall be considered on the floor and to control the proceedings there, subject in the lower Chamber to the terms of its Rules Committee. Committees can amend or rewrite bills to suit themselves. They can report bills or pigeonhole them. They can initiate measures they desire and bury or emasculate those they dislike. They can proceed with dispatch or stall indefinitely. In short, congressional government is still government by the standing committees of Congress, as Woodrow Wilson wrote in 1885.

The second major stage in the legislative process is the floor stage. Numerous ways are provided by the House and Senate rules for taking up a bill once it is on a calendar. In the Senate a bill is taken up either by unanimous consent or on the call of the calendar. In the House there are five routes by which a bill may reach the floor. Admission to the House floor of important, controversial bills usually depends upon getting a special order or green light from its Committee on Rules which has acquired power to prescribe the terms of admission, including a time limit on debate, the conditions of amendment, etc.

When a bill has finally reached the floor, it may be debated, amended, passed, or rejected. Debate is strictly limited in the House under various rules and rarely lasts more than 1 or 2 days per bill. In the Senate debate is unlimited, except by unanimous consent, and may continue for several weeks. Bills strongly opposed by a few Senators may be filibustered indefinitely, i. e., talked to death. The Senate adopted a cloture rule in 1917, but it has been successfully invoked only four times in 35 years, and never since 1927. A majority vote of those present and voting is required to pass an ordinary bill. A two-thirds vote is needed to suspend the rules and for certain measures specified in the Constitution, such as a resolution to amend that document.

After a bill has gone through its several stages in the House where introduced, it is engrossed and transmitted to the other house where the same steps are repeated. If the bill finally survives all the possible pitfalls in its path—pigeonhole, filibuster, Rules Committee blockade, irrelevant debate, dilatory tactics, a single objection on the call of the Senate Calendar—and passes both Houses in other than identical form, it is referred to a conference committee. This is the final major stage in the legislative process. A conference committee is a joint committee composed of Representatives and Senators, appointed by the Speaker and the Vice President, respectively, which is charged with the duty of compromising the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The conference committee, which has been called a third house of Congress, nearly always reaches an agreement, and then resubmits the revised bill to each House for a majority vote. The report of the conference committee is almost invariably approved by the vote of both Houses, although the House surprised the country in October 1951 by rejecting the first report of a conference committee on a tax bill.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Ada McCown, historian of the origin and evolution of the conference committee, traces its origin back to 14th century England.[1] In that century the English Parliament became a bicameral body, with the lords and prelates sitting in one house and the knights and burgesses in the other. Contemporaneously the custom arose for members of both houses to confer together on the answer to be given to the king's request for funds. According to the historian, William Stubbs, a real conference committee system existed in England before 1378.[2] The first conference recorded in the Journals of the House of Commons was held in 1554. We learn from these early Journals that parliamentary conferences were usually held in the Painted Chamber, that twice as many Commoners as Lords attended them, that the upper chamber fixed the time and place of meeting, and that "the Lords came in a body, expecting the Commoners to await them. They sat with their hats on while the Commoners stood with their hats off. While a conference was in session all other proceedings in both houses were suspended."[3]

Conferences became especially signficant during the 17th century in England when they were used in a series of parliamentary crises. But with the development of the cabinet system in the 18th century they declined in importance; and by the middle of the 19th century they had disappeared. The conference device has been obsolete in England for a hundred years.

While the conference committee was dying out in the mother country with the rise of the cabinet system, colonial records indicate that it was widely used in the American Colonies as a means of reconciling differences between the two houses of the Colonial legislatures, and it continued to be used in the State legislatures after the Revolution. In New York State the Constitution of 1777 provided for conferences between the Assembly and the Senate which were held in public and sometimes excited great public interest, as in the differences between the two houses over the State's support of the Federal Government in the War of 1812.

McCown reports that "from the very beginning of our congressional history, the conference committee was the accepted method of adjusting differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate. At the beginning of the 1st session of the 1st Congress, on April 7, 1789 * * * the Senate charged a committee with the duty of preparing rules for the government of the two houses in the case of conference."[4] The House chose a similar committee of 5 members and the result of their report was a joint rule which read as follows:[5]

"*Resolved*, That in every case of an amendment to a bill agreed to in one House and disagreed to in the other, if either House shall request a conference, and appoint a committee for that purpose, and the other House shall also appoint a committee to confer, such committees shall, at a convenient time, to be agreed on by their chairmen, meet in the conference chamber, and state to each other verbally, or in writing, as either shall choose, the reasons of their respective Houses for and against the amendment and confer freely thereon."

According to McCown, several conferences were held during the 1st Congress on such subjects as the impost bill, Members' salaries, the amendments to the Constitution, judicial procedure, the Treasury and Post Office bills, trade with the Indians, and other matters.

Inherited from England, the conference committee system is an evolutionary product whose principal threads were woven on the loom of congressional practice into a unified pattern by the middle of the 19th century. "By 1852," writes Ada McCown, "the customs of presenting identical reports from the committees of conference in both Houses, of granting high privilege to these conference reports, of voting upon the conference report as a whole and permitting no amendment of it, of keeping secret the discussions carried on in the meetings of the conference committee, had become established in American parliamentary practice."[6]

CONFERENCE PROCEDURE

A large body of law and practice has developed over the years governing conference procedure and reports. They operate under the limitations of a code of rules which occupy 16 pages of the Senate Manual, 14 pages of the House Manual, and 22 pages of Cannon's Procedure. The essential features of conference procedure under the modern practice have been succinctly described by Gilbert Steiner as follows:[7]

"The conference stage is reached in congressional action when disagreement is formally stated by one House or the other. Usually, this will occur when the second House has amended a bill and returned it to the House of origin which refuses to accept the amendment(s). Not infrequently, however, the second House assumes that the House of origin will refuse to accept a change, and consequently votes to insist, and requests a conference without returning the bill to the House of origin. In either case, the Presiding Officer does not dispose of the conference request on his own initiative, some Member will address the Chair; he may ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the table with the amendments of the second Chamber, that the amendments be disagreed with (or insisted on), and that a conference be agreed to (or requested). When unanimous consent is not obtained in the House, a special rule may be brought in by the Rules Committee providing for a conference. In the Senate it is, of course, always theoretically possible to filibuster against the appointment of a conference committee. Actually, no cases of real opposition to agreeing to a conference have been found. The reason for this is obvious—the bill has already been passed by the Chamber involved, and presumably sufficient votes to agree to a conference should therefore be garnered. In addition, opponents of a measure may well prefer to wait for the conference report, before taking obstructive action, since the report may result in a modified bill more to the liking of disaffected elements.

"Under House rule X, clause 2, dating back to 1890, the Speaker appoints House managers. By tradition, Senate managers are named by the Vice President or President

---

[1] Ada C. McCown, The Congressional Conference Committee (1927), ch. II.

[2] William Stubbs, Constitutional History of England (1860), vol. ii, pp. 645–646.

[3] McCown, op. cit., p. 25.

[4] Ibid., p. 38.

[5] Annals, 1st Cong., 1st sess., p. 20, April 15, 1789. Quoted by McCown.

[6] McCown, op. cit., pp. 254–255.

[7] Gilbert Y. Steiner, The Congressional Conference Committee: 70th to 80th Cong. (1951), pp. 7–11.

pro tempore of the Senate. The range of free choice is strictly limited, however, in that the customary practice in both Chambers is for the chairman of the committee having charge of a bill to send to the desk a "little pink slip" bearing the names of his nominees for appointment. The chairman and ranking majority and minority members of the committee are usually named conferees, although as is noted subsequently, there has been something of a problem in determining the membership of conference committees with the growth of the subcommittee device. A tradition has not yet developed as to whether subcommittee members deserve a preferred place on the conference committee over ranking members of the full committee originally involved. Indeed, the seniority principle itself has sometimes been ignored, and this has led to charges of "packing" the conference with proponents of a point of view supported by the standing committee chairman and the presiding officer of the House involved. The number of managers appointed is also determined by the standing committee chairman with the approval of the Presiding Officer, but by precedent it is three, five, seven, or nine. There does not seem to be any correlation between the number of managers and the importance of the legislation. Nor does the number of managers appointed by one House determine the number appointed by the second Chamber.

"A fairly elaborate process governs the possession of conference papers; the original engrossed copy of the bill attested by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate; the engrossed amendments; any special acts concurring in amendments with amendments, and the messages transmitting them between the two Houses, all similarly attested; and later, the conference report signed by the managers. The House agreeing to the conference sends the papers to the House asking for a conference. The managers on the part of the House asking the conference bring the papers to the conference room. At the close of a successful conference, the papers change hands; the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference receive them and take them to their House, which is first to consider the conference report. If the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference fail to take possession of the papers, by agreement or otherwise, from the managers on the part of the House asking conference, the report may be received first by that House. A conference report may not be considered when the original papers are not before the House considering the report. If the conference is not successful in reaching agreement, the papers are not surrendered, but remain with the managers of the requesting House, and that Chamber first receives the report of disagreement and takes action. If a conference report is recommitted to the conference committee, the papers are no longer before the House ordering recommittal, and no motion regarding the amendments in disagreement is in order.

"Instructions to conference managers must be given before managers are named, but after the House has agreed to a conference. Once instructions are given, no further motions to that effect are in order. Whether instructed or not, managers may disregard all instructions, and the conference report is not subject to the point of order that it is in violation of instructions. Insertion of new matter, and alteration of agreed matter, is cause for a point of order since the rules of both Houses have presumably outlawed these practices. However, a technique which Miss McCown dates back to the 1860's and 1870's has developed whereby one House may strike out all after the enacting clause of a bill passed in the other Chamber. The second House then substitutes its own bill as a single overall amendment, retaining only the number and the enacting clause of the bill passed by the first House. Under such conditions, it has been successfully argued that everything in the legislation was in technical disagreement, and that the conferees were legally empowered to write a completely new bill eliminating matters agreed on by both Houses or inserting legislation never approved by either Chamber. Section 135 of the Reorganization Act was designed specifically to eliminate this practice. An evaluation of its efficacy is made in this study.

"The operation of the conference itself is very informal. Meetings are usually held on the Senate side of the Capitol, and by tradition, the first named Senate manager is nominal chairman of the committee. Voting is by the unit rule, and a majority of the managers of each Chamber sign the conference report. The minority has no authority to file a separate report, but may do so under unanimous consent.

"A conference committee may secure whatever expert opinion it thinks desirable. Members may bring aides to conference with them so long as no objection is raised by managers of the second House. In at least one instance, the managers on the part of the House of Representatives prevailed upon the House to pass a resolution requesting that Senate aides be asked to depart from a conference. Invariably, House and Senate legislative counsel will be present at a conference to aid in the actual drafting of the report. This is particularly necessary when the conference committee recommends a third bill as a substitute for two bills committed to it. A conference report may not be called up for consideration until the conferees have formally reported the matter back to their respective Houses.

"Under the rules of the House of Representatives, if a conference fails to yield a report within 20 calendar days, it is a matter of high privilege for any Member of the House to move to discharge its conferees from further consideration of the measure assigned to them and appoint new managers. During the last 6 days of a session, the limitation is reduced from 20 days to 36 hours. A conference report may not be called up in the House until 1 day after it is filed, except by unanimous consent or during the final week of the session.

"It should be noted that the motion to send to conference is certainly not the only possible disposition of a bill amended in the second Chamber. Indeed, six other motions are possible, each of which takes precedence over a motion to disagree and ask for a conference. These are a motion to lay on the table, a motion to postpone indefinitely, a motion to postpone to a certain date, a motion to refer to a standing or special committee, a motion to amend, and a motion to agree. As has been stated, however, in the case of important legislation, the motion to disagree and ask for a conference is nearly always made.

"There are no minutes or formal records kept of the sessions of conference committees. On the contrary, members seem to feel that the conference is a confidential matter, and explanations of conference activity made on the floor of House or Senate are sometimes preceded by the comment that the speaker does not wish to violate the confidence of the conference. Usually, influential members of the conference will make a statement to the press on the day-to-day progress at a conference, but only the formal conference report embodying the recommendations of the committee becomes a part of the official record. The rationale for this practice is that publication of debates and votes would subject the managers to external pressure and would hamper the give and take necessary for a successful conference. The process may be compared to international diplomacy; great powers deem it unwise to make public detailed progress reports, out of fear of giving a strategic advantage to the other powers. The process may also be analogous to collective bargaining in labor agreements, since detailed interim statements may adversely affect the results for one group or the other.

"Because the formal conference report is often very little more than a recommendation that each Chamber recede on certain numbered amendments, the House of Representatives has adopted a rule requiring that every report be accompanied by a statement. This statement must be sufficiently detailed and explicit to inform the House what effect suggested amendments or propositions will have on the measure to which they relate. In practice, this statement has been used to make clear to the Members of the House the differences between a bill as originally passed by the House and as it would be if the recommendations of the conference were approved. The statement must be in writing and must be signed by a majority of the House managers. A conference report may not be received in the House without the accompanying statement. There is no requirement in the Senate of any comparable nature.

"Conference reports are considered matters of high privilege in both House and Senate. In general, they are in order except when the body is dividing or when the Journal is being read. The Senate rules specify that when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of a conference report, if raised, shall be put immediately, and shall be determined without debate. In the House, the previous question may be ordered to decide the question of proceeding to consider a conference report if a challenge is raised.

"A conference report may not be referred to a standing committee, and, in the House, may not be referred to the Committee of the Whole. A conference report may be withdrawn in the Senate by leave of the Senate, and in the House by unanimous consent. It is not in order to amend a conference report, and it must be accepted or rejected as an entirety. This last requirement, of course, greatly enhances the potential power of conferees. This is particularly true near the close of a session when rejection of a conference report, because of dissatisfaction with a single portion of it, may well cause the loss of the entire bill, time being too short to permit a new report to be drawn. Rejection of a report is usually followed by the ordering of another conference, if there is adequate time, and in accordance with custom, the same conferees are appointed to the second committee as served on the first. The only method whereby conference reports may be amended is by concurrent resolution or order, and this is usually reserved for technical corrections.

"Finally, partial reports from a committee of conference will be accepted in both Chambers. In such a case, approval is given to that portion of the report on which agreement has been reached in conference, and the respective Houses indicate whether they desire their managers to insist further, whether they are willing to recede, or whether they wish to propose a further compromise."

EXTENT OF PRACTICE

The conference committee has been a medium of continuous struggle for legislative supremacy between the Senate and House of Representatives. Here behind the legislative scenes many decisive battles of congressional history have been waged. For 2 weeks during the 79th Congress, for example, the conferees on the full-employment bill locked horns.[8] In the 81st Congress the civil-functions appropriations bill was tied

[8] See Stephen K. Bailey, Congress Makes a Law: the Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946 (1950), ch. XI: Conference and Compromise.

up in conference for 4 months—a period longer than any within the memory of living Members. According to Representative CANNON: "The delay was due to the unanimous objection of the managers on the part of the House to agreeing to exorbitant and unwarranted expenditure of public funds proposed by the other body."[9] In the first session of the 82d Congress the House, in a surprise move, rejected a conference report on a tax bill by the combined action of Republicans and Democrats who voted against it for different reasons.

This device has been used extensively by every Congress since 1789. Of the 217 public laws enacted by the 2d session of the 82d Congress, 90, or 41 percent, went through conference and, of these, 13 were appropriation bills. Most important legislation goes through the conference closet and is there revised, sometimes beyond recognition, by the all-powerful conferees or managers.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

During the 1945 hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, considerable testimony was presented regarding the introduction by conferees of new material into conference reports, and the elimination or substantial change of legislation agreed to by both Houses. While the standing rules are clear regarding the limitation of conferees to the disagreements between the two Houses, parliamentary procedures make it possible for conferees completely to rewrite legislation substantially agreed upon in both Chambers. This is done by one House striking everything after the enacting clause, substituting one overall amendment, and thus technically placing everything in the bill in disagreement and making it subject to complete revision by the conferees.

To meet this situation, the La Follette-Monroney committee recommended in its final report "that conferees of the two Houses be limited to adjustment only of actual differences in fact between the two Houses and that matters on which both Houses are in agreement be not subject to change in conference."[10] This recommendation was followed by the inclusion in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 of the following section:

"SEC. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

"(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order."

Thus, the act restated the old rule that the authority of conference committees is limited to matters which are in disagreement between the two Houses, while recognizing their right to report a substitute on the same subject matter.

Few points of order against conference reports under this rule have been made or sustained in recent years. On June 4, 1947, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan made a point of order against the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, etc., on the ground (1) that the conferees had changed the text theretofore agreed to by both Houses, and (2) had inserted additional matter which, even though germane, they had no authority to insert. "The House is considering an entirely new bill," said Mr. HOFFMAN, "that was written in conference by seven men * * *." After discussion, the Speaker was "convinced that the conferees had followed well-established precedents" and overruled the point of order.[11]

On October 5, 1951, Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, made a point of order against the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951 on the ground that it contained matter not committed to the conferees by either House in a section providing for making the Mutual Security Director a member of the board of the Export-Import Bank. After discussion, the Speaker sustained the point of order.[12]

On October 1, 1951, Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho, made a point of order against the same conference report on the ground that the conferees had changed identical sections in both the House and Senate bills by changing the percentage of funds which the President could transfer between military and economic aid. After spirited debate, the Chair overruled the point of order and held that the change was a germane modification of the original language. Upon appeal, the Senate sustained the decision of the Chair by a vote of 41 to 36, with 19 absentees. This vote seemed to strengthen the powers of the conferees and to weaken control of legislative action by the Senate.[13]

The ensuing Senate debate on the powers of conferees revealed a loophole in the conference rules which Senator Ferguson, of Michigan, sought to plug by offering a resolution (S. Res. 221, 82d Cong., 1st sess.) to amend paragraph 3 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate by prohibiting conferees from striking out matter passed in identical form by both Houses or from modifying any such matter. The Ferguson resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which took no action upon it. The effect of the Ferguson amendment would be to restore language in the rule which was approved by the Senate when it passed the legislative reorganization bill in June 1946, but which was deleted from that bill after it had passed the Senate and while it was on the Speaker's table.

On September 15, 1950, and again on April 11, 1951, the Senate agreed to a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) providing that every conference report shall be accompanied by a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee. Seventy years earlier the House of Representatives had adopted a similar rule on February 27, 1880 (rule XXVIII–1b). Compared with the strict code of the House, the rules of the Senate have advanced at a snail's pace.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that in the House the chairman of the House conferees usually asks and obtains unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the conference report. Then, after the statement explaining the conference report has been partially read, the chairman usually requests that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with. Since neither the conference report nor the explanatory statement has yet been printed in the RECORD during the last 6 days of a session, Members have little knowledge of the contents of conference reports, of the changes that have been made by the conferees, or of whether or not the rules regulating conferences have been complied with. In the absence of such knowledge, they can hardly make points of order against conference reports.[14]

EVALUATION OF DEVICE

Comparatively unknown except to the few who are familiar with the mysteries of the legislative process, the conference committee is today perhaps the most unique and powerful legislative institution in America, the least dramatic, and one that has received all too little attention.[15] It is a notable fact that American legislatures stand alone among modern bicameral legislative bodies in providing a formal method for adjusting differences between them. Since few, if any, important bills ever pass both Houses of Congress in precisely identical form, and since the final shape of differing measures must be determined in conference, the strategic role and importance of the ad hoc conference committees will readily be appreciated.

Commenting upon the powers of conferees, Willoughby writes:[16]

"In cases such as these [substitute bill situations] the committee has before it the whole subject and has practically full discretion with respect to the drafting of a new measure for submission to the two Houses. Even where resort has not been had to this form of amendment, conditions are often such as to permit of a wide range of action by the committee in seeking to formulate provisions that will be mutually acceptable. Except, therefore, where the matters in dispute are very specific, these committees have large powers in the determination of the provisions of many important bills that will come before the two Houses for final action. To such an extent is this true that the statement is often made that the real character of the legislation actually had it determined by these bodies * * *."

In general, writers on Congress regard the conference committee as an admirable device for achieving its purpose. The advantages claimed for the system are that it settles differences between the two Houses in most cases, that it serves to expedite legislative business and prevent deadlocks, and that it facilitates majority party control of legislation. Some mechanism for reconciling differences under a bicameral system is obviously essential.

Yet the disadvantages of the system have also been recognized. In her authoritative history of the subject, Ada McCown writes:[17]

"The evils and dangers of this conference committee system are perhaps apparent. It gives too much power into the hands of a few men who are not really held to answer for what they do. In the privacy of the conference mutual concessions may be made which involve provisions which would never pass if considered openly in the House or the Senate. The conference committee has much power of independent action, but it is not held responsible in any such manner as is a ministry under a cabinet system. No conference committee of either House is forced to resign because it has gone counter to the wishes of the House which it represents. Its Members still retain their positions on the regular standing committees and they will be members of the next conference committee which is chosen to settle differences on a bill coming within their province."

Writing in 1946, George B. Galloway remarked that serious evils have attended the

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 3, 1949, p. 13970.

[10] S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 8.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 4, 1947, pp. 6537–6539.

[12] Ibid., October 5, 1951, pp. 12962–12964.

[13] Ibid., October 1–2, 1951, pp. 12678–12681, 12718–12737.

[14] For an example of this situation, see remarks of Representative COLMER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 7, 1952, p. A4742.

[15] The books by Ada McCowen (1927) and Gilbert Steiner (1951) are the only full-length studies of the American conference committee system. Brief descriptions of it are given in textbooks and treaties on American government. See, for example, W. F. Willoughby, Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration (1934), ch. XXVI.

[16] Willoughby, op. cit., p. 421.

[17] McCown, op. cit., p. 16.

development of the conference committee system.[18]

"Suffice it to say here that serious evils have marked the development of the conference committee system. In the first place, it is highly prodigal of members' time. McConachie calculated that the average time consumed in conference was 33 days per bill. (He made this estimate by comparing the dates upon which the appropriation bills passed the Senate in the 54th Cong., 1st sess., with the dates when they became laws.) Bills are sent to conference without reading the amendments of the other Chamber. Despite rules to the contrary, conferees do not confine themselves to matters in dispute, but often initiate entirely new legislation and even strike out identical provisions previously approved by both Houses. This happened during the 78th Congress, for instance, when an important amendment to the surplus property bill, which had been approved by both Houses, was deleted in conference.

"'Conference committees, moreover, suffer like other committees from the seniority rule. The senior members of the committees concerned, who are customarily appointed as managers on the part of the House and Senate, are not always the best informed on the questions at issue, nor do they always reflect the majority sentiment of their Houses. Furthermore, conference reports must be accepted or rejected in toto without amendment and they are often so complex and obscure that they are voted upon without knowledge of their contents. What happens in practice is that Congress surrenders its legislative function to irresponsible committees of conference. The standing rules against including new and extraneous matter in conference reports have been gradually whittled away in recent years by the decisions of presiding officers. Senate riders attached to appropriation bills enable conference committees to legislate and the House usually accepts them rather than withhold supply, thus putting it, as Senator Hoar once declared, under a degrading duress.

"It is also alleged that under this secret system lobbyists are able to kill legislation they dislike and that 'jokers' designed to defeat the will of Congress can be inserted without detection. Senator George W. Norris once characterized the conference committee as a third house of Congress. 'The members of this house,' he said, 'are not elected by the people. The people have no voice as to who these members shall be. * * *' This conference committee is many times, in very important matters of legislation, the most important branch of our legislature. There is no record kept of the workings of the conference committee. Its work is performed, in the main, in secret. No constituent has any definite knowledge as to how members of this conference committee vote, and there is no record to prove the attitude of any member of the conference committee. * * * As a practical proposition we have legislation, then, not by the voice of the Members of the Senate, not by the Members of the House of Representatives, but we have legislation by the voice of 5 or 6 men. And for practical purposes, in most cases, it is impossible to defeat the legislation proposed by this conference committee. Every experienced legislator knows that it is the hardest thing in the world to defeat a conference report."[19]

One Senator's opinion of the power of conferees was reflected in a satirical speech a few years ago by Senator FULBRIGHT, who congratulated the conferees on a national defense appropriation bill "for so forthrightly disregarding the wishes of the common lay Members of the Senate and the House." Said he:[20]

"I submit, Mr. President, in all sincerity that there is no need whatever for the ordinary lay Member of Congress to come back to Washington for a special session. It is clearly evident, Mr. President, that to save the world and the people of this country from disaster, all that is needed is to reconvene, preferably in secret, only those incomparable sages, the conferees of the Appropriations Committee. From their deliberations the same results would be achieved and without the expense and trouble to everyone that is involved in going through the archaic ritual of pretended legislation. It is quite clear that regardless of what the common Members of this body may wish, the conferees make the decisions."

The chief criticisms made of this device over the years have been that: (1) bills are sent to conference without reading the amendments of the other House; (2) much legislation has been forced through Congress in the form of Senate riders on House appropriation bills late in the session; (3) conference reports are voted upon blindly without knowledge of their contents, especially during the end-of-the-session log jams; and (4) Congress has docilely surrendered its legislative powers to irresponsibile committees of conference.

PROBLEM OF CONTROL

The central problem connected with the conference committee system is that of controlling it. Various rules and rulings of the Chair have been made to this end during the past century. In 1918 the Senate adopted the Curtis rule which makes it possible to challenge a conference report on the point of order that it contains new matter not committed to the conference committee, whether germane or not, even under a substitute bill situation. This appears in clause 2 of rule XXVII of the standing rules of the Senate which has been strictly construed and which reads as follows:

"2. Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference."

In the House a rule of 1920 (rule XX, clause 2) forbids House managers to agree in conference to a large class of Senate amendments to appropriation bills without a separate vote on each amendment by the House. This rule has been generally observed and is regarded by McCown as "probably the most effective means yet devised of controlling the evils of the conference committee system."[21]

In 1946, as noted above, the Legislative Reorganization Act, in section 135 applicable to both Houses, authorized conferees to report a new bill where one House strikes out all after the enacting clause of the bill of the other House and inserts new language. The defect of this amendment, as noted above, is that it does not forbid conferees to delete or modify matter passed in identical form by both Houses.

In the House of Representatives the Speaker may rule out a conference report if it be shown that the managers have exceeded their authority; and points of order may be made against conference reports in the House before the reading of the explanatory statement. The House adopted a rule (rule XXVIII, clause 2) in 1902 which provides that "it shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the RECORD, except on either of the 6 days preceding the end of a session."

This rule may be evaded, however, by the granting of unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a conference report; and by its own terms it is inoperative during the last 6 days of a session when many conference reports are made.

In practice, the rules governing conferees, like all rules, depend for their effectiveness upon their enforcement. Writing in 1927, McCown reports that the rule forbidding the insertion of new matter in conference reports has been "flagrantly violated in recent times."[22] Points of order against infraction of the conference rules are, in fact, seldom made. Committees of conference enjoy largely uncontrolled powers to write new legislation in substitute bill situations where the rules allow them to report any bill germane to the bills under consideration. Sometimes conference reports are brought up in the House of Representatives under a special rule granted by the Committee on Rules waiving points of order against them. Under all these circumstances, it is obivously difficult to control committees of conference, which have long exercised a determining influence upon the shape of much important congressional legislation.

CONCLUSIONS

However, it would appear that effective control of conference committees is possible under existing rules, if they are enforced. McCown concluded "that under the House and Senate rules of the present time a fair degree of control is maintained over the managers * * * since the additions of the Senate rule of 1918 and the House rule of 1920, control of the managers has been increased so that there is much less conference committee legislation than there was at one time. Certainly there is now [1927] more control over the conference committee by the two Houses than there ever has been in the past. It would seem, then, that conference committee legislation is bad," concludes McCown, "but that there is not enough of it that eludes the rules and practice of the two Houses to cause despair."[23]

"The truth is that the conference committee system is a necessary part of the congressional government system. It must, however, be kept under the control of the two Houses. The managers must not be allowed to include in their report any matter not committed to them by either House nor must they be allowed to eliminate items which have been agreed upon by both Houses. On the other hand, the peculiar composition of a conference committee makes it particularly fitted to offer constructive suggestions in regard to a bill that may have been altered several times in the course of its progress through the two Houses * * *."

Similar conclusions were reached by Dr. Gilbert Steiner, of the University of Illinois, in his 1951 study. Steiner made an intensive analysis of 56 pieces of the most significant legislation enacted between the 70th and 80th Congresses, inclusive, which went through conference. He concludes that "the conference committee has not been a consistently irresponsible 'third house' of Congress. Conference committees have sometimes been reckless, and sometimes have flouted the will of a congressional majority, but the number of such instances is small, too small to justify a damning generalization. Conference committees may be and have been controlled by effective rules and precedents. It would not appear, however, that the institution of the conference committee is such as to require closer oversight

[18] George B. Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads (1946), pp. 98–99.

[19] The Model Legislature, address at Lincoln, Nebr., February 22, 1934. Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 27, 1934.

[20] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 2d sess., p. 9206 (June 19, 1948).

[21] McCown, op. cit., p. 260.

[22] Ibid., p. 262.

[23] Ibid., pp. 264, 266.

than is given any other congressional committee." [24] Steiner concludes that "the conference committee is both a practical and satisfactory device" of accommodation and that no new method of adjustment is needed.

In the 56 cases studied by Dr. Steiner in the period 1928–48, he found only 3 outstanding instances in which conference committees had deleted matter agreed to by both Houses or had included new matter. These involved the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the Transportation Act of 1940, and the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Of special interest is Dr. Steiner's conclusion that the House has been more influential in conference than the Senate. For the period and cases studied, he reports that "the House achieved 57 percent of the victories, the Senate 27 percent, and 16 percent of the cases showed joint influence." House influence was predominant in all cases of revenue and appropriation acts studied, while the Senate dominated in broad fiscal policy legislation.

PROPOSED REFORMS

Thus, we see that the conference committee is a little known institution which operates secretly behind the legislative scenes and exercises large influence over the final form of much important legislation. It takes the handiwork of the two Houses and, in the interests of compromise, can modify the actions of either branch no matter how preponderant the vote therein may have been on the original bills, and submit a conference report which almost always becomes law.

Several suggestions have been made from time to time for changes in the congressional conference committee system. Mention has already been made of Senator Ferguson's resolution to amend paragraph 3 of Senate rule XXVII so as to plug an apparent loophole in it, making it crystal clear that it is the intent of Congress to limit the power of conferees in dealing with a substitute bill. To the same end, Senator Vandenberg sought in 1938 to add the following sentence to the rule:

"It is hereby expressly provided that this paragraph shall be deemed to include reports on measures where one House has struck out all after the enacting or resolving clause and inserted a substitute."

Adoption of this proposal by both Houses would eliminate the loophole still provided by permission to "include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement." The problem in the substitute bill situation has been less that of inclusion of new matter than that of deletion of matter agreed to by both Houses, and section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act does not meet this squarely.

Another recurring suggestion is to permit conferees to report new matter separately for separate consideration in each House. This requires unanimous consent and has occasionally been done. It has been the practice in the House under the 1920 rule in the case of certain Senate amendments to appropriation bills.[25]

As a remedy for secrecy it has been suggested that conference meetings be open to Members of either House. Open conferences were prescribed by the New York State Constitution of 1777 and the first congressional conference ever held over a legislative disagreement—the conference on the impost and tonnage bills on June 26, 1789—was an open one attended by several Members of both Houses. The annals of Congress record no other such open conference from 1789 until 1911 when a tariff conference opened its meetings to representatives of the press under the influence of Senator La Follette who was strongly in favor of publicity.[26]

In order to avoid inadequate consideration of conference reports during the crowded closing days of a session, the elder La Follette also suggested that a deadline be fixed by rule upon the receipt of bills from the other House. No action was ever taken on this proposal which is probably impractical.[27]

Another abortive suggestion was that made by Representative McRae in 1902 that conference reports be printed in bill form, with changes in italics so that they can be readily recognized and any "jokers" discovered. But Congress has been content to rely upon the explanatory statements for knowledge of the changes made in conference.

Others argue that the real remedy for the defects of the device is to keep it under congressional control by enforcing the conference rules so as to make theory and practice coincide. Congress makes its own rules and only Congress can compel compliance with them.

Several alternatives to the conference device are conceivable. Conference committees are not used in the Legislature of New York State. Amendments made to a bill in one chamber at Albany are returned to the house of origin for acceptance or rejection. And agreement is apparently achieved under the leadership of the Governor.

Under the parliamentary form of government used in England and many other countries, deadlocks between the houses are avoided by the cabinet which originates all important legislation, keeps harmony between the two chambers, and replaces the conference committee as the instrument for adjusting interchameral differences. Under the Cabinet system disputes between the chambers are conciliated by the Government whose ministers move freely between the two Houses, consult with their committees, and defend Government measures on both floors. But adoption of the Cabinet system in the United States would be a herculean remedy for the evils of the conference committee system.

Within the bicameral framework perhaps the most promising remedy is to make more use of joint standing committees in the formulation of important bills. It is easier through such committees to prevent differences from arising in the initial stages of the legislative process than it is to compose them after measures have passed both Houses. Persuasive testimony on this point was presented to the La Follette-Monroney committee by Representative HALE, of Maine. "A committee of conference," he said, "is not nearly as well adapted to framing legislation as a joint standing committee. A joint standing committee having agreed upon a bill can generally procure its passage with minor amendments through both bodies. But a committee of conference finds it much harder to get the coordinate branches of the legislature to recede from a position previously taken and concur with the other branch. All sorts of factors of pride and prestige are involved on the presentation of conference reports which are not involved in the report of a joint standing committee." [28]

Increased executive influence, perhaps in the form of a joint executive-legislative cabinet, has also been suggested as a potential method of minimizing House and Senate differences. This suggestion was made by Thomas K. Finletter in 1945 in chapter XI of his well-known little book Can Representative Government Do the Job? It was also proposed by the La Follette-Monroney committee in its final report which recommended "that the majority policy committees of the Senate and House serve as a formal council to meet regularly with the Executive, to facilitate the formulation and carrying out of national policy, and to improve relationships between the executive and legislative branches of the Government." [29]

The taking of steps to strengthen party government in Congress might be expected to reduce the need of conference committees, except when opposing political parties control the two Houses. Several proposals to this end have been made in recent years. Most noteworthy among them are the suggestions to revive the party caucus as an instrument of policymaking, to create single responsible leadership committees for each party in each House, and to abandon the seniority custom in committee appointments and the selection of chairman.[30]

A drastic remedy for the alleged shortcomings of the congressional conference committee would be to allow the example of Nebraska and adopt a unicameral legislature, thus eliminating the need of conferences. There are those who believe that the United States Senate no longer performs any unique or indispensable functions in the American system of government.[31] Its tolerance of unlimited and irrelevant debate and its frequent absenteeism have been severely criticized by its own Members.[32] The decay of second chambers and the trend toward unicameralism in the democratic constitutions of the postwar world are widespread phenomena.[33] Twenty-nine nations have unicameral national legislatures today. And in several others the role of the second chamber has been reduced to a mere suspensive veto. The British House of Lords was finally emasculated by the Parliament Act of 1949. Some students of representative government believe that under the new order of affairs there is less justification for the bicameral system than it has had in the past. As Walter Shepard wrote in 1935, "The Senate * * * may lose its raison d'etre. A single chamber * * * might constitute a better instrument to do the work which seems to lie ahead of Congress."[34] But unicameralism is probably merely an academic suggestion, for neither House of Congress would sign its own death warrant by submitting such a constitutional amendment to the States.

---

[24] Steiner, op. cit., p. 174.

[25] McCown, op. cit., pp. 267–268.

[26] Ibid., pp. 36, 43, 177.

[27] Ibid., pp. 268–69.

[28] Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 79th Cong., 1st sess., April 24, 1945, p. 342.

[29] S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 13.

[30] For a full discussion of these suggestions, see Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System, Report of the Committee on Political Parties, American Political Science Association, September 1950; and pertinent testimony on Party Government in Congress before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, hearings on the Organization and Operation of Congress, June 1951.

[31] Cf. Arthur N. Holcombe, Our More Perfect Union (1950), p. 230.

[32] HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. The Senate on Trial, American Political Science Review, September 1950, pp. 650–660. See also Holcombe, op cit., pp. 231–34.

[33] Arnold J. Zurcher, ed. Constitutions and Constitutional Trends Since World War II (1951), ch. 4, The Position of the Representative Legislature in the Postwar Constitutions, by Edward G. Lewis.

[34] Walter J. Shepard, Democracy in Transition, American Political Science Review, February 1935, p. 16. Presidential address.

Absurd Legal Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, where a person testifies under oath in a completely contradictory manner, he shows his utter contempt for the sanctity of his oath and should be found guilty of perjury. Under the present Federal statute on this subject, before proceeding to obtain an indictment, the prosecution must decide which time he was lying and then allege and prove that was the time he gave false testimony. All he has to do to escape conviction is to show that he happened to tell the truth that time and was lying the other time. Such a situation simply cannot be understood by the layman and should not be tolerated by the lawmaker.

It was to correct this intolerable and absurd loophole in the law that I introduced H. R. 799, to extend the law relating to perjury to cover the wilful giving of contradictory testimony under oath. The Attorney General has recently endorsed the principle behind this measure. I have requested the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to grant an early hearing to plug this loophole. I hope this Congress will act promptly to wipe out this absurdity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following splendid editorial on this subject from the Washington Star:

ABSURD LEGAL LOOPHOLE

A big loophole in the Federal perjury law will be plugged up if Congress approves an amendment proposed by Attorney General Brownell. Under the present law it is not sufficient to prove that a person made contradictory statements under oath. The Government must show which of the statements was false and which was true. In some cases this is not easy to do—and the Matusow case would seem to be one of those in the difficult category. Yet the former Communist has made false statements, at one time or another, before grand juries, in the courts and at congressional hearings. A grand jury and a Senate committee are trying to sift fact from fiction.

But it ought not to be necessary to spend time and money in such a search when it is plain from two sets of contradictory sworn statements that a person is a deliberate perjurer, or when such a person states that he has lied. Last year, to meet just such a situation, Mr. Brownell asked Congress to amend the perjury law so as to permit conviction on the mere showing that sworn contradictions have been given to a grand jury, a court or congressional committees. The request was made so late in the session, however, that no action was taken. Now the Attorney General, with the Matusow type of case in mind, has renewed his request. (The proposed amendment makes no mention of perjury committed before such an administrative agency as the Federal Communications Commission, to which Mrs. Marie Natvig gave conflicting testimony that has led to her indictment for perjury.) Mr. Brownell is right in describing as "ridiculous" the shortcomings of the present law. No self-confessed perjurer should be permitted to escape the consequences of his falsifications because of Government difficulty in proving which of two conflicting statements was a lie.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak republic. He lived an extraordinarily productive life—1850–1937. He is acknowledged as one of the great democratic philosopher-statesmen of this century. A friend of Woodrow Wilson, and married to an American, Charlotte Garrigue, whose surname he adopted as his middle name, he was always an admirer of the United States. Thomas G. Masaryk was born in Moravia, the son of a Slovakian coachman. His unusual ability enabled him to study at the University of Vienna, where he became professor of philosophy. From 1882 to 1911, he taught at the University of Prague. From his youth, he was active in the political education of his people and took a leading part in the movement to liberate his country from Austrian rule. He was elected to the Austrian Parliament, but was forced to flee to Paris at the outbreak of World War I. There, he formed the Czechoslovak National Council, which was recognized by the Allies as the Government of Czechoslovak Republic, and was reelected to the office in 1920, 1927, and 1934. In 1935, he resigned as President because of his advanced age.

It is very befitting that Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan, issued the following proclamation on behalf of this great statesman:

PROCLAMATION—THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK DAY

This year on March 7 American citizens of Czechoslovakian descent, along with all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world, are celebrating the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

On October 28, 1918, Thomas Masaryk proclaimed from Washington the independence of the Czechoslovak Republic. Mr. Masaryk's great patriotism was equalled only by his belief in liberty and his magnificent intelligence. He contributed much to western culture and our peoples honor him equally for each of these contributions.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim March 7, 1955, as Thomas Garrigue Masaryk Day in Michigan, and urge all our people to join their fellow citizens of Czechoslovakian descent in paying homage and tribute to the memory of this great statesman of peace and independence.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this second day of March in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

The Blessings of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, several days ago at the second century convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren, delivered a thought-provoking address entitled "The Blessings of Liberty."

I commend its reading to my brethren in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and I now ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY

(Address of Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at the second century convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1955)

It is a thrilling experience to participate in the opening session of this second century convocation of Washington University. The time, the place, and the cause to which the convocation is dedicated make it an occasion of major importance. The campus of Washington University enriched by a hundred years of devotion to the highest ideals of education and by the contribution of its thousands of alumni to the good life in America provides an ideal place to reflect upon "the blessings of liberty." To do so at a centennial celebration where the experience of the past, the events of the present and aims for the future can so appropriately be brought into balance adds greatly to the content of the occasion.

The times in which we are living are not normal times. Powerful forces are at work in the world—both to preserve liberty and to extinguish it. The interplay of hope and fear, belief and doubt, determination and frustration keeps the affairs of mankind and the minds of people in a state of turbulence—a turbulence that destroys perspective and clouds the vision. Such times call for constant reflection and reappraisal. In the atmosphere of these surroundings where men and women have devoted their lives to the pursuit of truth throughout an entire century, we can more effectively detach ourselves for the moment from the complexities of everyday life in order to determine what our heritage of liberty is and what we are doing today to preserve it for our children and for those who come after them.

It is imperative that we do this. Notwithstanding the contributions of patriots through the centuries, the farsighted wisdom of the Founding Fathers or the written guaranties of the Constitution, liberty is not necessarily our permanent possession. Both external and internal pressures constantly assail it. It is axiomatic that every generation, to keep its freedom, must earn it

through understanding of the past, vigilance in the present and determination for the future.

It is easier to know how to combat a foreign enemy who challenges our right to these freedoms and thus prevent a sudden collapse of the things we hold dear than it is to subject ourselves to daily analysis and discipline for the purpose of preventing the erosion that can with equal effectiveness destroy them. I say "easier" because Americans have never hesitated to make the choice between liberty and death. Normally we can rely upon our representatives in government to keep our defenses sufficiently strong to enable us to ward off outside attack, but we cannot delegate to any or all of our governmental representatives the full responsibility for protection of our freedoms from the processes of erosion. Such protection can be had only through an understanding on the part of individual citizens of what these freedoms are, how they came into being and whether their spirit dominates our institutions and the life of our country. The protection I speak of is that sense of strength and comradeship which flows from national unity, buttressed by freedom of thought, of expression, of mobility, and of participation by all in the life and Government of the Nation.

I have no doubt it seems strange to some people that we take time to discuss such things almost 2 centuries after the adoption of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. There are some who regard our freedoms merely as their birthright which they may simply take for granted. There are others who would never shrink from the loss of little freedoms—by the other fellow of course. And there are also those who would procrastinate until the deluge. The fact remains, however, we do have a battle today to keep our freedoms from eroding just as Americans in every past age were obliged to struggle for theirs. Many thoughtful people are of the opinion that the danger of erosion is greater than that of direct attack. I do not mean to suggest—nor do they, I am sure—that outside of the totalitarian menace any substantial group of our citizens would wilfully destroy our freedoms. But the emotional influences of the times coupled with the latent suspicion and prejudice, inherent in human nature, are capable of threatening the basic rights of everyone, unless those emotions are controlled by self-discipline, community spirit, and governmental action.

A few days ago I read in the newspaper that a group of State employees—not in Missouri—charged with responsibility for determining what announcements could be posted on the employees' bulletin board refused to permit the Bill of Rights to be posted on the ground that it was a controversial document. It was reported that the altercation became intense, and that only after the governor in writing vouched for its non-controversial character was the Bill of Rights permited to occupy a place along with routine items of interest to the State employees. And this happened in the United States of America on the 15th day of December 1954, the 163d anniversary of our Bill of Rights, declared by proclamation of President Eisenhower to be Bill of Rights Day.

It is straws in the wind like this which cause some thoughtful people to ask the question whether ratification of the Bill of Rights could be obtained today if we were faced squarely with the issue. They inquire whether we are as united today in defending our traditional freedoms as were the American people in asserting them during the first years of Constitutional government in the United States.

My faith in the sober second thought of the American people makes me confident that it would now be ratified. On the other hand I am not prepared to dispute with those who believe the issue would provoke great controversy.

Have we not had enough controversy over teaching in and the conduct of our colleges and schools, both public and private, to warrant the inference that an effort would be made to curb freedom of speech and thought in that important segment of American life?

Have not sufficient doubts been expressed concerning the rights of individuals to invoke their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination to justify the belief that the proposed adoption of this safeguard against tyranny might provoke heated discussion?

Does not the suspicion that has attached to lawyers who represent unpopular defendants indicate some departure from the constitutional principle that every person charged with crime is entitled to be effectively represented by counsel?

Are there not enough shortcuts advocated, and too often practiced, in our time-honored legal procedures resulting in what we called a denial of due process of law?

Have there not been enough invasions of the freedom of the press to justify a concern about the inviolability of that great right?

Departures from the letter and spirit of our constitutional principles are not the product of any one person or any one group of persons. They are more properly chargeable to the entire body politic; to the suspicion, hatred, intolerance, and irresponsibility that stalk the world today; and also to a lack of appreciation of the age-old struggle of mankind to achieve our present-day blessings of liberty. Government, whether national, state or local, is not the sole culprit in this matter. For it does not operate in a vacuum. In the last analysis it only reflects the mores, the attitudes, the state of mind of the dominant groups of society.

How do we come to have a Bill of Rights, and what is its significance in the history of this Nation?

The Bill of Rights, which became part of our fundamental law in December 1791 does not by any means define all our rights. Many of our rights are to be found in the original Constitution, and others are formulated in later amendments.

The Bill of Rights did not originate the rights which it guarantees; there was at the time of its adoption not a single novel idea in it. It did summarize in a striking and effective manner the personal and public liberties which Americans 164 years ago regarded as their due, and as being properly beyond the reach of any government, old or new.

The men of our First Congress knew, as we may be in danger of forgetting, that each element in the Bill of Rights was a painfully won acquisition. They knew that government must be neither too strong nor too weak; that whatever form it may assume, government is potentially as dangerous a thing as it is a necessary one. They knew that power must be lodged somewhere to prevent anarchy within and conquest from without, but that this power could be abused to the detriment of their liberties. Confronted by this paradox, they turned to the experience of their forebears for counsel.

The English people, in their long struggle to control the monarchy founded by William the Conqueror, hit upon a happy solution: government should remain strong for its proper ends, but its strength should be kept within clearly defined limits. It became the consensus of the English people that certain acts should be clearly understood by all to be beyond power of government, and illegal if committed by any of its agents. Here we have the basis of the Anglo-Saxon legal and constitutional tradition.

The first great document in this tradition was the Magna Carta of 1215. There was little new in Magna Carta. It merely recorded the rights which had been asserted, with varying success, against the Norman monarchy during the previous century and a half, and needless to say, there were reactions and backslidings in the five centuries that followed. But in the main the movement was forward, toward the accumulation of a body of well-established liberties and immunities enjoyed by the true-born Englishman.

The century or so during which the British colonized America was especially important in the development of British constitutional rights. A full century before Madison rose in the First Congress and proposed our American Bill of Rights, the British Bill of Rights had already come into being. It was the culmination of generations of struggle against the arbitrary government of the Stuart dynasty in England.

In the course of the 18th century, the question arose whether the residents of Thirteen American Colonies were true-born Englishmen, and as such entitled to the traditional liberties and immunities enjoyed in the homeland. Since the King and Parliament of Great Britain were resolved upon giving a negative answer to this question, the colonies decided, in the year 1776, that the time had come to make a fresh start, and to adopt a Declaration of Independence.

In one sense, the Declaration is a lineal descendant of Magna Carta. But in another sense, it is a very different sort of document, a characteristic product of the Age of Reason. Instead of appealing to royal concessions and traditional immunities, it takes its stand upon self-evident truths, the laws of nature, and unalienable rights. It was a new turn in human history. It was an experiment which had never been attempted. It is still on trial.

Our Revolutionary forefathers had had their fill of royal governors, and of George III and his ministers, and so they forgot for a time one of the great lessons of constitutional history: that government must be strong for its proper ends. Many of the new State constitutions set up a hobbled and ineffectual executive branch. Our first attempt to create a national Government, the Articles of Confederation, provided for no executive at all. Our attempt to operate under a weak government barely got us through the Revolutionary War. The return of peace began a drift which, all clear minds perceived, was toward anarchy. The inevitable and timely reaction brought about the Federal Convention of 1787, by which our present Constitution was submitted to the American people.

To the American people, the Constitution was a new and permanent legal basis for their Government. They wanted nothing left to conjecture. They insisted upon concrete rights being set down in black and white. If government was to be strengthened, the more apparent became the need to delimit its proper powers, and to itemize the immunities which its citizens ought to enjoy. And so, directly upon the establishment of Government under the Constitution, the first Congress submitted the Bill of Rights to the States.

Such, in the most general kind of way, is the process by which we acquired our Bill of Rights. If you have not read its provisions recently, I urge that you read and reread them. They were never more important. The Bill of Rights contains only 462 words and can be read in only a few moments, but from the American viewpoint it embraces the wisdom of the ages as divined from man's struggle for freedom throughout civilization.

The liberties thus written into our fundamental law have not gone unassailed in the course of our national history, for men in office are still men. Whether men derive their authority from hereditary right or

from popular election, they remain prone to overstep constitutional limitations and invade legal immunities. Periods of domestic dissension and of foreign war are especially liable to produce tendencies to disregard established rights in the name of national safety. Often the tendency persists after the danger which provoked it has passed away, and at such times Americans who cherish these rights have had to fight to vindicate them. The French Revolution, and the deep cleft of opinion which it brought about in our country, led to the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. When Thomas Jefferson succeeded to the Presidency 3 years later, he set free all those who had been imprisoned under what he regarded as an unconstitutional statute. Our Civil War saw the tendency to substitute military for civil tribunals which the Supreme Court rebuked in the famous case of Ex parte Milligan in 1866. World War I was followed by a wave of repressive measures, such as mass arrests without benefit of habeas corpus, which were strenuously opposed by the libertarians of that day. In our time, we have seen the greatest of wars give way to a decade of chronic tension and crisis, in which it is to be expected that new encroachments upon traditional liberties may have to be countered.

I have suggested that if there has been damage done to our traditional rights it has been accomplished by a process of erosion. Are the privileges and immunities summed up in our Bill of Rights in danger of loss through subtle changes in our climate of opinion? Is distrust of our fellow countrymen wearing away our traditional concept of the innate dignity of man?

These questions call for constant and intense exploration far beyond the limits of this discussion, but because we are here on the campus of a great university, I would remind myself and you that if our other rights are to be of value to us we must first have the untrammeled right to search for the truth in institutions such as this, and then to teach it in accordance with the dictates of conscience. If that right should ever fail, so will our other blessings of liberty. That is precisely what has happened to people in other parts of the world, and in our time.

But I do not wish to end on a mournful note. Nor do I wish to suggest that our liberties are about to be lost. Erosion may have begun in some respects but the fabric of our liberties is still far from undermined.

Surely the America that sent 12 million men into a world war to preserve freedom everywhere will not allow its own freedoms to be frittered away. Surely the America that has poured out its substance to rehabilitate the free world, and even our former enemies, so that they can resist tyranny, will not willingly pass on to its children less freedom than it has itself enjoyed.

It has been sagely remarked that men more frequently require to be reminded than informed, and I hope that we may all join in the good work of reminding each other of how much we have to lose, and how heedless we would be to lose it.

With a strong belief in the wholesomeness of our objectives and the courage to defend our freedoms, I have no doubt we shall preserve our heritage.

Faith, the apostle tells us, is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Faith in America confirms the hope that we shall preserve for our children all that our fathers, by the way of clear thinking, firm resolution, patient endurance, and willing sacrifice secured for us; that our heritage of liberty will not dwindle but increase; and that we will prove worthy of what we have so abundantly received.

It is such faith, I believe, that brings all of us together today to consider the blessings of liberty.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I have today submitted to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture in opposition to the proposed cut in moneys for the school-lunch program. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to express my opposition to the proposed reduction in appropriations for the school-lunch program. Budget recommendations, if followed, would mean a reduction of approximately $15 million worth of section 6 foods, and such action would seriously affect the school-lunch program in my State. With an increasing number of children participating, we need these section 6 foods along with the donated commodities received each year to keep our children's meals up to standard. If the $15 million were cut off, it would mean less adequate meals, fewer free meals, and the closing of several schools.

Section 6 foods are of value to the school-lunch program because children throughout the country need more vitamin C than they receive at home. Canned fruits and vegetables are very necessary for an adequate and well-balanced diet, a diet that is delectable, interesting, and colorful. Peanut butter is accepted and enjoyed by practically all children, and this product supplies the additional proteins needed by youngsters.

An increasing number of meals are being served under this program in West Virginia, and this might be expected as a result of any normal population growth. Even though our Federal appropriations should continue at $83,236,197, one can see how thinly it has to be distributed when figures from the biennial report of 1947–48 are compared with those of the 1953–54 report.

	1947–48	1953–54
Number of schools participating	1,278	1,478
Number of meals served	13,406,002	21,394,925
Number of free meals served	2,215,750	3,334,503
Average daily participation	86,828	123,862
Total expenditure	$3,097,484.35	$5,149,117.77
Amount paid by children	$1,782,611.87	$3,551,219.87

West Virginia's population, however, is not increasing. Rather, it has been decreasing over the past several months as a result of conditions in the coal industry which have seriously and adversely affected the State's economy. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been a decrease in population, there is an accelerated increase in school lunches served. In December of 1954, we had an average daily participation of 143,474 children, or almost 20,000 more children per day than we had last year.

Gentlemen, these facts are enough to convince anyone that it would be a serious mistake to curtail this humanitarian program. Many children never receive a well-balanced and appetizing meal other than that which is provided under the school-lunch program. Over 225,000 people in West Virginia are dependent upon surplus food commodities at the present time. In such a distressed area, anyone who is willing to look a fact in the eye can see that children are being deprived of adequate diets in the home, and must depend upon meals such as those served at school for additional fruits and vegetables so necessary to proper health and growth.

Gentlemen, if this Government must retrench and curtail its spending, let it not be miserly in a program like this, a program which, in my opinion, is one of the best ever to be devised.

A nation's wealth is not to be found only in natural resources; its greatest wealth is in its human resources, its people, and these must be healthy in mind and in body if America is to be strong. Let us not be penny-wise and pound foolish in our attempts to economize. I am in favor of economizing wherever and whenever it is practicably possible to do so, but I submit that funds for the school-lunch program cannot be and should not be cut in the name of economy. I urge you, therefore, as members of this committee, not to sustain the reduction that has been recommended. I beseech and implore you to restore the amount to the extent that it will equal or surpass the figure within which the States are presently operating. The health and welfare of children cannot be measured in dollars and cents, and the strength of this Nation lies not in its gold and silver but in its boys and girls, the men and women of the future.

Kalewala Day of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1835, the Finnish national epic, the Kalewala, first appeared in book form. The 120th anniversary of this great epic was celebrated on the 28th of February of this year. Composed of folk verses about the deeds of three semi-divine brothers of gigantic stature who lived in Kalewala, the epic has had a great effect on all Finnish art.

The Kalewala is a mythical land of happiness and abundance. This epic of rich mythology is composed in the eight-syllable trochaic line that was imitated by Longfellow in Hiawatha. Scholars had known of the Kalewala since 1733, but the verses had to wait until the following century to appear in print.

The verses were first collected by two Finnish physicians, Dr. Zakarias Topelius, who published fragments of the epic in 1822, and Dr. Elias Lonnrot, who was responsible for the 1835 edition and the Kalewala as it appears today.

Appropriately close to Kalewala Day is the date of March 5, the anniversary of the birth of John Ludvig Runeberg, 1804–77. This great national poet of Finland, like all Finnish authors of his day, wrote in Swedish. From 1837 until the end of his life, he served as professor of Latin at Provoo, near Helsinki.

The Finnish national anthem was taken from Runeberg's The Tales of Ensign Stal, 1844. Among his other best known works are the peasant epic The Elk-hunters, 1832, a cycle of romances, King Fjalar, 1844, and Nadeschda, 1841. Runeberg's works have been, in part, translated into English.

The country of Finland, through its struggle to remain free and independent, has endeared itself in the hearts of all Americans. The relations of the United States with Finland have been noteworthy for the respect each holds for the other. It would be a sad day for the world if Soviet imperialism ever endangered Finnish independence. And I know that I speak for all Americans in saying that we intend that a free Finland shall continue the fine contributions that distinguishes her history and traditions.

Commemoration of the 105th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in observing the birthday of one of those great men of our times who belongs not only to his own homeland but to the entire world. March 7 was the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, who was such a man. Born in Moravia, of a humble parentage, Thomas Masaryk rose to prominence as a scholar, author, philosopher, and man of affairs.

It was his vision and tenacity that led to the emergence of the Czechoslovak state, out of the wreckage of World War I. He established the Czech National Council in 1917. He organized the famous Czech Legion which marched through the great expanse of Russia in the aftermath of the Bolshevik revolution. He came to the United States and, winning the support and friendship of President Wilson, proclaimed the independence of the Republic of Czechoslovakia and secured its recognition by all the great powers.

Masaryk became the first President of Czechoslovakia, and dominated its sound development as a European power until 1935, when he resigned on account of his health. It is perhaps a blessing that Thomas Masaryk died before the Nazi scourge immersed Europe. His complete dedication to his country and to the ideals of freedom and democracy will live on forever in his memory and teachings. His great friendship for the United States will remain as an inspiration to all of us who feel the strong bond of friendship in return toward the brave men and women who are keeping their country alive through the ordeal of Russian domination behind the Iron Curtain.

Federal Appropriations for Forest-Fire Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I submitted last week to the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior. My remarks are in opposition to the proposed reduction of Federal funds for the forest fire suppression and control program. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to express my opposition to any reduction in moneys for the Federal forest fire control fund. It is my understanding that the President's budget would cut the appropriation by $1,083,690, and I believe that it would be a great mistake to follow this course.

I am not in a position to speak for the Nation as a whole concerning this subject, but I do know something about the problem as it pertains to my State of West Virginia.

West Virginia, being situated in the heart of the Appalachian Mountains, has an extremely rugged terrain that provided numerous watersheds and produces many streams. These meandering streams are the source of the navigable rivers that serve West Virginia and many other States. Most of the slopes are covered with an indispensable form of plant life—trees. These trees produce a sponge on the forest floor that creates a continuous flow of small streams. Other types of vegetation are not consistent to proper land use of these rugged slopes.

Today we are faced with the tremendous problem of fire that is threatening to destroy this vital natural resource and West Virginia, I am sure, is only one of many States that are confronted with this enemy. Progress has been made in recent years in combating this serious enemy to our forests, but not sufficiently to bring the problem under control. Recently, we have experienced serious droughts that have added to the severity of the problem. In 1952 and 1953, West Virginia suffered a forest fire loss of more than one million acres. During the fall of 1952, the southern part of West Virginia was riding on the brink of disaster and, had high winds prevailed during this period, there is every reason to believe that a loss of human lives and homes would have resulted. Presently, if West Virginia were to experience a severe outbreak of fires, we would be without adequate funds due to heavy expenditures in 1952 and 1953.

United States Weather Bureau records cause some experts to believe that there are more dry years just ahead. Should this be true, we would not be financially equipped to control forest fires.

In view of the fact that more States are increasing their areas of protection and the fact that all of West Virginia's forests are under protection, the Federal appropriations for West Virginia have been on the decline, as shown in the following table:

Federal allotments and State budgets

Fiscal year	Federal allotment	State budget
1955	$136,431	$200,538
1954	136,431	259,974
1953	141,379	283,343
1952	152,918	[1] 325,000
1951	163,462	349,023
1950	163,462	344,001
1949	175,766	232,169
1948	193,329	187,180

[1] Estimated.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake to follow a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy in reducing funds for combating this great enemy of our natural resources. It is imperative that, during the critical days and years ahead, years which will spell the destiny of our Nation in world history, we exert every precaution for the protection of our forests which, in turn, preserve the watersheds and conserve the soil of America. I, therefore, urge the Committee not to reduce this important item, but, rather, that it be increased by $2 million in order to provide an equitable Federal distribution of funds for the forest fire suppression and control program.

Incorporation of Veterans of World War I of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would grant a Federal charter to a new national organization known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. This organization meets a need which has become more and more apparent in recent years—a need for separate recognition of the common interests of those who served in our first great world conflict. It is not, of course, that these older veterans want in any sense to dissociate themselves from all the brave young men who carried on so splendidly in World War II and in Korea. But some of their memories and traditions are distinctive, and I can fully understand how there is a growing desire to band together for the purpose of keeping them alive.

Actually, this new group has been operating since 1949, when it was first established by a group of veterans who met in Cleveland, Ohio. In 1953 it held its first national convention, in Baltimore, which was attended by representatives from all over the country, and in 1954 it met again, in Buffalo, with a much larger attendance. It is now formally organized in 31 States and several Territories, including even a post in the Philippine Islands. It has a total of 186 units, some with as many as 400 individual members. There is also a ladies

auxiliary which has organized 84 units to this date.

The organization is, of course, nonprofit, and it has not aspirations which would bring it in conflict with the other large veterans groups. I hope it will be accorded the honor and privilege of a Federal charter.

Tenth Anniversary of Capture of Remagen Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment briefly on the significance of the 10th anniversary of the capture of the Remagen Bridge on March 7, 1945. This was one of the heroic acts which turned the tide of battle during World War II. I quote from the Washington News of March 9, 1945, the report sent by C. R. Cunningham, United Press war correspondent:

Victory is in the air on this side of the Rhine, where American troops hit the pay dirt of Germany.

It can't be told yet how the Americans crossed the Rhine, but it took only 15 minutes to get at least one company of infantry to the eastern side yesterday afternoon.

The crossing was a case of spotting an opportunity and grabbing it. Maj. Murray Deevers, of Hagarville, Ark., ordered his men across and the company swept into inner Germany.

An earlier dispatch from Cunningham had reported that a Second Lieutenant Burroughs and 1st Lt. Carl Timmerman, of West Point, Nebr., spotted the opportunity and flashed the word to battalion headquarters where Lt. Col. Leonard Engemann, of Minnesota, made the historic decision.

It is with understandable pride that I mention the outstanding contribution made in this historic advance by the late Maj. Murray Deevers, of Hagarville, Johnson County, Ark., at that time within the Fifth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. Johnson County is now a part of the district represented by our able colleague Mr. TRIMBLE.

I am sure that the Members share my feeling of deep appreciation for the service of Major Deevers, and those associated with him who contributed so much to the defense of our country.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today is the national independence day celebrated by the Slovak people throughout the world. For 10 years their traditions and ideals, firmly dedicated to a heritage very like our own, have been kept alive beneath the cruel oppression of Soviet occupation. Let us joint in acknowledging their brave resistance. Let us send them words of hope and cheer. And let us reaffirm our high resolve to help them win freedom and independence once again.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, bowing at this wayside altar of Thy grace, may we be vividly conscious that we need not turn back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost speak no longer to those now upon the earth. Give us ears to hear Thy imperial imperatives above the noise of crashing systems, yea, Thy voice in and through the change and confusion of our day. May we not imagine that the judgment which shall search the secrets of our hearts is postponed to some far-off future assize, when in these days of destiny, by our response to the want and woe of Thy world and of Thy children, Thy throne is set up. Even now Thou art searching out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat. So, hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our compassion help to heal the open sores of the world as we serve the present age, our calling to fulfill. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 8, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 10, 1955.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 829) to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the Second Pan-American Games, the Seventh Olympic Winter Games, Games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American Games and Olympic Games, and certain other international amateur sports competition, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFERENCE OF REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF COVER ON MAIL OF SENATORS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed order will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the report of the Special Committee on Investigation of Cover on Mail of Senators, authorized by Senate Resolution 332, 83d Congress, 2d session, filed with the Secretary of the Senate on December 3, 1954, by Mr. Ferguson, on behalf of the Committee, and printed as Report No. 2510, be referred, together with the accompanying testimony and exhibits, to the Attorney General of the United States for such action as he deems appropriate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the proposed order? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the order is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the report of the special committee, which consisted of the then senior Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson, and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The report is brief, and I think it should be printed in the RECORD immediately following the order, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF MAIL COVERS ON SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY OR ANY OTHER SENATOR

Senate Resolution 332, adopted December 1, created this special committee and authorized it to conduct an investigation to determine if a cover was maintained on the mail to or from Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY or any other Senator and, if so, the persons responsible and the period during which this cover was maintained.

The committee, consisting of Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, and Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, met pursuant to the resolution Thursday, December 2, to hear testimony from a number of Senators and other witnesses believed to have knowledge of the use of a mail cover.

By way of explanation, a mail cover appears to be an investigative technique which enlists the aid of the postmaster at the office where the coverage would occur to determine the addressee, return address, and postmark of all mail received at a certain address, or addresses.

On the basis of the testimony, it is clear that a mail cover was imposed on first-class mail incoming to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY at his home address for the period from October 24, 1952, to November 16, 1952. The post office at Washington, D. C., in the request for the mail cover, was asked to furnish the names of addresses, the postmarks, and the names and addresses of the addressors and to forward that information to the committee on a daily basis marked for the attention of Paul J. Cotter, chief counsel.

The mail cover was imposed on all first-class mail addressed to 5157 33d Street NW., Washington, D. C., which appears to be the address shared by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and Ray Kiermas, administrative assistant to Senator MCCARTHY.

Mail covers were also imposed on mail addressed to 3032 24th Street NE., from November 6, 1952, to December 6, 1952. This appears to have been the address of Miss Jean Kerr. The mail addressed to Mr. Donald A. Surine at 9606 Garland Avenue, Takoma Park, Md., was also put under cover, as was mail addressed to 509 13th Street SE., Washington, D. C., from October 24, 1952, to November 16, 1952.

The record is also clear that mail covers were imposed and maintained without the consent of Senator MCCARTHY or any of the others covered.

According to the testimony, no cover was maintained against the mail addressed to Senator MCCARTHY, or anyone else, at the Senate Office Building.

Regulation concerning mail covers is contained in chapter III of the Post Office Manual and reads as follows:

"INFORMATION FURNISHED

"1. Persons to whom information may be furnished: Postmasters and others in the postal service shall not give to unauthorized persons information concerning mail. They shall furnish such information to post-office inspectors, and may furnish it also to the sender, the addressee, or the authorized representative of either, upon satisfactory identification and provided the information requested is proper for the applicant to receive. To aid in the apprehension of fugitives from justice, postmasters may give to officers of the law, upon proper identification, information regarding the addresses, return cards, or postmarks on mail, but shall not withhold such mail from the addressees or delay its delivery. If the information so given to such officers relates to a violation of the postal laws, the postmaster shall report this action immediately to the post-office inspector in charge of the division in which his office is located."

D. H. Stephens, chief inspector for the Post Office Department, testified that never are the contents of the mail inspected and, further, that the mail must not be delayed or withheld as a result of the cover. Nevertheless, it is obvious to your committee that some delay in the mail is unavoidable if the request for coverage is complied with.

These mail covers were imposed in the course of investigation of JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and William Benton, conducted by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections pursuant to Senate Resolution 187 and Senate Resolution 304 of the 82d Congress. Your special committee is convinced on the basis of conclusive evidence that the mail covers were imposed without the knowledge and without the consent of any of the members of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and the chairman of the full committee. They were initiated by chief counsel to the subcommittee, Paul J. Cotter, who was responsible for them, and actually put into effect by Staff Investigators Francis X. Plant and Robert Shortley under instructions from Cotter.

The mail cover was actually requested from the postmasters at Washington, D. C., and Kensington, Md., in letters of request from the subcommittee, which set forth the address to be covered and dates for commencement and termination of the activity. These letters, both in original and file copy, have been received by the committee as exhibits in the inquiry. The originals carry a facsimile of the signature of Subcommittee Chairman THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., made by a rubber stamp. Your committee is convinced that the representation of Senator HENNINGS' signature was affixed to the letters without his knowledge or consent.

Evidence discloses that a signature stamp of the subcommittee chairman, Mr. HENNINGS, was available in the committee room and in his personal office. The committee is unable to determine upon the evidence who actually stamped any of the letters in question.

The facsimile of Senator HENNINGS' signature was acted upon by the postmasters at Washington and Kensington, Md., as his actual signature.

The committee received no testimony and no evidence to indicate that mail covers were ever maintained against any other Member of the United States Senate. In fact, the testimony indicates that it has never been done on any other occasion. The committee, however, finds it almost impossible to make an exhaustive finding on this point since a conclusive determination could be made only after examining the records of every post office in the Nation.

Your committee desires in strong language to condemn the use of mail covers by a Senate committee or its staff.

The committee's attention was directed to certain sections of the United States Code, sections 1701, 1702, and 1703, title 18, dealing with obstruction of mails, obstruction of correspondence, and delay or destruction of mail or newspapers. This committee has no authority to refer this matter to the Attorney General of the United States, but the committee recommends that the Senate refer the testimony and exhibits to the Attorney General for such action as he deems appropriate.

Respectfully submitted.

HOMER FERGUSON.
WALTER F. GEORGE.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

VOLUNTARY EXTENSIONS OF ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period July–December 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949 RELATING TO INCREASED ALLOWANCE FOR TRAVEL EXPENSES

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska Road Commission, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the

Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, LEHMAN CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT, NEV.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit at Lehman Caves National Monument, Nev. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT, RELATING TO EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN SCARVES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt from its application scarves which do not present an unusual hazard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of January 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., recommending the enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide a small civil penalty for violation of the rules and regulations of that Commission, applicable to all radio stations, other than those in the broadcast services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PAYMENT OF JUDGMENTS BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the payment of judgments by the Post Office Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN DEFECTORS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain alien defectors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTRACTS FOR CONDUCT OF CONTRACT POSTAL STATIONS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Corps of Engineers and the Congress of the United States relative to the land-acquisition program in the Missouri River Basin

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

"Whereas the land-acquisition program of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army in connection with lands required for the Missouri River dams is of such size as to affect a large number of the citizens of the State of South Dakota; and

"Whereas it is unfair to the landowners in that the land appraisals do not take into consideration the fact that the acquisition involves a mass taking of practically the whole Missouri River bottom lands from one side of the State to the other; and

"Whereas as a result of such mass taking, the number of displaced landowners who desire to buy replacement land runs into the hundreds and perhaps thousands and the demand pressure thus built up forces these landowners to pay much higher prices for such land than they are offered by the Government for their land; and

"Whereas as a result of this pressure and increase the landowner is placed in a much worse position than before the taking; and

"Whereas there are relatively large blocks of school and endowment lands held in trust by the State of South Dakota for the benefit of the common schools and other endowed institutions, which lands are now, through long-term leases, a part of, and an asset to, residents of the area to be evacuated; and

"Whereas large bodies of such school lands are not available for lease adjacent to land available for resettlement; and

"Whereas the 'willing seller, willing buyer' concept which has been adopted by the courts as a basis for determining the compensation to be paid the landowner is unfair in that the landowner is not a willing seller but is forced to sell: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this legislature respectfully requests the Corps of Engineers to take into consideration the cost of replacement land and to adopt a scale of appraisals which will enable displaced landowners to purchase other relatively good land at the amounts received by them; and it be further

"Resolved, That the legislature respectfully requests the Corps of Engineers to abandon the 'willing seller, willing buyer' concept as a basis for its appraisals and that it take into consideration the fact that the landowner is forced to sell; and be it further

"Resolved, That if congressional action be necessary to correct the present unjust system, this legislature respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to take such action promptly; be it further

"Resolved, That the 'willing buyer, unwilling seller' concept be adopted in the appraisal of all such common school and endowment lands held in trust for the benefit of the common schools of the entire State, and all of its existing endowed institutions, when negotiating with the United States Army or any other branch of the United States Government; and commensurate with provisions to be made for individuals and Indian tribes; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States; the Honorable Secretary of Defense of the United States; the Honorable Secretary of the Army of the United States; the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army at Omaha, Nebr.; to the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota; to the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE and the Honorable E. Y. BERRY, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota; and to the Presiding Officer of both Houses of Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the 34th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, March 4, 1955.

"L. R. HOUCK,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.
"NILS BOE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution No. 25

"Resolution memoralizing Congress to protect the coal industry and the economic status of the employees therein by restricting the importation of foreign residual oil

"Whereas the importation of foreign residual oil has stifled the market for the sale of coal; and

"Whereas the curtailment of the sale of coal, resulting directly from the unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil, has and is reducing the living standards of the people of the State of West Virginia and is resulting in untold hardships and needless unemployment to the coal miners in the State of West Virginia; and

"Whereas this importation of foreign residual oil has resulted in a tremendous loss of State revenues to the extent that the State government has been hampered in providing essential services to the people of West Virginia: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That the Members of West Virginia serving in Congress exert their best efforts in opposing the importation of foreign residual oil into the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates forward attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress now serving from West Virginia."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable ORVIN B. FJARE, Representatives from Montana, requesting the appropriation of sufficient Federal funds to be set aside as an emergency fund for Indian relief and welfare of all kinds to be used during the period of adjustment when the United States Government shall withdraw from the field of providing medical, hospital, and other welfare and security needs of the ward Indians of the United States

"Whereas the Federal Government previously has assumed partial responsibility for medical, hospital, and other welfare and security needs of ward Indians of the United States; and

"Whereas it is inevitable that the Federal Government will ultimately withdraw from this field of support; and

"Whereas such withdrawal must necessarily involve financial hardship upon the State of Montana and particularly the counties of Montana wherein large Indian populations are located, on tax-exempt lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the appropriation of sufficient Federal funds to be set aside as an emergency fund for Indian relief of all kinds to be used during this period of adjustment; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, and to Representatives LEE METCALF and ORVIN B. FJARE.

"GEORGE GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved March 4, 1955."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from MONTANA; to the Honorable ORVIN FJARE and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Representatives from the State of Montana; relating to the long and short haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Whereas there will be proposed and introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation providing for repeal of the long and short haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

"Whereas the repeal of the long and short haul clause would permit railroad companies to assess lower rates and charges for long hauls than for shorter hauls over the same route in the same direction; and

"Whereas the passage of such legislation will result in increased freight rates and charges on articles moving in interstate commerce to and from Montana to the detriment of producers, shippers, and consumers of the State of Montana; that it would encourage discriminations in rates against small shippers in favor of large shippers that would be against the public interest; and would, we believe, be in the end detrimental to the best interests of the railroads themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to deny the passage of any legislation providing for the repeal or amendment of the long and short haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, when, as, and if presented for its consideration; be it further

"Resolved by the 34th Legislative Assembly of Montana, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States be required to put forth every honorable effort to defeat the aforesaid type of legislation upon presentation to the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana.

"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.
"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"A joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senators of Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and ORVIN B. FJARE, Representatives in Congress from Montana, and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States requesting an increase in acreage allotments for Montana's premium high-protein milling wheat

"Whereas Montana's economy is substantially dependent upon the prosperity of Montana agriculture; and

"Whereas the production of wheat is a major part of Montana's agricultural economy; and

"Whereas the wheat farmers of Montana have practiced to a high degree summer tillage and strip farming, thus taking out of normal annual production several hundred thousand acres of their wheatland; and

"Whereas the production of wheat in Montana has been lowered further by national reductions in acreage, which has been applied uniformly to all grades and type of wheat; and

"Whereas of the 5 million acres of wheat in Montana in 1953, less than 10 percent was of low-milling quality; and

"Whereas there is no surplus of Montana's hard, high protein, premium quality milling wheats: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be respectfully petitioned to increase the acreage allotments of producers of such premium wheats; and be it further

"Resolved, That if legislative action is required to accomplish such increase in acreage allotments, then the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully petitioned to enact the necessary legislation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States of America, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressman LEE METCALF, Congressman ORVIN B. FJARE, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House."

"Approved March 2, 1955."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to timber land in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HAYDEN on March 8, 1955, p. 2473, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HAYDEN on March 8, 1955, p. 2473, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the San Bernardino (Calif.) Real Estate Board, relating to sufficient appropriations to make more effective the services of the Federal Housing Administration office in that city; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of James H. Combs, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the La Mesa Republican Club, of La Mesa, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate joint resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of Frank F. O'Brian, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate joint resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation providing increased compensation to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States, at Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the completion of the national system of highways and urban connections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to appropriate money under the Arkansas River multiple-purpose plan and the President of the United States to approve such appropriation for the beginning of construction of dams within the State of Arkansas on the said river as set out in the comprehensive plan and recommended by the United States engineers

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in 1946 authorized a comprehensive plan for the development of the Arkansas River Basin and its tributaries known as the Arkansas River multiple-purpose plan and designed to promote flood control, navigation, generation of electrical energy, and other beneficial uses of the said water; and

"Whereas a combination of domestic and international problems has confronted this United States constantly and continuously since the adoption of the said plan, making it inadvisable to put the construction plans into operation; and

"Whereas construction and development of other river basins in these United States have progressed to near completion, and the requirements of the defense system in this country now dictate a need for the development of the Arkansas River Basin as planned; and

"Whereas control of flow and sediment on certain of the upper tributaries of the Arkansas River has been begun, removing the objections previously expressed by the United States engineers to the commencing of construction of the dams commonly known as the Dardanelle and Ozark Dam; and

"Whereas development of electrical distribution system in the Southwest, and especially in the State of Arkansas, has reached such a point that any and all of the surplus electricity which might be generated by the said dams is now needed and can be completely integrated with existing distribution systems; and

"Whereas the economic conditions both from the standpoint of the development of agricultural pursuits and industrial growth within the Arkansas River Valley and the State of Arkansas demand that this development be commenced immediately: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 60th General Assembly of Arkansas, That we, the representatives of the people of the State of Arkansas, do insist and urge the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation

in and during the 82d session of the Congress of the United States for the commencement of construction of the Dardanelle and Ozark Dams in Arkansas and approved dams in Oklahoma necessary for control of floods and silt, as located and recommended by the comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin, and if such an appropriation is made, we urge the President of the United States to approve same and direct the United States engineers to begin work without delay; and be it further

"Resolved, That when approved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the 60th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States representing the State of Arkansas and the State of Oklahoma."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 24

"Whereas it appears at this time that there is a great need for a trout hatchery to be located in the area known as northwest Arkansas; and

"Whereas from investigation it has been determined that a suitable location for said trout hatchery has been found in the North Fork River, specifically just below the Norfork Dam; and

"Whereas this location has been approved by the United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas the location of this hatchery would be of great service to the people of the area, including Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma; and

"Whereas it would be necessary for the Congress of the United States to appropriate to the United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, the necessary funds for the operation of this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 60th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas hereby respectfully requests the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Arkansas to introduce into Congress and seek the passage of proper legislation for the construction of a trout hatchery at Norfolk Dam for the hatching and distribution of trout in the area, and to seek an appropriation for the necessary funds to operate said hatchery.

"SEC. 2. That upon the signing of this resolution by the Governor, the secretary of state is hereby directed to furnish a certified copy hereof to each Member of the Congress of the United States from Arkansas.

"CHARLES F. SMITH,
"Speaker of the House.
"NATHAN GORDON,
"President of the Senate.
"ORVAL E. FORBUS,
"Governor.

"MARCH 9, 1955."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide necessary funds for the development of Port Royal Harbor in South Carolina

"Whereas Port Royal Harbor, lying between the port of Savannah, Ga., and the port of Charleston, S. C., is regarded as one of the excellent harbors on the Atlantic coast; and

"Whereas during the year 1954 the Congress of the United States passed an act authorizing the development of this great harbor for commercial and military purposes; and

"Whereas although this authorization was passed nearly 1 year ago, there have been no funds allotted by the Congress of the United States for this much needed work; and

"Whereas the development of this harbor in the southeastern section of South Carolina will greatly implement the economic development of this section of South Carolina and the entire State of South Carolina, and will further develop one of our great natural resources into a facility which can bring prosperity and development to the entire State of South Carolina: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take such steps as are required to provide the necessary funds for the development of the Port Royal Harbor into a useful facility for commercial, military, and naval purposes; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two Members of the Senate and to each Member of the House of Representatives from this State, to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in Congress, and to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate."

NARCOTICS BUREAU—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday, March 4, I pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 2386–2387 that the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association rightly opposes any proposed transfer of the United States Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department to the Justice Department.

I definitely concur in the position adopted by that association.

Today I have been pleased to hear from Dr. Karl Bambach, executive vice president and secretary of the American Drug Manufacturers' Association, who has written to me endorsing my position and conveying a similar resolution which has previously been adopted by the distinguished organizations which he represents.

I believe that an exceedingly strong and valid case has been made against any transfer of the Bureau. I feel sure that those of my colleagues who are increasingly looking into this problem of narcotics addiction will recognize the soundness of the position adopted by the pharmaceutical industry.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Bambach's letter, along with the resolution which he had forwarded, be printed in the RECORD and thereafter referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DRUG MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 4, 1955, has been read with interest. On behalf of the American Drug Manufacturers Association, I would like to state that your observations are most constructive and pertinent.

The provision in Senate Joint Resolution 19 that the functions of the Bureau of Narcotics are to be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice has been a matter of great concern to the American Drug Manufacturers Association and its member companies. A formal resolution was adopted by our executive committee on February 21 and I am enclosing a copy of this statement. A membership list of the association is also enclosed.

The enclosed resolution and this letter may be used in any way in which you see fit. Copies of the resolution have been sent to each of the Senators sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 19 and also to members of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Whether or not other portions of Senate Joint Resolution 19 have merit, we are strongly opposed to the provision mentioned above. Through several decades the ethical pharmaceutical industry and the Bureau of Narcotics have worked constructively together. Our combined efforts have made it possible for the citizens of the United States to have narcotic drugs available at any time and in any location for legitimate medical treatment. This is particularly vital in emergencies, such as serious automobile accidents, and any change in this arrangement which would tend to limit the medical availability of narcotics would not be in the public interest. During many years the proper distribution of narcotic drugs has been accomplished with an absolute minimum of illegal diversion. I think I am correct in stating that an insignificant quantity of narcotics is obtained by addicts from manufacturers, wholesalers, and retail pharmacists. This successful accomplishment is due to the constructive work of the Bureau of Narcotics in regulating narcotic drug distribution with the other capable groups in the drug trade.

If the functions of the Bureau of Narcotics should be transferred to the Department of Justice, there is a grave danger that through the years the emphasis on the control of narcotics would gradually change to rest upon enforcement and investigatory activities, and not upon regulatory and administrative functions. While we have the highest regard for the Department of Justice and its agencies, it must be recognized that the Department is not equipped to serve as an administrative and regulatory body in technical fields. On the other hand, the Treasury Department has a number of other regulatory functions similar to the control of narcotics and none of these should be transferred to the Department of Justice.

Furthermore, the chain of control of narcotic drugs is accomplished by means of a Federal tax which is properly administered by the Treasury Department.

Should the control of narcotics through the years grow into a function which is primarily a policing activity, we believe that the distribution of essential narcotic medication would be curtailed and the drugs would become less readily available for medical treatment, particularly in rural areas. Wholesalers and retailers, who now stock these drugs, would discontinue them under those conditions.

We respectfully ask your consideration of these points, with the thought that appropriate changes could be made in Senate Joint Resolution 19 which would not atler the present authority of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department. Your interest in this important problem is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

KARL BAMBACH,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTION APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN DRUG MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 21, 1955

Whereas Senator PAYNE (Maine) has, with 41 cosponsoring Senators, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 19, including an Omnibus Narcotic Control Act of 1955 and providing

among other things for the transfer of the functions of the Bureau of Narcotics from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury to that of the Attorney General; and

Whereas House Joint Resolutions 141, 147, 149, and 155 have been introduced in the House of Representatives, containing similar provisions and many other similar pieces of legislation are being contemplated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Drug Manufacturers Association, in connection with the foregoing, and directing its attention exclusively to the principle of transferring the functions of the Bureau of Narcotics to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, believes that such a transfer is wrong and contrary to the best interests of the public for the following reasons; to wit:

1. The Bureau of Narcotics is staffed from the Commissioner down with very able and competent public officials who have administered the Federal narcotic laws in efficient fashion. If any weaknesses exist, they exist in the laws and international control and not in the personnel of enforcement, or in the Secretary of the Treasury. To transfer the functions of the Bureau of Narcotics to the Department of Justice would, in our opinion, destroy the present Bureau which has proved so valuable throughout the years.

2. The principal source of illicit drug traffic in the United States is wholly beyond the control of the Bureau of Narcotics, or any Federal agency, and is entirely in the control of Red China, Soviet Russia, and many other countries outside of the so-called Iron Curtain who call themselves allies of the United States.

3. Inasmuch as the problem of illicit narcotics is primarily international, it is of first importance that the Bureau of Narcotics be and continue in close association with, the Bureau of Customs under the Secretary of the Treasury, in order to better protect the public against the introduction of illegal narcotics into this country.

4. Consideration should be given to the fact that one of the principal duties of the Bureau of Narcotics is to manage, control, regulate, and encourage the distribution of narcotics in legitimate channels for the benefit of the injured, sick, and dying.

5. The United States drug manufacturing industry and the Bureau of Narcotics have for many years worked in an atmosphere of constructive cooperation. The many technical activities carried out by the Bureau of Narcotics inspectors and administrators can be more effectively performed by a regulatory agency than by a police agency.

6. The Department of Justice is largely an enforcement organization without the experience or technical staff to appreciate or properly administer the very technical phases of the distribution of narcotics through legitimate drug, hospital, and medical channels, nor the very scientific problems of drug addiction.

7. It is of the utmost importance to the public of the United States that there be no hindrance to the proper distribution of narcotics through legitimate channels to the end that when human suffering exists, narcotics may be immediately available for administration by appropriate professional persons. Any change which would hinder legitimate medical use and availability of narcotics in emergencies, anywhere in this country, would not be in the public interest.

8. Inasmuch as practically every piece of Federal legislation involving trade practices in this country contains some regulatory provisions, it would be just as logical to transfer the administration thereof to the Department of Justice as the Bureau of Narcotics, but for sound and proper reasons, they will not be so transferred; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the executive vice president and secretary of the American Drug Manufacturers Association to appropriate Senators and Representatives as evidence of the position of this association in respect of the contemplated legislation.

FEDERAL AID FOR SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution which I have received from Mr. Harry Schuzler, secretary of the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors. This resolution was adopted by the Association at its annual meeting held in Madison, Wis., on February 3, 1955.

It has been my conviction that the Soil Conservation Service renders invaluable service to our country. Its program is designed to safeguard the best interests of farmers and all the people of our Nation and of future generations.

In recognition of this vital subject, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and accompanying resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS,
Fish Creek, Wis., February 11, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEX: I was instructed by the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, at its annual meeting held in Madison on February 3, 1955, to send you the attached resolution in behalf of the Soil Conservation Service.

The resolution expresses the opinion of supervisors from 67 countywide soil-conservation districts of Wisconsin.

We supervisors believe that the Soil Conservation Service should continue to be supported 100 percent by Federal funds if this organization is to continue to effectively serve the best interests of farmers and all people of our Nation.

Very truly yours,

HARRY SCHUYLER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, FEBRUARY 3, 1955

In looking back over accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service in soil conservation districts in Wisconsin, real progress has been made. Cooperation between this agency and others working in the field of soil and water conservation in the State is most excellent.

Wisconsin has long recognized the wise use and vital importance of our natural resources and has helped develop soil and water conservation and good land use for the agriculture within the State.

We recognize the sound farmland and water policies adopted by Congress in the past and would very much like to see it continued.

Whereas the Soil Conservation Service has demonstrated its ability to serve with outstanding efficiency and skill in soil conservation districts of America; and

Whereas any transfer of responsibilities or change of organization of this agency would delay and decrease progress in our soil and water conservation efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, in annual session, That it favors—

1. Continuation of the Soil Conservation Service under the present financial and administrative form with responsibility for carrying out programs developed by the locally administered Soil Conservation Districts and for furnishing technical assistance in the development of small watershed conservation projects.

2. Appropriation of Federal funds for the Soil Conservation Service in sufficient amount to permit accelerated progress in the important work of protecting and saving our vital soil and water resources and for additional responsibilities under the Small Watershed Act; further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative in Congress.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—RESOLUTION OF TEXAS DAILY NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Texas Daily Newspaper Association, relating to the regulation of the field price of natural gas.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS DAILY NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

Whereas production of oil and gas accounts for approximately 35 percent of all taxes paid into the Texas treasury; and

Whereas such production vitally affects all phases of Texas economy, members of the Texas Daily Newspaper Association, in convention assembled at San Antonio this 6th day of February, 1955, hereby express alarm that the Federal Government has singled gas production as an industry to control by fixing prices for such production; and

Whereas it is feared that where one phase of the Nation's economy so comes under arbitrary control, the foundation is set for other such advances: Therefore be it

Resolved, That inasmuch as the field price of natural gas is adequately regulated by free competition, there is no need nor justification for such price regulation by the Federal Power Commission as is now being undertaken under the so-called "Phillips" decision of the Supreme Court. While regulation of prices charged by public utilities is entirely proper, the gas producing business has none of the characteristics of a public utility.

We are opposed to the extension of price regulation in circumstances in which competition is effective as a regulatory factor. We are also opposed to Federal regulation in any area in which State regulation is applicable as is true for the conservation of natural gas.

We strongly favor Congressional legislation to make doubly clear that the Federal Power Commission have no control over the field price of natural gas, regardless of who produces it. That Congress has intended this all along is shown by its original provision in the Natural Gas Act of 1938, expressly exempting production and gathering from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, and is also shown by the provisions of the act passed in 1952 reiterating this purpose.

It is further resolved that a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of Congress from the State of Texas.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 61. A resolution authorizing a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect (Report No. 50);

S. Res. 66. A resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary (Report No. 55);

S. Res. 67. A resolution to authorize a study of the narcotics problem in the United States (Report No. 56); and

S. Res. 70. A resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Committee on Public Works (Report No. 57).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 57. A resolution authorizing further expenditures and temporary employment of additional assistants by the Committee on Banking and Currency (Report No. 48); and

S. Res. 65. A resolution to authorize an investigation of national penitentiaries (Report No. 54).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with additional amendments:

S. Res. 58. A resolution to further increase the limit of expenditures under S. Res. 366, 81st Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States (Report No. 49).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 62. A resolution to study juvenile delinquency in the United States (Report No. 51);

S. Res. 63. A resolution providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Report No. 52); and

S. Res. 64. A resolution extending the authority to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations (Report No. 53).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 67. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Report No. 58).

VIVIAN COLLINS MATHEWS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) to pay a gratuity to Vivian Collins Mathews, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Vivian Collins Mathews, widow of Clyde H. Mathews, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 8½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 36)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 8, 1955,

Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BARKLEY) on March 9, 1955, submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on Finance, on the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, which were ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 10, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Robert H. Jackson, deceased;

Ben F. Cameron, of Mississippi, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Edwin R. Holmes, retired;

William E. Miller, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Tennessee; and

Mr. Frank Reid, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; and

Kingsley Davis, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1957.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board, vice Louis S. Rothschild; and

Charles E. Haley, and sundry other persons, to be chief warrant officers in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Robert Tripp Ross, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Russell V. Perry, Jack P. Ancker, and Hugh W. Bush, Jr., for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list;

John R. Connolly, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Frederick R. Abrams, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States;

William Broady, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Lowell F. Lawson, for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States; and

John A. Keaczenski, and sundry other students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, as in executive session, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I wish to report the recommendation of that committee that the nomination of George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report the nominations of 67 flag and general officers. Certain of these officers are nominated for placement on the retired list in 3- and 4-star rank, which is the rank in which they were, or are, serving on the date of their mandatory retirement. Others are major generals, brigadier generals, or rear admirals, Regular and Reserve, who now hold temporary appointments and who are being nominated for permanent appointment without increase in rank.

A substantial number of nominations of qualified officers for temporary appointment in 1- or 2-star rank was not acted upon by the committee pending a final report to the committee of the Subcommittee on Officer Grade Limitations. We anticipate that this group of flag and general officers will be acted upon within the very near future.

I would point out, Mr. President, that the five general officers of the Army who are being nominated to fill positions of special importance or responsibility in 3-star rank are recommended for confirmation under section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and not under sections 504 and 515.

I request that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations reported by Mr. STENNIS are as follows:

Gen. John Edwin Hull, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army);

Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolte, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army);

Gen. William Morris Hoge, and Major Generals Withers Alexander Burress and William Benjamin Kean, to be placed on the retired list;

Maj. Gen. John Wilson O'Daniel.

Maj. Gen. James Dunne O'Connell, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. John Wilson O'Daniel, United States Army, to be Chief, Military Assistance

Advisory Group, Indochina, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Hobart Raymond Gay, United States Army, to be commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, United States Army, to be commanding general, Army Antiaircraft Command, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Wade Herren, United States Army, to be commanding general, First Army, and senior United States Army member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, United States Army, to be deputy commanding general, Army Forces, Far East, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Edward W. Snedeker, and sundry other officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps; and

William A. Read, and sundry other officers of the Reserve of the United States Navy, for permanent appointment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE (by request):

S. 1385. A bill for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

S. 1386. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 1387. A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

S. 1388. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 1389. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1390. A bill to improve the enforcement of laws pertaining to gambling by suppressing the transmission of certain gambling information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 1391. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1392. A bill to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1393. A bill to repeal the provision of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, which requires recoupment of certain Federal funds spent for school construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 1394. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late E. S. Paxson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1395. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1396. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1397. A bill providing for the conveyance to St. Mary's Mission of certain lands on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1398. A bill to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Victorine (Vicky) Shalam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1400. A bill to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1401. A bill for the relief of Ciro Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1402. A bill to authorize mileage allowance of 10 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1403. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to control the number of licenses issued in the District of Columbia for the operation of motor vehicles for hire (taxicabs); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, five bills which have been submitted by the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and a proposal by the Department of the Air Force in behalf of the Department of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, to accompany each of these bills, the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and the Department of the Air Force in behalf of the Department of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1385. A bill for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1385 is as follows:)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith is a draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

I suggest that this proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

The proposed bill would reimburse certain employees of the United States for the loss of certain tools, which were their personal property, in a fire at the consolidated garage, at Fort Defiance, Ariz., on February 6, 1953. These mechanics and helpers were using their personal tools to work on Government equipment in a Government-owned shop and stored them there each night.

The building was erected in 1938 and was used continually as a garage by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Consequently, it was saturated with oil and greases. The fire had been burning for some time when it was discovered by school boys at 5:55 a. m. When the volunteer fire department responded to the alarm at 6:05 a. m., the building was completely in flames which made it very difficult for the volunteer fire department to control the fire.

The immediate cause of the fire is unknown. There is, however, no evidence of negligence or wrongful act or omission on the part of the prospective beneficiaries of the proposed bill. Since there is no evidence of negligence or wrongful act or omission on the part of any employee of the Government, the claim cannot be paid under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672). The heating plant in this building was fired by an employee who goes off duty at 11 p. m. and returns to duty at 6 a. m. the following morning.

The total cost to the Government if the proposed bill were enacted would be $3,169.29. There is enclosed an itemized list of the property destroyed by the fire, showing the original cost of the property and its depreciated value.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant,
Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosures.

S. 1386. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1386 is as follows:)

JANUARY 5, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide relief for certain former and present officers of the Treasury Department for various unavailable items in their accounts.

The Department has given careful consideration to the various items included in the proposed legislation and recommends in the interest of economy and good fiscal administration that provision be made for clearance of the amounts from the fiscal officers' accounts. Such action will not affect the efforts of the Government to make recovery. Evidence indicates that the officers acted in entire good faith, and that they were not remiss in any respect in the exercise of their official duties. Moreover, the Treasury Department handles several hundred million financial transactions each year and a few errors are inevitable.

There are enclosed exhibits which explain more in detail the items included in the proposed legislation.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

S. 1387. A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1387 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of legislation, "To further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c), so as to remove the $2,500 limitation upon the amount which may be recovered under that Act. This proposal would also permit the recovery of the full amount of any claim in excess of $2,500 in the case of an individual whose claim may have been settled in the interim period after July 3, 1952, and prior to the date that this proposed legislation would be enacted and become effective. The limitation was imposed by an amendment on the floor of the Senate in the closing days of the 82d Congress. Prior to this time, there was no limit on the amount which could be recovered as a result of loss or damage to personal property.

The Department of Defense is of the opinion that this monetary limitation imposes the greatest hardship on those members of the military service who are least able to bear the burden. The usual claim averages about $250 or less, and involves damage or loss of household furnishings and personal property incident to transportation of shipment by Government carrier or by Government contract carrier. Events of catastrophic proportion such as fire, flood, and airplane crashes, account for the vast majority of claims in excess of $2,500. These major claims usually involve total losses of household furnishings and personal possessions of the unfortunate individuals concerned.

With regard to the monetary aspects of this proposal, the military departments report as follows concerning the recovery limitation in the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 during the fiscal year of 1954:

	Army (estimate)	Navy (estimate)	Air Force
Number of claims affected by the limitation	22	7	33
Amount by which the limitation reduced the total amount paid	$23,450.98	$12,896.37	$41,240.38

It is realized that personnel with claims in excess of $2,500 are not precluded from ultimate recovery of the full amount as they may request the Congress to enact private relief legislation in their behalf. However, as pointed out above, the cases involving more than that amount usually result from a disastrous event of accident. The Department of Defense feels that especially in these cases of extreme hardship the full amount of the claim should be paid very promptly. The removal of the limitation would allow this to be accomplished and, in addition, the Congress and the President would not be burdened with additional private legislation. In this regard at least one private relief bill has already been introduced on behalf of a claimant who was limited in the amount of recovery, after having filed a claim in the amount of $6,749.85, for the loss of household furnishings caused by fire (H. R. 5651, 83d Cong.). It is assumed that such private legislation will be introduced on behalf of other claimants as long as the limitation remains in effect. Further, claims in excess of $2,500 would be subject to congressional scrutiny as the act provides that all settlements shall be reported annually to the Congress.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

An identical proposal was submitted to the Congress on November 18, 1953, as a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1954. It was introduced as H. R. 7068 and passed the House of Representatives on July 6, 1954. No further action was taken on that proposal.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the enactment of this proposal would result in an increase in cost to the Army of $23,450 for fiscal year 1956, however, no worth-while estimate of the increase in cost to the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps is possible.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1388. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1388 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to validate payments of the subsistence portion of station per-diem allowances heretofore made to approximately 1,737 members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, in the total approximate amount of $1,683,189, who were on permanent duty at Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson, Alaska, from February 1, 1949, to October 12, 1950. This legislation is needed because of the decision of the Comptroller General of the United States numbered B–103602, dated February 19, 1952 (31 Comp. Gen. 399), in which such payments were held to be invalid. A copy of that decision was forwarded as an inclosure to a report by the Comptroller General to the Congress dated March 6, 1952, relative to these payments.

Under the provisions of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364), as amended by section 203 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 859), the Congress authorized the payment to members of the uniformed services "on duty outside continental United States or in Alaska, whether or not in a travel status, of actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, considering all elements of cost of living, including cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses." Regulations issued in implementation of the statute permitted the payment of prescribed allowances when Government messes were not available.

Acting upon a considered construction of the controlling law, the Director of Finance, Headquarters United States Air Force, on March 30, 1951, expressly authorized to be made the payments which would be validated by enactment of this proposed legislation. The action of the Director of Finance was taken with the knowledge that the notices concerning availability of messing facilities which had been posted at the installations concerned did not make Government messes available to the officers concerned. Following this authorization, payments were made to and accepted by over 1,700 officers of the Air Force and Army. Similar payments were made to a very limited number of naval personnel. These payments were additionally supported by the individual and personal certifications of the payees, made pursuant to the Act of October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 987), to the effect that a Government mess was not in fact available to them.

In comments to the Bureau of the Budget concerning legislation proposed by the Department of Defense to validate these payments, the General Accounting Office reaffirmed views in opposition to enactment of the bill. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget after considering the views expressed by the General Accounting Office has advised this Department that while he concurs fully with the views expressed by that Office, "it would appear to impose an undue financial hardship to require the refund now of payments made 3 years ago to individuals who, through no fault on their part and acting in good faith, thought they were entitled to receive them." Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget has interposed no objection to submission of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Air Force on July 22, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. It was introduced as H. R. 10059.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

This proposal would cause no increase in current budgetary requirements of any establishment of the Department of Defense.

As previously indicated, payments in the approximate amount of $1,683,189 have heretofore been made. This act would not authorize payment of special per diem allowances to any officers who have not heretofore been paid; however, it would authorize the repayment to those officers who have been required to make a refund of payments made during the period involved. Accordingly, under section 3 of the proposed legislation, payments to those officers will be absorbed in appropriations available to the military departments concerned for pay and allowances of military personnel.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1389. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1389 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, generally referred to as the Foreign Claims Act. This act, as amended, authorizes the secretary of a military department to appoint commissions to settle claims against the United States where military or civilian personnel of that department have caused property damage, injury, or death to inhabitants of any foreign country.

One of the requirements in the act is that the person must have sustained the property loss, injury, or death in the country in which he is an inhabitant. If the claim arises in a foreign country of which the claimant is not an inhabitant, there is no authority for an administrative settlement. For example, a French inhabitant may be paid if he is injured in France but he cannot be paid if he is injured in Belgium, or some other foreign country. Section 1 (1) of this proposal would eliminate this situation by deleting from the act the words "arising in such foreign country," and substituting therefor the words "arising outside of the United States, its territories and possessions." The fact that settlements can be effected only in those cases where the claimant is an inhabitant of the country where the incident occurred has resulted in numerous private relief bills. This would be obviated by the enactment of the proposed bill.

At the present time, almost all death claims and many property damage claims are found to be meritorious in an amount exceeding $5,000. When so found, they must be certified to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget for an appropriation out of which to pay the claim, thus resulting in a delay in payment and consequent dissatisfaction with the presence of United States Armed Forces in otherwise friendly foreign countries. Enactment of section 1 (2) of the proposed bill would not only expedite payment of these meritorious claims, but would reduce by approximately 90 percent the number of claims so certified to Congress. The proposed amendment would raise the jurisdictional limit of claims which may be settled administratively from $5,000 to $15,000.

The existing law permits claims against one service to be settled and paid, upon the request of the service concerned, by a claims commission composed of officers of a different service during time of war. Section 1 (3) of the proposed bill would provide permanent authority for the use of joint commissions or commissions of other services. Under the present law, each military department must, in peacetime, have a claims commission available for every area in the world where civilian or military personnel of that department are assigned for duty. Enactment of this legislative proposal will decrease the peacetime budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense by eliminating the necessity for three commissions in foreign countries where civilian or military personnel of all three military departments are assigned.

Finally, the coverage of the Foreign Claims Act is limited to the activities of military and civilian personnel of the three military departments. It does not cover activities of those civilian employees of the Department of Defense who are not employed by a military department, such as civilian employees of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and of Military Assistance Advisory Groups. Section 1 (4) of the proposed bill would extend the coverage of the Foreign Claims Act to the activities of these civilian employees. Any claims made cognizable by this extension of the act would be handled by the commissions already established by the military departments. While the number of claims caused by the activities of civilian employees of the Department of Defense has been limited, the lack of authority to settle them has been a source of embarrassment to the Government. The effect of the proposed amendment is to extend the act so that it will conform with existing Department of Defense organization.

All of these amendments are designed to effectuate as fully as possible the avowed purpose of the Foreign Claims Act, which is to promote and maintain friendly relations with foreign countries by the prompt settlement of certain meritorious claims arising in those countries.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

By letters dated January 5, 1953, and March 23, 1953, the Office of the Secretary of Defense forwarded two proposals to the Congress which were introduced as H. R. 2565 and H. R. 4364, respectively. By a letter dated December 2, 1953, the Department of the Air Force forwarded a proposal to the Congress which was introduced as H. R. 7067. All three of those proposals would have amended the Foreign Claims Act. The proposals which were introduced as H. R. 2565 and H. R. 4364 were also introduced as S. 1239 and S. 1449, respectively. H. R. 2565 and H. R. 4364 were passed by the House of Representatives on April 20, 1953, and May 19, 1953, respectively, but no further action was taken thereon. No action was taken on H. R. 7067 after its introduction. This proposal is a consolidation of those three proposals.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the enactment of this proposal would result in an increase in costs to the Army of $139,000 and to the Air Force of $49,000 for fiscal year 1956, however, no worthwhile estimate of the increase in costs to the Navy and the Marine Corps is possible.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

CONSERVATION ACREAGE RESERVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve.

The purpose of this bill is to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, and to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, the bill is aimed at an improved approach to the problem of diverted acres of productive farmland not immediately needed to fulfill the present effective demand for food and fiber, yet acres that must be safeguarded for the future needs of our expanding population.

Just as we wisely maintain adequate safety reserves of food and fiber above the ground to make sure our consumers are protected in case of natural disasters or suddenly expanded consumption needs, we should also wisely take the added precaution of maintaining safety reserves of productive ability below the surface of our soil through sound conservation farming.

Most of us, I am sure, agree that such would be the wisest use of acres diverted from normal use during any year by reason of the operation of acreage allotments and marketing quotas. What this bill proposes is a realistic way of seeking to achieve this objective.

In encouraging farmers to make the fullest and best economic use and conservation of the Nation's soil and water resources, first priority for the use of such resources must be to provide needed food and fiber for the growing population of the Nation.

Next, it is our responsibility to maintain adequate safety reserves of all staple commodities and products. Furthermore, it should be our policy to assure ample production of farm commodities required for all needed exports through normal channels of trade and for augmented exports to relieve starvation, shortages of clothing, and famine in other nations, to promote economic development, and to bolster other United States foreign economic and diplomatic policies.

Under this bill the farm soil and water resources not required to fulfill the foregoing needs would be conserved and handled in a manner to improve their fertility and keep them in readiness to meet unforeseen emergencies as well as long-range normal future needs for increased farm production.

The bill calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to annually determine and proclaim, prior to November 15 of each year, a national conservation acreage reserve for the succeeding crop year. National acreage to be designated in this reserve would be determined by subtracting the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to be needed for the commercial production within the continental United States of sufficient quantities of all agricultural commodities to meet domestic and export needs and to maintain adequate safety reserves to meet emer-

gency needs, from the total of the number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used for such production during the crop year immediately preceding plus the number of acres which were diverted from their normal use during such year as a result of acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

The conservation reserve acreage would, in turn, be allocated to States and counties in the same ratio as the relationship of each State and county's total previous year's acreage in production to the national totals.

County farmer committees would then allocate the county's total conservation reserve among individual farms in the county on a similar basis.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to enter into annual agreements with individual farm operators, under which the operator agreed to put into effect on the specified number of acres in the conservation acreage reserve for his farm, such soil and water conservation and improvement uses and practices as the Secretary may specify, for which he would become eligible for payment of a conservation reserve award.

Such incentive payments would be based upon the value of the customary landlord's share in the area where the farm is located, of the commodities which the Secretary determines would be produced on the reserve acres if they were used for commercial production during the crop year for which the contract is made, with a limitation of $2,000 for such award for any one farm operator's unit.

Farmers would be required to sign contracts for the conservation acreage reserve in order to be eligible for participation in price-support programs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1396) to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INTEGRITY OF GRADE CERTIFICATES UNDER UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the summer of 1953 a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I was chairman, conducted hearings in Galveston, Tex., on the disposition of Canadian wheat imported into this country as unfit for human consumption. The testimony there revealed that the "slugging" of ships was a common practice. The elevator operator testified that they ran sample grade wheat into the ship every time the sampler's back was turned; and the evidence showed that they were very successful in obtaining No. 2 grade certificates on ships which actually should have graded sample. The operators testified further that they had to do this because they received so many cars that were plugged with low-grade wheat and foreign material, and because "plugging" and "slugging" were so common in the industry that they had to do it to meet competition. I do not believe that the situation is so widespread as their testimony would have us believe; and our subsequent investigations are showing that it probably is not.

I wish to emphasize that even though the witnesses who came before the committee and gave such testimony stated that they had to "slug" ships in order to meet competition at other wharves and other loading points, the main point simply is that we must safeguard ourselves in the future against operations such as the subcommittee discovered and uncovered in its hearings at Galveston. It is for that reason I am introducing a bill today. If the integrity of our grade certificates is to be preserved, so that foreign buyers can rely on them, this situation must be cleaned up.

The men who engaged in these activities were indicted on other grounds, but those indictments were dismissed because, as the Attorney General advises us, of lack of evidence. They were not indicted for the activities I have described, on which apparently plenty of evidence would have been available, because it appears that those activities are not illegal.

I am, therefore, today introducing a bill which would make it a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment for—

First. Any sampler to take samples improperly for inspection under the United States Grain Standards Act;

Second. Any such sampler to accept a bribe for improper performance of his duty;

Third. Any person to attempt to influence any such sampler improperly;

Fourth. Any person to load, handle, or sample grain in a manner designed to cause the issuance of a false grade certificate under that act;

Fifth. Any person to submit for inspection under that act any grain so loaded, handled, or sampled; and

Sixth. Any person to do any other act to cause the issuance of a false grade certificate.

Mr. President, I introduce a bill which covers the questions I have raised, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1400) to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of S. 1309, a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, the name of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC DISARMAMENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 71

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on March 8 I made some remarks regarding Senate Resolution 71, dealing with economic disarmament. At that time 44 Senators had indicated their desire to join as cosponsors of the resolution, and their names were read into the RECORD.

Since that time, my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], have stated they would also like to join as cosponsors.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the names of these Senators placed in the RECORD as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 71.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. BARKLEY) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 4259, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to submit an amendment to H. R. 1, the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I do this in the belief that the Congress should not abdicate its constitutional powers over international trade agreements. I am submitting this amendment to provide that no trade agreement shall become effective until it has been approved by a majority of both Houses of Congress. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, no one can doubt, is a delegation of congressional powers to the executive branch of the Government. Under it the State Department fixes the tariff rates which under the Constitution is the duty and responsibility of the Congress.

The legislative arm of the Government recognizes this, and for that reason has

never been willing to make the delegation of authority to the President except for a few years at a time. It is even proposed now to cut the period of delegation from 3 years, as provided by the House, to only 2 years or perhaps 1 in order to appease high protectionists in the Republican party who are also reluctant to surrender their powers.

It is said that the President can be trusted to use these powers wisely. The wisdom and ability of the President is not the issue of our time. The issue is whether the representatives of the people will retain and exercise the responsibility imposed upon them by the Constitution or whether they are willing to trust the fate of the people's trade and commerce to the decision of anonymous experts in the Department of State. The President does not have the time to work out the details of these trade agreements. He has even less time than the Congress would have. His aids and assistants in the White House and in the State Department are subject to exactly the same pressures to which Members of Congress are subject. It is much better to conduct the public business in the public eye so that the people can watch the pressure of special interests upon their Representatives and Senators than to allow these pressures to be concealed behind the doors of the State Department and the White House offices.

As long ago as April 4, 1940 this amendment of mine failed of adoption by only 6 votes; the rollcall vote was 38 to 44. That vote was taken in time of peace, for we had not yet been drawn into World War II. The vote this year will be taken during the "cold war" which may at any moment turn into a "hot war." Nobody in the executive arm of the Government or in the Congress can tell now what position any nation will assume if we should have a "hot war."

We cannot now judge the position of even the friendly nations of Europe and Asia if the Red Chinese should attack Quemoy and Matsu. Clearly, therefore, this is no time for Congress to surrender its constitutional power over the trade agreements which will be authorized by the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I support the extension of the act, but I oppose the complete abdication of the constitutional powers of the Congress.

The contest of our time is between totalitarian government by executive authority and democratic government by the representatives of the people. I am offering this amendment to require the submission of trade agreements to the Congress in order to preserve democratic government by the people at a time when its existence is seriously threatened by the advances of executive power all over the world, and in the United States itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by Senator ERVIN at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner held at Richmond, Va., on March 4, 1955.

By Mr. WELKER:

Statement relating to safety and labor-management relations at Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., Boise, Idaho, published in the Em-Kayan for March 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article from New York Times of March 1, 1955, relating to awards in Westinghouse Annual Science Talent Search.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today a list of 201 names of persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States, including consular and/or diplomatic designations for Career and Staff Officers. Notice is hereby given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule. The list appears elsewhere in the Senate proceedings of today.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to, and are now pending before, the Committee on the Judiciary:

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Louie W. Strum, deceased.

John Stephens Wood, of Georgia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term of 3 years expiring March 4, 1958, vice Watson B. Miller, term expired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Thursday, March 17, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF CONGRESSIONAL GROUP OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Members of the Senate who are interested in the Interparliamentary Union, I desire to announce that a meeting will be held of the congressional group of the Interparliamentary Union in the old Supreme Court Chamber on Tuesday, March 15, at 10 a. m.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a recent news item from the February, 1955, issue of the Washington Municipal News, published by the American Municipal Association. The American Municipal Association represents 12,000 municipalities, in 44 States. The article expresses the support of that association for Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and myself, to establish a permanent Congressional Committee on Civil Defense. It is a pleasure for me to announce that the resolution was endorsed by the executive committee of the association, at its recent meeting. I welcome the support of the American Municipal Association in this effort to help the Congress face its civil defense responsibilities. I believe the adoption of such a measure is long overdue .

I also take this opportunity to express my hope that the Senate Armed Services Committee will soon see fit to have hearings on my resolution, so we can move closer to the goal of establishing such a joint committee as the one we propose. No committee of either House has for its primary responsibility the subject of civil defense. Unless this is changed, and such a joint committee established, it is doubtful whether the Congress will ever be in a position to give civil defense the consideration and strong support that the safety and security of the Nation requires. Recent disclosures regarding the deadly effects of radio-active fall-outs only serve to heighten and reinforce the necessity for civil defense for the United States.

UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN THE QUEMOY AND MATSU ISLANDS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there was published in this morning's Washing Post and Times Herald a very interesting and informative editorial entitled "As Clear as Mud," which discussed the involvement of the United States in the Quemoy and Matsu Islands.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS CLEAR AS MUD

Is the administration preparing to write off any American involvement in the Quemoy and Matsu islands? This question is invited by Secretary Dulles' speech and by various other contemporary pronouncements. Mr. Dulles, to be sure, made no specific mention of the coastal islands, and the purport of his remarks was to emphasize the American determination to protect Formosa and to warn the Communists against thinking that the United States is a "paper tiger." But in one interesting passage Mr. Dulles observed:

"How to implement this flexible defense of Formosa the President will decide, in the light of his judgment as to the overall value of certain coastal positions to the defense of Formosa, and the cost of holding these positions."

Does this mean that the administration is leery of the feasibility of holding the Quemoys and Matsus in the face of a concentrated artillery barrage? Senators report that Mr. Dulles himself has mentioned a new military appraisal. Defense Secretary Wilson said on Tuesday that loss of the Quemoys and Matsus, although a handicap,

would not make much difference in the long-run defense of Formosa. An unidentified top United States military leader, who presumably had access to the discussions at Taipeh, has been quoted as saying in Tokyo that the importance of the islands could be more psychological than military, and as feeling that there would not be much reaction in the Far East if the coastal positions were abandoned. Senator KNOWLAND to the contrary, all these statements may add up to a straw in the wind.

Possibly such an inference is too sweeping. It is a logical outgrowth, however, of the deliberately vague line pursued by Mr. Dulles, in which he hopes to appear resolute on the defense of Formosa and obscure about the perimeter. Mr. Dulles was more precise in other portions of his report on his visit to Southeast Asia. He was encouraging, for example, in his exposition of the threefold aim of SEATO to protect the area against overt aggression, to enable it to prevent subversion and to strengthen it economically—although the economic point would be more convincing if the administration would give some concrete backing to the Secretary's words. It is another question whether the Communist Chinese, who do not think in western terms, will be deterred by Mr. Dulles' warning that the United States and its allies would use tactical atomic weapons in the event the Chinese engaged in open armed aggression in Southeast Asia.

Despite the cold reception of Mr. Dulles' hints about the desirability of linking SEATO with the Formosa and Korea treaties, there has been reason to think that a basic understanding exists between Britain and the United States on policy respecting Formosa. It may even be suspected that some of the speeches in Britain about the danger in the Quemoys and Matsus have been for internal consumption, much as Mr. Dulles sometimes plays to a certain audience on Capitol Hill. But if the administration is now preparing a change toward the Quemoys and Matsus, the result can hardly be other than to cause more confusion, with the American people the most confused of all.

Undoubtedly there is a point beyond which further concessions would be excessively damaging to American prestige and to the determination in the Far East to resist Communist expansion. Would an abandonment of the Quemoys and Matsus now be excessively damaging, and would it increase any illusion in Peking that the United States is a "paper tiger"? This newspaper does not know. Certainly such a move at this time would be more damaging than if it had been included in the effort to draw a clear line for the defense of Formosa. This is part of the price the administration would have to pay for taking what all along has seemed to be an untenable position. No one can envy the administration in this predicament, especially since the general purpose of the revised policy in the Far East is so constructive. But if an abandonment is in the works, assuredly it would be less disruptive to effect it now than to wait until Communist bombardment forced the issue under fire.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF GIRL SCOUTING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this week marks the 43d anniversary of girl scouting in the United States. I offer my hearty congratulations to this great organization and its members, and express the hope that it will continue to grow in scope and in influence.

The theme of the 1955 observance is "Believe—Belong—Build." This slogan describes the philosophy and the ideals of the organization which has for 43 years encouraged Girl Scouts to develop the resourcefulness which is so valuable an American trait and which has played so large a part in the march to world influence.

There are now about 1,750,000 girls enrolled in the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. They are guided and helped by more than half a million devoted men and women who are registered members, and countless thousands more who work with and for the Girl Scouts. Some 10 million women have enjoyed scout experience; and since the organization was set up with a group of neighborhood girls 43 years ago, it has grown from a small, personalized movement to a nationwide influence for better citizenship among girls and women—truly the "growing force for freedom of which its founder dreamed."

I think we may all take great pride in the achievements of this fine organization and seek in every way within our power to strengthen it to live up to the ideals of its founders and its present members. I wish it continued full measure of success.

JAMES WESLEY REARDEN—83 YEARS ON ONE JOB

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, being thoroughly familiar with the working conditions in cotton mills in South Carolina and other States, I was amazed to learn of a man who had spent 83 years at this kind of work. Like Mr. Rearden, I started to work in South Carolina cotton mills at the age of 11. Although this young man of 94 years has had a great deal more experience than I have had at this type of work, I am sure we would have a lot to reminisce about.

I think he would agree with me that many changes have taken place and that working conditions have improved immeasurably since he began his career at the age of 11.

I congratulate Mr. Rearden on his outstanding record and say that I hope he adds many more years to that already amazing total.

I shall now quote from the article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 6, 1955:

This will be quite a year for James Wesley Rearden, a leading citizen of this little mill community nestled in the rolling hills of upper Horse Creek Valley near Aiken. On June 6 he'll celebrate his 94th birthday. On May 10, he'll round out 83 years of work with the Graniteville Co., a group of modern cotton mills.

And that makes Mr. Rearden the holder of the longest continuous industrial work record in the world. In the office of the president of the Graniteville Co. hang five portraits. Four are those of presidents of the firm. The fifth is that of the shipping clerk to whom the firm long has paid tribute for "always doing a little more than is expected of him."

The remarkable Mr. Rearden has a standing offer from the Graniteville Co. to retire any time he wants to or report for work any hour of the day he chooses. But he's regularly among the first on the job, walking the short distance from his white frame home (not far from the plant gates) to his office. He treats himself to a short rest period after lunch every day, but otherwise puts in full time.

A retirement system was adopted by Graniteville in 1949 for employees reaching 65, but Mr. Rearden—then 88—had been told long before that he could work as long as he cared to. So he's doing just that. "As long as they'll let me," he says, "I'm going to show up for work each morning. I like the people I work for and I'd feel lost without something to do."

That "something to do" for the past 35 years has included teaching the young men's Bible class at St. John's Methodist Church in Graniteville, where he has been a member 70 years and has sung in the choir almost that long.

Mr. Rearden won his longest-work-record title fair and square. In 1950, the Thomas De La Rue Co., Ltd., printers and engravers, of London, challenged the United States to produce a man with a longer continuous work record than their Harry Adkins, a 75-year man. The Rearden record, supplied through the National Association of Manufacturers, showed that he topped Adkins by 3 years.

HE STARTED AT 10

He began work for Graniteville on May 10, 1872. He was nearly 11 then, but—as he recalls—"big for his age." That was the only reason he was able to get a job in the plant: every child under 13 was supposed to be in school. Mr. Rearden's first job was "tack boy," his only tools a needle and thread plus a shoe knife for cutting thread to tack cloth.

Mr. Rearden still remembers the company's founder, William Gregg, who started the mill in 1845. It is the oldest cotton mill in the South operating under its original charter. As for Mr. Rearden, he feels the same about his job today as in 1947, when the company honored him on his 75th consecutive work year.

Said he then: "If I had to make the choice again, it would be the same as it was in 1872."

May this man live many more years and continue at his employment is my wish.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jackson	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Clements	Knowland	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Langer	Thurmond
Daniel	Lehman	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Douglas	Magnuson	Welker
Duff	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Young
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	
Frear	McCarthy	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr.

MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

THE 191ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on the 15th day of January the great city of St. Louis celebrated its 191st birthday.

I wish to express my appreciation for the very thoughtful statement made on the floor of the Senate by my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] regarding this significant occasion. Likewise, I wish to congratulate Mayor Tucker and the St. Louis Council on World Affairs for their successful efforts in commemorating this most recent milestone in the progress of St. Louis.

All the other great cities in this country of freedom can look at St. Louis with envy, and emulate it to their advantage. It is not only a center of business, cultural, and religious progress, but also a center of democratic principles.

DR. J. ROBERT OPPENHEIMER AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am proud of the State which I have the honor in part to represent in this body.

Under pressure and coercion, the University of Washington recently canceled a series of scheduled speeches by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the distinguished scientist.

Disregarding pressure, the Oregon State System of Higher Education refused to cancel scheduled appearances by Dr. Oppenheimer at Oregon State College, at the University of Oregon, and at Portland State College.

The man most responsible for this courageous decision in Oregon is Dr. Charles D. Byrne, who is just concluding a distinguished career as our chancellor of higher education. Said Dr. Byrne, with reference to Dr. Oppenheimer's recent controversy with the Atomic Energy Commission:

> Dr. Oppenheimer is one of the world's most distinguished physicists. No evidence of disloyalty or impairment of his scientific standing came out of the investigation.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch had this to say about Dr. Byrne's defense of free speech and opinion:

> The people of Oregon can take genuine satisfaction in this stand against hysteria on college campuses.

The Oregonian, largest daily paper in my State, editorialized:

> The Oregon State System of Higher Education emerges from the latest Oppenheimer imbroglio with much better marks than the University of Washington.

In an editorial commending the distinguished scientist, the Oregon Journal said:

> To muffle him smacks of persecution. The Oregon board's decision comes at a time when academic freedom needs strong friends. It does credit to the State.

In my opinion, Mr. President, Dr. Byrne has made the proper decision. Defenders of free speech everywhere in America will rally to his cause.

I do not know Dr. Oppenheimer. I am sure I would not necessarily agree with all—or even many—of Dr. Oppenheimer's views. But when pressure can bring about cancellation of the lecture of an eminent scientist, then every American has lost a little bit of his freedom. It is part of being American to have the privilege of hearing whom we wish, and then rejecting or accepting the doctrine offered, as we best see fit.

It is significant that two noted editors who recently visited Oregon—Irving Dilliard of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Palmer Hoyt of the Denver Post—both expressed to the annual meeting of Oregon newspaper publishers their support for Dr. Byrne's faith in the ultimate wisdom of the people. Both of these distinguished publicists spoke out bodly for free speech.

Newspaper editors of the calibre of these men realize that freedom of the press is dependent upon our other basic freedoms. If free speech can be denied, a free press is in peril. In our land of liberty, one freedom cannot be separated from others. Freedom is indivisible. If a threat can shut off a college forum to a scientist, then similar—or perhaps sterner—threats might someday take away an editor's right to comment on such denials of our basic liberties.

As a Senator from Oregon, I take pride in the courage of Dr. Byrne and his associates in the State system of higher education. They have shown themselves dedicated to the finest traditions of our country—the traditions in support of free speech, academic freedom and the unfettered exchange of ideas. The State of Oregon gains through contrast with the timidity of an official of her sister State to the north.

In my opinion, the courageous decision of Dr. Byrne—and in this stand he had the support of Oregon's board of higher education—is of the first order of importance because of its favorable impact on academic freedom in my State. Academic freedom, although not specifically mentioned in the Bill of Rights, is at the root of other basic liberties. It is the freedom of the teacher to teach and of the student to learn. It presupposes the fact that our teaching profession is an honorable one, and that teachers should not be subjected to intimidation or to coercion.

If a learned scientist can be denied access to a college lectern because of the political controversy surrounding him, then a subtle but nevertheless sinister pressure has been applied to every teacher on that campus. He ceases to venture into controversial issues. He becomes a conformist. While this may seem desirable to us in a period of tension, it is disastrous for learning and for knowledge in the long run.

We must remember that human slavery, our subjection to British tyranny, the establishment of the first forest reserves, women's suffrage, the direct election of United States Senators by the people, the curtailment of child labor—all of these were controversial subjects in their day and time. What if teachers in other periods and a different era had feared to discuss such momentous matters with their students?

Mr. President, I believe that Dr. Charles D. Byrne, Oregon's chancellor of higher education, has struck a blow for academic freedom in Oregon and in the Nation, which will be to his everlasting credit.

To Dr. Byrne, upon the eve of his retirement from active management of Oregon's public colleges, I say: Godspeed and good fortune to you, sir. In refusing to run down the flag of freedom, you have upheld the principles of our third President—Thomas Jefferson—who founded the University of Virginia, who wrote the immortal document confirming our separation from European tyranny and who defended the right of every shade of opinion and viewpoint to be heard throughout the land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an editorial on the Oppenheimer situation in the Northwest from the Portland Oregonian of February 19, 1955; an editorial on the same subject from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 22, 1955; and news items on this topic from the Oregonian of February 16, 1955; of February 18, 1955; and February 19, 1955, and an editorial on this topic from the Oregon Journal of February 25, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of February 19, 1955]

SEATTLE'S LOSS OREGON'S GAIN

The Oregon State system of higher education emerges from the latest Oppenheimer imbroglio with much better marks than the University of Washington. The president of the latter institution canceled a lecture series that would have brought Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer to the Seattle campus. Chancellor Charles D. Byrne promptly announced that there was no question of similar action with regard to Dr. Oppenheimer's scheduled appearances this spring at the University of Oregon, Oregon State College and Portland State College.

The action of the U. of W. president, Dr. Henry Schmitz, is incomprehensible to us. Apparently it is so on the Washington campus as well, for representatives of student organizations voted 47 to 0 to ask reconsideration of the ban; and faculty criticism of Dr. Schmitz' arbitrary decision has been bold. The university president's explanation that his action has no bearing on academic freedom, on Dr. Oppenheimer's capabilities as a physicist or on the latter's right to express his viewpoint is no help to understanding.

Dr. Oppenheimer is a respected scientist whose counsel is sought by other scientists. His complete loyalty to his country was attested by the members of the Atomic Energy

Commission in the statement setting forth their decision to deny Dr. Oppenheimer access to classified documents because of past association with Communists. Following this action, he was retained by unanimous vote of the board of directors as director of the Princeton (N. J.) Institute for Advanced Study, an endowed organization with the simple purpose of promoting free inquiry in all fields of learning.

We assumed that all university presidents subscribed to the high purpose of the Princeton institute; but Dr. Schmitz apparently has his reservations. The University of Washington will thus miss what Oregon schools will gain in Dr. Oppenheimer's appearances in April and May.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 22, 1955]

GOOD FOR OREGON

Just now the University of Oregon and the University of Washington—the State universities of the two neighbor States in the Pacific Northwest—present a notable contrast. The contrast is all to the credit of Oregon and an unhappy one for Washington.

Both institutions scheduled Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer for a series of lectures this spring. Under pressure, the University of Washington canceled the noted scientist's visit to the Seattle campus. But the Oregon State Board of Education, in a statement strongly supported at Eugene, seat of the University of Oregon, stood steadfastly by the Oppenheimer lecture dates at the State University, Oregon State College, and Portland State College.

Chancellor Charles D. Byrne said all that needed to be said: "Dr. Oppenheimer is one of the world's most distinguished physicists. No evidence of disloyalty or impairment of his scientific standing came out of the investigation." The people of Oregon can take genuine satisfaction in this stand against hysteria on college campuses.

[From the Portland Oregonian of February 16, 1955]

OREGON HOLDS TO PLANS FOR OPPENHEIMER TALKS

Dr. Robert J. Oppenheimer, whose scientific lecture series at University of Washington was canceled by the university's president Monday, will appear on three Oregon campuses in April and May, as announced earlier, officials of the State system of higher education said.

There is not and has not been any question of canceling the invitation to Dr. Oppenheimer to come to Oregon as the Condon lecturer, Chancellor Charles D. Byrne said Tuesday.

"Dr. Oppenheimer was chosen in March of 1954 by the State system's Condon lecture series committee to give the annual scientific lecture series at three campus locations, the university, Oregon State College, and Portland State. His selection was endorsed unanimously and with enthusiasm by the executives and physical scientists of the three campuses because of the fact that he is one of the world's most distinguished physicists, and presently director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University.

"He will appear in late April and early May, giving two lectures on each campus on 'Composition of Matter.' The outcome of previous investigations will have no bearing on his appearance because he was chosen prior to the investigations and because there was no evidence of disloyalty or impairment of his scientific standing that came out of the investigation."

Withdrawal by President Eisenhower and the Atomic Energy Commission of Dr. Oppenheimer's security clearance brought worldwide controversy last spring. President Henry Schmitz of University of Washington Monday was reported to have refused to allow the school's physics department to present the atomic physicist as the Walker-Ames lecturer on the campus.

The Condon lectures were established by the State board of higher education in 1944 in memory of Dr. Thomas C. Condon, first professor of geology at the university.

The physicist will be at the University of Oregon April 19–21, at Oregon State April 26–28 and in Portland May 3–4.

[From the Portland Oregonian of February 18, 1955]

SNUB OF DR. OPPENHEIMER STIRS PROTEST AT U. OF W.

SEATTLE.—Four hundred students and some faculty members voiced objection in a mass meeting Thursday to a decision by the president of the University of Washington not to invite Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer to appear as a lecturer on the campus.

Prior to the meeting at which it was decided to march on Olympia and carry the protest to the legislature—some individuals had hanged in effigy Dr. Henry Schmitz, the president, on the campus quadrangle.

MARCH SET FOR FRIDAY

The effigy was removed quickly and a university spokesman said no disciplinary action was contemplated.

The march to Olympia was set for Friday morning although final plans were not immediately completed. A few of those present objected to the Olympia jaunt on the ground the matter was a university affair not related to the legislature.

The group also voted to ask Dr. Schmitz to address the student body on the matter. Dr. Schmitz has declined to discuss his refusal to invite Dr. Oppenheimer to the campus beyond saying his decision was made after long and careful study of his (Oppenheimer's) governmental relationship.

DR. SCHMITZ STANDS PAT

He has said he will not reconsider the decision despite a storm of protest from faculty and students. A full page of letters in opposition to the decision appeared in Thursday's University Daily.

Among faculty members criticizing Dr. Schmitz was Dr. Edwin A. Uehling, acting director of the university's physics department. Dr. Uehling said the decision was most unfortunate and "told the world and ourselves that we do not seek to become a great university."

[From the Portland Oregonian of February 19, 1955]

EDITOR HAILS OREGON VIEW

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE.—Oregon's State board of higher education was congratulated here Friday by Irving Dilliard, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, for its stand on the current controversy over whether Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer would be invited to speak at universities and colleges.

Dilliard praised the board in a talk to some 250 newspaper people throughout the State who are here attending the 36th annual Oregon press conference.

The board is to be congratulated for not being swept off its feet in the hysteria, the Erick W. Allen memorial lecturer said. The board has stuck to its guns in inviting the scientist here and at Oregon State and Portland State colleges, despite the refusal to do so by the president of the University of Washington.

Alton Baker, Sr., publisher of the Eugene Register-Guard, was given the Amos E. Voorhies award for distinguished community service.

The award was made at a dinner meeting of the Oregon press conference, addressed by Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, who spoke on the role of a newspaper as a community servant.

POLICY REVERSES LOSSES

Hoyt said, "I have found that a newspaper's reputation for fairness is not seriously impaired by what it says editorially as to the issues of the day, if only it presents both sides in its news columns."

The one-time publisher of The Oregonian who went to the Denver Post 8 years ago recalled:

"I remember in the old days at The Oregonian when with a total of only 80,000 daily circulation, we managed to lose 1,000 subscribers a month every time we had an election. But by reversing our policy and presenting both sides, we discovered that elections were the greatest gain periods."

He answered often heard criticism by saying:

"A newspaper is not only a bulletin board of information for its public, but is also a mirror of life and should reflect the current goings on in its community, its State and its nation.

"The reflection that a newspaper must make as a mirror of a life is to report crime news, sex, bank robberies, divorce and juvenile delinquency in a true proportion to the actual flow of our life. That is important. Unless we know what is going on, how may we correct it? My answer to people who say 'you print too much crime news' is that there is too much crime in our city and our State."

[From the Oregon Journal of February 25, 1955]

STRONG BLOW FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The issue of academic freedom in higher education has presented itself in both Oregon and Washington recently in a way which permits a clear comparison. Oregon, we believe, comes out the better.

President Henry Schmitz of the University of Washington has refused to invite Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, physicist and key figure in an Atomic Energy Commission controversy over security, to lecture on the campus. The refusal has resulted in a storm of protest.

At the same time the Oregon State Board of Higher Education has ruled in favor of permitting Dr. Oppenheimer to fill commitments at several institutions here. The action drew the praise of Irving Dilliard, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, speaker at the annual Oregon press conference at Eugene, who said board members "are to be congratulated for not being swept off their feet in the hysteria."

President Schmitz unquestionably remembers the ruckus over Reds on the faculty which rocked the Washington campus several years ago and is particularly sensitive. Nevertheless, we believe his ruling hurts the school's standing in the academic world.

In the AEC decision which barred Dr. Oppenheimer from further participation in the atomic-energy program, his loyalty was not questioned. None can question, either, his greatness as a scientist. He is now the distinguished director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J.

His lectures here will be on noncontroversial subjects. To muffle him smacks of persecution. The Oregon board's decision comes at a time when academic freedom needs strong friends. It does credit to the State.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Tuesday, March 8, Mr. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, delivered an address in the nature of a report

to the Nation concerning his recent trip to the Far East. This report is of such significance and has such an important bearing on our foreign policy that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE

REPORT FROM ASIA

I

I return from 2 weeks in southeast Asia and the West Pacific. I visited the forward positions against which the waves of communism are beating and where the issues of war and peace, of freedom and captivity, hang in precarious balance. There a gallant band of independent and freedom-loving nations stand between 600 million Communist-dominated Chinese and the broad reaches of the Pacific Ocean.

I visited 7 Asian and Pacific countries, and met with the Foreign Ministers of 3 others. I saw Bangkok and Rangoon with their splendid monuments of ancient civilizations. I visited simple agricultural countries such as Laos, where the landing of our plane had to be delayed until water buffalo were driven from the runway.

Everywhere I found ominous evidence of the Communist efforts to terrorize, to beguile, to subvert. But also I found the passionate desire of the free peoples to remain free.

That desire will not prevail unless those who love liberty unite to help each other. So, the United States, acting within the framework of the United Nations Charter, has joined in mutual security treaties which cover the freedom-loving countries of Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, Pakistan, Australia, and New Zealand.

One of these treaties, the eight-nation Manila Pact for southeast Asia, has just come into force, and I went to Bangkok for the first meeting of the Treaty's Council.

It was fitting that this first meeting should have been held in the capital of Thailand, for the word "Thailand" means "land of the free." Also it dramatized the new role of Asia when, for the first time in history, a Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom and a Secretary of State of the United States traveled half way around the world to come to Thailand.

The Manila Pact has three main purposes: first, defense against open armed aggression; second, defense against subversion; and third, the improvement of economic and social conditions.

II

For military defense we shall rely largely upon mobile Allied power which can strike an aggressor wherever the occasion may demand. That capacity will, we believe, deter aggression. We shall not need to build up large static forces at all points and the United States contribution will be primarily in terms of sea and air power.

I pointed out at Bangkok that, for military purposes, the Chinese Communist front should be regarded as an entirety because if the Chinese Communists engage in open armed aggression this would probably mean that they have decided on general war in Asia. They would then have to take into account the mutual defense treaties of the United States with the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China, and the forces maintained under them. Thus general war would confront the Chinese Communists with tasks at the south, center, and north, tasks which would strain their inadequate means of transportation.

The Allied nations possess together plenty of power in the area. The United States in particular has sea and air forces now equipped with new and powerful weapons of precision, which can utterly destroy military targets without endangering unrelated civilian centers.

Our treaty council, after appraising the military factors, concluded that the available military power offered solid hope of deterring open armed aggression against the treaty area.

In order to bring our power to a concerted pitch, our military advisers at Bangkok started their work together. It is expected that another military meeting will be held at Manila next month. In this way information will be exchanged about the forces which could be made available, and strategies can be agreed upon. Also out of these meetings may come plans for combined military exercises.

III

Then we took up the problem of subversion. At the moment, it is perhaps the greatest danger to the area. This danger will, I think, be diminished as it is better understood that the treaty nations have the power, and the will, to strike down an open armed aggressor.

To illustrate this connection between direct and indirect aggression I may mention the situation in Laos. In two of its Provinces there are disloyal elements, supported by the Chinese and Viet Minh Communists. The Laos Government is seeking to reestablish control over its own territory. But it is worried lest, if it suppresses the Communists within, it will be struck by the Communists from without. I hope that that worry is now allayed by their better understanding of the protective nature of the Manila Pact.

In other countries also, active subversion is being promoted from without. To deal with this is in each case primarily the responsibility of the governments concerned. However, often the nations can help each other by exchanging information, for example, about the movements and activities of international Communist agitators. Also, those who have dealt successfully with this problem can give advice which will help others of lesser experience. The Philippine delegation did this at Bangkok. They told how their Government had dealt decisively with Communist-inspired revolt of the so-called Huks.

It was agreed there would be meetings of experts to facilitate exchanges of views about these problems of subversion.

IV

Also at Bangkok we dealt with the third treaty task, that of improving economic and social conditions. This problem divides itself into two parts. First is the problem of meeting the cost of more effective security forces.

As I have said, the Council is not trying to build up vast new military establishments. But there is need of modest national forces which are well equipped and loyal, which can support the authority of the government throughout its territory and fight initial defensive actions if there should be attack from without.

Even these limited forces involve an economic burden which some of the countries cannot carry without help. So, the strong will help the weak by providing some military equipment and financial support. Funds for that have been voted by the Congress for the current fiscal year and the administration is asking for a renewal of funds for this purpose for the coming fiscal year. Thus there will be special recognition of those countries which assume military obligations with us.

A second phase of the economic problem is general improvement of economic conditions in the area. This calls for capital developments. Industrialization should be speeded. There should be better roads, more irrigation works and improved port facilities. There is particular need for a larger exchange of goods and services as between the countries of south and southeast Asia and the western Pacific. Japan, with its large capacity for industrial production, and its need for food and raw materials, is an important element in this situation.

This problem of economic improvement goes beyond the immediate treaty area. The treaty area is not and never can be a self-contained economic unit. The great bulk of its trade is with outside areas. There is need for programs to develop broadly the economic possibilities of all the free Asian countries. The treaty nations will study their problems from this viewpoint.

At the Bangkok Conference, I took occasion to reemphasize President Eisenhower's desire that atomic energy should be used to benefit mankind and to enrich the life of the great masses of humanity. We are not satisfied to see atomic missiles becoming conventional for war while vast possibilities for peaceful betterment are still undeveloped. I described our programs for education in this field, and I extended a special invitation to the Manila Pact nations to send representatives to the United States so that they could begin to study the good uses to which atomic energy may be put. There will, I believe, be a welcome response to this invitation.

V

The Manila Pact represents not only enlightened self-interest, but also high ideals. These are expressed in the Pacific Charter, a document inspired by President Magsaysay which was signed with the Manila Pact. That charter deals with political independence and economic progress and social well-being.

Three of the Asian parties to the Pacific Charter—Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand—may shortly be meeting with other Asian countries at a so-called Afro-Asian Conference. So our Conference at Bangkok sent a message of cordial greeting to this Afro-Asian Conference, and we expressed the hope that it will support and reinforce the ideals so nobly expressed in the Pacific Charter.

In the sound ways I outline, the Manila Pact was made an effective going concern. The way of the aggressor has been made harder.

VI

After the close of the Bangkok Conference, I went to Rangoon, where I met with the leaders of Burma.

Burma is one of the countries which has newly won its independence, and the Government and the people of that country are determined to maintain it. They feel that they can best do so by avoiding regional security groupings. I know that all of the American people hope that their policy will succeed. Burma's evolution to independence had the strong moral support of our Nation, and we want to see that independence preserved.

I talked fully and freely with the President of Burma and with the Prime Minister, U Nu, and with other members of the Government. In this way we each came to a better understanding of the policies of the other. That was worth while. As between free nations, there is never the need of total agreement, but there is always the need of mutual respect.

VII

After Burma, I went to Laos, Cambodia, and Free Vietnam. These three nations are not themselves members of the Manila Pact, but their territories are covered by the Manila Pact. In each of these countries, I found leaders of great ability and of patriotic dedication to the independence of their country. Also, they well realize the danger to their independence that comes from sub-

version inspired by international communism.

I have already spoken of the task, in Laos, of suppressing subversion in two Provinces.

In Cambodia, the King—now ex-King—is passionately patriotic. His recent abdication was, I believe, due to a desire to find better ways to help his people to preserve the freedom he so ardently seeks for them.

The greatest problems confront the Free Government of Vietnam. It has the task of developing an efficient government of its own in substitution for French rule. This task, difficult enough under any conditions, is now complicated by three abnormal problems.

There is the problem of absorbing and resettling the refugees from the north. As always, when international communism moves in, those who love liberty move out, if they can. So far, about 600,000 persons have fled from northern Vietnam, and before the exodus is over, the number of refugees will probably approach 1 million. It is not easy for southern Vietnam to absorb these new peoples. They are destitute and penniless persons with only such possessions as they could carry on their backs. They need help.

One dramatic response is Operation Brotherhood. That is privately sponsored by the Philippine Junior Chamber of Commerce. It provides Philippine doctors and nurses who work on a 24-hour-a-day basis at the refugee centers. It is inspiring to see the Philippine people, who only lately achieved their own independence, now turning to help the most recent addition to the ranks of free nations.

A second problem faced by the Free Government of Vietnam is created by the fact that various religious groups, known as the sects, have heretofore had virtual autonomy, maintaining their own police forces, collecting their own taxes, and acting largely independently of a central government.

If Vietnam is to maintain its independence and the religious freedom desired by all, including the sects, there needs to be increasing allegiance to the central government. Reports indicate this allegiance is still not being granted by the sects to the Free Government of Vietnam. I hope that motives of patriotism will inspire all groups in free Vietnam to join together. Only as a united people will they be able to meet the threat of communism.

The third and greatest problem is, of course, that presented by the Communists in the north. Under the armistice they should have removed their forces from the south. Instead, many of their soldiers there merely put on civilian clothes and faded into the local community as a source of future trouble. Communist propaganda is rife, and in addition the free people of the south are subjected to the terrorizing threat of armed aggression from the north. As against this, local forces are being trained. But the principal reliance is the Manila Pact and its deterrent power.

In July of this year, conversations are scheduled to begin between south and north looking toward elections in 1956 to unify Vietnam. Under the terms of the armistice, these elections are to be held under conditions of freedom. There can be little doubt but what most of the people of Vietnam will want to unite under a genuinely independent and democratic government. In the north there is great discontent with Communist despotism. For each one of the many who have actually fled south to find freedom, there are many more who want freedom. Also, economic conditions in the north are deplorable and in many localities there is near starvation.

It will, however, be hard to create in the North conditions which allow genuine freedom of choice.

In Northern Korea and in Eastern Germany the Communists stubbornly refuse to permit the free elections which would bring unification. We hope this pattern will not be repeated by the Communist Viet Minh.

I was much impressed by Prime Minister Diem. He is a true patriot, dedicated to independence and to the enjoyment by his people of political and religious freedoms. He now has a program for agricultural reform. If it is effectively executed, it will both assist in the resettlement of the refugees and provide his country with a sounder agricultural system. I am convinced that his government deserves the support which the United States is giving to help to create an efficient, loyal military force and sounder economic conditions.

VIII

I stopped at Manila on both my outgoing and homecoming trips. Both times I talked with President Magsaysay. Whenever I meet him, I am deeply impressed by his grasp of the Communist problem. He has given his full moral support to the anti-Communist position of the United States in Asia. The Philippine Republic is proving itself to be a staunch and an effective ally.

On my return stop at Manila, I spent a day in conference with the United States Ambassadors in the area. United States representatives had come to Manila from 15 countries for a regional conference. We discussed together the policies of the United States in relation to the Asian scene. The conference continued on after I left, and has been of great value both to those of us who work primarily in Washington and to those who work in the field.

In this connection, I want to pay tribute to the Foreign Service and other representatives of the United States in the area I visited. Oftentimes they work under most difficult physical conditions. They do so without complaint and with a great sense of dedication to the service of our country. They are our first line of defense against an external peril which is perhaps the greatest our Nation ever faced. They deserve the respect and thanks of the American people.

IX

My last stop was at Formosa, where I conferred with President Chiang Kai-shek, Foreign Minister George Yeh and other members of the government. I exchanged there the instruments of ratification which officially brought into force our Mutual Defense Treaty covering Formosa and the Pescadores, or to use the Chinese names, Taiwan and Penghu. The ceremony was cheered by those who crowded into the room to see it, and by many thousands who lined the streets as I drove by. They saw in the treaty a significance—also seen by overseas Chinese I met—that so far as the United States can assure it, there will always be a free China.

After the treaty came into force, we held a first meeting of consultation under article IV of the treaty with reference to implementing the treaty. At this meeting, Admiral Carney, the Chief of Naval Operations, was present and also Admiral Stump, our Commander in Chief in the Pacific. They remained on after I left for further conferences with the military advisers of the President of the Republic of China.

Let me make it clear that we have here to deal with two distinct matters—first the political decision as to what to defend, and then the decision as to how to defend.

The political decision of what to defend has been taken. It is expressed in the treaty and also in the law whereby Congress has authorized the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the Formosa area. That decision is to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. However, the law permits a defense which will be flexible and not necessarily confined to a static defense of Formosa and the Pescadores themselves. How to implement this flexible defense of Formosa the President will decide, in the light of his judgment as to the overall value of certain coastal positions to the defense of Formosa, and the cost of holding these positions. This judgment would take account of consultations provided for by the Mutual Defense Treaty.

We hope that the present military activities of the Chinese Communists are not in fact the first stage of an attack against Formosa and the Pescadores. We hope that a ceasefire may be attainable. We know that friendly nations, on their own responsibility, are seeking to find substance for these hopes. Also, the United Nations is studying the matter in a search for peace. So far these efforts have not been rewarded by any success. The Chinese Communists seem to be determined to try to conquer Formosa.

The response of the United States will have importance both to Formosa itself and to all the southeast Asia and Pacific countries.

X

I come back from Asia greatly impressed by the spirit and the purpose of the governments and peoples with whom I had contact. They want to preserve their freedom and independence. However, patriotism alone is not enough. Small nations cannot easily be self-confident when they are next door to Communist China. Its almost unlimited manpower would easily dominate, and could quickly engulf, the entire area were it not restrained by the mutual security structure which has been erected. But that structure will not hold if it be words alone. Essential ingredients are the deterrent power of the United States and our willingness to use that power in response to a military challenge.

The Chinese Communists seem determined to make such a challenge. At the same time they are persistently trying to belittle our power and to throw doubt on our resolution. They boast that in 1950, in Korea, they drove United States forces back from the Yalu and gained a great victory. They boast of their victory over the French Union forces in Indochina and they misrepresent our nonparticipation as due to our weakness of will. When we recently helped the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate the Tachens and other coastal islands, the Chinese Communists claimed that this represented great victories for them. They continue wrongfully to hold our fliers and other citizens.

In such ways Chinese Communist propaganda portrays the United States as being merely a paper tiger. It suggests to the small peoples whom they threaten that the United States will always find reasons to fall back when faced by brutal and uncompromising force, and that Communist China is sure to win.

The United States, in the interest of peace, has made great sacrifices and has shown great self-restraint. That is nothing for which we should feel ashamed. Indeed, it is something in which we can take pride. But we must always remember that the free nations of the western Pacific and southeast Asia will quickly lose their freedom if they think that our love of peace means peace at any price. We must, if occasion offers, make it clear that we are prepared to stand firm and, if necessary, meet hostile force with the greater force that we possess.

A big step in the right direction was taken by the Congress when, at the President's request, it passed the joint resolution which authorized the President actually to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of Formosa and, to the extent the President judges appropriate for that defense, to protect related areas in friendly hands. That nonpartisan action, taken with virtual unanimity, did more than any other recent act to inspire our Asian friends with confidence in us. I believe that their confidence is not misplaced.

We have power that is great. We have a cause that is just. I do not doubt that w

have the fortitude to use that power in defense of that just cause.

If that will be manifest, then I believe that peace and freedom will prevail.

STATEMENT BY PAUL BUTLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRESIDENT AND MRS. EISENHOWER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it has been a notorious fact for some time that the Democratic Party has been feverishly engaged in a search for issues. For 2 years Democratic Party strategists in Congress have been probing for soft spots around the periphery of a sound Republican administration in a desperate hope to come up with something they can use to lift their flagging spirits for 1956. They tried to belabor the administration's Air Force program, the farm program, and the programs for development of power, and when the plain facts exploded their charges they turned to Dixon-Yates, which they are still dredging for political pay dirt.

More recently they have come forth with the $20 income tax reduction scheme, which they are now willing to shave and compromise to cover the irresponsibility contained in their first proposal. In the House of Representatives, the Democratic Party strategists are deploying their forces in preparation for another aggressive attack on the Republican farm program—the soundest farm program the Nation has had in more than 20 years.

It makes no difference to these Democratic political strategists how irresponsible they become in manufacturing false political issues so long as they can pit rich against poor, labor against management, borrower against lender, farmer against the administration, and generate other class conflicts. Always they look to where the most votes lie, and then they adopt the slant which will allow them to wear the shield labeled "champion of the little fellow." They care nothing for economic balance, economic stability, a sound dollar, a balanced farm program, or any of the other yardsticks which measure the general good of the Nation and which protect the little fellow far more surely than does the easy handout system which prevailed under 20 years of the New Deal.

As a Republican and as a member of an administration as fine as the Nation has had in a generation, I look with amusement on this desperate thrashing about of our Democratic opposition. So long as they continue to search for genuine political issues—even falsely manufactured ones—I can regard them with indulgence. Republicans will spot them every one of these synthetic issues and fully meet their challenge when the time comes to go to the people.

But when they stoop to personal insinuations about the morals, integrity, and health of our President and his beloved First Lady, I say that is the place to draw the line. Yesterday's insinuation by Mr. Paul Butler, Democratic national chairman, about the health of the Nation's First Lady is another sample of personal smear tactics which have now become typical of Butler's idea of political warfare. Members of the Senate do not have to search far back in their memories to recall how a former Democratic chairman tried to insinuate a moral charge against our President by hinting that the Dixon-Yates contract was made to give a favor to a personal friend of the President's. When this vicious lie was exposed, that chairman weaseled out of the charge.

Now Mr. Butler has turned his sights on the beloved wife of the President to indicate that her health may be poor and that in all probability the President and his wife may be looking forward to private life in 1956.

Mr. President, our distinguished President and his wife both have had colds, as millions of other Americans have at the time of the year when the seasons change. But let me tell you, Mr. President, that both are in sound, healthy, and vigorous condition—in vivid contrast to the condition of the man who ran for a fourth term and withheld information of his mortal sickness from the Nation.

I can understand Mr. Butler's desperation. He believes the only chance his party has for 1956 is to tear down the leader of his Republican opposition. But I cannot believe he is so frantic that he has to stoop to personal insinuations in order to build up the hopes of Democratic Party politicians. Let them stick to issues concerning the Nation's problems, and leave personalities out of them, because I warn these politicians that the American people will not stand idly by and watch any attempt to besmirch the morals, good faith, or health of the President and the beloved First Lady of the land.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, apropos of the statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I am frank to say that I was quite shocked when it was called to my attention that the chairman of the Democratic National Committee had found it necessary to bring Mrs. Eisenhower's health into the discussion of the political campaign of 1956. The facts of the matter are that the President and Mrs. Eisenhower, like a good many thousands of other Americans, have had a touch of cold or flu. That situation is not unusual in any household in the country. I think it is most unfortunate and quite irresponsible for the chairman of the Democratic National Committee to use that as an anvil upon which to beat the question of the presidential campaign of 1956.

I am pleased to say that this did not originate from the responsible leadership of the Democratic Party in the Congress, and I think all Americans should repudiate this attack of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Democratic National Committee which is receiving such undivided attention this morning. If the chairman of the Democratic National Committee or anyone else said anything reflecting adversely on the motives, or spoke an untruth concerning the health, of either the President or of the First Lady, I would be the first to feel that he made a mistake. It seems passing strange to me, however, that my delightful friends on the other side of the aisle should be so disturbed in this year 1955. In previous administrations, they talked about the President's health, the President's wife, the President's daughter, and the President's piano, and everything else they could think of which concerned the President. Yet, when the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee gives his opinion of what is going to happen in 1956, whether it is good or bad—and I cannot follow the predictions of the chairman of either party, religiously—his statement rouses all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Humphrey, the very able Secretary of the Treasury, has just issued a statement concerning many of our colleagues in the Senate, some of the most distinguished men in this body. They include a former distinguished Vice President and former majority leader, for many years a Senator from the State of Kentucky and for many years a Representative from that State.

I can understand Secretary Humphrey disagreeing with the merits of a proposal, but I do not understand this statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. It did not shock me to the extent the minority leader is shocked, because I have come to understand these things. It is merely a repetition of what the Secretary of the Treasury said a few days ago, but today we read:

Treasury Secretary Humphrey denounces the compromise tax-cutting plan proposed by Senate Democrats as irresponsible—

He questions their responsibility—

political and silly.

Mr. President, I would respect the Secretary of the Treasury a great deal more if he advanced his reasons for being opposed to a proposal to which I am sure he has not given adequate study.

I shall not engage in a name-calling contest. I shall not question people's motives. I think we would be better advised to leave all motives and names out of these questions and discuss them on their merits.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that I do not associate myself with the chairman of the Democratic National Committee or with any other chairman who makes improper statements reflecting upon the integrity, the character, or the health of the President of the United States. But I think it ill-behooves some of my colleagues who talk so often on this floor on such subjects, to sit silent while reports go out to the country that the most influential man in the Cabinet is branding their colleagues as silly.

Oh, there have been Presidents who said there were too many of certain kinds of Members of the Senate. There were Presidents who called for purges.

The PRESIDING OFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Many Democrats refused to associate themselves with such actions of the President. I hope the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Republican policy committee, and also the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] the chairman of the Republican Campaign Committee, who just spoke, will dissociate themselves from the statement by the Secretary of the Treasury—that great tax expert, who showed up with a billion dollar "blooper" in the 1954 revenue bill, which he is now trying to have remedied in the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that most of us in the Senate have had some political experience, so I believe we can take care of ourselves. However, I think the situation is a little different when a reference is made such as was made about the wife of the President of the United States. She is not in a position to use this forum, or any other forum, for that matter, when it comes to a discussion of her health, or as to what she might have tried to influence her husband to do, when such statements are totally without foundation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in which they referred to a recent comment made by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee concerning the health of our beloved first lady of the land.

I listened also to the impassioned plea of my friend, the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who I wish were present at the moment, during which he read the charge which Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey had made, to the effect, I understood, from what the distinguished majority leader said, that Secretary Humphrey had called the Senator from Texas and certain other Senators irresponsible, political, and silly.

The Senator from Texas thinks that certain of us should dissociate ourselves from the statement made by Secretary Humphrey. I am glad to dissociate myself from two parts of the statement.

I observe the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] occupying the seat of the distinguished majority leader, so I know that he will convey my statement to the Senator from Texas.

I do not wish to hear my friend from Texas or other of my colleagues and friends, whom I know to be most sincere, called silly or irresponsible. But when the Secretary called them "political," I think that probably he had a very good name for them. I do not see how these Members who sponsored this Democratic tax plan can object to being called political in their views when they have produced proposed tax legislation such as has been reported in the last few days. I think the word "political" really "clicks."

Mr. President, because there has been some dispute as to what was said by the Democratic national chairman, Mr. Butler, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of an Associated Press dispatch entitled "Butler Views Ike's Future—Democratic Head Sees Wife's Health as Factor in 1956," published in this morning's Baltimore Sun. Thus, we may see exactly what was said.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTLER VIEWS IKE'S FUTURE—DEMOCRATIC HEAD SEES WIFE'S HEALTH AS FACTOR IN 1956

NEW YORK, March 9.—The chairman of the Democratic National Committee said today Mrs. Eisenhower's health may deter her husband from running again for President.

Paul M. Butler had said yesterday he doubts President Eisenhower will seek reelection because of "a personal situation in the Eisenhower household."

"What I meant," he told a news conference today, "was that from all reports traveling around in Washington I did not believe the President was happy as an administrator."

NOTES HER HEALTH

Then he added that newspaper reports indicated Mrs. Eisenhower's health was not too good and that he believed that, too, might be a factor.

In any event, Butler claimed:

"We are confident that a Democratic President will be elected in 1956."

In Washington, James C. Haggerty, White House press secretary, was asked if there was any comment on Butler's statements. He replied: "There will be no comment now." There were indications the White House might have something to say tomorrow.

Earlier Butler was asked on a TV program if Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, would be the Democratic presidential candidate in 1956.

"This is possible," Butler replied.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Before I yield, I should like to say that while the distinguished majority leader has referred to the pianos of other Presidents, the sons of other Presidents, and so on, I have never heard a great decision being made on such a slim reed as that upon which Butler's belief is based when he says that the President is not going to run again. I know Butler has been desperately wishing and hoping that the President will not run, but I never believed he would base such statement on the fact that the President's wife had a head cold. So far there have been more important and major considerations on which to determine whether the President should run again. I think the chairman of the Democratic National Committee has advanced a pretty slim reason when he states that he believes the President will not run again.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I enjoyed what the Senator had to say. I want to dissociate myself from one part of the analogy that the minority leader used when he referred to the fact that Mr. Butler was using the cold of the President's wife as an anvil on which to beat the President. Instead of an anvil, it is a mirage on which to pin a tattered and futile hope for 1956.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I had not intended to make any comment on the matter under discussion by the Senator from Arizona, and other Senators until the distinguished majority leader mentioned a fellow Ohioan for whom I have had the greatest respect throughout my life. Above all else, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, is a gentleman; and I know he is not given to making any snide references or personal references in any way reflecting on the character or the ability of any individual.

Certainly many of us feel the $20 alleged tax cut to some extent justifies the contention that it is a frivolous proposal. Certainly it is already obvious that it is designed for political propaganda purposes only. The same persons who are urging the adoption of the proposal are the Democrats who never cut a tax in all the time they were in office, before, during, and after the war years. These same persons are asking for more appropriations for military purposes, for more public housing, and for more Federal spending, up and down the line. Yet at the same time, they pretend to be sincere in asking for reduced taxes.

There is no way in which our Government can cut taxes and spend more money simultaneously. We cannot eat our cake and have it, too, without risking the kind of inflation which hits the pocketbooks of every working family in our country.

I shall oppose this political tax cut, but I shall do my best to encourage Congress to reduce major Federal spending so that we can have a balanced budget and honest tax relief.

I hope we will have that in mind all the time when the tax measure is under consideration.

We cannot cut taxes unless we first cut spending. When more expenditures for schools are being encouraged, which is wholly in order, or greater expenditures for other purposes, such as increasing our Military Establishment, if necessary, we cannot talk about cutting taxes unless we are playing politics with the people of the country, and when we advocate tax reduction, in view of the condition of the Treasury, we are proposing something that is perfectly absurd.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes, in making a rejoinder to the comment I heard a moment ago from the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate this courtesy.

I was very much intrigued with the comment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in reference to the tax bill. My comment would be quite pertinent. The Democratic Party unfortunately has had to bear the burden of conducting

the affairs of the Nation during World War II and also during the very trying and difficult postwar period. It is interesting to note that the accomplishments of those two periods are now matters of great historical significance to the Nation, and of great pride to the American people.

Our Republican friends seem to indicate that they are in favor of tax reduction. There is no doubt that they have reduced taxes. My question to the American people is this: Tax reduction for whom?

I suggest that as the Banking and Currency Committee reviews the operations of the stock market, the committee may find that the tax-reduction bill of last year has had as much to do with what is occurring in the stock market as has anything else.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the only time our Republican colleagues seem to be interested in inflation is when it adversely affects some of their warmest friends. I point out that the inflation in the stock market does not seem to be a subject of great concern to the leadership of the Republican Party. I further point out that the tax reductions which have occurred thus far have been of little or no benefit to the multitude or the majority of the American people.

I point out that the Democratic leadership of the Senate will present a tax program for the Senate to vote upon, and that program will give the administration its long-heralded opportunity to balance the budget, if it wishes to do so, and at the same time will provide a modicum of tax relief for those who really need it.

It appears to me that a $10 or $20 tax relief for the average citizen is a modicum of equity, in view of the almost unbelievable amount of tax relief which has been extended, by two tax bills of the 83d Congress, to the large business and financial interests of the country.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that I am not at all impressed with the fact that the administration "blooper" of permitting a great loophole to occur in the tax law—a loophole which resulted, as a minimum, $1 billion in loss of revenue—is compensated for by saying, "I am sorry." A $1 billion revenue loss exceeds even some of the greatest extravagancies of the Democratic Party.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say a word about a matter which has been discussed earlier today on the floor of the Senate, namely, one with respect to the indisposition of the wife of the President.

To me, Mr. President, it is something more than political. I would regard it as an affront to the President himself.

Ten years ago the President of the United States was the chief of a great military operation in Europe. If someone had indicated at that time that his devotion to duty was predicated upon the indisposition of some member of his family, I am sure that the person making such an allegation would have been censured. To say now that his determination as to his political future is to be based upon that factor is, after all, an affront to his sense of devotion and his sense of responsibility to the country, because if a President were to measure his devotion on that basis, it would be a matter of deep concern.

His entire lifetime has been devoted to a military career, in which the sense of devotion to duty has always been exalting. To say now that some day in the future, when the country may be confronted with an emergent situation, he would allow an indisposition on the part of a member of his family to determine what his duty was is not only unfair to the President, but I think it is an affront to his sense of duty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Carrying forward the Senator's idea, is it not also an affront to the devotion to duty of his wife, who has gone through many difficult days during times when he was away for protracted periods carrying out his responsibilities to his country? Is there not an affront on that score?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. It is forgotten that he is not only President of the United States, but also Commander in Chief of its Armed Forces at a time when an uneasy situation has been generated in the Pacific. How long it will last, I do not know, but I am confident as to his sense of devotion and his fealty to his country under every circumstance.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning when I woke up and turned on the radio to get the news items, there was one which came over which I could scarcely believe. A half-hour later I turned on the news again, and I found I had heard correctly the first time. It was in effect an attack made by Chairman Butler, of the National Democratic Committee, upon the President and Mrs. Eisenhower.

If I understood correctly, the report of what Mr. Butler said, he indicated that he did not believe President Eisenhower would run for reelection because of trouble in the family, and then the explanation was that Mrs. Eisenhower's health was not good, and that the President probably would not run again on that account.

Why did Mr. Butler go to this inhuman length? Why did he try to upset not only these good Christian people in the White House—and thank the Lord they are just that—but also other people in the United States? There can be only one answer. He does not want President Eisenhower to run for reelection. His statement could lead one to think he would be very happy if Mrs. Eisenhower were in poor health. Fortunately, she does not appear to be. We know she is not a strong woman compared to some persons. She is not a tennis champion. She does not climb mountains. She does not go racing halfway around the world every week. But she is one of the most gracious and human hostesses we have ever had in the White House.

Does Mr. Butler think he can make her sick by this kind of talk, by starting these rumors? Does he think he can make her feel she is a drag on her husband's office? Does he think he can make President Eisenhower feel he would be doing a terrible thing, on Mrs. Eisenhower's account, if he insisted on remaining in the White House?

I do not know what goes on in the mind of a man who would use tactics like those resorted to by Mr. Butler. We have often heard the question asked, "Just how low and evil and loathsome can an animal in human form get?" I think Mr. Butler answered that question very well.

I do not believe there is a self-respecting Democrat in this country—and there are millions of them—who would approve the kind of tactics this scoundrel is attempting to use, trying to hurt the President and his gracious wife, trying to hurt the President at a time when he is called upon to make decisions affecting literally the lives of millions of Americans.

I shall not give any advice to the Democratic Party; its members can stand for this type of thing as long as they like, but I think Mr. Butler has answered the question thoroughly as to just how low a man can get.

1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—RESOLUTION OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the legislature of my State of Nevada urges the Congress, through Assembly Joint Resolution No. 31, to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12, 1955, and return the constitutional responsibility of adjusting duties or tariffs on foreign imports to Congress.

A part of that resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States after June 12, 1955, should set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon fair and reasonable competition administered by a reorganized and experienced Tariff Commission functioning much in the same manner as the long-established Interstate Commerce Commission so that the market for foreign goods in this country would be based on a fair and reasonable competition with our own agricultural, industrial, and mining production.

The act should be allowed to expire.

THE RESOLUTION—NEVADA RESOLUTION

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 31

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12, 1955, so that the regulation of foreign trade and the laying of tariffs and import fees will immediately vest in Congress as the Constitution requires and thereby stop the lowering of the American standard of living by the importation of foreign-made goods

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada is aware of the fact that the selective so-called free-trade policy, adopted by the State Department of the United States under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, is lowering the American living standard through the lowering of wages and is causing unemployment and a

subsequent decline of the demand for minerals, agricultural products, and other commodities produced in the State of Nevada; and

Whereas the indiscriminate lowering of import fees and tariffs, without regard to the differential between the costs of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this Nation and foreign competitive nations, has a demoralizing effect on the mining and agricultural markets of this country and thereby causes unemployment and loss of labor; and

Whereas the State of Nevada is in a particularly vulnerable position in attempting to compete with foreign sweatshop labor because the products produced in Nevada, such as livestock, wool, tungsten, lead, zinc, copper, magnesite, chemicals, manganese, mercury, silicon, and many others, are readily importable at a lower cost from sources outside of this country under the so-called reciprocal trade act, all to the great detriment and economic hardship of this State; and

Whereas many mining companies in the State of Nevada are practically shut down and almost all of the zinc miners are out of work and the cattle industry is being endangered because our ranchers cannot compete with the importation of hides, beef, or live cattle from Argentina or Mexico; and

Whereas the haphazard lowering of the floor under wages and investments represented by the tariffs and import fees destroys American workingmen and shifts their jobs to foreign soil; and, as a result, many of our mines, mills, and factories have been closed and our farm production saved only by subsidies; and

Whereas those industries which depend upon the power of Hoover Dam and Davis Dam are in danger because similar products are being imported at a price less than production costs in this State; and

Whereas the Nevada wool industry has found it impossible to compete with the importation of wool from Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere; and, for the first time, the wool industry of Nevada is only being saved from destruction by the use of subsidies; and

Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living that world trade should only be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and based on the principle that foreign products produced by underpaid labor should not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standard of our workers, farmers, and miners; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States requires that Congress should lay duties, imposts and excises, and regulate foreign commerce, but the Congress of the United States has abrogated its constitutional duties by virtue of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 by transferring the duty of fixing tariffs to the executive department of the Government which has, in turn, carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce; and

Whereas the free-trade policies fostered by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act have resulted in our dependence upon foreign nations across one or both major oceans for many of the materials and minerals which we would need to fight a war and to prepare our own defense and thus stifled the initiative to explore, develop, and produce such needed materials in our own country; and after having become dependent on foreign sources for critical materials the foreign countries have been able to cause us great embarrassment by manipulation of export permits and fees so that we must bow to their demands and submit to international blackmail; and

Whereas the United States has in the last several decades only been able to prosper because of war or the threat of war and under this cover of war the industrially inexperienced State Department has been wrecking the national economy by the simple expedient of tampering with tariff or import fees so as to open the door to foreign commodities, which, in turn, prevents the flow of venture capital into the business stream of the Nation even in time of emergency since investors know that when the emergency is over their investment will be destroyed through foreign sweatshop labor competition; and

Whereas it is mandatory to the future economic growth and development of this country, and Nevada in particular, that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act be allowed to expire on June 12, 1955, so that Congress can immediately recover its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade through the adjustment of tariffs and import fees, and with such an expiration of the act the so-called trade agreements already made and, in effect, will in no way be affected but will continue in effect for their full terms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the legislature of the State of Nevada most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to stop the dreadful deterrent to American economic well-being and the lowering of our standards of living and that it return to its traditional and constitutional method of fixing tariffs based on the principle of protecting American industry, agriculture and commerce by allowing the 1934 trade agreements act to expire by its own force and limitation on June 12, 1955; and be is further

Resolved, That until the expiration of the agreement, the Department of State should exercise its powers in fixing tariffs only in accordance with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution until such time as the responsibility for regulating foreign commerce be vested where it belongs, in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States after June 12, 1955, should set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon fair and reasonable competition administered by a reorganized and experienced tariff commission functioning much in the same manner as the long-established interstate commerce commission so that the market for foreign goods in this country would be based on a fair and reasonable competition with our own agricultural, industrial and mining production; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly certified by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada, be promptly transmitted by him to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, and to the United States Senators and Congressman from Nevada.

A CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY THE AMERICAN WORKINGMAN AND INVESTORS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act transfers the constitutional responsibility of Congress—Article I, section 8—to adjust the duties or tariffs on foreign imports, and to regulate foreign commerce (foreign trade) to the executive branch of the Government, with authority to virtually remake the industrial map of the United States through the adjustment of such duties or tariffs without the approval of Congress.

Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is the economic approach to destroy the workingman and small investors of this Nation, and to make us dependent upon foreign nations for critical materials without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace.

The frantic attempt to extend this act for 3 years and to lower still further the duties or tariffs without regard to the differential of costs of production here and abroad, due to our higher wage standard of living, can be called a conspiracy to destroy this Nation.

The act should be allowed to expire.

CONDUCTED TOUR FOR YOUNG RUSSIAN EDITORS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the proposed tour of young student editors from Russia which our immigration authorities are sanctioning this year. The theory is that this tour will be an experience similar to the one enjoyed by young American college newspaper editors in Russia last year. It is historically painful to remember that every Russian journalist who has ever visited our country has seen only what he wanted to see. Sometime back Mr. Ilya Ehrenburg, a famous Russian journalist, visited America and saw nothing but slums, bread lines and segregation and his reports made America look like something out of the Dark Ages.

I should like to permit these young editors the opportunity to see everything in this country, but I should like to make sure that at some time during their visit they see America at its best.

I should like personally to conduct these visitors on a tour of Ohio. Let them visit our public schools; take them to a Cleveland Indians baseball game when Larry Doby is batting against a weak right-handed pitcher; walk into the courthouse in Cleveland, Ohio, where Judges Perry B. Jackson and Charles White are presiding over cases; visit the Thompson Aircraft Products Co. and take a look at the parking lot; have them meet the members of the State legislature and city councils of our big cities; have them talk to our farmers. I think we could top it all off with a visit to some of Ohio's colleges, of which our State has more than any other in the Union; show them the work being done in our community centers, and let them ask all the questions they wished.

I am certain that some of those who go through this kind of experience will be tempted to do what a courageous young Yugoslavian student did a few months ago when she came to America on a student tour. She came, she saw, and she stayed, escaping from her watchful Communist guards and marrying a fine young American.

MILK MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many times on this floor I have called attention to some of the inequities of the milk marketing orders in discriminating against dairy producers of the Midwest.

I am proud that we now have in Minnesota a Democratic governor to help carry on the fight for protection of our Minnesota dairy producers; and today I serve notice that a determined effort is going to be made to improve these marketing orders, to the point that such discrimination is avoided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD, a joint resolution of the Minnesota Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, as it pertains to these milk marketing orders.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act.

Whereas in many milk marketing areas of the United States in which orders promulgated pursuant to the Federal Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 are effective, the minimum price to producers for fluid milk has been set unreasonably high; and

Whereas certain of said orders have arbitrarily discriminated against various forms of milk produced in other areas; and

Whereas various State statutes and local ordinances which ostensibly were enacted for the protection of the health of consumers of milk and milk products actually lack any reasonable degree of uniformity, and are unduly restrictive and arbitrary, and not reasonably related to such ostensible purpose; and

Whereas by reason of the premises, the price of fluid milk to consumers in such areas has been raised so high as to curtail consumption of fluid milk, and uneconomic production of large surpluses of milk has been stimulated in such areas, and the price of milk for manufacturing purposes throughout the United States has been unduly depressed, and producers of milk in other areas of the United States who produce milk of good quality more economically have been deprived of normal and natural markets for their milk, and interstate commerce in milk has been unduly obstructed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to limit the differential between the price of milk for fluid purposes and the price of milk for manufacturing purposes which may be allowed by any order promulgated under said act, and so as to require that each such order applicable to milk include a provision requiring that the price of milk for fluid purposes be reduced whenever the production of milk in the area subject to such order is in excess of the market requirements in such area during the seasons of short production in such area, and so as to prohibit the inclusion in any such order of any provision which will have the effect of discriminating against milk or milk products produced outside of such area and so as to render lawful the sale in such area of any milk or milk products produced anywhere in the United States in compliance with such sanitary standards as may be promulgated by the United States Public Health Service, and so as to recognize and protect effectively the interests of producers and handlers who are outside of such area but desire to market milk or milk products within such area; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

Approved by Minnesota State Legislature on March 7, 1955.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD a copy of a press release issued by Governor Freeman of Minnesota, announcing a three-pronged attack on the problem of opening markets to Minnesota milk and milk products.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Orville L. Freeman today announced the launching of a three-pronged attack on the problem of opening markets to Minnesota milk and milk products, stating that such efforts are long overdue:

"1. We intend to take legal action directed toward ending arbitrary and unrealistic so-called "sanitary" regulations which are really intended to create a monopoly for producers in certain preferred areas. Several such areas are located where, if it were not for such restrictions, Minnesota milk could pay transportation costs and still compete favorably with their locally produced milk. Certainly milk and milk products produced anywhere in the United States in compliance with standards set up by the United States Public Health Service should not be barred from markets in any part of our country.

"2. We will take legal steps provided for under the Milk Marketing Agreement Act to protest and prevent the incorporation into orders under that act such 'gimmicks' as have the effect of excluding our dairy products from milk marketing agreement areas. An example of such an order is that which provides that evaporated milk sold in the New York area either must be manufactured from fluid milk for which the producers have been paid prices equal to those paid producers in that area, or—if prices to producers have been lower—the difference must be paid into a pool to help support the program in the New York area. Since Minnesota milk production is carried out more economically than that in New York, this effectively keeps our evaporated milk out of the New York market. Efforts are being made to extend this practice to dried milk as well.

"3. We will exert every effort to secure an amendment to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to limit the differential in price that may be established under that act between the price of milk for fluid purposes and the price of milk for manufacturing purposes.

"This part of the program is of immediate importance to us in Minnesota," Governor Freeman said, "and I am urging the legislature to memorialize Congress to that effect. The differential between the prices of milk for fluid consumption and for manufacturing is often so great that the result is: (1) A price on fluid milk that is so high that consumption is curtailed; (2) a price on milk used for manufacturing that is so low that the finished milk product competes on a cut price basis with similar products manufactured here. In the milkshed area in which this prevails there is thus an uneconomic production of large surpluses of milk which go into manufacturing, at the expense of a greater consumption of fluid milk which the people of the area really need.

"We have had numerous examples of manufactured products from milkshed areas being sold at levels below those from our manufacturing milk areas. Only about a year ago, one of our larger milk powder manufacturers was forced to cut his price in order to meet competition from the New York milkshed, with the result that almost immediately prices declined everywhere in the country.

"I want to make it clear," the governor said, "that we are not opposed to the principle of Federal market orders. We do not want to bring about the demoralized price situation which was responsible for their creation in the first place. We ask only that they do not set up monopolies which encourage local production beyond its normal expansion and that they do not price fluid milk so high that consumers lower their consumption. Specifically we recommend that the price for fluid milk be reduced whenever the production in the milkshed is in excess of the market requirements of the area."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Governor Freeman has invited his neighbor States of the Midwest to join with him in this effort. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a copy of his letter to Governor Hoegh, of Iowa, a similar letter having been sent by Governor Freeman to Gov. Joe Foss, of South Dakota, Gov. Norman Brunsdale, of North Dakota, and Gov. Walter J. Kohler, of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 3, 1955.

GOV. LEO A. HOEGH,
State Capitol, Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR GOVERNOR HOEGH: Enclosed herewith you will find a copy of a press release and a resolution, the contents of which I believe are self-explanatory. I know that you and the people of Iowa share the same deep concern that we of Minnesota feel regarding the progressive restrictions preventing us from competing in various milk markets throughout the United States.

We of the upper Midwest are blessed with an efficient and productive dairy industry. Yet we find ourselves in a position where we are progressively excluded from milk markets where we could sell a cheaper and better product than the presently favored and protected suppliers. The present restrictions, both in the nature of arbitrary and unreasonable sanitary regulations and also by way of "gimmicks" which have been added to milk-marketing orders, seriously penalize our efficient producers, hurt the United States as a whole, and in addition are, I believe, unconstitutional.

We of Minnesota therefore propose to institute legal action, both in the courts and through appropriate administrative channels, and also to urge the passage of necessary corrective legislation by the Federal Congress.

We would like to invite you of Iowa to share with us in this effort. I would be most happy to review this matter with you personally or confer through my agricultural advisers with whomever you might designate from your State to look into this matter.

I predict our efforts to correct the present injustices will be long and a sometimes bitter battle. Nonetheless, our cause is just, and if we pursue it with vigor, I am sure we shall triumph.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Governor Freeman and the junior Senator from Minnesota have discussed this situation at great length, both before and since his election, and have determined upon a course of action which we believe is only justice to the Midwest.

Governnor Freeman has my hearty backing in this effort, and will have my energetic support. Amendments to

the Marketing Act, to carry out these objectives, are now being prepared. I shall welcome having the Senators from Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin and other States join me in introducing the bills which will incorporate these amendments to the act, as soon as they are completed.

However, I want to join Governor Freeman in making it clear that we are not opposed to the principle of Federal market orders, and do not want them abolished. We believe in economic protection for all dairy producers, everywhere. We do not want to see any return of the demoralized price situation which was responsible for creation of the marketing orders in the first place.

We only want safeguards to protect against monopolies which encourage local production beyond its normal expansion, and against having fluid milk priced so high in our big cities so as to hamper consumption.

All that we are seeking is that the price for fluid milk be reduced whenever the production in the milkshed is in excess of the market requirements of the area.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

HOUSING CENTER PAYS CITY $14,249

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article, published in the Minneapolis Star of recent date, and bearing the headline "Housing Center Pays City $14,249." I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING CENTER PAYS CITY $14,249

A total of $14,249.68 was paid by the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority to Hennepin County in lieu of taxes for the Glendale public low-rent housing development in southeast Minneapolis between October 1, 1952, and September 30, 1954.

A. C. Godward, executive director of the authority, so informed the city council today by letter.

In 1950, prior to creation of the project, private homes in the area produced a tax return of $2,957.19, Godward reported.

In 1954, the authority paid a total of $7,124.84 in lieu of taxes, he said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I make note of the fact that, according to the article, in 1950 prior to the creation of the housing project, private homes in the area produced a tax return of $2,957.19; and in 1954, the authority paid a total of $7,124.84 in lieu of taxes. It now appears that during the 2 years the sum total of $14,249.68 has been paid, which I may say proves the sound economics of an effective housing program, and proves that even though the Federal Government may be helpful in this matter, the local and State governments actually benefit from the expenditures which are made.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on Monday, February 21, I placed in the daily RECORD—where it appears on page A1097—an address delivered by Brig. Gen. L. V. Hightower, on the subject of training a modern army.

In order that we may have trained men remain with the service, it seems to me that it is necessary to have universal military training. This is fair and it is American.

The Gallup poll made a poll of the women of the United States, as to their attitude on universal military training, and this report has been printed by the American Legion.

The report is so important, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Seven out of every 10 Protestant women and 8 out of every 10 Catholic women are in favor of UMT (national security training) legislation, according to the latest poll by Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion at Princeton, N. J. The principle of UMT has been approved by the general public, Dr. Gallup states, in more than a score of institute surveys since 1942. The survey of February 20, 1955, says: While women leaders of the Methodist Church have undertaken a campaign to enlist their members to oppose UMT, a nationwide survey conducted by the institute finds that 7 out of every 10 Protestant women favor the proposed defense measure. Among Catholic women, the figure is higher still—with more than 8 out of every 10 in favor. A smaller ratio in favor was found among women of the Jewish faith reached in the survey, with nearly 6 out of every 10 approving universal training in principle. Nationwide, the vote in favor of UMT today is 73 percent with 22 percent opposed and 5 percent expressing no opinion. Today's vote by religious preference is:

WOMEN

	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor	70	81	59
Oppose	24	17	31
No opinion	6	2	10

MEN

Favor	75	82	81
Oppose	22	13	16
No opinion	3	5	3

PRODUCTION OF BURLEY TOBACCO

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, at the present time a joint House-Senate Subcommittee on Tobacco, from the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, is meeting to try to reach a decision on proposed legislation and other administrative steps which may be taken or should be taken to alleviate a situation which is presently found to exist with respect to burley tobacco. There is on hand nearly a 3½-year stock, when a sound program would call for only about a 2.6 or 2.5 years' supply.

There were 2 fine statements made this morning before the joint committee, 1 by Mr. Randolph S. Taylor, executive secretary, Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., and 1 by Mr. Burl S. St. Clair, president of the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation.

I ask unanimous consent that the statements may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY RANDOLPH S. TAYLOR, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, BURLEY & DARK LEAF TOBACCO EXPORT ASSOCIATION, INC., BEFORE JOINT HOUSE-SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOBACCO, MARCH 10, 1955

My name is Randolph S. Taylor. I am executive secretary of the Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc. This is a federated trade association with offices here in Washington having as its members associations of growers, dealers, warehousemen, and farm organizations from the eight-State burley tobacco-producing area. The primary objective of the association is to promote the use and sale of burley tobacco in domestic and export channels.

The critical situation facing growers of burley tobacco was outlined in detail to your committee by witnesses of the Department of Agriculture last week. Briefly and bluntly it can be summarized simply as a situation where we have too much tobacco in the face of a down-turn in domestic consumption, with 442 million pounds, including one-third of the 1954 crop, under loan to the various growers cooperative associations. In fact, if there were not one single pound of burley tobacco produced during the year 1955 our supply situation at the beginning of 1956 would only then be at about the desired level. The paramount question facing all of us who are interested in the commodity is therefore one of finding a suitable orderly solution to the problem which will save the program and at the same time prevent economic disaster in the areas where it is grown.

I desire to submit for your consideration a three-point package legislative proposal which I sincerely believe will accomplish the objective we all desire. I shall list the proposals involved and discuss each one individually.

PROPOSAL NO. 1

The Secretary of Agriculture should be given legislative authority to redetermine the 1955 burley tobacco quota and individual farm acreage allotments on the basis of the most recent statistical data available provided that the additional reduction for 1955 shall not exceed 15 percent.

Comment

Present legislation does not permit the Secretary to further decrease a quota previously announced. Due to the drastic change in the supply situation now as contrasted with last November the Department of Agriculture in testimony before this committee has requested the authority to take this action and has indicated that the additional reduction in acreage might be as much as 25 percent. The Eight State Burley Tobacco Committee, various associations of growers, farm organizations and other groups have recommended this action. Everyone with whom I have talked considers this action absolutely necessary in order to spread out the needed reduction over a 2-year period and in order to avoid a reduction in 1956 of such proportions as to wreck the program and completely cause economic ruin to the principal burley tobacco producing areas. The proposal for the 15 percent limitation will be recognized as a moderate approach in developing a means of softening the reduction insofar as practicable for 1955.

PROPOSAL NO. 2

Notwithstanding any other provisions of present law legislation should be enacted to

permit a reduction in allotments of 0.7 acre or less provided such reductions for these allotments are limited to a maximum of 0.1 acre per year.

Comment

This proposal brings up the touchy minimum acreage allotment controversy which has been troubling the program since 1947 and which in my considered opinion has contributed more than any other single factor to our present serious situation. Among others present in this room today I had a small part in urging the enactment of this minimum legislation in the spring of 1944.

It is perhaps ironical that legislation designed and enacted by Congress to continue the program has now evolved into a vehicle to destroy it. The 1-acre minimum allotment for burley tobacco was enacted in March of 1944 as a wartime measure to increase production and continue the program at that time. Simply, it provided that for any farm having a 1943 acreage allotment of less than 1 acre the allotment for 1944 would be increased to 1-acre subject to certain limitations relating to the acreage of cropland in the farm. You will remember that this was during World War II and that all other farm programs had been suspended except those designed to increase or encourage production of food and fiber crops. I would like to read to you the preamble of the legislation as enacted by Congress in the spring of 1944 as Public Law 276.

"Whereas the increased demand for cigarettes and other tobacco products has resulted in record usages during recent years of burley tobacco; and

"Whereas due to a shortage of labor and equipment and the need for the production of essential food and fiber crops, the production of burley tobacco has not kept pace with this increased usage; and

"Whereas small growers of burley tobacco could, if their acreage allotments were increased, produce additional burley tobacco without adversely affecting their production of essential food and fiber crops: Therefore be it resolved—"

I am sure you will agree that the condition outlined then is vastly different from that facing us today. There is evidence to show that this legislation accomplished the desired objective. Production was increased and the quota acreage allotment program was maintained without interruption. Public Law 276 was in the light of the circumstances that followed mistakenly enacted as permanent legislation. At the time of its emergency passage no one could foresee an end to the worldwide conflict in which we were then engaged.

No reductions in allotments were made for the year 1945 but by 1946 when it was realized that a reduction in allotments was necessary it became evident to many of us that some action was needed with respect to revision of Public Law 276. The first such legislative action came in that year when Congress kept the legislation but for the year 1946 only permitted 1 acre allotments to be reduced by 10 percent which was the same reduction applied to all other allotments in that year.

In 1947 a further decrease in acreage allotments of 19.6 percent was invoked with the reduction applying only to allotments above the 0.9-acre level. By this time the group of protected allotments had increased to an estimated 150,000 or an estimated 50 percent of the total number. Since the 19.6 percent reduction for 1947 applied only to that 50 percent of the allotments of 1 acre or more the actual overall reduction obtained in total allotted acreage amounted to less than 16 percent. Thus the first seeds of inequity, injustice, and unfairness were sown.

During the following 3 years 1948, 1949, and 1950 a further reduction of 16.1 percent was imposed on all growers having allotments in excess of 0.9 acre. No reduction was made during any of these years to the ever-growing protected minimum acreage group. By this time the size of the protected group had increased to an estimated 56 percent of the total. As in 1946 the 16.1-percent reduction for these 3 years resulted in only an 11-percent reduction overall, all of which came from the unprotected 44 percent of the growers. Thus was the second inequitable action taken.

In 1951 an 11-percent increase was proclaimed which was applicable to all allotments including the 58 percent having allotments of 0.9 acre or less. This action forcefully illustrated that the small growers were protected from decreases but shared in all increases. This particular procedure, which seemed proper and justified to me, nevertheless caused much criticism and comment from growers having allotments of 1 acre or more and therefore can be listed as inequitable step No. 3.

A change in farm acreage allotments was not necessary for the year 1952 and it was during this year that the Congress approved a revision in the minimum acreage level to its present figure of 0.7 of an acre. Therefore the acreage reductions which were necessary and taken successively for the years 1953, 1954, and the 10 percent previously announced for 1955 have all been taken on an equitable basis. These three reductions have reduced the protected 1-acre allotment group to a present level of 0.7 of an acre. This group which is not subject to further acreage cuts now totals 207,000 growers or 64 percent of the total allotments established. The remaining 36 percent of growers whose allotments are in excess of 0.7 of an acre must therefore, under present legislation, completely absorb the entire 50 percent plus reduction which the Department states now appears necessary for 1956.

I have had the pleasure to have been closely associated with the present quota program since its inception in 1938. I have had active participation and experience with the program at the farm, county, State, and Washington levels during the last 17 years. It is on the basis of this experience that I repeat my previous statement that it is my considered opinion that the minimum acreage provisions of the program—more than any single other factor—is responsible for our present situation. I firmly believe that the principle of treating one group of farmers different from another is fundamentally unsound in a production-control program. The average burley allotment for 1955 is less than 1.2 acre. The establishment of a protected group of farm allotments constituting 64 percent of the total at a level of 60 percent of the average for all allotments completely removes the possibility of an equitable or effective production-control program under circumstances existing today.

I sincerely believe that circumstances such as this have created a feeling about the program which has set the stage for the condition we have at present with a host of excess producers, numerous hidden fields, cases of improper destruction of tobacco, lax measurements, and an overall letdown in field administration generally. We have increased yields more in burley tobacco than in any other type. I suggest the possibility of less emphasis having been placed on this endeavor had not many producers felt that something had to be done to overcome what they believed to be a matter of inequitable treatment.

The net result of this condition of a feeling of inequity and injustice associated with the minimum-acreage allotment procedure has had serious consequences. It has provided the basis for misunderstanding and resentment among farm neighbors, among communities, among counties and States producing this commodity. It has prevented the realistic proclamations of acreage reductions or increases. It has prevented all of us, as a group, growers, warehousemen, dealers, farm organizations, and the Government, from having a common ground on which to meet and work out agreeably and satisfactorily the solutions to our problems as they have arisen.

I have yet to find a single person who is thoroughly acquainted with the program that will admit to me privately that the minimum-acreage provision of the program is sound. Some of the national farm organizations for many years have had resolutions opposing minimum-acreage provisions. No other type of tobacco has a minimum-acreage allotment. Yet there are other types with successful quota programs and with smaller average acreage allotments.

The suggestions embodied in proposal No. 2 are offered for your consideration from an understanding, practical viewpoint, and in a definite spirit of compromise. They are equally fair to large and small growers alike. The proposal as recommended would for the large present 0.7-acre group of growers place the minimum acreage at 0.6 acre for 1955 and 0.5 acre for 1956. It is my sincere feeling that in 2 years' time under this equitable, fair approach that we will have the program in hand to the point that further acreage reductions will not be necessary.

PROPOSAL NO. 3

Notwithstanding other provisions of law, the Secretary should be directed to conduct a referendum in the regular manner among growers by May 1, 1955, to secure their approval or disapproval of the actions recommended for the 1955 crop year under proposals 1 and 2.

Comment

Under present legislation the next referendum in burley tobacco will be held this fall for the crop years 1956, 1957, and 1958. The quota program for 1955 has previously been approved by the growers with the understanding that allotments of 0.7 acre or less would not be reduced. Even if legal, to my mind it would not be morally right to change the rules in the last part of the game without approval of the growers. This proposal would place responsibility for acceptance or rejection of the matter exactly where I feel it belongs—on the grower himself. I submit to each of you that this is the only proper, fair way for action of this kind to be taken.

CONCLUSION

I am fully aware of the economic situation facing burley tobacco growers. Contrary to the ideas of some people, it will affect all areas alike. It is not a one-sided or big grower versus small grower problem. In the final analysis, all growers are small. About 90 percent of all tobacco grown on the larger-allotment farms is produced by tenants. The tenants' average share of the crop for the entire burley belt is less than 1 acre. A 50-percent reduction in the allotment for these farms can only result in 1 of 2 alternative actions as far as the tenants are concerned. Their shares in these crops will be reduced to approximately a half acre or, and this is more likely, about one-half of the thousands of tenant farmers will be entirely displaced from the only occupation they know—the growing of tobacco.

The three proposals submitted to you today have been thoroughly checked with various leaders in the industry as well as informally with representatives of the Department of Agriculture. In each instance they have indicated that they believe that the proposals are sound. No claim is made for their completeness nor is it suggested that other proposals might not work. There is no pride of authorship. On the contrary any suggestions containing helpful additions or changes will be welcomed.

May I emphasize the fact that I recommend the adoption of all three proposals as a unit. Adoption of proposal No. 1 without adoption of proposal No. 2 will only serve to aggravate and intensify an already trouble-

some situation. Adoption of proposals 1 and 2 without adoption of proposal No. 3 would result in what I believe to be unfair treatment of growers.

I sincerely feel that these proposals, if all are adopted, coupled with an increase in the penalty rate, removal of credit for overplanting, identification of red-card tobacco and other administrative actions which the Department has stated can be taken to tighten up the program will present a fair and equitable solution to the problem which the growers will overwhelmingly approve. In closing may I suggest to you that it is the responsibility of all leaders in the industry, working with the Congress, to develop a sound workable program. It then follows that it is the responsibility of the growers to accept or reject the program through the democratic process of a referendum vote.

STATEMENT BY BURL S. ST. CLAIR, PRESIDENT OF THE KENTUCKY FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BURLEY TOBACCO, REPRESENTING THE HOUSE AND SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEES, MARCH 10, 1955

The Kentucky Farm Bureau commends the Senate and House Agriculture Committees for recognizing the seriousness of the present Burley tobacco situation. We appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee with regard to our suggestions as to how we think some of these problems confronting the Burley grower today can be solved.

The Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation is composed of 74,007 farm families. It is an independent, nongovernmental, self-financed, family organization, founded for the purpose of protecting and promoting the best interests of farmers in the State of Kentucky.

Several years ago we conducted a survey of our membership and found that 86 percent of the farmers in Kentucky who belong to the Farm Bureau list tobacco as their major cash crop. We feel that we would be doing something far less than our duty if we did not seek to appear before this group with positive, workable suggestions that may be put into action for the purpose of helping the Burley farmer in his present dilemma.

We know that this committee has before it factual information regarding stocks of Burley tobacco on hand and the reasons for the surplus supply. As most of our recommendations are based on United States Department of Agriculture figures, we will not burden you with reiteration. Therefore, I present to you today the recommendations of the Kentucky Farm Bureau board of directors adopted at a special meeting held in Louisville March 3.

We favor continued acreage controls and we would supplement these controls with poundage quota, providing that a practical and workable figure can be reached as to what the pounds per acre would be. It is our opinion that any definite poundage to be proclaimed at this time without due consideration with tobacco authorities, Government and nongovernmental agencies and others in the industry, would be indefensible.

We favor necessary legislation from Congress to cut further the present acreage allotments for 1955, in order that further tobacco surplus may be prevented.

Because of the inconsistencies now existing in regard to tobacco allotments, we favor legislation for the reduction of acreage allotments on a basis that would apply to all growers alike.

We urge that allotments given to new farmers be based on qualification of the landowner and not the tenant.

We ask that the penalty of 75 percent of previous year's average selling price be levied on excess tobacco.

We favor the further tightening up of the present burley program as far as administration is concerned. For example: The training of persons responsible for measuring tobacco acreage by engineers and other college personnel; that one person be responsible for all measurements in each county; that all excess tobacco be destroyed in the field if this is at all possible; that enforcement measures should be taken in order that marketing cards should be presented at the scales when crops are weighed and that no tobacco crop will be weighed without a marketing card; that necessary measures be taken to change the amount allotted for acreage adjustment and the amount allotted to new growers from one-half of 1 percent to one-tenth of 1 percent; that the total "cropland" and "facilities" provisions of the present law be enforced to require strict compliance by so-called town-lot growers.

We believe that these suggestions and recommendations would be beneficial to the tobacco farmer with no unjust hardship on any segment of the industry. We appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee today and we certainly hope that our program will be seriously considered by this subcommittee. Thank you.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PLAN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials and articles in regard to the Federal highway plan.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Malone (N. Y.) Telegram of January 29, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Nobody will argue with the President when he says that the United States is caught in a traffic jam. But several objections are being fired at the details of the White House $100 billion program to get the Nation out of the jam.

Very shortly the President will send his program to Congress for action. Motorists, bus riders * * * just about all of us * * * have a stake in this Federal highway program, so let's take a short look at it and some of the objections.

The American Automobile Association objects principally to the building of any more toll roads. This is part of the President's proposal. The New York State Automobile Association says this State should not rely on the national program. The State should go ahead and spend the proposed $50 million agreed on by both parties at Albany, says the NYSAA, making sure that any increase in motor fuel taxes is used to pay for better roads.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Virginia Democrat, who now heads the Senate Finance Committee, also has an objection. He doesn't like the idea of tying up the revenues from Federal taxes on motor-vehicle fuel to pay for highway bonds. The Senator suggests that these Federal fuel taxes be cut so that the States can raise their own taxes on gasoline and diesel oil. That way, he says, the States can build these roads and control them. His idea is undoubtedly good, so far as it goes, for the bigger, more populous States. But will the smaller States be able to pay for their share of the roads we will need to carry the 80 million vehicles that will be crowding them within 10 years?

Even Senator BYRD and the group that support his distaste for the financing plans of the President's program do not come out flatly and say we do not need a national net of superhighways. That would be something like saying we do not need peace on earth. There seems to be recognition that we as a nation have committed ourselves to living on wheels. The problem is bigger than the ability of the separate States to cope with it. Whatever is done in this Congress to the President's program, if the alterations result in putting off the solution, may be regretted by the whole Nation. Details may be altered, but some national program should be started.

[From the Garden City (Long Island, N. Y.) Newsday of January 22, 1955)

DEBT BY DEFINITION

Senator HARRY BYRD, the Treasury watchdog, has raised violent and valid objections to the $101 billion Federal-State road building plan which the President is expected to submit to Congress next week.

BYRD is well qualified to speak. He is an expert on finance, and under his leadership Virginia has built—and paid for—thousands of miles of first-rate roads.

Under the road-building plan, the result of work by a committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, the Federal Government would continue its present aid-to-highways program at the rate of $623 million a year, and spend, in the next 10 years, an additional $25 billion on a 40,000-mile interstate highway system.

To raise the money, the Clay committee proposed that a Federal highway corporation be established and issue $20 billion in 3-percent bonds, maturing in 1987. Another $5 billion would be raised by fees from gas stations and motels operating on the right-of-way.

The rest of the money would come from States and localities through which the roads pass. No mention is made of how the States are supposed to raise their $70 billion share.

Let it not be said that we—or BYRD—are against road construction. The Nation is in desperate need of highways, not only to meet current demands but also to be ready for the vast increase in car and truck use expected in the future. Our highways are 25 years behind the times. The Nation must spend a great deal of money, and must spend it now.

VIOLENT ASSUMPTION

But the Clay suggestions, as BYRD points out, are not the way to raise and spend the money.

Interest of the bonds alone would run to $11.5 billion, assuming that they can be sold at 3 percent and can be paid off on schedule. And, as BYRD says, "Based on all recent Federal experience, I submit it as a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years."

Just as bad is that the plan is a subterfuge to get around the Federal debt ceiling. The bonds, technically issued by a separate corporation, are not added to the Federal debt, yet appropriations would be required from Congress each year to meet the payments on them.

"You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain," BYRD says, "and you cannot evade debt by definition." The citizens will have to pay no matter what you call it.

BYRD'S PROPOSAL

Far better than the Clay plan is a program devised by BYRD. He suggests that the 2-cent a gallon Federal gas tax be repealed so that the States can reimpose it. The money would be earmarked for roadbuilding. The present Federal-aid-to-highways program should be maintained. This would be financed, instead of from general revenues as at present, from the existing tax on lubricating oil and from a half-cent gas tax.

Under BYRD's plan, the States would control their highway development, the $11.5 billion interest would be saved, and plans could be flexible to meet new problems. His proposal would also keep the Federal debt

down and preserve the integrity of the budget system.

This is a far better plan. Those who use the roads would pay for them. And from reliable estimates, it would result in more roads faster.

[From the Binghamton (N. Y.) Press of January 27, 1955]

HIGHWAY PLAN STRONGLY OPPOSED

President Eisenhower's message on his 10-year $101,000,000,000 highway program has been postponed until next week to permit completion of congressional action on the Formosa question. But even before formal presentation, the program faces strong opposition. Opponents call the proposal to issue non-Government bonds amortized by tax revenues "trick financing" and a devious device to evade the Federal statutory debt limit.

Leading the opposition will be Senator F. BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, whose career has been one of constant striving to reduce Government waste and extravagance.

The President's expected program calls for "modernizing the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend approximately $70 million over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels, restaurants and the like—on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 million would come from 30-year, 3 percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of "the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates."

Senator BYRD charges that the bond plan would mean "operating the Government on two sets of books: one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the (public) debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

He charges also that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11,500,000,000, or 55 cents on the dollar.

As an alternative, Senator BYRD proposes that the present 2-cents per gallon Federal gasoline tax be reduced to one-half cent, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility. Says Senator BYRD:

"States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11,500,000,000 interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

Senator BYRD's points become the more cogent with current proposals that the Tennessee Valley Authority and school facilities on a nationwide scale be financed with non-Government bonds given Government guaranties, but not counted in the public debt. Such financing would certainly open the door to limitless Government fiscal irresponsibility with ultimately disastrous consequences in inflation.

With inadequate highways, the Nation is caught in a costly and murderous traffic jam. But a solution more conservative than one that could end statutory control of public debt is required.

[From the Reno (Nev.) State Journal of January 21, 1955]

NEW BORROWING GIMMICK

By now people may be understandably confused concerning the new expenditures contemplated under the President's proposed 10-year highway program.

At one point the program is referred to as a $101 billion undertaking. At another point it's called a $50 billion project. Actually the confusion occurs because the contemplated new expenditures are lumped together with existing highway spending which would continue regardless of what happened to the President's plan.

As matters stand highway spending at all levels of government would total $47 billion in the next 10 years without reference to the President's proposal. But the President's plan calls for an additional $25 billion of federal spending in the next 10 years and an added $29 billion of spending by the States, cities and counties.

The Federal Government's $25 billion would be raised by bond issues to be retired by congressional appropriations. For bookkeeping purposes the bonds would not be considered a part of the public debt and therefore they would not bump into the statutory debt limit. But regardless of definition they certainly would be a public obligation as long as their retirement depended on congressional appropriations, and that's why Senator BYRD is skeptical.

The committee which conceived this scheme refrains from recommendations as to how State and local governments should go about raising their $9 billion. It is not clear whether the committee is being considerate of the States and cities or simply does not know what to propose.

The recourse open to the Federal Government in financial matters is not open at the lower levels of government. States, cities, and counties must deal in actual money raised by taxes. And this applies to the taxpayers who must pay the taxes. They cannot spend regardless of revenues as the Federal Government does and leave the rest to borrowing and inflation.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union-Leader of January 22, 1955]

AN UNSOUND EVASIVE PROGRAM

Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has sized up President Eisenhower's multibillion road program exactly, when he labeled it as unsound, a defiance of budget control, and an evasion of the Federal debt law.

This proposal drafted by an advisory committee is expected to be transmitted to Congress by the President. It suggests using $31 billion of Federal funds in a road program over a period of 10 years. Twenty-five billion would be employed to construct 40,000 miles of interstate highways. Of this amount, $20 billion would be sold by a Federal corporation in 30-year, Government-guaranteed bonds at 3-percent interest. The other $5 billion would be paid by fees, taxes on filling stations and motels, and by tolls. The remaining $6 billion of the thirty-one would go as highway aid to the States.

Meanwhile, the States would be asked to shell out $70 billion for the program—making a total of $101 billion. And the whole thing would be kept outside the Federal debt limit.

Senator BYRD has revealed that unsoundness of this proposal:

(1) He points out that 30-year bonds would cost the taxpayer more than $11½ billion. This would mean that every dollar borrowed eventually would cost $1.55. Meanwhile there is no assurance that the bonds would be paid off as they came due, which would mean that they would cost still more.

(2) The proposal to exclude the bonds from the regular Government debt figure is an outright deception. This is a game the Eisenhower administration is promoting today—to split Federal finances into two parts. One part would cover receipts and payments of social security and other trust funds, and capital items like the construction costs of post offices and office buildings—all of which would be left out of the budget. Thus a doorway would be opened to pile endless outlays on the taxpayer without giving them formal recognition.

The budget today is a crushing burden. One-fifth of the national income goes into Federal taxes. Yet President Eisenhower would add to this burden by establishing a method of Federal spending outside the budget. This would still add to the load on the taxpayer by a system of double bookkeeping. One set of books would be balanced, while the deficit was concealed in the other. The net result would be to wipe out the prospect of ever achieving a balanced budget. The Government has not paid off a single dollar on the Federal debt for 25 years and the Eisenhower administration now tries to invent a game of delusion whereby Federal extravagance can be multiplied. The whole affair surely is preposterous.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Evening Globe of January 28, 1955]

A BATTLE LOOMS

Echoes of one of the oldest conflicts of political opinion in the history of the United States are beginning to resound in Washington and throughout the country in the wake of President Eisenhower's proposed $101 billion ten-year highway building proposals. Deep division of views about what, in the days of Jefferson and Hamilton, used to be called "internal improvements" has appeared once more.

The essence of that ancient quarrel is not in the least mysterious. On the one side stand those who would bar the Federal Government from any domestic activity which the States are presumably able to handle themselves. On the other are alined those who insist that changed times require different approaches.

One of the oddities of this situation is that the project comes from an Administration strongly committed to taking the Federal Government out of State concerns. The President's program not only would boost spending $54 billion above the sums which the Congress normally would appropriate for Federal help in roadbuilding during the coming decade. It also would call upon local and State agencies "to chip in" $70 billion more.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, that would be 80 percent or $39 billion more than the 48 States contemplate spending in line with their present highway construction plans during the next decade. Just where they would acquire this sum, the Federal plan does not say, though official Washington believes the States "would meet the challenge."

Another little-noted fact is that the plan envisages the building of not a single mile of new highways. Those who picture great new transcontinental roads emerging at the end of a decade of construction are in error. The plan entails only the reconstruction and widening of the existing network of primary, secondary, and rural roads and municipal links in trans-State arteries.

Critics suggest that this, to the politically mature, amounts to a wholesale invitation to local extravangance. The Federal plan also grants special consideration to States willing to expand the building of toll roads. The American Automobile Association sees in this a step toward rapid reduction of free highways in America. They suggest that there be a restudy of the history of toll roads in this country during the early 19th century, when similarly bright expectations collapsed.

Perhaps the stiffest criticism comes from "States righters," such as Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, who says the President's program would "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade the Federal debt law." Senator BYRD insists that the proper way to speed modernization of our countrywide road system is for the Federal Government to get out of the gas-tax picture and let the States go ahead with the local tax margins thus returned to them.

There is a total of 3,366,190 miles of highways in the United States today. Over that system roll 56,279,864 registered cars of all types, carrying 89 percent of all farm products to market, 75 percent of all livestock, 90 percent of our milk supply, 94 percent of our vacationists and 63.5 percent of all workers going to their jobs.

Here assuredly is one of the half-dozen basic factors in America's day-to-day economy.

As an offset against depression, a "pump-priming public works plan," and as a planned easement of growing traffic problems, the administration's highway building project has plenty of supporters. The only certain fact about its prospects now is that it faces a fast and furious battle in the Congress.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

[From the Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel of January 18, 1955]

NEW HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Under the massive roadbuilding program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission on Highways, some $101 billion would be spent for modernization and expansion over a 10-year period by the Federal Government, States, and other levels of jurisdiction. Actually the committee recommends that the Federal Government take over virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system (abolishing the 60–40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program) and that it be financed by methods which are thoroughly unsound.

In the first place, how can we assume what we will need in 10 years? It is possible that the automobile as we know it now will be all but obsolete. The railroad and the waterway once provided all long-distance travel, and the need for the hard-top road did not come into being until comparatively recent years with the advent and growth of the automotive industry. New modes of travel are supplemented by the airplane, and who knows to what great position of strength it will have arrived in a decade? Moreover, as we grow, population shifts, and the impact on specific roads changes, and therefore our road needs shift and change. There is no such thing as a permanent road because no one can predict years in advance what roads will carry the most traffic.

Aside from this consideration, there is the question of raising roadbuilding funds. The committee has suggested that a portion of the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by the subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government were to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

If the Federal Government can borrow money for roads in this manner, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless projects. The Government would then be operating on 2 sets of books—1 for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control. But regardless of all attempts at camouflage or legerdermain, the obligations of the Federal Government and all its citizens still remain; the responsibility is still that of the taxpayer. And when the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, rightly brands the plan as one that violates financing principles, defies budgetary control, and evades Federal debt law. Further he states: "Based on all recent Federal experience, I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period. And it is certain that the system will be thousands of miles greater than contemplated in the committee report." Senator BYRD says that he has a plan, to be disclosed in detail momentarily, that will avoid increasing the public debt and preserve the soundness of the Federal budgetary system.

Another objection to the committee's Federal road program: every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States. Under the proposed plan, a Federal agency will determine the location of the interstate road system, will fix the number and location of access roads, will fix fees for filling stations, motels and restaurants located along the rights-of-way, and will control construction standards. Time and time again the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy has bent the States to its will because of Federal grants. And the unhealthy trend in this direction is evidenced by the fact that in 1934 the total of such grants was $126 million for 18 grants-in-aid programs; now the total of Federal grants is $3 billion for these programs.

The proposed highway program has served to set up a cry from other quarters for more Federal aid. For example, Dr. J. L. McCaskill, legislative director of the National Education Association, has asserted that President Eisenhower's highway-building program will discriminate against education unless similar help is provided for building schools. Pointing out that there is a 370,000-classroom shortage at the present time and that the NEA believes that $1 billion in Federal money will be needed annually in the next 5 years to make up the deficit, Mr. McCaskill said that he fears some States will use money for highways that should go to the schools if Federal highway grants are expanded greatly without commensurate aid for school construction. After President Eisenhower submits his 10-year highway program to Congress January 27, he will send another message 17 days later dealing with school problems. He has not indicated whether his recommendations will include Federal aid for construction.

Federal aid, as we have emphasized many times, is a misnomer inasmuch as the Government has no money except that which is extracted from the taxpayer in one way or another. In the unbalanced budget for the 1956 fiscal year, expenditures will continue to outpace revenues even with the continuance of present taxes. And the budget estimates of tax receipts are based on expectations of an $11,900,000,000 increase in personal income coupled with perhaps as much as a $4 billion rise in corporate profits. This could be long-range planning with undue optimism.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger of January 18, 1955]

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, one of the most respected authorities on fiscal matters in the Senate and head of the influential Senate Finance Committee, calls the President's money raising proposal "thoroughly unsound."

Senator BYRD pressed for incorporation of the highway program in the regular Federal budget so we can see what we're getting. He also forecast that eventually the taxpayers would pay a total of 55 percent interest on the 35-year highway bonds.

Schools all across the Nation are in a deplorable condition—classrooms are overcrowded, there aren't enough teachers to go around and it looks as if things will continue to get worse unless a lot of new money is allocated to new school buildings and higher teacher's salaries.

The military budget has been trimmed drastically, and the President expects the total cost of the military budget to be about $34 billion. And even this is only a hope since individual defense items actually add up to $35¾ billion. But Defense Secretary Wilson hopes to trim out the extra $1.75 billion.

There are many in Congress who question the wisdom of these defense cuts, and believe the administration is sawing off its sword in the interests of economy.

Foreign aid would be about $3.5 billion, of which about $1.3 billion would be economic aid, the rest military. There was no designation of where this money is slated to go but Asia presumably would be in for a large share of it.

Many observers feel that this is not enough to save Asia from communism, and that we might some day regret penny pinching. Foreign Operations Administrator Stassen wants a Marshall plan for Asia, but he has been overruled by budget cutting Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey.

Despite this clamor, in some quarters, for higher spending there is the accompanying clamor, sometimes in the same quarters, for lower taxes. President Eisenhower disclosed that tax relief for fiscal 1955 amounted to $7.5 billion but said that further relief this year was out.

Yet the national chamber of commerce has demanded lower taxes and meat-ax slashes in the Federal budget, and the Democrats are expected to press next year for a tax cut on individual income taxes.

It appears sometimes that nobody sees the contradiction between urging higher Government spending and demanding lower taxes.

What can be done?

For one thing, the Committee for Economic Development (CED) has urged some major changes in the way the Government frames the budget. It would have specific amounts in the budget allocated toward specific goals rather than to different departments, as is done now. It also has numerous other reforms designed to clarify the budget to make it easier to weigh programs against each other, and save money.

This seems to be a step in the right direction.

But there still exists the necessity for the American people to decide what specific

Government programs they want in preference to others, how much they want to spend and then to tax themselves accordingly.

We need new roads, we need new schools, we need continued investment capital, we need foreign aid and defense spending, we want a continuation of social services and veterans' aid—in short, we want practically everything.

But are we willing to pay for them? Or how much more do we want one than another?

Congress will make the decisions, but it will decide whatever it thinks the people want.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Morning Union of January 26, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

A proposal has been submitted to the administration by a committee appointed for the purpose of financing a multibillion-dollar national highway system. The recommended provisions have been attacked by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, as thoroughly unsound. Such criticism from a man of the stature of Senator BYRD deserves profound attention. One of the provisions of the report appearing especially obnoxious to him is that the bonds issued for the highway construction be not included in the regular Government debt figure, now approaching the new legal ceiling of $281 billion.

The purpose of this proposed exclusion appears obvious and reminds one of the more flamboyant New Deal theories such as the statement by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt decrying alarm over the skyrocketing public debt because "we owe it to ourselves." Pretending that the money is not owed by the expedient of keeping it off the official debt figures looks equally fallacious. As Senator BYRD says: "Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs. When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit."

The Senator declares such action would pave the way for endless outlays for building programs in education, hospitals, and public health, and would mean keeping two sets of books. "You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain," he says.

This program of high debt financing is scheduled to be submitted to Congress soon. It should be gone over with a fine-tooth comb, lest other undesirable provisions be contained in it.

[From the St. Joseph (Mich.) Herald-Press of January 20, 1955]

THOSE HIGHWAY BILLIONS

Most of us are as confused over the proposed 10-year highway program as we were in World War II when tire shortages and gasoline shortages were alternately assigned as the reason for A, B, and C stamps.

At one point the President's road program is referred to as a $101 billion undertaking. In the next breath it becomes half that much.

The confusion arises because the contemplated new expenditures are lumped together with existing highway spending that would continue regardless of what happened to the President's plan.

As matters stand today, highway spending at all levels of government would total $47 billion in the next 10 years without reference to the Presidential proposal.

Eisenhower suggests that the Federal Government chip in an additional $25 billion, and that the State and local governments add another $29 billion. This proposal, added to the $47 billion that would be spent normally, is the $101 billion grand blueprint.

The Federal Government would create a corporation, float its $25 billion in bonds and retire that debt by periodic appropriations from the Public Treasury. It is a bookkeeping device to get around the statutory debt limits in the law books that already has drawn the fire of Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia.

BYRD calls it a flim flam and even goes so far as to say that changing conditions make it impossible to spend very much into the future intelligently.

For what it may be worth it is interesting to note that toll roads play no outstanding role in the President's overall program. Washingtonian silence also covers the question of how the States and local governments could dig up $29 billion.

So far the only definite item in the planning stage concern primary roads. The cost to salvage or revamp the secondary network would leave Senator BYRD and all of us completely speechless.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune of January 27, 1955]

NATION NEEDS ROADS, MUST PAY FOR THEM

American highways are about 10 years and 20 million vehicles behind the times. Publicity and controversy about modern toll roads keep some of us from seeing how many other kinds of toll roads we have. For a few you have to pay, in money, each time you use them. For thousands of road people pay in delays, frustration, excess wear on vehicles. From time to time there's a tragic special assessment, in the form of an accident which takes a life, or injures someone, or causes damage to property.

Our highway inadequacies are an ill-kept military secret. Any foreign spy who has the stamina to drive or ride in or near a large center of population can file a report exposing our vulnerability on this point.

Last summer President Eisenhower outlined a 10-year road development plan. Gen. Lucius D. Clay was appointed chairman of a special committee which reported earlier this month. The President is scheduled to submit his highway plan recommendations to Congress today.

We need roads. Those who use them must expect to pay for them. Starting from these simple, generally accepted facts, we might expect agreement to an expanded highway plan would be almost automatic. In sober fact, powerful opposition has made itself known—not to highways, but to some suggested methods of financing them.

The American Automobile Association fears that the Clay committee report might mire the road work down in politics of the pork barrel variety. Its spokesman agreed with part of the report, but attacks its toll road suggestions. He sees danger in Federal reimbursement of States for toll roads which become sections of the future interstate network. He cannot find that the Clay committee has said a word about making toll roads free at some future time. Without such a requirement, he says, the motorists become captives of the bondholders.

Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, objects to a proposal to have a 30-year, 3 percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation. Bonds of that type, taxable like any others, but guaranteed by the Treasury, would not be included in the public debt. The Virginia Senator says this means two sets of books, and a repayment plan to absorb gasoline tax revenues for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987. Interest, over the years, would add up to 55 cents on the dollar.

As an alternative, Senator BYRD suggests that the Federal Government cut its gas tax demand from 2 cents a gallon to half a cent, giving the States an opportunity to add the difference to their gasoline tax. Then, he argues, the States could push right ahead with highway construction.

Taxpayers in States which have no toll roads won't be ecstatic about financing such money extractors for other States, particularly on a tolls-forever basis. The BYRD objections emphasize something every installment shopper knows—that fewer and larger payments cut the total interest cost amazingly. But it's difficult to imagine 48 States or even 36 of them boosting their gasoline taxes and pouring all that money into a unified, coordinated highway plan.

The basic thought of a few years of intensified highway building, to meet national needs, is too valuable to lose in disputes over debt accounting, States' responsibilities or trick clauses in toll road charters. Congress shouldn't find it difficult to correct any road program to meet these objections.

[From the Red Wing (Minn.) Republican-Eagle of January 20, 1955]

HOCUS-POCUS BOOKKEEPING

People sit up and notice when Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, takes issue with Government over financial matters. BYRD, who is a Democrat, made a name for himself during the 20 years of free-deal spending when he took his party and President to task time after time for questionable fiscal tactics. BYRD is one of those fellows who backs up his arguments with figures. And his figures, those who have questioned them have learned to their sorrow, will usually stand up under the most rigid examination.

Now Senator BYRD has attacked the money-raising formula proposed by President Eisenhower's highway committee for the so-called Interstate Highway System. He calls it thoroughly unsound. "Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law," he contends.

The Virginia Senator objects to the proposal for a Federal corporation which could issue $20 billion in Government bonds. Congress would have to appropriate the money to pay the principal and interest. He bitterly attacked the methods to be followed by the Federal Government in assuming virtually the complete obligation for the highway system. He called them "unique and so far as I know thoroughly unsound." When Senator BYRD says a financial deal is thoroughly unsound, most people who know him and his ways are apt to be a bit alarmed. He isn't given to talking through his hat.

He objected particularly to a proposal that the highway corporation bonds not be included in the regular Government debt figure, which is already pressing against the legal debt ceiling. He said it would mean operating the Government on two sets of books. Spending more than our income means we are adding to the debt, BYRD pointed out. The least Government can do, in fairness to the taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs, he said.

Senator BYRD says there is no way by which Government can avoid financial responsibility, nor cover up obligations by hocus-pocus bookkeeping. The Federal Government and all its citizens will still be responsible for debt incurred by any method. Strange, isn't it, that so many otherwise sensible people seem to think there is some method of accounting that will dodge those responsibilities.

[From the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger of January 10, 1955]

THE DOLLAR THAT COSTS $1.55

How would you like to pay $1.55 for a dollar bill?

That is what Senator BYRD says you will pay if the President's highway committee has its way in financing new highways.

Here is the background:

Because highways pretty much throughout the Nation are failing to keep up with the number of cars, and the size and speed of modern cars, the President properly appointed a National Advisory Committee for a National Highway program.

This committee, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, made two general recommendations:

1. That the Federal Government continue its present aid to highways at the current rate of $623 million a year; and

2. During the next 10 years spend an additional $25 billion—billion, that's right—for a so-called interstate highway system.

This means Federal costs of the 2 programs for 10 years would total $31 billion.

For financing the interstate highway program, the committee recommended the Government peddle 30-year taxable bonds sold at 3 percent interest to cover $20 billion of the cost and cover the remaining $5 billion from fees charged filling stations, motels, and so forth, on the interstate highways.

Senator BYRD, who has played an outstanding role in our Government, watching Federal costs, points out that if the proposed 30-year bonds are paid off on schedule at 3 percent interest—as proposed—the interest cost would be $11.5 billion. "At this rate," he says, "every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55."

The Senator adds, "Based on recent Federal experience, I submit it is a violent assumption to predict that these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase of the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period."

The Senator then adds that an even better way to build better and needed highways is possible. He recommends that the Federal gasoline tax (2c) be repealed so that the States can reimpose it; continue Federal aid to primary, secondary and urban roads; continue the lubricating oil tax, and impose a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline.

The Senator, in his statement, closes by saying he will supply still more detailed figures soon on what such a financing program could accomplish.

Certainly, all of us agree that still more adequate, safe and sensible highways are needed. Certainly, most of us in Missouri are proud of our own State's nonpolitical Highway Department and its 10-year program of highway and road modernization. And, certainly, all of us will await with interest further details on Senator BYRD's plan.

Dollars are the key to any road program, and any program costing $1.55 for the $1 spent is drastic, to say the least.

[From the Grand Island (Nebr.) Independent of January 21, 1955]

UNCLE SAM IN THE RED

There was nothing by way of surprise or shock in the budget submitted to Congress by President Eisenhower. Spending requirements, including those for national security which claim 65 cents of every dollar paid in by the American taxpayer, will again entail a deficit estimated by the President as less than that experienced in the current fiscal year, but still a deficit and still an unbalanced budget.

Mr. Eisenhower is experiencing the same difficulties in achieving a balanced budget that confronted his predecessor. He is discovering that it is one thing to talk about reducing taxes and balancing the budget, and something else entirely different to accomplish these objectives.

The demands continue. The requirements for purposes other than that of national security are not too burdensome. They, in fact, have taken a beating particularly in recent years because of the promises made to balance the budget and to reduce taxes; promises which filled the air in 1952.

This administration no longer can nor should fall back on the excuse that commitments made by previous administrations make it impossible to carry out its pledges. This administration now is on its own. We can anticipate, however, that the failure to achieve a balanced budget in the last year of the Eisenhower administration, and the impossibility of providing another tax cut may collide seriously with Mr. Eisenhower's international program. The pressure to terminate foreign aid is certain to mount. In Congress the cry arises that we have spent $40 billion to enable our friends in other sections of the world to regain their feet and to ride out the storm, and the time now has come to stop. That could prove the dominant note in discussion of any foreign-aid program.

In one other respect the President has placed himself in a difficult position to which Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia directed attention at week's end. The Virginian is opposed to the President's massive superhighway program. It contemplates the borrowing of billions by Uncle Sam to finance this network of superhighways, billions which shall not be computed as a part of the national debt. That is a strange line of reasoning which the Clay Commission has adopted. Senator BYRD's position makes sense. If that type of financing is to be adopted in connection with highway construction, then limitations by way of a ceiling on the national debt lose all significance.

We doubt that the public will become excited over the prospects of another year of an unbalanced budget and deficit spending. If recent years mean anything, the public will take it in stride.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of January 20, 1955]

THE CLAY HIGHWAY NETWORK; A PLAN OUT OF WONDERLAND

Concerning the Clay committee's proposals for a superhighway network to cover America, Virginia's Senator HARRY F. BYRD recently said:

"They violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law."

Today on this page Columnist Raymond Moley, the one-time New Dealer and longtime professor of public law at Columbia University, joins Senator BYRD in denouncing the scheme. We think the Moley piece should be required reading in Congress.

So far as the roads are concerned, the report of General Clay's committee presents a beautiful dream. Certainly everyone who drives could wish that such roads were in existence, or soon would be.

But the financing plan proposed in the report comes straight out of Wonderland.

The general idea is that a "Government corporation" would be formed, and would issue $2 billion worth of bonds each year for 10 years. These bonds would run for 30 years and, according to the estimate, would require payment of $11,500,000,000 in interest.

This "corporation" would have no money-making assets whatever.

It would be able to pay interest on the bonds, and retire them, only when, as and if it received the money from the United States Treasury. Thus the highway debt would in fact be indistinguishable from the rest of what the Government in Washington owes. But because of the "corporation" gimmick, this spending would not be included in the budget, nor would the $20 billon worth of bonds be included under the ceiling which Congress places on the national debt.

In other words, it's a scheme to farm out part of the Government's annual spending so it won't show on the books.

If it works in this case, Senator BYRD predicts it will be no time at all until similar systems of bogus bookkeeping are worked out to disguise deficit spending for "education, hospitals, public health, etc." That would seem to be a not unreasonable conclusion.

Mr. Moley recalls that similar tricky methods of financing were discussed in the Franklin Roosevelt administration, of which he was a member, but were abandoned because FDR "never quite summoned the audacity to propose them."

The scheme that was too hot for the New Deal is now proposed by an agency of the Eisenhower Administration—which took office only 2 short years ago on a balance-the-budget platform.

It should be borne in mind that this highway problem is not a 1-year crisis and will not be solved once and for all by the Clay plan or any other.

With 7 million cars or thereabouts pouring out of Detroit every year, and with the heavyweight trucks seemingly getting bigger and more numerous every year, America will never finish building highways.

If the Clay plan were adopted now, it would have to be followed 10 years hence by another plan to carry on from there. The net effect of Clay financing would be simply to transfer the cost of today's roads to the shoulders of some future generation—with interest charges added.

This newspaper yields to none in its admiration for good roads. If the network outlined in the Clay report can be built out of current tax revenues, with a balanced budget, we think it will be a grand thing for America.

But to pretend that highways can be built as a capital investment, and paid for on a "revenue bond" basis without charging tolls, is thoroughly dishonest. We hope President Eisenhower will categorically reject that plan when he presents his highway message to Congress next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4259.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to speak on H. R. 4259, a bill providing for a 1-year extension of the corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates. This bill was amended by the Senate Finance Committee by a vote of 9 to 6 to delete a $20 credit against individual income tax for each personal exemption.

The enactment of this legislation at this time in the form as modified by the committee is made necessary by reason of the state of the budget submitted by the President in January. Under the terms of this budget the Government is faced with a deficit of $4,504,000,000 for the fiscal year 1955 and $2,408,000,000 for the fiscal year 1956. The $2.4 billion deficit estimate for fiscal year 1956 was extremely conservative and based on arbitrary reductions in summary figures which may not be accomplished. The expenditure detail in the budget document adds to a deficit of $4.1 billion on the basis of present tax rates.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point two tables taken from the report of the committee on the bill now under consideration.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of effect of House and Finance Committee bills on receipts*

[In millions of dollars]

	In the fiscal year—			On a full year's basis	
	1955	1956			
	Both bills	Committee bill	House bill	Committee bill	House bill
Individual income tax $20 credit (House bill only)	0	0	−815	0	−2,093
Extension of 5 percentage points of corporation normal tax	0	1,075	1,075	1,750	1,750
Extension of certain excise taxes	191	889	889	1,080	1,080
Total	191	1,964	1,149	2,830	737

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE 2.—*Effect of the Finance Committee bill on the 1955 and 1956 budgets*

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—	
	1955	1956
Expenditures, including proposed legislation	63.5	62.4
Receipts, existing law only	58.8	57.7
Difference	−4.7	−4.7
Effect of extending corporate and excise tax rates as in committee bill:		
Increase in tax collection	+.2	[1] +2.0
Postponement of floor-stock refunds	0	[2] +.2
Budget deficit under existing law, adjusted for extension of rates	−4.5	[1] −2.5

[1] The budget estimate of the effect on revenue in the fiscal year 1956 of extending the corporate and excise tax rates is $100 million above the joint committee staff estimate. Using the budget figures would decrease the deficit shown by $100 million.

[2] These floor-stock refunds, without the extensions, might affect the 1955 instead of the 1956 budget. They, however, are shown as reported in the President's budget.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the first of these tables shows the effect of H. R. 4259 on receipts in the fiscal years 1955 and 1956 and in a full year of operation. This is shown for the bill as it passed the House and as the committee proposes to amend it. The second table shows the effect of the bill, as the committee proposes to amend it, on the 1955 and 1956 budgets.

The deficits of $4,504 million and $2,400 million take into account a further 1-year extension of the present corporate rate of 52 percent and a continuation for 1 year of the present rate of excise taxes on automobiles, trucks, auto parts, gasoline, Diesel and motor fuel, cigarettes, wines, beer, and liquor. If we do not extend these taxes at the present time, the estimated deficit for 1956, based on staff estimates of receipts, would be increased from $4.5 billion to $4.7 billion for 1955 and from $2.5 billion to $4.7 billion for 1956. This 1956 deficit might go as high as $6.4 billion if these corporate and excise taxes are not continued and if contingent reductions are not realized.

Mr. President, I am greatly disappointed that the present administration has not presented a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1956. On the other hand, it would be very unfortunate if any steps we take here would reverse the trend toward a balanced budget and provide for 1956 an estimated deficit slightly larger than is now expected for 1955. In a full year of operation these reductions, if allowed to take effect on April 1, 1955, would result in a loss of revenue of nearly $3 billion. The committee bill prevents the loss of this revenue by extending the corporate and excise rate increases for an additional year, namely, from April 1, 1955, to April 1, 1956.

The corporate income-tax rate without the 1-year extension provided by this bill would decrease as of this April 1 from 52 percent to 47 percent. The decrease would occur entirely in the normal tax rate, which would go down from 30 percent to 25 percent. This is the rate which applies to all corporate taxable income. The 22-percent surtax rate, which would remain unchanged, applies to income in excess of $25,000.

The excise-tax rates involved in the extension are shown in a table which I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Excise tax rates extended until Apr. 1, 1956 [1] *under both the House committee bills*

	Unit of tax	Rate extended for period from Apr. 1, 1955, to Mar. 31, 1956	Rate to become effective Apr. 1, 1956 [1]	Effect on revenue		
				Fiscal 1955	Fiscal 1956	Full year of operation
Liquor taxes:				*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
Distilled spirits	Per proof gallon	$10.50	$9	$38	$89	$127
Beer	Per barrel	$9	$8	21	64	85
Wine:						
Still wine:						
Containing less than 14 percent alcohol.	Per wine gallon	17 cents	15 cents			
Containing 14 to 21 percent alcohol.	do	67 cents	60 cents			
Containing 21 to 24 percent alcohol.	do	$2.25	$2			
Containing more than 24 percent alcohol.	do	$10.50	$9	3		10
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, cordials, etc.:						
Champagne or sparkling wine.	do	$3.40	$3			
Liqueurs, cordials, etc.	do	$1.92	$1.60			
Artificially carbonated wines.	do	$2.40	$2			
Tobacco taxes: Cigarettes	Per 1,000	$4	$3.50	46	139	185
Manufacturers' excises:						
Gasoline	Per gallon	2 cents	1½ cents	31	219	250
Passenger cars and motor cycles	Manufacturer's sale price.	10 percent	7 percent	37	263	300
Trucks, buses, truck trailers	do	8 percent	5 percent	7	53	60
Auto parts and accessories	do	do	do	7	49	56
Retailers' excises; diesel and special motor fuel.	Per gallon	2 cents	1½ cents	1	6	7
Total excises				191	889	1,080

[1] These rates were increased by the Revenue Act of 1951 and the increases were scheduled to terminate on Apr. 1, 1954. The Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 extended these rate increases to Apr. 1, 1955.

Source: Prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the committee bill follows the House bill in providing for the extension of the corporate and excise rates. However, the House bill went a step further and provided for a $20 credit against the individual in-

come tax for each personal exemption, effective January 1, 1956. This House provision, while having no effect upon the budget for the fiscal year 1955, would increase the deficit in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1956 by $815 million, and in a full year of operation would cause a loss in revenue of $2,093,000,000 under our staff estimates, and $2,300,000,000 under Treasury estimates. As much as I would like to see a tax reduction at this time, the present budgetary situation will not justify it.

I know the impossibility of running any business where the expenses are greater, over a long period, than the income. I believe that governments are much like people in this respect. The Government must make every effort to keep its books in balance and meet its obligations as they fall due.

In spite of any contention to the contrary, these are prosperous times. Our gross national product in 1954 was the second highest in our history. The worst that anyone has been able to say is that it was not as high in 1954 as in 1953. Yet even this understates our true prosperity because the trend is upward.

As I have already suggested, our gross national product was up from $355.5 billion in the third quarter of $362 billion in the fourth quarter of 1954, an increase of $6½ billion.

Personal consumption expenditures reached a new high of $234 billion for 1954, as contrasted to only $230 billion in 1953, the year which was supposed to represent the peak of our prosperity. The consumption figure of $234 billion should be of interest to those who have been suggesting that we especially need an increase in consumption expenditures. Moreover, the trend of these expenditures is upward. They have increased steadily from an annual level of about $230 billion in the fourth quarter of 1954.

Gross private investment, next to personal consumption expenditures, is one of the more important segments of our gross national product. As would be expected, these expenditures reached a peak in 1951 as a result of the Korean war. Since that time they have been tapering off. However, it is important to note that late in 1954 this trend appeared to be reversed. These expenditures in the fourth quarter, on an annual basis and seasonally adjusted, increased by over $4 billion.

Production also has been increasing, and here, where we have some evidence of conditions in January of 1955, the trend is still upward The Federal Reserve Board Index of industrial production has shown constant improvement since this last August At that time it stood at 123. By January of this year it had risen to 131.

While overall price stability has been attained in the past 2 years, it is necessary to be alert to the danger of further inflation. The brevity and mildness of the 1954 adjustment and the vigor of the recent recovery suggest the power of the underlying forces of economic expansion. The possibility of inflation is particularly dangerous in times of unbalanced budgets and especially when tax reductions are made in periods of deficit financing without accompanying reductions in Government expenditures. I believe the inflationary effect of deficit financing is strikingly illustrated by a comparison of the effect of the Federal deficits in the recent past with the shinking purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. President, I have had compiled from official figures from the Library of Congress a table showing deficit spending by years since 1940. The table also shows the fall in the purchasing power of the dollar from 1940 through 1954. I ask unanimous consent to have that table reprinted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Purchasing power of the dollar as measured by index 1935-39=100	Fiscal year deficits (−) or surpluses (+) in billions
1940	99.8	−$3.6
1941	95.1	−5.1
1942	85.8	−19.6
1943	80.8	−55.8
1944	79.6	−49.6
1945	77.8	−53.9
1946	71.7	−22.0
1947	62.7	+.7
1948	58.2	+8.4
1949	58.8	−1.8
1950	58.2	−3.1
1951	53.9	+3.5
1952	52.7	−4.0
1953	52.3	−9.4
1954	52.1	−3.1

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the table shows that the purchasing power of the American dollar fell 10 cents in the 1 year from 1941 to 1942. In that year there was deficit spending of $19 billion. In the 1 year from 1945 to 1946 the purchasing power of the American dollar went down 6 cents. In that year there was deficit spending of $53 billion. The figures in the table are comparative figures, and show the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar in each year as compared with the deficit spending in that year.

The table shows that, beginning with 100-cent dollars in 1939, the purchasing power of the dollar dropped to 52 cents in 1954. During the same period our cumulative deficit was $218 billion. These deficits were a principal reason for the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar by nearly 50 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the public debt for selected years from 1915 to 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public debt of the United States, for selected years, from 1915 to 1956

[In millions of dollars]

1915	1,191
1920	24,299
1925	20,516
1930	16,185
1935	28,701
1940	42,968
1943	136,696
1945	258,682
1946	269,422
1948	252,292
1950	257,357
1952	259,105
1954	271,260
1955 (estimated)	[1] 274,300
1956 (estimated)	[1] 276,000

[1] Reflects extensions of corporate and excise rates but not $20 tax-cut proposal.

Source: The Federal Budget in Brief, fiscal year 1956, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I point out that in 1915 we had a debt of $1,191,000,000. From that point we have gone to a debt of nearly $280 billion. Under the law, the debt is required to be reduced to $276 billion by June 30 of this year.

I do not contend that deficits are the only cause of inflation; nor do I mean to imply that we will necessarily be faced with strong inflationary pressures next year. However, the Nation is now enjoying a sound and expanding prosperity. Its rapid recovery in 1954 indicates its resilience. In such a situation an unsound or premature tax cut, irrespective of the amount of the cut, may be the factor that tips the scales toward inflation. With the budget already showing a sizable deficit, no one can be sure which additional billion may be the straw the breaks the camel's back.

The harmful effects of an unwise tax cut would arise not only from its direct but also from its indirect repercussions. This $20 tax-cut proposal is dangerous, not only because of the dollar loss in revenue involved but also because it would be a symbol of a reversal of the effort to cut deficits and work toward a balanced budget.

Mr. President, I have never thought, as my record will show, that we should borrow money in order to reduce taxes. I think that is fiscal folly of the first magnitude. It would be a symbol that we had abandoned the principles of sound finance, and would be accepted by the country as evidence of a drift into slackness in our financial affairs.

No one today can predict with any certainty what the status of the economy or the revenue needs will be 1 year from now. If we put a tax-reduction requirement on the books now, we will be committing ourselves almost a year in advance to a reduction in revenue, and subsequent events may show that the Government cannot afford this. If next year we had to reverse the stand that some would have us take today, it would undoubtedly be contended commitments had been made on the basis of the legislation passed this year. Then we would be in a position of taking away the tax relief we grant, should we adopt the House proposal.

The proposed $20 tax reduction would amount to 38 cents a week for each individual exemption claimed for income-tax purposes.

For such an income tax reduction advocates of the proposal would increase annual Federal deficits, on a full year basis, by approximately $2¼ billion, add the same amount to the Federal debt,

and increase the requirement for taxes to pay interest on the debt increase at the rate of 2½ percent compounded annually.

The interest on the Federal debt is already costing $6.4 billion. This is more than 10 percent of total Federal expenditures; it is approximately 11 percent of all the revenue collected, and it is 130 percent of the estimated deficit.

We have been on a deficit financing basis for 23 of the past 26 years. In these 23 years we have spent more than $900 billion—nearly a trillion dollars; we have collected in taxes and other receipts about $675 billion; we have added approximately a quarter of a trillion dollars in the Federal debt.

The present administration, in its third year has failed to balance the budget, just as the two preceding administrations spent more than they collected. And the end of deficits is not yet in sight.

We of this generation are trustees for the future. Personally I am disturbed by repeated efforts to use this trusteeship temporarily to gain for ourselves a few cents a week in a time of relatively high prosperity at tremendous expense to future generations for whom we cannot assure continuing high prosperity.

There is no doubt about the fact that taxes are too high. They should be reduced. But we cannot reduce taxes by deficit financing and remain solvent.

Legitimate and sound tax reduction can be accomplished only by reducing Federal expenditures. This can be done if there is the will to do it, and it can be done in sufficient amount without impairment of a single essential function of government.

As a Member of the Senate, and as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I advocate responsible tax reduction. I am opposing all tax reductions unless they are made fiscally sound by sufficient reduction in expenditures.

Our taxes are burdensome, but we would merely increase the burden by borrowing money to reduce them.

Another tax reduction now with borrowed money, such as was made last year, is simply higher taxes deferred.

Sooner or later, one way or another, the American people must pay the colossal debt we are incurring. New tax reduction debt makes it even more colossal.

We are mortgaged to the hilt. We have a direct Federal debt of $280 billion. In addition to this we have a contingent debt of another $250 billion.

The $280 billion direct debt is equivalent to the full value of all the land, all the buildings, all the mines, all the machinery, all the livestock—everything of tangible value—in the United States.

It should be the considered judgment of everyone of us that the Federal debt should not be increased except for extreme national emergency. To increase the Federal debt by the sum of $2,250,000,000 a year for a 38-cent-a-week tax reduction just does not make sense.

This Nation has been through many wars, and after each of them, except World War II, we have discharged at least part of the debt incurred for our defense.

But after World War II we have continued to borrow and add to the Federal debt. Now, 10 years after the conclusion of World War II, we are still borrowing.

We should never be misled by academic stargazers who contend that public debt is unimportant when we owe it to ourselves. I do not know of any owners of Government bonds who do not expect the Government to pay off on them when the maturity date arrives.

Public debt is not like private debt.

When individuals default on private debt they are foreclosed and their assets are liquidated.

When public debt is not paid off in taxes, liquidation takes the form of disastrous inflation or national repudiation. Our form of government cannot survive either.

The continuing toboggan of the purchasing power of our dollar which, through the year just ended, has dropped more than 25 percent since the end of World War II, demonstrates our progress along this primrose path.

We may regard these facts and figures lightly if we choose, but the loss of half the purchasing power of our money in 24 years, and 25 percent of it in the last 10 years, should be a serious warning to any nation.

The United States Government now represents the greatest fiscal operation in the history of the world. The management of our national financing should be a sobering responsibility. It is vital to the security of every individual in the United States, and the collective security of the free world. I sincerely hope it will never be exploited for political advantage.

We must act and act promptly on the bill before us, as the Finance Committee has reported it, to prevent the Government from losing over $1 billion in revenue from the termination of the existing excise rates as of the first of this April, and another $2 billion from the termination of the 5 percent corporation income tax. We must act now to prevent an increase in the national deficit and a corresponding increase in the national debt.

I believe my position with respect to the present budget deficits is well known. I have been deeply disappointed that we have been unable to make better headway toward a balanced budget. I can say, however, that in my opinion the estimated reduction in budget deficits is a step in the right direction. Approval of the House individual income tax reduction, however, would reverse this trend. If we cannot now move toward a balanced budget and achieve it in the near future, when we are at peace, when there is no war, and when we are at or near the highest income levels in our history, what prospect have we of ever balancing it?

In times like these, an increase in the debt as a result of a tax reduction, such as the proposed $20 tax cut, is an admission of failure. It is an acceptance of perpetual deficit financing, and an admission that we are on the road to a larger and larger debt, the burden of which will be on our children and our children's children.

I hope the Senate will pass the bill reported by the Committee on Finance, which has deleted the $20-per-taxpayer cut adopted by the House of Representatives. Reporting the bill as amended by the committee was approved unanimously with certain Members reserving their right to offer amendments or to change their positions. The House $20-reduction amendment was rejected by the Committee on Finance by a vote of 9 to 6.

I hope the action taken by the Senate Committee on Finance will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 9, 1955, addressed to me by Under Secretary of the Treasury M. B. Folsom. The letter states that if the excise taxes are permitted to expire on March 31, there will be a loss of $191 million in revenue from floor stocks, because the law now provides that all revenue from floor stocks shall be refunded in case the tax shall expire. Let me emphasize that the $191 million could not be recovered.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 9, 1955.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In accordance with our telephone conversation yesterday, I am giving you the figures on the revenue loss from floor stock refunds which would occur if the excise-tax rates are not extended by March 31. These are our estimates of the amounts involved:

	Hundreds of millions of dollars
Alcohol	132
Tobacco	19
Automobile, trucks, and parts	39
Gasoline	1
Total	191

Refunds on floor stocks will be due even if the rate reductions are effective only momentarily.

Also, on the basis of average collections, calculated on a 5-day business week, there would be an estimated daily loss of revenue of $4,007,000 for each day the lower rates are in effect. The detail of this loss is:

Alcohol	$823,000
Tobacco	702,000
Gasoline	922,000
Automobile, trucks, and parts	1,536,000
Diesel fuel	24,000
Total	4,007,000

A temporary reduction of rates would probably involve daily losses several times greater than the foregoing average figures, except in the case of gasoline and diesel fuel where storage problems are serious. Prospective buyers of the other products would doubtless concentrate their purchases in a brief period when rates were low. This would not only increase the revenue loss, it would also lead to erratic and confusing fluctuations in sales and inventories.

These revenue losses would be permanent and irretrievable if the rates are not extended by March 31. I am advised that there would be constitutional problems involved in any effort to abrogate by subsequent legislation the floor stock refunds or

to apply the higher rates to interim sales, even if it were desired to do so.

With best personal wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at a later time I intend to discuss the bill and also the so-called substitute which will be offered. However, I did not want this opportunity to pass without rising to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], because I am sure it is well recognized not only in this Chamber but throughout the country, that he has, during the entire period of his service in the Senate, believed in a sound fiscal policy in the Nation's economy and in the Government's operations. The Senator from Virginia has favored the Government's being, as nearly as it was possible to be, on a pay-as-you-go basis, save and except when the Nation's life itself might be endangered in time of war or imminent threat of war. So I think the distinguished Senator has the respect of the Senate and of the country, and I commend him for his remarks today, which I believe to be sound.

The Committee on Finance has reported a bill which is now in the form as originally proposed by the administration, by continuing the corporate and excise tax levies which otherwise would expire on March 31. I think nothing should be done in the bill which would tend to complicate that simple proposition. I believe that the amendment to be proposed to the bill might very well jeopardize the measure from becoming law on April 1.

The Senator from Virginia has pointed out what the loss of revenue would be. I also wish to call to the attention of the Senate the unfortunate fact that, even with existing revenues, and if no new expenditures were made by Congress over and above the amount requested in the budget, the estimated deficiency from the loss of revenue would obviously increase the deficit.

In view of the fact that not a single regular appropriation bill for the coming fiscal year has been cleared by either the House or the Senate, it would seem to be the height of unwisdom to proceed at this time to reduce the revenue which would otherwise go into the Federal Treasury.

There may be objection on the part of some persons to the tax reductions which took place in the last Congress. The difference, however, between the two situations—and I think the Senator from Virginia will bear me out—is that Congress and the administration had brought about a reduction in the cost of the operations of the Government by some $10 billion, and had passed on to the taxpayers about $7 billion of that amount. That was done at a time when there were dire predictions on the part of even some of our colleagues of a major recession or depression, which they believed was in the offing. Such a recession has not taken place. To the contrary, as the distinguished Senator from Virginia has pointed out, both 1953 and 1954 were years of the highest gross national product in our country's history.

If there was any such danger, perhaps adjustments in the tax laws last year, which were made under the circumstances I have stated, namely, that Congress and the administration had reduced expenditures and had provided a reduction in the tax levy, would be justified. That condition does not prevail as of now.

I shall have further remarks to make later on the subject, but I desired to pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the views of the six Democratic members of the Senate Finance Committee on H. R. 4259.

There being no objection, the views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWS OF SIX DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON H. R. 4259

INTRODUCTION

Those of us who are signing this report find ourselves in basic disagreement with the present national administration on a fundamental point of national policy—the distribution of the tax burden among our people.

The issue can be drawn clearly and briefly.

The present administration believes that tax policy should be shaped in such a manner as to encourage vast accumulations of capital on the theory that if the top is prosperous, some share of the prosperity will trickle down to others.

In contrast, it is our belief that the national interest is best served by tax policies which insure individual Americans maximum possible purchasing power—the most potent force in shaping an America in which all our people will be prosperous.

The conflict between these two philosophies is the only point truly at issue in our effort to secure a tax reduction for individual taxpayers—wealth in the hands of a few; purchasing power in the hands of many. We take our stand on the side of increased purchasing power and an expanding economy.

BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

It is true that the present administration has seen fit to interpret this issue in terms of balancing the budget. But it is difficult to consider such arguments seriously in light of the same administration's actions when it assumed the initiative in tax legislation in 1954.

Actions frequently speak louder than words. If that axiom is valid, it is apparent that the present administration considers a tax reduction fiscal irresponsibility only when it accrues to the benefit of low-income wage earners.

Early in 1954, the present administration forecast a 1955 fiscal year deficit of $2.9 billion. This was clearly and unmistakably a deficit, differing from the deficit which now leads the administration to oppose a tax cut in only one respect—it was $500 million greater.

And yet, the deficit forecast for fiscal 1955 did not prevent the administration from embracing a tax-reduction bill in which 77 percent of the immediate relief and 91 percent of the long-term relief went to corporations and large income earners.

It was not considered fiscal irresponsibility to deprive the Treasury of $362 million in annual revenues by extending special benefits to those whose incomes are derived from dividends.

It was not considered fiscal irresponsibility to deprive the Treasury of one to two billion dollars a year in revenue for a period extending 18 years into the future by granting large corporations rapid depreciation benefits.

These provisions were not approved through mere inadvertence. They were enacted over the vigorous protests of the then minority which presented an alternative plan that would have granted the greater part of the tax relief to the lower-income brackets which stood in the greatest need.

On this basis, it is fair to assume that the present administration regards fiscal responsibility as that state of affairs in which the rich get richer and the poor are expected to balance the budget.

Despite this precedent, however, we have no intention of emulating the casual disregard toward the problem of budget balancing displayed by the present administration in 1954. We recognize that this is not merely an academic issue and we intend to deal with it responsibly and squarely.

There is nothing mutually exclusive about the two concepts which should be considered by responsible legislators—the need of our wage earners for tax relief and the need of our budget for balancing. Prudent consideration of the elements which go into each problem will lead to a solution for both.

To this end, we advance three points for the thoughtful consideration of our colleagues:

1. The stimulus to our economy and the resultant creation of revenue-producing wealth that will follow a tax reduction designed to increase purchasing power among individual Americans.

2. The need for a reexamination of the benefits that were granted to large-income earners and corporations in the 1954 tax bill under the theory that these benefits would grant a few individuals more money to invest in economic expansion.

3. The inadequacy of the administration's present (and only revenue-producing) proposal which would extend current excise taxes on such items as whiskey, champagne, cigarettes, and automobiles for only 12 additional months from April 1, 1955.

EFFECTS OF A TAX REDUCTION UPON THE ECONOMY

We are not wedded irrevocably to tax reduction in the form approved by the House of Representatives but we are in full accord with the spirit that motivated the House majority. We interpret the House action as a desire to do justice to those who were bypassed last year when tax relief was given chiefly to corporations and taxpayers in the upper income brackets.

However, justice, though a compelling motive, is not the sole basis of our case. It is our deep-seated conviction that a tax reduction granted to those in need of relief would have beneficial effects upon our economy, bolster the trends toward prosperity, and strengthen our Nation.

The evidence from every quarter indicates that such strengthening is needed.

We are not implying—directly or indirectly—that a tax reduction is necessary to ward off a depression. We know of no one who has forecast such a state of affairs. Neither do we intend to enter the arena of semantic debate over such phrases as "recession" or "rolling readjustment." Such phrases engender considerable heat but shed little light upon the problem before us.

But it takes neither a crystal ball nor profound economic analysis to determine that there are "soft spots" in our economy. These "soft spots" amount to unemployed workers and unemployed machinery.

The science of economics is far from exact. But one statement can be taken as a truism. It is that unemployed workers and unemployed machinery produce no wealth and

consequently no revenue either for the Government or for private individuals. It is equally a truism to state that both workers and machinery will remain unemployed unless there is a market for the goods which they jointly produce.

The numbers of the unemployed are far below the frightening levels of the 1929 depression. But this is cold comfort to the Kentucky miner or the Georgia textile worker or the Oklahoma farmer facing the problem of economic survival for himself and his family.

Furthermore, the unemployed worker represents a drag on the entire economy. In addition to his own problems, his jobless status restricts his participation in the consumer's market. He cannot buy and therefore others cannot sell. And when "others" cannot sell, they tend to dump new workers into the ranks of the unemployed.

We cannot agree with the attitude of the present administration which appears to be that the problem of unemployment is so insignificant it can be ignored.

The current trends are disturbing. Full-time unemployment in 1954 was double the level of 1953. Furthermore, 1954 witnessed a vast increase in "part-time" unemployment—a factor difficult to measure but as dangerous to the economy as permanent joblessness.

The statistics of recent months are not encouraging. The latest figures show that unemployment in January, 1955, was a quarter of a million greater than during the corresponding month of 1954. The experts hold forth no hope for a significant upsurge in employment during the next few months.

Aside from the human tragedy involved in unemployment, there is also the factor of waste. Within that factor can be found some of the elements that are now contributing toward an unbalanced budget. Employed workers have the purchasing power that maintains the business activity that balances a budget. Unemployed workers are the drain on our economy that slows business activity and helps to unbalance the budget.

The case was stated very well by the ranking minority member of the Senate Finance Committee in 1954 when he said on the floor of the Senate:

"How are we to balance the budget unless we have an economy that will enable the people of the Nation on a per capita basis to pay for the products of the mills and factories? * * * In this America, in this free economy, have we become so accustomed to luxury and extravagant spending and living that we cannot see the long arm of the tax gatherer as it descends into the breadbasket of the poor in this country?"

We are in full agreement with this attitude toward budget balancing. The budget cannot be balanced unless our people have the purchasing power to keep business activity at high levels. There can be no argument with the proposition that the best way of stimulating that purchasing power is to grant tax relief to the lower-income brackets—the people who are the most likely to translate their increased income into increased consumption.

We know of no direct method of measuring increased purchasing power in terms of Government revenues. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that such an effect exists.

Furthermore, we do not intend to dispute contentions that reductions thus far proposed may possibly be inadequate to the problem. We do know that the proposals are a step in the right direction and we would rather walk in the right direction than stand still.

REEXAMINATION OF BENEFITS TO LARGE INCOME EARNERS AND CORPORATIONS

We do not intend to decry the value of incentives to investment in new facilities at a time when demand has outstripped production. Nevertheless, we believe that there are a number of benefits granted to corporations and large income earners in the 1954 tax bill which could well bear reexamination.

At this point, we will consider only three, without foreclosing the right to examine others at any time.

Rapid depreciation: This was probably the most important concession to large business in the 1954 tax bill and yet it is doubtful whether the implications were fully appreciated at the time. According to the tax report of the House Ways and Means Committee, H. R. 8300, 83d Congress, 2d session, page B–13, it amounts to a net revenue loss of $19.5 billion for an 18-year period, over what we would have lost had customary instead of accelerated depreciation been used. The loss is distributed as follows:

Fiscal year 1956: $1.05 billion.
Fiscal year 1957: $1.55 billion.
Fiscal year 1958: $1.9 billion.
Fiscal year 1959: $2.1 billion.
Fiscal year 1960: $2.2 billion.
Fiscal year 1961: $2.15 billion (from this point to the end of period the revenue loss declines).

We are implying no commitment on the principle of depreciation no matter how rapid. We recognize that all of this loss cannot be recovered completely without committing an act of bad faith—especially in the first 2 years. But if the choice must be between tax benefits for corporations and tax relief for individual citizens, the decision of the 1954 tax bill should, in our opinion, be reexamined.

Dividend credit and dividend exclusion: These provisions of the 1954 tax bill will cost the treasury $362 million per year for an indefinite period. Again, we imply no final commitment on the principle involved but are constrained to note from the standpoint of public policy, there might well be a reexamination of the justice of granting benefits to those whose income comes from dividends while withholding relief from those in the low-wage bracket.

Reserves against future business expenses: Through inadvertence, section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 permits the establishment of reserves against future business expenses and their immediate charge-off against current income. The repeal of this provision would save the Treasury at least $1 billion this year.

INADEQUACY OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S CURRENT PROPOSAL

Despite the administration's professed anxiety over balancing the budget, it has only advanced one revenue measure to achieve that end. It is to extend the current rates on excise and corporate taxes an additional year beyond April 1, 1955 (next month), to bring in additional revenue of $2.8 billion.

This seems to confront Congress with the alternatives of letting the taxes expire now or extending them in such a way as to renew the tax fight in an election year.

We are in agreement with extending the current rates. However, we do not think the proposal goes far enough. It is obvious that a simple extension in time will maintain Government revenues at higher levels and that there is no necessity to permit present rates to lapse on April 1, 1956.

To argue that this is legislating for the future would come with poor grace from those who so cheerfully welcomed rapid depreciation proposals extending forward for 18 years.

CONCLUSIONS

1. There is ample basis in justice and economics for an equitable tax adjustment at this time designed to help low-income earners and to stimulate our economy. At the very least, it would correct the injustice that was done to individual citizens through the inequitable tax bill of 1954.

2. A tax reduction to those in low-income brackets would stimulate the economy and increase revenue-producing wealth. To that extent, it would tend toward—rather than away from—a balanced budget.

3. The tax bill of 1954 should be reexamined carefully to remove the inequities which favored corporations and large-income earners at the expense of low-wage earners.

4. Consideration should be given to extending the present corporate and excise rate to a date beyond April 1, 1956—the termination date for the administration's present proposal.

ROBERT S. KERR.
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
RUSSELL B. LONG.
GEORGE A. SMATHERS.
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the statement just presented there be printed in the RECORD two charts prepared by the same members of the committee.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVENUE EFFECT OF NEW PROPOSAL (IN TERMS OF FISCAL YEARS), WITHOUT CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL EXTENSION OF EXCISE AND CORPORATE TAX RATES AND REPEAL OF EXPENSE RESERVE PROVISION

1. Repeal rapid depreciation provisions effective March 9, 1955:

Savings effected in fiscal year:	
1956	$175,000,000
1957	900,000,000
1958	1,450,000,000

2. Repeal dividend credit and exclusion provision effective July 1, 1955:

In millions of dollars.

	Liability	Receipts
Savings effected in fiscal year:		
1956	362	181
1957	362	362

3. Effective January 1, 1956, provide a $20 tax credit for each taxpayer, with none for spouse, plus a $10 credit for all dependents other than spouses, effective only to the extent that the credit exceeds any advantage obtained by income-splitting benefits.

[In millions of dollars]

	Liability	Receipts
Cost in fiscal year:		
1956	454	353
1957	908	908

4. Net fiscal effect of changes in:

[In millions of dollars]

	Liability	Receipts
Fiscal year—		
1956: Gross savings	537	356
Tax credit cost	454	353
Net savings	83	3
1957: Gross savings	1,262	1,262
Tax credit cost	908	908
Net savings	354	354

TAX PROPOSAL SPONSORED BY SIX DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

1. A tax deduction effective January 1, 1956, of $20 for each taxpayer (excluding spouse), plus a $10 deduction for each de-

pendent other than spouse, to the extent only that the credit exceeds any advantage obtained by income-splitting benefits.

2. Repeal of the accelerated depreciation provision of the 1954 tax bill, effective March 9, 1955.

3. Repeal of the dividend credit and dividend exclusion provisions of the 1954 tax bill, effective July 1, 1955.

(The above provisions authorize a tax cut and more than offset the resultant revenue losses with revenue savings. The following provisions complete the overall proposal.)

4. An extension of current corporate and excise tax rates to July 1, 1957.

5. Repeal of the "error" in the 1954 tax bill which permits the establishment of reserves for future business expenses and their charge-off against current income.

Effect of the proposal on the Nation's budget picture to July 1, 1957

[In millions of dollars]

	Liability	Receipts
1. Tax deduction	[1] 1,362	1,261
2. Repeal of accelerated depreciation provisions	[2] 1,075	1,075
3. Repeal of dividend credit and exclusion	[2] 724	543
4. Corporate and excise rate extension (in addition to administration's current proposal)	[2] 3,537	[3] 3,537
5. Repeal of "error" in 1954 tax bill (minimum estimate)	[2] 1,000	1,000
Gross revenue savings	6,336	6,155
Less tax deduction	1,362	1,261
Net revenue savings	4,974	4,894

[1] Revenue loss.
[2] Revenue savings.
[3] Actual receipt figure not yet available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in explaining the charts. First, the proposal presented would repeal the depreciation provisions and the dividend credit and exclusion provisions of the act of 1954, and the repeal of those 2 provisions would result in a gain of $1,618,000,000 for the Federal Treasury by July 1, 1957. With that $1,618,000,000 gain, Mr. President, we propose to extend relief to the extent of $20 for each taxpayer, excluding spouse, plus a $10 deduction for each dependent. That would result in an expenditure of $1,261,000,000 between now and July 1, 1957, leaving a net gain as a result of repealing the depreciation and dividend provisions of $357 million for the Treasury.

In addition, Mr. President, we propose to offer an amendment to extend the corporation and excise taxes until July 1, 1957, and to repeal the error in the 1954 tax bill.

Before the day is over, I hope to send to the desk certain amendments, and ask that they lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Revenue" and insert "Tax Rate Extension."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jackson	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Clements	Knowland	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Langer	Thurmond
Daniel	Lehman	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Douglas	Magnuson	Welker
Duff	Malone	Wiley
Dworshak	Mansfield	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Young
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	
Frear	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and five other members of the Senate Finance Committee, I am proposing certain amendments to H. R. 4259.

These amendments would repeal the accelerated depreciation and the dividend credit and exclusion provisions of the 1954 act. This would amount to a revenue gain of $1.618 billion during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957.

The amendments would also provide a tax deduction of $20 for every taxpayer—excluding spouse—and a $10 deduction for each of his dependents. This tax deduction would cost the Treasury $1.261 billion during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957.

Consequently, the revenue raising measures would pay for the tax cut, and at the end of fiscal 1957, there would be a $357 million surplus to apply to budget balancing.

In addition to these provisions, the amendments would repeal section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This is the "error" which—unless corrected—will cost the Treasury somewhere in the neighborhood of one billion dollars this year.

We also intend to amend sections 2 and 3 of the bill to extend the corporate and excise rates to July 1, 1957. This would bring the Treasury additional revenue of $3.537 billion over and above the administration's proposal.

I realize that there is a possibility that the administration will attempt to correct the error, and could possibly recommend the extension of the excise and corporate taxes. But I see no reason for not doing so now, particularly since it would remove the next decision on excise and corporate rates into 1957—a nonelection year.

Mr. President, I send the proposed amendments to the desk, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I joined with five of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the Finance Committee in submittting minority views with respect to House bill 4259, which is now before the Senate.

The levying and collecting of taxes is one of the most important and far-reaching of the functions of government. It is an operation justified to the extent that the national welfare and the national security require it.

It was said in the early days of the Republic that the power to tax is the power to destroy. The long history of legislation in the Congress of the United States has demonstrated the accuracy of that statement. The power to tax, if used wisely, meets the requirements of government and builds the economy. If it is used unwisely, it creates discrimination and injustice, and produces harmful effects which are unjustified in the exercise of the necessary power and function of taxation.

There could be no better example of two philosophies of taxation than can be found in the bill now before the Senate.

In the minority views my colleagues and I are entirely in accord with extending the excise and corporate taxes as provided in the bill, at least for the period of time specified in the bill. However, we feel that the extension is inadequate and that, from the standpoint of constructive operation of governmental functions and responsibility, these taxes should be extended for a longer period of time.

There is not a member of the Committee on Finance who does not know that the budget of the Government in the next 2 fiscal years will need the amount of money to be raised by the extension of excise and corporate taxes, or the necessity will exist to find other means with which to replace such revenue.

We know that next year is an election year. We believe it would be wise at this time to eliminate the necessity of coming back next year with another proposal again to extend corporate and excise rates into the future beyond April 1956. Therefore we believe that that responsibility should be met today.

We were in accord with the spirit of the action taken by the House of Representatives in its bill in providing tax relief for the low-income groups. There was not complete agreement among us on whether the specific measure passed by the House was the one best calculated to do what we feel the Government is now in a position to do. However, we are not afraid to meet our responsibility in taking action which we believe is indicated and necessary and justified and equitable.

Accusations have been made in high places that the Democratic leadership in Congress does not have the courage to do certain things. The Democratic leadership and membership in Congress—and, thank God, many of the Republican Members of Congress also—have the courage this year, as they did last year, to face the responsibility of determining what is equitable as between the various groups of taxpayers in

our country. I submit it requires as much courage to do justice as between all the taxpayers as it does to decide what form the courageous act shall take, and when it will be performed.

Therefore, in view of the fact that there is before Congress a proposed extension of certain taxes, and in view of the further fact that now, in 1955, we have had an opportunity to study the operation of various sections of the 1954 act, we feel we should face our responsibility with courage and to do justice as between the various taxpayers of the Nation. So we bring to Congress suggestions which we believe will correct some of the inequities of the act of 1954, and do equity and justice in 1955.

Figures which have just been released by the Government indicate an increase in unemployment in February as compared to January, 1955. Figures from the same Government source disclose that there was nearly twice as much unemployment in 1954 as in 1953, and that there was a substantial increase in unemployment between January 1954 and January 1955. The same Government sources disclose that a considerable percentage of our total national industry and productive capacity is idle.

Thus we are confronted with these realistic facts: Between 5 and 10 percent of our labor force is unemployed. If my memory serves me correctly, nearly 10 percent of our productive capacity is idle.

Yet we still have on the statute books provisions in the act of 1954 which give a bonus and a premium to the building of more production facilities. We call it accelerated depreciation, or amortization.

Such a provision was included in a previous revenue act, which had for its purpose meeting the requirement of increased production during the war effort. Certainly there could be no serious objection to a law which provided an incentive on the part of industry to increase industrial productive capacity with respect to the equipment and material we needed during the war effort to the point where we could produce the goods our people needed and provide an adequate supply of such material and at the same time avoid excessive inflation. In fact, there would be a great deal of merit in such a law.

However, the needs of the people were met prior to 1954. Since a provision was included in the act of 1954 to provide a continuing premium and bonus for increased productive capacity, which was not needed, it can be interpreted only as the act of a Congress which wanted to give a premium to one group of taxpayers as opposed to other groups of taxpayers. The report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House last year disclosed that that provision in the Revenue Act of 1954 would reduce the revenue of the Government in excess of $1 billion a year for 18 years. That means that that premium in the act of 1954 was given to those who claimed the benefits of accelerated depreciation.

The 1954 act provides a greater tax exemption than was contained in the revenue act which was in effect during the Korean war emergency. Under the Revenue Act of 1954 a person building a racetrack gets accelerated depreciation by way of a tax exemption premium. At the same time, relief in the form of an additional exemption was denied to a laboring man, who may perhaps, have a half dozen dependents. The act of 1954 gives a premium for the installation of new equipment in a distillery.

If an individual owned a racetrack, Mr. President, under the Revenue Act of 1954 he could completely renovate and rebuild his track, recover most of his cost in the form of a tax bonus or exemption in a period of 5 or 6 years, and then sell the track as a capital asset and get back two-thirds of the money he had saved through the accelerated depreciation feature of the act of 1954.

If a man were in a business using automobiles, he could have bought a fleet of Cadillac cars and charged off 75 percent of their cost in 2 years, regardless of how little he used them, and then could have sold them and recouped most of the charge-off in tax-free funds he could keep.

Those are examples of some of the provisions of the tax bill passed by a Congress which refused to incorporate a further provision giving an additional exemption to a wage earner making $5,000 a year, in spite of the fact that he may have had a wife and 5 or 6 children.

Another feature of the act of 1954 was the exemption from taxation of a certain percentage of dividend income. As finally passed by the Congress, the act excludes from taxation the first $50 of dividend income. In addition, it exempts 4 percent of the taxpayer's dividend income from any taxation whatever.

Thus was enacted a law which cost the Government from $360 million to $375 million a year, and, by the same token, provided that much of a tax bonus to those whose income is derived from dividends.

But, Mr. President, was there any provision in the bill for the benefit of a wage earner with a wife and half a dozen children? Not a single dime.

We felt at that time that it was a grave injustice. We consider that the operation of the law has proved the degree of its injustice; in fact, Mr. President, as another year has come and gone and unemployment has not been eliminated, but has increased, as productive machinery has not been fully utilized, but is operating at a lesser rate, we feel not only that the injustice of that act becomes heavier and heavier, but that the argument made a year ago in favor of a substitute providing an increased personal and dependency exemption in lieu of a dividend exemption has been demonstrated and completely vindicated and reinforced in the passing months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the principle that unearned income, income from dividends, was to be taxed at a lower rate than income from effort, was not only new but was a complete reversal of previous principles of American taxation? Is it not true that earlier in the operation of American income taxation the favors had been given to earned income, so that persons who earned their income by the sweat of their brows paid a lower rate of taxation than did those who received dividends and interest?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. The original principle gave a better and more favorable treatment to a taxpayer's earned income than it did to a taxpayer's investment income.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But by the previous Congress the opposite principle was established, so that a person receiving his income from dividends would pay a lower rate of taxation than he would if he received the same amount of income from effort.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct in his statement of the pinciple.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not a fact that it also discriminates against the citizen who may invest in local development—development of his home community—and in favor of one who invests in the securities of corporations?

Mr. KERR. The Senator's illustration is valid and his conclusion is correct.

Mr. President, it is our purpose to offer a substitute or to amend the bill in order that relief may be given this year to the taxpayer in the low-income group in lieu of the relief now available in the form of accelerated depreciation and dividend exemption. We make this suggestion, Mr. President, with validity and responsibility. Statements have been made in high places that those favoring this kind of a program are guilty of cowardice and irresponsibility and they are accused of being silly. I shall explore the meaning of that word in a few moments. It has been a long time since I looked it up. If it means what I think it means, I am going to resent the manner in which it has been used.

Mr. President, I wish to talk about fiscal irresponsibility for a moment. Early in 1953 the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury came before the Congress and asked for an increase in the national debt limit from $275 billion to $290 billion. He was a man who spoke with authority in many ways. In the first place, he was the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. In the second place, he was regarded as the strongest man in the President's Cabinet. In the third place, he was acclaimed to be one of the foremost and ablest industrialists and businessmen in the Nation.

Naturally, Mr. President, statements from that kind of source and authority had a good deal of significance. Mere United States Senators were timid in his presence and, with their limited experience and limited vision, were profoundly impressed by the weight of his pronouncement.

The Baltimore Sun of July 31, 1953, had this to say:

> The Secretary said the administration had hoped to avoid asking for an increase of the debt limit, "but we are caught in a squeeze and cannot help ourselves."

He said:

If Congress does not raise the debt ceiling now, it will have to come back later in the year and do so.

That was in 1953.

He was asked:

But what if Congress refuses to increase the debt limit?

He answered:

If Congress refuses to raise the debt ceiling, we will just run out of money and we cannot pay our bills.

Then he made this significant statement:

If this country did not pay its bills, it would just cause a near panic.

Then he made another statement.

Said the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and this is quoted from the record:

Secretary Humphrey, I wanted to ask one question: Suppose Congress leaves here without making any proposal to increase the debt limit. What will be your legal situation?

Said Secretary Humphrey:

I think I will leave when Congress does.

Congress did not increase the debt limit in 1953. Secretary Humphrey did not leave Washington when Congress left. The Treasury did not run out of money in that fiscal year. No near panic was created.

The only trouble that bedeviled our economy during that time resulted from two causes: The tight, hard money policy of the same Secretary of the Treasury, on the one hand, and the tragic, cruel operation of the Department of Agriculture by Ezra Taft Benson.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked on the floor a little while ago, How low can a human being get? He was talking about a Democrat.

I answer by saying that I do not know. Benson is still Secretary of Agriculture. I think we will know, before Benson gets out, how low a human being can get, in or out of his position.

Talk about damage to human beings. Certainly no one would damage the great President of the United States or any of his fine family. But I have just as much regard for the average farm family in Oklahoma as I have for the family in the White House.

No; the great exponent of fiscal responsibility, after saying that the stars would fall from the heavens and the world would be changed in its course if he did not get an increase of $15 billion at that time, found out that he was able to get through that whole fiscal year without any increase in the national debt.

Congress had not any more than assembled last year when the Secretary of the Treasury again asked for an increase in the national debt. The debt limit had to be a minimum of $285 billion, $10 billion above what it had been; and in order to keep the Government from getting into a position where it could not pay its bills, it was necessary to have a permanent increase in the debt ceiling.

I wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the Committee on Finance. He was not impressed by the fiscal responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury on those occasions. He took the position that others in the Government, besides the Secretary of the Treasury, might have some fiscal responsibility. I was proud of myself as a Senator as I saw the great Senator from Virginia vigorously disputing with the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and making his pronouncement with just as much dignity as the one to which he had been listening and with much more authority in fact.

That is one reason why I was sorry to see him led off by the Secretary of the Treasury on another urging of fiscal irresponsibility. I say to my great friend from Virginia that the Secretary of the Treasury is in just as great error today, when he talks about this proposition being fiscal irresponsibility, as he was a year and a half ago and a year ago, when he was saying that if Congress did not do certain things it would be guilty of fiscal irresponsibility in connection with increasing the debt limit.

The distinguished occupant of the White House has made some statements about fiscal policy; and since he also has hurled a charge of fiscal irresponsibility, I think we are entitled to examine what he has said in that field of human endeavor.

The President told reporters on February 17, 1953, that he had planned no tax cuts until the budget was balanced. In a speech before the Department of Commerce Business Advisory Council on March 18, 1953, he reiterated his stand against cutting taxes until the budget was balanced. He said:

Unless we balance the budget, there will never be any lowering of taxes.

Those were the words of Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, on March 18, 1953.

Imagine my astonishment a few days ago when, as a member of the Committee on Finance, I listened to the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury make some statements along that line. In a statement to the committee, he said:

We have reduced the Federal taxes $7¼ billion.

Yet his chief, speaking less than 2 years previously, had said:

Unless we balance the budget, there will never be any lowering of taxes.

I do not know which one of them was guilty of fiscal irresponsibility or inaccuracy; but I know this: The two statements are in direct conflict with each other.

What is fiscal responsibility? It is giving due regard to the requirements of responsibiilty and integrity. It is giving due regard to the obligation of the office one holds or the position one occupies.

Have we fulfilled our responsibilities to the people of the country when we have given substantial tax relief to a very few of the people of our Nation, while we have denied it to the general group of our citizens and taxpayers? Have we met our responsibilities in the offices we occupy when we have provided tax relief in excess of a billion dollars a year for 18 years to those who are operating great corporations and large businesses, whether they be individual or corporate; in providing a tax bonus or premium or exemption for the building of new production facilities, regardless of whether they are needed in our economy or war effort, or are not; and then by denying relief to the 70-odd-million taxpayers, especially to that group whose income is under $5,000 a year?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The answer to the question asked by the able Senator from Oklahoma might well depend, it seems to me, upon the person who was providing the answer and his outlook upon his fellow man.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's observation. I must say, though, that I would have to strain my imagination to believe that he felt other than that he was justified. I should still doubt whether he could substantiate his position.

Mr. GORE. Is the able Senator interpreting my statement——

Mr. KERR. I know the Senator from Tennessee said the answer would depend on the outlook or viewpoint of the one meeting his responsibility.

No, I alined the Senator from Tennessee with myself, and I said what I did only because I thought he was being complimentary, unjustifiably, to those about whom we both were speaking.

Mr. GORE. The Senator interpreted the remarks of the junior Senator from Tennessee correctly. I would like to inquire further if in the opinion of the senior Senator from Oklahoma it is irresponsible to give as much as $10 relief for each child of a worker, to whom the Senator has already referred, who may have several children and is receiving a low income, but it is very responsible when there is provided a tax write-off for the remodeling of a racetrack, and when it is made possible for a concern to buy a fleet of Cadillac automobiles, use them very little, keep them 2 years, and then recoup a major part of their cost. Is not that the height of fiscal responsibility?

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator from Tennessee, in the same spirit of sarcasm in which he asked the question, that my answer is in the affirmative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that both the accelerated depreciation and the dividend-tax-credit provisions operate to the benefit of those who own stocks in American corporations?

Mr. KERR. Oh, very definitely so. I might say, the accelerated-depreciation provision is available to an individual who might reduce his own taxes, at the

level in which he is paying taxes, in excess of the 85 percent which would apply if he did not have that privilege.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But since most industrial property is owned by corporations, is it not true that the benefits of accelerated depreciation will primarily go to owners of stock in such corporations?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the stock of American corporations is, in the main, rather tightly held?

Mr. KERR. That is true of the large corporations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Federal Reserve Board had a study made for it, which was published in the article "1952 Survey of Consumer Finances" in the September 1952 issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin which showed that less than 11 percent of the families in this country owned any corporate stock at all; that is, one family out of every 9?

Mr. KERR. I take it the question is, Is it not true that less than 11 percent of the families own most of the corporate stock?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; own any corporate stock at all. I think that was the result of the study.

Mr. KERR. In other words, the study to which the Senator from Illinois refers discloses that not only do 11 percent of the families own most of the stocks, but they own all of them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Is it not further true that 1 percent of the families receive approximately 80 percent of the dividends?

Mr. KERR. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And therefore the chief benefits under the Republican tax bill accrue to the 1 percent of American families who receive approximately 80 percent of the dividends.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, was not the tax bill which our Republican friends passed last year in effect class legislation?

Mr. KERR. Without the slightest question of a doubt.

I wish to refer to another provision of the act which exemplifies the exalted fiscal responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury. There now exists in the law what is known as the Humphrey "blooper," which provision I believe is section 462 (c). That provision gives taxpayers the right to anticipate the expenses they are going to incur next year and take credit for them on this year's tax return.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I shall yield as soon as I lay down this proposition. When that proposal was made to the Ways and Means Committee the representatives of the Treasury Department stated that the loss of revenue as a result of that provision would be negligible, and that it and some other items in total would not result in a loss to exceed $47 million, and that this particular item was of such little account as not to warrant thought, notice, or consideration.

Mr. President, it is now disclosed that that little gadget may result in a benefit of billions of dollars to corporate taxpayers in 1955. The minimum amount which I have heard estimated by any responsible authority is that it will cost the Government, and therefore save certain taxpayers, a billion dollars. Authoritative sources have said that in their judgment the provision would result in a loss to the Government of $5 billion. Fiscal responsibility. What a delightful thing to compliment, and what a noble attribute to claim for one who operates in that fashion.

I yield now to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it the Senator from Oklahoma is referring to section 462 of the 1954 tax law; is he not?

Mr. KERR. I think it is 462 (c).

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and that provision permits the taxpayer in the first year to deduct, not only the expenses for the current year for a certain number of items, but the anticipated expenditures for the following year, which have been contracted for and for which a reserve may be set up.

Mr. KERR. Whether contracted for or not; all he has to do is anticipate them or imagine them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There can be included under that provision allowances for payments to welfare funds; that is, employers' contributions to welfare funds to pay sickness and hospital benefits to the employees.

Mr. KERR. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The provision would include allowances for vacations with pay.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And in all probability the provision would also include reserves for payments toward employee pension funds.

Mr. KERR. If either contracted, anticipated, or imagined.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that a whole series of other purposes might be covered such as freight allowances, return sales, repairs, and replacements under guarantees, quantity discounts, legal expenses, pending litigation, and not yet billed, for insured, injury, and damage claims, cash discounts on open accounts based on past experience of the percentage of discounts taken, future services under contracts with automobile owners, repurchase of returnable containers sold, publishers' reserves for magazines to be returned by distributors, future costs of pending tax litigation, salesmen's or other employees' bonus, in addition to the vacations with pay and welfare funds and pension funds?

Mr. KERR. And a trip around the world for the board of directors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, in the first year, in 1954, the employers could deduct not only the actual expenditures made in 1954, but the expenditures in 1955, as anticipated, and therefore get 2 deductions in 1 year. Is that not correct?

Mr. KERR. That is absolutely correct, which would amount to giving to certain taxpayers a tax-interest-free revolving fund, on which the Federal Government would pay interest, since it would increase the national debt to that amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And after this year there would be deducted expenses not only for this year, but also for future years. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So there is granted a "one-shot bonus", so to speak.

Mr. KERR. Those taxpayers would receive the benefit of the bonus, because it would be built up by anticipating each year's expenses for the following year in the current year's tax return. They would never have to pay that tax unless Congress does what it is being asked to do in the amendment, and repeal the "blooper."

Mr. DOUGLAS. What was primarily done by section 462 (c) was to allow the employer to make double deductions in the first year, and then anticipated deductions in the following years, but the benefit would come in the initial year.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was based on the so-called Ruml plan which protected taxpayers for a period of time as the tax base moved from a past year to a present year or current basis for computing and paying income taxes quarterly, forgave a portion of the tax for the year in which the base was shifted.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, those who wrote this section—whoever they were—and I think it would be very interesting to find out who they were—intended to have a double deduction given in the initial year; is not that true?

Mr. KERR. It is absolutely true.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. In a moment, Mr. President.

First, I wish to get into the RECORD at this point the definition of the word "silly," because the Secretary of the Treasury, so we were told a little while ago by the newspaper reports, said that the members of the Finance Committee who sponsored this substitute provision were ridiculous, irresponsible, and silly. Mr. President, I find that the word "silly" means just what I was afraid it did. [Laughter.]. It means "archaic, helpless, frail, weak, sickly, rustic, plain, weak in intellect, witless."

Mr. President, you do not suppose the Secretary of the Treasury was referring to six Members of the United States Senate, do you? [Laughter.]

I read further from the definition of the word "silly":

"Lacking in sense, foolish, fatuous, proceeding from or characterized by weakness of mind or by folly, absurd, stupid."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now we know what the Secretary of the Treasury thinks of us.

Mr. KERR. Yes, sir. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wish to ask Senators a question. As between, on the one hand, the group who are trying to give to those in the low-income brackets tax relief in the pitifully small sum of a $20 exemption for the head of the house and an additional $10 exemption for each member of his family, and, on the other hand, the group who have given such relief to those who say that, unless conditions change, they are going to have a

certain amount of expense next year, thus permitting them to make deductions this year—in only 1 year—in an amount equal to nearly the total amount of tax relief we propose to give the others in the next 2 years—I wish to ask Senators, Which one of those groups, if either, could qualify for that designation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this point?

Mr. KERR. For a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; for a question.

Mr. KERR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma—since he objects to the language of the Secretary of the Treasury; and I do not intend to discuss whether perhaps more appropriate terms might have been used—would settle for the statement of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Chairman of the Finance Committee, namely, that it was erroneous and fictitious. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Are those two alternatives the only ones the Senator from Oklahoma has? Does he have to settle for one of the two? [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since the Senator from Oklahoma was complaining about some of the adjectives which had been used by the Secretary of the Treasury, I thought that when the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee—who, I think is very restrained in his language, and certainly has as good a grasp of the fiscal problems of the Government as has any other Member of the Senate—speaks of it as being erroneous and fictitious, perhaps the language he uses is better than a statement that the proposal is "silly." It is at least subject to some criticism by reasonable persons, I think.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the great Senator from California that if he wishes to criticize the Chairman of the Finance Committee, I shall be glad to listen to the Senator from California when he does that, as soon as I have finished my remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait just a minute, please.

I would not blame the Senator from California for it, but I would not give him any aid and comfort in it.

I wish to say Mr. President, that I am sure the Senator from California is perfectly capable of doing his own criticizing; but I remind him that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said the $20 tax reduction proposal was subject to criticism, whereas the Secretary of the Treasury said that the men who offered it were ridiculous, irresponsible, and silly.

In the first place, I wish to say that the Senator from Oklahoma does not have to choose between the two; he is privileged to decline either the criticism of the one or the opprobrium of the other. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may turn from the badinage across the aisle—a contest in which the Senator from Oklahoma always wins—to the discussion of section 462, would the Senator from Oklahoma be interested in statistics, which some of us have gathered, as to the probable cost of section 462, as written by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and his associates?

Mr. KERR. I would be delighted to have that appear in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we consider paid vacations, we find there are in the United States approximately 15 million workers who, under union contracts, have paid vacations provided for them, and therefore those vacations are a contractual obligation. I am told that the average vacation credit so provided is approximately 2 weeks. The average weekly wage in the United States is approximately $75 a person. So this would mean a liability for this year of approximately $150 a person, or a total of approximately $2.25 billion; and, for next year, the same amount.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question to clarify the situation: To whom are the exemptions to be given? To the corporations or to the workers?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To the corporations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The exemptions are not to be given to the workers?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Oklahoma well knows, this issue was raised in the House of Representatives by two very able Democratic Members of the House, namely, Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, and Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, of New York. Representative ZELENKO inquired of the Department of Labor as to the probable cost of vacation credits. I hold in my hand a copy of a letter, which I believe to be correct, from the Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, to Representative ZELENKO, the third paragraph of which reads as follows:

> No precise data exist as to total expenditures by employers for paid vacations.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

> Using several different bases of estimation, we believe that total vacation payments fell in a range of $3,225,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 in 1954.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this point, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done without causing me to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he is complaining about paid vacations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; not at all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Or does not the Senator from Illinois believe that a paid vacation is a proper charge against the earnings of a corporation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly it is. What I am objecting to is the employer being given credit twice for the same payment.

Mr. KERR. During this year, for a payment he is not going to make until next year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. He is given credit this year not only for this year's payment, but for next year's payment, too, and the Government loses 52 percent of this sum, which it would otherwise collect in taxes. On this item alone it loses between one and three-quarters and two billion dollars.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a further question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The item to which I have referred relates to vacations with pay. Let us consider the question of employee pension plans. This morning the chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank, Mr. John J. McCloy, an eminent Republican, testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that in 1954 there was expended on pension funds between $1,600,000,000 and $2 billion. It is my understanding that deductions for pension funds also come under section 462. So there will be a double shot on pension funds, and the Government will therefore lose on this item alone between $800 million and $1 billion more. This, added to the cost of vacations with pay, makes a total of between two and three-quarters and three billion dollars. Then we have welfare funds and all the other items. So I think the Senator from Oklahoma is eminently conservative when he speaks of possible losses of $3 billion in governmental revenue through section 462.

Mr. KERR. In 1 year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1 year.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for this illuminating discussion and statement at this point in the RECORD. It illustrates that those who hold themselves out as great fiscal authorities have records which show—if mistakes in actions and inaccuracies in statement can do so—that they themselves are guilty of irresponsibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the administration and the Treasury Department began to frame the revenue bill of 1954 early in 1953, and that in the secret places of the Treasury Department the bill was drafted and built up over a period of a year and a half, and then presented, section by section, to the House Ways and Means Committee? It was not presented as a whole, but section by section, allowing the members very little time in which to analyze it.

Mr. KERR. I must answer the distinguished Senator by saying that I am not in a position, from firsthand knowledge, to answer the question as to how it was presented to the House Ways and Means Committee. The deliberations of the Senate Committee on Finance on the same bill were lengthy. I was a member of the Finance Committee then, as I

am now. The deliberations were totally inadequate to enable us to gain anything like a complete or accurate grasp of the situation. The only thing I have seen of greater length than that bill, which is in common circulation, is either the telephone directory of New York City or a Sears-Roebuck catalog.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It contains 984 pages of fine print. In my judgment, as was said on the floor of the Senate last year, it is more of a full-employment act for tax attorneys, and a compilation of special privileges for about 5 percent of the taxpayers of the country, than anything else I can think of.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hold in my hand a copy of the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means on that tax bill. On page B–6 the minority complain of the fact that the staffs of the Treasury Department had spent more than 2 years preparing recommendations in connection with the bill, while in contrast the committee was given only 1½ months to deal with it. Further inquiry develops that the committee was given the bill section by section. It was doled out to them in installments. The committee stated:

> The staffs of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department together have spent over 2 years preparing recommendations for this bill. * * *
>
> In contrast, the committee deliberated on this bill for only 1½ months.
>
> We fear that, in the hasty manner in which this most complicated legislation has been handled, we will have to spend many weeks straightening out the law in the future, if the bill becomes law.

And the opposite party was in control of the Congress at that time.

> In the short time which we have had to review the bill—and we were only given a completed committee print a week ago—we have found certain changes which are being proposed which we question. The fact that we have not commented on other changes in the bill does not necessarily mean that we approve them.

In other words, the bill was jammed through the House Committee on Ways and Means under more or less of a gag rule, and when it was brought to the floor, amendments were not permitted. The only thing that was permitted was a motion to recommit.

Mr. KERR. I know that the Senator's reading is accurate, and I must say that in my judgment the statements referred to are fully justified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma serves on the Senate Finance Committee. When the bill came to the Senate, was not the pressure on the Senate Finance Committee very heavy?

Mr. KERR. I must say to my good friend that members of the Finance Committee of the Senate had some opportunity to examine the bill, discuss it, and ask questions about it, but it was handled in a very limited time, during which it would have been physically and mentally impossible to have become fully aware of and acquainted with all the provisions of the bill, which is one of the reasons why the Senator from Oklahoma voted against it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that a very public-spirited citizen by the name of J. S. Seidman, chairman of the committee on federal taxation of the American Institute of Accounting, made a very reasoned criticism of the bill, and called special attention to section 462? I read from page 1321 of the Senate hearings——

Mr. KERR. I will say to the Senator that the accountants' organization advised the Senate Finance Committee that that provision should be carefully looked into and examined, and indicated their judgment that it would be far more expensive than had been indicated by the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma, as usual, is correct. Will the Senator permit me to read a passage from the hearings?

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The witness stated as follows, with respect to section 462:

> The definition of estimated expenses should be narrowed to permit the deduction of only those expenses related to the current year and prior years—

Not future years—

> subsequent to election. Otherwise, as the provision now stands, it would seem that interest for all years to maturity would be currently deductible.

He then goes on to criticize other sections, and comments as follows:

> To avoid the impact on the revenues in the transitional year where there will be a deduction both for the actual expenses and the estimated expenses, and in order to avoid undue distortion of income, the addition to the reserve should be spread as a deduction over the transitional year and the 2 succeeding years.

In other words, he proposed to ease the blow by spreading the added deduction over 3 years, instead of concentrating it all at once.

Did the Secretary of the Treasury pay any attention to the warning thus given to him?

Mr. KERR. I do not know whether he called the accountants irresponsible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Secretary is now saying that this so-called inadvertence was not revealed in the hearings? I ask that question because I hold in my hand a transcript of the television program Face the Nation, of last Sunday on the CBS network, in which the Honorable George M. Humphrey appeared. He was asked this question by Mr. John J. Madigan, of Newsweek:

> Was there any explanation of why it was not discovered during the testimony before congressional committees at the time it went into——
>
> Secretary Humphrey. No.

I am sure the Secretary of the Treasury spoke in good faith. However, the record clearly shows that it was pointed out by the American Institute of Accountants and that the institute recommended different treatment for this item. Therefore, was not the Secretary of the Treasury somewhat irresponsible in this case in not taking into account the enormous losses of income?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I do not know that I would describe the Secretary's actions as being irresponsible, so much as bullheaded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator would admit, would he not, that it was either an irresponsible answer, or a political answer, or a silly answer?

Mr. KERR. Or worse; yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true, is it not, that in recent days the Secretary of the Treasury has admitted that it was an error?

Mr. KERR. He not only has admitted it was an error but he actually thinks it ought to be corrected. The group of members of the Committee on Finance who have submitted their minority views, with the aid of the distinguished Senator from Illinois and, I hope, all the other Members of the Senate, will correct it for him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury admitted that it was an inadvertence only after Representative MILLS had raised the question in a meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House on February 21 and had asked a question about it, and after Representative ZELENKO, of New York, had made a slashing speech on the floor of the House when the tax bill was under consideration?

Mr. KERR. And also after both actions had been widely publicized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore it was due to action on the part of Democratic Members of both the House and the Senate that this great loss of revenue has been called to the attention of the general public. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. And it has resulted in either inspiring or provoking the suggested action by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oklahoma permit the Senator from Illinois to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of deductions which a number of great American corporations will make for this year and the coming year in their tax figures?

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean with reference to the Humphrey "blooper"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. With reference to the so-called Humphrey "blooper"; yes.

Mr. KERR. I should be delighted to have the Senator do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to read the names of some of the corporations, and insert more later.

Mr. KERR. I am delighted to have the Senator do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of page 39 of the Wash-

ington Post and Times Herald of January 28, 1955, which reads:

Capital Transit Co. doesn't owe Uncle Sam any income tax for 1954, according to the company's preliminary report filed with the District Public Utilities Commission.

The windfall, a CTC spokesman explained, is due to section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code. This new clause, he said, permits a company to create reserves for estimated expenses related to 1954.

Of course, also for 1955.

I have collected figures from a number of corporations which show, for example, that the Union Carbide & Chemical Co. will benefit to the extent of about $3,500,000; Allied Chemical, about $3 million; and General Baking, about $497,000. For other firms I have figures showing their actual tax reductions. These are: Montana Power Co., $64,580; Continental Baking, $616,000; Connecticut Light & Power, $273,000; Mohawk Carpet Mills, approximately $300,000—includes depreciation of additions to capital assets on a liberalized basis; Oklahoma Gas & Electric, $227,000; Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., $1,350,000. These are merely a few corporations from which I have been able to get annual statements in the past 24 hours.

Mr. KERR. A few of the smaller corporations, I assume.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are not giant corporations.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks.

I wish to examine another aspect of the fiscal thinking and recommendation of the present administration with which I came in contact this morning. I heard the Secretary of Commerce before the Public Works Committee discuss the proposed Eisenhower road program, as provided in S. 1160, which is now before the Public Works Committee.

Under that bill the United States Government would organize a financial corporation with authority to issue from $20 billion to $25 billion worth of bonds, and the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the officers of that corporation, would advance to it out of the Treasury of the United States up to $5 billion of Government funds. Furthermore, the bill would appropriate ad infinitum all the revenue derived by the Government from the present excise tax of 2 cents a gallon on gasoline and other motor fuels, which would provide approximately $650 million a year.

The Secretary of Commerce said the appropriation would provide sufficient revenue to fortify and justify a bond issue of up to $25 billion, pay the interest on it and retire it in full in a period estimated at not to exceed 30 years.

He was asked if such an operation would involve the full faith and credit of the United States Government, and he said, "Not at all."

He was asked if the operation would be a direct obligation of the United States Government, and he said, "Not at all."

He was asked if such an operation would indirectly involve the full faith and credit of the United States Government, and he said, "Not at all. Who ever heard of such a silly idea?"

He was asked if the operation would indirectly involve an obligation of the United States Government, and he said, "Not at all."

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has had quite a good deal to say about the fiscal responsibility of that proposal. I wish to say that what he has said about it is far more accurate and justified with reference to an act constituting fiscal irresponsibility than the suggestion of the minority of the committee is in accord with the accusations of the Secretary of the Treasury. The action of the House of Representatives does not justify the accusation by the President of the United States of being fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. President, I wish to ask Senators this question: As between the Secretary of the Treasury having a directive from the Congress of the United States to loan corporations $5 billion of Government money without collateral, without a due date for its repayment, without interest, and a proposal to provide less than a billion dollars a year in tax relief to the low-income groups in our country, which one is consistent with a high regard for fiscal responsibility?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma took note of a certain provision of the bill concerning which the Secretary of Commerce testified this morning, and of which I have now learned for the first time. I refer to the provision which sets up a board of directors for the corporation and enables it to issue bonds against the United States for which a permanent appropriation has been made. Did the Senator see that provision?

Mr. KERR. I saw it. I should be glad to have the Senator say what he wishes to say about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Senator take note of the fact that this provision of the administration bill creates a board of directors of 5 persons; that it provides that 3 shall be selected without regard to political affiliation, from the general public; that one of them shall be the managing director of the corporation, on full salary and at full time; that the other two chosen to represent the public shall serve when they are called, at $100 a day, and they shall be called not less than twice a year; and that the other two directors are the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury. So the provision clearly places in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the full-time director employed at a large salary to represent the public, the handling of the entire bonding of this proposed road system.

I think it is the zenith of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his observation, for this reason, Mr. President: We have an administration whose spokesmen are branding the Democratic leadership of the Senate and of the House of Representatives as being fiscally irresponsible for trying to provide tax relief to the many instead of to the few. That is said to be irresponsible, ridiculous, and silly. Then the representatives of the same administration tell the Congress that the Treasury is to put up $5 billion of Government money, and that it is not a direct obligation of the Government and not a part of the national debt, and that Congress will be called upon to pass laws making appropriations of public funds from now until the bonds are paid, or throughout all eternity, without the bonds being a direct or an indirect obligation of the Federal Government, or without in anywise involving the full faith and credit of the Government. Yet those in the administration who advance this proposal are holding themselves out as the apostles, advocates, and examples of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to concur in what the Senator from Oklahoma says with respect to the proposed road plan and I should like to go a step further and say that if this road plan should be adopted, it would destroy honest bookkeeping, because we would have two sets of books. In one set the Government would conceal from the people a bona fide debt, for it must be a bona fide debt, if the bonds are sold.

Mr. KERR. If it is not a bona fide debt of the Government, the corporation could sell no bonds, or they would be perpetrating a fraud.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Has the Senator noted that the bill provides for selling these bonds to trust funds of the United States?

Mr. KERR. Yes; to any bank of the United States or any trust fund operated by any bank.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is familiar with the Social Security trust fund, for instance, in which are deposited the savings of those who contribute to their old-age retirement.

What does the Senator think of a bill which in one section declares these highway bonds would not be a debt of the Federal Government, and in another section provides that the officials of the Federal Government can sell the bonds to Federal trust funds for which they are guardians? What does the Senator think of that?

Mr. KERR. I thank the great Senator from Virginia for referring to that fact, because it shows to what length representatives of this administration will go in sponsoring a program which they favor, as contrasted with the length to which they will go to hold up to scorn and ridicule those who advocate a measure with which they disagree. There can be no question in the minds of fair and reasonable people—and the American people are fair, reasonable, alert, and intelligent—that the public will become aware of the hypocrisy of the representatives of an administration who say we can use $25 billion worth of funds of the Federal Treasury and make the bonds representing that amount available for investment, but the bonds are no part of the national debt, although they involve the faith and credit of the Federal Government. Sponsors of

this proposal say it is a measure of high fiscal integrity and virtue. Why, Mr. President? Because the bonds carry a higher rate of interest than would otherwise be available to private investment firms in this country.

Mr. President, what is the proposal of the minority members of the Finance Committee? They give the Congress of the United States a clear choice. We can do one of two things: We can provide less than a billion dollars a year tax relief to the low-income taxpayers, or we can leave in the law tax relief in excess of a billion dollars to those who are the most favored and best situated among our taxpayers. We can provide less than a billion dollars a year tax relief to seventy-odd million taxpayers, or we can continue as is now provided by the Revenue Act of 1954 in excess of a billion and a quarter dollars a year tax relief to less than 5 percent of the people of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted to ask the Senator a question having to do with the point which he and the Senator from Virginia were discussing, namely, the investment in trust funds.

The distinguished and able Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] asked me a moment ago if it was my opinion that under a law which declared that the bonds were not a direct obligation of the Government, it would be possible to sell them to any bank or institutional investor.

I answered him by saying that the question overlooked the fact that such investment is permitted in the trust funds. This means that all the money which the small people of the United States may invest in postal savings, all the money which the employees of the United States Government may contribute to their retirement fund, and all the money which may be paid by workers throughout the country toward social security—all that money, under the provisions of the bill, may be diverted from the purposes for which it was intended, and invested in bonds which the bill says would not be a direct obligation of the United States.

In all my experience, it is the most fantastic proposal I have ever encountered as coming from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator say it might even be a little bit silly?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not like to apply adjectives.

Mr. KERR. I did not refer the word to those who advocated the proposal; I meant the proposal itself. Would the Senator from Wyoming say that the proposal is a little bit silly?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should say the proposal is completely silly. It is more than that. I think it is a proposal which, in the language used in the bill, covers up the purpose that is sought to be accomplished.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, so long as the money spent or the interest involved is with reference to those in the low-income groups—yes, the widows and the orphans—either doing them justice or safeguarding their assets, it is a matter of little note; and regardless of what may be done with it, no criticism can attach. But, Mr. President, we must not touch the precious few who constitute less than 5 percent of the people of the country, and for whose benefit those provisions of the act of 1954 were exclusively written upon the statute books of the Nation.

The choice is this: The proposal of the minority would bring in, during the next 2 fiscal years, a minimum of $6,155,000,000 in revenue not now provided for, and not provided for in the bill.

Of that amount there would be expended in the next 2 fiscal years a total of $1,261,000,000 in the form of tax relief to the income-earners receiving an average of less than $5,000 a year. This would leave in the United States Treasury a net of $4,894,000,000 minimum in the next 2 fiscal years, over and above the amount which the Treasury will receive either under existing law or under the provisions of the proposed substitute.

Or, if the proposal of the minority group be rejected, the result will be a continuation of in excess of $350 million a year tax bonus, exemption, and benefit to less than 5 percent of the people who receive the dividend income of the Nation. It will continue in excess of $1 billion a year tax bonus, tax permium, and tax benefit to those taking advantage of the accelerated depreciation feature of the act of 1954. It should also be noted that under the provisions of the substitute, individual and corporate rates will be extended until the end of fiscal 1957 or into the middle of 1957, so as to correct the so-called Humphrey "blooper."

In my judgment, the adoption of the substitute would recognize our responsibility to do equity and justice as between all the taxpayers of the Nation.

In his testimony on the bill, the Secretary of the Treasury made the statement, "We reduced taxes last year $7,400,000,000," when the fact is that $3 billion of the reduction to individual taxpayers was the result of the Democratic tax bill of 1950 or 1951; $2 billion of the reduction was the result of the expiration of the excess profits tax, originally provided for in a Democratic bill, and then extended and terminated by the Revenue Act of 1953; $1 billion was the result of a reduction in excise taxes, brought about last year, which the Secretary of the Treasury admitted was over his objection and over the objection of the administration. The Secretary said $1,400,000,000 in relief was provided by the Revenue Act of 1954, for which he took responsibility, and with reference to which I was glad to have him take responsibility.

But I reminded him, and I now remind the Senate, that the $7,400,000,000 tax relief granted by all these reductions is of less benefit to the families earning less than $5,000 a year than would be the substitute suggested and sponsored now by the minority of the members of the Committee on Finance.

The substitute to which I now refer, and the adoption of which I favor and urge, in providing an exemption of less than $1 billion a year—$20 to each taxpayer, other than his spouse, and an additional $10 credit for each dependent of the taxpayers generally, who do not have the benefit of the split income feature, thus holding the reduction, on the average, to those earning less than $5,000 annual income—will furnish a greater degree of tax relief to those who need it most than will the total amount of $7,400,000,000 in reductions which went into effect last year.

Mr. President, the choice is simple, plain, and clear. In voting upon the substitute proposal, we shall vote either to give relief in a limited manner and degree to those who need it most, or to keep giving relief to those who need it least.

By voting for the proposed substitute, we shall provide a minimum of an additional $4.5 billion in revenue during the next 2 fiscal years, which, if the estimates of the Treasury are correct, will come very close to balancing the budget in fiscal 1957. By voting against the substitute, we shall leave tax relief to be looked at, and either to be provided or ignored in the election year of 1956.

Therefore, I urge the favorable consideration and acceptance by the Senate of the substitute proposal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in the interest of accuracy, I think it would be well to place into the RECORD at this point a statement which Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House at 10 o'clock this morning, when testifying on the bills before that committee; H. R. 4725, which was introduced by Mr. COOPER, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; an identical bill, H. R. 4726, which was introduced by Mr. REED, of New York, the ranking minority member of the committee; together with copies of two letters which the Secretary of the Treasury addressed to Mr. COOPER, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, dealing with this subject, and suggesting proposed legislation in regard to it.

I ask unanimous consent that those documents be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY TREASURY SECRETARY HUMPHREY BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 10, 1955

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to urge prompt action, as I did in my letter to the chairman on Monday of this week, to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The original objectives of these two sections which cover prepaid income and reserves for estimated expenses was simply to conform tax accounting with business accounting. It was never intended that these provisions would result in any substantial loss of revenue or result in windfalls to taxpayers. A review of the consideration of this subject by this committee will confirm the impression held at the time by lawyers, accountants, and businessmen, that the basic motive for these provisions was simplifica-

tion of tax accounting procedures, and not radical tax reductions.

This tax law became effective on August 16, 1954. During the fall, as the knowledge of its provisions increased, there began to be rumors that these particular provisions might not work as originally intended. Before the end of the year, studies by the Treasury staff, working with the staff of your committee, were undertaken to see if the threatened situation could properly and effectively be cured by regulation. Proposed regulations were issued on January 22. However, until the time came when these provisions began to be put into actual practice by taxpayers preparing their income tax returns and the 30 days expired for protests against the proposed regulations, there was not much reliable information available.

It then developed that there is a sharp difference of opinion between taxpayers and the Government as to the scope of these sections. The tentative regulations issued by the Treasury on January 22, in order to carry out the provisions of the law, have come under strong attack as being too restrictive in limiting the intended application of the sections. Taxpayers have already served notice that they intend to litigate this restriction. Should they be successful in the courts, the revenue loss under the law might be far in excess of anything contemplated by the Congress. As soon as the checks were sufficiently conclusive to satisfy the staff that the original objective might not be carried out and that the situation could not be adequately corrected by regulation, they reported their findings and we promptly made this move to call the matter to the attention of the Congress.

The original estimate for several so-called bookkeeping items, of which sections 452 and 462 were the principal revenue items, was $47 million. The limited check that we have made around the country indicates that the loss would be substantially greater than the original estimates. How much greater it might be we cannot now say because we simply do not have the information as to what the bulk of taxpayers concerned might claim should these provisions remain in the law, and with the litigation that would surely be involved in many cases should the provisions remain, we might not have final figures on the loss for years to come.

Repeal of these two provisions will reinstate the legal rights of everyone just as they were under the old law prior to last August and protect the Government from revenue loss which was never intended by the Congress.

I wish to emphasize that there is almost no new money over our original estimates which will be added to the Treasury by repeal of these two provisions. This action simply avoids unplanned loss of revenue.

The objective of trying to conform tax accounting with business accounting is still a sound one. In trying to do this, however, a serious mistake was made in not sufficiently limiting the application of the provisions and restricting the revenue impact of the changes as enacted. That is why repeal is required rather than amendment, so as to be sure that in any new approach to the original objective the revenue is adequately protected.

As we have previously testified and said many times, in a revision of tax laws involving 875 pages of printed matter covering all of the law with respect to Federal taxation, it is inevitable that some errors should creep in. These can all only be developed by experience in actual practice and we have repeatedly said that as soon as any discrepancy between the original congressional intent and actual operation of the law became apparent we would call it to the attention of the Congress for corrective action. This is such a case.

H. R. 4725

A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. Repeal of sections 452 and 462.

(a) Prepaid income: Section 452 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed.

(b) Reserves for estimated expenses, etc.: Section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Technical amendments.

The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (c) of section 381 is amended by striking out paragraph (7) (relating to carryover of prepaid income in certain corporate acquisitions).

(2) The table of sections for subpart B of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 (relating to taxable year for which items of gross income included) is amended by striking out—

"SEC. 452. Prepaid income."

(3) The table of sections for subpart C of such part II (relating to taxable year for which deductions are taken) is amended by striking out—

"SEC. 462. Reserves for estimated expenses, etc."

SEC. 3. Effective date.

The amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

H. R. 4726

A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. Repeal of sections 452 and 462.

(a) Prepaid income: Section 452 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed.

(b) Reserves for estimated expenses, etc.: Section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Technical amendments.

The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (c) of section 381 is amended by striking out paragraph (7) (relating to carryover of prepaid income in certain corporate acquisitions).

(2) The table of sections for subpart B of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 (relating to taxable year for which items of gross income included) is amended by striking out—

"SEC. 452. Prepaid income."

(3) The table of sections for subpart C of such part II (relating to taxable year for which deductions are taken) is amended by striking out—

"SEC. 462. Reserves for estimated expenses, etc."

SEC. 3. Effective date.

The amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

MARCH 3, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you with respect to reserves for estimated expenses under the provisions of the new tax code. The Treasury staff in collaboration with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has been investigating for several months this subject and several others which may need congressional correction.

We will submit to your committee a full list of these provisions, together with our suggestions, in the near future. This will include our report and recommendations concerning reserves for estimated expenses.

Although the studies made thus far are not finished, it seems clear that some of the reports on the revenue law involved are grossly exaggerated.

We will urge your committee to take prompt remedial action.

Sincerely,

G. M. HUMPHREY.

MARCH 7, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This supplements my letter of March 3 concerning the operation of the two new accounting provisions covering deferred income and reserves for estimated expenses (sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954). Our studies now have proceeded far enough to indicate clearly that many taxpayers are planning to use these provisions to defer income and create deductions in excess of any contemplated at the time they were proposed.

The objective of these sections was simply to conform tax bookkeeping with business bookkeeping. They never were intended to cover innumerable items some taxpayers apparently intend to claim. If permitted to remain in the law, they will cause a greater loss in revenue than estimated and cause considerable litigation. We are unable to adequately correct this by regulation. Accordingly, I recommend that the two provisions cited above immediately be repealed retroactively to their original effective dates.

Our report and recommendations on various other technical corrections in the 1954 code will be ready soon.

Sincerely,

G. M. HUMPHREY.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the point where I placed other material in the RECORD including a statement by the Secretary of the Treasury before the House Committee on Ways and Means, information which has been extracted from the unedited record of the Committee on Ways and Means, and in which the following colloquy took place, wherein the word "silly" was used.

I think it important that the connotation be made clear, because I do not believe the statement connotes what it was earlier interpreted to mean. I read from the statement by Secretary Humphrey, in part, as follows:

> Now, there is no gain in any of the fiscal years involved except the fiscal years as they come by the extension of these other taxes. So there is no gain by the extension of excise taxes or corporate taxes in years that we are discussing. Those are for future years, and it is just as silly to say that that is a saving of tax or an increase of tax to the Treasury as it would be to say that we are going to add $60 billion a year with the other taxes in those same years.

When that is made clear, it can be seen that some misinterpretations were placed on the Secretary's remarks. He was not referring to individual Senators, but to a claim that merely extending excise taxes an additional year beyond what they are proposed to be extended in the bill would provide a gain in revenue at this time which would affect the balancing of the budget.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY HUMPHREY BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 10, 1955

Secretary HUMPHREY. I will be very glad to comment. In the first place, as I said in my statement, this bill will not make any money to speak of. We estimated a total loss of $50 million for this and other items. Some one of those items was dropped out and the 50 revised to 47, so that this and the other items together, we estimated, would be $50 million. Now, if this is repealed, some part of that $47 million will not be spent. That is, it will be saved. But that is all that is involved in this bill. There is no billion dollars or any other amount that will be saved to the Treasury, that will be added to the Treasury's receipts, over and above estimates, because of this bill. All we will do will be to save a possible loss under Treasury estimates.

Now, there is no gain in any of the fiscal years involved except the fiscal years as they come by the extension of these other taxes. So there is no gain by the extension of the excise taxes or corporate taxes in years that we are discussing. Those are for future years, and it is just as silly to say that that is a saving of tax or an increase of tax to the Treasury as it would be to say that we are going to add $60 billion a year with the other taxes in those same years.

Mr. MILLS. It would add to the revenues for the fiscal year 1956.

Secretary HUMPHREY. There will be $60 billion of other revenues. And to say that you are going to have $60 billion added is just as silly as anything I can think of, and it is perfectly misleading.

Now, as to the extension of taxes into future years, that is just silly to say that adds to the Treasury's return.

Now, as to the two items that he suggests be withdrawn, be canceled, one is the dividend credit, which is 180 to 360, and the other is the depreciation item, which is somewhere from 300 to 900, depending upon the quarters you are talking about, as he gives the figures; and I am not sure those are the correct figures and we haven't checked them, but they are good enough to talk about.

If you will go back, Mr. MILLS, just about 1 year, you will recall that the prophets of doom and gloom were sending this country to the dogs—that we were heading straight for the dogs if various things weren't done. A lot of very unsound, in our opinion, proposals were made which were discarded. In lieu of those unsound things that were suggested to pull us out of the doom and gloom that was threatened, we did several things—this administration did several things—one of which was to pass this tax law which contained these two provisions.

Now, then, the things which were done, including these two provisions, have reversed this field and, instead of being headed for doom and gloom today, we are headed for and are in better times, and I think there is nobody anywhere who will deny that. If the prophets of doom and gloom of a year ago now want to start out repealing the things that reversed the field and send us back into doom and gloom, they ought to adopt this kind of proposal.

This proposal is just as irresponsible, just as political, and just as bad from every point of view as the original proposal, with the added amount of repealing the things that have been helpful in reversing the field from doom and gloom to better times—to making jobs instead of losing jobs.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Secretary, do I understand, then, from what you say, that we should do nothing about the provisions of H. R. 8300 that are correctly drawn to carry out the principles which were agreed upon for inclusion in the bill because of the possibility that, if we do upset any of those provisions, we may reverse the upswing in business activity and bring about depression or a downturn in business activity?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I said last year—and I told you and I told everybody—that, in my opinion, those were two important provisions to help strengthen the economy—to make jobs. The jobs are being made. Those provisions were enacted and the jobs are being made and I think they are contributing to it. I think it would be a great mistake to repeal them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think those who are interested in the facts rather than in the politics of the situation will see that the Secretary of the Treasury has given a very forthright statement of the background of the tax provision, the repeal of which he has recommended, and has pointed out in his statement that the matter had been called to the Department's attention.

The provision under discussion went into effect only in August of last year. As soon as the Treasury began to check it and learned that there had been some difference of opinion, apparently, between the taxpayers and the Treasury Department as to the effect of the provision, the Treasury's experts were put to work on it. The Secretary has very promptly called the matter to the attention of Congress and has recommended definite action.

I do not think any fairminded American will contend that every piece of legislation enacted by this Congress or by any prior Congress is perfect in every detail. We are constantly passing bills to amend acts of previous sessions of Congress. I think at least fairminded Americans will recognize that when an error is discovered, due credit should be given to members of the minority party, who also called the matter to the attention of their respective Houses of Congress, and should likewise be given to the Treasury Department, which itself was working on this problem, and which promptly recommended corrective action.

It has not always been true that corrective action was taken in past administrations when errors were called to their attention. I well recall in the Alger Hiss case that for 5 years the executive branch of the Government had knowledge of his subversive activities and his membership in an espionage ring, and yet he was kept in positions of the highest responsibility in the Government of the United States for a period of several years thereafter.

I only wish that those mistakes had been corrected as promptly as the Secretary of the Treasury has corrected what appears to be an honest mistake in the application of the particular section of the law which has been mentioned.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from California has stated that the administration was moving to correct the error, and he was giving due credit to the minority party for having discovered the error. Will the Senator tell me to which party he was referring?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I said minority party, I misspoke. I meant to say that due credit should be given to the Democratic Party. If I said minority party, I meant to say Democratic Party.

Mr. KERR. I desired to understand correctly what the Senator said, lest his remarks go into the RECORD uncorrected and the Senator be subjected to charges of irresponsibility.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was so used to referring to the Democratic Party last year as the minority party that I misspoke. I wish the RECORD to be corrected. I certainly wanted it to be clear that it was members of the Democratic Party in the House and in this body who called the matter to the attention of their respective Houses. I think the Secretary's statement and my statement made it clear that the Treasury Department was prompt in its action.

Mr. KERR. In spite of the fact that only last Sunday the Secretary of the Treasury made a different statement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me a word?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the statement of the Senator from California, in which, if I heard it correctly, he said that the mistake had first been discovered by the Treasury, and only subsequently by members of the Democratic Party, I should like to read a statement by Chairman JERE COOPER, of the Committee on Ways and Means, which he issued on the 8th of March. We all know of Representative COOPER, of his long experience, high standards, and personal honor. I should like to read the statement of Representative COOPER on this point:

For some time some of us on the committee have been concerned about the operation of these provisions and the resulting loss of revenue, due to the fact that these provisions were rumored to be creating windfalls for affected taxpayers. During the appearance of the Secretary of the Treasury before our committee on February 21, 1955, when we were considering the extension of the present corporate and certain existing excise-tax rates, Mr. MILLS (Democrat, of Arkansas) asked the Secretary about section 462, and in particular whether or not it was true that there might be a considerable loss of revenue involved in this provision.

I ask Senators to take note of the following statement by Mr. COOPER:

The Secretary replied that the estimate for the revenue loss for all the accounting provision changes, including section 462, was still $47 million, as originally estimated, and that he was not aware of the fact that there were reputed to be windfalls under this provision for taxpayers. Mr. Mills then asked the Secretary to investigate the rumored windfalls and report to the committee immediately if he discovered that they might exist.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think there is any inconsistency. The Treasury Department is a large Department of the Government. The Internal Revenue Service is one agency under the Treasury Department. I know both of the men whose names have been mentioned are honorable men. Mr. COOPER has a distinguished record in the House,

and is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and I would take his statement at full and face value.

I also believe it is equally correct to take at face value the Secretary's statement that within the Treasury they also had been concerned by some of the developments; that they were having checks made to see whether the rumors were correct, as to whether deductions beyond what the Treasury had in mind were being taken, and that the information was being gathered by whatever branch of the Treasury Department would normally carry that work on.

I merely make that statement in the interest of achieving the objective which I am sure the committee wants to achieve, namely, that people will pay their fair share of the tax burden, and that undue benefits will not inadvertently be given to any taxpayer through a loophole in the law. All I am saying is that the administration, I think in a responsibile manner, has, by addressing a letter to Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which handles tax legislation in the House, with a copy of the letter being sent to the Speaker of the House, and with the introduction of a bill which would repeal the particular section in question, to which perfectly valid criticism has been made, has proceeded promptly, and has proceeded in the proper way, to clear this matter up.

I only repeat that I think if all the mistakes which have been made in either Democratic or Republican administrations, many of them perhaps inadvertent mistakes, were cleared up as promptly, we would not have before us some of the problems which exist today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out to my good friend, the Senator from California, that the investigation by the Secretary of the Treasury seems to have followed, not preceded, the charge made by Representative MILLS, of Arkansas, and Representative ZELENKO, of New York, that it was they who prodded the Treasury into action; and the record also shows that at the time when this point was raised, the Secretary of the Treasury said he knew of no windfall, and that he stood on his testimony of the preceding year.

I wish to say that when Mr. Humphrey was confronted with the facts showing that this was about as gross a "blooper" as ever had been perpetrated in a tax bill, with a consequent loss of billions of dollars of revenue, he admitted it. I am glad the admission was made, and I wish to give him credit for making it. But, on the other hand, I desire to point out that a great deal of the damage has already been done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator from Illinois wishes to state the facts. Let me say I have been informed—and I believe the information to be correct, although I may be mistaken—that if the bills introduced in the House of Representatives are passed, there will be no loss in revenue. As a matter of fact, in any event we would not gain any revenue. What damage would be done would be in respect to the estimated revenue in the budget; there would be a reduction of that. But the closing of the so-called loophole—which of course should be done, and as to which there is no disagreement, so far as I can observe, as between the administration and those on the other side of the aisle—will not result in giving additional revenue over what was had theretofore. It will merely prevent the loss of that estimated revenue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there are two issues here. One is as to how far back the change in the law may be made retroactive. It is my estimation that in this instance probably the repealer can date back until only about March 9, and therefore we shall lose a certain amount of revenue for the first 10 weeks of the year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the information of the Senator, the bill to correct this loophole, which has been introduced in the House of Representatives and which has been recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, was introduced by both Representative REED, the ranking minority Member, and Representative COOPER, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. This bill makes the effective date of this correction applicable to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953; and it has been ruled that such retroactive features would be legal.

Furthermore, I do not believe that any Member of Congress has expressed any opposition to the making of such a correction; therefore, the passage of the bill will be automatic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator from Illinois had in mind the accelerated depreciation, rather than section 462 (c). But let the Members of the Senate be under no illusion.

Mr. President, on Monday of this week, following extended meetings on Sunday with Members of the Senate, there was prepared for presentation to the Members of this body corrective legislation on section 462 (c).

I wish to commend the able minority leader for his most recent attitude on section 462 (c). Earlier in the day he appeared, in a manner, at least, to justify it; but I am quite glad now to see that he has joined in a movement which has been inaugurated to repeal that section. But the decision had been made to include, as an amendment to this bill, proposed legislation correcting that error and that mistake; and the authorities in the other body had been informed as to that decision.

Then what happened? A hurried-up effort was made on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury to have such a bill introduced. Then what happened?

The majority leader discussed the situation with spokesmen of the other body, and said that although we did plan to propose repeal of section 462 (c) as an amendment to the bill now before us, since it was the constitutional responsibility of the House of Representatives to initiate tax legislation, we saw no objection to having a bill for this purpose introduced in the House of Representatives. We also saw no objection to having hearings held by the appropriate House committee on such a bill. We said we hoped that, as a result of those hearings and as a result of the insistence of the Secretary of the Treasury upon prompt action perhaps the Senate would wish to move on that matter, in connection with this bill.

Mr. President, I hope that is exactly what the Senate does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in order that the record on this matter may be more complete, let me say that I welcome the statement of the Senator from Delaware that the repeal of section 462 (c) may be made retroactive. I am informed that that is correct, and I am delighted it is.

But as regards the alertness of the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with this matter, I wish to point out that on February 21, in reply to the question by Representative MILLS, the Secretary of the Treasury said it would cost only $47 million, and said he was not aware that there were reputed to be any windfalls; and on last Sunday, in his nationwide telecast, when he was asked about this matter by Mr. Madigan, the Secretary of the Treasury replied, in referring to the loss about which he had been asked: "I do not know whether it might be two or three hundred million dollars or not."

So, Mr. President, even as late as last Sunday, 4 days ago, the Secretary of the Treasury was not aware of the enormous loss in revenue which would come from section 462. I think the record is perfectly clear that although the Secretary of the Treasury did, when under pressure, admit—as he was forced to do—there would be a great loss in revenue, the real credit for this movement should go to Representative MILLS, of Arkansas, and Representative ZELENKO, of New York.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that when the Secretary of the Treasury was before the Finance Committee only a few days ago the junior Senator from Louisiana asked him about the possibility of such a loss of revenue, in the amount of billions of dollars, and at that time the Secretary of the Treasury said that was not correct, that it was enormously exaggerated, and that the loss would be no more than a few million dollars?

I recall the matter very distinctly, because it had concerned me as I know it concerned other members of the committee, to have it stated that the loss from this mistake could have been so enormous. I believe the Senator from Illinois will find in the hearings the testimony to which I have referred; I believe it will be found at the end of the

hearings, because it happened in connection with the hearings on the reciprocal trade bill, but perhaps it might have been included at the very end of the hearings on the tax bill, in order to have it appear in that connection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall examine the hearings to see whether I can find that part of the testimony.

Mr. President, I am assured by the Senator from Louisiana that in the initial hearings on the reciprocal-trade bill he addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury a question as to whether there would be an appreciable loss of revenue. It is my understanding that the Secretary of the Treasury replied that there would not be. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Louisiana would bring out this point by questions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the Senator will find that on the first day of the hearings on the reciprocal-trade bill, on March 3, or 4, last week, I asked the Secretary of the Treasury about the possible loss of revenue. At that time he stated that he had had occasion to look into the question, and that the proposal referred to would mean the loss of some millions of dollars, but that it would not mean anything like the loss which had been indicated. He said that it had been greatly exaggerated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to have this material, because it builds up the case still further. On the 25th of February the Secretary of the Treasury said that he knew of no windfall. On the 4th of March he said there would be no windfall. Last Sunday, over a nationwide television program, he stated that the loss would not amount to more than $80 million.

So the record shows that the Secretary of the Treasury either ignored or minimized the loss until the Democrats in the House, with some prompting from Democrats in the Senate, brought the attention of the country to the terrific loss of revenue which would be involved. We congratulate the Secretary of the Treasury for having finally learned the true situation. I feel that gratitude to the Democrats for revealing this great loss in revenue, and gratitude to the Democrats for the contribution which they have made to the Treasury of the United States, should lead the Secretary of the Treasury to be more gentle in his speech when he refers to the members of our party.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator aware of the fact that a Democrat on the committee also suggested what the Secretary of the Treasury said he would like to see done, that is, to continue the corporation tax, and that every Member on the Republican side of the aisle voted against continuing the corporation tax, at a time when we are in no position to suggest to corporations that we can afford to reduce their taxes 10 per cent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been my observation that virtually everything that is good in the Republican tax bill has come from the Democrats, and the evil additions have been their own.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, very briefly I wish to discuss the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to the tax bill which has been offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and other Senators.

First, I wish to make it clear there is no disagreement among Senators on either side of the aisle as to the wisdom of extending the 5-percent corporation tax rate.

Likewise, there is no difference in our positions as to extending the excise taxes, which are scheduled to expire on April 1 of this year, including the excise taxes on alcohol, tobacco, automobiles, and other articles.

Likewise, there is no question with reference to the loophole which was discovered in H. R. 8300, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as enacted by Congress last year. It is my understanding that there is no objection either in the House or in the Senate to the repeal of section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

As I pointed out before, its repeal will be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954. Therefore, there will be no loss of revenue in that respect.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of H. R. 4726, which is the bill introduced in the House by Representative REED. It is the same bill that was introduced by Representative COOPER and it is the legislation that was recommended to Congress by Secretary Humphrey in his testimony earlier this week.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. Repeal of sections 452 and 462.

(a) Prepared income: Section 452 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed.

(b) Reserves for estimated expenses, etc: Section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Technical amendments.

The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are hereby amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (c) of section 381 is amended by striking out paragraph (7) (relating to carryover of prepaid income in certain corporate acquisitions).

(2) The table of sections for subpart B of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 (relating to taxable year for which items of gross income included) is amended by striking out—

"SEC. 452. Prepaid income.'"

(3) The table of sections for subpart C of such part II (relating to taxable year for which deductions are taken) is amended by striking out—

"SEC. 462. Reserves for estimated expenses, etc."

SEC. 3. Effective date.

The amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we come back to the question of how such a loophole could occur in a revenue bill. I am a member of the Committee on Finance, as are the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and other Senators; and I believe all of us will agree that certainly it was not the intention of the Committee on Finance, or the intention of any of the committees of Congress, or of Congress itself, that any such interpretation should be placed on the provision in question. However, after the law had been enacted it was found that many corporations were placing such a loose interpretation on that section.

Only recently, it was called to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury by Representative COOPER and by another Representative whose name I forget at the moment. I am perfectly willing that credit for the discovery should go to these Representatives. At the same time I feel that credit should also be given to the Secretary of the Treasury for the prompt action he took to urge the repeal of the section after the loophole had been called to his attention.

The question might well arise as to why he did not discover the loophole sooner in view of the fact that the Internal Revenue Code was passed in August of last year. It was not discovered sooner because corporations did not begin to file their tax returns until March. They are not due until March 15. It was only when they began to file their annual returns and after their annual reports became public that this loophole was discovered either by the Secretary of the Treasury or by others. I say that by way of explanation, and do not cite it as an excuse for what happened.

As to why it did occur, perhaps it happened for the same reason that a few years ago a loophole got into our tax laws under the previous administration, which loophole was interpreted as giving authority to write off, as legitimate business deductions, political contributions to the Democratic Party in exactly the same way that authority was given to write off contributions to churches and other charitable organizations. By no stretch of the imagination was it ever the intention of Congress to provide that the Democratic Party should be given that benefit or that contributions to the Democratic Party should be permitted to be written off as contributions. This loophole had the indirect effect of financing the 1948 Democratic campaign out of the Federal treasury.

I am rather pleased to note that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey took steps to plug the loophole just discovered within 48 hours after it was

called to his attention. All of us remember that it took more than a year to get the previous Secretary of the Treasury to take any action. Therefore, I believe we should pay our respects to Secretary Humphrey for his promptness.

Perhaps another explanation of how that loophole got into the law is furnished by an examination of the manner in which a loophole was written into the FHA act, under which millions of dollars in windfall profits were allowed to go to certain large operators. These excessive profits in turn resulted in extra large charges being made to Korean veterans when they sought to buy their homes. I believe it was the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who first called the attention of Congress to that loophole. We know that billions of dollars were lost to the Federal Government, the American taxpayers, and homeowners because of that loophole.

That particular loophole came into being under the previous administration and through a law that was administered for a long period of time by a man who had a long-established criminal record. I refer to Mr. Clyde L. Powell. It certainly took a long time to find out about that loophole, to expose the scandal, and to get Mr. Powell out of Government service. His criminal record had been covered up by the previous administration.

These loopholes have ways of creeping into laws, and Congress must always be alert to detect and correct such situations. The prompt action taken by Secretary Humphrey, within hours after the time the matter was called to his attention, is something unusual in the history of Washington politics.

It has been said that the tax revision act which was passed last year gives benefits to those who need them the least; namely, the rich. That has been the theme here this afternoon by the group who with their crocodile tears have been pleading for a tax reduction.

It seems that there are more of the smaller taxpayers who vote at the polls, and for that reason there is always much concern expressed by Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle for those small taxpayers.

Mr. President, I am not interested in getting into any discussion this afternoon as to which party represents fiscal irresponsibility. I wish briefly to review the record, because it is based upon the performance of the parties in the past when entrusted with power that the record stands.

Down on the farm when we ask a farmer in the middle of January what kind of fruit a certain tree will bear, he will tell us, for instance, that it will be a white or a yellow peach. He speaks from his knowledge of what kind of fruit that tree bore in the past.

That is the only way we can judge a political party. We cannot judge either party based upon what it says it will do in the future. Therefore, let us examine the record.

With reference to a balanced budget, there has not been a speaker this afternoon who has not expressed great interest in balancing the budget. In reviewing the 1932 platform of the Democratic Party——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would rather not yield at this time.

I read from the Democratic platform of 1932:

> We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government, * * * and we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

At that time, Mr. President, it was costing approximately $4 billion to pay all the operating expenses of the Federal Government. The Democratic Party was elected in 1932 upon that well-phased promise; but, 20 years later, when that party went out of office, it was costing $60 billion to run our Government; and at the time the Democratic Party went out of power it had left a national debt which was at an all time high of $266 billion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator tell us what was the gross national production when the Democratic Party came into office and what it was when the Democratic Party went out of office?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not have those figures before me, but I shall be glad to get them.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator be surprised to know that it was five times as much when the Democrats went out of office than it was when they came in?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not at all surprised at that. But the national debt was nine times as great.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the Democratic platform——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator say that the national debt was then at its all-time high?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was, so far as any administration leaving power was concerned. It had been higher 2 or 3 times. It had reached a peak, I think, of around $278 billion or $279 billion; it had dropped down, but at the time the past administration went out of office it was $266 billion.

Mr. KERR. What is the amount of it at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is approximately $274 billion; however, to offset that increase contractual obligations or unrecorded bills have been reduced by over $20 billion representing a net reduction of over $8 billion.

I continue quoting from the Democratic platform of 1932:

> We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

I read further:

> We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe.

I now read from the Democratic platform of 1948:

> We pledge the continued maintenance of those sound fiscal policies which under Democratic leadership have brought about a balanced budget and reduction of the public debt by $28 billion since the close of the war.

I do not know where they found that figure, because at that time the Federal debt had been increased $200 billion over what it was when the Democratic Party took control. The record shows that during the 26 years in which the Democratic Party had control of the Government, they had never lived within their income except in two of those years. It might be said that part of this could be attributed to the fact that there were two world wars during the history of Democratic administrations, but all the deficit was not during the war years. During the peacetime years in which they were in control there was a deficit of over $70 billion, which when added to the $198-billion wartime deficit means that during the 26-year regime they spent $268 billion more than they took in through taxes. Yes, $268 billion worth of the so-called benefits which have been given to the people by the Democratic Party are charged to their grandchildren and to future generations.

Spend, tax, and elect has been the password of the Democratic administration for the past 20 years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the Senator has gone back 25 or 30 years, I should like to ask him if he is aware of the fact that the only time the national debt was ever paid off was under a Democratic President—Andrew Jackson?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That only emphasizes my point when you have to go back to President Jackson to find a Democratic balanced budget.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, has had control of the Government 28 years since 1900, and taking those 28 years, subtracting deficits from surpluses, we find that there was a surplus of $10 billion which was paid toward liquidation of the national debt. The only net reductions in the national debt which have been made by either political party during the past 50 years, have been made under Republican administrations.

Mr. President, now let us discuss the tax policy of the two parties. The claim has been made that the Democratic Party expresses a greater sympathy for

the American taxpayers. Both parties always express sympathy because the taxpayers vote on election day. But unfortunately sympathy does not have a cash value. It is the political parties record of accomplishments, not promises, that counts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been on the floor the entire afternoon and I have rather enjoyed the cascade of tears and solicitude for the taxpayers. Just to make the record clear, I wonder if the Senator from Delaware would take the example of an ordinary family, a man and wife, in 1932, and then state how much tax under present rates, after the lapse of 20 years, the same family would pay?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall bring it to the attention of the Senate because I think it is interesting. A man and wife with a taxable income of $3,500 in 1932 had an exemption of $2,500. That would represent a taxable income of $1,000. The rate at the time the Democratic Party took over was 4 percent, which would mean that a married man with a taxable income of $3,500 would pay a tax of $40.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us anchor it there. I can understand the dollar sign. A man and wife with an income of $3,500——

Mr. WILLIAMS. A taxable income.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. It would represent a net tax of $40?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have not yielded to the Senator from South Carolina. We have heard from the other side of the aisle for approximately 5 hours, and I notice that some of their Members are leaving the Chamber. I am sorry they are leaving, because I am quoting the Democratic platform, which is something they have not looked at in years. This record of observing these promises is not too good, and I do not blame them for not enjoying this review.

The tax rate was 22 percent in 1952, at the time the Democratic Party went out of power—a rise from 4 percent to 22 percent in 20 years or an increase of over 500 percent.

This is an increase on the lowest income group and the same group about whom so many tears are being shed here this afternoon.

Continuing the example, the married man with $3,500 net taxable income in 1952 had only a $1,200 exemption. His tax on the remaining $2,300 at 22 percent would be $506 compared with $40 on the same income when the Democratic Party took control. That is the manner in which the Democratic Party has put its pledges into practice. As I said before, down on the farm we judge the tree by the fruit which it bears.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So in 1932, the tax on a $3,500 income, after exemptions for the taxpayer's family, would have been $40.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At the end of 20 more years, as my friend Adlai Stevenson would say, the tax would have been $550. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would have been $506.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that since 1932 there have been World War II and the Korean war?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad the Senator from South Carolina has mentioned that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Was it not necessary for us to pay for those wars?

I should like the Senator from Delaware to tell us, also, the number of people who were making $3,500 in 1932.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from South Carolina mentioned the two wars. I am glad he did so because in every campaign which has been held since 1932 the question has been raised about the depression which took place under the Republican administration. A good argument could be made that this depression which was worldwide should not be attributed solely to the Republican Party. However, let us review the record on that point as far back as 1900. We find that since 1900 the control of our Government by the two political parties has been about equally divided, the Republican Party having had control 28 years and the Democratic Party 26 years. During the 28 years in which the Republican Party has had control of the Government since 1900, there has been but one depression.

It could be argued that the depression was a worldwide depression and not chargeable to the Republican Party. But I shall skip that. Since it occurred in a Republican administration, let us momentarily charge the depression to the Republican Party.

I point out, however, that while there was one depression which lasted 3 years—it was a severe one, as we all know—nevertheless let us not forget that under the Republican Party the United States enjoyed 28 years of peace—28 years in which the boys and girls of America could be sent to college. They were not engaged in war.

But, as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out, under Democratic administrations the United States has engaged in two world wars and also what is called a Korean police action. The Democratic Party would rather not refer to three wars.

I wish to make it clear that I am not accusing the Democratic Party of being a war party. I know that the wars were world wars; and an excellent argument, with which I would agree, could be made that the United States was engulfed in those worldwide conflicts. But they were wars, and they happened under the Democratic administration and if——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not at this moment. I want Senators on the other side of the aisle to hear what I have to say. I listened to them all afternoon.

If members of the Democratic Party wish to charge the depression to the Republican Party, a depression which was worldwide but which they wish to charge to the Republicans solely because it happened in a Republican administration, then I want the Democratic Party to take full blame for the wars which occurred in the Democratic administrations. If they boast of the artificial prosperity which accompanied those wars let them have full credit for the wars.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for reminding me of the wars, although I do not think the country would be forgetful of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I prefer to finish what I am saying. To return to the tax question, because that is what we are discussing——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would rather not. The hour is late, and the Senator from Illinois did not wish to yield to me when he was speaking.

Let us review the record to determine which political party has actually been the friend of the taxpayers, which party has reduced taxes, and which party has just talked about it.

In 1913, the first income-tax law was placed on the books. During the 41-year period which has elapsed since 1913, there have been 15 increases on individual income taxes. This report was furnished by the Joint Committee on Taxation and signed by Mr. Colin F. Stamm under date of October 14, 1954. The record shows that there have been 15 tax increases on individuals. Thirteen of those increases took place under Democratic administrations.

On only two occasions during the past 40 years have there been increases in taxes under Republican administrations.

On the other hand, there have been 10 tax reductions passed by Congress. Eight of those reductions took place under Republican administrations. On only two occasions since 1900 have there been tax reductions passed by Democratic Congresses.

On that record alone, I think, the American people can determine which party means what it says when it claims sympathy with the American people on the question of high taxes.

Let us now consider the history of personal exemptions. A lot of crocodile tears have been shed here this afternoon by those pitying the low income taxpayers. Which political party has actually helped the low income groups?

Certainly we all hope that we shall soon see the time when exemptions can be raised. Certainly I am not arguing that they are high enough. But we find again that when the Democratic Party took control of the Government in 1932, the personal exemptions were $1,000 for a single person and $2,500 for a married person.

As I pointed out to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a few moments ago——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to finish what I am saying.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not believe the Senator is stating the facts correctly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The facts are correct. They just sound bad when they are reviewed. I repeat: In 1932, when the party of the Senator from South Carolina came into power, individual exemptions were $1,000. The exemption for a married couple was $2,500. That amount was gradually whittled away by the Democratic Party until in 1948, when the Republican Party took control of the 80th Congress, the amount of the exemption had reached an all-time low of $500 for an individual and $1,000 for a married couple.

It was then over the veto of a Democratic President that the exemption was raised by the Republican 80th Congress from $500 up to $600. It is true that several Members on the other side of the aisle cooperated with the Republican Party in overriding the veto. But, as President Truman then said, the Republican Party, which was in control of the 80th Congress, was responsible for everything that happened. That was his statement. So the Republican Party takes the credit for that tax reduction. We are proud of it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to review briefly what that 1948 tax reduction amounted to because it was vetoed by a Democratic President, whose party today says it is such a great friend of the low-income groups.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Delaware aware of the fact that in the 80th Congress the tax bill was passed by the Senate and the House, and that in both Houses more than 90 percent of the Democrats voted for increased exemptions, while most Republicans voted against increased exemptions?

The President vetoed the first bill because it did not provide anything for those in the lower income brackets.

In the subsequent bill, which was passed over the President's veto, an amendment was offered in the House to increase the exemption another $100, and most Democrats voted for the exemption.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have great respect for the junior Senator from Louisiana, but he is confused on this matter. It would not have been mathematically possible for the Democratic Party to have passed any bill in the 80th Congress because the Republican Party had an overwhelming majority in both Houses.

Mr. LONG. I am certain the Senator from Delaware misunderstands what I am saying. During the 80th Congress, at a time when the Democrats admittedly were in the minority, a great majority of the Democrats voted repeatedly to raise the exemption, and offered amendments to that effect to the tax bill passed during that Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The record will show that the amendment raising exemptions was a part of a Republican tax bill and vetoed by a Democratic President. It is true that it was supported by many Members on both sides of the aisle. I am not trying to say that it was not. Nevertheless the Republican Party had overwhelming control of both Houses of Congress, and none other than the President of the United States said that the Republican Party was responsible for everything that happened in that Congress, and he vigorously denounced this same tax reduction measure in his campaign.

I review that 1948 tax bill. In addition to raising the exemption from $500 to $600, which was a reversal of the policy of gradually whittling down the exemption over 20 years, it also raised the exemption for persons over 65 years of age from $500 to $1,200. The Republican Party said that the earning capacity of those over 65 was limited, and that such persons were entitled to an additional exemption not of an additional $100 but of $700 more than they received before. That action had the effect of removing 1,400,000 persons over 65 years of age from the tax rolls.

That was tax relief where it was most needed.

The Democratic Party under President Truman said that that was bad; that those people should not be helped. President Truman vetoed the bill. It was necessary for the 80th Congress, which was controlled by the Republican Party, with the help of some of the Democratic members, to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Again, the Republican Party said that persons who were handicapped by blindness should receive a special exemption, and the exemption for persons in that category was increased from $500 to $1,200. That proposal, too, was vetoed by a President from the Democratic Party, a party which has more than once shed crocodile tears here this afternoon.

It will be found that altogether 7,400,000 persons were removed from the tax rolls in 1948 by this Republican Congress, which passed this tax bill over the veto of the Democratic President, when the individual exemption was raised from $500 to $600.

Yes, that action was denounced by the same political party whose representatives are shedding all these crocodile tears in the Senate this afternoon.

Once again, I pay my respects to the Members on the other side of the aisle who cooperated with the Republican Party in passing that wise legislation. Nevertheless, I point out that the bill which affected beneficially so many persons was opposed by the same political party which today is shedding crocodile tears for the same people, it was passed over their objections.

That action by a Republican Congress represented the first reversal in the whittling away of the amount of exemptions in the low-income group which had taken place in 20 years.

Again I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle that if they had been so interested in raising exemptions why did they not do something about it during their 20 years in power? Their present concern sounds to me—and I think it will be so considered by the American people—like a deathbed repentance.

Let us examine another section of the law that is being attacked as a giveaway program, namely, the accelerated depreciation-allowance provision. I want to make it clear that I am one of, I think, 13 Members of the Senate who voted against the tax bill last year. I voted against it because I felt it was unwise to pass the reduction at that time, that we should first have balanced the budget. I think if the law is to be criticized I am in a better position to criticize it than are some Senators who are criticizing it today but who voted for it when it was before the Senate because they wanted it passed, either because they desired the benefits for themselves, or for some other reason. Yet they now denounce the same depreciation provision which last year they supported.

I refer to the accelerated depreciation feature. As one Senator who voted against the bill, I say now that that provision was one of the wisest provisions included in the bill. It did more to help the little business man and farmer than any bill previously enacted. While this accelerated depreciation provision did not mean another 5-year amortization program it did represent a more rapid depreciation. It means that every taxpayer whether he is building a filling station, whether he is a farmer buying a tractor, or a small-business man building a warehouse, can more rapidly write off the cost of such investment without going to Washington and getting an amortization certificate. We all know that small-business men and farmers do not know how to get around the red tape in Washington. He cannot afford to pay a high-priced lawyer or a lobbyist to get him an amortization certificate. The record shows that under the previous administration 95 percent of all the amortization certificates of the 5-year writeoffs were given to the large corporations. The small-business man and farmer were ignored.

I wish to review what happened under the old law. We know that an expansion of plants was necessary during World War II. It was agreed that accelerated amortization would be justified. So during World War II accelerated amortizations were allowed in order that the plants which were needed for World War II could be constructed. Under this program a total of $7,300,000,000 was allowed in 5-year amortization certificates. That was adequate. We won the war. Those plants were still in existence and available when we became involved in the Korean war.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the total farm-price support for all the farmers in the United States amounts to only about $1 billion?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not have that figure before me.

Mr. LANGER. Yet a small group of businessmen and large corporations received over $7 billion; but one does not

read about that in the newspapers, does he?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I have said, I do not have those figures before me.

In World War II we granted $7,300,000,000 in accelerated depreciation. However, the past administration granted amortization certificates amounting to $11,104,000,000 in 1951 alone, or 150 percent, in the first year of the Korean war of what was granted in the entire period of World War II.

In 1952, the figure was extended higher again; $11,727,000,000 was granted in 1952, or a total, in that 2-year period, of over 3 times the amount granted during the entire World War II period. I repeat, 95 percent of that amount went to the major corporations, and it was the 1954 Revenue Code which corrected this inequity and placed the small corporations and farmers on a level with the largest.

This is one of the provisions which the Senators sponsoring the substitute bill here today would repeal. They want to go back to the old law where the large corporations or those with the proper influence will be the only ones to get a tax credit.

Yes, this record shows which party has been talking and which has been acting. In 1953, the first year of the Eisenhower administration the amount granted in amortization certificates to the large corporations was cut down to $4,780,000,000, and in the first 3 months of 1954 it was $421 million.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, came before the Congress and said he recommended a proposal which would treat all taxpayers alike. It was not a question of speaking against large industry, but as he said it was a provision which would give the farmer, the small-business man, the same rate of depreciation that had previously been granted so freely under the previous administrations to the large corporations alone.

I am sorry that Members of the Democratic Party would try to repeal a provision which gives the farmer for the first time in history the right to write off his tractor at the same rate of depreciation as was previously granted to the manufacturer who makes the tractor. Apparently they would now put him back under the old discriminatory provisions previously in existence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter furnished by Mr. Parnell, executive assistant to the Financial Policy Committee of the Bureau of the Budget, showing a breakdown of these amortization allowances be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In compliance with your telephone request of March 31, 1954, the following data is submitted relating to tax amortization certificates.

During World War II (1940 to 1945) tax amortization certificates were issued in accordance with the Second Revenue Act of 1940, covering privately owned facilities estimated to cost approximately $7.3 billion. Substantially all of these certificates were on a 100 percent basis, that is, authorizing the writeoff of the entire cost of the facility over a 60-month period. In addition, the Government expended approximately $18 billion of public funds for industrial facilities during this period.

Tax amortization certificates have been issued pursuant to section 124-A of the 1950 Revenue Act approved on September 23, 1950, to stimulate private investment in defense facilities, as follows:

Calendar year:	*Dollar amount*
1950	$1,470,000,000
1951	11,104,000,000
1952	11,727,000,000
1953	4,780,000,000
1954 (to Mar. 24, 1954)	421,000,000
Total	29,502,000,000

Of this total amount, approximately 60 percent, or $17,700,000,000 may be written off for income tax purposes over a 60-month period. The remainder of the cost not certified for defense purposes can be written off concurrently at normal depreciation. It should be noted that this amount of $17,700,000,000, above referred to, is in lieu of normal depreciation applicable to the certified portion of the investment. The difference between the accelerated amortization and the normal depreciation, at the prevailing tax rates, represents a tax deferment repayable to the Government during the remaining useful life of the facilities. It may be of interest to you, based upon a study made by the Treasury Department of the activity under the World War II amortization statute, that perhaps approximately 30 percent of the amortization certified will not be utilized either because of failure of the taxpayer to proceed with the certified expansion or because of an election not to use tax amortization for business reasons.

I would like to call your attention to the third annual report (p. 3) of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, dated October 20, 1953: "* * * Expansions have been accomplished with minor public-fund expenditures, in contrast with the World War II expansion when public funds were used for more than 70 percent of plant expansion."

I trust this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

F. L. PARNELL,
Executive Assistant, Financial Policy Activity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the information contained in these documents shows a breakdown of the amortization certificates as distributed by both political parties.

I think from that information alone one can see which party is protecting the smaller taxpayer. I wish to repeat that it was only under this provision as enacted in the law last year that the farmer who buys farm machinery could, for the first time in history, write off that farm machinery at a rate of depreciation comparable to that used by the owner of the plant which manufactured the machinery.

Our major farm organizations enthusiastically endorsed this accelerated amortization provision as it was incorporated in the 1954 revenue act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Notwithstanding that the rate would be somewhat smaller than the depreciation allowance on, let us say, an Oklahoma oil well. Is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, you are right. The 27½ percent depletion allowance allowed the oil companies is a major loophole. For years we have unsuccessfully tried to plug this millionaire "gravy train." One point that should be remembered as we discuss this accelerated depreciation provision of the 1954 act is that while the small-business man and the farmer now get a greater depreciation allowance the larger corporations get a smaller allowance than they enjoyed under the old law. Personally, I doubt that in the long run the provisions of the 1954 code will be as expensive as the old law.

I still cannot understand how those who so enthusiastically voted for the bill last year can justify the position they are taking on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator for the very fine speech he is making. Every Senator on the floor knows the fine record which the Senator from Delaware has made in connection with tax matters. In all the investigations made by the Senator from Delaware has he ever discovered a small farmer who kept two sets of books?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I never found any small farmer or any large business which did so, because I have not had occasion to investigate that question. However, I will agree with the Senator from North Dakota that the overwhelming majority of the American farmers are honest. I go further than that lest my remarks be misunderstood. I think the overwhelming majority of American corporations and the American people, regardless of the position they occupy, are honest. My experience in exposing irregularity in the Treasury Department showed that while the irregularity involved crooked taxpayers, they were involved only as they connived with crooked Government officials. Furthermore, what I have said with respect to the farmers and the American people generally can be said for Government officials. While there were a few bad or rotten apples in the barrel, the overwhelming majority of Government officials, even those in the Treasury Department, were trying to perform their duties well; but there were some who were dishonest.

As the Senator knows, it took the last administration much longer to recognize the problem than was necessary. I placed in the RECORD time and time again matters calling irregularities to their attention. It was only after convictions were obtained that the administration admitted we were right.

Mr. LANGER. I remember the Senator from Delaware did a very fine job in connection with the Internal Revenue collector up in New York, whose name was Johnson, and how time after time on the floor of the Senate the Senator

appealed to the Department of Justice and to others to see that justice was done. The Senator is entitled to all the credit for the exposures in that matter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. When the Senator speaks of accelerated depreciation which was granted to war industries during the Korean war, the Senator realizes, does he not, that at that very time Congress also enacted a 10-percent corporation tax and also an excess-profits tax? If we had not provided for accelerated-depreciation credit at that time, no one would have had any profit incentive whatsoever to set up a war industry, because—after all—for the most part those industries could not have anticipated very good business conditions after the war was over. Ordinarily it would have been anticipated that there would be a great falling off in the demand for their products, after the Korean war was over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have already said that there would be some justification for the issuance of amortization certificates, but I point out that the arguments the Senator from Louisiana uses in behalf of the issuance of such certificates are the same ones which were used in favor of the issuance of amortization certificates during World War II. During World War II there was also an excess-profits tax, just as there was during the Korean war. Conditions were identical, except that as we approached the Korean war, we then had left over from World War II all the vast productive capacity we had used in order to win that war, whereas when World War II began we had to build from a scratch. Yet, I point out that the amortization certificates issued for 1951 and 1952—for those 2 years alone—were granted in the amount of $22 billion, or over three times as much as the total amount required during World War II. I point out further that over 95 percent of those certificates went to only a few of the major corporations.

I know the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me that, under the accelerated depreciation provision which is under attack today, there is for the first time in years equal treatment for every taxpayer in the United States—for the small-business man who is building a warehouse, for a farmer who is building a barn or purchasing a combine or a tractor, as well as for the manufacturers of those products.

I do not know the position the Senator from Louisiana took in the committee. I believe he supported the provision. I do know that the committee overwhelmingly subscribed to the recommendation of the Treasury Department that all taxpayers be treated on a basis of equality, and also overwhelmingly subscribed to the principle that unless this provision was written into law, small taxpayers would not be able to obtain amortization certificates or credits.

I doubt that there is in the United States a small taxpayer who would even go to the trouble of applying for an amortization certificate. I know the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me as to that principle.

Mr. LONG. But my point is that I gained the impression that perhaps the Senator from Delaware was suggesting that in the previous tax bill, the previous Democratic administration was favoring big business, because of the depreciation provision. However, I wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that the same administration also slapped on big business an excess-profits tax and a 10 percent increase in corporation taxes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. But the provision about which I am speaking is an exemption whereby such concerns could write off $23 billion of accelerated depreciation, rather than pay excess-profits taxes. Regardless of whether that was right or wrong, I know it was a direct tax credit, 95 percent of which went to the large corporations; and that is what is proposed to be restored in place of the accelerated depreciation provision, which now is being given to all taxpayers on the basis of equality. I am merely trying to get the record straight as to what you propose to do under your substitute proposal being offered here this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Delaware well knows, and I think all other Members of this body well know, that the term "tax amortization" was familiar to every clerk and secretary on Capitol Hill, and that there was not an office of a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives that did not have visitors from home who were interested, and who in most cases could afford to come to Washington to present their case to the appropriate agency, whereas the average farmer or small-business man was not in that happy position. So this provision took care of all in an equal way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right. As I said before, a farmer who builds a barn or a farmer who purchases a tractor, or a small-business man now gets exactly the same tax credit as that obtained by the largest business corporation in the country. However, that is not a condition which existed in prior years. I certainly think that fact, too, should be stated for the record in order to show which party favors the smaller taxpayers.

Mr. President, earlier this afternoon we were told that under the preceding administration the national debt had declined by $3 billion. It is true that on June 30, 1946, the public debt was $269,400,000,000; and on June 30, 1953, the last fiscal year for which the preceding administration was responsible, the national debt stood at $266 billion, or a decline in that 7-year period of $3.4 billion. There has been much boasting about that figure; however, I wish to point out that almost anything can be proved by figures if a part of the figures are omitted. I desire to incorporate in the RECORD today figures which perhaps, shall we say, were overlooked by those boasting of that reduction.

Mr. President, yes; on June 30, 1946, the public debt was $269,400,000,000. That is correct. However, at the same time the cash on hand or the general fund was $14,200,000,000.

On June 30, 1953, the cash on hand had declined to $4,600,000,000, or a decline in cash on hand of approximately $10 billion. On that point alone we have a decline of $10 billion in the cash on hand, and we have a decrease of $3 billion in the national debt. Those figures alone put the previous administration in the position of having a $7 billion deficit.

But, still that does not tell all the story; and we want all the story told this afternoon.

Continuing the record of the 7-year period of the preceding administration we find that on June 30, 1946, the unexpended appropriations, or contract authorizations were $28 billion. When the preceding administration left office, it had increased the contractual obligations as of June 30, 1953, to $83,298,000,000, or an increase of approximately $55 billion in that item. Thus we find that taking this $55 billion in unpaid bills, and adding the $10 billion loss in cash, then subtracting the $3 billion credit made on the national debt leaves the record to show that the Truman administration actually spent $62 billion more during their 7-year term of office than they collected in taxes. Yes, during those 7 years the Truman administration spent a total of $62 billion more than it took in, and those obligations were passed on to the Eisenhower administration.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, figures furnished to me by the Library of Congress which substantiate this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In reply to your recent inquiry for various Federal financial data, the following information is submitted:

1. Unexpended appropriations (general and special accounts):

June 30, 1946	$28,022,633,816
June 30, 1947	17,720,154,104
June 30, 1948	19,632,952,700
May 31, 1953 (actual)	91,280,853,215
June 30, 1953 (estimated)	83,298,436,271

2. Gross public debt (as of June 30):

1946	$269,422,099,173
1947	258,286,383,109
1948	252,292,246,513
1953	266,071,061,639

3. General fund balance (as of June 30):

1946	$14,237,900,000
1947	3,308,100,000
1948	4,932,000,000
1953	4,607,200,000

4. Rescissions of appropriations and contract authorizations by the 80th Congress:

	80th Cong., 1st sess.	80th Cong., 2d sess.	Total, 80th Cong.
Appropriations	$4,111,339,814	$79,681,845	$4,191,021,659
Contract authorizations	132,000,000	205,071,294	337,071,294

With regard to the effect of Congressional rescission of appropriations on the public debt, such action did not directly bring about a reduction the total Federal debt. Indirectly, the public debt was affected in that it did not rise as high as it might have, had Federal expenditures been at the high level originally provided by Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What my friend, the Senator from Delaware, seeks to emphasize is that the previous administration had all the fun of doing the shopping and buying the merchandise; and then, when that administration went out of office, it laid on the desk of President Eisenhower all the bills, to the tune of approximately $83 billion, and those bills confronted us when we came in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So they had the fun, and we have had to pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Stated in more simple terms, during the first 12 months of the Eisenhower administration, every dollar and every dime of revenue collected was insufficient to pay off the outstanding bills the present administration inherited from the Truman administration. I am speaking now only of those bills not included in the national debt figure.

At no other time in the history of the United States Government has any previous administration in going out of office passed on to its successor any such amount of unpaid bills or indebtedness. The nearest to it was in 1945, when President Roosevelt died unexpectedly in the midst of his term. The contractual obligations of the Federal Government then amounted to $28 billion, but that was in large part due to the fact that World War II was going on, and there were a great many unpaid bills.

But why would there be three times as many unpaid bills in 1953 when the Eisenhower administration took over as there were during World War II—unless the previous administration was afraid to tell the American people just how much they were spending. They were afraid to tell the American people the cost of some of the programs that had been "given" to them.

I wish to repeat something that is often overlooked. The Federal Government does not give anything to the American people. The only benefits the American people receive through legislation are benefits which are paid for by the taxes taken directly or indirectly out of the pockets of those who receive the benefits. The Government has no mysterious source of income. The only source of revenue available to the Federal Government is that of taxes on the American people or from money which is borrowed in their name.

I think we are fortunate that after 22 years we have an administration in power which is trying to turn back to the people some of the control over their own money.

One thing which we should remember in connection with this proposed tax reduction is that every dollar of tax reduction proposed in this bill or any other bill can be paid for only by borrowing the money. Expenses have not been cut sufficient to offset the loss in revenue. I am not speaking on the merits of whether $600 exemption is high enough or not but merely pointing out that every dollar of tax reduction can be paid for only by borrowing the money. In order to borrow the money, we must first raise the ceiling on the national debt. I do not believe that at any time, under any consideration, a tax reduction based on borrowed money can be justified, particularly at a time when the country is at peace and when we are enjoying the highest degree of prosperity we have ever known.

1953 and 1954 were the 2 years of highest prosperity this country has ever known. For the first time, after 20 years, the American people are seeing that they can have both peace and prosperity and that they do not have to choose between peace and prosperity.

I think it is important to remember, as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] so ably pointed out, that we cannot continue down the road of deficit spending. The reductions in the proposed substitute would lose about $2¼ billion. I wish to point out that not only must we borrow the money to pay for the tax reduction, but we must borrow an additional $67½ million annually to pay the interest on the money we borrow to meet the tax reduction. Yes, it will cost $67½ million dollars to pay the interest on the money we borrow to pay for the tax reduction alone.

Certainly that type of financing could be described as fiscal irresponsibility. As further evidence of the danger of continued Government-deficit spending, I point out that in 1929 the income of two-thirds of the people of the State of California would have been sufficient to pay all the operating expenses of our Government.

Ten years later, in 1939, to pay the operating expenses of our Government it would require all the income of all the people in 11 of our most Western States.

In 1953, at the time we took control of this administration, it would require all the income of all the people in 23½ States, or all the income of all people west of the Mississippi, plus the income of the people of 1½ States east of the Mississippi. The devouring shadow of taxation is gradually rolling eastward. Eventually, under this rapid spending program, all the people will be working for the Government, and the Government will ultimately take control. History shows that more governments have spent themselves into socialism than have ever adopted that philosophy through legislation.

The greatest danger to America today is the growing tendency on the part of too many political leaders to overlook the importance or necessity of the Government's living within its income.

There is no question today but that our Federal budget could be balanced if Congress and the executive branch only have the will to do it. It cannot be done, however, if political leaders continue to promise their constituents support for every Federal aid program or appropriation and at the same time promise lower taxes, all in the name of political expediency.

The indirect effect of this 20-year inflationary policy has been to destroy one-half the value of every Government bond sold. The past administration has expressed a great deal of sympathy for the average working man, elderly people, and those in the low income brackets. If sympathy had a dollar value, they would all be millionaires today. Ten years ago the Government sold an American citizen a Government bond and said to him, "You pay in $3, and we will pay you back $4." The holders of such bonds cannot buy with the $4 what they could have bought with $2 at the time they purchased the bond. One-half the purchasing power of every Government bond had been taken away. One-half the value of every life insurance policy, every savings account, every pension or social security fund, and every retirement fund, has been destroyed as the result of the inflation of the past 10 years.

In every town in America we can picture some elderly couple who retired 10 or 15 years ago on what we would have said at that time was adequate income, either from a life insurance policy or a pension fund, to take care of them for the rest of their lives. However, today as the result of the depreciation of the purchasing power of their dollar those people have reached the point where they are compelled to appeal to the welfare agencies in order to provide the actual necessities of life.

Through no fault of their own, the purchasing power of the money which they had saved and accumulated has been destroyed by an administration which at the same time was shedding crocodile tears for them. They are the forgotten people of America.

During the past 2 years the decline in the value of the American dollar has been arrested. Last year showed a slight increase in the value of the dollar. For the first time in 20 years we have reversed the trend. I think it is very important that the Congress stand by the administration at this time and not enact the proposed tax reduction, which, as the Senator from Virginia has said, might well prove to be the spark to touch off another inflationary spiral.

The depreciation of the dollar by as little as one-half of 1 percent would wipe out all the benefits of the proposed $2½ billion of tax relief. A government which undertakes to provide tax relief with borrowed money will ultimately end in bankruptcy.

Mr. President, as evidence that this tax reduction is not needed from an unemployment angle, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing unemployment figures beginning with the year 1939 and continuing through 1953.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unemployment figures as compiled by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation from figures furnished to them by the Department of Commerce

[Thousands]

Month	1948	1949	1950
January	2,065	2,664	4,480
February	2,639	3,221	4,684
March	2,440	3,167	4,122
April	2,193	3,016	3,515
May	1,761	3,289	3,057
June	2,184	3,778	3,384
July	2,227	4,095	3,213
August	1,941	3,689	2,500
September	1,899	3,351	2,341
October	1,642	3,576	1,940
November	1,831	3,409	2,240
December	1,941	3,489	2,229

	Yearly averages
1939	9,480,000
1940	8,120,000
1941	5,560,000
1942	2,660,000
1943	1,070,000
1944	670,000
1945	1,040,000
1946	2,270,000
1947	2,142,000
1948	2,064,000
1949	3,395,000
1950	3,142,000
1951	1,879,000
1952	1,673,000
1953	1,602,000

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. W. C. WENTWORTH, A MEMBER OF THE AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have as my guest on the floor of the Senate today Hon. W. C. Wentworth, a member of the Australian Parliament, whose constituency is in Sydney, Australia. [Applause.]

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it seems to me that a few remarks concerning statements made by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are appropriate at this time, although for the most part I shall discuss the bill and express my views on it tomorrow.

In the first place, the senior Senator from Delaware mentioned the fact that income taxes were raised during Democratic administrations. Of course he is completely correct in saying that. Historically it has always been the Democratic Party that urged the enactment of income tax laws, because taxes, according to the view of the Democratic Party, should be based on ability to pay. It will be remembered that many years ago the Democratic Party urged the adoption of a constitutional amendment to make possible the levying of income taxes, and eventually the Democratic Party was successful.

I submit that an income tax on individuals and corporations is undoubtedly one of the fairest means of collecting taxes. Certainly it became the major way of raising revenue in this country.

It is unfortunate that in raising great revenue it is necessary to reduce exemptions, and it is true that during World War II the exemptions were reduced to as low as $500 for each person. Although I was not a Member of the Senate when that was done, it was explained on the floor that it was the intention that the exemption should be raised immediately after the war was over.

After the war, there was an opportunity to reduce taxes. At that time we had a Republican Congress. The Democrats, both in the House and in the Senate, urged that in reducing taxes Congress should keep its pledge, and see to it that those who are denied the sustenance of life, who in effect have the very bread taken out of their mouths by burdensome taxation, should have the first relief.

I do not have before me the full House record, but I believe it will parallel the record made in the Senate.

The Senate had before it H. R. 1, a measure to reduce taxes on incomes. When that measure was before the Senate the then Senator Lucas of Illinois moved that the exemption be raised from $500 to $600, and that provision be made to permit family-income splitting to reduce surtax rates by 2 percent, and to postpone the effective date of the bill to January 1, 1948.

On that vote 27 Democrats, or 73 percent of the Democrats present, voted for the amendment, and 11 Democrats, or 27 percent, voted against the amendment. One Republican, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], voted for the amendment. All other Republicans, 47 of them, or 98 percent of the Republican Senators present in the Senate at that time, voted against the amendment. This record will be found as vote No. 72, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 5, page 5925.

When that amendment was defeated, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], offered an amendment to increase the exemptions of single persons from $500 to $750, and to raise the exemptions for married couples from $1,000 to $1,500.

How did the Senate vote on that amendment?

Twenty-three Democrats, or 77 percent of the Democratic Senators present, voted for the McClellan amendment, and 7 Democratic Senators, or 23 percent, voted against it.

On the Republican side of the aisle, 4 Republican Senators, Senators Ferguson, Langer, Wilson, and Young, voted for the amendment, and 37 Republican Senators voted against the amendment.

H. R. 1 was passed by a vote of 52 to 34, with 9 Senators not voting. Seven Democrats, or 18 percent, voted for the bill, and 32 Democratic Senators, or 82 percent, voted against it.

Forty-five Republican Senators, or 96 percent, voted for the bill, and 2 Republicans voted against it.

For the most part, if I understand what the issue was at that time, there was severe criticism that the bill did not adequately take care of the ordinary working people, those in the low-income brackets, who needed the additional purchasing power with which to buy the necessities of life.

I am sure the Senator from Delaware will recall that he voted against raising the exemptions and voted to pass the bill reducing taxes at that time by several billion dollars.

That bill was vetoed by the President of the United States. The bill went to the House of Representatives, and the House sustained the veto of the President.

Another bill was introduced. That bill again provided for a 20-percent reduction on incomes between $1,400 and $137,000; a 15-percent reduction on incomes in excess of $137,000, but not in excess of $302,400; a 10½-percent reduction from $302,400 on up; and certain additional tax reductions for those over 65 years of age.

That bill was passed by the House of Representatives. In the Senate an amendment was offered to increase the exemptions. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] offered an amendment to increase the exemption from $500 to $600 for single persons, and from $1,000 to $1,200 for married couples.

That amendment was defeated, 43 yeas, 47 nays, 5 not voting. In that instance 37 Democrats voted for raising the exemption, 9 Democrats voted against it; 10 Republicans voted for it, and 38 Republicans voted against it.

That bill was vetoed, and my understanding is that the President vetoed it for two reasons: First, that the Government needed the revenue; and, second, that it did not adequately provide for persons in the lower income brackets. Once again the President's veto was sustained by a vote of 57 yeas and 36 nays.

Mr. President, only after the Democrats had successfully sustained the President's veto on two occasions, the argument being in each case that there was not adequate consideration for those in the lower income brackets, did the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives finally introduce a bill which would raise exemptions from $500 to $600. Even then it is my understanding that the Democrats in the House once again tried to increase the exemption, and the Republicans voted almost solidly against increasing it.

Since World War II, the Democrats have a consistent record of trying to give relief to those in the low-income brackets. It was consistent in the last Congress, because once again the Democrats joined together in supporting an amendment which, instead of giving tax relief on corporation dividends, offered relief to persons in the low-income brackets. In that instance 95 percent of the Democrats supported it. I believe only 2 Democrats voted against the amendment offered by the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the committee [Mr. GEORGE]. The others voted for the amendment which would have substituted relief for those in the low-income brackets in terms of either a tax credit or a provision whereby there would be an increase in the exemption of approximately $100.

On that occasion, the Republicans joined in supporting an amendment to

cut by one-half the relief urged by the Democrats. Their amendment failed in an almost solid party vote. Thereupon more than 90 percent of the Republicans voted against the George amendment which would have increased the exemption by $100.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

Mr. LONG. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is present. I do not want him to misunderstand me when I speak of the Republicans voting almost solidly against raising the exemption. I know that on every occasion the able Senator from North Dakota voted in favor of raising the exemption. That is why, in speaking on the border of the State of North Dakota, I said last year that the Senator from North Dakota should be a Democrat because he voted like a Democrat so many times.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I am an Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-George Norris Republican, and I am doing my very best to reform the Republican Party from the inside. I am trying to get them to think the Abraham Lincoln way and the way of the other distinguished men whom I have named. I think I shall finally get President Eisenhower to do some of that same thinking. I would not be surprised if the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] might revise his thinking. I have known him a long time. He is one of those very fine men from the State of Delaware of which we are so proud. I am sure that if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will take a little time, he may convert the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LONG. I hope I shall not have to wait as long for the Republican Party to follow the point of view of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota as he has waited. The Senator from North Dakota has not left the Republican Party; that party has time and again left him, because it abandoned the principles to which he is dedicated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Louisiana referred to the Johnson amendment. I wonder if he would yield at this time so that I may incorporate in the RECORD the vote on the amendment.

Mr. LONG. I shall be glad to have it placed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the vote on the Johnson amendment and on the Monroney amendment.

There being no objection, the votes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTE NO. 173—83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, page 9468)

Subject: H. R. 8300, tax revision bill. Johnson amendment, calling for a study of the question as to inclusion of dividends in gross income.

Synopsis: The amendment introduced by Senator Johnson of Colorado had as its purpose to strike from the bill the section (section 34) extending tax relief to apply on dividends to individuals, and to substitute in place thereof a provision directing the Secretary of the Treasury to make a study of questions involving the inclusion in gross income of dividends received by individuals and to report thereon to the next Congress, in January 1955.

Proponents of the Johnson amendment argued that as the Senate had refused to grant the kind of income-tax relief proposed in the Millikin and George amendments (see Vote Nos. 171 and 172), it would be inconsistent to grant tax relief on dividends at this time, and that, instead, it would be desirable to have a complete study made of the question during the time elapsing between enactment of the bill by this Congress and the convening of the next Congress. Proponents contended that the dividend section of the bill unfairly favored about 6 percent of the taxpayers and discriminated against about 94 percent.

Opponents of the Johnson amendment offered no arguments. However, in the course of the discussion, some defense of the tax relief provided in the dividend section was implied by references to "double taxation." It was said that a tax on stock dividends received by a taxpayer was "double taxation" because the company paying the dividend had previously paid a tax on the same earnings.

Action: Johnson amendment was passed.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 13, as follows:

Yeas—71: Aiken, *Anderson, Barrett, Beall, Bowring, Bricker, *Burke, Butler of Maryland, *Byrd, Capehart, Carlson, Case, *Chavez, *Clements, Cordon, Crippa, *Daniel, Dirksen, *Douglas, Dworshak, *Ervin, Ferguson, *Frear, *Fulbright, *George, *Gore, *Green, Hendrickson, *Hill, *Holland, *Humphrey, Ives, *Jackson, *Johnson of Colorado, *Johnson of Texas, *Kefauver, *Kennedy, *Kilgore, Knowland, Kuchel, Langer, *Lehman, *Lennon, *Magnuson, *Mansfield, *Maybank, *McCarran, Millikin, *Monroney, †Morse, Mundt, *Murray, *Neely, *Pastore, Payne, Potter, Purtel, *Robertson, *Russell, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, *Smathers, Smith of Maine, Smith of New Jersey, *Sparkman, *Stennis, Thye, Watkins, Welker, Williams, Young.

Nays—13: Bennett, Bridges, Bush, Cooper, Flanders, *Gillette, Goldwater, *Hayden, Hickenlooper, *Long, Malone, Martin, Upton.

Not voting—12: Butler of Nebraska, Duff, *Eastland, *Ellender, *Hennings, Jenner, *Johnston of South Carolina, *Kerr, McCarthy, *McClellan, *Symington, Wiley.

Analysis of vote	Republicans	Democrats	Independent
Yeas (71)	33	37	1
Nays (13)	10	3	0
Not voting (12)	5	7	0
Total	48	47	1
Positions of Senators not voting:			
Not paired—Position "yea"	[1] 1	[2] 7	------
Not paired—No position	[3] 4	0	------

Absent:
Official business: Duff, Eastland, Ellender, Hennings, Johnston (S. C.), Kerr, McClellan, Symington.
Necessarily absent: Jenner, McCarthy, Wiley.
Illness: Butler (Nebr.).

[1] Duff.
[2] Eastland, Ellender, Hennings, Johnston (S. C.), Kerr, McClellan, Symington.
[3] Butler (Nebr.), Jenner, McCarthy, Wiley.

VOTE NO. 179—83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, page 9618)

Subject: H. R. 8300, tax revision bill. Monroney amendment, which would strike out all proposed tax revisions and extend the 52-percent corporate tax for 1 year.

Synopsis: The Monroney amendment would change the title of H. R. 8300 to refer only to extension of the tax on corporation income. The amendment would be in the nature of a substitute for the bill as reported.

The arguments on the amendment, pro and con, were identical with the arguments offered relative to passage of the bill itself. (See synopsis of Vote No. 180.)

Action: Monroney amendment was rejected.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58, as follows:

Yeas—15: *Chavez, *Fulbright, *Gore, *Jackson, *Johnson of Colorado, *Magnuson, *Mansfield, *McCarran, *Monroney, †Morse, *Murray, *Russell, *Sparkman, *Stennis, Williams.

Nays—58: Aiken, *Anderson, Barrett, Beall, Bennett, Bowring, Bricker, Bridges, *Burke, Bush, Butler, Capehart, Carlson, Case, *Clements, Cooper, Cordon, Crippa, *Daniel, Dirksen, *Douglas, Duff, Dworshak, *Ervin, Ferguson, *Frear, *George, Goldwater, *Hayden, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, *Holland, *Humphrey, Ives, *Johnson of Texas, *Kennedy, Knowland, Kuchel, Langer, *Long, Malone, Martin, Millikin, Mundt, *Neely, *Pastore, Payne, Potter, Purtell, Schoeppel, *Smathers, Smith of Maine, *Symington, Thye, Upton, Watkins, Welker, Young.

Not voting—22: *Byrd, *Eastland, *Ellender, Flanders, *Gillette, *Green, *Hennings, *Hill, Jenner, *Johnston of South Carolina, *Kefauver, *Kerr, *Kilgore, *Lehman, *Lennon, *Maybank, McCarthy, *McClellan, *Robertson, Saltonstall, Smith of New Jersey, Wiley.

Analysis of vote	Republicans	Democrats	Independent
Yeas (15)	1	13	1
Nays (58)	40	18	0
Not voting (22)	6	16	0
Total	47	47	1
Positions of Senators not voting:			
Paired—"yea"	0	[1] 2	------
Paired—"nay"	[2] 1	[3] 1	------
Not paired—Position "yea"	0	[4] 2	------
Not paired—Position "nay"	[5] 3	0	------
Not paired—No position	[6] 2	[7] 11	------

Absent:
Leave of Senate: Maybank.
Official business: Byrd, Eastland, Ellender, Gillette, Green, Hennings, Hill, Johnston (S. C.), Kefauver, Kerr, Kilgore, Lehman, Lennon, McClellan, Robertson.
Necessarily absent: Flanders, Jenner, McCarthy, Saltonstall, Smith (N. J), Wiley.

[1] Maybank, Robertson.
[2] Saltonstall.
[3] Ellender.
[4] Byrd, Hennings.
[5] Flanders, Jenner, Smith (N. J.).
[6] McCarthy, Wiley.
[7] Eastland, Gillette, Green, Hill, Johnston (S. C.), Kefauver, Kerr, Kilgore, Lehman, Lennon, McClellan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say that the Senator from Louisiana voted against striking out the dividend provisions.

Mr. LONG. I certainly did; and I also voted against striking the accelerated depreciation provisions. It is my position that I should like very well to see corporate stockholders have some relief and have accelerated depreciation, but if I am in a position where I must

favor the corporations or the people, I will favor the people. Of course, the Senator from Delaware had an opportunity to vote the same way. He did vote to strike out the dividend provision, but he did not vote for any relief for the small taxpayers by increasing their exemptions. I regret that he did not agree with my position on that point.

Furthermore, in considering the tax bill this year, I was not anxious to extend the high rate of corporation tax. It was only because it was necessary to obtain revenue for the Government that I was willing to vote for a bill which extended the corporation tax rate. But in view of the fact that we did not give any relief to the average man, we had no right to be holding out a promise to the corporations of America that their taxes would be cut 10 percent next year. So I moved to strike out the provision that would cause the corporation tax to be reduced by 10 percent next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. During the discussion of the bill last year the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] offered an amendment proposing that the tax reduction be postponed until we balanced the budget. The Senator from Oklahoma's amendment struck out all tax-reduction features of the bill and provided for a simple extension of the corporation tax rates. His amendment was defeated by 15 votes. I supported that proposal, and thought it should have passed. The Senator from Louisiana differed with us on that point, and I respect his opinion. I certainly attribute to the Senator from Louisiana the same degree of sincerity which I hope he attributes to me. But it could not have been such a terrible bill, because the Senator supported it. So, do not attack it too strongly this afternoon. It could not have been such a vicious piece of legislation.

Mr. LONG. I do not attack last year's bill as being a vicious piece of legislation. I have stated that the Democrats have consistently tried to do something for the little people of the Nation. The only thing which was really wrong with last year's bill, the only thing I severely criticized, is that while it did so many things for corporations and business people—and I was glad to see most of those things done; I was delighted to see stockholders get special treatment and I was pleased to see something done about accelerated depreciation—nothing was done for the low-income people, except in a few instances. There were some little tidbits here and there, handed out to lower bracket taxpayers, such as the man who had a boy working his way through college, a retired aged person or a retired school teacher, to mention a few.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that that bill took care of babysitters?

Mr. LONG. No, I am sorry to say, it did not take care of babysitters. It took care of the working mothers who hired babysitters.

If we Democrats had had our way, the bill would also have taken care of babysitters. But, unfortunately, we did not prevail, and we could not take care of babysitters.

The babysitters did not get relief, but the working mothers got a little relief if they were in a position to hire babysitters.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to make one comment, to get the RECORD straight.

I point out for the RECORD that the exemptions were reduced from $1,000 to $750 under Democratic administrations prior to 1941. At that time the then President was campaigning on the platform that there was absolutely no threat of war; therefore, it cannot be claimed that the exemptions were reduced as a result of rearmament for war.

The exemptions were reduced by the Democratic Party during the peacetime years as well as during the war years.

Likewise, the rate was raised from 4 percent to 10 percent on the lowest tax bracket before World War II and from the 10 percent rate to 22 percent after the outbreak of war. A continuous increase in taxes in peace and war has been the policy of the past Democratic administrations. Unbalanced budgets have been ignored as the New Deal, Fair Deal politicians danced to the tune of taxes, spend, and elect.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, stating my own opinion, I believe the record of the Democratic Party speaks for itself. So far as doing what could be done within the limits of the Government's situation, and providing for the average person and giving him every consideration possible, I believe the Democratic record is a very good one.

I believe I have demonstrated that the record of the Democratic Party during recent Congresses is good, in looking after the average workingman and other persons in average walk of life.

Point for point, issue for issue, that record will stand up to any criticism, scrutiny, or comparison.

At this time I do not wish to delve many years back into history, because I do not have available all the issues which were raised at the time the income-tax law was passed or at the time exemptions were lowered.

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

John K. Emmerson, of Colorado.
Edward S. Maney, of Texas.
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
George A. Morgan, of the District of Columbia.
Woodruff Wallner, of New York.

George H. Emery, of North Carolina, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

R. Austin Acly, of Massachusetts.
N. Spencer Barnes, of California.
Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts.
Sterling J. Cottrell, of California.
Robert C. Creel, of New York.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Edward L. Freers, of California.
Richard D. Gatewood, of California.
Wesley C. Haraldson, of Virginia.
Landreth M. Harrison, of Minnesota.
Owen T. Jones, of Ohio.
Sidney K. Lafoon, of Virginia.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.
Walter W. Orebaugh, of Oregon.
John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia.
Robert C. Strong, of Wisconsin.
Alfred T. Wellborn, of Louisiana.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.
Eric C. Wendelin, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Bernhard G. Bechhoefer, of the District of Columbia.
William I. Cargo, of Maryland.
Sam P. Gilstrap, of Oklahoma.
John W. Jago, of California.
Charles H. Mace, of Ohio.
Alfred Puhan, of Wisconsin.
Joseph W. Scott, of Texas.
Richard S. Wheeler, of Michigan.
William D. Wright, of the District of Columbia.

Gerald Warner, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a counsul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

James M. Byrne, of New York.
Keld Christensen, of Iowa.
Clyde L. Clark, of Iowa.
Merritt N. Cootes, of Virginia.
Roy T. Davis, Jr., of Maryland.
Juan de Zengotita, of Pennsylvania.
Donald P. Downs, of Nevada.
Philip F. Dur, of Massachusetts.
James R. Gustin, of Wisconsin.
David H. Henry, 2d, of New York.
William P. Hudson, of North Carolina.
William E. Knight, 2d, of Connecticut.
Roswell D. McClelland, of Connecticut.
William D. Moreland, Jr., of Oregon.
Clinton L. Olson, of California.
Norman K. Pratt, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Rossow, Jr., of Indiana.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.
Cyril L. F. Thiel, of Illinois.
Edward L. Waggoner, of Ohio.
Joseph J. Wagner, of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

George H. Alexander, of Maryland.
Morton Bach, of Minnesota.
Edward P. Dobyns, of Virginia.
Bryan R. Frisbie, of Arizona.
Robert A. Hancock, of Michigan.
John E. Hargrove, of Mississippi.
Marshall P. Jones, of Maryland.
Warren H. McKenney, of Florida.
Robert M. Marr, of Ohio.
Howard Meyers, of Maryland.

Trevanion H. E. Nesbitt, of Maryland.
Nils William Olsson, of Illinois.
Nestor C. Ortiz, of Virginia.
Lawrence A. Phillips, of Maryland.
Arthur J. Waterman, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Robert B. Dreessen, of Missouri.
Harry F. Pfeiffer, Jr., of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Theo C. Adams, of Texas.
Willard Allan, of Colorado.
John Q. Blodgett, of the District of Columbia.
Archer K. Blood, of Virginia.
Robert W. Dean, of Illinois.
Richard H. Donald, of Connecticut.
Adolph Dubs, of Illinois.
John W. Fisher, of Montana.
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.
John I. Getz, of Illinois.
Robert S. Henderson, of New Jersey.
Edward W. Holmes, of Washington.
Thomas D. Kingsley, of Maryland.
Herbert B. Leggett, of Ohio.
Edward V. Lindberg, of New York.
Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
James A. May, of California.
Cleo A. Noel, Jr., of Missouri.
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr., of Connecticut.
Jordan T. Rogers, of South Carolina.
John A. Sabini, of the District of Columbia.
Dwight E. Scarbrough, of Minnesota.
John P. Shaw, of Minnesota.
Francis T. Underhill, Jr., of New Jersey.
Milton C. Walstrom, of the Territory of Hawaii.
Park F. Wollan, of California.
Parker D. Wyman, of Illinois.
Sam L. Yates, Jr., of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Paul C. Campbell, of Pennsylvania.
Roger P. Carlson, of Minnesota.
Antonio Certosimo, of California.
Asa L. Evans, of South Carolina.
Mrs. Florence H. Finne, of California.
Harry George French, of Wisconsin.
Harrison M. Holland, of Washington.
William S. Krason, of New York.
Frederick D. Leatherman, of Ohio.
Allen F. Manning, of Maryland.
Ralph J. Ribble, of Texas.
Charles M. Rice, Jr., of Montana.
Robert M. Schneider, of Iowa.
Peter J. Skoufis, of Maine.
Harry R. Stritman, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Richard H. Adams, of Texas.
William G. Allen, of Vermont.
Robert J. Ballantyne, of Massachusetts.
William R. Beckett, of Michigan.
William D. Broderick, of Michigan.
North C. Burn, of Washington.
Alan L. Campbell, Jr., of North Carolina.
Frederic L. Chapin, of the District of Columbia.
Maxwell Chaplin, of California.
Edward R. Cheney, of Vermont.
James D. Crane, of Virginia.
Franklin J. Crawford, of Ohio.
John E. Cunningham, of Pennsylvania.
David Dean, of New York.
François M. Dickman, of Wyoming.
James B. Freeman, of Ohio.
Alexander S. C. Fuller, of Connecticut.
James Robert Greene, of California.
Herbert M. Hutchinson, of New Jersey.
Kempton B. Jenkins, of the District of Columbia.
Richard E. Johnson, of Illinois.
George R. Kenney, of Illinois.
Lucien L. Kinsolving, of New York.
John F. Knowles, of New Jersey.
Henry Lee, Jr., of Massachusetts.
William W. Lehfeldt, of California.
Harry R. Melone, Jr., of New York.
Thomas N. Metcalf, Jr., of Massachusetts.
George C. Moore, of California.
Benjamin R. Moser, of Virginia.
Harvey F. Nelson, Jr., of California.
Richard D. Nethercut, of Wisconsin.
G. Edward Reynolds, of New York.
Ralph W. Richardson, of California.
William E. Schaufele, Jr., of Ohio.
Kennedy B. Schmertz, of Pennsylvania.
Talcott W. Seelye, of Massachusetts.
William C. Sherman, of Illinois.
Robert K. Sherwood, of Nebraska.
Christopher A. Squire, of Virginia.
Heywood H. Stackhouse, of Virginia.
William W. Thomas, Jr., of North Carolina.
Lewis R. Townsend, of New Jersey.
Charles L. Widney, Jr., of Tennessee.
Frank S. Wile, of Michigan.
William D. Wolle, of Iowa.
Chester R. Yowell, of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert Anderson, of Massachusetts.
Miss Mildred J. Baer, of Maryland.
Miss Edna H. Barr, of Ohio.
Miss Dorothy V. Broussard, of Texas.
M. Lee Cotterman, of Ohio.
Ray H. Crane, of Utah.
A. Hugh Douglas, Jr., of Rhode Island.
Elden B. Erickson, of Kansas.
Richard V. Fischer, of Minnesota.
Ralph C. Fratzke, of Iowa.
John H. Hermanson, of Massachusetts.
Miss Olive M. Jensen, of Iowa.
Richard N. Kirby, of Ohio.
Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.
Kenneth W. Linde, of Connecticut.
Charles G. Mueller, of Montana.
Virgil E. Prichard, of Oklahoma.
Joseph H. Quintanilla, of Texas.
Miss Martha Jean Richardson, of Illinois.
Robert F. Slutz, Jr., of Maryland.
Miss Violet Smith, of New York.
Miss LaVerne L. Thomsen, of Washington.
Paul E. Woodward, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert J. Allen, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Harvey J. Cash, of Texas.
Brewster R. Hemenway, of New York.
Adolph W. Jones, of Tennessee.
William H. McLean, of Kentucky.
Paul J. Plenni, of West Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth J. Rex, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Betty A. Robertson, of Pennsylvania.
Carl G. Seasword, Jr., of Michigan.
Miss Alice M. Smith, of North Carolina.
Nicholas A. Veliotes, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

John A. Birch, of Maryland.
Gordon Dale King, of Texas.
James P. Parker, of Connecticut.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

James Weldon Jones, of Texas, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1957, vice Oscar B. Ryder.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired September 19, 1954.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James F. Brophy, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia, vice Joseph H. Young, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, source of wisdom and power, we are daily beseeching Thee to direct and prosper us in our programs of legislation.

Deepen within us a sense of our responsibility to protect and promote the safety, the honor, and welfare of our beloved country and all freedom-loving people.

Wilt Thou be especially favorable unto our ambassadors and representatives who have been placed in positions of counsel and diplomacy.

May they carry on their negotiations with the leaders of other nations so wisely and faithfully that peace and concord shall be established and maintained.

Inspire the Members of Congress and all our citizens with the spirit of patience and self-restraint and may we seek to excel in the practice of friendship and fraternity, of good will and love.

Grant that our faith in Thy divine justice and righteousness may never become eclipsed by fear for Thou canst crush the mightiest forces of evil and bring to naught the most subtle devices and designs of our enemies.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 8, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 2, 1955, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3828. An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 829. An act to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes;

S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase

certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 942. An act to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; and

S. 1051. An act to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

EXCISE TAX ON GASOLINE USED IN FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit farmers to recover from the Federal Government the 2-cents-per-gallon excise tax that they now pay on all gasoline used in propelling and operating their farm equipment. In the State of Indiana, we permit farmers to recover State tax on gasoline used for farming purposes, and this has worked out very satisfactorily.

The original purpose of the gasoline tax was to require the people who use the roads to pay for their improvement and upkeep. Practically all highway vehicles are motor-propelled at the present time, and the gasoline tax is a practical means of accomplishing this purpose.

When the gasoline tax was first enacted, farmers were not nearly as mechanized as they are today. But now farmers use a great variety of motor-driven equipment, and, in buying gasoline to operate this equipment, they are obliged to pay taxes on this fuel just as though their equipment were to be used on the highways, which it is not. Farmers' crop-raising equipment should not have to bear this special tax intended to be borne by highway vehicles.

I believe my bill is a very fair one, and I hope the House will support it.

UNITED STATES SHOULD SPEAK UP FOR UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as long as Great Britain maintains its control over the six conquered provinces of northern Ireland, the indictment charging her with aggressive imperialism still stands.

And the United States, by failing to use its good offices to bring about an end of partition, is viewed as condoning this injustice toward the Irish Republic and the Irish people.

On this issue there can be no compromise.

All Ireland belongs to the Irish.

In pursuance of this, and in order to clarify the position of the United States Government, I wish to make public the following letter which I have addressed to our State Department:

MARCH 10, 1955.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In behalf of 20 million Americans with Irish blood in their veins, I ask for a definite policy statement by the United States Government in support of the unification of Ireland.

The United States House of Representatives passed a resolution favoring a free and undivided Ireland in 1919, House Joint Resolution 357.

Silence on the part of the executive branch of the Government has failed to express the representative opinion of the American people, and their traditional faith in the principle of self-determination.

The Irish people have steadfastly asked for a plebiscite which the British Government has steadfastly refused.

This lingering imperialism on the part of the British puts us in the contradictory position of supporting colonialism, as long as we fail to speak up against it.

Therefore, I believe that the Government of the United States should declare itself as morally opposed to the continuing partition of Ireland, and should enter into diplomatic negotiations with the British Government that will bring about the unification of Ireland without further delay.

A clear majority of the American people support this in principle, and want it implemented in practice.

In their name, I ask you for a definite foreign policy statement on the Irish question, and for assurances that our Government will work unremittingly for the inclusion of all 32 counties within the sovereignty of the Irish Republic.

Trusting in your prompt and unequivocal support of unification for Ireland, I am

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to invite to the attention of this distinguished body the fact that Saturday, March 12, marks the 43d anniversary of the founding of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

Just 43 years ago Saturday, this great organization was founded in Savannah, Ga., by the late Juliette Gordon Low. Today the Girl Scouts of America number more than 2,300,000 in membership whose good work benefits every State in this Union.

It gives me pleasure to report that the birthplace of the founder of the Girl Scouts in Savannah, Ga., is to be remodeled as a memorial to this great woman who initiated the Girl Scout movement. The old Gordon home will serve as a museum of Girl Scout history and also as a center where new and dynamic program activities of the Girl Scouts will be developed.

In the Girl Scout theme for 1955, "Believe, belong, build," we find a graphic expression of the ideals of this great sisterhood which I know you join with me in expressing fond good wishes for the continued progress and development of their splendid work.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Girl Scouts of America upon the splendid service this organization has rendered during its 43 years' existence. I wish to pay tribute, not only to the 8,000 Girl Scouts of Arkansas, but to all Girl Scouts and to those loyal adults who give so generously of their time to guide and direct the organization's program of activities.

March 12 is the anniversary of the day in 1912 when Juliette Gordon Low called together the little group of girls in Savannah, Ga., who formed the first Girl Scout troop. Mrs. Low profited by her experience in Scotland, having given much of her time as a leader of a Guide company in a small Scottish village. She taught the girls to raise poultry, spin and weave, and found markets for their homespun. Before sailing to the United States in 1912 she cabled her family as follows: "I am bringing home the biggest thing yet."

Mrs. Low's ideas were accepted—others caught the spark, and in June 1913, the first national Girl Scout headquarters was opened. In June 1915 the Girl Scout organization was incorporated. The first Girl Scout handbook was called How Girls Can Help Their Country.

Since that eventful day, March 12, 1912, a constantly increasing number of girls all over these 48 States—now numbering millions—have repeated the Girl Scout promise:

> On my honor, I will try to do my duty to God and my country, to help other people at all times, to obey the Girl Scout laws.

From the time they are 7 years old, Girl Scouts are taught that American citizenship involves duties and privileges; that at 7 they are not too young to become active citizens. Many continue membership for 10 years. I am certain these girls become immeasurably useful to our country no matter what threats, political problems, or crises arise.

A Girl Scout's training is based on respect and love of country, and she is taught that the flag of her country is a spiritual symbol. She learns its significance. A Girl Scout's pride in her community is expressed in action. The groups' sponsoring bodies are community organizations. Their administrative councils, sustaining committees, and

consultants, as well as troop leaders, are all composed of representative citizens of the community.

In turn, community service absorbs much of the time of Girl Scouts; it is part of their reason for being. Scouting exists by and for the community.

It is encouraging to know, in these times when cases of juvenile delinquency appear too often in our headlines, that the program of the Girl Scouts of America is successfully contributing to the sound growth of youth today. But as I interpret its literature, the Girl Scout movement does not undertake to serve as a substitute for home, church, or school. It is a contributing element in a girl's life.

As Longfellow sagely remarked, "Youth comes but once in a lifetime." Some have said it is our most precious possession. The whole world is ahead: life is new, adventurous, and filled with great opportunities. To find and grasp life's most precious opportunities demands guidance. Girl Scouting offers to help guide our women of tomorrow into a fourfold life—where love, worship, work, and play are equally developed. The Girl Scout program represents a stake in the future of America.

Happy birthday, young ladies, and Godspeed.

FARM INCOME

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal this morning reports that hogs sold yesterday at the lowest price for which they have sold during the last 5 years.

Department of Agriculture reports show that farm prices were lower in proportion to farmers' costs in December than at any time in the last 13 years.

Farm parity dropped from 92 percent in January 1954 to 86 percent in January 1955.

And in the past 2 years the farmer's net worth, including his investment in land, equipment, livestock and money in the bank, has dropped $20 billion. During the same time the value of stocks on the New York Exchange has risen to the highest level in the history of the Exchange.

Taxes on farmland are higher today than they have been at any time since Columbus discovered America and still the Missouri State Board of Equalization is adding $2 million more to land taxes in Missouri for 1955, after the drought has left entire farms barren in many sections of the State.

Both taxes and interest are being increased and Drew Pearson in commenting in yesterday's newspapers on Secretary Benson's increase of the interest on farm and home administration loans, says that the to-heck-with-the-farmer recommendations of the Hoover Commission indicate that "the farmer can now look forward to a new kind of drought—a credit drought."

Everybody else is enjoying unprecedented prosperity. Never before were prices so high and profits so great. Never before were wages so high and dividends so large. In every city, incomes are at the peak. While farm income has been dropping, city incomes have been increasing. Everybody is getting more money than they were getting when the farmer was getting $30 for hogs and $35 for cattle and top prices for poultry and dairy products.

The Association of American Railroads reports the January earnings of the railroads for January 1955 were double their earnings for January 1954.

General Motors' profits for the first half of 1954 jumped 36 percent over the same period for the previous year.

The Federal Reserve banks' net income totaled 37 percent more for 1954 than for the preceding year.

Dupont reports that in the first half of 1954 it earned 33 percent more than in the first half of 1953.

The Bell Telephone and the General Electric reported last week increased dividends over former years.

But on the farm it takes twice the number of hogs to buy a tractor. It takes three times the number of fat hens to buy a pair of shoes.

The railroads have increased freight rates on wheat and hogs ten times in the last ten years. Hogs and wheat have gone down and freight charges have gone up.

The cost of automobiles and trucks has almost doubled in the last ten years.

The Missouri utilities are this month demanding a new contract with REA under which the wholesale cost to the farmer's REA is increased from 6.4 to 10.3—practically twice the present rate at a time when electricity is being produced cheaper than ever before.

Telephone and interest and chemical charges are the highest on record. Everybody is charging the farmer more and more, and the income from which he must pay is steadily falling.

Everybody is trying to ride the free horse to death.

And the consumer is not getting the benefit of the farmer's loss. Every day somebody is telling the city consumer that he is being robbed by the farmer. In the last session of Congress Chairman CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, after an exhaustive investigation, reported that much of the time the cost of living was rising while the farmer's prices were falling.

And the Kansas City Star in its issue of August 2, 1954, reported that while the price of wheat went down 32 percent, the price of bread advanced 23 percent, and that when the farmers supplying milk to Chicago got 8 cents a quart the housewife paid 25 cents a quart.

Workers don't win when farmers lose. Farmers are being driven off the farms to the city where they congest the labor market. And when they stay on the farm they cannot buy labor's products. Unemployment as of March 10, 1955, was in excess of 4½ million and was still rising. Lower farm income, lower farm prices, lower farm buying power, less sales of factory-made goods, less business for merchants, and less employment and less wages for factory labor.

But look ahead. The excess of births over deaths is now running at the rate of 2,600,000 a year. According to the census reports that means 7,000 more people to feed every morning of the year. If the farmers are driven off the farms who will feed these people 10 years from now—or 5 years from now?

Mr. Speaker, we are not so much interested in who is responsible for this situation. We are not so much concerned about who is bringing poverty to the farm or why they do it or how they do it. The one thing we want to know is how to remedy the situation. How to bring back to the farmer the great prosperity he enjoyed for so long. How to bring back to the merchant the business he received from the farmer those golden years. How to bring back to labor full employment and fair wages received from farm patronage. For the farm and the factory—the shop and the stockyard—the labor union and the farm organization—have a common cause. Both are exploited by the same predatory interests—who want cheap food for cheap labor. The farmer is labor's customer. And when labor receives fair wages, that means fair prices for farm products. Merchants cannot sell to the farmer when his money is gone. And labor cannot buy eggs and bacon when out of a job.

It is a matter of gratification that the Committee on Agriculture is reporting out a bill this month, which takes care of both farmer and consumer. We must end poverty on the farm and unemployment in the city.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a privileged report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1956.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES reserved all points of order on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1956.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN BUTLER, OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed that Chairman Butler, of the Democratic National Committee, would seize an influenza illness of the charming first lady, Mrs. Eisenhower, in his political propaganda. Certainly, it is a type of politics which will not meet with the approval of thinking Democrats or Republicans. Chairman Butler and the country will, I am sure, be pleased to know that Mrs. Eisenhower enjoys normal good health and her present influenza illness is only one which unfortunately has visited millions of our people. It is certainly poor taste to drag a temporary illness into the political offensive.

The incident reveals how worried is the Democratic high command over another Eisenhower candidacy.

AUTHORIZING PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SECOND PAN-AMERICAN GAMES, THE SEVENTH OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 829) to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Act of July 1, 1947 (Public Law 159, 80th Cong.; 61 Stat. 243), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That as used in this act, the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Defense, and, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a part of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary concerned is authorized (1) to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, the games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and (2) subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) herein, to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in other international amateur sports competition not specified in (1) above, if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 30 days prior to the commitment of personnel pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (2) hereof, furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed participation by personnel of the Armed Forces in international amateur sports competition.

"(c) Subject to the limitations contained in section 3 of this act, the Secretary concerned may spend such funds and acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide training of personnel of the Armed Forces for such games, to provide for their attendance at and participation in such games, and for training of animals of the Armed Forces for, and their attendance at and participation in, such games.

"SEC. 3. (a) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in the activities covered by this act, not more than $800,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act, to be apportioned among the military departments as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Coast Guard in the activities covered by this Act, not more than $100,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act.

"(c) Appropriations available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Treasury, as the case may be, may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall authorize the payment of allowances at rates in excess of those fixed for participation in other military or naval activities.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (a) no member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to the travel or transportation allowances authorized by section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which his expenses for travel or transportation are being paid by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions authorized by this act, and (b) no member of the uniformed services without dependents shall be entitled to receive the basic allowances for subsistence and quarters authorized by sections 301 and 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which such member is subsisted and quartered by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions as authorized by this Act."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3014 was introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and a companion measure, S. 829, was introduced in the Senate by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Both bills have for their purpose the authorization for the armed services to participate in the second pan-American games, the Olympic games, and similar amateur sports competitions.

The subcommittee over which I preside as chairman heard testimony on the McCormack measure, after amending the bill in one particular, approved it and sent it to the full committee. Under the administration of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, the McCormack bill was approved and sent to the House for action. In the meantime, the Senate acted on the Saltonstall bill and, in doing so, adopted the exact amendment which had previously been approved by the House Committee on Armed Services and sent this bill to the House of Representatives for action. This is the bill before you today.

After the Saltonstall bill came to the House, the Armed Services Committee of the House authorized and approved the Saltonstall bill and authorized it to be taken up for quick passage and to be sent to the President. This is the bill which we have before us today.

It is urgent that this measure be passed at once. The second pan-American competitions begin in Mexico City on March 12 of this year. It is highly desirable to have this bill in the hands of the President at once in order that our people may participate in these competitions in Mexico City. We have done everything possible to expedite the handling of this measure for this reason. The bill carries with it an authorization for $800,000 to be spent over a 4-year period beginning with the date of this loan. This amount of money is to be apportioned among the three military departments by the Secretary of Defense and a limitation of $100,000 is placed upon the amount of money to be used by the Coast Guard.

This money will permit the payment of travel and living expenses for those athletes participating in these international games.

I believe that fine publicity could be obtained for our Military Establishment from its action in providing athletic teams for the Olympic and other international amateur games and would help the morale of our armed services and would also help in recruiting in the services. Experience has shown that clean, aggressive athletic teams obtaining publicity produce almost immediately results in the attitude of our people generally toward the armed services and in recruitment.

Most of the nations of the world will have teams at these events. Even Russia may send athletes to compete. Personally, I want to have the satisfaction of knowing that our teams from the United States have our full support and that the military services make a strong showing on their own behalf in these games.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK has been most active in pushing this measure. He appeared before the House Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Armed Services Committee and made a strong statement. He has been most aggressive in pushing the measure and is entitled to credit due to one who has shown a vigorous and active interest in a good measure.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3014) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRIC POWER FROM ATOMIC REACTORS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days there has been released highly significant information on the production of electric power from atomic reactors.

Next summer the first commercial supply of electricity will be delivered from a reactor in West Milton, N. Y. Within 2 years a considerably larger installation by the Duquesne Light Co. in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission will be operating in Pennsylvania. About the same time the Consolidated Edison Co., of New York, plans to build a still larger plant based on atomic energy.

That atomic energy is destined to be one of the major sources of electric power in the world can be seen by the fact that Great Britain plans to produce 25 percent of its new electric power from this source over the next 10 years. Following that period it is expected that all new power production in that country will be from atomic energy.

In this country work is going on speedily on the development of atomic reactors which can breed their own fuel supply. They promise eventually to be the cheapest source of power yet devised.

I have no quarrel with the fact that private power companies are leaders in this field. I congratulate them on their enterprise.

I am disturbed by the fact, however, that as of now the Tennessee Valley Authority has not entered on this program even experimentally. As one of the great power producers in the world, it seems to me that it should have been in the forefront of experimentation in this field.

The TVA area, in which most of my district is included, is rapidly growing. Its residents want no ceiling placed on its growth by any lack of power in the future. If the future of electric power production lies in the field of atomic energy converted into electric power, the people of the TVA area want the TVA to have the facilities to employ it.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the same attitude in this administration which, working in secrecy, produced Dixon-Yates, is not going to keep the TVA from being a pioneer in this new field of power production. I hope earnestly that the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission will not seek to stifle the TVA in this matter by withholding funds or information or both.

A good part of the operations of the AEC lies in the TVA area. TVA power was in past responsible for the fact that we achieved the atomic bomb when we did. It would be unnatural if these two agencies of the Government could not act in partnership at least on a basis equal to the partnership with which the AEC is acting with private industry in this field. I hope that experience with Dixon-Yates has proved once and for all that the Atomic Energy Commission has no business acting as a hatchet man on the TVA.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Small Business Committee may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that the United States group of the Interparliamentary Union will meet at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, March 15, for the purpose of transacting business which was not completed at the annual meeting held in January. The meeting will be held in the old Supreme Court Chamber.

THE LATE REVEREND FATHER PAUL A. McNALLY

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to hear of the recent passing of the Reverend Paul A. McNally, S. J., of Georgetown University in Washington, D. C.

Some time ago, I had the honor and pleasure of visiting with Father McNally on the occasion of my appearance on the television program, the Georgetown University Forum.

Father McNally's death is a great loss to the field of education in America and to American youth to whom he has devoted so many years of his life. The contributions of this great educator in the science of physics can only be truly estimated by future history.

I wish to extend my condolences to his relatives and many friends as well as to his colleagues at Georgetown University where he had devoted so much of his time and effort.

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the people admire courage, even in politics.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Paul Butler, has set a bad example of political cowardice in fomenting smear attacks against the Vice President and other members of the administration because he and those who read the speeches prepared by his ghostwriters do not have the guts to attack the popular President. Mr. Butler's tactics have taken a particularly unsavory turn today. With singularly bad taste, he has reached into the presidential household with dark implications that the members of the President's family may swerve him from his sense of duty by what he refers to as family considerations. Mr. Butler should be advised that wishful thinking combined with crudity of manners will get him nowhere.

REPORTING AND TRANSCRIBING THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always remarkable how people who are so engrossed in the management and operation of their own affairs take for granted the services that are rendered by others in making their work possible. It also seems inevitable that these important operations which are accepted as commonplace are generally extremely complicated and their end product is the result of a high order of devotion to duty coupled with extreme efficiency. These observations are merely preliminary to a few remarks I wish to make about the services rendered by the staff of congressional reporters who work with unobtrusive faithfulness in transcribing the proceedings of the House of Representatives.

An important part of the business of Members of Congress is to make speeches and to engage in debate on the floor of the House and, of course, it is the obligation of the Speaker or whoever may be the presiding officer to render decisions and conduct the proceedings in accordance with the rules. All of these operations are recorded with meticulous care and are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is available to the membership and the world on the following day. It is of interest to know how all the proceedings which take place in a fast and at times confusing tempo are welded into a clear and consecutive record. Any attempt to explain the procedure to make the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the accurate official account of the daily deliberations of the Congress that it is, is very difficult because while it appears to be simple it is in reality very complicated. With the help of some members of the staff of reporters, who insist on remaining anonymous, I will briefly and in all humility try to explain what happens.

Let us start when a Member is recognized by the Chair to make a speech. Be it for 1 minute or in the Committee of the Whole for a longer period, from the time when he starts speaking a reporter is on the job nearby taking down his words. Indeed, a reporter is always present taking down what is said whenever anyone says anything during a ses-

sion of the House, and to compile and edit all these proceedings so they appear in the RECORD in their proper continuity is an exacting task. These reporters make up a team of 7 carefully selected and highly trained men who record in shorthand everything that is said, each member of the team recording the proceedings for only 5 minutes at a time. As soon as a reporter has finished his 5 minutes he is relieved and he immediately proceeds to a room on the floor below the House Chamber to dictate his notes into a machine. These notes are then transcribed by 1 of a staff of 7 expert typists and the reporter compares this transcription with his original notes, making whatever corrections that may be necessary. He brings the corrected transcription back to the Chamber to be delivered as promptly as possible to the Member of the House who had the floor when his remarks were taken down, but before the transcription is delivered to this Member for revision, the manuscript is given to the Chief Clerk for the reporters, who sits at the reporters' desk at the foot of the rostrum. The Chief Clerk maintains what is called a "turn book" where a double-column record is kept of the assignment of each reporter. In the right-hand column the name of the Member having the floor is recorded and in the left the names of those to whom he yielded during his speech. This book contains the names of all Members who may speak and the order in which they speak, whether it is to submit a consent request, make a speech, or ask a question of a fellow Member. The reporters' clerk assembles all the pages of the Member's completed speech, folds them together, and on the back endorses the page numbers and the statements "Remarks of Mr. Blank for revision," Mr. Blank being the man who had the floor at the time of the speech.

This manuscript, which is recognized by the reporter as Mr. Blank's speech, is then given to Mr. Blank for "revision and extension" and later to anyone who may have engaged in a colloquy with him during the speech, such person being referred to as a "colloquial speaker." The right-hand side of a reporter's notebook is generally used to take down the remarks of the Member who has the floor and the left-hand column is devoted to any interruptions which may occur during his speech. Under the rules the copy is first given to the Member who had the floor for revision and later to anyone to whom he may have yielded.

It is evident from the fact that as a reporter is engaged in taking down a speech for only 5 consecutive minutes more than 1 reporter will report a speech of more than 5 minutes, and in order to keep the continuity in proper order, each reporter numbers his pages of transcribed notes under a system by which both he and the speaker are identified. This system is an intricate one and is hard to describe, but suffice it to say that it works without confusion, and the numbering system used insures the proper continuity of the proceedings. The fact that the reporter who first started may work a second or third time on the same speech gives some idea of how complicated the system of identification may become in assembling the entire proceedings in their proper continuity. The system is not complicated to the reporters, but it is beyond my feeble capacity to describe it adequately.

The reporters divide the proceedings of the House into two categories, business and special or debate. Such things as purely routine matters, like the submission of consent requests on which there is no debate, extensions of remarks, the formal calling up of matters for consideration, rollcalls, announcement of votes, and so forth, come under the heading of business, and these transcriptions are not given to the Members for revision unless there is special request or direction to do so. All speeches, debate, or colloquy come under the head of speeches and, of course, these transcriptions are submitted to the Members for revision in accordance with whatever directions may be given in any particular instance. It is important to the smoothness of the entire operation to have the Members revise their speeches as promptly as possible so the copy may be sent on its way to the Government Printing Office.

After the House has adjourned, a Member's remarks not previously delivered are sent by messenger to his office for revision and, of course, a record is kept of the page numbers and the names of the Members when the transcript leaves the control of the reporters' clerk. After revising the copy, Members may leave it with the guard in charge of the main doors of the two House Office Buildings or at the northeast door of the Old House Office Building, where it is picked up by messenger for delivery to the Government Printing Office. While the absolute emergency deadline in the Government Printing Office for the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is 12 o'clock midnight, all copy should be in the hands of the Public Printer by 9 p. m. Any matter which is delivered subsequent to midnight is published in the following day's RECORD.

When the copy arrives at the Government Printing Office it is assembled in its continuity and undergoes a very careful check to make sure that it appears in its appropriate and proper place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. First a check is made on extensions of remarks to see that permission for the extension had been granted and that the same matter has not already appeared in a previous edition of the RECORD, inserted by either a Member of the House or of the Senate. It is also checked to determine that the matter does not exceed the limit of two pages in the printed RECORD as provided by the rules. After this has been completed the copy is cut up into small "takes" in order to spread the linotype work over a large number of operators. Each "take" is clearly identified and a long speech may be worked on by a great many linotype operators. After the operator sets his "take" he places his type on a numbered galley, a galley proof is run off and with the copy is put together in proper order and sent through pneumatic tubes to the proofroom. In the proofroom, the galley proof is read twice against the original manuscript, corrections are noted in the margin of the galley proof and then it goes back to the linotype section where corrections are made in the type itself. After these corrections in the type are completed a new galley proof is taken which is sent back to the proofroom once more for another check. When the proofreaders have finished their work, the type is made up into pages, a page proof is struck and this proof goes to the proofroom for a final check to see that the "takes" tie into each other and the pages connect properly. When this has been done, the type is locked up for the foundry. In the foundry, mats are made from the linotype pages and from the mats metal plates are made for use on the presses.

These presses are built especially for printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although they are also used for other work, and a press load consists of 64 pages of the RECORD. Thirty-two pages which consist of 16 sheets are called a signature and you will note that as the finished RECORD comes to you, several signatures or sections may be bound together to make up the completed RECORD. These signatures come off the press in folded form and are placed in proper order on a gathering machine which gathers them in sequence and stitches them together. Three sides of the RECORD are then trimmed and it is ready for distribution.

It will be seen from this brief description that there are 15 or more separate processes that take place before a Member's speech appears as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and it is a remarkable tribute to the individuals who do this work that so few errors are made.

Devotion to duty and pride in their work on the part of the reporters and the printers are what makes the compilation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarkable feat that it is. These men are dedicated to their tasks and recognize that theirs is an important role in the operations of the legislative branch of our Government. Indeed the Houses of Congress could not function without them and their accurate handiwork. We Members are too apt to take all this for granted and it is a great tribute to these men that their tireless and efficient work is done in such an unobtrusive and quiet manner. They merit our praise and our grateful appreciation as well as our profound admiration.

STORY OF A LIBRARY

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, L. Quincy Mumford, formerly director of the Cleveland Public Library, sent to Congress his first report as Librarian of Congress. It is an admirable statement, clearly explaining some of the problems as well as the accomplishments of that great institution during the past fiscal year. I hope that many of you will find time to read

the introduction, at least, which summarizes the growth of the collections for the past century and a half and the outstanding events of the last year.

Too many of us are inclined, I believe, to think of the Library of Congress in terms of the Legislative Reference Service, which we find so useful, and to forget that basic to the effective functioning of the Legislative Reference Service are all the operations of the Library. Without materials gathered from the ends of the earth, catalogued and classified, and made available to the Legislative Reference Service and to the Members of Congress directly, we could scarcely claim to be the best informed legislative body in the world.

The report points out that hundreds of thousands of other Government officials, scholars, and other private citizens made use of the Library during the year; that through the self-supporting card distribution service some 22 million catalog cards prepared by the Library helped to make up the catalogs of libraries all over the country; and that the resources of more than 1,600 libraries throughout the United States, including some in my own district, were augmented by the Library of Congress through its interlibrary loan service.

In the Washington Evening Star of February 10, 1955, there appeared an editorial on the annual report of the Librarian of Congress that expresses, I think, the significance of the Library both to Congress and to the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it herewith:

STORY OF A LIBRARY

There is a temptation to discuss the annual report of the Librarian of Congress in terms of statistics. And it is important that the Library now contains 33 million pieces and it paid into the Treasury, during 1954, more than $1.9 million from index card sales and copyright registrations. But this it not by any means the whole story.

What the American people really want to know about their national Library is what it means to them. Each yearly certification of progress suggests the question: What does all this signify? And the Librarian has an answer—namely, the readable text of his report. A reader may open the 178-page book at random and find convincing evidence of the Library's value. Here, for example, is testimony of its worth as a depository of precious papers. In the period chronicled it received the files of Senator Robert A. Taft, General Benjamin F. Butler, Whitelaw Reid, Norman H. Davis, General Peyton C. March, Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, Robert P. Patterson, Jo Davidson, and Frank S. Lahm—the very stuff of the history of the age to which these notable men belonged. It is obvious that there should be a central library of such material here in the Capital of the Nation.

But the Library is not simply an archive. In fiscal 1954 it did reference work for literally every Member of Congress, dealing with some 69,000 inquiries from Senators and Representatives and thus fully justifying the appropriations for its support and enlargement. The number of questions received from other Government officers and agencies ran to astronomical heights and were matched by requests for information from uncounted thousands of private citizens who naturally look to the Library as a university of the whole American community.

Of course, many of the inquiries from the public had nothing to do with public affairs. They were concerned with the private enterprises and activities of citizens interested in industry and commerce, education, the sciences and the arts, literature in its inclusive sense of written records of every useful sort, philosophy and religion. A casual glance through the Librarian's report shows how various, how complex and how engaging these interests are. But the Library brings them into practical focus. No other institution on earth surpasses it as a mirror reflecting humanity in action.

OUR SHREDDED CONSTITUTION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the March 2, 1955, issue of the Indianapolis Star points up a situation which Congress cannot continue to ignore.

We have lived to see a sad and sorry day in the history of this Republic when, with hundreds of thousands of American servicemen stationed in foreign countries, great numbers of them no longer have the guarantees of our precious Constitution.

I have tried in a small way to remedy this situation through the introduction of House Joint Resolution 236. It seems to me that the least we can do for our servicemen is to warn them before departure from our shores that under certain conditions in foreign lands their Constitutional rights have been forfeited.

As the Indianapolis Star suggests, the effective method of stopping the shredding of the Constitution is enactment of the Bricker amendment which would make it impossible for any treaty or agreement with a foreign nation to supersede the Constitution.

The editorial:

RIDDLED SHIELD OF LIBERTY

It is a strange paradox that the same American Constitution which permits Communists to escape prosecution by pleading the fifth amendment also allows an American lad in his country's armed services overseas to be stripped of his liberties by a foreign court and subjected to punishments which would be cruel and unusual in the United States.

Pvt. Richard T. Keefe has now been turned down by the United States Supreme Court in his fight against a five-year sentence at hard labor meted out to him in a French court for making off with a French taxicab following some injudicious tippling in a bar in the city of Orleans.

Private Keefe pleaded guilty. This, one would think, should have procured some mitigation of his sentence for what was, after all, a prank—especially since the French keep insisting that we maintain our troops on their soil to defend them against their neighbors. But no, the French court dealt with Keefe as though he were a member of a hostile occupying army. They have the right to do this under the status of forces agreement signed by President Eisenhower on Oct. 27, 1953, with NATO countries. These countries are given the right to arrest Americans stationed within their borders and judge and penalize them according to their own lights. Thus, Americans sent abroad in service of their country no longer are protected by the American Constitution.

The soldier's wife said in her brief, filed with the Supreme Court, that Keefe was compelled to be a witness against himself, subjected to cruel and unusual punishment and deprived of his rights as an American. But her challenge to the treaty which made this possible was not ruled on by the court.

We will not attempt to understand the reasoning of the Justices in refusing this ruling. But it is certainly well known by this time that the Constitution itself allows its own guarantees to be overridden by such treaties and agreements as the status of forces treaty. It is exactly this loophole in the Constitution that proponents of the Bricker Amendment seek to close. The amendment would make it crystal clear that any treaty, or provision of a treaty which conflicts with constitutional guarantees will be without validity. If this amendment were in our basic law, Keefe and others of our soldiers who may be vulnerable to legal injustices abroad, would carry the Constitution with them as a shield. As of now, that shield does not protect them.

A MORAL OBSCENITY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the questions raised in the following editorial in the March 3, 1955, issue of the Indianapolis Star ought to be answered forthwith. Failure of those still living who know the facts and refuse, voluntarily, to make them public should be the signal for drastic action on the part of Congress.

Abraham Lincoln said:

Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved.

The editorial:

A MORAL OBSCENITY

About 6 o'clock in the morning of February 24, 1946, more than 4,000 prisoners of war were roughly aroused from sleep by their grim-faced guards. The guards began herding them toward cattle cars. Suddenly the prisoners began to resist. They fought and cursed and struggled. Many of them cut their wrists in suicide attempts. The air was filled with the crunching sounds of rubber truncheons on human skulls, with moans and screams and shouts. But still the brutal scene went on. Before the day was out those who had not taken their own lives or been killed by the guards were on their way to the certain death and torture that awaited them at their final destination. And this was only the beginning. In a period of 2 years over 2 million more, including women and children, suffered the same fate—unless they were mercifully spared by jumping off trains to kill themselves.

Americans stand aghast at such inhuman brutality. We would never condone such a moral obscenity, as one writer called it. Americans believe in the dignity and rights of all human beings. We respect the sacredness of the human personality. All our institutions reflect this attitude.

Oh yeah? Those grim-faced guards were Americans. Those pitiful refugees from murder and tyranny were anti-Communist Russians held by our troops after World War II. They were being driven back against their will to the homeland they had left to escape the brutality and ugly inhumanity of Communist rule. The orders to drive them back also came from Americans who would yield to no man in their desire to placate, to please and to honor "our great Soviet ally."

Why was this done? Who ordered it? Who permitted it?

At Yalta, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill had agreed with Stalin to repatriate "prisoners and civilians." Nothing specific was said about forcing unwilling prisoners back by brutality * * * unless a still-secret clause exists somewhere. The decision to beat and kick and shoot

these unwilling anti-Communists was made in Washington. It came in 1945 from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in reply to a query from General Patch, who had halted this horrible task in disgust and asked for orders. The whole story, or at least a good part of it, is told in the December issue of the American Legion magazine. The author, Julius Epstein, says, "It is unlikely that a decision involving the lives of millions was made without consulting the Commander in Chief."

How and why was this decision made? Whose influences were paramount? Did Gen. George Marshall have the final say—the order came from the Joint Chiefs of Staff? Did Alger Hiss or Harry Dexter White or somebody else sit at the elbows of the mighty when the order was drafted to destroy these helpless people? "Who was so anxious to rid the world of anti-Communist Russians, and why?" asks Epstein.

Somebody still living knows the truth. General Marshall must know. Others must know why it was more important to placate the bloodiest tyrant in modern history than to adhere to the high moral principles upon which our whole American way of life is based. Who are they?

We must find out—Congress must find out—who made the United States a party to the most horrible pogrom in modern times; who helped Stalin eliminate his bravest opposition; who made certain that the Kremlin could prove to its people that they would get no help from us if they sought to throw off the Communist yoke in war's aftermath?

In Korea the United States reversed this beastly policy after some initial hesitation. We fought on for 6 months to make sure that Korean and Chinese prisoners of war would not be similarly driven back to death and torture. That was in 1952 after the Eisenhower administration took over. And that was also the year when the American people were led to believe the secrets of Yalta and its consequences would be laid bare before the conscience of the West.

Last fall Americans were told that the secret documents relating to the Yalta decisions would be published after 10 years. The date was postponed until after the election. It was postponed again. The papers are still secret. Why? Is it because General Marshall is involved? Is it because someone still high in the councils of Government must be protected?

It is up to Congress to find out the truth about this indelible blot on the conscience of America. It makes no difference who is hurt. For the conscience of our country hurts, and only by baring the truth before ourselves and the world, by confessing this monstrous crime against humanity, by exposing those responsible for it, can we in some degree expiate this moral obscenity.

We will be told that it is all over and done with. "Why rake up the past?" some will say. Why indeed? Why ever confess a sin, or apologize for a mistake, or right a wrong? Until Americans prove by public exposure that this is heavy on our conscience, we cannot prove to the world that this is not an act condoned or approved by the free people of America. Millions of people behind the Iron Curtain think it was.

We may face similar situations again. If we are going to meet them true to the great moral principles of our historic past, true to our Christian heritage, our faith in the dignity of man and the rights of all, we must extirpate this awful stain upon the conscience of our free people.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 12

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow to file minority views on H. R. 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have permission to file on Wednesday, April 13, a report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and the judiciary and related agencies, and that it may be brought up for consideration on that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 10, 1955.*

CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committe on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 169 provides for an open rule with 3 hours of general debate on the bill, H. R. 4720, the military pay bill.

At the hearing before the Committee on Rules the interest expressed on this subject was great enough to warrant the 3 hours of general debate which we decided to give. Since the rule is an open one, which would allow amendments of any type from the floor and since the time for debate is so great I can think of no reason why there should be any objection to the adoption of this rule. The bill itself was reported unanimously from the Committee on Armed Services.

According to the report on H. R. 4720, Mr. Speaker, the bill would increase the pay for all enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service, for all warrant officers with over 2 years of service, and for all other officers with over 3 years of service, in an amount not less than 6 percent of basic pay.

The largest percentage increase for officers is in the grades of first lieutenant and second lieutenant—a 22.33 percent and 25 percent increase respectively with over 3 years' service.

The smallest percentage increase for officers is in the grade of major general with less than 26 years of service with an increase of 6.07 percent. The largest dollar increase for officers in the basic pay tables is for the brigadier general who completes more than 30 years of service where the increase amounts to $107.64 per month. First lieutenants with over 3 years of service will receive under this bill a $61.22 per month increase, while captains with over 6 years of service will receive a $49.92 increase per month.

In the enlisted grades, the largest percentage increase is for the E–4—corporal in the Army, sergeant in the Marine Corps—with over 8 years of service who receives a 17.35 percent increase amounting to $26.52 per month. The largest dollar increase for enlisted personnel is in the grade of master sergeant with over 26 years of service who receives an increase of $29.64 per month.

The report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, brought out the fact that the pay scale that is proposed in the bill is based upon a formula, taking into consideration the

recommendations of the Hook Commission, the 4 percent increase in pay enacted by Congress in 1952, and increased increments in pay periods following a normal career pattern.

Increased incentive pay is also provided in H. R. 4720 for those members of the service engaged in flying or submarine duty. It is also proposed in the bill that the per diem allowance be increased from $9 to $12 for those individuals who would be entitled to a per diem allowance, upon being away from a permanent duty station.

H. R. 4720 also proposes to increase the pay of midshipmen at the Naval Academy and cadets at West Point as well as the cadets at the Air Force Academy and Coast Guard Academy. Their pay will be increased from $81.12 per month to $111.15 per month, if the bill is passed in its present form.

It is estimated that the proposed bill would involve an annual expenditure for members of the armed services for fiscal year 1956 of $734,045,571. In addition, the increase with respect to the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service for fiscal year 1956 will be $11,797,444. This would make a total cost, if the bill is passed in its present form, of $745,845,015 for fiscal year 1956.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of provisions in H. R. 4720 which I am sure will be elaborated upon during the general debate on the bill. H. R. 4720 represents an important piece of work by the members of the Committee on Armed Services and no matter what our individual opinions may be about the bill itself, I think we must all agree that the subject is an important one and worthy of the serious consideration of the House. I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the House may then proceed to the consideration of the bill itself.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States imposes upon the Congress the duty to raise and maintain the Army, Navy, and now the Air Corps of the United States.

The Armed Forces have had a little trouble in recent times in maintaining its strength. Witness the fact that the reenlistment rate during the last fiscal year is the lowest in the entire history of the country.

This is so because of many things. Many of the members of the armed services have lost what they call fringe benefits, which are important to some. We have lost many reenlistments because of competition with private industry. The Government trains highly skilled personnel, and then private industry comes in and offers them more money, and many of the most skilled of our members of the armed services personnel, leave the Government and go with private industry.

In response to the obligation that the Constitution imposes upon the Congress, your Committee on Armed Services has sought to bring back a bill which meets this situation in a very fair and effective manner. It provides an incentive for every member of the armed services, no matter what his rate and no matter what his rank.

The principal increases in pay, as provided in this bill, go to the younger officers at a time when they might be considering leaving the armed services of the country. To borrow a phrase from the gentleman from Missouri, when he appeared before the Committee on Rules, this is a bill which tends to give stability and dignity to every member of the armed services.

It is true that this measure will cost the Government a large amount of money, but in these very critical times, it is a measure which we cannot afford not to pass.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this 3-hour open rule.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 18]

Bell	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Boggs	Hope	Roberts
Bolton, Oliver P.	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Bowler	Kee	Schwengel
Canfield	McGregor	Sheehan
Christopher	Mollohan	Thomson, Wyo.
Dawson, Ill.	Moulder	Wickersham
Dingell	Murray, Tenn.	Willis
Eberharter	Poage	Wilson, Ind.
Grant	Powel	Young
Hinshaw	Prouty	
	Radwan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4720, with Mr. RAINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, by unanimous vote of the subcommittee which heard the bill and by unanimous vote of 30 to 0, the whole Committee on Armed Services, we bring you the bill for an increase in military pay.

I would call your attention specifically and particularly to the title of the bill. It is the Career Incentive Act of 1955. I believe that if you analyze the bill you will find it conforms exactly to its title.

What we propose here are incentives to attract into the service and then to retain men on a permanent basis.

Mr. Chairman, so long as we seek to maintain a present military strength of approximately 3,100,000 or to maintain a military strength which the President has now proposed for the end of the next fiscal year of some 2,800,000—I believe all will agree we must attract and retain in the services just as many as possible. Let us not forget that for every enlisted man that you retain in the services that it means one less man to be drafted. I believe it is common knowledge among the people, and certainly among the Members of this House, that we are not attracting and we are not retaining in the service on a career basis the numbers of men which we should be able to attract and retain. The figures are available showing the situation. I shall cite some of them. Taking the regulars only, from the figures of the Department of Defense, in 1950 the reenlistment rate was 59 percent. It averaged 55 percent in fiscal years 1951 through 1953. It averaged only 23.7 percent in the fiscal year 1954. From July to December 1954, the average was 24 percent.

The Army reenlistment rate has shown an increase during this fiscal year, and has risen from an average of 22 percent to 54 percent from July to December. The Army states that this can be attributed to the unit rotation plan and the increase in reenlistment bonuses. It should be noticed that these are for the regulars only. When the inductees are added to this, the overall percentage drops considerably since the inductee rate of reenlistment is now below 3 percent, giving the Army an overall reenlistment rate for the month of January 1955, of 13.2 percent.

The Navy enlistment rate is still decreasing from a high of 66 percent in the fiscal year of 1950 to 7.4 percent in the period from October to December 1954.

A similar situation prevails in the Air Force where the reenlistment rate has dropped from 55 percent in the fiscal year 1950 to 21.8 percent in the period from October through December 1954.

The Marine Corps rate has shown a slight increase from an average of 18.1 percent in the fiscal year 1954 to an average of 20.1 percent for the period from July to December 1954.

The situation with reference to the regular officers in the services is most

alarming. When we realize in the Army only 21 percent of the distinguished graduates of our ROTC and OCS courses applied for regular commissions in 1954. It has dropped to 30 percent in 1953 and 34 percent in 1952, 38 percent in 1951, 47 percent in 1950 and 54 percent in 1949.

In the Navy, only 3.4 percent of the 16,681 officers eligible for regular commissions from the Naval ROTC aviation cadet, and other programs applied for a commission.

This is approximately one-half of the rate of applications in 1953.

In the Air Force, applications for regular commissions among ROTC, aviation cadet, and OCS graduates, was only 6 percent in 1954 as compared with 61 percent in 1950.

Let us go back to the period prior to World War II and contrast that situation with the present situation. So long as we attempt to maintain these figures, we are going to have to give this most serious consideration. First of all, we must realize that among the American people there is a relatively small percent who have any desire or are temperamentally suited to pursuing a military career. Of that relatively small percentage, even a smaller percentage possess military aptitude which would make them successful in a military career. So in maintaining these numbers, we must attract to our services on a permanent career basis, every single individual we can. Before World War II, we were able to keep men of such tremendous, outstanding ability as President Eisenhower. He stayed on duty from July 2, 1920, to July 1, 1936, as a major, a period of 16 years. General Omar Bradley stayed on as a major from July 1, 1920, to June 26, 1936, also a period of 16 years without promotion.

Admiral Nimitz remained a captain in the Navy from 1927 to 1938, a period of 11 years. Gen. H. H. Arnold, the late Gen. Hap Arnold, became a major on July 1, 1920, and remained a major until 1931, a period of 11 years. General Vandergraft, now retired as commandant of the Marine Corps, was appointed a major in 1921 and served for 13 years.

In those days we were able to keep men of that caliber in our services. Why can we not maintain those men at this time? I think a number of things are involved. A military career is not as easy a career as some would like to paint, for either the enlisted men or for the officers. Surely you do not have the selection of location, the right to pick the place you might want to live. Back in those days the military had things which have been lost, or other advantages over civilians that have passed into history. In those days there were less than 30,000 regular officers in all the services. They were a selected group serving voluntarily. They held positions of honor. That was before the epithet "Brass Hat" was in common use. To make up for what they lost because of frequent change of situation, and other restrictions and lack of promotion, they had things that nobody else in the United States had. They had an adequate retirement system. If they served 30 years they were guaranteed retirement at 75 percent of their base pay. No other industry or business in the United States in those days had such retirement provisions; but after the Social Security Act was passed the situation changed, until today the business or industry which does not have a retirement system which implements and increases the social-security system, is an exception, not the rule. So that that advantage no longer exists. There are adequate retirement systems in all phases of business and industry.

In those days the size of the service permitted medical, dental, and hospital care to be available to a member of the service and to his dependents. Now it is frequently unavailable. In those days there was no such thing as hospital and medical insurance. Since that time the industry or business without group hospitalization is the exception. Practically all of them have it.

There are a number of other things. The post exchange facilities were more adequate in those days than they are now. Many in the services complain about what the local merchants have done to the post exchange system. I think the services themselves have done far more than the local merchants. In those days the post exchange operated on a basis to provide recreation on the base or post where earned. The profit they made went to recreation on that base or port and nowhere else. During the war it was changed. Since then post exchanges are operated on a service-wide basis. The chain store idea took over and it is operated from Brooklyn, N. Y., rather than on a post, base, or station level, where only enough profit was desired to produce recreation for that installation.

Congress has done some things to the commissary. Most people do not understand the distinction between the post exchange and the commissary. The post exchange is to provide small items of convenience and necessity for members of the Armed Forces. The commissary is for the sale of staple items of food, which are permitted to be sold at cost, or thereabouts. This food is acquired by the services in large quantities and is sold to military personnel and their families who eat at home instead of in a mess.

A few years ago, through an amendment placed on an appropriation bill in the other body, it was made mandatory that certain other costs be added, so that those advantages were lost.

So we find ourselves today, whatever may be the cause of it, unable to attract and to retain the men that we want in our armed services. Pay alone will not do it, but that is the first change we must consider. First we must see to it that the pay we give them is adequate.

A few general remarks with reference to a particular phase of this bill.

In time of war you cannot compensate a man, you cannot pay him enough, to get killed. So the military pay that you give him cannot be based upon compensation; it can only be a reasonable amount for his personal needs. A relatively small percentage of inductees or enlistees have dependents. You cannot compensate all of them by pay to take care of their dependents. We have provision for allotments and allowances to accomplish that purpose.

In time of peace you cannot pay a man who has no intention or desire of pursuing a military career for taking 2 years out of his life and delaying for 2 years getting started in the profession he intends to follow whether it be one of the learned professions or whether he intends to be a skilled worker. He loses 2 years' seniority in his field of employment, he gets stated 2 years late. We cannot compensate him by pay for that. All we can do is to pay him an amount reasonably sufficient for his personal needs and then follow whatever policy the Congress may adopt with reference to compensating for that lost period. In the past we have done it either by payment of a bonus or by the GI bill of rights granting educational benefits and such things.

I would call your attention now to the report at page 25. We have inserted a table which shows the present pay scale in each grade, in each year of service bracket. We have also shown in the table what was proposed in the bill which came to us from the Department of Defense. We then show what is proposed to be done by the bill which we have reported to the House and which is now under consideration here. It also shows the dollar increase in those various grades and the percentage increase in the various grades as proposed by the bill. So I would urge that those of you who want to know specifically just what we do for any enlisted man or officer in a particular grade, turn to page 25 for the officers, page 26 for the warrant officers, and page 27 for the enlisted men. From these tables you can tell exactly what is done for each both dollarwise and percentagewise.

There are, of course, a few things I might say to give you some idea of what we have done with reference to military pay generally. I believe experience has proven that granting overall increases does not accomplish our purpose of making an attractive career that will furnish men the incentive to stay in the service; experience shows the critical points at which we are losing the men. An enlisted man who has been inducted, serving a period of 2 years of obligated service—that is an obligation placed upon him by law—we propose no increase. For every one of those whom we get to enlist, at the end of those 2 years, is one other that we will not have to induct or to draft. So we propose at the end of 2 years of service to give a rather substantial increase.

Then when you go to the officer corps, nowadays officers going into the service are obligated for a 3-year period. Many were deferred during college, and took the ROTC course in college on the understanding that they would serve for a period of 3 years after eradication and getting their commissions. Every single lieutenant we can retain on active duty reduces the cost to us.

Let us not forget that training is a most expensive item. I guess the most expensive thing we have in the Government of the United States is the recruit. We bring him in; he has to be equipped,

and he has to be trained. During the time he is going through this basic training he does not produce any service; rather, he is absorbing the service of a tremendous number of people who are training him. So that by the time he is ready to render any service at all he has cost you well in excess of $5,000. That is an old figure, however. I am sure that figure would have to be adjusted upward and would be perhaps nearer $7,500. And as to officers relatively a good deal more.

Let us take the lieutenant you train as a pilot. By the time he is trained as a pilot you have spent $120,000. By the time you have trained him as a jet-bomber pilot you have spent $275,000. This is no piker's game. This is a business that really calls for money and we have got to do something to keep these people in the service.

We go to the points where we know from experience they are falling out, the points where we know their services are essential and that we have to have them and when you refer to the table you will see that there is a very substantial increase moneywise and percentagewise.

A second lieutenant who completes more than 3 years' service—that would include his time as an enlisted man, total service—under the present law receives a basic pay of $237.12 per month. Under the proposed legislation he would receive $296.40, an increase of 25 percent or $59.28 per month.

A first lieutenant who has completed over 3 years' service under present law receives $274.18; under the proposed legislation he will receive $335.40, an increase of 22.33 percent or $61.22 a month.

We have the smallest increase in the case of major generals. A man who has reached the rank of major general has reached the top of the career; it is the highest scale bracket we have. I hope you understand that the pay scales run only through major generals. Thereafter, a lieutenant general draws the money allowance of $500 a year more than a major general and a four-star general receives $2,200 more than a major general. The importance of that is when he retires he does so at the pay of a major general. No one but the five stars retire at any greater pay than a major general. We provide for the major general, if he has over 26 years of service, an increase of 6.07 percent or $58.50 a month. If he has more than 30 years of service we provide 8.41 percent or $83.46 per month.

The private with over 2 years of service under the present law receives $91 a month; under the proposed legislation he will receive $98.80 per month, an increase of 8.57 percent or $7.80 per month.

When a man goes into the service as a recruit he serves for $78 a month for a period of only 4 months, at which time he is automatically promoted to private. After that the one who remains as a private is the exception rather than the rule. If he has aptitude, if he applies himself, if he is a man you want to keep in the service, he is moved up. The corporal is the fellow who has shown his ability as a soldier, he is now assuming a responsibility, and there we increase him from $137.59 per month to $159.90 a month, an increase of 16.21 percent or $22.51 per month.

A master sergeant with over 18 years of service, who receives $275.18 per month, under the proposed legislation will receive $304.20, an increase of 10.55 percent or $29.02 per month.

So the matter has been worked out on the basis of spending the money at the points where we need the man, where he is on his way on a career. He is wavering. He is asking himself: Am I going to sign up again or am I going into civilian life?

We are hopeful that with the bill that was passed last year for the reenlistment bonus plus the increases which are provided in this bill by grades and in grades we will be able to attract an additional number. I would not attempt to represent what percentage we will attract, but for every 10 percent that you can, you have saved an awful lot of expense in training.

Of course, the bill provides additional hazard pay. Hazard pay for regular participation in airplane flight and for submarine diving has been in the law for many years. It first came into the law in 1917. It was again brought on the floor in 1949 and was sustained. So we have adopted as the policy of the Government the idea of incentive pay for hazardous duty. If that is correct—and the Congress has many times in the past held it to be correct—you must maintain the proper relationship between base pay and incentive pay. If you offer a man making $75 a month $10 in addition for certain other duties that he would perform, you are giving him an incentive, but to a man drawing $200 a month the $10 does not constitute anywhere near the incentive that it does to the man in the lower bracket. So that we have here provided for increases, and there again we have given the major portion of those increases to the man that we want to keep the most. The man who is doing the most of the flying will get most of the money by which we increase the incentive pay of the military services.

I believe there is now a vast difference between the attitude of our people toward flight pay, for instance, than there was in 1949. At that time it was predominantly reciprocal engines. Now we are moving over rapidly to jet planes, such planes as crossed the United States yesterday on a transcontinental flight in 3 hours and 46 minutes. The insurance companies recognize this as extrahazardous duty. In fact, we have figures from a number of insurance companies, and four of the large companies in the United States refuse to accept jet pilots at any rate. They will not take them no matter what rate they are willing to pay. There is one company which will take them if they have less than 800 hours of jet plane flying at $28.50 extra per 1,000 per year. And here again, emphasizing from the point of industry reason why we should attempt to keep the man who has been trained and had service, for the man under 800 hours they want $28.50 more per 1,000 to insure him, but if he has over 800 hours they will take him for a little less than half of that, $14.10, emphasizing that the experience in the mortality rates has proven that experience is what gives us safety in the air.

Now, we have brought into this bill a new item. I said there were many things contributing to our inability to attract and hold people in our regular service. Pay is a major, if not the major, one. I think, personally—I do not know whether anybody else at all agrees with me—that too frequent change of station is equally as important. Surely, all will agree that it is of great importance. I know we have all heard that President and Mrs. Eisenhower, in 35 years of service in the Army, had 35 stations. If you talk to the enlisted men and officers of all of the services, you will find, if they have been in 7 years, they probably have had 7 permanent changes of station. Maybe he did not move every 12 months, but it averaged out to where he moved one time each year. I think that the departments can do a great deal to eliminate that. I think it has been produced in large measure by failure on the part of the departments to institute a long-range personnel planning program. They were worked over before our committee in very considerable detail on that.

The suggestion was made—and I believe it to be a good one—for each permanent change of station, the person who is ordered to change station and actually changes station, and his family moves with him from one station to another, shall be entitled to receive an additional allowance for 1 month; not pay, but the quarters and subsistence allowance for 1 month.

When that matter was presented to the committee, some of us—and I was one—felt that that would do more to aggravate the situation than to cure it. We felt that while we realized—and surely, it is not necessary to explain this to the Members of the House who have to move their families to Washington and back again—that it is an expensive proposition. We felt that there might be an attitude that would grow up or become even more pronounced than it has been in the past in the department, perhaps not at the policy level but at the working level to the effect "What is he kicking about? He is getting paid for it." So there would be no effort to reduce the number of changes of station. So we changed that provision so that this dislocation allowance can be paid only once in any fiscal year except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared, or in the case of men moving to service schools. That is, only once in a fiscal year, but if exigencies of the service require it, he may be moved oftener than that, but only on the approval of the Secretary of the department concerned.

I think if that does nothing else, it will impress upon all of the military departments the fact that the Congress insists that long-range personnel planning be instituted and that this matter of constant changes of station and of dragging people all over the face of the earth has got to be reduced to a minimum.

The provision of sending the matter for approval to the Secretary may not sound like much of a restriction, but when it comes to the administration of the department, it is a very substantial restriction. It takes the matter of a change of station of an individual out of the military organization and sends it up to the Secretary level, the highest echelon in that department. We have done that concerning a number of other matters in the past, and it has generally worked out when we permitted something to be done only upon the approval of the Secretary, that the number of those activities was minimized, and in some cases eliminated entirely.

I think this will have two effects. It will partially compensate the man who has to tear up his home, take his family and move and reestablish himself in a new home. And, second, I think the department will so administer it as to eliminate many of those changes of station. I think I should say this. At one time there was an attitude upon the part of at least one representative of the department that if you do that the man is going to be moved anyway and he will not get the money. We told him that we realized that that can be done, but that is not the way we think the department will administer it, and we hoped that we did not have to go into the matter and have them explain why that is the way they were administering it. In other words, this means that the Congress says, "You shall reduce the number of these permanent changes of station."

Mr. Chairman, I think I have covered the major provisions of this bill. I stated that it had been reported unanimously by the committee, which spent many days in hearing the testimony and analyzing the provisions of the bill and the pay scales which are incorporated in it. I believe it is as good a pay bill as I have seen drafted in my service in the House. I believe it is one which places the increases provided in the spots where they are needed the most so that we can attract men and hold men. I sincerely trust it will be favorably received by the House and that it will be adopted.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Just as a matter of clarification of a matter which came to my attention just last night, actually, in view of the fact that the bill is to be cited as the Career Incentive Act some of the Reserves have been concerned as to whether or not it has application to the reserve forces. I assured them on my own that it does, but I would like to have it in the RECORD that these increases of pay, allowances, and so on, have equal application to the Reserve officer or enlisted man whether he be on active duty or on duty for training.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman from Maryland is correct. The form of the bill is that we strike out of existing law the pay table under which they are now compensated and we insert the new pay table. Of course, all persons on active duty are compensated the same for the same rank and length of service. Those who are on training or serve for limited periods of time draw under the same pay table. It is applicable to them in the same way.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I was glad to hear the gentleman say that the committee had taken some action to restrict the services from shifting personnel back and forth across the country and overseas. I know of some instances where it has been a real hardship on the members of the armed services, men with families who are shifted about an average of once a year. In many instances where the family is quite large the individual is put to personal expense in doing so.

Mr. KILDAY. There can be no doubt about it. I think the committee has made it abundantly clear to the departments that we feel there is no necessity for it, and that it has just been due to lax administration.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman made a very significant statement in regard to the cost of training a jet pilot, for example, when he said it costs more than $200,000.

Mr. KILDAY. That is a jet bomber pilot; $275,000.

Mr. FISHER. Probably not as high but a somewhat comparable figure would apply to those in electronics and other specialties in all branches of the service; is that true?

Mr. KILDAY. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Military organizations nowadays are most complicated. The fellows who carry a rifle and a bayonet and sling grenades are of the greatest importance. But scientific development in electronics has come into the thing in all of the services. The infantryman depends on scientific developments for communications; electronics are used in every phase of military action.

Let us take two situations. The gentleman mentioned the pilot. We inquired of the president of the Airline Pilots Association when he was before us what percentage of the airline pilots had been trained by the military. He answered, "Practically all." We are running a training school. He gave us the rates of pay for first pilots and copilots, and they are most attractive.

Let us get to electronics. We had before us a fire controlman first-class of the Navy. I believe he said he had 14 years of service. He has just completed a course in school here in Washington, a rather long course. Just as soon as he graduated he received a letter from one of the large electrical companies—I do not know which one, and it does not make any difference, but one of the large companies—offering him a job in their organization at twice his Navy pay. They got his name, I assume, from the school or somewhere, and knowing that the Government had spent all that money on him and that he was about to go on duty to use that knowledge for the benefit of the Government, they offered him twice as much as the Government would pay to come into their private employment.

Mr. FISHER. Could the gentleman elaborate on the rate of turnover generally in the various branches of the service now?

Mr. KILDAY. I gave that, I believe, as fully as I have the figures available here at the moment. We have gone into that in very considerable detail. But I think this is significant, the reenlistment rate in the Navy today is the lowest it has ever been in the entire history of the Navy.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I was particularly interested in the colloquy which was just had with the gentleman about the cost of training people who are jet bomber pilots. Looking at that for a minute, you will find there are jet bomber pilots who are in the Reserve Corps and who are not regular pilots, but who want to be regular pilots. There are World War II pilots who are slightly over age by just a few months and the Air Force wants to keep them in, and they want to make that their career. I know of one who was shot down in the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. He has been in ever since and has just been trained on the new B–47. That man, although he has been in between 12 and 14 years, cannot yet be in the Regular Service. What is the reason for that?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know just what the reason may be in that particular case. There have been many reasons for such situations.

Mr. FULTON. The man is just slightly overage, perhaps several months overage, where they feel he should be taken into the Regular service.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true.

Mr. FULTON. But, they keep him in the Reserve, do you not see?

Mr. KILDAY. The personnel problems are tremendously difficult. I assume the situation to which the gentleman refers has something to do with the attempt constantly going on, and apparently never successful, of preventing humps. To prevent what caused President Eisenhower to remain a major for a period of 16 years. When you put too many men in one grade, then you slow down the promotions behind him. We have always had a provision in the permanent law that the maximum age for a Regular commission was 27. That was suspended at various times during the integration program. That was regarded as the age at which he was still young enough to have a career and which would qualify him for full active service for 30 years as an officer, or until he was 60, 62, or 64 years of age. So there are many things which enter into it, and perhaps the Department on occasion has been a little bit too technical or too choosy.

Mr. FULTON. If I may ask the gentleman this further question: Why not have a provision that after a man is on active duty and in the Reserve for a period of 10 years, then he automatically

has the right to become a Regular officer in the service?

Mr. KILDAY. Now, I do not think you are going to be able to do that, because, you see, once you get a man in the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, or anywhere in the Regular service, you have him for life unless you court-martial him and kick him out. Once he is commissioned, you have him until he retires or you get him out by court-martial or retire him for physical disability. So, so long as we have a fluctuating strength, if we overload, and we have had that happen in the past, in 1921, when we had to retire some relatively young men, when we put the retirement on the basis of 3 percent of the pay times the years of service because we had more officers than we could use. That is a most difficult problem, which I assure the gentleman we cannot settle here on the floor of the House.

Mr. FULTON. Is that question being considered?

Mr. KILDAY. There is a bill to do something for the Reserves now pending before the committee, but I do not know the exact details of it.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. Would the gentleman mind stating for the record the pay and allowances that a second lieutenant gets?

Mr. KILDAY. I figured that out yesterday for the Committee on Rules, but do not have it here at the moment, but our clerk informs me it is $428, including his subsistence and quarters allowance.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am glad to have that on the record because I believe I have heard remarks on the floor today that they were overpaid, and started at $500 a month.

Mr. KILDAY. No, sir; I do not think anybody could ever find a second lieutenant who has ever been overpaid.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It is sound, constructive legislation which is very much needed and long overdue.

First I want to congratulate the very able and distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and all members of subcommittee No. 2 who held long and thorough hearings on this particular measure. Members of that committee were very faithful and diligent in their attendance. They exercised almost infinite patience and painstaking care in the consideration of the bill, which, as you can see from the tables incorporated in the bill and in the report, is quite intricate and complicated and rather uninteresting. It is like taking a table out of trigonometry or a page of logarithms, but I feel that the full Committee on Armed Services, and every Member of this House, are deeply indebted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and all members of his subcommittee who, in my judgment, have done a magnificent job.

There is little I can add to what the gentleman from Texas has said, but I want to point out a few significant facts which I think we should keep uppermost in our minds. We all know that the armed services cannot compete with the wages or salaries paid in private industry. Of course, pay is not everything. There are other considerations and compensations. Though we spend thousands upon thousands of dollars in educating men in different branches of our armed services, particularly in the scientific field, the field of radar, electronics, and so on, we know that after we spend those thousands of dollars and train those men, along will come General Motors or General Electric or Westinghouse or some other big company and take those men away from us.

This particular bill is not only the product of the Defense Department—in fact, they brought very little, if any, pressure upon us for its consideration. This is a committee bill, and the bill as reported out of our committee unanimously, both by the subcommittee and out of the full committee by a vote of 32 to 0, grants greater increases in pay to all members in all branches of our armed services than were recommended by the Department of Defense itself. I think that is a compliment to the genuine and intense interest that Members of Congress have in the security of the Nation and in the welfare of the personnel in our armed services. We actually voted them more than the services themselves requested, which goes to prove that pay is by no means the only incentive for the men who serve their country.

Now, what does the bill do? It increases the pay of all enlisted personnel with more than 2 years' service. Of course, the draftee is obligated. Do not worry about that incentive for him. He has got to serve his 2 years. We voted an increase in pay for all warrant officers with more than 2 years' service, and of all officers with more than 3 years' service. This increase in pay goes to every man in every branch of our armed services, from buck private to major general, or from seaman to rear admiral. Increases are provided for Reserve officers and also for retired officers. The increase is from 6 to 25 percent of the basic pay. The lowest percentage increase goes to the major general—6.07 percent. The largest percentage increase in pay goes to the second lieutenants—25 percent. The first lieutenants, 22½ percent, because it is from that critical period of their careers as young officers that we lose them unless we can give them at least enough so that they will not have to worry about groceries.

That is what the bill does. It provides for increases in pay not only to members of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, but also the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, and a substantial increase to all midshipmen in the Naval Academy, to all cadets in the Military Academy, the Air Force Academy, and to those in the Coast Guard Academy.

Provisions are also made for dislocation or to give increased travel amounts when a family is compelled to move; and we all hope with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Texas that there will be fewer moves made in the future than we have had in the past.

This bill provides an increase in pay for all members of the armed services of $734 million. Add to that a little more than $11 million for the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Public Health, and you have a grand total in excess of $745 million. That is a lot of money and I share the apprehension the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], expressed in the Rules Committee when we appeared before that body yesterday, at the alarming increased cost of government. But we are concerned even to a greater degree over the safety and security of this Nation; and unless we pass legislation of this sort that will provide a real and an active incentive for bright, young and capable officers to make a military life their career, I fear for the future defense and security of the country.

Let no one here for 1 minute think that this $745 million is a net increase. I am not so sure but that, in my own little humble, but honest judgment, over a long period of time and after this plan gets into actual operation it will save us money, because the most expensive thing in the world is this quick overturn or rotation of men. As the gentleman from Texas pointed out clearly, the recruit consumes the services of all the fellows who are training him—and it costs approximately $7,500 a year to equip and train a buck private. If you can hold these officers in the services without that vast and rapid turnover it is going to save the taxpayers untold millions of dollars. And that is a thing I think we should bear in mind. It is shocking to a lot of people to think that it costs $120,000 to train a jet fighter pilot, and more than a quarter of a million dollars, $275,000, to train a jet bomber pilot to handle a B–47 or B–52.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. It occurs to me that the armed services could save quite a bit of money if they could work out a system which would eliminate this indiscriminate rotation of the personnel of the armed services.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that our committee has had that matter very much in its mind and we are doing everything we can to lessen it, but it is rather difficult to limit the movement of any branch of our military service or to put them in a straitjacket, because they have got to have a certain flexibility and elasticity to meet changing conditions. Training is not a static thing; it is something that is always more or less in a fluid state.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I realize that you cannot put them in a straitjacket, but it occurs to me, and I imagine to many other people, that you could keep from changing them once a year on an average.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to point out to my very good friend that the pilot to whom the gentleman just referred is flying a piece of equipment that costs a couple of million dollars.

Mr. SHORT. I am very glad that the gentleman points that out. It costs more than $2 million. I think it would be nearer $4 million for a B–52 bomber.

Of course, if you can hold this man in the service in whom you have invested such a fabulous sum of money, including the high value of the expensive equipment that he is forced to use, naturally you will save the taxpayers much money because whenever one of these officers leaves the service you have to start from taw, you have to start from scratch, from the very bottom to train someone else to take his place. So I say that while the bill increases the amount of pay for the members of our armed services, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health by $745 million, it will over the long pull, in a period of years, result in enormous savings to the taxpayers of the Nation and it will keep this country strong militarily and prepared to defend itself at any and all times instead of our constantly having to train green troops or raw recruits.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What will happen in reference to the pay of the mechanics who service these boxcars and other valuable equipment? The greatest value is in the precious lives of the pilots and military personnel. It has been brought to my attention that they have had altogether too many accidents and too many deaths in these so-called boxcars and it has been suggested to me by a man who has manufactured airplanes for years, who went down to the airfields and watched the pilots and some of the planes that he believes that they have not in many instances been properly serviced, that the best mechanics are being taken by private industry and that there should be an inducement to keep them in.

Mr. SHORT. I quite agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I think no doubt that many of the accidents we have suffered have been due at times to an inadequate force of skilled mechanics and aviation engineers whose services are necessary, because they have to see that that old crate is in good shape before it is ever taken off the ground. Many of these essential men are members of the armed services serving in that capacity and, of course, will get an increase along with every other member of the armed services; but the civilian personnel who are employed by the armed services to assist are not included in this piece of legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Something ought to be done for them because private industry is getting the best ones. I compliment the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and all of the committee for bringing out this fine bill.

Mr. SHORT. It poses a real problem. It is much easier to recognize the problem than it is to solve it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to turn over control of the time for the minority to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], who is ranking minority member of the subcommittee and who spent more time in the consideration of this particular measure than I have.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is my good fortune to serve as ranking minority member on the Armed Services Subcommittee of which my distinguished and extremely able friend from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is the chairman. Frankly, I know no other Member of this body more fully qualified to speak on this subject of military pay, or any other military personnel problem, than the gentleman from Texas.

You know the care and the thoroughness with which the gentleman from Texas approaches all our defense problems and bills taken up by our Armed Services Committee. The measure before us is no exception in this respect. I will even say that my respect and confidence in the judgment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is such that I believe I would support this measure even if I had not had the opportunity to be a member of the committee which reported it and to have learned firsthand the urgent need for its enactment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I overlooked it, and I do not know whether the gentleman is going to or not, but I would like to interpolate at this point that great as that subcommittee is, I do not think you could have done this job without the constant and able help of the smiling Mr. Blandford.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman just beat me to it. I was just going to mention the fact that we have one of the most outstanding and capable members of our staff over there by the name of Mr. Blandford. I wonder at times how he retains all these facts and figures and data in his mind that have proven so helpful to us on this subcommittee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And you have also a very able man in Mr. Smart, do you not?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes. I say, in fact, we have an exceptional, outstanding staff on the Armed Services Committee.

It is not my purpose, nor desire, to enter into any detailed discussion of the pending bill. It is necessarily a somewhat technical and rather complex subject, as we are here dealing with all the services and all the grades or ranks of those who wear the uniform. The committee report accompanying the bill, supplemented by the thorough presentation just made by our subcommittee chairman the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], leaves little to add as to the purpose of this bill, the absolute necessity for it, and the manner in which it will operate to accomplish the purpose. I do, however, want to make a few general observations.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, with all the emphasis I can command, that we are faced with a very serious problem with respect to our military personnel. It is serious to those who serve, and it is serious to us as we seek to develop and maintain the best possible in national defense.

I call your attention to the alarming rate we lose each year the trained men who fly our airplanes, sail our ships, and man our defense guns. The reenlistment rate in our armed services is one-half the reenlistment rate that prevailed in 1949. The reenlistment rate in our Navy, composed entirely of volunteers, is the lowest in the recorded history of the Navy. Applications for Regular commissions from among qualified reserve officers—distinguished graduates of ROTC, OCS graduates, NROTC graduates, and other officer programs—are so low that I am seriously concerned as to the caliber of the officer corps that will be leading our Armed Forces in the years ahead.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff on February 20, 1953, issued a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense warning that the present situation with respect to the future of the military service as a career invites and encourages mediocrity in our Armed Forces.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know I speak for every Member of this House when I say I do not want the young men of this Nation to be led by mediocre officers, commissioned or noncommissioned, at any time, in war or in peace. It is imperative that we provide the incentive that will keep these highly trained, highly skilled, competent men in the service of their country. To provide that incentive I am willing to pay the cost in dollars.

Just as take home pay is important to us in our civilian pursuits, it is important to a military man. You cannot educate your family and provide for the good things of life just on love for the service, however great that love may be. I am convinced in my own mind that many a young man in this Nation who really wanted, deep down in his heart, to make a career in the armed services has had to let the practical consideration of attaining a reasonable standard of living prevent him from so doing. He had his family to think of and the future of his children.

To be sure, pay is not the only answer to this question of making the service a good career. Promotion, retirement, hospitalization, adequate medical care, and adequate housing are all parts of the problem. They are all factors, along with pay, that enter into one's decision whether to follow a military career.

Last year, after long and careful study by the Armed Services Committee, the Congress enacted into law the Officer Grade Limitation Act. That law provides a reasonable grade spread in our

armed services. It permits orderly promotion planning and removes the uncertainty that previously existed with regard to limitations that might be imposed because of the lack of limitations that existed prior to the enactment of that law. Today the promotion pattern is fairly well established not only for the officers but also for the enlisted personnel. I believe that this improved system of promotion provides an incentive for a military career. But it is not in itself enough to make a military career attractive to competent, ambitious young men, particularly considering what such young men can accomplish for themselves and their families in civilian life.

Last year we also passed a Warrant Officer Act which, for the first time, set up a uniform promotion system with attrition to weed out those who do not qualify for promotion. This, too, has been helpful in meeting the problem but still not enough.

All these steps were taken in the last Congress as part of our efforts to establish an attractive career in the military service for the long pull that lies ahead. We recognize that a stable force well in excess of that which can now be maintained on a voluntary basis is the only answer to this constant threat of extinction that now faces us and likely to face us many years from now.

Of course, all of us would like to think that some day our armed services can exist on a purely voluntary basis. I certainly would be the first to say such ideal will not result from the enactment of this bill. Nonetheless, I am definitely convinced that the enactment of this bill, together with the substantial reenlistment bonus law that we passed last year, will considerably increase the reenlistment rate in our armed services. This bill, together with the Warrant Officer Act and Officer Grade Limitation Act I mentioned, will result in more qualified young men applying for regular commissions in our armed services.

We must give all of our career people an incentive to stay in the service. We must show the man in the lower grade that he can aspire to a higher grade with increased emoluments. Remember we are dealing with American boys from American homes who have been reared in American tradition. To these boys opportunity to get ahead, to improve themselves, is vitally important. That is as it should be. And we must show them that a military life offers such opportunities in accordance with the best American tradition.

In this connection, I should like to call your special attention to the new pay scales for warrant officers. The committee revised these scales to fit the new Warrant Officer Act, and this will provide considerable incentive for enlisted men to aspire to warrant grade.

By this legislation we seek to put into effect the principle of increased pay for increased responsibility. We seek to provide an incentive not only to remain in the service but to work to improve one's self in the service. We thereby improve the entire service.

At best, service life is not easy. Dollars in a pay envelope cannot compensate for separation from home and family. Pay will not compensate for the inability of the average serviceman to take roots in one town and live there for a long period of time. Pay will not compensate for taking the youngsters out of school in one State and putting them in school in another State or another country. But it will help compensate. It will help provide an incentive to serve. At least it will be a strong indication to the men and women who dedicate their lives to the military service that the Congress of the United States is keenly interested in their welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I do most sincerely hope that this bill will pass this House with an overwhelming vote as it has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, today the House of Representatives will make a major decision affecting the future of our Armed Forces.

As I see the situation we can adopt one of two alternatives—we can pass the proposed legislation and provide a sufficient inducement in pay so that men will make a career of our armed services, or we can do nothing and continue to pay the fantastic training costs brought about by the excessive turnover in our armed forces.

I think it is imperative that we keep in mind at all times that it costs the taxpayers $3,200 for each inductee or recruit who enters our armed services. Every new man must undergo basic training and at the end of 6 months we have an initial $3,200 investment in that individual.

If this were the only cost involved, the situation could be tolerated. But to this must be added the other expenses of schooling that are necessary in all of our armed services.

We live in a complex age. It is no longer sufficient that a man merely knows how to fire a rifle or do squads right. Today a soldier, sailor, airman, or marine must have better qualifications than those that prevailed prior to World War II. We need electronics men, ordnance experts, communicators, ordnance repairmen, guided missile experts, men trained in nuclear weapons, men trained in defense against nuclear weapons, aircraft mechanics, radio mechanics, and a multitude of other specialties. A radio repairman's training exceeds $9,000; to make a man an electronics technician costs approximately $8,900; to produce a radar repairman involves a training cost of $12,870; aircraft mechanics cost $7,950 apiece.

Now there are just a few examples of the training costs involved in a handful of our specialties in the Armed Forces. To this must be added hundreds of other categories involving special training. A modern armed force involves the latest techniques in communications, weapons, and transportation. We cannot sit idly by and rest upon the knowledge that was sufficient to win World War II. We must always keep our Armed Forces in a superior position with respect to the technological advances of warfare.

Think of these costs for a minute: It costs $120,000 to train an F94C jet pilot; a B–47 pilot's training costs $275,000. These are fantastic figures, but they represent the investment the American people have in men who possess the capabilities that they have acquired as a result of their training in the armed services. Are we going to be pennywise and pound foolish and do nothing to retain these men? Are we going to have to continue to duplicate and reduplicate the training costs involved as a result of these men leaving the service? We are going to lose 4,500 pilots in fiscal 1956. That is the present estimate. If we could keep half of these men, we would save millions.

Mr. Chairman, I do not contend for one moment that the proposed legislation is the answer to all of our problems with regard to the fantastic turnover in our armed services.

But I do say that it will have a marked effect upon this turnover and will reduce it to a more acceptable figure. Perhaps 1 day we will reach that ultimate desirable goal of an all-volunteer force. The proposed legislation is a step in that direction. And for every man who reenlists in our armed services there is one less individual who has to be drafted. Every officer who remains in our armed services on a career basis is one less officer who must be put through the training mill to acquire the skills that are absolutely essential for the defense of this Nation.

The passage of this legislation will not stop inductions; it will not stop ordering ROTC graduates to duty; it will not stop training of new men, but it will reduce those training costs and it will go a long way toward protecting the absolutely incredible investment that we have in the thousands and thousands of young men who today possess the knowledge that will make it possible for us to survive as a nation if another war becomes our fate. And, while it is impossible to estimate, any reduction in our present turnover cannot help but increase the efficiency of our combat forces. To me the choice is clear—we must make every reasonable effort to retain these men in service.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for many years I have introduced legislation designed to increase the pay of military personnel. In each instance consideration of the bill was delayed because of the refusal of the Bureau of the Budget to support such legislation.

While congressional action was delayed we all know what happened to the morale of our Armed Forces, as evidenced by the almost unbelievable number of resignations by officers and the refusal of enlisted personnel to renew their enlistment.

By passing this bill today, the House will have performed the best single thing it has done since the end of World War II on behalf of the career personnel in the armed services.

This is a good bill—a thoroughly sound measure—and let us hope that its final enactment will be speeded by the Senate.

It is a bill that I know will be greatly welcomed throughout the services.

It will bring some long-overdue and badly needed pay relief to the gallant men and women who have remained on active duty beyond the time the law requires them to serve.

By continuing to perform their duties during these critical days, they have contributed a tremendous lot to the security and welfare of this great Nation.

They have done so in countless cases at the cost of hardship and privation to themselves and their families—and with very little thanks or real recognition from Congress or the other people of this country.

Those who choose to make a career of military or naval service do so with the knowledge that they are probably the most underpaid group of people, not only in the civilian economy, but in Government as well.

They do not work under any 8-hour day.

Neither do they get any overtime pay for the many longer days they often put in.

Nor do they have any unions or wage bargainers.

They have only Congress—and we certainly have not done overly well by them—in recent years.

We have allowed their pay to lag farther behind the rising national economy and cost of living than for any other group.

But pay alone is not, and never has been, the only element that makes a career in the armed services acceptable as a way of life.

This fact has always been accepted and recognized by the Congress and by those in service.

We could not possibly afford to pay enough in dollars for the hazards that must be accepted—or for the countless technical skills that are so urgently needed.

Nor could we pay in dollars and cents for the long absences from home and family—or for the faithful, unsung, unnoticed performance of duty on ships and aircraft, regiments, and stations throughout the world, 24 hours a day.

How many of us have ever stood on board an aircraft carrier in the black of night watching the clockwork team precision that enables jet planes to take off and land on that pitching deck? But it goes on somewhere—every night of the week.

How many of us are familiar with the heavy tasks and great skills that are constantly demanded of the air crews in the heavy bombers of the Strategic Air Command?

How many of us know about the fantastically complex electronic and other technical equipment that must be kept repaired and operating in all the services?

How many of us have stopped to think that in this day of specialization, one of the rarest and most valuable of all specialists is the well-trained combat leader—the man who is competent to lead our sons amidst the great dangers and difficulties of actual combat. The sergeant, the platoon leader, the ship captain, the regimental commander, the squadron leader.

No, we cannot pay in dollars what these people are worth to the Nation, nor what private business can, and does, pay for comparable skill and responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, it has always been traditional for certain other benefits to be made available to military personnel, to partially compensate for their relatively low pay.

These have included such things as commissary privileges, medical care for dependents, housing, the advantages of post exchange stores, certain tax benefits, to name some of the principal ones.

What has happened to those privileges—the so-called fringe benefits?

We all know what has happened. We the Congress have either taken them away ourselves, or have permitted them to be hacked down to nothing by others.

What have been the results of this neglect on our part?

First, it has amounted to actual and entirely unjustified reductions in pay to service personnel.

Secondly, and perhaps of even greater seriousness and significance, this continuing reduction of fringe benefits is regarded by the average officer and enlisted man as lack of recognition by the Congress, which of course it is.

They feel it is a blow to the traditional prestige and the high regard in which we formerly held those in military service.

I ask you when at any other time in our history has it ever been more urgent, more important, that our military services be manned from among the very best, the most competent, loyal and courageous of our citizens?

Let us, through the passage of this bill, reaffirm our esteem and our great faith and confidence in the career men and women of our Armed Forces.

We will be doing a fine and a just thing in passing this pay bill.

After passing this bill, we should give serious attention to restoring the other benefits that have been constantly chipped away and removed during the past 9 years.

Let us make it perfectly plain that we intend to compensate our military forces with adequate pay and to restore other rightful benefits. By doing so we will be telling all of these fine men and women that we do recognize and appreciate the great service they are rendering to the Nation and to the free world.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my appeal for support of this bill, I want to point out that not only will the Regulars benefit from the granting of a pay increase, but likewise the Reserves on active duty.

In addition to the Reserves on active duty, those who attend drills and take annual training in order to maintain their efficiency will benefit from this bill since they receive the same pay as the Regulars.

For an illustration, a Reserve who is authorized to attend drills will receive one-thirtieth of his monthly pay rate, and when on active duty for training he receives a day's pay for each day of training commensurate with his rate or rank.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, when it becomes law, as I hope it will at an early date, will not only benefit the Regulars but likewise the thousands of officers and enlisted men in our military Reserves.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, today, with the House considering the Career Incentive Act of 1955, we have heard considerable testimony about the necessity of attracting and keeping highly skilled young men in our jet-powered Navy and Air Force. As evidence of the tremendous growth of jet activity in the Navy, I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks a recent article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of March 7, 1955, detailing the jet activities at Miramar Naval Air Station, at San Diego, Calif., under the able command of Capt. D. L. Mills, United States Navy.

Since Miramar is one of the leading naval air bases in the country, it seems highly fitting that one of the Nation's most beloved naval air advocates, Adm. Marc Mitscher, be honored by naming this field after him. Consequently, I have recently appealed to the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, to give consideration to the communitywide support for such a move by naming the flying field portion of the Miramar Naval Air Station after Pete Mitscher.

I know that such action would be welcomed by Captain Mills and his officers and men, who remember Admiral Mitscher as the pilots' admiral and who, like Mitscher, are dedicated to the improvement of the naval air service.

The Evening Tribune article follows:

AIR BASE EXPANDING AT JET-LIKE SPEED

(By John Bunker)

The Miramar Naval Air Station is growing with a jet age zip.

Almost 400 jet planes now are based at Miramar, making it the largest operational fleet support air station in the Navy.

Expansion plans include new shops, barracks, hangars, roads, runways, storehouses, and other facilities.

By 1960 the Navy plans to have spent $80 million on this mesa-top field. About $38,500,000 has been spent to date to make it the Navy's largest master jet airfield.

KEY AIR STATION

Miramar is the key air station in the San Diego area, with satellites consisting of the Brown Naval Auxiliary Air Station 20 miles to the south near the Mexican border and the naval auxiliary air station at El Centro, 85 miles to the east of Miramar.

The naval air station at North Island serves as a coastal terminal for the repair of aircraft and the berthing of carriers.

Miramar is a dramatic example of what a typical Navy installation means to San Diego in terms of jobs and as a customer for local purveyors.

In 1939 Miramar consisted of a mooring mast for a dirigible and a bombing target for aircraft. During the next few years it will become one of the largest and most modern military airfields in the world.

The field is used for operational training; for the regrouping and reforming of pilots for assignment to carriers of the Pacific Fleet. Here fliers learn to operate new types of aircraft like the FJF3, Fury and the FTUF3 Cutlass.

They test new flying gear; practice fighter techniques; keep pace with the constantly changing demands of high altitude flight for enemy bomber and missile interception.

Miramar-based aircraft belong to 4 carrier air groups, plus 2 air task groups, a tactical photo squadron, and a long-range photographic squadron.

Naval Air Reserve squadrons use the field for 2 weeks of annual training.

In addition, Miramar soon will become a west coast stock point for guided missiles launched from planes. According to Capt. D. L. Mills, Miramar commander, this activity will become one of the field's prime functions, supplying all west coast and Pacific Fleet units with air-to-air missiles.

During 1955, Mills says, $3 million will be spent by the station for operating expenses.

Two million dollars will go to salaries of civilian plumbers, carpenters, electricians, garbage collectors, janitors, and drivers. About $90,000 will be spent at San Diego stores for auto parts, janitor supplies, and other retail items used in day-by-day operation of the field.

San Diego will bill Miramar for $40,000 worth of water. Its other utility bills will be $45,000 for gas, $90,000 for electricity, and $44,000 for telephone service, all of which contribute substantially to job making, public utility plants in the San Diego area.

In 1954, Miramar spent $337,500 for supplies purchased in San Diego, Mills said.

This does not include money flowing into the San Diego economy from pay checks of Miramar officers and enlisted personnel.

This payroll has been running around $6,520,000 a year. Mills estimates it will eventually top $10 million a year.

Hundreds of jobs and millions of dollars in payrolls and locally purchased supplies will result from Miramar's program of future construction.

By early summer of 1955, more than $5 million in new buildings and service facilities will be underway.

This will include a $2,630,000 hangar, more than $1 million worth of radio communications equipment, a $400,000 radar air traffic control center, extension of sewers and utilities, a runway lighting system, and other facilities.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot be present for the rollcall on this pending bill. I favor this measure and wish to commend the Committee on Armed Services for its comprehensive study and recommendations with reference to the needs of our men and women in service. If present for the rollcall, I would vote "aye."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, like the rest who preceded me, I consider myself very privileged to have served on this committee with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. I can attest to you we really burned the midnight oil in trying to resolve this question and to present it to you for your consideration. Today at least 10 million eyes are focused on the House of Representatives. Three million plus in the military and at least 7 million dependents, some of them up in the gallery looking to see what we are going to do for them and for their loved ones who wear the uniform of this country. This bill, which we have reported out unanimously from the subcommittee and on up through the large committee, is our own thinking and our own doing for and on behalf of those whom we have serving in the military. As long as you and I live—as long as you and I live—we are going to live in an armed camp and we are going to have a great segment of the world pointing daggers at our very hearts. We cannot afford not to have the finest military men on earth to occupy the billets which they now occupy. They occupy places all over the earth, in Africa where they have nothing but sand, morning, noon, and night. In the southwest area of the world and the dry and arid countries, and in the far north, way up in Alaska. They do not have any bed of roses, and the least we can do is in some measure to remunerate them for the great sacrifices they are performing on our behalf because of sheer necessity. Sixty-five cents out of every taxable dollar goes for the upkeep of the military. That is not small change. This military is big business—big business. It is the biggest business on earth, as Secretary Humphrey has said. There is nothing to compare with the United States Government or the military—there is nothing by comparison. The man who headed the biggest corporation on earth, Charlie Wilson, who is now the head of the Department of Defense, finds out that General Motors is a drop in the bucket by comparison. It requires smart people to run this military. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has related to you how it requires two-hundred-and-seventy-thousand-odd dollars to train one of Curtis LeMay's boys to fly one of those B–47's or B–52's or B–36's, and one-hundred-and-twenty-five-thousand-odd dollars to turn out one of these jet fighter-bomber flyers. They are no longer fighters; they are fighter-bombers which span this continent in fewer than 4 hours. They have to be smart to go into this military. We cannot pay them what they are worth. We realize that. It is just a gesture on our part to in some measure remunerate them and their loved ones for what they have to endure. We are losing these men in this critical period. We are losing that first lieutenant and that captain and their counterparts in the Navy. That is where we are losing them, and when we have gotten this money invested, we have to try to retain them. This is only one factor of what we are trying to do—housing, and hospitalization, and other fringe benefits.

We do not claim that this legislation is even adequate because no man can be paid enough money to give his life if necessary for any cause. This legislation is only one of the factors in the over-all problem that confronts the men in service and their dependents.

Never in the record history of this Nation have reenlistments gone to such a low level as now. From the President of the United States down to every responsible individual in the Government comes testimony that the man in the service is inadequately paid, inadequately housed and inadequately provided with dependent medical care.

The instant proposal before you is, as our distinguished chairman has related, an orderly process by which we will try and point out to the men and women in the service that there is an incentive to remain in uniform and to progress as this service continues.

The largest percentage increase for officers is in the grade of first lieutenant and second lieutenant, to wit, 22 percent and 25 percent respectively, the smallest increase is for officers in the grade of major general with less than 26 years service. This is roughly an increase of 6 percent.

I desire to address you today on that phase of this bill which relates to incentive pay for hazardous duty and I direct my remarks first to submarine duty and then to flight duty in this age we call the jet age.

Since the end of World War II, submarine design has made rapid advancements, particularly in the field of high underwater speed and in the submarine's ability to dive deeper depths than those attained during World War II. The development of the Guppy type submarine, which was an efficient modernization of our Reserve Fleet submarines left over from World War II, and the recent acquisition of the atomic-powered submarine have introduced a new phase of American submarine operations. We are now entering the era of long-range, continuous high speed, deep submergence type submarines. These new characteristics have introduced additional hazards. Furthermore, the fact that the new atomic-powered submarine may remain submerged for extremely long periods of time means that the officers and men attached to such a type submarine will be required to remain in congested spaces without benefit of fresh air and sunshine for those long durations, one mistake from disaster.

It is absolutely essential that the quality and efficiency of all officers and men serving in submarines be of the highest order; submarine operations depend entirely on the perfect effectiveness of the team as a whole. A mistake made by one individual may cost the lives of all. It is therefore necessary that we do everything possible to retain the highest quality personnel in submarine service. To obtain such quality a volunteer service is needed to assure proper selectivity. To provide for such a voluntary service, incentive pay is mandatory for it has been proven in the past that there are not enough men in the Navy who will

volunteer for submarine service just because they have a desire to serve in submarines. There are not too many individuals who like to spend years of service in the extremely congested confines of a submarine with its high hazardous potential existing at all times. This statement can be supported by looking to the past history of incentive pay for submarine duty.

In 1928 the Congress of the United States enacted a law which provided incentive pay for submarine duty; this law was brought about after the disastrous sinking of the U. S. S. *S–4*. Prior to 1928 no submarine pay existed for officers. As a result, the officer class at the submarine school in New London had about a 12- to 15-percent volunteer enrollment; for example, in the fall class of 1928, there were but 5 volunteers out of a class of 40. The remaining were draftees who did not particularly desire submarine duty and who served in it only as long as they were required to do so.

In the case of the enlisted man at that time, the situation was not much different. They received a dollar to dive up to a total of 20 dives per month. The incentive was not enough to attract men of high intelligence.

The result was that the quality of the personnel of the submarine force prior to 1928 was well below the average of the overall Navy.

What was the effect of this lower quality of personnel on submarine operations? During the period of 13 years prior to 1928 there were 17 serious submarine accidents which resulted in heavy loss of life. These accidents varied in type from submarine battery explosions to the complete loss of the submarine with all hands aboard.

By contrast let us now look at the submarine-personnel situation in the years following the introduction of submarine pay. From 1928 on, volunteers for both officer and enlisted duty in submarines greatly exceeded the numbers required for submarine duty. Thus we see the immediate effect of incentive pay in that the Navy was in a position to select the higher quality candidates who were volunteering. This condition existed even during World War II.

Better and much safer operational results also were realized in the period subsequent to 1928 and prior to 1941; there were but two serious submarine accidents involving loss of life during that time and one of these was probably caused by faulty material.

More important is the fact that when we entered World War II, our submarine service was fortunate in having the highest quality of personnel in both the officer and the enlisted categories. The successes of the submarine service in World War II indicate the results of this fortunate condition.

For the first 5 or 6 years following World War II, the submarine service had a large pool of excess submarine officers and men to draw from because of the reduced numbers of submarines in operation in our postwar Navy.

Since 1949, however, this pool no longer existed and we now see a definite trend downward in the recruitment of volunteers for submarine service. For example, in 1949 there were over 300 applicants for the 60 vacancies in the 6 months' officer class at submarine school, a 5-to-1 selectivity. In the last class of calendar 1954 there were but 209 applications for a class of 120 or a 2-to-1 selectivity. For the class entering on July 1 of this year with the applications deadline of March 1, 1955, there are but 107 applications for the 120 vacancies in that class. Thus, for the first time the quota for submarine school will not be filled.

At the same time, the resignation rate of officers in the submarine service is now over four times that which it was in 1949; most of these officers are young lieutenants.

One of the obvious answers to the foregoing is the fact that the incentive pay for hazardous duty is not as attractive to the young officers as it was during World War II when it was 50 percent of his base pay.

The case of the enlisted man is quite similar, particularly in the senior enlisted grades. The chief petty officer, for instance, does not receive enough incentive pay for hazardous duty to make it worth his while to serve in the less desirable type of duty with its added hazard. This is particularly true when he can enjoy sea duty aboard a submarine tender or some other form of surface ship with its comforts and less confined areas.

With this downward trend of interest in submarine duty since 1949 we begin to see a lessening in personnel quality and thus we are once again beginning to have accidents and many close calls. Since 1949 we have had the loss due to fire of 1 submarine off the coast of Norway, which would have been extremely disastrous had not another submarine been in the vicinity; all but 5 of the stricken submarine crew were rescued. More recently in the case of the U. S. S. *Pomodon*, which suffered a battery explosion in the San Francisco shipyard with a loss of five persons. In addition to that, we have had several close calls when submarines acting as targets for advanced antisubmarine warfare training have been hit by surface ships. So far these have resulted only in material damage to the submarine, fortunately without any loss of life to date.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is absolutely essential that the incentive hazardous duty pay for submarine duty be increased as proposed in H. R. 2607; the recommended increases place particular emphasis on raising the incentive pay in the greatest amount for the younger officer and the enlisted man. These are the men who comprise the bulk of the submarine service. I urge the enactment of this bill.

FLIGHT PAY

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago we considered this country and even this continent an impregnable fortress, surrounded by 3,000 miles of ocean, adequately defended by our great Navy. Over a year ago, a B–47 jet bomber crossed the Atlantic in about 4½ hours. In May of 1953 the crew of a B–47 bomber remained aloft for 24 hours with the aid of in-flight refueling. During this period they flew more than 12,000 miles. At midpoint of the flight, they dropped a dummy 10,000-pound bomb to simulate an actual combat mission. This is a distance greater than a flight from San Antonio, Tex., to Moscow and return. You have only to reverse the point of departure to realize the significance of this flight.

Today, it is clear that our fortress is no longer impregnable by virtue of our geographical position. The United States, for the first time since the colonial wars, is called upon to provide defense of its cities and its institutions against a foreign power. We are trying to push this defense as close to the source of a possible attack as we can get, and we must build the maximum retaliatory power this country can afford to counter such an attack if it should be forced upon us.

To get this defense in the air we have committed ourselves to a qualitative rather than a quantitative superiority over a possible aggressor. We want and expect American industry to build the best airplanes in the world. We are spending billions to accomplish this purpose. We want and expect our armed services to train the best pilots and air crews in the world.

The race for technological superiority has brought us to the jet aircraft, the intercontinental missile, and the atomic submarine. But it has not yet fashioned a substitute for the human pilot and the human mind. It has brought us the jet age, but it has not brought us a new species of human being to man and operate the weapon systems it has developed.

We have had to devise means to suit the man to this new and dangerous environment. We have provided him with pressurized cabins and pressure suits to enable him to live and fight at altitudes up to 10 miles above the earth. Our scientists have provided him with pressurized oxygen and forced it into his lungs at altitudes where his own lungs are incapable of maintaining life without this help. We have provided him with a .37-millimeter cannon shell to catapult him out of disabled aircraft at speeds which make it impossible for him to abandon his aircraft under his own power. We have provided him with G-suits to increase the limits of human tolerance to aid him to fight against forces of gravity which drain away his consciousness in seconds.

We have taken this human being who has changed little since the time of Christ and we have placed him in an environment where his weapons, are almost as deadly as his enemy. We have picked men to man these weapons, we have weeded out in our training programs all but the fittest, we have crammed their heads with knowledge of mathematics, of engineering, aerodynamics, navigation, and many other branches of science. We have spent years, and in some cases hundreds of thousands of dollars in their training.

I have mentioned these facts to demonstrate that our scientists have already built machines which are beyond the limits of human capability to operate without similar scientific devices to increase that capability. These same

scientists will tell you that we have only reached the frontier of aircraft development. They will also tell you that the machines can be no better than the men who employ them.

What, then, are we asking of the men who fly these aircraft of the jet age? First, we are asking that they undertake long and rigorous training to prepare themselves to enter into unknown and unfamiliar areas of altitudes, speeds, and distances which were undreamed of just a few short years ago. Next, we are asking that they undergo the stresses and strains of preparedness for instant combat. The defense of our cities against atomic attack cannot wait for months, weeks, or even days of refresher training for the interceptor crews of our Air Defense Command. To be effective, the retaliatory power of our Strategic Air Command must be maintained in a state of continuous readiness to strike back at any potential aggressor. The men of the 7th Fleet must be prepared to perform whatever mission is required, in areas less than 10 minutes flying time away from hostile shore.

This state of instant readiness against attack is a requirement this country is experiencing for the first time. It requires long hours of constant alert for our fighter interceptor crews. We have heard testimony that these crews are required to spend up to 60 hours per week at the end of the runways of our ADC bases waiting for a signal to scramble within 2 or 3 minutes to check on unidentified aircraft. It requires that we station men in remote areas where living conditions are little better than primitive. Some of these bases have no dependent housing at all, which means involuntary separation from home and family. We are asking for sacrifices in peacetime which have been required only in times of war.

Mr. Chairman, Air Force Secretary Talbott has stated that we must be prepared to maintain—and I quote—"a day and night watch for the rest of our lives. We cannot maintain this watch with amateurs."

Mr. Chairman, we can never pay these men for the hazards, the discomforts, the strain, and the tensions they must undergo. We can only offer to those who will serve in these vital and dangerous duties a standard of living which is comparable to that promised in other forms of endeavor. In justice and to face reality, we must pay a premium to induce our young men to gamble with their lives.

The provisions of this bill have been under study for many months. We have held hearings for a period of more than a month. I am convinced that it is the least we can offer if we are to maintain the security this jet age demands. I, therefore, urge its enactment.

Mr. Chairman, in summarizing our proposal to the House today, the proposed legislation provides increases in pay for all enlisted personnel with over 2 years of service, for all warrant officers with over 2 years of service, and for all officers with over 3 years of service, in an amount of not less than 6 percent of basic pay.

The largest percentage increase for officers is in the grades of first lieutenant and second lieutenant—22.33 and 25 percent, respectively, with over 3 years' service. The smallest percentage increase for officers is in the grade of major general with less than 26 years of service with an increase of 6.07 percent. The largest dollar increase for officers in the basic pay tables is for the brigadier general who completes more than 30 years of service where the increase amounts to $107.64 per month. On the other hand, first lieutenants with over 3 years of service will receive a $61.22-per-month increase, while captains with over 6 years of service will receive a $49.92 increase per month.

In the enlisted grades the largest percentage increase is for the E–4 (corporal in the Army, sergeant in the Marine Corps) with over 8 years of service who receives a 17.35 percent increase amounting to $26.52 per month. The largest dollar increase for enlisted personnel is in the grade of master sergeant with over 26 years of service who receives an increase of $29.64 per month.

The pay scale is based upon a formula, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Hook commission, the 4-percent increase in pay enacted by Congress in 1952, and increased increments in pay periods following a normal career pattern. Under present law, an increment increase in pay is the increase authorized within the same grade for additional years of service. In the enlisted grades, these increments increase every 2 years, until reaching a maximum career point, or until 18 years of service. Thereafter, increments are doubled, but only upon the completion of 4 years of service. The officer pay scale is constructed along similar lines. In the case of enlisted personnel, the increment amounts to $7.08 per month; in the case of officers the increase amounts to approximately $15 per month. The proposed pay scales are constructed along similar lines, but in some cases increments have been increased. For example, there are double increments in pay for the E–3 who remains in service over 3 years and completes more than 4 years of service. There is likewise a double increment in pay for the E–4 who moves from over 3 years of service to over 4 years of service. There is a double increment for the E–5 who moves from over 3 years to over 4 years of service. There is a one and one-half pay increment for the E–6 who moves from over 8 to over 10 years of service and a double increment in pay for the master sergeant who moves from over 16 to 18 years of service. On the other hand, the E–6 who moves from over 4 to over 6 years of service receives two and one-half increments at this critical point in the career pattern.

Among the officers, second lieutenants with over 3 years of service receive a double increment in pay and first lieutenants with over 3 years of service likewise receive a double increment in pay.

Captains with over 4 years of service get a double increment in pay as do captains with over 6 years of service; majors with over 8 years of service receive a double increment in pay, as do majors with over 10 years of service.

Lieutenant colonels receive a double increment in pay with over 12 years of service, and likewise with over 14 years of service. Colonels with over 16 years of service receive a double increment in pay, as do colonels with over 18 years of service. Brigadier generals with over 26 years of service receive a double increment in pay, as do brigadier generals with over 30 years of service. Major generals with over 30 years of service rereceive a double increment in pay.

The pay increase for senior officers is obviously not necessary in order to keep these officers on active duty. They have already acquired a considerable equity in retirement and obviously, except in rare cases, could not surrender this equity. But the Committee on Armed Services has been impressed with the arguments presented from many sources that young officers on active duty today are refusing to enter the armed services as a career because of the lack of incentive now present in the pay scales for senior officers.

The Department of Defense originally recommended a further increase in pay for major generals upon the completion of more than 35 years of service. The committee rejected this proposal.

The proposed legislation provides substantial increases in incentive pay for those engaged in flying and submarine duty.

The increases amount to $15 monthly for major generals and $10 for brigadier generals, $10 per month for colonels with over 16 years of service, and $35 for colonels with over 18 years of service; $45 a month for lieutenant colonels with over 14 years of service, $65 a month for majors with over 12 years of service, $60 a month for captains with over 6 years of service, $40 a month for first lieutenants with over 3 years of service and $35 a month for second lieutenants with over 3 years of service.

In the enlisted grades, flying and submarine pay is increased by $30 per month for master sergeants, $32.50 for technical sergeants, $30 for staff sergeants, $25.50 for sergeants, $15 for corporals, $22.50 for private first class, and $25 a month for privates. The increases have been related to basic pay and are constructed on years of service and grade. Again, the increases are more substantial in the critical career area.

The proposed legislation, in addition to increasing flight pay and submarine pay, also increases all other incentive pays by 10 percent.

Retired personnel drawing retirement pay under the Career Compensation Act will be entitled to have their retired pay computed on the pay scales of the Career Compensation Act as amended by the proposed legislation. In view of the fact that certain officers, warrant officers and enlisted personnel have retired for disability before completing 3 years of service as an officer, or 2 years of service as a warrant officer or enlisted man, and would not otherwise receive an increase under the proposed legislation, a specific provision provides that these individuals will be entitled to retirement pay based upon the basic pay to which

they are now entitled, plus a 6 percent increase.

Retired personnel entitled to retirement pay under laws other than the Career Compensation Act receive a flat 6 percent increase in their present retired pay.

The proposed legislation provides for a dislocation allowance for members of the armed services who are entitled to move with their dependents at Government expense. In view of the fact that the present reimbursement system is completely inadequate for members of the armed services who move with dependents, the committee has adopted a recommendation of the Department of Defense that such members be entitled to a dislocation allowance in the amount of 1 month's quarters allowance if they undergo a permanent change of station. However, this allowance will only be payable for one permanent change of station in each fiscal year except for individuals who are assigned to service schools. If an additional permanent change of station is required during any fiscal year other than to a service school, the allowance may not be paid except upon a finding of the Secretary concerned that the exigencies of the service require more than one such change of station during any fiscal year. The limitation with regard to only one payment during any fiscal year will not be applicable in time of war or national emergency declared since and during these periods it can be expected that there will be a large number of permanent changes of station depending upon the particular type of military operation involved.

The proposed legislation also increases per diem from $9 to $12 in the case of those individuals who are entitled to such per-diem allowances upon being away from a permanent-duty station. This action is taken in anticipation of a similar proposal which may be considered by the Congress during this session for civilian employees of the Federal Government.

There is likewise a substantial increase in the proposed legislation for aviation cadets. Under present law, aviation cadets are prohibited from receiving flight pay and are limited to a monthly pay of $109.20. The committee adopted the recommendation of the Department of Defense that aviation cadets be entitled to 50 percent of the pay of a second lieutenant with under 2 years of service—$111.15 per month—and flight pay of $50 per month, when actually engaged in flying duty. The pay of aviation cadets engaged in flying would thus be increased to $161.15 per month.

The proposed legislation would involve an annual expenditure for members of the armed services for fiscal 1956 of $734,045,571. In addition, the increase with respect to the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service for fiscal 1956 will be $11,797,444. Thus the total cost of the bill for fiscal 1956 will be $745,845,015.

In that connection I cannot pass over lightly what the Defense Department is doing to some of our benefits. The Congress of the United States passed a law providing six doctors for every thousand men in the military. The Congress passed that law. They have whittled that down to 3.2. That is what the Defense Department has done.

Yesterday I read a short article which I could hardly believe, and I do not believe it can be attributed to that great American, Herbert Hoover, and he is a great American. The Hoover Commission recommends closing certain dependents' hospitals in the Norfolk area, which is a tragedy. I lay it at the door of the American Medical Association. I do not believe the Hoover Commission can be charged with that. I say here and now I am going to make a speech on that in a few days, and I want to give ample notice, because I am really going to expose somebody. I am going to expose those babies who are cutting these dependents while their boys are marching off to war and are sailing our ships all over the world. I am not going to take it lying down, because this Congress has guaranteed certain benefits.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the gentleman's bringing up this suggestion that the family hospital medical care facilities in the Norfolk area should be closed. It would be a tragedy if it should occur, notwithstanding the fact that it came out of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not believe Mr. Hoover knows what that is.

But I want to address my remarks to what is done in connection with the incentive pay for these submarines and the Air Force. At the outset let me tell you if anybody is suffering from claustrophobia, stay out of the submarine business, because you go a long way down into the sea. The submarine is always one mistake away from disaster. You had better get people on that submarine who get along well with each other. They do not have the advantage of the fresh air and sunshine on board ship. Consequently, it requires infinite skill and patience and ability to get along with each other in the selection of the men qualified to man and operate one of these things. They go on these long tiresome trips. They have everything on earth inside of that submarine. I am going to relate to you just what is happening in the submarine service since we passed the law creating this after 1949.

I was at the new Air Force field in Colorado, Lowry Field. A representative of some big corporation went to the commanding general of that field and he said to him, "I want to be honest with you. Do you know why I am here? The minute you release these boys you have been training down at Keesler Field in Mississippi and at Lowry Field in electronics and radar and all kinds of electronic gadgets, I am going to pay him three times what you can offer him. I thought I would tell you so that you could be on the lookout." That is what is happening, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] said with that clarity of which he is so capable. We are running a training school; industry benefits. This is only one of the factors. We are trying to retain these men in this critical period when we need them so badly.

Take flight pay. Do you think any of these boys running these jet airplanes are doing so because they like it? It is not child's play breaking the sound barrier; that is not child's play, that is a man's game; and if we are going to keep able men in these jet planes—the reciprocal engine is on its way out; it is either obsolescent now or will be obsolete in a few years—we cannot have children running these turbo-prop jobs that can kill you so quickly if one little thing goes wrong. We have got to find a way to keep our trained men; and that is why we recommend this bill to you, while there is time, especially if we are to retain this 2,875,000-man armed military force, as Admiral Radford said so forcibly, for at least 50 years. We have got to raise our sights, my colleagues, if we are going to pay these men anything like what they are entitled to. We have got to pay them if we are going to keep them; if we are going to keep them we have got to pay them for the privation of being away from their families for these long endurance contests; we have got to increase the benefits. It cannot be as the Duke of Marlborough said:

> God and the soldier we adore
> In time of danger, not before;
> Danger past and all things righted,
> God forgotten and the soldier slighted.

We cannot follow that line if this Nation is going to exist.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill should and probably will pass by a unanimous vote. I am heartily in accord with the purpose and the provisions of the bill. The author of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], is the best informed man in the House of Representatives on the problems of military pay. His name as the sponsor of the bill assures me that it is the best bill that could be drafted under the conditions of today.

Briefly, the bill frankly states that its purpose is to stimulate soldiers, airmen, sailors, marines, and their officers to remain in the various services through the medium of increased pay and allowances.

Under the conditions of today and the tensions which exist in the world today, we need experienced and trained men in our various military components. They are the ones that will be called upon to defend our country, institutions, homes, and all we hold dear if we should be attacked. Today they must be ready now. As in all professions, experience, training, and love of the military profession makes for more capable and efficient officers and men of our Armed Forces. This bill definitely gives better increases percentagewise and also in dollars to the particular groups that need this the most. Noncommissioned officers, second lieutenants, first lieutenants, and captains all get a special boost. They are important as leaders to develop and train and build the morale of those whom they

command. There are also some important benefits to other special groups in higher ranks.

It is a pleasure to see that hazard pay encountered no resistance during the consideration of this bill, as it did when the last pay bill was before us, when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and myself had to fight back hard to resist a determined effort to eliminate or greatly reduce hazard pay for Air Force officers.

I extend my congratulations to the chairman and all the members of the subcommittee who wrote this bill. Their excellent work made it easy and a pleasure to vote for this bill, which I think will give the results that its title implies.

Under the cover of the protection which our great Armed Forces give us, we hope that the peace which we are all looking for will soon arrive.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my very good and able friend the gentleman from Texas, our chairman, in handling this legislation. His amazing knowledge of the subject matter, his years of experience in handling legislation of this nature, eminently qualify him to turn in the fine performance he did in bringing to us this bill we have before us today.

I also want to compliment the various services which presented the case to the committee, particularly Admiral Grenfell and Captain Martineau, of the Department of the Navy; Colonel Corbin and Lieutenant Colonel Wells, of the Department of the Air Force; and Colonel Brinkman, of the Department of the Army; on their able presentation. Their knowledge of the details of the proposed legislation, presented in a clear, understandable manner, was most helpful to the committee. They turned in an outstanding performance and have earned and deserve our hearty commendations.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to confine my remarks as to what effect I believe the passage of this career incentive bill will have on the Army.

As we all know, the Army has had to rely on the Selective Service System to maintain its required strength. Over 55 percent of the Army's enlisted personnel are inductees. This results in a heavy turnover of personnel each year.

Our inducted personnel serve an obligated tour of 2 years during which time they go through an expensive training program. While we can closely estimate the cost of this training, we cannot measure the loss of know-how and experience when these trained men decline to continue in a military career beyond their period of obligated service. It is in this group that we have a large potential for reenlistment in the regular service.

I feel that this career incentive bill creates the additional incentive needed to influence suffiicent numbers to accept military service on a career basis, and thereby materially improve the present low reenlistment rate for inductees from its alltime low of but 3 percent.

Army service as a career can be stimulated. I believe this is borne out by the results by the Army in its improved percentage increase in reenlistments among its regular service personnel since the passage of the reenlistment bonus last July. The enactment of the reenlistment bonus last year did check the exodus from the regular Army of career personnel. It did not, however, provide a sufficient stimulus to attract sufficient numbers of obligated service personnel to accept military service as an attractive career.

I believe a good part of that needed extra stimulus is now provided in this bill before us today. This bill together with last year's reenlistment bonus law plus those other service measures the President emphasized in his special message of January 13, 1955 will greatly enhance a military career attractiveness program and will give our inducted personnel a real incentive to become career soldiers.

Let us not for a moment forget that when we here in Congress provide the military services with the means whereby our Nation's young men can be offered an attractive and respected career in the service of our great Nation, the sooner will come the day that the Army will no longer need to depend on draft calls to meet its strength requirements but can secure its required personnel by voluntary enlistments.

An Army sergeant, a fine upstanding combat-decorated leader whom I wish all of you could have seen, appeared before the subcommittee when we were conducting the hearings. The Sergeant said that he was positive that the combined effect of this well-deserved and much needed pay boost and the increased reenlistment bonus will be sufficient to attract many of the high-type inductees who are at present undecided about continuing in the military service after their obligated service is finished.

The sergeant complained that he now just gets a man really trained to the point where he can render effective service when his period of service is finished and the lad is on his way home.

Well may this sergeant complain. Did you know that 80 percent of the Army's male enlisted personnel have less than 4 years' service?

Think what this inexperience means in terms of leadership; leadership is the most important factor bearing on the effectiveness of our combat arms. Research conducted in Korea on men very recently engaged in close combat indicates that the success or failure of the small unit depended to a marked extent upon the leader. For this reason the importance of the initiative and integrity of the junior noncommissioned officer leader cannot be over estimated.

There were situations in Korea, as in all other wars, where the competence, courage, and sometimes mere presence of a respected leader virtually saved a situation and won us a tactical advantage.

Normally, the leader just does not happen—he is trained. His training is both time consuming and costly. We must increase the attractiveness of the Army so that these fine sergeants are readily available when needed.

Can you imagine a more costly method of maintaining an effective fighting force than the present situation? A situation which in fiscal year 1953 saw the active Army lose 792,000 men, while it was gaining 724,000 men; which in fiscal year 1954 saw Army losses of 550,000 men and input gains of 436,000; which in fiscal year 1955, the Army's personnel chief estimates will result in losses of 700,000 soldiers while at the same time acquiring 401,000 others, the bulk of which comes from selective service. A much more costly method of maintaining an effective fighting force can hardly be conceived. Voluntary enlistments and reenlistments we believe will cut this tremendous turnover. We must further encourage voluntary enlistments and reenlistments.

Part of the means to correct this situation lies in this bill before us today. Later in this Congress I trust we will take the necessary action to increase dependent medical care, survivors' benefits, and provide for adequate housing, so that all of our service personnel can provide an acceptable standard of living for their families.

My deep inward feeling for our Army personnel has prompted me to stress the Army problem; however, the loss of career attractiveness is equally prevalent in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force. We can materially improve that problem. Let us, the 84th Congress, become known as the Congress that restored dignity, honor, and prestige to service in the Armed Forces of our great Nation.

I was pleased to listen to the remarks of my very good and distinguished and able friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], in discussing hazard-duty pay. This is a matter which I, too, am greatly interested in.

I want to state at this time that I know of no more controversial area of military pay than the rates of incentive hazardous-duty pay particularly as it pertains to senior flying officers. In my experience as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to state that I have also experienced misgivings on this subject which have caused me to look at this particular item of pay very carefully. I am now convinced that it is a genuine bona fide requirement for senior Air Force commanders to participate in flying throughout their active military careers.

I should like to quote from a statement of General LeMay who, as you know, is charged with the responsibility for the effectiveness of the Strategic Air Command:

> A very large number of our flying personnel are constantly pressured by their families to stop flying. Following every major accident these pressures approach the unmanageable. They affect staff and supervisory personnel as well as air-crew members. There are two factors which keep these pressures under control: first, the most vigorous leadership on the part of staff and supervisory personnel; second, the added measure of security our fliers are able to afford their families by virtue of their incentive pay.

I believe that there is a misconception on the part of many people as to the purpose of incentive hazardous-duty pay. Flying pay has been recently defined as

an incentive to attract individuals to enter into and remain in a career known to be hazardous. While there are many factors which serve to keep an individual in a flying capacity other than pay, such as love of flying, esprit de corps, and pride of organization, many factors mitigate against the continuation of an individual in a flying career. These are extraordinary hazards, increased expenses, separation from family, but perhaps the most important of all are the family pressures brought upon our fliers to abandon this duty. Unquestionably, flying is a part of the vigorous leadership on the part of the staff and supervisory personnel referred to by General LeMay, which serves to keep men in flying status.

Present law, which has not been changed since 1920, requires that the commanding officer of a flying organization be a rated pilot. I, for one, believe that this law is extremely sound. The active flying leadership of such generals as Lemay and General Weyland, former commander of the Far East Air Forces in Korea, is indispensable to our combat effectiveness. By virtue of the continued flying status of these officers, General LeMay is aware of exactly what he is asking his subordinates to do. General Weyland, as commander of the Tactical Air Command, is enabled to establish high standards of leadership from among his own commanders; General Chidlaw of our Air Defense Command is an active pilot with many thousands of hours of flying time.

Morale cannot be measured in terms of dollars but only in terms of combat effectiveness. Military flying today has come to be a coldly scientific, exacting business. Developments in military aviation have progressed so rapidly that even those most closely associated will find it difficult to keep abreast of these new developments. In the last few years we have moved from the horse-and-buggy age of aviation into the present fantastic areas of speeds and altitudes which were undreamed of a few years ago. As equipment becomes more complex, training lead time becomes greater. Considering the increasing cost of aircraft and the experience needed we are now going into the lieutenant-colonel grade for individual aircraft and unit commanders. The colonel in his higher responsibility commands flying units and bases. The generals command still larger units and combinations thereof, employing them tactically and strategically. Experience indicates that when the commanders and senior staff officers fly the same type of aircraft assigned to the unit the results can be measured in esprit de corps. The commander and his men can experience the same risk while flying. They share at least some of the same hazards and hazard is no respector of rank.

In our hearings we heard testimony from leaders in military and civil aviation. Leaders in both facets stressed the necessity for the retention of experience in actual combat flying as well as the leadership aspects of aerial warfare. Age is no criterion of flying ability. Five Air Force colonels became jet aces in Korea.

While we are on the subject of age, I should like to point out that less than 5 percent of the total flying officers in the Air Force are over age 40. This seems to me to be a very thin leavening of the maturity and judgment required to lead our combat forces. It is characteristic in any form of endeavor that experience is an integral part of leadership. To gain this experience an aviator must continue to fly year in and year out. In the business of military flying those individuals who do not fly for extended periods of time lose their flying proficiency and their motivation to fly.

In the Air Force today the major Air Force commanders have accumulated an average between 4,000 and 6,000 hours of flying time. Wing commanders have between 3,000 and 4,000; group and squadron commanders between 2,000 and 3,000 hours. Any program which would deny flying status to individuals while serving in a temporary administrative or other than an operational flying billet would increase by years the amount of time required to gain this necessary experience. In the Air Force and the Navy it is not a question of whether our senior officers want to fly, they must fly if they are to perform their duties as commanders and staff officers. Our combat capability can be no better than the quality of its direction.

In closing, I should like to quote from a letter to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, from Gen. Curtis LeMay, of January 23, 1955:

> Much has been said about the necessity of higher pay for crew members and little has been said for the men in the top position. Every rated officer is a potential crew member or commander. Each of my commanders retain flying proficiency and will lead his unit in combat. While providing the incentive for the crew member we must also increase the attractiveness of the higher command for staff position which is the eventual goal of the junior officer.

Mr. Chairman, the increases in incentive hazardous duty pay for general officers in this bill amounts to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total increase in flight pay.

I consider these increases to be a most economical and necessary investment in our national defense. I strongly urge the support of this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself to the important feature of this bill which establishes a distinction between obligated service and career service. I refer to the exclusion from any increase in present basic pay for those individuals performing statutory obligated military service. This exclusion applies to enlisted members and warrant officers with less than 2 years of military service and to commissioned officers with less than 3 years of service.

This particular feature of the bill makes it a selective rather than an across-the-board pay-increase proposal. We looked into this matter very thoroughly, and I believe that some further amplification may be helpful. There is ample justification for the selective nature of this bill. I should like to give you some of the reasons which prompted the Armed Services Committee to concur in this selective philosophy.

First of all, the title of this bill, the "Career Incentive Act of 1955," explains its purpose. This is a bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services to undertake or to continue in career military service. It is not for the primary purpose of extending to every member of the uniformed services a cost-of-living pay increase. Such an across-the-board increase would not be economical. It would not offer a significant differential between pay for career service and pay for obligated service. It would continue the trend, noticeable in service-pay scale since 1908, of telescoping the pay differential between the starting enlisted grade and the commissioned-officer grades. This trend, if continued, would be bound to deter capable men from entering into a career in the Armed Forces.

We have been told that the Armed Forces will be stabilized at somewhere near the total strength of 2,850,000 men for the long-range pull. We certainly will require the draft or some form of selective service to supply the numbers of personnel required to maintain this size force. Under existing economic conditions the country could not afford to make the pay for military service strictly competitive with that of industry. On the other hand, the Congress and the people of the country are aware of the increasingly technical nature of modern warfare, and the astronomical costs of modern weapons of destruction. We cannot operate and maintain complex and expensive weapons systems without skilled and highly trained personnel.

This is the first reason and the principal one for the selective nature of this bill. If the country is to receive a fair return on its defense investment, money should be spent where it will be most effective. The greatest need today is for trained personnel. Those who have spent at least one enlistment in the Armed Forces are trained personnel. At the present time the Armed Forces are not reenlisting sufficient numbers of individuals who have had prior military service. The situation in regard to first reenlistments is particularly critical. The young man who completes one enlistment in the military services today is generally not interested in reenlisting. Not enough of these trained and experienced men are remaining in the services to maintain the required experience level for maximum combat efficiency.

This situation, if not corrected, is worse than wasteful of defense dollars—it is dangerously deteriorating the combat capability of our Armed Forces. Therefore, this bill is intended to attract the career serviceman to the maximum extent. Increased recognition is given to required skills and to experienced men by broadly defining career service as service which commences at the completion of the obligated service period.

This bill offers substantial in-grade increases in pay to the enlisted man and junior officer at the completion of the obligated service, and at later reenlistment and career promotion points.

These are the critical periods in the early years of career service—the times when the capable young officer and the trained enlisted man decide for or against career military service. The young first lieutenant at the completion of his 3 years of obligated service would receive an increase in his base pay of $61.22, or 22⅓ percent—if he decides to remain in the service. This is percentagewise the highest increase in the officer scale from the first lieutenant grade to admiral. It is not matched dollarwise until the grade of colonel at the over-18-years-of-service point.

The enlisted man, after he attains 2 years of service, will receive in-grade increases in the middle enlisted grades which are very respectable, approximately 9 percent at the completion of 2 years' service and averaging nearly 15 percent at the first and second reenlistment points. In addition the amount of differential increases between grades so that incentive for promotion to the next higher grade is increased. Appropriate adjustments and incentive increases have been provided for warrant officers also.

This bill is fair to all servicemen. It is designed to give the highest increases in pay to those capable individuals who are making the best career progress. Its maximum benefits derive from making desired progress throughout a normal service career. It is a career bill—it fits the career man. Passage of this bill in my judgment is essential in the interest of the Nation's defense because it is necessary to the continued effectiveness of our uniformed services.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the new rates of incentive-hazardous duty pay proposed by this bill. I shall confine my remarks primarily to the proposed scales of additional pay for flight and submarine duty, for several reasons. First, because these scales provide the largest percentage increases which are included in the bill. And secondly, they represent the areas which most need realistic adjustment. This is because the quality of people in these areas, or the lack of it, most directly affects the combat capability of our armed services today.

I do not believe that the necessity for these pays is a matter in question. The payment of additional pays for hazardous duties is an accepted principle in practically all the military services of the world. It is accepted in industry, and has been a part of the American military pay structure since 1913. It has been debated in these halls many times, and each time it's necessity has been confirmed in law.

In 1948, the Hook Commission studied the question of incentive pays for hazardous duties at great length. In the report of 1948 to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Hook stated, and I quote:

> It was necessary to retain a special pay as an incentive for individuals to engage in and remain in certain hazardous duties.

Based upon this principle, the Commission adopted a scale which varied from $100 per month for second lieutenants to $210 per month for colonels, for flying military aircraft and for assignment as members of a submarine crew. With certain exceptions these scales were enacted into law.

In its closing remarks on this subject, the Hook Commission report stated:

> Finally the Commission feels that there must be a constant review of regulations governing hazardous pay. The present proposals must not be looked upon as the final and permanent word on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, the Hook Commission conducted its deliberations at a time when there were thousands of World War II trained pilots available. Many of these officers desired to continue on active duty in the armed services. The rates of incentive pay recommended by the Hook Commission and adopted by the Congress were, indeed, sufficient for that period. There have been many changes since that time. Jet aircraft of that day, which were prototypes or in the design stages, are in full production today or are already in the hands of our fighting units.

Today we find that the present rates, which have not been increased since 1949, are not accomplishing the desired results.

It has been estimated that approximately 4,500 flying officers will leave the service in fiscal year 1956. This loss is staggering when measured in terms of dollars; but more important, the continuation of these losses will mean that the air defense of our cities will be placed in the hands of inexperienced young men who, however valiant, can be no better than the degree of skill which they have attained.

The losses I have referred to are in all grades below the rank of general, which indicates that there is a certain level of dissatisfaction in all grades. Mostly, however, these losses will be confined to the grades of major and below—the very core of our combat air strength.

In 1952, as a result of a request of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the esteemed gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], a Commission similar to the Hook Commission composed of eminent civilians made a detailed study of all special pays and allowances. Members of this Commission included Mr. John T. Cahill, of New York; Mr. Joseph Campbell; Mr. Don G. Mitchell; Dr. Harold G. Moulton; and Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, who served as its Chairman. In its report to the Secretary of Defense, this Commission made several valuable recommendations.

One recommendation of this Commission resulted in the enactment by this body of the law authorizing the reenlistment bonus.

Another recommendation was that incentive pay be expressed in percentages of basic pay.

I should like to read from page 23 of the report of this Commission, now known as the Strauss Commission:

> The Commission believes that the principle of additional pay for the hazardous duty of military flying is sound. We have expended such tremendous sums of money on aircraft and related equipment that it would be pennywise and pound-foolish to attempt to man the Air Forces with nonvolunteers. It appears doubtful that a satisfactory training program could be established to produce well-qualified military aviators from individuals who did not wish to learn such skills.
>
> We believe that the rates of flying pay should be sufficiently high to insure retention of the best qualified pilots and airmen on a career basis.

The Commission pointed out the sound economy of retention of aviators beyond the initial period of service and stated:

> Apparently most individuals weigh their hazard pay against their total earnings. A man whose base pay is $100 per month will volunteer for flight status, for an extra $50 per month, while a seasoned aviator who is entitled to a base pay of $400 per month would not find this adequate incentive to remain in an occupation which he knows from first-hand experience to be very hazardous.
>
> * * * * *
>
> When Congress has increased base pay to reflect changes in the purchasing power of the dollar, it has not made parallel increases in the differential pays. We believe that this has had the effect of depreciating the value of the differential pay. The Commission believes that this condition can and should be corrected by establishing the effective rates of differential pay as percentages of base pay.

This philosophy has been accepted and is the basis for the rates of pay proposed in this bill. These new rates of pay have also been analyzed recently by Mr. Charles R. Hook, the original Chairman of the Hook Commission. In testimony before our Committee Mr. Hook endorsed this bill in its entirety, including the proposed rates for incentive hazardous duty pay.

We have heard considerable testimony as to why these young men are leaving the Service. Let me give you two examples: A B–47 commander, in the grade of captain with 10 years service, receives $120 a month in incentive hazardous duty pay in addition to his basic pay. In the performance of this duty this young man can expect to spend 90 days each year away from his home station on a rotation training mission to Europe, Africa, or the Far East. He must perform routine training flights in which he may be aloft for 15 to 24 hours with the aid of in-flight refueling. On each of these missions he must expect to go 24 to 36 hours without rest. He will operate at altitudes where an unforeseen emergency could easily cost his life. He is in an occupation which is rated by insurance companes to be the most hazardous in peacetime of all major occupations and his chances of survival in an aircraft accident have been greatly reduced when compared to a similar experience in World War II.

In the Air Defense a fighter-interceptor pilot can expect to spend up to 12 hours per day in flight gear waiting at his aircraft for the signal to "scramble." He must be prepared to go at night and in any weather to provide the defense of our homes and cities. In order to provide security for his family he must, by virtue of the performance of his duty, pay from $5.35 to $25 per year per $1,000 in additional premiums for his life insurance, if he can buy it at all. In this bill we propose to increase the incen-

tive pay for flying for this captain from $120 to $190 per month, at 10 years of service. It is my belief that this increase is not only justified as a matter of equity, but is absolutely necessary if we are to retain highly skilled, competent individuals to provide this Nation's security.

This bill would again place incentive pay for hazardous duty in its proper perspective in relation to basic pay. There have been increases included where the pattern of this relationship is not consistent. For example, the second lieutenant has been increased from 41 percent of his basic pay, the amount established by the Career Compensation Act, to 45 percent. The first lieutenant has been increased by 7 percent to 45 percent, the captain by 12 percent to 44 percent. The colonels and generals have been decreased slightly or kept at the same levels on the basis that not so much incentive is needed in these ranks to induce these officers to remain in a flying status.

The rates of pay for flying and submarine service contained in this bill are designed to adjust these rates to the point where they provide realistic incentive. I must strongly emphasize that these rates are smaller than the percentages in effect before World War II. They are the highest, both in percentages and in dollars, for the lower grades where most of our actual operational flying is performed. Ninety-five percent of the dollar increases will be paid to the grades of major and below.

Let us analyze briefly the incentives we offered a young man to undergo flying training just prior to World War II. The Army Air Corps with a strength of less than 3,000 pilots, with no inflation, offered incentive pay computed at 50 percent of basic pay instead of the lower rates of today, and with much less arduous conditions of service, and paid an additional bonus of $500 per year, to attract the 500 to 600 cadets needed to maintain flying officer strength.

Today, when we require something like 20 times as many young applicants for flying training each year we are offering rates which run from a little over 40 percent for the second lieutenant down to 16 percent for the major general. The $500 bonus no longer exists. The rates we offer today do not provide the incentive necessary to attract and retain the quality of men we must have to perform these duties. We have heard how the Navy is receiving only about half the applications it needs to maintain full classes in the naval aviation cadet program. The Air Force has kept its classes full only through the lowering of educational standards, and through its requirement that all except certain specially trained ROTC graduates accept flight training, or not be commissioned. We have examined the resignation rates of young flying and submarine officers, and we have been appalled at the lack of interest in applications for regular commissions among this group.

Let me, here and now, try to dispel a series of unfortunate statements and articles deploring the softness of American youth. Much has been learned by the military services of their thinking and their motivation. They are perhaps a bit more mature. They are logical and thinking men. They are the kind of men needed by the services to operate the complex and expensive weapon systems of today. But the services must be placed in a position to appeal to the maturity of their judgment as well as to their emotions.

We ask these young men to gamble with their lives to provide security for this Nation. We must stand prepared to provide the incentives necessary to attract and hold them in a military flying career.

I strongly urge your support of this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I favor this legislation.

There is no field of legislation before this Congress which issues a greater challenge to us than the field of legislation to improve the living conditions of personnel in the armed services. Such improvement is in order by application of the adage that a "servant is worthy of his hire;" and is also in order because there needs to be improvement along this line if we are to attract to and keep in the armed services the personnel which are needed there to provide adequately for our national security.

A chart at page 457 of the hearings shows that reenlistment rates have fallen to an unacceptable level. A chart at page 460 of the hearings shows that this has resulted in a dangerous lowering of the average level of experience in the services. A similar situation is indicated among the officers, as shown in a chart at page 468 of the hearings. An indication of how much this situation is costing the American taxpayer is indicated by a chart on page 483 of the hearings. The loss in military security, although not so easily demonstrated in figures, must be apparent to anyone who considers the complexity of modern warfare and the value of experience and training in these specialized activities.

Testimony before our committee has shown a need for improvement in living conditions among personnel in the armed services by increased pay, particularly at certain specific points; by reducing the frequency and the difficulties of transfers; by increasing retirement benefits; and by other adjustments as detailed at page 488 of the hearings. There is a chart on that page which shows answers to a survey which indicated that failure to increase pay, to decrease transfers, and to increase retirement benefits were primary reasons for personnel not reenlisting. The pay element was way out in the lead as the most important matter. Other tangible matters in the order of their importance are listed there as increase in dependent medical care, increase in Government housing, improvement of commissary and PX privileges, increase in survivors benefits, and increase in travel allowances. The chart also gave intangibles a rating higher than any other element except pay.

We have before us today the first of a series of bills to assist in this situation. This bill is essentially an incentive-raise bill not merely a pay-raise bill. Appropriately it is called Career Incentive Act of 1955. In it almost all military personnel receive at least 6 percent pay increases, including retired personnel; but what is more important from the standpoint of service career attractiveness, there are especially large pay increases provided by this bill for points where the record shows that there have been the greatest number of potentially good career men leaving the service. This is the first way in which this bill is an incentive to personnel to choose a military career. Another way in which it is an incentive is that the pay in the upper ranks of enlisted men and in the upper grades of officers is increased so that those on the lower ladder rungs will have something substantial to work toward. Testimony before our committee showed that frequently competent enlisted men and officers have left the service because the ultimate level of financial return to which they might aspire in the service was not comparable with what they could expect in civilian employment.

A third type of incentive to be found in this legislation involves increased pay for various types of hazardous duties in the military services, such as flight pay, submarine pay, diving pay, and so forth. Three new types of such hazardous pay are also added by this bill: Duty as low-pressure chamber inside observer, duty as human acceleration or deceleration experimental subject, and duty involving the use of helium-oxygen for a breathing mixture in the execution of deep-sea diving.

Other incentives to continue in the service are found in the bill. For instance, at page 6 of the bill in subsection 12 of section 2 a dislocation allowance equal to the monthly basic allowance for quarters is established. This should help to minimize, as much as possible, the expenses of such transfers. The committee made it clear at the hearings that the armed services should not use this allowance as an excuse for increasing transfers and that transfers should be reduced wherever possible, taking into account that money provisions for such transfers do not eliminate the entire source of friction from excessive transfers and family dislocations.

Further, in subsection 11 of section 2 there is provision for increasing per diem allowances from $9 to $12, which has value to those who are required to travel for the services.

The proposed legislation would involve an annual expenditure for members of the armed services for fiscal 1956 of $734,045,571. In addition, the increase with respect to the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service for fiscal 1956 will be $11,797,444. Thus the total cost of the bill for fiscal 1956 will be $745,845,015.

This legislation represents requests from the Department of Defense except that the Armed Services Committee has recommended greater increases in certain respects, greater than the Department of Defense requested. The moderateness of the Department of Defense's request is no indication that larger amounts are not needed, but instead represents budgetary limits which were placed on them in the executive branch of the Government. I am sure that the

legislation now before us will meet with the full approval of the Department of Defense and of the executive branch.

I enthusiastically endorse this legislation and hope that it will be promptly enacted, as it is greatly needed from the standpoint of fairness to our service personnel and from the standpoint of our national security.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, firstly, I desire to congratulate the chairman and every member of the subcommittee which held extended hearings and then presented this Career Incentive Act of 1955, analyzing H. R. 4720, on the splendid, constructive work each of them did in the premises. But, in my cordial support of the objectives of H. R. 4720, I wish to also make it clear that I consider increased pay as provided in this bill as only one of the essential factors which enter into the fact that we cannot now obtain an adequate volunteer military department, or substantially so, also which enter into the fact that our total Military Establishment is having a very unsatisfactory and strategically dangerous experience by reason of experiencing one of the lowest reenlistment rates in the history of our great Nation. For instance, the analytical report of the committee accompanying H. R. 4720, quotes the President of the United States, in his message to Congress, dated January 13, 1955, wherein he said:

> To sustain our active forces at required levels of strength and efficiency, it is necessary to increase the present rate of voluntary enlistments. It is also necessary to induce volunteers, both officers and enlisted men, to continue in the service on a career basis in order to obtain maximum usefulness from the skills and leadership which are achieved after long and costly training. The increasing mechanization and complexity of defense forces make technical skills and a wide background of experiences vastly more important than ever before.

Also, the committee's report frankly stated that:

> During fiscal 1954, the armed services experienced one of the lowest reenlistment rates in the history of the Nation. The composite rate for all reenlistments in the armed services at that time was 14.9 percent. In the Army, for example, the reenlistment rate in 1954 was only 11.6 percent compared with a reenlistment rate of 41.2 percent in 1949. This rate for the Army reflects the very low reenlistment rate from among inductees, but even excluding inductees from the Army's reenlistment rate shows that the Army's reenlistment rate from among volunteers for fiscal year 1954 was only 22 percent.

And, in treating the very unsatisfactory situation relating to our great Navy Department, the committee said:

> In the Navy, the decline in reenlistment rates has been even more disturbing. In fiscal 1950, the Navy experienced a reenlistment rate of 66 percent. In fiscal 1951 through 1953 the Navy averaged a reenlistment rate of 61 percent. In fiscal 1954 the figure dropped to 23.7 percent, and from July to December of 1954 the reenlistment rate in the Navy has been reduced to only 8.1 percent, the lowest recorded figure in the history of the Navy.
>
> In the Marine Corps, reenlistment rates for fiscal 1954 were 18.1 percent, and increased slightly to 20.1 percent in the period July through December 1954. Marine Corps reenlistment rates have shown an increase recently which may be attributed to the reenlistment bonus law which went into effect last summer and likewise may well reflect the wide publicity that has been given to this proposed legislation.

And, as to our magnificent Air Force, the committee told us this shocking condition:

> The Air Force has been experiencing a declining reenlistment rate from an average of 56 percent for the fiscal years 1951 through 1953, to 31.2 percent in fiscal 1954; and for the period July through December 1954, a further decline to 22.4 percent.

And then in conclusion, on page 2, our able committee said:

> Most alarming is the reenlistment rate from among volunteers in all of the services who are eligible to reenlist after completion of their first term of enlistment. The reenlistment rate for the period July through December 1954 of this group amounted to only 12 percent.

While treating the situation with regard to officers it gave us the following information:

> The situation with regard to officers is equally alarming. In the Army, for example, only 21.8 percent of the distinguished graduates of ROTC and OCS programs eligible to apply for Regular commissions actually applied for Regular commissions. This contrasts with a 54.4 percent application rate for fiscal 1949. It is significant to note that from 1949 to 1954, and to the present date, the rate of application from among distinguished graduates of ROTC and OCS programs has shown a steady decline.

While in reporting to us the situation with reference to resignations of Regular officers from our military establishments our able committee informed us as follows:

> Resignation rates from among Regular officers has shown a steady increase since officers have been permitted to submit their resignation following the termination of war in Korea. In the Army, for example, 187 officers resigned in fiscal 1949 as contrasted with 793 who resigned in fiscal 1954. In the Air Force, 69 resigned in fiscal 1949, as contrasted with 345 in fiscal 1954. In the Marine Corps, 73 officers resigned in fiscal 1949, as contrasted with 246 in fiscal 1954. In the Navy it is significant to note that the highest resignation rate from among commissioned officers were from those assigned to submarine and flight duty.

Mr. Chairman, with such alarming and significant facts and conclusions thus frankly told us by the subcommittee of the full Committee of the Armed Services, of which I have the honor to be a member, I cannot do less than cordially support this Career Incentive Act. But, as you well know, all of these 8 years I have already served in this great legislative body I have favored the support by this Congress of every sound factor by way of legislation and procedure, which would make it as attractive and reasonable for men to chose a military career, instead of making us depend upon the draft and any other form of involuntary military service. I have always felt thus, because as I read history, it is that a volunteer Army is much more effective and dynamic toward victory.

Therefore, as was so well stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] the distingushed chairman of our subcommittee who reported this bill when he said, in substance, that every 10-percent increase we obtained in volunteer enlistments saved the taxpayers a huge sum of money. Also my distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] likewise called attention to the fact that there are other factors which encourage enlistments and reenlistments other than those incentives of pay. So, Mr. Chairman, I not only agree with these statements by my distinguished colleagues in this area of career pay, but I wish to emphasize, even more than they did, some of these factors which I feel are still being overlooked or neglected to a dangerous and costly extent; to-wit, first, take the matter of adequate medical care of military dependents. Within the last 10 days when the distinguished Secretary of the Navy was before our Armed Services Committee in testifying in support of this very bill, H. R. 4720, in answer to a question by me, he frankly stated that he recognized that adequate medical care for military dependents was an important factor. He further stated that he was trying to get the numerical ceiling for the number of doctors per thousand men in the Navy increased from over and above the 6-per-thousand personnel, now the ceiling. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I believe I am very recently accurately informed when I state that the fact is that the Navy is presently, right now today, only using one-half as many doctors per thousand naval personnel, as is allowed by direction of the Secretary of Defense and the executive department of our great Government. Believing this to be a fact I wish to very emphatically urge the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense to promptly correct this condition, which I believe is one of the active deterrents toward thousands of able and patriotic American lads enlisting and reenlisting in the Navy. There is nothing more important or more intimate toward the happiness and security of a military man's contentment and willingness to stay in the military service and make it a career than that his loved ones, including his wife, his babies and growing children should have adequate medical protection. And, is it not a fact that hundreds of thousands of men now in our military establishments were virtually promised that these dependents of theirs would receive prompt and adequate medical care as part of the understanding and moral agreement between our Government and these men who enlist and reenlist with medical care as one of the vital and manifest questions? In this connection I wish to say that on my way eastward from my native State of California by automobile to take my oath of office for the fifth time as a member of this great legislative body, I visited several naval airbases and in every case, upon inquiry from various levels of naval personnel from whom I inquired, I was told there was shockingly inadequate medical care for their dependents. Yes, this even applied to personnel billeted in naval establishments on our very shores. Since it was my beneficial experience several years ago to be a member of the Rivers

subcommittee on military hospitals, and to travel to many of the military hospitals in our great Nation in that connection, I wish to here and now state that I am keenly disappointed to find that this year, as several years ago, the military personnel at various levels of service frankly state upon my inquiry that they will not reenlist unless this condition is immediately corrected. In making these remarks about inadequate medical care, I include therein adequate hospitalization care.

Secondly, and now as to adequate housing for military personnel. Granting that it will be a splendid morale factor as well as an economic boost to these men in our military to receive the increased pay as set forth in this worthy bill, H. R. 4720, I surmise that even this increased pay will not enable them to rent or occupy better housing accommodations for their families where and when that adequate housing facility is not constructed and available for use. In other words, Mr. Chairman, our records show that there are hundreds of thousands of housing units for military personnel lacking. They are nonexistent. How then will this increased pay enable these distinguished men to adequately house themselves and their family dependents? So, again we must promptly move forward more vigorously and vigilantly to see that there is adequate housing available.

But, since my time for making these ad lib comments has about expired, I wish to also join my distinguished colleagues who are also members of the Armed Services Committee and who have heretofore in this debate called your attention to the fact that there is also the factors of certain so-called fringe benefits which have acted as inducements for men to enlist and reenlist. For instance, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], called attention to the fact that the fringe benefits of the commissary, post exchange, and commissary stores are important considerations which help shape the decisions of patriotic Americans as to whether or not they will enlist or reenlist.

I also wish to clearly state that I am pleased that the personnel of the active Reserve was not overlooked in the worthy provisions of this incentive-pay act. Also, it is good that this legislation does not overlook the fact that candidates to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and the new United States Air Force Academy, and at the United States Coast Guard Academy are in absolute need of a worthy increase. I am very proud of each and every lad whom I have had the honor to name to compete to enter these distinguished academies to date. I know how hard it has been—and almost impossible in a few cases—on account of the increased cost and the financial inability of the boys' own families to meet this sharply rising cost and expense. This bill will raise the present pay of $81.12 per month to $111.15 per month, or an increase amounting to $30.03 per month. I learned much of the difficulties of some of these distinguished lads in the academies, by reason of my having the honor and responsibility several years ago of being designated by our distinguished Speaker as a member of the Board of Visitors. Hence, I for several days lived right there on the grounds with them, attended classes, witnessed athletic events and their social events, as well as faculty meetings.

Under present pay conditions the report shows that the required expenditures at the academies shall include uniforms, books, personal services, stationery, toilet articles—leaving for each 4-year graduate a deficit of $302.68. The increase proposed in this bill will leave each 4-year graduate and midshipman the average sum of $845 at the end of his 4-year studies and honorable graduation. I think it is right, for he then has to purchase service uniforms; he has to pay travel and living expenses until he has received the first active-duty pay remittance.

In closing, may I just again add that I hope that this great Congress will soon get about doing whatever else is necessary to add other career incentives in other fields of obligation and responsibility to our distinguished military personnel, as well as unanimously passing this present-day Career Incentive Act, which only applies to the matter of incentive pay.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this is one bill which I can wholeheartedly support, and I wish to congratulate and compliment the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and his subcommittee for their painstaking work in bringing the measure to the floor.

I only wish that more bills relating to the military could be based upon the incentive principle. This bill seeks to do financial justice to armed services personnel, an end to which I have long been strongly committed; and to furnish incentives for young men to serve and remain in our Armed Forces on a purely voluntary basis, an end which evokes my most enthusiastic support.

This bill is extensive and complex. It will confuse pay standards, as all such measures have done in the past, but the confusion will be pleasing to the many beneficiaries whose pay and remuneration in so many instances are materially and equitably increased. In the main, the bill seeks to apply increases where they are required to retain the services of needed personnel and to encourage others to adopt service in the various branches of our defense system as a career.

This incentive principle should be applied across the board to all our military manpower requirements as soon as an appropriate study can be made to formulate a general bill designed to broaden the area in which incentives rather than compulsion shall apply.

The draft has been necessary in wartime and emergency. It is a frankly militaristic technique, but it has served the Nation as well and as equitably as such a system can. It is necessary in wartime. It is hardly justified in peacetime.

In this period, however, when we are not at war and yet not completely at peace—when the country is facing uncertainty and beset by dangerous threats to its security—our needs for manpower continue relatively large, yet are not emergent. We have had time to perfect a voluntary method, but have been content to struggle along with the compulsory system, even though its use has been greatly curtailed.

I believe this bill sets a fine example of the utilization of the incentive principle and I hope the Congress will extend this principle to other manpower measures relating to the procurement of adequate Armed Forces.

The Nation urgently needs a well organized, efficient, thoroughly modernized defense system comprised of professionally trained technicians and well trained personnel in every category. The Air Force and the Navy have been able to secure sufficient personnel largely without benefit of the draft. Only the Army has required the draft to obtain men to conduct its farflung operations.

It is my thought that with the right approach, with the application of the incentive principle, well conceived, carefully applied, wisely administered, it would be possible to eliminate all forms of compulsion in the military forces and their various reserves.

Surely that is a laudable aim to achieve in a democracy, if it can be done without jeopardizing the national security. Adequate defense we must have at all times. But that does not mean that in peacetime we should militarize our institutions. To the contrary we should see to it that they are not militarized, but demilitarized, if need be, and that we adhere as closely as we can to voluntary patterns and reject compulsory patterns except when they are absolutely necessary for the national safety in time of war or great emergency.

Since I am of the opinion that with the right program, our armed services could be entirely and successfully recruited for the regular forces and the Reserves on a voluntary basis except in time of war, I would like to see a study of this entire question with a view to attracting adequate service personnel by offering higher pay rates, more generous allowances and allotments, retirement benefits at more satisfactory rates and generally increased and improved fringe benefits so-called which would in sum total insure adequate enlistees and retainees in all our armed services. It is certainly worth trying and I hope it will be done.

It is my view that if the pay and other perquisites of the armed services are fixed at rates favorably comparable to those in private industry, by virtue of the incentive principle, we could put all our peacetime armed services manpower procurement on a voluntary basis. And that would be a great boon to the young men and the fathers and mothers of America as well as in accord with our national tradition.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the proposal to provide additional incentives for careers in the military service by additional pay.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no question of the fact that a major problem of the armed services in these perilous times is the difficult problem of keeping career men in uniform.

The rates of reenlistment in recent years have been a matter of great concern, and it is imperative that we provide the incentives to reverse these unsatisfactory trends and keep our Armed Forces strong and experienced.

While increased pay is not the only answer, it is certain to help. Without it, we are going to continue losing some of our finest soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. I know, from personal acquaintance and experience, of the very considerable sacrifice at which many servicemen are continuing in uniform—a sacrifice which is shared by their loyal wives and children, and which is strong evidence of their devotion to their country and its service.

Personally, I am doubtful of the adequacy of the action being taken at this time, in view of the heavy cost of living in military areas, and the so-called "service benefits" which have been reduced in recent years. Nevertheless, this bill is a step in the right direction, and I welcome the opportunity to support and vote for this bill.

I trust the very able committee will continue to watch our enlistment and reenlistment figures closely, and will not hesitate to recommend such further steps as are proved necessary to keep our Armed Forces strong and their morale high.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, the matter of proper pay schedules and other benefits for the members of our Armed Forces is important not only to each of them personally but it is also important to our entire Nation.

We can all point with the greatest pride that our Nation has never been and will never be an aggressor nation for the purpose of acquiring more territory.

The very basis of the Constitution of these United States is the freedoms, rights, and privileges it guarantees to each citizen so long as in the exercise of these freedoms, rights, and privileges we do not interfere with the full enjoyment of these same opportunities by our fellow citizens. We are all justly proud of this heritage which has been won and protected for us by the work, effort, and even supreme sacrifice of life itself by our great forefathers. We are so proud of this great achievement that we want other peoples of the world to share the same freedoms. Therefore, we have dedicated our policies of relationship with other nations of the world on the premise that we will assist them to remain free of the tyranny of those who seek to dictate the lives and living of peoples. This, of course, has brought down upon us the wrath of those ideologies and their dictator leaders who seek to control people and governments for their own selfish personal gain of power.

All of this has made it necessary for us to be militarily strong so that we can assist our friendly nations and at the same time properly protect our own Nation and our citizens from any attack upon us by an unfriendly power.

There are no better scientists, technical experts, or skilled workmen anywhere in the world than there are here in these United States. The combined efforts and abilities of all these people have produced the most outstanding and effective weapons in the world. The power and ability of these weapons to devastate an enemy is almost beyond the comprehension of man and we are indeed fortunate in having as our President a man who knows full well the terrible price and havoc of war in these modern times. I know President Eisenhower will do everything humanly possible to avoid war. I am convinced that the best way to assist the President and our greatest hope for peace is to be well prepared. The enemies of freedom have repeatedly shown that they respect nothing but power and we must be strong.

Science and the traditional ability of America have produced the best and most powerful weapons the world has ever known. It is also an understandable corollary that the members of our Armed Forces must be especially well trained in the operation and maintenance of these extremely complicated weapons of warfare. Such training requires a great deal of time and costs tremendous sums of money.

There are, of course, men and women who like military service and want to make it their chosen career. We cannot help but honor and respect those who choose a military career, because they are the ones who stand between us and all that we hold dear and those who seek to destroy these precious American heritages and privileges. It is only right and proper, therefore, that our Federal Government should adopt such courses as are open to us to encourage those who like military life and service to make it their career. I have been reading some material and reports recently that applies directly to our United States Air Force, but the same principles also apply to other branches of our Armed Forces.

The total cost of all armed services to train hundreds of thousands of short-term servicemen each year is an almost staggering amount and saving a substantial portion of it would help a great deal to bring the budget of our Federal Government much nearer to a balance. I learn through this report to which I refer, that our Government spends approximately $14,800 on the training of an airman during his 4 years enlistment. The training of the average airman includes instruction in many matters. If at the end of his first 4-year enlistment the airman decides to leave the service and seek his place in the civilian life of our Nation, we have spent approximately $14,800 to train him, but what is even of greater importance, our Air Force must start all over again to train another man and in the meantime the efficiency of our Air Force is not what it could be if the airman had reenlisted. I am told that 2 out of 3 fail to reenlist and I understand that Secretary Talbott has estimated that the airmen leaving the service will represent training which has cost our taxpayers $2.5 billion worth of training this fiscal year. If the information given me is correct, there is an officer turnover of about 45,000 Air Force officers a year out of a total of about 130,000 Air Force officers.

That the Air Force needs well-trained capable airmen of all categories and ground crews was forcibly brought out in a statement by Lt. Col. Robert Scott in a very interesting television show last evening. Colonel Scott, who, it was said, flew 117 missions in Korea, established another record yesterday, when, according to public announcement, he flew a jet airplane from Los Angeles to New York in 3 hours and 46 minutes. Colonel Scott paid high tribute to the able and trained ground crews who make it possible for such flights to be made.

I have also seen other reports to the effect that the training costs for a military pilot are greater than any other profession, including even brain surgery. It was estimated that because of the great many highly technical skills and the vast amount of technical knowledge needed by the modern jet pilot that our Government invests over $70,000 in the training of each pilot.

Thus the failure of men and officers to reenlist is costing our Government huge sums of money each year, but what is even more important, we are also losing the skills and abilities of these men at a time when we can ill afford to do so.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if we can encourage a greater percentage of the members of our Armed Forces to reenlist and make military service a career, we will be accomplishing a number of worthwhile objectives. We will be saving a considerable sum of money for the taxpayers. We will have more efficient and better trained Armed Forces. We will lessen the need for considerable numbers of new recruits and might well be able to maintain the necessary strength through voluntary enlistments.

There is no question but that the weapons used by our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are equal in all respects and better in many respects than the equipment and weapons of those who might seek to destroy us. The very best equipment and weapons in the world, however, mean absolutely nothing unless we have the very best trained personnel in the world. These men must also feel that their abilities, attitudes, courage, and patriotic devotion to their great Nation is deeply appreciated and recognized by every American. This recognition should not only be shown by our personal attitude toward all those in the uniform of the United States, but it should also be shown by our willingness to see that they are properly paid and that they also have other necessary benefits.

It is, therefore, Mr. Chairman, my considered judgment that increasing the rates of pay and other benefits for those who reenlist is a very worthy objective of this proposed legislation. I am also con-

vinced, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation has been reported out for the consideration of the House only after the most thorough consideration by the members of the distinguished and able Committee on Armed Services, and is their unanimous recommendation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of this legislation is justified on the basis of cost of living alone, but more important is the very evident fact, that it is necessary for our military security. During fiscal 1954, the armed services experienced one of the lowest reenlistment rates in the history of the Nation, and this situation is not only alarming but of extreme concern to us all. It is also a very expensive problem to the taxpayers of our country.

Military pay has increased less since 1949 than that of industrial workers, salaried business-management personnel, or civil servants. It has also lagged well behind the cost of living. Further, the pattern of pay increases in recent years has served to compress the scales by raising the pay of the lower enlisted grades by a much higher percentage than those of the higher enlisted grades and the officer grades. Considering the present value of the dollar, our high-ranking officers today are paid only about one-half as much as they were 45 years ago. This has had an adverse effect on the attractiveness of a career as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces. Job opportunities for the high type of man needed in the uniformed services are plentiful in the civilian economy.

The cost of training aviators in the complex military airplanes of today is the highest item of service-training costs. Depending on the type of aircraft and the level of training—basic or advanced—the training investment in a single pilot varies from $70,000 to nearly $600,000. Many pilots are returning to civil life upon completion of their obligated service. Records of the Air Force indicate that this loss of experienced pilots is costly in terms of men and equipment.

The aircraft-accident rate and the related fatality rate is highest among pilots in the first few years—corresponding to the obligated service period. If the services can retain pilots beyond the obligated service period, we can expect the accident rate to decrease. This will be reflected in sizable dollar savings, and more important, in the saving of young American lives.

The personnel-turnover problem in the military services is costly in dollars. However, it has serious consequences in other than budgetary and fiscal areas. The experience level of our Armed Forces is directly affected by the excessive personnel turnover. The combat readiness of our Armed Forces is directly related to the experience level. At a time when the increasing complexity of the weapons of warfare requires a higher level of skill and more experienced personnel, the uniformed services are faced with unacceptable rates of personnel turnover. The result is that our tremendous and complex Military Establishment is in danger of suffering a serious reduction in combat effectiveness.

The Career Incentive Act of 1955, as this bill is titled, is designed to encourage personnel whose skills and leadership abilities are needed by the Armed Forces to undertake or to continue in career military service. This bill is not an across-the-board pay proposal, but one which provides incentive increases in pay on a selective basis. The bill calls for selective increases in base pay and proportionate increases in incentive hazardous-duty pays. It also provides for the improvement of certain benefit items which are important to a large segment of our service personnel, particularly those with families. Other legislative proposals to be submitted separately will provide for improvement in such vital areas as survivors' benefits, dependents' medical care and dependents' housing.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the passage of this bill will benefit career service personnel—those who are serving on active duty today and those who have devoted long years of honorable service to their country. It will demonstrate to our servicemen that the Congress is alert to their needs and aware of their sacrifices. It will convince the high quality youth whom we want to embark upon a career need not be accompanied by unacceptable lowering of his standard of living.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, through the graciousness of the commanding general and of the Secretary of War, the Chicago offices of the Second Congressional District of Illinois are located in the headquarters of the Fifth Army, situated near Lake Michigan in the heart of the district that I have the honor to represent. My associations there have been most pleasant and my high esteem for the officers and the enlisted personnel of the Army has been heightened by these associations.

I have come to know very intimately the problems of the men and women who, at great self-sacrifice, have maintained the fine traditions of the Army of the United States. The headquarters of the Fifth Army are located in an area of high rents and of living costs greater than those in many other areas. The benefits provided for in H. R. 4720 are long overdue. I was happy to learn from the remarks of the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. SHORT] that the increases in pay provided for in the bill exceed the request of the armed services. In other words, H. R. 4720 gives everything requested and something in addition.

I know that the morale of the fine officers and enlisted personnel at the headquarters of the Fifth Army, which has always been of the highest, even when conditions as to pay and benefits were discouraging, will be lifted to new heights by this token of appreciation of them by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. I sincerely hope that H. R. 4720 leaves the House as it left the great Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous vote of approval.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It is my feeling that this bill is a definite saving of money rather than an expenditure as is indicated on the face of it.

One of the most expensive parts of our Defense Department is in the training of officers and men and then releasing them after they have completed their obligated term of service. Keeping these trained men in uniform would be a tremendous saving to the American taxpayer and would more than justify all the money authorized by this bill as well as giving us a better defense.

The pay raises included herein are not across the board so as to include those new men who are putting in their necessary time but start at the point where they must make their decision whether to leave the service or remain in uniform. It is an incentive to have them stay in and make a career out of the military.

I think this bill was well named when it was called the incentive bill rather than a pay-raise bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to speak in support of and urge all Members to vote in favor of this measure, H. R. 4720, to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances.

It is common knowledge that our Defense Department officials have submitted testimony to show that a disturbing number of promising career men are leaving the services because the compensation is not sufficient, under present economic conditions, to enable them to properly provide for themselves and their families. The President himself has voiced his fears of the deterioration of our military machine on this score and on several occasions, in state of the Union and budget messages, has urged the creation of greater incentives to make military careers more attractive and stable.

The percentage of non-reenlistments has been and is a plague on the continuing efficiency of all branches of the Defense Department and the replacement cost is extravagantly expensive—to put it specific—Air Force authorities have testified their analysis shows that pay increases to encourage reenlistments will actually result in major savings and economy.

There is little need to stress the fact that the highly specialized training and skill required for effective operation of the technical equipment necessary for modern warfare practically demands that we have career personnel in our military organizations.

I am sure that there is no need for me to emphasize the fact that a military unit is no better than the spirit that exists among its members and equally important is the sustained high morale of their families, despite whatever powerful war weapons that may be possessed. Assurances to military personnel as well as their families of a reasonable salary scale that will enable them to

live without extraordinary economic fears and worries is certainly a major factor in the maintenance of high spirit and morale and surely is in the best national interest.

I urge you all, therefore, to approve this measure without further delay.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the growing rate of turnover among our service personnel in recent years has tended to reduce the combat readiness of our military forces. Fewer men are choosing military careers. More career men are leaving the services for opportunities in private employment. There is at the present time, it appears, insufficient incentive for experienced, well-trained military personnel to remain in the service.

The Committee on Armed Services, in approving the bill for military pay increases, has taken what appears to be an indispensable step to correct this problem of personnel turnover. It remains for the House to endorse this committee action by a prompt vote of approval.

I personally favor this pay increase bill for many reasons, some of which, by themselves, are sufficient grounds for voting the increase.

In the first place, the incentive for career service which this increase would create will undoubtedly result in substantial dollar savings to the Government. The bill is designed to provide cash incentives to personnel in the training of whom the Government has invested valuable time, money, and equipment. At the present time too many of these personnel are leaving the service as soon as they have fulfilled their terms of obligated service. This includes both enlisted and officer personnel.

It has been pointed out, for example, that the reenlistment rate in the Army has declined from 41.2 percent in 1949 to 11.6 percent in 1954. The combined reenlistment rate for all the services has declined to about 20 percent. This means that 800,000 men out of a total of 1 million whose enlistments expire this year will have to be replaced. When one considers the cost of training these personnel—from $5,000 to $9,000 for basic and technical training for one man in a typical specialty—it becomes apparent that the replacement of 800,000 men this year will be of considerable cost to the Government.

This problem of cost is a serious one, and one which has been of concern to me for some time. But an even more important problem created by this high rate of turnover among our service personnel is one concerning the overall efficiency and combat readiness of our military forces. The loss of large numbers of military personnel soon after they have acquired the experience and technical training needed by the services makes it extremely difficult to build stable, experienced combat units. In other words, the high turnover rate is not only expensive, but it also drastically reduces the effectiveness of our fighting forces.

The military pay-raise bill approved by the Committee on Armed Services, which endorsed it by a vote of 30 to 0, promises to reduce the rate of turnover considerably, and in this manner it is expected that the experience and technical skills which will be retained by the services will make a significant contribution to our military preparedness. At the same time, the growth of a career-service military force will pay off in dollar savings in terms of long-term training and transportation costs.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge the bill's passage.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time on either side, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Career Incentive Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. The Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 804), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 201 (a) is amended by striking out the tables therein and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service													
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O–8	$963.30	$963.30	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,021.80	$1,076.40
O–7	800.28	800.28	850.20	850.20	850.20	850.20	850.20	850.20	850.20	850.20	850.20	850.20	904.80	967.20
O–6	592.80	592.80	631.80	631.80	631.80	631.80	631.80	631.80	631.80	655.20	717.60	748.80	780.00	811.20
O–5	474.24	474.24	507.00	507.00	507.00	507.00	507.00	530.40	561.60	577.20	608.40	639.60	670.80	670.80
O–4	400.14	400.14	429.00	429.00	429.00	452.40	483.60	499.20	514.80	530.40	561.60	577.20	592.80	592.80
O–3	326.04	326.04	351.00	374.40	405.60	421.20	436.80	452.40	468.00	483.60	499.20	514.80	514.80	514.80
O–2	259.36	274.18	335.40	335.40	351.00	366.60	382.20	397.80	413.40	413.40	413.40	413.40	413.40	413.40
O–1	222.30	237.12	296.40	296.40	312.00	327.60	343.20	358.80	374.40	374.40	374.40	374.40	374.40	374.40

"WARRANT OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service													
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W–4	$332.90	$354.90	$354.90	$354.90	$370.50	$386.10	$401.70	$421.20	$452.40	$468.00	$483.60	$499.20	$514.80	$530.40
W–3	302.64	323.70	323.70	323.70	331.50	339.30	347.10	358.80	374.40	382.20	405.60	428.00	443.60	459.20
W–2	264.82	280.80	280.80	280.80	288.60	304.20	319.80	335.40	350.00	357.80	373.40	389.00	404.60	420.20
W–1	219.42	251.20	251.20	251.20	266.80	286.30	294.10	305.80	313.60	321.40	337.00	352.60	368.20	368.20

"ENLISTED PERSONS

"Pay grade	Years of service													
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E–7	$206.39	$222.30	$222.30	$230.10	$237.90	$253.50	$261.30	$273.00	$280.80	$288.60	$304.20	$319.80	$335.40	$335.40
E–6	175.81	187.20	187.20	195.00	214.50	222.30	234.00	241.80	249.60	257.40	273.00	288.60	288.60	288.60
E–5	145.24	163.80	163.80	183.30	191.10	202.80	210.60	218.40	226.20	234.00	241.80	257.50	257.50	257.50
E–4	122.30	140.40	140.40	159.90	167.70	179.40	187.20	195.00	202.80	210.60	218.40	218.40	218.40	218.40
E–3	99.37	117.00	117.00	132.60	140.40	148.20	156.00	159.90	163.80	163.80	163.80	163.80	163.80	163.80
E–2	85.80	101.40	101.40	109.20	117.00	124.80	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60	132.60
E–1	83.20	98.80	98.80	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60	106.60
E–1 (under 4 months)	78.00													

(2) Section 201 is further amended by redesignating subsections "(d)" and "(e)" as "(c)" and "(d)", respectively.

(3) Section 201 is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(e) Aviation cadets enlisted or appointed under the Army Aviation Cadet Act (55 Stat. 239), as amended, or under the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 737), as amended, are entitled to monthly pay at the rate of 50 percent of the basic pay of a commissioned officer in pay grade O–1 with under two cumulative years of service.".

(4) Section 204 (a) is amended by—

(A) striking out the word "part" in clause (3) and inserting the word "clause" in lieu thereof;

(B) striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (8);

(C) striking out the period at the end of clause (9) and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof; and

(D) adding the following new clauses:

"(10) duty as low-pressure chamber inside observer;

"(11) duty as human acceleration or deceleration experimental subject; and

"(12) duty involving the use of helium-oxygen for a breathing mixture in the execution of deep-sea diving.".

(5) Section 204 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the performance of hazardous duty as prescribed in clause (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section, a member of a uniformed service qualifying for incentive pay thereunder is entitled to pay at a monthly rate as follows:

"Incentive pay for hazardous duty performed under section 204 (a) (1) and (2)

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service													
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-8	$155.00	$155.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00
O-7	150.00	150.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00	160.00
O-6	200.00	200.00	215.00	215.00	215.00	215.00	215.00	215.00	215.00	220.00	245.00	245.00	245.00	245.00
O-5	190.00	190.00	205.00	205.00	205.00	205.00	205.00	210.00	225.00	230.00	245.00	245.00	245.00	245.00
O-4	170.00	170.00	185.00	185.00	185.00	195.00	210.00	215.00	220.00	230.00	240.00	240.00	240.00	240.00
O-3	145.00	145.00	155.00	165.00	180.00	185.00	190.00	200.00	205.00	205.00	205.00	205.00	205.00	205.00
O-2	115.00	125.00	150.00	150.00	160.00	165.00	170.00	180.00	185.00	185.00	185.00	185.00	185.00	185.00
O-1	100.00	105.00	135.00	135.00	140.00	145.00	155.00	160.00	170.00	170.00	170.00	170.00	170.00	170.00

"WARRANT OFFICERS

"Pay grade	Years of service													
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$115.00	$115.00	$115.00	$115.00	$120.00	$125.00	$135.00	$145.00	$155.00	$160.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00	$165.00
W-3	110.00	115.00	115.00	115.00	120.00	120.00	125.00	135.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00	140.00
W-2	105.00	110.00	110.00	110.00	115.00	120.00	125.00	130.00	135.00	135.00	135.00	135.00	135.00	135.00
W-1	100.00	105.00	105.00	105.00	110.00	120.00	125.00	130.00	130.00	130.00	130.00	130.00	130.00	130.00

"ENLISTED PERSONNEL

"Pay grade	Years of service													
	Under 2	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-7	$80.00	$85.00	$85.00	$85.00	$90.00	$95.00	$100.00	$105.00	$105.00	$105.00	$105.00	$105.00	$105.00	$105.00
E-6	70.00	75.00	75.00	80.00	85.00	90.00	95.00	95.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
E-5	60.00	70.00	70.00	80.00	80.00	85.00	90.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00	95.00
E-4	55.00	65.00	65.00	70.00	75.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00	80.00
E-3	55.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00
E-2	50.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00
E-1	50.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00
E-1 (under 4 months)	50.00													
Aviation cadets	50.00													

"

(6) Section 204 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Officers and enlisted persons of the uniformed services who are qualified for the incentive pay authorized under subsection (a) are entitled to be paid at the rate of $110 and $55 per month, respectively, for the performance of any hazardous duty described in clauses (3) to (12) of subsection (a)."

(7) Section 204 (e) is repealed and subsection "(f)" is redesignated as "(e)."

(8) Section 205 (a) is amended by striking out the figures "$5" and "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$5.50" and "$33," respectively.

(9) Section 205 (b) is amended by striking out the figure "$5" and inserting the figure "$5.50" in lieu thereof.

(10) Section 205 (c) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "However, receipt of incentive pay under that section does not bar the member from entitlement to $5.50 for each hour or fraction thereof in addition to basic pay, as authorized by subsection (b) of this section."

(11) The last sentence of section 303 (a) is amended by striking out the figure "$9" in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$12."

(12) Section 303 (c) is amended by inserting the following at the end of the first sentence thereof: "Under such regulations as may be approved by the Secretary concerned, a member of a uniformed service whose dependents are authorized to move and actually move in connection with his permanent change of station shall be entitled to a dislocation allowance equal to his monthly basic allowance for quarters. However, the member shall be entitled to the payment of a dislocation allowance for not more than one permanent change of station during any fiscal year, except on the finding of the Secretary of the Department concerned that the exigencies of the service require more than one such change of station during any fiscal year. This limitation upon the payment of a dislocation allowance shall not apply to members of the uniformed services ordered to service schools as a permanent change of station. In addition, this limitation shall not be applicable in time of war or national emergency declared after the effective date of this amendatory act. A member is not entitled to payment of a dislocation allowance when ordered from home to first duty station or from last duty station to home."

(13) Section 508 is further amended to read as follows:

"Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, cadets at the United States Air Force Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to receive pay at the rate of 50 percent of the basic pay established for a commissioned officer in pay grade O-1 with under 2 cumulative years' service, and to receive allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman."

(14) Section 202 (d) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a comma and adding the following: "including retired enlisted men advanced to commissioned officer rank on the retired list by virtue of the act of May 7, 1932 (Public Law 123, 72d Cong.).".

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended (34 U. S. C. 850c), is amended by—

(1) striking out the first sentence; and

(2) amending the second sentence to read as follows: "Aviation cadets, while on active duty, are entitled to the same allowances for subsistence now or hereafter provided for officers of the Navy, and shall, while on active duty, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization, and have issued to them uniforms, clothing, and equipment at Government expense.".

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 303, 304, 304b), is amended by—

(1) striking out the first sentence; and

(2) amending the second sentence to read as follows: "Aviation cadets, while on active duty, are entitled to the same allowances for subsistence now or hereafter provided for officers of the Army, and shall, while on active duty, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization, and have issued

to them uniforms, clothing and equipment at Government expense.".

SEC. 5. Any person now or hereafter entitled to retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay (including persons entitled to temporary disability retirement pay) computed at the rates prescribed in section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 shall be entitled to have his pay computed at the rates prescribed by that section, as amended by this act. For the purposes of that computation, an officer with less than 3 years of service for pay purposes, or a warrant officer or an enlisted person with less than 2 years of service for pay purposes, retired for physical disability or placed on the temporary disability retired list, shall have those rates increased by 6 percent.

SEC. 6. Members and former members of the uniformed services who are entitled to receive retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay under laws in effect prior to October 1, 1949, shall be entitled to an increase of 6 percent of the retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, to which they are now entitled.

SEC. 7. This act shall become effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 8. No person, active or retired, in any of the uniformed services, including a Reserve component thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer by reason of this act any reduction in basic or retired pay to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this act.

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 399, nays 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—399

Abbitt	Andersen, H. Carl	Aspinall
Abernethy	Andresen, August H.	Auchincloss
Adair	Andrews	Avery
Addonizio	Anfuso	Ayres
Albert	Arends	Bailey
Alexander	Ashley	Baker
Alger	Ashmore	Baldwin
Allen, Calif.	Aspinall	Barden
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Barrett
Bass, N. H.	Fjare	McCarthy
Bass, Tenn.	Flood	McConnell
Bates	Flynt	McCormack
Baumhart	Fogarty	McCulloch
Beamer	Forand	McDonough
Becker	Ford	McDowell
Belcher	Forrester	McGregor
Bennett, Fla.	Fountain	McIntire
Bennett, Mich.	Frazier	McMillan
Bentley	Frelinghuysen	McVey
Berry	Friedel	Macdonald
Betts	Fulton	Machrowicz
Blatnik	Gamble	Mack, Ill.
Blitch	Garmatz	Mack, Wash.
Boggs	Gary	Madden
Boland	Gathings	Magnuson
Bolling	Gavin	Mahon
Bolton Frances P.	Gentry	Mailliard
Bonner	George	Marshall
Bosch	Gordon	Martin
Bow	Granahan	Mason
Boykin	Grant	Matthews
Boyle	Gray	Meader
Bray	Green, Oreg.	Merrow
Brooks, La.	Green, Pa.	Metcalf
Brooks, Tex.	Gregory	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Griffiths	Miller, Md.
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Brownson	Gubser	Miller, N. Y.
Broyhill	Hagen	Mills
Buchanan	Hale	Minshall
Budge	Haley	Morano
Burdick	Halleck	Morgan
Burleson	Hand	Morrison
Burnside	Harden	Moss
Bush	Hardy	Moulder
Byrd	Harrison, Nebr.	Multer
Byrne, Pa.	Harrison, Va.	Mumma
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Murray, Ill.
Cannon	Hays, Ohio	Natcher
Carlyle	Hayworth	Nelson
Carnahan	Hébert	Nicholson
Carrigg	Henderson	Norblad
Cederberg	Herlong	Norrell
Celler	Heselton	O'Hara, Ill.
Chase	Hess	O'Brien, N. Y.
Chelf	Hiestand	O,Hara, Ill.
Chenoweth	Hill	O'Hara, Minn.
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	O'Konski
Chudoff	Hoeven	O'Neill
Church	Hoffman, Ill.	Osmers
Clark	Hoffman, Mich.	Ostertag
Clevenger	Holifield	Passman
Cole	Holmes	Patman
Colmer	Holt	Patterson
Cooley	Holtzman	Pelly
Coon	Horan	Perkins
Cooper	Hosmer	Pfost
Corbett	Huddleston	Philbin
Coudert	Hull	Phillips
Cramer	Hyde	Pilcher
Cretella	Ikard	Pillion
Crumpacker	Jackson	Poff
Cunningham	James	Polk
Curtis, Mass.	Jarman	Preston
Curtis, Mo.	Jenkins	Price
Dague	Jennings	Priest
Davidson	Jensen	Prouty
Davis, Ga.	Johansen	Quigley
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Rabaut
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Wis.	Rains
Dawson, Utah	Jonas	Ray
Deane	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
Delaney	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
Dempsey	Jones, N. C.	Rees, Kans.
Denton	Judd	Reuss
Derounian	Karsten	Rhodes, Ariz.
Devereux	Kean	Rhodes, Pa.
Dies	Kearney	Richards
Dixon	Kearns	Riehlman
Dodd	Keating	Riley
Dollinger	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Dolliver	Kelly, N. Y.	Robeson, Va.
Dondero	Kilburn	Robsion, Ky.
Donohue	Kilday	Rodino
Donovan	Kilgore	Rogers, Colo.
Dorn, N. Y.	King, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Dorn, S. C.	King, Pa.	Rogers, Mass.
Dowdy	Kirwan	Rogers, Tex.
Doyle	Klein	Rooney
Durham	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Edmondson	Knox	Rutherford
Elliott	Knutson	Sadlak
Ellsworth	Krueger	St. George
Engle	Laird	Saylor
Evins	Landrum	Schenck
Fallon	Lane	Scherer
Fascell	Lanham	Schwengel
Feighan	Lankford	Scrivner
Fenton	Latham	Scudder
Fernandez	LeCompte	Seely-Brown
Fine	Lesinski	Selden
Fino	Lipscomb	Shelley
Fisher	Long	Sheppard
	Lovre	Short
Shuford	Thompson, N. J.	Westland
Sieminski	Thompson, Tex.	Wharton
Sikes	Thomson, Wyo.	Whitten
Siler	Thornberry	Widnall
Simpson, Ill.	Tollefson	Wier
Simpson, Pa.	Trimble	Wigglesworth
Sisk	Tuck	Williams, Miss.
Smith, Kans.	Tumulty	Williams, N. J.
Smith, Miss.	Udall	Williams, N. Y.
Smith, Wis.	Utt	Wilson, Calif.
Spence	Vanik	Winstead
Springer	Van Pelt	Withrow
Staggers	Van Zandt	Wolcott
Steed	Velde	Wolverton
Sullivan	Vinson	Wright
Talle	Vorys	Yates
Taylor	Vursell	Younger
Teague, Calif.	Wainwright	Zablocki
Thomas	Walter	Zelenko
Thompson, Mich.	Watts	
	Weaver	

NAYS—1

Taber

NOT VOTING—35

Bell	Gwinn	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Harris	Roberts
Bowler	Hays, Ark.	Scott
Buckley	Hillings	Sheehan
Canfield	Hope	Smith, Va.
Chatham	Kee	Teague, Tex.
Christopher	Keogh	Thompson, La.
Dawson, Ill.	Mollohan	Wickersham
Diggs	Murray, Tenn.	Willis
Dingell	Poage	Wilson, Ind.
Eberharter	Powell	Young
	Radwan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reece of Tennesssee.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Young.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was unavoidably absent on official business at the time the vote was prematurely taken on H. R. 4720, the Career Incentive Act of 1955, a meritorious and noncontroversail bill for which I have striven during the years. Had I been here, I would have added the 400th vote to the total. But, due to the fact that the scheduled debate was materially reduced, I, like a number of others, was unable to express my desire and to lend my voice and my vote to this meritorious bill. I wish the bill had gone further than it does.

Had I been here, I repeat, with gusto and with great pleasure, I would have added my vote to the 399 others and made it a distinguished 400.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I just want to say the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has an outstanding record in support of legislation for increased pay and other benefits for members of the Armed Forces of this country, together with their dependents. He is correct, this measure is noncontroversial. The vote was called much earlier in the day than was expected.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my friend from Kansas very much. He is very gracious indeed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please inform us as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to.

On Monday we will take up House Resolution 22, relating to an investigation resolution relating to the Committee on the Judiciary.

On Tuesday there will be the call of the Consent and Private Calendars and the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill for 1956.

On Wednesday and Thursday we will take up a resolution relating to the disposal of rubber plants based on the report of the Commission. It has to be acted upon within 60 days, and I think the deadline is around March 25 or thereabouts. Then, if a rule is reported on H. R. 3322, the donor property bill, that will be taken up. That is a bill relating to the donation of surplus property to hospitals and colleges, universities, and schools.

On Friday we will take up the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1955.

If there is any additional legislation ready for action, I will advise the House as quickly as possible. Of course, there is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time. But, if there is any further program, that will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. Will my good friend from Massachusetts advise me whether or not he expects any record rollcall on St. Patrick's Day?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very happy my friend refreshed my memory on that. The leadership has agreed that if there is any rollcall requested on any matter coming up on March 17, on any primary question, the rollcall will go over until the next day.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on March 18, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a task force of the Hoover Commission has come up with the most absurd, beguiling, and amazing report I have ever read. At a time when every veterans' hospital in the country is overcrowded, at a time when sick and disabled veterans are being turned away from veterans' hospitals every day for lack of space, at a time when there is growing demand and increasing need for additional hospitals in every section of the country, the Hoover Commission task force has come up with the astounding recommendation that 19 veterans' hospitals—some of them brand new—be closed.

The Commission says our veterans' program costs too much and should be reduced. For the first time in my memory an agency of the Government has hung a dollar sign on the moral obligations of our people to the man who has fought his country's battles in time of war.

The Hoover Commission task force wants destitute veterans who are treated for non-service-connected disabilities to agree to pay for their medical attention if, by some stroke of good fortune, they should accumulate a few dollars after the hospitalization ends. It wants to deny these privileges entirely to our senior veterans who need it most.

The Hoover Commission task force would close down 19 veterans' hospitals at a time when thousands of veterans are receiving inadequate medical care. I say close down instead the Hoover Commission, dismantle it, terminate it, abandon it, and turn the legislative responsibilities of this Government back to the Congress, where they constitutionally belong.

If 19 veterans' hospitals are closed, veterans now occupying beds in these hospitals either would have to be turned out on the streets or transferred to other hospitals. Most of them, of course, would have to be turned out because the facilities of other hospitals are taxed to the limit. Transferring would mean that the already inadequate facilities of other hospitals would be burdened even further by a sudden influx of new patients.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the narrow, restrictive, and repressive views expressed by the Hoover Commission. In this connection I desire to congratulate my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] for taking exception to these outrageous recommendations and filing a minority report. I certainly agree with him that the position taken by the majority is wholly unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker, there are now 172 Veterans' Administration hospitals in this country. One is under construction and five others are authorized by law. New hospitals are needed everywhere. In Oklahoma, where we have an excellent State program and excellent State hospitals, we are sorely in need of a neuropsychiatric hospital. We have the location, we have the need, we have the demand, we have the medical background, for a first-class, modern-type, large-scale Federal veterans' neuropsychiatric hospital. We should be thinking in terms of building such hospitals, not of dismantling the ones we have. We should be making plans to fulfill our responsibilities to our sick and disabled veterans and not of abandoning that responsibility.

This is not just an Oklahoma problem. It is a national problem. The Commission's report shows that there are 16,000 applicants waiting for admission to veterans hospitals for neuropsychiatric treatment. What would we say to these men if we adopted the recommendations of the Hoover Commission Task Force and closed 19 VA hospitals?

In all parts of the country hospital facilities are inadequate. Here in Washington, D. C., where a new hospital has been authorized the Mount Alto hospital is a disgrace to the Nation's Capital. It is much too old and far too overcrowded.

Despite this fact and despite similar circumstances in other parts of the country, the Hoover Commission wants to cut down further on veterans hospital beds. Let me cite one example of the Commission's reasoning. It proposes to close a hospital in New York State where veterans with tuberculosis are treated. It says the hospital is isolated from New York City and has trouble obtaining an adequate staff. Yet the Commission's own survey shows that all of the 535 beds in this hospital are occupied. The Commission suggests that one section of a new 1,250-bed general hospital in New York be set aside for the tuberculosis patients now at Castle Point, N. Y.

Perhaps this would save money. It might be done in the name of economy. But, Mr. Speaker, it would be cold and cruel economy to deny a patient in either of those hospitals the bed he needs for treatment.

The American people will not stand for that kind of economy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs,

already has called attention to some of the problems involved in the proposed closing of veterans' hospitals in the Dakotas, Montana, and Michigan. If the Hoover Commission Task Force recommendations are carried out, veterans in this area will be compelled to travel hundreds of miles to obtain treatment.

Is that fair? Is that just? Is that the American way of dealing with its veterans?

I asked the Veterans' Administration what the average occupancy rate was in veterans' hospitals during the week of February 28, the same week the Hoover Commission sent its report to Congress. I was advised that the rate of bed occupancy in that week was 92.9 percent. The rate of occupancy ranged from 90.3 percent in the general hospitals to 95.7 percent in the neuropsychiatric hospitals.

Do these figures sound as though our hospitals were being run uneconomically, or ineffectively?

There are no figures to show the effect on the remaining VA hospitals if 19 are closed. There likewise are no figures to show what the effect would be on the already overcrowded and understaffed private hospitals. But you and I know the impact would be tremendous. Some of the remaining hospitals simply would not be able to accommodate the patients. I have heard of one instance where the Veterans' Administration closed a hospital ward, then found itself in trouble with the local citizens who demanded that it be reopened. The abrupt closing of a large number of hospitals would bring a nationwide demand for fast reopenings.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the Congress will repudiate this iniquitous proposal of the task force of the Hoover Commission. I trust it will kill it and give it an unceremonious funeral, without benefit of clergy, and will bury it in the ignominious oblivion that it deserves.

THE CABINET REPORT ON FUELS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether individual Members of Congress have given sufficient attention to the White House report on energy supplies and resources policy? This report represents the findings of a Cabinet committee, and it was presumably approved by the White House. Therefore, I feel that it is incumbent upon Congress to give it careful scrutiny.

The report is, in effect, a fuels policy. How many—if any—of the recommendations should be adopted is something for Congress to decide. Some phases of the report merit immediate action. It is not all-inclusive as regards the whole fuels picture, so there will be other phases of energy resources problems upon which we must act independently. It seems to me, however, that the report does offer a good starting place. The fact is that America has been endowed with specific amounts of coal, petroleum, and natural gas. The judicious utilization of these resources is essential to the welfare of not only present generations, but to that of our children and our children's children as well.

Of the total known energy resources within our borders, coal constitutes upwards of 90 percent, with gas and oil combined amounting to about 2 percent. Oil shale is another important source of energy, and geologists and fuel experts will undoubtedly be able to determine, with a fair amount of accuracy in the not too distant future, the amounts of fissionable materials that are available in this country.

Keeping in mind the percentages of recoverable resources in the three principal fuels currently being utilized, we are unlikely to find any serious dissent with the Cabinet Committee findings relative to the need for a strong coal industry. The report very specifically points out that coal must—and I quote—"maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary."

Each of the several recommendations made by the Cabinet for the reinvigoration of our coal industry will have to be considered by the Congress as quickly as possible. Inasmuch as the residual oil imports problem is now under discussion by the Senate Finance Committee and an amendment to restrict foreign oil has been introduced by a number of Senators representing a diversity of areas of this country, it is logical that we take up this matter first.

The Cabinet report states without equivocation that unless there is a definite check on oil imports, the domestic fuels situation "could be impaired so as to endanger the industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense.

This fact established, the committee comes to the conclusion that in the interest of national defense, imports of crude and residual oil must not "exceed significantly the respective proportion that these imports of oil bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954."

The Cabinet report further states:

> It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made to avoid the necessity of Government intervention.
>
> The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to the domestic production of crude in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet committee has forthrightly declared that the unceasing surge of foreign oil into our shores must be controlled, and it is the duty of Members of Congress to provide whatever implementation to the report is necessary to assure that our Nation's defense structure will remain sound and impregnable. We cannot, of course, accept the 1954 imports statistics as a benchmark for the limitations that are to be established. That level, first reached in 1953, was 75 percent higher than the annual totals which a Senate committee in 1950 found to be highly destructive to the domestic coal industry. Although the 1954 figure might provide a convenient base, it is not a logical or practical one.

When the devastating floodwaters of the Conemaugh River inundated much of Johnstown's business district in 1936, engineering experts got together in an attempt to preclude a recurrence of these conditions. They did not design flood walls merely to prevent the river from sending its raging water higher than the level of the previous year. Had they done so, boating on Johnstown's streets could become commonplace and employees of downtown stores would be well advised to keep life jackets at their counters.

Coal's markets on the east coast have been all but engulfed by last year's 131-million-barrel deluge of foreign residual oil. This figure must be drastically reduced to permit proper resuscitation. It is recognized that energy requirements in this country will continue to rise in the ensuing years and ultimately will reach a point where perhaps 131 million barrels of foreign residual oil may not be considered out of proportion to domestic fuel consumption. Under normal conditions, that day will not arrive for a decade or more. Meanwhile, a sharp reduction of oil imports must be effected at once.

The Cabinet committee, as I have pointed out, suggests the desirability of restricting oil imports by "voluntary, individual action." This proposed course is vague, unrealistic, and impractical. In the first place, the history of the international oil companies is replete with instances of insincerity, intrigue, selfishness, and greed. We were given to believe some 6 years ago that imports were going to be held at approximately the current levels of that time. You know what has happened since then. The House Ways and Means Committee had hearings on the Simpson bill in 1953 and heard witnesses for importing oil companies actually deny that imports are destructive to domestic coal production. This performance was repeated again this year when H. R. 1 was under consideration by the House. This duplicity and deceit was carried into the propaganda campaigns sponsored by these importers, who even had the temerity to lead our citizens to believe that a limitation on residual oil imports would tend to increases costs of household heating oil. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Lest there be any misinterpretation of what I am saying here about oil importers, let me make it very clear that we have no complaint whatsoever with America's own great petroleum industry. Oil was first produced in this country 96 years ago in a little town in Pennsylvania not far from my congressional district.

It is not necessary to attempt to recount, even briefly, the dramatic story of progress that has been written by the domestic oil industry in the ensuing years. Through hard work, determination, a willingness to invest, and a willingness to take a chance, and by assign-

ing science and research to the pursuit of dreams and ideas, this industry has contributed immeasurably to the building of a greater America, to the power necessary to thwart diabolical objectives of tyrants who would conquer the world, to the well-being, enjoyment, and education of each and every one of us.

The American petroleum industry has provided employment—direct and indirect—for millions of American workers. Like other businesses in this land of the free, it has provided the opportunities for the realization of the fondest ambitions of our youth. I read only last week of the impending retirement of the president of a great Midwestern oil firm. He had risen from a job as oil field laborer to the head of the Nation's third largest oil company. The man who will succeed him also started as an oil field roustabout. Similarly, the records of many of the oil companies in Pennsylvania offer numerous outstanding examples of the possibilities for individual success in this progressive industry.

We salute these petroleum companies. They are competitors of coal, but they do not join in the illicit practices of overzealous international importers who would submerge domestic fuel markets in a sea of foreign oil without regard to American workers or national security. As a matter of fact, independent petroleum companies have associated themselves with coal, railroad, and allied industries in asking that Congress enact legislation against excessive imports of petroleum and petroleum products.

Voluntary restrictions? Let's not be naive. The duty of imposing quotas is constitutionally prescribed to Congress. Even if the shrewd manipulators involved in this business of international oil had not already demonstrated the futility of having our Nation rely upon their word for a sane course of action in regard to these importing deals, it would still be risky for us to encourage them to get together and decide upon the quantities of oil that they are going to pick up in their assorted foreign refineries and ship to the United States. The next move in such collusion is the further regulation of their prices, and woe to us when these internationalists set up housekeeping—and bookkeeping—under Government sponsorship.

I commend to your attention the Cabinet committee report, and I suggest as a first step in establishing our fuels program on a firm foundation, the imposition of a 10-percent quota limitation on foreign crude, residual oil, and on other products. This course of action is absolutely necessary for the guarantee of a strong national defense and for the reactivation of the domestic and coal industries.

COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON MOUNTAIN DIVERSION PROJECT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss this afternoon one of the greatest irrigation projects that has ever been undertaken by the Department of the Interior in all of the fine work that it has done in the West. It is one of the most interesting projects in all the world.

Mr. Speaker, within a short time we will see the completion of a project which had its beginning in 1933. That project is the Colorado-Big Thompson transmountain diversion project of the Bureau of Reclamation. With the gigantic job completed, northeastern Colorado can look forward to the greatest period of achievement and prosperity in its history.

The idea of bringing water from the western slope of the Rocky Mountains to the eastern slope in northern Colorado is not new. Plans were proposed as far back as 1890, 65 years ago. The present Colorado-Big Thompson project was conceived in Greeley, Colo., in August 1933, when a group of men met to consider once and for all whether such a plan was feasible or practical.

The man who should be called the father of the present plan was the late Charles Hansen, editor and publisher of the Greeley Daily Tribune. It was Mr. Hansen who organized the first meeting of interested citizens and who spearheaded the enthusiasm in the project.

Many public-spirited individuals and organizations contributed funds for the preliminary survey. This survey was conducted by R. J. Tipton, deputy State engineer for Colorado. The report issued by Mr. Tipton revealed that about 300,000 acre-feet of water from the western slope could be diverted in a project of this type.

Subsequent to the Tipton report the Bureau of Reclamation received an appropriation of $150,000 to make a complete survey and report on the possibility of the project. This survey took more than 2 years, during which time Mr. Hansen and his associates formed the Northern Colorado Water Users Association, a mutual-stock company. The purpose of this organization was to promote interest in the project.

When it became known that the report of the Bureau of Reclamation would be favorable, an organization was formed to guarantee repayment of construction costs of the irrigation features of the project. This organization was the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, authorized by the 1937 State legislature.

The enabling act provided for payment of a portion of the costs of operation of the program by the public as a reflection of the prosperity created by an increased and stabilized water supply. In this way, farmers and urban dwellers who benefited from the increased prosperity would share in the cost. The idea of hydroelectric power in connection with the project had had little consideration. The central idea was supplementary irrigation water.

After the organization of the district, the officers and directors negotiated with the Bureau of Reclamation for a contract that would be acceptable to the property owners in the district.

As finally agreed upon, the contract described the 34 features designed to divert and distribute an average of 310,000 acre-feet of water annually to the Eastern slope irrigated area, as well as to generate and market the electric power.

It provides that the district and the United States shall share the project cost, with the obligation of the district limited to $25 million. The cost assumed by the United States Government would be repaid by the sale of power to distributing agencies.

The contract further provides that beginning the next year after the project is completed and water delivered, the district shall pay $450,000 per annum for the next 20 years, $500,000 per annum for the next 10 years, and in each of the last 10 years of the 40-year replacement period, one-tenth of the remaining total. Under the existing law, the cost of a reclamation construction project must be repaid, without interest, in 40 annual payments.

The contract was submitted to property owners and was approved by a majority vote.

The first congressional appropriation for the project was made in 1937 for $900,000. This enabled work to begin on the Green Mountain Dam and power plant on the Blue River on the western slope. This is a replacement and supplementary storage feature, designed to protect western slope water users and assure them of a permanent water supply before the 300,000 acre-feet would be diverted. Water collected in this reservoir was largely responsible for profitable and successful farm operations on the western slope in 1954 during a severe and disastrous drought.

The powerplant with a capacity of 21,600 kilowatts went into operation early in 1943 and has substantially increased the industrial potential of the area since that time.

Work has continued steadily on the project since 1937 except during World War II, when construction was considerably curtailed.

The backbone of the project, the Alva B. Adams Tunnel, which carries the water under the 12,000-foot mountain range, was begun in 1940 and completed in 1947. The tunnel was named for the late Senator from Colorado, Alva B. Adams.

The tunnel itself is a true miracle of engineering achievement. More than 9 feet in diameter and 13.1 miles long, it is the longest irrigation tunnel in the world and the longest tunnel of any kind in the United States. The eastern portal is 109 feet lower than the western portal, thus allowing gravity to carry the water from one side of the Continental Divide to the other. It has a capacity of 550 cubic feet per second.

The Colorado-Big Thompson project is a complex engineering achievement, but its many individual units can be described briefly to give you an idea of the magnitude of the operation.

First is the collecting and storing in reservoirs of water on the western slope.

Second is the pumping of some of this collected water to an elevation where it flows by gravity through the Adams Tunnel. Third is the generation of electricity in hydroelectric plants as the water flows down the eastern side of the mountain range. Fourth is the storage of the water in two large foothill reservoirs—Horsetooth Reservoir and Carter Lake Reservoir—where it is stored for irrigation purpose. Fifth is the construction of electric transmission lines.

In order to achieve all of these objectives, 13 reservoirs and regulating basins within an area of 14,960 acres have been built with total storage capacity of 984,975 acre-feet. Twenty-three dams and dikes have been constructed, using 23 million cubic yards of earth and rock, 52,000 cubic yards of concrete and nearly 2,500 tons of steel. Twenty-four different tunnels have been drilled with a combined length of 35 miles. These tunnels contain 336,700 cubic yards of concrete and 5,600 tons of steel. Eleven canals totaling 93 miles have been dug to convey the water from one section of the project to another. Four powerplants, generating a total of 107,350 kilowatts, have been construted. A total of 40 million man-hours of work will have been utilized to construct the project in spite of today's many labor-saving devices.

This is but a bare outline of the project.

In summary, the project provides supplementary water for a large area of excellent farmland; a new source of vital electric power for a region still in its industrial infancy; attractive areas for recreation on mountain lakes and reservoirs.

I include excerpts from the publication, the Golden Jubilee of Reclamation. This brochure was published in 1952 and commemorates the 50th anniversary of the Reclamation Service—now the Bureau of Reclamation, 1902–52. A large portion of this publication is devoted to the Colorado-Big Thompson project, but the final paragraphs, I believe, are particularly appropriate:

A project such as the Colorado-Big Thompson is not just rock, steel, tunnels, turbines, canals, and siphons. First, there must be men—men of vision, men of courage, and men of tenacity. The project called forth the best in such men and they gave unstintingly.

They were found on the land itself and they were found in the Bureau of Reclamation. From Kremmling to Julesburg, from the Wyoming line to the New Mexico border, and in fact, throughout the Nation, men worked to help, directly and indirectly, in furthering the project.

The State's delegations in Congress, regardless of party, put their shoulders to the wheel. They have included such men as United States Senators E. P. Costigan, Alva B. Adams, Eugene D. Millikin, and Edwin C. Johnson; such Congressmen as Fred Cummings, William S. Hill, Lawrence Lewis, John Martin and Edward Taylor. Governors of the State lent their help and influence.

The late Judge Clifford H. Stone, who had been director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board since its formation in 1937, must be listed among those who gave vital service in advancing the project.

To call the roll of all the men who helped would be almost impossible of listing; but it would be a roll of honor. There is the late Charles Hansen, publisher of the Greeley Daily Tribune, one of the initial sponsors of the project, who became president of the Northern Colorado Water Users Association at its inception in 1935 and then became president of Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District upon its formation in 1938. His determination and faith contributed greatly to keeping the project moving ahead when others would have faltered.

There was Thomas A. Nixon, attorney, now deceased, who along with William R. Kelly, attorney, both of Greeley, labored long and hard in preparing the project plans for presentation to Congress and in solving the many legal problems that arose. Both have served as attorneys for the conservancy district.

J. M. Dille, long associated with irrigation systems in northern Colorado, was called upon as early as 1933 to assist in the furtherance of the transmountain diversion project and he was appointed to the first board of directors of the conservancy district and was named secretary-manager in 1938, a post he still holds.

Dr. Charles A. Lory, president emeritus of Colorado A. & M. College, was among the early planners of the project and served as a district director. The late Judge Claude C. Coffin, district judge, granted the petition for the formation of the conservancy district.

In Longmont, Loveland, Fort Collins, Estes Park, Berthoud, Lyons, Windsor, Boulder, Johnstown, Sterling, Brush, Fort Morgan, Grand Lake, Julesburg, and other towns and communities, countless others contributed their full share to success. Residents of all, or parts of, Boulder, Larimer, Weld, Adams, Morgan, Washington, Logan, and Sedgwick Counties stood up to be counted.

During most of the years of planning and construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Ray Walter, at one time a practicing engineer in Greeley, Colo., was Chief Engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Porter J. Preston, who died in 1950, was senior engineer for the project for the Bureau of Reclamation from 1933 to 1938 and from 1938 to 1940 when he retired, he was supervising engineer. Educated in Colorado and having spent his professional life in Colorado or nearby States, he felt a native son's interest and enthusiasm for the project.

It was during the administration of the late C. H. Howell as construction engineer and project engineer that the Adams Tunnel was completed. He served as project engineer on the project from 1941 to 1947 and as construction engineer on the Alva B. Adams Tunnel from 1938 to 1940. He was instrumental in the development of the Howell-Bunger valve which has been used successfully for outlet works.

Many others have contributed on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation to the planning and construction of the project.

Most certainly, the Colorado-Big Thompson project has been a big job for big men, but the men came forth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss some of the aspects of reclamation in general. All too often critics of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the projects that have been so beneficial to the West and the Nation, attack without much basis of fact, the fine work that Bureau has accomplished.

To illustrate, let me quote from an article written by Robert H. Hansen which appeared in the Denver Post on January 16, 1955, and entitled "Prairie Dogs Versus Prosperity?"

Just a little more than 100 years ago, Daniel Webster scornfully described the western half of the United States as the formidable home of savages and beasts and an expanse of wastelands and brooding mountains.

Speaking against western railroad development, Webster declared:

"I will not vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer to Boston than it is.

"What do we want with this worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs?

"To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and these endless mountain ranges?"

Few men so illustrious have ever proved so wrong on such a tremendous scale so soon.

Now I have another quotation I would like to add to that. On page 64 of a brochure entitled "What Price Federal Reclamation?" written by Raymond Moley and published by the American Enterprise Association, Mr. Moley said:

These authoritative studies, together with many more from Government sources, show the utterly insubstantial character of the argument for the further reclamation of arid land, at the prices envisaged because of a future national need for food and fiber.

Mr. Moley, while not so illustrious as Daniel Webster, is just as wrong.

In his pamphlet, Mr. Moley attempts to build a case against any further reclamation projects.

For the information of the House I would like to quote several excerpts from Prairie Dogs Versus Prosperity, detailing just what reclamation has meant to the West and the Nation:

Today, 54 years of Federal reclamation have cost $2.4 billion—insignificant compared to the fabulous new frontiers it opened, the billions of dollars it poured into the pockets of farmers, wage earners, and businessmen, the millions it has raised in local, State, and Federal taxes, the hundreds of thousands of new jobs, new farms, and new industries it created, the tremendous new markets, sources, and opportunities it developed.

But today, the continuation of that program has been slowed down by skeptics, opponents, and men of little faith.

Reclamation appropriations have been more than cut in half since 1950, from $358.3 million a year to $143.6 million.

Total reclamation employees have been reduced by nearly one-third in the last 2 years alone, from 13,348 in 1953 to 9,700 today. Hundreds of those 3,600 employees who have been laid off are going to be hard to replace when and if reclamation is ever cranked up again, for they include some of the world's finest engineers and most expert technicians.

President Eisenhower promised a revival of major reclamation activity when he addressed the opening of the 84th Congress. He pledged support of the upper Colorado River storage project, which will be a $1-billion-plus undertaking that will require something more than 30 years to complete. As with other enormous projects of that kind, Congress will be asked to appropriate funds each year to carry them on, rather than put up all the money in any single year.

A smaller but still costly and complex project is the Arkansas-Frying Pan which will provide supplemental water to 300,000 persons in the Arkansas Valley, and add to the critically short water supply of Pueblo, Colo.

The President, Interior Secretary McKay, and Reclamation Commissioner Dexheimer are all committed to both projects. But they have been unsuccessful in selling Congress on them as a result of strong opposition by nonwestern Representatives and Senators, and by other groups who insist the economic justification of such public works is missing. And in finding fault with the repayment procedures, the power-sales policies, and the subsidies to agriculture,

opponents of reclamation often ignore the demonstrated benefits that have flowed from this program over the years. Too many of those who flatly reject reclamation as a worthy function of Government don't know the facts.

* * * * *

The total $2.4 billion spent on all Federal reclamation since 1902 would finance the Defense Department less than 1 month.

What has been spent on reclamation over 50 years would finance our foreign aid program to overseas nations for only half a year.

What was spent on reclamation in the one fiscal year of 1953 would have financed the Defense Department less than 3 days, the foreign aid or Veterans' Administration programs less than a month.

Now take revenue returns to the Federal Government from reclamation projects:

The 29 powerplants now in operation have paid back $226 million net to the Federal Treasury, $34 million in fiscal 1954 alone after deductions for annual operation, maintenance and replacements. Over the next 50 years a total net return of $1,692,500,000 in power revenues is predicted.

Irrigation and municipal water repayment contracts will return $691 million, of which $109 million has already been paid. While making these construction account repayments, the water users have also paid operation and maintenance costs as they became due.

The total return to the Treasury from water and power projects combined will come to $2.6 billion over the next 50 years, of which $335 million has already been paid.

Now taxes:

Since 1916 Federal income-tax revenues which can be attributed directly to Federal reclamation project developments have exceeded $3 billion. This sum alone exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all bureau-constructed projects to date.

"Long after project costs have been repaid fully through the sale of electric energy and operations of repayment contracts," the report stresses, "the new wealth created through the Federal investment in the development of its own resources will be reflected in a continuing flow of tax revenues from the project areas and from the rest of the Nation as well."

* * * * *

The crops and livestock shipped out of a reclamation project area create income in transportation, processing, milling, spinning, weaving, manufacturing, wholesaling, financing, retailing, and all other processes between the farm and the consumer.

Total crop production on reclamation projects since 1906 stands at $10 billion—nearly five times the total cost of all reclamation works.

* * * * *

The irrigated west produces almost all the Nation's apricots, almonds, walnuts, dates, lemons, figs, prunes, and olives. It grows 95 percent of the grapes; 90 percent of the lettuce; 75 percent of the avocados, pears, and cantaloups; 65 percent of the asparagus; 50 percent of the peaches, and more than half the truck crops.

Off-season production is important, too. Witness these contributions to the Nation's dinner table from Arizona's Gila, Yuma, Salt River, and Boulder Canyon projects alone:

More than 97 percent of United States grown dates; 45 percent of winter and 42 percent of spring lettuce; 85 percent of early spring cantaloups and 80 percent of early summer melons; 85 percent of the spring carrots, and sizable portions of the national supply of other choice vegetable and truck crops vital to healthy diets.

The second trade-creating aspect of reclamation is the purchasing power of project farmers and others whose livelihoods depend on their production.

The Reclamation Bureau discovered that the new income generated at the local farm and nonfarm level is about 170 percent of the value of crop production. That would be $1.3 billion in 1953 alone. Largely, that goes into retail sales.

California's Central Valley project—one of the world's biggest—was cited as an excellent example of the business this new income makes possible. The Central Valley project, it is estimated, provides a new market for:

One million pair of shoes every year, from Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Missouri.

Ten million dollars worth of tobacco products, which come from North Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, Florida, and Pennsylvania.

And 8,000 vacuum cleaners, 8,000 refrigerators, 8,000 ranges, 8,000 washing machines, 8,000 radios and TV sets—all of which will come from many States but chiefly from Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

And that's not all. The report continues:

"The increased purchasing power of this one project translates into an annual market for 15,000 new cars, some from Detroit and South Bend and other cities, but many assembled in California from parts manufactured in Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin; for hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of textiles from New England and the South Atlantic States; and for thousands of automobile tires and accessories, home appliances, office machines, and all the assorted gadgets of the day produced in all corners of the country."

The 6,000 new farms carved out of the Central Valley desert, the report disclosed, also require 8,000 tractors, largely from Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Wisconsin; 7,500 trucks from Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin; and 1,000 hay balers, spray outfits, harvesters and other machines from Tennessee, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; and thousands of plows, harrows, cultivators, mowers and other implements from the Great Lakes, East Central and South Central States.

* * * * *

All this in a land not even Daniel Webster wanted only 100 years ago, in a land only cowboys, trappers, and Indians even knew. And still this digest has only scratched the surface of the role reclamation has played in this great boom.

The Reclamation Bureau's fact-finding report makes this comment, populationwise:

"The story of the phenomenal growth of our Nation is the story of the new frontiers it has conquered. The Ohio Valley, Louisiana Territory, California, the Oregon country, Alaska, and the persistent development of the resources of these and many other new frontiers have provided the Nation with the ingredients for economic growth.

"From the Nation's beginning it was the resources from the new frontiers that nurtured it from economic infancy as a nation of farmers and woodsmen to the industrial giant it is today, and made possible the population growth from the 5.3 million of 1800 to 161 million today."

Clearly, said the Bureau, the West today is that new frontier with the new resources the Nation needs to feed and clothe its climb to 200 million by 1970.

Since 1900, it noted, the 17 Western States gained 204 percent in population; the 11 Mountain and Pacific States, 378 percent, and the 3 Pacific States, 499 percent. During the same time, the national population did not quite double.

Since 1940, the Bureau went on, the 17 Western States gained 25.8 percent; the 11 Mountain and Pacific States 40.9 percent; and the 3 Pacific States 48.8 percent. The total United States population increased only 14.5 percent.

"The West is growing up and, in the process, is assuming more than ever a position of vast strategic importance in the Nation's future," the Bureau sums up.

In direct benefits such as reclaimed land, irrigation and other water development, public power and flood control, reclamation makes perhaps its most valuable contributions to the Nation's economy.

There are 69 irrigation projects or major divisions constructed by the Government, or receiving water through Government-built works, scattered over the 17 Western States.

They supply full or supplemental water to more than 7 million acres. About two-fifths of those lands depend on reclamation for their full water supply; three-fifths for part of it.

They lie from the hay and pasture producing high mountain valleys to below sea-level truck crop farms. They constitute only 23 percent of the total number of acres irrigated in the West, and only 21 percent of the Nation's irrigated land. The rest is irrigated by private projects.

* * * * *

Federal reclamation water serves about 125,000 family-size farms, and another 125-000 suburban homes. On the projects were 417 towns with a population of more than 1.6 million.

"Considering power, municipal, and industrial water and irrigation," says the reclamation bureau, "more than 5 million people in the service areas of reclamation projects obtain their living directly or indirectly by reason of the project development."

* * * * *

Seventeen multipurpose reclamation projects with 29 powerplants are now in operation. They include 4.72 million kilowatt capacity, almost 9,000 miles of transmission lines, and nearly 300 substations.

In fiscal 1954, these plants generated and sold 24.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity, enough to supply a city of 7 million people.

The sale of that power netted the Government nearly $34 million, after paying all operation, maintenance, and replacement costs.

The rates are fixed to pay off the Federal power investment, plus 2½ to 3 percent interest, in the first 50 years of plant operation.

The 29 powerplants now in operation on Federal reclamation projects have paid back some $226 million to the Government, and in the next 50 years at current rates should return a total of $1.7 billion more. That revenue will keep right on coming in long after the plants are fully paid off.

* * * * *

Under the present concept of comprehensive, multipurpose water development, the Federal Government now includes current and future water needs of all cities and towns in project areas.

It also carefully considers downstream flood-control needs as well.

The first reclamation projects were strictly for irrigation. Then along came power to help pay the bills, and domestic water for thirsty cities. And today, flood control protection is a major consideration.

The Bureau has found that a little more cost to include flood-control features can save millions of dollars and even hundreds of lives downstream.

For example, the dams on the Columbia River saved an estimated $5.5 million in flood damages in 1950. The giant Shasta Dam in California held that State's worst flood in history to a toll of $10 million, also in 1950.

Remember the great Kansas flood of 1951, the following year? Worst in the Nation's history, it caused nearly $1 billion in damages, killed 18 persons, drove 87,000 from their homes, destroyed 351 businesses, did $363 million damage to Kansas City alone.

That scarred into history just how disastrous floods can be.

And it was all so needless. Engineers can prove those raging torrents could have been

reduced to a mere trickle by dams and levees long held on drawing boards by lack of construction funds.

Each of the reclamation dams, then, holds back water, stores it for time of greatest need, and puts it to beneficial uses for all the Nation that can be measured only in the billions—water which, if not controlled, could destroy property and life with the sudddenness of lightning.

* * * * *

To what extent does the future of America rest upon water development? The Bureau, in reply, quotes President Eisenhower's letter to Secretary McKay on May 26, 1954, as follows:

"The conservation and use which we make of the water resources of our Nation may in large measure determine our future progress and the standards of living of our citizens.

"If we are to continue to advance agriculturally and industrially," President Eisenhower continued, "we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil, or which can be extracted from the oceans.

"It is my desire that this administration furnish effective and resourceful leadership in establishing national policies and improving the administrative organization needed to conserve and best utilize the full potential of our water resources."

Reclamation, then, stands today at the crossroads and so does the Nation.

In 52 years reclamation has built facilities to supply water to 7 million acres of land which includes a full water supply for 3 million acres and a supplemental water supply for 4 million acres.

This area provides an estimated 125,000 irrigated farmsteads (80-acre average) and an equal number of suburban homesteads.

Each irrigated farm of 80 acres supports 8 people in the project service area, produces an average of $10,000 gross farm income each year, provides an average market of $4,550 in retail sales, contributes an average amount of $1,250 in Federal taxes and comparable amounts in State, local, and school taxes, is an island of production stability in an area where dependence on normal rainfall brings inevitable drought disaster.

In summary let me point out how reclamation pays:

Crop production in 1953 from 69 reclamation projects or major divisions was valued at $785.9 million.

The cumulative value of crops produced from 1906 to 1953 totals almost $10 billion.

The total cost of plant, property, and equipment of all Bureau of Reclamation-constructed projects through June 30, 1954 is about $2.6 billion.

Income to reclamation-project farmers and farm workers totaled $550 million in 1953, or cumulative income since 1906 of $6.8 billion.

Annual business activity attributed to fishing, hunting, and other recreation at reclamation reservoirs is estimated at about $33 million annually

Irrigation and municipal water repayment contracts will return $691 million to the Federal Treasury.

Twenty-nine power plants under Federal reclamation operation have a total installed capacity of 4,718,450 kilowatts.

Sales of electric energy in 1954 totaled 27,071,363,414 kilowatt hours. This produced a total revenue for the Federal Treasury of more than $50 million.

Potential returns from water contracts and power revenues for the next 50 years will aggregate $2.6 billion.

Federal tax revenues since 1916 from reclamation areas now stand at more than $3 billion. This sum exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all Bureau-constructed projects to date.

I now yield to my colleague from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. First, I should like to compliment the gentleman and his presentation of the Big Thompson project and the good it has done in our great State.

May I further state that as he has described it, the north and the northeastern part of our State is in great need of water and is probably one of the areas in the United States that depends more on irrigation water than any other section; that as he pointed out the people of the State of Colorado in conjunction with the Congress of the United States made it possible for the development of this great project the object of which as he told us is the transportation of water through a tunnel under the Continental Divide known as the Alva B. Adams Tunnel.

Just this last year there was a serious drought in this area in the northern part of the State. Due to the fact that the people were foresighted enough to join in this program—and I may say that they agreed within the Northern Colorado Conservancy District that they would pay ad valorem taxes on all property, be it farmland, machinery, automobiles, or whatnot, in order to help make this project feasible—they were paid in the water that was received this year when they had that serious drought, because there was a sufficient amount to act as a supplemental water supply that made possible the production of the abundant crops that were harvested in the northeastern part of the State.

We in Colorado believe this is a step in the right direction, because it makes possible the utilization of a large percentage of the water that rises on the high Rockies and particularly the Continental Divide.

Again I want to compliment the gentleman for calling the attention of the House to the tremendous success of the Big Thompson project in our State.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks about the Big Thompson. His district in Colorado adjoins part of my district in Nebraska. I have lived in the shadow of that development since 1919. The value of water to an arid land is incalculable in dollars and cents.

During its 52 years of operation the Bureau of Reclamation has built 116 dams, including the Hoover, Grand Coulee, Shasta, and Hungry Horse. They have also built 5,000 miles of canals carrying water through that thirsty land. As the gentleman from Colorado pointed out, more than 7 million acres now receive additional water or entirely new water as a result of irrigation projects.

The value of new wealth added to the Nation's economy last year from this source was something like $800 million. About the turn of the century this country may well have a population of 300 million within its borders. Those people are going to have to be fed and clothed, and much of those necessities must come from new farming methods and from new land brought into production.

Give me 1 more minute to say this, and I say it in all kindness to some of my esteemed friends from Pennsylvania, New York, and other Eastern States, relative to flood control: We are having now a hearing in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the question of the upper Colorado development where they are trying to impound some 7,500,000 acre-feet of water to benefit the people in that area and, indeed, furnish electric energy for a large, large area.

The amount of money spent since the inception of irrigation in this country is only $2,158,185,000. I repeat, that is the amount of money spent since the inception of irrigation projects. No interest is paid on that money but the principal is repaid to the United States Government. Those payments are nearly current now. On the other side of the ledger those who sometimes complain about irrigation projects have large flood-control projects in their States. Flood control since it started, and that has not been many years ago, has been given $7,245,017,000. Not 1 penny of that returns to the Federal Treasury in interest or principal. Some of the States benefit as follows: California $418,183,000, Louisiana $593 million, Michigan $186 million, Mississippi $274 million, New York $296 million, Pennsylvania $323,865,000. Remember, not 1 penny of that is paid back in either interest or principal to the Federal Treasury.

During all of that time and through 1952 more than $7 billion has been spent for flood control. I voted for that. About $2 billion has been spent for irrigation and reclamation projects and the reclamation projects pay back. There are great and untold millions of dollars that go to the Federal Treasury because of the new wealth that is created and the new taxes being paid on that wealth.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I commend the gentleman from Colorado for making this fine statement today, not only about the Colorado-Big Thompson project but also in defense of reclamation in general. The names that the gentleman mentioned are very familiar to me. I am happy to see the gentleman give credit to the late Charles Hansen for being the father of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. It was my great pleasure to visit with Mr. Hansen many times. I know this was something very close to his heart and I know of the time and energy he devoted to bringing this project to reality.

I want to state to the gentleman that while he has a fine project in northern Colorado in southern Colorado we are attempting to bring about the same type of project through the construction of

what is known as the Frying Pan-Arkansas transmountain water-diversion project. The bill is pending in this Congress and I am hoping to have it authorized during the present session. This project would bring water from the western slope of Colorado, just as the Colorado-Big Thompson project brings water to northern Colorado. The water from the Frying Pan project would go into the Arkansas Valley in southern and southeastern Colorado, where additional water is desperately needed, both for supplemental irrigation and for domestic purposes. So I am happy to join with my colleague this afternoon in his presentation of the reclamation program. I am sure that if those who are critical of reclamation would visit the Colorado-Big Thompson project, which the gentleman has so ably and accurately described this afternoon, much of this criticism of reclamation in general would be dissipated.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that I have some figures the gentleman will be interested in. This is to answer the folks who extend their hands high to the heavens crying that you will bankrupt the Treasury. Take the budget for 1954, $62.4 billion, and let us consider the 17 Western States. I have the total here of all the projects that they have had up to 1950. That is as close as I can get it. All of the money that has been spent up to that time is what part of 1 year's budget? These are not figures taken from the Department of the Interior; they are figures from the Department of Commerce. Here they are: 2.89 percent. Total cost of the Colorado-Big Thompson project is now estimated to be $164 million. The total cost of $164 million would be less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the budget for 1956. Then these folks say you are bankrupting the Treasury.

Tell me, where is their soundness or reasons for making any such wild and absolutely unfounded statements?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wonder if the gentleman in his preparation of this very splendid statement has computed the amount of money which the United States Treasury received in increased income taxes and in purchasing power as the result of not only the Big Thompson project but these other reclamation projects in the West.

Mr. HILL. I gave some figures on that.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will not take part in this discussion only to say that I was privileged to do a great deal for the Big Thompson project at the time of its authorization and when the appropriations were made. I want to say at this moment, whether it be the Arkansas-Frying Pan or the Big Thompson or any other project, where you divert the water by tunneling from the western to the eastern slope, that it is the only way you can get the water there; that half of the State of Colorado will always be parched and not nearly as productive as it can be if water is supplied. It is the only way it can be done, by making this very sound investment; and an investment it is, nothing else, else I from Michigan would not be enthusiastic about it. The more prosperous you are in Colorado, the more of Michigan's products you will buy and the happier we both will be. Under the old Colorado River Compact, which has always capitivated me, and I was intrigued by its discussion many years ago when I lived in Colorado Springs, the only way under that compact that you can ever get anything out of the vast volume of waters which Colorado contributes to the Colorado River drainage system is by boring tunnels from the west through the mountains and getting it from where there is too much of it and bringing it to the areas that need it to make a paradise out of the parched prairie lands to the east. It is a good investment, and it is something for all the people, although primarily the people of Colorado will benefit.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that Colorado contributes 72 percent of all the water that flows down the Colorado River.

Mr. DINGELL. I am familiar with that, and it gets very little in return.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his support of western reclamation and for his interest in Colorado, as a former resident. We do appreciate your help, and I want again to thank you.

Mr. DINGELL. You could not drive me away from this type of work.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend as part of my remarks a summary of The Prairie Dogs Versus Prosperity, written by Robert H. Hansen, published in the Denver Post January 16, 1955.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

INCENTIVE PAY FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to vote for the incentive-pay bill, as it is called, which the Committee on Armed Services brought in uanimously. I have a great interest in and sympathy for the young men and women of the country today who are sitting, perhaps, in the shadow of a war. We hope it will not come. It is very difficult for them to make their plans, and if they have a little more pay, it certainly eases the tension a little. It shows an appreciation of the service that they are rendering.

I want to speak especially of the Air Force. Everybody knows that every time a pilot goes up in a plane, if that plane has not been properly serviced, that pilot is in danger of losing his life.

I like very much Secretary Talbott, the Secretary of the Air Force, because of his interest in the men who fly the planes, and in their families. He realizes full well what the danger is every time a pilot takes off. It is much more dangerous now that we have these tremendously fast and effective jet planes. And everybody knows what it means when a plane takes off from a carrier at sea, particularly in rough weather. That pilot may never be able to land again.

I wish everybody in the country could see the moving picture The Bridges of Toko-Ri. It would give them a chance to see the actual dangers to which these men are subjected and an evidence of their courage.

I am deeply troubled, Mr. Speaker, at the innumerable—I say "innumerable" advisedly—commissions that have been formed and are being formed all the time to see how economies can be effected in the care of veterans. I would rather see these commissions formed with a view to seeing how improved care can be given to the veterans instead of how those items could be cut. I think we ought to talk upon that subject constantly, because these men get out of the service and some of them have been wounded, some of them are disabled and some mentally sick, too sick to file any claims for compensation. It is easy to forget and they do not talk about it. It is easy to forget the care that they must have. The service organizations fight their battles. But I point out that those service organizations cover only a comparatively few of the men and women who serve. Some of the commissions to investigate veterans benefits that are appointed do make a few good suggestions, and some of the work is bad, very bad and very unfair, but much of the work they do is done by officials of the Veterans' Administration in preparing the figures and in explaining the various functions of the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration officials do not recommend anything but they prepare the figures. There are sometimes as many as 4 or 5 people representing different departments, the Budget, the Appropriations Committee, the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and the Comptroller General's Office. They are all investigating the activities of the Veterans' Administration. In many instances they do so without too much thought of the future well-being of the veterans. They do so just with a view to saving money.

TEN YEARS OF RUSSIAN SLAVERY IN RUMANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEMPSEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was just 10 years ago, on March 6, 1945, that the Kremlin installed by violence its absolute rule over the Rumanian nation and people. The takeover and the occupation of Rumania by the Russian Communists was in violation of all the tenets of international law as well as the commitments made by the Russians to the Western Allies as to the manner in which the people of Central and Eastern Europe would choose their governments at the end of hostilities.

For 10 long years the Rumanian nation has been occupied and exploited by the Russian Communists and their local henchmen, and unbelievable crimes have been committed against the Rumanian people.

Rumania did fight against the Soviet Union during World War II. Centuries of experience of living in an area close to the Russian autocrats taught the Rumanians that it was impossible to be an ally of the Russians and survive as a national entity. The passage of events since 1945 have well demonstrated that the Rumanians were not fighting as allies of the Nazis but rather as enlightened defenders of the Rumanian nation.

Andrei Vishinsky was the principal agent of the Kremlin in bringing about the Communist takeover of Rumania in March 1945. It was this same Vishinsky who laid the groundwork for a campaign of terror, torture, and murder which characterized the so-called elections of November 1946, in Rumania. Vishinsky has passed on to his reward, but the tyranny of Russian communism continues in Rumania and all the other captive non-Russian nations of the empire.

We must not forget that Rumania was fighting on the side of the Western Allies during the closing months of World War II, and suffered more than 150,000 casualties. Nor should we forget that 130,000 Rumanian soldiers were declared prisoners of war by the Russians and deported to the Soviet Union after the Rumanian cease-fire and the armistice declaration.

During these long and dark 10 years of Russian occupation of Rumania the Moscovites have established at least 14 joint companies, known as the Sovroms, which are bleeding the country white. Rumania was obliged by treaties to pay reparations to the U. S. S. R. a sum of $300 million. However, conservative estimates indicate that more than $3 billion had been looted out of Rumania by the Russian-managed Sovroms.

One of the largest forced labor camps in Central Europe has been organized in Rumania as one of the devices to crush the tremendous resistance of the patriotic Rumanian people. The peasant resistance against communism in Rumania is considered to be one of the strongest throughout the whole Russian Communist empire. It is a popular saying among the enslaved people of Rumania that enemy No. 1 of communism is the peasantry and enemy No. 2 the United States.

For over 200 years the Rumanian nation and its people have suffered at the hands of Russian imperialism, with all its depredations and well-known political oppression. There is good reason to believe that one of the objectives of Moscow's European policy is to completely annihilate the Rumanian nation. These facts account for the heroic resistance of the enslaved people in Rumania as well as natives of Rumania who are now living in exile in the free world. One can well understand the anxiety of these Rumanian exiles when they know that slowly but surely their native land and its people are being suffocated and destroyed. Against this background we can understand better the motivation of the Rumanian patriots who took over the Communist-occupied Rumanian Legation in Bern, Switzerland.

One of the outstanding organizations fighting for the cause of freedom is the League of Free Rumanians. This organization is comprised of Rumanian exiles who anxiously await the liberation of Rumania and the re-establishment of a democratic-parliamentary form of government in their homeland. The president of that organization, Mihail Farcasanu, has communicated with the president of the Swiss Confederation, concerning the case of the Rumanian patriots and the Bern incident, copy of which has come to my attention. I would like to quote a part of that letter because it expresses so well the motivation of those Rumanian patriots:

> The true conflict expressed by the events in Bern is the conflict between the aggressor and their victim—the Rumanian people. This inexorable conflict has been ignored in the west for reasons of expediency. A puppet government has been recognized in Bucharest, a peace treaty has been concluded with it in 1947, although the west had ample proofs of its total subjugation to Moscow, of its nonrepresentative character and its totalitarian, inhuman methods. * * * The Rumanian people, seeing that all legitimate juridical means of defending their rights have been denied them, through their abandonment to Soviet rule, are making use of the means forced on them by the very slavery to which they have been reduced. It is extreme necessity (force majeure) which compels Rumanians to express their aspirations for freedom and claim their rights through de facto methods, through sabotage, and through active and passive resistance against the Soviet aggressor and his agents.
>
> There is no paradox in asserting that it is through such means, extraneous to the existing order—which in regard to Rumania is an exploiting and tyrannical one—that the rights of the Rumanian people find their expression today. The incidents in Bern are due to the tragic situation in which the victims of tyranny are obliged to make use of their sacred right to resist oppression.
>
> We declare that the free Rumanians are morally and solidly with every action which could help in the fight for restoring the liberties and rights of the Rumanian people. It would be a grave mistake to believe that this fight can be stopped. On the contrary it will grow in intensity and force until the liberation of the country.
>
> In face of the tragedy besetting the subjugated peoples, the free world cannot avoid any longer the choice: Is the free world on the side of tyranny, or is the free world coming at the 11th hour to the side of those who fight and die for human liberty?

Mr. Speaker, I think that the most serious problem of our time rests on this question. Are we determined to make the cause of human freedom triumph, and through it, provide for our own security and the maintenance of international order? Are we clear concerning the steps which must be taken if we are to achieve such a victory?

There are some encouraging signs that the American people are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that there is no possibility of peaceful coexistence with the conspiracy of communism and that, should we attempt to make accommodations for the Communists, we will be doing little more than preparing the deathbed for our beloved Nation. There seems to be a growing feeling that we have reached the point where we must reappraise the entire situation with respect to the international conspiracy of communism. Recently Sir Winston Churchill made a plea to the leaders of the West to take advantage of the few years we have left to preserve the civilization of which we are a part. It was his estimate that during the next 3 or 4 years the free world should retain an overwhelming superiority in hydrogen weapons, but that in 3 or 4 years time—and it could be less, the scene would be changed. He put before us the possibility of diplomacy by ultimatum as the likely method the Russians will use when they have reached a point of parity with us in nuclear weapons and ability to deliver them.

Three or 4 years is a very short time, but it is surely time enough for us to set in motion a positive political action program which, if properly managed, could prevent the Russians from attaining nuclear parity with us and could therefore shape the course of history.

It is for this reason that I take advantage of this sad anniversary to pay homage to the heroic Romanian people, and at the same time, to urge a renewed faith in America's destiny as the champion of the cause of human freedom. The desire for liberty boiling within the borders of the Russian Communist empire as well as the aspirations for freedom of the enslaved Chinese people, constitutes a political weapon of incalculable strength. We must take advantage of this political advantage while time permits.

INJUSTICE IN THE MUSIC BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the high privilege and great pleasure of attending a luncheon at the National Press Club of Washington, which was attended by a distinguished group of American popular musical composers en route as a unit to entertain American troops in the European theater and other members of that great organization of geniuses and artists known as the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, generally known as ASCAP.

I understand that a similar gathering is assembled about every year by the inspired leadership of the National Press Club. This recent occasion was largely attended by many outstanding members of the press and distinguished guests from artistic circles, business, and public life.

After the luncheon, a succession of leading American composers, whose names are a byword in the Nation and the world, went to the platform and presented their personally composed selections for the great edification of the gathering. The reactions of the audience, which I had the opportunity to observe, impressed me very deeply. I could not help but think of the remark of Andrew Fletcher, the Scottish writer:

> Give me the making of the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws.

Each composer sang his own songs and, in the aggregate, the songs brought to mind in panorama the history of the past 30 years. As they were sung by these talented persons, it was as if the life story of many a person in the audience was being unrolled and vividly reenacted before his very eyes. I saw grizzled veterans of the press and of the political arena furtively wipe a tear from their eyes as the songs, one after another, led them through the span of their life from childhood to maturity, from the nursery to the Moulin Rouge and Okinawa.

The youngest successful songwriter was there too and he did his "stuff," which carries so much appeal to the younger generation. I would not attempt to evaluate the value of the contributions of this group throughout the years because there is no satisfactory measure, no norm which could furnish an accurate appraisal. The product of the songwriter is cultural, artistic, and spiritual. It cannot be appraised in terms of money or material things. It is of the spirit rather than the substance, but in net effect it exemplifies the spirit of America, the temper of our people, our way of life, our modes and customs, the very soul of our country.

In times past, as well as in the present, composers, writers, artists of all kinds have been exploited. There is probably less exploitation today of this class in this country than ever before, but nevertheless, the composers of popular songs are not free from ruthless human selfishness and greed, which sometimes most deplorably move individuals and groups in positions of economic power to take advantage of weaker and less privileged individuals and groups.

In the past this kind of exploitation of composers was notorious, ruthless, and pathetic. Take for example, the case of Stephen Foster, that great genius, who wrote songs in an earlier period of our history which are still standard pieces of our folkmusic known virtually to all Americans, who was shamefully exploited and paid only a pittance for some of his outstanding offerings and died penniless and impoverished. There are many other instances in the history of music of outstanding writers who were denied their just due for their creative work.

There is no reason for exploiting artistic talent at any time or under any circumstances and to the extent such practices exist today they must be deplored and they must be banished from our economic life. In fact, exploitation of any kind has no place in America.

The advent of the movies, of radio, of television have made great changes in the production, marketing, and use of popular music. Control over popular music over a period of time has come into the hands of a relatively few individuals in this country, who represent large financial interests. Although song writing is a creative activity that requires great talent and even genius, because of the practices of these powerful groups, in one sense, it has been converted into a coldly materialistic mass-production business.

Real worthy songs cannot be produced on such a basis because they emanate from the creative abilities and talents of the individual. Good songs cannot be mass produced like automobiles but, unfortunately, that is what is often now happening in this country. A few powerful individuals, who can decide whether or not a song is to be exploited and publicized are in a position to block the creative efforts of many worthy, talented composers.

The results are plain to one familiar with current American music, but in a realistic sense they could be no different than they are, because it will never be possible to create good music by the mere decree of so-called song dictators or moguls who sit in ivory towers in Tin Pan Alley or in Hollywood and send out orders to play only the songs of chosen favorite composers and to omit all others. Yet there is evidence even to the casual observer that that is just what is often happening and, of course, it accounts for the present relatively inferior quality of many current American popular songs because under this system worthwhile compositions possessing real merit are arbitrarily blocked, while prosaic, commonplace offerings are circulated under forced draft by arbitrary edict throughout the media of musical reproduction.

As a result true creative art is stultified, and mediocrity and banality are artificially cultivated and forced upon the American public. How long a suffering and afflicted public will endure these conditions is problematical but there is a widespread rebellion going on among the people against the type of popular music that is often being palmed off upon them. The pathetic fact in the situation is that those responsible for these conditions seem to be entirely unaware of the irreparable damage which their selfish practices are doing, not only to the great music industry, but to contemporary American creative art.

There are even worse features to this situation in that because of the operations of special cliques and special interests, highly successful, prominent songwriters and composers are daily being deprived of the fruits of their work.

Some years ago the Congress passed and later amended copyright laws to protect these talented people and insure them of just compensation for their creations. However, ways and means have been devised by clever lawyers and special interests by which, in effect, many songwriters are being shamelessly exploited. For example, it has been discovered that a section of the copyright act of 1909 does not permit composers and authors of musical works to receive any payment whatsoever on juke box performances although everyone else connected with the operation of these newer musical devices makes a profit on every playing.

Some unbelievable and unintended results flow from the operation of the present law. If a public restaurant, ice cream parlor, or tavern uses an ordinary phonograph played without inserting a coin, this is considered a public performance for profit and the composers may share in it. But if anyone in the same establishment in order to play music, puts a coin in a jukebox, this is not considered a public performance for profit and the composers are excluded from sharing in such receipts.

Of course, no law can anticipate scientific and technological developments of the future and the copyright law of 1909 was no exception. No one at that time could possibly have conceived the huge development that has taken place through science, radio, television, and electronics and mechanical reproduction in the distribution of musical sound through such diverse media.

One unchallenged fact emerges from all these developments and that is that since the year 1934 or thereabout the jukebox industry has become practically a billion dollar enterprise, yet it is the only branch of the musical distribution business which is exempt from paying composers and authors for the profitable use of their products. Many have become enriched in this new industry, many are deriving huge profits from it, but the composers and authors who made and are making it possible for others to achieve great economic success are not getting one single penny as a result of its operations. While the statistics are not all embracing at present, and obviously do not cover a large part of this field, they clearly indicate a total gross revenue of more than $450 million a year to the jukebox industry and this is admittedly an extremely conservative figure.

Such conditions constitute gross discrimination against composers, authors, and publisher, against the men and women whose great talents and abilities furnish so much pleasure and relaxation to the American public, yes, to people the world over, who are listening to American music in larger numbers every year. Popular music is one of the great bonds which link us to the free world and to Western civilization. Potentially this music, if properly directed and utilized in our foreign programs could well be a most powerful media by which we could reach the people in the enslaved world of the Soviet Union. From Paris to Calcutta, from Moscow to Capetown, from Belgrade to Peiping, American music is heard and sung and has an irresistible appeal to millions and millions of people. Everywhere people want to sing or hear American popular songs.

I want it clearly understood that I am not in any sense opposed to the jukebox business or jukebox operators. To the contrary, I believe that their particular medium is rendering a splendid public service to the American people and I commend the ingenuity and enterprise which members of this industry have exhibited in expanding its business and broadening the field in which music is used.

But I submit that in fairness, justice, and equity this and every other branch of the music industry, and other industries which utilize the products of creative art, should be prepared and willing to compensate those who, above all, have made their huge business enterprises and great financial success possible. The jukebox industry in its own interest, has a greater

stake in the steady flow of acceptable popular songs than the writers and composers. If, for any reason, the supply of attractive popular songs should cease or diminish the jukebox industry would be certainly one of the chief sufferers.

It is my understanding that the jukebox industry has up to this time refused to meet with representatives of the composers and authors to discuss the possibilities of equitable compensation for the use of the creative product of the composers and authors. It is my understanding that some members of our Congressional Judiciary Committees have in the past urged that all segments of the music industry meet and try to come to some agreement that would be fair and equitable to those who make musical reproduction possible. Various legalistic arguments have been advanced against this proposal which do not appear to go to the real merits of the controversy. It is well settled, however, in law and morals, that to use the property of another in order to make a profit without paying the owner of the property, or securing his permission, is unjust enrichment and wrongful. The present fee of 2 cents a record which inures to the publisher for the privilege of making a recording attaches to the manufacturing royalty only and is not in any sense a performance royalty. The public use of such a record for profit rightfully implies that the profit should be shared with those whose property is used to make the profit possible.

When one considers the decline in sheet music and other changes in the music business which have greatly reduced the income of the average composer it is manifest that in this day and age the composer's principal income must in many instances be derived from his royalty rights. It is unconscionable that selfish, private interests should seek to deprive the composer of these rights and deny him a fair share of the proceeds derived from the use and exploitation of his own creative work. When it is further recognized that these proceeds annually run into millions and millions of dollars, yes, probably billions of dollars, it is all the more incredible and unjust to allow one class to reap enormous profits while another class, whose creative genius makes this result possible, is cut off without a penny.

We talk—and rightly so—about our great system of free private enterprise and the incentive it affords to American citizens and others living within our boundaries. Fundamentally, the theory behind this system is that each man shall receive the fruits of his labors, his industry, and his creative genius, and that no one shall be permitted to deny him of his justly due share of profits that are honestly derived as a consequence of his efforts or conceptions. That sound traditional American principle is grossly violated by present refusal to share profits with composers and publishers.

There are several bills pending in the Congress at present designed equitably to readjust the evils implicit in denying to composers and publishers the fruits of their work. These measures are based upon eliminating the special favors and special privileges now attached to the operation of jukeboxes which unjustly deprive the creative artists of America of the merited rewards of their genius and industry. It is my opinion that the jukebox operators like every other group in the music industry and every other group utilizing the musical concepts of our composers should, as a matter of fairness and right, be willing to enter into conferences and negotiations designed to agree upon the shares accruing to various segments of the music world upon some equitable basis. If this cannot be done speedily and effectively, the Congress will have to take appropriate action to revise the present law; in fact, it is my opinion that this should be done in any event, in order to equalize obligations and require all parties concerned to comply with basic principles of copyright law which have ben long followed in this country.

Notwithstanding any settlement that may be made in these matters, and regardless of any juke box bill so-called, that may be enacted by the Congress, it is a paramount obligation of the Congress to move speedily along a broad front to correct and to extirpate the manifest evils that have crept into the music industry over a period of years and which are so obviously discouraging incentive, impeding creative impulses and working serious injustice upon a group of talented people who, if they do not write the laws of America, write the great songs that inspire, relax and entertain our people and that are heard around the world.

The anti-monopoly statutes, the fair-trade and fair-practice laws now on the statute books provide substantial means for adjusting the evils of the music industry. The executive branch of the Government, upon whom responsibility rests for enforcing these laws could, of its own motion, take effective action to remove the shackles upon the composers and artists of America, clear away the barriers that are currently causing discouragement, blocking incentive and reducing the high standards of American musical artistry. So long as one man or a small group of men in Tin Pan Alley, in Hollywood or anywhere else shall be allowed to visit injustice upon the geniuses who compose our songs and give expression to the soul of America, these evils will exist.

Unless current evils and intolerable conditions in the music industry penalizing, discouraging, and exploiting the talented men and women who write our national songs are promptly dealt with, it is clear that Congress will have to act. I hope that all segments of this business will soon voluntarily enter into negotiations to bring about fair, equitable settlements of pending differences and banish existing evils and injustices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. MACDONALD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. HAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YOUNG (at the request of Mr. BENTLEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. ASHLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. JENKINS.

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. WOLVERTON on H. R. 4720 and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GARY), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. RIVERS), for today and Friday, on account of official business.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for 1 week, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 456. An act relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 941. An act to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1051. An act to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

527. A letter from the United States Attorney, District of Columbia, Department of Justice, relative to a letter addressed to Hon. FRANCIS WALTER, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, relating to the case of Wilbur Lee Mahaney, Jr., cited for contempt of the House of Representatives by House Resolution 535, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

528. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize voluntary extensions of enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for periods of less than 1 year"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

529. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

530. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

531. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt from its application scarves which do not present an unusual hazard"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

532. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1955, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

533. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, recommending enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, "a bill to provide a small civil penalty for violation of the rules and regulations of the Commission applicable to all radio stations other than those in the broadcast services, and to further provide for remission or mitigation thereof by the Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

534. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Miss Blanche Yersin, which will, when approved by the regional director, region No. 3, National Park Service, authorize her to provide lunches, refreshments, and a limited line of souvenirs at Lehman Caves National Monument, Nev., for a period of 3 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

535. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

536. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

538. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the payment of judgments by the Post Office Department"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

539. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $1,488,820 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

540. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $85,000 for the Federal Communications Commission (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

541. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Alaska Road Commission, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

542. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1954, pursuant to the charter of the American Academy of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 8, 1955, the following resolution was reported on March 9, 1955:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 169. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4720, a bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; without amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the House Calendar.

[*Submitted March 10, 1955*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3014. A bill to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the Second Pan-American Games, the Seventh Olympic Winter Games, Games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American Games and Olympic Games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 197. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 198. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3560. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4367. A bill to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3338. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914; with amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 12. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; with amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy; with amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1719. A bill for the relief of William V. Dobbins; without amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer; without amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer; with amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3361. A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3362. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3363. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3364. A bill for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service schoolteacher; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3365. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3366. A bill for the relief of Mary J. McDougall; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3367. A bill for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani; without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej; without amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes; without amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 890. A bill for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez; without amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 891. A bill for the relief of Alberto Cortez Cortez; with amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin; without amendment (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 913. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Noble; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen; without amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 924. A bill for the relief of Joseph Marrali; without amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1081. A bill for the relief of Anna Tokatlian Gulezian; with amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn; without amendment (Rept. No. 185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Maria Theresia Reinhardt and her child, Maria Anastasia Reinhardt; with amendment (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1166. A bill for the relief of Florence Meister; without amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1656. A bill for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui; without amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1660. A bill for the relief of Wencenty Peter Winiarski; without amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; without amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Miss Martha Kantelberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo; with amendment (Rept. No. 192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Vida Kosnik; with amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2361. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro; without amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3020. A bill for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone; with amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 4776. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the uniformed services during certain periods of combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4777. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 4778. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4779. A bill to authorize construction of certain flood-control improvements on Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4780. A bill declaring the inundation of property because of, or aggravated by, wind, waves, or tidal effects on the Great Lakes to be properly within the flood-control activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4781. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4782. A bill to change the name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Evans; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4783. A bill to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 4784. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide a revised rate of duty on jute backing for tufted rugs and carpets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 4785. A bill to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to fix a minimum standard of 3.5 percent butterfat for whole milk; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 4786. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4787. A bill to create a Committee on Railroad Retirement Policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4788. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4789. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Government buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 4790. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4791. A bill to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4792. A bill to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4793. A bill to provide tax equity through the taxation of cooperative corporations and to provide tax credits for recipients of dividends from genuine cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 4794. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pensions for permanently and totally disabled wartime veterans, and for the widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the excise tax on gasoline which is used to operate or propel farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4796. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall review the reports on Pigeon Creek, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 4797. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4798. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 4799. A bill to require that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Supreme Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges in order that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by a full Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4800. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable at age 60 in lieu of at age 65, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4801. A bill to authorize the appointment of Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 4802. A bill to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 4803. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce for purposes of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, the age requirement from age 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the refund of manufacturers' excise taxes paid on gasoline used exclusively for nonhighway purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4805. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4806. A bill to authorize Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of privately owned real property as well as the shores of publicly owned real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4807. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits may become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 4808. A bill to provide for transmission through the mail of keys and identification cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4809. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4810. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 4811. A bill to provide that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall convey to the State of Louisiana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (together with any improvements thereon) located in the Parish of Rapides, La.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 4812. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of Amelia Earhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4813. A bill relating to the Federal estate and gift tax treatment of bequests and gifts to certain hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4814. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit liability from being imposed upon a licensee because of defamatory statements made in a broadcast by a political candidate unless such licensee participates in such broadcast with intent to defame; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4815. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 4816. A bill to provide exemptions to taxpayers who support aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4817. A bill relating to the payment of money orders; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 4818. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4819. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4820. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4821. A bill to amend section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the definition of "nonbusiness debt"); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4822. A bill relating to the Federal estate and gift tax treatment of bequests and gifts to certain hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 4823. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which give tax preference to individuals who receive dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4824. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4825. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow who loses her widow's benefit by remarriage may again become entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 4826. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4827. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4828. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4829. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4830. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 4831. A bill to amend the Federal Employers' Liability Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4832. A bill to amend the Safety Appliance Acts to provide increased safety for employees and travelers upon railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4833. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Standards Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 4834. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 4835. A bill to provide for a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina (by request):

H. R. 4836. A bill to provide that membership in the Fascist Party of Italy shall not of itself cause forfeiture of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4837. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4838. A bill to increase the income limitations governing payment of nonservice-connected pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4839. A bill to increase the rates of compensation payable to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4840. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of deceased veterans of World War II, or of service on and after June 27, 1950, on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4841. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of certain real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the amount of income tax payable in the case of an individual 65 years of age or over who sells his home and does not acquire a new one; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4843. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4844. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4845. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special stamp commemorative of the 125th anniversary of the establishment of savings and loan associations in America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 4846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the excise tax on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively in farm tractors or farm machinery or for other agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4847. A bill to prevent discrimination against fiscal year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 4848. A bill to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 170. Resolution to declare that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to the Congress on January 24, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to disapprove proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic rubber facilities as recommended by the Rubber Disposal Commission report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 172. Resolution authorizing the creation of a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Res. 173. Resolution authorizing an investigation and study of the factors involved in the discharge of Warden Foster Asher from his position as a civil engineer draftsman by the United States Navy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 174. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to increase the pay of witnesses; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 175. Resolution favoring a reduction of armaments with a view to improving world living standards; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. UDALL: House joint memorial No. 1, 22d Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to timberland in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, House joint memorial No. 5, 22d Legislature of the State of Arizona relative to the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending the Forest Service and its employees on their golden anniversary for a job well done, both in natural-resource development and progressive citizenship; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to protect the coal industry and the economic status of the employees therein by restricting the importation of foreign residual oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4849. A bill for the relief of Carl T. Bruell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4850. A bill for the relief of Frank Thomas Race (formerly Racz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4851. A bill for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox & Fur Farm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4852. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4853. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 4854. A bill for the relief of Johanna Rampitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 4855. A bill for the relief of Giuseppi Castrogiovanni, his wife Anna Castrogiovanni, and their minor child Stefano Castrogiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4856. A bill for the relief of Chai Ho Min; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Herman Sharma and Gertrude Sharma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4858. A bill for the relief of David Dembitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Luis Fuentes (Luis Fuentes Millares); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy Kasanof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL (by request):

H. R. 4861. A bill for the relief of Sven Antonious Steffner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Argyro Apostolou Tripodis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4863. A bill for the relief of Stanley Bronuis Mazintas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 4864. A bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Spyridon V. Karavitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Viviane Lucienne Therese Felicie Renee Vennin Carter (Mrs. Billy Ray Carter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4868. A bill for the relief of Herbert Otto Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Vincent Pecoraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Antonio Colantonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Athanassios Theodore Stathopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Barsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4874. A bill for the relief of Andrea Failla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4875. A bill for the relief of Audrey Jean Youkers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

143. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of the Pope County Arkansas Soil Conservation District urging full cooperation for the planning and efforts to carry out a 5-year program of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

144. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to appropriate funds for the planning and construction of Pine Canyon and Matthews Canyon Dams; to the Committee on Appropriations.

145. Also, petition of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to enact legislation and appropriate funds for Federal aid to university students engaged in the universal military training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

146. Also, petition of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Nevada, requesting the President and the Congress to halt American aid to foreign countries which divert such aid to Russia and her satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

147. Also, petition of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to extend to the Territory of Alaska full status of a State of the United States with full representation in Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

148. Also, petition of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to extend to the Territory of Hawaii full status of a State of the United States with full representation in Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

149. Also, petition of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Nevada, requesting Congress and the Department of the Interior to give attention to the development of Lehman Caves National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

150. Also, petition of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress and Federal officers to encourage, by legislation and otherwise, the economy of the domestic mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

151. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, forestry section, Jackson, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommending that additional funds be made available to State agricultural experiment stations within the southern division for marketing research on forest products; to the Committee on Appropriations.

152. Also, petition of the president, Lithuanian American Council, Rockford, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing gratitude to the United States for its favorable attitude toward the eventual restoration of the independence of Lithuania, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

153. Also, petition of Brabenic Oldrich, Covina, Calif., relative to a drawing and description of an invention called the compound engine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Three Hundred Years of Jews in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I was privileged to make to the Jewish community of the city of Wildwood, N. J., and their friends and neighbors, on February 28, 1955, celebrating the completion of three centuries of the participation of the Jewish people in our national life:

THREE HUNDRED YEARS OF JEWS IN AMERICA

It is always an honor to be called upon to speak before a substantial congregation of your fellow citizens, because I think that the invitation must imply that you expect, or at least hope, that the speaker will have something of merit to say to you. I trust that in this instance you will not be too disappointed. In this case, however, I feel a particular sense of honor and responsibility that you should have selected a non-Jew to speak to you on an occasion which is not only essentially a Jewish one, but one which is very close to your hearts, and which in a sense is a huge family celebration. I take this to mean a recognition that you and I, with all of our differences of race and creed and background and past cultures, are nevertheless one in our viewpoint of what makes a great society and a good life; that you and I are one in our Americanism, and in our intense pride in being Americans.

I like to think too that I am honored partly because of your appreciation for the small but sincere and continuous efforts that I have made over a period of many years in behalf of the Palestine homeland, and finally in behalf of the creation of the State of Israel. It can be truly said that Israel exists as the results of the devoted work and support of the American Jewish Community, and of the consistent support of the Congress of the United States. I think we can both take great pride in our work, and have great hopes for the future of this State, which is at once both spiritually and materially of the greatest significance.

We are here tonight to celebrate the Tercentenary of Jews in America. It is surprising how few people realize that Jews have been a substantial part of our history from the very beginning. A great many people associate the incorporation of the Jews into American society as beginning after the great pogroms in Russia at about 1880, and it is true that there was a huge influx of eastern Europeans at that time, but centuries before that, your people had identified themselves with the very beginning of what was to become the United States. It is true beyond a doubt that Jewish merchants and Jewish adventurers were associated with the first voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World, assisted in the financing of those voyages, and were actually aboard. There were records of Jews in North America in 1621, which was within 1 year of the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers. About the first Jewish group to settle permanently in North America, apparently landed at New Amsterdam (now New York) in 1654, and thus you are well within historical limits in marking your 300th birthday.

You came for the same reason that the Pilgrims came; to achieve religious and political freedom. And while America, from the beginning, was heavenly in contrast with the Old World, progress toward acceptance was slow. Governor Stuyvesant was unfriendly, as indeed he was to Lutherans and "Papists" and it was 30-odd years before any measure of rights were won. Restrictions were not removed until 1785 in Virginia, 1816 in Maryland, and as late as 1868 in North Carolina. The first prayer by a rabbi was uttered in the House of Representatives on February 1, 1860. The first Jewish chaplain was appointed in the United States Army during the Civil War.

It is a strange paradox of history that some of our ancestors, who came here for their liberties, were unwilling to grant it to others who did not conform to their views. Thus Protestants were as unwelcome in Maryland as Catholics were in parts of New England.

Too many people, even now, are for freedom of speech only so long as what you say pleases them. Too few, even now, really believe with Voltaire, who said: "I disagree with all that you say, but I will fight to the end for your right to say it."

But there were giants in the land, too, and one of them was Roger Williams. The tiny province of Rhode Island, under his liberal influence, provided that "all men whatever nation soever they may be, that shall be received inhabitants of any of the towns, shall have the same privileges as Englishmen, any law to the contrary notwithstanding."

With the climate of freedom thus provided, one of the earliest settlements was Newport, R. I., where a congregation was established in 1658. It was to the Hebrew congregation there that, in 1790, George Washington wrote in part:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now, no more, that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Remember these glorious words, "The United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

The fact that you were here from our beginnings is not important, but your full participation in our development is important. It is safe to say that as high a percentage of Jews backed the movement for independence as did the English. There were only 2,000 Jews in the Colonies at the time of the Revolution. Most of them backed General Washington. At least one of them, Haym Solomon, was necessary to its success. A man of great wealth, he impoverished himself in behalf of the patriots' cause.

The pattern set by the Revolution has been followed in all our wars, the Jewish people serving their country valiantly and well.

And so, in peace, they have helped to weave the strong social fabric of America, both in the humanities and in commerce.

Abraham Duker says: "Jews pioneered in philanthropy, initiating through federations, the Community Chest movement, and introducing free loans, cooperative credit, visiting housekeepers, settlement work and visiting nurse services. Jewish workers pioneered in trade unionism, in unemployment insurance, cooperative housing, labor banking, medical care and recreational facilities for workers, with names like Samuel Gompers and Sidney Hillman among the outstanding labor leaders. Together with Jewish industrialists they often set the pattern of arbitration and peaceful settlement of disputes.

"In commerce and industry, they are best known for pioneering in the garment, motion picture and plastic industries, and for activities in the publishing field. They have been particularly active in the sciences, scholarship, and medicine. Like Americans of other faiths, Jews have also been prominent, and frequently made notable contributions, in all three branches of government."

Enemies of your race view with alarm your great influence in the fields of public opinion. But you can point with pride to their conduct. Who can say that the National Broadcasting Co., headed by David Sarnoff, or the Columbia Broadcasting Co., largely Jewish controlled, are not wholly American in their outlook? Who will argue that the Jewish-owned New York Times is not, by and large, the world's greatest newspaper, or that its columns reflect bias or prejudice?

But the activities of the Jewish people in the business world can be overemphasized. You have made preeminent contributions to your country in the world of literature, music, and the arts. Louis Untermeyer, the poet; Edna Ferber and Fannie Hurst, the novelists; David Belasco in the theater; Elman and Menuhin in music; Isadore Baline, if you please (whom all Americans love as Irving Berlin), come to mind amongst literally hundreds and thousands of others who have brought culture and pleasure to our millions.

In the field of enlightened capital, shall we mention the Kuhns, the Strausses, the Guggenheims; in the field of labor leadership, Sam Gompers, who for 40 years, was the American Federation of Labor.

And because the Jewish people have loved their country and wish to serve it, they have given us a dozen Senators, 50 or more Representatives, and other great public servants, of which Bernard Baruch, Eugene Meyer and Henry Morgenthau are but a few. Because of their love of law and order, justice and

freedom, they have given us Brandeis and Cardoza.

But I labor the point. It is even more important that the everyday lives of the families of the 5 million Jews in America can and do teach us lessons in self-reliance, in law and order, in culture and decency, and good living.

And so you have won, and deserved to win, a full measure of acceptance in this great society which is America, but you and all of us must continue to guard our inalienable rights, remembering that to secure them is the highest purpose of government; remembering too that 2,500 years ago Solon said: "That is the most perfect government under which a wrong to the humblest is an affront to all."

Again quoting the Father of his Country in his letter to Newport congregation:

"May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy."

I again thank you for the privilege of participating with you tonight on this memorable occasion and I express to you my everlasting gratitude for the good citizenship award which you have so graciously given me.

The Great Contribution of the Irish People to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of St. Patrick's Day, I deem it appropriate to speak on the great contribution of the Irish people to America.

Many people believe that there were only a few Irish in America at the time of the Revolutionary War and that no considerable portion of them arrived until around the middle of the last century. However, the facts disprove this statement. In Pennsylvania, for example, there is evidence to show that an important Irish colony came over with William Penn in 1682. Penn was well acquainted with the Irish people for he lived many years at Kansale, County Cork, as manager of his father's estate. When he first came to America he brought with him a number of Irish people from Cork and Wexford. Seventeen years later, on one of his return voyages, he brought with him a brilliant young Irishman, James Logan, of County Armagh, who later became Chief Justice of the provincial courts. In 1723 a considerable number of Irish people located in Dauphin, and in the next year Irish settlements were established west of the Susquehanna River, what is now York County. In 1728, 5,600 Irish arrived in Philadelphia.

It looks as if Ireland is to send all her inhabitants hither—

Wrote Secretary Logan in 1729—

for last week not less than 6 ships arrived. The common fear is that if they continue to come they will make themselves proprietors of the Province.

When the British Government started to suppress the American Colonists, the Irish unanimously gave their support to the Colonists for two reasons: the first was the inherent love of liberty which ever dwells in an Irishman's heart and his sympathy for all people struggling against political inequality; the other was the bitter heritage of struggle with the British Empire which heritage they brought with them to America, and which was transmitted with undiminished fervor to their descendants. It was easy to show that the power which had trampled upon the affections of their fathers and tyrannized over their rights in the Old World was aiming at the same object in the case of their children in the New. Only one generation removed from the exiled and suffering generation the sons had as lively recollections of the tyrannies of Britain as if the experience had been immediately their own.

Three native-born Irish—Smith, Taylor, and Thornton, were signers of the Declaration of Independence, as were six descendants of Irish—Carroll, McKean, Read, Lynch, Paine, and Rutledge.

Washington had a high regard for the Irish people and the records show that he had many of them as friends and associates. In 1748, when surveying land for Lord Fairfax, his journal shows that several Irishmen accompanied him—he mentioned among them Patrick Rice, Patrick Matthews, James McCormick, and Timothy McCarthy. Many of the Irish officers of the Army and Navy of the Revolution enjoyed his friendship and esteem. On March 4, 1776, he appointed Colonel Stephen Moylan his aide and private secretary. Moylan was born in County Cork and was a brother of the Catholic Bishop of that diocese. When Colonel Moylan was promoted to the command of the Fourth Pennsylvania Dragoons, Washington appointed Colonel John Fitzgerald, a native of Wicklow, as his aide. Fitzgerald's successor in the office of aide to Washington was Major James McHenry, a native of Anthrim. A later secretary to General Washington was Colonel Joseph Reed "The Incorruptible," whose parents were from Dublin. At Cambridge on March 16, 1776, Washington selected "St. Patrick" as the password and he named General John Sullivan as officer of the day. At Valley Forge on St. Patrick's Day, 1778, General Washington directed "that all the Army keep the day" and on March 16, 1780, in his general orders he directed "that all fatigue and working parties cease for tomorrow, the 17th, a day held in particular regard by the people of the Irish Nation." On December 18, 1781, Washington attended a banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia and was then "adopted a member of the society." On the same day he wrote the president of the society accepting "with singular pleasure the gold badge of membership in so worthy a fraternity as that of the Sons of St. Patrick in this city, a society distinguished for the firm adherence of its members to the glorious cause in which we are embarked."

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia contributed approximately $500,000 to the cause of the colonists and from its own members supplied the Colonial Armies with 11 generals: Stephen Moylan, Edward Hand, William Maxwell, William Thompson, Griffith Rutherford, John Patton, Anthony Wayne, Walter Stewart, Richard Butler, William Irvine, and John Shee.

One of the most brilliant generals in the Revolutionary War was Gen. Anthony Wayne, born at Waynesboro, Pa. His father and grandfather were born in Ireland. Wayne was an active member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia, and was also a member of the Hibernian Society of Philadelphia. He was commander of one of the most effective fighting arms of the Revolutionary forces known as the Pennsylvania Line. Gen. Henry Lee, afterward Governor of Virginia, in his Memoirs of the War in the Southern Department, makes the following reference to General Wayne and the Pennsylvania Line:

Wayne had a constitutional attachment to the decision of the sword and this cast of character had acquired strength from indulgence as well as from the native temper of the troops he commanded. They were by the designation of the Line of Pennsylvania whereas they might have been, with more propriety, called the Line of Ireland.

The muster roll of the Pennsylvania Line, as shown by the archives of Pennsylvania, reads like the registry of a parish in Ireland as, for instance, the muster roll of the 7th Regiment company commanded by Capt. John McDowell, shows 76 percent natives of Ireland; the company commanded by Capt. Jeremiah Talbot, 70 percent; Capt. Samuel Montgomery, 69 percent.

When Washington evacuated Long Island on August 30, 1776, he personally selected 4 regiments of the Pennsylvania Line and 1 from Maryland to cover the retreat. The Pennsylvania regiments were commanded by four native-born Irishmen: Col. John Shee—later General Shee—from Westmeath; Col. Robert Magaw from Strabane, County Tyrone; Col. Edward Hand—later adjutant general of the Continental Army—from Kings County, now Offaly; and Col. John Haslet from Dublin.

After the evacuation of Long Island, Col. Robert Magaw, with 3,000 soldiers from the Pennsylvania Line, was selected to defend Fort Washington in upper Manhattan against a force of 14,000 under the combined commands of Generals Howe and Matthew, Lord Cornwallis, and the Hessian commander, Baron von Knyphausen.

Among other Irish generals in the Revolutionary War were Gen. John Sullivan, who captured Fort William and Mary 6 months before the Battle of Lexington; Gen. Richard Montgomery, killed at the Battle of Quebec; General Warren, killed at Bunker Hill; and General Stark.

The first captain to be commissioned in the American Navy was an Irishman, John Barry; he was also the first American commander to receive the title of "Commodore."

Among the French troops sent by France to aid the American Colonies were the regiments of the famous Irish Brigade under the commands of Gen. (Count) Arthur Dillon and Colonel Walsh.

Among the members of the convention that framed the United States Constitution were four native-born Irishmen: Thomas Fitzsimons, Pennsylvania; Pierce Butler, South Carolina; Dr. James McHenry, Maryland; and William Paterson, New Jersey. Four were of Irish descent: George Reade, Delaware; Daniel Carroll, Maryland; Hugh Williamson, North Carolina; and John Rutledge, South Carolina. William Paterson was later appointed Justice of the United States Supreme Court. John Rutledge served as Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States from 1789 to 1791, was chief justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina from 1791 to 1795. In 1795 he was appointed by President Washington as the second Chief Justice of the United States, but was not confirmed by the Senate.

In St. Paul's Cemetery on the west side of Broadway from Fulton to Vesey Street, two of the most imposing monuments are erected to Irishmen. On the Fulton Street side is the tall obelisk erected to the memory of Thomas Addis Emmett, a brother of Robert Emmett; the Gaelic inscription on this monument is by Rev. John England, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Charleston, S. C., born in the city of Cork. On the Vesey Street side is a monument to the memory of Dr. William J. McNevin, one of the men of 1798, an associate of Robert Emmett. The inscription is in Latin, Gaelic, and English. Dr. McNevin, however, is not buried in St. Paul's Cemetery, but is buried in the Riker family cemetery on Long Island.

Right at the entrance of St. Paul's Church is the grave of Gen. Richard Montgomery, born in County Donegal, one of the brilliant young leaders of the Revolutionary War who was killed in the Battle of Quebec.

The equestrian statute of General Sherman at the plaza, 5th Avenue and 59th Street, is the work of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, born in Dublin, Ireland.

The first colonial Governor of New York was Thomas Dongan, a native of County Kildare. He was responsible for the charter which set up public schools, and he also proclaimed the doctrine of religious toleration. The first mayor of New York after the Revolution was James Duane, a son of Anthony Duane, of County Galway, Ireland. Duane had been a member of the Continental Congress. The first Governor of New York after the Revolution was George Clinton.

The Clinton family played a very important part in the history of New York and the United States. George Clinton and his brother James were born in Orange County. Their father came from County Longford, Ireland. George Clinton was a member of the Continental Congress; a brigadier general in the Revolutionary War; elected Governor of New York in 1777. In 1804 and in 1808 he was elected Vice President of the United States.

James Clinton served as a colonel and brigadier general in the Revolutionary War; took part in the siege of Yorktown; served in the New York Legislature and constitutional convention.

DeWitt Clinton, son of James Clinton, was born in 1769. In 1797–99 he was a member of the New York Legislature; in 1801 he was a United States Senator; in 1803 elected mayor of New York City; from 1811 to 1815 he was mayor of New York City and also lieutenant governor of New York; in 1812 he was a candidate for President of the United States against James Madison and received 89 electoral votes. From 1817 to 1828 he was Governor of New York, and died in office in 1828.

That many Irish families bear names of other than Irish origin is due to the fact that under the reigns of Henry and Edward IV many penal laws were passed by Parliament compelling the Irish families to adopt English names, or the name of a town, or a color, or an art or science. These laws were forerunner to the Austrian Empire law of 1787, and Napoleon's decree of 1808 ordering Jews to adopt surnames.

These laws of the Henrys and the Edwards resulted in Irish families adopting such names as White, Brown, and Black, Butler, Carpenter, Mason, and Taylor. They also resulted in a rough translation of the Gaelic names into English; for example, James Smith, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a native of Dublin, a descendant of a family named MacGowan. In Gaelic "Mac" means "son of" or descendant of." The prefix "O'" also means "son of," and "Gow" means smith or blacksmith. When the laws of Edward IV became effective this branch of the MacGowan family changed their name to Smith. Other changes were "McShane" meaning literally in Gaelic son of Shane, or John became Johnson or Jackson. McTiernan, literally the son of Master, became Masterson. O'Donnall became Donalson. McFergus became Ferguson. O'Cleary became Clark.

How a name is changed from English to Gaelic is illustrated by the fact that a few years ago an energetic man from Ireland, Erie O'Gowan, toured America in support of a campaign to remove the border between North Ireland and Ireland. During World War II he was a well-known brigadier general in the British Army, known as Eric Smith, and he changed the name to the Gaelic O'Gowan when he realized the injustice the border was inflicting on the Irish people.

As an example of the Irish contribution to America, we might look at the record of James Shields, born in Dungannon, County Tyrone. He was a brigadier general in the United States Army during the Mexican War; in 1848 he was appointed Governor of the Territory of Oregon; in 1849 he was United States Senator from Illinois; 1858–59 he was United States Senator from Minnesota. He was commissioned a brigadier general in the Union Army in the Civil War, was wounded at the Battle of Winchester, and finished his public career as a member of the State Legislature of Missouri from 1877 to 1879.

President Theodore Roosevelt boasted that two collateral branches of his family were Irish.

The ancestors of Presidents Buchanan, Polk, and McKinley were from County Donegal; the ancestors of President Chester A. Arthur from County Antrim, Ireland.

Andrew Jackson, the 7th President of the United States was born in the Waxhaw settlement between North and South Carolina on March 15, 1767. His parents came from Carrickfergus, County Antrim, Ireland in 1765. His father, a poor farm laborer, died before Andrew's birth. In 1780, at the age of 13 he enlisted in the Revolutionary forces under General Sumter. In 1781, he was captured by the British and experienced brutal treatment from his captors.

Jackson taught school and began the study of law at the age of 18. In 1823, he was elected to the United States Senate, and the next year was a candidate for President. He received the largest popular vote among the four candidates, though John Quincy Adams was elected by the House of Representatives through the influence of Henry Clay.

In 1828, Jackson was triumphantly elected President over John Quincy Adams after a campaign of great bitterness.

With Jackson began a new era in American politics. His was the age of "Jacksonian democracy," the rule of the people.

Former Presidents, even Jefferson, had been chosen from the more learned aristocratic class—from the "rich and well born" as Alexander Hamilton put it during the Constitutional Convention. In the early years of the Republic it was understood this favored class should take the lead in managing public affairs, while the masses were to follow and obey. With the election of Jackson the people came into their own. Himself a sturdy frontiersman who had risen from lowest poverty, "Old Hickory" was one of the plain common people, and they gave him their confidence and trust more fully than any other President. Victor in two Indian wars; hero of the battle of New Orleans. Men acclaimed Jackson for his proven courage and directness in accomplishing results; even his enemies, and he made them by the score, could not deny his honesty, sincerity of purpose, and his warm heart.

John C. Calhoun, Senator from South Carolina, one of Jackson's political opponents, was a son of Patrick Calhoun born in Ireland.

The New York World-Telegram in March 1947 had the following news item:

HONOR MRS. ROOSEVELT

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whose great grandfather, Valentine G. Hall, emigrated from Ulster, Ireland, and settled in Flatbush, will receive the honor medal of the Ulster Irish Society of New York at the organization's banquet Friday night in the Wedgewood Room of the Waldorf-Astoria, it was announced today. The medal is awarded to

Americans of Ulster ancestry for notable service rendered to the United States.

In the field of invention the Irish have given us Fulton of the steamboat, Morse of the telegraph, McCormack of the reaper and binder, and John P. Holland, inventor of the submarine.

In surgery they gave us Drs. Agnew and Murphy.

In journalism: Greely, Laffin, Grady, and S. S. McClure.

On the stage: Bouccicault, Barrett, the elder Drew, and Keane.

In poetry: Father Ryan, the poet of the South, John Boyle O'Reilly, O'Hara, and James Whitcomb Riley.

In industry: Orr and McCall of life insurance; James J. Hill, the railroad builder; A. T. Stewart; O'Day of the oil industry; Cudahy, meat packer; Mellon and Farrell of steel industry.

In music: Patrick Sarsfield Gilmore, predecessor to John Philip Sousa, Victor Herbert, and John McCormack.

In athletics: Sheridan, Ryan, McGrath and McDonald, and in baseball McGraw, Jennings, and Connie Mack.

In religion: Dr. Francis Mackenzie, founder of the Presbyterian Church; Rev. James Waddel known as "the blind preacher"; Father Mathews who preached temperance; Archbishop Ireland, Cardinal Gibbons. The first Catholic bishop in New York was a native-born Irishman, Rt. Rev. Luke Concannon.

During the Civil War President Lincoln selected the first Catholic Archbishop of New York, John Hughes, born in County Tyrone, Ireland, to visit Europe as a special envoy.

A few years ago Reader's Digest published an article entitled "Prelude to Fame," a recopy of an article previously published in the Queen's Work. It told dramatically the story of nine young Irishmen who were convicted of treason in the young Ireland uprising in 1848, and sentenced to death, which sentence was later commuted to banishment for life to Van Diemen's Land, then an English penal colony, now Tasmania. They all escaped; and later when the Queen's authorities investigated the convicts were located as follows:

Richard O'Gorman was Governor of Newfoundland.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee was a Member of Parliament from Montreal, Minister of Agriculture, and President of the Cabinet of the Dominion of Canada.

Sir Charles Gavan Duffy was Prime Minister of Victoria in 1871.

Morris Lyne was Attorney General of Australia, and was succeeded in that office by his assistant and fellow convict, Michael Ireland.

Four of the convicts came to the United States:

Patrick Donohue was a brigadier general in the Union Army during the Civil War.

Terence Bellew McManus was a brigadier general in the Union Army during the Civil War, and is known for his intense spirit of Irish nationalism.

Thomas Francis Meagher was a brigadier general in the Union Army in the Civil War, and was in command of the famous Irish Brigade made up of New York's 69th, 88th, and 63d regiments, the 28th Massachusetts, and 116th Pennsylvania Regiments. Later he was Governor of Montana.

John Mitchell was the only one of the nine convicts who did not hold public office. He was an editor and publisher, and a fearless, caustic writer. He lived in New York City after his escape from prison. In 1862 he became editor of Jefferson Davis' paper, the Richmond Enquirer; this caused a breach with his Irish friends who were all fighting on the Union side.

When the war ended, two of Mitchell's sons had been killed while soldiers in the Confederate Army; Mitchell's property in Richmond had been destroyed by fire in the siege of Richmond, and Mitchell was imprisoned in Fortress Monroe with Jefferson Davis. When he was released, he returned to New York, became reconciled with his old friends, and took an active part in the Fenian movement to free Ireland. In 1874 he returned to Ireland and was elected to the British Parliament from County Tipperary. Then ensued a vitriolic battle between Mitchell and the Prime Minister. Mitchell refused to take the oath of allegiance to Queen Victoria, and the Prime Minister insisted he could not be seated because he was an escaped convict. In the midst of the controversy Mitchell died.

His grandson, John Purroy Mitchel became the Fusion mayor of New York in 1913.

No matter how one may view the Irish contribution to America, these facts cannot be controverted. In the 48 States of the United States there are 253 counties bearing distinctive Irish names; there are 65 places beginning with "O"; there are 1,000 places beginning with "Mc"; there are 7,000 places bearing Irish names; there are 24 Dublins; 24 Waterfords; 18 Belfasts; 16 Tyrones; and 10 Limericks.

Irish blood, brain, and brawn have played a valiant part in the fabric of America, and the people of Irish descent may take a pardonable pride in the Irish contribution to the development and preservation of the American Government.

The Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, on George Washington's birthday last week, February 22, Bob Post, of Glenshaw, Pa., a constituent of mine, was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

This coveted honor was bestowed upon Mr. Post because of his achievement in producing a motion picture entitled "The Law of the Land." The picture was selected from over one hundred submitted as being distinctly effective in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life during the year 1954.

Of particular interest to us is the fact that the Congress of the United States is the "star" of Mr. Post's picture. His story is that of a proposed bill being made a law of the land. It is told in a highly dramatic style and captures all the significant highlights, the heat and heartaches, the trials and tribulations that go into making a law.

Special permission was given to Mr. Post to set up his cameras in the House of Representatives and the Senate. His cast is one that I am sure would be a Hollywood casting agent's dream. It includes our present and former Speaker, the President of the United States and the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and many individual members of the House and Senate.

The film is strictly nonpartisan and attempts only to tell the story of how we make laws with proper emphasis on democratic principles at work. It has received enthusiastic reviews from educators, civic leaders, fraternal groups and service clubs all over the Nation.

A comparative newcomer into the field of documentary motion pictures, Mr. Post conceived the idea for The Law of the Land, wrote the story and was the "spark-plug" behind the picture's production. To him and to all those who worked with him to make his achievement and award possible, I offer my most sincere congratulations.

To the Eyes and Ears of the World We Must Seem Pretty Silly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we must seem pretty silly in the eyes and ears of the world when we look upon certain incidents occurring within our own shores.

We are spending billions of dollars to stop communism all over the world, and yet permit known Communists freedom of action within our own shores.

To give an idea of such an incident, I would like to quote from a newspaper column appearing in the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune. In the column, titled "Between Us," by Siinto Wessman, there appears the following very pertinent and oh so truthful, pointed statement:

> Knut Heikkinen * * * the man convicted of being a commie-alien * * * still doing whatever commie-aliens do on a newspaper in Superior * * * the Tyomies * * * Government has tried to deport him for 4 years * * * but every time, Knut appeals * * * He's now free on $5,000 bail while court of appeals ponders his case * * *. Here we spend 15 million bucks on the Duluth airbase * * * to defend ourselves against them * * * while one of their number runs around loose in our own backyard.

I want to say that Siinto Wessman speaks the mind and the heart of many

millions of Americans who are getting pretty impatient with our silk-glove treatment of Communists within our own midst.

American Victory in Korea Twice Abandoned on Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are still many big holes in the history of America's first military defeat—in Korea, June 1950–53. But thanks to the determined inquiries of the Jenner Committee on Internal Security, the day-to-day chronicle of Dean Acheson's personal management of the war from the State Department, in Washington, has gradually been unfolded.

Our military forces had two great opportunities to win the Korean war decisively and conclusively. But on each occasion the smashing final stroke of victory was countermanded from Washington. Who ordered the victory twice to be abandoned, and why?

The most recent chapter on Acheson's "limited war" was related on November 23, 1954, by Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, retired, who had been Gen. Douglas MacArthur's chief of staff in Korea. He was asked in public session: "General, how many opportunities did our side have to win the war in Korea?"

His answer, illustrated with 13 field maps from the Korean theater, was two—first, in November 1950, following the historic Inchon envelopment of the North Korean forces; and second, in June 1951, when some 50 Chinese divisions were trapped and routed clear across the peninsula on a line extending roughly from Seoul to Kansong. At that point—2 months after Truman's sacking of General MacArthur—the whole American offensive was halted and abandoned on direct orders from Washington—hearings, page 2109.

Your answer is, then, we had two opportunities to win the war?
I think so—

General Almond responded.

General Almond's testimony comprises 78 printed pages, including 13 detailed operations maps depicting various phases of the Korean war.

We believe—

Said Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, in his opening statement—

That there have been and still are, hostile forces working tirelessly to corrupt, to misdirect, and to destroy us from within. We believe that the most skillful, and the most menacing, of these forces are engaged in trying to subvert our political and military policy.

The Senator then recalled that the committee earlier had heard Gens. Mark Clark, George Stratemeyer, and James Van Fleet.

In each instance, information was gleaned that helped clarify the still confused, partly undisclosed, story of the Korean war. In each instance, it was discovered that these great generals shared our uneasiness and had asked themselves some of the questions the American people are asking—Why? And who? And when? And how will it end?

General Almond was assigned to General MacArthur's staff in Tokyo in June, 1946, advancing to Chief of Staff in February 1949. He returned to duty in the States in July 1951, and retired in January, 1953.

From 60 percent of normal peacetime strength as of October, 1946, MacArthur's command gradually was built up to approximately 75 percent by June 1948; and by June 1950, General Walker's Eighth Army had been built up almost to full peace strength, Almond told the committee.

But peacetime organization meant a battalion of infantry with only 3 companies, instead of 4. It meant a regiment of infantry with only 2 battalions instead of 3. It meant a tank battalion with only 1 company instead of 3. It meant an artillery battalion with 1 battery instead of 3 in it. That was the condition of the Eighth Army when we were faced with throwing our troops into Korea (hearings, p. 2056).

The Communist aggression in Korea broke on June 25, 1950, just 6 months after the British Government had extended formal recognition to the Chinese Communist regime at Peiping.

From the very outset it was a confused and uncertain war.

Many things happened back here that I didn't understand, and I would hesitate to try to assign reasons for them—

General Almond told the committee.

In other words—

Questioned Senator WELKER, of Idaho—

your impression was that the State Department was calling the signals at that time?
That is correct, sir—

Replied General Almond.

On June 20, 5 days before the war began, 2 distinguished visitors had been in Tokyo from Washington. They were Secretary of Defense Johnson, and Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Did you get any impression or intelligence from those officers to the effect that trouble was brewing in Korea?—

Senator WELKER asked.

No, sir; we did not. I don't think they knew it—

General Almond responded.

General Almond was at his desk in Tokyo when first word of the Communist invasion reached him, about 2 p. m. Sunday, June 25. During the next 2 hours the whole peninsula burst into flame. Almost 200,000 North Korean aggressors swept into action in a military operation which had been skillfully planned and meticulously organized for almost 3 years. The South Korean forces were, as planned, overwhelmed and routed in 48 hours.

Two days later, June 27, the Pentagon directed Tokyo to send a reconnaissance party to Korea to determine the nature and extent of the Communist military operation. But so swift and demoralizing had been the Communist thrust from the north that this American party never reached the Seoul airport, already in Communist hands. The party was forced to put down at Suwon. On June 29, MacArthur himself joined this reconnaissance group at Suwon. Everywhere the ROK defenders were in utter rout.

At best, there were some 24,000 ROK troops available to resist the swiftly advancing column of 150,000 North Korean Communist troops. Back in Tokyo that night General MacArthur began a series of two-way ticker conferences with the Pentagon.

It was during that period, just before and during this trip to Korea—

General Almond continued—

that it became known to us, much to our surprise, I will say, and much to General MacArthur's surprise, that this country was going to participate in armed action in Korea. None of our plans had included this.

This was the beginning of the Truman-Acheson "police action," which was to cost 143,000 American casualties and $20 billions, during the coming 3 years.

The first directive from the Pentagon suggested that MacArthur send a regiment of infantry to Pusan to protect the supply base there. Later MacArthur was directed by the Pentagon ticker to use whatever forces he deemed necessary to protect the supply lines through Pusan.

That terminated the telecon, and General MacArthur immediately ordered 3 divisions under General Walker, the bulk of the Eighth Army, to Korea; because he knew the situation was so bad that nothing short of a fundamentally sound military movement would salvage it. I don't think you have to have me testify that even that wasn't enough for the next 3 months. The immediate action that was taken was barely enough to drag along, so that General Walker could maintain the semblance of a continuous line in defense of Pusan, called the Pusan perimeter (hearings, p. 2062).

That is how Truman and Acheson pushed the United States into the Korean war—unprepared, underequipped, still at less than full peacetime strength, and into a campaign which never had been considered even as a theoretical possibility by the staff headquarters in Tokyo. Korea was not in the Far Eastern Command's defensive area. Congress was not consulted on the decision for war.

At this point, General Almond told the committee:

Our lines held, in spite of the restrictions and limitations imposed by our own Government, and our casualty lists were enormous (hearings, p. 2063).

From this tenuous beginning, however, General MacArthur was able at length to fashion victory. The historic Inchon landing was planned and executed in 23 days, and was effected on September 15, 1950. In another 60 days our United States forces were up to the Yalu River.

But Formosa had been neutralized by Truman late in June, thus releasing all the Communist Chinese coastal forces

to be concentrated in the north, in defense of Manchuria. As General MacArthur himself asserted:

Actually it was this protection which permitted the transfer of the very Communist armies assigned to the coastal defense of central China, for the attack upon our forces in Korea (hearings, p. 2069).

President Eisenhower revoked this neutralization of Formosa by our 7th Fleet late in January 1953, an act applauded publicly by MacArthur as one which "should be supported by all loyal Americans irrespective of party." The Korean armistice followed in 6 months.

But as soon as MacArthur hit the Yalu, in November 1950, the question of bombing the Yalu bridges developed. Specific orders from Washington sharply forbade this interruption of the Communist lines of supply and retreat—hearings, page 2068.

Similarly, the question of "hot pursuit" by American fighter planes was resolved by Washington in favor of the Communist forces sheltered in Manchuria.

So, too, was the issue of bombing the Manchurian bases resolved in Washington in favor of the Communist position. Of this situation, General Stratemeyer, commander of the United States Air Forces in the Far East, complained:

The enemy can hit me where I am based. I cannot hit him.

Precisely at this point the first victory in Korea was abandoned and forfeited on specific orders from Washington.

General Almond was asked at this juncture of his recital if he ever had heard of any commitments made in Washington not to win the Korean war.

His response:

Senator, I have no way of knowing what commitments were made. I can only answer that the things as they happened looked very strange insofar as the assurance with which the enemy appeared to operate. I think it would have been a very hazardous thing for the Chinese to enter North Korea in the abundant numbers in which they did, if they had thought that their bases of rice or ammunition, or any other kind of base, would be subject to attack.

That's the whole story of the first Korean victory abandoned by Washington. The Chinese Communists, somehow, had obtained complete assurances that they would not be bombed in Manchuria.

In November 1950 the Chinese Communists entered from their sheltered north to drive the Eighth Army and General Almond's X Corps back to Seoul. For the American forces, the brilliant and smashing Inchon victory of late September had been turned, in less than 3 months, into a tragic Dunkirk at Hungnam.

In this first Chinese attack from the protected north our Eighth Army was outnumbered 20 to 1—hearings, page 2072. But still MacArthur was not permitted to bomb the Communist bases in Manchuria. History one day will tell us who in Washington ordered this brilliant military victory at Inchon turned into shocking and humiliating defeat.

The second great victory for our United States forces in Korea came in May and June 1951. General MacArthur had been removed from his command by President Truman on April 11.

The Chinese Communists sent in a massive offensive on April 22, 1951. These forces comprised 38 Communist divisions, of which 24 were destroyed, and the Chinese withdrew on April 30.

But on May 16 the Chinese Communists returned to the attack with 175,000 new troops, principally against the United States 2d Infantry Division of approximately 20,000 men. This operation lasted 6 days and nights, during which General Almond's X Corps of 7 divisions suffered 14,000 casualties, and was driven back at some points almost 100 miles.

Nevertheless, on May 22, Almond launched his counterattack, slashing through the enemy at every point of contact, "and in the next 2 or 3 days this complete enemy force reversed itself and started hiking for the rear," General Almond continued.

They lost every piece of transportation that they had in this area. * * * With the result, by the 1st of June we had regained much of this territory that we had lost in December-January 1950–51, and some more besides.

About this time—I will say, between the 1st of June and the 1st of July, when we were adjusting this new line—a thing happened to me that I have never experienced before. By private conversation with my commander, the Eighth Army Commander, General Van Fleet, I was told to halt my troops on that line and advance no further. * * * In other words, it was decided somewhere above General Van Fleet's head—and where, I do not know—I complied with the orders—that when we had defeated this huge force * * * the cream of their army * * * I think we were entitled to capitalize on it * * * the mission of any battlefield commander is to win in the field, and not be denied a victory for his forces—hearings, page 2074.

Dean Acheson testified before the MacArthur hearings, in early June 1951 that the 38th parallel limited the official area of United States operations in Korea.

General Almond was asked:

When were you informed that the 38th parallel would constitute victory?

He replied:

I was never informed of that fact or decision. I was only informed that my troops, which I considered victorious, and which were prepared to destroy the enemy—that could have been easily done; the only knowledge I had of that statement by Mr. Acheson is the fact that we were ordered not to advance further.

This, then, was the second specific occasion on which the State Department ordered the American Forces in Korea not to win the war.

And, of course, they never did.

Acheson's policy—never to crush the Communist forces—prevailed to the very opening of the cease-fire talks.

When the Chinese Communist forces first were spotted in massive formations in Manchuria, in November 1950, President Truman met in emergency session with the National Security Council, in Washington. After the session he issued a public statement, November 16, declaring in part "that we have never at any time entertained any intention of carrying hostilities into China."

That was all the Communists needed. Seven days later, on November 24, the first Chinese units appeared in North Korea in organized massive offensive operations. And when these new forces finally were destroyed the following June, Washington summarily ordered the American counterattack halted in its tracks.

Mr. Acheson's war was America's first military defeat—not because our forces were wanting in valor, courage, or sacrifice—but only because it was a war rigged against victory from the very outset.

As soon as MacArthur's forces got close to winning it—"in spite of the restrictions and limitations imposed by our own Government"—MacArthur was summarily sacked.

And when MacArthur finally was busted, the New York Daily Worker heralded the news in screaming headlines of Communist triumph.

"Good riddance" roared the Daily Worker headline, in 72-point blackface.

The Owen Lattimore plan of 1947, to deliver China to communism, was now a fait accompli.

Hello Uncle Sucker: American Shipyards Close and Lose $1.8 Billion—Foreign Shipyards Boom and Take in $1.2 Billion From Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, of the 1,347 merchant vessels under construction today in the world's shipyards, being paid for by Uncle Sucker, only 14 of these vessels are being built in the United States of America. In 1954, United States ships carried only 29 percent of our own Nation's foreign trade.

Vessels aggregating 3,884,749 gross and 6,054,831 deadweight tons have been ordered in foreign yards by American interests during the postwar period. If placed in American yards these vessels would have cost $1.8 billion. Their cost abroad is approximately $1.2 billion. Here then is the wholesale flight of American capital—which has made the difference between a sound shipbuilding establishment in the United States and one that has been reduced to a state of emergency. The answer—lower shipbuilding costs.

However, there is no reason to blame the shipowner. Sound business practice dictates his orders. He needed ships. He could get them built in foreign yards for 33 to 45 percent less than it would cost in this country. Some had funds tied up in foreign currency which were not convertible to dollars. It was the only way to get their money out.

The high cost of American-built tonnage is keyed to higher wages enjoyed by this country's labor force. Certainly the solution to making our shipyards more competitive is not to lower our standard

of living. The only alternatives are greater efficiency and Government aid.

Our shipyards have been operating on an austerity basis for some time, and a minimum of man-hours and a maximum of efficiency go into each ship. Therefore, Government help is necessary to keep some of this work in our own shipyards.

It would have cost the Government approximately $67 million a year to have held this business for United States shipyards. However, the Government would have received back in taxes at least $50 million each year.

The cost to the American economy is greater. The shipyards alone would have had to employ 17,000 more workers. An equal number would have been employed in supporting industries throughout the country. What it will cost in an emergency cannot be calculated.

At last report with the small backlog of orders on hand, our yards had dropped to 12th place in world shipbuilding.

An exclusive survey just concluded by Marine Engineering shows that shipbuilding contracts placed abroad by United States and affiliated interests in the postwar years now total 302 vessels of 3,884,749 gross tons, 6,054,831 deadweight tons, equipped with propulsion machinery aggregating 2,691,165 horsepower.

The contract value of this work if it had been placed with United States shipyards is estimated at $1.8 billion. It is estimated that the cost of these 302 vessels built by shipyards in Europe and Japan will total about $1.2 billion.

This great volume of new shipbuilding business placed abroad by American and affiliated interests had its beginnings in 1949. It far exceeds the total business contracted for with United States shipyards in the postwar years. During the past 8 years, beginning January 1947 and running through 1954, American shipyards completed 247 major-sized vessels of 4,642,000 deadweight tons for Government and private shipping interests. This is one-third less than the total tonnage ordered abroad in the past 6 years by these same private shipping interests.

This very definite and disturbing trend toward buying abroad, with its attendant neglect of the United States shipbuilding industry, is entirely a postwar development. In the 20 years between the two great wars very few vessels had been ordered from foreign shipyards by American interests. These were principally a few fruit carriers constructed for subsidiaries of the United Fruit Co. However, this trend has been developing very rapidly in recent years as will be noted from the following tabulation which shows the accumulated total of orders placed with foreign shipyards at various dates of exclusive surveys conducted by Marine Engineering.

Date of survey	Number of vessels	Deadweight tons
September 1950	32	559,900
June 1951	100	1,630,310
February 1952	178	3,313,970
September 1953	261	5,273,034
March 1955	302	6,054,831

It will be noted that the rate of increase in the total of these orders has slowed somewhat in the past 18 months as compared with the period represented by the other surveys. Part of this is due to the cancellation of some few orders during the past 2 years, and to the considerable contraction in ocean commerce and activity experienced since the end of the Korean war. During the past 6 months, however, there has been a very definite revival in the ordering of new ships in the principal maritime nations of the world. American interests have participated in this and ordered some especially large vessels from Japanese and European shipyards.

If only one-half of these 302 orders had been placed in the United States, the shipbuilding industry would be in a flourishing condition. Instead it has reached a point where shipyard employment is now at a postwar low. However, due to remedial measures passed by the last Congress the prospects ahead for the United States shipbuilding industry have brightened considerably. This has been brought about by cooperative efforts on the part of the Maritime Administration, the Shipbuilders Council of America, and the trade associations of the American shipowners.

This loss of business by American shipbuilding establishments to foreign competitors has meant not only a reduction in employment at the yards, but contraction for the very many affiliated industries in the 48 States which supply materials and parts for the building of ships. The United States Government and State governments also have been big losers through reduced income taxes from individuals and smaller corporation taxes.

The shipyards of the world now have orders on hand for the construction of 1,300 seagoing vessels of about 16,500,000 deadweight tons. A large percentage of this huge deadweight tonnage is for American interests as, of the over 6 million tons ordered from foreign shipyards, well over 50 percent remains to be constructed. Many of these vessels ordered abroad by American interests will not be completed until the end of 1956, and some few in 1957.

During the postwar years the shipbuilding industry of most maritime nations has experienced an almost constantly expanding volume of business, except for the last 2 years. The American orders placed abroad have been a major contribution to this condition and in effect has been a major source of export business for these nations. While the vessels cannot be classed as imports into the United States, the business does represent tremendous purchases from foreign interests, and in many cases is paid for in American dollars. To import these vessels into the United States and register them here would hardly be practical in view of the high duty that would have to be paid.

WHY ORDERS ARE PLACED ABROAD

All of these vessels ordered abroad will fly foreign flags upon completion. Most will be registered in Liberia and Panama. A liberal number, however, will be documented in Honduras, Great Britain, Holland, France, Norway, Italy, and Germany. This will enable the owners to employ foreign crews at greatly reduced rates over those paid to American seamen. A number of these vessels will never come to the United States as they will be utilized by foreign subsidiaries of American interests trading to the countries in which they are registered. However, many will be employed in the foreign trade of the United States and will fly the flags of Panama and Liberia. These vessels, of course, cannot be used in the coastwise and intercoastal trade of the United States as these routes are restricted by law to American built and registered ships.

This postwar trend of ordering new ships from foreign shipyards will continue and additional contracts will be placed this year and for the next few years if world conditions warrant. The principal reason for this is, of course, the cost factor. The higher cost of labor and materials in the United States makes it practically impossible for American shipbuilders to compete in the world shipbuilding market.

Another major reason for ordering tonnage abroad is blocked currency owned by American oil companies in foreign countries. This has been principally in the sterling areas. In return for the privilege of marketing their products in these sterling and other areas, American oil companies have been forced into agreements to accept payment in sterling, and so forth, without conversion privileges. As a result, considerable balances, through profits, have been built up abroad. The most practical method to retrieve these profits is to invest in goods produced in the foreign areas involved, and take them out upon completion. Therefore, American oil companies with profits on hand in foreign countries have ordered a large number of oil tankers, oilfield equipment and other materials required in the conduct of their business. Under these conditions United States shipyards are practically eliminated from bidding on the construction of any of these new tankers.

Among the American oil companies affected by the blocked currency condition are the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Tide Water Associated Oil Co., The Texas Co., and the Caltex group. The latter is a combination composed of the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co.

While a considerable number of tankers have been ordered abroad by this American oil company group because of blocked currency, the total represents only a small percentage of the grand total of tankers and other types of vessels contracted for with foreign shipbuilders by American interests, mainly because of the cost factor. Some of the tanker orders placed abroad, however, have been contracted for by subsidiaries of American oil companies established principally in Great Britain, Italy, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Norway, and Denmark, and will be used by these subsidiaries to import oil into these particular countries where their products are marketed. A brief study of the companies listed in table 1 will reveal,

through similarity of names, the foreign affiliates of American companies established for marketing or tanker operating. A number of oil refineries have been built in many of these countries since the end of the war by American oil companies.

Many of the 217 tankers listed in table 1 have been ordered abroad, chiefly because of the cost factor, by other than oil companies. Included in this grouping are the National Bulk Carriers, Tidewater Commercial Co. of Baltimore, Hillcone Steamship Co. of San Francisco, Naess Shipping Co. of New York. Also, large investment groups composed in many cases of Greek-American backed by American bankers and insurance companies. Several of the largest banking institutions in the United States, among them the National City Bank and the Chase National Bank, have loaned money for the building of tankers, as have, also, insurance companies like the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. These vessels when completed are long-term chartered to oil companies for periods ranging up to 15 years. Among the Greek-American groups ordering tankers abroad are the Orion Shipping & Trading Co., J. M. Carras, Inc., Olympic Oil Lines, Onassis, North American Shipping & Trading Co., Niarchos, Atlantic Oil Lines, Livanos, and many smaller organizations.

The oil companies, both here and abroad, have for a long period encouraged the construction of tankers by independent investment groups, as by so doing the oil people are able to retain their capital for the development of oil properties and the marketing of oil. In many cases the investment group orders the size and type of vessel needed by the interested oil company, complying with their established construction practices and specifications.

A principal factor contributing to this postwar development of ordering new vessels built abroad is the vast increase in the amount of imports required by the United States since the end of the war. While the importation of all types of basic materials has experienced great increases compared with pre-war figures, the big volume has been in iron ore, bauxite ore, gypsum, and oil, and this movement will continue.

For the transportation of this type of bulk cargo there is no necessity to operate ships under the American flag with attendant higher operating costs. Therefore, lacking the proper ships to move these bulk cargoes, American interests have gone abroad to secure most of the tonnage needed, mainly because of the difference in production cost between United States and foreign shipyards.

The types of cargoes moved has led to an ever-increasing size of vessel, and this has proven economically feasible because of the long hauls involved and the constantly spiraling cost of shipboard labor, upkeep, and maintenance. Along with this has come in the postwar years a new trend toward increased speed of ships. Accordingly, where one new 30,000- to 45,000-ton tanker now is displacing 2 and 3 smaller ones this same vessel with the sea speeds now being adopted is making almost twice the number of yearly voyages her counterpart of prewar days accomplished.

Before the war the number of large bulk iron-ore carriers in existence for ocean transportation was negligible. This situation is fast changing in the postwar years due to the development of new ore fields and the approaching exhaustion of American mines. This has necessitated the construction of big bulk carriers especially designed for long-haul runs.

The major steel producers, such as United States Steel Corp., Bethlehem Steel Co., Republic Steel Co., and the Inland Steel Co., have developed these new foreign iron-ore sources to serve the new and expanded steelmaking capacity created in recent years. None of these companies desire to engage in the transportation business, preferring to retain their capital for the development of steel mills and ore mines. Therefore, contracts have been made with shipping companies to move the ore into the United States.

Ships had to be built for this service and, based on costs, the business went to foreign shipbuilders. A number of iron-ore carriers already have been completed in foreign shipyards for American interests, ranging in size from 24,000 to 62,000 deadweight tons each. Bids currently are being solicited in Europe and Japan for the construction of additional ore carriers. Combination vessels also are being built which alternately can carry oil or iron ore and thus be in a position to participate in whichever trade offers the best freight rates.

Ore is being moved in new bulk-ore carriers by the States Marine Corp. from Liberian ore fields to Baltimore, where it is transshipped to railroad cars traveling inland to Republic Steel Co. mills. Considerable ore now is being taken from the Venezuelan mines of the United States Steel Corp. and the Bethlehem Steel Co. The National Bulk Carriers and the Joshua Hendy Corp., with new ships, are bringing the United States Steel ore into Mobile and the new Fairless Works at Philadelphia. The Bethlehem Steel Co. is moving its Venezuelan ore into Baltimore with its existing vessels.

The new Labrador ore fields being developed by a United States-Canadian combination headed by the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, now is beginning to produce. Ore has been moved down the St. Lawrence River from the Labrador fields by the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. with new vessels. Also, the M. A. Hanna Co. has ordered two 30,000-ton bulk-ore carriers from British shipyards to participate in this ore movement. Ore soon will be mined in new fields in Peru by the Utah Construction Co. and moved to the United States in big bulk carriers being built in Japan for an affiliate, Associated Ocean Freight Services of San Francisco.

TYPES OF VESSELS ORDERED ABROAD

The increase in the total of orders placed abroad since our last report has been mainly in the tanker and bulk-carrier categories. It will be noted from table 2 that five-sixths of the total deadweight tonnage ordered is of the oil-tanker type, these accounting for 217 vessels of 5,100,828 tons. Large bulk-ore and bauxite carriers total 27 of 615,450 tons, while dry cargo and refrigerated cargo ships add up to 43 of 321,673 tons. The very large majority of these 302 vessels ordered from shipyards in foreign countries are of the large transoceanic type.

From table 3 it will be observed that almost 30 percent of the total deadweight tonnage has been ordered from shipyards in Scotland and England, totaling 102 vessels of 1,698,152 tons. Japanese shipbuilding establishments secured the second largest percentage of the deadweight tonnage ordered, this representing 47 vessels of 1,331,249 tons. German plants are running a close third with 64 vessels of 1,238,368 tons.

While these three nations secured between them more than two-thirds of these particular vessel orders and almost 70 percent of the tonnage, totaling 213 vessels of 4,267,769 tons, the balance spread around among shipyards in other nations amounted to 89 vessels of 1,787,062 tons. This went to yards in France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, and Canada.

Low building costs has been the principal reason for attracting so much of this new construction to shipyards in Germany and Japan. In 1954 contracts were reported placed in Japan for the building of some of the tankers included in table 1 at costs ranging between $105 and $130 a deadweight ton. Japanese yards were aided to some extent by indirect Government subsidies and by building contracts directly linked to the importation of sugar. Dutch and German yards currently are reputed to have the lowest building costs in Europe, and this has attracted much of the building for American interests. Italian yards, although aided by direct Government subsidies, have not been successful in securing the orders.

Largest of the vessels ordered abroad by American interests are the three bulk-ore carriers built at the Kure Shipyard, Japan, for the National Bulk Carriers. Two of these were finished in 1954 and the third in January 1955. These vessels have been registered in Liberia under the ownership of a National Bulk subsidiary, the Universe Tankships, Inc. Each is 794 feet long overall, 116-foot beam, 56-foot depth, twin screws, propelled by geared turbines of 16,500 shaft horsepower. These are the largest cargo vessels in the world.

Also completed at the Kure Shipyard for the National Bulk Carriers last year was the 47,000-deadweight-ton tankship *Phoenix*.

The largest oil tankers owned by any oil company in the world were ordered in January of this year by the Tide Water Associated Oil Co., western division, from two French shipyards. These vessels will be of 48,000 deadweight tons, and two each will be constructed by Chantiers de Penhoet, and Ateliers and Chantiers de France.

Four 39,000-ton tankships have been ordered in Japan by Orion Shipping & Trading Co. Two will be constructed by Harima Shipbuilding & Engineer-

ing Co., and two by Mitsubishi-Yokohama.

Among the many tankers being built abroad for the Afran Transport Co., affiliate of the Gulf Oil Corp., are two 37,000-ton vessels ordered from the Netherlands Dock & Shipbuilding Co., and one 36,800-ton ship now nearing the launching stage at Chantier de Penhoet, France. Two 47,000-ton tankers are underway at Vickers-Armstrongs, England, for the World Tankers Corp., and one 38,500-ton vessel at Howaldtswerke Hamburg A. G., Germany.

These are but a few of the very many outstanding vessels which have been completed or are on order in foreign shipyards of the world for the account of American or affiliated interests. Many slightly smaller vessels of 30,000 to 32,000 tons have been finished or are now underway together with an even greater number ranging in size between 20,000 and 30,000 tons.

TABLE 1.—*Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years*

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length BP	Gross tons	Dead-weight tons	Horse-power	Drive	Knots	Year of delivery
BULK ORE									
			Ft. In.						
Carl Schmedman—Tropical S. S. Co. (Reynolds Metals Co.).	Vickers Armstrong—England	British	504	10,839	15,500	7,000	Turbine	15	1952
Bomi Hills—States Marine Corp	Fairfield S. B. Co.—England	Norway	613 1	17,318	22,400	8,500	Diesel	14¾	1952
Enduro—States Marine Corp	do	do	613 1	17,318	22,400	8,500	do	14¾	1953
Chateaugay—States Marine Corp	do	do	613 1	18,232	22,400	8,500	do	14¾	1954
Mosie Bay—States Marine Corp	do	do	613 1	18,232	22,400	8,500	do	14¾	1955
Not completed (2) States Marine Corp	do	do	613 1	18,200	22,400	8,500	do	14¾	
Pathfinder—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.).	Hawthorn, Leslie—England	Panama	447	5,466	7,500	3,400	do	12	1950
Prospector—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.).	do	do	447	5,466	7,500	3,400	do	12	1950
Dispatcher—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.).	Burntisland S. B.—England	do	425	6,650	8,000	3,300	Turbine	12	1954
Discoverer—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.).	Burntisland S. S.—England	do	425	6,650	8,000	3,300	do	12	1954
Not completed—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.).	Ommell Laird—England	British	650	21,300	31,000	7,700	do	12	
Do	Lindholmens—Sweden	do	601	18,500	26,000	8,000	Diesel	12	
Wanderer—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.).	do	Panama	425	6,715	8,000	4,150	do	12½	1953
Wayfarer—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.).	do	do	425	6,715	8,000	4,150	do	12½	1954
Not completed (2)—National Gypsum Co	Nordseewerke—Germany		500	10,000	15,000	4,500	do	12	
Not completed—U. S. Gypsum Corp	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Panama	425	8,000	10,600	3,000	Turbine	12	
Cerro Bolivar—Joshua Hendy Corp	Eriksbergs—Sweden		549	12,000	19,000	7,500	Diesel	15¼	1955
Sunbrayton—Saguenay Terminals (Alcoa)	Burntisland—England	Canada	427 3	6,650	7,850	4,000	Reciprocating	12	1954
Not completed—Utah Construction Co	Nippon Steel Tube—Japan		625	11,300	31,400	13,000	Turbine	16	
Ore Chief—National Bulk Carriers	Kure Shipyard—Japan	Liberia	756	20,910	62,000	16,500	do	15	1954
Ore Transport—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	756	21,690	62,000	16,500	do	15	1954
Ore Titan—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	756	21,690	62,000	16,500	do	15	1955
Sunrip—Saguenay Terminals (Aluminum Co.).	Davie Shipb., Ltd.—Canada	British	450	8,000	12,700	5,000	do	13½	1954
Not completed—M. A. Hanna Co	Furness S. B. Co.—England		630	22,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955
Do	Swan, Hunter & W. Richardson—England.		630	22,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	
REFRIGERATED									
Almirante—United Fruit Company	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	Honduras	343 3	3,677	3,430	3,920	Diesel	15	1954
Aragon—United Fruit Company	do	do	343 3	3,677	3,430	3,920	do	15	1954
Atenas—United Fruit Company	do	do	343 3	3,677	3,430	3,920	do	15	1955
Not completed (3)—United Fruit Co	Cammell Laird & Co.—England	do	426	6,500	5,500	9,000	Turbine	17	
CARGO									
Leon—United Fruit Co	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	Honduras	315	2,765	2,900	2,800	Diesel	12½	1952
Lempa—United Fruit Co	do	do	315	2,765	2,900	2,800	do	12½	1952
Simoa—Global Transport (States Marine Corp.).	Fairfield S. B. Co.—England	Norway	461	9,516	12,500	7,000	Turbine	16	1953
Sjoa—Global Transport (States Marine Corp.)	do	do	461	9,506	12,500	7,000	do	16	1954
Sira—Golbal Transport (States Marine Corp.)	do	do	461	9,538	12,500	7,000	do	16	1953
South African Merchant—Global Transport States Marine Corp.	do	do	461	9,506	12,500	7,000	do	16	1955
El Cafetero—Gulf & Atlantic Shipping Co	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Panama	349	2,743	4,320	3,500	Diesel	14	1952
Sakura—Nortuna Shipping Co	Yokohama S. & E.—Japan	Liberia	442 11	5,976	8,873	7,000	do	16	1950
Eugenia—Monrovia Shipping Co	Wm. Gray & Co.—England	do	438	7,404	10,000	3,000	Recip. turbine	11½	1952
Aliki Livanos—Monrovia Shipping Co	do	do	438	7,404	10,000	3,000	do	11½	1953
George—A. G. Pappadakis	Wm. Denny & Bros.—England	do	475 5	7,200	10,500	7,000	Turbine	16	1953
Not completed (2) P. D. Marchessini	A. G. Weser—Germany		475	7,300	10,600	7,500	do	16½	
Not completed (2) St. S. Niarchos, N. Y	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany			8,000	12,500	5,400	Diesel	15	
Not completed—West Africa S. S. Co	Bartram & Sons—England	Liberia	445	6,100	10,750	5,500	do	15	1956
Baie Comeau—Quebec-Ontario Trans. Co	Atlantic S. B. Co.—England	Canada	252 3	2,260	3,000	1,220	do	10	1954
Not completed—Quebec-Ontario Trans. Co	do	do	252 3	2,260	3,000	1,220	do	10	1955
Not completed—Canadian Gulf Line	Uddevallavarvet—Sweden		330	3,800	5,400	5,600	do	16	1955
Anna C—West African S. S. Co	Bartram & Sons—England	Liberia	445	6,100	10,800	4,800	do	15	1954
Not completed (3)—Consolidated S. S. Corp	Hitachi S. B.—Japan		262 5	1,500	2,000	2,900	do	15	
Not completed—Comp. Nav. Valiente S. A	do		475 8	7,000	12,000	6,600	Turbine	15	
Not completed (2)—Fianza Comp. Nav. S. A	do		475 8	7,100	12,000	6,250	Diesel	15	
Not completed—Parana Comp. de Vapores, S. A.	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany		470	6,400	11,100	6,300	do	15	
Pindar—Parana de Vapores	Short Bros.—England	Panama	450	6,129	10,200	5,550	do	14	1954
Aghios Nicolaos—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	W. Doxford & Sons—England	do	450	6,590	11,000	5,000	do	14	1954
Aghia Marina—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	do	do	450	6,590	11,000	5,000	do	14	1954
Atlantic Countess—St. S. Livanos	W. Gray & Co.—England	Liberia	475	8,000	12,500	6,000	Turbine	14	1954
Daphne—Cia Arm. Transoceanic	do	Panama	450	6,000	9,000	4,000	Diesel	14	1954
Nymphe—Cia Arm. Transoceanic	Furness, S. B. Co.—England	do	450	6,000	9,000	4,000	do	14	1954
TUGBOAT									
Sandy—United Fruit Co	Elsflether—Germany	Ecuador	75	100	100	600	Diesel	10	1954
WORKBOATS									
Not named (4)—Arabian American Oil Co	Haarlemsche S. B.—Holland	Liberia	61	60	110	240	Diesel	10	1954

TABLE 1.—*Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years*—Continued

TANKERS

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length BP	Gross tons	Dead-weight tons	Horse-power	Drive	Knots	Year of de-livery
			Ft. In.						
Maritime Leader—Maritime Transportation Co.	Jn. Cockerill—Belgium	Panama	548 6	12,064	18,519	8,000	Turbine	16	1953
Maritime Trader—Maritime Transportation Co.	do	do	548 6	12,064	18,519	8,000	do	16	1953
North America—The Texas Co. (Norway)	Kockums—Sweden	Norway	581 8	15,925	23,925	8,500	Diesel	14	1952
Brasil—The Texas Co. (Norway)	do	do	513 3	10,546	15,625	6,800	do	14½	1952
Not completed—The Texas Co. (Norway)	Deutsche Werft—Germany	do	540	12,000	18,300	9,500	do	16	1955
Britannia—The Texas Co. (Norway)	do	do	540	12,000	18,300	9,500	do	16	1954
South America—The Texas Co. (Norway)	do	do	540	12,000	18,300	9,500	do	16	1954
Not completed (2)—The Texas Co	do	Panama	595	18,000	28,000	13,750	Turbine	17	1955
Not competed—The Texas Co	Frammaes Mek Verkstad—Norway	Norway	520	10,000	15,750	7,000	Diesel	14½	1956
Not completed—Oriental Trade & Trans. (Std.-Vac. Oil).	At. & Ch. de la Seine Mar.—France	British	406	7,300	11,000	3,660	do	12	1956
Royal Arrow—Sovosco Transp. Co	Netherlands Dock—Holland	do	630	20,413	31,000	15,000	Turbine	16	1954
Sylvan Arrow—Sovosco Trans. Co	do	do	630	20,413	31,000	15,000	do	16	1955
Aramis—Soc. Mazout Transports (Socony-Vacuum).	Chantier de Penhoet—France	France	600	18,200	27,400	13,750	do	17	1953
Seahawk—Seabird Tankers, Inc	Mitsui S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	Panama	539 8	12,200	19,000	8,000	Diesel	15	1953
Porthos—Soc. Mazout Transports	Chantier de France—France	France	600	16,000	27,000	13,750	Turbine	16½	1954
Thermidor—Soc. Mazout Transports	Odense Skibs—Denmark	do	539	11,000	18,000	8,000	Diesel	15	1954
Not completed—Deutsche Vacuum Oel	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	German	500	10,000	16,500	7,000	do	14½	1955
Vacuum Pioneer—Vacuum Oil Co	Grangemouth Dock—England	British	245	1,300	2,000	2,000	Reciprocating	11½	1953
Magwa—Afran Transport Co. (Gulf Oil Corp.).	Furness S. B. Co.—England	Liberia	600	15,813	24,600	6,800	Diesel	14	1951
Suhail—Afran Transport Co. (Gulf Oil Corp.)	do	do	600	15,813	24,600	6,800	do	14	1952
Melika—Afran Transport Co	do	do	630	20,550	32,000	13,750	Turbine	16	1954
Not completed—Afran Transport Co	do	do	630	20,550	32,000	13,750	do	16	
Persian Gulf—Afran Transport Co	Chantier de Penhoet—France	do	631	20,390	31,461	15,000	do	16	1954
Not completed—Afran Transport Co	do	do	660	24,800	36,800	16,250	do	16	1955
Not completed (2)—Afran Transport Co	Netherlands Dock—Holland	do	660	23,000	37,000	13,750	do	15	
Do	do	do	630	20,000	31,000	13,750	do	16	
Not completed—Gulf Oil (Netherlands)	Terneuzensche S. B.—Holland	Holland	181 1	220	450	250	Diesel	10	1955
Cabimes—Afran Transport Co	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Liberia	630 11	22,000	32,000	13,750	Turbine	16	1955
Lagunillas—Afran Transport Co	do	do	630 11	22,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955
Not completed (2)—Tide Water Associated Oil Co.	Mitsubishi S. B. & E.—Japan		698 10	27,400	45,000	16,000	do	16	1956
Do	Chantier de Penhoet—France		698 10	27,400	48,000	16,000	do	16	1956
Do	At. & Ch. de France—France		698 10	27,400	48,000	16,000	do	16	1956
Monagas—Afran Transport Co	A. G. Weser—Germany	Venezuela	446	8,000	12,750	6,000	Reciprocating	15	1954
Andros Venture—Andros Shipping Co	Davie S. B. & R. Co.—Canada	Canada	595	17,845	28,070	13,750	Turbine	17	1953
Andros Fortune—Andros Shipping Co	do	do	595	17,845	28,070	13,750	do	17	1954
Esso Margarita—Comp. de Petroleo Lago	Rotterdam D. D. Co.—Holland	Panama	406	7,434	10,905	4,000	Reciprocating	14	1954
Esso France—Esso Std. Francaise	At. & Ch. de la Loire—France	France	666	25,000	37,350	17,000	Turbine	17	1955
Not completed—Panama Transport Co	do	Panama	660	25,000	35,550	16,500	do	16	
Do	dell Adriatico—Italy	do	660	25,000	35,550	16,500	do	16	
Esso Antwerp—Esso Standard Co	Cockerill Yard—Belgium	Belgium	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
Esso La Guaira—Comp. de Petroleo Lago	Giessen & Zonen—Holland	Panama	406	7,434	10,905	4,000	Reciprocating	14	1954
Esso La Caroubier—Esso Std. Francaise	van der Werf—Holland	France	280	1,800	2,730	2,000	Diesel	10½	1952
Not completed—Esso Nederland, N. V	Giessen & Zonen—Holland	Holland	601	17,000	26,650	13,750	Turbine	16	
Esso Liguria—Esso La Columbia	del Tirreno—Italy	Italy	406	6,836	10,248	4,000	do	14	1954
Esso Venezia—Esso La Columbia	Navali Riunitu—Italy	do	558 1	14,700	21,500	10,600	do	16	1955
Not completed (2)—Esso Waried Tankers	Deutsche Werft—Germany	German	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
Esso Dusseldorf—Esso Waried Tankers	A. G. Weser—Germany	do	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
Esso Munchen—Esso Waried Tankers	do	do	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
Esso Westminster—Esso Petroleum Co	Vickers-Armstrong—England	British	601 2	17,515	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
Esso Canterbury—Esso Petroleum Co	do	do	601 2	17,515	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
Esso York—Esso Petroleum Co	do	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
Esso Exeter—Esso Petroleum Co	do	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
Esso Oxford—Esso Petroleum Co	Cammell Laird & Co.—England	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1953
Esso Cambridge—Esso Petroleum Co	do	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
Esso Paris—Esso Std. Francaise	Penhoet—France	France	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
Not completed—Standard-Vacuum Transp. Co	Jn. Brown & Co.—England	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
River Boat—Esso Transportation Co	Dunston, Thorne, Hessle—England	do		600	1,000	800	Diesel	9	1954
10 barges—Esso Transportation Co	do	do		350	500				1954
Esso Odin—Dansk Esso A/S	Kremer Sohn—Germany	Denmark		400	600	900	Diesel	9	1954
Not completed—Dansk Esso A/S	Odense Yard—Denmark	do	621	17,600	26,400	11,000	do	15.3	1956
Not completed—Esso Petroleum Co	R. Dunston, Ltd.—England	British	190	700	1,070	865	D-E	9	1955
River Boat—Esso Nederland N. V	Schram & Zonen—Holland	Holland	240	500	750	500	Diesel	9	1954
Bitumen Boat—Esso Petroleum Co	Hull, Russell & Co.—Scotland	British	290	1,500	2,300	1,300	Recip	11	1955
Not completed—Esso A. G	Scheel & Johnk—Germany	German	100	200	300	200	Diesel	9	1955
Not completed—Esso Std. Belgium	Cockerill—Belgium	Belgium	170	600	900	400	do	9	1955
Not completed—Esso Std. Belgium	do	do	100	200	300	200	do	9	1955
Stanvac India—Std.-Vacuum Oil Co	Cammell, Laird & Co.—England	British	601 2	17,350	26,700	13,750	Turbine	17	1954
Stanvac Japan—Std.-Vacuum Oil Co	Mitsubishi S. B. & E.—Japan	do	601 2	17,379	26,700	13,750	do	17	1953
Stanvac South Africa—Std.-Vacuum Oil Co	do	do	601 2	17,379	26,700	13,750	do	17	1953
Imperial Leduc—Imperial Oil Ltd	Collingwood Shipyds.—Canada	Canada	600	12,639	18,000	4,500	do	12	1951
Imperial Woodbend—Imperial Oil Ltd	do	do	600	12,639	18,000	4,500	do	12	1952
Imperial Sarnia—Imperial Oil Ltd	do	do	380 6	4,580	6,800	2,500	do	12	1948
Imperial Redwater—Imperial Oil Ltd	Port Arthur S. B. Co.—Canada	do	600	12,582	18,000	4,500	do	12	1951
Caltex Pakanbaru—Caltex Oceanic Ltd	Jn. Cockerill—Belgium	Holland	250	2,000	3,200	1,600	Diesel	11	1952
Caltex Bangkalis—Caltex Oceanic Ltd	A. F. Smulders—Holland	do	250 5	1,984	3,220	1,600	do	11	1952
Caltex Rupat—Caltex Oceanic Ltd	L. Smit & Zoon—Holland	do	250	1,984	3,220	1,600	do	11	1952
Caltex Antwerp—Overseas Tankship Corp	Jn. Cockerill—Belgium	Panama	517 7	11,863	17,000	7,300	Turbine	15	1950
Caltex Brussels—Overseas Tankship Corp	do	do	517 7	11,863	17,000	7,300	do	15	1951
Caltex Liege—Overseas Tankship Corp	do	do	517 7	11,863	17,000	7,300	do	15	1951
Caltex Delhi—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd	Wm. Doxford & Sons—England	British	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	Diesel	14	1952
Caltex Kenya—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd	do	do	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	do	14	1952
Caltex Tanganyika—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	do	14	1952
Caltex Calcutta—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd	do	do	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	do	14	1952
Caltex Liverpool—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	Hawthorn Leslie & Co.—England	do	524 3	11,814	17,000	7,300	Turbine	15	1952
Caltex Bahrain—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd	do	do	524 3	11,814	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
Caltex Manchester—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	524 3	11,814	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
Caltex Canberra—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	Furness S. B. Co.—England	do	524 3	11,860	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
Caltex Perth—Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd	do	do	524 3	11,860	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
Caltex Padang—Caltex Oceanic, Ltd	Smit & Zoon's—Holland	Holland	250	2,038	3,220	1,640	Diesel	11	1954
Not completed—Caltex Oceanic, Ltd	van P. Smit—Holland	do	540	11,000	18,000	9,200	do	16	1955
Not completed—Caltex Oceanic, Ltd	Rotterdam D. D.—Holland	do	530	12,000	18,000	8,800	Turbine	16	1956
Not completed—Caltex Oceanic, Ltd	Wilton-Fijenoord—Holland	do	630	20,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1956
Not completed—Nederland Pacific Tankvaart	Hitachi S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	do	270	2,150	3,400	1,600	Diesel	14	1955

TABLE 1.—*Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years*—Continued

TANKERS—Continued

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length BP		Gross tons	Dead-weight tons	Horse-power	Drive	Knots	Year of de-livery
			Ft.	*In.*						
Not completed—Overseas Tankship UK	Hawthorn Leslie & Co.—England	British	524	3	11,814	18,000	7,300	Turbine	14½	1957
Not completed—Overseas Tankship UK	Scott's S. B. & E. Co.—England	do	524	3	11,800	18,000	7,300	do	14½	1956
Not completed—Alvion S. S. Corp	Vickers-Armstrong—England	Panama	640		21,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955
Not completed—Alvion S. S. Corp	Jn. Brown & Co.—Scotland	do	640		21,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955
Not completed—Alvion S. S. Corp	Blythswood S. B. Co.—Scotland	do	540		11,000	18,500	8,000	Diesel	15	1956
Cygnus—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	Furness S. B. Co.—England	do	500		10,800	16,300	5,500	do	16	1954
Arcturus—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	595		18,288	28,238	13,300	Turbine	16	1953
Proteus—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	Netherlands Dok. Co.—Holland	Greek	600		15,800	24,000	9,200	Diesel	14½	1955
Not completed (3)—Atlantic Refining Co	Cockerill Yd.—Holland		530		12,500	18,700	11,000	Turbine	16	1955
Not completed—Marine Enterprises, Ltd	Bartram & Sons—England	Panama	525		10,000	17,000	6,800	Diesel	15	1955
Not completed (2)—Western Shipping Corp	Harima S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	do	630		21,000	32,000	15,000	Turbine	16	1955
Not completed—Comp. Maritime LaEmpresa	do		630		21,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1956
Not completed (2)—Orion Ship. & T. Co	do		656	2	24,200	39,000	17,500	do	16	1956
Do	Mitsubishi-Yokohama—Japan		698	10	26,000	39,000	19,000	do	16	1956
Not completed—United Shippers, Ltd	Kawasaki Dockyard—Japan		659	5	24,200	39,000	20,250	do	16	1955
Not completed—Petromar S. A	Mitsubishi-Kobe—Japan		629	11	21,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1956
Not completed—J. A. Cosmas, San Francisco	Oresundsvaret—Sweden	Panama	535		13,000	20,000	8,150	Diesel	15	1956
Ionian Messenger—Transocean Carriers Co	Nippon Steel Tube Co.—Japan	Liberia	551	4	13,490	20,000	9,500	Turbine	15	1953
Ionian Challenger—Transocean Carriers Co	do	do	551	4	13,490	20,000	9,500	do	15	1953
Ionian Traveler—Transocean Carriers Co	Mitsubishi—Japan	do	585	2	15,826	24,000	8,500	do	14	1952
Tini—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras)	Hitachi S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1952
Genie—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras)	do	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1953
Darnie—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras)	do	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1953
Christina—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras).	do	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1953
Leonidas—Miramonte Cia Naviera	Nippon Steel Tube—Japan	Panama	550		13,000	20,000	9,500	do	15	1953
Andrew Dillon—Tanker Transports Co	Uraga Dock Co.—Japan	do	556	8	13,500	20,000	9,000	do	15	1953
Virgin Islands—Caribbean Land & Shipping Corp.	Deutsche Werft—Germany	do	517	5	11,362	17,000	8,000	Diesel	15	1952
Windward Islands—Caribbean Land & Shipping Corp.	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	do	513	6	11,197	17,000	6,500	do	14	1952
Patricia—Oriental Nav. Corp. (Caribbean L. & S. Corp.).	Kawasaki Dockyd Co.—Japan	do	600	1	18,000	28,400	12,500	Turbine	17	1953
Mosoil—Neptune Shipping Co	Deutsche Werft—Germany	do	517	5	11,349	17,000	7,600	Diesel	15	1952
Mostank—Neptune Shipping Co	do	do	517	5	11,349	17,000	7,600	do	15	1952
Almak—Alvion S. S. Corp	Jn. Brown & Co.—England	do	540		12,618	19,000	8,000	do	14½	1952
Algol—Alvion S. S. Corp	do	do	540		13,618	19,000	8,000	do	14½	1952
Alkaid—Alvion S. S. Corp	Netherlands D. & S. B.—Holland	do	600		16,000	24,000	7,550	do	14½	1953
Alkor—Alvion S. S. Corp	do	do	600		16,000	24,000	7,550	do	14½	1953
Karen Naess—Norness Shipping Co. (Naess Mejlander & Co.).	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Liberia	510	11	11,157	16,870	8,000	do	15	1952
North King—Comp. Petrolera Armadora, S. A. (Pappadakis).	Blythswood S. B. Co.—England	do	536	7	12,191	18,500	7,300	do	15	1952
North Prince—Comp. Petrolera Armadora, S. A.	Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	540		12,029	18,300	7,300	do	15	1952
Nicolas—Parana Cia de Vapores	Blythswood S. B. Co.—England	Costa Rica	530		12,350	18,500	7,500	do	15	1953
Chloe—Cia Armadora Transoceanica, S. A	Furness S. B. Co.—England	Panama	560		15,800	24,500	6,800	do	14	1953
Sakura—Oceanic Shipping Co	Kawasaki Dockyard Co.—Japan	Liberia	554	3	13,000	19,000	9,500	Turbine	15½	1953
Eurycleia—Soc. Maritime San Nicolas, S. A	East Japan Heavy Ind.—Japan	do	584		15,869	24,223	8,500	Diesel	15	1952
Adrias—Republic Marine Co	Nippon Steel Tube Co.—Japan	do	551	4	13,752	20,000	9,500	Turbine	15½	1953
Kipawa—Unitas, Inc. (Maritime Trading Co.)	Jn. Brown & Co.—England	Panama	535		13,099	20,000	6,500	Diesel	15	1951
Ottawa—Unitas, Inc. (Maritime Trading Co.)	do	do	535		13,099	20,000	6,500	do	15	1950
Clydewater—Tidewater Commercial Co	do	do	535	6	12,774	19,000	6,500	do	15	1951
Petrokure—National Bulk Carriers	Kure Shipyard—Japan	Liberia	645		21,262	38,000	17,600	Turbine	18	1953
Petroking—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645		21,262	38,000	17,600	do	18	1953
Petroqueen—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645		21,262	38,000	17,600	do	18	1953
Petroemperor—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645		21,240	38,000	17,600	do	18	1953
Phoeniz—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	693	9	25,733	44,633	17,600	do	16	1954
Not completed—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645		21,300	38,000	12,500	do	16	1955
Atlantic Duchess—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Wm. Gray & Co.—England	do	470		8,631	12,910	4,750	Diesel	13	1950
Atlantic Duke—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Smith's Dock Co.—England	do	508	5	10,930	16,652	5,500	do	13½	1952
Atlantic Baron—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Fairfield S. B. & E. Co.—England	do	545		12,700	20,000	8,000	Turbine	15	1953
Atlantic Baroness—Atlantic Oil Carriers	do	do	545		12,700	20,000	8,000	do	15	1953
Atlantic Lord—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Furness S. B. Co.—England	do	525		12,000	18,100	7,600	Diesel	15	1953
Atlantic Viscount—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers.	A. G. Weser—Germany	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	Turbine	15	1954
Atlantic Viscountess—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers.	do	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	do	15	1954
Atlantic Marques—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers.	do	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	do	15	1954
Atlantic Marchioness—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers.	do	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	do	15	1955
Atlantic Lady—Atlantic Oil Carriers	de la Seine Mar.—France	do	538		12,000	19,800	9,800	do	15	1955
Atlantic Earl—Atlantic Tankers, Ltd	Kockums—Sweden	do	500		11,000	16,800	8,100	do	15½	1954
Not completed—Naess Shipping Co	Netherlands Dock—Holland	Norway	650		24,000	38,000	16,000	do	16	1956
Not completed (2)—Naess Shipping Co	do	Holland	580		15,500	24,700	8,400	Diesel	15	1956
Milton Araujo—Naess Shipping Co	Knockums—Sweden	Panama	570		15,800	24,830	9,200	Turbine	15½	1954
Olympic Light—Olympic Oil Lines	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	Liberia	552		13,923	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1952
Olympic Mountain—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,923	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1953
Olympic Valley—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,652	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Hill—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,580	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Snow—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,665	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Rock—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,665	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Ice—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,665	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Brook—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,678	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Lake—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552		13,678	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Dale—Olympic Oil Lines	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	552		13,678	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Cloud—Olympic Oil Lines	A. G. Weser—Germany	do	557	9	14,047	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1953
Olympic Wind—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	14,047	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Storm—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	14,047	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Breeze—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	13,934	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Rainbow—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	13,934	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1955
Not completed—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	13,934	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1955
Olympic Valour—Palmas Transp. Co	Penhoet—France	do	631		20,453	31,688	15,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Honour—Montserrado Transp. Co	At. & Ch. de France—France	do	631		20,611	31,397	15,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Splendour—Olympic Oil Line	de la Ciotat—France	do	628	3	20,595	31,440	15,000	do	16½	1954
World Enterprice—World Tankers Corp	Vickers-Armstrongs—England	do	635		20,536	33,040	13,750	do	16	1953
World Harmony—World Tankers Corp	do	do	635		20,991	33,040	13,750	do	16	1954
Not completed (2)—World Tankers Corp	do	do	725		28,000	47,000	20,000	do	16	
World Unity—World Tankers Corp	do	do	625		20,131	31,745	13,750	do	17	1952
World Concord—World Tankers Corp	do	do	625		20,131	31,745	13,750	do	17	1952
Saxonsea—No. Am. S. & T. Co	Kockums—Sweden	British	525		13,000	20,000	10,000	do	15½	1953
Saxonsky—No. Am. S. & T. Co	do	do	525		13,000	20,000	10,000	do	15½	1953

TABLE 1.—*Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years*—Continued

TANKERS—Continued

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length BP	Gross tons	Deadweight tons	Horsepower	Drive	Knots	Year of delivery
			Ft. In.						
Saxonheath—Oriental Tanker Corp	Nederland Dok—Holland	Liberia	538 9	12,705	18,500	9,000	Turbine	15½	1952
Saxonhill—Oriental Tanker Corp	do	do	538 9	12,705	18,500	9,000	do	15½	1953
Saxonglade—No. Amer. S. & T. Co	Vickers-Armstrongs—England	British	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1952
Saxondale—No. Amer. S. & T. Co	do	do	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1952
Saxonglen—No. Amer. S. & T. Co	do	do	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1953
Saxonmead—No. Amer. S. & T. Co	do	do	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1953
Tina Onassis—A. S. Onassis	Howaldtswerke A. G.—Germany	Liberia	723 2	25,010	46,000	17,600	do	15	1953
Al-Malik Saud Al-Awal—A. S. Onassis	do	do	723 2	28,738	46,000	17,600	do	15	1955
World Gratitude—World Tankers Corp	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	630	20,035	32,500	17,600	do	16	1954
World Grace—World Tankers Corp	do	do	630	20,431	32,500	17,600	do	16	1954
World Guardian—World Tankers Corp	do	do	630	20,431	32,500	17,600	do	16	1955
Not completed—World Tankers Corp	do	do	630	20,431	32,500	17,600	do	16	1955
World Justice—Intermarine Nav. Corp	Mitsubishi-Nagasaki—Japan	do	630	20,500	32,000	15,000	do	16	1954
World Jury—Intermarine Nav. Corp	do	do	630	20,500	32,000	15,000	do	16	1954
Not completed—Stavros S. Niarchos	Kockums—Sweden	British	640	22,000	32,500	16,500	do	16	1955
Not completed—Stavros S. Niarchos	Howaldtswerke—Germany	Panama	663	24,000	38,500	16,000	do	16	1955
East River—Tidewater Commercial Co	Jn. Brown & Co.—England	Liberia	535 6	12,775	19,000	7,000	do	15	1954
Not completed—Tidewater Commercial Co	do	Panama	631	20,400	32,000	15,000	do	16	1955
Not completed—Stavros S. Niarchos	Kockums—Sweden	Liberia	663	24,000	38,500	16,500	do	16	1957
CAR FERRY									
New Grand Haven—West India Fruit & S. S. Co.	Canadian Vickers—Canada	Honduras	436	5,074	4,280	8,560	Unaflow	18	1951
DREDGE									
Sandpiper—Creole Petroleum Co	Canadian Vickers—Canada	Dutch	237	1,902	2,500	2,880	D-E	14	1950
Clarence B. Randall—Construction Aggregates	Port Arthur Sy.—Canada	Canadian	174	1,800	2,500	10,000	D-E		1955
Joseph L. Block—Construction Aggregates	do	do	174	1,800	2,500	10,000	D-E		1955

Totals—302 vessels; 3,884,749 gross tons; 6,054,831 deadweight tons; 2,691,165 horsepower.

TABLE 2.—*Types of vessels ordered from foreign shipyards by United States and affiliated interests during the postwar years*

Type	Number	Gross tons	Deadweight tons	Horsepower
Tanker	217	3,270,685	5,100,828	2,241,515
Bulk carrier	27	372,251	615,450	213,900
Reefer	6	30,531	26,790	37,860
Freighter	37	197,106	294,883	165,850
Carferry	1	5,074	4,280	8,560
Dredge	3	5,502	7,500	22,880
Tugboat	1	100	100	600
Oil barge	10	3,500	5,000	
Total	302	3,884,749	6,054,831	2,691,165

TABLE 3.—*Countries building vessels for American and affiliated interests during the postwar years*

Type	Number	Gross tons	Deadweight tons	Horsepower
United Kingdom:				
Cargo	17	116,117	170,750	83,290
Reefer	3	19,500	16,500	27,000
Bulk	15	216,221	283,750	110,600
Oil barge	10	3,500	5,000	
Tanker	57	808,921	1,221,152	516,715
Total	102	1,164,259	1,698,152	737,605
Germany:				
Cargo	8	45,273	67,420	41,200
Reefer	3	11,031	10,200	10,860
Bulk	3	28,000	40,600	12,000
Tugboat	1	100	100	600
Tanker	49	715,879	1,119,958	525,500
Total	64	800,283	1,238,368	590,160
Canada:				
Bulk	1	8,000	12,700	5,000
Ferry	1	5,074	4,280	8,560
Dredge	3	5,502	7,500	22,880
Tanker	6	78,130	116,940	43,500
Total	11	96,706	141,420	79,940
Japan:				
Cargo	7	31,676	50,873	33,800
Bulk	4	76,100	217,400	62,500
Tanker	36	666,652	1,062,976	468,350
Total	47	774,428	1,331,249	564,650

TABLE 3.—*Countries building vessels for American and affiliated interests during the postwar years*—Continued

Type	Number	Gross tons	Deadweight tons	Horsepower
Sweden:				
Cargo	1	3,800	5,400	5,600
Bulk	4	43,930	61,000	23,800
Tanker	9	138,271	212,180	93,750
Total	14	186,001	278,580	123,150
Denmark:				
Tanker	2	28,600	44,400	19,000
Norway:				
Tanker	1	10,000	15,750	7,000
Italy:				
Tanker	3	46,536	67,298	32,200
Belgium:				
Tanker	9	79,517	119,088	53,850
Holland:				
Tanker	29	360,630	580,550	254,190
Workboat	4	240	440	960
Total	33	360,870	580,990	255,150
France:				
Tanker	16	337,549	530,536	228,460
Grand total	302	3,884,749	6,054,831	2,691,165

TABLE 4.—*Number of vessels ordered abroad by major American organizations in postwar period*

	Number
United Fruit Co	9
States Marine Corp	10
Aluminum Company of America	10
Reynolds Metals Co	1
M. A. Hanna Co	2
Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, and affiliates	45
Standard-Vacuum Oil Co	6
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	7
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	6
Gulf Oil Co	13
The Texas Co	8
Caltex group	21
Atlantic Refining Co	3
National Bulk Carriers	9
North American Shipping & Trading Co	25
Atlantic Oil Carriers	14
Olympic Oil Lines	21

TABLE 4.—*Number of vessels ordered abroad by major American organizations in postwar period*—Continued

	Number
Orion Shipping & Trading Co	6
Naess Shipping Co	7
J. M. Carras, Inc	4
Hillcone Steamship Co	2
United States Gypsum Co	1
National Gypsum Co	2
Chicago Tribune	2

The Founder of Czechoslovakia: Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, first president of the Czechoslovak Republic, it is only fitting that we should do him honor. As much as George Washington was the father of our country, Thomas G. Masaryk was the father of his. Yet the people of Czechoslovakia are not permitted to celebrate his birthday, because those who rule Czechoslovakia today represent the negation of everything Thomas G. Masaryk stood for. He stood for truth; they stand for falsehood. He stood for liberty; they stand for the bitterest kind of oppression. He stood for a religious and moral basis of life; they stand for atheistic materialism. He was the friend of America, and they are our sworn enemies.

Under the inspiration of Masaryk, Czechoslovakia became a model of de-

mocracy in the heart of Europe. Her fate at Munich left the friends of freedom dismayed. After enduring the worst of Nazi tyranny the Czechoslovak people looked forward to an era of peace and freedom. Those hopes were cruelly dashed by Communist conspiracy and betrayal. Today the people of Czechoslovakia and the other enslaved peoples of the world need our continued support and encouragement. We will furnish that support and encouragement, for we believe that the spirit of the Czech people is still the spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk.

Correct an Injustice of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act. This bill provides that a widow who loses her widow's benefits by remarriage may again become entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage.

Recently my attention was called to a situation in my home of Everett, Wash., which pointed up very sharply the need for the legislation I have proposed. A widow became entitled to widow's benefits under the Social Security Act. Shortly thereafter she married a second time. Within 9 months her second husband died. Upon her remarriage the widow's benefits from her first husband were, of course, terminated. Under the present wording of the Social Security Act, the widow received no benefits from the second husband following his death as the statute stipulates that the parties must have been married for a full year. So, at the age of 67, this woman finds herself twice widowed and unable to receive any widow's benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that such a situation was ever intended and my amendment to the Social Security Act would correct it. While the requirement of 1 full year of marriage is perhaps, under ordinary circumstances, a justifiable standard to prevent fraud, such a standard has no application in these special conditions. Furthermore, under my bill the benefits to which the widow will be entitled upon the death of her second husband are those of her former husband. Thus, there is no chance that a remarriage would be arranged on the chance of receiving higher benefits from the death of a second husband of less than 1 year.

The situation which my bill seeks to correct is unjust. I believe it is incumbent upon Congress to make sure that social security benefits are not kept from the deserving by unnecessary technicalities of the law.

Results of Statewide Poll Among Nevada Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have recently conducted a statewide poll among Nevada citizens on seven important issues facing this Congress.

The results have been tabulated by International Business Machines Corp., and I wish to call them to the attention of my colleagues.

May I also make formal expression of my appreciation to the thousands of Nevadans who took the time to express their views and thus render a valuable contribution to the shaping of national policy.

The poll follows:

	Yes	No	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Regarding foreign policy do you feel:			
(a) Red China should be admitted to the U. N.?	9.8	81.6	8.6
(b) The United States should withdraw from the U. N. if Red China is admitted?	33.9	54.0	12.1
(c) Economic assistance and technical advice to non-Communist countries should be continued?	69.9	17.5	12.6
2. Regarding taxation and the budget (the national debt now totals over $274 billion; the interest on this costs American taxpayers more than $6 billion each year; the deficit for present fiscal year is $4 billion plus), do you favor:			
(a) Higher taxes to balance the budget?	15.9	65.7	18.4
(b) Following the President's recommendations which continue the gradual trend toward a balanced budget but still maintain a deficit?	75.3	11.3	13.4
(c) Reducing taxes by increasing the individual exemptions from $600 to $700 (will cause loss of $2.4 billion annually)?	22.9	60.0	17.1
3. With regard to national security do you feel:			
(a) Administration is placing sufficient emphasis—over 45 percent of military budget—on airpower?	66.5	15.7	17.8
(b) Universal military training is preferable to extension of selective service?	66.2	20.5	13.3
4. Which of the following statements expresses your views on the Taft-Hartley law?			
(a) "Slave labor law which is unfair to unions and the average workingman."	7.3	40.1	52.6
(b) "Not strict enough in prohibiting monopolistic, unjust, and dangerous practices by unions."	31.9	18.6	49.5
(c) "Experience has shown that law is fair and just; may need some amendments but over all is a good law."	77.0	4.5	18.5
5. Do you favor the health reinsurance program whereby the Federal Government plans to encourage expansion of private health insurance by assuming exceptional risks?	42	39.4	18.6
6. Regarding natural resources do you favor:			
(a) More emphasis on State and local participation in reclamation projects?	69.9	12.4	17.7
(b) Encouraging private enterprise to participate in developing atomic power for peacetime use?	85.2	7.4	7.4
7. Do you feel postal rates should be increased to assist in cutting down the postal deficit (now $1 million plus per day)?	74.1	20.9	5.0

The Navy Needs the "Forrestal" Type Carrier as Replacement for World War II Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1955, Adm. D. B. Duncan, United States Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, read the following statement of Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, to the House Armed Services Committee, urging support for the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding and conversion program.

Admiral Carney's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ADM. ROBERT B. CARNEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WITH RESPECT TO H. R. 4393

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to have my personal statement with respect to H. R. 4393 presented to you today by the Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

This bill incorporates the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding and conversion program, approved by the President, and for which we are now seeking funds from the Congress. Mindful that this committee already has an extensive knowledge of the Navy's shipbuilding requirements, it is my intention to present as concise and meaningful a picture as possible to this group, dealing with the program as a whole, and then follow by a more detailed discussion of one item in the program. I thank the committee for giving its time and attention to this program, so important to the Navy.

At the outset I should like to comment on the relation of military strategy to national policy. The fundamental character of military strategy derives from and must be in consonance with national policy. The Armed Forces functioning in accordance with approved military strategy are thus carrying out the mission of support of the national policy, from which a large number of functions and activities extend. Since our Government, to mention a few examples, is a party to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which ties us to the general area of Europe, from the North Cape to north Africa and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Middle East, and since we have mutual security arrangements with many of the nations in the western and southwestern Pacific, not to mention those in our own hemisphere, and since national policy involves cooperation and collaboration with the free nations of the world, it is evident that our grand military strategy must be a forward one. From the fact that our grand military strategy is a forward one is derived the Navy's overall task to control the seas. The proper performance of this task is essential in order to project the power of our Armed Forces overseas and to any part of the world where it is needed and includes direct and positive support of the land battle and the air battle in overseas theaters of operation. The Navy is a primary and indispensable element in the projection of military power to overseas areas and naval airpower is an essential element in all phases of naval operations. The Navy on the sea, under the sea, and in the air, may well be the factor which determines whether a war is fought far from our

shores or in our own homeland. This is important. Ships and aircraft and the means of operating them, of the kinds and numbers required to fight in the kind of a war which we may expect if we are so unfortunate as to be plunged into one, are essentials to the Navy, and a continuing, progressive and forward looking shipbuilding program is a good part of the lifeblood of the Navy.

The basic objective of our annual shipbuilding and conversion programs is direct and clear-cut. Each is an increment of a longer range plan, designed to maintain the most modern Navy possible, with the needs of the future always in mind.

The two most important factors affecting our programs are, first, the specter of overage and block obsolescence as it affects many of our existing ships; and, second, the vital necessity of maintaining the lead in today's race in the technological field. There are other factors which we must take into consideration. Our programs must be orderly, keeping pace with evolutionary transition, for it would neither be practicable nor desirable to replace the entire fleet at once. We will always have some old and some new. We must consider the importance of maintaining the know-how and mobilization base in the shipbuilding industry.

In preparing our annual shipbuilding and conversion program, we are also mindful of the naval capabilities of unfriendly powers. While such naval capabilities do not directly control the level of our forces, they do have a most definite impact on the tasks that we will have to accomplish. In the case of the Soviet Navy the most dangerous element is its submarine force. A large part of the U. S. S. R. undersea craft, now estimated at about 350, are modern and are certain to be well-armed and equipped. While we have no information that the U. S. S. R. has built, or is building, aircraft carriers, the number of Soviet naval aircraft is upwards of 3,000. This weakness in the lack of aircraft carriers is a weakness which we must exploit, and for which, I may add, we may take some measure of comfort. Soviet naval construction of surface combat ships, as well as submarines, is increasing. Both cruisers and destroyers in relatively large numbers have been built by the Soviets since the end of World War II. The U. S. S. R. has more ships in active service in commission than any other navy except our own.

Of major importance—our programs must place the emphasis on hitting power rather than on massive numbers of ships, mindful that balance must be retained.

Most of the ships now in our active and reserve fleets are World War II vintage; many have already passed the midpoint of their useful life expectancy. Unless a continuing and orderly shipbuilding and replacement program is provided, large numbers will become obsolete at about the same time, and because of the long lead-time for building ships, it would be impossible to replace these ships in a relatively short time, even if unlimited authorization and funds were available. In the technological weapons race of our era, yesterday's or even today's weapons in old or new hulls soon become marginal or obsolescent. We must not fail to continue our strenuous drive to develop new weapons, and when ready, to incorporate them in our ships without delay.

Our shipbuilding and conversion program is designed to achieve a proper balance between useful modernizing of the old and acquisition of new and advanced types with modern characteristics not achievable through modernization, and we are mindful of the need for proper phasing of our programs in order that economy and efficiency may both be realized to greater measure.

In every case where it would be economical and practicable to modernize an existing type, we have taken that course; but where an existing hull cannot meet the need, or where a conversion would be disproportionately costly in the light of future value of the ship, we have requested that a new ship be built. I think that the committee understands that the point of diminishing returns is eventually reached with regard to the modernization of existing ships. When that point is reached, we must either replace the ship or vacate its place in the fleet.

My own philosophy with respect to this program may be briefly stated as follows:

It is a program designed around long-range needs—the fast carrier task force, to project airpower where it will be most effective; the development and employment of nuclear power for propulsion; weapons modernization, including missiles; greater seakeeping qualities in our ships; and last, but far from least, the improvement of our antisubmarine effort, including the procurement of a few prototype escort types which could be produced rapidly and cheaply with a minimum of material and labor.

The bill before you would authorize and direct the President to undertake the construction of, or to acquire and convert, 34 naval vessels, large and small, plus about 14,000 tons of landing craft; and to convert or modernize 28 existing ships. The individual types and their respective tonnages are listed in the bill, but in summary, I should like to indicate briefly, for the more important items some of the features or reasons why they are included in the program.

(a) One, *Forrestal* type carrier has been requested in the program in order to continue an orderly replacement program of World War II carriers; to meet the operational demands of carrier aircraft envisioned for the future, such as requirements for increased catapult capacity, increased arresting gear capacity, stronger flight decks, larger elevators with higher lifting capacity, higher hangar deck overhead to accommodate larger aircraft; and in order to provide for increased jet fuel capacity, greater speed, and survival power.

(b) Eight submarines, three of which are nuclear powered, and five with improved conventional diesel powerplants. One of the latter will have guided missile capabilities.

We attach great importance to the 3 nuclear-powered submarines, 1 of which is a large radar-picket submarine. They represent a progressive advance in nuclear power, and will incorporate the latest developments available. The 3 nuclear-powered submarines represent a part of our continuing efforts to phase in nuclear power for ship propulsion as rapidly as practicable, depending upon the state of the art and upon the capacity of industry to produce the required powerplants. This transition must proceed in a prudent, orderly, and forward-looking manner, recognizing that development of nuclear-power propulsion is still in its infancy, and that the ships which we build must be useful for many years.

The 5 submarines with conventional propulsion systems are included in the program as a part of our efforts to overcome the acute problem of block obsolescence in this type. I would point out that the conventional propulsion powerplants are not obsolescent, or will they become so in the near future. The submarines in this program, with the diesel-electric-propulsion machinery, will have many advanced features, including new weapons, deep-diving capacity, and are badly needed in the fleet. We cannot afford to delay submarine construction until adequate nuclear powerplants are proven and available. We are confident that the conventional powerplants in the 5 non-nuclear-powered submarines in this program will be useful and effective for the life of the ship.

(c) World War II destroyers are rapidly becoming obsolescent, and on a modest replacement basis, we are requesting as new construction:

(1) Seven conventional destroyers with the latest antiaircraft armament, sonar, and antisubmarine weapons.

(2) Six frigates, a type similar to the destroyer *Leader* previously constructed, which will now also be classified as frigates. These ships will have improved antisubmarine and antiaircraft warfare capabilities, and improved sea-keeping qualities. We now plan that 3 of the 6 will have guided-missiles capabilities.

(3) Two escort vessels. Upon mobilization there will be a requirement for a large number of escorts for merchant convoys and slower naval forces, and these new escort vessels are being developed as a low-cost prototype that could be mass produced.

(d) The program includes 3 auxiliary ships—2 fast ammunition ships, and 1 fast general stores issue ship. In the design of these ships, consideration was given to increased speed and to a more rapid replenishment-at-sea rate.

The principal items in the conversion program are:

(1) The installation of angled decks on six carriers to gain improved performance from jet aircraft, plus the additional safety factor inherent in the angled deck.

(2) One austere conversion of a light cruiser to carry the Talos missile and one conversion of a destroyer to carry the Terrier missile. Again, these are prototypes.

(3) To permit the Navy to carry out its commitments in support of continental defense, it is planned to convert 12 escort vessels and 4 Liberty hull cargo vessels into radar picket ships. This is a continuation of a previous program.

The ships in this program have been recommended by me as Chief of Naval Operations, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, and the President. It has been included as a program deemed essential by those who are responsible not only for the effectiveness of our naval forces, but also by those of the executive branch, who have great responsibilities for the security of the United States and the responsibility of making recommendations in the premises to the Congress. Notwithstanding the approval by these officials, some questions have been raised with respect to the carrier included in this program and therefore, I feel it would be appropriate to discuss in more detail the need for this particular ship.

I mentioned earlier that we place greatest dependence on hitting power rather than on massive numbers of ships. Our greatest hitting power today is spearheaded by our mobile carrier task force, and this bespeaks the importance attached to developments in aircraft carriers, aircraft, weapons and techniques, in order that we keep abreast of technological advances. It is essential that we keep abreast if we expect to carry out effectively our missions and tasks.

Our striking power must be available on D-day to initiate immediately our offensive and defensive tasks.

The inescapable effects of age are such that by 1965 we will have only 7 attack carriers fully capable of operating our high performance aircraft if the carrier program is discontinued; and 3 of the 7 would be 16 to 20 years old. Six more ships, incorporating every possible improvement, will have become marginal in capability. Such a situation would not meet the security requirements as envisaged today by those who are responsible for the military security of the United States.

It is the clearly and emphatically stated policy of our Government today that we should strengthen our airpower. The President has defined the United States airpower as the total airpower of the military forces.

The foregoing considerations constitute the basis for including an aircraft carrier in the fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program.

For the nuclear deterrent role, the United States must possess striking forces which are powerful, varied in their nature and employment, and as invulnerable to surprise attack as we can make them. They must be varied in character because, if we were to rely on only one type of striking force, the enemy's defense problem would be much more easily solved, or he might more easily persuade himself he has solved it, and in this belief launch his surprise attack. A variety of types of forces also lessens the vulnerability of our national striking power to any single type of enemy attack. A mobile base, for example, will not be vulnerable to the very long-range ballistics missiles of the 1960–70 era. A sea base can be more readily defended against many forms of air attack, particularly in the atomic area. The sea base from which we can employ airpower, offensively and defensively, on the seas and contiguous land areas where the use of airpower would otherwise be unfeasible, impracticable, or impossible, is the carrier striking force. I would like to evaluate the capabilities of a carrier striking force.

A sea-based carrier striking force has the following capabilities:

1. An ability to deliver nuclear weapons in considerable quantity.

2. An ability to deliver such weapons against the very bases from which the enemy may challenge our control of the seas, such as enemy submarine pens, or other bases from which the enemy might operate vessels or aircraft against our forces.

3. Dispersal of part of our national power upon the sea where it is able to move about and thus, because it does not remain in a fixed position, reduce its likelihood of destruction.

4. An ability to operate effectively against targets the destruction of which requires very accurate delivery of weapons.

5. An ability to participate readily and effectively in "brush fire" type of warfare, such as Korean war and the Tachens, while retaining a power to join in an all-out nuclear attack.

6. An ability readily to shift pressure as the center of the threat shifts without constructing new bases and without danger of the old base falling into enemy hands.

7. And finally, the carrier striking force represents power that we can place overseas and use as we will, without negotiation or consultation with foreign governments, and without the advance build-up for which there may not always be time.

I can state unequivocally that the most important ship in the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program is the aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class. This ship, together with the four *Forrestal* class carriers previously authorized, is necessarily larger than any of our present carriers in order to be able to operate, without restrictions, new and more powerful carrier aircaft, as I have mentioned earlier. The modernization program for World War II carriers has permitted the Navy to date to keep abreast of carrier aircraft development and the needs of naval aviation. However, the practical limit for a substantial improvement of these carriers is clearly in sight. Anticipating this situation, the Navy designed the *Forrestal* class carrier with aeronautical and other features which will provide substantial operating margins for aircraft envisioned for its useful life. The *Forrestal* class carrier is a logical and forward looking step in the development of a proven weapon.

Carrier forces are deemed essential elements of the Armed Forces and are incorporated in approved force levels recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the President for the fiscal year 1956. As a matter of interest, the fiscal year 1956 naval force levels include one more carrier and one more carrier air group than in fiscal year 1955. This, I believe, clearly demonstrates the essentiality of the carrier forces.

Furthermore, the approved force levels for fiscal year 1956 include the operations of the best and most formidable carriers in our inventory, a fact which indicates the necessity for obtaining the best possible capabilities from this essential component.

Under the philosophy that we are girding for the long pull, and are leveling off with powerful forces that can be supported for such a period, it is to be expected that carrier forces will be needed for the foreseeable future, and it is axiomatic that the carrier forces in commission should have the maximum capabilities attainable. The aircraft carrier and the Fast Carrier Task Group make up a vitally important weapons system in which we have a major advantage over our most likely enemy. Any action at this time that would forfeit this advantage would appear to be a most unwise course indeed.

In conclusion, I should like to assure this committee that every ship included in this program is essential. Each type has a definite mission and definite tasks to perform in our concept of modern naval warfare. Each is designed to be useful for the maximum period of time. I earnestly hope that we will have the support of this committee in obtaining approval of this program and I recommend the enactment of H. R. 4393.

Iron Curtain Captives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of two European nations this week have special occasion to lift their minds and hearts to the remembrance of freedom, even though they now find themselves bowed under the relentless hand of communism.

March 7 was the 105th birthday anniversary of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, founder of the Czechoslovak Republic and on March 15 the Hungarian people will mark the 106th anniversary of Hungarian independence from Hapsburg rule.

It is our hope that the people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia will look back to the origins of their freedom, now lost, and renew their resolve to once more attain independence and a rightful place among the free nations of the world.

I have great faith in the spirit and resolve of these captive peoples. During my work with Radio Free Europe I saw, over and over again, evidences of it. And I saw, too, how these courageous people look to the United States for help and encouragement.

It is not enough that we voice pious tributes and bold promises to the liberty-loving people behind the Iron Curtain. Only by our continuing fight against communism at home and abroad can we set the pace for others who would be free. Only by our unwavering insistence in the councils of nations and on the very doorstep of the Kremlin itself can we keep the spark of hope alive.

We must give concrete evidence of our genuine concern for these oppressed peoples. Let us liberalize our immigration laws and welcome to our shores their homeless. Let us redouble our efforts, through such agencies as the Voice of America, to pierce the Iron Curtain, and let us make sure that our military strength matches our urgent demands for a free world.

Federal Payroll Reduced by $612 Million in 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal payroll for civilian employees of the executive branch during the calendar year 1954 was $612,123,000 less than for the preceding calendar year.

In December 1954, the number of Federal civilian employees was 186,238 less than in January 1953.

Since 1930 the population of the United States has increased 30 percent. In the same period the number of Federal employees increased 300 percent and the dollar amount of the payrolls increased 900 percent.

However much we may wish for even more substantial reductions in the payroll figures than were accomplished in 1954, the achievement of President Eisenhower's administration on this score is tremendously significant and heartening.

Not only have the brakes been put on, so far as a dangerous 20-year trend is concerned, but the trend has actually been reversed.

The following charts, taken from News Bulletin No. 49, issued by Paul O. Peters, give the comparative executive payroll figures for the calendar years 1953 and 1954:

Calendar year 1953

Month	Employees	Payrolls
January	2,554,310	$893,513,000
February	2,546,954	836,739,000
March	2,526,819	897,785,000
April	2,502,772	887,785,000
May	2,478,963	799,638,000
June	2,482,359	823,980,000
July	2,454,714	834,482,000
August	2,430,412	783,594,000
September	2,401,912	808,805,000
October	2,373,113	787,943,000
November	2,366,710	757,788,000
December	2,357,294	874,352,000
Total for 1953		9,986,386,000

Calendar year 1954

Month	Employees	Payrolls
January	2,346,892	$756,498,000
February	2,340,962	729,975,000
March	2,340,137	803,530,000
April	2,335,296	782,146,000
May	2,330,509	751,688,000
June	2,333,894	781,945,000
July	2,332,200	774,902,000
August	2,331,508	774,464,000
September	2,317,565	780,632,000
October	2,323,029	753,513,000
November	2,343,707	780,632,000
December	2,368,072	904,338,000
Total for 1954		9,374,263,000

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner—Address by Hon. Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine address delivered by our colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Richmond, Va., on Friday, March 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR HERITAGE: A BLESSING AND AN OBLIGATION

(Address by Senator SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.)

I am grateful to the Democratic State Central Committee of Virginia for inviting me to join the militant and unterrified democracy of the Old Dominion in this Jefferson-Jackson Day gathering. The invitation affords me ample excuse for absenting myself for the time being from the babel of Washington, where the confusion engendered by the Republicans calls to my remembrance an event which occurred some years past in my home town of Morganton, N. C.

On that occasion my diplomatic colored friend, Jock Fleming, went automobile riding with two companions. The automobile was undoubtedly full of gasoline. Its occupants were allegedly full of moonshine. The automobile left the road and turned over, causing substantial injuries to Jock's two companions. Jock was unhurt. After extricating Jock's companions from the wreckage and sending them to the hospital for medical attention, Morganton's Chief of Police, Fons Duckworth, undertook to ascertain by inquiry of Jock who was driving the automobile at the time of the accident. He received this reply from Jock: " 'Fore God, white folks, 'fore God, I don't know. The last thing I remember all three of us were riding on the back seat."

I trust you will pardon at this point an allusion rather personal in nature. I cannot come to the Old Dominion without experiencing emotions similar to those which prompted Moses to remove his sandals from his feet because he stood on Holy ground. Kindred of mine fought for the Confederacy in virtually every engagement on Virginia soil from Bethel to Appomattox. One of my great-uncles was killed in action at Seven Pines. Another fell in combat on the Darbytown Road.

In the words of Britain's heroic poet, Rupert Brooke:

"These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of work and joy, and that uphoped serene,
That men call age; and those who would have been,
Their sons, they gave, their immortality."
—*The Dead.*

Since their dust is commingled forever with Virginia's good earth, Viriginia to me is hallowed ground.

I wish to bear this testimony to the Democrats of Virginia: It is a great privilege to serve in the Congress with the able and devoted men sent by you to that body. Senators HARRY BYRD and WILLIS ROBERTSON and Congressmen WATKINS ABBITT, VAUGHN GARY, PORTER HARDY, BURR HARRISON, PAT JENNINGS, EDWARD ROBESON, HOWARD SMITH, and BILL TUCK bring to the performance of their legislative duties the high courage, intelligence, intellectual honesty, and patriotism which the Nation has long since become accustomed to expect of Viriginians.

In my remarks on this occasion, I forego discussion of the transient issues of the hour. I prefer to consider with you fundamental principles which must be preserved if the America we know and love is to endure.

1. OUR HERITAGE

As Americans, each of us can assert with the psalmist of old: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage."

These words of the psalmist suggest the subject of my remarks: "Our Heritage: A Blessing and an Obligation.

We received our heritage in trust for ourselves and our children and our children's children from all those men and women, both great and small, whose blood, sweat, tears, and prayers made the America we know and love a living reality.

Our heritage is liberty. While liberty has blossomed in our land, love of liberty did not have its origin here. It was brought hither by courageous men and women from the British Isles, the vine-clad hills of France, and the Palatinate of Germany, who craved above all the things of earth the economic freedom, the political freedom, and the religious freedom denied to them by the tyrannical rulers of the Old World.

Since so many men now appear so anxious to swap the reality of human liberty for the mirage of economic security, it would be well if we would pause a moment, and ponder the choice our ancestors made when they forsook the compartive security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New. It was not without many pangs of regret that they turned their backs for all time upon the scenes of their childhood, the graves of their beloved dead, the comparative security of the then civilized world, and journeyed in tiny barks across a boisterous ocean to establish homes for themselves and their children and their children's children in what was then a perilous wilderness in a new and strange land.

Why did they do this? Why did they exchange the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New? The answer is simply this, and nothing more: They believed that only the slave, who depends upon a master for the bread of bondage, is really secure; and they knew that only the self-reliant soul, who spurns security for opportunity, is truly free. For this reason, they chose liberty rather than security.

Liberty reveals herself in a threefold guise as economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. Let us consider her attributes in each of these aspects.

2. ECONOMIC LIBERTY

The brave men and women, who brought the love of liberty to these shores, did not learn economics sitting at the feet of those who promise "abundance for all" by robbing "Selected Peter to pay for Collective Paul." They acquired their knowledge the hard way. Their teachers were despotic governments, which robbed them of the fruits of their labor by confiscatory taxation, and in that way reduced them to the status of economic slaves.

The valiant folk who made America great had the hardihood to accept the economic truths plainly visible to all persons who possess the capacity and willingness to meet reality face to face.

They knew that earth yields nothing to man except the products of his own labor. They knew that Adam's curse is an unchanging and unchangeable law of life: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." They knew that man has but one choice in respect to this immutable economic fact, and that such choice is simply this: Whether the bread which he must eat in the sweat of his face shall be the bread of freedom or the bread of bondage. They knew this unalterable decree of the Creator of the universe: Freemen cannot be induced to produce things of value unless they are permitted to retain a fair share of the fruits of their labor for themselves and their families.

They knew, moreover, that man can be free only if he is willing to accept the responsibility for his own life which is inseparable from liberty.

3. POLITICAL LIBERTY

The political philosophy of the Founding Fathers is readily understood if one bears in mind the historical fact that the Thirteen Original States—Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Virginia—became self-governing Commonwealths 12 years before the United States had its legal birth.

The representatives of the people of these States met in constitutional conventions, and framed State constitutions. These men were conversant with the story of the long and bitter struggle of the English-speaking race for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual. They loved liberty and loathed tyranny, and were convinced that government itself would have to be compelled by fundamental law to respect the inherent rights of the individual if freedom were to be preserved and oppression were to be prevented. In consequence, they inserted in the constitutions of the States declarations of rights designed to protect citizens from the States.

It was no accident that the first words incorporated in the constitutions of the original States were declarations to the effect "that all political power is vested in and derived from the people" and "that the people of * * * (the States) * * * ought to have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof." The writers of the organic laws of the States placed these declarations in first place in their constitutions because the political concepts embodied in such declarations occupied first place in their hearts and minds. They had much cause for assigning prime importance to their beliefs in the sovereignty of the people and the rights of the States to local self-rule. They had suffered many things at the hands of a government far removed from the people.

The consciousness of early Americans that liberty is inevitably imperiled by a government far removed from the people finds further example in their implacable insistence upon the insertion of the first 10 amendments in the Federal Constitution. These amendments guarantee the personal and property rights of the individual, and declare that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The ancient beliefs that all political power is vested in and derived from the people and that the States ought to have the right to regulate their internal affairs are as valid today as they were when the Declaration of Independence was signed and the Constitution of the United States was ratified.

4. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The most heart-rending story of history is that of man's struggle against civil and ecclesiastical tyranny for the simple privilege of bowing his own knees before his own God in his own way. As Chief Justice Walter

P. Stacy of the North Carolina Supreme Court so well declared in one of the great judicial opinions of all time, "men contend more furiously over the road to Heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walks on earth," and history records "the tragic fact that men have gone to war and cut each others' throats because they could not agree as to what was to become of them after their throats were cut."

The men and women who gave liberty to America were devout souls. They had learned some of the sorrowful facts of the spiritual life of man in the bitter crucible of experience. Most of them dissented from the doctrines and usages of the churches established by law in the lands of their origins. They were denied the right to worship God in their own ways. They were compelled to pay tithes for the support and propagation of religious opinions which they disbelieved. They had their marriages annulled and their children adjudged illegitimate for daring to speak their marriage vows before ministers of their own faiths rather than before the clergymen of the established churches.

But these cruel oppressions merely steeled their convictions that religion is a private matter between man and his God; that no human authority should undertake to control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical."

For these reasons, our ancestors staked the very existence of America as a free Nation upon the principle that "all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences," and the corollary that this natural and unalienable right can be secured only by keeping the hands of the state out of religion and the hands of religion off the state.

5. A BLESSING AND A WARNING

Courageous men and women built America with strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands. They gave us a great country dedicated to the proposition that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, the enjoyment of the fruits of their own labor, and the pursuit of happiness." They gave us this land with the knowledge, however, that God grants freedom only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it; and they left us the solemn warning that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty.

They bequeathed this warning to us because they had read the history of the long and bitter struggle of men for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual, and had found this shocking but everlasting truth inscribed upon each page of that history: Government itself is the deadliest foe of liberty.

This tragic truth was well expressed a third of a century ago by a great statesman and Virginian, Woodrow Wilson. He said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

6. OUR OBLIGATION

Let us ponder these words of Wilson. Let us recur with frequency to fundamental principles. Let us preserve for ourselves and our posterity our goodly heritage—economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. This is our obligation. We must perform it. As followers of Jefferson and Jackson, we cannot do otherwise.

Revision and Amendment of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and Revision of Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend and revise our present immigration and naturalization law. I am also introducing a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25.

First, may I state that insofar as the present Immigration and Naturalization Act is concerned, I am in vigorous support of the chief objections to this law. At no time in the history of our Nation has there been a more desperate need, for the sake of preservation of civilization, to resolve misunderstandings, fears, and distrust among the peoples of the world. We are gripped by awareness that it is these tensions which have spurred nations in the race for military supremacy in atomic warfare.

Over and over again, in this critical period of world history, America has reavowed its concepts of fairness and standards of decency; its faith in the dignity and worth of all men. We have reaffirmed our faith in the principles of our Declaration of Independence, and to uphold these principles are now, in this Congress, considering the issue of maintenance of Reserve Armed Forces to protect our way of life, our Nation—homes and families—in their right to freedom and equality.

Yet these contentions, backed up by thousands and thousands of American dollars invested in programs of economic assistance to fellow-nations, in channels of communications—radio, press and goodwill ambassadorships—that we may make our American way of life and the basic concepts of our form of Government made known to propagandized and enslaved peoples of the world, are contradicted by one of the most important laws of a land which proclaims:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

I do not hesitate to say that there is an apparent keen bipartisan awareness of those contradictions. Former President Harry S. Truman saw them in his veto of present immigration legislation. The present administration's awareness of them was made known in campaign pledges promising remedial action.

The very title of title II, chapter I, of our present immigration law is a contradiction to American concepts in its statement "Annual Quota Based Upon National Origin." It is a provision which discriminates against certain peoples because of national origin, color, and religion. In addition, the quota is based upon statistics concerning the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920, not withstanding the fact that well before November 11, 1941, concepts concerning unified relationships in foreign policy were revolutionized.

In its administrative features, its vestment of wide discretionary powers within the hands of one official, the present act withholds from its guests and those who proclaim their accord with the American concepts, equal protection of the law. It subjects them as has already been discovered to the possibility of imprisonment without charge of crime.

In addition, the act contains unnecessary restrictions and penalties against individuals. These are but the major objections to this plan.

The bill which I am sponsoring today is one originally introduced by the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER.

Through it the national origins quota system would be eliminated and in its stead our Nation would establish in its book of law its basic policy of acceptance of persons without regards to race, color, national origin, or religion. Preference groups would be established with regard to purpose—as family unification, occupational preference, national interest preference—rather than with regard to national origin and would establish a unified quota system based on 1950 census, with minimum and maximum percentages set equally for all countries.

The bill would eliminate insubstantial ground for revoking or denying citizenship and arbitrary grounds for denying admission. It would make clear distinctions in requirements for entry between aliens seeking permanent residency and visitors coming for other purposes.

We, who form the Congress of the United States, that governmental body which is to represent, reflect, and uphold the principles of government under which our Nation found its freedom from oppression, under which it rose to its present status of world leadership must uphold our own integrity and exhibit openly our sense of moral responsibility by erasing from our books a law which is not in keeping with American faith. I urge this Congress to take swift action to demonstrate its bipartisan faith in the American way of life by working for and voting for the passage of the measure which I have presented.

The second bill which I am introducing would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25. In our program of fostering economic security, we must give our attention to domestic affairs. The minimum wage under Federal law of 75 cents per hour was established in 1950. In the 5 years since that time there has been an acknowledged substantial increase in the cost of living and in the average hourly earnings in many of the Nation's industries. The increase of the minimum hourly wage, in keeping with the economic growth of our Nation, would assist

those workers in areas where recognition has not been given to increasing costs. Such an increase in these areas would have, in increased spending, its beneficial effect upon the Nation's total economy.

I urge the Congress to adopt this measure for a minimum hourly wage of $1.25 as that figure adequate to meet present economic standards.

Labor-Management Relations at Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., Boise, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the State of Idaho, which I have the honor in part to represent, is indeed proud of the world's largest construction engineering firm, namely, the Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., and its subsidiary corporations, which have done great work not only in the United States but also, I dare say, in almost every country on the face of the globe.

In these days, when we hear so much criticism of those who have made free enterprise work, when we hear them called materialists and industrialists and haters of labor, when we hear it said that management cannot get along with labor, I am moved by an article which I read in the March 1955, issue of The EM-Kayan, official publication of Morrison-Knudson Co. This company, incidentally, has the finest labor-management relationship that it has been my privilege ever to have observed. If more persons would pay attention to the profound remarks made by the president of the Morrison-Knudson Co., Mr. Harry W. Morrison, I feel certain there would be less bickering between labor and management.

It was my privilege as a young boy to have seen the beginning of what is now a giant corporation. I saw it grow from humble beginnings to be the largest company of its kind in the world.

Listen now, Mr. President, to the words of the president of Morrison-Knudson Co., when he speaks not only to the laboring man, but also to supervisors and other persons.

I read from his statement in the March issue of the company's magazine:

> The company's continuing investment in accident insurance, safety supervision, and safety equipment is substantial; but no amount of mere money can be measured against the life of a man carelessly lost—as any widow will testify. Time lost in a hospital bed is never recovered by the employee or the company.

Mr. Morrison closes with this exortation:

> Keep alert to keep alive. Safety is no accident.

I have never heard more profound or finer words addressed to labor or management.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire message of President Harry W. Morrison, of the Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S MEMO—SUBJECT: PASTE THESE SLOGANS IN YOUR HARD HAT

No more important advice that I know of can be constantly urged upon the construction men of M-K than is expressed in the blunt but realistic catch phrase: "Keep alert to keep alive."

Through the years, each month's back cover of this magazine (except our annual New Year's covers) has illustrated an actual situation on an M-K job, portrayed by our own cartoonist as an example of unsafe performance that has caused a serious accident. Please read and absorb these messages, gentlemen, and remember especially the ones that apply to your own work or the work of men under your supervision.

The management is proud of the fact that for several years our safety records have progressively improved and are generally better than the the national averages for comparable operations. We are delighted with frequent reports printed in the Em-Kayan safety column of awards made by Government engineers to M-K jobs for outstanding safety performance. These Government agencies and, likewise, private owners for whom we work are increasingly conscious of the good or bad safety reputations of the construction jobs they authorize.

The company's continuing investment in accident insurance, safety supervision, and safety equipment is substantial; but no amount of mere money can be measured against the life of a man carelessly lost—as any widow will testify. Time lost in a hospital bed is never recovered by the employee or the company.

Our earnest appeal to every thinking man of M-K—and I trust we have no others—is to memorize these two easy slogans and keep them in mind until you are ready for retirement at a ripe old age: "Keep alert to keep alive," and "Safety is no accident."

H. W. MORRISON.

A Bill To Authorize Issuance of a Stamp To Honor Amelia Earhart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, I today introduced a bill in Congress which authorizes the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of, and bearing the likeness of, Medford's own Amelia Earhart.

While it may be truthfully said that Amelia Earhart was not born in Medford but rather in Kansas on July 24, 1898, still we citizens of Massachusetts and particularly those proud citizens of Medford have as great a claim to Miss Earhart not only because she made her home here for many years but, as a matter of fact, we are further proud of the fact that her mother and her sister still reside in our district in the city of Medford.

Amelia Earhart is recognized as the most outstanding of all aviatrix. From the time of her first flight in 1920 until the cruel Pacific wave tops reached for her gallant spirit on July 7, 1937, there was never for her any music quite like the cadence of the skies with its unbounded mysteries to be discovered. Miss Earhart was the first woman to fly the great expanses of both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. She was the first woman to reach the height of 14,000 feet, and one of the first American fliers of either sex to experiment with air-cooled engines, which later proved so valuable in our Nation's hour of need. In fact, Amelia Earhart is rightfully acknowledged as the supersaleswoman of our great aviation industry. She slogged out distance records, pioneered the autogiro, tested experimental planes and engines, gave hundreds of young enthusiasts their air instruction, boosted air travel with learned articles and thousands of lectures.

All men admired her for her femininity and good sportsmanship. All women warmed to her modesty, her championship of careers for their daughters. She was showered with honors and decorations, was feted by royalty, mobbed whenever and wherever she appeared in public. She was the best known woman of her day, and with it all her head remained unturned and she was the sweet epitome of gentle womanhood that we all look up to and admire.

Few women have been able to contribute so much to their country in such a short time as Amelia Earhart. Every day we see more clearly the outstanding contributions that she made to the happiness, the progress, and to the welfare of the American people and to the strength and security of our Nation. Men and women everywhere cling in their sorrow to her unconquerable courage and selfless devotion in building American aviation. There is now no question that she, too, gave her life in our Nation's and humanity's war for freedom of all people. It is to be hoped that the commemorative stamp will be issued as it will pay tribute to Amelia Earhart, a truly remarkable woman and a real American, and keep immemorial the services she so unselfishly gave our country, thereby encouraging thousands of American young women in their efforts to make this country even a greater place in which to live.

Westinghouse Annual Science Talent Search

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there was held in the Nation's Capital the award dinner of the Annual Science Talent Search conducted by Science Service throughout the Nation as a means of en-

couraging the interest of young people in a scientific career.

Naturally, I was particularly pleased to note that a fine young lady from my own State, Miss Kathleen Hable, aged 18, of Loyal, Wis., was awarded the second highest honor.

But, irrespective of that, I pay tribute to the great job which is being done by the Science Clubs of America, an activity of Science Service, whose noted director is Mr. Watson Davis.

Officers of Science Service are: Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president, secretary of Smithsonian Institution; Mr. Charles Scripps, vice president, chairman of board of E. W. Scripps Co.; Mr. O. W. Riegel, treasurer, director, Washington and Lee School of Journalism.

Science Service itself is a nonprofit corporation with trustees nominated by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the E. W. Scripps estate, and the journalistic profession.

By means of the science clubs, which it sponsors—15,000 clubs in the United States and abroad, including more than one-third of a million boys and girls—we are getting our youngsters to start in high school on the adventuresome paths of physics, chemistry, astronomy, biology, geology, and all the innumerable other phases of modern science.

Also, by means in particular of the science fairs, 70 of which are affiliated, including the one in my own science-minded State, Americans can participate at the grassroots.

On April 15, 16, and 17, there will occur at Brooks Memorial Union, Marquette University, the Southeast Wisconsin Science Fair, sponsored by Marquette and the Milwaukee Journal. Director of the fair is Father L. W. Friedrich, and working with him is an outstanding group of civic, industrial, educational, labor, engineering, and other leaders who are going to make this fair a grand success, I am sure. The National Science Fair winners will be selected at the nationwide competition taking place in Cleveland on May 12 to 14.

I am sure, too, that next year there will be still more science fairs affiliated in the national competition, and I am wishing every success for the continued flourishing of this grand concept.

Increasingly, our Nation is aware of the dangerous shortage of scientists and of the necessity of expanding their ranks. The Westinghouse talent search is one vital means of achieving this fine objective.

In the March 1, 1955, issue of the New York Times magazine there appeared an article describing the meeting by the young science talent winners with the President, and referring to the fine address which was delivered at the award dinner by Assistant Secretary of Defense, Donald A. Quarles. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask a question. Is it not true that a North Dakota girl received the first prize?

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is correct. I am glad the Senator is on his toes today, and recognizes that while the folks in North Dakota may not obtain ambassadorships, occasionally they win first prize.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLENTOWN BOY IS SCIENCE VICTOR—CHOSEN FROM FINAL LIST OF 40 FOR $2,800 SCHOLARSHIP IN WESTINGHOUSE CONTEST

WASHINGTON, February 28.—A 17-year-old physicist-mathematician-chemist, Frederick P. Greenleaf, of Allentown, Pa., received tonight the $2,800 Westinghouse grand science scholarship.

He was chosen from a field of 40 high-school seniors for his method of separating metals by distillation. The method is regarded as widely useful in such processes as refining and atomic fuel production.

Second honor, a $2,000 Westinghouse science scholarship, was won by Kathleen A. Hable, 18, of Loyal, Wis., who submitted "an exacting study in heredity." She traced a widow's peak in a Wisconsin family for 4 generations which included 65 individuals. She found frequency of more than 50 percent in the fourth generation.

Next was Vaughan A. Aandahl, 17, of Denver, a biologist, who brought here a collection of butterflies and moths. He was 1 of 8 contestants who won $400 scholarships.

OTHER $400 WINNERS

The others were Thomas S. Briggs, 16, of San Francisco; Charles Jetter Eichman, 17, of Audubon, N. J.; Roald Hoffman, 17, of Woodside, Queens, N. Y.; W. Stanley Marshall, 18, of Nashville, Tenn.; David K. Hergaard, 18, of Princeton, N. J.; James E. Potter, 17, of Rockford, Ill.; and Daniel H. Wilson, 17, of Kansas City, Kans.

The 40 contestants, 32 boys and 8 girls, visited President Eisenhower at the White House during the day.

Instead of making a speech to them he asked them questions about their projects. In his informal chat he said that he thought there should be more junior colleges in the country.

Tonight's awards in the Westinghouse Annual Science Talent Search were made at a banquet. Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense, said in an address that the talent search touches on the security of all of us.

"Like it or not," he declared, "we are in a race for technicological supremacy with Communist world and this science talent search has a direct bearing on the outcome of this race."

INCENTIVES IN UNITED STATES STRESSED

He asserted that the Soviet Unon was now "graduating well-trained scientists and engineers at more than twice the rate we are in this country." But, he added, because of our freedom and incentives "their pool would have to be considerably larger before it equalled the effectiveness of our own."

"Nevertheless, these statistics must give us pause," he continued. "We certainly can no longer take our superiority and military technology for granted."

He noted that the President had sent to Congress a plan to modify and expand the Selective Service Act and to revamp the National Reserve System. He declared that the training and use of scientists and engineers was an important part of the President's plan and that it included research grants and special scholarships.

He told the young scientists that work like theirs stimulated the interest of young people in professional careers in the physical sciences and engineering.

He closed by asserting that success against communism would depend on moral fiber as well as scientific skills.

In Favor of Bill H. R. 4720 To Provide Incentives for Members of Armed Services by Increasing Certain Pay and Allowances

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly pleased that the House Committee on Armed Services has reported favorably H. R. 4720, a bill to provide incentives for members of the Armed Forces by increasing certain pays and allowances.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage continued service so as to avoid the tremendous turnover of personnel that now prevails in the armed services.

The President, in a message to Congress on January 13, 1955, set forth with convincing and cogent reasons the necessity and advisability of passing legislation that would encourage officers and enlisted men to continue in the service on a career basis in order to obtain maximum usefulness from the skills and leadership which are achieved after long and costly training.

When the type of service that is now required of our men, whether they serve on land, sea, or in the air, is considered it becomes readily apparent that increasing mechanization and complexity of defense forces as stated by the President in his message make technical skills and a wide background of experiences vastly more important than ever before.

All of this is sufficient in itself to justify the passage of the bill now before us. But in addition thereto is the fact that during 1954 the armed services experienced one of the lowest reenlistment rates in the history of the Nation. This applies to every branch of our services.

The situation with regard to officers is equally alarming. The report submitted by the Armed Services Committee of the House in support of this legislation has given the detailed figures. It confirms the general statement that I have made that the situation is alarming.

Not only does the lack of reenlistments in sufficient numbers justify the passage of legislation of this character as a means, we hope, of correcting that situation, but the cost involved in training service personnel reaches such proportions as to make it necessary to adopt some means of making the services appealing enough to incline men to remain in service and thereby diminish the cost of training programs for additional men. It is known, as the report sets forth, that each man who enters the armed services

and undergoes basic training and up to the time of assignment to his first unit, involves approximately 6 months, costs the Government $3,200 in pay, allowances, subsistence, clothing, and overhead directly chargeable to the trainee together with the costs chargeable to the trainers. Thus, if the reenlistment rate could be increased by only 100,000 individuals in the year 1955, the savings cost alone for replacements would be tremendous and most worthwhile.

To increase the number of reenlistments the present legislation limits the pay increases to officers with 3 years and over of service, and enlisted personnel with 2 years and over of service. Thus it can be seen that the objective is solely and entirely to encourage officers and men to continue in the service. However, I am personally of the opinion that it would have been proper under existing circumstances to allow some increase for enlisted men and their dependents. We are all familiar with the financial hardships that are created when a father, or a son supporting his aged parents, is called into service. While I would have liked to see the bill grant some help to these whom I have just mentioned, yet I am aware of the necessity of the bill as presented and, accordingly, it has my approval and support.

Interest Grows in Copyright Factfinding Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on January 20 a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision," and set forth the background of this proposal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. On March 2, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, WILLIAM LANGER, introduced a companion measure, S. 1254, in the Senate.

There has been a growing interest in this proposal for a study commission, and I am pleased to be able to include here the following items as evidence of that interest:

[From Billboard magazine of March 12, 1955]

FACTFINDING HEATS UP

Although the habits of Congress are a bit difficult to understand—as when a Senator and Congressman introduce one another's conflicting bills—the pattern of events during the past 2 weeks indicates factfinding is gaining strength.

The original advantage enjoyed by the licensing agencies, an advantage derived from the almost unprecedented organized strength behind the Kilgore bill, is slowly being dissipated. The gap is narrowing not so much because of defensive measures on the part of the jukebox industry, but because the legislators are becoming more aware of the tremendous complications involved. They are learning that a lot of missing facts must be amassed before conclusions can be drawn.

That such an awareness should crystallize is inevitable. It develops as more and more people become cognizant of the opinions of unbiased copyright experts, such as Prof. Walter J. Derenberg, professor of law at New York University and a member of Attorney General Herbert Brownell's antitrust committee, and Prof. Benjamin Kaplan, of the Harvard University School of Law.

There is no black or white, right or wrong to the copyright problem. It is not as simple as that. Congress, for over 30 years, has unsuccessfully tried to come up with the answer. The Kilgore bill is exactly the same as those which stymied previous legislatures.

Let's be done with the time-consuming, misguided effort. Let's get into the basic economics of the problem, the basic economics of the music business. Let factfinding go beyond the licensing agencies, beyond the Music Operators of America, to the people who are directly involved—the operators, writers, and publishers.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
New York, N. Y., February 23, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK J. THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: As you may know, our law school has done some pioneer work in the field of copyright and we are currently conducting a seminar in advanced problems on literary and artistic property which is attended by some 40 graduate students. Your bill, H. R. 2677, proposing a Federal fact-finding commission to study revision of the copyright law, has stimulated a great deal of discussion here and I am taking the liberty of suggesting to you some thoughts that have occurred to me in this connection.

I have been a member of the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws, which is about to submit its report to the Attorney General within the next 2 or 3 weeks. This committee consists of some 60 experts in antitrust law representing both private and public points of view, who were appointed by the Attorney General upon recommendations made by the co-chairmen of the committee, the Honorable Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General and head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, of the University of Michigan Law School. No congressional action preceded the appointment of the committee and its work was financed by the appropriation available to the Department of Justice. The committee came into existence simply upon a suggestion by the Attorney General to President Eisenhower.

Some of us believe that a similarly constituted committee to revise our copyright law might best serve to bring about a much needed revision of our entire statute. In view of the many technical aspects of this field of the law, it may be more advantageous to have a committee appointed under the auspices of the Librarian of Congress which would not consist primarily of Congressmen or Senators but of copyright experts on both our domestic and international copyright law. Such a national committee might well lay the necessary groundwork for subsequent congressional action.

Similar committees of experts have handled similar assignments in Great Britain and Canada with outstanding success as evidenced by the Report of the Copyright Committee (Board of Trade), London (October 1952). Since I have gained the impression from reading some articles in the trade papers, Billboard, etc., that you are interested in getting reactions to the bill which you have proposed, I am taking the liberty of offering these thoughts to you.

Very sincerely yours,
WALTER J. DERENBERG,
Professor of Law.

P. S.: I am enclosing, as a matter of possible interest and information, a notice of the current seminar and an outline of the cases and materials used in my course on copyright at New York University School of Law.

MARCH 8, 1955.

Prof. WALTER J. DERENBERG,
School of Law, New York University, New York, N. Y.

DEAR PROFESSOR DERENBERG: Thank you very much for your very kind letter regarding the bill I have introduced to establish a commission to study the copyright law. You were quite correct in assuming that I would like to have comments on the bill from interested and qualified persons such as yourself.

I have been giving your suggestion that we set up the Commission under the Librarian of Congress considerable thought. It would seem to me that the bill as it stands at present would accomplish the ends you state in your letter. This bill would empower the President to appoint 7 of the 13 members of the Commission. He would thus be able to appoint men with outstanding reputations in the field of copyright law either from the Copyright Office and other branches of the Government and/or eminent members of the bar. In addition, the Commission would be composed of 3 Senators and 3 Representatives. These members would be taken from the membership of the respective Judiciary Committees of the two Houses. Since any revision of the copyright law would necessarily have to be passed by the Congress, it seems desirable to have some Members represented on the Commission.

This, at any rate, is the way the matter appears to me at the present time. If you have any further thoughts on the matter, I would greatly apppreciate hearing from you. In any case thank you again for your interest.

Cordially,
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[From Billboard magazine of March 12, 1955]

GETS IN COPYRIGHT ACT—NYU PROFESSOR SUGGESTS FACT-FINDING GROUP SIMILAR TO ANTITRUST ORG

(By Ben Atlas)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—A new wrinkle in the copyright fact-finding issue on Capitol Hill was added this week when Walter J. Derenberg, professor of law at New York University and a member of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.'s, antitrust committee, in a letter to Representative FRANK J. THOMPSON (Democrat of New Jersey) suggested that possibly a fact-finding group similar to the Attorney General's antitrust committee might perform the task specified by THOMPSON in his bill for a Federal Commission to study revision of the copyright law.

Professor Derenberg informed THOMPSON that proposed legislation for creation of a Federal factfinding commission "has stimulated a great deal of discussion at New York University's Law School which," Professor Derenberg said, "has done some pioneer work in the field of copyright" and is currently holding a seminar on advanced problems on literary and artistic property.

DERENBERG'S LETTER

Derenberg's letter went on to state:

"I have been a member of the Attorney General's national committee to study the antitrust laws, which is about to submit its report to the Attorney General within the

next two or three weeks. This committee consists of some 60 experts in antitrust law, representing both private and public points of view, who were appointed by the Attorney General on recommendations made by the cochairman of the committee, the Honorable Stanley M. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General and head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, of the University of Michigan Law School. No congressional action preceded the appointment of the committee and its work was financed by the appropriation available to the Department of Justice. The committee came into existence simply upon a suggestion by the Attorney General to President Eisenhower.

"Some of us believe that a similarly constituted committee to revise our copyright law might best serve to bring about a much-needed revision of our entire statute. In view of the many technical aspects of this field of the law, it may be more advantageous to have a committee appointed under the auspices of the Librarian of Congress which would not consist primarily of Congressmen or Senators but of copyright experts on both our domestic and international copyright law. Such a national committee might well lay the necessary groundwork for subsequent congressional action.

"Similar committees of experts have handled similar assignments in Great Britain and Canada with outstanding success, as evidenced by the report of the Copyright Committee (Board of Trade), London, October 1952. Since I have gained the impression from reading some articles in * * * Billboard, etc., that you are interested in getting reactions to the bill which you have proposed, I am taking the liberty of offering these thoughts to you."

CONSIDERATION UNLIKELY

It appears unlikely at this time that Professor Derenberg's suggestion of a Library of Congress committee on copyright will get serious consideration in Washington. Nevertheless, the suggestion was indicative of the awakening of interest, particularly on law campuses, in the fact-finding proposal. Previously, Prof. Benjamin Kaplan, of the Harvard University Law School, in a communication to Representative THOMPSON, voiced interest and indicated that the subject would be taken up by the Harvard Law School faculty (the Billboard, February 26).

Professor Derenberg enclosed with his letter a schedule of New York University Law School's copyright seminar. The seminar course is directed by Professor Derenberg "with the cooperation," he explained, "of outstanding experts in various specialized branches of copyright law." These experts include the following, several of whom are familiar figures on Capitol Hill as supporters of legislation in previous Congresses to end the copyright law's exemption of jukebox royalty payments.

The seminar roster of experts includes:

Arthur Fisher, registrar of copyrights, Library of Congress; Herman Finkelstein, general attorney, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; John Schulman, general counsel, Authors' League of America; Edward E. Colton, negotiator for the Dramatists' Guild; Edward A. Sargoy, former chairman, copyright committee, American Bar Association; Morris Ebenstein, legal department, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.; Samuel W. Tannenbaum, of Johnson & Tannenbaum; Robert J. Burton, vice president and resident counsel, Broadcast Music, Inc.; Charles B. Seton, of the New York Bar; Philip Wittenberg, author of the Marketing of Literary Property; Prof. Harry G. Henn, of Cornell University Law School; Joseph A. McDonald, treasurer, National Broadcasting Co., and former general attorney, American Broadcasting Co.; and John P. Allison, formerly editor, Tax Barometer.

Professional Soldiers Plus Incentives Equal Top Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States depend upon professional soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen to protect and defend our Nation.

The officers and noncoms are the backbone of our Military Establishment.

They have the special knowledge and experience and steadiness that cannot be drafted suddenly from civilian life in time of emergency.

We need them every day and every hour to handle complex equipment in farflung stations.

Devoted to honor, duty, country. Always faithful. Ready to give their lives if need be, and asking so little in return. Only respect and consideration.

The disciplined pride of a military man suffers severely when he and his dependents are not reimbursed for the sacrifices that they make by volunteering to serve their country.

At a time when pay and fringe benefits are increasing for civilians, we have seen the status of our service personnel slip farther and farther behind the average standard of living.

Before this pay-raise bill was passed, a master sergeant with over 18 years of service, received only $275.18 per month.

Only $3,300 a year for the highest noncom.

Short rations, at best.

Small wonder that the military service has ceased to be attractive.

We have made it so because of our neglect—our failure to consider the human factors.

The most effective and costly military equipment in the world will not buy us protection if the men to operate the equipment are amateurs, or if their hearts are not in their jobs.

A military pay increase bill will serve to keep the best-trained men in uniform. That is, if it is supplemented by further legislation to increase dependent medical care, survivors' benefits, and to provide for adequate housing.

The wives and children of professional military men also serve their country in ways that merit our understanding and our gratitude.

The vote in the House—399 for and only 1 against—reflects the overwhelming opinion in Congress that our career men in uniform are deserving of much better treatment than we have accorded them in the past.

We take this action not only for compelling economic reasons, but as a means of expressing to the men and women who have sacrificed the freedoms, the comforts, and the moneymaking opportunities of civilian life in order to dedicate themselves to the protection of all—our admiration and our deep respect.

Those who serve their country before themselves earn the highest honor and consideration.

It is a privilege for Congress to pass—with flying colors—the Career Incentive Act of 1955.

Hawaiian-Alaskan Statehood?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my statement before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on February 14 in relation to Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood.

The statement follows:

HAWAIIAN-ALASKAN STATEHOOD?

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, the controversial problem of statehood for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska continues to challenge the wisdom of this Congress. My remarks shall pertain to bill H. R. 2535, which proposes to grant statehood to both Territories and is now under consideration by this committee.

THE IMPORTANCE AND THE FINALITY OF STATEHOOD

This momentous issue of statehood compels us to give our most serious attention to its consequences. We are confronted with a measure that has vast implications relating to the internal affairs of this Union. We must also concern ourselves with the finality of whatever decision we may make.

No other problem will, as vitally, affect and shape our future as statehood. The seriousness of this subject is transcended only by our struggle to survive the Communist holocaust.

The various domestic and foreign problems of this Congress which relate to finance, defense, health, and foreign aid, are of extreme importance. Yet, if we find ourselves in error, our mistakes can readily be rectified by congressional action or by the flexibility of executive power. With one exception, even our Constitution and its amendments may be amended to conform with changing conditions or attitudes. The most recent example of this change is the repeal of the 18th amendment.

The one exception to the right to change our Constitution applies to the present proposal. Article V of our Constitution provides that no amendment may be made to this clause "and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The principle that no State can secede from this Union is established. The corollary principle that this Nation cannot divorce any State from this Union or restore it to the status of a Territory is equally accepted. Thus, the grant of statehood becomes an irrevocable act.

The finality of our decision as to statehood gives us cause to approach this matter, not with a lighthearted generosity, but rather with a somber realization and precaution that any mistake will burden us for the life of this Republic.

THE EMOTIONAL, IRRELEVANT, AND MINOR ISSUES

There have been so many issues injected into this debate that it has become difficult

to see the forest for the trees. Almost every conceivable argument has been presented pro and con to a degree that has confused and confounded rather than enlightened those who may be interested.

This appears a suitable time to attempt to clarify and place the arguments into their true political perspective. The leading arguments in favor of statehood which are grouped together here as being either emotional, irrelevant, or of minor consequence are:

(a) Americanism and military service.

(b) The psychological impact of statehood upon the Asiatic peoples.

(c) The references to precedent in favor of statehood.

(d) Partisan political considerations.

THE EMOTIONAL APPEAL OF AMERICANISM AND MILITARY SERVICE

Every informed person will acknowledge the courage and the sacrifices of the Hawaiian veterans in both World War II and the Korean conflict. This Nation is eternally indebted to them and in an equal degree to all other American veterans who fought so gloriously in those wars.

The proponents of statehood have cited individual cases of heroism on the part of Hawaiian soldiers. They have made comparisons of the Hawaiian casualties and the numbers in military service as against the casualties and the number of servicemen from the United States as a whole.

The Alaska Statehood Committee has published this claim:

"In two world wars and in Korea they have fought—in number exceeding the national per capita average—and by so doing have written a war record second to none in the Nation."

The Library of Congress has furnished the following table of inductees for World War II:

State	Population, 1945	Draftees in World War II
New Hampshire	459,000	32,430
Montana	477,000	38,453
Idaho	507,000	38,612
Hawaii	460,000	28,008
Alaska	79,000	3,482

(Hawaii had 8,769 additional enlistees. No figures are available for other States.)

These figures do not substantiate claims of superiority in the number of citizens from Hawaii and Alaska who served in World War II.

The statements regarding casualties and bravery cannot support the inference that these soldiers were more loyal and more brave than the veterans from the other areas of this country. I defend all segments of this country from the innuendo that any group or area of our people have a monopoly upon patriotism or bravery. There is no scientific thermometer that can measure the warmth of devotion for this great country.

The sacrifices on the battlefield do not constitute legitimate political, economic, or social premises for the admission of these territories to statehood. These highly emotional appeals could have been, most properly, left out of this debate.

THE IRRELEVANCE OF FOREIGN PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The proponents of statehood claim that statehood would create good will for the United States in the Pacific area and would avoid for us the stigma of colonialism.

The question of statehood is solely and wholly a domestic problem of our internal affairs. It is a strange theory that would permit foreign opinion to influence or decide the conduct of our domestic affairs. The Communist line of charging us with colonialism cannot be increased in volume nor will it be softened by any act of compliance.

We should not fear to disappoint those enemies. Our foreign friends need no explanations.

The psychological impact of statehood upon foreign peoples is irrelevant and deserves no consideration here.

The height of irrelevancy was attained by a former governor of one of the Territories. He advanced as an argument in favor of statehood, "the delectation of visitors, the sweetness of Hawaiian music, and the rhythm of its dance." Certainly, the muscular gyrations of the Hula dance is far afield from the crux of the statehood problem. This sentimentality borders upon the frivolous.

THE PRECEDENTS FOR STATEHOOD

The proponents of statehood rely extensively upon the use of precedent to lend validity to their claims.

The Northwest Ordinance was adopted under the Articles of Confederation in 1787. This Act, providing for the admission of that Territory to statehood, is cited as precedent and as the source of the inherent right of every Territory to become a State. This precedent is invalid for the following reasons:

1. The Articles of Confederation has been superseded completely by the Constitutional provisions relating to the admission of new States.

2. The Northwest Ordinance was limited in its application to the Northwest Territory.

3. The framework of the Confederacy, the division of powers and the scheme of representation was totally different from our present constitutional Government.

References by the Supreme Court to incorporate Territories as "inchoate" and "embryo" States are mere dicta and an attempted intrusion into the field of Congressional legislative authority and responsibility.

The admission of other States is referred to as precedent for the admission of Hawaii and Alaska upon the basis of equal representation in the United States Senate. The last State to be admitted was Arizona on February 14, 1912.

Following the admission of this 48th State, the 17th Amendment was adopted by final ratification on April 8, 1913. The mode of selection of Senators was altered from that of choice by the State legislatures to that of election by popular suffrage. This change of election of Senators has resulted in representation by the Senators of the people of the States as individuals in substitution for representation by the Senators of their respective States collectively and in their corporate capacities.

The 17th Amendment created a new concept of Senatorial representation. No State has been admitted under these fundamentally altered conditions.

Thus, the admission of other States furnishes no valid precedent for the admission, today, of Territories upon the same basis of representation in the United States Senate.

PARTISAN POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The Democratic National Party platform contains a plank favoring immediate statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. The Republican National Party platform favors immediate statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska under an equitable enabling act. However, no responsible Republican Party spokesman has, as yet, given us an adequate detail explanation of the meaning of the term "equitable enabling act."

In the 1952 elections, the Republican Party retained control of the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature by the election of 8 Republican Senators to 7 Democrats. In the House there were 19 Republicans elected to 11 Democrats.

In the same year, Alaskan Republicans won the Alaskan Senate by seating 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats. In the House, there were 20 Republicans elected to 4 Democrats.

Based upon these returns, it was predicted that in the event of statehood, Hawaii would elect 2 Republican Senators and that Alaska would possibly elect 1 or 2 Republican Senators.

Two years ago the Republican administration attempted to pass the bill giving statehood to Hawaii and kill the Alaskan statehood bill. This writer opposed the immediate admission of these States either severally or jointly. The Republican Party subjected itself to the charge of attempting to gain partisan political advantage in its attempt to support the Hawaiian statehood bill alone.

In 1954 the political picture reversed itself. The Hawaiian Legislature was won by the Democratic Party for the first time in the history of that Territory. The Democratic Party swept both Houses overwhelmingly. The Democrats won a 9 to 6 majority in the Senate and a 22 to 8 majority in the House.

A similar sweep was gained by the Democrats in the Alaskan Territorial Legislature. There, the Democrats gained control of the Senate by winning 12 seats to 4, and in the House 21 seats to 3.

Another political factor is the successive drop in the plurality of the Republican Delegate from Hawaii. The Republican pluralities for that office are as follows:

Year:	*Republican plurality*
1948	[1] 52,000
1950	[1] 31,000
1952	[1] 9,000
1954	[2] 890

[1] Approximate.
[2] Official.

Based on the 1954 election returns, it appears that, in the event of statehood, Alaska would surely elect 2 Democrat Senators and Hawaii would be likely to elect 2 Democrat Senators.

It is most obvious that the passage of the joint Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood bill by the Congress would place the Republican Party in a difficult position. The President would be placed in a political dilemma. By approving statehood for both Territories, he would risk the probability that these two Territories would return 4 Democrat Senators. If he vetos statehood, he assumes the political onus of defeating a measure of popular favor.

Partisan politics is a transitory consideration. This issue ought to be decided upon American principles having a true political validity. The solution should pass the test of what will be permanently just for the peoples of both majority and minority parties of the whole Nation.

GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE REJECTS STATEHOOD

At the hearing before this committee on February 4, 1955, the impression was left that the Governor's Conference endorses statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. This is not so.

Resolutions were adopted by the Governors' Conferences, for 6 years from 1947 to 1952, favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

On March 2, 1953, the writer addressed communications to each of the 48 governors indicating the prospective loss of voting power for the people of each State in the senatorial and presidential elections upon the grant of statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. No claim is made that the subsequent failure to endorse statehood is due to these communications.

At the 1953 governors' conference, a resolution favoring Hawaiian statehood was presented. This resolution failed to receive a favorable report. No resolution for either Hawaiian or Alaskan statehood was presented at the 1954 conference. The governors, perhaps, perceived the prospective loss of representation to the peoples of their respective States. Failure to approve statehood resolutions, under these circumstances can be fairly construed to constitute rejection.

COMMUNISM, A MAJOR CONSIDERATION IN HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The extensive communistic influences in Hawaii continue to present an alarming condition for both Hawaii and the United States. A careful study of the facts does not give hope that communistic power is on the wane. Communism remains a potent force permeating the economic, political, and social structures of this Territory.

The New York Herald Tribune of June 23, 1953, reported a labor strike by the ILWU on June 22, 1953, in Hawaii. The facts, as reported there, are as follows:

Twenty-four thousand employees on the island went on strike in a mass protest against the conviction of Jack Hall and six other conspirators convicted of plotting to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government.

Two thousand of these employees are stevedores, members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU), who refused to load military cargo for Korea. Eighteen thousand out of 19,000 ILWU union workers on the sugar plantations joined in this strike. One thousand of these men refused to strike. Four thousand out of 5,000 pineapple workers also joined the strike. One thousand of these men refused to strike.

Now, these men went on strike, not because of any legitimate labor dispute, but in protest against the conviction of these Communists for the advocacy of treason and revolution.

The fact that 1,000 men in the sugar industry and 1,000 men in the pineapple industry refused to join this strike is proof that it was possible to refuse to join in this dastardly demonstration of Communist close-order drill.

Those who refused, a pitiful minority of 2,000, demonstrated their courage and Americanism. The same cannot be said for the other 24,000. The refusal to load military cargo for Korea borders upon sabotage.

If these men went on strike because of threats or pressures, then a condition exists in Hawaii so dangerous that Hawaii should not be granted statehood at this time. If they went on strike willingly because of their sympathy for the Communist convicts and the Communist movement, then this type of citizen does not deserve statehood. This country can do well without their voice and their vote in Congress.

This same union, ILWU, called another strike as recently as last December 1954, while members of this Territorial subcommittee were attending hearings in Hawaii.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) has a membership of 25,000 and dominates unionism in that territory. Its president is Harry Bridges, who is 1 of the top 3 Communist leaders in this country. Jack Hall is the Hawaiian spokesman for Harry Bridges and the leader of that union there.

The unions in Hawaii controlled or infiltrated by Communists have a membership of about 30,000. The names of the Communists and those persons closely related to the Communist Party who occupy positions of power in the unions, union locals and the top organization of the ILWU are contained in the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee for the year 1950.

These hearings regarding Communist activities in Hawaii are contained in three volumes and contain a startling revelation of the infiltration of communism into both the ranks of unionized labor and in the political parties. These volumes are proof that the Communist Party controls the ILWU, lock, stock, and barrel.

By means of union devices such as closed shops, union stewards, and grievance committees, it is possible for the Communists to control the employment, lay-offs, firings, and hiring of labor. This control, and the use of cadres of union officials and Communist stooges to propagandize, persuade, and coerce, gives the Communists a tight control over the ideology and political action of its members. The individual laborer doesn't have a chance to earn a living or to keep from being maimed by a premeditated "industrial accident" unless he complies.

It is a political axiom that each employee can be counted upon to deliver three votes in a political election. If the ILWU can order 24,000 men to go out on a Communist sympathy strike sabotaging United States military transport, can there be any doubt that they can deliver 50,000 votes to their political choice?

The political objectives of the Communist Party are reported in these hearings. They are:

1. Communists support statehood (p. 1559, pt. 2 of the hearings).

2. Development of a following in the Democratic Party to back Communist causes (p. 1570, pt. 2 of the hearings).

3. Establish legislative caucus to act as pressure group on Democratic Party for Communists objectives (p. 1570, pt. 2 of the hearings).

The fact that statehood for Hawaii is supported by the Communist Party and the ILWU does not per se make this cause wrong or undesirable. However, one can be sure that their support for statehood is not actuated by the same motives for good government as those who sincerely believe that statehood is a just cause. The support of the Communists is based upon their self-interest in advancing the Communist cause and that cause alone.

Can there be any doubt that the Communist Party and the ILWU would not make an all-powerful drive to elect 2 United States Senators in the event of statehood? And it makes no difference to them whether they bear the Republican or Democratic label. By statehood, we not only open the door for 2 Communist-influenced United States Senators, but we actually invite 2 Soviet agents to take seats in the United States Senate.

On June 19, 1953, Jack Hall, ILWU regional director and Communist Party leader was convicted of violation of the Smith Act along with 6 other defendants. A 1954 publication of the Hawaii Statehood Commission cited these convictions as proof of "unalterable and aggressive opposition" of the people of Hawaii to communism. The record of the 1954 election completely refutes this statement.

In the race for the office of mayor of the city of Honolulu, Frank F. Fasi, the Democratic candidate was opposed by Neal Blaisdell, the Republican candidate. During the campaign Frank Fasi charged that Blaisdell was courting ILWU support.

On October 15, 1954, the leading newspapers carried the charge by Frank Fasi, the Democratic candidate, that "The big issue of this campaign is whether a candidate for mayor can be elected without the support of the Communist leaders in Hawaii."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which is an outstanding newspaper of the highest standards, reported on November 1, 1954:

"He (Fasi) has struck out at Governor King and the ILWU leadership."

On November 3, this same newspaper carried the following front page headline:

"ILWU sample ballot supports Blaisdell."

During this campaign, the Republican candidate did not once deny these charges or repudiate and reject ILWU support. The following legal maxim certainly applies to this situation, "When one owes a duty to speak, silence implies consent."

The electorate of Hawaii answered Mr. Fasi's issue by proving that a mayor cannot be elected without the support of Communist leaders. Perhaps, the ILWU support was unsolicited. However, there can be no question that the ILWU support was given with Mayor Blaisdell's knowledge and was accepted without repudiation by him of the ILWU leaders or the Communist principles.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin made a survey of the Hawaiian election of November 1954 and reported its findings as follows:

"The ILWU endorsed 71 candidates. Of these, 58 won, a batting average of 81 percent.

"In the Senate, 5 ILWU candidates won out of 6 candidates endorsed in contests for 7 seats. There are a total of 15 seats in the Senate.

"In the House, 22 ILWU supported candidates won out of 28 endorsed. There are 30 seats in the House.

"In the county, 32 ILWU supported candidates won out of 38 contests which includes Neal Blaisdell, Republican mayor of Honolulu."

The 1954 election was a complete victory for the ILWU and the Communist Party. They can now exercise either control or a considerable influence over both Houses of the Legislature and the Mayor of Honolulu. This victory is made more impressive by the fact that the ILWU political influence can be exerted in both Republican and Democratic parties.

Mr. Jack Hall not only directed the ILWU political activities but also claimed full credit for the victories of the Republican Mayor of Honolulu and the Democratic victory in both Houses of the Hawaii Legislature. Mr. Hall even offered his advice for the full use of the political power gained by that election.

The secretary of the former mayor made a practice of greeting Harry Bridges at the Honolulu airport when that distinguished Communist arrived there. He sent the Honolulu municipal band to money-raising affairs held to defray the legal defense of the Communists.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission claims that statehood would enable Hawaii to deal more effectively with Communism and the ILWU. On the contrary, statehood would free the Communists and the ILWU from United States control and jurisdiction. They now have the power and could immediately proceed without Federal interference to Socialize and Communize that State.

The atmosphere in Hawaii is one of tolerance, appeasement and encouragement for communism. The burden of proof that it can eradicate communism properly rests with the people of Hawaii. The proof has not been presented. If there is a reasonable doubt as to an extensive communistic economic and political control in Hawaii, then the party to suffer thereby is the United States. The people of the 48 States are entitled to the benefit of possible doubt. Statehood should be rejected now and deferred for an appropriate time when communism no longer threatens the well-being of either Hawaii or the United States.

The 1954 election issues, the political maneuverings and the election results serve as a "Stop, Look, and Listen" warning to us.

THE POLITICAL POWERS OF STATEHOOD

Man's struggle for liberty never stops. That goal is gained in the degree of acceptance of the proposition that all sovereign power rests with the people. Constitutional government is an instrumentality for carrying out this concept of freedom.

Under our system of constitutional representative government, sovereign power can be placed into three broad categories. First, the power inherent to the people. This power can be generally described as all sovereign power that remains after constitutionally conferring such political powers to the States and the Nation as are needed for the attainment of their purposes. Second, the power granted to the Federal Government. In a broad sense, this power is limited to the enumerated political powers granted to the Federal Government under our United States Constitution. The third category is the power reserved to the States. This consists of all the residual political power constitutionally conferred by the people and not granted to the Nation.

In the present discussion, we are concerned with the second and third categories of political power. An analysis of statehood reveals a dual concept.

First: Statehood would grant to the territories the same sovereign and political powers as possessed by other States to conduct the affairs of these areas without Federal supervision or control.

Second: Statehood would grant to the proposed States the power of representation in the Federal Government.

THE POLITICAL POWER TO CONDUCT THE AFFAIRS OF THE STATE

Statehood is not essential for the grant of power to the Territories to enact laws relating to its property, affairs, and government. Congress has entire dominion, national and local, over Territories. It may transfer full legislative powers with respect to local affairs to legislatures elected by the Territories.

Both Alaska and Hawaii now possess general legislative power for these purposes. The major exception in Alaska is the power to legislate over public lands, fisheries, and subsurface resources. Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove territorial legislation, no law passed by either territory has ever been disapproved by Congress.

The executive power could very well be transferred to the Territories. There could be no serious objection to any necessary extension of judicial powers for these Territories.

However, neither of these Territories appears to seriously want these powers. No reasonable proposal or request has been made to Congress for the reorganization or an extension of the jurisdiction of the Territorial courts.

There appears to be no sincere desire upon the part of the Territories to elect their own governors and to assume executive power.

While this committee has, over the course of years, considered many bills relating to the control of fisheries, minerals, and public lands, it has not yet approved any overall proposal to grant such power to Alaska. On the other hand, neither Territory has ever presented to Congress a comprehensive bill of particulars for an extension of legislative power to enable it to govern its own affairs.

The complaints made by these Territories of a lack of power to administer Territorial matters can be interpreted in either of two ways. Either this committee has failed to give adequate consideration to their needs for additional power or the Territories have failed to present and press for a comprehensive program designed to obtain for them the necessary power to govern. This writer believes that the latter alternative prevails.

It would appear that the concern of the proponents of statehood lies not in their desire or need for additional power to conduct the affairs of the Territories but rather in their drive for representation in Congress and in the election of a President.

THE POLITICAL POWER OF REPRESENTATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The history of Government is, in essence, a recital of the distributions of power. We are concerned here with an equitable apportionment of legislative and executive power. Statehood would transfer a share of these powers to the proposed States. Their participation in the Federal Government would consist of:

(a) The right to be represented in the United States Senate by two Senators.

(b) The right to participate in the election of a United States President.

(c) The right to be represented in the United States House of Representatives.

ORIGINAL BASIS FOR SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION

The problem of equitable representation in the United States Senate continues to plague this country since May 1787, when the Constitutional Convention convened.

The historical struggle has been between the smaller States desiring representation on a basis of equality for States (as corporate sovereign entities) and the larger States seeking representation in proportion to population. The plan of giving each State two Senators conform to the pattern of a federation of States while representation in proportion to population conforms to the framework of a national government.

We are concerned today with the question of the political justice and wisdom of equality of representation for newly admitted States in the United States Senate. The plan of equality of senatorial representation by States was adopted for the protection of the States from encroachment by the Federal Government. In furtherance of this purpose, the provision that the Members of the United States Senate be chosen by State legislatures was enacted.

I cite the following statement made in the Constitutional Convention by Delegate Wilson of Pennsylvania:

"The leading argument of those who contend for equality of votes among the States is that the States as such being equal, and being represented not as districts of individuals, but in their political and corporate capacities, are entitled to equal suffrage."

Alexander Hamilton, supporting the adoption of the Constitution, stated in the Federalist, Paper No. 62:

"It (referring to appointment of Senators by State legislatures) is recommended by the double advantage: of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the Federal Government as must secure the authority of the former and may form a convenient link between the two systems."

It seems clear that the plan of representation in the United States Senate was implemented by the provision that the States in their corporate capacities as States and as an organic whole be secured in that right of equality by the grant to them as States to choose their Senators by vote of the State legislatures. The provision for election of Senators by the State legislatures was an integral part of the compromise by which two Senators were provided to the States. The convention would never have agreed upon this principle of Senate representation if that right had not been secured by this mode of selection, that of choice by legislatures.

The 17th amendment of our Constitution, ratified on April 8, 1913, destroyed the reason for the provision that each State shall be entitled to 8 seats in the United States Senate.

STATEHOOD BASICALLY SHIFTS SENATORIAL AND PRESIDENTIAL REPRESENTATION FROM THE 48 STATES TO HAWAII AND ALASKA

Reduced to fundamental terms, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska grants representation in the United States Senate and in the election of the President. In the Senate they would be represented by 4 Senators out of a prospective total of 100 Members. In the electoral college they would be represented by 7 votes out of a prospective total of 535 votes.

The representation proposed for these Territories will be taken from the present representation possessed by the people of the 48 States and shifted to the people of these 2 Territories. This transfer of sovereign power seriously and correspondingly reduces the right of suffrage of the peoples of the 48 States in the United States Senate and in the election of the President.

REDUCTION IN THE SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION OF THE 48 STATES

The admission of Hawaii and Alaska under the present constitutional provision will entitle their residents—628,437 combined—to 4 seats in the United States Senate. The average representation would be 1 Senator for each 157,000 inhabitants. The people of the 48 States, having a population of 152,572,000, represented by 96 Senators, today enjoy the average representation of 1 Senator for each 1,589,000 persons. Thus, Hawaii and Alaska would become entitled to representation in the United States Senate 10 times greater than the average representation of the people of the 48 States. Each voter will have approximately 33 times the power of the vote of the people of California in the United States Senate, 27 times the power of the vote of the people of Illinois, 32 times the power of the vote of the people of Pennsylvania, and 47 times the vote of the people of New York.

A comparison of the voting power of the voters of Hawaii and Alaska (combined) with that of the people of the 48 States in the election of United States Senators is contained in schedule A of the accompanying table:

Tables comparing the prospective voting power of the average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter in the election of United States Senators and a United States President with the voting power of the voters of the 48 States

METHOD OF COMPUTATION

Schedule (A): Population of Hawaii and Alaska (combined) is 628,437 with 4 Senators. 1 Senator for 157,000 residents. Population of Alabama is 3,061,000. 1 Senator for 1,537,500 residents. 1,537,500 divided by 157,000 equals 9.8 representing the average voting rights of the residents of Hawaii and Alaska as compared to 1 vote for voter in Alabama in the election of the United States Senate.

Schedule (B): Presidential electors for Hawaii and Alaska (combined) will be 7 or 1 for each 89,700 residents. Presidential electors for Alabama is 11 or 1 for each 278,000 residents. 278,000 divided by 89,700 equals 3.1 representing the average voting rights of residents of Hawaii and Alaska as compared to 1 vote for the voter of Alabama in the election of a United States President.

State and Territory	Population (1950 census)	Number of presidential electors	Voting power of average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter versus 1 vote for voters of other States for—	
			(A) United States Senate	(B) United States President
Alaska	128,643	3		
Alabama	3,061,743	11	9.8	3.1
Arizona	749,587	4	2.4	2.1
Arkansas	1,909,511	8	6.1	2.6
California	10,586,223	32	33.7	3.6
Colorado	1,325,089	6	4.2	2.4
Connecticut	2,007,280	8	6.4	2.8
Delaware	318,085	3	1.0	1.2
Florida	2,771,305	10	8.8	3.0
Georgia	3,444,578	12	10.9	3.2
Hawaii	499,794	4		
Idaho	588,637	4	1.9	1.6
Illinois	8,712,176	27	27.8	3.6
Indiana	3,934,224	13	12.5	3.4
Iowa	2,621,073	10	8.3	2.9
Kansas	1,905,299	8	6.1	2.6
Kentucky	2,944,806	10	9.4	3.3
Louisiana	2,683,516	10	8.5	3.0
Maine	913,744	5	2.9	2.0
Maryland	2,343,011	9	7.8	2.9
Massachusetts	4,690,514	16	15.4	3.2
Michigan	6,371,766	20	20.3	3.5
Minnesota	2,982,483	11	9.5	3.0
Mississippi	2,178,914	8	6.6	3.0
Missouri	3,954,653	13	11.3	3.4
Montana	591,024	4	1.9	1.6
Nebraska	1,325,510	6	4.2	2.4
Nevada	160,083	3	.5	.6
New Hampshire	533,242	4	1.1	1.5
New Jersey	4,835,329	16	15.6	3.3
New Mexico	681,187	4	2.2	1.9
New York	14,830,192	45	47.2	3.6
North Carolina	4,061,929	14	12.9	3.2
North Dakota	691,636	4	2.2	1.9
Ohio	7,946,627	25	25.2	3.5
Oklahoma	2,233,351	8	7.1	3.1
Oregon	1,521,341	6	4.9	2.8
Pennsylvania	10,498,012	32	32.8	3.6
Rhode Island	791,896	4	2.5	2.2

Tables comparing the prospective voting power of the average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter in the election of United States Senators and a United States President with the voting power of the voters of the 48 States—Continued

State and Territory	Population (1950 census)	Number of presidential electors	Voting power of average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter versus 1 vote for voters of other States for—	
			(A) United States Senate	(B) United States President
South Carolina	2,117,027	8	6.7	2.9
South Dakota	652,740	4	2.0	1.8
Tennessee	3,291,718	11	10.5	3.3
Texas	7,711,194	24	24.5	3.5
Utah	688,862	4	2.2	1.9
Vermont	377,747	3	1.2	1.4
Virginia	3,318,680	12	10.5	3.0
Washington	2,378,963	9	7.6	2.9
West Virginia	2,005,552	8	6.3	2.8
Wisconsin	3,434,575	12	10.9	3.1
Wyoming	290,529	3	.9	1.1

The representation in the United States Senate for Hawaii and Alaska is acquired by a corresponding reduction of the present power of representation of the people of the 48 States in that body, today. The right of suffrage equal to that of 6,356,000 persons is taken from the 152,572,000 residents of the 48 States in varying percentage amounts and is transferred to the 628,437 residents of Hawaii and Alaska.

Statehood will give Hawaii and Alaska 4 votes in a Senate of 100 Members or one twenty-fifths of the membership. Although their combined population is only one two-hundred-and-forty-two-seconds of the population of the 48 States. This grant of one twenty-fifths of the membership in the United States Senate dilutes and diminishes by that fraction the representation in that body of the people of the 48 States.

POLITICAL POWER IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, A MAJOR CONSIDERATION

The disproportionate advantage of Alaska and Hawaii would also apply in the presidential elections. Upon admission, these States would have a total of 7 electoral votes, an average of 1 electoral vote for each 89,776 inhabitants. The 152,572,000 people of the 48 States, with a total of 531 electoral votes, are entitled to 1 electoral vote each for an average population of 287,300. Thus, the voter in Hawaii and Alaska would have an average voting power in the election of a United States President 3.2 times greater than the average vote of the voter in the 48 States.

The comparison of the voting rights of the voters of Hawaii and Alaska—combined—with that of the people of the 48 States in presidential elections is contained in schedule B of the accompanying table, page 16a.

The electoral vote of 2,011,100—7 electoral x 287,300 average population for 1 electoral vote—persons will be taken from the 152,572,000 residents of the 48 States and transferred to the 628,437 residents of Hawaii and Alaska. The disfranchisement of the residents of the 48 States applies not only to the executive branch but also applies to the judicial branch of our Government because the appointing power to the judiciary lies with the President.

The total electoral vote will be temporarily increased to 538 by the 7 electoral votes of Hawaii and Alaska. After the 1960 census, the House of Representatives would be reapportioned to reduce the temporary membership of 438 to 435. With the Senate increased to 100 Members, the electoral college would be permanently increased to 535 members.

Although the combined population is only one two-hundred-forty-seconds of the population of the 48 States, Hawaii and Alaska (combined) would enjoy one seventy-sixth (or seven five-hundred-thirty-fifths) of the total voting strength of the 48 States in the election of a President. The right of suffrage of the 48 States in this respect is dimnished by that fraction.

THE DILEMMA OF STATEHOOD

Congress is confronted with the unpleasant alternatives of continuing to withhold statehood and Federal representation for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii or to grant statehood under terms that would unduly reduce the Federal representation of the people of the 48 States. Under present provision of the Constitution, a difficult choice must be made between the following alternatives:

A. By the denial of statehood:

1. Shall 499,794 citizens of Hawaii and 128,643 citizens of Alaska continue to be denied representation in the United States Senate and be limited to representation in the United States House of Representatives by a nonvoting delegate? and

2. Shall these citizens continue to be denied representation in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government by the lack of suffrage in the election of a President? or

B. By the grant of statehood:

1. Shall the citizens of the 48 States be disfranchised to the extent of one twenty-fifth of their representation in the United States Senate and shall that share of representation (possessed on an average by 6,357,-168 citizens of the 48 States) be transferred to the 628,437 citizens of Hawaii and Alaska? and

2. Shall the citizens of the 48 States be disfranchised to the extent of one seventy-sixth of their electoral college voting rights in the election of a President and his appointment of the judiciary and shall that share of representation (possessed on an average by 2,011,100 citizens of the 48 States) be transferred to the 628,437 citizens of Hawaii and Alaska?

It is my conviction that neither alternative can wisely and justly solve this subverting dilemma.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS IN PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

There have been a number of joint resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives proposing constitutional amendments to deal with the problem of statehood.

One group proposes to empower Congress to determine whether the newly admitted State shall have either no representation in the United States Senate, or 1 Senator or 2 Senators. While the intent of this resolution is laudible, the political pressures upon Congress would probably prevent a nonpartisan consideration of this determination.

The second group would provide for the admission of States by the same procedure that is required for an amendment to the United States Constitution. This proposal appears to be a procedural and not a substantive amendment. It would serve to erect an almost insurmountable barrier to statehood. The proposal has the advantage of placing the final decision of statehood in the State legislatures which represent the people affected more closely than either House of Congress. It offers no cure for the weakness of disproportionate representation.

The third, a resolution, House Joint Resolution 208, introduced by this writer, proposes a limitation upon representation in the United States Senate for newly admitted States. It would establish an inflexible standard of representation in the United States Senate on a basis proportionate to population. By its provisions, any State hereafter admitted, upon attaining a population of one-half of the average population represented by each Senator (1950 Census: 794,646), would become entitled to 1 United States Senator. Upon attaining a population of 1½ of the average population represented by each Senator (1950 Census: 2,383,-938) it would become entitled to 2 United States Senators.

JUSTIFICATION FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 208, PROPORTIONATE POPULATION REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES SENATE FOR NEWLY ADMITTED STATES

The Senate today, in terms of power derivations, accountability, and representation, constitutes another House of Representatives. Since the reason for equality of senatorial representation no longer exists, there is no further need for this constitutional provision. The only other tenable apportionment for the exercise of senatorial power is that of representation proportionate to population.

The proponents for statehood contend that Hawaii has a larger population than a number of States. They contend that it would be unfair to limit their senatorial representation as a condition to statehood. An adequate answer to this contention is that while article V of the Constitution prohibits depriving any State of its equal suffrage in the Senate, this protection does not apply to Hawaii and Alaska since they are not States and cannot be deprived of a power they do not now possess. It has been suggested that the present senatorial representation be rearranged. This is neither practicable nor constitutionally possible, since this protection of Senate suffrage is not amendable.

The farsighted statesmen who drew our Constitution were very careful to make this Constitution flexible enough to allow an amendment for the admission of States without the representation of two Senators.

The clause of article V of the Constitution, "that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate," carries a double connotation.

First: The Constitution cannot be amended to deprive any State of equal suffrage in the Senate without its consent.

Second: The Constitution cannot be amended to deprive a State of its power to consent to be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The farsighted vision of a possible gross inequality of representation in the Senate is confirmed by a study of the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention. In the considerations of the provisions of article IV, section 3, "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union;" the Convention deleted, by a 9-to-2 vote, a proposal to the effect that "new States be admitted on the same terms with the original States."

The Constitution affords ample authority to justify an amendment to equalize, per population, senatorial representation for States to be admitted.

STATEHOOD POSSIBILITIES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PUERTO RICO, GUAM, VIRGIN ISLANDS, SAMOA

No one can accurately foretell what lands and peoples may seek statehood in future decades. The holdings of the United States, in addition to the trusteeship of the trust islands in the Pacific, are the incorporated Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, the vague commonwealth status of Puerto Rico, the unincorporated but organized territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam, and the unincorporated and unorganized possession of American Samoa.

The residents of these Territories all enjoy United States citizenship excepting those in Samoa, who are classified as "nationals."

The people of each of these possessions, and the people of the District of Columbia aspire for statehood. The Virgin Islands hints for a delegate to the House of Representatives. Delegates to both Houses of Congress have been proposed for the District of Columbia.

Each of these political entities are edging toward statehood. In the coming half century, Congress will be called upon to decide their fate without any principle to guide it in relation to representation in the Senate and the electoral college. Certainly, the determination should not rest upon the political expediencies that may exist at that time.

House Joint Resolution 208 would provide Congress with an equitable basis for the consideration of statehood and remove the problem of representation from the strains of party politics. It would establish a just and inflexible standard of equal application to all States hereafter admitted. It would lessen the clamor for statehood where it is sought primarily for the political powers inherent in two seats in the United States Senate.

OTHER ASPECTS OF STATEHOOD: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The proponents of Alaskan statehood claim that statehood would advance the economic development of Alaska. This hope does not conform to historical fact.

Hawaii and Alaska have had territorial status for about the same length of time. Yet, Hawaii has progressed at a far more rapid pace, economically, than has Alaska. Hawaii's economy compares quite favorably with that of the States. It is not the political status that accounts for the differential in the rate of their economic growth. The growth of Hawaii can be principally ascribed to favorable physical characteristics, the temperate climate, and her arable lands.

THE VOTE IN ALASKA

The office of Delegate is the highest elective office in Alaska. The total vote cast for that office in the 1954 election was 26,999. This compares with the latest estimated civilian population of 132,000. No attempt will be made to analyze the reason for the meager ratio of vote to that of population.

When compared to congressional districts which cast from 150,000 to 200,000 votes, the voting differential is startling. This vote sharply and clearly shows up the fantastically excessive disproportionment of allowing 2 Senators to be elected by the choice of 27,000 voters.

LOSS OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES—THE GROWTH OF NATIONAL POLITICAL POWER—THE REDUCTION OF STATES RIGHTS

The past 25 years, can be noted for the vast and alarming growth and concentration of power in the National Government. A parallel concentration continues to take place in the executive branch of our Government. These increasing concentrations of power coincide with a reduction of powers of the States, the loss of sovereign rights and liberties of the people, and the deprivations of the legislative powers and responsibilities of Congress.

Statehood for these Territories would accentuate the inequalities of senatorial representation. It would tend to strengthen the national concept and weaken States rights. It would increase the pace of nationalization of local government services and concentrate power in the Federal Government and in the executive branch.

There is no standard of measurement of political power. There is however a standard for the measurement of the exercise of power. This standard is the percentage of the national product siphoned off by our Government. The following table illustrates the increase in the Federal absorption of our national production:

Government expenditures and gross national product

Calendar year	Gross national product	Government expenditures					
		Amount			As a percentage of gross national product		
		Total expenditures	Federal expenditures	State, local expenditures	Total expenditures	Federal expenditures	State, local expenditures
	Billion	*Billion*	*Billion*	*Billion*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1929	$104.4	$10.2	$2.6	$7.5	9.8	2.5	7.3
1930	91.1	11.02	2.7	8.2	12.1	3.0	9.1
1940	100.6	18.4	10.08	8.3	18.4	10.0	8.3
1950	285.06	61.2	40.9	20.2	21.5	14.4	7.1
1953	364.8	102.5	78.05	24.4	28.1	21.4	6.7

The above table indicates that Federal spending of our national production increased from 2.5 percent in 1929 to 21.4 percent in 1953. An increase of more than eightfold. In the same period, the spending by States decreased from 7.3 percent to 6.7 percent of our national production.

The founders of our Constitution envisioned a government of limited national power. The residuary power of the States was conceived to be far greater quantitatively that the powers granted to the Federal Government. The grant of two Senators to each State was based upon these assumptions. Appointment by legislatures was devised to safeguard this objective.

The above table proves that the exercise of Federal power, 21.4 percent of production, is more than 3 times the exercise of State power, 6.7 percent. This shift from State power to Federal power coincides with the alteration of our mode of selection of Senators from that of legislatures to that of popular suffrage.

The equitable measure of representation for a dominant national government is that of representation in proportion to population. That is the only possible protection of the majority of the people against the preponderant power of a minority of the people.

Statehood, by increasing the power of the minority, will tend to break down our two party system. It leads to blocs and coalitions based on sectional and popular interests. The function of party organization to compromise between sectional and national interests is bypassed.

Instead of considering legislation in accordance with sound principle, excessive power encourages the consideration of legislation by political expediency and the pressures of the electorate. Theories are evolved afterward to accommodate acts of political expediency.

The senatorial powers to be assigned by H. R. 2535 will not lie dormant. The powers of senatorial representation granted to these two Territories invite their abuse by reason of the fact that these powers are not coupled with corresponding and balancing accountability and responsibility.

For example; Alaska, with 2 Senators, would possess one-fiftieth of the power to determine the expenditure of more than $60 billion per year. That share of power to spend is $1.2 billion. Yet Alaska's responsibility for the collection of the amount to be spent, $60 billion, as represented by her Federal taxes, is only $48 million, or more than 1,000 times less than the total national expenditure. Alaska's 2 Senators would be accountable to a population of 132,000 (27,000 votes) although her 2 Senators would enjoy the senatorial power possessed on the average by about 3 million people of the Nation.

REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This problem poses a number of unpleasant alternatives. The present bill would increase the Members of the House by three seats allotted to the Territories. The membership of the House is increased from 435 to 438 Members. Although the membership of the House is to be increased, the increase is made not because of any advantages or need to increase the size. In fact, the present limitation of 435 Members was a careful decision as to the maximum desirable membership. The proposed increase by three seats is provided in this bill for the purpose of accommodating the proposed new Members. It is intended to anticipate the necessity for reducing the Representatives from other States if the membership is permanently limited to 435 Members.

Hawaii bases her claim to 2 Representatives upon the United States census population figure of 499,794. The latest estimate of her population would indicate that after 1960 her representation would probably be reduced to one Representative. Yet, the membership of the House is being permanently increased by 2 seats to accommodate Hawaii's proposed Representatives and 1 seat to accommodate Alaska's Representative. Although, as of today, Hawaii is only entitled to one Representative.

If H. R. 2535 is amended so that the increase of membership in the House is temporary and will be reduced to 435 after the 1960 census, then the additional representation from Hawaii and Alaska will be included at the expense of representation from some other State. That reduction will probably be at the expense of those States who have failed to increase their population in pace with the national rate. The States that have shown a loss of population between the 1950 census and the July 1, 1952, estimates are:

Loss in population

State:	
Maine	22,000
New Hampshire	1,000
Vermont	7,000
Iowa	13,000
North Dakota	17,000
West Virginia	36,000
Tennessee	32,000
Mississippi	15,000
Arkansas	65,000
Oklahoma	9,000

If the membership of the House is retained at 435 by an amendment in the House or Senate, then we commit ourselves to reducing the representation of other States by either 2 or 3 seats to be allotted to these Territories.

The Federalist, Paper No. 58, warns us against a multitudinous representative assembly. Excessive numbers lead not to democratic processes but, on the contrary, to government by the few.

The latest United States Census population estimates (1954) for these Territories are:

Alaska:	
Civilian	132,000
Military	50,000
Total	182,000

Hawaii:	
Civilian	467,000
Military	55,000
Total	522,000

Due to our military bases, the ratio of military personnel to the civilian population is far greater in these Territories than exists in the other States. The military personnel consists of citizens and inhabitants of the 48 States. Yet the census makes no differentiation but adds the military population to the civilian in computing their entitlement to representation. This method violates the intent of amendment 14, section 2, of our Constitution.

Article II, section 2 of the proposed Hawaiian constitution provides:

"No person shall be deemed to have gained or lost residence simply because of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States."

Thus we find that both Federal civilian and military personnel are excluded from the right of suffrage by this section. Yet, their numbers are added to establish a base for Hawaii's entitlement to representation in the United States House of Representatives.

This section would appear to constitute an abridgement and denial of the right to vote. If so, then amendment 14, section 2 provides that the basis of representation shall be reduced in proportion. This writer suggest the desirability of congressional action to conform the apportionment of representation in Hawaii and Alaska with the requirements of amendment 14, section 2 of the United States Constitution.

The Alaska Statehood Committee reports that Alaska is politically impotent in Washington because it has no voting representative in either House of Congress.

During this writer's short tenure here, both Hawaii and Alaska have had the benefit of the finest, most capable and diligent delegates. They would bring honor to any constituency. They have distinguished themselves by outstanding service to this Nation and to the territories they represent.

Most Representatives are limited to serving on one standing committee of the House. These committees vary considerably in the volume and importance of the legislation referred to them. The distinguished delegates from Hawaii and Alaska enjoy the unique advantage of membership on three major committees: Agriculture, Armed Services and Interior and Insular Affairs. The delegate from Alaska, in addition, serves on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Their service on these committees gives them the advantage of an association with fellow committee members which no other Representative enjoys. This opportunity enhances their influence and power.

The great mass of decisions made by Congress are made without a vote. The influence upon legislation in Congress can not be measured by the right to vote. It is not a pleasant task to vote in opposition to measures which have adverse political repercussions for a fellow member of the House. It is not conducive to political good-fellowship. This distinguished delegates are saved from this necessity. When balanced out, the disadvantages of the lack of a vote are far outweighed by the advantages accruing to the delegates.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Chairman, the following conclusions and recommendations are respectfully submitted to this committee as an equitable disposition of this problem:

1. Statehood for Hawaii ought to be deferred until she has unquestionably eliminated communistic influences in her political, economic, and social structures.

2. Statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska should be deferred pending the adoption of an appropriate constitutional amendment to provide for representation in the United States Senate on a basis proportionate to population.

3. If statehood is to be granted upon the basis of equal representation in the Senate, then admission should be approved by three-fourths of the States pursuant to a constitutional amendment providing for the admission of States by the same procedure that is now required to amend our Constitution.

4. Congress should immediately grant to each Territory the autonomy of statehood with full power of self-government in such form as may be recommended by the Territories.

The autonomy would include:

(a) Complete executive power with the right of election of Governor.

(b) Full legislative power over all Territorial affairs, including public lands, fisheries, and subsurface resources.

(c) Exclusive judicial jurisdiction.

5. The enactment into Federal statute of such reasonable restrictions, comparable to limitations in their proposed constitutions, as may be recommended by the Territories to safeguard individual liberties and to insure a republican form of government.

6. The immediate and outright grant to Alaska of specifically described public lands to be selected by the Territory from vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved lands, not to exceed 20 million acres.

7. Grants of $7 million each year for a period of 5 years to defray the cost of governmental services assumed from the Federal Government.

This solution would strengthen and unify this Nation in the years to come. It would help preserve the rights of the States and the liberties of our people. The cause of justice and freedom would be advanced.

JOHN R. PILLION,
Member, United States House of Representatives.

FEBRUARY 14, 1955.

Community Action: A Key to Rural Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture:

A great and latent force is being remobilized in America.

It was present at the birth of civilization. It brought mankind out of roving in wildernesses. It was the strength of mutual effort in the American Colonies and in the founding and formative years of our great Nation.

This force is the community spirit.

But somehow in many places this spirit seemed to have receded in our new age of invention, of bigger and glittering cities, of fast travel, of movies, radio, television, gadgets, in the myriad of other devices for entertainment and diversion—and in a kind of snobbery for many simple virtues.

The results have become plain to all of us, in the shapes of an alarming growth in juvenile delinquincy, of crime, of rotting little towns, of neglect of community loyalties and pride, and a lack of the full satisfactions of a free trade in friendship and common purpose that community effort nourishes.

But now I believe one of the best signs of our time is that more people feel a need to reexamine the old virtues of neighborliness, of mutual concern, and of community action.

We can tell as we travel across our own great State where the community spirit has been revived or was never lost. We see it in the beautiful farms, well-kept church and school buildings, in evidences of work and pride all around. We can tell, too, where the spirit has withered.

The story of the Rabbit and Cat Creeks community in western North Carolina should be an inspiration to all of us. In 1936 a survey showed that the land there was eroded, crop yields small, homes were poor, the standard of living was low, and the church and school needed attention. The people decided to do something about this. And today that community is a symbol of the progress that comes of community action. There are other models in our State for us to work by.

I believe a great new ground swell in community action awaits only upon leadership and organization.

Someone has said that a community is the image of the people who live in it and I think a good start can be made by each citizen asking himself or herself a few questions:

Am I proud of my community?

Do I boast about it to other people?

What are the good points of my community? Also, what are its needs, and how can those needs be met?

Could better living result if more of my neighbors and I worked together in a community program?

What can we do to start such a program or to move it forward?

I was impressed recently by a news story from Butler, Mo., that started off by saying, "You'd be surprised to see what they are doing here in Bates County to those old, abandoned rural schoolhouses." The story then told how the people there were putting pretty drapes at the windows and bright linoleum on the floors—making them into cheerful clubhouses where they meet to discuss community affairs, eat home-cooked food and have loads of fun.

That a revival of community action is about to take hold in a big way is demonstrated in a motion picture I recently saw. It was produced by one of the big automobile manufacturing companies and bore the title "The Town That Came Back." The theme of the picture is that it always takes people to make anything happen. It is the true story of a group of people who breathed new life into the almost-dead community spirit of a small Midwestern town.

Neighbors in this town hardly knew each other any more and there was not much left to hold young people in the community.

Then somebody got the idea of reactivating a 4–H Club, and things began to happen. Where there was disinterest and defeat, a new community now thrives.

It is a story that could be repeated a thousand times over across this broad and good land of ours.

One of our great Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, always stressed the importance of the community, and he once had this to say:

"When I look back on the processes of history, when I survey the genesis of America, I see this written on every page, that the nations are renewed from the bottom, and not from the top; that the genius which springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the growth and energy of the people."

I am impressed, too, by a statement that comes from the Committee for Economic Development, an organization of the Nation's top business leaders, as follows:

"America came to greatness from her grassroots, and it is from life in small communities that strength must continue to flow and nourish our country toward greater accomplishment which can be shared by all. The hope of America is not that our huge

cities shall become more vast—it is rather that the small communities shall consolidate their opportunities to grow and become better, more interesting places for our people to live in and prosper. In the final analysis, our Nation is just one community added to another until the splendid total makes us what we are."

What needs to be done is clear. How to do it provides the problem—and the challenge.

"If," said the shrewd Portia, "to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches and poor men's cottages princes' palaces."

First, in considering community action, it must be remembered that to get anywhere, it is necessary to start from where you are, and that nothing will run itself except when it is going downhill.

A few public-spirited citizens can start a community-betterment program. I believe that all that's needed is a sincere interest in the community and a willingness to assume initial leadership in arousing general interest and enthusiasm in community self-improvement.

The University of Illinois, after considerable study, has published a bulletin on how a betterment program can work in the community. This suggests steps in organization, as follows:

1. A public mass meeting at which everyone could speak his mind, where experiences of other communities with improvement programs can be discussed, and where specific needs of the community can be reviewed.

2. A community council should be organized at the public mass meeting. This council would serve as the overall planning and directing force of the betterment program. The council should be a broadly representative group, its members coming from the various occupations and interests of the community, including youth organizations. It would formulate general policies as guides in developing action programs.

3. An executive committee, drawn from the members of the community council, should be named as the first step in setting up action machinery to transform general policies into definite projects.

4. Action subcommittees should function to follow through on specific action programs.

While the program will not change a community overnight, the payoff in a more satisfying community life can be expected within a short time after it is started. Better streets, better recreational programs, community beautification, new business and industries—these may be some of the first signs that the program is beginning to work.

Then it will be known that the spirit of neighborliness and mutual concerns and efforts that sustained our forefathers in conquering the wildernesses has returned. This will be a happy day.

The community spirit simply is friendship in action.

Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, today all freedom-loving people throughout the world are observing the 105th anniversary of the birth of the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic. Speaking of Thomas Masaryk, as one of the greatest statesmen, politicians, philosophers, and above all a real democrat of the 19th and 20th centuries, one cannot forget how deeply rooted were the principles of true Americanism that were embodied in this great man. Emil Ludwig, considered to be a great German biographer, once put this question to Bernard Shaw: "Who could be President of the United States of Europe?" to which the distinguished British playwright answered: "I know of only one man—he is Masaryk."

And it was Masaryk who believed so strongly in the idea of uniting all Europe, despite the fact that first he began by uniting his own beloved country. He knew, however, that "federation without freedom is impossible" and if any of our statesmen of the past had followed the political line of thinking that Masaryk had laid down and preached many years ago, they never would have made the mistakes for which millions of human beings have had to pay so dearly. The man who had founded one of the greatest democracies existing between the two world wars had this to say on democracy:

> Democracy is a fight for humanly free and unfolding world order with no dictatorial and repressive prerogatives for any.

Can these words be quoted today by those who rule that unfortunate country? It therefore is no surprise to us that the Communists do not claim him. What is more, his works have been criticized by them. His simple room, which even the brutal Nazis respected during the occupation, has been entirely changed by Gottwald, the man who calls himself President of the Czechoslovak Republic. Thomas Masaryk's modesty and simplicity were not only expressed by his teachings, but also through his actions. It followed him throughout his entire life. His humility and modesty were born with him and did not leave him until he died.

Thomas Masaryk was born on this day in 1850, 2 years after the manifesto of socialism was announced in Germany. His father was an ordinary coachman and his mother a former household servant. Yet he received the best education one could get in those days. He spoke German, French, and English very fluently, and was well versed in Latin and Greek. In his early years he had a passion for the theater, and throughout his life he adored poetry. In fact, Preston Warren, Masaryk's biographer recalls that Masaryk, speaking for Paderewski against those who believed the latter should keep to his music rather than to get mixed up in politics said:

> The bearing of poetry upon politics, and to reveal the artist Paderewski as a true political awakener of his people. Poetry educates imagination, a vision of the future, a penetration into the souls of others.

For us Americans, it is important to recall one major aspect of Masaryk's life, which was that he was devoted to the same principles laid down by the Fathers of our Country. I refer here to the wife of Thomas Masaryk, Charlotte Garrigue, a young American who had been a pupil of Liszt. She was his whole inspiration, both in his domestic and political life. The love for the American principles, which he imbedded in his own country can only be explained through the wonderful relationship between Thomas Masaryk and his wife.

When Thomas Masaryk died in 1937, it was Eduard Benes, his greatest friend and follower, who spoke these words at the great Czech's grave:

> How can we be other than calm, clear, and firm when we look upon the clear and straight path which that life shows us? How beautiful and how exalting it is to see that this great warrior, who never shirked a fight, leaves us in harmony with himself, with his faith in Divine Providence, in harmony with his environment, with his faith in man, faith in the ultimate triumph of man, in the triumph of justice and truth, in the triumph of humanity here against us, in Europe, and throughout the world.

This was Thomas Masaryk who had gone already into history with the greatest men mankind has known.

The Ohio River Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio Valley has suffered, and is now suffering from the results of a terrific flood. The damage resulting from these widespread floods can hardly be estimated. Every house in some of the villages has been reached by the flood, and the people have been driven from their homes, leaving their furniture behind them. Likewise, many stores and business houses have been flooded, the water reaching to the ceiling and destroying valuable stocks of goods. Plants have been flooded and many thousands of persons have lost many days employment at their places of employment. I would say that the damage on the Ohio side of the river from Marietta to Cincinnati would amount to tens of millions of dollars.

While these Ohio River floods are terrifically disastrous to properties, it is a very consoling fact to know that very few lives are lost in any of these Ohio River floods. This is due to the fact that the river rises slowly and the people have a chance to get out of the way of the water and they generally have a chance to take with them their livestock and some of their other possessions.

As is generally known, the Federal Government has control over the navigable rivers of the country. This control is exercised through a very competent Government agency known as the Army engineers. In these flood seasons the Army engineers are always busy in their efforts to minimize the effects of the floods where they possibly can.

The Congress of the United States has taken an interest in the destructive floods which affect our country. This is especially true of the Ohio Valley. While it has not been expected that the Government would restore property destroyed in floods, the Government has, through the

Congress on a number of occasions, passed legislation that was greatly to the benefit of those who might suffer from the results of disastrous floods. The two most disastrous floods that afflicted the Ohio Valley occurred in 1913 and 1937. Of these two floods, the 1937 was the most disastrous.

Following the 1937 flood former Congressman William M. Whittington and I decided to attempt to secure the passage of legislation that would relieve against future floods, especially those of gigantic proportions. We were successful in our efforts because the Members of Congress appreciated the destructive effects of big floods. Our legislation provided, in effects, first that the Army engineers should find that the location was such that flood defenses would be practical. If it was found that the construction of a flood wall was feasible, then the community would be required to purchase the rights-of-way that would be necessary upon which to construct the proposed flood walls. If the Army engineers found that the construction of a flood wall would be feasible, then it would be necessary for the city to issue bonds or to find the funds in some other way to purchase the rights-of-way. The law further provided that if and when the rights-of-way had been purchased, the Government would have the power to provide the other funds necessary to construct the walls and would proceed to construct them. This construction would then be done under the direction of the Army engineers and to the full approval of the engineers and the officials of the city or village which was being protected.

Having been familiar with the provisions of the law I naturally proceeded immediately to secure the benefits of the law for my home city of Ironton, Ohio, and for her people. We had no doubt that the Army engineers would find that our beautiful city of about 35,000 population, with many fine dwellings and business houses, and many large factories and mills would qualify for the construction of protective flood walls.

The Army engineers did find Ironton, as a city, meeting the physical qualifications.

It was then up to our people to secure the rights-of-way. They did this, promptly, by voting a bond issue of $750,000, which was used to purchase the rights-of-way. Because of our alertness and our desire to comply with the law and secure flood protection for our city and our people we soon had the Army engineers at work drawing the plans for adequate flood protection. Soon, thereafter, the Government arranged to contribute about $4 million, which was the amount required to do the work and to meet the amount provided by the city of Ironton and her people.

With the financing and the plans all arranged bids were asked for and a contract was soon entered into and in due course our beautiful city of Ironton was secure behind large, adequate walls.

Our city of Ironton was the first city in the whole United States to get a flood wall under the law that Mr. Whittington and I were responsible for its passage. Naturally, we are all proud of this, and still more proud because we are protected against any more destructive floods, that previously put 15 feet of water in the First National Bank Building, and all the downtown buildings in our fair city, and which also put most of our people out of their homes.

While we, the people of Ironton, were getting our flood wall, the people of Huntington, W. Va., which is a large city located about 15 miles up the river from Ironton, were working diligently to secure a flood wall—they were successful and since that time this large city, with a population of at least 100,000 people, is completely protected.

I was glad and proud that while we were all pushing the development of these flood walls, I was able to render some help to the city of Portsmouth, Ohio, which is located about 25 miles from Ironton, and has a population of about 50,000. It was largely through my efforts that we got a million and a half dollars with which the last of six units of the Portsmouth wall was built.

While Ironton, Huntington, and Portsmouth rest complacently behind flood walls which have cost them and the Government millions of dollars, still I am saddened with the thought that thousands of fine citizens on both sides of the majestic Ohio River living in villages and in the rural sections are still subjected to the scourage of these periodical floods. I surely hope that we can develop many water conservation projects similar to the big dam which bears my name, and which impounds a lake 10 miles long above Glouster, Athens County, Ohio; and which holds back a great quantity of water from rushing down to the Ohio to augment the raging floods already pouring down the Ohio. There are a number of conservation projects in the Muskingum River in Ohio which have held back great quantities of water and thereby have reduced the amount of water flowing into the Ohio. I hope we can construct many more of these in our country.

Mr. Speaker, floods are terrific, but ours is a great country and I think we can and will control the floods for the protection of all our people.

No Free Enterprise for the Gold Miner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, every producer has the right to sell his product in the best market which bidding under conditions of freedom and full information provide. This proposition is incontrovertible.

The producer of gold is the only producer who must sell his product at a fixed price and is compelled by law to sell it to a single buyer, the United States Government.

This constitutes an unjust combination of economic servitude and reprehensible monopoly.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL

It is repugnant to the American principles of free enterprise and contravenes the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

It is a denial of the right to sell and the correlative right to buy.

It forces the gold miner to surrender the fruit of his labor at an arbitrary price to a single buyer.

NOT LEGAL

Denying the gold producer the greater value which a free market would afford is a deprivation of property without due process of law.

The law compels the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish rates which permit a reasonable return on a fair value of the property. Under this statutory duty railroad rates have been raised 5 times since V-J day for a total of 52 percent.

LIVING RETURN DENIED GOLD PRODUCERS

This right to a living return does not extend to gold producers.

The law enjoins the Federal Power Commission to set a rate structure on gas which permits a fair return on property. The FPC has construed such a fair return at 6½ percent.

No such consideration applies to the gold producer.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is admonished by law to maintain a rate structure which will permit a fair return on capital and promote the further investment of capital in air transportation.

No such duty has ever been imposed upon the Treasury in the purchase of gold.

Every State utility commission is compelled by law to set rates which will permit a fair return on property and promote the flow of capital into the electric utility industry.

No State, by law or in any other way, has displayed any genuine solicitude for the gold producer.

PARITY PRINCIPLE IN LAW

The Federal Government, recognizing the elementary and imperative duty to survive, incorporated the parity principle in law to assure a fair return to the farmer. At substantial cost to the taxpayer minimum prices are guaranteed for every important farm crop.

There is no price parity for the gold producer.

MINIMUM WAGE FOR WORKERS

The Federal Government enforces a minimum wage for workers. It encourages the organization of workers in order to enable them by collective bargaining to get the best price for their services which the market can afford.

There is no minimum wage for the gold producer. Collective bargaining is impossible.

The tailor and the shoemaker can sell their product in the best market. The gold producer has a tightly bound, dictated market.

HAS BUT ONE CONSUMER

The gold producer has a single consumer totally indifferent to his losses,

although eager to share in his profits, if any.

The owner of a security has well-organized free markets in which he can offer his shares to the highest bidder.

The producer of gold is not permitted to search for bidders.

Freedom of choice is one of the basic human rights in a democracy. In the United States this is denied only to the gold producer. The law treats him as a pariah. He is an economic untouchable.

This malevolent discrimination has brought great hardship to the gold producer. The price of his products was fixed in January 1934. His costs were not fixed.

WAGES UP 189 PERCENT—GOLD REMAINS SAME

Since January 1934, wages have gone up 189.3 percent. Wholesale prices have mounted 130.7 percent. Fuel is 64.2 percent higher. The cost of living has risen 83.4 percent.

The United States Treasury still pays $35 an ounce for gold. Since the price was fixed in January 1934, the value of the money which the Treasury uses has dropped 43 percent. The ounce of gold which the producer must deliver is still 100 percent pure. There has been no addition of base alloy to compensate for the decline in the value of the dollar. The cheating has been strictly unilateral.

When the United States abandoned the gold standard in 1933, it was believed to be a temporary expedient justified by an urgent crisis. It left the control of the currency in the hands of a bureaucracy neither elected by nor directly responsible to the people.

CONSPIRACY BEHIND NO GOLD STANDARD

Under the influence of imported English monetary dogma and totalitarian ideology the country has never returned to gold. A sinister conspiracy of silence shrouds the question.

The Federal Reserve Board and the International Monetary Fund both have a vested interest in managed currency. They constitute a mischievous cabal opposing the return of an honest currency. The lack of a common currency denominator, which only gold can provide, has maintained artificial currency values completely out of touch with the realities of fair value.

PREVENTS INTERNATIONAL TRADE

False currency values soothing to the pride of alien ministries have prevented the revival of wholesome international trade.

The stubborn refusal to permit gold to exercise its historic function as a currency has retarded world recovery and placed an intolerable burden on the American economy.

TREASURY PRACTICE UNJUST

Who would say that the $35 of 1934 could by any stretch of imagination be construed as $35 today? If that was a pledge of value to us by our Government they owe us now at least $70 an ounce for gold, but as the Treasury Department is now administering the Gold Act the industry is only allowed to receive value of about $17 an ounce. And remember, we are not allowed to seek other markets and sell our products to higher bidders.

The gold-mining industry has thus been picked out as the sole victim of a particularly vicious swindle, perpetrated upon it under the power and majesty of the Government which controls our money and presumably stands on the pinnacle of integrity.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, who hath cast our lot in pleasant places: We praise Thee for our goodly heritage in this land; we remember with gratitude those whose gifts of head and heart and hand established the foundations of this Nation as they looked to Thee, author of liberty. We bless Thee for the ideals of faith and freedom which they cherished. Help us to hold them dear and to prize them above luxury or ease. Deliver us from pride and self-sufficiency. In times of prosperity, let us not forget Thee; in the hour of achievement, let us not be unmindful of our dependence upon Thee.

Grant to our national leaders purity of motive, soundness of judgment, the faith of their fathers, and to all our people fidelity, integrity, and genuine religion, that there may be concord within our borders and that our America may be an influence for righteousness throughout the world. Bring us, we beseech Thee, speedily out of our present anxiety and confusion into the order and righteousness of Thy kingdom. We ask it through Him who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 10, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL—CORRECTION

The following request and order were inadvertently omitted from the RECORD of Thursday, March 10, 1955:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of S. 1309, a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, the name of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee Investigating Unemployment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Defense Production of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee be permitted to meet this afternoon. The meeting is in connection with taking care of thousands and thousands of Indians who are on the verge of starvation and who have a great many small children.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Murray
Allott	Green	Neely
Barkley	Hayden	Payne
Bible	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Scott
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Thye
Dirksen	Knowland	Watkins
Duff	Langer	Welker
Dworshak	Lehman	Wiley
Ervin	Magnuson	Williams
George	Mansfield	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES TO CERTAIN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the two nominations appearing on the Executive Calendar of representatives of the United States to certain United Nations organizations be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Kimbel to be a representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kingsley Davis to be a representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Morning business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROMOTION OF PAUL A. SMITH (RETIRED) TO GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL IN COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

APPORTIONMENT OF COST OF ALTERATION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 21, 1940, as amended, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters so as to change the method by which the apportionment of the total cost is made (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

"Whereas the importance of high-river storage must be recognized and given immediate priority as to order of authorization, appropriation, and construction; and

"Whereas the stream regulation, water supply, and resulting electrical energy will be of great importance in developing the natural resources of the State of Colorado, as well as enhancing the recreational facilities and the continued growth of population; and

"Whereas the development of the natural resources within the basin of the Colorado River will promote the welfare and national defense of the United States; and

"Whereas the States of the upper Colorado River Basin under the Colorado River compact of 1922 are required to deliver to the lower basin a specified amount of water which cannot be assured without holdover storage; and

"Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission, the Colorado State Conservation Board, and the Colorado River Conservation District have unanimously approved and recommended the authorization of the following projects: Curecanti, Echo Park, Pine River extension, Silt, Parshall, Rabbit Ear, Woody Creek, Bluestone, Tomichi Creek, Ohio Creek, Bostwick Park, Dallas Creek, Dolores, Florida, Juniper, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit), Smith Fork, Troublesome, Eagle Divide, West Divide, Battlement Mesa, East River, Fruitland Mesa, Grand Mesa, Savory-Pot Hook, Fruitgrowers extension: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to enact legislation authorizing the Upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects including all of the projects herein set forth; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"STEPHEN R. MCNICHOLS,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas the United States Forest Service was established in the Department of Agriculture by an act of Congress, February 1, 1905; and

"Whereas this organization has had a prominent part in development of natural resources and in the pioneering history of Idaho; and

"Whereas employees and families of the organization throughout the forested part of the State have, in their communities, carried out their official and civic duties with devotion and integrity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the 33d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho command the Forest Service and its employees on their golden anniversary for a job well done, both in natural resources development and progressive citizenship; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the Senate Journal, and the secretary of the senate be instructed to send copies of this resolution to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Congress, Secretary of

Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, and Chief of the Forest Service, Richard E. McArdle.

"This senate resolution was adopted by the senate on the 2d day of March 1955.

"J. BERKELEY LARSEN,
"President of the Senate.

"I hereby certify that the within senate resolution originated in the senate during the 33d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"ROBERT H. REMAKLUS,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorables JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senators from Montana, and to the Honorables LEE METCALF and ORVIN B. FJARE, Representatives in Congress from Montana, and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States requesting the Federal Government to give every consideration to an emergency program of control for spruce budworm infestations of the forests which are in critical stages in Montana

"Whereas there are nearly 2 million acres of fir and spruce timber infested with spruce budworm in the State of Montana, of which some 230,000 acres are classified by entomologists as being so heavily infested that the timber is about to die; and

"Whereas this infestation started in Broadwater County some 15 years ago and has spread over a wider area each succeeding year, resulting in the death of much timber already, with no relief in sight; and

"Whereas approximately 40 percent of this infested acreage is privately owned and 58 percent federally owned; and

"Whereas most of the privately owned infested timber has little commercial value and therefore the owners cannot afford the cost of control on even a partial basis; and

"Whereas the spruce budworm can only be effectively controlled by spraying during a 10-day period usually occurring in June; and

"Whereas the past emergency measures have not been of the scope large enough to cope with the problem and the infestation is now in critical stages; and

"Whereas the seriousness of the problem to the State and Nation is of great magnitude and further that the watershed, recreation, wildlife, and aesthetic values of large acres in Montana face untold damage if this infestation is not controlled, with resultant loss to municipal watersheds that depend on an even flow of water and to our irrigated farms and to the State's tourist business: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 34th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate and house of representatives concurring) does hereby respectfully urge Congress to consider adequate appropriations for an emergency program of control for spruce budworm infestations of the forests which are in critical stages in Montana; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States of America, Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressmen LEE METCALF and ORVIN B. FJARE and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved March 5, 1955."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senators from Montana, to the Honorable ORVIN FJARE and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Congressmen from the State of Montana, memorializing the Congress of the United States to the rehabilitation and education for Montana landless Indians

"Whereas a group of Indians in the State of Montana are descendants of Chief Little Shell's band of Chippewa Indians, who never participated in any permanent allotment of land; and

"Whereas this group became known as the Montana Landless Indians, Inc.; and

"Whereas many of these landless Indians reside near and on the outskirts of the various cities of Montana and in many cases live under deplorable conditions; and

"Whereas these landless Indians are American Indians for all intents and purposes, and are not subjects of any foreign land and as such are entitled to all rights and benefits that have been extended to other tribes of American Indians; and

"Whereas prior to World War II a program of rehabilitation was undertaken but was interrupted by the outbreak of war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 34th Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1955, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), do earnestly request that the Congress of the United States resume and initiate an adequate program of recognition, education, and rehabilitation, designed to put the Indians on a self-supporting basis equal to that enjoyed by other citizens; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.
"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved March 5, 1955."

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the agencies of the United States Government involved, Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY and Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, Hon. LEE METCALF and Hon. ORVIN B. FJARE, Representatives from Montana, requesting the Government of the United States and the agencies thereof involved to provide payments or grants in lieu of taxes on nontaxable governmental and Indian lands in the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the counties of Montana wherein such Indian lands are located as payment for governmental and welfare services provided to the Indian population by the State of Montana and the particular counties involved

"Whereas there are presently upon the statutes of the United States of America, various provisions authorizing the Government of the United States to contribute to the several States of the United States payments in lieu of taxes, for the benefit of counties wherein other governmental lands are located: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 34th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge and request the Government of the United States and the agencies thereof involved, to provide payments or grants in lieu of taxes upon these lands, to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the counties wherein Indian lands are located, as payment for governmental and welfare services provided to the Indian population in the particular counties involved; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, and to Representatives LEE METCALF and ORVIN B. FJARE.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved March 4, 1955."

"House Joint Memorial 10

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and Orvin B. Fjare, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; and to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Glenn Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; requesting that Congress authorize long-term contracts between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the State of Montana which would guarantee specific sums of money to the local government units for services rendered on Indian reservations

"Whereas the Congress of United States has been actively legislating to terminate supervision of Indian Affairs on reservations in the United States; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs has absorbed this philosophy in the administration of Indian Affairs and has offered contracts to various State agencies asking them to take over such functions for the Bureau of Indian Affairs on reservations in the State of Montana such as the extension service, schools, roads, welfare, and health; and

"Whereas the United States Government by treaty and statute is responsible for law and order on Indian reservations but has not effectively administered this responsibility and furthermore has attempted to transfer this responsibility to the counties of Montana frequently without reimbursement; and

"Whereas the problems and impacts among Indian people on reservations in areas of health, education, roads, and economic conditions are the result of inconsistent policies of the Federal Government and have not been created by local Indian communities; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has been striving for years to solve these problems and remove these impacts with only a reasonable degree of success throughout 100 years of effort and millions of dollars of money; and

"Whereas the Federal Government desires to transfer these responsibilities to the counties and apparently expects the counties to solve these problems within a relatively short period of time and without giving the counties specific assurance of reimbursement over a period of years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Montana State Legislature request Congress to enter into long-term contracts with the State of Montana which would guarantee to the State of Montana and the local governmental units specific sums of money over a long period of years or to enable them to carry out the government functions now rendered by the Federal Government so that the State of

Montana and local taxpayers will be able to solve and administer these problems; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana transmit this memorial to the various Federal governmental officials, agencies, and committees referred to in the title of this memorial.

"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"Speaker of the House.
"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved March 5, 1955."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to enacting a statute authorizing an additional United States district judge for the southern district of California

"Whereas the 83d Congress of the United States enacted a statute authorizing an additional United States district judge for the southern district of California; and

"Whereas the judicial council of the southern district of California has not assigned said additional authorized United States district judge to the southern division of the said district; and

"Whereas a special committee of the San Diego County Bar Association has conducted an investigation and rendered a report recommending the establishment of a separate district of the United States district court for the counties of San Diego and Imperial, to be known as the southern district of California, with the permanent assignment of two resident United States district judges to said district; and

"Whereas the board of directors of the San Diego County Bar Association has approved said report; and

"Whereas the Imperial County Bar Association has studied and approved said report and has otherwise investigated the matter: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact a statute establishing a separate district of the United States district court for the counties of San Diego and Imperial, to be known as the southern district of California, and to authorize the permanent assignment of two resident United States district judges, including the present resident United States district judge to the said district; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 71

"Resolution relative to opposing enactment of H. R. 1 by the United States Congress

"Whereas there has been introduced and is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill for a public law, H. R. 1, which, if enacted, would dangerously weaken the only safeguards in existing legislation under which industries injured by low-price foreign competition may seek recourse, namely, the escape-clause and peril-point provisions; and

"Whereas this proposed bill, H. R. 1, if enacted, would give the executive branch of the Federal Government extended and broad new authority to reduce United States import duties and regulations without further congressional action and even contrary to express findings and recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission; and

"Whereas the Senate of the State of California is seriously concerned by the adverse effects which substantial tariff reductions already made are having upon important industries of the State, such as the almond, dairy, fig, citrus, livestock, olive, vineyard, walnut, fish, and wool industries and by the failure of the trade-agreements program to obtain effective reciprocal concessions for United States products, including the products of essential agricultural crops: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the Senate of the State of California does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to pass H. R. 1, or comparable legislation, unless it is amended to greatly strengthen the peril-point and escape-clause provisions and thus provide legal means by which American workers and industries suffering injury as a result of excessive tariff reductions may seek relief; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, to United States Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, and California Members of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Cummings Brothers Post, No. 1436, the American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 25

"Resolution memorializing Congress to protect the coal industry and the economic status of the employees therein by restricting the importation of foreign residual oil.

"Whereas the importation of foreign residual oil has stifled the market for the sale of coal; and

"Whereas the curtailment of the sale of coal, resulting directly from the unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil, has and is reducing the living standards of the people of the State of West Virginia and is resulting in untold hardships and needless unemployment to the coal miners in the State of West Virginia; and

"Whereas this importation of foreign residual oil has resulted in a tremendous loss of State revenues to the extent that the State government has been hampered in providing essential services to the people of West Virginia: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That the members of West Virginia serving in Congress exert their best efforts in opposing the importation of foreign residual oil into the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates forward attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Members of Congress now serving from West Virginia."

TRANSFER OF SOIL CONSERVATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATE — CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota Legislature, memorializing the President of the United States and his Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture relative to transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal, together with the concurrent resolution, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD, together with the letter of transmittal.

The letter of transmittal and concurrent resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Bismarck, March 7, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hereby transmit a copy of House Concurrent Resolution N–1 as filed in this office by the 34th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota.

Yours very truly,

BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

House Concurrent Resolution N–1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and his Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture relative to transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States

Whereas the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, a subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, has reportedly recommended to the Commission the transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States; and

Whereas the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing more than 2,600 soil-conservation districts in the United States, and the North Dakota Association of Soil-Conservation Districts, representing 79 soil-conservation districts in this State, along with other individuals, groups, and organizations who are vitally interested in the program, are opposed to the reported recommendation; and

Whereas if the reported recommendation is approved it would place an inordinately heavy financial burden upon the State of North Dakota, since the contemplated State appropriation each biennium could amount to a sum in excess of $1 million if assistance to local soil-conservation districts is to be maintained at current levels; and

Whereas such program would greatly retard, if not eventually destroy, the national program of soil and water conservation now being carried on, and since the problem is national in scope, it should be dealt with accordingly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, relative to gradual transfer of soil conservation technical assistance functions from the national authority to the various States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Nation's Capital.

K. A. FITCH,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LECCO,
Secretary of the Senate.

BEET SUGAR PRODUCTION—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Nebraska has several of the Nation's major sugarbeet producing areas within its borders. The largest are in the Gering Valley near Scottsbluff and in the region around Grand Island in central Nebraska.

The State ranks near the top among beet sugar producing States and the number of acres being planted to sugarbeets is increasing. In 1953, Nebraska farmers planted 55,200 acres to the beets, increasing their planting to 67,000 acres last year. That is a 20 percent increase over the average number of acres planted during the previous 10 years.

Beet sugar production also is on the increase in Nebraska, although unfavorable weather conditions last year resulted in a temporary setback in total production due to lower yields per acre planted. In 1953, Nebraska produced 789,000 tons of beet sugar, with last year's production totaling 744,000 tons.

Although sugar beets produce less than 1 percent of Nebraska's total cash income from agriculture, the State has ranked fourth in the Nation in sugar beet production.

Nebraska farmers, like those in other States where irrigation is making a growing impact on the agricultural economy, have used sugar beets to make a success of many irrigation projects. Reclamation officials have long recognized that sugar beets are the backbone of many irrigation projects in the areas where the beets are grown.

Mr. President, the Sugar Act of 1948 will expire next year, and the question of its renewal in somewhat modified and amended form was brought to the attention of the unicameral legislature of my State early this week.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution on that subject, adopted by the Legislature of Nebraska, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Legislative Resolution 11

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, provides for an inflexible limitation upon the quantity of sugar which may be marketed in the United States in any one year by the domestic beet, mainland cane, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, Virgin Islands, and Philippine sugar industries; and

Whereas since the establishment of these rigid marketing quotas the population of the United States has increased from approximately 150 million to more than 165 million inhabitants, the consumption of sugar by this expanding population has at the same time increased from approximately 7 million tons in 1948 to 8,200,000 in 1954; and

Whereas sugar consumption in the United States may be expected to continue to increase at the rate of more than 100,000 tons per year; and

Whereas under provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, every ton of this increase in consumption is reserved to Cuban and other foreign producers of sugar, and not one ton of this expanding market may be supplied by our domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas an equitable share of this expanding market is essential to the continued stability and vigor of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas the beet sugar industry is prepared to meet the challenge of an expanding market, because it has achieved major gains in productivity per acre and new acreages for the production of sugar beets continue to be developed in the State of Nebraska; and

Whereas the welfare of our State and our Nation requires the existence of a strong and vigorous domestic sugar industry, especially during periods of war and national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 67th session assembled:

1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in such a manner as to enable the domestic sugar industry of the United States to have a fair and equitable share in our Nation's growth.

2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
Speaker and Acting President of the Legislature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTION—RESOLUTION OF TOWN MEETING OF PUTNEY, VT.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution introduced in the town meeting of Putney, Vt., by J. Carleton Lyons on March 1, 1955.

This resolution was opposed by a brother of the head of the well-known Putney School, and uncle of the William Hinton who recently returned to this country from Red China, and took the fifth amendment when asked about his connections with the Communist Party and the Chinese Reds.

The resolution was adopted by nearly 2 to 1.

I wish to congratulate the patriotic citizens of Putney on their vigorous restatement of the principles on which our Republic is founded, and their determination to preserve their rights and liberties against any groups attempting to destroy them, and to encourage other nations which seek to achieve the same liberties.

This resolution is evidence of the fire and fervor of patriotism that burns in our American communities. I should like to see every local community and every State legislature enact a similar rededication to the principles of liberty and constitutional law, and of fellowship with other nations through our common devotion to liberty and right.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are several groups of people, both within and without the United States of America, which embrace various political ideologies the effects of which are to enslave human beings; and

Whereas we, the people of Putney, being an informed, religious, and patriotic people, do unequivocally reject all such political ideologies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the people of Putney, go on record as firmly believing in, and as upholding the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as desiring to keep and retain for ourselves and for our posterity all of the liberties, freedoms, rights, and privileges now enjoyed by us and guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as favoring a standard of liberties, freedoms, rights, and privileges comparable to our own present standard for all peoples everywhere as soon as may be; and be it further

Resolved, That the town clerk of Putney be hereby authorized and instructed to forward as soon as possible a copy of the foregoing resolution in its entirety to each of the two United States Senators from Vermont, namely, Senator AIKEN and Senator FLANDERS; and to forward a like copy to the congressional Representative from Vermont, namely, Representative PROUTY; and that the above resolution so forwarded shall have clearly indicated thereon that it has been approved by the people of Putney in town meeting assembled.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 948. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; with amendments (Report No. 59).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Curtis Clark, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John M. Moore, retired.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the the Committee on Government Operations:

Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States, vice Lindsay C. Warren, retired.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 1404. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1405. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1406. A bill for the relief of Miss Kaithe Steinbach; and

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Guillermo B. Rigonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1408. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1409. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1410. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1411. A bill for the relief of Marion Drucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1412. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of elderly widows, widowers, or a single person to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1413. A bill to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY ASPECTS OF COMMON SYSTEM OF AIR NAVIGATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am about to submit a concurrent resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it more than 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there has been brought to my attention the existence of a major disagreement as to what should constitute the basic air navigation system of this Nation. This is something which very vitally affects the personal safety of everyone who travels by air in the United States. It affects the security of our country.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, which is responsible for the appropriations for the Department of Commerce, and as a member of the Armed Forces Committee, which is responsible for the programs of the Department of Defense, I have become greatly concerned over the effects of this dispute upon the safety, efficiency, and economy of our aviation industry; and I am equally concerned as to its effects upon the security and defense of the Nation. The information that is available to Congress upon this long-smoldering conflict between the Commerce Department and Department of Defense is limited. I do not know all the facts, and I venture to say that no Member of Congress knows all the facts, because the controversy hinges about the details of a new electronic system of air navigation developed by the military, which so far has been considered by the Department of Defense as classified information.

As I know them, the facts appear to be that a previous Congress created the Congressional Aviation Policy Board to undertake a study of what should be the aviation policies of the United States. This joint board labored long and hard, and produced what has been recognized as a document of significant importance, making major recommendations as to our Nation's aviation policies. One of these policies was that as a nation we could not afford two separate air navigation systems, one for civil aviation and one for military purposes. Instead, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the agency responsible for the operation of the civil-airways system, create and operate a common system which could meet the needs of both civil and military aviation. This decision had been urged upon the Congressional Aviation Policy Board by the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics in its so-called SC–31 report and by representatives of the executive branch of the Government and the aviation industry. The executive branch followed this policy recommendation of Congress and, as we all know, in 1948 adopted as the common system for both civil and military aviation those electronic devices recommended by the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics.

The technical name for an important part of this system is VOR/DME, which means very high frequency omnirange and distance measuring equipment. Since 1948, the Appropriations Committee has continually recommended and the Senate has wholeheartedly approved the appropriation of large sums to complete the development and proceed with the installation of this system. Sums amounting to upward of $200 million have been invested by Government and industry in this country in the development and installation of these common system facilities, both ground and air. Concurrently, facilities of the same type have, on the urging of our State Department, been adopted as a worldwide standard and installed in many foreign countries. I am reliably informed that the military participated and concurred in the decision in 1948 to adopt VOR/DME as the "common system" short-range air navigation facility.

However, since that time, the Department of Defense is reported to have been busily developing in secret another air navigational aid, known as TACAN, which it says meets some of the military requirements that the existing VOR/DME system does not. This week, American Aviation Daily stated that the military's TACAN procurement program involved up to $325 million in production commitments alone. No information appears to be available as to what additional sums have been expended or what may yet be required in experimentation and development. The problem of whether to scrap the already developed and installed VOR/DME system and replace it with TACAN on the urging of the military, I understand has become of real concern to the executive branch since 1952. It has been argued and debated in the Air Navigation Development Board and finally proposed that TACAN, subject to a few further investigations and tests, should eventually replace the VOR/DME system.

Like many other Americans I have ridden thousands of miles on the civil airways of this Nation. I have talked to the operators of the scheduled airlines, executive aircraft owners, private pilots, and scheduled airline pilots, and not one of these men has been in any way critical of the safety and efficiency of the existing VOR/DME system. All seem agreed that for safe, efficient, and reliable air transportation, the common system now existing has been doing and continues to do the necessary job. At the same time—and this is one of my major concerns—the military proponents of TACAN clearly indicate that further development of TACAN is necessary before it could be put into operation and provide the same degree of safety, efficiency, and reliability for air transportation as the existing common system. Nevertheless, the proposal at the present time is to discontinue a major portion of the VOR/DME system on July 1, 1955 and to anticipate the complete discard of the present VOR/DME system by 1965 or before.

I understand that the TACAN system of navigation admittedly requires further development at great and substantial costs, and the fact that we must discard some hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of proven equipment of the common system now in existence and in operation causes me great alarm.

I am and always have been vitally concerned with the security and defense of the United States, as are all the Members of the Congress. The views of the Department of Defense on such vital matters as defense and security are not to be lightly disregarded. Consequently I want to make it clear that I have no preconceived notion as to which side of this controversy is right and which is wrong. I am, however, convinced that the seriousness of the matter, with its implications to the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the aviation industry and to the defense and security of our country, coupled with the magnitude of the expenditures involved, requires serious study and consideration. The decision to have a common system of air navigation for both civil and military purposes was made upon the recommendation of a body of Congress.

The committees of this Congress and the individual Members of Congress have

followed through on that recommendation. We have provided millions and millions of dollars to develop a safety system. We have used our influence to have other countries adopt the system. When we adopted that safety system we requested private airplane owners, scheduled airlines, and others, to so equip their planes as to meet the requirements of the common system. It has worked pretty well, so far as I know.

If a better system is available, perhaps the time has come when we should scrap hundreds of millions of dollars invested by the United States Government, by other governments at our request, by private aircraft owners, by scheduled airlines, and by other persons; but before we scrap a usable system I want to make sure the new system will be one that will be for the benefit and the safety of the air-traveling public.

Make no mistake. No one can laugh this question off and say there is no complaint, because nothing produces more serious repercussions than airplane accidents with large death tolls. When an accident occurs a great hue and cry goes up from the people.

The system of navigation which we adopted and which we have been following is the key to the safety of the air-traveling public. It is the key to the safety of our military operations. If the time has come when we are ready to scrap several hundred million dollars of investment by the Government, and by private persons, and we are sure we have a better system to put into effect, that is one thing. It is another thing to scrap the huge expenditures which have gone into the present system without being sure that there is a better one.

As I have said, much of the information on the subject is under the cloak of classified information, and I have purposely avoided disclosing such information; but it has been reliably reported, from one source, that we have spent on the present system more than $325 million, and other figures run higher than that.

The decision to have a permanent system of air navigation for both civil and military purposes was made upon the recommendation of a body of Congress. Therefore, because of the seriousness of the problem and because of recurrent rumors of possible irregularities which I have heard and which many of my colleagues have heard in the city of Washington or around the country if they have listened; because of the traditional concern of Congress in this matter; because all these years, a part of the time as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I have taken the leadership in appropriating money for air-navigation facilities; because my colleagues in the committee have followed those recommendations, and my colleagues in the Senate and in the House have followed such recommendations with action, and because of their responsibility and their earnest interest in the matter, I am submitting a concurrent resolution calling for the appointment of a joint committee of both Houses of Congress to investigate the matter. As a rule, I am not too favorable to the establishment of joint committees, but I should like to point out that the reason for suggesting a joint committee in this instance, rather than a single committee, is that the original recommendations came as a result of action by a joint committee.

Thus, after thorough investigation and mature consideration of all facts and circumstances surrounding this matter, the Congress may itself be informed on the merits of this controversy, and may take whatever action it deems necessary or desirable.

I should like to emphasize that, like other Members of Congress who have given thought to this study, I have no preconceived notions. I know that so far we have been proceeding in good faith. Even if a new system of navigation is going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars more, and in spite of the fact that the present system has cost us hundreds of millions, if the new system is better and more efficient, then I shall certainly want to know about it, and I think the Congress will want to know. However, without having an investigation so that we will know the facts, I am not ready to scrap an existing system which involves the personal safety of the entire air-traveling public, which is successfully operating today, and which we have influenced other countries to put into effect, so there will be continuity in the safety of citizens of other nations and our own citizens.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate concurrent resolution calling for such an investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the Government of the United States has long recognized that a single basic system of air navigation and traffic control, known as the common system, must be developed and installed in the United States which will satisfy the requirements of all users to the greatest extent feasible; and

Whereas the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of the 80th Congress and the Special Committee No. 31 of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics recommended and the appropriate Government agencies adopted and installed a system of air navigation facilities for the common use of military and civil aircraft operating within the United States, such common system being currently implemented by very high frequency omni-directional range and distance measuring equipment air navigation facilities; and

Whereas it appears that by joint action of the Departments of Commerce and Defense in the Air Navigation Development Board it has recently been proposed to substitute a different air navigation facility in the common system; and

Whereas such proposal has been the subject of intense controversy and there is reason to believe that it may have been premature; and

Whereas the implementation of the proposal at this time would drastically affect all elements of aviation in the United States and abroad; and

Whereas all material and relevant facts relating to the present common system and changes proposed thereto should be explored by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate (3 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate after consultation with the chairmen and ranking minority member of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Armed Services, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives (3 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives after consultation with the chairmen of the House Committees on Appropriations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Armed Services.

SEC. 2. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original seletcion. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of six members, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to—

(a) study thoroughly all aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States and the use in that system of air navigation facilities; and

(b) transmit to the Congress a report containing comprehensive statements of its findings and conclusions and its recommendations for the development, installation, operation, and improvement of the common system of air navigation in the United States.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The executive branch of the Government is hereby requested to postpone any action to implement any decision for the use of an air navigation facility in lieu of the very high frequency omni-directional range and distance measuring equipment air navigation facilities in the common system until the joint committee completes its study and reports thereon to the Congress and the Congress has acted upon such report.

SEC. 7. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

SEC. 8. The joint committee shall make its report to the Senate and the House of Representatives during the Eighty-fourth Congress. Upon the submission of such report,

the joint committee shall cease to exist and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate.

REPUDIATION OF YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD a resolution which I shall submit, but which I do not intend to discuss today. I shall discuss it next Tuesday or Wednesday, depending upon which day the Senate may be in session. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the 1952 Republican platform, adopted July 10, 1952, declared that "the Government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings such as those of Yalta which aid Communist enslavements"; and

Whereas the President in his address to the Congress on February 2, 1953, declared that the United States will never "acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves" and that "this Government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement"; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement has not as yet been repudiated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should, and he is hereby requested to, take such action as may be necessary to repudiate the Yalta agreement and to relieve the United States of all commitments undertaken by it in such agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISAPPROVAL OF SALE OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

Mr. MORSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 76), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Article by him entitled "America's Future," dealing with the military reserves of the United States, published in the February issue of the Reserve Officer magazine.

By Mr. YOUNG:

Address with reference to the Rural Electrification Administration delivered by Representative GROSS, of Iowa.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the nomination of former Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, to be Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of the Philippines, vice Raymond Ames Spruance, resigned. Notice is hereby given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule. Also received was a list of 67 persons for appointments as Foreign Service officers of various classes, as well as consular and/or diplomatic designations for career and reserve officers. The list appears elsewhere in the proceedings of today. These nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

James F. Brophy, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia, vice Joseph H. Young, term expired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Friday, March 18, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

THE 1956 WISCONSIN SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the 1956 election campaigns.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

During my recent speaking trip throughout Wisconsin, I was asked on many occasions about the 1956 presidential, senatorial, congressional, and State elections.

I stated uniformly that my task in Washington is to perform the legislative business of the people of Wisconsin. Necessarily, I regard this as a full-time job. So I do not feel that a lot of idle speculation as to campaigns to come should dissipate the time of a busy legislator who has a job at hand to accomplish.

At the same time, I did express a few observations, and I am pleased to supplement them now. They are as follows:

IKE THE BEST, STRONGEST CANDIDATE

1. The best and strongest Republican candidate for President of the United States, to be chosen at the 1956 San Francisco convention is, of course, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Our great Chief Executive has proven his abilities as a leader in peace as well as in war.

He has helped assure for our country its peak historic prosperity in peacetime.

His presence in the White House is in itself a major insurance policy, so to speak against world war. International communism respects him, respects his strength and firmness.

Now, as the President himself has said, he is not indispensable. No man is indispensable in the American system. One does not have to prove he is 100 percent for Ike by contending that he is indispensable. He, himself, has pointed out that there are many fine Republican leaders.

But Dwight D. Eisenhower is still the best Republican leader, the strongest Republican leader, the one whom we want and should have to lead our party to victory once more in 1956.

NIXON TOPS FOR NO. 2 SPOT

2. The best and likeliest choice for Vice President of the United States in November 1956 is RICHARD NIXON.

He has done an outstanding job in the second highest office in the land. Although a young man, he has proven his maturity, judgment, and leadership.

He has been a faithful captain and teammate of the Eisenhower administration. He has been subjected to many unfair attacks, but has taken them uncomplainingly.

He has proven a great credit to our Nation in its dealings with foreign lands.

He and his charming wife, Pat, like Mamie and Ike Eisenhower, are a wonderful, typically American couple who hold warm spots in the personal affections of the American people.

VOTERS WILL BE SELECTIVE

3. As to the other candidates for Federal, State, and local offices on the Republican ticket, they are basically going to have to paddle their own canoes.

None of them should expect to coast into office, behind the high wave of the Republican candidates for President and Vice President.

It is a fact that President Eisenhower no doubt will generate a great number of Republican and independent votes. But the voters proved in November 1954 that they are highly selective. A great many of them are not going to vote a straight Republican ticket just because they like President Eisenhower.

There will be many millions of faithful Republicans who will indeed vote straight GOP. However, there will be considerable numbers of independents who will prefer to vote for President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, but to cross parties when it comes to other places on the ticket.

UPHILL FIGHT IN SENATE AND HOUSE

4. The GOP can regain the Senate in 1956, but as our industrious campaign-committee chairman, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, has well said, it will be an uphill fight, because most of the current Republican seats are in marginal States.

In the House, we have a better chance for recapturing control; but in both Chambers we have got to offer the strongest possible candidates who will stand on their own feet and yet be loyal teammates of the President.

WISCONSIN WANTS FORWARD-LOOKING CANDIDATES

5. I am not going to attempt to offer detached predictions on the specific senatorial race in my own State in 1956.

That will take care of itself in time to come. The only major point I should like to state is this:

The candidate, whoever he may be, who will be chosen by the Wisconsin electorate in the GOP primary and in the general election of 1956, must be a forward-looking individual who represents the dynamic political philosophy of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The people of Wisconsin, like the people of our other States, want Eisenhower and they want Eisenhower policies.

They do not want a 19th-century-minded individual to try to lead them in the 20th century atomic age.

They want active middle-of-the-road leadership which avoids either the reactionary extreme right or the Socialist extreme left.

They want a candidate who recognizes that the Federal Government has very substantial responsibilities in our complex industrial society, but a candidate who knows there are definite limits on Uncle Sam's Treasury and there should be limits on the Federal Government's power.

On the foreign-policy issue the people of Wisconsin will want a candidate who supports President Eisenhower's strong leadership in the international struggle against communism. They will not accept some nearsighted isolationist who believes in abandoning the rest of the world to communism by default, someone who believes in sticking our head in the ground like a scared ostrich.

WISCONSIN WILL REMAIN UNBOSSED

The people of Wisconsin will want a Republican senatorial candidate who represents all of them—from the grassroots up.

Wisconsin is unbossed and it will remain unbossed.

I have spoken to and heard from numerous fine statewide, district, county, and city Republican leaders and workers. These Republican leaders and workers, high officials, as well as rank and filers, want an Eisenhower man—a man of the people. They want a man who will work as a teammate with the party, yet one capable of enlisting the support of many independent voters as well.

HEAL PARTY DIFFERENCES

Admittedly, there are differences within the Republican Party, but none so deep or wide that they cannot be healed by men of good will who think of the Nation first—who think of loyalty to the President and to the party rather than holding some narrow extremist prejudices.

I have had fine contacts along this line with our national committeewoman, Mrs. Town, and with our State chairman, Bob Pierce.

They and I know that we have a big enough job on our hands without waging war in our own ranks, but we have got to unite on the basis of supporting President Eisenhower with votes and with Eisenhower candidates.

WISCONSIN WATCHED BY NATION

The eyes of countless voters in 47 other States will be on Wisconsin in 1956.

Let us of Wisconsin be worthy of the occasion. Let us rise to it and rise to be No. 1 in backing our President.

We may not agree with him on every last issue; he doesn't, of course, ask for that, but he does have a right to expect a broad basis of support on the main line and direction of his fine policies.

This, then, must be the theme for GOP victory in 1956: Eisenhower candidates and an Eisenhower program and Eisenhower spirit.

DUST STORMS IN NEBRASKA AND OTHER STATES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there appears in the Washington Post and Times Herald today an item entitled "Forty Mile Winds Whip Dust Across Plains." The item reads as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, March 10.—The first general dust storm of the year hit Southwestern States today with 40-mile-an-hour winds whipping the plains left barren by drought.

A vast cloud of choking dirt turned the sky a chocolate gray in some sections, a dirty orange in others. It spread from southern Nebraska through parts of Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas.

Visibility dropped to zero at Imperial, Nebr., at midafternoon and at Akron, Colo., weathermen said mud-covered hail fell as dust reduced visibility to 300 feet.

Center of the blow area was in the Oklahoma and Texas Panhandle, northeastern New Mexico, southwestern Kansas, and southeastern Colorado.

J. W. Hamilton, chief forecaster here, said strong winds aloft will carry some of the dust eastward possibly as far as Kentucky and Tennessee.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and present it in support of Senate bill 1319 which I introduced last week and which proposes to release certain funds from the unexpended balances in the emergency control fund.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's business the Senate stand in recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEMORIAL TO LINCOLN'S TEACHER IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, few Americans know the story of Mentor Graham, the man who was teacher to Abraham Lincoln. Like, I daresay, a majority of other citizens, I have been under the impression that the railsplitter President got his only formal education in a few short months while only a boy and that thereafter he extended his knowledge solely by his own efforts.

Another chapter in Lincoln's life, however, has come to my attention through reading an article by Harold S. Milner, of the Associated Press, which appeared in the February 10, 1955, issue of the Huronite and Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak.

It is the story of Mentor Graham, born in Kentucky, in whose Illinois home Lincoln lived and studied with Ann Rutledge, and whose son, Harry Lincoln Graham, established a home in Blunt, S. Dak., where Graham lived for a year before passing away in 1885.

Great credit is due our State historian, Will G. Robinson, and the members of the South Dakota Historical Society for restoring the last home of Mentor Graham, the man who taught Lincoln. It will serve as a memorial to him and his contribution to the clarity of expression that marks the immortal speeches of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. President, I ask permission to append Mr. Milner's story to these remarks.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEMORIAL AT BLUNT—LINCOLN'S GRAMMAR TEACHER SPENT HIS LAST YEAR IN SOUTH DAKOTA

(By Harold S. Milner)

BLUNT.—You're wrong, if you think Abraham Lincoln got his education by plopping in front of a fireplace with a borrowed book.

He had a teacher.

There's a memorial here to Mentor Graham, the man who probably had much to do in shaping the destiny of Lincoln, the Civil War President.

The house where Graham died is far removed from his associations with Lincoln. It was saved from being scrapped and the land sold for tax deed 8 years ago by a group of members of the South Dakota Historical Society.

BORN NEAR PUPIL

Lincoln's teacher was born in the northwest corner of Green County, Ky., close to the birthplace of the Great Emancipator. Like Lincoln, Graham had a penchant for books. Both were born to lowly circumstances.

Graham was fortunate in that for several years, starting when he was 10, he lived with a doctor uncle, who had broad knowledge for those days and had a store of books.

He rode behind the doctor as he made his horseback rounds, and school for Mentor was a continuous affair at the home and on the horse. The story of his life is told in the book, Mentor Graham: The Man Who Taught Lincoln. The biography was written by Lunigunde Duncan and D. F. Nichols.

Although they were born in northern Kentucky, the paths of Lincoln and Graham never crossed until 1829 when they were both living at New Salem, Ill. It was through an adversity.

DRIFTING STOPPED

Lincoln at that time, according to his biographers, still called himself Driftwood.

The teacher and pupil worked together in 1831 when Graham was instrumental in getting Lincoln drafted as the clerk of an election.

Something was holding the self-styled drifter in New Salem. It developed that something was Ann Rutledge, daughter of the miller and tavern keeper.

Miss Rutledge was studying with Mentor Graham for entrance into an academy. Lincoln also was studying. Lincoln lived at the Graham home for 6 months starting in February 1833. There the two young people met and studied together.

Lincoln at one time wanted to give up further study. It was Mentor Graham who argued that a man, if he was to pursue public life, must have a perfect knowledge of grammar.

Thereafter Lincoln studied grammar under the tutelage of Graham. He recited his lessons in a fence corner or other place where the pupil and master might meet.

Graham as a teacher was famous for his emphasis on correct word usage, succinctness of speech and writing. There is little doubt that the effective and terse style of Lincoln, best exemplified by his Gettysburg address, found its inception in the teachings of Graham.

Graham named his last of six children, Harry Lincoln, after his most famous pupil in 1842, although the future President then was an unknown.

INVITED TO PLATFORM

However, at his inauguration, Lincoln spied Graham in the crowd and asked him to sit on the platform with him.

Harry Lincoln Graham purchased property in Blunt, S. Dak., in November 1884, and brought his father to live with him. Mentor Graham died there less than a year later at 85.

On the wall still hangs a framed copy of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, something Mentor Graham always displayed in his home.

Graham was buried in a small graveyard near Blunt but later relatives moved the body to Farmers Point, Ill.

Blunt was a thriving community at the end of the Northwestern Railroad before it was extended 22 miles southwest to Pierre, the present South Dakota capital.

Blunt doesn't have even a weekly paper now, but at that time its daily newspaper carried a brief story on Graham's death, including:

"Abraham Lincoln and Governor Yates were among his pupils."

The home where he died is being restored as closely as possible to the way it was in 1885 as a memorial to Graham.

MISSISSIPPI VOCATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the February issue of the American Vocational Journal. This particular issue of the Journal saluted the outstanding work that has been done by the Mississippi vocational program. The vocational education type of teaching and training has made important contributions to the growth and prosperity of our Nation, and I am particularly proud of the steady progress that has been made in this program in Mississippi.

The program in Mississippi has become a symbol of real progress in converting scientific and technical advances into practical and appropriate know-how. Mississippi and other States of the Union are becoming increasingly concerned with what measures can be taken to improve agriculture, industry, business, and public service. I strongly feel that an adequate and farsighted vocational education program offers a challenge for opening new avenues of opportunity and prosperity.

Congress recognized the importance of this program last year when it increased appropriations by $5 million. I had visualized this as a steppingstone in terms of building and expanded program, and I hope that consideration will be given again this year to stepping up the funds made available for this important program.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL JOURNAL SALUTES MISSISSIPPI AND ITS INTEGRAL CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM OF VOCATIONAL AND PRACTICAL ARTS EDUCATION

The Mississippi Legislature in 1910 enacted laws providing for the establishment of a system of county agriculture high schools. These schools were to provide in the curriculum for the teaching of both agriculture and home science. The law also provided that students in these schools would work a given number of hours a week on the farm and in the school facilities as a means of gaining practical experience to supplement their classroom instruction in agriculture and home science.

With the enactment of the Smith-Hughes law in 1917 the State Board for Vocational Education in Mississippi was established and the county agriculture high schools became the first schools to be approved under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act; that was 38 years ago. In the 38th year in vocational education in Mississippi there is a total of 497 public schools offering training in some phase of vocational education. Much effort was spent in the promotion and development of vocational education in Mississippi but in recent years the problem has been one of approving situations in which the greatest good would be accomplished within available funds.

Mississippi's representation in Congress has worked cooperatively with other leaders in the promotion and development of vocational education. Our own Congressman Russell Elizey was coauthor of the George-Elizey Act, which was one of the supplemental supporting acts for vocational education.

Recognition is given to the importance of vocational education through accrediting agencies; and schools now accredited by the Mississippi Accrediting Association must provide vocational education to meet the needs of their students.

Since 1917 there has been enrolled in the public schools in Mississippi 793,090 boys and girls who have received instruction in some field of vocational service and during this same period 634,795 adults have received vocational training that would assist them with the problems of the farm, home, and industry. This represents a grand total of 1,426,885 years of instruction in vocational services or units of instruction for adult people.

Vocational education has made its contribution in the economic and social welfare of the people of Mississippi and, as an integral part of the public schools, offers opportunity for further development in the years ahead.

A review of the several divisions will show the development in each of the services.

Vocational education in agriculture had its beginning in Mississippi under the Smith-Hughes law in 1918. Thirty vocational agriculture departments were established in the State that year with $16,107.79 Federal funds plus a share of the $1,450 appropriated by the State legislature for vocational education.

Today the vocational agriculture departments total 378 and more than $1,417,848 are expended on the Federal, State, and local levels in reaching 39,884 students enrolled in agricultural classes.

Agriculture in Mississippi varies from the gulf coast to the hills of north Mississippi and the vast rich delta bordered on the west by the Mississippi, but everywhere cotton is grown. Cotton is still king in Mississippi; but forest trees, the State's new crop, is fast cutting down the lead of cotton as the top money crop. Emphasis on this phase of the farming program has been increased through the employment of a forester to work directly with the vocational agriculture teachers. Cattle and dairy farming are steadily looming into the picture and because of the climate which is favorable to pastures almost the year around, this phase of Mississippi agriculture is expected to increase.

In order to keep the agriculture teachers up to date in scientific farming, subject matter is streamlined by a specialist at Mississippi State College, and sent directly to the teachers. In-service training, field tours, demonstrations, and workshops are other methods of keeping the teachers posted.

Farming in all sections of Mississippi is becoming more and more mechanized with all types of farm equipment. The mule as a source of farm power is swiftly being replaced by the tractor. In a 12-year span (1939–51), the number of tractors at work on farms increased 32,000. Many in-school vocational agriculture boys know little about horse-drawn farm equipment; and education in care, maintenance, and adjustment of farm machinery is of utmost importance to both in-school vocational agriculture boys and adult farmers.

Seeing the need for more specialized training in this area for the adult farmer classes, many schools, with the support of the State vocational agriculture department, have employed skilled mechanics to teach adult farmer classes; many schools, machinery. Group instruction is followed up by individual instruction on the farm.

The steady increase in enrollment in homemaking classes, the continuous requests for additional departments and teachers, and the need for extended terms of employment of teachers bear evidence to the effectiveness of the vocational homemaking program in Mississippi since its beginning in 1920.

The Future Homemakers of America and New Homemakers of America organizations, with their numerous activities, are an integral part of the homemaking program in Mississippi. The 320 chapters of FHA have a membership of approximately 13,000 and the 129 chapters of NHA have a membership of approximately 7,000.

Teacher-training staffs work very closely with the State staff to build a functional program. Short, intensive courses are designed and offered to meet special needs of teachers on the job.

Industrial arts falls in the category of general education, but perhaps no other one general-education subject makes a greater contribution to the student by way of preparation for more specific types of training they may receive through vocational education. The program is yet in its infancy, but is definitely in process of growth and development.

In keeping with the concept that vocational education is an integral part of the total program of public education, it is recognized by many that local public schools are responsible for all training of this type for the community. Whether for the in-school student, out-of-school youth, or the employed adults, training should be available to those who need it and can profit therefrom.

Industrialization of our State is progressing at a rapid pace. Of the slightly more than 2 million people who reside within our boundaries, approximately 100,000 are employed in industrial pursuits. Since World War II, a total of 241 new industries have taken advantage of our market outlets, a generous supply of willing labor, a favorable climate, and a considerable resource of raw materials.

Approximately 10,000 individuals received preparatory and trade-extension training during the past fiscal year. Partly because of the problem of limited finances, day-trade offerings developed slowly. To overcome this, Mississippi and several other Southern States, working jointly, devised the part-time cooperative plan of training now known as the diversified occupations, or the DO program. This enabled students in even small communities to receive specialized training for a variety of occupations. In a recent year, training for 74 different occupations was given to some 800 high-school students.

Following preparatory training, graduates are awarded advanced standing on their apprenticeship. Typical of placement under this arrangement, those completing high school who have had at least 1 year of specialized vocational training have consequently been employed by local industry, given advanced standing on apprenticeship, and paid a corresponding wage.

Distributive education has become a vital part of the program of vocational education in Mississippi. The first educational effort in this field was with evening classes for

employed distributive workers, and immediately following this beginning, the part-time cooperative program was developed for the in-school group of youths who were to become employees in distribution occupations.

As Mississippi has grown industrially the need for distributive education has also increased. The program grew in general acceptance by school administrators, and by leaders in the field of distribution. At one time, approximately 5,000 people were reached within a year. With decreased appropriation, however, there was necessarily some retrenchment in the program. Every effort is being made in Mississippi to promote a sound program in the field of distribution that will merit continued support from the national, State, and local levels.

Mississippi's changing economy, along with developments in school philosophy, has caused administrators to recognize the need to organize and extend vocational guidance services. Some schools in the State were already moving in this direction when the George-Barden Act was passed. Now several of them have "pilot" guidance programs which are financed through Federal, State, and local funds. A new State law provides that a cumulative record will be kept on every child, grades 1–12.

Almost every high school in the State has a faculty member with some professional guidance training. Forty-two counselors are now devoting at least half time to guidance, while over a hundred high schools have a faculty member with some time scheduled for counseling. Programs are being developed as organized guidance services based on student needs.

High standards for counselor certification have been established and graduate schools in the teacher-training institutions are preparing counselors with the necessary professional training. An especially effective inservice training program for local faculties is being provided by approved counselor trainers in several cooperating schools over the State.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared concerning the President's White House Conference on Education be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Education in a free society is vital to our youth and to the future of our Nation as well as the free world. It is therefore only proper that education should be the responsibility of all our citizens, not just educators alone. Now this in no way reflects adversely on the efforts of educators. I believe that on the whole they have done a good job in the face of tremendous difficulties and a certain degree of public apathy. But it is in this area of citizen responsibility that I would like to call attention to President Eisenhower's plans for dealing with the vast complex of educational problems throughout the Nation.

The President's White House Conference on Education is scheduled for November 28–December 1, 1955. It seems to me that this historical program, established by the 83d Congress in response to President Eisenhower's appeal for a national study of the problems of education, deserves our attention. The President, himself, has referred to the program as unparalleled in history.

In brief, the President's program calls for a series of State conferences on education to culminate in a national conference in Washington November 28–December 1, 1955. President Eisenhower, in a letter to the heads of the 48 States and the Territories inviting their cooperation, described the effort as the most thorough, widespread, and concerted study that the American people have ever made of their educational problems.

To my knowledge, it is the first time in the educational history of this Nation that a massive national study of our educational ills has ever been initiated by a President of the United States. The effort deserves the attention of every Member of Congress.

Public Law 530, which set up the program, stipulates that it be "broadly representative of educators and other interested citizens from all parts of the Nation * * * to consider and report to the President on the significant and pressing problems in the field of education." The President has appointed a 33-member Committee for the White House Conference on Education under the chairmanship of Neil H. McElroy, a distinguished citizen of Cincinnati, Ohio, and president of the Procter & Gamble Co.

The Presidential committee includes leaders from industry, business, publishing, radio and television, agriculture, labor, education, and religion. President Eisenhower has placed the dignity and prestige of his office behind the effort, not only in recommending the establishment of the conference program, but in his willingness to serve as honorary chairman. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, and United States Commissioner of Education, S. M. Brownell, are serving as honorary vice chairmen. The distinguished list of citizens on the committee is as follows:

Neil H. McElroy, chairman, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Procter & Gamble Co.

Finis E. Engleman, vice chairman, Hartford, Conn., State commissioner of education.

Mildred C. Ahlgren (Mrs. Oscar A.), Whiting, Ind., past president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Ethel G. Brown (Mrs. Rollin), Los Angeles, Calif., first vice president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Ralph J. Bunche, Kew Gardens, N. Y., under secretary, United Nations.

John S. Burke, New York, N. Y., president, B. Altman & Co.

John Cowles, Minneapolis, Minn., president, Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

John A. Hannah, East Lansing, Mich., president, Michigan State College.

James W. Hargrove, Shreveport, La., vice president, Texas Eastern Gas Transmission Co.

Albert J. Hayes, Silver Spring, Md., president, International Association of Machinists.

Margaret Hickey, St. Louis, Mo., editor, public affairs department, Ladies' Home Journal.

Henry H. Hill, Nashville, Tenn., president, George Peabody College for Teachers.

Mildred M. Horton (Mrs. Douglas), New York, N. Y., past president, Wellesley College.

James R. Killian, Jr., Cambridge, Mass., president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Allan B. Kline, Vinton, Iowa, president, American Farm Bureau Federation.

W. Preston Lane, Jr., Hagerstown, Md., ex-governor, Maryland.

Roy E. Larsen, Fairfield, Conn., president and director, Time, Inc.; chairman, National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.

Thomas Lazzio, Paterson, N. J., president, Local 300, UAW-CIO.

Joseph C. McLain, Mamaroneck, N. Y., principal, Mamaroneck High School.

William E. McManus, Washington, D. C., assistant director, department of education, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Lorimer D. Milton, Atlanta, Ga., president, Citizens Trust Co.

Don G. Mitchell, Summit, N. J., chairman of board, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.

Frank C. Moore, Buffalo, N. Y., president, Government Affairs Foundation, Inc.

Herschel D. Newsom, Takoma Park, Md., master, National Grange.

William S. Paley, Manhasset, N. Y., chairman of board, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

James F. Redmond, New Orleans, La., superintendent of schools.

Martha Shull, Portland, Oreg., high-school teacher.

Frank H. Sparks, Crawfordsville, Ind., president, Wabash College.

Potter Stewart, Cincinnati, Ohio, judge, United States court of appeals.

Jesse G. Stratton, Clinton, Okla., president, National School Boards Association, Inc.

Harold W. Sweatt, Palm Beach, Fla., chairman of board, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

H. Grant Vest, Denver, Colo., State commissioner of education.

Mayme E. Williams (Mrs. Charles L.), Miami, Fla., teacher and president, National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers.

The committee for the White House conference on education held its first organizational meeting in Washington last December 2. Since that time, in response to the President's appeal to the States and Territories for cooperation 50 out of 53 States and Territories scheduled to participate in the conference program have taken some official action in planning or holding State conferences. Forty-two States have appointed conference chairmen, 26 have scheduled conference dates, 6 already have held conferences, and 39 have applied for Federal funds under Public Law 530. The Congress appropriated more than $700,000 to help States defray costs of their conferences. The minimum any State may receive is $5,000, a sum arrived at on the basis of population.

Meanwhile the committee for the White House conference on education has drawn up tentative working plans for the national conference for an estimated attendance of some 2,000 participants. Of this number, 1,400 will be invited from the 48 States and Territories. The minimum number of invitations based on population slated to be issued to any one State is 10. The remainder will be drawn from representatives of national organizations which have cooperated with the program at the State and national level, Members of Congress with legislative responsibilities in education, foreign observers, and others selected by the Presidential committee. The educators and lay citizens will be broken down into panels of no more than 10 persons to a table. This procedure has been adopted to allow all participants a chance for full discussion.

The agenda for the conference will include six major subjects for discussion. They are: (1) What should our schools accomplish? (2) In what ways can we organize our school systems more efficiently and economically? (3) What are our school building needs? (4) How can we get good enough teachers—and keep them? (5) How can we finance our schools—build and operate them? (6) How can we obtain a continuing public interest in education?

The Presidential committee will be divided into subcommittees to discuss, study, and analyze each of these subjects. In addition, experts in each area will be hired as staff consultants. Three main phases of the conference program will be considered by the committee in its report to the President:

1. The committee's own studies.

2. The findings and reports of the State conferences.

3. Results of the White House Conference November 28 to December 1.

I think this is an appropriate place to add that President Eisenhower's $7 billion emergency school construction program does not conflict in any way with the White House Conference. The President himself has said so, and Mrs. Hobby has indicated that the two programs mesh. The problem of financing schools is only one of the six major subjects scheduled for discussion at the national conference.

Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD a number of excerpts from various magazines and other publications which have indicated an interest in the goals of the White House Conference on education. The New York Times editorial is especially significant. Some of these quotations are from periodicals published by national organizations which have responded to President Eisenhower's appeal for widespread citizen participation in these State and national conferences. It is encouraging to note the measure of their acceptance of responsibility in the vital area of education.

Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, in the February 1955 NCPT newsletter:

"The other contribution that you (PT members) can make is to guarantee a broad representation of parent-teacher leaders among the participants in the White House Conference on Education next November. It is my understanding that 70 percent of the delegates to this conference will be selected by the governors of the various States. It would seem, therefore, that the best way to guarantee adequate PTA representation in Washington next November would be to insure broad and competent representation at the State conferences and on any State committees that are set up to plan for the final conference. If your State leaders can make a real contribution at the State level, surely some of these participants will be named delegates to the national conference.

"Who are the parent-teacher leaders in your congress who are best fitted to handle questions in the areas to be discussed? Do what you can to see that they are included in State conference plans and brought to the attention of your governor as possible delegates to the White House Conference on Education at the end of the year."

Gould Lincoln in the Washington Evening Star, February 2, 1955:

"The whole question of what to do about the school shortage, which includes a shortage of teachers, is now in the process of study by committees in every State, as provided for by Congress during its last session. These studies are preliminary to a White House Conference on Education next fall, when it is hoped that a comprehensive and long-range program may be worked out."

Douglas Larsen in the Dictaphone Education Forum:

"Educators here are well pleased with the two men (Neil H. McElroy, Clint Pace) elected to take over the key jobs of directing the White House Conference on Education to be held next year."

Same column, quoting Mrs. Hobby: "'I share the President's conviction that these conferences can be tremendously helpful in solving the grave and complex educational problems which face Americans across our land.'"

Commissioner S. M. Brownell quoted in the Education Summary:

"'The State conferences, to be followed by a White House Conference on Education in 1955, will stimulate the greatest citizen-study and citizen-action efforts in behalf of the education of the country's children we have ever made.'"

American School Board Journal, February 1955:

"Important steps have been taken in recent months to bring closer to realization the hope President Eisenhower expressed in his second state of the Union message that 'a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference' to appraise pressing educational problems."

John H. Lloyd, managing editor, School Life:

"The President's call in his 1954 state of the Union message for State conferences on education's pressing problems is being answered. By the end of 1955 all States will probably have held such conferences to assess the critical problems of the schools and colleges. Their reports to the White House Conference on Education will doubtless represent the greatest inventory of educational problems and progress ever made in the United States."

Education Notes, American Association of University Women, general director's letter:

"The White House Conference, 1955 * * * an opportunity for the States to bring their unsolved problems to the attention of the Federal Government and the Nation * * * and to work out further means by which the American people can jointly bring a halt to the ever-mounting crises in education."

News and Cues, Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"Reports from these State conferences on school conditions will be the basis of a White House Conference on Education to be held not later than November 1955.

"We urge all committees on education and businessmen everywhere to 'put first things first' and contribute time, thought and energy to these State education conferences and to the solution of their own school problems. * * * Business leaders everywhere have a stake in and a responsibility for the validity of the report which their State sends to the White House—and for the State and local action found necessary to maintain good schools."

Benjamin Fine in the New York Times, December 12, 1954—Education in Review:

"If the local communities and States cooperate, the Washington sessions (of the White House Conference) will provide this Nation with an extremely valuable opportunity to broaden the basis of understanding of the educational system."

Journal of Teacher Education:

"It certainly would be a wholesome thing if citizens in every State had the opportunity to face up to the enormous problems of the schools and to decide what they want to do about them."

Journal of the American Association of University Women:

"We in the AAUW who have long been concerned with the ever-increasing problems confronting education in our several States will surely welcome the President's invitation to enroll us all in a united nationwide effort to examine our educational problems, assess our local resources for meeting the needs, and together determine the role, if any, of the Federal Government in helping the States to meet their educational obligations."

Engineering and Scientific Manpower Newsletter, December 15, 1954:

"These conferences present an excellent opportunity for those interested in education problems and the needs of our schools to make their views known in their own State."

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Bulletin, October 29, 1954:

"In view of the importance which these conferences hold for future developments in education, the membership of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education should be alert to the plans being made on the State and National level. * * * The proposed State and National conferences will provide an excellent opportunity to bring the current problems facing teacher education and the schools of America to the attention of the Nation."

Aids for Council Leadership, National Council of Jewish Women, December 8, 1954:

"Teacher shortages, poor facilities, and overcrowding are among the many problems which drag down the level of education. These forthcoming State conferences and the White House Conference offer an excellent opportunity to bring these concerns before the attention of the country as a whole for serious study and action."

The School Executive, February 1955:

"At the recent annual meeting of the council (American Council on Education) a resolution was passed instructing the President to inform the State governors of the interest of council members in the conferences now being held preliminary to the White House meeting later this year."

Washington Report, November 5, 1954, Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"All leaders, we believe, who put first things first will contribute time, thought, and energy to the State education conferences requested by the President and to the solution of the school problems there defined."

Citizens and Their Schools, National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools:

"The Nation will take one of the most comprehensive looks at the public schools in years in the wake of recently enacted congressional legislation.

"When the 83d Congress passed Public Law 530, it set in motion a $900,000 program which calls for a conference on education in every State and Territory, topped by a nationwide meeting—the White House Conference on Education."

Worth McClure, executive secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, in the secretary's letter, February 2, 1955:

"Your secretary asks that you give continuing support to State and White House Conferences on Education * * * he thinks the conferences carry great promise. * * * He strongly recommends that our officers and their State associations of administrators should support the State conferences on education, should join up with other constructive agencies in seeing to it that these conferences are held, that they are broadly representative, and that the delegates chosen for the White House Conference next November are also broadly representative."

[From the New York Times of March 6, 1955]

EVERYBODY'S SCHOOLS

The half-dozen major items just listed as the agenda for the White House Conference on Education next fall illuminate and emphasize the scope as well as the diversity of the problems of our schools. While people tend to think, naturally, in terms of the most immediately urgent of these, this important conference would ill serve its aims if it did not look beyond the present emergencies to a sound foundation for the longer future.

The topics chosen, with a subcommittee for each, are in themselves a logical outline of directions that thinking on our schools should take. President James R. Killian, Jr., of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, will be chairman of a group to suggest "what should our schools accomplish." Organizing school systems more efficiently and economically will be the subject studied by a committee under the Colorado commissioner of education, Dr. H. Grant West. M. Preston Lane, Jr., former Governor of Maryland, directs a fact-finding inquiry into our school building needs.

"How can we get enough good teachers and keep them?" is the gravely important question to be answered by the first vice president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Mrs. Rollin Brown, of Los Angeles. "How can we finance our schools—build and operate them?" is another critical

issue. Frank C. Moore, former Lieutenant Governor of New York and now president of the Government Affairs Foundation, Inc., brings to this problem long practical experience. Finally, the topic "how we can obtain a continuing public interest in education" will be explored by Jesse G. Stratton, of Oklahoma, past president of the National School Boards Association.

It would be difficult to assign a priority of importance to these subjects, for they march together to determine the welfare of our schools, the health of our democracy, and the advancing future of our Nation. Certainly without adequate school plant, the supplying of which is now a matter of congressional controversy, the education of our children must suffer.

But the key to meeting the present emergency in that respect, as well as to the adequate supply of good teachers, must finally lie in enlightened, enthusiastic, sustained public interest in education, for ill fares the school system in any community when the people of that community are too busy, too indifferent, too pocketbook conscious to concern themselves about and make the sacrifices for school plant, a sufficiency of teachers, and salary scales that will recruit to education the qualified young people to staff the classrooms. So it becomes obvious that interest in education and its physical and human problems starts from the ground up. It proceeds through school boards, village, town, and city officials, thence to State and National capitals.

To inspire and channel effectively this public interest is, of course, a major purpose of this White House conference, for which preparatory studies are going on throughout the country, State by State. The breadth of preliminary work suggests what is, indeed, the fact, that education must be everybody's business.

PROPOSED FEDERAL TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence and several editorials from different newspapers relating to proposed tax legislation.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

CONGRESS RENEGES ON ITS WORD—MEMBERS ACCUSED OF IMMORAL AND EX POST FACTO ACTION IN TRYING TO REWRITE PART OF 1954 TAX LAW

(By David Lawrence)

Morality is perhaps getting to be an obsolete word in public life, as selfish politics often reveals, but there can be no crime worse than a broken word given by the Congress of the United States to the taxpayers of the Nation.

Yet this very thing—repudiating the words of a law passed last August and making the repeal of certain provisions on taxes applicable to a year already ended, namely, the calendar year 1954—is what is being seriously proposed in the Congress.

If a private citizen writes his signature on a promissory note and then backs out on his word, he is subject to the penalties of the law. But evidently Congress can welsh and get away with it even though the Constitution says plainly that no "bill of attainder" or "ex post facto law" shall be passed.

The Democratic nine-member Policy Committee has just come out nevertheless with a bill which, if passed, would repeal immediately the property depreciation tax formula written into law last year. This would affect all companies which since the law was passed in August 1954 have made extensive plans of a financial nature to conform to that formula.

Some other tax-relief provisions which were granted last year and which the taxpayer in good faith accepted as applicable to the calendar year 1954 are to be repealed if pending bills are passed. The taxpayer cannot recover any sums he now may lose because he rearranged his business affairs during 1954 to fit in with the new law. For all transactions of the year 1954 now are closed and the taxpayer is not permitted to change those items as he pleases after his income-tax return is filed, though the Government reserves the right to change its own rulings at any time.

Many a business which started last year on a depreciation plan permitted under the 1954 law made commitments and probably borrowed money for expanding plant and renovating equipment because of a reliance on the good faith of Congress. But evidently the Democrats who are sponsoring the repudiation program are not concerned with how much they undermine the confidence of the public in the future of business. They appear more and more irresponsible, as if the sole object might be to bring on a depression. This would, of course, be politically advantageous, as the citizens usually vote against an administration in power when economic conditions take a turn for the worse.

It could be that the stock market in the last few days, which has been struck by a selling wave, is sensing this very irresponsibility in Washington and that businessmen are being told, in effect, that they cannot be sure of their plans at any time if the Democrats come into power.

No businessman can go back on a written commitment and be regarded thereafter in his community as either honest or sincere. But the Congress collectively is being asked by a number of Democrats of the radical school of thought to cancel existing legislation and make the cancellation retroactive through last year.

It is the right of Congress to repeal anything it has ever passed, but the date on which the repeal becomes effective ought, in fairness to the citizens, naturally be a day in the future. The 1954 tax revision law was passed after many years of study by expert accountants and specialists. It now is reported that Congress made some mistakes and that some taxpayers will get some temporary tax advantages. But, instead of acknowledging its errors in manful fashion and making any new laws applicable only to the future, Congress is considering a scheme which will impose upon the citizens a penalty for the errors made by the legislators themselves.

This isn't morality. It may be political expediency, but it is not calculated to improve the relations between the taxpayer and his Government. It is far better that the Congress should make up any losses from its own mistakes by passing new laws with new rates applicable to future earnings than that Congress stand convicted of crooked dealing with the citizen.

How can any American hereafter plan for his children's education or for the care of his widow if the Congress feels it can at any time pass retroactive laws taxing the savings of years already gone by? It's a discouraging picture of the future which some Members of Congress are today giving to the American people.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 11, 1955]

NEW TAX GIMMICK

The objections to the tax-cut plans of Senate Democrats are the same as the objections to the version of House Democrats: The cut is politically inspired and it is proposed too far in advance of the effective date of the cut. No one today can predict with accuracy the budgetary requirements or the economic needs a year hence. Therefore, it would be highly unrealistic to make tax changes now that will not take effect until early 1956. Although the Senate version makes a concession to revenue needs by readjusting tax concessions granted dividend recipients last year, this is a play to the gallery not related to economic or fiscal essentials.

At the moment, it is too early to tell how much Senate support there is for the new Democratic package. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that there is no final indication of how Senator GEORGE will vote on it. If he should support the plan it would have a chance—although a small one—of approval; otherwise it would have almost no chance at all. Senator GEORGE is the key figure in this tax debate. The rest of the show is largely for the record.

Perhaps the Democratic policy committee, which hatched this new plan, knows that its proposal will not be approved. There is much shadow boxing between the parties in preparation for the real slugfest next year. In 1956, the Democrats will be able to say that they have been unrelenting in their efforts to obtain tax cuts for the little fellow. If Democrats should win their fight this year the voter by next year would know how little he has been offered and would be asking for more—more than even an election-year Congress could give. The Democrats, therefore, may be in a stronger position next year if they are defeated on their tax plan this year.

The country clearly will be better off if the administration plan to extend the corporate and excise taxes for 1 year is adopted and if the tax-cutting plans are defeated. When Congress reconvenes in January there will be ample time to consider tax cuts. Also by January Congress will have far more information than it has today on the country's budgetary and economic requirements.

[From the Washington Star of March 11, 1955]

MORE POLITICS IN TAXES

The Senate Democratic leadership has produced a tax-revision program designed to attract votes. It is difficult to see in it any worthier purpose.

It is, in brief, a plan to give broad tax relief in the lower-income brackets only, to repeal the limited relief given last year on dividend income and on the accelerated business-depreciation provision and to extend present excise and corporation income-tax rates for 27 months instead of 12 months as requested by the administration.

In addition, the Democratic program includes retroactive repeal of two other provisions of last year's law that bear upon tax allowances for business reserves. However, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey has testified in favor of repeal of these two latter provisions on grounds they were technically in error, although he has challenged vigorously the Democratic estimates of revenue involved.

Basically the Democratic program in the Senate is a substitute for the Democratic-sponsored plan approved in the House to give a $20 tax credit to every taxpayer and dependent. The revenue loss by this provision was estimated at approximately $2 billion yearly. The fact that the Senate Finance Committee, with Democrats BYRD and GEORGE joining the Republican minority, voted this proposal down presumably led to the package alternative sponsored by the Senate Democratic leadership. In it the low-income individual relief would be limited to a $20 credit for each head of household and $10 for each dependent, but not for a spouse. While the cost of this provision is estimated at about $1.2 billion between now and July 1, 1957, Democratic spokesmen claim that revenue gains from other proposals would give the Government a net increase of $4.8 billion in the same period.

Senator BYRD, promptly opposing the plan of his party's leadership, described these figures as erroneous and fictitious. Secretary Humphrey has described the Democratic program as "just as irresponsible, just as political, as the original proposal for a $20 tax reduction."

It has been clear from the beginning that the Democrats are playing politics with this tax legislation. The administration has asked a 1-year extension of the excise and corporation income-tax rates, and they can be extended again if necessary next year. It also favors closing the two loopholes in business levies found in last year's omnibus tax bill. Progress is being made toward a balanced budget and further tax relief can be voted next year if conditions warrant such action. It would be premature to do so now. Furthermore, as Secretary Humphrey says, it would be unwise to repeal parts of last year's law which have "proved so helpful in making jobs and better times for most Americans." The Democratic majority should not engage in this kind of political maneuvering.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 11, 1955]

TAXATION FOLLIES: ACT II

Instead of reproving their House colleagues for playing politics with taxation, the Democratic leaders in the Senate seem determined to go them one better. Not only do the Senate Democrats propose to keep the $20 tax cut passed by the House, but they would help finance this vote-buying expedition by eliminating tax reforms achieved by the Eisenhower administration.

The Democrats, of course, have always taken the tack that these reforms were designed to help the big taxpayer at the expense of those who pay smaller taxes. That there might be some justice in doing this, as well as economic wisdom, is conveniently overlooked. In fact the whole Eisenhower tax plan was aimed initially at correcting some basic inequities in the tax structure—inequities which bear upon all tax brackets.

For example, the double taxation of security values (at the corporation source as well as at the stockholder level) is not sound or fair tax practice. It directly concerns some 8 million American stockholders. The measure of relief granted as dividend credit is very small, carefully guarded and requires an intricate calculation. Few can hope to save as much by this process as the $20 voted so jauntily to every taxpayer by the House Democrats. But a sound principle has been affirmed.

To consider the abolition of this principle as a setoff, either economically, or in public morals, for an across-the-board slash simply compounds the offense of which the Democratic Party is guilty in its approach to tax problems. The same applies to the Senate Democrats' proposal to repeal depreciation clauses passed in the last session. Other items of the Democratic bill, such as extension of corporation and excise taxes and repeal of a faulty provision on accounting methods, would have been introduced anyway.

Fortunately some Democrats, such as Senators BYRD and GEORGE, refuse to go along with the taxation follies of their party associates. The Republicans in the House have already demonstrated that they will not be stampeded into following the Democratic line. If they hold firm, and the Senate Republicans do the same, a victory can still be won for sane fiscal policies in the face of demogoguery.

[From the New York Times of March 11, 1955]

SAME HOAX, NEW GUISE

On February 21 the Democratic majority of the House Ways and Means Committee, in a maneuver calculated to identify that party with tax relief for the little fellow, tacked onto the administration bill for extending the corporate income taxes and certain excise taxes a provision which would have given every income taxpayer a rebate of $20 and increased the allowance for each dependent by the same amount. When he got a chance to express his views on this rider before the committee, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey argued forcefully against it as the very antithesis of "responsible government."

The House supported the committee in this political embellishment of the administration-sponsored tax measure, but when a counterpart of the administration bill came before the Senate Finance Committee the latter rejected efforts to write in the $20 tax cut by a vote of 9 to 6. Allied with the 7 Republican members of the committee on this vote were Democratic Senators BYRD and GEORGE, both of them members of great experience in the field of fiscal legislation and highly respected by their colleagues on both sides of the Chamber.

On Wednesday Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority floor leader, announced that the tax cut rider would be sponsored on the floor in a revised form by the six members of the Finance Committee who failed to sell it to their colleagues in the Finance Committee. One of the more obvious arguments against the original version of this political measure was the argument that there was nothing to justify a tax reduction at this time—10 months before it could become effective, when no one could predict what conditions would be and when the long uphill fight to achieve a balanced budget was still not yet won. Well, that argument, Senator JOHNSON explains, has now been disposed of. Under the new, beautified version we are going to have our cake and eat it too. The little fellow is going to get the tax reduction promised him in the earlier version (or a large part of it), but this will be achieved without adding to the budget deficit. In fact, Senator JOHNSON and his associates have arranged things so efficiently that not only will there be no increase in the deficit but there will be no deficit.

By what kind of legerdemain is this result to be achieved? It would be produced by offsetting, on page, the losses resulting from this political tax cut by increasing revenue from three other sources. Looked at superficially, none of these seems to touch the little fellow directly. Actually, all are part of the carefully considered and economically well-rounded tax program of the administration.

Under the plan announced by Senator JOHNSON the top layer of the corporate income tax and certain excise taxes would be retained for 2 more years instead of the 1 year proposed by the administration. This increase in revenue is, to begin with, a pure figment of the imagination. As Senator BYRD points out, the Democrats could hardly claim they were picking up additional revenue by extending these taxes through the fiscal year 1957, since there is no reason to doubt that the Finance Committee would do that in any case when the time came, should the budget situation make it desirable.

But even if this proposal were not an optical illusion it would be unsound and unjust. These particular taxes were enacted for emergency purposes in connection with the rearmament effort. They are entitled, therefore, to priority when the budget situation indicates the fiscal emergency is over. The additional new revenue would be obtained by repealing two measures adopted last year in connection with the general revision of the Internal Revenue Code. These are the modest relief which that legislation provided from the flagrantly unjust double taxation of dividend income, and the provision for permitting corporations more flexible depreciation policies, with respect to plant and equipment.

Thus, Mr. JOHNSON's program consists of 1 part fiction and 2 parts the reintroduction of conspicuous and long-standing injustices and imperfections that had existed previous to the comprehensive reform legislation of 1954.

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 11, 1955]

SHOW OF RESPONSIBILITY

Refusing to give up a good thing, the Democratic leadership in the Senate has now emerged with modifications of the House's $20-a-head tax handout. The modifications are worse than the original proposal.

The chief gimmick in this new deal is an attempt to answer the huge revenue losses the unadulterated House bill would have entailed. The long-postponed corporate and excise rate cuts would be postponed not just to a year from April, as the administration asks, but to July 1, 1957. The depreciation, taxation of dividend, and some other provisions of last year's law would be repealed.

And instead of cutting taxes $20 for each taxpayer and each dependent, the new play is to give the taxpayer $20, plus $10 per dependent other than wife, and in effect to limit this boon to people making less than $5,000 a year. The Democrats claim all this would result in a net gain of $4.9 billion for the Treasury.

So there, say these Democrats; we can, too, be responsible. We're going to help the little folks and balance the budget besides.

It is cute, all right. But then, politicians can always boost the revenue take—even boost it enough to balance the budget—if they completely disregard justice and blind themselves to the economic implications of their actions. And perhaps soaking the rich to help the poor is still good politics, even in a country where the distinction is fast being obliterated by the growing middle class.

But even in the present surcharged political atmosphere, the Senators perhaps ought to give a few seconds' thought to exactly whom they would be soaking. It's great sport in Washington to punish corporations, but it so happens that these favorite whipping boys also pay the wages of those little folks. The Senators might ask themselves whether a reimposition of inequitable depreciation rules and a 28-month extension of rates which take more than half the corporations' profits will tend to encourage or discourage them to expand and employ more people and pay higher wages.

The Democrats' economic argument is that increasing the purchasing power of the little folks by reducing their taxes promotes economic expansion. It doesn't by itself, of course. It does nobody much good to have his income-tax lowered if he has no income or less income than he might otherwise have.

The straight $20-a-head trick was too nakedly irresponsible to get very far. The new version is more devious and so more dangerous. But the economics on which it rests are just as unsophisticated. This sudden show of responsibility may prove to be unsophisticated politics as well.

ACCOUNTING PROVISIONS COVERING DEFERRED INCOME AND RESERVES FOR ESTIMATED EXPENSES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to read a letter, a copy of which I have received, addressed by the Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, to Representative JERE COOPER, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means. The letter is dated March 7, 1955, and has reference to the so-called error made in the tax bill which was

passed last year. The letter is as follows:

MARCH 7, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This supplements my letter of March 3 concerning the operation of the two new accounting provisions covering deferred income and reserves for estimated expenses (secs. 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954). Our studies now have proceeded far enough to indicate clearly that many taxpayers are planning to use these provisions to defer income and create deductions in excess of anything contemplated at the time they were proposed.

The objective of these sections was simply to conform tax bookkeeping with business bookkeeping. They never were intended to cover innumerable items some taxpayers apparently intend to claim. If permitted to remain in the law, they will cause a greater loss in revenue than estimated and cause considerable litigation. We are not able to adequately correct this by regulation. Accordingly, I recommend that the two provisions cited above immediately be repealed retroactively to their original effective dates.

Our report and recommendations on various other technical corrections in the 1954 Code will be ready soon.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY.

Yesterday Mr. Humphrey appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means. I understand the House will take action on the bill very shortly. When it comes to the Senate, the Committee on Finance will be immediately called into session to pass upon the bill and to report it to the Senate as an emergency measure.

I make this statement to allay any fear whatsoever which may exist that there will be a loss of revenue by reason of the error in the tax bill of 1954, because the proposed legislation will be made retroactive, and not a single taxpayer will be able to take advantage of the mistake.

THE TAX EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my position on the proposed $20 tax cut can be stated very simply and succinctly.

I favor the proposal because it will grant some measure of equity to the people who were largely ignored when the present national administration handed out vast tax reductions in 1954.

At the start of the 1954 senatorial campaign in Oregon, Mr. President, I told a newspaper which queried me on the subject that I felt it would have been advisable to make no tax cuts while the Nation was heavily in debt.

But, as I told this newspaper—the Bend Bulletin—the administration provided generous tax cuts for business and industry and for people in upper-income brackets. That having been done, I said that tax relief was deserved by the general run of American citizens in order to redress an obvious inequity.

That continues to be my position.

In 1954 the present administration approved tax cuts totaling $7.4 billion, at a time when the deficit was amounting to about $4.5 billion annually. These tax cuts went to management and business and to people owning stocks of industrial corporations. Only about 23 percent of this tax relief went to families earning less than $5,000 a year, although such families included approximately 70 percent of American taxpayers.

No high administration official said such tax cuts were "irresponsible." Indeed they were hailed as a magnificent stimulus for our economy.

Today, Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, headed by the distinguished Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, have taken the lead in sponsoring a bill to reduce taxes by $2 billion, at a time when the deficit is running at about $3.2 billion annually. This is the $20 tax cut per person—for every man, woman, and child in the land. Approximately 66 percent of this tax relief would go to families with incomes below the $5,000 level.

WHY NO TAX RELIEF FOR AVERAGE TAXPAYERS?

The administration regards that proposal as "irresponsible."

I may be naive or poorly informed; but I do not understand how a tax cut for industry and for the wealthy can be statesmanship, when put through by the administration in 1954, whereas a tax cut for all Americans is irresponsible, when pushed by Democrats in 1955. It seems that there are different kinds of litmus paper in this administration's laboratories, where tax cuts are put to the test. Can it be that the decisive measurement is who gets the particular tax cuts, rather than the effect of the cut upon the economy of the United States?

Actually, of course, so far as the national welfare is concerned, a measure of tax relief for average families is considerably more justified than is tax relief for those in the upper-income brackets.

Average families will spend the money for such necessities as food, clothing, medical care, transportation, shelter, and a modest portion for recreation. This sends money flowing into all channels of legitimate business and trade. It keeps our economy moving at an even and steady pace. It is a safeguard against stagnation.

Furthermore, this tax cut might benefit families who are carrying the load of raising the next generation. My wife and I, who have no children, will get only a reduction of $40. But one of my staff assistants, Lloyd Tupling, of Portland, who with his wife has 4 small children, will receive a total tax cut during the year of $120. I regard this as only just and equitable.

IT MAKES A DIFFERENCE WHOSE OX IS GORED

At this time there is emanating from high places within the administration a great deal of self-serving talk over the recklessness of the proposed $20 tax cut. Yet, on the eve of the 1954 elections, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee himself proposed a $20 tax credit for each taxpayer. It was not quite so fair as the present Democratic proposal, because it did not extend the $20 cut to children. But it was along the same general line. The Republican Members of the Senate favored it by a margin of 46 to 1. No observation of "irresponsibility" came from the administration at that time.

Mr. President, a year or so ago it might have been better to hold the line on taxes, considering our indebtedness as a nation. But the line was not held. The administration took the lead in breaching it, and the battering ram was a whopping tax cut for those near the top rung of the economic ladder. In the 83d Congress the Republican Party went even beyond the administration in pursuing what now is indignantly called "fiscal irresponsibility."

In an editorial of February 23, 1955, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch pointed out the inconsistency of the President's position toward tax reduction. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOSE IRRESPONSIBILITY WHEN?

There is no question that the House Democrats' tax-cutting plan is politically inspired, as we noted on Monday. But the excessive heat with which President Eisenhower commented on it at his news conference suggests that the President must have forgotten a little tax history that occurred not even a year ago.

House Democrats under Speaker RAYBURN'S leadership propose a flat $20 income tax cut for each taxpayer and dependent effective next January 1. This the President angrily finds to be some sort of a height in fiscal irresponsibility.

What he must have forgotten is that the Senate Republicans in 1954 offered a strikingly similar tax cut proposal—$20 for each taxpayer and $40 for married couples—and that the GOP turned out a rousing 46 to 1 vote in favor of it.

Mr. Eisenhower also overlooked how the members of his party in the House likewise got on the tax-cutting bandwagon last year (an election year).

Does he not remember that he asked Congress not to reduce excise taxes? That the then GOP Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, nevertheless came out for a billion-dollar cut? That the House Republicans supported this cut by a vote of 211 to 0? And that President Eisenhower himself not only signed the bill, but in the fall campaign claimed credit for it on behalf of the GOP?

It may be the height of fiscal irresponsibility to support tax cuts when the budget is not yet balanced, but a little compassion ought to convince President Eisenhower that the weakness is almost universal among politicians.

Last year, if he will look up his history, the Senate managed to vote on both a Republican-sponsored income tax cut and a Democratic-sponsored income tax cut. Fortunately for the sake of fiscal responsibility, both cuts were defeated by precisely the same vote. But only 4 Senators voted against both cuts, and only 1 of those 4 was up for

reelection, and he was a Democrat from Virginia.

And if the President wanted to go further in this kindly vein, he might recall that he himself offered no objection to the 10 percent income tax rate cut which took place January 1, 1954, and that he himself strongly supported a $1,400,000,000 tax reduction last year in his proposal for a general overhaul of the tax code.

We agree with the President that the Democratic tax cut ought to be defeated at this time, and we suggest that he can best seek that end by persuading his party's congressional leaders to lead the fight for its defeat. But there is no need to get all lathered up over the politics in tax bills. This is like being indignant over the oxygen in water.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I cannot agree, however, with the conclusion of the Post-Dispatch that the $20 tax cut ought to be defeated. After the major benefits granted last year to business and its proprietors, I think the great majority of taxpayers ought to be able to look forward to some concrete and specific tax relief next year—not merely to the vague hopes and promises of the administration's speechwriters. There is ample reason for the belief that this kind of cut, which will give more take-home pay—more actual spending money—to every family, will benefit our economy. This boost to consumption will directly stimulate the economy at a time when, as we in Oregon know from bitter experience, we do not have full employment and full use of the productive capacity of agriculture and industry.

RURAL PEOPLE NEED TAX RELIEF

Nor can we overlook the favorable impact which a tax cut might have on the farmers of the country. Since 1948, the share of our national income going to agriculture as a whole has dwindled from 10.3 percent to only 6 percent. Mrs. Neuberger's mother and her family operate a dairy farm 18 miles from Portland. From their economic problems, I know of the importance and value of a tax cut for average citizens, which category includes our farm citizens. No segment of the population has been more hard hit in recent years than the rural population of America on the farms. Their stake in a fair tax cut has been underestimated to date in this debate.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote for the proposed tax reduction.

I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a table showing what has happened to farm income in America in the past decade.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Income derived from agriculture	Total national income	Percentage of national income derived from agriculture
	Millions	*Millions*	
1945	$15,425	$163,536	9.04
1946	18,107	167,440	10.8
1947	18,964	183,539	10.3
1948	21,352	206,936	10.3
1949	16,909	202,808	8.3
1950	17,428	218,937	8.0
1951	20,297	249,234	8.1
1952	18,932	266,284	7.1
1953	17,030	278,926	6.1
1954	[1] 16,763	[1] 278,153	6.0

[1] Preliminary.

NECESSITY FOR AMENDMENT OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT, SO AS TO PROVIDE PROPER TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL AND NONAGRICULTURAL GROUPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in a few minutes I desire to make a reply to the speech delivered in the Senate a few days ago by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] on the Hells Canyon Dam issue.

However, first I wish to call attention to a very able statement which was made by Mr. J. Walter Hebert, of Yakima, Wash., president of the Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation, when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on March 9, 1955. In his statement he dealt with the Trade Agreements Act as presently embodied in H. R. 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, Mr. Hebert's statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON H. R. 1 BY J. WALTER HEBERT, OF YAKIMA, WASH., PRESIDENT OF THE CHERRY GROWERS AND INDUSTRIES FOUNDATION, BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, MARCH 9, 1955

Mr. Chairman, my name is J. Walter Hebert. I live in Yakima, Wash. I appear before you as the president of the Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation, a trade association of more than 18,000 cherry growers, processors, and handlers located in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Michigan, and New York. The foundation's office is located in Corvallis, Oreg.

The sweet cherry industry is very much interested in H. R. 1. Approximately 40 percent of the entire national sweet cherry production is brined (that is, bleached and preserved in a sulphurous acid solution) for manufacture of maraschino and glace cherries now used very extensively by the bakery and confectionery trades, in ice cream, in cocktails, and as household items. The domestic cherries in brined form compete directly with imported Italian brined cherries in the United States markets, and when further processed into glace form they compete directly in our domestic markets with glace cherries from France. Such competition with the imports in our own domestic markets will be possible only so long as tariff rates are maintained at levels sufficient to make up in some reasonable degree for the great differences between the domestic and foreign labor costs and other costs in production.

I will not repeat here what was said on behalf of the Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation before the Ways and Means Committee relative to H. R. 1. The bill, as it emerged from that committee and as passed by the House, still includes most of the provisions to which we strongly objected before the Ways and Means Committee. I understand that the testimony presented to that committee by Mr. William R. Shinn, of Salem, Oreg., on behalf of the cherry foundation, is available to the members of this committee.

This oral statement therefore will be confined to a brief discussion of a serious deficiency of the peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the present Trade Agreements Act, which H. R. 1, as it passed the House, makes no attempt to correct.

These provisions, which are in sections 3, 4, 6, and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, provide that the Tariff Commission shall determine and report to the President under certain circumstances whether or not a contemplated or existing tariff reduction would or does cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry which produces products like or directly competitive to the imported items concerned.

The Tariff Commission in several escape-clause proceedings under section 7 of the present act, involving imports of finished products, has held that the term "domestic industry" as used in the act includes only the domestic manufacturers of the finished product involved, and does not include or cover growers, fishermen, or other producers of the raw material or components from which the finished product is prepared.

The sweet-cherry industry of the United States, comprising the growers, handlers, and first processors of the fresh fruit, specifically has been denied status under the present escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. In 1952, in an escape-clause proceeding [1] brought by glace-cherry manufacturers, the Tariff Commission majority ruled that the cherry growers and the briners who grow and prepare the cherries used by the domestic glace-cherry manufacturers are not a part of the domestic industry producing products like or directly competitive to imported glace cherries, and that therefore any injury which the imports might cause to the growers and briners would be immaterial in determining whether or not the domestic industry was injured.

The Commission then proceeded to find that in fact there was no serious injury to the glace-cherry manufacturers themselves because (1) their volume of glace-cherry manufacture was only a relatively small part of their total business in all lines, and (2) they could avoid injury from the imports by discontinuing glace-cherry manufacture and simply jobbing the imported cherries. These findings were based upon the situation as it applied to the 20 to 25 domestic companies which were then manufacturing glace cherries. The effects upon the thousands of cherry growers and briners dependent upon the glace-cherry outlet, were held under the present wording of the statute to be immaterial.

A similar result was reached in the canned tuna escape-clause proceeding in 1952,[2] where the Tariff Commission indicated that the fishermen producing the tuna canned by the domestic canneries were not a part of the tuna-canning industry.

The inequity of this situation is obvious. Very large numbers of growers, fishermen, miners, and other producers and workers may be wholly dependent upon a particular manufacturing outlet for their products, yet are without protection or remedy against excessive and ruinous tariff reductions.

We feel sure that this situation was not the original intent of the Congress in enacting the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, when the escape-clause and peril-point provisions were inserted. We assume, also, that the present Congress does not intend that the peril-point and escape-clause procedures shall not be available to the many industries of producers of products which are finally processed other than by the original producers. Yet Congress, by continuing to ignore this situation, in effect would approve and give legal status to the present narrow and discriminatory interpretation and application of those provisions of the statute.

Certainly, so long as this situation continues, any representation that the Trade Agreements Act affords opportunity for any industry injured by excessive imports to be heard and obtain appropriate protection or relief, is contrary to fact.

[1] Tariff Commission Rept. No. 185, second series, Glace Cherries, October 1952, p. 7.

[2] Tariff Commission Rept. No. 187, second series, November 1952, p. 11.

If the Congress and the administration actually intend that the peril-point and escape-clause procedures shall not apply to domestic growers, workers, and other producers whose products are channeled into the domestic markets through relatively small numbers of final manufacturers, then the present trade agreements statute and H. R. 1 should no longer be represented to the public as providing fair and full protection and relief for any industries which can show serious injury from excessive tariff reductions. Otherwise, we can see no reason or excuse for further reluctance to clarify and rectify this situation.

This can be done by amendment of H. R. 1 whereby the term "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products" as used in the peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the present Trade Agreements Act, would be changed to read "the domestic workers, miners, farmers, or producers, producing like or directly competitive products, or producing raw material or other components of such products." This would require the Tariff Commission to apply the "serious injury" standard to each of the industries involved in production of the product affected by the imports, rather than merely to the one industry which finally puts that product into completed form. It would make the peril-point and escape-clause provisions truly available to each and all industry groups which suffer serious effects from excessive tariff reductions.

My emphasis here of this one problem should not be taken to mean that H. R. 1 is otherwise satisfactory to the cherry industry of the United States. Such is far from the case. We still fail to see any proper basis for the fixing arbitrarily of a 50-percent ad valorem rate as the presumed borderline between reasonable and excessive-duty rates. We are, however, apprehensive of the lack of any definition of the term "negligible" on which would hinge the authority of the President to make a reduction as drastic as 50 percent.

We further urge that there be added to H. R. 1 a caveat which definitely and without equivocation would make clear the intent of Congress that this measure shall not constitute congressional approval of the present or any renegotiated general agreement on tariffs and trade.

Finally, I want to observe that the peril-point and escape-clause provisions, no matter how broad their coverage and no matter how clearly worded, will be worse than useless if the findings of fact of the Tariff Commission, reached after careful and exhaustive investigations, are to be brushed aside by the executive department. We believe that the findings of the Tariff Commission in peril-point and escape-clause proceedings ought to be given full and final force and effect unless and until modified or supplanted by specific act of Congress.

Even this, however, will be of no help to those industries which do not have recourse to the Tariff Commission, such as growers and other producers whose products are passed on to other related industries for final processing. We earnestly urge this committee to include among its amendments of H. R. 1 a provision whereby such growers and other producers will be given the full benefit of the peril-point and escape-clause procedures.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was pointed out by Mr. Hebert that agricultural producers whose products are processed or otherwise changed in form before final distribution are now excluded from access to the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351 et seq.), by reason of the Tariff Commission's narrow construction of the term "domestic industry" in sections 3, 4, 6, and 7 of the 1951 act. I find that a good many of my colleagues in the Congress are not aware of that fact. This applies to the growers of cherries, grapes, mint, and various other products which are not finally processed by the growers. It also excludes from the escape clause fishermen, miners, and other nonagricultural groups—see Tariff Commission's Report No. 185, Second Series, Glace Cherries, October 1952, page 7.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit to the Senate that continued inaction by the Congress on this matter will, of course, establish this interpretation of the act, through congressional acquiescence.

Unfortunately the growers' and processors' industries concerned were precluded from obtaining a remedy in the House, through amendment of H. R. 1, by the administration's refusal to permit amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to announce that I have asked the legislative counsel to prepare an appropriate amendment to remedy the situation, which I believe to be most unfair to these agricultural producers. This action has been taken in the hope that the amendment will receive favorable action in the Senate.

Of course, Mr. President, we have reached such a point that if one proposes any amendment to H. R. 1, he is charged with being opposed to reciprocal trade. I doubt that any Member of the Senate has a more consistent record of voting in support of a true reciprocal trade program than has the Senator from Oregon; but, as my past speeches show, I have always insisted that the policy be truly reciprocal, and that we recognize our duty to pass only such trade legislation as will not do irreparable injury to American economic life.

I am one who recognizes that we have entered a new era in which world economics have become interdependent; that we cannot live unto ourselves alone, economically, any more than can any other nation; and that we are dependent upon world trade in a much greater degree than many economic isolationists seem to recognize. Yet, it does not follow that because there is interdependence so far as world economics is concerned, we should enact a measure which would do irreparable damage to various segments of our economy. I am particularly concerned—although I take the same attitude in connection with any manufacturing process or any manufacturing industry—about allegations which are being made, I think with prima facie proof in support thereof, that H. R. 1, in its present form, does not do justice to various segments of American agriculture.

I have been heard to say before that, in terms of historic time, no nation long survives when it loses control of an abundance of food supply. In fact, I think history teaches that civilizations have continued to climb only when there was such an abundance. I believe that a civilization is on the way to decadence when it reaches a break-even-food-supply point. Therefore, in our generation, we need to be constantly on guard in the interest of the safety of future generations of Americans, and we should not follow a course of action in connection with so-called reciprocal-trade legislation which would do irreparable damage to American agriculture.

I respectfully submit that the particular point which has been brought out in the testimony I have just inserted in the RECORD is a warning sign to us that when it comes to the Senate there is a need to adopt some amendments to House bill No. 1. These amendments should protect the agricultural industries which allegedly are damaged, as indicated in this testimony.

To that end I expect to offer certain amendments to protect farming interests. I am perfectly willing to have the amendments judged on the basis of the supporting evidence which is now being submitted before the Senate committee in defense of the position I am taking on this point. Although there will be those who will say that I have weakened on reciprocal trade, I have not, because it was never contemplated that a reciprocal-trade program should be adopted in a form which would do irreparable damage to any segment of American agriculture, or, for that matter, to any segment of American industry.

Mr. President, I now desire to turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

DEPRECIATION UNDER THE NEW TAX LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because I shall be referring to it on Monday or Tuesday next in connection with a speech on the tax bill which I shall then make, and because I should like to have it available to Members of the Senate in advance of that speech, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Depreciation Under the New Tax Law," written by Robert Eisner and published in the Harvard Business Review for January 1955. This article serves as the information basis for an amendment which I would have offered to the tax bill had it not been made a part of the minority views submitted to the Senate, dealing with the question of depreciation allowances under the 1954 act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPRECIATION UNDER THE NEW TAX LAW

(By Robert Eisner)

Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides explicitly for the use of two methods of charging depreciation in addition to the hitherto widespread straight-line technique: (a) The declining balance method at a rate up to twice the straight-line rate; (b) the sum of the years' digits method. These provisions have been described generally by the administration and in the press as offering greater flexibility. Public discussion of them has been relatively slight compared, for example, to the furor over the dividend provisions in the new law.

This article will demonstrate, however, that the effect on corporate-tax payments of application of these depreciation provisions will be tremendous, so tremendous indeed that one may begin to wonder whether those in Congress who voted the new tax law, let alone the business community and the gen-

eral public, quite knew what was transpiring. Individual companies would be well advised to make sure that they understand just what the various methods are likely to signify for their own firms. At stake are, literally, billions of dollars.

In general, two more things may be anticipated at this point: (1) The new depreciation provisions will have an uneven impact on industry. The expanding company and the company in a heavy industry will be affected differently from the firm whose sales have stabilized or the firm in an industry like retailing where capital expenditures are a relatively small element in total costs. (2) The effect on the national economy will be substantial, and will have to be taken into account in formulating future tax policy.

NEW METHODS

Those familiar with literature in the professional economic journals on the subject of accelerated depreciation, once recognizing that both the declining-balance and the years-digits techniques are in effect forms of accelerated depreciation, may have a pretty good notion of their implications.[1] Here, however, I propose to examine the specific methods involved and ascertain what they add up to. I shall, wherever possible, deal in simple arithmetical examples.

Let us assume a property costing $100 and lasting 5 years, with depreciation charges beginning in the year after its acquisition. (The more realistic assumption that a half-year's depreciation is taken on properties in the year of their installation is made in the charts and general algebraic formulations which underlie this article. The current simplification eases the arithmetic without biasing conclusions.) The straightline depreciation charges of each of the 5 years of the property's assumed life would be $20. With the declining-balance method at double rates, the straightline rate of 20 percent would become 40 percent of the undepreciated value or declining balance. Thus, in the first year, declining-balance depreciation would be $40; in the second year, the charge would be 40 percent of $60 ($100—$40), or $24; in the third year, it would be 40 percent of $36 ($100—$40—$24), or $14.40; in the fourth year, the depreciation charge would be down to $8.64; in the fifth year, it would be $5.18.

One notes that while depreciation charges were higher in the early years of the property on the declining balance method, not only are they lower in the later years but at the end of the 5-year assumed life period only $92.22 of the original cost of $100 has been recovered. The balance of $7.78 remaining at the end of the fifth year continues to decline in subsequent years but never entirely disappears. (Actually, the new tax law offers the taxpayer the opportunity of subsequently switching from declining balance to straight-line depreciation, which would enable him to eliminate this "tail" in the recovery of original cost.)

[1] See Robert Eisner, Accelerated Amortization, Growth, and Net Profits, Quarterly Journal of Economics, November 1952, pp. 533–544, and Depreciation Allowances, Replacement Requirements, and Growth, American Economic Review, December 1952, especially pp. 827–831; Evsey D. Domar, Depreciation, Replacement, and Growth, Economic Journal, March 1953, pp. 1–32, and The Case for Accelerated Depreciation, Quarterly Journal of Economics, November 1953, pp. 493–519; also Erich Schiff, A Note on Depreciation, Replacement, and Growth, Review of Economics and Statistics, February 1954, pp. 47–56, and George Terborgh, Realistic Depreciation Policy (Chicago, MAPI, 1954). See also a comment on Dolmar's The Case for Accelerated Depreciation, by Eisner, and rejoinder by Dolmar, scheduled for publication in Quarterly Journal of Economics, February 1955.

Under the years-digit method, by contrast, with the assumption that the life of the property is 5 years, one would add the integers 1 to 5, securing a sum of 15. Then, in the first year, depreciation charges would be five-fifteenths of $100, or $33.33; in the second year, they would be four-fifteenths of $100, or $26.67; in the third year they would be three-fifteenths of $100, or $20; in the fourth year, depreciation charges would be only two-fifteenths of $100, or $13.33; and in the fifth year, they would be one-fifteenth of $100, or $6.67, thus exhausting the original value of the property.

The comparison of the three methods set forth above is presented in exhibit 1.

RELATIVE IMPACT

Unfortunately, many analysts of the new tax law cease at this point, concluding hastily that the only differences between the old and the new methods relate to whether depreciation charges come early or late, or whether tax payments come late or early. "It all washes out in the end," is the cheerful and misleading conclusion which an amazing number of accountants apparently reach.

EXHIBIT I.—*Depreciation on a single property: comparing straight-line, declining-balance, and years-digits depreciation on a single property costing $100 with an assumed life of 5 years*

Year (age)	Straight-line	Declining-balance	Years-digits
0			
1	$20.00	$40.00	$33.33
2	20.00	24.00	26.67
3	20.00	14.40	20.00
4	20.00	8.64	13.33
5	20.00	5.18	6.67
Total	100.00	92.22	100.00

EXHIBIT II.—*Depreciation on a constant stream of property additions: comparing straight-line, declining-balance, and years-digits methods for a firm whose gross property additions are $100 per year and have an assumed life of 5 years*

Year (age)	Straight-line	Declining-balance	Years-digits
0			
1	$20.00	$40.00	$33.33
2	40.00	64.00	60.00
3	60.00	78.40	80.00
4	80.00	87.04	93.33
5	100.00	92.22	100.00
Total	300.00	361.66	366.66

Such a conclusion not only is misleading; it is to all practical purposes flatly erroneous. Controllers, company presidents, or economists operating on the basis of such a conclusion would be making costly mistakes. They would have failed to turn from the elementary example of a single property to the relevant problem of depreciation charges on all the properties of a going concern.

CONSTANT PROPERTY ADDITIONS

Such a problem, still in simple form, is presented in exhibit II. Here we see the total depreciation charges of a firm, year by year, on all the additions subject to the new law. Operating under the assumption that the firm makes capital expenditures of $100 every year, and that depreciation begins in the year in which the property becomes 1 year old, we find that declining-balance charges exceed straight-line charges in all but the last of the first 5 years. And while declining-balance charges are less than straight-line charges from the fifth year on, one would find, if the table were extended far enough, that some $50 of the initial excess of declining-balance charges are never canceled out by subsequently higher straight-line charges.

The startling thought that things do not "wash out in the end" receives a striking reinforcement when one considers charges under the years-digits method. For now one notes that years-digits charges exceed straight-line charges in each of the first 4 years, but never subsequently fall below them. Hence the initial gains, which accumulate to $66.66, are never paid back at all.

Yet this is only part of the story because of two factors of tremendous quantitative significance: (1) The average life of property of American firms is considerably more than 5 years. Evsey D. Domar, citing studies by Solomon Fabricant and the United States Department of Commerce, suggests an average life of 30 years.[2] (2) The typical American firm does not make the same amount of gross property additions each year. Rather, on the average it spends more on new property each year than the year before. This is because of economic growth, which is such an essential and necessary part of our system, and also price inflation, which makes even a constant stream of real investment grow in monetary terms.

Accordingly, let us turn our attention to the series of tables in exhibit III which compare the depreciation charges that would result under each of the methods if it is assumed, conveniently yet not unrealistically, that the properties last 33⅓ years. Thus the straight-line rate would be 3 percent per year, and the declining balance rate 6 percent. The years-digits can be taken as 1717/3; the first year is 100/3, the second 97/3, and so on, the 34th being one-third (the effect of the usual business practice of charging only half the normal rate on properties in the year of their installation having been brought in by lagging half of all depreciation 1 year).

EXHIBIT III.—*Comparison of straight-line, declining-balance, and years-digits depreciation methods on a constant stream of property additions with an assumed life of 33⅓ years*

[Depreciation charges expressed as ratio of gross additions, with half-depreciation taken in year of addition]

Year	Straight line	Declining balance	Years-digits	Declining-balance minus straight line	Years-digits minus straight line	Years-digits minus declining balance
0	0.0150	0.0300	0.0291	0.0150	0.0141	−0.0009
1	.0450	.0882	.0865	.0432	.0415	−.0017
2	.0750	.1429	.1421	.0679	.0671	−.0008
3	.1050	.1943	.1960	.0893	.0910	.0017
4	.1350	.2427	.2481	.1077	.1131	.0054
5	.1650	.2881	.2985	.1231	.1335	.0104
6	.1950	.3308	.3471	.1358	.1521	.0163
7	.2250	.3710	.3940	.1460	.1690	.0230
8	.2550	.4087	.4391	.1537	.1841	.0304
9	.2850	.4442	.4825	.1592	.1975	.0383
10	.3150	.4775	.5242	.1625	.2092	.0467
15	.4650	.6166	.7062	.1516	.2412	.0896
16	.4950	.6396	.7373	.1446	.2423	.0977
17	.5250	.6612	.7667	.1362	.2417	.1055
18	.5550	.6815	.7944	.1265	.2394	.1129
19	.5850	.7006	.8203	.1156	.2353	.1197
20	.6150	.7186	.8445	.1036	.2295	.1259
25	.7650	.7935	.9391	.0285	.1741	.1456
26	.7950	.8059	.9528	.0109	.1578	.1469
27	.8250	.8175	.9648	−.0075	.1398	.1473
28	.8550	.8285	.9750	−.0265	.1200	.1465
29	.8850	.8388	.9834	−.0462	.0984	.1446
30	.9150	.8484	.9901	−.0666	.0751	.1417
31	.9450	.8575	.9950	−.1089	.0233	.1322
32	.9750	.8661	.9983	−.0875	.0500	.1375
33	1.0000	.8741	.9997	−.1259	−.0003	.1256
34	1.0000	.8816	1.0000	−.1184	.0000	.1184
35	1.0000	.8887	1.0000	−.1113	.0000	.1113
40	1.0000	.9184	1.0000	−.0816	.0000	.0816
50	1.0000	.9560	1.0000	−.0440	.0000	.0440
100	1.0000	.9980	1.0000	−.0020	.0000	.0200
Infinity	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000

[2] Economic Journal, March 1953, p. 5.

Exhibit III shows the following relationships when depreciation charges are expressed as a ratio of gross additions:

Declining-balance charges would exceed straight-line charges in each of the first 27 years during which an option as to method was available, under the assumption that gross additions of property are made at a constant rate. (Actually, they would much more likely be made at an increasing rate, which would magnify the differences.)

As for the years-digits charges, they exceed straight-line charges in every one of the first 33 years, and never subsequently fall behind. (As a consequence of our technique of lagging to spread out the half-depreciation of the year of installation, years-digits charges take 1 year longer to reach their equilibrium level than do the straight-line charges. Hence the years-digits charges are in fact exceeded by straight-line charges by and insignificant amount, as indicated in exhibit III, in the year 33 or the 34th year.)

And, further, except for insignificant amounts in the first 3 years, years-digits charges always exceed declining-balance charges.

These relationships are presented graphically in exhibit IV (chart not printed).

A notion of the magnitude of the figures involved may be had by applying them to a situation, certainly not uncommon among giant American companies, where additions run at an annual rate of $100 million. One would note then that by the year 16 (1970 under the new tax law, which a company can apply to all additions dating from January 1, 1954), years-digits depreciation charges would be exceeding straight-line charges by $24,230,000 for that year alone. Assuming that marginal tax rates are in the neighborhood of 50 percent, these increased charges would represent a tax saving of some $12 million. Exhibit III shows that, contrary to a widespread notion, this savings would in no practical sense be a deferral, for it would be followed by additional savings in subsequent years. In no future years would lesser depreciation charges and higher taxes cancel out the initial gains, so long as the depreciation provisions of the new tax law remain in effect.

For the corporation whose additions run at $100 million annually, the sum of the excesses of years-digits depreciation charges over straight-line charges in the entire 34-year period of transition would mount to $538 million. Declining-balance charges would exceed straight-line by as much as $294 million in the first 27 years but would thereafter be less than straight-line charges. However, after 44 years declining-balance charges would still be some $156 million ahead and would remain forever at least $50 million ahead.

INCREASING PROPERTY ADDITIONS

The perhaps startling results shown in exhibits III and IV are still but a small part of the story. Thus far it has been assumed that the rate of gross additions remains constant from year to year. Yet this certainly is not the picture for the economy as a whole, with the dollar rate of capital expenditures increasing at a rapid rate through most of this century. I dare say that few if any current-day companies, looking over their records of past property acquisitions, would find anything but a substantial rise, not steady to be sure, but averaging perhaps 3 percent to 5 percent or more per year. Who would be willing to insist that the future will not show a similar picture?

I believe that a more realistic view of what is likely under the new tax law may be provided if we assume that gross additions increase in the future at, say a 4-percent rate; a new price inflation alone, without any real growth, could bring about part or all of such an increase. The increase can be assumed to be at a constant rate, to ease the mathematics, but the results would not be altered in any consequence if more realistic fluctuations were considered.

Exhibits V and VI (chart not printed) show that not only do declining-balance and years-digits charges both rise above the straight-line figures during the first 34 years, but they both remain permanently higher. To the initial tax saving, then, should be added further tax savings, year after year indefinitely, so long as the depreciation provisions of the new tax law remain in effect, and so long as the assumption of long-run growth remains valid.

EXHIBIT V.—*Comparison of depreciation methods assuming 4 percent annual growth in rate of gross additions with life of 33⅓ years*

[Depreciation charges expressed as ratio of gross additions, with half depreciation taken in year of addition]

Year	Straight line	Declining balance	Years-digits	Declining-balance minus straight line	Years-digits minus straight line	Years-digits minus declining balance
0	0.0150	0.03000	0.0291	0.0150	0.0141	−0.0009
1	.0438	.08600	.0843	.0422	.0405	−.0017
2	.0716	.13660	.1357	.0650	.0641	−.0009
3	.0983	.18230	.1836	.0840	.0853	.0013
4	.1239	.22360	.2282	.0997	.1043	.0046
5	.1486	.26090	.2696	.1123	.1210	.0087
6	.1723	.29470	.3081	.1224	.1358	.0134
7	.1951	.32520	.3437	.1301	.1486	.0185
8	.2170	.35280	.3767	.1358	.1597	.0239
9	.2381	.37770	.4072	.1396	.1691	.0295
10	.2583	.40020	.4353	.1419	.1770	.0351
15	.3486	.48430	.5452	.1357	.1966	.0609
20	.4227	.53490	.6140	.1122	.1913	.0791
21	.4359	.54240	.6238	.1065	.1879	.0814
22	.4485	.54900	.6325	.1005	.1840	.0835
23	.4607	.55510	.6402	.0944	.1795	.0851
24	.4724	.56060	.6469	.0882	.1745	.0863
25	.4837	.56550	.6527	.0818	.1690	.0872
26	.4945	.57000	.6576	.0755	.1631	.0876
27	.5049	.57400	.6618	.0691	.1569	.0878
28	.5149	.57770	.6652	.0628	.1503	.0875
29	.5245	.58100	.6679	.0565	.1434	.0869
30	.5338	.58400	.6699	.0502	.1361	.0859
31	.5427	.58670	.6714	.0440	.1287	.0847
32	.5512	.58910	.6723	.0379	.1211	.0832
33	.5581	.59130	.6727	.0332	.1147	.0814
34	.5581	.59330	.6728	.0352	.1148	.0795
35	.5581	.59820	.6728	.0401	.1148	.0746
40	.5581	.60520	.6728	.0471	.1148	.0676
50	.5581	.61000	.6728	.0519	.1148	.0628
100	.5581	.61199	.6728	.0539	.1148	.0608
Infinity	.5581	.61200	.6728	.0539	.1148	.0608

The annual excess of declining-balance over straight-line charges approaches a ratio of more than 5 percent of gross additions (which themselves are increasing at a rate of 4 percent); years-digits charges, from the 35th year on, exceed straight-line charges by over 11 percent of gross additions. Not only do the disparities between the old and the new methods fail to wash out in the end; they grow greater and greater as the years wear on.

Suppose there is an annual decline in the rate of gross additions? This is not a likely case for any American firm, implying as it does that retirements will exceed replacements and that the firm will eventually dwindle away. Yet even in this case declining-balance charges would exceed straight-line charges during each of the first 23 years, and year-digits charges would exceed straight-line charges during each of the first 28 years. Only thereafter would straight-line charges prove larger—and by ratios of dwindling dollar amounts and hence of less and less significance, at that. In the case of a decline in the rate of additions, the initial gains by accelerated methods, would by the end of time be canceled out, but no more than canceled out, by the relatively larger volume of straight-line charges in later years.

The entire range of long-run or equilibrium effects of growth on depreciation charges by the various methods is presented in exhibit VII. We see here that, for all of the positive rates of growth, years-digits depreciation charges would exceed those by either of the other methods, and the excess is greater as the rate of growth is greater. For negative rates of growth, however, straight-line charges exceed year-digits charges and also, except where the rate of decline is relatively rapid, declining-balance charges. (Of course, negative rates of growth are atypical. Not many firms, I dare say, would remain in business after a 30-or-more-year decline in the rate of property additions.)

EXHIBIT VII.—*Growth and depreciation after long-run equilibrium has been reached*

[Annual depreciation charge expressed as ratio of gross additions for various rates of growth of gross additions; assumed life of property, 33⅓ years]

Rate of growth of gross additions (percent)	Annual depreciation charge		
	Straight line	Declining balance	Years digits
−0.04	2.131	2.940	1.676
−0.02	1.427	1.485	1.273
−0.01	1.188	1.194	1.124
−0.005	1.088	1.088	1.059
−0.0025	1.043	1.042	1.029
0	1	1	1
+0.0025	.9595	.9612	.9799
+0.005	.9213	.9254	.9462
+0.0075	.8852	.8922	.9210
+0.01	.8511	.8614	.8968
+0.0125	.8188	.8328	.8736
+0.015	.7883	.8060	.8514
+0.02	.7321	.7575	.8097
+0.025	.6815	.7147	.7713
+0.03	.6361	.6768	.7359
+0.035	.5951	.6426	.7031
+0.04	.5581	.6120	.6728
+0.045	.5245	.5843	.6447
+0.05	.4941	.5591	.6186
+0.055	.4664	.5361	.5943
+0.06	.4412	.5150	.5717
+0.07	.3971	.4777	.5309
+0.08	.3600	.4457	.4952

IMPLICATIONS

It should be clear from the foregoing evidence that the new methods of accelerated depreciation authorized in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and particularly the years-digit method, offer management the opportunity to make considerably increased annual depreciation charges for an indefinite period and, consequently, very great tax savings. Moreover, contrary to erroneous general belief, these tax savings will be permanent—at least as long as the law remains in effect. In no legitimate sense may they be considered tax deferrals.

For the company

There are certain corollary implications for the company. Statements prepared for tax purposes using years-digits (or declining-balance) depreciation, as opposed to straight-line depreciation, will generally show:

1. Higher annual depreciation charges;
2. Less taxable income;
3. Less tax payments;
4. Less income (net of depreciation charges) after taxes;
5. Higher real return on invested capital (depreciation charges plus income after taxes);
6. Higher accumulated depreciation reserves and lower figures for the net or depreciated value of property.

Any company can get a good notion of the magnitudes involved in its own case by setting up a little study to ascertain, for example, just what depreciation charges would have been under each of the major methods being considered in this article if the company had had any had exercised in the past the choice now open to it under the new tax law. Thus, a firm might go back to its records of capital additions, and retirements where relevant, between 1913 (when the Federal income-tax law went into effect) and 1953 to see what charges would have been under the new law. Or it might

use any plausible estimates of future capital expenditures and retirements for the same purpose.

The results will, of course, vary somewhat from firm to firm and, for future periods, with the particular set of estimates made. But the broad outlines of the conclusions should in virtually every case be astonishingly similar to those of the preceding analysis. (To the extent that national income statistics are built from corporate income statements and balance sheets, and these, in turn, reflect accounting methods for tax purposes, there will be similar effects on aggregative measures. For example, national income, which is calculated net of depreciation charges, will appear smaller under years-digits depreciation than it would be under straight-line depreciation.)

Of course, the new depreciation provisions will have an uneven impact on different industries. Those industries and companies in which capital expenditures are relatively heavy compared to income will gain more from the new depreciation provisions than those industries and companies making relatively light capital expenditures. Thus, as noted earlier, retail establishments should have relatively little to gain in the way of tax benefits as compared to certain public utilities, railroads, and manufacturing industries. Similarly, companies which are expanding stand to gain more than those which are not expanding.

For the economy

The effect on the national economy may well be substantial. Assuming, for purposes of illustration, that the new depreciation provisions and resultant changes in tax liabilities had no effect on the amount of the gross national product, we could estimate roughly that by the year 1960 the United States Treasury would be losing about $3 billion per year as a result of these new provisions if current tax rates on business income remain the same. By 1965 the tax loss would rise to more than $5 billion per year, and it would continue to rise thereafter.

Such a reduction of business income taxes may represent in effect a step in the direction of reversing the past trend in this country toward more progressive rates of taxation, for to the extent that the reduction is not passed on to the consumer the tax incidence will be relatively greater on the less wealthy rather than the other way around.

In reality, the new tax law should affect the level of national income as well as taxes. The question is: How? There are at least two views. Let us first take the optimistic view, which the administration held.

The optimists: One of the main arguments for the new provisions was their anticipated "incentive effect" on the level of gross capital expenditures.

It should be clear that any cut in tax rates is in itself a stimulant to business. If rates are cut, the initial effect is to leave somebody in the economy with more disposable income. It is entirely reasonable to assume that this somebody, or rather "somebodies," whether consumers or businesses themselves, will use some of the increased disposable income to buy more of the products of business. In the economist's terms, aggregate demand will be raised.

To the extent that lower taxes will in fact raise the level of capital investment, national income will be higher and tax receipts will, accordingly, be higher than they would be without the increase in national income. It is even conceivable that the increase in spending might redound so much to the benefit of some companies that they might end up paying more taxes, in spite of the higher depreciation charges.

The skeptics: But before one becomes too much taken with this line of analysis, one should recognize that the cut in tax rates embodied in the depreciation provisions of the new tax law cannot properly be considered by itself. A cut in tax rates will cause some increase in national income, but it is hardly likely to cause enough of an increase in national income to prevent a considerable drop in total tax receipts. Then, unless either government expenditures are reduced or other tax rates are raised, the Government will be left with a budget deficit.

If one believes that it is not likely that the administration will operate indefinitely with a budget deficit (I do not want to argue the wisdom of doing so here), one must conclude that the depreciation changes will be accompanied by, or swiftly followed by, either reductions in Government expenditures or increases in other tax rates of comparable magnitude. Indeed, since the Government has already been operating, with a budget deficit, one need only believe that an increase in this deficit would be countered by efforts to cut Government expenditures and/or increase other Federal tax rates.

If this happens, as I expect it will, the effect on the level of national income becomes, at best, most uncertain. With their favorite qualification about other things remaining the same, economists point out that equal reductions in Government expenditures and taxes definitely will cause a decline in national income. (Very briefly, the reason has to do with the fact that Government expenditures have more of a leverage effect than equivalent increases in disposable consumer income, some of which is channeled into savings.) Of course, other things never do remain entirely the same in reality, but the burden of proof would still appear to rest on those who contradict the principle.

The optimists supporting the theory of the new tax law may properly be called on to show just what things would change, and change sufficiently, to raise income. Certainly they must acknowledge that, putting it as simply as possible, Government expenditures involve in large part Government purchases of the products of industry. If the Government is to cut its purchases of these products by, say, $3 billion in 1960, that is a clear loss of $3 billion in sales to American business.

If national income is to be prevented from dropping, the optimists must show that every dollar of the $3 billion in tax gains under the new depreciation provisions (or tax losses from the Treasury's point of view) estimated earlier in this article will create a dollar of private purchases. This, and more, is possible—but not likely.

Tax increases: Suppose that the tax-rate decline from the depreciation changes is compensated not by reducing Federal expenditures but by a proportionate increase in tax rates elsewhere? There is a question as to which tax rates would be increased, but it is possible that tax rates on business income would be. If they were, tax payments by the average business would be the same as if the law had not been changed, with the tax reduction because of higher depreciation deductions offset by the increase in business income-tax rates. Companies making relatively heavy capital expenditures would, of course, be better off, while those with little in the way of capital expenditures would be worse off. It is difficult to see any increase in national income from such a favoring of some firms at the expense of others.

It is also possible that the compensatory increase in tax rates would be made in personal income taxes or in excise taxes. In this case one might argue that the weight of recent economic theory and statistical data suggests that increases in these taxes would reduce the amount spent in buying the products of business by at least enough to offset the advantage of a reduction in business tax liability. In any event, there certainly is no clear case for the proposition that the increase in what business would spend out of its tax reduction would be greater than the decrease in spending forced on other sectors of the economy by a corresponding rise in taxes on them.

Thus, as long as the demand for all that American industry is capable of producing cannot be taken as assured, there is a substantial likelihood that the typical American firm will find that what has been given in the form of tax gains from the liberalized depreciation provisions has been largely taken away in reduced sales to the Government, to the consumer, and to other firms, and in higher tax rates. I say "largely" and not "entirely" to allow for some effect of the change in tax incidence, whereby businesses pay less and individuals pay more in taxes. It is even possible, unfortunately, that the total effect of all these various associated changes in amount of Government purchases, definition of taxable income, and corporate and individual income tax rates may be deflationary in character. Then the typical American firm would find itself worse off than it would have been in the event that no firms had been allowed to use the new depreciation methods for tax purposes.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

But suppose that in one way or another we can set aside or take care of the problem of aggregate demand. What effect, then, will the new law have on the capacity for production or on the supply of output? One good argument runs as follows: If full employment and capacity output can be maintained, or, at least, if the new depreciation provisions can be assumed to leave unaffected the level of employment or proportion of capacity utilized, the inducements to capital expenditures offered by the new law will shift resources from the production of goods for immediate consumption to the production of plant and equipment for future production. This shift will lead to a growth of productive capacity. Unless a lack of demand interferes, therefore, we can conclude that the liberalized depreciation provisions will induce a faster rate of growth of the national output.

We might then be able, after all, to eat our cake and have it too. We should enjoy lower tax rates per unit of gross national product but be able to sustain the same amount of Government services out of taxes because total tax payments would be maintained by the larger total product. Whether, or the extent to which, this happy possibility might eventuate raises major questions central to the operation of our economic system. It suggests also the problem of what measures, in addition to or instead of the changes in tax depreciation regulations we have been considering, the Government might undertake to help bring about such an outcome. Such matters are, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this article.

It is not my purpose to make a conclusive evaluation of the new depreciation provisions as good or bad. Such an evaluation must, in the last analysis, involve a political judgment which I shall not undertake in this space. But whether the law is "good" or "bad," the earnings-conscious businessman should secure the best possible advice from tax experts, management consultants, and even economists, who can evaluate the new depreciation methods in the light of the situation of the individual firm. For whatever the ultimate effect on the economy as a whole may be, no intelligent businessman can afford to forego the advantages which are now legally his.

THE PROPOSED HIGH DAM AT HELLS CANYON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire now to speak briefly by way of reply to a speech which the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] made in the Senate on March 8 on the Hells Canyon Dam

issue. I regret that the Senator from Idaho is not present in the Chamber at the moment, but he could not be present today. I made clear to his office my intention to make this reply today, because in my section of the country, it is very important that this reply be made available over the weekend. It has been sent to the Press Gallery. There is a great deal of interest in it in the Pacific Northwest, because the senior Senator from Idaho and I are poles apart on the Hells Canyon Dam issue, as will be seen from the comments I shall make in the course of this speech. The reply is due today, and I make it, even though the Senator from Idaho is absent from the Chamber, as I was absent from the Chamber the other day when he made his speech.

On March 8, it was my privilege to introduce a bill to authorize Federal construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam on behalf of myself and 29 other Senators, all but 2 of them Democrats. Simultaneously, Mrs. PFOST of Idaho, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MAGNUSON of Washington, and Mr. METCALF of Montana introduced identical companion bills in the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately in the Senate the State of Idaho is unrepresented among the sponsors of the Hells Canyon bill. All of the Senators of the other States of the Pacific Northwest—all Democrats—are sponsors.

It was with some surprise that I read the remarks of the senior Senator from Idaho delivered in the late afternoon of March 8.

On March 8, 1955, the senior Senator from Idaho indicated his opposition to the Hells Canyon project for the first time in public so far as I am aware. Certainly he did not do so during his campaign for reelection last fall.

In the course of those speeches I said, "You should smoke out your senior Senator and find out where he stands on Hells Canyon Dam. Is he for it or against it?" So far as I know, at no time during the campaign did the senior Senator from Idaho even come near committing himself one way or the other on this issue. I am sure the people of Idaho would be surprised to hear him say that he did commit himself. Hells Canyon Dam is one of the most important issues in our region.

Certainly he maintained a studious silence before his reelection campaign, although I remember that he was on the floor several times during the last 2 years when the Hells Canyon project was discussed.

I was able to discern two major points raised by the senior Senator from Idaho: First, that the sponsors of S. 1333 were both ignoring and threatening the interests of the State of Idaho, and second, that with future upstream use of water for irrigation, including some vague projects which he did not specifically describe, water supply for the operation of Hells Canyon project would be inadequate.

Therefore, in this regard, he should have taken the time to read carefully the provisions of S. 1333 affecting his State before he prepared his speech. I presume his eagerness to be heard on this matter exceeded his eagerness to learn what specific proposals in the bill had direct bearing upon Idaho. I can understand this eagerness, which in anyone else than the senior Senator from Idaho might be construed to constitute prejudgment.

POWER RESERVED FOR IDAHO AND EASTERN OREGON

I should therefore like to remind him that section 3 (a) of our bill allocates 500,000 kilowatts of prime, year-around power to the State of Idaho and those sections of eastern Oregon on the Snake drainage, more electric energy than is now being generated in southern Idaho by all the utilities, private and public combined.

That fact is ample proof that the sponsors of this bill have not forgotten southern Idaho. But the senior Senator from Idaho apparently forgot to read the bill before he made his charge, because the 500,000-kilowatt guaranty in the bill represents more power for southern Idaho than is being generated at the present time by all the private and public utilities combined.

Would the senior Senator from Idaho say that this low-cost power would be a disservice to the citizens of the State he represents? Would he persist in implying that Idaho was not included in the power benefits which would accrue to underdeveloped areas rich in human and natural resources crying for such low-cost power to provide new industries and jobs?

Would the senior Senator from Idaho deny that the transmission interconnection with the Columbia River power system would mean that more than half a million kilowatts of Federal low-cost power will be available from this power pool for his State of Idaho when load growth there so requires? Would this be a disservice to the State of Idaho under our bill?

IDAHO WATER RIGHTS FULLY PROTECTED

Will the senior Senator from Idaho then choose to comment upon his obligation to the people of Idaho in regard to section 2 of S. 1333? Does this language or does it not plainly and unequivocally subordinate the operation of the Hells Canyon project to upstream rights to the use of water from Snake River and its tributaries both present and future, and without limitation other than those of Idaho law, as to extent of such upstream rights?

Would the senior Senator from Idaho then care to comment concerning the water rights section in his own Hells Canyon bill which he introduced in the 81st Congress, which limited the amount of upstream diversion to which the operation of Hells Canyon would be subordinated to reasonable and equitable amounts which would, in effect, place a ceiling on upstream development about which he now appears to be protesting by way of an allegation that will not bear analysis in connection with the bill several of us introduced the other day?

Has the senior Senator from Idaho changed his ideas on reclamation in the meantime? Did he then wish to limit it, and now does he wish to provide for fullest possible reclamation? If so, would he agree with me that the language in section 2 is the kind of ironclad provision assuring such development without any obstacle from a downstream project at Hells Canyon in contrast with the equivocal provisions of his own bill which apparently he has chosen to forget for fear of embarrassment?

If the senior Senator from Idaho desires to facilitate expansion of Idaho reclamation, where does he expect to obtain the power revenues from which to help make these projects feasible? Will his small holdover storage projects and run of river dams on the extreme upstream reaches of Snake River provide this? He apparently is more interested in some alleged flood control to a small area of his State than he is for expanded irrigation. For he has called in the Corps of Engineers to conduct studies of possible upstream storage on the headwaters of the Snake River, with the Bureau of Reclamation acting merely as a guest. The Bureau has studied over and over for long years these possible installations upstream from Idaho Falls, which are small and at best would provide merely a few thousand kilowatts of power for pumping purposes, and some insurance to land already under ditch that supplementary water will be available in extraordinary dry years.

These upstream projects have been studied for many years and have yet to be proposed for authorization. The senior Senator from Idaho knows this to be so.

Could this be the same Senator DWORSHAK who said on the floor of the Senate on April 11, 1950:

> I should like to point out * * that those who advocate development of the Mountain Home project, involving subsidies for reclamation, are thoroughly aware of the fact that the project could not be defended unless it were tied to the Hells Canyon development. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 4, p. 5031, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

I should also respectfully and good naturedly say: "End of the argument."

I say that because the senior Senator from Idaho, out of his own mouth, on the floor of the Senate, has expressed the knowledge that Mountain Home has no chance of development except in connection with the development of Hells Canyon Dam. Is he no longer concerned about the Mountain Home irrigation project?

I fail to recall any expressions by the senior Senator about the proposed Mountain Home project. He seems chiefly concerned with eastern Idaho and little with the rest of his State. But since he conveyed the impression that the Hells Canyon bill, S. 1333, was little concerned with Idaho, I shall refer him at this time to section 4 of this bill which provides that the Secretary of the Interior must—that is mandatory—make a report and findings on the Mountain Home project during the next Congress, after which the Congress will be able to act upon it.

I say from the floor of the Senate today to the people of Idaho that section 4 of the Morse bill contains a mandatory requirement in that the Secretary of the Interior report to Congress his findings on the Mountain Home project during the next Congress. That will be of great service to the people of Idaho.

When we consider the merits of the Mountain Home project, it will be found to be of great benefit to the people of the State of Idaho as well.

In serving the people of Idaho, would it be possible that the senior Senator from Idaho wishes to carry water on both shoulders, so to speak, by diverting attention from the big grab which the power companies are engineering at Hells Canyon, at Mountain Sheep, and Pleasant Valley downstream, and on the Clearwater? Is he accomplishing this by holding out a few small lollipops to local interests while the power companies get their hands on the magnificent sites along Snake River's middle stretch and on the Clearwater?

Where is his Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley legislation, if he is in favor of it? Where is his proposed legislation for Federal construction of Bruce's Eddy and Penny Cliffs on the Clearwater River? The senior Senator from Idaho has, since the private power companies have decided to take over those projects, been so quiet that you can almost hear a pin drop, but he chooses to roll his thunders over the headwaters.

THE WATER SCARCITY SCARE ARGUMENT

The senior Senator has brought up the matter of adequate water supply for Hells Canyon. He says that his phantom projects on the Snake's headwaters will not allow a high dam at Hells Canyon because it will divert all the water.

But at the same time he holds that the Bureau and Corps know their business on the matter of proper preconstruction investigation, hydrology and engineering of his own projects. Then at the risk of being thought inconsistent, would the Senator consider that the water studies of the two great resource agencies would be misleading when they reveal that there is plenty of water for all conceivable upstream irrigation in the next 50 years, together with the operation of Hells Canyon?

I only need to cite the testimony of J. R. Riter and Frank Clinton, of the Bureau of Reclamation to this effect. And since the senior Senator from Idaho sets great store by the impeccable objectivity of the Federal Power Commission, let me quote from the staff counsel opening brief on the matter of water supply at Hells Canyon, found on page 4 of appendix B:

> The additional irrigated acreage, as such, does not have much effect on the estimate of power production in the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River, as long as a reasonable figure is used.

The staff counsel consider both the estimates of Mr. Lynn Crandall, upper Snake River watermaster, and that of the task force of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee as being realistic. The first of these envisions, 1,300,000 new acres—I ask Senators to mark that figure—to be brought under irrigation in the next 50 years, the second 1,196,000 new acres.

These official Government reports all indicate there is plenty of water for that and also for the power development of Hells Canyon.

Mr. Crandall is employed by the very irrigation districts on Snake River which the senior Senator mentions as being concerned over water supply for irrigation versus Hells Canyon. In his testimony before the Federal Power Commission he reached the conclusion that the water supply is adequate for the high dam.

In fact, Mr. President, in all the years I have been fighting for the construction of this high dam at Hells Canyon during which time I have conferred with the Bureau of Reclamation engineers and with the Army engineers, never have they raised a question as to the adequacy of the water. To the contrary, they have made clear time and time again that there is adequate water both for reclamation development and power development as well. Farmers can be scared by this type of argument—this raising of a bugaboo—as the senior Senator from Idaho has done and as the power companies in the Pacific Northwest have been trying to do for years, and as they tried to do in my State not so many years ago when there was a referendum on this question. They have raised the scare argument that Hells Canyon should not be built because there is not enough water for both irrigation and power. So they tried to drive a wedge of discord and disagreement between the farmers and those who want the power for industrial development. That is why I intend to pin down this argument, which is a fallacious argument, that there is not enough water for both irrigation and power. The expert testimony of the United States Army engineers has consistently shown that there is plenty of water for both purposes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that in the period in which the senior Senator from Oregon has been making a fight for Hells Canyon Dam, the various Members of Congress from Idaho have never once raised the argument of there being enough water when it comes to private dams, but there is not enough water when it concerns a Federal dam?

Mr. MORSE. My colleague is correct. I shall cover that point later in my speech. There was never a question raised about whether there would be enough water for the private companies for their low-head dams. Except for that great Democratic Congresswoman from Idaho, Mrs. PFOST, those of us who have been fighting for Hells Canyon Dam have looked in vain for any support from the congressional delegation from Idaho for this project, which is so vital to the economy of the Pacific Northwest, including the State of Idaho.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that in the State of Idaho, where the views of the senior Senator from Idaho on power have unfortunately prevailed, population, economic growth, and all the other elements that indicate prosperity of the people have lagged behind as compared to Idaho's sister States in the Northwest?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. That is one of the reasons why there is a growing concern at the grassroots in Idaho.

In his speech the other day the senior Senator from Idaho gave the impression that we would find this a very unpopular issue in the State of Idaho. Of course, he is not going to get very far by telling Mrs. PFOST that, because she was elected by a handsome majority in her district on the Hells Canyon Dam issue more than on any other issue.

Mr. President, I wish to say for the RECORD—and the Senator from Idaho can reply to it next week—that I should be perfectly willing, after a full discussion in the State of Idaho, to have the issue go to a referendum in that State and let the outcome be determined by that referendum. I think the Senator will discover that when the people of his State come to understand the issue as the people in Oregon and Washington understand it, they will join forces in insisting that Hells Canyon Dam be constructed.

Mr. President, Mr. Crandall, to whose statements I have previously referred, is employed by the very irrigation districts on Snake River which the senior Senator from Idaho mentioned as being concerned with the water supply for irrigation versus power supply from Hells Canyon.

Either of the two amounts mentioned will be superfluous and overestimates so long as the senior Senator from Idaho ignores two questions, as he did in his remarks on the floor of the Senate on March 8, 1955:

First. Where are the major power revenues coming from to aid such a massive new irrigation development? He has already washed his hands of the last two possible ones—Hells Canyon and Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley—for the private power companies want them for their own monopolistic uses.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that if the farmers of the State of Idaho think they have the ghost of a chance of getting cheap power from the Idaho Power Co. for pumping purposes, then they do not know the record of private utilities in this country in respect to supplying farmers with cheap power for such purposes. The record has been a consistent one of high power rates once there is removed competition with a great people's dam such as Hells Canyon would provide. That is why I said in my speech a few days ago that the farmers could be served by the phosphate beds in the Northwest; and that they are going to suffer unless the Hells Canyon Dam is constructed, because those phosphate beds cannot be developed with the high-cost power of private utility companies.

The testimony in the record is that Hells Canyon Dam power would reduce from $15 to $20 the cost per ton.

Second. Where is the cheap secondary power coming from to expand groundwater pumping irrigation on the Snake River plains as the lift depths increase and the excessive private rates hang like a millstone around the neck of those new farming enterprises otherwise willing to undertake the watering of new land by pumping?

The senior Senator from Idaho has adopted a remarkable device of not facing up to these two issues which are so closely bound up with the future of

Idaho at Hells Canyon by setting the Corps and the Bureau at each other's throats in a race for dam sites reminiscent on a local scale of the same kind of procedure that was stopped by President Truman on both the Columbia and the Missouri River by the drawing up of a joint coordinated plan for development of the entire basin.

In 1952 when Hells Canyon legislation was being heard in the House, where was the Senator from Idaho? He was introducing a bill for the small Scriver Creek power facilities which the House bill already included. In other words, he took a little segment of the House bill involving Idaho and introduced it in the Senate; but it was already included in the House bill.

In 1953, where was the senior Senator from Idaho? He was engaged in setting the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation at each other's throats below Hells Canyon and on the Clearwater. In his speech on March 8, the senior Senator from Idaho urged that Mountain Sheep, Pleasant Valley, and Nez Perce be developed. It might be well to remind him that such a development would constitute a major achievement, for if Nez Perce were ultimately constructed, as it should be, the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites would be flooded out, and vice versa.

The senior Senator from Idaho cannot have this both ways. He cannot eat his cake and have it, too. He will have to make up his mind whether he wants Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley, or Nez Perce. He cannot have all three, because if Nez Perce were constructed, Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley would be flooded out. If he has Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley, Nez Perce will be flooded out.

The senior Senator from Idaho should be advised also that, even with the addition of Salmon River diversion into either Nez Perce or the Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley political dams, either would call for the same water from the upper Snake as does Hells Canyon. This is the point which was made by my junior colleague a few minutes ago. It is interesting to hear a discussion about water supply in connection with Hells Canyon, but the opponents of Hells Canyon do not like to talk about water supply in connection with private dams.

Therefore, if the theory of the senior Senator from Idaho is correct about the inadequacy of the water supply by virtue of upstream depletions, would this not be equally true below as at Hells Canyon? Of course, it would not be true at either place, let me emphasize for the record; but if it were true at one place, obviously it would be true at the other.

Moreover, assuming that there was not enough water for the high dam, would there be enough for the three Idaho Power Co. projects, which in the company's filings with the Idaho Reclamation Department, call for nearly three times as much water delivered as does the proposed Federal project?

POLITICAL ENGINEERING VERSUS PRIVATE UTILITY SCUTTLING

It is perplexing to me to read that the senior Senator from Idaho regards Hells Canyon as simply a political dam, and that it is obstructing the true path to more power and other benefits which come from an orderly development of our river potential. It is particularly ironic to read this in light of the amount of time and money spent in assiduous study of the Hells Canyon site in relation to the Senator's little phantom projects on the headwaters of Snake River which have not even been formally proposed by either of the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. I wonder if the senior Senator from Idaho would also care to total up the number of new starts of major projects in the Pacific Northwest or anywhere else by the Eisenhower administration since it has taken office. The great dams like McNary, Grand Coulee, Hungry Horse, Shasta, Bonneville, Chief Joseph, and the Dalles were each and every one produced by Democratic administrations. Yes, and in the Senator's own State there are the Anderson Ranch and Palisades Dams. I understand that the senior Senator from Idaho has claimed some credit for having had Palisades Dam constructed. It is my own understanding that Democratic Senators from his own State, working together with various local citizens, did the real work, and that the senior Senator from Idaho, while supporting Palisades, was merely in at the kill, but not during the chase.

I am not sure that I completely understand the senior Senator's power policy. Thus far, in serving the people of Idaho, he has been chiefly responsible for a series of interminable studies of river reaches in Idaho already studied half to death. I am not too sure that that might not constitute a violation of his well-known stand on economy in Government.

But where are the new low-cost kilowatts? Where are the power revenues for assistance to future irrigation, which the senior Senator from Idaho says he champions? Where is the low-cost power to aid in pumping irrigation? No low-cost kilowatts have sprung up like magic at the sound of the senior Senator's voice. I can assure the Senate that none will.

In serving the people of Idaho, the senior Senator should consider these matters very carefully, before he condemns those who proposed legislation which will provide in great measure on the Snake River the economic impetus that he must realize his State so urgently requires. This cannot be done by studies and more studies, by equivocal positions, by setting one resource agency against another, by setting one section of a State against another.

The senior Senator from Idaho should evaluate the situation his State faces instead of attempting to chart his course in a half dozen different directions in an effort to avoid facing the wind.

In his speech on March 8, he said he did not propose to debate the bill on the floor of the Senate, but that the debate would take place before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I am willing to meet the senior Senator from Idaho in that forum or in any other. In the next few weeks field studies on this bill will be held in the Pacific Northwest by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I wish to compliment and thank the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for announcing that such field hearings will be held, because by them I am confident the facts can be brought to the people of the Pacific Northwest. Once they understand the facts, I have no doubt as to what their verdict will be. It will be an overwhelming verdict in support of urging Congress to proceed, without greater delay, to build the indispensable dam, indispensable so far as the economic future of the Pacific Northwest is concerned—the high Hells Canyon Dam.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there are many reasons why I favor a tax reduction for the average American. The first is that I believe those in the middle- and lower-income brackets are entitled to tax reduction as a matter of simple justice. I say this because they have been ignored thus far by the Eisenhower administration. As a group, they have had virtually no increase in their purchasing power during the past 2 years. Especially those who are farmers have seen their net worth and their income decline drastically.

Let us consider now what happened to the favored few during the same 2 years. One of the most fantastic aspects of this picture is to be found in the enormous increase in value of corporation stocks.

Since the administration came into office in January 1953 the value of the shares listed on the 15 American stock exchanges has increased by the staggering total of $50 billion. Mr. President, this figure stands even after deducting $5 billion for the 39 new issues of stock which were placed on the market during this period. It represents an increase in value of nearly 40 percent.

Taking Secretary Humphrey's own figures regarding stock ownership, and ignoring others showing even greater concentration of stock ownership, which he has disputed, we find that 90 percent of the American families own no corporation stock. Therefore, none of them participated or benefited in any way from this tremendous bonanza. The remaining and lucky 10 percent, however, benefited in increased net worth on the average by almost $12,000 for each family.

In addition, and again according to the Eisenhower administration figures, 1 percent of the American families own 70 percent of the stock. When this is worked out, we find that this 1 percent, or 450,000 families in America, had an average gain of $78,000. Stated another way, each member of these families has

had his or her net worth increased on the average by nearly $25,000.

What has happened in the way of national tax policy, which has served to contribute to this situation?

On January 1 of last year, 1954, the excess-profits tax expired, thus reducing corporation taxes by $1,700,000,000 annually.

Later last year, the Eisenhower-Humphrey tax relief bill went into effect, providing an additional $1,400,000,000 each year in tax relief to corporations and businessmen. Of this amount $360 millions a year was in a direct reduction of taxes on stock dividends. For the first full year of operation, a major portion of a billion dollars will be due to the provision for rapid write-offs on purchase of new machinery, and this loss will go up to more that $2 billion by 1960.

There were many other provisions, little noted except by the experts who assist the corporations and the rich in filing their tax returns, which were of almost equal value. One of them has been aptly called the Humphrey blooper.

This was not calculated to result in any loss to the Treasury—or only a negligible amount—but it has been discovered that it is likely to cost a billion dollars unless Congress takes action to plug up the loophole.

Mr. President, I do not suggest that these factors alone have accounted for the situation on the stock market, but I do say insofar as the Eisenhower administration tax policy has been concerned, that its effect has been in this direction.

While stock prices have been soaring, profits of the large corporations have continued to rise, especially those having assets of more than $100 million each.

An entirely different picture is found when we look at other elements of the economy. Manufacturing companies with less than $250,000 net assets have had their annual rate of profit fall from 10.6 percent after taxes for the first 6 months of 1952 to 4.1 percent in 1954, or, in other words, their profits have been reduced by almost two-thirds. In addition, there were 10,300 fewer businesses of all types started in the first 6 months of 1954 as compared with the same period in 1953, and Dun and Bradstreet report 2,224 more business failures involving court proceedings or voluntary actions likely to result in loss to creditors for 1954 than there were in 1953.

The farmer has certainly not shared in this bonanza. His realized yearly net income has gone down from $13,600,000,000 in 1952 to $12 billion in 1954. The net worth of the farms and equipment has been going down at least 10 percent—all of this, mind you, at the same time that each of the 1 percent of the American families owning most of our corporation stock had their average net worth increased by $78,000.

During the past 2 years the small wage earner has certainly not been experiencing any such bonanza. Those who have managed to remain steadily employed without having to suffer either part-time or total unemployment have just about managed to stay even with the game. They have had only small wage increases to meet the further increase in their cost of living.

Unemployment has increased. It is still increasing. In 1954 there were 3.2 millions unemployed, according to the Census Bureau. This is twice as high as the rate in 1953. There was an increase of 250,000 unemployed from January 1954 to January 1955. Furthermore, it is generally predicated by most of the experts that unemployment is likely to increase more during the present year. It is especially pointed out that the automobile industry cannot sell cars at anything like the rate of 8.5 million annual production, at which rate it is currently producing. This can only mean serious unemployment later this year, both in the automobile companies and in the very important related industries, such as steel.

Even the current unemployment figures are not representative of the true situation. The unemployment figure does not record the many people who have entered the labor force or who have lost their jobs in manufacturing, mining, or construction, and have been forced to take less desirable jobs in service and other subsidiary industries.

I am sure that all of us have been told by our wives that domestic help is much more easy to obtain now than it was 2 years ago. The reason should be clear to everyone.

What is revealed is the clear and unmistakable need for additional purchasing power to be placed in the hands of the average family. We certainly do not have any lack of production facilities in which to employ our millions of unemployed or poorly employed. I refer my colleagues especially to the excellent diagram distributed this week by U. S. News & World Report, on pages 26 and 27. This chart certainly leaves no room for doubt as to the availability of additional capacities in virtually all fields and, in addition, the existence even now of surplus commodities, especially on our farms.

Mr. President, I should like to make my position clear regarding the particular tax relief proposals which I would favor. I am for the $20 tax credit for each taxpayer and for each dependent. I would favor placing it into effect immediately.

The Democratic proposal for a $20 per person tax credit would work as follows:

A man would save $20 for himself; he would save another $20 for his wife and $20 more for each child. A family of five would save $100 each year.

This would mean that people in the lower income brackets would buy more of the things being produced on our farms and in our factories. This would mean more jobs. It would mean greater national production and, in the long run, it would mean greater revenues for our Government, because full national production and full employment would bring greater tax receipts.

To say that this is inflationary is ridiculous. Prices actually went down last year when $7 billions of tax reductions went into effect. The $20 tax credit would cost only one-third as much.

This tax proposal is aimed directly at the objective of stimulating consumer buying. If it suffers from any defect, it is the defect of being too small and too late, not too large and too hasty. I recognize this shortcoming of the proposal, but I believe that one step in the right direction is better than standing still.

If we cannot put through even this small reduction and make it available immediately, I certainly shall try to settle for what can be obtained. I am well aware that several of my most esteemed colleagues on this side of the aisle have been persuaded that we should not reduce taxes at this time, because of the budgetary deficit. If it is necessary to withdraw some of the benefits granted to the corporations, business men, and our wealthier taxpayers, in order to obtain some relief for the average American families, I shall certainly be prepared to support such proposals.

The position taken by the majority of Democrats on the Finance Committee is based upon experience. It adheres to the facts of the situation. It does not pretend that we can eliminate the rising unemployment by ignoring it, and, above all, it puts the well-being of the average American family first. It is only upon the well-being of these American families that the well-being of their Government and its financial affairs can be soundly based, in the long run.

The general economic arguments in favor of increasing purchasing power for the average American families are compelling. By very competent estimates, we would already be producing close to $30 billions more in additional goods and services for our people if we had merely continued in the past 2 years to maintain the long-term average annual increase in our national production.

Stimulation of purchasing power is necessary if our economy is to regain momentum and is to continue its expansion at the rate which is necessary for our national well-being. The experts seem to be in agreement that our national production can reach the tremendous total of $500 billions annually within the relatively near future. This cannot be done, however, so long as we have an administration which hounds itself with the unfounded fear of inflation.

It is difficult to accept at face value the current outcries of administration spokesmen who brand this measure designed to provide a meager measure of relief to our average citizens as irresponsible and inflationary.

Certainly this same administration claimed credit in the last elections for the "biggest reduction of taxes in history in 1 year." This was true with a Federal deficit more than twice as large as it is now. Moreover, the tax reduction was 3 times as large as the full $20 tax credit proposal adopted by the House of Representatives would cost.

In opposing a tax reduction at this time, it seems to me that the administration is faced by inescapable logic. Either it must believe—

(a) That the economic recovery has reached the point where a tax reduction to stimulate purchasing power to carry the recovery forward is no longer needed, or

(b) That the $20 tax credit is less likely to promote economic recovery than the type of tax reduction granted last year.

Neither of these views is supportable. With almost 4 million people unemployed, including those partially employed, and tremendous unused facilities of almost every kind, it is absurd to argue that the recovery is complete. It is equally wrong to say that a direct tax reduction for those who spend rather than for those who save would not have a stimulating effect upon our economy.

Inasmuch as the majority of the Senate Finance Committee has seen fit to vote against the $20 tax credit, and inasmuch as the Eisenhower administration is using all of its great powers to prevent the giving of any tax relief to those in the low-income brackets, those of us who were in the minority of the Finance Committee have felt obliged to work out a provision which I shall call the "balance the budget" proposal. Under this proposal, some relief could be given without having the Government go more deeply into debt.

While this provides to the great majority of our people less tax relief than some of us would like to provide, it is much better than nothing, which is what the Eisenhower administration would provide. Thus, we propose to take back some of the concessions given last year to corporations and business in general, and this proposal is made in order to offset the cost of the tax relief which we still propose to provide for those in the low-income brackets.

The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on this proposal. It would provide a $20-tax credit for each taxpayer, but without providing any credit for the taxpayer's spouse. A $10-tax credit would then be provided for all other dependents. Thus, a family of 4 would save $40; a family of 5 would save $50; and so on.

While I would prefer $20-tax relief for each individual, the $20-$10-tax credit proposal squarely meets the administration argument against tax reductions without balancing the budget. The proposal would raise offsetting revenues to more than pay for the relief which would be provided for those in our lower income-tax brackets.

Mr. President, at this point I might refer to the hearings on the $20 tax-credit proposal during the course of which I asked the Secretary of the Treasury about his attitude in regard to the arguments he had made against our proposal. As shown on page 69 of the hearings, I asked the following question:

> Senator LONG. Mr. Secretary, if we should undertake here to reduce the spending by an amount equal to the tax relief, or if we should raise offsetting revenue to the extent that we give relief here—although we may thereby create other differences of opinion—the facts that you have given here would not apply, would they?

I now read the reply:

> Secretary HUMPHREY. That is correct. If you know where the money is coming from and you provide it, then you can disburse it.

Therefore, Mr. President, all the arguments the Secretary of the Treasury made, so ably supported by some of the members of our committee, by the admission of the Secretary of the Treasury do not apply when we undertake to raise revenue to offset the loss of revenue occasioned by giving some tax relief to the average American citizen. Then we have to decide only the question of whether we are going to continue to favor the "trickle-down theory," which has not proved effective in providing additional employment or the recovery we desire; or whether we are going to accept the theory which most sound economists advance today, namely, that by providing greater purchasing power for the mass of our people, we provide more jobs, more employment.

Last year I voted against striking from the Eisenhower-Humphrey tax relief bill the concessions which were made to corporation stockholders. I voted also against striking the provision which granted businesses the right to a very rapid tax write-off of their expenditures for new equipment and machinery.

I felt that there was merit to both of these proposals. Nevertheless, as between the two alternatives, I did not feel that we could afford to grant such favored tax treatment to corporations and businesses, in clear preference to our smaller wage earners and their families.

For that reason, last year I voted to substitute a provision similar to the $20 per person tax credit for the provision that would grant preferential treatment to income in the form of corporation dividends.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Then the Senator from Louisiana is not taking a new position; but, rather, he is affirming the position he took last year, as I understand. Does he not feel that the position he took then has been thoroughly vindicated by events?

Mr. LONG. Yes, Mr. President, I feel it has been thoroughly vindicated, and also endorsed, I may say, by the American people at the last election, because that was the George amendment, for which 90 percent of the Democratic Members voted, as the Senator from Tennessee knows.

As one who campaigned in many parts of the Nation, I wish to say that I gained the impression that this particular issue—the question of whether the great masses of the people should have received tax relief at the same time we were giving such relief to corporations and to businesses—contributed in large measure to the Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield again to my friend, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. It so happens that I served as chairman of the speakers bureau of the Democratic National Committee, and therefore I am in a position to verify the statement which has just been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, namely, that the tax bill was one of the principal issues, if not the foremost issue, in the campaign last fall.

Does not the Senator from Louisiana think that those who now denounce this proposition as "silly and irresponsible" would tend to ignore the expressed will of the people?

Mr. LONG. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I know that many of our Republican friends last year voted for what was called the Millikin amendment, which was offered as a substitute for the George amendment. Many of us Democrats regarded the Millikin amendment as merely a proposal to cut into half the relief which would have been afforded by the George amendment to the great mass of the people of the United States, if the George amendment had been adopted. Nevertheless, many of our Republican friends would like to have the public believe they would have voted for the Millikin amendment if it had been substituted for the George amendment. Many of them would also like to have the public believe that they did vote for tax relief, when they voted for an amendment which would merely have cut in half the tax relief which 90 percent of the Democratic Members were supporting last year, for the average American. Assuming that it is correct that those Republican Members would have voted for the Millikin amendment, and assuming that that is how they still feel about it, this amendment would cost just about the same as the Millikin amendment of last year, and thus our Republican friends will have an opportunity to demonstrate that by voting for the Millikin amendment, they genuinely meant they were in favor of giving tax relief to the average American.

This year, we have great need of increasing the purchasing power among the rank and file of our citizens, and it is proposed to vote at least some tax relief for the masses of our citizens and to recover the cost of providing such tax relief by removing some of concessions made last year to those who receive corporation dividends and businesses who write off their capital expenditures under the new provisions.

I do not intend to challenge in any way the motives of those of my colleagues who disagree. It is for every Senator to choose the course he will take. The question he must answer is, "Does he believe tax relief should be given to those in the low-income brackets, if this can be done without affecting the balancing of the budget? Would he not be willing to prefer those who were ignored last year, the average workingman and his family, to those who have had such favored treatment throughout the first 2 years of this administration?"

Mr. President, let not those who charge political considerations attempt to mislead the public. The people know partisan politics. They know that our two great political parties are in the business of politics. Most people would feel that it was Republican politics, last year, when businesses and corporations were favored, and when the great majority of

Americans were ignored. If anyone wishes to charge that it is Democratic politics to provide tax relief for the great mass of our people, I shall not argue with him.

But, Mr. President, certainly this issue should be held above politics. This type of tax relief for our people will result in more spending for the necessities and conveniences of life. That will lead to more jobs and greater production, and it will contribute measurably to the prosperity of America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that the Senator from Louisiana is saying that with the introduction of the new plan, on yesterday, by our majority leader, the tax issue has shifted from whether, in the interest of economic stability, the budget shall be further unbalanced, to the question of where, shall be lodged the relative burden of raising approximately the same amount of taxation.

Mr. LONG. That is completely correct. This amendment will actually help balance the budget. It will gain more revenue for the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the proposed increases in taxation proposed by the Democratic plan would yield approximately $1,600,000,000 in the coming year? Namely, about $360 million from removing the 4 percent dividend exemption and about $1,260,000,000 from removing accelerated depreciation.

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the proposed reductions in income tax of $20 and $10 would cost approximately $1,250,000,000?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the net effect would be to increase revenues by approximately $350 million.

Mr. LONG. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would leave us, would it not, some funds with which we could make appropriations for school construction and for other social-welfare purposes which we Democrats wish to promote?

Mr. LONG. I completely agree with my very able friend from Illinois, that we would have additional revenue with which to plan for overall expenditures. Of course, some of us would particularly like to see some additional reductions in spending. The junior Senator from Louisiana has always favored a major reduction in the foreign aid program, for example. Nevertheless, I believe it is well to face the fact that in reducing Government spending we shall be reducing the number of people employed in this country. If we should make a major reduction in the foreign aid program, many of those producing commodities to be exported to foreign countries, in terms of the so-called foreign giveaway program, would lose their jobs. This type of tax relief is necessary in order to place those people in the civilian economy, producing civilian goods, in the event we cut the foreign aid program.

I wish to make this point clear: Insofar as the arguments advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury in the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee are concerned, by the Secretary's own admission, none of those arguments apply to the amendment being offered by a majority of the Democrats, the so-called balance-the-budget amendment, which would not only give tax relief to those most in need of additional purchasing power, but would also gain revenues for the Government. This amendment would do more than merely gain additional revenues from corporation shareholders, and additional revenues in connection with the accelerated depreciation provisions. It would also extend, for at least another year, the taxes on corporation income.

In the committee, the junior Senator from Louisiana moved such an extension. Incidentally, the Secretary of the Treasury testified in favor of it. He said that he would like to see that provision extended indefinitely, because he felt that our fiscal situation was not such that we should undertake to promise corporations that they would have tax relief.

Yet, notwithstanding that fact, when the junior Senator from Louisiana made the motion to continue the 52 percent rate of corporate taxation, not a single Republican on the committee voted in favor of it, although a majority of the Democrats voted for such an amendment. But again, let me point out that the arguments made by the Secretary of the Treasury do not apply against this proposal.

Therefore the question resolves itself into the issue of whether we favor the "trickle-down" theory of tax relief, the theory urged by the Secretary of the Treasury, that we should strive to give tax relief to those who own corporation stock, and to business executives, and give fast tax write-offs, and things of that sort which might encourage people to buy equipment, in the hope of making a greater profit.

Many of us do not consider that argument to be sound, because we feel that today we do not now need more factories. What we need is people working in the present factories. Many people are idle. We need additional purchasing power in order to bring the factories to full production.

I have before me a chart which appears on pages 26 and 27 of the U. S. News & World Report for March 11, 1955. It very well illustrates the excess capacity we have in our country.

It points out that, in automobile production, the expected output for this year is 6.6 million cars; the potential production is 9 million automobiles.

In steel the expected output is 107.4 million tons; the capacity of the industry is 125.8 million tons.

In cotton the expected use is 9 million bales; our capacity to produce is 13,500,000 bales.

In TV sets, the current output is 9.2 million a year; the capacity is 12.4 million a year.

In electric ranges the current output is 92 percent of the 1947–49 production, and the capacity is estimated to be 166 percent of the 1947–49 averages.

In refrigerators, the current output is 78 percent of the 1947–49 averages, while the capacity is 177 percent of those same averages.

In vacuum cleaners, the output is 73 percent of the 1947–49 production, while the capacity is 136 percent of the 1947–49 production.

In furniture, the current output is 115 percent of the 1937–49 production, and our capacity is 132 percent of the 1937–49 production.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the very able Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last year our gross national product fell off about $8 billion. Private investment dropped about $5 billion. Unemployment increased by 1 million people. Under those circumstances, does not the Senator feel any tax relief should embrace a broad base, rather than a relatively narrow base?

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator is correct. The reason we have unemployment to the extent of 3,350,000 today—and partial unemployment which, if converted to terms of full employment, would increase that figure to 4.1 million people—is simply that we do not have the purchasing power to buy the things industry is producing. There is no shortage of machinery. There is no shortage of labor. The Senator will find, if he looks at the figures of employment in manufacturing, employment in the factories of America, that it has actually gone down by 347,000 jobs during the past year, while, on the other hand, production has gone up to some extent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In 1950, in order to accelerate industrial mobilization for the Korean war, we passed the so-called accelerated amortization-tax law as an inducement for people to expand their production facilities so as to win a war. Does not the distinguished Senator agree that to continue that law now, at great expense to the Government from the standpoint of tax revenue, especially when already many plants which could be utilized are idle, is hardly logical? To continue giving special accelerated tax-amortization benefits to those who build new plants would seem hardly a logical method of obtaining more tax revenue, especially when the Government is operating at a deficit.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator is referring to the rapid tax writeoff which was given in the early stages of the Korean war, and extended for some time thereafter, I certainly agree with him. With regard to the so-called accelerated depreciation provision which was in last year's bill, while I find some merit in it because I should like to see industry continue to modernize and equip its plants, it seems to me that when we come to the point of choosing between tax relief for the great mass of our citizens who have inadequate buying power and corporations which today are not producing at full capacity, it would be better for us to spread more purchasing power among the masses of our people.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. This morning I noticed in the newspaper that one of the great corporations of the United States, on considerably less sales than the previous year, made a net profit more than $100 million in excess of the previous year's figure. Does not the Senator believe the problem we are now discussing on the floor of the Senate is concerned with that particular set of figures to which I have referred?

Mr. LONG. That is completely true. The income of corporations with assets of more than $100 million is up substantially over what it was a year ago, although the income of small business is down. Of course, I mentioned in the early part of my speech, which I hope the Senator from Missouri heard, that on the New York Stock Exchange and on the other stock exchanges stocks are up an average of 40 percent over what they were 2 years ago.

We must consider another factor when we look at the entire picture of corporations generally in this country.

When we look at the large incomes made by the great corporations, those large incomes do not reflect the full picture, because of the rapid tax writeoff we provided last year, which permits corporations to depreciate machinery more rapidly than the actual depreciation. In other words, over the first year a corporation can depreciate its machinery perhaps twice as rapidly as the true depreciation of the machinery would be.

That being the case, if the Senator will look at the excellent newsletter issued by the National City Bank of New York for this week, he will find that many corporations are writing up two balance sheets for their stockholders. One of the balance sheets shows what their profit is so far as Government taxes are concerned. The other balance sheet shows what their real balance is when they take into consideration the fact that they have taken a much larger tax writeoff in terms of amortizing equipment at a faster rate than is justified by the actual depreciation or depletion of their machinery.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield for a final question?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The other day someone referred to perhaps the largest corporation in the country, stating that company had made a 35-percent increase in profits on an 8-percent lower output of merchandise. Would the Senator care to express his views on what would happen to the average workingman who demanded a 35-percent increase in wages for 8 percent less work?

Mr. LONG. I suppose it has been requested from time to time, but I do not believe that many businessmen have agreed to such a request, certainly not without a long fight and possibly strikes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator from Louisiana is proposing that the tax burden be readjusted in favor of the lower and middle income groups, for two reasons; first, because it would be more just; and, second, because it would be a better way of bringing about economic recovery?

Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that so far as the first point is concerned, that in the field of local and State taxation today, the lower income groups probably pay a larger percentage of their income in taxes than do the upper income groups?

Mr. LONG. In many respects that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that with respect to State sales taxes on food and retail transactions, inasmuch as such taxes exempt rent, household services, and investments, they cause the lower income families to pay a larger percentage as their contribution than they cause the upper income groups to pay?

Mr. LONG. There are many computations of the rates at which people pay income taxes that do not reflect the real situation. For example——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am speaking of State sales taxes now.

Mr. LONG. That is correct. While it is true that sales taxes, excise taxes, and other taxes of that kind tax the necessities of life, most of which the small wage earners must exclusively purchase, it is not usually realized that at the same time the upper groups get many so-called breaks under tax laws. These "breaks" are not always noticed.

When reference is made to a person paying taxes in the 80-percent bracket it is not always realized that a person in the higher income brackets gets many "breaks" which are denied to the workingman. If a man in an upper income group decides he must travel on business, he can deduct the expense of such travel from his income tax. If he entertains friends or engages a hotel room, he can put those expenses on his expense account. On the other hand, if a laboring man decides that he must go to an adjoining town to seek a job, he is not permitted to deduct the expense of that trip from his income-tax return. He is told that it is a personal expense, which he must pay himself. There are many similar examples.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With reference to local taxation, is it not also true that as the general rule, the residences, particularly those of the lower and middle income groups, are assessed at a higher percentage of their true value than is the case with reference to industrial and commercial property? That has been our experience in Illinois.

Mr. LONG. It is my impression that that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that in one community in Illinois the workingmen's homes are generally assessed at 90 percent of their sales value, whereas an industrial plant in the same community, which originally cost $74 million to construct, is carried on the tax rolls as having a value of $1 million.

Mr. LONG. That oftentimes occurs because of the difference in influence as between a workingman, who believes he should pay at whatever rate the assessor fixes on his home, and a businessman, who might have substantial influence in a community and would be in a position to fight a higher assessment. Such a man is usually able to participate in the decisions of public issues from day to day and year in and year out, and perhaps sometimes is even personally acquainted with the assessor and other officials. In that way is able to hold down his assessment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yet the higher taxes upon residential property are an immediate and direct out-of-pocket expense for the owner of the home. If he is a workingman or is in the lower-income group, or, if he is a tenant, he pays for most of it in the form of an increase in monthly rentals. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that property taxes on the whole weigh heavier upon the lower-income groups than upon the upper income groups, and sales taxes do likewise. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And to a large extent the same is true of gasoline taxes.

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those are the three primary sources of State and local taxes, are they not?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, so far as State and local taxes are concerned, instead of having a progressive system of taxation, with the rate increasing as the income increases, we have a regressive system of taxation, with the rate diminishing as the income increases. Is that not true?

Mr. LONG. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, so far as the Federal excise taxes are concerned, particularly those levied on beer, spirituous liquor, and tobacco, they also tend to be regressive inasmuch as the millionaire does not smoke a thousand times as many cigarettes or drink a thousand times as much beer as the man with a lower income. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. The Senator is right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, virtually every part of the revenue system, with the exception of the income tax and the corporation tax, is regressive. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. It tends to be that way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the progressive features—I use that term not in a moral sense but in an arithmetical sense—of the income and corporation taxes suggest that probably the total tax burden is not far from being proportionate and on a percentage level. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is probably true. I do not want to suggest by my answer that I feel that persons in the upper income brackets are not sufficiently and heavily enough taxed at the present time. They are very heavily taxed. I hope that in due course it will be possible to give them appropriate relief.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. LONG. However, when we have a situation in which taxes paid by some people are so onerous that they cannot put meat on the table, while other people suffer only a small inconvenience, but not a real sacrifice, it seems to me that we should try to effect tax relief for the

great majority, for those who might be denied even an adequate diet because of the taxes they must pay on their income.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that the Senator from Louisiana is familiar with the series of articles which appeared in the Journal of the National Tax Association. I believe, the first one was by Dr. Musgrave, of Michigan, and it was followed up by criticisms by Mr. Rufus S. Tucker, an economist of the General Motors Corp. The articles indicated that the total relative tax burden might be expressed graphically in the shape of a fishhook; that is, quite high for the lower-income groups, and then diminishing in percentage of income for the middle groups, and then rising again with the percentage of income paid by the very high income groups, to a point somewhat higher than the percentage paid by the lowest income groups.

Mr. LONG. Of course, some will gain the impression that high-income groups pay more taxes than is oftentimes the case. Sometimes foundations are set up, the Ford Foundation being an example, and by this device the foundation may receive dividends without paying a personal income tax. Such foundations are wholly tax exempt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, the Ford family does not benefit personally from the income of the foundation nor do they draw dividends from it.

Mr. LONG. I was under the impression that they are in position to say who is to be employed by the foundation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana does not mean to imply that the Ford family has been paid salaries because of their connection with the Ford Foundation.

Mr. LONG. No; I would not imply that. However, there are instances of some foundations benefiting some of the persons who set them up, or at least the descendants of the persons who set them up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is saying that if we take into consideration the total burden of taxation which the lower- and middle-income groups must bear, it is much heavier than is commonly believed, and they are the groups which from the standpoint of justice most need relief.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator for taking that position.

The Senator mentioned another thing, namely, that we can get more recovery by building up the purchasing power of the lower- and middle-income groups than by building up the purchasing power of the upper-income groups.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the question as to whether there is involved a greater monetary purchasing power, under the present proposal there will be no more monetary purchasing power injected into the economic system by additional Government borrowing. It is instead a question of the adjustment of the burden, and Mr. Humphrey, in his zeal to help savings, ignores the fact that we already have a large amount of idle plant capacity.

Mr. LONG. That is correct; and he takes the attitude that by giving tax reductions to business firms and corporations we create more jobs, when the facts do not support that assumption. There are fewer persons employed this year than were employed a year ago when the tax bill was passed. January of last year compared with January of this year shows that employment in mining, manufacturing, and construction is down substantially.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Louisiana has been talking about a matter which is of very great interest and of vital concern to this debate. He has referred to the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury that the way to increase the number of jobs is to encourage the expansion of industrial production facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that as industrial production facilities are being increased, it is done on the basis of reducing the number of jobs?

Mr. LONG. That is the way it is working out at the present time. Many productive facilities which are being placed in operation today are reducing employment rather than increasing it.

Mr. KERR. Is not the present trend in the increase of industrial productive facilities toward what has been referred to as automation?

Mr. LONG. That is true. It involves very expensive machinery which displaces workers. Certain machinery will permit one man, watching the dials to see whether the machine is operating correctly, to do the work of many persons. For example, in 15 minutes a machine is able to grind a cylinder block, for instance, which used to require 9 man-hours.

Mr. KERR. The bill which was passed last year with accelerated depreciation benefits is a great incentive to the investment of large sums of money in more expensive and larger machines which have greater productive capacity. Is not that a fact?

Mr. LONG. It is.

Mr. KERR. And in every instance it tends to reduce jobs as well as to make jobs.

Mr. LONG. I do not know whether that is the case in every instance, but the facts show that there are fewer persons working in industry than there were a year ago. The tax bill last year was intended to put more people to work in factories, as the Senator will recall.

Mr. KERR. It is perfectly apparent, then, that if an industry or a unit of an industry is making good money and paying 52 percent of it to the Federal Government in income taxes, there is a very decided incentive in the form of an opportunity to save taxes by spending vast sums of money for very modern industrial productive capacity which automatically reduces the number of men and women required to produce the same amount of goods as that heretofore produced.

Mr. LONG. Yes. There is such an incentive. I do not wish to be misunderstood by my answer as giving the impression that I would not like to see machinery steadily modernized, thus making it possible for workers to accomplish more in a day. But the point is that if that is to be done new factories should be built, more people should be put to work. That is where the Secretary's proposal has failed. While it may have encouraged manufacturers to buy more machinery, it has not encouraged the opening of new plants.

Mr. KERR. I am in entire agreement with the Senator. We were discussing what I regard as inaccuracy, or what might even be the irresponsibility of the position of the Secretary of the Treasury, in saying that the accelerated depreciation feature in the tax bill of 1954 is an incentive to the creation of more jobs for American workers, when the record shows that just the opposite has been the case and is the case.

Mr. LONG. I completely agree with my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, in that connection let me read from the testimony of Secretary Humphrey on March 10——

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was yesterday?

Mr. LONG. Yes. The Secretary said:

> It is just silly to say that adds to the Treasury's return.

Mr. President, it seems to me that those of us who may not agree with the Secretary would not want to use such a description of his proposal as to say it is silly. But, nevertheless, the Secretary said it is silly to talk about getting more revenue in this way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In connection with the specific sources of tax revenue about which the Senator from Louisiana has been speaking, he has, I take it, been talking about current periods; that is, up until the first of July 1956, or perhaps, in one case, up until the first of January 1957, so that thus far, in discussing the removal of accelerated depreciation and the removal of the dividend exemption the Senator from Louisiana has been confining himself to current periods identical to those with which he deals in the case of the $20 and $10 deductions.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question of the extension of corporation and excise taxes beyond April 1, 1956, is therefore a separate issue and thus far has not been discussed by the Senator?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. If the Secretary of the Treasury is simply taking it for granted that he is going to have an extension of the 52-percent rate of corporate taxation he had better reconsider his position, because he urged it should be continued indefinitely before the Finance Committee a week ago.

I took the Secretary at his word. He said he would like to extend the 52-percent rate. I made a motion to extend it indefinitely.

What happened? There was not a single Republican member of the committee who voted to extend the corporation tax for an additional year. I voted for it; the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] voted for it; I believe the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] voted for it, and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] voted for it. That was four votes. More than

four votes are needed to extend the corporation tax.

Perhaps the Secretary of the Treasury feels that he can control the Republican side of the aisle, but I rather doubt that he is capable of doing it. I think some of those Members are independent thinkers, and will vote their own judgment when the time comes.

Therefore, it seems to me that when we undertake to extend the corporation tax there may be a very real question of revenue, far more than the Secretary realizes at this time. Far from saying that it is a silly proposition, I am one who says that if additional revenues are needed, we had better not count our chickens before the eggs are hatched. If the Secretary wants additional revenue, he would do well to support the present Democratic proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that we Democrats are now protecting the fiscal solvency of the Treasury, which is Secretary Humphrey's avowed desire, as against the possible political and avaricious desire of the Republicans for votes in the election year of 1956?

Mr. LONG. I think the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the Senator from Louisiana uses the name "Humphrey" in relation to the tax bill, will he please differentiate between "George" and "HUBERT"?

Mr. LONG. I believe the RECORD should show that Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey is a great believer in the "trickle-down" theory; that is, if relief is given to corporations and businessmen, such relief will trickle down to help the average workingman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. HUBERT HUMPHREY is a believer in the percolate-up theory.

Mr. LONG. He believes the other way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. "Trickle - down George" and "Percolate-up HUBERT."

Mr. LONG. That is correct. I hope I have not made a mistake in giving my views, by referring to Senator HUMPHREY instead of to Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, because I am well aware that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY is a believer in the economic well-being of the average person. He believes in having financial benefits work themselves up. He is one who simply believes that when we have prosperity among all the people businessmen and corporations will do very well, indeed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have received much of my inspiration from the philosophy which has been enunciated by the Senator from Louisiana and our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is standing beside him, and also from our friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I am glad to be in this very congenial and very sound, constructive company. I shall be engaged in the tax debate with the junior Senator from Louisiana, and I shall return to the fray in a moment.

Mr. LONG. I am grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota. He has long been an advocate of improving the conditions of the great masses of our people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was listening to the colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois, and I wonder whether it crossed the Senators' minds that there are glaring inconsistencies in this administration on the question of so-called fiscal responsibility. On the one hand, the administration talks, talks, and talks about balancing the budget. On the other hand, the administration was able to cut taxes for the benefit of those who needed the cut the least, while the budget was still unbalanced.

Next the administration comes along and talks, talks, and talks about balancing the budget, and also about the possibility, in the future, of tax relief, only to propose a $100 billion roadbuilding program and a several billion dollar school-construction program, neither of which, supposedly, is considered to cost anything. It sounds very good, but it has no relevancy to the doctrine of a balanced budget.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct. The administration has been willing to go into that.

As the Senator knows, in 1954 we had tax reductions amounting to $7 billion. At that time we had behind us a budget deficit twice as great as the budget deficit of the preceding year, and were approaching a year in which the budget deficit would be about twice as great as we were told it will be next year. Oddly enough, the administration having twice as great a budget deficit was ready to recommend a tax reduction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that that was an election year?

Mr. LONG. Yes; it was an election year. Perhaps the administration might be proposing this tax relief with an eye to next year. Of course, that would not be politics.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no; that would be responsible principle. I want those words to be impressed upon the Secretary. The proposals which the administration will make next year will be timed, incidentally, before the elections. This will be a fulfillment of the highest responsibility of public office, with plenty of piety and pontifical pronouncement; make no mistake about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may return to the question of the relative stimulus of the economy given by tax rebates to the well-to-do as compared with tax rebates to the lower and middle income groups, is it not true that even though the tax favors to the wealthy—which were included in the administration tax bill of last year—may increase the savings by individuals and, indeed, by corporations, they do not necessarily increase the actual physical investment in plants and machinery; because, with surplus equipment, why should industry build proportionately more plant and construct more machinery?

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois is completely correct. Who will go into the automobile business when General Motors and Ford are driving the smaller manufacturers into very distressed situations, as is the case now? Who will open new automobile plants in competition with them?

Furthermore, when there is already a capacity for building 9 million automobiles, and the industry is set up to produce only 6.6 million, why should anyone wish to build additional plants?

So far as increasing the purchasing power of someone who owns stock in an automobile company, a person can drive only one automobile at a time; he can only wear one suit of clothes at a time; certainly it would not be well for his health if he ate more than one meal at a time.

No matter how much a person's income may be increased, the increase would not necessarily reflect itself in more spending and more employment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the savings of the well-to-do, that is, the excess of income over current personal expenditures not translated into investment, might either be locked up in idle deposits in the banks or put into the stock market. Is not that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator has indicated, is not part of the increase in securities values in the stock market probably due to the tax policies of the Republican administration? For example, if we capitalize the Republican tax cut of $1.4 billion by 15, which is not far from the earnings ratio, about $21 billion of the $50 billion increase in stock values would be accounted for by this item alone.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the facts speak for themselves. During the past 2 years there have been new stock issues to the extent of about $5 billion. I assume that is more than the actual savings of those in the upper brackets for the past 2 years.

Furthermore, we have seen prices in the stock market go up to a point where stocks which were on the market 2 years ago have increased in value by more than $50 billion.

So that does not indicate that, for the most part, the savings of businesses and corporations have been reflected in the building of more plants and in the creation of more jobs.

The actual facts show that employment in the construction, mining, and manufacturing industries is about the same.

Let me continue with the testimony of Secretary Humphrey before the House Committee on Ways and Means. Following the portion I read sometime ago, the Secretary had this to say:

> Now, as to the two items that he suggests being withdrawn—

I assume the Secretary is referring to the recommendation by the majority of the Democrats in the Senate Committee on Finance—

> be canceled, one is the dividend credit, which is 180 to 360—

The Secretary, I believe, is referring to millions of dollars—

> and the other is the depreciation item, which is somewhere from 300 to 900—

I am certain the Secretary is referring to savings in millions of dollars—

depending upon the quarters you are talking about, as he gives the figures; and I am not sure those are the correct figures and we haven't checked them, but they are good enough to talk about.

If you will go back, Mr. MILLS, just about 1 year, you will recall that the prophets of doom and gloom were sending this country to the dogs—that we were heading straight for the dogs if various things weren't done. A lot of very unsound, in our opinion, proposals were made which were discarded.

I assume the Secretary was talking about tax relief for the masses, for it will be remembered that we Democrats wanted to raise the exemption by $100 a person.

In lieu of those unsound things that were suggested to pull us out of the doom and gloom that was threatened, we did several things—this administration did several things—one of which was to pass this tax law which contined these two provisions.

Now, then, the things which were done, including these two provisions, have reversed this field and, instead of being headed for doom and gloom today, we are headed for and are in better times, and I think there is nobody anywhere who will deny that.

Mr. President, I am one who will deny it. Unemployment in January of this year was 250,000 greater than it was in January of last year. I deny we are any better off, or that the farming families of America are any better off. Their income is down 20 percent from what it was the year before the present administration came to power.

There are 3,350,000 persons out of jobs. I would say those persons are no better off. Many of those who are fortunately employed have had their work hours cut, which has amounted to an equivalent of 700,000 being unemployed. I say those persons are no better off.

So far as the economy as a whole is concerned, it is no better off. The administration has predicted great gains, looking ahead 10 years, based on the Democratic theory that we should increase our production 3½ percent each year. The facts have not borne out that theory, because during the past 2 years we have gone backward rather than forward. Based on those facts, the administration might as well have predicted that in 10 years we would have only half of the present production rather than to predict that it would be 50 percent greater.

It is a question of which way we are going. The administration says we are going forward, that we have made great gains; but in fact in the past 2 years we have gone backward. That was recognized by the Secretary of the Treasury when he said that January 1953, which was the month when the President took office, was the height of the Eisenhower boom.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Louisiana believe that the boom in the stock market is a healthy condition?

Mr. LONG. No, but that apparently is what the Secretary is saying, because I cannot think of any other place where a boom is going on. Most people are worse off.

Mr. GORE. There is no boom in purchasing power on the part of the average citizen, is there?

Mr. LONG. None at all. Their purchasing power is less than it was a year ago, and less than it was 2 years ago.

Mr. GORE. With an automobile industry capable of producing 9 million automobiles a year, may it be said that our economy is booming when it is expected that the industry will produce no more than 6 million automobiles?

Mr. LONG. Where is the boom? I do not see it.

Mr. GORE. I suspect the boom is in the stock market.

Mr. LONG. I suppose so. Some of the persons who are participating in that boom may find that they are participating in a "bust" sometime in the future.

Let me read further, because it is a good presentation of the "trickle-down" theory of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary went on to say:

And I think there is nobody anywhere who will deny that.

If the prophets of doom and gloom of a year ago now want to start our repealing the things that reversed the field and send us back into doom and gloom, they ought to adopt this kind of proposal.

In other words, according to the Secretary, if we are going to give tax relief to the average man and his wife and children, making it possible for them to purchase goods which they cannot buy today because they lack purchasing power, that is not the way to get rid of gloom and doom. On the other hand, if we give relief to those who already have had their assets increased by $50 billion, meaning those who hold corporation stocks, then, of course, we will be headed away from doom and gloom.

Speaking again of the proposal to give tax relief to the average person, the Secretary said:

This proposal is just as irresponsible, just as political, and just as bad from every point of view as the original proposal—

Referring to the proposal to give everybody a $20 tax cut—

with the added amount of repealing the things that have been helpful in reversing the field from doom and gloom to better times—to making jobs instead of losing jobs.

I am curious to know where the Secretary thinks the jobs were made. Were the jobs made in the factories of America? He does not mean that, because employment in manufacturing, mining, and agriculture is down. Farm income has gone down. It is only on the stock exchange that this policy of reversing the tendency and causing things to boom has been reflected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana means to include the profits of large corporations, does he not?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury, with his real abilities, and they are real, tends to have a very restricted view of the welfare of the people of the Nation? He looks at the wealthy, and judges the prosperity of the Nation by the condition of the wealthy. What the Senator from Louisiana is urging is that we should look at the condition of the average people, is he not?

Mr. LONG. That is entirely correct. I say the Secretary's theory, in connection with the stock exchanges and in dealing with the stock market, is that he believes that if the stock market is in good shape and the larger corporations are showing profit, everything is fine. If he is doing that he must be ignoring the rather distressed conditions that exist on many farms and the conditions with respect to unemployment in industry.

I wish to refer to the exact figure relating to employment. These are not my figures. I hold in my hand the Economic Indicator of February 1954, prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the Council of Economic Advisers. These figures are approved by the Eisenhower administration. I take it they are approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

In January 1954 employment in manufacturing totaled 48,147,000. Let us look at the figures for January 1955. Employment was 47,802,000. That is a drop of more than 300,000 in employment.

The Secretary of the Treasury states that the bill he supported last year resulted in more jobs. The figures show a decrease of 300,000 jobs. That was the result of the accelerated depreciation provision and the additional benefits to owners of corporation stocks, when at the same time relief was denied to those individuals who really needed it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that during that year the number of jobs in the age group seeking work increased by from a million and a half to two million, and the number in what might be termed the labor force increased by at least 750,000?

Mr. LONG. Yes. Nevertheless the employment figure for nonfarm occupations is lower in January this year than it was in January a year ago. What has been happening? The first thing is that the administration has guaranteed to keep the folks down on the farm. None of the farm people are going to the city, because there are no jobs available. There had been a trend for many years of people leaving the farms to go to the cities, but there were no jobs in the cities in the past 2 years for them to take.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, I was a little surprised at the statement of the Senator from Illinois, who said, if I did not misunderstand him, that the President of the United States, President Eisenhower, was only interested——

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I did not refer to the President of the United States. I said the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know that the RECORD stands that way, because I was quite shocked, and I would like to hear what the RECORD actually says; but

unless I misheard, the distinguished Senator from Illinois referred to President Eisenhower as being interested only in the wealthy and not in the average citizen. That is not correct. The President has shown a very great interest in the problems of the people of the Nation. He himself is not a man of means. He has devoted a whole lifetime to the service of his country in the field of military service and as president of Columbia University and as President of the United States. So I wanted the RECORD to be very clear in that regard; and I did not want silence on my part to be interpreted as constituting acquiescence by me in what appeared to be an obviously erroneous statement of the matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I made such a statement, it was in error. I shall now ask the Official Reporter to read from his notes, so that we may determine whether I so referred to the President of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, I understood the Senator from Illinois to take the same position regarding the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, the Senator from California said I made such a statement about the President of the United States. So I now ask the Official Reporter to read that passage of his notes, so that we may see whether I so referred to the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Official Reporter will read as requested.

The Official Reporter (N. J. Cinciotta) read as follows:

> Is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury, with his real abilities, and they are real, tends to have a very restricted view of the welfare of the people of the Nation? He looks at the wealthy, and judges the prosperity of the Nation by the condition of the wealthy in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the RECORD will show that I did not so refer to the President of the United States. Therefore, Mr. President, I request that the Senator from California withdraw his statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Inasmuch as that is what the Official Reporter's notes show, I stand corrected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me also say that I stated that despite his capabilities, the Secretary of the Treasury holds that point of view. I think he holds that point of view honestly; but it is a narrow and restricted point of view, and it is that point of view which has led him into some of the mistakes he has made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in regard to the unemployment figures, they reflect that there was a considerable—indeed, a substantial—increase in Government employment, Federal State, and local, taken together; also there was some increase in employment in wholesale and retail trades.

The tabulation I have before me does not show it, but I believe that, if we had all the figures and all the facts in this connection, they would show a considerable increase in employment in domestic service because, in my opinion, many persons who have been displaced from jobs in mining and manufacture have sought jobs as servants—jobs which do not pay so much—but, nevertheless, good Americans as they are, they desire to work rather than to sit back, remain unemployed, and draw unemployment compensation checks indefinitely.

However, when we see what resulted from that proposal, which we were assured was going to put more people at work in the factories, we find that the actual result was that during the same year that proposal went into effect there was actually an increase in unemployment in both the factories and the mines. So it is apparent that the employment situation was worse in each of those 2 years. There was an increase of 1,000 in employment in construction alone, while there was a reduction of employment in mining and a major reduction of employment in manufacturing.

Of course, manufacturing is the one industry in which we would expect the greatest increase to occur. But there was a reduction rather than an increase in that area.

If the Secretary of the Treasury thinks his proposal to give aid, in the form of stock dividends and accelerated depreciation, will result in increased employment, he will find the record at variance—and to judge by his own figures in that respect, Mr. President—in terms of employment in manufacturing, mining, and construction.

Yet, Mr. President, when someone proposes the kind of tax relief which we believe will lead to more employment and will give greater purchasing power to the average citizen, the Secretary of the Treasury seems to believe that such a proposal is a political one because it will be of benefit to most of the people. On the other hand, the Secretary's recommendation would benefit very few; and he seems to believe that his recommendation would be nonpolitical, I suppose, because it would be of benefit to very few.

Thus, Mr. President, it would seem that in the view of the Secretary of the Treasury, a proposal which would be of benefit to very few in the Nation would be for the overall good of the Nation—whereas his position seems to be, that a proposal which would benefit everyone in the Nation, the mass of the people of the United States, is to be regarded as a political proposal.

When the Secretary of the Treasury was asked to test such a comparison, in terms of stating which one would cost more money, he replied by saying:

> This proposal is just as irresponsible, just as political, just as bad from every point of view, as the original proposal, with the added fault of repealing the things that have been helpful in reversing the field from doom and gloom to better times; to making jobs, instead of losing jobs.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Then the choice in this case is not between deficit spending, on the one hand, and a balanced budget, on the other; but, rather, is not the choice between which group of our citizens we shall allow to enjoy tax reduction—whether the many, on the one hand, who need tax reduction most; or the few, on the other hand, who need tax reduction the least? Is not that the choice?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. President, I was also rather concerned with the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, after he had charged that other persons were irresponsible. At that time he was asked, "How much revenue would this particular proposal bring in?" He replied, "I do not know."

Then he was asked, "How much would the other one bring in?" His reply was, "I do not know."

When the Secretary was asked how much the so-called Humphrey "blooper" would cost, he replied that he thought it would cost a few million dollars. But, Mr. President, it now seems that it will cost a billion dollars.

If there is to be responsibility in government, it seems to me we should expect the Secretary of the Treasury, above all others, to be able to tell us what the facts of our fiscal situation are and how much revenue the various tax reductions he has recommended have cost the Government, or how much revenue will be brought in by various Government revenue-adjustment measures which are being considered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana will recall that when the 1953 tax bill was before the Senate, the justification given for its passage was that it would increase both production and employment. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has already given the figures regarding employment, and he has shown conclusively that that law has not increased employment.

Is the Senator from Louisiana aware that at the hearing held on yesterday by the Banking and Currency Committee, which I attended, Marriner Eccles, former head of the Federal Reserve Board, testified that in the last month of 1954, production was still 5 percent under the average for 1953—showing conclusively that in spite of tax forgiveness in the form of repeal of the excess-profits tax, and in spite of the accelerated depreciation allowance and other tax benefits, which cost the Treasury in excess of $4 billion, there had been no increase either in production or in employment in the United States?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is right. Today, production is down. Although there are a few more jobs, they are in the less desirable positions.

The Senator from New York must keep in mind that we were told that bill would create more jobs in terms of factory employment. However, we were not told that it would keep more folks on the farms, or that it would send folks back to the farms, to live there with their families, when they could not find jobs in the cities. Instead, we were told that bill would result in putting more machinery into production, with the result that there would be greater production and, in that connection, greater industrial employment.

Instead, we have less production now than we had a year ago. The jobs in

manufacturing, mining, and construction are fewer rather than greater in number. I shall obtain the exact figure and place it in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not further a fact that the greater part of the deficit with which we have been faced for 2 years, and with which we are still faced, is due to the fact that we repealed the excess profits tax, permitted accelerated depreciation, forgave a part of the tax which was paid on dividends, and included other similar provisions in the tax bill? None of the Republicans emphasize that fact. They do not acknowledge that the deficit could have been avoided if we had not taken these steps, which have benefited no one, least of all the great mass of the people of the country.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, it was the Secretary's idea to refer to Democrats as being irresponsible, playing politics, and things of that sort. He referred to our proposals as being silly. I believe it is only fair to point out that before the House Ways and Means Committee Representative BOGGS asked the Secretary certain questions. I read from page 56 of the transcript of the hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee:

> Now, we have several other provisions in the bill that we have some estimates on. We have an estimate on the premium payment test on life insurance of $25 million. Have you made any studies on that, Mr. Secretary?
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. I am not prepared on that, no.

Mr. President, that was a tax reduction, a tax consideration, which the Secretary of the Treasury recommended. If we are to have responsible government, it seems to me that the Secretary of the Treasury should be able to tell us how much revenue loss has occurred as a result of the change in the premium payment test on life insurance policies. I know that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] debated that issue last year, and he estimated that it would cost a considerable amount of money. It seems to me that a responsible Secretary of the Treasury should be able to tell us how much that would have cost. However, his answer was:

> I am not prepared on that, no.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator. I am undertaking to obtain some responsible estimate from the Treasury Department as to the loss of revenue. I think the loss of revenue is very considerable for the present year, and that it will become larger and larger as time goes on, because that provision permits wealthy people to escape both the estate and gift taxes through the process of writing their wills by way of insurance policies.

Mr. LONG. I recall that the Senator was very much concerned about that question last year.

Let me read the next question and answer from the transcript of the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, as found on page 56 thereof:

> Mr. BOGGS. We had the same provision before us in 1948.
>
> Meaning the premium payment test on life insurance—
>
> We estimated that it might cost as much as a hundred million dollars.
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. I will be very glad to look it up and see, but I do not have it in mind at the moment.
>
> Mr. BOGGS. Is there anyone on your staff who can comment on the premium test on life insurance?
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. If you would like to give us a question on that subject, we would like to prepare it for you, Mr. BOGGS, so that we know what we are doing.
>
> Mr. BOGGS. All right, Mr. Secretary. I will appreciate an answer for the record on the life-insurance proposition.
>
> Now, we had an estimate of $10 million on soil and water conservation expenditures. Have you had any chance to study that?
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. I have the same feeling about that. I am not prepared to answer that question.
>
> Mr. BOGGS. Let me ask you a general question. Aside from these two provisions which are now up for repeal, have you had a chance to study any other sections of the bill?
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. I personally have not. The staff is working on the various things, the various items, which I have said we will be prepared to come in here with in 10 days or 2 weeks to present to you, and they are getting the data together, and when they get it together I am going to go over it, but until I have a chance to see it and go over it, I am not prepared to testify.
>
> Mr. BOGGS. May I ask my question another way: Has the staff made a study of all of the estimates we had before us last year, or just a few of them?
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. No, what they are doing is checking to see what, if any, estimates are apparently out of order or being changed radically as we have a little experience. And that is a continuing thing, Mr. BOGGS. That will have to go on right along. We may find we will go for some time before experience will show that some estimate will prove to be wrong. If we find that at any time, not today but any other time, next year, or the following year, if we find that this thing is not working as we thought and as you gentlemen thought it was going to work, that the thought of Congress is not being brought forward, we will bring it to your attention just as soon as we are sure of our facts.

Mr. President, not only here, but in other instances, we find that the Secretary of the Treasury cannot give us the facts about the Treasury. He comes before Congress with his experts and turns his experts over to us for examination, but still we cannot find out the facts. We are told at one time that the "Humphrey blooper" would not cost more than a few million dollars. At another time we are told that the cost might be in the billions of dollars. Yet the Secretary of the Treasury, making that type of record for himself, says that we are irresponsible and silly when we propose conscientiously to raise sufficient revenue to offset any loss to the Government as a result of finding the means to pay for tax relief for the average person.

Mr. STENNIS. I suggest the absence of a quurum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are at the point in the discussion of the tax bill before the Senate where we will determine in the main the fiscal policy of this country for a considerable period of time, as it relates to the burden of taxation, not only with reference to the burden of the amount of tax revenues, but also with reference to the principle of how the revenues will be collected and from whom.

The first and basic principle of American tax policy throughout our history has been the principle of ability to pay. We have called this principle progressive taxation.

In other words, the tax laws have been designed not only to obtain revenue but to obtain revenue equitably, and to obtain revenue with consideration of the ability of the taxpayer to pay and to assume his fair share of the burden.

The administration's tax proposal is merely one of continuing for another year the corporation and excise taxes. It makes no basic alteration in the present tax laws, and it would not remove from the tax laws any inequities or loopholes.

Over a considerable period of time some of us have demonstrated to the Senate, to the best of our ability, that there are a number of loopholes in our tax structure. I spent a good deal of time in that endeavor, and I have pointed out in other debates on tax policy that loopholes of tremendous proportions exist, and that such loopholes benefit a small number of our taxpayers and cost the Government of the United States a substantial amount of revenue, running into billions of dollars.

It is interesting to note that in section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, adopted by the 83d Congress, there is a provision which permits the establishment of reserves against future business expenses and their immediate chargeoff against current income.

This was brought out by a Member of the House of Representatives who was looking over the advertisements as well as the tax material presented by tax lawyers and accountants to their clients. In looking over the material he found, to his amazement, that there was a loophole in the tax laws which gave unusually large benefits to certain corporations. He brought this out at the time of the debate in the other House, and since that time there has been a good deal of what might be called reexamination of the Internal Revenue Act of 1954. I am quite intrigued at the way the administration passes off this "little" inadvertence which amounts to about $1 billion in 1 year. I have heard many a vitriolic speech over sums of money considerably less than that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. What social benefits will flow to the American people from this "little" inadvertence?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only benefit I can see at this stage is that it is revealing, by the fact of this "little" inadvertence, what I would call an incapacity on

the part of the administration really to write tax laws which are equitable. It may also have the social benefit of revealing to the American people that a billion-dollar tax loss, when it affects a few people, does not seem to be of major concern.

It seems to me that a bill which has been on the statute books and administered by the Treasury Department for better than 6 months should be carefully reexamined. The Department of the Treasury has little or no difficulty in finding out that some persons are short in their payments a few hundred dollars. The Treasury has all kinds of people to examine tobacco taxes and alcohol taxes, but when it came to a billion-dollar "blooper," one that no one seemed to be able to find, it is amazing to me that there can be charges made of irresponsibility against the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives regarding a $20 tax reduction and at the same time have in the Internal Revenue Act a billion-dollar loophole through which we could drive a Sherman tank crosswise.

Mr. GORE. That is by no means the only loophole in the Revenue Act of 1954.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It certainly is not.

Mr. GORE. It may be the biggest "blooper," but there are more of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am of the opinion that a very careful financial analytical analysis and examination of the act of 1954 would reveal some other startling developments.

I notice in the Washington Post and Times Herald a special story which tells us that the tax loophole will aid the Capital Transit Co. That company was listed in the House Ways and Means Committee as an example of a company free from paying any 1954 income tax under a provision permitting businesses to list expenses which though accrued in 1954 would not be paid until 1955. They could take 1954 vacations and also 1955 vacations based on work performed in 1954. I can well imagine how the average citizen would feel. Do not the American people wish they could take their vacations as a business expense—and not only once, but twice. They could stay twice as long on their vacations.

So there is a loophole in the act which was uncovered by a Member of the House who found it out by going over the documents and material prepared by tax lawyers and tax accountants. In fact, I have seen some of these prepared documents, and they are very beneficial to the large taxpayer.

I might point out that if one is in the upper-income brackets, under the 1954 Internal Revenue Act, he should have a tax lawyer. No matter how much the lawyer charged him, he would still be making money. There is a sort of hunting ground or financial game refuge for tax lawyers and tax accountants.

I am happy to report that the Secretary of the Treasury is going to see that this little inadvertent mistake will be corrected. It is interesting to me that the administration can find some inefficiency that may be costing a few hundred dollars, and can blow it up into a big story, but a billion-dollar loophole was not discovered by the able officials of the Treasury Department. A billion-dollar loophole in the tax laws, now to be passed off as an inadvertent mistake, was discovered by 1 or 2 able and alert Members of the House; and it will be remedied.

I am pleased to note that the administration is going to support the plugging of that loophole. My admonition to my colleagues is that they look into the plugging and see how much is really being done, because if there can be an inadvertent mistake of $1 billion, there may be a mistake of a couple of hundred million dollars, also, if we do not watch out.

Some of the other charges made in this debate are very interesting. I have heard, for example, that the proposals of the Democratic leadership are irresponsible. In fact, the newspaper headlines tell us that there have been angry statements made; that caustic statements have been passed out about the Democratic proposal. All at once the administration seems to have more concern about an unbalanced budget. I know they have been concerned about it during campaign years, but this is the third year of this administration, and the budget is still unbalanced.

As I said a few minutes ago, to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], this administration does not intend to balance the budget. It is not raising any more revenue for the $10 billion-a-year road program. They can have it paid off by certificates, or set it off in some capital account.

I do not care what we name it or where we put it, we cannot build a hundred billion dollars' worth of highways without paying for them. They will be paid for by only one source of revenue—tax revenue. They can be paid for only out of the Treasury of the United States.

The administration is also considering a school-construction program. That school-construction program will amount to $7 billion over a period of years. With a $100 billion 10-year road program and a $7 billion school program, we shall not have a balanced budget and will not raise any more revenue.

To me, Mr. President, it seems rather difficult to spend $107 billion of new money beyond our present commitments and not be somewhat concerned as to whether the budget will be in balance.

The argument might be turned on the Democratic leadership, and they be asked, "What are you planning to do about it?"

We intend to do two things: To supply additional revenue for the Treasury from persons and corporations who can afford to pay, by extending certain taxes which will automatically be lowered under present law and, at the same time, by plugging loopholes in the tax law; and second, we intend to provide some tax relief for the great multitude of the American people. This tax relief, in terms of dollars, will be spent in the marketplace, thereby generating renewed business activity, which in turn will provide a financial base of such proportions that additional revenue can be yielded to the Treasury. That is how the Democratic tax proposal finally boils down as to its application and effect.

A moment ago I asked a page boy to bring me a copy of today's Washington Post and Times Herald, which contains an article that was quite intriguing to me. It is characteristic of articles I have been reading on the financial pages of the Nation's press for some time.

On page 31, in the financial section of today's Washington Post and Times Herald, there is an article whose headline is: "Du Pont Earnings Rise, Sales Decline."

The article reads as follows:

> The Du Pont Co. reported sales for 1954 3½ percent less than 1953 but earnings totalled $344 million compared with $236 million for 1953.
>
> President Crawford H. Greenwalt, in the annual report to the stockholders set sales for last year at $1,688,000,000 compared to $1,750,000,000 for 1953.
>
> As announced previously, earnings for 1954 were $7.33 per share of common stock, compared to $4.94 a share for 1953.

Mr. President, listen to this:

> Greenwalt said this increase was due primarily to expiration of the excess profits tax.
>
> Of the 1954 earnings, $252 million came from Du Pont sources and $92 million from General Motors Corp. dividends. This compares with $162 million and $74 million from the same sources in 1953.

Mr. President, that is a classic example which can be found in industry after industry, corporation after corporation: Sales down, profits up. Profits are up for one simple reason: The tax loss resulting from the tax bill passed by the 83d Congress, a tax loss which gave special tax privileges to corporations and to persons in high-income brackets. This is but the beginning; there is still more to come under the existing tax structure.

Let us take a look at what the Democratic proposal is, to see how it applies to the present situation. The proposal which is being offered by the Democratic leadership would repeal the accelerated depreciation dividend provisions of the 1954 Revenue Act. To have that provision remain in the tax law will cost the Treasury $362 million a year for an indefinite period of time.

As we know, if we recall the tax fight of 1954, the Senate defeated the stock dividend credit provision; but when the bill came back from conference with the House, the modified stock dividend tax credit provision of $50 and the 4-percent tax relief on stock dividends were incorporated in the statute. This resulted in a loss to the Treasury of $362 million. That $362 million did not go to widows and orphans; it did not go to men and women working in factories; it did not go to the rank and file of the American people; it did not go to the farmers of America, who have seen not only their gross income, but also their net income, go down every single month.

The benefits of that tax reduction went to a handful of persons in this country who own the bulk of the stock. I shall not burden the RECORD again with the available statistics as to who owns the stock and who gets the tax relief. I shall not let anyone falsify or distort the RECORD by pointing out that more

than 80 percent of the American people have investments in stocks, because most of that stock is owned by insurance companies. The insurance companies themselves make investments in stocks, although we, as policyholders, are somehow or other supposed to be the recipients of the benefits derived from the stocks. I do not believe very many insurance-company policyholders have received any large tax rebates or reductions in their taxes because of the stock dividend credit provisions of the 1954 Revenue Act.

So one of the first provisions of the proposal before the Senate is to repeal the provision of the 1954 Revenue Act relating to stock-dividend credits.

Second, it is proposed to repeal the provision relating to accelerated depreciation of capital equipment. This will amount to a net saving to the Treasury of $1,618,000,000 by July 1, 1957.

The tax reduction of $20 for each taxpayer, excluding his spouse, plus the $10 deduction for each dependent, will cost the Treasury $1,261,000,000 for the same period.

Therefore, the revenue to be saved will result in net savings to the Treasury of $357 million.

That is the proposal which is presented on the part of the Democratic leadership in lieu of the administration's proposal of merely a 1-year continuance of corporation taxes, with no modification in the tax laws other than that, and no removal of any of the inequities.

The Democratic Party is also proposing an extension of the corporate- and excise-tax rates to July 1, 1957, and also the repeal of section 462 of the 1954 Revenue Act.

The extension of the corporate and excise taxes would bring into the Treasury an additional $3,537,000,000 more than would the proposed administration bill, mostly during the next 2 fiscal years.

The repeal of section 462 would save an undetermined amount, but an amount conservatively estimated to exceed $1 billion, which was the little, inadvertent mistake of the administration.

If we add that amount, we find that there will be approximately $4,500,000,000 of new revenue up to 1957. It appears to me that that is a substantial amount of revenue, which will give the administration an opportunity to fulfill, by Democratic action in Congress, the promise of a balanced budget. We shall accomplish this by repealing the accelerated depreciation and dividend-credit provisions of the 1954 tax act. At the same time, we shall be giving a tax cut to the individual taxpayers and families of America, in the amounts of $20 for the head of the household and $10 for each dependent. The tax deduction will cost the Treasury $1,261,000,000, but there will be brought into the Treasury new revenues aggregating $1,618,000,000, as a result of the repeal of the stock-dividend credit and accelerated depreciation provisions of the 1954 Revenue Act. Actually, the Treasury will have a net gain of $357 million.

I do not believe any Member of the Senate would want to defend a continuation of section 462 as it is now written.

Mr. President, so that we may have a very clear understanding of the proposal advanced by the six Democratic members of the Senate Committee on Finance, and so that the administration may know what the facts are, rather than believe their own description of the facts, I wish to put into the RECORD the exact data which have been developed as to the economic effects of this particular tax proposal.

I wish again to state that I am convinced the Secretary of the Treasury has not taken the time to read the proposal of the six Democratic members of the Committee on Finance advanced as an amendment to the administration's tax proposal, because if the Secretary of the Treasury had read it, and if the administration were sincere about its desire for a sound fiscal policy, the word should be coming down from the White House and the Treasury Department to support what the Democratic members are proposing.

The revenue effect of the new proposed amendment in terms of fiscal years, without consideration of additional extension of excise and corporate tax rates and repeal of expense reserve provision is as follows: The repealing of the rapid depreciation provisions effective March 9, 1955 would result in savings, effected in fiscal 1956, of $175 million; in fiscal 1957, of $900 million; and in fiscal 1958, of $1,450,000,000.

The proposal would repeal the dividend credit and exclusion provisions effective July 1, 1955. I want the RECORD to note we are not breaking faith with the people who have made investments in capital improvement under the so-called fast writeoff of the amortization provision. We are going to give them credit for what they have done, and we are not permitting favoritism in terms of stock dividend credit; but by repealing the dividend credit provision, savings effected in fiscal 1956 would be $181 million, receipts into the Treasury. In fiscal 1957, the savings would be $362 million.

Effective January 1, 1956, the Democratic proposal would provide a tax credit of $20 for each taxpayer of the Nation, not including spouses, plus $10 credit for all dependents other than spouses.

What would be the effect of that proposal? The cost in fiscal 1956 would be $454 million; in fiscal 1957 it would be $908 million. The net fiscal effect of the changes in the tax revenues to this Government are included in a tabulation which I hold in my hand.

I ask unanimous consent to have the tabulation incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVENUE EFFECT OF NEW PROPOSAL (IN TERMS OF FISCAL YEARS), WITHOUT CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL EXTENSION OF EXCISE AND CORPORATE TAX RATES AND REPEAL OF EXPENSE RESERVE PROVISION

1. Repeal rapid-depreciation provisions effective March 9, 1955:

Savings effected in fiscal year:

1956	$175,000,000
1957	900,000,000
1958	1,450,000,000

2. Repeal dividend credit and exclusion provisions effective July 1, 1955:

[In millions of dollars]

	Liability	Receipts
Savings effected in fiscal year—		
1956	362	181
1957	362	362

3. Effective January 1, 1956, provide a $20 tax credit for each taxpayer, with none for spouse, plus a $10 credit for all dependents other than spouses, effective only to the extent that the credit exceeds any advantage obtained by income-splitting benefits.

[In millions of dollars]

	Liability	Receipts
Cost in fiscal year—		
1956	454	353
1957	908	908

4. Net fiscal effect of changes in:

[In millions of dollars]

	Liability	Receipts
Fiscal year—		
1956: Gross savings	537	356
Tax credit cost	454	353
Net savings	83	3
1957: Gross savings	1,262	1,262
Tax credit cost	908	908
Net savings	354	354

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish the RECORD to show that in fiscal 1957 there would be approximately $354 million in net savings for the Treasury, or increased revenues for the Treasury, under the proposals we have outlined, exclusive of the extension of corporate and excise-tax proposals.

Let us see if there is any economic justification for what we are attempting to do. I think it is fair to say that a tax bill has as much to do with the nature of the economy as has any other single measure. Taxation not only provides revenue for the Government; it sometimes has a great deal to do with the tempo of our economic system.

What is the most obvious fact about the American economy? I think every report of every respected economic institution and economist would reveal that this is essentially a consumer's economy; that when consumption ability is high, business prosperity is sound and good; that when the consumer has dollars to spend, investment in capital plant is heavy. I am not one who favors limiting the incentives for capital investment, but I wish the RECORD to be clear that, insofar as this Senator is concerned, the best incentive for capital investment is high business activity at the wholesale and retail levels.

When the American consumer is buying and causing an expansion in production, investment capital in new plant constantly goes up.

As I pointed out about 6 months ago on the floor of the Senate, during the debate on the 1954 Revenue Act, there is no evidence that by adjusting downward the tax rate on corporate income or on stock dividends, the rate of investment in capital goods is really affected. The corporate tax rate in 1922 was about as low as it has been in recent years. The

corporate tax rate in 1952 was the highest it has ever been in the history of the country. Yet in 1952 economic reports reveal that the individual stockholders in America were not investing a substantially larger part of their income in stocks than they were in 1922, or vice versa, they were not investing less than they were in 1922.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator recall the argument made by the Secretary of the Treasury last year that providing additional incentives to individuals to purchase corporation stock would result in more employment, and encourage people to make private investments, and encourage stock purchase? If that was the objective, I think we have gone as far as we can, because stocks have increased by $50 billion in value over what they were 2 years ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know that. While stocks have been increasing in value by $50 billion, insofar as the tax bill of 1954 was concerned, which it was alleged would result in more independent enterprises, that result has not occurred. There are fewer independent enterprises than there were a year ago. There are more mergers than there were a year ago. The rate of mergers is at an all-time high for 25 years. I think one of the facts the Committee on Banking and Currency will be looking into is the effect of the Republican sponsored tax bills on the stock market, and the effect of the Republican sponsored tax bills on corporate profits. Corporate profits are reflected in the earnings of common stock, preferred stock, and bonds. I think when that committee gets through with the inquiry, it will find that the tax proposals enacted in the 83d Congress had primarily as their effect the devaluing of the purchasing power of literally hundreds of thousands of the American people. There is no beneficial effect on farm income as a result of the Republican sponsored tax bills. The only area of income affected by the tax law is stock market income.

Parenthetically, it is interesting to note that every time the Republic Party gets a tax bill passed, it affects the stock market—not the stock market where there are Texas longhorns or good Angus cattle, but the Wall Street stock market. I hope it is nothing but accident—I hope it is not just constant coincidence—that when Republican administrations take hold of the fiscal policy of the United States, there is always a drop in agricultural net income and a rise in top financial net income. But I wish to say to my friends in the Republican Party, that is the fact.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Minnesota know that during the same fiscal period, small businesses have not increased their income? Instead, they have had major reductions of income, for the fact is that corporations with assets of less than $250,000—the bottom group, but the group containing the largest number—actually have had their income reduced by approximately two-thirds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Not only has their income been reduced but, as I pointed out a moment ago, because of the nature of the tax law of 1954, it has acted as an incentive to mergers. So instead of having a greater number of independent business enterprises to give vitality to the competitive system which is the free, automatic regulatory device for a fair price system, we see a greater and greater number of mergers and a greater and greater tendency toward monopoly in both production and distribution.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Insofar as corporate income is involved, even the statements presented to us do not reflect all of the corporations' increased earnings, because, as pointed out in the letter issued by the National City Bank of New York during the last week, many corporations present to their stockholders double statements, one showing the profit in terms of the corporation's books as that profit is to be reported to the Government, and the other showing the corporation's real profit, in view of the fact that last year the Government let the corporations take an artificial depreciation far beyond the real depreciation in the value of their equipment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is a very articulate and very able member of the Senate Finance Committee. He has had the privilege and opportunity of hearing the testimony by financial experts, both those in the Government and those outside the Government. I am happy that the Senator from Louisiana not only is correct now, but likewise in the past he has been correct.

I recall his speech of last year on the tax bill, when he warned the Senate where the tax relief would go and what its effect would be. I recall that he also pointed out what could happen under the so-called accelerated depreciation method, or tax writeoff method, in terms of relief to the larger corporate interests.

The Senator from Louisiana may recall that I asked whether that method would be of help to the small business establishments; and I pointed out that although theoretically it might be of value and of help to them, actually they were few real benefits for them. Does the Senator from Louisiana feel that is correct?

Mr. LONG. I feel, as a matter of fact, that there is some merit to a proposal for expanding aid to industry by way of allowing accelerated depreciation. However, although industry has received all sorts of advantages, and has been permitted to keep many more savings than it was previously permitted to keep, that policy has not been of great benefit to the Nation, because at the same time the Government has ignored the need of the great mass of the people for greater purchasing power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has said what the economic experts have frankly stated as their opinion and what they advise. In the monthly reports or newsletters or economic reports of prominent banking institutions, I have read statements such as the one the Senator from Louisiana has just reiterated. I shall not burden the RECORD by reading into it, in full, the minority views, as submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and certain other members of the Finance Committee; but I suggest that all Senators read those minority views. When they do read them, I suggest they will find in them a very sound case, economically, for the proposal which is being sponsored by the six Democratic members of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. President, I cannot help but make note of one or two paragraphs in the minority views, in light of the hue and cry about irresponsibility, as that hue and cry has been raised on Capitol Hill, and at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and at the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, who is irresponsible? How irresponsible does one have to be before he is called irresponsible, when he cannot write a tax law that does not have a $1 billion mistake in it?

I suggest that when someone starts charging irresponsibility, he had better take a look at himself. The Treasury Department, with all its attorneys and experts, could not find a $1 billion mistake. Mr. President, one must be very, very blind to miss such a mistake; either that, or he is so interested in big business and big figures, that $1 billion does not impress him.

But I should like to remind the Treasury Department that the $1 billion "blooper" in section 462 is about three times the amount of the tax relief the Administration provided for the 165 million American people, exclusive of the large corporations and business groups. That was done by just that "one little blooper" in section 462.

Early in 1954, the present administration forecast a 1955 fiscal year deficit of ¢2,900,000,000. Let me suggest, in a spirit of charity, that the administration increase that estimate to one of approximately $4 billion. I recall that in the fall of 1954, the Secretary of the Treasury visited my home city of Minneapolis, Minn., and, while there, suggested that possibly the deficit might even be $4 billion or more.

Now, Mr. President, the same administration which knew it faced a deficit of $2,900,000,000, at a minimum—although when the administration honestly evaluated the deficit, it found it to be one of approximately $4 billion—did not seem to think it was irresponsible to propose a tax-relief bill which gave no relief to those who needed it, but gave a great deal of relief to the forces, groups, and persons who really did not need it. The administration had no hesitancy in proposing, under the guise of proposing a codification of the tax laws, a tax-relief bill amounting to relief of more than $3 billion for such groups. No, Mr. President; there was no irresponsi-

bility in doing that. On the contrary, that was economic statesmanship. Ah. It was what this country really needed, Mr. President. The deficit forecast for the fiscal year 1955 was—by the administration's own estimates—$2,900,000,000; but it actually became very much larger. That administration proceeded to get through Congress a tax bill by means of which 77 percent of the immediate tax relief and 91 percent of long-term tax relief went to corporations and large income earners; and ever since then the administration has spent a great deal of time every month in trying to explain why that tax bill was good for the country.

I stated on the floor of the Senate that if it takes the newspapers of America 3 months in concerted series of articles to explain why a tax bill is good, there is something wrong with it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was called out of the Chamber, and have just returned. I wish to ask which tax bill the Senator from Minnesota is talking about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The tax bill of 1954.

Mr. BARKLEY. When I was called out of the Chamber, the Senator from Minnesota was discussing with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] the question of whether that tax bill had benefited the country economically; and he was talking about the stock market and the rise in prices in the stock market.

I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota can give us any figures in regard to the comparative rise in stock prices, thereby bringing profits to those who owned stocks and then sold them, under the high prices, and also any figures regarding any benefit which has come to the general public as a result of the stock-price rises, and also any information as to whether the tax law of last year has resulted in the establishment of any new industries anywhere, or has resulted in the creation of any new factories anywhere, or has actually created dividends which have been paid to those who own stocks for investment, rather than for speculation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, our esteemed friend.

Mr. BARKLEY. My information and observation is that there has been no increase in dividends to stockholders who bought stocks years ago for investment and not for the purpose of selling them on a high market and buying them back on a low market. They invested their money in long-term securities—common stocks, we will say—for the purpose of having an income from such stocks. I do not now know, and I have not received any information—although I am making a study of such subjects day by day—whether there has been any increase, because of the tax bill passed last year, in the normal, year-to-year dividends of those who have put a little money in stocks in order to have income. Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On Monday I intend to have the facts to which the Senator refers. I have had my office looking into the subject. A few moments ago I stated to the majority leader that I would have preferred to withhold some of this comment until Monday. The research material for which the Senator from Kentucky is asking will be available, and I shall make it available for the RECORD. It is my impression that the long-term investor, so far as any appreciable increase is concerned, has not had the benefit of additional dividends.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my impression.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the short-term operator, the man who buys and sells quickly, has been reaping the profit.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not dividends. That represents an increase in the price of stocks. The operator tries to get in when the price of a stock is low, and get out when it is high, and make a profit. That is not the regular dividend about which I am talking.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator inform the Senate whether, as a result of the tax bill of last year, a single new factory has been established anywhere in the United States to employ people? If so, I should like to know where it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not aware of any. Possibly some new factories have been established, but I am sure that much of the planning and designing in connection with those factories occurred before that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been claimed, indeed, it was claimed before the committee by the Secretary of the Treasury, that the tax law of last year has given great stimulus to business, has brought about greater employment, and has brought investment of capital into new industries. If that is true, I should like to know where they are and what they are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to know, too. I have not witnessed such advancement in the area which I in part represent. I point out that we were having a substantial business expansion before the 1954 Internal Revenue Act was passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have had a substantial business expansion in the past 22 years, beginning in 1933, when we were in the midst of a profound depression. We gradually climbed out of that and became the greatest producing nation in the world. Our production record during that period was greater than at any other previous time in our entire history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I think it should be pointed out that in the period from 1946 through 1953 the average annual rate of capital investment was more than $27 billion for every year, even though there were so-called high taxes, and even before the great benefits of the Republican-sponsored tax bill of 1954 came about. We were able to go along on our poor living standards, with a $27½ billion capital improvement every year for a period of 7 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. In spite of our high taxes due to war, due to the depression, and all the other things, we climbed from a total production of about $40 billion in 1932 to more than $300 billion in 1954.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To more than $350 billion. The Senator is correct.

A few moments ago I pointed out that even when corporation taxes were as low as they were in 1922, as compared with the high of 1952, the actual total percentage of individual investments in stocks for business expansion was no greater than it was in 1952, so it was not tax rate which provided the incentive. What provides the primary incentive for an American business corporation which is really out to do business and sell products rather than symbols is consumer purchasing power.

I want the record to be complete. Every single economic study that has been made of the fourth quarter of 1954, which reveals an upturn in the economy, predicates that upturn upon one principle alone—not investment capital, not a tax bill, but the availability of consumer spending, and the fact that consumers went into their savings to take out additional funds for consumer spending and expanded consumer credit.

The whole purpose of the Democratic tax proposal before the Senate is to give a little extra to the consumer, to the individual, to whom tax relief will not necessarily represent a saving, but rather increase spending in the market place, to generate new business, new distribution, new wholesaling, and new manufacturing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Speaking of politics in tax bills—and that is the charge now made—if this proposal, which some of us have brought forward, is politics, fiscal irresponsibility, and silliness, it sounds as though we have entered an era of Government by epithet.

I recall that in 1948 the 80th Congress was controlled by our opponents. That was a presidential year. We had reduced our public debt from the end of the war in 1945 up until 1948, from about $275 billion to about $254 billion, or a reduction of more than $20 billion in our national debt. A tax bill was passed by a Republican Congress in a presidential year, with political undertones and connotations.

President Truman vetoed the bill. It was passed over his veto. It did not do the political party which inaugurated it any good, because it lost that year.

Last year was another political year. The Republican Party brought forth a tax reduction bill with respect to which great boasts were made all over the United States. I ran into them on every street corner in Kentucky. It was boasted that the Republicans had reduced taxes by $7 billion. The other day, before the Committee on Finance, the Secretary of the Treasury started by saying, "We reduced taxes by more than $7 billion last year." I asked, "Whom do you mean by 'We'? He replied, "The Government of the United States."

Of course, it was the Government, composed of both the Congress and the

executive branch. He conceded that more than $6 billion of the $7¼ billion tax reduction was brought about by the Democrats, who, before they went out of power, had provided for the expiration of certain taxes.

Of course, that was a political year. I have no doubt that there were political undertones and connotations in connection with that bill, as it was recommended by the administration. It did not seem to do them any good in 1954. Now they come forth with a hope, held out by the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury, that in 1956, which will be another presidential election year, they will reduce taxes somewhat further; yet they object to a reduction at this time, to take effect in 1956, but which would project itself into 1957, with a proposal to balance the budget of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Kentucky has put his finger on what undoubtedly is the most important issue before us. I think what is really bothering the administration is not so much what we are proposing in the tax bill as the fact that the Democrats are proposing it. The timing does not please them.

I am sure that what is really in the minds of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Republican leadership, from the President on down, is the fact that they would like so much to be able to make this proposal next year. We are going to help them, by getting the program underway this year and taking it out of the election by putting it over until 1957.

Of course, this administration does not want to play politics with our fiscal policy. This administration wants to have fiscal responsibility. The best way to get fiscal responsibility is to pass a fair tax bill in 1955, which would be effective through 1957. Then the administration would not have to play politics with fiscal matters in 1956.

We shall be able to keep the record clean. We shall be able to keep the financial atmosphere pure. We shall be able to give to business the assurance it needs for several years, rather than having to wait until political developments make it more desirable to have a tax reduction in 1956. In addition the proposal sponsored by the Democratic Members of the Senate, as ably explained by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is a measure which will not only give tax relief where it is needed, but will also bring some equity into our tax laws, where it is needed.

All the charges about irresponsibility and foolishness and silliness are charges that fall right back on the administration. The administration has been irresponsible if it sets up as its standard a deficit for taxes at a time of needed tax relief. The administration has had nothing but a deficit since it has been in power. They are just as interested in maintaining one as any previous administration; in fact, it is guaranteeing that there will be one. In the face of that situation, the administration wants to give tax relief on its terms. So far as being silly is concerned, I would suggest that nothing is sillier than to have a responsible officer of the administration come before Congress and admit that he could not find a billion-dollar loophole in the tax law. How silly can one get? That is really a silly matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The same distinguished officer of the administration who came before the Committee on Finance claimed that the $20 deduction which the House approved would lose $2,300,000,000 to the Treasury, and that it would create a $4,600,000,000 inflation fund for the American people. In other words, he multiplied by 2 the amount of revenue he said would be lost to the Treasury, and then used it as a sort of scarecrow against inflation, when, as a matter of fact, assuming that the Government would buy a certain amount of goods and services which would cost $2,300,000,000, it would not cost the Government any more whether it borrowed the money or had it in the Treasury.

Therefore, it is not true that turning back $2,300,000,000 to the people would create twice as much inflation. Does not the Senator agree that such a statement skirts around the lake of silliness?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The lake of silliness; yes.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT TO CONSIDER EN BLOC CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE TAX BILL AND TO LIMIT DEBATE ON THE BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may yield to me for the purpose of enabling me to make a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that he will thereby not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the amendments which I have at the desk, and which have been printed, are offered under the unanimous-consent request which I shall later propose, I be permitted to offer them en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is at the desk a unanimous-consent request submitted on behalf of the minority leader and myself, which we desire to have read for the information of the Senate and considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Tuesday, March 15, 1955, after the close of morning business, the pending bill, H. R. 4259, shall be considered under the following limitation of debate:

Two hours on any amendment, motion, or appeal excluding substitutes), to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD];

Four hours on each substitute, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer thereof and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD];

Two hours on the question of the passage of the bill, motion, or appeal, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]: *Provided*, That if Mr. BYRD is in favor of any amendment or substitute, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or someone designated by him: *Provided further*, That, with the exception of the amendment designated as 3-10-55-B, intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and certain other Senators) and ordered printed on March 10, 1955, no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR AND PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are certain noncontroversial nominations on the Executive Calendar. I hope that at some time during the day on Monday next we may be able to consider all such nominations.

Also on the Executive Calendar is the nomination of the Honorable John Marshal Harlan to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader with respect to this nomination, and we have agreed that as soon as the Senate disposes of the tax bill it will proceed to the consideration of that nomination. I merely wish to make this announcement at this time so the Senate will be on notice.

It is the plan of the majority leader to have the Senate sit as late on Monday evening and as far into the evening as it may be desirable in order to accommodate as many Senators as possible who wish to speak. The Senate may sit until 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening on Monday if Senators desire to speak.

It is our plan to have the Senate convene at 12 o'clock on Tuesday, and after morning business to proceed with the tax bill under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the unanimous-consent request was agreed to, I was commenting on some of

the more pertinent observations made by the minority of the Senate Finance Committee concerning the tax proposals before it and concerning some of the administration's fiscal policies. I cannot help but read these words, because I think they are stated so succinctly and are so pertinent that it would be unnecessary and unworthy to try even to elaborate upon them. The minority report says:

It was not considered "fiscal irresponsibility" to deprive the treasury of $1 to $2 billion a year in revenue for a period extending 18 years into the future by granting large corporations rapid depreciation benefits.

These provisions were not approved through mere inadvertence. They were enacted over the vigorous protests of the then minority which presented an alternative plan that would have granted the greater part of the tax relief to the lower-income brackets which stood in the greatest need.

On this basis, it is fair to assume that the present administration regards "fiscal responsibility" as that state of affairs in which the rich get richer and the poor are expected to balance the budget.

Despite this precedent, however, we have no intention of emulating the casual disregard toward the problem of budget balancing displayed by the present administration in 1954. We recognize that this is not merely an academic issue and we intend to deal with it responsibly and squarely.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If I may suggest, the point made by the majority of the Democrats on the committee is even more valid at this moment than it was when the report was written, because subsequently the Secretary of the Treasury went before the House committee and testified that the so-called balance-the-budget substitute which would give tax relief to the little people of this Nation and regain sufficient revenue so the Government would have more money rather than less emoney, was even a worse proposal than the one which we had been discussing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana, I believe, read such a comment by the Secretary of the Treasury into the RECORD in the presentation of his argument.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is quite obvious that no matter what proposal may be advanced, other than the administration proposal, it is to be branded by the public relations experts as irresponsible.

Mr. LONG. And silly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And silly. I suggest that what the administration needs is an economist rather than a slogan-maker or one who knows how to concoct words to apply to a sensible fiscal program.

Mr. LONG. The effect of what the Secretary of the Treasury had to say is that it is a fine thing for the Nation to go into debt in order to give tax relief to corporations, but it is a terrible thing to do something for the people generally in terms of tax reductions to the average American family, even when we raise compensating revenues.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will read the testimony of Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. He testified before the Finance Committee on Tuesday, March 1, 1955. He presented some very pertinent material as it relates to unemployment. While he makes some observations as to what has been happening to the employment picture in the past year, he notes, for example:

Despite the widespread impression that the unemployment situation has improved recently, due in part to the tendency of Government press releases in any administration to paint a rosy picture, the unemployment situation has not improved appreciably. Seasonally adjusted, full-time unemployment in December 1954 was about 3 million, and the true level of unemployment—translating the part-time unemployment into its full-time equivalent—about 3.7 million.

So, Mr. President, the facts are that we are not exactly out of our economic difficulties. The facts are that the fiscal policy of this Government should be directed toward an expanding economy, an accelerated amount of production and consumption; and the best way to obtain this is through a tax policy which accords its benefits to the consuming public, the family units, and the individual purchasers of the country, thereby giving them the advantage of increased income to be expended in the market place.

Mr. President, I shall bring my argument to a conclusion. I shall address the Senate on Monday or Tuesday as to what is developing in our economy and discuss our fiscal and tax policies. The real argument and issue in this dispute over tax policies is as to where the tax relief should come from and to whom it should go. Secondly, when?

Let us be very frank about it, Mr. President. The President of the United States, in his state of the Union address, stated quite categorically that next year the administration is planning additional tax relief. Are we to interpret that as meaning that next year corporation taxes will be reduced; that next year, even under the proposal of this year, there will be an automatic reduction? Is that the tax relief which is proposed? Or is it that next year the administration will come back with the original proposal with reference to stock dividends which provided a 15-percent tax relief, as it was originally presented, rather than a 4-percent tax relief which came out of the committee as a compromise?

I have heard no word that they contemplate any reduction in individual taxes on earned income, either in terms of dependency allowance or in any other terms. There has not been even as much as a faint, inarticulate expression of tax relief for the earned income of 95 percent of the taxpayers, nor has there been any expressed intention on the part of administration spokesmen for the relief of those who have an income of $5,000 or less a year. What we hear is that there will be some tax adjustments in 1956. We hear that 1956 will give the administration an opportunity further to consider the tax laws with the objective in mind of additional tax relief.

The time to deal with the problem is when it is before us. The administration has come to the Congress and asked for an extension of corporation and excise taxes for another year. The question of tax policy is, therefore, pertinent, and amendments to the tax bill are, therefore, germane.

A substantial number of Members of the Senate a year ago felt that the tax bill as then passed was inequitable, that it gave too many benefits to a limited number of persons, and that it provided new loopholes in the tax structure which could only lead to further abuses. Speech after speech was made on this floor on those very issues.

Considerably more than 40 votes were cast for a $20 tax reduction for each and every taxpayer. We came within 2 or 3 votes of adopting that very measure in the Senate.

To quote another phrase of the administration, "This is the opportunity to take a good new look," at the tax program. What should that new look include? A simple little peek produced a $1 billion loophole. Someone got down, looked through a small keyhole, and found a $1 billion loophole.

There were some Members who felt that the stock dividend tax credit relief provision was not warranted at a time when the budget was unbalanced, at a time when no tax relief was given to the great numbers of American people. We so stated, and we so voted. Let the record be clear that the United States Senate took out of the tax bill the provision for stock dividend credit relief. That was our record in the 83d Congress. We had no choice, later, but to accept a compromise bill, because it was a revenue bill.

But all we are seeking to do in the proposal now before the Senate is to reaffirm the decision once made by the Senate, namely, to clean out of the tax laws the special benefit, special privilege, special consideration, and special credit group, which is a limited group at that, who are provided with stock dividend credits in terms of tax relief.

This is not new for us; this is merely an effort to reiterate and reestablish the position which was taken on that item by a substantial number in the Senate a year ago.

So far as the fast writeoff provision, the accelerated depreciation provision, is concerned, I charge that that provision was never fully explained to the Senate. I recall the debate; I participated in it. We were told how much it would cost the first year, and perhaps the second year; but we were unable to get the complete table of figures which would have projected the cost 10 or 20 years into the future.

The truth is, that in that section of the tax bill alone, there were billions and billions of dollars of tax credit, so to speak, to be given to a handful of large industries. So we say, Let us repeal that provision. In fact, a large number of Members of the Senate in 1954 voted against that very provision, and other Members of the Senate were doubtful about it in their own minds even when they voted for it.

Now the opportunity is at hand for us to do what needs to be done, namely, to remove inequities from our tax laws.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the loss would amount to about $7 billion a year, and the total would be, roughly, $13 billion. We did not hear anything about that. But when the Government spends a billion dollars to support farm prices, we read about it in every newspaper in America. Yet 13 times as much as $1 billion was involved in that one loophole, about which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is talking..

I wish to compliment him on bringing this situation to the attention of the American people, and I shall certainly support him in his position.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I ask him, Is it not interesting to note that when the stock market goes up, up, and up, the Republican leadership on Pennsylvania Avenue says, "That is a good sign of economic health"; but when farm prices go up, it says, "Oh, we must get those prices down"?

Whenever the price of beef goes up, the Secretary of Agriculture says, "The price is inflated; it must come down."

Whenever it has been possible to get the price of wheat up to a point where a farmer can start to make a good living and enjoy a few of the common things of life, immediately the Secretary of Agriculture comes charging in and saying, "We must do something about this. We will have to get the price of wheat down."

But when profits go up, and when stock prices go up, the big-business spokesmen of the administration say, "That is a healthy sign. This is the way things should be."

I said a moment ago that the only prices in which this administration is interested are the prices of stock on the stock market.

I wish the administration leaders would come to Minnesota and take a look at the stock prices in the stockyards in south St. Paul. When we come right down to it, I say to my good friends from North Dakota and Louisiana, that the prosperity of this country is not going to be measured by fictitious values on the stock market in New York. The Nation's prosperity will be better measured by the prices of the stock in somebody's pasture and somebody's feed lot. It will be better measured by prices in the Chicago Stockyards than by prices on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the tremendous fall in hog prices in the past 2 months?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware of it. I am aware of the fact that only a little more than a year ago hogs were selling for $30 a hundredweight. The price is now down to between $14 and $16 a hundredweight.

I am also aware of the fact that the leaders of the administration do not have as much as one little bead of perspiration on their collective brows about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I follow very closely the hog price quotations in central Illinois. The figures of $15.50 and $16 are really for the choice hogs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, they are.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When sows and other hogs of inferior quality are considered, the price is down to $13, and that is the price at the shipping points. The price realized by farmers, as the Senator from Minnesota well knows, is somewhat less than that, due to the cost of transportation, watering, insuring, and handling.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct.

I make the further suggestion that the administration spokesmen, who have expressed such great concern about the irresponsibility of the Democratic leaders—and I should think perhaps that would even include the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota because of his loyalty, interest in, and dedication to the interests of his people, whom he, in part, represents in the Senate—have not even given a passing glance to the matter of depressed farm prices. They are beginning to say that the market is returning to normal; that they have readjusted it; that they have the agricultural market back to normal.

I repeat what I said a moment ago: Every time the Republican leadership finishes passing a tax bill or perfecting its economic policy, two things happen: We can be certain that farm prices will go down and that stock-market prices will go up.

A man could come to the United States and not know upon his arrival which political party was in power. He could be blindfolded and not be able to read or write. But if he had ever heard anything about the political history of the United States, all that would be necessary would be to tell him the prices of agricultural commodities and the prices on the stock market. If the stock-market prices were extraordinarily high, and hog prices were extremely low, he would not have to be a college graduate to be able to know that the Republicans were in power.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was the Senator on the floor when I read the price of eggs as being 6 cents a dozen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was.

Mr. LANGER. Some Member disputed the statement and said it was not true. I telegraphed to Rutland, N. Dak., for corroboration. I was advised that a farmer there had sold 30 dozen eggs and had received $1.80 for them, or 6 cents a dozen.

Does my distinguished friend from Minnesota remember the drought years of the 1930's?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. LANGER. Were eggs selling any lower at that time than 6 cents a dozen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be a cruel and inhuman treatment to require hens to lay eggs for less than 6 cents a dozen.

While the Secretary of Agriculture may not know it, every chicken has got to be a pullet once in its life. Those 6 cents a dozen eggs were pullet eggs. During the campaign, after I had written to the Secretary about the price of eggs, he replied that they were pullet eggs. In the section from which I come the farmers have not been able to do anything about persuading chickens to bypass the pullet stage. They still want to be pullets and to lay eggs. It is hardly worthwhile, from what I know, for a chicken to lay eggs at 6 cents a dozen.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator remember what was said about the price that was received for white leghorn hens?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember that white leghorn hens were selling for 8 or 9 cents a pound—with feathers.

Mr. LANGER. I imagine a mother trying to send her daughter to college on 6 cents a dozen eggs and 50 cent hens.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota is really unappreciative of what is being done for those folks. Does he not realize that they have had stock dividend credits made available to them? Does he not realize that the administration has provided stock dividend credits for those farmers? Does he not realize that the administration has provided a fast writeoff for big-capital plants?

These are all benefits the farmers have had an opportunity to read about in the newspapers; now they are wondering when their turn is coming.

Mr. LANGER. Babysitters are taken care of.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Only some; that is, the working mother is taken care of, provided she does not earn too much. When she reaches the point where she earns enough to enjoy the time when she has a babysitter, she cannot enjoy the tax benefits.

Mr. LANGER. I do not think the Senator should take all the credit away from the Republicans, because they did take care of the babysitters.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I hope it is not stated that something was done for the babysitter. There was a provision in the bill advanced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to obtain certain benefits for a working mother, so there is a small tax provision to help a working mother. But the babysitter obtained no relief. She had to depend on the amendment supported by the Democrats.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not going to make this a Democratic amendment. I am going to make it a bipartisan amendment. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is going to work on the amendment. He represents an attitude and a philosophy of the Democratic Party which every American can embrace. I wish to make this a bipartisan proposal. If we can get 2 more Republicans to vote for it, we will get it agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am lucky to have my own vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is in good hands. We will need that vote. The Senator

from North Dakota will cast his vote for the people.

I think the administration has some answering to do on its tax policy. It took us up and down and over the hurdles on tight credit. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is now presiding, gave many a splendid address on tight credit, and alerted us to its dangers, as did the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators, and occasionally the junior Senator from Minnesota joined in the colloquy, because, in my book, hard money means hard times.

Then the administration decided it would give some tax relief. I want to say the administration gave tax relief to those it knows best. There is a natural tendency for people to know best those who are in their own environment. They generally have an appreciation of the problems of the persons they know best. It is understandable why the present administration gave tax relief to corporations. It is understandable why the present administration gave tax relief to persons who receive large stock dividends. I suppose it is understandable why the administration did not give tax relief to the remainder of the American people who were denied any tax relief. Members of the administration had not met them. But the administration thought about that a great deal. It cut farm price supports. If the administration can prove that the cutting of the farm supports was beneficial, I should like to hear the evidence.

In and out of office, the Republican Party has talked about fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget. Its members are experts at least in the talk field on that particular subject. Some of us have not been quite so concerned about a balanced budget during a period of national emergency as has been the Republican leadership. I must confess, speaking for myself only, I have not been able to keep up with the Republican orators in being able to embellish the great and wonderful meaning of a balanced budget.

As I listened to their powerful addresses, they almost persuaded me. I was persuaded that once the Republicans got into office, balancing the budget was one thing they would do. In view of their past, I was not at all sure they would have a balanced economy; I was not at all sure there would be a balance of power in the world to keep the peace; but I think a great many persons were depending on these architects of sound fiscal policy to balance the budget.

Before the Republicans even undertook to balance the budget, they said, "Now, look, we must reduce taxes. We must reduce taxes on corporations. We won't do it in such a way that everybody will know it; but if we reduce corporation taxes and fail to reduce taxes on dividends, somebody will get mad." So they came up with a provision for accelerated depreciation—the fast writeoff. It had been the principle used in taxes on defense plants. My, but that provision got good results. They said, "Let us try it for all business," and they did—at an annual cost of from $1 billion to $2 billion in decreased revenue. That did not bother the Republicans one bit. That action was as "responsible" as Solomon, as prophetic as Isaiah, and as noble as Patrick Henry and George Washington. It was not even silly; it was substantially constructive, forward-looking, dynamic, and progressive.

Then someone comes along and proposes to repeal the provision benefiting recipients of dividends from corporate stocks and the writeoff provisions; to extend the corporation tax for 3 years, or until 1957, so as to get beyond the election year and not be playing politics with this question; and to extend the excise taxes, so as to remove some of the inequities in the tax law, and obtain additional revenue to carry the heavy burdens of the Government. It is proposed to grant tax relief for the American consumer and for families which each and every year have greater financial burdens and responsibilities. It is proposed to give those families tax relief in the amount of $10 for each dependent and $20 for the head of a household. It is proposed to provide a little more equity in the tax law.

What does the administration say? The administration says "silly." Do my colleagues know why? Because members of the administration have never thought in these terms. They have not had for a fleeting moment any idea of giving tax relief to the great majority of the American people.

In its 2½-year period, the administration has had as its major financial maneuvers and proposals two things: Raising the interest rates on Government securities, only to find out they made a colossal mistake; secondly, the repeal of the excess profits tax and the adjustment of corporate tax levels in peculiar and individual ways. That is an administration that is not going to give tax relief, if it can help it, to 156 or 157 million remaining Americans.

So I shall lay it on the line to my colleagues in the Senate. If they desire to have tax relief for the American people, if they want to give the administration a chance to help balance the budget, they have that chance. It can be done by voting for the proposal of six Democratic members of the committee, including the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and other Senators, who are the major sponsors.

I happen to think that the Senate of the United States is going to have a rather difficult time justifying a vote against the proposal. I happen to believe that working people in low-income brackets are going to be asking questions such as this: "We can understand why you felt it was necessary to give incentives to large corporations, and why you gave them tax relief, we can understand your deep concern for the stock owners receiving dividends, but what we cannot understand is that we do not come in for any of your concern at all. Are we not citizens, too?"

I know how I am going to vote, and I think I know how approximately 45 other Senators will vote. I hope there will be enough so that we get a majority. I will state why, Mr. President. I hope that is so because I think it will provide the kind of tax base and economic stimulation which will keep our economy moving forward, so as to provide more jobs, greater production, expansion, and a solid base for the free-enterprise, private-economy system.

If at this time we fail to accomplish our purpose, let the electorate know who was responsible; let the electorate know that this administration has yet to propose to either the 83d Congress or the 84th Congress, a single economic measure which would lend any benefit, in terms of tax relief, to more than 90 percent of the American taxpayers—an administration which has the unmitigated gall to go about the country, saying it has given tax relief.

Mr. President, in the past year I have talked to a great many persons who have asked me, "Who got the tax relief?" I talk to thousands and thousands of people in my State, on the highways and byways; and I have talked to them about the tax bill. I have yet to find anyone who would say to me, "Senator, we truly appreciate what Congress did, last year, for us little folks, in giving us some tax relief."

They did not get any tax relief, Mr. President. We tried to provide tax relief for them, in respect to their purchases of farm machinery, and to stimulate the sale and production of farm machinery. But what happened to that proposal? Down it went; the administration opposed it, and succeeded in killing it. The administration would not agree to it. But the administration said, "Instead, we will give the agricultural people some increase in soil conservation benefits." Mr. President, I figured how much that amounted to, for each farm family. I think $10 million was included under that item of the tax bill. I shall stand corrected if my figures are wrong, but I believe that under that provision of the bill, $10 million was provided for American farmers, in the form of soil conservation benefits. Under that provision, the farmers could take deductions up to that amount. Mr. President, there are 5 million farm families in America, so that amounted to a benefit of $2 for each of those families. Oh, Mr. President, what a time they had on that $2. What a bonanza. What a windfall. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. President, in that tax bill the same administration made 1 mistake which amounted to more than 100 times as much as the tax relief the administration gave the farmers, in connection with the soil-conservation-benefit provision. I repeat that it took the administration ever since last August to find out about that mistake. The administration did not find out about it until March, the present month; and then the administration learned that it had made a mistake of $1 billion in section 462. But the administration would not even yet have learned about that mistake, if it had not been for the activity of a Democratic Member of Congress from the State of New York. The administration had not found that mistake, because the administration had not been looking. One cannot find something if one does not look, but merely keeps his eyes closed; one cannot locate something, if one keeps his

hands behind his back, and does not attempt to make a search. The administration would have been able to find better tax laws if it had wanted to find them, but the administration did not want to find them.

One of the reasons why the administration is opposed to the present Democratic proposal is that it did not think of it and did not work it out. The administration is also opposed to the proposal because it would remove from the tax bill some of the juicy plums to which some special groups have become accustomed. Ah, Mr. President, it will be hard on those groups to have to get along without the $7,300,000,000 a year of tax relief in the form of depreciation allowance and the $362 million a year of tax relief in the form of stock-dividend credits.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator from Minnesota say that none of the working people in Minnesota had come to him and thanked him for the tax deductions or tax relief they obtained in the tax bill of last year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly did not find any of the working people of Minnesota taking that position.

Mr. LONG. Did it occur to the Senator from Minnesota that one of the reasons why they did not thank him for tax relief was that on the same day when they obtained the small amount of tax relief, by way of a tax decrease, they were subjected to an increase in their social-security tax? In other words, in the case of a man earning $3,500 a year or less—and half the people of the United States do not earn more than that—on the same day when he received a tax decrease in the amount of $16.50, he received word that his social-security tax had risen in the amount of $17.50. So, by subtracting, we find that at the conclusion of that process the average workingman in the United States, making $3,500 a year, was paying in taxes $1 a year more, instead of obtaining any real tax relief. Therefore, his take-home pay was $1 per year less.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. President, most of the people of the Nation are not impressed by the giving of a credit. All they know is whether they have more take-home pay or less take-home pay.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that all the majority of working people noticed was that in January 1954, the Government took from them a little more than it had previously taken from them, with the result that they had less take-home pay? Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree that such "tax relief" does not impress the people very much?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly, that is correct.

Mr. President, I shall not charge that the administration was irresponsible in its tax bill, because the administration was not irresponsible; instead, that bill was premeditated. The administration knew exactly what it was doing. [Laughter.]

I shall not charge the administration with being "silly"; I simply charge the administration with being selfish, because the administration knew exactly to whom it was giving the tax relief.

But I say the administration is either incapable or unwilling of meeting the economic argument which the proponents of the Democratic proposal are placing before the Senate, because the only way the administration is attempting to meet it is by using mere words. The administration has called in—instead of its Council of Economic Advisers—the firm of B. B. D. & O. Mr. President, I am not opposed to the great advertising or public-relations firms. They have a place in our society. But they are not needed when we are discussing a tax bill; and after they get through writing so many speeches, I suggest that the administration take a look at the economic facts of America, and read some of the basic economic data.

I challenge the administration to produce from a Federal Reserve district or from a large bank in the United States a single economic document which will not show that in 1954 the one thing which started a change in the economic tide, and began to increase production, was the change in the income credit. It was the single most important factor. But the administration closes its eyes to that very obvious fact, and persists in pursuing a policy which can lead to nothing but trouble.

Now we are giving the administration a chance to get out of trouble; we are giving the administration an opportunity to show good faith to the American people. We are even giving the administration a chance to keep a promise, for a change—for instance, its promise to try to balance the budget. If the administration does not want to keep that promise, I wish it would stop talking about it. This proposal gives the administration a chance to erase the political blackboard. The administration should either give up these slogans, or should produce. The administration should stop talking about balancing the budget, or else should get down to doing something about it. The administration should either stop talking about giving an economic chance to the American people, or it should proceed to do something about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield now to the Senator from Illinois, Mr. President, if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely wished to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether he had talked to merchants about—I realize this may seem strange—the smell of the bills which have been given to them in payment for groceries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I have had some conversation with merchants about that very situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have talked with the manager of a large chain store in Chicago. He showed me the bills he had taken in that day, and commented on the odor of the bills and their appearance. They were dull and lifeless; they had the odor of having been closed away from fresh air for a long time, either in safe-deposit boxes or buried in tin cans, underground, as if they had been drawn from savings in order to finance current purchases. They were not evidence that current earnings had increased, but that the great mass of the people had been compelled to draw on their savings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is correct. Let me say, so that the Secretary of the Treasury will not again accuse the Senator—falsely and irresponsibly—of things he never said, that what the Senator from Illinois is saying is what the National City Bank of New York said in its December 1954 letter, namely, that consumers were digging down into their savings they had put away for a rainy day; they were digging down into their savings, in order to be able to sustain the consumer purchasing power of the American economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the unskilled workers, many segments of the farming population, and certain white-collar workers do not have large reserves, it will not be possible for them to dig down forever.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is entirely true that it is not going to be possible for them to dig down forever; nor is it going to be possible to extend expanding consumer credit to a group of people whose earnings or take-home pay are not adequate to meet the costs of financing or the repayment of loans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be healthier, therefore, to give them a tax cut, so that out of their current earnings they could buy more goods?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think definitely it would; also, I feel that this would result in greater revenues to the Government. It is not the tax rate alone which is important. It is the rate applied to the volume or the amount of income—the old theory of the velocity of money—the turnover of goods and servics in terms of dollars.

This, of course, is the philosophy which has been expounded on the floor of the Senate again and again by certain Members of the Senate—one of them, in a position of leadership, being the Senator from Illinois.

Why is this philosophy being stated? Because, I repeat, this economy, unique in this world, is essentially the consumer economy, with due consideration for and and great respect for incentive to investment capital. There is plenty of incentive, but the best incentive in the world is profit. The way to make profit in the United States under competition is to produce goods that can be sold in a market which has the purchasing power and the capacity to absorb the production.

That is a statement of our case in part. As I have said, at a later time I shall wish to document these broader generalizations by pertinent, detailed facts. In the meantime, over the weekend, I hope the Republican administration will see the error of its way. I hope that

over the Sabbath it may repent and come to the conclusion, on Tuesday, as we vote on the bill, that there should be some support for a tax measure which would give some consideration to the great majority of the American people. We shall welcome such support. In fact, we solicit it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I wish to congratulate him on his very able speech. Does he not think that it would be appropriate to send to Secretary Humphrey the words of that old hymn, which I think both the Senator and I sang as boys in church—

> And while the lamp remains to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator that while the lamp remains to burn we will welcome home, into the home of constructive, progressive finance, any Republican who has strayed from the path of fiscal responsibility. We want them to be responsible. We do not want anyone to be so silly and so wrong as to vote against what we propose.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if no Senator desires the floor at this time, I wish to move a recess until Monday. As I understand, there is a unanimous-consent agreement that when the Senate takes a recess today, it will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next. I so move.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 11 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines, vice Raymond Ames Spruance, resigned.

E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Sidney B. Jacques, of New York.
Jeremiah J. O'Connor, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John S. Barry, of California.
Joseph T. Bartos, of Colorado.
Edward W. Harding, of New York.
A. Guy Hope, of Virginia.
Cass A. Kendzie, of Michigan.
Homer W. Lanford, of Alabama.
Henry F. Nichol ,of Virginia.
Philip D. Sumner, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Willis B. Collins, Jr., of Alabama.
John E. Crawford, of Minnesota.
Charles W. Falkner, of Oregon.
Miss Sofia P. Kearney, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
Kenneth A. Kerst, of Wisconsin.
Paul D. McCusker, of Colorado.
Franklin H. Murrell, of California.
G. Etzel Pearcy, of California.
Harold D. Pease, of California.
William A. Root, of Maryland.
Frederick L. Royt, of Wisconsin.
Robert R. Schott, of Oregon.
Charles C. Sundell, of Minnesota.
Maurice E. Trout, of Michigan.
Donald L. Woolf, of California.
Henry D. Wyner, of Virginia.

J. H. Cameron Peake, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry T. Andersen, of Connecticut.
John G. Bacon, of Washington.
William E. Berry, Jr., of Virginia.
William W. Blackerby, of Texas.
Walter S. Burke, of California.
Wallace Clarke, of California.
Miss Alice M. Connolly, of Washington.
Miss Virginia I. Cullen, of Pennsylvania.
Charles W. Davis, of Virginia.
Robert E. Dowland, of Tennessee.
William B. Dozier, of South Carolina.
Xavier W. Eilers, of Minnesota.
Miss Shirley M. Green, of Missouri.
Oscar H. Guerra, of Texas.
Ernest B. Gutierrez, of New Mexico.
Malcolm P. Hallam, of South Dakota.
George A. Hays, of Pennsylvania.
Roy R. Hermesman, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Margaret Hussman, of Idaho.
Samuel M. Janney, Jr., of Virginia.
Miss Thelma M. Jenssen, of Minnesota.
Robert S. Johnson, of Michigan.
Hugh D. Kessler, of Florida.
Arthur C. Lillig, of Oregon.
Edwin H. Moot, Jr., of Illinois.
John A. Moran III, of New Jersey.
John Patrick Mulligan, of Colorado.
Robert C. Ode, of Michigan.
Glen S. Olsen, of Utah.
Robert H. Rose, of Utah.
James T. Rousseau, of Florida.
Irving I. Schiffman, of Virginia.
Robert W. Skiff, of Florida.
Robert T. Wallace, of Michigan.
Robert A. Wooldridge, of Indiana.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis L. Foley, of Colorado.
William T. Keough, of Pennsylvania.

Alfred C. Ulmer, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Charles P. Kiteley, of Tennessee, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul of the United States of America.

In the Army

Maj. Gen. Silas Beach Hays, O17803, Medical Corps, United States Army, for appointment as the Surgeon General, United States Army, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, O12687, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Army Forces Far East and 8th Army, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be captain

Powell, John J., VC, O427930.

To be first lieutenants

Benedict, Daniel B., MC, O999420.
Gibson, Jack L., MC, O1940129.
Godfrey, William H., MSC, O1546995.
Gunuskey, Dolores L., ANC, N762590.
Lysak, William, MSC, O966641.

The following-named person for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Griffin, Martin E., Jr., O4030389.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Cluck, Charlie E., O999028.
Madden, William R., Jr., O975483.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Dillard, Herbert A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Bittl, Frederick E.
Fitter, Patrick M.
Garcia, Eliseo J., O4024771.
Heverly, Clifford C., O4017296.
Kennedy, George I., Jr., O1941273.
Nack, Thomas P., O4044536.
Purdy, Harry E., Jr., O4025765.
Turner, Joseph E., Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

United Nations

William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Kingsley Davis, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1957.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter of 1954.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1954:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is produced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description; (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting strategic minerals, including manganese.
E. (10) $34.55.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.
E. (2) $3,750; (7) $671.25; (9) $4,421.25; (10) $14,194.82; (11) $18,616.07.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $125.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $620.
E. (7) $42.93; (9) $42.93; (10) $69.35; (11) $112.28.

A. Joseph Amann, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. American Association of Port Authorities, 919 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For legislation increasing appropriation to United States Merchant Marine Academy involving shipping, Panama Canal tolls, foreign trade zones, river and harbor development, and reciprocal trade agreements.

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) AAUW national legislative program for 1953–55.[1]
E. (10) $3,107.11; (11) $3,107.11.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $4,999.98; (7) $1,618.62; (9) $6,618.60; (10) $19,387.81; (11) $26,006.41.

A. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation involving the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.
D. (6) $6,872.21.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $2,141.42.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $1,884.19; (4) $6.76; (5) $62.91; (6) $8.56; (7) $179; (9) $2,141.42; (10) $7,456.87; (11) $9,598.29; (15).[1]

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To protect and further the interests of the public and the dental profession in matters of patents, legislation, and regulations, etc.[1]
D. (6) $7,914.32.
E. (2) $7,914.32; (9) $7,914.32; (10) $24,976.56; (11) $32,890.88; (15).[1]

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $21,318.
E. (2) $17,592; (4) $5,686; (5) $2,832; (6) $2,098; (7) $333; (9) $28,541; (10) $83,867; (11) $112,408.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people.
E. (1) $6,900.50; (2) $22,478.32; (4) $3,946.67; (5) $851.40; (9) $34,176.89; (10) $91,819.27; (11) $125,996.16.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped.
E. (10) $8,600; (11) $8,600.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The American Hospital Association is concerned about all legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect the care for the American people.
D. (6) $11,248.66.
E. (2) $5,946.79; (4) $455; (5) $950.08; (6) $562.14; (7) $413.11; (8) $449.04; (9) $8,776.16; (10) $29,605.55; (11) $38,381.71.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $132,371.46.

A. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the conduct of the business of marine insurance.
E. (2) $750; (6) $209; (9) $959; (11) $959; (15) $959.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $231.18.
E. (2) $12,112.52; (4) $2,914.36; (5) $2,575.56; (6) $336.78; (7) $475.58; (9) $18,414.80; (10) $60,099.04; (11) $78,513.84.

A. American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the business of hull insurance.
E. (2) $250; (6) $70; (9) $320; (11) $320; (15) $320.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (2) $6,611.26; (4) $584.41; (5) $912.89; (6) $279.23; (7) $1,219.04; (8) $942.17; (9) $10,549; (10) $28,571.17; (11) $39,120.17.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $13,875.96.
E. (2) $5,250; (9) $5,250; (10) $23,138.90; (11) $28,388.90.

A. The American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $680.
E. (10) $6,210.55; (11) $6,210.55.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $453.10.
E. (2) $375; (5) $69; (6) $9.10; (9) $453.10; (10) $1,524.12; (11) $1,977.22.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interests affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operation, properties, and practices.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,762.72.
E. (2) $1, 277.39; (4) $33.94; (5) $364.69; (6) $49.56; (7) $22.29; (8) $103.27; (9) $1,851.14; (10) $9,063.80; (11) $10,914.94.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $158.
E. (2) $6,145; (5) $3,500; (6) $272; (9) $11,381; (10) $34,868; (11) $46,249; (15).[1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interests affecting the pulpwood industry, its operation, properties, and practices.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $70,036.92.
E. (2) $8,750; (5) $773.33; (6) $455.98; (7) $299.02; (9) $10,278.33; (10) $31,337.06; (11) $41,615.39.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,733.23.
E. (2) $737.50; (4) $171.87; (5) $195.12; (6) $54.55; (7) $560.99; (8) $13.20; (9) $1,733.23; (10) $6,610.45; (11) $8,343.68; (15).[1]

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (15).[1]

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The association is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
D. (6) $200.
E. (1) $25; (2) $2,062.50; (4) $26.27; (5) $161.54; (6) $161.42; (7) $1,939.32; (8) $273.30; (9) $4,649.35; (10) $24,126.34; (11) $28,775.69; (15).[1]

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests of ATA include all bills, resolutions, and investigations affecting the trucking industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $10,290.06.
E. (2) $1,332.78; (7) $169.89; (8) $1,500; (9) $3,002.67; (10) $12,726.76; (11) $15,729.43.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) AVC is concerned with legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights and liberties, and veterans' benefits.
D. (6) $677.89.
E. (2) $450; (7) $15; (9) $465; (10) $3,510; (11) $3,975.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $970; (7) $322; (9) $1,292; (10) $4,146.08; (11) $5,438.08.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) No specific legislative bills.
D. (6) $2,660.
E. (2) $2,085; (8) $615.20; (9) $2,700.20; (10) $9,104.03; (11) $11,804.23.

A. John R. Arant, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $42.30; (9) $42.30; (10) $257.80; (11) $300.10.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $1,805.76; (11) $1,805.76.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Arkansas railroads.
E. (10) $6,857.92; (11) $6,857.92.

A. Mrs. R. Gordon Arneson, 5520 North 23d Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Spokesmen for Children, 20 East 93d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Funds for maternal and child health, child welfare, school lunch programs, and Federal aid for school construction.
E. (4) $12; (6) $228; (9) $240.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $291.35; (9) $1,191.35; (10) $3,489.84; (11) $4,681.19.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $33,396.18.
E. (2) $19,439.21; (4) $185.50; (5) $2,238.55; (6) $268.12; (7) $3,394.90; (8) $7,869.90; (9) $33,396.18; (10) $151,983.37; (11) $185,379.55.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $1,982.48.
E. (2) $1,456.26; (4) $88.94; (5) $132.70; (6) $28.85; (7) $80.77; (8) $194.96; (9) $1,982.48; (10) $5,170.89; (11) $7,153.37.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,390.49.
E. (9) $1,390.49; (10) $1,390.49.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.
E. (2) $250; (9) $250; (11) $250.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $8.86; (11) $8.86.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 126, Vienna, Va.
B. Junior Order United American Mechanics (National Council), 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) No control of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism.
D. (6) $147.
E. (5) $14; (6) $2; (7) $3.57; (8) $1.25; (9) $20.82; (10) $131.48; (11) $152.27.

A. John A. Baker, 1404 New York Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (7) $590.77; (9) $590.77; (10) $1,166.03; (11) $1,756.80.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting labor, especially railroad.
D. (6) $1,952.75.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (6) $113.71; (7) $262.67; (8) $348.06; (9) $724.44; (10) $1,744.30; (11) $2,468.74.

A. Ivins, Phillips & Barker, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Remington Rand Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B.[1]
C. (2).[1]
E. (6) $3.08; (9) $3.08; (10) $186.77; (11) $189.85.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the machine tool industry.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $355.25.
E. (6) $0.08; (7) $51.38; (8) $7.60; (9) $59.06; (10) $259.44; (11) $318.50.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 7840, S. 2930.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $375; (11) $500.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America (CIO), 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting libraries and librarians.
E. (2) $1,511.20; (3) $18; (4) $40.50; (7) $98.70; (8) $40.55; (9) $1,708.95; (10) $4,847.34; (11) $6,556.29.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $4,500.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Mrs. Louella Miller Berg, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Business Practices Council, 1030 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $18; (5) $69.44; (6) $34.68; (7) $9.25; (9) $131.37; (10) $1,269.31; (11) $1,400.68.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1001 Conecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To obtain repeal of the excise tax on jewelry and jewelry store merchandise.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (2) $926.76; (5) $1,385.08; (6) $217.95; (7) $512.02; (9) $3,041.81; (10) $7,841.82; (11) $10,883.63.

A. Tell Berna, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the machine-tool industry.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America (CIO), 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
E. (10) $4,346.55; (11) $4,346.55.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and workers specifically.
D. (6) $3,010.
E. (6) $25.15; (7) $233.80; (8) $59.05; (9) $318; (10) $1,027; (11) $1,345.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (10) $279; (11) $279.

A. Robert J. Bird, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert J. Bird, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Minot Mercantile Corp., care of Equitable Trust Co., Wilmington, Del.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the business enterprises of independent retail grocers.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (4) $72.20; (5) $90; (6) $13.26; (7) $26.47; (9) $201.93; (10) $452.49; (11) $654.42.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,500; (11) $2,000.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry.
E. (10) $204.74; (11) $204.74.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America (CIO) 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership.
D. (6) $2,098.56.
E. (2) $1,999.98; (7) $98.58; (9) $2,098.56; (10) $7,297.77; (11) $9,396.33.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $16,700; (8) $2,889.72; (15).[1]

A. Daniel L. Boland, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $12.75; (11) $12.75.

A. Ivins, Phillips & Barker, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Community Services Inc., Graniteville, S. C.

A. Borax Cartel Story, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $450.56.
E. (2) $150; (4) $192.08; (5) $55; (6) $7.70; (7) $40.78; (8) $5; (9) $450.56; (11) $450.56; (15).[1]

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Company, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Labor relations, wage and hour matters, controls over wages and salaries, and social security.
D. (6) $375.
E. (5) $130; (6) $5; (7) $196; (9) $331; (10) $771.50; (11) $1,102.50.

A. E. B. Bowden, 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation to protect innocent purchasers of converted CCC grain.
D. (6) $49.15.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen E. V., Contrescarpe 46, Bremen, Germany.
C. (2) All bills affecting the Trading With the Enemy Act, etc.[1]
E. (5) $204; (6) $24.15; (8) $451.50; (9) $679.65; (10) $1,209.82; (11) $1,889.47.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc.
E. (10) $434.93; (11) $434.93.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and N Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and N Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. David F. Brinegar, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $663.30; (9) $663.30; (10) $432.22; (11) $1,095.53.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Board of Trade, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Guaranties against the risk of nonpayment by foreign debtors due to currency inconvertibility, exchange transfer block, and other noncommercial hazards.
D. (6) $802.18.
E. (5) $75; (6) $10; (7) $88.42; (9) $173.42; (10) $249.34; (11) $422.76.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Revenue Act of 1954, H. R. 8300.
D. (6) $2,499.98.
E. (6) $27.62; (8) $14.98; (9) $42.60; (10) $285.10; (11) $327.70; (15).[1]

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $5,949.99.
E. (2) $6,317.49; (5) $262.50; (6) $6.47; (8) $17.50; (9) $6,603.96; (10) $17,323.78; (11) $23,927.74; (15).[1]

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
E. (10) $546.40; (11) $546.40.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. John M. Brumm, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,374.98.
E. (8) $119.64; (9) $119.64; (10) $83.65; (11) 203.29.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) All legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (6) $4.68; (8) $22.85; (9) $27.53; (10) $63.57; (11) $91.10.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to the business of policyholders of accident and health insurance.
E. (2) $105.22; (5) $17.88; (8) $5.50.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $200.
E. (7) $45.73; (8) $12.26; (9) $57.99; (10) $210.12; (11) 268.11.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,495.
E. (7) $962; (9) $962; (10) $2,886; (11) $3,848.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $11,133.80.
E. (2) $3,796.95; (5) $392.30; (6) $114.08; (7) $607.43; (8) $612.20; (9) $5,522.96; (10) $11,075.06; (11) $16,598.02.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as annual and sick leave; Federal retirement liberalization; unemployment insurance and severance pay, and other more liberalized benefits for Federal and other workers.
D. (6) $2,875.03.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions, and organizations.
D. (6) $2,874.99.
E. (10) $113.64; (11) $113.64.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $760.20.
E. (6) $3; (7) $10; (8) $10; (9) $23; (10) $69; (11) $92.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,187.50.
E. (10) $20; (11) $20.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Matters pertaining to Central Valley Project (Calif.) which affect the interest of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.
D. (6) $416.03.
E. (8) $72.69; (9) $72.69; (10) $764.10; (11) $836.79.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,486.68.
E. (3) $232.90; (4) $4; (5) $9.18; (6) $12.70; (7) $194.40; (8) $33.50; (9) $486.68; (10) $1,344.53; (11) $1,831.21.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting company's interest.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $720; (6) $62.50; (7) $380.20; (8) $215.30; (9) $1,378; (10) $3,647.86; (11) $5,025.86.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $27.10; (9) $27.10; (10) $20.80; (11) $47.90.

A. Ralph H. Case, 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak., and of Lower Brule Reservation, S. Dak.
C. (2) Public Law 776, 83d Congress (H. R. 2233).
D. (6) $150.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington. D. C.
B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Aviation legislation—Railway Labor Act.
D. (6) $2,625.
E. (10) $1.20; (11) $1.20.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.
D. (6) $7,504.37.
E. (2) $4,980; (4) $187.85; (5) $880.21; (6) $114.81; (7) $1,325.65; (8) $69.96; (9) $7,558.48; (10) $23,067.84; (11) $30,626.32.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Development of the strategic stockpiling program of the United States.
D. (6) $4,125.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $5,024.42.
E. (1) $92; (2) $3,055; (4) $3,170.11; (5) $135.47; (6) $23.18; (7) $288.40; (8) $46.31; (9) $6,810.47; (10) $23,943.24; (11) $30,753.71.

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans.
D. (6) $2,891.19.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.
D. (6) $15,075.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $156.31; (11) $156.31.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including H. R. 108.

A. Howard C. Colgan, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
D. (6) $75.
E. (7) $33.02; (9) $33.02; (10) $6.75; (11) $39.77.

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $1,352.08; (11) $1,352.08.

A. Colorado River Association, 307 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $2,250; (4) $281.36; (5) $436.60; (6) $447.72; (7) $1,462; (9) $4,877.68; (10) $20,410.46; (15).[1]

A. Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (4) $3.60; (6) $31.27; (8) $138.91; (9) $173.78; (10) $26,456.33; (11) $26,630.11; (15).[1]

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., Building A. Room 801, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C.(2).[1]
D. (6) $833.33.
E. (4) $245; (5) $230.05; (6) $57.82; (7) $81.98; (8) $58.03; (9) $672.88; (10) $770.16; (11) $1,443.04.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $193.68.
E. (2) $5,423.24; (4) $66.55; (5) $1,172.18; (6) $156.78; (7) $361.14; (8) $60; (9) $7,239.89; (10) $27,986.96; (11) $35,226.85.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $12,187.56; (5) $1,395.65; (6) $176.39; (7) $1,003.36; (8) $1,984.75; (9) $16,747.71; (10) $42,542.91; (11) $59,290.62; (15).[1]

A. Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $500; (5) $500; (6) $20; (7) $100; (9) $2,100; (10) $465.73; (11) $2,565.73.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 LaSalle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to a possible revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 895).
E. (10) $2,500; (11) $2,500.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan-American World Airways System.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Amendment of section 303 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. 903 (b)).
E. (10) $14,561.21; (11) $14,561.21.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposition to Federal taxation of State and local government bonds.
E. (10) $1,848.47; (11) $1,848.47.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. Y.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (7) $512.50; (9) $512.50; (10) $4,977.78; (11) $5,490.28.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives. (3) Report on Congress.
D. (6) $29,957.25.
E. (2) $15,618.17; (3) $500; (4) $4,987.41; (5) $2,374.65; (6) $800; (7) $2,877.32; (8) $2,799.70; (9) $29,957.25; (10) $90,161.84; (11) $120,119.09.

A. Julien D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (10) $246.32; (11) $246.32.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 512 South Market Street, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Excise tax on utility trailers.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 8300.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $300.
E. (2)$194; (5) $9; (6) $14; (9) $217; (10) $651; (11) $868.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,650.
E. (1) $2,500; (9) $2,500; (10) $19.91; (11) $2,519.91; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which may effectuate the unification of Ireland.
D. (6) $750.
E. (10) $220; (11) $220.

A. Cotton, Brenner & Wrigley, 225 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Martin Aloysius Madden, 27 West 96th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden, S. 3216.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (4) $113.82; (7) $85; (8) $0.86; (9) $199.63; (10) $1,732.60; (11) $1,932.28; (15).[1]

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. 2 All bills of interest to technical engineers, especially those engineers employed by the United States Government.
D. (6) $195.
E. (7) $20; (9) $20; (10) $60; (11) $80.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1722 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal taxation, Federal expenditures, social security, and labor relations.
D. (6) $10,603.46.
E. (2) $11,959.23; (4) $1,496.46; (5) $998.39; (6) $207.95; (7) $599.81; (8) $913.29; (9) $16,175.13; (10) $60,640.09; (11) $76,815.22; (15).[1]

A. A. M. Crawford, 718 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (10) $9,039.19; (11) $9,039.19.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $40,699.98.
E. (2) $525; (8) $1.25; (9) $526.25; (10) $1,562.77; (11) $2,089.02.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting communications.
D. (6) $6,874.98.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $1,352.08; (11) $1,352.08.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. The Townsend bills, H. R. 2446, 2447.
D. (6) $2,386.82.
E. (5) $586.19; (6) $136.02; (7) $103.55; (8) $102.71; (9) $928.47; (10) $4,729.18; (11) $5,657.65.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,550.
E. (7) $413.74; (9) $413.74; (10) $533.22; (11) $946.96.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 519 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $4,050.

A. Joan David, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Public Law 199, H. R. 2685; S. 3263.
D. (6) $1,387.50.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.
E. (10) $183.33; (11) $183.33.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to taxation of gains and losses upon sale of real property by dealers.
E. (10) $342.81; (11) $342.81.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Copley Press, Inc., 428 Downer Place, Aurora, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of 1954 Revenue Code relating to corporate distributions and adjustments, including corporate liquidations.
E. (10) $533.66; (11) $533.66.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. John Stuart, 345 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code relating to corporate distributions and adjustments, including corporate liquidations.
E. (10) $572.49; (11) $572.49.

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Motor Carriers Leasing Conference, 4195 Central Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 3203 (trip leasing) for passage.
D. (6) $625.

A. Denver Association of Building Owners and Managers, 624 17th Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For passage of section 164 (b) (5) (B) of Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide for deductibility for Federal income-tax purposes of taxes levied by the Moffat Tunnel Improvement District.
E. (2) $1,000; (6) $2.04; (9) $1,002.04; (11) $1,002.04.

A. M. D. DeTar, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 708, Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislative matters which would (a) restrict importation of crude oil and hinder petroleum production; and (b) establish a national fuels policy.
E. (10) $530.73; (11) $530.73.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4587 and legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (10) $3,900; (11) $5,200.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 312 Courthouse, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation in support of the Sacramento River deep-water channel project authorized by Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session. H. R. 8367, 83d Congress, and H. R. 9936, 83d Congress.
D. (6) $2,460.30.
E. (8) $60.30; (9) $60.30; (10) $271.75; (11) $332.05.

A. Direct Mail Advertising Association, Inc., 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 6052; H. R. 569; against.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $25; (7) $30; (9) $55; (10) $165; (11) $220.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $5,120.15; (7) $86.94; (9) $5,207.09; (10) $16,595.16; (11) $21,802.25.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,750; (9) $2,750; (10) $8,250; (11) $11,000.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,565.46.
E. (10) $340.60; (11) $340.60.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $3,333.32.
E. (10) $10.35; (11) $10.35.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Building Granite Quarries Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Specific legislation is for percentage depletion relating to granite and other minerals.
D. (6) $600.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $13,475.04.
E. (2) $6,679.11; (4) $500; (5) $1,031.99; (6) $391.71; (7) $508.12; (8) $4,888.23; (9) $13,999.16; (10) $48,971.44; (11) $62,970.60.

A. Doherty, Rumble & Butler, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1451 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendment of Internal Revenue Code.
E. (10) $1,005.67; (11) $1,005.67.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.
E. (7) $172.40; (9) $172.40; (10) $1,371.99; (11) $1,544.39.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 236 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof.
D. (6) $1.625.
E. (10) $217,18; (11) $217.18.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise tax on alcoholic beverages.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. O. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,489.07.
E. (10) $159; (11) $159.

A. John E. Dougherty, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Attorney, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Opposed to S. 3075 which if enacted would divorce pipelines.

A. Adin M. Downer, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington. D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents. (3) VFW magazine (Foreign Service) and VFW Legislative Newsletter.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $45.92; (9) $45.92; (10) $289.20; (11) $335.12.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, State Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) P. R. notes.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (10) $675; (11) $900.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Banking legislation.
D. (6) $2,834.

A. Stephen M. Dubrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $435.
E. (10) $60.26; (11) $60.26.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $27.05; (9) $27.05; (10) $221.70; (11) $248.75.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $3,276.
E. (7) $456.12; (9) $456.12; (10) $1,490.25; (11) $1,946.37.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $4.14.
E. (2) $24.98; (4) $5.72; (5) $2.62; (6) $0.18; (7) $5.24; (8) $1.84; (9) $40.58; (10) $139.77; (11) $180.35; (15).[1]

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans.
D. (6) $140.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $45; (11) $60.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to matters affecting the engineering profession.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (10) $180; (11) $180.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th Street at F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest previously on all bills relating to the education and training of veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.

A. Oscar Elder, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Enactment into law of the Townsend plan; amendment to the Social Security Act.
D. (6) $910.
E. (7) $5.78; (9) $5.78; (11) $5.78.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification magazine.
D. (6) $5,798.64.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 708, Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in general legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers and marketers.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Housing and labor legislation and all other matters affecting retail lumber dealers.
D. (6) $3,050.
E. (7) $225; (9) $225; (10) $907; (11) $1,132.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (10) $475.78; (11) $475.78.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department appropriations bill, 1955, and legislation affecting social-security coverage for municipal employees.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (10) $19.34; (11) $19.34.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (10) $121.46; (11) $121.46.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $3,828.28.
E. (6) $45.53; (8) $10.25; (9) $55.78; (10) $425.27; (11) $481.05.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department appropriations bill, 1954; waterfowl management, Central Valley project; irrigation distribution systems bills; and legislation affecting the Central Valley project and Federal reclamation and power policies generally.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (10) $152.90; (11) $152.90.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Army civil functions appropriations bill, 1955, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.

A. Robert B. Ely III, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Petitioner is interested in having the present Congress pass an act providing for a full judicial review of certain claims arising from French spoliations occurring prior to 1800.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business. (3) Pulling Together.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $193.15; (9) $193.15; (10) $884.75; (11) $1,077.90.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1417 California Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) National Farmers Union is interested in all Federal legislation, bills, resolutions, appropriations, and other proceedings affecting American agriculture and farmers, either directly or indirectly.
D. (6) $15,366.38.
E. (2) $10,175.45; (3) $237.50; (4) $466.72; (5) $2,421.67; (6) $1,695.83; (7) $405.56; (8) $161.04; (9) $15,563.77; (10) $70,198.72; (11) $85,762.49.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To support legislation providing for the return of confiscated German and Japanese, Swiss, and American property, through amending the Trading With the Enemy Act, through other appropriate legislation, or through a treaty.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (11) $231.23.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the National Association of Electric Companies.
D. (6) $472.50.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $7,650.
E. (1) $345.77; (2) $2,320; (4) $74.10; (6) $37.02; (7) $457.45; (8) $147.35; (9) $3,381.69; (10) $73,591.40; (11) $76,973.09.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $618.62; (6) $82.65; (7) $470.57; (8) $28.27; (9) $1,200.11; (10) $6,187.70; (11) $7,387.81.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation.
E. (7) $29.63; (9) $29.63; (10) $117.38; (11) $147.01.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant-disease control and crop improvement.
D. (6) $2,225.
E. (2) $33.33; (5) $159.46; (6) $31.27; (9) $224.06; (10) $3,006.61; (11) $3,230.67.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (legislative fund), Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that affects the citrus industry and for legislation that affects it favorably and against legislation that affects it unfavorably.
E. (4) $16.56; (8) $0.27; (9) $16.83; (10) $8,418.72; (11) $8,435.55.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
E. (2) $*,350; (8) $27.53; (9) $1,377.53; (10) $4,113.57; (11) $5,491.10.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (2) $1,875; (6) $3.72; (7) $34.73; (9) $1,915.45; (10) $6,696.37; (11) $8,611.82.

A. John J. Flynn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation affecting the welfare and security of working men and women and their families.
D. (6) $1,425.
E. (7) $330.81; (9) $330.81; (10) $566.01; (11) $896.82.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2).[1]

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) 1955 agricultural appropriations bill. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (10) $781.84; (11) $781.84.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,309.16.
E. (7) $482.35; (9) $482.35; (10) $379.50; (11) $861.85.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $68.75.
E. (7) $7.95; (9) $7.95; (11) $7.95.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,228.96.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting communications.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
B. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 2309, Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
C. (2) Tax limitation.
D. (6) $560.
E. (2) $375; (7) $60; (9) $435; (10) $1,885; (11) $2,320.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession; (3) N. A. R. D. Journal.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $40; (9) $1,114; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,510.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $24,328.46.
E. (2) $9,359.89; (4) $2,999.65; (5) $2,572.37; (6) $289.42; (7) $998.68; (8) $967.43; (9) $17,187.44; (10) $47,632.63; (11) $64,820.07; (15).[1]

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.
E. (10) $2,435.70; (11) $2,435.70.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. John F. Gale, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $30.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $1,450.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B.[1]
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $500.
E. (10) $1,523.87; (11) $1,523.87.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Foreign aid; farm program.
E. (7) $44.59; (9) $44.59; (10) $157.80; (11) $202.39.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; the Alert.
E. (10) $124.48; (11) $124.48.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Sperior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $1,277.82; (11) $1,277.82.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.
D. (6) $117.76.
E. (2) $1,000; (9) $1,000; (10) $5,212.26; (11) $6,212.26.

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,002.
E. (7) $331.77; (9) $331.77; (10) $360; (11) $591.77.

A. General Gas Committee, 1612 Continental Life Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) For amending Natural Gas Act, 150 SC., section 717 et seq.
D. (6) $20,800.
E. (2) $1,772.20; (4) $1,355.84; (5) $3,233.25; (6) $487.94; (8) $426.30; (9) $7,275.53; (11) $7,275.53; (15).[1]

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) Senate Resolution 49, H. R. 2685, H. R. 8353, S. 586, H. R. 6052, S. 3263, S. 2836, H. R. 8654, H. R. 8300, H. R. 3599, H. R. 7125, H. R. 5860.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, N. K. Brehner & C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) Senate Resolution 49, H. R. 2685, H. R. 8353, S. 586, H. R. 6052, S. 3263, S. 2836, H. R. 8654, H. R. 8300, H. R. 3599, H. R. 7125, H. R. 5860.
D. (6) $3,000.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (10) $200; (11) $200.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation and federal relations division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $1,404.75.
E. (7) $44.05; (9) $44.05; (10) $318.71; (11) $362.76.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2)[1]
D. (5) $162.49; (6) $162.49; (7) $487.47; (8) $649.96.
E. (10) $16.50; (11) $16.50.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Governmen employees is of interest to this council.
D. (6) $7,440.88.
E. (2) $3,566.46; (4) $434.52; (5) $637.84; (6) $160.13; (8) $1,033.37; (9) $5,332.32; (10) $18,318.31; (11) $24,150.63; (15).[1]

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $375.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.
E. (2) $100; (4) $5; (8) $6.20; (9) $111.20.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $58,448.
E. (2) $4,274.32; (4) $12.12; (5) $845.59; (6) $248.87; (7) $1,636.05; (8) $31.61; (9) $7,048.56; (10) $21,936.33; (11) $28,984.89; (15).[1]

A. Charles A. Grant, Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 831 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Francis Thornton Green, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interest in support of legislation favorable to maintenance of American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (3) $200; (9) $200; (10) $1,120.91; (11) $1,320.91.

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (7) $40.85; (9) $40.85; (10) $2.07; (11) $42.92.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing, transportation, and import and export of the products thereof.
D. (6) $6,875.06.
E. (10) $13; (11) $13.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $1,403.04.
E. (7) $342.22; (9) $342.22; (10) $1,057.13; (11) $1,399.45.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $1,541.52.
E. (7) $126.49; (9) $126.49; (10) $708.26; (11) $832.75.

A. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For percentage depletion on gypsum.
E. (2) $10,605; (6) $11.73; (9) $10,616.73; (10) $18,568.54; (11) $29,185.27.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.
E. (11) $738.22.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Taxation, trip leasing, agricultural appropriations, farm credit legislation.
D. (6) $950.
E. (7) $30.53; (9) $30.53; (10) $55.45; (11) $85.98.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver Colo.
D. (6) $1,950.
E. (11) $1,475.46.

A. L. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,395.80.
E. (7) $593.75; (9) $593.75; (10) $1,502.32; (11) $2,096.07.

A. Jess Halsted, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For percentage depletion on gypsum. (3).[1]
D. (6) $9,438.45.
E. (6) $11.73; (9) $11.73; (10) $5,113.98; (11) $5,125.71.

A. Lloyd C. Halvorson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $139.97; (11) $154.97.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,298.27.
E. (6) $5.41; (7) $167.86; (9) $173.27; (10) $967.97; (11) $1,141.24.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1700 I Street NW., Suite 4, Washington, D. C.
B. Oil Workers International Union, 1340 California Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $2,055.
E. (7) $180; (9) $180; (10) $540; (11) $720.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association. (3) Official association bulletins.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C.[1]
D. (6) $500.
E. (11) $123.78.

A. Bernard C. Harter, 5402 Albemarle Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. A. B. Baker, University Hospital, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Seek increased appropriations for research in neurology.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (11) $217.40.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, 808 Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (7) $9.10; (8) $1.25; (9) $10.35; (10) $196.67; (11) $207.02.

A. Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all matters pertaining to the business or policyholders of accident and health insurance.
E. (2) $105.22; (5) $17.88; (8) $5.50.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-Ops; The Alert.
E. (11) $12.25.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Long range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food canning industry, and opposition to mandatory marketing orders, title IV, S. 3052.
D. (6) $833.33.
E. (7) $297.32; (9) $297.32; (10) $570.86; (11) $868.18.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Kenneth C. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations. (3) National Letters.
D. (6) $200.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents. (3) The American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $127.
E. (7) $127; (9) $127; (10) $482.65; (11) $609.65.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the wool trade industry.
D. (6) $600.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.
C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the hothouse vegetable industry.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice-cream industry.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $187.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (10) $1,345.06.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $427.84.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $3,200; (9) $3,200; (10) $9,600; (11) $12,800.

A. Charles M. Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $216.60.
E. (10) $23.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4310 Queensbury Road, Riverdale, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $896.32.
E. (7) $276.32; (9) $276.32; (10) $652.58; (11) $928.90.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, Thomas C. Dennehy, Jr., et al., trustees, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting taxation of decedents' estates.
E. (10) $30.10.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Underwriters Service Corp., Meridian, Miss.
C. (2) H. R. 8300, tax revision legislation.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jesse V. Horton, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $2,375.
E. (7) $116.24; (9) $116.24; (10) $454.55; (11) $570.79.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) National Housing Act.
D. (6) $674.88.
E. (1) $5; (2) $280; (4) $21.62; (5) $150; (6) $10; (7) $58.26; (8) $150; (9) $674.88; (10) $3,744; (11) $4,418.88.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

A. Harold K. Howe, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry.
D. (6) $2,649.99.
E. (2) $1,154; (7) $343.52; (9) $1,497.52; (10) $3,192.42; (11) $4,689.94.

A. Harold K. Howe, 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters of interest to the lawnmower industry.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
E. (10) $1,322.75.

A. W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,430.
E. (6) $24.95; (7) $226.95; (8) $60.10; (9) $312; (10) $1,186; (11) $1,498.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $825; (9) $825; (10) $2,475; (11) $3,300.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman.
D. (6) $2,150.
E. (1) $1,250; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $2,150; (10) $6,450; (11) $8,600.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Banking legislation.
D. (6) $9,555.
E. (2) $6,231; (4) $479.40; (5) $697.32; (6) $284.37; (9) $7,692.09; (10) $28,615.16; (11) $36,307.25.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $31,865.13.
E. (2) $7,200; (5) $375; (9) $7,575; (10) $23,725; (11) $31,300.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $11.75

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades, and in other legislative matters affecting American-flag shipping.
E. (6) $15.70; (7) $70.83; (9) $86.53; (10) $382.29; (11) $468.82.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $230.

A. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (7) $53.56; (9) $53.56; (11) $53.56.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $14.46; (9) $14.46; (10) $67.41; (11) $81.87.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.
E. (4) $36.45; (6) $23.93; (7) $2,207.69; (9) $2,258.27; (10) $34,928.27; (11) $37,196.54; (15).[1]

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $738.75.
E. (7) $156; (9) $156; (10) $296.23; (11) $452.23.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, Secretary's Office, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $699.96.
E. (5) $125; (8) $125; (9) $125; (10) $375; (11) $500.

A. Delos L. James, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $225.
E. (10) $50.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Japanese American Citizens League.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
E. (10) $900.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrielles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr, 19 Basle Str., Switzerland.
E. (1) $118.32; (7) $247.81.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Repeal of the excise tax on jewelry and jewelry store merchandise.
D. (6) $10,861.50.
E. (2) $3,750; (5) $2,617.67; (6) $217.95; (7) $1,004.51; (9) $7,590.13; (10) $40,770.48; (11) $48,360.61.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945 and legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (2) $1,250; (9) $1,250; (10) $5,555.76; (11) $6,805.76.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (10) $149.56.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr., 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,236.25.
E. (7) $19.93; (9) $19.93; (10) $108.18; (11) $128.11.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) All legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,916.65.
E. (10) $9,129.91.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting the pottery industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $280.73; (6) $71.07; (7) $122.59; (8) $161.58; (9) $635.97; (10) $1,614.05; (11) $2,250.02.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948, and related legislation.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $298.02; (9) $290.02; (10) $516.58; (11) $814.60.

A. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists and Proprietors, International Union of America, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $896.32; (9) $896.32; (10) $2,227.58; (11) $3,123.90.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Field Enterprises-Educational Division, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) To obtain change in tax treatment for taxpayers electing to use the installment method of accounting.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Field Foundation, Inc., 135 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill.
C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting real-estate holdings of charitable organizations.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 23 West Irving, Chevy Chase, Md.
C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the Antarctic Continent, such as that regarding geopolitical decisions, inventions, transportation, communications, equipment, long-range planning, exploitation of natural resources, etc., in the interests of all United States taxpayers, world peace and prosperity: House Joint Resolution 353, Senate Joint Resolution 127, S. 3381, and H. R. 8954, for.
E. (4) $5; (6) $25; (9) $30; (10) $162.50; (11) $192.50.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $970.
E. (7) $322; (9) $332; (10) $132.34; (11) $457.34.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (9) $200; (10) $670; (11) $970.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (3) American Legion magazine.
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (6) $34.20; (7) $472.54; (8) $41; (9) $547.74; (10) $553.53; (11) $1,103.27; (15).[1]

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2).[1] (3) VFW magazine (Foreign Service), and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $240; (9) $240; (10) $768; (11) $1,008.

A. Jeff Kibre, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interests in legislative matters affecting trade unions and their members, and the maritime industry as well.
D. (6) $699.62.
E. (2) $260; (5) $185.29; (6) $81.85; (8) $63.20; (9) $595.34; (10) $1,060.33; (11) $1,655.67.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meatpackers.
D. (6) $875.01.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $210.64; (9) $210.64; (10) $80.87; (11) $291.51.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2404, posting of bonds for livestock purchasing; Taft-Hartley Act revision; tax law revision, H. R. 8300.
D. (6) $110.35.
E. (7) $45.83; (9) $45.83; (10) $127.90; (11) $173.73.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Proposed amendment to Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to tax real estate investment trusts like security investment trusts.
D. (6) $5,500.
E. (6) $32.75; (7) $21.72; (9) $54.47; (10) $322.34; (11) $376.81.

A. Joseph William Kinghorne, 1365 Iris Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broiler Association, Box 44, Lombard, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of broilers.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $3.85; (9) $3.85; (10) $157.43; (11) $161.28.

A. Bill Kirchner, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Banking legislation.
D. (6) $1,999.98.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $360.
E. (7) $27.68; (9) $27.68; (10) $102.56; (11) $130.24.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly. (3).[1]
E. (11) $112.69.

A. Allan B. Kline, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting directly American agriculture. (3) Official publications of the American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $1,042.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative developments of interest to Association members.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (11) $117.20.

A. John T. Koehler, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation authorizing final settlement of claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States in 1941.
E. (11) $1.50.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Eastern Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For Mutual Security Act of 1954.
E. (11) $9.05.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (11) $57.66.

A. Horace R. Lamb, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. St. Regis Paper Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Public Law 509, 83d Congress.
D. (6) $500.
E. (11) $10.24.

A. A. M. Lampley, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to railroad labor and opposing legislation inimical to railroad labor.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
C. (2) Legislative proposals and governmental programs.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
C. (2) Legislative proposals and governmental programs.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C. Serve in an advisory capacity.
B. State Tax Association, Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2).[1]

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) Legislative proposals and governmental programs pertinent to objectives of Trinity Improvement Association.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. D. B. Lasseter, Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Box 381, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the classified employees of the Federal Government.
D. (6) $400.
E. (9) $35; (10) $50; (11) $85.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (7) $49.94; (9) $49.94; (10) $29.90; (11) $79.84.

A. John G. Laylin and Wallace G. Dempsey, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2237.
E. (2) $23.18; (4) $80.35; (6) $83.75; (7) $207.82; (8) $59.85; (9) $454.95; (10) $561.53; (11) $1,016.48.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the United States Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $8,710.43.
E. (2) $1,800; (4) $1,335.06; (6) $69.03; (7) $583.40; (8) $422.94; (9) $4,210.43; (10) $14,280.70; (11) $18,491.13.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba and trade between the United States and Cuba. (3).[1]
D. (6) $1,714.92.
E. (4) $21.76; (6) $4.51; (8) $188.65; (9) $214.92; (10) $4,723; (11) $4,937.92.

A. James R. Lee, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which concerns water heater manufacturers, particularly the excise tax.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (11) $1,852.36.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before Congress relating to public education. (3 Washington Outlook on Education, NEA Federal Legislative Policy, Flash.
E. (2) $2,353.60; (4) $1,111.31; (5) $23.04; (6) $86.30; (7) $1,062.96; (9) $4,637.21; (10) $22,000.33; (11) $26,637.54.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Measures which affect the welfare of children and youth. (3) National Parent-Teacher.
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. William N. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.

A. Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the mechanical specialty contracting industries.
D. (6) $763.39.
E. (8) $763.39; (9) $763.39; (10) $21,441.13; (11) $22,204.52.

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace.
D. (6) $1,299.52.
E. (7) $74.53; (9) $74.53; (10) $386.01; (11) $460.54.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $5,417.39.
E. (2) $3,527.22; (5) $1,776.18; (6) $90.57; (7) $23.42; (9) $5,417.39; (10) $20,069.66; (11) $25,487.05.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In support of increase in personal tax exemption on corporation dividends. (3) Educational leaflets.
D. (6) $377.
E. (2) $80.27; (5) $182.20; (7) $482.21; (9) $745.28; (10) $15,305.45; (11) $16,050.73.

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. John W. Lindsay, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation relating to investment banking or securities business. (3).[1]
D. (6) $375.

A. Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
E. (11) $1,006.59.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2)[1].
D. (6) $495.
E. (6) $2.53; (7) $59.40; (8) $12.94; (9) $74.87; (10) $332.87; (11) $407.74.

A. Walter J. Little, 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Major Steam Railroads of California.
C. (2) trip-lease bill; 3 cents airmail; time-lag bill; repeal of excise transportation tax.
D. (6) $1,158.28.
E. (7) $445.54; (8) $65.48; (9) $511.02; (10) $2,950.44; (11) $3,461.46.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipeline Cos., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the pipeline industry.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Select committee on survivor benefits bill.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation for payroll deductions for Federal employees, war damage, economic controls, taxation of fringe benefits, health programs for Federal employees, and hospital and health matters.
D. (6) $7,850.
E. (6) $29.51; (7) $283.30; (8) $2.78; (9) $315.59; (10) $2,500.12; (11) $2,815.71.

A. Leonard Lopez, Room 303, Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,750.03.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $10; (11) $25.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. S. A. Healy Co., 61 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1762.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retail industry.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $18.75; (8) $1.25; (9) $20; (11) $20.

A. Lucas and Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $57.67; (7) $12.50; (8) $1.25; (9) $71.42; (11) $71.42.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation affecting mobile homes.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $101.87; (7) $6; (8) $1.25; (9) $109.12; (11) $109.12.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation providing for continuation of suspension of certain import taxes on copper.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $27.34; (7) $9.50; (8) $1.25; (9) $38.09; (11) $38.09.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
C.[1]

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,343.75.
E. (7) $54.46; (9) $54.46; (10) $215.10; (11) $269.56.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $555.56.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia employees.
D. (6) $1,546.14.
E. (7) $11.50; (9) $11.50; (10) $88.35; (11) $99.85.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $550.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $81.40; (9) $81.40; (10) $422.05; (11) $503.45.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.
E. (6) $25.74; (7) $105; (9) $130.74; (10) $3,359.90; (11) $3,490.64.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,555.55.
E. (7) $347.95; (9) $347.95; (10) $781.12; (11) $1,129.07.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $810.
E. (7) $150; (9) $150; (10) $900; (11) $1,050.

A. Ernest W. McFarland, Florence, Ariz.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp.; RCA Communications, Inc.; and Western Union Telegraph Co., New York City.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. M. C. McKercher, 5860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation in connection with parcel post.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (7) $254.10; (9) $254.10; (10) $2,035.66; (11) $2,289.76.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $251.25.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, Care of Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
C. (2).[1]
E. (9) $4; (10) $197.55; (11) $205.55.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 8300, suggesting amendment.
E. (10) $19.87.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support legislation favorable to the maintenance of the American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $42.65; (9) $42.65; (10) $93.19; (11) $135.84.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (9) $106.03; (10) $451.69; (11) $557.72.

A. Ellis W. Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Shell Oil Company, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the chemical industry.
E. (10) $7,125.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78.
E. (8) $53.60; (9) $53.60; (10) $143.04; (11) $196.64.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
E. (10) $3,909.75.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Morton Co., Worcester, Mass.
C. (2) Tariff status of silicon carbide.
D. (6) $812.50.
E. (6) $14.51; (7) $7.93; (9) $22.44; (10) $151.47; (11) $173.91.

A. Robert F. Martin, 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $56.
E. (7) $3; (9) $3; (10) $8.50; (11) $11.50.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112-18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting and of interest to the B. F. Goodrich Co.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco 15, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $300.
E. (10) $72.25.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of our country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,010.
E. (6) $29.95; (7) $240.80; (8) $57.25; (9) $328; (10) $1,065; (11) $7,393.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,750.01.
E. (7) $901.18; (9) $901.18; (10) $1,959.38; (11) $2,860.56.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to or affecting the waste-materials industry.
E. (10) $149.86.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $251.08; (9) $251.08; (10) $115.31; (11) $366.39.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, State Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) PR Notes.
E. (2) $1,800; (4) $225; (9) $2,025; (10) $6,075; (11) $8,100.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

A. Merchants National Bank and Trust Company of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $334.02.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
E. (10) $280.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (7) $162.38; (9) $162.38; (10) $1,087.46; (11) $1,249.84.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (6) $25.95; (9) $25.95; (11) $25.95.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., Homan and Arthington, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 8300.
D. $17,500.
E. $2.82; (6) $45.16; (9) $47.98; (11) $47.98.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas.
D. (6) $2,200.
E. (5) $155.54; (6) $61.62; (7) $699.59; (8) $65.40; (9) $982.15; (10) $2,845.01; (11) $3,827.16.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (6) $16.34; (7) $73.60; (9) $89.94; (10) $332.51; (11) $422.45.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislation affecting sulfur industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (5) $835; (6) $121.86; (7) $356.01; (8) $99.50; (9) $1,412.37; (10) $4,370.09; (11) $5,782.46.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John H. Davis, Harriett O. Davis, Harry Handley Cloutier, Elinor S. Cloutier, Estate of Henri H. Cloutier, deceased, Harry M. Cloutier, executor, Margaret S. Cloutier, Seattle, Wash.
C. (2) Tax legislation.
E. (6) $70.64; (8) $18.62; (9) $89.26; (10) $98.35; (11) $187.61.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $207.07.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (10) $1,473.09.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (7) $88.30; (9) $88.30; (10) $473.45; (11) $561.75.

A. George W. Morgan, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Shipowners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.
E. (10) $11,516.98.

A. Giles Morrow, Suite 610, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D. (6) $4,374.99.
E. (5) $36.82; (6) $487; (7) $46.11; (9) $87.80; (10) $325.52 (11) $413.32.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $620.75; (9) $620.75; (10) $1,852.42; (11) $2,473.17.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $110.

A. Allen P. Mullinnix, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (10) $900; (11) $1,200.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, P. O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) 1955 agricultural appropriations bill and general tax revision bill. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (10) $629.84.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (10) $3,131.47.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest previously on all bills relating to the education and training of veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $13,956.25.
E. (4) $94; (9) $94; (10) $264.52; (11) $358.52.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $4,148.67.
E. (1) $4,200; (2) $25,152.43; (4) $530; (5) $1,040.82; (6) $281.46; (7) $1,341.24; (8) $272.57; (9) $32,818.52; (10) $77,718.62; (11) $110,537.14; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $214.62.
E. (2) $56; (4) $155.62; (7) $3; (9) $214.62; (10) $208.75; (11) $423.37; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents.
D. (6) $3,070.25.
E. (2) $3,866.56; (5) $590.76; (6) $216.72; (7) $127; (9) $4,801.04; (10) $13,772.65; (11) $18,573.69; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company legislation.
D. (6) $43.
E. (2) $42; (7) $1; (9) $43; (10) $150.50; (11) $1,193.50.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $5,335.25.
E. $2,375; (4) $3,536.45; (5) $300; (6) $75; (7) $116.24; (9) $6,402.69; (10) $18,705.48; (11) $25,107.17.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 1111 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation appertaining to the postmasters of the United States.
D. (6) $45,440.05.
E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $3,129.78; (11) $3,629.78.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) Retirement Life.
D. (6) $525.
E. (2) $525; (9) $525; (10) $825; (11) $1,350.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $855.57.
E. (4) $152.75; (9) $152.75; (10) $454.28; (11) $607.03.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 1218 Locust Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gauger.
D. (6) $316.65.
E. (10) $1,500.

A. National Broiler Association, Box 44, Lombard, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers.
D. (6) $300.
E. (2) $300; (6) $21.99; (9) $321.99; (10) $841.77; (11) $1,163.71.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.
E. (2) $600; (7) $51.86; (9) $651.86; (10) $6,643.30; (11) $7,295.16.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Long-range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food canning industry, and opposition to mandatory marketing orders, title IV, S. 3052.
D. (6) $374,145.85.
E. (2) $833.33; (4) $30.70; (5) $32.48; (7) $958.69; (8) $51.27; (9) $1,906.47; (10) $19,165.09; (11) $21,071.56; (15).[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.
D. and E.[1]

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Parcel post size and weight limitations.
D. (6) $3,988.22.
E. (2) $1,399.50; (4) $321.99; (5) $6.62; (7) $2.65; (8) $20.45; (9) $1,751.21; (10) $9,567.53; (11) $11,318.74; (15).[1]

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act.
D. (6) $350.
E. (10) $294.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Urging the enactment of legislation which will repeal the existing excise taxes on the transportation of persons and property.
D. (6) $1,171.50.
E. (2) $10; (4) $986; (9) $996; (10) $1,754.17; (11) $2,750.17; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) All matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $55.50.
E. (2) $55.50; (9) $55.50; (10) $810.67; (11) $866.17.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 81, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $1,144.82.
E. (2) $903; (5) $199.80; (6) $14.34; (7) $27.68; (9) $1,144.82; (10) $11,379.85; (11) $12,524.67; (15).[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service.
D. (6) $2,023.91.
E. (1) $1,150; (4) $142.76; (6) $3.18; (7) $385.49; (8) $342.48; (9) $2,023.91; (10) $6,999.73; (11) $9,023.64; (15).[1]

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2).[1] The Junior American.
E. (2) $150; (4) $12.50; (6) $12; (9) $174.50; (10) $742.47; (11) $916.97.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace.[1] (3) Peace Action.
D. (6) $4,817.95.
E. (2) $3,301.93; (4) $515.63; (5) $1,179.50; (6) $123.12; (7) $192.98; (8) $1,335.46; (9) $6,648.62; (10) $24,589.60; (11) $31,238.22; (15).[1]

A. National Economic Council, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Favor legislation that tends to support private enterprise.
D. (6) $1,022.06.
E. (2) $500; (4) $514.92; (5) $100; (6) $25; (8) $25; (9) $1,164.92; (10) $4,598.85; (11) $5,763.77; (15).[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
(C) (2) Bills to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies.[1]

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
(C) (2) Legislation with respect to imports of electrical products into the United States.
E. (10) $3,875.34.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $132,842.30.
E. (2) $8,587.36; (4) $24,360.19; (5) $380; (7) $174.91; (8) $1,030.37; (9) $34,532.83; (10) $111,479.92; (11) $146,012.75; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,361.74.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $331.74; (5) $30; (9) $1,361.74; (10) $5,925.62; (11) $7,287.36; (15).[1]

A. National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,350.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $189.97; (11) $204.97.

A. National Housing Conference, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,137.46.
E. (2) $7,548.98; (4) $335.22; (5) $1,261.01; (6) $467.98; (7) $1,331.68; (8) $2,564.68; (9) $13,509.55; (10) $58,758.75; (11) $72,268.30; (15).[1]

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $58.03.
E. (2) $515.88; (4) $93.21; (5) $95.17; (6) 27.05; (7) $146.98; (8) $61.98; (9) $940.27; (10) $3,434.30; (11) $4,374.57; (15).[1]

A. National Institute of Diaper Services, Inc., 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interest previously to secure deduction for income-tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper service.

A. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tariffs.
D. (6) $1,100.
E. (2) $1,184.96; (4) $283.45; (5) $206.97; (6) $114.50; (7) $158.34; (8) $113.33; (9) $2,061.55; (10) $14,815.74; (11) $16,877.29; (15).[1]

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $601.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry.
E. (10) $14,054.98.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-Ops; and the Alert.
E. (10) $185,496.13.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $600; (7) $194.24; (9) $794.24; (10) $2,326.55; (11) $3,120.79.

A. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $52.10.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $14,778.22.
E. (2) $5,408.98; (4) $2,125.56; (5) $956.60; (6) $254.02; (7) $2,485.54; (8) $782.62; (9) $12,013.32; (10) $31,728.14; (11) $43,741.46; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,780.67.
E. (2) $240; (5) $100; (6) $50; (7) $116.65; (9) $506.65; (10) $2,008.65; (11) $2,515.30.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (2) $3,375; (4) $269.02; (5) $517.60; (7) $9.10; (8) $2.50; (9) $4,173.22; (10) $17,897.18; (11) $22,070.40; (15).[1]

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.
E. (4) $50; (9) $50; (10) $125; (11) $175.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,027.
E. (2) $2,601.80; (3) $5; (4) $7; (5) $149.50; (6) $30.61; (7) $114.23; (8) $467.99; (9) $3,376.13; (10) $18,344.93; (11) $21,721.06; (15).[1]

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural eletctrification program. (3) Rural Electrification magazine.
D. (6) $38,638.32.
E. (8) $38,638.32; (9) $38,638.32; (11) $83,325.92.

A. National Savings & Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.
E. (2) $700; (4) $55.38; (9) $755.38; (10) $4,830.41; (11) $5,585.79; (15).[1]

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
E. (2) $4,637.92; (5) $1,492.53; (6) $154.46; (9) $6,284.91; (10) $18,607.29; (11) $24,892.20; (15).[1]

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers. (3) Legislative bulletin.
D. (6) $24,886.01.
E. (2) $1,183; (4) $1,466.73; (9) $2,649.73; (10) $5,406.85; (11) $8,056.58.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $40,150.15.
E. (2) $2,916.65; (9) $2,916.65; (10) $34,843.02; (11) $37,759.67; (15).[1]

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tariffs. (3).[1]
D. (6) $21,225.
E. (2) $7,871.61; (4) $1,597.21; (5) $748.63; (6) $225.97; (7) $633.63; (8) $467.53; (9) $11,544.58; (10) $70,346; $81,890.58; (15).[1]

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. and Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all matters pertaining to the business or policyholders of accident and health insurance.
D. (6) $178.35.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C., D., and E.[1]

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Otis H. Ellis, General Counsel, National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters which might affect business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D. (6) $2.25.
E. (7) $55; (9) $55; (10) $165; (11) $220.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.
D. (6) $6,195.45.
E. (2) $131.18; (5) $1,720.73; (6) $438.50; (7) $55.04; (9) $2,445.45; (10) $8,014.34; (11) $10,459.79.

A. J. L. Nellis, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Midwest Conference on Truck Reciprocity, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For H. R. 407.
D. (6) $2,650.
E. (1) $1,500; (2) $1,637.73; (4) $187.86; (5) $255; (8) $146.22; (9) $3,726.81; (10) $8,488.16; (11) $12,214.97; (15).[1]

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman.
D. (6) $900.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place N. W., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange. (3) The National Grange Monthly.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting the ship repair industry directly or indirectly.
D. (6) $2,997.88.
E. (2) $2,800; (5) $194.33; (6) $16.89; (7) $110.89; (9) $3,122.11; (10) $15,315.85; (11) $18,437.96; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
E. (2) $5,982.35; (7) $191.73; (8) $33.02; (9) $6,207.10; (10) $9,891.12; (11) $16,098.22; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (6) $11.78; (7) $1.80; (8) $3.38; (9) $16.96; (10) $167.39; (11) $184.35.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (9) $215.90; (10) $326.25; (11) $542.15.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $970.01.
E. (6) $0.43; (7) $57; (8) $9.29; (9) $66.72; (10) $62.60; (11) $129.32.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and the Alert.
E. (10) $412.07.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (10) $338.54.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,825.25.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to maintenance of American merchant marine.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (5) $675; (6) $38.55; (7) $95.45; (8) $18.20; (9) $827.20; (10) $4,170.80; (11) $4,998.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 3596, in support thereof.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $3.40; (7) $12.85; (9) $16.25; (10) $154.88; (11) $170.83.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.
E. (10) $266.76; (11) $266.76.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (10) $495.44; (11) $495.44.

A. A. E. Oliver, 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation to protect innocent purchasers of converted CCC grain.
D. (6) $48.50.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (10) $1; (11) $3.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which the mutual savings banks have an interest in opposing or supporting.

A. Robert Oliver, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,624.98.
E. (7) $1,230.66; (9) $1,230.66; (10) $2,461.32; (11) $3,691.98.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (3).[1]
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $74.75; (9) $74.75; (10) $447; (11) $521.75.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Box 381, Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $445.
E. (8) $721.08; (4) $280.29; (5) $7.10; (9) $1,008.47; (10) $2,840.49; (11) $3,848.96.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Missouri railroads.
E. (10) $1,994.38; (11) $1,994.38.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Spokesmen for Children, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. [1]
D. (6) $67.
E. (7) $67; (9) $67; (10) $50; (11) $117.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine.
D. (6) $200.
E. (2) $1,625; (9) $1,625; (10) $5,131.33; (11) $6,756,33.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Corp., College Park, Md.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the pen-and-pencil industry, the plate-glass industry, and legislation dealing with excess-profits tax relief in hardship cases.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Parker, Milliken & Kohlmeier, 650 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, Fourth and Main Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal estate tax.
E. (10) $968.51; (11) $968.51.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1417 California Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $908.40; (11) $908.40.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1814 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (10) $156.34; (11) $156.34.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. International Minerals & Chemical Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To amend section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.
E. (10) $62.89; (11) $62.89.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,650.
E. (6) $30.46; (7) $183.25; (8) $86.73; (9) $300.44; (10) $659.95; (11) $960.39.

A. Pershing, Bosworth, Dick & Dawson, 320 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Denver Association of Building Onwers and Managers, 624 17th Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) For passage of section 164 (b) (5) (B) of Internal Revenue Code of 1954.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $2.04; (9) $2.04; (11) $2.04.

A. Hugh Peterson, Ailey, Ga.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (8) $600; (9) $600; (10) $2,000; (11) $2,600.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Inc., Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) Legislation that affects the citrus industry.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (4) $16.56; (8) $0.27; (9) $16.83; (10) $828.35; (11) $845.18.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., 8-10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.
C. (2) For legislation similar to section 1237 of H. R. 8300.
E. (8) $1.74; (9) $1.74; (10) $8.09; (11) $9.83.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the Intercoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee to the Anclote on the west coast of Florida.
E. (6) $2.84; (8) $1.46; (9) $4.30; (10) $124.01; (11) $128.31.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $57.50.
E. (10) $83.02; (11) $83.02.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $200.
E. (10) $118.24; (11) $118.24.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. Stanley I. Posner and Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Diaper Services, 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Deduction for income tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper service.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining.
D. (6) $1,125.
E. (7) $13.10; (9) $13.10; (10) $58; (11) $71.10.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia employees.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (10) $3.50; (11) $3.50.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Charles M. Price, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For percentage depletion on gypsum. (3).[1]
D. (6) $1,166.55.
E. (10) $342.29; (11) $342.29.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.
C. (2) Bank holding company legislation.
D. (6) $42.
E. (7) $1; (9) $1; (10) $112.63; (11) $113.63.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry. (3) Legislative bulletins.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $375, (11) $500.

A. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $7,500; (7) $1,248.10; (9) $8,748.10; (10) $26,945.71; (11) $35,693.81.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (8) $1.20; (9) $1.20; (10) $45.70; (11) $46.90.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation in connection with the promotion and advancement of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $749.99.
E. (7) $251.22; (9) $251.22; (10) $365.89; (11) $617.11.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to architectural profession.
D. (6) $200.
E. (4) $35; (6) $25; (7) $50; (10) $210; (11) $210.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.
E. (10) $1,114.55; (11) $1,114.55.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 527 West 57th Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 369 Lexington Avenue, New York City; Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Public health.
D. (6) $7,500.01.
E. (2) $921; (5) $1,830.66; (6) $304.67; (7) $2,531.89; (9) $5,588.22; (10) $14,316.13; (11) $19,904.35.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $85.42.
E. (7) $5.33; (9) $5.33; (10) $278.87; (11) $284.20.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For H. R. 122.
D. (6) $48.60.
E. (4) $11.14; (5) $34.82; (6) $4.35; (7) $27.10; (8) $5.71; (9) $83.12; (10) $699.40; (11) $792.52.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the marketing and distributing of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver.
D. (6) $4,250.02.
E. (7) $438.89; (9) $438.89; (10) $2,163.26; (11) $2,602.15.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Joint Committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy products manufacturing firms.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (1) $7.20; (2) $375; (4) $101.70; (5) $367.11; (6) $144.45; (7) $673.83; (8) $460.55; (9) $2,129.84; (10) $991.43; (11) $3,121.27.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $1,708.20.
E. (2) $1,223.89; (4) $409.31; (5) $75; (9) $1,708.20; (10) $8,607.14; (11) $10,315.34.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer and the ROA Washington Newsletter.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $38,334.05.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,093.56.
E. (2) $3,753.87; (4) $1,024.79; (5) $523.61; (6) $30.03; (7) $105.62; (8) $1,255.64; (9) $6,693.56; (10) $19,600.86; (11) $26,294.42.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $525.
E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $21.10; (11) $22.35.

A. Andrew E. Rice, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights and liberties, and veterans' benefits.
D. (6) $450.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $50; (11) $65.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $585.

A. Harry H. Rieck, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
C. (2).[1]
E. (11) $17.12.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Hualapai Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Nez Perce Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Oglala Sioux Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Pueblo of Laguna in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the San Carlos Tribe in particular.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, Winnebago, Nebr.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Winnebago Tribe in particular.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C, D, and E.[1]

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,010.
E. (6) $25.40; (7) $238.95; (8) $61.65; (9) $326; (10) $1,034; (11) $1,360.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects, and appropriations for construction of projects.
E. (2) $222; (4) $55.64; (5) $129.27; (6) $18; (9) $424.91; (10) $1,562.98; (11) $1,987.89.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, P. O. Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of the American farmer to grow and market sugar beets.
D. (6) $325.
E. (2) $38.40; (4) $28.54; (5) $26.79; (6) $5.72; (7) $211.64; (9) $311.09; (10) $1,302.42; (11) $1,613.51; (15).[1]

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $524; (9) $524; (10) $969.77; (11) $1,493.77.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,300.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Delbert L. Rucker, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $25.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (10) $221.61.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (7) $68; (9) $68; (10) $516.75; (11) $584.75.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (10) $235.69.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $481.15; (9) $481.15; (10) $1,116.96; (11) $1,598.11.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (8) $60; (9) $60; (10) $125; (11) $185.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,650.01.
E. (6) $17.66; (7) $38.39; (8) $5.94; (9) $61.99; (10) $640.54; (11) $702.53.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fulton Land and Timber Co., 711 Orchard Road, Hagerstown, Md.
C. (2) Depletion provisions in the Internal Revenue Code.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. and C.[1]
E. (6) $3.08; (9) $3.08; (10) $186.77; (11) $189.85.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lessees of B. V. Hedrick Gravel & Sand Co., Lilesville, N. C.
C. (2) Depletion provisions in the Internal Revenue Code.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $182.25.
E. (10) $33.70.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (10) $217.07.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance matters.
E. (10) $20.12.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.
C. (2) All proposed legislation which would affect the intercity motor bus industry.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $100.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $156.31.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $2.40; (9) $2.40; (10) $106.51; (11) $108.91.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $4,633.99.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $70.45; (9) $70.45; (10) $222.51; (11) $292.96.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $375.
E. (6) $1.43; (7) $767.72; (9) $769.15; (10) $984.68; (11) $1,753.83; (15).[1]

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $120.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (10) $495.44.

A. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (6) $11.78· (7) $1.80; (8) $3.38; (9) $16.96; (10) $2,508.20; (11) $2,525.16.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2555, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver.
E. (2) $6,584.36; (5) $977.52; (6) $385.75; (7) $438.89; (8) $94.80; (9) $8,481.32; (10) $26,131.48; (11) $34,612.80.

A. Russell Singer, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G. Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River, etc.[1]
E. (2) $3,000; (8) $55.78; (9) $3,055.78; (10) $14,882.77; (11) $17,938.55; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Stephen Slipher, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting savings and loans, housing, home financing, thrift, and financial institutions.
D. (6) $1,600.
E. (10) $77.50.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Postal rate legislation.
D. (6) $1,290.
E. (2) $1,693.57; (4) $23.18; (7) $79.37; (9) $1,796.12; (10) $6,282.44; (11) $8,078.56; (15).[1]

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
C.[1]
D. (6) $606.12.
E. (6) $26.85; (8) $172.58; (9) $199.03; (10) $1,071.82; (11) $1,270.85.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Forestry, regional development, resources conservation, and labor relations.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (7) $312.92; (9) $312.92; (10) $368.79; (11) $681.71.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and the Great Northern Railway Co.
D. (6) $3,733.33.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (6) $20.88; (7) $276.60; (8) $22.50; (9) $319.98; (10) $945.63; (11) $1,265.61.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. $825.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin.
D. (6) $28,511.64.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $16,376.25; (4) $6,062.60; (5) $1,890.68; (6) $117.80; (7) $434.27; (8) $523.89; (9) $25,405.49; (10) $74,400.39; (11) $99,805.88; (15).[1]

A. Spence and Hotchkiss, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. $41.
E. (1) $25; (4) $77.68; (5) $141.06; (6) $7.64; (7) $117; (9) $368.38; (10) $577.55; (11) $945.93; (15).[1]

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1] (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,500; (4) $1,400; (6) $163.20; (9) $3,277.70; (10) $13,315.36; (11) $16,593.06.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $150.
E. (10) $37.85.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 9307 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to sugar and Cuban trade.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Health, education, and welfare.

A. Russell M. Stephen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to technical engineers, especially those engineers employed by the United States Government.
D. (6) $240.
E. (7) $20; (9) $20; (10) $60; (11) $80.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $3,971.72.
E. (7) $410.47; (8) $61.25; (9) $471.72; (10) $527.14; (11) $998.96.

A. Erskine Stewart, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25; (10) $3.75; (11) $5.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $2,816.01.
E. (6) $0.30; (7) $228.73; (8) $86.98; (9) $316.01; (10) $170.80; (11) $486.81.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 3d Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,117.79.
E. (8) $103.27; (9) $103.27; (10) $465.81; (11) $569.08.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,680.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,875.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (10) $225.

A. William C. Stronach, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $625; (8) $2,500.
E. (7) $1; (9) $1; (10) $24; (11) $25.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Box 2084 Capital Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) All legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. (3) Texas water.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (2) $92.45; (5) $70.94; (6) $8.45; (7) $1,095.34; (8) $259.35; (9) $1,526.53; (10) $2,689.52; (11) $4,216.05.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting general public health, tuberculosis in particular.
E. (10) $892.51; (11) $892.51.

A. Barrett Godwin Tawresey, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Having the present Congress pass an act providing for a full judicial review of certain claims arising from French spoliations occurring prior to 1800.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, I. R. C.
D. (6) $588.
E. (2) $146.25; (5) $135; (7) $87.39; (8) $2.94; (9) $371.58; (10) $3,431.22; (11) $3,802.80.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Jay Taylor, 712 First National Bank Building, Amarillo, Tex.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (11) $1,241.38.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect tobacco growers, dealers, and warehousemen.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $258.03; (8) $20.80; (9) $278.83; (10) $1,338.55; (11) $1,617.38.

A. Tyre Taylor, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free enterprise system.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $273.14; (6) $51.47; (9) $324.61; (10) $1,175.73; (11) $1,500.34.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) All legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and State and Federal agencies. (3) Texas water.
D. (6) $4,484.
E. (1) $568.80; (2) $2,217.20; (3) $600; (4) $1,039.18; (5) $548.55; (6) $257.83; (7) $823.49; (8) $2,715.02; (9) $8,770.07; (10) $18,042.30; (11) $26,812.37.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.
D. (6) $6,500.
E. (7) $141; (9) $141; (10) $621.15; (11) $762.15.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (7) $23.42; (9) $23.42; (10) $128.04; (11) $151.46.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C .
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $42; (9) $42; (10) $48.50; (11) $90.50.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.
E. (10) $700; (11) $700.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interests.
D. (6) $695.31.
E. (7) $9.50; (9) $9.50; (10) $118.82; (11) $128.32.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops; The Alert.
E. (10) $795.39; (11) $795.39.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $55.50.

A. Tomoka Land Co., 8–10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.
C. (2) For legislation similar to section 1237 of H. R. 8300.
E. (8) $0.74; (9) $0.74; (10) $504.44; (11) $505.18.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.
D. (6) $600.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Immigration, Mexican farm labor importation, transportation, grazing land, St. Lawrence seaway, ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing, Watershed Protection Act, Water Facilities Act, irrigation legislation.
D. (6) $1,912.50.
E. (7) $64.21; (9) $64.21; (10) $256.18; (11) $320.39.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co.; Southern Pacific Co.; Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William S. Tyson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Box 493, Balboa, C. Z.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting Panama Canal pilots.
D. (6) $183.71.
E. (6) $96.31; (7) $5.25; (8) $32.40; (9) $133.96; (10) $571.34; (11) $705.30.

A. Unemployed Service Association, 623 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Various proposals for unemployed people.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $1,000.03; (7) $723.70; (9) $1,323.73; (10) $6,210.91; (11) $7,534.64.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba. (3).[1]
D. (6) $114,929.55.
E. (1) $2,863.22; (2) $1,260.85; (4) $4,116.85; (5) $604; (6) $65.56; (8) $5,000; (9) $13.910.48; (10) $20,632.21; (11) $34,542.69.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C.[1]
D.[1]
E. (2) $4,937.05; (4) $2,129.11; (5) $916.27; (6) $32.73; (7) $961.23; (8) $379.95; (9) $9,356.34; (10) $42,119.16; (11) $51,475.50.

A. Arvin E. Upton, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. St. Regis Paper Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Public Law 509, 83d Congress.
D. (6) $500.
E. (6) $2.42; (9) $2.42; (10) $22.82; (11) $25.24.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $25.

A. Claude R. Wallace, 203 Eighth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. POSSE, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Social security and old-age benefits.
E. (10) $500; (11) $500.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,493.77.
E. (6) $4.77; (7) $154.75; (8) $7.98; (9) $167.50; (10) $227.39; (11) $394.89.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (10) $31.95; (11) $31.95.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 National Bank Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Company of America.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (7) $735.60; (9) $735.60; (10) $3,967.93; (11) $4,703.53.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D.[1]
E.[1]

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2413.
D. (6) $2,786.15.
E. (2) $860; (4) $345.45; (5) $535.87; (6) $80.46; (8) $702.19; (9) $2,523.97; (10) $10,591.23; (11) $13,115.20.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E. (10) $500; (11) $500.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests will continue until it is determined whether a new bill similar to S. 3111 will be introduced in the 84th Congress. (3) a Danger to American Industry and to the Public.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (2) $6,593.13; (4) $57.85; (6) $14.38; (9) $6,665.36; (10) $7,638.67; (11) $14,304.03.

A. J. R. Watson, I. C. RR. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I. C. RR. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting the ship-repair industry, directly or indirectly.
D. (6) $5,000.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bigham, Engler, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting marine insurance companies as subrogees of property owners whose property was damaged or destroyed by the enemy during World War II.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr.; Henry H. Glassie, Edwin H. Pewett, and Thomas M. Cooley II.
B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation respecting mechanical specialty contracting industries, and in any legislation dealing with contracting or subcontracting by the Government, Government construction contracts, public works and building.
E. (4) $87.14; (6) $3.97; (7) $7; (8) $13.77; (9) $111.88; (10) $2,007.30; (11) $2,119.18.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,505.83.
E. (3) $52; (4) $78.70; (7) $508.89; (8) $72.90; (9) $712.49; (10) $1,709.95; (11) $2,422.44.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation training or contract overhaul of aircraft.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (10) $14.88; (11) $14.88.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,499.96.
E. (6) $14.15; (7) $312.38; (8) $9.40; (9) $335.93; (10) $1,295.53; (11) $1,631.46.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (7) $112; (9) $112; (10) $334; (11) $446.

A. Richard H. Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting in any way the bowling industry.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902, and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.
D. (6) $3,249.99.
E. (6) $39.92; (7) $1,538.12; (8) $102.85; (9) $1,680.89; (10) $1,440.79; (11) $3,121.68.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to a possible revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 895).
E. (6) $2.40; (9) $2.40; (10) $46.73; (11) $49.13.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the Intercoastal Waterway.
E. (2) $600; (6) $2.84; (8) $1.46; (9) $604.30; (10) $904.01; (11) $1,508.31.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) $51.30; (9) $51.30; (10) $44.70; (11) $96.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurseryman, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (2) $33.75; (4) $21.64; (5) $15.30; (6) $8.02; (7) $11.60; (9) $90.31; (10) $230.73; (11) $321.04.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interest of manufacturers of gas applicances and equipment.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $750.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.
D. (6) $1,860.82.
E. (2) $1,140; (5) $318.05; (6) $20.02; (7) $362.75; (8) $20; (9) $1,860.82; (10) $5,949.70; (11) $7,810.52.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association.
C. (2) All legislative matters before the Congress that affect the oil and gas industries.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $50; (7) $50; (9) $100; (10) $300; (11) $400.

A. Joseph F. Wildebush, 7 Church Street, Paterson, N. J.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks enactment of a law establishing qualities and standards.
E. (10) $92.51; (11) $92.51.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
E. (4) $2.68; (9) $2.68; (10) $47.49; (11) $50.17.

A. Hugh S. Williamson, 1621 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Shipowners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $4,800.
E. (6) $32.08; (7) $1,302.10; (8) $25; (9) $1,359.18; (10) $1,854.72; (11) $3,213.90.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87.
E. (7) $413.11; (9) $413.11; (10) $1,089.01; (11) $1,502.12.

A. James L. Milmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Junior American.
D. (6) $24.50.
E. (4) $12.50; (6) $12; (9) $24.50; (10) $159; (11) $183.50.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (6) $7.44; (7) $207.82; (8) $0.50; (9) $215.76; (10) $802.46; (11) $1,018.22.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $285.97; (9) $285.97; (10) $728.83; (11) $1,014.80.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $366.19; (9) $366.19; (10) $1,271.36; (11) $1,637.55.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina and Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) Legislation effecting Texas railroads.[1]
D. (6) $5,988.87.
E. (6) $54.64; (7) $1,184.77; (9) $1,239.41; (10) $4,635.81; (11) $5,875.22; (15).[1]

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation that may effect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $8,059.12.
E. (6) $54.64; (7) $1,035.73; (9) $1,090.37; (10) $2,317.91; (11) $3,408.28; (15).[1]

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $22.55; (9) $22.55; (10) $379.95; (11) $402.50.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (10) $81.63.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1954:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) In favor of extension and amendment of Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 2201 North Oak Street, Arlington, Va.
C. (2) Interested in any bills affecting re-refined oils. (4) Not to exceed $1,000.

A. George P. Baker, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation, including all pending bills before the House and Senate. (4) Monthly salary, $2,500.

A. R. H. Barry, 121 15th Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
B. American Seed Trade Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect members of the American Seed Trade Association. (4) $625 per month, plus traveling and out-of-pocket expense.

A. Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. G. B. Macke Corp., 212 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Automatic Canteen Co. of America, Merchandising Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; National Automatic Merchandising Association, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Seeking amendments to District of Columbia Sales and Use Tax Acts. (4) $250 per diem.

A. Warren B. Bledsoe, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation under consideration in the Congress which will affect postal employees. (3) The National Rural Letter Carrier. (4) Monthly compensation, $121.45; expenses approximately $50.

A. The Borax Cartel Story, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, to authorize a study of the anti-trust laws, and to increase penalties under the Sherman Act. (4) As much as $250 per month for any one officer and $750 per month for office expense and literature.

A. Bureau of Accident & Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation which may affect the business of accident and health insurance.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which will affect the magazine-publishing industry. (4) Approximate rate, $60 per diem; expenses reimbursed.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Inc., 312 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Inc., 312 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 110, dealing with mineral rights; other legislation dealing with the conservation of natural resources.

A. John G. Coffey, 742 Hospital Trust Building, Providence, R. I.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in all railroad legislation. (4) Estimated expenses $5,000; annual salary $7,500.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1] (4) Anticipated expense, 1955, $2,500; annual compensation, $10,500.

A. Joan David, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal matters. (4) $325 per month, plus expenses.

A. Jerry K. Fields, 5124 45th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Improvement of the aged and blind and dependent persons; Social Security Act, for its betterment. (4) $350 monthly.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of legislation which is in the interest of a sound national air transport policy and opposition to legislation contrary to such interests. (4) Annual rate of compensation, $20,000.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that affects the citrus industry. (4) Anticipated expenditures $833.33 per month for our attorney; expense estimated at about $1,000 per year.

A. Carmen Fortier, 1825 T Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2)[1].

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) $500 annually, plus expenses.

A. General Gas Committee, 1612 Continental Life Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) For amendment of the Natural Gas Act. (4) Salary and expenses of the committee, approximately $75,000.

A. William F. Giesen, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Maritime Association of the Port of New York, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting maritime interests of the Port of New York. (4) Annual salary $17,000, plus actual expenses.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Institute, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Particularly matters relating to plywood.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Woven Wood Fabric Industry—Columbia Mills, Inc.; Consolidated General Products, Inc.; Hough Shade Corp; Warren Shade Co.; Williams Manufacturing Co.
C. (2) Tariff matters.

A. Hawes & Gosnell, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Generally.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. H. C. Hicks, 2201 North Oak Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 2201 North Oak Street., Arlington, Va.
C. (2) Bills affecting re-refined oils. (4) $200 per month.

A. Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the business of accident and health insurance.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Annual rate is estimated at $550 and actual expenses.

A. E. F. Hines, 58 Philbrick, Roslindale, Mass.
B. International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, 3615 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the iron workers' union and labor. (4) Salary, $9,390 per annum; expenses $25 per day, maximum.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Promoting the interests of merchandise warehousemen.

A. Herman Archibald Johnson, 209 33d Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Brokers, Inc., 420 East 45th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertaining to housing with particular emphasis on minority housing. (4) Expenses, if and when required.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, 1701 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Equal-rights amendment and equal-pay legislation. (3) The Independent Woman. (4) Anual salary $5,000; estimated expenses $600 per annum.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, postoffice box 1170, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association. (4) Annual retainer of $1,500.

A. National Association of Real Estate Brokers, 420 East 45th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the business of accident and health insurance.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting the ship repair industry directly or indirectly. (4) $10,000 per year.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) $800 per year and expenses.

A. Charles Thomas O'Hara, Collins Avenue and 27th Street, Miami Beach, Fla.
C. (2) Legislation essential to the economic security and general welfare of veterans and dependents.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the phonograph record industry. (4) $5,000 retainer.

A. Peoples Lobby, 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Emory Speer Avant, 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (legislative fund), Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) For legislation granting tax relief for sale of fruit on trees, and any legislation that affects the citrus industry. (4) $833.33 per month and $1,000 per year expenses.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., 8–10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.
C. (2) For legislation similar to section 1237 of H. R. 8300 so as to make same applicable to corporations on lands held for more than 10 years and for similar legislation. (4) $500 for expenses.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the Intercoastal Waterway. (4) $200 per month and expenses not to exceed $500.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting employer.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The legislative interests of the CIO, as determined each year by the annual convention and the CIO Executive Board. (4) Salary $8,500 a year; anticipated expenses $1,500.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention—adopted program of organization. (4) $5,200 a year salary.

A. Protective Committee for Equality of Business and Labor Under the Antitrust Laws, 209 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association, 2201 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
C. (2) Cotton acreage legislation. (4) Salary $1,000 per month; expenses $1,000 per month.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Blackfeet Tribe in particular. (4) Retainer of $3,000.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroads.

A. Charles B. Shuman, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 9307 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba, and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to sugar and Cuban trade. (4) $1,250 monthly plus expenses.

A. William T. Stephens, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 519 South Broadway, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) General legislation affecting the utility trailer industry, particularly Federal tax legislation.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in the inclusion of safeguards to domestic industries in proposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act. (4) $125 per day, plus expenses of $500.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) $6,300 annually plus expenses.

A. Tomoka Land Co., 8–10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.
C. (2) For legislation similar to section 1237 of H. R. 8300 so as to make same applicable to corporations on lands held for more than 10 years.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting the ship repair industry directly or indirectly. (4) $10,000 per year.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the intercoastal waterway. (4) $200 per month.

A. A. E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anaconda Copper Mining Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
C. (2) In favor of legislation to suspend excise import tax on imported copper. (4) $500 per month compensation plus estimated expenses of $500 per month.

A. V. T. Worthington, 2201 North Oak Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 2201 North Oak Street, Arlington, Va.
C. (2) Interested in any bills affecting refined oils. (4) $200 per month.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation affecting American Indians. (4) Salary of $500 monthly and estimated expenses of $150 monthly.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Military Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each year since 1948 it has been my pleasure to cooperate with the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States in furtherance of National Defense Week, and, in particular, with the splendid ROA in my own State.

Through the courtesy of Maj. MacArthur H. Manchester, I have prepared annual articles published in the ROA magazine which he capably edits.

This year, my article appeared as usual, in the February issue. I am glad to say that on the front cover of that particular issue is a picture of the President of the United States talking things over with our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who is president of the ROA and a brigadier general of the United States Army Reserve. With him was Major Manchester.

I think it is appropriate that this article be reprinted, especially in view of yesterday's most welcome action by the House of Representatives in providing for an annual pay increase for members of the military and related services.

This is but the first step in strengthening the position of those who serve in the honored uniform of our country, and of those who have been so frequently recalled to the colors. Career soldier and citizen soldier, 30-year man and Reservist—all are entitled to fairness and justice.

I may say that our big job affecting the Reserve still lies ahead, however, in order to eliminate numerous unfortunate and almost chronic inequities which have arisen and in order to give our men the best possible training and equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article in the ROA magazine entitled "America's Future: Great Opportunity, Great Peril," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S FUTURE: GREAT OPPORTUNITY, GREAT PERIL

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, former chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

What does the future hold? Peace or war? A golden age of prosperity for mankind? A nuclear Armageddon—with civilization blasted into radioactive rubble and with mankind plunging back into the Dark Ages?

These are the great question marks of our time.

You, the reader, and your family and friends and associates, along with millions more like you hold, in part, the answer to this great riddle.

Upon you and me and upon our countrymen will depend basically the future course of mankind. Modern science will be our obedient servant or our impersonal destroyer. It is indeed strange irony that this great miracle force of science may jet-propel us into an age of unparalleled high standards of living, of wonderful conveniences and comforts—or it may explode us into an orgy of destruction more frightful than man has ever conceived.

I believe that science will provide man's greater fulfillments.

I believe that we today are but touching the "hem of the garment" of the mysteries of the new age. Man will unlock heretofore-undreamed-of secrets of the tiniest atom and of the vast reaches of starry outer space. I believe that our children and children's children will be a part of the most exciting, most rewarding eras of history. All this is possible. Peace is definitely possible—with honor, but only through vigorous, continuous preparedness. I believe that science will be man's continued servant.

And in this National Defense Week, we are given a precious opportunity to think, to plan, to rededicate ourselves to the goal of entering this golden age—the era of abundance for the common man.

But, to achieve this, we are now called upon to attain and maintain a level of preparedness more complete, more effective than we have ever found it necessary to reach in our history.

Why?

Because you, the sovereign people of the United States, and we, your elected and appointed officials, are living in an age of total peril. It is the age of aggressive, conspiratorial, international communism—a force contrary to its occasional peaceful coexistence lullabies, is aimed at our violent destruction.

Never before in our history have we faced such a terrible danger to our very survival—a danger so vast, so all-present, so hideous in its proven record, a danger so powerful.

THE MANYFOLD PERIL

The peril which it represents is a total peril for two reasons:

1. It is total in its possibility of total annihilation of its enemies through lightning-like nuclear attack. I emphasize "lightning-like;" we will not have months and years to recover from a Pearl Harbor-like blow the next time—if we are hit unprepared and unalert.

Listen to the words of 4-star Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, chief of our Air Materiel Command at Dayton:

"With * * * modern weapons, the next war could be decided in a matter of hours or days. We must never lose sight of this in all our thinking and planning.

"We cannot put a price tag on those hours or days because they are a precious natural resource beyond price."

2. Second, our peril is total in that communism assaults every segment of our society.

The Communist assault on the free world is always a combined operation; military, diplomatic, political, economic, social, and psychological.

As the attack is total, so our defense must be total.

RIGHT CITIZEN THINKING

Thus, never before has it been more important that the average citizen understand and contribute to the overall defense of our beloved country.

He must remember always that the most basic aspect of our defense is, of course, our military defense—by air, ground, and sea. But, it is by no means the only area of defense. Our society within must be strong and healthy. Every American community, every trade union, every factory, business, mine, home, must be a center of strength in American society; a center of reason and understanding, a center in which the peril to our society is recognized and combatted—logically, carefully.

So, the responsibility is great upon every citizen—for right thinking, right action. It is particularly great upon you, my readers, the dedicated men and women who comprise America's reserve officers. You are our minute men and women—ready at all times to spring to arms to lead us in any emergency.

STRONG RESERVE INDISPENSABLE

Your vital role must and could be appreciated by your fellow citizens. Every nonreservist must understand that it is upon our Reserve Forces that we indispensably depend in our eternal vigilance against future dangers. A strong Reserve with deep pride in its traditions, with firm confidence in its future, with undimmed faith in fair dealing by its Government, a Reserve with modern equipment, with streamlined training, with highest morale—these have become not luxuries but absolute necessities for the United States.

Reservists and nonreservists alike must understand that to be adequate against the total Communist peril, we must marshall and strengthen our forces—tangible and intangible—our own and our allies—internal and external—to defend ourselves and our way of life.

NEW PRINCIPLES IN THE AGE OF TOTAL PERIL

Ours is an era of change. From the new factors on the world scene stem new principles which will determine America's survival in the age of total peril.

First, is the vital principle that there must be correct and fearless policy formulation. Why? Because an error in policy may prove irreversible—uncorrectible—fatal. In the past, America's errors in defense, its delay in accepting automatic weapons over the muzzle-loader, mechanized cavalry over the horse, airplane over the dirigible, carrier task force over the battle fleet, resulted in unnecessary military losses but did not jeopardize completely our national survival.

Today, a single failure—for example, failure to accept the obligation for all-out development of an intercontinental guided rocket—a failure which could result in Soviet Russia's prior development of such a missile, might mean utter disaster for us.

Second, closely connected with the new importance of right policy is the principle of policy interdependence. Never before have foreign and domestic policies become so closely intertwined. Our price level, productivity, civil liberties, security practices, road system—these and a hundred other phases interact and vitally affect United States defense.

In the present age, we are conducting a continuous and complex cold war against the continuous and complex pressure of world communism. So, policy weakness or failure in almost any area of national or international life—may lead to Communist misinterpretation and Communist aggression.

Thus, if America gives the impression of, or if in actuality if it experiences, economic depression, domestic isolation, endless partisan discord, or worst of all, military weakness, then America stands to lose its allies. It thereby encourages piecemeal aggression and its own possible ultimate destruction by its Communist foe.

Hence, it becomes increasingly apparent that America can survive and maintain peace only through maintaining a healthy society and continuous and proven military superiority over world communism. This means adequate forces-in-being, capable of devastating, instantaneous retaliation. This in turn requires optimum weapons research development and appropriate production.

America's military superiority coupled with America's unwillingness to use this superiority, except in self-defense, must be made absolutely clear to the world at large and to the Communist leaders in particular. No short-sighted considerations here at home—penny-pinching or partisanship should be allowed to impair the applying of this fundamental principle of overall preparedness upon which hinges America's survival.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP VITAL

Finally, in the age of total peril, America must accept the absolute necessity of membership and of leadership for the indefinite future in the global free world coalition.

This free world coalition—a coalition which must be hardened in fact and not merely in lofty words—remains the key to America's future. It is the key for broadening our base of manpower and our mineral resources base; for dispersal of our strategic air forces and increased capability of massive retaliation; for local land forces to halt local aggression and to flank Communist global aggression; for the maintenance of world economic prosperity and well-being. It is the key to American survival no less than to the preservation of the most cherished rights amongst free men of all races and creeds.

Likewise, America itself is an absolute necessity to the global coalition. Without our predominant power base, virtually no other free nation could prove adequate to withstand the continuous pressure of Communist aggression or subversion.

MILITARY STRENGTH OF RUSSIA

Against the background of these principles, it would be well to bear in mind certain facts with regard to the tremendous military capabilities of the Soviet Union. No sensible person reviewing even this brief list of 10 factors which I shall present could fail to appreciate the enormous significance of the Soviet threat.

I will not attempt to compare Soviet with United States and allied military assets. Obviously, a detailed comparison—division compared to division, fleet unit to unit, air wing to wing, atom stockpile to stockpile is a highly technical, classified, and complex matter. And clearly it is within the province of our military leaders rather than of those of us who are concerned primarily with diplomatic policies.

But, here are a few of the ingredients of the Soviet menace, as reported in the public print.

1. First and most obvious are the massive Soviet and satellite armed forces in the West. They consist of a reported 175 Russian and 80 satellite divisions, considerably mechanized and highly standardized. An immense air umbrella of 20,000 operational aircraft could cover a Soviet offensive with 20,000 planes in reserve.

2. In the East there exists the most powerful military force in Asia—the battle-tested, fanatically indoctrinated Chinese Commu-

nist Army of 100 divisions comprising 3 million trained men. It is backed by an additional 13 million homeguard of Chinese militia which could step into uniform overnight and also by a reported 7,000 Chinese Red military aircraft.

3. The Soviet sea arm now constitutes the second strongest naval power in the world. It includes a U-boat fleet seven times as large as the number with which Nazi Germany entered World War II. Among them are perhaps 100 oceangoing snorkel-equipped vessels with a radius of action of 20,000 miles. Some of these modern U-boats would be capable of raining a hail of atomic rockets on coastal areas of the United States.

4. Another Red asset is the reported massive Soviet preparation in the field of bacteriological warfare. This includes intensive efforts in the field of nerve gas—GB—an odorless, colorless, inexpensive weapon of mass destruction—regarded as constituting, under the right conditions, almost as great a threat to mass population as the A-bomb.

RED ATOMIC STOCKPILE

(5) Generally regarded as the grimmest threat of all is the mounting stockpile of A-bombs and Russia's intensive development of thermonuclear weapons—wtih all their terrible capacity of obliterating whole areas of an enemy nation.

A noted military observer wrote recently: "The quantitative tally of the world's atomic tests indicates that we have entered the age of atomic plenty and that stockpiles of operational, deliverable weapons are steadily increasing. These stockpiles probably are numbered in a very sizable 4 figures in the United States, in a sizable 3 figures in the Soviet Union, and in 2 figures in Britain.

"But the nuclear race is qualitative as well as quantitative. The meaning of the current Soviet tests is that the Soviet Union is acquiring a whole family of atomic weapons, comparable to (though not yet as varied as or as qualitatively equal to) the family of weapons possessed by the United States."

6. The Kremlin has the capacity to deliver these instruments of mass obliteration. Her modern long-range bombers include the TU-89, with the size and characteristics of America's B-52, but powered by 4 immense-thrust engines instead of our 8. The revelation of these new-type engines and planes was described by our Air Chief of Staff, Nathan Twining, as a more important milestone than the knowledge of the first Soviet atomic-bomb explosion.

7. Another factor is the all-out Soviet effort to develop an intercontinental guided missile—a weapon against which there is no known defense today.

8. Another consideration is that the Soviet Union is graduating three times as many engineers as the United States and is giving other evidences of intensive scientific effort in expansion of her weapons systems.

9. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is constantly expanding its mighty industrial bases, obviously not for civilian production, but for production of the elements of war.

Already the Communist bloc produces around 60 percent as much coal as the rest of the world and around one-third as much pig iron and steel; 20 percent as much electric power, and 11 percent as much petroleum. But these resources are used for military purposes basically, rather than for civilian convertible cars, deep freezes, TV sets, or air conditioners.

MILITARY AND NONMILITARY WEAKNESSES

The basic fact of the matter is that there are enormous stresses and strains within the Soviet slave empire. The world of communism is a vicious jungle in which cannibal devours cannibal, in which leaders and underlings at home and abroad are purged ruthlessly. It is a world in which fear, suspicion is an ever-present factor.

From this side of the Iron Curtain it is hard to assess the degree to which the nonmilitary weaknesses of the Soviet Union impair her admitted military prowess. But the Soviet Union definitely does have grave nonmilitary weaknesses in addition to certain flaws in her military system of which competent military observers are aware.

Nevertheless, neither her nonmilitary nor her military limitations should becloud the fact that she possesses today and will possess increasingly in time to come the capabilities of total annihilation of her enemies.

OTHER RED NONMILITARY ASSETS

For the ledger to be more complete, certain additional nonmilitary Red assets should not be listed. Among them are the following:

1. Outstanding is the economic bait which she is offering in her renewed trade offensive throughout the world. To countries hungry for expanded foreign markets, from England in the West to Japan in the East, the Soviet Union offers the fake but alluring possibility of tremendous exchanging of goods with the Iron Curtain. With the trade emissaries will, of course, come the usual Red spies, propagandists, intriguers to undermine societies.

2. A second key advantage of the Soviet Union is the widespread repugnance among the underdeveloped peoples for the Western so-called imperialist powers. The fact that generally the United States is the ally of Great Britain, France, Belgium, and Holland, for example, has tended to cause the colonial and ex-colonial peoples in their thinking to lump us in with the present and former imperial powers. The colonial and ex-colonial areas forget that the United States itself was once a group of 13 weak colonies, and that no nation in the world has stronger tradition than we of friendship for peoples striving for sovereignty. We are, however, rightly wary lest nonself-governing peoples achieve independence sooner than they are in a position to exercise it soundly: We are wary lest such peoples become easy prey for the Soviets.

3. A third factor is the widespread anti-white feeling which is sweeping the nonwhite areas of the earth. Eurasian communism is eager to fan the flames of racialism as directed against the white American, Englishman, Frenchman, Belgian, or others. Everything which weakens the Western Powers is regarded as an asset to the Soviet cause.

4. A fourth factor is the worldwide hunger for peace. This is particularly true among the nations which were devastated during World War II, like France and Italy. It is true also of the ex-colonial areas which are confronted by so many domestic problems of widespread illiteracy, disease, malnutrition, that any thought of war or even of costly defense against war is often repugnant.

This hunger for peace blinds many people to the fact that only adequate preparedness will assure peace.

Thus, the Soviet propaganda theme of peaceful coexistence falls on eager ears—war-weary and economy-minded ears—throughout much of the globe.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has tried to smear us from one end of the world to the other as an alleged "warmongering power, recklessly experimenting with A-bomb and H-bomb explosions."

To some extent, we have counteracted this propaganda; nevertheless, wirespread neutralism and pacificism are strings on which the Soviet Union continues effectively to play.

It is odd that the Kremlin, dripping with the blood of its own and its satellite victims and of the Korean and Indochinese people should pretend to be peaceful and should be able even partly to get away with it. It is odd that we who prize peace more than anyone should be vilified as warmongers. But, these are the facts and we must realistically combat these conditions by a strengthened program of truth dissemination.

WHAT AMERICA MUST DO

We must act now. Time is of the essence. We must strengthen further the Voice of America and our overseas exchange program, our book, release, pamphlet, motion picture and television programs. Citizens must contribute further to Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia.

No one perceives more clearly that we are in this battle for men's minds than the great Chief Executive of our country, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Fortunately, we have in this distinguished statesman, too, a military leader of proven genius who is determined that we shall be adequate against whatever future military crises may hold.

President Eisenhower and his distinguished associates know that to counteract the Soviet military threat will take a strengthened program of United States preparedness. We do not want to bankrupt ourselves in the process, but neither do we want to pinch-pennies when the survival of our country is at stake.

Simultaneously, under our able Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, we must and will further strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We will press for the carrying out of the Western European Union, including the setting up of the new West German Army. We will strengthen our bilateral alliances and such vital groupings as the Organization of American States. We will expand the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, which at present has too few component powers and too little defensive firepower available to it.

We will implement the President's famous "atoms-for-peace" plan—one of the most dramatic and constructive international programs ever offered. We will widen our splendid program of technical point 4 assistance. We will encourage more private investment overseas and will seek a favorable climate for such investment.

And we will continue our efforts everywhere to combat the Communist termites who are at work night and day in subversion, sabotage, sedition, treason, undermining the foundation of our own and other countries.

THREE MORE MILITARY FACTORS

But, we return at last to the ultimate determinant of our fate—our military strength.

We must and will prepare for the war of the future, not the war of yesteryear. The war of the future may be another "brush-fire" war like Korea, a so-called limited war. We must be prepared against it.

But, it may be the big war—the intercontinental war—the war of intercontinental ballistic missile.

So, time is important in our development of an intercontinental guided missile. The race for the perfection of this weapon is probably one of the most critical in the world today.

Observers say that the prospect is by 1960, both the United States and the Soviet Union will have guided missles that can carry hydrogen payloads at 10,000 miles per hour with a range of some 5,000 miles.

We of the United States have made great strides in the rocket field. Each of the three branches of the service has contributed important developments.

I am inclined to feel, however, that the needs of our country require that we far more closely approximate the type of more centralized wartime Manhattan district project, which produced the A-bomb on "a crash basis," than the present more leisurely, more scattered basis of our efforts toward an intercontinental guided missle. We all know that there have been strong criticisms of our rocket development—criticisms of division of

authority, a certain conservatism in approach, of overly stringent fiscal considerations.

One writeup of the guided missile race recently read:

"For several year, the United States, complacent of its ability to stay ahead of Russia in all things technological, has been daintily fingering missile projects. Its smugness was roughly shattered last year by intelligence reports of a Soviet breakthrough: the development of a rocket engine with a thrust of at least 240,000 pounds which could be used as part of the power plant for a multistage intercontinental missile."

Hand in glove with this missile problem, is the challenge of possible development of a man-made satellite for the earth or even colonization of a nearby planet with a few key experts. These are possibilities opening almost unlimited fields for both civilian and military application.

A second military problem is our continued United States industrial and population overcentralization. I have warned in previous statements in the Reserve Officer that the United States cannot afford the continued overconcentration of prime industrial targets in a few major areas.

Right now, there are 10 areas in the United States, each 25 miles in radius, that account for 77 percent of our coke products; 82 percent of iron production; 73 percent of steel ingot capacity. Over half of America's foreign commerce is carried on in 6 port cities. Our 32 largest metropolitan areas cover only 55 square miles, out of our total 3 million square miles, and in these 55 square miles are jammed 32 million people. These and other statistics underline the importance of far-seeing steps to encourage dispersal and decentralization to the most feasible extent, particularly in view of our admitted vulnerability to enemy attack and the low killrate which we now expect against an attacking enemy force.

Lastly, we turn to our Armed Forces themselves—the men and women and their families. The fact is that the present low-reenlistment rate among specialists in our Armed Forces is a particularly deep cause for national concern. Each year, for example, our country's Air Defense Command suffers a personnel loss—a blow so heavy that it would cost an enemy dearly to inflict it. But, it is a blow which we, ourselves, cause in that we fail to provide conditions attractive enough to stimulate reenlistment by our highly trained officers and enlisted personnel.

In 1954, it was estimated that the Air Force lost a quarter of a million men. One survey showed that only 8½ percent of the eligible Defense Command airmen planned to reenlist when their 4-year period was up.

It is fantastic that we spend near-fortunes to train these men to peak skilled efficiency, and then look on relatively complacently while they resign in disgust and resume their civilian clothes.

The civilian and military chiefs of our Armed Forces are keenly aware of this problem, and fortunately steps are being taken to correct it. But remedial action must come promptly and thoroughly.

CONCLUSION

Let us end on a note of well-justified faith. The future lies, to a great extent, within our own hands for molding. While we are not the complete masters of our destiny, neither is the Soviet Union. Nor, for that matter, is any one power or group of powers.

The possibilities of peace are tremendous, and they are bright. A golden age of peaceful prosperity is attainable. A rough equilibrium—uneasy but continuing—between East and West is achievable.

But, it will never be achieved if we ignore the fact that the nature of communism is conquest. The Communist, by habit, by dogma, by discipline, is a creature geared to attack. He thrives upon assault. He lives for assault. He may die in assault. But by our overwhelming power, military, and spiritual, we can deter him from starting a chain reaction which could lead to disaster for the world.

This must be the key to American thinking, the key to every Reservist's thinking.

World war III is not imminent. It is not probable. It is always possible—by accident or Red design. But, by exercising our God-given ingenuity and imagination, world war III will never come. America will fulfill the great peaceful opportunity which rests before it.

The Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent address delivered by Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Atlantic City, N. J., on February 16, 1955. I hope that every Member of the Senate will take time to read this speech. Congressman GROSS is a real friend of the farmer, and knows farm programs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and guests, I am honored to be invited to speak to you who are assembled here today on the eastern seaboard from every nook and corner of our broad and good land. You have come from the South, the Far West, the Pacific Northwest, from New England, and from the heartland of America, of which my own State of Iowa is a part.

Let me say that we in Iowa are mighty proud of our rural electrification program and it is a real pleasure for me to have this opportunity to visit with delegates from the tall corn State, as well as other delegates.

I want to say a few words about Clyde Ellis and his staff in Washington. They have been cooperative at all times and may I say that they are on the job at all times, as you are on the job at this convention at all times. I have never seen harder working conventions than the conventions that you hold.

What brings about these tremendous annual meetings of farm people? The common purpose that brings you together is the advancement of the farmer's standard of living, a better way of life for you, your families; your neighbor and his family. Though your homes may be hundreds of miles apart, you are joined again by thousands upon thousands of miles of cooperative transmission lines that thread their way throughout the land.

And this great organization, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, is the spontaneous outgrowth of your need for unity and public expression on a nationwide level.

A quick look at the past clearly reveals why you have formed together to accomplish your purpose of bringing power to the farms of America, and unfortunately, that quick look reveals it has not been many years ago that you were unable to acquire this powerful and silent servant of man—electricity.

Less than a quarter of a century ago, only about 1 farmer in 10 had central station service. This meant that most farmers, their wives and children were committed to long and ceaseless hours of toil in doing household and farm tasks that are now accomplished by the flick of a switch. This meant, among other things, that if the youth of rural America wanted a standard of living similar to that of their city cousins, they had to leave the farms.

Permit me to say at this point that Mrs. Gross and I were born and raised on Iowa farms in the days of coal oil lamps and lanterns. Life on the farm in those days was not without its good points, but kerosene lamps and lanterns were not two of them. And by coincidence, although we were raised on farms as distantly separated as the north and south borders of Iowa, we each lived within a stone's throw of a town and had the doubtful pleasure of studying our school lessons and doing our chores by the light of lamp and lantern while less than a mile away twinkled those wonderful electric lights. How we envied those youngsters in town.

And why didn't we on the farms, who needed it most, have this great blessing of electricity that was readily conceded to others? Because what then amounted to a monopoly decreed that our parents must pay an exorbitant price—a price they could not afford—for installation and service. The monopoly was interested only in skimming the cream of profit as represented by service in towns in the rural area.

Well do I remember working a pump handle in a sweltering August sun, when there wasn't enough breeze to turn a windmill, pumping the last 10 feet of water out of a 30-foot dug well for a herd of thirsty cattle—and begrudging them every gulp. That's why I still can't find it in my heart to quite forgive those who made it impossible for us to operate even one small electric motor, although the power transmission line ran along the road and past our front gate.

To overcome these difficulties, to bring electricity to the farms when the power companies said it was not good business to serve most farmers, you joined together and went into the utility business for yourselves—the cooperative way. How the skeptics laughed and gave you but a brief time to bankrupt yourselves. They predicted that in a short time the farms of America would again be dark from sunset to sunrise.

In the first place, the smart boys were wrong, because they failed to understand that the farmer for generations has had to be a practical man—a realist who, although endowed with extreme patience, can be driven, abused, and victimized only so far. Then invoking the law of self-preservation, he can become, individually and collectively, the most resolute and determined of our citizens.

Why is this true? Because he constantly faces the trials and perils of drought, flood, storm, wind, insects, and livestock diseases. He has faced prices so low he could scarcely afford to take his products to market. He has been confronted with discriminatory freight rates, monopoly, and speculation in the marketing of his crops, animals, and dairy products. He has planted with faith, cultivated with hope and sometimes reaped a harvest of charity.

He has been held up to ridicule and worse. Remember the Vice President of the United States who asserted from the public platform that farmers were "too damned dumb to understand"?

Out of the forge of these experiences, the steel of the farmer has been tempered. Not

for capricious reasons will the farmers of America now surrender their much improved living conditions and those who may think otherwise will do well to remember that a short quarter of a century ago, peaceful, industrious farmers, driven to despair by forces beyond their control took action that brought the attention of the Nation to their desperate plight. We pray this will never happen again, but let it ever stand as a warnnng to those who may have the notion that American farmers will accept the status of peasants.

Out of the mire of the depression, and in the face of what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles, the farmer went to work to bring electricity to his darkened farmland, and he succeeded.

The second thing the skeptics overlooked was that the farmer would be able to enlist the aid of his Government. But he did—and the REA program was the result. He did not ask for a handout. He asked for a helping hand in the form of loans which he has been repaying with interest and in many, many cases far ahead of schedule.

It is this second aspect, the helping hand of the Government, to which I want to direct some attention today.

The rural electrification program has succeeded because it is basically a partnership relation between you—the farmer-cooperative members—and your Federal Government.

At the outset of our consideration of this partnership I wish to make one thing very clear—this program must be kept above and beyond political considerations. We must especially beware of those elements in both major political parties who would like to make the rural electrification program a rudderless ship to be tossed about upon the stormy seas of political controversy, and eventually wrecked.

Rural electrification has had strong support from both political parties and let it be kept that way. At the same time, you who are in charge of this program must not be driven off course by those who would cry partisan politics simply to dissuade you from raising your voices in protest when you see the ship headed for the rocks.

You must beware of a siren song from either quarter—the one trying to make your every need a partisan issue; the other trying to accuse you of partisanship when speaking out for or against those matters vitally affecting your program.

History shows the power program of this nation has been the result of bipartisan support. President Theodore Roosevelt was one of the early and strong proponents of public resources development. And he made it plain he thought such development should be for the common good. Out of his resources philosophy grew the reclamation program that resulted in development of the West. Out of his philosophy of river development grew the tremendous public power projects of the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest.

His was a sound view of conservation and utilization of river resources for the common good and, speaking as a Republican, but one who refuses to have a ring in his nose, it would be well for the leaders of the Republican Party to read these pages from our history and consider resources development in the light of Theodore Roosevelt's philosophy.

It was left to such Republican leaders as Senators Norris and McNary, together with their counterparts in the Democrat Party, to bring about a practical working relationship between the Federal Government, public bodies and cooperatives.

The first and most important result of this bipartisan action was the REA program in which the Government became the banker-partner and you, in organizing your cooperatives, became the operating partner. This partnership has paid tremendous tangible and intangible dividends in raising rural standards of living, increasing production and opening new markets. For example, for every dollar that was loaned by the REA to build lines to a farm, the farmer himself has spent some $4 to $5 in the market place for wiring, electrical tools, and appliances.

Another result of this partnership was to make hydroelectric power available on the wholesale level to cooperatives. This cheaper power made it possible and economical to serve widely scattered farms and, in addition, brought an element of competition to the power industry with the result that wholesale rates to cooperatives came down.

Another reason why this partnership paid big dividends was the preference clause. Here again, a page was taken from Theodore Roosevelt's reclamation philosophy and applied in the power field. Preference was written into the law in order that public bodies and nonprofit cooperative organizations would have first call upon Federal power. Without the preference clause, coupled with necessary transmission facilities, Federal power could and would have been put under long-term contracts by private utilities. Even with the preference clause, rural electric cooperatives were obtaining only about 6 percent of all Federal power generated compared to about 18 percent going to private utilities.

In this connection, it will be recalled that not too long ago Assistant Secretary of the Interior Aandahl attempted to change this marketing arrangement. Cooperatives in the Missouri Basin learned that a plan was afoot whereby it would be virtually impossible for them to recapture power flowing from Federal dams on the Missouri River to meet their growing loads once it was sold to the private power companies. We in Congress were amazed at this attempt to change, strictly by administrative procedure, the traditional concept of the preference clause for rural cooperatives. The House Interior Committee immediately investigated. It has always been my position that the preference clause means exactly what it says—that cooperatives shall have the first call upon available Federal power.

As you know, because of prompt committee action and by individual Members of Congress we were able to prevent the proposed knifing of the preference clause and as far as I am concerned, Congress will continue to safeguard this vital policy in the marketing of Federal power, regardless of who sits in the seat of authority in the Department of Interior or anywhere else in Government.

Now a report is current in Washington that a Hoover Commission task force may recommend that the interest rate on REA loans be raised to 4½ percent. Since this is only an unconfirmed report, I will not dwell on the implications of such a move except to say that it would represent the second of a two-pronged insidious attack on the industry of agriculture. With farm income already seriously impaired, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson apparently determined upon a policy of cheap food for consumers, an increased interest rate of 4½ percent would only increase the squeeze now being worked upon farmers.

Secretary Benson ought to know there is no such thing as cheap food unless it is literally taken out of the hides of the farmer producers. And the Hoover Commission task force ought to know that a doubling of interest rates to farmers could only mean dire consequences for the REA program as a whole.

I can assure you that any such move will get a hot reception in Congress.

I would like now to turn to a discussion of the struggle over atomic energy legislation in the last session of Congress. I shall try to be brief, for I am sure Senator GORE, who is from the area most directly affected and who has been in the forefront of the fight in opposition to the legislation that was enacted, will have much to say on this specific issue.

While this battle centers around TVA, it is of vital importance to everyone here and to every citizen of the land for all of us have a $12-billion-plus investment in the development of this new source of energy and the legislation charts new policy in the field of production and use. Since the people—all of them—have paid the price, the benefits should be shared accordingly.

Under the Cole-Hickenlooper bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, this principle would have been scrapped for all practical purposes. It would have been possible for a few large companies, operating on the inside track, to have effectively gained a monopoly in the field of atomic power for commercial use because of the patent provisions. That was one of the important reasons why I voted against the House version of this legislation, one of the few Republicans to do so.

Fortunately, before final action on the part of the Senate and House, this provision for completely private patents was changed. The Atomic Energy Commission has the authority to declare these patents affected with a public interest, and it is my hope the act will be further amended to provide that rural electric cooperatives may have a fair opportunity in this field. Along with that, the AEC should provide for a power reactor program that is designed to fit the needs of rural cooperatives as well as the large power companies. This we must all work for.

Much of the fight in Congress on the atomic energy bill was precipitated by the now well-published Dixon-Yates amendment. This gave legislative sanction to what had been considered legally questionable up to that time for it legalized the AEC as a power broker—a function entirely beyond its major purpose, which is the production of nuclear military weapons essential to the defense of this Nation. Certainly nothing should be allowed to hinder or delay the AEC from that primary objective.

Its secondary function is to develop the peacetime uses of atomic energy, including power. But what is the result that has been brought about by the so-called Dixon-Yates-AEC agreement? We find the AEC diverted from its primary and secondary functions in order that two power combines in the South can take over TVA's market. In effect, we have here another governmental agency engaged in the field of policymaking—a field and a responsibility that properly belongs to those you elect to office—your Representatives and Senators.

Important as is the fact that the Dixon-Yates-AEC deal is some $100 million more expensive in the life of the contract than if TVA supplied its own needs, it is of equal importance to understand that the Atomic Energy Commission is now cast in a role it is not equipped to carry out, and not intended by Congress.

If there be any doubt that the AEC has become embroiled in issues in which it has no business, the testimony of AEC Commissioner Murray before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy should erase that doubt. Let me quote from Mr. Murray's statement made on January 31, 1955, to the joint committee:

"There is one fact regarding industrial atomic power which I feel should be especially emphasized. Industrial atomic power will come quickly or slowly depending on the importance attached to the program, and on the men assigned responsibility for carrying it out. It also hinges on the teamwork between your committee and the Commission. * * * It is for this reason that I draw

your attention to issues that have been giving me special concern.

"One issue, more than any other, in my opinion," continued Commissioner Murray, "has contributed to this unhappy situation. I refer, of course, to the Dixon-Yates controversy. * * * So damaging has been its effect that something must be done to free the Commission from any connection with this cause for so much discord. * * * Unless the Commission is so freed, untold hours will continue to be devoted by the Commissioners and their key staff to a matter which will not contribute one iota to our program for improved weapons, for military and industrial reactors, or to any of the infinite number of tasks needing our attention.

"And, as I have so often said, anything that diverts the attention of the Commission and its staff from the development and production of weapons, along with the gigantic task of bringing into being peacetime applications of atomic energy, is not in the public interest. * * * To the exclusion of all other interests it (the Commission) must focus its attention solely—and in the public interest—on the development and exploitation of atomic energy for defense and for peace."

If for no other reasons than those so recently expressed by AEC Commissioner Murray, it is my opinion that the sooner the Dixon-Yates-AEC contract is given a quiet burial the better it will be for the public interest. And far be it for me to mourn its timely passing.

Another reason why some of us in the House of Representatives found this legislation highly unpalatable was the manner in which it was rammed down our throats. On July 23, 1954, with the Senate still debating the bill and with Congress still nearly a month from final adjournment, the House was called into session at 10 o'clock in the morning and remained in constant session until 3:13 o'clock on the morning of July 24—a total of more than 17 hours, with all action completed except the final vote.

In the first place, it is almost unprecedented that the House should take up legislation, still under debate in the Senate, unless it be of an extreme emergency nature. Not by the wildest flight of the imagination did an emergency exist in connection with this measure. There was nothing pressing in the legislative schedule before the House, and the leadership should have awaited final action by the Senate and then allotted at least 4 days to this complicated and far-reaching legislation. The answer is that the leadership was determined to use the House as a lever.

Interesting, too, is the fact that when debate opened on amendments in the House, sponsors of the bill made a point of order, which was quickly sustained, that opponents could not refer in any way to statements that had been and were being made in the Senate. Rules of the House prohibit the use of a Senator's name but never before, in the 6 years I have spent in the House, had there been strict enforcement of the rule that there could be no reference, even without attribution, to a statement made in the other body. I mention these sidelights to show the lengths to which advocates of the Atomic Energy Act carried their roughshod campaign in the House.

Let me say that there was much in connection with this legislation that had a very peculiar and unhealthy aroma—the kind that lingers in your nostrils.

Turning now to financial assistance for the REA, and speaking as both a Republican and one who has always supported an adequate rural electrification program, I was shocked by President Eisenhower's request last year for only $55 million in new electrification loan funds. However, a Republican Congress recognized that this figure was dangerously low, overrode the President's budget, and made available $135 million for this fiscal year.

Better treatment for the REA is accorded in the President's budget for the next fiscal year with a request for $160 million, almost triple the amount he recommended last year. This represents at least a temporary victory over those interests within the administration which have been attempting to put the rural power program on a starvation diet.

Strange, indeed, is the fact that these same interests in the administration endorsed legislation which victimizes American taxpayers for money to be thrown around all over the world. Approximately $13 billion was made available for giveaway purposes to foreigners in this fiscal year, and it is always interesting to make comparisons in dealing with our own citizens.

For example, let's compare expenditures of American tax dollars for reclamation projects in foreign countries and in the United States. For some strange reason, it is difficult to obtain specific information from the Foreign Operations Administration concerning handouts abroad. Instead of the item-by-item breakdown employed in budgeting and spending for our own Federal reclamation program, FOA officials admitted they have no such information readily available; that to obtain it requires much time, much paperwork, and the circularizing of desks of officials of each of the so-called free countries which participate in the Foreign Operations Administration program.

From various sources, including the Library of Congress, is pieced together the information that for 5 fiscal years only, from July 1, 1948, to July 30, 1953, and for power facilities in Europe only, this country handed out a minimum of $1,084,000,000. This compares with spending for our own public-power program of $2,400,000,000 from 1902 to 1953. Included in this are such dams as Hoover, Shasta, Grand Coulee, and Hungry Horse as well as the Central Valley and Columbia Basin projects.

The Foreign Operations Administration admits that under the heading of "Water Resources and Power Assistance Rendered Foreign Countries, July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1953," there was expended $1,729,123,000 in Europe and the Far East. During the same period, by comparison, Congress appropriated, under the reclamation law, for all Bureau of Reclamation construction in this country, $1,200,000,000—a half billion less than was handed foreigners.

And it should be kept in mind that hundreds of millions of dollars advanced by the Government for power and other projects in this country will be repaid. Is anyone rash enough to predict that we will get back anything on the enormous gifts we have made to foreigners? In every showdown thus far we have been denied even moral support from most of the nations which have been the beneficiaries of our squandering.

It is estimated that since the end of World War II, the total bill for foreign aid is $60 billion. It is estimated that taxpayers of the 17 principal reclamation States contributed $13,300,000,000 of that amount—enough to build 109 Shasta dams, or 77 Hoover dams, or 93 Grand Coulee dams, or 27 each of Shasta, Grand Coulee, Hoover, and Hungry Horse dams.

During 5 years (1948–53) only, and for power and irrigation development in Italy alone, American taxpayers coughed up $63,900,000. This compares with a grand total of $52,700,000 in Federal reclamation funds spent in the 3 States of North Dakota, Kansas, and Oklahoma during the last 50 years—not just 5 years.

France and Greece got $45,800,000 of our money during the same 5-year period for power and irrigation projects. Compare this with Oregon's $49 million for reclamation in 50 years, Utah's $45,100,000 in 50 years, and New Mexico's $43,700,000 in 50 years. To this can be added air-conditioned apartment buildings in the Belgian Congo. And we also sent a cornshucker to Italy to show them how to do it. We sent a track coach to India to teach the Indians to run—when their legs are the chief source of motor power in that country. We helped build a plush railroad station in Rome that would make Grand Central look like a tank-line facility on a branch line. So all you have to do is change the name of your cooperative to Italy or the Belgian Congo or some place else and you'll get your money.

Thus runs the fantastic story of American handouts to foreigners while our own citizens clamor for Federal assistance in the building of schools, roads, dams, and other necessary public improvements, bitterly protesting at the same time steadily mounting State and local taxes.

We can't continue to strew hundreds of millions and billions of dollars throughout the world each year unless we are prepared to accept further deficits, debt, inflation, and eventual bankruptcy. Foreign spending must be limited to whatever money is available within the limits of a balanced budget and after provision has been made for the economic, educational, and social needs of the people of the United States of America.

You are concerned—and rightly so—in your rural power program, but let me warn you that no issue is more important to you and every citizen of this Nation than what this Government does as a matter of foreign policy and commitment. This is true because the demand for military manpower and money to implement these commitments reach into and become a levy upon the lives and fortunes of those in every home in America.

Inherent in this program of attempting to police and finance the world upon which we are embarked today is increasing centralization of power in Washington. Our great and free institutions—political, economic, religious, social, and cultural—the foundation upon which this form of government and way of life rests, can only be perpetuated under a diffusion of power.

Through all the ages, concentration of governmental authority has eroded and then destroyed free men and free institutions.

Our first President, George Washington, the anniversary of whose birth we will observe next Tuesday, warned that this Nation must remain independent and steer a clear and sure course away from foreign intrigues and quarrels.

In his famous Farewell Address, in which he warned repeatedly of the pitfalls ahead, President Washington said:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence a free people ought to be constantly awake since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of a republican government."

The words of our revered first President are as rich in wisdom today as they were then.

We must readjust our foreign commitments to bring them within the ability of the American people to honor and support. We cannot go on indefinitely policing and financing the world, dissipating our resources, and piling up burdens of debt and taxation which the children of the tomorrows to come cannot possibly discharge or endure.

The hour is late but there is still time to make the light of freedom burn more brightly on our own shores and the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

We not only can but we must reaffirm the wisdom of our forefathers if we are to save this great constitutional Republic as we know it and as we cherish it.

I wish you well in your deliberations during this 13th annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. You will have my support in every reasonable undertaking.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1955

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of grace and glory, in hours of confusion and commotion we are sure of no light but thine, no refuge but in Thee. To Thee who knowest the secrets of our hearts, we commit ourselves and our Nation; we bring to Thee the moral chaos of our world, its spiritual fatigue, its restlessness of heart, its dark forebodings. We acknowledge our share in the world's sin; our love of ease, our pride of race and place and possession, our hard bargaining and ruthless competition; our failure to take account of the needs of others, and to realize that in very truth humanity is one. Work in us by Thy grace, we pray, a miracle of renewal and transformation. Grant us the strength of will to keep Thy commandments and walk in Thy ways. We ask it in the name of that One in whom life lay and whose life is the light of men.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 11, 1955, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempcre laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Seventh Semiannual Report on the Mutual Security Program. This report covers operations during the 6-month period June 30 to December 31, 1954, carried out in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

During this period, you will note there was a significant acceleration of operations in Asia, where the bulk of the free world's population occupies its greatest land mass, and where communism is stepping up its efforts of expansion.

These worldwide programs of military aid, economic development, and technical cooperation are increasing the military security and economic progress of the United States and our cooperating partners in the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1955.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 829) to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the 2d Pan-American games, the 7th Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Bush	Hruska	Purtell
Butler	Humphrey	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cotton	Knowland	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Thurmond
Daniel	Langer	Thye
Dirksen	Lehman	Watkins
Douglas	Long	Welker
Dworshak	Magnuson	Wiley
Eastland	Malone	Williams
Ellender	Mansfield	Young
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may now be a morning hour, under the usual 2-minute limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF LENDING AGENCIES BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on lending, guaranteeing, and insurance activities of the Federal Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Executive Director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Federal Facilities Corporation, with respect to expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, for the 7-month period for fiscal year 1955 ended January 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States to the Honorables JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to the Honorables LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, urging that the Congress reject the proposal of the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to dismantle the Soil Conservation Service and turn its functions over to the States

"Whereas the Federal Soil Conservation Service, working with soil conservation districts, has been outstandingly successful in

serving the Soil Conservation Districts of America; and

"Whereas the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended that this program be relegated to the various States with a progressively decreasing grant-in-aid status; and

"Whereas the present corps of SCS technicians would be gradually shifted to the status of State employees; and

"Whereas the idea is financially impracticable because a number of the States, including Montana, have in the past been unable to make sufficient appropriations to meet their obligations on other similar grant-in-aid programs such as Federal highways and other worthwhile projects; and

"Whereas a good program must be based and dependent on well-trained and educated personnel who can be assured of the security and permanence that only the civil service status could provide; and

"Whereas a high standard of achievement is unlikely of achievement in all 48 States under separate programs; and

"Whereas under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, this undesirable shift in Soil Conservation Service responsibility will automatically go into effect after its approval by the Federal commission unless rejected by the Congress within 60 days; and

"Whereas the benefits of a nationally administered program of soil conservation accrue to all the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, now in session, hereby most urgently request the Congress of the United States to reject the aforesaid reorganization plan, and retain the soil conservation as a Federal service in substantially its present form, with responsibility for carrying forward the programs developed by the locally administered soil-conservation districts; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana be hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorables JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to the Honorables LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 15

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Texas, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of article V:

"'ARTICLE V

"'SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"'SEC. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable.

"'SEC. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"'SEC. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States'; further

"Resolved, That such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; further

"Resolved, That as the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Texas hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: That the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitution of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend, and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within, the limitations and provisions so prescribed; further

"Resolved, That such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

"1. That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States and, in honor of the Nation's founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

"2. That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to 3 delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to 1 vote; one of whom shall be selected by the Lieutenant Governor from among the membership of the Senate of Texas, one by the speaker of the house of representatives from the membership of the house of representatives, and one to be chosen by the Governor of the State; that in case of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled by the governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated;

"3. That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of such amendment to article V, the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order thereat, the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates, adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitations herein prescribed;

"4. That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of the several States;

"5. That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States, represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat, by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise; further

"Resolved, That this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and the manner herein provided; further

"Resolved, That proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to 60 days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such convention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications; further

"Resolved, That as this application under article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, it is requested that receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the

Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress; and further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Secretary of State of the United States; and to the secretary of state of each State.

"BEN RAMSEY,
"President of the Senate.
"JIM LINDSEY,
"Speaker of the House."

The petition of Frank C. Tobian, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the United States Public Health Hospital, also known as the Brighton Marine Hospital in Brighton

"Whereas the proposed closing of the United States Public Health Hospital, also known as the Brighton Marine Hospital, in Brighton, would cause great inconvenience to merchant seamen, members of the United States Coast Guard and disabled war veterans, and would greatly lessen the hospital facilities available for such merchant seamen, members of the United States Coast Guard and veterans: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Federal Government take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the closing of said hospital; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Army, and to each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Delegates of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. THYE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood

"Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii have applied to be admitted to statehood; and

"Whereas these Territories have long been valued possessions of these United States, and the people thereof in times of both peace and war have demonstrated their loyalty, their spirit of self-sacrifice, their trustworthiness, and their abilities to be good citizens; and

"Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are important outposts in the preservation of world peace and in the defense of the shores of the continental limits of these United States, and their admittance to statehood will strengthen the position of these Territories in the defense of our shores and in the maintenance of world peace; and

"Whereas the peoples of these Territories are capable of self-government and are desirous of joining the family of States comprising this American Republic: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood and that the necessary enabling legislation therefor be enacted during the current session of Congress: Be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate this 15th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"TEX DORCEY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 28th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved March 4, 1955.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support measures authorizing the deepening of all Great Lakes connecting channels to a depth of 36 feet

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized the construction of a portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway; and

"Whereas the legislation enacted by Congress would not provide for the deepening of the connecting channels leading into Lake Superior; and

"Whereas if Minnesota is to realize the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaaway, it is necessary that the connecting channels be deepened to 36 feet; and

"Whereas deepening of the channel will result in annual transportation savings to shippers in Minnesota and the upper Northwest and will enable Minnesota to share fully in an expanded world trade: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact the necessary legislation to secure the immediate deepening of the connecting channels to a depth of 36 feet and to appropriate immediately the funds necessary for the completion of this work by the date of the completion of the remainder of the St. Lawrence Seaway; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 8th day of February in the year of our Lord 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 2d day of March in the year of our Lord 1955.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved March 7, 1955.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"A joint resolution memorializing the President, the United States Public Health Service, and the Congress of the United States to further develop requirement for interstate transportation of dairy products and to eliminate artificial trade barriers

"Whereas Minnesota is in that section of the Nation which comprises the greatest interstate dairy products export area and which excels in the quality of its dairy products; and

"Whereas the movement of dairy products in interstate commerce is restricted by locally established artificial trade barriers, some in the form of restrictive devices on sales, others in the guise of quality and sanitation standards which vary from one local jurisdiction to another to favor local producers and discriminate against imported products; and

"Whereas State and local jurisdictions refuse to provide inspections outside of certain limited zones and refuses to accept the inspections of any other States or local jurisdictions; and

"Whereas the issuance of retail and wholesale distributor permits is restricted to those processors or distributors who have plants located within a given geographical area; and

"Whereas large producing areas such as Minnesota are forced to subject themselves to prohibitive multiplicity of inspections in attempting to comply with the requirements of the various interstate trade markets; and

"Whereas the United States Public Health Service has developed a model milk sanitation ordinance which has been adopted, together with its interpretative code, by many municipalities and counties and by some States; and

"Whereas in order to avoid duplicate inspections the Public Health Service has a plan of surveying and rating the continuous inspection service rendered by local control officials; and

"Whereas it seems unreasonable for a market to impose its own inspection service upon suppliers when they can be assured of the adequacy of inspection at the source by obtaining a rating of such inspection by the United States Public Health Service; and

"Whereas the Nation's reciprocal recognition of substantially equivalent inspection standards in the dairy industry would contribute to the health and welfare by facilitating the interstate movement of dairy products and by encouraging increased consumption of dairy products at an equitable price based on fair competition; and

"Whereas restrictions of trade in interstate commerce effects a contravention of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the President and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to further extend and develop the use of the United States Public Health Service Milk Sanitation Code and to insure the unrestricted interstate movement of dairy products whose quality conforms to the standard of that code; be it further

"Resolved, That we request Congress to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 to provide that prices of all milk sold under provisions of Federal market orders must be related to the general level of manufacturing milk prices; and to provide that prices of class 1 milk shall be revised downward when production in the milk shed embraced within each Federal order shall be in

excess of 115 percent of class 1 requirements in the low season of production; and to provide further for the elimination from such orders of all provisions designed to discourage, or which have the effect of burdening and obstructing shipments of milk or cream from any production area in the United States to any marketing area regulated by a Federal milk order.

"KARL T. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"ALFRED O. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 23d day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1955.

"H. E. GARNEY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 1st day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved March 7, 1955.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution B-1

"Concurrent resolution relating to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the closing of the Minot and Fargo veterans hospitals

"Whereas a recent report of the Hoover Commission after a study of the Veterans' Administration has recommended that the veterans hospitals at Fargo and Minot be closed; and

"Whereas adoption of the report of the Hoover Commission would mean that veterans of the State of North Dakota would have to travel for medical treatment between 250 and 650 miles to Minneapolis where the nearest veterans hospital would be located; and

"Whereas such action would result in unfair discrimination and hardship to the veterans of the State of North Dakota who are in need of medical treatment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the President and Congress of the United States are hereby urged and requested to allow the veterans hospitals in the cities of Fargo and Minot in the State of North Dakota to remain open in order to provide adequate and accessible medical treatment to the veterans of this State; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the President of of the United States, the chairmen of the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees of the United States Congress, the Commissioner of Veterans' Affairs, and to all Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution B

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers to resell surplus lands above the normal pool level of water impoundments in North Dakota to the original landowners

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers have acquired a substantial amount of land in fee along the Heart Butte Reservoir and the Garrison Dam Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, which is above the normal pool level of such impoundments; and

"Whereas the above Federal agencies have no need for any interest in such lands except to protect such agencies from damage in extremely unusual years when the water level of these impoundments rises above the normal pool level; and

"Whereas it appears that a flowage easement running to such agencies would adequately protect their interests; and

"Whereas the great majority of the former landowners who sold such lands to the Federal agencies involves through condemnation proceedings or threat thereof desire to reacquire such surplus lands above the normal pool level of the above impoundments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the United States Congress is hereby requested to pass suitable enabling legislation to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers to resell such lands to the former landowners upon similar terms as those under which the lands were acquired, subject to a flowage easement to the Federal agencies involved, and that copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to all Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota by the secretary of the senate.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution C

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Army Corps of Engineers to provide for the development of recreational areas along the Garrison Dam Reservoir and authorizing the State historical society to explore avenues of cooperation in the management and maintenance of such areas

"Whereas the Garrison Dam Reservoir when filled to the normal operating level will be the largest body of water in the State of North Dakota and the only body of water in western North Dakota with shore area suitable for the development of substantial recreational areas; and

"Whereas the people of the State of North Dakota desire to obtain the fullest use of the recreational opportunities resulting from the impoundment of the waters in the Garrison Dam Reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Army Corps of Engineers is hereby urged and requested to provide for the full development of the desired recreational opportunities afforded in the area, and that the State historical society is hereby authorized to explore avenues of cooperation in the selection, management, and maintenance of such areas; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the district engineer of the Army Corps of Engineers by the secretary of the senate with the request that the resolution be further forwarded through channels to the proper person in authority within the Army Corps of Engineers, and that copies also be sent to the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Concurrent Resolution G-1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to authorize the payment of 100 percent of the cost of acquisition of right-of-way, construction, and maintenance of military highways in North Dakota

"Whereas Congress has made available an increase amount of Federal aid for the construction of highways in North Dakota during the 1955-57 biennium; and

"Whereas it appears that North Dakota will have great difficulty in matching the Federal aid available at the 1955-57 level; and

"Whereas the President of the United States is recommending to Congress a substantially increased Federal-aid program for the construction of highways, with special emphasis upon the construction of a military system of highways at very high standards; and

"Whereas it appears the State of North Dakota will be unable to match any increased Federal-aid funds for highway construction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That Congress is hereby urged and requested to provide for the payment of 100 percent of the cost of acquisition of right-of-way, construction, and maintenance of the military system of highways within the State of North Dakota, and that control of access on such right-of-way be under the jurisdiction of the State of North Dakota; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution J

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide full 100 percent parity for products produced on family-type farms

"Whereas the very existence of the farm home and the family-sized farm is endangered by continuing economic trends, with farm prices declining 25 percent since 1951, net farm income steadily falling, farm operating costs remaining at near record heights, and the Nation's farm population declining 12.6 percent between 1950 and 1954, while national income continues upward; and

"Whereas the best interests and general welfare of the Nation as a whole would suffer incalculable loss if the farm family home were to be replaced by large, commercial, manager-operated farms, because—

"The farm home is such a large consumer of the Nation's goods and services and upon its patronage depends the survival of so many villages and towns;

"The traditional farm home has been one of the very foundations upon which this country has been built;

"From the farm home have come, not only much of the raw material and food so necessary for all, but young citizens, reared in God-fearing families, trained by hard work to contribute their willing share to the tasks which lie ahead, and possessed of the character and fortitude which are so necessary if this Nation is to endure and prosper;

"The farm home is still a close-knit family unit, where the ideals of our democracy are respected, taught, and preserved; and

"Whereas it is for the best interests and general welfare of the whole Nation that those who toil on these family-sized farms to maintain their farm homes receive for their labors a fair return, comparable with industry, so that these farm homes may not be replaced by large, managerial-type, commercially operated farms: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States and the United States Secretary of Agriculture are hereby requested and urged to provide price supports for the products of these family-type farms at higher levels than those which may be established for the large, commercially operated farms; that up to a fair and reasonable limit, the prices of products raised on such family-sized farms be supported at 100 percent of parity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation and the United States Secretary of Agriculture by the chief clerk of the North Dakota house of representatives.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution G

"Concurrent resolution urging Congress to take favorable action upon measures for flood control in the Red River Valley watershed area

"Whereas the flooding of the Red River and its tributaries during the years 1943, 1948, and 1950, has caused untold millions of dollars of damage to property; and

"Whereas no effective means of controlling such floods have yet been developed because of lack of information and surveys of the watershed area of the Red River; and

"Whereas the development of suitable flood-control projects will conserve the water of the Red River watershed area for beneficial use; and

"Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers is including in its budget a request for sufficient funds to complete a survey of the Red River watershed area in order to develop plans for effective flood control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the North Dakota House of Representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the United States Congress is hereby urged to give favorable consideration to the budget requests of the United States Army Corps of Engineers for sufficient funds to complete the above survey of the Red River watershed area; be it further

"Resolved, That the United States Congress is also requested to provide such funds as may be necessary to implement such reasonable flood-control plans as may be developed for the control of floods on the Red River and its tributaries.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL.
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution L

"Concurrent resolution urging the division of land management of the Department of the Interior to give adjacent landowners preference in leasing lands

"Whereas the Department of the Interior presently holds title to large amounts of grazing land in western North Dakota, which lands are managed by the Division of Land Management of the Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas privately owned lands are found in the midst of such federally owned land, which privately owned lands are often of too small a size to make economical farming or grazing units unless adjacent federally owned land can be leased to supplement such privately owned lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the United States Secretary of the Interior and the Division of Land Management are hereby requested to adopt leasing policies whereby landowners owning private lands adjacent to, or within the same civil township as such federally owned lands, be given first preference in the leasing of such lands; be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the North Dakota House of Representatives is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the United States Secretary of the Interior and to the North Dakota congression delegation.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL.
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. CAPEHART:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Engrossed House Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to issue a protest to the United Nations against the removal of the Narcotics Division of the United Nations to Geneva, Switzerland

"Whereas Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, of the United Nations, has a recommendation before him made by the Third Committee at the United Nations to transfer the United Nations' Narcotics Division from New York to Geneva, Switzerland; and

"Whereas the reasons for suggesting the transfer are shrouded in deep political mystery; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower has appointed a special interdepartmental committee to review and coordinate the Federal Government's programs to combat narcotics addiction in this country; and

"Whereas it would be most unwise for the Secretary General to effect this transfer, and it would be a grave mistake to do it before the committee appointed by the President has an opportunity to make a report; and

"Whereas to eliminate at this time the New York division in the United Nations with its specialized laboratory could be disastrous; and

"Whereas it is quite evident that the transfer of the Narcotics Division would remove it from the watchful eye of the American newspapermen and that its efforts would receive less news coverage: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly (the Senate concurring):

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to issue a vigorous protest to the United Nations against the removal of the Narcotics Division of the United Nations from New York to Geneva, Switzerland.

"SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be sent to the following:

"1. The Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State;

"2. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge;

"3. Indiana's representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

NEW FEDERAL BUILDING FOR CITY OF WILLISTON, N. DAK.—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from L. M. Carlson, president, Board of City Commissioners, Williston, N. Dak., enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by that board, relating to the construction of a new Federal building for the city of Williston. I present the letter and resolution, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF WILLISTON,
Williston, N. Dak., February 24, 1955.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The board of city commissioners of the city of Williston, N. Dak., by resolution hereto attached, urges consideration by the Federal Government of the need for new or expanded post office facilities for the city of Williston, which will include a Federal courtroom and office space for other administrative agencies, which will add to the growth of our territory.

The city of Williston is presently without the services which could be offered if such a building were realized.

Your assistance and support of such a worthwhile undertaking will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
L. M. CARLSON,
President, Board of City Commissioners.

Whereas there is need for new or expanded post office facilities in the city of Williston, N. Dak.; and

Whereas there is also a need for a Federal courtroom and office space for other administrative agencies to benefit this territory: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city of Williston, N. Dak., respectfully request consideration by the Federal Government of the need for a new Federal building in the city of Williston, N. Dak., which would include a Federal courtroom and office space for other administrative agencies.

EFFECT ON PANAMA CANAL TOLLS OF TREATY WITH PANAMA—RESOLUTIONS AND LETTERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a great many individuals and organizations directly or indirectly interested in maritime activities are concerned with the possible effects upon Panama Canal tolls arising from the recently approved treaty between this country and the Republic of Panama. Many of them have written me asking that Congress act to prevent the imposition of any undue tolls burden upon American shipping as a result thereof.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence

and resolutions upon the subject sent me by the mayor's maritime advisory committee, city of Seattle; the board of port commissioners, port of Oakland; and the Grand Lake Taxpayers Association, Oakland, Calif.

There being no objection, the resolutions and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 7, 1955.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: At the last meeting of the Mayor's Maritime Advisory Committee, we passed the following resolution, and are sending it on to you in hopes you will give it your fullest support. We feel the problem of payments of tolls to the Panama Canal is affecting revenues which should be derived from more shipping out of the Puget Sound area if this situation were corrected.

"Whereas this committee is vitally interested in the maintenance of a strong and adequate American merchant marine; and

"Whereas intercoastal shipping is a vital part of such a merchant marine: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this committee supports corrective legislation designed to recognize the national defense value of the Panama Canal so that commercial cargoes will not be required to pay more than their fair share of tolls for the commercial transiting of the canal; further be it

"*Resolved,* That fiscal and financial policies of the canal be corrected to prevent the placing of an inequitable toll burden on commercial shipping and that increases in the equity payments to the Republic of Panama be paid for the United States Government and not by commercial tolls."

We, therefore, urge you to take the necessary action to insure the passage of corrective legislation.

Very truly yours,

MAYOR'S MARITIME ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
E. A. BLACK, *Cochairman.*

PORT OF OAKLAND,
BOARD OF PORT COMMISSIONERS,
February 25, 1955.

The Honorable WARREN MAGNUSON,
The United States Senate, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Attached is Resolution No. B4218 passed by the Board of Port Commissioners, City of Oakland, at their regular meeting of February 21, 1955.

We urge that the Panama Canal problem be given your full consideration, and that legislation be adopted to correct present inequities.

Very truly yours,

DUDLEY W. FROST,
Port Manager.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

Whereas the Board of Port Commissioners of the City of Oakland operates marine terminals handling a volume of waterborne freight which is important to the welfare of the City of Oakland; and

Whereas the volume of ocean freight using the marine terminal facilities of the Port of Oakland is influenced by the tolls assessed for the use of the Panama Canal; and

Whereas it appears that Panama Canal tolls are presently assessed upon an inequitable basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is urged to adopt legislation which will correct such inequities, particularly with respect to a portion of the cost of maintaining and operating the Panama Canal being recognized as an obligation of the national defense rather than the commercial users of the Canal; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution shall be sent to Members of the Congress and others interested in the subject matter of this resolution.

GRAND LAKE TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION,
Oakland, Calif., February 22, 1955.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

"*Resolved,* That the Grand-Lake Taxpayers Association does hereby request that corrective legislative action be taken and enacted which will recognize the Panama Canal a vital defense utility, and the need for altering the present financial and fiscal policies at the Canal, such as limiting the amount of annuity paid the Republic of Panama out of commercial tolls, to the end that a reduction in the tolls will result in fair taxation which will benefit us all."

This resolution passed by the Grand Lake Taxpayers Association because of the recognition of the extreme importance of intercoastal shipping and economy to us all therefrom.

The secretary is requested to transmit this resolution to our congressional Representatives in both Houses of the Congress of United States.

CHARLOTTE W. LA POSEA,
President.
MARIE E. ARNOLD, *Secretary.*

INCREASE OF FEDERAL TAX ON GASOLINE—TELEGRAM AND LETTERS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram which I received from the secretary of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation. The telegram voices very strong opposition to a proposed increase in the Federal tax on gasoline.

I have also received a letter from Mr. William B. Pearson, master, State Grange of Minnesota, and in the letter he, too, on behalf of the State Grange of Minnesota, expresses strong opposition to any increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

I also received a communication from the city of Minneapolis, including a resolution by the Minneapolis city council.

I ask unanimous consent that the communications and the resolution which I have mentioned may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 11, 1955.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We understand that Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, has introduced a bill in the Senate for a 3-cent increase in Federal gas tax. Please register the opposition of Minnesota Farm Bureau to this bill in as strong a manner as possible. We oppose by resolution the Federal gas tax in its entirety and think that this total form of taxation should be reserved for States. We are unalterably opposed to any increase in the present Federal gas tax or in typing this amount to highway building appropriation either as direct appropriation amounts or matching fund amounts. We appreciate your influence on our behalf.

J. DELBERT WELLS,
Secretary, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation.

STATE GRANGE OF MINNESOTA,
Ogilvie, Minn., March 11, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senator from Minnesota, Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I have just read of a bill introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, which would increase the excise tax on gasoline by 3 cents per gallon. I want you to know that Minnesota farmers, both in and out of the grange, oppose such an increase and ask you to oppose it. We also desire a refund of all excise taxes on gasoline used for nonroad purposes.

The Clay report advocates a linkage between excise taxes on gasoline and Federal road appropriations. The grange has always opposed a linkage such as this and we urge you to oppose this move also.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM B. PEARSON,
Master, State Grange of Minnesota.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 11, 1955.

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with instructions of the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, we are forwarding copies of resolutions of the city council passed at a meeting held March 11, 1955, on the following:

1. Opposing the passage of the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560) and requesting the Members in Congress from the State of Minnesota to use their utmost efforts to defeat this bill.

2. Requesting the enactment by the Congress of the United States of an amendment to the Natural Gas Act relating to regulation of rates.

Yours very truly,

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

Resolution requesting the enactment by the Congress of the United States of an amendment to the Natural Gas Act relating to regulation of rates

Whereas the city of Minneapolis has been and is confronted with the need of protecting the interests of its rate payers in connection with numerous filings of natural gas rate tariffs under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act; and

Whereas the Natural Gas Act is designed for the purpose of effective regulation of natural-gas rates; and

Whereas such regulation would be facilitated and improved if time limitations now in the Natural Gas Act were modified: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the Representatives and Senators from Minnesota in the Congress of the United States be requested to sponsor legislation amending the Natural Gas Act in the following respects:

1. By extending the presently authorized period of suspension of filed natural-gas tariffs.

2. Extension of the authority of the Federal Power Commission to include the establishment of temporary natural-gas rates during the period of suspension and pending final determination of appropriate rates; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the Representatives and Senators from Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

Resolution opposing the passage of the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560) and requesting the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to use their utmost efforts to defeat this bill

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis:

Whereas the City Council of the City of Minneapolis has under consideration the provisions of the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560); and

Whereas under the provisions of the Harris bill it is proposed to take away from the regulation of the Federal Power Commission all production, gathering, processing, treating, compressing, and delivering of natural gas to pipeline companies; and

Whereas by the provisions of said bill it is proposed to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission to regulate natural gas to only such sales for resale as occur after the completion of all production, gathering, processing, treating, compressing, and delivery of such gas to pipeline companies; and

Whereas it is proposed by such legislation to limit sales of natural gas for resale to such sales in interstate commerce as occur after the commencement of the transportation of such gas in interstate commerce but which do not include any sales which occur in, or within the vicinity of, the field or fields where produced at or prior to the commencement of such transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce; and

Whereas it is further proposed by said Harris bill (H. R. 4560) to require the Federal Power Commission to fix a rate based on the fair field price of such natural gas; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the city council that the passage of this bill, or any legislation similar in purpose or effect, will nullify the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *State of Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 672, 74 S. Ct. 794 (1954)), which may result in substantial benefits to consumers of gas; and

Whereas the consumption of natural gas by domestic consumers in the city of Minneapolis is proportionately greater than most other large urban centers because of the long and intensely cold winter season, and, therefore, the city of Minneapolis is vitally interested in any legislation which might tend to increase the price of gas to consumers; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the city council that passage of this bill, or any similar legislation which has for its object the removal from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission all production, gathering, processing, treating, and compressing in the producing field or in the vicinity of the producing field of natural gas, may well result in increased cost burdens to consumers of gas in the city of Minneapolis for the reason, among others, that the producing States, before such gas enters the pipelines, may levy substantial attribution and other charges, which charges may be included in the cost of gas to the consumers thereof; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the city council that requiring the Commission to fix a price according to the fair field formula may result in increased rates to consumers of natural gas in the city of Minneapolis; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the city council that the so-called Harris bill is not in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That it opposes the passage of the so-called Harris bill or any legislation having a similar object; Be it further

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Minneapolis requests the Members in Congress from Minnesota to exert their utmost efforts to defeat this bill; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to submit forthwith a copy of this resolution to each Member of the United States Congress from the State of Minnesota.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENT OF TYPOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition which I received from Washington and Lee University dealing with the need to improve the typography of congressional reports.

The petition and accompanying papers enclosed merit careful and serious attention by the Congress, and I ask that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition and accompanying papers were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PETITION FOR IMPROVING THE TYPOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

BACKGROUND

1. The congressional committee has undergone an especially rapid development during the past 30 years. Committee hearings and reports are increasingly designed to provide broad background information. As a result committee reports have become increasingly significant publishing events, far transcending the earlier notion of the committee report as a working tool for legislators in their daily tasks.

2. Not only the more widely publicized reports such as the Watkins report, but also such documents as the reports of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—especially the two recent ones entitled "United States Monetary Policy: Recent Thinking and Experience," and "Trends in Economic Growth"—are among the most important contributions to economics of the year. Should Senator DOUGLAS' projected background study of the stock market come to fruition, we may be sure that it will be one of the most significant documents of our day.

3. Such reports are major publishing events. They are directed to those outside the legislative branch as well as to working legislators. Documents of such importance should be designed to enlist interest rather than to repel interest.

4. The results of an inquiry directed to our Congressmen, a poll of the citizens of a small town, and the testimony of experts in the publishing field indicate that there is a widespread feeling that the type size, face, and format of congressional reports repel interest rather than enlist interest. Given the importance of these documents their significance outside Congress as well as inside, and the paramount need in a democracy to make every effort to provide for an informed citizenry, every effort should be made to determine whether improvements in readability may be made without significant increase in publishing costs.

5. The Public Printer has stated that "the general makeup and typography of congressional reports and hearings have been consistent since the First Congress. * * * Beginning in 1900, the present format was put into use, and is essentially the same today." During this time tremendous developments have been made in our knowledge of how to design a well-printed page which is also economic. Each of the executive branches has redesigned its typographical practices with a view to informing the general reader as well as administrators who must use these documents in their daily work. It should be possible for congressional committees to designate certain of their reports as being likely to have widespread public appeal and therefore meriting better typographical treatment than the average report or printed hearing.

6. For all these reasons we are requesting your support of the following petition.

PETITION

1. It is our request that the Joint Committee on Printing conduct an investigation to determine (a) the potential demand for congressional reports from individuals outside Congress and (b) the opinion of experts outside the Government Printing Office on the possibilities of improving the type size, face, and format of congressional reports, with a view to establishing a more attractive and a more easily readable form for congressional reports deemed likely to appeal to a wide public audience.

The following documents are submitted in support of this petition:

1. Results of congressional questionnaire.
2. Poll of townspeople of Lexington, Va.
3. Statement by Mr. E. E. Morsberger.
4. Statement by Prof. C. Harold Lauck.
5. Excerpts from congressional replies.

Results of congressional questionnaire

[Total number: 501 [1]]

Questions asked	Yes	No	Indefinite
1. Do you think that the format, type size, and type face make congressional reports difficult to read?	21	16	13
2. Do you think that the interest of the average person is discouraged by the format and type?	22	20	10
3. Do you think that improvements in the printing and design would increase interest in congressional reports?	25	18	10
4. Do you think that congressional reports should be designed to be read by the citizen as well as the working Congressman?	31	11	11
5. Do you know of any attempts to improve congressional reports?	3	39	13

[1] Due to the shift from fall to spring semesters it proved impossible to write all Representatives and Senators. Of the 100 Congressmen who responded to the questionnaire, 30 referred their questionnaires to Representative Burr P. Harrison, whose district includes Lexington, Va.

COMMENTS.—These answers show a remarkable proportion of the Congressmen who replied to our questionnaire think congressional reports hard to read and believe they should be redesigned to be made more readable.

Poll of Lexington, Va., townspeople

[Total number in poll: 151; average age: 46; number of males: 76; number of females: 75; education: grade school, 10; high school, 54; college, 38; unreported, 49]

Questions asked	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	Undecided; no answer
1. Are you acquainted with congressional reports?	51	33	92	60	8
2. Have you ever read a congressional report?	46	30	101	70	4
3. Would you be interested in reading a report, such as the Watkins report on Senator McCARTHY? [1]	72	49	64	42	15
4. Do you know how to get a congressional report?	65	43	71	49	15
5. Do you think the appearance is appealing?	43	28	97	63	11
6. Would you use congressional reports if they were more attractive?	62	40	64	42	25
7. Do you think something should be done to make them more appealing?	48	31	51	33	52

[1] This was used as an example only because it was assumed to be the congressional report the largest number of people might have known about.

COMMENTS: One of the most remarkable results of the poll is the indication from question No. 3 that something around 50 percent of our people might be interested in reading the most important or most publicized of the congressional reports; in this case the example used was the Watkins report. However, 63 percent thought them unattractive in appearance, and 40 percent believed they might be more interested in using them if they were more attractive.

Statement of E. E. Morsberger, assistant planning manager for Raymond Blattenberger, Public Printer, United States Government Printing Office:

"The general makeup and typography of congressional reports and hearings have been consistent since the First Congress. Until about 1848 reports were set in 10-point Scotch Roman, with page width of 4 inches. In addition, text was leaded: that is, with space of about one thirty-sixth of an inch between lines.

"From about 1848 to 1900, the page width was increased to 4⅝ inches, and the typeface was changed to text type of the period, but text was set solid. Beginning in 1900 the present format was put into use, and is essentially the same today. * * *

"Early printers designed the format for congressional printing, and it was accepted by the early Congresses. The typeface presently in use is regarded as most readable and practicable."

Statement by Prof. C. Harold Lauck, director, journalism laboratory, Washington and Lee University: "The legibility of many congressional publications is notoriously bad. * * * I believe the Government Printing Office could help some if they give some study to the matter, and get away from some of the hide-bound traditions regulating the typefaces and sizes used. For the most part I would think it would be necessary to increase not only the type size but also to add extra space between lines. * * * I know Mr. Blattenberger, with his wide background as a printer, would be agreeable provided the economics could be worked out. Of course, the changes I have suggested would increase costs since they would involve an increased number of pages but these are necessary for better understanding by both people and Congressmen."

EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSIONAL REPLIES

Senate

"I have often wondered when somebody else would recognize the deficiencies."

"My answer to your first four questions is in the affirmative. On calling the Joint Committee on Printing, I find that a number of the Members of the Senate and House have communicated with them as a result of your letter and they are preparing a reply in response to your fifth question."

"It is my opinion that the insert material * * * is difficult to read. * * * It is my further belief * * * that the average person would not be encouraged by the format and type used in the subject reports. * * * I think changes in design might increase interest. * * * I am happy to advise you that, as a result of several letters of an almost identical nature to your own, the Public Printer of the United States has been requested to have the Division of Typography and Design make a thorough study."

House of Representatives

"There is no doubt that the present makeup and type styles used in publication of congressional documents gives a forbidding appearance to them. Much could probably be done to improve them without resorting to the techniques of the huckster. * * * Anything which would make a document more useful to a Member would also make it more useful to the interested citizen."

"My reply is in the affirmative. * * * I have talked with the members of the official reporters staff to House committees, and while they, too, apparently agree that there is room for improvement, I understand that nothing definite has been done lately. * * * I shall do all I can to improve the congressional reports in connection with the suggestions outlined in your letter."

"I definitely feel that the format, type size, type face, printing design, and similar qualities of congressional hearings and reports should be improved to the end that they become much more widely read. To my way of thinking, there is no more interesting reading material, in general, than that developed by the various committee hearings. Were this material more attractively printed and indexed I think it would be much more readily read. I feel that a great part of the strength of a democracy is due to citizen interest and participation. Anything we can do to increase this interest and participation should be done. To me, it follows we could easily increase participation by making printed matter connected with the legislative process more readable."

"Your questions * * * suggest some dissatisfaction. * * * I agree with you that an improvement well might be made."

"I think that congressional reports should be designed to be read by citizens as well as working Congressmen."

"I am inclined to think that the average person is discouraged by the makeup of the congressional reports."

"May I say * * * that I do believe that the format, type size, and type face make congressional reports difficult to read, and it would obviously follow that I, too, think the interest of the average person would be discouraged by all this. * * * I believe that some improvement would certainly make them more readable. * * * I do think that the average citizen should be encouraged to read many congressional reports, especially those of investigating committees."

"I think that improvement of the printing techniques of congressional reports would increase interest. * * * I do think someone should give the matter thought. You will hear from me further on this."

Submitted by:

JOHN HARVEY WHEELER,
Associate Professor of Political Science, Washington and Lee University.

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT (S. REPT. NO. 60)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, pursuant to the Employment Act of 1946, section 5 (b) (3), I submit the following unanimous report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1955 Economic Report of the President, together with supplemental views filed by individual members of the committee. The report also contains a section on the economic outlook for 1955 prepared by the committee staff.

The statutory date for submission of this report is March 1. This year permission of the Congress was asked, and granted, to extend the date to March 15.

This report is the result of extensive executive sessions of the Joint Economic Committee. Our considerations were based upon lengthy hearings on the President's Economic Report covering the period January 24 to February 16. These 1,260 pages of testimony have been published, and may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents for $3.50 a copy.

A limited supply of single copies of the Joint Economic Report are available for distribution through the committee offices. Additional copies may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for 30 cents a copy.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY (S. REPT. NO. 61)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 89, 83d Congress, 1st session, and Senate Resolution 190, 83d Congress, 2d session, relating to study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, submitted an interim report thereon, which was ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

COMIC BOOKS AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY (S. REPT. NO. 62)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 89, 83d Congress, 1st session, and Senate Resolution 190, 83d Congress, 2d session, submitted an interim report on comic books and juvenile delinquency, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 14, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 829) to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competition, and for other purposes.

DOMESTIC TIN INDUSTRY—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SUBMITTING REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, under Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, 83d Congress, 2d session, it was stated to be the sense of the Congress that the tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., be continued in operation until June 30, 1955. The present law, unless modified by the Congress, remains in operation until June 30, 1956. In the meantime an appropriate committee of the Congress, to be designated, is to conduct a study of the desirability of maintaining a permanent domestic tin industry and the adequacy of our strategic stockpile of tin. The report back to the Congress was set for March 15, 1955.

Senate Resolution 254, 83d Congress, 2d session, considered and agreed to on June 1, 1954, subsequent to the date of passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, provides that the Senate Committees

on Banking and Currency and Armed Services, acting jointly, conduct a study and investigation of the matters with respect to tin which were determined by section 1 (c) of Public Law 125, 80th Congress, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, 83d Congress, to be required to be studied and investigated by the Congress in the public interest and in the promotion of the common defense. Such study and investigation is to be completed and a report with respect thereto filed with the Senate not later than March 15, 1955.

The then chairman of the Banking and Currency and Armed Services Committees, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] designated two staff members each to conduct the preliminary study. The staff group immediately contacted interested Government agencies and departments to set up a series of conferences to discuss the overall problem. Conferences were held with officials of the Federal Facilities Corporation—the operating agency for the Texas City tin smelter—ODM, GSA, the State Department, and the Bureau of Mines.

A series of questions were embodied in the letters sent to these Government agencies on January 6, 19, and 21, 1955. Responses to the letters have been received from all but two agencies, ODM and the State Department, and information is at hand to the effect that for understandable reasons these Government agencies will be unable to have their completed responses in the hands of the staff by the deadline date, which, of course, is tomorrow. Clearly, the staff is in no position to prepare any report to either committee when such significant phases of the study are missing. Moreover, after the staff study is presented to each committee, some reasonable length of time will be required for its perusal by committee members.

Under the foregoing circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the time for submitting the report as directed by Senate Resolution 254 be extended from March 15, 1955, to April 1, 1955.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if I understand his request correctly? Do I understand that he is asking only for additional time in which to file the committee report?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Kansas is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. No funds are involved. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No funds.

Mr. CARLSON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of James Edward Robinson; and

S. 1415. A bill for the relief of Anna Mertikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Joseph G. Ferrara; and

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Hong Ban, also known as George Mon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1418. A bill to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 1419. A bill to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 1420. A bill to provide that the daily ration of personnel in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard shall include at least 1 quart of milk per day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1421. A bill to liberalize the definition of "widow of a World War I veteran" governing the payment of compensation or pension; and

S. 1422. A bill to provide certain benefits for persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning December 8, 1910, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1423. A bill to prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1424. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for widows of officers and employees separated from the service with title to deferred annuity who dies before having established a valid claim for annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1425. A bill for the relief of Hazel Anna Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1426. A bill to amend title IV of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to extend the operation of such title and to authorize assistance to certain school districts providing free public education for children residing on Federal property situated outside such school districts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1427. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Mortimer T. Clement, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1429. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante;

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service school teacher;

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of McFarland Cockrill, and for other purposes; and

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Mary J. McDougall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1433. A bill for the relief of Skevos N. Tsoukalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1434. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Capt. Grady C. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 1436. A bill to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and to provide that the benefits of future increases in tobacco acreage allotments shall first be extended to farms on which there have been decreases in such allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 1437. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of "employee", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1438. A bill for the relief of Corazon A. Manayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1439. A bill to amend title IV of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to authorize assistance under such title to certain school districts providing free public education for children residing on Federal property situated outside such school districts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1440. A bill relating to appointments to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, by placing a limit on the time within which a veteran may be paid the special unemployment compensation benefits provided by title IV of the act.

Also sponsors of this bill are the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The President's budget message recommended a time limit of 3 years after the veteran's discharge or the date of enactment of such a time limit, whichever is later. The bill would carry out this recommendation and is a part of the legislative program of President Eisenhower and of the Department of Labor.

Veterans of the Korean war who do not have enough employment to qualify for unemployment-compensation benefits under a State law are entitled to receive total benefits of $26 a week for a maximum period of 26 weeks. Veterans

who do have enough employment to qualify for benefits under State unemployment compensation laws but whose State benefits are smaller either in duration or amount are entitled to supplemental benefits until they receive a total of $676, the equivalent of $26 for 26 weeks. The cost of this program is financed by the Federal Government.

The Presidential proclamation of January 1, 1955, provided that all benefits shall cease under this program on February 1, 1960. Although these benefits were primarily designed to assist veterans during the period of readjustment immediately following their discharge, there is no limit upon the time within which a veteran can be paid these special benefits during the period before 1960. A veteran discharged in 1953, for example, might still be eligible for these special benefits in 1959 or later even though he had fully qualified for benefits provided under State law. As a result, costs will continue to mount and records will have to be kept on each veteran until he has drawn the maximum amount.

Expenditures under this program are increasing as the number of eligible veterans increases. It is estimated that the enactment of this proposal would result in very substantial savings for fiscal 1959 and 1960 in addition to those savings which will result from the Presidential proclamation of January 1, 1955.

The bill proposes to amend the act to provide that an ex-serviceman shall not be eligible for these special benefits more than 3 years after his discharge or the effective date of the amendment, whichever is later, except where the veteran has pursued education and training or vocational rehabilitation programs provided by the act or regulations thereunder. In the latter case he may have an additional year after he has completed such a program, subject to the overall limitation of February 1, 1960.

A 3-year period should be sufficiently long to enable the veteran to make the adjustment from military to civilian life and to give him an opportunity to accumulate wage credits under the State program. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which provided unemployment compensation for World War II veterans, contained a time limitation of 2 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this short bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1418) to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Act, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. ALLOTT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 409 of title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 409 (a). No compensation shall be paid under this title for any week commencing more than 3 years after the effective date of this amendment to this section or the effective date of the discharge or release prescribed in section 407 (a), whichever is the later date.

"(b) In the case of any veteran who has pursued a program of education or training under title II, a program of vocational rehabilitation under part VII of Veterans' Regulation numbered 1 (a), or a program of education or training under part VIII of Veterans' Regulation numbered 1 (a) for a period or periods in excess of 2 years after the 90th day after the date of enactment of this act, or after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is the later, no compensation shall be paid under this title for any week commencing more than 1 year after the termination of his program of education or training, or vocational rehabilitation, or 5 years after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is the earlier.

"(c) In no event shall compensation be paid under this title for any period after January 31, 1960."

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO GAMBLING MATERIALS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials. This bill would add important amendments to the Lottery Act and extend its provisions to other forms of gambling. The Lottery Act is a very comprehensive and effective piece of legislation, but even though lottery has been liberally construed by the courts, it is still primarily and almost exclusively an antilottery act. It is therefore necessary that some type of legislation be enacted to broaden the coverage of the Lottery Act. The bill which I introduce today would have the beneficial effect of giving the courts a stronger foundation on which to base their opinions as well as halting the interstate flow of such gambling devices as punchboards and pushcards which now move freely in interstate commerce. In this respect, I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD at this time a letter I recently received from the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, attorney general of the State of Montana.

While the bill would close off the interstate commerce lanes as a means of transporting or transmitting gambling materials, great pains have been taken in drawing up the bill to safeguard bona fide fishing or recreational events as well as track racing events upon which betting is legal under applicable State laws. Safeguards have also been taken to protect our cherished freedom of the press by exempting from the provisions of the bill the importation and distribution of any foreign newspaper, pamphlet, or other publication distributed as a bona fide medium for news, information, or opinions in any foreign country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1423) to prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,
DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Helena, Mont., January 8, 1955

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I understand that the interstate crime legislation which you introduced in the United States Senate 2 years ago may be acted upon in this session. For the benefit of all law-enforcement officers everywhere, I hope that all the measures become law, and I want to congratulate you again on your determined fight for their enactment.

I would like to suggest an amendment to present Federal law which, I believe, would cause a sizable reduction in commercialized gambling. The act of January 2, 1951 (64 Stat. 1134), cut off the interstate traffic in slot machines and other types of coin-operated gambling devices. It has been a tremendous help in curbing gambling. However, many professional gamblers immediately transferred their operations to punch-and-pull boards, which are also illegal in most States, but are smaller, easier to conceal, and may still move in interstate commerce. It is far more difficult to stop punchboard operations, since it is very difficult to confiscate enough of them at any one time to cripple the operation.

If the Slot Machine Act could be widened to include punchboards, a big avenue of gambling revenue could be closed immediately. Once the interstate shipment ceased, the traffic would stop automatically because a punchboard, unlike a slot machine, can only be used once.

Thanks again for your leadership in the fight on organized crime.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

ARNOLD H. OLSEN,
Attorney General.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title IV of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to extend the operation of such title and to authorize assistance to certain school districts providing free public education for children residing on Federal property situated outside such school districts. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, together with a letter from B. Alden Lillywhite, Associate Director for Federally Affected Areas, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1426) to amend title IV of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to extend the operation of such title and to authorize assistance to certain school districts providing free public education for children residing on Federal property situated outside such school districts, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement and letter, presented by Mr. THYE, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

I am introducing a bill to provide amendments to title IV, Public Law 815, 81st Con-

gress, in order to extend the operation of such title and to authorize assistance to certain school districts providing free public education for children residing on Federal property situated outside such school districts.

The bill would provide for a 1-year extension for making agreements for assistance under title IV, which relates to assistance to school districts which have large enrollments of children living on tax-exempt Federal property.

Secondly, it would permit the Commissioner of Education to consider applications of school districts which are voluntarily educating Indian children living outside of those districts and which cannot, therefore, meet the residence requirements for eligibility for assistance in school construction under the present act.

There are a number of school districts, including several in Minnesota, which were not able to meet the deadline for applications for Federal aid for construction, which was set for December 24, 1954, under title IV.

The bill which I have introduced would provide that the closing date for Federal assistance, which is now June 30, 1955, would be extended to June 30, 1956.

This would permit the Office of Education to make a closing date for applications on possibly January 15, 1956, and thus enable these districts to comply with the requirements and receive the assistance to which they are otherwise entitled under the policies laid down by Congress for assistance in meeting the school construction needs in these federally affected districts.

The change in date would also conform to other present provisions of Public Law 815, as amended, where the final period is now a year beyond that provided under title IV.

The second provision of the bill is intended to cure situations where school districts are qualified for assistance but are unable to comply with one of the requirements; namely, that the Indian children must reside on property within the district upon which no taxes are collectible for support of the schools.

I have been informed by the division for federally affected schools of the Office of Education that there are 8 or 10 such districts in the United States.

These districts have large enrollments of Indian children who come from other districts where no secondary schools are maintained and where it would be impractical and uneconomical to establish them.

If the school districts now receiving these children should subsequently be unable to take them, it would mean that a much larger outlay of funds would be necessary, including the primary obligation of the Federal Government, if new schools were to be set up.

In order that the objectives sought by this amendment may be clearly indicated, I wish to cite the three districts in Minnesota with which I am familiar, although there are other similar situations in several other States.

These three districts are: Joint Independent Consolidated District No. 1, at Mahnomen, where there are 77 Indian high school pupils from the Naytahwaush Indian community; Joint Independent Consolidated District No. 2, at Waubun, in Mahnomen County, where there are 76 Indian high school pupils from the White Earth Indian reservation; and the school at Orr, St. Louis County unorganized territory, where 70 nonresident Indian high school pupils are enrolled from the Nett Lake Indian reservation.

Each of these schools would be entitled to Federal aid of approximately $100,000 for construction purposes except for the residence requirement of the present law.

The matter is more fully explained in a letter which I have received from Mr. B. Alden Lillywhite, Associate Director for Federally Affected Areas.

(See exhibit A.)

CI——175

I believe that in all fairness these amendments should be adopted and these districts permitted to receive assistance in line with the objectives which Congress has sought to achieve by the program of Federal assistance under Public Law 815.

The proposed changes would not require any additional authorization for appropriations or any additional appropriation of funds.

There will be sufficient funds under the program already authorized to take care of their nominal needs.

Adoption of this bill would, therefore, merely correct limitations in the present act and make it apply to all school districts where the problem of education of our Indian children must be met.

EXHIBIT A

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
March 10, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: Reference is made to your telephone request concerning the status and possible eligibility of the application for three school districts in northern Minnesota under the provisions of Public Law 815, as amended. You ask for some specific information about these districts. The districts are:

Project No.	Name of applicant	Number of Indian high school pupils from other districts
54-C-404..	Joint Independent Consolidated District No. 1, Mahnomen County.	77
54-C-405..	Joint Independent Consolidated District No. 2, Mahnomen County.	76
54-C-40...	County Board of Education for Unorganized Territory, St. Louis County.	70

We regret to inform you that under the existing act, all three of these districts are ineligible for a Federal grant. The applications are based on federally connected children residing on Federal property outside the boundaries of the school districts. Section 401 (a) sets up four criteria for eligibility in this type of school district. These districts meet all of the criteria except one, and they all fail to meet this particular one. This section reads as follows:

"If the Commissioner determines with respect to any local educational agency that * * * the immunity of such Federal property to taxation by such agency has created a substantial and continuing impairment of its ability to finance needed school facilities * * * he may provide the additional assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide such facilities."

In order to be eligible under the above section, a district must meet one or the other of these two conditions, (1) the Federal property upon which the parents of the children reside must be within the boundaries of the district and thus being tax exempt impair the district's ability to finance needed school facilities, (2) the district must be required by State law or regulations to accept and provide facilities for such children living on Federal property (outside the district) and thus impair the district's ability by forcing it to provide facilities for children for whom no tax revenue is provided.

We have been informed by the Minnesota State Department of Education that these pupils reside in districts of small enrollment that do not maintain high schools and the State because of their size would not encourage their so doing, yet there is nothing in the Minnesota law which requires the receiving district to accept such children. Therefore, it appears that the applications of these three districts do not meet the above quoted provisions under section 401 (a) of Public Law 815, as amended, and are therefore not eligible for Federal assistance. Some, if not all, of these districts indicated that in order to provide for the increase in their own resident pupils, it will probably be necessary for them in the near future to exclude nonresidents from their schools.

We appreciate your interest in this situation and if there is any further information which we can supply, we shall be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

B. ALDEN LILLYWHITE,
Associate Director for Federally Affected Areas.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter, addressed to me by Harold E. Hanson, Superintendent of Schools of Cass County, Minn., and a letter which I have just received from Commissioner Brownell, which is a reply to Mr. Hanson's letter, and relates to a school district in Minnesota which filed application too late for consideration, be printed in the RECORD at this point. These letters indicate the need for extension of title IV, as provided in the bill I have introduced.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
UNORGANIZED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Cass County, Walker, Minn.,
February 14, 1955.

Senator EDWARD THYE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: We, the Board of Education of the Unorganized Territory of Cass County, acting in behalf of its residents, ask that you support special legislation in this session to continue Public Law 815, title 4. The previous board failed to act on this matter prior to the dateline of December 31, 1954.

In the event that the law is not continued and we cannot apply under it, we would like to submit for your kind consideration and approval, a request to help us secure Federal funds to assist in building a much-needed high school in Federal Dam, Minn.

This high-school area around Bena, Federal Dam, and Boy River is composed mainly of Federal forest lands, Indian lands, and tax-forfeited lands.

At the present time a very inadequate high school is located at Boy River, Minn. This small three-room high school is all that we have to serve students from Bena, Federal Dam, and Boy River. Most of our buses travel over 75 miles per day over extremely rough roads to transport the youngsters to this school. The housing is simply inadequate. They have no physical education facilities, no vocational training, no home economics, no shower facilities, no business training, very poor lunch facilities, and practically no library at all. About 75 high-school students, grades 9–12, are attending at this time. Of these, approximately 36 percent are of Indian blood.

Too many children in this area drop out of school as soon as they reach the legal age. As is obvious, our holding power is practically nil as we have nothing attractive enough to offer them. Many other students transfer out to other private or public schools at their parents' own expense to obtain enriched curriculum courses. Of course, the majority of parents with limited finances are forced to expose their children to inadequate schooling being offered. Opportunities for equal education is strictly nonexistent for this area.

The problem is acute. Unless better educational facilities will be offered to these people, the patrons of a portion of this area are going to demand to be annexed to an adjoining district. Much of the only valuable tax property in our district will be taken with them leaving the remainder of the unorganized district in still worse shape. The patrons remaining in the inner area would be forced to send their children to another school entailing still further travel, perhaps boarding out. We do not feel that it is the intention of our representatives and Congressmen to force the youngsters of high-school age out of their homes, inadequately educate them, nor expose them to undue hardships to reach school.

We of the unorganized territory of Cass County are in a peculiar financial and physical position. We are limited by Minnesota law 123.52 in the unorganized territory in that the total bonded indebtedness shall at no time exceed 7½ percent of our assessed valuation. Since our assessed valuation is about $900,000, the maximum that we could bond for would be $67,500. However, it would not be possible to raise this amount nor would it be practical to do so. The Federal Dam, Bena, Boy River area that would be benefited by this proposed building constitutes about 33 percent of our territory. The schools in existence in the remaining parts of the unorganized will be in need of buildings in the near future. Were we to go to the limit of our indebtedness at this time, nothing could be done for the other residents in our territory for quite some time.

Since 36 percent of our school population in the proposed building area is of Indian extraction, we feel that Federal funds, allocated for this purpose can be obtained to help us obtain this much needed school building.

We are willing to do our share and certainly will cooperate with you in every way to do what is necessary to expedite this matter. The need is great and we know that we can count on your help. May we hear from you?

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD E. HANSON,
County Superintendent, Cass County Schools.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
March 14, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: This is in reply to your letter of February 16, 1955, transmitting a letter from Mr. Harold E. Hanson, superintendent of Cass County Schools, Walker, Minn., regarding Federal assistance for that school district under title IV, Public Law 815, as amended.

The Cass County School District failed to make application for assistance under section 401 of Public Law 815, as amended by Public Law 246, before the deadline date for receipt of applications, December 31, 1954. You ask if it would be administratively feasible to advance the deadline date originally established to some future date so that this district as well as others could file the applications.

This amendment added a provision, title IV, specifically designed to meet the problem where large numbers of people, particularly Indian children, lived on nontaxable Federal lands and the school district was unable to provide school facilities for them by reason of the nontaxability of the Federal property. Title III of the act was not applicable to these situations because it required an increase in school enrollment due to Federal activities in order to establish eligibility. Title IV provided that no agreement shall be made to extend assistance under this section after June 30, 1955. This means that the final cutoff date for receipt of applications had to be established far enough in advance of the June 30 date to permit processing of the applications, preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost, obtaining the assurances required by the act, and giving final approval to the projects by that date.

School districts had from August 1953 to December 31, 1954, to file applications under the cutoff date that was set. This gave 6 months, before June 30, 1955, to process the applications and complete all the requirements of the act.

The school superintendent from Cass County wrote us after the December 31, 1954, deadline asking if we could accept an application after the deadline date had passed. We considered the matter very carefully to determine whether or not it would be possible to advance the deadline date to allow this and other school districts to make application. It was our judgment that it would not be practicable to revise the regulations to set a new and later cutoff date and still complete the assurances required by the act for approval of all projects by June 30, 1955.

Your interest in this program is appreciated. If you desire further information regarding this matter, we will be pleased to discuss it with you.

Sincerely yours,

S. M. BROWNELL,
Commissioner of Education.

REPEAL OF SILVER PURCHASE LAWS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce a bill to repeal the silver purchase laws and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to stop the mandatory purchases of silver required by certain laws. This action was recommended in 1950 by a subcommittee on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, composed of both Republicans and Democrats. This subcommittee, in questioning the leading economists, businessmen, and bankers in the country, found that the silver purchase laws were universally condemned by all who did not profit directly through them. This subcommittee concluded that the present monetary policy relative to silver is objectionable, unnecessary, and a net expense to the Government. They found also that it is inflationary, and defective as a subsidy program, aid being granted to producers of silver without any test as to need.

My own record in connection with the silver situation is perfectly clear. I sponsored the so-called Green Silver Act which enabled the silver industry to obtain silver for war purposes during World War II. I have previously sponsored legislation similar to that being introduced today.

The silver issue is bipartisan and it had been my hope that upon the advent of a Republican administration in 1952 the repeal of the silver purchase laws would receive immediate attention, particularly in view of the sound money program advocated at that time by the Republican Party. I was disappointed to find that the Treasury Department, which, under the Democratic administration had not hesitated to endorse the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, under the Republican administration, took the position that under the conditions then existing such action would not be timely. It appears to me that enactment of legislation in the interest of sound money is always timely. I would be interested to learn if and why it would not be timely now.

I have listened for many years to the proponents of our present silver laws make glib statements that these laws enable the Treasury to make huge profits, and that the subsidy provided through these laws is necessary to support the producers of copper, lead, and zinc. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the daily statement of the United States Treasury on February 16, 1955, less than 4 weeks ago, there is shown as an asset 1,888,107,449.1 ounces of silver, valued at approximately $2,441,189,427.44. This valuation is based on the fiction that silver is worth approximately $1.29 per ounce. The New York market, which is the only place in this country where we can find a quotation, values silver at 85¼ cents per ounce. In other words, the Treasury is showing an asset of $831,577,827.08 which does not exist.

Not so long ago some Members of Congress became concerned as to whether or not all the gold that was supposed to be at Fort Knox could be accounted for. I wonder whether these same Members of Congress will be equally concerned to find that the United States Treasury, with reference to silver, shows an asset of nearly $1 billion which, in fact, does not exist. The truth of the matter is that the so-called profits which have been taken by the Treasury in accordance with the silver-purchase laws, have been taken as a result of a false valuation of silver. In fact, we do not know that this huge hoard of silver in the Treasury is worth even as much as 85¼ cents per ounce. No other nation in the world guarantees any price for silver. This absurd and unsound money situation is becoming worse each year by the purchase of millions of ounces of domestic silver.

The silver bloc has tried to justify continuation of the silver-purchase laws, regardless of their unsound monetary aspects, by the argument that a fixed subsidy price for silver is necessary to bolster the production of the other metals—copper, lead, and zinc. Nothing could be further from the truth. An analysis of the companies producing copper clearly shows that the subsidy price merely increases their profits. It is a windfall paid to the copper producers regardless of need. It is true that some of the lead and zinc producers have been in trouble due to recent low prices for these base metals. The administration took cognizance of this fact by buying lead and zinc for stockpiling purposes. Now there is a great deal of agitation among these producers for increased tariffs. In other words, the record clearly indicates that the problems of the

lead and zinc producers must be solved by methods other than the present silver-purchase laws.

In addition to adversely affecting our monetary system, the silver-purchase laws adversely affect the silver-using industry. This includes not only the manufacturers of silverware and holloware, but also the manufacturers of photographic paper, mirrors, pharmaceutical products, electrical contacts, silver-brazing alloys, and many other products using silver. With the Treasury paying above market prices for domestic silver, the silver-using industry is totally dependent on foreign supplies. This results in control of the silver market by Mexico and other silver-producing interests. This control has resulted in a price of 85¼ cents per ounce for silver in the New York market for a period of 2 years. This price has been maintained regardless of supply and demand. No other commodity has been so rigidly controlled.

My friends in the silver-using industry in Rhode Island and elsewhere in the United States never know when the insidious forces controlling the silver market will raise the price and threaten their existence. This proud industry has shown great fortitude and patience, in the hope and expectation that Congress will deliver them from the grip of these selfish interests. But even more than that, they are desirous of ending the unsound silver-monetary practices which affect not only the silver-using industry, but the entire Nation.

In sponsoring this bill it is my hope that the various departments and agencies of the Government will reexamine this matter of vital public concern. Particularly it is my hope that the Treasury Department will change its present attitude that a nonexistent asset of nearly $1 billion does not embarrass it at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1427) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills which have been submitted by the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, and a second proposal by the Department of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these bills the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, and the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1429. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1429 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is inclosed herewith a draft of a bill to provide for the payment of certain claims for personal injuries arising out of activities of the Army, which the Department of the Army recommends be enacted into law. The submission of this legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to provide for the payment of certain claims that this Department believes to be meritorious and worthy of payment, which cannot be settled administratively.

These claims arose out of an automobile accident which occurred on Okinawa, Ryukyus, on May 5, 1950. On that date, a 1941 Ford sedan owned by Manuel R. Ocampo, address unknown, and operated by Rodolfo C. Delgado, in which Jesus M. Lagua and Vicente D. Reynante were passengers, was proceeding south on Highway No. 1, Machinato, Okinawa. A United States Army semi-tractor, hauling a 750-gallon water trailer, operated by an enlisted man on official business, was proceeding north on the same highway. As the two vehicles approached each other, the tongue of the trailer broke at a point where it had been welded, and the trailer, becoming disengaged, veered to the left side of the road and crashed into the Ford sedan. The civilian automobile was completely demolished and its occupants sustained serious personal injuries which are more fully described below.

Particulars with respect to each of the occupants of the civilian automobile are as follows:

Rodolfo C. Delgado, a native of the Republic of the Philippines, was born on April 17, 1928, and is currently residing at 183–C Camarines Street, Santa Cruz, Manila, Republic of the Philippines. At the time of the accident he was employed as a guard by the Rycom Central Exchange (a nonappropriated fund activity of the Army) in Okinawa at a biweekly rate of $51.50 and had been performing considerable overtime work. As a result of the accident, he was hospitalized in the 34th General Hospital, Okinawa, from May 5, 1950, to July 8, 1950, for a compound fracture of the left femur. He was then evacuated at the 1st Hospital Group, Clark Air Force Base, Republic of the Philippines. More than a year later, Lt. Col. Thomas H. Crouch, Chief of Surgical Service at that hospital, issued the following statement on July 23, 1951, regarding Mr. Delgado's injury:

"Open reduction of a compound comminuted fracture of the left femur was performed on August 2, 1950. This fracture of the left femur failed to unite, therefore an open reduction with bone graft taken from the right ilium and fixed by two bone plates was performed on January 10, 1951. The patient developed a chronic draining sinus at the upper end of the wound and was reoperated upon on May 17, 1951, and the bone plates and screws and one sequestrated piece of bone graft was removed and the wound was debrided and closed by primary suture. He was treated with multiple antibiotics and healing progressed without incident. He was fitted with a double-bar ischial weight-bearing brace and discharged from the hospital on June 19, 1951.

"ReX-rays taken on July 20, 1951, show progressive healing but the femur is not yet sufficiently healed to allow unsupported weight bearing on this leg. Operative scars are well healed. There is limitation of flexion and extension of the left knee and ankle. The permanence and degree of disability cannot be determined for at least another 6 months."

On December 29, 1950, Mr. Delgado filed a claim in the amount of $24,104.30 for the injuries he sustained in this accident, including the following:

"(a) For actual and necessary payments for hospitalization (the receipts are in my possession)	$256.80
(b) For further hospitalization	500.00
(c) For actual loss in wages from July 8, 1950, to date	669.50
(d) For loss in wages for 2 years during which I cannot resume profitable employment	2,768.00
(e) For loss in earning capacity on account of injuries sustained	10,000.00
(f) For moral damages for physical pain and suffering and extreme mental anguish	10,000.00
(g) Total	24,104.30"

In May 1953, Mr. Delgado had recovered sufficiently to do light work and obtained employment at Bagnio City, Republic of the Philippines, at an average monthly salary of ₱105 ($52.50). A physical examination, made on December 29, 1953, indicated the following:

"Disability, 25 percent, partial permanent, due to damage of the left femur associated with atrophy of the flexors, extensors, and lateral rotators of the left thigh. Patient is unable to perform work involving maximum stress on the left leg."

A subsequent physical examination made on January 11, 1954, showed that while his left leg was one-half inch shorter and was smaller in circumference than his right leg, Mr. Delgado had made a complete functional recovery with complete healing of the fracture and osteomyelitis. Although he stands with a slight pelvic tilt to the left, he walks well and without a limp, and can do any kind of work. The expenses actually incurred by him in connection with medical treatment and hospitalization appear to have totaled $460.65.

It is the view of the Department of the Army that Mr. Delgado should be compensated for his injury in a reasonable amount and that the payment of $8,000, composed of $460.65 for actual expenses incurred in connection with the injury, $4,490 for complete loss of earnings for 3 years, and partial loss until January 1954, and the balance for the very substantial amount of pain and suffering sustained is reasonable. Mr. Delgado has signified his willingness to settle his claim for this amount by executing a settlement agreement.

Jesus M. Lagua, a native of the Republic of the Philippines, currently residing at 16–B Perla Ext., Tondo, Manila, Republic of the Philippines, at the time of the accident also was employed as a guard by the Rycom Central Exchange. As a result of the accident he sustained a compound fracture of the left lower jaw and lacerations of the face and left eyebrow. He was hospitalized from May 5, 1950 to June 8, 1950 at the 34th General Hospital, Okinawa, and his face is permanently disfigured by two scars, one above the left eye and the other on the lower part of his face extending from a point centrally located between the lower lip and the chin to a point near the base of the left ear. An injury to the left eyelid prevents the normal functioning of the lid and makes it impossible for him to close his left eye

fully. On July 31, 1950, he filed a claim with the Department of the Army in the amount of $4,500, which he amended to the amount of $10,000 on January 27, 1951, because the malfunctioning of the left eyelid and the disfiguring scars had been found to be permanent. His hospital expenses amounted to $40.80 and he was unable to work for 26 days sustaining a loss of earnings in the amount of $176.51.

It is the view of the Department of the Army that Mr. Lagua reasonably may be compensated for this permanent injury and disfigurement by the payment of $2,000, composed of $40.80 for hospital expenses, $176.51 for loss of earnings, and the balance for pain and suffering, facial disfigurement and permanent injury. Mr. Lagua has signified his willingness to settle his claim for this amount by signing a settlement agreement.

Vicente D. Reynante, a native of the Republic of the Philippines, and currently residing at Kawit, Cavite, Republic of the Philippines, at the time of the accident similarly was employed by the Rycom Central Exchange as a guard. As a result of the accident he sustained injuries diagnosed as a scalp wound with temporary cerebral concussion. He was treated at the 34th General Hospital, Okinawa, from May 5, 1950, until May 10, 1950, when he was released with no apparent permanent disability.

His hospitalization expenses amounted to $6 and he sustained a loss of earnings in the amount of $38.25. On July 31, 1950, he filed a claim with the Department of the Army in the amount of $2,500 which was amended to the amount of $3,000 on March 31, 1951, because of headache and recurring dizziness.

It is the view of the Department of the Army that Mr. Reynante reasonably may be compensated for his injury by the payment of $500, composed of $6 for hospital expenses, $38.25 for loss of earnings and the balance for pain and suffering and any residual disability. Mr. Reynante has signified his willingness to settle his claim in this amount by the execution of a settlement agreement.

None of these claims could be considered under the provisions of the Foreign Claims Act (act of Jan. 2, 1942, 55 Stat. 880), as amended (31 U. S. C. 224d), as the claimants are natives of the Republic of the Philippines and could not be considered inhabitants of the Ryukyus. The claims could not be considered under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 842), as amended (28 U. S. C. 921–934), as they arose in a foreign country.

The only portions of these claims that could be considered under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372), as amended (31 U. S. C. 223b), are those dealing with medical and hospital expenses actually incurred (Delgado, $460.65; Lagua, $40.80; Reynante, $6) because of the express limitation contained in that act. As all of these claimants were employees of the Rycom Exchange and were therefore treated at Army facilities, this element is a minor part of the claim in each case.

There is no other statute under which these claims may be paid.

The Congress, on occasion, has favorably considered bills to pay persons injured as a result of the activities of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who would have been paid under the Foreign Claims Act, supra, but for the fact that the injury occurred in a foreign country of which the claimant was not an inhabitant. The most recent case in point is Private Law No. 322, 83d Congress, for the relief of two natives of Austria, Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son, who was injured in Czechoslovakia.

The total cost of the bill, if enacted, will be $10,500.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service schoolteacher.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1430 is as follows:)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Ernest W. Berry, Alaska Native Service schoolteacher."

I request that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

This bill would authorize an appropriation of $1,070 to be used in reimbursing Mr. Berry for the loss of provisions and personal effects through fire in Government quarters occupied by Mr. Berry at Unalakleet, Alaska. No insurance was carried by Mr. Berry due to the prohibitive insurance rates in effect in this isolated area. The fire occurred on the morning of December 15, 1946. The exact cause of the fire could not be determined but it originated in a chimney in the attic of the building. Immediately upon discovery of the fire, Mr. Berry, natives of the village and employees at the local station of the Civil Aeronautics Administration fought the fire with every firefighting facility available but were unable to extinguish it. The interior of the building of one and one-half stories was constructed of frame and plasterboard, which burned very rapidly. Most of the furnishings from the building were removed but because of the rapid spread of the fire, it was impossible to enter the kitchen and the basement and attic areas used as storage space. Personal property belonging to Mr. Berry which was in this space was destroyed. This included food supplies valued at $1,007 and personal effects, including clothing, valued at $63. The records of the local trader revealed that 3 days before the fire occurred Mr. Berry had purchased food supplies at an approximate cost of $1,050. Delivery of these supplies was made shortly before December 15. Enclosed is a copy of a voucher submitted by Mr. Berry, which itemizes the articles lost in the fire and their original cost.

During the 5-month period Mr. Berry had occupied the building he had tested and refilled the fire extinguishers in the building, and he had inspected and made minor repairs to the building. The fire was not due to any negligence or wrongful act or omission on the claimant's part or on the part of any employee of the Department; therefore, the claim could not be paid under the provision of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672) permitting administrative adjustment of claims. It is believed in view of the circumstances that Mr. Berry should be reimbursed for his loss of personal goods and effects. The delay in filing a claim for this loss appears to be due to his unfamiliarity with procedures in presenting a claim.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed bill to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant,
Secretary of the Interior.

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of McFarland Cockrill, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1431 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a bill for the relief of McFarland Cockrill, and for other purposes. The submission of this proposed legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Col. McFarland Cockrill, United States Army, retired, of all liability to refund civilian compensation received by him while employed by the Fort Sam Houston Golf Club and to authorize payment of certain Federal pay otherwise due him which has been withheld by the Government.

Colonel Cockrill, a resident of San Antonio, Tex., was retired from the United States Army on October 31, 1946, for physical disability incurred in line of duty. His service extended for over 30 years, primarily as a cavalry officer, and included 22 months in France in World War I and service throughout World War II.

On November 1, 1946, Colonel Cockrill accepted civilian employment with the Fort Sam Houston Golf Club, a nonappropriated fund activity. Due to his retirement for physical disability, his employment was exempt from the prohibitions of the so-called Dual Office Act (sec. 2, act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62)). He was paid for his services the sum of $200 per month from November 1, 1946, through November 30, 1948, and $300 per month from December 1, 1948, until the termination of his employment with the club on December 15, 1951. He received annual retired pay during the period of $5,148. However, by letter addressed to Colonel Cockrill (FINCS–B 210 Cockrill, McFarland, 0 4 938) subject: Retired Pay, dated August 2, 1954, the Retired Pay Division informed him that he was due $3,622.64 on account of a readjustment of his retired pay retroactive to October 1, 1949, and that the amount was being withheld as an offset toward his indebtedness to the Government arising out of his employment by the Fort Sam Houston Golf Club. The funds from which Colonel Cockrill's salary was paid by the club was derived from dues received from the individual members of the club and revenues received from the club's various activities. No appropriated funds were involved in his salary.

The Comptroller General of the United States considered the dual compensation aspects of Colonel Cockrill's concurrent receipt of the mentioned compensation from the club and retired pay from the Army, and determined that such payments were illegal under the provisions of the so-called Economy Act (sec. 212, act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a; Public Law 300, 83d Cong.)). That officer's letter to Colonel Cockrill dated April 5, 1954, demanding refund of the full amount of his civilian compensation for the period in question reads, in part, as follows:

"The records of this office disclose that you are indebted to the United States on account of your employment in a civilian capacity as manager and caretaker of the Fort Sam Houston Golf Club, San Antonio, Tex., an Army officers' club, and an instrumentality of the United States Government, for which you received compensation in the total sum of $16,050, during the period from November 1, 1946, through December 15, 1951, when you also were receiving retired pay as an Army officer retired, at the rate of $412.50 per month.

"The payment as above stated was dual compensation within the prohibitory terms of section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47

Stat. 406), as amended by section 3 of the act of July 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 761, 5 U. S. C. 59a), since your retired pay on account of services as a commissioned officer in the United States Army was at a rate in excess of an amount which, when combined with the annual rate of compensation from the civilian office involved makes the total rate more than $3,000 per annum. The act provides also, that when the retired pay amounts to or exceeds the rate of $3,000 per annum, the person shall be entitled to the pay of the civilian position or the retired pay, whichever he may elect.

"In view of the foregoing, and since it is assumed that you would elect to retain the larger amount, or the retired pay, on the basis of this assumption, the amount for refund is $16,050. Accordingly, you are requested to make full payment of said amount at this time or to submit an initial payment together with a definite plan for settlement of the balance within a reasonable period."

It is apparent that Colonel Cockrill and all other persons concerned at Fort Sam Houston were of the view that as he was retired for physical disability, the restrictions of the Economy Act like those of the Dual Office Act, were not applicable to his employment by the Fort Sam Houston Golf Club. Generally, officers retired for physical disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or caused by an instrumentality of war are exempt from the prohibitions of the latter act. However, it appears that Colonel Cockrill's disability for which he was retired did not result from either of said causes. The record discloses that his employment was approved by the club's board of governors, the deputy post commander of Fort Sam Houston, and the commanding general of the Fourth Army, all of whom had knowledge of Colonel Cockrill's retired status. Throughout the period of his employment Colonel Cockrill frequently indicated his retired status in connection with his signature on business papers of the club, and apparently no exception was taken by auditors and other inspecting personnel who periodically examined the status of the club's affairs. Immediately on being informed of the views of the Comptroller General, Colonel Cockrill terminated his employment with the club.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this legislation would entail an expenditure of $3,622.64, the Federal pay due Colonel Cockrill which has been withheld as an offset toward his indebtedness to the Government of $16,050. It is important, however, to point out that the $16,050 Colonel Cockrill received from the Fort Sam Houston Golf Club was derived from nonappropriated funds rather than from funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Mary J. McDougall.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1432 is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mary J. McDougall.

I suggest that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

The bill would authorize the payment to Mary J. McDougall of the sum of $631.99 to reimburse her for the loss of her personal effects which were destroyed when the Government quarters which she was occupying at Napakiak, Alaska, burned to the ground on January 13, 1950. No insurance was carried by Miss McDougall due to the prohibitive insurance rates in effect in this isolated area. There is enclosed an itemized list of the property destroyed by the fire, showing the original cost of the property and its depreciated value.

The fire was apparently caused by spontaneous combustion due to overheating of the light plant which was located in a small room in the rear of the quarters. Investigation of the causes for the fire failed to indicate any negligence or wrongful act or omission on the claimant's part or on the part of any employee of the Department; therefore, the claim could not be paid under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672) permitting administrative adjustment of claims. It is, therefore, recommended that favorable consideration be given to this proposed bill for the relief of Mary J. McDougall.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior.

CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF "EMPLOYEE" IN FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of "employee," and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a list of reasons for the introduction of this bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the list of reasons will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1437) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of "employee" and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. CURTIS) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The list of reasons for the introduction of Senate bill 1437, presented by Mr. CAPEHART, is as follows:

LIST OF REASONS FOR INTRODUCTION OF SENATE BILL 1437

1. The status of certain individuals who, since the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act have been regarded as independent contractors, is now rendered uncertain by reason of regional office activity of the Wage and Hour Division. Examples are: independent contract buyers of cream, poultry, and eggs and independent contract haulers in the dairy and other industries.

2. The same individuals are regarded as self-employed independent contractors under the Social Security Act. There is no reason for holding them to be employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

3. The proposed amendment is based upon the language of the Gearhart amendment to Social Security Act passed over President Truman veto in 1948 (Public Law 642, 80th Cong.).

4. Any attempt to apply the terms of the Fair Labor Standards Act to these unsupervised individuals would result in unfairness, confusion, and would be impractical administratively.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution proposing a change in the Rules of the Senate, dealing with Senate consideration of conference reports.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement, prepared by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and me, a listing of Senate Rules requiring that certain matters lie over for a period of time, together with two examples of Senate consideration of highly important conference reports during the last session, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement and others matters will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 77) submitted by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"1. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read or a question of order, or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing. It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until 1 calendar day has passed after the presentation of such report, and until the text of such report has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or has otherwise been made available to Senators in printed form. Thereafter, the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate. No request to suspend this rule by unanimous consent shall be in order, unless immediately prior to the request it has been ascertained, by a rollcall ordered for such purpose, that a quorum of the Senate is present."

The explanatory statement and other matters, presented by Mr. LEHMAN, are as follows:

STATEMENTS BY SENATORS LEHMAN AND MORSE

We are today submitting a proposed change in the Senate Rules dealing with the consideration of conference reports by the Senate.

Our primary intention is to provide the Senate with a rule which would require the printing of every report from a conference committee, and for the report to lie over for 1 day prior to its consideration by the Senate.

We are moved to submit this proposal to the Senate in view of two outstanding instances during the last session of Congress when conference reports on the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Communist Control Act of 1954 were jammed through the Senate without adequate notice. In both these instances there were no copies of the proposed changes and amendments reported

by the conference committee readily available to Senators, and no time was provided for adequate consideration and study of the important changes being proposed.

At the present time no Senator has any recourse in the Senate Rules by which he can insist on receiving a printed copy of a conference report, and there is no direct way by which even a limited time can be obtained for the study and analysis of the impact and content of changes proposed in pending legislation as the result of conference committee agreements.

We wish to avoid future situations which would require us to vote on measures vital to the interest of the United States on a moment's notice. We want to plug this gap in the Senate Rules, and protect our right to study fully the frequently new, detailed, and complex proposals which may be submitted to us by conference committees.

Under present Senate Rules there are at least 10 specific instances where bills and motions must lie over for a specified period of time in order that adequate study and consideration can be given them before we are called upon to vote. The House of Representatives has a rule which requires the printing of conference reports prior to House action, but the Senate Rules contain no such protection.

We are hopeful that after adequate study, the Senate will see fit to adopt our proposal as a modification of the Senate Rules, and thus enforce its great tradition of being the "greatest deliberative body in the world."

RULES OF THE SENATE REQUIRING A MATTER TO LIE OVER FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD OF TIME BEFORE CONSIDERATION

1. Rule XII (voting, etc.):

"SEC. 3. No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a rollcall ordered for the purpose by the Presiding Officer, it shall be disclosed that a quorum of the Senate is present; and when a unanimous consent is thus given the same shall operate as the order of the Senate, but any unanimous consent may be revoked by another unanimous consent granted in the manner prescribed above upon 1 day's notice."

2. Rule XIV (bills, joint resolutions, and resolutions):

"SECTION 1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day."

"SEC. 3. No bill or joint resolution shall be committed or amended until it shall have been twice read, after which it may be referred to a committee; bills and joint resolutions introduced on leave, and bills and joint resolutions from the House of Representatives, shall be read once, and may be read twice, on the same day, if not objected to, for reference, but shall not be considered on that day, nor debated, except for reference, unless by unanimous consent.

"SEC. 6. All resolutions shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct."

3. Rule XVI (amendments to appropriation bills):

"SEC. 3. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least 1 day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner, amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills, establishing post roads, or proposing new post roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Public Works."

4. Rule XXII (precedence of motions):

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, except subsection 3 of rule XXII, at any time a motion signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but 1, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote, the question: 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close.'"

5. Rule XXVI (reference to committees; motions to discharge, and reports of committees to lie over):

"SEC. 2. All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of a subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct."

6. Rule XXXVII (executive session—proceedings on treaties):

"SEC. 1. When a treaty is reported from a committee with or without amendment, it shall, unless the Senate unanimously otherwise direct, lie 1 day for consideration; after which it may be read a second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole, when it shall be proceeded with by articles, and the amendments reported by the committee shall be first acted upon, after which other amendments may be proposed; and when through with, the proceedings had as in Committee of the Whole shall be reported to the Senate, when questions shall be, if the treaty be amended, 'Will the Senate concur in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole?' And the amendments may be taken separately, or in gross, if no Senator shall object; after which new amendments may be proposed. At any stage of such proceedings the Senate may remove the injunction of secrecy from the treaty, or proceed with its consideration in open executive session."

7. Rule XXXVIII (executive session—proceedings on nominations):

"SEC. 1. When nominations shall be made by the President of the United States to the Senate, they shall, unless otherwise ordered, be referred to appropriate committees; and the final question on every nomination shall be, 'Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?' which question shall not be put on the same day on which the nomination is received, nor on the day on which it may be reported by a committee, unless by unanimous consent."

8. Rule XL (suspension and amendment of the rules):

"No motion to suspend, modify, or amend any rule, or any part thereof, shall be in order, except on 1 day's notice in writing, specifying precisely the rule or part proposed to be suspended, modified, or amended, and the purpose thereof. Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, rule XII."

H. R. 9757, 83D CONGRESS (THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT)

The conference report (H. Rept. 2639) was submitted in the House and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 9, 1954,, (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 10, pp. 13765–13779). This was rejected by the Senate August 13, 1954, (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 11, pp. 14338–14364). Another conference report (H. Rept. 2666) was submitted in the House and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 16, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 11, pp. 14852–14867). It was submitted, read, and agreed to by the Senate August 16, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 11, pp. 14603–14606).

S. 3706, 83D CONGRESS (THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT)

The conference report (H. Rept. 2673) was submitted in the House and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 19, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 12, p. 15236). It was submitted, printed, and agreed to by the Senate August 19, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 12, pp. 15101–15121).

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENT

Mr. GORE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address entitled "Let's Meet the Challenge of Our Times," delivered by him before the Greater New York Branch of the Atlantic Union Committee; on February 18, 1955.

Statement prepared by him entitled "Another Gas Bonanza," dealing with the action of the White House Committee on National Fuel Policy, with particular reference to the recommendation that the Federal Government remove itself from all regulation of field producers of gas; together with letter and table.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at the 60th anniversary banquet of the Sons of Norway, in New York City.

Articles on the future of Guatemala, written by Daniel James.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Opening statement made by him on Walter Winchell's American Broadcasting Co. simulcast in New York, on Sunday, March 13, 1955, together with questions of Senator CAPEHART of Walter Winchell.

By Mr. BYRD:

Article entitled "Senator GEORGE—Monumental, Determined," written by William S. White, and published in the New York Times magazine of March 13, 1955.

REHABILITATION PROGRAM OF ALCHOLICS ANONYMOUS UNDER SUPERVISION OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ROBERT J. CONNER, SR.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a report recently filed with the municipal court for the District of Columbia, de-

scribing the outstanding success of the rehabilitation program of Alcoholics Anonymous, conducted under the supervision of the municipal court. This program is carried out under the able and conscientious direction of Mr. Robert J. Conner, Sr., assistant director of probation. My colleagues will be interested to know that Mr. Conner is the father of young Bob Conner, Jr., supervisor of our Senate pages, whom all of us hold in sincere esteem and affection. After 7 years of service in the Senate, our diligent and always cheerful Bob Conner, Jr., will soon shoulder even heavier responsibilities as a member of our country's armed services. I am sure, Mr. President, that all of us join in commending and congratulating Bob on a job well done, and in wishing him God speed in this greater endeavor in his country's service.

We shall all miss him very much.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS IN OPERATION IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Robert J. Conner, Sr., Assistant Director of Probation)

This, the A. A. plan of rehabilitation, has conquered more drinking problems and finally set more men free from the bondages of dissipation than any plan yet devised. The A. A. program has shed more light on things, human and divine, than all philosophers and scholars combined. The program speaks such words of life as were never spoken before, produces effects which lie beyond the reach of the orator or the poet, and furnishes themes for more intelligent oration and discussions, learned volumes, works of art, and songs of praise than the entire army of great men of ancient and modern times.

There was never in this entire world a program so unpretendingly modest and lowly in its outward form and condition, yet producing such extraordinary effects upon men of all classes.

The annals of history furnish no other example of such complete and astounding success, in spite of the absence of material, social, literary and artistic powers and influences which are indispensable in the average plan of rehabilitation.

Characters are determined by what we look at, whether it be through the physical eye or the mind. We generally look at what we think about and we generally think about what we look at. Only in the light of deeds, character, and influence can this program be entirely understood and appreciated. It can be truly said of this plan, "It is the preserver, benefactor, and redeemer of mankind."

It would be good if it were possible to assess the true value of human happiness regained, dignity restored, and financial status improved.

The transformation from one degree of sobriety to another depends upon the consistency with which we keep our eyes fixed upon the master plan. Its truth is demonstrated in the overwhelmingly impressive record of A. A. in operation in the municipal court. The average alcoholic costs the taxpayer approximately $3,000 per year in terms of police, hospital treatment, and welfare expenses. But by our plan of recovery, the present method is not costing the taxpayer an additional penny. However, it is very true that a great deal of time and effort has been freely and voluntarily put forth by the members of A. A. and myself. The achievements are most gratifying to all of us who have contributed to this cause.

The following members of A. A. have voluntarily contributed so much of themselves to this cause: First, our friends, Jim F., Helen C., and Bill E.; and from the Cosmopolitan group, Bob H. and others. The above-mentioned members have been consistently helping us throughout the years. Without their assistance, we could not have attained what has been accomplished.

No man comes to us in an atmosphere of triumph, but full of human anguish, his fate trembling in the balance. If it were not for the excellent judicial temperament of this, our outstanding judiciary, the judgment might read, "Let the transgressor receive the punishment for his offense against society," and the offender would be left to perish in his own iniquities. But out of this crisis the unfortunates who come to us begin to see a ray of hope and a glimpse of a decent future. For these are among the contemplations that brought these men to the final, irrevocable decision to continue on the road to complete recovery.

The following is the record, not only in numbers, but in terms of living, human evidence of the success of this plan:

Beginning January 1, 1954, and through December 31, 1954, 164 probationers were referred to Alcoholics Anonymous who later made good. All had drinking problems. Some were chronic alcoholics; others had disintegrated to a point of apparently no return. Ten others violated their probation to the extent where it was necessary to request a revocation of their probation. Nine probationers are presently classified as absconders. Two probationers died during the past year. Ten persons have been referred to the probation office from other sources. Two of these came from hospital clinics, two from lawyers who had friends in need of help with their drinking problems, 1 from a physician, and 5 from other sources. Five of these voluntary referrals are still sober and consistently making progress in this program of rehabilitation.

One hundred and ninety-five represents the total number of individuals with whom we have attempted to work toward rehabilitation through the medium of A. A. As of December 31, we still have 164 people in the process of becoming normal, sober, self-sustaining individuals. Many of them now occupy respectable stations in life, socially, financially, and morally.

EXAMPLES

I. George T., colored male, 55 years old, had been employed at the United States Capitol for many years. He came to us through the District Court Probation Office after a conviction of manslaughter. He had been a social drinker for a number of years, who had been retrogressing for quite some time. While driving away from the curb in his Cadillac, he drove directly over a pedestrian and killed her instantly. Because his past record of employment and conduct was good, he was placed on probation for a period of 5 years. He finally became affiliated with A. A., first in this court and then in the Washington Negro group. Gradually but surely, he is working his way back to his normal position in life. He is still employed in the same capacity at the United States Capitol and regaining the respect of the people with whom he works. Thus, instead of serving a long period of time in the Department of Corrections, he is gradually working himself back into a decent way of living. A great transformation in this case has been recognized, not only by the people who work with him in the court and A. A., but by his friends and associates.

II. Gerald F., white male, 28 years old, was referred to us by a well-known and very prominent attorney, for the sole purpose of helping him to obtain gainful employment. When he arrived in the probation office, it was very obvious that he was not employable. He was sober; but he admitted being a chronic alcoholic. At the time, he was apparently desperately ill from the effects of drugs. He stated that he was a patient of a very well-known physician, who was treating him for a nervous disorder, and that his medication was sedatives. We advised him to discontinue the use of sedatives for a period of 30 days and to attempt rehabilitation through the medium of A. A. He responded by saying, "I've tried everything else, and nothing works, so I'll try your plan." He discontinued the use of the medication, attended A. A. meetings, and began to practice A. A. principles. At first, the withdrawal effects of the drugs were rather difficult to accept. However, he did cooperate. No effort was made to find him a job because of his physical and mental condition.

In a short time, I received a telephone call from Gerald's attorney, who rather indignantly stated, "I sent Gerald to you to help him find employment, but you declare him unemployable, advise him to join A. A., and disassociate him with his doctor. I don't appreciate what you've done." The attorney was very frankly advised that we were directing our efforts for his friend's personal benefit. He was further advised that we were not interested in his criticism. The young man continued following the advice given him in the A. A. program and he recovered. In less than 60 days we found him a job. Today he is doing his work in a normal way and living a happy, contented life without any medication whatever.

A few months after our last conversation with the attorney, he came to the probation office in person and stated, "your plan is working. I apologize for my attitude at the outset of this procedure. I had no idea that you would take the time and put forth the effort to help my friend as you have done, freely and voluntarily, and without compensation. There has been a marvelous transformation in Gerald's entire life. His outlook is constructive, and he is making progress in every direction. This is the most amazing plan of rehabilitation I have ever seen in operation. This young man has been a problem for many years, but today he is no problem. He is strictly on his own; he is at this time adequately supporting his family, something he has not done in years. I had to be shown that this plan would work because I had no idea there was such a facility for assisting the person who was mentally and physically as sick as Gerald was when I first saw him."

These examples are typical of hundreds of examples of rehabilitation through the medium of A. A.

THE FORMOSA RESOLUTION AND TREATY WITH CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on a great many different occasions I have spoken on the subject of the Formosa resolution and treaty with Chiang Kai-shek, against both of which I voted. I have also inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of thoughtful and informative articles by different writers, columnists, and public officials, pointing out the very dangerous mess into which we have permitted ourselves to be maneuvered. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a most interesting article by the distinguished columnist, Drew Pearson, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOU LAUGHS AT DULLES' WARNINGS

(By Drew Pearson)

The Burmese Government has given a confidential, highly important report to the State Department regarding an exchange between Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-lai and Burmese Premier U Nu. It sheds shocking light on how our policy of waving the big stick has failed in the Far East.

The Burmese Premier told Chou quite recently that he was convinced the United States meant business and would now fight to defend Formosa and the surrounding area.

Chou En-lai's reply was a hearty laugh.

He said the United States had been cutting its military budget at the same time it was shaking the big stick and he just wasn't worried a bit.

Premier U Nu argued that he was certain the United States, despite various other retreats, was now ready to stand pat.

But the Chinese Foreign Minister continued to laugh.

Later the Burmese passed this on to us for whatever it was worth.

MASSIVE BLUFF

What Chou En-lai had in mind, of course, was the long series of "massive warnings" given by Secretary of State Dulles, Vice President Nixon, and the President himself, which in the Orient had been tabbed "massive bluff." Every time we have warned we have backed down in Indochina or withdrawn from the Tachen Islands or cut the budget further—as detailed in this column last week.

All this is partly why Secretary Dulles has been pounding conference tables behind closed doors in the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees and stating with more vehemence than ever that the United States now means business, that we will not back down again.

At any rate, here are some of the backstage happenings that have taken place in quick succession since Dulles arrived from the Far East:

Dulles has definitely and positively recommended to Eisenhower that the United States defend the small offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Hitherto he had been opposed.

Eisenhower, before making a final decision, has ordered the Joint Chiefs of Staff to review the military consequences of defending the two islands.

It seems strange that this was not done a long time ago. However, the Joint Chiefs have been meeting almost continually during the past week, and by the time this appears in print the review should be completed.

JOINT CHIEFS SPLIT

It will show, as indicated in earlier columns, a serious split inside the Joint Chiefs of Staff with Gen. Matt Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, emphatically opposed to getting bogged down on the islands immediately adjacent to the Chinese mainland.

Ridgway argues that the islands are only 3 minutes' flying time from the mainland; that the Chinese could pepper our installations with both aerial bombs and artillery, make mincemeat of our defenses. He believes it would be folly of the worst kind to defend, that thousands of American troops would be lost, that instead we should evacuate Chiang Kai-shek's army immediately.

United States Naval reports are also disconcerting. Adm. Felix Stump, who's been looking over Matsu, is not much impressed with Chiang's makeshift defenses. He fears the 9,000 poorly trained troops on the island—if unsupported—could not hold out for more than a week.

THE REAL DECISION

All this boils down to the fact that there is only one way to defend these islands—the atom bomb.

The Army already has a store of small A-bombs on hand which can decimate troops without injuring civilians. This was hinted by Secretary Dulles in his backstage talks with Senators.

What President Eisenhower faces, therefore, is not a decision to defend a group of small islands off the Chinese mainland.

What he really faces is a momentous decision to drop the atom bomb for the first time since it was dropped during the closing days of the Japanese war 10 years ago.

Note: Use of the atom bomb on the Chinese mainland will, of course, send waves of propaganda hatred reverberating against us throughout Asia. Even if the bomb is confined to troops, the reaction will be just as bad as the reaction against the Kaiser when he authorized the use of poison gas in World War I. In contrast, the use of the boycott blockade, favorite weapon of the Oriental, would cause no bad backfire, would in the long run be more effective.

ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, March 15 is to be celebrated in the United States as the anniversary of Hungarian independence from the rule of the Hapsburg monarchy.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in commemoration of this anniversary be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

March 15 marks the anniversary of Hungarian independence from under the rule of the Hapsburg monarchy.

Under the inspired and valiant leadership of Louis Kossuth, the Hungarian people threw off the yoke of foreign enslavement during the war of independence of 1848–49.

Today, the Hungarian people find themselves enslaved under the Communist tyranny. We in the United States, and in the free world, have a special obligation to give encouragement and hope to the fighters for freedom who keep the torch of liberty burning through the long nights of foreign occupation.

There are several specific things which we Americans can do to show our continuing concern for the eventual liberation of the Hungarian people. We should revise and liberalize our basic immigration and refugee laws, so that some of the escapees and refugees from Hungary can find permanent haven in the United States. We must press for the ratification of the Genocide Convention, in order to demonstrate to the world our conviction and determination that the destruction of national, racial, or religious groups must be placed beyond the pale of international law and punished accordingly. We must improve our foreign-information programs so that the voices of freedom will penetrate the barriers of the Iron Curtain.

It is through acts such as these that Americans will be fulfilling the fundamental principles for which our Nation was conceived, and for which many great Hungarian fighters for freedom have given their lives throughout history.

THE PROBLEM OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement made by Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Civil Defense on March 11, 1955. This is a brief statement, and a very clear one from the State point of view, on the very difficule subject of civil defense.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY GOV. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 11, 1955

Like every other State in the Union, we in Massachusetts have been working very hard on that element of Civil Defense which would seem to be the most important with respect to the saving of lives; namely, the evacuation of target areas. Massachusetts is located in Federal Civil Defense Region I, an area comprising New York, New Jersey, and the New England States. It has a population of 30 million people, 22 million of whom live within designated critical target areas. Of the nearly 5 million people in Massachusetts, 3 million are within such target areas, and would have to be evacuated in the event of an attack.

I emphasize these figures by way of pointing up the fact that we are seriously disturbed by important gaps in our knowledge, which make it impossible to do intelligent planning or to give intelligent orders in the event of an attack.

In our evacuation planning, we are working on certain assumptions. First, we assume that the size of the nuclear missile used on a given target area will completely destroy the major part of that target area. Based on that assumption, we can make rough calculations as to the extent of the fall-out, but without immediate, accurate knowledge of the direction and velocity of the wind, particularly in the higher altitudes, it is impossible for us to predict immediately the fall-out area of danger, and, therefore, order any safe evacuation.

Our only Weather Bureau is located in Boston. Given advance warning, we can probably get the necessary information from the Weather Bureau quickly, but we believe that steps should be taken so that the Weather Bureau will be in a position to advise us at any time.

Secondly, if there should be a sneak attack which destroyed the Weather Bureau, we should know to whom to turn in order to secure this information, so that we could safeguard the areas outside the target area from the effects of fallout. We believe that Army or Air Force posts or the National Guard should be furnished with meteorological equipment so that they may be able to supply us with information very quickly. In view of the fact that a fallout pattern is likely to be a long, cigar-shaped one, knowing the direction of the wind in the upper altitude as well as its velocity is basic information that we must be assured of.

Thirdly, in order to make any plans with respect to the maintenance of law and order, we should know at once just what the status of the National Guard would be, either at the time of an alert or an actual attack.

At the present time, the National Guard has been given specific duties to perform by the Federal Government of a classified nature. These presuppose that the National Guard will be federalized immediately, and will therefore leave the States without any auxiliary aid for the enforcement of law and order other than our limited State police. A decision should be reached immediately at the highest levels as to whether or not the State could count on its National

Guard, and if so, for what period of time in order to assist in the emergency.

In the event that the decision by the Federal Government is to take over the National Guard so that it is no longer available to us, we should then be authorized to recruit immediately in conjunction with the National Guard an auxiliary force which would remain under the command of the respective Governors of the States. This would, of course, entail a great expense to the States, but it is preferable to being left comparatively helpless. Legislation covering this latter point is now pending before the Congress.

Fourth, we should have immediate information with regard to the elementary precautions which can quickly be taken by our citizens during a period of evacuation, as well as by those units, whether medical or military which may have to be ordered into an area subject to fallout.

For example, we have no idea whether or not raincoats are preferable to cloth coats, whether hands or faces should be kept covered, whether or not riding in an automobile with all windows closed provides a degree of protection, and whether or not radioactive particles permeate windows or the walls of buildings, or seep into cellars.

We should like to know how and in what way bulk foods such as grain, flour, and similar commodities, perishable foods and water supplies are to be protected. We should like to know whether we should stockpile foods such as K-rations or their equivalent. The matter of contaminated water is a very serious one and frankly, we have not been advised what to do about it except not to drink it.

At the present time, our National Guard does not own even one Geiger counter. The State owns a few which are in bad condition, which it could supply to specially trained teams which would be entering the affected areas.

In other words, it is impossible for us or, I believe, for any other State to make even the simplest advance preparation until we have the simple and basic information at hand about which I speak, both for our National Guard and for our citizens.

There are two other aspects of this problem that I want to discuss.

One is that the Federal Civil Defense Law was passed in 1951. That law placed the major share of the responsibility for civil defense upon the States. In the last 4 years, however, tests of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb indicate that their potentials are infinitely greater than had been envisaged at the time the law was written. With a comparatively small State like Massachusetts, a major explosion and its resultant fall-out would go well beyond State lines. Similarly, attacks on target areas in other States might well carry fall-out and evacuation problems into the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This means that Federal responsibility with respect to protection becomes much greater.

Let me be specific. I have recommended that we construct in Massachusetts an underground communications center, with auxiliary power, for the use of our civil defense command. Clearly, that communications center should have the facilities for maintaining contact with similar centers and Federal installations within and outside our own borders. This obviously means a degree of Federal responsibility. Here again, armed services installations of whatever nature can be of major importance, but until we know clearly what role they are expected to play, we cannot make our own plans. In addition, we should know what Federal help will be given the respective States in order to effect a coordinated program.

My last point has to do with roads. The program of accelerated building proposed by the Clay committee is an extremely important matter in relation to civil defense. In fact, the speed with which evacuation from urban centers can take place may well determine the fate of hundreds of thousands of people.

The proposed accelerated road program, with its emphasis on interstate and urban arterial facilities should, I believe, be advanced with the greatest speed. I also feel that the importance of these roads to civil defense fully justifies a borrowing program as against any pay-as-you-go program because of the time element involved. This is a matter in which the views of the Armed Services Committee and our military commanders who can evaluate all the factors, ought to carry great weight with the Congress of the United States.

ROLL-BACK BY ADMINISTRATION OF PRICES ON PEANUTS ALREADY BELOW PARITY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the roll-back by the administration on March 9, 1955, of the prices on peanuts, which are already below parity.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

THE ADMINISTRATION BY ITS ORDER OF MARCH 9 ROLLS BACK PRICES ON PEANUTS ALREADY BELOW PARITY

The administration has rolled back prices—already below parity—on the Nation's peanut growers by its order of March 9 increasing the import quota 51 million pounds at import fees which will permit peanuts to come into the United States below the domestic market price.

The administration has previously pulled down the minimum levels to which most farm commodities can fall in the free market by imposing the sliding scale of price supports. Now it has moved to drag down the price of an agricultural commodity that has managed to move up to 92 percent of parity average price to farmers.

I am now studying amendments to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which will prevent any repetition of the use of importations to beat farm prices down below a fair, parity level to farmers. It was never intended nor contemplated that section 22 would be so used. Our farmers and all Members of Congress should be made aware of the significance of this peanut import order because it reveals administration policy to claimp a lid on farmers' prices if they flex upward toward parity—and even to drag them back down before they reach the parity level.

This same sort of action can be taken in relation to cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, dairy products, feed, livestock and other commodities following the present precedent.

The Government called on farmers to vastly increase peanut production during World War II and farmers responded with production well over a million tons a year.

Since the end of the war, peanut producers have taken repeated cuts in acreage as well as in price. As a result of acreage restriction and drought, the 1954 crop and carryover from the previous year totaled an estimated 652,000 tons and was nearly in balance with use, estimated at 636,000 tons. This would leave a smaller year-end carryover than in any recent year.

Peanut prices advanced to approximately 92 percent of parity average. Farmers with fewer peanuts to sell must get better prices. Their incomes already have been reduced back to depression levels by administration farm policy.

Certain big candy makers and other manufacturers of peanut products petitioned the Tariff Commission to increase import quotas, complaining against prices. The import quotas have now been raised to admit 51 million pounds of foreign-grown peanuts, on terms which will permit them to sell at 5 or 6 cents a pound below the current price of American peanuts.

I am advised that peanuts are being bought abroad as low as 11 cents per pound delivered to the United States. Adding 7 cents per pound regular duty and 2 cents special fee, will bring the cost of imported peanuts to 20 or 21 cents per pound compared to domestic prices, on a comparable shelled and cleaned basis, of up to 26 cents per pound.

The market effect is obvious. Farmers who have not yet disposed of their stocks will have their price dragged down and their opportunity to get somewhere near a parity price for their small crops will be taken away. Shellers who have bought stocks from farmers at prices in line with the objectives of the price-support program, and are now caught with them, will also suffer as the cheaper peanuts come on the market.

Besides injuring the farmers who now hold stocks, the administration action will seriously disrupt marketing for all peanut raisers in future years because shellers will be reluctant to buy from American farmers and carry stocks. In view of the administration's policy of rolling back farm prices, shellers will consider it unsafe to have stocks on hand.

All farmers have a stake in what has happened to peanuts. The same thing can happen to any other farm commodity.

This precedent makes clear a readiness on the part of the administration not only to lower price-support floors so farm products can drop to a fraction of a fair, parity level, but to clamp low ceilings on them—even to roll back prices before they can reach 100 percent of parity in the market place.

This is another shocking example of the administration's disregard for the pledges it made farmers in the 1952 campaign. Farmers were led to believe during the campaign that the Republicans would boost price supports to 100 percent of parity—full parity. After the election, the pledges were explained to mean that the administration favored lower floors but still wanted farmers to get 100 percent of parity in the market place.

Now that 1 of the 6 basic farm commodities has approached 100 percent in the market place, the administration has promptly knocked the free market into a cocked hat, changed the rules in the middle of the marketing year and let imports pour in to depress market prices and insure that farmers cannot get 100 percent of parity in the market.

THE ADMINISTRATION ROAD-BUILDING PLAN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD several editorials relating to the new road-building plan as presented by the administration.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Duncan, (Okla.) Banner of January 21, 1955]

TODAY'S COMMENT

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, has one idea about the tremendous Federal road building program for the next 10 years that probably just about every Oklahoman would go along with if BYRD can get the plan adopted.

It's a good idea as far as all 48 States are concerned. Not all of them, however, are as highway conscious as Oklahoma right now, so it is questionable how far BYRD's suggestion may get in Congress.

The Virginia Senator thinks the Federal Government should drop the present Federal tax it collects on gasoline, and allow the States to collect it instead. That would increase State collections but not the amount paid by motorists.

When Uncle Sam collects a gas tax, and then returns it to the States, some of the collections go for overhead and otherwise get lost before being returned. So not all of the Federal tax comes back to the States.

Not so with the States if they took over the same per-gallon tax now going to Washington. The States already have their overhead, and it would not be increased by adding a little to the amount of the tax.

That's all right as far as it goes. BYRD complicates the situation, and gets right back to where he started, by proposing that the Federal Government, under a new bill, should start collecting half a cent a gallon to pay for the huge Federal 10-year highway construction program.

His proposal, he thinks, would finance the Federal program on a pay-as-you-go basis. It must be financed in one way or another, so perhaps that method would suit the man who pays for a tankful of gas.

BYRD's proposal has two merits. It probably would be a 10-year deal to pay for the big Federal program. That would eventually take the Federal Government out of a field it entered when States already were taxing gasoline to build highways.

Meanwhile, the States would be collecting the amount now going to Washington, spending it on State highways, and getting full value instead of part value since there would be no lost revenue involved.

So (1) the Federal Government would be out of the gasoline tax field when the 10-year program is completed, and (2) more money would go for highways, with less overhead.

A third advantage is that the objective of the Federal program would be retained: Faster construction of more and better highways as proposed by President Eisenhower would still be assured.

In the end, it could mean a little higher gasoline tax for the next 10 years. But motorists would be getting highways for their money; not a penny of it would be diverted except for costs involved regardless.

We like the idea of paying as we go, especially when that money could be spent only for what the highway users want, to meet the needs of twice as many vehicles on the road as there were before World War II.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Times of January 17, 1955]

THAT ROAD PROGRAM

We have a notion that President Eisenhower's elaborate program for building a vast system of Federal-State highways will not be wholeheartedly accepted, even by some of the States which badly need new roads. In fact, we look for some pretty stiff opposition to it in Congress, chiefly in the Senate where Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is sure to lead a fight against it, particularly its financing provisions.

There is no doubt that such a system of highways contemplated by the administration's report, submitted by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, would greatly benefit all the States and the Nation as a whole. Or that once launched, it would be a boon to the country's economy. Also, no one will dispute the administration's role in projecting the plan.

But there is sure to be objection to two phases of the program. First, there is the matter of financing. The program looks to an ultimate expenditure of $101 billion, but the Federal Government will put up no more than $35 billion, about 30 percent of the total. This leaves $66 billion for the States to provide, and that is where much of the trouble will develop.

More than one governor is likely to resist the temptation to accept a new allotment of Federal funds on a matching basis. State governments are not in a position to go very far these days in mounting new projects requiring huge expenditures. Ever since the war, the debts of all the States have been rising. So have their costs and taxes. The amount of revenue they contribute to the Federal Treasury has been going up every year, and their share in the distribution of Federal funds has not increased. Their sources of new revenue are scant, indeed nonexisitng in most instances.

Next, there is the provision for creating a Federal Highway Corporation to manage the Government's part in the expenditure. The reason for such a corporation is obvious, to wit: it can be given authority to issue its own bonds, and thus make it unnecessary for the administration to include them in any computation of the public debt. This is a dodge to keep within the statutory debt limit, which now gives the Government very little leeway for new enterprises.

This is the scheme that fills Senator BYRD with fight, for he is an unreconstructed opponent of all unsecured Federal bonds. He will be quick to point out that they will not be self-liquidating, and so will have to be serviced by annual appropriations from the revenues hauled in by the Treasury. In short, they would, in reality, be part of the debt.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of January 17, 1955]

BYRD'S WARNING

Serious objections have been raised to the ingenious plan devised by a Presidential commission to finance Federal highway building.

Under the plan of the commission, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, a Federal highway corporation would be formed for the purpose of floating $20 billion of bonds, which would not be considered part of the Federal budget and which would be retired from the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. An additional $5 billion would be raised from fees paid by gasoline stations, motels, and other roadside businesses.

First to object to this scheme was the influential Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

BYRD doesn't like the plan for two reasons. First, he thinks it would cost too much. He estimates that taxpayers would pay 55 cents interest on every borrowed dollar. Second, and perhaps more important, the Senator objects to the precedent-setting principle involved.

He contends the plan would completely destroy the budget and the Federal-debt limitations, adding, "If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything."

BYRD is right about that.

Everything considered, adoption of the plan may be desirable anyway, but Congress should understand fully that the proposal means a historic departure from fiscal practices of the past.

The need for highway improvements is unquestioned, but who would argue that Federal borrowing outside the budget can be justified for highway building and for nothing else?

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of January 18, 1955]

THE SOMETHING-FOR-NOTHING BOYS AT IT AGAIN ON HIGHWAY FINANCING

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has come out with a blast against the proposed method of financing the strategic network of highways recommended by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message. Mr. BYRD, we understand, is not against the highways as a defense measure, but only against the trick financing that some people—not the President—have suggested.

This scheme is to create a Government-owned corporation and let it issue bonds to finance the highways. That way, the sleight-of-hand bookkeepers say, the cost of the highways would not be a part of the public debt. It would be the corporation's debt.

But the Treasury would guarantee to pay to the corporation each year enough money to pay off the bonds. Further, the corporation could borrow from the Treasury as much as $5 billion in any year that it happened to need the money. It wouldn't be a part of the public debt. Oh, no. The corporation would owe the money.

Those who propose this scheme try to compare the corporation with turnpike and toll bridge authorities, but the comparison does not hold at all, because such authorities have their own revenue from tolls and are responsible for their own debts.

When the strategic network was recommended by the President, we approved it as a defense measure; for, in spite of all the soothing sirup being fed to the people, we are convinced that 1955 is going to be a year of dangerous crisis in international affairs, and we had better be ready for anything. The current propaganda recalls former President Truman's statement in May 1950 that the prospects for peace were never better. Within a month we were at war in Korea.

We hold to our original thesis: That the strategic network should be built as a defense measure, but corresponding reductions should be made in nonessential expenditures to avoid throwing the budget farther out of balance than it is.

No matter how it is disguised by trick bookkeeping, the cost of these roads is going to come out of the public till, one way or another. Let us build the strategic network and admit frankly that it is going to cost us plenty. Let us shave corners on other expenses to make up for it. But let us not fool ourselves that by juggling figures or creating dummy corporations we can get these roads for nothing.

[From the Kannapolis (N. C.) Independent of January 24, 1955]

THANK YOU, MR. BYRD

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, has offered two grave objections to the national highway plan presented to President Eisenhower by the National Advisory Committee and, in turn, offers a substitute plan designed to save taxpayers billions of dollars.

The Committee's recommendations fall generally in 2 parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional $25 million for the so-called interstate highway system. Federal expenditures on the 2 programs in 10 years would total $31 billion.

The Committee estimates the $25 billion would construct 40,000 road-miles designated by the Federal Government as interstate highway. This would be little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. The average would be about 800 miles per State. For all this the Committee recommends borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the Committee can be sold at 3 percent, and if they are paid off on schedule—the last maturing in 1987—the interest would cost more than $11.5 billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55.

As a substitute highway plan, Senator BYRD makes the following recommendations:

1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, which for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. This amounts to $535 million.

3. That the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

4. A one-half-cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from the Federal lubricating-oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

Under such a plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

Under the Committee plan principal and interest payments on the $20 billion bond issue would dry up gasoline-tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, with the exception of about $600 million, which is committed to matching funds of States for their primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Everyone recognizes the urgent need of road improvement to meet the constantly increasing impact of modern-day traffic and, if this can be accomplished without increasing the public debt, the plan submitted by Senator BYRD is certainly worth consideration.

[From the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal of January 20, 1955]

FEDERAL ROAD PROGRAM

The impressive highway-building program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission on Highways gives the American people a broad conception of the Nation's problems and needs in this area. It suggests the spending of $101 billion for modernization and expansion over a 10-year period by the Federal Government, the States, and other agencies.

The Commission's plan already has drawn fire from a number of quarters. The American Automobile Association objects to its toll-road feature. And Senator BYRD, the Senate's watchdog on expenditures, vigorously opposes the program both from the standpoint of the Federal spending it entails and the element of Federal controls it involves.

The Clay committee plan provides that the Federal Government assume primary responsibility for the cost of a modern interstate network of arterial highways to be completed by 1964 at an annual cost of $2½ billion; that regular Federal aid to States for highways be continued at the rate authorized by the 1954 act; that Federal funds continue to be made available at the present rate to aid primary and secondary systems in urban areas not on the interstate system (about $75 million yearly), and that Federal funds for forest highways be continued at the present rate of $22½ million yearly.

The program embraces the creation of a Federal Highway Corporation empowered to issue bonds to finance the Federal share of the costs, and these bonds would be paid off by the revenue from Federal gasoline and oil taxes. Toll roads built to acceptable standards and meeting other standards which the highway corporation might establish could be included as segments of the interstate system. Under this plan the Federal Government's share in the overall highway program would be upped from the present 9 percent to 30 percent.

The plan is designed to create a strategic network of arterial highways covering some 40,000 miles and joining together 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. But Senator BYRD says that this would be little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage, with the average being about 800 miles per State. "For this," he states, "the committee recommends borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

"If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the committee can be sold at 3 percent interest," BYRD continues, "and if they are paid off on schedule—the last maturing in 1987, the interest would cost more than $11½ billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55."

But BYRD insists experience shows that these bonds probably would not be paid off at maturity. He says that in effect we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in the past 25 years. So one of the plan's effects would be to increase the Federal debt.

In lieu of the committee program Senator BYRD proposes that the Government continue its present matching fund aid program; continue its present lubricating-oil tax; and repeal the present 2-cent Federal gasoline tax, replacing it with a ½-cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Reduction of the Federal gasoline levy would enable the States to increase their gasoline levies, thereby giving them more highway-fund revenues. The lubricating-oil tax and the ½-cent Federal tax on gasoline would shortly raise enough revenue, according to estimates of increasing use, "to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid" to the States.

By almost common agreement the highways proposed by the Clay committee are needed or certainly will be needed within the next decade or so. What is the best method of obtaining them? That is the question for Congress and the country to decide.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of January 17, 1955]

BYRD RIGHT AGAIN

The President's special message on a highway program is not due until January 27 which gives him time enough to consider Senator BYRD's completely valid criticisms.

The Virginia Senator describes the financing plan as one that "violates financing principles, defies budgetary control, and evades the Federal debt law."

It seems to us he is right on all counts. The scheme is to set up a Federal corporation to issue 20 billion in Government-guaranteed bonds, and retire them in 30 years from the proceeds of the Federal gasoline tax. In some strange way these bonds would not be reckoned as a part of the Federal debt.

This is certainly a subterfuge. The corporation has no assets except a part of the Government's taxing power. But taxing power is the only thing that secures any Federal debt. Hence the road bonds must be a part of the debt.

When the Roosevelt administration sought to split the budget into regular and emergency expenditures. Republicans readily saw through the subterfuge. They should be as clear-sighted now.

There should be only one set of books. If a second set is admitted, we shall soon have, as Senator BYRD notes, a third set for schools, a fourth for hospitals, and another for anything Government chooses to embark upon.

We hope the President will look at the financing end of this scheme carefully—and reject it.

[From the North Tonawanda (N. Y. News of January 28, 1955]

UNITED STATES ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program encountered serious opposition in Congress even before its formal submission. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy watchdog of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, the 10-year plan concentrates on modernizing the key 40,000-mile National System of Interstate Highways. The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of "the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates.

Whether the Federal or State Governments are to bear the increased costs of an adequate highway system, our highways will have to carry some 80 million vehicles by 1974, according to the President's Commission. Its Chairman, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, told the National Conference on Highway Financing of the United States Chamber of Commerce on January 13: "We are indeed caught in a traffic jam, nationwise."

[From the Newburgh (N. Y.) News of January 21, 1955]

SUBTERFUGE IN UNITED STATES ROAD FINANCING

The President's special message on a highway program is not due until January 27, which gives him time enough to consider Senator BYRD's completely valid criticisms. The Virginia Senator describes the financing plan as one that "violates financing principles, defies budgetary control and evades the Federal debt law."

It seems to us he is right on all counts. The scheme is to set up a Federal corporation to issue $20 billion in Government-guaranteed bonds, and retire them in 30 years from proceeds of the Federal gasoline tax. In some strange way these bonds would not be reckoned as a part of the Federal debt.

This is certainly a subterfuge. The corporation would have no assets except a part of the Government's taxing power. But taxing power is the only thing that secures any Federal debt. Hence the road bonds must be a part of the debt.

QUALITIES OF CITIZENS OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, upon various occasions I have been criticized because of my determination that the States which are small in population shall get a square deal in the matter of appointments. Some newspapers have

written long editorials which only show their ignorance of what one of the duties of a Senator from a State, small in population, is, namely, to see that the State gets a square deal.

Naturally, among the States I have fought for has been the State of North Dakota, and upon numerous occasions I have glorified the remarkable physical, mental, and esthetic qualities of its men and women—particularly the younger citizens. My colleagues will remember that last week, when the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] spoke about a young lady getting a second prize in some contest or other, he admitted that a North Dakota girl outranked the Wisconsin girl.

Today, I once more want briefly to mention the remarkable stamina of our North Dakota soldiers. Upon a previous occasion I have mentioned how, based on population, more soldiers from North Dakota have received Congressional Medals of Honor and other decorations than have those from any other State. Those soldiers got those decorations, because they earned them.

Illustrative of what the average North Dakota soldier can do, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate an Associated Press dispatch, dated 4 days ago. I now read the dispatch:

TOKYO, March 10.—A small Japanese taxi ran into a large American soldier today with these results: windshield smashed, right fender torn off, front grill damaged, wheels wrenched awry, driver shaken.

Pvt. Charles Broxmeyer, 6 feet 4, 225 pounds, Bismarck, N. Dak., small facial bruise.

Of course, Mr. President, the soldier this taxi hit was a North Dakota soldier. He was not quite so large as the average North Dakota soldier. But Private Broxmeyer, who I know personally because he comes from Bismarck, N. Dak., and who is 6 feet, 4 inches tall and weighs 225 pounds, was the man who grappled and wrestled with the oncoming taxi. By some quirk of fate, Charles Broxmeyer—the AP dispatch says—received a small facial bruise. Undoubtedly, if this taxi had met up with a North Dakota soldier of average size, it could not have bruised the soldier's face. The citizens of Bismarck, N. Dak., will, likely, hang their heads in shame that there should be any marks on this young man. I have today written to Mr. Evan E. Lips, mayor of Bismarck, asking him to make a complete investigation of this incident, and I have also written a letter to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, making it clear to him that when administrative officials have a particularly hard project to accomplish—one that defies the capabilities of an ordinary citizen from any other State—in the moment of danger they consider all the North Dakota soldier boys who are available in the emergency. I have also recommended that when the next vacancy occurs in the Secret Service, Mr. Charles Broxmeyer, of Bismarck, N. Dak., be remembered.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I say "hail! hail! the saviors of the Nation—the boys from North Dakota."

STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE OPPOSED TO EXTENSION OF 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the members of the Senate and the Assembly of the State of Nevada, which adopted a resolution opposing the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nevada

Senator	Assemblymen
Ralph Lattin	Norman Shuey (R), C. B. Stark, Sr. (R).
Mahlon Brown	William B. Byrne (D), M. J. Christensen (D), E. J. (Ted) Dotson (D), William Embry (D), Maude Frazier (D), Tom Godbey (D), George Harmon (D), Stan Irwin (D), George Von Tobel (R).
Fred H. Settelmeyer	Henry W. Berrum (R).
Newton W. Crumley	Jack J. Hunter, Jr. (D), J. F. McElroy (D), Hugh D. McMullen (R), Robert O. Vaughn (R).
Harry Wiley	Henry G. Carlson (D).
E. C. (Ed) Leutzinger	Mr. Murray (R).
Richard M. Black	Lyle L. Ellison (R), Donald M. Leighton (D).
Rene W. Lemaire	William D. Swackhamer (D).
Roy R. Orr, Sr.	Cyril O. Bastian (D), Hazel Denton (D).
Walter Whitacre	Bruce Barnum (D), John F. Giomi (D).
Farrell L. Seevers	Charles A. Hendel (R), Keith L. Mount (D).
William J. Frank	Norman E. Hansen (R), Glenn H. Jones (D).
Kenneth F. Johnson	Archie Pozzi, Jr. (R), Richard L. Waters, Sr. (D).
W. G. (Glen) Emminger (R).	Thomas Ivers (D).
James M. Slattery	Michael R. Nevin (D).
Forest B. Lovelock	Gary J. Adams (R), Chester S. Christensen (D), Don Crawford (D), Manford I. Hardesty (D), Mabel (Mrs. C. V.) Isbell (R), Oscar D. Jepson (D), Thomas Kean (R), Rodney J. Reynolds (R), Clarence Ruedy (R), James E. Wood (R).
Charles Gallagher	A. C. Barr (D), L. M. Hose (D), Darwin Lambert (D), Max R. Wainwright (D).

BROADCAST BY WALTER WINCHELL REGARDING STOCK BUYING

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a transcript of Walter Winchell's broadcast over the ABC net work on March 13, 1955, at 9 o'clock p. m.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CAPEHART. Thank you, Mr. Winchell, for inviting me here tonight, and I came at your invitation because you said I could ask you any question that I might care to ask you. Now, I've got many questions to ask you here tonight, about what was said about you before the hearing in Washington, and about the facts in respect to the stocks that you have talked about over your broadcasts—in previous broadcasts. Now, if time permits, I want to get through all these questions, but if it does not, I'm going to, with your permission, give the balance of the questions to the press, and ask them that they print them, and then I hope that you, on Tuesday, will give us an answer to these questions in your column in the Mirror.

Mr. WINCHELL. I will do so, Senator. Senator, before you start, may I ask just one question: When you were chairman of the same Banking and Currency Committee in the Senate, Senator, I remember reading that you said something like this, that anyone who was disparaged or criticized before that committee would be given an opportunity immediately to speak in his own defense. Does that still go?

Senator CAPEHART. Well, I hope it goes, and I did say that, and I practiced it when I was chairman, and I think it's a fine thing for every committee in Washington to practice, and that is, when any man's name is mentioned disparagingly or he's—and he feels he's been injured—injured, that he ought to be permitted to immediately come before the committee and give his side of the story. I—I've pleaded that Senator FULBRIGHT would permit you to do that. I have urged him to do it, but I'm certain that he will. He ought to and I—, I just—he just should do it. There is no question about it.

Mr. WINCHELL. Well, I certainly hope so, Senator, and thank you for what you've said here tonight.

Senator CAPEHART. And I hope every committee down there adopts that policy, because it's a fine thing for every American to know, that if his name's mentioned before a committee, he could feel that he could go before that same committee and be heard.

Mr. WINCHELL. Thank you, very much. I am ready, Senator CAPEHART.

Senator CAPEHART. Now, Mr. Winchell, the first question I wish to ask you is this: Why should you or any radio or television commentator ever refer to a stock as a good or bad investment?

Mr. WINCHELL. Senator, I never recommend stocks. I never knock them, either. I never did it. I offer news in advance, most of the time, on the plans and the health and wealth of the companies listed on both stock exchanges. The president of the American Exchange testified before your committee that Winchell's market facts are accurate, and that I was not irresponsible.

Senator CAPEHART. Well, do you make a distinction between yourself and, say, the New York Times, that is, the financial pages, or the magazines, like Time and Life, and other commentators?

Mr. WINCHELL. Well, I feel, Senator, that they're in the business of reporting the news, and so am I.

Senator CAPEHART. In other words, you feel that you've done nothing more than what they do from time to time?

Mr. WINCHELL. That's right. I've taken some of the market news out of the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, and the other papers.

Senator CAPEHART. Well, how many specific stocks have you mentioned on your broadcasts or telecasts?

Mr. WINCHELL. More than 50; 42 in 1954, and some in 1953, and of course in 1955. Once a week, at least.

Senator CAPEHART. Well, how and why did you select those particular stocks?

Mr. WINCHELL. Incidentally, I would like to again quote President McCormick's testimony. Before your committee, he said, we investigated and found Winchell was not inaccurate.

Senator CAPEHART. Have you or any member of your family ever been paid or received anything of value for mentioning any of these stocks, Mr. Winchell?

Mr. WINCHELL. No, sir. Nobody can ever reward me in any way, Senator, for any news that I publish or broadcast. If that were true, Senator, I think I'd be brought before some grand jury or the district attorney and in some jail by now.

Senator CAPEHART. Then your answer is that you've never taken anything of value from anybody in respect to——

Mr. WINCHELL (speaking at the same time). No, sir. I would like——

Senator CAPEHART. (A phrase covered over by Winchell). Stock.

Mr. WINCHELL. This is what I would like to get into the record, too. This is from the Associated Press, a few hours ago, from New York. It came off the ticker. An official of the Securities and Exchange Commission, that's for the United States Government, said today, "Walter Winchell was not 'guilty of violating any SEC regulations or law in giving out his so-called tips on securities.'" The official, whose name is Frank Purcell, New York regional director, said there was nothing incorrect in the information broadcast by Winchell, such as the recent mention of Pantepec Oil——

Senator CAPEHART. Let me—I want to ask you this question, now. Have you ever recommended to your listeners that they either purchase or sell any particular stock or stocks?

Mr. WINCHELL. Senator, I have never recommended it. I made a statement of fact.

Senator CAPEHART. Well, now, what about Pantepec, which was brought out in the hearings the other day in Washington the other day, and Amurex Oil Co.——

Mr. WINCHELL. Pardon me, Senator, Mr. McCormick testified about Pantepec as follows: "Winchell made no misstatements of fact, according to our investigation." Incidentally, I read that in the New York Times on the front page.

Senator CAPEHART. He did say this—I heard him say that, so I can vouch for that. He made that statement in my presence.

Mr. WINCHELL. Senator, I have a memo here I would like to add. In 1953 I reported advance news about Amurex Oil. That company denied it. After my news sent their stock up from 13 to over 20 points, their denial, according to your committee record, sent it down at once, falling back to 13, and—at the time, and I think lower, since. But Mr. McCormick testified, Senator CAPEHART, before the Fulbright investigating committee, that what Winchell said was accurate, and that the denial by the company was untrue. In short, they made me the goat. The newspapers didn't play up what Mr. McCormick testified. It was not in any headlines that Winchell was accurate and that the company made a false statement.

Senator CAPEHART. Well, now, Mr. Winchell, one more question here—many more, but one more right at this moment.

Mr. WINCHELL. Pardon me, Senator, they—we have to sell few——

Senator CAPEHART. I well understand that.

Mr. WINCHELL. Thank you very much.

* * * * *

Senator CAPEHART. Now, Mr. Winchell, what stocks have you or the members of your family purchased in the last 2 years, and did you purchase any of the stocks you mentioned on the air? That's the 40 or 50 stocks you mentioned on the air.

Mr. WINCHELL. Senator CAPEHART, I have never bought a stock—for myself. I did buy three securities, over 2 years ago—for my family. As a matter of fact, it happened when we were invited by the stock exchange; that is, the Runyon Fund was, of which I am the treasurer, to come down there. So, Marlene Dietrich, who is the director of the Runyon Fund; Jackie Gleason, who is also a member; and several other personalities from show business and television and radio and stage and screen; we were all down there to get these contributions from these very generous people. And just about 2 minutes before the gong sounded, I—and thanking them all, I said to the top executives, "Thanks very much. I'd like to return the compliment. I'd like to buy something around here. What are you fellows selling in this store?" And so, someone suggested A. T. & T., Du Pont, and General Electric and I bought $50,000 worth for my family's security.

Senator CAPEHART. That was over 2 years ago.

Mr. WINCHELL. Yes, sir. I've never mentioned them——

Senator CAPEHART. Now——

Mr. WINCHELL. Mentioned them in any way, except to explain to the people and anyone who wanted to know——

Senator CAPEHART. Now, one other question. What did you—did you ever suggest or infer to your listeners that a specific stock would go up or down in price?

Mr. WINCHELL. No, sir. I only recommended United States Government bonds, of which I have bought them in bunches. I have often said to the people in the paper and on the air, investigate before you invest.

Senator CAPEHART. Well, has any officer, director, employee, or stockholder of any corporation ever asked you to mention or plug any stock in which they were interested?

Mr. WINCHELL. Senator CAPEHART, I am not aware of any private financial interest in my news reports. No person even knows the name of any firm on the big or small board I intend to discuss Sunday nights. My sources see me Friday nights after the markets are closed. Sometimes not until Sunday night about curtain time. These sources usually tell me what the rumors are on Wall Street, what the touts, the tipsters, and the other phoneys down there claim I am going to say.

I can't stop that or them, Senator CAPEHART. When I hear what the rumors are, I of course do not mention that company. The answer is no. Incidentally, President McCormick of the American Stock Exchange testified that my market news was accurate, but that the rush of almost 500 thousand orders for Pantepec, or I think 493 thousand, gave Wall Street brokers a headache. Senator, I can remember when they all had a big heartache because there weren't any orders.

Senator CAPEHART. Has any statement about a stock that you ever made turned out to be wrong?

Mr. WINCHELL (interrupting, phrase of Winchell's lost). Senator, this old commercial thing again interrupts us.

* * * * *

Mr. WINCHELL. I beg your pardon. Since the Fulbright friendly inquiry started, the public has been very frightened. Last week the values of stocks slumped almost $7 billion because of the Fulbright committee. When I was Wall Street's best press-agent booster, plus signs were blooming almost everywhere. Incidentally, if I were going to buy anything, I would buy Tri-Continental common stock. It's, I understand, a very healthy and wealthy company.

Senator CAPEHART. Now, Mr. Winchell, one other question. Has any statement about a stock that you ever made turned out to be false? Now that's very important.

Mr. WINCHELL. Well, it's been testified before president—by President McCormick that I've never made a misstatement. I hope that's the answer. I don't know of any. I would like to know. I hope the SEC is continuing its investigation. And I'd like to know the names of anyone who gave me any misleading or false information—I would press for criminal action.

Senator CAPEHART. One other question. Has any individual ever given you any stock tips, either orally, or in writing?

Mr. WINCHELL. Oh, yes sir. That's how I get my news.

Senator CAPEHART. They give you tips.

Mr. WINCHELL. I don't call them tips. I call them advance news. I try to tell the future plans of a company listed on both stock exchanges.

Senator CAPEHART. What's the difference between advance news and tips?

Mr. WINCHELL. Well, Senator, if it's a tip it's for a private circle, for private use. When I put it on the air—they estimate about 25 million or more listeners—it's no longer private. Everybody's heard it, or those who have listened to me—I think. That's advance news, sir. I once said about Missouri Pacific——

VOICE. Last line.

Mr. CAPEHART. If asked, Mr. Winchell, would you go to Washington and answer these questions under oath, and if so, will your answers—your answers be the same?

Mr. WINCHELL. I certainly will be glad to. I'd shout it from the rooftops, Senator CAPEHART, and thank you for what you've tried to do about it.

Senator CAPEHART. Then the answers under oath would be the same as the answers——

Mr. WINCHELL. Oh—oh, yes, of course.

PROPOSED VISIT OF COMMUNIST FARMERS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in reference to the proposed visit of Communist farmers to this country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

The hungry and the destitute are most susceptible to the doctrines of communism.

We have been taught that for years.

We have spent billions of dollars in all parts of the world to prevent the spread of communism by providing food and clothing and working tools to hungry and destitute peoples.

We did all this because we have been preaching and teaching that the doctrines of communism are bad.

We have convinced ourselves and millions of other people throughout the world that communism is an enemy of freedom.

Now, communism is failing in its own bailiwick.

People of Communist countries do not have food.

Are we to change our policies now and help to make communism successful?

Are we to teach the Communists how to keep their people well fed and happy under Communist rule?

Are we to aid and abet the Communist cause by inviting the Communist farmers to learn our methods of raising more food for the strengthening of the Communist cause?

Do we believe for one minute the people of Communist countries who benefit by such policies will be told that they will no longer be hungry because of the use of farming methods learned in the capitalist country of the United States?

I can remember the long years of depression in this country when Communist agitators roamed through our communities denouncing the capitalist system and blaming the American system of government for the plight of those who were victims of the economic chaos of the time.

I remember well that every red-blooded American fought with all he had in him to fend off the onslaught of the Communists in those times of stress.

I have in my files speeches I made during those years encouraging our people to forego the preachings of the Communists.

I do not recall any effort by Russian Communist leaders at that time to offer help which would strengthen the belief of our people that freedom and Americanism were best.

Quite the contrary; they did all in their power to incite rioting and uneasiness among our people against their form of Government.

Perhaps the plan to invite Communist farmers to this country to assist them in learning ways and means of enlarging production can be classified as a friendly gesture on our part.

Let me refer to an article authored by our present Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, as it appeared in the Reader's Digest in August 1946.

Mr. Dulles at that time wrote:

" 'Friendly,' in Russian, is a word of approval reserved for those who profess belief in Soviet ideals and who prove their sincerity by working to promote them.

"So interpreted, Soviet policy is admittedly intolerant. It seeks to eliminate what, to us, are the essentials of a free society. It seeks this with urgency because Soviet leaders believe that, until this is done, peace is in jeopardy."

Let me repeat that paragraph:

"So interpreted, Soviet policy is admittedly intolerant. It seeks to eliminate what, to us, are the essentials of a free society. It seeks this with urgency because Soviet leaders believe that, until this is done, peace is in jeopardy."

Let me quote Mr. Dulles further:

"Tolerance of non-Soviet thinking is, to them, dangerous weakness."

How about non-Soviet thinking in farming?

What is so different in the Soviet thinking today as to lead this same man, Mr. Dulles, into believing that the Communists will be tolerant?

Have they been tolerant in Korea, in Indochina, in China, in Europe, in the Middle East?

If they have, it has been well disguised as belligerency.

Since it is also being considered that editors of Communist newspapers are to be invited to come to the United States and be permitted to see, hear, and do as they please, I should like to quote further from Mr. Dulles' 1946 article.

"To the Soviet people the Iron Curtain is pictured as necessary defense against an unfriendly outer world.

"Soviet leaders welcome and, indeed, seek occasions which seem to show that such unfriendliness is habitual.

"At the San Francisco conference and at meetings of the assembly and security council of the United Nations, the Soviet delegation have almost always pressed their proposals to public debate and voting, even where defeat was inevitable."

Has there been any change in that procedure? I have noticed none; in fact, it has been accelerated.

Mr. Dulles further wrote:

"That makes it easier for them to dramatize, at home and to their followers abroad, what they call the 'unfriendly' and 'fascist' attitude of the outer world."

Are we expecting the visiting editors to return behind the Iron Curtain and in one fell swoop tell their people and their satellites that all they had written before was a pack of lies?

Of course not. Let's be sensible.

Mr. Dulles wrote a most interesting article in 1946 and it has proved him to be a prophet because events have proved him to be correct. Let me quote just once more from that article:

"When diplomacy or business takes Soviet nationals abroad, Soviet policy requires them to observe rigorously the thesis that Soviet 'democracy' cannot be tolerant of alien thinking."

Those, Mr. President, are most important words by a man who today must guide us in our diplomatic relations with Russia, and I certainly approve all his commentary.

He wrote further:

"Soviet diplomats and, indeed, all Soviet nationals abroad are not to mingle freely with those of opposite faith."

Except, perhaps, to help feed the unfortunates under Communist rule?

I am not one to turn my face from that of a hungry person.

I have been hungry many times in my life and didn't have a nickel for a hamburger (when they were a nickel).

That is not the problem.

We have been fighting for a principle. Our boys have died for that principle. We have men suffering in Communist prisons today because they believe in that principle.

We have burdened our people in peacetime to finance the fight for that principle.

Mr. Dulles wrote that the Soviet people are equally loyal to their principle.

I don't want to say coldly that these invitations are wrong.

I just want to say that it appears to me our policy toward communism is bordering a bit on the inconsistent.

PEACETIME PROSPERITY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared concerning the fact that the United States is now enjoying the greatest peacetime prosperity in its history.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

The United States is now enjoying the greatest peacetime prosperity in history, President Eisenhower's Republican administration has given the country a prosperity heretofore unknown during peacetime.

Yet last week stock market prices dropped $7 billion. It was the greatest stock market drop in 15 years. Why did the value of securities owned by the people decline $7 billion in 1 week?

This morning's New York Times reveals these statistics: retail department stores sales in the week ended March 5 were 15 percent greater than in the corresponding week last year; steel operations were 91 percent of capacity last week compared with 69 percent a year ago; motor vehicle production was 193,000 compared with 132,000 a year ago; oil production was 6.8 million barrels a day compared with 6.4 million barrels a day a year ago; building construction contracts were $1.5 billion compared with $1.2 billion a year ago; exports and imports are both up; industrial production is up; and unemployment is down by 300,000 from a year ago.

That healthy business picture in a growing nation like ours should keep stock prices up; then why did they go down $7 billion in 1 week—the greatest drop in 15 years. I do not know the answer; but I am reminded of those instances, prior to the time that the Federal Government guaranteed bank deposits, when people for their own purposes started a run on a solvent bank by spreading rumors about its solvency. Credit always depends on confidence. That applies to any business corporation, to the credit of the Federal Government, or to the stability of the stock market.

Our financial structure is built on confidence. Millions of us have purchased homes, automobiles, appliances, and other goods on credit. Few could pay those debts immediately if called upon now to do so; but those people have confidence in the future of our Nation.

I hope that there is no one person or any group who is trying to destroy or even to shake public confidence in the stability of the many corporations whose securities are listed on the stock exchanges. However, whether inadvertently or intentionally the end result has been a loss of $7 billion in 1 week.

I can think of no greater disservice to this Nation than to destroy public confidence in the financial stability of this Nation. Only those who must want to cause a business recession, create unemployment, and weaken our Nation would seek to precipitate a stock market decline.

I thoroughly believe, however, that if by irregularities or any improper methods anyone has, or is trying, to rig the market in any security and fleece ill informed investors they should be subjected both in the spotlight of public opinion and to vigorous prosecution. I am hopeful that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will ferret out any such specific manipulations that may exist and expose them.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on nominations which appear on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George W. Perkins to be the United States permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Von Neumann to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES — NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Tripp Ross to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George C. McConnaughey to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence G. Morse to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ben F. Cameron to be a United States circuit judge, fifth district.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gilbert H. Jertberg to be a United States district judge for the southern district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Miller to be a United States district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the name of M. Frank Reid to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coast Guard nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over. I understand that a minority view will be filed on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Curtis Clark to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATIONS DEFERRED

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that the Harlan nomination and the Holmes nomination have not been considered. Can the majority leader inform the Senate when they will be considered?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Harlan nomination will be considered as soon as the Senate disposes of the tax bill.

Mr. LANGER. Today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. Under the unanimous consent agreement entered into, the Senate will start voting on the tax bill tomorrow. A couple of days will elapse before the nomination will be considered.

Mr. LANGER. How about the Holmes nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No plans have been made with reference to that nomination.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations may be permitted to sit and hold hearings at any time during the remainder of this week while the Senate is in session.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I most respectfully ask the Senator from Arkansas, in view of the fact that the majority leader and the minority leader are not present, if he will confine his request to 1 day, to which request there would be no objection, and the Senator from Arkansas can make his request again tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent, then, that the subcommittee be permitted to sit tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator means today, does he not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The subcommittee is not meeting today. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that hearings are scheduled for all week. Some of the witnesses are Army personnel and are stationed overseas, and we wish to expedite the hearings. Once hearings are started and we are assured of being able to sit in the afternoons, we can expedite them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My only reason for raising any question at all is that, under the unanimous-consent agreement on the tax bill, there will be certain votes tomorrow, and I wondered if the leadership, particularly on this side of the aisle, would consent to having committees meet at that time. If the Senator from Arkansas has the majority leader's approval of his request, I would have no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not conferred with the majority leader. It is one of those situations which occasionally arise. I cannot always schedule hearings. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts knows, a great deal of interest has been evinced in the forthcoming hearings. I am trying to make preliminary preparations with the view that, once hearings are started, the subcommittee may hold hearings both in the mornings and afternoons, because of the inconvenience and expense to the Military Establishment of having to bring some of its personnel back to this country from overseas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I personally would have no objection to the Senator's request, but I think it would be preferable that the Senator withhold his request for the time being, and confer with the majority and the minority leaders after they return from the luncheon at the White House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall accede to the wishes of the acting minority leader, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], at the present time. I shall confer with both the majority and the minority leaders if I can do so in the next hour, but I should like to get authority to hold hearings tomorrow afternoon. At the present time I shall withdraw my request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas very much. I assume that the majority leader and the minority leader will be back very shortly.

Mr. McCLELLAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONDITION OF OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] concerning our national economy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

Let's be frank. Certain large segments of our national economy are sick. Most of the illness hinges on the cold, painful fact that untold thousands of our families in the low-income groups do not have enough ready cash to buy the necessities of life.

Almost 4 million people are unemployed at this very moment, and even more are expected to be out of work within the next few months. At the same time untold thousands of farm families are being forced to leave their farms and join welfare rolls because they can no longer make ends meet. Farm income has dropped sharply in North Carolina each year since 1951. Between 1951 and 1952 it dropped $11 million. In 1953 it dropped $31 million. In 1954 it dropped another $10 million. Last year North Carolina farmers received $52 million less for their products than they did in 1951.

Even in the face of rising unemployment both farms and factories are turning out commodities faster than they can be consumed. Supply is far ahead of demand, mainly because of a serious shortage of cash funds among low-income groups. Surpluses in wheat, cotton, and other basic commodities continue to pile up. The steel industry is operating anywwhere from 15 to 20 percent below capacity. Freight-car loadings are off by about the same percentage.

The point is this: If we expect to take up the slack in our economy, it is imperative to increase consumption. There is no point in kidding ourselves. Low-income groups simply do not possess the purchasing power to buy at the rate commodities are being produced.

These are facts, not opinions. Consequently, in the face of these facts, claims that a tax cut for low-income groups at this time will cause inflation are utterly absurd. The only time you can have inflation is when people have more money than they know what to do with. That causes inflation.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey says that if the Government gives the low-income families a few meager dollars by small tax reductions, it will cause inflation. That is pure hogwash, and he knows it. It is the same hogwash the Eisenhower administration has worked day and night to sell to the American taxpayers for 2 years.

But the taxpayers aren't as gullible as Mr. Humphrey and his Republican magicians think they are.

The average taxpayer knows how he was rooked last year.

He knows that the Republicans handed the wealthy—people who clip coupons and live off stock dividends—big, fat checks on silver platters. Under Mr. Humphrey's tax law, the people who depend on the weekly paycheck have to pay for these handouts for the rich.

The tax reduction proposals now before the Senate will correct much of the damage caused by Mr. Humphrey. They would repeal the special-privilege dividend section. They would also repeal the quick depreciation writeoff provisions and the section allowing reserves for future business expenses. In addition, corporate and excise tax rates now in effect would be continued until July 1957.

These changes would more than pay for the cost of giving a $20 tax reduction for each taxpayer—excluding spouse—and $10 for each dependent.

Just what would this tax cut do? It would mean that some 3 million people who are paying income taxes now could forget that burden next year. In North Carolina alone, an estimated 150,000 people would no longer be required to pay Federal income taxes.

By and large, it would mean that those families now having an income of $1,000 or less per year would be taken from the Federal income tax rolls. These same people today pay 25 percent of their total income in Federal taxes of one kind or another.

Families who have incomes under $5,000 need far more relief than this proposal gives, but we are at the stage where anything will help.

The main objection to a tax reduction has been the question of where the loss in revenue would be made up. That objection has been met. I am sure the proposal will be approved if Congress will get down to business and go to work instead of wasting time listening to administration leaders convince themselves that things are rosy with the working people of this country.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 4259.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was on page 1, line 3, to strike out the word "Revenue," and insert "Tax Rate Extension."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand it is the desire of the majority leader that action be taken on the first committee amendment, which strikes out only the word "Revenue" and substitutes in place thereof the words "Tax Rate Extension." It is purely to make a correction in the title, and for no other purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. I understand there is no opposition to the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Allowance of $20 credit for each personal exemption.

Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by renumbering section 38 as section 39 and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. Credit for personal exemptions.

"(a) General rule. In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, there shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to $20 multiplied by the number of exemptions allowed under section 154 as deductions in computing taxable income.

"(b) Limitation on amount of credit: The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and 37 (relating to retirement income)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent granted last Friday, I offer, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from

Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a substitute amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "(a)"; and on page 1, beginning with line 5, to strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 16, and to insert certain language.

In the event that the substitute amendment is agreed to, at the proper time I shall propose an amendment to the title to correspond with the purpose of the proposed amendment.

I have a very brief statement, Mr. President, summarizing the effect of the proposed amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the Senator, in conformity with the unanimous-consent agreement, is offering his substitute so that it will be the pending amendment before the Senate and, under the normal legislative course, will be the first amendment on which the Senate will vote when the time for voting comes tomorrow; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendments in the nature of a substitute will be printed in full in the RECORD.

The amendments proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, for himself and other Senators, in the nature of a substitute, are as follows:

On page 1, line 3, after "That" insert "(a)."

On page 1, beginning with line 5, strike out all through line 11 on page 16, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"(b) Whenever in this act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment or repeal of any provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"SEC. 2. Twenty-seven-month extension of corporate normal-tax rate.

"Section 11 (b) (relating to corporate normal tax), section 821 (a) (1) (A) (relating to mutual insurance companies other than interinsurers), and section 821 (b) (1) (relating to interinsurers) are hereby amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out 'April 1, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957';

"(2) By striking out 'April 1, 1955' each place in appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957';

"(3) By striking out 'March 31, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1957';

"(4) By striking out 'March 31, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1957'.

"SEC. 3. Twenty-seven-month extension of certain excise-tax rates.

"(a) Extension of rates: The following provisions are hereby amended by striking out 'April 1, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957'—

"(1) section 4041 (c) (relating to special fuels);

"(2) section 4061 (relating to motor vehicles);

"(3) section 4081 (relating to gasoline);

"(4) section 5001 (a) (1) (relating to distilled spirits);

"(5) section 5001 (a) (3) (relating to imported perfumes containing distilled spirits);

"(6) section 5022 (relating to cordials and liqueurs containing wine);

"(7) section 5041 (b) (relating to wines);

"(8) section 5051 (a) (relating to beer); and

"(9) section 5701 (c) (1) (relating to cigarettes).

"(b) Technical amendments.—

"(1) Section 5063 (relating to floor stocks refunds on distilled spirits, wines, cordials, and beer) is hereby amended by striking out 'April 1, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957', and by striking out 'May 1, 1955' and inserting in lieu thereof 'August 1, 1957'.

"(2) Section 5134 (a) (3) (relating to drawback in the case of distilled spirits) is hereby amended by striking out 'March 31, 1955' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1957'.

"(3) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 5707 (relating to floor stocks refunds on cigarettes) are hereby amended by striking out 'April 1, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957', and by striking out 'July 1, 1955' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1957'.

"(4) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 6412 (relating to floor stocks refunds on motor vehicles and gasoline) are hereby amended by striking out 'April 1, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957', and by striking out 'July 1, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1957'.

"(5) Section 497 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to refunds on articles from foreign trade zones), as amended by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954, is hereby amended by inserting after 'Internal Revenue Code' each place is appears 'of 1939 (or section 5701 (c), 5001 (a), 5022, 5041 (b), or 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954)', and by striking out 'April 1, 1955' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957'.

"SEC. 4. Repeal of provisions allowing credit against tax and exclusion from gross income for dividends received by individuals.

"(a) Repeal of section 34 and section 116: Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1955, section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals) and section 116 (relating to partial exclusion from gross income of dividends received by individuals) are hereby repealed.

"(b) Application of section 34 to taxable years beginning before July 1, 1955: Effective with respect to taxable years beginning before July 1, 1955, section 34 (a) (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) General rule: Effective with respect to taxable years ending after July 31, 1954, and beginning before July 1, 1955, there shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to the following percent of the dividends which are received after July 3, 1954, from domestic corporations and are included in gross income:

"'(1) 4 percent, in the case of a taxable year ending before July 1, 1955.

"'(2) 2 percent, in the case of the taxable year beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on December 31, 1955.

"'(3) In the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1955, and ending after June 30, 1955 (other than one beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on December 31, 1955), a percentage obtained by—

"'(A) multiplying 4 percent by the number of calendar months in the taxable year prior to July 1, 1955; and

"'(B) dividing the product obtained in subparagraph (A) by the total number of calendar months in the taxable year.

For purposes of this paragraph and of subsection (b) (2) (D), a calendar month only part of which falls within the taxable year (A) shall be disregarded if less than 15 days of such month are included in such taxable year, and (B) shall be included as a calendar month within the taxable year if more than 14 days of such month fall within the taxable year.'

"(c) Limitation on credit under section 34 applicable to taxable years beginning before July 1, 1955: Effective with respect to taxable years beginning before July 1, 1955, section 34 (b) (2) (relating to limitation on amount of credit) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(2) the following percent of the taxable income for the taxable year:

"'(A) 2 percent, in the case of a taxable year ending before January 1, 1955.

"'(B) 4 percent, in the case of a taxable year ending after December 31, 1954, and before July 1, 1955.

"'(C) 2 percent, in the case of the taxable year beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on December 31, 1955.

"'(D) In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1954, and before July 1, 1955, and ending after June 30, 1955 (other than one beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on December 31, 1955, a percentage obtained by—

"'(i) multiplying 4 percent by the number of calendar months in the taxable year prior to July 1, 1955; and

"'(ii) dividing the product obtained in clause (i) by the total number of calendar months in the taxable year.'

"(d) Application of section 116 to taxable years beginning before July 1, 1955: Effective with respect to taxable years beginning before July 1, 1955, section 116 (a) (relating to partial exclusion from gross income of dividends received by individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Exclusion from gross Income: Effective with respect to any taxable year ending after July 31, 1954, and beginning before July 1, 1955, gross income does not include amounts received by an individual as dividends from domestic corporations, to the extent that the dividends do not exceed—

"'(1) $50, in the case of a taxable year ending before July 1, 1955.

"'(2) $25, in the case of the taxable year beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on December 31, 1955.

"'(3) In the case of a taxable year beginning before July 1, 1955, and ending after June 30, 1955 (other than one beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on December 31, 1955), an amount obtained by—

"'(A) multiplying $50 by the number of calendar months in the taxable year prior to July 1, 1955; and

"'(B) dividing the product obtained in subparagraph (A) by the total number of calendar months in the taxable year.

For purposes of this paragraph, a calendar month only part of which falls within the taxable year (i) shall be disregarded if less than 15 days of such month are included in such taxable year, and (ii) shall be included as a calendar month within the taxable year if more than 14 days of such month fall within the taxable year.

If the dividends received in a taxable year exceed the amounts prescribed in paragraph (1), (2), or (3), as the case may be, the exclusion provided by this subsection shall apply to the dividends first received in such year.'

"(e) Technical amendments.—

"(1) The table of sections to part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is hereby amended by striking out

"'SEC. 34. Dividends received by individuals.'

"(2) Section 35 (b) (1) is hereby amended by striking out 'the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 and 34' and inserting

in lieu thereof: 'the credit allowable under section 33'.

"(3) Section 37 (a) is hereby amended by striking out 'section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals),'.

"(4) The table of sections to part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 is hereby amended by striking out

"SEC. 116. Partial exclusion of dividends received by individuals.'

"(5) Section 301 (f) is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (4).

"(6) Section 584 (c) (2) is hereby amended—

"(A) by striking out the heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'partially tax-exempt interest.—';

"(B) by striking out 'in the amount of dividends to which section 34 or section 116 applies, and'; and

"(C) by inserting a comma after 'interest' in the first sentence.

"(7) Section 642 (a) is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (3).

"(8) Section 643 (a) is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (7).

"(9) Section 702 (a) (5) is hereby amended by striking out 'a credit under section 34, an exclusion under section 116, or'.

"(10) Section 854 (a) is hereby amended by striking out 'section 34 (a) (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 116 (relating to an exclusion for dividends received by individuals), and'.

"(11) Section 854 (b) is hereby amended by striking out 'the credit under section 34 (a), the exclusion under section 116, and' in paragraph (1) and by striking out 'the credit under section 34, the exclusion under section 116, and' in paragraph (2).

"(12) Section 854 (h) (3) is hereby amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(B) The term "aggregate dividends received" includes only dividends received from domestic corporations other than any dividend from—

"'(i) an insurance company subject to a tax imposed by part I or part II of subchapter L (sec. 801 and following);

"'(ii) a corporation organized under the China Trade Act, 1922 (see sec. 941); or

"'(iii) a corporation which, for the taxable year of the corporation in which the distribution is made, or for the next preceding taxable year of the corporation, either is a corporation exempt from tax under section 501 (relating to certain charitable, etc., organizations) or section 521 (relating to farmers' cooperative associations) or is a corporation to which section 931 (relating to income from sources within the possessions of the United States) applies.

"'(C) In determining the aggregate dividends received, any amount allowed as a deduction under section 591 (relating to deduction for dividends paid by mutual savings banks, etc.) shall not be treated as a dividend.

"'(D) In determining the aggregate dividends received, a dividend received from a regulated investment company shall be subject to the limitations prescribed in subsection (a) and paragraph (2) of this subsection.'

"(13) Section 6014 (a) is hereby amended by striking out '34 or'.

"(14) The amendments made by this subsection shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after June 30, 1955.

"SEC. 5. Allowance of credit for personal exemptions.

"(a) Credit against tax: Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by renumbering section 38 as section 39 and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"'SEC. 38. Credit for personal exemptions.

"'(a) General rule: In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, there shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(1) $20, plus

"'(2) $10, multiplied by the number of exemptions allowed under section 151 (e) (relating to exemptions for dependents).

"'(b) Joint returns: In the case of a joint return of a husband and wife, only one $20 amount under subsection (a) (1) shall be allowed.

"'(c) Husband and wife filing separate returns:

"'(1) Credit of one spouse reduced: If a husband and wife (other than a husband and wife to whom paragraph (2) applies) both file separate returns, that portion of the credit allowed under subsection (a) (1) shall be allowed only—

"'(A) to that spouse agreed upon by the husband and wife under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, or

"'(B) if there is no agreement as provided in subparagraph (A), to that spouse designated by regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(2) Income of husband and wife under community property laws: If a husband and wife both file separate returns and if any of the income of the husband and the wife is community income under the laws of the State of residence of the husband or the wife, the credit under subsection (a) (as modified under subsection (b)) or under subsection (d) shall be computed as if the husband and wife filed a joint return, and one-half of the credit (if any) so computed shall be allowed to the husband and one-half shall be allowed to the wife.

"'(3) Husband and wife having different taxable years: The application of this subsection in the case of husbands and wives having different taxable years shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(d) Taxable years beginning before January 1, 1956, and ending after December 31, 1955: In the case of any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1956, and ending after December 31, 1955, there shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount computed as follows:

"'(1) determine an amount under subsection (a) (as modified by subsections (b) and (c)) as if such subsections applied to the taxable year,

"'(2) multiply the amount determined under paragraph (1) by the number of calendar months in the taxable year after December 31, 1955, and

"'(3) divide the product obtained under paragraph (2) by the total number of calendar months in the taxable year.

For purposes of this subsection, a calendar month only part of which falls within the taxable year (A) shall be disregarded if less than 15 days of such month are included in such taxable year, and (B) shall be included as a calendar month within the taxable year if more than 14 days of such month fall within the taxable year.

"'Credit reduced by tax benefit from income splitting.—

"'In general: In the case of—

"'(A) a husband and wife who elect to file a joint return for the taxable year, or

"'(B) a taxpayer who is the head of a household (as defined in section 1 (b) (2)) or a surviving spouse (as defined in section 2 (b)) for the taxable year,

the credit otherwise allowable under subsection (a) (as modified by subsections (b) and (c)) or under subsection (d) shall be reduced by the income-splitting tax benefit for the taxable year.

"(2) Income-splitting tax benefit defined.—

"'(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "income-splitting tax benefit" means, in the case of any taxable year, the amount (if any) by which—

"'(i) the tax imposed under this subchapter on the taxable income of a single individual who is not a head of household or surviving spouse and who has the same taxable income for the taxable year as the taxpayer, exceeds

"'(ii) the tax imposed under this subchapter for such taxable year on the taxable income of the taxpayer.

"'(B) In the case of a husband and wife who elect to file a joint return for the taxable year, subparagraph (A) shall be applied to their combined taxable income.

"'(f) Limitation on amount of credit: The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and 37 (relating to retirement income).'

"(b) Technical amendments.—

"(1) Subsection (d) of section 1 (relating to rates of tax on individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Cross references.—

"'(1) For allowance of credit based on personal exemptions, see section 38.

"'(2) For definition of taxable income, see section 63.'

"(2) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is hereby amended by striking out—

"'SEC. 38. Overpayments of tax.'

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 38. Credit for personal exemptions.

"'SEC. 39. Overpayments of tax.'

"(3) Subsection (c) of section 443 (relating to returns for a period of less than 12 months) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Adjustments for personal exemptions: In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, if a return is made for a short period by reason of subsection (a) (1) and if the tax is not computed under subsection (b) (2), then—

"'(1) the exemptions allowed as a deduction under section 151 (and any deduction in lieu thereof), and

"'(2) the credit allowed by section 38,

shall be reduced to amounts which bear the same ratio to the full exemptions or to the full credit (as the case may be) as the number of months in the short period bears to 12.'

"(4) Subsection (a) of section 642 (relating to special rules for credits against tax) is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"'(4) Credit for personal exemption: An estate shall be allowed the credit provided by section 38 (relating to credit for personal exemptions). Such credit shall not be allowed to a trust.'

"(c) Collection of income tax at source on wages.—

"(1) Subsection (a) of section 3402 (relating to requirement of withholding) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Requirement of withholding: Every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages a tax equal to 18 percent of the amount by which the wages exceed the sum of—

"'(1) the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1), and

"'(2) the credit claimed pursuant to regulations prescribed under subsection (j).'

"(2) So much of paragraph (1) of section 3402 (c) (relating to wage bracket withholding) as precedes the first table in such paragraph is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall

deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax (which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be collected and withheld under subsection (a)) equal to the excess of—

"'(A) the tax determined in accordance with the following tables, over

"'(B) the credit claimed pursuant to regulations prescribed under subsection (j):'.

"(3) Section 3402 (relating to income tax collected at source) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(j) Credit against withholding.—

"'(1) Entitlement to credit: An employee receiving wages shall on any day be entitled to a withholding credit, if, on the basis of facts existing at the beginning of such day, there may reasonably be expected to be allowable a credit under section 38 (relating to credit for personal exemptions) for the taxable year under subtitle A in respect of which amounts deducted and withheld under this chapter in the calendar year in which such day falls are allowed as a credit.

"'(2) Amount of credit: The amount of the credit under this subsection shall be that amount which, for the payroll period, may reasonably be expected to reflect most accurately the amount of the credit which such employee will be allowed under section 39 for such taxable year.

"(3) Credit allowed under regulations: The allowance of the credit under this subsection shall be made only under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection, including (but not limited to) regulations relating to—

"'(A) the filing of withholding credit certificates, the time at which such certificates take effect, the period during which such certificates remain in effect, and the effect of change of status;

"'(B) the rounding of the credit for any payroll period in the same manner as withholding exemptions are rounded for the same period; and

"'(C) the extent to which the credit will be allowable to married individuals.'

"(d) Effective dates: The amendments made by this section (other than by subsec. (c)) shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1955. The amendments made by subsection (c) of this section shall apply only with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1955.

"SEC. 6. Termination of provisions allowing accelerated depreciation in case of property acquired after March 9, 1955.

"(a) Termination of section 167 (b): Section 167 (relating to deduction for depreciation) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(i) Termination of subsection (b) with respect to property acquired after March 9, 1955: Subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of any property—

"'(1) the construction, reconstruction, or erection or which is commenced after March 9, 1955, or

"'(2) acquired after March 9, 1955.

For purposes of paragraph (1), the construction, reconstruction, or erection of property shall be considered to have commenced before March 10, 1955, if the taxpayer furnishes proof, satisfactory to the Secretary or his delegate, that an enforceable contract for such construction, reconstruction, or erection was in existence on March 9, 1955, and that such construction, reconstruction, or erection was required by the terms of such contract as in effect on March 9, 1955. For purposes of paragraph (2), property shall be considered to have been acquired before March 10, 1955, if the taxpayer furnishes proof, satisfactory to the Secretary or his delegate, that an enforceable contract for the acquisition of such property was in existence on March 9, 1955, and that the acquisition of such property was required by the terms of such contract as in effect on March 9, 1955.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after March 9, 1955.

"SEC. 7. Repeal of provision allowing deductions for additions to reserves for estimated expenses.

"(a) Repeal of section 462: Section 462 (relating to reserves for estimated expenses, etc.) is hereby repealed.

"(b) Technical amendment. The table of sections for subpart C of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 is hereby amended by striking out the following:

"'SEC. 462. Reserves for estimated expenses, etc.'

"(c) Effective date: The repeal and amendment made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

"(d) Savings provision. No interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to the tax shall be imposed, for any period before the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, with respect to any amount of underpayment resulting solely from the repeal of section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by subsection (a) of this section."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have an appointment at the White House at 1 o'clock, but I shall be glad to yield briefly to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, will the substitute be subject to a 4-hour limitation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. President, these amendments go both to the committee amendments and to sections 2 and 3 of the House bill.

At this point, it is my intention only to describe these amendments briefly.

First, we propose to extend the present corporate and excise tax rates to July 1, 1957—15 months beyond the time limit of the House bill. This would bring into the Treasury an additional $3,537,000,000 not otherwise contemplated.

Second, we propose to repeal the "error" in the 1954 bill which has opened such tremendous loopholes in computing corporate taxes. According to conservative estimates, this will save the Treasury at least $1 billion. The Wall Street Journal, in an article this morning, estimates it at from $1 billion to $5 billion.

Third, we propose to repeal, effective March 9, 1955, the accelerated depreciation provisions of the 1954 bill and, effective July 1, 1955, the dividend credit and exclusion provisions of the 1954 bill. By July 1, 1957, this repeal would save the Treasury $1,618,000,000.

Finally, we propose a $20 tax credit for each taxpayer and a $10 credit for each of his dependents. The credit does not apply to the taxpayer's spouse. The credit will become effective January 1, 1956, and by July 1, 1957, will have cost the Treasury $1,261,000,000.

The cost will be more than met by the budget balancing provisions of the amendments. These budget balancing provisions will provide $4,894,000,000 in savings by July 1, 1957.

In summary, we propose to extend the excise and corporate rates for a 15-month period beyond the House bill; to repeal the error in the 1954 bill; to repeal the accelerated depreciation and dividend provisions of the 1954 bill; and to use the savings to provide a tax cut for individual American citizens.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in knowing whether, if the substitute should be adopted, it would militate against the farmers in depreciating their farm machinery.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the farmer can take advantage of the accelerated depreciation which is in the present law, he could be affected.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator mean that it would hurt him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It would depend upon what method of depreciation is used by the farmer.

Mr. LANGER. Under the pending bill, as I understand, a farmer can figure a certain percentage of depreciation on his tractor, for instance. What does the proposed substitute provide in that regard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. He has a choice of certain types of depreciation. Under the substitute, the big business provision which we think was put in chiefly for the benefit of large manufacturers, would be eliminated. The substitute proposes to repeal the accelerated depreciation feature.

Mr. LANGER. The farmer would be hurt, if the substitute should be adopted, would he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It would depend entirely on what method the farmer uses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that if the substitute is adopted it will restore the old law with reference to amoritization benefits?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator is correct. I think the accelerated depreciation is largely for the benefit of the big corporations. Tomorrow the Senate will have a choice of voting in favor of the farmers of North Dakota and every other State by giving them some relief, or voting in favor of the big dividend boys and corporations. Under the accelerated depreciation provision they were given benefits which amounted to more than a billion and a quarter dollars. We propose to recover that revenue and to distribute the benefits more equitably.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should be happy to yield at any time during the next 2 days, but I must attend a conference at the White House in a few moments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to clear the record.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator will have 2 days in which to clear the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Texas wants to leave the record incorrect——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The record is clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator will agree that if this proposal is adopted, we shall be repealing benefits which small-business men and farmers have had under last year's bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my opinion that the small farmer and the small taxpayers got very few benefits from the bill which Secretary Humphrey rammed through Congress last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that under the bill, big business concerns and large corporations got actually less than they did under the old law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. The estimates show that under the accelerated depreciation provision which was incorporated into the big business bill last year, the Treasury in an 18-year period will have a net loss of $19½ billion. At the House Ways and Means Committee where Secretary Humphrey was testifying, mention was made in one instance of a man who bought a Cadillac automobile with 4 years' depreciation on it. Under the accelerated depreciation provision, he can double his depreciation. On a car that sells for $4,600 he can deduct 50 percent the first year, and at the end of the first year he has depreciated it $2,300. So he can take his capital gain. That is in the Committee's record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator has just shown how little study has been behind the substitute proposal, because if he will read the law, he will find a provision which specifically states that under no circumstances can anything be depreciated beyond 33⅓ percent. The Senator says we can save $3 billion for the Treasury under the substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We do not propose to extend certain tax rates for 1 extra year. The Senator from Delaware has not studied the substitute. We propose to extend the time an extra 15 months. We propose during the next 15 months, to raise the money that has been lost in 12 months.

Before the Senator comes to the floor to talk about the substitute, he ought to be certain of what is in it, and not draw conclusions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware has read the substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware has stated that the substitute extended the time 12 months. Does the Senator stand corrected?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Texas wish to yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to yield; I should like to keep my engagement, if the Senator from Delaware will permit me to do so.

However, if the Senator decides that the matter must be settled between now and 1 o'clock, I will yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as the country is concerned, I think it is settled anyway.

PROSPERITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, there is no more overworked congressional cliche than the one that says of many bills that "our current debate involves the most crucial issue we shall face in the current session." But I think it may well be true in the case of the tax bill. What started out to be a routine extension of corporate and excise taxes has suddenly become a test of the confidence of Congress and the American people in the fiscal program of the Eisenhower administration, and I shall discuss it from that point of view.

In this whole problem the word "confidence" is the key, because, like every other basic problem, ours is basically spiritual, even though its spiritual content is often obscured by the material terms of "taxes," "money," and "debt," in which it is made manifest.

The basic issue is the prosperity of the American people, and this is itself a spiritual concept. The word "prosperity" means "hope for the future," and describes a feeling, an attitude, rather than a measureable income. If a man can face his economic future with hope, based on faith and courage, he is prosperous. If he faces it in fear, expecting economic decline or disaster, he is not prosperous, no matter what his economic condition is in the present or has been in the past.

In a Nation of free men the role of government in economic affairs should be threefold:

First, to provide a sound and stable dollar to preserve his economic values and accurately measure his economic gains.

Second, to operate so as to be the lightest possible burden in taxes.

Third, to leave the individual citizen the widest possible freedom to manage his own financial affairs, with a basic attitude of helpfulness rather than control.

To me any administration that accepts these goals and makes progress toward them is responsible in the finest sense, and any ideas or programs that weaken these objectives or move us away from these goals are irresponsible and dangerous.

I submit that these are the goals of the Eisenhower administration, and, under the able management of Secretary George M. Humphrey, we have made remarkable progress toward them under very difficult circumstances.

By the time Mr. Humphrey took office in 1953 the dollar had shrunk, in 14 years, to 52.3 cents—an average loss of 3½ cents a year. The shrinkage in the past 2 years has been less than one-half of 1 cent, representing practical stability.

This was not done by fiat, controls, or legerdemain. It was a miracle of management.

(A) The general operations of the Government were better managed.

First. Current expenditures were cut from $74.3 billion in fiscal 1953 to $63.5 billion in fiscal 1955.

Second. The overhanging unexpended balances were cut from $78.4 billion on July 1, 1953, to $53.9 billion by July 1, 1955, and it is estimated that this figure will be cut to $49.6 by July 1, 1956.

Third. The appropriations were cut from $80.3 billion in fiscal 1953, the last appropriation of the previous administration, to 57.3 billion in fiscal 1955, with an estimate of $56.3 billion for fiscal 1956.

(B) Because these happened, the operating deficits were cut from $9½ billion at the end of fiscal 1953 to $3 billion at the end of fiscal 1954 and a projected $2½ billion at the end of fiscal 1955. Thus, we are two-thirds of the way to our goal of a balanced budget—the first planned one in more than 20 years. Of course, we could have had a balanced budget in fiscal 1955—with a small surplus—if taxes had not been reduced, but in the wisdom of responsible management, having stabilized the value of the dollar, it was decided to move simultaneously, if more slowly, toward the two goals of balanced budget and lowered taxes rather than to take one before the other.

Last year, in this spirit we brought about the biggest tax reduction in the history of this country. This program was carefully balanced to bring some measure of relief to every part of our economy. It was patterned for overall economic benefit—not partisan political advantage. Three billions of last year's tax reduction were accounted for by individual income tax cuts involving a 10 percent cut in the lower and middle brackets and scaling down to only about 2 percent for the highest bracket incomes. The administration tried to keep that cut at 6½ billion, which would have balanced the reductions in expenses accomplished by the administration. We all joined to add a billion to it in long-overdue relief from wartime excises.

(C) These are achievements that are easy to measure, but they are not the only tasks that had to be undertaken.

One. Our great debt has to be so managed that its refunding will not dry up the sources of money for State or local funds and private investments—or upset the delicate inter-relationships of interest rates for all these myriad borrowings. The enormity of this task appears when we realize that in 1954 the Treasury had to refinance more than $74 billion. This fact again emphasizes the wisdom of its program to get as much of the debt as possible into notes of longer term.

Two. Then too, our money supply had to be managed so well by the Federal Reserve Bank that its very volume did not upset the balance. The great post-war decision that made this possible was made in 1951, and Secretary Snyder deserves great credit for his wisdom; but the new administration had to resist substantial pressure to again destroy the bank's freedom to carry out the responsibilities Congress gave to it.

Three. Great steps were also taken toward the third goal of private economic freedom. Price, wage and rent controls were removed—without the inflation prophesied by the apostles of State centralism; and the Government has moved significantly out of direct competition with its citizens.

This transition would have been difficult under the most favorable circumstances, but it was even more difficult because it had to be made during the period of adjustment from war to peace, with all of its attendant dislocations.

When the Truman administration faced a similar adjustment after World War II, it demonstrated its ignorance of, and lack of faith in, the virility of our free-enterprise system. Secretary Snyder, its spokesman, fearfully predicted unemployment up to 8 million, and there was the beginning of preparations for a vast program of Government jobs. But the economic realities of a nation starved for civilian goods and an industry capable of quick readjustment worked a typical American miracle, and the predicted tragedy never happened.

The problem the Eisenhower administration faced was less severe, but this time it did not have the benefit of a backlog of civilian demand. So there was the potential threat of unemployment. The prophets of doom called for Federal intervention, but the administration—sure of the essential virility of our economy—refused to panic. Unemployment rose by 2 million, but employment also rose by 4 million, and the trough of the recession was shallow and narrow. Many authorities now think we passed through it in the 3 months between July 1953 and October 1953, when the upward climb began, although the upturn in employment lagged until March 1954.

Time will not permit further discussion of this phase of our problem; but I submit that these facts demonstrate that this has been a sound program, achieved by responsible management.

First. Its economic goals have been sound, and we have made remarkable progress toward them.

(a) We have a sound dollar.

(b) The cost of Government is being reduced as fast as defense needs will permit.

(c) The economic freedom of the individual citizen has been increased.

Second. These achievements have been made possible by confidence and courage, and thus have increased our spiritual hope for the future, which is true prosperity.

Mr. President, one would think that in this vital program, which affects the life of every American—regardless of party—there would be no partisanship. But this has not been the case.

Last year, our friends of the other party, seeing what they thought was potential political opportunity, tried to upset the Treasury's balanced program, by proposing that additional relief in the equivalent of $20, be given every taxpayer and dependent. This would have increased the current annual deficit by more than $2 billion. It was narrowly rejected.

So I suppose we should not have been surprised when the idea suddenly came to life 2 weeks ago. This time it looked sure fire, because it could be attached to what might seem to be a veto-proof bill. So it was pulled out of the hat by Speaker RAYBURN on a Saturday, rammed through a party caucus, and then through the House on Monday, without any statement relating it to our overall economic needs, and without hearings. When it came to the Senate its advocates had to ask for a chance to get a witness—any witness—to explain it to the Finance Committee. They rounded up two—and for them it was either the crash job it seemed on the surface, or one of those cases of "Strangely enough, I just happen to have brought my music, though of course I didn't expect you to ask me to sing."

In essence, the program asked for a return to the old, rejected fiscal policies of the New Deal, while trying to reassure us that this time the inevitable inflation would not occur. Fear was used as the whip—fear of widespread unemployment. The basic idea was the old one of pump-priming and bootstrap-lifting: "If we started going into debt again we could create prosperity and lower taxes more." This was the siren song that Mr. Leon Keyserling sang to the Finance Committee. This was a reprise of the song he sang to the newspapers on February 12, when he said:

> A rise in the annual rate of Federal spending above current levels by about 6 billion by the fourth quarter of this year would be accompanied by a rise of almost $30 billion in our total national product.

Mr. President, it is difficult to accept this bland premise, when we view the results of deficit spending by past administrations.

To the junior Senator from Utah, it is the same old fiscal numbers racket based on a materialistic system of push-button economics. It leaves out the human equation and the spiritual drives that are our greatest resource. It assumes that prosperity is a product of government, not of individual effort; and that by pumping deficits into the economy we can, by some magic, create the solid substance of production. It asks us to rewrite history, but to shut our eyes to the results of the same sorry program over 20 tragic years.

Mr. Keyserling's eager attempts to persuade us that this plan of his, although inadequate, was certainly not inflationary, has an interesting relation to a statement by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who examined the same problem in his book Economy in the National Government, published in 1952. On page 253, Senator DOUGLAS said:

> An increase in public debt is, however, not a desirable end in itself. Moreover, it would be dangerous constantly to increase the public debt in time of peace when the prospect of war still hangs over us, because during the time of war further enormous increases always occur. Unless we provide a margin of safety in peacetime for the war which may occur, we are likely to be in great trouble if and when such a war breaks out.

Mr. President, I continue to quote, and this is important:

> To use deficit financing in order to drive unemployment down below 6 percent is therefore very dangerous. It will tend to do far more harm through inflation than the good it will do by absorbing some of those who are unemployed from seasonal and transitional causes.
>
> For in a period when unemployment is less than 6 percent, there is no real supply of workers ready to go into productive activity. Instead, the unemployed are primarily either the hard core of the perennially unemployed, such as the handicapped, and the transitionally unemployed for whom job openings exist. Since there is no real idle supply of labor, extra money pumped into the economy by budgetary deficit cannot appreciably increase production. Rather, it will be used to bid up the prices on the available supply of goods and services, and hence it will bring about inflation.

Mr. President, let me acknowledge that my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from whose book I have been quoting, has now come to the floor; and I wish to say to him that I have been quoting from his book entitled "Economy in the National Government."

I now read further from that book:

> There is a further zone of uncertainty within which we do not know what is going to happen. I submit a rough judgment that probably we should not run a governmental deficit unless unemployment exceeds 8 percent and, indeed, possibly slightly more than that. When unemployment is between 6 and 8 percent, the governmental budget should at least balance and therefore be neutral in its effects. When unemployment is over 8 percent, we should have a deficit; but when it is under 6 percent, there should be a surplus.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I regret that I was not on the floor when the Senator from Utah started his remarks. Of course he recognizes, does he not, that the figures of the Department of Commerce are subject to a considerable margin of error, and that they tend to understate the amount of lost time because of business declines—for at least two reasons, and possibly for a third. The first is that the figure on unemployment does not take account of what are called layoffs, referring to those who do not have jobs, and are not earning, but who, it is thought, will have jobs within 30 days. These persons are eligible to receive benefits under unemployment insurance. It was the testimony of Mr. Burns, before our Economic Committee, in January of 1954, that they really are unemployed. So if the number of temporary layoffs be added to the number of unemployed the total is increased by between 250,000 and 300,000, normally. In March 1954, the number was 236,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am happy to accept that information.

At this time I should like to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me state that this is an important item; and inasmuch as the Senator from Utah has been quoting me, I wish to have the RECORD correct on this point.

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to accept the correction for the RECORD, and I appreciate it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Utah.

There is another point which should be made, namely, with respect to involuntary part time. A great many men are not discharged or laid off, but are put on a basis of 1, 2, or 3 days a week. If we include figures representing involuntary part time, and reduce those figures to terms of full-time employment, the total is raised to approximately 5 million, as of the low point of last year. The staff study of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report places it at 4,880,000 in March 1954. I think it is

now running around 4.1 or 4.2 million. The exact figure was 4,307,000 in February of 1955, according to the same study found on page 96 of our committee report submitted today. Therefore it was running around 8 percent of the total number as of the low point of last year. It is now running around 7 percent.

There is one final point. The Census Bureau tries to find out whether people are actually looking for work, whether they are a part of the labor force. Even though they may be out of work, if the enumerator thinks they are not really looking for work, they are not counted as unemployed. This is a difficult question——

Mr. BENNETT. Let me say to my colleague that I have a long speech. I welcome the explanation of his own figures. However, I do not intend to use any further quotations from his book. I should appreciate an opportunity to continue with my speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since these figures have been quoted by other Members of the Senator's party out of context, I should appreciate an opportunity to make the record clear. I am sure the Senator from Utah has never quoted them out of context, but other members of his party have done so. I should like to make the record clear, that the census figures on unemployment as such understate the amount of time that is lost through business declines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table which I asked the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to prepare on the relationship between reported unemployment and the full-time equivalent unemployment. It appears on page 96 of the Joint Economic Committee report submitted today.

There being no objection the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In thousands]

Item	December 1953	1954 March	1954 May	1954 August	1954 November	February 1955
(1) Unemployed (census)	2,313	3,72	3,305	3,245	2,893	3,383
(2) Temporary layoffs	195	236	294	143	120	145
PART-TIME WORKERS IN NONAGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES (CENSUS): WORKED LESS THAN 35 HOURS PER WEEK						
(3) Usually work full time at present job but worked part time because of economic factors	1,258	1,712	1,548	1,451	1,285	1,148
(4) Man-hours equivalent to full-time work (37.5 hours per week)	47,213	64,200	58,050	54,413	48,188	43,050
(5) Man-hours actually worked	31,397	43,550	39,286	37,532	31,932	28,137
(6) Time lost (4—5)	15,816	20,650	18,764	16,881	16,256	14,913
(7) Full-time equivalent unemployment (6 divided by 37.5 hours per week)	420	550	500	450	430	398
(8) Usually work part-time at present job but prefer and could accept full-time work	467	794	866	1,059	935	810
(9) Man-hours equivalent to full-time work (37.5 hours per week)	17,513	29,775	32,475	39,713	35,063	30,338
(10) Man-hours actually worked	9,046	15,890	18,601	20,814	18,402	16,053
(11) Time lost (9—10)	8,467	13,885	13,874	18,899	16,661	14,285
(12) Full-time equivalent unemployment (11 divided by 37.5 hours per week)	230	370	370	500	440	381
(13) Total full-time equivalent unemployment (1+2+7+12)	3,158	4,880	4,469	4,338	3,883	4,307

Source: Computed from data in the monthly sample survey of the labor force of the Census Bureau, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the RECORD should show that it is the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that such is the case.

Mr. President, I should like to continue and say that perhaps this explains to the Senator from Utah—referring to the use by the Senator from Illinois of the words 6 and 8 percent—an attempt by Mr. Keyserling, in his testimony, to inflate the unemployment statistics. The official figure for February 1955, shows 3,383,000 unemployed. Mr. Keyserling said that figure was inaccurate, and that the correct figure was more than 4 million. The total labor force at the present time is 66,550,000, and 3,383,000 is only 5 percent. So, to protect himself against the charge that his program is inflationary—as measured by the Senator from Illinois—he boldly inflates his basic facts.

I recognize that the Senator from Illinois and I have a different interpretation of the facts, but I think the point is interesting.

In a way, the detailed discussion in which I have been indulging may seem academic, because the Senate Democratic policy committee abandoned the House-passed amendment in favor of one which they hope has more vote appeal. But their very retreat from the Rayburn proposal is convincing evidence to the junior Senator from Utah that they recognize the validity of the President's charge that this was "fiscal irresponsibility" and, without shifting to ground they thought could more easily be defended, prefer not to face it.

The new proposal is a curious mixture. Though the members of the Democratic policy committee still give lip-service to the Keyserling theory that a tax cut now would put money into the hands of the consumer and thus stimulate the economy, they cut the amount from $20 a head to $10 a head—or from 5½ cents a day, enough to buy chewing gum, to 2½ cents—which buys nothing. Thus they seek to preserve the shadowy virtue of a cut, per se, while abandoning half its meager substance. Mr. Keyserling told us in the Finance Committee that the Rayburn proposal was far too small.

To recoup the loss to the Treasury of this great tax saving, they propose to scuttle two tax programs that, while not new, were written into the 1954 act. These changes would tend to upset the balance carefully built up by this act, but they have the political appeal that, on the surface, they are taxing the rich more and soaking the corporations.

Let us look at each of the changes in turn.

For many years, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, recognizing the simple fact that new things lose their value most rapidly during the early part of their use, have permitted what is here called "accelerated depreciation." The law calls it "The declining balance method," or "The sum of the year's digits method." It had been used sparingly for many years prior to World War II, but became general policy in the early forties at the request of Wilson Wyatt, Housing Administrator, and was done by administrative decision in the Treasury and without any sanction of law.

The 1945 act, to which our friends take violent exception, follows the program laid down by the Wyatt decision. It validates the existing program, but merely changes the rate.

If this is so wrong in principle, as it would seem to me to be, perhaps this is a "blooper" which operated for a least 10 years under the Democratic administration without anyone having caught it.

Under the Wyatt decision—and I use the name merely to identify it—the taxpayer was allowed to start the "declining balance" at 150 percent of the value of the assets. Under the law enacted in 1954 the taxpayer was allowed to start at 200 percent. It is true that under both these methods the taxpayer recovers half the cost of his asset before half of its lifetime has been reached, but it is also true that after passing a certain point in time, his allowable annual deduction decreases with every year. It is mathematically interesting that both programs, both the 150-percent program used under the administrative decision and the 200-percent program provided by the 1954 law, passed the point of declining returns at approximately the same time, after 30 or 33⅓ percent of the lifetime of the asset had been reached. When the declining rate passes the normal rate, of course, the taxpayer begins to pay higher taxes which will continue for the remainder of the life of the asset. I realize that this information is new to some of my colleagues. I am sure the fact will be developed by anyone checking it with the Bureau of Internal Revenue that this has been a part of standard interpretation of the depreciation schedule. The Senator from Utah remembers taking a long look at it in 1947 and deciding that it did not accord any particular benefit to him under his situation at that time.

When we look at either the Wyatt proposal, which began the depreciation at

150 percent, or the provision written into the 1954 law, which began it at 200 percent, we must realize that here again we have an interesting application of what I have called the "numbers" game. This is represented by the argument that by allowing a higher rate of depreciation in the early life of an asset—a machine or a whole plant, for example—a situation is created whereby the lower rate of the capital gains tax becomes an overriding incentive, and that men will choose it in order to avoid paying the tax on their annual profits at a higher rate.

Under the 1954 act or under the 1942 Wyatt administrative decision, the greatest opportunity comes in the first third of the life of an asset. Then the period of diminishing rates, below the straight line rate, begins to set in.

This argument makes some startling assumptions:

First, that people will try to take advantage of it in order to substitute a capital gains tax for the normal income tax.

Second, it further assumes that the policy of killing the goose that lays the golden egg is wisest after all. Obviously, if the business plant or asset cannot be proved to be profitable, no one will buy it at a price to produce a capital gain.

Third, it assumes that men will go into business, go through all the painful preliminaries of getting capital, constructing a plant and installing equipment, securing raw materials and recruiting and training men, and building all of it to a profitable level only for the purpose of selling out in the first period of useful life for optimum capital gain, simply because the tax rate on capital gains is lower than that on operating profits. I doubt that anyone can point to one case in which such motivation can be clearly demonstrated. Usually when a man sells out, he does so for a very human reason, such as the fact that he can no longer operate his business at a profit.

I realize that there was put into the RECORD on Friday an article written by a Harvard economist, Mr. Eisner, which undertook to show the tremendous tax advantage which could be achieved by operating either under the Wyatt program or under the 1954 program. In the first place, it seems to me that the Eisner article ignores the fundamental fact that all assets decrease more rapidly in value in their early life than in their later life.

Second, a program which recognizes that situation tends to correct an inequity, instead of providing a windfall.

Third, as the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) pointed out, it provides to a limited extent for the small-business men the privilege the Democrats provided for the big-business men through tax amortization certificates to a total of $31.6 billion; $7,300,000,000 in World War II, and $24,300,000,000 during the early years of the Korean conflict.

The Eisner point of view is to me another chapter in the "numbers" game. It assumes that if smart men, with pencil and no experience, can figure out a remote possibility, which is theoretical but unrealistic, it can somehow become a basis for destroying the practical program.

The Eisner idea rests on three impossible assumptions:

First, that any business could or would make additions to plant or equipment every year at the same rate. What actually happens, of course, is that such additions are made in the amount and at the time that good business judgment indicates they are necessary or profitable.

Second, the Eisner idea assumes that the overriding policy consideration in business decisions is tax saving. It ignores the practical considerations found in normal motivation to increase profits by increasing volume or reducing costs.

As I have already stated, Mr. President, inasmuch as this program, which starts deductions for depreciation of an asset at a rate higher than the amount arrived at by dividing the total rate by the number of years of its expected life, was actually put into operation in 1942 by administrative decision, I should like to ask why our Democratic friends did not object to it then, if they object to it now.

The second proposal, to repeal the dividend credit, is a definite step backward toward the injustice of double taxation, and if it is not class legislation, it is at least anticlass legislation.

To assume that all stockholders are rich is to deny the modern facts of corporate life. Let us take, for example, the telephone system. A quarter million of its employees are also stockholders.

Another interesting fact found by the Revenue Bureau is that in 1951 more than 4 million returns showed some form of stock ownership, and one-half million of the persons filing those returns owed no tax, because of low net earnings. These are the pensioners, the widowers, and widows, and others for whom this law promised some greatly needed relief.

The third proposal hardly warrants a comment. How can we assume that by arbitrarily extending the corporate tax into a period beginning and ending after the present year, we are providing added revenue for this year's budget?

I agree with the editorial in the New York Times which calls the program "1 part fiction and 2 parts the reintroduction of conspicuous and longstanding injustices and imperfections that had existed previous to the comprehensive reform legislation of 1954."

Finally, the move to take credit for correcting the only unforeseen loophole in the 1954 act which has developed, and then to add it as an offset to a suggested tax reduction proposal is a transparent trick, in the face of the quick action which Secretary Humphrey and his department have taken to correct it.

The grab at a straw in this case is only matched in irresponsibility by the estimates of $5 billion and $1 billion which have been bandied about.

I believe the editorial and the Arthur Krock column, in the New York Times of March 11, have called the turn, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 11, 1955]

SAME HOAX, NEW GUISE

On February 21 the Democratic majority of the House Ways and Means Committee, in a maneuver calculated to identify that party with tax relief for the little fellow, tacked onto the administration bill for extending the corporate income taxes and certain excise taxes a provision which would have given every income taxpayer a rebate of $20 and increased the allowance of each dependent by the same amount. When he got a chance to express his views on this rider before the committee Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey argued forcefully against it as the very antithesis of responsible government.

The House supported the committee in this political embellishment of the administration-sponsored tax measure, but when a counterpart of the administration bill came before the Senate Finance Committee the latter rejected efforts to write in the $20 tax cut by a vote of 9 to 6. Allied with the 7 Republican members of the committee on this vote were Democratic Senators BYRD and GEORGE, both of them members of great experience in the field of fiscal legislation and highly respected by their colleagues on both sides of the Chamber.

On Wednesday Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority floor leader, announced that the tax cut rider would be sponsored on the floor in a revised form by the six members of the Finance Committee who failed to sell it to their colleagues in the Finance Committee. One of the more obvious arguments against the original version of this political measure was the argument that there was nothing to justify a tax reduction at this time, 10 months before it could become effective, when no one could predict what conditions would be and when the long uphill fight to achieve a balanced budget was still not yet won. Well, that argument Senator JOHNSON explains, has now been disposed of. Under the new, beautified version we are going to have our cake and eat it too. The little fellow is going to get the tax reduction promised him in the earlier version (or a large part of it), but this will be achieved without adding to the budget deficit. In fact, Senator JOHNSON and his associates have arranged things so efficiently that not only will there be no increase in the deficit but there will be no deficit.

By what kind of legerdemain is this result to be achieved? It would be produced by offsetting, on paper, the losses resulting from this political tax cut by increasing revenue from three other sources. Looked at superficially, none of these seems to touch the little fellow directly. Actually, all are part of the carefully considered and economically well-rounded tax program of the administration.

Under the plan announced by Senator JOHNSON the top layer of the corporate income tax and certain excise taxes would be retained for 2 more years instead of the 1 year proposed by the administration. This increase in revenue is, to begin with, a pure figment of the imagination. As Senator BYRD points out, the Democrats could hardly claim they were picking up additional revenue by extending these taxes through the fiscal year 1957, since there is no reason to doubt that the Finance Committee would do that in any case when the time came, should the budget situation make it desirable.

But even if this proposal were not an optical illusion it would be unsound and unjust. These particular taxes were enacted for emergency purposes in connection with the rearmament effort. They are entitled,

therefore, to priority when the budget situation indicates the fiscal emergency is over. The additional new revenue would be obtained by repealing two measures adopted last year in connection with the general revision of the Internal Revenue Code. These are the modest relief which that legislation provided from the flagrantly unjust double taxation of dividend income, and the provision for permitting corporations more flexible depreciation policies, with respect to plant and equipment.

Thus Mr. JOHNSON's program consists of 1 part fiction and 2 parts the reintroduction of conspicuous and longstanding injustices and imperfections that had existed previous to the comprehensive reform legislation of 1954.

A PLAIN CASE OF POLITICAL FACE SAVING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—The purposes of the tax bill produced by the Democratic Policy Committee of the Senate emerge with a clarity that does not always invest badly partisan maneuvers. Principally these purposes are:

To prevent the Democratic ranks in the Senate from splitting as widely as they would if the $20 per head income-tax-reduction bill passed by the House were the only amendment before the Senate to the administration's bill extending present corporate and excise-tax rates.

To eliminate the administration points made against the House bill that (a) it would reduce next year's revenues by $2,100 million to $2,300 million without providing compensating taxes; and (b) order this reduction months before the state of the 1956 economy could possibly be estimated.

To provide a show by the Senate Democratic leadership of standing by the House Democratic leadership for more relief to the low-income group than was afforded in 1954 by the Republican-inspired 10 percent income tax cut.

To save as much of the face of Speaker RAYBURN, who made the $20 per head bill his own, as was possible when demolishing the basis of his measure. This was an advance revenue reduction of $2,100 million to $2,300 million without providing for any recapture of the sum by new levies.

To maintain, on the surface anyhow, the unity of the Texas Democratic leadership of Congress—the Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, who managed the RAYBURN salvage operation in the Democratic Policy Committee.

ASSETS AND DEBITS

The operation was successful in some particulars and a failure in others. It did aline the Democratic leadership of the two branches on the strategy of pushing income-tax reduction in 1955 before the Republicans propose it, as they are expected to do, in the Presidential year of 1956. The operation did support the party argument that Republican tax relief is concentrated on corporations and the higher income groups while Democratic tax bills concentrate on the relief of citizens who earn $5,000 a year or less. By closing a loophole in the 1954 Republican measure which threatened revenue losses deeply underestimated by the Treasury, the Democratic Senate proposal did put the administration on the defensive in this particular.

But not even the brave words with which the Democratic amendment was introduced could divert attention from the fact that, like the Rayburn measure, it was a partisan quickie, or conceal its statistical and other shortcomings. The device of adding optimistically calculated corporate-excise revenues for 1957 and 1958 to estimated 1956 collections was promptly exposed by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey today. The proposal to take away retroactively certain 1954 tax relief which small business especially has made the basis of this year's planning will disturb a group in which the Democrats assert special protective interest. And the effort to create a party front on the amendment in the Senate failed to enlist the cooperation of Senators BYRD and GEORGE, the acknowledged Democratic leaders in fiscal affairs.

THE BATTLE GROWS HOT

But the partisan conflict initiated by the sudden decision of Speaker RAYBURN to attach the $20 per head relief—a revenue-reducing measure—to the administration's bill to preserve for another year the corporate-excise rates—a revenue-maintenance measure—has already acquired the intense heat typical of such battles. Doubtless this has attracted Democratic support of the Senate majority amendment it would not otherwise have had. And some Republicans who long to be counted among those who would release several million taxpayers from the rolls—the effect of both the House and Senate Democratic amendments—will probably stand with the administration.

The more solid the party lines the clearer the interpartisan issue. It is likely, therefore, that the Democratic leaders in both branches welcome this effect of the rising political heat and calculate that it will supply a useful campaign issue in 1956. They have now been termed "irresponsible" in fiscal policy by both the President and Secretary Humphrey. Today the Secretary, in discussing the Senate revision of the Rayburn plan, added the term "silly" with reference to the estimates of its revenue yield. The Democrats were quick to protest that "silly" added insult to their already injured feelings over the use of "irresponsible" in describing anything sponsored by such a statesman as they proclaim RAYBURN to be.

All this has developed into pitched battle the first wholly partisan maneuver by the Democrats at this session of Congress. There will be party deserters and casualties, and some of the wounds may prove politically fatal in 1956. But actually Congress, after a lot of nonsensical forecasts of how high the 84th would rise above partisanship, is now behaving the way it always does with an opposition majority and a Presidential election 1 year away.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I began this discussion by saying I thought these unexpected maneuvers have become a test of the faith of Congress and the people in the fiscal program of President Eisenhower.

Before I end my discussion of prosperity and responsibility I wish to move back onto an affirmative note. Let us take stock of our situation and see which way we are headed under the program of the administration and by reason of its accomplishment to date. Are we moving up or down? Is there hope or fear for the future?

First, and above all, we have a sound dollar, whose stability has weathered and survived the post-Korean adjustment. Therefore we can have faith in it.

Employment is up nearly 4 million. Unemployment is down a third or more from the high.

Bank deposits are up from $129 billion to $163 billion. Disposable income is up from $247 billion to $255 billion.

I have here, Mr. President, a number of other indices which I shall not read, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the indices were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Low	Current
Employment (millions):		
January 1954	59.7	
February 1955		63.3
Unemployment (millions) (high):		
February 1954	3.7	
February 1955		3.38
Bank (debits and demand) (billions):		
February 1953	129.6	
January 1955		163.4
Disposable income (billions):		
1st quarter 1953	247.8	
4th quarter 1954		255.9
Gross national product (billions):		
3d quarter 1953	356	
4th quarter 1954		361
Auto production (1,000's per month)	221	668
Steel production (1,000's per month)	6,628	8,500
TV production (1,000's per month)	307	698
Textile production	91	101
Rubber goods production	97	133
Individual income (billions per year)	284.4	291.1
New construction (billions per month)	3.0	3.4

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to make these interesting observations:

New construction is up from $3 billion a month to $3.4 billion.

Factory orders are up from $20.7 billion to $25.4 billion.

Factory shipments are up from $23.3 billion to $24.9 billion.

Retail sales are up from $13.6 billion to $14.9 billion.

1955 looks good. All the authorities indicate a belief that it will be better than 1954.

Who wants to change this and return to inflation?

First. The consumer, whose prices have been stabilized?

Second. The union members, whose wage raises are now actual instead of theoretical?

I quote an article printed in the New York Times, February 1, 1955, which reports:

AFL REPORTS PAY AT POSTWAR PEAK—FINDS STABILIZED PRICES HELP MAINTAIN BUYING POWER—JOB PERILS DISCERNED

MIAMI BEACH, January 31.—The American Federation of Labor reported today that unionized workers had fared better on the wage front in the "recession year" of 1954 than in any other postwar year.

A research report was given by the federation's staff economists. It said higher hourly wages and stable living costs had given most workers their greatest postwar gains in purchasing power.

This was true, the report said, even though the average pay rise of 5 to 9 cents an hour had been modest by comparison with the increases in previous years. Last year the wage earner got the full benefit of his fatter pay envelope. In other years inflation gobbled up much of its gains, the economists explained.

The report was prepared for submission to the AFL executive council. The group opens its midwinter meeting at the Monte Carlo Hotel here tomorrow.

Third. The managers of 4 million businesses, whose freedom of action has been restored? Charles Dickens had Mr. Micawber say in David Copperfield:

Annual income 20 pounds, annual expenditures 19–19–6, result happiness.

Annual income 20 pounds, annual expenditures 20–0–6, result misery.

Mr. Keyserling, as chairman of Mr. Truman's Council of Economic Advisers said, in his mid-year report to the President in 1950:

Confidence is no substitute for sound policy. But sound policy must rest upon confidence commensurate with our natural resources, our business equipment and skills, and our uniquely proficient working population.

Secretary Humphrey expressed the confidence generated by the present administration's program when he said:

I once said my job was like taking over the wheel of a runaway truck speeding down an icy hill. We have that truck in hand now. If we can just keep doing what is right, we can handle it.

I am sure that our country's economy can ill afford to have the fiscal thrill drivers of the past take control of the vehicle of our economy by this proposal.

We now have a sound policy, backed by the spiritual force of confidence, which is faith. This is a firm foundation on which to build that hope for the future which is prosperity. By this proposal we are asked to risk all this, for a present benefit of 2½ cents a day—not even chewing gum.

It seems to me that to do this would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility on the part of Congress. I am sure it would not represent the wise judgment of the people whose welfare we are supposed to serve. I am sure that, on saner reflection, the Senate will reject it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that during the time the Finance Committee was holding hearings on the bill the most enthusiastic supporters of the accelerated depreciation formula were the small-business men and the farmers of America?

Mr. BENNETT. There can be no question about that. Amortization through tax amortization certificates was made possible at a much more rapidly accelerated rate than the law of 1954 provides. The tremendous advantage which was made possible only to big business has long made the small-business men feel that they were injustly dealt with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not also a fact that, under the present acceleration formula, the large corporations will actually have a lesser rate of depreciation than they had under the old amortization formula?

Mr. BENNETT. Much less; yes. Let us suppose that with a tax-amortization certificate a company could amortize a building with a normal 30-year life in 1956. Thereafter it could deduct six times as much depreciation a year as could its competitor, which had the same kind of a building, but no certificate.

The greatest privilege the 1954 act gives is the right to deduct twice as much for 1 year, or approximately 1½ times as much for the second year, 1¼ for the third year, and from there on the taxpayer may not deduct as much as he would if he stayed on the straight-line system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that under the present law which was passed by the Congress last year, for the first time in history there is provided a mathematical formula for depreciation which is applicable to all taxpayers, small and large alike?

Mr. BENNETT. That is not quite true, because, as I have tried to point out, by administrative fiat in 1942 the Bureau made that pattern available to taxpayers, but at a lesser rate, starting at 150 percent instead of 200 percent the first year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is now automatically available, and a taxpayer does not have to curry favor with some bureaucrat in order to obtain the benefit.

Mr. BENNETT. It is provided in the law. If it were not in the law, the ordinary taxpayer would not know it existed. Someone would have to tip him off.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He does not have to know the right official in order to get the benefit of the formula.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have had prepared a statement based on a $100 asset, assuming that with a 10-percent annual depreciation the taxpayer would take a 10-percent reduction each year for 10 years. If the life of the $100 asset were for more than 3 years, and if it were acquired new since January 1 last year, the taxpayer could exercise his option and use the rapid writeoff method. Under these conditions the alternative methods could be compared as follows:

	Rapid write-off rate	Straight line rate
First year	$20	$10
Second year	16	10
Third year	12.8	10
Fourth year	10.2	10
Fifth year	8.2	10
Sixth year	6.5	10
Seventh year	5.2	10
Eighth year	4.2	10
Ninth year	3.4	10
Tenth year	2.8	10

It indicates that there is no loss to the Government over that period of time. Further, should taxes be increased during the period, the Government would gain instead of losing.

Mr. BENNETT. It is interesting to observe that the taxpayers who, in World War II, had the great advantage of certificates of amortization, were able to postpone and for 5 years avoid the full burden of the tax rate, but they were actually worse off than those who did not have such certificates, because the tax rates went up after World War II, when they had lost the chance to make deductions.

Mr. BYRD. I have lately been building a cannery for canning apples. I discussed and considered the matter fully with my auditors, and I decided not to take the rapid depreciation method. Looking into the future, I felt I was better off to take the straight line rate, because, as the Senator knows as a businessman—and a good one—the most valuable asset which any businessman has today is the unused depreciation rate.

Mr. BENNETT. When I was in the middle of my prepared speech, I digressed to observe that in 1947 the company with which I am connected faced the same choice on the basis of the administrative ruling. We decided we would be better off if we took the straight line rate, so we rejected the other method. It is not a completely unmixed blessing.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I was especially desirous of asking a question or two of the Senator from Utah, and did not know that he was about to yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Did I understand the Senator from Utah to say that the provisions in the 1954 act with reference to accelerated depreciation benefits to the taxpayer were similar in principle to the operation of existing regulations of the Treasury Department?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Utah aware of the fact that under the 1954 act a taxpayer who buys new equipment or new machinery can get accelerated depreciation of 200 percent of the normal amount in the earlier years?

Mr. BENNETT. For the first year only.

Mr. KERR. For the first year; and then 200 percent?

Mr. BENNETT. No; 160 percent of the actual original cost of the machinery, in the second year.

Mr. KERR. Yes; but still 200 percent of the normal depreciation of the balance.

Mr. BENNETT. Ah, but when a taxpayer uses the straight line method, he does not calculate depreciation on the declining balance; it calculates it only on the original cost.

Mr. KERR. Without losing the point I wish to make, under the 1954 act the taxpayer can apply the accelerated rate with reference to new machinery and continue the long line depreciation with reference to old machinery; is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct; but it was possible prior to that time for him to continue at the so-called Wyatt rates on the same basis.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Utah not aware of the fact that under the regulation to which he referred, any time the taxpayer took advantage of the privilege to apply the 150 percent of the regular annual amount of depreciation of new equipment, he had to accept the penalty on the balance of depreciation he was entitled to on old equipment.

Mr. BENNETT. That was never explained to me by the representative of the Internal Revenue Service. He took the position that in the case of a new asset, the new depreciation system was started on that asset, which is the same condition as exists under the 1954 act.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Utah be surprised to know that that statement is inaccurate?

Mr. BENNETT. Am I to understand it to be the point of view of the Senator from Oklahoma that once a man chose to use the declining balance method, under what I call the Wyatt administrative decision, he was forced to recast his depreciation and use that method on everything else?

Mr. KERR. With this resulting penalty: That if he had a million dollars' worth of equipment which he had been depreciating at 10 percent a year, he would be entitled to $100 credit a year on his old equipment.

If he bought half a million dollars' worth of new equipment and sought to depreciate it at the accelerated rate, then his depreciation on his old equipment would be reduced to what it would have been had he started in on the 150 percent accelerated rate with reference to the old equipment.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not understand that to be the case. If that was in fact what was done, then I should say that the Internal Revenue Service was dishonest in its relation to the taxpayer, because the taxpayer certainly is entitled, having depreciated an asset to a certain point, to follow it out to the end; and it would be manifestly dishonest to say that because he had used the straight line system to a certain point, he would lose the difference between the straight line system and the declining balance system simply because he chose to apply the declining balance system on another asset.

Mr. KERR. I can only say to the distinguished Senator from Utah that what I have said to him is correct. If he will go to the trouble to make inquiry, the Senator from Utah will find that what I have said is correct, and that there is a great difference between the principle under the old 150-percent accelerated privilege and that of the 200-percent privilege under the new law.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. Indeed, the Senator may.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma, to take a specific case, that if a taxpayer, using the straight-line method, had gone through half the period of depreciation, and his asset had been reduced thereby to half of its depreciable value, and he then at the halfway point, went over onto the Wyatt method, or if he had started according to the Wyatt method, and he had got to the halfway point, the actual depreciated value or remaining depreciable value of his asset would be something like one-third of its value?

Is the Senator saying that on that basis the Treasury says the taxpayer may not have the privilege of recapture which existed between the halfway point he had arrived at under the straight-line method, and the two-thirds point he would have arrived at under the other method?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. Under the old, Wyatt method, to which the Senator has referred, before the taxpayer could get the 150-percent rate, he first would have had to show a rapidly declining asset or a special situation other than that normally existing to get that benefit; and, in addition, if he were a taxpayer who was in business, and who had been following the normal rate of depreciation, and then sought and secured the privilege to depreciate more rapidly an addition to his facility or plant, he would be penalized on his old depreciable asset the difference between what he would have got had he continued the straight-line rate and what he would have got had he put the 150-percent principle into effect on the old asset at the beginning of the depreciable period.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma that that penalty was permanent and complete; that the taxpayer never would be able to recoup that part of the value of his asset which represented the difference between the two points?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct; the taxpayer had to make an election between those two methods.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I should say we are proposing to correct a manifestly inequitable, unfair operation, and it is a good thing that we are.

Mr. KERR. I would not want to dispute that statement on the part of the Senator from Utah; but I am certain he is grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma for correcting his impression about what the situation was concerning the matter to which he addressed himself.

Mr. BENNETT. I shall reserve my expression of gratitude until I have been able to check the situation with the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If X corporation had used the old-line method, as the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, whereby it would not have been possible for it to change over to the 150 percent under the Wyatt method, but had wanted to make a $100 million expansion in plant, all that it would have been necessary to do would be to set up a separate corporation or entity in the old corporation to hold all the stock, build the new plant, and write it off at the rapid rate of amortization. Is not that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not pretend to pose as an authority on the tax-saving possibilities of that situation. If the Senator from Delaware will permit me to do so, I should like to yield the floor and go to lunch.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield for a further question, I think he will find it is correct that it will not be possible to find that any farmers have been able to set themselves up separately. Under the existing law, passed last year, for the first time in the history of this country the American farmer and small-business man have been placed in a position where they do not have to hire expensive lawyers or to curry favor to get the same type of depreciation which previously was allowed only to the chosen few.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma, as soon as he gets the floor, intends to correct some of the erroneous impressions held by the Senator from Delaware, according to the statements he has made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware will be looking forward to the statement by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, as a preface to my remarks, and I shall be brief, I desire to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on his comprehensive and convincing presentation of the financial situation in which we find ourselves as a nation. In his opening address on H. R. 4259, the able chairman of the Finance Committee depicted very clearly and with absolute accuracy the dangers that would arise from any ill-considered or unwarranted reduction in income-tax revenues at this time. I am glad to associate myself with the views of my good friend on the other side of the aisle, and I extend to him my congratulations and my thanks.

For my own part, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize my firm conviction that we do not have to look beyond the present national debt to find ample justification for opposing the proposed tax reduction at this time.

As we consider the dangers that confront us in these days of uneasy peace, we cannot escape the conclusion that the national debt hangs over our heads as a constant threat to the stability and security of our Nation.

Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today.

It should be a matter of deep concern to every American that in 20 years the national debt has been multiplied almost 10 times, and is now approaching the fantastic total of almost $280 billion.

Twenty years ago, when we were fighting the worst depression we ever had, the Federal debt was less than $29 billion. Since the end of World War II the debt burden has been increased by $20 billion.

It is frightening to realize that the public and private debt of the American people has reached a total of more than $600 billion—3 times as much as the debt of 15 years ago.

In the last 5 years alone, the public and private debt has increased by $50 billion.

The same pattern of bigger debt, year after year, has been followed by State and local governments. Their debts have increased 16 percent in 1 year alone, reaching a total of $38 billion on June 30, 1954.

Mr. President, there is real cause for alarm in the tragic fact that while the debt burden is increasing by millions every day, many of our people do not seem to be worried about it.

They take the position that we are a strong Nation, we are prosperous, our people have a backlog of savings, times are good, the national income is high; why worry?

But the danger is all about us. If for any reason we should be forced into a decline—even a slight decline—in business activity, jobs, and income, the staggering burden of debt could prove too much for our economy to sustain and could bring us to disaster.

Our people should be reminded that the debt, which so many hold so lightly, is not a mere bookkeeping item. It will

have to be paid by generations far in the future—out of the earnings of Americans who had no part in creating the debt.

Uncontrolled debt, rising higher and higher year after year, places a crushing burden on the economic structure of our country and points the way to possible financial collapse.

Therefore, Mr. President, I find it impossible to accept the proposal that we should now borrow more money, that we should go deeper in the red, in order to reduce taxes.

Mr. President, no one regrets more than I do that we have not yet been able to achieve a balanced budget. The Eisenhower administration has done a real job in directing our fiscal affairs toward that objective. The administration has brought about substantial reductions in Government spending, and is doing everything possible to bring nearer the day when we can have a balanced budget.

That effort should have our united support. It would be most unfortunate if the trend in that direction should now be reversed, pushing further and further into the future any hope of a balanced budget.

Finally, Mr. President, there can be no doubt that continued deficit financing and ever-increasing debt are the greatest causes of inflationary pressure that destroys the value of our currency, shrinks the purchasing power of all earnings, and places a heavy burden upon every household.

The record of history, from ancient times to our own day, shows very clearly that more nations have been brought to destruction by excessive debt and excessive taxation than by invading armies.

Mr. KERR obtained the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me, to permit me at this time to make a correction, and to make a statement in connection therewith?

Mr. KERR. Yes; if it will not take too long. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to correct and clarify the RECORD concerning the unjust and mistaken charges of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey that I was predicting a depression in early 1954.

At the hearings on the tax bill on February 28, 1955, the Secretary declared that Democratic Senators "were saying that we were going to be in a great depression". On being challenged by the Senator from Oklahoma to name one, the Secretary rejoined: "Senator DOUGLAS said it a number of times"; and, again, "He said he did not want us to go into a depression, but he said that was where we were headed."

Mr. President, I categorically denied this at the hearings, and submitted for the record four different statements of mine in early 1954 which directly refuted the charge, and in which I stated that I did not predict a depression. The Secretary then referred to certain other hearings as the place where my alleged statements were made, and I read from those hearings, and again refuted his charge.

Following the hearings, however, in a further effort to support his groundless charge, the Secretary submitted for the record some excerpts from a letter which I addressed to President Eisenhower on February 19, 1954. He also sent some excerpts from two newspaper clippings of November 1953. These appear on pages 21 and 22 of the hearings.

I did not predict a depression, as he had charged, in any of the excerpts. But since these were widely publicized as if in proof of his charges, I felt that in deference to the facts and in justice to myself, I should make it quite clear how the Secretary has attempted, by quotations out of context, to make it appear that I said the opposite of what I did in fact write.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the added matter submitted to the Finance Committee by the Secretary be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the hearing on Monday it was suggested that I should provide quotations to support my assertion that some Democrats had suggested we might be heading for a depression.

I feel that Senator DOUGLAS' letter to the President of February 19 contains some such statements (extracts are attached). The assertion that "to prevent the recession from deepening into a depression" and "a look at the present economic situation indicates, in my judgment, that the time for action is here" would seem to me to indicate a fear that we were heading into a depression. This fear is supported by Senator DOUGLAS' suggestion in the same letter urging the President to advocate immediate increases of $200 in personal exemptions as a solution to the problem. You will recall that exemptions were not increased and that a depression did not occur.

In a story in the Detroit Free Press on November 9, 1953 (excerpts from which are attached) Senator DOUGLAS is quoted as saying "in the last 5 or 6 weeks the industrial slump has been gaining momentum." In a story in the Detroit News on November 9 (excerpts from which are attached) Senator DOUGLAS was quoted as saying he had seen signs of a "growing industrial recession" especially in the automobile and farm equipment fields.

These are among the items which are immediately available on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Attachments.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM SENATOR DOUGLAS, FEBRUARY 19, 1954, AS PRINTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, VOLUME 100, PART 2, PAGES 2871–2872

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to reconsider your tax proposals in the light of later clarifications in the economic picture. * * *

A look at the present economic situation indicates, in my judgment, that the time for action is here. At least we should take some initial effective steps to counteract the downward trend. * * *

To prevent the recession from deepening into a depression, it is, therefore, far better to stimulate consumption than it is savings. * * *

Therefore, I sincerely hope that you will see fit to advocate immediate increases of $200 in personal exemptions on individual income taxes and selective decreases in the excise taxes. * * *

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

[From the Detroit Free Press of November 9, 1953]

AUTO SLUMP DUE, DOUGLAS ASSERTS

(By Miller M. Hollingsworth, staff writer)

The breakdown in farm prices has started an industrial recession which will soon strike Detroit in full force, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS said here Sunday night. * * *

"In the last 5 or 6 weeks the industrial slump has been gaining momentum," said DOUGLAS in a TV interview and a press conference. He appeared on the television program, Meet the UAW–CIO.

The Senator said he was alarmed over the situation in the farm-equipment manufacturing plants brought on by the slumping agriculture and cattle prices.

* * * * *

He expressed alarm over the immediate future of automobile production in the face of slackening demand, particularly in the agricultural areas.

"I have seen dealer after dealer not only with their floors crowded with cars they couldn't sell, but also with new automobiles on their lots," said the Senator. "They just can't sell them."

* * * * *

"I don't want to spread alarm, but I'm afraid Detroit is headed for a mighty rough time."

[From the Detroit News of November 9, 1953]

PERIL SEEN BY DOUGLAS IN TAX CUT

Congress can reduce taxes next year only if the Nation is willing to jeopardize its security, Senator DOUGLAS told a Detroit audience last night.

He also said that in the last 6 weeks he had seen signs of a "growing industrial recession" especially in the automobile and farm-equipment fields.

DOUGLAS spoke before the Men's Club of Beth Aaron Synagogue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in further support of my own position, I had inserted in the hearing record of the committee the full text of my letter of February 19, 1954, to President Eisenhower. It appears on pages 46 to 48. In that letter I stated not once, but twice, that I did not predict a depression. These parts of the letter, which with a great deal more of the letter were omitted by the Secretary, were as follows:

So far as my being a prophet is concerned, I have not predicted a depression. But I have, as emphatically as I could, tried to keep our Nation on its toes and ready to act to stop a worsening of the economic picture.

The above appears as paragraph 3 of my letter to the President of the United States, which the Secretary completely omitted; and

While I believe we are in a very definite recession, I still do not predict a depression. We have erected many safety nets during the past 20 years to prevent the bottom from dropping out of the national economy.

This quotation appears in paragraph 7, lines 1 to 3 in my letter to the President, which the Secretary omitted entirely.

So that the fragmentary nature of the excerpts by the Secretary torn out of the whole context of my letter may be easily understood, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my letter of February 19, 1954, to the President be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that in a parallel column opposite their place in the full text, the Secretary's excerpts be printed. Mr. President, I have prepared this material in tabular form, which shows that the Secretary jumped from one passage to another, and omitted the direct statements which would have contradicted his charge and imputation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the text and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR DOUGLAS' LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT—FULL TEXT

FEBRUARY 19, 1954.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to reconsider your tax proposals in the light of later clarifications in the economic picture. I believe, after careful reflection, that you will agree with me that increasing personal exemptions for income-tax purposes to $800, and drastic reductions in taxes on consumer goods (excise taxes) would be far more just and stabilizing than the current administration proposals which are primarily aimed to stimulate savings through tax reductions to corporations and to the upper-income groups.

I hope that, by now, you realize that my attempts during the past 3 months to alert the country on the need to be on guard against depression neither mark me as a "prophet of doom and gloom," nor represent any desire to "talk the country into a depression." Perhaps it is true that my party would get more votes this fall if the country were to go into a depression. But, it seems obvious that if our motives were selfish and political, the course I would have followed would have been to remain silent and let it happen. I would rather the Democratic Party remain out of power perpetually rather than return to power in the wake of the mass misery of a great depression.

So far as my being a prophet is concerned, I have not predicted a depression. But I have, as emphatically as I could, tried to keep our Nation on its toes and ready to act to stop a worsening of the economic picture.

A look at the present economic situation indicates, in my judgment, that the time for action is here. At least we should take some initial effective steps to counteract the downward trend.

The Census Bureau now estimates that there were 3.1 million unemployed in January, or 750,000 more than they had estimated a few weeks before. There is no doubt, therefore, that unemployment has increased markedly in the last few months. In addition the Census figures for January estimated that there were 275,000 temporarily laid off who were counted as having a job although they drew no pay and would not have been permitted by their employer to work had they showed up at their former jobs. Employers have also put large numbers on part time in order to spread the work and reduce the payments which they would otherwise have to make to the State unemployment compensation funds. During the month of January the Census estimates that there were 1.9 millions of workers outside of agriculture who actually worked less than 15 hours a week, 1.7 millions from 15 to 21 hours and 1.6 millions from 22 to 29 hours. In all, therefore, 5.2 million workers, or 10 percent of those employed in nonagricultural occupations, worked less than 30 hours a week. Some of this lost time was caused by absenteeism, sickness and voluntary abstention from work, but a large proportion was undoubtedly involuntary and caused by the employer putting the workers on part time.

SECRETARY HUMPHREY'S EXCERPTS

EXTRACTS FROM LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM SENATOR DOUGLAS, FEBRUARY 19, 1954, AS PRINTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, VOLUME 100, PART 2, PAGES 2871–2872

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to reconsider your tax proposals in the light of later clarifications in the economic picture. * * *

A look at the present economic situation indicates, in my judgment, that the time for action is here. At least we should take some initial effective steps to counteract the downward trend. * * *

SENATOR DOUGLAS' LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT—FULL TEXT—continued

The ratio of farm prices received to prices paid by farmers is hovering at its lowest point in 12 years. Steel production has dropped to only 75 percent of capacity compared with 99 percent a year ago, and is 21 percent below last year in physical volume. Freight car loadings are down 10 percent. Mail order sales are over 13 percent below last year and retail sales have fallen off somewhat. Business failures have risen by almost 50 percent.

While I believe we are in a very definite recession, I still do not predict a depression. We have erected many safety nets during the past 20 years to prevent the bottom from dropping out of the national economy. We have farm price supports, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, collective bargaining, social security, assistance to the needy aged, blind, and dependent children, insured savings deposits and housing programs, to mention a few of these safeguards. But while they may very well cushion the heaviest impact of a depression such as the one which began 25 years ago, that is about as far as they can go. They, by themselves, will not stop the economy from getting into a tight situation.

Thus, I am urging you, as an immediate step, to alter your tax proposals. I know that you are subjected to tremendous pressures to grant the vast majority of tax relief to business, investors, and those in the upper income brackets generally. But what is needed as a stabilizing force in the economy is a tax policy to stimulate purchasing power. Increased purchasing power will mean more consumption, sales, services, production, and employment. In short, it will mean more business activity which will do much to reverse the downward trend.

I know it has been argued that stimulants to business and investors are what is needed to keep the economy up. It is argued that by giving such incentives business will expand production and hence increase employment. But under such a premise, who will buy the goods? Only adequate monetary purchasing power broadly distributed can do this.

A reduction in taxes to the upper income groups and to corporations would probably stimulate savings. In normal times, savings are converted into investments and give each worker more capital with which to work. This in turn leads to increased productivity and to higher real wages.

But in times such as these while savings may flow into banks, they do not flow out to the same degree in the form of actual investments since businesses are afraid to borrow and banks are afraid to lend. With the large supply of idle industrial equipment on hand business in general does not want to borrow to add to it. The savings therefore tend to be in large part sterilized and do not expand production and employment as they would in normal times.

To prevent the recession from deepening into a depression, it is therefore far better to stimulate consumption than it is savings.

The idea of giving tax relief only to business and investors as a stabilizing force is simply the old trickle down theory or what's good for business is good for the country. Such policies followed in the twenties, ended up with the greatest depression this Nation ever had. What is necessary is a trickle up theory or what's good for the country is good for business. If people have money to buy, business will have markets and persons will have jobs.

The present administration tax proposals, when in full effect, give investors and business 12 times as much relief as individuals. Individuals would get only $250 million in the form of such items as baby sitter allowances and an increase in allowable medical deductions. Recipients of dividends would

SECRETARY HUMPHREY'S EXCERPTS—continued

'To prevent the recession from deepening into a depression, it is, therefore, far better to stimulate consumption than it is savings. * * *

SENATOR DOUGLAS' LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT—FULL TEXT—continued

get $1.2 billion and businesses would get $1.8 billion, for a total of nearly $3 billion.

Yet saying that individuals would get only one-twelfth of the relief given to investors and business is vastly to understate the disparity. Let us analyze this further.

The average individual would get $6 in tax relief ($250 million divided by 39 million tax returns showing taxable income) while the average dividend recipient would ultimately get $200 ($1.2 billion dividend by 6 million stockholders) or 33 times as much. The discrimination is still understated since less than 4 percent of the taxpayers receiving dividends (those with income over $10,000) get more than three-fourths of all taxable dividends (see table I of Treasury Release No. H-266, Oct. 8, 1953). If we consider families rather than tax returns, we find that less than 1 percent of the American families own 80 percent of all publicly held stocks.

This seems unfair, and I believe it is. Yet the cause I am pleading is based not only on justice, but on the economic needs of the Nation. For tax relief to individuals means increased purchases and business activity.

Let us consider a family of four—husband, wife, and two children. Increasing personal income tax exemptions by $200 would give total extra personal exemptions of $800. At the lowest tax rate of 20 percent, this would mean tax savings of $160 a year, enough to buy a major appliance, or any one of several dozens of goods and services on the market. It would mean an increase of about 8 cents an hour in take-home pay.

Lower taxes on consumer goods, meanwhile, would leave more money for the purchase of other items and hence greater purchasing power.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that you will see fit to advocate immediate increases of $200 in personal exemptions on individual income taxes and selective decreases in the excise taxes.

When I advocated such measures while representatives of your administration were before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, they seemed to have little sympathy for them. I have hitherto advocated such policies in radio and television discussions, and in talks before and with businessmen of my own State of Illinois. I found in most cases that there was a wide public appreciation of their merit.

I should like also to call your attention to a reasoned, powerful statement made in the Senate today by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE of Georgia, ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance and its former chairman. Senator GEORGE recognizes and ably stated the case, that the situation calls for tax relief for the millions of individual taxpayers, and an expansion of purchasing power. He advocated, as have I, an immediate increase of at least $200 in the personal income exemption. His competence as a tax authority commands the most serious consideration of his views.

If you adopt these suggestions, I believe Congress will enact them. There may be some opposition in the ranks of your own party, but we Democrats, I believe, will provide the force you need to enact such tax revisions, just as we have helped to provide the necessary support for the main lines of your foreign policies.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

SECRETARY HUMPHREY'S EXCERPTS—continued

Therefore, I sincerely hope that you will see fit to advocate immediate increases of $200 in personal exemptions on individual income taxes and selective decreases in the excise taxes. * * *

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to point out again in the full text the very explicit—but omitted—statements of mine directly to the contrary of what the Secretary has charged.

I believe it will be clear that the asterisks in the Secretary's matter cover a big part of my letter, and parts which directly refute his claim. Note, especially, the whole of paragraph 3 and the first two sentences of paragraph 7.

While the excerpts from the Detroit Free Press article were not quite as unfair in what they omit, they are decidedly fragmentary; and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the full text

of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the parallel column showing the Secretary's excerpts at the appropriate place in the full text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the text and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL TEXT OF ARTICLE

[From the Detroit Free Press of November 9, 1953]

AUTO SLUMP DUE, DOUGLAS ASSERTS—SAYS DEALERS ARE OVERSTOCKED; SENATOR RAPS GOP FARM POLICY

(By Miller M. Hollingsworth, Free Press staff writer)

The breakdown in farm prices has started an industrial recession which will soon strike Detroit in full force, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said here Sunday night.

DOUGLAS said Detroit automobile manufacturers are maintaining high production through the artificial means of forcing cars on dealers under some pressure.

"In the last 5 or 6 weeks the industrial slump has been gaining momentum," said DOUGLAS, in a TV interview and a press conference. He appeared on the television program, "Meet the UAW-CIO."

The Senator said he was alarmed over the situation in the farm equipment manufacturing plants brought on by the slumping agriculture and cattle prices.

"Farm-machinery plants in Moline, Ill., and other places are laying off men and working on a drastically shortened schedule," he said.

Because an estimated fourth of the Nation's farm equipment is manufactured or distributed by Detroit firms, this cutback in demand may also affect the local work force, though DOUGLAS didn't mention this.

He said the depressed agricultural situation developed because the administration failed to give farmers the support prices they are entitled to under Federal law.

DOUGLAS said farmers are entitled to $1.61 support for a bushel of corn and are receiving only $1.30. In wheat, he said, they are getting only $1.70 a bushel and are entitled to $2.30.

He expressed alarm over the immediate future of automobile production in the face of slackening demand, particularly in the agricultural areas.

"I have seen dealer after dealer not only with their floors crowded with cars they couldn't sell, but also with new automobiles on their lots," said the Senator. "They just can't sell them.

"In most instances the regional men have forced these cars on the dealers under threats of canceling their franchises.

"I don't want to spread alarm, but I'm afraid Detroit is headed for a mighty rough time."

Senator DOUGLAS said the underlying cause for what he called an economic letdown was that the Eisenhower Administration had given the Nation too big a dose of big business.

He said the voters in recent elections, both in a Wisconsin farm area and a suburban district in New Jersey, have shown they are disappointed with the Republican Administration.

"The voters are showing resentment toward the big business tactics that have been forced upon them," DOUGLAS asserted.

"Why, there is more money in Ike's cabinet now than in the Treasury."

He said prospects for the Democrats sweeping back into power in 1954 were good—so good in fact that he was toying with the idea of seeking reelection. Several months ago DOUGLAS indicated he would not run again.

DOUGLAS said that Senator MCCARTHY, Republican of Wisconsin, had a strong support in one segment of the population and that his influence should not be underestimated.

Later Sunday DOUGLAS spoke before the Men's Club of Beth Aaron Synagog in the synagog at 18000 Wyoming.

SECRETARY HUMPHREY'S EXCERPTS

[From the Detroit Free Press of November 9, 1953]

AUTO SLUMP DUE, DOUGLAS ASSERTS

(By Miller M. Hollingsworth, staff writer)

The breakdown in farm prices has started an industrial recession which will soon strike Detroit in full force, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS said here Sunday night. * * *

"In the last 5 or 6 weeks the industrial slump has been gaining momentum," said DOUGLAS in a TV interview and a press conference. He appeared on the television program, Meet the UAW-CIO.

The Senator said he was alarmed over the situation in the farm-equipment manufacturing plants brought on by the slumping agriculture and cattle prices.

* * * * *

He expressed alarm over the immediate future of automobile production in the face of slackening demand, particularly in the agricultural areas.

"I have seen dealer after dealer not only with their floors crowded with cars they couldn't sell, but also with new automobiles on their lots," said the Senator. "They just can't sell them."

* * * * *

"I don't want to spread alarm, but I'm afraid Detroit is headed for a mighty rough time."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from a reading of the full text of the newspaper report of that speech in Detroit on November 8, 1953, it will be clear that I was indeed warning of the drop I had observed in farm equipment production and automobile sales. My speech described an existing situation, and accurately cited the danger of some further slump. It did not predict a depression.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that what actually happened to employment in the automobile industry is not only history, but fully supported the serious look which I urged my audience to take of the situation in November of 1953, because the figures show—according to the Department of Commerce—that from an employment of 715,000 in October 1953, employment fell to 534,000 in August of 1954, or a decline of nearly 200,000, and slightly under 30 percent; and according to the Department of Labor, the decline was from 875,000 in October 1953, to 620,000 in September 1954—or, according to this, a decline of over 250,000.

The automobile employment figures—from the Survey of Current Business, United States Department of Commerce and from the Monthly Labor Review, United States Department of Labor—are as follows:

Month	Department of Commerce	Department of Labor
October 1953	715,000	875,500
November 1953	686,000	844,100
December 1953	707,000	862,900
January 1954	677,000	828,200
February 1954	655,000	803,100
March 1954	637,000	785,300
April 1954	625,000	770,900
May 1954	601,000	744,800
June 1954	594,000	739,500
July 1954	561,000	706,700
August 1954	534,000	677,600
September 1954	478,000	619,800
October 1954	561,000	701,800

I submit, therefore, Mr. President, that what happened in the automobile industry exactly bore out the predictions I had made in my speech in Detroit, in November of 1953.

Let me say that I deeply regret that in order to rewrite history to support inaccurate, political charges, the Secretary has been willing to tear words out of their context and to cite them to try to prove the exact opposite of what I said in the full text. The Secretary has not only failed to prove his case. He has, on the contrary, proved again how groundless his charges were, and has revealed an unfortunate willingness to resort to the irresponsible method of quoting a person out of context.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to deal fairly with Secretary Humphrey in regard to a point which occurred in the debate last week.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Illinois say that what the Secretary has done with reference to lifting certain sentences out of context would be one form of slight irresponsibility?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, I would say that if someone else had done it to the Secretary, I do not think the Secretary would have stopped with that word. But I wish to be charitable to the Secretary; and I merely submit these parallel columns, to let the reader make up his own mind. I do not believe in bandying loose charges about.

Mr. President, I wish at this same time to deal fairly with Secretary Humphrey on a point in the debate where I inadvertently referred to a different set of figures from those used by him on a television show, in estimating probable revenue losses from section 462 of last year's tax bill.

I therefore ask for unanimous consent to correct the RECORD for March 10, 1955, on page 2607, where I reported the response of the Secretary of the Treasury to a question propounded by Mr. Madigan on a nationwide telecast on the preceding Sunday.

The quotation, as it appears in the RECORD, is a correct report of what the Secretary said about earlier estimates. But in the context in which I cited the Secretary's remarks, I intended to cite his own estimate of that loss at the time of that telecast. While it does not change the point of argument, I want to be sure that the figures attributed to the Secretary are cited in the context in which he used them. These figures were 200 to 300 million dollars and I therefore ask that the sentence be corrected from "I will say $70 million or $80 million" to the correct quotation: "I don't know whether it might be two or three hundred million dollars or not."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

Mr. KERR obtained the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. GORE. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to do a favor for my distinguished friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I had hoped that he might be present during the course of my discussion, in order that he might be aware of the degree to which I am trying to be of service to him.

The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] illustrates one of the unfortunate features of this debate. In the first place, he propounded as his thesis how well off we are in this country today with reference to the vitality and strength of our economy.

I am sure he is familiar with the governmental statistics with reference to employment and unemployment, and with reference to the amount of the national production. I am sure he is aware that the monthly average unemployment in this country in 1953 was 1,600,000; that government figures tell us that unemployment in January, 1954, rose to 3,087,000; that the number of unemployed increased until, in January of 1955, it was 3,347,000; and that, rather than showing a favorable trend in February as compared with January, the figures show that the total unemployment increased to 3,387,000 in February of this year, according to the figures released by governmental agencies.

I refer the distinguished Senator from Utah to the statement and evidence given by the Secretary of the Treasury himself, Mr. Humphrey. When he was before the committee in certain hearings a few days ago he was asked if he was not aware of the continued increase in the number of unemployed and the continued decrease in the number of employed.

Finally, the Secretary of the Treasury made a statement to the effect that January, 1953, was the height of the Eisenhower boom. I think it is a statement of great accuracy and great significance. I believe the economy of the country was at the highest pitch in the month that Mr. Eisenhower became President of the United States than it has been or will be during the Eisenhower administration.

I am sure, Mr. President, that only the uninformed would take the position that economic production or employment are at a higher level today than then, or that they are now increasing, or that unemployment is at a lower level now or is presently decreasing.

The fact is that the number of employed in manufacturing in our country today is just barely what it was in February 1952.

The distinguished Senator from Utah referred to the fact that the rate of production is greater now than it was then. While it is true that the rate of production has not reached the height it attained 2 years ago, there has been some increase in the past few months, and the industrial production index for February 1955 is 132, as compared with 121 in February 1952. However, the fact is that the number of employed in manufacturing industry has not increased at all. The fact is also that the number of unemployed is now more than twice what it was in the average month of 1953.

I make the statement that the accelerated depreciation provision of the 1954 Revenue Code is in part responsible for this situation. The provision in last year's tax law, which we seek now to repeal, is an incentive to unemployment. That is demonstrable by an examination of the provisions of the law, and it is demonstrable on the basis of the record of the operation of the law.

The accelerated depreciation provision in last year's tax law, instead of doing what its proponents claimed it would do, which was to increase employment, is directly responsible for a lessening of employment and an increase in unemployment, and it is a positive incentive to both.

Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say it because the operation of that provision accelerates the rate at which we approach the status sometimes referred to as automation.

The Senator from Oklahoma would not take the posture of opposing progress in the development and utilization of more efficient machinery. Far from it. Neither would I take the position that government should by means of tax bonuses and special privileges accelerate the rate at which we are moving in that direction.

I believe one of the great problems of today is the difficulty labor encounters in being able to replace itself as it is displaced by more efficient machinery. The problem is acute enough in the normal development of our economy and the use of more efficient machinery, which results in greater production with fewer laborers and fewer hours of labor. When government steps in and provides tax bonuses, which constitute incentives and special privileges for those who accelerate the rate at which we approach automation, it is not only doing an injustice to our economy, but, when it happens to be the act of those who say it will increase the number of employees, it proves that they are mistaken in their claim. Furthermore, insofar as their doing something to increase employment and decrease unemployment, they perpetrate an economic fraud, because they produce exactly the opposite result to the one which they claimed would accrue from their act.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, made a statement before a House committee to the effect that the tax reduction of last year brought better times and more employment and put more people to work?

Mr. KERR. I am aware of it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is the Senator also familiar with the fact that although the provision was supposed to bring about the building of more factories, the installation of more machinery, and the creation of more jobs in the factories, the contrary is true, in that employment has gone down, instead of going up during the past year?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct in the statement of his conclusion. I should like to suggest an amendment to his question, however, wherein he asked if I knew that that provision was supported to bring about the opposite result. I am sure he meant to ask me if I was aware of the fact the proponents of the act claimed that that would be so?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Instead, it brought about the opposite result.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. If it had any effect, it had the effect of costing men their jobs. Is not that true?

Mr. KERR. Yes; and it accelerated the rate at which men lose their jobs by reason of improved machinery, as our economy moves in the direction of what we call automation.

Mr. LONG. If last year we had adopted the George amendment, which would have had the effect of spreading several billions of dollars of additional purchasing power among people in the low-income brackets, would we not have put more people to work?

Mr. KERR. Yes; it would have brought about greater purchasing power, more jobs and greater overall national production. The Senator from Louisiana is eminently correct.

The record is that in August 1953, there were 63,400,000 people gainfully employed in our country. As of February 1955, there were 3½ million fewer people gainfully employed.

The fact is that in manufacturing operations in August 1953, there were 17½ million employees, and in February 1955, there were 16,100,000 employees, or nearly 1½ million fewer employees than in August 1953.

The reason, among many, is a series of events of the character of the tax bonus provisions for the few which were included in the Revenue Act of 1954.

Today on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is a fine and able Member of the Senate, made a statement which some people might interpret to mean that he thought the proponents of the substitute proposal did not know what they were talking about.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think I recall making any such statement as that.

Mr. KERR. I should be delighted to have the Senator repeat his statement or refer me to that portion of the RECORD where he was discussing the subject with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], when the Senator from Delaware said that if the Senator from Texas knew what he was talking about he would know——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said that if the Senator understood the law as it was written he would know there was a certain catch in it. If I am in error in what I stated at the time I would be willing to incorporate in the RECORD a statement from the Treasury Department and let the RECORD stand. I do not think a taxpayer, under the old law, can accelerate depreciation on anything more than 33⅓ percent a year.

Mr. KERR. I shall try to correct the impression which the Senator from Delaware tried to create that the proponents of the substitute do not know what they are talking about. Second, I am going to try to correct the impression the Senator from Delaware tried to create when he indicated that he did know what he was talking about.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope that when the Senator from Oklahoma gets through I shall know what he was talking about, because I have been somewhat confused.

Mr. KERR. I am not surprised at the confussion of the Senator, and I am trying to clarify the situation. I shall do so with good will. I would not have intimated the possibility of the Senator from Delaware not being fully informed as to what he was talking about had he not made a statement on the floor indicating that the proponents of the substitute did not know what they were talking about. The Senator has just repeated his statement that under the Revenue Act of 1954 a taxpayer cannot depreciate an investment in tools or equipment or machinery at a greater rate than 33⅓ percent a year. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the RECORD will show that we were speaking of a Cadillac automobile.

Mr. KERR. The Senator said a taxpayer cannot depreciate an item at a greater rate than 33⅓ percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am still speaking about the point raised by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] regarding a Cadillac car. Let us keep to that subject.

Mr. KERR. I am glad the Senator has a feeling of approaching illumination which has caused him to hedge on what he said on this floor in the past 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not hedging at all. The Senator from Texas pointed out that one could depreciate a car at a 50-percent rate a year. If that be true, I am in error, and there is no need for the Senator to argue the point. I am sure the Senator thinks he is right, and I think I am right. I see on the floor at this time the chief of the staff of the Finance Committee, and I should be glad to ask him to correct the RECORD, if I am incorrect. I do not claim to be infallible, but it is my understanding that equipment cannot be depreciated under 3 years.

Mr. KERR. I am going to answer that point with pleasure, because in the statement which the Senator from Delaware made to the Senator from Texas, he did not limit himself with reference to what a taxpayer could do under this bill. In the second place, in his statement of about 5 minutes ago, he did not limit his statement to the depreciation of a Cadillac automobile. He said that under the act of 1954, a taxpayer could not depreciate an investment in machinery or equipment at a greater rate than 33⅓ percent a year.

Mr. President, the provision with regard to accelerated depreciation was inserted in the Revenue Act of 1954 as section 167. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to know what is in the law, he can either read it or listen to me. He can get his information either way. The act provides that accelerated depreciation benefits shall not be available in the case of an item the reasonable life of which is in excess of 3 years. But it also makes that the accelerated depreciation benefit available with reference to machinery or equipment with a reasonable life of 3 or more years. With reference to machinery or equipment the reasonable life of which is 3 years, under the old method of figuring depreciation, the taxpayer could depreciate its full value at one-third each year for 3 years, or 33⅓ percent a year.

Under the provision in the code which was adopted last year a taxpayer can accelerate depreciation so that he gets credit the first year of the life of that piece of machinery or equipment for 66⅔ percent of its total value.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I shall yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator, at a later point in his remarks, permit me to incorporate in the RECORD a statement prepared by Mr. Stamm, which will clear up the question of whether I am correct or incorrect? I know the Senator from Oklahoma thinks he is right, and I think I am right. I have asked the staff of the committee to prepare a statement, and I wonder if the Senator would permit me to have it incorporated in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. KERR. All the Senator needs to do is to refer to the language of the act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have referred to the language of the act, and I still think I am correct.

Mr. KERR. Subsection (c) of section 167 of the act provides for the use of certain methods and rates. Paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of subsection (b) apply only in the case of property described in subsection (a), with a useful life of 3 years or more.

I am showing that under the Revenue Act of 1954, the taxpayer can get as much as 66⅔ percent of the total cost of machinery as a depreciation item in the first year of his ownership of the item.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the staff will prepare a memorandum which can be placed in the RECORD later which will show items whose useful life is less than 3 years and items whose useful life is greater than 3 years, with a depreciation rate of 33⅓ percent.

Mr. KERR. The law plainly states that the accelerated depreciation provisions are not available for a useful life of less than 3 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. That means that they are available if the useful life is 3 years or more.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. If the useful life is 4 years——

Mr. KERR. Let us take 3 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us take it for 3 years. It would be technically 66⅔ percent; or, for 4 years, technically 50 percent, as the Senator from Texas has pointed out; except that there is a catch in it which provides that if the useful life is more than 3 years, the depreciation cannot exceed 33⅓ percent. That is the basis of a difference of opinion. I may be in error. However, the staff of the joint committee is preparing a memorandum on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me, since the Senator from Delaware has mentioned my name?

Mr. KERR. I shall be delighted to yield to the majority leader; then I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware to place in the RECORD that which I claim is a figment of his imagination, and not to be found in the act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Oklahoma may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware if he has changed the position he took this morning, when he questioned me and lectured me on not having studied the accelerated depreciation provisions sufficiently? As I recall, he stated that under no circumstances could there be a 50-percent depreciation in the first year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I have not changed my position. The Senator from Texas was speaking of how a Cadillac car could be depreciated at a rate of 50 percent. I took the position that I did not think that could be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have not changed my position. I still take the position that a Cadillac automobile can be depreciated 50 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think it can be. As I said before, I have asked the staff to prepare a memorandum on the subject. There is no need for the Senator from Texas and me to get into an argument on the question. I have asked the staff to prepare a memorandum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not provoke the argument. I tried to get the Senator from Delaware to withhold his argument so that I could attend a luncheon meeting. But for the Senator's information I wish to bring to his attention an excerpt from the House hearings, at which the distinguished and responsible Secretary of the Treasury was in attendance and testified on the proposed Democratic substitute which he had never seen, never read, never knew anything about.

Representative BOGGS, referring to a newspaper article, said:

And I shall read it. The Secretary does not have to comment on it if he does not want to.

"Free cars are for rich motorists only. You've got to be in a high tax bracket, where every deduction is merely a dollar earned. But say you're making $100,000 a year. You buy yourself an auto because you need it in your business. It has to be a fancy one, for purposes of prestige. This you'll probably have to prove to a skeptical tax collector.

"But the weight of the law's on your side. You spend $4,600 for a V-8 sedan deluxe."

At this point, Mr. President, I wish to correct the figure of $4,800 which I gave this morning. I resume the quotation of the article:

"This you classify in your tax returns as a piece of business equipment.

"Under the new tax laws, the cost of such equipment may be amortized at the rate of 50 percent the first year. This is where Congress did you that favor by mistake, according to my tax specialist."

I understood the distinguished Senator from Delaware in his lecture to us this morning to say that that could not be done.

"So you deduct $2,300 on your income-tax form after you've driven your fancy buggy 12 months. If you are in the proper high tax bracket this can save you a cool $2,000.

"So your super-dooper motor car at this stage of the game has cost you $2,600.

"Now you take your year-old sedan, which probably has been driven only 15,000 miles and looks like new, and sell it on the open market. You'll get, say, $3,400 for it. Since it has been amortized on the Government's books as being worth only $2,300, your gross profit on it is $1,100."

I should like to interject at this point, Mr. President, that I think that shows the viciousness of the whole accelerated depreciation program, not as it affects people who are going to keep a piece of property indefinitely, but as it affects those who keep it a couple of years, then sell it, and wind up with a profit by way of the capital-gain route.

I continue the quotation:

"This money is a capital gain and is taxable at 25 percent, or $275. So you deduct that from the $3,400 and your net proceeds from the sale are $3,125. Add to this your $2,000 tax saving, and you've got $5,125.

"Now you buy a new model for $4,600, and you've got $525 left—or enough to have it air-conditioned."

Secretary HUMPHREY—

Here is the responsible Secretary of the Treasury. Does he try to explain it away? No; he has been snake-bitten once. He tried to explain away this "blooper." What did he do? He had to come running to Congress quickly. He in effect said to the House, "Please have this bill introduced, hold hearings, and get action in the House before the Senate corrects the error."

What did the Secretary say in response to the statement by Representative BOGGS, who quoted an article in a reliable newspaper?

Secretary HUMPHREY. He would be even better off if he sold it for $4,000.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, do you mean that?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I imagine that is what is the trouble. Don't you? I can't tell about it, Mr. BOGGS, until I check into it. If there is a loophole there, we will look after it. But I imagine that the difficulty is getting the sales price.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, the reason I brought that up is that it leads me to a question or two about this depreciation provision. Now, there have been all kinds of estimates on what that may cost. In the debate on the recent measure in the House, I had before me an economist's estimate that it could run as high as a billion dollars in the first year or two. Is that true? Is there any basis for that kind of estimate?

That is a responsible statement by a responsible Secretary of the Treasury, the best big-business Secretary since Andrew Mellon. What did he say?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I will ask these boys.

Do you know anything we ought to change our estimates on today?

There is nothing that I know of, Mr. BOGGS, unless they do.

That only relates to new purchases, as you recall.

The issue before the Senate is relatively simple. If Senators think more of the accelerated-depreciation provision, if they think more of the dividend provisions of the tax bill of last year, than they do of all the people, then they should vote against the substitute.

I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield so that I may reply to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KERR. I will not yield for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Delaware to reply to the speech by the Senator from Texas. I will yield to the Senator from Delaware for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma yielded to the Senator from Texas for the purpose of allowing him to place in the RECORD excerpts from the record. I think I should have an opportunity to reply to the Senator from Texas and to make clear my views.

Mr. KERR. How much time does the Senator from Delaware desire?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be very brief.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will yield to the Senator from Delaware. I yielded to the Senator from Delaware this morning until I was late for a luncheon engagement. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. KERR. How much time does the Senator from Delaware ask? Ten minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be very brief. Will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. KERR. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have asked Mr. Colin Stam, chief counsel of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and who certainly should understand the Internal Revenue Code better than any of us on the floor of the Senate——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware does not contend, does he, that anyone understands the problem more than the responsible Secretary of the Treasury, who did not reply?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not speaking to the question whether Mr. Humphrey replied or did not reply.

I have asked the chief counsel of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to clear up the question, and I desire to read into the RECORD the statement which he has prepared and handed to me:

Under the provisions of section 167 (c) of the Revenue Code of 1954, the new accelerated rates do not apply to property with estimated useful life of less than 3 years.

In other words, I was correct this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I never limited the time to 3 years. The Senator from Delaware knows that better than does anyone else.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot do better than to quote the authoritative statement of the chief counsel of the joint committee. If he is in error——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I never said this morning that I was limiting anything to 3 years. The Senator from Delaware knows that to be so. The Senator's question was whether there could be 50 percent depreciation in 1 year.

The Senator from Delaware took the position that there could not be. The Senator ought to correct himself, if he has finally seen the light.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I took my position based upon advice given me by the chief counsel of the joint committee; namely, that under the accelerated rate provision of the 1954 act, a taxpayer could not take the benefit of the accelerated rate if his car or a piece of machinery was less than 3 years old.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No one has spoken about a period of less than 3 years except the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the article was used for more than 3 years, the maximum rate of depreciation would be 33⅓ percent. The Senator from Texas this morning referred to a rate of 50 percent, which would be for 2 years. I said it could not be applicable, based upon advice which had been given me. According to the information which I have read into the RECORD, as given to me by the chief counsel of the staff, I am correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from Delaware will read the RECORD, and bring himself up to date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Texas is in error. Perhaps he is not.

Under the old law, if a taxpayer had a tool the life of which was less than 3 years, he could use the law as it was previously, rather than come under the new law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not want to suggest any nightwork or homework for the Senator from Delaware, but I am informed that Mr. Stamm has just represented that the formula did not apply in the case of an automobile which had a life of 3 years. I hope the Senator will catch up on his homework in connection with that, so we may discuss it tomorrow, and I hope he will correct the mistake he made this morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I just heard the majority leader talk about irresponsibility. It seems to me the Secretary of the Treasury last week made a statement before the House Ways and Means Committee which I would say indicated his responsibility, because at that time they were discussing a loophole in Mr. Humphrey's tax bill of 1954, which he has since disclaimed. A loophole was uncovered by a Democratic Representative to the effect that big business was being given further benefits than even this administration anticipated. As I recall, Mr. Humphrey said it was the fault of the Congress that it had passed the bill. Does the Senator recollect that statement?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that be true, does the Senator not think it would be in line with proper responsibility if the Congress wrote the bills instead of having them sent to it by the Treasury Department?

Certainly, if Members of Congress write a bill, they ought to know what is in the bill, rather than follow the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury, who seems to be a gentleman who knows everything, but who in reality does not, inasmuch as he is blaming the Congress for overlooking a loophole.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In that respect, who would be irresponsible—Congress, or the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. KERR. Of course, the Congress cannot escape its responsibility, Mr. President, in connection with the writing of tax laws. Neither can the Treasury Department escape its responsibility of giving the committees of Congress accurate information with respect to a proposed tax law.

The error was discovered, if it was an error; and I must assume that those who refer to it as an error are indeed charitable. It has not yet been demonstrated to me that it was not intentional on the part of the Treasury Department to label the item under discussion as one that would cost but little, knowing that it could cost up to $5 billion in 1 year. But, at best, it was an error. That is the most charitable interpretation that can be made. Although the Secretary of the Treasury and his staff recommended the provision, and said it would cost but an insignificant amount, that it, together with other items, would not cost more than $47 million, after he had been compelled to acknowledge that one provision alone would cost in excess of $1 billion, he then accused the Congress of irresponsibility in connection with its passage.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the chairman of the Committee of the American Institute of Accountants pointed out this loophole, and urged that it be corrected?

Mr. KERR. He warned against it, and the Treasury Department hooted at the warning. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the assessment of responsibility for irresponsibility, admitting that Congress, of course, is primarily charged, under the Constitution, with the duty of writing tax laws, who bears the greater portion of irresponsibility, the body that fails to catch an error when a proposal is sent to Congress by the Treasury Department, or the Secretary of the Treasury, who sends it?

Mr. KERR. And then refuses to recognize it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Who bears the greater portion of irresponsibility?

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for asking the question. I say the question answers itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me long enough for me to read a relatively brief article which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal bearing on the point he is discussing?

Mr. KERR. I yield if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. GORE. This is a front-page article of the Wall Street Journal of Monday, March 14, 1955, under the heading, "Tax 'Loopholes.'"

Many a businessman is sadly concluding Uncle Sam is nothing but an Indian giver.

Two little-noticed sections of last year's 984-page tax law would save business anywhere from around $1 billion to $5 billion in 1954 taxes. But Congress, which had figured the saving at less than $50 million—

I digress to say, upon the advice of the Treasury Department—

is set to wipe both sections off the books.

A Wall Street Journal check of businessmen around the land indicates most of them were counting heavily on the two provisions. Talk of retroactive repeal stirs up a lot of corporate wrath.

"It is inconceivable to me that repeal would be retroactive," says the financial vice president of an eastern Pennsylvania company. "We would look on it as a 1955 tax against 1954 earnings."

"Retroactive repeal is unsound and unfair," argues Theodore O. Hofman, general controller of Borden Co., "because it changes the rules after the game has been played."

The game, Mr. President, was played last year, in preparation for a game that will be played next year.

I continue to read:

"We're opposed to repeal," says the tax consultant for a large San Francisco shipping firm, "because we made the changes in good faith. We resent the implication we are trying to get away with something shady."

THE BIGGER TROUBLEMAKER

One of the two provisions—section 452—merely provides that a company will not be taxed on income, such as advance rental payments, until the income actually is earned. But the bigger troublemaker is the more complex section 462. It permits a company to deduct from its 1954 taxable income not only its 1954 expenses but also reserves set aside to take care of certain estimated expenses in 1955 and later years.

Example: A taxpayer who sold household appliances subject to a service warranty in 1954 can deduct his 1954 expenses under the warranty and also a reserve fund for expected servicing expenses during the balance of the warranty's life.

Repeal—retroactive to January 1, 1954—appears certain. Treasury Secretary Humphrey, conceding the provisions were a serious mistake, has urgently requested it. And Democrats in Congress seem only too willing to go along. Because of a volley of protests from the National Association of Manufacturers and other business groups, the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee has scheduled public hearings beginning on Thursday (see story below), but these are regarded as little more than a formality.

IMPACT WILL BE HEAVY

The impact on many companies will be heavy. Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.'s 1954 taxes will be increased by about 10 percent, or $3 million.

In other words, Mr. President, that is one concern which, by this "blooper," unless repealed, will benefit by $3 million.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt at that point?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. And that as a result of a proposal from a responsible Secretary of the Treasury who says it is fiscal irresponsibility to give a workingman a $20 deduction in the tax bill for himself and $10 additional for each one of his dependents.

Mr. GORE. Not only irresponsible, but it is plain silly; I believe that is what was said.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I read further:

Continental Baking Co. figures its taxes will rise by $16,000, also about 10 percent.

Wagner Electric Corp., St. Louis, will find its tax bill boosted from $260,000 to $1,157,900.

Mr. President, I should like to have Senators on both sides of the aisle understand the difference between this corporation's tax bill without the "blooper" and its tax bill with the "blooper." By having the benefit of the "blooper," the corporation's tax will be only $260,000, instead of $1,157,900.

Mr. President, I read now another example:

A major trucking concern in New York, by using the provisions, was able to convert a substantial profit into an operating loss, not only eliminating 1954 taxes but potentially reducing its taxes in 1955 and later years—

All by benefit of the "blooper."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It did not take these boys long to find out about the "blooper." The figures the Senator from Tennessee has been reading already have been presented to the Bureau of Internal Revenue by the taxpayers concerned, namely, those particular companies.

Mr. GORE. Is the able Senator assuming that no one knew about it in advance?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am assuming that Mr. Humphrey, who has just appealed to the House Ways and Means Committee, is giving the impression, at least, that he did not know about it until last week, when it was uncovered by a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GORE. I do not challenge the assumption the able Senator makes; but, like the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I have yet to see it demonstrated that this was a plain error. Surely, before such a far-reaching change in the tax law was presented, someone in the Treasury Department must have made an analysis of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, from what the Senator from Tennessee has said, it would appear that the person who is guilty of fiscal irresponsibility is the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure the Secretary of the Treasury is guilty of either responsibility or irresponsibility. But he is Secretary of the Treasury; he is the responsible head of that Department. The Treasury Department estimated that this change in the tax law would result in a loss—I believe I am correct in the figure—of approximately $50 million. Is that not correct?

Mr. KERR. No; a representative of the Treasury Department said that a number of these provisions, including the "blooper," would result in a loss of approximately $47 million; but that the loss due from section 462 (c) alone, to which the Senator from Tennessee addresses himself, would be an insignificant part of the $47 million.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the correction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield, to permit me to make an observation?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has pointed out the fact that in the initial year there could be a double deduction for expenditures for the current year, for the items for which a reserve is kept; and then a deduction for the following year.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and I have shown that this responsible newspaper has made a poll of corporations from coast to coast; and finds one that converts a sizable profit into a loss, and finds one that eliminates entirely its tax; and finds another that by benefit of the "blooper" will pay, in 1954 taxes, only $260,000, when without the "blooper" its tax would be $1,157,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In one case the Senator from Tennessee pointed out that a profit was turned into an apparent loss, by this section. Of course the same thing was true in the case of the Capital Transit Co., as I showed last week by a quotation from the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Has the Senator from Tennessee noted section 172 of the law, which provides that where there is a net operating loss, it may be carried back against the profits of the two preceding years? So a taxpayer can obtain a double deduction by means of these "bloopers"; he can get, first, a deduction for 2 years, rather than for 1; he can deduct the expenses for 2 years, rather than 1. Then, if that gives him a bookkeeping loss, he can apply that loss to the profits of the 2 preceding years, and can obtain a still further deduction.

Mr. GORE. In other words, he can go either backward or forward.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. O, Mr. President, the "blooper" is a good one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, actually, the effect would be that in some cases, although the corporation had made a profit, the Government would have to pay the corporation money; is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes; a refund.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not that be equivalent to dropping a flyball twice?

Mr. GORE. Or to being called out twice, after making three strikes.

Mr. KERR. Or it would be equivalent to having the umpire rule a foul ball a home run. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the senior Senator from Oklahoma in permitting me to read these examples of the windfalls. Whether by mistake or by error or by the rules of the game of last year, it has been revealed as the major tax loophole in the history of tax legislation enacted by the Congress.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has made, with his usual alertness and keen discernment. I would join him in what I understood to be a part of the significance of his remarks, namely, that as between the Secretary of the Treasury and the taxpayers, the Secretary of the Treasury alone did not know what the "blooper" would do.

Mr. President, before we continue this phase of the discussion of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], let me say, again, that I think he is one of the fine Members of the Senate. I do not know what there is about this tax bill debate that today caused him to turn with such ferocity on the majority leader, and say to him that if he and his associates on the substitute knew what they were talking about, they and the Senate would be better off.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Oklahoma will yield now to the Senator from Delaware, I think the Senator from Delaware is prepared to present the facts to which he addressed himself.

Mr. KERR. I will yield to him, but first I wish to get something into the RECORD.

Mr. President, after the Senator from Oklahoma had corrected the mistake for the Senator from Delaware; after the Senator from Oklahoma had read from the law, to verify the position he was taking, the Senator from Delaware continued to affirm that the positions he had taken with the majority leader and with the Senator from Oklahoma were correct, and continued to indicate that the only trouble with the Senator from Oklahoma was that he, also, had to depend upon having someone outside the Senate tell him what was in this law; and the Senator from Delaware read into the RECORD a statement which he said came from the chief counsel of the Joint Committee on Taxation, Mr. Stam.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I think Mr. Stam is one of the great authorities on taxation in the Nation. I think he is an invaluable public servant, one of the most competent and most underpaid men on the Government payrolls in Washington. I am not surprised at what he wrote. The thing that surprises me is that the Senator from Delaware read it and did not know what it meant.

There is no fault in Mr. Stam's knowledge or statement. He is entirely accurate, but the Senator from Delaware did not know what it meant. This is what it says:

Under the provisions of section 167 (c) of the Revenue Code of 1954 the new accelerated rates do not apply to property with estimated useful life of less than 3 years.

The Senator from Oklahoma had, somewhat previous to that, read that same language from the bill, but he had also called the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that the accelerated depreciation provision did apply to machinery and other equipment with a useful life of 3 years or more, and had illustrated the effect of the law with reference to machinery which has a useful life of 3 years, to which the law is applicable. Straight line depreciation would give the taxpayer 33⅓ percent a year. But with the provision of the law which enabled him to take twice that amount in the first year of the life of the equipment to which the accelerated provision was applicable, the taxpayer would get 66⅔ percent credit in the first year, despite the fact that the Senator from Delaware said there was another provision in the law, which provided that in no event could the taxpayer get more than 33⅓ percent credit in any one year.

Mr. LONG and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. Just a moment.

Under that law, if the item has a useful life of 4 years, the taxpayer can take 50 percent the first year. If it has a useful life of 5 years, the taxpayer can take 40 percent credit the first year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to have the Senator yield for a very brief statement. I do not know how to phrase it as a question. I wish merely to straighten out the RECORD.

What I previously said, I thought, was correct. I have since checked further with the chief counsel, and I find, under a certain mathematical formula, that it is possible under certain circumstances, over a period between 3 and 4 years, for the rate to be in excess of 33⅓ percent. I stand corrected, and I have so told the Senator from Oklahoma. I thought I was correct. I made an error.

So far as the statement I made earlier to the Senator from Texas is concerned, the substitute proposal would take away the accelerated rates which were available to farmers, and which had been extended for the first time in history. To that extent I was 100 percent correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas never questioned that statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know the Senator from Texas did not. I was correct in that statement, but I was in error in the other statement I made to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My delightful friend from Delaware is now willing to admit that he does not need to lecture the Senator from Texas on that specific item, and that he has not done his own homework; is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall have more to say about the computations of savings which the Senator makes, most of which are fictitious. Also, I shall have something further to say as to the accelerated rate of depreciation. In my opinion, based upon figures which I placed in the RECORD, and which the Senator from Texas has not challenged, and which I do not think he will challenge, for the first time in history the accelerated rate of depreciation under the 1954 act gave to farmers and to small-business men a rate of depreciation which, previous to that time, had been extended only to the large corporations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas does not deny that. That law gave the small-business man and the farmer the rate, but it gave the big money to the tool manufacturers and others who had peculiar situations, and they are getting away with almost $1 billion a year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas will debate that question with the Senator from Delaware tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What the Senator from Texas wishes the RECORD to show is that the Senator from Delaware, who earlier questioned the statement of the Senator from Texas, now admits that it was the Senator from Delaware who was in error, and not the Senator from Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On the point to which I referred; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We were not in dispute as to whether the farmers could get the accelerated depreciation allowance or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as concerns the Johnson proposal, which would cut the amortization allowance for the large corporations, we are in complete disagreement, because the Senator's proposal would go back to the old law, under which the major corporations got 20 percent, whereas under the 1954 act large corporations got less, but the farmers and small-business men got more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas understands that the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Delaware are not in thorough agreement. The Senator from Texas would never expect that. When the Senator from Texas was in Rochester, Minn., he read that there were at least 47 Senators on the other side of the aisle—I wish they were present to hear the debate—who had already decided on what kind of tax bill should be passed.

What the Senator from Texas wants the RECORD to show is that the statement he made earlier, to which the Senator from Delaware objected, and which the Senator from Delaware sought to correct, was a correct statement. The Senator from Delaware stated that it was unfortunate that Senators did not have accurate information. The Senator from Delaware is now willing to admit that he was in error, and that the Senator from Texas was right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us get the record straight. One of the remarks of the Senator from Texas, in which I said he was wholly in error, related to the estimated loss in tax revenue for 1 year under the Senator's tax reduction proposal. The projected savings, based upon extending the corporation rate 15 months beyond the time in the committee bill, were completely fictitious. I know of no better way to emphasize that fact than to ask the Senator this question: Instead of extending the rate for 15 months more, why did not the Senator strike out the termination date entirely and say, "We will extend the time indefinitely. Over a period of 100 years there would be a saving of three or four hundred billion dollars, and we could pay off the national debt"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. For two reasons the Senator from Texas does not want to extend it indefinitely. He is not so hopeful as was the President in his message, that along about next April corporation taxes and excise taxes can be reduced. The Senator from Texas thinks it would be better to consider the entire problem in 1957, when we are not engaged in campaigning for office. That is the first reason.

The Senator from Texas realizes that the responsible Secretary of the Treasury testified before the committee, of which the Senator from Delaware is a member, that he had no objection to extending the rates indefinitely. If the Secretary of the Treasury, that responsible man, is willing to extend them indefinitely, I do not know why the Senator from Delaware becomes so upset about extending them for an additional 15 months.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware has not said that it makes no difference. I am not speaking about that point. I am speaking about the fallacy of saying, when the rates are extended for another 15 months, "Here is $3 billion or $4 billion more."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator deny that if we were to extend the rates from April 1956 to July 1957, which the Senator's proposal would not do, there would be an increase as compared with the Senator's proposal? Before the substitute was formulated, I asked for assurance from the administration to the effect that if we had no tax cut this year there would be none next year, until we could get the budget in balance. The Senator from Texas divulges no confidence when he says that he was unable to obtain such assurance. Being unable to obtain it, he thinks the administration has something in mind for next April, before the political conventions. In the light of the tax bills which have previously been recommended by this administration, the Senator from Texas believes that that "something in mind" is perhaps a little shot in the arm to help business to some extent next year. If we can do that for business next year, we can do it for all the people this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After having had in power for 20 years an administration which operated on the theory of tax, spend, and elect, always raising taxes but never lowering them, I am glad that at last we have an administration in power which is looking forward to the time when there can be a tax reduction. I am glad we have in power an administration which, when it did grant tax reductions, gave them based upon the historical record of what was done, and not on the basis of what was promised. It gave them where they were most needed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now that this question has been disposed of, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he has studied Latin.

Mr. KERR. To a limited degree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Oklahoma remember the peculiar Latin verb "aio"? It means "to affirm" or "let it be." It is a very peculiar Latin verb.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, shorn of an avenue of escape, in the face of a point-blank question, and rising to the heights of frankness and sincere response, I must admit to the Senator from Illinois that I do not remember the word.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oklahoma be interested in the question of why section 462 (c) is like the Latin verb "aio"?

Mr. KERR. I would be interested and delighted to have the information from my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say it is for these good reasons; namely, it is present, it is imperfect, it is impossible to conjugate, and it has no future.

Mr. KERR. In order to reorient myself, I take it that we are not only talking about a Latin word—well, Mr. President, I shall not make any personal application in this case. I leave it to the imagination of Members of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By any chance is the Senator from Oklahoma referring to the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. KERR. The Secretary of the Treasury is such a delightful and charming fellow, the Senator from Oklahoma feels that sufficient direct reference has been made to him today. For the rest of this particular illustration, it might be well to leave the matter to innuendo and suggestion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator from Delaware speak about the type of sound tax proposal that was being made by this administration, and I believe he illustrated his statement by referring to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Who benefited from the tax act of last year.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it just so happens that that question is answered in the minority views filed with the Senate. This is the answer:

> And yet, the deficit forecast for fiscal 1955 did not prevent the administration from embracing a tax-reduction bill in which 77 percent of the immediate relief and 91 percent of the long-term relief went to corporations and large-income earners.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may continue, is it not true, that, on the basis of the most recent "blooper" uncovered by the Democrats, these percentage figures would be up?

Mr. KERR. Materially.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as corporations are concerned. However, so far as the people were concerned, they are getting nothing, and they have gotten nothing from the administration in over 2 years. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that some corporations have had difficulty in reporting to their stockholders the full extent of their corporation profits, in view of the new tax law?

Mr. KERR. In view of the fact that they do not know yet completely how many benefits they have under the law.

Mr. LONG. Furthermore, there is an additional difficulty in that they are permitted under the law to take depreciation on their equipment twice as rapidly as the actual depreciation occurs. Therefore, some stockholders are concerned when they receive a report which would indicate that the corporation has made a lower profit, when in fact, the corporation had made actually a greater profit. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the recent letter published by the National City Bank of New York which set forth that many large corporations are sending out two statements of profit and loss to their stockholders, pointing out that the profits reported to the Government are much less than actual profits, and also sending an accompanying statement which shows the actual profits, which are much greater than those reported to the Government.

Mr. KERR. That the actual profits are far greater than they have reported to the Government and on which they pay taxes, because they are under the umbrella of the Secretary's "blooper."

Mr. LONG. Not only because of the "blooper," but because of the accelerated depreciation, which the Secretary of the Treasury still defends?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma would also be interested in the background of the votes taken in Congress by which the Democrats have repeatedly tried to raise the exemptions, whereas most Republicans have consistently opposed such efforts. I heard the reference made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] a few days ago, to the effect that the Democrats had not tried to raise the exemptions. I have had prepared a statement on that subject, which I would like to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. KERR. Certainly. I thank the Senator for doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS HAVE CONSISTENTLY FAVORED RELIEF FOR SMALL TAXPAYER

During the past few days, we have heard the claim repeatedly made that Republicans have always favored tax relief for the little man while the Democrats have always increased tax burdens. More specifically, it has been charged that increasing personal exemptions has been consistently an objective of the Republican Party, and equally consistently resisted by members of the Democratic Party.

A simple, brief chronology of some of the more critical votes on the tax bills of the 80th Congress, and on the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, should be sufficient to disprove this erroneous claim.

On March 26, 1947, H. R. 1, sponsored by Congressman KNUTSON, was brought up for debate in the House under a closed rule—granting 6 hours' general debate after the bill was read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. During the debate, proponents stated that the purpose of H. R. 1 was (1) to provide income-tax relief for all individual taxpayers who are still bearing the high and oppressive taxes of the war, and especially the little man; (2) to remove the deterrent to managerial efforts and to the investment of venture capital, which constitute so serious a threat to the maintenance of the present high level of production and employment and to the business of the future.

The first vote came on March 27, 1947, on a recommittal motion made by Congressman DOUGHTON to recommit H. R. 1 to the Committee on House Ways and Means for further study, with instructions not to report a tax reduction bill until the Congress had passed the several appropriation bills, thereby giving them an opportunity to consider individual income-tax reductions as a part of our overall postwar tax program and to provide for more equitable relief in the lower income bracket. The recommittal motion was rejected by a vote of 237 to 172. Two hundred and thirty-three Republicans, or 99 percent, voted against recomittal and 98 percent of the Democrats voted for recommittal.

Final passage of H. R. 1, on March 27, 1947, which gave to a couple with $100,000 income 1,000 times the tax relief ($12,625) it gave to a couple with $1,200 income (only $11.40 relief), was by a vote of 273 to 137. Two hundred and thirty-three Republicans, or 99 percent of the Republicans voting for passage and 133, or 77 percent of the Democrats voting against.

H. R. 1 was reported to the Senate amended and on May 28, 1947, Senator MCCLELLAN offered an amendment to raise personal exemptions to $750 from $500 for single persons and to $1,500 from $1,000 for married couples. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 44 to 27. Twenty-three, or 77 percent of the Democrats voted for the increased exemption and 37, or 90 percent of the Republicans voted against.

Following the rejection of the McClellan amendment, Senator Lucas proposed an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to: (1) raise individual exemptions from $500 to $600; (2) permit family-income splitting, (3) reduce surtax rates by 2 percent; and (4) postpone effective date of bill to January 1, 1948. The Lucas amendment was rejected by a vote of 58 to 28 with 27, or 73 percent of the Democrats voting for and 47, or 98 percent, of the Republicans voting against.

On June 2, 1947, the House adopted the conference report on H. R. 1 which would have given a 60 percent increase in take-home pay to the 1,400 taxpayers earning $300,000 or more, and a 5 percent increase in take-home pay to the 46 million taxpayers earning less than $5,000. The vote was 220 to 99 with 183, or 99 percent, of the Republicans voting for the conference report and 97, or 73 percent, of the Democrats voting against.

The conference report then went to the Senate for consideration on June 3, 1947, where 42, or 96 percent, of the Republicans voted for adoption and 26, or 82 percent, of the Democrats voted against.

On June 16, 1947, the President vetoed H. R. 1 and on June 17, 1947, the House sustained the President's veto by a vote of 268 to 137 with 233, or 99 percent, of the

Republicans voting to override and 134, or 80 percent, of the Democrats voting to sustain.

The first House vote on the second individual income-tax reduction bill of the 80th Congress, H. R. 3950, sponsored by Congressman KNUTSON, came on July 8, 1947 on Congressman FORAND'S motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report back immediately with an amendment increasing personal exemptions from $500 to $600 and lowering surtax 3 percentage points. The motion was defeated by 261 to 151 with 232, or 99 percent, of the Republicans voting against recommittal and 148, or 84 percent, of the Democrats voting for. H. R. 3950 was passed July 8, 1947 by vote of 302 to 112 with 233, or 99 percent, of the Republicans voting for and 109, or 62 percent, of the Democrats voting against.

H. R. 3950 was reported in the Senate July 9, 1947. On July 14, 1947, during the debate on the bill, Senator MCCLELLAN proposed an amendment to raise personal exemptions to $600 from $500 for single persons and to $1,200 from $1,000 for married couples. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 47 to 43 with 33, or 75 percent, of the Democrats voting for and 38, or 79 percent, of the Republicans voting against. The bill, as passed by the Senate July 14, 1947, reduced individual income taxes by removing only 21 percent of the wartime tax burden for married couples with an income of $2,500 but 64 percent of the wartime tax burden for a couple with an income of $100,000, and 85 percent for a couple with an income of $1 million. The vote was 60 to 32 with 48, or 96 percent, of the Republicans voting for and 30, or 72 percent, of the Democrats voting against.

The President vetoed the bill July 18, 1947. The veto was sustained in the Senate on July 18, 1947 by a vote of 57 to 36 with 47, or 94 percent, of the Republicans voting to override and 33, or 77 percent, of the Democrats voting to sustain.

The third Republican income-tax reduction move occurred on January 27, 1948 when H. R. 4790 was reported to the House and brought to the floor January 29 under a rule allowing 2 days of general debate but no amendments, except those from the House Ways and Means Committee. The then Minority Leader RAYBURN moved to recommit H. R. 4790 and substitute a bill which would exempt 10 million low-income taxpayers from paying Federal income tax by raising personal exemptions by $200, or to $700. The motion was defeated by a vote of 258 to 159 with 236, or 100 percent of the Republicans voting against and 158, or 88 percent, of the Democrats voting for. The bill, as passed, although considerably improved by Democratic amendments within the House Ways and Means Committee, still favored the wealthy and the Committee estimated the revenue loss at about $7.1 billion. The vote was 297 to 120 with 234, or 99 percent, of the Republicans voting for passage and 118, or 65 percent, of the Democrats voting against.

H. R. 4790 was reported in the Senate March 16, 1948, and passed on March 22, 1948, by a vote of 78 to 11 with 48, or 100 percent, of the Republicans voting for and 30, or 73 percent, of the Democrats voting for passage. As passed by the Senate, the bill increased personal exemptions to $600 from $500, a tribute to the untiring persistence of the Democrats.

Although President Truman vetoed this bill because in his judgment the remaining inequities disqualified it for favorable action, that veto was overridden by the Democrats in Congress who were more realistic in their appraisal of the insuperable task of persuading a sufficient number of Republicans to relax their tenacious grasp on these unjust provisions. The House overrode the veto on April 2 by a vote of 311 to 88 with 229, or 99 percent, of the Republicans voting to override and 82, or 49 percent, of the Democrats also voting to override. On the same day the Senate overrode the veto by a vote of 77 to 10 with 50, or 100 percent, of the Republicans voting to override and 27, or 73 percent, of the Democrats also voting for passage of the bill.

H. R. 8300, the so-called tax reform bill of the 83d Congress, passed the House March 18, 1954, after 2 days of debate under a closed rule providing for 7 hours of debate. The closed rule provided that the bill could be amended on the floor only if the House Ways and Means Committee offered or agreed to specific amendments. The test vote came when Congressman COOPER made a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to eliminate the dividend tax credit provision and raise individual personal exemptions to $700 from $600. Recommittal motion was rejected by a vote of 210 to 204 with 201, or 95 percent, of the Republicans voting against and 193, or 96 percent, of the Democrats voting for recommittal. The bill passed March 18 by a vote of 339 to 80 with 208, or 97 percent, of the Republicans, and 131, or 65 percent, of the Democrats, voting for.

On June 30, 1954, the Senate's first vote came on the Millikin substitute amendment for the George amendment. The Millikin substitute would have provided a $20 tax credit for taxpayers only. The substitute was rejected 49 to 46 with 47, or 100 percent, of the Democrats voting against and 46, or 98 percent, of the Republicans voting for. The George amendment, which would have increased to $700 from $600 the personal income-tax exemptions for all taxpayers and their dependents, was rejected by a vote of 49 to 46 with 43, or 91 percent, of the Democrats voting for and 45, or 96 percent, of the Republicans voting against.

The Long amendment, very similar to the Millikin substitute, would have granted each taxpayer a $20 annual tax reduction and also would have deleted the provision giving corporation shareholders $50 of dividend income tax free. This was rejected by a vote of 50 to 33 with 30, or 77 percent, of the Democrats voting for the amendment and 41, or 95 percent of the Republicans voting against it.

After the Senate had acted to eliminate the provisions in the bill which would in 3 years have increased dividend credits to 15 percent from 5 percent the first year, Senator JOHNSON of Colorado offered an amendment to delete the dividend credit entirely. This amendment carried, 71 to 13, with 93 percent of the Democrats voting for it and 23 percent of the Republicans opposing it.

During House consideration of the conference report, which carried the 4 percent dividend credit provision now in the law, Congressman COOPER moved to recommit the conference report with instructions to delete the dividend tax credit which would benefit only 8 percent of the country's taxpayers. The motion was rejected by a vote of 227 to 169 with 204, or 99 percent, of the Republicans voting against and 165, or 88 percent, of the Democrats voting for. The House adopted the conference report on July 28, 1954 by a vote of 316 to 77 with 202, or 97 percent, of the Republicans voting for and 73, or 38 percent of the Democrats voting against.

The Senate adopted the conference report July 29, 1954 by a vote of 61 to 26 with 22, or 54 percent, of the Democrats voting against and 42, or 93 percent, of the Republicans voting for.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for putting that statement in the RECORD. I am familiar with it. I believe it would be worthwhile for the Senator from Delaware to read the statement.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find that the statement shows that since the last war the Republicans have never supported a provision to raise exemptions, although they finally agreed to raise the exemptions after the Democrats had repeatedly sought to raise them and twice sustained the President's veto for failure of the Republican-controlled Congress to put such a provision in their bills during the 80th Congress.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. LONG. Reference has also been made to the fact that back in 1941, in a Democratic Congress, the exemption was lowered to $750. I have had another statement prepared which points out that at that time the purchasing power of the dollar was 40 percent higher than it is today, which would make an exemption of $750 as of that date appear to be more in the nature of $1,100 in terms of today's purchasing power. Furthermore, at that time the average laboring man was making $29.58 a week. That was in 1941. Today the average laboring man is making $71.64 a week.

Therefore, it can easily be seen that the average laboring man was not paying any income tax even when the exemption was $750. That was the case even if the laboring man was single. If he was a family man, he could have been earning the equivalent of $4,000 or $5,000 in terms of today's purchasing power of the dollar, without having to pay any income tax in 1941, at the time the exemption was reduced.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma to permit me to have that statement placed in the RECORD at this point in his remarks.

Mr. KERR. I should be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF $750 EXEMPTION IN 1941—COMPARISON OF 1941 WITH 1954

(Data obtained from Mr. Knowles of Joint Committee on Economic Report)

The purchasing power of the dollar, using 1947 as a base equal to 100, was 159 in 1941. In 1954, using the same base, it was 87. This represents more than a 40-percent decline in purchasing power.

The average weekly wage in manufacturing establishments for 1941 was $29.58. In 1954 it was $71.64.

The decline in purchasing power of the dollar from 1941 to 1954 would indicate that $750 for each personal exemption in 1941 was equal to more than a thousand dollars today.

Despite this difference, a comparison of ability to pay for industrial workers indicates that the workers' increased income has been greater than the decline in purchasing power. This aspect is not especially pertinent in any event, because it would have to be related not only to the personal exemption but also to the level of taxation and other factors.

Mr. KERR. I now wish to return to the subject of the infallibility of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am wondering whether the Senator from Oklahoma was aware of the fact that, although what the Senator from Louisiana said is correct, namely, that there have been a great many expressions from the other side of the aisle with reference to raising the exemption, historically the record shows that in their entire history the Democrats did not raise the exemption even once, and that the exemptions were raised only in 1948, by the Republican 80th Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. When I have answered that question of the Senator from Delaware.

To the degree that the inference of that statement is correct, let me say that it is the purpose of the six sponsors of the substitute to correct the situation. To the degree that the Senator from Delaware is sincere in the indication that he thinks the exemption ought to be raised, we ask him to join us in voting for the amendment, which will increase the exemption and recoup the revenue lost from the few, who last year received a special privilege under the 1954 act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I would be glad to join him in raising the exemptions if we had in the Treasury the money with which to pay the cost. I took the same position the Senator from Oklahoma took last year, and voted against the bill as it was passed by Congress, because I said then that I did not believe it was sound tax legislation. We cannot help the American people under any form of a tax program which provides for reducing taxes on the basis of having to borrow money.

I did not think it was sound last year, and I agreed with the Senator fully last year. It is also an unsound policy this year. I pointed out the other day that, with a budget that is not balanced, to any degree that we cut taxes at this time we not only must borrow money in order to make a tax cut, but we must also pay interest on the money which we borrow, and charge it all to future generations. That is unsound financial policy.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's question. The Senator referred the other day to the fact that he, and he alone, of those who were sounding off against the substitute proposal had voted against the Revenue Act of 1954. I remind the Senator from Delaware that the Senator from Oklahoma voted against the Revenue Act of 1954. The Senator from Oklahoma is among those who sponsor the pending amendment, and he and the other Senators who favor it are the ones with reference to whom the Senator from Delaware the other day asked the question, why if they felt it was unsound, more of them did not vote against the bill last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not believe that the Senator from Oklahoma was the one I was speaking about. If he will check the RECORD, he will find that many of the Senators who were asking that question had voted for that tax act. I believe it was the Senator from Louisiana who made the statement that he had voted last year for the dividend provision in the bill. That is fine. I do not question his sincerity. I do not question the sincerity of any of those who voted for the bill last year because I voted against it. However, in my opinion, when we must borrow money in order to make a tax reduction, we are not giving the American people bona fide relief. I think it can be done only by first cutting expenditures. That is my position this year, and it was my position last year. Many Senators on the other side of the aisle voted as I voted. The bill was not passed by the Republican Party alone.

As for the bill passed in the 80th Congress, President Truman said the Republican Party was responsible for everything that happened, so therefore, we took the credit or the blame for raising exemptions.

Mr. KERR. That is one further example of the Senator's liability to err. He said President Truman made the statement that the Republicans were responsible for everything that happened in the 80th Congress. In the first place, he was not even responsible for the 80th Congress.

But I wish to differentiate between the Senator's position last year and his position this year in reference to providing some tax relief to the low-income group.

Last year an amendment was offered to provide a tax credit to low-income groups that would have cost in the neighborhood of $2,300,000,000 in lieu of a provision in the bill that would involve a tax loss of $262 million. But the objection to the substitute this year does not have the same application as did the objection last year, because the substitute would raise more revenue than it would lose. The substitute, by repealing the dividend amendment of last year, and by repealing the accelerated depreciation provisions of last year's act, will bring more revenue into the Federal Treasury from those two sources alone in the next 2 fiscal years than will be required to give the benefits provided for the low-income taxpayers of the country.

The Senator from Delaware knows that to be so. Therefore, he knows that his statement that the bill is similar to the one of last year, in that it would increase the deficit, is not correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. I have yielded to the Senator from Louisiana. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware in a little while. I would not, for the world, have him leave, because I want to continue to educate him if he will listen to me.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Delaware stated that the Senator from Louisiana had voted against striking from the bill last year the provision relating to dividends on corporation stocks. Of course, the Senator was correct when he made that statement. There was an occasion when I did. I also voted against striking accelerated depreciation. But the Senator from Delaware neglected to say that I also voted for the George amendment which would have stricken from the bill relief on corporation dividends and substituted in lieu thereof relief to the average taxpayer by extending to them an increase in exemptions.

I took the position that while I was willing to vote tax relief for corporations, if I had to choose between corporation stockholders and the average taxpayer, I was going to give the little man the benefit of my vote. So I did vote to strike the dividend provision in favor of increasing exemptions when the George amendment was offered. The Senator from Oklahoma and I were cosponsors of the George amendment.

Mr. KERR. And the Senator from Louisiana voted for it, as I did, and the Senator from Delaware voted against it.

Mr. LONG. Furthermore, the Senator from Delaware referred to the fact that during the 80th Congress the Republicans passed a bill which increased exemptions. I hope the Senator will consult the memorandum which I placed in the RECORD on that subject which shows that not only once, but twice, in the Senate, and twice in the House, did the Republicans vote against any increase in exemptions.

Because of the votes cast by the Democrats in the Senate and in the House provision was finally inserted in the tax bill passed in that Congress for an increase in exemptions, and it was the Democrats in the Senate and the House who made it impossible to override the President's veto, until an increase in exemptions had been agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for this very illuminating recitation of legislative action.

Mr. President, again saying that I do this in the spirit of the best of good will, in an effort to get the record straight, and to illustrate the fact that the Senator from Delaware is not infallible, I should like to say that the Senator stated a few days ago, and repeated on the floor today a number of times, that if Congress repeals the rapid depreciation provisions of the 1954 act we shall thereby reinstate the rapid amortization provisions for defense facilities passed some years previously, and, thereby, grant greater benefits to big businesses.

If I am in error in that statement, I should like to have the Senator from Delaware correct me at this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator will agree with me that in 1951 and 1952, under the previous administration, $22,800,000,000 worth of amortization certificates were issued, to large corporations, mostly, and there was a 20 percent rate of depreciation. In World War II there were only $7,300,000,000 worth of such certificates. After the Korean war three

times as many were granted as during World War II. For the first time in history we have extended a program whereby a farmer can write off his farm machinery on the same basis, and every man can get the same depreciation if he so elects.

I would refer the Senator from Oklahoma to page 1983 of part 4 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance, where it is shown that Mr. Lloyd B. Culbertson, an economist of the National Grain Growers' Association, enthusiastically urged the committee to increase accelerated depreciation, because he said it would give the farmers a right to write off their plants on a more realistic basis. The only exception he made was that it should be made retroactive on equipment which had already been purchased. The committee felt it could not do that, but it did make it applicable to all equipment purchased thereafter.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma will agree with me that under the provisions of the Johnson substitute we are repealing this accelerated rate of depreciation which, for the first time in history, gave the American farmer and the small-business man the right to write off their equipment.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate what the Senator has said. It is not at all in response to the question I asked him. I did not too greatly expect that he would respond to my question, because to have done so would have been to agree with my thesis at this time, which is that his statement with reference to the repeal of the provisions had elements of error in it. He said that the repeal of the rapid depreciation provisions of the 1954 act would result in the reinstatement of the rapid amortization provisions of the Defense Facilities Act and allow greater benefits to big business.

The fact is that the Johnson-Kerr-Barkley-Long-Frear-Smathers substitute, now before the Senate, does not in any way affect the rapid amortization provisions of the Defense Facilities Act, which was passed some years ago. That law is now section 168 of the Revenue Code and is in full force and effect. Under it last year, more than a billion dollars of accelerated depreciation was allowed. Accelerated depreciation is being allowed under it this year. The estimate is that another billion dollars of accelerated depreciation will be granted under that law this year.

In spite of the fact that the Senator from Delaware has said that which would tend to lead us to believe that the passage of the proposed substitute would reinstate that law, that act is still on the books, and will be until an action by the President of the United States terminates it, regardless of whether or not Congress repeals the provisions written into the 1954 act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. I shall phrase what I have to say in the form of a question.

Does not the Senator know that if the accelerated rate of depreciation provision should be repealed, the prior act will be put back into full force? Does he not agree with me that any corporation or any individual utilizing the accelerated rate of depreciation under the existing act would not be able to use the amortization formula; and for that reason, since this act has been passed, the amount of amortization certificates has dropped $1 billion—I do not have the figure; the Senator from Oklahoma said it was $1 billion; I accept that—as compared with $11 billion before the law was passed? In other words, the amount of amortization certificates is $10 billion lower, based upon the figures of the Senator from Oklahoma. All of that was at the 20-percent rate. That is $10 billion lower on the 20-percent rate. The Senator has defeated his own argument.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator from Delaware uses many words which fail to disclose his lack of confusion, and which, if not understood by listeners, would create for them confusion.

The repeal of the accelerated depreciation provisions of the 1954 act would not reinstate the provisions of the prior law, because the provisions of the prior law are still in effect. How can something be reinstated which has not been "instated"? How can something be reenacted which is still the law?

If the Senator from Delaware would read the law, and then limit his statements on the floor to what is contained in the law, he would both save himself embarrassment and the rest of us hesitation on account of the high regard we have for him; and then we would reflect that merely because he said it, perhaps it was correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that one of the reasons why there has been a decline in the authorizations for rapid depreciation under the Defense Facilities Act is simply that the war, the shooting, is ended in Korea; and second, that the large amount of defense plant construction which had been authorized under the terms of that act has already come into being; and that it is not possible to compare this year with 2 years ago in terms of total volume of dollars?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct.

I am leaving unchallenged the statement of the Senator from Delaware, with reference to the decline from $11 billion to $1 billion, because I intend to check that. Then I think I will have an opportunity to call the Senate's attention to another error made by the Senator from Delaware; but I shall not do so until I have checked the record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not possible, too, that under the provisions included in the 1954 Internal Revenue Act pertaining to accelerated depreciation schedules, because of the laxity of those provisions and the generous treatment contained in them, which cover not only defense facilities, but also all other types of facilities, many persons who would have had to justify their applications under the Defense Facilities Act were able automatically simply to take advantage of the opening of the floodgates under the Internal Revenue Act of 1954?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. President, the crying injustice of the Act of 1954 is illustrated by this fact: Under the Defense Facilities Act, accelerated depreciation was allowed only to the extent of letting a taxpayer charge off a defense facility in 5 years. In order to do that, the taxpayer had to justify the action by the Government to permit him to charge it off at the accelerated rate; and only in the rarest of instances did the taxpayer get permission to charge off more than 60 percent of his investment by the accelerated rate to get it entirely charged off in 5 years.

Lo and behold, under the provisions of the 1954 Act, the taxpayers do not have to make application. They are not limited to five years, on many investments. They are not limited to a percentage of their total investment. But automatically they have a provision of accelerated depreciation charge-off which can be as great as 66⅔ percent in one year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. In a moment. I wish to refer to the farmers. Then I will yield to the great Senator from Delaware. I think he will be wanting me to yield then.

If it were not so pathetic, if it were not so tragic, I would have to say that to defend the accelerated depreciation act of 1954 because of what it does to the American farmer would be the height of absurdity and most ludicrous.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Based upon that, it must be——

Mr. KERR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Can you imagine, Mr. President, letting the corporations accelerate depreciation on millions of dollars' worth of equipment, simply in order to let a farmer who has not made any money in 3 years, have an additional charge-off against income that he has not had, with reference to a tractor on his farm?

Does not the Senator from Delaware know that Benson is the Secretary of Agriculture, and that farmers no longer have profits against which to charge off their purchases of equipment at any rate of depreciation?

The defense of the depreciation provisions of the 1954 act because of the benefits farmers received from them reminds me of the deep mourning in one community of citizens back yonder, in a year when there was a scarcity of swine. They did not have any hog killings that year, and that group of citizens did not get any chitlins, which was all they had ever got out of the hogs anyway. They were in mourning because there had not been any hog killing that year; therefore they did not get any chitlins.

About all the farmers ever would get out of the accelerated depreciation provisions of the act of 1954 would be a small portion of spoiled chitlins.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Based upon his description of the accelerated depreciation amendment, the Senator from Oklahoma almost convinces me that it may be as vicious as the oil-depletion allowance, which I am sure we do not wish to discuss now.

I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the facts which I placed in the RECORD with respect to accelerated depreciation were based upon reports furnished by the Director of the Budget. I am sure the Senator does not challenge them. If they are embarrassing to the Senator from Oklahoma, to that extent I regret that I felt the necessity of placing them in the RECORD.

Mr. KERR. Let me say to the great Senator from Delaware that he is incapable of embarrassing the Senator from Oklahoma either with facts or misfacts or figments of the imagination. Let the Senator make his efforts on this floor and try to embarrass the Senator from Oklahoma. He would welcome such efforts. I say to the Senator the result would be repeated acknowledgment of error on his part.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I fully recognize it would be very hard to embarrass the Senator from Oklahoma, and I certainly am not going to try it.

Mr. KERR. Then we understand each other.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As to the accusation of the Senator, in speaking of Secretary Benson, I wish to remind the Senator that in the first 2 years of Secretary Benson's administration he was administering a law which was left on the books by the previous administration, providing for 90 percent of parity. We are hoping for better things when the new law which the Secretary has urged the Congress to pass goes into effect. I may add that the so-called flexible formula was in the Democratic platform of 1948 and was defended by both parties.

Mr. KERR. I dispute the statement of the Senator from Delaware. Secretary Benson was not administering the law. He was misadministering the law. To administer a law, one has to carry it out in both letter and spirit, and I submit the record shows, and every farmer in this country knows it, that Secretary Benson did neither.

I invite the Senator from Delaware to tell the dairy farmers of his State that Secretary Benson carried out the spirit and the letter of the law he found on the books at the time he took office. Let him tell it to the farmers of Oklahoma and Minnesota. The Senator will then understand why it is, and why in the future it will be, that when Benson speaks to farmers he goes under the protection of a special corps of deputy sheriffs, and has the protection of barriers of barbed wire and snow fences between him and his audience.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Senator from Oklahoma been impressed by the Republican economics involved in some of their attitudes on fiscal and economic conditions as they relate to the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, namely, that the way to make the country efficient, healthy, and prosperous is by lowering farm prices on the one hand and increasing exemptions and deductions for corporate business on the other hand?

Mr. KERR. Both statements are consistent with the record of the present administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it not be fair to say that if someone who was merely a cursory student of American government, but had some knowledge of American political parties, should come to this country on a visit, and notice that farm prices were down and the stock market prices were up, he might immediately assume that the Republican Party was in charge of the Government?

Mr. KERR. He would only have to see the first of the two conditions mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota to know that the Republican Party was operating.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The second condition would confirm his opinion, would it not?

Mr. KERR. The second circumstance would not be necessary to the observer. If he saw that farm income was down and going lower, he would know the Republican Party was in power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is apparently a design on the part of the proponents of the tax measure of the Secretary of the Treasury to indicate to the American people that this great tax law was of benefit to the farmers. Would it not be well for those who are supporting that proposition to point out the generous benefits which the American farmers have received from this great measure?

Mr. KERR. I will tell the Senator how that illusion arose. This administration has reduced the tax burden of the American farmer——

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. KERR. By eliminating his income. The only promise made by this administration to the American farmer which it has kept is that it would reduce farmers' income taxes, and it kept that promise by eliminating the income that was taxable.

Then the proponents of the law talk about the benefit a farmer gets from the accelerated depreciation provision, which will represent a benefit according to the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, of $19 billion-plus in the next 18-year period. I challenge the Senator from Delaware to show what part of that estimate was based on the benefits the farmers will receive from accelerated depreciation on tractors and other machines.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am yielding presently to the Senator from Minnesota. I shall yield to the Senator from Delaware shortly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma has noted with accuracy, as would be expected from him, how the Republican administration lowered the income tax for the farmers by lowering their incomes——

Mr. KERR. By eliminating their incomes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, by eliminating their incomes. The Senator from Oklahoma knows, of course, that the administration wants to be fair——

Mr. KERR. No, I do not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator recognizes the administration would like to get equal benefits for all taxpayers——

Mr. KERR. No, I do not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For the purposes of this discussion, let us assume that as a hypothetical situation. Would the Senator say, from the pronouncements of the administration——

Mr. KERR. Oh, I am aware they are claiming that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since the administration has reduced income taxes by lowering the income of agricultural workers, would it not be fair to expect the administration to reduce the income taxes of big business by certain gimmicks in the tax law so the administration could say that it had also lowered the taxes on big business?

Mr. KERR. The administration could say it has lowered taxes, and it could say to farmers, "We have given you a gadget which will benefit you in the event you are ever in the black again." [Laughter.]

I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware I can think of no more comforting knowledge in the hearts of the farmers than the hope of that gladsome day when once again the farmers can clasp with strong and clinging hands that portion of the 1954 act which gives them the opportunity to have the benefits of the accelerated-depreciation provisions on farm machinery. Oh, what a happy thought that is as the farmer lives in the midst of the economic reaction brought about by the maladministration of the party of the Senator from Delaware. How happy it ought to make him as he looks in the faces of children that can no longer be sent to school, as the farmer looks at cattle that are no longer worthy of a place on his farm, as he looks at dairy cattle that can no longer give enough milk for him to sell in order to buy feed for them. How marvelous it is that the farmer can comfort himself by saying, "If my farm operations again show a profit, the great Republican Party has discharged its duty to us by fixing it so I will have the privilege of the accelerated-depreciation provision on farm machinery which I am going to buy in the future."

What a travesty on justice. I want to say that is about as strong as any other claims I have heard the Republican Party make to justify the reasons why farm families should support a Republican administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator would not want to exclude from the alleged benefits granted to farmers, credit for

dividends received from stock; would he?

Mr. KERR. I think it is going to be wonderful and be a great comfort to the farmer to realize that if the day ever comes when he will have an income, he can thank the equity and the fairness of the Republican Party which made it possible for him to claim exemptions in his income tax for dividend credits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be inclined to believe that the Republican Party got the two kinds of stocks confused, the stock which is going up in the market and the stock that is found on the feed lot, which is going down?

Mr. KERR. I wish I could say what the Republicans did in that connection was due to ignorance on their part. But I desire to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I think they knew just as well what they were doing when they destroyed the economic foundation of the American farmer, as they did in building a greater foundation under the economic security of the large corporations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today the Senator from Minnesota is in a charitable spirit, let me say. That is why I am treating this subject with kindness and compassion. However, I shall come tomorrow with a little touch of acid.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, who knows but that on tomorrow the great Senator from Minnesota will be as realistic in his appraisal as he so often is; and I wish to be present to hear him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall try to accommodate the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I wish to be here to revel.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware now has any questions to ask, I am willing to yield to him at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from Oklahoma to yield to me. But, frankly, I have forgotten what he has been talking about. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Well, Mr. President, there is this difference between the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Delaware: The Senator from Delaware may have forgotten what I was talking about; but that indicates that at least once in his experience he knew what I was talking about. And that is more than he can say about himself when speaking on this floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in voting on the Johnson amendment, the Senate is not choosing between a balanced budget, on the one hand, or tax reduction, on the other. Neither is it a choice between a large reduction in governmental revenue or a large increase in governmental revenue. True, the Johnson amendment will provide some millions of dollars of additional revenue; but that is not its distinguishing characteristic.

The real choice of the Senate, Mr. President, is between tax reduction for the economically privileged few, on the one hand, or for the economically hard-pressed many, on the other. As I see it, the choice is precisely that simple.

Despite the recent rise in unemployment, I would seriously question the wisdom of voting materially to reduce, at this time, governmental revenue from either group. Indeed, I publicly announced my inability to vote for the individual tax reduction that recently passed the House of Representatives. To be sure, I am aware of the compensating economic theory and of the recommendations of Mr. Keyserling and many other economists. Moreover, I acknowledge that there is much merit to this theory of taxation. I have always had my reservations about taking it too literally, though, because it appears somewhat impractical in political practice. In other words, Mr. President, many in Congress are ready to vote large tax reductions at the very first signs of recession, or, indeed, without such signs. But the brave knights who advocate higher taxes even in the most prosperous times are a bit hard to find. I do not, however, find the stated reservation which I hold incompatible with a choice of a small tax reduction for our many low-income families, instead of large and, to say the very least, questionable tax reduction for a favored few.

Thus, Mr. President, I shall support the Johnson amendment. Should this amendment unfortunately fail of adoption, I will then offer amendments to close several glaring tax loopholes in the Revenue Act of 1954.

Last year when the Congress voted to reduce taxes I opposed the cuts partly because I felt we should not be reducing the flow of revenue to the Treasury when we were faced with a $4.7 billion deficit and a demand on the part of the Eisenhower administration for an increase in the national-debt limit. In the absence of compelling economic factors, I do not believe it is sound to make tax cuts when the Government has to borrow money to pay for those reductions. I doubt if economic factors were sufficiently compelling last year to justify large-scale tax reduction.

And, then, I held the deepest of convictions that the 1954 tax bill was unfair and unsound—that it contained many, many loopholes, errors, and unjustified tax favors.

This year, when the President sent his budget message to Congress, he forecast a $2.4 billion deficit. True, that is smaller than the deficit we faced last year. But a $2.4 billion deficit is still a great deal of money, and I fear that it is an overly optimistic estimate. Furthermore, I do not believe the budget took adequately into account the tremendous sums of money the Congress is likely to be asked to appropriate this year when the highway and school-building programs are finally reported from committee and enacted. There is urgent need for these programs; and because of these and other needs, we may find when we total up appropriations at the end of the year that the deficit will be considerably larger than the $2.4 billion forecast by the President.

Unfortunately, however, as I have said, the Senate is not faced with a choice between balancing the budget and voting tax relief. The choice before us is whether we shall continue to give unwarranted tax favors to business and stockholders of corporation stock or whether we shall revoke those favors and substitute therefor tax relief to millions of low-income families throughout the Nation. Faced with such a choice, as I and others are, I am constrained to support the kind of tax relief which will benefit the low-income families, for they constitute the greater part of our population, and they need the relief most. I hope the Johnson amendment will be adopted. Simple social justice requires it.

I shall shortly send to the desk, Mr. President, one of several amendments to be called up in case the Johnson amendment shall be defeated.

This amendment would repeal sections 34 and 116 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which gives certain favorable tax credits to recipients of income from corporate stock.

This provision of law admits to our tax statutes unwarranted tax favoritism that is the very antithesis of the principle of taxation according to ability to pay.

For the first time in American history unearned income from corporate stock holdings is given a tax preference over earned income—indeed, over all other income, even income from wartime United States savings bonds.

I point out that during the war drives were made for the sale of such bonds. The people responded patriotically, digging deep into their savings. Since then the rise in the cost of living and the advance in the cost index have depreciated the value of those bonds, yet the tax law of 1954 gives an income tax preference to income from corporation stock, even over the meager return from these wartime bonds.

One would hardly believe this possible in popular government, but here it is in the law. It must not be permitted to stand. The principle and precedent—the nose-under-the-tent—is more important than the amount of revenue involved, though the loss in revenue is very considerable.

When a citizen buys General Motors stock, I believe he invests his money. I doubt if very many, if any, average citizens buys G. M. stock because of pure pride of ownership or under any illusion that they will thereby become part of the management of General Motors. No, I submit, that is not the motive. The motive is investment, with the hope of reward. In this sense, it differs but little from investment in a farm, a gasoline service station, a piece of rental property or for that matter, a United States Government bond, except in limited liability, which favors the corporate investor.

Income from all these investments should be equal before the law.

Some day, when we can afford it, I would like to see a reenactment of a reasonable preference for income earned by the sweat of the brow. Wartime need for revenue forced the abandonment of this essentially sound preference for human effort over rewards from material possession. A tax preference for income from corporation stock over earned income and all other income cannot be successfully defended.

One of the principal arguments relied upon by the proponents of this provision is that the income received by shareholders in private corporations in the form of dividends is taxed twice, once to the corporation and again when received by the shareholders. Proponents object to this as "double taxation." I submit that in consonance with law it is not double taxation, and I can perceive no logical basis for this argument. When the corporation earns income, it is taxed as such to the corporate entity. When the investment of the stockholder earns income in the form of dividends, it is taxed to him. I can see no anomaly in this. The proponents of this provision would have us ignore, for the purpose of income tax, the independent existence of the corporate entity—but only to a certain extent.

They would not have us ignore that corporate form to the extent of taxing the income of the corporation directly to the owners of that corporation. In objecting to this proposition, they declare that if it were compulsory, various constitutional implications would be raised since income must be realized to be taxed and it is doubtful whether undistributed income has been realized by the stockholders. Thus, shareholders seek the protection of the corporate veil so as to shield themselves from the imposition of individual income taxes upon their proportionate share of the earnings of the corporations. But for the purpose of this scheme which they have put across they ignore the corporate form and blandly declare that the recipients of dividend income have already been taxed upon such income because their corporation has paid its tax. Consistently they have sought the protection of the corporate form when it would benefit them, and have sought to ignore it when their self-interest dictated.

If they would escape the corporate income tax they can easily do so. There is no legal compulsion upon any businessman to incorporate, nor is there any compulsion upon any investor to purchase the stock of a corporation. Yet, the incorporation of business enterprises continues and investments in corporate stocks increase. The investors responsible for this increase are aware of the distinction made in the Federal tax laws between the corporate form and its shareholders. They are aware that a tax is imposed upon each. That they choose to continue to invest in this type of enterprise is indicative of the fact that they feel that the advantages to be gained by incorporation far outweigh the so-called tax disadvantages.

We are all aware of the best-known privilege enjoyed by holders of corporate stock; namely, the economic insulation which the corporation affords its owners. Though the vicissitudes of business may imperil the investment of the shareholder his risk stops there. His other personal possessions are free from the demands of creditors, safe from the levy of the court, secure behind the walls of his own personal identity. All this because the corporation and the stockholder are separate persons, between whom there is a chasm which cannot be crossed by the most insistent creditor or the strongest process of the court.

Do the recipients of dividend income imagine that this freedom from personal liability is a gift of nature? Is it a natural resource which they enjoy by right of discovery? Of course not.

The proponents of this unsound provision of law were aware of those facts at the time the bill was passed. They are aware of them now; so are those of us who resisted its passage and who now seek its repeal.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very much interested in what the junior Senator from Tennessee is saying about the advantages which are enjoyed by investors in corporate stocks and the insulation from the normal personal risks as compared with those taken by a private entrepreneur.

While both are parts of our free-enterprise system, I agree that the man who risks his money in a partnership or in a personal business venture is certainly at a disadvantage as compared with the man who merely sits back and purchases existing stocks, particularly those listed on the stock exchanges of our great cities.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee well knows, the Banking and Currency Committee is engaged in a study of the stock market and the conditions surrounding its present high level.

It has been developed in that inquiry that today stocks are selling on the stock exchange at approximately 15 times their earnings; whereas before the crash in 1929, when stocks reached an alltime high, they were selling at only 17 times their earnings.

The point I wish to ask my distinguished colleague about is, if the cry regarding so-called double taxation and the great penalty stockholders claim they bear as a part of the tax burden, were real and true and important, could the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee feel that the stock market could have possibly reached the high figure at which it is today under such an onerous burden of taxation?

Mr. GORE. I believe the record of the rise in value of corporate stocks proves that such stocks are profitable investments. It proves also, I believe, that the American people enjoy a fling at speculation. It also demonstrates the effect of the tax legislation of 1954, which gives favors to income from that particular source.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee would agree with the junior Senator from Oklahoma, would he not, that the vast increase in stock market prices, in rising to new highs, has taken place since the passage of that act, which treats the giant corporations and the holders of securities on a very special basis. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. It is.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am advised that in the past 6 months the appreciation has been more than $66 billion in paper profits in the stock market, at a time when farmers and other elements of our national economy were losing billions of dollars. Yet, with the tax favoritism shown in the last tax bill, we have seen the stock market reach new highs each day, until this past week. Yet the cry goes up about double taxation and that this booming business in negotiable stocks is carrying too high a proportion of the taxload.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his contribution. As he well knows, the corporate entity is a legal fiction, a product of the law. It exists only in the laws of the United States and in the laws of our respective States. It is ridiculous to say that there is anything wrong, either legally, morally, or ethically, in making the enjoyment of this benefit subject to any conditions which the Federal Government or the States choose to impose.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I should like to invite his attention to some figures developed by the staff of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency which show that more than half of the earnings made by corporations over the years 1944 to 1954 have been plowed back into the corporations. In other words, more than half of the earnings have been retained, and, therefore, have borne only the original corporate tax, with all the advantage of depreciation, wartime-accelerated depreciation, and other devices which have been found in the tax laws.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator not agree that that demonstrates one other advantage of corporate ownership and the ownership of corporate stock? The retained earnings have not been taxed to the shareholder, and yet there has been an appreciation of his holdings. Should he sell his stocks at their appreciated value he would pay not the normal tax, but only a capital-gains tax. Not so with a partnership. Not so with personal ownership of a business.

Every dollar that is earned from a personally owned business or from a partnership is taxed at the time, in the year, and to the person to whom it belongs. But not so with corporate holdings. The record shows that in recent times as much as 70 percent of corporate expansion has been financed by retained earnings.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may request unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement of the corporate profits, after taxes, for the years 1944 to 1955, in billions of dollars, the retained earnings in billions of dollars, and

the dividends declared in billions of dollars, which roughly show that far more than half of corporate earnings have been plowed back and have not paid income tax, but, as the Senator from Tennessee has so well shown, have resulted in an appreciation of capital values which can remain untaxed forever unless the owner of the securities chooses to sell on an advantageous market. Furthermore, if he should sell on a disadvantageous market, he has the right to offset his loss against other profits he has made, so that he is doubly insulated against losses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the table of earnings to which I have referred, showing corporate profits after tax, retained earnings, and dividend distributions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Corporate profits after tax, retained earnings, and dividend distributions, selected years, 1944–54*

[Billions of dollars]

	Corporate profits after tax	Retained earnings	Dividends
1944	10.4	5.7	4.7
1946	13.4	7.7	5.8
1948	20.3	13.0	7.2
1949	15.8	8.3	7.5
1950	22.1	12.9	9.2
1951	18.7	9.6	9.1
1952	17.2	8.1	9.1
1953	18.3	8.9	9.4
1954	17.8	8.0	9.9
Total	154.0	82.2	61.9

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this brings to mind one other advantage of the corporate entity. It has been advanced by some that this provision was put forward for the benefit of the small shareholder. That is not so. It has been represented that it was for the benefit of small business. That is not so. One advantage which the small corporation has and one which is rather typically in use is the payment of most of the profits of the corporation in the form of salaries and bonuses.

Then there is still another, which is the opportunity of the small closely held corporation to liquidate and distribute, subject only to the capital-gains tax.

I wish to say emphatically that those who make a corporate investment choose it in the knowledge of the treatment under the law of a corporation as a separate legal entity. They choose it fully aware of the fact that the Federal tax laws levy a burden upon the corporation as one person and upon the shareholder as another person whenever a dividend is declared and distributed.

The corporate person is a legal fiction. It exists only in the laws of the United States and of the States, and it is ridiculous to say that there is anything wrong—either legally, morally, or ethically—in making the enjoyment of this benefit subject to any conditions which the Federal Government or States choose to impose.

In spite of the tremendous advantage of limited liability made possible by the corporate form, this is by no means the only—or even the greatest—benefit, which incorporation makes possible. In this day and age, the complexities of modern business life require a business unit which possesses an existence uninfluenced by such human frailties as death or sickness—a business unit which may serve an enterprise for an indefinite period into the future. This perpetual continuity of existence is especially important in making plans for long-term utilization of heavy property investments.

The advantage of perpetual life is a major factor in another—and perhaps the most important—advantage of incorporation: Its greater accessibility to means of financing. Lenders are especially interested in the fact that the lifetime of the corporation is independent of any of those persons who have joined to create it. The ability to issue and sell additional equity securities without materially diluting the control of the business enterprise is an added financing advantage not available to sole proprietorships or partnerships. The widespread use of the corporate device has led to the development of stock exchanges which, in turn, have enabled corporations to tap sources of capital unavailable to other business forms, for the small stockholder, with only a moderate amount to invest, constitutes an important reservoir of new money, which the corporation managers are striving to tap with every resource at their command.

Many investors might hesitate to risk money in a business venture if they knew it would be difficult to withdraw whenever they desired. The corporate device offers at one and the same time the appeal of continuous business activity by the corporation, with the added possibility of entrance and withdrawal from ownership rights by every individual investor. This liquidity of the shareholder's investment has been one of the most effective of all corporate advantages in stimulating general investment and in making possible the accumulation of large sums of money for disposal by the corporation's management. I submit that it is this fact which constitutes one of the principal attractions for corporate investors. It is an advantage inherent in the nature of the corporate form, which is in no way enhanced or diminished by the dividend credit concessions embodied in the present law.

There is an additional advantage for corporations which is granted by the very tax laws so consistently and vehemently denounced by the political champions of dividend recipients. This is the invaluable privilege of retaining in the corporation itself, at greatly reduced rates of tax, sufficient capital for its growth and expansion. This is an advantage which is not shared on an equal basis by partnerships or individual enterprises, as the entire earnings of such concerns must be included in the income of their owners and taxed at personal income rates, which frequently are much higher than the corporate rates. The election granted in the 1954 code to certain partnerships to be taxed as corporations is so bound by restrictions and qualifications that it cannot seriously be said that partnerships are placed thereby in a position comparable to their corporate competitors. That this particular advantage is of inestimable importance to corporations is amply evident from the fact that at least 70 percent of corporate expansion is financed by retained earnings. The 1954 Tax Code greatly enhanced this valuable attribute possessed by corporations through its extremely liberal and highly questionable provisions for accelerated depreciation and amortization.

In this brief summary of the advantages of incorporation, I have mentioned only the more obvious ones. Of course, any person familiar with the intricate nature of present-day industrial and commercial activity realizes that there are many more to which I have not made reference.

Many of the more subtle benefits derived from incorporation are vastly important to the organizations which enjoy them. Among these is the increased bargaining strength available to larger scale organizations in buying and selling, as shown by quantity discount practices. Also, the possibility of intercorporate consolidations make possible the concentration and centralized direction of many varied enterprises, to the resultant benefit of their owners.

The dividend tax credit cannot be defended, as some seek to do, as a tax benefit to small business. Earnings of small corporations are typically distributed through salaries, bonuses, and other benefits. And, then, there are the inviting privileges of plowing back the earnings and later sale of appreciated values with capital-gains treatment of profits.

Let me remind the Senate that this is at the approximate rate paid by an individual with a personal income of $7,000 a year, even though the income to be treated by the capital gains tax may be $700,000 a year, or without limit.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Observing that point, is it not also true that one of the favorite methods of rewarding management, or the presidents or superintendents of giant corporations, is to give them stock options, from which they can thus realize the payment for their services on a capital gains basis, under the 25 percent tax, which the distinguished Senator mentions, rather than to pay the exceedingly high personal income tax on a salary of $100,000 or $200,000, which would leave a relatively small percentage of that amount for take-home pay?

Mr. GORE. It is all too widespread. It is one more tax loophole which Congress should seek to close.

I wish to inject this thought. The 1954 tax law was taken to the American people. Sitting near me is a distinguished Senator who made the tax law an issue in his campaign. I spoke in the course of that campaign in some 14 States. In all those 14 States, the favoritism and unfairness of the 1954 tax law were a principal issue.

The American people expect this Congress to seek to close some of the loopholes, not only those to which reference has been made, but also others which are deeply imbedded in the law.

It is in that direction that we are now trying to move, and I appreciate the contribution of the able junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Even if the tax on dividends did in fact constitute double taxation, which I deny, ample justification could be found in the many valuable advantages and concessions granted to corporations and, through them, to the stockholders.

But I repeat, and I insist, that the phrase "double taxation" when applied to taxation of the corporation on the one hand, as one person, and the taxation of the dividend when realized by the stockholder on the other hand, as another, is a canard.

The advantages of incorporation which I have mentioned are more than just advantages enjoyed by corporations; they are distinguishing features between corporations and other forms of business enterprises. They serve to emphasize the distinct and separate nature of the corporate person as compared to its individual stockholders; and to differentiate it from other forms of American business. A tax on each of these two separate persons does not constitute double taxation.

Assuming, however, for the sake of argument, that the tax upon dividends does result in double taxation, can it be contended that this instance of double taxation presents a unique phenomenon in our American tax structure?

Our daily life is replete with numerous examples of multiple taxation. Take the example of the automobile. My small business in my home town bought a new automobile a short time ago. A State sales tax was paid on it, and that sales tax of 2 percent was calculated not only upon the cost of the automobile, but it included 2 percent of the Federal excise tax, which had been added to the cost of the automobile. It included 2 percent of the tax on the tires. It included 2 percent of all of approximately 100 taxes which had gone into the cost of that automobile. It was estimated that before that automobile reached my home town, $400 in taxes had been added to its cost. Then the purchaser paid not only 2 percent of the cost of the automobile, but also 2 percent of the $400 taxes. Thus, as my colleagues can see, there is not only double taxation in that instance, but multiple taxation.

I believe Mr. Eisenhower, during his campaign for the Presidency, illustrated this form of taxation by holding up an egg and saying that by the time it reached the breakfast table it had had 40 taxes added to it. Taxes on manufacturers, processors, shippers, wholesalers, and retailers are all passed on to the consumer.

I recall that when an effort is made to raise the tax rate on corporations, it is argued that the corporation would not pay the tax, but would merely pass it on to the consumers. I think that is a correct statement; but it is correct in the instant case, too.

There is no way in which the consumer can escape double and quadruple and quintuple and multiple taxation. He must pay the taxes imposed on those from whom he buys, and he must pay these taxes on every single item he buys, from the most extravagant luxuries to the very necessities of life. The investor can avoid the so-called double taxation of his investment dollar, by making noncorporate investments, but there is no way the consumer can escape the multiple taxation of his dollar.

One other point in this controversy commends itself to us for further emphasis. What is the method employed to grant relief from this so-called double taxation? The recipients of dividend income are first privileged to exclude a flat sum from their gross income. Then, in addition, they are allowed to deduct a certain percentage of their remaining dividend income from their tax. This is an extremely valuable advantage in that there is no ceiling in terms of dollars on this latter deduction. Although it may amount to many thousands of dollars, the specified percentage may be deducted directly from the tax of that individual, up to 4 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I am delighted to yield to my able and brilliant friend, the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Tennessee is making a most extraordinary point, which needs to be emphasized over and over again, namely, that the 4-percent dividend credit is deducted from the taxes which the individual pays, and not from the taxable income upon which the tax is levied.

Mr. GORE. That is correct; and that is a very valuable form of favoritism, which is not extended to any other category of taxpayer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, the credit is applied directly to the tax.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not income exempt from tax, but it is a direct deduction from the tax, and therefore amounts to a much larger tax reduction.

Mr. GORE. To put it in another way, it is not a deductible expense which is subtracted from gross income before arriving at the taxable income. For the first time in American history this particular favored group is allowed to subtract the credit, not from its income, but from taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request, in order that I may submit a modification of the substitute now pending?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of the amendment now pending, and ask that it may be printed, so that it may be available tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that the modification be read?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I merely ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification of the amendment proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas on behalf of himself and other Senators is as follows:

On page 13, line 13, after "husband and wife" insert "(other than a husband and wife to whom paragraph (2) applies)".

On page 13, after line 22, insert the following:

"(2) INCOME OF HUSBAND AND WIFE UNDER COMMUNITY PROPERTY LAWS.—If a husband and wife both file separate returns and if any of the income of the husband and the wife is community income under the laws of the State of residence of the husband or the wife, the credit under subsection (a) (as modified under subsection (b)) or under subsection (d) shall be computed as if the husband and wife filed a joint return, and one-half of the credit (if any) so computed shall be allowed to the husband and one-half shall be allowed to the wife."

On page 13, line 23, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the advocates of the fallacious policy I have been discussing have openly stated that their real desire is the complete elimination of the individual income tax on dividends, with the immediate objective of providing stockholders with a dividend tax credit of 20 percent of the amount of dividends received.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my memory when I say that when last year the Humphrey tax bill was first introduced in the House, or was first submitted to the House committee, it provided for a 20-percent dividend tax credit?

Mr. GORE. I believe it was 15 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct that the proposal aroused such a storm of indignation that when the bill went to the House floor, the Republicans reduced that percentage to 10 percent?

Mr. GORE. Yes, because certain Members of Congress, including the able senior Senator from Illinois, pointed out that such a tax credit would be almost equivalent to the complete elimination of all corporate taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that although that bill came to the floor of the Senate, with a 10-percent dividend credit, when the eminent, able, and witty senior Senator from from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] saw what was likely to happen to it on the floor of the Senate, he withdrew the 10-percent provision, and then instituted a 4-percent dividend credit?

Mr. GORE. In conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senate initially voted to eliminate the dividend credit on the floor, did it not?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the 4-percent credit was restored in conference.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the purpose was rather clearly indicated in the original bill, was it not?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While they were willing to retreat on the percentages, they would be content if they could establish the priciple. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. In this instance the principle was more important than the amount. For the first time in American history we have by law given a tax preference to a particular type of income, as compared with the income from the sweat of one's brow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If they can anesthetize or intimidate the conscience of America, and thus can establish this 4-percent provision, then in future sessions of the Congress, if they are in power, are not they likely to expand it to 5 percent, 10 percent, 15 percent, or 20 percent?

Mr. GORE. That is the stated objective. In addition to what has been stated by the able senior Senator from Illinois, they may be able to accomplish it through misleading, misguiding, and beguiling the American people with the canard of "double taxation."

Mr. President, having before us the effect on the Federal revenues of the credits contained in the 1954 tax law, there is required little imagination to foresee the condition of the Federal Treasury if this fondest hope of the dividend bloc is realized.

The concession which they have actually been granted by the 1954 Code is not large, compared with their original request, but it is a beachhead from which the fight for bigger and better tax concessions will be waged.

We have heard repeatedly the argument that section 34 has been drawn for the benefit of the "little man"—the small investor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that Mr. George M. Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, when appearing before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in 1954, stated that, after all, the stock of American corporations was owned primarily by those of low incomes or middle incomes, and that therefore the benefit of a policy which helped corporations would help the small-income families?

Mr. GORE. I did not know he had said that. I would be surprised if he did, because the record shows that less than 1 percent of American families own 80 percent of the publicly listed stocks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I heard the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury; and I should like to submit for the RECORD an excerpt from his remarks.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Illinois may have the privilege of inserting at this point in the RECORD the quotation to which he has referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. From the hearings I quote the following:

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, 15. (Continuing.) That will be close to $700 million more and, of course, the overwhelming proportion of dividends are received by those in the upper income group?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I do not believe I will agree to that. Dividends more and more are being received by the people who own pensions, who have insurance, of all sorts. It is the great mass of the American people that are getting the great ownership in American industry today, and it is coming through pension funds and through insurance funds and things of that kind that are drawing tremendously and are going into equity securities.

Senator DOUGLAS. Is it the poor people who receive the dividends?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; indeed. They get through their——

Senator DOUGLAS. Do the poor people receive the major portion of the dividends?

Secretary HUMPHREY. They get dividends through their pension funds and through their insurance. (Hearings, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, p. 80.)

Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Tennessee acquainted with the various studies of consumer finances which have been conducted by the Federal Reserve Board, and which have appeared in the Federal Reserve Bulletin in 1949, 1950, and 1952?

Mr. GORE. I have seen them, but I am not familiar with them in detail. Would the Senator from Illinois mind refreshing my memory about them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The survey for 1952 showed that only 7 percent of all spending units—that is to say, families and bachelors living outside the family home—owned any stock at all; and that was substantially the same condition which existed in 1950 and 1949.

The survey showed, further, that only 8 percent of the 47 million families own any stock. This is roughly the same result that the Brookings Institution—a most conservative group—found for approximately the same period of time. Its figure was 9.5 percent.

So the fact is established, namely, that, at the most, not more than 1 family in 10, and probably not more than 1 family in 12, owns any stock.

Mr. GORE. And the bulk of the stocks are owned by less than 1 percent of American families.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is an extremely important point.

The group which made this study for the Federal Reserve Board—namely, Messrs. Katona, Lansing, and De Janosi, of the University of Michigan, published an article in the Michigan Business Review for January 1953; and in the article it is pointed out that 8 percent of the families which did own stock owned over four-fifths of the value of all publicly held stock. So 8 percent of the 8 percent which did own stock would be 0.64 percent or two-thirds of 1 percent.

So the statement of the Senator from Tennessee seems to be in complete conformance with these studies of the Federal Reserve Board.

In terms of incomes, they summarize the study as follows:

Families with incomes under $5,000 own substantially less than 10 percent of the stock.

Families with incomes of between $5,000 and $10,000 own approximately 20 percent of the stock.

Families with incomes of over $10,000 own over 80 percent of the value of all publicly held stock.

Even if we make allowances for errors caused by sampling—because, after all, they had to limit the amount of sampling—they conclude that—

It is highly probable that among the 5 percent of American families with incomes of over $10,000 are the owners of at least three-fourths of all publicly held stock.

That is the most conservative of all, and it provides for the widest possible range of error in sampling.

Mr. GORE. Which illustrates a statement I made in the beginning of my remarks, namely, that the choice of the Senate in voting on the Johnson amendment is not between balancing the budget or tax relief; but, rather, the choice of the Senate is between giving tax favors to the economically privileged few or giving a small tax reduction to the economically depressed many.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the issue is whether the concessions shall go to the upper 1 percent or, at the most, to the upper 5 percent; or whether the concessions shall go to the American people as a whole. Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. I think that is very aptly put.

During recent years the large corporations have made a determined drive to place at least 1 share of stock in the hands of each of their employees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Despite that, not more than 8 percent of the families own stock.

Mr. GORE. The purpose of the drive is, I think, but thinly veiled. They would like, however, to have a very thick veil, which would conceal the statistics to which the Senator has referred, and thereby make more feasible the tax favoritism embodied in the 1954 act, and the tax favoritism which they yet desire to attain.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator observed the way some of the sponsors of the stock ownership idea have twisted it around so as to make it appear that actually they were helping the little man—for example, by suggesting that the majority of corporation stockholders were making less than $5,000?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Without pointing out the fact that the majority of such corporation stockholders held only one share of stock.

Mr. GORE. Yes. That is the use of the veil.

Mr. LONG. The Secretary of the Treasury questioned the very figures which the Senator from Tennessee was discussing with the Senator from Illinois. I requested that he bring in his figures to show us what the concentration of stock ownership was. Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey brought in figures indicating that 1 percent of the people owned 70 percent of all corporation stock, which is not very much at variance with the figures the Senator was discussing a moment ago.

Mr. GORE. I should say that was very good, coming from Secretary Humphrey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has pointed out very plainly that approximately 1 percent of American families own about 80 percent of the publicly held stock.

Mr. GORE. I believe it is considerably less than 1 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am using a generous figure. Is it not equally important that of the 1 percent of American families—or less than 1 percent—which own 80 percent of stock, a very small percentage of American families actually control the voting stock in the corporations, which voting stock has control of the business policies of the corporations? I think this goes to the heart of the whole matter of fiscal management of the funds about which the Senator was speaking a moment ago. Under such management some 40 percent of the profits were plowed back into the business, 40 percent which would have gone out as taxable income, in the form of dividends, but which went back into the business, to be managed by less than 5 percent of the 1 percent of families which owned controlling interest and the voting stock.

Mr. GORE. Would not the Senator like to know the amount of their political contributions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be very interesting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee was speaking about political campaigns last year. I happened to go through one of them. I am very proud that I made the corporation tax one of the major issues in my campaign. I happened to win by a very large majority. I think this issue was one of the most dominant issues in the campaign.

I was interested in a letter which the Republican Finance Committee of Illinois issued over the signature of some eminent industrialists and Republicans, to business groups in the State, pointing out to them that they had received large tax favors in the tax bill, and asking them to contribute a portion of the tax reductions in the form of contributions to the Republican Party, also saying that the result would be still greater tax reductions in the future.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator suppose that that was the game which was played last year, to which reference was made earlier in the day?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, if Democrats had done that they would have been denounced. However, Republican businessmen did it. I shall search my scrapbook during the next hour to see if the material to which I referred cannot be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Illinois may have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD at this point the letter to which he has made reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I present the letter for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN CITIZENS' FINANCE COMMITTEE OF ILLINOIS,
Chicago, September 23, 1954.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: The significance of the election in Maine has been played down by much of the press and by Republican political candidates. The election of a Democratic governor and important percentage drops in the majorities of the four winning Members of Congress in that State must be viewed more realistically. They are an indication that the success in 1952 has produced an apathy that could turn the Congress back to the Democrats.

We should be proud of the progress of economy in Government under this Republican administration. The tax reform bill has been most favorable to business. 1954 has been a good business year overall. 1953 was an all-time high in our country's economic history. To return to the Democratic inflationary tax-and-spend principle would be a calamity.

At this writing the Republican Citizens' Finance Committee is far short of its goal of $750,000. To meet Illinois' 1954 quota for the National budget and to back up our Republican candidates in the State of Illinois with the adequate finance needed for an aggressive campaign requires the generosity of each Republican who believes his government is managed better by Republicans.

This is an appeal to you to give and give generously. Why not base your contribution on a percentage of this year's savings in personal income tax. Twenty-five to fifty percent of your tax savings should be dedicated to elect men who are pledged to further economy in government and further tax cuts.

Vital commitments cannot be maintained in this campaign if the money is delayed. It will be greatly appreciated by those responsible for raising these funds if your response would be prompt.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD L. RYERSON,
President.

FRED M. GILLIES,
General Campaign Chairman.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. To show how the corporation-stock provision favors the little man or the widow who has 1 or 2 shares of stock, I should like to illustrate to the Senator how much it could mean to her

Mr. GORE. Are they not nearly all widows?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us take 2 minutes out for weeping, now.

Mr. LONG. Assuming that a widow is left $100 in corporation stock, and she receives $6 in dividends on that stock for 1 year, she would be entitled to a 4-percent credit, which means she would be entitled to a credit of 24 cents against her tax bill. Assuming that she paid taxes at perhaps 20 percent, that would mean that that widow would be saved 6 cents.

Mr. GORE. That is marvelous.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us not be unmindful of these great benefits. I am sure the Senator wants to pay appropriate tribute to the Republican tax policy for these gifts, even though they may not be large. As the Senator can plainly see, the spirit is there—the 6-cent spirit is there.

I wish the Senator from Louisiana would use his computing ability to determine how this would affect one, let us say, in the upper-income brackets, a member of one of the families which own most of the publicly held stock. I think such a showing would be impressive.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the junior Senator from Louisiana has a fine mathematical mind. However, it does not require an astute mathematician to envision as much as a $100,000 benefit to many taxpayers on this basis. Let us take a dividend of $100,000, which is rather small for the 1 percent of American families about whom we have been speaking. Such a person would receive a tax reduction of $4,000. How much larger would it have been had we not fought this provision in the Congress last year, and how much more favorable would it become if we had not won the election last year?

Now let us take a look at the contention that dividend relief was necessary to encourage investment capital. Proponents of this argument urged the trickle-down theory. They said they sought wider use of investment capital so more businesses and industries would be built. Such expansion of business and industry, they claimed, would create more and more jobs and thereby improve the lot of the low-income family. But what has happened. Full time unemployment now stands at about 3.5 million workers. With part time unemployment averaged in, actual unemployment is estimated to be about 4 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Earlier in the day I submitted the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report of the President. On page 96 the staff submitted a report on what the total amount of unemployment was, taking into account not only (a) unemployed as such, but (b) layoffs, which are virtually unemployment, and (c) involuntary part time, reduced to total numbers of unemployed. The final result at which they arrive is that in February the equivalent number of totally unemployed was 4,307,000.

Mr. GORE. I ask the Senator, Is this unemployment attributable to a lack of industrial capacity?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly not.

Mr. GORE. Do we need to create more industries to put unemployed people to work, or are some production facilities lying idle now?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, is not the test of the pudding in the eating thereof? As of last year the situation did not improve. More people are out of jobs. More people have lost their jobs on farms and factories than have

found jobs. The result was increasing unemployment, rather than reducing unemployment.

Mr. GORE. At the same time we have had a booming stock market, a stock market propelled in part by tax favoritism in connection with dividend income.

At the same time, according to the opinion and statement of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], another feature of the 1954 Revenue Act permitted so much depreciation as to directly contribute to unemployment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. To summarize it, the effect of last year's act seems to have been that industry has produced less, hired fewer people, and made more money and paid less in taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That summarizes a major portion of my speech. In addition, I have made an attempt to disrobe and unmask the canard of double taxation.

We have the capacity to produce 9 million cars, but this year automobile manufacturers do not expect to be able to sell more than 6.6 million. So production will be only about three-fourths of capacity.

We can make 125 million tons of steel, but the market for steel this year is expected to be able to absorb only about 107 million tons.

We can make 12.4 million TV sets per year, but manufacturers figure they can sell only about 9.2 million.

Because of market conditions we will make only a little more than half the electric ranges, refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners we are capable of producing.

There is no shortage of productive capacity in most industry in this country, and a look at the booming stock market ought to convince almost any reasonable man that there is no shortage of investment capital to expand any sound industry that can find a market for expanded production.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Has the Senator from Tennessee noticed any booming in the stock market since the investigation of it started?

Mr. GORE. I believe the stock market is still in a booming condition.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It boomed $7 billion off since the investigation into the market started. I wonder whether the Senator knows that.

Mr. GORE. That may be a very healthy development. I remember another boom some time ago. If the stock market has no sounder foundation than that which can be undermined by a mere revelation of a few facts of its operation, then it is in a weak condition indeed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator subscribe to the idea that a loss of $7 billion of potential income to the people of this country, regardless of where it may go, is of no consequence and that we should not be concerned with it?

Mr. GORE. I would not at all subscribe to any thought that the loss of $7 billion in capital is a matter of no consequence. I am not at all sure, however, that an additional $7 billion of synthetic value added on top of an unsound market would not be even more of a detriment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sorry that the Senator thinks it is an unsound market.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Inasmuch as the Senator from Arizona has raised this issue, I should like to call attention to the fact that some of the best financial analysts, who are extremely conservative, such as Mr. J. A. Livingston, have said it has been a very healthy thing to get these matters appraised, so that the public can make up its mind; that the same sentiments are being expressed by Miss Sylvia Porter, who is probably one of the best financial writers in the country; and that this morning the New York Times published an article written by Mr. Edward H. Collins, one of the most conservative writers in the United States, in which he pointed out that in March, 1928, when the Senate held a similar inquiry, Senators were certain that everything was all right, and went no further with the investigation—since those were Republican days—and that as a result the boom continued through 1928 and into 1929, only to collapse later in that year.

The inference which Mr. Collins drew was that it was a good thing that these matters were being appraised before the situation got out of hand.

General Wood, who was one of the witneses who testified before our committee—and certainly he does not love the Democrats in any sense—and who probably stands politically at the extreme right of the American spectrum, approved the investigation. And Mr. McCloy, of the Chase National Bank, also approves it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I would further remind the able Senator from Arizona that there is certainly involved the danger of inflation of the stock market, as well as deflation of the market, whether justified or unjustified.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Tennessee aware of the fact that the stock market on the whole has gone up during the past 2 years approximately by $50 billion in the value of the stocks listed on the exchanges?

Mr. GORE. I am indeed familiar with it. I have pointed out that the gains thereof are taxed as capital gains, or at the 25 percent tax rate.

Mr. LONG. Therefore, those who had the good fortune to share measurably in the $50 billion increase in stock values are certainly faring better than farmers, for example, who have had their assets reduced by 10 percent; are they not?

Mr. GORE. I believe those who operate in the stock markets could take some further losses and still fare much better.

Mr. LONG. They are certainly faring much better than laboring people, many of whom have lost their jobs; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I believe so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not have the slightest idea whether the stock market is too high or too low. I say that despite the fact that I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, I believe it is a very misleading statement for our good friend from Arizona to make, that there has been a capital loss of $7 billion. We do not know whether there has been any loss at all. Ever since markets have been established, they have fluctuated. They have gone up and they have gone down. They went up for 2 years. Now they have gone down during the last week.

There has been a diminution in value of securities on paper of possibly $5 billion or $6 billion or $7 billion. There is no certainty that the market will not come back. We may well find it at an even higher level, if the securities are worth the price which the people are willing to pay for them. There is no evidence that there has been a loss in capital of $5 billion or $6 billion or any other amount at the present time.

Mr. GORE. I would not wish to attribute the fall in the market to the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I believe a service will have been performed if the committee ascertains the facts. If the market is soundly based, it will have been a service to let the American people know it. If synthetic and inflated values are being further inflated, then it will be a service to the American people to have them know that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we heard any loud objections from our friends on the other side about the decline in other so-called stock markets, namely, with reference to the price of livestock in the past 3 years and the price of hogs in the past few months?

Mr. GORE. I do not believe I heard it. There may have been something said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the case of hogs, about a year ago hogs were selling for 25 cents a pound, and that today they are selling between 15 and 16 cents a pound for the tops and below 13 cents a pound for the inferior grades?

Mr. GORE. Unfortunately that is true. I know it because I have some to sell. It is unfortunate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee, who has not had an opportunity to follow the hearings as closely as the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Illinois and other Senators, realizes that possibly

without exception every one of the witnesses who has appeared before our committee has expressed the opinion that the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency serve a very useful purpose.

In that group I include the president of the New York Stock Exchange, the president of the Midwestern Stock Exchange, at Chicago, the president of the San Francisco Stock Exchange, and also Mr. Marriner Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board. This morning there appeared before the committee a witness for the New York Stock Exchange. Every one of those men said it would be serving a very useful purpose to bring the entire situation out into the open. They refused to commit themselves on whether stocks are too low or too high; and I think they are very wise in that position. Every one of them thinks the investigation is serving a useful purpose in developing the facts, and they sounded a very necessary note of caution.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that, in general, the Senators on the other side of the aisle seek to discredit anyone who implies that there may be rocks and shoals ahead?

Mr. GORE. I think they are a little bit unappreciative of our efforts in that direction. I would not wish to say that the stock market is sound or unsound, that the values are falsely based or soundly based, but I believe the committee will be of service to the American people if it proceeds with its fact finding and truth finding, making the results available to the American people.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to suggest to the able Senator from Tennessee that we have no objection to a committee endeavoring to chart the rocks and shoals. We do have objection to individuals attempting to build rocks and shoals.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator mean to imply that he thinks the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is deliberately trying to undermine the market or deliberately trying to break this country up on the rocks and shoals?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sure the Senator would not misinterpret my remarks in any such fashion. I was merely referring to people who lost several million dollars during the past week and who might like to know some possible cause for it. I have not explored it myself.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator imply that the loss of values in the market has been the direct result of the hearings by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us say this, that when a dark cloud passes over, sometimes some rain falls.

Mr. GORE. That is a witticism worthy of the able Senator. I am not sure of his meaning, but some time when I have the privilege of visiting the Senator's State——

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator can bring a dark cloud there, so that there will be rain, we shall be very much obliged to him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, investors are competing wildly with each other for shares of industry. But with all this risk capital readily available, is industry moving to expand production and make more jobs? We have but to look at the Economic Report of the President for the answer. It indicates that expenditures for new plants and equipment during the first quarter of 1955 will be $1.45 billion less than for the same period last year.

The key to expanding our production at this time is not investment capital, but rather a stimulation of consumption. I submit that tax relief for business and a relatively few stockholders will not stimulate consumption nearly so well as will relief for low-income families. For these families for the most part will not put income from tax relief into savings, but will immediately plough it into the market by using it to pay for consumer goods.

Thus consumption will be stimulated, and if our economy can cousume more, then industry can put to work some of the production capacity which is now standing idle. A step up of production will mean more jobs, and more jobs will mean more payrolls, and more payrolls will mean greater buying power in the hands of the masses of the people, and so the circle goes. Tax relief to low-income families will give a magnified stimulation to the economy, because the income from that relief will turn over and over several times in the economy.

So, Mr. President, if we must choose between tax reduction that will stimulate consumer purchasing power or tax favors that may or may not stimulate an expansion of productive capacity, as we must in voting on the Johnson amendment, then we had better transfer that stimulation to the marketplace. Business bases its investment plans primarily upon current and prospective markets. I do not think there has ever been a time when there was a lucrative market for a product that a way was not found for business to expand to meet the market demand.

The Johnson amendment would also substitute tax reduction for other unjustified tax favors and loopholes for big business and big income. I favor repeal of this tax favoritism and will offer amendments for this purpose in the event the Johnson amendment is not adopted. But first I wholeheartedly support the Johnson amendment and hope it will be adopted.

I wish to close by saying that I appreciate the attention of my colleagues, and particularly that of the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. Along with him, I announced my opposition to the tax reduction which passed the House. But when an opportunity is afforded to give tax relief to the hard-pressed many in substitution of what I believe to be unwise and unsound tax favoritism to the economically favored few, then I choose tax reduction for the many.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to correct the RECORD to the extent that I misinformed the Senator concerning the situation of a widow who received $100 in dividends on stock. Actually, such a person would find it to advantage to take the dividend exclusion provision whereby the first $50 of dividends is excluded from taxation. In any event, the widow would have a benefit of $1.20.

Mr. GORE. I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that the dividend credit stated in that amount and the percentage run concurrently.

Mr. LONG. Yes. It would be my best calculation that a widow would have to have at least $2,000 in stock, on the average, to be as well off as she would be with the $20 tax credit proposed. Furthermore, I think the Senator might be inclined to agree with me that between the two policies, it might be wise to encourage the people to invest in bonds rather than to buy stock on the stock exchange.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator, as I did, went out on bond selling campaigns and encouraged people to invest in Government bonds. Inflation has wiped out a part of their investment, and now we discriminate against them by giving certain tax advantages to others.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the tax bill proposed by the minority as a substitute for the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee is not like the simple, single-shot $20 amendment adopted by the House. It is a five-barreled blast loaded with complex legislation which has not been considered by any congressional committee.

The sponsors of the proposed substitute claim that their plan will not only offset the $908 million loss of revenue it will create, but, in addition, that it will eliminate the deficit in fiscal year 1956 and produce a surplus in the Treasury.

I wish first to address myself to the claim that the proposed substitute will balance the budget. How do the sponsors of the substitute figure this would be done?

They start off by taking credit for $1 billion in the correction of an "error" in the 1954 tax bill. This is an utterly fallacious claim, because to date the loss has not occurred. Proposed legislation is already on its way through the House to correct the provision on a retroactive basis. Correction by the sponsors of the substitute or otherwise would not add to revenue in terms of budget estimates.

I think the Senate may feel well assured that the Senate Finance Committee, in orderly procedure, will act promptly on the proposed legislation which is now under consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

However, the correction may be made, the facts of the situation reduce the revenue gain figures in the proposed substitute by $1 billion.

The committee bill extends certain excise taxes and the 5 percent additional corporation taxes for 1 year until April 1, 1956.

The substitute bill would extend these taxes from April 1, 1956, to July 1, 1957, and the sponsors claim this would result in a revenue gain of $3,530,000,000.

It should be remembered that these were temporary war taxes, superimposed on already high rates to meet Korean war expenses. The excises are on such items as gasoline, passenger cars, trucks, buses, trailer, automobile parts and accessories, motorcycles, tobacco, beer, wine, and distilled spirits. The additional corporation taxes apply to little corporations as well as to big corporations.

Since the end of the Korean war Congress has been extending them on a year-to-year basis, after a thorough review of the fiscal situation and the conditions existing. If it is found that these taxes should and can be renewed a year from now, there can be no doubt that that will be done then, as it has been in the past.

By the nature of these taxes, and on the basis of the record of their continuation, it is fallacious for the sponsors of the substitute to claim revenue gain in a proposal to extend the taxes into an additional fiscal year. They might just as well propose to extend them 10 years and claim a $30 billion gain. If this were correct, a start would be made toward paying off the national debt.

These war taxes were imposed under legislation enacted in 1950, and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee at that time, wrote the expiration dates in the act.

I want to take this occasion to say that it has been my high privilege to serve on the Senate Finance Committee with the distinguished Senator from Georgia for 22 years. During this momentous period we have experienced a depression and two wars, and Congress has been compelled to assess taxes and collect revenue totaling $629 billion. I dare say that never in all history has it been necessary, in a period of this duration, to collect such taxes from the people of any one Nation.

Day by day, and year by year, with profound admiration, I have watched the Senator from Georgia use his great capacity to distribute this burden in a manner to finance these terrible emergencies and, at the same time, to preserve our free enterprise system. I do not have to tell the Senate how easy it is to destroy business enterprise with exorbitant taxes levied disproportionately.

I predict that long after we are gone, generations to come will pay tribute to the wisdom, the courage, and the capacity of Senator GEORGE, and that history will record him as one of the greatest American Senators.

As I have said, it was the Senator from Georgia who, by writing expiration dates into the war-tax legislation, properly provided for their annual review, giving Congress an opportunity to judge their effect in terms of changing conditions.

This safeguard, inserted by the Senator from Georgia, would be nullified by the substitute amendment. The sponsors of the substitute would extend these taxes for 2¼ years without review, and by some strange reasoning they take credit for a revenue gain in such a process.

This revenue until April 1, 1956, is already provided for in the committee bill, and it is subject to extension at that time.

Now let us examine the revenue gain claimed for the substitute bill proposal to repeal the so-called rapid depreciation provisions of the 1954 tax code.

In the first place use of this provision is optional; a taxpayer can continue to use the so-called straight-line basis, which the substitute bill would not disturb, or he could elect the new rapid basis. In connection with the new rapid depreciation provisions, the fact that they apply only to new property, acquired after December 31, 1953, should not be overlooked. They cannot be applied to assets having a life of less than 3 years.

Let me set the record straight also on the fact that if a taxpayer acquires a new asset, takes the rapid write-off provided under the 1954 code, and then sells the asset, the buyer cannot take the accelerated depreciation.

Just as in the case of the straight-line method, the taxpayer can write off his base cost, but no more.

The rapid depreciation proposal was discussed at great length in the Ways and Means Committee of the House, on the floor of the House, in the Senate Finance Committee, and on the floor of the Senate. In the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered an amendment to strike out the accelerated provision from the 1954 revenue act. The list of Senators who voted against the Morse amendment, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, page 9481, is as follows:

Senators Aiken, Anderson, Barrett, Bowring, Beall, Bennett, Bricker, Bridges, Burke, Bush, Butler of Maryland, Byrd, Capehart, Carlson, Case, Clements, Cooper, Cordon, Crippa, Daniel, Douglas, Dworshak, Ervin, Ferguson, Frear, George, Goldwater, Green, Hendrickson, Hickenlooper, Holland, Ives, Johnson of Colorado, Johnson of Texas, Kennedy, Knowland, Kuchel, Lennon, Long, Malone, Martin, Millikin, Mundt, Pastore, Payne, Potter, Purtell, Robertson, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smathers, Smith of Maine, Smith of New Jersey, Sparkman, Thye, Upton, Watkins, Welker, Williams, and Young.

That is a total of 60 Senators, of whom 4 are sponsors of the proposed substitute which would repeal this section.

It will be recalled that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] last year, when the matter was before the Senate, proposed a still more generous write-off for farm machinery. At the same time the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] offered, and the Senate took to conference, an amendment which would have allowed writing off the cost of grain storage facilities in the year of construction.

In the end, the so-called accelerated depreciation amendment allows no more depreciation than does the straight-line method. In both cases the taxpayer can write off only his cost of the asset. Should, for example, tax rates increase in the period when less depreciation is allowed, there would be an actual gain to the Treasury by the accelerated method.

I submit that proposed legislation having such widespread application should not be enacted without notice and proper hearings.

I repeat that the adoption of the accelerated depreciation method is optional, and no estimate can be fairly made as to how many will avail themselves of this plan.

If the Senate will permit a personal reference, I may say that my business, known as H. F. Byrd, Inc., has been engaged in constructing a cannery for our apple products. After consultation with our auditors, we have decided not to take advantage of the option of the accelerated depreciation but to continue with the straight-line method. We made this decision because, in our judgment, an unused depreciation allowance is one of the best assets that any business enterprise can have, and we prefer to continue on the old method. I predict that many other corporations and individuals will do the same; but the fact remains that over a period of time there is no loss to the Treasury from this method. To the contrary, if some emergency situation should force the Government into an increase in taxation, the taxpayer would lose by adopting this method, and the Government would gain.

In any event, the depreciation deducted cannot be greater than the cost of the asset.

I submit that the third claim, namely, that of a valid revenue gain, is fallacious. The claim by the proponents of the substitute on this item amounts to $1,075,000,000.

To recapitulate, the claims for new revenue gains, which I believe to be erroneous, are as follow:

1. Correction of error in 1954 tax bill	$1,000,000,000
2. Extension of corporation and excise taxes beyond Apr. 1, 1956	3,537,000,000
3. Repeal of depreciation provisions	1,075,000,000
Total	5,612,000,0000

I submit that there is only one item in the 5-barrel program which would produce a net gain to the Treasury. It is the item providing for the repeal of the dividend credit, or exclusion, provisions of the 1954 act. These refer to the $50 exclusion per taxpayer and the 4-percent credit on dividends. The amount involved in these items is $362 million annually, which will be saved for the Treasury should this repeal be enacted.

The cost of the proposed tax reduction of $20 for each taxpayer, with none for the spouse, plus a $10 deduction for each dependent other than the spouse, without giving any deduction for joint income returns, will mean a loss to the Treasury of more than $900 million.

Therefore, instead of balancing the budget and wiping out the deficit, as has been claimed, the substitute proposal

would not even pay its own way, but would, over a period of time, add nearly $600 million to the existing deficit.

There are other features of this proposed legislation that deserve full discussion before the vote is taken, but I do want to emphasize the fact that the proposals will have the most far-reaching consequence to practically all the taxpayers of America. They should receive the consideration of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Senate Finance Committee in the normal course of tax legislation.

It is significant that in the hearings on the pending bill only 1 proposal relating to any 1 of the 5 provisions of the substitute plan was presented to the Senate Finance Committee, and that was the proposal to extend the 5-percent corporate tax for 3 months, from April 1, 1956 to July 1, 1956. It was rejected by the Finance Committee because hearings had not been held on this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing the loss in revenue and other details of the proposed plan.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of the revenue effect of the Finance Committee bill and the Johnson amendment, excluding the effect of extending corporate and excise rates for an additional 15 months, and excluding termination of the depreciation provision*

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	Col. (1) Finance Committee bill	Col. (2) Johnson amendment	Col. (3) difference (col. (2)—col. (1))
1955	191	191	0
1956	1,964	1,792	[1] −172
1957	550	4	[2] −546

[1] Breakdown of difference in revenue effect in fiscal 1956:

Repeal of dividend exclusion (Johnson amendment)	+181
$20 tax credit for individuals (Johnson amendment)	−353
Net effect	−172

[2] Breakdown of difference in revenue effect in fiscal 1957:

Repeal of dividend exclusion (Johnson amendment)	+362
$20 tax credit for individuals (Johnson amendment)	−908
Net effect	−546

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate and of the Senate Finance Committee 22 years. If I have learned anything from this long experience, it is that tax legislation cannot be written in a hurry. It involves complex problems. Its effects are far-reaching. It requires comprehensive study. Its drafting needs the advice of experts.

The resources and economy of this Nation have been subjected to terrific stresses and strains over the past 30 years, and I firmly believe survival of our form of government and our free-enterprise system through this period has been due to the check and balance of sound taxation.

Sound and prosperous enterprise is essential to the welfare of all. This cannot be sustained without confidence in the future. There is nothing more destructive of the confidence requirement than vacillating tax policies.

I say to sponsors of the substitute amendment that not one among them will work harder for sound tax reduction than I will. But I also say to the Senate that the only reason for Federal taxes is Federal expenditures. This substitute amendment will not reduce expenditures by one dollar.

The reduction can be measured in dimes—ten-cent pieces—in terms of the weekly paycheck. For such a reduction the proponents of the substitute amendment ask the Senate to accept a sweeping tax bill fraught with the hazards that come from hasty consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an opinion of Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, with respect to features of the substitute now pending.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the present law a married couple receives the same tax treatment regardless of whether they live in a community or noncommunity property State. For example, a married couple without dependents where entire income consists of a $10,000 salary received by the husband from the X company will pay a tax of $1,636, regardless of whether they live in Texas or any other community property State or whether they live in a common-law State. Under the substitute, their tax liability will be different depending upon their State of residence. For example, in the case of the married couple with the $10,000 salary, if they lived in Texas their tax under the amendment would be $1,616 on account of the $20 credit. On the other hand, if they lived in a common law State, they would receive no benefit under the amendment and their tax would remain as under existing law, namely $1,636. This discrimination is caused by the provision of the amendment which requires married couples to reduce the $20 credit by the amount of tax benefit they receive from income splitting. Income splitting was provided in 1948 to place married couples living in a common law State on the same basis as married couples living in a community-property State. In a community-property State married couples are permitted to divide their community income, which, for example, is the $10,000 referred to, by operation of State law which is recognized for Federal tax purposes. The effect of the substitute is, therefore, to destroy the equalization of tax treatment between married couples living in community-property and noncommunity property States.

The substitute proposed also in certain cases discriminates against married couples as distinguished from single individuals.

The tax of a single individual with 1 dependent and an income of $4,999 under present law would pay a tax of $681 if he uses the optional tax table. A married couple with the same income under present law would pay a tax of $656, or $25 less.

Under the amendment the tax of the single person would be decreased by $30, that is $20 for himself and $10 for his dependent. Thus his tax would be $651. The married couple on the other hand do not receive any benefit under the amendment because their income-splitting benefit was greater than $20. As a result their tax would remain at $656 and would in fact be higher, rather than less, than that of a single person with 1 dependent. This is merely an example of one of the many quirks in the proposed amendment.

NOMINATION OF JOHN MARSHALL HARLAN TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for reasons which I shall hereafter assign, I shall not vote to confirm the nomination of Honorable John Marshall Harlan as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

At the outset, I say with emphasis that I make no attack on the integrity or on the ability of the present membership of the Supreme Court, nor on Mr. Harlan. I assume that each of the present members of this Court have the very highest motives in the discharge of their duties, motives just as high as those I claim for myself, and that they do their best and do their duty as they see it. I assume the same would be true as to Mr. Harlan.

For purposes presently under consideration, I am expressing an interest, not in persons, but in the Supreme Court as an institution, the most important branch of our constitutional Government. I want to see it at all times elevated to the highest and most revered position in the minds of our people, as well as the position to render profound judicial service to the people. Accordingly, when the present vacancy occurred and before Mr. Harlan's name or any other name had been mentioned prominently, I issued a public statement on October 7, 1954, which read, in part, as follows:

The vacancy on the United States Supreme Court caused by the unfortunate passing of the late Justice Jackson affords President Eisenhower an opportunity to select an appointee who will have, among other essential qualifications, a background of wide judicial experience. A Supreme Court Justice is immediately vested with judicial power far beyond that of any like position in any other government in the world. His one vote of nine can be the deciding vote in a decision that will overrule all other Federal courts and the 48 State supreme courts. Obviously, the great majority of the membership of the Court should be men who are not only learned in the law, but who have lived the law and have dedicated their lives and active years to the legal profession and have a judicial maturity that can be attained only by service on a court. Judicial officers of this type cannot be created by mere appointment; they have to grow.

This need is accentuated by the fact that the combined judicial experience of the present eight members of the Court prior to their ascendancy to their present positions totals only 8 years and 4 months, and is confined to Justice Minton.

There are a great number of experienced judges available from both Federal and State courts. Judicial experience alone will, of course, not qualify one for this position. However, under present conditions, I think this experience is an essential element, and I am raising this point now before personalities become involved, and I shall vigorously raise it on the floor of the Senate. I strongly hope the President will consider this need.

In issuing this public statement, I was seeking to create public opinion favoring the appointment of a Justice to the Supreme Court who was a seasoned and a mature jurist.

Mr. President, in order to halt a trend of some years in making appointments to the Supreme Court, I had reached the firm conclusion before making the statement just quoted that it was the duty of

the Senate to see that at least some of those appointed to the Supreme Court were seasoned and mature judges at the time of their appointment. This course should be followed regardless of party lines and without reference to the personalities of the nominees.

Let us briefly make certain constitutional comparisons. Those who framed the Constitution of the United States put definite and positive limitations and prohibitions on the President of the United States. First, he is circumscribed by a limited tenure of office. Although he is the Chief Executive of the Nation, he is authorized to make treaties with foreign nations only with the advice and consent of two-thirds majority of the United States Senate; all of his appointments have to be approved by a majority of the Senate. Congress has the power to pass laws over his strongest opposition and over his official veto.

Also, definite and positive constitutional limitations were placed on the Congress. Its Members must first be elected, and they serve for only limited terms of office. There is an age limitation on the membership. One House cannot even adjourn for over 3 days without the consent of the other. There is a limitation on the taxes to be imposed. Through the first 10 amendments passed soon after the adoption of the Constitution, Congress is further limited in many ways. It can make no law affecting the establishment of a religion, and no law restricting the freedom of the press, nor of the right of the people to peacefully assemble. Jury trial and compulsory process of witnesses was assured. Unreasonable searches and seizures cannot be authorized. Private property is given an absolute protection against being seized without just compensation; no person can be compelled to testify against himself; no person can be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

The Constitution expressly prohibited the States from entering treaties, issuing money, or laying imposts or duties; and many subsequent amendments to the Constitution have put further limitations on the powers of the States, as well as limitations on the powers of the Congress and of the President.

But, by contrast, Mr. President, in the consideration of limitations on the powers of the Supreme Court, the Constitution is silent as to ordinary and also as to extraordinary limitations. There are very slight limitations indeed as to the entire judicial system, except for a guarantee of jury trial and rights of venue. Instead of limitations on the Supreme Court, the Constitution abandons its usual pattern of fixed tenure for officials and provides that the Justices shall hold their offices during good behavior.

What reasons, Mr. President, can be assigned for this striking difference in the treatment of the persons who occupy these three different branches of our Government? Was there a belief that persons appointed Justices would be wiser than other men? Was it assumed that the motives and the character and integrity of the Justices would be superior to those of all other men? Certainly asumptions so contrary to known facts would not be made. How could they be so bold as to give life tenure to such positions?

The conclusion is inescapable to me. Those who laid this constitutional pattern certainly assumed that at least a great majority of the men who compose this Court would be men of judicial attainments and judicial maturity when they assumed their duties.

What are the facts on this point as to the present eight sitting members of our Court? The combined judicial experience of these eight gentlemen up to the time that they assumed their present positions, was a grand total of 8 years. These 8 years are all confined to one of the Justices—Justice Minton, who had served those years as a member of the United States circuit court of appeals. The present nominee, Mr. Harlan, has less than 1 year of judicial experience, a tenure far too short to produce a seasoned and mature jurist.

Mr. President, a seasoned judge or Justice is not made overnight. A person reaches judicial attainments and judicial maturity only after long years of the most painstaking study, analysis, rigid application, and exacting work. His mind must be molded to a judicious approach to the many problems and cases that confront him. He must get the feel of the precedents and of the opinions. This cannot come through advocacy alone; this cannot come through learning alone. It comes only through long experience in carrying judicial responsibilities.

This judicial experience needs to be under conditions where the judge will be reversed by a higher court if his rulings are not correct, so that his errors will not be perpetuated in the lawbooks to be viewed for generations to come. This process of judicial approach requires years to develop.

This requirement is more compelling and demanding now than when our Constitution was framed. We have grown into a powerful Nation with more than 160 million people. The Supreme Court has found in the Constitution and has exercised implied power whereby it can declare null and void a law passed by the Congress. It can declare any State statute invalid, and can set aside any or all parts of a State constitution.

I am not now becrying this power. I am pointing to its existence to show the absolute need for men of the most mature and fully developed judicial maturity who have been willing to withdraw from the activity of life's affairs and develop that priceless gem—a judicial mind. We have scores of such persons throughout the entire United States with 10 years or more such experience who would be available for this vacancy. They are to be found in our United States district courts, in our United States courts of appeal, and on the 48 State supreme courts, as well as among some of the outstanding trial judges in our State courts of general jurisdiction.

It seems to me that during the last 25 years the judicial branch has been the most neglected part of our Government. But I still believe that it is the most important branch of our great constitutional system. To condemn the court, or a member, or a decision, or a nominee, serves no useful or helpful purpose. It is the system that we must improve.

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION IS NEEDED

To this end, I am today introducing a bill which is long overdue. It is quite simple in its language and its operation. It merely provides that not less than 1 of each 2 Associate Justices appointed to the Supreme Court must have a minimum of 10 years of judicial experience in either a United States circuit court of appeals, a United States district court, a State supreme court, or a State court of general jurisdiction.

After full consideration I am satisfied that such a law would be well within the constitutional powers of the Congress. I expect to be heard later on this point.

The point I have raised here is a salutary principle of sound government. It has nothing whatever to do with the present Chief Executive, and nothing to do with the present nominee.

It might be that before the day is over voices will be raised here that we must back up the President as to this nomination. This is not the issue, and is no part of the issue. But I do wish to discuss briefly the Presidential appointive power.

Here in the Senate there has been a rather well-established practice to the effect that if a President nominates a person of character, honor, and ability for an appointment, then there is no sound basis for withholding Senate confirmation. So far as appointments in the executive branch of the Government are concerned, this is certainly the general rule, and is one that I ordinarily follow. However, as to judicial appointments, especially at the very top, it has no application whatsoever; and, further, it is dangerous to the judiciary, as an independent branch of our Government. Justices of the Supreme Court are not on that tribunal to carry out the policies of any administration; they are not there to enforce the laws or the policies of any group. They are there to declare and interpret the law as they find it. Every policymaking member of the executive branch of our Government either resigns or can be removed when an Executive retires. Members of the Court serve during good behavior.

Thus all of the reasons ordinarily applying to approving a potential nominee, provided the nominee is one of character and ability, do not apply to an appointment to the United States Supreme Court.

On the other hand, there are many strong and compelling reasons for an altogether different approach in the consideration of such nominees. A standard of measurement and determination for the guidance of both the President and the Senate is long past due. My course has been determined. I trust that, following full consideration and debate, this bill will be enacted into law at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill which I now send to the desk, and which I request be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1440) relating to appointments to the Supreme Court was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of title 28 United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"From and after the date of enactment of this paragraph not less than 1 out of every 2 persons appointed to the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the appointment, have had at least 10 years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, 'judicial service' means service as a justice of the United States, a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction."

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I should like to announce, in connection with the request, that I have conferred with the minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance. That arrangement is agreeable to them. It is hoped that the Senate will have a relatively short morning hour. Perhaps the Senate can begin operating on limited time by 11:15 or 11:20 o'clock a. m. If all the time on the substitute is used up, that should mean that discussion on it would be completed by a little after 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SETTLEMENT OF BOUNDARY DISPUTE BETWEEN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for many years there has been an argument between the States of Arizona and California in regard to the use of the waters of the Colorado River; but little known is the fact that for more than 100 years our two States have argued about exactly where that river flows and therefore exactly where the boundary between Arizona and California lies.

So I am very happy to say that in yesterday's New York Times there appeared an article stating that the two States have settled this boundary difficulty, and that now we know exactly the position of the line which separates Arizona and California.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the article dealing with that situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO STATES SETTLE A BOUNDARY ROW—CALIFORNIA AND ARIZONA FIX JOINT LINE AFTER 100 YEARS OF CONTINUOUS STRIFE

LOS ANGELES, March 12.—California and Arizona are approaching settlement of a century-old dispute about their boundary.

The dispute has never quite reached the point of open warfare, but it has involved the reciprocal taking of prisoners down the years.

The two States adjoin each other for about a 250-mile stretch of the Colorado River from the southern tip of Nevada to the Mexican border.

The boundary is supposed to be the middle of the river. But over the southern hundred miles floods have changed the river's course many times during the century. A no-man's-land of bottom-lands and islands aggregating up to forty square miles resulted.

This isn't a lot of territory, but it has caused a lot of problems. Inhabitants of the land have totaled at most a hundred people. It's been a cronic conundrum where they were to pay taxes and vote. Some have paid taxes to both States, some to neither.

GAME WARDENS ROAM

In addition, it's good duck-hunting and fishing country. For years game wardens of the two States have prowled the area, arresting sportsmen they alleged to be on the wrong side of the line. Whether the line was the river's center at the moment or where it had been by tradition before the last flood was a perennially unresolved question.

This controversy capped a tradition of disputation over the extent of California's southeastern corner. By some maneuvering in the 1848 treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, ending the Mexican War, California established a claim to 150 acres east of the Colorado River in what became Yuma, Ariz.

California achieved statehood in 1850. Arizona remained a territory until 1912. In 1870 the county tax collector from San Diego, Calif., 200 miles to the west, attempted to ply his trade in Yuma. He was tossed in jail on a charge of collecting money under false pretenses, and got home to San Diego only by jumping bail.

Three years later, Congress awarded the tract to Arizona. Then things calmed down until the river started cutting periodical capers.

BOUNDARY IS FIXED

Two years ago, foreseeing endless headaches if the boundary wasn't fixed, the two States appointed boundary commissions to treat on the question. They have been holding hearings and doing extensive historical research and surveying ever since.

The settlement they arrived at was that the boundary would continue to be the middle of the river wherever its course seemed stable, and the middle of all present man-made crossings, such as bridges and pipelines.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and other Senators to the tax bill, to close glaring loopholes in our tax structure, which during the last Congress were built for the benefit of the big corporations, at the expense of the public Treasury; and, at the same time, it is our purpose, to give a measure of tax relief to individuals of low income who are, in my judgment, bearing a disproportionate share of the national tax burden.

In 1954, tax reductions totaling $7.4 billion went into effect, tax cuts for which the administration has on more than one occasion taken credit. A substantial part of that loss of revenue stemmed from the enactment of the administration's omnibus tax bill, H. R. 8300, which provided a grossly disproportionate share of tax relief to corporations and individuals in the high-income brackets.

Those taxpayers with annual incomes of more than $5,000 received roughly one-third of the immediate benefits of the administration's tax bill, and the corporations received an even higher share of immediate relief from this legislation, while those with incomes of less than $5,000 who comprise 70 percent of our people received only one-fifth. Even more unfair are the long-run effects of that bill, which give to those taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year only a pittance of tax relief, while corporations and the upper-income brackets will receive the overwhelming share of the bill's eventual benefits.

Mr. President, that was the most unjust tax bill, the most shockingly contrived tax measure, enacted within my memory. That was a tax measure to relieve the big corporations of their fair share of the tax load, a tax measure to shift the load to the little wage and salary earners of the country; to the pensioners and retired people.

That bill was passed just before the election, despite the fact that we faced a deficit. We actually ran up a deficit of $4.5 billion. We added that much to our national debt while handing out special tax favors to the privileged few, to the wealthy and the big corporations. That is why I voted against that bill last year. I am proud of that vote.

Mr. President, I should like to see the budget balanced. I believe in a balanced budget when it is possible. In general, this is a time of moderate prosperity, but today there are, just as there were last year, soft spots in our economy. A recent report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report points out some of those soft spots. They are, in a sense, more serious than they were last year.

The proposed bill would certainly not even remotely balance the budget. Last year's tax bill was a trickle-down tax bill. It was based upon the theory—false, in my judgment—that if tax benefits are given to corporations and to the wealthy few, vastly increased economic activity will result, and economic benefits will flow down to the people as a whole. They said "flow down." We said "trickle down." The bill did not even do that. Virtually nothing flows or trickles down.

Mr. President, the results are in. The administration's trickle-down theory did not work. The tax relief for stockholders and recipients of dividends, tax relief for corporations in the form of accelerated depreciation, and all the other forms of tax relief given corporations and persons with large incomes did not result in any markedly greater prosperity for the country as a whole. It did not wipe out unemployment. It did not create new jobs. It did not heal the sickness which is present in certain of our industries and certain areas of our country. The distressed areas are still with us, including some in my home State of New York.

In this respect it is clear that the trickle down tax bill in 1954 was a failure. It was a success only in giving greater profits to the larger corporations.

I do not believe that many people in the country or many Members of Congress are aware of the great benefits which have come to the large corporations through recent tax laws. I could cite many corporations which have greatly profited by the provisions of the various tax laws. It is all a matter of record in the economic reports and in the manuals.

I need cite only one example, which I think will demonstrate the point I am trying to make. I have before me an article which was published in the New York Times of Friday, March 11, 1955. The headline is "Du Pont Profit Up 46.2 Percent to New High."

The subhead is:

$344,386,015 cleared in 1954 despite 3.5 percent sales dip—taxes down sharply.

The article—and, mind you, Mr. President, this is from the New York Times—goes on to describe some very important and dramatic situations which are not thoroughly understood by the people of the country. The article reads in part as follows:

The earnings statement showed that last year's net income was a record $344,386,015. This was equal to $7.33 a share on 45,604,345 common shares. It compared with $235,565,266, or $4.94 each on 45,454,287 shares, for 1953.

That shows that the earnings, despite the dip of 3½ percent in the sales of the company, increased $109 million. On the surface that looks like prosperity; but what are the facts? Those increased earnings, and more besides, were made exclusively because of the lower taxes which the company had to pay into the Treasury of the United States, although the taxes theretofore paid were, in my opinion fair, because of the importance and the prosperity of this company.

Let me cite some of the figures. The article further states:

Federal taxes on income and renegotiation last year amounted to $258,290,000. This consisted of $245,410,000 on operating income and $12,880,000 for other income. A year earlier the company's tax bill was $404,840,000, reflecting charges of $389,320,000 on operating income and renegotiation and $15,520,000 for other income.

In other words, in 1953 the company paid more than $400 million. In 1954, because of the operation of the tax laws, it paid only $258 million. In other words, the Du Pont Company, one of our great corporations, made a saving in taxes alone of $146 million.

The example which I have been given could be duplicated time and time again by other great corporations, possibly not to the same extent in dollars and cents, but proportionately to just as great an extent.

Mr. President, the tax bill passed last year did not increase the national revenue. Indeed, as the record shows, although President Eisenhower forecast a deficit of $2,900,000,000 in the fiscal year 1955, our deficit, after the tax cut, was actually $4,500,000,000.

So, Mr. President, the national welfare and interest calls for our rejection of the trickle-down theory and for a return to the view that the impetus which needs to be given to our economy should be given by increasing the purchasing power of the many, not of the few.

That can be done by adopting the Johnson amendment to grant a $20 tax credit to every taxpayer whose income is $5,000 and less. That will increase spending.

It will help the national economy. Above all, it will help individuals of low income, wage earners, persons on social security, and those living on pensions.

The other provisions of the pending amendment will close some of the worse loopholes opened up in our tax structure by the 1954 tax law. Increased revenue for the Treasury will result. We will come closer to balancing the budget. We will help repair the damage that was done by the 1954 tax law. We will redress the balance of injustice that was written into that tax law. We will make is possible to spend more for national defense and for essential public services.

Mr. President, I was not entirely happy in my own mind over the $20 tax credit proposal as approved by the House. I recognized the great injustice that was done to persons of low and moderate income in the tax bill of 1954. But I also recognized the need to balance the budget, and, above all, the need to increase our expenditures for national defense in these critical times. I am not at all satisfied with the defense proposals submitted by the Eisenhower administration. I do not think they are at all adequate. I do not think we can afford to shop for bargain-basement defense and to make savings at the cost of our national security.

So I was not altogether willing to propose tax cuts that would decrease our revenues while at the same time strongly believing that we should increase our expenditures for defense, among other purposes.

But, Mr. President, the proposal that has been worked out by the Democratic majority in the Senate meets all my reservations and quiets all my doubts. I think the proposal in question is sound and conservative.

The proposal I am supporting, which I hope will be approved by the Congress, will mark us as a responsible Congress, a humanitarian Congress, and a forward-looking Congress.

RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 15, 1955, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of March 10), 1955.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert C. McFadden, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana, vice Julius J. Wichser, resigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

Riley J. Sipe, effective March 2, 1955.
Frank G. Johnson, in accordance with law.

To be commissioned ensign

Robert J. Candela, effective March 21, 1955.
Willard L. Shireman, in accordance with law.
James F. Schumann, in accordance with law.
Norman B. Madsen, in accordance with law.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Chaplain

×Tindall, Robert Wesley, 18804A.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Air Force

Ballard, Ralph Thompson, Jr., 22718A.
×Carter, Braxton, 23726A.
Reynolds, John Robert, 24710A.
×Flaherty, Leo Francis, 24711A.
×Perdew, Denning Miles, 20688A.
×Younger, Clyde Wade, Jr., 22719A.
Alvarado, Ricardo Raphael, 26678A.
Dellinger, Edward Ray, Jr., 26680A.
Jacobson, Richard Kalman, 20689A.
×Krauska, Thomas Joseph, 23186A.
×Lange, Roy Allert, 20690A.
Neale, James Moseley, 24712A.
×Halicki, Chester John, 26679A.
Early, Robert Kirkland, 23727A.
×Eddy, Egbert Bennett, 23728A.
×Homza, George Joseph, 22720A.
×Hinton, John Richard, Jr., 20691A.
×Griffith, William Thomas, 25617A.
×Calhoun, Atticus Aubrey, 24271A.
×Kratochvil, Otto, 25618A.
Gore, Granville Ivan, 22721A.
×Webber, David Dencil, 23187A.
×Frazier, John Robert, 23188A.
×Anderson, DeLane Edward, 20693A.
Mandros, William James, 20692A.
×Lyons, Richard Edward, 18306A.
×Braswell, Arnold Webb, 17745A.
×Anderson, Carl Andrew, 17747A.
×Wurster, Charles Anderson, 17748A.
Pickering, John Charles, 17750A.
Hayden, William Comstock, 17751A.
×Buckley, John Joseph, Jr., 17752A.
LeConte, Louis, Jr., 17754A.
×Heikkinen, Wilho Richard, 17755A.
Moore, Otis Corcoran, 17756A.
×Young, Stewart, 17757A.
×Burrows, William Claude, 17758A.
×McGinness, William Thornton, 17760A.
×Sandman, James Gage, 17762A.
Barton, Raymond Oscar, Jr., 17763A.
Di Loreto, Benjamin Joseph, 17764A.
×Edwards, John Arnold, 17765A.
×Eakins, Benjamin Wynn, 17766A.
×Brill, Jay, Richard, 17767A.
×Weaver, Paul Elwood, 17769A.
×Rutter, George Warren, 17770A.
×Lynch, William Henry, 17772A.
Mumma, Morton Claire, 3d, 17773A.
×Barondes, Arthur deRohan, 17774A.
×Smith, William Young, 17775A.
×Phillips, Thomas Albert, Jr., 17776A.
×Miner, Richard Lee, 17777A.
Muehlenweg, James Allen, 17778A.

×Stelling, Henry Barthold, Jr., 17779A.
×Bertoni, Waldo Emerson, 17780A.
×White, Samuel, Jr., 17781A.
Graves, Warren Reed, 17783A.
×Stein, Richard Neil, 17784A.
×Bettis, Harry Moody, 17785A.
×Schalk, Louis Wellington, 17786A.
×Mathis, Robert Couth, 17787A.
×Chanatry, Fred Isaac, 17788A.
×Allen, James Rodgers, 17789A.
Quanbeck, Alton Harold, 17790A.
×Anderson, Andrew Broadus, Jr., 17791A.
×Gorrell, Joseph Eugene, 17792A.
×Josephs, Jay Silverman, 17793A.
×Pomeroy, Robert Murray, 17795A.
×Elebash, Clarence Couch, 17796A.
×Williams, Francis Marion, 17798A.
Locke, W. Grim, 17800A.
×Scott, Eward Leigh, 17801A.
×Selig, Ivan Morange, 17802A.
×Butler, Blaine Raymond, Jr., 17803A.
×Lyon, William Meredith, 17805A.
Rosencrans, Evan William, 17807A.
×Kavanagh, Donal Denis, 17809A.
MacCartney, Gaylord, 17810A.
Thomas, George Selby, 17813A.
×Morgan, Rhonel Earl, 17814A.
Withers, John Kesson, 17816 A.
×Swenholt, Donald Brunhoff, 17817A.
Kipfer, Donald Charles, 17819A.
×Schoenberg, Irving Bernard, 17820A.
×Johnston, Floyd Allan, 17822A.
Leitner, George Newton, 17824A.
×Kritzer, Edward Anderson, 17825A.
×Gillogly, Harold Sherwood, 17828A.
×Van Arsdall, Robert Armes, 17829A.
×Skinner, Richard Ingram, 17830A.
Pompan, Jacob Bernard, 17832A.
×Buechler, Theodore Bruce, 17833A.
×McInerney, Francis William, Jr., 17834A.
×Thevenet, Stanley Edward, 17836A.
×Kastris, John, Jr., 17837A.
Pater, Robert Edwin, 17838A.
×Berry Richard Parks, 17840A.
×Waller, Walton Vernon, 17841A.
×Tashjian, Michael Joseph, 17842A.
×Snyder, Arthur, Jr., 17843A.
×Huey, Joseph William, 17844A.
×Barber, Kenneth Hawthorne, 17845A.
Dildy, Sims Gerald, 17848A.
×Shively, James Cole, Jr., 17849A.
×Dent, John Francis, Jr., 17850A.
×Porter, Philip Steven, 17854A.
×Davis, Robert Carroll, 17855A.
×D'Allura, Joseph Anthony, 20694A.
×Yeoman, David Charles, 25619A.
×Hadley, Russell James, 20695A.
×Higdon, John Kenneth, 22723A.
×Mock, Theodore Eugene, 22724A.
×Lane, Joe Vernon, 25454A.
×Henderson, Paul Bryan, 25455A.
Dwyer, George Thomas, 25512A.
Williams, Paul Edwin, 25501A.
Cooper, Joseph Donald, 25499A.
×Emmons, Richard Albert, 25516A.
×Grundy, Francis Charles, 25513A.
×Coke, Paul Ellis, 25500A.
×Mattingly, Edwin Joseph, 25492A.
×Tolley, Oswald David, 25515A.
Mahl, Floyd Delmar, 25496A.
Klinginsmith, Russell Ellis, 25497A.
×Keriakou, Paris Nicholas, 25511A.
×Baleski, John Joseph, Jr., 25490A.
×Nacey, Edward Raymond, 25495A.
Romine, Charles Garland, 25494A.
Lamb, Thomas Eugene, 25498A.
×Merritt, James Vergil, 25505A.
×Oakley, Grover Cleveland, Jr., 25509A.
×Pitts, Morris Bernard, 25502A.
Murfield, Junior Donald, 25489A.
×Denomy, Robert William, 25510A.
×Craun, Leonard Dale, 25491A.
Parrott, John Henry, Jr., 25504A.
×Novak, Alfred Robert, 25503A.
×Miller, George Leonard, 25508A.
×Waid, Charles Leighton, 25507A.
Beardsley, Leonard Nelson, 25514A.
×Ely, John Thomas Anderson, Jr., 25506A.
×Cowgill, John Daniel, 17860A.
×Goss, Raymond, Jr., 17859A.
×Hodge, Phillip Edwin, 17856A.
Newton, John R., Jr., 17858A.
×Rusk, Richard Norman, 17857A.
×Heaton, Robert Raymond, 25517A.
×Arndt, Paul Cahoon, 22726A.

Medical

×Norton, John Burgess, 25470A.
×Webster, John Gordon, 25658A.
×Dahl, Elmer Vernon, 25654A.
×Baker, Robert Wescott, 25655A.
×Richard, Eli Frederick, 25471A.
×Kratochvil, Clyde Harding, 25663A.
×Tredici, Thomas Joseph, 25656A.
×Manogue, Edmund James, 25473A.
×Grissom, Paul Manley, 25474A.
Turner, David Allen, 26362A.
Draper, David Henry, 26361A.
×Good, Hugh Durell, 25657A.

Veterinary

×Shuler, James Meade, 25673A.

Medical Service

×Davis, Franklin Lee, Jr., 23221A.
×Nowell, Wesley Raymond, 25737A.
×Dunn, Charles Clinton, 21628A.

Chaplain

×Wolk, Henry Charles, Jr., 24688A.
Trent, B. C., 26649A.
×Groome, Thomas Marvin, Jr., 24689A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Air Force

McHugh, Joseph Edwin, 3d, 23964A.
×Brooks, William Thomas, 24105A.
×Lindorme, Edward King, Jr., 23256A.
×Ashbaker, Joseph Louis, 23949A.
Wentzler, Herman Louis, 26608A.
Hicks, Forrest Llewellyn, 26610A.
Allen, Frederick Randolph, 26609A.
×Pollard, Thomas Nelson, 25365A.
Bierman, Donald Joe, 25364A.
Numbers, Richard Scott, 26611A.
×Batten, John Edward, 3d, 24869A.
×Mueller, Arnold Emil, 23950A.
×McDivitt, James Alton, 24153A.
×Williams, Nelson Noah, Jr., 24160A.
×Winters, John David, 24161A.
×Lake, Harley William Richard, Jr., 24156A.
Kasparek, James Joseph, 24164A.
Ward, John Allen, 3d, 24159A.
Carlson, Robert Vernon, 24163A.
×Shortal, Paul Edwin, Jr., 24157A.
×Smith, Robert Burns, 24168A.
×Kirk, Robert Link, 24165A.
Wampler, Glen Edward, 24158A.
×Monchil, Donald Lee, 24155A.
×Beck, Joseph Conrad, 24162A.
×McDonnell, Miles Chapline, 24154A.
Morris, Morgan Phillip, 26613A.
Woten, Homer Glenn, Jr., 26612A.
Christians, Dale Klaas, 26614A.
×Patton, James Franklin, 23951A.
×Weir, Billy Gene, 23953A.
Eagle, William Carter, 23954A.
×Hauer, Edward William, 23955A.
×Sharp, James Manville, Jr., 23956A.
×Malm, Herbert Allen, Jr., 23952A.
×Palmer, David Garner, 24872A.
×Messerli, Robert Edward, 24871A.
×Stadsklev, Glenn Harris, 23957A.
×Schmidt, Robert George, 23958A.
×Schlagal, Robert Charles, 23959A.
×Stanley, Fred Carlton, Jr., 23961A.
×Choate, Jim Keith, 23963A.
×Puffenbarger, Edward Samuel, 23960A.
Burgess, Kenneth Lazelle, 23962A.

Medical Service

×Chamlis, Elbert Ray, 25688A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

George W. Perkins, of New York, to be the United States permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

John Von Neumann, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring June 30, 1959.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert Tripp Ross, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

George C. McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1950.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1956.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Ben F. Cameron, of Mississippi, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Gilbert H. Jertberg, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California.

William E. Miller, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

M. Frank Reid, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

Curtis Clark, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following persons to be chief warrant officers, W–3, in the United States Coast Guard:

Charles E. Haley
Zoltan Papp
Claude M. Hutchins

The following persons to be chief warrant officers, W–2, in the United States Coast Guard:

Edward R. Harris	Robert S. Phillips
Francis A. Massey	"A" "Z" Shows
Parker R. Johnson	Carroll Tingle
Philip H. Fry	Luke B. Midgett
Thadeus Penry	Paul A. Woodard
Albert J. Bates	Moses McNure
Michael Kabaczy	Woodrow F. Clookie
John H. Brown	Malcolm Versaw
Manuel L. Bent	William R. Gaither
Walter P. Stipcich	Fletcher R. Peele
Clarence B. Anderson	Leon A. Anderson
Robert H. Burn	George B. Schack
Leroy H. Harmon	Albert DeCosta
Joseph J. Dobrow, Jr.	Leonest L. Tillett
Alfred M. Livingston	Gilbert Coughlan
John P. Ryan	Henry A. Cook
Roland R. Davis	John Chartuck
Oliver F. Rossin	William E. White, Jr.
James W. Lockhart	Edward E. Lewis
Russell M. Young	Louis M. Piermattei
Kenneth E. Payson	Andrew Hauswirth
Cyril D. Kring	Ellis M. Moore
Gene D. Vecchione	Harvey J. Hardy
Harry V. Hardy	Frank D. Coffey
Andrew Kirkpatrick	James A. Somers
Oliver T. Henry, Jr.	Roy L. Singleton
William Keokosky	Alexander M. Grant
Louis S. Schweitzer	Kenneth G. Fields
John R. Howarth	Gustave A. Kuhnert
Howell O. Wall	John W. Short
Elmer J. Nolan	Earlie W. Shelton
Frank Jakelsky	Ernest R. Stacy
Anthony F. Glaza, Jr.	Roy Huffstetler
Meredith D. Hazzard	John Ventre
Frank J. Recely	Nevette A. Gardebled
Elmer C. Knudson	Neal Griffin
Walter V. Corteg	Charles R. Ellington, Jr.
Gordon B. Sworthout	Charles E. Christman
William F. Winslow	Leonard W. Arnold
John Senik	Henry L. Cotton
Joseph L. St. Pierre	

Kenneth E. Diem	Clemens F. Knox
Raymond L. Barnett	John J. Pinton
Bernard A. Koebbe	Harry L. Partridge
Irving T. Bloxom	Thomas A. Smith
Suell R. Grimm	Martin J. Connolly
James W. Freeman	John E. Giles
Homer E. McCullough	Lloyd L. Franklin
Foister E. Blair	Ralph L. Tarr
Norris D. Hickman	Henry O. Aeschliman
Charles U. Stastka	William S. Gray, Jr.
Thomas J. Bennett	George A. J. Michaud
Norman R. Hundwin	Allen S. Marsdale
Andrew J. Donaldson	John Szakara
Walter R. Terry	Earl W. Skinner
John T. Mears, Jr.	Hobart E. Sadler
Victor J. Shurkus	Robert S. Gaddy
Harold D. Gallery	Van H. White, Jr.
Robert N. Piland, Jr.	William D. Oliver

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be generals

Gen. John Edwin Hull, O7377, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Gen. Charles Lawrence Bolté, O6908, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Gen. William Morris Hoge, O4437, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Withers Alexander Burress, O4812, United States Army, retired, to be advanced on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Maj. Gen. William Benjamin Kean, O12470, United States Army, retired, to be advanced on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment to the position indicated and for appointment as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. John Wilson O'Daniel, O7342, United States Army, to be chief, Military Assistance Advisory Group, Indochina, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Hobart Raymond Gay, O7323, United States Army, commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, O7042, United States Army, to be commanding general, Army Antiaircraft Command, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Wade Herren, O7430, United States Army, to be commanding general, First Army, and senior United States Army member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479, United States Army, to be deputy commanding general, Army Forces, Far East, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425.
Maj. Gen. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O8472.
Maj. Gen. Boniface Campbell, O9788.
Maj. Gen. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663.
Maj. Gen. Philip Edward Gallagher, O11249.
Maj. Gen. David Ayres Depue Ogden, O12051.
Brig. Gen. John Hamilton Hinds, O12106.
Brig. Gen. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966.
Brig. Gen. Douglas Valentine Johnson, O15072.
Maj. Gen. Robert Parker Hollis, O15079.
Brig. Gen. Kenner Fisher Hertford, O15120.
Brig. Gen. Einar Bernard Gjelsteen, O15143.
Brig. Gen. John Joseph Binns, O15207.
Brig. Gen. Charles Vinson Bromley, Jr., O15239.
Brig. Gen. John William Harmony, O15240.
Maj. Gen. Earl Shuman Gruver, O15259.
Brig. Gen. Robert Ward Berry, O15554.
Brig. Gen. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777.

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Brig. Gen. James Melvin Epperly, O16288.

Maj. Gen. James Dunne O'Connell, O14965, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, and major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181.
Maj. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746.
Maj. Gen. George Honnen, O12816.
Maj. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914.
Maj. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328.
Maj. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, O15897.
Maj. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395.
Maj. Gen. Victor Allen Conrad, O15546.
Maj. Gen. Francis Marion Day, O15614.
Brig. Gen. Peter Conover Hains 3d O15657.
Brig. Gen. Vonna Fernleigh Burger, O15667.
Brig. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15698.
Brig. Gen. Willard Koehler Liebel, O15723.
Maj. Gen. William Henry Maglin, O15812.
Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952.
Maj. Gen. Arthur Lawrence Marshall, O38593.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

To be colonel

Perry, Russell V., O15383.

To be captains

Ancker, Jack P., O37217.
Bush, Hugh W., Jr., O60626.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of sec. 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of Aug. 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Cong., and Public Law 36, 80th Cong., as amended by Public Law 87, 83d Cong.:

To be captains

Connolly, John R., MC, O2103459.
Cowgill, Herbert F., MC.
Kilpatrick, William C., Jr., MC, O1717778.
Mincks, James R., MC, O2097881.

To be first lieutenants

Blough, Leland S., MC, O4003873.
Gardenier, Edward D., DC, O2267251.
Horton, Virginia A, ANC, N780235.
Hunsuck, Ervin E., DC, O2270447.
Johnson, Elizabeth F., ANC, N798022.
Louro, Jose M., MC, O2041851.
Mitchell, Bradford W., JAGC, O2267214.
Parker, James W., MSC, O717952.
Pogrebniak, Alexander, MC, O2268932.
Young, William H., Jr., MSC, O2263182.

To be second lieutenant

Randolph, George B., Jr., MSC, O1920422.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated under the provisions of sec. 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

To be first lieutenant

Abrams, Frederick R., O2273772.
Barrett, O'Neill, Jr., O971387.
Bergin, James J., O2273743.
Boehrer, Philip M., O4030393.
Canby, John P., O4024337.
Carey, Philip O., O2268941.
Herman, Robert H., O2268933.
Price, Frank W., O4002903.
Price, Ira B., O4002576.
Grass, Adrian L., O2273750.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenants

Broady, William, O2028412.
Sherberg, Auden L., O1924859.

To be second lieutenants

Berry Fred C., Jr.	Foley, William R.,
Craver, Roger H., O4021064.	C4006426.
	Simcox, George N., O4026470.
Early, Charles D., Jr.	Treadway, Thomas J.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be second lieutenant

Lawson, Lowell F.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be second lieutenants

Kaczenski, John A.	Price, Raymond S.,
Krengel, Thomas F.	O4024963.
Lokie, Andrew P.,	Saxon, George E.
O4032758.	Street, Clover B.
McFather, Bennie S.,	Soupene, James C., Jr.,
O4033500.	O4029449.
Murphy, Charles K.,	Vandeventer, William
O4029919.	R.
Pede, August R.	Weiskirch, Thomas N.,
Perry, Archie,	Jr., O1940922.
O4025001.	Williams, Thomas W.,
	O4029469.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Reserve of the United States Navy are nominated for permanent appointment to the grade and line or staff corps indicated:

To be rear admirals, line

William A. Read	William W. Drake
Karl L. Lange	Charles L. LaBarge
James M. Ross	Harry P. Stolz
Edward C. Holden, Jr.	Richard R. McNulty

To be rear admirals, Medical Corps

Richard A. Kern.
Alphonse (n) McMahon.

To be rear admiral, Dental Corps

Charles R. Wells.

To be read admiral, Medical Corps

William L. Nelson.

To be rear admiral, Chaplain Corps

Maurice S. Sheehy.

To be rear admiral, Civil Engineer Corps

Robert C. Johnson.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier generals

Edward W. Snedeker
Arthur H. Butler
Thomas A. Wornham
Roy M. Gulick

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we enter upon this new week, wilt Thou inspire us with sincere longings and desires to be governed and guided by Thy divine spirit in all our deliberations and decisions.

Grant that when we face hard tasks and the burdens and responsibilities of life press heavily upon us we may have an undimmed vision of Thy strength and sympathy and a deepening experience of Thy nearness and companionship.

We beseech Thee that all the Members of the Congress may earnestly strive to do Thy will for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

May we daily seek to be partners with Thee in bringing in that blessed time when men everywhere, in obedience to Thy holy will, shall do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with the Lord, their God.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of Thursday, March 10, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from New York explain this resolution?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides $710,000 additional for the payment of fees and expenses of witnesses who appear on behalf of the Government in cases in which the United States is a party. The budget estimate as contained in House Document No. 88 totaled $750,000. The committee was advised that the Department of Justice will be out of funds for this purpose prior to April first making it necessary to handle the request in this fashion rather than in the next supplemental appropriation bill. It should be noted that this action would not have been necessary had the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Justice called the situation to the attention of the committee when the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration.

Mr. BOW. Is it not true that if the $710,000 is not used for the payment of witnesses in the Federal courts that the money will go back to the Treasury?

Mr. ROONEY. Any balance would most certainly revert to the Treasury.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, the following sum:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Fees and expenses of witnesses

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of witnesses," $710,000.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEVENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 97)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Seventh Semiannual Report on the Mutual Security Program. This report covers operations during the 6-month period June 30–December 31, 1954, carried out in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

During this period, you will note there was a significant acceleration of operations in Asia, where the bulk of the free world's population occupies its greatest land mass, and where communism is stepping up its efforts of expansion.

These worldwide programs of military aid, economic development and technical cooperation are increasing the military security and economic progress of the United States and our cooperating partners in the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 14, 1955.*

TARIFF ON JUTE BACKING

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to report that last Friday, March 11, I introduced a bill which is designed to correct an inequity which results from an unfortunate grouping of words in paragraph 1008 of the Tariff Act. My bill is designed to establish a new rate of duty on jute backing for tufted rugs and carpeting.

I have elected to sponsor this bill only after careful study has satisfied me that an unintentional hardship is being thrust upon the American jute-backing industry because foreign-made jute backing is permitted entry for duty purposes as though it were burlap. Because the customs officials feel that the existing wording of the Tariff Act of 1930 precludes their classifying jute backing different from burlap for duty purposes, it is necessary to effect the change through legislation.

The duty on burlap is low as indeed it should be. But burlap and jute backing are two entirely different products; different in use, different in appearance, and different in price. Ordinary burlap cannot be used for backing of tufted rugs and carpets. Jute backing is not specifically described in the existing tariff schedules only because it was not manufactured in 1930. It is a product of the postwar period. It is a product pioneered in America by American talent. The full benefits of this development are, however, not being enjoyed here only because the foreign-made product is underselling the American-made product because of the unfortunate classification of the product for duty purposes.

Hazlehurst, Ga., one of the fine cities in my district, is the home of the Hazlehurst Mills division of Patchogue-Plymouth Mills Corp. This is the company which pioneered the development of jute backing for tufted rugs and carpeting. Patchogue-Plymouth has recently transferred its jute-backing manufacturing to its Hazlehurst plant. We welcome the company to our area, and I shall seek to have corrected the existing illogical tariff provisions which have thwarted the company's expansion.

The Eighth District of Georgia is an ideal area for manufacturing. There is ample space, ample labor, and a plentiful supply of utility services. I want to see more industry come to southern Georgia, and I deem it my duty as a representative of that area to sponsor legislation of benefit to the companies which see fit to establish there.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Armed Services may sit today during the session of the House to try to conclude a very important hearing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me last Friday for today be vacated, and that I may address the House for 20 minutes on Wednesday, March 16, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 60 minutes on Wednesday, March 16, following the special orders heretofore granted, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INADEQUACY OF THE PRESENT DROUGHT RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year a number of us have been reporting upon the inadequacy of the present drought relief program of the present administration. The past few weeks have brought to us more disturbing information concerning the growth of the situation that exists in the Southwest and Middle West.

The United Press in an article on March 10 stated that the first dust storm of the year had struck the southwestern States with 40-mile-an-hour winds whipping the plains left bare by drought: The center of the blow area was in the Oklahoma and Texas Panhandles, northeastern New Mexico, southwestern Kansas, and southeastern Colorado. The Department of Agriculture has described 26 million acres in this area as "critically in danger of wind erosion."

This is a grave situation. We do not have an adequate action program by our Government today. I hope all Members of the House will join in calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to do something aggressive and adequate to meet this very urgent problem that confronts millions of people in the Dust Bowl area.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today the Hoover Commission has made public its report on lending agencies. By and large, the recommendations in the report, if fully carried out, would make it harder for American citizens to buy homes or to get loans for their farms or businesses.

I have gone into this fully in a dissent and separate statement which, under permission previously granted, I am inserting in today's RECORD.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST A SMALL SEGMENT OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago a valued constituent of mine in Seattle, Wash., Brig. Gen. E. S. Laue, United States Marine Corps (retired), drew my attention to a grave injustice which inadvertently is being perpetrated on a small but very important segment of our Armed Forces. I use the word inadvertently advisedly, for I am sure it has never been the intent of Congress to slight one single American boy who is called to his country's defense when her future as a free nation is threatened. The particular segment to which I have reference is known as the Air National Guard. This group, though comparatively few in number, has a proud record written in the skies over many a far-flung Korean battleline and should be forever indelibly inscribed in the hearts of their countrymen. A regulation of the United States Air Force prescribes that any unit of the Air National Guard of any State, if federally recognized by the United States Air Force, can be considered a component part of the Air Force Reserve program. As the distinguished Members of this House well know, a United States Air Force regulation, impressive though it may be, cannot qualify this group under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. Therefore, affirmative action on the part of Congress is required. Remember all these men during the Korean conflict flew in daily combat beside their more favored comrades—more favored in that the Regular Air Force reservists have the added protection to themselves and their families of the Employees' Compensation Act, while the National Guard Air units are denied that protection. Mr. Speaker, this, in my opinion, constitutes a great injustice and should be corrected. Consequently, I have today introduced remedial legislation designed to extend this added protection to these neglected units, retroactive to July 26, 1947. It was on this day, incidentally, that Billy Mitchell's dream was realized and the United States Army Air Force was born. Therefore, it seemed to me appropriate that the provisions of my bill be effective as of that date.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this Congress will support my bill to extend to members of the Air National Guard benefits presently available to other members of reserve components of the Armed Forces.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING THE PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time, subject to the call of the chair, for the purpose of meeting and receiving the Prime Minister of Australia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to vacate special order for today and that the same special order be granted for Thursday, March 17, 1955.

PAYMENT BY UNITED NATIONS TO CERTAIN AMERICANS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last week it was announced that the United Nations has paid approximately $180,000 to 11 American employees of the U. N. who sought refuge behind the fifth amendment and refused to testify as to whether they were engaged in subversive activities.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress during the latter days of the last session passed a resolution providing that no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used to pay these 11 persons. I suggest that the proper subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations investigate and find out what funds were used to pay back salaries and alleged damages to these 11 fifth-amendment characters who were fired from the United Nations.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call

up House Resolution 22 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, effective as of January 3, 1955, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

"(1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the administrative operations under the Refugee Act of 1953, as amended, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;

"(2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;

"(3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;

"(4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in Territories and possessions; and

"(5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act:

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

"The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and acting during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any members of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

The title was amended to read as follows: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction."

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 22 which has been considered, amended, and favorably reported by the Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22 would authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. The Committee on Rules amended the resolution as originally introduced so that the resolution would state more clearly the general subjects to be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary in accordance with the policy of the Committee on Rules.

The resolution spells out clearly the areas in which the Committee on the Judiciary anticipates doing most of their work. The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to investigate and study the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the administrative operations under the Refugee Act of 1953, as amended, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation.

The committee would also be authorized to investigate and study claims, both public and private against the United States; the operation and administration of national penal institutions; the judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof and finally the operation and administration of the various antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The resolution which the Committee on Rules has reported prohibits the Committee on the Judiciary from undertaking any investigation of any subject, which is being investigated by any other committee of the House, and the Committee on the Judiciary would be empowered, if the resolution is adopted, to sit and act only within the United States. The committee would have the usual subpena power and the subpenas could be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and could be served by any person assigned by the chairman or the member acting under the authority of the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House membership will adopt the resolution which will give those powers to the Committee on the Judiciary which are so necessary if this committee is to carry on its work. I move that the House adopt House Resolution 22.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from New York has stated, and I have no objection to this resolution.

I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DELANEY. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAMILY-SIZE FARMS VERSUS CORPORATE FARMS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article by Mr. Martin Schroeder and a statement about two counties in Indiana.

They are as follows:

[Reproduced with kind consent of Martin Schroeder and the Christian Century Foundation. For extra copies write the Rural Life Association, Quaker Hill, Route 28, Richmond, Ind.]

CORPORATION OR FAMILY FARMS?

(By Martin Schroeder)

Driving home across the plains from a late meeting on a recent night, our little group fell into a discussion of the changes taking place in farm life. With hardly any traffic on the road at that late hour, our attention was attracted by the many lights slanting through the darkness from tractors moving back and forth over the fields, plowing and planting. Why such hurry? Why this burning of the midnight oil when days are getting longer and one man and his machine can do more work than several could do in the past?

To what goal is American farming moving? The sagging market for its products reflects the problem of surpluses crowding our granaries. An even greater concern is the fading out of the family owned and operated homestead. Once considered so essential for national strength, the family farm is now forgotten when blueprints are being drafted for our country's future, whether by church or state. What effect will this change have on the church? Active rural churches, large or small, are vital for a healthy farming community. So all churches should make Rural Life Sunday a day for self-examination.

FARMS AND FREEDOM

Why should some farmers be working day and night, in shifts, while others, though hungry for work on the land, must seek their living in the city? The answer is found in the increasing size of farm units whose ground must be covered within a given number of days, in time with the respective season. Bigger machines do not mean less work or fewer hours for the farmer. His first purchase of an expensive outsize implement is but the beginning of a chain reaction. Along with the acquisition of more powerful tools comes the need for more land to make his heavy investment pay. When he gets more land, he needs more machinery.

In this process the homestead principle, formulated and put into law about a century

ago, has given way to an ever-accelerating land monopoly, to a trend away from the family-sized farm. Tractor lights piercing the once peaceful night of the American countryside are signals marking the end of an era that helped the Nation to become great. Then what? Will America in time be driven into the pattern of older countries where the same fallacy of excessive land acquisition confronts the people now with revolutionary land reforms, the ABC of communism? You cannot undermine democratic land distribution, with a consequent ignoring of the little man, without paying a heavy price in democratic liberty.

THE TREND TO LARGER UNITS

The family farm is one owned and operated by the family that lives on it, sufficient in size to provide the necessities of life. It is a fundamental institution in our national life. Sentimentalizing about the peace and beauty of the countryside will avail little if the family farm goes. Those who remember the prosperous little towns and the churches surrounded by frugal farm homes must look at today's trend with misgivings.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture, we have now approximately 600,000 fewer farms than in 1920, though the population has increased by more than 50 million and more land than ever is under cultivation. Furthermore, farms of from 3 to 10 acres have more than doubled in number during the same period. These are acreages operated by part- or full-time industrial workers and semiretired folk. The sharpest decrease in number has come to those farms from 20 to 259 acres in size, the kind we are here concerned about. The group with from 260 to 499 acres, mostly well-established family holdings, have about held their own. But those consisting of more than 500 acres, the king-size commercial properties, have enjoyed the greatest increase in number. This increase has been accomplished at the expense of the second group, whose units have disappeared by the hundreds of thousands. Traditional American farm life, caught between the upper and nether millstones by the multiplication of suburban acreages on the one hand the growth of agricultural giants on the other, is slowly being ground out of existence.

However, where country churches are effective this process is less apparent, if not entirely absent. An adequate church program can reverse this trend. The churches are called on to take missionary action which will prevent further erosion of wholesome rural life.

THE CHURCHES' DUTY

What is pointed out here is nothing new. But except in the case of a few denominations it has not received the needed emphasis in the churches' program. In 1931 the New York Herald Tribune carried an editorial, "Twilight of the Small Farmer," pointing out that drastic steps would have to be taken to preserve the rural community. It said in part:

"Out in the West the tractor and giant combine have declared a war of extermination on the small agriculturist. From the panhandle of Texas north to the Canadian border, large-scale farming uses costly machinery and cultivates at one lick anywhere from 10,000 to 50,000 acres of land. * * * For these farmers there is no farm crisis. But their prosperity is the ruin of millions of little tillers of wheat and cotton. * * * The little growers are trapped."

Since drastic steps to turn the battle have never been taken, we have dust bowls and other tragic consequences. But in many a small farm home the tenant family is going over its financial resources to find the wherewithal that might take it across the line into farm ownership, or perhaps it is scraping the savings that could take the son, at heart a farmer, out on his own. It is for such people to whom farming is the way of life that the church's heart should be touched. Helping young America by sound business methods to hold the line against obliteration is a worthy Christian service. Today only 1 out of 10 farmers is below 30 years of age; the majority are past 50. Where will this trend lead our national economy?

DOES BIGNESS MEAN EFFICIENCY?

The point may be raised that grand-scale farming, like giant industry, has the advantage over the small farmer. He may just as well give up now and take his place as a serf under economic royalty without prolonging the agony against overwhelming odds. Under the impact of progress there is no other choice, so some people say; the handwriting is on the wall. But is it, really? What are the facts?

The core of the problem is efficient farming. Where do you find it? Sufficient independent research has been made, south and north, to demonstrate that the change from tenancy and sharecropping to family ownership has had nothing but beneficial results for people and land. One of the latest studies along this line, confirming the observations of others, was undertaken by Stanley Hamilton, of the Rural Life Association. Employing the latest official information, he compared 2 Indiana counties—Benton and Elkhart—both with about the same number of acres in farms, slightly over 250,000 each. There the similarity ends. Benton has rich black priarie soil worth $209 an acre. Elkhart is handicapped with land valued at an average of only $160. Benton is mostly a commercial farming area, divided into 1,138 farms averaging 223 acres each. Elkhart's farming is diversified and intensive and in the hands of small farmers who operate on the average only 86 acres. Benton's land is 54.1 percent operated by tenants, while Elkhart has only 16.8 percent not tilled by the owner.

SMALL FARMS MORE PRODUCTIVE

In the eyes of those who favor the large-farm system, commercial Benton should be financially in the lead. But here is the payoff. Benton reports $14.8 million cash income for the census year, covering all proceeds from land and livestock, while "inefficient" family-farming Elkhart walks off with $20.7 million. Benton, with its 54 percent of more-or-less temporary tenants, counts 37 rural churches. Elkhart, with 83 percent of its farms occupied by owners, has 91 such churches. Do we have here an answer to those who measure efficiency by size?

I was a member of a group of rural church people who last summer took part in a tour to study rural church life in Europe. We had some surprises coming when we observed old country efficiency. In a dreamlike atmosphere that sometimes suggested the quaint village scenes of a Walt Disney cartoon, we saw oxen used for pulling power in field and on the road; wheat, which had been planted in small fields dotted here and there over the landscape, harvested by women with sickle in hand; hay brought in from the meadow on the back of a man who could hardly be seen under the load; water carried by bucket from the village pump to the home. We shook our heads and dubiously inquired how much wheat could be raised under such a system. The answer set us back on our heels. They grew as much as 80 bushels per acre. Where I live in Nebraska we are pleased with 18 bushels per acre for a 10-year average, produced with the latest of know-how on big farms with big machines. In farming, it seems, size and speed are not just other words for efficiency and dollars.

All of which suggests that our much-vaunted progress before which the family farm is supposed to fold up and give way to ever more corporation farming is not all that propaganda would have us believe. It is a grave error to envision the future of agriculture in the light of the gigantic strides that have been made in centralizing industry. What is good for General Motors is not necessarily good for general farming.

PEOPLE COUNT MOST

Two arguments are constantly advanced in favor of the big farm. One is that it follows the principle of free enterprise. There is no objection to that principle if it is allowed to operate on all levels and is not made a moral justification for the big man's power to absorb less fortunate men's businesses or farms. The giants in industry may be able better to make automobiles, but to use the standards of big industry as a measuring stick for agriculture is absurd. The one produces according to specifications, moving and stopping the assembly line at will. The other deals with soil, seeds, and seasons, never knowing what the outcome will be in any one year.

The second argument points to the better experimentation facilities available to the large farms. Again, this is true. But most such farms are corporations that farm the farmer. Listen to their daily spiel over the radio. Most useful experimentation is still done at State agricultural colleges, whose services are accessible to anyone who requests them.

This much-alluded-to parallel of industry and farming breaks down completely when seen in the light of a community's welfare. When industry expands, more people are needed, more housing, more stores, more schools, more churches. When farms expand, we get bigger machines and fewer workers, and homes are taken off the land. Towns lose business and railroads withdraw their trains and soon pull up their tracks. Schools are turned into granaries. Big business may benefit the community; big farming destroys it.

PROBLEM IS ALSO SPIRITUAL

It goes without saying that the type of agriculture which finds its best expression on the family farm shelters economic and spiritual values for which there are no substitutes. Apart from our observations of Elkhart County, this claim is supported by the character of such rural communities as New Knoxville, Ohio; Freistatt, Mo., and Decorah, Iowa,—described in detail in the Christian Century's survey of Great Churches in America in 1950.

It is evident that the farmer's economic problem as steward of God's gifts is primarily a spiritual one, involving the preservation of the Christian home in the country. Observation of rural life Sunday must include helpful action along missionary lines toward that end. It calls for ever stronger denominational guidance and support to call a halt to the erosion of rural community life. The church at large owes a debt to this bypassed mission field. Rural life Sunday is a good time for us to take stock and where the need exists, do penance—then act.

What is efficient farming?—Two Indiana counties compared

	Benton	Elkhart
Population:		
Urban	None	52,042
Rural	11,462	32,470
Population per square mile, total	28	180.6
Number of farms	1,138	2,953
Land in farms—acres	254,644	256,440
Average size—do	223.8	86.8
Percentage of tenancy	54.1	16.8
Farms over 500 acres	47	9
Farms under 10 acres	231	392
Cropland harvested—acres	210,847	151,723
Land pastured—do	30,365	58,345
Value, land and buildings:		
Average per farm	$48,802	$14,958
Average per acre	$209.17	$160.90
Value, all farm products sold	$13,425,211	$13,632,255
Average per acre	$52.73	$53.16
Poultry sold:		
Farms reporting	766	1,953
Dollar value	$1,085,679	$4,038,901
Dairy products sold:		
Farms reporting	525	1,918
Dollar value	$326,065	$3,679,824

What is efficient farming?—Two Indiana counties compared—Continued

	Benton	Elkhart
Cattle:		
Farms reporting	990	2,261
Number	21,071	36,625
Hogs:		
Farms report-ng	830	1,463
Number	49,772	34,075
Dollar value	$1,054,067	$672,308
Facilities and tools on farms:		
Motor trucks	618	805
Tractors	2,053	2,413
Automobiles	1,254	3,066
Telephones	859	2,106
Electricity	1,061	2,601
Electric hot water heaters	296	991
Electric home freezers	592	569
Rural churches (survey by Indiana Farm Bureau)	37	91

These two Indian counties are compared because they are nearly the same size in total acres of farmland. Benton County, as the figures show, is more nearly a corn and hog producing county. It is largely a commercial farming area. (Farming is a business—just like any other business.) Elkhart County farming is diversified and intensive. It is in north-central Indiana on the Michigan border. The farming is based on family-sized units. (The farm is owned and operated by and for the family.) The soil is better in Benton County. It includes much black prairie land; it is on the Illinois border.

Note the value of products sold. Compare the two counties at this point. Compare the returns per acre and the investment in land and buildings per acre. What is efficient farming?

All figures are from 1950 United States Census of Agriculture, United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Prepared and distributed by The Rural Life Association, Quaker Hill, Route 28, Richmond, Ind.

DARYL M. PARKER, M. D.
Chairman.
STANLEY HAMILTON,
Executive Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend their remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN at the end of the proceedings today and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a resolution.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include an analysis of laws as prepared by the Library of Congress.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for 2 days on account of attending a funeral.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 829. An act to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international sports competitions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 15, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

543. A letter from the executive director, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting Report No. 10 prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities during the 7-month period for fiscal 1955 ending January 31, 1955, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

544. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

545. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

546. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, as amended, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters so as to change the method by which the apportionment of total cost is made"; to the Committee on Public Works.

547. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on lending, guaranteeing and insurance activities of the Federal Government, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 10, 1955, the following reports were filed on March 11, 1955:

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska: Committee on Agriculture. Part 2, minority views on H. R. 12. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4876. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted March 14, 1955*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 252. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 3322. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 10, 1955, the following bill was introduced on March 11, 1955:

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4876. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[*Introduced and referred March 14, 1955*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4877. A bill to provide for assistance to State agencies administering laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe work places and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4878. A bill to provide for the establishment of a post office at Dover, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 4879. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4880. A bill to provide a mandatory life sentence for any person convicted, in the District of Columbia, of a felony for the fourth time; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 4881. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4883. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4884. A bill for the relief of the city of Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4885. A bill to transfer ownership to Allegany County, Md., of a bridge loaned to such county by the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4886. A bill to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4887. A bill to provide that Federal real property used primarily for the production of commodities of a type commonly produced by private enterprise shall be subject to State and local real property taxation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4888. A bill to provide for a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4889. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4890. A bill to extend to members of the Air National Guard and their survivors certain benefits presently available to certain other members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces and their survivors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the refund of manufacturers' excise taxes paid on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4892. A bill to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of July 1, 1954, so as to assure the availability of materials essential to national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4893. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of fine arts programs and projects, to establish a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 4894. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4895. A bill to amend part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide a 15-percent increase in the compensation which may be earned by veterans pursuing training under such part without reduction in their subsistence allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 4896. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act to prevent sudden and unreasonable decreases in the price of hogs and cattle which are sold at stockyards subject to that act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4897. A bill to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery immediately below Norfolk Dam on Northfork River, Ark.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to provide for official acknowledgment of the action of the homing pigeon, GI Joe, in carrying a vital message during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. Res. 176. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "The House of Representatives"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Resolutions memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the United States Public Health hospital also known as the Brighton Marine Hospital in Brighton; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the United States Public Health hospital also known as the Brighton Marine Hospital in Brighton; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, requesting the Congress to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire; requesting the Department of State to exercise its powers in fixing tariffs until the expiration of said agreement; and requesting the Congress to set up, after June 12, 1955, a flexible import fee to be administered by the Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prevent the closing of the United States Public Health hospital also known as the Brighton Marine Hospital in Brighton; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to admit the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska to statehood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Federal Government to give every consideration to an emergency program of control for spruce budworm infestations of the forests which are in critical stages in Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging rejection of the proposal of the Subcommittee of the President's Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations to dismantle the Soil Conservation Service and turn its functions over to the State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that long-term contracts be authorized between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the State of Monotana which would guarantee specific sums of money to the local government units for services rendered on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the rehabilitation and education for the Montana landless Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide payments or grants in lieu of taxes on notaxable governmental and Indian lands in the State of Monotana for the use and benefit of the counties of Montana wherein such Indian lands are located as payment for governmental and welfare services provided to the Indian population by the State of Montana and the particular counties involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in such a manner as to enable the domestic sugar industry of the United States to have a fair and equitable share in our Nation's growth; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide appropriations for the construction of the 230,000-volt transmission line from Fort Randall to Grand Island in such amounts as may be necessary to complete construction of such line in 1956; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to encourage local and State development of small irrigation and reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 12, 1955, so that the regulation of foreign trade and the laying of tariffs and import fees will immediately vest in Congress as the Constitution requires and thereby stop the lowering of the American standard of living by the importation of foreign-made goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to making application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing a certain article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of article V; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing a certain article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of article V; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish and enact a uniform time system for the entire United States of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that additional funds be made available by the Department of the Interior to assist the present native owners of reindeer herds and to aid additional in-

terested Eskimos in acquiring and establishing herds for the expansion of this particular industry; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that it is the dedicated purpose and policy of the Federal Government to nurture, sustain, and encourage private enterprise and labor in joint efforts in the defense and development of the Territory of Alaska, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 4898. A bill for the relief of Bernd Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 4899. A bill for the relief of Helmut Klestadt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4900. A bill for the relief of Blanca G. Hidalgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4901. A bill for the relief of Alvaro J. Barretto and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4902. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

154. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Olga Pritchett, Ketchikan, Alaska, requesting passage of H. R. 2535, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

155. Also, petition of the post commander, Cummings Brothers Post, No. 1436, the American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. Also, petition of Alice L. Waalkes, Oakland, Calif., requesting legislation to amend the income-tax law so as to allow flexible tax deductions for medical bills; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

157. Also, petition of the manager, Lubbock Chamber of Commerce, Lubbock, Tex., requesting a reasonable curtailment of petroleum imports, and passage of such legislation as is necessary to correct the present situation as regards to Federal control over the production of any States' natural resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

158. Also, petition of Clarence L. Palmer and others, Salt Lake City, Utah, relative to going on record as being in favor of passage of H. R. 4259; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to Senator George

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a remarkably fine article on the career of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], written by William S. White and published in the New York Times magazine of March 13, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GEORGE: MONUMENTAL, DETERMINED

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—"Monumental" is the word for WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE, the organ-voiced patriarch of the Senate and the third most powerful man in the United States in foreign policy. For "Mister GEORGE"—this is what his wife "Miss Lucy" calls him in the way of the old-fashioned southern gentlewoman in speaking to others of her husband—is for the Eisenhower administration in these tense days both a rock and an adornment.

He is a Democrat but in any ways, and especially in world affairs, a very unpartisan one, indeed. He has now resumed, after what to him in his long Senate career is a short hiatus of 14 years, the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is hand in glove with Secretary of State Dulles and with the President himself, though sometimes his is the hand and theirs is the glove. And though the George hand is seemingly gentle, it can be steely.

It is obvious to those in position to observe these matters closely that Mr. GEORGE is in the confidence of the Secretary of State to a degree that no other Senator has ever been during Mr. Dulles' tenure. This does not exclude Senators of Mr. Dulles' own Republican Party, no matter who they may be.

Senator GEORGE keeps up with the highest affairs of the State Department—the crises, the burgeoning new policies, and all the rest that matters—in a very personal way. He does not do this by going to the State Department. Every Thursday, barring his absence from the country, Mr. Dulles comes by at breakfasttime to Mr. GEORGE'S apartment in the Mayflower Hotel to put the whole burden of the moment on the breakfast table.

Senator GEORGE, in his discretion, passes on to his colleagues of the Foreign Relations Committee such of these matters as he may think fit as the dean of the Senate as well as the chairman of that committee. He is not merely a partner in bipartisanship but its ambulant embodiment. An irreverent junior Democrat—the word "irreverent" is used because, while Mr. GEORGE is in no sense stuffy, he is profoundly impressive—observes of the arrangement: "GEORGE is the rich man's Arthur Vandenberg."

This irresistibly apt comparison to the last great Senate exemplar of bipartisanship—the late Republican Senator from Michigan in the days when the White House was in Democratic hands—is unconsciously revealing. No one on the Democratic side, and not many on the Republican side, if it comes to that, would think of comparing Mr. GEORGE to any other Senator in any way that did not clearly put him in the senior position.

This position he occupies, not simply in the committee but in the whole of the Senate, for a variety of reasons. First of all, to all there present he is senior; he has been 30 years in that body, and that is a very long time. Then, he not only runs the Foreign Relations Committee but also is the voluntary ex-chairman and still senior Democratic member of another body that in some ways is even more puissant, the Committee on Finance.

He is, therefore, in a position with one hand to help shape the great affairs of the world—not excluding such affairs as peace and war—and with the other to assist in adding to, or relieving, the tax burden of everybody in the United States. He is also the President pro tempore of the Senate, its Presiding Officer in the Vice President's absence.

But all this indicates only a small part of the story of the prestige of GEORGE. (The monosyllable "GEORGE," by the way, is the most common way of speaking of him in Washington, even though now and then one hears him referred to as "Walter." When a man in the Senate is called almost habitually by his last name, it implies an unconscious concession by the speaker that here is a personage who does not need even the grand, rolling title of "Senator.")

WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE, in his front-row seat just next to the chair of the majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, is an institution. Stocky rather than tall, his eyes cavernous behind thick spectacles, his small hand wearily smoothing his shock of white hair, he is for all the world like a proctor or monitor in a school for boys. Very grown men dread his frown and fear his displeasure, the one because it is so forbidding, the other because of the magnificent basso-profundo of his admonishing voice.

When he feels aggrieved he puts the case with the air of a patient man long, long put upon—intolerably and endlessly put upon—and now at last compelled to utter, as politely as may be remotely possible, some slight suggestion of the incredible travail that he has had to endure. Clearly, he honestly considers his capacity for endurance to be extraordinary.

Thus when he indicates that even this capacity has now been exceeded, the whole Chamber comes to a most respectful halt. The air is thereupon filled with Jovian bolts and rolls of thunder, and Members not remotely involved in the cause of his distress will nevertheless look a bit guilty and apologetic that matters have come to such a sorry point.

These incidents rarely occur—Mr. GEORGE is as far as possible from being a quarrelsome man—but when they do, they are memorable. One such occurred last year.

Senator GEORGE was determined to break a proposed constitutional amendment to limit the President's treatymaking power that had been put in by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio. He was equally resolved upon the adoption of an amendment of his own, and this George paper, along with the Bricker paper, met the opposition of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.

Mr. Brownell had sent to the Senate a memorandum disapproving some aspects of Mr. GEORGE'S project, and it became the duty of the unfortunate Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, the Republican Senate leader and a respectful disciple of WALTER F. GEORGE, to read the Attorney General's caveats on the floor.

Senator GEORGE arose in all his splendid fury to dispose of the luckless Mr. Brownell, who, had he been present, would hardly have known what had hit him until it was all over.

The Senator recalled with a mixture of sorrow and anger that he had undertaken

to listen to the proposals of the administration, which he need not have done at all. But now, he said, with an incredulous scorn, look what had happened.

Someone in the Justice Department, GEORGE quickly concluded that it was "some kloik" (clerk), as he put it—had sent up a document that was both ridiculous and impertinent. This, he indicated, was about all that could have been expected of an agency in the hands of Mr. Brownell. For this, the Senator loudly suggested several times, was "a very odd little Attorney General."

His curiously wounding description, the nearest thing to an epithet that this correspondent ever heard GEORGE employ in debate, for good or ill, all but swept Brownell's influence from the Senate floor. The small incident is a key to much of the Senator's operating power.

His most admiring friends (and they are very many) could hardly have maintained that GEORGE really dealt with the Brownell memorandum on its merits. Nevertheless, he destroyed it in a single phrase; it is his gift—and now a gift unique in all the Senate—to be senatorial in the grand manner. Senators do not always and necessarily require of a George that precision of logic, or that information as to details that they require of younger and lesser men.

Who expects a great prima donna to parse the sentences of her lyrics? It is enough that she sings. It is thus with GEORGE when with matchless effectiveness he takes the lead on the floor for an Eisenhower foreign policy. Like many of the great politicians of the old school, he will not be bound by the details, nor will he haggle over the fine print.

Those who seek to engage him in these areas are wasting their time; he will peer at them in morose, lofty indifference, as not long ago he peered at those who wanted to put reservations into our defense treaty with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

He looks upon all high policy as a traveler sees a distant landscape. It is the panorama in which he is interested; it is not his habit of mind to be concerned with the situation of the hills and valleys. A traditionalist in these matters, he has the deep conviction that the conduct of foreign policy belongs in the hands of the President and, all in all, he will, before he is through, return to the White House a measure of control over world affairs that it has not had since Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He will do this, that is to say, so long as he remains convinced that the White House itself is acting with proper responsibility—and with due deference to the Senate. He is perhaps the only man who could make so difficult a rationale—that is, both a rendering unto Caesar and a retention of the Senate's own proper place in the scheme of things.

His own views are internationalist, as is fit and apt for a southern politician of his generation. They are oriented more toward Europe than toward Asia, in the typical fashion of Democrats who find it very hard to understand the passionate intensity of the old Republican preoccupation with Asia.

But these views could not fairly be called, even by the most vehement America Firster, hospitable to give-away. Mr. GEORGE in his time has helped to open the treasury to many foreign enterprises, and will do so many times again. For all of that, he does not gladly fling public money about. Few public men feel, in principle, a deeper pain at the size of the public debt. In a word, he is suitably safe in the fiscal sense—a circumstance that greatly forwards his influence in the Senate.

He is, moreover, the only man in the Senate who can visibly, undoubtedly, and repeatedly change votes simply by his incomparable rhetoric on the floor. Other men are much more effective in gathering votes in the lounges and corridors—Mr. GEORGE's junior colleague, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, for one. GEORGE, for his part, scorns the practical kind of operation, the man-to-man discussion in which Mr. RUSSELL so excels.

It is, nevertheless, the judgment of some of the most open-eyed and informed men in the Senate that GEORGE of Georgia, given ideal circumstances, can come close on the floor to controlling as many as 25 votes on certain issues at certain times. These issues will for the most part be issues of foreign policy; whatever GEORGE decides in this field is very nearly final with nearly all the Democratic rank and file and with a good number of Republicans as well.

Why this is so it is very nearly impossible to explain, though some suggestive considerations may be offered. There is the fact that the Senate is basically a hierarchal body; and GEORGE is the great hierarch. There is the fact that GEORGE is an authentic and profoundly safe conservative; no man supposes for a moment that GEORGE will lead him onto any terrain of sticky innovation.

One seeks to avoid exaggeration here. It is, nevertheless, for all practical purposes, a fact that when GEORGE takes a position it has, for many in the Senate, much of the political force that the proclaimed dogmas of the established churches may in the spiritual realm have for the faithful. The Senate feeling is that in GEORGE there is safety, there is continuity, there is dignity, there is a kind of indescribable stability as the years go by and he goes on.

It is so secret that when the Democratic leadership of the Senate senses trouble one of the regency is likely to mutter to another: "Shouldn't we ask GEORGE to go in now?"—meaning to go on the floor and do his stuff. GEORGE, of course, will go in or not, as he pleases. He is not the sort of man to be assigned to do anything, indeed the very suggestion of attempting to direct him in any way would be regarded as appalling heresy.

Like most artists, essentially he goes his own way. For example, in spite of his incredible seniority he is not a member of the Senate Democratic policy committee—though this is not to say that his views are not sonorously heard there from time to time.

The chief of the Democratic high command, Senator JOHNSON of Texas, is 30 years junior to his seat mate; Mr. GEORGE needs no membership on any committee to transfer his views to Lyndon. Lyndon, for his part, looks with an affectionate fascination on his senior and would no more think of interfering with that senior in his sphere—foreign policy—than he would propose to try to tell a Texas uncle how to run a ranch.

Some of the rank and filers occasionally will attempt to challenge "the Old Man," but these youngsters most often are put in their place by the leaders even before they go so far as to provoke the Olympian frowns of GEORGE himself.

The Senator, more than any man who sits with him, embodies the powerful quality of long success. He was, for example, one of the triumphant survivors of 1938, the year that Franklin Roosevelt undertook to purge Congress of certain rightwing Democrats who were, the President felt, getting in the way of the New Deal.

Today, Mr. GEORGE recalls that episode with what can only be called a splendid, and somewhat absent, detachment. Mr. Roosevelt came to a political meeting in Barnesville, Ga., and sat on the platform with Senator GEORGE himself, among others. The President told the crowd that the Senator was both a scholar and a gentleman; but then he went on to say in substance that Mr. GEORGE, for all that, just wouldn't do in the Senate. As the President finished his speech, he turned to the Senator, said quietly, "God bless you, Walter," and went away.

Mr. GEORGE was returned to the Senate in a great outpouring of votes. Later, in the 6 months that he served in 1941 as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he became indispensable to Mr. Roosevelt's great foreign-policy designs; there was, for example, the little matter of passing the lend-lease bill.

The President never afterward referred directly to the contretemps of 1938. Once, however, in the crowded and anxious war years he sought a certain tax program of Mr. GEORGE, who then had on his other hat as chairman of the Finance Committee. Pressing this program as one likely to be popular with the voters, Mr. Roosevelt said urgently:

"Walter, if I know anything at all about Georgia politics * * *." At this point GEORGE caught the Presidential eye. " * * * and certainly I don't," Mr. Roosevelt finished with a laugh.

"Mr. Roosevelt," says Mr. GEORGE now, in a soft, forgiving rumble of a voice, "had a quite genuine gift for separating his personal feelings from his political feelings. He never mixed the two."

Senator GEORGE, on his side, has an equally decisive way of separating the personal from the official. Just before this Democratic Congress met, the administration was most anxious for him to leave the chairmanship of the Finance Committee and return to the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee.

At length he was requested by the President and Secretary of State Dulles to come to the White House. They put their hopes before the Senator. He agreed to go along. But, as he says, "I told them that I could not undertake the social part of this job. I do not much care to go out in the evening. I said I might feel obliged to come once a year to some official entertainment at the White House, but nothing beyond that. It was agreed."

What has happened in practice is that the unofficial stand-in for Mr. GEORGE at diplomatic affairs is his tireless and convivial junior on the Foreign Relations Committee, the 87-year-old Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island. By custom Mr. GEORGE, who is only 77, is still invited everywhere; by general understanding he will now and then accept an invitation, but more or less at the last minute it will somehow turn out that he cannot go after all.

Determined is also the word for WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE.

Natural Gas Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on February 26, 1955, I issued a statement commenting upon the action of the White House Committee on National Fuel Policy with particular reference to their recommendation that the Federal Government remove itself from all regulation of field producers of gas. I would like to place a copy of my statement in the RECORD, and also a letter from Mr. Thomas W. Goodloe, president of Tennessee Natural Gas Lines, Inc., with tabulation showing weighted average price of producers for gas purchased in southwestern fields by 10 major pipeline companies from 1948 to 1953. Mr. Goodloe's letter and tables show that the price to field producers has increased 300 percent during that 6-year period. Further relaxation of regulations would be disastrous to the consumer.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The White House Report on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, released today, is bad medicine for consumers.

The weasel-worded section on natural-gas regulation means that the White House is giving administration backing to what amounts to a repeal of the Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case. This means consumers had better get ready for more millions on their gas bills.

The policy enunciated in this section is much worse than proposals to exempt the so-called independent producers of gas from interstate regulation—the so-called Kerr bill.

It harks back instead to proposals of some years ago which would exempt all field producers from Federal regulation. Integrated companies, which own both pipelines and field production, serve as an illustration. Under this policy, such an integrated company produces its own gas in the field and could charge whatever it wishes to its pipeline company. The pipeline company then would be subject to regulation only in transmission costs. At the other end, the distribution end, local regulation would be powerless to deal with anything that has gone before.

The White House policy statement simply sacrifices the interests of some 60 million consumers who depend on natural gas to the profits of a comparative handful of oil companies who produce it.

TENNESSEE NATURAL GAS LINES, INC.,
Nashville, Tenn., March 1, 1955.

Re Regulation of gas field prices.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ESTES: Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. supplies most of middle and east Tennessee. This company's weighted-average cost of gas in 1948 was 4.28 cents per mcf and at present that company's weighted average cost of gas in the field is more than 12 cents per mcf, or approximately 300 percent of the 1948 field-price cost.

Attached is a tabulation showing the weighted-average price of producers for gas purchased in Southwestern fields by 10 major pipeline companies in the years 1948 to 1953. This tabulation is an excerpt from an exhibit introduced by United Gas Pipe Line Co. in FPC Docket No. G-1142. In most cases prices have further increased substantially since 1953. It appears that the increase in field prices over this very short period has been tremendous and such prices should certainly now be approaching fair prices to producers, if indeed they have not already arrived.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS W. GOODLOE,
President.

Weighted average prices paid to producers for gas purchased in the field by 10 major pipeline companies (includes 745.11 field purchases and 745.12 gasoline plant outlet purchases)

[14.9 p. s. i. a.]

	Cents per thousand cubic feet					
	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co	3.37	3.65	4.39	6.41	7.85	9.01
Mississippi River Fuel Corp			10.03	11.07	11.30	11.96
Southern Natural Gas Co	5.77	6.04	6.36	6.29	7.15	8.08
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co	4.28	4.57	5.11	5.54	6.53	9.37
Texas Eastern Transmission Corp	6.69	6.50	6.48	6.53	7.51	12.05
Texas Gas Transmission Corp		6.89	6.77	7.34	7.26	9.79
Texas Illinois Natural Gas Pipeline Co				8.70	8.54	8.89
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp			8.41	7.20	7.53	7.83
Trunkline Gas Co				7.74	7.76	8.04
United Gas Pipe Line Co	3.67	4.29	5.03	5.86	7.37	8.04
Total (weighted average)	4.23	4.79	5.43	6.25	7.42	8.82

NOTE.—Gas purchased in the field by the above companies is produced primarily in Louisiana and Texas. Some purchases are also made in Arkansas and Mississippi fields.
Source: FPC annual reports.

Norway and the Viking Spirit in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on last Saturday night it was my pleasure to address the 60th anniversary banquet of the Sons of Norway, meeting in New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY AND THE VIKING SPIRIT IN THE ATOMIC AGE

It is a pleasure to participate in observing this 60th anniversary of your outstanding organization—the Sons of Norway.

It is a privilege for me from many standpoints.

First, as a United States Senator, I am pleased to pay tribute to a great ally of our country—Norway; an ally which has proven its stanch mettle in war and in peace.

Secondly, as an American, I am pleased to pay this tribute to a freedom-loving land, a land whose people share the values which we do.

Norway, like ourselves has always been deeply dedicated to the cause of liberty. Her people have always been a living demonstration of the principles of human brotherhood. Norway, like our own, is a devout nation, with a reverence for the Lord.

And, then, there is a third reason: It is because like many in this audience tonight, I am proud to be a descendant of Norwegian parents and grandparents. We share, therefore, a common admiration for the land from which our forefathers came, a land which has always been truly worthy of that admiration.

MY VISIT TO NORWAY

May I say that it was our good fortune to spend a few days in Norway last summer.

Our good friend Trygve Gottas arranged for a car, and we set out on a journey to my father's old home in Numedal.

We stopped at Dramen and met some of the distinguished folks of that city.

From there, we journeyed to Kongsberg where our friend Trygve had assembled some 30-odd relatives of mine; we were treated there to a wonderful dinner.

We had rommegrout; we had gjeost and mountain trout and many other tasty dishes that spoke of Norway.

Of course, there were exchanges of toasts and much that was spoken brought up memories of days that are gone.

We then journeyed by car into Numedal to my father's old home. Of course, here again we had to eat before we left.

In one of the rooms we found an old album with pictures of my parents and of us children when we were youngsters. There were pictures of the family taken in various periods.

This visit recalled another visit I had made back in 1939 before the Second World War.

I was attending the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference in Oslo, and took a day off to get down to my father's old home. I also took a day off to go to Gudbransdalen and located the house in which my mother was born.

She came to America as a little child with her folks before the Civil War.

My father emigrated when he was about 21, right after the Civil War.

While in Norway, I visited with the Crown Prince and a number of the Norwegian officials. We were the guests of our Ambassador and his wife.

NORWAY'S BRIGHT BUT CHALLENGING OUTLOOK

Our general impressions of Norway last summer were that here were a people that were going ahead, that realized they belong completely to the West and are taking a strong position in that regard.

But the legacy of World War II's hardships, when 20 percent of Norway's national wealth was destroyed, are still with her.

Norway has serious domestic problems, for her's is basically a country poorly endowed with national resources. She has a $400 million yearly deficit. Her taxes are high. Controls are strict on many phases of economic life.

Yet her production is booming. Her modest agriculture is expanding. Her great shipbuilding industry reached one-half million tons last year. Her shipping fleet—third largest in the world—flies her respected banner on the seas. In 1954, she had the biggest herring catch in history.

Norway, in spite of the damage of war and occupation, in spite of considerable defense burdens, stands stanchly with the free world.

NORWEGIAN-AMERICANS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED STATES

And now friends, I want just briefly to turn back a few pages of history here in our own land.

From the mid-19th to the mid-20th century, approximately 850,000 persons of Norwegian birth settled in the United States. Unlike other immigrant groups (who gravitated to the cities) Norwegians settled principally in the rural areas of America where they became among the sturdiest American farmers.

Their assimilation into the American scene was rapid. They took up our language promptly. Their ways and customs from the old country were not too dissimilar from the ways and customs of the new land.

The first Norwegian pioneers in my own State established a colony at Muskego, near Milwaukee, in 1839. Prior to the middle of the 19th century most Norwegian immigrants headed for Wisconsin.

As the years went on, Norwegians, as you know, settled elsewhere in the Middle West. By 1914, there were more Norwegians in my neighboring State of Minnesota than in any other State. Then, North and South

Dakota, Montana, Washington, and Oregon attracted great numbers.

Norwegians brought to the new land their deep devotion to religion, and their deep interest in schooling for the young. Luther College, in Decorah, Iowa, was established in 1861, and St. Olaf College, in Northfield, Minn., in 1874. They established Concordia College in Moorhead, Minn.; Augustana College in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; and Pacific Lutheran College in Parkland, Wash. They set up many newspapers, many singing societies and bands.

From the ranks of Norwegian Americans have come Knut Nelson, Governor of Minnesota and United States Senator for more than a quarter of a century; O. E. Rolvaag, author of the epic of adjustment to the American scene, Giants in the Earth; Thorsten Veblen who is regarded universally as one of the greatest economists so far produced in our land; Victor Lawson, journalist and financier; and Eric Severeid, one of our most prominent radio-TV commentators, a man who, like his Viking ancestors, does not run from a fight.

NORWAY'S OWN CONTRIBUTIONS

From Norway itself to the world came Henrik Ibsen, in literature; Magnus Olsen, in science; Edvard Greig, in music; Kirsten Flagstad, in opera; Gustav Vigeland, in sculpture; and in discovery and exploration in centuries gone by, Leif Ericson; and in more latter days, Friedtjof Nansen and Roald Amundsen.

Yes; here is a country with a population only approximately that of my own State of the Union. Here is a country of meager resources, of often difficult weather conditions. Here is a country which has to live principally by the sea, which is often a hard master.

Yet, here is a country where culture has flowered, where freedom has thrived, where her sons and daughters, both those who have remained at home and those who have journeyed beyond the seas, have made important contributions to mankind.

Here is seen the triumph of courage, of resourcefulness, of industry over all obstacles.

And these are precisely the qualities needed in today's troubled world.

THE BIG ISSUE: NEUTRALISM OR DEFENSE

But now I should like to turn at this point to the major issue of our times: whether the nations will prove adequate to defend themselves against international Communist aggression or whether they will succumb one by one to that dreadful conspiracy.

Throughout the world today, there are hundreds of millions of individuals in many free lands whose leaders unfortunately have chosen thus far blindly to turn their backs to and ignore the Communist international menace.

The neutralist leaders seem to prefer to make believe that it does not exist.

Many of these leaders recognize that communism is a threat at home. Some of them have adopted stern measures against internal subversion. But they seem to prefer to deceive themselves and to deceive their own people into believing, on the international front, that the Peiking Government and the Moscow Government do not really represent a direct and immediate threat to the peace and security of mankind.

Indeed, many of these neutralist leaders seem to act as if it were the United States which is the principal threat to world peace and security.

Nothing could, of course, be further from the truth. No land in the world more dearly desires peace than our own. No land more dearly desires to devote its major energies to constantly raising living standards and improving the peaceful way of life for its people.

But no land more clearly recognizes than ourselves that in this dangerous atomic age, to be weak is to "commit suicide on the installment plan."

NORWAY: SYMBOL OF DEFENSE

But, I am pleased to say that there are many lands which are in far closer proximity than ours to the Communist threat which definitely recognize as we do the grim danger to the free world.

Here is a land, like Norway, which is within but minutes of Soviet jet bomber bases, at modern supersonic speeds. Yet, Norway has bravely and completely cast her lot with the free world in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

She is contributing to the sinews of defense in terms of manpower, installations, military production, maritime strength, and vigilance.

Here is a wonderful symbol for all the world to observe and admire.

Brave Norway stands practically at the jaws of the Soviet bear. Yet, unafraid, undismayed she calmly, coolly signifies that she will take her stand in defense of her own independence. And by her very act of courage, she thereby deters the danger of war to herself and to all the free world.

Now, let me say that there are many reasons why some lands have preferred neutralism thus far: Historical reasons, cultural reasons, military, religious, economic, and political reasons.

We must understand why various lands have chosen neutralism. We must see the problem through their eyes. We must not be overly quick to criticize, although we must be frank and objective.

At the same time, we should take off our hats in salute to a country which has known what war can mean, what dreadful occupation can mean, and yet is willing to risk its all, knowing how close it is to the deadly peril.

This is the spirit which we need in our time.

LET'S NOT BE PANICKED BY WAR DANGER

Here, in our own country, we read every day alarming stories of what a thermonuclear war could mean.

We read about how many casualties could occur in our major cities.

We read about the danger of radioactive fallout, potentially contaminating areas of 7,000 square miles.

There are some who allow these admittedly grim stores virtually to paralyze themselves. They throw up their hands in dismay as if nothing constructively can be done or should be done.

That, however, is definitely not the attitude to adopt.

And Norway is the living proof that there is a more positive attitude to adopt, an attitude of courage, or forthrightness, an attitude which recognizes the peril, which recognizes all the horror that a third world war could mean.

But Norway knows that if there is anything worse than war, it is slavery.

Norway knows that hysteria concerning the danger of war can only bring war closer, that it is one thing to try all-out to prevent war; as we are, indeed, trying; it is another thing to become so panic-stricken about the danger of war that you try to appease; you forget that there is something worse in this world than to fight on your feet. It is to crawl eternally on your knees before a Red dictator.

PROBLEM OF QUEMOY AND MATSU

What we can use in this country today is more of the Viking spirit. It is a fearless spirit which is willing to brave the unknown and to take calculated risks.

Nowhere, perhaps, on the international scene today do we more need this spirit than in troubled Asia, particularly in the western Pacific, in connection with our problem of defending Formosa, the Pescadores, and the related areas.

There are those in America who still would have us shrink back from this mission. They seem to say, "Let us not venture into this dangerous unknown affecting a few offshore islands 6,000 miles from the California mainland. Who knows where the uncertainty affecting Matsu and Quemoy may lead us?"

Well, the answer is: No one can accurately predict what will happen tomorrow morning, much less, next month or next year.

But we know quite well what would have happened or would happen were we to eliminate uncertainty and openly to exclude Matsu and Quemoy from our commitments.

Some of our good friends in the United Kingdom keep repeating, "Abandon outright Matsu and Quemoy."

But we have rightly refused to do so, preferring instead to leave the ultimate decision as to whether those islands will be defended under the varying circumstances of the future, to the great man who now occupies the White House, aided by his most expert advisers.

The burden of that decision will be a heavy one, a fateful one, a prayerful one. But you can be sure that when it is made, it will be objective, not emotional. It will be on the basis of all of the factors in the situation. It will not be based on just one factor, one geographic area; it will not just be on the basis of the problem of Formosa and the Pescadores, it will take into consideration our position in Korea, in Japan, in southeast Asia, and elsewhere in the world.

BOTH MILITARY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS CRUCIAL

And if I may say just a few more words about that particular critical situation, let me say this: There is entirely too much piecemeal thinking in our country today.

Some individuals seem to say, "there is no important factor but the military factor with regard to Formosa, the Pescadores and related areas."

But that concept is nonsense. The principal Communist victories in Asia have been scored, not by traditional techniques of military warfare, but rather by the revolutionary new application of psychological warfare, by skilled propaganda techniques, by the eroding of morale among its foes.

So, a key question is, "What would be the psychological effect of possible loss of Matsu and Quemoy on the Chinese Nationalist forces on Formosa, on our allies and friends in southeast Asia and elsewhere, on our enemies in Peking and in Moscow?"

But then, there are those who swing to the opposite extreme and say, "The only factor is the psychological factor."

That concept, too, is false.

The Peking regime consists of shrewd military (and political chess players). It tries to ridicule us as a paper tiger, but it knows we have sharp military claws.

As for ourselves, the decision as to when and how we will use our strength is not a simple one.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States must determine whether Matsu and Quemoy are (a) defensible in view of their proximity to the Chinese mainland, and (b) are worth the price of defense. The Joint Chiefs will weigh the effect of the possible rain of artillery fire from the mainland which may soon fall unceasingly on those offshore islands. The Joint Chiefs will consider the availability of Red jet fields and of Red jet fuel and Red sampans and Red paratroops. The Joint Chiefs will weigh the commitments of our Armed Forces in the Pacific and elsewhere. So, their military decision will be an immensely complicated one; let no armchair general or amateur admiral attempt to assert dogmatically what should be our military course under any and all cir-

cumstances. We have competent Chiefs of our Armed Forces; let us retain our confidence in their military judgment.

Let us maintain our well-placed faith, too, in our Chief Executive who obviously has so broad a background in military science that he is in a position personally to weigh the judgment of his own highest military advisers.

DANGER IN PUBLICIZING ALL PLANS

Another example of piecemeal thinking is that very often people here in the United States seem to want to insist on publicizing virtually all the facts and plans—which we may want for our public, but which our enemies may want still more.

The President and the Secretary of State—a marvelous team—have been absolutely sound in resisting unwise efforts to have us give away completely our hand.

They have perceived very clearly that, while from some standpoints it might be advantageous to outline very clearly and precisely what specific areas we actually propose to defend and those we do not propose to defend—that there are obviously grave disadvantages to that procedure.

We all remember the unfortunate consequences which flowed from the decision openly to exclude Korea from the United States perimeter of defense.

So, we do not intend to engrave any more invitations to Peking to swallow up more territory with impunity.

But the piecemeal thinkers are still not satisfied, all they can see is one segment of the problem—the matter of informing our own people, but they ignore the consequences of "spilling the beans" to the enemy.

RED CHINA WILL PROBABLY NOT CHOOSE WAR

We can be sure, Peking and Moscow will try to guess or plans by all sorts of little or big experiments. They will probe, they will jab here or there.

Let's not make their guesswork any easier. They have enough spies without our giving away our intelligence secrets on a silver platter.

Our splendid Secretary of State—one of the greatest to ever occupy that high office—has told Red China exactly what we want her to know and nothing more. John Foster Dulles has spoken with vigor and clarity and substance. We will defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas with force of immense power. But the decision as to war rests squarely in Peking. She will stand self-indicted before the world if she chooses the course of war.

I do not believe she will choose war. For all its admitted strength, the Red dragon's fire for the present may be so much hot air. Clearly, she burningly covets Formosa and all the islands. But her ambition outreaches her limited capabilities. Mao-Tse-Tung and company are hard realists, not idle daydreamers.

KREMLIN WATCHING OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

And before I conclude my references to the current situation, let me say this: The crisis in the Formosa Straits is being judged by Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts in the Kremlin and Peking on the basis of many other facts elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Khrushchev is watching what the United States does in relation to strengthening its Armed Forces. This is not merely a matter of quantity, but rather, of quality, particularly the quality of our nuclear weapons and our strategic air programs which are definitely progressing.

He is watching what we do to the vital appropriations request of the United States Information Agency. If the USIA funds are slashed, Mr. Khrushchev could declare a few hours holiday in Moscow. If Congress were to be penny-wise and pound-foolish and to reduce the ability of the United States Information Agency to get across the facts to the peoples of the world, particularly to the people of southeast Asia, it would be a sad day for the cause of the free world.

KHRUSHCHEV HOPES FOR AID SLASH TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. Khrushchev is watching even more closely the nature of our future economic aid program to southeast Asia. He is hoping we will pinch our pennies so tightly that he can easily pick up such valuable but vulnerable population, real estate, and resources as South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand—all of which vitally need United States aid. Giving them aid with an eye-dropper won't be of any more help than giving them more aid than they can reasonably absorb.

Mostly, Khrushchev is hoping that America's almost universal and completely understandable desire for a balanced budget will lead us to miserly errors of ommission. Those errors would make for a further unbalanced world; a world in which a balanced United States budget would become absolutely impossible thereafter.

And—in our own land, Mr. Khrushchev is watching, too, what happens to civil-defense appropriations. He will want to see whether we regard seriously the problem of defending the lives of 165 million Americans, in a small Nation which has now been crossed by a jet plane in 3 hours, 46 minutes, or whether by slashing civil defense, Congress were to indicate that it doesn't take too seriously this grim problem of defense in this superspeed age.

Most of all, Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts will be watching the American spirit, the United States backbone.

Do we cringe, and shrink, and waiver, or do we stand firm and resolute and brave?

The latter course is the only true American course, and it is the one course which we will indeed follow.

CONCLUSION

It has been a great privilege to address the Sons of Norway tonight.

As we blow out these 60 warm candles in this fine organization's birthday cake, we look forward to its innumerable anniversaries to come.

We know that in the years up ahead, its members and their families will continue to contribute not only to America, not only to friendship with Norway, but to the cause of the free world.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings on Federal aid for school construction. Members of Congress who have introduced legislation on this subject and who have a special interest have been heard and have made worthwhile contributions to the general information on this important question.

It was no surprise that one of the outstanding presentations was made by our very able colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. His analysis of the questions confronting the committee provided the answers to many of the objections raised against the school-construction proposals. His statement before the committee is worthy of study by every Member. The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON BILLS TO PROVIDE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MARCH 9, 1955, BY REPRESENTATIVE STEWART L. UDALL, SECOND DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

I am appearing today before my own committee, not merely as another Congressman urging positive action, but as a grassroots witness—a former school board member in a typical "problem" district faced with an oppressive tax rate and a shortage of classroom space.

There is an old saying that in our preoccupation with the forest we sometimes lose sight of the trees. My focus will be on the "trees" in this presentation. I would like to point out some elementary facts which might help to point the way around the two stumbling blocks which seem to lie across the path of full-scale Federal participation in a national school-building program. I refer to: (1) the argument that large-scale Federal participation necessarily means Federal control of education, and (2) the argument that the size of the national debt prohibits such Federal action.

THE FEDERAL CONTROL OBJECTION

This objection was squarely posed by the President in his school message in these terms: "Federal aid in a form that tends to lead to Federal control of our schools could cripple education for freedom." I daresay no one here will quarrel with this assertion as a general statement. However, when we attempt to determine whether the Hill-Bailey-Kearns type legislation is, or is not, "aid in a form that tends to lead to Federal control" our quarreling grounds are quickly staked out. Apparently the administration feels that all of these bills "tend to lead to Federal control," otherwise the President's proposals would have adopted the grant-in-aid technique as a major premise.

Before exploring this subject further. I would like to take a moment to examine one of the "trees"—the organization and functioning of a typical school district. We all know that the governing body of a school district is a board of education. However, it was my experience that the people take a keen interest in school government, and in many respects the conduct of school affairs represents democratic self-government at its best. I might say, too, that a wise school board is always closely attuned to the mind of the community, and consults freely with parents of school children and makes frequent use of citizens' advisory boards.

As a community project school operation might be roughly divided into three general areas—educational management, fiscal management, and plant management. Let us attempt to list the main initiative and responsibility exercised under each of these management areas.

A. Educational management includes these functions:

1. Hiring and firing of administrators and teachers;

2. Determination of basic educational policies (e. g., whether teaching shall be "traditional," "progressive," etc.);

3. Human relations policies—parent-teacher and pupil-teacher relationships; and

4. Curriculum policies, classroom procedures, use of school facilities, extracurricular activities, etc.

(Obviously educational management is the most important function of a board of education, and is an area where communities traditionally stand guard against any outside intrusion. I would venture to say that there are few, if any, fields of government where local prerogatives are so jealously guarded and outside pressures so intensely repelled.)

B. Fiscal management includes these functions:

1. Determination of annual school budget outlay;
2. Fixing salaries and wages; and
3. Financing capital improvements by bond issues, special levies, etc.

C. Plant management includes these functions:

1. Selection of school sites;
2. Design and construction of school buildings;
3. Maintenance and operation of school facilities and grounds;
4. Purchase of equipment and furnishings; and
5. Hiring and supervision of maintenance force (busdrivers, groundskeepers, etc.).

Any discussion of Federal control of a school system takes place in a vacuum unless the usurpation of control relates directly to the management duties outlined above. It must be, to use the President's words, a type of encroachment that would "take away the responsibility of communities and States in educating our children."

Let us look then, for a moment, at the type of Federal controls created by the Hill-Bailey-Kearns legislation. As I read these bills they require State agencies to qualify to administer the disbursement of funds. These agencies would devise federally approved plans designed to guarantee that the Federal funds will be properly matched and channeled where the need exists. Field administration to ensure compliance by local districts would be the function of the State agency.

Now I do not think the average school board member would consider that his governing power or the right of local determination would be seriously threatened by this type of legislation. Such supervision as might be asserted over him would touch on 1 or 2 functions of fiscal and plant management, and then only to assure compliance with minimum State standards. I venture to predict, too, that State administrators would exercise their powers with restraint and due regard for local prerogatives.

EXPERIENCE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 815

I would like to comment briefly on the experience of my district under the old program—Public Law 815. This is a plan, mind you, where a Federal agency deals directly with local districts, determines eligibility, and exercises the necessary supervision to ascertain that the Federal moneys are actually used economically to build classrooms. Our school board received three Federal grants totaling $737,818.99 during my tenure. We selected the architects. We had buildings designed to suit our special requirements. And these structures were erected by local contractors on sites chosen by a citizens committee. I met a Federal official only once during the entire process, to discuss clearing title to a school site. As far as I recall, our vital management prerogatives were preserved from all except nominal encroachment. * * *

Unless the Hill-Bailey-Kearns bills have hidden controls not apparent on their face, it would be my opinion that the amount of Federal control under these laws would be considerably less than under Public Law 815. I can only conclude that Federal regulation of local school boards would be minimal, and local management of the school systems would be kept 99 percent intact. Sincere people may well argue that the limited controls proposed by these bills are the opening wedge and that more encroachments will follow. This may be a sound argument. But if we are to proceed on the basis of past experience and take actual controls inherent in the legislation before us, pernicious Federal control is largely a myth.

THE NATIONAL DEBT OBJECTION

It seems to me that the other chief stumbling block is the budgetary fear which has caused the administration to hang back when massive Federal participation is proposed. A day or so after the President sent his school message to Congress, he was asked at his press conference to comment on criticism from congressional quarters that his program merely loaded more debts on overburdened States and school districts, and it was reported that he replied: "Did they [the critics] mention the national debt?" Perhaps this is the nub of the administration's opposition. If so, I think the President might well be persuaded away from this objection if he would listen to the schoolmen of the country for a moment—and turn a deaf ear to Secretary Humphrey.

Thirty years ago most public schools were wholly operated and maintained from taxes levied against the real property located within the particular school district. As that burden became more oppressive a movement was set afoot in the State legislatures to shift some of it to the counties and the States. This has been done on the theory that providing an education for the children of the State is a statewide problem and should properly be met, in part at least, by mustering the full taxing power of the State. We are now confronted with a nationwide classroom shortage of sufficient magnitude to constitute a serious national problem. Acting on much the same theory as that embraced by the citizens of the States, many of us here have concluded that Federal responsibility is involved, and that the whole national wealth should be marshaled to help hard-pressed communities cope with this situation.

Practically everyone is agreed that the shortage exists. And I believe that everyone (including the President) is also agreed that the funds must be provided to overcome this educational "deficit," we disagree only in regard to where the burden shall fall.

In short, our diagnosis is the same, we are agreed on the cure, and the only dispute concerns how the doctor shall be paid; the administration says the patient should pay; Hill-Bailey-Kearns says the whole family (i. e., local districts, States, and the Federal Government) should share the load.

I'm afraid the President's advisers have confused the Federal debt with the national debt. The Federal debt, as we well know, is some $278 billion; the national debt is the sum of the debts of Federal, State, county, city, and school district governments. Once we have agreed that the classrooms must be built, the Rubicon is crossed, and the only question that remains is where the funds shall be raised to accomplish the agreed purpose.

Mr. Chairman, having participated intensively in school education at the local—one might say the child—level, and holding strong convictions as to the vital place it occupies in our national life, I would like to say today that if we are forced to place priorities and choose this year between a national highway program and a national classroom construction program, I shall cast my lot with the schools.

Mr. Speaker, I also call attention to the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald on March 13 commenting on Mr. UDALL's testimony:

WHOSE MONEY IS IT?

Representative STEWART L. UDALL thoroughly deserved the general acclaim he received from his fellow-members on the House Committee on Education and Labor the other day for his striking analysis of the school-aid problem. He provided some much needed perspective on the issue which constitutes the essential difference between President Eisenhower's school-aid proposal and the formula sponsored by Senator HILL and Representatives BAILEY and KEARNS—whether the principal additional financial burden should be borne locally or by the Federal Government.

Mr. UDALL put his finger on what is apparently the nub of the President's objections to direct Federal grants-in-aid to the States—the fact that this will tend further to unbalance the Federal budget. "Did they ever mention the national debt?" Mr. Eisenhower retorted to critics who objected that his program placed increased indebtedness on already overburdened States and school districts. "I'm afraid," commented Mr. UDALL, that "the President's advisers have confused the Federal debt with the national debt. The Federal debt, as we well know, is some $278 billion; the national debt is the sum of the debts of Federal, State, county, city, and school district governments. Once we have agreed that the classrooms must be built, the Rubicon is crossed and the only question that remains is where the funds shall be raised to accomplish the agreed purpose."

Thus the problem, as this newspaper has suggested from the beginning of the controversy, is basically a bookkeeping one. We share Mr. UDALL's view that just as the burden of financing schools was originally shifted from local districts to counties and State governments, it needs now to be shifted, in part at least, to the Federal Government. The reason is that the Federal Government has the revenue resources, while the States and the localities have not. And the problem has become a national one with a disastrous impact on the whole Nation.

Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be invited to speak at the seventh annual banquet meeting of the convention of the Ohio Conservation Congress on Saturday evening, March 12. This important subject of conservation is so very important that, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD.

The address follows:

As an introduction to this particular talk, I feel that it is fitting that I quote President Eisenhower on the subject of conservation: "Vitally important are the water and minerals, public lands and standing timber, forage and wildlife of this country. A vast growing population will have vast future needs in these resources. We must more than match the substantial achievements in the half century since President Theodore Roosevelt awakened the Nation to the problem of conservation."

President Eisenhower then calls for a strong Federal program in the field of resource development and I again quote from the President: "The best natural resource program for America will not result from exclusive dependence on Federal bureaucracy. It will involve a partnership of the States and local communities, private citizens and the Federal Government, all working together."

My personal interest in conservation is that of one as a farmer, as a conservationist, and as a legislator. For this reason, my approach to this particular subject on this occasion will be from this three-armed point of view.

This past winter I had the opportunity with my congressional committee to visit briefly in Spain. This is a country with more

than 2,000 years of history. The guide and informant that accompanied us on a portion of this journey stated that the population of Spain at the present time is some 29 million people. However, it was told that an estimate of some 43 million was made for the number of people living in this area at the time of the occupation of the Iberian Peninsula by the Romans. It also is recorded and reported that Spain was one of the most prosperous and industrious countries that the Romans occupied at that time. There were vast timber resources and forests that were standing. It also was a place where ships were reprovisioned with food and fiber products from a very rich soil.

We noticed that many of the farmers still used the old wooden plows drawn by oxen, and that the soil seemed to be very thin and of low productivity. In fact, the average production of grain products has dropped so low that in our country it would be considered a failure if our farms produced in the same manner that theirs are producing. The vast timberlands have been depleted, and the country today has a shortage of water. In fact, the hotel at which we stayed in Madrid shut off the electricity from 4 to 6 each afternoon, because they stated that the hydroelectric plants did not have sufficient water to supply them with the energy required. At the same time, they have no coal resources and, since imported coal is expensive, very few steam-generating plants can be or have been built.

It then occurred to some of us that the timbers had been exhausted in the construction of vast fleets of ships that were used in fighting their neighbors and even among themselves. The Spanish nation has been ravaged by wars with other countries and even with civil wars in its own boundaries. The last civil war cost more than 1 million lives and billions of dollars of loss in property damage. Thus it is seen that a once rich country now has wasted its resources in wars and in the lack of conservation practices. Spain has a recorded history of more than 2,000 years, and the United States has a history of less than 200 years. Is there a comparison to be drawn and can a lesson be taught to those of us who are interested in the conservation program?

An eminent agronomist in this country not too long ago asserted that if any foreign power really has imperialistic designs on our country that she would be wise to delay action for perhaps another 100 years. By that time, this authority stated, we shall have used and wasted so much of our natural resources and especially our topsoil that our people will be so starved that they will not be able to resist.

Not long ago, I had the privilege of visiting in Nevada and witnessing the explosion of one of the atomic bombs. Our committee also saw the immense destruction that is possible with the use of this new type of nuclear energy. It has been pointed out by prominent conservationists that every day the amount of waste of certain natural resources is greater than the explosion of many of these same hydrogen and atomic bombs. For example, it has been discovered that at a certain spot in Indiana on the Ohio River that every minute a 40-acre farm passes by in the form of silt. I am going to estimate that this farm is worth at least $300 per acre and, in our section of Indiana, it is worth much more than that. This then means that every minute $12,000 worth of good rich topsoil is floating down the Ohio River eventually to be deposited in the ocean where it is lost forever. This amounts to more than $17 million per year for this one given spot and think of the many, many other rivers that are carrying silt from the topsoil of so many of our farms throughout this country.

In the last 40 years, the United States has spent more than $586 billion on wars of various kinds. This is a staggering figure and it is done in the hope that the world can be made a more peaceful place in which our children and children's children will live. However, are we saving for our children and our children's children the God-given resources that we inherited or are we returning these to the ocean to be deposited where they will be lost.

Reference was made to the age of Spain and the age of the United States. In less than the 200 years, in fact only approximately 180 years, we have made approximately one-third of our soil incapable of producing a crop. At that same rate, more than one-half of our soil will be destroyed in 100 years. Perhaps the agronomist that gave the dire suggestion of a foreign power waiting 100 years was not too far from wrong. For this reason it behooves all of us to pay a tribute to the defenders of soil, woods, water, and wildlife, and to all conservationists. It is for this reason that I consider your invitation to meet with you a distinct privilege.

In this talk I almost feel that the subject of water should be the one to be emphasized. Man's earliest recorded history was on shores where streams of sweet water flowed to the sea. Even as man pushed back from the seashore to the uplands, he recognized a good land as one "of brooks of water, of fountains and springs flowing forth in valleys and hills, a land of wheat and barley, of vines and fig trees and pomegranates, a land of olive trees and honey, a land in which you will eat bread without scarcity, in which you will lack nothing, a land whose stones are iron and out of whose hills you can dig copper." The author of this portion of Deuteronomy recognized the value of water whether it comes in the form of rain or snow or fog or dew or in any form of precipitation. Sea water is too salty to meet most of man's needs and thus he depends largely upon fresh water.

The need to conserve water reaches to one of the most basic points in life. Water is needed to quench the thirst and for many personal needs not only of man but of livestock and to keep crops alive and growing. Modern industry uses water for steam generation, for washing, cooling, conveying, and for a multitude of other processes today. Not counting the stream flow that is used mechanically to generate hydroelectric power, industries in the United States in 1950 used approximately 120 billion tons of water—almost 50 times the weight of all other industrial materials.

This took a flow of about 80 billion gallons per day which is 8 times as much as that which was used in 1900. The expectation by 1975 is that industry will require 2½ times as much or 200 billion gallons of water per day. In this connection, most of the States in our Union can double the present withdrawals of water at relatively low costs and a few States could increase them 10 or 20 times.

Before proceeding to a further discussion of conservation, it is necessary to stop and realize that whenever a quart of crude oil, or a ven of coal, copper, lead, stone, iron or gravel is mined and taken from this earth that it is gone forever. It also must be remembered that it never can be replaced. This fact alone should make us stop and remember what a tremendous role these resources play in our everyday living.

It was for this reason and for many other similar motivating factors that the 83d Congress passed the Watershed Protection and Control Act of August 4, 1954, which now is Public Law 566. This is an outstanding and historical accomplishment in the field of water conservation. It sets up the regular procedures for aiding local groups within a single watershed whereby they may have assistance in carrying out watershed protection works. It applies to the entire country and provides for cooperation from the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior. It expands and gives impetus to the watershed phase of the Nation's flood control program which the Department of Agriculture has been carrying on since 1936. Thus, it reflects the growing sentiment for nationwide action on upstream watershed protection and tributary flood control.

"In the Department of Agriculture" according to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, "we are determined to assist farmers to carry out a more effective program of soil and water development and wise utilization on a nationwide basis. This naturally includes protection and development of soil and water resources on individual farms and ranches and also in the small watersheds of subwatersheds."

Secretary Benson very wisely has pointed out that this program is very well the lifeblood of the West both for irrigated and dryland farming, and in the East where many farmers today are using supplementary irrigation at some time during the growing season. Businessmen, bankers, and residents of small towns and communities that are harmed by floods and small tributaries of rivers, likewise are very much concerned and will be benefited by the eventual work and development of this watershed program.

Watershed development should be comprehensive and include flood control, power, irrigation, and navigation. It should also keep all natural resources in proper balance and in proper priority in relation to need. Some of these several points have been listed by the Department of Agriculture:

1. Sustained and improved agriculture production without waste.
2. Protection and sustained yield management of forest lands.
3. Prevention of erosion, protection of streams from excessive siltation, and flood control.
4. Protection of community and industrial water supply.
5. Maintenance of underground water sources.
6. Irrigation and drainage on sound land use basis.
7. Maintenance of fish and wildlife resources.
8. Areas for recreation and various studies—esthetic, cultural, and ecological.
9. Protection of grasslands suited to range utilization.

Those of you who have traveled across our vast country and even in other lands undoubtedly have wondered whether or not their barren ground had some use to which it could be placed. Even the wastelands of Nevada which I visited at the time of the bomb tests only recently are serving a valuable purpose at the present time in the advancement of science and, we hope, in the protection of the human race. In hills and mountains nearby they are finding new sources and supplies of uranium which is one of the important factors in the development of this new science.

Thus, it is evident that the problem of water reaches into every particular phase of human endeavor. One of the important considerations in certain portions of Ohio and Indiana and, for that matter, in many areas is that of the pollution of water. Pollution of water supplies is characteristic of nearly all of the heavily inhabited watersheds, but it is most serious in the manufacturing belt from St. Louis and eastward to the Atlantic coast. Pollution of the Ohio River became so objectionable that Congress by special resolution gave the affected States authority in 1936 to form an interstate compact to deal with the problem.

Withdrawals of water for cooling purposes are so heavy in some areas that river water sometimes becomes too hot to act as an effective cooling agent and increases pollution because some forms of waste matter dissolve more readily in warm water. The United States has reached a point where the costs imposed upon its economy by using streams and rivers as open sewers exceed

the apparent savings. Many downstream communities are forced to pay large sums to purify water or to develop alternative supplies sometimes from distant sources. Valuable wildlife and recreational assets are destroyed and public health is menaced. Industries that require relatively clean water are discouraged from locating along heavily polluted rivers even though good plant sites, labor supply, and other attractions exist. Some plants whose water supplies have deteriorated have moved to other localities rather than incur high costs of purification.

Some of the above information was secured from Resources for Freedom, which points out the necessity for the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 which was passed by the 80th Congress. This Water Pollution Control Act provided the beginnings of a program of Federal cooperation with States and interstate bodies. It authorizes the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, in cooperation with other interested agencies and bodies, to prepare comprehensive programs for interstate streams and underground water and, at the request of State or interstate agencies, to undertake research on specific problems. There are many other provisions in this worthwhile act, but I merely point it out as one of the steps taken by the Federal Government in the protection of this natural resource—water. The entire program is designed to gife impetus to the local communities and to the States to first undertake the correction of this pollution problem. However, the Federal Government is ready at all times to step in and assist if the States and local communities have failed to act.

This bring up the study and consideration of pollution from coal mines. Seepage from abandoned coal mines is a source of sulfur water and acid that has ruined many good fishing streams and made the water unfit for many other purposes. Generally speaking this has been recognized as a State responsibility but insofar as the pollution affects streams that flow from one State into another, it can be said to enter the Federal domain. Previous sessions of Congress have considered bills which would require owners of abandoned coal mines to stop them against leakage. Otherwise, the Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, would be directed to enter such mines and construct stoppings such as will prevent the formation and escape of polluting materials. A bill of this nature was introduced in the 83d Congress. However, within my knowledge no such legislation has been introduced in this 84th Congress. Several Members from Pennsylvania have introduced other bills which would authorize cooperation with that State for flood control and drainage in anthracite mines.

Incidentally, it has been estimated that the Ohio River and its tributaries receive daily some 25 million pounds of sulfuric acid derived from active and abandoned coal mines of which some 60 percent reaches the water courses above Pittsburgh.

Public Works Administration funds were used to seal up more than 40 percent of the abandoned coal mines in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and other coal-producing States during the depression period from 1933 to 1938. At that time, the cost of sealing each opening ranged from $365 to $467. The higher prevailing present-day cost was cited by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior as one reason for advising against enactment of certain types of legislation.

The Secretary of the Interior has expressed the opinion that the cost of sealing the mines should be assumed by the people of the States in which the mines are located and not by the country as a whole. The State of Pennsylvania, for example, during the past 15 or 20 years has followed some such extensive mine-sealing program.

Since I am a farmer, as I indicated earlier in this discussion, soil conservation is of special interest. Perhaps a report on Indiana alone would give an illustration of the work of this agency. There are 65 soil-conservation districts in my home State. These districts comprise 15,850,827 acres or 68 percent of the total area of the State. This area also comprises or consists of 109,367 farms which is 66 percent of the total number of farms in the State. These 65 soil-conservation districts are on a county basis and there are 92 counties in the State. Thus, it is seen that the big majority of the State of Indiana has adopted the soil-conservation program.

Until January 1, 1955, soil surveys completed a total of 4,920,317 acres, including practices on contour farming, cover cropping, strip cropping, seeding of pasture, wildlife area improvement, tree planting (which includes windbreaks), pond construction, terracing, diversions, and farm drainage.

On the national level, more than four-fifths of the country's farms and ranches and nearly 90 percent of farmland now are within the boundaries of the soil-conservation districts. More conservation planning and treatment is being done each year.

The policy of the Department of Agriculture, or the keynote of our national action program of soil and water conservation can be stated by saying it is one to encourage and aid the farmers to plan and apply conservation farming measures, and to do for them only those things which need to be done in the public interest and which local people cannot do for themselves.

The basic Soil Conservation Act of 1935 established this principle and designated the United States Department of Agriculture through Soil Conservation Service to provide technical and certain other assistance to accomplish that end.

The 83d Congress passed several laws of far-reaching effect in this conservation program. The first was the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to which reference previously was made. The second was the amended Water Facilities Act which will make loans available for this particular purpose. The third is a new provision in the internal-revenue law that enables farmers to treat expenditures for various soil and water conservation measures as current expenses that may be deducted from farm income for tax purposes.

With this Federal recognition of conservation, especially through the watershed program, the success of this program is going to depend on public understanding of the problems and objectives and upon local participation all of the time. The program is purely local and Federal Government merely becomes a partner by providing technical and cost-sharing assistance. To be successful, the program must be advertised and encouraged and public acceptance must be developed.

May I return to the farming problem to illustrate the importance of the conservation program. From 1919 to 1927, the number of persons engaged in farming dropped 4 million; 19 million acres were withdrawn from cultivation and 76,000 farms were abandoned. However, the farm income for fiber and food products during that same period increased 15 percent.

During World War II, high rigid price supports were used as incentives to increase production. Unfortunately, these supports were continued at great cost to the taxpayers and as an illusion to the farmer. At the same time, lower prices can tend to force the producer to reduce costs and become more efficient and perhaps even increase production.

For example, in the last 15 years yields per acre have risen 20 percent. In cotton, for example, the gain has been more than a third. In tobacco the gain has been as much as one-half and in corn the gain in production has more than doubled. This illustrates the advancement of technological research in farming and in agriculture in general. Since the farmer can produce more from his soil with modern fertilizers and modern farming methods and since one man can farm a larger acreage than previously with modern machinery, it means that there is a terrific strain placed upon the soil and the farmer wants to keep it for future generations.

However, there are many other considerations which I know will be of interest to you and to all other people interested in conservation practices. Polluted streams and waters are contrary to the public interest for another reason and it is because they reduce opportunities for fish and wildlife to exist. Polluted streams also make the neighboring areas repulsive to all who would use them. Each species of fish has its own temperature needs but all fish demand reasonably pure water. Some are more tolerant of impurities than others but the best sports fish are those which thrive in clean water. Trout want cold water. Small-mouth bass want cool water. Large-mouth bass want warm water. If the temperature is too low, the fish become sluggish, they don't eat enough food to grow on and if the temperature is too high, the fish die.

Thus, good watershed protection, whether for lands under farm management or in forests, tends to encourage the maintenance of cool springs of water with a fairly even temperature. Conditions which reduce the flow of springs tend also to raise the summer temperature of these springs. This, in turn, can have a bad effect upon the streams that normally support trout and small-mouth bass. The water becomes too warm to support such fish.

Watershed management is vital to good fishing also because, except during periods of rain or fast-melting snow, most streams receive their flow from what might be called leaks in the ground water reservoir. These are the free-flowing springs. If they go dry, the stream goes dry. Then, sooner or later, the fish will disappear and so will their sources of food. Neither fish nor fish food can live in a dry stream bed. Good watershed management maintains soil conditions that encourage water to seep into the lower soil levels.

The recommendation given by President Eisenhower in his budget message on January 17 of this year makes the following important statement: "Under the recommendations for the fiscal year 1956, the Federal Government will spent $673 million for development of land and water resources. A large share of this total—$430 million—is for continuation of work on 152 river basin development projects and units under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. Much of this work is multiple purpose development for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power."

It was pointed out that there are under construction 37 of these projects which virtually will be completed in 1956. The budget message further included recommendations that would intend to encourage States and local public and private groups to take the initiative in developing the valuable water resources with Federal cooperation where national interests are involved. In fact, the budget includes $20 million under proposed legislation to enable the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to participate in 1950 in partnership water developments.

We finally come to the conclusion, and it certainly is clear that clear water and plenty of it in a continuous flow is necessary for the life of man, for the industries upon which he depends, and for the wildlife to which he looks for much of his recreation. To provide the clear water requires effective management of all watersheds coupled with such controls that sources of pollution may be kept down to the amounts to which nature can adjust. The Watershed Protec-

tion and Flood Control Act of August 4, 1954, is a major step toward this goal of achieving clean waters. To a great extent it supplements the Pollution Control Act of 1948. Acid seepage from abandoned coal mines continues to be a source of much damage to many fishing streams but the programs now underway in some of the States promise to fit in with the Federal program and reduce even this danger to the extent that it may be met by natural processes.

The laws whether Federal or State are merely tools available to be used. Without vigilance and citizen leadership of such conservation organizations as are represented here, such laws may be so neglected as to be no more than clanging gongs. As with the maintenance of freedom, we must fight to maintain conditions which will assure the continuous flow of clear, uncontaminated water.

Some time ago I read the story about Daniel Webster who scornfully described the western half of the United States as a formidable home of savages and beasts and an expanse of wasteland and brooding mountains. This was just a little more than 100 years ago. Webster even made the significant statement that he would not vote one cent from the public treasury to place the Pacific Ocean one inch nearer to Boston than it is. He could not see any use to which the great deserts and endless mountain ranges ever could be put. The comment on this statement is the fact that few men so illustrious have ever proved so wrong on such a tremendous scale so soon. As a result, would it not be well for us to look 100 years ahead and try to determine not only the number of people who will be living off of the soil and will be dependent upon the products of the soil, but also to know in advance whether or not this same topsoil still will be with us to produce the necessities of life. Reclamation, of course, is important, but conservation is a first-line defense to avoid the necessity of reclamation in the future.

We have enough good land left in these United States to keep us prosperous and well fed if we conserve and improve it. It can be done and with the assistance of conservation groups such as yours and others throughout the United States, the people will learn and know how to do it. We can make most of our land produce more and more year after year. We also can save that same land but will we do it in time?

Atlantic Union: Let's Meet the Challenge of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered before the Greater New York Branch of the Atlantic Union Committee last Friday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE GREATER NEW YORK BRANCH OF THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 18, 1955.

Judging from the experience of the past few years—and indeed, from the long history of military alliances—the longer we delay exploring better means of uniting the free peoples, the worse emergencies we shall face in the coming months and years.

Along with some 29 of my colleagues in the Senate and House, I have again introduced the Atlantic Union resolution to make that exploration possible.

Many of you will recall a day 4 years ago when President Eisenhower, at that time NATO Supreme Commander, addressed the Congress. In his speech he asked this question: "Why, then, are we frightened of dictatorial government?" And he gave this answer: "Only for one reason, because they have a unity of purpose. What we have to do—the only thing we have to do—is to meet that unity with a higher type, the unity of free men that will not be defeated."

Since that day, the Atlantic democracies have increased their collective military strength and the military effectiveness of the North Atlantic Alliance. Let us not forget, however, that during this same period the rulers of Russia and Red China have increased their military strength and effectiveness and that Soviet Russia is now building hydrogen bombs and transoceanic planes which can drop them on the United States.

During these 4 years, the Atlantic democracies as a group, and notably some of the nations of Western Europe, have increased their economic strength. Let us not forget, however, that Soviet Russia and Red China have also increased their economic strength even more rapidly under the lash of dictatorial power.

But in these 4 years the Atlantic democracies have not made comparable progress in increasing their political unity. Indeed, conflicts of policy between them concerning relations with areas of Asia and attitudes toward Communist propaganda offensives suggest that they are less united in some respects than they were 4 years ago. Our need for such unity, emphasized then so clearly by our present President, remains both critical and urgent. Threatened by a Communist bloc which can maneuver and strike with dazzling speed, we must still negotiate before we can act jointly.

This contrast between our respective accomplishments in the military field and in the political field is the more striking when our potential capabilities in those two fields are recalled. For our military capabilities are clearly subject to strict limitations for the long-haul limitations set by the need to maintain a free and prosperous economy.

But there is no limitation on our political capabilities except ourselves. As free men, nothing except our own intelligence, our own will, and our own attitudes can bar us from doing anything which our security and welfare demand.

I am convinced that the introduction of this resolution will contribute directly to early ratification of the Paris Agreements. It will be regarded in France, in the German Federal Republic and in all other nations which must still ratify these agreements as a proof that there is powerful support in the Congress of the United States for further development of the Atlantic community. They also recognize that the failure of EDC and the inclusion of the German Federal Republic directly in NATO have made further development of the Atlantic community imperative. Knowledge that this impressive support exists in the Congress for a resolution proposing a convention which would explore on the broadest basis the possibilities of achieving this objective will give them new hope and confidence that ratification of the Paris agreements will not lead up a dead end street, but will contribute toward the Atlantic development which these agreements themselves and the time in which we live have made urgent and necessary.

The history of the last few years has shown that progress on an Atlantic basis and progress in Europe are closely interrelated. When we have taken the lead in developing NATO and have emphasized the importance of increasing the solidarity of the Atlantic Community, which includes our country, Canada, and Britain as well as the countries of Western Europe, we have seen progress toward unity in Europe. But when we have refrained from mentioning the word "Atlantic," have called only for unity in Europe and have exerted pressure to persuade Europeans to take steps in which we were to have no part, the result has been failure.

We recognized in 1949 by becoming a party to the North Atlantic Treaty that our defense and theirs were inseparable. Surely, there is every reason why we should explore together in common, in a convention comprising our best minds and theirs, how our common defense might be made more effective and less costly and how we might attain that greater unity for which President Eisenhower has so consistently called.

This resolution opens to the democracies a new and broad road toward the attainment of this objective. At the same time, it provides the free nations with a means of taking the intiative in the war of ideas which forms a central part of the cold war. We cannot win the war of ideas if we remain on the defensive. To move forward toward ultimate victory in this ideological struggle, to make possible an expansion of the frontiers of freedom which have receded so far in the last decade, we must take the offensive.

Our forefathers demonstrated unsurpassed political capacity throughout our history as a nation, first in creating our American Union and afterward in expanding that Union from a fringe of 13 States along the Atlantic seaboard into a continental area containing 50 times as many people and constituting the freest and the most powerful and productive Nation in the world. They met the challenge of their time. Shall we fail to meet ours?

Difficult Problems of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for many years I have been following closely the situation in our sister Republic of Guatemala.

I was one of the first Members of Congress to point out what was then the rising Communist crisis in the hemisphere, as the former Arbenz regime evolved more and more into a complete Soviet-style dictatorship. At that time I urged strong action to curb what was then the mounting threat to the Panama Canal and to the hemisphere as a whole.

Then, with the fortunate overthrow of the Arbenz regime by the liberation forces to Col. Castilo Armas, I pointed out that the hemisphere had secured an historic opportunity to help a sister republic show how the ruin and slavery of communism could be replaced by the prosperity and good life of freedom.

Although, since the liberation, Colonel Armas and his associates have taken many sound administrative actions, and although the United States Government has been deeply sympathetic with the problems of the new government, unfortunately, the situation in that country remains exceedingly troubled.

I frankly believe that our own Government could and should do far more to be of assistance to the Government of Guatemala, to help make of it a showcase for the Western Hemisphere.

This does not relieve Guatemala itself of its own basic responsibilities. On the contrary, I believe that the Guatemalan Government and people are, fortunately, determined to rely upon themselves to the fullest possible extent. But they realistically recognize, as we should, that the Communist legacy of ruin cannot be overcome overnight.

The tens of millions of dollars which the Communists stole from the now bankrupt treasury; the heritage of an agrarian and labor discontent which the Reds promoted; the shortage of corn; the problem of unemployment—these are but a few of the serious aspects of the current situation, coupled with the disturbed coffee market.

Surely, I say, in the instance of at least the corn shortage, American official resourcefulness is capable of helping our friends promptly to meet this problem. And surely, we can be of other assistance, consistent with our commitments elsewhere in the hemisphere.

I have a high regard for State Department and FOA intentions to be of genuine assistance to Guatemala. But my earnest hope is that the programs already announced will definitely be implemented in full as speedily as possible; and, more important, that they will be supplemented as needs require. I urge this in the interest of Pan-American unity and freedom.

Mr. President, I send to the desk two hard-hitting newspaper articles published last week under the theme Whither Guatemala. They were written by Mr. Daniel James, and were released by the Spadea syndicate. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITHER GUATEMALA?

ECONOMIC CRISIS LOOMS—RED REVIVAL FEARED

(By Daniel James)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Daniel James is author of the new book Red Design for the Americas: Guatemalan Prelude. He is an authority on Central America, and has just returned from the Caribbean.)

Guatemala is on the verge of an economic crisis. The crisis could topple her new anti-Red government, revive communism, and wreck United States policy.

Americans seem totally unaware of these grim prospects. They have been fed too much ballyhoo and too few facts about anti-Communist Guatemala. Yet fact No. 1 is that President Carlos Castillo Armas' regime, after 6 months in power, faces bankruptcy.

And so does our policy in Guatemala.

Two-thirds of Guatemala's 120-million-pound coffee crop is unsold. Her notoriously tight-fisted, short-sighted coffee growers have been holding out for high prices while the market has been falling. Since coffee accounts for 80 percent of national revenues, the Government is at this moment virtually without an income.

It scraped through January and February thanks to incoming corporation and land-tax payments then due, and to bumper cotton exports. But no more money is due from those sources, and other expected revenue is piddling. With coffee still unsold, Castillo Armas may find it difficult or impossible to pay his obligations this month.

At best, if all the coffee were sold, the Government would lose $6 million in taxes owing to unexpected low prices. Unless new sources of revenue are developed, Castillo Armas faces a rough year even if he rides out the impending crisis.

Unfortunately, there is no Guatemalan money in sight to help the Government. It can be authoritatively stated that some $50 million fled Guatemala between 1952 and 1954, when the Reds were in power. Of that sum, $24 million was deposited in foreign, mostly United States banks. Another $6 million was invested in foreign enterprises. The rest, $20 million, is reckoned to be in Red hands.

Some flight capital has returned, but not enough to start a trend.

Added to these woes is a shortage of corn. Potentially, this may be the most explosive element of all. Corn is the basis of the national diet. It is worshiped almost as a deity by the Indians and thus possesses profound psychological meaning. A scarcity of corn could be calamitous.

Communism, hoarding, or both, may be responsible for the corn shortage. Prices are up to 6 cents a pound whereas normally they range between 4 and 5. Plantings were disrupted last year by the Red agrarian reform, and corn already planted was damaged by fall storms. However, peasants may be withholding corn in anticipation of higher prices.

Guatemala's progressive young Minister of Economy and Labor, Jorge Arenales, has authorized the private importation of 80 million pounds of corn. This, when put on the market, is expected to drive prices down and force hoarders to sell. By April, Arenales expects to know whether hoarding or a bad crop caused the scarcity.

If it is a bad crop, as many think, Guatemala will have to beg, borrow, or steal enough corn from somewhere to prevent starvation this year.

Still another serious economic problem is unemployment.

Around 20,000 workers, most of them in the capital, are believed to be unemployed. They present a political, as well as economic, headache. Some were lopped off Government payrolls for economy reasons. Others were fired by antilabor employers. Still others were laid off unfinished public works.

Officials say most of the jobless will be absorbed within 3 months on new highway projects, but by then the situation could be out of hand.

Behind the unemployed lies a discontended urban working population. The workers feel they are losing under Castillo Armas the rights they enjoyed under his Marxist predecessor, Arbenz. They begin to long for the days when their unions were a power in the land, ignoring the fact that they were Red controlled.

Specifically, the workers disapprove the abolition of the old unions. Castillo Armas is giving the unions every chance to purge themselves of Red influences, but that has been done in very few cases and so there is really no labor movement in Guatemala.

Also resented is a decree issued in January which gives employers the right to fire employees for union activity and virtually prohibits peasant unions. The latter, however is directly attributable to the fact that the illiterate peasantry is a prey to Red demagogy and only last January 20 Red-led peasants joined a conspiracy to overthrow Castillo Armas.

Trade-union leaders blame everything on the antilabor atmosphere they say prevails among leading politicians. There is some truth to the charge. At best, the Government itself has been barely lukewarm to labor. On the other hand, labor has thrown up no really able men to replace its old Red bosses, and that is perhaps a primary reason why no labor movement exists.

Whatever the pros and cons of labor, this much is true: worker discontent is on the rise and there is a developing nostalgia for the past. In an acute economic crisis, this could be turned by clever Communist agitators into a strong leftist current.

Confronted by the prospect of an economic crisis accompanied by a political one, Castillo Armas can pull through only with the aid of the United States.

WHITHER GUATEMALA?

TOO LITTLE GUATEMALA AID THREATENS UNITED STATES POLICY

(By Daniel James)

United States policy in Guatemala is failing. That is the sad conclusion this reporter has reluctantly reached after a 4-week, on-the-spot survey.

The consequences, if we fail in Guatemala, will be disastrous. Our prestige in Latin America will practically vanish. Our programs in Asia will be compromised. Communists everywhere will have a field day as we argue over who lost Guatemala.

When Guatemala's Reds were overthrown last June, United States leaders from President Eisenhower on down swore to make the Central American Republic an anti-Communist showcase. They were solidly backed by both political parties and the public. Rarely has there been such unanimity as on the need for all-out aid to Red ravaged Guatemala.

Now, 8 months later, how much aid have we given?

On paper, $6,425,000. In fact, less than half that amount. Money is being doled out for certain projects only as, if, and when, they start.

Of the total aid authorized, $4,425,000 will eventually go into roads—if Guatemala can match it with $1.5 million of her own. Another $500,000 will go to finish a hospital—if Guatemala can match it with $500,000. Health, agricultural, and other projects likewise depend on Guatemala's ability to match funds.

So far, then, our aid largely consists of putting up dollar for dollar in a situation where the matching party sorely lacks dollars.

But even if we donated the entire $6.5 million outright, that would be about as helpful as feeding aspirin to a man with appendicitis.

That sum, Guatemalans point out, represents exactly what their Government paid its employees in back wages last December.

It about equals what the Government expects to lose in coffee taxes this year.

It is less than one-third of what the Reds are known to have stolen.

"A fraud" is how one Guatemalan bitterly described our aid to me. He was echoed by others. Already, our policy of too little is breeding dissillusionment in us.

Washington is relying upon United States Private capital to give Guatemala what she needs. That is sound general theory. The trouble is, it does not apply to Guatemala's immediate problems.

United States businessmen are swarming into Guatemala seeking investment opportunities. Some are already building roads, exploring for oil, selling machinery, making lumber.

The Electric Co. of Guatemala, a United States subsidiary, is putting $17 million into new hydroelectric facilities to increase the capital city's power capacity. Pan American World Airways is about to join with local money to erect a big hotel. United Fruit reportedly awaits disposition of a United States antitrust suit before investing $25 million.

Tourists are beginning to return, realizing no Red problem now beclouds enjoyment of Guatemala's unparalleled scenic beauty.

President Carlos Castillo Armas deserves great credit for the improving business picture. His personal popularity, general policies, and practical measures—such as a progressive petroleum code—have combined to assure United States business a warm welcome and fair treatment in Guatemala.

Backing up Castillo Armas is the most talented and dedicated team of United States officials this reporter has ever seen abroad. United States Embassy, Information Agency, and Foreign Operations Administration personnel deserve medals for their handling of a delicate task.

Owing to all these factors, Guatemala is acquiring a new look. Guatemala City streets, once deserted, are filled with busy and happy people. Stores are brimming with new merchandise. Hotels are full. New buildings are going up.

But overshadowing this bright picture is the dark legacy communism left behind. A looted treasury, a corn shortage, a jobless problem, and a falling coffee market (for which the Reds cannot be blamed) all spell a major crisis. Neither the Guatemalan Government nor United States investors are equipped to tackle it.

An economic crisis in Guatemala just now would, as a matter of fact, slow down the flow of investment. It would destroy confidence in Castillo Armas, and perhaps cause his downfall. It would wreck United States plans for Guatemala and United States policy nearly everywhere in Latin America. We must awaken to these dangers at once and realize that only swift and unstinting United States aid can ward them off.

The primary immediate job is to help Castillo Armas acquire sufficient funds to carry on the task of governing. Second, Guatemala may need emergency food and grain supplies. Third, we must expand and accelerate our technical assistance—and without requiring Guatemala to match funds. Fourth, coffee prices must be adjusted.

Further, we should announce a long-term program. Guatemala needs about $50 million to build a decent road network—one of the keys to an expanding economy. She needs perhaps another $50 million for such basic projects as modernizing her agriculture. For about $20 million yearly spent over the next 5 years, Castillo Armas' chances of finishing his term in 1960 would be immeasurably enhanced and Guatemala's stability and prosperity practically underwritten.

Vice President NIXON, just back from the Caribbean and keenly aware of Guatemala's problems in particular, might well suggest that President Eisenhower ask Congress to enact a $100 million, 5-year program for Guatemala. Only such a program will demonstrate that we are really trying to make the world's first anti-Communist revolution a success.

H. R. 4720

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 10, this Congress passed H. R. 4720—what might be called the career incentive bill. In my opinion this legislation will have a tremendous effect upon the morale of our people as well as upon the military and economic condition of our country.

This bill will increase the base pay of the active, retired, and Reserve forces of our military units and certainly it will be an incentive for young people to make a career of the armed services. I have always advocated, and last year introduced House Resolution 521, requesting that a study be made to make the Armed Forces more attractive, giving those who volunteer their services, compensation, and benefits comparable to what could be earned in civilian life. I want to thank the military, administration leaders, and especially the Armed Services Committee for their cooperation in considering my resolution.

I firmly believe that the intent of my resolution, at least a portion thereof, has been put into effect by the passing of H. R. 4720.

I am sure all of us recognize that we must have an adequate defense and I am certain that this legislation will go a long way to help this Nation protect the freedoms that we all enjoy.

I am one who does not like the word compulsion and one who firmly believes that the least Federal controls we have the better off we are. I hope and pray that this increased incentive will so attract the younger people into military service that we will soon be able to do away with the draft and other forms of compulsory military training.

Packers and Stockyards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, to prevent sudden and unreasonable decreases in the price of hogs and cattle which are sold at stockyards and subject to that act.

In the year 1952, hogs had reached a $15 price from the high in 1947 of $31. About a year ago hogs had rebounded to around $26. They have been dropping back in price since that time until they have virtually reached the 1952 price of $15 to $16.

In 1947 and 1948 the top price on cattle was around $41 to $42. Since that time they have gradually gone down in price to the low of probably $22, and now the same grade around $26.

During these fluctuations of hogs, they have dropped on some days as much as 75 cents per hundredweight. While this severe drop per day was going on, in my opinion, a corresponding decrease of meat over the counter was not brought about. A hog raiser or cattle feeder would naturally try to guess when he thought there would be a light run of these animals at the stockyards and send in some of his animals accordingly. The legislation which I have introduced to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act would not permit the price paid at a stockyard for swine of any grade to fluctuation more than 15 cents a hundredweight less than the average price paid at such stockyards for swine of the same grade on the preceding day. The price paid at a stockyard for cattle of any grade will only be within the permissible range of fluctuation only if it is not more than 25 cents a hundredweight less than the average price paid at such stockyards for cattle of the same grade on the preceding business day.

This fluctuation limitation should, if it becomes public law, not cause a hog raiser or cattle feeder to try to hit the market when there are short runs. Regardless of any day the markets are open, a hog raiser or cattle feeder would know that there would only be a certain fluctuation downward and no more in his price. It seems that this should help stabilize the market. If hog prices especially continue their downward trend, it only means that the hog raiser will sell his brood sows and market his corn at the Government price. If this is done, and I believe it will be, there will then, within 6 months to a year's time, be a shortage of pork, and the same vicious cycle will proceed over again.

The same thing, I think, is true with cattle. Fifteen to sixteen dollars per 100 weight for hogs at the stockyards with the price of concentrates today is not a very profitable one.

This office has not consulted with the Department of Agriculture relative to this legislation or with the packers. It is my hope that the Agriculture Committee will call an early hearing on the bill that I have introduced. At this time, anyone interested, the Department of Agriculture, the packers, hog raisers and cattle feeders, and the agriculture associations, would be allowed to express their views. I have no pride in the authorship of this offered legislation. If during the hearings a better solution is forthcoming, I will be the first to welcome it. I sincerely feel that someone should come up with some kind of a solution and soon. I feel that a packer would rather have a stabilized livestock market than one with violent fluctuations. If a hog is worth $16 today to the packers to slaughter, it should be worth a minimum of $15.85 the next day and not $15 or $15.25. Again, I think the same is exactly true about cattle.

I believe the hog raiser and the cattle feeder would welcome some attempt at stabilization.

Slovak Independence Day, March 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1939, the Slovak Parliament, perhaps under unusual circumstances, but nevertheless, declared the independence of Slovakia. I say under unusual circumstances, because the Slovaks would not have chosen that particular time to declare publicly what we and the whole world consider as their God-given and inalienable right to do. But were it not for the pressure exercised by Germany the yearning of the Slovaks for their national home would have been delayed

much longer. As it happened, March 14 became the day of the fulfillment of Slovak national aspirations.

At the commemoration of this historical day of Slovaks throughout the world, I wish to remind the Members of the House that it was our own President Wilson who was intimately acquainted with the situation of the Slovaks in the newly born Republic of Czechoslovakia and that it was exactly this President who, after witnessing the plight of the Slovaks in that new state, proposed that the right of self-determination of the Slovak Nation should be brought to the attention of the League of Nations at one of its first meetings.

That this was so, is testified by no one less authoritative on this subject, than was the eminent American journalist and aide to President Wilson during the Versailles negotiations following World War I, Colonel Stefan Bonsal, who as a close friend of the foremost Slovak Patriot General Milan R. Stefanik witnessed the interview of President Wilson with General Stefanik at Paris in 1919, and who later was to learn about the Slovak national aspirations from other sources.

As it appears to us Americans, we may object to the Slovaks that they seized the opportunity to declare their independence on March 14, 1939, when Germany seemed to dominate the fate of the whole area of central Europe, a Germany which at that time was or was about to become our enemy. But, as we cannot blame the sick for accepting medical treatment at the first opportunity of seeing a doctor instead of waiting in agony for their own doctor, so we cannot reproach the Slovaks for the very fact of having declared their independence in 1939 instead of waiting for our own encouragement.

No, we cannot reproach them for having used their God-given right for freedom; on the contrary, we join our Slovak friends throughout the world in their joy of the glorious past of their nation and in their hope that soon again the chimes of victory of the good over the evil will ring in Bratislava and Kosice the hymn of freedom and liberty denied to them now under the Communist domination.

To make this possible, however, we cannot just stand by. We have to encourage all such brave and democratically minded Slovaks throughout the world, and their organizations that we are willing to help them if they also will help themselves. In this respect, I mean not only the organizations of those Slovak exiles who before all are responsible for the liberation of Communist-dominated Slovakia, such as the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, but also organizations, clubs and lodges of Americans of Slovak descent, who are inspired by the plight of so many of their countrymen in Slovakia. Only recently one such organization was founded in the Luzerne County district under the guidance of some of my friends such as John T. Kmetz, Andrew Kosik, Stephen Farris, John J. Baloga, John Adamchak, and others in order to seek ways and means for a better understanding of the Slovak problems.

As for me, I have already expressed my views about the Slovak problem when on July 3, 1952, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 238, in which I have not only stressed the traditional friendship of the American people with the people of Slovakia, and reaffirmed the firm conviction of the American people that the Slovak people have the right of self-determination and the right to be governed by their own consent, but, ever since, I have convinced myself by closely studying this same problem, that only then when Slovakia will become an equal member of the family of free nations, peace will prevail in that area of central Europe.

Dissent and Separate Statement of Commissioner Holifield on Commission Report on Lending Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Commission report is so faulty in concept and method that I must object to it even though a few recommendations, standing alone, may have merit.

By and large the recommendations in the report, if fully carried out, would make it harder for American citizens to buy homes or to get loans for their farms or businesses.

The recommendations point in the direction of tighter agricultural credit, a slowing down of housing construction, restrictions on the rural electrification program, and limitations on other direct or indirect aids provided by the Federal Government.

Persons will differ as to the wisdom of these programs. There is no doubt, however, that they concern intimately the affairs and well being of millions of Americans and the health and strength of the national economy.

The Congress recreated the Hoover Commission to study the present organization and operations of the executive department and agencies, with a view to better management and economy. I do not believe that the Congress wanted advice from the Commission on public policies of every sort.

The Commission has construed its congressional mandate otherwise. This report indicates that the Commission is willing to roam far and wide in the field of public policy.

No matter how wise and well informed, the 12 Commission members cannot be expected to have more than a casual acquaintance with many of the complex issues posed by this report. The task force study contributed little, in my opinion, to the deliberations of the Commission.

It is unfortunate that the present Commission did not benefit from the experience of the first Hoover Commission along this line.

The previous Commission engaged Price, Waterhouse & Co., a firm of certified public accountants, as a task force to study Government lending activities. The previous Commission's report, based on that study, was criticized by three Commission members—Acheson, Pollock, and Rowe—as being wholly wrong in its organizational approach and as reflecting a narrow accounting view on broad public policies.

Senator AIKEN, in a separate dissent, stated at the time that the Price-Waterhouse report on lending agencies "does not adequately represent the broad public-interest viewpoint which motivated the establishment of these agencies"—Report on Federal Business Enterprises, 1949, pages 113–114.

Nevertheless, Price, Waterhouse & Co. were engaged a second time to make a study for this Commission. Their present report is a rehash of the old report, with some additions to bring it up to date and with some modifications in the light of recent developments. Many paragraphs are taken verbatim from the earlier report. Senator AIKEN's comment is equally applicable today.

Neither the Price-Waterhouse report nor the Commission's own report represents an adequate study of Government organization and management. Numerous agencies are strung together on a common thread of lending, guaranteeing, or insuring activities, however diverse the Government purposes served thereby. The activities range all the way from housing loans to Eskimos in Alaska to American participation in the International Monetary Fund.

Instead of studying Government agencies and functions and then deciding what reorganizations should be effected, the report attempts a wholesale rearrangement and curtailment of these agencies and functions to fit an oversimplified pattern.

Thus, starting with the assumption that Government lending is generally a bad thing, the report then easily disposes of a variety of important Government functions. Recommended for termination are the following:

Crop loans to farmers made by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Loans to American firms in foreign trade made by the Export-Import Bank.

Loans to colleges for student and faculty housing made by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Loans to veterans for home and farm improvements made by the Veterans Administration.

Loans to public housing authorities for low-rent projects made by the Public Housing Administration.

Loans to rural electric cooperatives and other groups made by the Rural Electrification Administration.

Loans to communities for planning and construction of public works made by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Where lending or related activities are not to be terminated outright, the report proposes that these be restricted by the imposition of higher interest rates or extra fees.

Thus the Federal intermediate credit banks are to add a premium charge on their loans to borrowers.

The Farmers Home Administration is to do likewise and to require greater equities from prospective farm owners.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is to increase its premiums to farmer participants in the crop insurance program.

The Small Business Administration is to increase its interest rates on loans and is given a grace period of 2 years to operate.

The Federal Housing Administration is to require larger equities from prospective home owners and to reduce its insurance coverage by sharing risks with mortgage lenders.

In place of the Government loan program for rural electrification, the Rural Electrification Administration is to be reorganized and required to obtain its financing from private sources. Likewise, the Federal Housing Administration is to be made a privately financed institution.

Reviving a concept of "mutualization" advanced by the first Hoover Commission report—Report on Federal Business Enterprises, 1949, page 36—the present report proposes that the Federal intermediate credit banks liquidate Federal ownership of their capital stock and that liquidation of the Federal investment be accelerated with respect to the banks for cooperatives, production credit associations, and the Federal savings and loan insurance corporations.

Reviving other proposals of the first Hoover Commission—ibidem, pages 12 and 15—the report recommends that those Government agencies which hold Government securities return them to the Treasury for non-interest-bearing credit; and that all agencies which lend funds or guarantee loans charge such interest rates or fees as will cover their administrative expenses and the cost of money to the Treasury.

These proposals are made without regard to the effect of the actions on established programs or objectives sought by the Congress.

The justifications advanced in both the first and second Hoover Commission reports are that the agencies involved should not be subsidized by public contributions to their administrative expenses or to their income in the form of interest on investments in Government securities. And, further, that such agencies should become privately owned and managed as rapidly as possible by retirement of Government stock or by obtaining their financing from private sources.

Again, these positions are taken without regard to the impact on authorized programs and without a careful evaluation of the consequences for the national economy.

The "mutualization" concept in the report is ill-defined; it does not indicate Government equity once the capital stock of the Government is retired.

Whatever the advantages of "mutualization," the result is the creation of hybrid Government agencies which are, in most cases, privately owned and privately managed, subject to a limited amount of Government regulation, but remote from congressional, Presidential, or General Accounting Office audit control.

At the same time the "mutualized" agencies enjoy many Government privileges. Among these are tax exemptions, free use of Government mails, free use of Government buildings and property, Government annuity contributions to the employees, access to Government funds, and reliance upon Government insurance or other commitments.

Even if these privileges are removed in whole or in part, the agencies are still Federal instrumentalities in some sense, and the conflict of interest between private and public management and policy remains.

Although the report recommends that certain agencies be brought under the Government Corporation Control Act, it fails to point out that withdrawal of Federal stock ownership from "mutualized" agencies ordinarily is accompanied by withdrawal of General Accounting Office audit.

In a few cases, such as that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Congress enacted special legislation to permit GAO access to the Corporation's books. However, the status of this agency is still a matter of debate. It is publicly managed and privately financed. Technically the Corporation has no owner since the Government stock was retired. The Commission does not consider this phase of the problem.

Government subsidies so vehemently criticized in this report, are means of achieving public purposes deemed worthy by the Congress. I may note that the report hardly begins to identify all the subsidies involved in Government activities.

Merely to cite one example, the hundreds of millions of dollars obtained by large companies as interest-free loans through the device of accelerated tax amortization gets no mention in this report.

The subsidies involved in the administration of Government programs which help home owners, farmers, small-business men, veterans, and others of modest means pale into significance when compared with the subsidies that are doled out to big manufacturers, publishing firms, ship operators, airline companies, and the like.

The Congress has authorized subsidies of many kinds throughout our history to develop the Nation and to keep it strong. The Commission made no systematic study on the whole subject of subsidies, nor does it recommend their elimination in all fields. The ones complained of in this report appear to be, in the main, those which bring widespread benefits to the whole population.

Great Spirit of the Slovak People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the 16th anniversary of Slovakia's independence—a date which Slovaks the world over are observing in their hearts and minds—occurs today. It is fitting that we, in America, pause and reflect on the present plight of Slovaks in their homeland and send a word of encouragement to them to keep alive their yearning for independence and freedom.

Slovakia has lived through many infamous partitions and has endured under the repressive yoke of more than one conqueror through the years. The present illegal occupation of this nation—no matter how severe, inhuman, and diabolically anti-Christ we know it to be—cannot snuff out forever the great national spirit of the Slovak people.

From the early 6th century to this very moment, history has recorded the glorious story of this heroic and principled nation. The integrity and courage of the people of Slovakia shall win for them, in time, that independent existence now denied them. May their stanch hearts live for the day when their beloved nation joins, again, the free nations of the world.

Walter Winchell's American Broadcasting Co. Simulcast of March 13, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the opening statement I made on Walter Winchell's American Broadcasting Co. simulcast in New York at 9 p. m., Sunday, March 13, 1955, together with the questions I asked Mr. Winchell about his stock market references.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART ON WALTER WINCHELL'S SIMULCAST IN NEW YORK CITY OVER ABC NETWORK AT 9 P. M., MARCH 13, 1955

Mr. Winchell, at your invitation, I am happy to appear on your program tonight.

I accepted your invitation because you said you would be willing to answer any questions I chose to ask.

There are several questions I will ask you which are intended to bring out the facts for your listening audience with respect to reference to stocks you made in previous broadcasts.

However, in the event time does not permit you to answer on this program all the questions I have here, I will release the unanswered questions to the press and you may answer them later.

QUESTIONS BY SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART TO WALTER WINCHELL'S SIMULCAST, NEW YORK, MARCH 13, 1955

1. Why should you, or any radio or television commentator, ever refer to a stock as a bad or good investment?

2. How many specific stocks have you mentioned on your broadcasts or telecasts?

3. Have you or any member of your family ever been paid, or received anything of value for mentioning any of these stocks?

4. Have you ever recommended to your listeners that they either purchase or sell any particular stock or stocks?

5. What stocks have you or the members of your family purchased in the last 2 years, and did you purchase any of the stocks you mentioned on the air?

6. Did you ever suggest or infer to your listeners that a specific stock would go up or down?

7. Has any officer, director, employee, or stockholder of any corporation ever asked you to mention, or plug, any stock in which they were interested?

8. Has any individual ever given you any stock tips, either orally or in writing?

9. Has any statement about a stock that you ever made turned out to be false?

10. If asked, would you go to Washington and answer these questions under oath, and if so, will your answers be the same?

Confiscation by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, for many months now, I have been pressing the International Joint Commission to establish administrative machinery to adjudicate claims arising from the power and navigation projects it has authorized on the United States-Canadian border, particularly those affecting Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

Shorefront residents of Lake Ontario find themselves faced with potentially severe damages if the lake level is raised and maintained at high levels. Yet the causes of these damages may well be diffused among a number of entities, national and international, with the result that litigants seeking redress or protection will find themselves lost in a legal jungle.

Up to this time, the International Joint Commission and the Department of State have insisted that there is ample protection for these individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States and the laws of Canada.

In order to determine whether this is accurate, I recently asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make an analysis of the relevant provisions of the Constitution and statutes.

That analysis has now been completed, and under leave to extend my remarks, I append a copy hereto.

It concludes "categorically" that the "extant treaty, statutory and administrative provisions—affecting shorefront property owners—afford no definitive protection," and that "the constitutional protection is more theoretical than substantive."

In other water resources development projects on the United States-Canadian border, the Commission has recognized the total inadequacy of normal legal procedures and remedies, and has itself assumed responsibility for the establishment of formal administrative machinery to adjudicate claims arising from such projects.

The Library of Congress study confirms, if confirmation is necessary, that such machinery should be established in connection with the St. Lawrence projects if the statutory and constitutional protection of the rights of United States citizens are to be safeguarded. Failure to do this will result in the virtual confiscation of their property by default.

The analysis of their legal remedies under our present laws, made by James P. Radigan, Senior Specialists Division of the Library of Congress, follows:

[The Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, Washington, D. C.]

ANALYSIS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS WHICH EXIST AND CAN BE INVOKED TO PROTECT AND INDEMNIFY RESIDENTS OF NEW YORK LIVING ALONG THE SHORES OF LAKE ONTARIO FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM THE PENDING ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

That there are constitutional, treaty, statutory, and administrative provisions that could conceivably be used, either singly or jointly, as a base upon which to erect a claim for damages resulting from a raising of the level of Lake Ontario in connection with the St. Lawrence development is not denied. These provisions are: Constitutional—the just compensation provision of the 5th amendment and the due-process provision of the 14th amendment of the United States Constitution; treaty—article VIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909; statutory—section 10 (c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C. 803 (c)), Public Law 358, 83d Congress, McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York, book 42, article 5, title I; and administrative—the order of approval issued October 29, 1952, Document 68, by the International Joint Commission and article 19 of the Federal Power Commission's order issued July 15, 1953.

Practically, however, none of these has the solid foundation it appears to have.

I

The constitutional protection afforded by the just compensation provision of the 5th amendment which would be available if the damages of the lakeshore property could be attributed to the activities of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation and the constitutional protection afforded by the due process provision of the 14th amendment which would be available if the damages to the lakeshore property could be attributed to the activities of the Power Authority of the State of New York (the designee of the Government of the United States, under sec. 1 of Executive Order 10500 signed by President Eisenhower on October 4, 1953) would not come into play in either instance unless the damages sustained were found to be in effect the taking of private property for public use. See *U. S.* v. *Lynah* ((1903) 188 U. S. 445); *U. S.* v. *Cress* ((1917) 243 U. S. 316); *U. S.* v. *Dickerson* ((1947) 331 U. S. 745); and *U. S.* v. *Kansas City Insurance Co.* ((1950) 339 U. S. 799).

It is possible and even probable that the damages suffered by these residents would not be considered a taking of private property for public use but would be considered a remote or consequential damage resulting from the exercise of the plenary power of the Government to make improvements in navigation. Such damages create no liability. See *Jackson* v. *U. S.* ((1913) 230 U. S. 1); *U. S.* v. *Chicago M., St. P. and R. Co.* ((1941) 312 U. S. 592).

Admitting for the sake of argument that the increased height of Lake Ontario resulting from the proposed project, in and of itself, is a servitude imposed upon the land for which there may be no just legal or equitable claim for compensation, there is a substantial equitable claim for relief for storm damages which would not be suffered by these residents were it not for the increased water height.

As stated by Melissa E. Bingeman, Fras, in a reprint from the proceedings of the Rochester Academy of Science, December 1953, page 18:

"The question arises: How much is destruction of shores increased by reason of high lake levels? Obviously a 3-foot wave that might be innocuous with the lake at a 245-foot level could be destructive in certain areas with the lake at a 247-foot level. Or, if a wind of a given force raises the cutting edge of a wave 5 feet, from 245 to 250 feet above sea level, then a lesser wind which will raise it 4 feet will raise it from 246 to 250 feet, and a wind which will raise it 3 feet will raise it from 247 to 250 feet. Manifestly, therefore, the higher the level of the lake, the less wind force is required to work damage upon the shore. The significance of this principle lies in the fact that the number of winds increases as their velocity decreases. There are more winds of 60 miles per hour than of 70 miles per hour, more of 50 than of 60, and so on progressively, in this area—which is in the zone of the great westerlies."

Even if liability is conceded, the proof these residents would be required to produce in sustaining their contention would be almost impossible to supply. If we consider the liability as analogous to the liability of a tort feasor, the rule of decision that the last efficient one (in this case the wind) of several successive causes (in this case increased height of water and wind) is regarded as the approximate cause or the rule of decision that where several causes are concurrent, the predominant efficient one (the wind) is regarded as the proximate cause where the damage done by each cannot be distinguished, might foreclose recovery See *Howard Fire Insurance Co.* v. *Norwich & New York Transportation Co.* ((1870) 12 Wall. 194).

II

The treaty protection, if any, emanates from article VIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, the pertinent part of which reads: "The Commission (International Joint Commission, United States and Canada) in its discretion may make its approval in any case conditional upon the construction of remedial or protective works. * * * and * * * may require that suitable and adequate provision * * * be made for the protection and indemnity against injury of any interest on either side of the boundary."

III

The statutory provision afforded stems primarily from section 10 (c) of the Federal Power Act, the pertinent part of which reads "each licensee shall be liable for all damages occasioned to the property of others by construction, maintenance, or operation of the project works pertinent or accessory thereto, constructed under the license, and in no event shall the United States be liable therefor." This provision, as is readily seen, does not create a new liability on the part of the licensee but merely provides that if there is a liability arising from the operation of the project the licensee and not the Federal Government is liable. See *Hope Plantation* v. *South Carolina Public Service Authority* ((1950) 59 S. E. 2d 132).

Granting argumento, that sufficient proof might be furnished to establish liability and to obtain a judgment against the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation or the Power Authority of the State of New York, the problem of collecting might arise. Even though the acts creating government corporations authorize them to sue and be sued, it does not necessarily follow that the property and funds of such corporation are attachable. See *Federal Housing Administration* v. *Burr* ((1940) 309 U. S. 242) and *Inland Waterways Corporation* v. *Young* ((1940) 309 U. S. 517).

IV

The administrative protection, if any, afforded by section (a) of the order of approval of the International Joint Commission which reads: "(a) All interests on either side of the international boundary which are injured by reason of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the works

shall be given suitable and adequate protection and indemnity in accordance with the laws in Canada or the Constitution and laws in the United States, respectively, and in accordance with the requirements of article VIII of the treaty," is nothing more than a notice to the applicants that the Commission expects them to recognize any liability which is found owing by the Court. It certainly does not go as far as the Commission could or as far as is implicitly possible under the provision of the treaty. The administrative protection, if any, afforded by article 19 of the Federal Power Commission license which reads: "ARTICLE 19. In the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of the project covered by this license, the licensee shall comply with all applicable provisions, and requirements of the order of approval (International Joint Commission Docket 68) issued October 29, 1952, by the International Joint Commission to the Governments of the United States and Canada for the construction of certain works for the development of power in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River," is nothing more than a requirement that the licensee comply with the order of approval, which unfortunately does not cover liability for the contemplated damages.

Neither sets up any administrative procedure for determining damages resulting from the development of the St. Lawrence, although such procedure could be set up under the terms of the treaty and the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act.

CONCLUSION

In summary, it may be stated categorically, that the extant treaty, statutory, and administrative provisions afford no definitive protection and that the constitutional protection is more theoretical than substantive. Therefore justice demands that the Governments of the United States and Canada afford these residents practical remedial aid.

Hungarian Freedom Day, March 15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary movements of mid-19th century Europe are probably not as well known as they deserve to be. Those movements, especially the revolution of 1848, are of particular significance in the political evolution of various European peoples toward national freedom. Even though the movement of that year did not result in definitive freedom for subject peoples, yet the seeds of liberty and independence took root firmly in many lands. Hungary was one of them.

The Hungarians were restless under Austrian rule and were clamoring for their ancient liberties. Early in 1848 they saw their chance, and under the leadership of Louis Kossuth they secured a number of political rights. On March 15 of that year they adopted a charter by which freedom of the press was guaranteed, a Hungarian national guard was established, feudal servitude as well as heavy taxes on the peasantry were abolished, and a general tax system was introduced extending to all classes. The Hapsburg Emperor agreed to this charter and appointed a Hungarian ministry responsible to the Hungarian Parliament. The country thus became practically independent.

As we all know those days of virtual independence did not last long. By the middle of the following year the gains registered in the freedom-day charter were lost and the Hungarians once more were brought under a form of government they did not desire.

Ever since 1848 the memory of freedom day has been revered by the Hungarians and they have celebrated it as a national holiday. It is indeed a memorable event in the long history of man's struggle to attain free and democratic government and I am happy to join in its celebration.

Disposal of Synthetic Rubber Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me before the House Armed Services Committee, March 11, 1955:

Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman and to the members of this committee for the opportunity to testify here today on this very important matter. I would not ordinarily presume to take up the time of this great committee if the matter under consideration were not so vital to the small-business community of the country and if I were not a member of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. And lest there be any misapprehension as to why I have been selected to testify on behalf of the committee, let me say it is not because of any particular or even general expertness with the intricate problem you are considering, but rather it is because I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee which has jurisdiction over the supply of raw materials, such as rubber.

I listened to Mr. VINSON'S splendid statement yesterday, in which he so ably recalled the history of the event's leading to the construction of the synthetic rubber plants and of the efforts to effect their disposition. There are very few Members of the House of Representatives who have the vast experience, background, and knowledge of the gentleman from Georgia, not only with respect to matters within the particular sphere of the Committee on Armed Services, but on almost all of the complex problems with which Members of the Congress must deal. It is difficult, therefore, to take issue with him on any subject, and it is with much trepidation that I face the task of having to do so in this complicated field. I am sure that if there is any disagreement between us, it is attributable to the difference in information furnished us or more probably to the unavailability of essential information.

Essentially, it was the lack of necessary information which troubled our committee, and which in great measure led to the action by our chairman, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, in filing the resolution to disapprove the sales. There are many questions which have not yet been answered and which must be answered before we can say that the Commission has complied with the safeguards established by the basic law.

I should like to make it clear at the outset that our committee does not disapprove of the fundamental policy requiring the sale of the rubber facilities. We favor their disposal to private ownership, but under such terms and conditions as will assure the use of the facilities for the continued security of our Nation, the reimbursement of our taxpayers for their investment in the rubber facilities, the protection of all segments of our free enterprise economy, including the small-business men, and resistance to further enhancing the dominating position in their industries of giant corporations who have regarded the antitrust laws of the United States as trifling obstacles in their economic progress. In short, Mr. Chairman, we believe that the guaranties and safeguards established by the criteria set forth in the basic legislation have not been adequately observed by the Rubber Disposal Commission. It is for that reason that we voice our objection to approval of the sales.

The chairman yesterday listed the standards imposed by the law on page 7 of his report. Determination of the question as to whether the disposal of the facilities is consistent with the national security is within the province of this committee and will receive your very capable consideration. There is no need, therefore, for our committee to touch on this point.

And while the attention of our committee technically should not be devoted to the criterion as to whether the full fair value for the facilities has been received, our grave doubt that the sales prices approved by the Commission reflects the fair value of the facilities compels us to ask you to give that matter your particular consideration. Ask yourselves this question: If the companies buying the facilities were the owners and wanted to sell the plants, would they accept for those plants the same price they are offering the Government? We doubt it. We think that rather than checking book value or reproduction cost as good, hardheaded businessmen, the companies would look first to the earnings of the facilities. What is the profit-making potential of the business? What will it earn? As a matter of fact, that is exactly what Congress intended should be done. This was emphasized in the Senate hearings (p. 179–181) and in the report of the Disposal Commission. Presumably, this is what the Commission said it was going to do. On page 15 of their report they say: "A fundamental precept of the disposal program was that the sale of the facilities should return to the Government a price that would truly reflect the value of the facilities as a going industry."

Again, on page 17, the Commission says: "While other standards, such as original cost, replacement cost, depreciated values, and the precedent of previous Government surplus property sales were considered, it was the decision of the Commission that because the disposal program made possible the purchase of a going profitable business, for negotiating purposes potential earning power should be the prime factor in the establishment of an appropriate price. In its earning power studies, the Commission did not give usual weight to the past earnings of the facilities. These plants had been operated as one integrated program. For example, for reasons of economy and efficiency, many costs were averaged and production was scheduled, for program reasons, in a manner different from that a private owner will follow."

Why didn't the Commission discuss earnings? If earnings were the primary basis for the Commission's evaluation of the worth of the facilities, why did not the Commission furnish the Congress with the underlying data showing the earning potential of the facilities, rather than actual and reproduction costs?

Our committee made a special effort to obtain this information and received it only in part. I have attached to my statement

as exhibit A, the Disposal Commission's estimate of the rates of return which the facilities' purchasers can expect, based upon the negotiated sales prices. We do not know what assumptions were taken by the Commission as to volume of production, sales prices of end products, the costs of production and distribution, the amortization of investment for tax purposes, the amount of the Federal income tax, and other factors significant to the estimated rate of return. Moreover, the Commission has not divulged the rate of depreciation which it used in reaching the percentage of return the companies would earn upon their purchase price. Under the new tax law the purchasers have the right to accelerate depreciation. For example, if the Commission used a 20-year depreciation base, it is obvious that the 10.44-percent return to Petroleum Chemicals, Inc., the first company on the list, for the puchase of butadiene plant 706 will be increased substantially if a 10-year depreciation base or even a 5-year depreciation base is used. This is true, as well, of all the purchasers. Furthermore, if the companies increase the selling price of rubber from 23 cents to a competitive position with natural rubber around 30 cents a pound, the number of years for recovering their investment will again be substantially reduced. Mr. Chairman, isn't it optimistic to say the least, to assume as the Commission did that the purchasers will be satisfied to maintain the price of rubber at 23 cents?

Thus, the companies have not only 1 means of leverage to increase their profits, but 2: the depreciation base and the price of rubber. The Commission's reports are singularly silent with respect to the value of the facilities if the purchasers begin to vary these two factors from the levels assumed by the Commission. Mr. Chairman, the data showing such variations are perhaps the most vital and essential facts the Congress needs in order to determine whether the full fair value of the Government's rubber facilities has been received.

There are other questions about full fair value which may properly be asked by this committee for answers by the Commission:

1. Copolymer plant 1056 has the same capacity as copolymer 956; why did 1056 sell for $239,000 less than 956, particularly when the book value of 956 is less than that of 1056 in both gross and net value?

2. Why did copolymer plant 983a sell for $1.5 million less than copolymer plant 983, although both have approximately the same capacity?

3. Why did copolymer plant 127 sell for approximately two-thirds of the sales price of copolymer plant 129, although 127 has approximately 130 percent of the capacity of 129?

4. Why did copolymer plant 1278 sell for approximately two-thirds of the sales price of copolymer plant 129, although 1278 has approximately 200 percent of the capacity of 129. Parenthetically, in this comparison it will be noted that the higher price was paid by one of the big four rubber companies. Was there an agreement between them not to bid on copolymer plant 1278?

5. Why were the initial bids on copolymer plants 129, 983, and 1278 acceptable as full fair value whereas the initial bids for other copolymer plants were considered to be too low? Why did the Commission establish acceptable bids of varying prices without regard to the capacities of the plants?

6. Why did copolymer plant 1278 sell for approximately the same price as copolymer plant 127, although 1278 has 150 percent of the capacity of 127?

7. Why did butadiene plant 1593 sell for approximately 17 percent of the price of butadiene plant 485, although the capacity of 1593 is slightly higher than 485?

8. Did greater competition for butadiene plant 1063 raise the sales price by $9 million over the initial high bid? If so, did lack of competition for other plants depress their sales prices?

9. Why did butyl rubber plants 572 and 1082 sell for exactly the amounts of the initial bids by the only bidder, since the other facility (butadiene plant 485) purchased by this bidder was sold after competition and resulted in a sales price 12 percent higher than the initial bid?

These are questions which in the opinion of the Committee on Small Business should be answered. Answers are not obtainable from the Commission's report.

So much for the question of fair value. Turning now to other criteria of the law with which the Committee on Small Business is more directly concerned, let us consider the safeguards in points 1 and 3 of Chairman VINSON'S statement:

"1. The program had to be designed to best afford small-business enterprises and users, other than the purchaser of a facility, the opportunity to obtain a fair share of the end products of the facilities sold and at fair prices.

"3. The recommended sales must provide for the development within United States of a free, competitive synthetic rubber industry and not permit any person to possess unreasonable control over the manufacture of synthetic rubber or its component materials."

The Commission expresses confidence that a fair share of synthetic rubber will be made available to small business. The report says (p. 14): "First, a large segment of GR–S capacity has been placed in the hands of Shell Chemical Corp. and Phillips Chemical Co., neither of which is a rubber fabricator. Consequently, they have no need for their GR–S output, and must sell to the market generally. Secondly, in each contract of sale for a copolymer plant, the Commission has required of the purchaser a commitment that he will make available to small-business enterprise a certain specified amount of his production."

On its surface, Mr. Chairman, this would appear to be a satisfactory assurance that GR–S would be supplied to small-business enterprises in even greater quantities than under present operation by the Government. The Commission apparently assumes that the total maximum capacity of Shell and Phillips, 152,000 long tons, would, because of the non-rubber-fabricating nature of these companies, be made available to an open market. Add to this the 90,000 long tons to be put on the open market by other prospective purchasers under contract commitments, and one arrives at a figure of 242,000 long tons annually to be sold in an open market under maximum capacity conditions, and presumably available for purchase by small business. The 242,000 long tons is approximately 35 percent of the total annual maximum capacity of 689,000 long tons for all the facilities proposed for sale.

It takes only a brief glance at the facts to cast serious doubt upon the validity of the Commission's conclusions.

The first assumption is that of maximum-capacity operation, on the basis of which 35 percent of GR–S production is to be sold on the open market. What is maximum capacity, Mr. Chairman, and how is it determined? It has been alleged that the theoretical technical rating of several of the plants concerned is unattainable in practice. If this be so, the maximum-capacity concept is to that extent a fictitious measurement device. Moreover, while maximum-capacity production is estimated at 689,000 long tons annually, the plants in question actually produced only about 478,335 long tons during 1954. In estimating the amount to be sold on the open market after sale, is it not therefore more realistic to use 1954 production figures, rather than so-called maximum capacity as a base for calculation? Should we not have reasonably expected the Disposal Commission at the very least to attempt to forecast probable production and demand levels for the near future, rather than resorting to an ideal-type model which could have only theoretical significance to justify its position?

The second assumption of the Commission—that Shell and Phillips, both non-rubber fabricators, will place their entire output on sale in the open market, for purchase by small or large companies—takes on meaning only if viewed in terms of the probable marketing pattern which such open-market sales will produce. Here one can prognosticate, to some extent, on the basis of previous experience. This experience shows that for the California plants proposed to be sold to Shell, there has in the past been a 90–10 division of total production—90 percent of sale to the Big Four fabricators, and 10 percent to other users. A similar situation has prevailed at the facilities to be purchased by Phillips. How, then, can the Commission have us believe that these distribution patterns will not persist after sale is made? And how, given the likelihood that they will persist, can it be said that the full production of these two companies will be placed on an open market?

To complete this phase of the argument, Mr. Chairman, let me share with you what is certainly one of the most curious aspects of this whole question. Let us assume that sale of the plants is to be consummated on March 25. Assume further that production for the next year continues at approximately the level of 1954, that the distribution pattern of the Shell plants is a 90–10 between Big Four and other users, and that Phillips' production is divided 40–60 based on that company's statement that a "major portion" of its production will be made available to small business. It can then be shown, Mr. Chairman, that small business during the coming year, even in the expectation of a competitive situation, will have available for purchase less of the total market than in previous years. This may sound incredible, but if you will follow these calculations the point may become clear.

Under a condition of maximum capacity, there would be approximately 242,000 long tons available to all purchasers in the open market. Of this total, based on present distribution data, about 110,000 tons would be purchased from Shell and Phillips by the Big Four. This would leave a total of 132,000 available for all other users. But these conclusions are based upon operation at maximum capacity, a condition which has rarely existed—if ever—and certainly did not exist during 1954, the year to which the Commission should properly have turned for a realistic appraisal. However, if we take 19 percent of actual capacity during 1954, rather than of the maximum capacity concept of the Commission, we find that there will be available for the use of small-business enterprises only 88,000 tons. Thus we see that the rubber available for purchase by small business under the proposed sale would seem to be approximately a third less than was available during 1954 under Government operation. If these calculations be correct—and they were made on the basis of the Commission's report—small business has indeed cause to fear the proposed sales.

The Commission makes a second basic assumption, which our committee is unwilling to accept. It states that the big oil purchasers will compete with the Big Four rubber purchasers. It says (p. 20) that its plan places "rubber-producing capacity in the hands of nonrubber fabricators—corporations with no captive demand which will have to look to the general market for the sale of their product." It cites both Shell and Phillips as examples. Yet, in the report of the Commission itself on page 158 of the supplement, Shell states that it "has contracts with the Firestone Tire and Rubber Co. and with the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., which provide for the payment of a commission to Shell Oil Co. as compensation

for Shell's assistance in promoting the sale of their products to Shell dealers, commission distributors, and jobbers."

Does not the pattern of manufacture of synthetic rubber and its distribution as an end product under the disposal plan become clear in the light of the above statement by Shell Oil Co.? Shell will manufacture synthetic rubber which will be supplied to both Firestone Tire and Rubber Co. and the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. for manufacture into tires and inner tubes. Shell will then distribute through its retail gas stations and outlets the same Firestone and Goodyear tires. Shell, therefore, will have complete integration from the point of manufacture of styrene to the final point of sale to the consumer. Shell will have a captive demand and a captive market. Firestone and Goodyear, instead of competing with Shell, as is assumed by the Commission, are a part of this integrated unit.

The effect upon small business is twofold: The Shell dealer, commission distributor, and jobber will be policed by Shell to see that they sell no brands in competition to Firestone and Goodyear. For this Shell will receive a promotional fee. This means a squeeze at the point of distribution upon both the small manufacturer of rubber tires and the small distributor whose brands will not be handled. It also means a squeeze upon the so-called independent Shell dealer. If such a dealer were to attempt to exercise his true rights as an independent businessman to receive and sell whatever products he believed would bring him the most security and the best profits, his 1-year lease with Shell would be canceled and he would be driven out of business. Complaints of this nature have been persistent and voluminous before our House Select Committee on Small Business, and are now currently the subject matter of an investigation.

The pattern of integration and monopoly which has led to these complaints will be immeasurably strengthened if the present disposal plan is adopted without providing adequate safeguards to small business.

Under the Commission's program, as is so graphically shown in the case of the Shell Chemical Co., this pattern can be used for many other types of monopolistic and discriminatory practices aimed at the destruction of small business. First of all, the promotional fee which Shell receives from Firestone and Goodyear, is in the nature of a direct discriminatory rebate. With Shell as both the supplier of synthetic rubber and distributor of the tire manufactured from that rubber, the opportunities for such discriminatory rebate and discounts is increased many fold. Secondly, since there is a completely integrated unit from the time of the production of styrene to the distribution of the tire, there is no possibility that factors of free competition will have an effect upon the setting of prices. Instead both the price for, and the production of synthetic rubber and tires, is subject only to the will and whims of Shell, Firestone, and Goodyear.

The situation is strikingly similar to that found to exist by the Department of Justice in the ownership of petroleum pipelines by major oil companies. Independent oil companies by law were of course allowed to use the pipelines to distribute oil to their refineries or retail outlets. But, at the same time, through control of the pipelines, the major oil companies were able to charge exorbitant prices. The effect of such prices was twofold. First the independents were forced to increase their own cost through such high prices and thereby lower their margin of profit to virtually a nonexistent level. At the same time, although the oil company owners of the pipeline paid the same high price for rates, they received back as dividends or income from their ownership not only their own money paid for rates, but also the money paid by the independents. The Department of Justice, branding this practice a system of discriminatory rebates, filed suit. In the case of *United States* v. *Atlantic Refining Company*, the district court entered judgment enjoining the owners of the pipelines from receiving a return in excess of 7 percent of the valuation of the pipeline.

A similar discriminatory practice is possible if not inevitable under the Commission's disposal plan. The small rubber fabricator or user may be said to be free to purchase synthetic rubber from the large integrated companies. But such large integrated companies are likewise free to charge as high a price as they desire. A high price will have no effect upon them since they will receive it back in dividends or income. But the high price may very well drive out of competition those small fabricators and users who today are so desperately trying to survive.

This situation is not confined to Shell. Instead it is a general rule throughout the Disposal Commission's plan. The Commission points with pride, if without facts, to its statement that the Copolymer Corp. is representative of small business which will promote free competition in the rubber industry. Copolymer Corp. consists of Sears Roebuck, Armstrong Rubber Co., Armstrong Rubber & Manufacturing Co., Dayton Rubber Co., Gates Rubber Co., Mansfield Tire & Rubber, Sieberling Rubber Co. The Armstrong Tire & Rubber Co. is owned 50 percent by Sears, Roebuck & Co. and 50 percent by the Armstrong Rubber Co. and is under contract to produce tires for Sears Roebuck. Dayton Rubber Co. is also under contract to produce tires for Sears Roebuck. Thus, again, the Copolymer Corp. brings into one integrated unit the manufacturers of synthetic rubber, the manufacturers of tires made from that synthetic rubber, and the distributor of the tires.

In the past discounts given to and demanded by Sears, Roebuck & Co. have been declared illegal. Under the disposal plan, however, identical discount and rebate practices could be carried on which undoubtedly would be immune from law. It is not only small business but also the consumer who would suffer from such practices.

Similar conditions are found among the participating companies in the American Synthetic Rubber Corp. The great majority of such participating companies are representative of big, not small business; the great majority have a lengthy background of antitrust and FTC violations, as was pointed out by Congressman CELLER yesterday. The great majority under the disposal plan will not only be the manufacturers of synthetic rubber but also the purchasers and distributors of the manufactured product.

There is again the likelihood that these integrated companies may discriminate against their competitors who must purchase the synthetic rubber at high prices and who will not receive back any of that price in the form of income or dividends.

The most naked combination between and integration of the oil distributors and the tire manufacturers are found in the proposed purchases of the copolymer plants by Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Inc., and Texas-United States Chemicals, Inc. Goodrich and Gulf together will manufacture synthetic rubber. The synthetic rubber will then be sold to Goodrich to manufacture tires. Under past contracts, Gulf will distribute the tires for Goodrich to the ultimate consumer at Gulf's service station outlets. Goodrich and Gulf are therefore fully combined and integrated in the manufacture of synthetic rubber to the final point of distribution at the Gulf service station. Gulf will of course allow its dealers to handle only tires approved by Gulf. The vicious price squeeze and discriminatory practices which have already been mentioned in connection with the integration of Shell Chemical Co. through Firestone and Goodyear are readily apparent.

The Commission's disposal program also allows United States Rubber and the Texas Co. to combine as a purchaser. Texas-United States Chemicals, Inc., the purchaser of the copolymer plant at Fort Neches, Tex., is 50 percent owned by the Texas Co., and 50 percent by the United States Rubber. United States Rubber in turn is owned and controlled, together with General Motors, by the Du Pont Corp. The Du Pont Corp. owns the Ethyl Corp. in equal shares with Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey). In the past Standard and Du Pont, through the Ethyl Corp., maintained a system of nationwide price fixing of retail gasoline until stopped, at least temporarily, by the United States Government. The United States Rubber Corp. has in the past, and also still does, sell its tires to all of the Standard companies through the Atlas Supply Co.

Finally and almost unbelievably, the Disposal Commission's plan allows Goodrich, Gulf, the Texas Co., and United States Rubber to combine together to purchase and operate the largest and most efficient Government-owned butadiene plant.

With these sales, the Government is turning over an entire industry to a few select companies. Can we say it will be a free, competitive, synthetic-rubber industry as the law requires? I don't believe so. With such interlocking and integrated patterns it is rather silly to talk about free competition. It is even more ridiculous to talk blandly about the protection of small business. The Commission's report makes crystal clear that no serious study or attention has been given to the problems of small business. One wonders whether by the bestowal of its blessing upon this merger movement the Congress will not participate in the economic demise of many small, now thriving, rubber fabricators. I have attached as exhibit B to this statement the letter I recently received from a small fabricator in Connecticut which reflects his fears about the proposed sales.

The small-business producers need protection in their procurement of rubber was graphically shown in hearings held by the Senate Select Small Business Committee in March and April of 1951. Because of the condition of short supply in that year, and because of an inequitable allocation formula by the United States Government, the plight of the small-rubber-business man became desperate. The chairman of the subcommittee issued a statement, reading in part:

"There are grounds for grave doubt that available supplies of rubber are being allocated equitably among small and large manufacturers of rubber products. I have personal knowledge of several small companies which are on the brink of bankruptcy because they cannot obtain sufficient rubber to operate at a mere break-even point. The larger companies, on the other hand, seem to be experiencing little difficulty in continuing operations. We intend to explore this situation fully."

The hardships suffered by small rubber users in 1951 because of the condition of short supply indicate the difficulties that small business may suffer in the future because of the predicted conditions of the long-range short supply of both natural and synthetic rubber. It is of great importance at this time, therefore, to provide adequate safeguards for the small rubber users in the event our supplies of rubber become scarce. The only protections given under the present disposal program are the general statements by the proposed purchasers that they intend to give small users certain percentages of their total production. Such statements, even if made with the best of intentions, are entirely inadequate. As a matter of simple contract law they provide no effective remedy whatsoever for the small-business man in the event he fails to get his fair share of synthetic rubber in the future. He cannot sue the synthetic-rubber producers and even if he could, he would undoubtedly be out of business before a final

determination was made. He can complain to the Government, but it is open to question whether under the proposed contracts the Government will be able to help him.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me again express my appreciation for your patience and graciousness in listening to my long statement. Obviously, this is a most important matter and deserves our most serious consideration. In determining what we shall do, we are called upon to balance two desirable public policies: the first is that the Federal Government should not engage in this type of business; the second is that while we favor the disposal of such facilities to private ownership, we must be sure that the facilities will be operated under such terms and conditions as will enhance the security of our Nation, will reimburse our taxpayers for their investment, and protect all segments of our free enterprise economy, including small business.

These principles of public policy are not necessarily in conflict with each other. Both are desirable and can be achieved. As a matter of fact, the Disposal Act requires that both be observed. The Commission's plan, however, gives only token observance to the vital safeguards implicit in the second principle.

While it is true that the plan provides for a sale of the Federal Government's rubber facilities, it is equally true that it does so in a way which will not strengthen our free enterprise system but will actually place it in jeopardy. If we approve the proposed sales, we will be hurting our competitive free enterpise system, not helping it—and hurting it irretrievably, I fear.

There must be a better solution than that proposed by the Commission, one which will make possible the effective operation of both principles. Although this matter has been pending for some time there are too many unknowns—the risk is too great to dismiss it by saying: "This is the best we can get; let's take it." It is not the best we can get.

If the sales were not approved pending the determination of a more appropriate proposal, the Nation would not suffer and the industry would not suffer. The Government is now making a profit of $50 million a year from the rubber plants. They are being operated by private enterprise for a fee, for the most part by their prospective purchasers, under what the Commission describes as "a partnership of industry and Government." Nobody would be hurt during the relatively brief period in which another plan could be formulated.

There is much more involved than the sale of a one-half-billion-dollar Government investment. We are dealing with the more pertinent question of protecting the freedom of our entire business community by preventing its economic strangulation through an undesirable concentration of industrial power and wealth. We must keep our free enterprise system free.

Mr. Chairman, the Select Committee on Small Business, for whom I have been designated to make this statement, recommends that this committee report the Patman resolution favorably to the House.

Thank you.

EXHIBIT A

Disposal commission's estimates of return based on proposed sales prices

Plancor No.	Location	Purchaser	Purchase price	Percent return	Amount of return
Butadiene plants:					
706	Lake Charles, La.	Petroleum Chemicals, Inc.	$16,000,000	10.44	$1,670,400
485	Baytown, Tex.	Humble Oil & Refining Co.	8,886,000	7.37	654,898
933	Port Neches, Tex.	Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Inc. / Texas-U. S. Chemical Co.	53,000,000	8.68	4,600,400
1063	Houston, Tex.	Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.	24,187,000	9.47	2,290,508
GR-S plants:					
1278	Louisville, Ky.	American Synthetic Rubber Co.	2,340,000	10.46	245,364
127	Akron, Ohio	Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	2,250,000	14.97	336,825
1056	Lake Charles, La.	do	11,650,000	11.90	1,386,350
983	Port Neches, Tex.	Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Inc.	13,000,000	9.10	1,183,000
126	Akron, Ohio	Goodyear Synthetic Rubber Corp.	2,075,000	14.97	310,627
956	Houston, Tex.	do	11,889,000	10.11	1,201,977
983-A	Port Neches, Tex.	Texas-United States Chemical Co.	11,500,000	10.00	1,150,000
129	Naugatuck, Conn.	United States Rubber Co.	3,200,000	7.67	245,440
Butyl plants:					
572	Baton Rouge, La.	Esso Standard Oil Co.	14,857,000	6.69	993,933
1082	Baytown, Tex.	Humble Oil & Refining Co.	17,500,000	10.77	1,884,750
Integrated plants:					
152 (butadiene), 876 (GR-S)	Baton Rouge, La.	Copolymer Corp.	10,000,000	9.35	935,000
484 (butadiene), 982 (GR-S)	Borger, Tex.	Phillips Chemical Co.	23,625,000	13.16	3,109,050
963 (butadiene), 929 (styrene), 611 (GR-S)	Los Angeles, Calif.	Shell Chemical Corp.	30,000,000	8.76	2,628,000
Total			255,959,000		24,826,519

EXHIBIT B

FAIRFIELD RUBBER CO., INC.,
Norwalk, Conn., March 7, 1955.

Representative SIDNEY YATES,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YATES: I had the pleasure of talking with your Mr. Gibbons this morning and asked him to convey to you my opposition to the sale of the rubber plants to the large rubber manufacturers. The small rubber manufacturer has built his business on the fact that he could purchase his rubber just as cheap as the large manufacturer—for there was a free rubber market for natural rubber and a fixed price to all by the Government for synthetic rubber. Now the several hundred small manufacturers will be at the mercy of a very few large manufacturers.

The small manufacturer must now purchase his rubber in a market where the price is set by his large competitor. If the latter chooses to raise the price of rubber and then take only a profit on the rubber and not on the finished product he forces the little fellow out of business—for the little fellow must necessarily raise his prices when rubber price is raised in order to maintain his profit. But the large manufacturer is making his profit on the rubber and need not raise the price on his finished product.

The fact that 20 percent of the rubber manufactured will be in the hands of other than large rubber manufacturers has little bearing on the matter for this 20 percent would doubtless go along with any raise in rubber price for it would mean more profit to them.

We are utterly opposed to the sale of these plans to rubber manufacturers. Your assistance would be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

FAIRFIELD RUBBER CO., INC.,
GEO W. WINCHESTER, Sr.,
President.

Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia Favors Deepening of Delaware River Channel and Opposes Recommendation That Local Interests Contribute to the Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in the deepening of the Delaware River as an international highway for commerce. However, the opposition to the recommendation that local interests contribute to the cost of deepening the channel is equally great.

As part of my remarks I herewith include a copy of a resolution adopted by the Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia, Inc. This resolution was adopted unanimously by its members at a meeting held on February 28. The association now has 434 members who are actively engaged in international commerce and, therefore, are vitally concerned with the adequacy of shipping. The resolution to which I have referred reads as follows:

In consideration of the importance of the Delaware River as a vital factor in the national security and mainenance of a strong economy, the Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia, Inc. hereby puts itself on record as opposing the recommendation that local interests contribute to the construction and recommended improvements of the channel in the Delaware River between the Philadelphia Naval Base and Newbold Island.